UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 88th CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 110—PART 12

JUNE 29, 1964, TO JULY 21, 1964
(PAGES 15261 TO 16504)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1964

J
11
.R
V.110
PT.12

DEPOSITED BY THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 88th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JUNE 29, 1964

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Matthew 5: 16: *Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father who is in heaven.*

O Thou eternal God, may this Chamber now be unto the Members of Congress a veritable mount of vision, transforming human life from what it is to what it ought to be and can be.

Here may we receive insight and inspiration for the duties and demands of this new day and obtain a radiant revelation of the availability and adequacy of Thy grace which is abundantly sufficient for our many needs.

Grant that we may commit and commend ourselves unreservedly and without mental reservation to the great adventure of building a social order that will be more wonderful and blessed than our fondest hopes.

When we stand at the crossroads, not knowing which way to go, may we hear and heed Thy voice saying unto us, "This is the way; walk ye therein, for he that followeth Me shall not wander in darkness."

Hear us in the name of our blessed Lord who is the Way, the Truth, and the Life. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, June 25, 1964, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 3941. An act to amend section 902 of title 38, United States Code, to eliminate the offset against burial allowances paid by the Veterans' Administration for amounts paid by burial associations;

H.R. 6777. An act to amend section 712 of title 38 of the United States Code to provide for waiver of premiums for certain veterans holding national service life insurance policies who become or have become totally disabled before their 65th birthday; and

H.R. 6920. An act to amend section 715 of title 38, United States Code, to authorize, under certain conditions, the issuance of total disability income provisions for inclusion in national service life insurance policies to provide coverage to age 65.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 2664. An act to amend section 6(o) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act to provide an exemption from induction for the sole surviving son of a family whose father died as a result of military service; and

H.R. 6455. An act to amend subsection (b) of section 512 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (dealing with unrelated business taxable income).

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 10300. An act to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. CANNON, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mrs. SMITH to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 187. An act to authorize establishment of the Fort Union Trading Post National Historic Site, N. Dak. and Mont., and for other purposes;

S. 1790. An act to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended;

S. 2082. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to accept a transfer of certain lands within Everglades National Park, Dade County, Fla., for administration as a part of said park, and for other purposes;

S. 2533. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Manson unit, Chelan division, Chief Joseph Dam project, Washington, and for other purposes; and

S. 2630. An act to amend the act of June 12, 1948 (62 Stat. 382), in order to provide for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Kennewick division extension, Yakima project, Washington, and for other purposes.

COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communications from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

JUNE 26, 1964.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: Pursuant to authority granted on June 25, 1964, the Clerk received from the Secretary of the Senate today the following message:

That the Senate passed H.R. 11375 entitled "An act to provide for the period ending June 30, 1965, a temporary increase in the public debt limit set forth in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act."

Respectfully yours,
RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives.
By: JOHN A. ROBERTS.

JUNE 26, 1964.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: Pursuant to authority granted on June 25, 1964, the Clerk received from the Secretary of the Senate on Friday, June 26, 1964, the following messages:

That the Senate passed H.R. 5514 entitled "An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain public lands in the State of Arizona."

That the Senate passed H.R. 10669 entitled "An act to extend the Renegotiation Act of 1951, and for other purposes."

That the Senate insists on its amendments and asks a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon to the bill (H.R. 11376) entitled "An act to provide a 1-year extension of certain excise-tax rates."

That Mr. BYRD of Virginia, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, and Mr. CARLSON be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

Respectfully yours,
RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives.

JUNE 27, 1964.

The Honorable SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: Pursuant to authority granted on June 25, 1964, the Clerk received from the secretary of the Senate on Saturday, June 27, the following messages:

That the Senate passed H.R. 10000, entitled "An act to extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, and for other purposes.";

That the Senate passed H.R. 11499, entitled "An act to amend section 14(b) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, to extend for 2 years the authority of Federal Reserve banks to purchase U.S. obligations directly from Treasury."; and

That the Senate passed House Joint Resolution 1041, entitled "Joint resolution temporarily extending the program of insured rental housing loans for the elderly in rural areas under title V of the Housing Act of 1949."

Respectfully yours,
RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives.
By: JOHN A. ROBERTS.

HOUSE BILLS ENROLLED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 10669. An act to extend the Renegotiation Act of 1951, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 11375. An act to provide, for the period ending June 30, 1965, a temporary increase in the public debt limit set forth in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to the authority granted him on Thursday, June 25, 1964, he did on June 26, 1964, sign the following enrolled bills of the House:

H.R. 10669. An act to extend the Renegotiation Act of 1951, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 11375. An act to provide, for the period ending June 30, 1965, a temporary increase in the public debt limit set forth in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act.

EXTENSION OF CERTAIN EXCISE-TAX RATES

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 11376), an act to provide a 1-year extension of certain excise-tax rates, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. MILLS, KING of California, BOGGS, BYRNES of Wisconsin, and CURTIS.

PERMISSION TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 11376

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees on the part of the House on H.R. 11376 have until midnight tonight to file a conference report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

TO AUTHORIZE CERTAIN CONSTRUCTION AT MILITARY INSTALLATIONS

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H.R. 10300, an act to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wonder if the gentleman from Georgia could tell us how much the other body increased or decreased the authorization for this purpose?

Mr. VINSON. They reduced the House authorization some $68 million.

Mr. GROSS. That is good news and I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. VINSON, RIVERS of South Carolina, PHILBIN, ARENDS, and NORBLAD.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE, PERMISSION TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce be permitted to sit during general debate this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY, COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Immigration and Nationality of the Committee on the Judiciary be permitted to sit this afternoon during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

IMMIGRATION HEARINGS

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce that tomorrow, June 30, is the last day for Members to testify on pending immigration legislation. Interested Members may file statements after that date, if they wish, in lieu of a personal appearance. All statements by Members will be included in the record of hearings.

Hearings will continue on Wednesday, July 1, to take testimony from the executive agencies. The Honorable Dean Rusk, Secretary of State, will open this phase of our hearings.

CREATION OF A COMMITTEE OF INQUIRY

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a resolution which has as its purpose the creation of a Committee of Inquiry as a standing committee of the House, which will have no legislative jurisdiction. It will consist of seven members. The chairman and at least three other members of the committee will be members of the minority party. The committee may investigate any matter within the legislative jurisdiction or investigative jurisdiction of any committee of the House, and shall report to the House its findings.

The committee shall have power of subpena and take testimony under oath. A committee of this type will forever prevent an investigation from being swept under the rug, so to speak, rather than gather the information which might be derogatory to the administration in power.

Two of the outstanding cases in recent history, involving the administration, were conducted by members of the party not in power at the time. I refer to the Teapot Dome case and the Sherman Adams case. It seems to me that a committee such as proposed in this legislation would be a good wholesome procedure for satisfying the public that a careful, thorough, and intelligent investigation had been made of possible illegal acts by members of the administration or Members of Congress.

Legislatively this idea has historical background in the legislative body of England where, in the House of Commons, a similar committee, chairmaned by a member of the minority party and having as a majority the minority members, has jurisdiction over examining all expenditures. Here we have assigned that function to the General Accounting Office.

I sincerely hope that this idea will receive attention with hearings held by the proper House committee.

ALLEVIATION OF THE COIN SHORTAGE

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I was happy to read in this morning's newspaper that the Treasury Department is going to take various steps to alleviate the coin shortage that is plaguing the Nation at the present time.

I was happy to note that the Treasury plans to continue to purchase metal strip for the blanking of coins in order to break the bottleneck in production that has held up the blanking of these coins. I am happy to say that some of the recent orders for strip have been placed with companies in my district.

There is one point that puzzles me. That is the refusal of the Treasury to permit private industry to actually make the blanks for the coins. Instead of doing this, the Treasury proposes purchasing presses from private industry or from surplus stocks.

There are industries in the country with a long history of experience in this very work, which was suspended at the time of World War II, that have the facilities and the know-how and the capacity to do this work and do it economically. They should be engaged to do this job—at least until the new mint is built.

This is one more step that the Treasury could and should take in order to cope with the very real problem of coin shortage in the United States.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 10433) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1519)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10433) "making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 4, 9, 12, 13, 14, 17, 18, 26, and 27.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 7, 8, 11, 19, 21, 24, 25, 29, 34, 39, and 41; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$95,868,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$40,390,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$52,009,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$29,075,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$27,373,600"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken and proposed by said amendment, insert the following: "one hundred and four"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$67,165,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$10,900,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$18,819,900"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$33,810,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$7,016,200"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 28: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$4,223,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$149,944,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$680,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$31,685,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 33: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken and proposed by said amendment, insert the following: "one hundred and twenty-nine"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$67,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$61,620,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 37: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$8,335,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$665,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 44: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 44, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,525,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 45: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 45, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert the following:

"ALASKA TEMPORARY CLAIMS COMMISSION
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

"For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of section 46 of the Alaska Omnibus Act (73 Stat. 152–153), including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), $33,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 40, 42, 43, and 46.

MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
WINFIELD K. DENTON,
GEORGE MAHON,
WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON,
BEN REIFEL,
Managers on the Part of the House.
CARL HAYDEN,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
ALAN BIBLE,
ROBERT C. BYRD,
GALE W. MCGEE,
KARL E. MUNDT,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at a conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10433) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Public land management

Bureau of Indian Affairs

Amendment No. 1: Appropriates $95,868,500 for education and welfare services instead of $95,200,000 as proposed by the House and $97,578,500 as proposed by the Senate. The increase provided over the House bill consists of an increase of $100,000 for maintenance of law and order on the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation, S. Dak., and $568,500 for assistance to the Blackfeet Reservation, Mont., required as a result of the June 8, 1964 flood.

Amendment No. 2: Appropriates $40,390,000 for resources management instead of $40,178,000 as proposed by the House and $40,490,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase provided over the House bill includes: $200,000 for development of wells and related water facilities and fencing on the Mescalero Indian Reservation, N. Mex., and $12,000 for preparation of a tribal roll for the Turtle Mountain Chippewa Indians.

Amendment No. 3: Appropriates $52,009,000 for construction instead of $46,700,000 as proposed by the House and $55,009,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase provided over the House bill includes: a net decrease of $100,000 in the funds required to fully finance the revised budgeted construction program; $175,000 for a fire station building and water treatment plant at the Flandreau Indian School, S. Dak.; $540,000 for construction of a dormitory at the Wahpeton Indian School, N. Dak., and $4,694,000 to replace facilities destroyed on the Blackfeet Reservation, Mont., by the June 8, 1964 flood. The latter amount includes $1,000,000 for transfer to the Bureau of Reclamation to cover planning costs and contractors' earnings during fiscal year 1965 for the replacement of the Lower Two Medicine Dam.

The effect of the conferees' recommendation is to finance fully the Bureau of Indian Affairs construction program. It is the conferees' expectation that reprograming of these funds for projects other than those presented in regular budget hearings shall be requested only when an unforeseen situation occurs which will result in actual loss or damage if the desired project is delayed until the next appropriation year. The conferees direct that during the next year's budget hearings there be presented statements of accomplishments and savings achieved during the current fiscal year.

Amendment No. 4: Appropriates $17,000,000 for road construction (liquidation of contract authorization) as proposed by the House, instead of $17,210,000 as proposed by the Senate. The amount allowed includes $210,000 for construction and improvement of the South Fork Spur and Bridge and Maverick Springs Road on the Wind River Reservation, Wyo.

The conferees are in agreement that the general administrative expenses of the Bureau to be financed from program funds shall not exceed $1,462,000 for the headquarters and area offices.

National Park Service

Amendment No. 5: Appropriates $29,075,000 for management and protection instead of $29,000,000 as proposed by the House and $29,150,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase allowed over the House bill is for commercial power and telephone service connection charges.

Amendment No. 6: Appropriates $27,373,600 for construction instead of $23,800,000 as proposed by the House and $28,049,125 as proposed by the Senate. The increase allowed over the House bill includes $2,073,600 for restoration of Ford's Theater in Washington, D.C., and $1,500,000 for restoration of Glacier National Park facilities destroyed or damaged by the June 8, 1964 flood. The latter amount includes $1,134,100 for buildings and utilities and $365,900 for minor roads, trails, and bridges. In addition, it is expected that $359,800 will be expended for this latter purpose from funds available under the appropriation "Construction (liquidation of contract authorization)."

Amendments Nos. 7 and 8: Appropriate $4,700,000 for land acquisition at Point Reyes National Seashore, Calif., as proposed by the Senate instead of $3,700,000 as proposed by the House. In addition, $2,300,000 will be available by transfer, making a total of $7,000,000 for land acquisition at Point Reyes National Seashore. The conferees agree that $1,000,000 of the funds available for land acquisition at Minuteman National Historical Park shall be used to acquire lands at Cape Cod National Seashore.

Amendment No. 9: Appropriates $29,000,000 for construction (liquidation of contract authorization) as proposed by the House instead of $29,122,500 as proposed by the Senate. Of the amount provided, $122,500 is for construction of roads and trails in the Jewel Cave National Monument, S. Dak. In addition, $359,800 of the funds provided shall be made available for repair and restoration of minor roads, trails, and bridges destroyed or damaged by the June 8, 1964 flood in Glacier National Park.

Amendments No. 10 and 11: Provide for purchase of 104 passenger motor vehicles instead of 94 as proposed by the House and 115 as proposed by the Senate.

Bureau of Outdoor Recreation

Amendment No. 12: Appropriates $2,700,000 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the House instead of $2,322,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees are aware of efforts now being made to assure that activities of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation do not duplicate or overlap activities of other agencies of the Department of the Interior, and concur in the Senate report language requiring a report on the criteria to be established to eliminate and avoid duplication.

Office of Territories

Amendment No. 13: Appropriates $15,300,000 for administration of territories, including $9,000,000 for rehabilitation of Guam, as proposed by the House, instead of $16,300,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 14: Appropriates $10,000,000 supplemental for administration of territories for rehabilitation of Guam as proposed by the House, instead of $11,464,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Mineral resources

Geological Survey

Amendments No. 15 and 16: Appropriate $67,165,000 for surveys, investigations, and research instead of $65,930,000 as proposed by the House and $67,682,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase provided over the House bill includes: $135,000 for the National Atlas; $100,000 for quality of water studies under the Federal-State program; and $1,000,000 for construction of a Nuclear Research Lab at Denver, Colo.

The amount allowed includes funds for the rehabilitation of the stream gaging stations on the Colorado River at Lees Ferry and at Grand Canyon.

Bureau of Mines

Amendment No. 17: Appropriates $30,100,000 for conservation and development of mineral resources as proposed by the House instead of $30,295,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 18: Appropriates $9,300,000 for health and safety as proposed by the House instead of $9,485,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Office of Coal Research

Amendment No. 19: Appropriates $6,836,000 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of $6,336,000 as proposed by the House. The increase over the House bill is for additional contracting in connection with conversion of lignite to gas.

Fish and Wildlife Service

Bureau of Commercial Fisheries

Amendments Nos. 20 and 21: Appropriate $18,819,900 for management and investigations of resources instead of $17,832,900 as proposed by the House and $19,069,900 as proposed by the Senate. The increase provided over the House bill includes: $87,000 for acquisition of a vessel and additional reservoir research in South Dakota; $50,000 for more adequate management and enforcement of fishing regulations in international waters; $50,000 for initiation of a research program on shell fish processing and utilization at Ketchikan, Alaska; $200,000 for initiation of a research program on North Atlantic lobsters; $200,000 for initiation of a program to survey and research the sea clam; and $400,000 to provide financial assistance, under section 4(b) of Public Law 88–309, to the Great Lakes commercial fishing industry.

Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife

Amendment No. 22: Appropriates $33,810,000 for management and investigations of resources instead of $33,550,000 as proposed by the House and $34,330,000 as proposed by the Senate. The net increase provided over the House bill includes: a decrease of $50,000 for operation and maintenance of the Izembek Wildlife Refuge, Alaska, and increases for the following: establishment of a cooperative fishery unit at the University of Arizona, $40,000; expansion of North Central Reservoir Research, $45,000; fishery management studies, Yellowstone National Park, $50,000; and for operation of a vessel and experimental facilities at the Sandy Hook Marine Laboratory, N.J., $175,000.

Amendment No. 23: Appropriates $7,016,200 for construction instead of $6,074,700 as proposed by the House and $7,275,300 as proposed by the Senate. The increase provided over the House bill includes: $100,000 for the Fish Genetics Research Laboratory, Beulah, Wyo.; and construction at the following National Fish Hatcheries: Natchitoches, La., $175,500; Leetown, W. Va., $180,000; Bozeman, Mont., $183,000; Corning, Ark., $99,000; Carbon Hill, Ala., $36,000; and Springville, Utah, $168,000.

Amendments No. 24 and 25: Provide for the purchase of not to exceed 129 passenger motor vehicles as proposed by the Senate instead of 124 as proposed by the House.

Office of Saline Water

Amendments No. 26 and 27: Appropriate $2,250,000 for construction, operation, and maintenance as proposed by the House instead of $2,300,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Office of the Solicitor

Amendment No. 28: Appropriates $4,223,000 for salaries and expenses instead of $4,173,000 as proposed by the House and $4,230,600 as proposed by the Senate. The increase over the House bill includes $25,000 to update the Federal reclamation laws annotated and $25,000 to establish a Solicitor's Office at Cheyenne, Wyo.

Office of the Secretary

Amendment No. 29: Appropriates $4,110,500 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of $4,065,000 as proposed by the House. The increase provided over the House bill includes $36,500 for the Office of Survey and Review and $9,000 for the Division of Management Research.

TITLE II—RELATED AGENCIES

Department of Agriculture

Forest Service

Amendment No. 30: Appropriates $149,944,000 for forest land management instead of $148,596,000 as proposed by the House and $150,419,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase over the House bill includes: $700,000 for construction of recreation-public use facilities, primarily for repairs in connection with the recent Montana flood; $23,000 for planning a combined regional office and experiment station in Radnor, Pa.; $250,000 for detection and evaluation under insect and disease control; $80,000 for extension of Ouachita National Forest, Okla.; $100,000 for extension of Clark National Forest, Mo.; $95,000 for construction of facilities at Charleston Mountain, Toiyabe National Forest, Nev.; and $100,000 for construction of a visitor information center, Cranberry Glades, Monongahela National Forest, W. Va.

Amendment No. 31: Provides limitation of $680,000 on land acquisition instead of $500,000 as proposed by the House and $730,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 32: Appropriates $31,685,000 for forest research instead of $30,019,000 as proposed by the House and $32,728,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase over the House bill includes: $60,000 for planning the combination regional office and experiment station in Radnor, Pa.; additional staffing at the following: Watershed Management Laboratory, Tempe, Ariz., $180,000; Forestry Sciences Laboratory, Athens, Ga., $150,000; Forestry Sciences Laboratory, Alexandria, La., $200,000; Forestry Service Laboratory, Bottineau, N. Dak., $75,000; Watershed Management Laboratory, Parsons, W. Va., $75,000; and forest products marketing program, Duluth, Minn., $100,000; $100.000 for research on harvesting small-diameter timber, Bozeman, Mont.; $70,000 for research on reduction of production costs for pine gum, Olustee, Fla.; $100,000 for insect and disease research, Gulfport, Miss.; $90,000 for research on maple sugar production, Burlington, Vt.; $125,000 for watershed and range studies, Logan, Utah; $75,000 for research on timber measurement problems, Portland, Oreg.; $150,000 for fixtures and equipment, Lake States Forest Experiment Station, St. Paul, Minn.; and $116,000 for preparation of designs and specifications for research facilities at the following locations: Fort Myers, Fla. ($16,000); Albuquerque, N. Mex. ($50,000); and Carbondale, Ill. ($50,000).

The conferees are in agreement that the funds provided for the forest roads and trails program include provision for not to exceed 25 new permanent positions.

Amendments Nos. 33 and 34: Provide for purchase of not to exceed 129 passenger motor vehicles instead of 114 as proposed by the House and 144 as proposed by the Senate.

Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review

Amendment No. 35: Appropriates $67,500 for salaries and expenses instead of $65,000 as proposed by the House and $70,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

Public Health Service

Amendment No. 36: Appropriates $61,620,000 for Indian health activities instead of $61,500,000 as proposed by the House and $61,935,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase provided over the House bill includes $20,000 for enrollment of qualified students at the Sioux Sanitarium Professional School of Nursing and $100,000 for expansion of the dental program of the Division of Indian Health.

Amendment No. 37: Appropriates $8,335–000 for construction of Indian health facilities instead of $8,000,000 as proposed by the House and $10,385,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase provided over the House bill includes $85,000 for planning a new hospital at Belcourt, N. Dak., and $250,000 for replacement and rehabilitation of Indian sanitation facilities destroyed during the June 8, 1964, Montana flood.

National Capital Planning Commission

Amendment No. 38: Appropriates $665,000 for salaries and expenses instead of $650,000 as proposed by the House and $725,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 39: Appropriates $550,000 for land acquisition, National Capital Park, Parkway, and Playground System as proposed by the Senate instead of $500,000 as proposed by the House. The increase over the House bill is for the purpose of making relocation payments to present occupants of the land to be purchased for the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts.

Amendment No. 40: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 41: Appropriates $2,175,000 for land acquisition, John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts as proposed by the Senate instead of $2,000,000 as proposed by the House. The increase over the House bill is for the purpose of making relocation payments to present occupants of the land to be purchased for the Center.

Amendment No. 42: Reported in disagreement.

Smithsonian Institution

Amendment No. 43: Reported in disagreement. The House conferees will offer an amendment to concur in the Senate amendment with clarifying language providing that gifts, bequests and devises of money, securities, and other property received by the Board of Trustees for the benefit of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts prior to July 1, 1965, may be used for matching the appropriation in the bill for construction of the Center providing such matching funds are available or have been used for expenditures directly incident to the planning, contracting, and construction of the Center. The conferees are in agreement that funds expended for fundraising purposes are not eligible for inclusion in the matching requirements.

Amendment No. 44: Appropriates $1,525,000 for construction and improvements, National Zoological Park, instead of $1,275,000 as proposed by the House and $1,776,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Alaska Temporary Claims Commission

Amendment No. 45: Appropriates $33,000 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the Senate.

Commission on the Status of Puerto Rico

Amendment No. 46: Reported in disagreement. The conferees will offer a motion to concur in the Senate amendment appropriating $250,000 for salaries and expenses.

MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
WINFIELD K. DENTON,
GEORGE MAHON,
WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON,
BEN REIFEL,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, in addition to the information contained in the statement of the managers on the part of the House, I wish to make this additional statement regarding the conference report:

The conference total is $1,028,277,200.

The conference report compared with:

Appropriations, 1964	+$17, 247, 700
Budget estimates, 1965	−7, 683, 800
House bill	+19, 101, 600
Senate bill	−14, 159, 225

In addition, the bill carries a borrowing authorization for the helium program of $14 million, a reduction of $6 million in the budget estimate.

The bill includes $7,012,500 of the funds added by the Senate for emergency assistance and repair of facilities required for the Blackfeet Reservation and Glacier National Park as a result of the June 8, 1964, flood in Montana. Excluding this essential provision of emergency funds for the Montana flood situation the comparative figures are:

Conference total $1,021,264,700, compared with:

Appropriations, 1964	+$10, 235, 200
Budget estimate	−14, 696, 300
House bill	+12, 089, 100
Senate bill	−14, 159, 225

In reference to the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, the entire legislative history clearly indicates that the superstructure, which is estimated to cost $31 million, is to be financed half by the Federal appropriation of not to exceed $15,500,000, which is appropriated in the bill, and half by private contributions. Therefore, at least $15,500,000 in private funds must be available for actual expenditure for costs directly incident to the planning, contracting, and construction of the Center. The conferees have amended the Senate language to make this abundantly clear and to exclude contributed funds expended for fundraising purposes, and other costs not included in the $31 million construction cost, from the funds that may be used to meet the matching requirements of section 8 of Public Law 88–260. I also want to reiterate the statement included in our House Report No. 1237 on the bill that our committee expects that any funds, in addition to the $2,500,000 carried in the bill, that might be required to complete the land acquisition program will be financed from donated funds.

The committee also wishes to reiterate the statement in its report that it highly endorses the current efforts of the agencies to limit the number of additional personnel requests. In this connection the conferees agreed to limit the additional permanent positions for the forest roads and trails program to 3,671, or 25 less than the Senate bill allowance.

The bill does not include the $50,000 proposed by the Senate to initiate the acquisition of 550,000 acres of land to extend the extension of the Monongahela National Forest, W. Va. The House conferees felt that this project should more appropriately be considered in connection with the pending authorization bill for Appalachia.

Within the amount provided for construction under the National Park Service, the conferees approved $133,000 for buildings and utilities at Jewel Cave National Monument, S. Dak.

Summary tabulation, Interior Department appropriation bill, 1965

Item	Budget estimates	Passed House	Passed Senate	Conference action	Conference action compared with—		
					Budget estimate	House	Senate
Title I—Department of the Interior:							
Public land management	$425,113,000	$409,294,000	$428,111,125	$420,132,100	−$4,980,900	+$10,838,100	−$7,979,025
Mineral resources	118,286,000	114,586,000	117,218,000	116,321,000	−1,965,000	+1,735,000	−897,000
Fish and wildlife	74,524,000	73,021,600	76,239,200	75,210,100	+686,100	+2,188,500	−1,029,100
Office of Saline Water	12,950,000	12,250,000	12,300,000	12,250,000	−700,000		−50,000
Office of the Solicitor	4,173,000	4,173,000	4,230,600	4,223,000	+50,000	+50,000	−7,600
Office of the Secretary	4,125,000	4,065,000	4,110,500	4,110,500	−14,500	+45,500	
Total, definite appropriations	639,171,000	617,389,600	642,209,425	632,246,700	−6,924,300	+14,857,100	−9,962,725
Total, appropriation of receipts	12,215,000	14,340,000	14,340,000	14,340,000	+2,125,000		
Total, borrowing authority	20,000,000	14,000,000	14,000,000	14,000,000	−6,000,000		
Total, title I—Interior	671,386,000	645,729,600	670,549,425	660,586,700	−10,799,300	+14,857,100	−9,962,725
Title II—Related agencies:							
Department of Agriculture, Forest Service:							
Definite appropriations	269,968,000	267,020,000	271,552,000	270,034,000	+66,000	+3,014,000	−1,518,000
Appropriation of receipts	770,000	770,000	770,000	770,000			
Total, Forest Service	270,738,000	267,790,000	272,322,000	270,804,000	+66,000	+3,014,000	−1,518,000
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review	70,000	65,000	70,000	67,500	−2,500	+2,500	−2,500
Commission of Fine Arts	161,000	120,000	120,000	120,000	−41,000		
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Public Health Service, Indian health activities	70,219,000	69,500,000	72,320,000	69,955,000	−264,000	+455,000	−2,365,000
Indian Claims Commission	313,000	310,000	310,000	310,000	−3,000		
National Capital Planning Commission	4,074,000	3,150,000	3,450,000	3,390,000	−684,000	+ 240,000	−60,000
Smithsonian Institution	36,581,000	36,286,000	36,787,000	36,536,000	−45,000	+250,000	−251,000
Civil War Centennial Commission	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000			
National Capital Transportation Agency	500,000	[1] (500,000)	[1] (500,000)	[1] (500,000)	−500,000		
Corregidor-Bataan Memorial Commission	1,536,000	125,000	125,000	125,000	−1,411,000		
Alaska Temporary Claims Commission	33,000		33,000	33,000		+33,000	
Commission on the Status of Puerto Rico	250,000		250,000	250,000		+250,000	
Total, definite appropriation	383,805,000	376,676,000	385,117,000	380,920,500	−2,884,500	+4,244,500	−4,196,500
Total, appropriation of receipts	770,000	770,000	770,000	770,000			
Total title II—Related agencies	384,575,000	377,446,000	385,887,000	381,690,500	−2,884,500	+4,244,500	−4,196,500
Grand total:							
Definite appropriations	1,022,976,000	994,065,600	1,027,326,425	1,013,167,200	−9,808,800	+19,101,600	−14,159,225
Appropriation of receipts	12,985,000	15,110,000	15,110,000	15,110,000	+2,125,000		
Borrowing authority	20,000,000	14,000,000	14,000,000	14,000,000	−6,000,000		
Total	1,055,961,000	1,023,175,600	1,056,436,425	1,042,277,200	−13,683,800	+19,101,600	−14,159,225

[1] To be derived by transfer from unobligated balances available under "Land acquisition and construction."

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENTON. I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, while in conference we do not always get what we want, I think the conference report we have brought in is a very fair adjustment of the differences between the House and the Senate. As the chairman said, it is $7,683,800 below the budget and $14,696,300 below the budget if you take out the funds for emergency assistance and repairs of facilities due to the Montana flood. I think the figures are proper. As I said, I believe this is a very good settlement of the differences, and that the House has come out of conference with a good bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENTON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. With respect to the Cultural Center, how much more was put in this bill than the House authorized?

Mr. DENTON. Only $225,000 for relocation payments to present occupants of land to be purchased for the John F. Kennedy Center.

These tenants may be reimbursed up to $25,000 per tenant, the same as the amount provided in title I of the Housing Act of 1949 and the regulations issued thereunder.

Mr. GROSS. Amendment No. 41 appropriates $2,175,000 for land instead of the $2 million authorized by the House, an increase of $175,000. The information we previously had was that the cost of relocation was to be $300,000. This does not seem to square with what we have been reading in the papers. Where do they get the rest of the money?

Mr. DENTON. I do not know what is in the newspapers, but there is provision for these payments under the two land acquisition appropriation items, one for $50,000 and one for $175,000.

Mr. GROSS. Is there anything retained in this legislation with respect to restricting language that appropriations shall not be made until and unless public subscriptions reach a certain amount.

Mr. DENTON. Yes. We insisted on amending the Senate language to make clear that the cost of promotion must be borne by the trustees of the John F. Kennedy Center out of private funds and these expenses cannot be counted in meeting the matching requirement of the law. To be used for matching, the private funds must be available or used for actual expenditure for costs directly incident to the planning, contracting, or construction of the Center. If they raise $15,500,000 and the cost of promotion amounted to $1 million, then the Government would match only $14,500,000. The act also provides the Government appropriation cannot exceed $15,500,000.

Mr. GROSS. I would hope so. We have gone far overboard on this now. Will the gentleman tell me or can he give us some estimate as to the present amount of public subscriptions?

Mr. DENTON. I do not know what the latest figure is.

Mr. GROSS. You do not know how much they have gotten by putting on the pressure, arm twisting, and extracting money from Federal employees?

Mr. DENTON. I do not know the exact figure covering both cash and pledges.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENTON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALEY. May I inquire as to amendment No. 2 which provides an increase over what the House bill passed of $200,000 for the development of wells and related water facilities and fencing on the Mescalero Indian Reservation in New Mexico. Is this an item which was in the House bill or is this a new item?

Mr. DENTON. That was put in by the Senate. They added $300,000 but we agreed to only $200,000.

Mr. HALEY. This item was not in the House bill?

Mr. DENTON. This was not in the House bill.

Mr. HALEY. It seems to me that an item of fencing on this reservation is not quite a proper item for the Federal Government to be paying. If they need fences down there, there are ways of getting them.

Now with reference to amendment No. 3—$1 million is included for the transfer to the Bureau of Reclamation to cover planting costs and contractors' earnings during fiscal year 1965 for the replacement of the Lower Two Medicine Dam.

Will the gentleman explain that item?

Mr. DENTON. That is for replacement of the dam that was destroyed by a flood. It was essential for water supply for the Blackfeet Reservation.

Mr. HALEY. I hope that in the replacement of this dam, and I think it should be replaced, but I hope we are not authorizing this million dollars and getting ourselves into another Seneca Reservation deal in building a reservoir or increasing the capacity of the dam.

Can the gentleman tell me whether this is merely to replace the dam?

Mr. DENTON. This is for replacement to meet the reservation's requirements for irrigation water.

Mr. HALEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 40. Page 37, line 11, after the word "available" insert: "*Provided*, That of such amount $50,000 shall be available only for the purpose of making relocation payments comparable to those provided for in title I of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1450–1464)."

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Denton moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 42: Page 37, line 23: "*Provided*, That of such amount $175,000 shall be available only for the purpose of making relocation payments comparable to those provided for in title I of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1450–1464)."

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Denton moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 43: Page 39, line 11: "received by the Board for the benefit of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts prior to July 1, 1965."

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Denton moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 43 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter striken and proposed by said amendment insert: "received by the Board for the benefit of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts prior to July 1, 1965, and available or used for expenditures directly incident to the planning, contracting, and construction of the Center:"

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 46: Page 42, line 13:

"Commission on the Status of Puerto Rico

"salaries and expenses

"For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of Public Law 88–271, approved February 20, 1964, $250,000, to be immediately available and to remain available until June 30, 1966."

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Denton moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

"In lieu of the matter proposed insert:

"Commission on the Status of Puerto Rico

"salaries and expenses

"For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of Public Law 88–271, approved February 20, 1964, $250,000, to remain available until June 30, 1966."

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include tables.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

TO PROVIDE FOR THE FREE ENTRY OF ONE MASS SPECTROMETER FOR THE USE OF OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY AND ONE MASS SPECTROMETER FOR THE USE OF WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 4364) to provide for the free entry of one mass spectrometer for the use of Oregon State University and one mass spectrometer for the use of Wayne State University, together with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments and request a conference with the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to inquire of the gentleman from Arkansas, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, if this is a bill on which there is a provision coming back from the Senate to refund duty imposed upon Italian-quarried and Italian-manufactured marble for a structure in one of the States at one of its universities?

Mr. MILLS. There was an amendment adopted by the Senate to the bill with respect to stone imported for use in the construction of the Sheldon Memorial Art Gallery located at the University of Nebraska in Lincoln, Nebr. I assume this is the amendment to which the gentleman refers.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, this is not the first instance in which we have had foreign-quarried marble and foreign-manufactured or fabricated marble come into this country under the belief it would be duty free. It is my understanding that when this particular order or shipment of marble came in it was believed to be coming in duty free. It has been discovered that is not the case. Now an effort is being made to refund the duty.

We feel that if this is allowed to pass and become a part of the act it will create a precedent, then permitting all foreign-quarried and foreign-manufactured or fabricated stone to come into this country duty free.

I would express the hope to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Mills] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Byrnes], that if this amendment from the Senate is sent to conference, they would do whatever possible to keep such a precedent from developing so that our domestic stone producers and so that our wage earners in the stone industry could be protected from such unjust and unfair competition.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANDRUM. Yes. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MILLS. Without making any possible commitment as to what I or anyone else who might be a conferee on this matter would take as his position in conference, permit me to say to my friend from Georgia that it does occur to me that it is possible that this particular amendment might be accepted and become law without establishing any precedent for any such action in the future. I say that for this reason: It was thought, as the gentleman from Georgia pointed out, that this particular stone or marble was subject to a certain rate of duty at the time the arrangements were made to purchase it. This was based on advice of the local customs appraiser. The Bureau of Customs later held it was subject to duty at a different rate. Now, all those who would import this particular marble or stone in the future would be on notice that the law does require the payment of the rate of duty proclaimed by the Bureau. This is the information which has been brought to my attention.

Mr. LANDRUM. Would that be so notwithstanding the provisions of this act should it be finally enacted into law?

Mr. MILLS. The duty was raised by the Bureau of Customs, as the gentleman from Georgia knows. However, let me say this: I would have the same feeling that my friend from Georgia has; certainly I would not want us by this particular action, if we should accept the amendment, to be setting a precedent for anyone and everybody who imports like stone or marble from abroad to get the same treatment. I think there is a definite distinction that can be made between giving these particular people the relief they request and denying it to those who would import like stone in the future.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. Stafford].

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I want to be associated with the remarks of the gentleman from Georgia. Also, I am hoping nothing would occur, should this Senate amendment be adopted, which would establish it as a precedent for the admission of marble or any other stone to this country duty free in the future.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANDRUM. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BRAY. I also want to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Georgia. This situation is getting rather serious. I, by no means, want this exception to be taken as a rule in the future. For instance, a very short time ago—and I guess it is still going on—millions of dollars of travertine stone was brought in from Italy. It was mined and fabricated there and brought into, of all places, Lincoln Center, New York. That is not the point here, but it is something we must keep ourselves aware of for American industry and American labor. I regret to see this exception being made here. As long as it is not the rule, perhaps these remarks on the floor will at least let them know it is not the intention of this body that this exception should become the rule.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I thank the gentleman, and I express the hope to the prospective conferees from the House on this that if this is finally agreed to, it be made very clear in the conference report that there is to be no precedent established and that marble or stone quarried or fabricated in foreign countries in the future shall be subject to the duties imposed as they would be imposed under any other circumstances.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANDRUM. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, if I should be appointed a conferee on this matter, I would not want this RECORD to reflect the feeling or thought on my part that I am accepting this amendment before it ever gets to conference. First of all, the Senate would have to justify this amendment to the House conferees in order to get us to take it. If we assume, though, for this purpose that they can justify the amendment and the House conferees would decide that they wanted to take it or felt they should, that equity and so on, justifies it, and that it was in the public interest to take it, then certainly I am sure the House conferees would not want this action on the part of the House conferees to be taken as a precedent that everybody else in the future, when the rate is now established and known by everybody who would be importing this stone, would get this same kind of relief. They would not be justified in doing it simply because we are rectifying this situation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from Arkansas why there should be any exception in this case?

Mr. MILLS. This is an amendment that was adopted in the Finance Committee of the other body, offered by one of the distinguished Members of that body, presumably because this gallery is owned by the university, a State university, located on the campus of that university. The Finance Committee report states that:

> It displays a notable collection of American paintings and sculpture in a setting of architectural beauty, exclusively for the cultural and educational use of the public.

Mr. GROSS. Did not the contractor or whoever purchased this stone or marble in Italy know that there was an import duty to be paid?

Mr. MILLS. We are advised that action was taken on the basis of advice from the local customs appraiser.

Mr. GROSS. Why did he not find out?

Mr. MILLS. Well, he could not. The opinion of the appraiser was reversed. The effect of it is that he is being charged now a higher rate of duty as a result of action of the Bureau of Customs, higher than anyone had the idea the duty would be. I say that this could be described as a different situation from any which might arise in the future. They now know what the rate of duty is. But it appears these people were caught under circumstances where the appraiser and everyone else thought that the duty on this particular stone was less than that which the Bureau finally decided.

Mr. GROSS. What does the gentleman mean by an "appraiser" in this case?

Mr. MILLS. There is always an appraiser used by the Customs Service in determining values upon which the duty is levied.

Mr. GROSS. It is not collected at the time the material clears into this country?

Mr. MILLS. Oh, yes; the value is determined and the duty is fixed. Technically this occurs at the time that the article is entered for consumption or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption.

Mr. GROSS. Is not the value determined before it leaves the country of origin?

Mr. MILLS. It is determined as of the time that the article is entered for consumption or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I think we have got to make clear what is being asked here now. The chairman of the committee is only asking that we take this bill to conference because there is a question about this particular amendment. I would hope we would not have any understanding or agreement now until we—that is, the House conferees—find out the merits of the case. This has not been before us. Let us wait until we get the facts and the full information when we go to conference. In other words, I would join my chairman in suggesting that anything here said will not create an assumption or a presumption that the amendment would be accepted. We do appreciate, I think, we are not creating a precedent for the free importation of this kind of material in the future, and that we only make an exception if the exception in equity can be justified.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LANDRUM. And that is all that was intended by the gentleman from Georgia.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. MILLS, KING of California, BOGGS, BYRNES of Wisconsin, and CURTIS.

AUTHORIZING RESERVE OFFICERS TO COMBINE SERVICE

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 2509) to authorize Reserve officers to combine service in more than one Reserve component in computing the 4 years of satisfactory Federal service necessary to qualify for the uniform maintenance allowance.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (b) of section 305 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(b) An officer of a Reserve component is entitled to an additional sum of not to exceed $50 for reimbursement for the purchase of required uniforms and equipment, upon completion of each period after July 9, 1952, of four years service as prescribed in section 1332(a)(2) of title 10, United States Code, performed in an active status in one or more Reserve components and which shall include at least twenty-eight days of active duty: *Provided,* That any period of active duty for a period in excess of ninety days shall be excluded in determining the period of four years required for eligibility under this subsection: *Provided further,* That a person who receives or has heretofore received a uniform reimbursement or allowance as an officer is not entitled to the reimbursement provided in this subsection until the expiration of not less than four years from the date of entitlement to the last reimbursement or allowance: *And provided further,* That until four years after July 9, 1952, an officer may elect to receive the uniform reimbursement not to exceed $50 to which he may be entitled under existing regulations issued pursuant to section 302 of the Naval Reserve Act of 1938, as amended, or section 11 of the Act of August 4, 1942, as amended. This subsection does not apply to officers of the Army without component or of the Air Force without component."

With the following committee amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and substitute in place thereof the following: That section 416(a) of title 37, United States Code is amended—

(1) by striking out the words "in a reserve component" and inserting the words "in one or more reserve components" in place thereof; and

(2) by striking out the figure "1332" and inserting the figure "1332(a)(2)" in place thereof.

SEC. 2. The amendments made by this Act do not entitle an officer to an allowance for any four-year period of service completed prior to the effective date of this Act.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SELL OIL FROM NAVAL PETROLEUM RESERVE NO. 4, ALASKA

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 6299) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy, to produce and sell crude oil from the Umiat Field, Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 4, for the purpose of making local fuel available for use in connection with the drilling, mechanical, and heating operations of those involved in oil and gas exploration and development work in the nearby areas outside Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 4, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I believe we need some explanation of this bill. It may have widespread effects.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I would be very glad to explain the proposal.

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, up in the Arctic Slope there is an oil reserve which is known as Naval Reserve No. 4. It contains 23 million acres of land. In 1945 the Umiat Field consisting of 6,000 acres was found by the Seabees. Thereafter, we drilled about 8 wells and capped them. Outside of this 23 million acres, private companies are exploring for oil. In order to operate their equipment, cook their food, and heat their shacks, they have to have oil. Oil which costs 15 cents a gallon at Anchorage, Alaska, cost from 93 cents to $1.30 a gallon up in the Arctic Slope. A barrel of oil which sells for $3 in Anchorage costs over $35 up where these people are exploring.

Mr. Speaker, it is proposed that we uncap two of these wells and permit private industry to operate them and obtain oil out of these wells and sell it to these private-capital people, outside of the 23 million acres, for not to exceed 30 cents a gallon. Whichever company returns to the Government the greater part of this 30 cents a gallon from these two oil wells which we uncap will get the contract from the Department of the Navy.

Now, as soon as two private enterprise companies, these private enterprise capital investors, find oil outside the gates of our reserve, we put the caps back on our wells and let them sell to the private drillers.

Now, Mr. Speaker, why do we want to engage in this activity? First, we hope that these private companies will find oil in Alaska. That is good for them and it is good for us. Second, if these private companies do find oil they will find means for bringing the oil out of Alaska; and these same oil transport facilities would be available for Government use should we ever want to move our own oil out of Alaska.

Mr. GROSS. If you uncap these two Government-owned wells, is the oil to be used to further the exploration for oil?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. That is right.

Mr. GROSS. Or, is it to be sold to finance operations?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Not to finance them; only to run their equipment, cook their food, keep them warm, and help them carry on their business, because it is powerfully cold in that country.

Mr. GROSS. I notice some rather peculiar language in your report.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. They have got to put in their own pumps and everything. We just give them the logistic support, and as soon as two of the private companies find oil, we close out our wells. That is all it does.

Mr. GROSS. On page 4 of your report, next to the last paragraph, you state as follows:

> Commercial drilling on nearby lands outside the reserve is understood to be scheduled to begin after the autumn freezeup of 1963.

Mr. GROSS. Do you mean 1964, or what is the meaning of that sentence? The autumn of 1963?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. This came up a year ago.

Mr. GROSS. I do not understand the gentleman.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. My counsel tells me that the bill came to the committee a year ago. The portion of the report you are referring to is a part of the letter from the Department of the Navy reporting on H.R. 6299, and you will note that that letter is dated August 19, 1963.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, until January 1, 1969, the Secretary of the Navy may, under subsection (a) of section 7422 of title 10, United States Code, produce and sell petroleum from the Umiat field, Naval Petroleum Reserve Numbered 4, for the purpose of aiding petroleum exploration and development in the nearby areas outside Naval Petroleum Reserve Numbered 4.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING MILITARY DEPARTMENTS TO SHIP AUTOMOBILES OF ARMED FORCES PERSONNEL TO AND FROM STATE OF ALASKA

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 8676) to amend section 2634 of title 10, United States Code, so as to authorize the military departments, in certain cases, to ship automobiles to and from the State of Alaska by commercial motor carrier via highways and the Alaska ferry system.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 2634 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by—

(1) striking out the word "or" at the end of clause (1);

(2) striking out the period at the end of clause (2) and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and the word "or"; and

(3) adding at the end thereof a new clause as follows:

"(3) in the case of movement to and from Alaska, by commercial motor carrier via highways and the Alaska ferry system or by railroad and trainship between customary ports of embarkation and debarkation, if such means of transport is more economical for the United States than other authorized means."

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, line 5, after the word "system", insert the following: "or by railroad and trainship."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE TO ASSIST THE GIRL SCOUTS AT THEIR 1965 ENCAMPMENT

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 9634) to authorize the Secretary of Defense to lend certain Army, Navy, and Air Force equipment and provide certain services to the Girl Scouts of the United States of America for use at the 1965 International Senior Girl Scouts roundup encampment, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the Secretary of Defense is hereby authorized, under such regulations as he may prescribe, to lend to the Girl Scouts of the United States of America, a corporation created under the Act of March 16, 1950, for the use and accommodation of approximately eleven thousand Girl Scouts and officials who are to attend the International Senior Girl Scouts roundup encampment to be held in July 1965, at Farragut Wildlife Management Area, Idaho, such tents, cots, blankets, commissary equipment, flags, refrigerators, vehicles, and other equipment as may be necessary or useful to the extent that items are in stock and available and their issue will not jeopardize the national defense program.

(b) Such equipment is authorized to be delivered at such time prior to the holding of such encampment, and to be returned at such time after the close of such encampment, as may be agreed upon by the Secretary of Defense and the Girl Scouts of the United States of America. No expense shall be incurred by the United States Government for the delivery and return of such equipment and the Girl Scouts of the United States of America shall pay for the cost of the actual rehabilitation and repair or replacement of such equipment.

(c) The Secretary of Defense, before delivering such property, shall take from the Girl Scouts of the United States of America a good and sufficient bond for the safe return of such property in good order and condition, and the whole without expense to the United States.

Sec. 2. The Secretary of Defense is hereby authorized, under such regulations as he may prescribe, to provide to the Girl Scouts of the United States of America, in support of the encampment referred to in subsection (a) of the first section of this Act, such communication, medical, engineering, protective, and other logistical services as may be necessary or useful to the extent that such services are available and the providing of them will not jeopardize the national defense program.

Sec. 3. Each department of the Federal Government is hereby authorized under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary thereof to assist the Girl Scouts of the United States of America in the carrying out and the fulfillment of the plans for the encampment referred to in subsection (a) of the first section of this Act.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 8, delete the words "International Senior".

On page 2, line 1, after the word "Scouts", insert the word "senior".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended to read as follows: "A bill to authorize the Secretary of Defense to lend certain Army, Navy, and Air Force equipment and provide services to the Girl Scouts of the United States of America for use at the 1965 Girl Scouts Senior Roundup encampment, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RESOLUTION OF APPRECIATION

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, prior to being recognized to call up certain bills listed for today, I ask unanimous consent that I may insert in the RECORD at this point, copy of a resolution of appreciation which was adopted on June 26 with respect to the distinguished services rendered the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation by Mr. Colin F. Stam upon announcement to the committee of his retirement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION OF APPRECIATION

JUNE 26, 1964.

Whereas Mr. Colin F. Stam has given 37 years of distinguished service to this committee; and

Whereas Mr. Colin F. Stam, as chief of staff of this committee, has for a period of 27 years provided this staff with the guidance and direction so essential to the development and operation of a successful staff; and

Whereas Mr. Colin F. Stam has been a loyal, efficient, and devoted public servant; and

Whereas Mr. Colin F. Stam has rendered honorable and dependable service and has filled with credit and distinction the position of high trust and confidence in which he has served for 27 years; and

Whereas Mr. Colin F. Stam has provided the members of this committee, as well as the members of the Committees on Ways and Means and Finance and the Congress, sound counsel and assistance in the formulation of the Federal tax laws in a manner truly reflecting the public interest: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation express to Mr. Colin F. Stam its deep appreciation and sincere gratitude for his distinguished service over the period of 1927 through 1964 to this committee, to the Committee on Ways and Means of the U.S. House of Representatives, to the Committee on Finance of the U.S. Senate, to the Congress of the United States, and to the Nation as a whole.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the bills that may be passed today I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES], the various authors and myself may be permitted to extend our remarks immediately prior to the passage of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

REFUND OF TAXES ON EXPORTATION OF IMPORTED DISTILLED SPIRITS, WINES, AND BEER

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 98) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to exportation of imported distilled spirits, wines, and beer, which was unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 5062 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (26 U.S.C. 5062) be amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection (c) as follows:

"(c) EXPORTATION OF IMPORTED LIQUORS.—

"(1) ALLOWANCE OF TAX.—Upon the exportation of imported distilled spirits, wines, and beer upon which the duties and internal revenue taxes have been paid or determined incident to their importation into the United States, and which have been found after entry to be unmerchantable or not to conform to sample or specifications, and which have been returned to customs custody within six months of their release therefrom, the Secretary or his delegate shall, under such regulations as he shall prescribe, refund, remit, abate, or credit, without interest, to the importer thereof, the full amount of the internal revenue taxes paid or determined with respect to such distilled spirits, wines, or beer.

"(2) DESTRUCTION IN LIEU OF EXPORTATION.—At the option of the importer, such imported distilled spirits, wines, and beer, after return to customs custody, may be destroyed under customs supervision and the importer thereof granted relief in the same manner and to the same extent as provided in this subsection upon exportation."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, after line 15, insert:

"Sec. 2. The amendment made by the first section of this Act shall apply with respect to articles exported or destroyed after the date of the enactment of this Act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, as reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, H.R. 98 provides for the refund or credit of the internal revenue taxes paid or determined with respect to distilled spirits, wines, or beer which have been imported into the United States under certain circumstances.

Most excise taxes are levied on the sale of a product, and if the sale is rescinded, a credit or refund of the excise taxes is available to the manufacturer or importer. Alcoholic beverage taxes, however, generally are imposed when the beverages are produced or imported rather than at the time sold. In the case of domestic distilled spirits, wines, and beer removed from the bonded premises and for commercial reasons returned to these premises or destroyed, present law generally provides for a refunding, crediting, or abatement of the tax. However, there is no comparable provision for crediting or refunding internal revenue taxes in the case of imported alcoholic beverages.

In the case of distilled spirits and wine, it is possible under existing law to achieve this result by an indirect method. This involves the transfer of the distilled spirits or wine to a rectifying plant where they are subjected to a manufacturing process and then removed from the plant in bottles or packages for export. In such a case, the drawback provisions of present law provide for a refund of the tax. This process, however, involves needless extra expense for the importer.

The pending bill, which was introduced by our colleague on the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from New York, the Honorable EUGENE J. KEOGH, would remove this discrimination against imported alcoholic beverages which have been found after entry not to be suitable for certain uses, by providing for refund or credit of the tax, with respect to articles exported or destroyed after date of enactment, where the specified conditions are met. The refund or credit is to be available in the case of imported distilled spirits, wines, and beer where these beverages, first, have been found to be "unmerchantable or not to conform to sample or specifications"; second, have been returned to customs custody within 6 months; and third, have been exported or destroyed under customs supervision.

The Treasury Department has indicated that it has no objection to the enactment of this legislation, which has been reported unanimously by the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 98 amends existing law to provide for a refund or credit of Internal Revenue taxes paid with respect to alcoholic beverages where such beverages have been imported into the United States, and first, they have been found to be unmerchantable or nor to to conform to standards; second, they have been returned to customs custody within 6 months; and third, they have been exported or destroyed in customs custody.

Alcoholic beverage taxes are generally levied at the time the beverages are produced or imported rather than at the time of sale as is the case with most excise taxes. Therefore situations can arise where alcoholic beverage taxes are paid and the beverages never enter the domestic market for sale and subsequent consumption. Where domestic alcoholic beverages are not removed for sale and consumption, the present law generally provides for a refund or credit of the tax. No comparable provision is available with respect to imported alcoholic beverages.

This bill will allow a credit or refund for imported alcoholic beverages similar to that available for domestic beverages. Since such beverages will never enter the domestic market, it is only logical that the taxes be credited or refunded. The bill is prospective in nature applying only to beverages exported or destroyed after date of enactment and in the committee's opinion involves only a negligible loss of revenues to the Treasury. I feel that this particular bill deserves your support.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

USE OF VOLATILE CONCENTRATES IN TREATMENT OF WINE

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 4649) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to authorize the use of certain volatile fruit-flavor concentrates in the cellar treatment of wine, which was unanimously reported favorably by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. Albert). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 5382(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to specifically authorized types of cellar treatment of natural wine) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(9) The Addition.

. "(A) to natural grape or berry wine of the winemaker's own production, of volatile fruit-flavor concentrate produced from the same kind and variety of grape or berry at a plant qualified under section 5511, or

"(B) to natural fruit wine (other than grape or berry) of the winemaker's own production, of volatile fruit-flavor concentrate produced from the same kind of fruit at such a plant,

so long as the proportion of the volatile fruit-flavor concentrate to the wine does not exceed the proportion of the volatile fruit-flavor concentrate to the original juice or must from which it was produced. The transfer of volatile fruit-flavor concentrate from a plant qualified under section 5511 to a bonded wine cellar and its storage and use in such a cellar shall be under such applications and bonds, and under such other requirements, as may be provided in regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate."

Sec. 2. Section 5382 of such Code (relating to cellar treatment of wine) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) Use of Juice or Must From Which Volatile Fruit Flavor Has Been Removed.—For purposes of this part, juice, concentrated juice, or must processed at a plant qualified under section 5511 may be deemed to be pure juice, concentrated juice, or must even though volatile fruit flavor has been removed if, at a plant qualified under section 5511 or at the bonded wine cellar, there is added to such juice, concentrated juice, or must, or (in the case of a bonded wine cellar) to wine of the winemaker's own production made therefrom, either the identical volatile flavor removed or—

"(1) in the case of natural grape or berry wine of the winemaker's own production, an equivalent quantity of volatile fruit-flavor concentrate produced at such a plant and derived from the same kind and variety of grape or berry, or

"(2) in the case of natural fruit wine (other than grape or berry wine) of the winemaker's own production, an equivalent quantity of volatile fruit-flavor concentrate produced at such a plant and derived from the same kind of fruit."

Sec. 3. Paragraph (2) of section 5511 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to establishment and operation of volatile fruit-flavor concentrate plants) is amended to read as follows:

"(2) such concentrate is rendered unfit for use as a beverage before removal from the place of manufacture, or (in the case of a concentrate which does not exceed 24 percent alcohol by volume) such concentrate is transferred to a bonded wine cellar for use in production of natural wine as provided in section 5382; and".

Sec. 4. The amendments made by this Act shall take effect on the first day of the second month which begins more than ten days after the date on which this Act is enacted.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "THE ADDITION." and insert "The addition—".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4649, as reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, would amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit winemakers to take advantage of a technological development in the production of wine which involves removing volatile fruit-flavor concentrates—which impart flavor and aroma to fruits and which are normally lost in the fermentation process—from the juice before the fermentation process and then adding it back to the wine after this fermentation.

The distillate process which enables producers to separate and collect the volatile highly flavored organic constituents of grapes and other fruits was developed by the Department of Agriculture, and is used currently in the production of jellies and jam. However, as is more fully explained in the committee report—House Report No. 1317—under the existing rules and regulations of the Treasury Department pursuant to present law, the process has not proved feasible in the case of wine.

The pending bill, which was introduced by our colleague on the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from California, the Honorable Cecil R. King, not only permits such a method of production in the case of wine, but in addition also makes it clear that this process will not be considered as making the wine an imitation wine. The Committee on Ways and Means sees no reason why winemakers should not be permitted to take advantage of a technological development such as this, and unanimously recommends enactment of this legislation.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, this bill—H.R. 4649—amends section 5282 and related provisions of the Internal Revenue Code to permit the addition of the volatile fruit flavor which is removed from wine in the fermentation process, at a later stage in production, without having to treat the product as an imitation wine. The bill will permit the domestic winemakers to take advantage of technological improvements and will enhance the flavor of our domestic wines. I urge your support of the bill.

RELEASE OF LIABILITY UNDER BONDS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 4844) relating to the release of liability under bonds filed under section 44(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 with respect to certain installment obligations transmitted at death, which was unanimously reported favorably by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 691 of the Internal Revenue Code of

1954 (relating to recipients of income in respect of decedents) is amended by relettering subsection (e) as subsection (f) and by inserting after subsection (d) the following new subsection:

"(e) Installment Obligations Transmitted at Death When Prior Law Applied to Transmission.—

"(1) In general.—Effective with respect to the first taxable year to which the election referred to in paragraph (2) applies and to each taxable year thereafter, subsection (a)(4) shall apply in the case of installment obligations in respect of which section 44(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 (or the corresponding provisions of prior law) did not apply by reason of the filing of the bond referred to in such section or provisions. Subsection (c) of this section shall not apply in respect of any amount included in gross income by reason of this paragraph.

"(2) Election.—Installment obligations referred to in paragraph (1) may, at the election of the taxpayer holding such obligations, be treated as obligations in respect of which subsection (a)(4) applies. An election under this subsection for any taxable year shall be made not later than the time prescribed by law (including extensions thereof) for filing the return for such taxable year. The election shall be made in such manner as the Secretary or his delegate may by regulations prescribe.

"(3) Release of bond.—The liability under any bond filed under section 44(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 (or the corresponding provisions of prior law) in respect of which an election under this subsection applies is hereby released with respect to taxable years to which such election applies."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, this bill provides that gain from installment obligations which were transferred to a taxpayer from a decedent in taxable years to which the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 applied—generally, years beginning before January 1, 1954—but with respect to which installment payments are still being made, may be reported by the recipient on a pro rata basis as he receives installment payments without the necessity of maintaining a bond with the Internal Revenue Service.

Under the Internal Revenue Code of 1939, in the case of the sale of real estate and casual sales of personal property, installment sale contracts at the election of the taxpayer give rise to gain or loss over the period of time over which the installment payments are made, where certain conditions are met. However, under the 1939 code, if an installment obligation is "distributed, transmitted, sold, or otherwise disposed of," any remaining gain or loss not previously reported must be reported at that time, with an exception to this rule being provided in the case of a transmission of property at the time of the death of a decedent if there was filed with the Commissioner of Internal Revenue a bond to guarantee that the recipient of any payment on the installment obligation would report the obligation as income in the same proportion and in the same manner as would the decedent if he had continued to live and received the payment himself.

Under the corresponding provision of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, the necessity of the filing of a bond was removed and the exception provided in the 1939 code with respect to transmissions of such property by a decedent became the general rule without such a requirement. The Internal Revenue Service has held, however, that the 1939 code provisions continue to be applicable with respect to those cases where the transfer took place before the general effective date of the 1954 code but the installment payments in question are received after that date; thus, in some cases, the bonding requirements of the 1939 code are still in effect.

It is the opinion of the Committee on Ways and Means that there would appear to be no reason to continue the bonding requirements in these cases, where the holders of the installment obligations enter into an agreement to have the 1954 code rules apply. Accordingly, H.R. 4844, which was introduced by our colleague, the gentleman from California, the Honorable Edward R. Roybal, would provide that the installment sales rule under the 1954 code—section 691(e)—may, at the election of the taxpayer, apply with respect to such an obligation received from a decedent in lieu of the 1939 code provision in those cases where gain was not reported at the time of the decedent's death but rather a bond was filed assuring that the recipient of the obligation would report the gain on a pro rata basis as the payments on the installment obligation were received. Where this election is made, the bill specifies that the deduction available under the 1954 code in the case of income received from decedents for the estate tax attributable to these income items is not to apply to these installment obligations which, in the absence of this legislation, were governed by the 1939 code rules. The bill also authorizes the release of any bond required under the 1939 code provision in any case where an election has been made under the new subsection provided by this bill.

The Treasury Department has advised that it has no objection to the enactment of this legislation, and that it will have no effect upon revenues other than a saving in administrative costs for the Internal Revenue Service. The Committee on Ways and Means is unanimous in recommending its enactment.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, this bill (H.R. 4844) provides for release of bonds given under the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 with respect to certain installment obligations transmitted at death, providing that the corresponding provisions of the 1954 code be made applicable to such transactions. Under the 1939 code, the taxpayer had the option of continuing to report such obligations on the installment basis, by providing a bond to secure payment of the tax. Under the 1954 code, the installment reporting was made mandatory, and a bond was not required. Collection of the tax will not be jeopardized, and the taxpayers will be saved the cost of maintaining these bonds. Such costs constitute a deductible expense, so that the repeal of this requirement will, in fact, result in some indirect benefit to the Government revenues.

INEQUITIES WITH RESPECT TO TAXATION OF LIFE INSURANCE COMPANIES

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 5739) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to correct certain inequities with respect to the taxation of life insurance companies, which was unanimously reported favorably by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 812(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to rules relating to new companies) is amended by striking out paragraph (2).

Sec. 2. Section 815(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to special rules with respect to distributions to shareholders) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(5) Reduction of policyholders surplus account for certain unused deductions. If—

"(A) an amount added to the policyholders surplus account for any taxable year increased (or created) a loss from operations for such year, and

"(B) any portion of the increase in the loss from operations referred to in subparagraph (A) did not result in a reduction of any tax under section 802 for any taxable year to which such loss was carried.

the policyholders surplus account for the last taxable year to which such loss may be carried shall be reduced by the amount described in subparagraph (B) or, if lesser, the amount in such account as of the close of such taxable year (computed before any subtractions for such taxable year)."

Sec. 3. The amendments made by this Act shall apply with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1962.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That (a) subsection (e) of section 812 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (rules relating to new companies) is amended to read as follows:

"'(e) New Company Defined.—For purposes of this part, a life insurance company is a new company for any taxable year only if such taxable year begins not more than 5 years after the first day on which it (or any predecessor, if section 381(c)(22) applies or would have applied if in effect) was authorized to do business as an insurance company.'

"(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to a loss from operations for taxable years beginning after December 31, 1955; except that, in the case of a nonqualified corporaton as defined in section 812(e)(2)(B) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 as in effect before such amendment—

"(1) a loss from operations for a taxable year beginning in 1956 shall not be an operating loss carryover to the years 1962 and 1963, and there shall be no reduction in the portion of such loss from operations which may be carried to 1964 by reason of an offset with respect to the year 1962 or 1963, and

"(2) a loss from operations for a taxable year beginning in 1957 shall not be an operating loss carryover to the year 1963, and there shall be no reduction in the portion of such loss from operations which may be carried to 1964 and 1965 by reason of an offset with respect to the year 1963.

"Sec. 2. Section 815(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to additions to shareholders surplus account) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: 'reduced (in the case of a taxable year beginning after December 31, 1961) by the amount referred to in clause (i),'.

"Sec. 3. (a) Section 815(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to special rules with respect to distributions to shareholders) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"'(5) REDUCTION OF POLICYHOLDERS SURPLUS ACCOUNT FOR CERTAIN UNUSED REDUCTIONS.—If—

"'(A) an amount added to the policyholders surplus account for any taxable year increased (or created) a loss from operations for such year, and

"'(B) any portion of the increase (or amount created) in the loss from operations referred to in subparagraph (A) did not reduce the life insurance company taxable income for any taxable year to which such loss was carried,

the policyholders surplus account for the last taxable year to which such loss is carried under section 812(b)(2) shall be reduced by the amount described in subparagraph (B) or, if lesser, the amount in such account as of the close of such taxable year (computed before any subtractions for such taxable year).'

"(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1963."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, as is stated in the committee report—House Report No. 1412—on the bill, as reported to the House, H.R. 5739 makes three modifications in the present tax treatment of life insurance companies.

First. It extends the area of application of the 8-year loss carryover, presently available for new life insurance companies only when they are not affiliated with another company—other than a fire or other casualty insurance company. Under the bill, the 8-year carryover is to be available for new life insurance companies without regard to whether they are affiliated with other companies.

Second. The bill corrects an imperfection in present law which permits a double inclusion in the shareholders surplus account with respect to the excess of net long-term capital gains over net short-term capital losses. This double inclusion which is removed by the bill permits the distribution to shareholders of an amount equal to twice this capital gain without the payment of a tax at the time of distribution—with certain other adjustments—under what is called phase 3.

Third. The bill corrects an imperfection in the additions which are required to be made to the policyholders surplus account. At the present time certain deductions, although they create a loss which cannot be used—in full or part—when carried back or forward to the extent permitted by present law, nevertheless are treated as additions to the policyholders surplus account. Since distributions to shareholders made out of the policyholders surplus account result in a tax at the company level at the time of distribution, these deductions at the time of the distribution in effect are restored to the company's tax base even though the taxpayer has previously obtained no tax benefit from them. The pending bill prevents this effect where the taxpayer obtained no tax benefit from the deductions.

The Committee on Ways and Means is unanimous in recommending enactment of H.R. 5739, which was introduced by our colleague on the committee, the gentleman from Florida, the Honorable A. S. Herlong, Jr., and the Treasury Department has indicated that it has no objection to its passage.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the bill (H.R. 5739) contains certain amendments dealing with the taxation of life insurance companies. The 8-year loss carryover deduction, presently granted to qualified new life insurance companies, is extended to other new companies without regard to affiliation. Under existing law, in order to qualify for an 8-year carryover loss deduction, a life insurance company must have become a business within 5 years immediately preceding and cannot be affiliated with any insurance company, other than a casualty company. The bill removes this qualification.

In addition, the bill makes certain technical changes in the accounting provisions of the Life Insurance Company Income Tax Act in order to eliminate certain unintended results in the treatment of capital gains, and to provide additional rules for the "policyholders surplus account."

The bill contains highly technical provisions, which have the approval of the Treasury Department and have been approved by the experts on the staff of the committee. Accordingly, I urge your support of the bill.

REFUNDS OF GASOLINE TAXES TO AERIAL APPLICATORS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 7267) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to authorize partial refunds of gasoline taxes directly to aerial applicators with respect to gasoline used by them in providing services to farmers in farming operations, which was unanimously reported favorably by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. GROSS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, this is limited strictly to farming operations?

Mr. MILLS. Absolutely; the aerial applicator who is putting something on the land.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 6421(e)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to inapplicability of section to gasoline used on farms) is amended by inserting after "in respect of gasoline" the following: "(other than gasoline used by aerial applicators)".

Sec. 2. (a) Clause (i) in section 6420(c)(3)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to meaning of the term "farming purposes") is amended by striking out "shall be treated as the user and ultimate purchaser of such gasoline" and inserting in lieu thereof "shall be treated (subject to subsection (f) of this section) as the user and ultimate purchaser of such gasoline".

(b) Section 6420 of such Code (relating to gasoline used on farms) is further amended by redesignating subsections (f), (g), and (h) as subsections (g), (h), and (i), respectively, and by inserting after subsection (e) the following new subsection:

"(f) Use of Gasoline in Farming Operations by Aerial Applicators.—If the use of gasoline on a farm for farming purposes is by an aerial applicator who was the actual ultimate purchaser thereof, the amount of the payment to which the owner, tenant, or operator of the farm is entitled under subsection (a) with respect to such gasoline (by reason of the treatment provided by clause (i) of subsection (c)(3)(A)) shall be—

"(1) the full amount prescribed by subsection (a) if the aerial applicator has waived in writing (under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate) his right to any payment with respect to such gasoline under section 6421; or

"(2) the difference between the amount prescribed by subsection (a) and the amount of the payment to which the aerial applicator is entitled with respect to such gasoline under section 6421 in any other case."

Sec. 3. The amendments made by this Act shall apply only with respect to gasoline used after June 30, 1963.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That (a) clause (i) in section 6420(c)(3)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to meaning of the term 'farming purposes') is amended by striking out 'shall be treated as the user and ultimate purchaser of such gasoline' and inserting in lieu thereof 'shall be treated (except as provided by subsection (f) of this section) as the user and ultimate purchaser of such gasoline'.

"(b) Section 6420 of such Code (relating to gasoline used on farms) is further amended by redesignating subsections (f), (g), and (h) as subsections (g), (h), and (i), respectively, and by inserting after subsection (e) the following new subsection:

"'(f) Use of Gasoline in Farming Operations by Aerial Applicators.—Clause (i) of subsection (c)(3)(A) shall not apply if—

"'(1) the use of gasoline on a farm for farming purposes is in an aircraft and by an aerial applicator who was the actual ultimate purchaser thereof, and

"'(2) the owner, tenant, or operator of the farm has waived in writing (under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate) his right to any payment under this section with respect to such gasoline.'

"Sec. 2. The amendments made by the first section of this Act shall apply with respect to gasoline used after June 30, 1963."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to authorize refunds of gasoline taxes directly to aerial applicators with respect to gasoline used by them in providing services to farmers in farming operations."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, as reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, the purpose of this bill is to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to authorize refunds of gasoline taxes directly to aerial applicators with respect to gasoline used by them in providing services to farmers in farming operations.

Under present law, a refund of the full 4-cent-a-gallon tax on gasoline is available in the case of gasoline used on farms. However, where work on farms is done by custom operators, the refunds are not available directly to the operators but only through the farmers themselves. For the farmer to claim the refund of the tax on gasoline used by an aerial applicator, it is necessary for the farmer to obtain information on the number of gallons used by the operator on his farm.

It has been brought to the attention of the Committee on Ways and Means that this information is not always readily available for individual farms in the case of operations by aerial applicators, since an applicator may operate over more than one farm as part of one operation. If the information as to the gasoline used on a farm by an aerial applicator is not furnished to the farmer, then no person may claim the refund for such gasoline under the terms of present law.

To meet this problem, the pending bill, which was introduced by our colleague on the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Oregon, the Honorable AL ULLMAN, would amend the applicable provision of the Internal Revenue Code to make the refund available directly to the aerial applicator for the gasoline he uses on a farm for farming purposes, if the aerial applicator is the actual purchaser of the gasoline, with respect to gasoline used after June 30, 1963. To insure that there can be no confusion between the custom operator in this case and the owner, tenant, or operator of the farm, the bill provides that the latter must waive in writing his right to any refund with respect to the gasoline used by the aircraft on his farm. This gives assurance that the farmer will recognize the tax benefit derived by the custom operator in this case and take this into account in terminating the appropriate amount of his payments for the aerial application.

The Committee on Ways and Means is unanimous in recommending enactment of this legislation.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, this bill (H.R. 7267) provides for the refund of gasoline taxes used in providing services to farmers through aerial applications of fertilizer, insecticides, and the like. Such gasoline would be exempt if used by the farmer himself. Accordingly, the bill merely carries out the intent of the exemption from the excise tax of gasoline used by farmers.

SECTION 341 OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 7301) to amend section 341 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954—relating to collapsible corporations—which was unanimously reported favorably by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 341 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to collapsible corporations) is amended by striking out "except as provided in subsection (d)," in subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof "except as provided in subsection (d) or (f)," and by adding after subsection (e) the following new subsection:

"(f) LIMITATION ON APPLICATION OF SECTION IN CASE OF CERTAIN SALES OF STOCK.—

"(1) IN GENERAL. Subsection (a) shall not apply to a sale of stock of a corporation if such corporation consents (in the time and in the manner as the Secretary or his delegate may by regulations prescribe) to have the provisions of paragraph (2) apply.

"(2) CONSENT TO RECOGNITION OF GAIN.—If a subsection (f) asset (as defined in paragraph (5)) is disposed of then, except as provided in paragraph (4), the amount by which—

"(A) in the case of a sale, exchange or involuntary conversion, the amount realized, or

"(B) in the case of any other disposition, the fair market value of such property,

exceeds the adjusted basis of such property shall be treated as gain from the sale or exchange of property. If the adjusted basis of a subsection (f) asset exceeds the amount specified in subparagraph (A) or (B) (whichever is applicable), and such loss would not otherwise be recognized (but for this subsection) then, to the extent of any gains on subsection (f) assets disposed of during the same taxable year (which but for this subsection would not otherwise be recognized), such loss shall be recognized. Such gain (or loss) shall be recognized notwithstanding any other provisions of this subtitle.

"(3) EXCEPTIONS: CERTAIN TAX FREE TRANSACTIONS.—If the basis of a subsection (f) asset in the hands of a transferee is determined by reference to its basis in the hands of the transferor by reason of the application of section 332, 351, 361, 371(a), or 374(a), then the amount of gain taken into account by the transferor under paragraph (2) shall not exceed the amount of gain recognized to the transferor on the transfer of such property (determined without regard to this subsection). This paragraph shall apply only if the transferee—

"(A) is not an organization (other than a cooperative described in section 521) which is exempt from tax imposed by this chapter, and

"(B) consents (in the time and in the manner as the Secretary or his delegate may by regulations prescribe) to have the provisions of paragraph (2) apply to dispositions of subsection (f) assets transferred to it.

"(4) SECTION 1245 GAIN.—To the extent that the disposition of an asset results in the recognition of gain under this section and any other section of this subtitle (which but for such provisions would not otherwise be recognized), the gain shall be treated as arising solely under such other section.

"(5) SUBSECTION (F) ASSET DEFINED.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'subsection (f) asset' means any property of a corporation, other than a capital asset which, as of the date of the sale of stock referred to in paragraph (1), is either owned by the corporation or subject to an option held by the corporation. For purposes of this paragraph only, a capital asset is one defined in section 1221 except that—

"(A) Stock of a collapsible corporation, and

"(B) Land,

shall in no event be treated as a capital asset.

"(6) FIVE-YEAR LIMITATION AS TO SHAREHOLDER.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to the sale of stock of a corporation if, during the five-year period ending on the date of such sale, the shareholder sold 5 percent or more of the value of the outstanding stock of another corporation which consented to the provisions of paragraph (2), and such sale was subject to the provisions of this subsection.

"(7) REGULATIONS.—Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate, a corporation consenting to the application of paragraph (2) shall maintain records adequate to identify subsection (f) assets, and such other records as may be prescribed by regulation.

"(8) CROSS REFERENCE.—

"For the treatment of a sale described in this subsection but which has the effect of the payment of compensation to the seller for services, see section 61(a)(1)."

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

That (a) section 341 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to collapsible corporations) is amended by striking out "except as provided in subsection (d)," in subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof "except as otherwise provided in this section," and by adding after subsection (e) the following new subsection:

"(f) CERTAIN SALES OF STOCK OF CONSENTING CORPORATIONS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a)(1) shall not apply to a sale of stock of a corporation (other than a sale to the issuing corporation) if such corporation (hereinafter in this subsection referred to as 'consenting corporation') consents (at such time and in such manner as the Secretary or his delegate may by regulations prescribe) to have the provisions of paragraph (2) apply. Such consent shall apply with respect to each sale of stock of such corporation made within the 6-month period beginning with the date on which such consent is filed.

"(2) RECOGNITION OF GAIN.—Except as provided in paragraph (3), if a subsection (f) asset (as defined in paragraph (4)) is disposed of at any time by a consenting corporation (or, if paragraph (3) applies, by a transferee corporation), then the amount by which—

"(A) in the case of a sale, exchange, or involuntary conversion, the amount realized, or

"(B) in the case of any other disposition, the fair market value of such asset,

exceeds the adjusted basis of such asset shall be treated as gain from the sale or exchange of such asset. Such gain shall be recognized notwithstanding any other provision of this subtitle, but only to the extent such gain is not recognized under any other provision of this subtitle.

"(3) EXCEPTION FOR CERTAIN TAX-FREE TRANSACTIONS.—If the basis of a subsection (f) asset in the hands of a transferee is determined by reference to its basis in the hands of the transferor by reason of the application of section 332, 351, 361, 371(a), or 374(a), then the amount of gain taken into account by the transferor under paragraph (2) shall not exceed the amount of gain recognized to the transferor on the transfer of such asset (determined without regard to this subsection). This paragraph shall apply only if the transferee—

"(A) is not an organization which is exempt from tax imposed by this chapter, and

"(B) agrees (at such time and in such manner as the Secretary or his delegate may by regulations prescribe) to have the provisions of paragraph (2) apply to any disposition by it of such subsection (f) asset.

"(4) SUBSECTION (f) ASSETS DEFINED.—For purposes of this subsection—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'subsection (f) asset' means any property which, as of the date of any sale of stock referred to in paragraph (1), is not a capital asset and is property owned by, or subject to an option to acquire held by, the consenting corporation. For purposes of this subparagraph, land or any interest in real property (other than a security interest) shall be treated as property which is not a capital asset.

"(B) PROPERTY UNDER CONSTRUCTION.—If manufacture, construction, or production with respect to any property described in subparagraph (A) has commenced before any date of sale described therein, the term 'subsection (f) asset' includes the property resulting from such manufacture, construction, or production.

"(C) SPECIAL RULE FOR LAND.—In the case of land or any interest in real property (other than a security interest) described in subparagraph (A) the term 'subsection (f) asset' includes any improvements resulting from construction with respect to such property if such construction is commenced (by the consenting corporation or by a transferee corporation which has agreed to the application of paragraph (2)) within 2 years after the date of any sale described in subparagraph (A).

"(5) 5-YEAR LIMITATION AS TO SHAREHOLDER.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to the sale of stock of a corporation by a shareholder if, during the 5-year period ending on the date of such sale, such shareholder (or any related person within the meaning of subsection (e)(8)(A)) sold any stock of another consenting corporation within any 6-month period beginning on a date on which a consent was filed under paragraph (1) by such other corporation.

"(6) SPECIAL RULE FOR STOCK OWNERSHIP IN OTHER CORPORATIONS.—If a corporation (hereinafter in this paragraph referred to as 'owning corporation') owns 5 percent or more in value of the outstanding stock of another corporation on the date of any sale of stock of the owning corporation during a 6-month period with respect to which a consent under paragraph (1) was filed by the owning corporation, such consent shall not be valid with respect to such sales unless such other corporation has (within the 6-month period ending on the date of such sale) filed a valid consent under paragraph (1) with respect to sales of its stock. For purposes of applying paragraph (4) to such other corporation, a sale of stock of the owning corporation to which paragraph (1) applies shall be treated as a sale of stock of such other corporation. In the case of a chain of corporations connected by the 5-percent ownership requirements of this paragraph, rules similar to the rules of the two preceding sentences shall be applied.

"(7) ADJUSTMENTS TO BASIS.—The Secretary or his delegate shall prescribe such regulations as he may deem necessary to provide for adjustments to the basis of property to reflect gain recognized under paragraph (2)."

(b)(1) Subsections (b) and (d) of section 301 (relating to amount distributed), and paragraph (3) of section 312(c) (relating to adjustments of earnings and profits), of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 are each amended by striking out "section 311" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 311, under section 341(f),".

(2) Subparagraphs (A) and (B) of section 453(d)(4) of such Code (relating to distribution of installment obligations in certain corporate liquidations) are each amended by inserting "section 341(f) or" before "section 1245(a)".

SEC. 2. The amendments made by this Act shall apply with respect to transactions after the date of the enactment of this Act in taxable years ending after such date.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 7301, as reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, is to amend section 341 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, the "collapsible corporation" provisions of the tax laws, so that they will not apply to the sale of stock in a corporation which consents to a special tax treatment on any later disposition by it of its assets. Under the bill, the corporation must consent to the recognition of gain on dispositions by the corporation of its assets in the same manner as if these assets had been sold for their fair market values. The gain recognized will be ordinary income, if ordinary income would have been recognized on a sale of the assets by the corporation, and will be capital gain if capital gain would have been recognized on such a sale.

In general, a collapsible corporation is a corporation used to enable the shareholders to realize the gain on property owned by the corporation without the recognition of taxable gain to the corporation. Frequently, the gain which would have been recognized to the corporation would have been ordinary income instead of the capital gain normally recognized to shareholders. To prevent this result, present law provides that gain resulting from the sale of stock of a collapsible corporation is treated as ordinary income.

The problem with which the pending bill deals centers around the sale of stock of a corporation that is rapidly growing and expects to continue in business but which holds constructed or produced properties which are worth substantially more than their cost and upon which there has not been substantial realization of the profits to be derived from the properties. The shareholders, through a sale of stock—whether or not through a public offering—would like to capitalize on the future prospects of this growing company. The buyers of the stock clearly intend to have the corporation continue in business. However, on such a stock sale, the corporation might be regarded as fitting precisely into the literal definition of a collapsible corporation if the shareholders intended to sell the stock of the corporation prior to the realization by the corporation of a substantial part of the income to be derived from the constructed or produced property. Moreover, the corporation usually cannot qualify under any of the several existing exceptions, principally because it has not had a substantial prior business history and is growing rapidly.

The pending bill, which was introduced by our colleague on the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from California, the Honorable JAMES B. UTT, meets this problem by providing that the collapsible provisions will not apply to the sale of stock in a corporation which consents to the special type of tax treatment provided in the bill, which has the effect of assuring that ultimately there will be the same tax consequences as if the assets had been sold before the stock. In general, under this treatment, the sale of the corporation's stock is not to be treated as a collapsible sale, if the corporation consents to the recognition of gain by it on every disposition of assets—other than certain capital assets—owned—or held under option—by the corporation on the date of sale. This rule providing recognition of gain would not apply if the assets are transferred in one of the various tax-free transactions in which the cost or other basis carries over to the recipient corporation if that corporation consents to the special tax treatment described above with respect to the assets received, but would apply if the recipient corporation does not so consent or is a tax-exempt organization. The provisions of the bill, effective with respect to transactions after the date of enactment, would not apply to a shareholder who had sold stock of another consenting corporation within the preceding 5 years.

The Treasury Department has indicated it does not object to this legislation, and the Committee on Ways and Means is unanimous in recommending its enactment.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, this bill (H.R. 7301) is intended to avoid certain restrictions on business transactions which inadvertently result from the "collapsible corporation" provisions of the Internal Revenue Code. The collapsible corporation provisions were intended to prevent the avoidance of tax where the stock of the corporation is sold within the prescribed period. In some cases, however, such sales might be made for the purpose of enabling new owners to come into the business and to carry on the business of the corporation. The bill provides that where the corporation waives any tax advantage, which otherwise might follow if exempted from the collapsible corporation provisions, such transactions shall not be treated as the sale of the stock of a collapsible corporation.

The bill is highly technical in nature. It has the approval of the Treasury Department. It was unanimously reported by the committee. I urge its adoption.

APPORTIONMENT OF DEPLETION ALLOWANCE ON CERTAIN CONTRACTS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 7307) to amend the Internal Revenue Codes of 1939 and 1954 with respect to the apportionment of the depletion allowance between parties to contracts for the extraction of minerals or the severance of timber, which was unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS]?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this applies principally to oil?

Mr. MILLS. No, it has no application whatever to oil or gas. It does apply to other minerals.

Mr. GROSS. It applies to other minerals?

Mr. MILLS. Yes, but not to oil or gas.

Mr. GROSS. What is the depletion allowance now; does it vary?

Mr. MILLS. This bill does not change the subjects to which the depletion allowance applies nor does it change the rate of allowance. It does have to do with the apportionment of the depletion allowance which is available under existing law in the case of these extractions of minerals other than gas and oil between parties to contracts. For example the depletion allowance, let us say, may be 10 percent on a particular item under existing laws and it might amount to, let us say, a thousand dollars in such an example. The problem here is the proper apportionment of that depletion allowance among contracting parties. It does not increase nor does it decrease the total amount of the depletion allowance in any way.

Mr. GROSS. Will this have any effect on cement manufacturers and, if so, what would be the effect?

Mr. MILLS. I would not think so, no; unless of course there are cement manufacturers who are parties to a contract covered by the bill for the extraction of minerals—other than oil or gas.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I think it needs to be pointed out that what this bill really does is to limit the depletion allowance to those people who have an actual interest in the property either by way of a lease or an interest in the ownership of the property rather than somebody who might only be extracting the minerals. In other words, the taxpayer has to have a definite interest in the property itself in order to have any allocation of the depletion allowance. So that the bill is a limitation on who can get whatever depletion allowance is provided under the law.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Of course, I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I think it is appropriate to point out at this time that this is a bill which was sponsored by and considered in the committee during the lifetime of our distinguished late colleague, Hon. Howard Baker, and also in which there was a great deal of interest expressed by another former late colleague on the committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Hon. William Green. Mr. Baker's name is still carried on the bill as the author of the bill. He gave a great deal of time and thought to this question of the distribution of the depletion credit among interested parties and more or less developed the idea of this economic interest and its limitation to those who have this economic interest.

Mr. Speaker, I want the RECORD to show that this bill bears the name of our late departed colleague and serves to recall to our attention the great service which for so long a period of time he rendered to the Committee on Ways and Means, to the Congress and to the people of this Nation.

I want the RECORD to likewise show that our late departed colleague, Hon. William Green, served in the Congress and the Committee on Ways and Means with distinction and made great contributions to the public interest.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to observe at this point that I am awaiting the day when President Lyndon Johnson sends a bill up to the Committee on Ways and Means, and applies the pressure that he is becoming notorious for on Members of Congress, to cut the oil-depletion allowance. I am waiting for that day in the history of the Congress when President Johnson submits a bill to cut the 27½-percent oil depletion allowance.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 23(m) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 (relating to the deduction of a depletion allowance) is hereby amended by adding the following sentence at the end of the first paragraph thereof:

"In the case of contracts for the extraction or severance of minerals, oil, gas, other natural deposits, and timber from such property, no part of the deduction shall be apportioned to a contracting party who (1) is neither an owner nor a lessee of the property; (2) is required by the contract to deliver all units extracted or severed to another contracting party, and (3) is paid under the contract a fixed sum for each unit so delivered (the tonnage rate used in computing which sum may vary according to market conditions), payment of which sum is a personal covenant of such other contracting party, enforcible without regard to the amount realized by such other contracting party from the disposition of such units."

SEC. 2. Section 611(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to the deduction of a depletion allowance) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(5) In the case of contracts for the extraction or severance of minerals, oil, gas, other natural deposits, and timber from such property, no part of the deduction shall be apportioned to a contracting party who (1) is neither an owner nor a lessee of the property, (2) is required by the contract to deliver all units extracted or severed to another contracting party, and (3) is paid under the contract a fixed sum for each unit so delivered, payment of which is a personal covenant of such other contracting party, enforcible without regard to the amount realized by such other contracting party from the disposition of such units."

SEC. 3. (a) The amendment made by the first section of this Act shall apply with respect to all taxable years to which the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 applies.

(b) The amendment made by section 2 of this Act shall apply with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1953, and ending after August 16, 1954.

(c) If refund or credit of any overpayment resulting from the application of the amendments made by this Act is prevented on the date of the enactment of this Act, or within one year from such date, by the operation of any law or rule of law (other than section 3760 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 or section 7121 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, relating to closing agreements, and other than section 3761 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 or section 7122 of the Internal Code of 1954, relating to compromises), refund or credit of such overpayment may, nevertheless, be made or allowed if claim therefor is filed within one year from the date of enactment of this Act. No interest shall be paid on any overpayment resulting from the application of the amendments made by this Act.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That section 611(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to special rules for allowance of deduction for depletion) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"'(5) EXTRACTION UNDER CERTAIN CONTRACTS.—In the case of any contract entered into after the 90th day after the date of the enactment of this paragraph for the extraction of any mineral (other than oil or gas), no part of the deduction under this section in respect of the property shall be apportioned to a contracting party who (A) is neither an owner nor a lessee of the property, (B) is required by the contract to deliver all units extracted from the property to another contracting party, and (C) is paid under the contract a fixed sum for each unit so delivered, payment of which is a personal covenant of such other contracting party enforcible without regard to the amount realized by such other contracting party from the disposition of such units.'"

SEC. 2. The amendment made by the first section of this Act shall apply with respect to taxable years ending after the 90th day after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the apportionment of the depletion allowance between parties to certain contracts for the extraction of minerals (other than oil or gas)."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, as reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means, H.R. 7307 would amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the apportionment of the depletion allowance between parties to contracts for the extraction of minerals—other than oil or gas—to provide that a contracting party is not to share in the percentage depletion deduction if: First, he is neither an owner nor lessee of the property; second, he is required by the contract to deliver the minerals extracted to another party; and third, he is paid under the contract a fixed sum per unit delivered which does not vary in accordance with the amount received by the other party upon the disposition of these minerals units.

The difficulties which have arisen in determining in different situations exactly who has an economic interest in a mineral in place for purposes of determining who shares in a percentage depletion deduction are explained in the committee report on this legislation—House Report No. 1516. The bill does not attempt to establish a general rule for determining what constitutes an "economic interest," and is intended to apply only to a contracting party who meets the three conditions set forth above. The new provision is to apply with respect to taxable years ending after the 90th day after the date of enactment of the bill, and only with respect to contracts entered into after that date. No inference is to be drawn from enactment of this legislation with respect to contracts entered into in the past, and no inference should be drawn with respect to a contracting party who does not come under the specific terms of the bill as to whether he has an "economic interest" which would entitle him to share in a percentage depletion deduction.

The Committee on Ways and Means is unanimous in recommending enactment of this legislation.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, this bill was introduced by my colleague, the late Howard H. Baker of Tennessee, to preclude the deduction of the depletion allowance to a contracting operator extracting minerals, who does not have any ownership in the property other than his contract for extraction. The bill was necessitated by certain confusion which has arisen as a result of court decisions in which the depletion allowance has been extended to such contractors. The bill would limit the allowance to actual owners or lessees of the property and to such contractors as have an interest in the mineral as distinguished from those contractors whose contracts merely provide for the extraction of the mineral.

The bill applies to contracts entered into 90 days after its enactment. It provides that no part of the depletion deduction shall be apportioned to a contracting party who, first, is neither an owner nor a lessee of the property; second, is required by the contract to deliver all units extracted or severed to another contracting party; and third, is paid under the contract a fixed sum for each unit so delivered—the tonnage rate used in computing which sum may vary according to market conditions—payment of which sum is a personal covenant of such other contracting party, enforcible without regard to the amount realized by such other contracting party from the disposition of such units. I urge favorable consideration of the bill.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join in the statement of the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS].

H.R. 7307 amends section 611(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to special rules for allowance of deduction for depletion) by adding a new paragraph (5). This new paragraph provides that in the case of contracts for the extraction of minerals other than oil and gas, no part of the depletion deduction shall be apportioned to a contracting party who (A) is neither an owner nor a lessee of the property, (B) is required by the contract to deliver all units extracted or severed from the property to another contracting party, and (C) is paid under the contract a fixed sum for each unit so delivered, payment of which is a personal covenant of such other contracting party enforcible without regard to the amount realized by such other contracting party from the disposition of such units.

Section 611(b)(1) of the code provides in effect that in the case of leases, the depletion deduction shall be equitably apportioned between the lessor and the lessee (including the sublessee, if any). In Parsons against Smith, the Supreme Court dealt with the equitable apportionment provisions of the code. The Court denied any depletion allowance to contractors who extracted coal from the lands of others but did not acquire any interest in the coal in place by purchase or lease from the landowners or the lessees. The Court pointed out that "the purpose of the depletion deduction is to permit the owner of a capital interest in mineral in place to make a tax-free recovery of that depleting capital asset." The decision is perfectly consistent with the terms of sections 611 and 613 of the code, in neither of which the Congress has given any indication of an intention to allow any of the depletion deduction to coal contractors.

H.R. 7307 involves no loss of revenue, since it relates to the apportionment of the depletion allowance and not to the quantity thereof. The enactment of this bill should effect a substantial saving to the Treasury Department and the Department of Justice, in terms of expense now being incurred to litigate cases which would be controlled by H.R. 7307.

I urge passage of this bill.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent because of the interest many Members have in this bill that has just been passed that all Members desiring to do so may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the subject matter of the bill, H.R. 7307.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

DEDUCTIBILITY OF ACCRUED VACATION PAY

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 10467), to continue for a temporary period certain existing rules relating to the deductibility of accrued vacation pay, which was unanimously reported favorably by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may we have a brief explanation?

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 10467 is to continue for an additional 2-year period certain existing rules relating to the deductibility, for tax purposes, of accrued vacation pay. Under the bill, deductions for accrued vacation pay will not be denied for any taxable year ending before January 1, 1967, solely by reason of the fact that the liability for it to a specific person has not been clearly established or that the amount of the liability to each individual is not capable of computation with reasonable accuracy. However, for the corporation to obtain the deduction, the employee must have performed the qualifying service necessary under a plan or policy which provides for vacations with pay to qualified employees and the plan or policy must have been communicated to the employees involved before the beginning of the vacation year.

A full explanation of the operation of the provision is contained in the committee report—House report No. 1514—on the bill. The Treasury Department has indicated that it has no objection to this legislation, and the Committee on Ways and Means is unanimous in recommending its enactment.

Mr. GROSS. Is the gentleman saying that this deals with private corporations?

Mr. MILLS. Entirely.

Mr. GROSS. It does not deal with accrued vacations in the Federal Government?

Mr. MILLS. Absolutely not. It is limited to private industry.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 97 of the Technical Amendments Act of 1958, as amended (26 U.S.C., sec. 162, note), is amended by striking out "January 1, 1965" and inserting in lieu thereof "January 1, 1967,".

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the bill (H.R. 10467) extends for an additional 2 years the suspension of an Internal Revenue ruling which would otherwise preclude the accrual of the employer's liability for vacation pay.

The employee earns vacation pay throughout the employer's taxable year. However, if the vacation occurs after the taxable year, and the employee's rights to a vacation, or payment in lieu thereof, might be terminated if he terminated his employment before the scheduled vacation period, the Internal Revenue ruling would preclude the accrual for tax purposes of the employer's liability for vacation pay.

The problem stems from the retroactive repeal of section 462 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. When we adopted that provision in the 1954 code, prior rulings with respect to vacation pay were modified in order that the accrual would qualify as a deduction under section 462. The retroactive repeal of section 462 left taxpayers without any basis for accruing and deducting vacation pay. Accordingly, the Internal Revenue Service then issued a ruling which precluded such accruals, where subsequent events might defeat the employee's right to the vacation. We have since been postponing the effective date of this ruling.

When the bill was before the House extending the period for accrual of vacation pay for taxable years ending before January 1, 1965, my colleague, the late Howard H. Baker, of Tennessee, said:

> I regret that the Treasury Department has not seen fit at this time, when we are considering a major revision of the tax laws, to propose legislative language which would permanently establish the right of the employer to accrue and deduct vacation pay. It would seem to me that after some 10 years of temporary status, a permanent rule could well have been proposed. This is particularly true since the Treasury supports this bill.
>
> I urge favorable consideration of the bill. However, I hope that further extensions will not be necessary but that in the 2 years provided for by this extension we will bring to the House permanent legislation providing a solution to the vacation pay problem.

Unfortunately, another 2 years have elapsed. In the meanwhile, the committee has received and acted upon various recommendations from the President and the Treasury Department with respect to changes in the Internal Revenue Code. However, the Department has not as yet come up with any recommendations which would avoid the necessity of bringing this bill before the Congress again. In urging your support for the bill, I wish to state that this matter should be cleared up permanently by appropriate legislation providing for the accrual of the liability for vacation pay, in order that we will not be faced with a further extension 2 years from now. I hope that the Treasury will, within this period, submit to the committee appropriate recommendations to accomplish this objective.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

IRRESPONSIBLE AND UNCONSCIONABLE ACTIVITIES OF OUTSIDERS IN ST. AUGUSTINE, FLA.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, again I call the attention of my colleagues to the irresponsible and unconscionable activities of outsiders who are doing all they can to make of beautiful St. Augustine, Fla., a desolate and abandoned city.

I want to call the attention of the Members of the House to this interesting article which appeared in the Florida Times-Union, of Jacksonville, Fla., on Saturday, June 27, 1964, and which is of particular interest since it concerns the views of a Tampa Negro lawyer.

The article follows:

[From the Florida Times-Union, June 27, 1964]

TAMPA NEGRO LAWYER BLAMES KING FOR STRIFE

TAMPA, June 26.—Tampa Negro attorney Francisco Rodriguez today condemned the "tragic and alarming" St. Augustine rights demonstrations, blaming the situation there squarely on the urge of "one man" to become a "super emanicipator."

The 46-year-old counsel for the southeast district of the NAACP referred to no one by name in a 2½-page prepared statement he titled "A Letter to the New Citizens of the South."

But in earlier spoken remarks, he identified that man as Martin Luther King, leader of demonstrations which have torn the Nation's oldest city.

Rodriguez said he had been asked to speak out by several "responsible leaders" in Tampa who had sought answers to the trouble.

"Unlike in other areas, the St. Augustine savagery was not inevitable," the lawyer said.

"To those who ask me, why have the demonstrations continued even after passage of the civil rights bill, I have no answer; with painful reluctance I am driven to the conclusion that those at the helm in the city of antiquity now look away from the goals that we have memorially sought and have become obsessed with the burning ambition to bring St. Augustine down on its knees.

"This would be only of transitory interest were it not for the fact that the entire struggle for human rights is being jeopardized by what seems to be on the one hand the yearning to demonstrate for the sheer sake of demonstration and on the other the irrepressible impulse in the heart of one man to have his name written on the skies as the 'super emancipator,'" wrote the attorney.

"I am unalterably opposed to what is occurring in St. Augustine," the former schoolteacher told a reporter earlier.

Asked then "why?" about the demonstrations, he replied:

"You see, in our movement there are persons with emancipator complexes. And each of those persons ends up trying to outemancipate the other."

He referred to King as a man often characterized as being imbued with "godlike powers."

"What this has created now," he said of St. Augustine, "is a kind of racial antipathy that never existed in the first place."

"In the State of Florida," asserted the attorney, "this shouldn't have happened in the first place."

He said now is no time for Negro citizens to "sit back and gloat. Now is the time to work with the law," he declared.

A BILL TO AUTHORIZE THE RELEASE AND SALE OF MOLYBDENUM

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, as the representative of the district in which the principal mine for the production of molybdenum is located, I naturally have followed with particular interest H.R. 11235, which authorizes the release and sale of 11 million pounds of molybdenum from the national stockpile.

I was gratified when the bill was reported favorably by the Committee on Armed Services a week ago tomorrow. Immediately I made my views, in support of this measure, known to Members who I thought might be helpful.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, I was prepared to address the House at the time the bill would be called up. Knowing the urgency for this legislation, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN], chairman of the subcommittee handling the legislation, called the bill up for immediate consideration 2 days after the report was filed under conditions that made it impossible for me to address the House on the need for the legislation. I appreciate the action of the gentleman from Massachusetts and his recognition of the need for urgent action.

Mr. Speaker, in order to complete the record on the legislative history on H.R. 11235, which passed the House of Representatives the last time the House sat, I am including with my remarks today my full statement setting forth the background and need for legislation to authorize the disposal of 11 million pounds of molybdenum from the national stockpile.

There have been increased demands for molybdenum as its uses have increased and as our economy has expanded. The producers have sought in this situation to maintain a proper level of production; but they have also resisted the temptation to allow inflationary price increases. As a matter of fact, they have made every effort to maintain a price structure equitable to the consumer.

The American Metals Climax, Inc., has, in its planning, taken into consideration reported excesses of molybdenum in the stockpile and in connection with its plans for mine expansion and plant addition. To demonstrate the sensitivity of minerals industries to stockpile conditions, I cite the fact that when the Office of Emergency Planning revised its estimate of the amount of molybdenum required for a national emergency, which resulted in a reduced figure for what it considered excess, American Metals Climax accelerated its production plans.

Enactment of H.R. 11235 will help fill any gaps in the interim period between the development of the increased market and the completion of production expansion.

In addition to my interest in this bill because of the congressional district I represent, I am also concerned, as chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, with the effect any disposal might have on the domestic mining industry. In this instance the strong market that has developed for molybdenum will not, in our opinion, be disrupted by the disposal of the 11 million pounds of molybdenum that would be released from the stockpile by this bill. This confidence, of course, rests upon the assumption that the concentrate will be sold to industry and kept out of the hands of speculators. This, I am assured, will be accomplished under the disposal plan prepared by the General Services Administration.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, may I express my deep appreciation for the attention that has been given by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], chairman of the Armed Services Committee, as well as the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN], chairman of the subcommittee handling the legislation, to this matter and other proposals for release of minerals from the stockpile. I take great pleasure in advising you, Mr. Speaker, and the Members of the House, that there is a very fine cooperative relationship between the Committees on Armed Services and Interior and Insular Affairs in these matters for which the Interior Committee has responsibility over mining and minerals, while the Armed Services Committee has jurisdiction over stockpiling generally. I am confident we will continue to work together in the national interest.

FUNDS AVAILABLE FOR FOREIGN ASSISTANCE

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include tables on funds available for foreign assistance.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I apprehend that during the impending debate on the foreign assistance appropriation bill there will be considerable interest in the question of how the main part of the bill—foreign assistance, title I—compares in amounts with the present fiscal year and with the totals for recent years. A proper view of the situation requires that we take into account not only the new funds being appropriated but also the reappropriated carryover balances, receipts, and "recoveries" of prior funds. On this basis, the fiscal 1965 amount is estimated to be below the companion total for the current fiscal year 1964 as shown by the following tabulation from page 3 of the report of the Committee on Appropriations. I should, of course, say that the committee bill is also below the 1965 budget request by $200,127,600 and it is also $1,008,625,000 below the budget request of a year ago:

Item	Fiscal year 1964	Fiscal year 1965
New appropriations	$3,000,000,000	$3,316,572,400
Carryover from prior year appropriations	398,793,000	53,100,000
Transfers between appropriations	−120,000	-------------
Reimbursements and receipts	5,500,000	3,600,000
Deobligations of prior year obligations	219,483,000	194,500,000
Total	3,623,656,000	3,567,772,400

In addition to the cut of $200,127,600, the bill puts another $300 million of economic aid funds on the shelf, none of which is to be used unless and until the President, after further reviews and determinations, deems its use, or any part of it, to be in the national interest.

Putting the estimated funds to be available for fiscal 1965 in deeper perspective, the total now estimated to be available for obligation in 1965, under the bill as reported, is the lowest in 9 years.

FOREIGN AID PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I requested this special order so that I could discuss some of the merits and demerits of the worldwide foreign aid program and the pending appropriation for that program. But, as the foreign aid appropriation bill will be before the House during this week, I now prefer to withhold the major portion of my comment for that occasion.

I believe, however, it would be appropriate for me to note that any person who cannot swim should stay out of the water. Former President Truman once advised that if a person could not stand the heat he should stay out of the kitchen. And, paraphrasing that statement, I would add that if a person cannot resist the aroma of roses and the accompanying persuasion he should stay out of the rose garden.

In order to assure that there is no misunderstanding of my position, I want also to take this occasion to say that there is absolutely no malice in my heart or mind about this appropriation bill toward any Member who may disagree with my position, or for any other reason. I endeavor to fight hard, but I always use ethical means in waging the fight.

Further, Mr. Speaker, I wish to include, at this point in the RECORD and as a part of my remarks, a letter and two tabulations concerning the foreign aid program, which I mailed to my colleagues on June 22. One of these items is a verified statement of foreign aid funds—titles I and II only—estimated to be on hand, unexpended, as of June 30, 1964, the end of the 1964 fiscal year, in the amount of $7,133,461,000. I would observe, in this connection, that any revisions of this information which might be received from the Aid Agency should be greatly discounted. And, if history repeats itself, certain revisions could be forthcoming.

The letter and the tabulations follow:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., June 22, 1964.

MY DEAR COLLEAGUE: Believing that I can be helpful, I am again sending you fact sheets covering the foreign aid program my subcommittee handles. There are now 26 Federal agencies dispensing some type of foreign aid, and the aggregate for fiscal 1965 may exceed $7 billion. This does not include the interest our Government is paying on the money it has borrowed to give away which is now in excess of $3 billion annually.

AID's system of obligating, deobligating and reobligating, and funding projects in excess of the cost to complete, make it impossible for even the most dedicated Member to determine what part of the unliquidated funds are firmly committed. AID's estimates show that there will be unliquidated funds on June 30 of over $7 billion. If history repeats itself, this figure will climb substantially at a later date, and, of the $7 billion plus in the pipeline, as much as $1 billion could revert to the unobligated category. Juggling and overfunding have been so rampant that AID has deobligated funds from 232 projects in the past 60 days.

It is fantastic but true that our Government will be dispensing funds during fiscal 1965 in 99 nations and 9 territories. Furthermore, this uncontrolled and apparently uncontrollable program now has 71,416 people, including participants, on its payroll. It has reached such proportions that even the confusion is confused.

The facts are so overwhelming against the claims of the spenders until there is positively no honorable way for me to yield to executive demands. Methods are being employed that will change votes but not facts, methods that are making foes out of friends, but again, they will not change facts. It is my duty as chairman of the subcommittee to continue my best efforts to help keep some sense in this international giveaway program.

I have nothing to offer you for your support but facts. The time is fast approaching when we will know whether or not facts can prevail over political expediency and executive pressure. I will supplement these facts on the floor of the House if it is again my privilege to handle the foreign aid bill.

Sincerely yours,

OTTO E. PASSMAN,
Chairman, Foreign Operations Subcommittee on Appropriations.

Foreign Operations Subcommittee on Appropriations—Foreign aid funds, by program and amount, from prior years' appropriations on hand unexpended—June 30, 1964, estimates of AID

TITLE I

Military assistance	$2,050,751,000
Development grants	324,856,000
American schools and hospitals abroad	20,080,000
Surveys-investment opportunities	1,420,000
International organizations and programs	99,640,000
Supporting assistance	308,723,000
Contingency fund	170,052,000
Chilean reconstruction	9,765,000
Alliance for Progress	1,232,507,000
Development loans	2,106,694,000
Administrative expenses, AID	11,929,000
Administrative expenses, State	865,000
Acquisition of property	3,284,000
Investment guarantees	273,196,000
Total, title I	6,613,762,000

TITLE II

Peace Corps	52,041,000
Army: Ryukyu Islands	3,200,000
State: migrants and refugees	4,743,000
HEW: Cuban refugees	6,875,000
Inter-American Development Bank	200,000,000
International Development Association	252,840,000
Total, title II	519,699,000
Grand total, titles I and II	7,133,461,000

TOTAL ECONOMIC AND MILITARY ASSISTANCE—9 YEARS

Fiscal year	Budget estimate	Appropriation	Reduction below estimate	Percentage below budget estimate
1956	$3,266,641,750	$2,703,341,750	−$563,300,000	17.24
1957	4,859,975,000	3,766,570,000	−1,093,405,000	22.50
1958	3,386,860,000	2,768,760,000	−618,100,000	18.25
1959	3,950,092,500	3,298,092,500	−652,000,000	16.51
1960	4,429,995,000	3,225,813,000	−1,204,182,000	27.18
1961	4,275,000,000	3,716,350,000	−558,650,000	13.07
1962	$4,775,500,000	$3,914,600,000	−$860,900,000	18.03
1963	4,961,300,000	3,928,900,000	−1,032,400,000	20.81
1964	4,525,325,000	3,000,000,000	−1,525,325,000	33.71
Total	38,430,689,250	30,322,427,250	−8,108,262,000	21.10

ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE ONLY—9 YEARS

Fiscal year	Budget estimate	Appropriation	Reduction below estimate	Percentage below budget estimate
1956	$2,141,641,750	$1,998,341,750	−$143,300,000	6.69
1957	1,859,975,000	1,749,070,000	−110,905,000	5.96
1958	1,786,860,000	1,428,760,000	−358,100,000	20.04
1959	2,150,092,500	1,783,092,500	−367,000,000	17.07
1960	2,829,995,000	1,925,813,000	−904,182,000	31.95
1961	2,275,000,000	1,916,350,000	−358,650,000	15.76
1962	$2,890,500,000	$2,314,600,000	−$575,900,000	19.92
1963	3,461,300,000	2,603,900,000	−857,400,000	24.77
1964	3,120,325,000	2,000,000,000	−1,120,325,000	35.90
Total	22,515,689,250	17,719,927,250	−4,795,762,000	21.30

MILITARY ASSISTANCE ONLY—9 YEARS

Fiscal year	Budget estimate	Appropriation	Reduction below estimate	Percentage below budget estimate
1956	$1,125,000,000	$705,000,000	−$420,000,000	37.33
1957	3,000,000,000	2,017,500,000	−982,500,000	32.75
1958	1,600,000,000	1,340,000,000	−260,000,000	16.25
1959	1,800,000,000	1,515,000,000	−285,000,000	15.33
1960	1,600,000,000	1,300,000,000	−300,000,000	18.75
1961	2,000,000,000	1,800,000,000	−200,000,000	10.00
1962	$1,885,000,000	$1,600,000,000	−$285,000,000	15.12
1963	1,500,000,000	1,325,000,000	−175,000,000	11.67
1964	1,405,000,000	1,000,000,000	−405,000,000	28.83
Total	15,915,000,000	12,602,500,000	−3,312,500,000	20.81

OTTO E. PASSMAN,
Chairman, Foreign Operations Subcommittee on Appropriations.

Now I want to say that I regret to read that Mr. David Bell, the present Administrator of foreign aid, might be leaving the top job in the Agency. I quote a news statement:

> BELL TO HEAD PLAN OF VIETNAM AID
>
> SAIGON, VIETNAM, June 27.—Reliable sources here reported today that David Bell, U.S. Aid Administrator, soon will be named to a new Saigon post heading the American economic aid program in South Vietnam.
>
> Sources said Mr. Bell, now Administrator of the U.S. Agency for International Development, would leave for Saigon soon.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. May I say that I think the Members of this Congress and the people, especially the taxpayers of the United States, owe the gentleman from Louisiana a vote of confidence. I think he knows more about the foreign aid program than any man in this House of Representatives. I think that over the time I have been a Member of the House, which is 12 years, the gentleman from Louisiana, in the face of all of the testimony that Members, the do-gooders, the one-worlders, and so forth have come here and brought to the House of Representatives, has reduced the requested appropriations for foreign aid probably to an extent of more than $8 billion. That was done in the face of the people downtown administering this program and Members of Congress saying, "Oh, you are destroying the program." I venture to say that no essential part of this program has been disrupted in any manner whatsoever by the reductions that have been made by the gentleman from Louisiana. I think that the people of this Nation owe him a debt of gratitude because he has stopped and held the line and saved the American taxpayers billions and billions of dollars. I do not think that the foreign aid program has ever accomplished what it was intended to. I do not think it ever will because I do not believe that you can buy people to your banners by the American dollar. We are hated, I think, today by more people even in the face of giving away and scattering the taxpayers' money throughout the world to the extent of $100 billion. I think we are the most hated Nation on the face of the earth today because we have certainly deserved to be called what many people have called us; that is, Uncle Sap or Uncle Sugar.

This program is not effective. This program has not accomplished the job and it never will.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Florida. But, may I say that the Member from Louisiana has never been able to do anything by himself. The credit belongs to the committee and the Congress. I am chairman of the subcommittee that handles the foreign aid money bill and in the past I have made the case for certain reductions in the committee, in which a majority of the subcommittee and the full committee supported me, and the House of Representatives went along with our recommendations. I do say that we have never damaged the program. The principal mistake we have made is that we have always recommended more funds than were needed. I hope to again establish that fact on the floor of the House later in the week. And in discussing this bill, I shall not deal in generalities. But, rather, I shall deal in realities. That has always been the course I have followed.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield to the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I hope the gentleman from Louisiana will take the floor of this House and discuss the foreign aid program. I hope that the House will support him in any reductions he thinks are necessary to be made. The gentleman is well aware of the fact that in the last 12 months we have loaned to Latin and South American countries and countries in southeast Asia and other nations around the earth $1,057 million for a term of 40 years with an interest rate of three-quarters of 1 percent. We do not have that money. We must borrow it from the taxpayers and the other people of the United States. And if my information is correct, the Treasury has to pay for money borrowed on long-term commitments about 4½ percent.

If we figure the interest alone that the American taxpayers have been saddled with on the giveaways that we have had for many, many years, from here until nearly eternity, we would find that this foreign aid program has cost us hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of billions of dollars. And it has saddled debts on the American people that your children and your grandchildren and their children's children will never be able to pay.

Mr. PASSMAN. May I say to the distinguished gentleman that we are not really making loans. In the language of the bill, these transactions are earmarked as loans. But, they are not loans, they are development credits. Secretary Dillon himself has so characterized them.

I may say to the gentleman that he is going to hear a lot of generalities later in the week. They are going to say that in the future the interest rate will be 2 percent. I think it was last year that we did change the language, but that 2 percent rate takes effect 10 years hence.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PASSMAN. Yes, I am happy to yield further to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. What the gentleman is saying is what this Congress has known for a long time. These so-called loans will never be repaid. If some of them are repaid, we will never be able to use the money. I venture to say that if this program were submitted to the American people they would beat it by a vote of 25-to-1. They are tired of it and they are tired of carrying this load of taxation and giving this type of financial aid to people who hate us in the first place and who have nothing in common with us and will never flock to our banner when we need their help.

I believe that time and time again it has been shown that that is true.

Mr. PASSMAN. I will say to the gentleman, before I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL], that if I discuss this bill later in the week—and I certainly hope I shall have an opportunity to do so—I do not expect to discuss generalities. I am going to deal in realities. I am going to bring out actual facts, and I am again going to provide to the Members of the House sufficient information to support the position which I have taken, just as has been the case during the past 9 years that I have been chairman of the subcommittee and during which time I have had to disagree with several Presidents.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. I appreciate the gentleman from Louisiana yielding to me. I want to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Florida about the activities and the convictions of the gentleman from Louisiana now in the well of the House. I associate myself with his thinking. I think maybe by the grace of southern gentility and the charming blossoms of the south have wafted to him he is stepping down at this particular time, which I believe to be the most critical in the Nation's history, and in connection with the foreign aid program he is bringing out that it has been in bad shape, and I hope he will be heard in abundance when H.R. 11812, the foreign aid appropriation bill, so-called, is considered by this body, which must originate all taxes and all means of raising taxes for the Congress later this week. I would hope he will bring a full measure of his dedication and his information to us as he has in the preamble today. I for one want him to know as a member of the minority we will be strongly behind him, and I hope with the submission of this new evidence the Congress will back itself up by its bootstraps and see to it that his position throughout the years is adjudicated as a wise one, rather than those who have stood up in the subcommittee or the full committee in the trying days of changes of administration.

Mr. PASSMAN. Let me say to the distinguished gentleman that I am merely yielding in the handling of the bill at this time because I could not with good conscience support the amount the subcommittee recommended and the full committee approved and defend the amount on the floor of the House.

Mr. HALL. I would that the grace and charm of the Deep South pervade the entire Chamber to the extent it does in your high ethicality in stepping down, and I think this does not obversely affect the judgment of the Members. It is my understanding, and I may be corrected, that the bill will be headed by another member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Virginia. Although I do not know as to what the plans of the leadership are, the bill in its totality will be supported by those of the majority. I would certainly hope that in the absence of the leadership of the gentleman who has brought this bill on the floor it would be possible to pare some, not as much as I would do, from the amount that is contained in the bill, and if there is as much in the pipeline as there apparently is, then it should be stopped altogether for a year or two until we can undertake a reorganization of the agency and see that we do have a motive of justice, equity, and righteousness in distributing these funds from the pockets of the taxpayers.

It is for this reason I say I hope the gentleman's charm and grace in stepping down, with all due regard to the ethics involved in the situation—and I say the gentleman from Louisiana will be missed in the well of the House—I am pleading with him that he have ample opportunity to portray and display his views to the other Members of the House.

Mr. PASSMAN. I am not stepping down, I am simply stepping aside temporarily. I do not know what strategy the leadership will use. I do not want to know. I am going to use the time allotted to me to discuss the facts from the record.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I know of no Member of the House with greater courage than the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN]. I look forward to the contribution I know he will make later this week to the discussion of what I call the foreign giveaway bill.

I want to say to the Members of the House that I shudder to think of the billions upon billions of dollars that would have been added to this program and dissipated through the years had not the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] been the chairman of the subcommittee. I compliment him for the work he has done, and I am sure will do.

I was much interested to hear that Mr. Bell is apparently being shipped off to Vietnam. As the gentleman has said, this is just a part of the course we have had demonstrated of a foreign handout program, another administrator who will last about 18 months or less. I believe the average through the years, since the inception of this program in about 1946, has been one administrator about every year to a year and a half. No program of this magnitude could possibly be successful with administrators coming and going with such rapidity.

Mr. PASSMAN. May I say to the gentleman, myself, I have already outlasted about eight of the administrators. If this program is ever to be successful, they are going to have to leave an administrator in for more than 12 or 15 months.

Mr. Speaker, I fully intended to talk for only about 2 minutes. I think I have used about 6 minutes, so I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield to the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. O'KONSKI. I would like to ask the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana if any overtures have been made to promote him to Vietnam or to send him to Saigon?

Mr. PASSMAN. Well, I am afraid that I would not know whether that would be a promotion or not, but if it were offered, I would not think of it as a promotion.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Because if such overtures were made to the gentleman, I think Mr. Bell ought to be notified since he is going to one of the danger spots in the world because we are engaged in a death struggle with the Red Chinese. Here is an article in today's Washington Daily News pointing out how U.S. wheat is being sold to Red China that is being imported from the United States that we are selling to Red China under our foreign aid program at reduced prices. We are selling wheat under our foreign aid program at reduced prices to Mexico. This article points out how that wheat merely is relabeled and reshipped to Red China. We are selling wheat to France under our foreign aid program at reduced prices. It never reaches the French shores but goes right straight through to Red China to our bitter enemy in Vietnam where we are engaged in this death struggle. I think Mr. Bell ought to be notified that while he is being sent over there for freedom and the United States under other parts of our foreign aid program we are actually helping the enemy and we are actually feeding the enemy and making him strong to be sure that they make a fight out of it. Last year, I would like to ask the distinguished gentlemen, and before Christmas, you recall, there was a bill here appropriating $3 billion to stop Communists all over the world and then in another part of the bill there was a $500 million program to help the Communists by selling them wheat at world prices. What happened to that part of the bill this year? Last year we were frank about it. We had two bills—one to stop communism and the other one to help communism. What happened to that part of the bill to help communism to keep this thing going to be sure that they make a fight out of it?

Mr. PASSMAN. May I say to the gentleman that he had better get the information from the people who administer the legislation that Congress enacts.

Mr. O'KONSKI. I think the gentleman has done a wonderful job. Singlehandedly the gentleman from Louisiana, and I have been here for 20 years, and I think the gentleman has been here about that long, but he has practically singlehandedly with the help of other Members of Congress like myself saved the taxpayers of the United States at least $50 billion that would have been spent and dished out under the foreign aid program, if it had not been for the gentleman from Louisiana and others in this body who have helped him.

Mr. PASSMAN. I thank the gentleman. But, I want to repeat that the Member from Louisiana has been only the chairman of the subcommittee and by dealing with the facts of foreign aid, he has been able to get the support of the subcommittee and the full committee and of the membership on the floor of the House for the past 9 years. I have proceeded exactly this year as I have done in previous years. I feel confident that the facts will again sustain my position.

REPORT ON "AMERICAN STRATEGY AND STRENGTH"

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Ford] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, this report on "American Strategy and Strength," prepared by a task force of Republican Congressmen under the auspices of the subcommittee on special projects of the House Republican policy committee, represents work carried on over the past 4 years and, in its final form, updates and revises a similar report issued on June 20, 1960.

The present task force, composed of Representatives Arends, Miller, Byrnes, Wilson, Laird, Frances Bolton, Wyman, Curtis, Hosmer, St. George, Chamberlain, John Rhodes, and myself, is indebted to many who prepared background material, conducted research, and assisted in the writing of this report.

In addition, several academic and professional experts who submitted study papers, especially Prof. James Rority, of William and Mary College, have been of great help to me and to the entire task force. The staff of the House Republican policy committee, including staff director, Dr. Don Ackerman, Philip V. Brennan, Jr., Mary Price Campbell, Alice Hipsley, and Stephen Smith, has been helpful in the organization and direction of the entire project.

If this Republic is to survive and prosper, it must from time to time assess the sources of its strength and examine the tenets of its strategy. In peace as in war, it must husband that strength and submit that strategy to searchingly honest criticism.

Today, the American Nation faces a perilous new stage in the protracted conflict of our times: the invasion of a subtle belief that survival against the Communist threat has ceased to be an issue. In a world no less at war than in 1944 or 1951, this belief can invite the doom of America and of the free world.

From every side, the ear is assailed by visions of a false dawn. The Nation's enemies, we are told, have attended a new "maturity"—as if Marxism-Leninism were the product of childish minds. Claims of a sweetness and light that are neither real nor apparent fill the air. At the same time, sociomilitary doctrines of dubious logic command those who have revised the Nation's defense and diplomatic policies.

The citizen, the scholar, the patriot, and the politician must ponder in some bewilderment the confusion of purpose and determination that has seized the United States. In this flaccidity of determination, the enemy can exult. For in less than 4 years, policies based on an accurate evaluation of the international situation and of the national need have been scrapped. Implementation of vital concepts for the defense of the Republic and the eventual triumph of order among free nations have been slowed and in many cases brought to a halt.

Four years ago, this task force of the House Republican policy committee enunciated the basic strategic concepts of the Eisenhower administration and noted the successes in American policy which had been a concomitant of these concepts. What was written 4 years ago bears repeating in full, in order to contrast it with the declarations of the present administration and its spokesmen:

> First. "Survival alone" is unacceptable as the objective of American strategy and strength. Liberty, justice and open societies are the only goals worthy of our heritage, and these are promoted by the rule of law, by a stable world, and by independent, internally healthy republics.
>
> Second. These can be accomplished by a national cold war strategy which becomes a public affair, understood and enthusiastically supported by people in all walks of life.
>
> Third. The first steps of this strategy have already been accomplished. Since 1953, national policy has renounced any defensive method of meeting aggression on the terms of the aggressor, has embraced a diplomacy of firmness which has deterred a Soviet adventure in Berlin, invasion of Formosa, reinvasion of Korea, and Soviet takeover in the Middle East.
>
> Fourth. The military phase of this strategy has achieved effectiveness by the mix of forces, incorporated with a worldwide shield of troops from the free world alliance and a sword of massive, mobile, and indestructible striking power, capable of varying and calibrated responses.
>
> Fifth. In the scientific phase, real progress has been made in integrating scientific and national purpose. American technology, in comparison with Russia's, is more broadly based, devoted to the welfare of mankind, and has produced far more solid scientific data from space exploration. If the public and the political leaders will give greater attention to basic research and education, in a climate of decentralized responsibility and creativity, and understand and support efforts such as the new 10-year NASA program, American science will win the resurgent confidence of the world and antiquate Iron Curtains.
>
> Sixth. The long-pull policies initiated in 1953 have ended the peaks and valleys characteristic of American preparedness since the Revolutionary War and have given stability within the Armed Forces and within the national economy. No sound economic alternative for the cold war has been offered to this policy, and this task force overwhelmingly endorses it as a basic prerequisite for both preparedness and the preservation of economic freedom and health.
>
> Seventh. Improved psychological techniques and timing are necessary, but by far the best antidote to the accepted Communist strategy of conditioning is an ideological initiative, not to force beliefs, but to articulate beliefs through purpose and public conscience.
>
> Eighth. Essential to a dynamic public strategy is a continuity of successful policies from one administration to the next, an offering of a real alternative by those who criticize, policymaking machinery within Congress to produce responsible partisanship, and executive machinery for overall evaluation and articulation of our strategy and strength. The foundation of any public strategy is national character, conviction and confidence.

Since those words were written, the Nation has traveled a grim and descending road—no less grim or descending because every step was greeted by the sound of applause machines and boom of mechanical optimists. However much these contraptions might please the administration, they are no substitute for facts or for the rigorous examination of what has been done and what remains to be done in developing a new strategy and increasing the strength of this Republic.

PROPOSALS

Restoration of national purpose: The United States stands at a historic juncture: with its matchless wealth and power it can take the initiative in effecting a revolution of liberty throughout the world.

Time and tide run with those who take the initiative; but time and tide run out on the indecisive.

Thus the essential error of the administration's "Why win policy" is that the administration has been hypnotized by the naive notion that it is possible to embrace the Soviet Union and to accept the Communist predator itself as a companion among the free in search of a "just and genuine" peace.

Not 2 years have passed since the Cuban "missile crisis." But its lesson has been lost on the administration. Mr. Khrushchev's professed fear of nuclear war rings hollow against the Soviet nuclear rockets which suddenly sprang up on the launching pads in Cuba in October of 1962.

Even without the use of nuclear weapons, the unceasing Red effort to subvert the free is merely forced into modes of conflict which, if less immediately destructive, are no less and perhaps even more dangerous to the cause of liberty.

A requirement of the present hour is the restoration of confidence in the power and purposes of the United States—a "restoration of will" that liberty and justice must prevail among men. Such a restoration can only be achieved through specific programs which effectively employ the power of the United States in behalf of liberty's interests. These programs, in turn, will be successful only insofar as they are based on a recognition of the struggle with world communism—a struggle that broadens in scope and sophistication each day.

THE RECONSTRUCTION OF THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION

If a "revolution of liberty" is to be the work of our age, the United States must recognize that it is a work for the partners of the free world. There will be no room for the dilettante attitudes of the past 4 years which have been the cause of discord and disarray among free nations. The very growth of freedom in the postwar decades calls for a revised outlook by the United States—an outlook of common cause among real partners.

As the time for revising the NATO treaty approaches, the United States must take its place as the leader in a search for a new formulation of the "basic alliance." The new NATO will rest on the premise of a genuine—not synthetic—partnership in which the United States takes special account of the evolution of France, West Germany and the United Kingdom. The United States must also explore plans for nuclear sharing among the Big Four and entertain possible new command structures in the alliance.

A Republican task force on NATO has pointed out the disarray which exists within NATO today. In correcting the causes of this disarray, the United States must commit itself steadfastly to a defense of Europe through all possible means, rejecting such aberrations in theory as the "pause." It must consider a new "entente cordiale" with France, giving full faith and credit to the place of her national deterrent within the overall NATO structure.

Above all, the United States must cooperate with NATO partners in such a manner as to make a full military contribution on their parts more likely.

A commitment to contain Communist China: The United States must make a full-scale commitment to halt Communist China's military expansion and subversion in Asia and in the Pacific.

A victory in South Vietnam over the military and subversive threats of communism is urgently required. We must repeal today's complacent commitment "to prevent a Communist victory" and substitute a commitment to insure a victory for freedom. And, once southeast Asia is free to pursue the development of democratic institutions of its own choice, the United States should then be prepared to help stabilize the area and to protect it from the Communist virus.

The United States, fully committed to the security and integrity of SEATO and ANZUS partners, should be prepared to take whatever action is necessary to help its friends to contain the aggressions of Indonesian President Sukarno.

The Monroe Doctrine: A new corollary: It is clear that communism in Cuba is a major threat to the liberties and institutions of the free peoples of the Americas. This urgent business of the United States in our own hemisphere can no longer be put off. While effective leadership by the United States can enlist the cooperation of our OAS partners, the elimination of communism is a prime responsibility of the United States.

In approaching the long-term problems of Latin America, the United States must drastically reshape its thinking. The initiative in the great enterprise of social and economic advancement lies with the Nations of Latin America; the basic role of the United States is to respond to such initiative with sympathy and support and to avoid aspiring to the futile role as "architect of the Americas."

In addition, it is the task of our Nation to give the Monroe Doctrine a new adaptation as a fundamental tenet of U.S. policy. In so doing, a series of programs must be set in motion with the explicit objective of ejecting communism from the island of Cuba.

Maintaining balance in defense: The United States has the capabilities and the resources to maintain a decisive edge across the entire spectrum of military contingency. But under the leadership of the past 4 years, the principle of the decisive edge has been sent into decline; the principle must be restored under new leadership.

Full-scale commitments must be made to forge ahead in the intensifying research and development race. The highest priority must be extended to four critical areas:

The transformation of propulsion systems in surface units of the U.S. Navy from conventional to nuclear power—most immediately in the instance of the forthcoming attack carrier.

The development of a new generation of strategic manned weapons systems for missions in the earth's environment or near space, and a full exploration of the possible military implications of outer space.

The establishment of a comprehensive antisubmarine warfare program, ranging from the most basic studies in ocean sciences to the production of end-product hardware.

Development of a defense against missiles must be given high priority.

Apart from these four crisis areas, a restoration of mutual confidence and balance between civilian leadership and military professionals must be achieved. This indispensable basis of effective defense policy has been weakened under the present administration.

The United States must sustain a full and continuous underground testing program, maintaining on a standby basis a readiness to test program in the three forbidden environments of land, sea, and space. If we do not, we weaken our chances of maintaining whatever fading nuclear advantage we might now have.

Above all, we feel that this Nation must be restored to its traditional and historic vigor with the knowledge that survival only is a prescription for surrender on the installment plan. The way to win the peace is to build up a military establishment strong enough to win a war; then, from this foundation, to build up a foreign policy, build up our alliance system, and thus build up the confidence of our own people and of all freedom loving people throughout the world.

FOREIGN POLICY: A RETREAT FROM POWER

This committee wrote 4 years ago in its report on "American Strategy and Strength" that "Americans must not tear down proven success, but must create an even better structure upon it." The Democratic administration, instead of building upon past successes, has injected confusion and disarray into the American purpose. At no point in the postwar era have the purposes and policies of the United States been so lacking in clarity and in direction.

In 1960, no Americans were dying in combat in Vietnam. No Soviet military power was yet massing in Cuba. No Berlin wall sealed East Germans from freedom. No fears of a NATO breakup haunted us, nor was Khrushchev yet embraced as an apostle of peace.

The decline of American leadership in the world and the dissipation of the Eisenhower legacy can be directly attributed to the "why win policy" of the present administration. This "why win policy" rejects the bitterest experiences, the hardest lessons, and the soberest judgments out of which an effective foreign policy and a commanding military posture were fashioned during the Eisenhower years. From a strategy of deterrence through military superiority in 1960 we have moved toward a situation of military parity. This strategy of initiative and confrontation which guided the Eisenhower years has been abandoned on the verge of success.

This about-face in American strategy was clearly indicated by President Kennedy's American University speech a year ago in which he expounded the fundamental premise of the "why win policy":

> The United States and its allies, and the Soviet Union and its allies, have a mutually deep interest in a just and genuine peace.

In his speeches during our election year of 1964, Mr. Khrushchev repeatedly hails the American University speech, which in effect compromised America's credibility of will to move forward in the quest for liberty, justice, and free societies in the world.

Yet the only peace the Soviet Union seeks is the peace of total Communist conquest. The administration's tragically misguided reading of Soviet intentions has become the impetus for a new mood of misplaced trust and accommodation. We are letting down our guard. For once the Soviet Union catches up, the friendly Kremlin smile will be gone and so will the United States superiority. The United States has planned no major new strategic weapons systems for the crucial decade of the 1970's.

The Johnson administration has embraced the dangerously false premise that the cold war is ending.

Any temporary victories we may have won in past confrontations with the Soviet Union have represented no genuine, permanent rollback of Soviet power and influence. Our conduct in many of these East-West confrontations marks a path of irresolution, at best, and retreat from purposeful uses of power, at worst. It is a record which has caused confusion among free peoples throughout the world. The result is a "crisis of will" in which the future of the world itself is at stake.

In 1961, the administration withdrew vital American support in the critical last moments of a covertly staged and supported Bay of Pigs invasion of Cuba, thus ending a gallant effort by free Cubans to dislodge Castro.

The administration has not only condoned but sometimes participated in blatant aggressions against the territory of NATO allies. For instance, in the Sukarno seizure of West Iran from the Netherlands and the Nehru seizure of Goa from Portugal, the administration not only failed to resist but also advised our allies to acquiesce. In the case of New Guinea, it forced them to do so.

The administration has tolerated a steady erosion of Western rights in the Berlin corridors and has not acted to end continuing attacks on American aircraft by the Soviet Union. In the case of the Berlin wall—erected in direct contravention of the four-power agreement on Berlin—the administration did nothing.

The most daring threat against American interests in the cold war came in 1962 when Mr. Khrushchev placed the full panoply of war in the nuclear age on the island of Cuba—90 miles from the Florida coast, including strategic, nuclear missiles; jet bombers and fighters; surface-to-air missiles; crack Soviet ground forces; military advisers and technicians.

Even though these forces were detected and identified by reliable refugee informants—these forces were somehow injected into Cuba without challenge. It was an unprecedented intrusion into the Western Hemisphere by a hostile power and constituted the most flagrant breach of the Monroe Doctrine in history.

The administration committed itself to a course which would require the Soviet Union to remove—subject to inspection—all "offensive" weapons from the island. Yet Soviet elements remain in Cuba today. The extent of the 1962 withdrawals is unknown, since the administration has abandoned its demand for inspection to verify Soviet claims. Moreover, the conclusion that removal of missiles from Greece and Turkey on our part was related to a missile crisis quid pro quo is inescapable.

Today, we ask our allies to join in an embargo against Cuba but ourselves refuse to impose a blockade for the purpose of determining whether there is continuing ingress of offensive weapons. At the same time, the administration entered into an agreement to sell wheat to the Soviet Union on a credit card basis in order to rescue Khrushchev from an agricultural crisis on the strange and dubious grounds that this is not trade with the enemy but that exporting trucks and buses to Castro is.

The involvement of the administration in the destruction of a friendly regime carrying on the war against communism in South Vietnam was, in many ways, the most tragic blunder of the past 4 years. The overthrow of the Ngo Dinh Diem regime and the subsequent murder of President Ngo and his brother has hardly improved the situation in the death struggle with the Vietcong. Neither have the base stories spread through the West about the brothers Diem and Nhu. These stories later were exposed as fraudulent in the report of the United Nations Factfinding Mission to South Vietnam. Currently, our indecision as to prosecution of the war against the sources of Communist strength in this area makes ultimate disaster more than a grim possibility, as does the vacillation of administration spokesmen, whose statements range from boasts of impending victory to admission of constant setbacks.

The record of the Democratic administration is no better when we turn from the confrontation with communism to relations with our allies.

Nowhere has our failure been more striking than in the deterioration of the Atlantic Alliance, the keystone in American collective security arrangements. The present disarray can be blamed on specific administration actions and attitudes.

The United States has refused to recognize the dynamic transformation of Western Europe which has brought our NATO partners to unprecedented levels of strength. Instead, while demanding unilateral controls inside the alliance we have often ignored NATO to seek unilateral agreements with the common enemy without consulting our friends.

Unilateral negotiations with the Soviet Union on Berlin, trade, cooperation in space and disarmament, all in the name of "reducing tensions," has weakened Western unity. "Bilateralism" is symbolized in the establishment of a "hot line" between Washington and Moscow—a private line from which our allies have been excluded.

The discord which has arisen between the United States and France flows from the administration's failure to grasp the marked improvement in the positions of our allies. That France should build its own national deterrent—force de frappe—to serve not only its own political and military strategies but ours as well perplexes the administration. That France and Germany should undertake to bring to a close a centuries-long alienation and join in a steadfast partnership against the threat from the East is a salutary development; but instead the administration refuses to visualize its implications. These tensions within the alliance are another byproduct of the "Why win policy."

The insensitivity of the "Why win policy" to problems of the alliance is displayed in the Skybolt affair. In scrapping our plans to fit the British V-bomber force with a standoff missile capability, the administration gave no heed to the inevitably unfavorable political impact on both the Macmillan and De Gaulle governments.

These and other episodes related to the military strategies and structure of NATO have sown doubts among our friends about the credibility of our commitments. The administration introduced the theory of the "pause," which proposes to meet a Russian onslaught into Western Europe with conventional weapons alone in the first stages. Despite the objections of General Norstad, former NATO Supreme Commander, the administration persisted in its course, thus weakening confidence in our solemn pledge to use nuclear weapons in defense of Western Europe. Suggestions by General Norstad and others that mobile, land-based medium range missiles in Western Europe would be more practicable than merchant ships fitted with Polaris missiles were also ignored.

The administration has also been unable to cope with the nation-building processes of former colonial peoples of Africa and Asia. An uncritical, even naive, tendency to support the most precarious and self-defeating "freedom movements" has marked the past 4 years, often at the cost of strained relations with our allies. We have lost prestige and respect in an effort to gain popularity ratings in the emerging nations. Except for the reflex-response of supporting all "freedom movements," the administration has been in a state of paralysis in the face of chaos in the Congo and in east Africa, and has failed to apply the criteria of our own national interest or the claims and interests of our allies in these areas. In the face of the phenomenon—the rise of emerging nations—the United States is without a policy while the Soviet Union throws itself into subversion and active aggression under the guise of "wars of national liberation."

In our own hemisphere, security has been breached through a series of aggressions by world communism ranging from the most obtrusive military moves to subtle subversion. Under the tenets of the "Why win policy," the administration finds itself unwilling to implement the Monroe Doctrine, which has long stood as a shield against the designs of those outside the hemisphere and as a buttress for free institutions within.

The most powerful nation in the world today takes no action in response to the most varied threats on its own doorstep. This failure of power and of purpose is manifest in the remarks of one of the leading exponents of the "Why win policy," Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT:

> I think we are bound to conclude that Castro is a nuisance but not a grave threat to the United States, and that he cannot be gotten rid of except by means that are wholly disproportionate to the objective.

While the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee feels that a blockade would be "extravagantly dangerous" and that "this threat can be dealt with by prompt and vigorous use of the established procedures of the Inter-American System," a report of the Subcommittee on Latin America of the House Foreign Affairs Committee contradicts this myth, asserting that:

> Although the Inter-American collective security system is prepared to meet the possibility of open military aggression by Communist forces against nations of the hemisphere, no plan for collective action against

Communist subversive aggression has been put into effect.

The depth of what is called the pervasive softness in Washington today is illustrated by an expectation that the national interests of the United States will be protected through nonexistent multilateral procedures.

In itself, the Alliance for Progress is eloquent testimony to a lack of understanding of American power and purpose. Conceived by some as a response to Castro, it misconceives the threat of Castroism. Conceived by others as a grand design for the amelioration of political, economic, and social ills of Latin America, it misconceives the depth and diversity of these problems, and fails to locate the central sources of initiative and action for their solution. The Alliance for Progress has proved to be overambitious and impractical.

In Asia, it is axiomatic that Communist China's first objective is to eliminate all aspects of the American presence. This is the key to Communist hegemony. Despite Peiping's aggressions in Korea, the Formosa Straits, Vietnam, Laos, Tibet, and India, the Johnson administration can evolve no other policy than that of "reflex-response," while the intramural brawling between Moscow and Peiping merely aggravates the belligerent tendencies of the Chinese.

Nor has the United States made preparations to take a stand against the Sukarno aggressions in Malaysia which threaten to disrupt the entire southwest Pacific area. Our relations with a stanch ally, Pakistan, have sunk to an alltime low. In the confrontation with Communist Chinese expansionism, the United States has failed to commit itself to any specific goal and thus finds itself once again unable effectively to employ its enormous power in a purposeful implementation of national interest.

The United States is the most powerful political-military-economic force for peace in the world. It is this consideration which makes elements of the present foreign aid programs a unique tragedy. The inability of the administration effectively to administer programs of economic, technical, and military assistance is patently due to the absence of clearly articulated objectives. Particularly in the economic area, many of the programs which lack clear purpose are errant, wasteful, and self-defeating.

THE MILITARY SPECTRUM: A FAILURE TO MAINTAIN BALANCED FORCES

During the past 4 years, the world's foremost peacekeeping agency, the Armed Forces of the United States, has come under serious threat from the policy direction of the administration.

At the behest of the Secretary of Defense, the administration has created two crises in the military realm which will have critical long-range effects on national security if not immediately rectified:

The administration has built into the Military Establishment a decline in innovation—the so-called research and development gap.

The administration has compromised the professional integrity and competence of American military men in an unparalleled disruption of the democratically sound civilian-military relationship.

It is recognized today that the prize of strength is peace; in this era of nuclear weaponry and Communist aggression, no cost is too great to maintain peace and justice. Yet, in spite of the realism of the American people on the issue of war and peace in our time, in spite of their willingness to meet the cost, the administration has allowed the decisive edge of American military superiority, bequeathed to them by the Eisenhower administration, to be blunted.

This decline in American strategy and strength demands the soberest consideration of the American people. For the result of the administration's policy of "planned obsolescence" will inevitably be second place for the United States.

Republicans believe that a strategy of initiative based upon military superiority and aimed at victory significantly decreases the risk of war. A strategy of response—our present strategy—invites small wars and increases the risk of large-scale war. In an era where powerful, belligerent aggressors exist, the best deterrent can be found in a superior and viable military posture.

The administration has decided to discontinue production of the manned bombers now in the SAC—Strategic Air Command—inventory—B-52 and B-58, and over the next few years to phase manned systems out of strategic missions altogether. Exclusive reliance is to be placed upon ICBM's—intercontinental ballistic missiles—such as Polaris, Minuteman, and so forth, to meet strategic requirements for the delivery of thermonuclear weapons.

Evidence thus far produced indicates that these missile systems have not been tested sufficiently with nuclear warheads to prove reliability. Thus any abandonment or downgrading of manned bombers not only destroys our balance of defensive posture but also substitutes a "maybe" for a "sure thing." The decision to take manned systems out of SAC and the failure to develop an oncoming generation of manned strategic systems for the 1970's is the most signal aspect of the emerging research and development gap.

At the same time, this decision is part of the crisis of military professionalism. The decision does not have the approval of a preponderance of military professionals most competent on the issue.

Significantly, the missile systems to which the administration would trust the entire strategic deterrent were all developed under the Eisenhower administration, with no new strategic missile system being added or imminent under the current administration. Yet it is known that only manned bombers presently have the capability of delivering thermonuclear bomb loads of from 20 to 50 megatons.

It is doubtful that the United States could refine yield-to-weight ratios in large thermonuclear warheads to the point where they could be reliably delivered by new manned or unmanned systems under the terms of the limited nuclear test ban treaty. This becomes a particularly vital matter in view of the known "hardening" of Soviet strategic strike systems. Should the Soviet Union achieve a substantial margin of invulnerability with respect to these systems as a result of a "nuclear freeze," the net effect would be one of destabilization.

Maintenance of a stable deterrent is adversely affected by still another program lag in the present administration—the failure to develop and deploy both "active" and "passive" missile defense systems. The administration has not agreed with the judgment of responsible military and civilian experts that this is an area in which the Soviet Union might well achieve a sudden and serious advantage. Consequently, they have not given priority to the development, production, and deployment of antiballistic missile systems, nor have they seen fit to put forth a comprehensive counterpart plan of civil defense, citing concepts such as "cost effectiveness," the "provocative implications" of such actions, and the inadequacy of a defense in the missile age in order to justify their inaction in this area.

Until effective defense programs to protect populations as well as weapons against strategic attack are in full operation, a fatal defect will exist in our American deterrent.

Obsessive emphasis on missile deterrence as differentiated from deterrence based on a balance of weaponry has tended to obscure the still-vital and manifold roles of seapower. No part of the American force structure lends itself to more varied and flexible uses than the instruments of seapower. As the spectrum of military contingencies widens and the demands for sophisticated and unobtrusive uses of force increase, the demands upon the U.S. Navy increase as well.

This Democratic administration has not kept pace with those demands; through lack of insight into the strategic significance of seapower in American military requirements, the Secretary has rendered the Navy less able to meet the demands of the sixties and seventies. The most reactionary single decision he has made—in the face of overwhelming military and scientific judgment to the contrary—is to construct an additional conventionally powered aircraft carrier. This decision came after superlative operational results with the nuclear-powered carrier *Enterprise*.

After an exhaustive inquiry into the matter, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy concluded unanimously that:

> The decision announced by the Secretary of Defense * * * against utilization of nuclear propulsion in the next aircraft carrier * * * was incorrect. More tragically, such a decision means that the Navy may be committed to a future of planned obsolescence with grave implications for the national security.

Other aspects of seapower are in much the same situation. For example, no significant "takeoffs" from World War II thresholds have been made in antisubmarine warfare. Nuclear-powered submarines are now being added to the already vast, oceangoing Soviet submarine fleet. The threat posed to the maritime commerce of the Atlantic Alliance and the concomitant missile threat to our own shores by such a fleet makes a full-scale antisubmarine warfare effort urgent.

The Soviet "quest for the high seas", evidenced by a rising merchant traffic, a greatly expanded oceanographic effort, and a major deployment into the fishing grounds, is being met by a declining American merchant marine.

Quite apart from the falling volume of commerce carried in American bottoms, no nation is more dependent upon "sealift" to satisfy military logistics needs than the United States. Recent "airlift" exercises serve to reinforce this point. Today the United States deprives itself of maximum exploitation of seapower through lack of imagination and planning at the highest policy levels.

It becomes increasingly clear that research and development in all phases of the force structure is the factor upon which maintenance of superiority will depend in military planning for the 1970's. Yet the United States is dangerously compromised in running that race by decisions such as those outlined above. These failures to come forth with adequate weapons systems and force structures for the next decade constitute a serious "research and development gap."

Closely associated with these policy decisions in the Department of Defense is an emerging "crisis in judgment" between lay technicians and military professionals over questions central to the military competence. It is basic to the new mode of thought in the Department that modern war can be simulated through the medium of mechanical models and played through with computers. Military art has apparently been superseded by the weapons revolution. On this assumption that science and technics have replaced art and experience, the lay technicians undertake to choose strategies and tactics, select weapons systems, and outline force structures.

Substituting cost analyses from consumer goods production experience for the vital military maxim of "an edge in operational performance", the laymen deprive the military professionals of adequate military hardware and choice of strategies. This poses an interesting contradiction, for under the guise of economy this approach costs the American people billions more in the long run.

The current sallies of civilians onto military ground threatens the first disruption of the time-honored American balance of civilian and military leadership. This imbalance, coupled with the administration's tactics of news management, stifling of dissent, and imposing political security measures augur a distinct threat to our form of government.

Finally, it must be said that the Nation's military posture and policies are integrally connected with national policies on disarmament. A policy on disarmament, just as a policy on armaments, that does not have as its explicit object the furtherance of national security, is a policy that is out of phase. Attention to this premise is notably lacking in this administration's disarmament negotiations with the Soviet Union. In what has been called his greatest achievement, the limited test ban treaty, President Kennedy sacrificed a principle of international inspection, the lodestar of all postwar American thinking on disarmament.

Inspection was again allowed to go by the boards in the Cuban missile crisis, allegedly the second greatest moment of the Kennedy administration. The United States has also accepted a United Nations resolution banning placement of mass-destruction weapons in space, without effective inspection.

The Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee concluded that the limited nuclear test ban treaty "will affect adversely the future quality of this Nation's arms, and that it will result in serious, and perhaps formidable, military and technical disadvantages."

Now the precedent of no inspection poisons the negotiations in Geneva.

This administration has decided that it knows better than the military, than the legislators and than the American people when questions arise on how to disarm. An underlying current of thought in this position is that we, the people, are not ready to accept an accommodation and, thus, it must be accomplished without our realization until it is too late.

To summarize, the administration has deliberately suppressed the dearly learned lesson of the 20th century—that peace can be better achieved by strength than by weakness. To the extent that the administration allows American superiority in arms to diminish, they are increasing the risk of war. Even more important, the increases of war, as already evidenced, is being invited by the lack of initiative and credible will.

We must put into practice what we have learned in the past—peace can be achieved only through strength. To diminish the risk of wars, American superiority must be maintained.

THE EVICTED AGAIN MOVES IN

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the complete collapse of foreign affairs is necessarily attracting the attention of the American public. As indicative of the complete mishandling of our foreign policy position, I place into the RECORD, as part of my remarks, an editorial in this morning's Chicago Tribune, telling of the return of Moise Tshombe to the Congo:

> ### THE "VILLAIN" RETURNS
>
> If anything demonstrates the tragic futility of the United Nations' 3-year vendetta against Moise Tshombe, it is his return to the Congo in a role which approaches that of the indispensable man. There are rumors that he may become Premier of a reorganized government at Léopoldville replacing his former antagonist, Cyrille Adoula.
>
> It was to protect and strengthen the Adoula government that the United Nations launched the costly campaign which finally succeeded in deposing Mr. Tshombe as President of the secessionist province of Katanga. But the exile of Mr. Tshombe and the dismemberment of his regime left the Léopoldville government no more effective than ever.
>
> Instead, it cleared the way for a succession of leftwing rebellions which are now raging throughout the eastern regions of the Congo. At least one of them, in Kivu Province, is being managed by Chinese Communists who have established headquarters in neighboring Burundi. It is being carried out by warriors armed with bows and arrows who believe themselves protected by magic spells.
>
> The Léopoldville government's excuse for an army has proved helpless against the spears and arrows of the rebels. One city after another has been ravaged or lost. The opposition of Communist and neutralist nations has prevented the United Nations from training the Congolese Army, as Mr. Adoula begged it to do. And tomorrow the last of the United Nations troops will pack up and depart from the Congo, leaving it at the mercy of rebels far more dangerous than Tshombe.
>
> Thus it has come about that some members of the Léopoldville Government, possibly at the instigation of French President de Gaulle, have called on Tshombe as the only man with the will and experience and backing necessary to bring together the dissident factions in the country. And thus it is that after 3 years of chaos and bloodshed aimed at getting rid of him and financed largely by the American taxpayers, we find the Congo turning to Tshombe himself for its salvation.
>
> It was clear from the beginning that Tshombe's government in Katanga was the best established, best educated, best endowed with revenue, and most reliably anti-Communist of any in the Congo. It was silly to think that the country could be governed by a regime which ignored him, thanks to the leftwingers, and drove him to secession and then to exile. Yet our State Department was so blind as to assure us that by supporting the U.N. against Tshombe, we could "insulate the African continent from military intervention by the Sino-Soviet bloc."
>
> Instead, the U.N. adventure accomplished just the opposite. Now, having set the stage for Communist intervention, the United Nations pulls out its troops. What better evidence can there be of who benefits from its ministrations?

Moise Tshombe was in effect evicted from the Congo by the administration-financed U.N. operation and now has returned, perhaps to become the savior of his country. Effective handling of the Congo crisis 3 years ago could have well saved the complications we face today.

But more than the Congo is at stake if we analyze the collapse of our foreign policy situation. In the Dominican Republic the Government is striving to bring order to the country against the deliberate opposition of our State Department. In France, General de Gaulle, harassed and ridiculed by the administration the last 3 years, refuses to cooperate with the NATO program. Where and when will this misguided foreign policy cease? What is the answer that the public demands? Certainly, not accommodation of communism and deliberate alienation of friendly governments and people.

BETTER UNDERSTANDING OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from

Illinois [Mr. Derwinski] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am indeed proud to submit for the Record the following letter which was received by my constituents, Mr. and Mrs. William A. Hoisington of Flossmoor, Ill., from the assistant director of the YMCA in Lyon, France, regarding their son, William A. Hoisington, Jr.

We can all be proud of the contribution he has made toward a better understanding of the United States and her citizens and better relations between our country and France. In view of all the adverse publicity regarding juvenile delinquency, we can be encouraged by this young man's accomplishments.

Incidentally, he is also the recipient of a national defense graduation fellowship for the next 3 years.

Lyon, *June 11, 1964*.

Dear Mr. and Mrs. Hoisington: In a few weeks your son, William, will be home and I am sure that you are looking forward to his arrival with great anticipation.

I would like, therefore, to tell you something of our relationship to him and the reaction of others with whom he was acquainted.

We were happy to have had "Bill" as a resident of our new YMCA building in Lyon, as well as to have had him as a guest in our home a number of times. I think I can say in all honesty that I have never known a young man his age who made a better impression upon those with whom he lived and worked than your son. He made a good impression for his country, his school (Northwestern University) and above all, his home. I think you should know this, and you can take justifiable pride in the standard he has set for Americans in France.

I am sure that none of this is "news" to you, his record at school, the Fulbright scholarship and now his new graduate scholarship are all real achievements, but above all it is the kind of a person he is, which transcends all.

Mrs. Aplin concurs in what I have said above, and we thank you for having sent him to us.

Sincerely yours,

Lawrence Aplin.

APPORTIONMENT OF STATE LEGISLATURE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Quie] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population. This is identical to the one introduced by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCulloch].

I have always felt that at least one house of a bicameral legislature should adhere to a strict apportionment on population consistent with the Federal guarantee to the States of a republican form of government. However, I am equally firm in my belief that other factors be permitted to be taken into consideration when adopting a plan of representation for a second body of a State legislature. These range from political subdivisions and natural geographical barriers to the distribution of population and individual citizen's economic, political, and social interests. Through the wisdom of the people themselves, as represented by the elected leaders of sovereign States, they may well decide that there is a need for representation of particular interests in one body of a legislature in addition to the representation of general interests in the other body. This is not a question of effective majority rule but, more important, one of minority entitlement to effective representation lest important segments of our people be completely subject to the tyranny of a temporary majority.

History reveals that the 14th amendment, and particularly the equal protection clause, was never intended to prevent a State from choosing any legislative structure it believes best suited to its needs, and the policy of apportioning one body of a State legislature on factors other than population long preceded the enactment of the 14th amendment. I believe it wise to permit apportionment according to population in one house of a bicameral legislature to be tempered by other considerations of importance, and I think the value of such a plan, approved by all qualified voters of a State, has been recognized since the founding of our country. My experience in the Minnesota Legislature bears this out, and it is interesting to note that in the Minnesota State Senate, where you would expect the area provision to be considered, the apportionment is still within 10 to 15 percent of the population apportionment norm.

THE GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE FINDS WASTE IN THE ACCELERATED PUBLIC WORKS PROGRAM UNDER THE AREA REDEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey[Mr. Widnall] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, for the second month in a row, the Area Redevelopment Administration has been caught by the General Accounting Office with its hand in the cookie jar. In a report dated June 25, 1964, the Comptroller General has revealed that Accelerated Public Works program grants of over $21 million had been made with the approval of the ARA for 85 projects in areas which no longer qualified as areas with substantial unemployment at the time the grants were consummated. Last month, the GAO found that under this same program the Area Redevelopment Administration was overstating the number of man-months worked on projects by 128 percent in projected estimates, and 83 percent in actual work reports.

This bureaucratic and political empire-building by the Area Redevelopment Administration has been at the expense of those areas most in need of assistance, a result directly contrary to the intent of Congress. The Comptroller General of the United States has commented:

> In our opinion the policies, practices, and procedures which resulted in grants of about $21 million to areas after the areas had recovered from their burdens of substantial unemployment are not in furtherance of the purpose and intent of the Public Works Acceleration Act and should be revised. These policies have also resulted in grants to nondepressed areas at a time when there is a large backlog of APW applications from depressed areas which cannot be met because of the shortage of APW funds. ARA has estimated this backlog to be about $800 million.

There is no doubt that the practices reported by the Comptroller General should be revised as he advises. Yet there is no indication whatsoever that the administration officials are willing to concede that the intent of Congress is being violated, much less put any simple reforms into practice. As the GAO report states, the Community Facilities Administration has a regulation which suspends the processing of grants to areas if the areas were declared ineligible prior to the approval of the Commissioner. The ARA, however, has on more than one occasion reinstated projects after the Community Facilities Administration, under its rule, had notified the applicant of the discontinuation of processing.

In other cases outlined in the report, ARA, with prior knowledge that the area would be or had already been declared ineligible under Labor Department statistics, rushed through approval. Despite these situations, and despite the pressing need for assistance to areas of real need, the ARA refuses to reform. As in the case of reporting accurate statistics so that Congress would not be misled on the work being accomplished under the program, the ARA appears to be more interested in protecting its already tarnished reputation, and perfecting political handout techniques than in assisting the unemployed and perfecting economic recovery techniques.

The responsibility for this situation is shared at the Cabinet level within the Johnson administration. Secretary of Commerce Luther Hodges, who has direct responsibility over the ARA programs, was asked at a news conference on June 16, 1964, prior to this latest GAO report, about previous reports. The colloquy in the official transcript reads as follows:

> Question. Mr. Secretary, the Comptroller General has issued three reports in a row charging incompetence in your Department. Will you tell us what you do with those reports when they come in? Do you fire anybody, or what do you do with these?
>
> Secretary Hodges. I can make a general statement we do not promote them on the basis of it. [Laughter.]

If you ask me if we fire them, I will say that, generally speaking, nobody in the Federal Government ever gets fired unless you can just prove something outright bad.

I do not know what three reports you are talking about. I do not get quite as excited about GAO reports as a lot of people because lots of times they are just as wrong as anybody else.

Let me say this: I think GAO is an essential part of the function of government, as any auditing group is, and I am glad to have them looking over our shoulders at all times.

What we do, to answer your question specifically—and these come out by the hundred, not just one or two. In any kind of an activity—I do not care what it is—you will find that either from a figure angle or from a program angle somebody will do the thing a little different from what may be according to the prescription. The prescription itself may be wrong.

The GAO has the responsibility of pointing these things out. We take a look at them very seriously, let them go through our own administrative department for doublechecking on our operating department.

Suppose it was on public roads. Well, the public roads people would look at it, and our own Assistant Secretary for Administration for budget management would take a look at it. And we would require them to give us an answer that was satisfactory to us as management.

It does not mean, as often the public thinks, that somebody has done something dishonest. It doesn't mean that at all.

Question. Are you satisfied specifically with the ARA report on the figures they issued about unemployment?

Secretary Hodges. I don't think that anybody has—I don't think that the GAO knows what it is. What we do on the ARA employment situation is to take the statement made by the company involved that it will do so-and-so and put in 104 people or 129 people, and then we are supposed to doublecheck that in the period to see that it's correct.

Now, if we're not doing that, then we are doing it wrong.

I'd have to look at the specific situation to give you the answer.

Mr. Speaker, the GAO report on the man-hour reports under the accelerated public works program specifically pointed out that the ARA was not doing the proper checking, so by the Secretary of Commerce's own statement, they are "doing it wrong." Yet the Secretary had that report available to him for several weeks preceding the news conference and he is apparently unaware of its existence. Instead, his answer on employment figures speaks of people, not man-hours; I wonder if he was confusing the question with the ARA's own program, which has also been misstating figures for 3 years.

The answer to the reporter's question, then, of what is being done about the GAO reports is found in one word—nothing. I fully expect the latest report to find the same fate. It is obvious that the Area Redevelopment Administration is more concerned with handout than fighting a war on poverty. A year ago this month the House wisely rejected an ARA request for additional money for its program. The incompetence of the administration already apparent at that time has grown with every passing day, and I see no reason for this body to change its position should another request for funds be brought up for a vote this year.

So that the press and the public can accurately evaluate the slogans, and the claims of economy, on the part of the present administration, I include at this point the full text of the report by the Comptroller General of the United States:

Report to the Congress of the United States—Assistance Under the Public Works Acceleration Act to Areas No Longer Burdened by Substantial Unemployment—Area Redevelopment Administration, Department of Commerce

(By the Comptroller General of the United States, June 1964)

Comptroller General
of the United States,
Washington, D.C., June 25, 1964.

To the Speaker of the House of Representatives,

To the President pro tempore of the Senate:

In our examination of the administration of the accelerated public works program by the Area Redevelopment Administration, Department of Commerce, and other Federal agencies, we found that grants of over $21 million had been made for 85 projects in areas which were no longer burdened by conditions of substantial unemployment at the time the grants were consummated.

The Public Works Acceleration Act, under which $880 million has been appropriated, authorizes grants-in-aid to local agencies to accelerate or initiate public works projects intended to provide immediate useful work for the unemployed and underemployed in areas of the Nation burdened by substantial unemployment and in areas which qualify as redevelopment areas because they suffer from persistent and chronic unemployment and economic underdevelopment. Under the policies currently followed by the agencies reviewed by us, grants are consummated for areas which are no longer sufficiently burdened by unemployment to qualify for such assistance, provided that the area was qualified at the time administrative approval of its application occurred. In addition, processing appears to have been expedited on applications from such areas before the areas are officially declared ineligible.

We have been informed by officials of the agencies concerned (1) that it would be unfair to deny assistance to areas which become ineligible during the period required for agency processing procedures because the areas had an investment of time and money in the project, (2) that a firm cutoff date for determination of eligibility was necessary because areas were frequently being designated and redesignated as eligible areas, and (3) that their policies were legally sound, in accord with the reasonable exercise of administrative judgment, and in accord with the letter and the spirit of the law.

Although we do not consider such grants to be illegally made because neither the statute nor the regulations issued pursuant thereto specifically provide at what point a determination of area eligibility must be made, we believe there is considerable doubt that the Congress intended that assistance under the Public Works Acceleration Act would be granted to areas under the circumstances noted in this report. In our opinion, funds appropriated to assist areas burdened by substantial unemployment should not be used to assist areas which have sufficiently recovered from their unemployment burdens to lose their eligibility. In view of the large backlog of applications for assistance under this act which could not be met because of insufficient funds, it would appear that the agencies should have concentrated their resources on processing applications from eligible areas rather than expediting the processing of applications from areas whose termination was imminent.

We are recommending that the Secretary of Commerce adopt a policy and devise procedures to preclude grants to areas which become ineligible during the grant processing procedures and that applicants be advised that all approval actions taken prior to the time of the formal grant agreement are conditional upon the area's being eligible for assistance at the time of formal agreement.

Copies of this report are being sent to the President of the United States; the Secretary of Commerce; the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare; the Secretary of Labor; and the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency.

Joseph Campbell,
Comptroller General
of the United States.

INTRODUCTION

The General Accounting Office has made a review of the policies, procedures, and practices of selected Federal agencies pertaining to Public Works Acceleration Act (42 U.S.C. 2641) grants for projects in areas no longer burdened by substantial unemployment. Our review was made pursuant to authority in the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S. 67) and was conducted at the Area Redevelopment Administration (ARA), Department of Commerce; Community Facilities Administration (CFA), Housing and Home Finance Agency; and Public Health Service (PHS), Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The scope of our review is stated on page 17.

BACKGROUND

The Public Works Acceleration Act authorizes Federal grants-in-aid of from 50 to 75 percent of the cost of projects to local agencies to accelerate or initiate public works projects intended to provide immediate useful work for the unemployed and underemployed in eligible areas of the Nation. Eligible areas are (1) those areas which the Secretary of Labor designates each month as having been areas of substantial unemployment for at least 9 of the preceding 12 months and (2) those areas which are designated by the Secretary of Commerce under subsections (a) and (b) of section 5 of the Area Redevelopment Act as "redevelopment areas."

In determining whether a condition of substantial unemployment exists, the Secretary of Labor considers (1) whether the area has a labor surplus which is expected to continue for the next 2 to 4 months, (2) whether an unemployment rate of 6 or more percent of the total work force exists, (3) whether net nonagricultural labor requirements for 2 and 4 months hence indicate declining employment levels or no significant increase in labor requirements, and (4) whether the current or anticipated labor surplus is due primarily to seasonal or temporary factors. Lists of newly designated and terminated areas are published monthly by the Department of Labor in its publication "Area Labor Market Trends." At its request, ARA is informally advised by the Department of Labor, 10 or 15 days before the release of the Area Labor Market Trends, of the areas which are due to have their eligibility for accelerated public works (APW) assistance terminated because they are no longer burdened by substantial unemployment. ARA informally notifies the agencies administering the grant programs, such as CFA and PHS, of the impending terminations.

Certain areas have been designated by ARA as "redevelopment areas" on the basis of unemployment criteria set forth in section 5 of the Area Redevelopment Act. These designations are based on the findings of the Secretary of Labor with respect to area unemployment rates, both current and past. Redevelopment areas are also designated on other criteria, such as family income.

The unemployment criteria for designating an area as a redevelopment area under section 5 of the Area Redevelopment Act are as follows:

1. The rate of unemployment, excluding unemployment due primarily to temporary or seasonal factors, is currently 6 percent or more and has averaged at least 6 percent for the qualifying time periods specified in (2) below.

2. The annual average rate of unemployment has been at least:

(a) fifty percent above the national average for 3 of the preceding 4 calendar years, or

(b) seventy-five percent above the national average for 2 of the preceding 3 calendar years, or

(c) one hundred percent above the national average for 1 of the preceding 2 calendar years.

Pursuant to the regulations issued by the Secretary of Commerce, ARA has the responsibility of terminating the designation of a redevelopment area when there has been such improvement in the economic circumstances of the area that it no longer meets the standards for designation as a redevelopment area. With respect to areas designated under standards of unemployment, the regulations specify that an area may not be terminated unless there has been a significant reduction in the rate of unemployment and such reduction in the rate of unemployment has continued for a reasonable period of time.

The reasonable period of time has ranged from 7 months to over 10 months and has averaged 9 months for such terminations to date. ARA notifies the areas and participating Federal agencies of such pending terminations. Accordingly, the participating Federal agencies are aware which areas are under consideration for termination many months before such termination.

Project approval and grant agreement procedures

Under regulations issued by the Department of Commerce (44 CFR 801), ARA has been designated to evaluate and coordinate the APW program. In addition, these regulations provide that all prospective projects, prior to any final commitment of funds, will be reviewed by ARA to assure that (1) adequate consideration is given to the relative needs of eligible areas, (2) at least one-third of all APW funds are allocated to small urban and rural areas designated under section 5(b) of the Area Redevelopment Act, and (3) no more than 10 percent of all amounts allocated under the Public Works Acceleration Act are made available to any one State.

Prior to ARA review, however, the prospective projects are reviewed by a joint conference composed of representatives of the Federal agencies participating in the APW program. The approval action of the joint conference is known as programing. The programing action is followed by ARA clearance. The participating Federal agencies are advised of ARA clearance by memorandum.

APW grants are made by the Federal agencies which administer the law under which the assistance is rendered. Accordingly, the head of the Federal agency normally approves the grants made by his agency.

After an application for an APW project is fully processed, cleared, and approved, a document is generally prepared which states that the Federal Government offers to make a grant to a particular municipality or public body for a specified amount of money subject to standard and special terms and conditions. A grant agreement is formally consummated when the applicant signs the grant offer, indicating acceptance of its terms.

Policies regarding projects in areas which become ineligible during processing of applications

ARA and PHS have no written policy directives covering applications from areas which become ineligible during processing. We have been informed by officials of both agencies, however, that it is their policy to process a project application to completion if the project was programed or cleared prior to the time that the area became ineligible.

The written CFA regulations with respect to projects for such areas state that processing of applications in CFA regional offices will cease immediately upon notification that an area has been removed from eligibility. If processing has progressed to the point where the funds have been reserved and the Commissioner has approved the press release announcing the project, the regional office is so advised and will continue to process the grant agreement. If the Commissioner has not approved the press release, the CFA regulations provide for processing of the application to be suspended and for the regional office to notify the applicant that it will not receive an APW grant.

The Public Works Acceleration Act, enacted on September 14, 1962, authorized the appropriation of $900 million, of which $880 million has been appropriated. As of November 1, 1963, about 7,000 projects involving APW assistance of about $790 million had been approved.

A list of the principal officials responsible for matters discussed in this report is included as an appendix.

FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Twenty-one million dollars in accelerated public works funds obligated for areas no longer qualified

Our review disclosed that about $21 million in APW funds were obligated for 85 projects in areas which were no longer eligible at the time the grant agreement was consummated or which were due to become ineligible shortly thereafter. CFA processed 66 of these projects involving APW grants of about $12,100,000; and PHS processed 19, involving APW grants of about $8,900,000. In view of the dates of the grant offers and acceptances and the procedures for informing the participating agencies of imminent area eligibility terminations, it appears that CFA or PHS was aware, at the time Federal funds were obligated for these projects, that the areas were no longer burdened by substantial unemployment.

Section 2 of the Public Works Acceleration Act states that certain communities of the Nation are presently burdened by substantial unemployment and underemployment and have failed to share in the recovery from the recession of 1960–61. This section states further that action by the Federal Government is necessary, both to provide immediate useful work for the unemployed and underemployed in these communities and to help these communities to become more conducive to industrial development and better places in which to live and work. This section of the act states also that Federal assistance is also most urgently needed in those areas, both urban and rural, which qualify as redevelopment areas because they suffer from persistent and chronic unemployment and economic underdevelopment. In addition, the congressional intent, as indicated by the committee reports and floor discussions, was that APW assistance would be directed toward those areas of the Nation most urgently needing such assistance. To this end the statute directs the President to prescribe rules, regulations, and procedures which will assure that adequate consideration is given to the relative needs of eligible areas and that one of the factors considered is the severity of the rates of unemployment and the duration of such unemployment in the eligible areas.

In our review we noted that the policies of ARA, CFA, and PHS with respect to making grants to areas which became ineligible during processing of the grant applications had resulted in 85 grants totaling about $21 million being made to areas which were no longer burdened by conditions of substantial unemployment at the time the grants were made. In addition, we found that the procedure whereby ARA is informed by the Department of Labor of impending termination of area eligibility appear to have been used to expedite processing of grants to applicants in such areas.

We noted further that CFA did not always adhere to its written procedures for suspending processing of grants to areas if the areas were declared ineligible prior to the approval of the Commissioner.

We do not consider such grants to be illegally made because neither the act nor the regulations issued pursuant thereto specifically provide at what point in time a determination as to area eligibility must be made. We believe there is considerable doubt, however, that the Congress intended that assistance under the Public Works Acceleration Act would be granted to areas known to have recovered from their burden of substantial unemployment sufficiently so that they were no longer considered eligible for assistance.

The following examples are indicative of the timing involved in the grants examined in our review and show that there was generally sufficient notice of pending termination of area eligibility before the grants were consummated for the agencies to have suspended action on applications for grants from such areas.

1. The eligibility of the Bridgeport, Conn., labor market area for APW assistance was terminated by the Department of Labor in the Area Labor Market Trends issued on January 4, 1963. ARA was notified by the Department of Labor on or about December 28, 1962, of the tentative termination of the Bridgeport area's eligibility. Despite this knowledge, ARA, on January 3, 1963, cleared a project for the construction of a municipal stadium in Bridgeport involving an APW grant of $475,000. CFA announced the project in a press release on January 11, 1963, and made a formal grant offer to the applicant on January 30, 1963, almost a month after the area's eligibility was terminated by the Secretary of Labor.

2. The eligibility for APW assistance of the Youngstown-Warren, Ohio, labor market area was terminated by the Department of Labor on October 9, 1963. CFA was informed by ARA on September 30, 1963, of the area's impending termination, and the CFA operating personnel were instructed to process any projects in the area already programed by the joint conference and cleared by ARA with the utmost speed. Grant offers were made for 25 separate projects in the area involving over $2.2 million in APW funds during October 1963. In addition, a grant offer of $1,305,000 was made for another project in this area on November 7, 1963, almost a month after the area's eligibility was terminated.

3. The Canton, Ohio, labor market area had its eligibility for APW assistance terminated by the Department of Labor on November 8, 1963, and ARA had been informally advised of this action on or before November 4, 1963. On November 7, 1963, the joint conference representatives took action to cancel four projects they had previously approved for this area but reinstated three of these projects, despite the fact that ARA was aware that the area had lost its eligibility for the projects. Also on November 7, 1963, ARA cleared these three projects.

On November 8, 1963, after it became aware that the Canton area was no longer eligible for APW assistance, the CFA Chicago regional office took action to stop processing applications from this area. The regional office went so far as to formally notify applicants by certified mail that their applications for grants would not be processed because the area was no longer eligible. However, by telegrams dated November 14 and 21, 1963, the CFA central office advised the Chicago regional office that the projects were to be approved, and the letters advising the applicants to the contrary were to be recalled because ARA had cleared the projects before the area was terminated.

CFA's written procedures call for suspension of processing on projects which the Commissioner has not approved before the area becomes ineligible. In this case the CFA was well aware, prior to the date the Commissioner approved the projects, that the area was ineligible. CFA records made available for our review do not disclose any valid reason for the Agency's departure from its written procedures. The three projects involved APW grants of $150,000 in total.

4. Livingston County, Mich., was designated a redevelopment area on October 28, 1961, because it was burdened by substantial and persistent unemployment. In its August 1962 Area Labor Market Trends publication, the Department of Labor announced that the area was no longer burdened by substantial and persistent unemployment. In accordance with regulations for termination of a redevelopment area, ARA, on December 6, 1962, notified Livingston County that if its employment improvement continued it would lose its designation as a redevelopment area. Despite the fact that ARA knew that the area was no longer burdened by substantial and persistent unemployment, the joint conference programed two projects for this area on July 16, 1963, and ARA cleared the projects on July 29, 1963. On August 1, 1963, 2 days after it cleared the projects, ARA officially terminated the eligibility of the area to receive APW assistance.

The projects involve a PHS grant of $43,500 for a lagoon and outfall sewer and a CFA grant of $232,000 for a sanitary sewer to be used in conjunction with the PHS project. Projects such as these are known as tandem projects and require coordination of approval between CFA and PHS for their respective shares of the project.

Following discussions with PHS officials, the Acting Deputy Administrator for Public Works Acceleration, ARA, reviewed the eligibility of these projects and on August 14, 1963, advised the Under Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare by letter that, since the ARA programing actions took place well in advance of the effective termination date of the area, the project was deemed fully eligible for an APW grant and urged PHS to promptly process the project. In this same letter ARA pointed out that CFA had already announced its part of the tandem project and that its announcement would have to be rescinded if the PHS project was not processed.

We noted, however, that on September 9, 1963, almost 1 month after ARA had informed PHS of CFA's announcement of the sanitary sewer, CFA advised ARA that it proposed to delete the project because of the ineligibility of the area. On the same date the CFA regional office notified the applicant that the project could not be approved because the area was no longer eligible. On September 12, 1963, the Acting Deputy Administrator for Public Works Acceleration, ARA, advised the Commissioner, CFA, that the project was proper because ARA clearance had taken place prior to termination of the area's eligibility. In this same letter ARA mentioned the PHS project and requested CFA to process its project grant in order that both projects could be completed. It appears that ARA, CFA, PHS, and the grant applicant were aware that the area was not eligible for APW assistance at the time the grant agreements were made and there was ample time to have suspended action on these projects involving about a quarter of a million dollars. It should be noted also that the Secretary of Labor had determined a year prior to these actions that the area was no longer sufficiently burdened by substantial and persistent unemployment to qualify for designation as a redevelopment area.

Agency comments and conclusions

In commenting on our findings, CFA, PHS, and ARA advised us that the policy of determining eligibility as of a date prior to the actual formalization of the grant agreement was fairest to the applicants and at the same time was in accord with the letter and the spirit of the law. These agencies generally stated that it was preferable, from the standpoint of program stability and administration, to adopt the early cutoff date permitting both the Government and the applicant to proceed in processing the application and perfecting the transaction without threat of imminent termination of eligibility status.

In addition, these agencies pointed out that APW applicants must incur expenses for a variety of activities before they are in a position to give an unqualified acceptance of the Government's grant offer. These activities include arranging to secure land; arranging for the financing of the non-Federal share of the cost of the project; and obtaining engineering, architectural, and similar services.

It has also been noted by these agencies that labor market conditions, which are the principal basis for the designation and dedesignation of eligible areas, are in a constant state of flux and that areas may be eligible one month, ineligible the next, and eligible again shortly thereafter. We were advised that under these circumstances, it was deemed necessary to fix a uniform cutoff date, the date of ARA clearance, which would serve as a guideline to ARA and the participating agencies for the processing of applications.

We question whether an early cutoff date is necessary or desirable in a program such as this and whether it is fair to all the applicants and in accord with the letter and the spirit of the law. The Public Works Acceleration Act was clearly intended to provide that assistance be furnished to depressed areas by providing jobs for their unemployed and necessary public facilities to make the areas more conducive to industrial development and a better place to live and work. Assistance to areas which had already recovered from their depressed condition would not, in our opinion, be in furtherance of these objectives. This would seem especially true in view of the many applications from eligible depressed areas which were not acted upon because sufficient funds were not available. Neither is it fair, in our opinion, to consummate grants to areas which are no longer depressed as long as there are other truly depressed areas in need of assistance. Prudent management would appear to warrant a decision as to area eligibility at the latest feasible point at which a grant would be made with finality from the Government point of view.

We recognize that areas may incur some expenses in anticipation of the grant agreement after they have been informed that their applications have been approved. In that respect, areas must incur expenses just to file an application. Eligible depressed areas, which have had their applications deferred and which may also be financially depressed, would appear to be less able to afford such expenses than areas which were no longer considered depressed. Further, in the case of CFA projects, the applicants in nondepressed areas may have been able to avail themselves of the CFA public facilities loan program if such assistance was necessary rather than to abandon their projects. We noted, also, that the CFA guide to applicants advises that the approval of the grant would be established by the execution of an agreement between the applicant and the agency and that it would, therefore, be prudent for the applicant to refrain from initiating any action which involves the incurring of liabilities until the agreement was signed.

We believe that a relatively simple procedure to prevent the expenditure of APW funds in areas no longer burdened by substantial unemployment would be to include in all press releases, project approvals, and grant offers a statement that the Federal assistance was conditional upon the area still being eligible at the time the agreement was consummated.

Although labor market conditions do change from time to time, we believe that this situation should not present significant administrative problems. According to the information published by ARA concerning eligible areas as of November 15, 1963, only 69 out of about 1,300 areas have had their eligibility for APW assistance terminated because of an improvement in their unemployment situation, and, of these, only 6 have been redesignated because of an upturn in unemployment. The very few areas where improvement in the employment situation does not continue could have their applications reinstated when they again become eligible. In this respect, we noted that a CFA regional office informed applicants from an area which had lost its eligibility that, if the area should again be listed as an area eligible to participate in the APW program, it could request to have its application reactivated.

In commenting on the matters discussed in this report, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare stated that, since there was no legal requirement to determine an area's eligibility at the same point in time that a grant was made, it was preferable to make such a determination at that point where it was necessary to assure prompt and stable decisions upon which both the applicant and the Federal agency could rely with assurance in undertaking, at times at some expense, the additional steps needed to perfect the transaction.

PHS determines area eligibility as of the date of ARA approval. In 8 of the 19 (about 44 percent) PHS grants to areas after the areas' eligibility was terminated, the ARA approval date occurred from 1 to 7 days prior to the area termination date. In our opinion PHS had sufficient time, after being notified of the area termination, to have suspended processing such applications without impairing program stability or requiring the community and the agency to operate under a cloud of indecision about area termination. Further, we noted that many projects were approved by ARA after that agency was aware that the area was no longer depressed and, as shown by one of the preceding examples, ARA, itself, had informed the area and participating agencies many months before its approval action that the area was likely to have its eligibility terminated.

In those cases where we were able to obtain sufficient documentation to ascertain the exact date when ARA was notified by the Secretary of Labor of an area's impending termination, we found that ARA had taken action to approve or clear eight projects in these areas on the same day of, or after, such notification. The agencies most directly involved with the matters discussed in this report have informed us that the current policies are necessary to have a program that is fair to the applicants and one that can be effectively administered and carried out by both the Government and the applicants.

In our opinion the policies, practices, and procedures which resulted in grants of about $21 million to areas after the areas had recovered from their burdens of substantial unemployment are not in furtherance of the purpose and intent of the Public Works Acceleration Act and should be revised. These policies have also resulted in grants to nondepressed areas at a time when there is a large backlog of APW applications from depressed areas which cannot be met because of the shortage of APW funds. ARA has estimated this backlog to be about $800 million. Accordingly, we believe that procedures should be devised to preclude, to the greatest extent practicable, the extension of assistance under the APW program to areas which have recovered from their depressed conditions.

Recommendations

We recommend that, in order to assure that funds appropriated pursuant to the Public Works Acceleration Act are used to assist those communities and areas in the Nation most urgently in need of such assistance, the Secretary of Commerce adopt a policy and devise procedures to preclude grants to areas which become ineligible during the grant processing procedures. We recommend further that the Secretary require participating agencies to advise applicants that all approval actions take prior to the time the formal grant agreement is made will be conditional upon the area's being eligible for APW program assistance at the time of formal agreement.

SCOPE OF AUDIT

Our review of grants made under the authority of the Public Works Acceleration Act for projects in areas whose eligibility had been terminated included:

1. Review of pertinent laws and regulations.

2. Review of the policies, procedures, and practices of ARA, CFA, and PHS with respect to grants for projects in areas whose eligibility had been terminated.

3. Review of the records at ARA, CFA, and PHS pertaining to actions taken through November 1963 on APW grants for projects in such areas.

APPENDIX

Principal officials responsible for management of the accelerated public works program during the period covered by this report

	Tenure of office	
	From—	To—
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE		
Secretary of Commerce: Luther H. Hodges	January 1961	Present.
Area Redevelopment Administration:		
Administrator:		
William L. Batt, Jr	May 1961	Do.
Deputy Administrator for Public Works Acceleration:		
Paul Southwick	November 1962	May 1963.
Assistant Administrator for Public Works Acceleration:		
Dr. Johannes U. Hoeber	December 1962	Present.
HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY		
Administrator: Robert C. Weaver	February 1961	Do.
Community Facilities Administration: Commissioner: Sidney H. Woolner	do	Do.
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE		
Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare: Anthony J. Celebrezze	July 1962	Do.
Under Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare: Ivan A. Nestingen	February 1961	Do.
Assistant to the Under Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare: Lloyd H. Rooney.	December 1962	Do.
Public Health Service: Surgeon General: Luther L. Terry	March 1961	Do.

TARAS SHEVCHENKO

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, last week as we fought for freedom over the world in the struggle against communism, a statue was unveiled here in Washington to a freedom fighter from another land. This statue was dedicated to Taras Shevchenko, a Ukrainian poet who fought against the same tyranny we are fighting today in southeast Asia. In his poems he spoke not only for the Ukraine but for all the captive nations enslaved by the Russian masters. As an Ukrainian, he expressed the sufferings of his people and their past under serfdom. As an European, he joined a society that was organized for the purpose of creating a great free union of all the Slavonic people under a republican form of government. Though in his life he had only 9 years of freedom, he chastised those who defended liberty too weakly and longed for the day when the Ukraine too would "receive their Washington." If Shevchenko were alive today I am sure that he would repeat his poetic hope, "And receive him we will some day."

OIL IMPORTS POLICIES

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SHRIVER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, once again the administration has brushed aside the urgent appeal of a domestic industry which is being damaged seriously by foreign imports.

Total disregard for the domestic petroleum industry has been demonstrated by the administration's decision to increase oil imports for the next 6 months.

In making this decision the administration has ignored the pleas of Governors, Members of Congress, the interstate oil compact, and a united group of independent producing associations.

On May 25, 1964, I wrote to the Secretary of Interior, the Secretary of Defense, and called to the attention of the President the need for a substantial reduction in the more than 2 million barrels of oil being imported into the United States each day.

Both the Departments of Interior and Defense indicated that further study and evaluation of the problems and recommendations of the industry would be undertaken.

These problems of independent oil producers will not go away just through studies and analyses.

The petroleum industry of the United States is vital to the defense and security of our Nation. This is an industry which has been going down hill steadily since 1956. In my own State of Kansas, the situation of independent producers is serious. Excessive imports constitute one of the primary reasons for the decline.

The administration's decision that oil imports into the United States for the next 6 months are to be increased more than 100,000 barrels daily over the same period of last year and 70,000 barrels over the current level will further depress this sick industry.

The independent oil producer is getting the same brushoff from the administration as the American livestock producer received earlier in his plea for relief from damaging foreign imports.

JUGGLING JOBS AND UNEMPLOYMENT FROM AREA TO AREA

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. TALCOTT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, the ARA encourages the "pirating" of industries—a movement of industry to new areas causing unemployment in some places in order to create jobs in others. There is substantial evidence that many ARA-financed projects are destroying as many existing jobs as the number of new ones claimed to be created. For example, ARA claims "200 direct new jobs will be created in the Holmes County, Miss., area as a result" of its $801,172 loan for a lightweight papermill despite the fact that the paper industry generally is suffering from overcapacity and operating at about 70 percent of capacity.

The ARA spent $118,000 on "technical assistance" for a project to prove the feasibility of growing sugarbeets in Cayuga County, N.Y., where they had not been grown for generations, and then persuaded the Agriculture Department to grant a special 50,000-ton sugarbeet quota to the New Yorkers at the sacrifice of beet farmers elsewhere who were crying for quotas for the scarce quota allocations.

> The Red River Valley of Minnesota and the Dakotas are not asking for ARA-financed studies.

Declared the gentleman from Minnesota, Congressman LANGEN.

> Our people are not asking for anything except permission to grow beets on some of

the richest and most productive soil in the world.

Projects like this do not make economic sense. The Federal Government simply pours thousands of dollars into areas that then compete directly with worthwhile organized local efforts elsewhere. The sorry part of this mess is that the farmers in known sugarbeet areas are being hurt because of efforts to solve problems elsewhere—problems our farmers had no part in creating. It is time we call a halt to make-work projects that do nothing except waste our money in one section and create new problems elsewhere. Representative STAGGERS of Washington also complained that the Moses Lake area in his State, with one of the highest per-acre tonnage productions in the United States, could produce more yet cannot get the tonnage allocation. He asked:

> Why should proven areas such as this be denied sugarbeet allocations because an unproven area wants to find out if it can even grow sugarbeets?

The administrators, managers, and promoters of ARA are grounded in, and motivated by, raw politics and they almost completely ignore basic economic and business facts of life. The Federal Government has an obligation to poverty-stricken areas where the local businessman and governments cannot help themselves. But the Federal Government has no business using public funds collected from all taxpayers throughout the Nation to juggle jobs for political reasons. Congress should investigate the ARA, its purposes, and real accomplishments.

COMPLIMENT TO OFFICIALS OF THE JOHN F. KENNEDY CENTER

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARRY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to commend our distinguished colleague, the chairman, the gentleman from Ohio, MIKE KIRWAN, and members of the Appropriation Committees of the House and Senate, as well as the Public Works Committees of the House and Senate for an efficient and expeditious job in connection with the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts.

I want particularly to compliment the work done by the officials and trustees of the John F. Kennedy Center, under the chairmanship of Roger L. Stevens. I wish to record the energetic efforts of their general counsel, Ralph E. Becker, who has coordinated the legislative activity of the Center, from its inception to the present time. His work has contributed substantially toward making the Center possible.

To date the Center has raised over $15 million, and it needs another $5 million. It is now up to the general public to meet its goal of $5 million from private funds. I am confident of the Nation's continued response.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an editiorial of the Washington Star of June 25.

THE FEDERAL PART

> Senate approval of an $18 million appropriation for the Kennedy Memorial Cultural Center is not merely another step in the Federal Government's contribution to this admirable project. It is, for practical purposes, the final step. All that now remains is to resolve in conference a few minor differences between the House and Senate versions of the bill.
>
> In addition to the Government's matching contribution of $15.5 million, the appropriation includes $2.5 million to acquire a needed addition to the site. Both these provisions are vital. While private donations to match the Government's $15.5 million have already been raised, an additional $5 million is needed from private sources. Final passage of the Federal appropriation should give this fund-raising effort just the stimulant it needs. The assurance of adequate space for the Center along the Potomac River in Foggy Bottom is no less important. Indorsement of this site once again by both the House and Senate, moreover, should settle the question of location once and for all.

NEW FORM OF FOREIGN AID—THE INTERNATIONAL COFFEE AGREEMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI], is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, we are witnessing a new form of foreign aid. The House has authorized expenditure of $550 million for the Alliance for Progress in H.R. 11380, but in addition, an expense of $600 million per year has been placed on the backs of U.S. consumers by the manner in which the State Department has represented the United States at the International Coffee Agreement meetings in London.

When the House passed the implementing legislation for the International Coffee Agreement (H.R. 8864), it clearly did not intend that the U.S. taxpayer be saddled with an additional $600 million per year in foreign aid, through higher prices for coffee. It did not intend that $600 million thus be transferred annually to the millionaire plantation owners or that it be transferred by them to numbered Swiss bank accounts, or that it serve to increase the funds which the Latin American government entities divert to state Socialist ventures with our State Department encouragement.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

The report of the House Ways and Means Committee on H.R. 8864 reads:

> The Department of State has assured your committee that the purpose of the treaty is not to raise coffee prices, but to prevent those prices from declining below the general level of prices prevailing in 1962.

President Kennedy, on October 21, 1963, wrote Chairman MILLS—letter published in the committee's report—that:

> The purpose of the agreement is to check the disastrous decline in coffee prices that began in 1955 by holding a floor under those prices at the general level prevailing in 1962, and to bring stability to coffee markets by preventing major fluctuations in price.

President Kennedy went on to assure the committee that:

> There are adequate safeguards in the agreement—to protect fully the interests of the American consumer. Probably the most important safeguard is that our votes plus those of any other single consuming country are sufficient to insure that export quotas will not be set below the level of estimated demand.

However, the State Department has betrayed the pledge made to Congress. The fact is that the State Department has approved the setting of export quotas below estimated demand, and has made it clear to the producing countries that it will not use its voting power to "stabilize prices" in the manner that the President had pledged to the Congress. Instead, the State Department has used the price-raising technique of the coffee agreement to provide in effect an immense expansion in foreign aid donations, free of the scrutiny of the Congress. The burden this placed surreptitiously on the U.S. consumer has already passed $600 million per year, and if the Senate approves H.R. 8864, a new rise will be touched off.

This is foreign aid without congressional approval. It is executive department abuse of the U.S. consumer.

EXPERIENCE WITH IMPLEMENTATION OF COFFEE AGREEMENT

First. Essentially, the agreement provides that member countries shall fix the maximum quantities of coffee that will be permitted to reach export markets. It is simple economics that the ability to limit the quantity going to market is the ability to fix prices.

That being the case, what were the objectives that the State Department set for this cartel-like control when it sought the approval of the Congress?

The cartel's targets were defined as follows:

"Not to raise prices"—House Ways and Means Committee report.

"To hold a floor under prices at the general level prevailing in 1962"—President Kennedy to House Ways and Means Committee.

"To assure such prices to consumers as will not hamper a desirable increase in consumption"—article 27 of the agreement.

"To prevent major fluctuations in prices"—President Kennedy to House Ways and Means Committee.

Second. In practice, the State Department abandoned these stated objectives and concentrated on the raising of prices so as to provide an immense donation to the producing countries without having to clear congressional committees on foreign aid.

The Department of Labor has reported that by April 1964, the price of coffee bagged to the consumer has gone up 25 percent, other coffees 18 percent, so that the annual cost to the U.S. consumer of the price increases had already passed $600 million per year.

Instead of working for a level of prices that would stimulate consumption and help relieve the market of the immense stocks overhanging it, the price level to which the State Department directed its efforts has caused a decline in consumption. The U.S. Department of Agriculture has reported that in 1963 per capita consumption of coffee declined by 2.5 percent and total consumption by 1 percent, and the decline in 1964 is reported to be accelerating under the burden of the immensely increased prices.

In other words, contrary to the pledges of the State Department to the Congress, major fluctuations have not been prevented, consumption has not been stimulated, and the simple target of policy has been to achieve an immense rise in the price of coffee.

The State Department has testified that the real cause of the immense rise in prices is a single bad crop in Brazil arising out of climatic difficulties.

This is a deliberate falsehood. There is not, was not, and will not be, any shortage of coffee, or any difficulty in meeting demand, except by the artificial barriers imposed by the export quotas to which the State Department acquiesced.

The Department of Agriculture has reported that Brazil alone, to say nothing of the carryovers of coffee in other countries, has surplus stocks of 20 to 25 million bags of exportable quality, and another 25 million bags that can be put into condition for export.

The Department of Agriculture has reported that world coffee stocks on July 1, 1963, were 70.6 million bags, or about a year and a half of world requirements, and that world stocks on July 1, 1964, will be even larger than this. It reports that the smaller 1964–65 Brazilian crop will necessitate some drawing down on these stocks, but this withdrawal from stocks will not absorb even a major part of the exportable qualities in the carryover. The Department notes the likelihood of production of a size in the following year 1965–66 that may cause new additions to carryover in the world.

As it lies about the cause of the present rise in the price of coffee, the State Department chooses to conveniently ignore its own previous testimony. On October 3, 1962, when the Department was trying to win congressional approval of the international coffee agreement—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, November 2, 1962—Assistant Secretary of State Dutton reported that:

> The supply and demand situation as presently known argues against any marked increases in coffee prices. Tremendous stocks are held by Brazil and Colombia, stocks are also building up in some African countries.

Secretary of State Rusk continued the explanation on May 10, 1963:

> We see no possibility in the immediate future of raising coffee prices—tremendous stocks of surplus coffee exert constant pressure on the market.

Thus, when Assistant Secretary of State Mann, on May 13, 1964, said that:

> A temporary imbalance of world supply and demand existed which brought about rapid and sharp increases in coffee prices.

He departed from the truth in an obvious manner that shows as much disrespect for the American public as his Department has exhibited disrespect to Members of the House.

WHY COFFEE PRICES ROSE

There was and there is no shortage of coffee to justify the great rise in price. The price rise came simply by a cartel's use in classic fashion of its capacity to limit supplies that can reach the market, and the recognition by the trade the world over that the State Department, despite its public pledges to the Congress, had shown by its actions at the London meetings that it preferred that export quotas be set so as to achieve an immense rise in price, and thus provide a bundle of loot for the producing countries without having to suffer the scrutiny of House Foreign Affairs Committee and House Appropriations Committee.

There is general agreement that the export quotas as manipulated with the full approval of the State Department were responsible for the rise in prices.

First. The American Farm Bureau on March 2, 1964, told the Senate Finance Committee that the International Coffee Agreement is to blame for the situation:

> Supplies have been held off the market through export quotas and prices have skyrocketed. Since the agreement came into force, coffee prices have risen nearly 50 percent and are still rising.

It recommended that the Senate reject H.R. 8864 and that the United States seize the opportunity to disengage itself from the International Coffee Agreement.

Second. The National Coffee Association, representing the trade in the United States, told the House Banking and Currency Subcommittee that "the export quotas set by the International Coffee Agreement contributed to the sharp rise in prices." And the spokesman for the association told the press after the committee hearings that the trade disagrees sharply with the claim of the State Department that export quotas were not responsible for the rise in prices.

Third. The chairman of General Foods Corp.—world's largest vendors of coffee—recently told his stockholders that "the quota restrictions of the International Coffee Agreement contributed to converting a buyers' market into a sellers' market."

Fourth. In Bonn, Germany, the Ministry of Economy assailed the export quotas as the cause of the rise in prices.

HOW STATE DEPARTMENT BETRAYED ITS PLEDGE TO CONGRESS

Contrary to President Kennedy's pledge, the State Department at no time used its influence or its voting power to bring export quotas to a level in line with the objectives that had been cited to the Congress when approval of the participation in International Coffee Agreement was being sought.

The first quotas set by the cartel after ratification of the agreement by the Senate totaled 45.7 million bags. The U.S. Department of Agriculture had reported world trade in 1962 exceeded 47 million bags, and that annual growth rate was 3.3 percent. This meant that the State Department approved the cartel's limiting of maximum supplies that could reach the market to a figure 5 percent lower than demand. Is it then any wonder that prices rose, and that speculators were encouraged to see this definition of State Department policy as assuring heavy increases of prices?

When prices rose as desired by the Department, and trade realization the world over that the Department of State was now on the side of higher prices began to be a market factor, other consumer nations objected strenuously. Then, the State Department made a halfhearted, I repeat, halfhearted effort to gain an increase of 1 million bags in the quotas. This would have kept quotas below anticipated demand. And yet, even this piddling rise was rejected by the cartel, in the knowledge that the State Department had no intention of using the voting power which it had bragged about to the Congress.

Prices continued to rise, in the comfortable knowledge that the State Department was committed to a betrayal of U.S. interest and to a betrayal of the pledges made to the Congress.

Later when the countries in London began to fear that the Senate might reject the implementing legislation (H.R. 8864), they consented to an increase of 2.3 million bags, but this still left supply below anticipated consumption requirements. And it was less than the European members had asked as consumers.

PHONY WHITE HOUSE PROTECTION OF CONSUMER

Meanwhile, the White House has named Mrs. Esther Peterson an adviser on consumer problems, quite obviously for political purposes. Mrs. Peterson was quick to say that she had no intention of challenging on behalf of the consumer this policy of the State Department to provide foreign aid through the vehicle of the coffee cartel. Therefore, Mrs. Peterson has no intention to protect the consumer. President Johnson's political protege turns out to be anticonsumer.

On May 27 the distinguished chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee discussed this matter. I direct your attention to his remarks as confirmation of the points I have emphasized. Interestingly, the distinguished chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee was using figures supplied him by the State Department that an additional million bags of coffee had just been made available by the cartel. This was not true, and further emphasizes the doubledealing of the State Department in this field.

Mr. Speaker, I raise these points since this week we debate the foreign aid appropriation bill, and in view of these facts which I have presented to you, I urge a substantial cut in the foreign aid appropriation bill.

Also, in view of these facts, is it not time to require that all foreign aid go through regular congressional procedure? Is it not time to make sure that the consumer does not pay double the foreign aid bill, once by H.R. 11380, and again by State Department manipulation of the coffee export quotas in violation of the pledges that President Kennedy made to the Congress and the people of the United States?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DERWINSKI. Yes. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I commend the gentleman from Illinois for bringing this subject before the House today. The gentleman will recall that when the implementing legislation went through the House we were assured that the coffee agreement would not result in increased prices to American consumers. However, we find, as the gentleman has stated, that coffee prices have done nothing but increase. I will not mention the brand name of the coffee which we use in our family, but that coffee has gone from 76 cents or 73 cents a pound, to 91 cents a pound. This is exactly the same brand and the same weight of coffee and, I am sure, the same blend of coffee. This is taking it right out of the hides of the American consumers.

On the other hand, we are called upon to pass foreign giveaway bills and pour additional cash into the coffee-producing countries in South America which have, I believe, a 2-year supply or surplus of coffee on hand. So on the one hand we take it out of the hides of the American consumers by permitting them to be gouged through an increased price for the coffee they drink and, on the other, we reach into their pockets and through their payments of taxes toss out more hundreds of millions of dollars to Central and South American countries by way of foreign aid handouts. There is no way the consumers and taxpayers of this country can win under that kind of double dealing.

Mr. DERWINSKI. If the gentleman will permit me to point them out, there are some other interesting observations I wish to make.

First of all, the reason why we cannot get much information from the executive branch of the Government about this coffee situation, is that we have to obtain our materials from different sources. I had to reach the Department of Labor to get the figures relative to the increase in the price of coffee. According to the Labor Department reports of April 1964, the price of coffee has risen 25 percent in the last year. The Department of Agriculture, which is responsible for keeping tabs on supplies available, reports that there is enough coffee on hand for a year and a half's normal world requirements. So the coffee market is not at all in danger of being saturated. As a matter of fact, this brings up one interesting question of the much-abused discussion of the intent of Congress. If anything, it is my thought that the Congress did not intend that the consumers of the United States pass on $600 million a year to the coffee growers of Latin America in the form of these price increases, especially when millions of these funds are diverted to Swiss bank accounts or, as we see, is diverted by various Latin American countries into socialistic ventures promoted by our State Department.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DERWINSKI. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. I do not think the gentleman, when he spoke of this individual over in the White House, an adviser or a consumer specialist or whatever she is called, I do not believe the gentleman really thought that she was going to make any great contribution, anyway, because there is no question but what she is strictly a political appointee. You would not expect too much from a strictly political appointee, would you? You would not expect her to be too interested in the rocketing of coffee prices to American consumers, particularly if that interfered with State Department policy?

Mr. DERWINSKI. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DERWINSKI. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to compliment him on bringing this subject succinctly to the attention of those who are here on the floor today and furthermore on his announcing ahead of time what he was going to do.

The fact of the matter is that actually those who were duped by the State Department in sponsoring this legislation, the so-called international coffee price-fixing agreement, subsequently apologized on the floor of this House for having been taken in and foisting off onto the consumer this foreign aid giveaway or Latin-American "progreso," behind-the-back handout, which has resulted therefrom.

The sad thing about that is that little of the $600 million that comes out of the pockets of the coffee buyers of the United States gets to the recipient of foreign aid, or the Alliance for Progress or the OAS intent on foreign aid. This goes to the coffee barons whom I can recall dumping coffee into the ocean a few years ago in order to stabilize world market prices, or to those who deal in coffee futures in New York or New Orleans, I am quite sure.

Would the gentleman not agree with me that we are coming full circle and have about arrived at the same place on this coffee price-fixing scheme and behind-the-back handout to Latin-American countries, that we are coming to in all areas under the Tariff Assistance Act of 1952? This becomes a somewhat subsidiary scheme of that and we are reaching the same place where we are with the impact of beef imports, lead and zinc, glass, shoes, pottery, the so-called chicken war with the Common Market that is being considered in the GATT conferences in Geneva. It is all part of the great scheme of the State Department and it matters little how we do it, we end up paying a subsidy to foreign nations predicated on our taxpayers' ability to pay or to borrow. The result is exactly the same. Would the gentleman agree with that?

Mr. DERWINSKI. The gentleman's comment is timely. The reason I directed this issue to the attention of the House this afternoon is not only that it is in direct relationship to the foreign aid appropriation bill that is pending before the House but that here is a burden that we have placed directly on the back of the American taxpayer. As a matter of fact, it is a rather open abuse of the taxpayer. It is not hidden. It is reflected immediately in the coffee prices that people pay. We recognize the fact that for practical purposes this means that the consumer of the United States has been defrauded by the State Department in deliberate contradiction to statements made to the Congress.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I would again comment that this is getting to be the habit and the rule rather than the exception. It is time that such fraudulent procedures were cast out by the Congress, the only truly legislative body remaining.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DERWINSKI. I appreciate the gentleman's pertinent and timely comments.

THE SHEVCHENKO MEMORIAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LIBONATI). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York, [Mr. HALPERN], is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to add my voice to those of the Ukrainian-Americans who are commemorating the 150th anniversary of the birth of Taras Shevchenko, the Ukrainian poet and internationally known champion of freedom.

It gives me particular pleasure, however, in seeing that the plans and expectations of so many Ukrainian-Americans have at last been fulfilled with the breaking of ground a year ago for constructing the memorial to this great poet and now the unveiling of that memorial this coming June.

Shevchenko deserves such a place of honor in this Capital City.

This is the least that we Americans can do to commemorate the life and works of a man dedicated to freedom.

For Shevchenko belongs to all humanity, not just to Ukrainians. His is a universal appeal. The hopes and aspirations of this great personality are those of every man in every land who seeks freedom, independence, and a way of life in keeping with the God-given dignity of man.

Our own Walt Whitman is the poet of American democracy. The magnificence of his poetic expressions will ever be enshrined in the memories of every American who has read his works. But Whitman wrote not just for Americans; he wrote for mankind; he is the property of humanity. And so it is with Taras Shevchenko; for he is the poet of all mankind; and his is a message for the oppressed, the suffering, the enslaved.

It is fitting, therefore, that this memorial to Shevchenko be raised in this capital of world democracy, Washington.

This memorial can serve as a reminder to all Americans of Russia's historic oppression of the Ukraine.

But more important, this memorial can serve as a reminder to all mankind that the values of Shevchenko, as those of Whitman, the values of freedom and democracy, are, indeed, imperishable and that our faith in those values, in those fundamental principles, must be constantly renewed so that they will never lose their force of example in this very imperfect world of ours.

APW PROBLEM SHENANIGANS FURTHER EXPOSED BY GAO—$21 MILLION SPENT IN AREA NO LONGER HAVING SUBSTANTIAL UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a letter from the Comptroller General of the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LIBONATI). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, further shenanigans going on under the Public Works Acceleration Act (APW), are evidenced in the latest report of the Comptroller General to the effect that $21 million was approved for 85 projects despite the fact that the areas involved were no longer burdened by conditions of substantial unemployment.

The Area Redevelopment Administration, administering agency for the APW program has been so anxious to use up the existing authorization of $900 million so it could come back to Congress and demand new authorization, that $21 million has been spent on projects in areas where unemployment is no longer chronic.

This is typical of the ARA's slipshod, haphazard but determined efforts to pump Federal project money under this massive public works program into every area of the country possible.

The attitude exhibited here by spending $21 million contrary to the clear intent of Congress in areas no longer burdened with chronic unemployment, evidences further the lack of wisdom in giving the Executive carte blanche spending and project approval powers that have always been reserved to Congress on a project-by-project approval basis.

ARA, in falsely overestimating job creating results of the program, in making grant money available for swimming pools and golf courses, in purposely soliciting projects to pump the money out; and now, in spending $21 million improperly, proves conclusively that ARA and APW should be terminated.

All future public works programs should be pursuant to proper congressional authorization and review to avoid such slipshod handling of the taxpayers' money.

The covering letter in the GAO report dated June 25, 1964, follows:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE
UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C., June 25, 1964.

To the SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
To the PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE OF THE SENATE.

In our examination of the administration of the accelerated public works program by the Area Redevelopment Administration, Department of Commerce, and other Federal agencies, we found that grants of over $21 million had been made for 85 projects in areas which were no longer burdened by conditions of substantial unemployment at the time the grants were consummated.

The Public Works Acceleration Act, under which $880 million has been appropriated, authorizes grants-in-aid to local agencies to accelerate or initiate public works projects intended to provide immediate useful work for the unemployed and underemployed in areas of the Nation burdened by substantial unemployment and in areas which qualify as redevelopment areas because they suffer from persistent and chronic unemployment and economic underdevelopment. Under the policies currently followed by the agencies reviewed by us, grants are consummated for areas which are no longer sufficiently burdened by unemployment to qualify for such assistance, provided that the area was qualified at the time administrative approval of its application occurred. In addition, processing appears to have been expedited on applications from such areas before the areas are officially declared ineligible.

We have been informed by officials of the agencies concerned (1) that it would be unfair to deny assistance to areas which become ineligible during the period required for agency processing procedures because the areas had an investment of time and money in the project, (2) that a firm cutoff date for determination of eligibility was necessary because areas were frequently being designated and dedesignated as eligible areas, and (3) that their policies were legally sound, in accord with the reasonable exercise of administrative judgment, and in accord with the letter and the spirit of the law.

Although we do not consider such grants to be illegally made because neither the statute nor the regulations issued pursuant thereto specifically provide at what point a determination of area eligibility must be made, we believe there is considerable doubt that the Congress intended that assistance under the Public Works Acceleration Act would be granted to areas under the circumstances noted in this report. In our opinion, funds appropriated to assist areas burdened by substantial unemployment should not be used to assist areas which have sufficiently recovered from their unemployment burdens to lose their eligibility. In view of the large backlog of applications for assistance under this act which could not be met because of insufficient funds, it would appear that the agencies should have concentrated their resources on processing applications from eligible areas rather than expediting the processing of applications from areas whose termination was imminent.

We are recommending that the Secretary of Commerce adopt a policy and devise procedures to preclude grants to areas which become ineligible during the grant processing procedures and that applicants be advised that all approval actions taken prior to the time of the formal grant agreement are conditional upon the area's being eligible for assistance at the time of formal agreement.

Copies of this report are being sent to the President of the United States; the Secretary of Commerce; the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare; the Secretary of Labor; and the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency.

JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
Comptroller General of the United States.

ANNIVERSARY OF SOVIET OCCUPATION AND DEPORTATIONS IN THE BALTIC NATIONS

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, the history of the lands and peoples lying between the Baltic and Black Seas is complex and often tragic. Populations have been uprooted. Invasion has come from the East and from the West. Once independent nations have been divided between conquering powers. Newly independent nations have hardly tasted liberty before again falling subject to a powerful neighbor fearful for its security.

The aftermath of World War I permitted many of the peoples in this area to realize a long-cherished dream of independence. The fever of self-determination swept over eastern and northeastern Europe. For 20 years following World War I these nations struggled to establish stable governments and viable economies. And then the cataclysm of World War II came to shatter hopes and to open a new period of suffering and oppression. As great power clashed with great power, the small nations in the path of mighty armies suffered the fate always suffered by the weak and defenseless. Their lands were invaded and their people made to serve the strongest power of the day.

In 1940 the Soviet Union occupied Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania and established puppet governments which voted the incorporation of their nations into the Soviet Union. Occupation and the end of independence were accompanied by mass deportations of recalcitrant elements of the population to remote regions of the Soviet Union. It is the anniversary of these events that we observe this month. With the Nazi drive against the Soviet Union in 1941 came a new invasion and a new terror. And as if two invasions were not enough, a third came as the Soviet armies turned the tide and began their push to the West.

The Baltic Republics did not regain their liberty following World War II. They became a part of the Soviet Union and thus returned to the conditions they had known before World War I; they once more became subject peoples. They did, however, regain peace.

Peace has enabled these wartorn nations to rebuild their farms and cities, to establish new industries, to turn their attention to the tasks left unfinished in 1940. Peace under Soviet auspices, however, has also brought forced collectivization, and the suppression of religious and political liberty.

True progress is best accomplished when men are masters of their fate. When freedom has once been tasted, its loss can never be accepted as final. The Baltic peoples have not lost hope that one day they will regain their independence, that one day, they will no longer be the victims of forces beyond their control. They dream of a truly peaceful world, wherein the grip of their oppressor may be relaxed and wherein their independence need not constitute a threat to any neighbor. The sad events whose anniversary we observe this month should help us remember that the hopes of these peoples are also ours, and help us to strive for that peaceful world which may result in their liberation.

TARAS SHEVCHENKO

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Michigan [Mrs. GRIFFITHS] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, this year marks the 150th anniversary of the beloved Ukraine poet Taras Shevchenko. An important observance of this anniversary was the dedication of the Shevchenko monument, June 27, in Washington, D.C.

Along with 2 million Americans of Ukranian descent and origin, let us all pay tribute to this man whose courage and faith inspired and extended the ideals of freedom. In the beauty of verse, his plea for human justice from the heart of the Ukraine, has transcended the boundaries of nations and the span of time.

A BILL TO INCREASE MILITARY SUBSISTENCE ALLOWANCES

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. On May 6, 1964, I delivered a speech on the floor of this House in which I stated that the Federal Government ought to stop beating our military personnel by reducing benefits, such as the proposed curtailment of commissary privileges. In that speech I also stated that in the near future I would introduce proposed legislation for new military pay increases. Today I have introduced the first of a series of bills designed to increase military pay and improve the standard of living of our men and women in the armed services.

The bill I have introduced today would simply increase the subsistence allowance for members of the uniformed services to $75 per month. Present subsistence allowances vary from $30.90 per month for enlisted personnel to $47.88 per month for officers. These present subsistence allowances are a national disgrace and a shame. If they are to continue at that low rate they ought to be renamed starvation allowances. A man cannot buy enough food for a healthy diet on $30 or even $50 per month. In my home State of Texas county the State welfare agencies recommend that child support payments for infants and young children be maintained at a minimum of $40 per month. This is a minimum figure so that the child may have enough food to grow up. And it is recognized that more will be required as he gets older. How can we expect men and women working hard in the service of their country to subsist on the amount of money it costs to buy milk and pablum for a baby?

The House Armed Services Committee in its report on the military pay bill of 1963 stated that since 1952 there has been a steady deterioration of the compensation provided members of the uniformed services compared to the compensation payments in private industry and to civilian employees of the Federal Government. What that report did not go into, however, is the fact that we have also systematically cut down and eliminated the services that used to be offered to military personnel. We have been chipping away at the serviceman's benefits since World War II. The deterioration of military pay and the erosion of military benefits has got to be stopped if we are to have a first-class Military Establishment—$75 per month is a realistic subsistence allowance.

Anyone familiar with the high cost of food knows that this amount of money is necessary each month to purchase enough food for an adequate diet. A raise in subsistence allowance is a particularly helpful way to approach the problem of low military compensation because an increase in this area is not subject to taxation. A $45 increase in subsistence will therefore result in a $45 increase in take-home pay. Our men and women in the armed services need this increase in take-home pay in order to buy food. I hope my colleagues in the House will seriously consider this bill, and will join with me to help our military personnel.

THE SUPREME COURT'S DECISION ON REAPPORTIONMENT

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WAGGONNER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I have risen on a number of occasions to call attention to the threat which has hung over the heads of the people pending the Supreme Court's decision on reapportionment. That decision has come now and it is just what many of us feared it would be: another in the long chain of anti-Constitution findings for which the Court has now become infamous.

An editorial in the Shreveport (La.) Journal last week explicitly spelled out, again, the viewpoint I have maintained since it became known that a decision was to be handed down.

I urge every Member to study the following editorial and, as you do, I believe it will become increasingly clear that this Congress must take affirmative steps to curb this Court and do so soon.

A LONG STEP BACKWARD

The political revolution wrought by Chief Justice Earl Warren's decision of "one man, one vote" in State legislative polls is the most far reaching in the Nation's history. It means that both houses of State legislatures must be apportioned so that they will be based as far as practicable on population.

It transforms representation based on county and senatorial districts to those based strictly on the number of people. It breaks the hold of the rural areas in most States. It gives the cities and growing suburbs the relative representation their numbers permit. It affects at least 40 of the 50 States in which such inequalities have persisted, in some cases for many decades.

In some of the larger States, it will mean control of both houses of the legislature will pass to the dominant party. For instance, in New York the Democrats have controlled the lower house because it is based more nearly on population. The Republicans have controlled the Senate because every county but one had at least one Senator and the upstate Republican and rural counties outnumbered those of the urban centers. Now the metropolitan New York area will have a much larger representation and, presumably, control on both houses will pass to the Democrats.

Not even the fact that a referendum had approved the apportionment in Colorado was affirmed by the Court. Warren said that voters cannot vote away the rights of citizens to equal representation. The State senate there will have to be reapportioned, as the house has been.

Justice Potter Stewart, writing for himself and Justice Tom Clark, called the decision harsh and said it is without support in the words of the Constitution. His comment follows:

"The Court's Draconian (barbarously harsh) pronouncement, which makes unconstitutional the legislatures of most of the 50 States, finds no support in the words of the Constitution, in any prior decision of this Court, or in the 176-year-old political history of our Federal Union.

"With all respect, I am convinced these decisions are a long step backward into that unhappy era when a majority of the members of this Court were thought by many to have convinced themselves and each other that the demands of the Constitution were to be measured not by what it says, but by their own notions of wise political theory.

"The rule announced today is at odds with long-established principles of constitutional adjudication under the equal protection clause, and it stifles values of local individuality and initiative vital to the character of the Federal Union."

Justice John Marshall Harlan closely examined the history of the 14th amendment on which the majority relied and quoted comments from its sponsors that it would not affect States' power to regulate voting. He held that the equal protection clause was never intended to inhibit the States in choosing any democratic method they pleased for the apportionment of their legislatures. He insisted that as the Court assumes the role of the repository of all reforms, it sows the seeds of trouble for itself.

But Warren carried a majority of six to these three dissenters. He wrote a separate opinion in six cases originating from Alabama, Colorado, Delaware, Maryland, New York, and Virginia and held apportionment in all six unconstitutional. Cases are awaiting action in the Supreme Court from Connecticut, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Illinois, Michigan, Ohio, Oklahoma, and Washington. Suits are pending altogether in at least 40 States.

No time limit was given for this wholesale overhaul of the Nation's State legislative systems, but Warren instructed Federal district courts to make sure no further elections are held under "invalid" apportionment. Courts may withhold immediate relief where an impending election is imminent and a State's election machinery is already in progress. Specifically, he told lower courts to decide now whether legislative districts must be revised before next fall's election but is is doubtful that much action can be taken before then. Most States have nominated legislative candidates. Few would relish going through that again before November. The full blow will fall in State legislative elections after this year.

The urban revolution is now complete. The rural areas are losing their political power, as they lost their economic power during this century with the mass migration from the farm.

As to the Warren court's decision itself, Justice Stewart is eminently correct. The decision was harsh, had no legal or historic justification, and was merely legislation on the part of the Court's majority. No graver indictment could be aimed at the Court.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Monagan, for 30 minutes, tomorrow, June 30, 1964.

Mr. Derwinski (at the request of Mr. Gross), for 1 hour, today.

Mr. Halpern (at the request of Mr. Gross), for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. Quie (at the request of Mr. Gross), for 1 hour, on June 30.

Mr. Steed, for 10 minutes, Wednesday, July 1, 1964; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Williams (at the request of Mr. Patten), for 30 minutes, June 30, 1964; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. Alger.

Mr. Farbstein.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Gross) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Dole.

Mr. Saylor.

Mr. Horton.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Patten) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Beckworth.

Mr. Powell.

Mr. Fraser.

Mr. Libonati.

Mr. Gonzalez.

Mr. Minish.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 187. An act to authorize establishment of the Fort Union Trading Post National Historic Site, N. Dak. and Mont., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1790. An act to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 2082. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to accept a transfer of certain lands within Everglades National Park, Dade County, Fla., for administration as a part of said park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 2533. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Manson Unit, Chelan division, Chief Joseph Dam project, Washington, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 2630. An act to amend the act of June 12, 1948 (62 Stat. 382), in order to provide for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Kennewick Division extension, Yakima project, Washington, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 3941. An act to amend section 902 of title 38, United States Code, to eliminate the offset against burial allowances paid by the Veterans' Administration for amounts paid by burial associations;

H.R. 5514. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain public lands in the State of Arizona;

H.R. 6777. An act to amend section 712 of title 38 of the United States Code to provide for waiver of premiums for certain veterans holding national service life insurance policies who become or have become totally disabled before their 65th birthday;

H.R. 6920. An act to amend section 715 of title 38, United States Code, to authorize, under certain conditions, the issuance of total disability income provisions for inclusion in national service life insurance policies to provide coverage to age 65;

H.R. 8462. An act to authorize the conveyance of certain real property of the United States heretofore granted to the city of Grand Prairie, Tex., for public airport purposes, contingent upon approval by the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, and to provide for the conveyance to the United States of certain real property now used by such city for public airport purposes;

H.R. 10000. An act to extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, and for other purposes;

H.R. 11499. An act to amend section 14(b) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, to extend for 2 years the authority of Federal Reserve banks to purchase U.S. obligations directly from the Treasury; and

H.J. Res. 1041. Joint resolution temporarily extending the program of insured rental housing loans for the elderly in rural areas under title V of the Housing Act of 1949.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills and the joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 10669. An act to extend the Renegotiation Act of 1951, and for other purposes;

H.R. 11375. An act to provide, for the period ending June 30, 1965, a temporary increase in the public debt limit set forth in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act; and

H.J. Res. 1056. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1965, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 56 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 30, 1964, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2219. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting the 12th report on the extent and disposition of U.S. contributions to international organizations for the fiscal year 1963, pursuant to Public Law 806, 81st Congress (H. Doc. No. 313); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

2220. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, relative to plans for works of improvement relating to the following watersheds: Marshyhope Creek, Del. and Md.; Mill Creek, Ga.; Turtle River, Ga.; and Wellington-Napoleon, Mo., pursuant to section 5 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1005), and Executive Order No. 10654 of January 20, 1956; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2221. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on an examination of the administration of the accelerated public works program by the Area Redevelopment Administration, Department of Commerce, and other Federal agencies, revealed that grants of over $21 million had been made for 85 projects in areas which were no longer burdened by conditions of substantial unemployment at the time the grants were consummated; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2222. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on a review relating to the unnecessary costs to the Government through the leasing of electronic data processing systems by the operating contractor, ARO, Inc., Arnold Engineering Development Center, Arnold Air Force Station, Tenn., Department of the Air Force; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2223. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States; transmitting a report on a review relating to disclosing that ineffective administration and control of travel advances and purchase of transportation for employees for travel expenses had been extended during periods in which the employees either did not travel or performed only limited travel; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2224. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States; transmitting a report on the Veterans' Canteen Service for the fiscal year 1963, Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2225. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report relating to unjustified disposal of aircraft parts, Department of the Army; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2226. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the fifth semiannual report on the activities of the U.S. Travel Service, pursuant to section 5 of the International Travel Act of 1961; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2227. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, relative to the appraisal of lands on the Third Division of the Riverton project and the negotiation of land purchase options with the entrymen or owners, pursuant to 78 Stat. 156; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2228. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, relative to plans for works of improvement relating to the following watersheds: Hiawassee River, Ga.; Muddy Creek, Kans.;

Presque Isle Stream, Maine; and West Fork Duck Creek, Ohio, pursuant to section 5 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1005), and Executive Order No. 10654 of January 20, 1956; to the Committee on Public Works.

2229. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the Annual Report of the Foreign-Trade Zones Board for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1963, together with certain other reports relating to certain other foreign trade zones, pursuant to Public Law 566, 81st Congress; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2230. A letter from the Chairman, Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission, transmitting the Eighth Interim Report of the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission, pursuant to Public Law 372, 84th Congress, and Public Law 842, 87th Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

2231. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated April 28, 1964, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of the reports on Wicomico River, Md., requested by resolutions of the committees on public works, U.S. Senate and House of Representatives, adopted February 6, 1959 and June 3, 1959; to the Committee on Public Works.

2232. A letter from the Secretary of the Army transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated April 21, 1964, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of the reports on Windmill Point Creek, Lancaster County, Va., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted June 3, 1959; to the Committee on Public Works.

2233. A letter from the Secretary of the Army transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated April 27, 1964, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a letter report on the Upper Fox River, Wis., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted September 18, 1945. No authorization by Congress is recommended as the subject project has been transferred to the State of Wisconsin under authority of section 108 of the River and Harbor Act of 1958; consequently, the United States has no further obligation with respect to operation of the project; to the Committee on Public Works.

2234. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated April 21, 1964, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of the report of South Fork of Crow River, Minn., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Flood Control, House of Representatives, adopted September 18, 1944; to the Committee on Public Works.

2235. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated April 28, 1964, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a letter report on Cornucopia Harbor, Wis., Lake Superior, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted June 3, 1959; to the Committee on Public Works.

2236. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated April 28, 1964, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of the reports on Rum River, Minn., requested by resolutions of the Committee on Public Works, U.S. Senate, adopted April 27, 1955, December 23, 1957, and January 10, 1958, and of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted July 29, 1955; to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of June 25, 1964, the following bill was reported on June 26, 1964:

Mr. KIRWAN: Committee of conference. H.R. 10433. A bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1519). Ordered to be printed.

[Submitted June 29, 1964]

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 793. Resolution for waiving points of order on H.R. 11812, a bill making appropriations for foreign assistance and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1520). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 11438. A bill to amend the Alaska Omnibus Act to provide assistance to the State of Alaska for the reconstruction of areas damaged by the earthquake of March 1964, and subsequent seismic waves, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1521). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BLATNIK: Committee on Public Works. H.R. 10619. A bill to amend the act of June 16, 1948, to authorize the construction of an additional bridge across the Chesapeake Bay in the State of Maryland, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1522). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MILLS: Committee of conference. H.R. 11376. A bill to provide a 1-year extension of certain excise-tax rates (Rept. No. 1523). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H.R. 11818. A bill to amend section 162 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to clarify the deductibility of premiums paid for flood insurance or indemnity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 11819. A bill to amend title 37 of the United States Code to increase the subsistence allowance for members of the uniformed services to $75 per month; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HARSHA:

H.R. 11820. A bill to amend the Trade Expansion Act of 1962; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

H.R. 11821. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special 50-cent piece in honor of each of the several States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. JONES of Alabama:

H.R. 11822. A bill to amend the act of March 3, 1899, to authorize the United States to recover by civil actions the cost of removing certain obstructions from the navigable waters of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 11823. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROUSH:

H.R. 11824. A bill to provide for the disposition of the funds arising from judgments in favor of the Miami Indians of Indiana and Oklahoma and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SECREST:

H.R. 11825. A bill to amend the Trade Expansion Act of 1962; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOLE:

H.J. Res. 1078. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OSTERTAG:

H.J. Res. 1079. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.J. Res. 1080. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARSHA:

H.J. Res. 1081. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARVEY of Indiana:

H.J. Res. 1082. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. QUIE:

H.J. Res. 1083. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TALCOTT:

H.J. Res. 1084. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H. Con. Res. 317. Concurrent resolution commending the President for his recent statement with respect to aggression in the Middle East and expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to such aggression; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNGER:

H. Res. 794. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to create a standing committee to be known as the Committee of Inquiry which shall have no legislative jurisdiction; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee:

H. Res. 795. Resolution authorizing the Speaker of the House of Representatives to appoint a special committee to investigate and report on campaign expenditures of candidates for the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MOORE:

H. Res. 796. Resolution to inquire into the financial or business interests of any present or former Member, officer or employee of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to take immediate action to stop the importation of foreign meat into this country, which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 11826. A bill for the relief of Aram Bagdasar Dinkci and Araksi Dinkci; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYS:

H.R. 11827. A bill for the relief of Sister Rose Alba (Maria Puprino) and Sister Ernestine (Giuseppe Vitiello); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

H.R. 11828. A bill for the relief of Miss Esther Robbins; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H.R. 11829. A bill for the relief of Chang Jin U; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H.R. 11830. A bill for the relief of Jaime Barges Bandarra; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WATTS:

H.R. 11831. A bill for the relief of Dr. Theresa Directo Cachuela; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

◆

SENATE

MONDAY, JUNE 29, 1964

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. METCALF).

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who dost speak to listening hearts in the holy hush of the dawn and in the brooding quietness of the evening, speak to us now, we pray, in the heat and burden of noontide's toiling, as the white scroll of a new day unfolds before us.

Give us this day our daily bread, not only of physical renewal, but also of spiritual sustenance, lest our souls starve in the far country of neglect or indulgence. May the eternal immensities shame our little, unworthy thoughts and ways. May those who have been here called to administer the affairs of the Nation make daily choice of spiritual integrity, amid the corruption that is in the world through the lust of power, that, being unafraid, they may contend steadfastly for the right, as Thou dost give them to see the right.

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, June 26, 1964, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following act and joint resolution:

On June 24, 1964:

S.J. Res. 103. Joint resolution to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated for the work of the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped.

On June 25, 1964:

S. 718. An act for the relief of W. H. Pickel.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Acting President pro tempore:

H.R. 3941. An act to amend section 902 of title 38, United States Code, to eliminate the offset against burial allowances paid by the Veterans' Administration for amounts paid by burial associations;

H.R. 5514. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain public lands in the State of Arizona;

H.R. 6777. An act to amend section 712 of title 38 of the United States Code to provide for waiver of premiums for certain veterans holding national service life insurance policies who become or have become totally disabled before their 65th birthday;

H.R. 8462. An act to authorize the conveyance of certain real property of the United States heretofore granted to the city of Grand Prairie, Tex., for public airport purposes, contingent upon approval by the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, and to provide for the conveyance to the United States of certain real property now used by such city for public airport purposes;

H.R. 10000. An act to extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, and for other purposes;

H.R. 11499. An act to amend section 14(b) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, to extend for 2 years the authority of Federal Reserve banks to purchase U.S. obligations directly from the Treasury; and

H.J. Res. 1041. Joint resolution temporarily extending the program of insured rental housing loans for the elderly in rural areas under title V of the Housing Act of 1949.

ORDER DISPENSING WITH CALL OF LEGISLATIVE CALENDAR

On request by Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the call of the Legislative Calendar, under rule VIII, was dispensed with.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements during the morning hour be limited to 3 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZATION TO RECEIVE MESSAGES AND SIGN BILLS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the adjournment or recess of the Senate today, the Secretary may receive messages from the House, and the President pro tempore or the Acting President pro tempore be authorized to sign bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Public Health Service.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

On motion by Mr. MANSFIELD, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request by Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on

Rules and Administration was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

Report on the U.S. Travel Service

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the U.S. Travel Service, for the period October 1963–March 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

Document Issued by Federal Power Commission

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a document entitled "Sales by Producers of Natural Gas to Natural Gas Pipeline Companies, 1962" (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on Commerce.

Reports of Foreign-Trade Zones Board

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1963, together with reports covering the operations during the same period of foreign-trade zones Nos. 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, and 8 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Finance.

Report on U.S. Contributions to International Organizations

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on U.S. contributions to international organizations, for the fiscal year 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Report of Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission

A letter from the Chairman, Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, the eighth interim report of that Commission (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

PETITION

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the petition of Philip C. Macfadden, of Represa, Calif., relating to his claim for a redress of grievances, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with amendments:

H.R. 10222. An act to strengthen the agricultural economy; to help to achieve a fuller and more effective use of food abundances; to provide for improved levels of nutrition among economically needy households through a cooperative Federal-State program of food assistance to be operated through normal channels of trade; and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1124).

By Mr. CHURCH, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments:

S. 1123. A bill to provide for the construction of the Lower Teton division of the Teton Basin Federal reclamation project, Idaho, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1127).

DISCLOSURE OF FINANCIAL INTERESTS AND ENUMERATION OF CERTAIN PROHIBITED ACTIVITIES—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—INDIVIDUAL VIEWS (S. REPT. NO. 1125)

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report an original resolution which would amend the standing rules of the Senate to provide for the disclosure of financial interests and enumerate certain prohibited activities.

The report accompanying this resolution will explain its terms and objectives. I ask unanimous consent that the Rules Committee may have an additional period of 24 hours during which to file its report on this resolution and I also ask unanimous consent that the report may include the individual views of certain Senators who are members of the Rules Committee.

At this time, Mr. President, I wish to emphasize that the report of which I now speak is not the report of the Committee on Rules and Administration which the committee was directed to make by Senate Resolution 212, agreed to October 10, 1963, relating to the study and investigation with respect to the financial or business interests of officers or employees of the Senate.

It is the intention of the committee to make that report to the Senate in the very near future, and I assure my colleagues that the members of the committee are diligently at work on the final draft at this moment.

The latter will contain a number of positive and constructive recommendations. The resolution I now report is solely concerned with two areas of conduct which the committee believes should receive early attention by the Senate through remedial legislative action.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received, printed, and placed on the calendar; and, without objection, the request of the Senator from North Carolina that the report, to be filed within 24 hours, be printed with individual views, is agreed to.

The resolution (S. Res. 337) is as follows:

Resolved, That the Standing Rules of the Senate are amended by adding at the end thereof the following new rules:

"RULE XLI—DISCLOSURE OF FINANCIAL INTERESTS

"Section 1. Each individual who is a Member of the Senate and each officer or employee of the Senate compensated at a gross rate in excess of $10,000 per annum on April 15 of any year shall file with the Secretary of the Senate on or before such date a report which shall contain a true and correct statement of—

"(a) the name, principal place of business, and nature of the principal activity of each private corporation, partnership, trust, or other legal entity engaged for profit in any business or professional activity in which such individual, as of January 1 of that year—

"(1) held beneficially and pecuniary interest having a value equal to or exceeding 50 per centum of the annual rate of gross compensation of such individual as a Member, officer, or employee of the Senate as of the time of the filing of such report; or

"(2) served as an officer, director, or partner, or in any other executive, managerial, or advisory capacity;

"(b) the name and address of any professional firm which engages in practice before any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States in which he has a financial interest.

"Sec. 2. Each such report shall be filed on a form prescribed and furnished by the Secretary of the Senate, and shall be prepared in such manner as the Secretary shall prescribe. Any individual who in any year has filed a report in compliance with the requirement of section 1, and whose pecuniary interests in and affiliations with such legal entities remain unchanged in a subsequent year, may so certify to the Secretary, upon a form to be supplied by the Secretary for that purpose, in lieu of filing for such subsequent year a report in the form required for compliance with section 1.

"Sec. 3. Nothing contained in this resolution shall be construed to require any individual to make any report with respect to any (1) pecuniary interest in any dwelling occupied as a residence by him, his spouse, or any member of his immediate family, or (2) non-revenue-producing property, or (3) pecuniary interest in or affiliation with any organization described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 which is exempt from taxation under section 501(a) of such Code.

"Sec. 4. On or before June 30 of each year, the Secretary of the Senate shall prepare and publish a report which shall set forth all information contained in all reports and certifications filed with him under this resolution in that year.

"Sec. 5. Upon application made by any individual (other than a Member, officer, or employee of the Senate) who is a candidate for nomination in any primary election, or election in any general or special election, to be a Member of the Senate, the Secretary of the Senate shall furnish to such individual a copy of the form prescribed for the making of reports in compliance with section 1 of this resolution. The report prepared and published by the Secretary of the Senate in any year under section 4 shall set forth all information contained in all reports which may be submitted to him on or before April 15 of that year by such candidates upon forms so furnished.

"Sec. 6. As used in this rule, the term officer or employee of the Senate" means—

"(1) an elected officer of the Senate who is not a Member of the Senate;

"(2) an employee of the Senate, or of any committee or subcommittee of the Senate;

"(3) the Legislative Counsel of the Senate or any employee of that office;

"(4) an Official Reporter of Debates of the Senate and any person employed by the Official Reporters of Debates of the Senate in connection with the performance of their official duties;

"(5) a member of the Capitol Police Force whose compensation is disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate;

"(6) an employee of the Vice President if such employee's compensation is disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate;

"(7) an employee of a joint committee of the Congress whose compensation is disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate; and

"(8) an employee of any Member of the Senate.

"RULE XLII—PROHIBITED ACTIVITIES

"1. No officer or employee of the Senate may be vested with or exercise any authority or responsibility for, or participate in any way in any consideration of or determination with respect to, the allocation between or among two or more Members of the Senate of any funds available for use to defray expenses incurred or to be incurred by any individual for or in connection with any campaign for the nomination or election of any individual to be a Member of the Senate.

"2. As used in this rule, the term "officer or employee of the Senate" has the meaning given thereto by Section 6 of Rule XLI."

REIMBURSEMENT TO OWNERS AND TENANTS OF CERTAIN LANDS OR INTERESTS THEREIN ACQUIRED BY THE UNITED STATES—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 1126)

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on Government Operations, I submit a report on S. 1509, a bill to authorize reimbursement to owners and tenants of certain lands or interests therein acquired by the United States for certain expenses, losses, and damages, and for other purposes.

I should like to make a brief statement in explanation of the proposed legislation, for the information of Members of the Senate, relative to the background and need for this legislation. It will benefit many of our citizens, small businessmen, merchants, farmers, and others, who in many instances are burdened with heavy expenses, or losses incurred in moving from land which was acquired by the Federal Government, for which under existing law they do not now receive adequate compensation.

A special subcommittee was appointed by the chairman of the Committee on Government Operations, on February 18, 1964, consisting of myself as chairman and Senators McIntyre, Ribicoff, Miller, and Pearson, to consider S. 1509, S. 1232, and H.R. 6237, bills introduced at the request of the Administrator of General Services, as part of the GSA legislative program for 1964.

This bill provides that reimbursement shall be in addition to, but not in duplication of, other payments authorized by law. The total reimbursement for moving household effects, business establishments, livestock and farm equipment, or other possessions shall not exceed 25 percent of the fair market value of the property as determined by the head of the agency. Such moving expenses, losses, or damages directly resulting from moving to a new location must be supported by an itemized statement submitted to the head of the agency concerned within 1 year from (a) the date the interest is to be vacated under an agreement with the Government, or (b) the date the parcel is actually vacated, whichever first occurs.

As set forth in the report on S. 1509, representatives of the GSA assured the committee that the 25-percent limitation placed on this bill was a ceiling only, and that this provision is identical to the provisions of existing law under which the Departments of Defense and Interior, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration have been operating for several years.

Similar legislation was reported by the committee in the 86th Congress and the committee gave further extended consideration to a similar proposal in the 87th Congress. The committee has been assured that the proposed legislation is desirable and in the public interest since it will permit the establishment of a uniform Governmentwide policy for the payment of actual expenses and losses incurred, within the limits prescribed, by individuals who are forced to vacate their homes or from land acquired by the Government regardless of the agency involved in the negotiations.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and printed, and the bill be placed on the calendar.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 2959. A bill for the relief of Maj. Robert G. Smith, U.S. Air Force; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NELSON (for himself and Mr. McGovern):

S. 2960. A bill providing for the formulation of an effective program for fulfilling our military manpower requirements on a voluntary basis in order that mandatory service in the Armed Forces may be terminated not later than June 30, 1967; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. Nelson when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTIONS

TO PRINT AN ADDENDUM AS PART 2 OF SENATE DOCUMENT NO. 69, 88TH CONGRESS, ON "WORLD COMMUNISM—A SELECTED ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY"

Mr. EASTLAND submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 336); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That there be printed as part 2 of Senate Document No. 69, 88th Congress, entitled "World Communism—A Selected Annotated Bibliography," an addendum to that document prepared by the Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress, at the request of the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary; and that there be printed five thousand three hundred (5,300) additional copies of part 2 of such document for the use of that committee.

DISCLOSURE OF FINANCIAL INTERESTS AND ENUMERATION OF CERTAIN PROHIBITED ACTIVITIES

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 337) relative to disclosure of financial interests and definition of prohibited activities of Senate personnel, which was placed on the calendar.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. Jordan of North Carolina, which appears under a separate heading.)

ADJUSTMENT OF RATES OF BASIC COMPENSATION OF CERTAIN OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES—AMENDMENT (AMENDMENT NO. 1079)

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 11049) to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF ALASKA OMNIBUS ACT—AMENDMENT (AMENDMENT NO. 1080)

Mr. GRUENING submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 2881) to amend the Alaska Omnibus Act to provide assistance to the State of Alaska for the reconstruction of areas damaged by the earthquake of March 1964, and subsequent seismic waves, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(See reference to the above amendment when submitted by Mr. Gruening, which appears under a separate heading.)

CALIFORNIA INTERTIE AND LIBBY DAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the recent announcement of the plan for the California intertie by the Department of the Interior will help implement the Canadian treaty, and therefore will help assure early construction of Libby Dam, in northwestern Montana. My colleague, Senator Lee Metcalf and I are hopeful that construction on this project can be started in the very near future.

Secretary of the Interior Udall recommended construction of four big electrical interconnections to sell surplus Northwest kilowatts in California, Arizona, and Nevada, and to exchange off-peak power between the Pacific Northwest and Pacific Southwest. Part of the plan calls for sale in California of Canadian treaty power which otherwise would be surplus to the Northwest for the first 5 to 10 years.

Canada has agreed to ratify the Columbia River treaty only if Canada's share of treaty power can be sold in the United States for 30 years for a lump sum of $254.4 million paid in advance by October 1, 1964. Libby Dam, which backs water 42 miles into Canada, can be built only if the treaty is approved by Canada.

A nonprofit corporation is now being formed by Northwest private and public utilities to buy Canada's share, sell revenue bonds to finance the prepayment to Canada, and resell Canada's share to produce revenues with which to repay the revenue bonds.

One of the more difficult problems of completing these arrangements is the fact that much of Canada's share of treaty power—which is more costly than the average cost of Bonneville Power Administration power—would be surplus to the needs of the Pacific Northwest for at least the first 5 years after treaty power comes on the line.

California utilities, public and private, however, have made firm offers to purchase at the established price large quantities of Canada's share of treaty power in these early years, and longer, if intertie facilities are built so treaty power can be transmitted outside the Northwest.

Assurance of a California market for surplus treaty power would greatly facilitate the completion of arrangements to prepay Canada for its share of treaty power and to hasten the day when Libby Dam is built.

Senator METCALF and I feel that the proposed intertie also would help Montana's industrial development and economic growth by helping keep the price of BPA power low. BPA expects to increase its net revenues by an average of $11 or $12 million per year for 50 years as a result of the intertie, and without intertie revenues would have to increase rates by that much more than with the intertie. I understand that total benefits to the Northwest resulting from the intertie are estimated at $1 billion over the next 50 years.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, let me say to both Senators from Montana that we have got to find a way to work out the intertie arrangement, because I believe Canada has been exceedingly reasonable and fair in her negotiations with the United States in connection with the use of Columbia River water.

The real problem, however, is the question whether public preference customers will be protected in any intertie arrangement. I am going to do everything I can to cooperate in working out an intertie agreement; but the problem which confronts us in this whole intertie situation is whether, at the time when we approve an intertie, we shall have some idea as to what we are going to agree subsequently, when it comes to making wheeling contracts with the private utilities. Unfortunately, the private utilities do not have a very good record in regard to putting the public interest first.

I shall speak on this subject at some length before the adjournment of Congress. It bears upon the speech I made at St. Petersburg, Fla., some weeks ago, on the whole problem of public power preference protection, and the desirability of having the private utilities and the public projects work together on a cooperative basis.

As both the Senators from Montana know, in my 20 years in the Senate, I have been a strong advocate of the pooling arrangement; and I can see a wheeling arrangement as part of a pooling arrangement. But we are confronted with a legislative problem when we sanction an intertie arrangement, and leave for future negotiation with the private utilities the working out of the agreements in regard to the wheeling of the power.

Let me say to the Secretary of the Interior that I shall scrutinize any intertie proposal from this standpoint: What assurance shall we have that the private utilities will give us fair agreements for the wheeling, over their transmission lines, of the power that is generated at dams owned by the American people?

Once again I point out that if we let the private utilities control the transmission of the power, we turn the dams over to them, and we might just as well give them power at the bus bar. But I shall never support that, because it is not in the public interest.

If the private utilities wish to come forward with an intertie agreement—and among the private utilities I think there are some industrial statesmen who would like to change the pattern of the conduct of the private utilities in years gone by—I am willing to work with them; but I do believe that we should get this matter settled before we approve an intertie agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Oregon has expired.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DODD in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. I sincerely hope the Secretary of the Interior and the President of the United States will see to it that the public interest is protected in this respect, before we enter into an intertie arrangement, and then leave to future negotiation chance the arrangement in regard to wheeling the power; because if the public preference groups cannot get the power on a fair-deal basis, we shall have cheated them; and I do not propose to be a party to cheating.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, of course I join my senior colleague in congratulating the Secretary of the Interior for arriving at this agreement, so that we can go forward with the construction of Libby Dam and the dams in Canada, and can carry out our agreement with Canada to market the power that is generated in the Northwest region.

I absolutely agree with the Senator from Oregon. In the Northwest, we have had a happy arrangement with the Northwest power pool and the Bonneville Power Administration. Private power, municipal power, and Federal public power have been working together in marketing their power and working for the benefit of the region to bring the power rates down, and thereby to bring new industries into the region.

I see no reason why the same program cannot continue in connection with the generation and transmission of power. If the power generated at publicly owned dams or through cooperative regional management is to move over transmission lines owned by private utilities, the result is the same, as has been said, as if the private utilities owned the power at the bus bar. To this, I am unalterably opposed.

But if we can work out an arrangement whereby the Federal Government owns the power, and, under long-term contracts, whereby the wheeling and the transmission lines are pooled, we can enjoy the same happy relationship that has been worked out in the Pacific Northwest, so that the private utility statesmen—and, as has been said, there are some—will, in cooperation with Federal public power and municipal power—such as that at the city of Los Angeles, aid in the pooling of these vast resources for the benefit of the people of America and for the benefit of their separate regions.

It will be the responsibility of the Secretary of the Interior to carefully scrutinize these contracts, to be sure the Bonneville Power Administration and the Northwest power policy, and the public interest are adequately protected. It goes without saying that the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. and the other private power companies will also carefully scrutinize the contracts, to see that their interests are protected.

The present fine program in the Northwest—a program worked out with the aid of private utility statesmen—should be a pattern for similar programs in other regions of the country, so that, through cooperation between the various power sources, the highest development of the resources of the region can be achieved.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, my recollection is that the specific proposal made by the Secretary of the Interior for an intertie has only recently been sent to Congress, and thus only recently been susceptible to public information and scrutiny.

Speaking for myself, I am quite unaware of its contents, other than in a rather general or nebulous way. Those who are at all acquainted with the proposal in California have both warmly endorsed and bitterly condemned the intertie proposal of the Secretary. I have said earlier, to the people of California, and I repeat now to the Senate, that Congress has a duty fully, carefully, and completely to scrutinize the proposal and then to determine where the public interest lies. That is what I propose to have done.

As I understand the mechanics of the process, the recommendation of the Secretary of the Interior will come before the Appropriations Committee of the Senate this week. It may likewise come before the Appropriations Committee of the House.

I venture to suggest that there may very well be a sufficiently serious policy question involved to require the Interior Committees of the House and the Senate likewise to participate in the hearings, and to scrutinize the proposal which has been made.

Mr. President, it appears to me that the public interest would best be served by having hearings before both committees in each House, rather than merely before the Appropriations Committees in the two Houses.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR DIRKSEN FOR HIS CONTRIBUTION TO THE PASSAGE OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS BILL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, Senator DIRKSEN's contribution to the passage of the civil rights bill is well known, but less well known is the reasoning and deep conviction which motivated his efforts. An editorial entitled "The Saga of Senator DIRKSEN," published in the Christian Science Monitor, on June 24, explains in accurate and moving terms why Senator DIRKSEN, the distinguished minority leader, worked so long, so hard, and so successfully to pass an effective civil rights bill. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SAGA OF SENATOR DIRKSEN

The story of Senator DIRKSEN yesterday is the story of the American people tomorrow. He had to study the civil rights problem. As he became expert his ideas changed. Then his moral approach to the problem was transformed.

What Senator DIRKSEN learned was the hard lesson that the Negro problem in the South is not what it seemed to be from a distance. He had thought it was essentially a social, economic, and legal problem to be solved by bringing the Negroes and whites progressively closer together.

What he discovered was that the process could not get underway until a closed door was opened in front of it. He found that those in control of the police power were increasingly alarmed as the Negroes demonstrated against the laws and rules of a segregated society. He came to the conclusion that voluntary effort could not suffice to bring about significant changes and that the local authority would not permit them.

"It has altered my thinking a little," he said in his gentle way. "The States and localities are entitled to have the first chance to work it out if they can. If they can't work it out, there has to be someplace to go." That someplace was higher authority, the Federal Government and the civil rights bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN had come face to face with the most uncomfortable aspect of the confrontation in the South; namely, that where a major social change is in the making, and is both advocated and resisted with great depth of conviction, the two sides tend to pull apart rather than closer together as a climax comes near. When this happens a peaceful local solution becomes almost impossible. Neither side will yield; each is determined to have its way. This is what nowadays is called a collision course.

Before he analyzed it this way, Mr. DIRKSEN told anyone who raised the moral argument that "I am a legislator." When someone mentioned the possibility of violence he replied that no legislator could take such matters into consideration.

When he began to think the problem through he said, "The best you can do is to go and pray for me, and I will also pray for myself." When he had grasped the nature of the problem he quoted Donne's 17th century "Devotions": "Any man's death diminishes me, because I am involved in mankind." Then he spoke for himself: "Whatever the color of a man's skin, we are all mankind. So every denial of freedom, of equal opportunity for a livelihood, or for an education, diminishes me. There is the moral basis for this legislation."

So he led the way to a national instead of a local solution.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I rather doubt that all our colleagues in the Senate, let alone the people of the United States, are very well acquainted with the long, arduous hours, days, and weeks which were unselfishly expended by the minority leader of the U.S. Senate in sifting the civil rights bill as it came from the House, in studying—as the able lawyer he is—the legal problems which each phrase and section conjured up, and then painstakingly preparing a series of proposed amendments—almost 100 amendments—to the House bill, and thereafter inviting into his offices both Senators who wished to vote in favor of civil rights legislation and those who hesitated to do so, in order finally to determine what the interest of the people of the country required in this case.

I say again that when our generous and very able friend the majority leader [Mr. MANSFIELD] sees fit to have an editorial printed in the RECORD commenting on our Republican leader, I join him in pointing out the indefatigable and excellent labor which our minority leader performed.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, the recognition of the contributions of the distinguished minority leader, EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, continues to grow.

His leadership performance concerning the civil rights bill has been described as one of the finest ever seen on Capitol Hill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial appearing in the Kansas City Star on June 22, 1964, and further, that an editorial appearing in the Parsons Sun on June 23, 1964, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Kansas City Star, June 22, 1964]

SENATOR DIRKSEN: BEYOND THE CALL OF PARTY

The leadership performance of EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN on behalf of the civil rights bill was one of the finest we have ever seen on Capitol Hill.

To say as much is not to underestimate the part played by Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, of Montana, the majority leader, or by his assistant, Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, of Minnesota. They had themselves the critical problem of a party irreconcilably split on the issue. The genesis of delay that sometimes seemed about to become paralysis was the Democratic Party. But MANSFIELD and HUMPHREY were guiding the destiny of a bill behind which a Democratic administration had placed its weight. It was a case of doing what was expected. Both came through.

But because of the defection in their party, their work would have been in vain had not Senator DIRKSEN, the minority leader, risen to such heights of leadership. We can recall, last September, a similar performance by the Illinoisan on behalf of the limited test ban treaty. It, too, needed bipartisan support. It was forthcoming. And perhaps the most eloquent speech in its behalf was made by DIRKSEN, who labeled himself as one who understood the meaning of Hiroshima and knew that the first step had to be taken.

Long ago, DIRKSEN, once known chiefly for the glories of his oratory, moved from role of speechmaker to the role of one of his party's great senatorial leaders. In the case of the civil rights bill it is obvious that he had no hope of political reward in his State. Whatever he might have done, he was not going to win an outpouring of Negro votes. As a group, Negroes have never supported him and he knew they would not. DIRKSEN was acting in the interests of his Nation and his fellow citizens. He did so by laboring many long hours with the majority leaders and Attorney General Kennedy to find the amendments that would make the bill acceptable.

It is important to history that he did so. Above all, this had to be a bipartisan bill, for there is so much danger in the explosive divisiveness of civil rights.

By late May, DIRKSEN could predict, in his own words, that "we shall finally contrive it." In the showdown he could deliver all but six of his party's votes. We would say that Senator DIRKSEN, of Illinois, has proved himself as a legislative leader.

[From the Parsons Sun, June 23, 1964]

ON ITS SIDE

Banning of the common drinking cup and the roller towel in public use long has been an accepted practice in Kansas as elsewhere.

It wasn't always thus. The late Dr. Samuel J. Crumbine, this State's crusading early-day public health officer, was vilified as a Socialist, reformer, wild-eyed dreamer and worse for pushing those measures in his productive regime in Kansas.

There is a parallel today on civil rights legislation, and it was brought to the attention of the U.S. Senate in a dramatic, forceful manner on the final day of debate by the commanding figure of that long and historic senatorial episode.

Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN, of Illinois, the Republican leader, reminded the Senate that the prohibition against child labor, the pure food and drug law, minimum wage law, and social security also were denounced as unconstitutional and assailed with doubts by opponents when they were first enacted.

"It required no constitutional amendment to bring about all these forward thrusts in the interest of the people," he said.

"It leads me to one conclusion: In the history of mankind there is an inexorable moral force that moves us forward.

"No matter the resistance of people who do not fully understand, it will not be denied."

Civil rights today is as controversial as any reforms of the past, possibly more so because of the extremely delicate human relationships it touches.

The controversy won't be resolved without bitterness and a struggle whose shape cannot be fully defined. But history, as Senator DIRKSEN points out, is with it, backed with the power of an idea whose time has come.

Before the civil rights bill is denounced in terms of current-day politics or even deep-rooted prejudice, it is well to consider that the long look of history is on its side just as it has favored other far-reaching laws that at the time seemed dangerous and revolutionary but now have become part of the bedrock of a system which regards human dignity as supreme.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am grateful to my friend from California. I am grateful to the majority leader. Also I thank the Senator from Kansas.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the majority leader at this time what the program is for today, and what he foresees for the next 3 or 4 days.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in response to the question raised by the distinguished minority leader, the first order of business will be H.R. 10314, the extension of the Civil Defense Act. It is anticipated that following that, the Senate will take up H.R. 10053, an act to amend section 502 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, relating to construction differential subsidies.

However, I am informed that because of a situation which none of us contemplated, this may likely come up tomorrow, rather than today. There will be more about that later in the afternoon. It is then anticipated that the Senate will take up H.R. 2434, the Congressional Medal of Honor special pension.

We next expect to take up S. 388, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the mid-State reclamation project, affecting the State of Nebraska.

It is next proposed to take up S. 1186, the Crooked River Federal reclamation project. Then there will be the Interior appropriations conference report, if it is ready.

On Tuesday, it is anticipated that we shall take up S. 2881, the Alaska Reconstruction Act; S. 6, the mass transit bill; H.R. 287, the social security amendments, as they affect the State of Nevada; and S. 2136, the Foreign Agents Registration Act. Then there will be the food stamp plan, if reported; and, of course, the conference reports will be in order at any time.

On Wednesday, it is anticipated that the Senate will take up H.R. 11049, the so-called Federal pay bill. On Thursday, it is hoped that we shall be able to take up the highway authorization bill, if it is reported.

That, in brief, subject to change, is the best outline I can give at the moment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I thank the majority leader.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. On the basis of that schedule, when is it expected that the Senate shall recess for the Fourth?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The leadership made a commitment to suspend at the close of business on Thursday next, until noon on Monday next.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator answer one more question if he can?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I shall try.

Mr. MORSE. Is it planned that the Senate will take the mass transit bill as it comes from the House and not have it go to conference? I believe it is a remarkably good bill as it came from the House. I prefer the Senate version but, after all, most of the main features of the bill have been preserved. I am proud to point out that the Morse amendment in regard to seeing to it that fair labor policies that were adopted by the Senate will be continued under the House version of the bill. Is it the plan to suggest that the Senate adopt the House version without going to conference?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, first, I am fully in accord with what the distinguished Senator from Oregon has said. It would be my hope that the Senate would accept the House bill, because I believe we are extremely fortunate. But several Senators wish to be heard on it. What their views on the bill are I do not know, but I am with the Senator from Oregon 100 percent.

Mr. MORSE. I merely wished to know what the policy legislativewise would be on the floor of the Senate.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S REMARKS AT THE SWEDISH DAY CELEBRATION IN MINNEAPOLIS, JUNE 28

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed at this point in the Record the text of the speech of President Johnson at the Swedish Day celebration in Minneapolis yesterday.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, June 29, 1964]

Text of Speech by President

The Bible counsels us: "To everything there is a season, and a time to every purpose under the heaven * * * a time of war, a time of peace."

I come to speak to you in the hope that, after decades of war and threats of war, we may be nearing a time of peace.

Today, as always, if a nation is to keep its freedom it must be prepared to risk war. When necessary, we will take that risk. But as long as I am President, I will spare neither my office nor myself in the quest for peace.

That peace is much more than the absence of war.

In fact, peace is much the same thing in our world community as it is in your community, or in the small community of Johnson City where I grew up.

THREATS TO PEACE

If, in your town, every morning brings fear that the serenity of the streets will be shattered by the sounds of violence, then there is no peace.

If one man can compel others, unjustly and unlawfully, to do what he commands them to do, then your community is not a place of peace.

If we have neither the will nor a way to settle disputes among neighbors without force and violence, then none of us can live in peace.

If we do not work together to help others fulfill their fair desires, then peace is insecure. For in a community, as in the world, if the strong and wealthy ignore the needs of the poor and oppressed, frustrations will result in force.

Peace, therefore, is a world where no nation fears another, or can force another to follow its command. It is a world where differences are solved without destruction, and common effort is directed at common problems.

HAMMARSKJOLD FORMULA

Such a peace will not come by a single act or in a single moment.

It will take decades and generations of persistent and patient effort. That great son of Sweden, Dag Hammarskjold, said: "The qualities it requires are just those which I feel we all need today—perseverance and patience, a firm grip on realities, careful but imaginative planning, a clear awareness of the dangers—but also of the fact that fate is what we make it."

With these qualities as our foundation, we follow several paths to the single goal of peace.

First is restraint in the use of power.

We must be, and we are, strong enough to protect ourselves and our allies.

But it was a great historian who reminded us that: "No aspect of power more impresses men than its exercise with restraint."

We do not advance the cause of freedom by calling on the full might of our military to solve every problem. We won a great victory in Cuba, because we stood firm without using force. In Vietnam we are engaged in a brutal and bitter struggle for the freedom of a friend. There, too, we will use the force necessary to help them maintain their own freedom.

CITES AGREEMENTS

Second is the search for practical solutions to particular problems.

Agreements will not flow from a sudden trust among nations. Trust will come from a slow series of agreements.

Each agreement must be fashioned as the products of your famous craftsmanship are fashioned—with attention to detail, with practical skills, and with faith in the importance of the result.

And so, even while we are caught in conflict in one part of the world, we labor to build the structure of agreement which can bring peace to all the world.

In this way we have signed a treaty ending nuclear tests in the atmosphere. We have cut back our production of atomic fuel for weapons. We have established a Hot Line between Washington and Moscow. We are meeting with the Soviets to pool our efforts in making fresh water from the oceans.

These agreements, by themselves, have not ended tensions or eliminated war. But because of them we have moved closer to peace.

Third, is respect for the rights and fears of others.

We can never compromise the cause of freedom.

But as we work in our world community we must remember that differences with others do not always flow from a desire for domination. They can come from honest clash of beliefs or goals. In such cases our strength does not entitle us to impose our interest. Rather, our desire for peace compels us to seek just compromise.

And we must also recognize, although this is very hard to do, that other nations may honestly fear our intentions or the intentions of our allies.

There is no need for such fear. For we seek neither dominion nor conquest. But where it exists, we must work to dispel it.

LONG-RANGE GOALS

Fourth, is cooperation in solving the problems which are greater than immediate conflicts.

Most of our neighbors in the world live in the midst of hunger and poverty, disease and ignorance.

We are proud of the fact that across the world American workers, American food, and American capital, are building industry, expanding farms, educating the young, caring for the sick, and feeding the hungry.

We will continue to seek such cooperation. No peace and no power is strong enough to stand for long against the restless discontent of millions without hope. For peace to last, all must have a stake in its benefits.

Fifth, is the ability to adjust disputes without the use of force. It is, in short, the pursuit of justice.

We can find guidance here in our own country's historic pledge to the rule of law.

That is a pledge to abide by the law and accept its settlements. It is a pledge to submit to courts and be satisfied by court decisions. It is a pledge to respect, uphold and obey the law of the land.

For if any take grievances and disputes into their own hands, the safety and freedom of all is in peril. "Due process" is the safeguard of our civilization.

OBEDIENCE REQUIRED

As a President of the United States, and as an individual citizen, I stand totally committed to the integrity of justice and the enforcement of the law. But legal government depends upon law-loving and law-abiding citizens.

Today, the key to peace in our own land is obedience to the great moral command that no man should deny to another the liberties the Constitution creates, as the law defines those liberties.

And it rests on the even more hallowed rule that—whatever our disagreements—we treat others with the peaceful respect we desire for ourselves.

So too, we seek a world community in which answers can win acceptance without the use of force. For this purpose all the machinery of international justice is useless, unless it is infused with the good faith of nations.

PRAISES UNITED NATIONS

On a worldwide basis we place much hope in the United Nations.

Twenty years after World War I the League of Nations was discredited. Twenty years after World War II the United Nations is a stronger force for peace than ever before.

Our support, and the steadfast support of nations like Sweden, has made this possible.

Let those who criticize the United Nations remember that where it has gone—from Iran to the Congo—the Communists have not conquered. This is not because the United Nations supports our cause or exists to help us against our enemies. It is because the United Nations is on the side of national independence, of peaceful justice, of self-determination, of human freedom. And that is the side we are on.

These are the several paths we take to peace.

PEOPLE GIVE STRENGTH

At times, in the solitude of my office, peace seems discouragingly distant. My day is often filled with crises and conflict.

Yet each time I go among the people of this country I feel new hope and renewed faith.

There was a legendary figure who, each time his feet touched the earth, redoubled his strength.

Your warmth and wishes are equally the source of my strength.

I know that all the power of my great Office will not bring peace unless you want it and work for it. For with you not with me, with the people not with their leaders, is the final question whether the liberties and the life of this land shall be "preserved to the latest generations."

If you can do this, then our children's children will gladly remember us in the ancient phrase: "Blessed are the peacemakers: for they shall be called the children of God."

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION DECISION ON THE COMMUNITY BLOOD BANK IN THE KANSAS CITY METROPOLITAN AREA

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, the recent initial decision of the Federal Trade Commission relating to the community blood bank in the Kansas City metropolitan area is a very disturbing one to all concerned with the availability of blood for medical use.

On June 8, the Commission ruled that a conspiracy existed between the Community Blood Bank of the Kansas City Area, Inc., the Kansas City Area Hospital Association, and personnel of 14 area hospitals with respect to the exchange, sale, and distribution of blood.

The FTC has obviously missed the importance of the existing arrangement and the implications of its action—not only in the Kansas City area but in many other areas around the country where similar plans exist.

The community blood banks are nonprofit corporations. They solicit, store, distribute, and exchange blood within local areas and, through a credit system, on a nationwide basis.

Blood is not a routine commercial product. Much of it is contributed by donors in response to community and individual appeals or in appreciation for having had the benefit of someone else's previous donation. It is thus not a product subject to the considerations which normally are associated with trade and profit.

Blood is prescribed as a medicine. The method of handling, storing, and labeling must be fully known to the doctor or pathologist whose responsibility it is to order or administer it. It cannot become subjected to loose handling or modification to meet cutrate competition.

I disagree most emphatically with this initial ruling of the Commission. I sincerely hope that the Commission upon review will see the error of its action and refuse to uphold this initial opinion.

I am a cosponsor with the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] of the bill S. 2560 to exempt nonprofit community blood banks from restraint-of-trade actions. We introduced this bill just in case the Commission should finally rule as it has initially. No consideration has been given the bill as of this date due to the pending litigation. I shall urge the Judiciary Committee to proceed as rapidly as possible to approve S. 2560 in order that existing blood bank plans throughout the country will not be irreparably damaged.

I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the Kansas City Times of June 27, 1964, titled "The Public Stake in the Blood Bank Case," accompany my remarks on this matter.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PUBLIC STAKE IN THE BLOOD BANK CASE

We cannot regard the community blood bank case as simply another routine matter of interstate commerce. The argument is not whether blood should or should not be sold for profit. We do regard the action—and the Federal Trade examiner's ruling against the bank and other respondents—as an issue with grave national implications. For the Government is dealing here with human blood and the health of millions who some day will need transfusions.

The action is directed against a nonprofit, charitable group, and it concerns the right of doctors and hospitals to use their own judgment in selecting blood. The community blood bank is not a moneymaking concern, but it is dedicated to making available to those who need it, blood of the highest quality. It also guarantees the availability of blood.

The medical profession's attempt to exercise control over a local system of collecting blood does not imply laxity by any commercial operator. But from a professional standpoint, it seems entirely proper for the profession and hospitals to insist on the fullest possible knowledge about their blood supply, one in which they can have the greatest confidence.

Basically, we seem to have here the pivotal question: Is blood a commercial commodity to be sold on the market like cabbages? The examiner's recommendation to the Federal Trade Commission seems to say that it is. It strikes us as a very unprofessional view. The ruling, of course, is not final. It will go to the full commission, and at least it may have the effect of bringing this tremendously expensive litigation to a conclusion. The public interest here and elsewhere, demands a decision and soon.

There is one predictable effect of the ruling that the nonprofit community blood bank, the Kansas City area hospital association, and 14 hospital pathologists have engaged in restraint of trade.

It is bound to lend renewed impetus to the drive for a Federal law to exempt nonprofit community banks from restraint-of-trade action.

Senator EDWARD V. LONG, Democrat, of Missouri, has nearly a score of Senators cosponsoring such legislation. Similar bills have been drawn in the House by Representative WILLIAM J. RANDALL, Democrat, of Missouri; Representative CHARLES S. JOELSON, Democrat, of New Jersey, and others.

There was no criticism in the hearings of the quality of blood obtained from commercial blood banks in Kansas City. But Senator LONG, who has studied the national results in many areas, reports in some other cities annotated cases of skid row bums selling blood for liquor money, and being unwilling to relate whether they have had communicable diseases such as hepatitis.

Thousands of Kansas Citians have contributed blood to the nonprofit community bank under replacement plans for families or friends, or as advance donors. The medical profession endorses the plan as the best means of obtaining quality blood because the donors will give reliable reports of their illnesses. It is rather bizarre, we suggest, to regard this as merely routine interstate commerce. It is, instead, an issue of the public's health.

The ability to exchange blood credits in a distant city, or keep a current clearinghouse record of rare types, is invaluable. The support of the Missouri Medical Society is dramatized by its assessment of every doctor to help pay the heavy costs placed on pathologists by the FTC probe.

The doctors who have thus lent their assistance are acting in the community interest. They are defending the Kansas City community blood bank that has attracted national attention as a model of its type. They are also defending the right of the public to support a voluntary, cooperative effort dedicated to the community's health and welfare. Should the FTC uphold its examiner's ruling, we would hope that Congress would act and act quickly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NELSON in the chair). The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUGAR SUPPLIES FOR AMERICAN CONSUMERS

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, I am becoming increasingly concerned over future sugar supplies for our American consumers. Unless the Congress acts on sugar legislation this year, and acts in what is obviously the national interest, we may be faced again, as we were last year, with a sugar crisis. The major concern I call to the Senate's attention today is our present too-great reliance on uncertain and precarious foreign sugar supplies, and the hardship a continuation of this reliance will cause to our domestic sugarbeet producers as well as to our consumers.

Under the present law, the domestic sugarbeet producers are permitted to market only about 30 percent of the sugar that is sold in the United States each year. The rest of our consumer market—70 percent—is held, under the present law, by the cane sugar refiners. The cane sugar refiners do not produce sugar. All they do is to convert from so-called raw form to refined form, sugar that has been produced by somebody else. Under the present law, more than half of the cane refiners' supplies of raw sugar are required to come from foreign sources. Some 40 percent of the total needs of our consumers, in fact, comes from foreign sugar interests, who supply raw sugar to the cane refiners; and some of these foreign sugar interests are of extremely doubtful reliability. The remaining 30 percent is authorized to come from domestic sources other than the beet sugar industry—that is, from the raw cane sugar producers in Louisiana, Florida, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

It is significant that the sugar crisis of last year was caused by the failure of the cane sugar refiners to obtain enough foreign raw sugar, in the quantities and at the times required, to supply American consumers at reasonable prices. It is equally significant that in that hour of crisis the U.S. Government turned to the domestic sugarbeet producers and urged all-out production in order to protect the interests of the sugar consumers of the United States.

The troubled international sugar situation was further agitated a few days ago with the announcement that Government corruption in the Dominican Republic may force this Nation to withhold economic aid. Such withholding could include withholding of sugar purchases. Thus, any disruption of the Dominican supply would leave a deficit in import expectations. This country's present sugar policy abroad could place us in the position of international sugar beggars. Our only future protection lies with the allotments our domestic growers receive, if we expect to work toward reducing our 40-percent deficit in sugar production.

My State of Kansas has been largely responsible for the production of wheat which presently accounts for a sizable percentage of the Nation's carryover stocks of wheat. At this time in the verdant fields of southwestern Kansas, farmers in 19 counties have successfully changed over from wheat to the production of sugarbeets. We have another section in the northwestern portion of Kansas where cultivation of sugarbeets continues to expand into a valuable crop. The importance of sugarbeets as a cash replacement crop for wheat is readily understandable when you compare the dependability of income from wheat with that of sugarbeets. Over the years, the income per acre from the production of sugarbeets has been steadier than that from wheat and, in addition, tends to eliminate production of a surplus crop.

The cash replacement aspect is significant in itself, but, Mr. President, my fear exceeds the bounds of local benefits which would accrue to Kansas. I believe we should seek an answer to that ever-present question of where 40 percent of our sugar supply would come from it we were faced with an emergency that choked off the foreign supply. Support of the domestic sugarbeet industry is an immediate measure which will provide some greater degree of self-sufficiency in sugar for our Nation.

I am a cosponsor with the senior Senator from North Dakota of a bill to authorize an increase in domestic sugarbeet marketing to provide for further expansion of the industry. Such an expansion will have the ancillary effect of spurring growth in local economies. Construction of new processing plants in those areas provided with increased acreage will produce immediate economic stimulation.

Mr. President, time is of great importance. A $20 million processing plant is not planned and built in the space of 1 or 2 years. If present production quotas for sugarbeets are rolled back after 1965, there would be little reason to negotiate financing and construction. Sugarbeet allotments must be extended a minimum of 4 years beyond present levels to permit communities to avail themselves of the economic expansion that would accompany construction of a new plant.

Administration proposals for future sugar legislation have not yet been submitted, as I pointed out earlier. At this time we can only speculate. Current predictions are that sugarbeet production will be held at about present levels. In addition, there are indications that there will be a recommendation to hold the Cuban sugar allotment open. This would, in essence, guarantee Cuba a future U.S. allotment if she ever returned to the Western community. If such recommendations are made, we will be asked to consider casting another shackle for our domestic sugarbeet producers. Such an allotment, reserved for the future, but distributed around the world until needed, would result in a major decrease in domestic production within a short time.

These factors must all be considered in any determination of what form of sugar legislation will be best for this Nation. The unrestricted production of sugarbeets permitted by the Department of Agriculture for 1964 and 1965 to offset a worldwide shortage last year will amount to overproduction next year unless domestic marketing quotas are raised. Should the sugar act not provide for an increased domestic allotment, our producers will be forced to reduce present acreage as much as 40 percent.

Mr. President, I submit that we should provide our domestic producers an opportunity to continue their production and build a sound and profitable industry. It could have a double impact of diversifying the agricultural base in heavy surplus crop areas as well as guaranteeing a future supply of sugar for our growing national needs. We must insist that the State Department act in the best interests of our domestic growers rather than cater consistently to foreign sugar interests.

It is difficult to understand the apparent inability of our State Department to comprehend the benefits of increased domestic sugarbeet acreage. By allotting 40 percent of our sugar requirements to politically precarious countries, we expose ourselves to a situation which could ultimately become most serious. Although the world sugar market presently is slow, due largely to stockpiling which took place last year, the real truth is that only an 8-week supply of reserve stocks exists throughout the world and production is running far behind demand.

The sugar problem was cited in a recent letter issued by the well-known brokerage firm of Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner and Smith. It pointed out that the "continued reduction of world sugar stocks serves to underscore the perilous dependence on present production. World stocks are at low levels—probably not much more than 8 million tons. This means that the market will remain extremely sensitive to developments affecting production around the world."

The National Confectioners Association recently took note of this increasingly critical problem. It will be recalled that at times in the past, this association—which represents major consumers of sugar—has supported a foreign sugar purchase program. However, recognizing the present changed world sugar situation, the organization on June 10 at their annual convention in New York, considered the matter again and approved the following recommendation urging increased domestic production and marketing:

> 1. Allow unrestricted marketings of domestically produced sugar during 1964, 1965, and 1966. In addition there should be provided a substantial increase in the regular quota for the domestic sugar producing industry. With the tight price situation in the world market which in turn affects the domestic market when the world price is near or higher than the U.S. price, it is in the interest of U.S. consumers to obtain as large a portion of sugar as is possible from domestic producing sources. The greater our U.S. demands are on the world market, the more this price will be stimulated with an adverse price effect in the United States.
>
> Also, increased marketings of sugar in the United States are necessary in the interest of consumers to promote free competition in the marketplace and to prevent monopolistic pricing. Unrestricted marketings would enable consumers in all parts of the country to have a more equal opportunity in acquiring their sugar supplies on an equitable and competitive basis.

With hearings in the House imminent, I hope that many of the points noted here today will be discussed in more detail so that we will have an accurate presentation of the serious situation facing our domestic sugar supply. I would urge all Senators to give this sugar legislation close scrutiny so that we may undertake to protect this Nation's supply of sugar by increasing domestic production before we are faced with a crisis in sugar supplies.

RESOLUTION LAUDS CARR

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, the Under Secretary of the Department of the Interior, Hon. James K. Carr, will soon be leaving Washington to accept another important assignment in his native State, California. We here who know Jim Carr appreciate the caliber of his work and we shall hate to see him go. But we wish him well in his new position with its challenging responsibility and we know that wherever he serves in public office, the public will benefit. Personally I bid him Godspeed with a great degree of reluctance because he has been ever so helpful to Alaska as Interior Under Secretary and because we have had a personal association since the old days on the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.

I am highly pleased that other Alaskans share my high opinion of Jim Carr. This was most recently made evident in a resolution adopted by the Common Council of the City of Seward, Alaska. I ask unanimous consent to have the resolution printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION 394 OF THE CITY OF SEWARD, ALASKA

Whereas due to the fine efforts of many people the industrial facilities of the city of Seward will now be rebuilt; and

Whereas an integral portion of this work will be the rebuilding of the Alaska Railroad and its dock facilities; and

Whereas this rebuilding was made necessary by the disaster which occurred in Alaska on March 27, 1964; and

Whereas one of the leaders and the principal spokesman for the city of Seward and its vicinity was Under Secretary of the Interior James K. Carr, who, acting through his post, assisted in every way in the proper dissemination of vital information on Seward and its economy, and in convincing other governmental officers in Washington, D.C., of the feasibility of such reconstruction: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Common Council of the City of Seward, Alaska, That this resolution, as an expression of appreciation from the city and citizens of Seward, Alaska, be enacted, honoring James K. Carr for his efforts on behalf of the city and the citizens of Seward, Alaska; and be it further

Resolved, That the best wishes and kindest personal regards go from the said city and its citizens to the said James K. Carr in his new position as general manager of utilities for the city and county of San Francisco, Calif.

PERRY R. STOCKTON,
Mayor.

Attest:

BEATRICE E. WATTS,
City Clerk-Treasurer.

OFFICE OF EMERGENCY PLANNING SERVES WELL ALASKA AND THE NATION

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, we in Alaska have an especial reason to know how very important is the work of the Office of Emergency Planning. This Federal agency is charged with the coordination and direction of the Federal response to natural or manmade disaster. This agency, under the extremely able direction of Edward A. McDermott, did its work superbly well in Alaska after the Good Friday earthquake, fire, and wave.

I ask unanimous consent that an article by Mr. McDermott, published in the June issue of Weston City magazine, describing the efforts of OEP in Alaska may be made a part of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OEP SEEKS LESSONS FROM ALASKAN TRAGEDY

(By Edward A. McDermott)

When we were recently confronted with the tragic and crippling earthquake in Alaska, we could observe on a smaller scale the terrible devastation which could, in a manmade disaster, be duplicated many times over. Fortunately the casualties were relatively light considering the magnitude of damage. But total disruption of transportation, communications, and the economy in general, portends a huge recovery and reconstruction effort over a long period.

In a matter of a few short minutes the major portion of Alaska's economic structure was torn asunder. With the destruction came a rent in the social fabric of the State. Redirection of a severely damaged socioeconomic establishment was clearly before us. However, this was the first occasion within recent times in which our theories were exposed to a practical test. As unfortunate and inopportune as the Alaskan earthquake has been, it has afforded us a small-scale working model of a postattack situation. By using this model we have confirmed, solidified and projected many of the recovery techniques which we hope will never have to be employed to remedy the chaos created by nuclear holocaust.

The Office of Emergency Planning moved into action immediately after a middle of the night conversation with President Johnson and he ordered me to the scene of the disaster. I flew to Alaska that same day—Easter Saturday—to confer with Governor Egan and other State and Federal officials, make a firsthand estimate of the situation, and mobilize the combined resources of all Federal departments and agencies for a concerted assault on the gigantic tasks of recovery.

The airview of Anchorage, as we overflew the city at low altitude, proved to be largely illusionary—the city from the air gave the appearance of being substantially intact. But ground observation soon after landing and in the still darkness of night produced a harrowing picture of widespread devastation repeated time and again in the ruins of Anchorage, Kodiak, Seward, and Valdez.

I cannot overemphasize the extent and effects of the damage and the lack of precedent for meeting them. I saw in Alaska the effects of having entire fishing fleets and processing plants—the lifeblood industries of many Alaskan communities—disappear into the sea or beneath earth slides. I observed the terrible drain on the individual wrought by the destruction of powerlines, highways, railroads, commercial establishments, and other facilities so necessary to our way of life. We can only guess at the exact effects of the disaster over a period of time, but it is already clear that the road to complete recovery will be long, and hard, and costly.

In the face of so strenuous an ordeal I found it remarkable that the citizens of Alaska responded so well. Those who found themselves homeless were quickly taken in by friends and relatives. The general attitude was one of dedication to the task of rebuilding.

While in Alaska, I directed our Region 8 Director to coordinate all Federal relief activities on the scene. Immediately the Corps of Engineers were directed to begin debris clearance and emergency repairs. Other appropriate Federal departments and agencies were directed to perform essential survey, relief, supply, transportation, and recovery actions. The business of recovery was underway.

Several weeks ago I spent 3 more days in Alaska in inspecting the diverse activities contributing toward recovery. At this time the emergency situation was under control and work progressing satisfactorily in the recovery and rehabilitation phase. The immediate emergency needs of the people are being met. The manpower and know-how are available. Contracts are being let speedily, complicated and time-consuming "redtape" has been eliminated, and the near future should see a considerable number of new projects underway and substantial progress made on those already undertaken.

PREARRANGED PLAN

We learned many things during the Alaskan quake, all of which are applicable to emergency planning in a broad sense. For one thing, we learned the value of a prearranged capability to manage resources in an emergency. I do not imply that Alaska possessed the type of emergency planning establishment recommended under OEP's "Comprehensive Program for Survival of Government and Management of Resources." But the fact that OEP's staff guidance was available enabled Governor Egan and State officials to assess quickly the magnitude and types of damages sustained in the State and to take immediate steps to cope with it.

We learned also that Alaska's quake damages in many ways represent a miniature version of what could happen in a nuclear holocaust. Again, I would not compare Alaska's problems, at least in magnitude, with those we might encounter in a nuclear attack. But we must not lose sight of the resource readiness procedures that were rapidly invoked during the hours immediately following the quake.

We saw, too, the merging of survival operations and rehabilitation and recovery efforts. These two phases of the common problem were not neatly compartmentalized in their own exclusive time frames but required simultaneous and immediate attention. While civil defense forces, assisted by military elements, performed their important mission, the job rehabilitation, of priorities, of resources management, of allocations and the rest, moved ahead.

Finally, I would stress again, we saw traits which confirmed the findings of behavioral science studies through the years. Despite the immensity of the tragedy, Alaskan citizens did not panic. There was shock, and perhaps the temporary paralysis of disbelief; but the traumatic phase was short lived and Alaskans quickly recovered from the initial impact of the disaster and calmly set themselves to the many and difficult tasks of recovery.

In summary, we learned a lesson in Alaska which is paid too little heed by the average American. There is no substitute for preparedness—no alternative to the maintenance of an organization capable of responding promptly to the unexpected, whatever it may be. The cold fact that disasters are going to occur should be our mandate to work and plan as if each rising of the sun might bring catastrophe. The tremendous job of conveying this message to the American public is a difficult and continuing challenge.

FOREIGN AID

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to make a very brief announcement regarding my position on the procedure of the foreign aid bill this year, because a great many inquiries have been directed to me and to my office, and those inquiries show a complete lack of understanding and comprehension on the part of the questioners concerning the position of the senior Senator from Oregon.

It is not true that the senior Senator from Oregon is seeking any delay in the Foreign Relations Committee in the handling of the bill. To the contrary, as the chairman of the committee would say, I have done everything I can, and will continue to expedite the handling of the bill in the committee.

It is necessary, because I am opposed to the bill in its present form, to make my record in the committee. I am doing that item by item, but with great brevity. I wish to have the bill considered as rapidly as possible. I am sorry that not many Senators are in attendance at the Foreign Relations Committee meetings. I do not know of any piece of proposed legislation more vital to the constituencies of Senators than the foreign aid bill. But we are making some progress. We shall meet again this afternoon.

I am glad that I can stand up and speak this morning without the use of smelling salts to give me vigor, because this morning my first amendment was unanimously adopted by the Foreign Relations Committee after we heard the AID officials almost all day Friday speak against my amendment. But they did not make their case. My amendment, which amounts to a saving of $9.6 million in the technical assistance program, was unanimously adopted by the committee this morning. I shall offer each amendment that I have in an effort to reach the minimum goal I think ought to be attained by the Senate in connection with the foreign aid bill this year.

I previously announced in the Foreign Relations Committee, and I announce it again, that I shall try to cut the bill to $3 billion, which is the amount of money that was made available last year, and which I believe is the maximum which should be made available this year, in spite of the so-called emergencies that the President has been talking about, for our drive ought to be to reduce the AID program and transfer more and more of our AID program over to the responsibility of the private segment of our economy and over to an ever-increasing program of loans, and preferably loans that come out of the private segment of our economy.

I ask unanimous consent for an additional 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. It will be my objective in committee, as I said to the committee this morning, that I will not be put in the position where it can be said on the record that I did not raise any objections to the foreign aid bill in committee. I am preparing written memorandums, which I am submitting to the committee, summarizing my views, and making them a part of the record. I shall discuss them at greater length on the floor of the Senate.

Because I consider this matter to be of such concern to my country, I want the leadership to know—and I am glad the majority leader and minority leader are present in the Chamber—that I shall insist this year, as I did last year, that the foreign aid bill be considered on its merits on the floor of the Senate, without any unanimous consent with regard to any time schedule or limitation of time in regard to any part of the bill. We shall save time by following that course of action. The senior Senator from Oregon will insist that the foreign aid bill be handled on the floor of the Senate in the absence of any unanimous-consent agreement whatsoever relative to taking the bill through the legislative process.

But let me say for the benefit of those who seek always to read things into my efforts which have no basis in fact so far as my motivation is concerned, that on the floor, as in committee, I intend to expedite the handling of the bill under the rules—but only under the rules.

CROOKED RIVER FEDERAL RECLAMATION PROJECT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1064, S. 1186.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1186) to amend the act authorizing the Crooked River Federal reclamation project to provide for the irrigation of additional lands.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with amendments on page 2, line 5, after the word "extension", to strike out "$995,000 (January 1962 prices)" and insert "$1,132,000 (July 1963 prices)", and after line 21, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 4. For a period of ten years from the date of enactment of the Crooked River Project Extension Act, no water from the project authorized by this Act shall be delivered to any water user for the production on newly irrigated lands of any basic agricultural commodity, as defined in the Agricultural Act of 1949, or any amendment thereof, if the total supply of such commodity for the marketing year in which the bulk of the crop would normally be marketed is in excess of the normal supply as defined in section 301(b)(10) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, unless the Secretary of Agriculture calls for an increase in production of such commodity in the interest of national security.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first section of the Act entitled "An Act to authorize construction by the Secretary of the Interior of the Crooked River Federal reclamation project, Oregon", approved August 6, 1956 (70 Stat. 1058), as amended, is amended by inserting immediately before the period at the end of the first sentence of such section the following: "and the Crooked River project extension. The principal new works for the project extension shall include six pumping plants, canals, and related distribution and drainage facilities".

SEC. 2. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for construction of the new works involved in the Crooked River project extension $1,132,000 (July 1963 prices), plus or minus such amounts, if any, as may be required by reason of changes in the cost of construction work of the types involved therein as shown by engineering cost indexes and, in addition thereto, such sums as may be required to operate and maintain such extension.

SEC. 3. Power and energy required for irrigation pumping for the Crooked River project and the Crooked River project extension shall be made available by the Secretary of the Interior from the Dalles Dam powerplant and other Federal plants interconnected therewith at rates not to exceed the costs of such power and energy from the Dalles Dam, taking into account all costs of the dam, reservoir, and powerplant which are determined by the Secretary under provisions of the Federal reclamation laws to be properly allocable to such irrigation pumping power and energy.

SEC. 4. For a period of ten years from the date of enactment of the Crooked River Project Extension Act, no water from the project authorized by this Act shall be delivered to any water user for the production on newly irrigated lands of any basic agricultural commodity, as defined in the Agricultural Act of 1949, or any amendment thereof, if the total supply of such commodity for the marketing year in which the bulk of the crop would normally be marketed is in excess of the normal supply as defined in section 301(b)(10) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, unless the Secretary of Agriculture calls for an increase in production of such commodity in the interest of national security.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the committee amendments are considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1122) explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF MEASURE

The purpose of S. 1186, which is sponsored by the two Senators from Oregon, Senators WAYNE MORSE and MAURINE NEUBERGER, is to expand existing facilities of the Crooked River Federal reclamation project, central Oregon, to provide water for irrigation of an additional 2,850 acres of land. The present facilities were authorized by the 84th Congress in Public Law 992 (70 Stat. 1058), and enlargement of the basic construction in contemplation of the additions which are the subject of the present bill were authorized in the 86th Congress by legislation sponsored by Senator MORSE and the late Senator Richard Neuberger.

The project facilities now irrigate some 20,000 acres, devoted primarily to production of livestock feeds. The proposed extension lands formerly were irrigated but now are dry range, growing principally native grass, sagebrush, and juniper. When again irrigated as provided by S. 1186, they also would be devoted for the most part to feed crops to support the prevailing livestock economy of the area. It is expected that some potatoes, mint, and small seeds also would be produced, none of which are under parity programs.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The bill is open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

SPECIAL PENSION TO CERTAIN HOLDERS OF CONGRESSIONAL MEDAL OF HONOR

Mr. **MANSFIELD.** Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1065, H.R. 2434.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The bill will be stated by title.

The **LEGISLATIVE CLERK.** A bill (H.R. 2434) to amend section 560, title 38, United States Code, to permit the payment of special pension to holders of the Congressional Medal of Honor awarded such medal for actions not involving conflict with an enemy and for other purposes.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance with an amendment at the beginning of line 4, to strike out "amended by (1) striking out ", who has attained the age of fifty years," and (2)".

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. **MANSFIELD.** Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1123) explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of this bill is to amend the existing law providing for the payment of a $100-a-month pension for holders of the Medal of Honor by including within the eligibility of the statute 17 individuals who received the Medal of Honor based on noncombatant service. Sixteen of these individuals served in the U.S. Navy and one in the U.S. Marine Corps.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

The bill as was passed by the House of Representatives would have removed the 50-year-age requirement which is one of the prerequisites to payment of the $100 pension; this provision, however, was stricken from the House-passed bill by the Committee on Finance.

It is the opinion of the Senate Committee on Finance that the awarding of the Congressional Medal of Honor should be a recognition solely of valor and heroism, without consideration of compensation or pension. The payment of the $100 pension should continue to be on an optional basis for those medal holders who have reached the age of 50 who may be in need.

GENERAL STATEMENT

As last amended by Public Law 88-77, July 25, 1963, 38 U.S.C. 560-562 provide for an Army, Navy, Air Force, and Coast Guard Medal of Honor roll upon which is recorded on written application to the Secretary of the department concerned, the name of each surviving person who has served on active duty in the Armed Forces of the United States, who has attained the age of 50 years, and who has been awarded a Medal of Honor for distinguishing himself conspicuously by gallantry and intrepidity at the risk of his own life above and beyond the call of duty (1) while engaged in action against an enemy of the United States, (2) while engaged in military operations involving conflict with an opposing foreign force, or (3) while serving with friendly foreign forces engaged in an armed conflict against an opposing armed force in which the United States is not a belligerent party.

Persons whose names are entered on the Medal of Honor roll who express a desire to receive a special pension are paid $100 a month for life by this agency based on a certificate of entitlement from the department concerned. The law provides that this special pension shall be paid in addition to all other payments under laws of the United States.

It should be noted that the Medal of Honor has been awarded under prior law for acts of gallantry not performed against an enemy and not involving conflict. However, entry on the Medal of Honor roll has been limited to persons awarded the Medal of Honor for acts of gallantry against an enemy or involving conflict. Consequently, there are a number of recipients of the Medal of Honor, in many cases awarded the medal for peacetime acts of gallantry, who cannot qualify for entry on the Medal of Honor roll although they may meet the current age requirement for such entry.

H.R. 2434, if enacted, would end the mentioned distinction between recipients of the Medal of Honor.

The average age of the noncombatant Medal of Honor holder is 68.2 years, and the youngest is 53 and the oldest, 85. The names and a brief description of the reason for granting the Medal of Honor follow:

Name	Date of birth	Age
Robert E. Bonney	Nov. 23, 1882	81
Demetri Corahori	Jan. 3, 1880	84
Raymond E. Davis	Jan. 5, 1906	58
William Badders	Sept. 16, 1901	62
Thomas Eadie	Apr. 7, 1887	77
William R. Huber	July 16, 1902	62
Charles A. Lindberg	Feb. 4, 1902	62
John Mihalowski	Aug. 12, 1910	53
Joseph Quick	Nov. 22, 1878	85
Thomas John Ryan	Aug. 5, 1901	62
Albert J. Smith	July 31, 1898	65
Charles Henry Willey	Mar. 31, 1889	75
Robert W. Cary	Aug. 18, 1890	73
James H. McDonald	July 15, 1902	61
Oscar Schmidt	Mar. 25, 1896	68
Jesse W. Covington	Sept. 16, 1889	74
Donald L. Truesdell	Aug. 8, 1906	57
Average age		68.2

Robert E. Bonney (U.S. Navy)

Date: February 14, 1910.

Place: U.S.S. *Hopkins*.

Action: Bonney displayed extraordinary heroism, on the occasion of the accident to one of the boilers on the *Hopkins*.

Thomas J. Ryan (U.S. Navy)

Date: September 1, 1923.

Place: Yokohama, Japan.

Action: During the 1923 earthquake and fire in Yokohama, Ryan with complete disregard for his life, extricated a woman from the burning Grand Hotel. His conduct on this occasion reflected the greatest credit on himself and the U.S. Navy.

Albert J. Smith (U.S. Marine Corps)

Date: February 11, 1921.

Place: Naval Air Station, Pensacola, Fla.

Action: Despite the explosion of a gasoline tank from a fallen and burning seaplane, Smith with total disregard of personal safety, pushed himself to a position to rescue Glen M. Phelps who was pinned beneath the burning wreckage, himself receiving painful burns.

Charles H. Willey (U.S. Navy)

Date: August 29, 1916.

Place: U.S.S. *Memphis*, off Santo Domingo City.

Action: Willey remained at his post in the engineers department amidst scalding steam and the rush of tons of flooding water, as long as the engines would turn, while the *Memphis* was suffering total destruction from a hurricane. When the boilers exploded he assisted in rescuing the men from the fireroom.

Robert W. Cary (U.S. Navy)

Date: January 21, 1915.

Place: U.S.S. *San Diego*.

Action: When the five boilers exploded in the No. 2 fireroom, Cary, who was an observer on duty there, held the doors open about 1 minute, between Nos. 1 and 2 firerooms, with escaping steam around him which was being closed electrically from the bridge, allowing three men to escape. His coolness of nerve did much to keep the men hauling fires on Nos. 1 and 3 fireroom boilers, which apparently had no water and were likely to explode any instant. After which he directed the men into bunkers in the event Nos. 1 and 3 boilers exploded.

James H. McDonald (U.S. Navy)

Date: May 23, 1939.

Place: U.S.S. *Squalus*, sinking disaster off Isle of Shoals, Portsmouth, N.H.

Action: McDonald, as a master diver throughout the rescue and salvage operations of the *Squalus*, displayed leadership, masterly skill, and general efficiency in directing diving operations, and made important and difficult dives under the most hazardous conditions.

Oscar Schmidt, Jr. (U.S. Navy)

Date: October 9, 1918.

Place: Explosion on the U.S. subchaser *219*.

Action: Attached to the U.S.S. *Chestnut Hill*, Schmidt, seeing a man with his legs partly blown off, hanging on a line from the bow of the subchaser *219*, which had exploded and was on fire, jumped overboard, swam to the man, and carried him from the bow to stern. Helped aboard the stern a seriously burned man who fell overboard from the burning midship section.

Jesse W. Covington (U.S. Navy)

Date: April 17, 1918.

Place: *Florence H.*, internal explosion.

Action: Following the explosion of the *Florence H.*, the sea was covered with boxes of smokeless powder repeatedly exploding. Covington plunged overboard from the U.S.S. *Stewart* to rescue a survivor amongst the powder boxes, fully realizing he was risking his life in saving the life of this man.

Donald LeRoy Truesdell (U.S. Marine Corps) (was formerly Truesdale: name officially changed to Truesdell)

Date: April 24, 1932.

Place: Northern Nicaragua.

Action: On patrol searching for a bandit group, a rifle grenade fell off its carrier igniting the detonator. Truesdell, knowing the grenade would explode in 2 or 3 seconds, grasped it in his right hand to throw it away from the patrol. It exploded in his hand, blowing it off and taking the full shock of the explosion himself, thus saving the members of the patrol from loss of life or serious injury.

At the present time there are 108 individuals on the Medal of Honor rolls who are receiving $100 a month pension payable in addition to any other pension, compensation, or retirement pay to which they are entitled. There are 158 individuals not on the rolls due to the fact that they are under age 50. Six who are eligible to receive the pension have never applied. Assuming that all 17 of the noncombatants would receive the $100 a month pension, and that all 158 below age 50 would elect to receive it, the first year cost of this legislation would be $210,000.

DEPARTMENTAL REPORTS

The reports on this bill received from the Department of Defense, Veterans' Administration, and the Bureau of the Budget, express no opposition to the enactment of this legislation.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendment and third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

MIDSTATE RECLAMATION PROJECT, NEBRASKA

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1054, S. 388.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 388) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the midstate reclamation project, Nebraska, and for other purposes.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with amendments on page 1, line 7, after the word "the", to strike out "midstate Federal reclamation" and insert "Nebraska midstate division, Missouri River Basin"; on page 2, line 11, after the word "The", to strike out "midstate project" and insert "Nebraska midstate division"; in line 22, after the word "the", to strike out "midstate project." and insert "Nebraska midstate division: *Provided, however*, That the authorization for the construction of the Nebraska midstate division shall not exceed $84,202,000."; and on page 3, at the beginning of line 4, to strike out "project" and insert "Nebraska midstate division"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to construct, operate, and maintain in accordance with the Federal reclamation laws (Act of June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. 388), and Acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto) the Nebraska midstate division, Missouri River Basin project, Nebraska, for the principal purposes of furnishing a surface irrigation water supply for approximately one hundred and forty thousand acres of land, aiding in the replenishment of the ground water supply of the area for domestic and agricultural use, controlling floods, conserving and developing fish and wildlife, and producing hydroelectric power. The principal works of the project shall consist of a diversion dam on the Platte River, a main supply canal, an interconnected reservoir system, hydroelectric power facilities, wasteways, pumps, drains, canals, laterals, distribution facilities, and related works, including, on a nonreimbursable basis, minimum basic recreational facilities.

Sec 2. The Nebraska midstate division shall be integrated, physically and financially, with the other Federal works in the Missouri River Basin constructed or authorized to be constructed under the comprehensive plans approved by section 9 of the Act of December 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 891), as amended and supplemented, and shall be a unit of the Missouri River Basin project therein approved and authorized, and the authorization for the appropriation of funds for the accomplishment of the works to be undertaken by the Secretary of the Interior under said authority shall extend to and include funds for the construction of the Nebraska midstate division: *Provided however*, That the authorization for the construction of the Nebraska midstate division shall not exceed $84,202,000.

Sec. 3. The interest rate used for computing interest during construction and interest on the unpaid balance of the capital costs allocated to interest-bearing features of the Nebraska midstate division shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury as of the beginning of the fiscal year in which construction is initiated, on the basis of the computed average interest rate payable by the Treasury upon its outstanding marketable public obligations, which are neither due or callable for redemption for fifteen years from date of issue.

Sec. 4. For a period of ten years from the date of enactment of this Act, no water from the project authorized by this Act shall be delivered to any water user for the production on newly irrigated lands of any basic agricultural commodity, as defined in the Agricultural Act of 1949, or any amendment thereof, if the total supply of such commodity for the marketing year in which the bulk of the crop would normally be marketed is in excess of the normal supply as defined in section 301(b)(10) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, unless the Secretary of Agriculture calls for an increase in production of such commodity in the interest of national security.

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be considered en bloc.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, the committee amendments will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are agreed to.

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1111), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The enactment of S. 388 would include the Nebraska Mid-State unit in the Missouri River Basin project so that the construction, operation, and maintenance of the proposed Mid-State development may be undertaken and may be integrated, physically and financially, with the other Federal works of the Missouri River Basin project.

NEED

An assured water supply to the Platte River Valley in central Nebraska has long been recognized as essential to maintain the present economy and for the continued growth and prosperity of the area. Demands on the ground water aquifers are exceeding the practical limits of safe yield for irrigation and municipal uses. The proposed project would replenish and stabilize the ground water and make practical expanded water use in the area by the application of surface water for irrigation. Furthermore, the project would regulate ground water levels for all purposes by means of the integrated system of reservoirs, canals, laterals, district wells, drainage facilities, and floodways.

The interconnected foothill reservoirs and wildlife developments along the Platte River included in the plan would provide extensive fishing and waterfowl hunting opportunities in an area where they are now limited. Many of the reservoirs and their shorelines, together with planned minimum basic facilities, will provide extensive recreation benefits. The proposed multiple-purpose reservoirs, canals, and floodways would furnish a high degree of flood protection to the district lands and property, and to the other areas of the Platte River Valley. The Corps of Engineers, has calculated the benefits which would be realized from this protection, and those benefits were used as the basis for the allocation of project costs for this purpose.

DESCRIPTION OF PLAN

The basic plan for the Mid-State project is the same as that contained in the Mid-State project report dated April 1958. The project is located in central Nebraska along the north side of the Platte River. Lands to be benefited cover a width of from 10 to 20 miles from east of Lexington to the vicinity of Silver Creek, Nebr. These are approximately 550,000 acres of land within the Mid-State district boundaries, of which about 363,000 acres have been designated as arable. Nearly 260,000 acres of land are now dependent on wells and pumps drawing upon the ground water and upon streams for their irrigation supplies.

The project would provide a regulated gravity and well combination water supply for approximately 140,000 acres of land and would replenish and stabilize to the maximum extent practicable the aquifer from which about 4,600 irrigation wells are pumping ground waters within the boundaries of the district. In addition, the development would produce substantial flood control, recreation, and fish and wildlife benefits. Provision also is made for initial irrigation pumping power and for ultimate development of commercial power.

The Mid-State project includes the following potential features:

(a) A diversion dam located in the Platte River about 7 miles east of Lexington, Nebr., to divert waters of the Platte River.

(b) A main supply canal and floodway designed to carry 3,000 cubic feet per second from the diversion dam to the reservoir system. Initial sections of the canal have greater capacities (7,700–12,700 cubic feet per second) to carry floodwaters of Buffalo and Strever Creeks to the Platte River.

(c) A system of 23 interconnected ravine reservoirs on the north side of the Platte River with an irrigation conservation capacity of 289,300 acre-feet.

(d) Four hydroelectric plant sites with a potential installed capacity of about 67,200 kilowatts. Only the Prairie Creek powerplant of 16,800 kilowatts would be constructed initially and would be operated primarily to furnish irrigation pumping power for district-operated pumps.

(e) Lower Mid-State State Canal and Floodway, Kearney Floodway, Shelton Floodway, and Chapman Floodway which would serve dual functions of conveying irrigation water to lands and carrying floodflows from the reservoir systems, together with flows intercepted in the project area, to the Platte River.

(f) Substation and transmission system to furnish power to project pumps and interconnecting facilities with the statewide power system.

(g) An irrigation distribution system consisting of improvements to natural channels to be used for conveyance of irrigation water and of laterals, and numerous lift and well pumps.

(h) Surface and subsurface drainage facilities.

(i) Fish and wildlife and recreation development.

Cost

Total project cost	$84, 202, 000
Irrigation	57, 604, 000
To be repaid by user:	
40 years	43, 151, 600
Repaid from Missouri River Basin account	14, 452, 000
Flood control	12, 644, 000
Fish and wildlife	9, 317, 000
Recreation	3, 419, 000
Deferred power	1, 218, 000

Benefit-cost ratio: 100 years, 1.57 to 1.

LOCAL ORGANIZATION

The Nebraska Mid-State Reclamation District, original sponsor of the multipurpose mid-State project is a political subdivision of the State of Nebraska, organized under the Nebraska Reclamation Act. This district was the first to organize under its provisions. The legality of the formation and organization, was upheld by the Supreme Court of Nebraska in 1950. Under this act and prior to delivery of water from the project works, the district may levy a 1-mill ad valorem tax on all tangible property within the district; after delivery of water, the district may levy a 2-mill tax, and in instances of deficiencies or impending defaults in contract payment, may levy a third mill. These levies plus local contributions have made over $1.1 million available for preliminary work to date.

The assessed valuation of real and personal property in the district was over $124 million in 1960.

A similar bill, S. 970, of the 87th Congress passed the Senate on September 21, 1961.

Mr. **HRUSKA**. Mr. President, the midstate reclamation project in Nebraska has been sought for more than a decade. Legislation to create it was first introduced in 1953. Very few irrigation projects in recent years has had the thorough and expert study given this one. Those of us associated with its sponsorship have been continually pleased and impressed with the care and quality of technical planning and engineering which have gone into its development.

Midstate also has come under careful congressional scrutiny, in both the House and the Senate. During past sessions, extensive hearings on its merits have been held by both bodies. In the 87th Congress, legislation authorizing its construction was passed by the Senate. Since then, certain revisions relating to cost, benefits, and repayment have been made. All of these have been improvements from the standpoints of desirability and feasibility, so while the bill before us today embodies the same plan of development that was previously approved, it actually is a better and sounder bill in several important respects.

The committee report on S. 388 contains a detailed explanation of the bill. I will not repeat what is stated there. However, there are several features of the midstate project which are unique and worthy of special attention. They clearly show that, by any standard of comparison, the project rates favorable consideration and action.

An assured water supply to the Platte River Valley in central Nebraska has long been recognized as essential to maintain the current economy and for the continued growth and prosperity of the area. In 1943, the local citizens, acting on their own initiative, conceived a plan for water conservation. It was their intention and hope that they could bring it into being without Government assistance. To their sharp disappointment, it ultimately became apparent that the project was too large for them to handle alone. But they did not lose heart nor did they quitclaim their share of the responsibility.

In 1948, they organized themselves into the Nebraska Mid-State Reclamation District. That district now embraces a land area stretching along 100 miles of the historic Platte River through three Nebraska counties. It has a membership of 60,000 interested citizens including farmers, businessmen and their families.

This has not been merely a paper organization. Since the district was created, the people within it have levied a tax upon themselves which has yielded close to $1.5 million to cover the cost of the investigations and surveys involved in determining feasibility. Through private donations and subscriptions they have raised an additional $180,000 to help assure that the project, which they started, will someday be realized. As was pointed out during the hearings on this bill, under usual project investigation practices and procedures, the money that has been spent to investigate this project normally would have been furnished by the Federal Government. For those Senators looking for meaningful evidence of the local citizens' attitude toward this project, I direct their attention to the unselfish way they have committed their pocketbooks as well as their time and energy. Such generosity is even more remarkable when one considers the faith, patience and steadfastness that have been required.

Also, as respects the issue of local support, it should be noted that under Nebraska law, reclamation districts are required to submit the continuance of the district to the will of the people if construction has not been started within a specified time. Accordingly, this question including the continuation of the tax levy, was placed to a vote in 1957. Eighty-five percent of the voters said aye for continuance.

Midstate is a multipurpose undertaking. It will provide irrigation, flood control, power, fish and wildlife, and recreation benefits.

From an irrigation point of view, the project will yield two related but actually separate dividends of coequal importance. Of course, its water will provide nourishment to hungry croplands when nature fails in this job; 140,000 acres of land will be directly involved in this part of the dichotomy. The second feature concerns the replenishing of the supply of ground water under the project itself and thousands of adjacent acres. There is believable evidence that the present demands on ground water in this region are exceeding safe limits. It is feared that unless a means is found to recharge and replenish such water, it eventually will become depleted, with calamitous results not the least of which will be the loss of the $20 million worth of pumping and related equipment presently in use by well irrigators. Midstate is the means by which this catastrophe and the concomitant economic crisis can be avoided.

Gravity irrigation of the land directly involved in the undertaking will stabilize the ground water supply for an additional 163,000 acres of land presently irrigated by wells and another 223,000 in the future. The results of simple arithmetic clearly show that over one-half million acres of prime cropland will be affected by this project and while the benefits of replenishment are not susceptible of easy or precise measurement, they must be considered to get a clear and overall picture of the full portent of this bill. With two clear-cut irrigation benefits to be realized from this project, its desirability from this point of view cannot be doubted.

Moreover, of the $55 million allocated to irrigation in the midstate plan, 78 percent will be repaid by the beneficiaries through water charges and ad valorem revenues. According to Bureau of Reclamation's testimony, this is almost five times the average of the overall comprehensive plans and approximately twice that of the next best completed unit in the Missouri Basin. In other words, the water users of Nebraska midstate can and have expressed a willingness to repay a higher percentage of the cost of this project than any other Missouri River Basin project unit and higher than most projects being considered elsewhere.

Mr. President, from time to time we hear the argument that the current abundance of food makes the continued orderly and prudent development of our land and water resources unnecessary. A close examination of the irrigation and reclamation record of the past few years simply does not bear out this contention. To the contrary, we have learned from experience that irrigation is a means of avoiding unneeded surpluses. Irrigated lands are more versatile and flexible. With water when and where he wants it, a farmer can plant a far wider range of products including those for which there is a competitive demand. Instead of growing only commodities which ultimately find their way into Government storehouses, he is free and has the capacity to grow things which are wanted in the marketplace. In the long run this is the way we will solve the surplus puzzle.

As a part of a growing nationwide irrigation complex, the midstate project is more than capable of standing on its own feet. It meets every test of desirability that has ever been developed by the Congress. It has economic justification as evidenced by the favorable benefit-to-cost relationship. Financial feasibility has been demonstrated by the overall financial analysis of the parent Missouri Basin project, and a responsible aggressive repayment entity is available to discharge the requirements that will be imposed on the local beneficiaries.

In reviewing the testimony of prior hearings I found these phrases used to describe this project:

> The Nebraska midstate project is a logical addition to the Missouri River Basin project. * * * Here is a project that by any comparison with any other unit, measures up head and shoulders above most of them. * * * The Nebraska midstate project is a good irrigation project.

Certainly, these words state the case for Nebraska midstate clearly and eloquently.

Mr. President, this project has been 20 years in the making. It has been studied carefully and investigated and surveyed by experts. It has been diligently reviewed and probed by the Congress. No one can say that it has been handled sloppily or carelessly at any stage of the proceedings. The citizens of the midstate area have patiently presented their case to the 86th, 87th, and 88th Congresses. They have generously spent their money to insure that all necessary engineering work would be done competently, and completely. The project has the wholehearted endorsement of all relevant government agencies, both State and Federal.

Even if construction were started today, it would take 10 years to bring this project into being. In other words, Mr. President, it will have taken one generation to carry midstate from conception to completion. Clearly, the time for action has come for the Congress.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I rise in support of S. 388, a bill to authorize construction of the Mid-State reclamation project.

From the standpoint of repayment of costs allocated to irrigation, the Mid-State reclamation project stands at the head of the list of all Missouri River Basin projects. Revenues available from the reclamation district will return 78 percent of the irrigation costs in 50 years after meeting operation and maintenance expenses.

Compare this, Mr. President, with the first 16 projects initiated on the Missouri River involving irrigation, where the average repayment by the water users of that portion of costs allocated to irrigation amounted to 21.1 percent. Of these 16 projects, 5 were in Nebraska and on those Nebraska projects repayment by water users averaged 28.4 percent.

Consider also that in the case of the Mid-State project, reimbursable costs allocated to irrigation represent 66 percent of the total project costs.

The Mid-State reclamation project has a long legislative history. Legislation providing for its creation and financing first was introduced in 1953. Since then it has been the subject of exhaustive hearings in both the House and the Senate. Probably no other irrigation project in recent years has had the thorough and expert study given this one. The Senate passed authorizing legislation in the 87th Congress.

Since the organization in 1948 of the Nebraska Mid-State Reclamation District, the people in the district have levied a tax upon themselves which, together with private subscriptions, has made available almost $1.5 million to finance investigations and surveys necessary to determining the project's feasibility. This abundantly demonstrates local support for the project.

In addition to supplying supplemental irrigation water to some 96,000 acres in the three-county area, and bringing 44,000 new acres under irrigation for the first time, the Mid-State reclamation project would further benefit other thousands of acres through replenishment and stabilization of the ground water supply. This would prove to be a benefit of the highest significance, in an area where the ground water table has been declining at an alarming rate.

Mr. President, I wish to include in my remarks the prepared statement presented by Mr. William I. Palmer, the then Acting Assistant Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation, at the extensive hearings on this project before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives in March of this year. His statement was as follows:

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM I. PALMER, ACTING ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER, BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, we are pleased to have the opportunity again to appear in support of legislation to include the Nebraska midstate project in the Missouri River Basin project. We also appeared in this regard during the occasion of hearings of the 86th and 87th Congresses. On those occasions, extensive testimony was offered concerning the evolution of the plan of development, engineering costs, and the economic and financial determinations that had been made. There have been no few feasibility studies, although reanalyses and a reevaluation have been made.

An assured water supply to the Platte River Valley in central Nebraska has long been recognized as essential to maintain the current economy and for the continued growth and prosperity of that area. Our report on the Missouri River Basin project—S.D. 191, 78th Congress—contemplated service to the area included in the Nebraska midstate project. However, that plan was predicated in part upon the use of water to be imported from the Loup River, which might have involved water right difficulties inherent in interbasin transfers of water within Nebraska.

The Nebraska midstate plan does not involve such transfers, but provides for an integrated and effective use of surface and ground water available locally. If, in future years, the need for additional surface water supplies should become apparent and if the existing impediments to interbasin transfers of water should be clarified favorably or removed, the project works we are now considering could continue in use and be expanded to utilize imported water easily and economically.

The sponsors' original intention was to build the midstate project entirely with their own funds, but they found the costs of such a project would have been beyond their ability to finance. Therefore, they proposed that authorization be sought for a Federal Government loan for that portion of the cost which, under a Federal project, would be reimbursable and proposed that grants be sought for the nonreimbursable functions.

Bills to provide for such a Federal loan and grants were introduced beginning in 1953. After these bills had been considered by two Congresses without enactment and since the proposed project plan embraces irrigation, flood control, hydroelectric power, recreation, and fish and wildlife, all prime purposes recognized in the multipurpose Missouri River Basin project, the sponsors decided to seek authorization as a unit of the Missouri River Basin project.

The plan as now proposed was developed by consultants to the Nebraska Midstate Reclamation District. Engineering cost estimates were reviewed by the Bureau of Reclamation, and adjustments were made in those areas of the engineering design where differences were noted.

The total estimated cost of $81,467,000, based on July 1958 price levels, has been indexed to $84,202,000 to reflect July 1963 price levels. Otherwise, it reflects the same basic plan as presented to the committee in previous testimony. The cost estimate is approved as to adequacy by the Bureau of Reclamation and the private engineering consultants who performed the original work.

Land sponsors have expended over $1,500,000 of moneys collected by general solicitation and ad valorem tax levies on district property in investigating this project, writing the report, and in presenting the plan to the Congress. Cooperative leadwork of the Bureau of Reclamation has been, and continues to be, financed mostly by the district. To this end, the district advanced $388,000 through December 1963 and has authorized an additional $50,000 for subsequent use. This is evidence of the outstanding local interest and active sponsorship of the project and vouches for the sincerity and good faith of the sponsors.

Construction and operation of the proposed works would rescue a highly developed and growing agricultural area from its complete dependence on a ground water aquifer where demands thereon appear to have exceeded the practical limit of safe yield. The project proposes to replenish and stabilize the ground waters and to expand the water use in the area by application of surface waters for irrigation and by careful regulation of the ground-water levels for all purposes through a complex but integrated system of reservoirs, canals, laterals, district wells, drainage facilities, and floodways.

The water supply from surface water and ground water sources to be developed by the project is adequate to furnish service directly to 140,000 acres and indirectly benefit an additional 163,000 acres of presently irrigated land within the total arable land resource of 363,000 acres within the district boundaries. Although the specific tracts to be served directly have not been delineated with precision, the irrigation experience within the district and sample area classification of lands furnish adequate assurance of sufficient high-quality lands to afford an economical distribution system layout. It is planned that detailed land classification now underway and farm budget analyses, distribution and drainage system designs, and other required studies will be conducted during postauthorization studies for preparation of the customary definite plan report. Also, at that time we would develop more detailed estimates of operation, maintenance, and replacement expense and payment capacity so that the repayment ability of the irrigators would be known with more exactness.

The interconnected upland reservoirs and wildlife developments along the Platte River as included in the plan would provide extensive fishing and waterfowl hunting opportunities in an area where they are now limited. The Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife has estimated average annual fish and wildlife benefits at $389,000. Further, many of these reservoirs and their shorelines, together with planned basic facilities, will provide extensive recreation benefits estimated by the National Park Service to average $175,500.

Collectively, the proposed multiple-purpose reservoirs, canals, and floodways would furnish a high degree of flood protection to the district lands and property and to other areas in the Platte River Valley. The Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army, has calculated the average annual benefits which would be realized from this protection to be $518,000, and those benefits were used as the basis for the allocation of costs to this purpose.

In recognition of the Area Redevelopment Act of 1961 and the policies and standards of Senate Document No. 97, 87th Congress, we have evaluated the area redevelopment benefits of the project. These standards permit the measurement of benefits attributable to values of labor and other resources required for project construction and expected to be used in project operation, maintenance, and area employment when, in the project's absence, this labor and these resources would not be fully utilized. Two of the midstate counties, Buffalo and Dawson, are contained in a designated rural redevelopment area. Considering construction and operation and maintenance expenditures in these two counties, we conservatively estimated such annual equivalent benefits to average $148,900. This total comprises $89,700 of wages paid to unskilled workers during construction and $59,200 in operation and maintenance salaries over a 20-year period.

In order to bring our proposal up to date, it was necessary to reanalyze and reevaluate the project to reflect changes in price levels for construction work and to assess the effect of changing procedures, methods, and criteria for analysis of water resource development projects.

As pointed out earlier, the construction costs have been indexed to current price levels. Certain other revisions of the analysis have been made to take into account the precepts of Senate Document No. 97, 87th Congress, a statement approved by the President on May 15, 1962, and more fully entitled "Policies, Standards, and Procedures in the Formulation, Evaluation, and Review of Plans for Use and Development of Water and Related Land Resources."

The interest rate applicable to fiscal year 1964, and as used in the current study, is 3 percent, as compared to a value of 2½ percent utilized in earlier evaluations presented to the committee.

Changes in benefits attributable to fish and wildlife and recreation also result from the provisions of Senate Document No. 97. Fish and wildlife and recreation benefits are derived from a schedule of values developed by a panel of consultants representing the President's ad hoc National Water Resources Council and are based on an evaluation of what users might be willing to pay as distinct from the sportsman-expenditure method previously used.

There have been increases and decreases in the benefits that have had a compensating or offsetting effect on the benefit-to-cost ratio. An especially significant factor has been the adoption of irrigation benefits deriving from farm budget analysis of enterprises, cropping practices, and yields logically expected to develop by the economic midpoint in the period of economic analysis. Previously, the Bureau of Reclamation has estimated benefits on the basis of conditions forecast for the beginning of the repayment period. This did not take into account the evolutionary trends actually observed on most large irrigation developments and, to that extent, understated the probable increase in benefits to be expected from irrigation development.

A comparison of the benefits as determined from the previous analysis and the current reevaluation is as follows:

Purpose	Annual benefits	
	Previous analysis	Current evaluation
Irrigation	$3,109,000	$4,551,000
Flood control	512,100	518,000
Recreation	480,000	175,500
Fish and wildlife	380,500	389,000
Area redevelopment	None	148,900
Total	4,481,600	5,782,400

The benefit-cost ratio, making use of the foregoing benefits discounted at 3 percent per annum and revised construction cost estimates, is 1.57–1. This compares with the previous value of 1.40–1. Both ratios make use of total benefits for the prescribed 100-year period of analysis.

The following tabulation shows the effect of revised cost allocation studies, making use of updated benefits:

Purpose	Allocated costs	
	Previous analysis	Current evaluation
Irrigation	$51,964,000	$55,431,000
Flood control	17,345,000	12,466,000
Fish and wildlife	10,846,000	8,738,000
Recreation	163,000	3,161,000
Commercial power (deferred)	1,149,000	1,218,000
Area redevelopment	None	3,188,000
Total	81,467,000	84,202,000

In accordance with prevailing provisions of reclamation law, the costs allocated to irrigation would be reimbursable without interest, and those allocated to flood control would be nonreimbursable. Costs allocated to fish and wildlife enhancement and recreation would, as provided by the administration's proposed bill for establishment of uniform cost-sharing policies for these purposes, be nonreimbursable in the aggregate amount of $10,143,000. Fish and wildlife enhancement and recreation costs in excess of this amount, or $1,756,000, would be reimbursable with interest, as would the deferred commercial power allocation. The allocated costs of $3,188,000 to area redevelopment would be nonreimbursable.

Prospective water users would repay from water service charges and ad valorem assessments over a period of 50 years after conclusion of an appropriate development period an estimated amount of $43,236,600, or 78 percent of the costs allocated to irrigation.

Costs in excess of this amount ($12,194,400) plus the reimbursable fish and wildlife enhancement and recreation allocations would be returned from basinwide power revenues of the Missouri River Basin power system. The latter amount, when capitalized for 37 years until power revenues would become available, would have increased to $5,612,000.

The "Report on Financial Position, Missouri River Basin Project, December 1963," submitted by the Secretary of the Interior to the chairmen, Interior and Insular Affairs Committees of the Senate and House of Representatives, anticipated the repayment of the deferred commercial power investment and necessary financial assistance to irrigation arising out of the proposed Nebraska Mid-State development. The revenue requirements for return of interest-bearing fish and wildlife enhancement and recreation costs were not anticipated in the preparation of the studies supporting the report on financial position; however, review of these studies indicates that these obligations can be met within permissible time period without invalidating the ability of the basinwide power system to meet other reimbursable obligations.

The Nebraska Mid-State project report of July 1958 and the current reevaluation statement accompanying the Department's legislative report on the measure under consideration conclusively demonstrate economic justification and financial feasibility of this development for authorization as a division of the Missouri River Basin project.

The water users can and have expressed a willingness to repay a higher percentage of the cost of this project than any other Missouri River Basin project unit and higher than most projects being considered elsewhere. For these reasons, we commend this legislation to the committee and recommend its early approval.

Mr. President, I also wish to include in my remarks certain paragraphs from the Senate report on S. 388, which paragraphs are as follows:

PURPOSE

The enactment of S. 388 would include the Nebraska Mid-State unit in the Missouri River Basin project so that the construction, operation, and maintenance of the proposed Mid-State development may be undertaken and may be integrated, physically and financially, with the other Federal works of the Missouri River Basin project.

NEED

An assured water supply to the Platte River Valley in central Nebraska has long been recognized as essential to maintain the present economy and for the continued growth and prosperity of the area. Demands on the ground water aquifers are exceeding the practical limits of safe yield for irrigation and municipal uses. The proposed project would replenish and stabilize the ground water and make practical expanded water use in the area by the application of surface water for irrigation. Furthermore, the project would regulate ground water levels for all purposes by means of the integrated system of reservoirs, canals, laterals, district wells, drainage facilities, and floodways.

The interconnected foothill reservoirs and wildlife developments along the Platte River included in the plan would provide extensive fishing and waterfowl hunting opportunities in an area where they are now limited. Many of the reservoirs and their shorelines, together with planned minimum basic facilities, will provide extensive recreation benefits. The proposed multiple-purpose reservoirs, canals, and floodways would furnish a high degree of flood protection to the district lands and property, and to other areas of the Platte River Valley. The Corps of Engineers has calculated the benefits which would be realized from this protection, and those benefits were used as the basis for the allocation of project costs for this purpose.

DESCRIPTION OF PLAN

The basic plan for the Mid-State project is the same as that contained in the Mid-State project report dated April 1958. The project is located in central Nebraska along the north side of the Platte River. Lands to be benefited cover a width of from 10 to 20 miles from east of Lexington to the vicinity of Silver Creek, Nebr. There are approximately 550,000 acres of land within the Mid-State district boundaries, of which about 363,000 acres have been designated as arable.

Nearly 260,000 acres of land are now dependent on wells and pumps drawing upon the ground water and upon streams for their irrigation supplies.

The project would provide a regulated gravity and well combination water supply for approximately 140,000 acres of land and would replenish and stabilize to the maximum extent practicable the aquifer from which about 4,600 irrigation wells are pumping ground waters within the boundaries of the district. In addition, the development would produce substantial flood control, recreation, and fish and wildlife benefits. Provision also is made for initial irrigation pumping power and for ultimate development of commercial power.

The Mid-State project includes the following potential features:

(a) A diversion dam located in the Platte River about 7 miles east of Lexington, Nebr., to divert waters of the Platte River.

(b) A main supply canal and floodway designed to carry 3,000 cubic feet per second from the diversion dam to the reservoir system. Initial sections of the canal have greater capacities (7,700 to 12,700 cubic feet per second) to carry floodwaters of Buffalo and Strever Creeks to the Platte River.

(c) A system of 23 interconnected ravine reservoirs on the north side of the Platte River with an irrigation conservation capacity of 289,300 acre-feet.

(d) Four hydroelectric plant sites with a potential installed capacity of about 67,200 kilowatts. Only the Prairie Creek powerplant of 16,800 kilowatts would be constructed initially and would be operated primarily to furnish irrigation pumping power for district-operated pumps.

(e) Lower Mid-State Canal and Floodway, Kearney Floodway, Shelton Floodway, and Chapman Floodway which would serve dual functions of conveying irrigation water to lands and carrying floodflows from the reservoir systems, together with flows intercepted in the project area, to the Platte River.

(f) Substation and transmission systems to furnish power to project pumps and interconnecting facilities with the statewide power system.

(g) An irrigation distribution system consisting of improvements to natural channels to be used for conveyance of irrigation water and of laterals, and numerous lift and well pumps.

(h) Surface and subsurface drainage facilities.

(i) Fish and wildlife and recreation development.

Cost

Total project cost	$84, 202, 000
Irrigation	57, 604, 000
To be repaid by user:	
40 years	43, 151, 600
Repaid from Missouri River Basin account	14, 452, 000
Flood control	12, 644, 000
Fish and wildlife	9, 317, 000
Recreation	3, 419, 000
Deferred power	1, 218, 000

Benefit-cost ratio: 100 years, 1.57 to 1.

LOCAL ORGANIZATION

The Nebraska Mid-State Reclamation District, original sponsor of the multipurpose Mid-State project is a political subdivision of the State of Nebraska, organized under the Nebraska Reclamation Act. This district was the first to organize under its provisions. The legality of the formation and organization, was upheld by the Supreme Court of Nebraska in 1950. Under this act and prior to delivery of water from the project works, the district may levy a 1-mill ad valorem tax on all tangible property within the district; after delivery of water, the district may levy a 2-mill tax, and in instances of deficiencies or impending defaults in contract payment, may levy a third mill.

The Mid-State reclamation project has been long delayed, Mr. President, and I am hopeful that successful legislative action can be completed this year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Nebraska midstate division, Missouri River Basin project, and for other purposes."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the votes by which the bills S. 1186, H.R. 2434, and S. 388 were passed be reconsidered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR FONG

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, as assistant Republican leader and one of the bipartisan floor leaders for the civil rights bill, no one knows better than I the critical role which Senator FONG has played in the passage of this vital legislation. He has been of inestimable help to me by frequently serving in the role of floor captain for the bill. His persuasive arguments contributed much to the effort to get enough votes to pass this legislation, both on the cloture motion and on final passage. His excellent speech in favor of the bill, just before it was enacted, was just one of his many efforts during this session of Congress to make equality of opportunity a reality for all Americans.

UNVEILING OF SHEVCHENKO STATUE

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the events of Saturday last, June 27, 1964, were a gratifying culmination for thousands of Ukrainian-Americans who worked long and energetically to raise a statue to Taras Shevchenko, the historic Ukrainian poet and freedom fighter. I am proud to have played a part in this undertaking, and I know that all who henceforth pass the Shevchenko memorial in Washington will pause and reflect on his message of freedom.

This brave Ukrainian stands a century removed from our time, but in many senses he is still our contemporary. The continued existence of Soviet imperialism, the savage iron rule by the Communists over many peoples once proudly independent, the spreading control of the Chinese Communists in the Far East—all these remind us with tragic force that the ideal of human liberty which Shevchenko extolled still remains unfulfilled for millions of human beings.

As Shevchenko spoke, so we all should speak, for only those who speak will be heard. I congratulate all who have helped in keeping the message of freedom alive.

PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, the Senate was deeply saddened by the news on Friday, June 19, of a tragic airplane crash that took the lives of two fine men and injured two of our colleagues and the wife of one of them.

We feel a deep sense of loss in the deaths of Edward Moss and Edwin Zimny in the crash of the plane in Massachusetts.

We were shocked to learn of the injuries to Senator EDWARD M. KENNEDY and of the injuries to Senator BIRCH BAYH and to Mrs. Bayh. We are all grateful that both Senators and Mrs. Bayh will recover fully.

There is a lesson to be learned from this tragic incident, however.

The Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments of which, ironically, Senator BAYH is chairman, has reported a proposal to the Committee on the Judiciary designed to solve problems created by vacancies in the office of Vice President and by possible disability of a President.

I am a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 139 which the subcommittee has agreed upon and which, I am hopeful, will soon be reported to the Senate by the full committee.

We have had in history 16 occasions in which the office of Vice President has been vacant. Three Presidents of the United States have experienced disabilities and have been unable to perform their duties.

All men—even Presidents—are vulnerable. They are vulnerable to illness.

As this airplane crash in Massachusetts shows us, the leaders of our Nation also are vulnerable to accidents. Men and women in political life must of necessity travel widely. Our constituents expect to see us as often as possible. We also have official duties that can take us to all corners of the earth.

I suppose we all feel that accidents are things that happen to others but never to ourselves. But we all know the foolishness of that notion.

Keeping in mind that we are but flesh and blood and that we suffer the disabilities that flesh is heir to, I would like at this time to place in the RECORD an article by Senator BAYH entitled "Our Greatest National Danger" which appeared in the April 7 issue of Look magazine; and an article by the distinguished columnist Walter Lippmann. Senator BAYH's article points out the ever-present dangers we will face until we do something about filling vacancies in the office of Vice President and providing a formula of action in the event a President is disabled.

Mr. Lippmann's article describes how the Bayh amendment, approved by the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments, would solve these problems.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent these two articles be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post]

THE PRESIDENCY: SUCCESSION AND DISABILITY

(By Walter Lippmann)

In its leisurely and happy-go-lucky way, Congress has now got to the point where a subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee has agreed on a bill dealing with the Presidential succession and with Presidential disability. This bill (S.J. Res. 139) is supported by Senators from both parties, DIRKSEN, KEATING, and FONG for the Republicans, BIRCH BAYH, DODD, and EASTLAND for the Democrats. Now, if the Judiciary Committee agrees with its subcommittee, the bill can go to the Senate. If it is passed there, then some day, perhaps next year, a similar bill will go to the House. Then if it has been approved by two-thirds vote in each House, it must be ratified by three-quarters of the States.

Thus we must accept the fact that a constitutional amendment to provide for a Vice President if there is no Vice President cannot go into effect during the present period when there is no Vice President. This vacuum will last until January 1965. Moreover, during this same period, there will be no orderly way to deal with the situation which would exist if, God forbid, this President were disabled.

Because such delay is a grave national risk and a reckless gamble, I have been among those who have argued that the problems of succession and disability should be dealt with at once, not by the long process of a constitutional amendment but, by repealing the unhappy legislation of 1947 and by a declaration interpreting what the Constitution says about Presidential inability.

The consensus of Congress and of the legal profession has been, however, that a constitutional amendment is necessary. It is evident that Congress is unwilling to legislate and that it is determined to take the longer road of a constitutional amendment. So be it. The amendment proposed (S.J. Res. 139) by Senator BIRCH BAYH's subcommittee has one compelling thing to be said for it. It has been agreed to by leading members of both parties. And, therefore, even if it were not so good as it is, it would still be a great deal better than an endless search for an ever more perfect solution. The absolutely perfect solution which deals with every conceivable contingency will never be found, and it is not necessary. What is necessary is that there should be a legitimate procedure which the whole country respects.

In fact, however, this proposed amendment is, so far as I can see, very good indeed. On the first problem, which is what is to happen when there is no Vice President, as there was when Truman succeeded Roosevelt and as there has been since Johnson succeeded Kennedy, Senate Joint Resolution 139 would have the President nominate a Vice President subject to the approval of both Houses of Congress. Probably this would work because the country would not look sympathetically on a partisan or factional effort to thwart the new President in a matter of this kind.

Above all, the proposal cures the vices of the existing system set up by the 1947 law. Under it, the Presidential office would go to the Speaker of the House when the Vice Presidency is vacant. He could, of course be of the opposition party. This would mean that the death of a President might be equivalent to the reversal of the previous election. The other vice of the existing law is that the man whose career has led him to the speakership is not likely to have passed through any kind of experience and training which qualifies him for high executive office. As against this, the Bayh amendment rests on a basic idea of the old pre-1947 law, which was that the successor of the President should be a man who has had his full confidence.

The other problem, which arises, when a President is disabled, has always in practice turned on this question: If the Vice President takes over, does he become President, and if he does, how can he be made to surrender his office if the elected President recovers? The Bayh proposal provides a reasonable answer.

If the President falls ill but remains in control of his faculties, he may declare in writing that he is unable to discharge the powers and duties of the office; the Vice President then becomes the acting President until the elected President declares in writing that his inability has ended. If, however, the President is too ill to do anything, as was the case, for example, when Garfield was dying, the Vice President with the concurrence of a majority of the Cabinet, or of anybody specified by Congress, could declare that the President is disabled and assume the position of Acting President.

There is here a somewhat tricky point. For it could happen that the President, though in fact incapacitated, would dispute the actions of the Vice President and of the Cabinet. In that event, which could have happened when Wilson lay paralyzed in the White House, the dispute would go to Congress which would have to decide by two-thirds majority of both Houses whether the Vice President should continue as Acting President.

There is an additional safeguard against a coup d'etat in the fact that if any member of the Cabinet disagreed with the majority, he could make his position known to the Congress, and under those circumstances it is unlikely that there would be a two-thirds vote.

This is about as good a way of dealing with what would be the most messy and muddled situation imaginable, which would be that of a President in apparent good health who was in fact deranged. The ultimate solution for this ultimate problem is in fact a form of impeachment, and that in effect is what is proposed.

[From Look magazine, Apr. 7, 1964]

OUR GREATEST NATIONAL DANGER

(By BIRCH BAYH, Jr., U.S. Senator from Indiana)

(If a President were disabled—or if he died—while the United States had no Vice President, we could face national panic or even international catastrophe. Here, a Senator tells why our present succession law and most proposals for amending it are inadequate, and offers his own proposals to prevent our greatest national danger.)

There is a classic tale about two boys: One of them ran away from home, and the other grew up to become Vice President. Neither was ever heard of again.

From the time of the Nation's founding until the mid-20th century, the office of Vice President of the United States was a target for the satirist. John Adams, the country's first Vice President, described his job as "the most insignificant office that ever the invention of man contrived." Theodore Roosevelt, when he was elected Vice President, at the age of 42, was quoted as saying that he was going to Washington not to be praised, but buried.

John Nance Garner graphically described the Nation's second highest office as not being worth "a pitcher of warm spit." And when Alben W. Barkley was sworn in as Vice President, he began his speech this way: "Inasmuch as I am about to enter upon the discharge of duties that require 4 years of silence, I will be brief."

But the course of human events has changed. Under the 34th and 35th Presidents, Dwight D. Eisenhower and John F. Kennedy, the Vice President became the Nation's chief ambassador. Since 1949, the Vice President has been a member of the National Security Council. He is chairman of the National Aeronautics and Space Council and the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunities. Most significantly, however, he remains the man who is always a heartbeat away from the world's most powerful office.

It is an amazing fact of American history that on 16 different occasions—totaling more than 38 years—this Nation has been without a Vice President. It is equally amazing, though extremely fortunate, that American democracy's tradition of peaceful transfer of executive authority has never been put to a decisive test by the death of a President and his Vice President during the same 4-year period.

The tragic death of President Kennedy has renewed the discussion of presidential succession and disability. There are few problems facing this Nation today of more critical importance than the need for permanent answers to these questions—yet few problems have received as little congressional consideration.

There have been three succession laws in our history. The first, passed by Congress in 1792, was a creature of political expediency. It provided that the President pro tempore of the Senate would be next in line of succession after the Vice President. This plan was devised by President George Washington and Secretary of the Treasury Alexander Hamilton because they did not want to risk the succession of Thomas Jefferson, who was then Secretary of State.

The next, the Succession Act of 1886, fixed the line of succession in the Cabinet, starting with the Secretary of State. But the law was ambiguous. It apparently assumed that while a member of the Cabinet acted as President, he would also retain his Cabinet post. The law required the acting President to assemble the Congress within 20 days, to give the legislators an opportunity to arrange for the selection of a new President. Under this plan, the Nation could have gone for months without a clear idea of who was in command or who would be in command when the Congress completed its deliberations.

President Harry S. Truman instigated the third and current succession law, which was passed by Congress in 1947. Under this law, the Speaker of the House of Representatives is next in the line of succession to the Presidency, if both the President and the Vice President should die during their term of office. That is the situation today, with Speaker JOHN W. MCCORMACK, Democrat, of Massachusetts, the potential successor to President Lyndon B. Johnson, should anything happen to the President before the next inaugural day, January 20, 1965.

A great deal of sound and fury has been heard about Speaker MCCORMACK's age (72) and his capabilities for the Presidency. This, as I see it, isn't the problem at all. JOHN MCCORMACK is an able and experienced man. The problem is, first, that we are now without a Vice President. Second, the Speaker, the potential successor to the Presidency, is purely a member of the legislative branch of the Government—not the executive branch.

The Speaker already has more than a full-time job running the House. Under an agreement with President Johnson, he attends only those meetings of the National Security Council and the Cabinet that would not, in the President's judgment, interfere with the Speaker's legislative role.

The Speaker has neither the time nor constitutional authority to serve as Vice President—flying to a trouble spot as the President's representative, making a policy speech that would be identified as an administration speech, heading such groups as the National Aeronautics and Space Council and the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunities, or casting the tie-breaking vote as President of the Senate.

The Speaker could be—and, in the past, has been—a member of the political party in opposition to the party of the President. Had anything happened to Mr. Truman between 1947 and 1949, Speaker Joseph W. Martin, Jr., a Republican, would have become President. This would have resulted in extensive Cabinet changes, sharp policy shifts and possibly a massive overhaul of patronage jobs—all at a time of national crisis and before the American people had an opportunity to express themselves at the polls. In 1948, President Truman won reelection over Thomas E. Dewey, an indication that the voters—the ultimate policymakers in our society—wanted no such changes at that time.

The present succession law ignores one of the major problems facing the presidency today. Like its predecessors, it makes no provision for what would happen if the President were disabled by illness or—and we must face this tragic possibility—by the bullet of a would-be assassin.

The Constitution is not clear as to whether the Vice President would become President or only acting President in the event of the President's inability to discharge the duties and powers of his office.

In fact, there is no hint either in the Constitution or the present succession statute of who would determine presidential inability or how; and what machinery would be used to determine the President's fitness to resume his duties once he recovered.

Twice in our history, we were brought to the edge of governmental chaos because we lacked the machinery to deal with presidential disability. In 1881, President James A. Garfield lay wounded 80 days before he died. His only official act in that time was the signing of an extradition paper. Meanwhile, postal frauds went unchallenged by the executive branch, foreign relations were deteriorating, and Federal officers did not perform their duties because they had not been commissioned by the President. The Cabinet managed affairs of state without constitutional authority. It was feared that if presidential duties were turned over to Vice President Chester A. Arthur, Garfield would cease to be President.

When President Woodrow Wilson collapsed from a stroke on September 25, 1919, the worst crisis of presidential inability in our history began. In her scholarly work, "Presidential Succession," Prof. Ruth S. Silva wrote that, during Wilson's illness, "public policy was being formulated by people whose stand was not necessarily Wilson's, by persons whose capabilities were not always commensurate with their loyalty to Wilson, and by people who had no legal mandate. * * * It seems obvious that, from September 25, 1919, to March 4, 1921, affairs of Government were not conducted in a manner stipulated by the Constitution."

Acutely aware of such dangers, President Eisenhower in 1958 made a precedent-setting agreement with Vice President Richard M. Nixon that, in the event of inability, the President would, if possible, inform the Vice President, who would then act as President until the period of inability had ended. If the President could not communicate his inability, the Vice President, "after such consultation as seems to him appropriate under the circumstances," would decide whether he should act as President. In either event, the President would determine when the inability had ended, and would then resume the full powers and duties of his office.

In 1961, President Kennedy made the same agreement with Vice President Johnson. Shortly after President Kennedy's assassination, Mr. Johnson made the same agreement with Speaker McCormack.

But these agreements do not have the force of law. They do not provide for a situation in which the President declared himself capable of performing his duties when, in fact, he might be physically or mentally incapable. Further, the agreements do not offer safeguards against a coup d'etat by an overly ambitious Vice President.

And what of the present situation? The Johnson-McCormack disability agreement does not answer several nagging questions: If the Speaker were forced to act as President, would he resign the speakership? If he did, would he still be an officer of the Government, entitled under the Constitution to act as President? Would the Speaker be required to resign his seat in Congress? If he did not, how then would we preserve the separation of executive and legislative authority that is so vital to our form of Government?

Richard Nixon, in his autobiographical, "Six Crises," pointed out that the 1958 agreement between him and President Eisenhower "was personal and had the force of (Eisenhower's) authority only during his term of office. These agreements, which are mere expressions of a President's desires, do not have the force of law. Even a law passed by Congress might be subject to constitutional challenge. * * * Surely the time has come for a truly bipartisan program to draw up a constitutional amendment which would define the rights and duties of a Vice President during any period when the President of the United States is incapacitated."

We cannot afford to gamble with the future of our Nation. We must amend the Constitution to provide for a Vice President at all times to assist the President in the performance of the Chief Executive's massive duties and to assure a legitimacy in succession that will inspire national confidence and gain national consent. We must amend the Constitution to answer the thorny questions about presidential inability.

In the event of presidential inability, I propose:

That the Vice President become acting President, should the President declare his own inability to perform his duties. If the President is unable to declare his own disability, a majority of the Cabinet, upon the petition of the Vice President, could declare presidential disability, and the Vice President would become acting President.

That the President determine the end of his inability. If the acting President disputed the President's judgment, and was supported in his contention by a majority of the Cabinet, the question would be laid before the Congress. A two-thirds majority of the House of Representatives and Senate sitting separately would be required to uphold the judgment of the acting President and the Cabinet majority. The acting President or a majority vote by the House and Senate sitting separately could thereafter return to the President the powers and duties of his office.

Such a proposal would provide for a quick—but temporary—transfer of the presidential duties and powers to the Vice President. The President, however, would be safeguarded from any usurpation of power by the requirement of both Cabinet and congressional consent to the Vice President's action.

That whenever a vacancy occurs in the Vice Presidency, either because of the death of a Vice President or his resignation (which has happened eight times in our history) or because the Vice President succeeds to the Presidency (which has happened eight times), the President be required to nominate a candidate for Vice President within 30 days. A majority vote by the House and Senate sitting jointly would be required to confirm the nominee.

Nomination of a Vice President by the President is clearly in keeping with American tradition. First, it is necessary that the President and Vice President be able to work harmoniously together. Second, it simulates the method by which vice presidential candidates are selected at almost every national convention.

To be sure, there have been exceptions, when counterbalancing forces within the party nominating convention prevailed. Wilson wanted to drop Vice President Thomas R. Marshall from the ticket in 1916, but was prevented from doing so by convention pressure. In 1920, Republican convention delegates asserted their independence of the head of the ticket by nominating Calvin Coolidge for Vice President. Clever convention maneuvering forced Theodore Roosevelt upon an unwilling William McKinley. But by and large, the presidential nominee has a great influence and, in most cases, has, at the very least, a veto power over the selection of the vice presidential choice. Franklin D. Roosevelt threatened to refuse the Democratic presidential nomination in 1940 unless Henry A. Wallace was made his running mate. John F. Kennedy made the decision to have Lyndon B. Johnson as his Vice President.

Congress would continue to act as the representative of the people, and would provide a reasonable countervailing force to presidential wishes in circumstances requiring the President to choose a Vice President. In all probability, the President's first nominee would be confirmed—much as the Senate generally, though not always, approves presidential nominations for Cabinet positions. But the President's judgment would always be open to question by the Congress, and the nominee would be subjected to thorough hearings that would provide the Nation with an awareness of his qualifications.

The argument that the electoral college should be reassembled to elect a new Vice President overlooks the present-day role of the electoral college. By modern tradition, the electoral college is designed to convey the wishes of the people of their respective States concerning the choice between two specific slates of candidates. This is merely the formal expression of the will of the people. Certainly, electoral college members are not chosen to exercise considered judgment and reasoning. The people they represent have already made their choice for President at the polls.

Congress, however, is a body designed to debate everchanging issues. Members are trained to ferret out facts, weigh differences of opinion and, in these special circumstances, are best qualified to judge who the new Vice President should be.

Special elections to fill the Vice Presidency would have many shortcomings. The Nation would be thrust into a full-scale national campaign among candidates who would have had little or no time to prepare for a campaign. The temptation would be great to depend on "scare" issues for attention. The voters would have little time to make a reasoned choice, and the winner could be a member of the political party in opposition to the President's party.

Some argue that two Vice Presidents would insure the presence of at least one Vice President at all times. But having two Vice Presidents would be the quickest way to return the Vice Presidency to nonentity status. Just when the Vice Presidency is becoming a significant job in itself and a likely springboard to the Presidency, it would be folly to adopt a plan that would diminish the importance of the office by creating two jobs, neither of which would have sufficient responsibilities or prestige.

It is not easy to arouse widespread interest in a subject like presidential succession and disability. But unless satisfactory corrective steps are taken, the danger to this Nation will remain a grave and ever-present one.

The stability and continuity of our democratic form of government are at stake. The time to act is now.

THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF BIRTH OF TARAS SHEVCHENKO, UKRAINIAN NATIONAL POET

Mr. HART. Mr. President, today the largest non-Russian nation within the Soviet Empire is Ukrainia. Despite cruel repressions, the Ukrainian people continue their search for freedom. June 27 of this year marks the 150th anniversary of the birth of Taras Shevchenko, the greatest of all Ukrainian poets, and a fighter all his life, not only for the freedom of Ukrainia, but also for the freedom and individual dignity of all human beings.

If this happy event can be celebrated in Ukrainia only clandestinely, Americans of Ukrainian background throughout the United States are celebrating the occasion with appropriate ceremonies and solemn pledges to continue their work to further the ideals of human freedom and the freedom of Ukrainia of which Taras Shevchenko sang with such lyric beauty in his poetry.

It gives me great pleasure to join my many friends of Ukrainian background in honoring this great poet and in joining them in solemn prayer that freedom for all peoples will come as Taras Shevchenko so fervently hoped.

WASHINGTON STAR ENDORSES TRUTH IN LENDING

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, last Friday the Washington Star joined the growing list of newspapers that have publicly endorsed S. 750, the truth in lending bill.

Earlier last week, the Senate Banking and Currency Committee voted to recommit the truth in lending bill to subcommittee for further study. Of course, the effect of that vote was to make it almost impossible to enact S. 750 in this Congress. In spite of this setback, however, I shall push to get the subcommittee to reconsider the bill at the earliest possible date. I had planned to have the subcommittee meet early next week.

I hope this growing support for the truth in lending bill will encourage other members of the committee to consider this proposed legislation as expeditiously as possible. Those of us who believe that the consumer has a right to know what interest rate he is being charged and how much he is paying to finance his purchases on credit, welcome the advice of the editors of the Star, when they urged that the subcommittee "show a bit of stubborn regard for the debt-owing public, and send the bill right back up to the full committee, and that the Senate finally will get a chance to pass on the measure."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from last Friday's Star be printed in its entirety at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Star, June 26, 1964]

TRUTH ON THE CUFF

Consumer borrowing—for autos, vacations, TV sets—is often done at a cost that the consumer doesn't recognize or can't figure out.

If he is told at all what "interest" he is paying for the privilege of buying on the cuff, the figure given him may be misleadingly simple. It may say that the rate is "8 percent," but that doesn't mean $8 a year on every $100 of debt he's taking on. Because of the obscure ways of retail finance, the actual cost may be many times $8 per $100.

It is hard to understand why some retailers and consumer lenders won't tell the straight—and full—truth about the fees they require on-the-cuff buyers to pay. Perhaps they are afraid of being found to be charging so much.

Congress should insist that financing charges be shown clearly and completely. A "truth in lending" bill hardly seems like a threat to free enterprise.. It at least deserves a chance to be voted up or down. And it hasn't had a chance in the 4 or more years that such a bill has been pending.

On its first test, just this week, a "truth in lending" bill could not get past the Senate Banking Committee. By a vote of 8 to 6, the committee voted to keep the bill from the full Senate, by recommitting it to a subcommittee.

The subcommittee, however, already approves of the bill. We hope that it will show a bit of stubborn regard for the debt-owing public, and send the bill right back up to the full committee, and that the Senate finally will get a chance to pass on the measure.

A TRIBUTE TO THE AMALGAMATED MEAT CUTTERS & BUTCHER WORKMEN (AFL–CIO)

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, on July 13, the Amalgamated Meat Cutters & Butcher Workmen of North America, AFL–CIO, will begin its 21st general convention. When President Thomas J. Lloyd and Secretary-Treasurer Patrick E. Gorman open the weeklong meetings, nearly 1,500 delegates and alternates will be in attendance. They represent some 450 local unions which have a total of 375,000 members throughout the United States and Canada.

The delegates will include packinghouse workers and fish processing employees, retail meatcutters and sheep shearers, leather workers and sausage makers, poultry workers and cannery employees, farm workers and egg candlers, fur workers and grocery clerks. For the Amalgamated, whose headquarters are in the city of Chicago, represents workers not only in the meat industry, but also in many other food industries, and in fur and leather production, as well.

It is a strong union, and a militant one. It organizes aggressively. It bargains hard in negotiations with employers.

It is also very responsible. It studies the problems of the industries in which its members work, and attempts to meet them. It does not flinch from striking or using other economic weapons; but it does so only as a last resort, and after all efforts to reach an amicable agreement have failed. Once a labor-management agreement is reached and then is ratified by the members, the contract is scrupulously adhered to.

We in the Senate know the Amalgamated Meat Cutters & Butcher Workmen best for its championing of a variety of social welfare and consumer protective legislation.

It performed a momentous public service in the mid-1950's when it called attention to the need for mandatory poultry inspection legislation, and worked hard for its enactment. I am proud to have participated with the Amalgamated in that legislative battle, which resulted in the inspection, for cleanliness and wholesomeness, of all poultry and poultry products in interstate commerce.

It has been a leader in the effort to secure farm-labor reform. Its massive work and great patience constitute a major factor in the coming elimination of the infamous bracero law.

It has been a stalwart in the fight for enactment of civil rights legislation—not only in the recent effort, but also in the partially successful and in the unsuccessful legislative battles of the years past. It has strongly advocated and supported attempts to increase the minimum wage and to extend its coverage to all workers in interstate commerce.

In short, Mr. President, this union has used its strength, not only for the benefit of its members, but also for the good of the Nation as a whole. Many a man, woman, or child who has never heard of this union will avoid food poisoning because of its consumer protective work with Congress and the executive agencies.

Many a destitute family of migrant farmworkers which has never seen an official of this union will find more work, earn better wages, and have more health and educational services because of the Amalgamated's concern with farm labor matters.

Mr. President, the Amalgamated Meat Cutters & Butcher Workmen, AFL–CIO, has come a long way. It has not always possessed this strength. Its convention will open 60 years, almost to the day, after the time when the union began one of the most momentous—and one of the most disastrous—battles in American labor history.

On July 12, 1904, some 50,000 meatpacking workers went on strike in plants all over the United States. Their demands were modest; in fact, the workers sought mostly to keep what the Amalgamated had previously won.

They scored an initial victory, but it was short lived. A second walkout took place over the rehiring of the strike leaders. Bloody battles with police and strike breakers ensued. But the broken heads and even deaths of strikers did not bring victory.

The strike ended on September 8, 1904. The union had lost and been crushed. The Amalgamated Meat Cutters & Butcher Workmen was a mere shadow.

Nor was that sad event the only occasion on which this gallant union was decimated. After many difficult and painful years of rebuilding, the Amalgamated Meat Cutters & Butcher Workmen again reached a point of strength. It won important gains for meat workers, especially through some brilliant arbitration victories during World War I. In 1921, the union was faced with a demand by meatpackers that it return to the 10-hour day and agree to a cut in wages.

Once again, a nationwide packinghouse strike took place. Once again, blood flowed. The strikers suffered from injuries, injunctions, hunger, and lack of money.

Once again, the strike was broken. Once more, the Amalgamated was crushed. After the strike, it had some 2,000 members left, and many of these were blacklisted.

But the union again rose from the ashes of defeat. A major architect of that rebuilding was Pat Gorman, the union's present secretary-treasurer, and, I am proud to say, a longtime friend of mine. Pat became president of the union in 1923 at age 30. His capabilities as a fighter and a harmonizer—in human relations, as well as in his avocation of song writing—were vital in moving along the long and difficult road back to organizational strength.

Jack Lloyd, now president of the Amalgamated, is also a longtime labor leader. As an often unpaid organizer, and later as a sometimes equally unpaid vice president, he worked hard to build the union in the Northwest and the Rocky Mountain States.

Mr. President, I congratulate both of these men and the other officers and members of the Amalgamated Meat Cutters & Butcher Workmen, AFL–CIO. I congratulate the international union and the local unions for their tenacity, their dedication, and their sense of responsibility.

I wish the Amalgamated a very good and successful convention. I hope it will make effective plans to achieve its goal to organize and sharply improve the living standards of hundreds of thousands of food industry workers, many of whom are now in dire poverty. And I hope fervently the union will accelerate its fight for the excellent social causes it has long championed.

DOES SUPREME COURT DECISION INVALIDATE ELECTORAL COLLEGE BLOC VOTING?

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, in supporting the majority decision of the U.S. Supreme Court decision of June 15, requiring that each State build its legislature so that, in each House, each Member represents substantially the same number of people, the Court held that States must apply the doctrine of "one person, one vote" in shaping its Senate and House districts.

Chief Justice Warren put it his way, in writing the majority opinion:

> Simply stated, an individual's right to vote for State legislators is unconstitutionally impaired when its weight is in a substantial fashion diluted when compared with votes of citizens living in other parts of the State.

If this Court doctrine is valid and logical from the standpoint of the apportionment of Senate and House legislative districts within a State, it would clearly indicate that the same Court doctrine, if there is to be consistency, must hold that an electoral college system of bloc voting designed to give a voter in New York State, for example, more than 14 times the weight and authority of an individual voter in the States of Delaware, Nevada, Vermont, Wyoming, or Alaska, is definitely an unconstitutional device designed to invalidate the concept of "one person, one vote."

Chief Justice Warren stated further in his majority opinion:

> Legislators represent people, not trees or acres. Legislators are elected by voters, not farms or cities or economic interests * * * And, if a State should provide that the votes of citizens in one part of the State should be given 2 times, or 5 times, or 10 times the weight of the votes of citizens in another part of the State, it could hardly be contended that the right to vote of those residing in the disfavored areas had not been effectively diluted.

Mr. President, no opinion of the U.S. Supreme Court could more eloquently or emphatically reject the concept that an electoral college system of winner-take-all unit voting which provides the winner with the right to add all of the votes of the loser to his total count is either appropriate, equitable, or constitutional.

Furthermore, when the Court holds that an elective setup which gives "the votes of citizens in one part of the State 2 times, or 5 times, or 10 times the weight of votes of citizens in another part of the State," is unconstitutional, it is inconceivable that the same Court could fail to follow the same reasoning by holding unconstitutional an electoral college voting mechanism which gives the votes of citizens of one State "2 times, or 5 times, or 10 times the weight of votes of citizens in another" State.

Mr. President, for many years I have protested the inequity and the injustice of such an electoral college voting procedure. Along with other Senators, I have introduced and sponsored Senate Joint Resolution 12, which would correct this electoral college discrimination against the civil rights of certain citizens, by giving to each American citizen, regardless of his State of residence, the same weight in voting for President and Vice President. In other words, Senate Joint Resolution 12 would provide exactly the "one person, one vote" doctrine now being prescribed by the Supreme Court decision of June 15.

I am from the State of South Dakota, which has only four votes in the electoral college. In addition to South Dakota, the following States cast only four electoral votes: Arizona, Idaho, Montana, New Hampshire, New Mexico, North Dakota, Rhode Island, and Utah. California and New York are alloted 43 votes in the electoral college. At least six of our other States cast 20 or more votes in the electoral college, thus providing the individual voter of those States with five or more times the weight and influence, by marking of a single ballot, than equally well qualified voters can exercise in States with four or less electoral votes.

THE ELECTORAL COLLEGE COUNT SHOULD BE CHALLENGED IN THE COURT

In view of this recent Supreme Court decision, Mr. President, I hope the Governor and/or the attorney general of one of our small States which are thus badly discriminated against by the electoral college mechanism of "bloc voting" will initiate in Federal court a case challenging the constitutionality of this procedure. On the basis of its June 15 decision, it would seem crystal clear that the Court must, in good conscience, and in conformity with the rules of consistency, also hold invalid the unconscionable electoral college counting system which relegates the vast majority of all Americans to the status of 2d-class, 3d-class, and 10th-class citizens.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD my testimony before the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments, of the Senate Judiciary Committee, in May of 1961, when the subcommittee was hearing testimony on amendments relating to the method of nomination and election of the President and Vice President.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MUNDT

My main theme in this whole connection, Mr. Chairman, can be stated in the first short paragraph of my report, that is that I believe, and I hope you believe, and think you believe, that every voter in this country, whether he lives in California, Delaware, New York, or South Dakota, ought to have equal voting power when it comes to electing the President of the United States.

This is the only important respect in which our electoral college system, so-called, has failed to function with fairness with only minor changes, important though they are, in effect, it has stood the practical test of time since our country was established. It has carried us through 44 presidential elections, through peace and war, from George Washington to John F. Kennedy. It was after the fourth presidential election that the 12th amendment was added to the Constitution to require presidential electors to vote specifically for President and Vice President, rather than, as the original provision provided, for two persons for Preisdent. Since then, 40 presidential elections have been held. It is obvious, therefore, that any system that has functioned so well for so long should not be changed lightly. Changes proposed or made should be the absolute minimum required to bring about the desired and necessary results.

Such minimum and wholly practical changes are proposed in Senate Joint Resolution 12, which I am sponsoring together with Senators Thurmond, McClellan, Hruska, Morton, and Blakley. This is the old Mundt-Coudert amendment, with which most of us are familiar, with an important change, and antigerrymandering provision which corrects a wholly valid criticism of the amendment as written in 1955.

Our Founding Fathers, in the Constitutional Convention of 1787, gave long and careful consideration to the method of electing the President. At first it decided he should be elected by the Congress. Then it changed its collective mind and transferred the power of choice to an electoral college that was to be an exact counterpart of Congress with the representation of the States as units, corresponding to the Senators, as well as population of the States, corresponding to Representatives, and which should meet at the seat of Government.

Upon further consideration this plan was dropped because of the fear that the electors wouldn't travel so far for a single purpose. It took days in those times to cover distances that we span in a few hours. The Convention went back to its original idea that a President should be elected by a joint session of Congress. They did this with reluctance because it ran counter to their strong beliefs in the principle that separation of powers of the executive and legislative branches of the new government.

At this point the idea developed that the electors could meet and cast their votes in their own States and transmit the certificates of their ballots to the seat of government.

Accordingly, the work of electing the President was divided. The Convention transferred the act of voting from a joint session of Congress to electoral colleges in the several States, the results to be transmitted to the President of the Senate. It left with Congress, in joint session, the function of counting the certified results from the States, as would have been the case had Congress done the voting.

This plan appears in article II, section 1, of the Constitution—a part of which has been superseded by the 12th amendment:

"Each State shall appoint, in such a manner as the legislature thereof may direct, a number of electors equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives to which the State may be entitled in the Congress; but no Senator or Representative or person holding an office of trust or profit under the United States shall be appointed an elector."

The exclusion of Members of Congress and Federal officeholders is required by the cardinal principle of separation of powers.

In Senate Joint Resolution 12, the clause, "in such manner as the legislature thereof may direct," is eliminated. In its stead, Senate Joint Resolution 12 requires:

"The electors to which a State is entitled by virtue of its Senators, shall be elected by the people thereof, and the electors to which it is entitled by virtue of its Representatives shall be elected by the people within single elector districts established by the legislature thereof; such districts to be composed of compact and contiguous territory containing, as nearly as practicable, the number of persons which entitled the State to one Representative in Congress; and such districts, when formed, shall not be altered until another census has been taken."

It is the clause, "In such manner as the legislature thereof may direct," that is the root of the present problem. Only 10 States participated in the election of our first President, George Washington. North Carolina and Rhode Island had not yet ratified the Constitution; and New York's two houses of the legislature could not agree on who the electors should be.

No uniform method of choosing electors was followed. Electors were chosen in a variety of ways: election by legislatures, election by the people in districts, and election by the people on a general ticket which means that each voter in the State could vote for every one of the State's electors. In Massachusetts, each of the eight districts chose two electors from which the legislature selected one per district and added two electors at large.

In the succeeding presidential elections through 1832, the various methods were used with States changing from one to the other. In 1836, the general ticket system was used in every State but South Carolina, which continued to elect by the legislature through 1860.

After Washington's two elections, the Presidency was contested every 4 years on a party basis as it is today. The majority party in each State was quick to see the advantage of consolidating its electoral strength either through legislature selection or through use of the general ticket system so as to exert maximum influence in electing a President. Federalists did this where they were in control, in the New England States for example, and the anti-Federalists, later Jefferson's Republicans, did the same thing in their States.

Since 1836, with the exception of South Carolina, there have been only three instances of departures from the general ticket system, the one we now employ. They were Florida in 1868 and Colorado in 1876, in which the elections were by the legislature, and Michigan in 1892, when the district system with two electors at large was used.

It is extremely doubtful if any voter living today has used anything but a general ticket system in presidential elections. This use of the general ticket system in every State is largely responsible for many of the misunderstandings of the electoral college system which exist today and for much of the notion that the electors are archaic and unnecessary.

When we regard the electoral college as the exact numerical counterpart of Congress we can see readily that it combines the two principles of representation in our Federal Union of States. We have the Federal principle of equal representation of the States in the Senate, regardless of population, and, then, we have the national principle of unequal representation of the States in the House of Representatives based on their unequal populations. State representation in the House in the present Congress ranges from 1 to 43.

Each citizen of each State is represented in the Senate by two Senators and in the House of Representatives by one Representative, with a few exceptions. His representation in Congress, therefore, is two parts Federal and one part national. In the electoral college, with the general ticket system in force in every State, there is no equality of citizen representation. It ranges from a high of 45 members of the electoral college for a citizen of New York—which the preceding witness and my good friend, Senator KEATING, represents so well—to three for a citizen of each of the six States that sent only one Representative to the present Congress.

Conversely, each citizen has as many votes in presidential elections as his State has members in the electoral college, because they are elected on a general ticket. In other words, when a New York voter pulls a voting machine lever for a presidential ticket, he is actually casting 45 votes, 1 for each of 45 electors on a party slate.

It may be hard to believe—this is a startling statistic I want this committee to reflect on—it may be hard to believe, but there are or were actually more than 325 million votes cast in New York in the last presidential election by something over 7 million voters.

On the other hand, the citizens of the six States which have only one Member of the House of Representatives had only three votes each in the presidential election. In my own State of South Dakota, each citizen had four votes

This tremendous disparity in voting weight between the citizens of the large States and the small States is the true source of all the valid complaints which have been made against the electoral college system. The real culprit is the use of the general ticket by every State. Of course, each State legislature could abandon the general ticket, but none will without certain knowledge that all other States will abandon it at the same time. This is why a constitutional amendment is necessary to bring about a change.

I might add that the State of Florida in the last session of the legislature considered very seriously by State action eliminating the general ticket system, and on wise reflection decided they would be penalizing only themselves if they did, and every other State continued the bloc system of voting, the winner-take-all general ticket system.

Mr. Chairman, there is no more justification for choosing electors on a general ticket than there is for electing a State's delegation to the House of Representatives, counterparts of electors, on a statewide, bloc basis, which is what the general ticket does. Imagine the howls of rage that would arise all over the country if a district's Representative was to be taken from it, and given to the entire State. And yet it would be just as fair to use the general ticket for Representatives as it is for their counterparts in the electoral college.

I submit that the number of persons which entitles a State to one Representative in the Congress should entitle the same group of people to one member of the electoral college.

What have been the effects of the general ticket system of choosing electors? I suggest these:

1. It excludes from the Office of President of the United States all men, no matter how able and outstanding they may be, unless they come from a State with a large bloc of electoral votes.

2. By the same token, the dominant forces in the large, pivotal States which are responsible for the nomination and election of our Presidents have inordinate influences at the White House and in the executive branch of our Government.

3. It invites fraud in the large States that are crucial and where the vote is expected to be close. The results in Illinois, Texas, and Missouri in the last election brought forth charges of vote frauds. The effect of such vote fraud is statewide under the general ticket. A fraudulent vote, undetected, counts just as much as a valid vote in the statewide total.

By utilizing the district system, if fraud would still prevail, it could influence simply the electors coming from that specific electoral district. It would, therefore, minimize the impact of fraud and, consequently, tend to minimize the importance of anybody coming forth.

4. Although the Constitution gives each State the same numerical representation in the electoral college that it has in the whole Congress, by using the general ticket for electors, we have formed a constituency for the President which is altogether different from that which elects the Congress. The great difference between these two constituencies is that almost all Representatives are elected in single member districts while their counterparts in the electoral college are elected in multimember districts consisting of entire States. This situation permits voters of a State, voting straight party tickets, to produce one result in the electoral college and an altogether different result in the House of Representatives at the same election. The effect of all this is that we have what I have called a presidential United States and a congressional United States that are, politically speaking, two different countries within one national boundary.

5. Many critics of the present system contend that the electoral college is an archaic institution, outmoded by our tremendous improvements in transportation and communications, and that it is incompatible with modern democratic principles. In the main, these charges are based on either a misunderstanding of the electoral college, or on deliberate intentions to change the structure of our constitutional system and change our Republic into something radically different.

6. Another criticism of the electoral college is in the contention that presidential electors are in no way bound to vote for the presidential candidate of the party on whose slate they were elected. This is coupled with the contention that the Founding Fathers

intended the electors to be free agents. Both these contentions are without basis in fact. On the contrary, there is overwhelming evidence that from the very first it was clearly understood that the elector's function was to express the view of those who had chosen him.

Since 1820, a total of 14,018 presidential electors have been chosen. Of these only eight are alleged to have voted contrary to the views of those who named them. In no case did any of these votes affect the outcome of a presidential election. In 1820, one elector did not vote for James Monroe. In 1948, a Tennessee elector voted for Thurmond, the States rights candidate, instead of for President Truman, but he had announced before the election that he would do this. The last case was in the 1960 election when a Republican elector in Oklahoma voted for Senator Harry F. Byrd instead of Richard M. Nixon.

It is said, too, that the Founding Fathers had no notion of political parties. But, in the very first election, Alexander Hamilton, leader of the Federalists, saw to it that John Adams would not run equally with Washington, as both men were being voted for as President. In fact, Washington received 69 votes and Adams only 34.

An outstanding authority on the Constitution, the late Chief Justice Charles C. Nott of the Court of Claims, has stated flatly that the notion that the framers of the Constitution had no plan in mind for electing a President different from that which is in force is completely in error. In the Encyclopedia Americana Judge Nott wrote:

"It is said by some of the commentators, and indeed it is now generally believed, that the electoral colleges were intended to be 'deliberative bodies.' In one sense this is true—in the legal sense. The electors are not ministerial or administrative officers; they do not perform a specific work in a way determined by higher official authority; in legal contemplation the responsibility of their action rests upon themselves. But the framers of the Constitution never supposed that the electors would disregard the political pledges upon which they were chosen, or that the American people, either directly or through their State legislatures, would blindly choose electors to evolve a President out of their inner consciousness. On the contrary, they contemplated the successful candidates receiving the votes of 'a majority of the whole number of electors,' and they required the electors to vote 'in their respective States,' and to vote on the same day. If they had framed a provision requiring all of the electors to convene at the seat of government in one body, and there in their own way and time proceed to choose a President, there would be good reason for saying that actual deliberation was intended; but they did not give to the electors one single power of attribute by virtue of which they could deliberate * * *.

"The idea that it was ever intended that the electors should nominate the candidate for whom they themselves should vote is a myth which has been unthinkingly reiterated by most eminent writers, but which does not rest upon a single fact * * *. He who supposes that the framers (of the Constitution) intended that 13 different bodies should convene in 13 different places at one time for one object and for 1 day, and that object the selection of the executive of a nation, confesses a most superficial knowledge of the greatest constructive statesmen of their century and of the great work which they deliberately planned and built."

As originally introduced several years ago, the Mundt-Coudert amendment provided that a State's electors corresponding to its Representatives in Congress should be elected from congressional districts and the two corresponding to its Senators should be elected statewide, as Senators are elected. Critics, most of them supporters of the status quo, objected strongly and with justice that the use of congressional districts was open to criticism since in some States district lines had been unfairly drawn by whatever political party controlled the State legislature, a practice long known as gerrymandering.

To meet this criticism the amendment, as now proposed, provides for the setting up, as I have previously stated, of electoral districts to be composed of "compact and contiguous territory, containing as nearly as practicable the number of persons which entitled the States to one Representative in the Congress."

Our amendment, if adopted, would require State legislatures to follow this constitutional directive. If they failed to do so Congress would have the power to step in and see to it that fair and equitable districts for electors are established.

It is altogether likely that these nongerrymandered electoral districts would at least sharply curtail the practice of setting up unfair congressional districts since it would be extremely difficult for a State legislature to justify one set of districts for electors and another for Representatives.

There is another often-raised objection to the present system of electing a President. It is the provision that if no candidate receives a majority of the electoral votes when they are counted in Congress that the House of Representatives shall choose immediately a President from among the candidates with the three highest numbers of electoral votes. The vote in such a case—the last time it occurred was in 1824—is by State; each State delegation having one vote. In the event a State's House delegation is evenly divided its vote is not recorded. A majority of the States is required for election.

The objection to this system is that it is grossly unfair to the larger States, giving New York, California, and Pennsylvania no greater voice than Alaska, Delaware, and Nevada despite the great population disparities.

Senate Joint Resolution 12 cures this situation. It provides that in the event no presidential candidate has a majority of the electoral vote that "then from the persons having the three highest numbers on the list of persons voted for as President, the Senate and the House of Representatives, assembled and voting as individual members of one body, shall choose immediately, by ballot, the President; a quorum for such purpose shall be three-fourths of the whole number of Senators and Representatives, and a majority of the whole number shall be necessary for a choice; if additional ballots be necessary, the choice on the fifth ballot shall be between the two persons having the highest number of votes on the fourth ballot."

The Constitution also provides that if no candidate for Vice President has a majority that the Senate shall choose him from among the two candidates with the highest electoral vote total. Senate Joint Resolution 12 provides that both Houses in joint session and voting by the head, as for President, shall select the Vice President from among the candidates with the three highest numbers of electoral votes.

So I point out that while we equalize the rights of individual citizens to vote for President, we recognize the validity that bigger States should have more authority if it comes to be decided in the House of Representatives, so in that direction we are fair and equitable to the big States by giving them more authority than they have now.

Our system of electing a President has, generally speaking, served as well during the 172 years since our Republic was established. It has never failed to give us a President.

Through no fault of the Founding Fathers, it has, however, become distorted through the use of the general ticket system. Most of the framers of the Constitution, it should be pointed out, went on record favoring a district system for choosing electors, as the fairest method of expressing the popular will.

Senate Joint Resolution 12 is, in my opinion and the opinion of the many who support it, the only simple method by which each voter in every State will have the same voting weight in electing a President. It is the only one among the various electoral reform proposals which have been offered which will bring about a needed reform without a basic change in our constitutional system. It alone leaves control of the election machinery in the States, where it belongs.

It is the office and person of the elector, and nothing else, that maintains the intrastate character of presidential elections. Interstate candidacies are legally unknown and unprecedented under the Constitution, and would remain so under Senate Joint Resolution 12. Now, party nominees for President and Vice President are extralegal, outside the law. They achieve constitutional status only when votes are cast for them in the electoral college. If we abandon the office and person of elector we will of necessity establish interstate candidacies which, in turn, will open the door for ultimate Federal control of elections, including the qualifications of voters. Few Americans will favor such a change.

WINNING ESSAYS IN 1964 McGEE SENATE INTERNSHIP CONTEST

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, in order that the Members of this body may share with me the excellence of thought and the depth of understanding shown by the Wyoming young people who were honorable mention winners in the 1964 McGee Senate Internship Contest, I ask unanimous consent that two of these essays—by Deena Lynn Sackman, of Riverton; and Richard Phillips, of Casper—be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the essays were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAKING DEMOCRACY WORK BETTER

(By Deena Lynn Sackman)

A lean, half-starved wolf was walking in the moonlight when he met a fat dog who looked quite pleased with himself. The wolf then asked the dog:

"Why are you so much better off than I? You are so fat and I am hungry and skinny."

The fat dog replied, "Just do what I do, and you could be fat also. I just guard my master's home."

The wolf added, "That sounds easy. Come, take me to your master."

After walking for some time, the wolf noticed a crease around the dog's neck, and when he asked about it, the dog replied:

"They tie me up in daytime. Only at night am I free, and that is when I work for my master."

The wolf stopped. "I'm not going with you. You may keep your fat happiness. Liberty is what I want, and what you offer cannot take its place."

Liberty was the most vital aspect of the wolf's life—just as freedom is the most important phase of our American democracy. The wolf knew he had to have the willingness to preserve his freedom, even if it did cost him something. We also must have such a strong desire to keep our rights as free people in order to maintain all our freedoms given to us under our type of government.

Our forefathers took this first step when they established our democracy; and the Constitution of the United States was at last ratified by nine States in 1789 after George

Washington, Robert Morris, and Alexander Hamilton, had worked for many months in order to give us the liberties we should have by law. Here our rights were put into black and white, here our freedoms were defined.

This Constitution gave the American people personal liberties of many kinds. However, the most important one granted was that of individualism. To have individualism is to be able to develop our own talents, skills, and desires, whether they be in science, foreign language, mathematics, music, athletics, or novel writing.

An illustration showing the importance of individualism under our democracy can be seen in two young boys who both wanted to become writers. Peter, living in a foreign country, spent many hours writing, in hopes of becoming a future novelist. Then, when he had reached the age of 15, he was assigned to a permanent factory job of shoemaking, where he spent the rest of his life. However, at this same time, a young American boy, John Steinbeck, became interested in writing also. He was able to become one of the greatest novelists in the United States because he was allowed to pursue the study and occupation of his choice. Certainly we can see the tremendous importance that freedom of America has given the individual person.

Seeing the value of this one freedom, we then ask how many of us take advantage of being able to develop all our talents, skills, and ambitious desires? Not enough of us do—and until we all work to develop and better ourselves, then our democracy will always have room for improvement.

Our democracy will work better if we use fully our freedom of individualism by developing our "natural resources" or talents. The secretary to the Iraq Ambassador said, "If people would use and develop all the abilities they had, then that would be all it would take to improve any nation." We can look at such people as Helen Keller to see how true this is.

Miss Keller was stricken with an illness at the age of 2, which deprived her of sight and hearing. However, in spite of these handicaps, she was graduated from Radcliff College with many honors. Helen went on to use her skills in English by writing six books, and by using her skillful patience and understanding as a teacher of both the seeing and the blind. Wouldn't you also agree that our democracy would be improved if every person worked and developed himself as did the deaf mute, Helen Keller? Following in her footsteps certainly will make us more prepared to accept the responsibilities of citizenship.

We are now aware of the manner in which our democracy can be improved. However, we must do something about it now. First, we should discover all our hidden talents or skills; second, we must strive to develop these. Even if you do not have as much ability as a neighbor, do not let it stop you. An important lesson can be learned from the old Biblical story of the master and his slaves.

The master of the house was leaving on a journey. Before departing he gave his three servants talents (or sums of money), giving each according to his ability. The first slave received five talents, the second servant was given three, and the third was handed only one. The first two slaves went out and invested theirs. But the third slave went out and buried his because he had only one talent and it "just wasn't worth investing." The master returned and was told of the slave who buried his one talent. He then said to the slave, "Even though you had only one talent you should have fully invested what you did have." And the master was very right—each of us should develop every skill we have, whether it is 1 or 10. By doing this, America will have better qualified, active, and able citizens, who will in turn improve our democracy by being more prepared and more qualified to accept citizenship responsibilities.

MAKING DEMOCRACY WORK BETTER

(By Richard Phillips)

Democracy. The voice of a united body of steelworkers seeking a shorter workweek, the inflexible position of Negroes demanding civil rights, the harsh accusations of controversial groups seeking radical reforms—all these examples are instances of democracy in action. We Americans think of our homeland as a democratic state. Surely, such examples as these would tend to verify this conclusion; however, a land of free people who possess equal opportunities to participate in their Government has never existed in pure form on this earth. Our United States of America has come as close to the conception of democracy as any other existing nation, and yet, in practice, this American democracy still shows evidence of malignant deficiencies and malpractices which are detrimental to its society. One can easily spot these numerous flaws in our supposed equality state, for all of them inhibit the efficient and effective functioning of the democratic system. To cite examples, racial discrimination, unequal apportionment in representation, and inequality in subsidizations represent some of the ailments for which this youthful Nation finds itself seeking cures.

The deficiencies in our system, for the greatest part, can be attributed to deficiencies in our society. Certainly, some faults do lie within the system itself, but, since peoples' attitudes and beliefs govern a democracy, most shortcomings can be traced to society. What then, are these imperfections in our society which debase the performance of the democratic machinery?

In my opinion, people make decisions (or fail to make decisions) for three basic reasons. These reasons are centered about prejudices, education, and fear. Perhaps one incontrovertible reason concerns prejudices and opinionated beliefs.

If, for example, an Alabama businessman detests Negroes because of beliefs acquired in living in that community, then there is absolutely no way of altering his viewpoint through persuasive argument. His opinions, as sacred to him as his religion, are as much a part of him as his southern accent. His attitude toward the Negro, due to constant exposure to parental bias or slanted opinions, as in this case, cannot be controlled by any legislative means. This aspect of human behavior constitutes the one basic social defect which defies change.

One of the primary problems in our democracy today is that participants in government constitute a poor percentage of our population. Participation is vital to any democracy, for democracy depends upon the people to voice their opinions. Without participation a democratic state is meaningless and ineffective; consequently, encouragement to take part actively in the American democratic government should improve the effectiveness of our democracy. This solution seems all cut and dried and is very appealing, but the overshadowing question of how to do it very rapidly adds a gloomy outlook to this problem. Here, however, is where I believe some definite action can be taken to make our American democracy work better.

A degrading and detrimental effect upon the American system of government is due to two ugly, but realistic, features: lack of education and fear of the unknown. When, for instance, uneducated people or people of poor financial means are approached by "salesmen" of subversive or anti-Yankee idealisms, it does not take many promises of future security before these people are instated or converted to similar activities. Also, there is a fear of the unknown, which so often accompanies ignorance, that perhaps tomorrow will lead to poverty, starvation, or some similar condition. It is this feeling of insecurity, together with poor education which has undoubtedly been a major factor in determining the poor participation by people who fall into this group.

There is a solution to this problem. Educational opportunities can be improved in districts where it is known that a lack of learning or ignorance prevails. Communications between the people and government officials can be improved so as to bring more people closer to the problems which the people of the United States of America face. Lastly, we can wipe out fear. As Franklin Delano Roosevelt phrased it: "The only thing we have to fear is fear itself." The surest way to wipe out fear is to establish the means of contacting all the people of all the United States of America. These tasks will require financial appropriations and a will on the part of every American to see his country maintain its ideals of democracy and freedom.

In the coming days lie a real test for the sincerity of our beliefs. Through the civil rights legislation, Americans will find out whether or not their democratic form of government guarantees equal rights for every American citizen, regardless of color, creed, or race. Not until every American has the right to vote, to speak out, and to realize the guarantees provided by the Constitution of the United States of America, without fear of penalty or persecution, will we ever achieve the democratic state for which we are striving. The strength of our democracy, it must be remembered, lies in the participation by the people of all beliefs and races. If our system of American government is to prevail, American citizens must fight for the cause, and in order to accomplish this task, we must be the arsenal of democracy.

SWEDE'S DAY ADDRESS BY PRESIDENT JOHNSON

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, yesterday President Johnson made a major policy address before a gathering of over 50,000 people at the 31st annual Swede's Day celebration in Minneapolis, Minn.

The President affirmed that we would fight to protect Asia and that we would risk war when it is essential to preserve the peace, and I want to express my support for this.

But a substantial part of his speech, appropriately enough on a Swedish day and before a predominantly Swedish audience, was devoted to the idea that people as well as nations must "abide by the law and accept its settlements."

It is only when acceptance breaks down, when nations or people "take grievances and disputes into their own hands" that force can and should be used. If it is not, then the "safety and freedom of all is in peril."

The United States and Sweden share a similar and great respect for the law, both international law and their respective domestic laws and traditions.

Both nations have written constitutions among the oldest in the world today and both have a tradition of freedom and individual liberty dating far back.

As a matter of fact, the month of June marks the anniversary of Sweden's Constitution, adopted in 1809, and flag day, commemorating the election of Gustavus Vasa as King in 1523.

Sweden's history has been one of progressive activity, of social reform and a constantly improving life for her people. Her deep dedication to harmony and understanding has successfully guided her through 150 years without conflict and has made her an important force for peace in today's troubled world.

Because her rich tradition and culture have contributed so much to American life, and because so many of her people have come to be our people, we join with the people of Sweden and our own Swedish-American citizens in remembering this Constitution and flag day.

There are more than 3½ million persons of Swedish descent among our population today. They are proud of their heritage, and we as a nation are proud of and grateful for the colorful tradition, the fruits of industrious labor, and the particular love of liberty which they have woven into American society.

Sweden has contributed great men and great work to the world as a whole in the arts, education, and the physical and social sciences. Many aspects of the Swedish programs for social reform, in particular, have served as a model and guide for the United States and other countries in our efforts to provide a better life for all our people.

When we think of Sweden's great men, perhaps the first to come to mind is Dag Hammarskjold, the late Secretary General of the United Nations. He served the cause of peace as he understood it in the finest possible tradition, and his untimely death was a tragic loss for the entire world.

Our common bond and our mutual devotion to freedom bridge the geographic and any day-to-day distance between our two nations and join us in a mutual search for justice and peace throughout the world.

During this month of June then I want to pay tribute to Sweden and to the many Americans of Swedish origin and descent who have given so much to communities throughout our country.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no business pending. The unfinished business will be laid before the Senate at 2 o'clock.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL CIVIL DEFENSE ACT OF 1950

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate and made the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10314) to further amend the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended, to extend the expiration date of certain authorities thereunder, and for other purposes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF MERCHANT MARINE ACT, 1936, RELATING TO CONSTRUCTION DIFFERENTIAL SUBSIDIES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, with the concurrence of the distinguished Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE] and the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG], I ask unanimous consent that the pending business, H.R. 10314, be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1043, H.R. 10053.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 10053) to amend section 502 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, relating to construction differential subsidies.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I offer an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the amendment, as follows:

> On the first page, line 7, strike out "1966" and insert in lieu thereof "1965".

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on Commerce, I accept the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio.

H.R. 10053 would extend for 2 years the current statutory limitation for construction differential subsidy payments of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. The present limits of 55 percent on new vessel construction and 60 percent on reconstruction or reconditioning of passenger ships will expire on June 30 of this year. If the current limits are not extended, the ceiling will revert to the original statutory limit of 50 percent. During the past several years the construction differential subsidy ratio has frequently exceeded 50 percent and it is therefore necessary to extend these ceilings.

This legislation is supported by maritime industry and by maritime labor. A 1-year extension of the present limits was recommended by the Maritime Administrator. Since every indication is that the construction differential ratio will continue to exceed 50 percent, the committee has recommended in its report a 2-year extension of the present statutory limit.

This legislation is, in my opinion, Mr. President, essential to the continued welfare and vitality of the American-flag merchant marine. Testimony at the hearing clearly indicated that the 50-percent construction subsidy level has been exceeded over and over again during the past 2 years. In fact, 14 of the 18 cargo vessels for which construction differential subsidy rates have been determined since January 1, 1963, have exceeded this 50-percent limit. The figures are as follows: Four ships at 49.8 percent, four at 54 percent, three at 53.9 percent, three at 54.5 percent, and four at 55 percent. In respect to the reconstruction of passenger ships, two were recently computed at 58.9 percent and two at 58.6 percent. I think this very clearly proves the need for a further extension of the present 55 and 60 percent subsidy levels.

It should be reemphasized that this construction differential is for the American shipyard and is paid directly to the shipyard. If the Government fails to pay the difference between the domestic and foreign shipbuilding costs, the expense of the national defense policy is shifted from the Public Treasury to the vessel operators.

It has been suggested that this construction subsidy program has had the effect of increasing the cost of shipbuilding in the United States. This is simply not true. Shipbuilding prices in the United States in 1962 were approximately 20 percent below the 1957 price level. Evidence of this reduction in price is seen most clearly in the fact that a particular design for a modified C-3 was bid at $9.6 million in 1958, and the bid price on a similar vessel in 1961 was $8 million. This reduction in price meant that although the construction differential increased from 44.5 percent on the 1958 ship to 49.5 percent on the 1961 ship, the Government cost was reduced from $4.3 to $4 million on a vessel of similar design. Therefore, between 1957 and 1962, the construction differential increased while the Goverment's subsidy costs per vessel decreased.

It has also been suggested that there have been enormous increases in ship construction and ship operating subsidies. Comparisons have been made between expenditures for ship construction and operating differential subsidies in 1957 and in 1963. The problem with the figures cited by those opposing this legislation is that they reflect annual expenditures rather than the amount actually obligated. Expenditure patterns can become distorted, since payments may be made in 1 year for obligations that were accrued in several previous years. For example, it has been stated that operation differential subsidies increased from $108.3 million in 1957 to $220.7 million in 1963. The facts are that the operating differential subsidy accrued in 1957 was $122 million compared to $193 million in 1963. This increase in amount was due primarily to the increase in cost of ship operations during the 6-year period and the fact that a larger number of voyages, involving higher costs and faster ships, were included in the 1963 calculations.

It has been stated that the expenditures for vessel construction rose from $16.4 million in 1957 to $90.5 million in 1963. Again the more meaningful figure is the amount that was accrued during each year. In 1957, there were no new vessel contracts awarded and no obligations accrued. The payment of $16 million was made pursuant to earlier obligations. However, 1957 did mark the beginning of the new vessel replacement program. The following table indicates the number of contracts awarded for vessel construction during each of the calendar years 1958 through 1963, the funds obligated for construction differential subsidy payments by the Government, and the average cost to the Government per ship. The table is as follows:

	Number of ships contracted for construction	Funds obligated for construction differential	Average cost per ship
		Millions	*Millions*
1958	15	$98.5	$6.1
1959	14	77.9	5.6
1960	13	93.4	7.2
1961	31	156.4	5.1
1962	13	66.7	5.1
1963	18	110.1	6.1

Mr. President, I believe this table clearly indicates that the cost of the program is related directly to the number of ships constructed. We are paying larger subsidies today than we were in 1957 because we are modernizing our liner fleet with a reasonable replacement program. This we were not doing before 1957.

I would like to add, Mr. President, a few words about the type of vessel we are now adding to our liner fleet and the success of the program to which I just referred. The American liner fleet today is the most competitive in the world. We have more 20-knot cargo liners than all foreign merchant fleets combined. This has been made possible by an imaginative new vessel replacement program that began some 6 years ago. At the close of calendar year 1963, the Government had contracted for a total replacement of over 100 ships. The program for the future calls for an additional 178 vessels to be constructed before 1975. But what is important is the fact that with this vessel replacement program, the Maritime Administration and the operating companies and unions have cooperated to take advantage of recent developments in the field of ship automation. This modernization program is continuing and I believe the principal saving will be to the Government through a reduction in operating subsidies.

I am convinced, therefore, that this legislation is needed in order to continue this excellent program. As long as we require our American-flag operators to build in the United States for purposes of national defense, I believe the Government rather than the operators should pay the cost of this national defense program. This can be accomplished only by extending the 50- and 60-percent ceilings. Failure to act would unreasonably increase the cost to American ship operators above the cost of all foreign competitors. This would in turn weaken their ability to compete and necessarily reduce the contribution which the American merchant marine makes to our national defense and economic strength.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert an excerpt of the committee report at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpt of the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

H.R. 10053 would continue for 2 years, to June 30, 1966, the current statutory limitation of construction-differential subsidy payments under the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. Under the present law which will expire June 30 of this year, the Secretary of Commerce is authorized to make construction subsidy payments to shipyards in the United States with a maximum of 55 percent on new vessel construction and 60 percent on reconstruction or reconditioning of passenger ships. If the current limits are not extended, the ceiling will revert to the original statutory limit of 50 percent.

BACKGROUND

Under the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, any citizen of the United States may apply to the Secretary of Commerce for a construction-differential subsidy to construct a new vessel for use in the foreign commerce of the United States. The application cannot be approved unless it is determined that the construction plans call for a vessel that will meet the national defense needs of the United States, that the applicant is in all respects qualified by experience and financial resources, and that the new vessel will replace obsolete tonnage and contribute to the foreign commerce of the United States.

If the application is approved the Secretary, on behalf of the applicant, secures bids for the construction of the proposed vessel. The construction contract is awarded to the lowest responsible bidder submitting a fair and reasonable offer. If the bidder is also acceptable to the applicant, the Secretary of Commerce signs a contract with the successful bidder for the construction of the approved vessel and for full payment by the Secretary to the shipyard. At the same time, the Secretary negotiates a contract for the applicant to purchase the ship from the Government at a price corresponding to the estimated cost of building the vessel in a foreign shipbuilding center as determined by the Secretary. Under the 1936 act and the contract, the Government makes certain requirements of the operator regarding the vessel including, among other provisions, an agreement to leave the ship in the foreign trade of the United States for 25 years, not to sell the vessel without approval of the Secretary, and to make the ship available to the Government for requisition in case of national emergency at depreciated book value.

The Merchant Marine Act, 1936, provided that the construction differential was not to exceed 50 percent of the cost of the vessel constructed in the domestic shipyard. The 50-percent ceiling presented no problem until 1960 when, for the first time, the shipbuilding differentials between United States and foreign shipyards began exceeding 50 percent. Legislation was then introduced authorizing a 55-percent ceiling. Testimony at the Senate subcommittee hearing on the legislation pointed out that the basic philosophy underlying the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, is the parity principle. Congress intended that the construction-differential subsidy should be sufficient to permit American shipowners to obtain an American-built vessel at the same price at which they could buy that vessel in a foreign yard. During the 1960 committee hearings, the Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation strongly endorsed the parity principle. However, the Under Secretary thought the removal of the limitation was not justified at that time because the Department was unable to determine if there would be a continuation of the situation in which the differential ratio exceeded 50 percent. Congress determined that it was likely to continue to exceed 50 percent and authorized a 55-percent ceiling for a 2-year period ending July 7, 1962.

In 1962, the Under Secretary of Commerce submitted legislation to extend the 55-percent ceiling for 1 additional year. The Under Secretary testified that during the 2 previous years the construction-differential subsidy determinations had ranged up to 53 percent. The Under Secretary expressed the hope that the subsidies could be kept down by the operators building standard ships and building a larger number of ships in each contract. Congress subsequently extended for 2 years, to June 30, 1964, the ceiling of 55 percent on new cargo vessels and 60 percent on reconstruction or reconditioning of passenger vessels.

COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION OF LEGISLATION

The Senate Subcommittee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries held hearings on H.R. 10053 and S. 2652 on May 20 of this year. The two bills are identical except the Senate bill authorizes a 3-year rather than a 2-year extension. Testimony was given by Nicholas Johnson, Maritime Administrator, by the Committee of American Steamship Lines, and by the Shipbuilders Council of America. Letters were received from the Labor-Management Maritime Committee and the American Merchant Marine Institute. All testimony was in favor of the legislation, but the Maritime Administrator recommended a 1-year, rather than a 3-year extension. The committee ordered H.R. 10053 reported with a 2-year extension.

At the recent hearings on H.R. 10053, the Maritime Administrator testified that the construction differentials during the past 2 years had continued to exceed the 50-percent level. Fourteen of the eighteen cargo vessels for which construction-differential subsidy rates have been determined since January 1, 1963, have exceeded the 50-percent level. The figures are as follows: Four ships at 49.8 percent, four at 54 percent, three at 53.9 percent, three at 54.5 percent, and four at 55 percent. In respect to the reconstruction of passenger ships, two were recently computed at 58.9 percent and two at 58.6 percent. The higher differential in reconstruction is due primarily to the high labor factor in tearing out and changing existing structure.

The Maritime Administrator supported a 1-year extension of the maximum rates to June 30, 1966. The Administrator acknowledged that the construction-differential percentage has been slowly increasing and that the authority was needed to pay subsidy in the cost range of 55 percent for cargo vessels and 60 percent for reconstruction of passenger vessels. The Administrator informed the committee of the study recently undertaken to review the method of determining costs in foreign shipbuilding centers and of the hope of reducing subsidies by awarding contracts in groups of ships and requiring standardization of ships.

The committee carefully considered the testimony of the Maritime Administrator but concluded that the undertaking of a study of the method of determining foreign shipbuilding costs would not alone justify a 1-year rather than a 2-year extension. The legislation only authorizes an increase in the maximum that may be paid and does not affect the administration's determination of the proper level of payment.

The committee appreciated the renewed expression of hope that awarding contracts for the construction of several ships and the standardization of ships would help reduce subsidies. The table submitted by the Maritime Administrator entitled, "Construction Differential Subsidy Rates Approved by the Subsidy Board for New Construction Projects," indicates that since October 1957, only one single cargo ship construction contract has been negotiated and that 13 out of the 20 construction contracts bid since 1960 have involved a grouping of 4 or more ships.

Moreover, some recent contracts represent as high as the eighth group of four ships built to a basic design. The committee concluded that whatever advantages could be gained from group concentration and standardization were already being largely realized.

The construction subsidy is designed primarily to help assure an adequate domestic shipbuilding capacity for purposes of national defense. In support of this national defense effort, the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, requires applicants to build in the United States. The construction subsidy is for the American shipyard and is paid directly to the shipyard. If the Government fails to pay the difference between domestic and foreign shipbuilding costs, the expense of the national defense policy is shifted from the Public Treasury to the operators required by law to build American. The committee regards passage of the bill as important to the continued welfare and vitality of an American-flag merchant marine. Failure to act on the bill would unreasonably boost the costs of American operators above the costs of their foreign competitors, weaken their ability to compete, and reduce the contribution which the American merchant marine makes to our national defense and economic strength.

VESSEL CONSTRUCTION COSTS

The committee was concerned not only with the difference between foreign and domestic shipbuilding costs, but also with the general price trend in vessel construction. Shipbuilding prices in the United States in 1962 were approximately 20 percent below the 1957 price level. Evidence of this reduction in price is seen most clearly in the fact that a particular design for a modified C-3 was bid at $9.6 million in 1958 and the bid price on a similar vessel in 1961 was $8 million. This reduction in price meant that although the construction differential increased from 44.5 percent on the 1958 ship to 49.5 percent on the 1961 ship, the Government cost was reduced from $4.3 to $4 million on a vessel of similar design. Therefore, between 1957 and 1962, the construction differential increased while the Government's subsidy costs per vessel decreased.

During the past 18 months shipbuilding prices have increased moderately to the point that today the price level is estimated to be approximately 15 percent below the 1957 level. Under the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, the Maritime Administration is responsible for conducting annually a cost survey of shipyards in the United States and of carefully scrutinizing the reasonableness of each construction bid. It is hoped that through continued energetic administration and increased shipbuilding efficiency, the shipbuilding prices can be held at a proper level. However, the committee is mindful of the added cost involved in the recent effort made to modernize the new vessels being constructed.

COSTS OF LEGISLATION

No accurate estimate can be made of the costs of the legislation since the construction-differential subsidy payments to be made during the next 2 years will depend on the condition existing at the time each construction contract is to be awarded. The factors upon which an estimate would be based are therefore unknown at present. These unknowns include the cost of ship construction in the United States and in various foreign shipyards during the next 2 years, the number of ships to be constructed with subsidy in 1965 and 1966, and the types of ships to be built by each approved operator.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Massachusetts may also file a statement.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator. I have a short statement that I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SALTONSTALL

I rise to support H.R. 10053 which would continue for 1 year, until June 30, 1966, the current statutory limitation for construction-differential subsidy payments on new and reconditioned or reconstructed American merchant vessels.

In 1936 Congress enacted legislation providing for payment of these subsidies to enable American shipowners to buy American-built vessels for the same price as they would pay for a foreign-built ship. The objective of that legislation was to maintain a vital American merchant marine and to insure the continuing capability of American shipyards in the interest of national defense needs. Certainly history has proven this judgment sound.

The original legislation provided that the construction differential could not exceed 50 percent of the cost of the vessel constructed in the domestic shipyard. However, in recent years the cost of construction in American yards compared with foreign yards indicated the necessity for raising this ceiling, and Congress therefore in 1960 raised for 2 years the construction-differential ceiling to 55 percent for new cargo vessels. In 1962 Congress granted an additional 2-year extension of the 55-percent ceiling and raised the differential ceiling for reconstructed or reconditioned passenger vessels to 60 percent.

In hearings earlier this year before the Senate Commerce Committee, the Maritime Administrator testified that in the past 2 years the construction differentials have continued to exceed the 50-percent level, with some new vessels requiring as high as 55 percent and some reconstruction or reconditioning rates going up to 58.9 percent. Although the differential rate remains high, it is encouraging to note that the actual construction costs of the American-built ships have dropped since 1957. I hope that these costs can be lowered further by improved construction techniques and standardization in vessel construction.

However, if we are to maintain a strong and vital American merchant fleet and retain the capability of our American shipyards, we must act now to extend the higher differential-construction rate. I firmly believe that it is in our national interest to do so, and I therefore urge enactment of H.R. 10053.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Lausche].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the amendment which I offered would extend for 1 year the support the Government gives to the maritime industry in the construction of ships. The Federal Government now is allowed to pay 55 percent by way of subsidy in the construction of a ship carrying the American flag on the high seas. The law was enacted in 1936. About 3 years ago it was amended to raise the limitation from 50 to 55 percent.

I objected to the increase in the subsidy. Each year it has been renewed.

The bill now before the Senate provides for a 2-year extension. My amendment would reduce the 2-year extension to 1 year. I have submitted the amendment because the Maritime Administration is now making a study and will make recommendations on this general subject.

Shipping costs—and especially shipbuilding costs—in the United States have risen to the point where they are positive threats to the future of U.S. shipping. The adequacy of our merchant fleet today has been in large measure hampered by the shipyard subsidy that gives us but one ship for every two built by other maritime nations for the same cost. In other words, it is possible to go to another country and have two ships of equal quality built for the same money with which one ship can be built in the United States.

I consider that these high ceiling extensions will boost rather than encourage reductions in high construction and reconstruction costs in the U.S. shipyards.

The best incentive for lowering costs would be to deny extension of the 50 percent ceiling. However, we shall be able to determine that issue when the study is completed. We must distinguish between our shipping and our shipbuilding needs. Until it is demonstrated that our national defense or economic needs require 21 major shipyards—now operating at 42 percent of capacity—we should not require that all American ships be built in this country.

When the law was initially passed in 1936, it was argued that it was necessary to do so because we had to maintain our merchant marine. It was also argued that in the course of time we would improve our position, and the subsidy would be reduced, rather than increased.

That argument has been proved to be completely false. Whereas the differential was 42 percent in 1936, it is now 52 percent, and the gap has been widened rather than narrowed. By subsidizing, we have caused the operators of shipbuilding yards to be indifferent. We have caused labor leaders to make constant demands far beyond the capacity of the competitive position of our navigating companies to meet.

The attitude has been: What difference does it make what the cost of operating the ships is? The Federal Government, through the taxpayers, will subsidize the costs.

I am thankful to the Senator from Alaska for accepting the amendment.

The issue will again be brought before the Senate next year, at which time we shall have a further opportunity to explore what should be done.

I ask unanimous consent that my individual views, contained in Report No. 1100, be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the individual views were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

INDIVIDUAL VIEWS OF SENATOR FRANK J. LAUSCHE

This bill, H.R. 10053, as cleared by the Senate Commerce Committee would again extend for 2 years the authority of the Maritime Subsidy Board to grant construction-differential subsidies up to a limit of 55 percent for the construction of new merchant ships and up to a limit of 60 percent for the reconversion of certain passenger ships. The subsidy represents the differential in cost of the construction or reconstruction of ships in the United States as distinguished from the cost of building in a foreign country. This large cost difference is basically due to labor costs and to some extent the difference in materials and finished shipboard equipment.

In 1960, in 1961, and again in 1962 amendments to the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 have been enacted extending the original construction-differential subsidy ceiling of 50 percent. I vigorously opposed the enactment of these previous rate extension amendments and I must reiterate my opposition to the present bill, H.R. 10053.

The need for these extensions has been caused by the growing difference between United States and foreign shipbuilding costs. While the original act provided subsidies to bridge the large gap between foreign and domestic costs, it is unreasonable for the Government to accept the entire burden of the ever-increasing cost differentials. The annual expenditures for ship construction subsidies have risen from $16,379,076 in 1957 to $90,514,302 in 1963.

In spite of this increase, during the same period expenditures to cover operation-differential subsidies have risen from $108,292,274 to $220,676,685. Total ship construction and reconstruction subsidy expenditures between 1936 and 1963 have been $659,512,385 while the total operating subsidies have been $1,532,443,081 in the same period. Individual ship construction subsidy rates have risen from approximately 45 percent in 1957 to the present range of 53 to 55 percent. During this same period the shipbuilding costs in the United States have risen some 12 to 15 percent, with the expectation of a minimum 2-percent increase per year. While the actual ship selling prices have not increased at the same rate, due to somewhat improved productivity of the shipyards, nevertheless shipbuilding prices are continuing to rise at a faster rate than foreign prices so that the price differentials will shortly exceed the presently proposed limits.

I am opposed to the further extension of this 55 and 60 percent authority because, as I stated in 1962, it is my firm conviction that it provides an extra incentive to interested parties to press for the highest differential percentages obtainable.

I believe that the Government should establish a limit in which it will participate to retain a strong and economic merchant marine. This limit should certainly not exceed the original 50-percent ceiling as established in the original Merchant Marine Act of 1936 and serious efforts should be made to reduce the subsidies further.

Shipping costs—and especially shipbuilding costs—in the United States have risen to where they are positive threats to the future of U.S. shipping. The adequacy of our merchant fleet today has been in large measure hampered by the shipyard subsidy that gives us but one ship for every two built by other maritime nations for the same cost. I consider that these high ceiling extensions will boost rather than encourage reductions in high construction and reconstruction costs in the U.S. shipyards. The best incentive for lowering costs would be to deny extension of the 50-percent ceiling.

We must distinguish between our shipping and our shipbuilding needs. Until it is demonstrated that our national defense or economic needs require 21 major shipyards (now operating at 42 percent of capacity) we should not legislate that all American ships must be built in this country. Most of our commercial yards are principally supported by Navy contracts representing in excess of $1 billion of unfinished shipbuilding work as of January 1964. The 17 to 18 commercial merchant ships under the Maritime Administration's program contribute relatively little to sustaining these yards. If they can compete for this work—with 50 percent of the cost being paid by the Government—well and good. If 50 percent is not enough, I believe we should seriously reevaluate whether we can afford, or need, such a shipyard subsidy program.

There are a number of things available within the shipbuilding complex to lower the cost of construction of ships. For the shipyard management there is the need to continue improving shipbuilding techniques. For the shipyard unions there is the need to simplify work rules. For the shipowner there is the need to standardize ships and components. This would assuredly lead to greater productivity and lower cost.

Continuing rise in labor costs and the increasing disparity between the U.S. and foreign hourly earnings should concern all of us. Shipyard labor costs vary over a wide range as shown below (average hourly earnings in U.S. dollars):

Country	Year		Increase
	1959	1962	
United States	$2.68	$3.01	$0.33
Japan	.66	.73	.07
Netherlands	.76	1.00	.24
Germany	.79	1.08	.29
United Kingdom	.82	.96	.14
Sweden	1.42	1.69	.27

Of particular interest is the fact that Sweden, which has the highest wage rate in Europe, constructs ships at a lower price than the United Kingdom, at one time the leading shipbuilding country in the world, and constructs ships at about the same price as Germany. This competitive capability was strongly influenced by a recent change in the shipyard work rules permitting more liberalized job interchangeability, which substantially increased productivity and resulted in insuring continued employment and retaining the more highly skilled workmen.

The subsidized shipowners have a substantial responsibility in lowering the operating cost of their ships. The seafaring unions must also contribute to increase productivity so as to enable the United States to maintain an economic and competitive merchant marine rather than continuing to rely on increased subsidies. It is ironic that the United States, which is able to compete internationally with so many commodities, is unable to even reduce to any degree the difference that exists between American and foreign shipbuilding costs.

The Maritime Administrator had asked for a 1-year extension limit on the premise that this would provide greater flexibility pending the outcome of his present studies relating to methods of computing the construction-differential subsidies and pending the outcome of other basic issues in the maritime program. It is gratifying to also note from the testimony that the Administrator is undertaking a program to reduce costs of building ships and to make the industry more nearly competitive in the world.

The maritime subsidy program is becoming more and more costly. The emphasis in the maritime industry must be on attaining an economic and competitive merchant marine with decreasing subsidy. H.R. 10053 should be rejected by the Senate.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] be permitted to add his name as a cosponsor of my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, a number of years ago I joined the Senator from Ohio in opposing the raise to 55 percent. I am glad that he has offered his amendment to hold the extension down to 1 year, with the understanding that before the year expires the Maritime Administration will have completed its study and submitted its report. Otherwise I would object to any further extension.

Mr. BARTLETT. The House of Representatives has already passed a bill for a 2-year extension.

It is true, as the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] said, that the Maritime Administration urged that the act be extended for only 1 year, a recommendation in which the Senate has now acquiesced by its acceptance of the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio. Since the existing law will expire on July 1, I am hopeful that the House, in the light of all the circumstances, will agree to the Senate amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is one the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H.R. 10053) was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. BARTLETT. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

CHANGE OF CONFEREES ON S. 2, WATER RESOURCES RESEARCH BILL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, due to an absence from the city, the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] is unable to serve as a conferee on S. 2, the water resources research bill. A conference has been scheduled on the proposed legislation for this afternoon. It has been suggested by Senator ALLOTT that the Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN] replace him as a conferee. This has the approval of the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Idaho be named as a conferee on S. 2 in lieu of the Senator from Colorado.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL CIVIL DEFENSE ACT OF 1950

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no objection, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10314) to further amend the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended, to extend the expiration date of certain authorities thereunder, and for other purposes.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, the Committee on Armed Services, to whom was referred the bill (H.R. 10314) to further amend the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended, to extend the expiration date of certain authorities thereunder, and for other purposes, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

This bill would extend for 4 years three civil defense authorities that otherwise would expire on June 30, 1964. These authorities—

First, provide for 50 percent contributions to States and local governments toward the cost of personnel and administrative expenses for federally approved civil defense programs;

Second, provide payments for travel and per diem expenses of trainees at civil defense schools; and

Third, permit procurement and maintenance of radiological equipment and the granting or lending of this equipment to States.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD that part of the committee report which relates to the background of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Before the 1958 amendments to the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, responsibility for civil defense was vested primarily in the States and their political subdivisions with the Federal contribution being limited basically to coordination and guidance.

Public Law 85-606, approved August 8, 1958, made some important changes to the basic law. Among them were—

(1) Responsibility for civil defense was vested jointly in the Federal Government and the several States and their political subdivisions;

(2) The Federal Government was authorized to purchase radiological instruments and detection devices and to grant them to the States;

(3) A limitation of $100,000 on amounts authorized to be appropriated annually for travel expenses and per diem allowances of persons attending civil defense schools was increased to $300,000, but States were required to pay one-half of these expenses;

(4) Federal financial contributions to States for civil defense personnel and administrative expenses and personal equipment for State and local civil defense workers were authorized.

The last three of these changes were made effective only through June 30, 1964. This bill would extend the effective date of these authorities for 4 years.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, a few weeks ago, the Governors of the several States held their 1964 Governors' Conference in Cleveland, Ohio. At that time, a strong favorable report was made by the Governors—incidentally, it was unanimously agreed to—commending the Civil Defense Agency, and also recommending that civil defense activities be carried on in the United States. I wish to quote one sentence from the report:

The conference recommends as imperative the enactment before June 30, 1964, by the Congress, of H.R. 10314, which extends the expiring matching fund provisions of the Federal Civil Defense Act.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD excerpts from the report, and also the complete report of the Governors' Conference, together with a presentation by Governor Egan, of Alaska, on March 27, 1964.

The excerpts, the report, and the presentation by Governor Egan were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOVERNORS' SUPPORT

Letters from individual Governors to your committee, supplemented by the reports we have received from the Department of Defense and the Office of Emergency Planning, all underscore the steady and continuing progress made this past year toward an effective civil defense program throughout the Nation.

Rewarding as this progress continues to be, it still falls far short of the program which this conference has persistently urged as the essential minimum required by the realities of the nuclear age if we are to meet our personal responsibility as Governors for the safety of our citizens.

* * * * *

1. *Resolved*, That the report of the committee on civil defense and postattack recovery endorsing an expanded civil defense effort by all levels of government, be and it hereby is, adopted and that a copy of that report, together with a copy of these resolutions, be transmitted by the chairman of the Governors' Conference to the President of the United States and to the chairman of the Armed Services Committees and the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate of the U.S. Congress;

2. *Further resolved*, That the Governors' Conference recommends that the Congress give the President's civil defense program, built around fallout shelters, a firm and high priority as an integral part of the national security effort;

"5. *Further resolved*, That the conference recommends as imperative the enactment before June 30, 1964, by the Congress of H.R. 10314, which extends the expiring matching fund provisions of the Federal Civil Defense Act."

EXCERPTS FROM PRESENTATION BY GOVERNOR EGAN ON THE ALASKAN EARTHQUAKE

Mr. Chairman and fellow Governors, as the committee on civil defense and post-attack recovery has stated, the capability of civil defense to perform under disaster conditions was critically tested by the earthquake in Alaska in March. The civil defense organization in Alaska passed this test with flying colors. It coordinated the rescue and relief activities and acted as a center for liaison with military forces and civil defense heads. Communications and other equipment purchased with Federal financial assistance provided the vital link between State and local governments and the disaster areas in need.

The State civil defense and local units of civil defense worked in such a manner that they command the respect of all Alaskans at this time.

I can only hope that, because of the magnitude of the disaster in Alaska, people all over these United States of ours recognize the need for a strong civil defense organization does not only exist with relation to a nuclear holocaust, God forbit, that may some day be thrust upon us, but in overcoming the disastrous results of natural disaster.

If a holocaust ever comes where nuclear weapons are involved, we will be much, much better able to cope with the results of such a disaster, which we all hope will never be, with the kind of civil defense organization that is vitally necessary. I think that it would behoove all citizens of the United States over a 2- or 3-year period to take a day or two off and become active in their local civil defense organization in the particular local community in which they reside so that they will have some good working understanding of what their duties might be if a natural disaster or other disaster ever befalls their particular area where such an organization is needed.

REPORT OF GOVERNORS' CONFERENCE COMMITTEE ON CIVIL DEFENSE AND POSTATTACK RECOVERY

Letters from individual Governors to your committee, supplemented by the reports we have received from the Department of Defense and the Office of Emergency Planning, all underscore the steady and continuing progress made this past year toward an effective civil defense program throughout the Nation.

Rewarding as this progress continues to be, it still falls far short of the program which this conference has persistently urged as the essential minimum required by the realities of the nuclear age if we are to meet our personal responsibility as Governors for the safety of our citizens.

RECENT STATE AND LOCAL PROGRESS

Progress has been made in the past 12 months on a number of fronts: on the construction of protected emergency operating centers to assure continuity of State and local government in the event of a nuclear emergency, on training, on resources planning, and on the marking and stocking of available fallout shelters.

Thirty-nine of the reporting States now have emergency operating centers (EOC's) with some degree of protection, as compared to the 24 last reported. At the county level, also, progress in EOC construction is continuing. Hawaii reports 75 percent of its counties with protected EOC's, Pennsylvania 40 percent. Although all reports show some effort by individual counties, a great deal still remains to be done in most States to insure continuity of the local government function in a nuclear emergency.

The Federal university extension program for training CD instructors was widely put into effect last year. A number of States, while endorsing the program, however, express concern that in its establishment, State civil defense authorities were bypassed. These States feel that better results, at lower overall cost, could have been achieved by accepting the appropriate State agency as a full partner in the program's implementation.

The comprehensive emergency resources planning program is also receiving active support. Many States have already applied to the Federal Government for funds to assist in the employment of personnel for this project. Others are conducting a planning program with their own funds. Only one State, Alaska, reports its inability to pursue the program, due to the disruptions caused by the March 27 earthquake.

Hawaii, on the other hand, reports that its entire emergency planning program is already 85-percent complete.

During the past year the Federal marking and stocking shelter program, similarly, made satisfactory progress. Vermont reports that it has achieved 124 percent of its shelter stocking goal. Connecticut will complete its program during June 1964. In some States, however, delays in transporting shelter stocks are occurring, due to lack of local funds and the consequent need to rely on the relatively few volunteer workers available.

It is especially interesting to record that this year 37 Governors report a more favorable public attitude toward civil defense than existed a year ago. In Western States particularly, the Alaskan disaster seems to have stirred public interest in all forms of predisaster planning. Most Governors, however, report a continuing apathy in many quarters toward the entire program. They attribute this to a number of factors, including a lack of understanding of the essentiality of the effort, the apparent detente in the cold war, the failure of Congress to act on the shelter-incentive legislation and the belief that a major nuclear conflict is becoming less and less likely.

THE FEDERAL PROGRAM

During the past year the Secretary of Defense and senior military leaders have testified before Congress, and in public statements, that the civil defense program, built around fallout shelter, should have a firm and high priority as an integral part of our national security effort. Indeed, the Secretary of Defense, in discussing ballistic missiles, made clear his view that the civil defense program recommended by the President "should be given priority over the procurement and deployment of any major additions to the active defenses" of the United States.

Since the Governors' Conference last year, the House of Representatives, for the first time, acted favorably on a bill (H.R. 8200) requiring the incorporation of shelters in Federal buildings and providing Federal financial assistance to those States and local governments, as well as nonprofit institutions, that create shelter space in their facilities. The responsibility and leadership exhibited by the House of Representatives in this respect did much to improve the public understanding and acceptance of the essentials of civil defense.

It is regrettable that the Senate Armed Services Committee has elected for the present to defer action on this modest but most significant legislation.

We concur with the Secretary of Defense, and with our national military leaders, that favorable action on this bill by the Senate, and its approval by the President, are essential to national defense.

Substantial progress has nevertheless been made in the Federal shelter program during the past year. More than 100 million shelter spaces have now been located, 74,000 buildings and over 57 million spaces are now marked, and over 38,000 buildings and 20 million shelter spaces have been stocked. Large numbers of shelter managers and radiological monitors are also being trained and shelter-use plans are being developed.

Impressive as these figures are, shelter capacity should be further expanded. We are satisfied that the Congress should appropriate the funds requested by the President for these purposes.

Your committee is also seriously concerned at the continuing delay by the Congress to enact legislation continuing the Federal matching funds program for State and local personnel and administrative expenses. Unless renewed, authority for this program will expire June 30, 1964, resulting in the dismissal on that date of many State and local civil defense employees. Even now, a number of these employees, facing possible loss of employment by July 1, are seeking positions elsewhere. Significant further delay in authorizing continuance of this matching funds program will seriously disrupt civil defense planning and operations in most, if not in all, States. The Congress should take immediate action to enact this matching program legislation.

Suggestions for the improvement of Federal civil defense and emergency planning operations have been offered by a number of Governors. These suggestions fall mainly into two categories:

1. Considerable feeling has been evidenced that stronger leadership at the Federal level is essential if further significant progress is to be achieved. Several Governors, in fact, urge a public statement by the President, endorsing the civil defense program and emphasizing its essentiality to our overall national defense posture.

2. The feeling still persists on the part of many Governors, though perhaps fewer than last year, that the division of responsibility and lack of close cooperation in Washington, as between the Department of Defense and the Office of Emergency Planning, continues to cause difficulty, duplication, and uncertainty at State and local levels.

To quote from one report: "At present, responsibility for the planning for secondary (intrastate and retail) resources is assigned to the Office of Civil Defense, whereas, responsibility for the planning for the same resource—as a primary resource (interstate and wholesale) is that of the Office of Emergency Planning."

In most States civil defense and emergency planning functions are either combined in one agency or are closely related, one to the other. The need for corresponding organizational relationships within the Federal Government is still apparent.

THE ALASKA DISASTER

The capability of civil defense to perform under disaster conditions was critically tested by the earthquake in Alaska last winter.

The civil defense organization in Alaska passed this test with flying colors. It coordinated the rescue and relief activities and acted as a center for liaison with military forces and city civil defense heads. Communications and other equipment purchased with Federal financial assistance provided the vital link between State and local governments and the disaster areas in need.

As Governor Egan has said:

"Anyone in Alaska who had reservations about civil defense in Alaska, I am sure has changed his mind now after seeing the great job this agency did and is continuing to do for our people.

"Civil defense shone all the way through. Those who had been sniping at the civil defense organization have now seen where they were wrong. Without civil defense we would have had a dreadful time. The civil defense people simply took hold of things in this emergency and proved its worth and value."

CONCLUSION

As has been demonstrated by the resolutions adopted at these annual Governors' conferences, and by the action taken in the 50 States, we as Governors are committed to providing for the American people an adequate, well-rounded civil defense program.

Essential to such a program are advance planning, resources management, training of personnel, establishment of better warning and communications systems, provisions for continuity in government, protected emergency operating centers for all levels of government, improved plans for radiological monitoring, decontamination and post-attack recovery and stocked fallout shelters in homes, factories, schools, offices, and public buildings.

Thus far the Congress has not provided the financial support requested for the necessary Federal programs. Such financial support, together with Federal leadership, are crucial to our own efforts as Governors to meet our responsibilities to our people. It is central to these responsibilities to provide the maximum feasible assurance that American families and American democracy can survive the threat, and if need by the actuality, of a nuclear attack against us.

In the service of that responsibility we urge the adoption by the 1964 Governors' Conference of the resolutions attached to and made a part of this report.

Respectfully submitted,

Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller, New York, chairman; Gov. Farris Bryant, Florida, vice chairman; Gov. William Wallace Barron, West Virginia; Gov. Edmund G. Brown, California; Gov. Jack M. Campbell, New Mexico; Gov. John H. Chafee, Rhode Island; Gov. John B. Connally, Texas; Gov. John W. King, New Hampshire; Gov. James A. Rhodes, Ohio.

PROPOSED RESOLUTIONS OF GOVERNORS' CONFERENCE COMMITTEE ON CIVIL DEFENSE AND POSTATTACK RECOVERY

1. *Resolved*, That the report of the committee on civil defense and post-attack recovery endorsing an expanded civil defense effort by all levels of government, be and it hereby is, adopted and that a copy of that report, together with a copy of these resolutions, be transmitted by the chairman of the Governor's conference to the President of the United States and to the chairman of the Armed Services Committees and the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate of the U.S. Congress;

2. *Further resolved*, That the Governors' conference recommends that the Congress give the President's civil defense program, built around fallout shelter, a firm and high priority as an integral part of the national security effort;

3. *Further resolved*, That the 1964 Governors' conference commends the Honorable Steuart L. Pittman, who resigned as Assistant Secretary of Defense in charge of civil defense on April 1, 1964, and the Honorable Edward A. McDermott, Director of the Office of Emergency Planning, who is shortly to return to private life, for the significant contributions they both made in the past 2 years to the development of sound and effective programs for civil defense and records its appreciation for the energy, competence, and character of which they both gave so generously in the public service;

4. *Further resolved*, That the 1964 Governors' conference urges the Senate Armed Services Committee to reconsider its postponement of action on H.R. 8200 since the conference believes that the President's fallout shelter program, of which the shelter incentive feature of H.R. 8200 is a vital element, is essential and minimal, since the conference is convinced that the effectiveness of the fallout shelter program is not dependent upon other programs for the active continental defense, and since the conference concurs with the Secretary of Defense that a fallout shelter program will contribute far more to the saving of lives per dollar spent than any other active defense program;

5. *Further resolved*, That the conference recommends as imperative the enactment before June 30, 1964, by the Congress of H.R. 10314, which extends the expiring matching fund provisions of the Federal Civil Defense Act;

6. *Further resolved*, That the Federal financial assistance program for resources management be continued and an additional $1.5 million be appropriated by the Congress for this purpose;

7. *Further resolved*, That each State take action to require the incorporation of fallout shelter space meeting criteria established by the Department of Defense, in new construction of public buildings under its jurisdiction, and that local governments be encouraged to take corresponding steps;

8. *Further resolved*, That each State emphasize in the coming year the licensing, marking and stocking of shelters identified

by the national shelter survey, the training for special civil defense skills, the development of shelter allocating plans and the establishment of protected emergency operating centers to assure the continuity of State and local governments;

9. *Further resolved*, That the chairman and the vice chairman of the committee on civil defense and post-attack recovery be authorized, in their joint discretion and on behalf of the Governors' conference, to appear and testify before any of the appropriate committees of the Congress of the United States so as personally to convey to the Congress the convictions of the Governors, demonstrated at each conference for the past 6 years, as to the crucial significance of an adequate civil defense program and especially as to the importance of a nationwide system of fallout protection, the soundness of the proposed Federal shelter development program, outlined in H.R. 8200, and the need for better understanding and affirmative leadership with respect to the Nation's capability for survival and recovery in the event of nuclear attack.

Presentation by Governor Egan on the March 27, 1964, Alaskan Earthquake, at the General Business Session of the 56th Annual Meeting of the Governors' Conference, Cleveland, Ohio, June 10, 1964

Mr. Chairman and fellow Governors: As the committee on civil defense and post-attack recovery has stated, the capability of civil defense to perform under disaster conditions was critically tested by the earthquake in Alaska in March. The civil defense organization in Alaska passed this test with flying colors. It coordinated the rescue and relief activities and acted as a center for liaison with military forces and civil defense heads. Communications and other equipment purchased with Federal financial assistance provided the vital link between State and local governments and the disaster areas in need. From the very moment that the March 27 disaster struck—it was a real large area in Alaska bordering on the outer perimeter of voilence in somewhat more than 30,000 square miles and when you consider that the area back of that outer perimeter added an area that entailed about 100,000 square miles more, you can readily see the extent that this violence really covered. But from the very moment this disaster did hit Alaska, the civil defense organization, which consisted of eight State employees, including clerical help, plus all of the voluntary units in the various affected communities and other communities of Alaska, the voluntary units working in conjunction and in total coordination and cooperation with the State agencies, performed a magnificent job, indeed.

Of course, in Alaska we have a defense command, a unified defense command, that was very, very helpful to the State in the first trying days, particularly following the earthquake and the seismic sea waves of the evening of March 27. But the major work of getting the show on the road and installing confidence and determination in the people of Alaska, that Alaska would rebuild, that we would come out of it and rise from the material effects that hit the State on that fateful evening, the State civil defense and local units of civil defense worked in such a manner that they command the respect of all Alaskans at this time. I am certain that all Alaskans and others from the many other States of the American Union who visited Alaska during the time of the disaster to offer their services will always hold a fond regard for the good work that was accomplished by the civil defense units in Alaska.

Each year that I have been Governor, the civil defense organization has accomplished great work in natural disasters that have hit the State of Alaska, particularly each spring when we have huge floods in the breakup period on the Kuskokwim River and the Yukon River. But these efforts were not dramatic enough and the destruction was not dramatic enough to bring home to all of the people in Alaska the vital necessity for a good and strong civil defense organization, nor of the necessity that scores and even hundreds of people throughout the State of Alaska should become active workers in civil defense activity. That is not the case today. In Alaska, all over our great State, there is a strong realization that there must be and will be an ever-increasing effort from the standpoint of the citizens of the State in becoming vitally and individually a part of the civil defense effort.

I can only hope that, because of the magnitude of the disaster in Alaska, people all over these United States of ours recognize the need for a strong civil defense organization does not only exist with relation to a nuclear holocaust, God forbid, that may some day be thrust upon us, but in overcoming the disastrous results of natural disaster.

I am firmly convinced now, and I know that there are several other Governors who sensed this prior to the time of the Alaskan disaster, that there has been a great psychological mistake and that is the name of the organization—the Federal organization and the organizations in the many States of the Union. I feel that if the name of the organization were titled "State civil disaster agency" or some such title, rather than State civil defense agency or national civil defense agency, the apathy of the American public, as has been so evident down through these years, would not have been the case. In Alaska we are going to change the name of our agency so that it will reflect the need for this kind of an organization really functioning well in time of natural disaster. But in the great disaster that hit Alaska—and I might say that, in attempting to visualize in your own mind the violence and the intensity of what happened on that March 27 evening—on the Richter scale a 6 reading is a dangerous reading. In other words, a 6 on the Richter scale can mean in many areas where there is an earthquake that terrible damage will result. When you reach a reading of 8 on the Richter scale, that is 1,500 times greater in intensity and velocity than is 6 on the Richter scale. We used the 6 figure because following the earthquake of March 27 in Alaska there were several aftershocks that reached the intensity of 6. But the intensity of the quake in Alaska reached a maximum of some 8.6 on the scale. That was probably more than 2,000 times the violence and intensity of the 6 on the Richter scale or some 20 million times more violence than occurred when the atomic bomb was dropped on Hiroshima.

All of the United States is earthquake country. Certain areas of our great United States, of course, in the fault areas, are more likely to have earthquakes of great violence. But I think that the disaster in Alaska points out the need more than ever before for a strong civil defense organization all over these great United States of ours to meet natural disasters.

And, of course, in planning in this way, in having a strong organization in every State of the Union, if a holocaust ever comes where nuclear weapons are involved, we will be much, much better able to cope with the results of such a disaster, which we all hope will never be, with the kind of civil defense organization that is vitally necessary. I think that it would behoove all citizens of the United States over a 2- or 3-year period to take a day or two off and become active in their local civil defense organization in the particular local community in which they reside so that they will have some good working understanding of what their duties might be if a natural disaster or other disaster ever befalls their particular area where such an organization is needed.

In Alaska, though our organization functioned real well, we noticed many things that can and will be improved. The ham operators did a tremendous job in Alaska as did other persons who took over security details when the National Guard went back to inactive status; and in many other ways people were very, very valuable in their working relationship with civil defense. But there were scores and even hundreds of people who came in to offer their services who had never attended a civil defense meeting in their local community and had no idea whatsoever of how they could be helpful in the various aspects following the disaster that demands certain manpower and aid that would be beneficial to the overall community.

Consequently, many of the offers and sincere desires of hundreds of people to be helpful had to be turned down. These people had to be turned away because of the fact that they had never participated in activities of this nature. But I know that in Alaska we in the State government, in all the State agencies, had many meetings over the past 2 years preparing for some great eventuality that might occur. And these people did a very fine job. But we never did get the support in the civilian community that was necessary and will be necessary in the future anywhere that such a disaster might strike. I agree fully with the report of the Committee on Civil Defense and Post-Attack Recovery and I hope that the Congress of the United States has become much more aware of the needs for an all-out civil defense organizational drive all over the United States of America.

In closing, I want to say that the Office of Emergency Planning, Mr. Edward McDermott, the Director of that Office, and all of his staff, the regional directors from many of the regions of the United States, which you Governors are from, and many of the people of your various civil defense organizations that came to Alaska to be of help, did a magnificent job for us. Alaskans are grateful, indeed, of the strong support, both from the moral and material standpoint, that came to us in these past 2 months from all of the citizens of the United States, of all of the States of the Union, and the great, warm feeling of fellowship that was the cause of this. It gave me a heartwarming feeling, I know, during this period of time. It gave the people of Alaska a stronger determination and spirit to rebuild Alaska and make a better Alaska than existed prior to the earthquake and tidal waves of March 27, 1964. And it made me more proud than ever to be a Governor of one of the great States of the American Union and to be an American. Thank you. [Applause.]

Gov. **Edmund G. Brown**. I would like to ask Governor Egan a question. Have you given any thought—I know you have because I spoke with you about it—about some form of disaster insurance that we might write on a national basis to take care of a situation like that? Because there is no insurance, no private insurance, that could be written on a disaster such as you experienced in Alaska. I know the Governors would be interested in your comments on that.

Governor **Egan**. I am firmly convinced that the intensity and the area covered by the Alaskan earthquake has proven beyond any question that the time has arrived when the Government of the United States must seriously consider setting up some kind of a natural disaster funding program that will be meaningful. Now, it is not likely that you would have a violent earthquake of this intensity in the centrally located part of the United States, a highly industrialized area. But it is possible and history shows very clearly that there have been earthquakes of tremendous violence, one in particular in the 1800's where the center was in South Carolina and it extended up into New York State. If the industrial centers that now exist in those areas had been there then and the population had been there at that time that exists in those States at the present time, you would probably have upwards of tens of thousands or maybe hundreds of thousands of fatalities. And it could be that if an earthquake of that intensity could strike that area, you would run into a situation where you would have a one hundred billion to two hundred billion dollar economic loss in industries and businesses that would be destroyed. So I think that now is the time to work on planning and recommendations to the Congress of the United States for some sort of long-range funding for natural disasters. Otherwise, we could find ourselves one of these days in a situation where the industrial areas would be damaged to such a degree that all at once the great United States of America, its Federal Government, could not have too much meaningful help in rebuilding. [Applause]

SUPPORT OF CIVIL DEFENSE FROM LOCAL OFFICIALS AND NATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND ASSOCIATIONS

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, by act of Congress, civil defense is a responsibility of National, State, and local governments. At the national level rests the responsibility for study, research, broad planning, and program formulation. At the State level lies a responsibility for adaptation of these broad plans and programs to the needs of the particular State. But, it is at the local level that action must take place.

A number of associations, representative of this "action" level, have expressed their support of a strong civil defense. I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from the statements of several organizations be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

American Municipal Association (representing some 13,000 municipal governments):

"Increased disaster assistance: We recommend that the Federal Government provide through surplus property or by direct grant, additional fire fighting, rescue, communications, medical supplies or other equipment needed by the communities to increase their capability of meeting disasters of great magnitude. We urgently request the Congress to provide an additional, more complete and adequate financial program for civil defense, which recognizes the urgent importance of protecting and defending our homeland. We recommend that the Congress, under the authority granted it by Public Law 85-606 continue matching funds to share the cost of State and local personnel, to procure, distribute, and maintain needed radiological detection equipment, and to train State and local civil defense personnel.

"The Congress of the United States should enact laws which give to all civil defense agencies a higher priority in the procurement of such Federal surplus properties as are necessary to the organization, maintenance and operation of an effective civil defense and disaster program.

"Civil defense and disaster preparedness should be a part of every municipal employee's training and civil defense and disaster assignments should be made so that their employees are better equipped to carry out their responsibilities."

National Association of Counties (representing some 3,050 county governments):

"Joint responsibility.—We approve Federal recognition of civil defense as a joint responsibility of the Federal Government, the several States, and their political subdivisions. We further approve legislation which provides that the Federal Government shall match the administrative and personnel costs of State and local civil defense organizations.

"County responsibility.—County governments should recognize their responsibility as a unit of the nationwide civil defense organization. They should promote civil defense organizations throughout the county and its local political subdivisions, and wherever feasible and practical, act as the coordinating agency for civil defense within the county.

"Natural disasters.—We favor a more flexible and expeditious administration of Federal laws and regulations intended to afford prompt assistance to local communities in times of natural disasters.

"We recommend that the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended, be further amended to include natural disaster activities within the definition of civil defense."

AFL–CIO (representing millions of Americans):

"*Resolved:* (3) Adequate information and training provided by the Federal Government both in educational material and in competent civil defense leaders.

"(6) Government control over construction of destructible high buildings in cities and Federal, State, and local control over new buildings such as schools, hospitals, office buildings, to make certain that they all contain adequate shelter space.

"Disaster relief is a part of the civil defense function in all States and this particular amendment set forth in section 3 was recommended by organizations representing State and local civil defense directors, who are now required to distinguish between civil defense and disaster relief activities.

"The AFL–CIO believes that planning and preparations for natural disaster relief should be related to preparations for civil defense operations, and we urge recognition of this essential relationship by enactment into law of a broader definition of civil defense which includes natural disaster relief operations. We believe adoption of this broader definition of civil defense will encourage and stimulate even greater participation by the American labor movement in civil defense and natural disaster relief activities."

INDIVIDUAL LOCAL OFFICIALS' VIEWS TO THE CONGRESS

James D. Dworak, mayor of Omaha, Nebr.: "I need not belabor the obvious; civil defense, when viewed from the standpoint of a city, becomes totally impractical if the Federal Government cannot be relied upon to carry through with a joint undertaking, with local governments, which was initiated by the Federal Government in the name of national defense. The Federal program has moved the city of Omaha to extraordinary effort.

"Many of our cities are well ahead of our Federal Government in civil defense and are tired of the vacillation of Congress which cannot but result in a totally unreliable Federal program.

"We intend to continue our efforts and to carry our end of the program. I will continue to call forth the effort of the public and private citizens of Omaha in the face of the Federal affront which says 'do as we say' not 'do as we do.'

"The responsibility of city and county officials is not to ask for the burdens of civil defense, but to do their part in a sensible national plan under Federal direction and guidance, quite apart from national defense requirements. It appears to me to be bad government, bad politics, and less than responsible for the Federal Government to take the lead in a joint undertaking in one year and to invite local government to take the lead in the next year.

"As the mayor of this city, I do not pretend to judge the needs of national defense. I have faith in the Federal Government and am prepared to carry out to the best of my ability, those defense actions the Federal Government indicates must be done by city government. It is difficult enough for me and other mayors and county officials to do our part in a program of national defense which appeals largely to a sense of duty. It will be an almost impossible task without continuity of Federal support."

Edmond W. Wade, mayor of Long Beach, Calif.: "A failure at this time for the Federal Government to continue the shelter program, which has just gotten off to a good start, will make it most difficult for the citizens to understand the need to be concerned about national preparedness at the individual and family level. It will also be most difficult at the community level to sustain a reasonable posture of readiness to help meet national emergency situations unless Congress demonstrates that such preparedness is desirable."

Neal S. Blaisdell, mayor of city and county of Honolulu: "Most important to public understanding is Federal attitude exemplified by action of Congress."

Mayor Cavanagh, Detroit, Mich: "We are hopeful and confident that a suicidal war can be avoided, but we recognize that preparations to protect our people are a part of the preventive program."

Myron Lotto, chairman, Brown County Board of Supervisors, Wisconsin: "Since civil defense became a part of the Department of Defense, there appears to be a feeling of leadership with a definite course of action that can and should be followed. The fallout shelter program is the most plausible and understandable undertaking to date."

U.S. Conference of Mayors: "Whereas municipal communities cannot properly plan for an effective long-term civil defense program without continuity of financing of Federal support: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the United States Conference of Mayors,* That, as chief executives of the cities of our Nation, we have the clear responsibility for organizing leadership in our cities to carry forward the necessary civil defense activities responsive to the national civil defense program.

* * * * *

"(d) Provide that all aids and grants for local civil defense purpose be channeled through local and city civil defense sources."

GENERAL SUPPORT OF CIVIL DEFENSE

VETERANS AND OTHER MILITARY AFFILIATED ORGANIZATIONS

Air Force Association, American Legion, American Legion Auxiliary, Amvets, Association of the U.S. Army, Catholic War Veterans, Disabled American Veterans, Jewish War Veterans, Marine Corps League, Reserve Officers Association, Regular Veterans Association, Veterans of Foreign Wars.

OTHER

B'nai B'rith, B'nai B'rith Women, Fraternal Order of Eagles, Exchange, General Federation of Women's Clubs, Junior Chamber of Commerce, National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Outdoor Advertising Association, PTA.

EXCERPTED STATEMENTS OF SUPPORT

"If your community has no civil defense as yet organized, or has a civil defense in name only, you might well want to join civic leaders and other organizations in assisting to organize an effective, meaningful civil defense program." (Joseph Foss, president, July 1962 letter to all locals, Air Force Association.)

"Now, therefore, be it resolved * * *

"3. To assist in establishing local civil defense organizations where none exist, and to support community civil defense by personal participation." (American Legion resolution, national convention, September 1963.)

"Now, therefore, be it resolved * * * that we call upon the Congress and the President of the United States to declare a national policy of civil defense to encompass the following:

"B. Cooperative financial support by the Federal Government to State, local governments and individuals to provide adequate fallout protection, including but not limited to fallout shelters in new construction using Federal funds, loans or guarantees.

"C. Accelerate and broaden education and training programs to instruct the public in warning and protection procedures for nuclear attack.

"D. Support the appropriation of Federal funds for the establishment of a nationwide, fully automatic radioactive fallout monitoring system supplemented by an attack-proof communications system to contact shelter occupants." (American Legion resolution, national convention, October 1962 (still in effect).)

"Now, therefore, be it resolved * * * that the OCD * * * continue to support and increase its contributions to the State and local civil defense organizations on a first-priority basis for the acquiring of the necessary equipment above mentioned and that the rules now governing the donation of Federal surplus property to said civil defense organizations be broadened so that all items that could be used to strengthen said organizations be donated for said civil defense purposes." (American Legion resolution, national convention, October 1962 (still in effect).)

"Whereas the civil defense organization has become very vital to the welfare and survival of all the people in guiding us through all types of disasters, both manmade and natural, and

"Whereas it is extremely important that well qualified personnel are chosen as the leaders in this very worthwhile organization, in order to become more efficient; Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the American Legion go on record requesting a thorough study of the National Civil Defense Act and amend it to guarantee the personnel to be free from any political restraint and be placed under some form of a merit system." (American Legion resolution, national convention, October 1962 (still in effect).)

"*Resolved*, That Catholic War Veterans posts offer their direct support to their community civil defense authorities and in recognition of the vast requirements for properly trained leadership, enroll members in the appropriate adult education courses being offered for this purpose." (Catholic War Veterans resolution, national convention, August 1963.)

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, the responsibility of government to be prepared for action in time of disaster—both natural and manmade—is recognized in the civil defense legislation of every State.

The role of civil defense is to serve as the emergency coordinating arm of the elected executive who, in a disaster situation, must direct a multitude of governmental actions to alleviate damage and speed recovery—and do all of this in a tightly compressed period of time.

Mr. President, a statement I have had prepared covers several civil defense actions which have taken place in many parts of the United States; for example, in Alaska, during the recent earthquake; during the tidal wave which struck Crescent City, Hawaii; the explosion of a dynamite truck in front of a snake farm at Stroudsburg, Pa.; the airplane crash at North Las Vegas, Nev.; the fire and explosion in San Francisco, Calif.; the floods on Montana and Nebraska in June 1964, and many others. They show the type of work which the State civil defense agencies are doing in behalf of their respective peoples.

I ask unanimous consent that the report be made a part of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ROLE OF CIVIL DEFENSE IN NATURAL DISASTERS

Alaska: The recent earthquake in Alaska provided a realistic appraisal of what civil defense can do in the face of peacetime disaster.

The State civil defense organization of five professionals and two secretaries was expanded to approximately 150 within 24 hours, and coordinated emergency recovery actions ordered by Gov. William A. Egan.

Because of water and sewer line destruction in Anchorage, water containers and sanitation kits from the public fallout shelters were distributed all over town. CD generators provided emergency power at critical location, including Providence Hospital, the central medical center for the Anchorage area.

Support by the military and by organizations and individuals was of the highest order in all devastated areas. An important point to remember, however, is that martial law was never declared at any time anywhere in the State. Civil defense—civil government in emergency—retained control of all emergency actions.

In the aftermath of the emergency, Governor Egan declared that "the direction came from civilians * * * and the efforts, to a large degree, followed closely along established disaster plans * * *. Civil defense was the key operational unit working directly from my office. And while coordination between State and local civil defense units was quickly established, the local units worked exceedingly well on their own.

"If this type of disaster agency had not been fully functioning at the time of the Alaska earthquake, I personally believe the first hours following the earthquake would have been ones of tragic confusion."

Crescent City, Hawaii (Alaskan quake): Soon after the Alaskan earthquake struck, a tidal wave warning was sent by the 28th Warning Center of the OCD National Warning System at Hamilton Air Force Base, Calif., to the State civil defense offices of California, Oregon, and Washington.

In California, the State disaster office (civil defense) dispatched the warning by teletype and telephone to Crescent City an hour before the first big wave struck.

In Hawaii, civil defense sirens sounded tidal wave alarms in coastal areas. Approximately 150,000 people were evacuated from lowlands. In Honolulu, civil defense authorities manned posts in an emergency control center deep in bedrock below Diamond Head.

Stroudsburg, Pa. (June 26, 1964, dynamite truck explosion in front of snake farm): Civil defense workers in the Stroudsburg, Pa., area were called out almost immediately after the explosion of a dynamite truck near Stroudsburg early in the morning of June 26. Volunteer firemen had been handling the situation until the explosion, which resulted from a brake fire. However, the explosion blew up a nearby snake farm, liberating hundreds of snakes, many of them poisonous.

About 50 civil defense workers from Monroe County Civil Defense at Stroudsburg were dispatched to help direct traffic around the blast scene, and to kill loose snakes.

Monroe County Civil Defense activated its new emergency operating center in the county courthouse at 4:17 a.m. to meet the situation. Civil defense people in charge: Marvin E. Abel, the country director, and Jack Anderson, the eastern area director for the State council of civil defense.

North Las Vegas, Nev. (plane crash): An example of military-civil defense cooperation came in May when an Air Force F-105 Thunderchief jet crashed into a housing area of North Las Vegas, Nev., killing the pilot, a woman, and three children, and demolishing 14 homes.

A civil defense emergency headquarters was quickly established on the outer perimeter of the disaster strike zone. Fire, police, and hospital officials dispatched ambulances and two medical teams to the emergency headquarters, and headquarters personnel directed the evacuation of families from homes in the disaster area.

Reflecting later on the emergency operations, Maj. Gen. John C. Meyer, commanding officer of U.S. Air Force Headquarters at Waco, Tex., stated (in a letter to Senator ALAN BIBLE): "In my opinion the civil defense capabilities, as demonstrated by its operation after this crash, is a model which cities of greater size and population may well copy. I am certain that the action of the civil defense unit did much to minimize the tragic aftermath of the crash."

California (fire and explosion, 1964): San Francisco's All-Hallows Church, devastated by fire which claimed 16 lives, prompted both the San Francisco Chronicle and the San Francisco Examiner to call public attention to the value of adequate civil defense organization and planning.

The Chronicle complimented the city civil defense director for coordinating rescue efforts while the Examiner said the fire showed "San Francisco that peacetime disaster, and not war alone, can leave a tragic wake of destruction, death, and terror."

The effective coordination of the efforts of doctors and nurses, ambulance crews, policemen, and firemen, contributed greatly to alleviation of the effects of the fire, the Examiner said.

Commenting that "many citizens have equated preparation for disaster with civil defense, associated only with war," the Examiner added that those who "think of civil defense as fostering war * * * are wrong."

Noting that "all would pray that such emergencies would never occur," the Examiner called for increased emergency capability "on a scale serving not just hundreds of casualties, but thousands."

Montana floods, Nebraska (June 1964): Civil defense worked jointly with the military and the Red Cross earlier this month in one of the worst floods in Montana's history.

Maj. Gen. Richard C. Kendall, Montana adjutant general and executive head of the State civil defense, rushed back from Cleveland, where he was attending the Governors' conference, to coordinate emergency operations for the State, including dispatching of typhoid vaccines, emergency bedding, and food supplies to flood-stricken areas.

Ham radio operators cooperated closely with government authorities during the emergency, reporting at one time from the town of Browning, near Glacier National Park, the recovery of 13 bodies.

In the wake of the Montana disaster, flash floods swept through Omaha, Nebr., on June 16, taking at least six lives. Civil defense organized an emergency force of boats to rescue stranded people, coordinating its efforts with National Guardsmen who were ordered to duty by Gov. Frank Morrison to assist in rescue operations.

Ohio River floods (March 1964): In the Ohio River floods in March 1964 civil defense organizations in four States mobilized to meet the threat of disaster.

In Indiana, civil defense and the Red Cross set up emergency shelters and food lines for flood refugees.

In Louisville, Ky., civil defense units assisted in the evacuation of thousands from flood-threatened areas, and took on the job of cleaning up and restoring order.

In Pennsylvania and Ohio, civil defense worked around the clock preparing shelters for evacuated families.

Attleboro, Mass. (Thompson Chemical Plant explosion): Early this year, a major explosion at the Thompson Chemical Plant in Attleboro, Mass., resulted in fatal injuries to seven employees. Of the six main buildings at the plant, only three remained relatively intact after the fire was extinguished. Forty other persons were injured in the blast.

By a prior arrangement, Attleboro police notified the city civil defense director as soon as the alarm was sounded. He in turn alerted civil defense auxiliary and police squads in Attleboro.

Civil defense set up a communications center to procure supplies and equipment to help Attleboro public safety units at the scene of the disaster. Volunteer auxiliary civil defense units assisted the city's regular fire and police forces during the night.

Michigan (tornado, 1964): On the afternoon of May 8, 1964, a tornado struck west of Mount Clemens, Mich., killing 10 persons and sending 82 to local hospitals. More than 200 persons were treated for injuries and released.

National Guardsmen, Selfridge Air Force personnel, and civil defense workers maintained order and assisted in the evacuation of casualties in the devastated area where damage was estimated officially at between $4 and $5 million.

On May 15, the Warren (Mich.) Tri-City Progress credited advance civil defense planning with holding down casualties and speeding relief to the injured and homeless victims.

The Macomb County civil defense director said the emergency plans of the county sheriff's department, the various police and fire agencies and private organizations all meshed when the tornado struck.

An emergency control point was set up by the sheriff's department, and from there the various agencies were activated by civil defense, and operations continued until there was assurance that all victims, living and dead, had been provided for.

Delaware: From editorial in Delaware State News, Dover, October 1963:

"Civil defense is more than a mechanism of war. It is a defense against the forces of nature as well. Every community is vulnerable to natural disasters which may strike anywhere in the form of hurricanes, tidal waves, tornadoes, floods, or fires.

"Without a well-organized CD program and citizens trained to cope with emergencies, many lives may be lost unnecessarily in the panic that follows when disaster strikes a community.

"If civil defense officials placed more emphasis in the vital role CD plays in these natural disasters, American citizens might wake up to the importance of preparedness to survival."

ASSISTANCE LOANS OF CIVIL DEFENSE ENGINEERING EQUIPMENT TO STATES FOR WATER SHORTAGES AND FLOOD AID

Civil defense engineering equipment is loaned to the States for use during water shortages and to alleviate floods. One unit consists of 10 miles of 8-inch pipe and necessary pumps and generators.

During the past 2 years, such equipment has been loaned to 15 States for use in 51 communities. Forty-six loans were made because of water shortages, and five were for flood aid. Eight States currently have on loan engineering equipment in use in 16 communities.

Engineering equipment has been or is on loan to the following States: Kansas, Massachusetts, Missouri, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Virginia, West Virginia, Indiana, Illinois, Vermont, New York, Maryland, Kentucky, and New Hampshire. Details are attached.

LIST OF ASSISTANCE LOANS OF CD EQUIPMENT TO STATES FOR WATER SHORTAGES AND FLOOD AID

Outstanding and date of issue

Kansas:

Galesburg, November 6, 1963; extended May 5, 1964.

Alma, February 18, 1964; extended August 17, 1964.

Massachusetts:

Gardner, October 30, 1963.

Maynard, April 6, 1964.

Leominster, June 9, 1964.

Franklin, June 15, 1964.

Lunenberg, June 18, 1964.

Missouri:

Adrian, September 16, 1963; extended June 11, 1964.

Fayette, June 12, 1963; extended June 13, 1964; reextended September 13, 1964.

Macon, October 15, 1963; extended July 20, 1964.

Ohio: Nelsonville, March 13, 1964.

Oklahoma: Beggs, November 15, 1963.

Pennsylvania:

Hanover, September 25, 1963; extended May 1, 1964.

Hyndman, April 30, 1964.

Virginia: Crozet, September 16, 1963; extended September 1, 1964.

West Virginia: Hurricane, May 26, 1964.

Completed, date of issue, and date of return

Indiana:

Austin, October 29, 1963; January 8, 1964.

Bedford, March 16, 1964; April 6, 1964.

Sellersburg, March 10, 1964; April 14, 1964.

Illinois:

Newton, November 15, 1963; December 17, 1963.

Chester, January 3, 1964; March 30, 1964.

Blandinsville, December 5, 1963; March 16, 1964.

Massachusetts:

Leominster, September 30, 1963; February 10, 1964.

Turner Falls, October 30, 1963; March 31, 1964.

Missouri: Lanagan, July 1, 1963; January 9, 1964.

Ohio:

Spencer, December 17, 1963; January 24, 1964.

Mount Orab, October 22, 1963; December 10, 1963.

Athens, March 11, 1964; March 26, 1964.

Marietta, March 11, 1964; March 26, 1964.

College Corners, November 5, 1963; May 26, 1964.

Oklahoma: Locust Grove, November 6, 1963; December 2, 1963.

Pennsylvania:

Spring Grove, October 18, 1963; May 5, 1964.

Cornwall, October 17, 1963; January 21, 1964.

Lock Haven, October 21, 1963; October 25, 1963.

Tower City, October 18, 1963; January 30, 1964.

Weatherly, October 24, 1963; January 7, 1964.

West Chester, October 17, 1963; January 28, 1964.

Schuylkill, December 9, 1963; December 20, 1963.

Ebensburg, October 23, 1963; May 5, 1964.

York, October 9, 1963; April 28, 1964.

Vermont:

South Royalton, September 25, 1963; October 17, 1963.

State of Vermont, November 7, 1963; December 31, 1963.

South Royalton, October 30, 1963; April 13, 1964.

Brattleboro, November 5, 1963; March 13, 1965.

Barre Town, December 27, 1963; January 24, 1964.

New York State, October 31, 1963; December 29, 1963.

West Virginia: Harpers Ferry, November 29, 1963; March 6, 1964.

Maryland: Myersville, October 18, 1963; December 17, 1963.

Kentucky: Louisville, March 12, 1964; March 18, 1964.

Virginia: Tazewell, September 23, 1963; March 3, 1964.

New Hampshire: Claremont, October 2, 1963; December 30, 1963.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I hope the Senate will look with favor upon H.R. 10314.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Hawaii and I have an honest difference of opinion regarding this authorization bill. I intend to ask for a yea-and-nay vote on the passage of the bill. While the bill was reported well nigh unanimously by the committee, I was the only member of the Committee on Armed Services present who voted against reporting the authorization bill to the Senate.

Because I desire later to have a yea-and-nay vote on the bill, I believe that at this time I should suggest the absence of a quorum, and I suggest it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on passage of the bill.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, for many reasons, I am opposed to the passage of this bill, the authorization of approximately $25 million for this fiscal year, adding this sum to $1.3 billion of the taxpayers' money that has already gone down the drain over the years in connection with the civil defense boondoggle.

The Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE] and I both serve on the Committee on Armed Services. He and I have a difference of opinion on the bill, which came from the Armed Services Committee with a well-nigh unanimous vote of those attending. I was the only member to vote aganist reporting the bill.

In the course of the hearings before the committee, certain facts came out and I shall briefly advert to them.

It is true, as my colleague and close personal friend states, that the Governors' conference in my home city of Cleveland, Ohio, after hearing the address by Secretary of the Army Ailes urging the Governors to ask for passage of this bill, unanimously adopted a resolution asking the Federal Government to enact this legislation which provides matching funds for the States so that every Governor can maintain and add to the present force of civil defense employees in his State.

No doubt, the Governor of my State of Ohio joined in, although recently, in Cuyahoga County, the largest in the State, John Pokorny, who has been for many years Director of Civil Defense, finally saw the handwriting on the wall and resigned as Director—of course, to take another job.

He was made superintendent of the workhouse. Indicative of how little the mayor of Cleveland thinks of this program is the fact that he has not yet appointed anyone to replace Pokorny as director.

For some year, the civil defense had an evacuation program. The stupidity of this soon became apparent when it was exposed that in Cleveland—similar situations occurred in Washington and elsewhere—the Lake Road was made an escape road from Cleveland to Lorain, approximately 25 miles distant, to the west of Cleveland; yet in Lorain citizens were instructed to take the very same road to flee from Lorain into Cleveland.

In Columbus, Ohio, the Civil Defense spent $677,000 on synchronizing the traffic lights, as if in a moment of panic, terror and devastation people fleeing from the city would be looking at the traffic signals—which were all pointing green one way.

They have given that up, but now they have come forth with a new program in recent years—a fallout shelter program.

What are we authorizing this money for? What has all of the money been appropriated for over the past years—the $1.3 billion for civil defense?

By exploding a warhead in the atmosphere, hundreds of yards above an airfield, or a city, the maximum amount of destruction and loss of life occurs, and there is no fallout whatever. That is the testimony. Any scientist will agree to that.

I want this Nation to be supreme over the Soviet Union. I have always supported defense measures. Of course, every Senator knows that at the present time the United States of America is the strongest and most powerful Nation that ever existed at any time in the history of the world under the bending sky of God, and we have a tremendous overkill capacity against the Soviet Union. They would be stupid indeed to seek to unleash any nuclear attack against us. Of course the Soviet Union and the leaders of the Soviet armed forces are not stupid.

Yet, at the present time in the Department of Defense, there are 1,042 civilian defense employees, civil defense bureaucrats, I would call them—but Mr. Durkee in his testimony stated that was not a bureaucracy, that it was a professional staff. But to the question, "When do you consider it a bureaucracy?" he said, "I suppose, Senator, it is a question of judgment." In my judgment it is a bureaucracy, pure and simple, and an utterly useless one from the taxpayers' standpoint.

That is his judgment against mine. I say that this is a bureaucracy. But there are certain facts that he did not dispute. It is a startling fact that the average salary paid at the present time, and last year, to those 1,042 persons is $10,592.

Later this week if the pay raise bill—which has passed in the other body—is passed in this body and is enacted into law, that $10,592 will shoot upward, as will the salaries of other bureaucrats. But let us now consider the $10,592. That figure is not disputed.

By comparison, employees of the Federal Bureau of Investigation average $9,206 per annum lumping them all together from the file clerk to the top, as I did in the civil defense bureaucracy. In other words, the difference is approximately $1,300 per annum between employees of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and employees of the civil defense organization. It seems to me that that is an indefensible difference.

Now we come to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, where the average yearly salary is about $1,000 under that of civil defense employees. The NASA average is $9,576.

Take the Small Business Administration. All Senators know the Small Business Administration is performing real and needful public service throughout the Nation—helping stimulate small business, saving small businessmen, and providing jobs. It is an important agency in our Government. Yet the average pay of officials and employees in the Small Business Administration in Washington is $8,015, as against $10,592 for the civil defense agency.

There is another group of civil defense employees scattered throughout the country. They are paid with matching funds. Half of the salaries are paid by the Federal Government, and half by State and local governments.

Let us see how this bureaucracy grows. In 1963, there were 5,012 of them throughout the country; their total is estimated at 5,594 this year. The civil defense officials now want 1,175 more employees next year for those matching funds. The Federal share alone of the salaries and expense, if this authorization bill passes, will be some $19 million. The rest will come from State and municipal governments, where tax dollars grow increasingly scarce, where vital programs for schools, hospitals, housing, and other services die for lack of funds.

It is the program on the national level that spawns the growth of State and city organizations and multiplies the waste

Unfortunately, too few Governors, mayors, and county commissioners can resist the temptation to ask for and to accept Federal matching funds to provide in many cases a comfortable haven in the political storms for defeated office holders and political hacks—people who do very little more than to give lectures, posing as authorities on nuclear fallout, but most of the time sitting around doing nothing but waiting for the bomb to drop.

Mr. President, we pay too little attention to the facts in considering extension of the civil defense program, which was passed by a voice vote in the other body. The measure would extend for 4 years, through June 30, 1968, three expiring civil defense programs, the most expensive being the one that I adverted to, which would provide States with matching grants for half the administrative and personnel costs of State and local civil defense activities.

Then there are civil defense schools that cost money for the so-called trainees. In addition, the measure would provide States, through donations or loans, with the necessary equipment to detect and measure atomic radiation.

In Alaska, which suffered a terrible earthquake, I understand the civil defense volunteers did fine work. However, the truth is that in the history of our country, in periods of floods, fires, and various other natural disasters, Americans have always come to the aid of their neighbors. They will continue to do so.

In addition, in every county in my State of Ohio—and I presume it is true in every county throughout the Nation—there are county sheriffs, deputy sheriffs, State police, local police, fire departments, Red Cross, and many other such agencies. They come to the aid of their fellow citizens and neighbors in times of distress.

However, in too many instances civil defense has been not only a complete waste of taxpayers' money but a deception, as the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse] stated on the floor not long ago:

> The civil defense shelter program is part of the propaganda drive of the military to frighten the American people in order to justify further raids by the military on the Treasury of the United States. If ever there was a boondoggle, this is it. The sad part is that it is also a program of deception. It is about time Congress brought it to a halt.

The senior Senator from Oregon reported that his State of Oregon was the leader in the Nation in bringing to an end support for the so-called civil defense program. The movement started in Portland, Oreg. Other cities followed suit. The Senator said:

> At long last Americans are getting wise to this shocking boondoggle. The facts are that in the city of Portland, Oreg., the city authorities voted to abolish its city defense program. It was costing $110,000 of local funds annually.

The Los Angeles City Council slashed $209,000 from its civil defense budget request, thereby virtually eliminating its civil defense program.

In Baltimore, Md., the city comptroller called for the outright elimination of the city's civil defense organization.

Mr. President, admittedly some places in the country have civil defense officials who, in times of flood and disaster, have rendered real and needful public service as good neighbors. However, there are many more spots in which civil defense people have not accomplished anything.

It is a historic fact that in times of emergencies the military takes over. We might as well face it. Were we to be attacked by the Soviet Union and were there to be another world war forced upon us, the President of the United States, as Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces, would immediately, for all practical purposes, become a dictator and civil authorities would be cast aside.

Historically we know that the War Between the States—or, as we in the North call it, the Civil War—was brutal and at that time was regarded as horribly costly in the loss of life involved. Notwithstanding its devastation, in this atomic era the Civil War would be classified somewhat as a brush-fire war. Yet, instantly at the outbreak of the Civil War, Abraham Lincoln suspended the writ of habeas corpus. He became practically a dictator in the North. The military continued in charge throughout that war.

If we are involved in a nuclear war with an enemy that unleashed a savage attack on us, certainly the civilians operating the civil defense program would be placed farther back than they are now. They have been downgraded in recent years. We no longer have an Assistant Secretary of Defense for Civil Defense. We have a Director and a Deputy Director in the office of the Secretary of the Army.

Mrs. Jane Hanna, Deputy Director of the Civil Defense Office, is undoubtedly a fine lady and very competent in her position. She is probably more competent than some of her predecessors in holding high appointive positions in civil defense. At least she was head of the Junior League of this country, and the Junior League is well regarded in top society circles as being a fine organization. So I accord deference to her. No doubt she is trying her utmost in this department seriously to take care of work that has been placed before her in her position as Deputy Director for the Nation in charge of Federal officials who are receiving among the highest—king-sized—salaries, of any group of Federal employees.

I realize this bill, which will be passed in the Senate this afternoon is an authorization, and not an appropriation. I do not want to imitate an ostrich and hide my head in the sand and think that my entire body is concealed. Frankly, I feel that by making these remarks and asking for a rollcall, so that Senators will go on record, those who are present in the Senate Chamber are much more likely to read what my friend and colleague from Hawaii and I have had to say on the subject, and will give this matter some thought.

I hope, when they do, that they will bear in mind that in England—which is closer than this country is to the Soviet Union—there is no fallout shelter program nor a civil defense shelter program comparable in any respect to ours. The tremendous subway of the city of London not only does not have the hideous black and yellow markings that desecrate fine buildings in cities throughout our Nation, but there are no markings whatever. There is no civil defense program in England. Furthermore, in Canada and in France there are no civil defense shelter programs.

Preston Grover, of the Associated Press, who has been in the Soviet Union for some time, stated that attachés from embassies who have looked around the country—that is, the Soviet Union—for signs of civil defense shelters have found none. Foreigners live in many of the newest buildings put up in Moscow and they have no bomb shelters.

Harrison Salisbury of the New York Times agreed with Mr. Grover. He said that diplomats, foreign military attachés, and correspondents who have traveled widely in the Soviet Union report that there is no visible evidence of a widespread shelter program.

Our neighbor and ally, Canada, has never had a civil defense shelter program and has never had an evacuation program, which we have abandoned, and has never propagandized the people of our neighbor to the north to build shelters.

Mr. President, it is noteworthy, in connection with this Federal-State matching fund program, that there have been many officials employed in Ohio in civil defense, and not one has built a civil defense shelter in his own basement or his own backyard. He has told other people to do it, but he himself has not done it.

Personally, I do not think ours is a nation of men and women who will or should dig holes in the ground and then cower there, at an hour of disaster, waiting for the conquering paratroopers to come. That would be foreign to our way of life. It is foreign to our way of life and unthinkable that such a policy has been followed and is being followed by bureaucrats of the Civil Defense Agency in the Defense Department. It is proposed to build shelters in public buildings as if, in a moment of terror, were the Soviet Union to unleash an atomic attack upon our country at any time, men who had wives and children in the suburbs would go down to where the black and yellow signs directed them in some building and remain there. It is unthinkable that in the proposed new Federal building in Cleveland that will cost in excess of $40 million, 6 percent of the cost is proposed to be spent for a shelter in the basement, to be stocked with food, as though people would go there in a moment of terror.

While it is a fact that the bill is only an authorization, it is an authorization which would extend for 4 additional years the current authority to squander the money of our taxpayers. Is it necessary to spend this money? We hear talk nowadays from the White House of the need for austerity and economy in government. I am for that. The junior Senator from Ohio is against duplication and waste in government and against unnecessary spending. I am certain my colleague from Hawaii feels the same way. We both believe in economy in government. Economy means the same in government as it does for an individual. It means going without something that one might like to have but which he does not absolutely need.

Congress has just increased the ceiling on the national debt. I did not vote for it. I voted against it. But the fact is that the national debt ceiling has been increased to the highest figure in the history of our country.

The Secretary of the Treasury indicated that he would ask for a further increase of $6 to $9 billion next year. It seems to me that we have to start economizing somewhere. I know of no better place to start than on the unnecessary civil defense boondoggle.

The shelter program would be absolutely worthless. Even if some shelter in a basement, stocked with food and water that had not deteriorated so as to be spoiled and unfit for human consumption, could save a few lives in September of 1964, it would be utterly valueless in a year thereafter—so rapidly is science advancing in this space age of change and challenge and exploration.

I do not wish to see the 5,300 State and local employees in civil defense increased to 8,000 or more, and then increased to 10,000, and continually increased further. It is an utterly futile expenditure.

We have stockpiled a tremendous quantity of materials for civil defense.

Why should not we try our best to dispose of this stockpile, instead of waiting for it to deteriorate, or sitting idly by while a large portion of them are stolen? That has been the case in many instances, not only in the State of Ohio, but also in other States. Equipment for civil defense, such as typewriters, seems to disappear overnight, and is not there when people sent out from Washington take an inventory.

As I said before the 1,042 Federal civil defense employees receive an average pay of $10,592 a year. That represents an unconscionable raid on the Public Treasury. It should be stopped.

In 1959 I first spoke out against expenditures for civil defense. I have written some magazine articles on the subject, which were published in the Saturday Evening Post, the Progressive, Reader's Digest, and other magazines. I have tried, as one Senator, to express my view and to express my hope that this unjustified expenditure be stopped. I have given a number of reasons. There is one more reason which I believe we all should consider, and that is that at this time, following enactment of the limited nuclear test ban treaty, we are proceeding with negotiations for further disarmament and for further lessening of cold war tensions.

I know that some of us cannot be too hopeful on that subject, because we have met with rebuffs and disappointments, and no doubt we shall continue to meet with disappointments and setbacks in dealing with Communist aggressors of the Soviet Union and Red China. However, one way in which we can manifest our sincerity in these negotiations without in any way reducing onr national security, is by eliminating or drastically reducing civil defense expenditures. At the same time, we would be saving taxpayers' money.

I hope that my colleagues will give thoughtful consideration to the matter of appropriating the money requested when the appropriation bill comes before us. I had hoped that perhaps the authorization bill could be defeated. It is because of that slight hope that I have had that I decided to speak out against it, although I am certain it will not be defeated today. I hope that some of the statements that I have made will be read by my colleagues.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, it grieves me that my distinguished friend from Ohio and I are at opposing ends on the pending measure. However, I should like to commend him for his most eloquent presentation.

Before the vote on this measure, I should like briefly to comment on some statements that have been made by my distinguished friend.

First. I note that in his opening remarks my distinguished friend stated that there is no radioactive fallout from the blast of nuclear bombs. From all the testimony I have heard and all the documents I have read, there is a great deal of radioactivity in explosions of nuclear bombs. I am certain that no country has yet produced what may be called a clean bomb.

Second. My distinguished friend spent a great deal of time discussing the 1,042 Federal civil defense employees.

I point out that the average GS grade civil defense employees, as compared with the FBI—because the Senator from Ohio referred to the FBI—and also NASA, are as follows:

For civil defense the average GS grade is 10.2 For the FBI it is 7.9. For NASA it is 10.

I believe the following information is pertinent whenever we cite statistics regarding the distribution of professional versus nonprofessional employees. In the Office of Civil Defense, 56 percent of the employees are professional employees, and 44 percent are nonprofessional employees. In the FBI, 35 percent are professional employees and 65 percent nonprofessional employees. These would be clerks and stenographers, and so forth. In NASA, 37 percent are professional employees and 63 percent nonprofessional employees.

It is true that the bill authorizes the expenditure of $18.7 million. I should like to point out that this is a very small amount to spend for such an important project. If by making such an expenditure we could save the lives of 10 percent of the people of the United States, which would be roughly 20 million, I believe it would be money well spent.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. INOUYE. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I agree with the Senator's statement. The absence of so many Senators from the Chamber makes me wonder if that fact is indicative of the interest on the part of the people in this country in civil defense. If the Presiding Officer and the Senator from Hawaii and I were to leave the Chamber, the Senate would be out of business temporarily.

What I would like to do is to put this shelter boondoggle out of business. In that connection I should like to read from pages 45 and 46 of the hearings held before the Armed Services Committee.

I questioned Mr. Durkee, as follows:

> Now, is it not a fact that scientists have testified that the nuclear fallout, the poisonous fallout from the explosion of a nuclear warhead, if that explosion occurs in the atmosphere, as ours did over Japan, that there is very little if any fallout from that?

To that question Mr. Durkee replied:

> There is none.

So the testimony of Director Durkee himself is that there is no nuclear fallout. There is none if the explosion occurs in the atmosphere, as the explosion of our atomic bomb did over Japan. There is no nuclear fallout whatever.

Apparently the terminology of those who are employees—all of the 1,042 executive officials, from the top to the bottom—is an attempt to justify the king-sized average salary they receive.

I thank the Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. INOUYE. I was happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Ohio.

In his closing statement, the Senator from Ohio said that because of the easing of tensions, there is little fear, if any, of any nuclear attack on the United States. I believe most Americans will agree with me that the so-called easing of tensions has not made impossible the explosion of nuclear weapons upon the United States, through calculation or miscalculation, accident, mistake, or madness. Therefore, I feel the need for civil defense is still as great as it ever was.

If the easing of tensions were as real as is represented by the Senator from Ohio, I should think the U.S. Government and governments elsewhere would soon be effectively disarming.

Recently, the Senate voted for the passage of a massive defense authorization bill. I am certain that when the appropriation bill comes before us, we will almost unanimously agree with the recommendations of the committee to establish a massive defense structure in the United States.

Like the Senator from Ohio, I wish there could be a realistic easing of tensions, so that a time might come when men and women throughout the world could live in peace, without worry or fear of destruction or death. But the realities of life today point to the fact that there are still madmen in the world. There are still possibilities of mistakes, still possibilities of miscalculations. So long as such conditions exist, our Nation should be prepared for any eventuality.

Fifty States—every State in the Union—are participating in the program. Approximately 1,500 counties and municipalities also are participating in the program. Similarly, our territories and possessions are participating in the program. This is one Federal program that has met with the unanimous approbation, participation, and cooperation of every State in the Union. I urge Senators to support the passage of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill (H.R. 10314) was ordered to a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass? The yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, a delegation of parliamentarians from South Korea is in the Chamber. Perhaps I should wait before introducing them until the vote has been taken, when more Senators will be in the Chamber.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McIntyre in the chair). The question is on the passage of the bill. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLARK (when his name was called). Mr. President, on this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Symington]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Brewster], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Edmondson], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Hartke], the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson], the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. Neuberger], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Thurmond] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Bayh], the Senator from California [Mr. Engle] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy] are absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Church], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Ervin], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Symington] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Williams] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Bayh], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Brewster], the Senator from California [Mr. Engle], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Thurmond] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Allott], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Case], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Fong] and the Senator from New York [Mr.

Javits] are necessarily absent, and if present and voting, would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 74, nays 4, as follows:

[No. 453 Leg.]

YEAS—74

Aiken
Anderson
Bartlett
Beall
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dodd
Dominick
Douglas
Eastland
Ellender
Fulbright
Goldwater
Gore
Hart
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Johnston
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Keating
Kuchel
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Mechem
Metcalf
Miller
Monroney
Morton
Mundt
Muskie
Nelson
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Robertson
Russell
Saltonstall
Scott
Simpson
Smathers
Smith
Stennis
Talmadge
Tower
Walters
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—4

Gruening
Lausche
Morse
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—22

Allott
Bayh
Brewster
Byrd, Va.
Case
Church
Clark
Edmondson
Engle
Ervin
Fong
Hartke
Javits
Kennedy
Magnuson
Moss
Neuberger
Pastore
Sparkman
Symington
Thurmond
Williams, N.J.

So the bill (H.R. 10314) was passed.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 4364) to provide for the free entry of one mass spectrometer for the use of Oregon State University and one mass spectrometer for the use of Wayne State University; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. Mills, Mr. King of California, Mr. Boggs, Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin, and Mr. Curtis were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10300) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. Vinson, Mr. Rivers of South Carolina, Mr. Philbin, Mr. Arends, and Mr. Norblad were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10433) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 40 and 42 to the bill, and concurred therein, and that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 43 and 46 to the bill, and concurred therein, each with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11376) to provide a 1-year extension of certain excise tax rates; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. Mills, Mr. King of California, Mr. Boggs, Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin, and Mr. Curtis were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H.R. 6920) to amend section 715 of title 38, United States Code, to authorize, under certain conditions, the issuance of total disability income provisions for inclusion in National Service Life Insurance policies to provide coverage to age 65, and it was signed by the Acting President pro tempore.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY MEMBERS OF THE CIVIL RULE PARTY, KOREAN NATIONAL ASSEMBLY

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, we have with us today two members of the Parliament of Korea. We have had previous visits from people of that country. We stood with Korea on the battlefield in defense of the freedom of the world.

Korea is one of the countries of the world that is making a fight to preserve liberty for itself and to help other nations which are likewise seeking to establish that way of life throughout the world.

There are about 18 million South Koreans. They have 750,000 men under arms. One-half of their national budget is devoted to the financing of their military strength.

I repeat that I do not believe there is any other country in the southeast or Far East that is making as noble an effort to preserve democracy as are the Korean people.

It is my honor to present to the Senate Mr. Yong-sam Kim, a member of the Civil Rule Party, the opposition party, and the spokesman for the party.

Also, it is my honor to present Mr. Pom-sok So, likewise a member of the Civil Rule Party, the opposition party.

We welcome you to the Senate. We welcome you to our country.

(The distinguished visitors rose in their places and were greeted with applause, Senators rising.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is very happy to welcome you here today.

THE JUVENILE DELINQUENCY AND YOUTH OFFENSES CONTROL ACT OF 1961

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate House bill 9876, passed some time ago by the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate a bill coming over from the House of Representatives, which will be stated by title.

The bill (H.R. 9876) to amend the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act of 1961, by extending its provisions for 2 additional years, and providing for a special project and study was read twice by its title.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, on September 25, 1963, the Senate passed a bill extending until June 30, 1967, the authorization contained in section 6 of the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act of 1961.

Only a few days ago, the House of Representatives, ignoring the Senate bill entirely—which I may state in passing is somewhat less than the courtesy usually extended to this body by the other body—passed a different bill.

The House bill would amend the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act by extending its provision for 2 additional years, and providing for a special project and study of juvenile delinquency in the District of Columbia.

The House bill has the approval of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Department head charged with responsibility for the administration of the program under the Juvenile Delinquency Act, and has been endorsed by the Attorney General and the Secretary of Labor who, with Secretary Celebrezze, comprise the full membership of the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime which plays a major role in the development of projects and studies sponsored by the act.

The House bill has been cleared with the majority leader, the minority leader, with the chairman and with the members, Republican and Democratic, of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The House bill differs from the Senate bill in one major respect which the parties responsible for the program regard as a welcome addition. I refer to the provision in the House bill authorizing a special project in the Washington metropolitan area for the purpose of demonstrating the effectiveness of a large-scale program for the elimination of juvenile delinquency in this area. The bill authorizes an additional $5 million which may be used as a grant to carry out this new program in the Nation's Capital. It also provides that this additional appropriation shall remain available until expended.

The seriousness of delinquency problems in the city of Washington is a matter which has been of profound concern to all of us. The delinquency rates in this city have almost doubled in the past 6 years and have now reached an all-time high. I think all of us will agree that the Congress has a special responsibility to support the development of effective methods for reversing this shameful trend in the Nation's Capital. Indeed, the administrators of the Federal delinquency program, in recognition of this special concern, awarded a $100,000 grant to the District Commissioners in July of 1962 to begin basic research on these problems and joined with them and with a citizens' commission to develop a broad-scale community action program. As a result of these efforts, the Washington Action for Youth was organized in late 1962 and received a $330,000 grant under the juvenile delinquency program to plan and demonstrate an overall project for this city. Plans for this program have been substantially completed and the project will be ready to begin its action phase within a short period after enactment of this bill.

This project will provide the Congress with a unique opportunity to observe at firsthand how a major and vital program under this legislation is progressing and to measure the success that can be achieved under the approach contemplated by the statute.

The Washington project has the wholehearted endorsement of Mr. Charles Horsky on behalf of the President of the United States, of Mr. Walter Tobriner, Chairman of the District of Columbia Commissioners, and Dr. Carl Hansen, President of the Board of Education for the District of Columbia. It has received broad community support from all elements who are involved in the handling of these problems.

In my judgment, the inclusion of a special program of this kind for the District is a desirable step and I recommend its acceptance by the Senate.

As I indicated earlier in my remarks, the House bill proposes to extend the act for a 2-year period rather than for a 3-year period as provided in the Senate bill. You will recall that the original proposal by the administration in 1961 was for a 5-year program and the House amendment conforms the program to this original estimate.

I might also point out that the House bill continues the $10 million authorization for the first year of the extended period only and requires special authorization by the Congress for the final year of the program. Under the Senate bill, the $10 million authorization would have been extended for each of the years in the extended period.

The House bill adds a new section requiring a special study by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare on the impact of compulsory school attendance and child labor laws on juvenile delinquency and youth offenses. This study requires an analysis of the experience under the child labor provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act and of the Walsh-Healey Public Contracts Act, administered by the Secretary of Labor and includes an analysis of State child labor laws as well. Some aspects of the study are thus, obviously, within the special competence of the Department of Labor while others touch on matters traditionally handled by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. I have been advised that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare has, for these reasons, expressed his intention to enlist the cooperation of the Department of Labor in developing this study.

A final difference between the House bill and the Senate bill may be found in section 1 of H.R. 9876 which broadens the scope of the demonstration projects authorized by the act to include projects for the evaluation or demonstration of the effectiveness of techniques for the establishment of high ethical and community standards.

The Federal policy expressed in the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act is even more significant and important today than it was in 1961 when the Congress enacted this legislation. The application of Federal resources to stimulate and to encourage the development and testing of techniques and practices for controlling juvenile delinquency has had a substantial impact thus far and continues to hold promise for developing effective methods and procedures for attacking these problems.

The Federal Government has invested $19 million in demonstration projects in 17 cities and in training grants to a substantial number of universities, foundations and various organizations for research, for the development of training centers, for workshops and for a variety of pilot programs. Completion of these projects will require continued support for another 2 years, within the original 5-year estimate made by the administration. Failure to extend the act would mean termination of these projects in this final stage of their development and would result in a tragic waste of resources and of opportunity.

Despite the fact that several members of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, including the able and distinguished chairman of the committee and myself, as the chairman of the subcommittee which first sent the Senate bill to the floor and then passed it, are not entirely happy with the protocol followed by the House, I now ask for passage of the House bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. What House number and order number is the bill?

Mr. CLARK. The House bill is H.R. 9876. It is not on our calendar. It has been held at the desk pending a polling of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, because of the lateness of the session, and the fact that the House bill is not so different from the Senate bill, to determine the views of the committee members on whether it would be wiser to pass the House bill.

The action of our committee was unanimous, with the reservation that I have stated.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a memorandum which I have caused to be prepared, outlining in somewhat greater detail the reasons why we believe the House bill should be adopted, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE 1964 AMENDMENTS TO THE JUVENILE DELINQUENCY AND YOUTH OFFENSES CONTROL ACT OF 1961; COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF S. 1967 WITH H.R. 9876

I. THE PROVISIONS OF THE JUVENILE DELINQUENCY AND YOUTH OFFENSES CONTROL ACT OF 1961

The Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act was enacted on September 22, 1961. This legislation recognized that the problem of dealing with juvenile delinquency was national in scope and required the application of the resources of the National Government to stimulate and encourage the development of methods and procedures for attacking these problems of youth in the various regions throughout the country.

The act contains three basic provisions:

1. It authorizes the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make grants to State, local, or other public or nonprofit agencies for projects to demonstrate techniques and practices for the prevention or control of juvenile delinquency or youth offenses.

2. It authorizes the Secretary to make grants to public or nonprofit agencies or institutions to develop courses of study and train personnel for employment in juvenile delinquency prevention or control programs.

3. It authorizes the Secretary to conduct studies, furnish technical assistance, and disseminate information relating to the prevention or control of juvenile delinquency.

Since the law was enacted, demonstration projects have been started in 12 communities, 7 of which are now engaged in full-scale operations.

Expenditures in supporting these projects and programs total approximately $19 million thus far, compared with the $30 million authorization in the 1961 act.

The Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offense Control Act is scheduled to expire on June 30, 1964, under the terms of the authorization section of the act.

Extension of the act is essential in order to permit the completion of the operational projects as well as those in the advanced planning phase.

II. EXTENSION OF AUTHORIZATION

S. 1967: The Senate bill extends the term of the act for 3 years. Under its provisions, the authorization period will continue until June 30, 1967.

H.R. 9876:

(A) The House bill provides for an extension for a 2-year period, thereby continuing the Federal delinquency program until June 30, 1966.

(B) It limits the $10 million authorization to the first year of the extended period and requires special authorization by the Congress for the second year.

III. OTHER PROVISIONS

S. 1967: The Senate bill makes no changes in the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act except for the 3-year extension described above.

H.R. 9876:

(A) The House bill broadens the scope of the demonstration projects authorized by section 3(a) of the act to include projects for the evaluation or demonstration of the effectiveness of "techniques for the establishment of high ethical and community standards."

(B) It adds a new section 8, requiring a special study by the Secretary of HEW on the impact of compulsory school attendance and child labor laws on juvenile delinquency and youth offenses. The new section directs the Secretary to file an interim report with the House and Senate Committees on Labor and to make a final report with recommendations to the President and to the Congress.

(C) It adds a new section 9, establishing a juvenile delinquency demonstration project for the District of Columbia and authorizes an additional $5 million for this purpose.

Mr. CLARK. At this point, I want especially to thank the ranking majority member of the subcommittee, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], for his effective attention to this legislation in the course of our consideration of the bill.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield to the distinguished Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, it is a privilege to join Senator CLARK, whose leadership is recognized in this field, in advocating this measure to our colleagues.

West Virginians are most interested in the program being carried forward at Charleston, where plans for the full-scale juvenile delinquency control project have recently been completed. The grant to date from the Federal agency is in excess of one-half million dollars. The action phase is now in its initial stages. Assistance under this bill promises to provide the means for continuing to develop a realistic frontal attack on this troublesome problem in our area.

Mr. President, I recall the testimony of several West Virginia civic leaders on Friday, August 16, 1963, in hearings on the Senate bill, S. 1967. I presided at that session, as a member of the Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower, which has jurisdiction over matters of this type.

Judge W. J. Thompson is president of the Youth Community, Inc., and Action for Appalachian Youth, Inc., board of directors, numbering 25 able citizens, representative of a wide range of vitally interested groups and political subdivisions. This group and its staff have designed an effective program to aid dropouts, unemployed youth, delinquents and potential delinquents in the capital city and Kanawha County.

My colleagues, Senator ROBERT C. BYRD and Representative JOHN M. SLACK, Jr., as well as other legislators from our State, have been supporters of the project. We have said in effect that the endeavor would be a blueprint for the State and for other problem areas in the Appalachian region.

Funds to complete the national program and specifically the West Virginia projects, are to be available in the $10 million which is an authorization for fiscal year ending June 30, 1965. An additional authorization of like amount will be enacted, I hope, by the Congress for fiscal 1966. This is an investment in building a better community and a better America. We must continue the work now underway if the purpose so merited is to be realized.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator from West Virginia. I should be happy to answer questions which may occur to any Senator.

If there are none, I ask for action on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H.R. 9876) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

HARRIS COUNTY COURT COMMISSIONER MEMORIALIZES FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION ON ITS 30TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the 30th anniversary of the Federal Housing Administration, June 27, 1964, provides an opportune time to look back at the tremendous achievements of this agency and this Nation of homeowners.

The Commissioners' Court of Harris County, including Houston, the sixth largest city in the Nation, recognizing the importance of the Federal Housing Administration and that rapidly growing, metropolitan gulf coast complex, has passed unanimously a resolution of tribute to the FHA and in particular the national leaders of FHA and Harris County Director Neal Picket "for the contribution made to this county and to the Nation in creating a better country for all citizens in a free America." This fine resolution pays tribute to the role of the Federal Housing Administration in making America a nation of homeowners. I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be printed in the RECORD as representative of the nationwide achievements of the Federal Housing Administration.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas June 27, 1964, marks the 30th anniversary of the creation of the Federal Housing Administration under the leadership of President Franklin D. Roosevelt; and

Whereas the insured financing offered under the Federal Housing Administration has made the United States of America a Nation of homeowners; and

Whereas the Federal Housing Administration has in its past 30 years and will continue into the future to be an instrument of aid in the elimination of slums and blighted conditions; and

Whereas from the first home built under Federal Housing Administration-insured financing until this anniversary, the agency has contributed to the total value of free enterprise business in excess of $90 billion on loans and mortgages to approximately 30 million families; and

Whereas the growth of Harris County has been stimulated and assisted by the new concepts of the Federal Housing Administration that have revolutionized the building and lending institutions of this county as well as those of this Nation; and

Whereas the program of the Federal Housing Administration continues to aid Harris County toward the goal of a "decent home in a decent neighborhood for every citizen": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Commissioners' Court of Harris County, Tex., does hereby recognize the 30th anniversary of the Federal Housing Administration and commends the national leaders of the agency and in particular the Harris County Director, Neal Pickett, for the contribution made to this county and to the Nation in creating a better country for all citizens in a free America.

It is hereby ordered that this resolution be spread upon the minutes of the court.

Passed in open court this 25th day of June 1964.

BILL ELLIOTT,
County Judge.
W. KYLE CHAPMAN,
Commissioner.
V. V. RAMSEY,
Commissioner.
PHILIP E. SAYERS,
Commissioner.
E. A. LYONS, Jr.,
Commissioner.

NUECES COUNTY DEMOCRATIC CONVENTION COMMENDS WORK OF DEMOCRATIC DELEGATION IN CONGRESS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, Mr. J. W. Agee, secretary of the Nueces County Democratic Convention has informed me by signed letter of a resolution passed May 9, 1964, at that convention which reflects credit to the Texas delegation to the U.S. Congress for many of its achievements, including support of President Johnson.

It expresses appreciation to Congressman JOHN YOUNG of the 14th Congressional District which includes Nueces County and commends work that I have been able to accomplish because of the great interest of the Congress in education, conservation and its willingness to provide funds for storm protection.

I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas our great President is aided in his legislative efforts by an outstanding Democratic delegation in the Congress of the United States under the able leadership of Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH and Congressman JOHN YOUNG: Be it

Resolved, That we hereby strongly commend our said Democratic nominee, the senior Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH and heartily endorse him for reelection and hereby recognize his outstanding leadership and ability on such projects as the National Seashore on Padre Island, storm protection for Corpus Christi, conservation of national natural resources, and his battle for educational opportunity and vocational training; be it further

Resolved, That we commend and heartily endorse Congressman JOHN YOUNG because of untiring efforts in our behalf on such projects as our port, the cattle industry, and other projects for his district: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That Nueces County Democrats proudly recognize its good congressional leadership and support the reelection of the senior Senator of Texas, RALPH YARBOROUGH and Congressman JOHN LONG.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1965—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10433) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of today.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, as this bill passed the Senate it provided for appropriations totaling $1,042,436,425 for the agencies and bureaus of the Department of the Interior, exclusive of the Bureau of Reclamation and power marketing agencies, and the various related agencies, including the U.S. Forest Service.

The conference committee bill provides appropriations totaling $1,028,277,200 for the programs and activities of these agencies. This total is under the budget estimates of $1,035,961,000 by $7,683,800; over the House bill of $1,009,175,600 by $19,101,600; and under the Senate bill of $1,042,436,425 by $14,159,225.

I ask unanimous consent to have included in the RECORD, at the conclusion of my remarks, a tabulation setting out the appropriation for the current year, the budget estimate, the House allowance, the Senate allowance, and the conference allowance for each appropriation in the bill.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Item	Appropriations, 1964	Budget estimates, 1965 and 1964 supplementals	House allowance	Senate allowance	Conference allowance	Conference allowance compared with—		
						Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR								
PUBLIC LAND MANAGEMENT								
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT								
Management of lands and resources	$46,652,500	$45,372,000	$45,372,000	$45,372,000	$45,372,000			
Construction	300,000	1,400,000	1,100,000	1,100,000	1,100,000	−$300,000		
Public lands development roads and trails (liquidation of contract authorization)	760,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000			
Oregon and California grant lands (indefinite appropriation of receipts)	(9,000,000)	(8,250,000)	(8,250,000)	(8,250,000)	(8,250,000)			
Range improvements (indefinite appropriation of receipts)	(1,248,000)	(1,523,000)	(1,523,000)	(1,523,000)	(1,523,000)			
Total, Bureau of Land Management	47,712,500	48,772,000	48,472,000	48,472,000	48,472,000	−300,000		
BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS								
Education and welfare services	89,235,250	96,910,000	95,200,000	97,578,500	95,868,500	−1,041,500	+$668,500	−$1,710,000
Resources management	38,191,300	40,728,000	40,178,000	40,490,000	40,390,000	−338,000	+212,000	−100,000
Revolving fund for loans	2,000,000							
Revolving fund for loans (1964 supplemental estimate)		900,000	900,000	900,000	900,000			
Construction	59,300,000	51,176,000	46,700,000	55,009,000	52,009,000	+833,000	+5,309,000	−3,000,000
Road construction (liquidation of contract authorization)	15,000,000	17,000,000	17,000,000	17,210,000	17,000,000			−210,000
General administrative expenses	4,265,000	4,331,000	4,331,000	4,331,000	4,331,000			
Menominee educational grants	132,000	88,000	88,000	88,000	88,000			
Total, Bureau of Indian Affairs, exclusive of tribal funds	208,123,550	211,133,000	204,397,000	215,606,500	210,586,500	−546,500	+6,189,500	−5,020,000
Tribal funds (not included in totals of this tabulation)	(3,000,000)	(3,000,000)	(3,000,000)	(3,000,000)	(3,000,000)			
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE								
Management and protection	27,349,000	29,712,000	29,000,000	29,150,000	29,075,000	−637,000	+75,000	−75,000
Maintenance and rehabilitation of physical facilities	21,966,750	23,500,000	23,100,000	23,100,000	23,100,000	−400,000		
Construction	32,697,000	25,406,000	23,800,000	28,049,125	27,373,600	+1,967,600	+3,573,600	−675,525
Construction (land acquisition) (1964 supplemental estimate)		3,700,000	3,700,000	4,700,000	4,700,000	+1,000,000	+1,000,000	
Construction (liquidation of contract authorization)	29,000,000	30,000,000	29,000,000	29,122,500	29,000,000	−1,000,000		−122,500
General administrative expenses	2,136,750	2,412,000	2,325,000	2,325,000	2,325,000	−87,000		
Total, National Park Service	113,149,500	114,730,000	110,925,000	116,446,625	115,573,600	+843,600	+4,648,600	−873,025
BUREAU OF OUTDOOR RECREATION								
Salaries and expenses	1,900,000	2,700,000	2,700,000	2,322,000	2,700,000			+378,000
OFFICE OF TERRITORIES								
Administration of territories	13,000,000	18,814,000	15,300,000	16,300,000	15,300,000	−3,514,000		−1,000,000
Administration of territories (1964 supplemental estimate)		11,464,000	10,000,000	11,464,000	10,000,000	−1,464,000		−1,464,000
Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands	15,000,000	17,500,000	17,500,000	17,500,000	17,500,000			
Limitation on administrative expenses, Virgin Islands Corporation	(186,000)	(156,000)	(156,000)	(156,000)	(156,000)			
Total, Office of Territories	28,000,000	47,778,000	42,800,000	45,264,000	42,800,000	−4,978,000		−2,464,000
Total, Public Land Management	398,885,550	425,113,000	409,294,000	428,111,125	420,132,100	−4,980,900	+10,838,100	−7,979,025
MINERAL RESOURCES								
GEOLOGICAL SURVEY								
Surveys, investigations, and research	63,700,000	68,623,000	65,930,000	67,682,000	67,165,000	−1,458,000	+1,235,000	−517,000
BUREAU OF MINES								
Conservation and development of mineral resources	29,404,000	30,346,000	30,100,000	30,295,000	30,100,000	−246,000		−195,000
Health and safety	8,664,000	9,511,000	9,300,000	9,485,000	9,300,000	−211,000		−185,000
General administrative expenses	1,460,000	1,410,000	1,410,000	1,410,000	1,410,000			
Helium fund (borrowing authorization)	(6,000,000)	(20,000,000)	(14,000,000)	(14,000,000)	(14,000,000)			
Total, Bureau of Mines	39,528,000	41,267,000	40,810,000	41,190,000	40,810,000	−457,000		−380,000
OFFICE OF COAL RESEARCH								
Salaries and expenses	5,075,000	6,836,000	6,336,000	6,836,000	6,836,000		+500,000	
OFFICE OF MINERALS EXPLORATION								
Salaries and expenses	850,000	900,000	850,000	850,000	850,000	−50,000		

Item	Appropriations, 1964	Budget estimates, 1965 and 1964 supplementals	House allowance	Senate allowance	Conference allowance	Conference allowance compared with—		
						Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
OFFICE OF OIL AND GAS								
Salaries and expenses	$615,500	$660,000	$660,000	$660,000	$660,000			
Total, Mineral Resources	109,768,500	118,286,000	114,586,000	117,218,000	116,321,000	−$1,965,000	+$1,735,000	−$897,000
FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE								
OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONER OF FISH AND WILDLIFE								
Salaries and expenses	386,000	393,000	425,000	425,000	425,000	+32,000		
BUREAU OF COMMERCIAL FISHERIES								
Management and investigations of resources	17,832,900	20,631,000	17,832,900	19,069,900	18,819,900	−1,811,100	+987,000	−250,000
Management and investigations of resources (appropriation of receipts)			(2,125,000)	(2,125,000)	(2,125,000)	(+2,125,000)		
Management and investigations of resources (1964 supplemental estimate)		100,000				−100,000		
Management and investigations of resources (special foreign currency program)	300,000	300,000	300,000	300,000	300,000			
Construction	5,100,000	4,788,000	4,788,000	4,788,000	4,788,000			
Construction of fishing vessels	750,000							
General administrative expenses	653,000	676,000	667,000	667,000	667,000	−9,000		
Administration of Pribilof Islands (appropriation of receipts)	(2,468,000)	(2,442,000)	(2,442,000)	(2,442,000)	(2,442,000)			
Limitation of administrative expenses, fisheries loan fund	(270,000)	(277,000)	(277,000)	(277,000)	(277,000)			
Total, Bureau of Commercial Fisheries	24,635,900	26,495,000	23,587,900	24,824,900	24,574,900	−1,920,100	+987,000	−250,000
BUREAU OF SPORT FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE								
Management and investigations of resources	30,529,900	34,359,000	33,550,000	34,330,000	33,810,000	−549,000	+260,000	−520,000
Management and investigations of resources (1964 supplemental estimate)		300,000				−300,000		
Construction	5,293,500	3,593,000	6,074,700	7,275,300	7,016,200	+3,423,200	+941,500	−259,100
Migratory bird conservation account	10,000,000	8,000,000	8,000,000	8,000,000	8,000,000			
General administrative expenses	1,359,000	1,384,000	1,384,000	1,384,000	1,384,000			
Total, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife	47,182,400	47,636,000	49,008,700	50,989,300	50,210,200	+2,574,200	+1,201,500	−779,100
Total, Fish and Wildlife Service	72,204,300	74,524,000	73,021,600	76,239,200	75,210,100	+686,100	+2,188,500	−1,029,100
THE ALASKA RAILROAD								
Payment to the Alaska Railroad revolving fund (1964 supplemental estimate)	20,000,000							
OFFICE OF SALINE WATER								
Salaries and expenses	10,000,000	10,650,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	−650,000		
Construction, operation, and maintenance	1,850,000	2,300,000	2,250,000	2,300,000	2,250,000	−50,000		−50,000
Total, Office of Saline Water	11,850,000	12,950,000	12,250,000	12,300,000	12,250,000	−700,000		−50,000
OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR								
Salaries and expenses	4,000,000	4,173,000	4,173,000	4,230,600	4,223,000	+50,000	+50,000	−7,600
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY								
Salaries and expenses	3,858,400	4,125,000	4,065,000	4,110,500	4,110,500	−14,500	+45,500	
Total, definite appropriations	620,566,750	639,171,000	617,389,600	642,209,425	632,246,700	−6,924,300	+14,857,100	−9,962,725
Total, appropriation of receipts	12,716,000	12,215,000	14,340,000	14,340,000	14,340,000	+2,125,000		
Total, borrowing authorizations	6,000,000	20,000,000	14,000,000	14,000,000	14,000,000	−6,000,000		
Total, title I, Department of the Interior	639,282,750	671,386,000	645,729,600	670,549,425	660,586,700	−10,799,300	+14,857,100	−9,962,725
TITLE II—RELATED AGENCIES								
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE								
FOREST SERVICE								
Forest protection and utilization:								
Forest land management	160,962,000	149,919,000	148,596,000	150,419,000	149,944,000	+25,000	+1,348,000	−475,000
Forest research	25,893,000	29,944,000	30,019,000	32,728,000	31,685,000	+1,741,000	+1,666,000	−1,043,000
State and private forestry cooperation	15,943,000	16,955,000	16,955,000	16,955,000	16,955,000			
Total, forest protection and utilization	202,798,000	196,818,000	195,570,000	200,102,000	198,584,000	+1,766,000	+3,014,000	−1,518,000
Forest roads and trails (liquidation of contract authorization)	63,200,000	72,000,000	70,300,000	70,300,000	70,300,000	−1,700,000		
Acquisition of lands for national forests:								
Wasatch National Forest	250,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000			
Special acts (appropriation of reciepts)	(70,000)	(70,000)	(70,000)	(70,000)	(70,000)			
Cooperative range improvements (appropriation of receipts)	(700,000)	(700,000)	(700,000)	(700,000)	(700,000)			
Assistance to States for tree planting	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000			
Total, definite appropriations	267,248,000	269,968,000	267,020,000	271,552,000	270,034,000	+66,000	+3,014,000	−1,518,000
Total, appropriation of receipts	770,000	770,000	770,000	770,000	770,000			
Total, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture	268,018,000	270,738,000	267,790,000	272,322,000	270,804,000	+66,000	+3,014,000	−1,518,000
FEDERAL COAL MINE SAFETY BOARD OF REVIEW								
Salaries and expenses	65,000	70,000	65,000	70,000	67,500	−2,500	+2,500	−2,500
COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS								
Salaries and expenses	91,000	161,000	120,000	120,000	120,000	−41,000		

Item	Appropriations, 1964	Budget estimates, 1965 and 1964 supplementals	House allowance	Senate allowance	Conference allowance	Conference allowance compared with—		
						Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE								
PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE								
Indian health activities	$59,697,750	$61,576,000	$61,500,000	$61,935,000	$61,620,000	+$44,000	+$120,000	−$315,000
Construction of Indian health activities	6,100,000	8,643,000	8,000,000	10,385,000	8,335,000	−308,000	+335,000	−2,050,000
Total, Public Health Service	65,797,750	70,219,000	69,500,000	72,320,000	69,955,000	−264,000	+455,000	−2,365,000
INDIAN CLAIMS COMMISSION								
Salaries and expenses	297,000	313,000	310,000	310,000	310,000	−3,000		
NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION								
Salaries and expenses	650,000	774,000	650,000	725,000	665,000	−109,000	+15,000	−60,000
Land acquisition, National Capital park, parkway and playground system (1964 supplemental estimate)		1,300,000	500,000	550,000	550,000	−750,000	+50,000	
Land acquisition, John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts (1964 supplemental estimate)		2,000,000	2,000,000	2,175,000	2,175,000	+175,000	+175,000	
Total, National Capital Planning Commission	650,000	4,074,000	3,150,000	3,450,000	3,390,000	−684,000	+240,000	−60,000
SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION								
John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts (1964 supplemental estimate)		15,500,000	15,500,000	15,500,000	15,500,000			
Salaries and expenses	13,191,000	14,794,000	15,000,000	15,000,000	15,000,000	+206,000		
Remodeling of Civil Service Commission Building	5,465,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000			
Construction and improvements, National Zoological Park	1,275,000	1,776,000	1,275,000	1,776,000	1,525,000	−251,000	+250,000	−251,000
National Air Museum	511,000	1,364,000	1,364,000	1,364,000	1,364,000			
Salaries and expenses, National Gallery of Art	2,176,000	2,147,000	2,147,000	2,147,000	2,147,000			
Total, Smithsonian Institution	22,618,000	36,581,000	36,286,000	36,787,000	36,536,000	−45,000	+250,000	−251,000
TRANSITIONAL GRANTS TO ALASKA								
Grants	3,000,000							
Grants (1964 supplemental estimate)	17,000,000							
Total, transitional grants to Alaska	20,000,000							
CIVIL WAR CENTENNIAL COMMISSION								
Expenses	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000			
NATIONAL CAPITAL TRANSPORTATION AGENCY								
Salaries and expenses	1,000,000	500,000	(500,000)	(500,000)	(500,000)	−500,000		
CORREGIDOR-BATAAN MEMORIAL COMMISSION								
Salaries and expenses (1964 supplemental estimate)		11,000				−11,000		
Salaries and expenses		25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000			
VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION								
Construction (1964 supplemental estimate)		1,500,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	−1,400,000		
Total, Corregidor-Bataan memorial		1,536,000	125,000	125,000	125,000	−1,411,000		
FEDERAL RECONSTRUCTION AND PLANNING COMMISSION FOR ALASKA								
Salaries and expenses (1964 supplemental estimate)	150,000							
ALASKA TEMPORARY CLAIMS COMMISSION								
Salaries and expenses (1964 supplemental estimate)		33,000		33,000	33,000		+33,000	
COMMISSION ON THE STATUS OF PUERTO RICO								
Salaries and expenses (1964 supplemental estimate)		250,000		250,000	250,000		+250,000	
Total, definite appropriations	378,016,750	383,805,000	376,676,000	385,117,000	380,920,500	−2,884,500	+4,244,500	−4,196,500
Total, appropriation of receipts	770,000	770,000	770,000	770,000	770,000			
Total, title II, related agencies	378,786,750	384,575,000	377,446,000	385,887,000	381,690,500	−2,884,500	+4,244,500	−4,196,500
Grand total	1,018,069,500	1,055,961,000	1,023,175,600	1,056,436,425	1,042,277,200	−13,683,800	+19,101,600	−14,159,225
Consisting of:								
Direct appropriations, 1965	998,583,500	985,918,000	961,365,600	991,654,425	978,959,200	−6,958,800	+17,593,600	−12,695,225
Appropriation of receipts, 1965	13,486,000	12,985,000	15,110,000	15,110,000	15,110,000	+2,125,000		
Borrowing authorization, 1965	6,000,000	20,000,000	14,000,000	14,000,000	14,000,000	−6,000,000		
Supplemental appropriations, 1964		37,058,000	32,700,000	35,672,000	34,208,000	−2,850,000	+1,508,000	−1,464,000

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield for a question?

Mr. HAYDEN. I am delighted to yield to the junior Senator from Montana for a question.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, let me say, first, that I am most grateful to the conferees, particularly the distinguished senior Senator from Arizona, and to Mr. Eaton of his committee staff, for their understanding of Montana needs, and prompt action to restore facilities destroyed and damaged in the disastrous June 8 flood. I do wish to put one question concerning Lower Two Medicine Dam.

When my colleague [Mr. MANSFIELD] and I submitted the floor amendment on the pending bill, concerning the additional money needed by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, National Park Service and Public Health Service, I spoke about several of the facilities which could be replaced were the money provided. I stated, on page 14607 of the RECORD for June 22, that "$4 million would replace the Lower Two Medicine Dam, which washed out." The conference committee has provided $1 million for preconstruction work on this dam.

There have been discussions, going back well before the flood, among Interior Department officials, concerning possible increase of the height of Lower Two Medicine Dam, in order to provide additional storage for irrigation.

Whether or not the height of the dam should be increased, and the storage capacity of the reservoir thus increased, is a matter which requires careful study, particularly inasmuch as national park and Indian lands are involved. It is my understanding that it is not the intent of Congress, in voting preconstruction funds for Lower Two Medicine Dam, to direct that the height of the dam be increased.

It may be that the additional storage is desirable and needed. It may also be that the disadvantages of a higher dam outweigh its advantages. Congress should have more information on this point before a decision is reached.

My question, then, is this: Will a decision on a possible increase in the height of the dam be deferred until the Department of the Interior has had time to report fully on the alternatives, and until we have had an opportunity to hear the views of persons who would be directly affected?

Mr. HAYDEN. It is my understanding that the decision will be deferred.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. COTTON. I should like to inquire of the distinguished chairman of the committee, or some other conferee, how many appropriation items or projects that were put into the bill by the Senate were disapproved by the House conferees?

Mr. HAYDEN. I do not know the total number. There were several.

Mr. COTTON. Can any Senator tell me the exact number?

Mr. HAYDEN. There was $14,139,000 worth of projects which the Senate put in that the House did not accept.

Mr. COTTON. One of the projects which was disapproved, I understand, was one in the amount of approximately $203,000 for the renovation, repair, and improvement of the Federal Fish Hatchery in Berlin, N.H. Am I correct in that statement?

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator is correct. We did our best to persuade the House conferees to accept it, but they were adamant. They said they would not do so.

Mr. COTTON. The House conferees absolutely refused to accept that particular item?

Mr. HAYDEN. They did.

Mr. COTTON. I should like to ask, if it is proper, whether they gave some particular reason why they did not consider that item proper for inclusion in the bill?

Mr. HAYDEN. They merely said they could not take it now. I think that perhaps in another year there will be a possibility.

Mr. COTTON. They could not take it now?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. COTTON. The distinguished chairman does not know why they objected?

Mr. HAYDEN. I do not.

Mr. COTTON. Were there any other fish industry appropriations that were rejected?

Mr. HAYDEN. One in the State of Arkansas was omitted.

Mr. COTTON. There were two for the State of Arkansas, and the conferees merely left one out.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. COTTON. Is any conferee able to tell the Senate to what the House conferees objected? Did the House conferees tell any other Senate Member of the conference? Obviously they did not tell our distinguished chairman.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. We pressed the House conferees hard on that point, since New Hampshire was the only State that was completely denuded of the proposed fish hatchery improvements that we had recommended. I agree with the distinguished chairman of our committee that our effort was futile. The House conferees were adamant. They simply said "No." I believe there was some indication that perhaps there might be a change of heart a year from now, but I was present throughout the conference and I heard no convincing or unconvincing reason except the very definite adherence to their negative position.

Mr. COTTON. Does the Senator recall the last time an item was included in the Interior appropriation bill for the State of New Hampshire?

Mr. MUNDT. I do not; but I do recall when the subject came before the Senate. At that time the Senator from South Dakota said, "I cannot remember New Hampshire ever coming before us in past years for any item in the bill." If the proposal has any merit at all, it should be included.

The clerk of our committee assured us that it did have merit. I felt, in justice to New Hampshire, which also is a taxpaying Commonwealth, that it should not be denied funds for improvement of its fish hatcheries, which we normally provide for fish hatcheries around the country which are in need of such assistance.

Mr. COTTON. I can quite understand that neither the distinguished chairman nor the distinguished minority member would be able to give any real reason for this action. However, there is no doubt in the minds of some of us as to exactly what the reason was. As carefully as I can phrase what I have to say, so that I will not violate the rule by any type of criticism of our companion body, I think the RECORD had better show very clearly what happened. In the first place, so far as the senior Senator from New Hampshire is concerned, he is not going out and weep bitterly over this. The people of New Hampshire, which is a poor State and has its problems, but which has gotten along for a great many years without any particular abundance of pork barrel contributions by anybody, can get along this year. New Hampshire can even get along next year.

The distinguished junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MCINTYRE], who is somewhat handicapped in this debate because he is the present occupant of the chair, is entitled to considerable credit, because he, along with the senior Senator from New Hampshire, on the recommendation of the service that operates these hatcheries, secured the inclusion of the colossal sum of $203,600 in a bill which carries $1,028 million; $203,600 for a State that, as long as I have been a Member of Congress—and I have been a Member of both branches now for 18 years—has not had a single item in the bill. There may have been times, but I do not remember when the State of New Hampshire has had one single item in the Interior appropriation bill. It has been the privilege of the senior Senator from New Hampshire to serve for 5 years on the Appropriations Committee of the House, and he is now serving on the Appropriations Committee of the Senate. There never has been a time when he has taken advantage of the fact that his own State and his own section did not have, and did not require, any particular appropriation under the bill. He has never made use of the fact to begrudge the Western and other States that figure largely, and justifiably so, in these appropriations.

Through the efforts of my colleague—and I want him to have the major share of the credit—this item was included. I yield my colleague much credit, because whatever may be the practice of others, when it comes to matters of the public good, there never will be a time when my colleague the junior Senator and I will not legislate and vote honestly for the best interests of the people of New Hampshire and the Nation.

Here are the facts, as I understand them. A distinguished Member of the other body, for whom I have profound respect, and with whom I served on the Appropriations Committee for the House, has made no secret of the fact that he desired to punish two men, one of them the Representative from the district in which this hatchery is located. The reason he is to be punished is that he dared to raise his voice in the other body to the distinguished chairman of the committee on which he was serving, who had, according to the allegations of the Congressman, many people on his patronage who never came near Washington at all. And apparently there was enough truth in what the Representative from the Second District of New Hampshire had to say so that that distinguished chairman of the committee was not even renominated by his own party in the recent primary. The other man to be punished is the senior Senator from New Hampshire, and the reason he is to be punished is that he dared and presumed, according to the dictates of his best judgment and conscience, to vote against a fish aquarium in the city of Washington that happened to be a pet project of the distinguished Member of the House.

So in order to punish the Representative from the district and the Senator from New Hampshire, one of them for daring to express what he believed to be the truth, and the other one for voting his own convictions—and in all the years I have been in the Congress I have never known of a Member to be punished because of his vote by a fellow Member—my good friend, my unfortunate friend, the junior Senator from the State of New Hampshire, who will obviously be a candidate for reelection 2 years from now in 1966, is made to suffer. I cannot support him, politically, as we are members of different political parties, but I like him and admire him, and I sincerely hope he will not be punished because the Republican Congressman from that district dared to speak and the Republican Senator from New Hampshire dared to vote their respective convictions.

I am confident that there will be a reconsideration before 1966, before my good friend comes up for reelection, and that this one small, paltry, but necessary, appropriation for the State of New Hampshire—the first one that it has had in this bill in my memory—will probably be restored. And I pledge myself to my friend and colleague from New Hampshire I will try to be good. I will try, not to say any untactful things. I will try, so far as my conscience will permit, not to cast a single vote from now until next year that might be offensive to any autocrat in the House of Representatives or anywhere else. Although it will be my painful duty to oppose my friend because of political reasons, I am very fond of him as a person. I could not ask for a better man, personally, with whom to serve in the Senate.

(Mr. McGEE assumed the chair as Presiding Officer.)

Mr. COTTON. I shall try to be good and not tread on anyone's toes from now until my colleague has obtained an appropriation for the Berlin Hatchery.

The Senator from New Hampshire will not be a party to the use of spite and spleen as criteria for the approval or disapproval of appropriations requests, and it is his earnest hope that his view is shared by the great majority of his colleagues in the Senate and the Members of the other body.

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. McINTYRE. I shared the disappointment of my senior colleague when we were informed last Friday that this item for the Berlin Fish Hatchery had been stricken from the appropriation bill by the action of the House conferees.

When this matter first came to my attention, in March of this year, I wrote to every member of the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee urging that funds for this fish hatchery be included in the bill.

I was very pleased when the funds were approved by the committee and remained intact during the Senate debate.

I join my senior colleague in expressing the thought that New Hampshire has gotten along pretty well over the years without too much of the so-called pork barrel.

It is a shame that this particular item, which was recommended by the agency concerned with promoting the development of sport fishing and wildlife services, should fall by the wayside.

When it first came to my attention that funds for the Berlin Fish Hatchery had been stricken, any attempt to restore them that I could make at that moment would have been in vain. I join in the hope that, along with West Virginia, we in New Hampshire may have improved fish hatchery facilities at Berlin for the enjoyment of our sportsmen.

I am very appreciative of the remarks of my distinguished senior colleague with respect to the good social relationship that we have enjoyed here. I regret very much to hear that he is already planning to oppose me—not personally, but as a representative of his party. I am confident that we can enjoy the same good behavior on his part, so that somehow or other we can get a little help now and then for the State of New Hampshire, which both of us love and try to represent here to the best of our ability.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield so I may ask a question of my colleague?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. COTTON. In the first place, I am sure my colleague understands that when I speak of opposing him I merely speak from the standpoint of party loyalty, which all of us have.

Mr. McINTYRE. I understand.

Mr. COTTON. Is it not the understanding of my good friend and colleague from New Hampshire that this small sum for the fish hatchery was included because of the fact that the equipment and the buildings were deteriorating, and would further deteriorate if steps were not taken to repair and preserve them?

Mr. McINTYRE. That is my understanding.

Mr. COTTON. So that waiting for 1 year for some purpose or other—possibly for the chastisement of someone—will not militate to the good of the taxpayers in regard to this particular item?

Mr. McINTYRE. It most assuredly will not.

Mr. COTTON. I would not want to embarrass my colleague. I do not want to involve him in the slightest degree in the heavy disgrace that has fallen upon me because I dared to vote against the fish aquarium, or involve the distinguished members of his party, but I am tempted to ask my colleague this question. I will not ask him what he has found out or what he has asked or who has told him what. I simply ask my colleague whether he knows of any real reason concerning this particular appropriation that caused the House conferees to refuse even to consider it.

Mr. McINTYRE. I would have to preface my remarks by saying that I was not a member of the conference committee. I have heard testimony this afternoon as to what was said and what was not said. It seems apparent from what the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. Mundt] has indicated, that this item met with firm resistance, and never had a chance. I might inquire of the Senator from Arizona whether there will be such a thing as a deficiency appropriation for Interior Department appropriations in January. Is there a possibility of such a thing?

Mr. HAYDEN. A deficiency bill will come up early in the next session of Congress.

Mr. McINTYRE. Ordinarily, though, it does not include any construction projects. Is that correct?

Mr. HAYDEN. No. It is to take care of cases in which the money runs short on something already established.

Mr. McINTYRE. I do not know whether there is any precedent for it, but I intend to press the members of the Appropriations Committee most intimately concerned with the problem to get the $203,600 appropriation for this hatchery. If there is a deficiency or supplemental which might cover this item, I will try to get it included. I hope my senior colleague will join me in that attempt, provided he remains a good boy.

Mr. COTTON. Probably the best way I can help him is to be very meek from now until then.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Is the Cheraw Hatchery contained in this bill?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I thank the Senator for that. As the Senator knows, two hatcheries had been included at one time, one at Cheraw and another at Orangeburg. Before the matter came to the committee, the hatchery at Orangeburg had been stricken. The hatchery at Cheraw was included. The Senate approved that hatchery. I thank the Senator for passing favorably upon the Cheraw Fish Hatchery.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I ask the distinguished chairman whether the two items in Florida, which were added by our committee, one at Olustee, Fla., for $70,000, for research into the matter of decreasing the cost of producing pine gum, that appropriation being made to the Forest Service laboratory, and the other, for $16,000, for planning and specifications for a timber and range management station at Fort Myers, Fla., are in the bill as it is now before us.

Mr. HAYDEN. Both of those appropriation items remain in the bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished chairman. I wish him to know and I want the Record to show that I regard these two projects as very necessitous items, which will pay off very greatly by the type of work that they will do and the type of information they will make available.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the

Senate to House bill 10433, which was read as follows:

In the House of Representatives, U.S.,
June 29, 1964.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 40, and 42 to the bill (H.R. 10433) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes," and concur therein.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 43, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken and proposed by said amendment, insert: "received by the Board for the benefit of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts to July 1, 1964, and available or used for expenditures directly incident to the planning, contracting, and construction of the Center."

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed, insert:

"COMMISSION ON THE STATUS OF PUERTO RICO

"Salaries and expenses

"For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of Public Law 88–271, approved February 20, 1964, $250,000, to remain available until June 30, 1966."

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 43 and 46.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

The motion was agreed to.

APPOINTMENTS BY THE PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McINTYRE in the chair). The Chair announces, on behalf of the President pro tempore, that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] is assigned to the U.S. delegation to the Interparliamentary Union Conference, which is scheduled to meet in Copenhagen in August 1964, in lieu of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], who has resigned.

The Chair further announces that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] have been designated as alternate delegates to this conference.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL NOON TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the business for today has been completed, the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT TO ALASKA OMNIBUS ACT PROVIDING FOR ASSISTANCE TO EARTHQUAKE STRICKEN ALASKA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1059, S. 2881, and that it be made the pending business. No action will be taken on the bill today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2881) to amend the Alaska Omnibus Act to provide assistance to the State of Alaska for the reconstruction of areas damaged by the earthquake of March 1964, and subsequent seismic waves, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments, on page 4, line 19, after the word "Act.", to insert The Administrator may increase the capital grant for a project assisted under this section to not more than 90 per centum of net project costs in communities the population of which is six thousand persons or less, as determined by the 1960 census of the United States Department of Commerce, including but not limited to the communities of Seward, Kodiak, Valdez, and Seldovia, where the Administrator determines that a major portion of the project area has either been rendered unusable as a result of the 1964 earthquake and subsequent seismic waves or is needed in order adequately to provide, in accordance with the urban renewal plan for the project, new locations for persons, businesses, and facilities displaced by the earthquake and subsequent seismic waves."; on page 5, line 13, after the word "Alaska", to insert "and in areas in California and Washington declared to be earthquake disaster areas in Federal Register Document 64–3574, filed April 10, 1964,"; and on page 6, line 13, after the word "seismic", to strike out "waves:" and insert "waves, or to complete capital improvements begun prior to the earthquake:"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "1964 Amendments to the Alaska Omnibus Act".

Sec. 2. The Congress hereby recognizes that the State of Alaska has experienced extensive property loss and damage as a result of the earthquake of March 27, 1964, and subsequent seismic waves, and declares the need for special measures designed to aid and accelerate the State's efforts in providing for the reconstruction of the areas in the State devastated by this natural disaster.

Sec. 3. Section 21 of the Alaska Omnibus Act (73 Stat. 145) is amended by adding a new subsection (f) to read as follows:

(f) Notwithstanding the limitation contained in subsection (f) of section 120 of title 23, United States Code, the Secretary of Commerce is authorized to make expenditures from the emergency fund under section 125 of such title for the repair or reconstruction of highways on the Federal-aid highway systems of Alaska which have been damaged or destroyed by the 1964 earthquake and subsequent seismic waves, in accordance with the Federal share payable under subsection (a) of section 120 of such title. The increase in expenditures resulting from the difference between the Federal share authorized by this subsection and that authorized by subsection (f) of section 120 of such title shall be reimbursed to the emergency fund by an appropriation from the general fund of the Treasury: *Provided,* That such increase in expenditures shall not exceed $15,000,000 in the aggregate."

Sec. 4. The Alaska Omnibus Act (73 Stat. 141) is amended by adding the following new sections at the end of section 50 thereof:

"NEW FEDERAL LOAN ADJUSTMENTS

"Sec. 51. (a) The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to compromise or release such portion of a borrower's indebtedness under programs administered by the Farmers Home Administration in Alaska as he finds necessary because of loss resulting from the 1964 earthquake and subsequent seismic waves, and he may refinance outstanding indebtedness of applicants in Alaska for loans under section 502 of the Housing Act of 1949 for the repair, reconstruction, or replacement of dwellings or farm buildings lost, destroyed, or damaged by such causes and securing such outstanding indebtedness. Such loans may also provide for the purchase of building sites, when the original sites cannot be utilized.

"(b) The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to compromise or release such portion of a borrower's indebtedness under programs administered by the Rural Electrification Administration in Alaska as he finds necessary because of loss, destruction, or damage of property resulting from the 1964 earthquake and subsequent seismic waves.

"Sec. 52. The Housing and Home Finance Administrator is authorized to compromise or release such portion of any note or other obligation held by him with respect to property in Alaska pursuant to title II of the Housing Amendments of 1955 or included within the revolving fund for liquidating programs established by the Independent Offices Appropriation Act of 1955, as he finds necessary because of loss, destruction, or damage to facilities securing such obligations by the 1964 earthquake and subsequent seismic waves.

"URBAN RENEWAL

"Sec. 53. The Housing and Home Finance Administrator is authorized to enter into contracts for grants not exceeding $25,000,000 for urban renewal projects in Alaska, including open land projects, under section 111 of the Housing Act of 1949, which he determines will aid the communities in which they are located in reconstruction and redevelopment made necessary by the 1964 earthquake and subsequent seismic waves. Such authorization shall be in addition to and separate from any grant authorization contained in section 103(b) of said Act. The Administrator may increase the capital grant for a project assisted under this section to not more than 90 per centum of net project costs in communities the population of which is six thousand persons or less, as determined by the 1960 census of the United States Department of Commerce, including but not limited to the communities of Seward, Kodiak, Valdez, and Seldovia, where the Administrator determines that a major portion of the project area has either been rendered unusable as a result of the 1964 earthquake and subsequent seismic waves or is needed in order adequately to provide, in accordance with the urban renewal plan for the project, new locations for persons, businesses, and facilities displaced by the earthquake and subsequent seismic waves.

"EXTENSION OF TERM OF HOME DISASTER LOANS

"Sec. 54. Loans made pursuant to paragraph (1) of section 7(b) of the Small Business Act (72 Stat. 387), as amended (15

U.S.C. 636(b)), for the purpose of replacing, reconstructing, or repairing dwellings in Alaska and in areas in California and Washington declared to be earthquake disaster areas in Federal Register Document 64–3574, filed April 10, 1964, damaged or destroyed by the 1964 earthquake and subsequent seismic waves, may have a maturity of up to thirty years: *Provided*, That the provisions of section 7(c) of said Act shall not be applicable to such loans.

"MODIFICATION OF CIVIL WORKS PROJECTS

"SEC. 55. The Chief of Engineers, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, is hereby authorized to make such modifications to previously authorized civil works projects in Alaska adversely affected by the 1964 earthquake and subsequent seismic waves as he finds necessary to meet changed conditions and to provide for current and reasonably prospective requirements of the communities they serve, at an estimated cost of $10,000,000.

"PURCHASE OF ALASKA STATE BONDS

"SEC. 56. The Housing and Home Finance Administrator is authorized to purchase, in accordance with the provisions of sections 202(b), 203 and 204 of title II of the Housing Amendments of 1955, the securities and obligations of, or make loans to, the State of Alaska to finance any part of the programs needed to carry out the reconstruction activities in Alaska related to the 1964 earthquake and subsequent seismic waves, or to complete capital improvements begun prior to the earthquake: *Provided*, That the aggregate amount of such purchase or loan shall not exceed $25,000,000."

APPROPRIATION AUTHORIZATION

SEC. 5. There is authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act, which shall be available for obligation until June 30, 1967. There is also authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the expenses of such advisory commissions or committees as the President may establish in connection with the reconstruction and development planning of the State of Alaska.

TERMINATION DATE

SEC. 6. The authority contained in this Act shall expire on June 30, 1967, except that such expiration shall not affect the payment of expenditures for any obligation or commitment entered into under this Act prior to June 30, 1967.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, no action will be taken on the bill tonight; it will be the pending business for consideration by the Senate tomorrow.

PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS BY ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION TO EXISTING AGREEMENTS FOR COOPERATION WITH SEVEN COUNTRIES

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I wish to inform the Senate that pursuant to section 123c. of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, the Atomic Energy Commission has submitted to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy proposed modifications to existing agreements for cooperation with seven countries. These countries are: The Kingdom of Greece, Iran, Republic of China, Republic of Vietnam, Kingdom of Thailand, Republic of France, and the Argentine Republic. Section 123c. of the act requires that such agreements lay before the committee for a period of 30 days before they become effective. The proposed amendment to the Agreement for Cooperation with the Republic of France was received by the Joint Committee on June 24. The other proposed amendments were received on June 9, 1964.

The subcommittee plans to hold public hearings on these proposed modifications on Tuesday, June 30, at 2 p.m., in the Joint Committee's open hearing room.

In keeping with the regular practice of the committee of informing Congress of the pendency of these matters, I ask unanimous consent, as chairman of the Joint Committee's Subcommittee on Agreements for Cooperation, to have printed at this point in the RECORD the text of the proposed amendments to the agreements for cooperation and the supporting correspondence.

There being no objection, the proposed amendments and the correspondence were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., June 9, 1964.

Hon. JOHN O. PASTORE,
Chairman, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Congress of the United States.

DEAR SENATOR PASTORE: Pursuant to section 123c of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, there are submitted with this letter:

(a) An executed amendment to the Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Kingdom of Greece Concerning Civil Uses of Atomic Energy;

(b) A copy of a letter from the Commission to the President recommending approval of the amendment; and

(c) A copy of a letter from the President to the Commission containing his determination that its performance will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security, approving the amendment and authorizing its execution.

The amendment, which has been negotiated by the Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, modifies and extends the Agreement for Cooperation with the Kingdom of Greece which was signed at Washington on August 4, 1955, as amended by the agreements signed on June 11, 1960, April 3, 1962, and June 22, 1962.

Under articles I and II of the amendment, the word "lease" as it appears in article II A and D of the agreement is changed to the word "transfer" and in article VI C of the agreement, the word "leased" is changed to the word "transferred" in order to permit either the lease or sale of enriched uranium for fueling defined research reactors. There is no immediate intent on the part of the Commission to change its policy of leasing fuel for research reactors. However, this change will permit the Commission flexibility to lease or sell such fuel should unforeseen circumstances require a change in that policy during the 10-year extension of the agreement.

Article I of the amendment also adds to article II of the agreement provisions with respect to the retention of title by the Government of the Kingdom of Greece to fuel purchased under the agreement, and with respect to rights in special nuclear material produced as a result of the irradiation processes. In addition, article I of the amendment modifies article II of the agreement to make provision for the reprocessing of source or special nuclear material received from the United States to be performed in other than Commission facilities. These same provisions are contained in agreements for cooperation with other countries.

Article III of the amendment provides for the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Kingdom of Greece to promptly request the International Atomic Energy Agency to assume responsibility for applying safeguards to materials and facilities subject to safeguards under the agreement. The transfer of this responsibility to the agency would be accomplished without further modification of the agreement by means of a trilateral agreement to be negotiated between the United States, Greece, and the agency.

Article IV of the amendment extends the agreement for a period of 10 years beyond its expiration date of August 3, 1964.

The amendment will enter into force when the two Governments have exchanged written notifications that their respective statutory and constitutional requirements have been fulfilled.

Sincerely,

GLENN T. SEABORG,
Chairman.

AMENDMENT TO AGREEMENT FOR COOPERATION BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE GOVERNMENT OF THE KINGDOM OF GREECE CONCERNING CIVIL USES OF ATOMIC ENERGY

The Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Kingdom of Greece,

Desiring to amend the Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Kingdom of Greece Concerning Civil Uses of Atomic Energy, signed at Washington on August 4, 1955 (hereinafter referred to as the "Agreement for Cooperation"), as amended by the Agreements signed at Washington on June 11, 1960, April 3, 1962, and June 22, 1962;

Agree as follows:

ARTICLE I

Article II of the Agreement for Cooperation, as amended, is further amended as follows:

1. Substitute the word "transfer" for the word "lease" wherever said word appears in paragraph A.

2. The following new sentence is added at the end of paragraph B:

"It is understood and agreed that although the Government of the Kingdom of Greece may distribute uranium enriched in the isotope U^{235} to authorized users in Greece, the Government of the Kingdom of Greece will retain title to any uranium enriched in the isotope U^{235} which is purchased from the Commission at least until such time as private users in the United States of America are permitted to acquire title in the United States of America to uranium enriched in the isotope U^{235}."

3. Paragraph C is hereby amended to read as follows:

"C. It is agreed that when any source or special nuclear material received from the United States of America requires reprocessing, such reprocessing shall be performed at the discretion of the Commission in either Commission facilities or facilities acceptable to the Commission, on terms and conditions to be later agreed; and it is understood, except as may be otherwise agreed, that the form and content of any irradiated fuel shall not be altered after its removal from the reactor and prior to delivery to the Commission or the facilities acceptable to the Commission for reprocessing."

4. Delete the word "lease" as said word appears in paragraph D and substitute in lieu thereof the word "transfer."

5. The following new paragraphs E and F are added to Article II:

"E. Special nuclear material produced in any part of fuel leased hereunder as a result of irradiation processes shall be for the account of the Government of the Kingdom of Greece, and after reprocessing as provided in paragraph C of this Article, shall be returned to the Government of the Kingdom of Greece, at which time title to such material shall be transferred to that Government, unless the Government of the United States of America shall exercise the option, which is hereby granted, to retain, with appropriate credit to the Government of the Kingdom of Greece, any such special nuclear material which is in excess of the needs of Greece for such material in its program for the peaceful uses of atomic energy.

"F. With respect to any special nuclear material not subject to the option referred to in paragraph E of this Article and produced in reactors fueled with materials obtained from the United States of America which is in excess of the needs of Greece for such material in its program for the peaceful uses of atomic energy, the Government of the United States of America shall have and is hereby granted (a) a first option to purchase such material at prices then prevailing in the United States of America for special nuclear material produced in reactors which are fueled pursuant to the terms of an agreement for cooperation with the Government of the United States of America, and (b) the right to approve the transfer of such material to any other nation or group of nations in the event the option to purchase is not exercised."

ARTICLE II

Article VI, paragraph C, of the Agreement for Cooperation is amended by deleting the word "leased" and substituting in lieu thereof the word "transferred".

ARTICLE III

Article VII (A) of the Agreement for Cooperation, as amended, is further amended to read as follows:

"A. The Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Kingdom of Greece, recognizing the desirability of making use of the facilities and services of the International Atomic Energy Agency, agree that the Agency will be promptly requested to assume responsibility for applying safeguards to materials and facilities subject to safeguards under this Agreement for Cooperation. It is contemplated that the necessary arrangements will be effected without modification of this Agreement, through an agreement to be negotiated between the Parties and the Agency which may include provisions for suspension of the safeguard rights accorded the Commission by Article VI, paragraph C, of this Agreement during the time and to the extent that the Agency's safeguards apply to such materials and facilities.

"B. In the event the Parties do not reach a mutually satisfactory agreement on the terms of the trilateral arrangement envisaged in paragraph A of this Article, either Party may by notification terminate this Agreement. In the event of termination by either Party, the Government of the Kingdom of Greece shall, at the request of the Government of the United States of America, return to the Government of the United States of America all special nuclear material received pursuant to this Agreement and in its possession or in the possession of persons under its jurisdiction. The Government of the United States of America will compensate the Government of the Kingdom of Greece for such returned material at the current United States Commission's schedule of prices then in effect domestically."

ARTICLE IV

Article VIII of the Agreement for Cooperation, as amended, is further amended by deleting the date "August 3, 1964" and substituting in lieu thereof the date "August 3, 1974".

ARTICLE V

This Amendment shall enter into force on the date on which each Government shall have received from the other Government written notification that it has complied with all statutory and constitutional requirements for the entry into force of such Amendment and shall remain in force for the period of the Agreement for Cooperation, as hereby amended.

In witness whereof, the undersigned, duly authorized, have signed this Amendment.

Done at Washington, in duplicate, this eighth day of June 1964.

For the Government of the United States of America:

PHILLIPS TALBOT,
Assistant Secretary, Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs, U.S. Department of State.

GLENN T. SEABORG,
Chairman, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission.

For the Government of the Kingdom of Greece:

ALEXANDER A. MATSAS,
Ambassador.

Certified to be a true copy:

EARLE W. COOK,
Division of International Affairs,
U.S. Atomic Energy Commission.

U.S. ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., April 16, 1964.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Atomic Energy Commission recommends that you approve the enclosed proposed "Amendment to Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Kingdom of Greece Concerning the Civil Uses of Atomic Energy," determine that its performance will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security, and authorize its execution. The Department of State supports the Commission's recommendation.

The proposed amendment which has been negotiated by the Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, would revise and extend the agreement between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Kingdom of Greece which was signed at Washington on August 4, 1955, as amended by the Agreements signed on June 11, 1960, April 3, 1962, and June 22, 1962.

The present agreement with Greece now contains a provision in article II that the Commission will lease uranium enriched in the isotope U^{235} to Greece for fueling defined research reactors. While there is no immediate intent to change Commission policy of leasing fuel for research reactors, it is believed that, in view of the proposed 10-year extension of the agreement, flexibility to lease or sell this material should be provided. Accordingly, articles I and II of the proposed amendment would substitute the word "transfer" for the word "lease" in article II A and D and the word "transferred" for the word "leased" in article VI C of the agreement.

Article I of the proposed amendment also adds to article II of the agreement provisions with respect to retention of title by the Government of the Kingdom of Greece to fuel purchased under the agreement, and with respect to rights in special nuclear material produced as a result of the irradiation processes. In addition, article I of the proposed amendment modifies article II of the agreement to make provision for the reprocessing of source or special nuclear material received from the United States to be performed in other than Commission facilities. These same provisions are contained in agreements for cooperation with other countries.

In keeping with U.S. policy that it is timely for us to arrive at an explicit understanding with those countries with which we have agreements as to the transfer of safeguards to the International Atomic Energy Agency, provision has been made in article III of the proposed amendment that the Agency will be promptly requested to assume responsibility for applying safeguards to materials and facilities subject to safeguards under the agreement. The transfer of this responsibility to the Agency would be effected without further modification of the agreement by means of a trilateral agreement to be negotiated between the Government of the United States of America, the Government of the Kingdom of Greece, and the Agency.

Article IV of the proposed amendment provides for the extension of the agreement for a period of 10 years beyond its expiration date of August 3, 1964.

Following your determination, approval, and authorization, the proposed amendment will be formally executed by appropriate authorities of the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Kingdom of Greece. In compliance with section 123c of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, the proposed amendment will then be placed before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Respectfully yours,

GLENN T. SEABORG,
Chairman.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, June 2, 1964.

Hon. GLENN T. SEABORG,
U.S. Atomic Energy Commission,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR DR. SEABORG: In accordance with section 123a of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, the Atomic Energy Commission has submitted to me certain amendments to agreements for cooperation between the Government of the United States of America and certain foreign countries concerning the civil uses of atomic energy and has recommended that I approve each such proposed amendment, determine that its performance will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security, and authorize its execution. The amendments so submitted are listed herewith:

Amendment to Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of China Concerning the Civil Uses of Atomic Energy (transmitted by letter of Apr. 16, 1964).

Amendment to Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Kingdom of Greece Concerning the Civil Uses of Atomic Energy (transmitted by letter of Apr. 16, 1964).

Amendment to Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Kingdom of Thailand Concerning the Civil Uses of Atomic Energy (transmitted by letter of Apr. 16, 1964).

Amendment to Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Vietnam Concerning the Civil Uses of Atomic Energy (transmitted by letter of Apr. 16, 1964).

Amendment to Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Argentine Republic Concerning the Civil Uses of Atomic Energy (transmitted by letter of May 5, 1964).

Amendment to Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Iran Concerning the Civil Uses of Atomic Energy (transmitted by letter of May 5, 1964).

Pursuant to the provisions of 123–b of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and upon the recommendation of the Atomic Energy Commission, I hereby:

(a) Approve each of the proposed amendments listed above, and determine that the performance of each of these agreements as amended will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security of the United States of America;

(b) Authorize the execution of each of the proposed Amendments on behalf of the Government of the United States of America by appropriate authorities of the Department of State and the Atomic Energy Commission.

Sincerely,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

U.S. ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., June 9, 1964.

Hon. JOHN O. PASTORE,
Chairman, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Congress of the United States.

DEAR SENATOR PASTORE: Pursuant to section 123c of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, there are submitted with this letter:

(a) An executed "Amendment to the Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Iran Concerning the Civil Uses of Atomic Energy";

(b) A copy of a letter from the Commission to the President recommending approval of the amendment; and

(c) A copy of a letter from the President to the Commission containing his determination that its performance will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security, and approving the amendment and authorizing its execution.

The amendment, which has been negotiated by the Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, modifies in certain respects the agreement for cooperation between the United States of America and Iran which was signed on March 5, 1957, and which entered into force April 27, 1959.

Under article I of the amendment the word "lease" as it appears in paragraphs 1 and 4 of article IV of the agreement is changed to the word "transfer" in order to permit either the lease or sale of enriched uranium for fueling defined research reactors. There is no immediate intent on the part of the Commission to change its policy of leasing fuel for research reactors. However, this change will permit the Commission flexibility to lease or sell such fuel should unforeseen circumstances require a change in that policy during the 5-year extension of the agreement.

Article I of the amendment also permits the Commission to furnish material enriched to more than 20 percent in the isotope U^{235} for purposes of fueling defined research reactors.

In addition, article I of the amendment adds to article IV of the agreement provisions with respect to retention of title by Iran to fuel purchased under the agreement, and with respect to rights in special nuclear material produced as a result of the irradiation processes. Additionally, article I of the amendment makes provision in article IV of the agreement for the reprocessing of source or special nuclear material received from the United States to be performed in other than Commission facilities. These same provisions are contained in agreements for cooperation with other countries.

Article II of the amendment removes the limitation on quantities of research materials which may be provided under article V of the agreement and makes such materials available on an "as may be agreed" basis.

Article III of the amendment provides for comprehensive safeguards to be substituted for the minimal safeguards now contained in article VIII of the agreement.

Article IV of the amendment provides for the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Iran to promptly request the International Atomic Energy Agency to assume responsibility for applying safeguards to materials and facilities subject to safeguards under the agreement. The transfer of this responsibility to the agency would be accomplished by means of a trilateral agreement to be negotiated between the United States, Iran, and the agency.

Article V of the amendment would extend the agreement for a period of 5 years to April 26, 1969.

When the agreement expired on April 26, 1964, the Department of State obtained assurances from the Embassy of Iran that during the interim period between the lapse of the agreement and the entry into force of the amendment, Iran would continue to adhere to its obligations under the agreement. The amendment will enter into force when the two governments have exchanged written notifications that their respective statutory and constitutional requirements have been fulfilled.

Sincerely,

GLENN T. SEABORG,
Chairman.

AMENDMENT TO AGREEMENT FOR CORPORATION BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE GOVERNMENT OF IRAN CONCERNING CIVIL USES OF ATOMIC ENERGY

The Government of the United States of America and the Government of Iran,

Desiring to amend the Agreement for Corporation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Iran Concerning Civil Uses of Atomic Energy, signed at Washington on March 5, 1957 (hereinafter referred to as the "Agreement for Cooperation");

Agree as follows:

ARTICLE I

Article IV of the Agreement for Cooperation is amended as follows:

(a) Substitute the word "transfer" for the word "lease" wherever said word appears in paragraphs 1 and 4.

(b) The following new sentence is added at the end of paragraph 2:

"It is understood and agreed that although the Government of Iran may distribute uranium enriched in the isotope U^{235} to authorized users in Iran, the Government of Iran will retain title to any uranium enriched in the isotope U^{235} which is purchased from the Commission at least until such time as private users in the United States of America are permitted to acquire title in the United States of America to uranium enriched in the isotope U^{235}."

(c) Paragraph 3 is deleted in its entirety and the following substituted therefor:

"3. The Commission may, upon request and in its discretion, make available all or a portion of the enriched uranium supplied hereunder as material enriched to more than twenty percent (20%) in the isotope U^{235} for use in research reactors capable of operating with a fuel load not to exceed six (6) kilograms of the isotope U^{235} contained in such uranium."

(d) The following new paragraphs 5, 6, 7, and 8 are added to Article IV:

"5. It is agreed that when any source or special nuclear material received from the United States of America requires reprocessing, such reprocessing shall be performed at the discretion of the Commission in either Commission facilities or facilities acceptable to the Commission, on terms and conditions to be later agreed; and it is understood, except as may be otherwise agreed, that the form and content of any irradiated fuel shall not be altered after its removal from the reactor and prior to delivery to the Commission or the facilities acceptable to the Commission for reprocessing.

"6. Special nuclear material produced in any part of fuel leased hereunder as a result of irradiation processes shall be for the account of the Government of Iran and, after reprocessing as provided in paragraph 5 of this Article, shall be returned to the Government of Iran, at which time title to such material shall be transferred to that Government, unless the Government of the United States of America shall exercise the option, which is hereby granted, to retain, with appropriate credit to the Government of Iran, any such special nuclear material which is in excess of the needs of Iran for such material in its program for the peaceful uses of atomic energy.

"7. With respect to any special nuclear material not subject to the option referred to in paragraph 6 of this Article and produced in reactors fueled with materials obtained from the United States of America which is in excess of the needs of Iran for such material in its program for the peaceful uses of atomic energy, the Government of the United States of America shall have and is hereby granted (a) a first option to purchase such material at prices then prevailing in the United States of America for special nuclear material produced in reactors which are fueled pursuant to the terms of an Agreement for Cooperation with the Government of the United States of America, and (b) the right to approve the transfer of such material to any other nation or group of nations in the event the option to purchase is not exercised.

"8. Some atomic energy materials which the Commission may provide in accordance with this Agreement are harmful to persons and property unless handled and used carefully. After delivery of such materials to the Government of Iran, the Government of Iran shall bear all responsibility, insofar as the Government of the United States of America is concerned, for the safe handling and use of such materials. With respect to any source or special nuclear material or other reactor materials which the Commission may, pursuant to this Agreement, lease to the Government of Iran or to any private individual or private organization under its jurisdiction, the Government of Iran shall indemnify and save harmless the Government of the United States of America against any and all liability (including third party liability) for any cause whatsoever arising out of the production or fabrication, the ownership, the lease, and the possession and use of such source or special nuclear material or other reactor materials after delivery by the Commission to the Government of Iran or to any authorized private individual or private organization under its jurisdiction."

ARTICLE II

Article V of the Agreement for Cooperation is amended to read as follows:

"Materials of interest in connection with defined research projects related to the peaceful uses of atomic energy undertaken by the Government of Iran, including source material, special nuclear material, byproduct material, other radioisotopes, and stable isotopes, will be exchanged for research purposes in such quantities and under such terms and conditions as may be agreed when such materials are not available commercially."

ARTICLE III

Article VIII of the Agreement for Cooperation is amended to read as follows:

"1. The Government of the United States of America and the Government of Iran emphasize their common interest in ensuring that any material, equipment, or device made available to the Government of Iran pursuant to this Agreement shall be used solely for civil purposes.

"2. Except to the extent that the safeguards provided for in this Agreement are supplanted, as provided in Article IX (A), by safeguards of the International Atomic Energy Agency, the Government of the United States of America, notwithstanding any other provisions of this Agreement, shall have the following rights:

(a) With the objective of ensuring design and operation for civil purposes and permitting effective application of safeguards, to review the design of any

(i) reactor and

(ii) other equipment and devices the design of which the Commission determines to be relevant to the effective application of safeguards,

which are to be made available to the Government of Iran or persons under its jurisdiction by the Government of the United States of America or any person under its jurisdiction, or which are to use, fabricate, or process any of the following materials so made available: source material, special nuclear material, moderator material, or other material designated by the Commission;

(b) With respect to any source or special nuclear material made available to the Government of Iran or any person under its jurisdiction by the Government of the United States of America or any person under its jurisdiction and any source or special nuclear material utilized in, recovered from, or produced as a result of the use of any of the following materials, equipment, or devices so made available:

(i) source material, special nuclear material, moderator material, or other material designated by the Commission,

(ii) reactors,

(iii) any other equipment or device designated by the Commission as an item to be made available on the condition that the provisions of this subparagraph 2(b) will apply,

(A) to require the maintenance and production of operating records and to request and receive reports for the purpose of assisting in ensuring accountability for such material; and

(B) to require that any such material in the custody of the Government of Iran or any person under its jurisdiction be subject to all of the safeguards provided for in this Article and the guaranties set forth in Article IX.

(c) To require the deposit in storage facilities designated by the Commission of any of the special nuclear material referred to in subparagraph 2(b) of this Article which is not currently utilized for civil purposes in Iran and which is not purchased or retained by the Government of the United States of America pursuant to Article IV, paragraph 6 and paragraph 7(a) of this Agreement, transferred pursuant to Article IV, paragraph 7(b) of this Agreement, or otherwise disposed of pursuant to an arrangement mutually acceptable to the Parties;

(d) To designate, after consultation with the Government of Iran, personnel who, accompanied, if either Party so requests, by personnel designated by the Government of Iran, shall have access in Iran to all places and data necessary to account for the source and special nuclear materials which are subject to subparagraph 2(b) of this Article to determine whether there is compliance with this Agreement and to make such independent measurements as may be deemed necessary;

(e) In the event of non-compliance with the provisions of this Article, or the guaranties set forth in Article IX, and the failure of the Government of Iran to carry out the provisions of this Article within a reasonable time, to suspend or terminate this Agreement and require the return of any materials, equipment, and devices referred to in subparagraph 2(b) of this Article;

(f) To consult with the Government of Iran in the matter of health and safety.

"3. The Government of Iran undertakes to facilitate the application of the safeguards provided for in this Article."

ARTICLE IV

The following new article is added directly after Article IX of the Agreement for Cooperation:

"ARTICLE IX (A)

"1. The Government of the United States of America and the Government of Iran, recognizing the desirability of making use of the facilities and services of the International Atomic Energy Agency, agree that the Agency will be promptly requested to assume responsibility for applying safeguards to materials and facilities subject to safeguards under this Agreement for Cooperation. It is contemplated that the necessary arrangements will be effected without modification of this Agreement, through an agreement to be negotiated between the Parties and the Agency which may include provisions for suspension of the safeguard rights accorded the Commission by Article VIII of this Agreement during the time and to the extent that the Agency's safeguards apply to such materials and facilities.

"2. In the event the Parties do not reach a mutually satisfactory agreement on the terms of the trilateral arrangement envisaged in paragraph 1 of this Article, either Party may by notification terminate this Agreement. In the event of termination by either Party, the Government of Iran shall, at the request of the Government of the United States of America, return to the Government of the United States of America all special nuclear material received pursuant to this Agreement and in its possession or in the possession of persons under its jurisdiction. The Government of the United States of America will compensate the Government of Iran for such returned material at the current United States Commission's schedule of prices then in effect domestically."

ARTICLE V

The first sentence of paragraph 1 of Article XI of the Agreement for Cooperation is amended by deleting the phrase "five years" and substituting in lieu thereof the phrase "ten years".

ARTICLE VI

This Amendment shall enter into force on the date on which each Government shall have received from the other Government written notification that it has complied with all statutory and constitutional requirements for the entry into force of such Amendment and shall remain in force for the period of the Agreement for Cooperation, as hereby amended.

In witness whereof, the undersigned, duly authorized, have signed this Amendment.

Done at Washington, in duplicate, this eighth day of June 1964.

For the Government of the United States of America:

JAMES P. GRANT,
Deputy Assistant Secretary, Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs, U.S. Department of State.

GLENN T. SEABORG,
Chairman, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission.

For the Government of Iran:

MAHMOUD FOROUGHI,
Ambassador.

Certified to be a true copy:

EARLE W. COOK,
Division of International Affairs,
U.S. Atomic Energy Commission.

U.S. ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., May 5, 1964.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Atomic Energy Commission recommends that you approve the enclosed proposed "Amendment to Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Iran Concerning the Civil Uses of Atomic Energy," determine that its performance will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security, and authorize its execution. The Department of State supports the Commission's recommendation.

The proposed amendment which has been negotiated by the Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, would revise the agreement between the United States of America and Iran which was signed on March 5, 1957, and which entered into force for a period of 5 years on April 27, 1959.

The present agreement with Iran now contains a provision in article IV that the Commission will lease uranium enriched up to 20 percent in the isotope U^{235} to Iran for fueling defined research reactors. While there is no immediate intent to change Commission policy of leasing fuel for research reactors, it is believed that, in view of the proposed 5-year extension of the agreement, flexibility to lease or sell this material should be provided. Accordingly, article I of the proposed amendment substitutes the word "transfer" for the word "lease" in article IV, paragraphs 1 and 4 of the agreement. Additionally, since the research reactor which Iran is building with U.S. assistance requires 90 percent enriched fuel, article I of the proposed amendment would revise article IV of the agreement to provide that the Commission, upon request and at its discretion, may make available material enriched to more than 20 percent in the isotope U^{235}.

Article I of the proposed amendment also adds to article IV of the agreement provisions with respect to retention of title by the Government of Iran to fuel purchased under the agreement, and with respect to rights in special nuclear material produced as a result of the irradiation processes. In addition, article I of the proposed amendment modifies article II of the agreement to make provision for the reprocessing of source or special nuclear material received from the United States to be performed in other than Commission facilities. These same provisions are contained in agreements for cooperation with other countries.

Article II of the proposed amendment removes the limitation contained in article V of the agreement on research quantitites of materials which may be made available for defined research projects. Such materials would now be made available on an "as may be agreed" basis when they are not commercially available.

Article III of the proposed amendment provides for the extension of comprehensive safeguards to materials and facilities made available to Iran rather than minimal safeguards as are now provided in article VIII of the agreement. The change in safeguards is required because of the increase in the enrichment of material and the removal of the limitation on research quantities of material which may be provided.

In keeping with U.S. policy that it is timely for us to arrive at an explicit understanding with those countries with which we have agreements as to the transfer of safeguards to the International Atomic Energy Agency, article IV of the proposed amendment adds a new article IX (A) to the agreement which provides that the agency will be promptly requested to assume responsibility for applying safeguards to materials and facilities subject to safeguards under the agreement. The transfer of this responsibility to the agency would be accomplished without further modification to the agreement by means of a trilateral agreement to be negotiated between the United States, Iran, and the agency.

Article V of the proposed amendment provides for an extension of the agreement for a 5-year period beyond its expiration date of April 26, 1964.

Following your determination, approval, and authorization, the proposed amendment will be formally executed by appropriate authorities of the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Iran. In compliance with section 123c of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, the proposed amendment will then be placed before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Respectfully yours,
GLENN T. SEABORG.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D.C., June 2, 1964.

Hon. GLENN T. SEABORG,
U.S. Atomic Energy Commission,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR DR. SEABORG: In accordance with section 123–a of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, the Atomic Energy Commission has submitted to me certain amendments to agreements for cooperation between the Government of the United States of America and certain foreign countries concerning the civil uses of atomic energy and has recommended that I approve each such proposed amendment, determine that its performance will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security, and authorize its execution. The amendments so submitted are listed herewith:

Amendment to Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of China Concerning the Civil Uses of Atomic Energy (transmitted by letter of Apr. 16, 1964).

Amendment to Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Kingdom of Greece Concerning the Civil Uses of Atomic Energy (transmitted by letter of Apr. 16, 1964).

Amendment to Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Kingdom of Thailand Concerning the Civil Uses of Atomic Energy (transmitted by letter of Apr. 16, 1964).

Amendment to Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Vietnam Concerning the Civil Uses of Atomic Energy (transmitted by letter of Apr. 16, 1964).

Amendment to Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Argentine Republic Concerning the Civil Uses of Atomic Energy (transmitted by letter of May 5, 1964).

Amendment to Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Iran Concerning the Civil Uses of Atomic Energy (transmitted by letter of May 5, 1964).

Pursuant to the provisions of 123–b of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and upon the recommendation of the Atomic Energy Commission, I hereby:

(a) Approve each of the proposed amendments listed above, and determine that the performance of each of these agreements as amended will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security of the United States of America;

(b) Authorize the execution of each of the proposed amendments on behalf of the Government of the United States of America by appropriate authorities of the Department of State and the Atomic Energy Commission.

Sincerely,
LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

U.S. ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., June 9, 1964.

Hon. JOHN O. PASTORE,
Chairman, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Congress of the United States.

DEAR SENATOR PASTORE: Pursuant to section 123c of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, there are submitted with this letter:

(a) An executed "Amendment to the Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of China Concerning the Civil Uses of Atomic Energy";

(b) A copy of a letter from the Commission to the President recommending approval of the amendment; and

(c) A copy of a letter from the President to the Commission containing his determination that its performance will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security, and approving the amendment and authorizing its execution.

The amendment, which has been negotiated by the Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, modifies and extends the Agreement for Cooperation with the Republic of China which was signed at Washington on July 18, 1955, and amended by agreements signed at Washington on December 8, 1958, June 11, 1960, and May 31, 1962.

Under articles I and II of the amendment, the word "lease" as it appears in article II–A and D of the agreement is changed to the word "transfer" and in article VI–C of the agreement the word "leased" is changed to the word "transferred" in order to permit either the lease or sale of enriched uranium for fueling defined research reactors. There is no immediate intent on the part of the Commission to change its policy of leasing fuel for research reactors. However, this change will permit the Commission flexibility to lease or sell such fuel should unforeseen circumstances require a change in that policy during the 10-year extension of the agreement.

Article I of the amendment also adds to article II of the agreement provisions with respect to the retention of title by China to fuel purchased under the agreement, and with respect to rights in speical nuclear material produced as a result of the irradiation processes. In addition, article I of the amendment modifies article II of the agreement to make provision for the reprocessing of source or special nuclear material received from the United States to be performed in other than Commission facilities. These same provisions are contained in agreements for cooperation with other countries.

Article III of the amendment provides for the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of China to promptly request the International Atomic Energy Agency to assume responsibility for applying safeguards to materials and facilities subject to safeguards under the agreement. The transfer of this responsibility to the agency would be accomplished without further modification of the agreement by means of a trilateral agreement to be negotiated between the United States, China, and the agency.

Article IV of the amendment extends the agreement for a period of 10 years beyond its expiration date of July 17, 1964.

The amendment will enter into force when the two Governments have exchanged written notifications that their respective statutory and constitutional requirements have been fulfilled.

Sincerely,
GLENN T. SEABORG,
Chairman.

AMENDMENT TO AGREEMENT FOR COOPERATION BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE GOVERNMENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF CHINA CONCERNING CIVIL USES OF ATOMIC ENERGY

The Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of China,

Desiring to amend the Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of China Concerning Civil Uses of Atomic Energy, signed at Washington on July 18, 1955 (hereinafter referred to as the "Agreement for Cooperation"), as amended by the Agreements signed at Washington on December 8, 1958, June 11, 1960, and May 31, 1962;

Agree as follows:

ARTICLE I

Article II of the Agreement for Cooperation is amended as follows:

1. Substitute the word "transfer" for the word "lease" wherever said word appears in paragraph A.

2. The following new sentence is added at the end of paragraph B:

"It is understood and agreed that although the Government of the Republic of China may distribute uranium enriched in the isotope U^{235} to authorized users in the Republic of China, the Government of the Republic of China will retain title to any uranium enriched in the isotope U^{235} which is purchased from the Commission at least until such time as private users in the United States of America are permitted to acquire title in the United States of America to uranium enriched in the isotope U^{235}."

3. Paragraph C is hereby amended to read as follows:

"C. It is agreed that when any source or special nuclear material received from the United States of America requires reprocessing, such reprocessing shall be performed at the discretion of the Commission in either Commission facilities or facilities acceptable to the Commission, on terms and conditions to be later agreed; and it is understood, except as may be otherwise agreed, that the form and content of any irradiated fuel shall not be altered after its removal from the reactor and prior to delivery to the Commission or the facilities acceptable to the Commission for reprocessing."

4. Delete the word "lease" as said word appears in paragraph D and substitute in lieu thereof the word "transfer".

5. The following new paragraphs E and F are added to Article II:

"E. Special nuclear material produced in any part of fuel leased hereunder as a result of irradiation processes shall be for the account of the Government of the Republic of China and after reprocessing as provided in paragraph C of this Article, shall be returned to the Government of the Republic of China, at which time title to such material shall be transferred to that Government, unless the Government of the United States of America shall exercise the option, which is hereby granted, to retain, with appropriate credit to the Government of the Republic of China, any such special nuclear material which is in excess of the needs of the Republic of China for such material in its program for the peaceful uses of atomic energy.

"F. With respect to any special nuclear material not subject to the option referred to in paragraph E of this Article and produced in reactors fueled with materials obtained from the United States of America which is in excess of the needs of the Republic of China for such material in its program for the peaceful uses of atomic energy, the Government of the United States of America shall have and is hereby granted (a) a first option to purchase such material at prices then prevailing in the United States of America for special nuclear material produced in reactors which are fueled pursuant to the terms of an agreement for cooperation with the Government of the United States of America, and (b) the right to approve the transfer of such material to any other nation or group of nations in the event the option to purchase is not exercised."

ARTICLE II

Article VI, paragraph C, of the Agreement for Cooperation is amended by deleting the word "leased" and substituting in lieu thereof the word "transferred".

ARTICLE III

Article VII (A) of the Agreement for Cooperation as amended is further amended to read as follows:

"1. The Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of China, recognizing the desirability of making use of the facilities and services of the International Atomic Energy Agency, agree that the Agency will be promptly requested to assume responsibility for applying safeguards to materials and facilities subject to safeguards under this Agreement for Cooperation. It is contemplated that the necessary arrangements will be effected without modification of this Agreement, through an agreement to be negotiated between the Parties and the Agency which may include provisions for suspension of the safeguard rights accorded the Commission by Article VI, paragraph C, of this agreement during the time and to the extent that the Agency's safeguards apply to such materials and facilities.

"2. In the event the Parties do not reach a mutually satisfactory agreement on the terms of the trilateral arrangement envisaged in paragraph 1 of this Article, either Party may by notification terminate this Agreement. In the event of termination by either Party, the Government of the Republic of China shall, at the request of the Government of the United States of America, return to the Government of the United States of America all special nuclear material received pursuant to this Agreement and in its possession or in the possession of persons under its jurisdiction. The Government of the United States of America will compensate the Government of the Republic of China for such returned material at the current United States Commission's schedule of prices then in effect domestically."

ARTICLE IV

Article VIII of the Agreement for Cooperation, as amended, is amended by deleting the date "July 17, 1964" and substituting in lieu thereof the date "July 17, 1974".

ARTICLE V

This Amendment shall enter into force on the date on which each Government shall have received from the other Government written notification that it has complied with all statutory and constitutional requirements for the entry into force of such Amendment and shall remain in force for the period of the Agreement for Cooperation, as amended.

In witness whereof, the undersigned, duly authorized, have signed this Amendment.

Done at Washington, in duplicate, this eighth day of June 1964.

For the Government of the United States of America:

MARSHALL GREEN,
Deputy Assistant Secretary, Far Eastern Affairs, U.S. Department of State.
GLENN T. SEABORG,
Chairman,
U.S. Atomic Energy Commission.

For the Government of the Republic of China:

TINGFU F. TSIANG,
Ambassador.

Certified to be a true copy:

EARLE W. COOK,
Division of International Affairs,
U.S. Atomic Energy Commission.

U.S. ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., April 16, 1964.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Atomic Energy Commission recommends that you approve the enclosed proposed "Amendment to Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of China Concerning the Civil Uses of Atomic Energy," determine that its performance will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security, and authorize its execution. The Department of State supports the Commission's recommendation.

The proposed amendment which has been negotiated by the Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, would revise and extend the agreement between the United States of America and China which was signed at Washington on July 18, 1955, as amended by agreements signed at Washington on December 8, 1958, June 11, 1960, and May 31, 1962.

The present agreement with China now contains a provision in article II that the Commission will lease uranium enriched in the isotope U^{235} to China for fueling defined research reactors. While there is no immediate intent to change Commission policy of leasing fuel for research reactors, it is believed that, in view of the proposed 10-year extension of the agreement, flexibility to lease or sell this material should be provided. Accordingly, articles I and II of the proposed amendment would substitute the word "transfer" for the word "lease" in article II–A and D and the word "transferred" for the word "leased" in article VI–C of the agreement.

Article I of the proposed amendment also adds to article II of the agreement provisions with respect to retention of title by the Government of the Republic of China to fuel purchased under the agreement, and with respect to rights in special nuclear material produced as a result of the irradiation processes. In addition, article I of the proposed amendment modifies article II of the agreement to make provision for the reprocessing of source or special nuclear material received from the United States to be performed in other than Commission facilities. These same provisions are contained in agreements for cooperation with other countries.

In keeping with U.S. policy that it is timely for us to arrive at an explicit understanding with those countries with which we have agreements as to the transfer of safeguards to the International Atomic Energy, provision has been made in article III of the proposed amendment that the agency will be promptly requested to assume responsibility for applying safeguards to materials and facilities subject to safeguards under the agreement. The transfer of this responsibility to the agency would be effected without further modification of the agreement by means of a trilateral agreement to be negotiated between the Government of the United States of America, the Government of the Republic of China, and the Agency.

Article IV of the proposed amendment provides for the extension of the agreement for a period of 10 years beyond its expiration date of July 17, 1964.

Following your determination, approval, and authorization, the proposed amendment will be formally executed by appropriate authorities of the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of China. In compliance with section 123c of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, the proposed amendment will then be placed before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Respectfully yours,

GLENN T. SEABORG,
Chairman.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, June 2, 1964.

Hon. GLENN T. SEABORG,
U.S. Atomic Energy Commission,
Washington.

DEAR DR. SEABORG: In accordance with section 123–a of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, the Atomic Energy Commission has submitted to me certain amendments to agreements for cooperation between the Government of the United States of America and certain foreign countries concerning the civil uses of atomic energy and has recommended that I approve each such proposed amendment, determine that its performance will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security, and authorize its execution. The amendments so submitted are listed herewith:

Amendment to Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of China Concerning the Civil Uses of Atomic Energy (transmitted by letter of April 16, 1964).

Amendment to Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Kingdom of Greece Concerning the Civil Uses of Atomic Energy (transmitted by letter of April 16, 1964).

Amendment to Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Kingdom of Thailand Concerning the Civil Uses of Atomic Energy (transmitted by letter of April 16, 1964).

Amendment to Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Vietnam Concerning the

Civil Uses of Atomic Energy (transmitted by letter of April 16, 1964).

Amendment to Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Argentine Republic Concerning the Civil Uses of Atomic Energy (transmitted by letter of May 5, 1964).

Amendment to Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Iran Concerning the Civil Uses of Atomic Energy (transmitted by letter of May 5, 1964).

Pursuant to the provisions of 123-b of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and upon the recommendation of the Atomic Energy Commission, I hereby:

(a) Approve each of the proposed amendments listed above, and determine that the performance of each of these agreements as amended will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security of the United States of America;

(b) Authorize the execution of each of the proposed amendments on behalf of the Government of the United States of America by appropriate authorities of the Department of State and the Atomic Energy Commission.

Sincerely,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

U.S. ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., June 9, 1964.

Hon. JOHN O. PASTORE,
Chairman, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Congress of the United States.

DEAR SENATOR PASTORE: Pursuant to section 123c of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, there are submitted with this letter:

(a) An executed "Amendment to the Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Vietnam Concerning the Civil Uses of Atomic Energy";

(b) A copy of a letter from the Commission to the President recommending approval of the amendment; and

(c) A copy of a letter from the President to the Commission containing his determination that its performance will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security, and approving the Amendment and authorizing its execution.

The Amendment, which has been negotiated by the Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, modifies and extends the Agreement for Cooperation with the Republic of Vietnam which was signed at Washington on April 22, 1959.

Under articles I and II of the amendment, the word "lease" as it appears in article IV, paragraphs 1 and 4 of the agreement, is changed to the word "transfer" and in article VIII, paragraph 3 of the agreement, the word "leased" is changed to the word "transferred" in order to permit either the lease or sale of enriched uranium for fueling defined research reactors. There is no immediate intent on the part of the Commission to change its policy of leasing fuel for research reactors. However, this change will permit the Commission flexibility to lease or sell such fuel should unforeseen circumstances require a change in that policy during the 10-year extension of the agreement.

Article I of the amendment also adds to article IV of the agreement provisions with respect to the retention of title by Vietnam to fuel purchased under the agreement, and with respect to rights in special nuclear material produced as a result of the irradiation processes. In addition, article I of the amendment modifies article IV of the agreement to make provision for the reprocessing of source or special nuclear material received from the United States to be performed in other than Commission facilities. These same provisions are contained in agreements for cooperation with other countries.

Article III of the amendment provides for the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Vietnam to promptly request the International Atomic Energy Agency to assume responsibility for applying safeguards to materials and facilities subject to safeguards under the agreement. The transfer of this responsibility to the Agency would be accomplished without further modification of the agreement by means of a trilateral agreement to be negotiated between the United States, Vietnam, and the Agency.

Article IV of the amendment extends the agreement for a period of 10 years beyond its expiration date of June 30, 1964.

The amendment will enter into force when the two governments have exchanged written notifications that their respective statutory and constitutional requirements have been fulfilled.

Sincerely,

GLENN T. SEABORG,
Chairman.

AMENDMENT TO AGREEMENT FOR COOPERATION BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE GOVERNMENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF VIETNAM CONCERNING CIVIL USES OF ATOMIC ENERGY

The Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Vietnam,

Desiring to amend the Agreement for Cooperation between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Vietnam Concerning Civil Uses of Atomic Energy, signed at Washington on April 22, 1959 (hereinafter referred to as the "Agreement for Cooperation");

Agree as follows:

ARTICLE I

Article IV of the Agreement for Cooperation is amended as follows:

a. Substitute the word "transfer" for the word "lease" wherever said word appears in paragraph 1.

b. The following new sentence is added at the end of paragraph 2:

"It is understood and agreed that although the Government of the Republic of Vietnam may distribute uranium enriched in the isotope U^{235} to authorized users in Vietnam, the Government of Vietnam will retain title to any uranium enriched in the isotope U^{235} which is purchased from the Commission at least until such time as private users in the United States of America are permitted to acquire title in the United States of America to uranium enriched in the isotope U^{235}."

c. Paragraph 3 is hereby amended to read as follows:

"3. It is agreed that when any source or special nuclear material received from the United States of America requires reprocessing, such reprocessing shall be performed at the discretion of the Commission in either Commission facilities or facilities acceptable to the Commission, on terms and conditions to be later agreed; and it is understood, except as may be otherwise agreed, that the form and content of any irradiated fuel shall not be altered after its removal from the reactor and prior to delivery to the Commission or the facilities acceptable to the Commission for reprocessing."

d. Delete the word "lease" as said word appears in paragraph 4 and substitute in lieu thereof the word "transfer".

e. The following new paragraphs 5 and 6 are added to Article IV:

"5. Special nuclear material produced in any part of fuel leased hereunder as a result of irradiation processes shall be for the account of the Government of Vietnam and after reprocessing as provided in paragraph 3 of this Article, shall be returned to the Government of Vietnam, at which time title to such material shall be transferred to that Government, unless the Government of the United States of America shall exercise the option, which is hereby granted, to retain, with appropriate credit to the Government of Vietnam, any such special nuclear material which is in excess of the needs of Vietnam for such material in its program for the peaceful uses of atomic energy.

"6. With respect to any special nuclear material not subject to the option referred to in paragraph 5 of this Article and produced in reactors fueled with materials obtained from the United States of America which is in excess of the needs of Vietnam for such material in its program for the peaceful uses of atomic energy, the Government of the United States of America shall have and is hereby granted (a) a first option to purchase such material at prices then prevailing in the United States of America for special nuclear material produced in reactors which are fueled pursuant to the terms of an agreement for cooperation with the Government of the United States of America, and (b) the right to approve the transfer of such material to any other nation or group of nations in the event the option to purchase is not exercised."

ARTICLE II

Article VIII, paragraph 3, of the Agreement for Cooperation is amended by deleting the word "leased" and substituting in lieu thereof the word "transferred".

ARTICLE III

Article X of the Agreement for Cooperation is amended to read as follows:

"A. The Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Vietnam, recognizing the desirability of making use of the facilities and services of the International Atomic Energy Agency, agree that the Agency will be promptly requested to assume responsibility for applying safeguards to materials and facilities subject to safeguards under this Agreement for Cooperation. It is contemplated that the necessary arrangements will be effected without modification of this Agreement, through an agreement to be negotiated between the Parties and the Agency which may include provisions for suspension of the safeguard rights accorded the Commission by Article VIII, paragraph 3, of this Agreement during the time and to the extent that the Agency's safeguards apply to such materials and facilities.

"B. In the event the Parties do not reach a mutually satisfactory agreement on the terms of the trilateral arrangement envisaged in paragraph A of this Article, either Party may by notification terminate this Agreement. In the event of termination by either Party, the Government of the Republic of Vietnam shall, at the request of the Government of the United States of America, return to the Government of the United States of America all special nuclear material received pursuant to this Agreement and in its possession or in the possession of persons under its jurisdiction. The Government of the United States of America will compensate the Government of the Republic of Vietnam for such returned material at the current United States Commission's schedule of prices then in effect domestically."

ARTICLE IV

Paragraph 1 of Article XII of the Agreement for Cooperation is amended by deleting the phrase "five years" and substituting in lieu thereof the phrase "fifteen years."

ARTICLE V

This Amendment shall enter into force on the date on which each Government shall have received from the other Government written notification that it has complied with all statutory and constitutional requirements for the entry into force of such Amendment and shall remain in force for the period of the Agreement for Cooperation as hereby amended.

In witness whereof, the undersigned, duly authorized, have signed this Amendment.

Done at Washington, in duplicate, this ninth day of June 1964.

For the Government of the United States of America:

MARSHALL GREEN,
Deputy Assistant Secretary, Far Eastern Affairs, U.S. Department of State.
GLENN T. SEABORG,
Chairman, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission.

For the Government of the Republic of Vietnam:

PHAM KHAC RAU,
Counselor, Charge d'Affaires ad interim.

Certified to be a true copy:

EARLE W. COOK,
Division of International Affairs, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission.

U.S. ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., April 16, 1964.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Atomic Energy Commission recommends that you approve the enclosed proposed "Amendment to Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Vietnam Concerning the Civil Uses of Atomic Energy," determine that its performance will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security, and authorize its execution. The Department of State supports the Commission's recommendation.

The proposed amendment, which has been negotiated by the Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, would revise and extend the agreement between the United States of America and Vietnam which was signed at Washington on April 22, 1959.

The present agreement with Vietnam now contains a provision in article IV that the Commission will lease uranium enriched in the isotope U^{235} to Vietnam for fueling defined research reactors. While there is no immediate intent to change Commission policy of leasing fuel for research reactors, it is believed that, in view of the proposed 10-year extension of the agreement, flexibility to lease or sell this material should be provided. Accordingly, articles I and II of the proposed amendment would substitute the word "transfer" for the word "lease" in article IV, paragraphs 1 and 4 and the word "transferred" for the word "leased" in article VIII, paragraph 3 of the agreement.

Article I of the proposed amendment also adds to article IV of the agreement provisions with respect to retention of title by the Government of the Republic of Vietnam to fuel purchased under the agreement, and with respect to rights in special nuclear material produced as a result of the irradiation processes.

In addition, article I of the proposed amendment modifies article IV of the agreement to make provision for the reprocessing of source or special nuclear material received from the United States to be performed in other than Commission facilities. These same provisions are contained in agreements for cooperation with other countries.

In keeping with U.S. policy that it is timely for us to arrive at an explicit understanding with those countries with which we have agreements as to the transfer of safeguards to the International Atomic Energy Agency, provision has been made in article III of the proposed amendment that the Agency will be promptly requested to assume responsibility for applying safeguards to materials and facilities subject to safeguards under this agreement. The transfer of this responsibility to the Agency would be effected without further modification of the agreement by means of a trilateral agreement to be negotiated between the Government of the United States of America, the Government of the Republic of Vietnam, and the Agency.

Article IV of the proposed amendment provides for the extension of the agreement for a period of 10 years beyond its expiration date of June 30, 1964.

Following your determination, approval, and authorization, the proposed amendment will be formally executed by appropriate authorities of the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Vietnam. In compliance with section 123-c of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, the proposed amendment will then be placed before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Respectfully yours,

GLENN T. SEABORG,
Chairman.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D.C., June 2, 1964.

Hon. GLENN T. SEABORG,
U.S. Atomic Energy Commission,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR DR. SEABORG: In accordance with section 123a of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, the Atomic Energy Commission has submitted to me certain amendments to agreements for cooperation between the Government of the United States of America and certain foreign countries concerning the civil uses of atomic energy and has recommended that I approve each such proposed amendment, determine that its performance will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security, and authorize its execution. The amendments so submitted are listed herewith:

Amendment to Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of China Concerning the Civil Uses of Atomic Energy (transmitted by letter of April 16, 1964).

Amendment to Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Kingdom of Greece Concerning the Civil Uses of Atomic Energy (transmitted by letter of April 16, 1964).

Amendment to Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Kingdom of Thailand Concerning the Civil Uses of Atomic Energy (transmitted by letter of April 16, 1964).

Amendment to Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Vietnam Concerning the Civil Uses of Atomic Energy (transmitted by letter of April 16, 1964).

Amendment to Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Argentine Republic Concerning the Civil Uses of Atomic Energy (transmitted by letter of May 5, 1964).

Amendment to Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Iran Concerning the Civil Uses of Atomic Energy (transmitted by letter of May 5, 1964).

Pursuant to the provisions of 123b of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and upon the recommendation of the Atomic Energy Commission, I hereby:

(a) Approve each of the proposed amendments listed above, and determine that the performance of each of these agreements as amended will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security of the United States of America;

(b) Authorize the execution of each of the proposed amendments on behalf of the Government of the United States of America by appropriate authorities of the Department of State and the Atomic Energy Commission.

Sincerely,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

U.S. ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., June 9, 1964.

Hon. JOHN O. PASTORE,
Chairman, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Congress of the United States.

DEAR SENATOR PASTORE: Pursuant to section 123c of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, there are submitted with this letter:

(a) An executed "amendment to the Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Kingdom of Thailand Concerning the Civil Uses of Atomic Energy," as amended;

(b) A copy of a letter from the Commission to the President recommending approval of the amendment; and

(c) A copy of a letter from the President to the Commission containing his determination that its performance will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security, and approving the amendment and authorizing its execution.

The amendment, which has been negotiated by the Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, modifies and extends the Agreement for Cooperation with the Kingdom of Thailand which was signed at Bangkok on March 13, 1956, and amended by agreements signed at Washington on March 27, 1957, June 11, 1960, and May 31, 1962.

Article I of the amendment provides for the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Kingdom of Thailand to promptly request the International Atomic Energy Agency to assume responsibility for applying safeguards to materials and facilities subject to safeguards under the agreement. The transfer of this responsibility to the Agency would be accomplished without further modification of the agreement by means of a trilateral agreement negotiated between the United States, Thailand, and the Agency.

Article II of the amendment extends the agreement for a period of 10 years to March 12, 1975.

The amendment will enter into force when the two Governments have exchanged written notifications that their respective statutory and constitutional requirements have been fulfilled.

Sincerely,

GLENN T. SEABORG,
Chairman.

AMENDMENT TO AGREEMENT FOR COOPERATION BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE GOVERNMENT OF THE KINGDOM OF THAILAND CONCERNING CIVIL USES OF ATOMIC ENERGY

The Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Kingdom of Thailand, Desiring to amend the Agreement for Cooperation between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Kingdom of Thailand Concerning Civil Uses of Atomic Energy, signed at Bangkok on March 13, 1956 (hereinafter referred to as the "Agreement for Cooperation"), as amended by the Agreements signed at Washington on March 27, 1957, June 11, 1960, and May 31, 1962;

Agree as follows:

ARTICLE I

Article IX (A) of the Agreement for Cooperation, as amended, is further amended to read as follows:

"A. The Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Kingdom of Thailand, recognizing the desirability of making use of the facilities and services of the International Atomic Energy Agency, agree that the Agency will be promptly requested to assume responsibility for applying safeguards to materials and facilities subject to safeguards under this Agreement for Cooperation. It is contemplated that the necessary arrangements will be effected without modification of this Agreement, through an agreement to be negotiated between the Parties and the Agency which may include provisions for suspension of the safeguard rights accorded the Commission by Article VI, paragraph B, of this Agreement during the time and to the extent that the Agency's safeguards apply to such materials and facilities.

"B. In the event the Parties do not reach a mutually satisfactory agreement on the terms of the trilateral arrangement envisaged in paragraph A of this Article, either Party may by notification terminate this Agreement. In the event of termination by either Party, the Government of the Kingdom of Thailand shall, at the request of the Government of the United States of America, return to the Government of the United States of America all special nuclear material received pursuant to this Agreement and in its possession or in the possession of persons under its jurisdiction. The Government of the United States of America will compensate the Government of the Kingdom of Thailand for such returned material at the current Commission's schedule of prices then in effect domestically."

ARTICLE II

Article VIII of the Agreement for Cooperation, as amended, is further amended by deleting the date "March 12, 1965" and substituting in lieu thereof the date "March 12, 1975".

ARTICLE III

This Amendment shall enter into force on the date on which each Government shall have received from the other Government written notification that it has complied with all statutory and constitutional requirements for the entry into force of such Amendment and shall remain in force for the period of the Agreement for Cooperation, as hereby amended.

In witness whereof, the undersigned, duly authorized, have signed this Amendment.

Done at Washington, in duplicate, this eighth day of June 1964.

For the Government of the United States of America:

MARSHALL GREEN,
Deputy Assistant Secretary, Near Eastern & South Asian Affairs, Department of State.

GLENN T. SEABORG,
Chairman, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission.

For the Government of the Kingdom of Thailand:

SUKICH NIMMANHEMINDA,
Ambassador.

Certified to be a true copy:

EARLE W. COOK,
Division of International Affairs, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission.

U.S. ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., April 16, 1694.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Atomic Energy Commission recommends that you approve the enclosed proposed "Amendment to Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Kingdom of Thailand Concerning the Civil Uses of Atomic Energy," determine that its performance will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security, and authorize its execution. The Department of State supports the Commission's recommendation.

The proposed amendment which has been negotiated by the Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, would revise and extend the agreement between the United States of America and Thailand which was signed at Bangkok on March 13, 1956, as amended by agreements signed at Washington on March 27, 1957, June 11, 1960, and May 31, 1962.

In keeping with U.S. policy that it is timely for us to arrive at an explicit understanding with those countries with which we have agreements, as to the transfer of safeguards to the International Atomic Energy Agency, provision has been made in article I of the proposed amendment that the Agency will be promptly requested to assume responsibility for applying safeguards to materials and facilities subject to safeguards under the agreement. The transfer of this responsibility to the Agency would be effected without further modification of the agreement by means of a trilateral agreement to be negotiated between the Government of the United States of America, the Government of the Kingdom of Thailand, and the Agency.

Article II of the proposed amendment provides for the extension of the agreement for a 10-year period beyond its expiration date of March 12, 1965.

Following your determination, approval, and authorization, the proposed amendment will be formally executed by appropriate authorities of the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Kingdom of Thailand. In compliance with section 123c of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, the amendment will then be placed before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Respectfully yours,

GLENN T. SEABORG,
Chairman.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D.C., June 2, 1964.

Hon. GLENN T. SEABORG,
U.S. Atomic Energy Commission,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR DR. SEABORG: In accordance with section 123a of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, the Atomic Energy Commission has submitted to me certain amendments to agreements for cooperation between the Government of the United States of America and certain foreign countries concerning the civil uses of atomic energy and has recommended that I approve each such proposed amendment, determine that its performance will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security, and authorize its execution. The amendments so submitted are listed herewith:

Amendment to Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of China Concerning the Civil Uses of Atomic Energy (transmitted by letter of April 16, 1964).

Amendment to Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Kingdom of Greece Concerning the Civil Uses of Atomic Energy (transmitted by letter of April 16, 1964).

Amendment to Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Kingdom of Thailand Concerning the Civil Uses of Atomic Energy (transmitted by letter of April 16, 1964).

Amendment to Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Vietnam Concerning the Civil Uses of Atomic Energy (transmitted by letter of April 16, 1964).

Amendment to Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Argentine Republic Concerning the Civil Uses of Atomic Energy (transmitted by letter of May 5, 1964).

Amendment to Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Iran Concerning the Civil Uses of Atomic Energy (transmitted by letter of May 5, 1964).

Pursuant to the provisions of 123b of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and upon the recommendation of the Atomic Energy Commission, I hereby:

(a) Approve each of the proposed amendments listed above, and determine that the performance of each of these agreements as amended will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security of the United States of America;

(b) Authorize the execution of each of the proposed amendments on behalf of the Government of the United States of America by appropriate authorities of the Department of State and the Atomic Energy Commission.

Sincerely,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

U.S. ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., June 23, 1964.

Hon. JOHN O. PASTORE,
Chairman, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Congress of the United States.

DEAR SENATOR PASTORE: Pursuant to section 123c of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, there are submitted with this letter:

(a) An executed "Amendment to the Agreement for Cooperation Concerning Civil Uses of Atomic Energy Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of France";

(b) A copy of a letter from the Commission to the President recommending approval of the amendment; and

(c) A copy of a letter from the President to the Commission containing his determination that its performance will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security, and approving the amendment, and authorizing its execution.

The amendment, which has been negotiated by the Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, would revise the Agreement for Cooperation between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of France which was signed at Washington on June 19, 1956, as amended by the agreements signed on July 3, 1957, July 22, 1959, September 30, 1960, and June 22, 1962.

The present agreement (art. VIII) limits the enrichment of uranium which may be transferred to France to a maximum of 20 percent in the isotope U^{235}, except that the Commission may, upon request and in its discretion, transfer to France uranium enriched up to 90 percent in the isotope U^{235} for use in (a) research reactors, materials-testing reactors and reactor experiments, each capable of operating with a fuel load not to exceed 8 kilograms of U^{235} contained in uranium, and (b) criticality experiments provided that not more than 100 kilograms of U^{235} in the aggregate would be available for such criticality experiments. The proposed amendment would modify article VIII of the agreement by eliminating the enrichment limitation of 90 percent for the purposes stated and by providing that uranium may be transferred for such purposes as material enriched to more than 20 percent when there is a technical or economic justification for such material. This modification is consistent with a recently adopted Commission policy permitting the transfer of material enriched to more than 90 percent in the isotope U^{235} for those uses which heretofore have qualified for material of up to 90-percent enrichment. The Joint Committee was informed of this change in policy by letter dated August 12, 1963.

The amendment will enter into force when the two Governments have exchanged written notifications that their respective statutory and constitutional requirements have been fulfilled.

Sincerely,

GLENN T. SEABORG,
Chairman.

AMENDMENT TO AGREEMENT FOR COOPERATION CONCERNING THE CIVIL USES OF ATOMIC ENERGY BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE GOVERNMENT OF THE FRENCH REPUBLIC

The Government of the United States of America and the Government of the French Republic,

Desiring to amend further the Agreement for Cooperation Concerning the Civil Uses of Atomic Energy Between the Government of the United States of American and the Government of the French Republic, signed at Washington on June 19, 1956 (hereinafter referred to as the "Agreement for Cooperation"), as amended by the Agreement signed at Washington on July 3, 1957, the Agreement signed at Washington on July 22, 1959, the Agreement signed at Washington on September 30, 1960, and the Agreement signed at Washington on June 22, 1962;

Have agreed as follows:

ARTICLE I

Paragraph C. 1. of Article VIII of the Agreement for Cooperation, as amended, is further amended by deleting the first sentence thereof and substituting the following:

"1. The Commission may, upon request and in its discretion, make available a portion of the enriched uranium supplied hereunder as material enriched to more than twenty percent (20%) in the isotope U-235, when there is a technical or economical justification for such material, for use in (a) research reactors, materials testing reactors and reactor experiments, each capable of operating with a fuel load not to exceed 8 kilograms of U^{235} contained in uranium and (b) criticality experiments, provided that not more than 100 kilograms of U^{235} in the aggregate will be available for such criticality experiments."

ARTICLE II

This Amendment, which shall be regarded as an integral part of the Agreement for Cooperation, as amended, shall enter into force on the day on which each Government shall have received from the other Government written notification that it has complied with all statutory and constitutional requirements for the entry into force of this Amendment.

In witness whereof, the undersigned, duly authorized, have signed this Amendment.

Done at Washington, in duplicate, in the English and French languages, both equally authentic, this twenty-second day of June 1964.

For the Government of the United States of America:

WILLIAM R. TYLER,
Assistant Secretary of State, Bureau of European Affairs, U.S. Department of State.

GLENN T. SEABORG,
Chairman, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission.

For the Government of the Republic of France:

HERVÉ ALPHAND,
Ambassador, Embassy of the French Republic.

Certified to be a true copy:

EARLE W. COOK,
Division of International Affairs, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission.

U.S. ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., May 18, 1964.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Atomic Energy Commission recommends that you approve the enclosed proposed "Amendment to Agreement for Cooperation Concerning Civil Uses of Atomic Energy Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of France," determine that its performance will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security, and authorize its execution. The Department of State supports the Commission's recommendation.

The proposed amendment which has been negotiated by the Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, would revise the Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of France which was signed at Washington on June 19, 1956, as amended by the agreements signed on July 3, 1957; July 22, 1959; September 30, 1960; and June 22, 1962.

The present agreement (art. VIII) limits the enrichment of uranium to a maximum of 20 percent in the isotope U^{235} which may be transferred to France, except that the Commission may, upon request and in its discretion, transfer to France uranium enriched up to 90 percent in the isotope U^{235} for use in (a) research reactors, materials-testing reactors and reactor experiments, each capable of operating with a fuel load not to exceed 8 kilograms of U^{235} contained in uranium and (b) criticality experiments provided that not more than 100 kilograms of U^{235} in the aggregate would be available for such criticality experiments. The proposed amendment would modify article VIII of the agreement by eliminating the enrichment limitation of 90 percent for the purposes stated and by providing that uranium may be transferred as material enriched to more than 20 percent when there is a technical or economic justification for such material. This modification is consistent with a recently adopted Commission policy permitting the transfer of materials enriched to more than 90 percent in the isotope U^{235} for those uses which heretofore have qualified for material of up to 90-percent enrichment. This new policy benefits the promotion of the civil uses of atomic energy abroad by permitting foreign countries to obtain their uranium at the same maximum enrichment as is generally available to U.S. civil users.

Following your determination, approval, and authorization, the proposed amendment will be formally executed by appropriate authorities of the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of France. In compliance with section 123c of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, the proposed amendment will then be placed before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Respectfully yours,

GLENN T. SEABORG,
Chairman.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D.C., June, 15 1964.

Hon. GLENN T. SEABORG,
U.S. Atomic Energy Commission,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR DR. SEABORG: In accordance with section 123a of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, the Atomic Energy Commission has submitted to me certain amendments to agreements for cooperation between the Government of the United States of America and certain foreign countries concerning the civil uses of atomic energy and has recommended that I approve each such proposed amendment, determine that its performance will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security, and authorize its execution. The amendments so submitted are listed herewith:

Amendment to Agreement for Cooperation Concerning Civil Uses of Atomic Energy Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of France (transmitted by letter of May 18, 1964).

Amendment to Agreement for Cooperation on the Civil Uses of Atomic Energy Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (transmitted by letter of May 26, 1964).

Pursuant to the provisions of 123b of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and upon the recommendation of the Atomic Energy Commission, I hereby:

(a) Approve each of the proposed amendments listed above, and determine that the performance of each of these agreements as amended will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security of the United States of America;

(b) Authorize the execution of each of the proposed amendments on behalf of the Government of the United States of America by appropriate authorities of the Department of State and the Atomic Energy Commission.

Sincerely,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

U.S. ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., June 9, 1964.

Hon. JOHN O. PASTORE,
Chairman, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Congress of the United States.

DEAR SENATOR PASTORE: Pursuant to section 123c of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, there are submitted with this letter:

(a) An executed "Amendment to the Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Argentine Republic Concerning the Civil Uses of Atomic Energy";

(b) A copy of a letter from the Commission to the President recommending approval of the amendment; and

(c) A copy of a letter from the President to the Commission containing his determination that its performance will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security, and approving the amendment and authorizing its execution.

The amendment, which has been negotiated by the Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, modifies and extends the Agreement for Cooperation with the Argentine Republic which was signed at Washington on June 22, 1962, and which entered into force on July 27, 1962.

Article I of the amendment provides for the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Argentine Republic to promptly request the International Atomic Energy Agency to assume responsibility for applying safeguards to materials and facilities subject to safeguards under the agreement. The transfer of this responsibility to the Agency would be accomplished without further modification of the agreement by means of a trilateral agreement negotiated between the United States, Argentina, and the Agency.

Article II of the amendment extends the agreement for a period of 5 years to July 27, 1969.

The amendment will enter into force when the two Governments have exchanged written notifications that their respective statutory and constitutional requirements have been fulfilled.

Sincerely,

Glenn T. Seaborg,
Chairman.

Amendment to Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Argentine Republic Concerning Civil Uses of Atomic Energy

The Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Argentine Republic,

Desiring to amend the Agreement for Cooperation between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Argentine Republic Concerning Civil Uses of Atomic Energy, signed at Washington on June 22, 1962 (hereinafter referred to as the "Agreement for Cooperation");

Agree as follows:

ARTICLE I

Article XI of the Agreement for Cooperation is amended to read as follows:

"A. The Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Argentine Republic, recognizing the desirability of making use of the facilities and services of the International Atomic Energy Agency, agree that the Agency will be promptly requested to assume responsibility for applying safeguards to materials and facilities subject to safeguards under this Agreement for Cooperation. It is contemplated that the necessary arrangements will be effected without modification of this Agreement, through an agreement to be negotiated between the Parties and the Agency which may include provisions for suspension of the safeguard rights accorded the Commission by Article IX, paragraph B, of this Agreement during the time and to the extent that the Agency's safeguards apply to such materials and facilities.

"B. In the event the Parties do not reach a mutually satisfactory agreement on the terms of the trilateral arrangement envisaged in paragraph A of this Article, either Party may by notification terminate this Agreement. In the event of termination by either Party, the Government of the Argentine Republic shall, at the request of the Government of the United States of America, return to the Government of the United States of America all special nuclear material received pursuant to this Agreement and in its possession or in the possession of persons under its jurisdiction. The Government of the United States of America will compensate the Government of the Argentine Republic for such returned material at the current United States Commission's schedule of prices then in effect domestically."

ARTICLE II

Paragraph B of Article XII of the Agreement for Cooperation is amended by deleting the phrase "two years" and substituting in lieu thereof the phrase "seven years".

ARTICLE III

This Amendment shall enter into force on the date on which each Government shall have received from the other Government written notification that it has complied with all statutory and constitutional requirements for the entry into force of such Amendment and shall remain in force for the period of the Agreement for Cooperation, as hereby amended.

In witness whereof, the undersigned, duly authorized, have signed this Amendment.

Done at Washington, in duplicate, in the English and Spanish languages, both equally authentic, this eighth day of June 1964.

For the Government of the United States of America:

Robert W. Adams,
Deputy Assistant Secretary, Inter-American Affairs, U.S. Department of State.

Glenn T. Seaborg,
Chairman, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission.

For the Government of the Argentine Republic:

Ezequiel F. Pereyra,
Minister, Chargé d'Affaires ad interim.

Certified to be a true copy:

Earle W. Cook,
Division of International Affairs, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission.

U.S. Atomic Energy Commission,
Washington, D.C., May 5, 1964.

The President,
The White House.

Dear Mr. President: The Atomic Energy Commission recommends that you approve the enclosed proposed "Amendment to Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Argentine Republic Concerning the Civil Uses of Atomic Energy," determine that its performance will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security, and authorize its execution. The Department of State supports the Commission's recommendation.

The proposed amendment which has been negotiated by the Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, would revise and extend the agreement between the United States of America and Argentina which was signed at Washington on June 22, 1962, and which entered into force on July 27, 1962, for a period of 2 years.

In keeping with U.S. policy that it is timely for us to arrive at an explicit understanding with those countries with which we have agreements, as to the transfer of safeguards to the International Atomic Energy Agency, provision has been made in article I of the proposed amendment that the Agency will be promptly requested to assume responsibility for applying safeguards to materials and facilities subject to safeguards under the agreement. The transfer of this responsibility to the Agency would be effected without further modification of the agreement by means of a trilateral agreement to be negotiated between the Government of the United States of America, the Government of the Argentine Republic, and the Agency.

Article II of the proposed amendment provides for the extension of the agreement for a 5-year period beyond its expiration date of July 27, 1964.

Following your determination, approval, and authorization, the proposed amendment will be formally executed by appropriate authorities of the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Argentine Republic. In compliance with section 123c of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, the proposed amendment will then be placed before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Respectfully yours,

Glenn T. Seaborg,
Chairman.

The White House,
Washington, D.C., June 2, 1964.

Hon. Glenn T. Seaborg,
U.S. Atomic Energy Commission,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Dr. Seaborg: In accordance with section 123a of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, the Atomic Energy Commission has submitted to me certain amendments to agreements for cooperation between the Government of the United States of America and certain foreign countries concerning the civil uses of atomic energy and has recommended that I approve each such proposed amendment, determine that its performance will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security, and authorize its execution. The amendments so submitted are listed herewith:

Amendment to Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of China Concerning the Civil Uses of Atomic Energy (transmitted by letter of April 16, 1964).

Amendment to Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Kingdom of Greece Concerning the Civil Uses of Atomic Energy (transmitted by letter of April 16, 1964).

Amendment to Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Kingdom of Thailand Concerning the Civil Uses of Atomic Energy (transmitted by letter of April 16, 1964).

Amendment to Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Vietnam Concerning the Civil Uses of Atomic Energy (transmitted by letter of April 16, 1964).

Amendment to Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Argentine Republic Concerning the Civil Uses of Atomic Energy (transmitted by letter of May 5, 1964).

Amendment to Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Iran Concerning the Civil Uses of Atomic Energy (transmitted by letter of May 5, 1964).

Pursuant to the provisions of 123b of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and upon the recommendation of the Atomic Energy Commission, I hereby:

(a) Approve each of the proposed amendments listed above, and determine that the performance of each of these agreements as amended will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security of the United States of America;

(b) Authorize the execution of each of the proposed amendments on behalf of the Government of the United States of America by appropriate authorities of the Department of State and the Atomic Energy Commission.

Sincerely,

Lyndon B. Johnson.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

U.S. ACTIVITIES IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the words of President Johnson yesterday in Minneapolis give rise to both hope and despair for the prospect of peace.

They give hope because the President recognized the great contribution to world peace afforded by the United Nations and our adherence to it. Unfortunately, he did not make the slightest reference to the United Nations as a check against American outlawry in South Vietnam.

The references in his speech yesterday to the willingness of the United States to risk war, if necessary, give rise to despair, because President Johnson and his administration seem to have firmly separated our responsibility to world peace and the rule of law in world affairs from our activities in southeast Asia. We cannot do that and follow either a consistent course of action or, in my judgment, an honorable course of action in keeping with our treaty obligations.

Mr. President, what rule of law is the United States bringing to southeast Asia? I ask the President what he is doing to bring the United Nations Charter to bear on the one most urgent and critical threat to peace of all—the war in southeast Asia?

How can the United States, through its President, proclaim the rule of law for the problems and issues of other nations, and practice the law of the claw where our own problems are concerned in southeast Asia?

The President quoted from the Sermon on the Mount when he said:

> Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the children of God.

But a few lines later in the Sermon on the Mount we are given some clews of how to go about making peace. The Master said:

> Agree with thine adversary quickly, while thou art in the way with him; lest at any time the adversary deliver thee to the judge, and the judge deliver thee to the officer, and thou be cast into prison. Verily I say unto thee, thou shalt by no means come out thence, till thou hast paid the uttermost farthing.

No government that says it is prepared to risk war in any area can know where or how that war will end, and more often than not an entire nation and a generation of its people pay the "uttermost farthing" to make good the pledge. We are not now in agreement with our adversaries in Asia; but before any administration threatens to take the United States to war it should exhaust the last possibility to avoid it—and the President, the Secretary of State, and the Secretary of Defense have not done it. They owe it to the American people to exhaust every possible rule of law through our treaty commitments, and particularly our commitments under the United Nations, before we start to rattle the American sabre and threaten to the world that we are ready to plunge Asia into war as a means of promoting American policy there.

This administration has not exhausted any possibility of international law in Asia because this administration has not resorted to international law and the procedures thereof in an attempt to avoid a war in southeast Asia. We are exhausting all the possibilities to keep Greece and Turkey from war by resorting to international law. We are using personal mediation, summit diplomacy, and the United Nations.

What of the conflict in Asia? There we talk of nothing but war. Are we the hypocrites also referred to in the Book of Matthew, of whom it was said:

> For ye are like unto whited sepulchres, which indeed appear beautiful outward, but are within full of dead men's bones and of all uncleanness.

There is, in fact, no problem we face in Asia that would be improved by war, any more than there is any problem in Europe from which any side could gain through war.

Right now we look upon China as a weak adversary, lacking not only nuclear weapons, but also much of the ordnance and industrial capacity for even a modern conventional war on a large scale. We are willing to practice "brinkmanship" against China in her backyard that would be unthinkable against Russia in her backyard.

But, does that mean that war against China is safer for the United States than war against Russia? I believe not. Nuclear bombs may not fall upon American cities as the result of a war with China, but the casualties and the cost would still vastly exceed the value to us of the territory we claim that we are protecting.

I protest this American course of action because I am convinced that this is not the course of action necessary to follow in order to give protection to the troubled, crisis-ridden areas in southeast Asia.

Moreover I believe that we would find our interests in southeast Asia, not to mention elsewhere in the world, severely weakened by such a war.

Communism has fed on war. It has spread its dominion through war. Whatever may be true today of Russia's fear that war would ruin her domestic economic advances, communism has come to power through the havoc and destruction of war.

I see no reason why that should be different now. Unless the United States is prepared to do with China what we did with Japan at the close of World War II—to occupy it, to rebuild it, and to reconstruct its society—there is every likelihood that communism would spread in Asia if a full-scale war should develop there.

We could destroy its present leaders, but we cannot contain or cope with the effects of the war in Asia, not only if that would occur in China, but also if that would occur in southeast Asia, in India, in the Philippines, in Burma, and the rest of the countries of the South China Sea and the Indian Ocean.

I say to President Johnson, to his Secretary of State, to his Secretary of Defense, and to Admiral Felt, that not a single one of them has offered the American people a goal, a purpose in Asia that could be accomplished or advanced through war. They have not been able to establish those viable nations about which they like to talk so much, even with an investment of billions of dollars worth of American money and military aid.

The loss of thousands of American lives in a war in Asia is immoral and uncalled for. It is not in keeping with the reference to the Scriptures which the President is so frequently quoted as supporting:

> Blessed are the peacemakers for they shall be called the children of God.

How do we expect to establish viable nations with war?

No, Mr. President, go back to the Book of Isaiah, another text that the President quotes from frequently,

> Come and let us reason together.

That is what the United Nations is for.

That is what we profess to believe.

Let us get away from the international policy of peace for Cyprus, but war for Asia.

Let us get away from the international policy of peace for the Middle East, but war for Asia.

Let us get away from the international policy of peace for the Congo, but war for Asia.

Mr. President, I regret to say that I wholeheartedly support my President on 99 percent of his stands, but disagree with him on his foreign policy in Asia because, if it is not changed, it will lead this country into a major war in Asia. It will result in loss of tens upon tens of thousands of American boys—unnecessary, unjustifiable, and uncalled for.

Up until the time that there is a declaration of war, my voice will continue to ask my President from the floor of the Senate today, as I have done for many weeks past, "Mr. President, when are you going to send up that proposal for a declaration of war? Under article I, section 8 of the Constitution, you have no constitutional power to kill a single American boy in Asia under a Presidential direction on a battlefront in the absence of a declaration of war. Only the Congress has the constitutional power to declare war."

I say once more, that goes for Laos, too. The illegal course of action which the United States has been following in Laos in violation of article 4 of the Geneva accords cannot be reconciled, either, with the clear constitutional duties of the President as Commander in Chief.

It saddens me to find it necessary to criticize my President in regard to what I consider to be his unsound stand in light of our international obligations.

I hold in my hand a treaty which the United States signed. It is called the Charter of the United Nations. Our signature is on that treaty. We cannot justify American foreign policy in Asia, in light of the commitments which we made under this charter.

Mr. President, I particularly refer to article 33 of the charter, although our obligation goes to the charter from its four corners.

Article 33 reads, and I read it again, as I have in the debates of the past several weeks:

> The parties to any dispute, the continuance of which is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security shall, first of all, seek a solution by negotiation, inquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, judicial settlement, resort to regional agencies or arrangements, or other peaceful means of their own choice.

We have never kept that commitment in southeast Asia. We have flouted that commitment to article 33 of the United Nations Charter. Section 2 of the article reads:

> The Security Council shall, when it deems necessary, call upon the parties to settle their dispute by such means.

I again ask the Secretary General of the United Nations, Mr. U Thant, "What have you been doing? Is the United States so powerful that the world is afraid to call the United States to an accounting for a violation of its obligations under the United Nations Charter?" No. Do not give me—as some do—the old fallacy that we are not the only ones who are violating the United Nations Charter in southeast Asia. We sure are not. North Vietnam is. The Pathet Laos are. South Vietnam itself is. Of course, Red China is.

The issue that I keep raising, and shall continue to raise until there is a declaration of war, if Congress makes the unfortunate mistake of writing that page of American history—is that on the return to this charter, that we proceed to request that the rules of law and the procedures for it be put into implementation immediately.

There is no doubt in my mind that Red China, Laos, North Vietnam, South Vietnam, and the United States are violating their international law obligations by the course of action that is being followed in southeast Asia. But that does not justify our committing a wrong because some other nation commits a wrong. Nor does it justify the United States setting itself up as the policeman of the world.

We must face the strategy that exists today, for there are those who have much to do with the recommending of American military policy who have become sold on the idea that Red China cannot fight an effective war at the present time against the United States, that she has no nuclear power, and that because of the split that has developed between Red China and Red Russia, she does not have the air power to last very long against the American air armada. That is all true.

These analysts conveniently neglect to mention land warfare against China. They pass over the fact that we have had unchallenged air and sea control in South Vietnam for 10 years, but the war has gone against us, anyway.

But these analysts seem to mean that the United States is justified in resorting to the jungle law of force. To the contrary, Mr. President, I should think it would justify even more following the thesis that the senior Senator from Oregon and the courageous Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] have been advocating in the Chamber for these many past weeks.

If the argument is that by using nuclear weapons we can knock out Red China now with a military victory, that is true. Do we think that is going to win a peace? That would create a hatred throughout Asia that would last for generations.

Mr. President, that course cannot be reconciled with the Sermon on the Mount, which the President quoted on yesterday in Minneapolis. Quite to the contrary. Of course, we would have to knock out Red China if we did not outbluff her—and I know of no reason to think that she is going to be outbluffed. As I have said so many times in the Senate, we are dealing with government leaders in Red China who are so despotic and despicable in their philosophy that they place no value on human life. They would not hesitate to sacrifice Chinese lives by millions. Some time ago a Communist leader of Red China pointed out that they could lose 400 million Chinese and come out of that kind of a war a stronger nation.

Mr. President, I am aghast at the apparent motivation and philosophy of the military policymakers of the United States. They are threatening the risk of a full-scale war in Asia unless the Chinese do our bidding.

I have no reason to believe that we are justified in taking that risk. I could not square such a policy with the principles of morality. Let us not prate about morality. Let us practice it.

Making war in 1964 is immoral. No matter how it is put, it is still immoral. If my country makes the great mistake of declaring war, then of course we have to unite behind that declaration and do everything we can to win the next military victory that the declaration calls for, and then try to recoup and recover from our immoral conduct in the hope that we can set up a permanent policy of substituting the rule of law for the jungle law of force. But we shall set back this charter for decades. We shall not be able to reconcile carrying out our threat of being willing to risk a war in Asia with our obligations under the charter.

Let me read article 37 of the charter, if there are any doubting Thomases as to the obligations of the United States under international law.

Article 37 reads:

> Should the parties to a dispute of the nature referred to in article 33 fail to settle it by the means indicated in that article, they shall refer it to the Security Council.

Why have we not done what this charter—this treaty on which we put the solemn signature of the United States—calls for? Is it because we think we are too mighty? Is it because we think the world will accept that most unfortunate speech of Adlai Stevenson before the Security Council only a few weeks ago—a speech which he should not have loaned his lips to read, because that speech belies all the idealism of Adlai Stevenson? The speech which he loaned his lips to read cannot be reconciled with the world statesmanship of Adlai Stevenson. He destroyed himself as a world statesman when he read that speech, because in effect in that speech he announced to the world that we intended to follow a course of action in Asia that we decided was necessary, and the rest of the world can like it or else. His ambassadorship was not worth that. Much better that Adlai Stevenson would have refused to read that speech and resigned his ambassadorship, which would be a small sacrifice, indeed, compared with the supreme sacrifice that American boys are making in South Vietnam.

I say to my colleagues in the Congress that it is one thing for them to sit here in relative security and safety and countenance the unjustifiable killing of American boys in South Vietnam. But by doing so, they are not following a course of action that in my judgment can be squared either with international law or with morality.

I should like to continue. Article 37, section 2, states:

> If the Security Council deems that the continuance of the dispute is in fact likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security, it shall decide whether to take action under article 36 or to recommend such terms of settlement as it may consider appropriate.

We signed a treaty that gave that authority to the Security Council.

"Ah, but," say some to the senior Senator from Oregon, "We do not think the Security Council would be able to take jurisdiction because Russia would veto it."

Perhaps, although Russia did not veto the peacekeeping mission for Cyprus, probably the odds are in favor of a Soviet veto.

As I have said so many times—and I shall continue to repeat it in the hope that at long last the leaders of my Government, as well as the American people, will come to understand our obligation—I wish to put Red Russia on the spot. I wish to show who it is in the world that really will not cooperate in keeping the peace. I wish to remove my country from the present unenviable position it now occupies, in announcing to the world that we are willing to risk war in Asia unless American foreign policy in Asia is followed. That is what it adds up to.

Who do we think we are? By what authority—by what right—does the United States set itself up as the international policeman of the world and state that we shall decide the merits of the various controversies, and then we shall decide which side we shall support. It is shocking that the United States should follow such a course of action in view of these solemn commitments in the United Nations Charter.

It is interesting that the President would even mention the United Nations Charter in his Minneapolis speech yesterday, and then fall completely silent when it came to applying the charter to an inexcusable American foreign policy in southeast Asia. It was a great disappointment to me. It makes me sad to find it necessary, in order to carry out what I consider to be my solemn trust as an elected representative of the people of my State, to take to the floor of the Senate and express this disagreement with my President. But I could not disagree with him more than I disagree with his saber-rattling policy in Asia, in which he threatens the risk of war unless the Communists follow our dictates.

So many people jump to the fallacious conclusion that if we protest the policy of the United States in Asia, someway, somehow, we are unpatriotic and pro-Communist. I say most respectfully that not even the President of the United States is more anti-Communist than the senior Senator from Oregon, for I am satisfied that Red Russia, Red China, their Communist underlings around the world, and their satellites seek to take over the world if they ever think they are strong enough to do it.

The United States is not justified unilaterally, outside the United Nations, in proceeding to set itself up as the law enforcement country of the world.

I am disturbed about another facet of the President's program in southeast Asia. If we risk that war, and if the Red Chinese call our bluff and a major war breaks out, we are on the horns of a dilemma, it seems to me. One horn is that we shall be doing Russia's job for her, because if Russia intends to make the split with the Red Chinese permanent, there is nothing she would welcome more than to have the United States fight Red China for an indeterminate period. But we shall not knock off Red China without terrific, horrendous cost in blood and economic resources. After we had destroyed the military power of Red China, with all the devastation that would go along with the nuclear power that we would have to use to do it, because we would never be able to do it with conventional American forces, for decades, then, being the great Christian nation that we are, we should be doing the humanitarian job in China that our religious faith dictates to us that we should do, for we are good Samaritans. Mr. President, we believe in the teachings of the Master in respect to the philosophy of the good Samaritan. But ignoring for just a moment—but only for a moment—the sacrifice of American life that such a war would produce, our economy could not possibly remain strong and stable—and it is our greatest security weapon—with the billions we would have to pour out in the decades ahead to rehabilitate the part of Asia that we would destroy in such a costly war.

Russia's other reaction could be to make good on her mutual defense treaty with China and support her war effort. She could do it with nuclear weapons against the United States; or she could do it merely to the extent of furnishing China with airplanes, oil, and ordnance to keep fighting.

Neither response by Russia would do the United States any good.

I am pleading to save the blood and the economic resources of my country, and resort to the procedures of the United Nations, rather than follow the recommendation of the President yesterday in Minneapolis. I cannot read his speech any other way than to come to the conclusion that he is underwriting to risk a major war in Asia without going to the United Nations. Yet in another part of the speech in Minneapolis yesterday he paid tribute to the United Nations in connection with its peacekeeping operations elsewhere in the world. What a paradox and what an inconsistency.

Let us take a look at article 36, referred to in article 37.

Article 36 reads:

> 1. The Security Council may, at any stage of dispute of the nature referred to in article 33—

Which I have already read—

> or of a situation of like nature, recommend appropriate procedures or methods of adjustment.
>
> 2. The Security Council should take into consideration any procedures for the settlement of the dispute which have already been adopted by the parties.
>
> 3. In making recommendations under this article the Security Council should also take into consideration that legal disputes should as a general rule be referred by the parties to the International Court of Justice in accordance with the provisions of the statute of the Court—

Which is a part of the charter.

By the way, if anyone in the Senate thinks that there are not large numbers of persons who are following this debate in the Senate, which has been going on for the past several weeks, since the distinguished Senator [Mr. GRUENING], who honors me with his presence as I make this speech, and I have conducted the debate, they could not be more wrong. My mail shows to the contrary. Immodest as it may have appeared to some persons, I have put in the RECORD, in three different installments, a large quantity of mail I have received. The Senator from Alaska says his mail has been running 100 to 1 in support of his opposition to involvement in a war in Asia and in opposition to American foreign policy in Asia. I have said that my mail has been running at least 9 to 1 in opposition, but my office tells me it is nearer the figure of the Senator from Alaska than the figure I have given of 9 to 1.

The American people are greatly concerned about the unilateral military course of action we have been following in Asia, first in South Vietnam, and now we are spreading it. We are in Laos now, in direct violation of article 4 of the Geneva accord of 1962.

While there are many other articles I could read, showing the failure on the part of the United States to live up to its signature on the United Nations Charter, I call attention to article 51:

> Nothing in the present charter shall impair the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense if an armed attack occurs against a member of the United Nations, until the Security Council has taken the measures necessary to maintain international peace and security. Measures taken by members in the exercise of this right of self-defense shall be immediately reported to the Security Council and shall not in any way affect the authority and responsibility of the Security Council under the present charter to take at any time such action as it deems necessary in order to maintain or restore international peace and security.

I shall reread that part of the article that is particularly controlling so far as the argument I am now making is concerned. It reads as follows:

> Measures taken by members in the exercise of this right of self-defense shall be immediately reported to the Security Council and shall not in any way affect the authority and responsibility of the Security Council under the present charter.

We have made no such report; and I wonder if we have made no such report because we would not have a leg to stand on if our argument were that we were in South Vietnam as a matter of self-defense. Of course we are not. We are in South Vietnam because we are supporting a creature of the United States, a puppet of the United States, a puppet government the United States set up, a puppet government that takes its orders and directions from the United States. We have no more right in South Vietnam under this charter than Russia has in East Germany. We use the same alibi, as I have said so many times, in this debate, seeking to rationalize the American presence in Vietnam, that Russia uses in East Germany. Says Russia, "The East German Government invited us in." Of course, the world knows who the East German Government is. It is the Communist puppet of Red Russia. And the world knows who the military dictatorship in South Vietnam is. It is the puppet government of the United States.

It grieves me to hear my President even use the word "freedom" in connection with South Vietnam. There is no freedom in South Vietnam. South Vietnam is an outright military dictatorship; and the overwhelming mass of its people have not the slightest understanding of the difference between freedom and communism. And they could not care less.

I want them to be free, but the way to eventually bring freedom to the masses of the people of South Vietnam is not for the United States to engage in war in South Vietnam—and a civil war at that.

The State Department becomes very agitated when we refer to the undeniable fact that the war in South Vietnam, so far as the Vietnamese are concerned, is basically a civil war, with families split. When the witnesses are put under cross-examination in the Foreign Relations Committee executive sessions, they admit the Vietcong are almost entirely South Vietnamese—Communist South Vietnamese. When we ask them to give us any evidence of any sizable contingents of North Vietnamese in South Vietnam, they cannot produce it. They talk about a few cadres here and there, but under further cross-examination, they cannot be sure they are North Vietnamese.

Do not forget that the North Vietnamese and the South Vietnamese come from the same country. Prior to the Geneva accord of 1962, they were all Vietnamese. The only foreign troops in South Vietnam in any substantial numbers at all are U.S. troops, not foreign troops. It is said, at the State Department and the Pentagon, "But they are being supplied by the North Vietnamese." Who is supplying the South Vietnamese? And what did the so-called neutral enforcement commission under the Geneva accords find? The Commission found that North Vietnam and South Vietnam are both violating the Geneva accords. South Vietnam is violating the Geneva accords because of the United States. The neutral commission found that the United States was supplying military supplies in great quantity, and that it had American military personnel there, in clear violation of the Geneva accords.

Our country, I may say to the American people, has been violating the Geneva accords, and at the same time has sought to rationalize and alibi the killing of American boys in South Vietnam, along with thousands of the native people of the indigenous population, on the ground that North Vietnam is violating the Geneva accords; and, therefore, we are setting ourselves up as the enforcement officer.

It is pretty sad, pretty shocking, but that is the page of history we are writing.

I want to change its course. I repeat my plea; and I shall repeat and repeat as long as this debate continues. So far as the senior Senator from Oregon is concerned, it will continue until the United States declares war, and then the die will be cast. Then the senior Senator from Oregon, after he votes against that declaration of war, if that declaration of war is offered on the basis of the present facts, will be heard to plead that we then unite behind the policy that then for the first time will have been established under the Constitution of the United States. But until then I am going to do all I can to change this mistaken course of action.

I shall never speak on this subject without pointing out alternatives. I have urged from the beginning—and not a word from the President about this in his speech at Minneapolis—that we call upon our SEATO allies, so-called, to join us in South Vietnam until such time as the United Nations can take jurisdiction and send a large contingent into South Vietnam. As I said on the television program "Issues and Answers," yesterday, I talk in terms of divisions.

Let us see if we can send into South Vietnam several divisions from SEATO, demonstrating our determination to keep the peace, but not divisions to make war, not divisions to drop bombs, not divisions to burn out towns and hamlets, not divisions to violate the borders of Cambodia and North Vietnam, which constitute acts of aggression on the part of the United States today, but divisions to keep the peace, divisions that would seek to perform the same function that the United Nations forces in the Middle East and Cyprus and the Congo have been performing, and then take the issue before the United Nations, asking the United Nations to assume jurisdiction, or perhaps to provide that those divisions of SEATO shall act for the United Nations. The charter provides for that. The charter makes clear that the United Nations can follow that course of action. The United Nations can underwrite a regional peacekeeping program.

That is quite a different thing from a regional warmaking program. Just as soon as we can get the matter resolved before the United Nations, which is our clear duty to try to do, I would prefer that the United Nations take over direct jurisdiction and send in a United Nations force.

It is argued by some that it would be very costly to do it, and that the United Nations at the present time does not have the funds. Have Senators ever heard such an argument, such a rationalization for the United States not going to the United Nations?

One day of a full-scale war in Asia would cost more than months and months and months of peacekeeping expenditures that I am pleading for. No; they cannot "sell" that one to me.

I say to the American people: "Only you can stop this." Only an aroused public opinion can stop it. I say to the American people that the hour has come, and the American people should take a stand in support of the substitution of the application of rules of international law for unilateral military action of the United States based upon the jungle law of military might.

The difference I have with the President, painful as it is, has nothing to do with my support of the President in the election ahead, and will have nothing to do with my course of action at the Democratic National Convention as a member of my State's delegation. There will be no problem in nominating the President. There will be no problem in reelecting him, because I believe he will win the election by a landslide.

Nevertheless, I have a duty as a Senator from my State to keep faith with my oath of office, as I see my responsibilities. That is why I shall continue to do what I can, as long as there is any hope of substituting peace for war in southeast Asia, to raise my voice over and over and over again, as I have this afternoon, in a plea to my President, for now, for the first time, it is squarely up to him.

The President has made his pronouncement as to what his position is. I plead for a change in that policy. The President has now taken unto himself McNamara's war. For weeks I discussed this general problem from the standpoint of its following the blueprint of the Secretary of Defense. The time has come now for the American people to raise their pleas with the President of the United States to end our unilateral military action in Asia and walk back into the framework of the United Nations Charter to which he referred in one part of his speech yesterday in such commending terms.

I have been heard to say before that the Conscription Act, the so-called draft law, is probably one of the most unfair laws on the statute books. It has become an unfair law because of its administration, because so many boys in this country are able now to go around the draft law, with all the policies of exemption that have developed. Too many do not. It is a discriminatory law, unfairly discriminatory in its administration. Congress must assume the responsibility for that because of the exemptions that we have written into it.

I am glad that when the law was last before the Senate I opposed it, because we did not adopt revisions in it that I thought should have been adopted.

Under that draft law we are sending by compulsion American boys to die in southeast Asia in the absence of a declaration of war. I do not believe it can be justified. I think we ought to bring back the draftees in the absence of a declaration of war. At least we should stop killing boys who are not over there of their own free will.

I think that is an appropriate suggestion to make, because some weeks ago, the President himself suggested that consideration be given to amendments to the draft law. He did not specify what the amendments should be; but, of course, the suggestion that the draft law should be amended was applauded by many across the country who have been subjected to its unfair discriminatory policy.

I make this suggestion to the President. This is one way to amend it. Bring back the boys who have been drafted and call for volunteers.

Although support for my position is overwhelming, every once in a while I run into some young fellow, or some fellow not so young, who thinks it is very important that we call the Communist bluff in southeast Asia. He thinks it is important that we make war on the Communists. I respectfully inquire of him whether he would like to have me see if I can somehow arrange to have him substituted for somebody on the battlefront in South Vietnam who did not ask to go there. It is always a little amusing to see the reaction of a person who has made that argument. I have had no volunteers whatsoever to accept my suggestion. It is easy to sit in the United States in security and talk about killing American boys in South Vietnam by carrying on a war to call the bluff of the Communists.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. As on previous occasions, I am most happy to associate myself with the forthright, courageous, and correct—in my view—position taken by the senior Senator from Oregon. The sad fact is that his forecasts of what would happen are taking place. The war in southeast Asia is being escalated.

First, we were told that our purpose was merely to assist the people of South Vietnam—those who did not like the existing government—to win against their opponents. Repeatedly, we were told in official announcements that that war could be won only by the South Vietnamese; that we were there merely to advise them. During that period, we were given to understand that the 16,000 or 18,000 Americans—whatever the number is—were stationed there merely to act as advisers.

Then the deaths of some 130 or more Americans in combat revealed that the advisers were quite other than advisers. They were, in fact, engaged in combat. This was, I regret to have to say it, a deception practiced on the American people.

Now the war has been escalated beyond South Vietnam. We are now also engaged in neighboring Laos. We have promised increased military air aid and activity there. We have engaged in bombing from the air. Continued escalation will involve the United States in all southeast Asia, and perhaps beyond.

Should American boys be sent to fight and die in southeast Asia? I have said again and again on the floor of the Senate that we had no business picking up where the French badly defeated, with 240,000 casualties, left off. We have no business to sacrifice American boys in that distant part of the world in a war that is not of our making and in which we should never have engaged. We had no business getting into Vietnam 10 years ago. We have no business to stay there—particularly to stay there all alone. If the war in South Vietnam is worth fighting—and there is considerable question about that—but assuming it is worth fighting, where are our SEATO allies? Where are Great Britain, France, Australia, New Zealand, the Philippines, Pakistan, and Thailand? Despite the repeated efforts of the administration to draw them in, they have so far given us no material assistance.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alaska yield?

Mr. GRUENING. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. The Secretary of State boasted at a recent meeting of the Committee on Foreign Relations that Australia was doubling its force in South Vietnam. We pressed him for an explanation of what that meant. When he finished, I told the Secretary that he had insulted my intelligence and the intelligence of every American citizen. Australia will increase its manpower contingent from 40 to 60, but they are to be kept away from the combat zone.

Also, perhaps in 4 months, Australia may make available 6 cargo planes in which to send material to South Vietnam, but they are not too sure about that. My suspicion is that the planes will contain Australian material to be sold at a good profit.

Mr. GRUENING. This subject has been thoroughly aired by the senior Senator from Oregon. He has said again and again—and has brought it out in complete detail—how completely erroneous the predictions were.

A year ago, Secretary McNamara said we would withdraw our troops by 1965. That is now not likely to happen. We find such knowledgeable pundits as Walter Lippmann raising this very question as to whether our policy is not wholly misconceived. He has said, as I have, that this is not a war that can be won by military means. It is not a war that we can win.

The senior Senator from Oregon has repeatedly urged—and I second him in it—that we at least try to wage peace as vigorously as we are waging war.

Why not—and the senior Senator from Oregon and I have asked the question repeatedly—at least try to get the United Nations to move in with its peacemaking machinery?

Why not request a cease fire? Why not at least attempt to use the method and mechanics we have used to keep peace between Israel and Egypt, where a United Nations police force has kept the former border raids at a minimum and has prevented the local animosities from escalating into armed violence on a national scale?

We have tried it in the Congo. We are trying it in Cyprus. We may not be wholly successful there, but such efforts have so far forestalled a far greater conflict and disaster. If we can make the effort in Cyprus, where no Americans are involved, it would seem that there should be no reason why we ought not make the effort in southeast Asia, where American lives are daily being sacrificed.

Why not, I ask again, use the peacekeeping machinery of the United Nations? The American people would support such a policy. A great cheer would go up at such a move. I know this because my mail is overwhelmingly in favor of such a policy. On several occasions I have said that it has been running 100 to 1 in favor of it; but the ratio has grown beyond that and is now about 300 to 1.

I shall continue to urge this approach. I am confident that the senior Senator from Oregon will do the same. Sooner or later the facts will be borne in on the American public that this is a better way out of a troublesome, difficult, impossible situation, which President Johnson inherited.

Again, I compliment the senior Senator from Oregon. Almost alone, he has placed this issue before the American people. He has exposed it historically in every way. He has made a most forceful case. I hope the administration will take heed of his counsel and, whatever it may be doing in a military way temporarily, will not ignore, as it is now, the peacemaking aspects. It may well be that the administration feels it must make a show of strength before going to the peace table. Why not at least make the efforts simultaneously? Why not give peace preference to war?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as we lawyers say, there are times when we rest our case. Nothing could be added to the eloquent, brilliant statement of the Senator from Alaska. I desire to have the RECORD show, so that the American people will know, that I look upon the great Senator from Alaska as one of my teachers, as a source of inspiration to me, as I serve shoulder to shoulder with him in the U.S. Senate.

His plea for the United States to seek a cease-fire order in Asia through the United Nations is unanswerable. That ought to be the course of action to be followed by our Government, rather than the course of action announced by the President at Minneapolis, Minn., yesterday.

AMENDMENT TO ALASKA OMNIBUS ACT—IF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IS TO HELP RESTORE ALASKA AFTER ITS UNPRECEDENTED DISASTER, LET IT DO A COMPLETE JOB.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, it is my understanding that S. 2881—the amendments to the Alaska Omnibus Act—is scheduled for floor action tomorrow.

The bill is a much-needed cleanup bill to provide various departments and agencies of the Federal Government with needed authority to bring relief to the stricken people of Alaska which has suffered the worst disaster that has befallen any State of the Union since the founding of our Republic.

We owe much to the dedicated efforts of many Federal officials who, in Alaska's hour of need, displayed a unique dedication to alleviate suffering.

President Johnson deserves special commendation for the speed and determination he displayed so soon after the disaster struck on Good Friday last. He also is deserving of the thanks of the people of Alaska for his continued and continuous interest in the problems of the people of Alaska since then. His compassion and understanding will be long remembered by the citizens of my State.

Another individual who deserves high commendation is Mr. Edward McDermott, Director, Office of Emergency Planning in the President's Office. He mobilized his forces within hours after the earthquake and resulting seismic waves struck Alaska. He took personal charge of the situation and has labored long and hard to bring order out of chaos in Alaska. I am pleased to learn that Mr. McDermott has decided to postpone his departure from Washington. He is the type of dedicated and effective public servant much needed here in the Nation's Capital. We need more like him.

I wish to praise also the efforts of Mr. Eugene Foley, Administrator of the Small Business Administration. He has worked quickly and well in trying to minimize the distress to the private sector of Alaska's economy. Within days after the disaster, Mr. Foley was in Alaska mobilizing his forces there to provide disaster loans to the Alaska people.

Mr. Foley and I have had our differences over interest rates charged on disaster loans. But the fact that I believe he should make available to the people of Alaska disaster loans at interest rates at least as low as those given under our foreign aid program—three-fourths of 1 percent per annum—and Mr. Foley does not agree, should not minimize the fact that Mr. Foley and his people have worked tirelessly for the stricken people of Alaska.

Mr. President, it is unfortunately impossible to name the literally hundreds of dedicated Federal employees who have worked to bring relief to the people of Alaska and to enable them to try to make the fullest possible recovery. To them, on behalf of the people of Alaska, I wish to say "Thank you for a job well done."

In the individual views I submitted at the time the report on S. 2881 was filed, I indicated three areas in which the bill brings no relief and where I strongly believe relief should be granted.

The first area relates to urban renewal. The bill as reported, and following partial acceptance of an amendment I proposed, provides a 90-to-10 matching formula for areas other than Anchorage. There is no reason why Anchorage should be excluded. It has had a goodly portion of its income base destroyed and will have difficulty meeting a 75-to-25 matching formula. Those responsible for Anchorage's future, knowledgeable about its potentials, so assert. The difference is small: $4 million. But it is small only by national standards. It is large—very large—by Anchorage standards, especially in light of the report issued at the end of last week indicating that Anchorage is facing a $4 to $8 million additional bill for shoring up the business district of Anchorage. This is further evidence that we have not yet fully appraised the extent of Alaska's disaster.

I ask unanimous consent that a news article on this latest development be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Alaska? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the second defect in the bill as reported is that it deals with owners of FHA-insured homes on a discriminatory basis. The owner of a FHA-insured home which was completely destroyed or severely damaged can have his mortgage indebtedness forgiven on payment of $1,000, only if the mortgage is being held by the Federal National Mortgage Association. If it is not—and 120 such mortgages are not held by Fannie Mae—there can be no forgiveness. This, I believe, is unfair to that number of innocent and deserving victims of the earthquake. In providing relief, persons in the same situation should be treated alike.

The third defect of the bill as reported lies in the interest rate to be charged on State of Alaska bonds which the Housing and Home Finance Agency by the terms of this bill is authorized to purchase. The rate to be charged is 3⅝ percent per annum. I contended that the rate should be at least the same as that charged foreign governments under our foreign assistance program—namely, three-fourths of 1 percent per annum with no repayment of principal for the first 10 years of the loan.

In the other body, the House committee has reported a companion measure—H.R. 11438—in which all three of these defects have been remedied. The committee has not gone all the way on interest rates on the State of Alaska bonds but has lowered such rates to 3 percent with a moratorium on the repayment of principal for 10 years.

I am submitting an amendment today for consideration tomorrow which would conform the Senate bill—S. 2881, as reported—to the House bill, as reported.

I ask unanimous consent that my individual views on S. 2881, as well as my amendment, No. 1080, be printed in full at the conclusion of my remarks, and that my amendment be printed and lie at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be received and printed, and will lie on the table; and the individual views will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment referred to is as follows:

On page 4 delete lines 22 through 24.

On page 5, line 1, delete through the comma following the word "Seldovia".

On page 6, lines 15 and 16, delete the figure "$25,000,000" and the quotaton mark at the end thereof and insert in lieu thereof the following: "$25,000,000: *Provided further,* That the terms of repayment of such securities and obligations or loans shall be as follows: Repayment of the principal sum in fifty years from the date of the borrowing payable in equal annual payments beginning ten years after the money is lent at an annual interest rate not to exceed 3 per centum on the unpaid balance."

On page 6, between lines 16 and 17, insert the following new section:

"PURCHASE OF HOME MORTGAGES

"SEC. 57. The Federal National Mortgage Association is authorized to repurchase at a cost not to exceed par any home mortgage insured by the Federal Housing Administration which is secured by property in Alaska which was lost, destroyed, or severely damaged as a result of the 1964 earthquake or subsequent seismic waves. Any such purchase shall be made from funds available to the Association for carrying out its special assistance functions pursuant to section 305 of the National Housing Act: except that the aggregate amount of such purchases shall not exceed $10,000,000."

On page 6, line 25, insert the following: "The total amount authorized to be appropriated pursuant to this section shall not exceed $50,150,000."

On page 7, after line 5, insert the following new section:

"REPORTING

"SEC. 7. The President shall report semiannually during the term of this Act to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House on the actions taken under this Act by the various Federal agencies. The first such report shall be submitted not later than February 1, 1965, and shall cover the period ending December 31, 1964."

The individual views of Mr. GRUENING were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDIVIDUAL VIEWS OF MR. GRUENING

The State of Alaska and its citizens are highly appreciative of and deeply moved by the sympathetic response of the people of the rest of the United States to the damage and distress resulting from the Good Friday earthquake and resulting seismic waves.

This bill represents yet another step in the process of Federal aid to the stricken State of Alaska and its people. Its provisions are sorely needed and will be thankfully received.

During the consideration of this bill by the committee, I offered a number of amendments. Senator ANDERSON, in his capacity as a member of the committee, as chairman of the Special Committee of the Whole which held hearings on the bill, and as Chairman of the Federal Reconstruction and Development Planning Commission for Alaska, opposed all the amendments I offered.

One amendment was adopted by the committee. One amendment was limited in scope. The other amendments were tabled.

It is important that the record clearly state my objectives in offering these amendments and what they sought to accomplish.

These were not unreasonable attempts to secure everything possible for the State of Alaska and its people from the Federal Treasury. Far from being an attempted raid on the Federal Treasury, it was an attempt to maximize the effectiveness of the Federal aid already given and to be given. The old adage "For want of a nail * * * the kingdom was lost" is particularly appropriate to this situation.

With 50 percent of the income base of the State of Alaska gone, the task is to rehabilitate the private sector of the economy to bring the tax revenues flowing back to the State government as soon as possible so that it can resume normal functions. Incidently, the renewal of such flow would also produce Federal tax revenues.

What does it profit the Federal Government to dangle the carrot of urban renewal—badly needed—before the people of Anchorage at matching rates which they simply cannot afford because their tax base has been crippled by the earthquake?

What justice and equity is there in a policy of the Federal Government making the forgiveness of the mortgage indebtedness of an Alaskan FHA-insured homeowner whose home is destroyed or severely damaged depend on whether the Federal National Mortgage Association has or has not resold the mortgage to a private lending institution?

How can the Federal Government justify charging the State of Alaska 3¾ percent interest on the $25 million to be loaned to it while lending billions to scores of foreign nations at three-quarters of 1 percent interest?

To correct these injustices and to make practical the Federal aid to be given, I offered in committee three amendments.

Two amendments were tabled. The third was severely limited.

The amendments are discussed in detail below.

1. URBAN RENEWAL (AMENDMENT NO. 801)

In disaster areas, urban renewal can normally be financed with 75 percent Federal funds and 25 percent State and local funds. In Alaska, because of the severe losses in several communities of property and income tax bases and the 50-percent loss by the State of its own tax base, financing urban renewal projects on a 75-to-25 ratio would be a practical financial impossibility.

My amendment would have permitted the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency to permit Federal matching for urban renewal projects in disaster areas up to 90 percent. Senator ANDERSON opposed the amendment.

The 90-to-10 matching proposal was originally made by the HHFA, but was not approved in the draft of the bill sent to the President by Senator ANDERSON.

The amount involved is small—at most a difference of only $6 million. But to the stricken communities which had had their tax bases literally wiped out this amount can make the difference between their ability to recover or not.

Thus to the town of Kodiak it means the difference between its share being $1,993,608 or being $797,443—a difference of $1,196,165. This is 1½ times the total revenue ($747,602) of Kodiak in fiscal year 1963.

The committee accepted my amendment, but limited it to communities under 6,000 population.

The committee thus excluded the city of Anchorage on the recommendation of Senator ANDERSON who expressed his belief that Anchorage could afford to pay 25 percent as its share of matching, despite the statements to the contrary by the mayor of Anchorage, the Governor of Alaska, and the Alaska congressional delegation.

By excluding Anchorage from the more favorable matching terms of 90 to 10, the urban renewal program in Anchorage will cost an additional $4,390,000. This is about one-third of the total anticipated 1964 revenue for Anchorage.

Since the news of the committee's action was announced, the city of Anchorage has again reiterated its position that it cannot go ahead with its urban renewal plans on a 75-to-25 basis.

What does the Federal Government gain by killing urban renewal in Anchorage? It is being penny wise and pound foolish. It is insuring that the tax base in Anchorage will not rebound for many additional years, thereby keeping tax returns depressed for many additional years. The growth of Anchorage would be much slower and the tax returns lost to the Federal Government by this parsimonious action will be many times the $4 million involved.

And the ironic part of this committee action is that my amendment was discretionary only. It set 90 percent as the maximum. The matching ratio could be set at any figure from 75 to 90 percent by the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency after careful evaluation of the financial abilities of Anchorage to pay.

Attempting to saddle the stricken city of Anchorage with an additional financial burden on the basis of guesstimate of its financial condition runs contrary to the facts cited by knowledgeable State and local officials and is unfair, unjust, and inequitable.

The total cost of this amendment is only $4,390,000.

2. FORGIVENESS FOR FHA-INSURED HOMEOWNERS (AMENDMENT NO. 870)

Another amendment which I proposed would permit the Federal National Mortgage Association (Fannie Mae) to buy at par mortgages on FHA-insured homes in Alaska which were destroyed or severely damaged where the mortgages are not held by Fannie Mae.

Under existing HHFA policies, FHA mortgages on homes severely damaged or destroyed in Alaska can be forgiven upon the payment of $1,000 provided the mortgages are held by Fannie Mae. Some of these mortgages were purchased by Fannie Mae out of its special assistance fund. Some FHA mortgages on such houses are still held by banks, never having been purchased by Fannie Mae. Some were purchased by Fannie Mae and resold.

This amendment would have done equity among FHA-insured homeowners in Alaska whose homes were destroyed or severely damaged. The homeowner could not control the sale to or the purchase by Fannie Mae of his mortgage. Nor could the homeowner control the resale of his mortgage by Fannie Mae. That was purely a matter of chance.

Without this amendment, Alaska homeowners in the same circumstances will be dealt with unfairly.

This is not a question of rescuing the banks holding the mortgages, but rather rescuing the homeowners who gave the mortgages. Banks cannot forgive a legal indebtedness without making every effort to collect. Forgiveness would not be permitted by the State banking commissioner. Forgiveness would not be permitted by the Internal Revenue Service as a writeoff as for a bad debt. Collection of any disaster insurance carried by any of the banks is also dependent on diligent efforts to collect the indebtedness.

The result will therefore be that many homeowners in Alaska having FHA-insured mortgages may have to go through bankruptcy in order for the banks to prove that they took diligent steps to collect the indebtedness. Others may be saddled with double indebtednesses.

This could be happening while a next door neighbor, whose FHA-insured house was also destroyed, could obtain forgiveness solely because of the chance that the FHA-insured mortgage had been purchased by Fannie Mae and not resold.

This amendment was supported by the National Association of Mutual Savings Banks in the following communication:

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF
MUTUAL SAVINGS BANKS,
New York, N.Y., June 10, 1964.

Hon. HENRY M. JACKSON,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR JACKSON: This is in response to your letter of June 4 and telegram of June 9 with respect to the problems and proposed legislation (S. 2881) concerning Alaskan properties damaged by the recent earthquake. I am pleased to have the opportunity to comment on these matters and to offer you precise information on the volume and status of Alaskan mortgage loans held by mutual savings banks.

You will note from the attached exhibits based on a direct survey made by our national association as of April 30, 1964, that 14 mutual savings banks in 7 States held 2,778 mortgage loans in Alaska, amounting to $61,550,000. The bulk of these loans are insured by the Federal Housing Administration and are on one- to four-family properties. Only 32 loans totaling $884,000 were secured by properties destroyed or beyond repair. As you can see, such loans account for only a little over 1 percent of the total—both number and amount.

Our information is that 4 of the 14 savings banks, having loans in Alaska, are covered by all-risk insurance. The coverage and terms of this insurance are not precisely known to us, but in at least one case, we know that the savings bank must take every legal action to recover whatever it can directly from the borrower before insurance proceeds are disbursed.

With respect to S. 2881, we urge the adoption of the amendment offered by Senator GRUENING, proposing a new section 57 authorizing the Federal National Mortgage Association to purchase FHA-insured loans, in an amount not to exceed $10 million, on Alaskan properties destroyed or irreparably damaged as a result of the earthquake. This proposal is in line with the suggestion made in our letter of May 14, 1964, to Dr. Robert Weaver, Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, a copy of which was sent to you. As noted in that letter, current Federal actions provide relief only for those home mortgagors whose mortgage contracts happen to be held by FNMA or VA. Other home mortgagors, whose homes have been destroyed or irreparably damaged, but those mortgage obligations are held by private lenders are being ignored. The Gruening amendment would go a long way toward correcting this inequity.

While we are aware that it is impossible to resolve all inequities arising out of tragic disasters, I hope you will agree that the Government should not knowingly discriminate among its citizens when it can readily avoid doing so. And the Gruening amendment offers an opportunity to deal more equitably with the plight of Alaskan homeowners than the proposals made and actions taken to date.

We urge the incorporation of section 57 in S. 2881, not only because of equity considerations to mortgage borrowers, but equally important because of the great needs Alaska has for expanded flows of private capital. Such capital will not be forthcoming unless private investors have confidence in the willingness and ability of the Federal Government to proceed equitably and imaginatively in dealing with emergency situations. The citizens of Alaska are able and willing to rebuild their State stronger than ever before and this can be done most effectively only through an accelerated flow of private capital.

In sum, the Gruening amendment appears eminently fair and feasible. We urge that you support it, not out of selfish concern for our industry—which you can see from the enclosed statistics stands to suffer only inconsequential losses—but out of broader considerations for the longer run welfare of Alaska and its citizens.

Thank you for your consideration of this letter.

Sincerely yours,
GROVER E. ENSLEY,
Executive Vice President.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MUTUAL SAVINGS BANKS

TABLE 1.—*Mortgage loans held by mutual savings banks on properties in Alaska, Oct. 31, 1962, and Apr. 30, 1964*

[Dollar amounts in thousands]

Savings bank State	Oct. 31, 1962						
	Number of banks	Total		Type of loan			
				FHA		Conventional	
		Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amoun
New York	4	911	$23,273	911	$23,273	--------	--------
Massachusetts	2	46	634	46	634	--------	--------
Other [1]	4	186	4,730	61	1,477	125	$3,253
Total	10	1,143	28,637	1,018	25,384	125	3,253

Savings bank State	Apr. 30, 1964						
	Number of banks	Total		Type of loan			
				FHA		Conventional	
		Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount
New York	5	1,489	$35,153	1,489	$35,153	--------	--------
Massachusetts	3	230	6,269	230	6,269	--------	--------
Washington	2	111	1,579	--------	--------	111	$1,579
Other [2]	4	948	18,549	415	10,444	533	8,105
Other	14	2,778	61,550	2,134	51,866	644	9,684

[1] Includes Alaska, Minnesota, Rhode Island, and Washington.

[2] Includes Alaska, Minnesota, Rhode Island, and Pennsylvania.

NOTE.—There were no holdings of VA guaranteed loans reported. Data were obtained by a direct survey made by the National Association of Mutual Savings Banks.

TABLE 2.—*Mortgage loans held by mutual savings banks on properties located in Alaska—Total and loans affected by property damage, by type of loan and property, Apr. 30, 1964*

[Amounts in thousands of dollars]

Type of loan and property	Total loans held		Estimated number and amount of loans affected by property damage							
			Loans on property destroyed or beyond repair				Loans on property incurring lesser damage			
	Number	Amount	Number		Amount		Number		Amount	
			Total	Percent of total held	Total	Percent of total held	Total	Percent of total held	Total	Percent of total held
FHA insured	2,134	51,866	28	1.3	777	1.5	147	6.9	3,711	7.2
1- to 4-family	2,132	49,496	28	1.3	777	1.6	147	6.9	3,711	7.5
Multifamily	2	2,370								
VA guaranteed										
Conventional	644	9,684	4	.6	107	1.1	44	6.8	826	8.5
Total	2,778	61,550	32	1.2	884	1.4	191	6.9	4,537	7.4

NOTE.—See note to table 1.

By its terms, the total cost of this amendment was limited to $10 million. The funds would come from Fannie Mae's special assistance funds—the very fund originally used by Fannie Mae to purchase some of the FHA-insured mortgages on Alaska homes. Through June 11, 1964, there had been authorized under the Fannie Mae special assistance funds over $2 billion, of which $181,756,000 had not yet been allocated. The amount involved in this amendment is therefore less than 6 percent of the total Fannie Mae special assistance fund available for allocation and would in no way disturb allotments already made for other special assistance functions.

The adoption of this amendment could do much to relieve the approximately 120 Alaska homeowners thus discriminated against from heavy debt burdens and possible bankruptcy. As one homeowner wrote me: "A great many of us are still expecting the Federal Government through FNMA to purchase the FHA guaranteed loans that are in the slide area in Turnagain. FNMA did offer to buy the loans that they have in their portfolio, but these number but a few. This seems to be a lopsided situation with a few people getting the benefit of having their loans with FNMA where some others have their loans in private portfolios."

Simple justice would have dictated the acceptance of my amendment. This amendment was also opposed by Senator ANDERSON and was tabled.

3. INTEREST ON FEDERAL FUNDS LOANED THE STATE OF ALASKA (AMENDMENT NO. 380)

Another amendment I offered would have reduced the interest rate on bonds issued by the State of Alaska for reconstruction of disaster damage, and purchased by the Housing and Home Finance Agency, to three-quarters of 1 percent, repayable in 50 years with a moratorium on repayment of principal for the first 10 years.

The bill provides for a rate of interest of 3⅝ percent (3¾ percent after July 1) with a repayment schedule of 40 years and no moratorium.

Immediately after the Good Friday disaster, the Legislature of the State of Alaska—as an indication of its willingness to do all within its means to undertake the issuance of $50 million worth of general revenue bonds. However, 50 percent of Alaska's economic base was destroyed by the earthquake and bond experts now state that State bonds can only be marketed now at an interest rate of considerably more than 3⅝ percent.

At an interest rate of 3⅝ percent, interest on $25 million of State bonds over the course of 40 years would cost the State of Alaska more than $18 million. If the interest rate could be reduced to three-quarters of 1 percent, with a moratorium on repayment of principal for the first 10 years, and repayment spread over 50 years, the saving to the State of Alaska would be almost $13 million and the repayment terms would be more within the means of the State.

What I suggested to the committee was that the Federal Government loan Federal funds to the State of Alaska at the same terms on which it makes loans to foreign countries under the foreign assistance program.

There are several reasons in support of this suggestion.

In the first place, the foreign loans are made at three-fourths of 1 percent interest whether or not there had been a disaster in the foreign country. Alaska has suffered a major disaster and should be entitled to at least equal treatment.

In the second place, there is no doubt that the loan to the State of Alaska will be repaid to the Federal Government. On the basis of past experience, there is considerable doubt that the foreign loans will ever be repaid to the United States.

In the third place, the loan to the State of Alaska generates tax revenues. Our loans to foreign countries produce revenues for those foreign countries, not for the United States.

In the calendar year 1963 alone, AID made loans in the amount of over $1 billion to 35 foreign countries at terms of three-fourths of 1 percent interest, moratorium of 10 years on the repayment of principal, and repayment of principal in 40 years. (See list below.)

Loans made by the Agency for International Development to foreign countries during calendar year 1963 at ¾ of 1 percent for 40 years[1]

LATIN AMERICA

[Repayable in dollars]

Country and borrower	Purpose	Date of loan agreement	Number of years repayment	Interest rate	Amount of loan
Argentina:					
Government of Argentina	Central housing bank	June 3, 1963	40	¾	$12,500,000
Do	Route 12 road project	Jan. 21, 1963	40	¾	6,700,000
Do	Road program loan	Mar. 18, 1963	40	¾	30,500,000
Do	Feasibilities studies	June 3, 1963	40	¾	3,000,000
Do	Grain storage facilities	Oct. 10, 1963	40	¾	21,700,000
Bolivia:					
Government of Bolivia	Access roads	Aug. 1, 1963	40	¾	7,200,000
Do	La Paz-El Alto Highway	Aug. 17, 1963	40	¾	3,400,000
Do	El Alto Customs Center	do	40	¾	2,200,000
Banco Industrial, S.A	Assist in financing subloans	do	40	¾	2,400,000
Government of Bolivia	Agricultural bank	do	40	¾	3,700,000
Brazil:					
Credito E. Financiamento, S.A	Development bank	Mar. 6, 1963	40	¾	4,000,000
CIA de Carbonos Coloidois	Carbon black plant	Mar. 11, 1963	40	¾	2,000,000
Government of Brazil	Emergency stopgap assistance	Apr. 24, 1963	40	¾	25,500,000
Super Desenvolvimento, N.E	Emergency electric power	Oct. 29, 1963	40	¾	2,400,000
Chile: Government of Chile	Development program	Jan. 31, 1963	40	¾	35,000,000
Colombia:					
Government of Colombia	Feasibility studies	June 26, 1963	40	¾	4,000,000
National Housing Institute of Colombia	Self-help housing	do	40	¾	7,500,000
Colombia Institute of Agrarian Reform	Supervised AG credit	do	40	¾	10,000,000
Government of Colombia	Mineral resources survey	Sept. 18, 1963	40	¾	2,000,000

See footnote at end of table.

Loans made by the Agency for International Development to foreign countries during calendar year 1963 at ¾ of 1 percent for 40 years[1]—Continued

LATIN AMERICA

[Repayable in dollars]

Country and borrower	Purpose	Date of loan agreement	Number of years repayment	Interest rate	Amount of loan
Costa Rica:					
Banco Nacional de Costa Rica	Agricultural development	July 23, 1963	40	¾	$5,000,000
Republic of Costa Rica	Slum replacement housing	do	40	¾	2,000,000
Do	Cachi hydoelectric project	do	40	¾	1,500,000
Do	Metro emergency water supply	do	40	¾	1,400,000
Do	IBRC/AIC highway program	do	40	¾	2,100,000
C.O.F.I.S.A	Financing subloans	Dec. 23, 1963	40	¾	5,000,000
Dominican Republic: National Housing Bank	Savings and loan association	Jan. 2, 1963	40	¾	2,100,000
Ecuador:					
Government of Ecuador	Quito-Quevede Rd	Sept. 1, 1963	40	¾	2,700,000
Do	Economic and engineering studies	Sept. 4, 1963	40	¾	2,000,000
Do	Administrative and fiscal reform	Sept. 2, 1963	40	¾	1,600,000
El Salvador:					
Republic of El Salvador	Primary school construction	Sept. 18, 1963	40	¾	2,400,000
Do	Agricultural loan program	do	40	¾	8,900,000
Do	INSAFI	do	40	¾	4,500,000
Honduras: Government of Honduras	Small water systems	Aug. 22, 1963	40	¾	1,050,000
Jamaica: Government of Jamaica	Project assistance	Nov. 29, 1963	40	¾	1,500,000
Nicaragua: Government of Nicaragua	Las Mercedes Airport	July 25, 1963	40	¾	1,000,000
Panama: Instuto de Acuedictos	Water supply and sewerage system	Feb. 6, 1963	40	¾	6,000,000
Peru:					
Government of Peru	Lima water sewerage	Mar. 15, 1963	40	¾	8,600,000
Do	Feasibility studies	do	40	¾	3,000,000
Uruguay: Banco Hipotecaric del Uruguay	Home construction	Feb. 28, 1963	40	¾	6,000,000
Venezuela:					
C.A. Bank for Economic Integration	Feasibility studies	Nov. 29, 1963	40	¾	2,500,000
Do	Home loan department	do	40	¾	10,000,000
FAR EAST					
Korea: Government of Korea	Changsong coal mine district	Dec. 7, 1963	40	¾	9,500,000
NEAR EAST AND SOUTH ASIA					
Afghanistan:					
Government of Afghanistan	Ariana Afghan Airlines	Mar. 23, 1963	40	¾	2,625,000
Do	Transport equipment	Dec. 3, 1963	40	¾	2,000,000
India:					
Government of India	Ramagundam thermal power	May 21, 1963	40	¾	8,400,000
Do	Delhi C thermal power	Mar. 8, 1963	40	¾	16,000,000
Do	Satpura thermal power	do	40	¾	25,100,000
Do	Central Ropeway F project	Oct. 21, 1963	40	¾	7,700,000
Do	Nonproject imports	Feb. 25, 1963	40	¾	240,000,000
Do	Chandrapura thermal stage II	Oct. 21, 1963	40	¾	16,000,000
Do	5th railway loan	do	40	¾	15,850,000
Do	Cucga coal washery plant	Nov. 29, 1963	40	¾	5,100,000
Do	Tarapur nuclear power	Dec. 7, 1963	40	¾	80,000,000
Nepal: Government of Nepal	Nepal Industrial Development Corp	Dec. 8, 1963	40	¾	1,000,000
Pakistan:					
Government of Pakistan	Sawmill and timber extraction	Oct. 23, 1963	40	¾	2,200,000
Do	Malaria eradication program	Feb. 28, 1963	40	¾	3,800,000
Do	Airport and airways equipment	Mar. 22, 1963	40	¾	2,100,000
Do	Salin Cont. and Reclamation Project No. 2	do	40	¾	10,800,000
Do	General commodities 2d	Mar. 27, 1963	40	¾	30,000,000
Do	Chalna anchorage project	Mar. 22, 1963	40	¾	3,600,000
Do	Feasibilty studies	Mar. 27, 1963	40	¾	2,000,000
Do	CPS and Maini-Rechna DCAB project	Aug. 15, 1963	40	¾	750,000
Do	Coastal embankment project	do	40	¾	6,500,000
Do	General consultants	do	40	¾	4,500,000
Do	3d commodity loan	Sept. 28, 1963	40	¾	70,500,000
Do	General services in public health	Dec. 9, 1963	40	¾	1,500,000
Do	Investigative services	Nov. 20, 1963	40	¾	5,600,000
Do	5th railway loan	do	40	¾	14,500,000
Do	Telecommunication expansion	Oct. 23, 1963	40	¾	4,700,000
Do	Machinery pool organization, WAPCA	Dec. 9, 1963	40	¾	5,000,000
Do	Mechanical equipment	Nov. 20, 1963	40	¾	1,500,000
Turkey:					
Government of Turkey	Keban and Ciceroz feasibility studies	July 15, 1963	40	¾	350,000
Do	Feasibility studies	Oct. 15, 1963	40	¾	3,000,000
Do	General commodities	Sept. 11, 1963	40	¾	35,000,000
United Arab Republic (Egypt):					
Government of United Arab Republic	Cairo west power project	Feb. 20, 1963	40	¾	30,600,000
Do	Cardborad project	Nov. 12, 1963	40	¾	5,700,000
AFRICA					
Cameroon: Government of Cameroon	Extension of railway system	Aug. 27, 1963	40	¾	9,200,000
Ethiopia: Government of Ethiopia	3d highway program	Dec. 2, 1963	40	¾	4,000,000
Ivory Coast: Government of Ivory Coast	Highway equipment	Nov. 29, 1963	40	¾	1,700,000
Liberia:					
Government of Liberia	National medical center	Dec. 5, 1963	40	¾	5,300,000
Monrovia Power Authority	MT coffee hydroelectric project	Sept. 26, 1963	40	¾	24,300,000
Government of Liberia	Monrovia Junior-Senior High School	Oct. 23, 1963	40	¾	1,700,000
Mali:					
Government of Mali	Teachers training college	Dec. 4, 1963	40	¾	2,100,000
Do	Central Veterinary Laboratory at Bamako	do	40	¾	1,100,000
Niger: Government of Niger	Development band	Dec. 14, 1963	40	¾	500,000
Nigeria:					
Government of Nigeria	Ibadan water supply	Dec. 4, 1963	40	¾	12,100,000
Do	Calabar-IKCM road	do	40	¾	8,600,000
Somalia: Government of Somalia	Chisimaic port	do	40	¾	3,600,000

See footnote at end of table.

Loans made by the Agency for International Development to forign countries during calendar year 1963 at ¾ of 1 percent for 40 years[1]—Continued

AFRICA

[Repayable in dollars]

Country and borrower	Purpose	Date of loan agreement	Number of years repayment	Interest rate	Amount of loan
Sudan:					
Government of Sudan	Industrial development bank	July 14, 1963	40	¾	$2,000,000
Do	Khartoum sewerage	Dec. 7, 1963	40	¾	3,800,000
Tanganyika					
Government of Tanganyika	Dar es Salaam water supply system	May 20, 1963	40	¾	2,200,000
Do	URBAN water supplies	Dec. 4, 1963	40	¾	1,300,000
Do	University college	Oct. 9, 1963	40	¾	800,000
Do	Teacher training college	Dec. 4, 1963	40	¾	800,000
Do	Commodity development training center	do	40	¾	250,000
Do	Agricultural college	do	40	¾	1,250,000
Do	Program loan	Dec. 6, 1963	40	¾	1,000,000
Do	Electrical equipment	do	40	¾	300,000
Tunisia:					
Government of Tunisia	Water and irrigation projects	Feb. 15, 1963	40	¾	2,400,000
Do	Commodity assistance	June 20, 1963	40	¾	15,000,000
Do	Construction of university	Oct. 31, 1963	40	¾	1,800,000
Do	Agricultural equipment	do	40	¾	6,500,000
Uganda:					
Government of Uganda	Development bank	Oct. 4, 1963	40	¾	2,000,000
Do	Secondary schools	Oct. 11, 1963	40	¾	2,400,000
Grand total for all countries					1,057,925,000

---

[1] Source: "Status of Loan Agreements" (W-224), Agency for International Development, as of Mar. 31, 1964, Office of the Controller, AID.

	Total amount
Argentina	$74,400,000
Bolivia	18,900,000
Brazil	33,900,000
Chile	35,000,000
Colombia	23,500,000
Costa Rico	17,000,000
Dominican Republic	2,100,000
Ecuador	6,300,000
El Salvador	15,800,000
Honduras	1,050,000
Jamaica	1,500,000
Nicaragua	1,000,000
Panama	6,000,000
Peru	11,600,000
Uruguay	6,000,000
Venezuela	12,500,000
Korea	9,500,000
Afghanistan	4,625,000
India	414,150,000
Nepal	1,000,000
Pakistan	169,450,000
Turkey	38,350,000
United Arab Republic (Egypt)	36,300,000
Cameroon	9,200,000
Ethiopia	4,000,000
Ivory Coast	1,700,000
Liberia	31,300,000
Mali	3,200,000
Niger	500,000
Nigeria	20,700,000
Somalia	3,600,000
Sudan	5,800,000
Tanganyika	7,900,000
Tunisia	25,700,000
Uganda	4,400,000
Total	1,057,925,000

Surely Alaska deserves these same terms.

The cost to the Federal Government of this amendment over the 50 years would be $13 million, or $260,000 per year. Not a large sum to the Federal Government, but a very large sum to a stricken State struggling to recover from the greatest disaster ever to strike any State of the Union.

For the reasons stated above, I must therefore reserve my position on this bill when it is called up for consideration by the Senate.

ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senator.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Anchorage (Alaska) Daily Times, June 26, 1964]

STUDY SHOWS DOWNTOWN NEEDS DRAINS, BUTTRESSES FOR SAFETY—$4 MILLION TO $8 MILLION ESTIMATED FOR COST OF SOIL STABILIZATION WORK

A program of ground stabilization for the downtown business district—expected to cost between $4 and $8 million—was called for in a report given the city today by a team of Federal scientists and engineers.

The long-awaited report was the first of three to be issued on a months-long Anchorage area soils study started here after the March 27 earthquake. The study has been conducted by a team of consultants working for the U.S. Army Engineer District, Alaska, and the Federal Task Force 9.

Today's report continued the high risk designation for the downtown business district between E Street and Barrow and from the Alaska Railroad depot to the alley between Fifth and Sixth Avenues.

The remainder of the downtown area, from E Street to the Inlet and south along L Street, will be included in the second report scheduled to be released July 6. A third report, covering the Turnagain residential district, is to be made on July 11.

City officials were briefed on today's report at a meeting held with Corps of Engineers and Task Force 9 personnel at the office of Col. Kenneth Sawyer, Alaska district engineer.

Mayor George Sharrock and Lyman Woodman, acting city manager, led the delegation of councilmen and city department heads attending the briefing.

While the report continued the high risk designation for the Fourth Avenue slide area it said the classification could be reduced to a nominal risk category through a program of soil stabilization.

The program would include removal of unstable soil and replacement with more stable material, regarding, installation of drainage, and buttressing of the northern end of the slope area.

While the report did not include cost figures for such a program, preliminary unofficial estimates indicated it would run between $4 and $8 million.

The report is expected to be presented to Senator CLINTON ANDERSON, chairman of the Alaska Reconstruction Commission on his return to Washington Monday. The next step apparently will be an economic study of the feasibility of the proposed stabilization program and possible methods of financing.

Continuation of the "high risk" designation for the Fourth Avenue area apparently continues for the present the Federal Small Business Administration's freeze order on loans for new construction in the area. The freeze was announced earlier when a preliminary report first labeled the downtown area as a so-called high risk zone.

The slide areas were originally designated high risk in the preliminary report issued on May 19. That report was based on preearthquake reports and later surface studies. Since it was issued, an intensive program of core drilling has been underway to provide more complete data. Results of the drilling were incorporated in today's report.

The area covered in today's report includes the five-block section on the north side of Fourth Avenue between E and A Streets where business establishments were destroyed by the quake and slide. Also included is the Fifth Avenue location of the five-story J. C. Penney Co. building heavily damaged in the quake.

The Seattle enginering firm of Shannon and Wilson conducted the soils study which were the basis for today's report. Consultants for the study included Dr. L. Bjerrum of Norway, an expert on unstable clay; Dr. Ralph Peck, soils foundation scientist; Dr. Harry Seed, University of California scientist; Dr. A. Spence, of Vancouver, British Columbia, soil consultant; and Dr. Neil Twelker, Seattle soil consultant. Engineers on the staff of the Army Corps of Engineers and geologists with the U.S. Geological Survey also participated in the study.

AUTHORIZATION TO FILE REPORTS AND REPORTS OF INDIVIDUAL AND MINORITY VIEWS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that committees of the Senate be permitted to file reports and reports of individual and minority views during the adjournment of the Senate this evening.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

A PLAN TO END THE DRAFT IN 1967

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I send to the desk a bill which proposes to end the draft, and I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGOVERN] be joined as a cosponsor with me on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the name of the cosponsor will be added.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, in essence, the bill would require that the Secretary of Defense submit in 1 year an alternative to the draft, based upon a voluntary system of recruitment, so that the Congress would have the opportunity to conduct hearings, to debate, to weigh, and evaluate a voluntary system of maintaining the Armed Forces.

President Johnson recently announced plans for a new comprehensive study of the draft system including the possibility of meeting our requirements on an entirely voluntary basis in the next decade.

The President noted that we may have "drifted" from the original idea of universal military conscription, which was based on the belief that all should share the obligations of military service "equally, in accordance with a fair and just system."

The President should be congratulated for taking a new look at the draft, an issue of vital importance to our national security and also to the daily lives of millions of Americans.

The Congress should play an active role in this study, and I believe an independent study by a Presidential Commission is also in order.

Although the Armed Services Committees have held hearings on the extension of the draft, the last time Congress considered the subject the Senate devoted only 10 minutes of discussion to it—and then extended present law for 4 full years.

That is not adequate consideration for a program which is supposed to be a cornerstone of our Nation's defense, and a program which has serious impact on the lives of millions.

This is a matter which affects the life of every American boy. It overshadows the most important formative years of his life—the years between 18 and 26.

We cannot claim to have fulfilled our responsibilities unless we give serious study to this problem. Yet it has been 14 years since Congress carefully weighed voluntary alternatives to the draft.

The last time we undertook a comprehensive review of voluntary versus compulsory methods to fill our manpower needs was before the Korean war, in 1948 and in 1950.

I think that by the time we next vote on the draft—in 1967 when present law expires—we should have before us for consideration at least two fully developed alternatives, one voluntary, one compulsory.

Today I am introducing legislation which would direct the Secretary of Defense to prepare and submit such alternatives to the Congress well in advance of 1967 so that we can discuss, debate, and choose between two clear cut, fully developed programs.

If the Congress will take the time to make a detailed study of the draft as it works today, I think it will be shocked and appalled at what it finds.

My own study has led me to this conclusion:

Our present draft system is outmoded. It should be terminated, in the interests of national security as well as justice. With careful planning, we can end the draft, responsibly, in 1967.

I want to discuss with the Senate the facts on which that conclusion is based. First, to summarize very briefly, let me list some of the principle shortcomings of our draft system today:

First. It is unjust and inequitable. The fact that 42 percent of the eligible age group do not serve destroys the whole concept of universal military service.

Second. It creates countless personal hardships. Most draftees are not called up until they are 23 years old. For 5 years after they become 18, they live a life of needless uncertainty because their plans for a career, marriage, and a future of their own are almost completely dominated by their draft status.

Third. It is militarily inefficient. The draft has been proven to be a poor source of the kind of professional servicemen which we need to guarantee national security today.

Fourth. The draft wastes both money and manpower.

Fifth. The draft is no longer necessary. The facts show that we could eliminate it by 1967 if we begin now to develop a better alternative system.

CRITICISM OF THE DRAFT

The New York Times commented on the draft on January 10, saying:

> It is none too soon to consider alternatives to or major revisions of the draft law, which expires in June 1967. It has been clear for some time that the inequities in the present law and the great increase in the draft age population, plus technological changes in the armed services, require a major reexamination of how to select, recruit, and retain the numbers of men required annually.

Similarly, the Milwaukee Journal commented, on February 9:

> Inequities of the Draft Act become increasingly apparent as the pool of draft age young men increases without an increase in the number needed by the Armed Forces. Universal military training is not universal. Many young men avoid service. Deferments are liberally granted to college students and men in critical occupations. Under the latest draft rules, married men are not taken.

Walter Millis, military historian, has said:

> It is shocking that Congress automatically extends the Draft Act year after year with little or no debate.

Dr. Eli Ginsberg of the conservation and human resources project at Columbia University calls our attitude toward the draft "an invitation to national disaster."

What does the general public think? Congressman ROMAN C. PUCINSKI of Illinois studied the draft in 1959. After an intensive survey in Chicago, he reported:

> The draft has a very important effect on the present development of our young people. Hundreds of thousands are forced to live in a shadow of constant doubt as to their future, when actually only a few thousands are ultimately drafted. Many young men who graduate from high school and who do not, or cannot because of economic reasons, go to college, find it impossible to get decent employment because the first thing they are asked by a potential employer is "what is your draft status?" I could not begin to tell you the hardships that this situation is causing.

My own constituents often raise the issue with me. A mother in West Allis, Wis., wrote me as follows:

> My grandfather left Germany in 1870 to avoid the universal conscription of that country, and we fought two wars to oppose German militarism. My husband and I fear that if general acceptance of the draft law continues, we will become what we opposed then.

A family in Beloit, Wis., wrote me:

> These young men should be launching out into the future with confidence instead of hesitancy and cynicism. Service to their country should be something they willingly do in an emergency rather than something to try to avoid in times when they cannot see its significance or fairness. It doesn't help the Army to have to shape reluctant draftees into an enthusiastic crew. It would do better with volunteers in a well-trained, well-disciplined force. War and manpower needs have changed since the Civil War, and the Berlin and Cuban crises have shown that military conscription is not an effective weapon of the current cold war.

EFFECTS OF THE BABY BOOM

The post-World War II baby boom is breaking the back of the present draft system.

Assistant Defense Secretary Paul has testified that our military manpower needs will probably remain constant at about 2.7 million men.

But the pool of men of draft age, available for military service, is growing by leaps and bounds. Today there are more than 1.4 million youths reaching the age of 18 each year. No more than 670,000 of these men are needed for military service.

By 1967, the numbers of youths reaching the age of 18 will total 1,800,000.

Today we have a pool of men eligible for the draft, from 18½ to 26½ years old, which numbers 10.6 million. By 1967 this total will be 12.4 million. The pool of men of draft age grows by one-third every 6 or 7 years. Yet our military manpower needs remain approximately the same.

The effects of these indisputable facts on our draft system are shocking.

At present, the draft calls on the average only about 90,000 men a year—from a Nation which is producing more than a million potentially eligible men.

Less than 1 in 10 is actually drafted. The draft supplies only about 9 percent of present Army strength and about 15 percent of the annual replacement quota of all the services. Some men enlist.

But the really startling fact is that only about 58 percent of those theoretically eligible serve at all. In other words, 42 percent of these young men are not called upon to serve under what the public thinks of as a system of universal military service. For the most part, these men are not to be criticized. The facts show that we simply do not need all the men eligible for the draft. But rather than abandon a system which has been proved unnecessary, we maintain it and then corrupt it by excusing 42 percent of the total.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a chart indicating the military service status of the male population from 18½ to 26½ years of age.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. male population, ages 18½ to 26½, and estimated number initially entering military service, fiscal years 1964–68

Fiscal year	U.S. male population [1]		Number initially entering service		
	Total 18½ to 26½ June 30	Men reaching age 18½	Total	Active Forces [2]	Reserve Forces
1964	10,570,000	1,420,000	670,000	520,000	150,000
1965	11,090.000	1 680.000	620,000	480,000	140,000
1966	11,800.000	1,880,000	650,000	510,000	140,000
1967	12,390,000	1 810,000	590,000	460,000	130,000
1968	12,900,000	1,820,000	610,000	500,000	110,000

[1] Adapted from unpublished estimates, U.S. Bureau of the Census.

[2] Includes officer accessions, enlistees, and inductees. The number of inductees in fiscal year 1964 is estimated at approximately 160,000. The average number of inductees in fiscal years 1965–68 is projected at about 90,000 per year.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, these figures show that before long, 50 percent of the men in this age group will never have served in the Armed Forces.

Assistant Defense Secretary Paul told the Senate last year:

> With more men becoming available and about the same number being needed for military service from year to year * * * we have faced the prospect of a continued buildup in the manpower pool of draft liables.

Reacting to the kind of facts I have cited, the chairman of the Armed Services Committee [Mr. RUSSELL] commented last fall:

> I would very much like to get some better system.

We are stuck with a system which supplies far more men than we can use. So what do we do? We corrupt the system by providing more and more ways to avoid the draft. As a result we actually encourage our young men to seek ways to avoid service.

The result is that many of those who do end up being drafted feel not that they are a part of any great system of universal military service, but merely that they are the suckers who got caught.

Because the draft in its "pure" form supplies far more men than we need, we have corrupted the system to favor: Those who can afford to stay in college until they are 26 years old; those who marry early; men with criminal records or moral shortcomings; those who are mentally or physically below standard—and the standards are increasingly arbitrary; those whose employers will claim that they are essential.

CLASS DISTINCTIONS IN THE DRAFT

The Defense Department does not want to draft men of very poor education. They are the hardest to train. So we push up our standards in preinduction examinations and the number disqualified in the South is much higher than in the North. One out of three men from South Carolina passed the examination in 1962, as compared with two out of three from Iowa.

While granting this exemption from universal military service to the poorly educated, we also grant a similar exemption to those of high educational level.

If the philosophical basis of universal military service is the belief that each man owes something to his country, I do not see how we can justify the fact that these two groups are arbitrarily excluded from the obligations of service. But each time the question is raised, we offer the weak alibi—"We do not need them."

THE DRAFT IS MILITARILY INEFFICIENT

I am sure that many people are aware of the inequities and injustices in the present draft system, but they feel that these are a part of the imperfections of life and that we must bear with a system vital to our national security even if it has its faults.

Therefore, it is important to understand that the draft is just as much a failure today from the standpoint of military efficiency.

Assistant Secretary Paul has testified:

> The volunteer is likely to be a better motivated soldier than the conscript. He is also available for a longer term of service, since initial enlistments are for 3- or 4-year terms as compared with a 2-year tour (for draftees).

At the present time, 97 out of 100 draftees leave the service as quickly as they can at the end of their tours. The money spent to train them is wasted. The morale of men who obviously cannot wait to get out is very low.

The Defense Department is well aware of these facts and has been for a long time. During the Korean war, faced with a serious emergency, more than 600,000 World War II veterans were called back while 1,600,000 young men of draft age were not called.

During the Berlin crisis, 150,000 reservists were called to active duty amid considerable protest, while the number of extra men drafted amounted to no more than several thousand.

Obviously, as these facts clearly show, a modern army needs trained professionals. A great mass of untrained men, waiting to get out, is of little value to the Armed Forces during a crisis.

IS THE DRAFT NECESSARY?

The facts I cite have been known to a lot of people for a long time. But we have struggled along with an inequitable, inefficient system because, I assume, most people thought it was necessary and there was no real alternative. I am sure there was a time when that was true. But it is no longer true today.

Any serious study of the facts shows that we could meet our manpower needs and build a better army if we would let the draft expire in 1967 and develop a new and better system.

First, we must remember that we are not talking about all 2,700,000 men in our Armed Forces. We are talking only about the 90,000 who are to be drafted each year. We are talking about only 1 man in every 30 in the Armed Forces.

I think every serious student of the subject would agree that these 90,000 men could be eliminated without any appreciable loss to the strength of the services.

Some will argue, however, that this is not the real question. The question is whether eliminating these 90,000 draftees, by eliminating the draft, would also cut down on voluntary enlistments by men who join up because they fear they would be drafted otherwise.

Assistant Secretary Paul was asked about this last year at hearings on extending the draft. He replied:

> I think the most important element in answering your question is, the absence of induction authority would drastically affect the recruitments programs that are now being conducted by the services, both in the enlisted and the officer area.

He said he did not think that we could maintain 2.5 million men in the armed services over the next 4 years without a draft law.

I would agree that this probably was correct for much of the period under discussion. But now circumstances are changing.

There is strong evidence that there will be enough volunteers to meet our manpower needs by 1967.

Moreover, we could easily fill in any shortages in the ranks by more imaginative use of civilian workers.

HOW TO ATTRACT VOLUNTEERS

Defense Department studies show that even with the existing pay system and existing manpower requirements, we may very well be able to fulfill our manpower needs without the draft in 1967.

If we will face up to the facts of life and modify our manpower policy we may even find ourselves with an oversupply of volunteers.

By 1967, the Defense Department estimates that there will be 12.4 million in the age group eligible for military service. The Department estimates that only about 590,000 will be needed for each year for active and reserve duty in all services.

The question is, therefore, whether we can attract 590,000 high quality volunteers without the draft.

The Defense Department has made a recent study on the extent to which the draft influences enlistment decisions. I ask unanimous consent that the results of this study be included in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the results of the study were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Influence of draft upon enlistment decision of 1st-term Army enlistees, by mental group

[In percent]

	Total	Group I	Group II	Group III	Group IV
No influence	46.8	21.7	35.2	55.9	66.9
Very little influence	16.5	14.0	18.0	16.3	14.6
Some influence	17.4	24.5	23.2	13.9	8.1
Very much influence	19.3	39.8	23.6	13.9	10.4
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Source: 5-percent armywide sample survey, as of Nov. 3, 1962.

Based on responses to following question: When you were a civilian without prior military service, how much influence did the selective service draft have upon your decision to enlist in the Regular Army?

No influence; I wanted to be in the Army.

Very little influence; I most likely would have enlisted if there had been no draft.

Some influence; I might not have enlisted if there had been no draft.

Very much influence; I would not have enlisted if there had been no draft.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, the important facts are the first two under the first column. A total of 46.8 percent of first-term Army enlistees said that the draft was no influence in their decision to enter the Army.

Another 16.5 percent said the draft had very little influence. They most likely would have enlisted if there has been no draft. Thus a total of more than 63 percent indicated that they probably would have joined the Army in any case.

If this seems surprising, one must remember that many young men still look to the armed services as a source of valuable training; others are anxious for adventure, and still others are affected by the high rate of unemployment among our youth.

But remember, these figures are based on the system as it exists today. The number of volunteers could be greatly increased if we would simply do two things: Pay more realistic salaries; adopt more realistic standards of eligibility.

Business attracts the number and the quality of the men it needs by offering realistic salaries.

Under the military pay bill we passed last fall, a private entering service earns $78 a month. The Air Force has 5,000 men who are receiving relief payments to help support their families. Is it any wonder that more men do not volunteer?

In Canada, a private starts at $112 a month, almost 50 percent more than in the United States. If he has specialized skills, he can earn as much as $202 a month—three times the American.

I ask unanimous consent that a table sent to me by the military attaché of the Canadian Embassy be included in the RECORD at this point. I also ask that part of the pay table approved by the Congress last year be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Canadian enlisted pay scale

Rank or classification	Monthly rates of pay									
	Standard group	Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Group 3-X	Group 3-A	Group 3-Y	Group 3-Z	Group 4	Group 4-A
Private, or equivalent rank, recruit of the Canadian Army (Regular) under 17 years of age: Basic rate	$60	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
Private, or equivalent rank, recruit: Basic rate	112	$124	$148	$166	$172	$175	$178	$184	$184	$202
Private, or equivalent rank, trained soldier:										
Basic rate	119	131	155	173	179	182	185	191	191	209
Higher rate	138	150	174	192	198	201	204	210	210	228
Higher rate with 3 years' progressive pay	159	171	195	213	219	222	225	231	231	249
Higher rate with 6 years' progressive pay	186	198	222	240	246	249	252	258	258	276
Private, holding appointment of lance bombardier or lance corporal: Basic rate	189	201	225	243	249	252	255	261	261	279

U.S. enlisted pay scale

Pay grade	Years of service computed under sec. 205														
	2 or less	Over 2	Over 3	Over 4	Over 6	Over 8	Over 10	Over 12	Over 14	Over 16	Over 18	Over 20	Over 22	Over 26	Over 30
E-9	----	----	----	----	----	----	$435	$445	$455	$465	$475	$485	$510	$560	$560
E-8	----	----	----	----	----	$365	375	385	395	405	415	425	450	500	500
E-7	$206.39	$275	$285	$295	$305	315	325	335	350	360	370	375	400	450	450
E-6	175.81	240	250	260	270	280	290	305	315	325	330	330	330	330	330
E-5	145.24	210	220	230	245	255	265	275	280	280	280	280	280	280	280
E-4	122.30	180	190	205	215	215	215	215	215	215	215	215	215	215	215
E-3	99.37	145	155	165	165	165	165	165	165	165	165	165	165	165	165
E-2	85.80	120	120	120	120	120	120	120	120	120	120	120	120	120	120
E-1	83.20	110	110	110	110	110	110	110	110	110	110	110	110	110	110
E-1 (under 4 months)	78.00	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, the Defense Department does recognize the principle that servicemen must receive a reasonable living wage, somewhat comparable with private business. But it recognizes this principle at every level except the beginning level.

The purpose of the pay raise bill passed last year to bring salaries closer to the standards in private business. At that time, the Congress also heard much testimony about Navy petty officers being eligible for supplementary relief payments; of West Point and Annapolis graduates earning $268 a month when a college graduate in the civil service could start at $462 and a teamster in New York City could start at $416.

But note that Congress did not raise military pay so as to induce enlistment. We granted no pay increase at all to the lower beginning ranks.

Rather we did as we have done for more than 14 years. We made no effort to attract volunteers; we merely relied on the crutch of the draft to pressure men into enlisting.

To pursuade men to reenlist, we have faced the facts of life and granted pay incentives. But to attract new men, we have simply relied on the compulsion of the draft.

America is too wealthy a country to rely on sheer force in order to solve its manpower problems.

As Prof. John Kenneth Galbraith has stated:

> The draft survives principally as a device by which we use compulsion to get young men to serve at less than the market rate of pay. We shift the cost of military service from the well-to-do taxpayer, who benefits by lower taxes, to the impecunious young draftee. This is a highly regressive arrangement which we would not tolerate in any other area. Presumably, freedom of choice here as elsewhere would be worth paying for.

I am convinced that if we were willing to offer realistic salaries to newly enlisted recruits, we could dramatically increase the flow of enlistments from our vast manpower pool.

Furthermore, I am convinced that the increase in costs would not be great. If we can persuade substantially increased numbers of men to enlist and to stay for longer periods, there will be a substantial saving in the training costs.

In 1957 the Secretary of Defense selected a special committee headed by Ralph

Cordiner, president of General Electric Co., to study the need for pay increases. The committee reported that "modern war technology makes it almost impossible to train a specialist in 2 years," which is the time the average draftee stays in service.

As Cordiner stated:

> I found antagonism and bitterness over the draft. They were checking off the days until they got out. We must devote 25 percent of our military effort to training men who don't stay. The trainers are discouraged. They resemble the poor teacher whose every class flunks.

The Cordiner report estimated, on the basis of figures submitted by the Armed Forces, that more realistic pay would increase enlistments and actually make possible a reduction in the size of the Armed Forces, especially in training and transportation of personnel, and a 10-percent cutback in maintenance technicians. The reasoning was that higher morale and better training would also reduce damage to technical equipment. The total possible saving, if all Cordiner report recommendations were adopted, was estimated at $2.8 billion in 1960 and $5 billion in 1962.

In 1962 the Army found that it cost $3,880 to equip, give basic training and advanced individual training, and transport an enlisted man to his first unit assignment.

If he were recruited, the enlistment cost was $162. If he was drafted, the enlistment cost was $66. Altogether, it cost $4,042 to prepare a recruit for his first unit assignment as against $3,946 for the draftee—a difference of $96 in favor of the draftee.

However, after training, the Army had 1 year less service from the draftee. This works out to $1,554 per man-year for the recruit compared with $2,466 for the draftee, an advantage of $912 per man-year in favor of the volunteer.

Suppose a soldier serves 3 years and then reenlists for another 3 years. Allowing for a bonus he receives on reenlistment, the cost of enlistment, training and transportation for this man would total $4,800. During his 6 years of service he would replace three inductees who would have cost a total of $11,838. The saving represented by this 6-year man would be over $7,000 in enlistment, training, and transportation costs. The saving would be greater if the man reenlisted for more than 3 years.

These estimates cannot be applied directly to today's problem. But the principle is clear. A professional military system based upon volunteers who are well motivated will be more efficient, more effective, and more economical. Since long-term, regular career personnel reenlist at the rate of about 90 percent, I suspect that the increase in pay of a voluntary system could be offset by savings in training and maintenance costs.

In Great Britain, the armed forces have followed industry's example and devoted all their talents into attracting recruits. Like Canada, they too have eliminated the draft. They have improved not only the pay but housing and recreation facilities; travel allowances, and educational opportunities. They have expanded their recruiting and publicity operations.

At present, we are spending about $50 million a year in recruiting. I am convinced that a private business with $50 million to attract qualified people would have no difficulty in hiring 600,000 a year.

While discussing ways to attract more volunteers, special attention should be paid to the officer ranks. It is often stated that the draft is particularly important in forcing qualified men into service as officers. I think its use for this purpose is especially questionable.

As Members of Congress we are swamped with requests from highly qualified young men who want to attend one of the various military academies and have a career in military service. The great majority must be turned down. We could easily solve our officer supply problem by expanding the Academies.

Among service academy graduates, about 85 percent remain beyond their obligated service commitment. Army and Air Force officers commissioned from Officer Candidate School—OCS—have a retention factor of about 75 percent. Air Force aviation cadet graduates since 1957 have a retention range between 65 and 90 percent. However, these three sources together provide less than 10 percent of the required number of new officers. The remainder enter through sources with much poorer retention experience.

Among ROTC graduates, the retention rate is only 33 percent. Among graduates of the Navy Officer Candidate School, which provides about one-third of the officers commissioned annually by the Navy, the average rate is about 12 percent. These men must serve for 3 years. Then most of them leave.

The major procurement sources for naval flying officers are the aviation cadet and aviation programs. They have retention rates of 45 and 30 percent respectively.

STANDARDS OF ELIGIBILITY

Another way to increase the flow of volunteers into the Armed Forces would to be revise our standards. Some of these standards have actually been set to reduce the number of men who could qualify for military service, because we have such an oversupply of men available. It is time that we took a careful look at our enlistment standards and revised them to enable more and more men to qualify while still maintaining such standards as are really necessary.

Assistant Secretary Paul testifies:

> Our studies indicate that, under recent physical and mental standards, about one-third of all young men examined for service (including volunteers as well as draft registrants) fail to qualify for peacetime military service, as compared to an overall rejection rate of about 24 percent during the period of the Korean conflict.

General Hershey, director of the Selective Service System, has stated:

> There is some evidence, though, that this overall rate (of rejections) might eventually climb toward two-fifths * * *. Additionally, both physical and mental criteria seem to be gradually interpreted and applied on a more and more rigid basis.

A review of the history of our present standards indicates that many of them were established mainly to keep back the flow of volunteers. If previous standards still operated today, we would admit more volunteers—and there would be little need for an average of 90,000 draft calls. Indeed, there is much evidence indicating that standards have been raised primarily to justify the present draft system.

The arbitrariness of today's standards can be clearly shown. For instance, it is possible for a man to be found unfit for enlistment—and still be drafted. The mental qualifications for enlistment are higher than those for the draft.

The recent report of the President's task force on manpower conservation, entitled, "One-third of a Nation," showed that 44,000 men were disqualified on mental, physical, or moral grounds when they sought to enlist in 1962.

Individual cases of outstanding athletes found unfit for military service occasionally hit the headlines and dramatize the arbitrariness of our standards. I think a basic question is whether we must set the same standards for all men accepted into service. Does a clerk in a Washington procurement agency need the same physical abilities as a front line rifleman? Does a cook need the same education and training as a radar technician? Should a radio repairman be barred from service if he is not quite tall enough, or is overweight or underweight? Would any businessman expect all his employees to meet the same mental and physical standards?

If we merely returned to the standards which applied at the time of the Korean war, there would be far more men qualified for service than there are today. At that time, about one-fourth were rejected, compared with about one-third today.

If we returned to Korean war standards, there would be about 9 percent more of the manpower pool eligible.

I ask unanimous consent that a chart be printed in the RECORD at this point which shows the present rejection rates of a number of NATO countries compared with the United States.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATO country rejection rates for armed forces[1]*—Percent of men who do not meet physical and mental standards*[2]

NATO country:	
United States	36
Belgium	8
Denmark	14
France	18
Greece	5
Italy	18
Netherlands	24
Norway	25
Turkey	1

---

[1] From hearings, Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower, Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, "Nation's Manpower Revolution," pt. 8, pp. 2592–2595; Nov. 12, 1963; and "One-third of a Nation," p. 11.

[3] Ibid. These are conservative estimates: Information is uneven in various countries, but where rates of rejection for volunteers and conscripts differ, the higher rejection rate has been used. Similarly, although rejection rates for medical and physical reasons often overlap (and are duplicative when added) the sum of both is, in fact, used.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, this table shows that almost every NATO country rejects far fewer men then we do. The American rejection and deferment rates combined permit 42 percent of all young men theoretically available for the draft to escape military service. The rejection rate alone is now more than 33 percent.

In other countries, the rejection rate runs from only 1 percent in Turkey to about 25 percent in Holland and Norway.

Reducing enlistment standards need not lower the quality of the Armed Forces.

During World War II and the Korean war, many men who rated low on their admittance tests did a creditable job.

In fact, there is clear evidence to show that these men, once properly trained, turn out to be very good soldiers. An excellent book, "The Uneduacted," by Prof. Eli Ginsberg and Douglas W. Bray, was produced shortly after General Eisenhower became president of Columbia University. The book says:

> Clearly, at a time when the armed services needed men badly, they were able with a small investment, to turn many illiterates and poorly educated men into capable soldiers.

This experience was confirmed by training successes between 1954 and 1957, and in new experimental programs this year.

General Hershey, in testimony before the Employment and Manpower Subcommittee of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, noted that in Israel only 4 percent are rejected. Much training is done in the Army. In Russia, the air force and navy have higher standards than the army but "much rehabilitative work after induction" is done in service.

I understand that the Defense Department already has plans for training such men in the event of a national emergency. It is simply a matter of applying our intelligence and skills to doing a job right.

Recently Sargent Shriver noted that many men of lower qualifications would especially like to be in the Armed Forces. They would appreciate such a chance to be trained and educated and make some contribution to their county.

This point is borne out in a letter to me from General Hershey, dated April 15, 1964. He stated:

> This headquarters receives a steady flow of letters and other inquiries from and on behalf of young men who, for one reason or another, have been disqualified from military service but who desire to enter service. The volume of requests for help of this nature indicates to me that significant numbers of young men not qualified for military service really want to serve.

I ask unanimous consent that General Hershey's letter be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS,
SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM,
Washington, D.C., April 15, 1964.

Hon. GAYLORD NELSON,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR NELSON: In response to your telephone request to a member of my staff, I am pleased to furnish the following comment.

This headquarters receives a steady flow of letters and other inquiries from and on behalf of young men who for one reason or another have been disqualified from military service, but who desire to enter service. The volume of requests for help of this nature indicates to me that significant numbers of young men not qualified for military service really want to serve.

If I can be of further service, please call on me.

Sincerely yours,
LEWIS B. HERSHEY,
Director.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, the President's poverty program emphasizes the need to conserve manpower and make more individuals into healthy and self-supporting citizens. The Armed Forces have a unique opportunity to help in this program and to produce trained, educated soldiers from the sizable pool of men who have missed out on some of the opportunities of life in America.

A LOOK AT MANPOWER NEEDS

There is nothing sacred about the present level of 2.7 million men in our Armed Forces. When General Eisenhower was President, the number was substantially less, averaging approximately 2.5 million at the end of his administration.

Our demonstrated capacity to transport large numbers of men from U.S. bases to join up with equipment and materials in Europe, for instance, indicates that the number stationed abroad could be reduced.

A reduction in manpower needs would of course, remove one of the main historical justifications for our antiquated draft system.

There are many other ways in which we could accomplish the same objectives with fewer men in actual service. I ask unanimous consent that a table presented to the Labor Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Enlisted skill structure, June 30, 1963 [1]*; total enlisted jobs 2,030,000* [2]

Occupation designation:	*Percent of total*
Ground combat	14
Electronics	14
Other technical	8
Mechanics and repairmen	25
Administrative and clerical	20
Crafts	7
Services	12

[1] Taken from hearings of Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, "Nation's Manpower Revolution"; pt. 8, p. 2579, chart 1, Nov. 12, 1963.

[2] Excludes about 320,000 trainees, transients and other "bulk" positions without occupational designation.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, note that the number of ground-combat enlisted personnel throughout the service amounts to only 14 percent of all other enlisted men in service.

Only about one-seventh of the total force are actual combat troops. Note that 20 percent are in administrative and clerical work, and that mechanics and repairmen make up 25 percent.

Representative THOMAS B. CURTIS told the Seabee veterans convention a few years ago:

> When we examine * * * the work performed by men in uniform for the Military Establishment, we will find that at least 80 percent (and some even estimate higher) is not fighting nor will it ever be fighting. It has to do with supplies, transportation, warehousing, maintenance, overhaul, bookeeping, housing, feeding, overhead. What they (military leaders) have not yet learned is that the civilian enterprise is better equipped to train men in those skills than the military, and incidentally, at one-tenth the cost, because we don't have to provide room, board, and wages for our civilian trainees. * * * Following such a formula, we need neither UMT, military socialism, nor destructive high taxes.

"Project Native Son," which the Air Force put into practice a few years ago, replaced military men with civilians living near the Air Force installation. It reduced manpower needs and also the need for military housing and supplies. In fiscal 1955, according to the September 6, 1954, issue of Aviation Week, the Air Materiel Command found that it could use 31,000 foreign nationals to relieve 43,000 military personnel.

Full and imaginative use of the "contracting out" process would reduce military manpower needs substantially, and cut related costs accordingly.

Another way to reduce the number of men needed each year is to increase the average length of stay.

A further means of reducing manpower needs is to increase efficiency of present forces. Administration will also be a problem with an enlarged armed force. Secretary McNamara has shown great incentive and ability in increasing efficiency and reducing costs. Yet recently the General Accounting Office revealed that the Army had put 35,000 soldiers in wrong jobs, wasting some $48 million. Highly trained Army helicopter mechanics in Korea have been given jobs as lifeguards, dog handlers, and company clerks. At Fort Leavenworth, Kans., a soldier with 13 weeks of specialized training in aircraft maintenance was assigned as a military policeman, under a "personnel management system that generates misassignments."

The panel headed by Ralph Cordiner said that if all its reforms in military manpower policies were adopted, combat capability could be improved by 8 to 16 percent within 5 years. The Cordiner recommendations are not precisely the same as those I would suggest, but the basic point is the same: If we can increase our military efficiency, we thereby can reduce our military manpower needs.

We also could take greater advantage of automation. In civilian life, automation use increases about 3 percent per man each year; each year, one man is able to do a little more than he was last year through improved technology.

Obviously, there are special problems in military service, but new forces, new missiles, new electronic techniques certainly affect the capability for each man.

SUMMARY

For all these reasons, I believe that the United States can now initiate immediately a program to end the draft in 1967, when the present law expires.

I am introducing legislation today which would:

First. Declare the intention of the Congress to end the draft as soon as feasible, by 1967 if possible.

Second. Direct the Secretary of Defense to present an alternative plan to the draft so that the Congress could have before it a choice between two fully developed plans, one compulsory, the other voluntary.

Such a plan must include revisions in entrance requirements, increases in pay at lower levels, increased fringe benefits, revised recruiting standards and a study of all techniques to reduce the number of men needed in military service.

The plan would be a way of making military service a more attractive career, based on freedom of choice.

Such a plan would of course include provision for use of the draft in the event of an emergency, upon declaration of the President that it is needed, and with the approval of Congress.

In essence, this proposal for directing the Secretary of Defense to submit legislation aimed at ending the draft is an attempt to present Congress with a real choice. It may be that I am wrong, and that the disadvantages of ending the draft outweigh the advantages. But we will know that only if we are able to consider both alternatives in detail. For this purpose, we must go beyond the administration's request for a general study: The Congress must be presented with a fully developed alternative.

This plan, Mr. President, aims at moving forward to end compulsion in the military service—to reinstitute freedom in this vital branch of American life. Its basic justification is the principle that freemen should be able to choose free ways to serve their country. The plan is based upon an analysis of our manpower needs which indicates we can establish a highly professional military service voluntarily.

I have concentrated my argument today on the question of the military necessity for the draft.

I have not stressed other considerations which are in our minds as we evaluate the draft. But let me just note in conclusion some of the advantages which will accrue if the draft is abandoned and there is a return to the traditional American volunteer system for obtaining military manpower.

For the student and the anxious parent, ending the draft will remove the cloud of uncertainty which is so unsettling during those crucial formative years in a young man's life. Plans for school, for a job, for marriage, for a family—will be made with a greater measure of certainty and confidence.

For the educator and counselor on the campus, it will take away the evasion mentality among young men which often creates undesirable attitudes toward our citizenship responsibilities and duties.

For the city official and police officer and the youth worker, it will take away one recognized factor which accentuates and intensifies juvenile delinquency.

For the businessman, it will enable him to hire promising young men without fear that a draft board call would take them away. It would mean greater use of private enterprise in servicing military installations. For the military men, it will mean a shift to a professional better trained, higher morale Military Establishment. For all citizens, it will remove a system which is inequitable in operation, which emphasizes class divisions, and which is not in accord with our democratic tradition.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill which I am introducing be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2960) providing for the formulation of an effective program for fulfilling our military manpower requirements on a voluntary basis in order that mandatory service in the Armed Forces may be terminated not later than June 30, 1967, introduced by Mr. NELSON (for himself and Mr. MCGOVERN), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

FINDINGS AND PURPOSES

SECTION 1. The Congress hereby finds—

(a) that the military manpower requirements of the Nation in the past several years have been relatively constant while the number of persons available for military service in those years increased substantially;

(b) that today approximately two out of every five persons eligible for compulsory military service under the Universal Military Training and Service Act are not called upon to perform any military duty;

(c) that there has been increasingly serious and legitimate criticism of the Universal Military Training and Service Act because it is neither universal nor equitable in its operations; and

(d) that the Congress should delay no longer in considering new programs designed to meet our military manpower needs, and those programs should, to the maximum extent practicable, be based on voluntary rather than involuntary service:

It is the purpose of this Act, therefore, to direct the Secretary of Defense to make a comprehensive study and investigation of our long-range military manpower requirements and to formulate and submit to the Congress for its consideration, at least two years prior to the expiration of the program now in effect under the Universal Military Training and Service Act, an alternative program designed to meet those requirements on a voluntary rather than involuntary basis.

It is further declared to be the purpose of this Act to express the intent of the Congress that the Universal Military Training and Service Act and related laws, as now in effect should not be extended beyond their present termination date of June 30, 1967.

STUDY AND INVESTIGATION AUTHORIZED

SEC. 2. (a). The Secretary of Defense is authorized and directed to make a comprehensive study and investigation of any and all matters pertaining to the means and methods of meeting the military manpower requirements of the Nation in future years. In carrying out such study and investigation the Secretary shall give special consideration to—

(1) Means of reducing the military manpower requirements of the Nation through—

(A) more efficient operation and use of personnel;

(B) maximum exploitation of automation;

(C) greater use of civilians in noncombat positions;

(D) increased efforts to retain experienced military personnel, thus reducing the number of new and inexperienced men needed each year; and

(2) Expansion of the pool of men available for military service through—

(A) the revision of enlistment standards;

(B) introduction of expanded training programs within the military;

(C) utilization of men trained and educated under programs outside the military, including programs which might be established under the presently proposed legislation dealing with poverty in the United States; and

(D) expansion of the service academies.

(3) Increased emphasis on expansion and improvement of recruiting operations and on the retention of military personnel through—

(A) a major increase in pay to military personnel, including new recruits;

(B) increased allowances and reenlistment bonuses;

(C) improved housing and barracks facilities;

(D) improved recreational facilities;

(E) increased allowances for travel and for shipment of household effects; and

(F) modernization of recruiting methods, including the best techniques used in industry for recruiting personnel.

(4) The recruiting and possible conscription of special categories of personnel such as doctors, dentists, and other highly trained and critical personnel.

(5) The feasibility and desirability of—

(A) authorizing the President to invoke legislation providing for the involuntary service of persons in the Armed Forces in the event of a national emergency or the failure of voluntary enlistments to meet the military manpower needs of the Nation; and

(B) preserving a skeleton force of selective service staff in the event of a reactivation of the draft laws.

(b) The Secretary of Defense is further authorized and directed, in connection with the study and investigation provided for in subsection (a) of this section—

(1) to determine the effectiveness of programs in other countries which rely on voluntary enlistments to meet their military manpower requirements;

(2) to provide the Congress with cost estimates for meeting military manpower requirements under a voluntary program; and

(3) to consider the methods and means by which young men may be motivated to serve voluntarily in the Armed Forces.

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS

SEC. 3. The Secretary of Defense shall report the results of the study and investigation authorized by this Act to the Congress not later than June 30, 1965, and shall submit with such report recommendations for legislation appropriate to effectuate an effective voluntary program for fulfilling the manpower requirements of the Armed Forces after the expiration of the Universal Military Training and Service Act.

AN ALTERNATIVE TO THE MILITARY DRAFT BY 1967

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NELSON. I yield.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I warmly congratulate the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON] for his enlightening remarks on the military draft.

The Senator from Wisconsin has given long and careful consideration to this problem. He has given several years of his own life to active military service. As the Governor of his State for 4 years, he was intimately associated with many of our military training programs. As a Member of the Senate he has consistently taken a forward-looking position on national security issues.

I am pleased to be associated with him in the sponsorship of legislation requiring the development of alternative proposals to the present draft.

The present system seems to me to be a wasteful, inefficient, and undemocratic method of securing our military manpower. It is a cloud over the lives of all of our young men and yet only a fraction of them are needed or will be called for service.

I think that by proper salary and job benefits we could secure the men we need on a voluntary basis. This would produce a military force of better motivated career servicemen and leave the rest of our young men free to pursue their careers and their private lives without the uncertainty of a draft hanging over their heads.

I have been a cosponsor with the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] of legislation calling for a study of the draft by a public commission. The legislation which I now join in sponsoring with the Senator from Wisconsin will supplement the earlier legislative proposal.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NELSON. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I congratulate the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin for discussing this problem. As the Senator knows, he and I are cosponsors of the bill which calls for a study of the entire draft system. I have very serious reservations as to whether the present plan of providing military manpower is the best method. The President announced, sometime following the introduction of our proposed legislation, a study. But that study is to be conducted only by the Defense Department. The bill which we are sponsoring calls for a much wider range of study by members of the Defense Department, military and civilian agencies, and the public. I feel very strongly that such a study should be made.

The Senator from Wisconsin would go further. In the measure which he has introduced—and he was very kind to furnish me with a copy of his remarks, which I appreciate—as I understand, the Senator proposes to take specific steps toward eliminating the draft at this point. Is that a fair statement of the Senator's bill?

Mr. NELSON. Yes; I think that is a fair statement. If I may interject a word or two, I joined the Senator from New York in sponsorship of a bill to establish a Presidential Commission on the Administration of Universal Military Training Service. I believe that is a fine bill and a necessary one, because I think the public should be represented in a comprehensive review and study of an issue which affects all the young men of our country.

Second, the President also asked the Defense Department to make a study of military manpower. There is no conflict between this study and the proposal of Senator KEATING. Nor is there a conflict with my proposal. My legislation merely insists that the Defense Department must come forth with an alternative to the draft to present to the Congress. Then Congress will be able to conduct hearings on an alternative to a compulsory system, and Congress will have an opportunity to participate in a broad-scale discussion of the entire issue. The bill would not compel the Secretary of Defense to support an alternative to the draft. It may very well be that when we are through, we shall find that there is no alternative. However, I am quite well satisfied, from my own studies, that with proper changes in recruitment, in salaries, and in treatment of the men in the service, we can have a highly skilled professional Army based upon a voluntary system that is better than the Army as it is now constituted.

Mr. KEATING. I thank the Senator. Our Canadian neighbors have devised a system which is purely voluntary. They have no draft. The system is one which I think we should study for several reasons: First, there is the very high rate of reenlistment compared to our rate. As the Senator has said, only about 3 percent of our draftees reenlist. In Canada the rate is very much higher. One of the reasons is that Canada pays her military personnel at higher rates and provides aid for education. Perhaps we would be money ahead if we did the same thing. The cost of training a draftee often amounts to as much as $3,000. That money is completely wasted for the 97 percent of those who enter the service and fail to reenlist.

The present system is unsatisfactory. An 18-year-old today who is physically and mentally fit does not know where he stands. He may be drafted next in order or next year or 4 years hence. Most likely he will be drafted 4 or 5 years from now. Since he has no way of knowing at any time when Uncle Sam will call on him, he is handicapped in planning his career and in applying for a job. This is one of the rare instances in which physical soundness is a strike against him.

Few employers now are willing to hire a young man who is 1–A. I suspect that the draft accounts in part for the fact that the unemployment rate of young adults under 22 is twice that of adults over 22.

The so-called universal system drafts only about half of the eligible youths between 18 and 26, and yet everyone in this rapidly growing pool is affected by the uncertainty of the draft unless he is favored by the circumstance of sufficient worldly goods to afford to go on to higher education, or to get married, or has some form of disability. Unless he is in one of those circumstances, he does not know where he stands. The Defense Department is not equipped to determine the needs of the ten and a half million or more young men between the ages of 18½ and 26½.

Elaborate attempts have been made to patch up the draft system for modern needs, but the result has been injustices that actually encourage evasion of the law.

Recently I learned of a young man who hammered away at his knee until he developed the athlete's affliction of a trick knee, and he was declared medically unfit for the draft.

Under this potluck system, flat feet may be a blessing or may not, depending upon the mood of the medical examiner. The draft system also has a great disadvantage of being an inadequate way to maintain our defenses. One or two years after a young man is discharged from the service, he is no longer up to date on the current military techniques and technology. The taxpayer has invested a great deal of money in his training, and yet his training has ceased to be adequate in the event of a national emergency. One does not have to be familiar with the Cordiner report, which reviewed this very problem in great detail, to know that in the end we must rely on man in the final analysis for our defense and for our progress. However, the fact is that under the universal military training system, and under the present rates of pay, both the draftee and the enlisted men in the lower ranks receive less attention and considerably less money than the arms, missiles, and computers that we have built to defend the free world. It is highly likely that if we were to increase the advantages of military service in the form of higher pay and educational benefits, we might not need this instrument of coercion.

I call attention to the fact that there are tens of thousands of men in the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marines who support their families, or try to, on less than $3,000 a year. That is considered the limit under the poverty program. The situation has become so desperate that in the Air Force there are 5,000 enlisted men who have had to seek relief payments. An estimated 70,000 are resorting to moonlighting to keep their families clothed, housed, and fed. I happen to have these figures from the Air Force, which made them available, but I assume they are comparable to the other services.

It is not surprising, then, that after 2 or 3 years of service, as the Senator has pointed out, only 3 to 5 percent of the draftees and about 26 percent of the volunteers reenlist. In effect, the serviceman is paying, in the worst way, and the civilian taxpayer is paying, too, for a highly inefficient and costly system.

Rough calculations suggest that we could increase the pay and benefits of each serviceman in the four lowest grades anywhere from $50 to $100 a month and thereby increase enlistment and reenlistment rates.

An exhaustive study of the economic and sociological, as well as the military aspects, of our draft laws by a Presidential Commission is the first step toward meaningful revision of the System. It is only a first step; yet without it there is far less likelihood for a solution that is both reasonable and just.

Again I congratulate the Senator for reviewing this problem. I want to study his bill with care, but I am sure the general objective which the Senator is seeking is similar to mine, and that of the 18 cosponsors of the resolution to establish such a Presidential Commission, which I have introduced.

We must continue to focus attention on the method of raising our military manpower, and not merely year after year or periodically, with a half-hour's debate, extend the draft law, without full consideration of all the factors that enter into the problem of raising and maintaining a strong military force.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I emphasize at this time that the bill I have just introduced does not conflict with the bill of the Senator from New York; it supplements it. Its sole objective is to require the Defense Department to bring to Congress an alternative, so this legislative body, which has the ultimate responsibility, will have an opportunity to consider plans for both compulsory and voluntary service, and so that there may be hearings and open debate. Therefore, there is no conflict between the two bills.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NELSON. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CHURCH. I congratulate the Senator on the excellent address he has given, which I have read with interest and with care.

I note with approval that the Senator commenced his address by making reference to President Johnson's recently announced plans for a new comprehensive study of the draft system, including the possibility of meeting our requirements on an entirely voluntary basis in the next decade.

We know there are many "sacred cows" in Government. We must not let the Selective Service System become one, by holding it above question or review.

I commend the Senator for pointing out that, not only should there be a Presidential Commission with responsibility for looking into the matter and making recommendations, but for urging that Congress, as well, should take part.

I think this is the objective the Senator wishes to serve, through the address he has made, and the legislation he has introduced. For this I commend him heartily. His bill could be the vehicle for a thorough congressional investigation for the present propriety of the Selective Service System in meeting the current security needs of the country.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NELSON. I yield.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I commend the distinguished junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Nelson] for his very thoughtful and timely speech regarding the termination of the draft in 1967.

Our thinking is being directed more and more to the problems that relate to the Selective Service System—the time break in a young man's career, the demands of national security, the retention of trained military personnel, and particularly, the appallingly high rejection rate of those called up for service.

With regard to the latter, on May 20, 1964, I spoke to this body about an excellent experimental program administered by the National Committee for Children and Youth, and joined in by the District school system and the Departments of Labor and Defense. In this project, 11 Army volunteer rejects were enlisted in an experimental course of 6 weeks' intensive and specialized educational training. On reexamination by the Army recruiting service, the rejectees scored much higher grades than they had on the initial test, and they were then able to qualify for Army service.

The project director, Mrs. Rita Valeo, did an outstanding job in this productive and educational effort. It points out two important things—that we are not properly meeting the educational needs of our young people, and that we can, when we do make an effort, provide greater opportunities for our youth.

I believe the article I had printed in the Record by B. D. Ayres, Jr., of the Washington Post, will add to Senator Nelson's penetrating analysis of the draft problem, and I ask unanimous consent that it be reprinted at this point, in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Eleven Who Failed Army Tests Win Reversal by Cramming

(By B. D. Ayres, Jr.)

Eleven men rejected early this year by the Army as educationally unfit have since passed military service examinations with the aid of a cram course.

Two achieved grades high enough to permit them to enter the Army as volunteers and thus receive preferred training and assignments. The remaining men scored high enough to permit them to volunteer for the draft and thus be placed at the top of the call-up list.

Military and labor specialists view the project with enthusiasm. They see it as an aid to both enlistment and job qualification.

Originally, the 11 men had volunteered for the Army but had failed the enlistment screening test, which determines if volunteers should take final service entrance tests. After learning of the failures, the National Committee for Children and Youth invited the men to take the special 6-week course, which was set up by the committee with Manpower Act funds designated for the renewed fight against poverty.

The course enabled each man to raise his screening test grade an average of about 20 points, for a class test average of about 35 out of a possible 48. The passing mark is 28.

As set up, the program offered job-placement aid to men who completed the course but chose not to take the Army reexaminations or men who failed the reexaminations. Army rules permit men to take the screening test twice.

The men who took the course told counselors they had volunteered for the Army in hope of acquiring training that eventually would give them a boost in the labor market. Almost all were school dropouts who came from impoverished backgrounds.

Committee officials currently are considering a second Washington program and work is underway on a Baltimore program.

Similar projects for rejected draftees are being planned by the Labor Department. Job placement will be emphasized even more heavily than in the committee's programs, which concern only service volunteers.

Initially, 27 men signed up for the national committee course.

Eleven dropped out early in the program, most because job hours conflicted with class hours.

Of the remaining men, only two failed reexaminations in the screening test. The others chose not to take more tests, were unable to find the time, or were physically disqualified.

Mr. PELL. In conclusion, I again congratulate the Senator from Wisconsin for his original thought and the attention he has directed toward this problem.

Mr. NELSON. I thank the Senator from Rhode Island for his comments. I emphasize that he called attention to what is one of the main problems; namely, that the Defense Department is setting rather arbitrary standards to keep people from being drafted. The example cited demonstrates that in a very brief time the Army could easily teach men an adequate amount to qualify them to pass examinations for service in the military.

I yield the floor.

POWERLINE HELD AGAIN

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I wish to insert into the Record an editorial which presents a cogent post mortem on a matter of great importance to southern Idaho: the recent refusal of a House committee to appropriate funds for a transmission line to carry surplus public power to and from southern Idaho.

Is this, as one might hope, an editorial from one of those Idaho cities which would directly benefit from such a line? I regret that it is not. These papers are too preoccupied with explaining how cheap BPA power would undermine all that is static in the southern Idaho economy. No, this editorial comes from an area so suffocated by the BPA bureaucracy that its private utilities show a record of expansion far in excess of the national average—where business has boomed, where consumers have enjoyed lower rates, and schools are better financed.

The editorial is from the Portland Oregonian, a cautious paper, not given to promoting socialism, a paper which has lived with BPA for more than 25 years. From this experience, the Oregonian can say:

> The presence of Bonneville Power is not incompatible with the continued existence of healthy private utilities serving their customers at rock-bottom rates. Idahoans ultimately will realize this too, however, diligently their private power companies work at the task of trying to persuade them they never had it so good.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Record the editorial

"Powerline Held Again," from the June 8, Portland Oregonian.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POWERLINE HELD AGAIN

If a House subcommittee has indeed axed a Bonneville Power Administration request for $1 million to plan a transmission line across southern Idaho, it is a notable victory for the Idaho Power Co. and the Utah Power & Light Co., which have managed for nearly 30 years to short circuit all efforts to bring low-cost Bonneville energy into their private marketing preserves.

It it is not the end of the most bitter clash between public power proponents and private power defenders in the Columbia basin since the Hells Canyon fight of the forties. Secretary of the Interior Udall last year formally declared southern Idaho to be a part of the BPA marketing area, which it logically should be when one looks at the geography of the region, and economically should be when BPA has power to sell at rates lower than southern Idaho consumers now pay.

A key issue in the dispute is the 20-year contract recently signed between BPA and the Monsanto Co. for delivery of some $2 million in prime power and $500,000 in interruptible power at 2.2 mills for production of phosphate fertilizer at Soda Springs, Idaho. This rate is less than half that which Monsanto now pays to its present supplier, the Utah Power & Light Co. The chemical firm has said if it gets this cheaper power it will expand its Soda Springs operations and employ 200 more people.

In the absence of a high-voltage transmission line from McNary Dam across southern Idaho, or a "wheeling" agreement with Idaho Power Co. to deliver the BPA power to Monsanto, the contract cannot be fulfilled.

Ipco and Utah argue forcefully that there is no power shortage in their area, that they can supply the needs of industrial and private consumers in their areas at acceptable rates, and that the proposed line would be too costly (they say $132 million, as opposed to BPA's estimate of $73.5 million). They have strong allies in Monsanto competitors such as the J. R. Simplot Co., which makes phosphate fertilizer with the "wet acid" process and would not benefit from low power rates, and from Republican State officials and Members of Congress in Idaho and Utah.

Idaho's three Democratic Members of Congress, on the other hand, have joined with mayors of southern Idaho cities and other potential BPA industrial customers in urging construction of the transmission line. Others on opposite sides of the battle, for reasons equally apparent, are spokesmen for Idaho's few public power distribution systems, and representatives of the Utah and Wyoming coal interests which supply fuel for private utility steam generating plants.

This is a dispute which for the moment will turn on the political strength the opponents can muster in Congress. But ultimately another voice will be heard: That of the people of southern Idaho whose rivers contribute to the hydroelectric power generation capacity of the Columbia River drainage, and yet who now pay about half again as much as do the people in the BPA service areas for the power they buy to light their lights and run their vacuum and TV sets. As Willamette Valley residents have learned, the presence of Bonneville power is not incompatible with the continued existence of healthy private utilities serving their customers at rockbottom rates. Idahoans ultimately will realize this, too, however diligently their private power companys work at the task of trying to persuade them they never had it so good.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, in accordance with the previous order, I move that the Senate stand adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 42 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, in accordance with the previous order, until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 30, 1964, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate, June 29, 1964:

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

John B. Duncan, of the District of Columbia, to be a Commissioner of the District of Columbia for a term of 3 years, and until his successor is appointed and qualified. (Reappointment.)

U.S. COAST GUARD ACADEMY

The following officer of the permanent commissioned teaching staff of the Coast Guard Academy for promotion to the grade of lieutenant commander:

Jimmie D. Woods

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States to the grades indicated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3442, 3443, and 3447:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Andrew Thomas McAnsh, O38667, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. William Welby Beverley, O21107, U.S. Army.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Cuyler Llewellyn Clark, Jr., O22947, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Gilbert Hume Woodward, O23102, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Delbert Earle Munson, O23156, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Vernon Anthony Walters, O1284614, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army Reserve).

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3299:

To be major

Aarestad, James H., O69576.
Aaron, Thomas E., O64021.
Ablett, Charles B., O67546.
Abood, Edmond P., O89022.
Adams, George H., O69450.
Adams, Lawrence E., O81938.
Adams, Paul G., O68067.
Aden, Irving J., Jr., O67635.
Aines, Donald S., O78694.
Akers, Albert B., O64211.
Albert, Benjamin B., Jr., O70246.
Albree, John A., O64529.
Albritton, John D., O64408.
Aldridge, George W., O69582.
Alfonte, William, A., Jr., O63765.
Alford, John C., Jr., O71751.
Allen, John C., O69583.
Alter, Charles P., O65505.
Alverson, Willard G., O64688.
Anderson, Dee R., O67637.
Anderson, Julian A., O85833.
Anderson, Skinner E., O69453.
Andrews, Donald A., O87466.
Andrews, George N., O64900.
Andrews, Robert J., O63759.
Anker, Don C., O64070.
Antila, Eric F., O64029.
Arculis, Sherwin, O70162.
Armstrong, Charles E., O64384.
Arnet, Robert A., O64700.
Arter, Robert, O63272.
Ashley, Floy L., O63897.
Atchison, Eulen D., O85468.
Atkeson, Edward B., O64089.
Atkins, Jesse J., O68072.
Atkinson, Larry R., O71439.
Aude, Peter N., Jr., O84847.
Austin, Garratt A., O65624.
Averill, Jack E., O99606.
Ayers, Carl W., O73436.
Bachinski, Stephen W., O70253.
Badger, Joseph E., O78706.
Baez-Murphy, Julio C., O70255.
Bailey, Bruce B., O64175.
Bailey, Joe, O68073.
Bailey, Robert A., Jr., O87469.
Bain, James, Jr., O68322.
Baker, Arthur R., O67639.
Baker, Harold L., O64244.
Baker, Milton S., O67640.
Baker, Theodore A., O75332.
Bannister, Bob C., O70261.
Barber, Ransom E., O64033.
Barclay, Robert H., O84945.
Barker, Frank P. K., Jr., O64243.
Barnes, Wilman D., O64821.
Barott, William C., O64102.
Barringer, Fred A., O71758.
Barringer, John D., O65398.
Barron, James T., O64039.
Barton, Harold A., O64013.
Basanez, Edward S., O69585.
Bashore, Frank M., O64197.
Bateman, Samuel J., Jr., O63761.
Bates, James D., O63607.
Bauer, James C., O64318.
Bauers, Robert E., O64157.
Baum, Alfred K., O69587.
Baumann, Adolph E., O63554.
Bayless, Robert M., O70163.
Beamer, William E., O69457.
Beardsley, William F., O80043.
Beaty, Raymond H., O63679.
Beavers, Joseph E., O70266.
Beczkiewicz, Peter A., O63950.
Bednar, Richard J., O75144.
Beers, Edwin D., O81954.
Begley, John L., O62777.
Bell, David A., O69459.
Bell, John E., O70270.
Bellomo, Jack B., Jr., O67643.
Benefiel, Daniel J., O69588.
Benefield, Ralph O., O67788.
Bennett, Alfred E., O83099.
Bennett, Risden T., Jr., O70272.
Benton, Arthur L., O94088.
Beran, Kurt, O67644.
Bernier, Jacques W., O64740.
Berry, Thomas S., O84849.
Best, Frederick W., Jr., O64245.
Bicher, George A., Jr., O63914.
Bieri, Albert P., O92237.
Biggs, Odie E., O65396.
Bills, David L., O63925.
Bilon, John J., O69591.
Birch, Harold B., O64656.
Bird, Russell D., O64365.
Birdseye, Elmer H., O64024.
Bishop, James M., O71444.
Bittick, Emmett K., O73288.
Black, John R., O64253.
Black, Marion R., O80046.
Black, Roscoe, O71445.
Blanchard, Howard B., Jr., O84850.
Blazina, Joseph J., O73289.
Bludworth, Donald G., O89033.
Boatner, James G., O63931.
Boggs, Lewis A., 4th, O84590.
Bohen, John M., O64116.
Bolak, Aloysius, O79189.
Boll, Kenneth H., O78724.
Bond, Robert M., O69596.
Bonham, Mark M., Jr., O78726.
Bostad, Allen B., O64636.
Bowden, James C., Jr., O66136.
Bowden, William C., O63516.

Bowers, Emmett W., O64359.
Bowman, Elmo L., O78729.
Bowman, James E., O88580.
Boyd, Robert U., Jr., O66137.
Boze, Wilburn H., O65320.
Bradford, Duke C., Jr., O69864.
Bradley, James T., O78732.
Bradley, Philip H., O65393.
Bradley, William J., Jr., O63973.
Bradley, Wray E., O79195.
Bradshaw, Charles W., O70283.
Bradshaw, John N., O75150.
Brady, Morris J., O69597.
Braim, Paul F., O69598.
Branch, Raymond L., O81964.
Brandenburg, John F., O69599.
Brandenburg, John N., O64653.
Breakiron, Richard C., O63993.
Breed, Edwin R., O69462.
Breen, Thomas A., O64746.
Brennan, William H., O78733.
Brinson, William J., O84851.
Britton, Thomas N., Jr., O70169.
Broady, James P., O64237.
Brooke, DeForrest, O68083.
Brooks, Edwin E., O71452.
Brooks, Harry W., Jr., O73494.
Brosky, Vincent I., O64232.
Brosnan, John F., O84594.
Brown, Billy R., O75156.
Brown, Dewey E., O63597.
Brown, Harry W., O64560.
Brown, Jack W., O89763.
Brown, John C., O70288.
Brown, Norman, O73295.
Brown, Wesley B., O65754.
Brown, William R., O69603.
Browning, Freddie L., O72827.
Brubaker, Russell E., O63652.
Brundrett, Tom H., O78740.
Bryson, Baird P., O69604.
Buchan, Earl K., O72829.
Buck, Bruce F., O69465.
Buck, Richard J., O64023.
Buckner, Boyce B., O93029.
Buergin, Allan A., O65331.
Burk, Frank E., O63513.
Burke, John P., O63563.
Burke, Robert B., Jr., O65327.
Burkett, Joseph W., O69608.
Burkholder, Lowell E., O69609.
Burton, Kenneth J., O78744.
Burton, Thomas M., O92169.
Butler, Jack R., O73062.
Butler, Lawrence E., O67650.
Byers, John R., O63880.
Bynum, Pierre D., O78747.
Callaway, Jack G., O64507.
Calvert, Charles L., O79211.
Campbell, Clarence P., O72836.
Canham, Charles D. W., 2d, O64000.
Canine, Ralph J., Jr., O69466.
Cannon, James W., O78750.
Cannon, Morris C., O66140.
Capers, Norris R., O64574.
Caras, James, O84597.
Carlson, Gerald J., O64155.
Carmichael, Donald B., O64313.
Carmichael, Donald Q., O65354.
Carpenter, Archie E., O65621.
Carpinteri, Paul S., O70170.
Carrigan, Marion R., Jr., O63494.
Carrillo, Arnold R., O64266.
Carroll, David A., O63956.
Carter, David G., O63934.
Carter, Edd M., O63132.
Carter, William G., O64807.
Casbon, Lewis M., O64137.
Casey, Joe P., O75162.
Cashman, William R., Jr., O64224.
Casner, Earl L., Jr., O64545.
Castille, Maurice J., O70299.
Castro, Joseph F., O64893.
Cathrall, Eugene H., 3d, O63496.
Cavazos, Richard E., O64593.
Chadbourne, Ralph G., O69617.
Champion, Alfred N., O70300.
Champlin, Allen R., O63511.
Chapman, James N., O70301.
Chappell, James H., O89325.
Charles, Carlyle H., O69618.
Charney, Theodore J., O63977.
Chastain, John D., O91185.
Check, James A., O63960.
Chesak, Kenneth L., O64584.
Chrisco, Robert H., O72841.
Chrisenberry, John S., O78760.
Christiansen, Thomas B., Jr., O64870.
Cipolla, Francis R., O64665.
Claridge, Earl W., O78762.
Clark, Donald T., O89043.
Clark, James, O69468.
Clark, Philip L., O69469.
Clark, Steven T., O64674.
Clarke, Robert B., O73951.
Clary, Thomas C., O69621.
Clause, James D., O75097.
Clay, Jack H., O64373.
Clem, Carrell A., Jr., O69470.
Clemons, Joseph G., Jr., O63871.
Cleveland, Edwin I., O88631.
Close, Malcolm R., O81975.
Cobb, John E., O65966.
Cochran, Arthur F., O63604.
Cochran, Maury F., Jr., O70303.
Coe, George B., O81976.
Cole, Billie J., O94450.
Coleman, Walter E., O70081.
Coleman, William E., O70305.
Coley, James P., O64744.
Collier, Harry H., O63691.
Collins, Roland H., O63122.
Collins, Thomas J., Jr., O63135.
Collom, Percy W., Jr., O64407.
Compton, Thomas J., O65366.
Conlee, John F., O64534.
Conn, Jack L., O66143.
Conway, Edward R., O67659.
Cook, George R., O64591.
Cook, Harold E., O64402.
Cook, James H., O69471.
Cook, Morris G., O81979.
Cook, Raymond L., O68089.
Cooper, John P., O64406.
Cooper, William W., O78772.
Cooper, William E., Jr., O64701.
Corbett, Charles D., O64626.
Corbett, William U., Jr., O64510.
Corkill, Harry L., Jr., O73064.
Corliss, James J., O70309.
Cortner, Sanders A., Jr., O64156.
Costanzo, Albert C., O63895.
Coughlin, Paul A., O64032.
Couris, John G., O64390.
Cousins, John H., O63877.
Cox, Carlisle B., Jr., O67661.
Coy, Malcolm L., O70313.
Craft, George E., O64254.
Craig, Francis W., O64022.
Craig, Max A., O63654.
Craig, Verne P., O70314.
Cram, George D., Jr., O69475.
Cramer, Raymond A., Jr., O63138.
Craun, Noel E., Jr., O71661.
Criswell, Daniel L., O65397.
Crochet, Elby J., O78776.
Crocker, Lawrence P., O63882.
Cromley, David J., O94851.
Cromwell, Raymond B., Jr., O63858.
Cronin, Walter J., Jr., O88250.
Crouch, William E., Jr., O64002.
Crow, Eldward E., O69627.
Crowe, Charles A., O64097.
Crowe, J. Godfrey, O64059.
Crowley, Ellsworth B., Jr., O89452.
Culp, James F., O80065.
Cummings, Clyde E., O78779.
Cunningham, Gene S., Jr., 064267.
Cuny, Philip A., O64048.
Curran, George W., 2d, O68091.
Curtis, Roland E., O63261.
Daigh, John D., O63918.
Daigneau, Louis A., Jr., O63565.
Dall, Burt, O87499.
Daly, David J., O81985.
Daly, Earl E., Jr., O63630.
Daniels, John L., O65974.
Dashiell, John C., O68093.
Davis, Ernest J., O64299.
Davis, Francis J., O64896.
Davis, Michael M., O64212.
Davis, William E., O63608.
Davison, Evan R., O70179.
Dawson, John G., O60280.
DeLoach, William W., O67668.
DeRamus, Thomas B., Jr., O64173.
DeYoung, Alan, O69478.
Dean, Allen M. R., O63927.
Decker, Oscar C., Jr., O64303.
Deichmeister, Frank L., O70322.
Denham, John P., O78793.
Dennis, Ralston K., O70324.
Denny, Lawrence E., O71479.
Dent, Thomas R., O70325.
Depew, William L., O64174.
Derrick, John T., O64178.
Deskis, Anthony J., Jr., O64424.
Desrosiers, Marcel L., O78795.
Dews, Robert W., O81413.
Diana, Michele N., O65356.
Dibbert, Bernard W., O64231.
Dickson, John F., Jr., O63633.
Dicus, Forest J., O80070.
Dietrich, Daniel H., Jr., O67669.
Diggles, Walter J., O64351.
Dillard, Douglas C., O92648.
Dittamo, Roy J., O64777.
Dixon, Willie F., O81989.
Dobson, Robert R., O69631.
Doerflinger, Otto C., Jr., O63922.
Donahue, Charles F., O87504.
Donaldson, John E., O65364.
Donnan, Joseph A., 064829.
Donovan, Timothy H., 093036.
Dorman, Robert L., O69633.
Doss, Jesse B., O64264.
Dotur, Stephen P., O78804.
Dougherty, Charles A., O64268.
Dover, Ralph S., O64468.
Downing Earl D., O63698.
Drake, Charles F., O75178.
Drenkhahn, Andrew O., O72859.
Driscoll, Vedder B., O75180.
Driver, Owen J., Jr., O98035.
Dubia, Christian F., O69637.
Dudney, Charles L., O71782.
Duff, Joseph C., O78806.
Dufour, Elmore G., O65405.
Duke, Lee E., O63947.
Dukes, David D., O64805.
Dumas, John L., O67670.
Dunham, John R., Jr., O84604.
Dunham, Wesley L., O78808.
Dunlap, Norman E., O63980.
Dupont, Albert A., O73321.
Duskin, Edgar W., O67671.
Dyer, Robert A. J., Jr., O71485.
Eastman, Robert W., O62413.
Eaton, Loren D., O65365.
Eberhardt, Ernest M., Jr., O63583.
Ebersberger, Robert C., O63690.
Edler, William C., 2d, O64124.
Ehni, Richard L., O63864.
Eicher, William E., O73325.
Eichinger, Louis S., Jr., O78816.
Eidecker, Earl E., O84978.
Einsel, David W., Jr., O63806.
Ellis, David M., O67672.
Ellis, George V., O64378.
Ellison, Robert J., O80078.
Ells, Leo E., O78818.
Emig, Harvey E., O64262.
Emmons, Earl, O67673.
Erdrich, Robert H., O63657.
Ernst, Harold O., Jr., O68097.
Escribano-Aponte, Angel, O67674.
Esper, Donald, O63581.
Esser, Alan C., O63954.
Estes, Van E., Jr., O63515.
Eva, Norman, Jr., O69641.
Evans, Arthur B., O78825.
Evans, Bill G., O69642.
Evans, Henry C., Jr., O64181.
Evans, John C., O72863.
Evans, Lester J., O78827.
Ewing, John B., O68099.
Ewing, Paul R., O87511.
Fade, Walter W., O65617.
Faistenhammer, Ludwig, Jr., O65249.
Fant, Joseph L., 3d, O64142.
Faulkner, Donald H., O64808.
Felch, James F., O92187.
Fessenden, Jack C., O81998.

Finch, Edward B., Jr., O88675.
Finch, Homer J., O64627.
Fish, Curtis D., O69485.
Fitzgerald, Leo J., O65382.
Fitzgibbons, Eugene T., O78833.
Flanagan, Robert W., O64172.
Fleck, Herbert A., O67675.
Flemming, Frederick F., O69647.
Fletcher, Robert A., O81999.
Flynn, William F., O63522.
Foldberg, John D., O64154.
Ford, Clarence E., O64281.
Forman, Robert H., O64878.
Forrester, Redmond V., Jr., O64057.
Foss, Peter J., O64062.
Foster, John B., O64042.
Foster, Thomas G., 3d, O63959.
Fountain, Foster F., Jr., O72869.
Fox, Douglas E., O67678.
Fox, Harley C., O69648.
Fox, John K., O64410.
Fox, William I., O78837.
Francis, Gordon H., O64540.
Franz, Robert F., Jr., O64645.
Fraser, Danny P., O64537.
Frazier, Lee V., O63195.
Fred, Walter A., O65349.
French, Daniel W., O67679.
French, Harry W., O67680.
Friar, Robert G., O70185.
Frick, Alan A., O63885.
Fridy, Richard S., O65400.
Fried, George W., O73330.
Friend, Edgar V., Jr., O64812.
Frith, Kenneth A., O82003.
Fucci, Michael A., O64415.
Fulmore, Charles E., O78839.
Fulton, James F., Jr., O64883.
Fyock, James A., O69652.
Gabe, Donald D., O63253.
Gaillard, Jack W., O82005.
Gallant, Wallace M., O70339.
Galligan, Hugh S., O64159.
Gardes, George H., O63976.
Garner, Frank R., 3d, O75189.
Garrison, Charles T., O63246.
Garrison, Frank L., O70341.
Gately, Matthew J., O78843.
Gauger, Daniel M., O64469.
Gause, Joseph W., Jr., O72877.
Gecoma, Richard M., O90039.
Gendron, Alvin J., O88697.
Gentry, Dennis V., Jr., O69490.
Gentry, Edwin B., O64362.
Gentry, Paul, O78845.
Genualdi, Joe, O63505.
George, Donald B., O97906.
German, Robert L., O64368.
Getz, Wilbur D., O82008.
Gibney, Louis G., Jr., O68103.
Gilbert, John M., O73334.
Gilbertson, Rodney D., O64041.
Gilchrist, Raymond, Jr., O69491.
Gildart, Charles R., Jr., O64106.
Gillilland, William S., O67682.
Gillingham, William R., O64611.
Gillis, Charles A., O64822.
Gillis, Ronald J., O64432.
Girven, Elijah H., Jr., O66000.
Gluck, Donald W., O91841.
Goble, David B., O69492.
Goettel, Donald J., O64757.
Goodnow, Chandler, O64092.
Goodson, Allen M., O71670.
Goodwin, Warner S., Jr., O64322.
Goosman, John F., O88701.
Gordon, John D., O69659.
Gouge, Kenneth G., O78853.
Gould, Jack W., O72881.
Gow, Arthur J., O67684.
Granger, Clinton E., Jr., O64081.
Granicher, John W., O63909.
Grant, Myles S., O63945.
Gray, Daniel P., O64623.
Gray, William W., O64859.
Green, Gordon, O82016.
Green, James A., O98272.
Gregory, Bob L., O69663.
Greimann, Theodore E., O97561.
Gressette, William C., O64706.
Griffith, James C., O70349.
Grills, Angelo, O70350.
Grimes, Richard A., O64649.
Grimm, Philip D., O70351.
Grisham, Jack P., O67687.
Grover, William S., O64454.
Grugin, William E., O64054.
Gudgel, John E., Jr., O64569.
Guest, Charles B., Jr., O64680.
Gunning, Robert, Jr., O64702.
Haas, Richard J., O69495.
Habermehl, Robert N., O68010.
Hadaway, Joseph L., O64913.
Hageman, Alger E., O63260.
Hagreen, Frederick H., Jr., O84859.
Haigler, Rayford H., O78864.
Hale, Earl H., Jr., O67690.
Hale, Warren C., O64257.
Hall, Charles E., O70356.
Hall, Francis G., O68108.
Hamilton, Benjamin M., O67691.
Hamilton. Frank E., O63933.
Hampton, David R., O64799.
Haney, Billy E., O82021.
Hankins, Robert B., O69498.
Hanley, Thomas L., O78868.
Hansen, Donald E., O85807.
Hardesty, George D., Jr., O63941.
Hardy, David E., Jr., O69665.
Harlan, James M., O69667.
Harman, George L., O63902.
Harper, Robert L., O63699.
Harrington, Rodney P., O63186.
Harris, Audley C., O69669.
Harris, Gerald E., O63606.
Harris, James E., O75205.
Harris, Leonard H., O63127.
Harris, Richard L., O63868.
Harrison, Benjamin L., O65760.
Harrold, Thomas U., O64198.
Hart, William J., Jr., O64315.
Harte, John F., Jr., O64431.
Harvey, Earl F., Jr., O64608.
Hastings, Thomas H., O64217.
Haugan, Edgar J., O78869.
Haumersen, John P., O63965.
Hawthorne, James D., O86235.
Hayden, Joseph E., Jr., O63512.
Haydon, Christopher R., O64796.
Hayes, John D., O67694.
Haynes, James T., O78871.
Hazelwood, John E., O68110.
Head, Robert L., O78873.
Heard, Falkner, Jr., O75208.
Hecht, Donald J., O64690.
Hein, Elwood J., O70369.
Helmick, Floyd J., O65345.
Hemler, John V., Jr., O64046.
Hemphill, John A., O64015.
Henchman, John M., O64475.
Henderson, Dwight O., O67697.
Henderson, John T., O69675.
Hendrickson, William R., O78876.
Henk, Floyd H., O63815.
Henley, Raymon D., O63490.
Henson, Jack A., O69677.
Henson, William F., O69678.
Herlihy, William J., Jr., O64739.
Herlinger, Harry V., Jr., O70375.
Herring, Kenneth G., O64149.
Herte, Roy J., Jr., O64205.
Hesterly, John H., O64771.
Hewgley, Clarence T., Jr., O63550.
Hexner, Peter E., O68113.
Hibbs, Kenneth K., O89506.
Hiebert, Donald L., O97132.
Higgins, William W., O69681.
Hill, John P., O63919.
Hill, Robert H., O70377.
Hilty, Paul R., Jr., O63999.
Hinton, John, Jr., O63971.
Hiscox, Richard A., O68117.
Holderman, Robert L., O64273.
Holland, Herbert S., Jr., O69505.
Holland, Rex L., O64823.
Hollinger, John, Jr., O69683.
Hollis, Richard C., O71521.
Holman, Jonathan L., Jr., O63996.
Holwick, William B., O70381.
Hook, John F., O64152.
Hook, John R., O63942.
Hooker, Joe R., O69684.
Hooker, Robert W., O72900.
Hoppe, Ralph R., O69685.
Hornback, Richard G., O77864.
Horner, John D., O70383.
Horton, Charles R., O64640.
Horton, Dan H., O69951.
House, John M., 3d, O70384.
House, LeRoy, O67699.
Howard, Cleo N., Jr., O69507.
Howard, Eli P., Jr., O70197.
Howell, William C., O90100.
Howells, Henry C., Jr., O69686.
Howes, Robert A., O64158.
Hubbard, Richard R., O64263.
Hubbell, Johnson, O64241.
Huber, Richard G., O64747.
Huckaby, Lewis C., O78893.
Hude, Halvor E., O68120.
Hudlin, Irving C., O94865.
Hudnall, Virgil R.,O64221.
Hudson, William A., O69687.
Huff, Lonnie R., O69508.
Huggins, William R., O69689.
Humphrey, Harold W., O69691.
Humphreys, Billy B., O64372.
Humphrys, James G., O70198.
Hunter, Horace L., Jr., O64806.
Huntzinger, Robert W., O64772.
Hurd, Robert L., O63580.
Hyatt, Robert A., O64186.
Hylton, Alvin R., O79341.
Hysinger, Jim, O94866.
Igo, Clarence C., O69692.
Ill, Theodore C., O91610.
Ingold, Kenneth R., O63764.
Ingrassia, Michael J., O64451.
Ireland, Merritte W., O64546.
Irvin, Darrell B., O80111.
Irving, Frederick F., O63966.
Irwin, Gordon R., O67700.
Isler, Jack J., O69694.
Israel, Walter N., O69695.
Iverson, Vernon L., O78896.
Jacobs, Ernest F., Jr., O94938.
Jahnke, Alden W., O64775.
James, George T., O69696.
James, Herman H., Jr., O69697.
James, Thomas Z., O63926.
Jansen, Kenneth F., O67702.
Jensen, Frank L., Jr., O78898.
Jester, Guy E., Jr., O63901.
Johnson, Carl C., O97139.
Johnson, Daniel F., O69700.
Johnson, Harlan W., O63953.
Johnson, Hugh H., O80119.
Johnson, Robert L., O63963.
Johnson, Russell L., O64069.
Johnson, Vernon D., O64463.
Johnson, Walter H., O63924.
Jonah, Maxwell V., O69512.
Jones, Carlton L., O70393.
Jones, Clinton D., O61352.
Jones, Lincoln G., O64119.
Jones, Richard L., O89345.
Joplin, Samuel H., Jr., O69513.
Jordan, Marcus C., O70396.
Jordan, Paul M., O63125.
Jorstad, Norman D., O64127.
Jose, Allan F., O78906.
Julian, Ralph W., O64778.
Kamaka, Frederick K., O64302.
Kark, John S., O80124.
Karo, James E., O69515.
Kasper, Alfred E., O84636.
Keating, John J., Jr., O64008.
Keeley, James A., O64008.
Keenan, Arthur P., O68122.
Keesling, Earl L., O64040.
Keister, Keith R., O69706.
Kelley, Edward A., Jr., O69516.
Kelley, John E., O67705.
Kelly, Arthur L., O78909.
Kelly, Lloyd R., O64327.
Kelton, Edwin C., Jr., O69707.
Kennedy, Clinton R., O64371.
Kennedy, James D., O67707.
Kennedy, Joseph L., O70200.
Kenny, Patrick J., O63432.
Kenyon, John R., O63495.
Kerfoot, Lester R., Jr., O64769.
Kerner, Robert C., O69709.

Kerr, Otto, Jr., O63861.
Keyes, George W., O65619.
Kiehnau, Donald W., O78913.
Kiely, John W., O67709.
Killen, Milton S., Jr., O78914.
Kimble, Roy E., O66174.
Kimman, John W., Jr., O78915.
King, Edward J., Jr., O84639.
King, Edward L., O69711.
King, John P., O63623.
Kintz, James R., O64026.
Kirby, Edward J., O64548.
Kirmse, George R., O64233.
Kirsch, John C., O63435.
Kirts, Arthur L., O64874.
Kizer, Robert A., O64425.
Klaus, Vincent J., O67710.
Klein, Frank S., O63130.
Klein, Walter A., O64053.
Klinger, David M., O64684.
Kluever, Emil E., O69714.
Knapp, Charles L., O64001.
Knight, John C., O78921.
Knittle, Joseph W., Jr., O64034.
Knotts, Noel D., O70402.
Knox, Joe T., O65388.
Koenig, Richard H., O69716.
Kouten, James J., O79355.
Kovalsky, Michael, O63991.
Kowalewski, Stanley W., O73357.
Krause, Laurence H., O69521.
Kreigh, Wilbur K., O69718.
Kromer, Elvin F., Jr., O63749.
Krueger, Carl L., O64396.
Krupinsky, Marvin J., O63910.
Kugler, Robert N., O72911.
Kuhl, George C., O97317.
Kuhn, Mark E., O65338.
Kulik, Frank M., Jr., O64544.
Kunkle, Brady L., O65344.
LaBrode, Richard E., O64582.
Labar, Merwin K., O78927.
Lacey, Vernon L., O84867.
Lackman, William F., Jr., O63932.
LaFlamme, Norman A., O78928.
Lakes, Cecil T., O74921.
Lakin, Clem R., O63560.
Lam, William L., O64614.
Lamer, Matthew B., Jr., O65341.
Landon, Robert M., O96972.
Lane, Maurice C., O63427.
Lange, Clarence A., Jr., O64403.
Lange, Ronald V., O64742.
Langley, James D., O65376.
Lansrud, Gaylord A., O65620.
Lanter, Marshall A., O63558.
Lantzky, Karl A., Jr., O78932.
Larsen, Keith E., O63688.
Larsen, Raymond H. M., O70405.
Latoni, Gerardo, O73362.
Laub, Edwin G., Jr., O67713.
Lauderdale, John R., O69721.
Laue, Martin W., O82038.
Lawler, William H., O69722.
Lawrence, David L., O65353.
Lawry, Walter A., O64354.
Lazzell, Robert E., O65322.
Lazzell, Rufus C., O64634.
LeMere, Norman J., O69725.
LeVasseur, Thomas J., Jr., O90323.
Leach, Charles R., O84059.
Leavens, Francis E., O64441.
Leavey, William J., O80129.
Lecker, Irwin E., O64482.
Ledbetter, Harry H., O64867.
Ledbetter, Robert C., O73363.
Lee, John L., Jr., O94942.
Lee, Robert C., O84868.
Leedom, George A., O91628.
Leehey, Donald J., Jr., O64177.
Leeper, John J., O72917.
Leffler, John J., O64182.
Lemnitzer, William L., O63869.
Lemr, Charles F., O78941.
Lennon, Lynwood B., O78943.
Leslie, James M., O64588.
Lester, Rufus E., Jr., O64723.
Levy, Walter, O88787.
Lewis, Alfred E., O70406.
Lewis, Hilliard H., Jr., O80134.
Lewis, John B., O63929.
Lewis, William L., O87545.
Liday, Robert A., O64307.
Lind, Carl B., O64647.
Lindsay, Patrick J.,O70408.
Lippard, Delmas V., O63636.
Little, Cecil D. M., O84644.
Little, Roger M., 2d, O64798.
Little, Walter E., O67715.
Littlejohn, James J., O78948.
Litz, Owen E., O70410.
Livermore, Richard L., O64861.
Livingston, Charles R., O67716.
Lloyd, Harold G., O94769.
Lobodinski, Stanley J., Jr., O64276.
Lodewick, Lawrence S., O62339.
Logan, Carroll D., O63561.
Logan, Douglas K., O80982.
Lombard, Harry W., O63916.
Longo, Domenic F., O68131.
Longstreet, John M., O68132.
Louisell, William C., Jr., O64038.
Lowden, John W., Jr., O64570.
Lowery, Brutus A., Jr., O68377.
Luce, George W., Jr., O67718.
Ludick, Gerald A., O70413.
Luger, Joseph A., O64125.
Lukert, Edward P., Jr., O63915.
Lupton, Johnnie E., O90219.
Luxemburger, John J., Jr., O70414.
Lynch, Francis J., O69732.
Lynch, Patrick H., O63891.
Lynd, Robert F., O63445.
MacDonald, Hugh A., O72924.
Mack, Edward, O84869.
Macklin, Robert E., O64203.
Madden, Harold V., O70417.
Madden, William R., Jr., O72377.
Maddox, Fletcher B., O94489.
Madsen, Charles G., O79369.
Maguire, Ramon D., O64724.
Majikas, Donald J., O97429.
Malloch, Donald P., Jr., O63553.
Malouche, William A., O64095.
Mancinelli, Thomas B., O88805.
Manion, Richard A., O64908.
Mankin, Richard T., O82047.
Mann, Clarence C., O64801.
Mann, Howard H., O60259.
Manning, William E., O64646.
Manross, Theodore D., O88806.
Mansinne, Andrew, Jr., O64657.
Mapp, James H., O70420.
Marker, Ralph E., Jr., O64337.
Markham, Edward M., 3d, O63955.
Markwell, Dick R., O65758.
Marr, Robert A., O94875.
Marsh, Raymond, Jr., O67720.
Marshall, St. Julien R., Jr., O64887.
Martin, Jack W., O63896.
Martin, John W., O64609.
Martin, Louis B., O63984.
Martin, Paul E., O81016.
Martin, Paul G., O63757.
Martin, Raymond L., O68133.
Martin, William J., O63269.
Martin, William L., O68134.
Martz, Bob H., O64837.
Masterson, Joseph H., O82348.
Mastricola, Gust H., O69980.
Matkovich, Ludwig D., O72931.
Matney, Edward E., O64085.
Mattern, Henry K., O63752.
Matthews, Frank A., O63609.
Mattingly, Joseph G., Jr., O88815.
Maxfield, Norman R., O70423.
Maxin, Stuart E., O90432.
Mayo, Leon D., O82049.
Mayor, Robert F., O69527.
McCall, Leon, Jr., O68136.
McCarey, Guy H., Jr., O70424.
McCarthy, Alfred B., O67722.
McChristian, Glenn E., O63874.
McClellan, George A., Jr., O63191.
McClure, Joseph W., O84873.
McClure, Richard C., O64047.
McConnell, Joe E., O67723.
McCord, Sherwood J., Jr., O72933.
McCormick, Joseph C., Jr., O71837.
McCraw, James C., O64443.
McCray, Neil O., O64200.
McCreary, John J., O64542.
McCune, Bernard J., O91639.
McDade, Joseph A., O68137.
McDaniel, Albert W., O64471.
McDonald, Jack E., O63251.
McDonald, James W., O63986.
McGill, John C., O67940.
McGinnis, Norman F., Jr., O69738.
McGlothlin, John E., O69739.
McHugh, Daniel T., O64336.
McIlwain, George W., O69741.
McKennon, Alton C., O78970.
McKenzie, Charles B., Jr., O94876.
McKeown, Charles D., O63508.
McLaughlin, Leonard F., O64516.
McLean, Charles B., Jr., O64131.
McLean, Charles P., O78974.
McLean, Richard P., O63876.
McMahon, Walter L., O64579.
McMahon, William J., O84649.
McManus, John J., O82058.
McNair, Leslie G., O69742.
McNeil, Arlen A., O63647.
McQuade, Thomas J., Jr., O63632.
Meader, Glenn S., Jr., O64753.
Meeken, Stanley R., Jr., O78977.
Meese, Robert A., O64691.
Meether, Arthur J. L., O84460.
Meighen, George A., O64109.
Meine, Frank C., O64669.
Mejasich, Matthew J., O82059.
Melnick, Arnold I., O75251.
Merrill, William K., O71840.
Merryman, James H., O87566.
Mesnier, Charles R., O67725.
Metcalfe, Samuel L., Jr., O64225.
Metheny, Orvil C., O70432.
Meyer, Edward C., O63968.
Meyer, Jules R., Jr., O69745.
Meyer, Keith, O71562.
Michael, Louis G., Jr., O64134.
Michienzi, James A., O64280.
Mickel, Woodburn J., Jr., O69747.
Middlemas, William B., O70433.
Miele, Anthony R., O78981.
Mierswa, Myles H., O64240.
Migaleddi, Peter D., O78982.
Milam, Charles M., O64261.
Milam, Ronald H., O64049.
Milburn, Robert W., O64199.
Miller, Fred R., O64139.
Miller, James C., O67727.
Miller, Wayne D., O64005.
Miller, William H., O91645.
Millican, William W., O69749.
Millwee, Joseph B., O64388.
Milner, Hughie G., O64435.
Minear, Jonathan L., O64527.
Mitcham, James R., Jr., O62728.
Mitchell, Bartholomew V., O78990.
Mitchell, John W., O67728.
Mjoseth, John H., O65362.
Moffat, John L., O63952.
Monsos, William S., O63935.
Moon, John C., O68140.
Moore, David S., O64349.
Moore, Donald R. O68141.
Moore, Harry L., O69750.
Moore, James H., O68142.
Moore, Joseph E., O69751.
Moreland, Arthur D., O69531.
Moreman, Marcus D., O69532.
Morgan, Milton J., O70437.
Morgan, Newton B., Jr., O64012.
Morgan, William R., Jr., O86546.
Morrie, Clifford O., O70438.
Morris, John P., O72947.
Morriss, Edward L., O64448.
Mortimore, Harold E., O64229.
Mott, John J., O66058.
Mounts, Pierce E., O91950.
Movsesian, Anthony A., O88850.
Mowery, Jack E., O64321.
Mryczko, Michael M., O63852.
Mueller, Harold P., O69754.
Mulder, Dean D., O64080.
Muldrow, Robert W., O64389.
Mullen, Lawrence E., O68144.
Mullens, Frank A., O63940.
Muller, Cecil W., O65757.
Muller, Robert W., O63648.
Mullett, Edwin, Jr., O71573.

Mulligan, Donald E., O79000.
Mundy, Angus McL., O70442.
Murphy, Joseph B., O63816.
Murphy, Thomas P., O95073.
Muscari, Abraham F., O69755.
Myers, Daniel J., O64016.
Myers, James M., O70447.
Nadeau, Frank W., Jr., O63559.
Naegele, Eugene L., O71576.
Naler, Robert B., O64530.
Nance, Edwin T., Jr., O64098.
Nash, Arthur B., Jr., O84652.
Nash, Razeal, O63545.
Nealis, Milford LeR., O70448.
Needham, William R., O65329.
Neff, James W., O65390.
Nefstead, Paul D., O69756.
Neinast, William H., O74790.
Nelson, Franklyn S., O63433.
Nelson, Kermit A., O70449.
Nelson, Robert E., Jr., O63464.
Nelson, Robert W., O64751.
Nelson, William, O65504.
Newburg, Robert L., O70450.
Nichols, Charles K., O68390.
Nist, Cecil W., Jr., O64164.
Norell, Dennis L., O70216.
Norris, Awbrey G., O71848.
Norris, Charles R., O70456.
Norris, Eugene V., O65292.
Norton, Donald J., O64075.
Norton, Jack, O73109.
Norton, James M., O84878.
Norvell, John B., Jr., O64162.
Novak, Thomas E., O79010.
Oblinger, Frank D., Jr., O70458.
O'Brien, Edwin F., O64361.
O'Brien, Leo M., Jr., O69535.
O'Connell, William C., O64754.
Oder, Lowell E., O68203.
Oglesby, Bob P., Jr., O64658.
O'Grady, Eugene J., O95589.
O'Keefe, Desmond, O64093.
Olcott, Frank R., O65508.
Oliver, Billie L., O70460.
Opitz, Donald J., O63510.
O'Rahilly, Patrick J., O72958.
Orlikoff, Robert, O63990.
Orr, Robert C., O79014.
Orton, George W., O64189.
Osborne, Wiley W., O64319.
Osgood, Ralph B., Jr., O69760.
Otte, Alfred R., O64666.
Otten, Henry C., O63972.
Overton, Norman L., O70461.
Owens, Garland L., O64067.
Pagel, Donald J., O99372.
Palmer, Joe M., O69764.
Palmer, Paul R., O67734.
Panttaja, William T., O64911.
Park, John W., Jr., O69765.
Parker, Joseph E., Jr., O84879.
Parkins, Everette S., O63905.
Parris, Kenneth B., Jr., O64341.
Parrish, Rodney G., O69767.
Partain, Edward A., O64004.
Pascal, Raymond P., O95376.
Patterson, David R., O64338.
Patterson, George E., O64891.
Pattillo, Hugh H., O63903.
Payne, Hilton D., O64483.
Payson, Paul M., O86620.
Pazderka, Robert J., O64144.
Peach, Robert M., O64532.
Pearson, John H., O70014.
Pearson, Paul F., O70469.
Peck, Michael, Jr., O64285.
Peel, Wesley E., O71711.
Peifer, Donald D., O63982.
Peixotto, Ernest D., O63920.
Peloquin, Edouard A., O64071.
Pelosky, Edwin F., O72962.
Peltz, Karl W., O63907.
Pence, Lawrence D., O79022.
Pendleton, Elmer D., Jr., O64073.
Pennington, James C., O69768.
Peppard, John J., Jr., O65348.
Perez, Adolph, O64427.
Perri, Angelo, O64825.
Peter, Edward C., 2d, O63917.
Peterka, Louis, O69769.
Peterson, Ralph J., O87881.
Petty, Floyd E., O68147.
Petty, Lloyd J., O68148.
Petty, William C., O63532.
Phillips, Charles D., O63921.
Phillips, Chester C., Jr., O64766.
Phillips, James H., O70472.
Phillips, James H., Jr., O63978.
Phillips, Walter C., Jr., O64037.
Phillips, Y. Y., Jr., O69540.
Philp, Peter L., O64919.
Pick, John W., Jr., O69542.
Pickett, Edward F., O82080.
Pierce, Billie R., O68149.
Pierce, James H., O64509.
Piercefield, Fremont, O72964.
Pinkerton, Bobbie J., O69543.
Pippin, William I., O69771.
Pittenger, Ronald R., O79025.
Pitts, James R., O64202.
Place, John E., O67740.
Plants, Donald N., O63552.
Platts, William H., O79026.
Plyler, Daniel B., O79028.
Polson, Harold A., O79030.
Ponder, William R., O70473.
Poole, Charles M., Jr., O89371.
Poole, Grady R., O72967.
Poole, Joseph H., O63853.
Porter, Edward J., O89955.
Porter, Robert D., O63769.
Porterfield, Jack B., O63659.
Powell, Isadore A., Jr., O64610.
Prehn, Robert A., O64130.
Preuss, Richard J., O79035.
Price, George B., O64760.
Price, James E., Jr., O63188.
Prince, Wendell L., O65395.
Pruett, Jack G., O85238.
Puccio, Dominick V., O71857.
Pugh, Philip S., 3d, O70477.
Pullano, Anthony L., O62047.
Pulsifer, Robert A., O68152.
Pulver, Earl B., O68153.
Pundt, Willie, O70478.
Quattrocchi, Frank S., O71858.
Quinn, Daniel G., O79036.
Rachek, Robert A., O64147.
Racke, Joseph C., O87589.
Rainer, Hewlett E., O79039.
Ramsey, James E., O64300.
Rawley, William F., Sr., O67742.
Ray, Herbert H., O69549.
Ray, James E., O79040.
Ready, Robert E., O64868.
Reames, Aaron G., O64342.
Redman, John R., O64496.
Redmond, Delyle G., O64450.
Reed, James B., O64915.
Reed, Philip N., O64112.
Reeves, James N., O64358.
Regan, Norman E., O71715.
Regas, George, O63259.
Rehm, William L., O64841.
Reilly, Neil A., O62091.
Reinke, Robert, O64820.
Remson, Andrew C., Jr., O63867.
Render, Bernard L., O84882.
Rennebaum, Raymond G., O64235.
Rennebaum, Robert E., O61382.
Reno, Carl, O69775.
Reus-Froylan, Johnny, O63805.
Reuter, Robert M., O70225.
Rhodes, Arthur B., O64314.
Rhotenberry, R. M., O92242.
Rice, Joseph P., O64103.
Rice, Maurice D., O64791.
Richardson, John H., O63642.
Richardson, Philip S., Jr., O64439.
Richardson, William R., O63979.
Ridgdill, Julia R., O64366.
Ritz, Robert E., O79050.
Rizor, George A., Jr., O79051.
Roberge, Ronald A., O63886.
Roberts, Donald L., O69778.
Robertson, Bruce H., O63894.
Robinson, Bernard L., O65325.
Robinson, Roscoe, Jr., O64066.
Robinson, Wayne, O99718.
Rockwell, Frederick G., Jr., O63906.
Rockwell, James M., O64171.
Rodgers, George M., O79054.
Rodgers, Willard L., O64334.
Roesser, Joseph C., O73481.
Rogers, Charles C., O64768.
Rogers, Ronald J., O64113.
Rondepierre, Jean R., O61633.
Root, Donald G., O82089.
Rooth, Richard A., O69780.
Roper, Lee R., O70118.
Rork, James R., O86701.
Rose, Peter W., O69781.
Roseman, Frederick E., O79059.
Rosenblum, Donald E., O64682.
Roshto, Lawrence E., O99720.
Rothwell, Francis M., O64332.
Rudd, David D., O64726.
Runnels, Johnnie L., O69551.
Rusek, Edward A., O64283.
Russell, Albert L., Jr., O64277.
Russell, Byron H., Jr., O64422.
Russell, Walter B., Jr., O63994.
Rust, Henry W., Jr., O89138.
Rutledge, Clifford T., O63538.
Rutledge, Robert B., O64256.
Ryan, Richard L., O64094.
Ryan, Robert E., O68159.
Ryason, Robert R., O79064.
Sabol, Fred, O79065.
Sample, Frank W., O63535.
Sample, James C., O79068.
Sanders, Horace M., Jr., O63598.
Sanders, Neal W., Jr., O67978.
Sanders, Oscar J., Jr., O68160.
Sanderson, John M., Jr., O68161.
Sandlin, Erle O., Jr., O63506.
Sarkesian, Sam C., O64434.
Savas, Sam M., Jr., O64470.
Sawyer, Kenneth A., O63748.
Saye, Joseph M., O64749.
Scalise, S. Arthur, O64161.
Schanche, Norman D., O67751.
Scheider, Max B., O63887.
Schiller, William E., O69785.
Schilling, Warren P., O70497.
Schnibben, John H., Jr., O65363.
Schowalter, Edward L., Jr., O64446.
Schrenk, Ralph D., O79075.
Schrepel, Maurice H., O73398.
Schultz, James D., O63507.
Schuman, Joseph F., O64045.
Schuyler, Francis D., O69786.
Schweizer, John E., O63878.
Scott, Stanley S., O64105.
Sears, Leslie R., Jr., O69788.
Seeley, Wayne L., O94341.
Seliskar, Jack, O79081.
Sellers, Philip D., O63616.
Sennewald, Robert W., O64832.
Sessions, Eldred S., O69789.
Seymoe, Joseph P., O57342.
Shaffer, Don W., O64727.
Shaha, James H., O70232.
Shareck, Everett P., O72987.
Sharp, Daniel G., O64074.
Sharp, Earl W., O64460.
Sharpless, Robert J., O63140.
Sheaves, William B., Jr., O79472.
Sheets, Phil K., Jr., O75293.
Sheffey, Fred C., O63139.
Sheldon, Lamar L., O64599.
Shepherd, Wilbur C., O69792.
Sheridan, Stan R., O63997.
Sheriff, Francis J., O63964.
Sherman, Harold R., O64346.
Shewski, Joseph A., O63595.
Shields, Richard B., O63517.
Shillingburg, John E., O63985.
Shipley, John M., O63582.
Shirk, Paul R., O64613.
Short, George P., Jr., O65328.
Shuffstall, Donald C., O70502.
Shuford, Richard H., Jr., O67756.
Shuman, Thomas A., O63258.
Sieger, Norman J., O88933.
Simmons, Frank R., O67757.
Simms, Carl H., O92249.
Simon, Henry, Jr., O60886.
Simon, Paul N., O79085.
Simonson, Eugene M., O64297.
Simpson, Dwight M., Jr., O64790.
Simpson, Robert I., Jr., O64068.

Siracuse, Angelo J., O73402.
Sites, Joseph L., Sr., O64017.
Skinner, George B., O63575.
Skoglund, Clifford E., O73486.
Slavich, Ivan L., Jr., O64223.
Slocum, John M., Jr., O71872.
Smith, Adair A., O86776.
Smith, Albert T., Jr., O68166.
Smith, Athol M., O69794.
Smith, Clayton J., O60005.
Smith, Fred D., O70236.
Smith, Gorman C., O63893.
Smith, Harrison S., O68168.
Smith, Herbert H., O67758.
Smith, Herbert M., Jr., O82094.
Smith, John A., Jr., O64478.
Smith, Joseph St. C., O63923.
Smith, Joseph W., O69797.
Smith, Kulman B., O63568.
Smith, William M., O79100.
Sneeden, Emory M., O68170.
Snowden, Charles S., Jr., O71605.
Snyder, Howard W., O64120.
Snyder, Melvin C., Jr., O63988.
Snyder, Richard W., O87624.
Snyder, Robert W., O63951.
Socky, Frank J., O70508.
Soldow, James J., O92254.
Sorensen, Ted O., O90161.
Souser, David H., O64382.
Souville, Laurence W., Jr., O64575.
Spaid, John F., O68171.
Sparks, Claude S., Jr., O67759.
Spaulding, Thomas J., O87626.
Spell, William H., O89613.
Spencer, Milton T., O67760.
Spencer, Thomas A., O63503.
Spicely, Samuel B., O64571.
Spieldoch, Richard B., O73407.
Spiro, Norman A., O64436.
Spiva, Derrell W., Jr., O64525.
Spivey, Benjamin G., O70238.
St. Mary, Francis A., O63944.
Stafford, Mebane G., O67761.
Stamper, Archie L., O64222.
Standley, Robert J., O73408.
Stannard, George W., O64176.
Starnes, Carl S., O83621.
Steele, Clyde K., O84676.
Steele, Howard M., Jr., O64180.
Steele, William B., O63267.
Steiger, Wallace C., Jr., O64007.
Stein, Lewis I., O69801.
Stenquist, Richard W., O69562.
Stephens, William C., O64455.
Stephenson, Floyd G., O64191.
Stevens, Chris W., Jr., O64416.
Stevens, John R., O64847.
Stewart, Bradley A., O75297.
Stewart, James B., O63190.
Stockdale, William K., O63875.
Stocker, Lee J., O85115.
Stoddard, Richard N., O63256.
Stolsits, Frank L., O64287.
Stoner, John K., Jr., O64590.
Storey, Robert G. M., O69808.
Strawhand, Tunstall L., 3d, O63430.
Street, Thomas J., O92260.
Stringfellow, Charles C., O63203.
Strong, William B., O64252.
Stubbs, Duane H., O64712.
Stumm, Thomas A., O63888.
Suddaby, Arlen R., O79110.
Sudderth, David H., Jr., O70519.
Sulenski, Joseph S., O70239.
Sullivan, John L., O89295.
Sumner, Robert B., O63859.
Sutton, Claude B., Jr., O67620.
Sutton, Harry L., Jr., O70522.
Sutton, James L., O70523.
Swan, Charles H., O82107.
Sweeney, Bradley W., O79111.
Sweet, Richard S., O64671.
Swift, Robert J., Sr., O73412.
Szymczyk, Richard A., O64058.
Tague, Duane R., O63995.
Takano, Thomas H., O69564.
Talafuse, Darwin D., O63564.
Tambe, Joseph T., O65374.
Tamez, Rudolph M., O67766.
Tanzola, Vincent J., Jr., O64355.
Tarbell, Frank S., O64464.
Tatum, John M., Jr., O64187.
Tausch, Roland D., O63961.
Taylor, Arthur H., O99111.
Taylor, George O., Jr., O67769.
Taylor, Porcher L., O76921.
Taylor, William W., Jr., O70524.
Teague, Jerry L., O75304.
Teehan, Paul A., O64499.
Teener, David R., O60871.
Teigland, Virgil R., O84893.
Tennant, Malcolm B., O64025.
Terrell, Ernest P., Jr., O70526.
Tharp, Charles B., O64770.
Thomas, Constantine, O67770.
Thomas David C., O69815.
Thomas, Francis G., Jr., O63499.
Thomas, John E., Jr., O79501.
Thomas, Monroe G., O90545.
Thomas, Robert F., O70528.
Thomas, William N., O64035.
Thompson, Nathaniel R., Jr., O64421.
Thompson, Richard H., O73415.
Thompson, Robert I., O85380.
Thompson, Roy, Jr., O75307.
Thompson, Thomas E., O70529.
Thorsen, Peter L., O64020.
Tominac, John J., O68172.
Toole, Raymond L., Jr., O64153.
Torseth, Lowell E., O64207.
Treat, Charles J., O67627.
Trolan, Rice T., O67772.
True, Richard D., O60864.
Tucker, George G., Jr., O65358.
Tuggey, Howard J., O92593.
Tumlin, Grady H., Sr., O94505.
Tyson, Robert M., Jr., O73082.
Underwood, Maurice R., O79124.
Uttinger, Joe W., O69568.
Valella, Dominic, O64265.
Van Delden, Karl H., O67773.
Van Derveer, Robert H., O83101.
Van Keuren, Edwin, Jr., O64104.
Van Matre, Donald A., O63974.
Vandenberg, William E., O63870.
Vanderslice, Robert D., O61841.
Vaughn, Clifford H., O71618.
Vaughn, Edward R., Jr., O64480.
Vaughn, George L., O79128.
Vellella, Frank P., O64078.
Vetort, Herman J., O63987.
Villaret, Gustave, 3d, O64166.
Vincent, Robert D., O63939.
Vogel, Edward B., O70546.
Volk, Robert H., O64210.
Von Schlemmer, Robert M., O63546.
Wainer, Douglas F., O64118.
Walby, William G., O70547.
Waldman, Francis J., Jr., O63879.
Walker, Billy G., O64248.
Walker, Charles J., O64193.
Walker, John R., Jr., O64526.
Walker, Samuel S., O71738.
Wallens, Charles N., O64133.
Walpole, Philip P., O64581.
Walsh, Daniel J., O64324.
Wang, Jesse, O95717.
Ward, Bynum P., O63526.
Wardrop, Daniel H., O64060.
Warren, James R., O94152.
Warthen, Brice L., O71891.
Waters, William W., O69825.
Watkins, John B., Jr., O79136.
Watson, Robert G., O88997.
Wayman, Elden E., O87461.
Weaver, James W., O69572.
Weaver, Jonathan M., Jr., O68174.
Weidner, Earl R., Jr., O79140.
Welch, Marhl L., O65333.
Welch, Paul B., Jr., O70062.
Welch, Robert E., O64050.
Wells, Obel H., O69827.
Wells, Richard M., O63928.
Wenneson, Richard M., O79521.
West, Charles F., O63753.
Weston, Robert A., O73010.
Westrich, Ralph L., O64661.
Weyand, Alexander M., O64122.
Weygand, Leroy C., O88318.
Wheeler, Richard G., O88319.
Whipple, Ward J., O96615.
Whisler, Harold H., O70560.
White, Kenneth H., Jr., O79144.
White, Marion E., O69830.
Whiting, Howell T., O88227.
Whitmire, Nelson L., O63588.
Whitted, Jack G., O64583.
Wholey, Paul R., O79145.
Wiard, Seth, Jr., O64755.
Wiethuechter, Donald W., O97053.
Wilder, Bliss W., O71626.
Wilhelmi, Sylvester L., O65373.
Wilkinson, Don A., O63819.
Williams, Aylwyn D., O64876.
Williams, Davant T., O71744.
Williams, Edward L., Jr., O64438.
Williams, Lawrence H. D., O69573.
Williams, Paul S., Jr., O64804.
Williford, Oliver J., 3d, O64620.
Willis, Edward M., O63899.
Wilmot, Francis G., Jr., O64533.
Wilson, Don E., O67781.
Wilson, Franklin L., O63975.
Wilson, James R., O71897.
Winfield, Francis E., O64194.
Winn, Arthur C., O70568.
Winter, Kenneth L., O64383.
Wirth, Herman L., O64745.
Wisnack, Joseph R., O70569.
Wolf, William S., O63436.
Wolffe, Peter D., O91541.
Wong, Frank, O64296.
Wood, Donald M., O64234.
Wood, George E., O67782.
Woodley, Thomas R., O63883.
Woodrow, Ralph T., O70570.
Woods, Chester A., O89765.
Woodward, Arthur Q., Jr., O64310.
Woody, Charles K., O64604.
Wretlind, Clayton L., O60931.
Wright, Corey J., O67784.
Wright, Dean E., Jr., O79153.
Wright, Louie E., O64412.
Wroth, James M., O64596.
Wysong, Richard C., O64607.
Yerks, Robert G., O64150.
Yoder, Donald A., O63570.
Yoder, Harry A., Jr., O64840.
Yost, William L., O86969.
Young, Fletcher R., Jr., O63577.
Youngblood, James O., O69841.
Yurko, Joseph J., O84899.
Yusas, Vitte V., O64316.
Zalomis, John A., Jr., O68178.
Zamparelli, Alfred A., O73434.
Zastrow, Richard E., O69842.
Zeigler, William A., O75328.
Zeller, Norman C., O71634.
Zeller, Richard G., O63640.
Zuver, Edward L., O64196.

To be majors, Chaplain

Ammerman, Elmer H., O75051.
Anderson, Robert T., O78033.
Brown, Norman R., O79681.
Covington, Donald M., O84146.
Keys, Clifford E., Jr., O78079.
Lightcap, Thomas K., O95062.
Paul, Harold J., O78114.
Reaves, James M., O87592.
Sather, Donald R., O95619.
Schweitzer, Gordon M., O78123.
Siege, John C., O88931.

To be major, Women's Army Corps

Barron, Helen F., L00481.
Bouldin, Patricia L., L00388.
Clarke, Mary E., L00468.
Edwards, Mary A., L00480.
Garrett, Pola L., L00376.
MacMichael, Kitt M., L00385.
McWilliams, Bonnie J., L00545.
McNaul, Barbara J., L00510.
Morsman, Phyllis J., L00360.
Paul, Geraldine, L00472.
Piggott, Virginia L., L00486.
Sherba, Dorothy, L00373.
Sollars, Jacquelyn R., L00362.
Wardell, Barbara J., L00375.
Wilkes, Kathleen I., L00374.

To be majors, Medical Corps

Aaby, Gene V., O75130.
Adair, Edwin L., O73540.
Alden, Alfred M., O73210.
Alexander, Joseph L., O78031.
Arbiter, David, O85718.
Augerson, William S., O74628.
Bailey, Richard H., O94988.
Baker, Ray D., O96730.
Berg, Bruce O., O73490.
Bever, Lloyd J., O73544.
Billingsley, James G., O74638.
Blakely, Lee A., Jr., O89032.
Blincow, John K., O73265.
Blough, Leland S., O72324.
Bolt, Donald A., O73545.
Bonilla, Kenneth B., O73546.
Boyce, Henry W., Jr., O73547.
Boyer, Carl W., Jr., O77807.
Brugger, Archie M., O74652.
Buchanan, Richard S., O71322.
Butler, Bruce, Jr., O73550.
Callahan, Donald M., O94741.
Calvert, William M., O84133.
Caperton, Clyde M., O84134.
Close, James M., O74974.
Collie, Lamar P., Jr., O73952.
Conklin, Harvey B., O73439.
Corbet, Paul A., Jr., O73440.
Creveling, Robert L., O73994.
Cutting, Robert T., O84150.
Dalbey, Charles G., O73996.
Dart, Leroy H., Jr., O73252.
Davis, Wallace R., O99306.
de Castro, Carlos M., Jr., O84153.
Del Valle, Rafael A., O75346.
Devaris, Dionisios P., O73497.
Dirks, Kenneth R., O73253.
DuBois, James J., O72702.
Fawcett, James L., O73552.
Fishter, Michael F., O87516.
Fitzgibbon, Rodney, O75101.
Freeman, Mahlon V. R., O74987.
Futoran, Jack M., O75360.
Garcia de Quevedo, Augusto, O88366.
Garcia-Gonzalez, Efrain, O74988.
Garcia-Torrado, Millan, Jr., O78061.
Gardner, Richard M., O80249.
Garrison, James M., Jr., O88695.
Gauld, John R., O84990.
George, Richard E., O73449.
Goldblatt, Harry, O74700.
Gordon, Walter C., Jr., O73555.
Gorsch, Allen M., O75196.
Gottheil, Edward, O74992.
Green, David C., O72389.
Griggs, Kendrick L., O77857.
Groth, Robert C., O73955.
Hammon, William M., O84114.
Harris, Richard J., O74714.
Harris, Stanley C., O74715.
Hartenstein, Paul E., O73959.
Hartvigsen, Robert E., O74915.
Harvey, David M., O88389.
Hefner, James D., O73558.
Hermann, Robert M., O77994.
Hertzman, Carl A., O74997.
Howbert, James P., O74998.
Hudson, Thomas L., O76247.
Huebner, Gilbert D., O73560.
Inkret, William, Jr., O75109.
Ionno, Joseph A., O75002.
Jacobson, Eugene D., O74733.
Jacoby, Philip R., O76262.
Jender, Joseph G., O78588.
Johnson, Lewis A., O89795.
Kaljot, Victor, O75068.
Kamin, Edward J., 3d, O73469.
Kammeraad, Lloyd A., O85012.
Karr, Walter J., Jr., O73470.
Kelly, Thomas W., O75110.
Kiel, Frank W., O72613.
Kirchner, Marvin M., O75382.
Kirkland, Benjamin B., Jr., O74920.
Klemme, William M., O73044.
Kmiecik, Joseph E., O89983.
Knospe, William H., O92210.
Krause, Manfred E., O85593.
Krekorian, Edmund A., O84209.
Kurke, Lewis, O73511.
Lahoda, Joseph G., O75011.
Lambert, Cary J., O74753.
Lau, Bennett M. K., O75386.
Laux, France A., O73272.
Levin, Herbert J., O72418.
Lidner, Victor H., O84212.
Liff, Elliot, O87546.
Ligo, Robert N., O88419.
Lindahl, James B., O91911.
Loe, Hardy D., Jr., O77887.
MacGregor, Robert J., O75071.
Marcure, Richard W., O88429.
Martz, Douglas G., O73570.
McClure, Jack B., O76403.
Miller, Robert E., O74924.
Mitchell, George L., O78102.
Morris, Alfred D., O73275.
Moskovitz, William S., O73577.
Moyer, Donald G., O74926.
Mueller, Robert L., O74021.
Nay, Leston B., Jr., O73578.
Nelson, Harold S., O75119.
North, Robert L., O75026.
Nussbaum, Paul S., O76473.
O'Rourke, Franklyn S., O84243.
Parson, Robert W., O72422.
Pegg, John R. P., O73515.
Perry, Lawrence B., O97181.
Piro, David F., O78016.
Plunkett, Guy D., O76515.
Reynolds, James S., O87596.
Reynolds, Terry N., O84256.
Rogers, Robert E., O82360.
Roper, Maxcy D., O73483.
Sample, Donald W., O73974.
Sanders, Graydon C., Jr., O76584.
Schane, William P., O80258.
Scherz, Robert G., O72646.
Schlegel, Robert J., O76593.
Schultz, Thomas L., O74027.
Skipworth, George B., O73195.
Smith, Joseph J., O84803.
Staley, Paul R., O84805.
Stanek, Robert G., O75036.
Stebler, Michael E., O77941.
Stromberg, LaWayne R., O74863.
Terry, Nathaniel V., O96806.
Tilson, Donald H., Jr., O87643.
Tisdale, Patrick D., O87948.
Tisdale, Samuel A., O96807.
Treat, Robert G., O75045.
Vaughn, Daniel L., O73278.
Vazquez, Angel M., O91714.
Wallace, Raymond D., Jr., O76727.
Waugh, David E., O91717.
Westfall, Arlie H., O75092.
Wheby, Munsey S., O89165.
Willi, Franz J. P., O95534.
Willner, David L., O73586.
Wills, Theodore E., O76758.
Woolvin, Samuel C., O73459.
Ylitalo, Elmer W., O90630.
Zone, Robert M., O75446.

To be majors, Dental Corps

Adams, John C., O98188.
Baker, Frank L., O85720.
Board, Hal J., O85904.
Boegel, Paul N., O94738.
Bond, William R., Jr., O73988.
Brown, Allen W., Jr., O96743.
Christensen, Richard R., O84769.
Clifford, Arthur G., O78043.
Clinton, Everett E., O72452.
Conley, Patrick J., O99172.
Cote, Robert R., O89195.
Crase, Silas M., O97100.
DuVal, Charles H., O74000.
Gardner, Robert J., O94749.
Gardner, Thomas V., O84172.
Gasior, Edwin J., O75058.
Hampson, Floyd F., Jr., O83719.
Hargis, Harold W., O74712.
Hettinger, Dale A., O75372.
Hunsuck, Ervin E., O72336.
Jacobson, Sheldon E., O84785.
Jacoway, John R., O94764.
Keagle, James G., O75006.
Kobrinsky, Samuel, O85343.
Lilly, Gilbert E., O74759.
Lord, Raymond Y., Jr., O92705.
Maddox, Belman C., O85615.
Milligan, Vernon L., O73244.
Nichols, Wharton A., Jr., O73178.
Norris, Russell S., O73231.
Obermeier, Bernard D., O85060.
Osbon, Donald B., O73179.
Peppe, Isadore O., O89126.
Radentz, William H., O75418.
Shepard, Walter L., O69556.
Stewart, Hugh A., Jr., O80262.
Suddarth, Jerome A., O78620.
Valkavich, Eugene S., O78139.
Venezia, Antonio J., Jr., O82374.
Vinall, William H., O87961.
Wagner, Allyn G., O91715.
Wormley, John H., O75326.
Zimmerman, Joseph S., O81839.

To be majors, Veterinary Corps

Baker, Roger W., O73018.
Eckermann, Edgar H., O88668.
Galbreaith, John D., O97305.
Johnson, Edward L., O71929.
Shay, Warren J., O95388.

To be majors, Medical Service Corps

Anderson, James E., O70249.
Angel, Charles R., O69848.
Anistranski, Charles, O70251.
Benson, Albert G., O69858.
Bethea, Thomas M., O70274.
Black, Gordon C., O73060.
Bolger, Robert E., O69863.
Brown, Earle W., O65956.
Buckius, Richard R., O70290.
Caras, George, O97290.
Carmick, Edward J., O69875.
Carmody, Francis J., Jr., O69876.
Cavanaugh, Dan C., O63187.
Chewning, Claudius D., O69881.
Christensen, Herbert E., O67557.
Christopherson, William, Jr., O68087.
Church, Roy S., O75339.
Cofield, Leaton C., O70304.
Cooksley, Boyd E., O97293.
Couch, Sidney A., O68090.
Crawford, John P., O69891.
Daly, Hugh F., Jr., O69896.
Davis, Robert E., O70320.
Dittmann, Stephen P., O69904.
Doyle, Thomas M., O75350.
Duvall, Wallace L., O84735.
Eggleston, Norman E., O68096.
Field, Gordon, O70335.
Fields, James S., O70336.
Foley, Paul M., O67573.
Foulk, William J., O69923.
Funk, John C., O73032.
Garis, Kenneth D., O69929.
Georgeff, Boris, O82327.
Godfrey, William H., O72372.
Graziano, James F., O70354.
Griffith, Henry V., O69938.
Grimes, Cecil H., O78667.
Haas, Robert F., O84739.
Hamm, Charles R., O69941.
Hammett, John W., O73070.
Hardwick, Willard E., O64447.
Henderson, Arnold C., O70372.
Hiatt, Robert S., O68114.
Hill, William G., O68116.
Holland, Willis D., O66021.
Holman, Edward F., O70380.
Jacobs, Joseph P., O69954.
Knowles, William R., O68124.
Kurtz, Myers R., O78652.
Learnard, Donald L., O69968.
Litrio, John J., O68129.
Lowe, Bryan T., O70412.
MacLennan, Robert J., O69975.
Madrano, Joseph P., O69976.
Marshall, John D., Jr., O69978.
McCaffrey, Joseph P., O73969.
McCandless, Earl R., O73048.
McFarland, Cowan J., O70427.
McKinney, Robert W., O69986.
Miner, Lewis C., O64409.
Mitchell, Henry C., O68139.
Mortensen, Raymond K., O69993.
Mundy, Roy L., O69997.
Needles, Herman C., O70002.

Newson, Harold D., O70451.
Nichols, Robert S., O75258.
Parker, Albert E., O70009.
Peterson, Merrill C., O70471.
Ports, Kenneth N., O68151.
Reese, Seth T., Jr., O67607.
Rogers, John E., Jr., O70493.
Rowe, Russell H., Jr., O78673.
Sankey, Theodore R., O70496.
See, Herbert G., O68162.
Shaw, Robert M., Jr., O67613.
Short, Robert D., O63621.
Smith, Jack C., O70041.
Spellman, Seth W., Jr., O70509.
Spencer, Lloyd E., O70511.
Storms, William G., O70047.
Summers, Samuel J., 3d, O70521.
Taylor, Robert L., O67622.
Trahan, Robert G., O71734.
Valentine, John P., O70054.
Veltri, Benjamin J., O66113.
Verser, Fort A., Jr., O65321.
Wagner, John R., O70056.
Walsh, Ralph J., O67632.
Walton, Bryce C., O70550.
Welton, George C., O70557.
Wheatley, Kenneth K., O70558.
Whitmore, Robert O., O70065.
Wilkinson, Clarence H., O73487.
Williamson, Robert L., O78676.
Wold, Vernon H., O63814.

To be majors, Army Nurse Corps

Anderson, Alma B., N2849.
Arnold, Vivian M., N2930.
Bagin, Isabelle J., N3007.
Black, Mary L., N2831.
Blackwell, Mildred E. W., N2698.
Blomer, Elizabeth A., N2909.
Brantly, Ruth S., N2870.
Carroll, Helene D., N2632.
Casey, Marguerite C., N2569.
Cavagnaro, Mary M., N2871.
Chrisco, Verla E., N2859.
Cox, Juana J., N2686.
Cundy, Elsie M., N2718.
Davis, Betty K., N2729.
Decker, Julia E., N2702.
Dupree, Lydia, N2813.
Everett, Anna E., N2534.
Ferebee, Constance L., N2880.
Flagg, Alice N., N2618.
Flynn, Euleta O., N2669.
Fritz, Mildred C., N2561.
Ginsberg, Miriam K., N2590.
Grech, Anna A., N2959.
Grote, Lillian H., N2682.
Hill, Nellie M., N2716.
Holtz, Betty L. B., N2630.
Imlach, Eleanor H., N2711.
King, Harriet J., N2732.
Kirk, Margaret C., N2633.
Kirkpatrick, Mable, N2721.
Kutyla, Mary M., N2717.
Liberty, Frances M., N2695.
Lofton, Juliet P., N2794.
Lundy, Sara N., N2551.
McCausland, Muriel J., N3133.
McLean, Mary F., N2572.
Mobley, Ruth Z., N2646.
Morgan, Betty F., N2744.
Moseley, Leanora M., N2648.
Nuttall, Edith M., N2853.
Olson, Ruth E., N2712.
Parks, Madelyn N., N2536.
Quinn, Mary C., N2671.
Riggs, Lucille M., N2653.
Rita, Mary, N2745.
Rock, Marjorie J., N2937.
Rothrock, Lois R., N2964.
Ryan, Patricia A., N2704.
Setter, Marian J., N2707.
Sharpe, Lorraine K., N2883.
Smith, Elsie L., N2543.
Stappenbeck, Edna F., N2939.
Starkey, Elizabeth J., N2587.
Steinhilber, Marion A., N2708.
Straley, Rose V., N2955.
Suess, Helen V., N2591.
Taimuty, Julia, N2854.
Vandiver, Frances O., N2533.
Watson, Elinor M., N2676.
Wright, Cecille D., N2924.

To be major, Army Medical Specialist Corps

Adams, Rachel H., M10148.
Anderson, Marilyn J., M10133.
Fecenko, Helen, J88.
Gilchrist, Priscilla K., M10159.
Hammill, Janet A., R10175.
Keegan, Nanette G., M10152.
Lambertson, Elizabeth L., M10139.
Leighton, Mary B., R10168.
Louis, Winifred M., J91.
McKinley, Harriet J. A., M10147.
Mendler, Helen M., M10153.
Noble, Beulah C., R10176.
O'Brien, Eileen F., J97.
Peterson, Dorothy J., M10156.
Stafford, Helen R., R10178.
Wakefield, Patricia, M10143.
Westhoven, Mary F., M10144.

To be captain

Abbott, Rudolph E., O82378.
Acosta-Rosario, Rafael B., O78029.
Acuff, Gerald R., O88321.
Adamcik, Merrill T., O82379.
Adams, Allen D., Jr., O99285.
Adams, Donald D., O85813.
Adams, Eural E. E., Jr., O75885.
Adams, James G., O89171.
Adams, Louis W., O85716.
Adamski, Richard G., O81772.
Addy, Buford W., Jr., O89025.
Adkins, Donald V., O89857.
Adriaansen, Leslie I., O89172.
Agostini, Victor M., Jr., O89400.
Aimi, Alfred C., O75886.
Akam, George R., O83672.
Alden, John H., O85823.
Alexander, Walter D., O85825.
Allen, Carl J., O94434.
Allen, David J., O82384.
Allen, William L., O88549.
Amaral, David J., O75887.
Amazeen, Charles P., Jr., O89673.
Ambrosino, Richard R., O85829.
Ament, Robert L., O92152.
Amlong, William E., O91738.
Anderson, Harold K., O91740.
Anderson, John C., O82389.
Anderson, John L., O81774.
Anderson, Leon L., O95214.
Andreson, Ronald K., O83115.
Andrews, Richard P., O75467.
Anglin, Richard C., O99603.
Ankenman, Harold D., O87994.
Antaya, Michel R., O86986.
Appling, David A., O92154.
Arcari, Joseph J., O88557.
Archer, Caleb J., O78034.
Armstrong, Raymond L., O75473.
Arnold, Bruce D., O75889.
Aschliman, Edward LeR., O89973.
Ashley, Alvie O., O89690.
Askelson, Dennis L., O82393.
Atkeson, Thomas L., O78035.
Ault, James W., Jr., O95147.
Ault, John W., Jr., O84941.
Avera, Graham J., O79547.
Aylward, James J., Jr., O88559.
Ayres, Richard F., Jr., O94986.
Bacon, Stanley, Jr., O83116.
Bagdanov, James LeR., O78036.
Bagozzi, Donald F., O82400.
Bahnsen, Peter F., 3d, O83117.
Bailey, Clark J., 2d, O83118.
Baillie, Donald A., O88331.
Baker, John P., Jr., O89175.
Baker, Robert E., O83119.
Baker, Robert W., O82403.
Balda, Edward J., Jr., O82404.
Balish, Warren N., O82405.
Ballew, Bobby G., O94041.
Barbe, Charles D., O88003.
Barge, Walter S., O89697.
Barham, Thomas J., O82407.
Bark, Paul L., O82408.
Barkley, William A., O86990.
Barnebey, Hoyt W., O89698.
Barnes, James M., O75899.
Barrett, Robert C., Jr., O85125.
Barrett, William I., Jr., O99608.
Barry, Joseph A., 3d, O99609.
Barta, V. William, O83120.
Bartlett, William E., Jr., O78569.
Bartlett, William G., Jr., O81775.
Bauchspies, Richard E., O83121.
Bauer, Anthony G., O83122.
Bauer, Hugh A., O83123.
Baxter, Wayne H., O85868.
Bay, Charles H., O85869.
Beach, Ernest E., O89357.
Beatty, Robert C., O75907.
Behm, Peter S., O75914.
Behrens, Helmer H., O77803.
Bell, Fred V., O75916.
Bellows, Ronald L., O83124.
Bennett, Edward LeR., O98332.
Benoit, Peter B., O89319.
Benson, William L., Jr., O88005.
Beran, Joseph J., O86995.
Berdux, Sylvester C., Jr., O99611.
Bernstein, Donald, O75923.
Berry, Louie G., O85884.
Berry, Tommie J., O90296.
Best, Darrell E., O75925.
Betke, Herman R., O75928.
Betters, Richard B., Jr., O75929.
Betts, Jerry W., O83127.
Bichler, Herman J., O91756.
Biddle, Albert, O90105.
Biesenbach, Donald E., O85891.
Bisch, Frederick R., O94703.
Biscomb, Gordon L., O75931.
Bivings, Donald E., O85294.
Black, Calvin D., O75934.
Black, Clinton H., O75935.
Blackham, Richard G., O94442.
Blair, John C., O97884.
Blake, Robert E., O82425.
Blatter, Erwin W., 2d, O90138.
Blazes, Peter J., O82428.
Block, Thomas R., O82429.
Bloedorn, Gary W., O89737.
Blume, Geoffrey E., O99613.
Bons, Paul M., O83128.
Boose, Howard R., 3d, O75939.
Borneman, Frederick H., O87478.
Bosway, Stephen G., O88575.
Bourland, David W., O83130.
Bowen, Frank S., 3d, O83131.
Boyd, Eugene T., Sr., O77806.
Boyd, Leo S., O97284.
Boyd, Thomas J., O89417.
Boyer, Kenneth S., O82436.
Bozeman, Paul, O94049.
Brackett, John R., O88014.
Bradley, John H., O83132.
Bradley, Lee M., O81779.
Bradshaw, Charles W., O97886.
Bradshaw, Jack O., O83133.
Brandl, Joseph W., O83134.
Brantley, Danon L., O91167.
Brantley, John T., O88585.
Braspenninckx, Harold J., O88586.
Brassfield, Bobbie A., O88587.
Bratcher, Dewey F., Jr., O81841.
Brewer, James A., O96947.
Bridgwater, Tom W., Jr., O82441.
Briggs, Bobby G., O83867.
Brill, Ronald R., O75957.
Brintnall, Clarke McC., O83136.
Broadus, James C., O88342.
Brock, Robert J., O88592.
Brockway, Frank N., Jr., O77809.
Brockwell, Daniel P., Jr., O83137.
Brokaw, Francis L., O97888.
Brooks, James R., Jr., O83139.
Brosman, James A., O91558.
Brothers, David L., O75962.
Brown, Charles L., Jr., O82446.
Brown, Clyde O., Jr., O83140.
Brown, Frank M., 3d, O83141.
Brown, Glenn A., O83142.
Brown, Joe M., O83869.
Brown, John Jr., O78574.
Brown, Joseph K., O83143.
Brown, Noel L., O82448.
Brown, Oreal L., O89766.
Brown, Roland D., O87484.
Browne, John P., O92167.
Brownfield, William I., O80238.

Brownlee, William A., Jr., O82452.
Bruck, Harold A., Jr., O88594.
Brugger, Karl A., O82311.
Brumbaugh, Larry W., O89187.
Brunner, Ronald S., O83144.
Bruzina, Dennis R., O83145.
Bryant, Walter R., O75975.
Buchanan, John C., O83146.
Buchly, William S., O83147.
Buckley, George M., O75977.
Budrich, Dudley J., O75979.
Bugay, Glenn L., O83148.
Bull, L. M., Jr., O85302.
Bullis, Lawrence H., O83149.
Bullotta, Anthony L., O75517.
Bunker, David L., O95661.
Bunker, Robert M., O83150.
Bunn, Edward J., O85952.
Bunting, Roger C., O96745.
Burdin, J. D., O82459.
Burford, John S., O84920.
Burke, Allan R., O89746.
Burke, Edward J., Jr., O83151.
Burke, John C., O83152.
Burkhalter, Edward L., O75985.
Burleson, Charles E., O97092.
Burns, George K., O91561.
Burrow, George D., O84961.
Burtnett, Richard J., Jr., O80239.
Butler, Robert W., O75993.
Byrn, James H., O84132.
Byrom, Seymour B., 2d, O94573.
Caddigan, James L., Jr., O83687.
Cahalane, Robert E., O79561.
Cain, Gene R., O82467.
Cain, William H., Jr., O75998.
Calello, Samuel C., O83688.
Callahan, Donald J., O89794.
Cameron, Thomas F., O83155.
Campbell, Donald M., O76000.
Campbell, Jerry K., O88605.
Cancienne, Louis G., O89040.
Canfield, James D., O87699.
Cannella, Phillip F., Jr., O76004.
Capelle, Gerald C., O83156.
Carlin, John C., O76005.
Carnahan, Ronald J., O88608.
Carpenter, Maxey B., Jr., O82472.
Carpenter, Thomas E., 3d, O83157.
Carr, Glenn P., O82473.
Carrick, John M., O97096.
Carson, John W., O83158.
Case, Ralph W., Jr., O91182.
Case, Robert O., O83159.
Cassell, James D., O85408.
Catlett, Charles, O88611.
Cauthen, Tommy E., O88612.
Chandler, Richard, Jr., O76009.
Chapman, Thomas R., O77814.
Chappell, Troy D., O83161.
Chapple, Gerald R., O89813.
Charlton, Daniel P., O83162.
Chaudrue, Robert G., O88617.
Cheesborough, Richard S., O89189.
Chesak, Charles D., O88619.
Chesney, Ted S., O83690.
Chick, Edward E., O85501.
Chisholm, John J., O92284.
Chopin, Lamy J., Jr., O82487.
Christenberry, James P., O82488.
Christensen, Neal R., O85737.
Chunn, Don C., Jr., O82490.
Churchill, Carl L., O81782.
Cibosky, William, O83164.
Claflin, Alan B., O83165.
Clark, Dennis J., O89191.
Clark, Donald R., O77815.
Clark, Robert E., Jr., O83166.
Clarke, David A., O83167.
Clarke, Robert G., O95615.
Clarke, Robert L., O82493.
Clary, William P., Jr., O83168.
Cleaver, Bruce H., O84141.
Clement, L. W. Jr., O96955.
Clewell, Robert M., O83169.
Clifford, Peter L., O95003.
Coats, John I., O76014.
Cobb, Edward R., Jr., O85998.
Coblentz, William S., O91796.
Cockill, Michael J., O82495.
Cockle, Dale S., O83170.
Cockrell, Allen A., Jr., O75340.
Cohan, Morton D., O88031.
Coleman, Lynn F., O83692.
Collar, Robert D., O78262.
Collett, Willis C., Jr., O83173.
Collier, John F., O89442.
Collins, Nicholas H., O85509.
Collins, Samuel P., Jr., O83174.
Conkel, Ronald P., O76025.
Connell, Jerry L., O83646.
Connell, Terence J., O83175.
Conner, Nelson O., Jr., O83176.
Cook, Billy G., O85310.
Cook, Cline G., O83177.
Cook, Larry J., O83879.
Coop, Harold L., Jr., O77821.
Cooper, William T., O83178.
Copp, Willard C., O85144.
Corbitt, Bradley G., O82503.
Corcoran, Gordon G., O82504.
Cordonnier, David J., O81786.
Corey, Robert J., O77823.
Coseo, Gregory F., O89446.
Cote, Paul R., O83695.
Coulter, Richard V., O87712.
Coury, David G., O83179.
Covington, George V., O75167.
Cox, Luther O., Jr., O88357.
Cox, Wallace R., O89196.
Craddock, Bo F., O83180.
Craig, Sam W., Jr., O88636.
Craighead, Clyde V., O88637.
Cramer, Rockwell C., O82511.
Crandall, John D., O83181.
Crane, George R., O76039.
Crane, Kenneth C., O87715.
Crawford, Cecil M., O97102.
Crawford, Jon C., O83883.
Crawford, Stanley B., O89448.
Creviston, Mark S., Jr., O82512.
Criss, Carl K., O85311.
Crittenden, Oliver H., O95179.
Cromartie, Eugene R., O80243.
Crosby, Ben G., Jr., O83182.
Crosby, Theodore F., Jr., O95750.
Crow, Nathan H., O83183.
Crox, John F., Jr., O85410.
Crum, Raymond H., Jr., O86029.
Crump, Roger L., O88360.
Culbreth, Edward C., O92178.
Cullins, Thomas E., O88638.
Culpepper, Oren R., O81787.
Cunningham, Joe N., O82516.
Curbow, Gerald D., O76049.
Curtin, Thomas R., O82517.
Curtis, Clarence E., 3d, O93034.
Daley, John M., O83185.
Daly, Federick R., O94287.
Daly, George M., O88642.
Dalzell, Gary W., O88643.
Damore, Robert E., O83184.
Damrill, Ronald E., O77826.
Damron, Herbert C., O73551.
Daniel, William D., Jr., O8804.
Danieli, Joseph A., Jr., O91571.
Daniels, Wesley E., O97594.
Danielson, Charles O., O82519.
Danilek, Donald J., O83697.
Danner, Billy G., O81788.
Dantzscher, David D., O83698.
Davall, Bernard M., O83186.
Davenport, David C., O78048.
Davis, Carl J., O81789.
Davis, David H., 2d, O82522.
Davis, Hal W., O87723.
Davis, James M., Jr., O83187.
Davis, Sidney I., O82524.
Davis, Wayne B., O97597.
Davoli, James O., O80244.
Day, Wayne D., O83189.
DeBerardino, Anthony, O76065.
DeBoeser, Edward V., Jr., O83190.
DeChant, Joseph M., O83191.
DeChristopher, Edward P., 2d, O82526.
DeGraw, Andrew E., Jr., O77827.
LeLoach, Ray B., O80245.
De Mouche, Louis F., O77981.
Deas, Carter L., O76064.
Degen, Robert, O83194.
Deibel, Charles L., O88363.
Delius, Robert D., 3d, O87726.
Delk, Joe E., O84707.
Delumpa, Felix M., O82533.
Demyanenko, Serge P. C., O82536.
Densford, Charles F., Jr., O83195.
Denton, Curtis W., O95009.
Derr, William R., O88254.
Detlie, Douglass S., O83198.
Detrich, Virgil D., O99636.
Devens, John W., O83199.
Dew, Donald L., O82540.
Dey, Robert A., O83200.
DiMauro, Philip V., O83201.
DiTommaso, Joseph M., O83202.
Dickens, Waverley J., 3d, O85522.
Dickerson, Jon R., O76075.
Dickinson, Kenneth K., O85155.
Dickinson, Roy B., O78052.
Dickover, Robert A., O82316.
Digh, Ned P., O88656.
Dikes, Billie N., O88045.
Dillon, Donald D., O93389.
Dillon, Oliver W., O77829.
Distefano, Herbert C., Jr., O89896.
Dixon, Dana R., O82543.
Dodd, Edwin N., Jr., O83203.
Doherty, Theodore L., Jr., O77830.
Dolby, John F., O88659.
Donnelly, Robert W., O85745.
Donovan, Claude B., 3d, O83204.
Donovan, Robert T., O83205.
Dorsey, Harry M., O81790.
Doster, David A., O83891.
Douglas, Henry A., O82548.
Downing, Edward J. Jr., O83206.
Drake, Cleo C., O99637.
Drisko, Melville A., Jr., O83207.
Duker, Robert P., O82552.
Duncan, Robert D., O88665.
Dunham, Edward K., O92184.
Dunning, Jon E., O75564.
Dus, Stanley E., O83208.
Dvorak, Ernest J., O91148.
Dyer, Donald E., Jr., O89201.
Dyer, Peter M., O96757.
Dykes, John M., O83209.
Eads, Hugh F., O92319.
Eady, Connie D., O95123.
Easley, Michael F., O83210.
Ebner, Stanley, O95013.
Edgar, Charles E., 3d, O82559.
Edge, John S., O76099.
Edwards, Charles R., Jr., O91581.
Edwards, William A., 3d, O83211.
Eiber, Robert A., O82560.
Eliot, John H., O83212.
Elliott, Norman T., O83704.
Emacio, William J., O82562.
Emery, Ronald H., O82322.
Ennis, Harry F., O82565.
Erickson, Curtis C., O89202.
Evans, James A., O90637.
Evans, Joseph A., O83215.
Evans, Robert H., O85320.
Evans, Roy T., 3d., O83216.
Evans, Wallace M., O97302.
Evans, William R., O91820.
Fairall, Richard L., O82570.
Farquharson, William R., Jr., O83707.
Farr, Lorin B., Jr., O83220.
Farrar, Melvin H., O83221.
Fassl, Laverne F., O88673.
Faulhaber, John M., O90503.
Fee, Gene B., Sr., O83898.
Fernandez, Claude E., Jr., O83222.
Fickett, Richard K., O76119.
Field, Charles N., Jr., O89482.
Fiely, Linus H., O76120.
Finch, Edwin B., O91252.
Fink, Henry J., Jr., O96965.
Finkenaur, Robert G., Jr., O83223.
Fischer, Richard W., O83713.
Fisher, Eugene A., O83224.
Fitzgerald, Donald G., O77839.
Fitzpatrick, Paul F., O76125.
Fitzwilliam, James C., O91823.
Flack, Louis E., O97445.
Flesher, Dale D., O88678.
Flesher, Franklin A., O82578.
Flick, William R., O77840.
Florey, Richard R., O89058.
Flynn, William S., O80248.

Fogle, William L., O77842.
Foley, Roger M., O81792.
Foley, Thomas C., O94856.
Forburger, Thomas V., O82580.
Forman, Thomas A., O83225.
Forney, Donald M., O83226.
Foster, Robert R., O83228.
Foster, William R., Sr., O76131.
Fowler, Darrell V., O89208.
Foy, William H., O82582.
Frank, Basil E., O82583.
Frank, Laurence A., Jr., O76133.
Franklin, Richard G., O83230.
Frankoski, Joseph P., O83714.
Franks, Francis J., O83231.
Fraunfelter, Edgar R., O89486.
Frazier, Robert J., Jr., O84709.
Freeman, Lowell F., O95023.
Frey, James L., O88261.
Frey, Jesse J., Jr., O99647.
Frick, James A., O83232.
Friedenwald, Robert L., O82587.
Friedman, Robert G., O88067.
Friend, Bernard D., O94927.
Friend, Stephen G., O88686.
Frink, Robert K., O89209.
Fry, James R., O77844.
Frye, Norman E., O91831.
Fulkerson, Charles W., O82589.
Fuller, James R., O88262.
Furlong, William J., O77845.
Fyffe, Carroll M., O82592.
Gaebel, John L., O87749.
Gaffney, James J., O76140.
Gall, Robert P., O83233.
Gallagher, Harold D., O78584.
Gallahorn, James T., 3d, O77846.
Gammons, Vance S., O83903.
Ganey, William G., O83234.
Gardella, John L., O89210.
Gardner, Eli, O77848.
Gardner, William H., O84989.
Garlick, Richard D., O83235.
Garman, Robert T., O88263.
Garoutte, Max W., O82596.
Garrison, Darrold D., O82597.
Garrity, Robert A., O96970.
Gauntner, Donald E., O91196.
Geddings, Cecil C., Jr., O88696.
Geer, William A., Jr., O91837.
Gehler, Robert R., O89954.
Geiger, Peter H., O87750.
Gelinas, Wilfrid E., O99951.
Gell, Richard W., O83236.
George, John D., Jr., O83238.
Gereau, Richard N., O75059.
Gerstenberger, Clay R., O87522.
Giallourakis, Bill C., O83239.
Giampaoli, Joseph P., O94461.
Gibbings, Leslie G., O83240.
Gibbons, James O., O86184.
Gill, Howard J., O77852.
Gill, Joseph T., Jr., O77853.
Gillem, Richard D., O82328.
Gillette, William P., 3d, O83241.
Gingras, Ronald W., O83716.
Gissendaner, William E., Jr., O83907.
Giuliano, Robert W., O83242.
Gleason, James E., O76157.
Gleeson, William J., O87753.
Glover, Charles W., Jr., O83243.
Glynn, Michael G., O85753.
Goetzke, George R., O91251.
Goldsmith, Stanley I., O76163.
Goncz, Joseph P., O94753.
Gongola, Victor J., O83245.
Goodchild, Gerald B., O89215.
Goodenough, Fred W., Jr., O83246.
Gordon, Bob F., O88079.
Gordon, Harold J., O74223.
Gordon, Henry J., O83248.
Gordon, Jack T., O97908.
Gordon, John B., O96973.
Gordon, Robert L., O76166.
Gordy, Terry L., O83909.
Gorman, Thomas P., O91844.
Gosnell, Carlos D., O88703.
Grabowski, Norbert D., O82611.
Graf, William S., O83249.
Grande, Alfred F., Jr., O82613.
Graves, Gary P., O83250.
Graves, Richard G., O83251.
Graves, Roy M., O77987.
Gray, Ernest D., O77854.
Green, Marvin R., Jr., O89335.
Greene, Dennis S., O76174.
Greenfield, Bennett E., O85548.
Greenwalt, Randall A., O81794.
Gregg, Noel D., O91852.
Gregory, David T., O81795.
Grenier, Donald H., O82616.
Griffin, Clarence M., O82617.
Griffin, George F., O77856.
Griffin, Lowell B., O91592.
Griffin, Richard E., O76177.
Griffin, Turner D., Jr., O83252.
Griffith, Warren E., 2d, O82619.
Griffiths, Richard E., O76178.
Griggs, Carlvin J., O94302.
Groh, Peter J., O83254.
Grove, Robert N., O97912.
Groves, Richard N., Jr., O83255.
Gruhl, Werner M., O82624.
Guild, William E., O82625.
Gullage, James T., O91702.
Gumbs, Selvin F., Jr., O87768.
Gunderson, Peter G., O83718.
Gustitis, Norman L., O83256.
Gwathmey, Lomax, Jr., O82628.
Haan, Philip J., O85555.
Haas, Willis J., Jr., O82332.
Hackney, Edward C., O89065.
Hain, Earl L., O82634.
Hale, Edward G., Jr., O83257.
Hall, Fred W., Jr., O83258.
Hall, Harrell G., Jr., O83260.
Hall, James B., O83261.
Hall, John M., O89218.
Hallada, Raphael J., O82635.
Hallauer, Donald W., Jr., O82636.
Halse, David L., O82637.
Haltiner, Robert G., O84711.
Hamilton, Bruce M., O83262.
Hamilton, William A., O88266.
Hammond, William D., O83913.
Hanks, James W., O79581.
Hansen, Donald W., O99094.
Harber, Bobby D., O91858.
Harbuck, James B., Jr., O81797.
Hardman, Richard W., O82641.
Harman, Walter D., O82642.
Harrington, David B., O82643.
Harrington, George S., Jr., O89660.
Harrington, Regis A., Jr., O96762.
Harris, Bryan D., O76195.
Harris, Donald M., O89337.
Harris, William K., O83916.
Hart, Jack S., O76200.
Hart, James E., Jr., O88090.
Hart, Roxie R., O93426.
Hartke, Harry J., 3d, O76201.
Harvey, Thomas H., Jr., O83266.
Hatch, Alden E., O84181.
Hatcher, Joseph F., O85558.
Hattler, Robert M., O83267.
Haushill, Paul W., O83268.
Hayden, Leroy R., Jr., O83269.
Hayes, John E., O91600.
Haynes, Ashton M., Jr., O83270.
Heaton, James A., O95334.
Hefford, Robert A., O76209.
Hehemann, George J., O87783.
Heinmiller, Arthur E., O90052.
Heins, Derek H., O99656.
Heipp, William A., O91866.
Heizmann, William A., 3d, O83723.
Helms, Bobby T., O91867.
Henderson, James M., Jr., O83919.
Henderson, Joe P., O83725.
Henderson, Richard H., O99658.
Hennen, Paul G., O85564.
Henninger, Kermit M., O83271.
Henry, Malcolm P., O82654.
Herberger, Kenneth S., O83273.
Herren, John D., O83274.
Herrera, Charles D., O76213.
Herrmann, Roger W., O88394.
Hestand, Kenneth D., O85567.
Hester, Jack W., O95038.
Hidalgo, Peter D., O83275.
Higgins, Paul J., O96763.
Higgins, Robert M., O83276.
Hiland, Bobby A., O82333.
Hill, Frederick P., Jr., O90072.
Hill, Gene P., O94307.
Hill, John R., Jr., O83277.
Hill, Orland K., O83278.
Hill, Robert P., O82660.
Hirata, Richard M., O83279.
Hirzel, James W., O94862.
Hitchcock, Walter A., Jr., O83280.
Hittner, Leon B., O88737.
Hock, Neil S., O82662.
Hodge, Charles D., O89070.
Hoffman, Lawrence W., O76229.
Hofmann, Robert M., O83731.
Hofstetter, James F., O82664.
Holbrook, Jack H., O76233.
Holck, Roy A. V., O82666.
Holcomb, Samuel A., O87794.
Holecek, John F., O83281.
Holland, Gerald R., O88741.
Holroyd, Donald E., O76235.
Holtman, Donald R., O94559.
Hopkins, Richard K., O76238.
Hopper, Samuel R., O84524.
Hort, John H., O82670.
Hosmer, William, O75066.
Hougen, Howard M., O96984.
Houts, Ray A., O76241.
Howard, Terence, O83282.
Howell, Raymond K., O76244.
Howley, Dennis C., O82671.
Hoyem, Slyvan D., O82672.
Hruby, Dale E., O83283.
Hubbard, Harry J., 3d, O83284.
Hubbard, Robert V., O90101.
Hudak, Robert J., O94471.
Hudson, DeWitt H., Jr., O76246.
Hudson, Ronald E., O83285.
Hughes, Jeremy H., O99663.
Hughes, Norman F., S., O91875.
Hughes, Robert K., O84782.
Hummel, Theodore W., O88749.
Hunt, John B., O82677.
Hunt, Larry H., O83289.
Hunter, Victor D., O89785.
Hunton, Eugene R., Jr., O82678.
Hurley, Paul C., O89515.
Hurst, Thomas K., O76254.
Hussey, George E., O83291.
Hutton, Paul C., 3d, O83293.
Huyssoon, John W., Jr., O83738.
Hyman, Stanley H., O91323.
Iacomino, Gennaro J., O83739.
Iori, Richard A., O89226.
Irish, Kenneth M., Jr., O85773.
Irwin, Allan S., O82680.
Isaacson, John L., O83294.
Ivers, Larry E., O88110.
Iverson, George R., O99332.
Jackson, Norwood E., O82341.
Jackson, Raymond F., O89227.
Jackson, Strube J., O83295.
Jacobson, Howard C., O88403.
Jambon, Orleans A., O76264.
Jansen, Edward F., O89076.
Jarrell, William J., O78366.
Jasaitis, Edward J., O83297.
Jaschen, Daryl G., O83298.
Jefferies, Ansell, Jr., O77867.
Jefferis, Robert J., O76266.
Jenkins, Richard J., Jr., O82684.
Jennings, Richard P., O88757.
Jenrette, Nathan P., 3d, O87802.
Jensen, Blaine P., O82685.
Jentz, Edward M., O76267.
Jew, Soot M., O82686.
Jobe, Joe D., O99665.
Joczik, Robert L., O85580.
Johansen, John M., O78075.
Johnson, Bradley J., O83300.
Johnson, David W., O82688.
Johnson, Donald W., O83301.
Johnson, Donald L., O82689.
Johnson, Edward H., O87537.
Johnson, Henry O., 3d, O97926.
Johnson, Hugh P., O83303.
Johnson, Jackie F., O76270.
Johnson, Jerome G., O85190.
Johnson, Ransom, Jr., O78076.
Johnson, Richard S., O95098.
Johnston, Alexander, 3d, O83304.
Johnston, Robert P., O87805.

Johnston, Robert L., O95505.
Jones, Billy G., O83933.
Jones, Charles C., O92205.
Jones, Eddie, H., O87807.
Jones James H., O83305.
Jones, John B. O82693.
Jones, Lincoln, 3d, O83306.
Jordan, James P., O83937.
Jost, Leland R., O93443.
Joyce, John A., O95343.
Joyce, Warren C., O76275.
Julian, Robert H., O83307.
Kageleiry, Harry Z., O82696.
Kahalekulu, Benjamin I., O94868.
Kaine, George R., O82697.
Kammer, Herman C., Jr., O85778.
Kannady, Donald R., O97929.
Kanning, James R., O82703.
Kastenmayer, Walter W., Jr., O89521.
Kaufman, Patrick S., O82709.
Kaufmann, Reynold W., O82710.
Kavanaugh, Paul F., O85425.
Keim, Carl D., O87815.
Kelly, John J., Sr., O79590.
Kelly, Joseph D., O91897.
Kelly, Thomas J., O83309.
Kennedy, Stanley W., O82714.
Kernan, James J., O83310.
Kersting, Don T., Jr., O98117.
Keyes, Joseph D., O83311.
Kidd, Wesley E., 2d., O75649.
Kidwell, Walter E., O82717.
Kilpatrick, Thomas M., O77875.
King, Edwin C., O77876.
King, Jack E., O91619.
King, James H., Jr., O87821.
Kinnison, Harlen W., O89235.
Kinzel, Arthur J., O82721.
Kirk, Mahlon, O83312.
Kirkegaard, Martin L., O83313.
Kirkpatrick, Roy S., O83314.
Kitay, Peter N., O78389.
Kittelson, Richard D., O83315.
Klingbeil, Richard C., O85781.
Klose, John A. G., O91900.
Klose, Karl R., O82728.
Knight, Peter S., O91902.
Knowlen, Charles B., O82729.
Kolb, Jerry W., O82732.
Kollhoff, Ronald K., O94311.
Kosmider, Gary L., O83318.
Kosmowski, Jerome A., O81847.
Koster, Brian L., O83319.
Krahn, Wayne E., O86387.
Krakower, Aaron J., O91903.
Kramer, James S., O87540.
Kraus, John H., O87829.
Kreitz, Rolf B., O89530.
Kreulen, Ray H., O88414.
Krimmer, John A., O76314.
Krisko, John, O83743.
Kroeber, Donald W., O99673.
Kuehn, Karl P., O87830.
Kuehn, Walter, Jr., O89237.
Kulik, Frederick W., O83321.
Kuntz, George R., O89238.
Kurgvel, Jaan, O77878.
Kurtz, Robert W., O89083.
Kusek, Leonard J., O83322.
Kvederas, Robert A., O81848.
Kwak, John J., Sr., O88774.
Kyle, David S., O83323.
LaGrassa, Joseph E., O87832.
Laabs, Robert G., O82736.
Lafayette, Richard J., O82737.
Lager, Kenneth E., O83324.
Lambo, Jerry D., O85195.
Lancaster, George N., O83325.
Landry, Gerard, O78596.
Lane, David L., O94603.
Lane, George H., Jr., O89240.
Lane, Glenn A., O83326.
Lang, Joseph A., O82741.
Langbein, Edward E., Jr., O96998.
Larsen, Roger G., O77880.
Laubscher, Alan L., O82742.
Laurson, Toivo, O77881.
Lawton, George C., O83328.
LeBourdais, Carl J., O88417.
LeMere, Charles E., O83329.
Leach, James E., O90266.
Leach, John H., Jr., O76325.
Leary, Donald B., O82744.
LeBlanc, Richard A., O76327.
Lee, Francis G., O87542.
Lee, Larry E., O77883.
Lee, Phillip A., O82749.
Leech, Earl W., O76330.
Leins, David V., Jr., O78087.
Lembcke, John D., O85789.
Lemons, Robert L., Jr., O97000.
Lesh, Burton A., O76336.
Levasseur, Julian J., Jr., O83331.
Lewis, Jerome C., O83332.
L'Hommedieu, Richard F., O76340.
Licht, William R., O82751.
Lide, Theodore A., Jr., O88788.
Lindquist, Robert E., O83333.
Lindsey, Richard C., O82753.
Little, Robert E., O92088.
Llewellyn, Marvin D., O88129.
Lloyd, Robert J., O91630.
Lockwood, Gary E., O95562.
Lockwood, William L., O82756.
Loffert, John W., O83334.
Loftus, Martin R., O76348.
Long, Raymond, Jr., O82759.
Longabach, Gordon A., O82760.
Longo, Vincent J., O75677.
Lotz, Thomas M., Jr., O92707.
Lovinggood, Jerry L., O88132.
Lowe, James I., O88799.
Lowe, John C., O81850.
Lowe, John M., O78089.
Lowe, Larry E., O83942.
Lowe, Nicholas C., O77888.
Lowrey, Austin, 3d, O83837.
Lowry, Louis L., O88800.
Loyd, David R., O88133.
Lufburrow, Robert P., O89097.
Lufkin, Linwood E., O82761.
Luisi, Gerhard H., O89248.
Lunde, Henrik O., O82765.
Lundgren, Duwayne C., O78599.
Lupi, Joseph A., O83339.
Lynch, Richard T., O83340.
Lyon, Harold C., Jr., O83342.
MacLean, Bruce D., O92091.
MacLeod, Albert D., O83343.
Mace, Arthur F., O83344.
Maddox, Bobby J., O82767.
Madigan, John J., 3d, O83345.
MaGee, Michael H., O88137.
Maggelet, Theodore F., Jr., O76364.
Mahalko, Gerald J., O90230.
Mahler, Michael D., O83346.
Major, Richard B., O82769.
Makowski, Paul, O83347.
Maliska, Thomas P., O83348.
Malloy, Shaun T., O91918.
Malone, John F., O94944.
Malone, Lawrence M., O83349.
Manges, Duff G., 3d, O83350.
Mangrum, Oren D., O77892.
Mann, Douglas J., O82772.
Manning, Norman G., O87844.
Marr, Francis W., O85032.
Marshall, Richard H., O88139.
Marshall, Willie J., O83352.
Martin, Bruce A., O89251.
Martin, Don, Jr., O83354.
Martin, Joseph E., O82776.
Martin, Robert W., O76375.
Martin, Samuel, O74361.
Martin, Willard L., O88812.
Mason, William B., O89104.
Massabni, Fadlo M., O99081.
Massey, John P., O77893.
Massey, Lee T., O90243.
Mathis, Robert N., O83358.
Matos, Joseph A., Jr., O83754.
Mattes, Richard W., O83755.
Matthews, Allan L., O78094.
Matthews, John B., Jr., O82781.
Mattingly, Roger K., O78600.
Maxson, Stanley A., Jr., O83361.
Maxwell, George M., Jr., O90426.
Mayer, Frederick F., O83363.
Mayes, Floyd B., Jr., O85619.
Mazo, David R., O88284.
McAdams, Michael C., O76397.
McAden, Henry J., Jr., O74767.
McAllister, James H., O88144.
McCaffrey, William J., O83364.
McCann, Thomas P., O90255.
McCarthy, Patrick F., O90257.
McCarthy, Robert A., O76401.
McClintic, Patrick W., O99351.
McCloskey, William B., Jr., O88817.
McCoy, Robert L., O75697.
McDaniel, James L., O95005.
McDermott, Charles L., O83954.
McDermott, Joseph B., O91455.
McDevitt, Donald T., O82787.
McDonald, Francis W., Jr., O76409.
McDonald, Larry P., O82788.
McDonald, Warren J., O92223.
McDonnell, Joseph M., O87559.
McGee, Milton J., O76411.
McGinnis, Michael, Jr., O88821.
McGrew, Palmer, 2d, O83367.
McIntosh, Bernard W., O78100.
McIntyre, Stephen, 3d, O83955.
McKay, Lawrence E., Jr., O83957.
McKenzie, Leon C., O76414.
McKenzie, Peter P., O89106.
McKibben, Clifford F., O88825.
McLain, David P., Jr., O84220.
McLean, William T., O83368.
McManus, James T., O77894.
McMullan, Frank W., O89256.
McNamara, Vincent E., O97946.
McNerney, Charles D., 2d, O77895.
McReynolds, Samuel O., O96823.
McVeigh, Andrew J., O92094.
Meadows, James S., O87849.
Meckel, Peter S., O94620.
Mee, Gregory C., O83760.
Meeks, Ronald C., O85213.
Megna, Joseph J., O76383.
Meininger, Herbert N., O88829.
Meister, Jerome F., O88830.
Mellin, James P., O83369.
Mernaugh, Paul F., O77898.
Merrill, Will G., Jr., O83371.
Merritt, Sylvester A., Jr., O94322.
Merritt, William D., O99691.
Meskunas, Edward F., O76387.
Messick, Thomas R., O82804.
Michael, George R., O83372.
Michael, John D., O83761.
Mickey, Joseph G., O88152.
Mignano, Bruce P., O83373.
Miles, Jerry M., O94111.
Miller, Billy F., O97012.
Miller, Charles A., O83375.
Miller, Charles E., O90302.
Miller, John D., O91937.
Miller, Milton L., O83376.
Miller, Richard L., O82808.
Miller, Robert H., O83377.
Miller, Robert L., O82809.
Miller, William R., O83378.
Mills, Harry L., O91646.
Mills, Richard L., O82810.
Mills, Robert M., O76432.
Min, Kellet I., O82812.
Miner, William R., O94112.
Mitchell, Gerald C., O83380.
Moe, Richard LeR., O94623.
Moentmann, Dwain T., O83381.
Moller, Carl M., Jr., O97343.
Mondok, Robert R., O76435.
Monfalcone, Frank L., O76436.
Montgomery, Kenneth H., O83382.
Monville, John J., O82819.
Mooney, Peter X., O96780.
Mooney, Robert E., Jr., O91465.
Moore, Charles F., O83963.
Moore, Charles S., O83383.
Moore, James W., O77904.
Moore, Olin J., O83384.
Moore, Robert J., O83385.
Morales, Steve G., O76439.
Morgan, Burford F., O95072.
Morgan, Hugh W., O83386.
Morgan, Thomas D., O83388.
Moriarty, Donald P., Jr., O88847.
Morin, Raymond J., Jr., O88160.
Morris, Alva J., O87859.
Morris, David W., O81813.
Morris, Ellis R., O92098.
Morrison, Leo S., Jr., O76443.
Morrissey, John J., Jr., O76445.
Morse, David L., O85625.
Moscatelli, Robert G., O83390.

Moss, Robert E., O91949.
Motes, Clyde L., O81814.
Mowry, Richard E., O96706.
Muhlenfeld, William F., O85629.
Mulcahey, Francis L., Jr., O95364.
Mullins, Jack A., O99359.
Mullins, Lawrence E., O88162.
Mulloy, Robert L., Jr., O80256.
Munn, Jack E., O87862.
Murphy, Joseph H., Jr., O88852.
Murphy, William I., O83391.
Murray, Owen P., O78106.
Myers, Charles M., O82834.
Myers, James A., O91650.
Myers, Samuel L., Jr., O83392.
Nabors, William T., O84237.
Nadal, Ramon A., 2d, O83393.
Nail, Frank M., O82835.
Najera, Pedro, O77907.
Nakasato, George I., O82836.
Nale, Billy E., O77908.
Napper, John L., O91474.
Natale, Matthew M., O97172.
Nathan, Walter E., O88457.
Nazarenus, James M., O91651.
Neale, Charles F., Jr., O97339.
Neary, Edward F., O95074.
Neely, Carl C., Jr., O88296.
Neely, Cecil N., O89020.
Nelsen, Ronald L., O91652.
Nelson, Arthur F., O91956.
Nelson, George R., O82839.
Nelson, Richard E., O82842.
Newell, Edward W., O76464.
Nicewicz, Walter A., O9783.
Nicholas, Frank E., O76466.
Nidever, David F., O83396.
Nix, Crispus C., O77912.
Norberg, William G., O88166.
Norbo, Gary J., O92231.
Norton, James A., O92232.
Novak, Jerry R., O83965.
Nowak, John A., O83397.
Nuffer, Frederick L., Jr., O83398.
Nugent, James, O91961.
Nun, John B., O83399.
Nydam, David A., O82848.
Nyfeler, George L., Jr., O96785.
Oakes, William H., O87575.
Oates, David T., O78111.
Oberg, Dick S., O83402.
Oberle, Joseph F., O91962.
O'Brien, John A., O94879.
O'Bryant, James E., O74421.
Oden, Lesley E., O77914.
Oelke, Karl E., O83403.
Ogden, George C., Jr., O97954.
O'Kelley, Richard D., O92107.
Oliva, Albert J., Jr., O90356.
Olsen, Thomas A., O75739.
Olson, Ronald C., O83405.
O'Malley, Joseph G., O88464.
Ordaz, Fernando E., O93068.
Ordway, Roderic E., O83406.
Orr, Gerald W., O89365.
Orr, Thomas L., O83407.
Osborne, James C., O90536.
Owen, Benjamin P., O82858.
Owens, Sammy L., O76484.
Oxford, Clyde E., O82859.
Packard, Bruce S., O83409.
Paes, Joseph A., O83410.
Painter, Keith, O82861.
Paladino, Vito W., O87579.
Palladino, Donald J., O83411.
Palme, Francis J., Jr., O8758.
Palmer, John L., O83412.
Paris, William, O78113.
Park, Donald R., O99704.
Parker, Charles E., Jr., O92002.
Parker, David M., O89272.
Parker, Jerry S., O87870.
Parker, Jimmie C., O8661.
Parker, Travis W., O87871.
Parks, William R., O83414.
Parman, Donald W., O90616.
Parsons, Ralph W., O96786.
Passailaigue, Edward P., Jr., O85232.
Patterson, James L., O89125.
Pauley, Richard A., O91971.
Payne, Garth H., Jr., O83416.
Payne, James C., O97559.
Peake, Hayden B., O86621.
Pearce, Joseph R., O76501.
Pearce, William L., O91665.
Pearce, William E., O89274.
Pearsall, Max G., O83417.
Pease, James W., O87879.
Peate, Laurence R., O97957.
Peck, James W., O83418.
Pedersen, Millard L., O83419.
Pellegrini, Benjamin J., O83420.
Pelot, Lynwood M., Jr., O96603.
Penick, Billy R., O77918.
Perreault, Lawrence F., O83423.
Peters, John W., O83424.
Peters, Richard K., O82871.
Petersen, Donald R., O82872.
Petesch, Gary L., O81821.
Pfeiffer, Richard W., O94332.
Phelan, Arthur J., O88875.
Philbin, Donald R., O93070.
Philbrook, Wallace R., O91977.
Pickett, John H., Jr., O86632.
Pierce, Ellis E., Jr., O85637.
Pierre, Allan, O76511.
Piff, Walter F., Jr., O94331.
Plageman, Robert C., O82878.
Platt, Edgar C., O99378.
Plaue, Walter M., O83425.
Plonk, Donald C., O77921.
Plummer, Gerrell V., O75414.
Pluta, Russell F., O76516.
Pointer, Robert W., Jr., O83426.
Pollenz, Richard S., O87885.
Pollock, Robert T., O95741.
Polo, Richard J., O78610.
Pompa, John R., O87586.
Pond, Kenneth S., O98364.
Poole, Ronald H., O85362.
Poor, George R., O87587.
Pore, Stanley C., Jr., O75758.
Porter, Ronald E., O88879.
Poteat, James D., O77922.
Powell, Colin L., O83771.
Powers, Davies R., O83427.
Press, Donald P., O83772.
Prewett, William A., O92505.
Price, Robert D., O89277.
Priddy, Bobby E., Sr., O79612.
Pridgen, Henry A., O95085.
Prince, Jimmy G., O76529.
Prince, Ted, O85641.
Proeschel, Donald L., O88886.
Proffit, Ray B., O77923.
Prunitsch, Karl F., O83428.
Pryor, Philip A., O83429.
Pujol, Elwray, O88478.
Purvis, Ralph M., O95086.
Puscheck, Herbert C., O83430.
Putnam, John D., O83773.
Qualtrough, Norman E., O97022.
Raby, Kenneth A., O92506.
Rachels, Ray H., O94885.
Raffaele, John, O96790.
Rafferty, James R., O91671.
Rahm, Richard R., Jr., O75027.
Rambo, James E., O89280.
Ramsden, James H., O83431.
Rash, Stephen E., O82894.
Rave, John S., O83432.
Raymond, John A., O83433.
Real, John P., O76541.
Rector, Zane K., O83434.
Reese, Cleland P., O77925.
Reese, Ronald R., O84531.
Reese, Thomas D., O88893.
Rehm, Walter E., O89374.
Rehmert, Colby D., O82900.
Rehusch, Kenneth S., O87896.
Reich, Charles J., Jr., O82901.
Reidy, Richard F., Jr., O83436.
Reifsnyder, Robert L., O76543.
Reilley, James J., O85648.
Reinert, John E., O83775.
Reiser, Andre K., O83776.
Rembecki, Edward X., O83662.
Renkin, Herbert L., O76545.
Renzi, Eugene C., O89584.
Resa, Philip E., O89133.
Revels, James W., O77927.
Reyburn, Dwight S., O82902.
Reynard, Richard L., O83438.
Reynolds, William H., O85650.
Reynolds, William M., O83439.
Rhodes, Robert G., O83440.
Rice, Charlie W., O82905.
Rice, James W., Jr., O89375.
Richards, Gene M., O90424.
Richey, Charles G., O85367.
Riggan, Raymond B., Jr., O83441.
Riley, Paul R., Jr., O82907.
Rilling, Henry C., O85368.
Riscassi, Robert W., O88189.
Ritchie, Thomas A., O76558.
Rivera, Frank T., O82909.
Rives, William T., Jr., O78120.
Roberson, Richard W., O82910.
Roberts, Birchard R., O76559.
Roberts, Donald J., O83443.
Roberts, Hollis L., O96857.
Robertson, George R., O83445.
Robinson, Kelly E., O83446.
Robinson, Richard A., Jr., O82916.
Roche, David, O82918.
Rodenberg, Louis B., Jr., O83447.
Rodgers, Thurman D., O76564.
Rodnite, Andrew J., O85654.
Roemer, Richard O., O81826.
Rogan, Robert E., O81854.
Rogers, Hugh K., Jr., O96773.
Rogers, Jerome J., O96791.
Roosma, Garret G., O83449.
Roosma, William A., O83450.
Rosenberg, David C., O88306.
Rosendahl, Richard C., O81729.
Ross, Jimmy D., O82924.
Rowe, Terry E., Jr., O81827.
Ruane, Douglas A., O76573.
Rundle, Ralph T., O86709.
Rushing, Theophilus H., Jr., O83984.
Russell, Richard R., O85660.
Rutherford, Frank E., O77930.
Ryan, Gerald E., O77931.
Ryan, William D., O87602.
Saint, Crosbie E., O83452.
Saling, Neil E., Jr., O82931.
Salisbury, Alan B., O83453.
Sampson, John B., O83454.
Sanchez, Reynaldo, O88193.
Sanchez-Alicea, Esteban, O99723.
Sanders, Milton D., O76585.
Sanders, Thomas C., O91999.
Sanders, Walter M., O87908.
Sands, Thomas A., O83455.
Sargent, Norbert J., O76590.
Satterthwaite, George E., O76591.
Sauer, Charles E., O83780.
Saunders, Richard G., O88913.
Savage, Leslie H., O82937.
Savery, Donald F., Jr., O78491.
Scales, Eugene J., O83456.
Scarborough, Edward, O78122.
Schafer, Floyd J., O89592.
Schaffer, John A., O83457.
Scher, Donald M., O89593.
Scherer, George H., O79617.
Scherman, Francis J., O82942.
Schmanska, Philip G., O95386.
Schmith, Albert T., O83783.
Schneider, John W., Jr., O83458.
Schonberger, Paul T., O83459.
Schonberger, Richard C., O83460.
Schrader, Frederick A., O78612.
Schuetze, Raymond A., Jr., O88918.
Schultz, Norman O., O88920.
Schurtz, Gerald P., O83461.
Schwar, Joseph H., Jr., O83462.
Schwarzbauer, Joseph W., O82947.
Schwendinger, Charles J., O77935.
Scott, Franklin D., O83989.
Scott, Richard L., O88921.
Scoville, Oscar G., O76602.
Seaman, Andrew M., O82948.
Seay, Michael, O76604.
Sedgwick, Douglass A., O83463.
Segers, Joseph W., Jr., O84268.
Sellers, Roger L., O82953.
Seltzer, James E., O83464.
Senn, Robert W., O82954.
Senneff, James C., O82955.
Serchak, William E., O83465.
Sewall, John O. B., O83466.

Shannon, John D., O89316.
Shaute, Joseph J., O83788.
Shaver, Charles W., Jr., O76618.
Shea, Charles E., 3d, O85664.
Shea, Joseph A., O83467.
Sheldon, William W., O88926.
Shelton, James E., O88927.
Shepard, James C., O76621.
Shepard, William J., 2d, O83469.
Sherman, Charles L., 4th, O87613.
Shetler, John D., O83471.
Shimerda, John H., O83472.
Short, Ronnie D., O83473.
Shrader, Cecil L., O83474.
Shunk, Peter, O83476.
Sibbald, John R., O82963.
Sibert, George W., O83477.
Sibley, Robert A., O78125.
Siderius, Robert R., O89141.
Sieck, Robert R., O97204.
Siegel, Eugene E., O88932.
Sigler, James M., O83478.
Siler, Samuel M., O88934.
Silvey, Bruce D., O96718.
Simmers, Richard A., O83480.
Singletary, Charles B., O94960.
Sisak, James C., O88938.
Sisler, Delmar R., O82969.
Sivils, Doye O., O87617.
Skaife, Stanley T., O76636.
Skelly, James G., O9049.
Skirka, George W., O82970.
Slezak, Donald J., O82971.
Slofer, Bernard P., O76639.
Smith, Anthony A., O83481.
Smith, Carl R., O97037.
Smith, David C., O82973.
Smith, Fletcher B., Jr., O91512.
Smith, Fred, O82974.
Smith, Harold R., O82976.
Smith, Robert T., Jr., O88942.
Smith, Sam G., O89384.
Smith, Stephen L., O82981.
Smith, Theodore F., O83483.
Smith, Thomas K., O83484.
Smith, Walter M., Jr., O93080.
Smith, William J., O88944.
Smyth, Rome D., O78563.
Snare, Ross W., Jr., O80229.
Snooks, James P., 3d, O76652.
Snowden, John R., O92253.
Solley, Lee R., O89993.
Solvin, Howard, O82986.
Sonnier, Robby J., O94346.
Sorensen, Gary A., O93511.
Sorensen, Martin P., O91603.
Sowell, Arnold M., O78616.
Sowell, Lewis C., Jr., O82988.
Sparks, Alton R., O95105.
Spaulding, Richard A., O90509.
Speairs, Phillip M., O88210.
Spencer, Floyd B., Jr., O83485.
Spurlock, Lon A., 2d., O83486.
Spurrier, Robert E., O82994.
Squier, Jack E., O89614.
Stahlman, John W., O83795.
Stalcup, Billy J., O91692.
Stanborough, Robert Mac A., O88310.
Stanton, James D., O83487.
Staples, Frederick B., O86806.
Statler, James B., O82995.
Stearns, Henry A., O94648.
Steedly, Ronald E., O78618.
Stein, Philip A., O75819.
Steinbach, James J., O97208.
Steinmetz, Charles P., O91731.
Stengel, Charles W., Jr., O96802.
Stephans, Richard A., O91520.
Stepp, Robert H., O87629.
Stevens, Lynn H., O83000.
Steverson, Lynn, O95108.
Stewart, James T., 099104.
Stewart, Jessie E., O76668.
Stiner, Carl W., O84001.
Stocky, Peter DeW., O76672.
Stokes, John P., 3d, O76673.
Stone, John B., O83491.
Stovall, James T., 3d, O98204.
Strickler, William H., O85378.
Stritzinger, Frederick G., 5th, O83492.
Strzok, Peter P., O92261.
Sturdivant, Thurman D., 3d, O98264.
Sturm, John A., O83009.
Sukalski, Mitchel V., O83010.
Sullinger, Carl W., O83493.
Sullivan, George C., O81830.
Sullivan, John H., O76679.
Sullivan, Robert F., O91700.
Summers, Harry G., Jr., O76680.
Suprise, Lyle G., O89296.
Sutherland, John R., Jr., O83494.
Swanson, David V., O94654.
Swanson, David W., O83495.
Swenson, Louis S., O97362.
Swift, John B., O74551.
Tait, Thomas H., O87939.
Takane, James N., O78622.
Talley, Earl H., O83017.
Tallgren, Robert W., O83496.
Taurke, Erwin A., O85270.
Taylor, Alfred E., O89299.
Taylor, Thomas W., O89150.
Tear, Harry R., Jr., O77948.
Tedesco, John J., O92573.
Teeter, Charles E., O83497.
Telfer, Jon R., O88214.
Terpstra, John J., Jr., O87637.
Thamasett, Otto J., O83498.
Theibert, Jude J., O83499.
Theuer, Paul J., O94655.
Thiede, Alfred J., O92133.
Thomas, Edward J. F., O77951.
Thomas, Govan C., O87639.
Thomas, John F., O83022.
Thomas, Richard E., O83500.
Thomas, Ronald E., O90546.
Thompson, David E., O91707.
Thompson, David E., O96394.
Thompson, George H., O87641.
Thompson, James E., Jr., O78134.
Thompson, Michael R., O94504.
Thompson, Richard A., O91402.
Thompson, Thomas M., Jr., O83501.
Thornock, John R., O92263.
Thorsen, John S., O92024.
Thovson, Paul W., O87947.
Tilley, James N., Jr., O83502.
Tipton, James A., O78623.
Tirre, Joseph C., Jr., O83503.
Tisson, Guenter J., O92579.
Toal, Alonzo R., O83026.
Tobiason, Allan R., O76699.
Todd, George K., Jr., O76701.
Toftoy, Charles N., O83504.
Tomei, Giancarlo A., O88979.
Tomlinson, Raymond F. R., O83505.
Totin, John R., O88981.
Trabert, Richard F., O83506.
Travis, Charles E., Jr., O78135.
Tredway, Robert N., O83507.
Trueheart, William H., Jr., O76705.
Truett, Curtis P., O85683.
Trumbull, Hugh H., Jr., O83508.
Trunkes, William J., O94899.
Tuck, John S., O76706.
Turner, Ronald D., O83509.
Tuttle, William G. T., Jr., O83510.
Tynes, Theodore, R., Jr., O77953.
Umbaugh, Lloyd D., O83511.
Valverde, Fernando E., O78140.
VanFleet, Townsend A., O83512.
VanMeter, Harold C., O84014.
Vanture, Paul D., O83513.
Verry, Horace D., O90226.
Victorine, Clifford D., Jr., O83514.
Villarreal, Julian, Jr., O88514.
Vincent, Charles J., O90310.
Vincent, Wendell C., O83040.
Vinson, Paul H., O83041.
Voss, Kenneth E., O94658.
Waddell, Roger W., O83515.
Wafer, William J., O83516.
Waggoner, Robert N., O97216.
Wagner, Robert E., O87653.
Waldack, Albert C., O90464.
Walker, Costelle B., O76724.
Walker, Donald G., O83047.
Walker, Jack A., O78145.
Wallace, Guy E., O75855.
Walling, James B., Jr., O95668.
Walsh, Raymond M., O92036.
Walter, John L., O83050.
Walton, Leroy, O76730.
Wands, Robert E., O83053.
Ward, James J., O88994.
Ward, Leonard M., Jr., O88995.
Ward, Rayburn L., Jr., O80265.
Ward, Wallace W., O83520.
Warnberg, Harry E., O85097.
Warren, Peter J., O81835.
Warren, Rufford, O83055.
Wasinger, Edwin P., O94659.
Waskowicz, Francis A., O83521.
Waterman, William R., O76733.
Watkins, Thomas D., 2d, O88996.
Weary, Sheron E., O88317.
Weatherman, James A., O87658.
Webb, Richard B., O83522.
Webb, Robert H., Jr., O78150.
Weber, Victor A., O97651.
Webster, Garah L., O88224.
Weckel, Edward C., O83523.
Weems, Sands S., 3d, O76736.
Wees, George G., O83524.
Weiffenbach, William L., Jr., O84019.
Weis, James H., O83525.
Weisto, John A., O83064.
Wellman, William H., O92040.
Wentworth, Eugene G., Jr., O83526.
Wesley, Clemon H., O89004.
Wessel, James R., O83527.
West, Donald R., O90636.
West, James A., O88523.
Wetzel, Gerald R., O92041.
Wharton, Terrance D., O83065.
Whedbee, John S., Sr., O78627.
Wheeler, Edward W., Jr., O81838.
White, David J., O85388.
White, Lawrence L., O85699.
White, Robert H., O83067.
Whitley, William R., Jr., O94533.
Whitt, Samuel T., O91723.
Wichert, Gilbert H., O92270.
Widell, Carl A., Jr., O89166.
Widick, James L., O89397.
Widmer, Edwin R., O89009.
Wiger, Leslie T., O76749.
Wilkins, Jesse B., Jr., O90608.
Williamon, Charles, O99418.
Williams, Donald R., O83529.
Williams, Forrest H., Jr., O76752.
Williams, Glen W., O87971.
Williams, Jack H., O92611.
Williams, Jimmie L., Jr., O78628.
Williams, John B., O83530.
Williams, Richard L., O99121.
Williams, Robert B., O95117.
Williams, Samuel, O76755.
Williamson, Donald R., O83811.
Williamson, Neil S., 3d, O83531.
Willis, Carlton R., O92845.
Willis, James S., Jr., O83532.
Wilmot, Richard W., O90615.
Wilson, Donald E., O83533.
Wilson, John P., Jr., O89310.
Wilson, Richard A., O83813.
Wilson, Richard L., O97271.
Winder, Richard C., Jr., O83077.
Winger, Norman, O78156.
Winslow, John E., O85804.
Winzurk, William F., O89648.
Wise, Paul E., O89312.
Wist, Fred C., O83079.
Witsell, Edward L., O78157.
Wittenberg, Kenneth J., O84299.
Wofford, Milton R., O83534.
Wolff, Robert A., O97222.
Wollerton, Charles V., O83081.
Wood, Nelson V., O77965.
Woods, Rex J., O83084.
Woolley, John E., O76767.
Works, Richard E., O91431.
Wright, Gregory F., O85391.
Wyatt, Sterling W., O83537.
Wynn, Sidney R., O78629.
Yarbrough, Ralph G., O91729.
Yaun, William W., Jr., O83090.
Young, Richard B., O80233.
Young, Wallace J., O87673.
Yurick, George W., O83539.
Zimmer, Gerald H., Jr., O83540.
Zimmerman, Robert, O75445.

To be captain, Chaplain

Banton, Huston J., 2d O94436.
Blunt, Kenneth L., O96357.
Bowers, Curtis R., Jr., O97283.
Brereton, Thomas F., O95443.
Crick, Robert D., O98557.
Dinkel, Emil L., O97300.
Gray, George H., O99236.
Grothe, Richard E., O97309.
Hyde, Patrick H., O96878.
Kyle, Charles G., O95056.
Petersen, Gordon H., O99274.
Prout, Gordon R., O97960.
Reswik, George V., O97963.
Rivers, Daniel L., O95588.
Silliman, Edwin T., O98328.
Thomas, Everette J., O95449.
Wilson, David L., O97999.

To be captain, Women's Army Corps

Dial, Retta F., L562.
Jump, Janice G., L564.
Lane, Betty J., L588.
Mathews, Charlotte L., L608.
O'Claire, Joyce W., L572.
Schairer, Agnes C., L592.
Wagner, Lillian N., L618.

To be captain, Medical Corps

Anderson, William D., O98093.
Bacon, William L., O99045.
Baker, Dudley P., O97358.
Barringer, Michel L., O97882.
Berman, Howard H., O99129.
Binion, Gerald R., O97055.
Blight, Edward M., Jr., O97431.
Brown, James H., O97234.
Burr, Donald C., O97889.
Calamita, Frank P., O97506.
Campbell, Peter M., O98446.
Caput, William G., O95235.
Caras, Thomas S., O97890.
Carter, Tom E., O99562.
Cashman, Thomas M., O99194.
Cook, Thomas L., O97792.
Cooper, John D., O97919.
DeLos Santos, Manuel T., O98486.
DiLallo, Chester A., Jr., O99307.
Dierdorff, Edwin P., O97475.
Dotin, Larry N., O97067.
England, Robert L., O99639.
Flair, Robert C., O99162.
Gardner, Richard L., O96794.
Gay, John H., O98496.
Haglund, Rodger B., O99327.
Harkins, Paul D., O95201.
Harshaw, William G., Jr., O97916.
Hays, Leonard L., O97918.
Hedlund, Kenneth W., O99083.
Henderson, Robert L., O97378.
Hering, Herman D., O98223.
Hickman, Lynn E., O97837.
Hollander, Arnold I., O98137.
Hurwitz, Richard A., O96684.
Hutchison, James R., O99067.
Kaplan, Gerald, O97930.
Kilgus, Andrew H., O97616.
King, Everett G., O97815.
La Piana, Francis G., O98292.
Lillie, Homer J., Jr., O99075.
Mani, Carl J., O97941.
Manuel, Wilbert J., O99079.
McIver, William J., O99073.
McNamee, Philip I., O98517.
Mulkerin, Lawrence E., O99358.
Navin, James J., O98039.
Nilges, Thomas C., O99088.
Nomura, Fred M., Jr., O97783.
Norcott, Edward A., O99362.
Phillips, Wesley F., O99090.
Ralph, James W., O97024.
Reinbold, Ronald G., O97660.
Rich, John D., O99386.
Robinson, Frederick C., O99093.
Ruymann, Frederick B., O97968.
Rymut, August F., Jr., O97570.
Schaaf, Daniel J., O99095.
Schaffner, Frederick, O97033.
Schettler, William H., O99511.
Schultz, Boyd L., O98406.
Schwindt, Robert R., O97972.
Segal, Avrom C., O99099.
Severance, Richard C., O97976.
Sills, Theron G., O97978.
Simmons, James W., Jr., O99101.
Slahorek, George J., O97526.
Slaughter, Robert L., O97980.
Smith, Henry I., O97981.
Smith, Samuel G., O97982.
Stephenson, Jackie D., O97984.
Stoller, Jerry J., O99105.
Stuart, Leo D., O99402.
Stucker, Paul J., O97603.
Thibeaux, Albert, Jr., O99411.
Vavrin, Charles R., O98216.
Ventry, Paul G., O99407.
Volpe, Joseph A., O97991.
Waldron, Frank D., O97993.
Wallner, Herman C., Jr., O99410.
Whiting, Edward G., Jr., O99533.
Wills, William R., Jr., O97997.
Young, Delosa A., O99420.

To be captain, Dental Corps

Foster, Richard A., O99317.
Hennig, Guenther H., O97131.
Hillis, Robert E., O98563.
Patterson, Jimmie F., O99211.
Walowitz, Charles, O99438.

To be captain, Veterinary Corps

Bellamy, Albert D., O96731.
Blanchard, Decatur D., Jr., O96737.
Bratthauar, Robert E., O92626.
Clark, William H. H., O95120.
DelFavero, John E., O96675.
Elliott, Mark P., O97110.
Flowers, Herschel H., O95020.
Hagberg, Mylo M., O95301.
Kovatch, Robert M., O96770.
Liddle, Charles G., O97002.
Loiseaux, Peter St. J., O95354.
Pakes, Steven P., O96709.
Reynolds, Scott L., O95380.
Woodling, William L., Jr., O95411.

To be captain, Medical Service Corps

Adcock, Bobby R., O75450.
Barden, Regginial R., O83849.
Bastron, Frederick C., O77802.
Bateman, Jack N., O82411.
Bates, Robert A., O82412.
Belcher, Lillard F., O89179.
Black, Edward J., Jr., O85724.
Boroski, Marvin R., O85727.
Borth, Alfred G., O85912.
Brand, Fred C., O85728.
Brekhus, Dennis A., O92164.
Brooks, Benjamin A., O85731.
Brown, Perry W., O93027.
Burkett, Samuel L., Jr., O88599.
Carper, Robert R., O91180.
Ciccone, Vincent J., O85136.
Cissell, Donald J., O85505.
Conklin, Robert D., O76026.
Davis, John F., O88645.
Dickson, Richard C., O82317.
Dobson, Benjamin F., O91578.
Dorrough, Earnest L., O78056.
Dubiel, Joseph, Jr., O91428.
Dunkelberg, Wilbur E., Jr., O94925.
Edwards, Lewis M., O98084.
Edwards, Tom R., O91815.
Emmons, Bobby B., O85747.
Fazio, Robert A., Jr., O95017.
Fields, Robert E., O88674.
Fountain, Donald B., O91233.
Frase, Howard J., O82584.
French, Ernest D., O82586.
French, George R., O88685.
Gaffney, John P., O85752.
Garland, William B., Jr., O92330.
Gillespie, Ronald L., O89490.
Greene, Marion F., Jr., O84993.
Harling, John T., O94303.
Hawkins, Sanders F., O76207.
Hayes, James H., O88728.
Hembree, Calvin S., O91267.
Herek, Robert L., O83728.
Hersey, William J., Jr., O91604.
Hobbs, Robert J., Jr., O85768.
Hucks, John A., O88747.
Johns, William C., O95048.
Johnson, William H., Jr., O78591.
Johnston, Jerry M., O91891.
Jones, Donn C., O89229.
Jung, Paul T., O91614.
Kaperick, Donald P., O94094.
Kisel, John G., O95055.
Kleber, Robert E., O85780.
Koch, Joseph L., O86380.
Lafleur, George J., O85194.
Lamb, William O., O92213.
Leeder, Laird G., Jr., O86411.
Lines, Max M., O87547.
Litman, Leon H., O88791.
Martinka, Gerald R., O92092.
McDermott, Frank E., O88819.
McDowell, Frank, Jr., O97327.
McGough, Sammy, O87560.
McMahon, Robert P., O89255.
Moody, Dan D., O84230.
Ney, Leland E., O88461.
O'Haver, Donald R., O88463.
Orbelo, William R., O83968.
Pannell, Robert F., O94948.
Pascal, Harold S., O85065.
Posey, William L., O81822.
Reddy, John J., Jr., O84253.
Redman, David E., O92117.
Reynolds, David G., O87595.
Roper, Rex S., O97027.
Rothwell, J. C., O86705.
Rumley, Richard E., O88906.
Silvas, Manuel M., O88935.
Simnacher, Bruce D., O76628.
Souter, John R., O82987.
Sperandio, John R., O82992.
Stavish, Peter J., O88958.
Steele, Billy D., O86812.
Tatam, William M., O98325.
Tilmon, George W., Jr., O88977.
Uemura, Edward H., O83033.
Vann, Lawrence K., O89304.
Wallace, Norman G., O78147.
Waller, Donald A., O88517.
Weaver, Joseph U., Jr., O87659.
Webb, Charles L., O89000.
Woodward, William E., O84302.
Yeats, Christopher S., O76774.
Young, John W., Jr., O86971.

To be captain, Army Nurse Corps

Castleman, Glynna K., N3129.
DeVoss, Joan K., N3075.
Diener, Dolores E., N2970.
Dixon, Georgia M. F., N3046.
Hernandez, Nilza R., N3049.
Jones, Addie B. L., N2961.
Lee, Linda, N3091.
Lyke, Elizabeth M., N3037.
McIntosh, Hazel M., N3033.
McKinney, Janet L., N2985.
McLoughlin, Audre J., N3134.
Michael, Marbeth G., N2963.
Miller, Patricia M., N3030.
Mott, Carolyn N., N3001.
Shimerda, Joan L., N3090.
Silvestre, Patricia A., N3077.
Slewitzke, Connie L., N3038.
Small, Norma R., N3162.
Symonds, Jean M., N3078.
Teele, Kathryn M., N2967.
Tinklenberg, Esther J., N2976.
Williams, Edith, N3034.

To be captain, Army Medical Specialist Corps

Hall, Mary S., M10183.
Landen, Betty R., M10184.
Ozburn, Mary S., M10189.

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3298:

To be first lieutenants

Avery, James W., O94973.
Biddinger, David E., O93577.
Browning, Albert J., Jr., O94674.
Burton, Lance J., O95237.
Butler, Rudolph E., Jr., O99299.
Carrier, Gerald L., O99621.
Carver, William G., O97891.
Click, Ira M., O99050.
Clune, James M., O94676.
Corcoran, Edward A., O94678.

Couch, John L., O99630.
Crotty, Timothy J., O94681.
Cundiff, Brian H., O94378.
Davis, Norman J., O99635.
Dauber, Peter F., O99634.
Elliott, John A., 3d, O94687.
Evans, Donald A., O97662.
Finstrom, Carl G., Jr., O95319.
Gerhard, Carl S., O94689.
Giboney, John N., O98231.
Griffith, Albert A., Jr., O99653.
Herts, Charles R., O92542.
Hooks, Harold V., O99662.
Hunt, Richard, O99664.
Jones, Thomas L., O94816.
Jones, Theodore S., O97711.
Keiser, Maurice R., O94536.
Kerwin, Kenneth H., 2d, O94817.
Killgrove, Albert G., O91904.
Knauer, William M., O94698.
La Bay, Paul H. M., 3d, O97845.
LaSorsa, John M., O92634.
Leister, Ancil D., Jr., O94702.
Lewis, Paul, Jr., O93229.
Lyon, Charles H., 3d, O98467.
Marks, James B., O99686.
Millet, James S., O98482.
Moore, Robert G., O94707.
Murai, Roger N., O94822.
Olsen, John W., O92772.
Poole, Joseph L., O98079.
Quick, James B., O94978.
Ray, Luther B., 3d, O99715.
Reagan, Wesley F., O92823.
Runey, Dennis I., O94830.
Sanabria, Agripino, O94241.
Schaefer, Gerhardt T., O94718.
Scott, Kenneth R., O99728.
Sexton, Donald E., O99729.
Shauf, Elton R., O99730.
Slife, Richard D., O99734.
Stone, Randolph, O94833.
Tellman, David W., O99742.
Thoms, Herbert G., O99745.
Williams, James D., Jr., O99417.
Wise, Glenn L., O99760.
Wright, Allen W., O99761.
Yates, John R., O99763.
Yeargan, Randall L., O94983.

To be first lieutenants, Medical Service Corps

Casey, Thomas D., O97291.
Cole, Evan H., O94677.
Collyer, William M., O95162.
Edwards, Joseph D., Jr., O99311.
George, Thomas A., O94688.
Gustat, Matthew P., 3d, O95521.
Hill, Arthur E., O99149.
Lyons, Gerard A., O97547.
McKinnery, William N., Jr., O94618.
Montgomery, Gordon K., O98244.
Sisk, Michael G., O99396.
Steen, Tyrone LaM., O92922.
Wahl, George H., O94836.

To be first lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps

Scott, Carolyn M., N3095.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army by transfer in the grades specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, and 3288:

To be colonel

DiFusco, Manrico P. (MSC), O80276.

To be first lieutenant

Fladd, Frederic H. (MSC), O94386.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grades specified under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, and 3288:

To be major

Ahern, Neal J., O1318004.
Johnson, Harvey W., O1924607.

To be captain

Ackerman, Donald C., O4066842.
Allee, Robert J., O2028539.
Beckman, Charles H., O5405116.
Bloomer, Harry P., Jr., O1881562.
Bradner, James W., III, O5405009.
Brazeale, Charles R., O5502397.
Brockington, John S., O2030459.
Christy, Deryck G., O2211671.
Corliss, Reginald H., O4014751.
Culbertson, James E., O5405126.
Cummings, Clarence T., Jr., O4012166.
diLorenzo, Lucius V., O5703579.
Drenzek, Richard M., O4084904.
Faulkinberry, Charles H., Jr., O4042256.
Faulkner, Robert S., O5302501.
Fleigh, Raymond L., Jr., O2028807.
Forte, Johnie, Jr., O4049265.
Foster, John A., O5700283.
Gaffney, William W., O4067150.
Gainey, Bobby M., O5301521.
Gallagher, Neil L., O4032228.
Hennigan, William J., O4038229.
Henry, Charles E., O4049598.
Hill, Fred L., O5400405.
Hougen, Harvey R., O5301976.
Huntsinger, William R., O4056917.
Kesterson, William L., O4005813.
Latham, Tilden R., O5701057.
Legener, Richard G., O4009173.
Livingston, Thomas R., O5400772.
Lockridge, William E., O5301769.
Mack, William H., O4053057.
Meidl, James L., O5503398.
Miller, Andrew J., Jr., O5301780.
Miller, Howard A., O4026199.
Morgan, Ernest R., O1877749.
Naber, Elmer W., Jr., O4064611.
O'Neill, Joseph J., O4084414.
Payne, Moses, O5303229.
Perkins, Claude D., Jr., O5202209.
Petitt, Homer, Jr., O1915271.
Petracca, John M., O4074737.
Phelan, Michael J., O4006546.
Plott, Thomas J., O2268807.
Polk, Paul G., O5302484.
Presnal, Henry L., O5400820.
Raymond, Robert A., O4006935.
Richards, David A., O1936608.
Robinson, Raymond H., O4031107.
Ross, Carl L., O5405076.
Roughen, Albert H., O1881699.
Sandidge, Charles R., Jr., O4005359.
Schwarz, Charles E., O4016870.
Simon, Ernest A., O5400240.
Smith, Richard A., O5301561.
Sternat, Robert F., O4030364.
Tabor, Ernest E., O2287915.
Teague, Charles A., O4074332.
Trent, William E., O5700595.
Turner, Wililam O., Jr., O4046481.
Vanderschaaf, John N., O4030286.
Waller, Ephraim E., O2103440.
Waltrich, Henry L., O1932403.
White, Gordon F., O4031023.
Wilson, William D., O5302472.
Youngblood, Robert L., O4006983.

To be first lieutenants

Adkins, Thomas J., Jr., O4042217.
Archibald, Harold R., O5704136.
Averill, Ronald H., O5703593.
Beasley, James W., O5702043.
Best, James W., O5403226.
Bunting, Willis R., O5209253.
Carr, Richard M., O5208742.
Castleman, Robert J., Jr., O2312884.
Catron, Robert L., O5501453.
Cozanitis, Eleas A., O5306549.
Crockett, Ralph G., O4047549.
Cummings, Ezra C., Jr., O5212720.
Dacey, Robert J., O5001038.
Fernald, John P., O5508217.
Ford, James L., O5403734.
Garrett, Billy R., O5309498.
Gilligan, Joseph M., O5000572.
Gottfried, Francis L., O5704116.
Griffin, Tracy W., O5405552.
Hallum, Joe K., O5312138.
Havis, Joe D., O4025497.
Hipps, Gary W., O5403281.
Hudson, Donald L., O5313086.
Hudson, William K., O5204447.
Jenrette, Albert W., O5310182.
Johnson, Bruce G., O5510295.
Jones, Alfred P., O4062835.
Klimaszewski, Michael P., O5307488.
McCamy, John R., O5311121.
McGinley, Stanley E., O5704330.
Marcinkowski, Francis D., O4056111.
Oelschig, Carl H., III, O5308474.
Pate, Rupert E., Jr., O5307635.
Paxson, Neil B., O5211327.
Perez-Lebron, Hector, O5826193.
Plummer, George W., O5000385.
Pozzi, Ronald J., O5005875.
Proctor, Michael J., O5208254.
Reeves, Troy, Jr., O5403586.
Reichner, Lawrence H., O5705411.
Schmidt, William A., O5510854.
Schomburg, August, Jr., O5303907.
Stone, James E., O5308135.
Strauss, Gerhard H., O5312212.
Tanner, Walter D., O2295516.
Todd, John J., O5308781.
Tomihiro, Walter T., O5705335.
Wendt, Robert L., O5704945.

To be second lieutenants

Aery, John W., O5406166.
Baumgartner, Gary W., O5010484.
Belcher, Bill G., O5317317.
Brainerd, Ardell T., Jr., O2306858.
Burroughs, Dale A., O5010854.
Coffman, Charles O., O5514746.
Collins, Scott S., Jr., O5515218.
Cullum, Bobbie J., O5406086.
Davis, William I., O2311520.
Drowatzky, Ernest M., O5412259.
Falk, Warren L., O5215571.
Feldman, Henry J., O5317025.
Flynn, Leslie T., O5215278.
Forte, David L., O5410291.
Friend, Peter K., O5223806.
Keravuori, Aito J., O5313667.
Kesler, James W., O5011456.
Kinnison, Paul, Jr., O5412295.
Kochenour, John A., O5706919.
Ladd, William F., O5514876.
Laughinghouse, Warren K., O5214925.
Lovejoy, William C., III, O5317511.
Matz, William M., Jr., O5214635.
Menoher, Paul E., Jr., O5706923.
Meyers, Jerry F., O5513668.
Norman, William S., III, O5310401.
Patterson, Jerry R., O5408812.
Poinier, David N., O5412844.
Reitz, Robert A., O5216580.
Repischak, LeRoy T., O5515051.
Reynolds, Colin R., O5703699.
Ringgenberg, Archie C., O5515846.
Roleke, Richard B., O5010287.
Schneeweis, Harold N., O5006028.
Shaler, Michael D., O5707114.
Smith, William D., O5309860.
Stafford, James L., O5516461.
Stynes, Robert E., O5314517.
Webster, Lynn C., O5515546.
Wells, Virgil R., O5515777.
Wilkinson, Robert H., O5517540.
Williamson, George D., O5512490.
Woods, Sanderson A., O5413190.
Worrell, Benton, O5007834.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades and branches specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, 3288, 3289, 3290, 3291, 3292, 3293, and 3294:

To be major, Medical Corps

Davis, Charles J., Jr., O5220012.

To be captains, Army Nurse Corps

Davis, Marion J., N901765.
Lewis, Margaret A., N2292212.

To be captains, Army Medical Specialist Corps

Rodriguez, Ana L., J100190.
Wise, Danessa V., J100268.

To be captain, Chaplain

Britton, Donald L., O2301047.

To be captains, Dental Corps

Bruner, Hugh H., Jr., O5500820.
Cohen, Marvin W., O5217235.
Conway, Michael H., O5315664.
Ginsberg, Jack S., O5205976.

Kazlusky, Joseph B., O5518669.
Madden, Robert J., O4068045.
Wentz, Clarence E., O4060296.

To be captains, Judge Advocate General's Corps

DeFrancesco, Joseph J., O2293295.
Greenglass, Herman A., O2288736.
Mooneyham, John A., O2289651.
Norman, Steven R., O5507414.
Shea, Quinlan J., Jr., O2304521.
Wilson, Norman S., O2304471.

To be captains, Medical Corps

Albano, Patrick M., O2313430.
Borgman, Robert L., O2300665.
Bussey, Frederick N., O4060687.
Ettore, Albert J., O5204505.
Freebern, Robert K., O5706108.
Gemma, Frank E., O5219355.
Gunderson, Carl H., O4025202.
Kurtzman, Neil A., O5219889.
Liakos, William G., O75672.
Reister, Henry C., III, O2309693.

To be captains, Medical Service Corps

Brumfield, Clyde E., O1925287.
Lucci, Frank J., O2290209.
Wilson, Robert G., O2287523.

To be captains, Veterinary Corps

Drolte, James E., O4041325.
Ferguson, James A., O2304315.
Jones, Larry P., O2304214.
Stedham, Michael A., O2299626.

To be first lieutenants, Chaplain

Bartley, Dcn L., O2305126.
Bezanson, Ronald S., Jr., O2309377.
Borson, Bernard K., O5500503.
DeVeaux, John A., Jr., O5001576.
Greenspan, Alan M., O5004880.
Heim, Richard L., O2309012.

To be first lieutenants, Judge Advocate General's Corps

Chucala, Steven, O2309832.
McColl, Archibald M. S., O2311869.

To be first lieutenants, Medical Corps

Beaver, Harry C., O5508445.
Boulis, Matthew N., O5209317.
Clarke, John S., O5203406.
Eversmann, William W., Jr., O2313125.
Grant, George R., Jr.
Lindstrom, Eric E., O5505449.
Lowry, Roswell T.
McBride, William P., O2313036.
Miura, Calvin M., O2309417.
Mock, Joseph P., O5209322.
Nagle, John P., O5703886.
Nalley, Robert A., O2312022.
Polender, Bruce A., O5501976.
Samson, Donald W., O5013468.
Tomlin, Jerrold E., O2313210.
Walters, Theodore A., O2313113.
Williams, Charles E., O5408335.
Winninghame, Donald G., O2313109.
Zuck, Thomas F., O2313201.

To be first lieutenants, Medical Service Corps

Diffie, Dale P., O2297219.
Marchetti, Vincent A., O2303987.
Watt, James E., O4015763.

To be second lieutenant, Medical Service Corps

Breen, Richard N., O5875245.

The following-named distinguished military student for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the Dental Corps, in the grade of first lieutenant, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, and 3294:

Coffey, Ralph D., Jr., O5310140.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the Medical Corps, in the grade of first lieutenant, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3289, and 3294:

Gunther, Robert C., O5008073.
Laskin, Richard S., O5008081.
Powell, George K., O5511664.
Stein, Frank, O5007398.
Yoxtheimer, Robert L., O5212222.
Zindel, Barry L., O5521004.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the Medical Service Corps, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, 3288, and 3290:

Braden, William F.
Caskey, Kindred P., Jr.
Lee, John G.
Lopp, David W.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, and 3288:

Allen, William F.
Allison, David B.
Anderson, William S.
Barrow, Joseph M.
Beames, Thomas E.
Bell, Terence M.
Blake, Bruce A.
Boulware, Ashby N.
Brandon, James C.
Broadhurst, Carl R.
Bryan, Paul N.
Burkett, Robert E.
Charpentier, Lino G., Jr.
Colclasure, Wyett H., II
Colvin, Harry J., Jr.
Courte, John P.
Crawford, Michael E.
Dragani, Robert B.
East, Jerred G.
Ebitz, Curtis V.
Ellis, Harold J.
Fischer, Paul H.
Ford, William T.
Forrest, Gerald B.
Francis, Marion E., Jr.
Friedman, Jay A.
Garner, David W.
Gibson, William D.
Graf, Bernard R.
Grams, David F.
Grisham, Jerret R.
Guess, Robert G.
Hancock, Lawrence M.
Hansard, James G.
Harman, Robert J.
Harris, James S. W.
Henderson, James R.
Herron, Reese P., Jr.
Hetzel, Kenneth G.
Houck, Frank W., Jr.
Jackson, Dixie J. E.
Johnson, Andrew M.
Johnson, Harry J.
Kafura, Herman G.
Kehoe, Thomas J.
King, Carlisle R., Jr.
Kirkpatrick, Charles D., II
Knudsen, Jerald G.
Lamar, Lawson L.
Lee, Frederick O.
Lestochi, Louis J.
Logie, Dwight W.
McCartney, William W.
McGinnis, Robert L.
Miller, Daniel J.
Miller, Gregory J.
Morris, John C.
Mraz, Louis F., Jr.
Murphy, Alfred W.
O'Connor, Daniel D., Jr.
Parker, John W.
Parrott, Preston A.
Paulson, James L.
Peters, Roosevelt
Polli, George J.
Richardson, Lloyd M.
Roth, Leonard W.
Rubel, Ronald G.
Samuels, Charles W.
Scott, James T.
Scully, John J.
Seale, James E.
Sherman, Roger G.
Skinner, Charles S.
Slifka, John, III
Spinanger, Thomas S., Jr.
Steiner, Joseph C.
Sweeney, John E.
Tapscott, James W.
Treinen, Michael D.
Turner, George L.
Turner, Thomas M.
Upchurch, Robert H.
Utley, Melvin A.
Venckus, Edward W.
Venneberg, Donald L.
Vogel, Jeffrey T.
Wagner, Terry L.
Walker, Lawrence A.
Wallace, Frankie L.
Warner, William F., Jr.
Weiss, Robert M.
White, Sidney R.
Williams, Kenneth J.
Wong, Frederick G.
Wrona, Richard M.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate, June 29, 1964:

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following candidates for personnel action in the regular corps of the Public Health Service, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law and regulations:

FOR APPOINTMENT

To be senior surgeons

George E. Bock
Martin M. Cummings

To be assistant pharmacist

Nancy B. Finch

To be health services officer

Howard L. Kitchener

To be senior assistant surgeon

Peter E. Dans

To be junior assistant sanitary engineer

Gerald K. Falin

To be senior assistant veterinary officers

George L. Clarke
James A. Peters

To be assistant health services officer

Betty Lou Gredig

FOR PERMANENT PROMOTION

To be senior assistant sanitary engineer

Gerald E. Siefken

To be medical directors

Pasquale J. Ciccone
William A. Walter, Jr.
Carl G. Baker
Gerald D. Barton
Arnold W. Pratt
Robert W. Hartley
Roger M. Cole
Katherine M. Herrold
Leroy E. Duncan, Jr.
Erwin S. Rabeau
Donald B. Tower
Edwin M. Lerner II
Joseph F. Wilson
Raymond T. Moore
Stephen Hajdu
Jack Orloff
Howard C. Goodman

To be dental director

Louis L. Murzin

To be sanitary engineer directors

Francis A. Jacocks
William Q. Kehr
Henry J. L. Rechen
Carl A. Lindstrom
Charles L. Weaver
Norman E. Tucker
Frederick K. Erickson
Israel Bernstein
Arve H. Dahl
Jens A. Jensen

To be senior sanitary engineers

William N. Long
Gordon G. Robeck
Gerald N. McDermott
James A. Westbrook
Wilbur J. Whitsell
Charles E. Sponagle
Lester E. Blaschke
Donald A. Pecsok
Robert P. Morfitt
William H. Davis
Ronald G. Macomber

To be sanitary engineers

Joseph P. Schock
Robert E. Novick
Robert H. Neill
Richard L. O'Connell
Thaddeus A. Wastler III
Ian K. Burgess
Leo A. St. Michel

To be senior assistant sanitary engineers

John A. Little
H. Clayton Ervine
R. Frank Grossman
Ralph W. Buelow
Albert C. Printz, Jr.
Donald F. Maddox
Jack R. Farmer
Lowell A. Vandenberg
Guntis Ozolins
Paul B. Smith
Robert S. Runkle
Malcolm C. Bruce
Elmer G. Cleveland
John E. Hagan III
Clarence C. Oster

To be assistant sanitary engineers

Sidney E. Clark
William J. Keffer
Leroy C. Reid, Jr.
Donald S. Baker
Fred O. Bridges
Walter S. Smith
Walter W. Liberick, Jr.
Edgar D. Preissner
Bernard R. Sacks
Kenton Kirkpatrick
L. Russell Freeman
James W. Carpenter, Jr.
Wayne A. Blackard
Robert L. Thoem
Darwin R. Wright

To be pharmacist director

William E. Dudley

To be senior pharmacists

John A. Scigliano
Richard F. Bolte
Allums F. Smith
Henery W. Beard
Alfred A. Rosenberg

To be scientist directors

John A. O'Donnell
Charles S. Richards
Andrew R. Fodor
Sanford M. Birnbaum
William F. Buren
Melvin H. Goodwin, Jr.

To be sanitarian director

William C. Miller, Jr.

To be senior sanitarians

Wilfred H. Johnson
Donald R. Johnson

To be veterinary officer director

Ernest S. Tierkel

To be senior dietitians

Eileen M. Reid
Rebecca T. Crockett
Geraldine M. Piper
E. Grace Gibson

To be senior therapist

Nellie L. Evans

To be senior health services officers

Jessie P. Dowling
Marjorie C. Zukel
Jeanne E. Wright
Marion Andrews
Jason N. Calhoun
Wallace W. Jonz

To be nurse directors

Margaret E. James
Elsie E. Richardson
Helen M. Hanley

To be senior nurse officers

Tabitha W. Rossetter
Philomene E. Lenz
Madge M. Neill
Jennie H. Rakich
Margaret M. Cahalan
Lillian S. Dick
Florence E. Gareau
Mary E. Allen
Mildred E. Barnett
Margaret F. Carroll
Mary J. McGee
Frences S. Wolford
Catherine N. McDuffie
Grace E. Mattis
Mary G. Demian
Mary R. Lester
Dorothy L. Connors
Ina L. Ridlehoover
Lucile G. Buderer
Mary S. Romer
Mary E. McGovern
Verna B. Grimm
Hilda A. Nivala
Myra I. Johnson
Merilys E. Porter

To be nurse officers

Marguerite M. Albrecht
Barbara T. Lanigan
Dorothy C. Calafiore

To be assistant nurse officers

Sara G. Giles
Richard A. Lindblad

To be senior surgeons

G. Gilbert Ashwell
Winthrop E. Hoyle
Robert M. Chanock
Jack D. Davidson
Tracy Levy
Sarah E. Stewart
Kamehameha K. L. Wong
Ernest C. Siegfried
John M. Buchness
John J. Walsh
Joseph A. Gallagher
Alexis I. Shelokov
Miriam D. Manning
Sigurd E. Dahlstrom
Robert N. Philip
John K. Irion
John M. Lynch
David R. Kominz
Daniel Steinberg
William H. Stewart
Franz W. Rosa

To be surgeons

C. Lowell Edwards
Michael W. Justice
John R. Trautman
Gordon S. Siegel
Emery A. Johnson
Jack C. Robertson
Clement P. Cotter
Robert W. Weiger
James M. Miller
Herschel C. Gore, Jr.
Douglas K. Powers
Carroll B. Quinlan
Louis Gillespie, Jr.
Charles E. Koch, Jr.
Albert D. Bloomstrom
Andrew F. Horne
Lawrence F. Dietlein, Jr.
William R. Martin
Maurice B. Burg

To be senior assistant surgeons

John R. Furman
Robert K. Heide
George A. Reich
David L. Child

To be senior dental surgeons

Stanley Raynor
Oswald Spence
Robert L. Weiss
Carl J. Witkop, Jr.
Biagio J. Cosentino
John E. Frank
James E. Kelly

To be dental surgeons

Selvin Sonken
Anderson F. Williams
Christopher E. Kennemer
Robert J. Lucas
Edward M. Campbell
Gunnar E. Sydow
Anthony A. Rizzo

To be senior assistant dental surgeons

Rudolph E. Micik
Ronald J. Wroblewski
Jack L. Cox
William S. Driscoll
Paul J. Carr
Richard P. Frank
Richard F. Rappl
Robert F. Williams
Louis S. Vodzak
Sheppard M. Levine
Fred D. Greenblatt
Robert H. Dumbaugh
Joseph Schwartz
John A. Matis

To be pharmacists

Thomas D. DeCillis
Frank W. Hollister
James E. Bleadingheiser

To be senior assistant pharmacists

Ray D. Crossley II
Jerome A. Halperin
Gary J. Wold
Donald E. Hill
Michael J. Tuohy
Arthur C. Willman
Jon R. May

To be assistant pharmacists

James C. Yatsco
Gerald A. Mankowski

To be senior scientists

Harold J. Fournelle
William R. Carroll
Roy W. Chamberlain
Robert K. Ness
Clarence A. Sooter
William F. Durham
Leo Kartman
Jack J. Monroe
Bill H. Hoyer
Robert Holdenried
Ernestine Thurman
Charles R. Maxwell

To be scientists

Herbert F. Hasenclever
Gerald Berg
William J. Goodwin, Jr.
Robert S. Shellow
Julius A. Kasel
Donald S. Boomer
Kenneth W. Walls

To be sanitarians

Joe L. Perrin
William A. Mills

To be senior assistant sanitarians

Vernon R. T. Bergman
George J. Bulter

To be senior veterinary officers

Robert E. Kissling
Karl R. Reinhard

To be veterinary officers

Paul Arnstein
Anton M. Allen
Kenneth D. Quist

To be senior assistant veterinary officers

Leonard C. Marcus

To be dietitians

Vilma C. Grassi
Mary E. Ferrell

To be therapists

Walter S. Sekiya
John B. Allis
Dean P. Currier

To be senior assistant therapist

Lauren E. Lane

To be assistant therapist

George H. Hampton

To be health service officers

John E. Baker, Jr.
Daniel Sullivan
Ernest D. Ficco
Cecilia C. Conrath
Mary L. Skinner

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate June 26, 1964, but omitted from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Hamer H. Budge, of Idaho, to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission for the term expiring June 5, 1969.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Taras Shevchenko

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 29, 1964

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, all who had the privilege of attending the festivities last Saturday, June 27, in honor of Taras Shevchenko were deeply impressed by the moving ceremonies. I am proud to have the honor of representing many members of the large delegation from New Jersey. These fine people are deeply committed to the ideals exemplified in the life of the poet laureate of the Ukraine, Taras Shevchenko, and I am happy to join them in paying tribute to this great freedom fighter.

His statue has been erected here in Washington as a source of encouragement to his admirers working for Ukrainian freedom everywhere around the world. By putting it here, the American people honor the language, culture, and democratic hopes of the Ukrainian people.

In a very brief 47 years, Taras Shevchenko did more for his nation than most men can ever hope to accomplish. He gave them for the first time a national literary language. He inspired them with the rights to independence and personal liberty for which our Founding Fathers fought. And by his personal example, he taught the downtrodden Ukrainian peasant how skill and intelligence can triumph if men are free.

The hearts of all Americans are heavy today with sorrow that Taras Shevchenko's memorial cannot be freely constructed in his own country. The Ukraine is still beset with the burdens of Russian domination. We hope that a new era of democracy may be opening in which the aspirations of Taras Shevchenko will be realized and the Ukrainian people will find freedom at last.

Our fellow Americans of Ukrainian descent have made a notable contribution to the strength and welfare of our beloved Nation. Their love of freedom, their hatred of tyranny, is shared by the 45 million Ukrainians, the largest captive nation in Eastern Europe. This splendid memorial to Taras Shevchenko in the Capital City of the United States will serve as a bridge of understanding and sympathy between our people and the unhappy captive peoples behind the Iron Curtain.

Amendment of Immigration Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 29, 1964

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD my testimony before the Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization on behalf of my bill, H.R. 7849, as well as on behalf of other legislation presently being considered by the subcommittee to amend our present immigration laws:

TESTIMONY OF CONGRESSMAN LEONARD FARBSTEIN, OF NEW YORK, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION ON PENDING IMMIGRATION LEGISLATION JUNE 25, 1964

Mr. Chairman, members of the Subcommittee on Immigration and Nationality, I appear before you this morning, in support of my bill, H.R. 7849, which is the same bill sponsored by the late President Kennedy and now by this administration.

A study of my bill and the administration proposals will show that it in no way significantly increases the basic numbers of immigrants to be permitted entry into this country. There is no increased immigration involved. There is, however, involved the promise of equality of opportunity which has always been the basic philosophy of the United States. Under this legislation there is an equal reduction of the percentage of quota numbers for a period of 5 years, at the end of which period, all quotas will be eliminated and these numbers will then be allocated to all countries on a basis of priority registration.

I do not think it necessary that I go into the details of the bill—each of you, I am certain, has studied the measure thoroughly and are knowledgeable of its content. I would prefer presenting my arguments in its favor, and to this end, I bespeak your indulgence.

It is almost 40 years since the national origins theory was enacted. Were that restrictive policy part of our laws when my parents emigrated to this country, I question whether I would be here today asking for the liberalization and equalization of our immigration laws. I question whether the majority of those present in this room today would be here were this restrictive law in existence when their parents or forebears emigrated to this country.

Let us not forget for a moment that we are a nation of immigrants which has grown great through the fusion of the blood, the ideas, the skills and the diversity of the peoples emanating from the four corners of the earth. Should we forgo the opportunity to choose freely from all the corners of the earth the talents and the skills we need? Shall we limit our choice because an individual of genius, by accident of birth, is deprived of the opportunity to emigrate to this country? How fair is a law which would permit 65,000 immigrants from England and only 300 from Greece? Could we possibly have attained the world leadership which we presently enjoy were we to follow rigid formulas in our daily existence? It is high time that we see the light; it is high time that we recognize the equality of peoples generally.

The attacks upon the national origins formula have been constant. In the 40 years that the theory has been in effect the discriminatory pattern of this law has produced only an imbalance to such a degree that Congress has found itself as compelled to modify the formula in numerous instances. In 1950, in 1952, in 1953, and in 1957 we chipped off and whittled away portions of the national origins formula. Since 1957 every Congress without exception passed laws attempting to equalize the situation until today the national origins formula governs the admission of only approximately 33 percent of our total annual immigration. The Congress has enacted legislation to permit the entry, outside of the quota regulations, of Hungarian refugees, of the Portuguese victims of the earthquake which took place on the Azores, of the Dutch expelled from Indonesia—to mention but a few instances. To maintain our status alongside the other nations of the world which have, since World War II, given refuge to those unfortunates who sought escape from persecution and discrimination, this action has been essential. Would it not be more in keeping with our own traditions to eliminate the need for such emergency legislation? Have not these one-shot laws made evident the inadequacy of the national origins formula?

Enactment of this legislation will bring to an end a policy clearly at odds with the American tradition of freedom and democracy.

Since I was first privileged to become a Member of Congress 8 years ago I have advocated the liberalization of our immigration laws. I have, since 1957, been presenting legislation to eliminate the national origins quota by replacing them with a system that would discriminate against no individual because of his country of birth. I was happy to cosponsor the present legislation because I believe in it and because I believe the country is prepared to accept the modifications contained therein. I believe in the overwhelming necessity and desirability of this legislation and I am proud to count myself as one of those who has taken unto himself its adoption so that it may become the new law of this land—a law truly representative of the greatest democracy in the world.

Gentlemen, I urge your favorable and immediate action on the measure. Thank you for the privilege of appearing before you.

Edward M. Sneed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROLAND V. LIBONATI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 29, 1964

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, the death of Cook County Commissioner Edward M. Sneed, Democratic committeeman of the third ward in the city of Chicago, marks the end of a powerful leader's career in politics.

He was the first Negro committeeman elected to the office of committeeman in the State of Illinois in 1932.

Commissioner Sneed was born in Nashville, Tenn., the youngest of 15 children. His family moved to Chicago. Edward, as a boy, entered the grammar school and upon graduation attended Jones Commercial High School.

His political career began with his appointment to the unexpired term of the third ward committeemanship. He filled various positions in State and local governments—sanitary district, the State parole office, the Illinois Vehicle License Commission, and as a deputy bailiff of the municipal court.

In 1938 he was elected county commissioner and held that office as well as the office of committeeman of the third ward at his death.

Mr. Sneed was a quiet person, gentle of disposition, who throughout his life dedicated his talents to serving the needs of the poor and unfortunate of the city and county communities, who seek the professional services of our county institutions.

Mr. Sneed had a natural gift for making one seeking advice or help to feel at ease. His personality radiated a sweet friendly interest. He was warm and understanding in handling the problems of his constituency. His popularity contributed much to the political strength of his party—the returns of the third ward gave tremendous pluralities to the Democratic candidates, election after election. The loss of this dedicated public servant will be felt by the party leadership. The city of Chicago, county of Cook, and State of Illinois have lost a dedicated leader and public servant. We, the members of the Illinois congressional delegation, send our heartfelt condolences to his lovely wife, Josephine; his son, Edward, and his sister, on their great loss. May the good Lord reward him with everlasting happiness for his undeviating and constant services to the indigent population of our communities.

The Salt Institute's 50th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT DOLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 29, 1964

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, 50 years ago this month, there was established in this country an organization known as the Salt Producers Association. With a name change so that it now is simply the Salt Institute and the added membership of Canadian producers to give it international status, the organization currently is quietly marking its 50th anniversary.

The Salt Institute, acting in behalf of the major producers of one of the essential elements in life, merits a "well done" for its work in helping to develop new ways salt can be helpful to industry, in agriculture and in a broadening range of facets of everyday living.

As rarely as does the average person think about it, common salt—sodium chloride, to the chemist—is one of the essentials of life. It has been throughout history, from the earliest records extant, and we have every reason to believe it always will be even into the unforeseeable future. As uninteresting and commonplace as it may look sitting in a kitchen or on a dining table, the story of salt is laden with romance and adventure. As far back as 27 centuries B.C.—4,700 years ago—the earliest known treatise on pharmacology was published in China, and a major portion of it was a discussion of more than 40 types and forms of salt. Ancient Greece's widely practiced trade of salt for slaves gave rise to our expression, "not worth his salt." Application of the Latin phrase "salarium argentum" to the special salt rations given early Roman soldiers was the genesis of the English word "salary."

So it has been over the years. The deaths of thousands of Napoleon's troops during their retreat from Moscow are supposed to have been attributable to lack of salt in their scanty diets. Thousands of Britons languished in prison for smuggling salt into their country in violation of laws promulgated by ancient-times British monarchs establishing salt monopolies; oppressive salt monopolies were a major contributing factor to the rise of the French Revolution. On our own continent, the British commander, Lord Howe, was reported jubilant and scenting victory when he captured Gen. George Washington's salt supply in 1777.

Today, the importance of salt to all life is better known and more widely acknowledged than ever. We all know of its essentiality to the human diet, even to the point of taking supplemental rations in some such form as salt tablets when, in hot weather, heavy perspiration depletes the body of its needed salt supplies. It is universally accepted as a vital element in livestock diets.

Salt's uses in chemical and industrial processes are legion. It has saved untold thousands of lives in its role as the most important element in keeping our streets, roads, and highways clear of accident-causing ice in wintertime, to say nothing of helping keep them clear of snow accumulations that would make them impassable to traffic. Its value in stabilizing earths and making them a solid, lasting base for lesser traveled roads, for farm ponds, even for aircraft landing strips, is gaining increasing recognition.

Another of the many uses of salt developed in recent years is as an essential agent in water-softening devices in which it is a part of the process of removing minerals and other impurities from "hard" water to make it "soft" and more satisfactory to the palate and for general household use.

The Salt Institute has contributed substantially to the development of many of these modern uses of its product. It has assisted in much research and development work in connection with highway, agricultural, dietary, and other uses of salt. It has assisted materially in developing the use of salt as a "carrier" for materials helpful to various forms of life, such as "trace minerals" essential to cattle and many other domesticated animals, and "iodized salt," which has been a major factor in drastically curtailing the incidence of goiter in humans.

One of the Institute's most important contributions, however, has been its functioning as an information-disseminating service. In this capacity, it gives circulation not only to information developed by its own research projects but to other data, produced by any reputable salt or its use. The institute has produced a veritable library of pamphlets, booklets, and bulletins on a broad variety of subjects involving salt which are of inestimable value to highway engineers and maintenance official, dietitians, agriculturalists, industrialists, and others.

Quarterly meetings of the institute's specialized groups, such as its subcommittees on highways, dietary, agricultural and soft water salt uses, serve as a clearinghouse for information about new developments. New developments are canvassed thoroughly in discussions which may even produce solutions to the problems. If any development, favorable or unfavorable, is deemed to warrant the action, the institute then will see that it is publicized.

The Salt Institute was established 50 years ago by 15 salt producers. Of the individuals involved, the only one still active is Howard J. Carey, Sr., president of the Carey Salt Co., of Hutchinson, Kans., who still frequently attends meetings of the institute and whose company is among the Nation's half-dozen biggest salt producers.

Today, the institute comprises 18 producer-members:

American Salt Corp., the Barton Salt Co., the Canadian Salt Co., Ltd.; the Carey Salt Co., Diamond Crystal Salt Co., Gordy Salt Co., Hardy Salt Co., International Salt Co., Leslie Salt Co., Michigan Salt Co., Morton Salt Co., Oliver Brothers Salt Co., Pawnee Salt Co., Solar Salt Co., United Salt Corp., Watkins Salt Co., Western Salt Co., Domtar Chemicals Ltd., Sifto Salt Division.

I know we all hope the institute will continue to make similarly helpful contributions in life for many, many years to come.

Independence Day of the Republic of Malagasy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 29, 1964

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on June 26, the Malagasy Republic celebrated the fourth anniversary of her independence. We would like to take this opportunity to extend warm felicitations to His Excellency the President of the Republic, Philibert Tsiranana; and his Excellency the Malagasy Ambassador to the United States, Louis Rakotomalala.

The Malagasy Republic, now entering its fifth year of independence, is considered today to be one of the future great nations of Africa. An island nation, the fourth largest in the world, it gained its independence from French colonial rule on June 26, 1960. Since then, the Malagasy Republic has maintained close and amicable relations with France, receiving generous foreign aid assistance and guidance.

The people who comprise this Republic are predominantly of Malaysian stock, having migrated to this island off the African Continent from the East Indies. The latest arrivals were the Merinas who formed a kingdom in the interior and who, at the time of the French occupation in 1896, had subjugated two-thirds of the entire island. It was they who fostered a common language and first attempted to unite all the tribes to form one nation.

The present government, ably guided by its President, Philibert Tsiranana, is democratic in form, modeled predominantly on French lines. Because the country is greatly underdeveloped, there has been inaugurated a 5-year plan to develop and encourage industry and agriculture. Although 8 percent of the total land area is cultivable, only 3 percent is actually farmed. Fortunately the Republic is underpopulated and food is sufficient to feed the population. But with a birth rate of over 2½ percent, the day is envisaged when demand will equal or surpass supply.

This 5-year plan will also concentrate on the development of industries. Chief among these will be the fishing industry, whose potential is almost unlimited since the territorial waters abound in fish of all kinds. Although current industries now in operation compliment agricultural production, expansion of mining facilities is scheduled. Recent mineral surveys have noted vast deposits of coal, as yet untapped. Uranium, thorium, and nickel will also be exploited for the benefit of the Nation's economy.

As a member of the United Nations, the Malagasy Republic takes an active interest in the proceedings of the world community. Because of its close ties with France, the Malagasy Republic is linked to and stands behind the Common Market. Furthermore, Mr. Tsiranana was instrumental in establishing the union of the majority of French-speaking African states, the Union of African and Malagasy states, and continues to support a policy of closer ties with the former French colonies of Africa.

Although considered a Francophile, Mr. Tsiranana differs with President de Gaulle on his policy toward Red China. Adamantly hostile to communism, Mr. Tsiranana has steadfastly refused to recognize Communist China and repeatedly warns the other African countries of the dangers of internal Communist interference. He has even accused the Soviet Union of having built a military base in Somalia and has linked the recent mutinies in east Africa to Communist subversion.

I am happy to extend my greetings to the people of the Malagasy Republic on the anniversary of their fourth year of independence. I am certain that the relations between the United States and its sister democracy will become more amicable as the Malagasy Republic progresses toward its future greatness in the world community.

Polish Workers' Rising in Poznan, June 28–29, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 29, 1964

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, the Poles have endured much suffering under alien regimes in their homeland in modern times, but they have never given up their hope for freedom and their distinct individuality. They have always defiantly fought their overlords and have rebelled against them. One of the most recent and the best known such actions is the rising staged by the factory workers in the industrial city in western Poland, in Poznan in 1956. These sturdy and tenacious workers felt that they were grossly underpaid by the government—which owned and operated the plant—some could not even buy sufficient bread with their hard-earned pay, and they all worked under abominable conditions. Thus they had real grievances against the government. They had complained more than once, but all their complaints had gone unheeded by the Communist-controlled regime. On June 28 the workers in this large steel plant, some 30,000 in all, staged a rising which was branded by the government as an open revolt against it. The authorities treated it as such, and did their worst to crush it with tanks, artillery and regular troops. The upshot of such a cruel move by the government was that in 48 hours the helpless Polish workers were beaten. More than 100 were dead, and several hundred were wounded. Thus ended this rising, the Polish workers' rising in Poznan in 1956.

As one views this event after 8 years, one cannot help but think that whatever improvements have been made in working conditions in industrial establishments in Poland in recent years, and also the better pay which workers in these establishments have been receiving, these beneficial moves were made subsequent to the Poznan rising. Though the actual rising was ruthlessly suppressed before its spread to other towns, the events of Poznan proved once more that the spirit of freedom and liberty was very much alive and active among the Poles, and that even the most oppressive of totalitarian regimes could not succeed in their efforts to suppress it effectively. Besides, the Polish Communist government sensed this, and then proceeded to make a number of concessions to workers, such as better pay, improved working conditions and shorter working hours. Thus the workers' rising in Poznan has had its benefical results. Today, on the eighth anniversary of that rising, let us hope that all workers in Poland keep up their heads and maintain their spirit of freedom against their Communist totalitarian overlords.

Lawbooks, U.S.A., Program Is Rapidly Expanding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 29, 1964

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the Lawbooks, U.S.A., program, which was so excellently described in the Record of April 14, 1964, by the Honorable Barratt O'Hara, of Illinois, is just barely getting underway, but its beginning has been auspicious. Already far more requests have been received from foreign countries for the Lawbooks, U.S.A., packet than can be filled at present.

Under this program, packets of books dealing with the philosophy and spirit of our legal system are sent to lawyers, jurists, teachers, and law students abroad by the Lawbooks, U.S.A., Association, with headquarters here in Washington. The mailings are financed by donations, and the donor's name accompanies each packet of lawbooks. It is hoped that the recipient of a packet will benefit not only from reading the books contained in it, but also from the ensuing correspondence which he will carry on with the donor of the books.

The idea behind the Lawbooks, U.S.A., program is a simple but potent one: To acquaint foreign jurists and lawyers, in particular those in whose hands lie the futures of so many emerging nations around the world, with the venerable principles of Western jurisprudence forged out of centuries of common law experience.

While requests for lawbooks have been received from all over the world, the program's sponsors will concentrate on meeting the demand from the emerging nations of Asia and Africa first. They consider it especially important that these countries be encouraged to take advantage of the program.

BOOKS ARE ON NONTECHNICAL SUBJECTS

Ordinarily, the books included in a typical Lawbooks, U.S.A., packet are not technical. Rather, they are most often essays by renowned legal scholars and jurists like Justices Learned Hand and Benjamin Cardozo. In their essays, these men treat subjects of general interest to legalists the world over, and they explain concepts—such as constitutionalism, freedom of speech, press, religion and assembly, and due process—which, while familiar to most Americans, may be new and untried, and even unknown, in the jurisprudence of emerging nations.

THE NEED IS GREAT, URGENT

The knowledge which a Lawbooks, U.S.A. packet can impart is invaluable; the need for such knowledge abroad is urgent and great. NLRB Attorney Herman Levy, recently back from Africa, found the libraries of universities throughout that continent sorely lacking in adequate supplies of lawbooks.

Often, American jurists and professors of law are responsible for creating law school curricula from scratch in brand-new universities abroad. Invariably, one of their most pressing needs is for books.

In a report from one country, the USIA, which distributes the lawbooks, said:

> It is difficult for us to imagine a number adequate to reach the saturation point of effective and useful distribution of packets.

SUPPORT FOR PROGRAM ASKED

Lawbooks, U.S.A., is catching on, and it merits every encouragement and assistance we can give it. It has received the enthusiastic endorsement of prominent jurists, statesmen, and lawmakers everywhere in the world.

Committees to promote the nonprofit Lawbooks, U.S.A., program are springing up all across the country. I am proud to announce that one is already very active in Minnesota. The Board of Governors of the Minnesota State Bar Association adopted the following resolution regarding the Lawbooks, U.S.A., program:

> Whereas the dissemination of information concerning the free world, and particularly the United States, is one of the most potent weapons in the struggle for men's minds; and
>
> Whereas we as lawyers are particularly aware of the need of the emerging nations for information concerning the American legal system with its reliance upon a government of laws and not of men; and
>
> Whereas the U.S. Information Agency has joined with the World Peace Through Law Committee of the American Bar Association and the Federal Bar Association in promulgation of a lawyer-to-lawyer program entitled "Lawbooks, U.S.A.," whereby American lawyers are encouraged to contribute a set of paperback lawbooks to a lawyer in one of the emerging nations: Now, therefore, be it
>
> *Resolved,* That the Minnesota State Bar Association, acting through its board of governors, hereby expresses its unqualified endorsement of Lawbooks, U.S.A., and urges the lawyers of Minnesota individually to give their financial support to this worthy undertaking; be it further
>
> *Resolved,* That the Minnesota State Bar Association authorizes its president to utilize association funds to finance a mailing to all its members in order to bring this program to their attention.

Justice Felix Frankfurter once called due process a "majestic concept." No less majestic and admirable are the many other facets of Western constitutional and legal tradition. When jurists around the world are more familiar with them, the day will be nearer when the rights and privileges of free speech and due process shall extend in actual practice to every man, and the rule of law begin to take precedence in the conduct of international relations.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 29, 1964

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following newsletter of June 27, 1964:

Washington Report

(By Congressman Bruce Alger, Fifth District of Texas)

Red Design To Conquer the United States

The Communist goal to conquer the United States has not changed. Khrushchev, in all his recent speeches, has made it clear:

1. The worldwide Communist apparatus has not been abandoned.

2. The world cannot permanently be divided between capitalist societies and Communist societies.

3. The Reds fully intend to rule the world.

4. The destruction of the United States is a major part of the grand design of Soviet conquest.

Dr. Fred C. Schwarz, a reputable authority on the Communist conspiracy, offers some pertinent points on the Red plan for defeating the United States and winning the cold war. To understand fully what is happening it is necessary to review the battle plan which has now been discarded by the Kremlin.

1. The defeat of the United States in thermonuclear war.

2. The seizure of power by a violent revolutionary coup under Communist leadership.

3. Election of a majority of Communist and pro-Communist candidates in a national, constitutional election.

The Communists have given up these methods for a less dramatic, but what they believe to be a surer way to bring about our defeat—progressive surrender. This will be brought about by a three-pronged attack for the destruction of the Republic:

1. The revolutionary Communist conquest of Asia, Africa, and Central and South America.

2. The neutralization of Western Europe.

3. The isolation and demoralization of the United States.

Even a casual study or recent history shows the Communists are making steady gains on the progress of this program.

The Communist conquest of Asia, Africa, Central and South America: This area of the world is in ferment with country after country falling into chaos or communism while American foreign policy disintegrates. In his study Dr. Schwarz says: "During recent interviews I have turned the tables on the newsmen by asking this question, 'Can you name one country in the world where American foreign policy is proceeding satisfactorily at the present time?' I have yet to meet one newsman who can name one country. We have only to look at such countries as South Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia, Zanzibar, the Congo, Ghana, Cyprus, Cuba, and Panama to gain some insight into the magnitude of the Communist success. All of these countries have lessons to teach, but do we have the capacity to learn?"

That we are falling into the trap of progressive surrender is shown in the foreign policy of the past two administrations. We forced a coalition government on Laos insuring an eventual Communist takeover; we have had an indecisive, no-win program in South Vietnam; we contributed to the United Nations debacle in the Congo which has resulted in the Reds overrunning Africa; we abandoned any firm program to get the Communists out of Cuba; and we allowed the Panama situation to deteriorate without any effort to protect U.S. prestige or sovereignty.

Neutralization of Western Europe: The present Communist goal in Western Europe is to neutralize it, not to communize it. This accounts for the moderation of the huge Italian Communist Party. Once again this program is succeeding as illustrated by:

1. France's recognition of Red China.

2. The determination of the principal allies of America to trade with Communist Cuba.

The Johnson administration has helped weaken U.S. influence by making deals with the Soviet Union, increasing trade and credit with Communist countries, and by refusing to stop aid to Communist countries. How can we demand others stop trading with Cuba when we trade directly with the Soviet Union the heart of the Communist conspiracy?

Demoralization of the United States: Communist strategy aims to isolate and demoralize the United States. The demoralization will be achieved when the will to resist Communist blackmail is inadequate. This point will be reached when a substantial number of American citizens, particularly the youth, believe that their country no longer merits their death and that accommodation with communism is inevitable.

The State Department under both the Kennedy and Johnson administrations has stressed "accommodation of the Communists" as necessary to keep the peace. Actions which have contributed to the demoralization of the United States include, the test ban treaty which limits our development of new weapons, but not the Soviets; the wheat deal which forces the American taxpayers to support the sinking Soviet economy to insure its health even at the expense of our economy; the Supreme Court decisions banning the right of the States to invoke loyalty oaths; preventing the Government from denying passports to sworn enemies of the United States; overruling action to force Communist Party members to register as enemy agents. The demand of the Johnson administration for more Federal power, bigger spending, expanded welfare programs.

This analysis is based only on the things we know. This administration, like the last one, is not telling Congress or the American people all the facts, so the actual situation could be much worse. What is needed is a winning policy and a leadership determined to see that we have such a policy.

"What I Think About the Texas First Officers Training Camp Association," Lyndon B. Johnson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 29, 1964

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a very masterful address which was delivered by President Lyndon Johnson in 1953. It is an address to the First Camp's 37th rollcall.

The address follows:

WHAT I THINK ABOUT THE TEXAS FIRST OFFICERS TRAINING CAMP ASSOCIATION

(By Lyndon B. Johnson)

Mr. Buck, members, and guests, there is a flavor to this meeting that tastes sweet in the mouth of every American.

It is compounded from a deep love of country; the memory of past sacrifice; a burning desire for present and future service.

This is a reunion of men who served their nation in time of war—and who built their nation to greater heights in time of peace.

Just a few days ago, I was looking over the roll of the members of the Texas First Camp. Is is an impressive list—a cross section of America.

The men who completed that "last, dusty mile" at Leon Springs in August 1917, can be found in almost every State in our country. They are in every walk of life * * * in every activity * * * in every community effort to increase the public welfare.

They include lawyers and doctors; merchants and businessmen; farmers and ranchers; engineers and technicians; teachers and public servants.

And everywhere they are leaders—men who are actively at work shaping the community in a form that is good and enduring.

Upon your silver bugle are engraved the names of great Texans and great Americans—men like Beauford Jester who died in office while still serving his people.

The Texas First Camp has remained true to its motto—a motto that should be burned into the mind of every American.

"Brave men shall not die because I faltered."

Those words were your guiding star through the dark days of the First World War. For many of you, they were a sustaining force when once again you put aside your civilian pursuits to face the enemy of World War II.

There is a larger sense in which we can consider those words in the troubled world of today. We can look about us as loyal Americans and devoutly pledge:

A nation shall not die because we faltered.

We are living through a period correctly called the most critical in the history of our Nation.

These are times that try men's souls and test the limits of their devotion. The summer soldier and the sunshine patriot will not long stand firm against the trial.

It is a time that calls for loyalty and dedication to our country—for purity of faith and unshaken patriotism.

I like to think that meetings of this character are graced not only by the presence of the living but by the presence of those who have gone before.

It is from the heritage of the past that we draw the strength to meet the problems of the present. It is from the collective wisdom of all America that we devise the plans which solve our difficulties.

We need the strength of that heritage and the force of that collective wisdom to steer us safely through the troubled currents of the modern world.

There is loose on the globe a mighty power for evil.

It is a vast power sprawling across two continents. It has enslaved hundreds of millions of people. It combines in one huge military machine unlimited manpower and the weapons of modern technology.

It is led by men who acknowledge no god; who obey no law; who concede no rights to their fellow man. They have sworn eternal enmity to the cause of freedom. They have no goal other than power for themselves and slavery for the multitudes.

To that end, they have devoted all the resources of their science; all the energies of their people.

They live in a world in which there is no room for liberty; no space for conscience; no tolerance of the rights of man.

It is not the first time in history that such a force has been unleased upon the world. Nor is it the first time free men have assembled to defend their sacred liberties.

But it is the first time that such a force has threatened to engulf not just a free nation but the concept of freedom itself.

You who fought so nobly against the enemies of World Wars I and II have understood this threat from the beginning. You refused to be deceived by clever propaganda or misleading words.

The evidence is in your publications and in the attitudes that you have taken as individuals toward the problems of our time. You identified the Communists for what they were and you called for the action that was needed.

When the Communists called for "progress"—you knew they meant a retreat to dictatorship.

When the Communists said "peace"—you knew they meant war.

Old soldiers are not easily fooled. Men who have fought for freedom know that it will not be granted by a power-mad despot.

Many of you are among my closest friends. I know how you have worked in your communities for the kind of defense program that will make America strong. I know how you have fought the agents of communism and their insidious activities.

It is that fight for a strong defense program that has saved America. It is that struggle for preparedness that will bring us peace and freedom in the days that lie ahead.

The unselfish work of the past few years is now bearing fruit and the fruit is rich.

The mighty Communist war machine—but yesterday so strong, so invincible—is creaking at the joints.

It has been battered by proud East Germans who faced Soviet tanks armed only with fists and bricks.

It has been scarred by Poles and Czechs and Hungarians who have defied the whole power of the mighty police state.

It has been stopped in its tracks by the free people of West Germany who repudiated the Communists for all time to come.

It has been bruised internally by a mighty struggle between the rulers themselves behind the walls of the Kremlin.

Victory for the free world is not yet in sight. We would be deluding only ourselves if we made that claim.

But the road to victory is on our horizon. We can march on that road firm in the belief that liberty will win. We can achieve our goal provided only that we are armored with the strength that knows no fear.

We have reached the point where we can call for a showdown. We have arrived at the stage where we can demand redemption of the broken pledges—the promises so easily given and so ruthlessly ignored.

The world is looking to us today for leadership—for bold but wise action that will break the stalemate of the cold war.

The time is ripe—the omens are propitious.

We were promised—at the end of World War II—a united and free Korea.

We were promised—at the end of World War II—an Eastern Europe in which the people would have the right to select their own leaders.

We were promised—at the end of World War II—a united Germany in which the people could live in freedom.

We were promised—at the end of World War II—that there would be no more plotting for the overthrow of constitutional governments.

These pledges have been stubbornly ignored. These pledges have been ruthlessly broken.

It is time to demand an accounting—to press for a settlement of those issues which are driving the world to a third great war.

We will not gain strength by waiting while the Russians stockpile atomic weapons and their newly developed hydrogen bomb.

We will not improve our position by waiting while they stamp out unrest in their satellite provinces.

We will not improve our position by waiting while they settle their own internal difficulties.

We will not increase our power by waiting while the Chinese Communists consolidate their gains and industrialize their country.

The time to call for a settlement is now—now before they recover the ground they have lost in recent months.

We must act boldly but not rashly. We do not want to run the risk of world war III—a war that could destroy civilization. But neither can we allow our fears of that risk to be the overriding consideration.

We will not avoid world war III by weakness and timidity. We will merely hasten the day when our liberties will be destroyed.

There is a path by which we can obtain our objectives. It is through strength—the kind of strength that is prepared for war even though war is not our goal.

In the entire field of human thought, endeavor, and achievement, there is only one element which the Communists respect. It is strength—the kind of strength which is effective and decisive.

They have no respect for law. They have no respect for constitutional government. They have no respect for the integrity of the human individual.

They even have no respect for their own cynical and corrupt philosophy.

They retreat from their objectives only when they are confronted by force—force too great for them to conquer.

In this historical fact, there is a lesson upon which we all can draw.

There is no security in weakness.

There is no peace when the forces of freedom are feeble.

Security and peace will come only if we are strong enough to demand them and to enforce them.

We are all united in a deep and lasting love for our country.

But love of country alone is not enough. It must be coupled with a willingness to sacrifice; a desire to work; a determination to preserve our way of life for ourselves and our posterity.

That has been the character of the men of the First Camp. That has been the bond that has held you together regardless of your field of endeavor or your geographical location.

That is still the character of your association. That is the attribute which will call you to service now and in the future.

The problems which we face cannot be settled on the field of battle. But they will be solved if we face them in the same spirit which men must display to win on the field of battle.

We must set aside our petty quarrels and meaningless divisions. We must forget our selfish desires for advancement at the expense of others. We must ignore the ignoble demands of partisanship that would subordinate the needs of our country.

There must be only one goal—the preservation of these United States as a land of freedom and opportunity.

We must unite behind our country's duly elected leaders and strive for victory for our way of life.

In the days ahead, our country will make many demands upon all of us. It will call for our best effort; our most unselfish loyalty; our finest and purest patriotism. It will ask us to work as we have never worked before; to dare as we have never dared before; to strive as we have never striven before.

To each and every one of us there will fall duties and obligations. I know every American will be worthy of them.

The tasks that come to us may be great or humble. They may be in the uniform of the soldier or in the office behind the production line.

Whatever they may be, we will perform them.

And when, in time of impending danger, America calls the roll of those who are ready to fight or work for their country, I know the men of the First Camp will again be among the first to respond.

Open Opportunity for Coal Progress: Appalachia to Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 29, 1964

Mr SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, now that coal communities are being headlined as the Nation's major surplus labor areas, the administration has indicated a determination to undertake a variety of measures to boost coal production. Based on undeniable statistics, the best ways to get miners back to work would be to cut back residual oil imports, reject further proposals to build uneconomic hydroelectric plants at Government expense, and stop Federal subsidies for atomic electric power. The demand for electricity is constantly moving upward, but unless coal is protected from inequitable competition permitted and promoted by ridiculous Government policies, the coal miner does not have a chance in the world of benefiting from this natural increase in energy requirements.

There are other steps by which Congress can open the way to coal progress. Last October 20 I introduced H.R. 8960, which is designed to promote the development of coal on the public domain by increasing acreage on leases. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] and my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Dr. MORGAN, introduced identical bills at the same time, and we are hopeful that this legislation will be ready for floor action in a very short time. Your support will be particularly appreciated by Rocky Mountain States, where vast storehouses of coal lie ready to be developed for use in the growing power markets from Denver to Los Angeles.

On May 12 of this year the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN] introduced H.R. 11204, a bill to grant consent for construction of a dam across the Savannah River so that the Duke Power Co. will have necessary water supply for use in a steamplant whose coal requirements would amount to 3½ million tons annually. This supply would necessarily come from the Appalachian region, which would benefit by at least $24 million each year in the sale of coal alone. When transportation costs are added and the value of mine supplies and equipment taken into consideration, it is easy to understand the enormous benefits that will accrue to Appalachian mining communities if H.R. 11204 becomes law.

Congress also has the opportunity of making a contribution to the future of Alaska, which contains 47 billion tons of coal reserves. On January 31, 1963, the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. RIVERS] introduced H.R. 3111, which would amend section 201(a)(3) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act relating to contracts for public utility services and the purchase of natural gas, coal, or oil. Presently the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act is interpreted to permit natural gas suppliers to enter into 10-year contracts to supply Government agencies with natural gas for the production of utilities while denying this privilege to coal and oil producers.

Despite the fact that H.R. 3111 was introduced almost a year and a half ago, it has not yet been the subject of hearings on this side of the Capitol. An identical bill, S. 572, was introduced at approximately the same time by Senator GRUENING, of Alaska, and was approved by the Senate in May of 1963. Senator GRUENING made this statement with regard to the need for enactment:

> Alaska, Mr. President, is fortunately blessed not only with an abundance of fuel but also with a variety of fuels. It has oil, natural gas, and coal in goodly amount and the greatest hydroelectric potential under the flag. Less than one-quarter of 1 percent of it has been developed. I am pressing for early completion of projects to utilize this great resource at Rampart on the Yukon, at Snettisham in southeastern Alaska, and at Lake Bradley in the Kenai Peninsula. Others will follow.

We in Alaska welcome the discovery and development of new sources of fuel be they oilfields, gasfields, or coal mines. All are needed and, in the true spirit of free enterprise, should compete, without let or hindrance, for their sale.

However, the provision of the Federal act to which I have referred, places coal and oil under a competitive handicap in bidding for Government contracts and gives to natural gas a competitive advantage.

That should not be.

An oil producer, a natural gas producer, a coal producer faces long-term expenditures and investments if he is to operate properly. Producers of one fuel must not have an advantage denied to his competitors.

To achieve and insure equality, the enactment of my amendment is necessary.

The urgency for making whatever adjustments are necessary to encourage development of the coal industry in Alaska is explained in the 13th Annual Report of the Activities of the Joint Committee on Defense Production, which contains material on mobilization from departments and agencies of the Federal Government. The following is a direct quotation from this report, which was submitted on January 13 of this year:

MOBILIZATION BASE FOR ALASKA COAL

Recently there has been a change in the coal supply situation in the Healy River field of Alaska, which services military installations "north of the range," which could have an adverse effect on the future coal supply of the military installations in that area.

Several years ago the Department of the Interior, because of its responsibility for assuring that there will be an adequate coal supply for both military and civilian requirements in an emergency, recommended that loans under the Defense Production Act be granted to assist producers in Alaska in expanding existing facilities in order to provide an adequate supply for the expanding military installations in Alaska. Such loans were granted, and for several years both the expanded capacity and the mobilization base for coal in the area were adequate, with three producers operating and the coal reserves of all three being readily available for expansion of production if needed.

Today, however, instead of three producers, there is only one, and this producer has only limited coal reserves for the future.

In view of this condition, the Director of OMSF and a staff member met with officials of the Department of Defense and pointed out that the coal reserves of the only mine now in operation in this area are rapidly diminishing, according to an investigation by the Geological Survey. It was suggested that the Department of Defense should consider these facts in connection with its coal purchasing policy, in an effort to encourage reactivation of one or more mines in this area.

The Office is concerned with the rapidly deteriorating supply situation and is initiating a mobilization base study to determine what other actions can appropriately be taken to alleviate the situation.

Under the circumstances, Mr. Speaker, I consider it an obligation of the House to move rapidly toward making this adjustment to the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act in order that the coal and oil industries of Alaska may enjoy the same right as their competitor, thus permitting these industries to expand and to become a part of the State's basic economy.

Congress has a serious obligation to the coal industry and to the people who depend upon it for a livelihood. We are not going to be able to rectify the prevailing numerous policy discriminations before the end of this session, but the spotlight on Appalachia and other depressed mining areas emphasizes the need for us to do whatever is possible before adjournment. Let there be no further delay in enactment of the bills to which I have referred. None would involve any Government expenditures whatsoever. All can serve as steps in the reinvigoration of the coal industry. It is incumbent that we act upon them all as quickly as possible.

The Congressman From Bexar Reports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 29, 1964

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

THE CONGRESSMAN FROM BEXAR REPORTS

TWO NEW FEDERAL BUILDINGS—FROM $7.2 TO $10 MILLION

The Government Services Administration has asked the Public Works Committee to approve a revision of plans for the San Antonio Federal Building project.

GSA plans are to increase the building project from $7.1 to $10 million and to eventually construct a second building at $7 million. Also, GSA plans call for a remodeling of the presently Federal building at a cost of approximately $1 million.

ECONOMIC SURVEY STILL UNDERWAY

A 19-member committee has been formed to work on the proposed economic survey for San Antonio. The business and other civic leaders met June 19 to map plans for project to evaluate San Antonio's resources and plan for their future utilization. The survey would be partially financed by ARA funds.

HENRY B. GONZALEZ TO SPEAK AT VALLEJO KEEL LAYING

There are many occasions when a U.S. Senator or Representative seeks the support of others in the House or Senate with a project. In January I joined the Honorable ROBERT L. LEGGETT and other colleagues in requesting of the President that the new Polaris submarine under construction at the Mare Island Naval Shipyard in Vallejo, Calif., be named after Gen. Mariano Guadalupe Vallejo, who supported the rebellion that led to the proclamation of the "free State" of California in 1836. In 1838 he was named commander of the State forces.

Vallejo protected and encouraged the immigration of American families and was influential in securing the admission of California to the United States in 1850. Since it has been the policy of the Navy to remind our citizens of the accomplishments and contributions of outstanding persons in our Nation's history, we thought that this would be a fitting way of honoring the general's inspiring record.

A couple of months later the President announced that the submarine would, indeed, be named after General Vallejo, and now the Secretary of the Navy has asked that I be the main speaker for the keel laying on July 7.

JOBS SOUGHT FOR MEDINA WORKERS

There has understandably been much complaint about the Atomic Energy Commission announcement that the AEC facility at Medina Base will be closed in 1966.

Needless to say, I was not at all happy about this disclosure which is not exaggerated to term as a surprise, and I have sought help on all levels of our Government for a complete investigation of why this AEC facility is being shut down, why it has been handled in this way, and what can be done to assist the nearly 700 persons who will lose their jobs.

Although only 40 of these employees are civil service employees (the others are contract employees with the Silas-Mason-Mason-Hanger Corp.) I feel that the Government certainly has a responsibility in this matter as it was a Government contract with the private corporation which resulted in jobs for these persons.

In response to an inquiry to him, John W. Macy, Jr., Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission, told me on June 16, that he has asked the regional director of Civil Service, Louis Lyons at Dallas, to instruct his representative, Francis B. Roser, to give whatever assistance possible in placing these people in the San Antonio area.

Mr. Roser is to meet with the contractor to arrange for meetings of all employees in order to provide information on civil service examining procedures and job opportunities. These outplacements efforts will be carried out with the full cooperation of the Army-Air Force Joint Board of Civil Service Examiners.

PART II. THE LEGISLATIVE PROCESS

In the previous issue of the newsletter I initiated a discussion of the legislative process and the legislative duties of your Congressman. In that issue I outlined the Federal lawmaking process from the origin of an idea for a legislative proposal through its introduction, passage, and publication as a statute, and I reviewed my own voting record.

In this issue I will continue that discussion with an explanation of the work in committee and speeches delivered in the House, It is my hope that these comments will add to your understanding of the legislative process and the legislative duties of your Congressman.

Committee assignments

Each Member of the House of Representatives receives at least one committee assignment. Generally speaking, no Member will be assigned to more than one major committee. The Committees on Agriculture, Appropriations, Armed Services, Banking and Currency, Foreign Affairs, among others, are considered major committees. In the Senate, because there are many less Senators than there are Representatives, Senators are appointed to more than one committee. Also, the majority party in each House will have a majority of its Members in each and every committee.

For example, on the House Committee on Banking and Currency, of which I am a member, there are 33 members. Of these, 19 are Democrats and 14 are Republicans. The chairman, WRIGHT PATMAN, is a Democrat, because the Democrats are in the majority in the House of Representatives. If, in the next election, a majority of Republicans are elected to the House, then this situation would be reversed and the Republicans would be in the majority in each committee and every committee chairman would be a Republican.

Subcommittees

Most committees are also organized into several subcommittees. Often the greatest amount of work is done in the subcommittee. For example, in the Banking and Currency Committee there are seven subcommittees.

I am assigned to three: the Subcommittees on Housing, Bank Supervision and Insurance, and Consumer Affairs. All bills affecting low rent public housing and slum clearance and urban renewal introduced in the House are immediately referred to the Banking and Currency Committee. Once in this committee the bills are referred to the Subcommittee on Housing. It is in the subcommittee that these bills receive their closest scrutiny. If public hearings are required they are conducted by the subcommittee. After the subcommittee completes its consideration of a bill assigned to it, the bill is sent to the full committee where a vote to approve or reject it is taken. If the full committee approves the bill it may be brought up on the floor of the House for a final vote. Sometimes public hearings will be conducted by the full committee, but, in many instances the subcommittee does an exhaustive and comprehensive study before the full committee is called upon to approve or reject a legislative proposal.

Committee jurisdiction

The jurisdiction of the Committee on Banking and Currency as well as the jurisdiction of all other committees is set out in the rules of the House of Representatives. The jurisdiction as set forth in the rules is listed in general terms only, and is not intended to summarize or to include all the subject matter of all bills referred to the committee over the years. It is only meant to illustrate the different subjects within the committee's jurisdiction. The enumeration as contained in rule XI of the rules of the House of Representatives follows:

Banks and banking: National Bank Act; Federal Reserve Act; Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Act; Reserve requirements of Federal Reserve member banks; bank holding companies; mergers, consolidations, and conversions of insured banks; chartering, regulation, conservation, and liquidation of national banks; insurance of bank deposits; examination of national banks, insured banks, and Federal Reserve member banks; investments by national banks; branches of national banks; unclaimed deposits in national banks; capital requirements of State banks for membership in Federal Reserve System.

Coins and coinage: Commemorative coins; denominations, value, and weight of coins; metals used in coinage; U.S. mints.

Creation of Government corporations: Commodity Credit Corporation; Federal Minerals Corporation; Federal National Mortgage Association; International Finance Corporation; National Disaster Relief Corporation; War Damage Corporation.

Currency: Denominations, value, and designs; issue and redemption; printing.

Economic stabilization and defense production measures: Redevelopment of economically distressed areas; encouraging maximum employment; price controls on commodities and services; wage controls; rent controls; credit controls; consumer and installment credit terms, real estate credit terms; allocations and priorities; Government requisition and condemnation of commodities and facilities; rationing; dispersal of defense plants; hoarding; guarantee of bank loans; business loans; Government purchase or resale of metals, minerals, and other raw materials; installation of Government-owned equipment in private plants; subsidy payments; voluntary agreements regarding prices, wages, service, or credit.

Export controls.

Federal credit unions: Chartering, regulations, examination and supervision.

Government lending: Flood and catastrophe loans; housing loans in Alaska; slum clearance and public housing loans; loans to small business; loans to small business investment companies; loans to State and local development companies; Export-Import Bank loans; defense production loans; CCC loans; municipal loan program; loans for community facilities; loans for prefabricated housing; loans for college housing.

Housing: FHA insurance of single family, and multiple unit rental projects; FHA insurance of repair and improvement loans; FHA insurance of disaster housing; FHA insurance of servicemen's housing; FHA insurance of housing in urban renewal areas; FHA insurance of defense housing; FHA insurance of military and atomic energy installation housing; FHA insurance of cooperative housing; FHA insurance of equity investments in rental housing; FHA insurance for elderly family housing; construction, operation, and disposition of Government-owned permanent and temporary war and defense housing; low-rent public housing; prefabricated housing; trailers and trailer camps; veteran preferences in housing occupancy; college housing; Alaska housing program; farm housing; housing census; housing research; moderate income housing; slum clearance and urban renewal; construction warranties.

Insurance: Against loss caused by war or expropriation of U.S. commodities stored abroad; against political and credit risks of loss arising in connection with U.S. exports; against property damage caused by floods; of deposits in national banks; of share accounts in savings and loan associations.

International finance: Bretton Woods Agreements Act; International Bank for Reconstruction and Development; International Monetary Fund; International Finance Corporation; International Development Association; Inter-American Development Bank.

International Wheat Agreement.

Mass transit.

Medals, commemorative: Issuance and striking.

Monetary policies: Valuation and revaluation of the dollar; gold and gold standard; support of Government bonds; general price level; bank reserves; operation of Federal Open Market Committee; Federal Reserve rediscount rates; issue of, and reserves behind, Federal Reserve notes; gold payments and ownership; credit terms; establishment of a National Monetary Commission; interest rates on bank deposits.

Residential mortgage credit, insurance, and guarantee: FHA insurance programs; Government secondary mortgage market (FNMA); national bank real estate loans; voluntary home mortgage credit program.

Savings and loan associations: Federal Home Loan Bank System; chartering and supervision of Federal savings and loan associations; savings and loan holding companies.

Silver: Coinage, value, and use.

Small business: Small Business Act; Small Business Investment Act.

Tin: Texas City tin smelter; Government purchase and sale.

Five hundred referred

This list of subjects over which the Banking and Currency Committee has jurisdiction will give you some idea of the tremendous volume of work performed by this committee. As of June 1, 1964, more than 500 bills and resolutions introduced in the House were referred to the Banking and Currency Committee. In addition, 14 bills and resolutions which had originally been introduced in the Senate were referred to the House Banking and Currency Committee after being passed by the Senate.

Busy committee

It would be almost impossible to calculate the amount of time and work that goes into a Congressman's committee assignment. It it necessary that each Congressman have a good working familiarity with all the bills pending in his committee; that he attend all hearings, some of which stretch out for weeks; that he study the testimony and evidence introduced at those hearings; and, in general, that he become somewhat of an expert in the subject matter over which his committee has jurisdiction.

To illustrate the amount of work that may be required on any legislative proposal, let us look at one bill, H.R. 5845. This bill was introduced into the House on April 24, 1963. Its purpose is to authorize national banks to underwrite and deal in securities issued by State and local governments. The subject matter of the bill is a complicated one, involving a proposed amendment to the National Banking Act of 1933. The National Banking Act was passed during the depression and has been the foundation of our present system of banking. The passage of this act in 1933, in the middle of the depression, saved the banking industry. Since that time this industry has made an amazing record of solvency and stability. Therefore, it is quite understandable that any proposal to modify the National Banking Act will become controversial. Our committee began public hearings on H.R. 5845 on September 23, 1963. So far, we have spent 20 days hearing testimony and evidence from interested parties. We had the honor and the privilege of listening to the testimony of both William McChesney Martin, Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, and James J. Saxon, Comptroller of the Currency. These are two of the most respected and important persons in the field of banking, yet their views are exactly opposite to one another on the question of whether this bill should be passed. The committee has not taken final action on this matter.

Productive

Not only is the House Banking and Currency one of the busiest committees in Congress, it is also one of the most productive. Below, I have listed some of the more important legislative proposals which have been handled successfully by my committee, passed by both houses, and signed into law by the President during the 88th Congress:

1. Silver legislation, Public Law 88–36: Reenacts with modifications certain provisions of the Silver Purchase Act of 1934, and authorizes the Federal Reserve banks to issue Federal Reserve notes of $1 and $2 denominations.

2. Extension of mortgage insurance authority, Public Law 88–54: Extends for 2 years the broadened eligibility provided under the House act of 1961 for FHA mortgage insurance on rental and sales housing.

3. Export-Import Bank Act extension, Public Law 88–101: Extends the life of the bank to 1968 and increases the aggregate amount of loans, guarantees, and insurance which the bank may have outstanding at any one time.

4. Amendments to the Federal Credit Union Act, Public Law 88–150: Provides Federal credit unions greater flexibility in the conduct of their operations.

5. Housing for the elderly, Public Law 88–158: Authorizes the appropriation of an additional $50 million for the program of Federal loans for housing for the elderly.

6. Increase in authorized capital stock of World Bank, Public Law 88–178: Authorizes the U.S. Governor of the World Bank to vote for a billion increase in capital stock. Such an increase will permit new countries to subscribe to the Bank and allow other free world countries to put funds into international economic development at no cost to the United States.

7. Coinage of John Fitzgerald Kennedy 50-cent pieces, Public Law 88–256.

8. Increased participation in the Inter-American Development Bank, Public Law 88–259: Authorizes the U.S. Governor for the Bank to vote for increases in the callable stock of the Bank and to vote for an increase in the Bank's fund for special operations.

9. Small Business Investment Act amendments, Public Law 88–273.

10. Increase in the resources of the International Development Association and U.S. participation, Public Law 88–310: Authorizes the U.S. Governor for the IDA to vote in favor of an increase in its resources and to contribute $312 million to that end.

Other bills

Other bills which have been before the Banking and Currency Committee and on which further action may be expected before the end of this session of Congress include the Urban Mass Transportation Act, Area Redevelopment Act amendments, a bill to increase the investment powers of Federal savings and loan associations and the Housing Act of 1964.

In addition to my regular committee and subcommittee assignments, Chairman Wright Patman has designated me special liaison representative for the Banking and Currency Committee in connection with matters related to Latin America. In this capacity I had the distinct honor of accompanying Secretary of the Treasury Douglas Dillon to Panama City, Panama, for the Inter-American Development Bank Board of Governors conference in April.

I feel that this assignment further enables me to make a constructive contribution to United States-Latin American relations.

As you can see, committee assignments represent weighty, time-consuming responsibilities. The work in this area does not receive much publicity and there is little glamour attached to it. But, the legislative process could not function without the groundwork laid down at this stage, and it is a great source of satisfaction to me to be assigned to the Banking and Currency Committee.

House speeches

The Constitution provides that each House may determine the rules of its proceedings. Accordingly, both the Senate and the House have developed their own rules and procedures to regulate the time that each Member may consume in debate of pending legislation and the manner in which a Member may obtain permission to insert in the Congressional Record speeches not actually delivered on the floor. Originally debate in the House was unlimited, as in the Senate. But, a rule limiting each Representative to 1 hour began in 1820 when John Randolph, of Virginia, consumed so much time that the rule was urged to prevent his holding the floor indefinitely.

The purpose of the Congressional Record is to provide an accurate and comprehensive record of the proceedings. Such a record is an indispensable adjunct to representative government. It lets the people know what their elected representatives are saying and doing in Congress. But, Congress is a large legislative body, and time is necessarily at a premium. By use of the 1-hour rule of debate in the House and the right to extend remarks and insert speeches in the Record, a Member has the opportunity to explain his attitude on pending questions of regional and national importance. This gives constituents a basis on which to approve or disapprove of his position on the issues. It also informs the Member's colleagues of the local sentiment of the people that Member has been elected to represent.

Speechmaking on the floor of the House and the insertion of speeches in the Congressional Record should therefore be considered an integral part of the legislative process as well as of our democratic and representative form of government. The rules governing this function are protected by the Constitution itself, as the Founding Fathers of this Nation knew well the importance of each elected representative having a public forum in which to debate the issues and voice his opinions.

So far this year, I have delivered more than 30 speeches in the House. The subjects range from purely local matters to national domestic and foreign affairs. Of course, I do not claim to be an expert on every subject, and I have tried to limit my remarks to areas of importance to the people of the 20th district, areas of particular concern to all Americans and in which I have some familiarity, and areas related to my committee assignments. Some of the subjects on which I have gone on record are as follows:

1. "Texas and Local History and Tradition: Texas Independence Day" (Mar. 2), "Battle of San Jacinto" (Apr. 21), "The Alamo" (May 6, 19).

2. "United States—Latin American Affairs: The Alliance for Progress" (Mar. 19, May 21), "Good Neighbor Bowling" (Apr. 10), "Hemisfair" (May 21), "Teodoro Moscoso" (May 21), "Peru's President" (Jan. 18).

3. "Civil Defense: Steuart Pittman, Secretary of Civil Defense" (Mar. 11).

4. "Banking and Currency: Federal Reserve System" (Mar. 10, 24), "Printing of Money" (June 8, 18).

5. "Foreign Affairs: Shooting Down of U.S. Planes in East Germany" (Feb. 4, Mar. 16, 23).

6. "Extremist Organizations: The "Minutemen" (Jan. 21), "Ease With Which Extremist Organizations May Obtain Arms and Ammunition" (May 26, 27, June 1, 9).

7. "Civil Rights" (Feb. 13).

8. "The Bracero Program" (Feb. 19).

9. "The Chamizal Treaty" (Feb. 20).

10. "Residual Oil Imports" (Apr. 10).

11. "Military Commissaries and Military Pay" (May 6).

12 "The Medina Atomic Energy Commission Facility" (May 7).

In addition, a Congressman (as well as other interested citizens) may testify before committees in the House or Senate holding public hearings. There is no requirement that a Congressman testify at any hearing, but, because of the rare opportunity of being in the Nation's Capitol and to further fulfill my obligation to the people, I represent, it is my policy to testify at those hearings in which I feel I may make a constructive contribution and in which the people of Bexar County have a deep concern. In the past I have given testimony at hearings involving the San Antonio River (House Appropriations Committee), the Bracero program and unemployment (House Agriculture Committee, Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee), water pollution (House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee), Brooke Army Medical Center (House Armed Services Committee), and most recently, on May 22, I testified in favor of the World War I veterans' pension bill (House Veterans Affairs Committee).

I have a limited supply of all the speeches I have delivered in Congress, and will be happy to forward copies of those in which you may be interested, at your request.

USIA FILM

Recently the U.S. Information Agency asked me to make a film with them which will be viewed via television in Latin American countries.

The program is a half hour long and consists of an informal interview and discussion of my role as a Congressman and my background and political history. My interviewers were two Spanish-speaking journalists and two students from Latin America at the University of Maryland.

TEXAS ALLIANCE PARTNERS

June 19 marked the formal announcement of the Texas Partners of the Alliance for Progress with a dinner meeting in San Antonio.

The speaker for the occasion was Peruvian Ambassador Celso Pastor.

The Texas Partners will assist with self-help programs for the country of Peru. San Antonian Harry Jersig and Bill Sinkin are members of the State steering committee.

FIVE FILL DISTRICT ACADEMY SPOTS

Five San Antonio youths have emerged as the nominees who will fill the vacancies at the service academies for the 20th Congressional District of Texas.

These young men fully qualified and made the highest scores among those I nominated to compete for each academy.

John Joseph Gonzalez (no kin), 259 Barbara, will fill the vacancy at the U.S. Military Academy at West Point, N.Y. He is the son of Mr. and Mrs. Manuel Victor Gonzalez and is a May graduate of Central Catholic High School.

The Air Force Academy vacancy will be filled by Steve Anthony McPhail, son of M/Sgt. and Mrs. Steve W. McPhail, 518 East Palfrey. He is a graduate of Highlands High School and attended the University of Texas before he was selected to enter the Academy.

Oscar Rey De Rodriguez, 238 Dresden, a May graduate of Central Catholic High School, qualified as 1 of 10 in the State of Texas to fill vacancies at the Merchant Marine Academy at Kingsport, N.Y. Each Texas Congressman may submit as many as 10 nominees to compete for 10 vacancies for the State rather than for individual congressional district vacancies.

Ray A. Wallace and Joe A. Ylitalo, graduates of John Marshall and Douglas MacArthur High Schools, respectively, will fill the vacancies for the congressional district at the U.S. Naval Academy at Annapolis, Md. Wallace's parents reside at 124 West Broadview Drive and Ylitalo's at 9503 Nona Kay Drive.

However, three other of my nominees for the Naval Academy will also enter the Academy this month. The Secretary of the Navy chose 2 of our qualified alternates for the 150 he selected from congressional sources for the first time this year due to legislation passed in March. They are Robert Kent Borden, 254 Latch Drive, 1962 graduate of Thomas Edison High School and a student at San Antonio College, and R. Allen Thacker, 411 Preswick Boulevard, May graduate of Highlands High School.

The Secretary also chose Charles C. Stevens, Route 8, Box 223, another congressional nominee, but, selected him through Mr. Stevens' nomination from the president of Rice University in connection with the university's NROTC contract program.

BEXAR GUESTS

Guests in the Washington office from Bexar County since my last newsletter have been Jack A. Martin, Gordon L. Clemmons, Sandra Callaway, Elton E. Schroeder, T. G. Peters, Larry W. Jenkins, Beverly Nix and William L. Coiner, Thomas G. Lowery, A. J. Lewis, Andrew Hernandez, Mr. and Mrs. Edward C. Sullivan, Kenneth C. Buckholdt, George T. Fanner, Joseph D. Foulkes, Mrs. Harold Henze, Col. C. E. Brand, Mrs. Luz Pizzini Castiglioni, Col, and Mrs. Merrick Bayer, John G. Morris, Mrs. H. E. Handley, Mrs. Frances G. Harper, Capt. Robert E. Rigney, Mrs. Elizabeth Weissmann, Walter Koenig, Rev. Dermot N. Brosnan, Ray Ellison, Jesse A. Baker, E. H. Jarorzewski, W. S. Hale, Jr., Mr. and Mrs. Charles Garrett and family, Quino Lee, Elizabeth S. Goldberg, Virginia L. Williams, Ruth Mitchell, David C. Campbell, Jr., Dr. Byron N. Dooley, Finis O. Kingery, Jr., Mrs. L. C. Whitehead, James R. Gillespie, Norman Fischer, David H. Brune, Melvin Sisk, Sister Mary Vincent, F. F. Devine, Jr., James E. Fields, Allen H. Elrod, Robert A. Walton, George C. Sarran, Ben Singleton, Capt. A. F. Curtis, Ann F. Miniel, Vivian Rosales, Joe Reid, Capt. Tom Jacobs, S. Lee Davis, James Reid, Mrs. E. H. Pfeiffer and Glenda, Robert D. Victoria, Mrs. Joyce Slaughter, Mr. and Mrs. Eloy Ceneno, Dr. Max E. Johnson, Dr. John M. Smith, C. Wallace Miller, Rosemary and Jack Nankervis, John R. Ulrich, Jr., and family, Mrs. H. R. Criakshank, Mrs. John R. Ulrich, Sr., Elva Ruiz, Ken Rogers, Louis W. Libscomb, Robert Stem, W. A. Weilbacher, Col. Robert C. DuBose, Dr. Russell T. Snip, Mrs. Roy Chambers, Miss Byrne Jones, Net Goodyear, Midshipman 3/c James N. Higdon, Robert Garcia, Carlos F. Brunet, Arthur A. Seeligson, Martin Goland, Mr. and Mrs. A. Belous and Alice, Joel and David Berry, Freddy, Miss Gloria Ortiz, Mr. and Mrs. George Ortiz, Mrs. C. H. Grasso and Randy, LeRoy K. Heidbreder, Mrs. H. F. Adler and Max, Mrs. Leona Pappas, H. T. Kramer, Charles J. Thiess, Jr., Judy Marcus, Raymond B. Ochoa, Rev. Arnold Anders, Mrs. Sam K. Reed and family, Mrs. Annie M. Sanchez and son, Mr. and Mrs. Tom Gish and Marijane, Dr. and Mrs. Charles Hodges, Lucille Benton, Miss Jerry Benton, David Jockrusch, Frank B. Lammons, Mr. and Mrs. Cecil M. Dawson, Alice Cerda, Mr. and Mrs. Bill Sinkin, Mr. and Mrs. D. H. Mebane, G. Torres, Robert E. Pugwand family, San Sinkin and family, Tammy Tiner, Mr. and Mrs. M. C. Maese and family, Louis Engelke, Tom Taylor, Mrs. J. Loustaunau, and Mrs. Lorraine Morton.

A DOUBLE WIN

May 22 was National Maritime Day and it was particularly significant to our area this year because San Antonio had two winners in the National Maritime Poster Contest.

Above, I am pictured with the two posters (not printed in the RECORD) submitted by Richard C. Heldt, Jr., who graduated last month from Luther Burbank High School, Jesse Trevino, who will be a senior at Fox Tech High School this fall. Mr. Heldt's poster placed third. His instructor was Jim Dulin. Mr. Trevino was a fourth place winner and his instructor was K. Alsup. This is the third consecutive year for one of Mr. Alsup's students to place among the top 53 winners in the Nation (there was a total of 8,500 entries this year). Benjamin Juarez, former Tech student, received honorable mention in 1962 and placed fourth in 1963.

ARMY-AIR FORCE WAGE SURVEY

The Army-Air Force Wage Board told me June 18 that they have started a survey of wages paid in the San Antonio area.

The results of the survey will be used as a basis for setting pay of hourly workers at San Antonio military installations (about 25,000 workers).

For some time now I have attacked the wage rates paid San Antonio workers as often San Antonians are paid 20- to 30-percent less than their counterparts in the Corpus Christi area. I hope that this survey will result in erasing some of the inequities of the differentials now paid.

TWO AT CORPS JOBS

The latest two Peace Corps volunteers from San Antonio to depart for their assignments this month are Miss Marguerite M. Kivlin, 56, for India, and Roy K. Cox, 25, for Ecuador.

Miss Kivlin, who will work as a secretary in agricultural extension program with which the volunteers will assist in the state of Maharashtra in west central India, has previously made her home with her sister, Mrs. John Dunsmore, 115 West Rosewood Avenue.

Mr. Cox is the son of R. K. Cox, Sr., 8515 Sagebrush Lane, and will teach biology in a small secondary school in Ecuador in order to help improve classroom instruction.

The Peace Corps reports that nearly 6,500 volunteers are now at work in 45 countries of Africa, Asia, and Latin America, and that requests for additional volunteers are received daily. Plans are being made to train up to 5,000 more volunteers this summer and 1,200 this fall. Applicants interested in the fall or subsequent training programs are urged to submit their questionnaires now and take the next nationwide placement test on August 8.

SENATE

TUESDAY, JUNE 30, 1964

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. METCALF).

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Spirit, high over all, blessed forever, whose dwelling is the light of setting suns, the round ocean, the living air, the blue sky, and in the minds of man: We lift our hearts to Thee who makest Thyself known to us in the stillness. Even as we come to the altar of prayer, our minds are plagued with questions we cannot answer as to how humanity, with the dread secrets of nature in its fumbling hands, can learn to live on this planet in peace and security.

O God, the answers for which we gropingly seek in the darkness of our devices are hidden in Thy heart. Nourish within us, we pray, a divine discontent that we may be restless and unsatisfied among the things that spoil the music of our common humanity. Amid all the distractions of this complicated, modern life of ours, keep our hearts childlike and trustful, that the gates of the kingdom of meekness, closed to the merely clever and conceited, may be opened unto us as we come in the simplicity as it is in Christ Jesus, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, June 29, 1964, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on June 29, 1964, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 1828) to amend the joint resolution establishing the Battle of Lake Erie Sesquicentennial Celebration Commission so as to authorize an appropriation to carry out the provisions thereof.

REPORT OF OFFICE OF ALIEN PROPERTY, DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am sending for the information of the Congress, the Annual Report of the Office of Alien Property, Department of Justice, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1963.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 30, 1964.*

EXCHANGE OF INFORMATION CONCERNING ATOMIC ENERGY WITH NATO—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States with a secret document, which was referred to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy:

To the Congress of the United States:

On May 16, 1964, the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, jointly recommended to me, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, a proposed new agreement to provide for cooperation in the exchange of atomic information with the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and its member nations.

The new agreement will supersede an existing agreement executed in 1955, and will do two things:

(a) It will extend the types of information which we can exchange with NATO. This expanded area of information is needed to enable our Allies to make effective use of nuclear delivery system being provided them by the United States under bilateral procedures and agreements following creation of NATO atomic stockpiles in 1957.

(b) It will permit NATO member countries to share in information which the United States has hitherto been exchanging only with the NATO organization itself under the 1955 agreement. This will make these countries' role in alliance planning in the nuclear field more effective.

This new agreement thus represents a logical and useful step in our continuing and varied efforts to insure wider Allied participation in NATO nuclear defense. Such wider participation is necessary on both military and political grounds. It is needed to enhance the effectiveness of NATO defense. On political grounds, it is needed to reinforce NATO cohesion by meeting our Allies' legitimate desire to make a constructive contribution to nuclear defense.

Therefore, I have authorized the Secretary of State to execute this new agreement between the Government of the United States and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and its member nations to provide for the cooperation relevant to the exchange of atomic information for NATO planning purposes.

In accordance with the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, I am submitting to each House of the Congress an authoritative copy of the signed agreement, together with a letter from the Secretary of State, a copy of the joint letter from the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission recommending my approval of the agreement, and a copy of my approval memorandum.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 30, 1964.*

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 98. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to exportation of imported distilled spirits, wines, and beer;

H.R. 2509. An act to authorize Reserve officers to combine service in more than one reserve component in computing the 4 years of satisfactory Federal service necessary to qualify for the uniform maintenance allowance;

H.R. 4649. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to authorize the use of certain volatile fruit-flavor concentrates in the cellar treatment of wine;

H.R. 4844. An act relating to the release of liability under bonds filed under section 44(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 with respect to certain installment obligations transmitted at death;

H.R. 5739. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to correct certain inequities with respect to the taxation of life insurance companies;

H.R. 6299. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy, to produce and sell crude oil from the Umiat field, Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 4, for the purpose of making local fuel available for use in connection with the drilling, mechanical, and heating operations of those involved in oil and gas exploration and development work in the nearby areas outside Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 4, and for other purposes;

H.R. 7267. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to authorize refunds of gasoline taxes directly to aerial applicators with respect to gasoline used by them in providing services to farmers in farming operations;

H.R. 7301. An act to amend section 341 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954;

H.R. 7307. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the apportionment of the depletion allowance between parties to certain contracts for the extraction of minerals (other than oil or gas);

H.R. 8676. An act to amend section 2634 of title 10, United States Code, so as to authorize the military departments, in certain cases, to ship automobiles to and from the State of Alaska by commercial motor carrier via highways and the Alaska ferry system;

H.R. 9634. An act to authorize the Secretary of Defense to lend certain Army, Navy, and Air Force equipment and provide certain services to the Girl Scouts of the United States of America for use at the 1965 Girl Scouts senior roundup encampment, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 19467. An act to continue for a temporary period certain existing rules relating to the deductibility of accrued vacation pay.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H.R. 98. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to exportation of imported distilled spirits, wines, and beer;

H.R. 4649. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to authorize the use of certain volatile fruit-flavor concentrates in the cellar treatment of wine;

H.R. 4844. An act relating to the release of liability under bonds filed under section 44(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 with respect to certain installment obligations transmitted at death;

H.R. 5739. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to correct certain inequities with respect to the taxation of life insurance companies;

H.R. 7267. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to authorize refunds of gasoline taxes directly to aerial applicators with respect to gasoline used by them in providing services to farmers in farming operations;

H.R. 7301. An act to amend section 341 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954;

H.R. 7307. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the apportionment of the depletion allowance between parties to certain contracts for the extraction of minerals (other than oil or gas); and

H.R. 10467. An act to continue for a temporary period certain existing rules relating to the deductibility of accrued vacation pay; to the Committee on Finance.

H.R. 2509. An act to authorize Reserve officers to combine service in more than one Reserve component in computing the 4 years of satisfactory Federal service necessary to qualify for the uniform maintenance allowance;

H.R. 6299. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy, to produce and sell crude oil from the Umiat field, Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 4, for the purpose of making local fuel available for use in connection with the drilling, mechanical, and heating operations of those involved in oil and gas exploration and development work in the nearby areas outside Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 4, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8676. An act to amend section 2634 of title 10, United States Code, so as to authorize the military departments, in certain cases, to ship automobiles to and from the State of Alaska by commercial motor carrier via highways and the Alaska ferry systems; and

H.R. 9634. An act to authorize the Secretary of Defense to lend certain Army, Navy, and Air Force equipment and provide certain services to the Girl Scouts of the United States of America for use at the 1965 Girl Scouts senior roundup encampment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements during the morning hour be limited to 3 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZATION TO RECEIVE MESSAGES AND SIGN BILLS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the adjournment or recess of the Senate today, the Secretary may receive messages from the House and that the President pro tempore or the Acting President pro tempore be authorized to sign bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZATION TO RECEIVE REPORTS FROM COMMITTEES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reports from committees may be received until midnight tonight.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules and Administration may be permitted to meet during the sessions of the Senate today and tomorrow.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, it is my understanding that the minority has cleared a meeting with the Rules Committee of the House today.

Will the able Senator from Montana restrict his request to today's meeting?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I shall be glad to do so. Mr. President, I modify my request accordingly, and ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules and Administration may be permitted to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR FILING OF REPORT BY GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS COMMITTEE

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time for the Government Operations Committee to file a report by the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations be extended until September 30, 1964.

This subcommittee completed its hearings concerning the Department of Agriculture and its relationships with Billie Sol Estes last fall. A draft of the report has been in the hands of committee members for a substantial length of time. However, some of the committee members have not yet been able to complete their deliberations.

For this reason I ask unanimous consent that the time for filing this report be extended to September 30, 1964.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON APPROVAL OF LOAN TO COLORADO-UTE ELECTRIC ASSOCIATION, INC., MONTROSE, COLO.

A letter from the Administrator, Rural Electrification Administration, Department of Agriculture, reporting, pursuant to law, on the approval of a loan to the Colorado-Ute Electric Association, Inc., of Montrose, Colo., in the amount of $5,352,000, to finance certain transmission and minor generation facilities (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORT ON APPROVAL OF LOAN TO GOLDEN VALLEY ELECTRIC ASSOCIATION, INC., FAIRBANKS, ALASKA

A letter from the Administrator, Rural Electrification Administration, Department of Agriculture, reporting, pursuant to law, on the approval of a loan to the Golden Valley Electric Association, Inc., of Fairbanks, Alaska, in the amount of $18,930,000, for the financing of certain generation and transmission facilities (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations.

ENCOURAGEMENT AND FACILITATION OF DETAILS AND TRANSFERS OF CERTAIN FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to encourage and facilitate details and transfers of Federal employees for service with international organizations (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT ON DEFICIENCIES IN ADMINISTRATION OF EARTHQUAKE RECONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION PROGRAM FOR CHILE

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a confidential supplementary report on deficiencies in administration of the earthquake reconstruction and rehabilitation program for Chile, Agency for International Development, Department of State (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON DEFICIENCIES IN ADMINISTRATION OF THE EARTHQUAKE RECONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION PROGRAM FOR CHILE, AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on deficiencies in administration of the earthquake reconstruction and rehabilitation program for Chile, Agency International Development, Department of State, dated June 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON UNNECESSARY COSTS INCURRED IN PROCUREMENT OF CERTAIN AIRCRAFT ENGINE RING AND VANE ASSEMBLIES

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on unnecessary costs incurred in the procurement of aircraft engine ring and vane assemblies from the Allison Division of General Motors Corp., Department of the Navy, dated June 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Commiteee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON UNNECESSARY COSTS TO THE GOVERNMENT IN LEASING OF CERTAIN ELECTRONIC DATA PROCESSING SYSTEMS

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on unnecessary costs to the Government in leasing of electronic data processing systems by the Goodyear Aero-Space Corp., Akron, Ohio, Department of Defense, dated June 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"HOUSE RESOLUTION 57

"Whereas by treaty dated November 11, 1794, and ratified January 21, 1795, between the United States of America and the tribes of Indians called the Six Nations of which the Seneca Tribe was a member provided:

"'Now the United States acknowledges all the land within the aforementioned boundaries to be the property of the Seneca Nation; and the United States will never claim the same, nor disturb the Seneca Nation, nor any of the Six Nations or of their Indian friends residing thereon and united with them, in the full use and enjoyment thereof; but it shall remain theirs until they choose to sell the same to the people of the United States who have the right to purchase'; and

"Whereas the Kinzua Dam project on the Allegheny River will dispossess some of the Indians located within the boundaries as described in the aforesaid treaty; and

"Whereas eviction notices have been served upon the Indians residing within the high water mark of the reservoir that will be created by the Kinzua Dam; and

"Whereas bills have been introduced in Congress, principally H.R. 1794, to provide funds for damages direct and indirect, and for a rehabilitation fund for the purpose of improving the economic, social, and educational conditions of said Indians; and

"Whereas said bill has passed the House, amended in the Senate, and is now in conference committee; and

"Whereas the Seneca Indians who have received eviction notices are in dire need of help and assistance for moving and transfer to new locations: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives of the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania memorialize the Congress of the United States to hasten the final passage of the legislation now pending before it in Conference Committee to provide the necessary funds for the Seneca Indians; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a duly attested copy of this resolution be immediately transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of the Congress from this State."

A resolution of the Senate of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"SENATE RESOLUTION 4

"A senate resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America to restore to the citizens of the several States their sovereign right to determine the form and the manner of their legislative representation in State government

"Whereas the Supreme Court of the United States by its recent decisions has held that 'the equal protection clause' of the 14th amendment to the Constitution of the United States requires every State to structure its legislature so that all members of each house represent substantially the same number of people; and

"Whereas the history of the adoption of the 14th amendment provides conclusive evidence that neither those who proposed nor those who ratified the amendment believed that the 'equal protection clause' limited the power of the States to apportion their legislatures as they saw fit; and

"Whereas one of the basic concepts of the bicameral legislative system is to insure territorial representation of the people in addition to their representation based solely on numbers; and

"Whereas the Supreme Court of the United States, in said recent decisions, by a divided vote, has, in fact, effected an amendment to the Constitution of the United States in derogation of the accepted and legal mode of amending said Constitution; and

"Whereas said decisions destroy State constitutional provisions which have been effective as the supreme law of several of our States from the very inception of our Federal system and which were primarily and intentionally designed to afford a system of checks and balances in State legislative representation: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the State of New Jersey:*

"1. The Congress of the United States is memorialized to take such action as may be required to insure that the judicial power of the United States shall not extend to or be construed to extend to any suit in law or equity commenced or prosecuted to invalidate or to challenge the validity of any provision of any State constitution or State law with respect to the composition of either or both houses of any bicameral State legislature or to the manner or method of choosing or selecting the members of said houses of the State legislature in any case where representation in one of said houses is reasonably and rationally apportioned on a population basis and representation in the other is based upon regional and local values as the State deems to be appropriate.

"2. A duly attested copy of this resolution be transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, the Senators from New Jersey and to each Member of the House of Representatives of the United States elected from New Jersey."

"I hereby certify that the above is a true and correct copy of a resolution adopted by the senate.

"HENRY H. PATTERSON,
"Secretary of the Senate."

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 2164. A bill for the relief of Polly Ann Mutz Kampouris (Rept. No. 1136);

S. 2452. A bill for the relief of Angelina Martino (Rept. No. 1137);

S. 2548. A bill for the relief of Nora Chin-Bing (Rept. No. 1138);

S. 2599. A bill for the relief of Denise Hojebane Barrood (Rept. No. 1139);

H.R. 2735. An act for the relief of Ligia Paulina Jimenez (Rept. No. 1140);

H.R. 2737. An act for the relief of Pedro Aguinaldo (Rept. No. 1141);

H.R. 5408. An act for the relief of Jackie Bergancia Smith (Rept. No. 1142);

H.R. 5501. An act for the relief of Wieslawa Marianna Borczon (Rept. No. 1143);

H.R. 6385. An act for the relief of Wolfgang Seidl (Rept. No. 1144);

H.R. 10407. An act for the relief of Keith Hills (Rept. No. 1145); and

H.J. Res. 950. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to an amendment to the compact between the State of Ohio and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania relating to Pymatuning Lake (Rept. No. 1146).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 2673. A bill for the relief of Debra Lynne Sanders (Rept. No. 1129);

S. 2698. A bill for the relief of Linus Han (Rept. No. 1130); and

S. 2730. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jorge A. Picaza (Rept. No. 1131).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

S. 2205. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe DiCenso (Rept. No. 1132).

By Mr. HRUSKA, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

H.R. 394. An act to amend sections 1, 17a, 57j, 64a(5), 67(b), 67c, and 70c of the Bankruptcy Act, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1133); and

H.R. 3438. An act to amend the Bankruptcy Act with respect to limiting the priority and nondischargeability of taxes in bankruptcy (Rept. No. 1134).

By Mr. LONG of Missouri, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

H.R. 6473. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Loward D. Sparks (Rept. No. 1135).

AMENDMENT OF ATOMIC ENERGY, ATOMIC ENERGY COMMUNITY, AND EURATOM COOPERATION ACTS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (REPT. NO. 1128)

Mr. PASTORE, from the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, reported an original bill (S. 2963) to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, the Atomic Energy Community Act of 1955, as amended, and the EURATOM Cooperation Act of 1958, as amended, and submitted a report thereon, which report was ordered to be printed, and the bill was read twice by its title, and placed on the calendar.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, U.S. Army, retired, of Missouri, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Republic of Vietnam;

Sam P. Gilstrap, of Oklahoma, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Malawi; and

U. Alexis Johnson, of California, to be promoted from the class of career minister to the class of career ambassador.

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Dorwin W. Suttle, of Texas, to be U.S. district judge for the western district of Texas;

Walter Ely, of California, to be U.S. circuit judge, ninth circuit.

Leonard L. Sells, of Virginia, to be a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board for the remainder of the term expiring August 9, 1964; and

Leonard L. Sells, of Virginia, to be a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board for a term of 5 years expiring August 9, 1969.

By Mr. HART, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Spottswood W. Robinson III, of the District of Columbia, to be U.S. district judge for the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KEATING, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Edmund Port, of New York, to be U.S. district judge for the northern district of New York.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MANSFIELD (for himself and Mr. METCALF):

S. 2961. A bill to provide for the disposition of the judgment funds on deposit to the credit of the Northern Cheyenne Tribe of the Tongue River Indian Reservation, Mont.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. MANSFIELD when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CURTIS:

S. 2962. A bill for the relief of Miss Choun Seem Kim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PASTORE:

S. 2963. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, the Atomic Energy Community Act of 1955, as amended, and the EURATOM Cooperation Act of 1958, as amended; placed on the calendar.

(See the reference to the above bill, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

By Mr. BURDICK:

S. 2964. A bill for the relief of the Swanston Equipment Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PROXMIRE:

S. 2965. A bill for the relief of Jonas Archiquette; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

S. 2966. A bill for the relief of Maria Nessim Djeddah De Ades; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ARISING FROM JUDGMENT IN FAVOR OF NORTHERN CHEYENNE INDIAN TRIBE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, my distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Montana, LEE METCALF and I have sent to the desk a bill providing for the disposition of funds arising from a judgment in favor of the Northern Cheyenne Indian Tribe recently awarded by the Indian Claims Commission.

It is quite important that this legislation receive expeditious consideration so that the Northern Cheyenne Tribe can proceed to program the distribution of these funds for the benefit of the individuals and the development of the reservation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have a statement from the Department of the Interior printed at the conclusion of these brief remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2961) to provide for the disposition of the judgment funds on deposit to the credit of the Northern Cheyenne Tribe of the Tongue River Indian Reservation, Mont., introduced by Mr. MANSFIELD (for himself and Mr. METCALF), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The statement from the Department of the Interior is as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., June 19, 1964.

Hon. CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE: Enclosed is a draft of a proposed bill to provide for the disposition of funds arising from a judgment in favor of the Northern Cheyenne Indian Tribe awarded by the Indian Claims Commission in docket 329–C.

We recommended that the bill be referred to the appropriate committee for consideration and we recommend that the bill be enacted.

A final judgment was entered by the Indian Claims Commission on November 27, 1963, in the amount of $4,360,886.19 to the Northern Cheyenne Indian Tribe of the Tongue River Reservation in Montana.

This sum was determined as a result of an order of November 13, 1962, amending the amended interlocutory order of August 6, 1962. By this order of November 27, 1963, and as a result of an agreement by the petitioner tribes in docket No. 329 and docket No. 348 any recovery from the United States will be dependent upon relative populations of the beneficiary tribes as of November 14, 1958, viz: Southern Cheyenne-Arapaho at 50.61 percent, Northern Cheyenne at 25.32 percent, and Northern Arapaho at 24.07 percent. It further stated that the determination of offsets chargeable to each respectively shall be separately determined and judgments entered separately in favor of each of the said tribes. The docket number assigned to the Northern Cheyenne Tribe was docket No. 329–C.

The Northern Cheyenne Tribe of the Tongue River Reservation in Montana is a successor tribal entity in fact to the Northern Cheyenne Tribe of Indians as recognized in the Fort Laramie Treaty of September 17, 1851. The Northern Cheyenne Tribe of the Tongue River Reservation was organized with a constitution and bylaws approved on November 23, 1935, pursuant to the provisions of the fact of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 984). An amended constitution and bylaws was approved on July 8, 1960.

The proposed legislation permits the Northern Cheyenne, subject to the approval of the Secretary, to decide precisely how they will program their judgment funds.

Early in the fall of 1963 the Northern Cheyenne Tribal Council initiated reservation district meetings to alert the membership toward planned use of the tribe's judgment funds. From a consensus of the wishes and desires of the membership, the tribal council and the tribal planning committee, with technical assistance by the Bureau, formulated a program for the tribe. The program was presented to the Northern Cheyenne people at subsequent district meetings and received unanimous approval.

In broad outline the tribe's program favors employment of the judgment funds for the purposes of developing individual and family type plans; an education program; and an economic development program. The latter includes the development of business opportunities on the reservation, industrial development, and the development of natural resources including irrigation development, range or grazing land improvement, soil and moisture conservation development, the development of forest resources, land acquisition, and recreation and tourism. The initial planning has been designed to improve the economic and social conditions of the tribal membership.

The proposed legislation will allow program flexibility looking toward permanent economic growth and development of the reservation. We concur with the principles of the tribe's program and recommend that the judgment funds be made available to the tribe for more detailed planning as proposed in the enclosed bill.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised us that there is no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

D. OTIS BEASLEY,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1965—AMENDMENT (AMENDMENT NO. 1082)

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I submit an amendment, intended to be proposed by me, to the bill (H.R. 11202) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes, and ask that it be printed and appropriately referred. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a letter from R. V. Segars, addressed to me, and requesting the proposed amendment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter and proposed amendment will be printed in the Record.

The amendment was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

The letter and amendment presented by Mr. Johnston are as follows:

Woodrow, S.C., *June 24, 1964*.

Senator Olin D. Johnston,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Johnston: It was good to talk to you over the telephone the other night. All of us in South Carolina are proud of you for the way you fought the civil rights bill and I know that you were disappointed to see it pass.

We missed you at our reception but we certainly understood your not being there and we appreciated very much your sending Tom and Bob. It was a pleasure to have them both.

I called your office earlier this week and in your absence talked to Tom Chadwick about a problem that the cotton farmers are facing.

The Department of Agriculture has added another factor called micronaire reading in addition to the classification of grade and staple for establishing the value of cotton in the loan. It is their intention to charge the farmers 6 cents per bale for this service. We feel that the Government should not place any more expense on the farmer and I am sure you agree.

Briefly this cost could be removed from the farmers by obtaining an amendment to H.R. 11202 now pending before the Senate Committee on Appropriations, to provide an increase in funds and authorize usage of them to provide micronaire readings without charge to farmers, in the section of the bill having to do with Agricultural Marketing Service. The suggested language of such an amendment is attached hereto.

Senators from other cotton States are being contacted by their constituents along these same lines.

We would certainly appreciate your help on this matter and we hope that the cotton farmers can be spared any more loss of income.

With kindest personal regards.

Yours very truly,

Ray V. Segars, Jr.

ENCLOSURE TO SENATOR OLIN D. JOHNSTON, JUNE 24, 1964

"On page 14, line 12 (of H.R. 11202 as printed and before the committee) delete '$39,389,000' and insert in lieu thereof: '$39,989,000: *Provided*, That on and after July 1, 1964, appropriations available for classing or grading cotton without charge to producers thereof shall be available for providing micronaire readings on cotton without charge to producers thereof; and hereafter there may be transferred to any such appropriation such sums from nonadministrative funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation as may be necessary for providing such micronaire readings in addition to other funds available for this purpose, such transfer, except for the cost of micronaire readings on cotton in which producers have obtained Commodity Credit Corporation price support, to be reimbursed from subsequent appropriations therefor.' "

ADJUSTMENT OF RATES OF BASIC COMPENSATION OF CERTAIN OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES—AMENDMENTS (AMENDMENT NO. 1081)

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to the pay raise bill, H.R. 11049. This amendment deals with the pension on retirement pay that Members of Congress receive.

Under existing law, the annual payment is predicated upon the average salaries of the 5 highest years of pay.

My amendment would change that requirement that the base be the 5 highest years, and would make the base the average pay of Members of Congress through the years which they have served.

Mr. President, I send the amendment to the desk and ask that it be printed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received, printed, and will lie on the table.

Mr. CLARK. On behalf of Senators Hart, Case, Neuberger, and myself, I send an amendment to the desk and ask that it be printed. We intend to offer this amendment to the amendment proposed by the Senator from New York [Mr. Keating] to H.R. 11049, an act to adjust and raise the basic compensation of Federal officers and employees in the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the amendment may be printed in the Congressional Record at this point in my remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 1083) is as follows:

At the end of the bill insert the following new title:

"TITLE VI—INTEGRITY IN GOVERNMENT

"Sec. 601. (a) Each Member of the Senate and the House of Representatives (including the Resident Commissioner), each civil or military officer and each employee of the executive or legislative branch of the Government of the United States or any department or agency thereof who is compensated at a rate in excess of $15,000 per annum shall file annually, and each individual who is a candidate of a political party in a general election for the office of Senator or Representative, or Resident Commissioner in the House of Representatives but who, at the time he becomes a candidate does not occupy any such office, shall file within one month after he becomes a candidate for such office, with the Comptroller General a report containing a full and complete statement of—

"(1) the amount and source of each item of income, each item of reimbursement for any expenditure, and each gift or aggregate of gifts from one source (other than gifts from any relative or his spouse) received by him or by him and his spouse jointly during the preceding calendar year which exceeds $100 in amount or value; including any fee or other honorarium received by him for or in connection with the preparation or delivery of any speech or address, attendance at any convention or other assembly of individuals, or the preparation of any article or other composition for publication, and the monetary value of subsistence, entertainment, travel, and other facilities received by him in kind;

"(2) the value of each asset held by him, or by him and his spouse jointly, and the amount of each liability owned by him, or by him and his spouse jointly, as of the close of the preceding calendar year;

"(3) all dealings in securities or commodities by him, or by him and his spouse jointly, or by any person acting on his behalf or pursuant to his direction during the preceding calendar year; and

"(4) all purchases and sales of real property or any interest therein by him, or by him and his spouse jointly, or by any person acting on his behalf or pursuant to his direction, during the preceding calendar year.

"(b) Except as hereinbefore provided, reports required by this section (other than reports so required by candidates of political parties) shall be filed not later than April 30 of each year. In the case of any person who ceases, prior to such date in any year, to occupy the office or position the occupancy of which imposes upon him the reporting requirements contained in subsection (a) shall file such report on the last day he occupies such office or position, or on such later date, not more than three months after such last day, as the Comptroller General may prescribe.

"(c) Reports required by this section shall be in such form and detail as the Comptroller General may prescribe. The Comptroller General may provide for the grouping of items of income, sources of income, assets, liabilities, dealings in securities or commodities, and purchases and sales of real property, when separate itemization is not feasible or is not necessary for an accurate disclosure of the income, net worth, dealing in securities and commodities, or purchases and sales of real property of any individual.

"(d) Each report required by this section shall be made under penalty for perjury. Any person who willfully fails to file a report required by this section, or who knowingly and willfully files a false report under this section, shall be fined $2,000 or imprisoned for not more than five years, or both.

"(e) All reports filed under this section shall be maintained by the Comptroller General as public records which, under such reasonable regulations as he shall prescribe, shall be available for inspection by members of the public.

"(f) For the purposes of any report required by this section, a individual shall be considered to have been a Member of the Senate or House of Representatives, a Resident Commissioner, or an officer or employee of the executive or legislative branch of the Government of the United States or any department or agency thereof, during any calendar year if he served in any such position for more than six months during such calendar year.

"(g) As used in this section—

"(1) The term 'income' means gross income as defined in section 61 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

"(2) The term 'security' means security as defined in section 2 of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended (15 U.S.C. 77b).

"(3) The term 'commodity' means commodity as defined in section 2 of the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended (7 U.S.C. 2).

"(4) The term 'dealings in securities or commodities' means any acquisition, holding, withholding, use, transfer, disposition, or other transaction involving any security or commodity.

"SEC. 602. Section 5 of the Administrative Procedure Act (5 U.S.C. 1004) is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(e) Communications to agency: All written communications and memoranda stating the circumstances, source, and substance of all oral communications made to the agency, or any officer or employee thereof, with respect to such case by any person who is not an officer or employee of the agency shall be made a part of the public record of such case. This subsection shall not apply to communications to any officer, employee, or agent of the agency engaged in the performance of investigative or prosecuting functions for the agency with respect to such case.'

"SEC. 603. (a) (1) There is hereby authorized to be established a Commission to be known as the 'Commission on Legislative Standards' (hereinafter referred to as the 'Commission') which shall be composed of four members to be appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate and four members to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"(2) The members shall be citizens of the United States (A) who are interested in good government and who by reason of professional training and experience are peculiarly qualified to carry out the duties of the Commission, and (B) who hold no elective or party office or position.

"(3) The Commission shall select a Chairman and a Vice Chairman from among its members and shall establish rules for its procedure.

"(4) Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

"(5) The members of the Commission shall each receive $50 per diem when engaged in the actual performance of duties vested in the Commission, plus reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of such duties.

"(b) Five members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

"(c) (1) The Commission shall have power to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable, without regard to the provisions of the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

"(2) The Commission is authorized without regard to any other provision of law to reimburse employees, experts, and consultants for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of their official duties and to make reasonable advances to such persons for such purposes.

"(d) The Commission shall conduct a thorough study of problems of conflicts of interest and of relations with executive and other agencies which confront Members of Congress with a view to devising and recommending measures and procedures to deal with such problems.

"(e) (1) The Commission or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof may, for the purposes of carrying out the provisions of this section, hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places, administer such oaths, and require by subpena or otherwise the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents as the Commission or such subcommittee may deem advisable. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the Chairman of the Commission, or the chairman of any such subcommittee (with the approval of a majority of the members thereof), and may be served by any person designated by the Chairman of the Commission or the chairman of any such subcommittee. The provisions of sections 102 to 104, inclusive, of the Revised Statutes (U.S.C., title 2, secs. 192–194), shall apply in the case of any failure of any witness to comply with any subpena or to testify when summoned under authority of this subsection.

"(2) The Commission may authorize the Chairman to make the expenditures herein authorized and such other expenditures as the Commission may deem advisable. When the Commission ceases its activities it shall submit to the Appropriations Committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives a statement of its fiscal transactions properly audited by the Comptroller General of the United States.

"(3) The Commission is authorized to secure from any department, agency, independent instrumentality of the Government or congressional committee any information it deems necessary to carry out its functions under this section; and each such department, agency, and instrumentality is authorized and directed to furnish such information to the Commission, upon request made by the Chairman of the Commission.

"(f) The Commission shall submit a final report of its activities and the results of its studies and investigations, together with such legislative recommendations as it may deem advisable, to the Congress not later than January 30, 1965, at which time the Commission shall cease to exist.

"(g) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section."

Mr. CLARK. This is the Case-Clark-Neuberger bill, S. 1261, rewritten as an amendment to the pay bill. It requires disclosure by Senators and all members of the executive branch, employees and officers of the Senate and of the House, and Members of the Congress, of their assets, securities, and real property transactions. It requires ex parte communications to regulatory agencies to be made a part of the public record. And it sets up a committee on legislative standards, consisting of four Members of the Senate and four Members of the House, to conduct a study of legislative conflicts of interest of employees of the legislative and executive branches.

AMENDMENT NO. 1084

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I submit an amendment to H.R. 11049, the Federal pay bill. The amendment eliminates the proposed $7,500 annual pay increase for Members of Congress. I ask that my amendment be printed.

The congressional pay increase is unjustified, unnecessary, and because it represents a dramatic example to the rest of the country, it could be seriously inflationary.

Members of Congress at their present $22,500 pay level already receive more than three times the income of the average American family.

According to the U.S. Department of Commerce, the average income of the American family is $7,200. Only about 2 percent of American families receive this.

When people are paid this handsomely in any line of work, the only convincing argument that even more should be paid is clear proof that without additional pay candidates simply cannot be recruited to do the job.

But in the case of Congress, seats are now more hotly contested than ever. It has become commonplace for candidates for the House of Representatives and their supporters to spend $30,000 or more in a single race.

Senate campaigns in the past few years typically cost $250,000 and up to more than a million dollars for a lone candidate.

When candidates and their supporters are willing to spend this kind of money, how in the world can we say a lush 33⅓-percent increase in salary is needed to secure people willing to serve as Congressmen?

No one has seriously argued that increased pay for Members of Congress will increase the competence or integrity of those who serve in the Congress.

Can this huge increase be justified on moral grounds? Are the trials and tribulations of congressional office so cruel that Members deserve this pay increase as solace? The answer is a loud "No."

A seat in the House or Senate is the best job in the world. If we could afford it, most of us would pay to hold this job. It is challenging, exciting, and gives a marvelous opportunity open to a very tiny minority of Americans for serving country and conscience.

Very few Members are in the Congress for the money. And no one should be. We can get along on the $22,500.

Congress has given itself as well as the rest of the country a tax cut this year. If the Member of Congress has other income, the tax saving will be even more. For the typical Member of Congress this will mean an $800 increase in take-home pay, even if he has no other income. That should be enough.

Implied in the tax cut at the time of its passage was that Congress would keep Federal spending down. How in the world can Congress even pretend to do this, unless it starts with itself.

Can anyone seriously believe in economy if he votes himself a huge one-third increase in salary on top of a salary already three times the size of the income enjoyed by the average American family and higher than the family income enjoyed by all but 2 percent of American families?

On the other hand, the President has made a persuasive case for increasing the pay of executive and judicial Government employees.

Cabinet officers, the judiciary, the entire Federal establishment must receive pay reasonably competitive with private enterprise or the Government simply cannot hire the competence it must have to do an efficient job.

This part of the pay bill is needed and justified. I warmly favor the pay increase for Federal employees, other than Members of the Congress. I stress and repeat I do favor the pay increase for the executive branch and the judiciary.

I will do my best to get a roll call for this amendment to cut out the congressional pay increase.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is it not a fact that in 1955 Congress increased the salaries of Members of Congress from $12,500 to $22,500, an increase of 80 percent?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. In 1955 the salaries were $12,500. If the increase is granted, in 1965 they will be lifted to $30,000. That means that in 9 years we will have increased our salaries by 140 percent. Is that correct?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is correct. I believe his figures are accurate. It is true, of course, that there was an expense allowance of $2,500, which some people felt was the equivalent of salary. But the increase was astronomical, and at least 100 percent under any kind of computation.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is it not also true that if we increase our salaries to $30,000, we will also be making ourselves a rich grant by way of increased retirement pay for each succeeding year that we serve in the capacity of Members of Congress?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is correct. It is certainly an additional advantage, because the increased contribution that we make will be matched by the Government.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I submitted an amendment this morning which will modify the present retirement law so as to make the retirement pay dependent upon the average pay of all the years which a Member of Congress serves in Congress, instead of the five highest years. Under the proposal in the pay increase bill, at the end of 5 years I would be entitled to a pension based on a salary of $30,000, instead of on a salary of $22,500. In my opinion that is a very lucrative emolument, to which I am not entitled.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator makes a good point.

AMENDMENT NO. 1087

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk to H.R. 11049. I ask that it may be received and printed and lie on the table, and also that it may be printed in the Record.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received and printed and will lie on the table; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the Record.

The amendment, submitted by Mr. Morse, is as follows:

On page 167, at the end of line 2, insert a new title, as follows:

"TITLE VI

"That each Member of the Senate and House of Representatives (including each Delegate and Resident Commissioner); each officer and employee of the United States who (1) receives a salary at a rate of $10,000 or more per annum or (2) holds a position of grade GS–15 or above, and each officer in the Armed Forces of the rank of colonel, or its equivalent, and above; and each member, chairman, or other officer of the national committee of a political party shall file annually with the Comptroller General a report containing a full and complete statement of—

"(1) the amount and resources of all income and gifts (of $100 or more in money or value, or in the case of multiple gifts from one person, aggregating $100 or more in money or value) received by him or any person on his behalf during the preceding calendar year;

"(2) the value of each asset held by or entrusted to him or by or to him and any other person and the amount of each liability owed by him, or by him together with any other person as to the close of the preceding year; and

"(3) the amount and source of all contributions during the preceding calendar year to any person who received anything of value on his behalf or subject to his direction or control or who, with his acquiescence, makes payments for any liability or expense incurred by him.

"Sec. 2. Each person required by the first section to file reports shall, in addition, file semiannually with the Comptroller General a report containing a full and complete statement of all dealings in securities or commodities by him, or by any person acting on his behalf or pursuant to his direction, during the preceding six-month period.

"Sec. 3. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b), the reports required by the first section of this Act shall be filed not later than March 31 of each year; and the reports required by section 2 shall be filed not later than July 31 of each year for the six-month period ending June 30 of such year, and not later than January 31 of each year for the six-month period ending December 31 of the preceding year.

"(b) In the case of any person required to file reports under this Act whose service terminates prior to the date prescribed by subsection (a) as the date for filing any report, such report shall be filed on the last day of such person's service, or on such later date, not more than three months after the termination of such service, as the Comptroller General may prescribe.

"Sec. 4. The reports required by this Act shall be in such form and detail as the Comptroller General may prescribe. The Comptroller General may provide for the grouping of items of income, sources of income, assets, liabilities, and dealings in securities or commodities, when separate itemization is not feasible or not necessary for an accurate disclosure of a person's income, net worth, or dealings in securities, and commodities.

"Sec. 5. Any person who willfully fails to file a report required by this Act or who willfully and knowingly files a false report shall be fined $2,000 or imprisoned for not more than five years, or both.

"Sec. 6. (a) As used in this Act—

"(1) The term 'income' means gross income as defined in section 22(a) of the Internal Revenue Code.

"(2) The term 'security' means security as defined in section 2 of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended (U.S.C., title 15, sec. 77b).

"(3) The term 'commodity' means commodity as defined in section 2 of the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended (U.S.C., title 7, sec. 2).

"(4) The term 'dealings in securities or commodities' means any acquisition, holding, withholding, use, transfer, disposition, or other transaction involving any security or commodity.

"(5) The term 'person' includes an individual, partnership, trust, estate, association, corporation, or society.

"(b) For the purposes of any report required by this Act, a person shall be considered to be a Member of the Senate or House of Representatives, an officer or employee of the United States and of the armed services as described in the first section of this Act, or a member, chairman, or other officer of the national committee of a political party, if he served (with or without compensation) in any such position during the period to be covered by such report, notwithstanding that his service may have terminated prior to December 31 of such calendar year.

"Sec. 7. The Comptroller General shall have authority to issue, reissue, and amend rules and regulations governing the publication of reports, or any part of them. He shall prescribe fees to cover the cost of reproduction. In formulating such rules and regulations, he shall seek to maximize the availability of reports for purposes of informing the public and agencies and officials of the Federal and local governments, and to minimize use of such records for private purposes."

AMENDMENT NO. 1088

Mr. KEATING (for himself and Mr. Javits) submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to House bill 11049, the Federal employees pay bill, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

FREE IMPORTATION OF WILD ANIMALS AND WILD BIRDS—AMENDMENT (AMENDMENT NO. 1085)

Mr. CURTIS submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the amendment (No. 465) intended to be proposed by Mr. Mansfield (for himself and other Senators) to the bill (H.R. 1839) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of wild animals and wild birds which are intended for exhibition in the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

AVAILABILITY OF CERTAIN CRITICAL MATERIALS DURING A WAR OR NATIONAL EMERGENCY—AMENDMENT (AMENDMENT NO. 1086)

Mr. METCALF submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 2272) to insure the availability of certain critical materials during a war or national emergency by providing for a reserve of such materials, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services and ordered to be printed.

ADJUSTMENT OF RATES OF BASIC COMPENSATION OF CERTAIN OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF AMENDMENTS

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yesterday I submitted two amendments to the bill H.R. 11049, the Federal pay bill. I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Lausche] appear as a cosponsor of the amendments.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ASSISTANCE TO ELDERLY PERSONS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, at its next printing, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss] be added as cosponsor of S. 2000, the bill to provide assistance in the development of new or improved programs to help older persons through grants to the States for community planning and services for training, through research, development, or training project grants, and to establish within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare an operating agency to be designated as the "Administration of Aging."

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2664) to amend section 6(o) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act to provide an exemption from induction for the sole surviving son of a family whose father died as a result of military service.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10053) to amend section 502 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, relating to construction differential subsidies.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11376) to provide a 1-year extension of certain excise tax rates.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Acting President pro tempore:

H.R. 9876. An act to amend the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act of 1961 by extending its provisions for 2 additional years and providing for a special project and study;

H.R. 10053. An act to amend section 502 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, relating to construction differential subsidies; and

H.R. 10314. An act to further amend the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended, to extend the expiration date of certain authorities, thereunder, and for other purposes.

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE CONTINUES RECORD OF EFFECTIVE SERVICE—PUBLIC PRINTER HARRISON PROPOSES RELOCATION AND CONSOLIDATION

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, 104 years ago last Tuesday, President Buchanan signed an act establishing a Government Printing Office. Almost obscured by the momentous events taking place in early March of 1861 as prolog to the Civil War, the U.S. Government Printing Office opened its doors for business. It has served the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of the Government continuously since that time. History and circumstances have demonstrated what a remarkably sound piece of business this was for our Republic.

In the first 6 months of its operation, the Government Printing Office recovered its entire purchase cost of $135,000. Prior to 1873, the proceedings and debates of the Congress were reported in abbreviated form in newspapers, printed by private firms, or contracted for from printers elected by the House and Senate who were, more often than not, different printers for each body. At the conclusion of each session, the Congress was regularly petitioned for redress of losses incurred in reproducing these proceedings. Finally, due to irregularities, delays, and excessive costs, this highly important segment of public printing was placed under the Congressional Printer, and the first CONGRESSIONAL RECORD appeared on March 5, 1873. Since that date, the Congress of the United States has been served effectively and economically by this agency.

In 1861, our Government ministered to the political, economic, and social needs of 32 million Americans. Today, we respond to the vastly expanded requirements of a population approaching 200 million. The Government Printing Office has met the challenge of a nation's government on the move. This agency now employs more than 7,000 persons and occupies a four-building complex a few short blocks from this Chamber. It leases paper-storage facilities in Franconia, Va., as well as document-storage warehouses in both Washington, D.C., and Maryland. In the past fiscal year, the Government Printing Office produced over a billion copies of publications of all classes. This total includes over 8 million copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and 3.8 million copies of the Federal Register. In addition, nearly 2½ billion postal cards were printed in fiscal 1963.

Its Division of Public Documents mailed out 181 million publications, and returned nearly $6 million to the U.S. Treasury from the sale of these publications. The Government Printing Office's dollar volume now exceeds $127 million annually. It includes central-office printing, field-service printing, blank paper supply to Government departments, as well as purchases of printing from commercial contractors. Purchases of printing from commercial contractors accounted for 47 percent of the printing and binding volume for 1963.

This agency is rather unique, since it operates similarly to conventional commercial enterprises: With a working capital used as a revolving fund. For example, when an agency orders printing from the Government Printing Office, the job is done and the publication delivered, together with a bill for the work. During the interval between production and collection, the Printing Office pays its help and purchases paper and supplies, using its revolving fund. When the agency pays its bill, the Government Printing Office reconstitutes its working capital on deposit with the U.S. Treasury. Capital purchases and replacement of obsolete equipment must be made from a small percentage of retained earnings to keep pace with rapidly changing technology which is so characteristic of the printing industry.

Realistic and competitive price structures are testimony as to how well the Government Printing establishment is doing its task. In recent months, Public Printer James L. Harrison, the most capable administrator of this important office, has submitted a proposal to the Congress for vacating the present four-building complex and distant warehousing facilities. Mr. Harrison envisions the relocating and consolidating of Government Printing Office operations at a building especially designed to meet its production and storage needs. Substantially lower operating costs are forecast if the Public Printer's plan is approved, with savings conservatively estimated at nearly $3 million annually. Moreover, such a move would permit conveying the highly desirable, but industrially incompatible, North Capitol Street space to the General Services Administration to help alleviate the serious space shortage which this agency has indicated exists in the close-in metropolitan area. As an example, the Post Office Department has an urgent requirement for Government Printing Office's warehouse with its railroad siding, and which is adjacent to the main Post Office Department building. Space thus returned to General Services Administration has an annual rental value in excess of $1.5 million. These multistory buildings are ideally suited for office use, but not for handling the paper tonnages processed daily by a large printing plant such as the Government Printing Office. A preliminary engineering survey, conducted by a highly reputable industrial engineering firm, confirmed Printing Office staff findings that printing operations in a two-story structure would be significantly more efficient and economical. I am told that the Comptroller General of the United States has examined these figures and is satisfied as to their authenticity. It is hoped that the Congress will consider this plan favorably.

Relocating the Government Printing Office out of the highly congested area it now occupies to a building constructed especially to accommodate the warehousing and manufacturing operations associated with public printing seems a wise and businesslike decision, especially when it has been shown that the cost of this relocation can be capitalized from savings in less than 11 years. After this building has been amortized, the American taxpayer will continue to benefit substantially from reduced operating costs and other economies brought about by this projected move. Relocation of the Government Printing Office is a comprehensive, practical, and well thought out solution to the pressing problems with which this agency is faced.

The Government Printing Office personnel have served this body with dedication and distinction for more than a century. The workers and machines, I am sure, will continue to do the necessary and the workmanlike job for the Congress and other departments. The Office is conscious of functional responsibilities to the Federal Establishment and is mindful of its fiscal responsibilities to the taxpayers of our country.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President——

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Has the business of the day been laid down yet?

Mr. MANSFIELD. It has not.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I should like to inquire of the majority leader what is intended to be called for?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Alaska omnibus bill. The conference report on excise taxes. The Aiken food stamp bill. The mass transit bill, perhaps. The Foreign Agents Registration Act. Social security legislation as it applies to the State of Nevada, provided there is sufficient time.

CIVILIAN NUCLEAR POWER INDUSTRY

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I read with considerable interest a series of articles which was published in the business section of the New York Times of Sunday, June 14 in regard to the civilian nuclear power industry. The purport of these articles was that civilian nuclear power has now passed out of the experimental stage and has become a healthy, viable part of the Nation's industrial system.

During hearings conducted last week by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, the same point was made by witnesses representing Government and private industry; namely, that nuclear power is now close to being competitive in the electric power industry, and that a booming future is in store for it.

I do not believe that anyone will quarrel with the thought that nuclear power has achieved a state of maturity far beyond that anticipated a few years ago.

It is my belief, Mr. President, that what has happened in this industry in recent months proves conclusively that the Government should get out of the nuclear power industry completely and should allow the industry to stand on its own feet.

No one will deny that massive Government expenditures are responsible for the tremendous advances of nuclear power since the adoption of the amendment to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 which emphasized the civilian aspects of nuclear power. The Government has spent, to date, more than $1½ billion on programs directly connected with civilian nuclear power and other billions of taxpayer dollars to bring the technology of this new industry to a state of usefulness. The technology has either been developed in Government-owned installations or by private industries, with the Government subsidizing a major part of the costs. Mr. President, Government participation in the civilian nuclear power program has now exceeded the limits which are compatible with our private enterprise system.

Testimony of officials of the Atomic Energy Commission and of private utilities and other privately owned companies engaged actively in this field stress that civilian nuclear power has now taken its place in the Nation's industrial system. Therefore, all Government assistance and subsidies should end, and the Government should get out of the civilian nuclear power business. Officials of General Electric and Westinghouse assured the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy that they are willing and able to supply efficient nuclear reactors to any privately owned utility which desires to build a nuclear plant as a part of its system. The New Jersey Power & Light Co. decided, on the basis of cold economic facts, to build a 500,000-kilowatt nuclear plant in place of a coal-fired generating plant. Some utility companies are predicting that, by 1980, 40 percent of their total capacity will be nuclear. Other utilities are considering building nuclear plants without Government subsidy of any kind. Apparently, they think it is smart business for them to do so.

But, Mr. President, the AEC seems to approach this matter of civilian nuclear power today with the same degree of urgency that it expressed 10 years ago. The AEC seems to wish to keep the Government involved in further developments of nuclear power at a cost estimated to be around $200 million a year. Even with the job done, these men in the AEC are reluctant to free this new industry from their authority and power.

It also must be borne in mind that if the Government persists in its present policy of using public funds to advance this new nuclear power industry, it will be unfairly creating competition to privately owned, taxpaying industries now producing fuels for the generation of electric power. This is not a wise or sound policy.

One of the industries which will suffer from a subsidized nuclear power industry is coal. This fuel has suffered grievous market losses during the past two decades, but is slowly fighting its way back to economic health through commendable efforts to reduce the delivered costs of coal. Its primary success has been in the electric utility market, and nuclear power, of course, is a direct threat to this large and growing market.

I believe that the coal industry has the right to compete for this and other markets, free of Government intervention. Coal is still an important industry, and in the seven major coal-producing States it means more than $2 billion a year to the economy in wages to miners and transportation workers, expenditures for purchases within coal States, and in State and local taxes. In Ohio, for example, coal contributes more than $200 million annually to the economy and provides employment for 17,000 persons. It is simply not right for the Federal Government, through the unwise use of taxpayers' funds, to subsidize a competing fuel, to jeopardize these jobs and the future growth and expansion of the coal industry.

As I said, Mr. President, the time has now arrived, based upon statements by the Atomic Energy Commission, the nuclear power industry, and the utility companies, themselves, to remove the Government completely from the picture.

There is no doubt that the so-called light water reactors, which were developed as a direct result of Government activity and expenditure, are capable of producing commercial electric power.

Further, there is no doubt that a great deal of pressure is being exerted to keep the Government involved in the further development and refinement of the so-called thermal reactors. The AEC wants to build four large plants in the 500,000-kilowatt range to demonstrate the practicality of the so-called advanced converters.

What business has the Federal Government in spending taxpayers' money to refine and improve these thermal reactors? Why cannot the manufacturers of nuclear reactors, who stand to profit from the sale of these reactors, bear the costs? Why should not the private utilities, who will use these reactors to produce commercial power to increase the profits of their operation, assume the financial risk? Why should it be the taxpayers who carry this load for GE and Westinghouse and the large private utility companies? All evidence indicates that these companies so vitally interested would welcome the withdrawal of the Government from the industry. This is welcome news, and I commend these industries for such an enlightened attitude.

Civilian nuclear power has been nurtured by funds from the Treasury. The Government has had to offer subsidies to induce private industry to build the plants. A sufficient number of plants have now been built to demonstrate the feasibility and practicality of nuclear power. I am sure that the private utility companies are not planning to build nuclear plants because they present an interesting exercise in physics. They are making their decision on a dollars-and-cents basis.

The time has come, Mr. President, for Congress to take the lead in requiring the withdrawal by the Government from the civilian nuclear power program. It can do this by passing the following legislation:

First. Require the immediate ownership of nuclear fuel by private utilities and others who would use it as a part of their normal commercial operations. The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy held hearings on this legislation last week. Personally, I believe that the transition period from Government to private ownership should be held to the shortest possible time. The Government should get out of the business of providing nuclear fuel for private utilities.

As it is now, the Government acquires the fuel, processes it in its multibillion-dollar plant, lets the utilities use the fuel free for a 5-year period or either leases the fuel to the utilities at 4.75 percent annually, as opposed to the cost of 10 to 14 percent annually under private financing. The Government should not be permitted to assure utilities that it will take plutonium created in nuclear power operation off of their hands at a guaranteed price. There is no market for plutonium at this time; but why should the Government purchase this nonweapons material and finance and store it for years?

Second. The Government should stop subsidizing indemnity insurance for privately owned nuclear powerplants. Manufacturers of nuclear reactors, the

AEC, and the operating utilities all assure the public and the users that nuclear plants are perfectly safe. If this is true, Mr. President, the Government should not supply $500 million of $560 million in indemnity insurance required on each plant, and at only a fraction of what such indemnity insurance would cost through private channels. This is nothing less than a direct subsidy to a privately owned and operated enterprise.

Third. To insure that future refinement of thermal reactors will be financed and conducted by private enterprise, legislation should be passed restricting Government-financed research and development work to the fast breeder reactor. The fast breeder reactor is a legitimate concern of the Government. It is still in the experimental stage and its development is of such potential value to the Nation's long-term energy requirements that continued Government work in this field is warranted. But further spending of taxpayers' money to improve and refine thermal reactors is completely unjustified. The Government should get out of this phase of civilian nuclear power entirely and leave it to free enterprise.

Recently, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy held hearings on legislation providing for private ownership of nuclear fuel. The utility industry, reactor manufacturers and others testified in behalf of the legislation. Although there was some disagreement as to details, everyone was united in a belief that Government domination and participation in this field is not desirable.

This is, as I stated earlier, a healthy attitude. I urge the Congress to take action not only to pass the private ownership bill, but also to take other action necessary to get the Government out of the nuclear power business.

The President's eloquent statement at Holy Cross College as to the advanced state of the nuclear power industry is further and compelling evidence that the time has arrived to take the step.

I am hopeful, Mr. President, that the Nation's investor-owned utility companies, the manufacturers of reactors and other private industries engaged in this new field, will join in the fight to bring this about.

We are assured by the Atomic Energy Commission that there are no technical difficulties in the path of private ownership and operation of the civilian nuclear power industry. It seems to me, Mr. President, that the protection of our free enterprise system demands that the Government turn over this new industry to private enterprise without further delay.

I ask unanimous consent to have the articles to which I have referred printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, June 13, 1964]

Changes Enhance Promise of Atom—Extended Period of Use Is Aiding Energy Projects

(By John W. Finney)

WASHINGTON, June 13.—If nuclear power is at last fulfilling its economic promise, it is partly because its developers underestimated the lifetime of atomic fuels.

Atomic fuels are living longer than expected in the radiation-filled inferno of an atomic furnace. This longer lifetime, in turn, explains in large measure why costs of nuclear power are being brought down to economically competitive levels.

Atomic fuels are extremely expensive, not only in their fissionable uranium material, but also in the cost of fabricating the fuel rods that go into the core of a reactor. Any reduction in fuel costs, therefore, has a direct and substantial effect in reducing the cost of the kilowatts that finally appear on the bus bar of an atomic powerplant.

One way to reduce the fuel costs is to keep the fuel rods in the reactor longer, thus reducing the expense of reprocessing the spent rods and replacing them with new fuel elements. This is precisely what has been happening in recent years as the nuclear engineers extended what they call the "burnup" time of atomic fuels.

TOO CONSERVATIVE

The longer lifetimes have come about not because of any technical ingenuity by the nuclear engineers but largely because of their misjudgments about the durability of atomic fuels.

As Dr. Frank Pittman, Director of Reactor Development in the Atomic Energy Commission observed, "We were just too conservative in our estimates."

The misjudgment was corrected as experience was gained with the first generation of water-cooled reactors and it became evident that their uranium oxide fuels would last considerably longer than had been predicted.

Only a few years ago, for example, nuclear engineers were talking in terms of getting 10,000 megawatt-days of power for each ton of uranium fuel. A megawatt-day is a unit the engineers use for measuring the amount of energy in a fuel. It is equal to 1 million watts of energy produced in 1 day.

On the basis of operating experience with such reactors as the Yankee atomic powerplant in Rome, Mass., and the Commonwealth Edison plant in Dresden, Ill., the estimated lifetimes have now been raised to the range of 18,000 to 20,000 megawatt-days, and Dr. Pittman predicts that in the relatively near future the figure will rise to 25,000.

For the reactor manufacturers and the utility operators, this extended lifetime has become a significant factor in reducing the cost of nuclear power. The manufacturers, for example, are now willing to give guarantees on the energy lifetime of the fuels, and the utilities do not have to look forward to repeated and expensive changes in the reactor fuel loadings.

The cost of nuclear fuel accounts for about a third of the cost of atomic electricity. Part of the cost comes in the expense of fabricating the fuel rods to the fine tolerances and high standards required for a reactor, part in the enriched uranium fuel that is burned and part in the reprocessing to remove the unburned uranium and newly created plutonium from the spent fuel.

OYSTER CREEK COSTS

In the pace-setting Jersey Central plant at Oyster Creek, N.J., for example, the cost of the first fuel loading is estimated at $24 million. The fabricating costs come to $10.3 million, the enriched uranium that is burned to $12 million and reprocesssing costs to $3.7 million.

Another factor in lowering the fuel costs, although not as significant as the extended lifetimes, has been a reduction in fabricating costs as companies gained experience in the difficult technology.

Five years ago, the fabricating costs ran between $125 and $150 a kilogram of fuel. Now the cost is below $100 and Dr. Pittman says it should go still lower as production increases and unit costs consequently come down.

Much of the basic technology that has led to the reduced fuel costs has come from the pioneering work of Vice Adm. Hyman G. Rickover in his development of atomic powerplants.

It was Admiral Rickover who decided over a decade ago to develop the uranium oxide fuels that have proved to have unexpectedly long lifetimes. The fuels were incorporated in the reactor built by Admiral Rickover at Shippingport, Pa., the Nation's first large-scale atomic powerplant. Their value was proved in the Yankee and Dresden plants, which were based largely on the fuel technology developed at Shippingport.

A new and somewhat political uncertainty about future fuel costs has been introduced recently by the Atomic Energy Commission's revival of its proposal to end the Government monopoly over fissionable materials and permit private ownership of nuclear fuels.

The proposal has been endorsed as a matter of principle by the utility industry, despite a realization that the practical effect of the move could be to increase fuel costs.

Under the past Government ownership, the utilities have been able to "lease" the atomic fuels from the Commission at an annual rate of 4.75 percent of the value of the uranium. With private ownership the utilities would have to finance the purchase of the uranium, which costs $20 million and more for a large reactor, at probably a much higher rate. Generally, for example, utilities charge 14 percent as a carrying charge for their fuel inventories.

Private ownership, therefore, is expected to increase fuel costs slightly, adding probably a fraction of a mill to the cost of nuclear power.

For the immediate future, the increased cost may be offest by the fact that utilities would be able to buy cheap uranium at around $4 to $6 a pound, rather than the $8 a pound minimum that the Commission has been paying as an incentive and subsidy to the uranium-mining industry.

Eventually, however, this high-grade, low-cost uranium will be mined out and the expectation is that there will be a gradual rise in uranium fuel costs. By that time, it is hoped, the increase in fuel costs will be offset by technological improvements in the reactors.

[From the New York Times, June 11, 1964]

Johnson Reports a Breakthrough in Atomic Power—Says Technology Leading to Economical Use Will Be Available to the World

(By Tom Wicker)

WORCESTER, MASS., June 10.—President Johnson said today that a recently achieved economic breakthrough meant the long promised day of economical nuclear power is close at hand.

The resulting new technology, "now being applied in the United States, will be available to the world," he said.

The President, who spoke at commencement exercises at Holy Cross College here, gave no details of the breakthrough. However, it was apparent that he was referring to the $68 million nuclear powerplant being built for the Jersey Central Power & Light Co., at Oyster Creek, N.J.

Mr. Johnson said that by September 1 he would report to the Third International Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy "on our new capability to use the power of the atom to meet human needs."

PLANT DESIGN IMPROVED

The breakthrough to which he referred has come in the last 6 to 8 months. More efficient plant design and longer life of nuclear fuels are expected to make nuclear power ultimately competitive with other forms of power in areas with large powerplants.

The Oyster Creek plant thus symbolically opened the door for greater interest in nuclear power here and abroad. Subsequently, the Mohawk Power Co. decided to have a similar plant built at Oswego, N.Y.

Mr. Johnson's remarks were part of an address to about 20,000 persons in the Fitton Field Stadium at Holy Cross. In the speech, he warned that "many of our most urgent problems" would exist even if the cold war were ended today.

A WARNING ON ISOLATION

"Even if peace were to come to the nations," Mr. Johnson said, "ominous obstacles to man's efforts to build a great world society" would remain.

"Those who live in the emerging community of nations will ignore the problems of their neighbors at the risk of their own prosperity," he said. They would become, he warned "an increasingly isolated island of wealth in the midst of mounting misery."

Mr. Johnson proposed that 1965, which has been designated International Cooperation Year, should also become "the Year of Science."

"I propose to dedicate this year to finding new techniques for making man's knowledge serve man's welfare," he said. "Let it be a turning point in the struggle—not of man against man, but of man against nature. In the midst of tension, let us begin to chart a course toward the possibilities of conquest which bypass the politics of the cold war."

Mr. Johnson said that he intended "to call upon all the resources of this Nation, public and private, to work with other nations to find new methods of improving the life of man."

This was the President's sixth commencement address this year, probably giving him the world's record for a single year. He received the honorary degree of doctor of civil law, his 5th honorary degree since becoming President and the 24th he holds.

Despite the occasion, Mr. Johnson's appearance here had a certain political tone. A crowd of about 150,000 persons lined the 6-mile route through this heavily Democratic city from the municipal airport to Fitton Field.

Mr. Johnson was cheered heartily in crowded downtown areas and spent about 10 minutes shaking hands with another crowd of about 3,000 persons that welcomed him at the airport.

The motorcade was routed through downtown Worcester. The city's schools had been closed for the day and the route was lined with school bands and drum and bugle corps.

Gov. Endicott Peabody of Massachusetts, a Democrat, who is seeking reelection, rode in the motorcade in another car. At Fitton Field, he told the applauding crowd that Mr. Johnson had been considered by President Kennedy "the best fitted of all living Americans to be President of the United States."

This was apparently a referenence to Mr. Kennedy's choice of Mr. Johnson to run for Vice President on the Democratic ticket in 1960.

Mr. Johnson interrupted his prepared address to announce to the crowd that cloture had been voted in the Senate to halt the filibuster against his civil rights bill.

He had just said, "We are going ahead, in our country, to bring an end to poverty and racial injustice."

That brought heavy applause. After it died, the President said:

"In the last 10 minutes, we have made considerable progress when we voted cloture in the Senate today by a vote of 71 to 29."

This brought even heavier applause.

Mr. Johnson, speaking in a city largely populated by Roman Catholics and at a Catholic college, opened by saying he was so surrounded by Irish aids inherited from President Kennedy that he sometimes felt like "a one-man ecumenical conference."

Then he paid high tribute to the late Pope John XXIII and to President Kennedy "two of the great men of this century."

Both, he said, "left a world transformed by their triumphs and lessened by their leaving."

"They both handed on a heritage of hope, a vision of the future which will occupy the thoughts and labors of men for generations to come," he said.

The large-scale nucelar reactor, he said, "offers a dramatic prospect of transforming sea water into water suitable for human consumption and industrial use."

"Large-scale nuclear reactors and desalting plants offer in combination economic electric power and usable water in areas of need," he said.

The Jersey Central nuclear powerplant being built by the General Electric Co., will have a capacity of 515,000 kilowatts when it is put into operation. Later, at maximum capacity, its output is expected to be 620,000 kilowatts.

At that maximum, the estimated cost of the power would be about 4.5 mills per kilowatt-hour. This rate would be competitive with power produced by other methods in about half of the United States. But this capacity would not be reached until the latter part of the decade.

Mr. Johnson said the technology of the plant would be shared with the world.

One difficulty in doing so, however, will be that the 4.5-mill rate can be reached only in plants at least as large as Oyster Creek will be. Such an output could be absorbed only in industrially advanced countries with large existing power grids—Japan, for example, or Britain.

Hopes Bolstered for Atom Power—President Johnson's Report of New Strides Studied by Utility Executives—Progress Is Outlined—But Some Industry Leaders Doubt "A Breakthrough" Describes Advances

(By Gene Smith)

President Johnson sought last week to remove any doubts over progress in the development of cheap electric power from the atom.

Speaking before graduation exercises last Tuesday at Holy Cross College in Worcester, Mass., the President said that a recently achieved "economic breakthrough" meant that the "long promised day of economical nuclear power is close at hand."

He did not elaborate, but those in the industry felt certain that the President was referring to the $68 million Oyster Creek, N.J., nuclear powerplant for which the Jersey Central Power & Light Co. is seeking a construction permit. This is slated to have an initial capacity of 515,000 kilowatts of electricity, but is expected to reach thereafter a capacity in excess of 600,000 kilowatts.

ECONOMIC ANALYSIS

The utility's economic analysis of the plant showed that at full capacity power would be delivered at a 620,000-kilowatt level at a cost ranging from 3.79 mills per kilowatt-hour during the first 5 years to 3.97 mills in the final 21 to 30 years.

A comparable fossil-fueled (coal, oil, or gas) plant at Oyster Creek could be expected to come in at 4.34 mills per killowatt-hour in the initial 5 years and drop to 4.33 mills in the final 10 years. Or, as Jersey Central explained in its own analysis: "After a reasonable break-in period, the station is expected to produce electric power at a total cost of less than 4 mills per kilowatt-hour—which is appreciably below the expected total cost of power from any other type of station that Jersey Central could build at this location."

But there are still many in the electric power industry who doubt that "breakthrough" is the proper word to describe the Oyster Creek development.

Donald R. McClang, president and chief executive officer of Pacific Power & Light Co., of Portland, Oreg., told a meeting of security analysts last Thursday that "from our viewpoint, it (Oyster Creek) is not a breakthrough but merely a matter of the progress that is being made every year."

On the other hand, a top executive of another leading west coast utility has gone on record as predicting that by 1980 his company will have 40 percent of its generation coming from atomic-fueled power.

MANY FACTORS

Whether atomic power is really "economical" or "competitive" depends on a variety of measures. There can be little doubt that Oyster Creek offers the electric utilities the lowest-cost power to date from any nuclear source. Nor can there be any doubt that the less-than-4-mill level was reached in far faster time than most industry experts had predicted.

But there are still areas where conventional fuels are cheaper and there is no question but that hydroelectric power will remain lower-priced for years to come. It is also true that the threat of nuclear power has produced radical cuts in the costs of delivered coal. No matter how anyone looks at it, the evolution of nuclear-fueled power has been a great boon to consumers.

In its analysis, Jersey Central noted that its present cost for fossil fuel was about 29.5 cents per million British thermal units. A British thermal unit, or B.t.u., is the amount of heat energy needed to raise the temperature of 1 pound of water 1° F. A subsequent proposal by coal and railroad interests reduced this to 26 cents per million B.t.u.'s, which formed the basis for the economic analysis.

"In order to offset the economic advantage of the nuclear station at the 620,000-kilowatt expected capability, the delivered cost of fossil fuel at the Oyster Creek site would have to be less than 20 cents per million B.t.u.'s" the company reported.

There are areas where such fuel is available. For example, mine-mouth power stations in the Appalachian area use fuel costing about 16 to 17 cents per million B.t.u.'s for generating the power on site. This does not include costs for transmission and distribution. Plants near gas and oil fields can also produce power at lower costs.

For the Nation as a whole, however, nuclear-fueled plants that may deliver power at the below-4-mill rate should prove competitive in many areas. They would certainly be lower than rates in New England, California, and Florida.

James F. Young, general manager of GE's atomic products division at Palo Alto, Calif., credited development of the Oyster Creek type plant on technical improvements, chief of which were development of a single-cycle system that is far less complicated than previous reactor systems and the availability of increased-size pressure vessels pioneered by Combustion Engineering, Inc., with the prospect of similar units from the Babcock & Wilcox Co.

Mr. Young said that GE has already told the power industry that it stands ready to "take orders for a half dozen or more of these units at this price level."

He said he was very pleased to hear the President promise to make available such plants and information to the free world.

As for critics and "doubting Thomases," Mr. Young said that there was some truth that the new plant is "a result of further process," but he also emphasized that the key factor was the jump to high-capacity plants. He also sought to assure the coal industry that GE's own "fastest estimates" on the growth of nuclear power indicated that coal consumption by utilities would still double by 1975 and that "nuclear power will share in the industry's growth but will be far from taking over the entire growth of the power industry."

J. E. Rengel, general manager of the atomic power division of the Westinghouse Electric Corp. GE's major competitor in the field, agreed that "nuclear power plants for generating electricity in large blocks of power are today competitive with fossil fuels in a number of areas where the cost of fuel delivered is above the national average."

As recently as last December 3, Sir William Cook, member of the United Kingdom Atomic Energy Commission, and Sherman R. Knapp, then president of the Connecticut Light & Power Co., predicted that atomic power would be on a competitive commercial basis with other forms of fuel "within about 4 years."

Whether Oyster Creek is, as the President has indicated, an "economic breakthrough" remains to be seen, but certainly no one can dispute the fact the nuclear power industry has come an unbelievably long way since the pioneering Shippingport, Pa., plant "went critical," or reached the condition where the chain reaction was capable of being sustained, on December 7, 1957.

Contrast that plant's energy cost—delivered at an estimated 60.15 mills per killowatt-hour back in 1957—with the expected less-than-4 mills for Oyster Creek somewhere in late 1967 or early 1968, and it's obvious that the nuclear power industry has far outstripped the predictions of its strongest backers.

ANNUAL MEETING OF AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF INSTRUCTORS OF THE BLIND

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, the American Association of Instructors of the Blind is presently holding its annual meeting at the Perkins School for the Blind, in Watertown, Mass. My grandfather, my father, and I have served as trustees of the Perkins School, and my brother presently is a trustee of that fine institution. It is the oldest institution of its kind in the country, and is doing an outstanding job of working with blind people. I consider it a great honor to have served as a trustee.

The American Association of Instructors of the Blind, to which the Perkins School is playing host this week, is celebrating its 93d anniversary; and it, too, has made many important contributions to the welfare of our sightless citizens. Not only has it done much to broaden the horizons of the visually handicapped and to extend their opportunities, but it has also helped to increase public awareness of the useful role the blind can play in our society. It has sought to dispel many misconceptions with respect to the handicapped.

The number of visually handicapped children in the Nation's schools has increased sharply in recent years, as have special residential school enrollments. Between 1949 and 1958, for example, the number of public school systems reporting enrollments of blind children increased tenfold. In the same period, public school facilities for children classified as partially seeing nearly doubled. The increased number of visually handicapped people attending institutions of higher learning is a tribute to the success of their instructors at grade school level in stimulating and training them. Many are now being educated for careers which demand great technical and professional knowledge.

Not only have the programs been expanded, but a new philosophy and different types of programs have also evolved. This is due in part to the caliber, imagination, and dedication of instructors of the blind, and it makes it more important than ever that they be chosen carefully. The results they have achieved have been remarkable, and must serve as a tremendous satisfaction to them. Theirs is the challenging and rewarding task of enriching the lives of people who are visually handicapped and of introducing them to new experiences which will help them become independent, well-adjusted adults, prepared to take their places in society.

On the occasion of this annual meeting of the American Association of Instructors of the Blind, I commend them for their dedication and for their accomplishments. I take this occasion also to point to the accomplishments of the Perkins School for the Blind, of which all residents of Massachusetts are proud.

WINNING ESSAYS IN 1964 McGEE SENATE INTERNSHIP CONTEST

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, in order that the Members of this body may share with me the excellence of thought and the depth of understanding shown by the Wyoming young people who were honorable mention winners in the 1964 McGee Senate Internship Contest, I ask unanimous consent that two of these essays—by Martha Joan Edwards, of Lander; and Guy G. Ray, of Rawlins—be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the essays were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAKING DEMOCRACY WORK BETTER

(By Martha Joan Edwards)

Education of every citizen and active participation by every citizen are the keys to a working democracy. The word "democracy" comes from two Greek words—demos, meaning people; and kratia, meaning rule. Because our government means rule "by the people, of the people, and for the people," these two things—education and participation—are essential.

Far too many citizens of the United States are either totally, or at least partially, ignorant of the workings of our Government. This fact is due to no fault of the Government or to lack of available information on the subject. It is due simply to the fact that the people aren't interested, that they don't care what happens or what is going on.

As high school students we are exposed to the workings of our Government through a course in American government. But unfortunately, this is often as far as it goes. Most students are far too busy to bother about current national and international affairs. Social life seems to be more important. Perhaps this can be expected because, as students and minors, there is little we can do to affect these events. We are not allowed to vote and our political attitudes are primarily accepted from our parents. But this apathetic attitude and complete lack of concern are difficult to change when students become adults.

There are two ways in which we can combat this threat to our Nation. Parents must accept the responsibility of establishing respect and love for our country and its way of life in their homes and families. Today status symbols tend to crowd out family and homelife. This is the main reason for our declining patriotism. Another way in which we can combat this is to create a lively interest in national affairs in the elementary schools. The word interest implies more than just factual knowledge.

If teachers could show the students what is happening and how it relates to each of us personally, this interest would become more than schoolwork. It would become a vital part of our way of living.

Participation in government comes as a natural result of an active interest in it. There are many ways in which citizens of all ages can participate. Participation means more than voting in every election. It is more than running for an office and more than holding an elected office. It means keeping well informed on current and vital issues. It means developing a sound, logical, and unbiased attitude toward these issues and toward elected officials and their duties.

Support of a political party, regardless of which party you choose, is important in our biparty system. It is through the people of the party that political platforms and philosophies are developed and put into effect in Congress. This support begins at the local level where volunteers are always needed and welcomed.

High school students usually have youth groups connected with the two major parties. Through these a person can learn more about the candidates seeking offices and more about the party philosophies. On election days these groups can provide babysitting and transportation services. They can also help with door-to-door campaigning in support of their chosen candidates.

Many people say, "What does it matter whether or not I vote? One vote can't make much difference." But suppose as many as 50 or 100 people felt this way. Those votes could make quite a difference in a local election. If this many people in every community in the country held this attitude, what a difference it could make in the course of history.

When so many people feel this way and don't bother to vote, it means that each individual vote that is cast has more significance. Voting is the method through which the citizen's voice is heard, and it must be heard to preserve our freedom.

Through education and participation we can maintain our freedom and achieve tolerance for ideas, cultures, and peoples different from our own. The need for tolerance is being dramatically shown in our country today. Protests are being made every day, peacefully and violently, for civil rights for our Negro citizens. Tradition and inbred prejudices are the cause for these protests. Through education of these people with backward ideas and through support of civil rights for our equally human Negro citizens, perhaps we will someday achieve our goal of freedom for every individual.

Our country is the leading nation of the world, in spite of the fact that it is comparatively young. This fact is due to our Constitution and type of government and to our capitalistic system of free enterprise. We can, and should, be proud of our country and our Constitution and what they stand for.

Before us there have been those who have laid down their lives for this country because they believed in it and in its Government. Among the greatest of these were Nathan Hale, Abraham Lincoln, and, most recently, John F. Kennedy. These sacrifices were surely not made for anything trivial. They are dramatic evidence that our country is great and it is worth dying for.

We can see that our Constitution and our system of government with its checks and balances are based on one fundamental doctrine—that of the sacred worth of the human being. All our rights and privileges are the inalienable rights of every human being. Our Government was formed to protect these rights. Through knowledge about our Government and active participation in it, our rights will be protected and our Government will be indestructible.

MAKING DEMOCRACY WORK BETTER

(By Guy G. Ray)

There is no simple plan or solution which we may carry out in order to make democracy work better. However, if we the citizens of this great Nation unite and work together to improve our democracy, we are sure to attain this goal gradually. The areas in which we should begin to work for the improvement of our democracy are effective thinking, sharing political power, assuring the rights of individuals, meeting social needs, using the Nation's resources wisely, providing prosperity, attaining national status, and maintaining peace.

In essence, effective thinking could also be called critical thinking or even clear thinking. By using this type of thinking we must first recognize that a problem exists; then the problem must be defined, plans for action must be considered, information concerning the problem must be gathered, and finally action which we must be responsible must be taken. This mode of thinking would not only be working for the improvement of our democracy but at the same time it would benefit the individual who practices it. The results obtained from practicing critical thinking would be freedom of mind, freedom to face problems and attempt to solve them effectively while being prepared to accept all resulting consequences. Thus, we may conclude that effective thinking is the very root of successful solution to any problem. Our problem is to improve the operation of our democracy so we should begin to formulate our solution through effective thinking.

One of the goals of our Government is the intelligent and responsible sharing of power in order to attain justice for all. If we want our democracy to operate better, we must realize there is a proper balance to be maintained between the Government and the rights of the individual. How should the power to govern be divided among the various levels and branches of Government, and what specific functions can best be carried out by the Government? The proper balance between the Government and the rights of the individual are dependent upon the differing values which people place upon liberty and security. Today the proper balance of power among various levels and branches of our Government, along with specific duties of each, seems well defined and operative in most instances.

Our Nation has earned the reputation as a world leader in promoting human freedom and welfare. Through our Constitution, the Bill of Rights, countless court decisions, and tradition we have upheld dignity and worth of the individual. However, today it is evident that certain people throughout the country or groups of people are being denied the proper respect for the dignity and value to which they are entitled. These minority groups are denied the respect in all civic, economic, political, and social endeavors. If we wish to improve the operation of our democracy, we must recognize our responsibility in assuring others the rights to which they as citizens of the United States are entitled.

The social organization of any area is dependent upon the physical conditions thereof, the type of family a person is from, the community in which he is from, the education he has received, the additional opportunities for knowledge available, and the values set up by his community. Although our physical characteristics play an important role in what we hope to achieve in the social world, at the same time our social environment affects us by influencing the goals which we hope to attain. While we may satisfy many of our basic needs by means of our own judgments or actions, we must also depend upon social organization to satisfy those needs created by judgments or actions of others. By recognizing these social problems throughout our Nation and by attempting to solve them, we again will be taking another step toward making our democracy work better.

Mankind's relationship to nature is worthy of our active interest, for man has always had to depend upon nature to satisfy his needs and desires. The problem in this area of the Nation's resources perhaps touches us more deeply than any other, for the quality and quantity of our Nation's resources will determine our standard of living during our lifetime. A deficiency in this area would not only deprive us in a physical sense but also in a spiritual and cultural sense. The problem we must face in this area in order to bring about a more effective democracy is the one concerning how to conduct ourselves in relation to our Nation's resources so that we may achieve the greatest possible benefit for mankind.

By providing prosperity we mean that the standard of living is to be raised while inflation and depression are avoided in our economy. The economy of our Nation is similar to a machine that is asked to provide countless services for us. However, oftentimes there is conflicting or perhaps too large of a service asked of this machine which causes certain areas to be deprived of its service. Our whole population is seeking from this economy numerous goals such as security, stability, growth, freedom, and justice. Here again the improving and importance attached to these goals varies with each and every economic endeavor. In attempting to make our democracy work better by providing prosperity, we find that the problems involved in this area are numerous with no one of them having any simple one-step solution.

Throughout the world today, people are constantly making judgments of other nations. We judge not only our country but all other countries in the world in all fields in which the government and its citizens participate. In order for our country to achieve its national stature, we must first make our democracy work better to insure the attainment of this lofty goal.

Finally, if we work together to maintain worldwide peace, we will be helping our democracy to function better. The price that nations would have to pay if they were unable to resolve their differences peacefully is greater than it has ever been before. With such great differences existing between governments of the world today, these nations find it increasingly difficult to join together for the purpose of solving their differences. To prevent total destruction of the world and to allow for future generations to enter a world of pleasant environment, we must make our democracy work better and by doing so we will have benefited not only ourselves but also future generations.

In conclusion I can only propose that by uniting all people of this great country and working together for advancement in all of the eight mentioned fields, we may be justified in expecting our democracy to work better, not only for our own good but the good of the entire world. It is up to us, the people, to make democracy work better. We must all contribute to the cause, for it can be done by no one person alone or even numerous groups of people, but it requires the help of all. Whenever we feel that conditions of our country need to be improved, the best method of having them improved is by making democracy work better.

THE SHAMEFUL PLIGHT OF OVERSEA SCHOOLS FOR MILITARY DEPENDENTS

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, last February 17, I spoke in the Senate concerning the low salaries of teachers in our Defense Department schools, a festering sore of discriminatory treatment under which their pay has lagged increasingly behind that of teachers in U.S. schools at home. Under the Overseas Teachers Pay Act of 1959, comparability with similarly sized urban school systems was supposed to be maintained. But while average salaries in those areas range from $4,941 to $8,840 today, oversea teachers under the Department of Defense are paid from $4,435 to $6,215. According to the National Education Association, teacher salaries in the United States have risen an average of 15.3 percent, while oversea teachers have been granted only two little increases of $2 per week in 1960 and in 1963–64. Indeed, the situation has deteriorated so badly that the National Education Association and its affiliate which speaks for this group have found it necessary, after long and fruitless negotiating efforts, to file suit against the Department of Defense to secure the equity they have been promised.

I recount this now, Mr. President, as commentary which confirms the findings of an article printed in the Washington Post of last Sunday, in the "Parade" magazine section. Entitled "How Service Families Are Being Cheated," and written from Paris by the well-known Jack Anderson, who has personally toured some of these schools abroad which are entrusted with the education of some 160,000 children of American service personnel, the revelations made there confirm dramatically the deterioration of the quality of education as well as of the pay for teachers which has been taking place under the Defense Department.

The $68 million a year which the Department spends on these schools is a pittance in the military budget. It is for the future of our children, which should be fully as important as military hardware; but it seems to take second place, in the name of economy. The author charges that while in some places the facilities are excellent, in others they are "educational pigpens."

I shall not go into the details of the charges made in this public way. I do not know from personal experience whether they are the whole truth; undoubtedly they highlight the worst, without giving a counterbalance to the best. But in view of the situation concerning the treatment of teachers by the Department of Defense, who have come to the point where they find it necessary to bring suit for the pay scale to which they believe the law entitles them, there can be no question that this description has a good deal of validity.

I offer no solution, Mr. President; but I certainly do urge upon the Department of Defense the kind of close scrutiny and the promotion of the kind of reforms within this educational system that will make it a feature of pride and excellence, rather than the often shameful stepchild of the military. We owe it to the children of our service personnel, and also to ourselves, as a nation whom these families serve, to remedy this situation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article referred to be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

How Service Families Are Being Cheated

Paris.—From Paris to Peshawar, 291 forgotten American schools in 28 foreign countries are now closing for the summer. These schools for the children of American servicemen abroad should be showplaces, displaying to the world the high quality of American education. Instead, all too many are slum schools, substandard and unsanitary, whose underpaid teachers are so harassed by redtape that one out of three quits in disgust every year.

Though the oversea school system ranks with the Nation's top 10 in size, it rates near the bottom in excellence. It was the only school system marked unsatisfactory last year by the National Education Association. In February and again in November, the NEA sent an urgent advisory to all U.S. teachers, warning of "unsatisfactory educational conditions" in oversea schools.

The 160,000 American children who attend these schools deserve better. They are servicemen's children, a junior Peace Corps, who are winning friends for America abroad. They symbolize our confidence in the security of our foreign bases (if the children are here, the Americans must mean to stay). Not a few, like those now in Saigon and other danger spots, are sharing the same risks as their parents. They go to school behind barbed wire. At any hour, they may become the target for some fanatic's bomb or an anti-American mob. Yet they are treated with indifference by the Armed Forces, which expect their fathers to fight for the freedom and future of all our children.

Oversea teachers, most of them idealistic young men and women, have been cheated both by Congress and the Pentagon. They get an average of $1,000 a year less than the law says they should be paid. In another year, they will be owed something like $10 million—ironically, the same amount that Congress, to please Representative Mike Kirwan, Democrat, of Ohio, has agreed to spend on an aquarium in Washington, D.C. It seems easier to get money for tadpoles than for teachers.

Each school is at the mercy of the local base commander, who dictates which quarters will be allotted, what equipment will be provided, how much cash will be spent. Not unnaturally, many commanders put military ahead of school needs. "If the base commander has no interest in education—and most of them don't—you can expect a bad time and bad schools," says one principal.

Even the supply sergeant is more important than the principal. Laments one teacher: "You have to be a regular Sergeant Bilko, conniving, bartering, even spending your own meager pay to get what you need to do a job of teaching. Once you've been forced to fill out a sheaf of forms to get a bottle of ink, you go out and buy one yourself."

The Defense Department spends around $68 million a year on schools for service children—less than the Air Force alone has been accused of wasting so that overage pilots, whose flying skills are no longer needed, can qualify for flight pay. The average cost per pupil in stateside schools is $320; only $285 per pupil is spent in the oversea schools, though they are farflung, serve smaller student bodies and are therefore more expensive to operate. Indeed, they can hardly be maintained at all, except by cheese paring.

Parade has completed a survey of schools in Europe, where there is little excuse for hardship either for pupils or teachers. True, a few U.S. schools were like palaces, but more were educational pigpens. Some could never pass fire inspection in the United States. Classrooms were dank and dingy and teachers lacked up-to-date books and the simplest equipment. Here is a country-by-country report:

Britain: At Lakenheath, the principal of an elementary school claims her office used to be a Royal Air Force jail. The classrooms are squeezed into quonset huts. Cold in winter, they depend upon acrid-smelling potbellied stoves to supplement the heat panels.

The high school had an oversupply of baseball bats but no balls, track suits but no track shoes. The football coach scraped together exactly 11 football suits, 12 helmets, and 12 pairs of shoes. Unfortunately the shoes had no cleats, just holding screws protruding from the soles. Some scrimmage was attempted, but the players suffered so many gashes from the bare screws that practice had to be called off until the coach could scrounge some cleats.

France: The high school at Châteauroux uses an old hangar for a gym. Shell holes from World War II let in the cold and rain.

The military built an attractive high school in a quiet Paris suburb, on the same street as the Pasteur Institute and the Lafayette Escadrille Memorial Park. But being security conscious, they erected a high barbed-wire fence with locked gates. What should be a showplace looks like a concentration camp.

The school's band instructor had 80 students but absolutely no sheet music. He was obliged to organize a cake sale to raise a music fund. On the other hand, the biology teacher put through a requisition for a small microscope and had an elaborate $500 instrument thrust upon them.

Germany: In Hanau, the school is located between a firehouse and truck lot. At Bad Nauheim, the school auditorium's floor sagged so badly it had to be shored up with timbers to keep it from crashing down on two classrooms. Finally, the base commander condemned the classrooms, but the auditorium is still used.

CIGARETTES FOR CHEMICALS

In Munich the schools are filthy, and only half the fire doors work. Two teachers offered to paint the bleachers, but it took them 3 weeks to get the paint from the Army. A science instructor couldn't get the chemicals he needed for basic experiments for his classes. He finally bribed a German hospital orderly with cartons of cigarettes for the chemicals.

Everywhere, teachers complained that they couldn't get enough ditto fluid to mimeograph test papers. Only at Dachau, a quarter-mile from Hitler's infamous crematorium, was Parade able to find a school with sufficient fluid. Enterprising teachers had obtained it outside Army channels.

Spain: In Madrid, children have been going to school in four floors of an old apartment house. A new school is now going up, designed by the Air Force and built by the Navy. Construction was far along before any educators were allowed to see it. They tried to have the boxlike classrooms changed to allow for flexibility and team teaching. It was too late; all the walls were load bearing.

The base commander ordered football uniforms for the high school team, but they failed to show up on the eve of the first game. The supply sergeant was persuaded to make a check, discovered they had been stashed away by a Spanish civilian employee. He had thought they were astronauts' gear and had locked them in the security vault.

REDTAPE

But the bane of the oversea teachers is the frustrating task of getting day-to-day supplies. "The galling thing," says one, "is that you can't get the small items." Most teachers blame military redtape, rigidity, rules.

In Frankfurt, a science teacher tried to discard 1956 textbooks, which lacked up-to-date information on space. The supply sergeant wouldn't replace them because their covers were still "serviceable." In vain, the teacher tried to explain it was what was inside the covers that mattered. Then the teacher tried a new tack. He crated the books and signed a form declaring them "unserviceable." The sergeant agreed and gave him a new supply of books—3 years out of date.

Another order went out that all old preprimers had to be burned. A teacher asked to keep a few, so her children could cut out the pictures. The books were burned.

Many oversea teachers not only work in squalor but live in squalor. They live where the military tell them to live—often in what they call American ghettoes. In one, inspected by Parade, women teachers were quartered in cell-like rooms 10 by 10 feet. In one corner was a daybed, in another a washbowl. The furniture was drab Army issue. A single bathroom served two rooms. Down the hall was a laundry room with automatic washer and dryer. Neither worked. There was also a kitchen with a four-burner electric stove and a single refrigerator. All teachers on the floor (about 20) shared these facilities.

But these are adventurous young people who sought jobs overseas to see the world. They don't mind the hardships so much as being shortchanged in pay. Congress passed a law in 1959 directing that oversea teachers should be paid the same basic salaries as those in U.S. cities. The Pentagon drew up an order to this effect, then ignored it.

The average base pay for oversea teachers ($4,535) has now fallen more than $1,000 below that of stateside teachers ($5,963). A Pentagon spokesman blamed Congress for not providing the money; Congressmen claim the Defense Department never asked for it. Congress finally got around to giving the oversea teachers an extra $100 beginning this year. Many were so outraged they started sending the money back in checks made out to the President, Defense Secretary, Treasury Secretary, and Members of Congress.

KIDS LOSE OUT

These teachers also hate to see the children, for whose basic education they are responsible, being cheated, too. They argue that displaying a high standard of American schooling overseas is as good a way of showing the flag as any. They contend, too, that the children of servicemen guarding their country shouldn't be deprived of their birthright.

Before the schools reopen in September, you can do a favor for the servicemen on duty around the world by calling upon your Congressman to give both the overseas children—and their teachers—a break.

THE POZNAN UPRISING OF 1956

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, 8 years ago today the Polish citizens of Poznan demonstrated that love of freedom which is so much a part of the heritage of Poland. The factory workers of this city of 430,000 were suffering economically. Wage increases had not kept pace with inflationary price rises so that the workers' real income had declined; overpaid taxes due the workers had not been returned and the local administrators had forbidden any overtime work. The result was severe economic hardships for many in this community.

On June 28, 1956, these workers, denied any satisfaction from the Communist authorities in Warsaw, took to the streets in an orderly demonstration against specific grievances. Other citizens began to join the demonstration as the pent-up frustration of 10 years of Communist economic oppression found expression. Rumor that the original factory delegation had been jailed caused the marching throng to attack the jail and free its inmates. Signs that originally said "We want bread" became "Down with Soviet occupation" and "We want freedom" as the Poznan citizens used this occasion to demonstrate their hatred of Soviet oppression.

Unity of the Polish people was demonstrated when the Polish Army cooperated with the people to attack the secret police. By the afternoon of June 29 the Army was reinforced and students and merchants used their fists and rocks to fight the tanks and machineguns dispatched by the central Government. This greatly increased opposition did not prevent some men from displaying a flag dipped in blood or crowds from lifting a picture of Our Lady of Czestochowa to the top of a captured building. By the end of the day 250 people were dead and many hundreds of others injured.

This great demonstration was not entirely in vain. It made a deep impression on the Soviet Government which was later that year forced to grant Poland increased autonomy. The Poznan uprising emphasized the fundamental contradiction between the Soviet principle of centralized control over the bloc and the national yearning for independent government which would possess a degree of local control.

Recent history has demonstrated that the local autonomy granted to Poland has not resulted in much political liberalization. But the lack of freedom has not destroyed the desire for it. The Poznan uprising had no leadership except the encouraging power of community feeling. The spontaneity of the demonstration revealed to the world in vivid terms the courage and fortitude of the Polish people.

This same courage and fortitude is much alive today. I have visited Poland and have felt the Polish desire for freedom. I have sensed the frustration of these devout people who reject communism in their hearts, and minds, and souls. The rebuilt cities and patched bullet holes in the renovated apartments attest to the hardships of the past. The hardships of the present are still distressing to all lovers of liberty.

The Poznan uprising demonstrates that the love of freedom will never die in Poland. I have seen and felt this love for myself; I have personally witnessed the political and religious persecution which is a part of the Polish daily life today. The endurance and high principles of the Polish people are an example to all of us who cherish freedom in our own land.

I returned from Poland convinced that the desire for liberty fills the hearts of the Polish people today as it did in 1956 and as it has for centuries. It is this unending desire for freedom which the Polish people have exhibited throughout their history which we honor today as we mark the eighth anniversary of the courageous Poznan revolt of June 28 and 29.

DR. WILLARD W. COCHRANE

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, Secretary Freeman has announced the resignation of Dr. Willard W. Cochrane as Director of Agricultural Economics, of the Department of Agriculture.

I have known Dr. Cochrane for many years. He is a distinguished economist, forthright in expressing his ideas. Beyond this, he is one with a deep concern for the welfare of American farmers. He was professor of agricultural economics at the University of Minnesota from 1951 to 1961, when he took a leave of absence, to join the Department; and he is returning to the University of Minnesota, to resume his position on the faculty.

I express my appreciation to Dr. Cochrane for his conscientious efforts and hard work during the past 3½ years. The Director of Agricultural Economics holds an important and challenging position. He is responsible for the economic research and statistical analysis programs of the Department of Agriculture, and he is also the key adviser to the Secretary on economic policies.

The responsibility for farm legislation and the decision as to the type of program rests with the Congress; but in order to make these decisions, we need an objective analysis of the estimated program results of alternative proposals. This is the area in which competence and frankness are needed. Dr. Cochrane has proved the quality of economic analysis in the Department.

One of the most serious problems facing Congress in 1961 was the situation in feed grains and in several other commodities. Surpluses had been increasing steadily, and so had Government costs, while farm commodity prices were declining. None of us is satisfied with the level of farm income today; but the economic drift has been stopped, and the feed grain and wheat situations have greatly improved. Dr. Cochrane has had a major role in clarifying the issues and in working out constructive alternatives in the broad effort to meet these farm problems. I know that many others join me in commending him for his services, and in expressing to him best wishes for the future.

PROPOSED ELECTRICAL INTERTIE BETWEEN THE PACIFIC NORTHWEST AND SOUTHWEST

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, the advantages of electrically tying together the great hydrosystem of the Pacific Northwest with the big steam and hydrosystems of the Pacific Southwest have long been known. These advantages have been spelled out in report after report. Proposals to actually build the intertie go back at least 16 years. That is when the distinguished junior Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], then a Member of the other body, introduced the first bill for Federal construction of an intertie; his bill also gave assurance to the Pacific Northwest that only power surplus to its needs would be exported from the region.

Despite this long history of efforts to bring about construction of intertie lines, two things have prevented it so far. The first was the need for legislation to define the primary marketing area of the Bonneville Power Administration, which markets power from the Federal dams in the Columbia River Basin. The second was serious differences of opinion as to what lines were needed and who should build them.

Three years ago, Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall, with the assistance of Bonneville Power Administrator Charles F. Luce and others, undertook to tackle seriously both these problems in a manner that would not only settle these problems, but also would protect the various interests. For 3 years, they have been working hard—with success at last in sight. It now appears that Mr. Udall and Mr. Luce have succeeded in bringing together nearly all the diverse interests in the West in support of a plan for construction of four big transmission lines by a combination of public and private utilities and the Federal Government.

It is a plan regarded by the Interior Department—and by many others, as I shall show later—as superior to the all-Federal "yardstick" plan, against which proposals by non-Federal parties to build parts of the lines were measured. It provides more capacity, and at less cost, than the all-Federal alternative.

It is a plan that takes into account the big investment of the Federal Government in the Columbia River Basin and the Colorado River Basin and the Central Valley of California. It is a plan that recognizes the tremendous investment of private utilities in the West in both generation and transmission, and the great benefits that can result to all from having these private systems interconnected with the Federal systems. It is a plan that recognizes and meets the needs of preference customers—some 251 cooperatives and other public agencies—in 11 Western States.

Of the total investment of some $700 million in the four long lines and three shorter connecting lines that comprise the plan, the Federal Government would invest about $280 million, or 40 percent. The city of Los Angeles would invest another 10 percent, and six private utilities would invest the remaining 50 percent. Yet, public agencies will have control over some 60 percent of the line capacity, and will receive about 66 percent of the benefits.

The plan is the result of good-faith negotiations, as directed by Congress. Last year, we appropriated $5 million to the Bonneville Power Administration and $2 million to the Bureau of Reclamation, to start construction of two all-Federal lines between the Pacific Northwest and Pacific Southwest. But we attached two conditions before any of the funds could be spent:

First, we said, S. 1007 or similar legislation must be enacted, to provide proper safeguards for the Northwest's power supply. I remain hopeful that the differences between the House and Senate on this legislation can be resolved soon, so this condition will be met.

Second, we said the Secretary was to conduct good-faith negotiations with non-Federal parties, to determine whether equivalent benefits to the national interest could be obtained through non-Federal construction, and to report to the Appropriations Committees. After months of negotiation and analysis, the Department of the Interior found that certain non-Federal proposals would result in greater benefits than all-Federal construction, and greater benefits than those possible from other non-Federal proposals. In good faith, then, a combination of the best proposals is what the Secretary recommended to Congress in his report to the Appropriations Committees.

Furthermore, at every stage of negotiation the Secretary and his able Bonneville Power Administrator have kept the concerned committees of Congress fully informed as to progress in the negotiations. Frequently over the past 6 or 7 weeks, when the Secretary's report was being drafted, the Secretary and the Administrator consulted with many Members of Congress and with committee staff members and with other interested parties.

I ask that there be printed in the Record, following these remarks, a sampling of editorials and letters and telegrams supporting the intertie plan.

I am pleased that public hearings have been scheduled by the Senate Appropriations Committee for July 1 and 2, in order to give both the opponents and the proponents a chance to state their views. I am confident that the hearing record will show overwhelming support for the recommended plan, and will provide the basis for quick and favorable approval by Congress of the plan, and funds to implement it.

There being no objection, the editorials, letters, and telegrams were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Seattle Post-Intelligencer, June 29, 1964]

Intertie Proposal

We expressed some doubts about an electrical intertie between the Pacific Northwest and the Southwest as originally proposed. When first outlined, the idea seemed to have for its basic goals the bailing out of the Bonneville Power Administration and the possible erection of a federally controlled power grid throughout the Western States.

The plan now before Congress from the Department of the Interior dispels this picture and embraces the partnership policy of public and private power endorsed by the Eisenhower administration and steadily supported by this newspaper.

The idea is challenging and exciting, and entirely within the role of the Pacific Northwest as leader in the development of hydroelectric power. It would be the biggest step yet taken by this Nation in the international field of electrical energy.

The opposition of California Democrats appears based upon political-ideological theories of monopolistic public power which found popularity in the thirties. It overlooks vast changes during three decades in the practical relationships between public and private utilities.

On the regional economic side there is no question about the impact of such a program. Senators Magnuson and Jackson of Washington State estimate this to be $1 billion.

Clearly the proposal is in for a tough battle in Congress. It is to be hoped that the controversy will not be as political as the California Democrats would like to make it. It is a plan which deserves close examination, to be sure, but in a spirit of progress we hope that it is found to be as practicable as the supporters claim.

[From the Seattle Times, June 29, 1964]

Northwest Preference Periled

What is behind the opposition of Representative John E. Moss and 20 other California Democratic Congressmen to the Johnson administration's plan for joint Government-industry development of an electric power intertie between the Pacific Northwest and Southwest?

The plan offers such obvious benefits to both regions that it is difficult to understand the delaying tactics of Moss and his colleagues.

For one thing, the joint Government and private industry development of the intertie will result in lower transmission charges than would a purely Federal development.

California is hungry for power. One would expect California's Representatives in Congress to expedite legislation providing for an early start on the intertie.

Instead, the California Democrats are making every effort to delay the measure, which is scheduled to go before the Senate Appropriations Committee tomorrow and Wednesday.

Why?

We suspect that the real target of the California obstructionists is a companion measure to the intertie legislation—the Northwest preference bill.

This measure, which would give Northwest consumers first call on energy generated by Federal dams in the Northwest, has passed both Houses of Congress, but has been stalled for many months in a House-Senate conference committee that has been unable to resolve differences between the House and Senate versions of the bill.

Construction of a Northwest-Southwest intertie without the safeguards contained in the regional preference bill would result in California raids on the low-cost, federally produced firm power that is a mainstay of the Northwest economy.

In the opinion of Interior Department officials, the new intertie plan provides the basis for resolving the differences between the House and Senate versions of the preference bill.

If those differences are not resolved, the outlook for safeguarding Northwest firm power is bleak. It would be extremely difficult, probably impossible to steer new protective legislation through both Houses of this or any succeeding Congress in view of opposition from California and the Eastern Coal Belt, and disinterest in much of the rest of the country.

Therefore, if California Congressmen can block passage of the intertie plan for the rest of the present congressional session, they may be able to kill the Northwest protection legislation which we suspect is their real target.

It is our hope that the Moss "block" has overreached itself, and that the West as a whole will rebel at this latest example of California's unsatiable appetite for the resources of other Western States.

The Johnson administration has set before Congress a wise compromise plan for sharing Northwest power with the Southwest in a manner that would greatly benefit the economies of both regions. In proposing that the intertie be built as a Government and private industry partnership package, the administration recognizes the diverse ownership of power production in the West.

The plan merits prompt and favorable congressional attention.

Davenport, Wash.,
June 25, 1964.

Senator Henry M. Jackson,
U.S. Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Urge immediate favorable action by Congress on the Udall plan for Pacific Northwest-Pacific Southwest EHV regional tie lines. Any delay may result in increased power rates to BPA customers.

George E. Janett,
President, Lincoln Electric Corp., Davenport, Wash.

Port Angeles, Wash.,
June 29, 1964.

Senator Henry M. Jackson,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

As an industrial customer of BPA in Port Angeles, Wash., we urgently request approval of the recent proposal of the Department of Interior in regard to the California interties. We believe, in view of the years of study that have been devoted to alternatives available, further studies are not warranted and that the recent Department proposal will best serve the Northwest and the Nation.

Crown Zellerbach Corp.,
F. W. Flynn.

Ephrata, Wash.,
June 29, 1964.

Senator Henry M. Jackson,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We urge your support of the proposed four-line package of transmission interties between the Pacific Northwest-Southwest. We also urge you to support enactment of S. 1007 as passed by the Senate.

Wm. Schempp,
President Public Utility District No. 2 of Grant County.

Spokane, Wash,
June 26, 1964.

Senator Henry Jackson,
Washington, D.C.:

The board of trustees of Nespelem Valley Electric Cooperative, Inc., strongly urge your support of the four west coast electric transmission lines. We also urge specifically that an appropriation be made for Federal construction of the line to Hoover Dam and we also strongly urge enactment of S. 1007 as passed by the Senate.

John P. Rasmussen,
Manager.

Aberdeen, Wash.,
June 29, 1964.

Senator Henry M. Jackson,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The economic stability and growth of the Grays Harbor area of Washington State is dependent upon the continued availability of low-cost electric power. The Grays Harbor public utility district has agreed to purchase treaty power to support the Canadian agreement which will provide flood control and a substantial quantity of electric power. The financing of the U.S. obligation to Canada of $254 million by October 4, 1964, is dependent upon marketing this large block of power.

It is the obligation of the U.S. Congress to recognize the national interest and immediately enact legislation for the Northwest-Southwest tielines as recommended by Secretary Udall. The Canadian Treaty power together with the U.S. Bonneville Power Administration's surplus power can then be sold in California which will conserve the fossil fuel supply and make maximum use of the Northwest's hydroelectric potential.

H. S. SWENSON,
President, Board of Commissioners PUD No. 1 of Grays Harbor County.

VANCOUVER, WASH.,
June 23, 1964.

Senator HENRY M. JACKSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Urgent that appropriation be approved this session for Northwest interior to implement Canadian treaty and minimize Bonneville's rate increase next year.

BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS, CLARK COUNTY PUBLIC UTILITY DISTRICT.

NEWPORT, WASH.,
June 27, 1964.

Senator JACKSON,
Washington, D.C.:

Strongly urge most emphatic effort to obtain approval construction of powerline industries from Pacific Northwest to California and southern points before the Senate Appropriations Committee July 1 and 2.

PUBLIC UTILITY DISTRICT NO. 1, PEND OREILLE COUNTY, OREG.
W. P. CAMPBELL, *Manager.*

RITZVILLE, WASH.,
June 24, 1964.

Senator HENRY M. JACKSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We urge consideration and adoption of Northwest-Southwest intertie plans which would be acceptable to the BPA.

WASHINGTON RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION,
FRED J. HARTT.

VANCOUVER, WASH.,
June 27, 1964.

Senator HENRY M. JACKSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Following wire sent President Johnson: "Urge your support of the four west coast electric transmission lines. We also urge specifically that an appropriation be made for Federal construction of the line to Hoover Dam."

ALAN JONES,
President, Northwest Public Power Association.

SPOKANE, WASH.,
June 23, 1964.

Senator HENRY M. JACKSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Please do all within your power to obtain a satisfactory regional preference bill and follow with a plan satisfactory to Bonneville for the construction of the Pacific Northwest-Pacific Southwest interties.

VINCENT P. SLATT,
Manager, Inland Power Light Co.

PASCO, WASH.,
June 23, 1964.

Senator HENRY M. JACKSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Extra high voltage lines to California is a vital economic concern to the Benton County Public Utility District, Kennewick, Wash. Independent studies indicate the lines are required to prevent the wasting of the valuable hydroresources of the Northwest and to conserve the fossil fuels in the Southwest. Lowest possible electric rates to our customers can only be achieved by the extra-high voltage lines.

Sincerely yours,
BENTON COUNTY PUBLIC UTILITY DISTRICT,
THOMAS E. BLACK.

SEATTLE, WASH.,
June 23, 1964.

Hon. Senator HENRY M. JACKSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Seattle City Light endorses the recommendations for the Northwest-Southwest intertie made by Secretary of the Interior Udall and his special committee. This is an excellent opportunity for Federal, non-Federal, public, and private power to work together on this tremendous project of transmitting power the entire length of the western coast of our Nation. We would appreciate your support of the recommendations and necessary appropriations to implement this desirable project keeping in mind always our desire to retain appropriate preference provisions. This message also sent to the Representatives of our State.

JOHN M. NELSON,
Superintendent of Lighting.

DAYTON, WASH.,
June 25, 1964.

Senator HENRY M. JACKSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The board of directors of this cooperative urge that you take whatever action necessary to support the Northwest intertie system as proposed by the Department of the Interior. Any delay will seriously affect the economy of the entire Northwest.

ELMER F. THOMPSON,
Manager, Columbia Rural Electric Association, Inc.

CITY OF PORT ANGELES,
Port Angeles, Wash., June 26, 1964.

Hon. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MAGNUSON: It would be appreciated if at the Senate Appropriations Committee hearing to be held July 1 and 2, you would convey to the committee that Mayor Charles Willson, the city council, the city manager, and the electrical superintendent of the city of Port Angeles support the plan for the four west coast electric transmission lines; the appropriation for Federal construction of the lines to Hoover Dam; and enactment of S. 1007 as passed by the Senate.

We feel that it behooves all Government people to look into the future and decide what is good in the long run for our citizens. When we do this, we feel that the intertie system is for the best of all concerned. Although the intertie will be of benefit to the northwest, we feel that it will be of more immediate benefit to California, Arizona, and Nevada.

Certainly in such an expensive and long-range program as this, we should not let petty squabbles hold up or defeat the plan. Private and public power must work together for the common good. In every decision that is made, there are some people who are against the decision. This must not keep us from making decisions. This is an age of change, and change we must if tomorrow we are to retain our leadership in the world.

We hope and feel that the above measures will be promptly approved by the Senate Appropriations Committee.

Sincerely,
DONALD D. HERRMAN,
City Manager.

WENATCHEE, WASH.,
June 24, 1964.

Hon. HENRY JACKSON,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

Speaking for an electrometallurgical company that is buying its power from the Bonneville Power Administration and whose existence in the West depends upon the lowest possible power rate, we strongly urge that the Pacific Northwest-Southwest intertie as proposed by Secretary Udall be passed with all possible haste.

The benefits to both areas of Western States should be sufficient to overcome any political objections that have or may arise.

Sincerely,
WM. THOROUGHMAN,
Plant Manager, Keokuk Electro Metals Co., Division of Vanadium Corp. of America.

JUNE 24, 1964.

President LYNDON JOHNSON,
White House,
Washington, D.C.
Senator HAYDEN,
Chairman, Appropriations Committee:

We urge your full support of the Department of Interior proposal for Federal-non-Federal construction of PNW-PSW tieline and passage of S. 1007. The proposed Hoover line should be authorized for Federal construction. Prompt action is essential to end present inexcusable waste of hydroenergy and thermal power facilities and provide an essential economic element for marketing Canadian treaty power.

WASHINGTON PUBLIC POWER SUPPLY SYSTEM,
OWEN W. HURD, *Managing Director.*

LONGVIEW, WASH., *June 22, 1964.*

Senator HENRY M. JACKSON:

We endorse legislation creating a Pacific Northwest-Pacific Southwest power intertie and urgently request your committee's approval of funds for its construction. Construction of this intertie needed to maintain present low rates and to avoid waste of surplus northwest energy further compounded by recent adoption of Canadian treaty. Intertie vital to economy of entire Pacific coast region. Original, Senator CARL HAYDEN; copies, Senators JACKSON, MAGNUSON.

O. G. HITTLE,
Manager, Public Utility District No. 1 of Cowlitz County, Wash.

PUBLIC UTILITY DISTRICT NO. 1,
COWLITZ COUNTY, WASH.,
Longview, Wash., June 26, 1964.

Hon. HENRY JACKSON,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR JACKSON: On June 22, we wired you urging your favorable influence and support of legislation which would create a Pacific Northwest-Southwest power intertie. We take this opportunity to amplify our remarks by saying, we strongly support the package plan of (1) the four west coast electric transmission lines as proposed by the Department of the Interior, city of Los Angeles and other interests, (2) an appropriation for Federal construction of the line to Hoover Dam, and (3) enactment of S. 1007 as passed by the Senate.

Volumes of testimony favorable to this plan have been presented for your consideration. At the risk of being repetitive we submit our arguments as follows:

One of the Pacific coast's most valuable resources, low-cost hydroelectric power, is in jeopardy if Congress fails to enact legislation authorizing Federal construction of its part of the high-voltage power intertie between the Pacific Northwest power load centers and the Pacific Southwest which has a drought of low-cost hydroelectric energy.

Millions of kilowatts of wasted hydroelectric energy are presently flowing over the dams in the Northwest for lack of a market, while the Southwest can absorb this energy by slacking off steam production.

The immediate benefits of the recent successfully negotiated power pact with the Canadian Government cannot be immediately realized unless the intertie makes it possible to absorb the surplus power generated in the Pacific Northwest, including Canadian entitlement, particularly in the early years of the pact. Failure to salvage this waste and temporary surplus firm power for sale to the Southwest would cost the Federal Treasury billions of dollars over the next half-century.

The diversity in power requirements between the Pacific Northwest-Southwest regions makes an intertie a natural since power may flow to and from these areas as diversity demands.

We feel that Federal construction and control of these transmission facilities is a must for the optimum benefit to the public in low rates and maximum utilization, including conservation.

Very truly yours,

O. G. HITTLE,
Manager.

PUBLIC UTILITY DISTRICT NO. 1
OF OKANOGAN COUNTY, WASH.,
Okanogan, Wash., June 26, 1964.

Senator HENRY M. JACKSON,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR JACKSON: We respectfully request that you support passage of S. 1007 and urge that you push for the adoption of the four-line intertie proposal. We also urge you to support the construction of a Federal line to Hoover Dam. Without this program, the Canadian upstream storage program will have much less meaning.

Very truly yours,

ELMER B. TITUS,
Manager.

OKANOGAN COUNTY ELECTRIC
COOPERATIVE, INC.,
Winthrop, Wash., June 26, 1964.

Hon. HENRY JACKSON,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We urge your support of the plan for four west coast electric transmission lines. We also urge your support of an appropriation for Federal construction of the line to Hoover Dam and the enactment of S. 1007 as passed by the Senate.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY MITCHELL,
Manager.

WEYERHAEUSER CO.,
Tacoma, Wash., June 26, 1964.

Hon. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MAGNUSON: As you know, our company, and particularly those operations under my supervision, consume substantial quantities of power purchased indirectly from the Bonneville Power Administration through various PUD's. Upon the completion of construction projects now underway, our bill will be well over $2 million per year. Consequently, we are vitally interested in the California intertie plans proposed by the Department of the Interior.

Bernie Orell and Dan Smith tell me that you played a key role in the recent developments relating to BPA rates and the formulation of the intertie proposal. As a consumer of power, I am basically interested in the economies of the situation rather than in the ideological conflict between public and private power groups. At first blush I had thought the proposals recommended by the Secretary of the Interior would be acceptable to everybody in view of the fact that they give a primary role to public power and at the same time leave something for private power.

I understand that you and some of your colleagues in both Houses, as well as the top people in BPA, have repeatedly emphasized the importance of an immediate solution of the intertie problem if we are to avoid a rate increase and rate structure changes that will be tremendously costly to the entire Northwest. Any postponement in the availability of cheap power will certainly also penalize consumers in California and other areas of the Southwest.

In view of these compelling economic considerations, I am sure most consumers of power are terribly disturbed by the threat to the entire intertie as posed by the recent action of the California House delegation. After the years of study that have been given to this problem by all interested people, it is difficult to see what purpose would be served by further studies. One begins to suspect that some people are more interested in seeing a 100 percent public power intertie dead than a public-private combine alive. We consumers hope we will not become the victims of any such doctrinaire battle.

We appreciate the efforts that you have expended in this cause in the past and we know that your continuing interest will prevent a frustration of these proposals, which admittedly represent some compromise of the real desires of the various parties to the dispute. We hope that soon after the hearings next week we will see the light turn green.

Sincerely yours,

——— ———,
Vice President,
Manager, Pulp and Paperboard Division.

JUNE 24, 1964.

Hon. CARL HAYDEN,
Chairman, Appropriations Committee,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The Chelan County Public Utility District supports the plan for four Northwest-South west power intertie transmission lines as outlined in the article in the Wall Street Journal of Monday, June 22, 1964, with the understanding that the regional preference legislation will be enacted to provide proper safeguards for the firm power supply of the Pacific Northwest. The plan as presented is a good plan and goes far toward meeting the needs of both sections of the west coast.

IVAN J. COMPTON,
L. J. RICHARDSON,
ROBERT O. KEISER,
Commissioners.
KIRBY BILLINGSLEY,
Manager.

TANNER ELECTRIC,
North Bend, Wash., June 26, 1964.

Hon. HENRY M. JACKSON,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We wish to support the partnership plan for the Northwest-Southwest intertie as proposed by Secretary of the Interior Udall.

We believe that the early adoption of the plan plus the appropriation of funds to construct the direct current line to Hoover Dam and the final enactment of S. 1007 as passed by the Senate are important to us as a Bonneville customer.

The intertie program with its promise of continued low Bonneville Power rates to its customers is of great importance to the small power distributor such as ourselves. The present Bonneville rates make possible the continued operation of our cooperative. Any increase in rates would threaten our entire operation, as we are a marginal operation under our present rate schedules.

In the entire history of our operation we have not had sufficient revenue for our needs. We are just arriving at that point where we can adequately cover all costs from current revenue. Should the intertie not be built and the Bonneville Administration be forced to raise rates, the additional cost to Tanner Electric would again place our operation in jeopardy.

We are certain that the early construction of the intertie lines will greatly benefit the entire west coast.

Sincerely yours,

E. LOUIS TOWNE,
Manager.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

ALASKA EARTHQUAKE RECONSTRUCTION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid down and made the pending business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will state the title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. S. 2881, a bill to amend the Alaska Omnibus Act to provide assistance to the State of Alaska for the reconstruction of areas damaged by the earthquake of March 1964, and for other purposes.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2881) to amend the Alaska Omnibus Act to provide assistance to the State of Alaska for the reconstruction of areas damaged by the earthquake of March 1964, and subsequent seismic waves, and for other purposes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JACKSON obtained the floor.

PRESENTATION OF THE THIRD ANNUAL HERMAN LOWE MEMORIAL SCHOLARSHIP

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield briefly to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, several weeks ago the third annual Herman Lowe Memorial Scholarship was presented at the dinner of the Washington professional chapter of Sigma Delta Chi, the national honorary journalistic society.

This scholarship was created by Florence Lowe, widow of the late Herman Lowe, whom many of us knew and respected, and by Mrs. Lowe's brother, Bernard Segal, a nationally known lawyer. Its purpose was to perpetuate the high professional standards and personal integrity of Herman Lowe by helping needy journalism students from colleges in the Washington area pursue their studies.

Lesley Lowe Israel, daughter of Herman and Florence, presented this scholarship. Lesley gave evidence of her father's influence on her life in her presentation of the Herman Lowe Memorial Scholarship to Donald Holmes, Jr., a journalism student at the University of Maryland.

I ask unanimous consent to have Lesley Israel's presentation statement printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. NEUBERGER in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The statement is as follows:

> Mother, gentlemen, Mrs. Graham, Donald, it is with great pride that I present the Herman Lowe Memorial Scholarship to another fine young man.
>
> I can think of no memorial which would have pleased my father more. When I was in college, and anxious to enter the wonderful world of journalism, he often reminded me, "No writer, no matter how flowing his style or how glib his words, can be a good reporter without a solid grounding in the facts which underlie his story. College is where you learn the most fundamental of these facts, and where you are trained to seek out those which you do not know."
>
> I find it most gratifying to present this scholarship, in my father's memory, to a would-be member of his profession. It will enable you to finish the education he found so crucial—and doubly so in your chosen field of technical and scientific journalism.
>
> Perhaps it will also inspire you to reach for his high standards of professionalism and to be the credit to your field which he always was.
>
> So to you, Donald Holmes, Jr., I present this certificate with congratulations from myself, my mother, and my brother.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

At the request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Finance was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

CHANGE IN AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the permission given to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to meet during the week of June 29 be rescinded as to the remainder of the week after today; so the authorization will permit the committee to meet only during the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TWENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF PAN AMERICAN WORLD AIRWAYS CLIPPER FLIGHT ACROSS THE ATLANTIC

Mr. MAGNUSON. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield to my senior colleague.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Madam President, an event of tremendous importance and significance occurred 25 years ago this past Sunday, on June 28, 1939. On that date Pan American World Airways, a fledgling corporation, dispatched a clipper across the Atlantic with revenue passengers for the first time in the history of the air transport industry.

This Nation has good reason to be proud of its international air carriers. Not only have they pioneered in routes but they have pioneered in equipment, they have pioneered in ideas, and they have pioneered in courage and ingenuity. Historically they have advocated lower fares for the traveling public in some cases in the face of relentless opposition from their foreign government-owned competitors.

Madam President, this has been a true symbol of American private enterprise. Our leadership in the area throughout the world is unsurpassed, particularly in commercial aviation. I congratulate Pan American Airways, its organization, and its fine people on this memorable occasion. Today people can travel all over the world largely because of the ingenuity and the work of American air transport operators; and in the leadership of transatlantic and transpacific air transportation is Pan American Airways.

It is, of course, very important to all of us, to the airline industry, to this country, to this body, that Pan American flew the Atlantic for the first time commercially 25 years ago. But of more importance, in my mind, and apparently in the mind of most of the members of the Commerce Committee, is the fact that Pan American has achieved success the hard way. Instead of keeping transatlantic or transoceanic air transportation reserved for the wealthy, Pan American has constantly fought to keep fares within reason and to open up the medium of air transportation to the many millions of Americans who are now traveling abroad each year and who 25 years ago would have found it impossible to go beyond the continental United States on their vacation holidays.

Twenty-one years ago, Juan T. Trippe, president of Pan American Airways, announced goals which seemed unattainable and a business philosophy considered revolutionary in the air transport industry.

Today, the goals are being reached, and the philosophy he stated has been followed by all international airlines.

Mr. Trippe, in May 1943, said he foresaw the day when a passenger could board a plane carrying 150 persons and fly from New York to London in 10 hours at a one-way fare of $100.

At that time, an average transatlantic flight carried 30 passengers; a crossing required 23 hours, and the one-way fare was $600. Transatlantic air service, inaugurated on June 28, 1938, by Pan Am, was only 4 years old, and flights were being made in 150-mile-per-hour flying boats.

Mr. Trippe's predictions on speed and passenger capacity have been exceeded by Pan Am's jet clippers, which can carry as many as 161 passengers across the Atlantic in 6 hours at nearly 600 miles per hour.

The one-way basic economy fare between New York and London is $210 on Pan Am's jet clippers—only $120 in terms of 1943 purchasing power. Fares have been lowered repeatedly at Pan Am's urging in accordance with the philosophy expressed by Mr. Trippe in 1943 when he said:

> Air transport has the choice—the very clear choice—of becoming a luxury service to carry the well-to-do at high prices or to carry the average man at what he can afford to pay. Pan American has chosen the latter course.

To carry out that policy, Pan Am successively introduced new transports capable of carrying larger passenger loads while simultaneously seeking lower fares, applying to air transport the traditional American business principle of increasing volume and reducing the unit cost.

Pan Am's efforts to lower fares began at the close of World War II, and are continuing despite a history of frequent opposition.

In 1945, when some airlines suggested a one-way transatlantic fare to London of $375, Pan Am proposed $275. Pan Am put the $275 fare into effect for a brief period but suspended it when foreign governments threatened to limit the company's transatlantic frequencies.

On September 24, 1948, Pan Am increased the number of seats on its clippers flying between New York and Puerto Rico, simplified its meal services, and reduced fares 20 to 25 percent below the first-class rate—thereby inaugurating the first oversea air tourist service. The experiment proved an immediate success, and within 5 months the number of passengers carried on the route more than trebled.

Next, Pan Am inaugurated tourist services around South America and to Bermuda, using this same high-density seating formula.

The effort for lower transatlantic fares continued and, in 1951, Pan Am announced it would open a transocean tourist service the following year. Other airlines decided to adopt the transatlantic tourist plan, too, and transatlantic tourist fares went into effect on May 1, 1952.

On April 1, 1958, economy-class fares—20 percent lower than tourist-class fares—were introduced. The economy-class fares have been so successful that they have supplanted tourist-class service on transatlantic flights.

The most recent fare reduction occurred on April 1, 1964. Then the New York-London economy fare, applicable all year except during a peak period in the summer, was cut to $210 one way and $399 round trip. First-class fares also were reduced, to $375 one way and $712.50 round trip.

In addition to the worldwide economic benefit resulting from the mass movement of passengers, Mr. Trippe has said that foreign air travel also can make a major contribution to international understanding:

> Mass travel by air may prove to be more significant to world destiny than the atom bomb. For there can be no atom bomb potentially more powerful than the air tourist, charged with curiosity, enthusiasm, and good will, who can roam the four corners of the world, meeting in friendship and understanding the people of other nations and races.
>
> The tourist plane and the bomber for years have been racing each other toward a photo finish. In my opinion, however, the tourist

plane, if allowed to move forward unshackled by political boundaries and economic restrictions, will win this "race between education and catastrophe."

Possibly on the example set by Pan American, but more probably on their own initiative, other U.S.-flag carriers have carried on the excellent tradition established by this pioneer so many years ago. We all have reason to be proud of the accomplishments not only of Pan American but of our other U.S.-flag carriers who have distinguished themselves so nobly around the world.

Mr. JACKSON. I yield briefly to the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

Mr. MONRONEY. Madam President, I join the distinguished Senator from the State of Washington, the chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee, in congratulating Pan American World Airways on the 25th anniversary of its inaugural flight across the Atlantic.

Pan American World Airways has set and maintained standards of safety and reliability that have done much to bring the entire air transportation industry to its present position of strength and dynamic growth. Pan Am has carried the flag of the United States into many foreign countries, enabling hundreds of thousands of people the world over to make the personal contacts so important to better understanding between nations. Commercial as well as cultural relationships between all nations now depend heavily upon air transport.

Pan American has played a major role in the development of new planes throughout its entire history. Many of the planes which have been used were developed as the result of the pioneering, engineering, and specifications that Pan American has insisted upon for its worldwide service equipment.

This airline, and the many other American-flag airlines that compete so appropriately with it, has enabled hundreds of thousands of ordinary people to realize the thrills and rewards of travel abroad.

While I have often found myself in disagreement with some of the policies pursued by the management of Pan Am, and may again in the future, I deeply respect Pan American's tremendous accomplishments in pioneering across the skies to once-remote areas of the earth. I deeply respect, too, the Pan Am employees who have steadfastly made these achievements possible.

I think it is well to remember on this anniversary of the first regularly scheduled transatlantic service that the future growth of our aviation industry requires unremitting surveillance and study on the part of Congress for safe and sound expansion of small as well as large airlines. Sound Government policy has fostered and protected opportunities that have produced prosperity for the major trunkline carriers. Other segments of our air transport industry have not fared so well.

An alert and dynamic policymaking apparatus, both in industry and in Government, is absolutely essential to the continued growth of our U.S. aviation industry. Though its growth has been fantastic in the past quarter century, aviation's contribution to our society—if it is to become the great society—must be multiplied many times.

Pan American is one company that has always had an alert and dynamic policy-making team of its own. This 25th anniversary of Pan Am's pioneer Atlantic crossing finds this company's team, and this company's potential, stronger than ever. I congratulate each and every Pan Am employee who has participated in the achievements of this fine airline.

Mr. JACKSON. Madam President, I yield to the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND].

Mr. HOLLAND. Madam President, I wish to associate myself with the distinguished senior Senator from Washington in warmly congratulating Pan American. While discussing the 25th anniversary of Pan American's first transatlantic flight, we are actually discussing events of comparatively recent vintage. Pan American was pioneering out of Florida 12 years before that first transatlantic crossing. As a matter of record, Madam President, in October of 1927 Pan American flew a small plane load of passengers and mail on a 90-mile run from Key West to Havana, then completing the first international flight carrying passengers and mail.

An epoch in transportation and a milestone in aviation became history Tuesday, October 28, 1947, when two nations, Cuba and the United States, led hemispherewide observance of Pan American's 20th anniversary of that first international flight.

Special ceremonies in Key West, Havana, and Miami were sponsored by the State of Florida and the Cuban Government in honor of Pan American's first flight from Key West to the Cuban capital, October 28, 1927.

President Harry S. Truman officially recognized the occasion by signing a special scroll presented to Pan American by the Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board.

The White House scroll pointed out that Key West was the cradle of U.S. international aviation. The service born here later spread throughout the Caribbean, encircled South America, pioneered transpacific air routes, conquered the Atlantic, and today encircles the globe.

I had the honor of presiding at the banquet climaxing the observance, and joined with official host Gov. Millard F. Caldwell, of Florida, and dignitaries from both Cuba and the United States in the celebration. The triple ceremony began at Key West where the site of the takeoff of the first pioneering clipper, at Meacham Field, was marked with a monument unveiled by Jose Diaz Garrido, president of the Municipal Council of Havana.

Later, two four-engine clippers took off for the 90-mile flight to Havana, where a monument was unveiled at Rancho Boyeros Airport, and a scroll was presented to Pan American Vice President Wilbur L. Morrison by Alberto Cruz, Cuban Minister of Communications. The group of dignitaries and press were guests of the Cuban Government for luncheon.

Two birthday clippers left Havana in midafternoon for Miami where a banquet climaxing the occasion was held that night. Speakers were Governor Caldwell, Vice President Morrison, and Jose R. Gutierrez, Cuban Under Secretary of Communications.

Distinguished guests were introduced, including Col. John Alison, Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Air, Enrique Aguero, Postmaster General of Cuba, and Dr. Herminio Rodriquez of the Cuban Ministry of State.

Others introduced included Brig. Gen. Homer L. Sanders, of the 14th Air Force, then Congressman and now Senator GEORGE SMATHERS, and then Congressman Emory H. Price, members of the Governor's cabinet, State supreme court, heads of the State's leading educational institutions, legislators, and city and county officials.

Of all of Pan American's important installations—at Kennedy International Airport, in San Francisco, in Los Angeles—none is more historic nor vital to the success of Pan American's systemwide operations than its extraordinary and brand new facility at Miami International Airport. More than 7,000 residents of Florida are employed by Pan American in Miami, many of whom have given a great part of their lives to the service of this most unusual and interesting organization.

Madam President, the crew that departed on that first Pan American flight across the Atlantic 25 years ago received all of its early training in Florida. I am sure it will be of interest to this body to know who those people were and where they are now.

Twelve men made up the crew of Pan American's Dixie clipper, June 28, 1939, when the airline inaugurated commercial passenger service across the Atlantic. Of the dozen, five are still active with the company. A sixth recently retired.

Robert D. Fordyce was a junior flight officer on the 42-ton Boeing flying boat that made aviation history. Today he is a captain flying transatlantic and round-the-world routes for the airline.

Benjamin S. Harrell, pilot-navigator on the first flight, is also a captain, currently flying Pan Am's routes across the Pacific. He was one of the first captains to take the controls of the first jet clippers in 1958. With the company since 1936, he has flown in all sectors of operation, and for a time was an assistant chief pilot in the overseas division.

Melvin C. Anderson, now of Los Altos, Calif., was an assistant engineering officer on the Dixie clipper. He is presently a Pan Am flight engineer operating out of San Francisco on Pacific routes.

Another engineer on the famous flight was Stephen H. Kitchell, who is now chief flight engineer for Pan Am's Latin American division, based in Miami.

What of the other members of the crew on that history making flight of June 1939? Capt. Gilbert B. Blackmore, of Colusa, Calif., the first officer, was based in San Francisco from 1940 until his retirement in December 1963, after a 30-year career with the airline.

The engineering officer was John A. Fisk. He is presently a pilot-flight engineer for Eastern Airlines, based in Miami.

Radio Officer Harry L. Drake left the company in 1950 to join Aeronautical Radio, Inc., of Miami, Fla. He is the company's stations operations chief. The firm provides air and ground communications for several airlines.

The stewards were John Salmini and Bruno Candotti. Salmini today is field service supervisor for Pan Am in Rome. Candotti operates a catering service at Maiquetia Airport, Caracas, Venezuela.

Skipper of the Dixie Clipper was veteran flyer R. O. D. Sullivan. Captain Sullivan passed away in 1955.

A third flight officer, J. Norman Gentry, and Radio Officer Harold G. Lambert are also deceased.

All of these men, Madam President, rendered good service in the advancement of Pan American particularly and of commercial international aviation generally. Their successors are carrying on for them all over the world. I am happy to join with the distinguished chairman of the Commerce Committee in congratulating Juan T. Trippe and his many thousands of devoted employees for the accomplishments of Pan American and for the additional pioneering achievements which I feel certain they will attain.

Mr. BARTLETT. Madam President, as one of the representatives of the great State of Alaska, I take great pride in congratulating Pan American World Airways on the occasion of its 25th anniversary of the inauguration of flights across the Atlantic.

The State of Alaska was deriving benefits from its association with Pan American for a full decade before the carrier commenced transatlantic service.

Measures of the continuing interest of the carrier in serving the people of Alaska are evidenced by its proposals whereby the carrier would provide a daily service to Fairbanks throughout the year, plus extra flights during peak months; daily service to Ketchikan and Juneau throughout the year, plus an increase to 11 flights weekly for Ketchikan in the summer; and a daily service to Anchorage throughout the year, plus an increase to 11 flights a week during the summer. These flights would be conducted with Boeing type 707-321 aircraft, with seats arranged to accommodate 135 passengers on the winter schedules, and 145 during the summer, thereby making available to Alaskans the latest in jet equipment.

Further evidence of Pan American's continued interest in serving Alaska was its decision to transfer voluntarily its Juneau-Fairbanks local service rights to Wien Alaska Airlines, Inc. This transfer reflected a realization by Pan American of the fact that the long-haul aircraft types which must now be utilized in the mainland-Alaska service are not also the ones most efficiently geared to the local service requirements. This transfer reflects a willingness on the part of Pan American to accept revisions—in fact, to propose them, so as to conform its certificate authorization to the most practical manner of providing the air transportation required.

Madam President, the foregoing is another example of Pan Am's continuing endeavor to provide up-to-date and adequate air transportation for the traveling public.

I congratulate Pan Am, on behalf of my fellow Alaskans and myself, not only on the occasion of its 25th year of passenger service across the Atlantic, but also on its 35th year of service to the State of Alaska.

Mr. COTTON. Madam President, as the ranking minority member of the Commerce Committee and the Aviation Subcommittee I should like to add my remarks to the observations made today by the distinguished chairman of the committee about the pioneering efforts of Pan American Airways in establishing transatlantic commercial service just 25 years ago.

The history of commercial flying across the Atlantic dates almost as far back as Col. Charles A. Lindbergh's epochmaking solo flight in 1927, the year Pan American Airways was founded.

Within 2 years after Colonel Lindbergh's New York-Paris flight Pan Am was actively planning a broad skyway to Europe. But flying the Atlantic "on a wing and a prayer," as the early civilian and military pilots did, was one thing. Establishing dependable, regularly scheduled air transportation for passengers across the "world's most dangerous ocean" was quite another.

Larger, safer, longer ranging planes had to be designed, constructed and tested; bases and maintenance facilities had to be established, not only in the United States and Europe, but at way stations in between; communications had to be vastly improved, and meteorology—until then largely a hit-or-miss proposition—had to be painstakingly developed into a science.

Colonel Lindbergh, as Pan Am's technical adviser, made survey flights to the Far East and Scandinavia. His Scandinavian route was not too far from the one taken by the Pan Am and TWA west coast-Europe flights today.

The experience and data gained from these and many other survey flights was added to the operational know-how Pan Am was acquiring at the same time on its rapidly expanding Caribbean and Latin American routes.

In 1935, Pan Am was ready to carry passengers across the oceans. On November 22 of that year, a Martin M–130 flying boat took off from San Francisco for Honolulu, then flew on to bases constructed by Pan Am on Midway, Wake, Guam, and at Manila. It was the first flying boat to cross an ocean on a regular schedule.

As this work progressed and more experience was gained, the German dirigibles Graf Zeppelin and Hindenburg began flying lighter-than-air routes across the Atlantic. But this form of travel was abandoned in 1937.

On June 18, 1937, Pan Am inaugurated passenger service to Bermuda. Less than a month later, on July 3, captain, now executive vice president, overseas division, Harold E. Gray was at the controls of a Sikorsky S–42B flying boat which took off from Port Washington, N.Y., for Southampton, England, arriving there in 22 hours and 39 minutes to complete Pan Am's first transatlantic commercial survey flight.

During the summer of 1937, additional survey flights were operated by Pan Am and, on a reciprocal basis, by Imperial Airways, a predecessor of British Overseas Airways Corp.

By early 1939, special planes—Boeing 314 flying boats—had been constructed to Pan Am's specifications and tested for transatlantic service.

On May 20, 1939, Pan American inaugurated transatlantic airmail service along the southern route from Port Washington to the Azores, Portugal and France. This flight carried nearly a ton of airmail. On June 17, 16 newspaper and radio reporters were guests of the airline on a flight from Port Washington to Marseille.

On June 24, Pan Am operated the first commercial air flight across the Atlantic via the northern route to Southampton via Shediac, New Brunswick; Botwood, Newfoundland; and Foynes, Eire. Capt. Harold E. Gray was in command of this flight which carried 20 special guests.

On June 28, the first passengers to purchase tickets to fly the Atlantic were onboard the *Dixie Clipper*, a Boeing B–314 flying boat, when it took off from Port Washington for Marseille, via the Azores and Lisbon. Twice-a-week schedules were established. Shortly thereafter, Pan Am inaugurated scheduled passenger flights over the North Atlantic to Southampton.

With the outbreak of war a few months later, service to Marseille and Southampton was discontinued, but Pan Am helped maintain a vital lifeline to Europe with its flights to Lisbon as Allied passenger ships were driven into port or converted to military use.

On December 7, 1941, just 30 minutes after Pearl Harbor was attacked, Pan American's worldwide facilities—the only ones of their type then in existence—were placed at the disposal of the U.S. Government. The line's planes were flown by civilian crews in every theatre of operations throughout World War II.

Of necessity, these men and machines were tested far beyond the limits to which they had been subjected in peacetime. And out of this grim, hard-won experience there emerged a vastly superior and greatly expanded transatlantic service at the end of the war.

A Pan Am DC–4 became the first commercial landplane in overocean service in October 1945. Later, the company's engineers helped develop the Boeing Stratocruiser, the famed doubledecker that was the last word in luxurious air travel in the late 1940's.

Then, in fast sequence, came the big speedy DC–6B's and DC–7C's—with their far larger passenger, mail and cargo capacities. On October 26, 1958, Pan Am inaugurated American Flag jet passenger service across the Atlantic with giant, 600-mile-per-hour 707 jet clippers.

Today, just 25 years after the first commercial passenger-carrying flight across the Atlantic, Pan Am helps make it the world's most air-traveled ocean by operating 222 transatlantic passenger flights on clockwork schedules every week.

Mr. KEATING. Madam President, 25 years ago this past Sunday, on June 28, 1939, a Pan American World Airways flying boat, the *Dixie Clipper*, made the first transatlantic passenger flight in history. This epoch-making flight, I am proud to say, originated in Port Washington, N.Y. It is, of course, but one episode in a long history of association between Pan Am and the Empire State, and today Pan Am's presence in New York is epitomized by its titanic home office building in midtown Manhattan and by its striking circular terminal at the John F. Kennedy International Airport.

All the good things that have come to pass in the exciting history of Pan Am are due in large measure to the organizing genius of Mr. Juan T. Trippe and longstanding associates of his at the helm of this transportation enterprise. Equally, Madam President, this company would not be what it is today without the dedicated efforts of its thousands of employees. The remarkable thing about Pan Am employees is their longevity of service with the company. Once on the job with Pan Am, they seldom leave. They become part of the community, part of the political, social, and civic life of the communities in which they live and work.

The five boroughs of New York City and the suburban counties are the residences of hundreds of these Pan Am people who today carry on the tradition exemplified by the flight commemorated this week. To them, I say, "Well done."

ALASKA EARTHQUAKE RECONSTRUCTION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2881) to amend the Alaska Omnibus Act to provide assistance to the State of Alaska for the reconstruction of areas damaged by the earthquake of March 1964, and subsequent seismic waves, and for other purposes.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. ANDERSON. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that David Finnegan, of the Department of the Interior who is acting as counsel for the Federal Reconstruction and Development Planning Commission for Alaska, may be permitted on the floor of the Senate during the afternoon discussions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JACKSON. Madam President, I rise to urge the passage of S. 2881, amending the Alaska Omnibus Act to provide assistance to the State of Alaska for the reconstruction of areas damaged by the earthquake of March 1964 and subsequent seismic waves, and for other purposes.

Committee action was unanimous in ordering S. 2881 reported favorably to the Senate. Subsequently, Senator GRUENING requested and was granted permission to file individual views.

The purpose of S. 2881 is to provide additional authority for executive agencies of the Federal Government to assist the State of Alaska and its citizens in recovering from the earthquake and seismic wave disasters of March 27. The bill would accomplish its purpose by amending the Alaska Omnibus Act—73 Stat. 141—to provide special aid for highways, urban renewal, harbors, housing, and State finances.

Thus, the private sector of the Alaska economy as well as the public would benefit under S. 2881.

The committee broadened the scope of the administration's proposal by the adoption of three amendments. The first gave discretionary authority to the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency to increase the Federal contribution to urban renewal project costs to a maximum of 90 percent in certain of the communities in the disaster area. The second permits certain areas on the coast of California and Washington, devastated by the seismic waves, to share in the benefits of the extension of the Small Business Administration home disaster loan program provided in the bill. The third authorized the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency to purchase about $7.2 million of State of Alaska general obligation bonds of a total of $11,624,000 which were authorized, prior to the earthquake, but were not issued, or to make loans in that amount.

The maximum amount of additional obligational authority involved in the bill would come to not more than $50,150,000.

I believe that the Congress and the executive agencies have acted promptly and generously to aid the people of Alaska in their hour of trial. As Senator ANDERSON, chairman of the Federal Reconstruction Commission, stated in a press release made May 28, 1964:

> Federal assistance to Alaska homeowners, businessmen, and local and State governments for earthquake recovery is estimated to range between $236 and $337 million. Part of these funds are contingent on congressional approval.
>
> In addition, the Federal Government will spend about $76 million on reconstruction of damaged Federal facilities and on the cost of operating Federal disaster-related programs. These funds will have an impact on the private economy of Alaska.
>
> All of these funds are in addition to Federal expenditures which would have gone to the State and for normal Federal programs in Alaska had there been no disaster.

I ask unanimous consent that this chart detailing the assistance activities of the Federal Government in the Alaska disaster, be printed in the body of today's RECORD.

There being no objection, the chart was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Federal costs related to Alaska earthquake [1]

[In thousands of dollars]

	Total Federal assistance	Grants and other direct expenditures [2]			Loans			Net Federal cost
		Total	Ordinary disaster and other programs	Extraordinary assistance for Alaska	Total	Value of repayments [3]	Subsidy	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(2)+(7)
Aid to private sector:								
Small Business Administration	50,000				50,000	42,803	7,197	7,197
Internal Revenue	25,000	25,000	25,000					25,000
Bureau of Commercial Fisheries	700				700	657	43	43
REA (loan forgiveness)	5,000	5,000		5,000				5,000
VA, FNMA, HHFA (loan forgiveness)	?	?	?	?				?
Total	80,700	30,000	25,000	5,000	50,700	43,460	7,240	37,240
Aid to State and local governments:								
Office of Emergency Planning	80,122	80,122	80,122					80,122
Bureau of Public Roads	63,200	63,200	48,200	15,000				63,200
Transitional grants	23,500	23,500		23,500				23,500
Urban Renewal Administration	44,263	44,263	44,263					44,263
Community Facilities Administration	25,215	215	215		25,000	22,768	2,232	2,447
Total	236,300	211,300	172,800	38,500	25,000	22,768	2,232	213,532
Total	317,000	241,300	197,800	43,500	75,700	66,228	9,472	250,772
Alaska Railroad	27,000	27,000	27,000					27,000
Total	344,000	268,300	224,800	43,500	75,700	66,228	9,472	277,772
Other Federal facilities	49,246	49,246	49,246					49,246
Grand total	393,246	317,546	274,046	43,500	75,700	66,228	9,472	327,018

---

[1] Based on Budget Bureau's May 22, 1964, compilation of "Data Relating to Alaska Earthquake and Federal Aid to Alaska."

[2] Includes tax offsets and loan forgiveness.

[3] Present value of expected repayments at 4¼ percent, which is the current average market yield on Treasury obligations with 20 years remaining to maturity.

Source: Office of the Secretary of the Treasury, Office of Debt Analysis.

Mr. JACKSON. Madam President, I cannot more persuasively tell the Senate of the need for swift approval of this measure than by citing President Johnson's recommendation:

> Concern for our fellow ctizen alone compels prompt action on this proposal. But practical considerations are also most important. The construction season in Alaska is about to begin and is of short duration. The sooner Alaska can complete its reconstruction efforts, the sooner it can begin again to devote its efforts toward the further development of the State's resources.

Madam President, I wish to pay special tribute to the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] for the enormous effort he expended in connection with the pending proposed legislation, and in connection with other bills that have been before the Senate, in an effort to aid the people of Alaska. He served as Chairman of the President's Federal Reconstruction Commission, and at my request undertook to handle the pending legislation in the Senate. He has been most thoughtful in his efforts to try to find solutions under existing criteria—and we have had to broaden some of the criteria—in order that Alaska might be given appropriate aid.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The question is on agreeing, en bloc, to the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to en bloc.

Mr. KUCHEL. Madam President, permit me to observe that the committee, in its wisdom, saw fit to approve an amendment which I had offered to extend the terms of the home disaster loan benefits available from the Federal Government for damage resulting from the earthquake wherever it took place.

The sad fact is that, while the fury of the act of nature did bypass the State represented by the Senator from Oregon, who is now the Presiding Officer [Mrs. NEUBERGER], it did wreak some damage in a portion of the State represented by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Commerce, and coming southward, in the northern part of California.

I express my gratitude to the committee for the beneficient action which it took in adopting my amendment.

Beyond that, all I wish to say is that we listened in the Chamber to the two distinguished Senators from Alaska at the time the shock and fury took place.

This represents an indication by the Members of the Senate that they wish to lend the helping hand of the people of the United States to the people of the State of Alaska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is before the Senate and open to further amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, the past year has been marked by several natural disasters of unusual proportions. First the earthquake created havoc in Alaska and portions of California and Washington. In early June of this year, my State of Montana was hit with the most disastrous flood in our history. Eight western Montana counties have already been designated disaster counties eligible for assistance under Public Law 81–875. I am informed that additional designations are being considered for five or six more counties. The most recent estimates indicate that property damage in the public area exceeds $21 million and private losses are more than $41 million.

These figures are very conservative, because I am informed that in one county alone, Flathead County, the damage is in excess of $50 million. The needs in the public sector have been taken care of very rapidly under existing programs administered through the Office of Emergency Planning and various other departmental programs. The response has been most gratifying.

I take this occasion to express my deep and grateful appreciation to Mr. Edward A. McDermott, Director of the Office of Emergency Planning, who has done a tremendous job, as have those under his direction, in Montana, as they had already done in the States of Washington, Oregon, and Alaska.

The question which creates the greatest concern is how we can assist the individuals who have suffered great losses. According to information received from Montana, some individuals have suffered as much as $12,000 loss to their own homes. As I am sure Senators realize, these unusual disasters are ruinous to many families, and that there is no really adequate program for assistance to these individuals.

It is with this thought in mind that I have had prepared an amendment which would permit the inclusion of Montana disaster counties under section 54 of S. 2881, the pending bill. This would permit Montana residents to become eligible for aid under the Small Business Act in extending the maturity of loans up to 30 years. I realize that this legislation is designed to meet the problems of our sister State, which recently suffered such great devastation.

I would hope that the distinguished members of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, especially the chairman, the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] and the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], who has made a special study of this kind of situation, might agree to the inclusion of these Montana counties in the section dealing primarily with relief for the private individual.

At this time, I would also like to suggest that Congress should give very serious consideration to the problem of relief for the individual in natural disasters. According to information made available to me, at the present time, there is no comprehensive program, and what relief is available is rather inadequate.

Madam President, I send to the desk an amendment which I ask to have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be read.

The legislative clerk read the amendment as follows:

> On page 5, line 17, after "seismic waves," insert "or for the purpose of replacing, reconstructing, or repairing dwellings in counties in Montana designated in the calendar year 1964 as disaster areas pursuant to the act of September 30, 1950 (64 Stat. 1109)."

Mr. ANDERSON. Madam President, I would not want to be regarded as unfavorable to anyone who is trying to help the people of Montana, but I would hope that the distinguished majority leader would try to leave the amendment out of this bill.

As I understand, the Small Business Administration is able to do a great many of the things the Senator from Montana desires to have done. The other agencies of Government are also authorized, under the Disaster Insurance Act, to do many of these things.

Many of the counties in Montana have been declared disaster areas. I would hope that the senior Senator from Montana and his colleague would go to the appropriate agencies, along with their constituents, and ask for help.

If that help is not forthcoming, I promise that I shall do what I can to make certain that assistance will be given to those who have suffered from the disaster. The Senator from Montana may recall that the State of Ohio had a devastating flood not too long ago. It was not so disastrous that relief was required to the extent provided in the proposal for Alaska. We have provided other relief assistance for Alaska.

In the future when States suffer from floods, the people may think it desirable to have applied to them the same provisions as are applied to Alaska, but their conditions may not be the same. While the disaster in Montana was major, it did not have the same relative importance to the State as the disaster in Alaska had to that State.

I therefore hope, since the bill is directed primarily to the Alaska earthquake and to the seismic wave that followed, touching California and other States, that it will not be encumbered by a provision which has not been considered by the committee and would be out of place in the bill.

I say that with all kindness to the majority leader. I think he ought to try, through the agencies concerned, to have done for Montana the work that Mr. McDermott has done for Alaska. Mr. McDermott has done outstanding work in Alaska. Publicly and privately, I have praised the work he has done in that State. He will do the same for Montana. The people of Montana will find that his agency is as ready to work there as it was for the people of Alaska.

I would hope the Senator from Montana would withdraw his amendment and try to have the individuals in the agencies concerned do similar work for Montana. If such relief is not obtainable, he should try to obtain legislative relief for that State alone.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I deeply appreciate the open mind displayed by the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico and the encouragement he has given.

My colleague from Montana [Mr. METCALF] and I have made contacts with all the Government agencies interested in disaster problems. We have been in touch with the Small Business Administration. So far as the public sector is concerned, adequate relief is being provided by the Office of Emergency Planning and other agencies of the Government.

But the factor which concerns us the most at the present time happens to be the individual homeowners, 5,000 of whom, in the southwest part of the city of Great Falls, have been flooded out in whole or in part. They have mortgages to pay. Some of them have made little more than downpayments on their houses. They have very little in the way of insurance to fall back on. This is an area of Great Falls that is, by and large, not peopled by the wealthy. These are people who need help the most.

I had hoped it would be possible, on the basis of this bill, or at the very least on the basis of the statement made by the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico, who has had so much to do with this bill, that the people of Montana might be given the same kind of consideration with respect to loans which would be amortized on a 30-year basis, and other considerations, because of the difficulties which confront the people in those counties at the present time.

I hope that Mr. Foley, Administrator of the Small Business Administration, who has been most cooperative, will take note of this situation and will derive encouragement from what the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico might still have to say on this particular subject as it affects the private sector.

Mr. ANDERSON. Madam President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I would be glad to accompany the Senator from Montana on a visit to Mr. Foley and to talk with him. I have found Mr. Foley to be a very reasonable person. He tries to be helpful in situations like this. So far as I am concerned, I believe he would be helpful.

One of the things that has been of great benefit to the people has been to permit them to have the benefit of low interest rates over a long period of years. In many instances, a person has had to pay an interest rate as high as 7, 8, or 10 percent, with repayment of the loan due in 15 or 20 years. But if that can be changed into a 3-percent loan for a period of 30 years, the burden will be completely changed.

I express to the Senator from Montana my assurance that I shall be glad to join him in making every effort possible to obtain assistance from the Small Business Administration. I express the hope that Mr. Foley will be receptive to whatever request the Senator from Montana may make.

Mr. JACKSON. Madam President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the senior Senator from New Mexico. A special problem exists in Montana which deserves the fullest support. It is only because our committee was, jurisdictionally speaking, responsible under the Alaska Omnibus Act that we were involved in this proposal in the first instance. I am completely sympathetic to the remarks of the Senator from Montana and will, as chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, do whatever I can to assist the people of Montana and the distinguished Senators from that State.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I express my deep appreciation to Senators who are in charge of the bill and assure them that their words are most encouraging. In view of the fact that the Senate seems to be unanimously in accord with the views expressed by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Anderson] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. Jackson] I withdraw my amendment at this time.

Mr. BARTLETT. Madam President, I express the hope that the people of Montana, who were the victims of a disastrous flood, will obtain quick and effective relief. I have the feeling that the law is now so arranged that when the problem is presented to Mr. Foley, who is one of the best administrators in the Federal Government, in my opinion, it will be found possible to extend the benefits of the 30-year loan period on the basis of existing provisions in the law.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I heartily support obtaining for the people of Alaska the maximum assistance that can be obtained for them under any bill that can be passed in the Senate. I have read the House bill. I think I prefer the House bill to the Senate bill, because it is more generous to the people of Alaska. We cannot be too generous to our own people.

I have spent hours in recent days trying to prevent the giving away of the largess of the United States to areas of the world where our handouts will not be appreciated anyway, and will very likely, as the reports of the Comptroller General of the United States point out, be the cause of corruption as well as great waste and inefficiency in the use of the foreign aid money of the American taxpayers.

I have listened once again to our AID and State Department officials try to justify loans running into the millions of dollars—what are called loans, at least—at the rate of three-quarters of 1 percent interest, with 10-year grace periods, and 50 years in which to pay. A large percentage of such loans is to be paid back if paid back at all in soft money, not even in hard, cold American dollars. Yet we find ourselves rather reserved about coming to the assistance of our own people by making the most generous possible arrangements that we can grant for loans in Alaska.

I quite agree with the Senator from Montana [Mr. Mansfield] that the Federal Government should assist the people of Montana by the most generous program that can be provided for that State due to the flood suffering of its people. The Senator has decided to withdraw his amendment. I would have voted for it if he had pressed for its inclusion in the bill. We have reached the point where we shall have to do a large amount of legislating if we expect to do justice to our people in the light of a Senate and a House which have already demonstrated, in my judgment, an uncalled for reserve in regard to doing justice to our people. I am ready to start voting for riders, if riders are necessary to do justice to our people, whether on this bill or any other bill. But the Senator from Montana has decided not to press his amendment.

I appreciate the assurance given by the Senator from New Mexico to the Senator from Montana that he will assist him in every way he can in consultation with Mr. Foley, the Director of the Small Business Administration.

I hope that it will bear fruit. The best way to deliver the fruit to the depressed areas of the country is to enact the necessary legislation. I look forward with hope—and I never give up hope—that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs will eventually get around to doing justice to the people of my State in respect to the deepest pocket of poverty that exists in the country today. The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs did not do justice to Oregon the other day, nor did the Appropriations Committee, in regard to the attitude that the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee and the Appropriations Committee have taken toward the Tongue Point facility. They trimmed down not only my recommendation and the recommendation of the Secretary of the Interior, but also the recommendations of our beloved President Kennedy.

Mr. President (Mr. Young of Ohio in the chair), I am sorry to be placed in a position where some Senators may feel that I am a little unpleasant. I am unpleasant about this unfair treatment of Oregon and I intend to continue to be unpleasant until I obtain justice for my State. I do not believe that the treatment my State has received in connection with Tongue Point can be justified by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, or by the Appropriations Committee of the Senate.

I have been pleading for $5 million for Tongue Point and I have received no answers to the merits of the issues I have raised. I have received no answers to the evidence which I placed in the Record justifying the special school for a special group of Indians at Tongue Point as recommended by President Kennedy, by Secretary of the Interior Udall, by the Bureau of Indian Affairs and by the recognized leaders of Indian groups in the United States.

Oh, I am well aware of the fact of what went on in the cloakrooms and behind the scenes, but that does not make it right. I intend to continue, so long as this session of the Senate continues, to try to save the people of my country the great waste of millions of taxpayers' dollars in a foreign policy which at the present time cannot be justified. This statement may not be felt to be germane, but it is germane, and I take this time to speak about it so that no more time will pass in the day before at least the record is made on my position with regard to what I consider to be the shocking position taken by our former Ambassador to South Vietnam, Mr. Lodge, before the Committee on Foreign Relations this morning.

He gave to us the same old McNamara-Rusk line, calling for the expenditure and waste of millions and millions more of taxpayers' dollars in South Vietnam when we should be spending more of that money in Alaska, Montana, Oregon, West Virginia, the Appalachian area, and the other depressed areas of this country.

This morning, when I asked Mr. Lodge to tell us why our Government is opposed to going to a 14-nation conference on the Asian crisis, why we oppose taking the crisis in southeast Asia to the Security Council of the United Nations and then to the General Assembly, why we are not bringing SEATO in under the SEATO Treaty to assume its treaty obligations in regard to South Vietnam, his testimony added up to meaning that the time is not propitious. That is no justification—as I told the Ambassador this morning—for the United States staying outside the framework of international law.

Ambassador Lodge tried to get us to swallow again the old bromide in the form of that old saw that we cannot hold at the conference table what we cannot hold in the military field.

Analyze that statement. Analyze it for what it means. It means that we first impose our military might on southeast Asia and then we say in effect to the world now we are willing to negotiate. Now we are willing to go to the conference table. This amounts to telling the world that it can either agree with us and do our bidding or challenge our military might.

We cannot square that with the professed ideals of the United States. I said to Ambassador Lodge that I rejected the position he is taking in South Vietnam, which is also the position taken by the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, and now, at long last, the position which the President of the United States has taken.

There are a great many values involved. The value of the loss of American blood. The value of the loss of American ideals. For no longer are we a country that can boast about the fact that we believe in substituting the rule of law for the jungle law of American military might.

There is a loss of something else as well, if we do not stop it, which is why my remarks are germane. I conclude with this observation, that there is a loss of strength of the greatest security weapon we have; namely, the economic power of the United States.

Unless we take care of our economy, and unless we take care of the needs of our people at home, we shall perform a vast disservice to future generations of American boys, because we shall not be leaving them a strong America. We are following a course of international outlawry in Asia and all rationalizing by Lodge, McNamara, Rusk, Taylor, and the President will not remove the blood from our hands. We can cleanse our sorry record only by reversing our course and calling upon the United Nations to carry out the clear provisions of the United Nations Charter designed to preserve peace wherever war is threatened.

Later, unrelated to the subject matter before us now, I intend to say a few words in rebuttal to some of the other things said by the Ambassador this morning. However, I wished the record to be made early in the day that, after listening to Ambassador Lodge this morning, I am more convinced than ever that our country is following a policy of outlawry in Asia, that we are outside the framework of international law, that we cannot justify use of the jungle law of American unilateral action by way of force and American military might.

We are, in my judgment, headed for a major war in Asia unless the policy outlined by Ambassador Lodge this morning is reversed and reversed quickly.

To the American people I say: "Only you can reverse it. Only you, the people, can reverse it. I recognize that the press has done a job on you by not printing the facts for you about South Vietnam. I recognize that those of us who are criticizing and documenting our charges regarding the facts concerning our country acting outside the framework of international law, are not going to have our story told to the American people by a 'kept' press. I am satisfied also, as my mail shows, that it is getting through to many Americans."

We owe our thanks to the radio and television for that—not to the press.

I am satisfied that once the American people understand what is going on, they will agree with me that they must make clear to the administration they want none of the war policy of the administration in Asia. Many leaders of both the Democratic and Republican parties are advocating a warmaking policy in Asia. The American people must reverse them or thousands of American soldiers and thousands of American citizens will die without justification because such a war will be entirely uncalled for.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska will state it.

Mr. GRUENING. Is the bill open to further amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, all citizens, and I am sure, all Senators, feel the deepest sympathy for citizens of the earthquake devastated areas in Alaska. All of us desire to extend a helping hand to those dealt with so tragically by the forces of nature.

There is, however, a limit beyond which it is neither constitutional nor practical for the National Government to transgress. The bill proposed by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, in some instances, exceeds this limit.

The bill provides for the forgiveness of private loans by the Farmers Home Administration. Approximately 200 such loans, totaling about $4 million are outstanding in the disaster area. In relation to the total annual expenditures of the National Government, this amount is not large; yet the precedent which this authorization for forgiveness of private loans would establish is extremely far reaching. There is no prior precedent for such action.

It is obvious that in many cases the pledged security for these loans has been totally destroyed and it would probably be impossible to collect the loans. I would remind the Senate, however, that bankruptcy proceedings can accomplish essentially the same ultimate result, and the individuals concerned could be relieved thereby from any potential burden of a deficiency judgment which the Government might obtain. This is the remedy which must be followed where liens are held on the destroyed property of individuals by private rather than governmental lenders. This has been the course which was available to disaster victims in years past, and it is available to all regardless of whether their indebtedness is owed to a private creditor or to the National Government.

The bill might well provide that the bankruptcy of an individual as a result of the disaster would not be considered as a disqualifying factor for new and additional loans from Government agencies to the individuals involved. Thus, the fact that the disaster victims were declared bankrupt would not prevent them from obtaining such Government assistance in the form of loans as are contemplated for new construction or reconstruction. This approach would, however, avoid the dangerous precedent of authorizing the cancellation or forgiveness of private loans. It would also avoid the inequities inherent in allowing forgiveness to those who had the good fortune to owe their indebtedness to the National Government rather than a private lender.

The bill, in its present form, should not pass. I would like the Record to show that I oppose that portion of the bill which provides for cancellation of loans by the Government to individuals.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THURMOND. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. There are 200 loans in the amount of $4 million. But only 82 of those loans are on property which suffered damage. It is a very small percentage. The total amount of forgiveness is probably in the amount of $100,000.

Mr. LAUSCHE. How much?

Mr. ANDERSON. Approximately $100,000. It so happened that God took good care of the farm people in Alaska. Their damage is not as large as we might have expected. When compared with the amount of money involved, it is a very small sum.

Mr. THURMOND. I am not opposed to the entire bill as proposed, but only to this portion of the bill that cancels individual loans. I think it is setting a dangerous precedent for the Government to cancel a debt owed to it by an individual.

We might be treading on dangerous ground. If an individual has been damaged—as I am sure a great many of these people have been, and I feel very sorry for them—they have a recourse. They can be relieved of their debt without the necessity of having it canceled by the Government.

They can do as other individuals do when hardship hits them. They can go into bankruptcy. That would accomplish the same result without having the Government establish a precedent of canceling a loan due it by an individual.

My objection is to the continued interjection of the Federal Government into fields of activity already adequately regulated and supervised under the application of currently existing Federal or State authority.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Inouye in the chair). The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I regret the necessity of calling up my amendment, No. 1080, which seeks only to conform the Senate bill, S. 2881, as reported, with the House bill, H.R. 11438, as reported.

My only regret in offering this amendment stems from the fact that it seemingly places me in opposition to the able and distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Anderson].

I have known and admired the Senator from New Mexico for many years.

He is a very capable, earnest, and sincere Senator, working assiduously and effectively for objectives in which he believes.

He was of immeasurable assistance in helping Alaska to obtain statehood. He conducted the first Senate hearing on Alaska statehood in 1950, as a result of which the Interior Committee voted to report an Alaska statehood bill for the first time. This was the first time any Alaska statehood bill had been reported by a Senate committee.

Later he was floor manager in the Senate of another statehood bill, and secured favorable action upon it. The history of the fight for Alaskan and Hawaiian statehood will inevitable record Senator ANDERSON's important participation and leadership in this epic legislative battle which extended the frontiers of democracy to America's farthest west, north, and south, and demonstrated to the world that our United States was still young, progressive, on the march, and validating that most basic of American principles, that of government by consent of the governed.

I might add that I have, further, a sense of personal obligation and gratitude for the participation of Senator ANDERSON at a certain confirmation hearing before the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee in April of 1949, when the then Governor of Alaska, whose name modesty forbids me to mention, had been nominated for a third 4-year term. I might say that certainly, in consequence, in part, of Senator ANDERSON's penetrating interrogation of hostile witnesses, the nomination was unanimously confirmed by the committee and later by the Senate.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GRUENING. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I am extremely happy that that was the result. I have no apologies to make for what I did. I thought I was doing a public service to support a Government official who was doing a good job.

Mr. GRUENING. I have never ceased to be grateful for that.

In accepting the chairmanship of the Federal Reconstruction and Development Planning Commission for Alaska, Senator ANDERSON did so at great sacrifice in time and effort. He threw himself into the effort of rebuilding Alaska with zeal and determination despite the many other calls upon his time.

I know he has Alaska's best interests at heart as he always had during the fight for Alaska statehood, and subsequently.

Our differences, therefore, are differences in how far the Federal Government should go in its efforts and how much the State and local governments of Alaska are financially able to assist themselves.

These amendments would not have been offered unless I considered them absolutely essential to the economic recovery of Alaska.

I had hoped that these amendments would have been adopted by the committee thus obviating the necessity for calling them up on the floor.

But in order to do full equity to the people of Alaska and to enable them to make as full a recovery as possible from the disaster of last Good Friday, these amendments are essential.

From a disaster of this magnitude a full recovery is not possible. Many citizens of Alaska have suffered the loss of personal possessions which can never be replaced and for which no compensation can be devised.

Even if S. 2881 were passed with both the committee amendments and my amendments there will be many residents who will have suffered losses for which no recompense is provided in this or any other bill.

However, where aid can be given I strongly urge that such aid be given.

As I have already indicated, my amendments are designed only to conform the Senate bill, S. 2881, with the House reported bill, H.R. 11438.

Two of these amendments, inserted by the Interior Committee in the other body, are limiting in nature.

The first amendment—paragraph 4—added by the House committee, puts an overall ceiling on the amounts authorized to be appropriated to carry out this bill. The ceiling stated is $50,150,000.

The second amendment—paragraph 5—calls upon the President to report semiannually, beginning not later than February 1, 1965, to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House. The periodic report is to set forth the actions taken by the various Federal agencies under the act.

The third amendment—paragraph 1—relates to the State and local matching requirements for urban renewal projects for the city of Anchorage—by far our largest city.

The history of this amendment is as follows:

The original recommendation by the Housing and Home Finance Agency to the Federal Reconstruction and Development Planning Commission for Alaska was that, because so much of Alaska's tax base had been destroyed, those areas in which urban renewal projects had to be undertaken because of the Good Friday disaster should receive special consideration in the amount of State and local matching funds required. HHFA therefore proposed that the matching formula for those areas be changed from 75–25, as already provided by law for "normal" disaster areas, to 90–10.

In a "normal" disaster area, the remainder of the State's tax base is not cut by 50 percent as it was in Alaska. In the "normal" disaster area the matching ratio for urban renewal projects is 75–25. In such areas the State is usually in a better position to assist the locality than is the State of Alaska.

While the original recommended matching ratio was 90–10, when the recommendations were made to the President by Chairman ANDERSON of the Commission, the recommendation with respect to special consideration on urban renewal projects for Alaska cities in economic difficulties because of the disaster was not included.

When Mr. George Hayes, the attorney general of the State of Alaska appeared before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on behalf of the State, he made a special plea that the matching formula for urban renewal projects in Alaska in disaster areas be reduced from 75–25 to 90–10. His testimony is before Senators in the printed hearings. His arguments were clear, cogent, and compelling.

The gist of his argument was not special privilege for the State of Alaska. It is merely a matter of "we would if we could but we cannot." It is a question of not having sufficient money. It is as basic as that.

Two weeks ago the Mayor of Anchorage, Mr. George Sharrock, wrote the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] in his capacity as chairman of the Federal Reconstruction and Development Planning Commission for Alaska as follows:

> Anchorage simply has no spare capital funds. We seek the 90–10 formula, coupled with the State assisting on the local share, simply because without such complete State and Federal aid we would have to leave our slide areas in private ownership for owners to dispose of as they might be able to; furthermore, we could not restore facilities or roads beyond the minimum being done under Public Law 875 for many years to come.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire letter from Mr. Sharrock be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. GRUENING. Since writing that letter, one of the contingencies dreaded by the city of Anchorage has come true. A committee of expert geologists has reported that a considerable portion of downtown Anchorage in the main business district will have to be shored up if it is to be made safe for construction. This will cost an additional $4 to $8 million. I ask unanimous consent that the article from the Anchorage Times recording this new and unforeseen development be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. GRUENING. The difference between an urban renewal matching ratio of 90 to 10 and 75 to 25 for the urban renewal projects in Anchorage before the Commission's report was approximately $4 million.

I have said before, and I will repeat: the exact amount of the damage caused to the State of Alaska by the Good Friday disaster is not precisely known. As time goes on, the ascertained damage will increase. The seismological report is but one example of such hidden damages to be discovered at some future date.

In the markup in the Senate Interior Committee on S. 2881, I offered an amendment to reduce the matching ratio for all urban renewal projects necessitated by the disaster from 75 to 25 to 90 to 10.

The committee accepted this amendment for all cities other than Anchorage.

It is my opinion that Anchorage needs the reduced ratio as much as do the other cities in Alaska.

The difference between my position and that of the able and distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico is one of fact: can the city of Anchorage afford an additional $4 million for urban renewal?

The State of Alaska with its intimate knowledge of its financial position and that of its cities says it cannot afford this extra sum.

The city of Anchorage says it cannot afford this extra sum.

Opposed to these opinions is the opinion of the able and distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico who says that, despite the statements by the city and State, the city of Anchorage can afford this extra sum.

The point, however, is that the amendment I propose—and which the committee in the other body has adopted—is permissive only. It does not require a 90–10 matching ratio. The 90 percent is a maximum and the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency can, when the time comes, exercise his discretion in authorizing a Federal matching ratio anywhere from 75 to 90 percent.

It is my hope that this amendment will be accepted either here on the floor or in conference, and that the exact amount of Federal matching up to a maximum of 90 percent will be left in the capable hands of the able Administrator of HHFA.

The next amendment—paragraph 3—relates to the purchase of FHA-insured mortgages on Alaska homes destroyed or severely damaged.

This amendment would permit the Federal National Mortgage Association—Fannie Mae—to buy at no more than par mortgages on FHA-insured homes in Alaska which were destroyed or severely damaged where the mortgages are now held by Fannie Mae.

Under existing HHFA policies, FHA mortgages on homes severely damaged or destroyed in Alaska can be forgiven upon the payment of $1,000 provided the mortgages are held by Fannie Mae. Some of these mortgages were purchased by Fannie Mae out of its special assistance fund. Some FHA mortgages on such houses are still held by banks, never having been purchased by Fannie Mae. Some were purchased by Fannie Mae and resold.

This amendment would have done equity among FHA-insured homeowners in Alaska whose homes were destroyed or severely damaged. The homeowner could not control the sale to or the purchase by Fannie Mae of his mortgage. Nor could the homeowner control the resale of his mortgage by Fannie Mae. That was purely a matter of chance.

Without this amendment, Alaska homeowners in the same circumstances will be dealt with unfairly.

This is not a question of rescuing the banks holding the mortgages, but rather rescuing the homeowners who gave the mortgages. Banks cannot forgive a legal indebtedness without making every effort to collect. Forgiveness would not be permitted by the State banking commissioner. Forgiveness would not be permitted by the Internal Revenue Service as a writeoff as for a bad debt. Collection of any disaster insurance carried by any of the banks is also dependent on diligent efforts to collect the indebtedness.

The result will therefore be that many homeowners in Alaska having FHA-insured mortgages may have to go through bankruptcy in order for the banks to prove that they took diligent steps to collect the indebtedness. Others may be saddled with double indebtednesses.

This could be happening while a next-door neighbor, whose FHA-insured house was also destroyed, could obtain forgiveness solely because of the chance that the FHA-insured mortgage had been purchased by Fannie Mae and not resold.

This amendment is supported by the National Association of Mutual Savings Banks.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter dated June 10, 1964, from the National Association of Mutual Savings Banks be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 3.)

Mr. GRUENING. By its terms, the total cost of this amendment is limited to $10 million. This amendment was also accepted by the House Committee and is in the House bill as reported.

By its terms, the funds to carry out this amendment would come from Fannie Mae's special assistance funds. Far from creating a precedent for extraneous uses of Fannie Mae's special assistance funds, this proposal would follow a precedent. Up until a few years ago, Fannie Mae's special assistance funds were allocated to purchase FHA-insured mortgages on Alaska homes and these mortgages were held in Fannie Mae's portfolios. The reason for this procedure was because there just was no private market—at least so it was alleged—for the purchase of FHA-insured mortgages on Alaska homes. The area was considered too remote and the risks too great. Shortly after statehood, Fannie Mae determined to make a real effort to sell to private banking interests FHA-insured mortgages on Alaska homes. It was quite successful in its efforts. Many of the mortgages involved in this amendment were originally purchased with special assistance funds and sold to private lenders. What this amendment does, therefore, in great part, is to reverse the process and use the very same funds to repurchase these mortgages so they can be forgiven under present policies on the payment of $1,000.

Through June 11, 1964, there had been authorized under the Fannie Mae special assistance funds over $2 billion, of which $181,756,000 had not yet been allocated. The amount involved in this amendment is therefore less than 6 percent of the total Fannie Mae special assistance fund available for allocation and would in no way disturb allotments already made for other special assistance functions.

The adoption of this amendment could do much to relieve the approximately 120 Alaskan howeowners thus discriminated against from heavy debt burdens and possible bankruptcy. As one homeowner wrote me:

> A great many of us are still expecting the Federal Government through FNMA to purchase the FHA guaranteed loans that are in the slide area in Turnagain. FNMA did offer to buy the loans that they have in their portfolio, but these number but a few. This seems to be a lopsided situation with a few people getting the benefit of having their loans with FNMA where some others have their loans in private portfolios.

I hope that this amendment will be accepted either on the floor or in conference. It is a good amendment. It is a just amendment. It should be adopted.

Another amendment—paragraph 2—also adopted by the House committee and contained in the House bill as reported, would reduce the interest rate on State of Alaska bonds purchased or loans made to the State of Alaska by HHFA.

The maximum amount of bonds or loans authorized is $25 million.

As introduced, the bill provides for a rate of interest of 3⅝ percent—3¾ percent after today—with a repayment schedule of 40 years and no moratorium on repayment.

The amendment I offered in committee would have reduced the interest rate on bonds issued by the State of Alaska for reconstruction of disaster damage, and purchased by the Housing and Home Finance Agency, to three-quarters of 1 percent, repayable in 50 years with a moratorium on repayment of principal for the first 10 years.

Immediately after the Good Friday disaster, the Legislature of the State of Alaska—as an indication of its willingness to do all within its means to undertake the recovery of the stricken economy of Alaska—authorized the issuance of $50 million worth of general revenue bonds. However, 50 percent of Alaska's economic base was destroyed by the earthquake and bond experts state that State bonds can only be marketed now at an interest rate of considerably more than 3⅝ percent, interest on $25 million of State bonds over the course of 40 years would cost the State of Alaska more than $18 million. If the interest rate could be reduced to three-quarters of 1 percent, with a moratorium on repayment of principal for the first 10 years, and repayment spread over 50 years, the saving to the State of Alaska would be almost $13 million and the repayment terms would be more within the means of the State.

What I suggested to the committee was that the Federal Government loan Federal funds to the State of Alaska at the same terms on which it makes loans to foreign countries under the foreign assistance program.

There are several reasons in support of this suggestion.

In the first place, the foreign loans are made at three-fourths of 1 percent interest whether or not there had been a disaster in the foreign country. Alaska has suffered a major disaster and should be entitled to at least equal treatment.

In the second place, there is no doubt that the loan to the State of Alaska will be repaid to the Federal Government. On the basis of past experience, there is considerable doubt that the foreign loans will ever be repaid to the United States.

In the third place the loan to the State of Alaska generates tax revenues. Our loans to foreign countries produce revenues for those foreign countries, not for the United States.

In the calendar year 1963 alone, AID made loans in the amount of over $1 billion to 35 foreign countries at terms of three-fourths of 1 percent interest, moratorium of 10 years on the repayment of principal, and repayment of principal in 40 years.

A list of three-fourths of 1 percent loans made to foreign countries under the foreign assistance program appears on pages 15362 to 15364 of yesterday's Record.

As I have stated, the House committee lowered the interest rate to 3 percent. I am offering the House amendment at this point.

The amendment I offer will permit a moratorium for the first 10 years on the repayment of principal, thus easing the burden on the State for repayment during the course of a difficult time anticipated ahead. As stated, it permits the Administrator of HHFA to negotiate a lower rate of interest than 3 percent, if he deems it necessary because of the State's financial condition.

What lies ahead for the State of Alaska none of us can foretell. But in this matter of loans to the State, we should arm the Administrator of the HHFA with sufficient authority to act to meet any emergency needed to aid the State.

I hope that this amendment also will be adopted either here on the floor or in conference.

As I stated yesterday, the people of the State of Alaska are grateful to the people of the remainder of the United States for the compassion shown and the aid given. My seeking these amendments should not be interpreted as any lack of appreciation on my part for the dedicated efforts made on behalf of the State of Alaska and its people since March 27, 1964, by the able and distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico, or the hundreds of dedicated people in the executive branch of the Government.

But I would be doing less than my duty to the people of the State of Alaska if I did not at this time point out that the Federal Government, with the expenditure of but a little more funds, would be able to obviate many inequities.

I think they should be obviated and hope that my amendments will be adopted.

Exhibit 1

June 15, 1964.

Senator Clinton P. Anderson,
Chairman, Federal Reconstruction and Development Planning Commission for Alaska, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Anderson: This is in reply to your letter of June 1 questioning the amount of money proposed to be spent for urban renewal in Anchorage following the March 27 earthquake. I should like to offer observations on a number of points you raised.

(1) The very high figures you cited prove to be the very early estimates, made hastily, immediately after the earthquake. I am advised by the Alaska State Housing Authority that more complete figures are substantially reduced. For instance, the proposed Federal capital grant for the Anchorage downtown project has been reduced to $17,672,160 and the Turnagain grant to $689,238 (from $28 million total) on the 75 percent basis.

(2) True, if Anchorage had to put up the sums involved, it would not embark on such programs. But this is the whole purpose of urban renewal, whether in normal times or in disaster: to help communities do what they could not do themselves.

(3) Anchorage simply has no spare capital funds. We seek the 90–10 formula, coupled with the State assisting on the local share, simply because without such complete State and Federal aid we would have to leave our slide areas in private ownership for owners to dispose of as they might be able to; furthermore, we could not restore facilities or roads beyond the minimum being done under Public Law 875 for many years to come.

(4) The Anchorage downtown project includes considerably more area than simply the portion devastated by slide activity. We had advised Mr. Dwight Ink that we needed the larger project so the increased tax revenues from the renewed downtown could help pay Anchorage's share of the cost of renewal under the 75–25 formula. If renewal is confined to the slide areas of Turnagain and the downtown area, where no private reuse will be possible because of unstable soils, there will be a net tax loss and thus no revenues to help the city pay its share of renewal; hence, we called for 90–10 assistance for these areas.

I hope this sufficiently clarifies Anchorage's position on this matter. Be assured we have no wish to spend any more public money than is absolutely necessary. I am confident that costs will continue to be reduced as more definite information becomes available and we will do all in our power to see that this is done. In the meantime, I hope it is understood that extensive aid continues to be needed and urban renewal is just one of the tools being used to provide it.

Sincerely yours,
George Sharrock,
Mayor.

Exhibit 2

[From the Anchorage (Alaska) Daily Times, June 26, 1964]

STUDY SHOWS DOWNTOWN NEEDS DRAINS, BUTTRESSES FOR SAFETY—$4 TO $8 MILLION ESTIMATED FOR COST OF SOIL STABILIZATION WORK

A program of ground stabilization for the downtown business district—expected to cost between $4 and $8 million—was called for in a report given the city today by a team of Federal scientists and engineers.

The long-awaited report was the first of three to be issued on a month-long Anchorage area soils study started here after the March 27 earthquake. The study has been conducted by a team of consultants working for the U.S. Army Engineer District, Alaska, and the Federal Task Force 9.

Today's report continued the high risk designation for the downtown business district between E Street and Barrow and from the Alaska Railroad depot to the alley between Fifth and Sixth Avenues.

The remainder of the downtown area from E Street to the Inlet and south along L Street, will be included in the second report scheduled to be released July 6. A third report, covering the Turnagain residential district, is to be made on July 11.

City officials were briefed on today's report at a meeting held with Corps of Engineers and Task Force 9 personnel at the office of Col. Kenneth Sawyer, Alaska district engineer.

Mayor George Sharrock and Lyman Woodman, acting city manager, led the delegation of councilmen and city department heads attending the briefing.

While the report continued the high risk designation for the Fourth Avenue slide area it said the classification could be reduced to a nominal risk category through a program of soil stabilization.

The program would include removal of unstable soil and replacement with more stable material, regarding installation of drainage, and buttressing of the northern end of the slope area.

While the report did not include cost figures for such a program, preliminary unofficial estimates indicated it would run between $4 and $8 million.

The report is expected to be presented to Senator Clinton Anderson, chairman of the Alaska Reconstruction Commission on his return to Washington Monday. The next step apparently will be an economic study of the feasibility of the proposed stabilization program and possible methods of financing.

Continuation of the "high risk" designation for the Fourth Avenue area apparently continues for the present the Federal Small Business Administration's freeze order on loans for new construction in the area. The freeze was announced earlier when a preliminary report first labeled the downtown area as a so-called high risk zone.

The slide areas were originally designated high risk in the preliminary report issued on May 19. That report was based on preearthquake reports and later surface studies. Since it was issued, an intensive program of core drilling has been underway to provide more complete data. Results of the drilling were incorporated in today's report.

The area covered in today's report includes the five-block section on the north side of Fourth Avenue between E and A Streets where business establishments were destroyed by the quake and slide. Also included is the Fifth Avenue location of the five-story J. C. Penney Co. building heavily damaged in the quake.

The Seattle engineering firm of Shannon & Wilson conducted the soils study which were the basis for today's report. Consultants for the study included Dr. L. Bjerrum, of Norway, an expert on unstable clay; Dr. Ralph Peck, soils foundation scientist; Dr. Harry Seed, University of California scientist; Dr. A. Spence, of Vancouver, British Columbia, soil consultant; and Dr. Neil Twelker, Seattle soil consultant. Engineers on the staff of the Army Corps of Engineers and geologists with the U.S. Geological Survey also participated in the study.

Exhibit 3

National Association of
Mutual Savings Banks,
New York, N.Y., June 10, 1964.

Hon. Henry M. Jackson,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Jackson: This is in response to your letter of June 4 and telegram of June 9 with respect to the problems and proposed legislation (S. 2881) concerning Alaskan properties damaged by the recent earthquake. I am pleased to have the opportunity to comment on these matters and to offer you precise information on the volume and status of Alaskan mortgage loans held by mutual savings banks.

You will note from the attached exhibits based on a direct survey made by our national association as of April 30, 1964, that 14 mutual savings banks in 7 States held 2,778 mortgage loans in Alaska, amounting to $61,550,000. The bulk of these loans are insured by the Federal Housing Administration and are on one- to four-family properties. Only 32 loans totaling $884,000 were secured by properties destroyed or beyond repair. As you can see, such loans account for only a little over 1 percent of the total—both number and amount.

Our information is that 4 of the 14 savings banks, having loans in Alaska, are covered by all-risk insurance. The coverage and terms of this insurance are not precisely known to us, but in at least one case, we know that the savings bank must take every legal action to recover whatever it can directly from the borrower before insurance proceeds are disbursed.

With respect to S. 2881, we urge the adoption of the amendment offered by Senator GRUENING, proposing a new section 57 authorizing the Federal National Mortgage Association to purchase FHA-insured loans, in an amount not to exceed $10 million, on Alaskan properties destroyed or irreparably damaged as a result of the earthquake. This proposal is in line with the suggestion made in our letter of May 14, 1964, to Dr. Robert Weaver, Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, a copy of which was sent to you. As noted in that letter, current Federal actions provide relief only for those home mortgagors whose mortgage contracts happen to be held by FNMA or VA. Other home mortgagors, whose homes have been destroyed or irreparably damaged, but those mortgage obligations are held by private lenders are being ignored. The Gruening amendment would go a long way toward correcting this inequity.

While we are aware that it is impossible to resolve all inequities arising out of tragic disasters, I hope you will agree that the Government should not knowingly discriminate among its citizens when it can readily avoid doing so. And the Gruening amendment offers an opportunity to deal more equitably with the plight of Alaskan homeowners than the proposals made and actions taken to date.

We urge the incorporation of section 57 in S. 2881, not only because of equity considerations to mortgage borrowers, but equally important because of the great needs Alaska has for expanded flows of private capital. Such capital will not be forthcoming unless private investors have confidence in the willingness and ability of the Federal Government to proceed equitably and imaginatively in dealing with emergency situations. The citizens of Alaska are able and willing to rebuild their State stronger than ever before and this can be done most effectively only through an accelerated flow of private capital.

In sum, the Gruening amendment appears eminently fair and feasible. We urge that you support it, not out of selfish concern for our industry—which you can see from the enclosed statistics stands to suffer only inconsequential losses—but out of broader considerations for the longer run welfare of Alaska and its citizens.

Thank you for your consideration of this letter.

Sincerely yours,

GROVER E. ENSLEY,
Executive Vice President.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I call up my amendments No. 1080, and ask that they be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments offered by the Senator from Alaska will be stated.

The legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendments.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendments be dispensed with and that they be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendments offered by Mr. GRUENING (No. 1080) are as follows:

(1) On page 4 delete lines 22 through 24. On page 5, line 1, delete through the comma following the word "Seldovia".

(2) On page 6, lines 15 and 16, delete the figure "$25,000,000" and the quotation mark at the end thereof and insert in lieu thereof the following: "$25,000,000: *Provided further,* That the terms of repayment of such securities and obligations or loans shall be as follows: Repayment of the principal sum in fifty years from the date of the borrowing payable in equal annual payments beginning ten years after the money is lent at an annual interest rate not to exceed 3 per centum on the unpaid balance."

(3) On page 6, between lines 16 and 17, insert the following new section:

"Purchase of home mortgages

"SEC. 57. The Federal National Mortgage Association is authorized to repurchase at a cost not to exceed par any home mortgage insured by the Federal Housing Administration which is secured by property in Alaska which was lost, destroyed, or severely damaged as a result of the 1964 earthquake or subsequent seismic waves. Any such purchase shall be made from funds available to the Association for carrying out its special assistance functions pursuant to section 305 of the National Housing Act; except that the aggregate amount of such purchases shall not exceed $10,000,000."

(4) On page 6, line 25, insert the following: "The total amount authorized to be appropriated pursuant to this section shall not exceed $50,150,000."

(5) On page 7, after line 5, insert the following new section:

"Reporting

"SEC. 7. The President shall report semiannually during the term of this Act to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House on the actions taken under this Act by the various Federal agencies. The first such report shall be submitted not later than February 1, 1965, and shall cover the period ending December 31, 1964."

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. GRUENING. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What expenditure on the part of the Federal Government would this amendment entail?

Mr. GRUENING. It would not exceed $10 million.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What would be the aggregate expenditure entailed in the several amendments that have been offered?

Mr. GRUENING. I think the aggregate expenditure entailed in the several amendments would be $10 million. There would be $4 million additional for urban renewal and $1 million if the interest were reduced from 3⅝ to 3 percent. I should say the total would not exceed $15 million.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GRUENING. I yield.

Mr. BARTLETT. The Senator quoted a figure of $4 million to be added to the cost of urban renewal. Other authorities—and I do not know that they are correct—suggest that a more nearly correct figure would be $3,330,000.

Mr. GRUENING. I think it is well, in replying to a question, to state a somewhat larger amount, so as to avoid a misstatement on the wrong side. I should say it would not exceed $4 million, and probably would be less.

Mr. LAUSCHE. For the purposes of information, may I ask if any Senator can answer what is the total expenditure or aid provided in the bill as it now stands, without any amendment?

Mr. ANDERSON. One would have to add the whole program together, and the whole program together runs to $327 million. Out of a total of Federal assistance of $393 million, there is a value of repayments of about $66 million.

Mr. BARTLETT. Will the Senator yield for a question? Does that or does that not include small business loans?

Mr. ANDERSON. I would just as soon put into the RECORD figures from the whole table:

Small Business Administration, $50 million of loan assistance, less the value of repayments of $42,803,000. The subsidy, through the Small Business Administration, would amount to $7,197,000.

For Internal Revenue tax forgiveness the amount is $25 million.

For the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries the amount is $700,000 of loans, the repayment value being $657,000.

REA—loan forgiveness—amounts to $5 million.

For VA, FNMA, HHFA—loan forgiveness—the figure is still uncertain.

Aid to State and local governments is as follows:

Office of Emergency Planning, $80,122,000, without anything in the way of repayment.

Bureau of Public Roads, $63,200,000.

There were heavy floods in the State represented by the Senator from Ohio. In his State the roads were put back into shape at a cost of one-half to the State of Ohio and one-half to the Bureau of Public Roads. In Alaska provision was made that the roads would be put back in shape at a cost of 94.9 percent to the Federal Government and only 5.1 percent to Alaska. Thereafter the State desired to have the roads built not for the same capacity they previously carried, but to meet certain higher standards, and that raised the cost several million dollars. So out of the total sum, some $63 million of the cost for that purpose will be on the shoulders of the Federal Government.

Transitional grants amount to $23,500,000.

Alaska Railroad, $27 million. That, however, is Government property. It operates generally at a loss. It is for the convenience of the people of Alaska, but it is federally owned property.

So the total runs to $344 million for the Federal Government.

The figure for other Federal facilities amounts to $49 million.

So the total Federal assistance amounts to $393,246,000, of which Alaskans will repay $66,228,000.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alaska enlighten me a bit? I know he has inquired very closely into the housing situation. I have made rather strenuous efforts to obtain information, and those efforts have not always been successful.

As I understand the amendment which he has now presented regarding action which he proposes be taken by the Federal National Mortgage Association, it differs from the amendment which he had presented to the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. I should like to ask my colleague if he would be so good as to tell us those differences?

Mr. GRUENING. I do not know that there is any essential difference. This amendment provides that the FNMA organization will take out of its $180 million funds $10 million to purchase mortgages of homeowners which are now in the hands of banks.

Mr. BARTLETT. How much did the Senator say FNMA has?

Mr. GRUENING. It has available $181 million out of the original $200 million authorization. Consequently, the $10 million which this amendment provides for is less than 6 percent of the available funds.

It is my understanding that the number of homes which would benefit under the amendment is approximately 120.

Mr. BARTLETT. One hundred and twenty would benefit by what amount?

Mr. GRUENING. It would vary, because the amount of the loans would be different, but I feel confident that the total amount would not exceed $10 million, and might be less.

Mr. BARTLETT. Is my memory correct in recalling that the Senator's original amendment provided for purchase of these mortgages at par on the part of FNMA, but the amendment now before the Senate provides that the purchases shall be made, at the discretion of the administrator, up to par?

Mr. GRUENING. That is correct. I understand that that is a change that has been made in the House amendment.

Mr. BARTLETT. That is a rather essential change; is it not?

Mr. GRUENING. I think it is a very useful change.

Mr. BARTLETT. Some of the mortgages—perhaps all of them, for all I know—were sold at a discount. Is that correct?

Mr. GRUENING. That is correct.

Mr. BARTLETT. As I understand, also—and I would like to have the Senator comment on this—the original action which was promptly and helpfully taken was that FNMA agreed, with respect to the mortgages it held in its own portfolio, that settlement would be made with those occupying the property, so that property owners could discharge their mortgage obligations, by means of SBA loans which would also be used for rebuilding. These loans would extend for a period of 30 years, at 3 percent interest, so that the monthly payments would be approximately the same as a houseowner was paying on his mortgage before the earthquake?

Mr. GRUENING. That is correct. I think that was a generous and wise proposal.

Mr. BARTLETT. And now the Senator proposes that it be enlarged by enabling FNMA to repurchase mortgages which it once held in its portfolio but which it subsequently sold to private financial institutions?

Mr. GRUENING. That is correct.

Mr. BARTLETT. At the same time, is it not true that there will be a large number of mortgagees who cannot be assisted even by these liberalizing amendments, because their mortgages, which may be conventional in nature, or which may be FHA insured, are held by, perhaps, a bank in Alaska, an insurance company in New York, or in Timbuktu, but which have not been purchased by the Federal National Mortgage Association? Is that correct?

Mr. GRUENING. Unfortunately, that is correct.

Mr. BARTLETT. Does the Senator have any information—and I have been unable to secure this information—as to how many homeowners whose properties were badly damaged, or perhaps even destroyed, might be included in the particular category which we are discussing?

Mr. GRUENING. No. It has been difficult to get that information. I sought to get it. This additional legislation would take care of a fairly substantial number of those whose homes have been totally or almost totally destroyed. To that extent it would furnish welcome relief to people who sorely need it.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I have just been handed a statement, prepared, I infer, by the FHA, which treats the situation which my colleague and I have been discussing. I should like to read from it briefly.

It reads as follows:

> Based on incomplete data obtained from a property damage survey made by the Alaska State Housing Authority, as well as from other sources, the following rough estimates have been made of magnitudes of outstanding mortgage debt on severely damaged or destroyed one- to four-family homes. Homes suffering value losses of 60 percent or more were classified as severely damaged or destroyed.
>
> SUMMARY
>
> (1) All severely damaged or destroyed properties—about $11 million.
>
> (2) All FHA-insured properties—about $7 million.
>
> (3) Mortgages sold by FNMA and held by mutual savings banks—less than $1 million, based on estimates by National Association of Mutual Savings Banks. (Mutual savings banks hold more than 80 percent of the mortgages sold by FNMA.)

Mr. President, I wish to join my colleague in expressing thanks and gratitude and appreciation to all those who have come to the assistance of the State of Alaska since that terrible day of March 27 when the earthquake and seismic wave did such tremendous damage to the new State.

As the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] has informed us already, early and constructive measures were taken by the Federal Government with almost unparalleled speed. Fifty million dollars was appropriated to the President for use by the Office of Emergency Planning. Not only will all of that go to Alaska, but, as the Senator from New Mexico stated a while ago, the total bill for the Office of Emergency Planning in Alaska will be on the order of $80 million.

We know that from an early hour after the disaster struck, President Johnson interested himself in the welfare of the people of our State, and dedicated himself to the task of rebuilding. He has led ever since in that endeavor.

In this connection I wish to say, as I have said so many times in the past, that the services and dedication of the President's representative, Mr. Edward A. McDermott, Director of the Office of Emergency Planning, have been highly helpful to Alaska and to the Nation, and have revealed him, in my estimation, to be a very, very superior public servant.

With my colleague I likewise pay tribute to the many administrative agencies and to the many Members of Congress—including, certainly, my friends on the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee and on the Appropriations Committee—who moved so quickly and so effectively. On this side of the Capitol, I believe that deserving of special mention in this connection is the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]. He not only shouldered the burdens that were imposed upon him by reason of his having been designated by the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], to head the legislative effort, but he was also named by President Johnson as chairman of the Federal Reconstruction Commission, made up of all the Federal agencies which have a part to play in this rebuilding program.

It is a big one.

The job has been started.

It will be years in its completion. Never has so much of a State's productive area been absolutely wrecked by nature in a natural disaster in the space of a single day or within any time span.

The bill before the Senate, which I sincerely hope will be passed today, will be extraordinarily helpful in the reconstruction program.

I shall not detain the Senate with an analysis of every section of the bill, but I point out that one section would confer legislative authority upon the Chief of Army Engineers to approve certain projects on his own motion, to see that harbors in Alaskan ports are rebuilt. The small harbors, which are so meaningful and even essential in the economic life of the Alaskan community will be rebuilt. We all recall that the small boat harbor at Seward was wiped out, that the harbor at Valdez was destroyed, that the harbor at Homer was seriously damaged, and that great damage was done to the one at Kodiak and Cordova; great damage was inflicted upon our harbors.

Because of this useful section in the omnibus bill, it will not be necessary to take every one of these projects before separate legislative committees. This provision does the job in a single package. I am particularly grateful that this is the case.

Speaking for myself, no matter how much the Federal Government assists reconstruction—and I wish to add that it is not only the instrumentality of government which has been so concerned, but all of the American people—it will be a long time before Alaska is made whole. It will be made whole again because of this help and because of the determination of the people of Alaska to make it so.

They turned to with a will within hours after the earthquake. When I and others arrived in Alaska, approximately

25 hours after the shock, men were already at work cleaning up in Anchorage and elsewhere. Machines and men were on the job. The people were not giving up.

I favor every liberalizing amendment that might be added to this bill.

I realize, also, that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has given close, careful scrutiny to the proposal submitted by the Federal Reconstruction Commission and that, in its judgment, the bill now before the Senate is the one which ought to be passed and sent to the House for conference, if a conference is necessary.

Only an hour or two before the Senate began its discussion of S. 2881, I received a telephone call from Gov. William A. Egan of Alaska, who expressed, above all things, concern lest there be undue delay in the consideration and passage of the bill by Congress and its approval by the President. He said it is imperative that the bill be translated as soon as possible into effective action. I join the Governor of Alaska in that sentiment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record a statement in connection with the disaster itself.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement by Senator Bartlett

For years, Alaska citizens have worked to build a productive self-sufficient economy to create an independent, prosperous, and growing community and State. Alaska had come a long way in this endeavor when, last Good Friday, it was struck by a frightening and devastating combination of natural disasters—earthquakes, fires, floods, and tidal waves. At one blow the work of years was destroyed.

The private economy of the State of Alaska was left in a shambles.

Alaska will be rebuilt; there is no doubt of that. The people of Alaska are determined to recover what they have lost and to begin anew to develop America's last frontier.

The work of recovery is, of course, being done by Alaskans themselves; they are not, however, working alone. The American people and their Government have provided—as this bill before us so clearly illustrates will continue to provide—truly substantial assistance and support. Alaska reconstruction is a partnership and shows what this Federal Union is about.

From the very first shock of disaster the Federal Government and its officials up to the President himself were at work on an emergency basis to provide help and relief as it was needed.

The President designated the Director of Emergency Planning, Edward A. McDermott, as his personal representative for relief activities. Mr. McDermott, the junior Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening], and I flew to Alaska hours after receiving the news of the disaster. Mr. McDermott and OEP officials worked literally around the clock for many days.

They have earned the respect and the gratitude of all Alaskans.

The full resources of the military in Alaska under the command of Lt. Gen. Raymond J. Reeves were made available for Alaska relief activities. Troops were used to assist local police. Military planes and trucks were used to provide emergency food and health supplies. Without the work of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force the disaster hardships would have been a good deal worse.

The Small Business Administration, under the direction of Gene Foley, was quick to respond to Alaska's needs and quick to cut redtape and unnecessary administrative detail to see that disaster loans were processed and approved as quickly as possible.

It is suitable and true to say that each and every Government agency with an interest in Alaska responded to my State's need in a generous and efficient manner. Alaskans will never forget.

The bill before the Senate today is the fourth piece of legislation dealing with Alaska reconstruction to come before the Senate this session. Three of these measures are now law and it is my hope that the present bill will soon become so. This is a remarkable record and it is due in large part to the hard work and skillful leadership of the senior Senator from New Mexico (Mr. Anderson), who was appointed by the President as Chairman of the Federal Reconstruction and Development Planning Commission for Alaska. The Senator and the truly able staff of the Commission have provided the coordination and direction for the Federal reconstruction effort. It is their legislative proposals which we have acted upon and which we now consider.

Alaskans are also grateful to the Interior and the Appropriations Committees which have given Alaskan recovery their very highest priority. In fact, Alaska is deeply in debt to the full Senate which allowed these recovery measures to come to the floor as they were reported without delay. These bills were called up, debated, and passed even in the midst of the civil rights debate. Surely this is an indication of the interest and sympathy of the Senate for the hardship which Alaska is undergoing. This interest and sympathy is deeply appreciated by Alaskans.

The first measure of assistance to be approved by the Congress was House Joint Resolution 976. This was a supplemental appropriation of $50 million for the President's disaster relief fund. This $50 million and more besides has already been committed for expenditure in Alaska. The President requested the money on April 6. The House approved the request within minutes of receiving the Presidential message. The Senate followed suit shortly thereafter and the bill was signed into law the day after the request was received. I can think of no occasion in the 20 years in which I have been in Congress in which action came more quickly.

The last measure to receive approval was S. 2772 introduced by the chairman of the Interior Committee [Mr. Jackson]. This bill provided the necessary legislative authority for an additional $23½ million for transitional grants to the State of Alaska to assure the continuance of essential governmental functions at the State and local levels in spite of the expected drop in tax revenues. This bill was introduced on May 4. Hearings were held, the bill was reported, and it received the final approval of the Senate on May 13. It was passed by the House on the 18th and the President signed the measure on the 27th.

The next relief measure to receive the approval of the Congress was contained in the deficiency appropriation bill, H.R. 11201. This measure passed the House May 11 but without Alaskan items. These were added May 28 by the Senate. The House on June 4 acecpted the Alaskan appropriations items which had been added by the Senate and the bill was approved by the President on June 9. As approved, the measure contained $41,970,000 for Alaskan relief including $20 million to rebuild the Port of Seward and the Alaska Railroad and $17 million for transitional grants to the State.

These measures which have become law have been helpful. They have been important, but they are not more important than the bill before us today. I am confident that it, too, will receive as prompt and as sympathetic a hearing from the Senate as have the previous measures which I have discussed.

Any lingering doubts which may have remained in Alaska as to the merits of statehood were resolved on March 27, the date of the disaster. From that day to this Alaska has received from here sister States and from her Federal Government fair and equal treatment.

The measure as reported to the Senate contains several amendments which were not included in the bill as introduced.

One of these relates to the matching formula for urban renewal projects. Under existing law the upper limit of 75 percent Federal participation-25 percent local has been applied to Alaska projects. The Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has recommended that the Housing and Home Finance Administrator be permitted to increase the Federal capital grant to 90 percent for all disaster communities of 6,000 population or less. This would cover all the earthquake-stricken areas but Anchorage. The House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee in reporting the companion measure, H.R. 11438, has applied the 90–10 formula to all disaster communities including Anchorage. I am hopeful the Senate might act to apply the 90–10 formula also to Anchorage. The stricken communities of Alaska simply cannot afford the extra burden of urban renewal matching funds. They are struggling just to keep up with the necessary operation, maintenance and capital improvements of day-to-day living. The urban renewal projects necessary to restore Alaska would not have been necessary without the disaster.

Don Berry, executive director of Alaska Municipal League, has pointed out that the city of Seward will be operating at a deficit for the 1964 fiscal year and that the deficit will total about $250,000 for the 1965 fiscal year. Prior to the earthquake, Anchorage expected an income of $15 million in 1965. Its estimated net loss of income for the same period totals about $2 million. Anchorage's present general obligation bonded indebtedness is an annual $3 million, or 25 percent of the total revenue. Kodiak, Mr. Berry states, which lost nearly all its commercial and tax base, still is faced with some $60,000 in bonded indebtedness to pay annually. Since the Senate committee saw fit to lower the matching to 10 percent State or local participation for all but Anchorage, I would hope that a second look at the situation would show the necessity for including Anchorage.

The Senate committee approved an amendment to permit the Housing and Home Finance Agency to purchase State bonds authorized before the disaster at the prevailing interest rate, now 3⅝ percent, which would cover $7.2 million in bonds which the State proposes to sell in early 1965. It has been estimated that the State would pay probably as high as 4⅝ or 4½ percent on such bonds at this time.

I was glad that the committee adopted the amendment proposed in recognition of the difficult position the State now faces on the sale of such bonds.

The bill before us contains many liberalizing provisions of existing law which will give Alaska ammunition to assist in fighting for the recovery effort. The Housing and Home Finance Administrator would be permitted to purchase up to $25 million of State of Alaska bonds issued to finance the State's share of earthquake reconstruction projects, or, alternatively, to make a loan to the State for this purpose at the prevailing interest rate, which is currently 3⅝ percent.

Indebtedness of the earthquake-affected borrowers of Farmers Home Administration and the Rural Electrification Administration would be adjusted.

One of the major provisions would allow the State of Alaska to match on a 94.9 Federal-51.1 State basis highway funds made available under the Federal aid highway program for reconstruction rather than the 50-50 formula now required in the emergency program for roads. It is believed that to replace all highways damaged will cost about $65 million of which about half would go for Federal aid highways, and the remainder for forest highways. The provision in S. 2881 would permit the State of Alaska to match on the reconstruction of primary, secondary and urban roads on the same formula which prevails under the regular Federal aid highway program.

The earthquake and particularly the subsequent waves smashed and twisted and destroyed a number of small boat harbors in Alaska so vital to Alaska's economy which is in a very major way dependent on our fishery resources. S. 2881 would be of immeasurable assistance in its provision to authorize the Corps of Engineers to modify existing harbor authorizations up to a total of $10 million. One of the main reasons for the urgency to pass the measure is to authorize this work. The administration has already submitted an appropriation request in the hope that before the short Alaska construction season ends work on the harbors can at least be initiated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration en bloc of the five amendments as set forth in amendment No. 1080? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, notwithstanding all the generous things said by the distinguished Senators from Alaska about my efforts in connection with the Alaska disaster, my only desire is to get on with the work in Alaska. I hope the amendments will be rejected.

The geological work is now in process of being finished. I have been in communication with people in Alaska who are hopeful that it will be possible to get to work at once. The bill before the Senate, as reported by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, is a good bill, and will aid in that process.

Because of the cooperative attitude taken by the two Senators from Alaska, I shall not detain the Senate; I merely say: Let us vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments (No. 1080) en bloc.

The amendments were rejected.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, S. 2881 represents probably the final legislative measure to be considered by the Senate aimed to help Alaska recover from the severe economic blow caused by the March 27 earthquake and subsequent waves. We have acted speedily on all proposals sought by the administration, including increased funds for the President's disaster program to assist the Office of Emergency Planning in constructive works in the public sector. We have authorized a transitional grant for the State to help it and the stricken communities replace some of the lost tax revenue; we have appropriated funds—again for the public sector—to rebuild the Alaska Railroad, to make available the transitional grant money, to rebuild housing for the native people of Alaska, and to replace property damaged and destroyed which belongs to the Federal Government.

Now we are considering a bill to liberalize existing laws so that Alaska can go ahead with the job which needs doing. S. 2881 deals with important areas of the economic well-being of the State. It provides authorization to allow the Corps of Engineers to rebuild destroyed small boat harbors so important to the State's economy. It would allow the existing formula for State matching on Federal aid highways to be applied to emergency funds made available by the Bureau of Public Roads to reconstruct and rebuild vital transportation links. Instead of requiring the State of Alaska to match 50–50 with the Federal Government, Alaska would be required to match on the order of 95 percent Federal-5 percent State. Other provisions are vital.

Mr. President, on June 3 of this year I submitted a statement to the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee on S. 2881, and I ask unanimous consent that my remarks be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON, A U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Chairman, the administration and the Congress have acted speedily in enacting legislation and appropriation measures to assist the people of Alaska to recover from the disastrous March 27 earthquake and subsequent seismic waves. These measures will help. However, without passage of the bill before you now, S. 2881, of which I am a cosponsor, that recovery will be jeopardized.

S. 2881 deals with vital areas more than merely touching the economic well-being of the State of Alaska. The provisions of the bill go to the very heart of the problem as we seek to find ways and means to restore functions of the communities crippled on Good Friday. Those provisions deal with small-boat harbor and other navigation problems, with roads, with marketing of the State's bonds or loans to the State, with urban renewal and with several Federal programs which we seek to liberalize to meet the needs.

There is an imperative requirement that we approve these provisions without delay because the construction season—all too short in Alaska—is at hand. Every day which passes without the authority contained in this bill carries with it a threat to the reconstruction effort.

Mr. Chairman, 6 years ago, lacking but a few days, the Senate was debating the merits of the Alaska statehood bill and on the final day of June in that year 1958 passed the measure and sent it to the White House. The advocates of the statehood movement—and certainly this committee which had jurisdiction over that measure—had a devotion to the cause for many reasons, principal among them being the desire to promote the economic growth of this great area of ours. Such growth did result. But that growth was dealt a devastating blow 68 days ago when the very economic heart of Alaska was bruised and damaged by a catastrophe of a kind greater than experienced anywhere in our country by forces outside our control.

I contend that what has already been done for Alaska and what we are seeking here with S. 2881 is the very least, not the maximum of what should be done. Expansion of the provisions of this bill may be desirable, and in one area particularly is imperative. I speak now to the matching provisions for urban renewal projects. Such projects will permit a relocation of homes and businesses and comprise a program which offers major assistance. Under existing law, the maximum matching is on a 75 Federal-25 local basis. Perhaps in some of the communities in the disaster areas the local share can be met but certainly this is not true in all of them. These communities have lost considerable sums in tax revenues and even if reimbursed through transitional grants voted by the Congress, the costs of local shares in urban renewal are far above revenues necessary for normal operations. I urge, therefore, that consideration be given by this committee to permit when necessary a 90–10 matching formula in connection with urban renewal projects. This is an area where a liberal approach is logical and should be taken.

Other liberalizing proposals may be advanced, and I know the committee will consider them in the light of the great need outstanding.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendments to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 2881) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. ANDERSON. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

FOOD STAMP ACT OF 1964

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1066, H.R. 10222, the so-called Aiken food-stamp plan bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 10222) to strengthen the agricultural economy; to help to achieve a fuller and more effective use of food abundances; to provide for improved levels of nutrition among economically needy households through a cooperative Federal-State program of food assistance to be operated through normal channels of trade; and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with amendments on page 2, line 5, after the word "among", to strike out "economically needy" and insert "low-income"; in line 13, after the word "households", to strike out "in economic need" and insert "with low incomes"; in line 20, after "(b)", to strike out "The term 'food' means any food or food product for human consumption except alcoholic beverages, tobacco, soft drinks, luxury foods, and luxury frozen foods as determined by the Secretary, and those foods which are identified on the package as being imported from foreign sources when they arrive at the retail store." and insert "The term 'food' means any food or food product for human consumption except alcoholic beverages, tobacco, those foods which are identified on the package as being imported, and meat and meat products which are identified as being from foreign sources when they arrive at the retail food store."; on page 5, after line 2, to insert:

(b) In areas where a food stamp program is in effect, there shall be no distribution of federally owned foods to households under the authority of any other law except during emergency situations caused by a national or other disaster as determined by the Secretary.

At the beginning of line 8, to strike out "(b)" and insert "(c)"; after line 12, to strike out:

SEC. 5. (a) Households eligible to participate in the food stamp program shall be those whose economic status is such as to be a substantial limiting factor in the attainment of a nutritionally adequate diet.

(b) Each State shall establish standards to determine the eligibility of applicant households which standards, among other things, shall take into account such of the factors used by each State in granting assistance under the federally aided public assistance programs as the Secretary determines will tend to effectuate the purposes of the food stamp program. The standards of eligibility to be used by each State for the food stamp program shall be subject to the approval of the Secretary.

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

SEC. 5 (a) Participation in the food stamp program shall be limited to those households whose income is determined to be a substantial limiting factor in the attainment of a nutritionally adequate diet.

(b) In complying with the limitation on participation set forth in subsection (a) above, each State agency shall establish standards to determine the eligibility of applicant households. Such standards shall include maximum income limitations consistent with the income standards used by the State agency in administration of its federally aided public assistancce programs. Such standards also shall place a limitation on the resources to be allowed eligible households. The standards of eligibility to be used by each State for the food stamp program shall be subject to the approval of the Secretary.

On page 7, line 16, after the word "a", to insert "low-cost"; on page 12, line 9, after the word "required.", to insert "In approving the participation of the subdivisions requested by each State in its plan of operation, the Secretary shall provide for an equitable and orderly expansion among the several States in accordance with their relative need and readiness to meet their requested effective dates of participation."; at the top of page 13, to insert:

(g) If the Secretary determines that there has been gross negligence or fraud on the part of the State agency in the certification of applicant households, the State shall upon request of the Secretary deposit into the separate account authorized by section 7 of this Act, a sum equal to the amount by which the value of any coupons issued as a result of such negligence or fraud exceeds the amount that was charged for such coupons under section 7(b) of this Act.

On page 19, line 3, after the word "appropriated", to strike out "not in excess of $25,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964;"; in line 8, after "1967", to insert a semicolon and "and not in excess of such sum as may hereafter be authorized by Congress for any subsequent fiscal year"; and at the beginning of line 22, to insert "If in any fiscal year the Secretary finds that the requirements of participating States will exceed the limitation set forth herein, the Secretary shall direct State agencies to reduce the amount of such coupons to be issued to participating households to the extent necessary to comply with the provisions of this subsection."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call may be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the main purpose of this bill is to bring under congressional control the rules, regulations, and appropriation authorizations under which food stamp programs are to be operated in local areas throughout the country.

First, let me point out that food stamp programs are not new. A similiar program called the food stamp plan was operated by the Department of Agriculture during the period 1939–43. That plan proved to be an effective method for increasing food consumption among participating households. It was discontinued in 1943 when wartime conditions had greatly reduced unemployment and substantially increased demands upon U.S. food supplies. At the height of participation in 1942, there were 1,741 counties and 88 cities included in the program. Average monthly participation totalled 3.4 million persons in 1942 and Federal costs totaled $112 million. In 1961, the first pilot food stamp project under the present program was inaugurated in McDowell County, W. Va. Pilot projects were gradually expanded. In March of this year they were in effect in 43 rural and urban areas in 22 States, with some 392,000 participants.

These pilot projects are operated under the basic authority of section 32 of the act of August 24, 1935, as amended, which authorizes expenditures to encourage the domestic consumption of agricultural commodities through "benefits, indemnities, donation, or by other means among persons in low-income groups as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture." This same authority was also used previously by the Department to operate the food stamp plan between 1939 and 1943, and it would be legally possible to continue food stamp programs under this general authority under the complete discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture. Section 32 provides no guidelines or congressional controls over the operating details or size of the program, and the pending bill would supply this need.

The pilot food stamp program has now been in effect for 3 years. During this period, the Department of Agriculture has gained experience which will minimize administrative problems in the conduct of the program as it is gradually expanded.

Of course, it is the intention of the Department to phase out the presently operating free food distribution programs as the food stamp program expands. Further, as I will point out later, the committee prohibits the operation of both programs in the same area, except in temporary emergency situations resulting from natural or other disasters.

In brief, this is how the program works: A State requests that a program be established in a certain area within its boundaries. That State develops a plan of operation and submits it to the Department of Agriculture. Upon approval by the Department, the State certifies low-income households as eligible under the program. These needy families then exchange the amount of money they would normally spend for food for coupons of a higher monetary value. The difference between the amounts the households pay and the value of the coupons received represents the Federal contribution.

During the 3 years the pilot program has been in effect, approximately $56 million in the form of Federal food coupons was added to the $91 million of their own cash that the participating families paid in order to obtain the additional food purchasing power.

The participating families use these coupons to purchase food out of regular commercial supplies at approved retail stores. Retailers redeem the coupons through the facilities of the commercial banking system. These procedures, tested by experience, are used under the discretionary authority of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Generally speaking, the bill includes the desirable administrative features which were developed and tested by experience. In addition, the bill provides more detailed guidelines, and tightens the procedures where appropriate.

Under the bill the initiative for the establishment of a food stamp program in any area must originate with the State in which the area is located. The program is made available in any area only if the State requests it, submits a plan setting out eligibility standards consistent with other State programs, and actively participates in it, accepting the responsibility for local administration.

Two committee amendments apply in this area. First, the committee amended the bill to prohibit the distribution of federally owned foods to households under the authority of any other law in any area in which a food stamp program was effective, except during emergency situations. The effect of this would be to prevent both a food stamp program and a food distribution program from being conducted simultaneously in the same area. And second, the committee included language which would provide for an equitable and orderly expansion of the food stamp program among the several States in accordance with their need and readiness to meet their requested effective dates of participation.

To initiate the program in any State, the State agency responsible for the administration of federally aided public assistance programs would submit to the Secretary for approval a plan of operation for the food stamp program in its State, specifying the various political subdivisions in which the program would be effective, the standards to be used in determining the eligibility of applicant households, and other details.

In this connection the committee amended the bill to restrict participation to those households whose income is a limiting factor in the attainment of a nutritionally adequate diet, and to provide for use of income standards essentially the same as those used by the State in the administration of its federally aided public assistance programs. These same standards would apply to nonwelfare assistance participants as well as welfare assistance participants.

In order to assure that the program would not be used to attempt to revolutionize well-established food habits and that the value of free coupons would not be such as to encourage uneconomical food expenditures, the committee added the words "low-cost" to the type of diet recommended by the Department as being the objective of the food stamp program.

The State welfare agency would be responsible for the certification of all applicant households and would be required to use the same care and diligence that it uses in other programs administered by it. An amendment was considered by the committee that would have provided for State participation in the cost of the bonus coupons for persons not on other relief programs administered by the State. The idea was that such State financial participation would assure due diligence on the part of the State in certifying such persons. The committee felt that this would impose the most cost on those States which have the greatest need and are least able to pay. The committee recommended amendment which would require the State to pay all of the cost of the bonus coupons provided for persons improperly certified as a result of gross negligence or fraud. This would impose all of the cost of careless certification on the State not using proper diligence.

Mr. President, the committee felt that the adoption of this amendment would deter States from going all out to provide coupons for people who were not entitled to them.

Coupons would be redeemable at approved retail stores for any food or food products for human consumption, except alcoholic beverages, tobacco, those foods which are identified on the package as being imported, and meat and meat products which are identified as being from foreign sources when they arrive at the retail food store. This last exception is a committee amendment designed to prevent Federal funds being used to subsidize meat imports.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. This is one amendment that I am concerned about. Without this amendment, we could be embarking for the first time upon a program of subsidizing the use of foreign meat imports in this country. What would be the penalty for violation?

Mr. ELLENDER. The penalties are stated in the bill. It would provide for 1 year in jail and up to $5,000 fine, if the value of the coupons used for the imported meats was less than $100. If a greater value of coupons were involved the penalties could be up to 5 years in jail and up to a $10,000 fine.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. The same penalty as would be provided for the violation of any other misuse of coupons?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Is it the understanding of the Senator that this amendment would prohibit a retailer, for example, from importing a whole carcass of beef, and grinding it up in his store into hamburger and selling it?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is the purpose. As was stated in the executive session, a Senator had noticed that in many of the large food stores they had boneless meat which had been imported from Australia. It was mixed in with meat that had been produced in this country. It was all ground together in making hamburger.

The committee liked the language that the Senator from North Dakota submitted. It was his amendment. The committee unanimously adopted that amendment so as to make it as certain as possible that no foreign meats would be subsidized in this program.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I thank the Senator from Louisiana. I have supported a food stamp program ever since I first came to Congress. I am pleased that we are finally getting a program of this kind on the statute books. I believe it is a vastly improved bill over that which came to us from the House. I am satisfied that in this form it will be a good, workable program.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. MILLER. How effective will this amendment really be? I understand that the Department of Commerce has interpreted the law that is now on the books with regard to imported items, as requiring the labeling of the imported items only at the wholesale level. If this is so, the provision as to meat and meat products which are identified at the retail food store would not be affected. Is this not correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. A great deal of the meat that the Senator refers to is handled by the large food stores. The large food stores mix meat that they obtain locally, or in other parts of the country, together with meats that they obtain from abroad. There is no way to identify it, at present, when it reaches the meat counter. But it was identified as imported when it was received at the store. Under the bill it would be excluded from the program. The retailers would be put on notice under this bill that they would be subject to fine and imprisonment if they used meat coming from abroad, and sold it for coupons under this program.

Mr. MILLER. If this amendment to the bill actually so provided, the Senator from Iowa would not be concerned.

All the language in the bill states is that the term "food" shall mean meat and meat products, except meat and meat products which are identified as being from foreign sources when they arrive at the retail food store.

If I happened to be a store owner, how could I possibly be subject to imprisonment if I should receive a cargo of beef from a wholesaler and mix it into a hamburger and turn it over for food stamps? How could I be subject to a charge of violating the law if the meat were not identified at the time it arrived at the retail food store?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator should understand that the problem is a very vexing one. We could not provide for the stamping of each piece of meat that is purchased by a retail store. However, most of the foreign meat is purchased by the large food stores, as I understand. Much of it is purchased in carcass forms, frozen, exactly in the form in which it was imported. We discussed that subject in executive session. The large food stores are the ones who cut the meat into steak or mix it with other meat for the purpose of making hamburger. Section 1304 of title 19 of the United States Code requires all imported articles to be conspicuously, indelibly, and permanently marked so as to indicate to the ultimate purchaser the name of the country of origin. Any person who, with intent to conceal such information, destroys or obscures such mark is subject to $5,000 fine and a year in prison. The carcass would therefore clearly be identified as imported when it is received at the store. The onus would then be on the retailer. I believe we would be able to make a good case against a retailer who tried to violate this provision. Those who would sell meat in violation of the law could be punished.

Mr. President, the committee did the best it could.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I invite attention to the definition of "retail food store" in paragraph (f) at the bottom of page 3 of the bill:

> (f) The term "retail food store" means an establishment, including a recognized department thereof, or a house-to-house trade route which sells food to households for home consumption.

That statement is interpreted to mean that a retail food store includes its packing and processing operations, where it is possible to control the situation. I agree with the Senator from Iowa that if it were a retail outlet alone, it would be very difficult, if not impossible, to enforce that provision of the law. But when we include packing and processing plants——

Mr. ELLENDER. That is why I made the statement which I did.

Mr. AIKEN. That is why that provision is in the bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. In answer to the question of the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], that is why I stated that the meat would be handled in carcass form by the retailer, as well as the wholesaler. It is the large stores or chains that receive the carcasses and cut them up, possibly at their warehouses or other fabricating facilities.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield, without losing my right to the floor.

Mr. MILLER. I should like to ask the Senator from Vermont about the provision at the bottom of page 3 to which he referred. I cannot see anything in that provision which indicates that the term includes a processing plant. It provides:

> The term "retail food store" means an establishment, including a recognized department thereof, or a house-to-house trade route which sells food to households for home consumption.

To my knowledge, a processing plant generally does not sell to households; it sells to retail stores which in turn sell to households. I do not follow the Senator from Vermont in his discussion of that provision.

Mr. AIKEN. A representative of the Department of Agriculture advised us that a packing and processing plant is considered a recognized department of a retail food store. That was the statement which he made to us, and that is what I am now repeating.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield for a further question?

Mr. ELLENDER. Surely.

Mr. MILLER. If it is the intention of the committee, supported by the interpretation of the Department of Agriculture spokesman, that the definition in item (f) on the bottom of page 3 does include processing plants, I should like to ask the Senator whether he would agree to an amendment which would spell that out specifically so that the term "retail food store" would mean an establishment, including a recognized department thereof, and including a processing plant.

Mr. ELLENDER. We discussed the question considerably in executive session. A whole morning was spent on that proposal. I can well recall the suggestions made by my good friend the Senator from North Dakota that he would not vote for a bill which would subsidize foreign meats, and I do not blame him for that position. We made suggestions to the Department. During the recess it came forward with an amendment which was adopted by the full committee and reported to the Senate. If a packing or processing plant is part of a chain store or supermarket establishment, it would be covered. If the meat is identified when received at the chain store's fabricating plant as imported, it is excluded even though it is unmarked hamburger when it arrives at the chain store's local outlet.

Mr. MILLER. I appreciate the explanation of how this language came about, but I believe the important thing is that if there is any question about the validity of the committee's work, all we have to do is merely to write into the bill what the Secretary of Agriculture testified to.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator may present his amendment, if he desires to do so, at the proper time. I am sure that the Senate will consider it.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. At the top of page 3 of the bill appears a definition of food, which we were discussing. Would not such an amendment be a very effective way of preventing from happening what the Senator from North Dakota does not wish to have happen, and what apparently the committee does not wish to have happen; namely, to subsidize foreign imports through the food stamp plan and make it illegal for someone to receive food stamps in exchange for imported meat products? If that action were taken, the retailer would sell at his peril, and he would know that if an inspector found him accepting food stamps in exchange for such imported items, subsidizing imported items, contrary to the intention of the committee, he would be in deep trouble. I wonder if that possibility has been discussed.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I read the bill, the intention is not to use food stamps to buy imported meats. It goes without saying that if anyone tries to bypass that provision, he will violate the law and subject himself to criminal prosecution as provided in the bill.

Mr. MILLER. I appreciate the explanation. I appreciate what the committee intends to do.

Mr. ELLENDER. I believe the bill does that. If any of the coupons were used for any purpose other than the purpose described in the bill, the offender could be punished. Not only that, but, as I pointed out previously, if a State should provide for the issuance of coupons to persons who are not entitled to them, the State would be responsible to the Government. I believe we have done all that is humanly possible in order to guard the bill or to put guidelines in it so as to protect the interests of the Government and the State.

Mr. MILLER. I shall not labor the point, but I thank the Senator from Louisiana for bringing it out of the committee. The Senator from Iowa may well prepare an amendment which will be designed only to make it clear and to reinforce the committee's intention on that point.

Mr. ELLENDER. If the Senator will read the report, he will learn from that report that we inserted language in it in an effort to indicate what the committee meant by the amendment to which the Senator referred.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. As a sponsor of the amendment, I wish to say that the intention was to prohibit the use of all foreign meats in the food stamp program.

Mr. ELLENDER. Surely; and if anyone uses coupons to buy foreign meat, he will violate the law and be subject to a penalty.

Mr. WALTERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. WALTERS. The retail store owner would have the responsibility of finding out for himself whether or not he was dealing in foreign meats. His responsibility is not eliminated. It would be up to him to find out for himself if he had foreign meats.

Mr. ELLENDER. If he does it intentionally, if he knows he is selling foreign meat in violation of this law, of course, he would be responsible.

Mr. WALTERS. But it would be his responsibility to find out for himself.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; that is the intention of the committee. The bill excludes meat products, and I quote, "identified as being from foreign sources when they arrive at the retail food store." They might be so identified by tag, label, invoice, or other means. The retailer could not ignore any identification of the meat as from foreign sources, whatever form that identification might take.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Do I understand correctly that, first, the States have to accept the plan; second, that it is to be State administered; and, third, that approximately 60 percent of the food is to be paid for by the people who buy it, and that 40 percent is to be contributed by the Government?

Mr. ELLENDER. That has been the case with the pilot program. The State accepts the responsibility of distributing the stamps, taking care of them, and seeing to it that they are distributed to the people entitled to them. The State also accepts responsibility for the program for a certain area, or two or three areas that may not be contiguous, in the State.

As I tried to point out and as I recall, under the pilot program in the last 3 years of the program the Government put up $56 million as compared to $91 million by the householders.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The proportion was about 60 to 40.

Mr. ELLENDER. To be exact, the figure is about 38.6 percent by the Government and the rest by the recipients. However, that fact does not mean that in the future the same proportion that my good friend has mentioned will exist. The bill provides for $75 million for the first year, $100 million for the second year, and $200 million for the third year.

The committee adopted an amendment which would permit the Secretary of Agriculture to cut back percentagewise on the amount of stamps to be given to recipients.

A suggestion was made that each State be apportioned a certain amount of money, but that would not work. We preferred to provide that the amount of stamps to be given to the recipients would be reduced, rather than have the Department come back to Congress and obtain more money. In other words, we say, "We are allowing you $75 million for the year 1965, and you make that do." The same would apply to the second year and the third year.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Does the Senator think that it would result in some States not receiving any fund?

Mr. ELLENDER. No, because instead of giving to the State 36.6 percent, as prevailed in the pilot program, the Department would make it 25 percent, so as to enable the money that is provided go to the areas in the States that have applied to participate in the program.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I think it should be stated that no State will be forced into this plan. Any State will be able to go into it if it wishes to, and any State will be able to stay out of it if it wishes to.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

I wish to repeat for the benefit of Sentors who may not have been present that this food stamp program has been in effect for quite some time without any guidelines, and without any limit as to the amount that could be spent by the Secretary of Agriculture. This bill places it in the form of a cooperative effort on the part of the Federal Government and the States to administer and manage this program. It will be up to the States to develop their respective plans in certain areas of the States. They will have to obligate themselves to select the persons entitled to aid under the terms of the bill, and they will have the responsibility of issuing the stamps to recipients entitled to them.

As I pointed out, if the States should not do a good job, if perchance fraud were exercised by some politicians in the distribution of the coupons, the Federal Government would not lose anything. The States would be responsible for it. We thought it best to put that provision in the bill so the State administrators would be more careful in seeing who shall and who shall not be entitled to receive stamps under this program.

To continue with my statement, I point out to the Senate that the term "retail food store" in the bill is defined as an establishment.

That was the point raised by my good friend from Vermont. He anticipated me when he brought it up.

In the committee report we point out that an establishment, among other things, would include a central warehouse, a distribution center, or a meat fabrication facility operated by a retail store.

The committee gave a great deal of consideration to the definition of "food," since that determines what may be obtained for coupons, and what the participant must pay for his coupons. The participant pays an amount equal to his normal expenditures for food. A definition of food with extensive exclusions would make administration of the program extremely difficult, and open the door to abuse. As passed by the House, soft drinks, luxury foods, luxury frozen foods, and foods identified on the package as imported when received at the store were excluded from the definition of food. The exclusion of soft drinks, according to the dictionary definition, would exclude such important foods as milk and orange juice or other juices. The exclusion of luxury foods would exclude no one knows what. The Secretary would have to prepare a long, constantly changing list.

The retailer would have to be sure that participants and checkout clerks were advised of the foreign origin of all products shipped to the store in packages showing them to be imported. The committee felt that this definition would result in confusion and difficult administration. Furthermore, the participants can be relied on themselves to avoid the luxury items. They are given coupons only in an amount sufficient to provide them more nearly with an adequate low-cost diet. If they use their coupons for high priced items, they will suffer the consequences and learn by trial and error to make the best use of their coupons. They are in a much better position than the Secretary to know what is a luxury and what is a necessity for them, based on their own needs and on the prices in their areas and, in fact, in the store at which they purchase at the time they purchase.

The committee therefore struck out the exclusions for soft drinks, luxury foods, and luxury frozen foods. Except in the case of meat and meat products, the committee limited the exclusion of imported items to those shown to be imported on the package purchased by the participant. Meat and meat products, the committee felt, were in a special category, and the committee therefore excluded those items if identified as from foreign sources when they arrive at the retail food store.

The State is responsible for the costs of administering the food stamp program in all local areas created. These include costs of certifying participating households, the handling, storage and protection of coupons, the issuance of coupons to eligible households, and the control, accounting and reporting involved in the operation of the program. The Federal Government would share the cost with the State in the certification of nonwelfare assistance households.

Penalties are provided for the misuse of coupons in any manner not authorized by the act. These penalties apply to eligible households, retailers, wholesalers, or any other person as well. Upon conviction for misuse, a person may be fined not more than $5,000, or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both, if the value of the coupons illegally used is less than $100; or be fined not more than $10,000, or imprisoned for not more than 5 years, or both, if the value of the coupons misused is more than $100.

Appropriations are authorized for 3 years in the amount of $75 million the first year, $100 million the second, and $200 million the third. In order to assure—I emphasize this point—that the committee will have an opportunity to review the program at the end of the 3-year period, an amendment was adopted to require additional authorization before any further expenditures could be made.

The program must be administered only with the amount of money provided. We will try the program for 3 years under expanded conditions and then it is entirely possible that the program may be further refined and improved.

Considering the high cost and waste of the bulk food distribution program, I feel that this bill should be enacted. The committee, in adopting the limiting amendments, has in my opinion, strengthened the bill immeasurably. At the same time, however, we have not diluted the bill or thrown stumbling blocks in the way of efficient and effective administration. All of the amendments are designed to strengthen the hand of the Secretary of Agriculture in developing a sound food stamp program, and all of the amendments have the unqualified approval of the Secretary.

It is my hope that the Senate will see fit to accept the committee judgment and pass this bill expeditiously.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, my interest in this program began about 1938, when certain communities in Vermont participated in the food stamp program of those days. The program appeared to work about the best of any of the new programs that were inaugurated in the 1930's.

Because of the interest which I took in the program when I came to Congress, I found it advisable to try to interest Congress in renewing the program. After 20 years, my hopes appear to be almost realized. A comparable bill was introduced by Senator La Follette and myself in 1943. In succeeding years we were joined by Senators Young of North Dakota, Humphrey, and Anderson, and, in the late fifties, by former Senator Watkins, of Utah.

It has always seemed to me that we ought not to tolerate want in the midst of plenty, and yet that appears to be a rather chronic condition with us.

I shall not undertake to go into detail on this type of legislation. The bill has been improved from time to time, and I think the one which is before us now, and which is to a considerable extent the result of the efforts of Representative LEONOR K. SULLIVAN, of Missouri, in the House, is the best bill which we have had an opportunity to even read, much less consider on the floor of the Senate.

I shall later ask to have inserted in the RECORD a part of the statement which I made before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry on June 14, 1944. I believe the part of the testimony which I shall ask to have inserted will explain better than I can my interest in this particular bit of legislation.

This program is designed, of course, primarily to improve the health of a large number of Americans who presently are unable to get enough of the right kind of food to live decently. But for the past 20 years we have been increasing our cost of farm programs. It is my hope that the enactment of this program will result in materially broadening the market for farm commodities.

I do not believe people realize that this year it is costing us about $2½ billion to pay farmers for not growing food, and about $1 billion more to support farm prices of food which they do produce, or a total of $3½ billion. That is all charged to the farm program.

The bill is not perfect, but I think if we can get away from spending several billion dollars a year in paying farmers not to produce food, and toward a program which will help consumers consume that food, we may not only be improving the health of the people of this country but also the economic health of our agriculture.

When we tell farmers not to produce, we hurt the economy of the community which used to produce agricultural commodities but no longer produces them because the people there can be paid for not producing.

No one can guarantee just what the bill would do. We cannot guarantee that it would not be improperly applied. We know that the intent of the committee is that no coupons shall be used for purchasing foreign beef. We cannot guarantee that no one, either in government or in the trade, will cheat. It is difficult to find a program of this extent in which there is no cheating whatever. But it is worth trying.

The legislation will be tried for a limited period of time, 3 years. When the 3 years are up, we can either extend the legislation, we can amend it and improve it, or, if it does not work, we can drop it completely. In the meantime, however, the appropriation of $75 million for the first year, $100 million the second year, and $200 million the third year, is a very small amount compared with the $3½ billion that it will cost us this year to pay farmers not to produce and to support farm prices.

This program is very much worth the 3-year trial. For that reason I hope it will be supported.

I ask unanimous consent to have the excerpt of my testimony in 1944 printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Testimony of Senator George D. Aiken Presented to the Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry Appointed To Consider S. 1331, Friday, January 14, 1944

I am cosponsoring this bill because I believe it to be a better solution to the problem of how to maintain the health and efficiency of our low-income citizens than any other plan that has so far been suggested.

I know it is not a perfect plan. I doubt if there is any perfect plan. This bill may be rejected by this committee. If it is approved by the committee, it may be rejected by either House of Congress. But, even though it is not enacted into law, yet I believe that these hearings may do much good. If out of the testimony which may be presented here there can be developed a better plan, I will gladly support it.

In these days of high wages, high prices, and large profits, when money is spent freely and often recklessly; when there is competitive bidding in the black market for insufficient quantities of certain foods, we are likely to get the impression that everyone is well off. I wish this were so. I wish that everyone had adequate means to support themselves comfortably, but that is not the case.

Millions of our American citizens do not have an income sufficient to enable them to maintain their health—to say nothing of living in luxury or even in comfort. Among these are 2,200,000 recipients of old-age pensions, 700,000 persons drawing old-age and survivors insurance under the social security programs, about 1 million disabled veterans drawing pensions or disability compensation, or their widows and dependent children, over 150,000 retired and disabled firemen, policemen, State and municipal employees; dependent children receiving aid through Federal and State welfare funds to the number of 739,000, blind people to the number of 53,000, and many persons living on a fixed income too low to enable them to buy the food they need.

At the time this bill was drawn, there was an indeterminate number of dependents of the 9 to 10 million men in our Armed Forces who would have been eligible under the provisions of this plan. These have since been better provided for by the increase in servicemen's allotment, but no doubt there is still a large number who would be eligible.

I would like to call the committee's attention here to the average amounts received as pensions or compensation by the veterans of our wars.

One hundred and forty thousand veterans of the Spanish-American War average $57.80 a month.

Four hundred and twenty-six thousand veterans of Word War I are drawing $39.02 a month and we already have over 8,000 veterans of World War II drawing an average of $40 a month.

The widows and children of deceased veterans of the Civil War average $37.70 a month; of the Spanish-American War, $30.56; of World War I, $44.11; and of World War II, $48.42.

An average of $34.09 per month is being paid to the families of 13,449 men in the Armed Forces who died from service-connected disability in peacetime.

I would add to these numbers which I have given you several million low-income workers whose paychecks have not increased during the years of the present war. These facts and figures should certainly bring home to us the realization that justice and mercy and income are not being equitably dispensed. Rising costs of living at a rate comparable to the increased costs during other wars make the difficulties of these millions of low-income citizens more serious.

Most of the low-income people today are deserving. A few years ago chiselers and smalltime racketeers were to be found in considerable numbers among those requesting assistance from their Government or other sources. Today the chiselers have pretty much disappeared. They would not be interested in the smalltime income which this bill would provide. I think that is one reason why the group this bill is intended to help is so silent. They are not organized and they cannot demand. They are patient, law-abiding, patriotic citizens who deserve earnest consideration just as much as the groups which are organized and speak loudly through their spokesmen.

It has been said that the distribution of food allotment coupons would be humiliating to those whom necessity forces to request them.

I expect there are those of whom this is true. I am glad that we still have proud people in our country. The fact is, however, that under the old stamp plan between 60 and 80 percent of those eligible made application for stamps.

The fact is that pride has not caused some of our higher income persons to decline subsidies. Everywhere all through our land war-time bonuses are being paid and there is no record of broken pride. Even the employees of the U.S. Government have received bonuses of $300 and up to help out on the cost of war-time living and I have heard no loud cries of resentment yet. The people whom this bill is designed to help are the ones who unfortunately cannot get cash bonuses or increases in salaries. A large part of them are unable to work for one reason or another. Thousands are borderline cases who may have to call upon their local government for help in the near future. Which will humble them most—to accept a war-time bonus to help out on the cost of living as higher paid groups are being helped—or a listing in the books of public relief and charity, which they do not deserve? During the great depression I saw people living under wretched conditions and doing without proper food to keep from going on relief. Most of them, however, accepted the stamp plan.

It is the purpose of this bill to provide equitable distribution of food in order to maintain health and productive capacity during wartime among low income consumers. The bill has been generally referred to as the stamp plan. It should not, however, be confused with the old stamp plan which was used partly as a relief measure and partly as a means of utilizing surplus farm commodities.

This plan provided for in S. 1331 attempts to make the best possible use of the experience gained through the application of the old stamp plan and at the same time eliminate the difficulties of that plan.

I wish to make it clear that the bill does not create any new organization for administering a food allotment plan. It will be under the direct supervision of a Deputy Director of the Food Distribution Administration, but the actual application will be in the hands of existing State, local, and, in some instances, private agencies. Because of regional variations of conditions, it is advisable to have this plan administered by persons familiar with each locality. For this same reason, provision is also made for regional differences with respect to the reasonable cost of the basic food allotments.

Administrative costs are to be paid by the Federal Government and must not exceed 5 percent of the funds appropriated. The bill sets no minimum income for determining eligibility because this amount would vary according to the variation in living costs. It does, however, require a redetermination of such costs every 6 months.

The measure of eligibility is the insufficiency of normal food expenditures of households of various sizes and income classifications to meet the cost of basic food allotment.

A basic food allotment is defined as the amount of various kinds of food per person per week representing a minimum adequate diet. I must confess that the diet as defined in paragraph (c) of section 2 of the bill is a pretty good diet for a minimum. The diet prescribed in the bill has been worked out by the most efficient home economists. It undoubtedly smacks of idealism because it does prescribe what is supposed to be a perfect diet. It is probably a better diet than most people enjoy today even though they can amply afford it.

If this bill passes, it is unlikely that Congress would appropriate a sum to very closely approach this objective. It is, however, a mark to shoot at. It should be our aim to see that everyone enjoys an ample, well-balanced diet and we might as well aim for the bull's-eye in hopes that we may run up a better score than we have up to now.

The strength of a nation depends largely upon the health of its people, and health depends upon an adequate amount of the right kind of food.

Considerable apprehension has been created through the rather widespread inference that the cost would be in the neighborhood of $3 billion. Such an estimate of cost is far, far outside the probable amount that would be required.

The War Food Administration has estimated that the current average cost of the basic food allotment as outlined in the bill would be approximately $646 a year for an average family of 4 persons. It appears that the average family of 4 spending $646 a year for food should be receiving an average income of not less than $2,350 a year.

The $3 billion figure is the maximum amount that could be spent under this bill if every person receiving less than $2,500 per year for a family of four received every dollar's worth of coupons to which he might conceivably be entitled.

It is rather startling to learn that there are as many as 60 million people in this country receiving an income at a rate less than $2,500 per year for a family of four.

In some large areas of our country, over 99 percent of the people would undoubtedly be eligible for assistance if Congress should choose this criterion.

It goes without saying that Congress would not, at the present time at least, use these figures as a yardstick in applying the provisions of the act. The bill provides, however, that if funds are not appropriated sufficient to make up the full difference between normal food expenditures and the cost of the basic food allotment, the food allotment coupons may be used to supplement normal purchases in such a way as to enable participating families to buy a certain percentage of the basic amounts. A reduction in the allowance for food coupons would also mean a decrease in the number of eligible families and persons.

If we should consider that eligibility should be based on a minimum income of $2,500 for a family of four, we would find that 60 million people would be eligible to receive food allotment coupons to some degree. If every one of these—both families and single individuals—took advantage of their eligibility and received the fullest amount of coupons that could be allotted, the total cost is estimated to be $3 billion.

Now, assume that the Congress decides to allow only 90 percent of the full basic diet, which would probably still be as good or better than that enjoyed by the members of this committee, the number of persons eligible would drop from 60 million down to 50 million, while the cost would drop from $3 billion down to $2,300 million, still assuming there would be 100 percent participation by all eligibles. But, it is not likely that the Congress would even appropriate for 90 percent of a full basic diet. It is more likely that a figure of 60 percent would be chosen, in which case the number of persons eligible would drop to 22,800,000 and the total cost would be about $600 million if everyone eligible participated fully.

However, experience has shown that when the stamp plan was in effect, only 60 to 80 percent of the low-income people took advantage of it.

Assuming that 70 percent of those eligible take advantage of this food allotment program, and receive coupons to enable them to enjoy a 60 percent diet, the total cost would amount to $420 million. This amount would substantially raise the living standards of 16 million of our lowest income people and protect them against actual want.

These 16 million people are the ones who really need and should have their meager income supplemented in order to maintain their health and efficiency and a reasonable degree of security and happiness. These are the people who average $1,100 a year or less for a family of four.

If we wish to go down still further and subsidize only to the amount of 50 percent of the basic diet, we would find that 19,600,000 persons eligible could be taken care of at a cost of $389 million if all participated or $282 million if 70 percent participated.

It is obvious that the really low income people of our country could be raised from a state of want, though not to a state of luxury, by any means, for approximately $400 million a year.

We cannot estimate the value received from this food allotment plan in terms of dollars and cents alone. By assuring millions of our people of enough to eat, we will be insuring many of them against the ravages of disease. We will keep an indeterminate number of them from calling upon their civic governments for relief. We will maintain or improve the efficiency of those who through part-time employment or otherwise are contributing materially to the war effort.

We can't put a dollar and cents value upon the eyesight, or the health of children now growing up in these borderline families. The money spent under the provisions of this plan might be returned to our country many times over in dividends of health and efficiency.

I have given the committee a general, rather than a technical, description of the food allotment plan as I see it. I reiterate what I said in the beginning. I know it is not a perfect plan. I know that it will likely lend itself to amendment by this committee, but such need for changes will develop as we listen to the testimony of many well-informed persons who will appear before us. As I said, we have tried to profit from the experience gained in applying the old stamp plan.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. PROUTY. My distinguished senior colleague has demonstrated that dogged persistence over the years produces results. As he has said, back in 1943 he and the late Senator La Follette first introduced a bill of this nature. Throughout the years, he has worked hard and enthusiastically on this plan. I commend him most highly for bringing the dream to a reality. I am convinced in my own mind that it will be of tremendous help to low-income families and also will expand farm markets. The distinguished senior Senator from Vermont deserves great praise for this outstanding achievement.

As a matter of historic interest, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial and an article published in the Rutland, Vt., Herald in 1945 be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Rutland (Vt.) Herald, June 29, 1945]

AIKEN FOOD ALLOTMENT BILL

WASHINGTON.—The national food allotment bill is explained by its sponsors, Senators AIKEN, of Vermont, and La Follette, of Wisconsin, as a measure to provide adequate diets for low-income families and better markets for farmers.

The two Senators, representing two of the Nation's great dairy States, say that the bill lays equal emphasis on consumers' needs for better nutrition and farmers' need for broader markets. The following analysis of the measure is taken from a news release on the subject.

The basic principles of the food allotment program are simple.

The first step is to determine scientifically the level of nutrition needed to keep an average person strong and healthy, and to translate that nutrition level into actual amounts of lower cost foods.

The second step is to determine the value of the low-cost adequate diet periodically at current retail food prices. This cost, on a yearly basis, would be known as the "food allotment."

The third step is to supplement the buying power of families that are not able to afford low-cost adequate diets.

In carrying out the third step, needless redtape that would limit the effectiveness of the program must be avoided. At the same time, Federal funds must be used in the most effective way to raise levels of nutrition and improve farm markets.

For example, suppose the food allotment per person was $15 a month. In that case, a family of four could buy food coupons worth $60. If the family had an income of $100 a month, it could get the coupons by paying 40 percent of its income, or $40. If the family income were $125, it could buy the same number of coupons for $50. But if its income were $150, the family would have to pay $60 for $60 worth of coupons, and therefore would find no advantage in participating. A family of five with an income of $150, however, would again benefit by buying $75 worth of coupons for $60.

Thus, the Government's contribution would largely represent a net increase in family food consumption. An average family of four with an income of $100 a month now spends about $40 a month for food. Under the allotment program the Government would sell this family $60 worth of food coupons for $40. The net cost to the Government—$20 a month—would in this case just equal the increased value of food consumed. Of course, it would not work exactly this way in all instances. Sometimes the increased food consumption might be a little less than the Government contribution, but in general, the Government money would be used for food; that is, for better diets, and larger markets for farm products.

How much would the program cost? Of course, that would depend on the Nation's level of prosperity and the number of eligible families who chose to participate. However, studies of what probably would have happened in past years with such a program in effect indicate that the cost of the food allotment program might range between three fourths of a billion dollars in times of prosperity to possibly $2½ billion in times of depression. One of the great merits of the program would be its tendency to level off the ups and downs of the business cycle. In good times, Government spending under the program would contract; in bad times it would expand and counteract the tendency toward shrinking markets.

How would the food allotment program affect the Nation's levels of diet? Again the best way to find out is to go back to what would have happened in the past. Had the program been in effect in 1942, for example, participating families probably would have bought 60 percent more tomatoes and citrus fruit, 30 percent more milk, meat, poultry, and fish, and substantially larger amounts of vegetables and other fruits, eggs, and potatoes and sweetpotatoes. Purchases of other foods, such as grains, fats and oils, and sugar, would have remained about the same.

What could farmers expect in the way of better prices and incomes? The food allotment program not only would increase consumer food expenditures by about the amount of the direct Government contribution, it also would tend in many instances to strengthen food prices throughout the market. It has been estimated that a Government contribution of $1 billion to a food allotment program in 1942 would have increased farm income from food products by about $1½ billion.

The food allotment program is especially important as a means of carrying out the Government's commitment to support farm prices and farm income after the war. The soundest way of doing this is by insuring a large and stable market for agricultural products. We cannot long avoid a balance between supply and demand. Shall we reach this balance by a compulsory crop reduction program to reduce supply or by a voluntary food consumption program to raise demand? The second way—and the way provided in this bill—is certainly better both for farmers and for consumers, and it would lighten the burden of price support operations.

[From the Rutland (Vt.) Herald, Sept. 22, 1945]

Senator Aiken Offers Food Allotment Bill—Vermont Senator Says Such a Measure Would Provide Alltime Market—Bill Comes Up Soon—Vermonter Joined by Senator La Follette, Progressive, of Wisconsin, in Offering Plan

(By Sidney A. Govenar)

Washington, Sept. 21.—Senator Aiken, Republican, of Vermont, farmer and legislator, believes that in years ahead the greatest single problem of the Nation's farmers will be to find markets for all they can produce.

And Aiken believes he has a solution to this major problem in his food allotment bill.

The measure, introduced jointly by Aiken and Senator La Follette, Progressive, of Wisconsin, last June, is expected to come up for hearings before a subcommittee of the Senate Agriculture Committee soon, possibly next month.

Aiken said, in an interview, that he is receiving many letters seeking quick action on his bill, some from New England dairy producers and fruitgrowers.

The Vermont Senator added, the purpose of his bill is twofold. First, he said, it would provide markets for farmers through normal channels, and second, it would enable lower income families to increase their food purchases, and thus improve their diets.

"Unless active measures are taken, we can expect that, even with full employment, American families will be going hungry while American farmers are looking for places to sell their products. With less than full employment, the outlook for want in the midst of plenty would be far more serious," Aiken said.

"The national food allotment bill is designed to head off such an unfortunate situation," he continued. "It is not, in the ordinary sense, either a welfare or a farm relief measure. It is an effort to put a floor under levels of nutrition for the Nation's families and to insure a large and stable market for food."

Aiken said that the basic principles of the food allotment program are simple, and listed them as follows:

"The first step is to determine scientifically the level of nutrition needed to keep an average person strong and healthy and to translate that nutrition level into actual amounts of lower cost foods.

"The second step is to determine the value of the low-cost adequate diet periodically at current retail food prices. This cost, on a yearly basis, would be known as the food allotment.

"The third step is to supplement the buying power of families that are not able to afford low-cost adequate diets."

It has been found, Aiken asserted, that on the average, lower income families spend about 40 percent of their incomes on food. Under the proposed program, participating families would continue their normal spending for food. The Federal Government would contribute funds to buy additional food.

"This," Aiken said, "would be accomplished by offering any family an opportunity to buy for about 40 percent of its income food coupons with a face value equal to the food allotments for all members of the family.

"Thus, while the value of the food coupons remained fixed, the amount that a family would pay for them would be determined by its money income. The Government would be bearing the difference between the family's contributions and the face value of the food coupons."

Aiken explained how the plan would work with the following examples:

If the food allotment per person was set at $15 a month, a family of four could buy food coupons worth $60. If the family had an income of $100 a month, it could get the coupons by paying 40 percent of its income, or $40.

If the family income were $125, it could buy the same number of coupons for $50. But if the income were $150 a month, the family would have to pay $60 for $60 worth of coupons, and therefore would find no advantage in participating.

"Thus the Government's contribution, would largely represent a net increase in family food consumption," Aiken said. "An average family of four with an income of $100 a month now spends about $40 a month for food. Under the allotment program the Government would sell this family $60 worth of food coupons for $40. The net cost to the Government—$20 a month—would in this case just equal the increased value of food consumed.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank my colleague from Vermont. There has been a considerable change of heart about this legislation in the past 20 years, but it has been a change for the better. The bill we are now considering is much improved over the one which was originally introduced. I am sure that it gives great promise.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. I wish to join the distinguished junior Senator from Vermont in the tribute he has paid to the distinguished senior Senator from Vermont. I have served on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry for 28 years. I know of the work the Senator from Vermont has done in attempting to have food stamp plans adopted.

If the junior Senator from Vermont will read the hearings, he will notice that a quite nice tribute was paid to his colleague by Secretary of Agriculture Freeman.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank my chairman. It has been a pleasure to serve under the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, who is chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, since the first day I arrived in the Senate, going on 24 years.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I, too, wish to identify myself with the remarks of my colleague from Vermont. I believe the Senator from Vermont, who has been concerned with this legislation since his introduction of the food allotment bill in 1943, in the 78th Congress, has rendered a monumental, historic service in bringing the proposal to the point of practicality, making it extremely appealing and desirable. I believe the millions of Americans who will benefit from the act will be grateful to the senior Senator from Vermont, who so often has led many of us on this side of the aisle, as well as on the other side of the aisle, in support of legislation.

I believe that in devoting his enormous talents to this effort, the senior Senator from Vermont has earned the respect and regard of the entire Nation.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator from New York.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I commend the chairman of the committee [Mr. Ellender] and the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. Aiken]. They have worked faithfully on the bill. This is not a proposal that has been before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry for a short time; we have been considering it for many years, and have finally agreed upon this bill.

This is a proposal that we want to try out. We do not say that it is perfect, by any means, but we believe it will work. We shall leave it to each State to decide whether it wishes to join in the program.

The program will include many people who are getting relief close to the borderline, and also lower income people. It will assist in keeping them from going from lower incomes onto the relief rolls. I believe the plan will be beneficial in many ways to the people of the United States, if only they are willing to give it a trial.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I commend the senior Senator from Vermont for having brought the proposed legislation so close to accomplishment. The Senator from Vermont is one of the most effective Members of the Senate. Usually it does not take him 20 years to get his proposals through Congress. He made a convert of me 19 years ago.

This is a far-reaching program. It will be one of the most effective, efficient, economic ways of bringing food to the poor people of the country. It will be a great step forward. I am happy to join in congratulating him upon his real accomplishment.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator from North Dakota for his remarks and for his support of this program.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be agreed to en bloc, and that the bill as thus amended be treated as original text for the purpose of further amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I first heard of the food stamp plan in the 1930's, when it was put into effect under the New Deal by order of President Franklin D. Roosevelt. That plan was the brilliant suggestion of Mr. Milo Perkins, who worked out the details and administered them in a most competent and efficient manner.

I was then an alderman from a ward in Chicago in which there was a great deal of poverty and unemployment. I saw the food stamp plan in operation. It effected a big improvement, both in the diet and in the morale of the people who were out of work. Previously, they had received surplus commodities which were restricted to cornmeal and certain vegetables. This program was not only restricted; it was humiliating, because the families and the children would have to go to relief stations, ask for the food, bring the food back in bags, and thus be exposed to the scorn of their neighbors.

I can testify that while the food stamp plan was in operation in the ward which I represented in Chicago, there was a vast improvement in the diet of the people and a great increase in their self-respect. Being paid in coupons, they could go into grocery stores and be indistinguishable from other patrons of the stores; they were not singled out as a pariah class or a dependent class. One could almost see the improvement in their self-respect after the food stamp plan went into effect. It was almost like water being sprayed over an arid flower garden.

Incidentally, the plan helped the small grocers, because instead of the surplus commodities being distributed from a central distribution point, the grocers acted as distributing centers and received the normal markup on the commodities which they sold. The plan was good for everybody.

I regret that the opposition to the food stamp plan was so great that it was discontinued. Those opposed to Roosevelt and the New Deal had their way. It might well have been continued, although it is true that increased earnings and the decrease in unemployment during the war improved the diet of many people. From 1952 to 1960 we could make no headway because of the opposition of Secretary Ezra Taft Benson and the Eisenhower administration.

Since 1957, there has been a marked increase in unemployment. A great many people in this country are in physical distress. Mr. Michael Harrington estimates that the total number of people in poverty is about 40 million, which would be, roughly, 21 or 22 percent of the population. That is a fairly conservative estimate.

In order to help the situation, surplus commodities were distributed once again, giving only badly balanced diets and causing humiliation to the recipients.

In late 1960, following his election, the late President Kennedy appointed me as Chairman of the Task Force on Depressed Areas, which was to make a report to him on actions which he should take to relieve economic distress. We made our recommendations just as he assumed office in January 1961. The first item which the Committee recommended was a liberalization and an expansion of the commodities distributed under the surplus food programs. President Kennedy signed that Executive order while returning from the inaugural ball. It was his first official act.

Our second recommendation was that the food stamp plan should be adopted on a trial and pilot basis in a number of communities and counties throughout the country. This recommendation was put into effect. Some 40 counties have been participating. One of the earliest, Franklin County in the coal mining section of southern Illinois, has a high unemployment rate and, unfortunately, a very high relief ratio. I have been in Franklin County several times during the 3 years since the plan was put into effect.

I have watched the distribution and handling of the coupons and the food. I have taken testimony from citizens, from bank executives, from grocery store owners, and others; and I can say that the program has worked extremely well. It has broadened the diet so that families on relief are now getting more milk, more meat, and more fruit and vegetables and are not being confined, as in the past, to cornmeal, lard, dried beans, and other similar foods of limited nutritional value. The coupon, as has been stated by the Senator from Louisiana, does not cover tobacco, liquors, soft drinks, chocolate, or other items which are not nutritious.

The Senator from Louisiana informs me that soft drinks are included in the present bill. I believe that this is a mistake. I am glad that hard drinks are excluded, as well as tobacco and other commodities which are either dangerous or of dubious value to health. I hope soft drinks may be excluded.

In recent months, I have visited the coal mining villages in Franklin County and I have found the general attitude and hopefulness of the people definitely better. Earlier, I had watched with horror the distribution of surplus commodities. I shall never forget an experience in one county. A wagon drove up loaded with surplus commodities. People suddenly came out of the woods and from behind buildings and swarmed like sparrows around the wagon to get the handouts of the articles. They did this with a hangdog expression on their faces because they were being publicly stigmatized as living on handouts.

I went into a nearby community after the food stamp plan had been in operation, and watched the womenfolk go into the grocery stores with a proud and erect bearing and with self-respect.

I took testimony from the grocery store owners, and they naturally like the program because it increased their sales.

There was one bank in the county which objected, but other banks were glad to cooperate. I believe the margin that was given to them for cashing the checks was increased slightly. I found no real objection whatsoever from any group in the community.

I am happy to see this plan now extended. I only wish that it could be extended further and with a larger authorization than is provided in the bill before us.

I congratulate all the members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, from both parties, for at last putting this program through. It is one of the most constructive steps that have been taken in a long time. I predict that with prudent management—and I believe that the Secretary of Agriculture will give it efficient and prudent management—the country will wholeheartedly approve of it.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment on behalf of myself and my colleague, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], to H.R. 10222, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NELSON in the chair). The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the bill, it is proposed to add the following:

AUTHORIZATION FOR STUDY AND INVESTIGATION

SEC. 17. (a) The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to make a study and investigation of the desirability and feasibility of expanding the scope of the food stamp program provided for in this Act so as to include authority for the distribution of basic clothing and other necessary household goods, made in whole or in substantial part of domestic agricultural fibers, to members of economically needy households.

(b) The Secretary shall submit the results of such study and investigation to the Congress not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act together with such recommendations for legislation as he deems appropriate.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I desire to make a brief statement with regard to this amendment.

My amendment would direct the Secretary of Agriculture to make a study of the desirability and feasibility of expanding the scope of the food stamp program so as to include authority for the distribution of basic clothing and other necessary household goods, made in whole or in substantial part of domestic agricultural fibers, to members of economically needy households. The Secretary would submit the results of his study to the Congress not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this legislation, together with such recommendations for legislation as he deems appropriate.

Since May 1961, the food stamp program has been in operation in selected local areas throughout the country and is now operating on an experimental basis in 22 States, covering some 372,000 persons. In that time, it has come to be recognized as an effective instrument to assure that needy Americans have an adequate diet.

In addition to providing a nutritionally adequate diet to a number of our citizens, this program offers a beneficial method of using the great agricultural abundance of this country, and thereby strengthens our agricultural economy.

With passage of the proposed legislation today, the Congress will make permanent the food stamp program. While I support this action, it is my opinion that we should not allow this opportunity to pass without authorizing a study of the possibility of expanding the program to include the distribution of basic clothing and other necessary household goods, made from domestic agricultural fibers. Certainly, a country as wealthy as ours can afford to assure its needy citizens not only an adequate diet, but also assure that they have basic clothing and other necessary household goods. Such a program, in addition to providing new relief for our underprivileged, would also absorb significant amounts of domestic agricultural fibers which are in surplus, thereby reducing the Government costs for storage, and subsidies for both domestic consumption and export purposes.

I hope that Senators will give careful consideration to this amendment which calls for a study of a possible new way to extend the food stamp program.

Mr. ELLENDER and Mr. CLARK addressed the Chair.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I express the hope that my good friend the Senator from Missouri will not press his amendment.

The Senator served on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry for quite a number of years and was a very valuable member of that committee. I was sorry, of course, when he left, but realized he could probably do more good for our country and the agricultural problems of his State through working hard on the wheat, feed-grain, and cotton surpluses as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations. Because of his background it was my belief at the time that he could perform a better service for the country by moving from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The Senator from Missouri knows the difficulties that we encounter on a committee when amendments are offered which are not exactly pertinent.

I give my assurance to the Senator from Missouri that if he will withdraw the amendment and introduce it in the form of a bill, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, of which I am the chairman, will give it consideration.

It is my hope to impress the Secretary of Agriculture with the fact that if this program is to continue in the future, it may be necessary to incorporate in it the very program to which the Senator is now addressing himself.

If the Senator will do that, I will ask the Secretary to make this study, and, if it is necessary, assist in passage of a resolution directing him to do it. I assure my good friend that the matter will be submitted to the committee in the hope that if action by the committee is required, the committee will act favorably on it. Then when the bill comes back to us at the end of 3 years, we will be in a position to incorporate in it the items to which he refers.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I thank the able and distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana for his typically thoughtful and kind remarks. Actually, the chief reason I left the Committee on Agriculture was it became more and more clear to me that a great deal of the problems of agriculture could be combined into one problem really—the ultimate disposal of our surpluses. More and more we see agricultural problems incident to our relations with other countries.

For example, today, in my State of Missouri, probably the most acute problem in this field has to do with the importation of beef. That importation has risen 32,000 percent in the last 10 years from one country alone.

As the able and distinguished chairman knows, today in negotiations incident to the Trade Expansion Act in turn incident to the GATT negotiations in Geneva, as being conducted by our former Secretary of State, the Honorable Christian Herter, we are negotiating to maintain what is by far the largest agricultural market the United States has today; and a cash market.

In addition, Mr. President, it became, and still is my hope that inasmuch as our balance of payments, with the exception of 1 year in the last 15 years, has been an unfavorable one, we would determine to substitute our agricultural surpluses for dollars in the distribution of our foreign aid.

Mr. President, based on the assurances of the able and distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] that he feels this amendment is not pertinent to the present food stamp bill, I would be glad to withdraw it at this time. This action on my part is especially reasonable because the chairman assures his distinguished committee will give the amendment full consideration. For that I am very grateful.

I congratulate my friend from Louisiana who, on agricultural problems, is one of the wisest Members of the Congress. I also congratulate the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] for his constructive interest in this problem.

I might add, Mr. President, that for many years a great lady from the State of Missouri has made this her No. 1 project—Representative LEONOR SULLIVAN. I thank the distinguished senior Senator from Vermont for mentioning her name in approbration. She has worked hard toward the passage of this bill, so ably presented to the Senate by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana this afternoon.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. If the Senator from Missouri ever expects or intends to introduce a separate bill on this subject, the Senator from Rhode Island would be honored to be included as a cosponsor.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I appreciate that statement from my able frined, and his interest in the matter. He will of course be included as a cosponsor.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I join my colleagues in commending the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, for his work on this bill. He is a man whom I respect as one of the most able committeemen with whom I have ever served. He is one of the best informed Senators on agriculture.

I congratulate also the acting minority leader [Mr. AIKEN], the ranking minority member upon the Senate Committee on Agriculture for his leadership in initiating the food stamp idea years ago, and for the constructive work he has done on the bill.

The bill is important to many people in my State. But it is not merely because it has importance to my State that I am interested in it. I am interested in it because I know my State is typical of many other States and sections of the country.

It is a paradox that in a country where the great majority of our people are prosperous—more prosperous than they have ever been—there are thousands who are out of work, and thousands who live on a bare subsistence.

In the past, I have supported measures to distribute surplus food to needy people. I remember that several years ago I urged the then Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Ezra Taft Benson, to provide a better balance of food to those who needed food.

I have supported other measures to provide employment to the people of depressed areas. I am interested in this bill. But I know that a bill of this type has capabilities for abuse. And when abuse occurs, it is not only bad for those who deservedly receive help, but it destroys the confidence of the people and their support of programs of this type.

I know that no bill can be drawn that will prohibit or prevent every abuse. But it is important that every effort be made to prevent abuses.

I would like to ask several questions to make clear the legislative intent that the program is intended to benefit the needy, and to be administered by the States.

Is it correct that the administration of this bill would be left to a State agency of the participating State? That is written into the bill?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. COOPER. But it is provided also that administration may be delegated by the State. I think it ought to be made clear that, however implemented, it is intended that the responsibility for the administration of this bill remains in the State government.

I believe that the responsibility may be diluted; and it will be more difficult to establish strict criteria if left wholly to local subdivisions. I should like to know if it is the interpretation of the chairman that the responsibility for the administration of the bill will rest with the appropriate agency of the State.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. As I stated earlier in the debate, merely as a deterrent, we have provided that if there is any fraud practiced—for example, if any of the coupons are used in a manner contrary to the law—the State will be responsible. We put the burden on the State to see to it that the coupons are made available to the people who are entitled to those coupons as defined in the bill.

Mr. COOPER. That is the point in which I am interested. I want everyone who is entitled and in need under the terms of the bill to receive help. But there has been criticism in my own State, and I am sure in other States, that people who do not need help, even with respect to surplus commodities, secure assistance. When this happens, the whole program is discredited.

Is it not correct that under the bill the State must submit to the Department of Agriculture its plan for the administration of the bill, including the criteria by which it will determine the families that will be eligible to obtain assistance under the food stamp bill?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct. When the plan is submitted, it may be submitted for one, two, or three areas within a State, and not the entire State. Wherever the plan is workable and people are entitled to the assistance, these plans are submitted by the State under regulations that are outlined in the bill, and afterward submitted to the Secretary of Agriculture for his study and, of course, his final approval.

Mr. COOPER. I have received some letters from owners of stores in my State who have complained because they were not designated or approved as stores under the pilot plan that is in operation in Kentucky. I do not know whether the complaints are justified. But is it correct that under this bill a method of review—including judicial review—is provided for storeowners who claim they have been improperly denied approval as participants in the food stamp plan?

Mr. ELLENDER. There is a method that the storekeepers must follow before they obtain approval. After they receive the approval of the Secretary of Agriculture, they are bound to obey the rules and regulations pertaining to the retailing of the goods. Unless a storekeeper should follow the rules and regulations strictly, he would be subject to punishment like anyone else participating in the administration of the program.

Mr. COOPER. If a retail store or a wholesale food store should claim that it had been wrongfully denied approval, a procedure is provided in the bill for review, even extending to the courts. Is that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. COOPER. I should like to ask another question. The Senator has covered the point, but in order to make the record clear, I point out that many believe, and I am one, that to insure the establishment of proper criteria with respect to the beneficiaries and also to assure the proper administration of the bill, a State should be required to contribute a certain percentage of the cost, however small? What is the Senator's view on this proposal?

Mr. ELLENDER. The State would assume all of the cost of administering the program on the State level, including auditing, taking care of the coupons, and seeing to it that those entitled to the coupons received them. If a recipient were not under the welfare program of the State at the time, but was a resident of another State in the area and entitled to coupons because his income is equal to or below that stated for the welfare group, in that instance, and in that instance alone, does the Federal Government provide part payment on the administrative features of the bill?

But as to all those in the welfare program the State assumes complete control of the administration, subject, of course, to the supervision of the Federal Government. The State must assume all costs of distributing the stamps, keeping an account of them, and also being certain that the stamps or coupons are made available to those who are entitled to them under the law.

I wish again to emphasize to my good friend that in the event of fraud, the State, through the agency of the State that administers the program, would be responsible for any stamp fraudulently made available to any recipient in the State.

Mr. COOPER. The chairman of the committee has always insisted that Governmental programs be operated properly, efficiently, and economically. Will there be opportunity for this program to be reviewed by the Committee on Agriculture of which he is chairman?

Mr. ELLENDER. There is no provision in the bill for that purpose. Every year the Congress will appropriate the money necessary in order to carry on the program. An opportunity will be given at that time to review the program. For example, for the year 1965 an appropriation of $75 million would be made. When the Secretary came in for an appropriation for the second year, that is, for 1966, there would be time to review what had been done with the $75 million previously appropriated.

I believe that through that method we can keep pretty close tab on what has been done under the program.

Mr. COOPER. I should like to address another question to the chairman——

Mr. ELLENDER. A while ago the Senator asked about the right of the storekeeper to appeal. At page 15 of the bill, beginning at line 9, the Senator will find the following language:

> If the store or concern feels aggrieved by such final determination he may obtain judicial review thereof by filing a complaint against the United States in the United States district court for the district in which he resides or is engaged in business, or in any court of record of the State having competent jurisdiction, within thirty days after the date of delivery or service of the final notice of determination upon him, requesting the court to set aside such determination.

I knew that the language was there, but I could not put my finger on it at the time the Senator asked me for it.

Mr. COOPER. I wished to bring it out, because I knew it was in the bill.

I desire to address another question to the Senator. The Senator may remember that in the public welfare amendments of 1962, with respect to the dependent children's program, an amendment was adopted which was described as the community work and training program. The amendment provided that the State could, if it desired, require able-bodied men receiving assistance under the dependent children's program to work for a time comparable in value to the amount that one would receive under that program. Would the Senator consider the adoption of a similar amendment to this program, to provide that a State, if it so desires, may require that an able-bodied person who receives food under this bill, above the cost paid by him, shall perform work of a public nature comparable in value to the goods received? Would he not consider such an amendment to be of value? I believe it would be beneficial to the morale of the people who receive this help, and, have effect in assuring that only those who really meet the standards or criteria shall receive this aid? Does the Senator think it would be an effective amendment and be of value?

Mr. ELLENDER. The committee gave consideration to such a provision. We felt that, since the administration of the program was in the hands of the States, the State laws should apply. During the course of the hearings I learned that the State of Kentucky requires, under similar laws, that before any welfare program benefit is made available to a household, if there is a job available, the job is to be offered to the head of the household. If he refuses to work, he receives no aid.

Since this program is to be administered by the States, I believe it might be well to leave that matter entirely in the hands of the States, and let the States make the determination, under rules and regulations, as outlined in the bill, as to who shall and who shall not be entitled to relief.

Mr. COOPER. The State of Kentucky, in adopting the program the Senator has described, did so under the amendment which was adopted under the aid to dependent children program. I believe it was, because the Congress wrote into that act a provision that the States could require such work of comparable value that gave the State of Kentucky the initiative to adopt such a requirement. I think it has had a good effect. People have been put to work in cleaning up communities, and doing other valuable work. It has aided the morale of the people who receive the aid, and has also given confidence in the program.

I have such an amendment. I wonder if the Senator from Louisiana would take it to conference, so it could be discussed there, and I hope adopted?

Mr. ELLENDER. We discussed the question to some extent during the hearings. Witnesses appeared from the Senator's State.

It is my belief that since the States are the ones that more or less administer this program, and will make the decisions as to who are eligible to receive this aid, we should rely on State laws, rather than impose that provision on all the States.

While I have not looked into the problem too thoroughly, I am of the impression that most of the States have laws such as the one on the statute books of the State of Kentucky, under which, if a person asks for relief, and does not have a job, if he does not take a job when it is offered to him he does not get relief.

I think it is something that should be taken care of by the States. I do not think the Government should give aid to anyone who refuses to work when he is offered a job. However, since practically all of the States have such laws, I think it might be best to leave it to the States.

As this program develops under the law as presently written, we could learn which States have such laws and which States have not, and how the program works in the States that have such laws. Then, in the future, there could be a provision offered to cover the situation the Senator is discussing.

I believe it might not be in order at the moment to impose such a law on all the States. Let us see how the program works. As the program develops, there will be ample time for proposals in keeping with what the Senator is suggesting.

Mr. COOPER. The amendment I suggest would not be mandatory on all the States. It would provide that States could impose a requirement of work.

Mr. ELLENDER. The States can do it now. Kentucky does it.

Mr. COOPER. But Kentucky was given the initiative to do it as a result of the provision in the Aid to Dependent Children Act.

Mr. ELLENDER. The mere fact that a State had the incentive to do it would not necessarily mean that it would adopt such a law.

I believe that as time goes on we shall see that, since the program is to be administered by the States, they will be very careful as to who will receive aid. The bill defines who shall receive aid. It is the responsibility of the States to determine who shall receive the benefits of the program.

In all the welfare programs the States decide who shall receive the aid, and what amount of income shall determine whether a recipient gets the benefits of the welfare programs.

Since most of the States that have such programs now have on the statute books sufficient laws to take care of the situation the Senator is discussing now, I think his suggestion is unnecessary. Personally, I would prefer that we proceed with the program as we have it for some time; and if occasion presents itself, a provision can be proposed to carry out what the Senator is speaking of. There will be plenty of time to do that.

Mr. COOPER. In asking these questions, I have not done so from any distrust of the people of the United States, or the States in the implementation of the program. I have voted for measures to provide relief for people who are really in need. I have had opportunity to work with the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. Douglas]. I appreciate the fact that he originally recommended the pilot program. However, I am extremely anxious that the benefits of the program shall go to the people who actually need it, and that it will not be used for those who do not need it. When that happens it brings discredit upon the whole program and produces a lack of confidence in the program on the part of the people.

I hope the interpretation and explanation of the safeguards in the bill, which the distinguished chairman has given this afternoon, will be impressed upon those who administer this program.

I shall offer the amendment. I know the Senator is opposed to it. I offer it to express a view that I hold, that this program and other similar programs should require comparable work of able-bodied beneficiaries. It will raise the morale of those who receive the benefit of these programs; that it would be helpful in assuring a better administration of the program, and save money.

Mr. President, I offer the amendment, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The Legislative Clerk. On page 18, after line 23, it is proposed to insert a new section, as follows:

> COMMUNITY WORK AND TRAINING PROGRAMS
>
> Sec. 16. For the purpose of assisting the States in encouraging, through community work and training programs of a constructive nature, the conservation of work skills and the development of new skills for unemployed individuals who are the head of a household receiving a coupon allotment under this Act, a State plan approved under section 10(e) of this Act may require as a condition of eligibility for receiving such coupon allotment in any month that such head of a household, if able bodied, be required to perform work for all or a portion of the value of the coupon allotment in excess of the amount charged such household, if such work is performed for the State agency or any other public agency under a program administered by or under the supervision of such State agency, and if such State plan includes provisions consistent with the provisions of paragraphs (1) through (5) of subsection (a) of section 409 of the Social Security Act, as amended.

On page 19, line 2, strike out "Sec. 16" and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 17".

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I have explained the amendment. A State, in the submission of its plan, could provide as one of its requirements, that those who receive assistance under the program, who are not employed, and who are able bodied, may be required to work a comparable time in terms of wages at the prevailing wages for the value of the food received.

As I have said, it would contribute to the morale of those who work. It would give greater confidence in the program as a whole. It would hold down the cost of the program, because it would have a tendency to make States stricter in setting the criteria to be applied. It would be a wholesome thing to do.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I have expressed my opposition to the amendment, and I have given my reasons for the opposition. I hope the amendment will not be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, I have an amendment at the desk. I ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk proceeded to state the amendment.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be not read, but printed in the Record at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment, ordered to be printed in the Record, is as follows:

> On page 5 of H.R. 10222, under "Eligible Households", strike out all of section 5 and substitute:
>
> "Sec. 5. (a) Households eligible to participate in the food stamp program shall be those which now qualify or later qualify for Federal-State or State public assistance programs.
>
> "(b) Each State may also establish standards to determine the eligibility of additional applicant households, such standards to include maximum income limitations consistent with the income standards used by the State agency in administration of its federally assisted public assistance programs. Such standards also shall place a limitation on the resources to be allowed eligible households. Any State requesting participation in the food stamp program under this subsection shall be required, from funds available to the the State or political subdivision thereof, to make reimbursement payments to the United States in an amount equal to 10 per centum of the value of those coupons issued to such additional applicant households within the State which is in excess of the value of coupons for which such households are charged. Such reimbursement payments shall be deposited into and made a part of the separate account created in section 7(d) of this Act.
>
> "(c) The standards of eligibility to be used by each State for the food stamp program shall be subject to the approval of the Secretary."

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, I offered the amendment in committee to provide for 25 percent State participation in the cost of so-called bonus food stamps to persons not on public assistance. I have reduced the amount to 10 percent. The amendment would make more definite the application of the food stamp proposal now before the Senate. In my opinion, it would make more effective the administration of the proposal.

I do not intend by the amendment to restrict or limit the application of the plan, but I believe the application should be more definite.

For example, as the bill is before us, section 5(a), on page 6, provides:

> Participation in the food stamp program shall be limited to those households whose income is determined to be a substantial limiting factor in the attainment of a nutritionally adequate diet.

My proposal would provide, in lieu thereof:

> Households eligible to participate in the food stamp program shall be those which now qualify or later qualify for Federal-State or State public assistance programs.

It seems to me that the language contained in section 5(a) of the bill makes a definite approach uncertain, except as limited by the following section, section (b).

Paragraph (b) of my proposal, however, provides that each State, in addition to setting forth the criteria of eligibility of those who are not presently qualified or who would be qualified to be on public or general assistance, would have to pay 10 percent of the cost of the coupons which is in excess of the value of coupons for which these households are charged. This would enable the States to participate in the cost of this portion of the program. In my judgment, the bill as it now is contains a large gray area. I do not know exactly where the limitation would be on those to be covered who are not on public assistance.

The appropriation for fiscal year 1965 is limited to $75 million. That is nowhere near the $360 million estimated for 1 year's cost, if the program were applied generally throughout the United States with its present wide coverage. My amendment would also provide more effective administration.

If a State is not participating financially in the program in some way or other, I can certainly see why Governors, State legislators, community and civic leaders, and others will not have too much interest in it. They will be interested, of course, but they will not have the incentive and interest they would have if the State were appropriating money to be used in the program. The cost of the stamps, under the program now provided in the bill, would be carried 100 percent by the Federal Government.

Let me make one distinction. In all except one of the programs to which I refer in paragraph (a), both the State and Federal Governments now participate. I refer to the programs for old age assistance, medical assistance for the aged, aid to families with dependent children, aid to the blind, and aid to the permanently and totally disabled. The only other category would be that of general assistance, which is taken care of totally by State and local communities. So the additional people who would be covered for nutritional aid, so to speak, would receive coupons provided entirely by the Federal Government and the State's only participation would be a share of the cost of administration.

My amendment would provide for State participation to the extent of 10 percent of these coupons. I believe it would make for more effective administration and assure a more bona fide overall operation.

It has been a privilege and a pleasure to serve on the committee under the chairmanship of the able Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. I congratulate both him and the distinguished senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the ranking Republican member of the committee, who advocated this program for many years. I sincerely believe that, improved and tightened by my amendment, the bill would provide a more effective, and more dignified program than the present bulk food distribution program which is being carried on.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, this amendment was discussed fully before the committee, and the committee rejected it almost unanimously. I hope the Senate will likewise reject it.

First, let me point out that in order to obtain bonus coupons, the recipient must put up in cash what he normally might be spending for food. In cases cited us, the recipients, on the average put up 60 percent of the total value of coupons received. Therefore, it cannot be said that the recipient does not participate in the total food cost.

Second, if we are going to require States, in the case of nonwelfare cases to put up an additional 10 percent the result will be to discriminate against the many low-income households not able to qualify for welfare assistance for one reason or another. I would expect that most, if not all of the States, would exclude these needy persons from the program. However, the fact that they were excluded would not make them less hungry or undernourished.

Third, the adoption of this amendment would severely limit the program, would create inequities, and would not permit, in many cases, the judicial and efficient operation of the food stamp plan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I am somewhat distressed at the change in the language at the bottom of page 2 and the top of page 3 in the House bill. Soft drinks were originally excluded from the operation of the food stamp plan. In the revised committee draft, as I understand it, soft drinks are now included, and food stamps can be used for the purchase of soft drinks. Is my understanding correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. The language of the House bill was stricken. One of the reasons was that under the definition of "soft drinks," milk drinks would be excluded. Certainly, we would not want to do that. Further, many soft drinks are used in hospitals and for other medical purposes. These same drinks are used in homes for convalescents and other sickly persons. I am sure that hungry persons will not spend much money for these items unless needed.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I do not want to include Coca-Cola or Pepsi-Cola or any of that family. I like them myself, but I do not believe they should be permitted to be substitutes for milk. They are not valuable for the diet. They can be a waste of money especially for young people. Personally, I think it is a great mistake to include them. Milk, of course, would be included; chocolate would be included; chocolate milk would be included.

I should like to include carbonated soft drinks—and I am willing to make the definition "carbonated"—among the items for which food stamps cannot be given. I move to include carbonated soft drinks among the items for which food stamps may not be issued.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I hope the Senate wil reject the amendment. The House bill included an amendment which would exclude drinks such as orange juice and milk drinks. I believe it should be left to the people who have the stamps to decide what they wish to buy. We have excluded alcohol and tobacco; I think we have gone far enough.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I should like to speak concerning the proposal. My suggestion is that the item which is included be not merely soft drinks, but carbonated soft drinks. That would exclude Coca-Cola, Pepsi-Cola, Dr. Pepper, and all the varieties of the family of cola drinks. If we include them, this will be used as propaganda against an otherwise splendid and much needed measure. I want to help the poor and hungry and not sacrifice them for Coca-Cola. The Senator knows that these have no nutritional value—none at all. They are poor alternatives for milk or chocolate milk. Actually, they are bad for kids, rather than good for them.

I hesitate to use such language, but the only benefit I can see in the present language is that it will increase the sales of the Coca-Cola and other cola and soft drink companies.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCINTYRE in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Illinois.

The nays appear to have it.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I call for a division.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A division is called for.

On a division, the amendment was rejected.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I wish the RECORD to show that I voted for it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wonder whether I could get some idea of how much more time will be spent on this food stamp bill, because we have an important conference report which will have to be brought up very shortly.

Mr. ELLENDER. So far as I am concerned, I am finished. I have no further amendments.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I realize that the Senate has spent much time on this bill, but there is overwhelming support for it, and I shall delay final action only a few moments. However, I do wish to express to the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, on which I have had the privilege to serve for 4 years, the satisfaction of the metropolitan Detroit area and its people with the pilot program which operated there beginning in early 1961.

The contributions made to that program by individual retail establishments in Detroit was an important plus. The Food Industry Committee of Detroit for some years had advocated just such action. Certainly, as we hear those at home criticizing us for evidencing concern for people overseas—a course of action which I heartily support—it should come as some comfort to realize that we do indeed respond prudently to need at home.

This is a prudent, effective program. I, too, wish that carbonated beverages had been excluded from the bill but on balance it is overwhelmingly plus.

Again, I salute the chairman of the committee for the leadership which he has given over these several years on that committee.

FOOD STAMPS INCREASE BEEF CONSUMPTION, IMPROVE HEALTH AND ASSIST FARMERS

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, one aspect of the food stamp bill which has been of great interest to me is the increases in consumption of domestic food products which it brings about.

Studies have shown that families receiving food stamps in Detroit and other areas increased their meat consumption at least one pound per person per week. In Detroit, 55 percent of the increase in meat consumption consisted of beef or a little more than one-half pound of beef per person per week. The administrators feel sure that this experience will continue nationally.

I have worked out what this bill means in terms of beef consumption, based on this experience.

In the first year of the new authorization it will amount to 21.5 million pounds of beef; in the second year, 28.6 million pounds of beef, and in the third year 57.8 million pounds.

The Department of Agriculture estimates that ultimately 4 million persons will be in the program. At that time, increased beef consumption as a result of this program would run about 115 million pounds annually.

The significance of this considerable increase in beef consumption, Mr. President, can be appreciated when it is compared to the 1963 increase in beef imports over 1962. The USDA report shows that our beef imports, including dressed meat and the meat equivalent of live cattle imported, increased 134 million pounds in 1963. The food stamp plan will offset 90 percent of such an increase.

The food stamp bill not only means more adequate diets for our poorer citizens, Mr. President, it also means expanded markets. It means a healthier citizenry and a healthier economy.

I would like to invite all those who are concerned about beef prices—and I continue to be concerned although prices are up some just now—to join in support of this bill. There are record numbers of feeder cattle in feedlots which will start coming to market this fall. Large supplies could again depress markets unless those markets have been expanded, as the food stamp plan would help to expand them.

There are other products which will enjoy improved markets under the food stamp program. I have used beef as an illustration because we have heard so much of the beef problems recently.

Producers of cereals and dairy products as well as fruits and vegetables will benefit from the increased markets it generates, reducing our surpluses.

And it will increase America's prestige throughout the world as a nation, with a democratic system of government under which all citizens are assured freedom from want for the essentials of life.

Each of us will stand a little taller for voting to provide our less fortunate fellow citizens the foodstuffs they need, while at the same time strengthening the incomes of our farm producers and retail grocers. As former director of our food for peace program, I came to a keen appreciation of what American food means to hungry people around the world. I know that we want to make certain that our own citizens have adequate diets.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, ever since coming to the Senate I have sponsored and supported a food stamp program. In 1959 I led the floor fight that resulted in the authority for such a program on a pilot basis. This authority, though not used at that time, was the result of an amendment to the act extending Public Law 480.

At the request of the late President Kennedy in his economic message of February 2, 1961, a pilot food stamp program was inaugurated by the Department of Agriculture. The first project began in West Virginia in May of that year. Since that time additional pilot projects have been added in order to get a full and complete trial of the food stamp program. At the present time it is operating in 43 counties and cities in 22 States with about 380,000 persons participating.

On the basis of these extensive tests—in widely different types of urban and rural communities and for a period of over 2 years—the program has proved eminently successful. Building on the experience of the previous food stamp plan operated from 1939 to 1943, and with the best advice and council of all segments affected by the program, it was designated to expand farm markets and to make our food abundance available to many of our people who needed it, in a dignified manner through normal commercial channels.

The operation of the program is quite simple. Individual families are certified by the public welfare authorities on the basis of their need. Both those families receiving public assistance as well as other low-income groups not receiving any other form of public assistance are eligible. The eligible families buy the food coupons. The price they pay is approximately what they would normally spend for food out of whatever income they have from whatever source. When the families have little or no income they make only token payments or receive their coupons free. In return for the coupons they receive food worth considerably more than they pay. On an average, across the Nation, the participants have been paying a little over $6 for every $10 worth of coupons they receive. They may then take these coupons to any grocery store and purchase any food for human consumption except alcoholic beverages, tobacco, and imported foods.

The grocer, in turn, deposits his coupons with his bank just as he does his other cash receipts. The banks, in turn, redeem the coupons through the Federal Reserve System just as they do their other paper. The Federal Reserve banks are reimbursed out of the moneys collected from recipients and Department of Agriculture funds.

This program has been an unqualified success. It has presented no real administrative problems. Violations of the program have been less than one-half of 1 percent of the 14,000 grocers participating. The benefits have been many.

BENEFITS TO AGRICULTURE

Agriculture benefits directly from the expanding markets, particularly since increased food consumption under the program has proved to be concentrated in livestock products and fruits and vegetables. While the coupons are not earmarked for specific surplus foods, the movement of price supported commodities under the stamp plan has been greater than under direct distribution. In Detroit, for instance, utilization of grains was increased by 24 percent, including indirect usage through larger use of livestock products. The program has increased the sale of foods providing a larger return to the farmer. In Detroit—where the costs of direct distribution and later the food stamp program were roughly comparable—the return to the farmer from the purchased food and donated commodities used by eligible persons under direct distribution was $1.75 per person per week. This same group of people, after inauguration of the food stamp program—including participants and nonparticipants—purchased food yielding $2.01 per person per week to the farmer.

BENEFITS TO PARTICIPANTS

Participants are able to obtain food assistance in a much more dignified manner—actually buying the privilege. They have substantially increased their food consumption, with more than 80 percent of this increase in livestock products and fruits and vegetables. Almost twice the number of families were able to achieve nutritionally adequate diets after the program went into effect.

BENEFITS TO THE COMMUNITY

Retail food store sales have increased an average of 8 percent in the pilot areas. The additional dollars moving into the community act as a stimulant to the overall economy of the area. Thus, rather than the Federal Government competing with commercial food sales—as it does to some extent under the direct distribution program—food sales and the economy of the project areas are benefited under the food stamp program at about the same cost to the Federal Government.

The pilot operations have been conducted under the general authorities and with funds available under section 32. This experiment has run long enough to demonstrate the validity and effectiveness of the program. Legislation to provide specific authority for a food stamp program and to make possible its gradual expansion to other areas of the country in need of such a program was introduced at President Kennedy's request in the 1st session of the 88th Congress. President Johnson again called for the enactment of this legislation to extend and expand the food stamp program in his state of the Union message and again in his farm message.

The legislation before us would accomplish this end. This bill embodies many refining and strengthening amendments in the bill originally introduced in the Congress last year and these amendments have been agreed to by the administration. The language of the bill, for example, makes its abundantly clear that participating grocers will not be arbitrarily suspended or disqualified for alleged violations; that "due process" principles will be observed, and that grocers will have access to both State and U.S. district courts if they want judicial review of the Department's administrative action. Also, the bill specifically states that no authority is granted to the Secretary of Agriculture to control prices in participating retail or wholesale stores.

This is a fine bill. It is a workable bill. It is a bill that proposes nothing new. It provides for the same type of program and the same administrative requirements as the pilot food stamp program which has been time tested and proven effective.

I urge its passage by the Senate.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The Legislative Clerk. In the committee amendment, on page 3, at the beginning of line 5, it is proposed to strike out "which are identified as being from foreign sources when they arrive at the retail food store" and insert "which are imported".

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I wish to advise my good friend the Senator from Iowa that I will gladly take his amendment to conference. We have changed the definition that is in the whole section. I know that there will be much work to do in conference with the House. Therefore, I agree to take it to conference.

Mr. MILLER. I very much appreciate the statement of the Senator from Louisiana.

The only purpose of my amendment is to tie in with the very first line in the preamble of the bill, which is to strengthen the agricultural economy and to reflect what the committee intends according to the colloquy we had earlier this afternoon.

Mr. President, I move the adoption of my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Iowa.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The title was amended so as to read: "An Act to strengthen the agricultural economy; to help to achieve a fuller and more effective use of food abundances; to provide for improved levels of nutrition among low-income households through a cooperative Federal-State program of food assistance to be operated through normal channels of trade; and for other purposes."

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments and request a conference thereon with the House of Representatives, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate on the food stamp bill just passed.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. Ellender, Mr. Johnston, Mr. Holland, Mr. Aiken, and Mr. Young of North Dakota conferees on the part of the Senate.

ONE-YEAR EXTENSION OF CERTAIN EXCISE-TAX RATES — CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11376) to provide a 1-year extension of certain excise-tax rates. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of today.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, first, let me state that the Senate conferees went to a conference with the House conferees under some disadvantages. Under the procedures of the House it was necessary that we enter into some kind of agreement before midnight last night; otherwise, the conference report could not be considered today and certain excise taxes on liquor, beer, tobacco, and wine would have expired. They will expire at midnight tonight unless this report is accepted and the President signs the bill before that time. The cost to the Government if this bill is not passed will be some $1.9 billion.

The House had to file its report before midnight last night in order that it might vote on the conference report today. Completion of the House action was necessary so that the Senate, too, might vote on the report today and complete action before midnight tonight.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd], chairman of the Finance Committee, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. Williams], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Carlson], and myself were the conferees on the part of the Senate.

We all endeavored to get the House to agree to the position which the Senate had adopted. However, we found that the House conferees were adamant.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long] suggested, first, that they accept our amendments. This they refused to do.

The Senator from Louisiana then suggested that if they would not take all the amendments which we had adopted in the Senate, would they be willing to take as a compromise a lesser amount with respect to the items on which we had reduced excise taxes. This they also refused to do.

Then other Senators asked them if they would be willing to compromise with us by eliminating some of the items which were covered. We argued about various combinations of items which might be eliminated for quite some time and they refused to take any of the combinations proposed.

The first basic House position was that the House Committee on Ways and Means had underway hearings with respect to these excise taxes. These hearings began on June 15 and they have some 200 witnesses scheduled to appear, some of which have already been heard, and many more who will be heard in July and August of this year. They assure us that the study is thorough. It is in depth. It is serious. It is designed to bring about a reduction—a thoughtful and intelligent reduction is the way they put it—with respect to these excise taxes. The chairman of the Ways and Means Committee hoped that the reduction could be made in 1965 if the budgetary situation permits, although there was some indication that the Secretary of the Treasury believed that, on economic grounds, these excise tax reductions should be postponed until 1966.

The House conferees wanted to move forward with their study before making excise tax cuts. They pointed out that they were not in a position at this stage of their study to pick and choose which excise taxes should be taken off first—at this point in their study they did not have sufficient information to properly make this decision.

They pointed out that some of the Korean taxes are probably less onerous than some of the excise taxes which have been on for a long time. However, before making reductions they wanted the benefit of their study. They wanted to give all of the parties in interest an opportunity to be heard by them, and subsequently to be heard by us.

Their second basic argument was that we had already cut taxes this year by some $11.6 billion and that for 1 year that was enough. Actually much of the corporate tax relief in the earlier legislation went to small businesses, the same retailers for whom the Senate now seeks excise tax relief. It will be remembered that in the tax reduction bill which we recently passed, we reversed the surtax and the normal tax rates applicable to these small companies that make less than $25,000 a year—we reduced the tax rate applicable in their case from 30 to 22 percent.

So those companies have had a great advantage. Some $2½ billion of the reduction in the Revenue Act of 1964 went to corporations generally. The balance of the tax reduction went to individual citizens—which, of course, involves all individual income-tax payers throughout the Nation.

Third, the House conferees took the position that the economy at this time did not require a further tax reduction. It did not need further stimulation, because corporate profits were at a high level, because personal income was at an alltime high, because civilian employment in April for the first time exceeded 70 million, and because the unemployment rate for the first time in years was down close to 5 percent. They felt that this was not the year, in the light of that which had previously been done, and in the light of our burgeoning economy, to bring about a further cut in taxes.

Fourth, the House conferees argued that to make a further reduction now would result in a greater deficit. It would increase the deficit to close to $6½ billion, whereas I understand now that the deficit for fiscal 1965 is expected to be $5.8 billion.

We tried, in every logical and conceivable way, and in every way that we thought was persuasive to present the Senate reductions to them. But they had us in the position where time was running out and after a while it became rather obvious that our arguments and entreaties were getting us nowhere.

Faced with that situation, the junior Senator from Florida made the motion that the Senate recede. In the light of what they had said, I was convinced that the excise tax expiration date, which is midnight tonight would have arrived and still the House conferees would not have agreed to the Senate amendments. Allowing the expirations of the excise tax reductions to take effect would have meant a reduction in taxes of $1.9 billion. The reduction would start immediately and would amount to $1.50 a gallon on whisky, $1 a barrel on beer, about an 11 percent reduction on wine, a

1 cent a pack reduction on cigarettes, a reduction from 10 percent to 7 percent of the manufacturers price on autos, a reduction from 8 percent to 5 percent on auto parts and accessories, as well as the elimination of the 10 percent tax on local telephone calls and the 5 percent tax on transportation by air.

I could not see the wisdom of doing this. It was not the view of the Senators on the conference committee that the Senate wanted to let all of the excise taxes on these particular items expire and result in a loss to the Government of $1.9 billion. So, having that in mind, we did recede.

However, we are back to the Senate with the assurance that excise taxation will be looked into very thoroughly by the House, and certainly by us next year, with the hopeful expectation that we can then have a meaningful and thoughtful excise tax reduction.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. First of all, I thank the Senate conferees. From all reports available, I have known that they themselves as members of the committee were sincerely opposed to the amendment that was passed by the Senate. This was the matter in dispute in the conference. Nevertheless they worked hard for its acceptance. There was an impasse, however, and they were up against a deadline. Unless the Senate were to do something by midnight tonight, there would be a chaotic condition—a threat to the stabilization of the economy of the country. Some of these taxes are absolutely essential; there is no question at all about it. In that juncture we might have had to pass some bill that would have made these taxes retroactive, and that would have added to the confusion.

There is a circumstance about these measures that irks the Senator from Rhode Island, and I think that irks every Senator, including the members of the Finance Committee. It is that these measures that have a deadline of midnight June 30 should come tardily from the House to the Senate. This measure was passed by the House on June 17. And I would suppose that it came to the Senate immediately thereafter.

The time stricture puts the Senate in a straitjacket. There seems to be little that we can do about it. I know that the House Ways and Means Committee is a rather busy committee. They have a lot of work to do. I can understand that they cannot come around to these measures as quickly as they would like. But I hope in the Congress we are not working ourselves into an operating procedure where the House holds up these measures and when it sends them over to us we are then placed in the position where under the pressure of deadlines we cannot make a free choice of what we think is right as against what we think is wrong.

The Senator from Rhode Island did not have any illusions that the House conferees would accept this amendment, even though the Senate passed it by a vote of 48 to 38. The one comfort that I get out of it is the assurance that has been given, of a meaningful excise tax reduction next year. There is no question about it, the Senate has felt for a long time that some adjustment should be made on these excise taxes. We realize that we cannot take them all off abruptly and entirely. The fact is that some graduated system should be worked out. I am happy that the House shares our concern.

I congratulate the Senator from Florida. There is not a great deal that we can do at this time. There is not much that we can do to affect the result. It has already been achieved. But I would hope that the House Ways and Means Committee would bear in mind the Senate vote by which the amendment was passed, a vote of 48 to 38. That reveals the temper and the thinking of the Senate.

I hope they will bear in mind that these were instituted as temporary taxes, that they were put on at a time of crisis, when we needed the money, and we wanted to discourage people from buying certain articles that were considered not as necessary as other articles at the time. That time has long since passed.

I would hope that they would look into this matter as expeditiously as possible and bring some relief to the drugstore owner on Main Street, and the little store owner on one of the side streets. The little fellow is bothered and bothered by these taxes. Relatively speaking, they do not produce much money, but are a tremendous nuisance to the retailers of the country.

I compliment the Senator from Florida for all that he has done, and the Senator from Louisiana, and all of the Senate conferees. They all pitched in as hard as they could, conscientiously following the mandate of the Senate even though they knew they were fighting a losing battle.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator from Rhode Island that it makes it difficult for us when the House sends matters like this over to us so late in the year, and so close to the deadline that we have a difficult time working the Senate's will on them.

The distinguished Senator from Rhode Island and the distinguished Senator from New York were joint sponsors of the principal amendment which was adopted. This amendment took the excise taxes off the first $100 of the sales price of jewelry and furs and completely eliminated the taxes on ladies' handbags, luggage, and toilet preparations. I believe it is clear from our discussion with the House conferees, that the Senate had established a priority with respect to these items, and I believe that the House Committee on Ways and Means will take this priority into account in its consideration of which excises to reduce. When they begin their talks in their committee concerning which excise taxes should come off, especially the priority of which taxes should come off first, I believe they will be mindful of the fact that the Senate has voted, 48 to 38, for the elimination of taxes on the items which I have mentioned.

I am happy to yield to the able Senator from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I appreciate the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Florida. I recognize what he was up against, and the other members of the conference committee, and what we are up against here in the Senate.

There is no realistic alternative to accepting this conference report. If the bill is not signed into law by tonight, there would be a gap in the force and effect of the excise levies which all concerned agree must be continued for another year.

It goes without saying that I deplore very much the conferees' action in deleting the Pastore-Keating amendment that had been approved by a solid margin in the Senate last week.

The four categories of retailers' excise taxes deserve, in my judgment, a top priority for repeal, and I take last week's vote at least as a hopeful sign for their final elimination in the near future.

I wish to join with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] in his expression of disquiet over the policy that the other body seems so often to adopt in relation to tax measures. Measures are sent to the Senate close to a deadline when there is no real opportunity to act. The House holds the whip hand. We cannot sit here and allow a necessary tax to expire.

The vote on the amendment to which the Senator from Rhode Island has referred was imposing. It seems to me that it was something to which the conferees in the other body ought to have given more acceptance and consideration than they did.

I appreciate the assurance given by the Senator from Florida. Our only hope is that in their consideration of the excise tax problems, Members of Congress will in the future be more cognizant of the vote that took place in the Senate. Insofar as possible, these particular items should have early priority.

I wish to express my gratitude to the conference committee for the fight I assume they put up, and I wish to express the hope that we shall still meet with success in removing these taxes that involve not only a nuisance to the small retail stores, but also a threat to the livelihood of thousands of employees in the industries concerned. When the taxes were inserted in the law, we promised that the taxes would be taken off in a relatively short period of time. At least the fight that has been put up this year has made the House committee, the public, and everyone else realize that the time is fast approaching when that promise to the American people will be kept.

Mr. SMATHERS. I thank the able Senator for his consideration of the position in which the conferees were placed. I am certain that the retailers in his State recognize the contribution which he has made in an effort to obtain relief for them. I am certain that they appreciate his efforts.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I proposed the tax cut on theater tickets, which the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] graciously accepted. Theater tickets are critically important to my State. That amendment went down the drain with the rest of the amendments.

The cooperation of the coordinate branches of Congress in respect to taxes is far more overlooked in the breach than in the observance. I say that with the deepest affection for our colleagues on the Ways and Means Committee in the other body.

I hope that one day, even at the 11th hour—at 4:25 p.m. on the last day—we shall not be driven to refuse to accept such a report and will throw the subject of taxes into a tailspin and put the blame where really, in all fairness, it belongs. I do not believe that the Senate is getting the recognition to which it is entitled on this subject. Knowing our colleagues as I do, and knowing the fight which was put up by the conferees, which, with other Senators, I appreciate, I hope that in between seasons that point will be impressed on the House. There is no guarantee that we will not become sore around here and really upset the applecart to the embarrassment of everyone. I hope very much that the knowledge that we have the capacity to take such action—we are not irresponsible here—may be used by our colleagues, who I know feel as we do in many of these cases, to advantage in between seasons before we get into a similar jam again.

Mr. SMATHERS. I thank the able Senator for his statements.

I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. HARTKE. First, I should like to express to my distinguished colleagues from the Finance Committee, the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], my appreciation for looking after an important item on the subject of excise taxes which arose during my absence. That was the tax upon musical instruments used for school purposes. I think it is very important for all of us to understand that the Finance Committee itself was under a sort of deadline. After all, the measure was passed. Hearings did not begin until June 4 in the House. Then the bill came over to the Senate Finance Committee on June 17. Those of us who were in the Finance Committee understood that we were under the gun, so to speak. There was a time bomb even in the committee. The fuse had been lit. We were moving under a deadline waiting for the House to try to adjust itself, to what the Senate feels is not only a system of priorities, but a system of justice.

A general excise tax, which does not go into a dedicated fund, as some of them do, is to me the most oppressive, repressive, and regressive type of taxation that we could have. We note what is happening in other countries. As Russia moves forward with her so-called transaction tax, we find it is putting more of the burden of taxation on those who are in the lower income brackets. That situation happens in relation to an excise tax.

We are a nation that has captured the idea that art is something to look upon with favor. One important form of art is music, and, of course, music calls for musical instruments. Anyone who participates in music personally knows that it is a form of self-satisfaction. Those who, as I do, listen to music rendered by high school bands, have an opportunity to understand that young people are dedicating themselves, and not alone their time, but also their spirits and minds, to something which is good and wholesome.

High school band instruments are purchased by the school, by parents, or by students out of their allowance. They are required to pay the tax on them. How ridiculous it is to have a tax on any musical instruments in the first place, but to see such a tax imposed in this fashion is repugnant to what we are trying to do.

I was criticized for supporting the quality stabilization bill. Throughout the country many small businesses are caught in fierce competition. Many people say, "If businesses cannot compete, let them go by the wayside." I do not subscribe to that attitude. I know that my distinguished friend, the Senator from Florida, is interested in small businessmen. Other Senators also are interested in seeing that small businesses shall be kept in the mainstream of American business life; and we should not permit the giants to have enjoyment of all our business activities.

It is 4:30 p.m. Certain taxes are to be extended. Along with other Senators, I shall back down and see this body take its action. I am certain that the Congress will again extend the excise taxes which would have expired.

I believe it is important to note that the Senate action was in relation to items which did not expire. The action was an affirmative action, and I believe that it should be clear to Members of the House of Representatives, all of whom we admire and respect, that the time is coming when action will have to be taken in a direct manner.

I feel that I personally have a right to make a little more complaint about the action taken than some others, because in order to secure the big tax cut which included businesses as well as individuals, throughout the United States last spring, I voted against my own convictions and helped kill excise tax changes at that time. At that time it was clearly indicated that to include excise tax amendments would bring a close vote in the Senate Chamber on the entire bill. I still feel that it is necessary for Senators to exercise fiscal responsibility. Therefore, when it became obvious that addition of excise tax amendments was about to kill the entire big tax cut, I was willing to concede that hearings could be held and ways studied for removing and reducing excise taxes instead of including them then.

The Senator from Louisiana at that time assured me, and I know he made the statement in good faith, that he would take up this controversy and try to secure reductions or elimination of taxes which are in the form of sales taxes. I thank him for his wholehearted cooperation.

I shall continue to apply pressure in this matter. One of these days there will not be a deadline. I am even hopeful that we can take up the matter in this session of Congress. I am not willing to give up the fight until these taxes are removed.

I thank the Senator from Florida for his cooperation, dedication, and sincerity in the very difficult situation in which we find ourselves at the moment.

Mr. SMATHERS. I thank the Senator from Indiana. I congratulate him for his vigorous fight in behalf of the removal of excise taxes, particularly with respect to the tax on musical instruments. I was pleased to offer the amendment for him.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, as one of the conferees, the junior Senator from Louisiana would have been the last one to hold out in favor of the Senate amendments. If the Senator from Louisiana had detected that there was a desire on the part of two more members of the conference ready to hold out until midnight, the Senator would have been willing to take a chance that the $1,900 million tax extension would expire.

In view of the adamant position of the House, and speaking for amendments that the Senator from Louisiana had not supported but for which the Senate had voted, I would have felt the Senate was justified in being equally as adamant.

Obviously, one side or the other has to yield in this matter. Both the House and the Senate cannot prevail. The House viewpoint, as expressed by the distinguished chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, who was chairman of the House conferees, was that they had taken the firm position that they would not go into the matter at this time, and they would not yield. Rather than take a few of these tax cuts, they did not want to be put in the position of choosing as between various possible tax reductions when the committee is studying the matter.

If the Senate is of the same will to vote these tax cuts in a bill which the President could veto or sign into law, I would be disposed to have the Senate conferees hold out until the end of the session and insist that the Senate position be taken to the President and give him a chance to veto or sign the bill, and then have the Senate act if the amendments were vetoed.

So far as I am concerned, the Senate has placed itself on notice that it believes that these taxes are going to have to come off—at least most of them will come off. The House is on notice that that is the way the Senate feels about it.

As a matter of fact, when the big tax cut bill was before the Senate this year, it took all the persuasion that could be mustered, by speeches on the floor, and by senatorial efforts to lobby behind the scenes, with all the help that could be obtained from the administration, to keep some of these very same amendments from being agreed to when the Senate was considering the big tax cut bill this year.

I regret we were not able to persuade the House on some of these cuts, because some of the reductions would have resulted, not in losing money, but in adding money to the Treasury. In some areas the taxes have restrained trade to the extent that elimination of them would result in an increase in a sufficient increase in business activity to bring the Government more money.

I regret that the bill has come from conference in the form it has, in light of the Senate recommendations, but as one who served on the committee and who signed the report only after a majority agreed that the Senate would have to recede on this matter. I would welcome the chance to try again to see if we cannot make the House agree in part at least to the position taken by the Senate.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. May I ask the distinguished Senator from Louisiana a question? I did not hear him make this statement in his direct statement. He may have. Was there any intimation by the chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee as to when we may expect some relief in the excise tax situation? The reason why I ask the question is that, if I am not mistaken, he is quoted in the newspapers as saying 1966. I have heard others say 1965. It seems to me we have been holding up action in this field for a long, long time. I thoroughly agree with the need of a study and an orderly reduction, not necessarily repeal of every single one, but perhaps reductions, of different taxes. That is the way some of the taxes have been taken off.

Will the Senator tell us when we may expect action in that regard? The reason I ask the question is that the Senator may remember that when the tax-cut bill, which he so ably handled, was being considered on the floor earlier this year, I wanted to vote for amendments at that time to eliminate many of these excise taxes. We had a colloquy. If I remember correctly, there was an exchange of thoughts in the colloquy with the Senator from Louisiana. We were told there would be an opportunity later, when the present bill came up, and we understood that would be in June. I honestly thought at that time it meant the House Ways and Means Committee would send the Senate a bill of some kind of a start on the program of eliminating or reducing excise taxes. I voted with the Senator from Louisiana at that time. It was difficult not voting for the amendments, but it had been recommended over the years that it be done in a regularized way.

Can the Senator give us some idea when we may expect those cuts?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Let me answer the Senator from Alabama in two ways. First, the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, as I best understand, has indicated he thinks there should be action on excise taxes in favor of adjustments and certain reductions some time in 1965 if the budgetary situation in 1965 makes that possible.

Speaking as one of the Senate members of the committee, I am here to say that if the House Ways and Means Committee wants to act on this matter, it had better get moving, because the Senate has expressed its views. As one Senator who pleaded that Senators should not vote for the same amendments in February, I am tired of resisting these particular amendments. The Senate has expressed itself. It has made its position clear. As one Senator, I am ready to vote for them and to insist on them.

Incidentally, when we speak of the House conferees, it should be made clear that I am speaking of the majority House members, because the minority members, represented by the ranking Republican member, Mr. BYRNES, were ready to accept some part of the Senate package.

As a practical matter, there is strong support in the House for the Senate's position. Therefore I say that the House Ways and Means Committee should be prepared to accept some of these cuts, or be prepared to see these cuts come to them as amendments to their bills.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, some of us feel that the conference report on the excise tax bill is completely unacceptable. We believe there should be a yea-and-nay vote on it, so that Senators may register their stand on it.

In the conference report the Senate has again been treated in a manner that I do not believe it should be treated. We adpoted some amendments by substantial votes.

I cannot possibly vote for an excise tax bill again until we start keeping our pledge to the American people with respect to excise taxes.

I believe Senators are perhaps forgetting what we promised the American people. The excise taxes were placed on the statute books, at a time when we were at war, for two main reasons. One was to encourage more production, with which to win the war. That certainly was justifiable reason. It curtailed civilian production. The excise taxes were effective in that regard. The other reason was to raise some quick war revenue. They did that also very effectively.

Mr. President, we ought to start returning to a civilian economy. We do not now enjoy a civilian economy. Our economy is a defense economy.

I do not know why we cannot cut some of these excise taxes. If Senators will read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD when the excise taxes were adopted, they will see Representative after Representative and Senator after Senator getting up on the floor of Congress and pledging that, as soon as the war was over the excise taxes would be repealed. I believe it is about time for us to start keeping those pledges.

I wonder, for the accommodation of those who wish a record vote, whether we can have an understanding that we may have a yea-and-nay vote on the conference report.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. MORSE. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, we found the House conferees fully determined to take no excise tax reductions at this time. I concluded that the House conferees, rather than to be forced to pick and choose among the reductions voted by the Senate, would have let the automatic excise tax reductions go into effect.

The automatic excise tax reductions would decrease revenues by $1.9 billion in a full year of operation. A reduction of this amount certainly cannot be tolerated by any of us. Moreover, I cannot think of any excise taxes which are much less appropriately candidates for reduction than those which would be reduced if these tax rates were not continued.

The excise taxes which will be reduced if this conference report is not continued are those on—

First. Distilled spirits, on which the tax would be reduced from $10.50 to $9 per proof gallon;

Second. Beer, on which the tax would be reduced from $9 to $8 per barrel;

Third. Wines, which are subject to various tax rates, which would be reduced by approximately 11 percent;

Fourth. Cigarettes, in which the tax would be reduced from 8 to 7 cents a pack;

Fifth. Passenger cars, on which the tax would be reduced from 10 to 7 percent of the manufacturers' price;

Sixth. Auto parts and accessories, on which the tax would be reduced from 8 to 5 percent of the manufacturers' price;

Seventh. General telephone service, on which the tax would be reduced from 10 percent of the amount paid to zero; and

Eighth. Transportation of persons by air, on which the tax would be reduced from 5 percent of the amount paid to zero.

It was necessary for us to reach agreement with the House conferees yesterday, because of the fact that these excise tax rates will expire if action on the bill is not completed by both Houses and if the bill itself not signed before midnight tonight. Had we not reached agreement with the House conferees yesterday, the House could not have brought up the conference report in the House today, because of their rules requiring that a conference report lie over 1 day, unless a two-thirds vote is secured. As a result, when it became evident to us that the House conferees would not change their opinion as to the excise tax deductions sought by the Senate, we agreed to the House version of the bill, with one minor exception.

The House conferees were willing to accept the Senate amendment providing for the deduction of nonbusiness losses arising from confiscation of property by the Government of Cuba. The House conferees were willing to accept this amendment, because in prior conference action they recognized that the failure to make this provision retroactive was due to an oversight in establishing the effective date. Therefore, acceptance of this amendment was in accord with the prior understanding on this matter.

Although I recognize that many Senators are disappointed that none of the excise tax reductions voted by this body appear in the conference report, I point out that failure to agree to the report would result in an excise tax reduction of nearly $2 billion in an area of excise taxation where no one has expressed a desire for reduction. This would increase our deficit for the fiscal year which now is upon us to nearly $8 billion, even if all the expenditures are held down to the levels most recently forecast by the administration. This would also necessitate further action in raising the statutory debt ceiling. Undoubtedly, we would have to raise this ceiling to $326 billion if this report were not approved.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the conference report. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] are absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] is necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON], the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN] is detained on official business; and, if present and voting, would vote "nay."

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] is absent to attend the funeral of a friend.

On this vote, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is paired with the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG]. If present and voting, the Senator from Illinois would vote "yea," and the Senator from Hawaii would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] is paired with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "yea," and the Senator from Kansas would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 73, nays 10, as follows:

[No. 454 Leg.]

YEAS—73

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Bartlett
Beall
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Case
Church
Clark
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Douglas
Eastland
Ellender
Fulbright
Gore
Gruening
Hart
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Johnston
Jordan, N.C.
Keating
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
Miller
Monroney
Morton
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Robertson
Saltonstall
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Walters
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—10

Dodd
Dominick
Hartke
Hickenlooper
McNamara
Mechem
Metcalf
Morse
Mundt
Simpson

NOT VOTING—17

Bayh
Brewster
Dirksen
Edmondson
Engle
Ervin
Fong
Goldwater
Hayden
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy
McCarthy
Moss
Pearson
Russell
Scott
Williams, Del.

So the conference report was agreed to.

URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1964

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be laid before the Senate the House message on the mass transit bill, S. 6.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** (Mr. MCINTYRE in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 6) to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems, both public and private, in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes, which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That this Act may be cited as the "Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964".

FINDINGS AND PURPOSES

SEC. 2. (a) The Congress finds—

(1) that the predominant part of the Nation's population is located in its rapidly expanding metropolitan and other urban areas, which generally cross the boundary lines of local jurisdictions and often extend into two or more States;

(2) that the welfare and vitality of urban areas, the satisfactory movement of people and goods within such areas, and the effectiveness of housing, urban renewal, highway, and other federally aided programs are being jeopardized by the deterioration or inadequate provision of urban transportation facilities and services, the intensification of traffic congestion, and the lack of coordinated transportation and other development planning on a comprehensive and continuing basis; and

(3) that Federal financial assistance for the development of efficient and coordinated mass transportation systems is essential to the solution of these urban problems.

(b) The purposes of this Act are—

(1) to assist in the development of improved mass transportation facilities, equipment, techniques, and methods, with the cooperation of mass transportation companies both public and private;

(2) to encourage the planning and establishment of areawide urban mass transportation systems needed for economical and desirable urban development, with the cooperation of mass transportation companies both public and private; and

(3) to provide assistance to State and local governments and their instrumentalities in financing such systems, to be operated by public or private mass transportation companies as determined by local needs.

FEDERAL FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

SEC. 3. (a) In accordance with the provisions of this Act, the Administrator is authorized to make grants or loans (directly, through the purchase of securities or equipment trust certificates, or otherwise) to assist States and local public bodies and agencies thereof in financing the acquisition, construction, reconstruction, and improvement of facilities and equipment for use, by operation or lease or otherwise, in mass transportation service in urban areas and in coordinating such service with highway and other transportation in such areas. Eligible facilities and equipment may include land (but not public highways), buses and other rolling stock, and other real or personal property needed for an efficient and coordinated mass transportation system. No grant or loan shall be provided under this section unless the Administrator determines that the applicant has or will have (1) the legal, financial, and technical capacity to carry out the proposed project, and (2) satisfactory continuing control, through operation or lease or otherwise, over the use of the facilities and equipment. No such funds shall be used for payment of ordinary governmental or nonproject operating expenses.

(b) No loan shall be made under this section for any project for which a grant is made under this section, except grants made for relocation payments in accordance with section 7(b). Loans under this section shall be subject to the restrictions and limitations set forth in paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of section 202(b) of the Housing Amendments of 1955. The authority provided in section 203 of such Amendments to obtain funds for loans under clause (2) of section 202(a) of such Amendments shall (except for undisbursed loan commitments) hereafter be exercised by the Administrator (without regard to the proviso in section 202(d) of such Amendments) solely to obtain funds for loans under this section.

(c) No financial assistance shall be provided under this Act to any State or local public body or agency thereof for the purpose, directly or indirectly, of acquiring any interest in, or purchasing any facilities or other property of, a private mass transportation company, or for the purpose of constructing, improving, or reconstructing any facilities or other property acquired (after the date of the enactment of this Act) from any such company, or for the purpose of providing by contract or otherwise for the operation of mass transportation facilities or equipment in competition with, or supplementary to, the service provided by an existing mass transportation company, unless (1) the Administrator finds that such assistance is essential to a program, proposed or under active preparation, for a unified or officially coordinated urban transportation system as part of the comprehensively planned development of the urban area, (2) the Administrator finds that such program, to the maximum extent feasible, provides for the participation of private mass transportation companies, (3) just and adequate compensation will be paid to such companies for acquisition of their franchises or property to the extent required by applicable State or local laws, and (4) the Secretary of Labor certifies that such assistance complies with the requirements of section 10(c) of this Act.

LONG-RANGE PROGRAM

SEC. 4. (a) Except as specified in section 5, no Federal financial assistance shall be provided pursuant to section 3 unless the Administrator determines that the facilities and equipment for which the assistance is sought are needed for carrying out a program, meeting criteria established by him, for a unified or officially coordinated urban transportation system as a part of the comprehensively planned development of the urban area, and are necessary for the sound, economic, and desirable development of such area. Such program shall encourage to the maximum extent feasible the participation of private enterprise. Where facilities and equipment are to be acquired which are already being used in mass transportation service in the urban area, the program must provide that they shall be so improved (through modernization, extension, addition, or otherwise) that they will better serve the transportation needs of the area. The Administrator, on the basis of engineering studies, studies of economic feasibility, and data showing the nature and extent of expected utilization of the facilities and equipment, shall estimate what portion of the cost of a project to be assisted under section 3 cannot be reasonably financed from revenues—which portion shall hereinafter be called "net project cost". The Federal grant for such a project shall not exceed two-thirds of the net project cost. The remainder of the net project cost shall be provided, in cash, from sources other than Federal funds, and no refund or reduction of that portion so provided shall be made at any time unless there is at the same time a refund of a proportional amount of the Federal grant.

(b) To finance grants under this Act there is hereby authorized to be appropriated at any time after its enactment not to exceed $75,000,000 for fiscal year 1965; $150,000,000 for fiscal year 1966; and $150,000,000 for fiscal year 1967. Any amount so appropriated shall remain available until expended; and any amount authorized but not appropriated for any fiscal year may be appropriated for any succeeding fiscal year. The Administrator is authorized, notwithstanding the provisions of section 3648 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, to make advance or progress payments on account of any grant made pursuant to this Act.

EMERGENCY PROGRAM

SEC. 5. Prior to July 1, 1967, Federal financial assistance may be provided pursuant to section 3 where (1) the program for the development of a unified or officially coordinated urban transportation system, referred to in section 4(a), is under active preparation although not yet completed, (2) the facilities and equipment for which the assistance is sought can reasonably be expected to be required for such a system, and (3) there is an urgent need for their preservation or provision. The Federal grant for such a project shall not exceed one-half of the net project cost: *Provided*, That where a Federal grant is made on such a one-half basis, and the planning requirements specified in section 4(a) are fully met within a three-year period after the execution of the grant agreement, an additional grant may then be made to the applicant equal to one-sixth of the net project cost. The remainder of the net project cost shall be provided, in cash, from sources other than Federal funds, and no refund or reduction of that portion so provided shall be made at any time unless there is at the same time a refund of a proportional amount of the Federal grant.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, AND DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS

SEC. 6. (a) The Administrator is authorized to undertake research, development, and demonstration projects in all phases of urban mass transportation (including the development, testing, and demonstration of new facilities, equipment, techniques, and methods) which he determines will assist in the reduction of urban transportation needs, the improvement of mass transportation service, or the contribution of such service toward meeting total urban transportation needs at minimum cost. He may undertake such projects independently or by contract (including working agreements with other Federal departments and agencies). In carrying out the provisions of this section, the Administrator is authorized to request and receive such information or data as he deems appropriate from public or private sources.

(b) The Administrator may make available to finance projects under this section not to exceed $10,000,000 of the mass transportation grant authorization provided in section 4(b), which limit shall be increased to $20,000,000 on July 1, 1965, and to $30,000,000 on July 1, 1966. In addition, notwithstanding the provisions of section 4 of this Act or of section 103(b) of the Housing Act of 1949, the unobligated balance of the amount available for mass transportation demonstration grants pursuant to the proviso in such section 103 (b) shall be available solely for financing projects under this section.

(c) Nothing contained in this section shall limit any authority of the Administrator under section 602 of the Housing Act of 1956 or any other provision of law.

RELOCATION REQUIREMENTS AND PAYMENTS

SEC. 7. (a) No financial assistance shall be extended to any project under section 3 unless the Administrator determines that an adequate relocation program is being carried on for families displaced by the project and that there are being or will be provided (in the same area or in other areas generally not less desirable in regard to public utilities and public and commercial facilities and at rents or prices within the financial means of the displaced families) an equal number of decent, safe, and sanitary dwellings available to those displaced families and reasonably accessible to their places of employment.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, financial assistance extended to any project under section 3 may include grants for relocation payments, as herein defined. Such grants may be in addition to other financial assistance for the project under section 3, and no part of the amount of such relocation payment shall be required to be contributed as a local grant. The term "relocation payments" means payments by the applicant to individuals, families, business concerns, and nonprofit organizations for their reasonable and necessary moving expenses and any actual direct losses of property except goodwill or profit, for which reimbursement or compensation is not otherwise made, resulting from their displacement by the project. Such payments shall be made subject to such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Administrator, and shall not exceed $200 in the case of an individual or family, or $3,000 (or if greater, the total certified actual moving expenses) in the case of a business concern or nonprofit organization. Such rules and regulations may include provisions authorizing payment to individuals and families of fixed amount (not to exceed $200 in any case) in lieu of their respective reasonable and necessary moving expenses and actual direct losses of property.

COORDINATION OF FEDERAL ASSISTANCE FOR HIGHWAYS AND FOR MASS TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES

SEC. 8. In order to assure coordination of highway and railway and other mass transportation planning and development programs in urban areas, particularly with respect to the provision of mass transportation facilities in connection with federally assisted highways, the Administrator and the Secretary of Commerce shall consult on general urban transportation policies and program and shall exchange information on proposed projects in urban areas.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 9. (a) In the performance of, and with respect to, the functions, powers, and duties vested in him by this Act, the Administrator shall (in addition to any authority otherwise vested in him) have the functions, powers, and duties set forth in section 402, except subsection (c)(2) and (f), of the Housing Act of 1950. Funds obtained or held by the Administrator in connection with the performance of his functions under this Act shall be available for the administrative expenses of the Administrator in connection with the performance of such functions.

(b) All contracts for construction, reconstruction, or improvement of facilities and equipment in furtherance of the purposes for which a loan or grant is made under this Act, entered into by applicants under other than competitive bidding procedures as defined by the Administrator, shall provide that the Administrator and the Comptroller General of the United States, or any of their duly authorized representatives, shall, for the purpose of audit and examination, have access to any books, documents, papers, and records of the contracting parties that are pertinent to the operations or activities under such contracts.

(c) All contracts for construction, reconstruction, or improvement of facilities and equipment in furtherance of the purposes for which a loan or grant is made under this Act shall provide that in the performance of the work the contractor shall use only such manufactured articles as have been manufactured in the United States.

(d) As used in this Act—

(1) the term "States" means the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the possessions of the United States;

(2) the term "local public bodies" includes municipalities and other political subdivisions of States; public agencies and instrumentalities of one or more States, municipalities, and political subdivisions of States; and public corporations, boards, and commissions established under the laws of any State;

(3) the term "Administrator" means the Housing and Home Finance Administrator;

(4) the term "urban area" means any area that includes a municipality or other built-up place which is appropriate, in the judgment of the Administrator, for a public transportation system to serve commuters or others in the locality taking into consideration the local patterns and trends of urban growth; and

(5) the term "mass transportation" means transportation by bus or rail or other conveyance, either publicly or privately owned, serving the general public (but not including school buses or charter or sightseeing service) and moving over prescribed routes.

(e) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the funds necessary to carry out all functions under this Act except loans under section 3. All funds appropriated under this Act for other than administrative expenses shall remain available until expended.

(f) None of the provisions of this Act shall be construed to authorize the Administrator to regulate in any manner the mode of operation of any mass transportation system with respect to which a grant is made under section 3, or, after such grant is made, to regulate the rates, fares, tolls, rentals, or other charges fixed or prescribed for such system by any local public or private transit agency; but nothing in this subsection shall prevent the Administrator from taking such actions as may be necessary to require compliance by the agency or agencies involved with any undertakings furnished by such agency or agencies in connection with the application for the grant.

LABOR STANDARDS

SEC. 10. (a) The Administrator shall take such action as may be necessary to insure that all laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors in the performance of construction work financed with the assistance of loans or grants under this Act shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended. The Administrator shall not approved any such loan or grant without first obtaining adequate assurance that required labor standards will be maintained upon the construction work.

(b) The Secretary of Labor shall have, with respect to the labor standards specified in subsection (a), the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 (15 F.R. 3176; 64 Stat. 1267; 5 U.S.C. 133z–15), and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (48 Stat. 948; 40 U.S.C. 276c).

(c) It shall be a condition of any assistance under this Act that fair and equitable arrangements are made, as determined by the Secretary of Labor, to protect the interests of employees affected by such assistance. Such protective arrangements shall include, without being limited to, such provisions as may be necessary for (1) the preservation of rights, privileges, and benefits (including continuation of pension rights and benefits) under existing collective bargaining agreements or otherwise; (2) the continuation of collective bargaining rights; (3) the protection of individual employees against a worsening of their positions with respect to their employment; (4) assurances of employment to employees of acquired mass transportation systems and priority of reemployment of employees terminated or laid off; and (5) paid training or retraining programs. Such arrangements shall include provisions protecting individual employees against a worsening of their positions with respect to their employment which shall in no event provide benefits less than those established pursuant to section 5(2)(f) of the Act of February 4, 1887 (24 Stat. 379), as amended. The contract for the granting of any such assistance shall specify the terms and conditions of the protective arrangements.

AIR POLLUTION CONTROL

SEC. 11. In providing financial assistance to any project under section 3, the Administrator shall take into consideration whether the facilities and equipment to be acquired, constructed, reconstructed, or improved will be designed and equipped to prevent and control air pollution in accordance with any criteria established for this purpose by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

STATE LIMITATION

SEC. 12. Grants made under section 3 (other than grants for relocation payments in accordance with section 7(b)) for projects in any one State shall not exceed in the aggregate 12½ per centum of the aggregate amount of grant funds authorized to be appropriated pursuant to section 4(b).

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments.

I do not intend to have precipitate action. I wish to make a statement on the proposal before the question is put.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY PRESIDENT OF COSTA RICA, FRANCISCO ORLICH

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], provided that in doing so I will not lose my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. INOUYE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of the Senate for a brief moment, we are privileged this afternoon to have in our presence a distinguished public official of a great and friendly country.

I refer to His Excellency Francisco Orlich, President of the Republic of Costa Rica.

I wish to express a warm welcome on behalf of the Senate to President Orlich and his party.

He is accompanied by the Foreign Minister, Daniel Oduber of Costa Rica; by his Ambassador who is well known to all of us in Washington, His Excellency Ambassador Gonzalo Facio; by the dean of the University of Costa Rica, Dean Tristan; and by the Minister of the Presidency, Mario Quiros Sasso.

This afternoon, we had the privilege, for a brief period, of having the President and his group as guests of the Committee on Foreign Relations. I know that Senators will join me in paying a well-deserved tribute, not only to a great leader of a friendly country, but also to the Republic of Costa Rica, which has set such a fine example in maintaining democratic institutions in this hemisphere.

If every country in the world would follow the fine example of dedication to the principles of democracy as exemplified by Costa Rica, this would be a world without war, a world without strife, and a world in which equality of opportunity and true freedom would be more than a promise—in fact, it would be a living reality.

We are particularly privileged to receive President Orlich, who represents a model democracy, and a political tradition which has provided progressive and inspiring leadership for the past two decades in the Caribbean.

President Orlich is a colleague and protege of that great Central American statesman, Jose Figueres who, together with Romulo Betancourt and Luis Muñoz Marín, was a leader in defending political democracy, and social and economic reform, long before the Alliance for Progress was launched by President Kennedy.

President Orlich continues in this great tradition. His government has maintained both freedom and stability in his country, while moving ahead in the field of economic development. President Orlich has fought the growth of Castroism in the Caribbean and in the hemisphere. Due to his efforts and to those of his Foreign Minister, one of the most talented Latin American political leaders of his generation, Daniel Oduber, and the efforts of the Costa Rican Ambassador to the United States, who has recently served with great distinction as Chairman of the OAS Council, Ambassador Gonzalo Facio, Costa Rica has taken the lead in pressing for hemispheric action to contain the menace of Castro's Cuba.

Costa Rica, under President Orlich, has joined in the Central American integration movement which has progressed so remarkably during the past 3 years, a movement which is aiding in the economic development of the area, a movement which, under the able leadership of men like President Orlich, will eventually bring political stability and free constitutional government to the area.

Under President Orlich, Costa Rica has been a leading exponent of the Alliance for Progress in this hemisphere. The Costa Rican Government has always shown a profound grasp of one central truth of the Alliance that has sometimes proved elusive for others: that social and economic progress must be linked to the preservation of political democracy and institutional government if the Alliance for Progress is to succeed.

As one who has visited Costa Rica and met with leaders of the Government and with representative Costa Ricans, it is a great pleasure for me to welcome to the Senate the distinguished President of the Republic of Costa Rica, Francisco Orlich.

I now yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I join the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] in expressing a word of greeting and welcome to the President of Costa Rica, and the group of his fellow countrymen who are with him today.

I fully endorse the words spoken by the Senator from Minnesota as to the fine example of friendly relations, and the good living which has been set by the Government of Costa Rica.

It is a great pleasure to have this distinguished visitor with us. I am very glad to join with the Senator from Minnesota in extending greetings and appreciation to them for coming to see us.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN].

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, on behalf of Senators on this side of the aisle, I join Senators on the other side of the aisle in welcoming the President of Costa Rica and his associates who are our guests in the Chamber this afternoon.

Costa Rica is a country which means a great deal to us. There is a great deal of cooperation between Costa Rica and the United States.

I know that Senators will wish to welcome the President in person. I expect that the acting majority leader will see to it that they will have an opportunity to do so.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I now yield to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as Chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs, I have already apologized to President Orlich because I was not able to be at the reception which the Committee on Foreign Relations gave in his well-deserved honor this afternoon in the Foreign Relations Committee room. It was necessary for me to be at a meeting of the subcommittee on the poverty bill, in order to assure that there was a quorum ever present so that we could report that bill from the full committee this afternoon—which we did.

Let me say to the President of Costa Rica that I had the great privilege of attending in his country the conference of the Presidents of the Caribbean, when the late beloved President Kennedy also went down to Costa Rica and participated in that historic conference. I wish the President of Costa Rica to know—and I am sure the other two Senators who were with me, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] share my opinion—that that conference would not have been the great historic success it was, had it not been for the able participation, the brillant leadership, and the inspiring statesmanship of President Orlich. The Western Hemisphere is greatly indebted to him for his record of giving support to the democratic ideals which our two Republics join in supporting.

There are many wonderful things about Costa Rica, but I believe that one of the great examples which Costa Rica sets is its belief that a great military establishment is not needed in order to preserve democratic processes in Costa Rica. It is a country without a professional army.

I have always looked to Costa Rica as a great example in support of a sound ideal, that when mankind learns to lay down its weapons and resort to the policy of substituting the plowshare for the sword, and the pruning hook for the spear, we shall have a better opportunity of strengthening peace in the world.

Costa Rica is one of the great leaders of the movement toward peace in the Western Hemisphere.

I am proud to rise on the floor of the Senate and thank the President of Costa Rica for his wonderful hospitality which he extended to President Kennedy and the rest of the American delegation, but more important, for his great statesmanship in the Western Hemisphere in seeking to carry out the sound ideals President Kennedy enunciated in his historic Alliance for Progress program.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I now yield to the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER].

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I thank the Senator from Minnesota for this opportunity to express to His Excellency, President Orlich of Costa Rica, to the Ambassador, and to the other distinguished members of the Costa Rican delegation, our warm welcome.

Let me say to the President of Costa Rica that the Republicans in this body are slightly less than half the number of Democrats in this body. We try to make up for that to you, sir, by being twice as warm in our welcome.

Seriously, I am sure that on both sides of the aisle the welcome is equally warm.

I have had the privilege of knowing His Excellency, and the other members of the Costa Rican delegation who are here, for a long time.

It was a great privilege and a great inspiration to attend the wonderful meeting in Costa Rica, which has been mentioned by the Senator from Minnesota and the Senator from Oregon. All of us admire the principles, the ideals, and the objectives of the people of Costa Rica. The way they have handled their social and economic problems inspires all of us. We believe that Costa Rica is the focal point for rallying the whole Central American area to advance the ideals of education, of health, and of expanding human freedom and liberty.

We welcome the Costa Rican delegation with all the warmth that we can muster.

I thank the acting majority leader for this opportunity to make this statement on behalf of myself and my colleagues.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT].

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks which have just been made. We have had the privilege of welcoming the President to our committee and were engaging in a discussion of our various interests.

The President has made an outstanding record as the leader of his country. Costa Rica is an example for all other countries in the Western Hemisphere to follow as to the efficiency of its democratic system. It is a hopeful sign to have such a country in Central America which can show to other countries an efficient, intelligent, and liberal approach to self-government—of which they have done an excellent job. I congratulate them and welcome them.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I thank the distinguished Senator from Minesota for yielding to me.

I call attention to the fact that accompanying the President of Costa Rica and his official party, as one of the representatives of our Government, is the American Ambassador to Costa Rica, the former mayor of El Paso, Tex., a statesman who has made an outstanding record as an Ambassador—Raymond Telles.

I express our thanks to the people of Costa Rica for the wonderful hospitality that they extended the late President John F. Kennedy last year when he visited Costa Rica, where the Presidents of seven American Republics met in San Jose, the capital of that Republic. They met in harmony and friendship, and their meeting resulted in progress for all of the Americas.

I thank the President of Costa Rica and his colleagues on behalf of the Senate, in which John F. Kennedy served, for the great hospitality which we understand was one of the greatest welcomes he received in the world.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, before the Senate takes a brief recess so that we may meet the President of Costa Rica and his colleagues, I ask my colleagues to join with me in a good old-fashioned American welcome.

[The visitors rose and were greeted with applause, Senators rising.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is very happy to welcome you here today.

RECESS TO 5:16 P.M.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess, subject to the call of the Chair, so that Senators may meet the President of Costa Rica and his colleagues.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5:11 o'clock p.m., the Senate took a recess until 5:16 o'clock p.m., the same day).

On the expiration of the recess, the Senate reassembled, when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. INOUYE in the chair).

URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1964

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 6) to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administration to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinate mass transportation systems, both public and private, in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a time limitation of 1 hour on amendments, to be equally divided between the majority and minority leaders, and a time limitation of 1 hour on the bill, with the same division.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the request of the Senator from Montana.

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I want to make it clear that I expect the unanimous-consent agreement to contain the understanding that a substitute, preferential motion which I will make to substitute the amendment for the House amendment will be in order, and also, Mr. President, that I will control the time on my amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator will control the time. So far as I know, such a motion would be in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. JAVITS. Will the Senator permit me to ask for the yeas and nays?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, apart from the time limitation entered into, that the Senate proceed to consider executive business, to consider the nomination on the calendar, reported today from the Committee on the Judiciary, which nomination I understand has been cleared by both Senators from Texas, as well as the committee.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will report the nomination.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. Dorwin W. Suttle, of Texas, to be U.S. district judge for the western district of Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I am pleased by the wise action of the U.S. Senate in confirming the appointment of Dorwin W. Suttle, a distinguished and honorable Texas trial attorney whom I have known well for 38 years, as U.S. judge of the western district of Texas.

Dorwin W. Suttle, born July 16, 1906, in Decker, Ind., is the son of William S. Suttle and Cordelia Hungate Suttle, of New Braunfels, Tex.

A graduate of New Braunfels High School and of the subcollege of the Southwest at Texas State Teachers College in San Marcos in 1923, Dorwin W. Suttle received his law degree from the University of Texas, where we attended many classes together, in Austin in June 1928. He began the practice of law that year in Uvalde, home of the former Vice President John Nance Garner. Dorwin Suttle served as State administrator of Vice President Garner's Texas office and was the Vice President's personal attorney more than 30 years.

A brilliant trial lawyer, he has served as city attorney of Uvalde, county attorney and special judge in Uvalde County court, director of the Uvalde Chamber of Commerce, school trustee and member of the border district, Texas, and American Bar Associations. In addition he has served as a member of the grievance committee of the Texas Bar Association.

In other civic activities, he has been president of the Uvalde Lions Club, Uvalde County bar and border district bar associations, director of the University of Texas Ex-Students Association, commander of the American Legion Post No. 26, Uvalde, and is active in St. Philip's Episcopal Church of Uvalde.

The man the Senate has confirmed for nomination as Federal judge is of judicial temperament and will serve fairly and with honor and I am confident will reflect great credit upon the decision of the U.S. Senate and on Texas and the Nation.

Mr. Suttle is married to the former Lucille Cram Whitecotton. Mr. and Mrs. Suttle have four children. They are: Steve Suttle, who attends the University of Texas School of Law at Austin; Joanna Suttle, who attends the School of Law at St. Mary's University; Fred Whitecotton, who attends Southwestern University at Georgetown, Tex.; and Frank Whitecotton, who attends public school in Uvalde.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1964

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 6) to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administration to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinate mass transportation systems, both public and private, in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the time under the time limitation begin to run.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. For a question.

Mr. TOWER. While the distinguished majority leader is on the floor, may I ask what other business will be taken up after action on the mass transit bill is completed?

Mr. MANSFIELD. No further business. But it is our intention to lay before the Senate the pay bill and make that the pending business for tomorrow.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the final passage of the mass transit bill.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask that my preferential motion be stated for the information of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

MOTION BY MR. JAVITS

I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 6) to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems, both public and private in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes, with the following amendment:

Strike out section 9(c) of the House amendment and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(c) The use of funds made available for the purposes of this Act shall be subject to the provisions of section 2 of title 3 of the Act of March 3, 1933 (47 Stat. 1520; 41 U.S.C. 10a), the so-called Buy-American Act, and to make such provisions effective, every contract or agreement of any kind pursuant to this Act, shall contain a provision identical to the one prescribed in section 3 of title 3 of such Act."

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield myself 15 minutes, or so much thereof as I shall use.

I emphasize that I favor the mass transit bill. But I rise in opposition to a provision of the bill, section 9(c), which is probably the most restrictive that I have been able to find with respect not only to buying everything which may be bought under the bill in the United States, but all components thereof which must also be manufactured in the United States. That is a provision which was inserted by amendment in the bill on the floor of the other body.

The requirement that contractors shall use "only such manufactured articles as have been manufactured in the United States" in fulfillment of contracts under the act will, in my view, cause no end of mischief to the United States—in our pocketbooks where it hurts the most.

I make that statement because experience has shown that nothing is more resented than efforts to tie procurement to sources within the United States to the exclusion of sources abroad, especially where there is no flexibility whatever of any kind or character in percentages or any other way out, and where it deals, as it does in the bill, with procurement which is obviously experimental in character and relates to the basic interest of the United States to do its utmost to get the improvements, for example, in transportation which are available anywhere in the world, and to bring into force upon American manufacturers the competition of foreign ingenuity, foreign ideas, and foreign costs.

It seems to me that we should take a page out of history and, for example, look at the year 1959 when, in the face of a similar effort to very sharply retrict procurement without much rhyme or reason to it, the subject became a hotly debated one between the United States and Britain, and it was at a Camp David conference, participated in by President Eisenhower and Prime Minister Macmillan, that the subject finally had to be settled.

Our negotiators in Geneva are trying to negotiate reciprocal tariff concessions and the mutual reduction of nontariff barriers. Here we are legislating with our left hand—to the exclusion completely of what our right hand is doing—an insurmountable, nontariff barrier to trade in a key and important area.

I said that this was the most broad-scale exclusion of any type of foreign procurement of which I know. I have tried to research the precedents on that score. What the bill provides is that not only the facility or the equipment which is bought be made in the United States, but every component of it should be made in the United States. Under the Buy American Act—and my amendment asks for the imposition of Buy American Act criteria—materials are considered of foreign origin, if the cost of the foreign products used in such materials constitutes 50 percent or more of the cost of all the products used in such materials.

In other words, if goods bought in the United States contain more than 50 percent of domestic components, the goods qualify as domestic articles. That, as one can see immediately, is not nearly the restriction which is sought to be imposed by the amendment over in the other body.

Second. The Buy American Act permits the Executive to set the percentage by which American prices may exceed foreign prices. Normally, that is 6 percent or 12 percent, where one is dealing either with small business or the goods are bought in an area which is a surplus labor area. There is nothing to stop any Government department, including the Department of Housing and Home Finance, which would be administering the law, from setting a higher percentage. Indeed, the Department of Defense has set 50 percent. There may be some percentage set between 6 percent and 50 percent in this case, but that is still better than an absolute prohibition such as is contained in the amendment.

To show how tight the prohibition is, I should like to refer to the interpretation which was given by the author of the amendment in the other body. I refer to page 14975 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 25, 1964. The amendment was proposed by Mr. SAYLOR. The manager of the bill for the majority on the floor explained that he understood the amendment to mean the following:

> Mr. RAINS. As I understand the gentleman's amendment, it would require not only that any manufactured product, such as say a locomotive, be manufactured in the United States, but that substantially all its manufactured component parts likewise be produced in the United States.

The tightest restriction of that kind that I have been able to find is the so-called Berry amendment, which has been inserted in the appropriation bills for the Department of Defense since 1954. That amendment requires the service departments to procure food, various clothing, and cloth supplies entirely from domestic sources. That is a pretty tight provision. But even that one allows exemptions as to nonavailability, emergency conditions, and perishability of food needed abroad. No such exemptions are contained in the very tight, absolutely impenetrable provision which is contained in the bill.

I predict that if we pass the bill as it is, we shall run into a thicket of disputes and arguments with some of our firmest allies. To those who might snicker at the idea of getting into arguments with our allies, I say they are the countries with which we do the most business. It seems to me that the major argument against the provision in the House bill and for the adoption of the amendment which I have proposed is based upon the juxtaposition between the interests that we have in our foreign trade and the interest that we would have in the enforcement of this particular provision. In the export-import trade we have an interest of something in the area of $39 billion a year—in round figures, about $22 billion a year—in exports and about $17 billion a year in imports.

All of the difficulties which we could compound by taking this position—flying in the face of everything else we preach to the world—could bedevil enormous sections of our export trade. We have infinitely more at stake in that than we have in all the things which are covered by Buy American laws, of which the present proposal is the tightest. They involve—and I used as my authority a study by the Bureau of the Budget on the foreign procurement of the U.S. Government dated 1963—something in the area of $25 to $30 million a year.

In addition, inevitably if we are going to have a tight position like that, it will tax our budget. We shall pay more money for everything that we buy, not only because we shall be prevented from buying it abroad, but also because we shall not even have an opportunity for foreign competition, thereby having some ameliorating effect upon the American manufacturer.

It seems to me that it is high time that some of us, at least, took a mature view of the situation. It is so superficially attractive to say, "We have a new program like the mass transit program. We must buy in the United States everything which comes under that program."

Mr. President, such an attitude defies almost every other thing which we are doing in foreign and domestic policy. It defies everything we are seeking to accomplish in international trade, as I just pointed out. It defies everything that we are seeking to accomplish in budget reduction, as I have just pointed out. It defies everything we are seeking to accomplish in benefiting the American consumer by bringing to bear in his favor foreign competition. It defies the fact that we are an open and not a closed world, and we are looking for ingenuity and inventiveness wherever it may be. If it is at home, it is great; if it is abroad it is not. It defies the proposition that almost invariably there is some component in an article of domestic manufacture which almost literally must come from abroad. Someone will have to wink at the law even if we pass it, because it is almost physically impossible to get a complete item manufactured with every component being manufactured domestically.

Indeed, some of the rare metals we need to produce—certain alloys—cannot be obtained in the United States.

The interesting thing is that under the Buy American Act itself, in all areas of procurement to which even the Buy American Act applies, the Budget Bureau study to which I have referred found 68 percent in fiscal year 1960, 58 percent in fiscal year 1961, and 53 percent in fiscal year 1962 of total procurement represented items which cannot be obtained in the United States at all.

Let us remember that it was not a committee amendment that was considered in the other body. It occurred on the floor. We can understand the superficial attractiveness of it to a State dealing with unemployment, and so forth. We have such problems in my own State. Let us take the State of Pennsylvania, where the author of this amendment comes from. He made a moving plea—and I deeply understand it—for his State and the fact that workers in his State need to be employed, and that there are pockets of economic difficulty, which is true. But even in his own State, the Saylor amendment could place hundreds of Pennsylvania manufacturers and their employees and their exports to foreign countries in jeopardy. This possibility would show the advisability of a provision such as I propose.

The difference is that Pennsylvania does not have to consider the question of export-import trade. The U.S. Government is supposed to take care of it. But the United States is not taking care of it in this bill. Let us remember that this bill provides two-thirds Federal aid. It seems to me the height of folly for us to defy our domestic and foreign policy by accepting a provision of this character.

I would not lightly seek to change a situation in which my own community of New York has a burning interest. We are deeply interested in mass transportation. I am strongly for the bill, but the economy of my State, as is true of many other States, is heavily dependent on an open world in which a maximum amount of international trade is engaged in.

In deep conscience, I would have felt it to be in derogation of my duty not to have pleaded for my proposal and to have raised this question, which I feel is so serious and portentous for the future of trade so far as the United States is concerned, especially in view of the exclusive, protectionist nature of the provision, if it is put on the statute books.

I appeal to all friends of international trade; I appeal to all friends of budget balance; I appeal to all friends of the consumer; I appeal to all friends of this program not to allow them to be debased by so narrow a provision which is in violation of the policy we have preached to all mankind. It is especially anomalous that this provision which is a complete reversal of everything we believe in and have preached in the world, should turn up in this most forward-looking bill. So I believe we would be doing ourselves a great disservice if we enacted the provision.

An effort is being made to avoid a conference. There have been other bills in which this situation has occurred. For example, I have in mind a particular amendment which the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] proposed to the river basin authorization bill which was pending before the Senate last December, and which was also very restrictive.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Does the Senator from New York have any substitute language in his proposal that will be placed in the bill when the buy American provision is taken out?

Mr. JAVITS. I do have a buy American provision.

Mr. LAUSCHE. May I hear it?

Mr. JAVITS. I apply to this bill the Buy American Act, which gives the executive department complete discretion to fix any percentage it wishes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is the 6 percent provision?

Mr. JAVITS. Six and twelve, or it can fix a higher one. The Defense Department fixes 50 percent. I am not quarreling that we not give preference to the people of the United States. I am for it. I am arguing against the absolute protectionist device to bar any kind of procurement from any place outside the United States, including components. This device flies in the face of what we, ourselves, have preached and will be used against us so heavily that we should not begin to think it is worth putting in the bill. That is why I offer my proposal.

It is said that if the bill goes back to the other body with an amendment differing from the Senate's acceptance of its amendment, the other body will not take it. In the first place, this is no reason for committing an injustice to our own policy, both foreign and domestic. Secondly, again let us keep our eyes on the ball.

The pending bill is what the Members of the other body voted for. I do not believe it is logical to suppose that this fact overshadows completely what the Senate should do. It is a niggling, unwise, and very injudicious provision, but I doubt that this will be the basis on which the House will reject the whole bill which, with respect to a totally different subject, especially as my amendment relates to it, does not seek to do anything but actually apply the buy American concept. All I am doing is seeking to remove an absolute bar to the application of a policy which, after much consideration, we have adopted, and which has been in effect for three decades.

I ask the Senate to adopt a substitute motion which would incorporate in the bill, in lieu of the bar against any procurement from abroad whatever, the provisions of the Buy American Act, the considered American policy on this particular subject.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield me 10 minutes?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I may not use all of it.

Mr. President, I am satisfied that the House amendment provides the basis for reorganizing our mass transportation systems to conform to the demands and requirements of our rapidly changing economy. There are few areas today which are as badly in need of overhaul and revitalization as are these troubled transport systems. The symptoms of the wide range of ailments which plague it have been expressed in numberless ways, too well known to most of us. The passengers complain. The shippers protest. The plight of the operating employees has occupied countless hours of the railway labor organizations, the railroads, the administration, to say nothing of the Members of Congress. Memories of the work rules disputes are still fresh and many of the problems which were raised at that time persist. Pressures for mergers and consolidations add to the general clamor. And, of course, compounding these deep-seated troubles in our mass transportation systems are the hopeless traffic tangles and highway congestion suffered by the suburban commuter in many of our major cities.

This legislation represents a major and long overdue step in the direction of bringing order out of this chaos from which the industry suffers.

It carries with it the hope and the promise of reorganizing these systems on a rational and comprehensive basis which is so desperately needed for the maintenance of our values of urban life.

Enactment of this bill, of course, marks only a beginning, but a most important beginning, in the drive to reform our transportation systems in a 20th century mold.

The course of this legislation has been long and painful. But persistent and courageous leadership in both bodies of Congress has produced results which, in my view, are, by and large, satisfactory. In my judgment, we have before us a good bill which should supply the means and the incentive for the development of realistic solutions to these most pressing urban problems.

I have examined in careful detail the provisions of the House amendment which condition the grant of any assistance under the act upon adherence to fair and equitable arrangements to maintain the interests and rights of employees affected by the reorganization and redevelopment of mass transportation systems under the bill.

These are the job protection provisions to which the Senate gave such particular care and attention during its consideration of S. 6 in April of last year.

Those of us who were immediately involved in the development of these standards at that time will remember that our task appeared to be one of the more difficult involved in the handling of this legislation. The proposal to regenerate the mass transit system brought into sharp focus the impact of innovation and change upon the railroad work force.

Indeed, this is a problem which has been particularly acute in railroading.

President Kennedy, in his message on railroad labor disputes on July 22, 1963, placed heavy emphasis upon this point as one of the central issues involved in that controversy.

To illustrate this, I might point out that three decades ago the average number of railroad employees in the service of class I railways exceeded 1,500,000 persons. This figure has been steadily dropping each year since that time and has now dipped below the 700,000 mark. In the period 1939 through 1961 employment on class I railroads dropped 74 percent, more than in any other industry with the exception of mining.

In the same period, productivity, judged on the basis of revenue ton-miles per employee, rose to approximately 220 percent.

As dramatic as these changes have been, we realize only too well that the transportation system has failed to keep pace with the rapid changes occurring throughout the economy. If this gap is to be closed as the bill proposes, it is no less essential to develop corresponding programs to absorb and cushion the impact of the changes which the bill contemplates upon the structure of railroad employment and upon the railroad work force.

When the bill was before the Senate early last year, it was my privilege to propose an amendment to the reported bill which developed specific procedures and standards to achieve this purpose.

The job protection provisions of the bill, as thus amended, made it clear that first, the rights of beneficiaries of transportation employees will be preserved along with the rights of the employees under existing collective bargaining agreements in effect in any mass transportation system which is involved in any project assisted under the bill; second, that collective bargaining in any situation where it now exists will be continued; third, that in the event of any layoff or downgrading in consequence of the development of any project under the bill, employees will receive basic job protection benefits at least equivalent to those which have prevailed in the transportation industries subject to Federal regulation; fourth, that continuation of employment of employees of any mass transportation system which has been transferred in consequence of any project assisted under the bill will be assured; and fifth, that employees displaced or threatened with displacement will receive paid training or retraining in suitable and related occupations.

The Senate approved the Morse amendment by a substantial margin and I am happy to say that the House amendment to the Senate bill has retained these job protection provisions intact.

The differences between the House amendment and the Senate bill in this respect are, for the most part, technical and grammatical. The substance of the provisions remains untouched.

The single exception to this statement is the provision in the House bill providing that the determinations as to fair and equitable arrangements and the certification of compliance with the requirements of these conditions shall be made by the Secretary of Labor alone. Since these determinations involve matters which are clearly within the jurisdiction and the special competence of the Secretary of Labor, I regard this change as an improvement. I ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks at this point an analysis comparing the job protection provisions of the Senate bill with those of the House amendment.

There being no objection, the analysis was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Comparative Analysis of the Labor Standards Provisions Contained in Section 10(c) of the House Amendment to S. 6, With the Morse Amendment, as Adopted by the Senate (Sec. 19(c)) of S. 6, as It Passed the Senate

I. Cordon analysis, showing changes in 19(c) (the Morse amendment) of the Senate-passed bill made by the House amendment (the language omitted by the House amendment is enclosed in black brackets, the language added by the House is italic)

LABOR STANDARDS

SEC. 19. * * *

(c) It shall be a condition [of the granting] of any assistance [or the financing of any project] under this Act that fair and equitable arrangements are made, as determined [jointly] by [the Administrator and] the Secretary of Labor, to protect the interests of employees affected by such assistance [or financing]. Such protective arrangements shall include, without being limited to, such provisions as may be necessary for (1) the preservation of rights, privileges, and benefits (including [the] continuation of pension rights and benefits [of all beneficiaries]) under existing collective bargaining agreements or otherwise; (2) the continuation of collective bargaining *rights* [in any situation where it now exists]; (3) the protection of individual employees against a worsening of their positions with respect to their employment [which shall in no event provide benefits less than those established pursuant to the provisions of section 5(2) (f) of the Interstate Commerce Act]; (4) assurances of employment to employees of acquired mass transportation systems [by the acquiring or operating entities], and priority of [employment or] reemployment of employees terminated or laid off; and (5) paid training or retraining programs. *Such arrangements shall include provisions protecting* individual employees against a worsening of their positions with respect to their employment which shall in no event provide benefits less than those established pursuant to [the provisions of] section 5(2) (f) of the [Interstate Commerce] Act *of February 4, 1887 (24 Stat. 379), as amended*. The contract for the granting of any such assistance shall specify the terms and conditions of [such] the protective arrangements.[1]

II. Analysis of House amendment

A. The differences between the House amendment and the Senate bill consist, for the most part, of technical and grammatical changes which do not change the substance of the job protection provisions contained in section 19(c) of the Senate bill. The single exception to this statement appears in the following provisions assigning responsibility for the administration of the labor protection conditions.

(1) Section 19(c) provides that determinations as to fair and equitable arrangements should be made jointly by the House and Home Finance Administrator and the Secretary of Labor.

(2) Section 10(c) of the House bill provides that these determinations be made by the Secretary of Labor alone.

B. The remaining differences in language are in the nature either of conforming changes or clarifying or perfecting changes.

(1) The Senate bill referred to both assistance and financing of projects whereas the House version refers only to assistance. Financing was included in the Senate version as a form of assistance explicitly covered by the section in order to insure that the job protection conditions would apply to guarantees as well as to grants, both of which were authorized by the bill. The House amendment eliminates the Senate provision authorizing guarantees and for that reason dropped the corresponding reference to "financing" in the section under consideration. There is no doubt that the House amendment covers all forms of assistance which may be provided under the act.

(2) Subparagraph (1) of the Senate version guarantees "the continuation of pension rights and benefits of all beneficiaries." The House version deletes the phrase "of all beneficiaries." The language modification is technical and does not change the meaning or the scope of the condition. Under both House and Senate versions, all pension rights and all benefits under existing collective bargaining agreements or under any other employment agreement or condition are guaranteed. The words "pension rights and benefits" in the House bill are not qualified and include the rights of employees under the described pension arrangements and the rights of their beneficiaries derived therefrom. The House eliminated the phrase "of all beneficiaries" because it was considered surplusage.

(3) Subparagraph (4) of the Senate version provides for "assurances of employment to employees of the acquired mass transportation systems by the acquiring or operating entities." The corresponding subparagraph in the House version drops the phrase "by the acquiring or operating entities" but otherwise retains the identical language of S. 6. Here again, the House deleted the designated phrase as surplusage. Under the House amendment, the "assurances of employment" required to be given to all employees of "acquired mass transportation systems," are precisely the same as under the Senate bill.

(4) The other modifications are all of the same nature as the foregoing.

III. Comment

Thus, it may be concluded that the only House modification of any significance is that dealing with the procedure for making the determination of what fair and equitable arrangements should be made. The subject matter of this provision is clearly within the special competence of the Secretary of Labor who has general responsibility in the administration of matters of this kind.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, of paramount significance is the fact that these job protection provisions represent another major step in the development of a realistic legislative policy dealing with grave problems of technological displacement in railroading as well as in other industries. Forming the cornerstone of this policy are, of course, the provisions of the Washington agreement of 1936 which for almost three decades have been successfully applied to problems of this kind in the transportation field. They have provided the basis for scheduling layoffs and position downgrading in federally regulated railroading throughout this time. They have been incorporated into the Interstate Commerce Act and have been generally accepted in collective bargaining in this industry and in the actions of the various Presidential emergency boards under the Railroad Labor Act.

Of at least equal importance is the requirement that the rights, privileges, and benefits of employees under existing collective bargaining agreements must be respected and maintained as a condition to the grant of any assistance under the act. Pension rights and benefits of employees as well as of the beneficiaries of employees under collective bargaining contracts must also be maintained. Stability of the employment relationship and maintenance of valuable benefits earned during a long course of employment are in this manner protected against impairment from a reorganization financed under the act. Assurances of continuous employment by successor companies or priority of reemployment in cases of termination or layoffs represent sound labor relations policies incorporated into collective-bargaining contracts and forming a logical part of the job protection system developed by this section. Finally, the obligation to train and retrain with pay those employees whose jobs have been jeopardized by programs developed under the bill reflects a sound policy expressed in the Manpower Development and Training Act, the Area Redevelopment Act, and in a wide range of collective bargaining contracts.

These provisions provide assurances that changes of the kind which are projected by this bill will not be carried out at the expense of a stable and dedicated work force which has served the public interest for so long a period of time.

The bill has established a well-balanced and broad program to absorb the impact of these changes which are about to take place under the impetus of this bill.

I regard this as an important contribution to the development of measures to solve the manpower problems which have confronted the transportation system for so many years.

Mr. President, I urge approval of the bill because I agree with the chairman of the committee and others, who have so masterfully handled the bill, that unless we accept the bill in its present form, the probabilities are that we will have no bill at all. If later, in the next session of Congress, some improvements are needed, we can offer them at that time.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, how much time has been used?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon used 4 minutes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I listened with a great deal of interest to the very able speech of the Senator from New York in support of his amendment dealing with the "buy American" provisions of the pending bill.

No one can logically answer successfully the arguments which the Senator from New York has made. It is very clear indeed to me that he is absolutely right; that the other body has put into the mass transit bill a protectionist provision which has no business there and which, in effect, as is so often the case, as we come to the end of a session, confronts us with a take-it-or-leave-it proposal, in view of the enormous difficulty of surmounting a parliamentary procedure necessary to have a successful conference with the House and come out on the winning side with the amendment of the Senator from New York as a part of the bill. I do not believe, as a practical matter, that the House would be willing to accept a conference report which incorporated the amendment of the Senator from New York.

---

[1] It should be noted that the House amendment has divided subpar. (3) of this section into two parts, splitting off the sec. 5(2) (f) condition and restating it as a new sentence. For this reason, the Cordon comparison contains a corresponding adjustment, showing the sec. 5(2) (f) provision as a separate sentence.

As we all know, 40 Republican votes were required to pass the bill in the House. It required more than a year to corral them. The Republican leadership in the House was and is disenchanted with the 40. I have no doubt that several of the 40 were impelled to vote upon the bill by reason of the quite unsound provision which the Senator from New York now attacks.

Those of us who agree in principle with the Senator from New York are confronted with the very difficult choice of having no bill or accepting the House bill as it comes to us. I do not like the bill a bit, and I would like to vote for the amendment of the Senator from New York.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. CLARK. May I have 1 minute more?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield 1 additional minute.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized for 1 additional minute.

Mr. CLARK. The exigencies and the practicalities of political life are such, and the needs of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania for this legislation are so very great, and have such high priority, that I personally shall knuckle under the House position and vote for the House bill, which I dislike to do, because I feel so strongly that this legislation must go through and that we must start the great metropolitan areas toward achieving mass transit, which they so badly need. Therefore, as a matter of political judgment I am of the view that if we do not defeat the Senator's amendment, we shall not have any bill.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the language that was added in the House appears on its face to be radically contrary to our national policy of trade expansion and would, in fact, be a contraction of our international trade. That is the appearance of the language that has been added. But that is not the fact. The fact is that there is now no importation of manufactured vehicles or equipment in the urban transit areas.

I should like to read at this point a telegram which was received today by the U.S. Conference of Mayors. It reads as follows:

BROOKLYN, N.Y., *June 30, 1964*.
LAWRENCE HENDERSON,
U.S. Conference of Mayors,
Washington, D.C.:

As this authority understands the purport of the amendment in the House version of the mass transit bill requiring the purchase of materials of domestic manufacture only we are of the opinion that it would have no practical effect on the operations of this authority as for many years more than 99 percent plus of the authority's equipment, materials, and supplies are manufactured in the United States and purchased by it here.

NEW YORK CITY TRANSIT AUTHORITY,
JOSEPH E. O'GRADY, *Chairman*.

I have talked personally with major users in the transit fields, and I can find no appreciable importation now. Therefore, this language would have no effect on international trade.

I admit that it might temporarily create some adverse international thinking or psychology. I believe that would be temporary.

For the reasons stated by the Senator from Pennsylvania, I believe we cannot run the risk of what would happen if the amendment of the Senator from New York were accepted.

Getting the bill to where it is now has been about as hard a job as running a commuter railroad without a transfusion of money from the public sector.

We are about to give urban transit that transfusion. If we do not do it with this bill, we shall continue to see a withering away of the services we have and the loss of hope of better services.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

I have a great deal of sympathy with the views expressed by the Senator from New York. I regretted that the House took this action, and used such restrictive language. However, there is a great deal in what the Senator from New Jersey has said, about the tortuous route the bill has had to take through the Congress.

More than a year ago we passed this bill in the Senate, after having passed several bills in previous years, and having had to accept a sort of an experimental program waiting on the House to take some action. It has been a most difficult task.

I am told by some of the best authorities that there is no noticeable amount of foreign material used in the construction of transportation systems at the present time, and that probably there will not be for a long time to come, if ever.

Furthermore, there may be some ambiguities here. There was a discussion on the floor of the House. I realize that what was said was a little ambiguous; it was used at one time, and then was to some extent rebutted—as to what was intended by this proposal.

I should like to read from a memorandum that was prepared by one who is, I believe, an authority. I read:

> The House amendment simply requires that if a product needed for a project is produced in the United States, the American product must be bought without regard to the price advantage that might accrue by using a foreign-made product. However, if a needed product is not available in the United States, this amendment would not preclude the purchase of a foreign product.
>
> If the purpose of the amendment is kept in mind, it is clear that the use of foreign materials or manufactured articles as components of American products is also not prohibited. Clearly, if the components of the American products are not available in the United States, it is permissible, within the intent of this provision, to use a foreign component.
>
> In addition, it may not be possible, in an intricate piece of machinery having many, many component parts, to practicably assure that every screw, every nut, every bolt, every can of oil, every coat of paint, is an American product.
>
> This provision does not require the impossible. One cannot practicably determine that in the manufacture of intricate, sophisticated machinery, some foreign articles have not been included, or used to construct the completed product.
>
> The House amendment simply requires that to the extent substantial components of the completed product can reasonably be identified and procured from American manufacturers, this must be done.

Even though I would not have supported the amendment or would not have proposed the amendment in the House myself, I do not believe it will do any harm to the bill at this time. I believe there will be plenty of time in which we may consider the matter more carefully, and in future legislation take care of the situation, if it requires taking care of.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am in accord with the general principles that have been advocated by the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], who is the floor manager of the bill, and also by the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], and the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. I am not at all unsympathetic to the amendment or the motion of the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS]. But as one who has followed this subject fairly closely in the leadership position, and who knows something of the difficulties that were encountered in the House, I merely say that based on the information that was available to me last Wednesday, I believe something in the nature of a miracle has occurred to get this bill through the House.

If we want a mass transit bill, we will, in my opinion, take the House bill; otherwise we shall have no transit bill at all.

The bill means nothing to me personally, because I come from the part of the country where mass transit is not a problem. But it does mean something in the urban areas of the country, where 70 percent of the people live.

I want to see legislation passed. It is a matter of practical realities. That is the situation in a nutshell, as the distinguished Senator from Alabama and other Senators preceding me have tried to make clear.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I thank the Senator from Montana.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. President, I yielded myself 5 minutes. Have I used the 5 minutes?

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The Senator's 5 minutes have expired.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield myself 2 additional minutes. I yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. TALMADGE. What provision is made in the House bill for the relocation of public utilities that might be affected under the terms of the bill?

Mr. SPARKMAN. The relocation of utilities is dependent upon the Federal-aid highway program. In that act, a program is provided for the location of utilities. I shall not at this time attempt to give the details; I am sure the Senator from Georgia will recall them.

I refer the Senator to section 111, paragraph A, of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956.

Mr. TALMADGE. I thank the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That act contains a provision that payment can be made or negotiated so long as State law does not prevent it.

Mr. TALMADGE. I thank the able Senator from Alabama for clarifying that point.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York will state it.

Mr. JAVITS. How much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York has 12 minutes remaining.

Mr. JAVITS. I yield myself 5 minutes.

I heard with a little amusement the arguments made by my colleagues. I love them; I hope they will forgive me.

The Senator from Alabama says this provision does not require the impossible. But it does require the impossible. The manager of the bill in the House said so on the floor of that body. Representative RAINS made very clear what he understood this provision to mean when he said, at page 14975 of the RECORD of June 25:

> As I understand the gentleman's amendment, it would require not only that any manufactured product, such as say a locomotive, be manufactured in the United States, but that substantially all its manufactured component parts likewise be produced in the United States.

The courts are not going to pay that much attention—I wish they would—to the interpretation of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN]. The courts are going to look at the words in the statute and the interpretation of the Members of the House who took the amendment, and that will be about as tight as we can make it. It will be absolutely impossible not to violate it. It will be violated; it must be violated, or a manufacturere could not buy anything, not even in the United States.

We are told by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] that the provision will not have any practical effect because we are not buying anything abroad now. I maintain that we shall be going out to adventure and find new ideas, whether it be in monorails or something else, to help to solve our mass transportation problem. What are we going to do? Clamp down on the transportation crush? The bill does not provide that we cannot look abroad; that we are going to be confined to the United States. If the amendment has no practical effect, why put it in the bill and make it extremely difficult for Christian Herter to carry out his negotiations in Geneva now?

Finally, I must say that apparently our Democratic colleagues think they have a better idea of what the Republicans will do in the other body than we Republicans do. That is what they are speculating on. The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD]—and I have the highest affection and regard for them—are guessing that Republicans in the other body will not take the amendment.

I think my view is also entitled to some consideration in that regard. I believe they will give some consideration to it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Frankly, I was not even thinking of the Republicans in the other body, but I was thinking of some Democrats who I know would be hard to persuade to go along a second time.

Mr. JAVITS. I certainly would honor the Senator's thinking as to members of his party. I honor it as to my party. But I think in the river basin bill, which we also handled this year, in the same Congress, there was an amendment which provided for domestic procurement unless there was a price differential of 50 percent between the domestic as against the foreign product. The House insisted that it go out, and it was taken out in conference.

Second, we are not at the end of this session by any means. Suppose we sent the bill back with the kind of amendment that we ought to have, instead of the amendment that is now before us. If the House does not like it, it can still send it back to us. There is plenty of time. I rather hazard a guess that we shall be around for a few weeks more. Why cave in? It is one thing to cave in on excise taxes, which will expire tonight. But why cave in on this fight? We have been fighting for years. Why allow it to be distorted and abused—I say that advisedly—by the kind of provision that has been incorporated in the bill, without trying, at least, what I am proposing to the Senate—and, incidentally, on a most reasonable basis?

Finally, Mr. President, the Budget Bureau study, to which I have referred about the operation of the Buy American Act itself, concluded that if the price differential were raised to 25 percent we would get to the point of diminishing returns where it will generally cost much more in the budget than is saved in terms of foreign procurement.

So, for all those reasons I believe, first, that it is my duty to propose this amendment, because I believe it is extremely important that voices be raised against trade "no-nothingism" in Congress, and because I oppose the superficially attractive idea, "We will buy everything here," which is without any real concern for what happens in the rest of the world.

Second, I respectfully submit that we have an excellent opportunity to carry our point. We have carried it before.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCINTYRE in the chair). The time of the Senator from New York has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized for 1 additional minute.

Mr. JAVITS. The reason for a bicameral legislature is exactly what is happening here tonight—that is, one body refines what has been done in the other body, in order to keep from falling into the abyss of the serious mistake that bifocal lenses are not working at the particular moment when a particular body acts. The Senate does it sometimes, and the other body stops us. They did so in respect to the river basin bill, which was considered earlier this year in the Senate. Now it is our turn. We should do the same thing.

I hope that the Senate will approve my amendment and will send the matter back to the House, because it should go back with a buy-American provision, but a proper one, in accordance with a policy which will not embarrass us and confuse the world.

Mr. President, if the Senator from Alabama is prepared to yield back the remainder of his time, I shall do likewise.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is yielded back.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, has all time been yielded back now?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded back on the amendment.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator from Ohio can get time on the bill if he so desires. If he wishes to speak, he can get unanimous consent to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment has now been yielded back. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New York. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senators from Washington [Mr. JACKSON and Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. WALTERS] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] are absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] is necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. WALTERS], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] is absent to attend the funeral of a friend.

If present and voting, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 14, nays 65, as follows:

[No. 455 Leg.]

YEAS—14

Aiken
Allott
Boggs
Cooper
Dominick
Douglas
Javits
Keating
Kuchel
Lausche
Nelson
Neuberger
Proxmire
Robertson

NAYS—65

Anderson
Bartlett
Beall
Bennett
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Case
Church
Clark
Cotton
Curtis
Dodd
Eastland
Fulbright
Gore
Gruening
Hart
Hartke
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Humphrey
Inouye
Johnston
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Mansfield
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Mechem
Metcalf
Miller
Monroney
Morse
Morton
Moss
Mundt
Muskie
Pastore
Pell
Prouty
Randolph
Ribicoff
Russell
Simpson
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—21

Bayh
Bible
Byrd, Va.
Dirksen
Edmondson
Ellender
Engle
Ervin
Fong
Goldwater
Hayden
Jackson
Kennedy
Magnuson
McCarthy
Pearson
Saltonstall
Scott
Smathers
Walters
Williams, Del.

So Mr. JAVITS' amendment was rejected.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Alabama to concur in the House amendment.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, as I understand, we have 30 minutes to the side.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is correct. Are there any further amendments?

The Senator from Alabama is recognized.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I am ready to vote, but I understand the Senator from Texas wants to use some time.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, a number of Senators on my side want to speak against the bill. I believe that we should not have a vote yet for 30 minutes anyway.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, several Senators have requested time, but I do not see any of them in the Chamber.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Ohio.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I urge the Senate to vote against this bill. In my opinion, if the bill were passed, we would enter into a program that would have no end. It would be interminable in its operation. The most optimistic estimators of what the cost will be give the amount of $6 billion. The figure of $6 billion is predicated upon the needs of about 40 metropolitan communities. Two hundred and seventeen communities may ask for help. In 1962 the Highway Act was amended so as to authorize a study of the problem. The study was to be completed by July 1, 1965. More than a year remains for the completion of that study. It has not yet been filed. We do not know what the findings and recommendations will be as ways and means of solving mass transportation problems in our cities. Forty cities have indicated that the amount of money that will be needed is $6 billion. Since 217 metropolitan cities in the United States may ask for help, the needs of 177 communities have not been studied.

In my judgment, if we pass the bill, the Federal Government will forever be in the field of providing moneys with which to buy buses, equipment, parking facilites, and other needs of local mass transportation systems.

I point out to Senators the looseness of the definition of "urban areas" in the bill. On page 41, line 19, of the House bill appears the following definition of an urban area:

> The term "urban area" means any area that includes a municipality or other built-up place which is appropriate in the judgment of the administrator for a public transportation system to serve commuters or others in the locality, taking into consideration the local patterns and trends of urban growth.

I submit to the Senate that under that definition practically every crossroads area in the United States, if the administrator should so determine, would become eligible for grants from the Federal Government to purchase buses, equipment, terminal facilities, parking areas, and other things needed by such transportation systems.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, may I have 2 additional minutes?

Mr. TOWER. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Ohio.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Ohio is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The problem is one of people. People refuse to ride the public transportation systems when they can ride in their automobiles. The problem exists in Boston, New York, Philadelphia, and other communities that have been imprudent in the management of their systems. They have not attempted to charge the fares that would produce a revenue adequate to sustain the service. They have been subsidizing the systems. Now they have come to the end of their rope and they want the Federal Government to subsidize.

I close by saying to Senators who do not reside in the metropolitan areas that if they wish the citizens and taxpayers of their States to finance the imprudence of the managers of transportation systems in New York, Boston, and Philadelphia—not so much in Chicago, because they have been making progress—they should vote for the bill. It is a pure subsidy of what I call extravagance, negligence, and unwillingness to take firm positions on the fares to be charged.

I yield the floor.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey such time as he may require.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, one of our colleagues, because of a recent serious plane accident, cannot be with us today to lend his voice in support of this very important piece of legislation. I, of course, refer to the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], who since coming to the Senate, has expressed a continuing personal concern, and has extended a real effort in the development of an effective Federal-State mass transportation program.

The Senator from Massachusetts has emphasized to the people of his State the urgency of finding solutions to the increasingly complex urban and suburban commuter problem. Largely through his efforts, funds were obtained from the HHFA for extensive commuter service experiments in the Boston area.

I might say parenthetically at this point, contrary to the statement of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], that some of the commuter lines in the greater Boston area have substanially increased ridership.

These experiments yielded valuable data and recommendations which led, to a considerable extent, to the development of a mass transit plan for Massachusetts, which plan was recently enacted into law by the Massachusetts general court.

In embarking on this pilot commuter study, and in developing a comprehensive State mass transit plan, Massachusetts has provided a very worthwhile record from which many other States and municipalities can benefit in the days ahead. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], can take pride in the fact that his State has moved forward with positive action in this field, and Massachusetts can be proud of its junior Senator who has exhibited the spirit and initiative to stimulate this progress.

I am very pleased to make this statement and to convey to the Senate his personal wish that this measure will be finally accepted by the Senate, and that it will become effective as soon as possible so that we can get on with the job of developing efficient mass transportation systems throughout our States.

For my part, and I think I speak for all of the Senate, we wish TED a rapid and complete recovery from his accident. The reports of his improvement have been very encouraging, and we are most thankful for this. We know TED KENNEDY is a strong and courageous young man who, in the past 2 years as a Member of the Senate, has impressed all of us with his dedication and his sincerity of effort in every job he tackles. We know he will tackle his new responsibility of getting back into condition for the fine career that lies ahead of him.

I should like to make one further comment in personal terms. The miracle described by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] in relation to the passage of the bill in the House was in large part wrought by the House Member from Alabama, ALBERT RAINS. The action is one of Mr. RAINS' valedictories this year. We regret so much his decision not to seek reelection. It is interesting that the leadership of the bill in the Senate has been by another Alabamian, Senator JOHN SPARKMAN. They are truly two stars from Alabama. I yield the floor.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TOWER. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, along with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] I spoke against the bill when the Senate originally considered it. That was the original Senate bill as modified by the Commerce Committee. The House bill is wholly new. I suggest to the Senate that many Senators have not studied the wording of the House bill. Following up what the Senator from Ohio said, I should like to cite some of the things which I think create real concern over the bill as it is now worded. The first is the definition of "mass transportation." That is what we are supposed to be providing aid for; and I presume from the comments that have been made by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] and by others that they are thinking in terms of commuters. But the fact is that the definition of "mass transportation" to which aid could be given under the bill is stated to be "transportation by bus, rail, or other conveyance, either publicly or privately owned, serving the general public and moving over prescribed routes."

This could be in a steamship. It could be in a freighter line. It could be in helicopter service. It could be in an airline. It could be in a ferry line. It could be in any single bit of conveyance at any place in the country, moving inside or outside the country, as included within the words of the definition.

The question of who is going to get the grants and who is not is left in the sole discretion of the Administrator.

My second point, again, goes to the definition. I reemphasize what the Senator from Ohio said. What is an urban area? Part of the definition is "any built-up place," anywhere, as far as one can see. If that does not mean a house or a barn with a couple of "Chic" Sale outhouses behind it, I never heard anything more indefinite than that. Any "built-up place" is the definition which will give discretion to the Administrator to give away $75 million of the taxpayers' money in the first year and $150 million in each of the next 2 years.

My third point is that it will be recalled from the original hearings that San Francisco and the State of California worked together to try to establish a mass transportation system in that State. I do not have the exact figures before me, but my recollection is that the total amount involved was $900 million of bond issue in order to provide an adequate commuter service in that city.

Going further, I said that the administrator, at his discretion, could give money to any place in America, but I point out that he could give no more than $9,375,000 in the first year to any one State and no more than $18,750,000 to any one State in the second or third year. Consequently, it is not going to do any good so far as producing an adequate commuter service that will do any good for the general public is concerned.

So we are kidding ourselves if we think the bill, if adopted, would be effective in solving the commuter problem.

We come now to what is going to be granted. Under section 3(a) of the bill the Administrator is given authority to make loans or grants, at his discretion, and he is authorized to make loans or grants on criteria which he determines are satisfactory.

Section 4(a) reads:

> Except as specified in section 5, no Federal financial assistance shall be provided pursuant to section 3 unless the Administrator determines that the facilities and equipment for which the assistance is sought are needed for carrying out a program, meeting criteria established by him.

Once again, this means that under the proposed act there would be an administrator who would have sole authority to determine what facilities and equipment are proper. It would give him a czarist position, if we want to use that term, over the whole industry.

It seems to me we are compounding about three evils in the bill as it is now written.

I merely want to say one more thing about the bill. We are being urged to push through a bill which is vague and indefinite, and which covers a far larger scope than anybody in the Chamber at the present time—unless he is on the committee—actually realizes. It is not going to do any effective good. It gives to one man power to give away $75 million the first year and $150 million in each of the next 2 years.

In my opinion, it is a poorly drawn bill and should not be passed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

The Senator from Alabama is recognized.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, does the Senator from Colorado desire further time? If so, how much?

Mr. DOMINICK. I could use 1 more minute.

Mr. TOWER. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Colorado.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Colorado is recognized for 1 additional minute.

Mr. DOMINICK. No study has been made as to the effect which the bill would have in connection with the Federal Aviation Agency. It is perfectly apparent that under the provisions of the bill it is entirely possible for the Administrator to take over many of the functions of the Federal Aviation Agency and to create complete discord in one of the few industries which is now working in somewhat well regulated and well modified terms.

It seems to me this is another proposal which we should study very carefully before we accept it.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I yield 6 minutes to the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND].

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from South Carolina is recognized for 6 minutes.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I change that to 5 minutes.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I reiterate the opposition which I have already expressed to the enactment of the proposed mass transit legislation.

There is no constitutional authority for the Central Government to enter this field of activity, because this is a purely local matter. This proposal does not come within the scope of the commerce clause of the Constitution, and the welfare clause of the Constitution was never intended to cover expenditures for activities such as this. Had the welfare clause been intended to cover such a broad scope of activity, there would have been no necessity for the specific enumeration of delegated power of Congress which is found in article I, section 8 of the Constitution. Also, had the welfare clause been intended to be this broad, the 10th amendment would have been meaningless, for the Central Government would have had all powers under the welfare clause, and there would have been no powers left to reserve to the States and to the people.

S. 6, in its amended form, authorizes appropriations in the amount of $75 million for fiscal year 1965, and $150 million for each of the fiscal years 1966 and 1967. It is clear, and I am sure that the proponents of this legislation would agree, that this $375 million is but the beginning of this extravagant program. Our country simply cannot afford to engage in this activity, even if it were an activity authorized by the Constitution. Congress has recently enacted tax reduction legislation which, of course, has the effect of reducing the revenues accruing to the Treasury. Just last week the Senate completed congressional action on the administration's request for another temporary increase in the national debt ceiling, this time to $324 billion. Congress owes it to itself and to the Nation to curb deficit spending and to practice restraint in its handling of public funds.

The essence of the argument in favor of this bill is that a "national problem" exists, and that, therefore, Federal action is necessary to solve that problem.

The facts do not support this approach. In fact, the inherent physical structure of our communities prove differently. We do not have a "national network" of mass transit facilities. Rather, we have as many different urban passenger transportation systems as we have communities. Clearly, then, there is not a national problem, although some of the communities having transit systems may be faced with specific problems. Accordingly, such problems, where they exist, are local in nature. This being so, there is no need, and indeed, no justification, for Federal assistance.

If a locality has a transit problem, then it should be solved at the local level, and Congress should not inject the Central Government into this area which is not authorized by the Constitution. What is the logic which would require people living in an area that does not have a transit problem to pay the bill for an area that has not worked out its own difficulties? These problems are not unsolvable for a number of communities have already met the modern day challenges in this field. They include San Francisco, Calif.; Phoenix, Ariz.; Santa Monica, Calif.; and Houston, Tex.

If one or more local communities can solve their problems, then I believe that all communities can do so. If Congress does enter this field, then, judging from the lesson of history, local initiative will soon falter and eventually die. All of our local communities will then look to Washington for the solution of their local transit problems.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. TOWER. I yield 1 more minute to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. THURMOND. Experience shows that when the Central Government subsidizes, it also controls. Control in the area of local mass transit could very well expand and ultimately result in complete control over, if not outright nationalization of the entire field of transportation. Some will contend that this proposal embodies no more than a first infant step. Perhaps this is true, but this is an infant which will grow and expand overnight and could well become a monster. This program should be rejected.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, more efficient transportation systems are absolutely essential to the growth and well-being of our metropolitan areas. Years ago, 75 percent of Americans lived in rural areas. Transportation was a much less complicated matter. Today, 75 percent of all Americans live in urban areas. It is estimated that in 20 years 140 million people will live in 40 large urban communities.

Today, urban areas cross city, county, and even State lines. Operators of bus, subway, and rail lines do not recognize political boundaries. Coordinated, areawide transportation systems are required. These systems require and merit Federal assistance so that urban areas can carry the burden of a growing, mobile American public.

This era of urban sprawl has removed whatever justification there may have been for attempting to solve urban mass transportation problems by local action alone.

Seven of ten Americans now live in metropolitan areas. This proportion is increasing—at the rate of 3 million of our fellow citizens yearly—while our rural population is declining.

Citizens living in rural areas can no more ignore the problems of our cities than citizens living in our great cities can ignore the needs of this Nation's rural communities. Economically, politically, and socially, they thrive on mutual well-being.

An ever-increasing volume of traffic chokes our city streets, hamstrings commerce and communication and hampers our national growth. It is clearly the responsibility of the Federal Government to join with private enterprise and local government to help solve this problem.

Inadequate public transportation has forced city dwellers to use their private automobiles. This in turn has meant a gradual strangulation of our city streets, highways, parkways, and freeways. In most communities, the construction of freeways cannot keep up with the ever-increasing volume of traffic.

There were 7 million new automobiles sold in the United States in 1963. A yearly sale of 10 million automobiles is expected within a decade. The implication is clear: foresight, planning, and action are needed now. The urban mass transit bill, it appears to me, is a good beginning. It is that always important first step.

The bill, if enacted into law, would provide $375 million in loans and grants over a 3-year period for commuter railroad projects aimed at moving people more quickly and efficiently. Federal funds will come into play only if initial anticipated revenues from a particular project are not sufficient to encourage private investment. The Federal Government's responsibility and interest terminates when a grant is made. Once this is done, all responsibility remains at the local level where it belongs.

Opponents of this legislative proposal deplore Federal spending for so-called local problems such as transportation. I cannot agree that the well-being of the economy and the people of Cleveland, Akron, Toledo, New York, Chicago, Columbus, and other great cities is of no concern to the rest of the Nation. In this space age of change and challenge, we can no longer legislate for a horse and buggy era, as some opponents of this bill would like to do.

Throughout our history the Federal Government has helped to build bridges and highways, to dredge canals and harbors, and to construct railroad lines across the continent. This has helped to build a great nation and a society of plenty. We must continue to build in this manner to move America forward.

Since the bill seeks to promote private investment, and since urban areas are free to develop transit systems best suited to their particular needs, the bill is a good example of a legislative proposal that, if enacted into law, will encourage local action. It in no way intrudes on the judgment, initiative, or responsibility of local government.

People want and will use public transportation if up-to-date, convenient service is available. This is being proved in those communities cooperating in experiments financed by combined local and Federal aid, under the pilot program authorized by Congress in 1961.

Mr. President, both of the great newspapers of Cleveland, Ohio, recently published editorials strongly urging the enactment of the urban mass transportation bill. Unfortunately, all of the Representatives in the Congress representing the Cleveland metropolitan area in the House of Representatives did not support this bill when it was recently passed by the other body. In June 22, 1964, there appeared in the Cleveland Press an editorial entitled "Taft, Bolton on Wrong Track" and on June 27, 1964, there appeared in the Plain Dealer an editorial entitled "Promote Transit Aid Plan." I commend these to my colleagues and ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD at this time as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Plain Dealer, June 27, 1964]

PROMOTE TRANSIT AID PLAN

Approval by Congress of the $375 million mass transit bill makes it imperative that Cleveland area Congressmen, no matter what their previous feelings on the issue, unite in the effort to get a fair share for improving Cleveland's public-transportation system.

It also is incumbent on the Cleveland Transit Board to provide, as soon as possible, a detailed, feasible plan which would qualify the Cleveland transit system for this aid.

The final program should stress three aspects in particular of rapid transit. These would be extensions of the network to the southwest region around the airport; to the Parma-Brook Park area; to the southeastern section of the city.

These are the most pressing needs in the system, the places where rapid transit does not serve now, or serves insufficiently, and where passenger traffic is waiting. The program, which, by the language of the bill, can include only capital improvements, must not be muddled with extraneous items which would divert attention from the most logical and necessary transit advancements.

A hurdle to be negotiated by the board after aid is secured under the new bill would be that of raising the local share of the expenditure of any approval project. The Federal grant would cover two-thirds of the cost. A further stipulation is that only the part of an approved transit program that cannot be supported by anticipated fare revenue is eligible for this Federal help.

Since during the 3-year authorization of the bill no State can qualify for more than $47 million, the need for Cleveland to make a sound case for its share takes on added importance.

Big cities, such as Cleveland, which are hubs of metropolitan areas, daily are finding it more difficult to find capital improvement money for transportation and allied civic housekeeping chores. The transit bill appears to be a way for Federal tax money to come back to the big cities which produce most of this revenue and need its benefits so urgently.

[From the Cleveland Press, June 22, 1964]

TAFT, BOLTON ON WRONG TRACK

Greater Cleveland's Republican legislators in Washington would do well to reconsider their opposition to the urban mass transportation bill before they vote on it this week.

If it passes the House the measure would provide up to $500 million in Federal aid for the development and expansion of such lines as the Cleveland Transit System. Thus the proposed extension of the rapid transit to Hopkins Airport would be accelerated. It would also hasten the day when the rapid could go to Cleveland Heights or elsewhere.

Congressman at Large ROBERT TAFT, who would like to be Senator, has declared against the bill, fearing excessive Federal expenditures. Congressman OLIVER BOLTON, Republican, 11th District, who would like to be Congressman at Large, plans to oppose it because he thinks it would "create a Federal mayor" on Main Street.

Rather than conjuring up imaginary hazards, these men would do their urban, suburban, and ex-urban constituents a positive service by voting to relieve the growing transportation complexities in expanding municipalities.

The money involved in the mass transit bill is almost lost when compared to the huge Federal outlays spent on the interstate highway program, including the several controversial Cleveland freeways under consideration.

The Republican Congressmen representing Greater Cleveland should weigh realistically the benefits of a mass transit bill against their dubious fears of Federal assistance.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, as a cosponsor of the mass transit bill in the Senate, I want to urge its final passage in the form passed by the House of Representatives. This long-needed legislation, which is awaited eagerly by municipalities in my own State and across the Nation, provides a valuable new departure in Federal participation in an increasingly complex area of public concern—the freedom of movement for our growing population in our vast urbanized areas. I am especially interested in the success of this legislation because it relates so closely to my own proposal, embodied in Senate Joint Resolution 18, for an interstate public authority to modernize rail passenger service between Boston and Washington. What the mass transit bill does for public transportation within cities, my bill would do, by somewhat different means, for public transportation between cities. Now that Congress has accepted the principle of Federal participation in transportation problems at the local level, I hope that in due course it will adopt the principles advanced in my own plan for Federal participation at the regional, or megalopolitan, level. Finally, I would like to express my congratulations to the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] and all who have worked with him to bring the mass transit bill to final passage.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I shall vote against the pending bill. I recognize that it might be a slight improvement over what was passed by the Senate some time ago.

In looking through the bill, I have come to the conclusion that it is not clearly drawn. With respect to the observation made by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], I note that with regard to the definition of an "urban area," the drafters of the bill went to some trouble to make sure that the term "States" included "possessions of the United States."

I should like to know what possessions of the United States have traffic problems to warrant the mass transportation assistance that is envisioned by the proposed act. If the manager of the bill has in mind any particular possession, I should like to have him describe it.

With respect to the comments made by the other Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG], that 75 percent of the people reside in cities, it seems to me that if that is so, perhaps they ought to pay for these developments. Not all of the cities have asked for this assistance.

It is my recollection that San Francisco, Calif., has done a very good job of self-help. If it has done it, why cannot other cities do so too?

I should like to make one other observation. On page 33 of the bill I note that it provides:

> (c) No financial assistance shall be provided under this Act to any State or local public body or agency thereof for the purpose, directly or indirectly, of acquiring any interest in, or purchasing any facilities or other property of, a private mass transportation company, * * * unless (2) the Administrator finds that such program, to the maximum extent feasible, provides for the participation of private mass transportation companies.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. TOWER. I yield a half minute more to the Senator from Iowa.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is recognized for an additional half minute.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I ask: Why are we to have a program that will provide for the maximum use of private mass transportation companies, and in the same breath provide for the acquisition of such private mass transportation companies? I hope the bill will be defeated; but I would guess, because of the control of the executive branch over this body, that this body will pass it.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

So many things are wrong with the bill that I do not know really where to start. To begin with, it is potentially a political grab bag. I believe it will result in a great deal of wasted money. The worst thing about it is that it does not address itself to the problem.

The bill is basically dishonest, because it is proposed to take $375 million and throw it at a $10 billion problem. That is a drop in the bucket. It will not do the job. But it will be a foot in the door. Ultimately, we shall have federally controlled mass transportation in every city in the United States, if we let the camel stick its head in the tent now.

The purport of the bill is that it will help resolve transportation problems in the cities, and encourage the cities to develop their own transit plans. I submit that the bill will discourage initiative and responsibility on the local level, because there are many people who will reason: "Let us not play around the issue and improve our own mass transit system. Let us not do what is necessary. If we wait a while, the Federal Government will appropriate more money. The law will be amended, and we will get more than 12½ percent. We shall have billions more to play with. Then we can go to Washington, and they will solve our mass transportation problem."

While those people are waiting around, they will not be doing anything about the problem locally, because they will be expecting the Federal Government to do something for them.

The bill contains insidious provisions. Not only will the bill stifle local initiative and responsibility; it will intrude the Federal Government into the political subdivisions of the States. Cities are creatures of the States. We shall be going over and around the State governments. The bill makes a calculated effort to reduce the cities and States to absolute dependencies of the Federal Government.

There is also the labor problem. The bill will do some strange and wonderful things. The labor provision will probably negate State laws pertaining to public employees, the right to bargain, the right to strike, and that sort of thing. The bill could, I think, affect State laws with regard to public utilities.

Further, the bill is probably in conflict with the civil rights bill, because it provides for freezing in particular jobs and situations the employees of companies that are taken over by local authorities to be subsidized by the bill. There may be companies in which discrimination is currently practiced. Then the bill would run into conflict with title VI of the civil rights bill.

I think it is high time, when we cannot balance our budget, to stop initiating new programs, programs that will cost the Government money. I think, even more, that it is high time that we stop reducing the people and the States to dependency on Uncle Sam. It is high time that we stop encouraging everyone to come to Washington with his problems, insisting that if there are problems, we will throw some money at them, and they will go away.

I hope the Senate will defeat the measure.

DEDICATION OF CAPE MAY-LEWES FERRY

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, today, as we debate a mass transit bill, the culmination of a long and remarkable transit development took place at Cape May, N.J. There, Gov. Richard Hughes, of New Jersey, and Gov. Elbert Carvel, of Delaware, presided at dedication ceremonies of the Cape May-Lewes Ferry and celebrated still another link of friendship and accessibility between the two States.

At ceremonies on both sides of Delaware Bay, the Governors were joined by those who helped make this new service possible. As Governor Hughes said, the dedication today was the result of bi-State, bipartisan action by State legislators, the Delaware River and Bay Authority, and individuals and groups that have a keen understanding of the benefits to be derived from the new facility.

Today's ceremonies also brought forth the prediction that the ferry ceremony may well be the forerunner of an eventual direct highway connection across Delaware Bay. This comment was made by Clarence D. Martin, Jr., Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation. He also reminded us that we are rapidly approaching the day when an Atlantic coastline ocean route will stretch from Maine to Florida.

Mr. President, the Under Secretary's speech clearly expresses the great local and national interest in new transportation advances. I ask that it be printed in the RECORD, along with an excellent summary of the history of the Cape May-Lewes ferry. This summary, written by Mr. William P. Frank, was printed as part of the official dedication program.

There being no objection, the speech and historical summary were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY THE HONORABLE CLARENCE D. MARTIN, JR., UNDER SECRETARY OF COMMERCE FOR TRANSPORTATION, INAUGURATING FERRY SERVICE BETWEEN LEWES, DEL., AND CAPE MAY, N.J., JUNE 30, 1964

It is a pleasure to take part in the opening of this important new ferry service, linking the resort areas of Delaware and New Jersey.

The State and local officials who took the initiative to develop this service we are inaugurating are to be congratulated. This is a welcome reminder of the important role of State and local governments in meeting transportation requirements.

This project, for instance, involves a brand new service. It is using vessels obtained from the State of Virginia which have been replaced by a vast bridge-tunnel project across lower Chesapeake Bay.

That project once started just as yours—as an experimental ferry service. Its place in the transportation system was quickly demonstrated. It grew and eventually the need outpaced the capacity of a ferry system. Now a more extensive facility is in operation. It may well be that history will repeat here. This may be the forerunner of an eventual direct highway connection across Delaware Bay.

Many of us have long been fascinated by the developing system of ocean highways along the Atlantic coast. Such links as the Garden State Parkway, the Long Island Parkways, and the highways of New England have made possible great stretches of available routes for travelers who enjoy the sight and proximity of the ocean.

Water barriers still hamper the full realization of an ocean route from Maine to Florida, but they are becoming fewer each year. The Virginia bridge and tunnel, the Narrows bridge in New York, and many other projects now exist.

This kind of facility—boldly conceived to open up new economic and social opportunities—involves the kind of local, State, and Federal cooperation which President Johnson has earnestly asked for to serve our great society.

The highway between Rehoboth and Ocean City, Md., opened in the late 1930's is an excellent example of how a highway can promote new kinds of community relationships, stimulate economic growth and help provide additional recreational opportunities.

The administration is fostering this kind of highway development in its program for Appalachia, the economically underdeveloped regions in the Appalachian mountains.

We are dedicating a facility catering to the vast, heavily populated region of the northwest corridor of the United States. This immediate area is one of the world's most popular playgrounds for the millions of families along the eastern seaboard.

As this region continues to prosper in the future, Federal, State, and local authorities must cooperate closely for transportation development. The planning studies undertaken by the highway department in cooperation with the Bureau of Public Roads are examples of what is being done. Federal aid to mass transportation, for which Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS deserves major credit, is another factor. The tireless leadership of the Johnson administration and Senator WILLIAMS and his colleagues in Congress has finally resulted in a transit bill being approved by both Houses of Congress.

A further step will be the growth of transportation services to supply high-speed movements of persons between the major urban centers of the region. The Department of Commerce has been charged with the responsibility for developing the plan for this service in the urban regions of the Northeast.

Transportation is vital to the social, economic, and recreational well-being of this great area. The ocean highway should be one part of a comprehensive program, evolved through the cooperation of all governmental levels.

I share your faith in the future development of this region—your desire to make it a better place to live and work—and to improve the access to its unparalleled resources for recreation.

I offer my congratulations and my best wishes.

Thank you.

CAPE MAY-LEWES FERRY

(By William P. Frank)

A ferry service does not begin in the drafting room of engineers nor in the swank offices of financiers. It begins, rather, in the imagination of men who want to get from one land base to another, across a body of water, in as straight a line as possible—and as quickly as possible.

This is how the Cape May-Lewes ferry began—back in the dawn of the histories of Delaware and New Jersey. From earliest days of colonization, men figured that the Delaware Bay and Atlantic Ocean could either be a barrier between the two States or a common bond.

The opening of the Cape May-Lewes ferry today caps the climax of dreaming, thinking and planning on how to bridge the barrier and establish what a New Jersey Governor recently called "the betrothal of our two States."

Even before the coming of the Dutch, Swedish, and English explorers in our area, the Indians ferried themselves across from one cape to another in their flimsy canoes. They didn't have to depend upon traffic studies to convince them of the importance of getting from one shore to the other.

The European settlers who followed them did likewise, although their craft was a lot more safe and dependable.

In the days before the Civil War, steamers would come down from Philadelphia, touch at Delaware ports, such as New Castle and Wilmington, and then proceed toward Cape May for weekend jaunts and summer holidays.

In the latter part of the 19th century and early 20th century, railroads and steamship companies combined their efforts to transport pleasure seekers across the Delaware Capes. That service died, but the dream of linking the two States with a ferry line did not fade. Men of southern Delaware and southern New Jersey stood on the shores of their respective States and in their minds' eyes could see a ferry service that would be beneficial to the entire area.

The only questions were—and they were major questions: How and who would start such a service?

Studies were made in the middle 1950's with great hopes that refused to be squelched by cynics and pessimists. Then came the big break which, oddly enough, grew out of a dispute between Delaware and New Jersey over the future of the Delaware Memorial Bridge.

In 1955, Gov. J. CALEB BOGGS, of Delaware, and Gov. Robert B. Meyner, of New Jersey, began conversations about the mutual problems of their respective States. As they discussed the future of the Delaware Memorial Bridge, they also began to talk about the ferry.

In the meantime, business and civic leaders of southern Delaware and southern New Jersey actively promoted the idea of a Cape May-Lewes ferry. They kept alive the plan which often faced defeat. It frustrated them that they were so close—and yet so far away with the absence of an agency that could bring them together.

Eventually, through intelligent understanding and a willingness to be partners in crossings of the Delaware River and Bay, the two States worked out a compact agreeable to the legislatures and the Governors.

So was born the 10-member Delaware River and Bay Authority, with blessings of the two States and the Congress. It had a directive to build other bridges across the Delaware and also establish a ferry between Cape May and Lewes.

Despite opposition in some quarters, the Governors of the two States—Elbert N. Carvel, of Delaware, and Richard J. Hughes, of New Jersey—worked together in harmony along with the authority representatives of their States.

From the time the authority was activated in February of 1963, its members proceeded with dispatch to establish the Cape May-Lewes ferry. It was visualized as "the missing link" in a route between New England and Florida and a stimulus in travel between central and southern Delmarva Peninsula and southern New Jersey.

Four ferries of the Kiptopeke-Cape Charles Virginia, line were purchased for $3,300,000. The vessels were refurbished and renamed in keeping with the Delaware-New Jersey "bethrothal."

And so after many years of dreaming and planning the 16-mile expanse of water between Lewes and Cape May is spanned. The Delaware Bay is no longer a barrier, it is now a bond between two States.

URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1964

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 6) to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administration to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems, both public and private, in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

I support S. 6, as amended, and passed by the House of Representatives on June 25. I urge the Senate to approve the House amendment without a conference. The differences in the House bill over the

Senate bill are not of earth-shaking importance. We can live with them. I believe the Senate should accept the House version.

I have prepared a memorandum showing the principal differences between the Senate and House versions of the mass transit bill. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, much of the debate this afternoon has seemed to follow a course as if we were passing a brandnew bill. That is not the situation. We are calling for action on a bill that has previously passed the Senate by a good margin, and then went to the House, where a complete substitute amendment was added.

Many Senators who have spoken against the bill ought to be pleased that the House cut in half the amount of the Federal funds involved. I refer to the deletion of the provision relating to guaranteed bonds, which the Senate bill originally contained.

I digress for a moment to pay my respects to the able junior Senator from New Jersey, who has handled the bill from the beginning. He was very active in the subcommittee in the course of the hearings, in developing evidence that the committee ought to have, and in fighting for the legislation over the years. I pay tribute to the Senator from New Jersey for the excellent work he has done.

The first mass transit bill was passed by the Senate in 1960. However, no action was taken by the House of Representatives. Again in 1961 we passed legislation on mass transit as part of the housing bill of that year. That legislation placed mass transit on a temporary basis. It was agreed to by the House after a conference. That law went into effect, and studies of experimental projects were made throughout the country with the assistance of Federal loans and demonstration grants.

In 1962, the Banking and Currency Committee reported a comprehensive mass transit bill to the Senate but held up its passage waiting for the House. When it became apparent that the Congress would take no action the Senate and the House reached an agreement whereby we would merely extend the temporary program for another year.

In April 1963, the Senate passed this bill. That made it 4 consecutive years that the Senate voted favorably on some aspects of mass transportation legislation.

I could take up many of the things that have been said about the bill and explain them; but all of it has been hashed over, not once, not twice, but four different times. The Senate has acted favorably three times on extensive bills and one other time to extend the existing program.

All that is being asked now is that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

Passage of this legislation by the House of Representatives is a milestone in good legislation and a great victory for the cities of America. This bill was conceived in order to help local transit overcome the traffic congestion that is paralyzing our cities. Every city in the country is caught between rising costs and declining patronage resulting in fares going higher and higher. Consequently, more and more people are using private automobiles which compounds the problem and creates considerably more congestion in the cities. This is a vicious circle. The cities have long recognized this but have been unable to do anything about it. They have appealed to the Federal Government for assistance and, at long last, the Congress has realized the significance of this problem and is about to pass legislation to do something about it.

Mr. President, the problems which this bill seeks to solve affect every one of us. It affects the millions of people who use mass transit daily; it affects those who find that driving their own cars becomes more difficult every day as traffic jams become worse and parking more difficult; it affects the whole Nation because our cities account for most of the business activity of the country and anything that makes them inefficient hampers our national growth; and, finally, it affects all of us who recognize that unsolved traffic and transit problems weaken local government and reduce the tax revenues on which they depend.

The passage of legislation this year will complete 4 years of effort on the part of the Congress to provide relief which the cities so badly need. During these 4 years, after many days of hearings and many hours of debate in both Houses of Congress, we have developed legislation which, with the exception of a few minor differences between the bill as passed by the Senate and amended by the House, represents the consensus of the Congress.

Mr. President, there are a few differences between the Senate and House versions which I find have no real significance. They can be reduced to three principal differences and a number of minor ones which, I believe, will in no way impair the effectiveness of the bill as passed by the Senate.

Mr. President, I feel that there are three principal issues before the Senate in deciding whether to approve the House-passed bill. One involves the question of guaranty of revenue bonds, which provision was not included in the House-passed bill, but which is in the bill as passed by the Senate. Another involves the buy American provision which is included in the House-passed bill, but which is not included in the Senate bill. The third involves the difference in the language of the labor provision in each bill.

Regarding the guarantee of revenue bonds, the bill as passed by the Senate would authorize the Federal guarantee of $375 million or revenue securities issued by public bodies but subject to Federal income taxation. The bill required that the Administrator was to first determine whether the guarantee provisions would satisfy the financial needs of a community before he would be permitted to make grants or direct loans.

All of us know that the big push behind this amendment was to satisfy the needs of a few communities on the west coast. One city in particular was operating under a State law which made it necessary to use the bond guarantee approach. Since passage of the bill by the Senate in 1963, however, I learned that the State of California has passed a new law for southern California which removes the necessity for the bond guarantee method.

Another provision which I feel represents a principal difference between the bills as passed by the Senate and House is the "buy American" provision which is included in the House-passed version of S. 6.

Section 9(c) of S. 6 as passed by the House would require that:

> All contracts for construction, reconstruction, or improvement of facilities and equipment in furtherance of the purposes for which a loan or grant is made under this act shall provide that in the performance of the work the contractor shall use only such manufactured articles as have been manufactured in the United States.

This provision attempts to assure that American made products are used in projects assisted with a loan or grant made under the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964.

I have no quarrel with this overall objective and I believe that most Members would support it in principle. However, the provision as contained in the House-passed bill is much more restrictive than the usual "buy American" provision regarding the purchase of goods financed with Federal funds. I am sure that some Members would object to such a restrictive provision primarily because of the precedent it sets. However, I have studied this matter and have concluded that it is not a serious matter as it would affect the administration of this act.

I believe there are a number of points that should be taken into consideration in deciding what its impact would be upon this program. In the first place, it does not appear that the House intended that foreign manufactured products or foreign articles which may be components of American products be entirely prohibited.

The purpose of the amendment is to assure maximum employment of American labor on projects assisted with funds provided by the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964. This purpose is not furthered if this provision is applied in so literal a fashion as to preclude this undertaking or completion of a project which is dependent upon the use of foreign-made products which cannot be acquired in the United States.

The House amendment simply requires that if a product needed for a project is produced in the United States, the American product must be bought without regard to the price advantage that might accrue by using a foreign made product. However, if a needed product is not available in the United States, this amendment would not preclude the purchase of a foreign product.

If the purpose of the amendment is kept in mind, it is clear that the use of foreign materials or manufactured articles as components of American products is also not prohibited. Clearly, if the components of the American products are not available in the United States, it is permissible, within the intent of this provision, to use a foreign component.

In addition, it may not be possible, in an intricate piece of machinery having many, many component parts, to practicably assure that every screw, every nut, every bolt, every can of oil, every coat of paint, is an American product.

This provision does not require the impossible. One cannot practicably determine that in the manufacture of intricate, sophisticated machinery, some foreign articles have not been included, or used to construct the completed product.

The House amendment simply requires that to the extent substantial components of the completed product can reasonably be identified, and procured from American manufacturers, this must be done.

The other matter which I should like to call to the attention of the Senate is the language of the labor provision in the House bill. On the surface, the language of the Senate version looks different from the House version, but a deeper analysis boils it down to one basic issue.

The Senate would have labor's rights under the bill protected by arrangements made by the HHFA Administrator in concurrence with the Secretary of Labor. The House would place the complete responsibility for this in the Secretary of Labor.

Now, Mr. President, I am sure we can find those who would support one or the other. However, in considering this matter, the House of Representatives had in mind the technicalities of labor legislation properly rested in the hands of the Secretary of Labor and not in the hands of the HHFA Administrator. Therefore, in considering this change, I, for one, feel this is a decided improvement, and I concur completely in the House action.

I will not take the time of the Senate to review the several minor differences between the two bills only to say that several of them were conforming changes made as a result of the deletion by the House of the bond guaranty section of the bill.

Beyond that, the House did not include several items which were in the Senate bill as a result of further study of these matters by the House Banking and Currency Committee which felt that many of these provisions were unnecessary and would be unduly restrictive in the administration of the program and that existing law and regulations would take care of matters of this sort.

For example, the Senate bill required the Administrator to approve a schedule of fares that would be economically sound and to watch over that schedule of fares to make sure that no change was made in it which would impair the economic soundness of the project. The House committee felt that the Administrator already had such authority and that the effect of the Senate provision would be to involve him too deeply into local affairs.

Mr. President, I believe that S. 6 as amended and passed by the House is a good and effective bill, and I hope that the Senate will accept it.

EXHIBIT 1

URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION BILL OF 1964—DIFFERENCES BETWEEN H.R. 3881, AS PASSED BY THE HOUSE AND S. 6, AS PASSED BY THE SENATE

1. GUARANTEE OF REVENUE BONDS

The Senate bill (secs. 5 to 12) would authorize the Federal guarantee of up to $375 million of transit revenue securities, issued by local public bodies but subject to Federal income taxation. The Administrator would be authorized to make grants or direct loans only where he determines that these guarantee provisions "would not provide the financial assistance required by the applicant." (Apparently, loan guarantees are intended to be used along with grants, in projects where such use will reduce the need for grants.) The guaranteed securities would have to be reasonably assurable of repayment from transit revenues, be amortized over not more than 40 years, bear whatever interest rate the market establishes, and be issued in connection with projects for which at least 25 percent of the "financing" is by "bonds and securities not guaranteed under this act."

To the extent that guaranteed securities would otherwise be in default, regular debt service payments to the security holders would be made from a Transit Revenue Bond Guarantee Fund. Appropriations to the fund would be authorized as needed to make such payments. The local public body issuing the defaulted securities would in turn give the fund a note, at an interest rate one-fourth higher than that of the defaulted issue, payable from any revenues available after all earlier issues had been retired.

The House bill contains no comparable provisions.

2. BUY AMERICAN PROVISIONS

The House bill (sec. 9(c)) would require that all "contracts for construction, reconstruction, or improvement of facilities and equipment" receiving loan or grant assistance shall provide for use only of "such manufactured articles as have been manufactured in the United States." The legislative history indicates that even component parts of articles are subject to the provision.

The Senate bill contains no comparable provision.

3. PROTECTION OF MASS TRANSPORTATION COMPANY EMPLOYEES

The House bill (sec. 10(c)) would require, as a condition to any assistance, that fair and equitable arrangements, as determined by the Secretary of Labor, be made to protect the interests of "affected" employees. These arrangements would have to include—(A) such provisions as are necessary for (1) preservation of rights, privileges, and benefits (including pension rights) under existing collective bargaining agreements or otherwise; (2) the continuation of collective bargaining rights; (3) the protection of individual employees against a worsening of their position with respect to their employment; (4) assurances of employment to employees of acquired systems and priority of reemployment of employees terminated or laid off; and (5) paid training or retraining programs; and (B) provisions (whether or not otherwise required under (A)) for protection of individual employees against loss of employment or reduction in pay which provide benefits at least equal to those established pursuant to section 5(a)(f) of the Interstate Commerce Act (which in effect assures that employees terminated or displaced from their old jobs will be assured of a continuation of their current wage-income for up to 4 years).

The Senate bill (sec. 19(c)) is substantially identical except that determinations as to what are "fair and equitable" arrangements would be made jointly by the Secretary of Labor and the Housing and Home Finance Administrator, rather than solely by the Secretary.

Note.—Both bills also contain regular Davis-Bacon prevailing wage requirements (secs. 10 (a) and (b) in the House bill, and secs. 19 (a) and (b) in the Senate bill).

4. RESTRICTION ON ACQUIRING OR COMPETING WITH EXISTING PRIVATE COMPANIES

The Senate bill (sec. 3(b)(1)) would prohibit acquisition of the facilities or other property of a private mass transportation company, or the improvement of facilities acquired from such a company after the effective date of the act, unless (1) the company has been declared bankrupt or is in receivership, or (2) the requested assistance is essential to a program for the acquisition of facilities or property supplementary to those provided by an existing publicly owned or operated system.

Also, the Senate bill (sec. 3(b)(2)) would prohibit financial assistance for facilities or equipment to be used in competition with, or supplementary to, service provided by an existing private company unless the Housing Administrator finds that (1) such assistance is essential to the comprehensively planned transportation program for the area, and (2) the program provides for the maximum feasible participation of private companies.

The House bill (sec. 3(c)) would apply less strict requirements in cases involving acquisition or improvement. It would prohibit acquisition, improvement, competition, or supplementation unless the Administrator finds that (1) such assistance is essential to the comprehensively planned transportation program for the area; (2) the program provides for the maximum feasible participation of private enterprise; (3) just and adequate compensation, to the extent required by applicable State and local laws, will be paid to companies for acquisition of their franchises or property; and (4) the Secretary of Labor certifies that the project complies with the labor-protective provisions of section 10(c).

5. CONTROL OF FARES ON GRANT-ASSISTED PROJECTS

The Senate bill (sec. 13(c)) would require the Administrator to determine whether a proposed fare schedule was "economically sound" in his estimate of the "net project cost" of a grant-assisted project. If, while revenue obligations for such a project were outstanding, the approved schedule was changed and the Administrator determined that the change "will substantially reduce revenues * * * and lessen the chances for an economically sound operation," no assistance "under any law administered by the Housing and Home Finance Agency" could be granted for any project in "such (urban) area" until the Administrator determined that changes had been made to permit an economically sound operation.

The House bill contains no comparable provision, but contains a provision prohibiting the Federal regulation of rates, as explained in item 6 below.

6. PROHIBITION AGAINST FEDERAL REGULATION OF CHARGES OR OPERATIONS

The Senate bill (proviso in sec. 11) would prohibit the Administrator from regulating "in any manner the mode of operation of any mass rapid transit system or the rates, fares, tolls, rentals, or other charges fixed or prescribed by any State, local public body, or agency thereof."

The House bill (sec. 9(f)) would specify that the Administrator is not authorized, after a grant is made, "to regulate in any manner the mode of operation of any mass transportation system with respect to which a grant is made under section 3 or, after such grant is made, to regulate the rates, fares, tolls, rentals, or other charges fixed or prescribed for such system by any local public or private transit agency," but is authorized to require compliance with undertakings furnished by an assisted agency as part of its grant application.

7. MAXIMUM LOCAL TAX RELIEF FOR ASSISTED PRIVATE COMPANIES

The Senate bill (sec. 3(c)) would require that before a local public agency could obtain Federal financial assistance in assisting a private transportation company, it must first have "afforded the company every feasible relief, compatible with * * * [its] * * * own fiscal responsibilities, including, but not necessarily limited to," relinquishment of real and personal property taxes and franchise taxes.

The House bill contains no comparable provision.

8. DIRECT LOAN INTEREST RATE FORMULA

The Senate bill (sec. 3(e)) would change the formula for determining the rate of interest on funds borrowed from the Treasury to make mass transportation loans. The new formula would be based on the average yield of all outstanding marketable Government obligations of comparable maturities and would result in a lending rate from one-half to 1 percent higher, depending on the maturity of the issue, than in the present loan program.

The House bill (sec. 3(b)) would continue the Treasury borrowing formula presently applicable in the transportataion loan program (and in the regular public facility loan program to which it is related, through the provisions of sec. 203 of the Housing Amendments of 1955). This formula is based on the average annual interest rate on all interest-bearing public-debt obligations, and presently produces a lending rate of 3⅞ percent.

9. STATE LIMITATION ON GRANT FUND

The Senate bill (sec. 18(f)) would limit the amount of capital grants per State to 12½ percent of the grant funds appropriated, plus up to an additional 1 percent from a 10 percent reserve fund. In applying this quota in the case of a project undertaken in two or more States, grants for the project could be allocated to any of the States involved.

The House bill (sec. 12) alows a straight 12½ percent to any State, but based on the aggregate grant authorization ($375 million) rather than on the grant appropriation.

10. PROHIBITION AGAINST REPLACEMENT RESERVES

The Senate bill (fourth sentence of sec. 13(a)) would require that the Administrator, in "determining net project cost" for any assisted project, shall not reduce the estimate of project revenues "by any amount to be allocated as a reserve for replacement of equipment or facilities."

The House bill contains no comparable provision.

11. PARTICIPATION BY SMALL BUSINESSES

The Senate bill (sec. 18(b)) would require the Administrator to develop, in cooperation with Small Business Administrator, a program to insure that small business concerns are given an equitable opportunity to share in all procurement aspects of assisted projects.

The House bill contains no comparable provision.

12. ADVANCE ACQUISITION OF PROPERTY

The Senate bill (second sentence of sec. 3(a)) would authorize financial assistance "for land and improvements acquired or constructed" in advance of their expected use, if there is assurance of repayment where the property is not in fact used as proposed "within a reasonable period of time."

The House bill contains no comparable provision.

13. CONSULTATION WITH THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

Both the House and Senate bills contain requirements (sec. 8 and 17(a), respectively) that the Housing Administrator and the Secretary of Commerce shall consult on general urban transportation policies and programs and exchange information on proposed projects.

The Senate bill (sec. 17(a)) adds specific requirements for cooperation with respect to the planning, financing, and construction of proposed projects in urban areas, including advance acquisition projects.

14. CONSULTATION WITH THE INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

The Senate bill (sec. 17(b)) would require the Housing Administrator to consult and cooperate with the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission with respect to projects affecting interstate transportation.

The House bill contains no comparable provision.

15. PUBLIC AVAILABILITY OF DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM DATA

The Senate bill (sec. 15(d)) would require grant contracts for technological research and development to include provisions to assure that "all information, uses, products, processes, patents, and other developments" from the project will be freely available to the general public. Exceptions could be made "in the interest of the national defense," and existing "background patents" would also be protected.

The House bill contains no comparable provision.

16. DEFINITION OF MASS TRANSPORTATION

The Senate bill (sec. 18(d)(5)) in defining "mass transportation" would exclude "aircraft or steamship service (other than ferrying service)."

The House bill (sec. 9(c)(5)) in defining "mass transportation" would exclude "school buses."

17. MAXIMUM USE OF PUBLIC TRANSIT AGENCY FUNDS

The Senate bill (sec. 3(c)) would prohibit Federal assistance to a public transportation company which has any "division or segment of its operations * * * operating profitably" unless the Administrator determines that a transfer of those profits "would not be compatible with the maintenance of a coordinated mass transportation system in the area."

The House bill contains no such specific provision. However, a similar result would be reached under section 4(a), which would allow grants only for that portion of project cost which cannot be financed from revenues. Under this provision all available local transit revenues would be considered, including revenues already accumulated in the form of reserves or unallocated profits.

18. PROTECTION OF FEDERAL INVESTMENT IN GRANT PROJECTS

The Senate bill (fifth sentence of sec. 13 (a)) would specify that the Administrator could make a grant for a transit project only if he determines that "(1) there exists a commitment from non-Federal sources to supply the remainder of net project cost, and (2) the Federal Government's interest in the project is adequately protected in the event of a default or a failure to complete such project."

The House bill contains no such specific provision. However, proper administration of the bill would in any case require that these conditions be met before grants are made.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, today is an important day, I believe, because shortly we will vote on and I hope complete congressional action on an urban mass transportation bill.

The Senate approved its bill, S. 6, on April 4 last year. From that date, until only a few days ago it has been a very discouraging situation for me and my colleagues from States with a high percentage of urban population because it seemed that this legislation would not get through the House.

But the House last week approved an amended version of our bill, one which I think should be accepted by the Senate so that we will not waste any more time before coming to the assistance or our urban areas.

Some of the opponents of an urban mass transportation program contend that it is special legislation to benefit primarily a handful of States, including the State I represent, Connecticut.

Admittedly there is a great need for improved mass transit facilities and services in our large metropolitan areas and I would expect a substantial share of any Federal assistance under a mass transportation program to go to them. And I might point out that my State almost without exception contributes much more in Federal revenues than it receives under the various Federal programs. So perhaps it is about time that Connecticut gets a fairer share of one program anyway.

The program that is proposed in the bill now before the Senate is a broad and diversified one, however, which takes fully into account the particular needs of urban communities of all sizes, in all sections of the country. So I do not think it should be criticized as being more beneficial to some States.

Federal assistance can go to small and medium sized cities which want to provide adequate bus service to their residents, for example, to keep transportation development in pace with urban renewal and the rapid growth of suburbs.

In Conneticut, Hartford, New Haven, Bridgeport, New Britain, and other cities are presently trying to cope with these difficult, indeed in some cases staggering, transportation problems. Undoubtedly a number of them would want to apply for Federal guidance and assistance. But so would many other small and medium sized cities throughout the country.

Federal assistance under this bill can also go to large metropolitan areas, including those overlapping the borders of one or more States as New York City does.

Needless to say I am especially interested in this specific situation because the commuter problem is so acute in my State.

One of the primary reasons for the financial difficulties of the New Haven Railroad is the fact that running commuter trains into New York City is a losing proposition. But the New Haven must continue to do this, despite the assurance of financial loss each year, because thousands of people who live in Connecticut need and depend upon this transportation to get to work every day.

To illustrate what might be accomplished once an urban mass transportation program is put into operation, I would like to cite a project worked out several years ago by the Tri-State Transportation Committee, in which Connecticut, New Jersey, and New York participate.

The objectives of this plan was to link up commuter train service from outlying areas in Connecticut with the New York intracity rapid transit system, with the addition of passenger train service over an alternative route into a station in Queens from which commuters would be able to make connections with the subways to other parts of the city.

This particular plan may never come to fruition, Mr. President, but it shows the possibilities that will be open once the Federal Government is in a position to help defray some of the large expenditures needed for facilities and equipment.

The urban mass transportation bill, in addition to making grants and loans available to various kinds and sizes of urban areas, also offers a variety of methods under which this assistance can be extended.

If the need for assistance is urgent, a city can apply for a grant or loan under the emergency provisions of the bill.

In cases where a city has more time in which to evolve a coordinated mass transportation plan, it can apply for assistance under the long-range program and thereby qualify for a larger Federal matching contribution.

One more important category of assistance relates to research, development, and demonstration projects, each of which will be of value in increasing our knowledge and experience in the urban transportation field.

It is regrettable that the House did not agree to the Senate loan guarantee program. A Federal guarantee of mass transportation loans would add greatly to our efforts to help communities, in effect it would have just about doubled the number of situations in which some kind of Federal help is available, and I can well understand the dismay of a number of my colleagues over this change.

But if we do not take a firm step forward in dealing with our urban transportation problems today, and who can predict with any certainty that we will pass any legislation this year if the Senate insists on keeping the loan guarantee provision in the bill, for example, there will be a continued and even greater deterioration of commuter transportation facilities than we face at present, one with which we may be unable to adequately cope at a later date.

We cannot and should not avoid this problem of how to provide adequate mass transportation services at a reasonable cost any longer.

Seventy percent of the American people live in urban areas, so the future of these mass transportation systems is of great concern to the majority of our population right now.

And it is certain that an even larger percentage will live in metropolitan and urban areas in the future. One reliable estimate is that 75 percent of a total population of 250 million will reside within urban areas by 1980.

Let us face up to our responsibilities to these people without further delay. I urge my colleagues to join with me in voting final congressional approval of this modest beginning.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I will yield back the remainder of my time, if the Senator from Texas will yield back the remainder of his time.

Mr. TOWER. We did, indeed, act on this bill before. I think it is wonderful, since we did not reject it earlier, that we have the opportunity to defeat the bill tonight.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Alabama to concur in the amendment of the House. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FULBRIGHT (when his name was called). Mr. President, on this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pell]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

Mr. MUSKIE (when his name was called). Mr. President, on this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold by vote.

Mr. MANSFIELD (after having voted in the affirmative). Mr. President, on this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I withdraw my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Ervin], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCarthy], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pell] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Bayh], the Senator from California [Mr. Engle], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy] are absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Edmondson] is necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Edmondson], the Senator from California [Mr. Engle], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCarthy] would each vote "yea."

*On this vote, the Senator from Montana [Mr. Mansfield] is paired with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen]. If present and voting, the Senator from Montana would vote "yea," and the Senator from Illinois would vote "nay."

*On this vote, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright] is paired with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pell]. If present and voting, the Senator from Arkansas would vote "nay," and the Senator from Rhode Island would vote "yea."

*On this vote, the Senator from Maine [Mr. Muskie] is paired with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy]. If present and voting, the Senator from Maine would vote "nay" and the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Fong], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Goldwater], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Pearson], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Saltonstall] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. Williams] is absent to attend the funeral of a friend.

If present and voting, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Pearson] would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott] is paired with the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Fong]. If present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "yea," and the Senator from Hawaii would vote "nay."

The pair of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen] has been previously announced.

The result was announced—yeas 47, nays 36, as follows:

[No. 456 Leg.]

YEAS—47

Anderson
Bartlett
Beall
Bible
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Case
Church
Clark
Dodd
Douglas
Gore
Gruening
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Hill
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Johnston
Keating
Kuchel
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
McGovern
McNamara
Metcalf
Monroney
Morse
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Randolph
Ribicoff
Russell
Smathers
Sparkman
Symington
Talmadge
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, Ohio

NAYS—36

Aiken
Allott
Bennett
Boggs
Byrd, Va.
Carlson
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dominick
Eastland
Ellender
Hickenlooper
Holland
Hruska
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Lausche
McClellan
McGee
McIntyre
Mechem
Miller
Morton
Moss
Mundt
Prouty
Proxmire
Robertson
Simpson
Smith
Stennis
Thurmond
Tower
Walters
Young, N. Dak.

NOT VOTING—17

Bayh
Dirksen
Edmondson
Engle
Ervin
Fong
Fulbright
Goldwater
Kennedy
Mansfield
McCarthy
Muskie
Pearson
Pell
Saltonstall
Scott
Williams, Del.

So Mr. Sparkman's motion to concur in the House amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the motion was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

---

*Live pair.

REIMBURSEMENT TO OWNERS AND TENANTS OF CERTAIN LANDS OR INTERESTS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate turn to the consideration of Calendar No. 1068, S. 1509. But, before the bill is laid before the Senate, may I say that there will be no more votes this evening. There are only two bills to which there is no objection that will be brought up. Then the Senate will stand in adjournment, unless some other Senator wishes to speak.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (S. 1509), to authorize reimbursement to owners and tenants of certain lands or interest therein acquired by the United States for certain moving expenses, losses, and damages, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committe on Government Operations with an amendment on page 4, line 2, after the word "Interior", to strike out "or (3) the Tennessee Valley Authority." and insert "(3) the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, or (4) the Tennessee Valley Authority."; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) except as otherwise provided by this Act, whenever any land situated within any State, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico or any possession of the United States, or any proprietary interest in any such land, is hereafter acquired by or on behalf of any executive agency by purchase, condemnation or otherwise, the head of that executive agency is authorized to reimburse the owners and tenants of such land or interest in land for any expense, loss, or damage directly and necessarily incurred by such owners or tenants in moving themselves, their families and their possession from such land to other places of residence or business to the extent that the head of such executive agency determines such reimbursement to be fair and reasonable. Such reimbursement may be in addition to, but not in duplication of, any payment to such owners and tenants otherwise authorized by law.

(b) The total reimbursement made under this Act to the owners and tenants of any parcel of land or interest therein shall in no event exceed 25 per centum of the fair value of such land or interest, as determined by the head of the executive agency making the payment.

(c) No payment under this Act may be made to any owner or tenant unless application therefor, supported by an itemized statement of the expenses, losses, and damages incurred, is submitted to the head of the executive agency within one year from (1) the date upon which the parcel of land or interest in land is to be vacated under agreement with the Government by the owner or tenant or pursuant to law, including, but not limited to an order of a court, or (2) the date upon which the parcel of land or interest in land involved is vacated, whichever first occurs.

Sec. 2. (a) The Administrator of General Services shall make such uniform rules and regulations as he determines to be necessary and proper to carry out the provisions of this Act. The head of each such executive agency concerned shall perform such acts and issue such orders and directives as he deems necessary to carry into effect the rules and regulations issued by the Administrator under this section. The head of each such executive agency may delegate the authority conferred upon him by this Act, including authority to make determinations and decisions, to any officer or employee of that agency.

(b) The provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act (60 Stat. 237, as amended; 5 U.S.C. 1001–1011) shall have no application to functions performed under this Act, except that the requirements of section 3 of the Administrative Procedure Act shall apply to the performance of those functions.

Sec. 3. Funds appropriated or otherwise available to any executive agency for the acquisition of real property or any interest therein shall be available also for obligation and expenditure to carry out the provisions of this Act.

Sec. 4. As used in this Act, the term "executive agency" means any executive department or independent establishment in the executive branch of the Government, including any wholly owned Government corporation, except that such term does not include (1) the Department of Defense or any military department thereof, (2) the Department of the Interior, (3) the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, or (4) the Tennessee Valley Authority.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 1509) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LOWER TETON DIVISION OF THE TETON BASIN PROJECT, IDAHO

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1069, Senate bill 1123.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title.

The Chief Clerk. A bill (S. 1123) to provide for the construction of the lower Teton division of the Teton Basin project, Idaho.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with amendments on page 3, at the beginning of line 2, to insert "all"; in the same line, after the word "in", to strike out "southern"; on page 4, line 9, after "(a)", to strike out "The Secretary is authorized to amend contracts heretofore made under the Acts of September 30, 1950, supra, and of August 31, 1954, supra, whereby the water users assumed an obligation for winter power replacement based on the winter water savings program at the Minidoka powerplant to relieve the contractors ratably by one-third of that obligation, and to make new contracts under these Acts on a like basis." and insert "The Secretary is authorized to amend contracts heretofore made under the Acts of September 30, 1950 (64 Stat. 1083), and August 31, 1954 (68 Stat. 1026), whereby the water users assumed on obligation for winter power replacement based on the winter water saving program at the Minidoka powerplant to relieve the contractors ratably by one-third of that obligation, and to make new contracts under these Acts on a like basis."; on page 5, after line 8, to strike out:

Sec. 5. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

Sec. 5. For a period of ten years from the date of enactment of this Act, no water from the project authorized by this Act shall be delivered to any water user for the production on newly irrigated lands of any basic agricultural commodity, as defined in the Agricultural Act of 1949, or any amendment thereof, if the total supply of such commodity for the marketing year in which the bulk of the crop would normally be marketed is in excess of the normal supply as defined in section 301(b)(10) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, unless the Secretary of Agriculture calls for an increase in production of such commodity in the interest of national security.

And, after line 23, to insert a new section, as follows:

Sec. 6. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the construction of the Lower Teton Division of the Teton Basin Federal Reclamation project $53,000,000 (1963 prices) plus or minus such amounts, if any, as may be required by reason of changes in the cost of construction work of the types involved therein as shown by engineering cost indexes and, in addition thereto, such sums as may be required to operate and maintain said unit.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in order to assist in the irrigation of arid and semiarid lands in the upper Snake River Valley, Idaho, to provide facilities for river regulation and control of floods, to utilize the hydroelectric power opportunities created thereby, to enhance recreation opportunities, and to provide for the conservation and development of fish and wildlife, and for other purposes, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to construct, operate, and maintain the Lower Teton division of the Teton Basin Federal reclamation project. The principal engineering features of the said project shall be a dam and reservoir at the Fremont site, a pumping plant, powerplant, transmission facilities, canals and water distribution facilities, ground water development, and related facilities in the upper Snake River Valley, Idaho. In the construction, operation, and maintenance of the said project and project works, the Secretary shall be governed by the Federal reclamation laws (Act of June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. 388), and Acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto) and the project shall be operated consistent with the existing agreements as to storage rights in the Federal reclamation reservoirs in the upper Snake River Basin.

Sec. 2. The period provided in subsection (d) of section 9 of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939, as amended, for repayment of construction costs properly allocable to any block of lands and assigned to be repaid by the irrigators may be extended to fifty years, exclusive of a development period, from the time water is first delivered to that block, or as near that number of years as is consistent with the adoption and operation of a repayment formula as therein provided. Costs allocated to irrigation in excess of the amount determined by the Secretary to be within the ability of the irrigators to repay within a fifty-year period shall be returned to the reclamation fund from revenues derived by the Secretary from the disposition of power generated at all Federal projects in Idaho.

SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary is authorized as a part of the Lower Teton division to construct, operate, and maintain public recreation facilities including access roads, to acquire or to withdraw from entry or other disposition under the public land laws such adjacent lands or interests therein as are necessary for present and future public recreation use, and to provide for public use and enjoyment of the land and water areas of the project in a manner consistent with the other project purposes. The Secretary is authorized to enter into agreements with State or local public agencies or other public entities for the operation, maintenance, or additional development of project lands or facilities or to dispose of project lands or facilities to State or local agencies or other public entities by lease, exchange, or conveyance, upon such terms and conditions as will best promote their development and operation in the public interest for recreation purposes. The costs of the undertakings described in this section, including costs of investigation, planning, Federal operation, and maintenance and an appropriate share of the joint costs of the Lower Teton division, shall be nonreimbursable.

(b) The Secretary may make such reasonable provision in connection with the Lower Teton division as, upon further study in accordance with the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (48 Stat. 401, as amended; 16 U.S.C. 661 et seq.) he finds to be required for the conservation and development of fish and wildlife. An appropriate portion of the cost of the development shall be allocated to fish and wildlife as provided in said Act and it, together with the Federal operation and maintenance costs allocated to this function, shall be nonreimbursable and nonreturnable under the reclamation laws.

SEC. 4. (a) The Secretary is authorized to amend contracts heretofore made under the Acts of September 30, 1950 (64 Stat. 1083), and August 31, 1954 (68 Stat. 1026), whereby the water users assumed an obligation for winter power replacement based on the winter water saving program at the Minidoka powerplant to relieve the contractors ratably by one-third of that obligation, and to make new contracts under these Acts on a like basis. To the extent such annual obligations are reduced, the cost thereof shall be included in the cost to be absorbed by the power operations of the Federal power system in southern Idaho.

(b) No construction shall be undertaken on facilities of the Lower Teton division which are required solely to provide a full water supply to lands in the Rexburg Bench area until the Secretary has submitted his report and finding of feasibility on this phase of the division to the President and to the Congress.

SEC. 5. For a period of ten years from the date of enactment of this Act, no water from the project authorized by this Act shall be delivered to any water user for the production on newly irrigated lands of any basic agricultural commodity, as defined in the Agricultural Act of 1949, or any amendment thereof, if the total supply of such commodity for the marketing year in which the bulk of the crop would normally be marketed is in excess of the normal supply as defined in section 301(b)(10) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, unless the Secretary of Agriculture calls for an increase in production of such commodity in the interest of national security.

SEC. 6. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the construction of the Lower Teton Division of the Teton Basin Federal Reclamation project $53,000,000 (1963 prices) plus or minus such amounts, if any, as may be required by reason of changes in the cost of construction work of the types involved therein as shown by engineering cost indexes and, in addition thereto, such sums as may be required to operate and maintain said unit.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1127), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PROJECT

The Lower Teton division of the Teton Basin project is located in southeastern Idaho near the confluence of the Henry's Fork River and the Teton River, both tributaries of the Snake River. The division contains 151,400 irrigable acres of land of which about 114,000 acres are presently irrigated but needs supplemental water. The balance of 37,000 acres is presently dry land and will receive a full supply. This is the area that would be affected by the "surplus crop" amendment added to the bill by the committee.

The Lower Teton division will be developed in two stages, with facilities to supplement the water supply of the presently irrigated lands to be constructed under the initial stage. These facilities would consist of Fremont Dam, Reservoir, and powerplant on the Teton River, a conveyance system, and 40 ground water wells to supplement the available capacity of Fremont Reservoir. The second stage, consisting of works to serve the dry lands, is proposed for later construction.

The cost allocation as indicated in testimony before the committee was:

Cost allocation:	
Power	$6,960,000
Irrigation	38,151,000
Repaid by water user	20,635,000
Repaid by power	17,516,000
Flood control	6,850,000
Fish and wildlife	913,000
Recreation	73,000
Total cost	52,947,000
Benefit-cost ratio, 100 years	2.3-1

At the hearings on the bill on March 3, 1964, it was testified that historically this area has been adversely affected by periodic periods of drought and flood. The need for stabilization was vividly exemplified when in 1961 the region was a drought emergency area and that 6 months later the same counties were declared a flood disaster area. Floods in 1961 and 1962 caused hundreds of thousands of dollars in damage to homes, buildings, roads, bridges, and utilities as well as the land itself. Proper controls on these streams as envisaged in the project proposal would have stored these waters in the spring and made them available for irrigation during the late summer and early fall months when historically water is in short supply.

Further testimony before the committee indicated that the movement for the creation of the Teton Dam and Reservoir commenced more than 30 years ago when Dr. Meade, then Commissioner of Reclamation, made a survey of the Teton project. The disastrous flood of February 1962 dramatically reemphasized the need for the construction proposed and resulted in the completion of the feasibility report by the Bureau of Reclamation that has formed the basis for consideration of the measure by the committee.

The project proposal has the unanimous endorsement of all Idaho agencies including that of the congressional delegation and the office of the Governor.

COMMITTEE DISCUSSION

The measure was considered at length by the full Interior and Insular Affairs Committee in executive session.

The committee accepted several of the amendments that had been proposed by the Department of the Interior, but rejected the recommendation that the source of financial assistance to repay that portion of the costs that is beyond the ability of the irrigator to repay should be charged to the entire Bonneville power system.

The committee intends to schedule hearings at an early date when the entire matter of establishing a Columbia Basin account can be explored in depth. In the meantime it was the committee's decision that authorization of worthwhile projects should not be delayed until this determination can be made.

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, I am a cosponsor of a bill for this same purpose in the Senate. This proposal is truly a multiple-purpose project with flood control, supplemental irrigation, recreation, and power generation as features. It has the full support of the people of Idaho. The Governor and the State legislature have both given it complete endorsement.

In years of a heavy snowpack or where sudden spring thaws or exceptional early spring rains occur, the fast runoff from this drainage causes disastrous flood damages to the farms and towns downstream. These floodwaters are badly needed later in the season for irrigation and should be stored for such use. As an example, in the summer of 1961, the two counties, Fremont and Madison, where the project will be located, were declared in a drought emergency area but within 6 months, in February of 1962, floods from these same streams necessitated a designation of the same counties as a flood disaster area.

A development of multiple-purpose programs such as this which stabilizes our upstream watersheds constitutes the highest type and the most economical of all of our conservation efforts. It will pay out all costs within a reasonable period of time and will add immensely to the total economy of our State.

This is proposed on a two-phase operation. The first would consist of the Fremont Dam, reservoir, and powerplant. The dam will be 310 feet high with a 315,000-acre-foot reservoir and the powerplant will have an installed capacity of 22,000 kilowatts. This storage provides supplemental irrigation water for some 114,000 acres in the Fremont-Madison Irrigation District.

The second phase of the project will not be constructed at this time until some water exchange proposals can be worked out. When completed a second phase of the project will have a 30-mile pump canal and a 28-mile gravity canal with the appurtenant works and about

100 ground water wells for irrigation at certain times when surface supplies are inadequate.

The Teton River is an excellent trout fishing stream and plans have been made to protect that sport to the fullest possible extent in this program. Water sports such as water skiing and swimming, also picnicking and camping all contribute recreational facilities so the full use of this beautiful spot near Yellowstone Park and the Grand Teton Mountains may be thoroughly enjoyed.

We find that in most of these high mountain valleys such as this basin, there is usually an excellent climate, rich mountain loam soil capable of producing fine crops, particularly alfalfa hay, potatoes, and feed grains. Most of these crops are not in surplus and are used in connection with the abundant forage which is grown in the adjoining mountains and used for the production and feeding of beef cattle, sheep, and dairy animals. With irrigation a stable productive economy will be built.

An early and proper stabilization of these watersheds is not only important to the local economy but to all of the farms, towns, and cities along the principal rivers all the way to the Pacific Ocean.

It is my wish that you as members of this subcommittee will give full and favorable consideration to this very worthwhile project so it may be developed before more disastrous floods or destructive droughts occur.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I join with my distinguished colleague in strongly recommending this bill to the Senate. In doing so, I express my appreciation to the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of the Senate, as well as the Subcommittee on Reclamation and Irrigation, for the speedy consideration that has been given this measure, for the prompt report to the Senate itself, which makes it possible for us to ask the approval of the Senate today for this most important Idaho project.

During the past 3 or 4 years, this region of my State has been subject to great fluctuations of alternating drought and flood. The floods have been the worst experienced in the history of the State. The droughts have also occasioned the need to declare a public emergency, and to seek sizable Federal aid. The Lower Teton Dam would help to correct both problems. By adding to the total storage capacity in our upstream reservoirs, it would help to protect against the problems of drought. Giving us our first effective flood control project on the Teton River would help greatly to ameliorate the hardship occasioned by these serious floods.

I do not know of a single river development project which has enjoyed such universal approval as this has. In recent years, our efforts to secure needed projects in Idaho have been burdened with controversy, and though the Senate has approved such worthy projects as Hells Canyon Dam and Burns Creek Dam, and though I personally have supported these projects, believing them to be in the public interest, nevertheless, the House of Representatives has not seen fit, thus far, to concur. Consequently, water development in southern Idaho has been stalemated for a number of years.

Happily, the Teton project is not fraught with this kind of controversy. It is a multiple-purpose project with benefits of flood control and irrigation, as well as the production of a modest amount of power, though little more than necessary for the needs of the project itself. Ultimately, it will not only mean supplemental irrigation water for land now being irrigated with an insufficient supply, but it will bring new land under irrigation as well. Thus, it unquestionably meets the criteria for multiple purpose development, so well established under our reclamation laws.

I am pleased to say that this project has the endorsement of the business community, the farm community, and the irrigation districts. It has been supported by my colleague, and it has enjoyed bipartisan support in the Senate. It has the approval of the Governor of the State and of both our Representatives in Congress. I know of no important group in Idaho that has taken a stand against it.

So, Mr. President, I urge the Senate to pass the bill. I do so in the hope that our action now may make it possible to secure the approval of the House of Representatives in this session. If that can be done, the comprehensive development of Idaho's water resources in the Upper Snake River Basin can commence again, and the future of our State, through the full utilization of our water, will be better assured.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (S. 1123) was passed.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

REMOVAL OF BILL FROM CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Calendar No. 909, the bill (S. 1790), a bill to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended, be taken off the calendar because the bill was passed by the Senate several days ago.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZATION FOR THE SENATE TO RECEIVE MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE AND FOR THE ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE TO SIGN BILLS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the adjournment or recess of the Senate today, the Secretary may receive messages from the House, and the President pro tempore or the Acting President pro tempore be authorized to sign bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES SALARY REFORM ACT OF 1964

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1063, the bill H.R. 11049, and that the bill be laid before the Senate and made the pending business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 11049) to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert new language.

"BLUNT WARNING BY 40 EARS"—MICROPHONES IN U.S. EMBASSY IN MOSCOW

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, the 40 microphones planted 10 years ago in our Embassy in Moscow by the Kremlin is a disaster for the American people and for the nations of the West. Most civilized people will consider this newly discovered, long-range thievery to be as bad as Stalin's theft of our atomic secrets soon after the so-called end of World War II, for it is a certainty that Khrushchev's line of peaceful coexistence now reveals itself to be a fraud based on conspiracy and deceit.

It is therefore heartening to read in the Washington Post and in the New York Times on May 25, 1964, a careful analysis of this latest piece of Communist perfidy, whereby vital U.S. diplomatic, military, and scientific secrets were stolen from us during those 10 fateful years.

Authored by Mr. A. N. Spanel, the founder of International Latex Corp., and presented by the company in paid newspaper space, as a public service, this editorial-advertisement, which is entitled "Blunt Warning by 40 Ears," should be carefully studied by foreign ministers and their staffs and by ambassadors and their assistants throughout the whole free world, with our own foremost among them.

I submit that Mr. Spanel and his corporation have again demonstrated, as in the past 25 years, their extraordinary patriotism and citizenship on behalf of our country and our allies; and for this they deserve highest recognition everywhere.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the article by Mr. Spanel be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BLUNT WARNING BY 40 EARS

(By A. N. Spanel, founder-chairman, International Latex Corp.)

Perfidy has been for so long a fixed element in the record and reputation of Soviet Russia that it has lost most of its earlier power to shock and anger its victims. Kremlin duplicities are by now accepted calmly, almost as if they represented a natural phenomenon.

Only that can explain the complacency with which the American public has received the State Department announcement that 40 microphones have been dug out of the walls of the U.S. Embassy in Moscow. But it is an ominous piece of news, one which we would do well to take seriously and ponder deeply.

The real danger is that, in our current eagerness to swallow Khrushchev's peaceful coexistence line, we may treat this latest evidence of Kremlin treachery too lightly—that we may ignore the grim warning it packs, for fear of disturbing the consolations of wishful thinking and self-delusion.

The discovery of the "bugging" of our Embassy, on a scale and for a duration without precedent even in the annals of Communist deceit, could be a blessing in disguise if it served to end the soporific myth that communism has changed its nature. It could be a reminder, perhaps in the nick of time, that the Red leopard, for all of Khrushchev's purring and meowing, hasn't turned into a pussycat.

WE HAVE BEEN WARNED

But if the reminder goes unheeded, if it does not compel us to reappraise the beguiling coexistence formula, we shall find ourselves more inextricably in the Soviet trap for America and the free world. We shall then be set up for another Pearl Harbor, this time of the nuclear variety.

Commonsense is our guarantee that if the Kremlin, for over 10 years has been eavesdropping on our Embassy staff, as well as on the conversations of visiting military men, scientists and foreign diplomats, Khrushchev has been playing diplomatic poker with us, with marked cards. Unfortunately the stakes in this game are nothing less than the future, the very survival, of America and the Western civilization of which it is a part.

Only the naive, the blind and the Communist-infected will minimize and wish away this decade-long exercise in treachery. It is their kind who once explained, in tones cultured and raucous, that we could do business with Hitler if only we "tried to understand the wave of the future."

The same voices are again being heard, pleading every imaginable argument with instant optimism dished up to whet our appetites for lucrative trade. There are, alas, too many in our Western World not only willing but eager to barter principles for the mirage of commerce with Communists, though a third of mankind is already in the bloody claws of Red tyranny. Under the spell of suicidal greed they close their eyes to the Kremlin's record of broken treaties. They forget that Moscow still refuses to pay even part of the $11 billion it owes the United States in war debts; on the contrary, they actually countenance plans for huge credits to the Communist lands.

WORLD AWAITS U.S. RESPONSE

The immediate question, of course, is what to do about this new proof of Soviet betrayal. First things first, it would probably be the best part of wisdom to dismantle the U.S. Embassy building in Moscow brick by brick. Our staff must be assured the privacy to which an Embassy is entitled by international law, tradition and civilized behavior. We might then build a new Embassy with clear American glass bricks, not on the present site but on the original plot of ground on Manezh Square from which our Embassy was ousted by Stalin in 1952. (It is noteworthy that at the time, the British Embassy was determined not to be budged, and they weren't.) Beyond that, our course in policy vis-a-vis the Kremlin must be geared to firmness based on a realistic understanding of the immoral essence of communism.

We have a useful precedent for firmness in an episode on March 23, 1962, between Soviet Russia and France. On March 18 France was negotiating the Evian agreements with the FLN, recognizing Algeria's independence on condition that the natives of that French territory would confirm by referendum that the majority desired it as the FLN claimed. General de Gaulle declared that if any nation recognized the FLN as speaking for a sovereign Algeria before such a referendum took place, it would risk a break of relations with France.

Moscow violated this reasonable stipulation by recognizing the FLN only 5 days later though the referendum had not yet taken place. In retaliation for this piece of arrogance, General de Gaulle at once recalled his Ambassador, Mr. Dejean, from Moscow and on March 23 demanded that Soviet Russia recall its Ambassador from Paris. One week later Mr. Vinogradov, the Soviet Ambassador, left France and was not permitted by General de Gaulle to return to his post until July 28, after the Algerian referendum had already taken place.

FIRMNESS, NOT DISUNITY

From that day until this, Khrushchev has behaved most respectfully toward France and its determined head of state, while he has not hesitated to vilify the United States, Germany, and England. For he knows that he can get away with any obscene method of downgrading and degrading us before the whole of mankind. Indeed, he has gotten away with much, much more than that.

Recently we had occasion to write in these columns that, inspired and supported by the Kremlin, "a Communist fortress, Cuba, stands at the very doorstep of our own country and serves as the staging area for the spread of the new barbarism to the entire American Hemisphere." Then we went on to say:

"The African Continent, having largely become independent, is racked by horrifying tribal warfare and many of the new countries are subjected to despotisms far worse than the worst exploitations of the colonial past. From Zanzibar to Ghana the agents of communism prowl for prey amidst the chaos. A Communist-armed and Communist-oriented Indonesia reaches out for empire in the South Pacific. India, as a reward for its naive neutralism, is menaced by Red China; and Pakistan, once a stanch ally against communism, finds comfort fishing in Communist waters. Nasser brazenly works both sides of the street yet our dollars continue to feed his sinister war machine and power-mad ambitions.

"The inventory of dissolution and defeat could be extended without end. The frontiers of freedom are shrinking and violence has the right-of-way. Yet the nations of the West are more disunited than ever, openly putting commercial profit above common purpose. Not only have our alliances been weakened but the objectives for which they were formed are fading from memory.

"Indeed, the free world could be competing for its own destruction under banners of nationalism which in essence reiterate the sick pronouncement made a century ago by a European statesman: 'We have no perpetual allies and we have no perpetual enemies, our interests are perpetual.'

"The very nations which thought they could do business as usual with Hitler are rushing to do business as usual with the Khrushchevs and Maos and Castros. The lessons of such recent history have been lost upon them. Those who thought they could buy peace by appeasing the Nazis—thereby making war inevitable—now unashamedly beg for the privilege of appeasing the Communists.

"Political leadership today," we ventured to warn, "is failing mainly because we have lost the compass of principle and are eager to compromise with evil."

The discovery of those 40 "ears" should bring the free world back to its senses, and especially our own country as its last bastion. Just as the microphones were built into the Embassy walls, perfidy is built into the Communist code of conduct; and the determination to bury us is built into the Communist ideology.

(Presented as a public service by International Latex Corp., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.)

NINETEENTH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF NATIONAL SECRETARIES ASSOCIATION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, although I was graciously scheduled to attend and speak before the 19th Annual National Secretaries Association Convention, in the Sheraton-Park Hotel, in Washington, on the evening of July 7, Senate duties unfortunately require me to be out of town on that date. Nevertheless, I feel that my colleagues should have the benefit of the information available to me in regard to this convention.

The National Secretaries Association—International—is the largest organization of business women in one profession in the world. Presently, there are 24,000 members in 550 chapters. There are chapters in all 50 States of the United States, 14 chapters in the Canadian Division, chapters in Mexico and Puerto Rico, and affiliate chapters in Finland and Panama.

The NSA was founded in 1942, to establish and improve secretarial standards. It is nonprofit, nonunion, nonpartisan, and nonsectarian, and is dedicated to a continuous program of education and professional improvement for all its members. The NSA sponsors the program for Certified Professional Secretaries—CPS, and promotes the designation of CPS as the recognized standard of proficiency in the secretarial profession. The NSA also sponsors the Future Secretaries Association, to help students prepare for business and particularly for secretarial work.

The convention will begin July 7, with an Open House, on Thursday evening, at which the international officers of NSA will be presented by U.S. Senators from their home States and by representatives of the New Zealand and Canadian Embassies. The U.S. legislators include the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG]. Had I been able to attend, it would have been my honor to present the international president of the National Secretaries Association, Mrs. Hazel A. Kellar, of Portland, Oreg.

The business part of the convention will start on Wednesday morning, July 8, at the Sheraton-Park Hotel, with the official theme of "Knowledge: Passport to Understanding." Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain of the U.S. Senate, will deliver the first invocation; and Dr. Albert Burke, scientist, economist, world affairs and TV lecturer, will deliver the keynote address, entitled "Education for What?" Approximately 1,500 delegates, alternates, and members of the NASA will attend the convention.

Once more, I express my disappointment at not being able to attend the convention. I wish the NSA the greatest success with its convention.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H.R. 11376) to provide a 1-year extension of certain excise-tax rates, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the Acting President pro tempore.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to, and (at 7 o'clock and 24 minutes p.m.) the Senate took an adjournment until tomorrow, Wednesday, July 1, 1964, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate, June 30, 1964:

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

John A. Schnittker, of Kansas, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

Arlon E. Lyon, of California, to be a member of the Railroad Retirement Board for the term of 5 years, from August 29, 1964. (Reappointment.)

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by Senate, June 30, 1964:

U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE

Dorwin W. Suttle, of Texas, to be U.S. district judge for the western district of Texas.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JUNE 30, 1964

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Psalm 34: 3: *O magnify the Lord with me and let us exalt His name together.*

Almighty God, whose inspiration and help are the supreme needs of our life, grant that we may be conscious of Thy all-pervading presence and sustaining power as we encounter the bewildering problems of each new day.

We pray that Thou wilt expand and enlighten our minds and hearts that they may be large enough to understand and comprehend Thy will and Thy love.

Guide the Members of this legislative body by Thy spirit as they take counsel together for the common good of all mankind and may we mobilize every moral and spiritual resource in behalf of a finer civilization.

Inspire us to believe in a social order in which men everywhere shall join hearts and hands in a great cooperative effort to establish peace and good will among men.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On June 9, 1964:

H.R. 1382. An act for the relief of John Gatzopi Overbeck and Mary Gatzopoulos Overbeck; and

H.R. 11201. An act making deficiency appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

On June 11, 1964:

H.R. 6876. An act for the relief of Capt. Wilfrid E. Gelinas, U.S. Air Force;

H.R. 7757. An act for the relief of Jesse I. Ellington;

H.R. 8222. An act for the relief of Edward J. Maurus;

H.R. 8348. An act for the relief of Mrs. Faye E. Russell Lopez;

H.R. 8532. An act for the relief of Ivan D. Beran;

H.R. 8828. An act for the relief of John T. Cox;

H.R. 8936. An act for the relief of Leonard M. Dalton;

H.R. 9475. An act for the relief of Miss Grace Smith, and others; and

H.R. 10078. An act for the relief of Philip N. Shepherdson.

On June 12, 1964:

H.R. 1727. An act for the relief of Richard G. Green, Jr.;

H.R. 5305. An act for the relief of Dr. Ernest P. Imle;

H.R. 5571. An act for the relief of Noble Frank Smith and his wife, Viola Smith;

H.R. 10774. An act for authorize the disposal, without regard to the prescribed 6-month waiting period, of cadmium from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile; and

H.J. Res. 889. Joint resolution commemorating the golden anniversary of the Naval Air Station, Pensacola, Fla., and authorizing the design and manufacture of a galvano in commemoration of this significant event.

On June 13, 1964:

H.R. 7332. An act granting the consent of Congress to a further supplemental compact or agreement between the State of New Jersey and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania concerning the Delaware River Port Authority, formerly the Delaware River Joint Commission, and for other purposes.

On June 24, 1964:

H.R. 1887. An act for the relief of Chang In Wu; and

H.R. 8964. An act for the relief of Diedre Regina Shore.

On June 25, 1964:

H.R. 9934. An act to authorize the construction of a dam on the St. Louis River, Minn.; and

H.R. 10465. An act to extend for a temporary period the existing provisions of law relating to the free importation of personal and household effects brought into the United States under Government orders.

On June 29, 1964:

H.R. 2818. An act for the relief of Elmer J. and Richard R. Payne;

H.R. 9220. An act for the relief of Elisabete Maria Fonseca;

H.R. 9720. An act authorizing a study of dust control measures at Lon Island, Port Isabel, Tex.;

H.R. 9964. An act to extend for 2 years the period for which payments in lieu of taxes may be made with respect to certain real property transferred by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its subsidiaries to other Government departments;

H.R. 10463. An act to continue until the close of June 30, 1965, the existing suspension of duties for metal scrap;

H.R. 10537. An act to continue for a temporary period the existing suspension of duty on certain natural graphite;

H.R. 11375. An act to provide, for the period ending June 30 1965, a temporary increase in the public debt limit set forth in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act; and

H.J. Res. 1056. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1965, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 9876. An act to amend the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act of 1961 by extending its provisions for 2 additional years and providing for a special project and study; and

H.R. 10314. An act to further amend the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended, to extend the expiration date of certain authorities thereunder, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 2434. An act to amend section 560 of title 38, United States Code, to permit the payment of special pension to holders of the Congressional Medal of Honor awarded such medal for actions not involving conflict with an enemy, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 10053. An act to amend section 502 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, relating to construction differential subsidies.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10433) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the House amendments to amendments of the Senate numbered 43 and 46 to the foregoing bill.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 388. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Nebraska Mid-State division, Missouri River Basin project, and for other purposes; and

S. 1186. An act to amend the act authorizing the Crooked River Federal reclamation project to provide for the irrigation of additional lands.

The message also announced that Mr. Jordan of Idaho had been appointed a conferee on the bill (S. 2) entitled "An act to establish water resources research centers at land-grant colleges and State universities; to stimulate water research at other colleges, universities, and centers of competence; and to promote a more adequate national program of water research" in place of Mr. Allott, excused.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 171]

Abele
Arends
Ashley
Avery
Bass
Bennett, Mich.
Buckley
Celler
Davis, Ga.
Derwinski
Dingell
Evins
Fascell
Glenn
Gray
Gubser
Healey
Hébert
Hoffman
Kee
Kilburn
King, Calif.
Kluczynski
Lankford
Lesinski
Lloyd
Long, La.
Macdonald
Michel
Miller, N.Y.
Morton
Murphy, N.Y.
Nelsen
Norblad
Patman
Pilcher
Pillion
Powell
Purcell
Rains
Robison
Roudebush
St Germain
Senner
Sheppard
Snyder
Staggers
Thompson, La.
Thompson, N.J.
Toll
Tuten
Whitten
Wilson, Bob

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 379 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

EXCISE-TAX RATE EXTENSION ACT OF 1964

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report to accompany H.R. 11376, to provide a 1-year extension of certain excise-tax rates, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1523)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11376) to provide a one-year extension of certain excise-tax rates, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"SEC. 3. LOSSES ARISING FROM CONFISCATION OF PROPERTY BY THE GOVERNMENT OF CUBA

"(a) TREATMENT OF LOSSES.—Section 165 (i) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to certain property confiscated by Cuba) is amended to read as follows:

"'(i) CERTAIN PROPERTY CONFISCATED BY THE GOVERNMENT OF CUBA.—

"'(1) TREATMENT AS SUBSECTION (c)(3) LOSS.—For purposes of this chapter, in the case of an individual who was a citizen of the United States, or a resident alien, on December 31, 1958, any loss of property which—

"'(A) was sustained by reason of the expropriation, intervention, seizure, or similar taking of the property, before January 1, 1964, by the government of Cuba, any political subdivision thereof, or any agency or instrumentality of the foregoing, and

"'(B) was not a loss described in paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (c),

shall be treated as a loss to which paragraph (3) of subsection (c) applies. In the case of tangible property, the preceding sentence shall not apply unless the property was held by the taxpayer, and was located in Cuba, on December 31, 1958.

"'(2) SPECIAL RULES.—

"'(A) For purposes of subsection (a), any loss described in paragraph (1) shall be treated as having been sustained on October 14, 1960, unless it is established that the loss was sustained on some other day.

"'(B) For purposes of subsection (a), the fair market value of property held by the taxpayer on December 31, 1958, to which paragraph (1) applies, on the day on which the loss of such property was sustained, shall be its fair market value on December 31, 1958.

"'(C) For purposes of section 172, a loss described in paragraph (1) shall not be treated as an expropriation loss within the meaning of section 172(k).

"'(D) For purposes of section 6601, the amount of any tax imposed by this title shall not be reduced by virtue of this subsection for any period prior to February 26, 1964.

"'(3) REFUNDS OR CREDITS.—Notwithstanding any law or rule of law, refund or credit of any overpayment attributable to the application of paragraph (1) may be made or allowed if claim therefor is filed before January 1, 1965. No interest shall be allowed with respect to any such refund or credit for any period prior to February 26, 1964.'

"(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply in respect of losses sustained in taxable years ending after December 31, 1958."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the title of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

Amend the title so as to read: "An Act to provide a one-year extension of certain excise-tax rates, and for other purposes."

W. D. MILLS,
CECIL R. KING,
HALE BOGGS,
JOHN W. BYRNES,
THOMAS CURTIS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

HARRY F. BYRD,
RUSSELL B. LONG,
GEORGE A. SMATHERS,
JOHN WILLIAMS,
FRANK CARLSON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11376) to provide a 1-year extension of certain excise-tax rates, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Amendment No. 1: This amendment adds a new section 3 to the bill, relating to retailers excise taxes.

Subsections (a) and (b) of section 3 would amend sections 4001 (relating to imposition of tax on jewelry and related items) and 4011 (relating to imposition of tax on furs) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. Under existing law the tax imposed by these sections is equivalent to 10 percent of the price for which the articles are sold at retail. Under the amendment the tax would be equivalent to 10 percent of the price for which so sold, to the extent such price exceeds $100.

Subsections (c) and (d) of section 3 would repeal subchapters C (relating to tax on toilet preparations) and D (relating to tax on luggage, handbags, etc.) of chapter 31 of the 1954 code.

Subsection (e) of section 3 would make technical amendments to reflect the changes made in the code by subsections (a), (b), (c), and (d).

Under subsection (f), the amendments made by section 3 would apply with respect to articles sold on or after the first day of the first month which begins after the date of the enactment of the bill.

The Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 2: Section 165(i) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 provides for income tax purposes that any loss of tangible property, if such loss arises from expropriation, intervention, seizure, or similar taking by the government of Cuba, any political subdivision thereof, or any agency or instrumentality of the foregoing, shall be treated as a loss from a casualty within the meaning of section 165(c)(3) of the code. Section 165(i) was added to the 1954 code by section 238 of the Revenue Act of 1964, approved February 26, 1964, and as so added was prospective in application only.

In general, the effect of Senate amendment No. 2 would be to revise section 165 (i) of the 1964 code to limit its application to individuals who were citizens or residents of the United States on December 31, 1958, to extend its application to intangible property, and to provide that it apply only to losses before January 1, 1964, of property held by the taxpayer and located in Cuba on December 31, 1958. In addition, under the amendment (1) a loss is required to be treated as having been sustained on October 14, 1960, unless it is established that it was sustained on some other day, (2) the amount of any loss is not to exceed the fair market value of the property on December 31, 1958, and (3) for purposes of the net operating loss deduction under section 172 of the code, a loss would be taken into account under the 3-year carryback and 5-year carryover rules rather than under the special 10-year carryover rules for expropriation losses as defined in section 172(k) of the code. Claims for refund or credit of any overpayment attributable to the application of the amendment may be made or allowed if claim therefor is filed before January 1, 1965, notwithstanding any law or rule of law. No interest is to be allowed on any overpayment for any period before January 1, 1965. For purposes of computing interest on underpayments of tax, the amount of tax is not to be reduced by virtue of the amendment for any period before February 26, 1964.

The amendment applies in respect of losses sustained in taxable years ending after December 31, 1958.

The House recedes with an amendment which makes technical and clarifying changes.

Amendment No. 3: This amendment adds a new section to the bill which would repeal the manufacturers excise tax on pens and mechanical pencils sold by the manufacturer, producer, or importer thereof on or after the first day of the first month which begins more than 10 days after the date of the enactment of the bill.

The Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 4: This amendment adds a new section to the bill which would repeal the manufacturers excise tax on lacrosse balls and sticks and on tennis and table tennis equipment sold by the manufacturer, producer, or importer thereof on or after July 1, 1964.

The Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 5: This amendment adds a new section to the bill which would provide an exemption from the manufacturers excise tax on musical instruments in the case of any musical instrument sold to a student in an educational institution if the instrument is to be used by the student in an orchestra, band, or similar organization sponsored by, or in a course of instruction offered by, such institution. The amendment would apply to sales of musical instruments made after the date of enactment of the bill to students of an educational institution.

The Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 6: Section 4231(6) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 imposes a tax equivalent to 10 percent of all amounts paid for admission, refreshment, service, or merchandise, at any roof garden, cabaret, or other similar place furnishing a public performance for profit, by or for any patron or guest who is entitled to be present during any portion of such performance. Under Senate amendment No. 6 the rate of tax would be reduced from 10 percent to 3 percent effective at 10 o'clock ante meridian on July 1, 1964.

The Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 7: Section 4231(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 provides the general rule for the tax on admissions. Under this section there is imposed a tax of 1 cent for each 10 cents or major fraction thereof of the amount in excess of $1 paid for admission to any place. In the case of a season ticket or subscription for admission, the tax is computed on the excess of $1 multiplied by the number of admissions provided by the season ticket or subscription. Under Senate amendment No. 7, there would be imposed (in lieu of the existing tax) a tax equivalent to 5 percent in respect of any admission to a live dramatic or musical performance presented in a theater, or presented in any other place if the presentation of such performance is the principal activity being conducted in such place at the time of such admission. The amendment would apply only with respect to amounts paid, on or after the first day of the first month which begins more than 10 days after the date of the enactment of the bill, for admissions on or after such first day.

The Senate recedes.

W. D. MILLS,
CECIL R. KING,
HALE BOGGS,
JOHN W. BYRNES,
THOMAS CURTIS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. **MILLS** (interrupting reading of the statement of the managers on the part of the House). Mr. Speaker, I think we can save some time if the House will agree to dispense with further reading of the statement, with the understanding that the gentleman from Wisconsin and I will explain the conference report fully.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. **MILLS**. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the conference committee has agreed to the House version of the Excise-Tax Rate Extension Act with one minor exception. Thus, the conference agreement which your House conferees bring back is the House passed bill with this one minor, non-excise tax, amendment which has a negligible effect on revenue. The House conferees succeeded in prevailing upon the Senate conferees to eliminate all of the amendments of the other body which would have provided for excise-tax reductions this year. The includes their amendments relating to retailers' taxes as well as the various manufacturers' excise taxes which they would have reduced or eliminated. This will give us time to study all our excise taxes and reach an appropriate and considered judgment on them after hearings and careful study. As you know, we presently are engaged in excise-tax hearings. We have received about 200 requests to be heard and we plan to hear witnesses on our whole Federal excise-tax structure.

The one Senate amendment which the conferees on the part of the House accepted relates to certain expropriation losses in Cuba.

Before the passage of the Revenue Act of 1964, the law provided that in the case of an individual, no loss deduction could be taken for an expropriation or similar taking of property by a foreign government unless the property was used in a trade or business or in the production of income.

The other body in its consideration of the Revenue Act of 1964, however, added a provision which would have made a loss deduction available in the case of the expropriation by Cuba of nonbusiness tangible property. Unfortunately, however, through an oversight, an appropriate effective date was not provided for this provision. As a result, the provision agreed to by the conferees on the Revenue Act of 1964 of necessity could have only prospective application. This, of course, does not cover the period at issue when Cuba was seizing property of Americans in Cuba.

In the floor statement on the conference report on the Revenue Act of 1964, I indicated that in future legislation we would be glad to consider an amendment applying this provision to the period which gave rise to this provision—namely, when Cuba was seizing American property in Cuba.

The amendment which your House conferees bring back does just that. It overcomes this effective-date problem as well as providing other improvements in the original amendment. This provision applies to losses sustained in taxable years ending after December 31, 1958. In addition, it provides that the expropriation or similar taking of property must have occurred before January 1, 1964.

The provision applies only to U.S. citizens or residents who had that status on December 31, 1958. For purposes of valuing the losses, the amendment also provides that generally the fair market value of the property is to be determined as of December 31, 1958. In addition, the loss in most cases is to be treated as sustained on October 14, 1960. This is the date the so-called urban reform law was adopted in Cuba, the law which permitted the nationalization of residential property. Taxpayers may still treat a loss as sustained on another date, however, if they can establish when the property was nationalized.

In order primarily to cover bank accounts, the provision applies to intangible as well as tangible property. No interest is granted on refunds for periods before February 26, 1964, nor will losses be treated as incurred before that time for purposes of the interest provisions.

Your conferees accepted this Senate provision with minor technical modifications.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is accurate to state that every Member of the House has just as much interest in excise-tax reduction and revision as does the other body and the public generally. I think that such reduction and revision should be on the basis of an orderly and complete review wherein each of our present excise taxes can be included and analyzed. Then we will be in a position to make recommendations to the House based on our considered judgment as to the changes that should be made.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to again impress on the House that there is $1.9 billion in revenue involved in this legislation. Since the legislation involves a continuation for another year, effective at midnight tonight, of the specified excise taxes, it is necessary that it be signed into law by midnight tonight. I would also like to point out that continuation of these rates has been taken into account in the budget figures for fiscal year 1965 as well as in setting the debt ceiling for the next fiscal year.

I urge adoption of the conference report which is largely a product of the House since it is in keeping with the House-passed bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES].

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I concur in the general explanation of the conference action as made by the chairman of our committee. As he reported, this bill is really the same bill that passed the House, with one rather minor technical amendment.

Under those circumstances, of course, I had no alternative except to sign the report of the committee of conference. It is the House bill. The extension of some of the taxes that are involved in this bill is certainly essential at this time. I think that the conference report should be adopted by this House. We have no alternative.

I would like to express, however, Mr. Speaker, a certain degree of regret that the majority members of the House conferees were so adamant in upholding the House position. It seems to me here, as in many other cases, we should be willing to compromise at least a bit in order to maintain proper comity and relationship with the other body. I would have hoped also that in addition to making a concession to the Senate, we might make a concession to the taxpayers of this country by doing something at this time about the retail excise taxes.

You will recall when this bill was before the House, I presented an amendment to phase out and repeal the retail excise taxes. The vote in the House was 185 for the amendment and 207 against, and it failed. But that is how close that vote was.

In the other body, however, an amendment for the outright repeal of these same retail excise taxes passed that body by a vote of 48 to 38.

Now why did we have to be so adamant about doing anything about these taxes that stand out as a sore thumb of inequity; and, that stand out as a sore thumb as far as the administrative problems created by them are concerned.

I do not think we had to be so adamant. Yet the majority membership of the House conference committee was adamant, and the Senate finally yielded on the basis that the House conferees had to file their report by last night in order that we could take up the general extension bill today and have it enacted before July 1.

What is the reason for our position? Why is it that we could not yield at all? Is it the $450 million of revenue that is involved? I hate to think, Mr. Speaker, that this country is going to rise or fall on the basis of this $450 million.

Is it the matter that these particular excise taxes, the taxes on jewelry, furs, cosmetics, luggage and ladies' handbags, have to be studied some more to find out how inequitable they are? Of course not; we know they are all inquitable.

But let me just point out one little thing in addition to what I told the House when we had this matter before us before. These retail taxes place an impossible burden on the small retail merchants in addition to the burden they place on the ladies of our Nation. Talk to any of your retailers handling any of these items. Talk to your druggists or anybody else who sells toilet articles. Talk to your local jeweler and ask them how much it costs to keep track of these items to find out each day which item is taxable and which item is not taxable, and in collecting the taxes and keeping the records and making quarterly reports and all the rest of it. They will tell you, I am sure, that the cost to them is in excess of a dollar a day to do that work. How many of these retailers are there in this country? There are at least about 1½ million of these people who have the burden imposed on them of collecting these taxes and keeping track of all these items.

At a cost of $1 a day for 300 days a year, that comes to $300 for each retailer. If we multiply that by 1½ million, we find that the expense of collecting this tax is as much as the $450 million involved in revenue in the Senate amendment. In fact, we could save these people more money than the Government collects in tax. In addition, this would relieve our ladies of the payment of at least $400 million on cost of things they buy on which we have put this discriminatory tax. That is why, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me the House very well could have made some concession in this area and could have moved down the road toward eliminating these obnoxious taxes.

Certainly I am going to vote for the conference report. I had hoped the House would make a start, by adopting an amendment to get rid of these retail excise taxes. After the Senate adopted the amendment, I had hoped our conferees might make some concession to the Senate and to our taxpayers. But they did not. So today we have no alternative, though it seems to me unfortunate. We must go along with the conference report. But I cannot go along with the conference report without at least expressing real disappointment that when we had the opportunity we did nothing.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. This is an interesting development. The House passed this bill and it went to the other body, where by a 10-vote margin—48 to 38—it adopted an amendment or amendments to the bill to strike out most of the wartime-levied excise taxes. Then Members of the other body went to conference and yielded that position, apparently without too much difficulty. I cannot help but wonder whether the other body is trying to get some political mileage out of this, whether the Members of the other body will now say, "Well, we tried to eliminate these obnoxious taxes, but when we got into conference our action on the floor did not prevail."

I am confused about this. I do not understand why conferees from the other body wilted so rapidly from the position they took toward repeal, and outright repeal. I agree with the gentleman from Wisconsin, and support him in his efforts to eliminate these war-levied excises.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. May I say to the gentleman that I cannot speak for any of the Senate conferees. I believe it will be interesting to read the debate which will take place in the other body in connection with the presentation of this conference report to the membership of the other body.

I will say, as to the position of the House managers, those members of the majority who were members of that conference were adamant. They insisted that they could not accept the Senate amendments with respect to repeal or reduction of the excise taxes. There is no question that that did take place. The chairman of the committee has expressed his reasons why. I differ with him. I do not believe that the reasons given sufficiently outweigh the benefits which would accrue if we had made some concessions to the Senate.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Arkansas yield?

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. With respect to the tax treatment in the conference report, dealing with the expropriation of American held property, is this to be limited strictly to property which was expropriated in Cuba, or will it relate to property which may have been expropriated in some country in South America? Will it be limited strictly to Cuba?

Mr. MILLS. The amendment is limited to properties expropriated in Cuba by the Government of Cuba.

Mr. GROSS. And it is retroactive in its effect to 1958. Is that correct?

Mr. MILLS. The gentleman is right.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMEND UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2664) to amend section 6(o) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act to provide an exemption from induction for the sole surviving son of a family whose father died as a result of military service, with a Senate amendment thereto and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That section 6(o) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act (50 App. U.S.C. 456(o)) is amended to read as follows:

"'(o) Except during the period of a war or a national emergency declared by the Congress after the date of the enactment of the 1964 amendment to this subsection, where the father or one or more sons or daughters of a family were killed in action or died in line of duty while serving in the Armed Forces of the United States, or subsequently died as a result of injuries received or disease incurred during such service, the sole surviving son of such family shall not be inducted for service under the terms of this title unless he volunteers for induction'."

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I have one question. Is this amendment or are the amendments adopted to this bill germane to the bill as it passed the House of Representatives?

Mr. VINSON. That is right.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD in explanation of the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, under the law today, a sole surviving son of a family in which one or more sons or daughters died while serving in the Armed Forces of the United States is exempt from induction. The existing law does not exempt a sole surviving son whose father died in service.

The bill, H.R. 2664, provides exemption from induction for the sole surviving son of a family whose father died as a result of military service.

The Senate agreed to the House bill insofar as extending the exemption to the sole surviving son of a father who died in service is concerned, but amended the bill to provide that all exemptions for sole surviving sons would not be applicable during a period of war or national emergency declared by Congress after the proposed legislation becomes law.

The net effect of the Senate amendment is that sole surviving sons will not be drafted in times of peace or during an emergency declared by the President, but sole surviving sons will be liable for induction in time of war or national emergency declared by the Congress after the proposed legislation becomes law.

AMEND MERCHANT MARINE ACT OF 1936

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 10053) to amend section 502 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, relating to construction differential subsidies, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

> Page 1, line 6, strike out "1964" and insert "1965".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I ask the same question I asked the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], namely, are all of the amendments to this bill germane to the bill as it passed the House?

Mr. BONNER. Yes. I will explain the amendment to you. It is merely that the subsidy provision expires tonight. This amendment changes the House bill from extending the subsidy 2 years to the Senate provision which extends it 1 year. So we agreed with the Senate and it will be an extension of 1 year.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A PROPOSED NEW AGREEMENT TO PROVIDE FOR COOPERATION IN THE EXCHANGE OF ATOMIC INFORMATION WITH THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION AND ITS MEMBER NATIONS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, and without objection was referred to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy:

To the Congress of the United States:

On May 16, 1964, the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, jointly recommended to me, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, a proposed new agreement to provide for cooperation in the exchange of atomic information with the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and its member nations.

The new agreement will supersede an existing agreement executed in 1955, and will do two things:

(a) It will extend the types of information which we can exchange with NATO. This expanded area of information is needed to enable our Allies to make effective use of nuclear delivery systems being provided them by the United States under bilateral procedures and agreements following creation of NATO atomic stockpiles in 1957.

(b) It will permit NATO member countries to share in information which the United States has hitherto been exchanging only with the NATO organization itself under the 1955 agreement. This will make these countries' role in alliance planning in the nuclear field more effective.

This new agreement thus represents a logical and useful step in our continuing and varied efforts to ensure wider Allied participation in NATO nuclear defense. Such wider participation is necessary on both military and political grounds. It is needed to enhance the effectiveness of NATO defense. On political grounds, it is needed to reinforce NATO cohesion by meeting our Allies' legitimate desire to make a constructive contribution to nuclear defense.

Therefore, I have authorized the Secretary of State to execute this new agreement between the Government of the United States and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and its member nations to provide for the cooperation relevant to the exchange of atomic information for NATO planning purposes.

In accordance with the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, I am submitting to each House of the Congress an authoritative copy of the signed agreement, together with a letter from the Secretary of State, a copy of the joint letter from the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission recommending my approval of the agreement, and a copy of my approval memorandum.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 30, 1964.*

ANNUAL REPORT OF ALIEN PROPERTY OFFICE FOR FISCAL YEAR 1963—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, and without objection was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am sending for the information of the Congress, the Annual Report of the Office of Alien Property, Department of Justice, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1963.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 30, 1964.*

THE CARNATION AS OUR NATIONAL FLOWER

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, my Colorado colleagues of the House and I have today introduced legislation to authorize the selection of the carnation as our national flower.

Undoubtedly, this vast Nation has been endowed with many natural beauties which could readily lay claim to such a title, but the carnation, with its history, growth, and development seems to symbolize the character of America.

The heritage of America included the inheritance of the fragrant, herbacious perennial known to us all as the carnation. Technically a native of southern Europe known as the Dianthus caryophyllus, the carnation is a simple garden flower which has flourished as well in a wild state in England.

Universally recognized for its simplistic beauty and fragrance, the fringed blossom of the carnation may be solid or striped or laced with color. Sometimes known as the colorful gillyflower, it has been acclaimed by Chaucer, Spenser, and Shakespeare. It was, indeed, the latter who dubbed these fragrant beauties: "The fairest flowers o' the season."

Others, of course, will advance their own fair beauties, and I could take no exception; however, if our national floral emblem is to be a symbol representative of America, it should be kept in mind that:

The carnation, a perennial, knows no season and is available always in all areas of the Nation.

The carnation, a floral beauty with no thorns or thistles, is as distinctive as it is democratic—it fits equally well in the setting of the family mantle and a state dinner at the White House—it is equally acceptable for wear by both men and women, it is adaptable to all occasions from wedding banquets to floral remembrances.

The carnation, as a truly national flower, would be a natural choice of the distinctive American character.

Mr. Speaker, although my native State, Ohio, has chosen the carnation as its State flower, no nation has yet named it as its floral emblem. If this Nation is to be so represented, it could wisely select this beautiful blossom as its national flower.

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield to my colleague from Colorado [Mr. BROTZMAN].

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, many flowers have been proposed as the official national flower. The spectrum of suggestions runs from the rose to the corn tassel. Each flower has its strong advocates and compelling arguments that support its claim to the honor of being the national flower.

The national flower, however, should reflect the many moods and facets of the American people. It should be both ornamental and utilitarian. It should not be confined to a single season or a single area. As a national flower it should represent the Nation.

The national flower should be dignified, yet bright; colorful to fit the most joyful occasion and somber to fit the most solemn. It should be the symbol of joy and happiness; of commemoration and remembrance.

In cool, colorful Colorado we specialize in the cultivation, growth and perfection of the crisp, cheerful carnation. This beautiful flower is equally at home in the winter corsage, worn at the Christmas ball; in the summer bouquet, decorating the Sunday evening table; as the groom's boutonniere and the bride's nosegay; and as the commemorative flower on Mother's Day.

We are a people of many moods. We are sometimes gay and carefree; we are sometimes solemn and contemplative. We are aware of history's lessons of the past and we are eager to walk into tomorrow.

The carnation fits each and all of these moods. I respectfully suggest it is the perfect choice as the national flower and have today introduced a bill with my colleague from Colorado on this subject.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague [Mr. CHENOWETH] be permitted to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I am indeed happy to join my colleagues from Colorado in urging that the carnation be designated as our national flower. I have today introduced a bill that would give the carnation this distinction, and national recognition.

The carnation is a lovely flower and is a favorite everywhere in this country. We are very proud of the fact that Colorado grows the finest carnations in the Nation. These carnations are shipped to every part of the country and Colorado carnations are always in great demand.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the bills my colleagues from Colorado and I have introduced today will receive favorable consideration. I am sure there would be general approval if Congress should pass this legislation making the carnation our national flower.

We are indebted to the carnation growers of Colorado for the lovely flowers you are wearing today. I am pleased that you could enjoy these carnations and observe their great beauty. I hope you are now fully convinced that the carnation should be our national flower.

IMMIGRATION HEARINGS

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I announced that testimony from the executive agencies on pending immigration legislation would begin on Wednesday, July 1, with the Honorable Dean Rusk, Secretary of State, as our opening witness. A change has been made in the date for the appearance of Secretary Rusk to Thursday, July 2, due to an engagement of Secretary Rusk with the President of Costa Rica on the prior date.

Testimony from interested Members will be concluded today and the record of hearings will be open for the next 10 calendar days so that Members who have not appeared before the subcommittee may file statements to be included in the first part of our record of hearings, which, as previously announced, was set aside for Members of Congress to testify or present statements for inclusion in the record of hearings.

In the event that Members may wish to testify this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Immigration and Nationality of the Committee on the Judiciary have permission to sit during general debate this afternoon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I inquire of the gentleman from Ohio if it is anticipated that we will hold hearings during the week beginning July 6?

Mr. FEIGHAN. No, I have not made any decision, because I am waiting to find out whether or not we shall have a recess beginning on the second.

Mr. POFF. Then, do I understand if the House stands in recess during the week of July 6, we will not hold hearings during that week or the week beginning July 13?

Mr. FEIGHAN. If the gentleman will yield further, I feel it would be highly inadvisable to hold hearings at that time because of the inability of the members of the subcommittee to be present.

Mr. POFF. I am afraid that the answer of the gentleman is not quite responsive to my question. We should have some definite assurance that there will not be hearings scheduled during the week of July 6 or the week of July 13. I am awaiting the answer to that question.

Mr. FEIGHAN. In the first instance, I believe the gentleman will agree that whenever hearings have been held before, they have been held with the mutual understanding and consent of the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. POFF. That is true, and I am grateful for the cooperation that has been shown me. Yet I must ask for a positive response to my question concerning the week of July 6 and the week of July 13.

Assuming that the House stands in recess during those 2 weeks, is my understanding correct that we will not hold hearings?

Mr. FEIGHAN. That is my understanding.

Mr. POFF. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

CLERK TO RECEIVE MESSAGES AND SPEAKER TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until tomorrow, July 1, 1964, the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate and that the Speaker be authorized to sign any enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

THE 400TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FIRST PERMANENT SETTLEMENT IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, 400 years ago today, June 30, 1564, the permanent settlement of our country began. It began with the saying of prayers of thanksgiving and the digging of earth in what is now northeast Florida.

Yes, 1564 not only saw the birth of Shakespeare in England, the death of Michelangelo in Italy and the death of Calvin in Switzerland. It was not only an age and a year unparalleled in literature, in art and in religion, but it was also the year of our beginning.

The 16th century has justly been called the golden age of discovery. As such, it was the product of the development of the science of navigation and the courage of its great navigators, who opened up the New World for settlement. For us Americans, 1564 was indeed a banner year for it marked the very beginning of the permanent settlement of what is now the United States.

It was Rene de Goulaine de Laudonniere, a French Huguenot sea captain who pulled off this event. He headed the Fort Caroline Colony for France's Queen Mother Catherine de Medici, discovered gold for the royal treasury in the Appalachian Mountains and experienced starvation with his colony when the promised aid from France did not come about. His critics said of him that he was more of a pilot than a Governor. He thwarted repeated efforts to stab him, to cudgel him, and to blow him to bits. In the colony's starving times he allowed no one to touch a feather of the colony's hundred chickens, saved to populate the farmyards of posterity. He observed:

> It was necessary for a Governor to make himself known and obeyed lest everyone would become the master.

Against Laudonniere's northeast Florida colony, Fort Caroline, Spain's King Phillip II sent Pedro Menendez de Aviles, admiral of the Spanish Armada and a crafty and firm man who drove Laudonniere from Fort Caroline and established St. Augustine as the oldest continuous settlement in what is now the United States. Mendoza, the priest companion of Menendez sums up the reason for the Spaniard's success by the comment that "he was a friend of his own opinion." He was truly persistent and of unshakable self-confidence.

The conquering of the French in Florida was marked by the martyrdom of Capt. Jean Ribault, a late arrival at Fort Caroline and an erstwhile friend of Queen Elizabeth of England. He met his death at the hand of Menendez when he refused to recant his independent religious beliefs to save himself from execution.

This settlement of Florida 400 years ago was not only significant because it began our permanent settlement, but also because it was the first settlement of men and women to come to our country for religious freedom. Mr. Speaker, these little-known facts of our ancient past should inspire us in our day to do better. It is a time for forbearance.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the greatest civil rights bill ever written for all our people is the Bill of Rights, the first 10 amendments to the Constitution. The civil rights bill now being rushed through the Congress subverts the Bill of Rights. The Bill of Rights guarantees trial by jury, property rights, peaceful assembly, and protects our homes and business from unwarranted search and seizure. This so-called civil rights bill would limit and curtail the Bill of Rights. This bill is the opposite of the Bill of Rights.

The passage of this civil rights bill will whet the appetite of the power-mad pressure groups for more such legislation. It will create more violence, demonstrations, and disrespect for law and order. It will sponsor invasions and phony crusades in some States and sections of the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I hope by some miracle political expediency will be postponed and constitutional government preserved by this civil rights bill being rejected.

COMMENTS ON MINORITY VIEWS OF FOREIGN ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, as we prepare to enter into the annual debate over the foreign aid program and the appropriations which are so essential to the strength of this Nation and our humanitarian commitments around the world, I would like to call some relevant material to the attention of my distinguished colleagues.

I refer to a series of statements made in the form of a rebuttal to the minority views, as contained in the committee report.

These statements should be read by every Member of the House. They offer convincing proof that there are a great many misconceptions regarding the tone and content of the foreign assistance program.

The rebuttals show, for example, the actual number of foreign aid projects being financed, the number of the people on the foreign aid payroll, and a number of other precise facts. These rebuttals indicate that many who oppose the program do so on the basis of hearsay.

The material will be included in the course of my speech this afternoon, and I hope and trust that every Member of the House will consider these facts. I am certain that the rebuttals to the minority views, together with the material presented during the debate by the supporters of this program, will prove sufficient momentum to pass the bill. I look forward to that debate and the prospect of passage of the appropriations without further cuts.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 172]

Arends
Ashley
Avery
Bass
Bennett, Mich.
Brown, Calif.
Buckley
Celler
Dent
Derwinski
Dingell
Evins
Glenn
Gray
Gubser
Hansen
Harding
Harsha
Healey
Hébert
Hoffman
Hosmer
Jones, Ala.
Kee
Kilburn
Landrum
Lankford
Lesinski
Lloyd
Long, La.
McDowell
Macdonald
Madden
Mailliard
Michel
Miller, N.Y.
Morrison
Morton
Murphy, N.Y.
Nelsen
Norblad
O'Hara, Mich.
Patman
Pepper
Pilcher
Pirnie
Powell
Purcell
Rains
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts, Tex.
Robison
Rogers, Tex.
Senner
Sheppard
Staggers
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, La.
Thompson, N.J.
Toll
Tollefson
Tuten
Van Deerlin
Wallhauser
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 364 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1965

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 793 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

> *Resolved*, That during the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11812), making appropriations for Foreign Assistance and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes, all points of order against said bill are hereby waived.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH]; and pending that, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I took this time and asked for this procedure in order that I might advise the House about what is going on in the House Rules Committee today. I think that the House is entitled to know what is going on there, and I think the House is entitled to know what is being done to the House and to the orderly procedure of the legislative process.

Mr. Speaker, civil rights bills have been around this Capitol for several years. This particular bill has been around here for about a year. After the bill was railroaded—and I know of no better term—out of the House Committee on the Judiciary, passed the House and went over to the other body, it was kept over there for some 3 months. There that bill was almost completely rewritten. It came back here with some 80 or 90 amendments. Whereupon the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], arose in this House and asked unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table this rewritten bill with some 80 or 90 changes and pass it without any debate or consideration. Objection was made and the bill went to the Committee on Rules, whereupon the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] then filed a resolution that was referred to the Committee on Rules designed to do what he had failed to do, and which I circumvented him from doing in the House, and that is to take the bill from the Speaker's table and pass it without any amendments and with only 1 hour of consideration.

Now, follow me, if you will. What they propose to do is to get a rule to take this bill from the Speaker's table and bring it down here to the floor of the House in the next few days, without even a member of the Committee on the Judiciary or even one of the great liberals who has teamed up as a coalition to pass this bill, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCULLOCH] with the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], will not have an opportunity to discuss or explain this bill in that limited time, unless it be through the graciousness of whoever happens to be handling the 30 minutes on the Democratic side and the 30 minutes on the Republican side.

Mr. Speaker, I make the statement here now, and no one can successfully challenge it, that there is not one-half of 1 percent of this great legislative body, the House of Representatives, who knows what is in that bill now that we are asked to report a rule out here and to ram it down their throats; and they will not know what is in it when they are called upon to vote on it, possibly tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, if that is orderly procedure, if that is good legislature process, all right, go ahead and handle it that way. However, I imagine some of the Members of the House when they get back home are going to be asked what is in that bill. I wonder if they are going to be able to answer that question.

Why, Mr. Speaker, one of the members of the Committee on Rules who was so anxious to get this bill out to the floor said this morning:

> Why, it has been in the press. There have been all kinds of stories written about what the Senate did.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, he said we should legislate based upon what the reporters in the Press Gallery say about this bill. Is that the way to legislate or is it not?

All right, the skids are greased. They propose to bring this bill out of the Committee on Rules today and then make you take it.

The question was asked this morning when we were in session up there of both these able leaders of the Committee on the Judiciary, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCULLOCH] and the great leader from New York [Mr. CELLER]:

> Would you object to lengthening the time a little bit here, say, for another hour or 2 hours?

Why, I understand we are going to debate this foreign aid appropriation bill here for 6 hours. Yet we are told that we cannot debate this bill, the so-called civil rights bill, with all of these changes, for more than an hour.

Both of them said no, they would not agree to any extensiion of time.

I ask you, why the rush? The leadership on both sides, as well as the White House, the NAACP and everybody that is back of this thing, says that we have to pass it, we are going to pass it. All right. Assume that to be true. Then why not give it decent consideration?

Apparently there is some politics involved in this thing. Some people have even been so brutal as to say it is political. I want to talk in language that maybe the membership understands. I think there are some things that ought to be said. A lot of people in both parties who think they are going to make political hay out of this thing are going to be disappointed. There are some people over on my left, my good Republican friends who think there is still some hay to be harvested from this political monstrosity. Frankly, I am interested in that. I want to see a strong Republican Party in this country, I want to see a strong opposition party. I believe that it is in the interest of the country to have a strong opposition party. But I want to say to my friends you have been going down the line chasing this elusive rainbow of the minority colored bloc vote for some time; and in every election you have been losing more, more and more. There is a process of erosion going on, and you are not going to get anything out of this either.

I wonder how many of my Republican friends saw the headline the other day when the NAACP had its convention down here? They came out with a resolution which they adopted unanimously opposing the nomination of the man whom all of the press said is going to be the Republican nominee, Senator GOLDWATER. They went on record unanimously as opposed to his election. Yet there are some Republicans who think there is some political hay in this thing for them.

As one who usually calls his shots as he sees them, let me say this to my Republican friends: Take it or leave it, or take it for what it is. You have one chance, and one chance alone, to come back into power, and be a major political factor in these United States, and that is to follow the leadership of your front runner, the man who all agree is going to be nominated, make an issue of conservatism and liberalism, and give the people a choice. I know some of you would like to applaud that, but it would not be a smart thing to do at this time.

How many votes are you going to get out of the minority bloc vote as a result of the passage of this, the greatest of all legislative evils and assaults upon the Constitution of the United States? How many are you going to get?

Do you really believe that this legislative rape of the Constitution is going to be as popular in November as it was in June?

Do you really believe, after all of these demonstrations and violations of State laws, that Republican votes are going to be enhanced? You are not going to get any, and you know it if you are realistic. So why not meet the issue? Why not vote against this thing when it comes down here? Oh, there are so many grounds you could vote against it on. You could vote against it like your leader Senator GOLDWATER—a man for whom I have a great admiration—upon principle. You could vote against it because you resent, as you rightly should, the leadership movement, the combined leadership movement to ram this thing down your throat without knowing what is in it. I prefer to vote against it on principle.

Let me say to you the people of this country are entitled to a choice. If the so-called moderates in your party have their way they are not going to get it, and you know that is true.

So much for my good friends over there on the Republican side. I want to appeal to my friends on the Democratic side. I admit that the politics in this is on your side; there is no question about that. You are the ones who are going to reap the profit, if there be any profit, as the result of the passage of this iniquitous piece of legislation. But you know, I am not so sure that you are going to profit as much as you think you are.

When a "carpetbagger"—and I use the word advisedly—can go north into some of your districts, carpetbag in reverse, and get some 30- to 40-odd percent of the votes, with the combined opposition of all of the leaders of the parties and the misguided people, and so forth, with all the forces of the White House lined against them, I tell you it is significant, is it not? Does it not mean something that under all of those odds this fine, crusading young Governor of Alabama could go up there in that role and get that kind of vote?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I have to yield to my friend because I referred to his Governor.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. I am sure my friend did not intimate that my Governor is a carpetbagger. To get the record straight, he is a great American, and he has done a wonderful job fighting for the cause of constitutional government. I am sure the gentleman will agree with me when I make that statement.

Mr. COLMER. I am so sorry that my friend from Alabama finds it necessary or even advisable to raise the question whether I cast any aspersions upon the great Governor of Alabama. I certainly did not. I certainly had no such intention. I repeat, I am a great admirer of this crusading young man from Alabama, as the gentleman from Alabama himself is. I merely say that he was cast in the role of a carpetbagger in reverse, and under those odds received that kind of vote.

If I have to explain that any further, let me say this: Suppose the gentleman from New York, Mr. JAVITS, would come down into Alabama or into any other Southern State, crusading for this civil rights bill.

Do you think he could get 33⅓ or 40 percent of the vote? Certainly not.

Now what I am trying to say to you is that I think if I were you, I would give a little consideration to this matter. I would give some consideration to it on the question of its merit. I would give some consideration to it from the political standpoint. Because it may not be as popular as you think it is.

You are going to have an opportunity here to pass on this question again. I hope you will vote against the bill this time.

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to the gentleman, a great and distinguished legislator and former Governor of the magnificent State of Virginia.

Mr. TUCK. I have not been a Member of the House of Representatives long enough, although I have served here a little more than 11 years, to join in any criticism of the leadership of either party in the House of Representatives. But I do want to say to the gentleman from Mississippi that I was in the Committee on Rules this morning and like himself I deplore the situation which exists with reference to this bill and I regret that this body composed of Representatives of the people from all the States of the Union cannot find time to give study to this bill and to the new amendments that have been added to it in the U.S. Senate.

I wondered this morning as I sat there, really disturbed and really shocked at the complacency with which my distinguished colleagues could discuss such a horrendous piece of legislation so destructive of the rights of people everywhere. I wondered why there was such haste. Finally, someone mentioned that the reason for the haste was that they wanted to sign this bill into law on the 4th day of July. Well, I certainly hope that if we should pass this bill between now and then that no one will consider it advisable to desecrate our freedom day, our liberty day, by signing such a piece of legislation into law on the 4th day of July. It would serve to demean and denigrate the memory of that great Virginian and American, Thomas Jefferson, who believed in the diffusion of power among the States and among the localities and among the people and who was opposed to the strong centralization of power in Washington. I am certain that if such a thing were done on that day which meant so much to him that it would detract from that memory of him amongst our people to which he is so richly entitled.

I do not claim to be a historian. I have only a superficial knowledge of history, even of the history of this great country. But I have read and studied something about Thomas Jefferson because of the fact that he was a native of Virginia and served as the second Governor of our Commonwealth. I have read the books on Jefferson in power by that great Indiana historian, Claude G. Bowers. I have also read Jefferson and Hamilton by the same distinguished and learned author. I have read about Jefferson in many other treatises, and certainly the impression I have gotten from such reading and study would be that Jefferson would be opposed to this centralization of power in Washington which is contained in this monstrous piece of legislation which is about to be foisted upon the people of the country today. I can say too, in conclusion, that Jefferson, after he had served as ambassador plenipotentiary to several of the larger countries in the world and had served as Vice President of the United States and for 8 years as President of the United States and had guided the destiny of this Nation for 16 additional years, before he died, wrote his own epitaph.

The first thing he wished to be remembered for was that he was the author of the Declaration of Independence, which was signed on the 4th day of July. Another thing was that he was the author of the Virginia statute of religious freedom. Another was that he was the founder of the University of Virginia, an institution of learning.

I hope that someone somewhere, if this monstrous bill should be enacted into law between now and the 4th of July, will have the good taste to select some other day for it to be signed into law. God knows I cannot think of any appropriate day, but I know that the 4th of July is not a good day for such a purpose. I certainly hope it will not be done on the 4th of July.

In my declining years, as comes to those of us who pass threescore years and ten, as we walk wearily under the burden of years, I want my conscience to be soothed by the knowledge that I have protested vigorously and I have done everything within my feeble power to prevent the enactment of such legislation as this. I resent the enactment into law of such a bill as this on July 4, a patriotic day.

I thank you, sir.

Mr. COLMER. I thank my good friend for his splendid contribution.

Mr. Speaker, I took this time because, although I am a member of the Rules Committee, I recognized this would be the only opportunity I would have. It is the only opportunity all Members will have to hear someone explain the procedure through which it is proposed to ram this bill down the throats of the people of the country. I merely wanted those of you who will not have the opportunity to speak to know what is going on.

Mr. Speaker, on June 19, 1963, when the late President Kennedy sent the civil rights message to the Congress, I issued a statement on what might be expected. Although more than a year has elapsed since that statement was issued, I think it was pertinent then and I think it applies today. I also think that it will prove to be prophetic. For that reason I have submitted it herewith for the record and for future events to disclose whether or not it was prophetic.

I am confident that most Members of both the North and the South, Democrats and Republicans, would prefer to have no part of it. But the power of the Presidency, the Justice Department, and the Negro bloc-vote appeal are powerful weapons.

The administration has created a "Frankenstein" and is now hollering "wolf." In fact, those responsible for the present racial unrest are even appealing to their pet whipping-boy, the South, and their traditional enemy, the Republicans, to bail them out.

We are told that we are faced with a revolution. What politicians, do-gooders and radical Negro leaders refuse to recognize is that the racial problem is one of evolution and not of revolution.

The Negro race has made the greatest progress in this country that any race has ever made in a similar period of time. This has been accomplished under the guiding and helping hand of his white brother, particularly his southern white brother. He cannot be brought up overnight on a plane with the white race which has had the benefit of civilization, Christianity and education for more than 2,000 years. He must trod the same slow path which has characterized the advancement of the white race.

There are already ample and adequate laws on the books to protect the rights of all minority groups. No amount of appeasement, no law or no court decree can or will solve the problem.

The President's proposals are more far reaching than his stated objective of equal rights for Negroes. The racial angle is but one facet of the evils proposed. These new civil wrongs advocated by the administration strike at the very foundation stones of our system of constitutional government.

The enactment of the President's recommendations can only result in:

1. The further tragic breakdown of good relations between the races.

2. A step-up in more and more demands by the Negro agitators.

3. More regimentation of the American people by a strong centralized Federal Government, with the resultant deprivations of the liberties of all American citizens.

4. A further significant, if not fatal, assault upon the free enterprise system and the death-knell of State sovereignty.

5. The end of the one-party system in the South.

These unwise and unconstitutional requests, with all of their dangerous implications, should be recognized by all Americans for what they are. They are purely political and should be treated as such. They are reminiscent of Reconstruction days when the prostrated people of the South were governed by the carpetbaggers and the bayonet.

"While this is a national problem, our southern representatives in both the House and the Senate should take the lead in opposing these new and drastic assaults upon constitutional government as envisioned by the Founding Fathers. Because of recent incidents in other sections of the country, it is possible that help may come from these sources. The South is historically the defender of States rights and sovereignty. It is also the greatest potential political minority in the country. Its representatives in the Congress must make this final effort to close the ranks and, oblivious to party alinement and self-aggrandizement, say like the Spartans of old 'They shall not pass.' "

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we are actually at this time considering House Resolution 793, which resolution, from the Rules Committee, relates to the foreign aid appropriation bill and would waive all points of order in regard to H.R. 11812, the foreign aid appropriation bill.

I wish to say at the outset, Mr. Speaker, I personally am opposed to this particular rule, even though I am presenting it for the minority side of the House.

This is the third time this year the Rules Committee has been asked to waive points of order. As to each of the previous bills, I was in agreement with the waiver of points of order for the reasons stated at those particular times. I believe the bills were the military construction bill and the public works bill.

This is the last appropriation bill, I believe the 12th, and it is the desire of all of us to pass the appropriation bills and get them over to the other side of the Capitol.

When this measure was presented to the Rules Committee it was my understanding that a request was made of our committee to waive points of order due to the fact that the foreign aid authorization bill had not been signed into law. None of us had any objection to waiving points of order so far as that particular reason was concerned. As a matter of fact, when we first went into executive session the decision of the Rules Committee was that we would waive points of order regarding the authorization, so that the appropriation bill could be considered legally by the House of Representatives.

The chairman of the committee, the honorable gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] agreed to prepare, with the Parliamentarian, the necessary rule.

Later in the day we were informed that apparently this could not be done, so we walked up the hill and we walked down again, and we went back into the committee at 5 o'clock in the afternoon and waived all points of order.

It is my understanding that there is some language in this bill which is subject to a point of order.

If we are to have rules, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me we should abide by them.

I have no objection whatsoever—neither do the five Members on the minority side—to waiving the point of order on the authorization, so that the appropriation bill can be considered.

I will say, too, that all five of us on the minority side oppose waiving completely all points of order on a bill as important as this foreign aid bill is.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of California. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. I wish to indicate my support for his position. As a matter of fact, I would have preferred that no rule be granted, but if we were to have a rule, we should have had the kind of rule described by the gentleman from California. We should not have gone as far as we have in the rule before us.

Mr. SMITH of California. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of California. Yes. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Does not the gentleman realize that because of the fact that there is no law authorizing these appropriations at the present time, this rule waiving points of order is merely a gimmick and used in order to get you folks to the Republican Convention so that you can nominate BARRY GOLDWATER?

Mr. SMITH of California. I would say to the distinguished gentleman from New York that that is not my understanding. We were here last year until Christmas, I will say to the gentleman, and I was up in the Rules Committee until 3:30 in the morning on this foreign aid appropriation bill. I do not think the way this rule is passed has anything to do with the convention. We are perfectly willing, as I say, to go ahead and expedite waiving the authorization, but there is language in here that I do not think the gentleman from New York would agree we should waive points of order on. I know you have never asked us to do that on any of your appropriation bills.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of California. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. So far as I know, there is absolutely nothing new in this bill that would be subject to a point of order with the exception of one paragraph. I do not believe that the House would object to waiving a point of order on that paragraph. If the gentleman will permit me, I will just read that paragraph.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman from California will yield for that purpose, I will cite to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] the paragraph in the bill. It is on page 4, beginning on line 5.

Mr. GARY. The gentleman is right. It reads:

> Of the foregoing amounts for economic assistance, $300,000,000 shall be available for obligation only through the apportionment review and approval procedure prescribed by law in such amounts and at such times as may be determined by the President in the national interest that funds otherwise available for the purposes of programs under this title are insufficient to meet the cost of additional authorized projects.

All that language does is to reserve $300 million of the amount in this bill which can only be used if the President certifies that it is in the national interest. The purpose of the section is to save money, and to put this amount aside and not permit it to be apportioned as the law requires the rest of the bill to be apportioned. This is an effort to save some of the money in this bill, and so far as I know, that is the only item in this entire bill subject to a point of order.

Mr. SMITH of California. My understanding is that was one of the points of language subject to a point of order. Although I only know what I am told on matters presented, I was informed the language might be questionable and subject to a point of order in some regard to the United Nations language in the bill. That is what I was told.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of California. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Of course, if the gentleman believes that only the language he has read is subject to a point of order, why did he not ask for a rule that would exempt that specific language? Why did you insist upon a rule that waives points of order on the entire bill? The gentleman knows, and I am sure he knows, that there are other items in this bill subject to a point of order. If he does not know that, he had better study his own bill.

Mr. GARY. If the gentleman will yield for just a moment——

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman in the well of the House has the time.

Mr. GARY. I have not admitted that the language is subject to a point of order, and I do not think it is, but I said, so far as I know, it is the only provision against which a point of order might lie.

I am told that there are one or two other provisions that might be subject to a point of order but the paragraph under discussion is the only new language that was put in the bill.

Mr. GROSS. You need no waiver of points of order if you do not have language in the bill that is subject to a point of order; the gentleman knows that. You were before the Rules Committee and asked for a waiver of points of order on the entire bill.

Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with the gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH], in the statement he has made in opposition to the rule. I, too, appeared before the Committee on Rules, as the gentleman well knows, and appealed to the committee to present a rule waiving points of order only on the basis of the authorization bill, providing the right to call up this bill. All other language in the bill then would have been subject to a point of order. That was fair. Presumably that was what members of the Appropriations Committee wanted when they went to the Committee on Rules, which thereupon held two meetings. They marched up the hill shortly after noon and by 5 o'clock in the afternoon they marched down the hill again, apparently appeasing the Democrat leadership of the House.

Mr. Speaker, is it becoming fashionable around here to go to the Committee on Rules to set aside the rules of the House? Is this to be the fashion in the future? It it is, then some of us around here will have to resort to every known device to throw roadblocks in the way of the leadership. That is what we will have to do if this is what we are going to have to contend with in appropriation bills, giving the right to the Committee on Appropriations to write legislation. And that is what you will do if you adopt this rule.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of California. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH] and, I might add, also with the remarks of the gentleman from Iowa

[Mr. Gross]. This action today seems to be part of the basic theory expressed by the majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Albert], previously this year, at the time the rules of the House were waived, when he said that the majority has the right to work its will. I made the point that the majority has the right to work its will only through following procedures which enable this body to be a deliberative body.

If it is simply a matter of having the majority work its will then, of course, you can do by majority vote what you wish on this rule, or any rule waiving in effect the rules of the House which have been carefully devised over a period of many years so that the subject can be orderly debated. The rules of procedure are the base for representative government.

I suggest that this continuing use on the part of the majority, or abuse I would say, by majority vote to disregard the rules that have been written for the Congress for a specific purpose, and have proved themselves over a period of years to be necessary in order that this may be a deliberative body, should be halted. The rules of the House are being disregarded. The majority is, in effect, eating at the very basis of representative government.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. SMITH of California. I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I respect the views of the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis]. But the only reason we have a Committee on Rules is to bring out special rules instead of using the general rules of the House. And that is a complete answer to what he has said, in my opinion.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the "ayes" appeared to have it.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 222, nays 162, not voting 47, as follows:

[Roll No. 173]

YEAS—222

Addabbo
Albert
Andrews, Ala.
Ashley
Aspinall
Ayres
Bates
Beckworth
Bennett, Fla.
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Brademas
Brooks
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Burke
Burkhalter
Burleson
Burton, Calif.
Byrne, Pa.
Cahill
Cameron
Carey
Casey
Chelf
Clark
Cohelan
Conte
Cooley
Corman
Daddario
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Diggs
Donohue
Downing
Dulski
Duncan
Dwyer
Edmondson
Edwards
Elliott
Everett
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Finnegan
Fino
Flood
Flynt
Fogarty
Fountain
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gary
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gill
Gonzalez
Grabowski
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Hagen, Calif.
Halleck
Halpern
Hanna
Hansen
Harding
Harvey, Mich.
Hawkins
Hays
Healey
Hechler
Herlong
Holifield
Holland
Horton
Hosmer
Huddleston
Hull
Jarman
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Wis.
Jones, Mo.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Keith
Kelly
Keogh
Kilgore
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Landrum
Leggett
Libonati
Lindsay
Long, Md.
McDowell
McFall
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin, Mass.
Mathias
Matsunaga
Matthews
Meader
Miller, Calif.
Mills
Minish
Monagan
Montoya
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Morse
Morton
Mosher
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Natcher
Nedzi
Nix
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill
Osmers
Patman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Price
Pucinski
Randall
Reid, N.Y.
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Riehlman
Rivers, Alaska
Roberts, Ala.
Roberts, Tex.
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Roosevelt
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Roybal
Ryan, Mich.
Ryan, N.Y.
St Germain
St. Onge
Schwengel
Selden
Shipley
Sibal
Sickles
Sikes
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Springer
Staebler
Stafford
Steed
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Teague, Tex.
Thomas
Thompson, Tex.
Trimble
Tupper
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vinson
Wallhauser
Watts
Weltner
White
Whitten
Wickersham
Widnall
Wright
Young
Zablocki

NAYS—162

Abbitt
Abele
Abernethy
Adair
Alger
Anderson
Andrews, N. Dak.
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Baker
Baldwin
Baring
Battin
Becker
Beermann
Belcher
Bell
Berry
Betts
Bolton, Frances P.
Bolton, Oliver P.
Bonner
Bow
Bray
Brock
Bromwell
Brotzman
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Bruce
Burton, Utah
Byrnes, Wis.
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Chenoweth
Clancy
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Collier
Colmer
Corbett
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtin
Curtis
Dague
Derounian
Devine
Dole
Dorn
Dowdy
Ellsworth
Findley
Fisher
Ford
Foreman
Gathings
Goodell
Goodling
Griffin
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Hagan, Ga.
Haley
Hall
Harris
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Henderson
Hoeven
Horan
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jensen
Johansen
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
King, N.Y.
Knox
Kunkel
Kyl
Laird
Langen
Latta
Lennon
Lipscomb
McClory
McCulloch
McDade
McIntire
McLoskey
McMillan
MacGregor
Martin, Calif.
Martin, Nebr.
May
Milliken
Minshall
Moore
Murray
Norblad
O'Konski
Ostertag
Passman
Pelly
Pillion
Pool
Quie
Quillen
Reid, Ill.
Reifel
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rich
Rivers, S.C.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Roudebush
Rumsfeld
St. George
Saylor
Schadeberg
Schenck
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Scott
Secrest
Short
Shriver
Siler
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Va.
Snyder
Stinson
Taft
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Thomson, Wis.
Tollefson
Tuck
Utt
Van Pelt
Waggonner
Watson
Weaver
Westland
Whalley
Wharton
Whitener
Williams
Willis
Wilson, Ind.
Winstead
Wydler
Wyman
Younger

NOT VOTING—47

Arends
Auchincloss
Avery
Barrett
Barry
Bass
Bennett, Mich.
Buckley
Celler
Derwinski
Dingell
Evins
Forrester
Glenn
Grant
Gray
Hardy
Hébert
Hoffman
Johnson, Calif.
Jones, Ala.
Kee
Kilburn
Lankford
Lesinski
Lloyd
Long, La.
Macdonald
Michel
Miller, N.Y.
Moss
Murphy, N.Y.
Nelsen
Pilcher
Powell
Purcell
Rains
Robison
Senner
Sheppard
Staggers
Thompson, La.
Thompson, N.J.
Toll
Tuten
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Kilburn against.
Mr. Celler for, with Mr. Hoffman against.
Mr. Toll for, with Mr. Michel against.
Mr. Auchincloss for, with Mr. Miller of New York against.
Mr. Glenn for, with Mr. Nelsen against.
Mr. Barry for, with Mr. Derwinski against.
Mr. Dingell for, with Mr. Thompson of Louisiana against.
Mr. Thompson of New Jersey for, with Mr. Long of Louisiana against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Bob Wilson.
Mr. Lesinski with Mr. Bennett of Michigan.
Mr. Hardy with Mr. Avery.
Mr. Macdonald with Mr. Robison.
Mr. Murphy of New York with Mrs. Kee.
Mr. Barrett with Mr. Buckley.
Mr. Bass with Mr. Forrester.
Mr. Evins with Mr. Grant.
Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Staggers.
Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. Gray.
Mr. Johnson of California with Mr. Rains.
Mr. Senner with Mr. Powell.
Mr. Tuten with Mr. Pilcher.
Mr. Purcell with Mr. Moss.

Messrs. QUIE, GUBSER, and WHARTON changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11812) making appropriations for foreign assistance and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes, and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the bill be limited to not to exceed 6 hours, one-half of the time to be controlled by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. Rhodes], and one-half by myself

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 11812, with Mr. PRICE in the chair.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] will be recognized for 3 hours, and the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES], will be recognized for 3 hours.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, let me say at the very outset that I am performing this task not by choice. We have a situation in which it fell to my lot to present this bill. The majority of the subcommittee did not agree with the recommendations of the chairman of the subcommittee and after the majority of the subcommittee had spoken the chairman said that he was not in accord with their action and he therefore withdrew from the further handling of the bill.

Under the rules of the House as the next ranking member of the subcommittee it became my duty to handle the bill. And here I am.

But may I say that I certainly cannot be considered a novice in the handling of the bill. It so happens that the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY], and I have had the privilege of serving on this subcommittee longer than any other person in the entire Congress. It fell my lot to become its first chairman back in 1948 when it was created. I served as chairman for about 6 years. During that time I had two chairmanships. I was the chairman of the Subcommittee for Treasury and Post Office Appropriations and also for Foreign Aid. The Subcommittee on Foreign Aid was a special committee. Then the chairman decided to make a regular subcommittee out of it, and under committee rules, a member could not hold the chairmanship of two regular committees. I chose the Subcommittee on Treasury and Post Office and willingly retired as the chairman of the Foreign Aid Subcommittee. I have, however, continued to serve on the subcommittee since that time.

Mr. Chairman, let me say that I favor the foreign aid program. I have been in favor of the program since its very inception. I consider it an essential part of our foreign policy as well as our national defense.

Oh, I know that there has been a lot of criticism of it. We talk about waste, inefficiency, and mistakes that have been made. Certainly, no one has striven harder than I to eliminate the waste, the inefficiency, and the mistakes in the program. However, in a program of this magnitude it is almost inevitable that there will be some errors made because it extends all over the world. We have the difficulty of selecting able men to conduct such an extensive program. When we get good men, we get a good program. When we get inefficient people, we get an inefficient program. Yet I do believe that in the last few years this program has been greatly improved.

Mr. Chairman, when we talk about the inefficiency of the program, let us also consider the other side of the ledger. In my judgment the foreign aid program has saved the world from communism. I say this without hesitation.

My mind goes back to the year 1947. I was in Europe that year. I came back and I told my people in numerous speeches that one thing that impressed me more than anything else was the fact that regardless of where we traveled, regardless of what country we were in, there was unmistakable evidence of the fact that the rulers of Soviet Russia had determined upon a course of world domination and that nothing short of that would satisfy them. Certainly nothing has happened since that time to change my opinion.

I well remember that just about that time Russia had taken over Yugoslavia; they had taken over Hungary; they had taken over Czechoslovakia, without firing a single shot. Italy was having an election at that time and we were desperately afraid that the Communists would win the election.

Then, Mr. Chairman, the Secretary of State, George C. Marshall, suggested what eventually became known as the Marshall plan. He suggested that we go to the aid of these weak countries in Europe. They had been overrun during the war, they were devastated, and they had lost hope. So, we started with the Marshall plan. What happened? Immediately the march of Russia was stopped. Italy voted against communism and eventually Europe was saved.

It was estimated that the Marshall plan would be a 5-year plan and would cost $15 billion. Instead it was completed in 4 years and cost $12 billion. It accomplished its purpose. I do not ask the members of the committee to take my word alone for this. In 1952 I was again in Europe, this time as a member of the so-called Richards committee. We were briefed by General Eisenhower, who was then the Supreme Allied Commander in Europe.

The question was asked him in this briefing:

> General, in your opinion what would have happened had we not had the Marshall plan?

He said:

> In my judgment if it were not for that program, with the possible exception of Spain, every country in Europe would be Communist today.

I think he was right.

When we stopped them there, what did they do? They blockaded Berlin, and we had to put forth that tremendous effort in the Berlin airlift. All of you will remember what a magnificent, outstanding job our military forces did in supporting Berlin from the air.

Then when they saw they were blocked there, they started to use force in Korea, and it was necessary for us then to meet force with force. This we did. We stopped communism again in Korea, at a great cost, I admit, but we stopped them. We found then that our allies were not prepared to render material military assistance in case of war, and we were convinced that Russia was going to continue to use force unless we opposed force with force.

So what happened? We started the military assistance program to aid our allies, and this we have continued along with the economic program to strengthen the free nations militarily and economically so that they could retain their freedom.

Mr. Chairman, I wish I could tell you that the fight or the threat is over. The threat still exists. Secretary Rusk and Secretary McNamara came before our committee and told us that it was essential that we continue this program. We need it today as much as we have ever needed it.

Let us look for a few moments at the budget request. In the budget that was presented last year for funds for the fiscal year 1964 the first request was for $4.9 billion—approximately $5 billion. You will recall that President Kennedy at that time appointed an impartial committee headed by General Lucius Clay to make a study of this program. After the Clay Committee reported, the President himself voluntarily reduced the program to $4.5 billion. The Congress authorized only $3.6 billion in the authorization bill. Then the request was further cut in the appropriation bill to a final figure of $3 billion, plus a carryover of $399 million of unobligated balances from 1963.

What happened this year? We have a new President. President Johnson, as all of you know, promised to present a reduced budget. He wanted a tax cut, as did the people of the United States and the Congress of the United States. The President felt that unless the expenditures were reduced the chances of getting a tax cut were very slim. The initial budget presented to him was for $104 billion.

He worked over it night and day for weeks, until he finally brought in a budget of $97.5 billion.

In doing that the estimates for foreign aid had to be reduced. He said:

> Surely the Congress cannot object to giving me the same amount this year that they gave my predecessor last year.

So he cut the requests for the foreign aid program $1 billion, until he got it down to the figure of last year, $3,391,700,000, which is the amount appropriated last year plus the carryover that we voted for the program. That was the figure that he submitted to the Congress.

Then we had additional difficulties in Vietnam. The President sent the Secretary of Defense and David Bell to Vietnam to investigate. When Mr. McNamara and Mr. Bell returned from Vietnam and made their report to the President, he decided that it was impossible for him to conduct a proper program in Vietnam with the funds he had requested. He then came to Congress with another request for $125 million for use in South Vietnam, $55 million for military assistance and $70 million for economic support. That made a total request of $3,516,572,400.

Mind you, even with that increase this was the smallest amount that had been requested, except for 3 years, since the inception of the program in 1948. What is more, I have a very interesting table here going back to 1956, showing the budget request for each year, the appropriations for each year, the unobligated carryover, and the transfers and reimbursements and the recoveries. What does this table show? It shows that the funds available for new programs in 1965 under the bill that our subcommittee is presenting to the House today is the smallest since 1956. In other words, the aid program will have less funds available for next year than they have had at any time since 1956.

Moreover, there has been a lot of talk about the unexpended dollars, ranging around $7 billion. But the unexpended balance, or the pipeline, for next year will be $400 million less than for the current fiscal year.

What did our officials who are administering this program say about it? Secretary Rusk told our subcommittee the request is a bare minimum, and pointed out that the program costs us less than 4 cents out of every tax dollar. Secretary McNamara called the program essential to our continued security as a leader of the free world, and said the military assistance fund should be $400 million more than the President's request. He added that it makes no sense to spend $50 billion a year on defense and then refuse to spend a mere 2 percent of that amount to support our allies in the collective defense of the free world.

Both Secretary McNamara and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Gen. Maxwell Taylor, testified before our committee that the military assistance program should be $1,400 million rather than the $1 billion that was requested. They said that the request for military assistance is not sufficient, and I also do not think it is. I did not think it was sufficient when we appropriated that amount last year. The only way they got by was by transferring money from the contingency fund to the military assistance program.

I will grant that we have not cut the military assistance estimate in this bill one single dime, but frankly I do not think the President asked for enough money insofar as military assistance is concerned.

But let me say this. I have gone along with the chairman and members of our subcommittee from year to year in cutting this program. I think this budget which has been presented this year is a tribute to our committee. I think we have won a great victory. We have been cutting the budget each year trying to eliminate the waste, and in recognition of that fact, the President this year accepted our figures of last year. So I think we have won a victory, and I, for one, am not for snatching defeat from the jaws of victory.

There is one other item I would like to discuss briefly, and that is the question of personnel.

We are told that the personnel in this program increased 7,000 during the past year. Now that just is not correct. I invite your attention to the table appearing on page 121 of our hearings. That table shows that instead of having 71,000 employees as claimed, the actual employees, that is, the direct-hire personnel, is only 28,569; and that is a reduction of 3,647 over the past year.

As to the persons participating in the program other than direct hire, which includes contractor employees and man-year equivalent of reimbursable support services of other agencies, they had 9,493 last year. This year the figure is 9,635. That is up by 142.

Now here is where the 71,000 figure comes from. There are participants in the program, the foreign nationals that we are training in the program. We do not pay them any salary. We do not pay them any wages. It is true we do pay in some instances for their subsistence and for their tuition in training programs. That figure is 33,212 in 1964 compared to 28,503 in 1963, and is the major factor in the total increase from 70,212 to 71,416.

In other words, they have reduced the number of regular employees, and they have increased the number of participants, which is proper.

Even then, if we include all these individuals, instead of an increase of 7,000 the increase is only 1,204.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. In the hearings for fiscal year 1964, part 3, page 189, a table was included in the record by the AID personnel which shows that the grand total of U.S. employees and foreign national trainees was 64,536 as of April of 1963. In addition, if the gentleman will turn to page 893 of the hearings of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations Appropriations, for fiscal year 1965, part 2, he will find a colloquy between the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Passman] and Mr. Tennant. Mr. Tennant, as the gentleman knows, is the Controller for AID. In that colloquy Mr. Tennant appears to agree that the figure a year before was 64,000 and the figure in 1964 was 71,000.

Mr. GARY. If the gentleman will look at page 121 of the hearings of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations Appropriations for 1965, he will find a table furnished by AID, which is a later table than the one to which he refers. There it is shown that the total for 1964 was 70,212. Those are not employees, but a combination of employees and participants. Twenty-eight thousand of them are participants and they are not employees in any sense of the word.

The participants ought not to be included in any tabulation of the number of employees, since they are not employees of the U.S. Government. Even taking those figures, it was 70,212 as compared with 71,416 in 1964, which is an increase of 1,204.

Mr. FORD. If the gentleman will yield further, the colloquy between the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Passman] and Mr. Tennant took place 1 month later than the chart to which the gentleman has referred. Mr. Tennant, the Controller for AID, apparently was disagreeing with the table which was inserted in the Record earlier. He was probably using more up-to-date information.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Tennant was not disagreeing with the table, because Mr. Tennant prepared the table. It may be that he did not have the table before him at the time.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONTE. The record should show clearly, so that it will not be muddled and confused, that the direct-hire personnel in the AID program in 1963 were 32,216, and by March 31, 1964, the number had dropped to 28,569, a drop of about 4,000 in direct-hire personnel. What increased was the military assistance personnel, the people in the program.

Mr. GARY. That is as it should be. They are training foreign nationals and substituting them overseas for U.S. employees. The number of U.S. employees has gone down. The number of foreign nationals participating in the program has gone up, and if they carry out the purposes of the program, that is the way it should be.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. What particular difference does it make whether they are employed by the Federal Government or not? They are still eating at the taxpayers' trough, regardless.

Mr. GARY. They are not being paid salaries. They are being trained, and they are getting certain aid in order to enable them to complete their training, but they are not employees. We are training these people so that they can go out to serve their own nations. That is one of the purposes of this program.

Mr. HALEY. They are still on the taxpayers' backs.

Mr. GARY. They do get some funds from the foreign aid program, if that is what the gentleman means.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONTE. It should be noted that on page 121, footnote 4 states, in part:

> Foreign nationals receiving training are not paid wages or salaries from foreign assistance funds; they are in no sense employees of the U.S. Government.

Mr. GARY. That is absolutely correct.

As I said, this is a minimum program that has been presented to us.

Everything points to that fact. What did our subcommittee do? The chairman of our subcommittee recommended a cut of $514.9 million. The majority of the members of our subcommittee felt that cut was too much, but we still felt that the bill could stand some trimming. We did not agree with our chairman. Neither did we agree entirely with the President of the United States. The President said he had offered the bare minimum request and he did not want it cut a dime, but nevertheless our committee voted to cut it $200 million.

This was the work of our subcommittee, but when we came to the full committee, on the motion of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], an amendment to our bill was adopted which reads, as follows:

> Of the foregoing amounts for economic assistance, $300,000,000 shall be available for obligation only through the apportionment review and approval procedure prescribed by law in such amounts and at such times as may be determined by the President in the national interest that funds otherwise available for the purposes of programs under this title are insufficient to meet the cost of additional authorized projects.

Now, there is a law which says that funds can be set aside as a reserve to be drawn on only in the case they are actually needed. Under the antideficiency law, agencies are required to apportion their expenditures in advance on a quarterly or periodic basis so that at the end of the year they will not incur a deficiency. That bill, which, in my judgment, has saved our taxpayers millions of dollars, was drafted by Mr. Cannon, the late former chairman of our Committee on Appropriations, and Mr. John Taber, than whom there are none "whomer." Those gentlemen were responsible for that antideficiency law.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, under this bill we have used that procedure to put into reserve an additional $300 million. In addition to the regular reviews required under the law, these funds can be used only if the President determines that it is in the national interest.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the chairman of my committee.

Mr. MAHON. Would the gentleman be willing to insert at this point in the RECORD that section of the statute which makes reference to the procedures to be followed in cases of this kind?

Mr. GARY. I would very much like to have it inserted.

Mr. MAHON. I do not want to take up the gentleman's time now, but I think it is well, in view of the point he has made, that it be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

The matter referred to is as follows:

TITLE 31, SECTION 665

(c) Apportionment of appropriations; reserves; distribution; review.

(1) Except as otherwise provided in this section, all appropriations or funds available for obligation for a definite period of time shall be so apportioned as to prevent obligation or expenditure thereof in a manner which would indicate a necessity for deficiency or supplemental appropriations for such period; and all appropriations or funds not limited to a definite period of time, and all authorizations to create obligations by contract in advance of appropriations, shall be so apportioned as to achieve the most effective and economical use thereof. As used hereafter in this section, the term "appropriation" means appropriations, funds, and authorizations to create obligations by contract in advance of appropriations.

(2) In apportioning any appropriation, reserves may be established to provide for contingencies, or to effect savings whenever savings are made possible by or through changes in requirements, greater efficiency of operations, or other developments subsequent to the date on which such appropriation was made available. Whenever it it determined by an officer designated in subsection (d) of this section to make apportionments and reapportionments that any amount so reserved will not be required to carry out the purposes of the appropriation concerned, he shall recommend the rescission of such amount in the manner provided in the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, for estimates of appropriations.

(3) Any appropriation subject to apportionment shall be distributed by months, calendar quarters, operating seasons, or other time periods, or by activities, functions, projects, or objects, or by a combination thereof, as may be deemed appropriate by the officers designated in subsection (d) of this section to make apportionments and reapportionments. Except as otherwise specified by the officer making the apportionment, amounts so apportioned shall remain available for obligation, in accordance with the terms of the appropriation, on a cumulative basis unless reapportioned.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. Yes. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. Apropos of our colloquy a few minutes ago, I think it is well to put in the RECORD at this point the total cost of all personnel, both the direct hire and other than direct hire, and the participant costs in fiscal 1964.

Mr. GARY. You mean the 28,000 who are not U.S. personnel?

Mr. FORD. I will read to you what it shows on page 132 of the hearings. For fiscal year 1964, as shown in part 2 of the hearings, it shows that direct hire, both economic and military, had a total cost of $214.9 million. Other than direct hire, for economic and military, had a total cost of $87.3 million. Participant costs, both economic and military, were $93.3 million, for a total cost for all categories of $395.5 million.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to the gentleman's inserting that information in the RECORD, but I do want to make it perfectly plain that when he is talking of participants, he is not talking about employees of the U.S. Government.

Our committee recommends, as I stated, an actual cut in the figures submitted by the President of $200 million; and in addition to that putting aside this reserve of $300 million, which means that we are calling into question practically the entire amount that our subcommittee chairman urged us to cut.

As I stated at the very beginning this program is a vital part of our national defense. I have never spoken to a military man who did not say that the periphery of islands beginning in the Aleutians, over to Japan, then over to Korea, over to Okinawa, over to Formosa and then on to the Philippines, were not a necessary part of our national defense. They are necessary for two reasons. As a matter of fact, that whole area is necessary for our defense. We call it the forward defense area. And why? Because as long as they remain in friendly hands we can use them as bases in the event of war, for an attack on the enemy.

On the other hand, if they are in Communist hands, they can be used as bases for an attack on our own country. They are therefore absolutely essential to our defense.

In this connection, let me present to you a table in volume 1, page 462 of the hearings. We have two means of protecting those islands. One is to let the natives themselves defend them or to send our troops over to defend them.

In Korea they have ample manpower. When I was in Korea during the Korean war, General Van Fleet, the then commanding general, told me personally that the Koreans made excellent soldiers, and he said, "Do not let anybody tell you to the contrary." They needed training. They needed equipment. They had nothing to fight with. They needed supplies.

The same is true of Formosa. They have the troops. I have also been to Formosa. But they did not have the equipment. We had the choice of equipping their forces or sending our own forces over to defend the islands. I requested the military authorities to prepare the table which appears on page 462 which shows that in Korea, the Philippines, Taiwan, Thailand, and Vietnam, that forward area of defense, they have 1,923,359 men under arms and the total cost of maintaining those forces is $822,823,062.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if we were to supplant those men with our own troops, it would cost us a vastly greater amount. The military can give you the cost per man for maintaining our own troops on those islands. To maintain the same number of troops would cost us in military expenditures $7,583,537,000. You might say, "Well, we would not need as many of our men because we have better soldiers." For the sake of argument let us cut the number in half. It would still cost more money just for those areas than the President has requested for the entire forign aid program all over the world. He has only requested $3.5 million. It would cost us over $3.5 billion just to maintain our own troops in those areas and, besides, it would mean that our boys in the United States who now can go ahead with their studies and prepare themselves for future life would have to spend a part of their time in these faraway places.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that Europe should be protected by Europeans. I believe that Asia should be protected by Asiatics. I believe that those islands should be protected by their natives, and they are willing to do it. But they cannot do it without aid from the United States.

Mr. Chairman, the aim of this program is to provide them with the equipment that is so essential for that purpose.

Friends, let me say this. This program has always been a nonpartisan program. One of my proud possessions is a letter that I received from President Eisenhower in July of 1953 which reads as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D.C., July 27, 1953.
Hon. J. VAUGHAN GARY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR VAUGHAN: In view of your previous leadership in the MSA program, I must admit that it was not a great surprise to me to find that you are still providing support for and having a positive impact on this effort. I do want you to know, however, that I greatly appreciate the help and assistance you have given this critically important national undertaking.

My compliments and congratulations to you for the fine contribution you have made to the Nation's security efforts.

With kind regards,
Sincerely,
DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

Mr. Chairman, I was a member of this committee at that time and I did assist President Eisenhower throughout his entire administration in supporting this program. I believe in it. I ask no credit for it. But again I say this is not a partisan program.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Eighty-seven Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 174]

Arends
Avery
Baring
Bass
Becker
Bennett, Mich.
Buckley
Celler
Corman
Davis, Tenn.
Dingell
Evins
Fisher
Frelinghuysen
Glenn
Griffin
Hanna
Harsha
Healey
Hébert
Hoffman
Kee
Kilburn
Lankford
Lesinski
Lloyd
Long, La.
Long, Md.
Martin, Calif.
Miller, N.Y.
Nelsen
Norblad
Pilcher
Powell
Robison
Rogers, Tex.
St Germain
Senner
Sheppard
Staggers
Steed
Thompson, La.
Thompson, N.J.
Toll
Tuten
Vinson
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PRICE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill, H.R. 11812, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 383 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. GARY. At the time of the quorum call I was explaining that this has never been a partisan issue. I hope it will not become one now, and certainly there is no reason why it should. I would like to read a recent telegram which was sent by ex-President Eisenhower.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I wholeheartedly agree that at least as long as I can remember this program has not been a partisan program. It has been supported by Democratic Presidents and Republican Presidents. As a matter of fact I recall back in 1961 when we were considering the fiscal year 1962 appropriation for the foreign aid program I offered an amendment on the floor to add $300 million to the military assistance program. This was necessary because the subcommittee and the full committee had made very substantial reductions in the program.

At that time the chairman of the subcommittee was the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN]. He opposed my amendment, and I should like to state for the record that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] opposed my amendment.

Mr. GARY. I beg the gentleman's pardon; if I am not mistaken I supported the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. FORD. The gentleman from Virginia did in another year but not in 1961. As a matter of fact the rollcall shows that the gentleman from Virginia and the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] voted against the increase in the funds that I requested. Some of the other members of the subcommittee voted with me on that occasion.

Mr. GARY. I remember on one occasion I succeeded in bringing about a compromise in the full committee——

Mr. FORD. That is correct.

Mr. GARY. On an amendment that the gentleman offered increasing the amount in the bill.

Mr. FORD. I think the gentleman was right. I think the net result was for the good of the country. But over the years there have been honest differences of opinion. In 1961 the gentleman from Virginia and Mr. PASSMAN were on the same side. I wanted to increase military assistance and I was supporting at that time the budget request submitted by the late President Kennedy. The subcommittee was opposed to the increase.

All I am trying to say is that each of us in any one year has had to exercise his own best judgment and that is the responsibility of the Legislative branch.

Mr. GARY. I agree with the gentleman thoroughly.

I want to read this telegram from former President Eisenhower which was sent to Congressman HALLECK and Senator DIRKSEN. He said:

I have long been convinced that continuation of a well conducted program of mutual security is necessary to the best interests of the Nation. During my years in the Presidency, in spite of much opposition and my realization that errors, duplications and even stupidity had often plagued the program, I consistently urged its adequate support by the Congress. While I believe that the Government should seek to eliminate waste and so improve the program that efficiency and sound long-range planning will result, I believe also that simultaneously the necessary financial support must be forthcoming. All of us of course recognize that the Congress has the final and independent responsibility for scrutinizing proposed expenditures and providing the appropriations for this program. And I am sure it will strive to fulfill that responsibility with good judgment and without partisanship.

But as a private citizen I voice my personal belief that the sum of $3.5 billion represents a level of mutual assistance that cannot be drastically reduced without damaging the vital interests of the United States.

With great respect,
DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has again expired.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I recognize that this is a highly controversial program. I realize that the taxpayers of the United States would like to get rid of it. They have had it for a long, long time. It is a sacrifice; I will admit it is a sacrifice. But, friends, it is a sacrifice in dollars and not in lives.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we are faced with conditions all over the world today, particularly in those areas on the perimeter of Soviet Russia and Communist China and all I am asking the members of the Committee to do—we have a new President, he is faced with a prodigious job—is to stand by our President, the new chairman of our Committee on Appropriations, and the majority of our subcommittee who believe that the amount that we have recommended in our bill is the reasonable and proper amount for this Congress to appropriate for this vital program.

Mr. Chairman, I ask the Members of this House to go along with us. If this amount is too much, it will not be spent. But if it is too little, it might be serious.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the members of the Committee for their attention.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, before discussing any of the details of the bill, I would like to make several factual statements that I believe will help to clear the air.

First, we are not considering a $3.5 billion budget request for the foreign aid program for fiscal year 1965. The facts are that President Johnson has submitted to the Congress a budget request for new obligation authority under titles I and II of $3,958,377,000. Unfortunately, based upon some of the discussion that has taken place here today, the impression has been created that the President only asked for $3.5 billion. In reality, he has requested $3.5 billion in round figures, plus $441,677,000. This comes about when there is included both titles I and II. In addition, in title III he has asked for the necessary operating expenses for the Export-Import Bank.

Certainly, the impression has been created that the budget request for new obligation authority in fiscal year 1965 is a very bare-bones request. The facts are that the $3,958 million requested in new obligation authority by President Johnson is $694 million more than what the Congress gave to the executive branch of the Government in fiscal year 1964. The final congressional new obligation figure for fiscal year 1964 as contained in titles I and II was $3,264 million.

Mr. Chairman, I believe this is important because it shows that the budget request for the next fiscal year is over a half billion dollars more in new obligational authority than what the Congress gave to the executive branch for the current fiscal year.

I think it is well to take a look at some of the precise figures on the one hand comparing the final new obligation authority which was granted in the fiscal year 1964 and the budget request for the fiscal year 1965 in new obligation authority. There are six areas in dispute between those who signed the majority report and those who signed the minority report. I will analyze these on the basis of the request for new obligation authority and the amount of new obligation authority which was made available in the fiscal year 1964.

In the first account we have development grants. The Congress in fiscal 1964 made available $155 million in new obligational authority. President Johnson when he submitted his budget request for the development grants program for new obligational authority asked for $224 million, a $69 million increase over what was made available in the fiscal year 1964.

International organizations is the next account. The Congress in the final version of the appropriation bill for fiscal year 1964 made available $116 million. President Johnson, in his January budget request for new obligational authority asked for $134,400,000, an increase of $18,400,000 over the current fiscal year.

The next account is supporting assistance. The Congress in its wisdom in the fiscal year 1964 appropriation bill for the AID program appropriated $330 million in new obligational authority. President Johnson in his budget submission requested new obligational authority for supporting assistance in the amount of $405 million, $75 million more than what Congress gave him for the current fiscal year.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. Is the gentleman including in those figures the carryover amount of unobligated balances from the previous year?

Mr. FORD. I am comparing obligational authority made available in 1964 with the President's budget request for new obligational authority in 1965. I am leaving it in that context.

Mr. GARY. I would appreciate the gentleman answering the question. Is he including the carryover funds, because that was a part of our appropriation last year. We appropriated $3 billion plus $399 million in unobligated funds which were carried over.

Mr. FORD. That is right; and in the appropriation bill we are considering today you are going to do the same thing. You cannot be very precise how much you are going to actually appropriate in this regard. One day they say it is $53 million, but I will wager my good friend from Virginia when the final chips are down it will be almost $100 million in the fiscal year.

Mr. GARY. I think the gentleman is wrong. It will not go anywhere near $100 million. The best estimate now is around $50 million.

Mr. FORD. I think that is irrelevant. I have been very precise, and have used new obligational authority in both cases.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. The gentleman from Michigan and the gentleman from Virginia realize it is impossible to tell how much of a carryover there will be for any fiscal year until about October of the next fiscal year. We have testimony to that effect. So the carryover at this time is always an estimate. But I can state for the benefit of the Committee, and particularly the gentleman from Virginia, that the estimate we get at this time varies rather widely from the final figure.

The estimate is always lower than the final figure, within my memory, at least. For instance, as of June 30, 1963, the original estimate for the carryover was $243,198,000. The final figure which we got in October was $402,443,000.

Mr. FORD. Almost 100 percent increase.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. So even if the figures which the gentleman from Virginia has given as to the estimate now are accurate, and I imagine they would be a little bit on the full side, still the carryover would be something in excess of $110 million.

Mr. FORD. I thank the gentleman from Arizona. I think it well states the fact that there is a high degree of uncertainty in this program as to the amount of unobligated balance which turns up at the end of the year, as well as the amount of deobligations, and the amount of reobligations. For that reason, I have strictly limited myself to a discussion of the new obligational authority requested. This is precise. There cannot be any uncertainty about it. This is the way we ought to discuss the bill.

In discussing the supporting assistance area, the President's budget is $75 million more than what Congress gave him last year.

In the area of the continguency fund, the President's request for new obligational authority was for $150 million. Congress, in the fiscal year 1964 appropriation bill, gave to the executive branch $50 million. The net result is that the President's budget request on this item alone is $100 million more than Congress gave last year.

Let us take the Alliance for Progress development loan.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield on the contingency fund?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONTE. The gentleman from Michigan is absolutely right. We appropriated last year $50 million in new money. We also gave the President unobligated funds there of about $127 million.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. I have some figures here on the contingency fund that were sent up to me just today. I wanted to get the latest figures. Last year they had new obligational authority of $179,499,000. To that was added $5,264,000 in deobligations, which made a total available for the contingency fund of $184,763,000. Of that amount, $75 million was transferred to military assistance, $47.4 million was used in the Far East, $53.6 million was used in Latin America, and $6.8 million was used for nonregional purposes which leaves an estimated balance of unobligated funds at the end of 1964 of $384,000.

Mr. FORD. Of course, the recitation of figures by the gentleman from Virginia does not relate to the point I have been making from the outset, where I have been comparing new obligational authorities that the President asked for in January and new obligational authority that the Congress made available in fiscal year 1964.

Mr. GARY. The question is, what is available for expenditures?

Mr. FORD. Now let us turn to the Alliance for Progress development loan.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. If I might further clarify the situation which the gentleman from Massachusetts was addressing himself to. On page 79 of the hearings dealing with the contingency fund, the following colloquy took place:

> Mr. PASSMAN. What was the amount of the unobligated funds that you did not previously request?
>
> Mr. BELL. $127 million.
>
> Mr. PASSMAN. What was the total that you had available for the contingency fund?
>
> Mr. BELL. After the appropriation—the Congress appropirated $50 million of new money, and allowed us to use—or reappropriated, I guess is the technical phrase, the $127 million.
>
> Mr. PASSMAN. Giving you a total of $177 million?
>
> Mr. BELL. Yes.

So the amount of money available last year in the contingency fund was $177 million. But I think the gentleman from Michigan will agree with me when we consider the use which has been made of the contingency fund last year, we should bear in mind that the administration used $75 million for military—which is a completely unauthorized use of contingency funds.

Mr. FORD. It might be well for the gentleman from Arizona to tell how it was an unauthorized use and how it actually took place. It would be an interesting story.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. The gentleman from Michigan knows that according to the law the contingency fund is only for economic assistance. But by transferring funds from the contingency fund over to another category of economic assistance, the administration is able to use the 10-percent transferability feature from each of these categories and in that way actually siphon money indirectly from the contingency fund over into military. This was done. This was an unauthorized act. There is a contingency fund of $300 million which is available for the military but which the administration did not choose to use at all. So when you consider what happened to that $177 million of contingency funds last year, I think in all due fairness you should deduct $75 million for military and say that at the very most the amount of $102 million was expended as Congress intended it to be expended and as the gentleman knows the minority will offer an amendment to appropriate the amount of $100 million for the contingency fund next year which will be almost the same as the amount that was spent properly last year.

Mr. FORD. I might add to the comment of the gentleman from Arizona. He mentioned there is a contingency fund under the authorization act for military assistance. I think it is section 510. Under section 510, if there is a need for additional military stocks over and above the funds made available in the appropriation bill for the foreign aid program, the President, the Secretary of Defense, can dip into our own military stocks up to the limit of $300 million. This is supposed to be the military assistance contingency fund. Subsequent to the utilization of this fund, of course, the administration, the President, has to come back and get a replenishment in order to rebuild our own Army, Navy, and Air Force stocks. But this would have been by far the more clean cut—the more legal way in which to help and assist the military assistance.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Just to bolster the argument we are making, that the use of contingency funds for the military was illegal or at least against the sense of the Congress, let me read from page 382 of the hearings from a colloquy between Mr. Bundy, one of the assistant secretaries of defense at that time, and the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN].

> Mr. BUNDY. A proposal was made about May or June last year to transfer an amount from the economic to the military side under section 610—

Which, I say parenthetically, is the transferability section—

> As to whether that could have come from the contingency fund, frankly, prior to the legislative history of the fiscal 1964 legislation, which on the floor of the Senate particularly did make clear that the contingency fund was available on the military side, it was the unanimous judgment of the lawyers in every corner I could find that it was not proper to transfer from the contingency fund for the military aid appropriation.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. I merely wish to say to the gentleman that if the President borrows from the military appropriation under section 510, he has to pay the military appropriation back. The testimony shows that he has never used that authority for that reason.

Mr. FORD. They used $75 million of it.

Mr. GARY. Not the military contingency fund; not under section 510.

Mr. FORD. They used the regular economic contingency fund to the extent of $75 million.

Mr. GARY. They used the regular contingency fund to that extent. The contingency fund was available. Mr. Bundy said:

> A proposal was made about May or June last year to transfer an amount from the economic to the military side under section 610. As to whether that could have come from the contingency fund, frankly, prior to the legislative history of the fiscal 1964 legislation, which on the floor of the Senate particularly did make clear that the contingency fund was available on the military side, it was the unanimous judgment of the lawyers in every corner I could find that it was not proper to transfer from the contingency fund for the military aid appropriation.

He says that the contingency fund was available.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Bundy was relying on a rather weak reed, if I may argue that point a little, because the legislation which set this up had already been adopted. He was using the debate on a later bill to try to determine what Congress meant at an earlier time. I do not mind saying, so far as one Member of Congress is concerned, I have never voted for that contingency fund in the expectation that it would be used for anything but economic assistance, and I do not believe other Members did.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I should like to finish my presentation.

I had started to mention that under the heading of "Alliance for Progress development loans," President Johnson in January made a budget request for new obligational authority of $465 million. Congress last year, in the consideration of the foreign aid appropriation bill, made available in new obligational authority for this item $375 million. In other words, President Johnson's budget submission in January was $90 million more in the Alliance for Progress development loan program.

Turning to development loans as a whole, in 1963 Congress appropriated new obligation authority of $687,300,000. That is new obligational authority. President Johnson in January of this year asked for $922,200,000 in new obligational authority, or an increase over what Congress gave him for the current fiscal year of $234,900,000.

I do not believe the record shows that this budget request for the foreign aid program is a "bare bones" request. It is not a request that is lower than Congress made available in new obligational authority in fiscal year 1964. In fact, it is substantially more.

Let us take another basis of comparison. If you will take the figure those of us who signed the minority report submitted—about a $510 million reduction—that will still leave available in new obligational authority for the administration $3,006,672,400 for fiscal year 1965. This would be more than $200 million above what the House of Representatives gave at the time we considered the bill last year.

It is more money than the Congress as a whole made available in new obligational authority for fiscal year 1964. So, with a half-a-billion-dollar cut, we still would be doing more than the Congress as a whole did last year.

Now, there have been some comments made earlier about the fact that this was the lowest budget request in a number of years. I think the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] said it was the lowest request in 9 years. My distinguished chairman and good friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], I guess wrote us all a letter, or at least he wrote me a letter, telling me, and I quote:

> Funds available for obligation are lower than for the current year, lower than at any time in the last 9 years, and $200 million below the new appropriation request.

I think it is rather interesting that they only went back 9 years, that is, the gentleman from Virginia and the gentleman from Texas, because if they had gone back 1 more year, they would have found it was not the lowest request in 10 years. I have before me several charts provided by the Agency itself which indicate categorically that if they had just gone back 1 more year, even under your criteria, the request for fiscal 1965 was not the lowest.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I will be very glad to yield.

Mr. MAHON. I think it would be well to go back and supply the figures since the very beginning of the program, but for the purposes of showing the total available funds for obligation in fiscal 1965, I thought we did a good job. The total available for obligation for the forthcoming year in this bill is $3.567 billion. Last year it was $3.623 billion. The year before that it was a billion dollars more, $4.573 billion. The year before that it was $4.972 billion.

My point is, if anyone finds it possible in his heart to follow the recommendations of the President and believes that the President needs a foreign aid program and that it is an important instrument in defense and foreign policy, then I believe he could reasonably support the pending bill, the lowest figure in 9 years.

Mr. FORD. The figures you just recited are the most helpful argument I have for the reduction we are proposing. The mere fact that they have had such large unobligated balances and such large amounts of deobligations proves one thing; that is, they have asked for and been given far too much money in each of the years the gentleman read the figures for.

Mr. MAHON. But here is a bill which is a billion dollars and a billion and a half dollars below the figures of fiscal years 1963 and 1962 respectively.

Mr. FORD. That just proves my point.

Mr. MAHON. So, if we believe this is an important instrument in foreign policy and national defense, if we have the lowest figure in 9 years in the pending bill, and if we believe in it at all in this critical stage in the history of the world, why should we not support it? This runs contrary to the gentleman's position when he signed the minority report in 1961, because the committee cut the bill, he thought, too much and he said he did not think that such a reduction could be defended. Yet that bill called for more obligational authority than this bill does today. I do not understand my friend's position now.

Mr. FORD. I find myself in a very desirable position because I have traditionally supported the program and have voted every year for the authorization. I have supported the appropriation bill every year. I supported President Kennedy when the gentleman from Virginia and a number of others opposed an increase that we tried to get for military assistance. I signed the minority report in 1960 when we were considering the fiscal year 1961 appropriation bill because the bill was too low. But when, I say, in 1964 some of my friends want to be rubberstamps for the executive branch of the Government, want to accept, as was done with the authorization bill without changing a figure, I rebel because they cannot justify their position on the facts.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. FORD. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to recall the word "rubberstamp." There has been no rubberstamp here. Over $200 million has been cut from the bill and $300 million of the request has been put on the shelf and cannot be released except under special circumstances.

Mr. FORD. My good friend from Texas knows better than to bring up that phony argument.

Mr. MAHON. The $300 million has been put on the shelf, so to speak, and $200 million has been cut out of the President's budget. The President himself reduced the request by $1 billion. In its action on the foreign assistance program last year the Congress said in effect, "Mr. President, we think the foreign aid budget request is too high; we think about $3.5 billion is enough." And we approved a total sum of approximately $3.6 billion last year. So who is the "rubberstamp," if there is one? The executive branch has apparently said, "Well, Congress, you may be right; Congress, we will agree with you; Congress, we will ask for the forthcoming year your figure of last year."

So if anybody has acquiesced it has been the Executive acquiescing in the will of the Congress. The Congress has not been a rubberstamp in any sense of the word.

Mr. FORD. Does my good friend from Texas think that we ought to appropriate this much every year just because we did it last year or just because we are doing it this year? Do you not think we ought to exercise a little independent judgment next year as we have in the past?

Mr. MAHON. That is the reason we made reductions. But when the President is trying to prevent war between Greece and Turkey over Cyprus, when the President is trying to prevent the loss of half a continent in the instance of the country of Brazil, when we have problems in South Vietnam, and when the Communists are threatening us in many ways, in many areas, why not give the President not everything he asked for but generally what he has asked for?

The President is the man who operates the program. We in Congress do not have to sit down and negotiate with foreign countries. We do not have to try to put out brush fires. The President says he needs this as a tool, as an instrument, to promote peace, to strengthen our defenses. We are, in the bill before us, giving him the lowest figure in 9 years. I am going to give a new President, for the first full year of his service, generally, the amount of money he has asked for in this dangerous area and hold him strictly accountable for it.

Mr. FORD. The gentleman makes a very persuasive argument, but I never heard him make that argument in the past.

Mr. MAHON. I have not had a chance to do so in 9 years because this is the lowest bill we have had.

Mr. FORD. No, I cannot agree with the gentleman, and I shall bring the figures to the gentleman's attention; and then I shall yield to the gentleman from Mississippi, because I know he has something important to say. But the facts are these. Let us go back to the fiscal year 1955. The President then asked for $3.4 billion. The Congress cut $700 million from that program and left new obligational authority of $2.7 billion. I did not hear the gentleman from Texas make this very strong and vigorous plea then. In 1956, in that fiscal year, the President asked for $3.2 billion. Congress cut that half a billion dollars and made available $2.7 billion. I did not hear this very impassioned plea then by the gentleman from Texas.

In fiscal year 1958 the President asked for $3.3 billion. Congress cut $600 million out of it, leaving a total of $2.7 billion.

The circumstances in those years were serious, were dire; they are today. The Congress in those years exercised its own independent judgment. It did not kowtow, it did not rubberstamp all of the requests of the executive branch of the Government.

Mr. MAHON. If the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman knows that we are not rubberstamping what the executive branch has asked for. We have gone back 9 years. If you go back 10 or 12 years, you have different situations and you have to realize the then existing conditions, what the facts and circumstances were as they existed at that time. I have done my home work on the last 9 years of the program. I am sorry I have not gone back further, but I believe 9 years is a pretty good stretch of time to give consideration to here.

I am quite surprised that my friend, the gentleman from Michigan, has ignored the $1 billion cut that the President himself made in order to get this program down to a lower figure. Then, we cut it $200 million and we put $300 million more on the shelf.

My friend is more or less out of character. He is not typical of the JERRY FORD who has stood up and defended this program in the past when he now insists on a total cut of $500 million, below the reduced figure which the President sent to Congress.

Mr. FORD. The President has not cut anything. It is his budget. All he did was cut the request of the bureaucrats in the Department. That is his responsibility as head of the executive branch of Government. The only thing we have before us is the request that says he wants $3.9 billion. And, when you include titles I and II, he has not cut anything. He is submitting a budget of that figure. If he had to beat some heads together over in AID, that is his job. That is what he is there for. He did not cut anything. Our job is to examine the program before us.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. If I wanted to abolish the Committee on Appropriations I believe I would have ample evidence to do so by quoting the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], based upon the statement which he has just made, and he made it in the full committee. The statement was about like this: "You do not know enough to mark up this bill, you do not know enough to mark up this bill," pointing to various members of the committee, "but the President does. The President has all the information at his fingertips. Therefore, I am going to give him everything he asks for."

If this is true of the foreign aid bill, it probably is true of many other appropriation bills also.

I wonder too, if this is the situation I say to my good friend, the gentleman from Texas, why do we bother to have hearings? Why do we not take the word of the people downtown and abolish the Committee on Appropriations and write a bunch of blank checks? I, personally, do not believe that we should do this.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, since my name has been mentioned, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. FORD. I yield further to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. Certainly, I believe that we should have the Committee on Appropriations and that we should make reductions and changes and modifications in executive estimates. We have done that to the extent of a half billion dollars in this bill. I believe that answers that part of the statement.

As to who is the best judge of the value of the foreign aid program, I say that the people who have had to operate that program—I would say President Truman, President Eisenhower, President Kennedy, and President Johnson, because they are the ones who have sat at the conference table and have tried to put out brush fires all over the world and have tried to negotiate with nations, not Mr. Ford or Mr. Mahon or Mr. Rhodes of Arizona. We are not the ones who have used this instrument. We have had no opportunity to use it. We have either approved it or disapproved it, but they are the ones who have operated it. If you have a manager down on a farm, the manager knows more about the operations of that farm than the banker, because the manager is out there running it.

I realize that there are members of the committee who know a great deal about the details of the individual projects, and more so than many representatives in the executive branch of the Government, but it is the President himself who is our spokesman in foreign affairs and who is the Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces. He is the best man to make these decisions affecting national policy in these areas.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Michigan yield further?

Mr. FORD. I yield further to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. If the gentleman from Texas feels incapable of marking up an appropriation bill, let him speak for himself. I, personally, do not. I feel just as capable of marking up this bill after going through the hearings and hearing the facts as anyone else.

Mr. MAHON. We marked it up and we cut it.

Mr. FORD. I said a very unkind thing, but I think personally it is accurate. I will give the gentleman an opportunity to reply.

Mr. WHITTEN. If the gentleman feels that way, I take no exception to his using his own description. I think this type of approach has worked very well in another subcommittee.

Let me describe what this does mean. It means that in the item in the bill for economic assistance if this section stays in the act, they will pull out of those items $300 million and set it aside. Then the remaining amount they will allocate under section 665, of title 31, United States Code, wherein it is provided that the remaining funds will be allocated on a monthly or quarterly basis.

If that section is carried out by the President, or by him through the Bureau of the Budget, it means that this amount the gentleman from Michigan and the gentleman from Louisiana and everybody else has complained about is put in the pocket before the first of July. They have it in a separate item, and if the provisions of this amendment are carried out there will have to be two determinations, one of them being that for the new projects for which they use this $300 million, under my amendment, they must show that there is a need, and so certify, and second, they also must show that there is not enough money in these other activities to meet that need. To my knowledge, in over 5 years, this will be the first time there will be any requirement in here requiring a review by the executive branch before the money is spent. I say that this is the first step to improve the situation that the gentleman from Michigan and the gentleman from Louisiana have complained about year after year. I want the record to be clear. I have not gone along with the billions that have been appropriated in times past. I do not think that is a sound foreign policy. I believe we are involved in the affairs of foreign countries too much. But if the gentleman will read the provision, and if it is carried out as it is intended, it will likely save $300 million.

Mr. FORD. May I say to my good friend from Mississippi, I have grave doubt that it will be very helpful in achieving economy. On the other hand, I hope it will. I will guarantee the gentleman from Mississippi, if this provision stays in the bill, and if I am back and a member of the subcommittee in 1965, I will pursue the method by which the executive branch of the Government executes the amendment which he has sponsored, and I hope that they will be able to prove to me that your amendment saved $300 million. I will pursue it to the end to be sure that they explain what they do.

Mr WHITTEN. May I say to the gentleman, I hope he will. Furthermore, it will do what I say if we can count on those administering it in the executive branch discharging the requirements of the provision. I just say it is a step forward, and 12 months from now we will have an opportunity to see how they discharge their responsibilities under the section.

Mr. FORD. If I am a conferee, I will fight to keep the amendment as is, because I want to see how it works, and I will expect the executive branch of the Government to execute it in bona fide good faith, to the "t," and we will get a report from them next year.

Mr. WHITTEN. I am glad to hear the gentleman say that, because the provision provides what I said. It will work if properly carried out. If it is not properly carried out, nothing will work.

Mr. FORD. In conclusion, I would like to say, although the President submitted a request in January for $3,900-some million, when we include both titles 1 and 2, that is not the full amount of funds available to the executive branch of the Government.

In the first place, according to a letter I have received from Mr. David Bell, head of AID, they expect to utilize in 1965, $1.5 billion of Public Law 480 funds, which, incidentally, is almost a half-billion dollars more than they used in the fiscal year 1958.

So they got $3.9 billion in new obligational authority. They anticipate spending through Public Law 480 another $1.5 billion. In addition, they have substantial amounts of local currency availability. They have both country-owned and United States-owned local currency availability. As a matter of fact, according to their own justification books, under the country-owned program they expect to have available $328.5 million. They expect to have in fiscal 1965 under local currencies United States-owned $1,192 million. This is a total of local currency availability in fiscal 1965 of over $1,500 million.

For some years we have been hearing that some of our allies whom we very generously supported in the days following World War II would make a greater and greater contribution to the foreign aid program to help underdeveloped countries throughout the world. Some of the allies whom we helped in the postwar period have been increasing their contribution. Go back to 1956. Countries like Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, and the United Kingdom made available in long-term financial resources about $1 billion. They have gradually increased this to about $2 billion, maybe a little more, when you go up to 1962. But the facts are they have not made as big a contribution as they should, and the facts are we have not been tailoring down our own foreign aid program. It seems to me it is high time that our allies take a greater share of the burden, get a more equitable distribution of the responsibility for the help of underdeveloped countries throughout the world.

May I conclude with this comment. I think if you believe in the integrity of the Congress, the legislative branch of the Government, its judgment, its prerogatives, and its responsibility, then I think you can honestly support the recommendations made by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Passman], the recommendations of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Andrews], and the recommendations proposed by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. Rhodes], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Minshall], and myself.

If you believe that the two other coordinate branches of the Federal Government, the executive and the judicial branches, are assuming legislative prerogatives and responsibilities, then you should support our recommendations.

If you believe the Supreme Court and the executive branch of the Government are seeking to engulf the legislative responsibilities of the Congress, then you ought to support the recommendations for reduction that we in the minority are supporting. These additional reductions of approximately $300 million are fully justified on the facts.

If you vote against the reductions, the additional cuts that we are proposing, you are in effect acquiescing in the usurpation of power and authority of the legislative by the executive branch of the Government. We have a responsibility to carry out our own independent judgment and not be a rubberstamp for the executive.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Haley] such time as he may desire.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, we are assembled here today to go through our annual ritual of deciding how many billions of the American taxpayers' dollars will be made available in the new fiscal year for distribution in our largely unsuccessful effort to buy the friendship of foreign nations.

I call this a ritual because, in the first place, there is no question at all that we are going to vote to spend another 3 billion-plus of the taxpayers' dollars and, in the second place, because we are going to do this when everyone of us knows that friendship is not a commodity, and therefore is not something which can be bought by the highest bidder.

But before we do approve this new—and in my opinion unconstitutional—disbursement of the taxpayers' dollars for the benefit of foreign nations, I do believe that we should give some real consideration to what we are doing. And thus I believe that we should give serious consideration to adoption of the amendment to further reduce the scope of this bill, which I am informed will be offered by our distinguished colleague from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN].

We should remember, in the first place, that what we are going to do when we pass this bill will be done not only without the consent of the taxpayers, but over the objections of what I believe to be a majority of them. I dare to say that not one of the proponents of this bill—in either this Congress or in the executive branch—would be willing to let the voters decide, in a national referendum, whether we should continue this program at all.

But in the second place, we should—indeed, I think we must—give deeply thoughtful and sincere consideration to the amendment to be offered by the able gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN]. I would urge that this consideration be given not merely because I agree with our distinguished colleague—nor on the basis of whether we like him as a friend and a colleague. To the contrary, I would urge that we look at the intended amendment by the gentleman from Louisiana solely on the basis of his past and proven record of deep insight into the methods by which foreign aid proponents have consistently, and sometimes deceitfully, padded their budgetary needs, and his equally proven record of eliminating these "falsies" and thereby saving the taxpayers billions of dollars in the past few years.

I say to you in all sincerity that the cut recommended by the Appropriations Committee is in itself a vindication of the past performance of our diligent colleague from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN]. It is true that the committee cut of "only" 6 percent in the administration's budget request has been hailed as a defeat for him and for those who oppose foreign aid. But the cold fact is that year after year, we have been presented with inflated foreign aid budgets, and then beleaguered and harassed to approve them at those inflated levels.

To our credit, we have refused to do so—last year, for instance, we cut 38 percent from a foreign aid budget its proponents said could not be cut without destroying the program. We made this cut because the foreign aid appropriations subcommittee, under the leadership of the gentleman from Louisiana, proved conclusively that the inflated budget could be cut—and could be cut with no detriment whatsoever to whatever merit the foreign aid program may have.

The new administration, I must admit, has not been slow to recognize the keen insight of the gentleman from Louisiana—and as a result, it sent up, probably for the first time in the history of foreign aid, a budget which was not deliberately and badly swollen. The evidence is that the administration believed sincerely the $3.5 billion it is asking was the lowest workable figure.

So now where do we stand? Well, it is obvious that our able colleagues of the Appropriations Committee did not quite agree with the administration's estimate. Even they have seen to cut this so-called barebones budget by $200 million. This action, in itself, was an admission that some fat still remained in the budget request. And I ask you—can we be certain that there still is not a bit of fat? I will remind you that 21 of our able colleagues on the Appropriations Committee agreed with the gentleman from Louisiana that another $300 million worth of fat still remains which should be eliminated. True, 26 members of the committee thought differently—under considerable pressure from the executive branch, I am told. But with this narrow majority against the half-billion cut, must we not consider, seriously, that there is a possibility that in this case the majority of the committee could have been wrong?

I think we must. For myself, I will support the greater cut in this appropriation which will be proposed by our colleague from Louisiana—who has proven he puts principle above rank—and I would hope that a majority of the House, in its wisdom would agree to trim out the fat which still remains in this bill.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA], a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. Chairman, last spring, a neighbor of mine planted a young willow on the edge of his lawn.

He was looking forward, he said, to the time—7 or 10 years hence—when his children could play in the cool bower made by the graceful boughs.

For a time, the willow did not do well. Some of its leaves yellowed; some of its streamers turned brittle and brown. The sun beat upon it, and the grass choked at it.

My neighbor continued his patient work of watering the willow.

I saw the tree the other day, after an absence of some time.

A few of the leaves were still yellow; the same streamers are still brittle and brown. But the tree, nevertheless, has a healthy look. Its roots are taking hold; it is beginning to thrive.

Gentlemen, this is the case with the Alliance for Progress.

After 3 years, when the doubtful said it could not thrive in such soil; when the cynical said the water would be insufficient; when the vicious stripped and broke its limbs; when the climate dealt it cruel blows; after 3 years, the Alliance has grown—measurably, significantly.

It is not yet, gentlemen, a tree under which we, or our children, can rest. But it has begun, surely, the slow climb to maturity, and to the fulfillment of all of our hopes for it.

I say that by our action here today we can assure that tree another year of growth. I say that we must do so—for the sake of ourselves, our children and our friends. I say that we must continue its achievement.

These achievements, despite the shortness of the time of the Alliance in both our own national life and in the life of Latin America, are many.

Most striking to me, gentlemen, is the change in the mood of Latin America—a change in the mood of individual nations with themselves, and toward us.

Four years ago, we were the rich outsiders who held aloof from any involvement in the demand of millions of Latin Americans for a better life. We were disliked, feared, hated.

This has changed. We now are working with these same Latin Americans to help them achieve this better life. Our money, our knowledge, and our sweat show that we are truly partners in their program.

Four years ago, there was immense resistance to change in Latin America. The ways of life which had endured for 400 years were still judged good. If change were to come, it should be only token change.

Today, throughout Latin America, you will find a general commitment to the idea of change—of rapid change, of deep change. The Alliance for Progress has focused on change, shown that it was peaceful and probable.

Four years ago, the currents of Castroism and communism were running strongly. Only by the Cuban example, or the Russian example, the Latin Americans were told, could progress come.

Today, the currents have died. Latin Americans, looking at Cuba, see ruin and retrogression, violence and servitude. They see no progress, no dignity and no peace.

But also striking are the changes that have been accomplished in only a few years, changes in the critical area of institutions.

Four years ago, only three nations had land reform laws or programs—of vital importance to an area where 10 percent of people own 90 percent of cultivable land.

Now, 12 nations have agrarian reform legislation and have created new land reform institutions. The emphasis is not solely on dividing up land, but on the equally difficult problems of improving productivity and marketing. There is movement, persuasive movement in land reform.

Four years ago, tax laws and tax administration in Latin America were regressive and chaotic. The laws bore heaviest on the poorest segments of the population. The rich evaded the taxes they owed.

Within the past year alone, 16 countries have brought about improvement in tax legislation and administration. The increase in revenues is truly startling, up to 128 percent on an unweighted basis. Government deficits are not yet eliminated, but they are being reduced, and Latin Americans are providing more of the funds that they need for development.

Four years ago, there were few credit unions or savings and loan institutions in Latin America. The institutions which could attract savings were weak or nonexistent.

Now, with U.S. assistance 400 credit unions already have been created, against an ultimate goal of 4,500. Seventy savings and loan associations have been established in five countries alone, and nine countries have enacted savings and loan legislation.

Four years ago, only three nations had begun the work of establishing priorities for development—work which we designate as national planning. There was a shortage of the technicians who could prepare such plans.

But today, every nation has a planning group of some variety. Eight nations have submitted their plans to the Organization of American States, and the technicians are growing daily in their experience and their effectiveness. The "development men" are moving toward the highest councils of government, and striking, too, in the physical change that has come with U.S. assistance under the Alliance.

Four years ago we of the United States had only begun to consider credits which would provide homes, schools, and water systems for the millions of Latin Americans without such necessities. We drew a sharp distinction between economic programs and social programs.

Today, we are much more aware that the two are a seamless web. Our credits have helped Latin Americans to build 222,000 homes, 23,400 schoolrooms, over 1,000 well and water systems. They also have helped publish nearly 7 million schoolbooks, and make over 200,000 agricultural credit loans.

By this time next year, gentlemen, the Alliance for Progress—if our action today is positive in support of it—will have benefited 24 million people with pure water systems, nearly 9 million with health care, and over 22 million more with food, under the food-for-peace program.

The circle of events, from the decision taken almost 3 years ago at Punta del Este, is ever widening. The Latin Americans have only begun to feel its effects; we, too, just now are beginning to have a fuller understanding of the vital program which the late President John F. Kennedy launched, and which President Lyndon B. Johnson has committed himself to carry on.

Gentlemen, we are engaged, truly, in the most historic undertaking of our time.

We are seeking, in the short space of 10 years, to bring much closer to its full and powerful potential, an enormous region of 220 million people. We are seeking to bring the 19 nations there much closer to the levels of self-sustaining growth, within the framework of democratic choice.

We are seeking, by our action, to assure that the world of tomorrow will be a world which shares, to the fullest degree possible, our own ideals of human dignity and representative democracy.

We are finding, to an intense degree, that Latin America's commitment to these same ideals, and the will in Latin America to maintain them, are being supported with devotion, dedication, and sacrifice, with self-help and with sweeping reform.

Already, much has been accomplished. I say that we must continue with the task so nobly begun. I say that we must put aside partisan cares, and honor our commitments to our Latin American friends, knowing that in so doing, we honor ourselves, our tradition and our history.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MINSHALL].

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MINSHALL. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLANCY].

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Chairman, there has been a lot of talk about this bill asking only for a rock bottom, absolutely minimal appropriation for continuation of our foreign aid program. Because we have already given away so many billions of dollars, $3.3 billion may not represent a substantial outlay to some, but I believe it is more than we can afford to appropriate at this time for this purpose. Accordingly, I intend to vote against H.R. 11812 and will support any attempts to decrease the appropriation.

For a long time I have thought unrealistic the theory that the United States can create politically mature and sound governments and raise living standards in underdeveloped countries merely by giving them money. I believe the fallacy of this theory has been amply demonstrated.

Despite our good intentions and our humanitarian motives, foreign aid as a means to world peace has failed to stop the advancement of communism. At the same time, it has not necessarily won friends, converts, and allies to the democratic cause.

I think the United States has undertaken too big a job; it is too much to hope to make the world over in our image. Despite our wealth and strength, we cannot continue indefinitely to assist almost every country in the world. Our heavy foreign commitments, added to our domestic ones, are draining our resources. Our soaring national debt and dwindling gold reserves attest to this fact.

Unfortunately, our aid has often been poorly conceived and has not been sufficiently selective to insure that the recipient country is able to use it effectively. It has always been my belief that technical assistance programs are preferable to direct financial grants. And I am strongly opposed to rendering any assistance whatsoever to Communist bloc nations.

Despite the appropriation cuts made by Congress, the various foreign aid agencies over the years have had more than adequate funds to spend, and there has always been a multibillion dollar balance of unexpended foreign aid funds available at the end of the fiscal year.

As the subcommittee chairman has pointed out, more than $7.1 billion remain unexpended at the end of this fiscal year from prior year appropriations. This would indicate that year after year we are authorizing foreign aid expenditures which are far in excess of the actual needs of a soundly executed program.

Furthermore, huge sums have been wasted for both military and economic projects. This waste in foreign aid funds has been documented time and again in many investigations by congressional committees and by the General Accounting Office.

The taxpayers have wearied of carrying this financial burden since the end of World War II. A recent poll of my constituents indicates that 83 percent of them favor reducing our foreign aid in scope or amount or discontinuing the program altogether.

The lack of value received for our tremendous outlays on this program through the years, the numerous cases of gross mismanagement and lax administration, and the urgent need to improve our domestic fiscal affairs and international balance-of-payments position convince me that this bill should be defeated.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I want to preface my remarks and would be remiss if I did not pay tribute to the courageous chairman of my Foreign Operations Appropriations Subcommittee. The Honorable OTTO PASSMAN is a Democrat of great personal honor and integrity who refuses to be led down the rose garden path, who refuses to sacrifice principle to anyone's selfish motivations and ambitions. I admire him for his strength of purpose, his steadfastness, and his courage.

Those of us who know that the foreign aid bill reported by a bare majority of the Appropriations Committee is a deceptive and wasteful bill, salute the gentleman from Louisiana for the brave and valiant battle he is waging for our country. Since becoming chairman of the subcommittee 10 years ago, he has been directly responsible for saving American taxpayers $8 billion which otherwise would have gone down the foreign aid drain.

It rests on his shoulders, and on the shoulders of those of us who joined him in signing the minority report, to make our case for a reduction of some $325 million in the bill before us.

The President and his supporters call this a "barebones" bill.

I do not question their right to call it that, but I do question whether they really believe it themselves. Let us look at the majority report.

In the report I call the attention of the House to paragraph 4 on page 2 and I quote:

> As a part of his effort to reduce the total Federal budget, the President requested $1,008,625,000 less for the foreign assistance program for fiscal year 1965 than was requested for the previous fiscal year. If this action had not been taken, the committee would in all probability have felt it necessary to repeat its action of last year and recommend a larger reduction in the funds provided.

They are saying that if the tumor had been bigger the surgeon would have removed it all. But it was a smaller tumor than expected, so only a portion was taken out.

In other words, if the President had asked for more money than President Kennedy did last year, the committee would have cut the foreign aid request literally to the bone. Since he asked for less, his reward is more money than he actually needs to operate an effective aid program.

That is what the majority report says. It is very clear. The words are those of the men who are telling you today that this is a "barebones" bill.

This bill calls for $526 million more than Congress appropriated last year. The reduction in this year's foreign aid budget is the smallest ever made by the House Appropriations Committee in the entire 18-year life of the foreign aid program.

I am not unrealistic; I am well aware of the importance, in many instances, of our aid program. Without it, much of the world would still be in ruins. Assistance still is essential in many areas of the globe to preserve our own security, to serve as a bulwark against Communist encroachment, and to fulfill a moral obligation. But, my votes against foreign aid are a protest against the manner in which the aid program is administered, all too often with complete disregard for the needs of the recipient country or the goals of good will and national security of the United States. My votes are against extravagance, waste, inefficiency and occasional corruption in the program. All too frequently our tax money has gone to further ideologies completely alien to our concept of the freedom of man and antagonistic to our Nation itself.

Since the inception of the aid program in 1956, a total of $50 billion has been eliminated by Congress from presidential budget requests. It has not hurt the program. The record will show that even more billions should have been eliminated. I protest the fantastic abuse of the aid money we hand over to the Executive year in and year out. When a country tells us to take our aid money and get out, it is baffling to me that the White House insists on sending the money anyway. But we are shipping more funds to Cambodia, Burma, and Indonesia, all of whom have categorically rejected our help.

It is baffling to appropriate $3.3 billion in the face of more than $7 billion in unexpended funds from prior years still on hand. We gave Tunisia $10 million in 1962, $15 million in 1963, we are asked to give them another $10 million this year, despite the fact that Tunisia still has $2 million of the $10 million in 1962 funds; $2 million still in the till from an appropriation of over 3 years ago.

Weeks of testimony before my subcommittee have convinced me that these programs are being requested with inadequate justification.

There is looseness in control and application of funds and programs. Only after the money is spent and gone do we learn of bungling, mismanagement, and waste.

Had Congress not signed a blank check in the past we could have perhaps avoided such absurd blunders as the $2 million Peruvian highway which serves nobody, carries no traffic, goes nowhere; the Peruvian irrigation project which is waterless after an expenditure of $125,000; $3 million worth of hayrakes rusted out in Iran because there is no hay grown in that country; $400,000 worth of TV sets for remote African jungle villages; $5.6 million for an Indonesian road leading to an athletic stadium. The list is endless. I have protested for years against this sort of abuse of tax money. Taxpayers are weary of it. Our economy will buckle if it continues. Our national security is not served by it.

The bill today opens the door for future blunders of this magnitude. It is not a "barebones" bill. A genuine "barebones" bill would follow the minority report.

We would cut development grants $49 million under the reported bill; international organizations and programs by $20 million; supporting assistance, $51 million; the contingency fund, $50 million; Alliance for Progress development grants, $50 million; administrative expenses for the Department of State, $94.9 million; the Peace Corps, $10 million.

We would cut an additional $325 million from this budget, and perhaps could cut more, and we would not injure one major project of merit, disrupt one worthwhile program, or jeopardize the cause of peace.

The printed hearings of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee reveal a number of examples justifying this reduction. Countless more can be found in the unpublished, classified transcripts. Once again censorship pencils have been busy in the State Department and the Pentagon, eliminating politically unpalatable facts from the public record.

This abuse of the top secret stamp is a grave disservice to the check and balance system of our government. With a phony security gag silencing Congress, the executive branch shows its contempt for the committee system and for the Congress itself.

This is not the first time I have taken the floor to protest this kind of censorship. I saw the Department of Defense Appropriations Subcommittee subjected to it this year. The same tactics were repeated by the same State Department and Pentagon people who appeared before the Foreign Operations Subcommittee.

On the facts as I heard them from witnesses testifying behind locked doors, from the facts available from past records and even from the current printed hearings, it is obvious that there is too big a price tag on the bill before us.

It is folly to call it a "barebones" bill. It is not.

I again call your attention to the minority report and I respectfully urge your support of it.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, is the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] down to his last speaker? Does the gentleman from Virginia have any additional speakers?

Mr. GARY. Yes, I do, but I would be glad for the gentleman from Arizona to proceed at the present time.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. How does the time stand, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. Each side has remaining 2 hours and 2 minutes.

If there are no further requests for time——

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. In a situation like this is it not the turn of the majority to yield time?

The CHAIRMAN. The majority has the right to close debate.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. If the gentleman from Virginia has only one speaker left, then I would be glad to yield time on this side.

Mr. GARY. If the gentleman from Arizona is ready to close debate now, I would be glad to do so.

The CHAIRMAN. The majority has the prerogative to close debate.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, with reference to my parliamentary inquiry I do not believe my chairman has answered my question.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], who is the author of the amendment that was adopted in the full committee.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I have consistently opposed the foreign aid bill for many years. Not only has it been wasteful beyond description but in my opinion in addition has now become an instrument of real danger to us because through foreign aid we have injected ourselves into the internal affairs of just about every country which would accept our money. Actually it was shown last year that some of the countries we aided were buying our gold. I have urged repeatedly that we review our foreign policy, end this costly and dangerous program.

In the appropriations bill which I have the honor to handle we pointed out this year in our report the following:

OVERSEAS PRODUCTION ENCOURAGED BY UNITED STATES

To further complicate this situation, our Government has been providing funds and technical assistance to enable competitors (Americans and foreigners) to increase their production overseas—both in quantity and quality—and to take over much of our traditional world markets with commodities produced with cheap labor, land and materials. It is extremely difficult for the American farmer to compete with foreign producers—although efficiency of production and superior quality has enabled him to retain some of his foreign markets despite this disadvantage.

The most serious situation facing the American farmer in this regard, however, is the current program of the U.S. Government which provides loans and investment guarantees to encourage American producers with American know-how to move their activities abroad to take advantage of cheap labor, land, and materials and to realize the benefits of certain tax advantages on oversea earnings.

Under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, American agricultural producers and other businessmen are being encouraged to go into business in foreign countries. In a brochure distributed to business interests throughout the country by the Agency of International Development (AID) entitled "Aids to Business—Overseas Investment." Americans who wish to move their interests abroad are given the following attractive inducements:

1. Investment surveys: AID will pay up to 50 percent of the cost of a trip to "explore the feasibility" of private investment abroad.

2. Dollar loans: AID will make dollar loans to encourage American investors to go into business abroad. The Export-Import Bank, International Finance Corporation, the World Bank, and the Inter-American Development Bank are also available for this purpose.

> 3. Local currency loans: AID will make local currency loans to Americans from foreign currencies generated under Public Law 480, the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act, to undertake oversea production.
>
> 4. Investment guarantees: AID will guarantee the American investor against inconvertibility of currency, expropriation, confiscation, and other political risks and will guarantee against certain normal business risks inherent in all business ventures.
>
> It should be noted, also, that the President's latest foreign aid message dated March 19, 1964 (H. Doc. 250) proposes even more liberal tax credit for American investment in less developed countries. Amendments recommended for enactment during the current session of Congress propose an additional tax credit of 30 percent on amounts invested by U.S. concerns abroad.

Mr. Chairman, our subcommittee is having an investigation made now. Several times in the past I have tried to get the Subcommittee on Foreign Aid to investigate these programs, since those of us opposed to the bill have been unable to defeat the appropriation.

I offered in the committee a few years ago a motion to determine what companies had been organized for the purpose of handling foreign aid only to lose. My purpose was to show who got the money as a start.

Mr. Chairman, notwithstanding our efforts against foreign aid, it has continued to pass the Congress and in the last 9 years more than $31 billion has been appropriated. Repeatedly members of this subcommittee have pointed out that there was virtually no review of the aid groups actions, that they obligated practically everything just before the new fiscal year, only to deobligate and use for a different purpose thereafter.

With that background, Mr. Chairman, I offered, in the Appropriations Committee the following provision which appears in the bill as the second paragraph on page 4:

> Of the foregoing amounts for economic assistance, $300,000,000 shall be available for obligation only through the apportionment review and approval procedure prescribed by law in such amounts and at such times as may be determined by the President in the national interest that funds otherwise available for the purposes of programs under this title are insufficient to meet the cost of additional authorized projects.

This provision when taken in connection with section 665, of title 31 of the United States Code, would call for the executive branch to withdraw $300 million from the items which appear theretofore in that title and place it on the shelf.

Then under section 665, the remaining funds would be budgeted or prorated on a quarterly basis to prevent running up a deficiency but this $300 million would not be allocated until and unless and then in such amounts as the President, doubtless through the Bureau of the Budget, determined was necessary to be spent in the national interest, and that funds otherwise available were inadequate.

Mr. Chairman, in effect the foreign aid people would have to empty their pockets, lay the money on the table to the Bureau of the Budget, and show there was insufficient money to meet the new need if this section is properly carried out.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to continuing foreign aid, but I truly believe this provision if properly carried out can help to bring order out of chaos, should perhaps result in saving this $300 million, and I know give at least an additional review to that which has had very little, if any, review in the executive department.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE].

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, we meet again in these Chambers to decide an issue of major consequence. At stake is the purpose and policy of the U.S. Government face to face with world communism and their increasing efforts to engulf and destroy the liberties and dignities of free men.

It is my personal belief and testament that our foreign economic and military assistance program—as a vital arm of the U.S. foreign policy—is the single most powerful weapon we have in this never-ending battle against the forces that would swallow our liberties. I have often been criticized for giving my full support to this program. I have often been criticized for fighting to insure a strong bipartisan base of support for foreign assistance. And yet overwhelming evidence indicates that from the outset of the modern foreign aid program, there has been strong and dedicated Republican backing for the foreign aid program. Republicans gave support to the Marshall plan, to the Truman doctrine and other major mutual security developments, most recently through the passage of the International Development Agency legislation.

I do not enjoy the prospect of voting against my colleagues on this issue. I do not like to put myself into the position of opposing some of my finest friends. If I were to change my position in deference to my friends, however, I would not be able to live with myself. Those who have consistently opposed the program from the beginning will plead to the effect that they cannot change while they are in midstream. By the same token, I cannot chart a different course at this time. That would be unthinkable, for this program requires continued strength and vitality.

One matter is peculiar. Certain of my friends who fought for a strong bipartisan program during the Eisenhower years are not now deeply committed to the program. I cannot understand this. I have said often in the past that it would be a tragedy if the foreign aid program were made a partisan issue.

Mr. Chairman, the world situation today requires unity in every respect. We find ourselves split asunder on all accounts. As a leader in the free world's aspirations for liberty and dignity among all men, we must fill the gaps created by our enemies. We have found that in spite of difficulties, the foreign aid program has greatly improved in recent years.

A number of reforms have been made in concept and organization of the program. The foreign aid program is highly selective and concentrated. Only key countries with real potential for development or significant security interest are being assisted to any appreciable extent. It would be unwise to turn our backs at this point of major improvement.

We are, whether we have willed it or not, the leader in the march of the world's millions toward a new destiny. It is a leadership due not simply to our great economic structure and our military posture, but rather a leadership based on the strength of our ideas, our tradition of independence, and our respect for individual dignity.

This is why, Mr. Chairman, we need unity at this perilous juncture in world history. As the standard bearer of free men throughout the world, we have the responsibility of proving by deeds—and not pious words—our justification and our leadership.

We know that much is expected of us. More importantly, we know we have been given a great deal—and woe to any man or nation who does not share what has been given.

Our program, in realistic terms, is a program of self-interest and self-preservation. No one can "go it alone" at this time, and we need our allies in every respect. Foreign aid can be compared to a two-edged sword. On one edge of the sword is the very practical aspect of working with our friends to make NATO, SEATO, CENTO, and the OAS—strong and powerful. Our self interest is involved. The practical, realistic application of the program is in keeping with these interests. Our security is involved. Is the Congress of the United States willing to lessen the security precautions that this program entails? Are we going to weaken ourselves vis-a-vis a world Communist design? Can we appropriate billions and billions for a moon program that may be the most impractical gesture ever made in the history of civilization and forget the nameable, countable human beings throughout the world who are embedded to the good earth and who cry out for our assistance?

On the other edge of the sword we have strong humanitarian traditions to uphold. In this regard I would like to say that foreign aid will not solve—and could never solve—all of the problems the United States faces in an increasingly complex world. It will not solve territorial or ideological disputes. It may not win us bosom friends. But let us not vent our feelings by slashing a program that asks a minimum amount of money which will be used to the fullest extent possible.

The program is consistent with our responsibility as Americans, and consistent with our long history of freedom. I urge all those who believe in the greatness of America to support foreign assistance at this time. Such support will continue to keep America strong and free at home, and resilient and powerful abroad.

FOREIGN AID AND AMERICAN WORLD LEADERSHIP

When the record of the 20th century is written, foreign aid will stand out as one of the greatest achievements of our time. Milton said, "Peace hath her victories no less renowned than war." There have been great victories in the 20th century, in peace as well as in war, but the greatest of all victories will be the securing of the freedom won at such great cost by war.

We live perhaps too close to events of the moment to comprehend their lasting significance. Yet we can see clearly enough to see that this is a turning point in history. From all of our experience, and from all we know about the world and its needs, it is clear that an enlightened program of assistance to less-developed countries is in the interest of all free men. President Eisenhower stated the case cogently in his last message on foreign aid when he said:

> Foreign aid is not only grounded in our deepest self-interest but springs from the idealism of the American people which is the true foundation of our greatness. It rests upon five fundamental propositions; one, that peace is a matter of concern to all mankind; two, that to keep the peace, the free world must remain defensively strong; three, that the achievement of a peace which is just depends upon promoting a rate of economic progress * * * which will inspire hope; four, that * * * help to the less-developed nations * * * is a common responsibility of the free world community; and five, that the United States cannot shirk its responsibility to cooperate * * * in this regard.
>
> The overwhelming support of the vast majority of our citizens leads us inexorably to foreign aid as a fixed national policy.
>
> Equally with military security, economic development is a common necessity and a common responsibility. An investment in the development of one part of the free world is an investment in the development of it all. Our welfare, and the welfare of all free men, cannot be divided * * * we are dependent one on the other.

Just the other day President Eisenhower reiterated his deep belief in the foreign aid program, and urged Congress to support President Johnson's request for the funds necessary to operate an effective program during the next year.

FOREIGN AID IS THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION IN ACTION

As President Eisenhower himself recognizes so well, nothing better symbolizes America's role of world leadership than foreign aid. Of all of the great acts of American statesmanship, foreign aid is the most outstanding, and, I might add, the most in keeping with our own history and traditions.

The United States of America was the first new nation. Ours was the first modern, democratic revolution. We were the first colony to win our freedom. We were the first newly independent people to face the wilderness. The word "bootstrap" is an American word. Americans know what it takes to lift yourself by your own bootstraps, because America was created by the determination and hard work of its people.

Americans were political pioneers as well. We were the first people in history to establish a new government in a new land. Ours was a political revolution, which, once it succeeded, left us without adequate government. This is why we understand the problems in beginning with a revolution and building a nation. We know how difficult it is, once freedom is gained, to unify the people of a country, to create one from many, to establish a government which can govern. The words, "E Pluribus Unum," describe our unfinished task, a task we have in common with every other country of the world which, having gained independence, is trying to build one nation.

We understand—because it has also been our problem—the great dilemma faced by the other new nations in keeping faith with freedom, while at the same time maintaining the political stability necessary to prevent anarchy and avoid destruction.

Foreign aid is the American Revolution in action in the 20th century. Conditions differ, but the basic problems facing the new nations are similar to those which we faced and continue to face. It is through foreign aid—conceived not just as economic development, for that is only part of the problem, but conceived as a total plan of action for bringing about social, economic, and political change in less-developed countries—that the ideals and goals of the permanent American revolution, and the permanent interests and aspirations of the human race best find expression.

THE MARSHALL PLAN WAS A GREAT SUCCESS

Our commitment to foreign aid was a part of our assumption of world leadership following the Second World War. Helping Europe to recover was the first stage of this commitment. Beginning in the late 1940's it became apparent that the problems of the less-developed world were equally urgent, and the point 4 program was launched. Then came Korea, and we were diverted from long-range development into emergency military assistance through the mutual security program. For about 5 or 6 years most of our energies were directed toward providing military assistance to the less-developed countries. Toward the end of the 1950's the immediate menace of external Communist aggression had diminished, while the need for long-term development, combined with internal security, had increased. Once again we changed directions, shifting from a program primarily military in concept to one primarily developmental.

It has been only 5 or 6 years now since we began to devote most of our energy to long-range development. After 15 years of aiding the less-developed countries, 10 of which were largely consumed by military efforts, we can begin to see results.

The Marshall plan had its critics. There were skeptics then, as there are now. The fainthearted said it would ruin us economically. The pennypinchers railed against adding to the national debt. The narrowminded complained about helping our competitors. The superpatriots protested spending our money on foreigners. Where are the critics and the skeptics now? What has happened to the doubters and complainers; to those who opposed the Marshall plan; to those who voted against the bill when it came up on the floor of this House?

Like the poor, they are still with us. And they are still singing the same sad song. The tune has changed, but the lyrics are the old leftover lines of 15 years ago. Of course, the Marshall plan succeeded. But the Marshall plan, they say, was different. Foreign aid to Europe worked; foreign aid to other parts of the world is predestined not to work. Foreign aid to developed Europe was justified; foreign aid to underdeveloped Latin America is a waste of money. A recovery program makes sense; a development program is beyond our means and capabilities.

History has not been kind to the doubters, the pennypinchers, the handwringers who said that the Marshall plan would not work. If experience has taught us any one lesson, it is that progress is made by those who look ahead, who have a vision of the future, who have the courage to attempt the seemingly impossible.

Foreign aid is the most ambitious and difficult endeavor in history. The concept itself is revolutionary. One hundred years ago England forcibly prevented her technicians from leaving the country for fear they would make their knowledge available to others. Today, it is a mark of enlightenment for a country to make available its technical skills and knowledge, and even to provide the capital necessary for economic growth. Yet part of our problem is that despite all the evidence to the contrary some are still reluctant to accept the validity of the concept itself. Others rightly argue that although the concept is valid, it has not been properly executed. But it is one thing to say that there have been mistakes, and quite another to say that the concept of foreign aid is not valid. It is one thing to offer constructive criticism—that is our duty, but it is quite another to find nothing but fault. It is one thing to say that foreign aid needs to be improved, but it is quite another to criticize without suggesting any alternative except less aid to fewer countries by a smaller staff with lower appropriations.

Every Member of this House wants to see improvements made in the foreign aid program. There is not a Member who does not have his own ideas about how this could be accomplished. Some of the criticisms and suggestions of Congress have been put into effect and have helped to improve the program. It is important for Congress to continue to suggest changes and improvements. If anything, there is need for even greater congressional examination of the strengths as well as the weaknesses of foreign aid. But there are any number of ways in which Congress can influence the course of foreign aid without casting doubt on the concept, undermining confidence in the program, and creating a negative political climate which favors restrictions and reductions rather than healthy, constructive criticism, and support.

ASSISTANCE TO LESS-DEVELOPED COUNTRIES ACHIEVING RESULTS

What are some of the accomplishments of foreign aid to the less-developed nations? We know what foreign aid achieved in Europe, but what do we know, beyond the successful prevention of Communist aggression, about the achievements of foreign aid in the less-developed world?

In terms of overall economic success, a recent analysis of 41 countries which have received more than $300 million in American assistance since the beginning of the program, or, in the case of countries of less than 10 million which have received at least $30 per person, reveals that 33 have achieved substantial economic growth of at least 1.5 percent per capita in increased income per year for the last 5 years. Fourteen of these countries have achieved complete self-sufficiency, while another 11 have reached the point of adequate self-sufficiency with less than 20 percent of their total investment presently being covered by foreign aid. In all 24 of the countries which have achieved both substantial economic growth and adequate self-sufficiency, democratic political institutions have also been strengthened. Let me put this record another way. Of the 50 countries which have received more than token U.S. assistance over the past 15 years, more than 30 have already achieved or are approaching self-support status. This is a record of effectiveness of which all Americans can be proud.

Another overall measure of the success of our foreign aid program is the increase in our trade with countries receiving our assistance. U.S. exports to Marshall plan countries more than doubled from 1953 to 1962. Our exports to Japan have more than tripled since 1950. In 32 countries receiving 80 percent of U.S. aid between 1957 and 1962, imports from the United States have increased four times as fast as U.S. economic aid. There are many reasons why foreign aid is in our interest. One of these is the contribution foreign aid makes toward promoting trade. The less-developed world is potentially a vast market for American goods and services. Through foreign aid American business can achieve new opportunities for commercial relations with countries which can become good customers in the future.

We know that besides promoting more and better trade between the less-developed countries and our own, the foreign aid program is also having an increasingly beneficial effect on the American economy—80 percent of all procurement now consists of American goods and services, and much of the remaining 20 percent eventually comes back home. Almost every State in the Union is now beginning to experience the good effects of aid contracts.

In 1960, only 11 percent of the iron and steel products financed by foreign aid appropriations came from American steel mills. During 1963, about 87 percent was purchased from U.S. producers. In 1960, 11 percent of the nonferrous metals financed under foreign aid came from the United States, compared to about 92 percent in 1963. For fertilizer the percentage rose from 17 to 97 percent. Similar figures could be given for many other products.

Furthermore, the restriction of foreign aid spending to U.S. goods and services means that a substantial share of U.S. exports in some lines is now financed by our foreign aid program. For example, in calendar year 1962, one-third of U.S. exports of locomotives, one-third of U.S. exports of fertilizer, and 21 percent of U.S. exports of iron and steel products were among the commodities purchased under the foreign aid program to assist the economic development of countries in Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

Under these new policies, the foreign aid program today accounts for a relatively small and declining element in the U.S. balance-of-payments deficit. The outflow of dollars under foreign aid next year is estimated at about a half billion dollars—far smaller than the $2½ billion spent abroad each year by U.S. tourists, or the nearly $3 billion invested abroad each year by U.S. business.

In addition to the direct benefit of sales, aid-financed U.S. procurement is also providing the opportunity for U.S. business to gain experience in world trade. Many contracts are being let to businesses which have never had any experience, or have had very little experience, in selling overseas. Through foreign aid contracts American businessmen are learning the ropes and acquiring the skills necessary for selling through regular commercial channels in the future. As trade replaces aid in the years to come, these skills, techniques, and business contracts will prove invaluable in enabling the American businessman to take his rightful place in the world market.

There are countless other examples of the successes being achieved in the less-developed countries with our help. You could write a shelf full of books on the technical assistance achievements made possible through U.S. aid, or on the advances made in public administration, taxation, and business administration. Countless other examples could be cited in the field of cooperatives; in the development of private enterprise through the extension of credit; or in the development of agriculture through a combination of technical assistance and agricultural credit.

Many stories could be told about the great achievements in the fields of health and education. One of the most dramatic of these is the story of malaria eradication. During recent years the number of cases of malaria in the world has been cut from 350 million to less than 100 million. In some countries malaria has been eliminated altogether, freeing millions of people for more productive lives. This is not only a great human achievement, it is a great step toward developing the economic potential of countries burdened with sickness and disease. In several areas of India, for example, the return on money invested in controlling malaria has been about 50 to 1 in increased industrial production, resulting in an increase in the Indian gross national product of some $500 million each year. In one rich region in northern India the elimination of malaria increased the area of cultivated land by 400 percent and the production of food grains by 130 percent.

THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS IS BEGINNING TO WORK

Although Latin America began to receive major foreign aid only 2 years ago, progress under the Alliance for Progress has been encouraging. Despite the great difficulties encountered in transforming the societies of Latin America, 11 countries have initiated significant tax reforms, 10 countries have passed land reform legislation and 3 others have legislation pending. Ten countries have exceeded the goal of a 2.5 percent annual growth rate called for by the Alliance. The total value of Latin American exports increased 7 percent in 1962, the last year for which figures were available, and trade within the region rose by 12 percent. Equally important, between 1957 and 1962 U.S. manufacturing affiliates in Latin America increased their sales by 70 percent.

By June 1965, more than 300,000 new homes, some 36,000 classrooms, more than 2,000 water systems and some 600 hospital and health units will have been built in Latin America with our help. Three hundred thousand farm credit loans will have been issued. Eleven million textbooks will have been printed.

All of the Alliance countries have improved their tax administration capacities. In a number of these—such as Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru, Argentina, El Salvador, Mexico, and Bolivia—these administrative changes are, or promise to be, sweeping. U.S. Internal Revenue Service teams have been assisting tax reform efforts in 10 countries and will soon be helping in 4 others.

Progress in basic agrarian reform has been slow, but there has been some encouraging movement. Cooperatives and credit unions are growing. For example, rural electric cooperative activity has begun in a dozen countries. Colonization and land settlement programs are active in half a dozen countries. Progress continues in the introduction of new legislation and in issuing regulations for the administration of existing laws. Twelve countries have already introduced agrarian reform legislation. The agrarian reform institutes or land reform agencies in these 12 countries have greatly strengthened their technical resources and show encouraging progress in conducting basic surveys and project development. AID is assisting in this rural development effort through the cooperation of the land-grant colleges.

Fifteen countries have self-help housing programs. Savings and loan legislation has been adopted by nine countries: Chile, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Peru, Venezuela, Argentina, El Salvador, Guatemala, and Panama. The first five of these countries now have operating systems—a total of nearly 70 savings and loan associations with 100,000 depositors who have accumulated deposits equivalent to more than $35 million. These associations provide savings badly needed for productive investment.

The building of new institutions to channel savings into investment is clearly seen in the establishment of development banks or other intermediate credit institutions in most of the Latin

American countries. Since the inception of the Alliance, private or public development banks have been set up or are in the process of creation in eight countries: Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, and Panama. In addition, the Central American Bank for Economic Integration—CABEI—has been established and is promoting private sector development in member countries.

Latin America is truly on the march. Nothing better demonstrates the difference between communism and democracy than the progress being made in the free countries of Latin America, by contrast to the slow death of Cuba under Communist rule.

SUPPORT FOR FOREIGN AID IS GROWING AMONG BUSINESSMEN

These are but a few examples of the accomplishments which can already be seen, even in this brief time, from long-term development assistance to the emerging countries. Clearly, this is not a time to turn back. This is a time to press ahead; to forge a more effective weapon for serving the ideals and purposes for which the foreign aid program stands.

There are those who would have us believe that the Americans are against foreign aid. On the contrary, support for foreign aid is strong, and growing stronger. A recent study of 1,500 prominent businessmen, for example, disclosed that a great majority of American business leaders consider foreign aid essential in promoting a self-supporting and prosperous community of free nations. These findings, reported in the General Electric Forum, were heralded as "revolutionary in their significance" and they are. They symbolize the new consensus in the United States about our responsibility as the leader of the free world, to provide assistance necessary for developing this community of free nations. American businessmen understand the significance of the foreign aid program for the future economic strength of the United States. They know that economic assistance to Western Europe and Japan has contributed to the doubling of our exports across the Atlantic, and a tripling of our exports to Japan.

The American businessman knows that there is a potential mass market of over $1.9 billion waiting in the less-developed nations, and that helping to increase the purchasing power of these people could be just as revolutionary as the development of wide-volume mass markets in America. Foreign aid could be the key to helping spread the industrial revolution to Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

The United States sells on the average $5.12 worth of goods to every person in the less-developed countries each year. Every dollar by which this is increased will add nearly $2 billion to total U.S. exports each year.

For every 1-percent increase in the gross national product of the less-developed world, U.S. commercial exports can be expected to increase by about 1.4 percent, or almost 50 percent as fast.

Foreign aid could, indeed, be the key to the creation of a great world market, and an international capitalist system which could be the final answer to the pretensions of communism.

THE MEASURE OF OUR GREATNESS

These signs of progress are gratifying. At the same time, it is becoming increasingly apparent that the road to development is not paved with quick solutions. It will take decades before many countries will achieve self-sustaining growth. The process will be long and painful, full of disappointment and temporary defeat. The task before us calls for determination but also for patience. We are an impatient people, used to doing things in a hurry. In the case of foreign aid, there are pressing problems—but they cannot be solved overnight.

We are also a very democratic people, intolerant of social injustice, extremes of economic inequality, and lack of political opportunity. We are sometimes impatient with others because we have difficulty seeing our own social, economic, and political progress in perspective. We also tend to measure the progress of others by what we have today, rather than by what they had yesterday. Only if we gain a better perspective of the process of development will we have the persistence to prevail.

It has been 15 years since the Marshall plan, yet only now are we able to see its results. I hope and believe that in years to come we will be able to enjoy the fruits of our present labor. It must be remembered, however, that in Europe all of the necessary conditions were present for rapid development. By contrast, many of the less-developed countries are beginning at the beginning. If it took 15 years to see the results of the Marshall plan for Europe, how much longer will it take to measure the results of our present program for the less-developed nations?

The world is entering a period of great uncertainty and stress, which will tax the patience and tolerance of every nation. It could become a time of trouble, with the poor turning on the rich, and the rich turning away from the poor. Or it can become the beginning of a new age, with freemen working together for their common good. That choice is in our hands.

Now, more than ever, our response to the challenge of development is a measure of our greatness as a people and our enlightenment as a nation. And now, more than ever, American genius is required to make foreign aid a more effective answer to the great questions facing the less-developed world.

President Johnson and General Eisenhower have asked for our support. Let us now give it, not grudgingly, or in a spirit of despair and defeat, but in full awareness that although the way be perilous and long, there can be no turning back. With a community of free nations as our ultimate goal, let us rededicate our country to the ennobling and historic task of helping two-thirds of the human race to win, not just freedom, but the blessing of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am going to submit here, because I do not want to trespass on the patience of my fellow members, some comments on the minority report which I feel should be answered by someone. I have the greatest respect for the members on my side, and I know that a great many of these join with the chairman of the subcommittee, but I know that these are some of his feelings, because I sat in that committee along with the gentleman from Arizona who has done such a tremendous job and has been most diligent in working with the committee and sitting there patiently day in and day out. He and several of us have been sitting there because the attendance has not been too great. I think the reason why it has not been too great is because of the chairman's insistence on asking the questions and then answering the questions without giving the witness the opportunity. Therefore, I am taking this opportunity here today to submit some of my comments on the minority report.

The comments on minority views are as follows:

First. Page 16: The minority views state that we are financing over 4,000 foreign aid projects.

This is not accurate. There are at present 2,358 active projects being conducted by AID. This includes all loan and grant projects for which there are unliquidated balances. During the hearings Mr. PASSMAN maintained many of these projects could be broken down into subprojects. However, the figure of 4,000 projects cannot be substantiated. The best and most accurate estimate is the 2,358 of actual numbered projects now active.

Second. Page 16: The minority report charges that there are now 71,416 people on the foreign aid payroll, an increase of 7,000 since fiscal year 1963.

This total figure includes 33,000 foreign nationals who are not employed in the foreign aid program at all. These people are being trained as part of our foreign assistance program. About 21,000 of them are being trained under military assistance training programs. The actual number of personnel in the foreign aid program, including both direct-hire and contract employees, was 38,204 as of March 31, 1964. The corresponding figure as of April 30, 1963, was 41,709. Therefore, the actual number of personnel employed in the foreign aid program has been reduced by 3,505 in 1 year. It should be noted that more than 17,000 personnel are foreign nationals being paid at pay rates current in the country where they work, which are usually much less than U.S. pay scales. Participant trainees are not paid wages or salaries; they are in no sense employees of the U.S. Government. They do, of course, receive living expenses, tuition, and so forth, while being trained.

The details of personnel are set forth in part 2 of the hearings on page 121.

Third. Page 16. The minority report states that 10 percent of the funds appropriated for any purpose may be used for other purposes.

This refers to the so-called transfer authority provided under section 610 of the authorizing legislation. This authority to transfer 10 percent of the funds appropriated from one funding category to another funding category may not be used for development loans, Alliance for Progress loans, or for administrative expenses. The authority may be used for other funding categories "whenever the President determines it to be necessary for the purposes of this act." This authority has been used this year to transfer funds to the military assistance program, primarily to meet requirements in southeast Asia.

Fourth. Page 16: The minority views state that the contingency fund may be used for any purpose authorized under the act.

As pointed out in the majority report, the contingency fund may only be used to meet urgent and unforeseen assistance needs that cannot be accurately defined in advance. It should be pointed out that the contingency fund may not be used directly for military assistance. It can, of course, be transferred to military assistance under the authority of section 610.

Fifth. Page 16: The minority views state that military assistance has its own contingency fund in the amount of $300 million.

This is not so. The statement refers to section 510 of the authorizing legislation which provides that the President, if he determines it to be vital to U.S. security, may use defense articles from existing stocks and defense services for the military assistance program. This special authority is limited to $300 million. However, it is not a contingency fund as such, and the value of any goods and services used must be made up in the following year's appropriations. This authority has never been used, largely because of the problem of cutting into future years' appropriations.

Sixth. Page 16: The minority charges that the foreign aid program is "uncontrolled and uncontrollable," that appropriations can be justified for the construction of a dam in one country and used to build a bridge in another.

The foreign aid program is subject to congressional review and control. Each year the program must justify its fund requests by grant project and by anticipated levels of lending before four separate committees of the Congress. Congress has provided necessary flexibility in the foreign aid program so that it can respond to changing demands. The presentation to the Congress is illustrative to the extent that, legally, the Agency could justify money for a project and not go through with it. If a given project which has been included in the Agency's presentation turns out to be unnecessary, or if the recipient country is unwilling to undertake the necessary self-help measures, or if sufficient funds are not available, the Agency does not and should not initiate the project.

The facts are that virtually all of the projects and programs which are justified to the Congress by the Agency are, in fact, undertaken. Twice each year the Agency must report to the Congress under the provisions of section 634(d) of the authorizing legislation, any major changes in its programs in each country and in each funding category.

Seventh. Page 16. The minority states that foreign aid programs are based on "conjecture and estimates of the wildest sort."

In fact, the aid program each fiscal year is built on rigorous analysis which begins about 18 months before the presentation is made and continues until each project is completed. This analysis is conducted in the field as well as in Washington. Decisions as to whether to proceed with activities depend on the importance of the activity to U.S. foreign policy, a continuing review as to the soundness of the activity, self-help, and other performance by the recipient country, and the availability of funds.

Eighth. Page 16. The minority implies that accurate estimates of unobligated funds for any fiscal year are not available until October of the following year.

It is true that fiscal year 1963 final exact figures on unobligated balances were published early in October. However, accurate preliminary estimates of final unobligated balances are available near the end of each fiscal year. The Agency has made a close and continuing analysis during fiscal year 1964 of unobligated balances. On June 19, they presented to the Appropriations Committee up-to-date estimates of what unobligated balances would be as of June 30. The total of such balances at that time was $53.1 million for both military and economic programs. The actual unobligated balances could be somewhat less.

Ninth. Page 17. The minority views quote a variety of witnesses on the adequacy of funds provided in fiscal year 1964.

The minority notes the appropriation of $3,000 million in fiscal year 1964 but does not show the total fund availability of $3,488 million. The quotation of executive branch witnesses which then follow were, of course, made on the basis of total funds available in fiscal year 1964.

The statements quoted are somewhat out of context. For example, the rest of the testimony of Secretary Rusk taken from part I, page 276 is relevant. He continued in part:

> This leaves us without leeway in two directions. One is, if we run into a very serious deterioration of a situation in particular areas, such as in the Far East where the attitudes of Peiping are ominous and threatening. On the other hand, as I indicated in my statement, we have not tried to budget for all of the important opportunities which would be in front of us if things went, shall we say, even more favorably.
>
> It is possible that on either side of this main highway we are talking about, we might have to seek additional assistance from the Congress.

Mr. Bell responded to this point—part II, page 17:

> Mr. Bell. I think the funds made available by the Congress, including the carryovers, are permitting us to do a great many things and conduct a great many programs that are strongly in the U.S. interests, and have a major impact. We are very tight on funds in the military assistance program, and in the supporting assistance program. In both cases, we expect to draw on the contingency fund, as I indicated in my statement. We expect to have more projects completed and ready for funding which we will not be able to fund under the regular development loan appropriation.

Tenth. Page 18: The minority uses part of a colloquy to imply that there would be $526.7 million more available in fiscal year 1965 than in fiscal year 1964.

This part of the report ignores a central point: Total availability in fiscal year 1964 was $3,488 million. The estimate of fiscal year 1965 availability at that point was $3,635 million—an increase of only $147 million over 1964. The addition of the special Vietnam request raised the estimated fiscal year 1965 availability to $3,760 million, and the difference to $272 million between 1964 and 1965.

The paragraphs of Mr. Bell's statement immediately following the one quoted by Mr. Passman explain the situation—part II, page 8:

> That is exclusive of the social progress trust fund, for which we are not asking an appropriation this year. However, to that amount must be added reappropriations and carryovers of nearly $400 million, and estimated recoveries and reimbursements during this year of another $220 million, so that our total funds available for programing in fiscal year 1964 are nearly $3,500 million.
>
> We do not expect to have unobligated funds of a similar magnitude at the end of this June to carry over into next year, and our total program for 1965 is only $145 million larger than for the current year.

Mr. Bell also said at that point in the hearings—part II, page 46:

> Mr. Bell. I think it is only fair, Mr. Chairman, to note the point about carryovers. The availability of funds this year for both economic and military is $3,488,656,000.
>
> The availability we anticipate for next year, including the new appropriations we have asked for and adding the estimated carryover, after recoveries, is $3,635,100,000.

Eleventh. Page 19: The minority implies that other nations take our aid and buy gold.

This is wrong. Those nations responsible for most of the gold outflow listed, in fact, repaid more to the United States on past assistance than they received during this period.

The table updates by 6 months a similar table included in the Passman report last year. Secretary Rusk placed in the testimony—part I, page 281—comments on this earlier table. The figures have changed slightly, but the comments are still valid.

Comments on Gold Purchases Statement in 1963 Report of the House Appropriations Subcommittee

The 1963 report of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Foreign Operations pointed out that 52 countries which received almost $12 billion in foreign aid between January 1958 and June 1963 purchased $6.8 billion of gold from the United States during that period. The report concludes that resources released by foreign aid, enabled these countries to buy $6.8 billion of gold from the U.S. Treasury.

The facts are correct, but the conclusion is largely wrong.

The 12 of those countries which bought most of the gold—$6.2 billion or 91 percent—actually returned to the United States $400 million more repayments of past aid than the assistance they received during the period. These countries received nearly $4 billion of assistance, two-thirds of it military, but repaid in principal and interest over $4.3 billion to the United States during this period.

The 12 major purchasers of gold were Austria, Belgium-Luxembourg, Denmark, France, West Germany, Italy, Japan, Lebanon, Netherlands, Saudi Arabia, Spain, and the United Kingdom. It should be noted that none of these 12 countries have received AID assistance for a year or more and that military assistance has virtually ended to most of them.

Twelfth. Page 22: The minority states that, since April 6, funds have been deobligated and then reobligated for 236 projects.

The actual number is 228. Deobligation and reobligation normally occur in this period of the fiscal year. It would be equally true to say that funds have been deobligated and reobligated for 228 projects in the amount of $50 million since the start of the fiscal year. Reobligation of deobligated funds is based on careful analysis of project funding requirements. This analysis continues throughout the fiscal year. Generally, reobligations occur toward the end of this process near the end of the fiscal year. It should be noted that estimates of deobligated funds which will be available for reobligation are taken into account in preparation of the budget estimates and the request for new appropriations reduced accordingly. As required by law, reobligations of funds are for projects previously justified to the Congress and are reported to the Committees on Appropriations.

Thirteenth. Page 22: The minority points out that expenditures from economic and military assistance funds and Public Law 480 commodities will be made in a total of 99 countries and 9 territories during fiscal year 1965.

What the minority does not state is that new commitments under programs of economic assistance will take place in only 76 countries and approximately 90 percent of the funds will go to 25 key countries. The minority does not point out either that military assistance programs are planned for only 40 countries with additional small training programs in 13. Naturally, economic assistance and military assistance do not always go to the same countries. Emergency and relief programs under titles II and III of Public Law 480 go to many countries.

Fourteenth. Page 22: The minority uses a colloquy between Mr. Rhodes and Mr. Bell to imply that only $30 to $50 million additional is needed for Vietnam.

This colloquy took place on April 22, 1964, relative to the President's request of January. It predates the events which led to the President's special message to Congress requesting an additional $125 million for Vietnam.

This special request was sent to the Congress on May 18, following a special trip to Vietnam by Secretary McNamara.

Fifteenth. Page 22: The minority points out that Burma has declined an $18 million supporting assistance grant.

The $18 million grant, which was to fulfill a commitment made to the Burmese in 1959 by President Eisenhower, has not been accepted by the Burmese Government. Events in southeast Asia which led to the President's special request for additional assistance for Vietnam will require an intensified effort during fiscal year 1965 in that area of direct confrontation with the Communists. We expect that this $18 million in supporting assistance funds will be needed during fiscal year 1965 to help support the defense of southeast Asia. By using supporting assistance funds there will be less demand on the contingency fund and, to the extent that the contingency fund is not used, money is returned to the Treasury.

Sixteenth. Page 22: The minority report comments on supporting assistance for Laos.

This paragraph is somewhat misleading without the context of other testimony on this point. A colloquy between Mr. Poats and Mr. Passman from part II, page 435 follows:

> Mr. Passman. At page 8 there is a statement: "We also finance those documented Lao 'invisible' expenses for official educational, transportation, insurance, and medical costs abroad which the AID mission in Laos determines to be legitimate."
>
> What kind of a program is that?
>
> Mr. Poats. That is part of a program whose total effect is to finance the Lao Government in almost every aspect of its existence. One aspect is the invisible expenses, and so forth, that any government or economy has for the purposes mentioned here—educational, medical, travel, official expenses of embassies.
>
> Mr. Passman. How do you define "invisible"?
>
> Mr. Poats. This is a term which distinguishes from visible imports; that is, goods. This covers services, in effect.

U.S. FINANCING OF EXPENSES FOR LAO EMBASSIES

> Mr. Passman. Is that financing actually the expenses of the Lao Embassies abroad?
>
> Mr. Poats. It is the financing of expenses of Lao Embassies, other than in the Communist countries.

Seventeenth. Page 23: The minority attacks AID's operations with regard to financing of the Tachien Dam.

The $40 million loan, repayable in Taiwan dollars, for the Tachien multipurpose dam was made by the Development Loan Fund prior to its incorporation into AID. When AID took over responsibility for the loan, it reviewed the project. That review called into question the benefit-cost ratio and reliability of the earlier estimates. As a result, negotiations with the Chinese Government were undertaken to revise and postpone the Tachien Dam project and to find alternative sources of power to the dam. Agreement was reached to build a thermal powerplant and a smaller hydroplant near the site of the proposed original dam. While the Chinese were reluctant to postpone the Tachien high dam, they did not object.

Economic assistance to Taiwan was coming to an end. Because AID had delayed the implementation of the $40 million loan, it was agreed that this $40 million loan for power development should not be subject to termination. Consequently, it was reserved until final plans for alternative power projects could be completed. Agreement has now been reached with the Chinese to proceed with the alternative proposal, and funds have been obligated.

These events were fully reported to the committee in the AID presentation for fiscal year 1964, page 503 in the presentation book for fiscal year 1965.

Eighteenth. Page 23: The minority attacks AID with regard to a $20 million loan to the United Arab Republic which AID has not made.

The loan discussed was, and is, under consideration by AID. On page 804 of the hearing Mr. Macomber testified:

> There are economic conditions important to this loan. We are not going to give this loan unless certain economic conditions are met.

This statement means that self-help and other requirements that the United States is requesting explain why there is no commitment to make the loan and why the negotiations are continuing.

AID would not make the loan in order to "reduce the amount of unobligated funds just prior to the end of the fiscal year," as implied in the report.

Nineteenth. Page 24: The minority states that new projects are begun without prior justification to Congress.

New projects are initiated in such cases where initiation of new projects is in the national interest and in accord with congressional criteria.

However, such projects are a small percentage of the total projects presented to the Congress. The need for such flexibility is authorized by law.

The Congress is informed of such changes. Although the 60 projects were not listed in the 1964 presentation, all of them are listed and fully described in the 1965 presentation to the Congress.

Twentieth. Page 24: The minority attacks AID for not sending Cambodia trainees home.

As indicated during the testimony, a decision was made by AID to continue support for training of students from Cambodia, although other aspects of the AID program to that country have been ended.

The major reason for the decision is that these students were already in the United States, pursuing a course of study at the time of the cancellation of aid to Cambodia. Sending them home without completing their prescribed courses, some of which will extend over several years, would have wasted the investment already made.

No new students have been brought to this country since the decision to terminate aid to Cambodia.

Twenty-first. Page 24: The minority states that a total appropriation of "$4,802 million" would provide very adequately for programs covered by this bill.

The majority of the committee is recommending an appropriation of only $3,739 million for the foreign aid program. The minority apparently considers the $1,353 million limitation on operating and administrative expenses of the Eximbank as appropriations. Obviously, this is not an appropriation at all.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Chairman, today we are faced with what seems to become a more bitter battle every year—the battle over foreign aid. Last year we witnessed a House in session at 7 a.m. to finish action on foreign aid appropriations.

It is remarkable and significant that we are over 5 months ahead of last year on appropriation bills in the House. There could be no clearer indictment of the failure of the Congress last year to do its work promptly and effectively.

The foreign aid bill we have this year seems to be a more realistic one. Despite several reservations and deep concerns I have over the administration of foreign aid and the policy that implements it, I, nevertheless, plan to vote for the bill.

From our own experience, from the ideas and the ideals we have received from others, we have learned that interdependence is the password today in world affairs. The days of a fortress America have long passed. What is important to us today is to have a world in which freedom can survive and in which it can be allowed to grow and blossom even more.

Economic viability—the economic well-being of a world community—is the best insurance policy in which this country can invest. The premium on that policy is foreign aid.

Certainly we should insist that our investment is worth every dollar. We must seek full value, but a cost-benefit ratio concept cannot be the sole guiding force behind our foreign aid program.

We are in these programs because they are right. This is the important thing. As a distinguished Latin-American visitor said to me:

> The foundation, the guidelines of U.S. foreign aid to other countries * * * cannot be exclusively on an economic basis. Foreign aid cannot be guided by a banking concept.

I wonder, when we weigh and measure every dollar of foreign aid, whether we realize that our own United States was the great recipient of foreign aid in the 18th and 19th centuries. During the Revolutionary War and thereafter, foreign capital played a key role in our economic development. The Federal Government, State governments, municipalities and private enterprise all borrowed heavily in Europe. The construction of canals and railroads, as well as the development of industry, relied heavily on foreign funds. In 1854 the Secretary of the Treasury estimated that the aggregate amount of Federal, State, county, railroad, and canal bonds, stocks, et cetera, held by foreigners amounted to $184,184,174 out of a total of $1,178,567,882. Of these foreign lenders England was by far the most important, followed by Holland and Germany. Furthermore, English merchants advanced credit to American importers on liberal terms and British capital helped develop many a western mine in the days of the mining frontier.

The European investor in the 19th century America received no guarantees on his investment. Indeed, he was sometimes victimized by fraudulent promoters and defaulting State governments. But he saw the promise of America; he contributed to American prosperity; and he realized a substantial profit thereby. Perhaps there is a lesson in this experience that we can apply today.

Nor was the foreign aid we received confined to money. Instead, the greatest contribution we received from abroad was people, over 37 million from 1820 to 1927. This peaceful transfer of populations, the greatest mass movement in history, brought the skill and knowledge of Old World methods to the ingenuity, resourcefulness, and ambition of the native workingman. Their merger produced the greatest economy on earth. America could not be what she is today were it not for the skilled and unskilled millions who poured in from abroad; who built our railroads and our cities, mined our coal, tilled our soil and contributed to the special flavor of America. But all this would not have been possible if the immigrants had flooded into a land that was not free. It was freedom, as the first prerequisite, that made America's growth possible.

I also wonder whether, in our dissatisfaction with various aspects of foreign aid, we do not forget about its positive side. Do we think sufficiently of the schools, hospitals, or roads it has built, of the technicians it has trained, of the people to whom it has given hope? Do we think of the more than 50,000 foreign students brought to this country under Government programs alone since 1949, who go back with generally favorable impressions of the United States, and become our stanch advocates among the leadership groups in their countries? Do we think of the Peace Corps, living with the people they work among, and by all reports winning new friends and new respect for the United States? All this is foreign aid, in one form or another, after all. And what of those dedicated members of our Foreign Service who have gone far beyond the call of duty, setting up schools, training local personnel, and actively participating in the community life around them? We drain the good from all these activities, it seems to me, when we haggle so loudly on foreign aid.

Of course we have every right to encourage freedom among the recipients of our aid today. Experience is the greatest teacher, and we know from our own experience that freedom is the precondition of growth. But you cannot have freedom without restraint, and restraint is rooted in the moral teachings of religion. In short, religion and morality are indispensable to free political development, and the United States need not apologize to anyone for pointing out these homely truths. Nor need we apologize for trying to develop freedom in foreign lands.

If any apologies are due, it is when we fall short of the ideals we espouse. As Americans, it is our job to inform and instruct by example. If we would impress on the emerging countries the importance of religion and morality to free political development, we must practice genuine religion and morality at home. If we wish to encourage democracy abroad, we must strive to perfect democracy at home. We must seek a deeper understanding of our own philosophy, if we aspire to lead the nations of Asia, Africa, and Latin America on the same path.

It is this very understanding which seems so sadly lacking in American foreign policy today. We have been floundering on a sea of pragmatism, with no sure principles to guide our action. Without clearly conceived national goals, our policies have been inconsistent, inadequate, our purpose unsure. Thus we can support a military coup in Vietnam while denouncing one in the Dominican Republic. Few would say that the Alliance for Progress is an unqualified success. We promise to keep our forces in Europe, but we stage exercise "big lift" which gives a contrary impression, and close out a base in Spain. Our foreign policy lacks conviction. There seems to be no long-range plan. We are heading for a dangerous crisis, a crisis of disillusionment. Should that crisis come upon us, it is likely to bring a retrenchment of American commitments all around the world. This will leave a vacuum into which Communist power will surely flow, and the forces that undermine freedom will be given a free hand.

But before the United States can follow a firm, consistent, purposeful foreign policy, it must define its goals. It will no longer do simply to be against something we do not like; rather we must clearly formulate and articulate what we are for. It is time for a clear-cut statement, in terms the American people can understand, of what the United States stands for in world affairs, and why we stand for it. Such a statement would open the lines of communication between the people and the Government. It could form the basis of a vast popular dialog in which the American people could clarify their beliefs respecting our foreign policy. Fortified with new support and understanding, our Government could act with a surer hand on the world scene.

An attempt to define national goals has been made before. President Eisenhower appointed a commission for that purpose. There is much in that report with which I could agree, but in some respects I believe it misses the mark. For instance, it states that:

> The basic foreign policy of the United States should be the preservation of its own independence and free institutions. Our position before the world should be neither defensive nor belligerent.

To my way of thinking, preservation of our own independence is not one of our goals abroad. Rather our goal should be the gradual extension of freedom. If we bring that about our own own survival is assured, and so is world peace. Also, it goes without saying that our position should be neither defensive nor belligerent. Such a statement contributes little.

May I therefore suggest, with no intention to be presumptuous, but as an American concerned with the future of his country, those principles I believe the United States should stand for in the world: First, we must stand for freedom. That means that the United States must everywhere associate itself with those programs which have as their object the extension of basic freedoms. In my conception there are five freedoms, comprising the famous four freedoms—freedom of speech and expression, freedom of religion, freedom from fear, and freedom from want, plus what may be called the freedom of movement. Men and goods, ideas, and ideals should be free to move across national boundaries. Communism professes to be for freedom from want only. It responds to none of the basic human aspirations beyond the material. Since it values neither religion, morality, nor the self-restraint which are the hallmarks of a free society, freedom cannot grow out of it. But the United States undergirds freedom around the world, and we must make it unequivocally clear that we support man's eternal quest for freedom.

Second, we must make it plain that we will resist, with all our powers of reason and judgment, every attempt to defeat or thwart the growth of these freedoms. Each foreign aid program has been an exercise of our reason and judgment aimed at this goal, although too often that end has been obscured. Indeed our entire foreign policy has been directed, or should have been directed, toward strengthening and extending the area of freedom, without resort to force.

Third, we must make it plain, beyond peradventure of doubt, that if the adversaries of freedom will not permit us to exercise our reason and judgment in its defense, we will resist with force. This is not warmongering. It is a simple statement of freedom's right to survive. That right cannot be qualified.

If we set out our goals in this fashion, it seems to me that the results would be salutary both at home and abroad. I believe that the American people would respond to the linking of aid and freedom in a way in which they have not responded in the past. People cannot get excited simply by being told they must support development. But they can get excited when they understand that the basic purpose of foreign aid is to support liberty. If Americans are given a definition of our foreign policy goals which they can understand, they will respond with overwhelming support for what needs to be done.

But it is not only at home that a broad discussion, debate, and new formulation of our goals is desirable. It would be most welcome abroad, too, where Lord knows there is ample misunderstanding of America's purposes, some of it willful. We need to allay suspicion of our motives, and again, a simple but firm declaration of our commitment to freedom, which is after all, the desire of the vast majority of mankind, would really help to clear the air. With freedom first in our order of priorities, I believe we can regain the moral initiative, both at home and abroad, which will enable us to move forward with our great world task of reconstruction and development.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, Fidel Castro's sister has defected to the free world. Yesterday in Mexico, Juanita Castro not only made known her flight from the Communist regime her brothers have instituted in Cuba, but condemned them for betraying the Cuban revolution and handing Cuba over to the Communists.

Juanita Castro's remarks assailing Fidel and Raul Castro, as well as her defection, represent a moral victory for the United States and the free world. Furthermore, her condemnation of her brothers' Communist ties now presents the United States with an excellent opportunity to influence world opinion.

This opportunity is particularly timely in light of the anti-U.S. propaganda which the Castro regime is making with the American student visitors now touring Cuba.

Here is a set of circumstances which requires quick action, and presents this Nation with a chance to use its initiative. I urge that immediate steps be taken to arrange for Juanita Castro to tour the United States and see firsthand the operations of a democratic society, to note the contrast between democracy and communism, and to take her observations before the people of Latin America in a subsequent visit.

I have contacted the U.S. Information Agency to urge that an immediate effort be made to take advantage of this dramatic way to demonstrate the failures of communism in Cuba and the strength of democracy.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to be very brief, because the hour is late.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and fifteen Members are present, a quorum.

The gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES] is recognized.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, the bill which you have before you today is a high bill. It is a bill, going into the appropriations process, which is at least $300 million higher than was the foreign aid bill at the comparable period last year. So let us have done with talk of this being an economical bill. Let us not say this is a low bill. Let us not say we are being penurious in this program. Let us recognize the facts of life, that this is a high bill. It is a bill $300 million, at least, higher than that of last year.

My good friend from Mississippi has an amendment which is unique, as far as this program is concerned. I understand it has worked and worked well in other programs and like the gentleman from Michigan, I sincerely hope that it will be adopted, and that it will work well. I shall do what I can to make sure that it stays in conference, if it remains in this bill. But I have very serious doubts whether it will work in this program because of the type of program this is, not because of any defect in the gentleman's amendment.

As we all know this is a program which is illustrative in nature. There is no line item appropriation for foreign aid. As we have realized before, you can justify funds for construction of a dam in Turkey and instead use it to build a bridge in Iran. Because of the very nature of the program and the fact that the money is appropriated for very broad purposes, I am at a loss to know how the administration would be able to administer the amendment of the gentleman from Mississippi. As I understand it, it would be necessary for the administration to divide the amount appropriated for each broad purpose into moieties to be spent by quarters and deduct from each one amount which would add up to $300 million for fiscal 1965. If the amount remaining was not sufficient to finance the activities of the department for a particular quarter then the department would be able to go to the Bureau of the Budget and ask for the release of all or any part of the $300 million which is to be withheld from immediate availability, as a result of the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it appears to me that since the purposes are so broad and so general there would be no difficulty whatsoever for the administration to make a very good case for release of some of the money. Either, it would not be difficult or it would be impossible. I do not know which will be the situation. I suppose that might depend upon the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. Chairman, my only purpose in making these remarks is to question the efficacy of the amendment as it applies to this particular program.

I have all the respect in the world for the gentleman from Mississippi and all of the admiration in the world for his ability as a legislator. Therefore, I certainly am glad now to yield to the distinguished gentleman for any further explanation which he would care to offer.

Mr. WHITTEN. I thank the gentleman from Arizona for yielding. May I say that I appreciate the kind remarks of my colleague, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. Rhodes]. Certainly, it has been my pleasure to work with him through the years and I return the compliment to him insofar as application, ability, and sincerity in his work are concerned.

May I say, if the gentleman will recall, this amendment was voted on after other amendments to cut the overall amount had failed. Only then did I insist upon voting on the amendment.

What the amendment does, in effect, is direct that of the items which have been approved by the Committee for Economic Assistance, the executive department would be directed by this provision to go back to those amounts and pull out $300 million from the totals which appear earlier in that particular section and put it on the shelf, so to speak. Then they would allocate, under existing law, the remaining amounts in those items on a quarterly basis, as is provided in section 665 of title 31, United States Code.

Then they would go from that point and the provisions of the antideficiency statute would apply. Again, the President would have to determine that the new projects which might be financed from the $300 million not only are in the public interest, but that there be a separate determination that the funds already in the hands of the Economic Assistance group are not enough to meet that which he then determines necessary. So with that in mind, I believe it meets many objections that I have heard through the years here not only from the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. Rhodes] but others and in fact from all Members who have spoken in opposition to this bill. Each year I have heard complaints that this Agency has obligated and deobligated and that just before the 1st of July of each year they had obligated practically everything in sight, only to deobligate once the new fiscal year started.

Therefore, I believe this $300 million would obviate that kind of operation and, at least, would bring the Bureau of the Budget into the picture as the arm of the President in passing judgment prior to the use of any of this $300 million.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Would the gentleman from Mississippi permit me to propound a specific question? The category of development loans is to receive $782.2 million under the bill which we now have before us.

Would it be possible for the administration to take the entire $300 million out of that one category, or is it necessary to divide it on a pro rata basis among the various categories?

Mr. WHITTEN. I would have to say that insofar as the wording of the provision is concerned, it makes no effort to tie it down on a pro rata basis or other basis. Presumably it would be done in the best judgment of the fellow doing the job, but I felt that we would get into too much detail if we were going to be able to get it adopted.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Would it be equally correct if the $300 million is all taken away from development loans, and if it became the objective of the administration later to beef up the category known as development grants, to have all of the $300 million then transferred into development grants?

Mr. WHITTEN. If the gentleman will yield, may I say that my answer up to this point as to the meaning of the section and the requirements of the section——

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and four Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. WHITTEN. Continuing my answer, if I may, I was referring to the requirements in the section mentioned, which is on page 4. There is nothing in there to require that this be prorated; however, the Administrator or the executive department having justified in the preceding item these items in the amount specified, I would presume anybody following this would, in effect, prorate. But I would also say that under no circumstances would I feel there would be any basis to use $300 million to exceed the amount fixed here in the first part of the act unless it is needed. The full amount of money is available to the President on two determinations: One, is it necessary to spend it in the national interest and, two, funds are not available from other sources.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Does the gentleman think that under no circumstances would more money be obligated in this next fiscal year in any one category than the amount provided in the bill?

Mr. WHITTEN. Yes. May I say the point the gentleman makes about the broad authority: he is more familiar with that than I am, and he would be a better judge of what the basic law might permit. But I have no such intention.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, the minority will offer certain amendments at the proper time. Let me state that in every instance the amendments which the minority will offer will exceed the amount of money which was in the foreign aid appropriation bill for fiscal year 1964. We have not attempted to ruin the program. We are attempting to help it. We have been told time after time by witnesses before the committee that the program of last year was an effective program; that enough money was appropriated for them to do the job which they had to do, with the sole exception of military assistance. I think it has been stated on this floor many times we were exceedingly disappointed with the administration for coming before us and asking for a military assistance appropriation which they stated at the time was too little and would not do the job. I hope that this type of budgeting is not followed by this administration or any other administration in the future. It is certainly within the rights of Congress to expect that when a budget come, up from downtown the executive department, that the amount recommended is the best guess of the amount that they can use in the next fiscal year.

To have them come up here and say they are asking for x amount, but they really feel the amount should be x plus three, is to me not playing fair with the Congress.

I do not think, Mr. Chairman, that in view of the money which we are voting here, in view of the other spigots of foreign aid—and bear in mind that there are 29-some spigots—in view of the amount of money that is being spread throughout the world, we are being anything but generous with our foreign aid. I think we are doing the job which must be done, to use foreign aid as an adjunct of our foreign policy, if, indeed, the administration desires to do so. So I do not think it is necessary for any Member of the House or any Member of the other body, and particularly any member of the subcommittee or the full Committee on Appropriations, to feel other than that he has done an adequate job. In fact, as I said, many of us think it is much too adequate, about $300 million too adequate. We will try at the proper time to reduce the sums which will be appropriated to a level which we feel is about right.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, we have no further speakers except to close debate.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Passman], the chairman of the subcommittee, 1 hour.

Mr. PASSMAN. Happy fiscal New Year's Eve, Mr. Chairman and my colleagues.

This is New Year's Eve as it applies to our fiscal years. Today we pull the curtain down on another fiscal year with a deficit no doubt in excess of $7 billion. This deficit condition has been repeated about 29 times out of the past 34 years. In the period of our greatest prosperity our budget deficits have been, and are, the largest.

Tomorrow we start a new fiscal year, fiscal 1965, and it is already acknowledged that we will again experience a huge deficit.

As I speak to you this afternoon, may I remind you that our public debt, including both borrowed money and statutory obligations, now exceeds $1,056 billion. Of this sum, $310 billion of the obligation is borrowed money, and some 108 statutes call for a payout of funds in subsequent years for services previously rendered, in the amount of $746 billion.

Mr. Chairman, I surely am not "holier than thou" and certainly not wiser, but I have practically lived with this worldwide foreign aid program for 10 years—weekdays, holidays, Sundays, and many nights. I have tried diligently to learn as much about it as possible.

And I have endeavored to keep the Members cognizant of some of the shenanigans practiced by the AID by, among other means, keeping your desks loaded with verified pertinent information.

I have also tried on many occasions to yield to several of our Presidents, but I have found that they have limited knowledge of many of the weaknesses of the program. On one occasion, for example, I spent a good part of an afternoon with one of our Presidents and 12 of the top leaders of our Government, from both the legislative and executive branches. When the meeting ended, the President reluctantly admitted that he had been misinformed by his subordinates, and that year we cut the foreign aid appropriation bill by $1 billion and still left the program overfunded.

That kind of situation has been true with relation to the Presidents up to and including the present Chief Executive. The program is indeed a "monster" of the State Department, and not a program of the President of the United States.

Let me say, Mr. Chairman, that most of the members of the subcommittee who attended the hearings the longest are today most assuredly supporting my position the strongest.

And, I state to you now, without fear of successful contradiction, that if the House should refuse to ever again appropriate a single dollar for foreign aid, the unexpended funds now on hand to the credit of the program could discharge every legal commitment we have outstanding for foreign aid.

So it is really a question of how much money you want to borrow and give away in fiscal year 1965.

May I repeat, if you never appropriated another dollar for foreign aid, every legal commitment we have outstanding in the program could be met out of the unliquidated funds presently on hand.

May I also state, most emphatically, that the request before you is not a "bare-bones" figure by any stretch of the imagination.

Title I only of this bill, as reported to the House, calls for $3,316,572,400. Contrast this sum, if you will, with the amount in the bill that the committee reported to the House and which you approved last year for comparable items. The last House bill at this point for these purposes was $2,666,700,000.

Therefore, the committee is asking you today to appropriate new funds for title I only in the amount of $649,872,400 more than the House approved last year at this point, or, in round numbers, $650 million more than you were asked to approve last year at this point.

And this fact does not take into account the large increases in title II appropriations or increases in many of the other agencies that distribute foreign aid funds.

You hear a lot of talk about title I, but they do not get into title II, and they do not get into title III and into the other spigots and the other agencies that are now dispensing foreign aid.

Mr. Chairman, this worldwide giveaway program is now to some extent being disbursed by about 26 agencies, and the total cost scattered throughout these agencies calls for foreign aid—in fiscal year 1965 in excess of $7 billion, and not $3.3 billion, as you have been told today.

Add to this amount the interest that we will pay in fiscal 1965 on what we have borrowed to give away, and the total cost will be in excess of $10 billion in fiscal year 1965.

Mr. Chairman, it is fantastic, but true, that our government will be disbursing funds during fiscal 1965 in 99 nations and 9 territories.

This is getting close to an aid program in every nation on the fact of the earth—including Communist, pro-Communist, and so-called "neutralist" countries.

Actually, is this the kind of "monster" that Congress desired to create?

The program cries out for correction. It cries out for control.

I have not misled the Members of the House in the past. I will not mislead you today. And, I will not mislead you in the future.

Capitulation to the wishes and whims of the 71,416 people, including participants, who are on the payroll of this "monster" is something I cannot do.

May I state further that this uncontrolled program has gone so far until now it has contract personnel from, or with, trade schools, business schools, auditing firms, teaching firms, colleges, and universities in 46 of the 50 States.

It is estimated that it is costing close to about three-fourths of a billion dollars annually to pay the salaries, traveling and related expenses of these 71,416 personnel, hopping all over the face of the earth. Is that what you want?

Mr. Chairman, should we not take control of this program? It is probably looser, wilder, more extravagant this year than in practically any year since I have dealt with this bill as chairman of the subcommittee.

I respectfully refer the Members to page 20 of the minority views in the committee report. This information is current, actual, and factual.

There are 57 countries included in the table on page 20. They have received $12,436,400,000 in military and economic assistance from the United States during the period covered by this table. During the same time—from January 1, 1958, through December 31, 1963—these 57 countries purchased $6,977 million of our rapidly diminishing gold reserves. That is nearly $7 billion of our gold to 57 aid-recipient nations in 6 years. Is that kind of situation what you want?

And, how about the balance-of-payments situation? It is a frightening story.

Fool me once, shame on you; fool me twice, shame on me.

The AID people have put out propaganda across the Nation that 80 percent of all the money for procurement in the program is spent here in America.

Hypothetically, let us say General Motors ships out a shipload of trucks. When that shipload of trucks goes out, does the invoice go to the country receiving the gift? No. It goes down to the U.S. Treasury. It is paid out of the American taxpayers' till, and not by the recipient nation.

So when you do that, when you credit to the recipient country $3 by which they can requisition what they would normally purchase, in a great many instances that act releases what they earn from exports, to buy our gold and to speculate.

If what the AID people advocate in this myth and misrepresentation—that 80 percent of the money is spent in America—is the case, then let us triple this program, and then really have some prosperity.

But, you know and I know that when we give money away it is a one-way street.

Now, let us take a look at the international organizations, which are getting bigger and bigger all the time. The International Development Association, for example, is a giveaway program. We put up 43 percent of the money and other part I countries put up 57 percent. However, 13 of them are getting more direct aid from us than they are contributing to IDA. If you will look at the record, you will find we are literally contributing, directly and indirectly, about 96 percent of the total. These things are not loans. They are credits, which is the designation Secretary Dillon gives to them. What countries have credit? India, for one. Maybe we give them $600 million out of bilateral funds and IDA comes along and gives them a $150 million credit. How is it handled? The maximum is 50 years and no interest, with a three-quarters of 1 percent service charge and 10-year grace period before anything is paid back; and then it will be 1 percent a year on the principal.

Let us also look at the Inter-American Development Bank, in title II of the bill. Last year we appropriated $50 million for the IDB. This year the bill calls for more than $205 million.

Mr. Chairman, how wild is this program? Everything is on an illustrative basis. AID can spend the money wherever they want for whatever they want. They can testify for funds for a highway in Brazil and can take that money and build a brick building in Algeria. Flexibility? Yes. They can testify for funds for 140 projects in Argentina and can vacate every one of those projects and spend every dime of the money in India. Is that what you want?

The foreign aid allocations are made on a political basis and made to nations whether they need the money or not.

Of course most foreign countries will take our aid. I talked to one of the ministers out in Lebanon and inquired of him as follows, and I paraphrase:

> Will you tell me, Mr. Minister, why my country, which has balanced its budget only a few times in the last 30 years, which has chronic inflation, a dollar steadily losing its purchasing power, and owes more money than all the rest of the governments in the world combined, should continue to send your country millions of dollars a year?

The Minister smiled as he replied:

> I know of no reason why you should, but if you are foolish enough to do it, of course we shall accept it.

Lebanon received $88 million, $77 million of it in outright grants.

In fiscal 1965 our Government will disburse funds in 99 nations and 9 territories. The prime "sub" and related projects are in excess of 4,000.

How are you going to examine a program when there are 4,000 projects in 99 nations and 9 territories?

Then, when you get into the bill itself, they have got it cut up into many different captions, to further confuse the issues.

During the first 9 years it was my privilege to serve as chairman of the subcommittee, the Congress reduced the several Presidents' requests by more than $8 billion below the budget estimates. But, even so, we gave to AID so much money that every time they needed $1 to pay for something they obligated $1.12. In the military every time they needed $1 to pay for something they obligated $1.28.

There is admitted overfunding of the cost of projects of approximately $3 billion in 9 years.

And the AID people have admitted that they are funding projects 8, 10, and 12 years in advance of the completion date. They are building in 10-percent contingencies in practically every development credit project.

Also, the abuses are so rampant that there are tens of millions of dollars carried in an obligated status for projects long since completed.

Since April 10, 1964, AID deobligated and reobligated funds from 236 projects totaling $50,065,000. If we could put a squeezeout on the remainder of the some 4,000 projects and related projects it might well be that out of the $7 billion in unliquidated funds $1 billion or more would be totally unencumbered.

Mr. Chairman, let me give you an example of just how gullible we are. Let us consider the Inter-American Development Bank. It is not under our control; we have one board member.

I shall never forget when we brought the bill out supporting the full amount to set up another "window" in this Bank. And when we appropriated the money, probably before the Bank had negotiated a loan, certainly before they had collected one penny of interest, they were pawing to get more of this money. So, they had a little "clambake" down in Rio that lasted for 6 days. They spent $143,358; $17,745 for representation allowance.

In 1962 they pulled another little party down in Buenos Aires and they spent $207,501 there.

In 1963 they pulled another one in Caracas, and they spent $201,624 in 1 week, entertaining each other.

Mr. Chairman, Assistant Secretary of State Bullock submitted some DLF telephone calls. He stated and I paraphrase:

> Attached here for your signature are five DLF toll calls on the following loans: India, Tunisia, Ecuador, Argentina.

Then there is a little note.

> Regarding four Pakistan loans just sent to you, Mr. Bell wishes to have these loans approved prior to your appearance before the Passman committee tomorrow.

Now, let us go into the Tunisian matter. If you do not think you are being taken for a buggy ride with a bare axle, listen to this: On November 27, 1962, AID credited Tunisia with $10 million in commodity assistance. On June 20, 1963, with a huge unobligated balance, AID started allocating funds left and right. So, they allocated another $15 million to Tunisa. Then in May, 1964, they allocated another $10 million to Tunisia.

Now, what are the facts? Thirty days ago there was in excess of $3 million of the 1962 money still on hand, untouched. All of the fiscal year 1963, $15 million was untouched, and the $10 million that was allocated for them the other day also is untouched.

Mr. Chairman, in March our public debt exceeded by about $25 billion the combined public debts of all of the other nations of the world.

Ways and Means Committee Chairman MILLS stood in the well of this House a few days ago and pleaded with the Members to raise the debt ceiling. Did he not state forthrightly that the blame for this condition is, of course, on the Congress, because we continue appropriating money and borrowing money and spending it and obligating it so that it becomes necessary to ask that the debt limit be raised? That kind of exercise in futility is becoming just about as regular as Members go after their pay checks.

The practice every year is to collect what we can, spend all we can borrow, and keep pushing the debt ceiling up.

Mr. Chairman, I shake in my boots when I think of the insults that our great Nation takes from some of the countries scattered around the world.

Egypt at one time said, "Get out." We suspended the program out there for 2 or 3 years, but we did not stop the funds.

Syria at one time said, "We have had enough; get out."

Mr. Chairman, I was out there a few years ago and a consul for them said: "If you will be nice and go with me we might start back receiving your aid."

I said: "Why do you not get a ticket and go home?"

Now let us look at Portugal. They said: "You are not going to wreck our country; get out. We like how we are getting along."

They would not accept our technical aid.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let us consider Cambodia. They said: "Get out; we do not want it. If you do not get out, we will throw you out."

Let us take Indonesia and Sukarno. He told us along about April: "Go to hell with your aid. We do not need it."

About 3 weeks later he said again, "Go to hell." I asked the AID people why they did not get out and they replied, "Oh, it might create an incident." I asked one of them how stupid could we be? He said: "You know Sukarno lives a fast life. He may die, and if he does, we might get somebody friendly."

Let us take Burma. We poured hundreds of millions of dollars into Burma. In this bill you have some $18 million for one item, and they have no use for it. They say: "We do not want it, we are not going to accept it. Our philosophy and yours are not compatible, we will not take it."

Let us consider another item. That country said: "We do not expect aid, but we will accept it if you will let us do the pricing."

We said, "That is wonderful." So we gave them $40 million worth of our aid.

"What price are you going to fix on it?" we asked.

"About 5 percent of what it cost you, around $2 million," they said.

"That is wonderful," we said.

"We want you to take the $2 million in local currency," they said.

We said, "That is all right, too."

They said, "Let us issue a joint statement. We have made ourselves a party to it."

They still owe us most of the money, even though it is in local currency.

I doubt that many Members of Congress realize that in connection with many of the aid programs they have blank checks. They go out, and they obligate and they spend and they draw checks.

Do not let anybody tell you that they have an empty pipeline. Do not let them tell you, unless you want to believe it, that the unobligated money is down to nothing.

We asked them, "What are the unobligated funds now?"

"We cannot tell you," they said. "We are waiting for another audit."

Later on we asked them the same question, and they told us the same thing.

We asked them in September, last year, and they said, "It will be October before we can tell you."

But, here we are in June, and they can tell you, "We have no money on hand."

However, if you look at the hearings they said, "It is going to be October before we can tell you."

Mr. Chairman, the AID directors come and go. It has reached the point where no outstanding American businessman will accept this position. I think 14 turned it down in 1 year.

They called in an Ambassador, Mr. Riddleberger, but he came back and said, "Get me out of this."

They brought in another one, Mr. Labouisse, an Ambassador. He stayed a little while, and then said, "Get me out of here," and they went back to the field.

Now, we have Mr. Bell, and a nice fellow he is. I understand that maybe his time is now about up, and that he is possibly going to be an AID chief in one of the countries, maybe South Vietnam.

They come and go, and the tenure is about 16 months on the average.

They have changed directors so often that I cannot keep up with them.

I questioned one of the regional directors, one time, and he said, "I do not know, sir."

I asked him about something else. "I do not know, sir," he said.

I asked, "Do you know anything about how we justify the projects?"

"No, sir; I do not know," he said.

The situation was so absurd that I said, "Off the record."

Then I told him: "I am going to ask questions, and I am going to give you the correct answers. I am going to go back on the record, and you give me my answers as though they were yours, and I will cover up for you."

That was to keep him from being embarrassed.

I asked the AID Comptroller a question 2 or 3 years ago.

He said, "We will get that, and we will have the answer tomorrow."

So the AID called the Library of Congress and asked them to come to their rescue.

The Library of Congress called me.

I said, "Yes, I know the answer." I gave them the answer.

The Library of Congress called the AID people back. The following day they gave me my answer.

That is how cooperative they are.

Mr. Chairman, my position on this bill is the same as it has always been, and it certainly is not to destroy the program.

Now, may I quote a few statements of some of the outstanding Members of this House:

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—vol. 108, pt. 15, p. 20168]

> Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, as I stated just a short time ago in paying tribute to my good friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], I have been associated with this program since its inception, and we have been fighting inefficiency and waste every year. This cut in the foreign aid program is nothing new. We have cut it every year, and every year we have been told that we were wrecking the program. Well, now, we have wrecked it about 10 or 15 times, but it is still going stronger today than ever before.
>
> Mr. Chairman, permit me to say that we have made some deep cuts. We have done so because we believe that they are justified. We believe that there is waste in the program. But I feel that our subcommittee under the able leadership of our chairman, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN], has brought to the House a fair, just, reasonable, and sane bill. I believe that we can carry on an adequate program of foreign aid under it.

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—vol. 107, pt. 13, p. 18156]

> Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I want to say this is a difficult bill to handle. I had the privilege of handling it as chairman for 4 years. We have been told, to my certain knowledge, every year for the past 10 years when we cut this bill, that we were wrecking the program. Yet, during the 13 years of the foreign aid program, we have succeeded in spending $106 billion and the program is still going strong. I think you will agree that we have not at any time wrecked this program by the cuts that have been made by the Congress upon the recommendation of our committee.
>
> In addition to that, notwithstanding the cuts we have made, we have had the Comptroller General of the United States appear before our committee time and again, and the Comptroller General is reviewing these programs all over the world and is auditing the accounts, and his statement time and again before our committee has been that the greatest trouble with the program has been that they have had too much money to spend.

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—vol. 106, pt. 10, p. 13106]

> Mr. GARY. In the last 25 years since 1935 we have balanced the budget only five times—five times in 25 years. We have had a deficit in every year except five. Let us see what the figures are today. For 1960 the expenditures are $77 billion. The national debt as of last Monday, June 13, was $289,300 million.
>
> Do you think we can keep that up for 25 or 50 years? I do not think we can. The time has come when we must begin to consider these facts. One thing is absolutely certain—a bankrupt nation cannot defend itself. And let me give you one other figure here. Already so far this year we are $4,772,354,000 over the receipts. That is, our expenditures for the 11 months and 13 days of the present fiscal year exceed our receipts by $4,772 million. How can we keep that up?
>
> We have got to stop and consider these programs in the light of our fiscal situation.

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—vol. 108, pt. 17, p. 22715]

> Mr. MAHON. If the gentleman would yield further, I wish to commend the gentleman from Louisiana for the magnificent job which he has done on this bill. I think the gentleman has done as good or a better job this year than in previous years. He has performed a service to the country and I support him. I am glad that the reductions were made.
>
> Mr. PASSMAN. I thank the gentleman.
>
> Mr. MAHON. Had the reductions not been made, I do not think I could have voted for this bill.

Let us continue, quoting now the gentleman from Georgia, [Mr. FLYNT]:

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—vol. 102, pt. 9, p. 12356]

> With reference to the foreign aid program "I have opposed it consistently on each rollcall vote since I have been in Congress. * * * Mr. Chairman, my study of this subject has truly convinced me of this: that our position among the nations of the world is not being strengthened and cannot be strengthened by an annual appropriation of $3 or more billions for foreign aid, or mutual security. Our actual security is possibly not one bit stronger because of mutual security expenditures than it was 10 years ago. We can never strengthen our position by this poorly administered mutual security program."

Another year, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FLYNT] offered an amendment to the foreign-aid appropriation bill providing that no part of the appropriation could be spent until after our budget was balanced.

He explained the purposes of his amendment in this manner—and I quote from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 105, part 11, page 14521:

> Mr. Chairman, this amendment is proposed and offered for two purposes:
>
> First. To write into law that the mutual security program shall not be paid for by deficit financing; and
>
> Second. To make another genuine attempt to balance our national budget, bring an end to deficit financing and make some payments on the existing national debt.

As chairman of the subcommittee, I was compelled to oppose this amendment. But I would say now that if the gentleman from Georgia should offer a similar amendment to the bill now under consideration, I would certainly support it.

And now, to quote the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee handling the appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies, has deplored the effects of the foreign-aid program on American agriculture. He has shown how oversea production in competition with U.S. production is encouraged by investment surveys, dollar loans, local currency loans, investment guarantees, and by other means, through foreign aid.

In this connection, I shall quote now only one paragraph from Report No. 1387, by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], dated May 8, 1964, to accompany the bill making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture. I shall read briefly from page 17 of that report, as follows:

> Our own Federal Government has been providing funds and technical assistance to enable competitors (Americans and foreigners) to increase their production overseas—both in quantity and quality—and to take over much of our traditional world markets with commodities produced with cheap labor, land, and materials. It is extremely difficult for the American farmer to compete with foreign producers—although efficiency of production and superior quality have enabled him to retain some of his foreign markets despite this disadvantage.

I agree with the points these outstanding gentlemen have made.

Now, Mr. Chairman: Convince a man against his will; he is of the same opinion still.

Let us face up to our responsibilities.

Do the Members realize that this is probably the only piece of legislation that was ever created in Congress whereby we just cut them loose and give them a blank check? You give the money to them and they can do exactly what they want to do with it.

I do not believe there is a Member on this floor who really believes we are justified in disbursing funds in fiscal year 1965 to 99 nations and 9 territories. It is fantastic. It is unbelievable. But, it is in the hearings. They give you the figures. If that is what you want, that is what you are going to have. However, I do not believe that is what you want.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I wish to summarize:

The bill under consideration would provide funds far in excess of needs for the foreign aid program. Last year, the Congress appropriated $3 billion in new funds, and during our hearings this year the committee was told repeatedly by "key" witnesses that the fiscal year 1964 program was "reasonable," "adequate," and "satisfactory." And the facts of record make it clear that a $3 billion appropriation would be just as adequate this year.

This year's so-called "tight" budget for title I of the program is $651,700,000 above the comparable appropriation for fiscal year 1964, although 14 countries and territories which were included in the budget last year have been deleted from the program for new money this year.

During the past 9 years the appropriations for foreign aid have been reduced by the Congress, $8,108,262,000, or 21.10 percent, below the budget estimates. Each year, without exception, the administration in power has predicted the direct consequences to our Nation and the so-called "free world" if such action were taken. But, in every case, the amount appropriated by Congress has proved to be excessive to actual needs. By not being taken in by cries of "wolf," the Congress has directly saved more than $8 billion for our country, while providing more money than the program needed. It is my hope that the majority of the Members of this House will refuse to be "taken in" this year.

The "pipeline" of unexpended funds in the aid program has increased by $1,783,162,000 over the past 5 fiscal years. This has been so despite the money cuts made by the Congress. One of the primary causes for this huge "pipeline" of money is the number of countries which are recipients of our aid—99 countries and 9 territories in fiscal 1965 from military or economic assistance or Public Law 480—surplus agricultural commodities—and 38 of these countries will be beneficiaries of all three of these spigots of aid.

The foreign aid program has no counterpart in any other program operated by the U.S. Government. The legislative authority specifies that funds shall be spent for programs which are outlined in the broadest of terms. Funds are authorized and appropriated for these purposes, but up to 10 percent of the funds appropriated for any purpose may be used for other purposes. In addition, a contingency fund is provided which the President may use for any purpose authorized under the act. And, military assistance has its own contingency fund, provided by law, in the amount of $300 million. This is indeed the most flexible program known to man.

The aid program is uncontrolled and uncontrollable. The executive department justifies its requests for appropriations on an "illustrative" basis. It tells the Appropriations Committee what it intends to do with money when it is appropriated; however, it can do something entirely different with the funds once they are appropriated. For example, it would be entirely possible for the Agency to justify the appropriation of money for the construction of a dam in Tunisia, and then use it to build a bridge in Iran.

During the fiscal year 1964, the AID initiated at least 60 projects which were never presented or justified to the Congress. The fiscal year 1964 cost of these projects was $7,202,000 and the cost to complete them is estimated to be $21,697,000.

Any budget prepared for the foreign aid program must, of necessity, be an estimate of the wildest type imaginable. From start to finish, it is based on conjecture as to, first, the number and extent of the projects which will be approved; second, development of worldwide situations; and third, the physical ability to spend money appropriated.

We are financing more than 4,000 foreign aid projects scattered all over the face of the earth, including prime, "sub," and related projects. Furthermore, there are 71,416 people, including participants, on the aid program payroll, and this represents an increase of 7,000 during the last year. The program has reached such proportions that even the confusion is confused.

Cambodia recently requested that we withdraw our aid program from that country—but on April 29, 1964, 5 months after we had been requested to get out of Cambodia, the AID obligated funds to continue the training of Cambodian participants through fiscal 1968, at a cost of $1,650,000.

It should be obvious to all that, at best, the foreign aid budget is not even a well-founded guess. Only a few people have gone into this program well enough to be thoroughly informed—and, I would say to the House that all of these people are not, by any means, in the executive branch. With due modesty, I should inform the Members that I, myself, spent more than 800 hours dealing with this program during calendar year 1963 and more than 300 hours, already, this calendar year in research and conducting hearings, and similarly during the preceding 8 years. I have looked only at the facts as I see them.

Among other serious matters in connection with the foreign aid program which disturb me a great deal is our Nation's "gold outflow" problem. Our gold stockpile stood at $15,596 million on last December 31, as compared with $22,857 million on December 31, 1957. Against this gold stockpile, which is the source of strength of the dollar, there are short-term U.S. due bills held by foreign nationals and governments estimated to amount to about $26 billion. Consequently, it is literally within the power of those countries, if they should so choose, to bankrupt the U.S. Treasury. The 57 countries which received $12,436,400,000 in military and economic aid from the United States during the 6 years from 1958 through 1963 purchased, in the same period, $6,977,800,000 of our gold.

Joined by others of the committee, I strongly feel that a total of $4,802,190,400—including more than $3 billion for economic and military aid under title I—will provide more than adequately for the programs covered by this bill. I wish to emphasize that for every category of economic and military assistance this recommendation provides for more than the amount approved by the House in the bill for fiscal year 1964 and is equal to or more than the amount provided in the final appropriation act for fiscal 1964.

This recommendation provides the full budget estimate for military assistance and the full budget estimate for Vietnam. Actually, about all that the recommended reductions would result in would be a long-overdue "squeezeout" of overobligations and a long-overdue shortening of the around-the-world "pipeline."

As chairman of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee, I have had tremendous support in the past from the majority of the members of the subcommittee, the full Committee on Appropriations, and the membership of this House. My position today is the same as it has been in the past, and I hope that those Members who have not had the opportunity to study the bill in detail will again support my position, as they have done in the past.

I thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. STAEBLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. PASSMAN. Yes. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. STAEBLER. I thank the gentleman for yielding. He has again referred to the gold flow problem.

Mr. PASSMAN. Yes.

Mr. STAEBLER. Mr. PASSMAN, the largest purchaser of our gold was Great Britain, was it not?

Mr. PASSMAN. You look at the sheet. There are 57 nations. You can analyze it.

Mr. STAEBLER. The largest was Great Britain.

Mr. PASSMAN. There had to be a largest and there had to be a smallest. Let us get down to the smallest and then work it in between. Go right ahead.

Mr. STAEBLER. Great Britain took more than a third of the gold we have lost in the last 2 or 3 years.

Mr. PASSMAN. I am surprised they did not take half of it.

Mr. STAEBLER. The figures were for Great Britain $2,368 million in gold purchases from us. During that period the amount of aid Great Britain received from us was a total of $280 million. In other words, a very small fraction of the total amount of gold. And at the same time and during the same period Great Britain repaid to us on prior obligations $1,112 million. So that there was no connection between aid and gold flow in the case of Britain.

Mr. PASSMAN. According to your understanding. That is your view and not mine.

Mr. STAEBLER. Are you able to demonstrate any connection here?

Mr. PASSMAN. I am getting a lot of fun out of hearing the gentleman run along. Go ahead, please.

Mr. STAEBLER. I follow the principle of the last laugh.

Mr. PASSMAN. Go right ahead.

Mr. STAEBLER. The second largest purchaser of gold was France. During the 6-year period France purchased $1,000,400,000. During that period the French repaid to us more than that, $1.03 billion on prior obligations. What connection here?

Mr. PASSMAN. I thank the gentleman. Will you answer one of my questions now?

Mr. STAEBLER. Yes.

Mr. PASSMAN. How much have you changed this figure here of $7 billion that these 57 nations borrowed of our gold in your deliberations? I used a net figure. Now, some may happen to be the largest and some must be the smallest and some must be in between. I can only repeat what I said, and you cannot refute these figures, my very dear friend from Michigan. Look at the table. Let us not just go over part of it. Let us look at the facts as they are. I do not care whether you give it all to one country or half of it or what. We have listed 57 nations that we gave $12 billion of aid to, and those 57 nations, whether it was Britain, France, Portugal, or what have you, purchased from us $7 billion worth of our gold. You know these figures are accurate. I have discussed the matter with the gentleman before and I thought we had agreed. I am sorry to find out we are in disagreement again.

Mr. STAEBLER. But the gentleman has not established any connection between the purchase of the gold and the aid.

Mr. PASSMAN. How much have you reduced the amount the 57 nations purchased, net? I am referring to a net figure. Fifty-seven aid-recipient nations have drawn out $6,980 million worth of our gold at the same time we were giving them $12,400 million. That is of record. You cannot change the record.

Mr. STAEBLER. May I point out that the gentleman has not answered my question.

Mr. PASSMAN. Will the gentleman ask his question again?

Mr. STAEBLER. The connection between the purchase of gold and the granting of aid in the countries we talked about which account for more than half of the gold purchased. There is not any connection.

Mr. PASSMAN. If I drive down a road 3 miles and back up 2 miles, what is the difference between the two? One mile. It is all the same. Here we have a net loss of $7 billion in gold.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, may I state to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. STAEBLER] that in the case of the United Kingdom since World War II we have given them some $7,258 million of foreign aid. In the case of France we have given them some $7 billion of foreign aid. I know the point that the gentleman is trying to make. But let me point this out, that that aid was not all delivered in 1 year. These are the years in which it was obligated. Therefore it is impossible to say that the aid did not have some effect on the ability of Great Britain to buy $2½ billion worth of our gold. That is the point the Chairman is trying to make, and it is a valid point. He has made it for the nations around the world.

The gentleman from Michigan is trying to put him to a point of proof which would be almost impossible to make. But the implication is so clear, if you have given this much aid and that much gold has been purchased within a certain reasonable period, the correlation is obvious. To me it is very obvious that there has to be a connection between the two.

Mr. STAEBLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PASSMAN. Let me say to the gentleman that I am not quarreling with him. I am speaking of the net result. Any way you take it, we have remaining in this country to our credit only about $15 billion worth of gold. It requires $12 billion to support our monetary system. That leaves $3 billion to pay $26 billion of short-term due bills held by foreign nationals and governments.

I do not believe we can pay $26 billion with $15 billion.

I have endeavored to make only one point and it is a valid point; it is factual. I only know that the 57 nations that we have documented, to which we gave $12 billion worth of aid in 6 years, requisitioned approximately $7 billion worth of our gold. That is a matter of fact.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, at the risk of breaking into the gentleman's presentation I would like to compliment him on his usual fine job of presenting the facts with reference to the foreign aid bill. He has done a magnificent job, in my opinion, as he always does. The gentleman from Louisiana is not only a very capable, industrious, and intelligent Member of Congress, but he is a very courageous man. And, whether you agree with him as to what he has done today, you have to admire his courage.

Mr. PASSMAN. I thank the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, let me say that I am very grateful for the confidence of the Members of the House and for their support in the past.

Mr. STAEBLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PASSMAN. Certainly.

Mr. STAEBLER. I hope the gentleman's information in other fields is better than it is on the subject of gold flow.

Mr. PASSMAN. Let me say to the gentleman from Michigan that I am going to kid him a little now. Do not let this get back to the people of Michigan, because they are already calling you "Governor." They will find that neither one of us knows very much about it, and this will also get me in trouble down in Louisiana.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I am happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. May I say to the gentleman from Louisiana and to the next "Governor" of Michigan, I believe the gentleman from Louisiana knows more about this program than the entire Congress, collectively.

Mr. PASSMAN. Thank you, my friend.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I am very happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I want to pay my highest tribute to a great American, a great statesman, the Honorable OTTO PASSMAN, who has just given the House the plain true single facts and figures on this foreign giveaway program that has cost the American taxpayers far over $100 billion.

How any Member of Congress can vote for this bill after listening or reading Mr. PASSMAN's remarks of this day—June 30, 1964, is to me beyond all understanding.

Every American owes you, Mr. PASSMAN, a great debt of gratitude for your good works here in this U.S. House of Representatives.

Mr. PASSMAN. I thank the gentleman.

We will have a better President, we will have a better program, we will have a better administration, and we will have a better Congress if we do not yield to the whims of someone downtown, and if we work our will and cut this bill down to probably $300 million more than was appropriated last year.

You know, if you want to spoil a child, just give him everything he wants. And, in this connection, I wonder whether this observation might also apply to Presidents?

Now, Mr. Chairman, before inserting some material in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, I should note that under the rules of the Committee on Appropriations, subcommittee chairmen either have to defend and support the recommendations of the majority of the committee or, else, temporarily step aside as chairman. In this case, that is what I have done, and the reasons are, of course, quite obvious.

I thank the Members for their attention, and I thank the distinguished gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES] for yielding this time to me.

Now, Mr. Chairman, here is the information I mentioned for insertion in the RECORD, as an extension of my remarks:

	1964 appropriation		Fiscal year 1965			
	House bill	Final	Estimate	House authorization	Appropriations subcommittee recommendation	Reduction below authorization
TITLE I—FOREIGN AID (MUTUAL SECURITY)						
Economic assistance:						
Development grants	$150,000,000	$155,000,000	$224,600,000	$224,600,000	$155,600,000	−$69,000,000
American schools and hospitals abroad	14,300,000	14,300,000	18,000,000	18,000,000	18,000,000	----------
American hospitals abroad (special foreign currency program)	4,700,000	4,700,000	----------	----------	----------	----------
Surveys of investment opportunities	----------	----------	2,100,000	2,100,000	2,100,000	----------
International organizations and programs	100,000,000	116,000,000	134,400,000	134,272,400	114,272,400	−20,000,000
Supporting assistance	300,000,000	330,000,000	405,000,000	405,000,000	354,000,000	−51,000,000
Contingency fund	50,000,000	50,000,000	150,000,000	150,000,000	100,000,000	−50,000,000
Inter-American social and economic cooperation program	100,000,000	135,000,000	----------	----------	----------	----------
Alliance for Progress:						
Development grants	80,000,000	80,000,000	85,000,000	85,000,000	85,000,000	----------
Development loans	350,000,000	375,000,000	465,000,000	465,000,000	375,000,000	−90,000,000
Development loans	600,000,000	687,300,000	922,200,000	922,200,000	687,300,000	−234,900,000
Administrative expenses, AID	50,000,000	50,000,000	52,500,000	52,500,000	52,500,000	----------
Administrative expenses, State	2,700,000	2,700,000	2,900,000	2,900,000	2,900,000	----------
Subtotal, economic assistance	1,801,700,000	2,000,000,000	2,461,700,000	2,461,572,400	1,946,672,400	----------
Military assistance	1,000,000,000	1,000,000,000	1,055,000,000	1,055,000,000	1,055,000,000	----------
Total, title I	2,801,700,000	3,000,000,000	3,516,700,000	3,516,572,400	3,001,672,400	−514,900,000
TITLE II—FOREIGN AID (OTHER)						
Peace Corps	89,000,000	92,100,000	106,100,000	106,100,000	94,100,000	−12,000,000
Army: Ryukyu Islands	10,000,000	10,000,000	14,441,000	14,441,000	14,441,000	----------
HEW: Cuban refugees	56,000,000	39,717,137	45,400,000	45,400,000	45,400,000	----------
State: Migrants and refugees	10,550,000	10,550,000	8,200,000	8,200,000	8,200,000	----------
Inter-American Development Bank	50,000,000	50,000,000	205,880,000	205,880,000	205,880,000	----------
International Development Association	61,656,000	61,656,000	61,656,000	61,656,000	61,656,000	----------
Total, title II	277,206,000	264,023,137	441,677,000	441,677,000	429,677,000	----------
TITLE III—EXPORT-IMPORT BANK						
Limitation on operating expenses	1,314,366,000	1,314,366,000	1,350,060,000	1,350,060,000	1,350,060,000	----------
Limitation on administrative expenses	3,500,000	3,500,000	3,781,000	3,781,000	3,781,000	----------
Total, title III	1,317,866,000	1,317,866,000	1,353,841,000	1,353,841,000	1,353,841,000	----------
Grand total, all titles	4,396,772,000	4,581,889,137	5,312,218,000	5,312,090,400	4,785,190,400	−526,900,000

U.S. GRAIN TO THE UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC

(By Drew Pearson)

During the last 3 to 4 years, the United States has been supplying $140 million worth of grain to Egypt under Public Law 480. This is the dollar value, and the actual value in Egyptian currency would be less. However, the total amounts to more than the contribution which the Soviet Union has made for the construction of the famed Aswan Dam. According to the American Embassy, the U.S. grain contribution amounts to 60 percent of all the wheat and wheat flour consumed annually by the Egyptian people and 25 percent of all grains consumed.

President Nasser has made no public effort to identify this big grain contribution with the United States. However, American Embassy officials are convinced that the Egyptian public generally recognizes the source of the grain.

Nasser's anti-Americanism: At the same time that the United States has been in effect balancing the Egyptian economy, Nasser has engaged in drastic, unrelenting opposition to American policies in the Near East. He has not been as vocal in his attacks on the United States as he was during the Eisenhower administration, at which time John Foster Dulles had canceled U.S. participation in the Aswan Dam. However, Nasser's anti-Americanism has been of late much more effective. They are as follows:

1. Unquestionably Nasser persuaded the Libyan Government to cancel the lease of the U.S. Air Force Base in Libya.

The Wheelus Base is the largest bomber base outside the continental United States and is considered of great strategic importance. Its importance has increased following American withdrawal from Air Force bases in Morocco. Nasser's demand that Arab countries cancel military contracts with the United States led to Libya's formal demand that the United States leave Libyan soil.

2. Nasser has been pressuring Ethiopia to cancel the Kagnew communications base at Asmara, the Ethiopian city on the Red Sea. This is probably the most important communications base the United States operates outside of the continental American territory. It is not only a tracking station but a communications center for the clearing of all messages across the Atlantic. Its geographical location is important, because it is near the Equator. Nasser has been embarrassing Emperor Haile Selassie with demands that all U.S. military installations be cleared from African soil. So far the Emperor has not yielded.

3. Nasser has been shipping arms to Somalia to be used against Ethiopia. This created a hot, guerrilla war during 1963 and part of 1964. Part of his strategy was to pressure for the removal of Kagnew; part was to create Arab unity as against a Christian state—Ethiopia. Ethiopia, while predominantly Christian, has large segments of Moslem population along the border of Somalia, and both Somalia and Nasser have been trying to get control of these areas. Ethiopia has been perhaps the most friendly country toward the United States of any in east Africa.

4. Nasser now has 40,000 troops in Yemen, chiefly for the purpose of trying to take control of that country and from it wage a political war against Saudi Arabia. Yemen under Nasser has declared the end of monarchies, and this, of course, is aimed at the monarchy of Saudi Arabia and its long alliance with American oil companies. Nasser's chief aim is to try to get control of Saudi Arabian oil, which would finance his drive for Arab unity.

5. Nasser has not paid American citizens for the property seized from them during his Socialist takeover. Most Americans whose property was seized have given up any thought of financial restitution. Meanwhile, within the past 2 weeks, Nasser has seized the property of the Shell Oil Co., valued at $100 million. While this is chiefly a British concern, it is closely affiliated with American companies and many American investors have their money in it. The fact that Nasser has seized this company so recently is significant.

6. The next Nasser attack on the United States, whether public or private, is expected to take place at the coming African unity conference in Cairo this summer.

WOULD NASSER RETALIATE?

Nasser's opposition to the United States even though unpublicized has caused many Americans and some U.S. Embassy officials to consider the question of whether the sale of American grain under Public Law 480 should be continued. In general, the American Embassy in Cairo believes that the policy should continue. One of the questions raised unofficially by Americans is what would Nasser do if the food was cut off. They seem to fear drastic retaliation such as Nasser's seizure of the Suez Canal when John Foster Dulles announced the end of American plans to finance the Aswan Dam. Dictators, it is pointed out, have a habit of losing their tempers and acting irresponsibly when they are provoked. Among other things, it is argued that Nasser would attack Israel in retaliation.

THE ANSWER

In Israel, various parts of Africa, and parts of southern Europe, I canvassed the question as to whether Nasser would attack Israel if American grain was cut off. There is no question but that Nasser is counting very heavily on this grain to balance his economy. He has budgeted it up to 1970. On the other hand, the United States has made no commitment to supply him with grain beyond 1966. Therefore it is quite possible that Nasser could and would take drastic action.

However, I doubt very much that he would attack Israel. In the first place Israel leaders with whom I talked are not worried about an attack. In the second place my own observations are that the Israel Army is too strong and is feared by all the Arab leaders. Nasser himself has said privately during the recent Arab summit conference that he was not going to fight a war against Israel with Egyptian troops. He had some experience on this point in the past, in fact was taken prisoner himself in 1948 by the Israelis.

There may well be an attack on Israel later—but only when Nasser has developed atomic weapons from the German scientists he has employed. He is not going to fight another ground, conventional war.

Meanwhile, the payment for atomic research by these Nazi scientists is indirectly supplied by the United States through the $140 million worth of grain shipments annually.

If U.S. grain was curtailed, Nasser could not turn to Russia because the Soviet Union is desperately short of wheat itself. The United States in effect is the chief country from which grain can be supplied. This means that as of now the United States is not only subsidizing indirectly the expense of Nasser's 40,000 men in Yemen, not only financing the experiments of Nazi scientists, but also curtailing the dollar balance of the United States which could get cash for this wheat. Even if Nasser did not buy the wheat directly from the United States and bought from Canada instead, the United States in the long run would benefit through indirect increased sales.

CONCLUSION

The tactics of President Nasser are quite similiar to those of Fidel Castro in Cuba. He has seized American property for which he has made no payment; he has endeavored to stir up trouble for the United States in all the surrounding area. He has aspired to acquire American oil companies in Saudi Arabia just as Castro has tried to get control of American oil companies in Venezuela. He has taken over the Suez Canal just as Castro has aimed propaganda and won expeditionary force at Panama with a view to disrupting the American hold on the Panama Canal.

The chief difference between Nasser and Castro is that the first is well groomed, unbearded, speaks with a flawless English accent, and is a past master at buttering up diplomats—in fact more—than the uncouth, bearded dictator of Cuba whom we now boycott.

The effect of this is to make our friendly allies in Africa wonder whether they, too, should not adopt Nasser's tough tactics against the United States. They note that we fall for blackmail.

The only logical excuse for continuing food to Nasser is to help the Egyptian people. When I discussed the matter with Israeli leaders, they were not worried about an attack by Nasser and dispelled the myth that they had asked the United States to feed Egypt in order to prevent an attack. Their only concern was that the people should be fed no matter what their religion and their enmity toward Israel.

This is a question to be considered seriously by the executive and legislative branches of the U.S. Government.

My own belief is that Nasser will not allow his people to go hungry. He has some internal problems already and he cannot afford a revolt. It is quite true that he would unloose a bitter barrage of propaganda against the United States if this food were curtailed. But he would find the money from other sources to feed his people. He could curtail his operation in Yemen, his large outlay of funds to Nazi scientists or his own television and radio propaganda in the Arab world which runs into considerable money and which again is paid for indirectly by the United States.

[From the Houston (Tex.) Post, May 5, 1964]

TWO DANCE GROUPS' TOURS COST THE UNITED STATES $1 MILLION

WASHINGTON. — Government-sponsored trips abroad by two modern dance groups cost the taxpayers more than $1 million, the State Department has advised Congress.

The information was given to the House Appropriations Committee during hearings on the State Department's appropriations bill scheduled for House consideration Wednesday.

The Martha Graham Dance Co., the committee was told, made two trips under the Department's cultural presentations program.

The first tour, late in 1955 and early 1956, cost $302,525.

The second tour cost $241,608.

Reobligation of prior year obligations

Date of letter	Number of projects	Amount of reobligation
Apr. 6, 1964	15	$9,838,000
May 1, 1964	5	1,502,000
May 28, 1964	7	2,387,000
June 2, 1964	3	11,970,000
June 5, 1964	6	181,000
June 8, 1964	19	938,000
June 10, 1964	35	2,341,000
June 11, 1964	88	6,678,000
June 12, 1964	37	1,768,000
June 17, 1964	17	11,814,000
June 19, 1964	4	648,000
Total	236	50,065,000

Status of prior commodity assistance loans to Tunisia

Loan No.	Purpose	Date of loan agreement	Amount authorized	Disbursements per loan ledger as of May 31, 1964
664-H-011	Commodity assistance	Nov. 27, 1962	$10,000,000	$6,745,109.33
664-H-014	do	June 20, 1963	15,000,000	0
664-H-019	Commodity financing	May 22, 1964	10,000	0

[From Newsweek, June 22, 1964]

DISSERVICE TO INDIA

So our aid to India has gone mainly to subsidize and prolong socialism, price controls, and an artificial value for the rupee. As the eminent Indian economist B. R. Shenoy wrote in the May 21 issue of the Wall Street Journal: "Foreign aid actually is doing a disservice to the Indian economy * * *. Aside from helping to perpetuate industrial white elephants, foreign aid * * * provides the foreign exchange needed for illicit export of capital; for illegal imports of gold * * * for speculative accumulation of inventories; for the construction of urban property as a hedge against inflation; and for luxury living for those few who succeed in manipulating the nation's economic controls to their own advantage."

In brief, aid to India, insofar as it has not been merely a futile effort to fill a leaking tub, has been encouraging and prolonging socialism, controls, inflation, and an overvalued currency. And what is happening in India is typical of what is happening in other "underdeveloped" countries into which we have been pouring taxpayers' dollars.

When, if ever, are we going to use foreign aid to encourage sound currencies, balanced budgets, private property, free enterprise, and increased productivity?

OF COURSE FOREIGNERS WILL TAKE U.S. AID

(By Dr. Howard E. Kershner, president of the Christian Freedom Foundation, Inc.)

Two years ago it was my privilege to discuss economic problems and international finance with a highly placed official of the Government of Lebanon. He explained to me proudly that his country was not in debt, always balanced its budget, had no inflation, and maintained a strong, stable currency. I congratulated him upon these facts and then inquired, "Will you tell me, Mr. Minister, why my country that has balanced its budget only six times in the last 30 years, has chronic inflation, a dollar steadily losing its purchasing power and owes more money than all the rest of the government in the world combined, should continue to send your country millions of dollars a year?"

The Minister smiled as he replied, "I know of no reason why you should but if you are foolish enough to do it, of course we will take it."

U.S. LEBANON AID

Through December of 1961, the United States had given Lebanon $88 million in foreign aid. Broken down, $8 million was in military assistance, $77 million was in grants (gift), and $3 million was in loans.

In 1950, Lebanon had a gold reserve of $20 million. At the end of July 1962, Lebanon's gold reserve stood at $172 million.

From the above figures, taken from official sources, it is unmistakably clear that Lebanon was never in need of our foreign aid.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished chairman of the full Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], to close debate.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I shall speak quite briefly, indeed. Certainly, at this hour it would not be appropriate for me to detain you long.

I want to compliment my good friend, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN], upon his very excellent talk. He is always very interesting. I believe, as my friend the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HALEY] stated, that the gentleman from Louisiana knows more about the details of the foreign aid program than anyone else in the Congress. He knows more about the details.

Now, one of my good friends said how anyone could have listened to that speech and vote for foreign aid, or words to that effect, he was not able to understand. Well, it is understood and known that my friend, the gentleman from Louisiana, does not support the foreign aid program, though he has voted for the appropriation bills which he has handled.

Mr. Chairman, I am frank to say that if you completely accept the philosophy of the gentleman from Louisiana, you certainly should not vote for any money for foreign aid because it is, in his opinion, an abomination, without a doubt.

Mr. Chairman, there really is not much difference between our good friend from Louisiana and the majority of the members of the Committee on Appropriations with respect to the content of the bill.

The gentleman wants to cut out in a direct amendment $300 million. The committee wants to put the $300 million on the shelf and make it unavailable to the President unless he makes a specific determination that these additional funds are needed and that they cannot be obtained from any funds otherwise available for the economic assistance program.

So there is really very little difference between the full Committee on Appropriations and the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN], insofar as dollars are concerned.

The majority of the Appropriations Committee, not wanting to cut more than $200 million in cash, which amount we cut, recommended that we put $300 million on the shelf, and not deny the President's pleas for flexibility in dealing with military and foreign policy and the opportunity to use these funds if they are urgently required. Is there a man within the sound of my voice who would deny to the President the $300 million that is in question in the reserve which the bill provides? I really doubt it very much. So the point is, the majority of the members of the Committee on Appropriations would put $300 million on the shelf and make it available only under certain circumstances.

The gentleman from Louisiana would cut it out, eliminate it entirely.

It seems passing strange, however, that the gentleman from Louisiana would be willing to provide about $3 billion for a program which he says is so bad. It is amazing and shocking to me that my friend, feeling that this program is so indefensible, would want to throw away $3 billion of the taxpayers' money. That to me is quite incomprehensible, and I think you must agree.

Another thing that shocks and disappoints me in my friend is that he has said in his remarks, and he has said it in the report in the minority views, that this program of foreign aid is "uncontrolled and uncontrollable."

Who has been Mr. Big in foreign aid, for the last 10 years? If it has been uncontrolled, who must answer at the bar of justice for the fact it has not been properly circumscribed in the appropriation bills?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. Why, if it is uncontrolled, has the Appropriations Committee, under the leadership of two of my dear friends, not done a better job of controlling it?

I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I want to answer the question. The reason for the bill being uncontrolled and uncontrollable is that the authorizing legislation provides that the funds will be appropriated for programs which are so broad it is impossible to have a line item appropriation. You get justifications on illustrative bases, bases which would allow the people who get the money to say they are going to build a dam in Iran, then build a bridge in Turkey. That is what the chairman means when he says it is uncontrolled and uncontrollable. If the legislation were the same type of legislation which we have, for instance, when we authorize a public works measure in the United States, it would be very simple with us to do the same job of controlling as we do in the Public Works Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee. But this is not the fault of the Appropriations Committee. I want to make that clear.

Mr. MAHON. If you provide only $3 billion, I assume that the gentleman would still say that the program is uncontrolled and uncontrollable. So, if the amendment sponsored by the gentleman from Arizona and the gentleman from Louisiana is adopted, the program would be as uncontrolled and uncontrollable as it would be with the higher figure.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. This program is a guess, and whatever we say is right is just about as likely to be right as anything else. In the last 10 years since this subcommittee has been appropriating for this item, there have always been carryovers, and we have always given them more money than needed.

Mr. MAHON. My friend from Louisiana made reference to the request of an official in the executive branch that certain funds be obligated prior to the appearance of Mr. Bell, the AID Administrator, before committees of the Congress in connection with the foreign aid program. While I cannot personally vouch for the facts in this case, I have been told that nine projects were involved and that some of them had been under study for several months. Mr. Bell advises that he wanted to have the latest information available before appearing before the appropriate committees. Mr. Bell has provided the following table in regard to the nine loans involved:

Aid loans approved by the DLC and the NAC during the week of Apr. 20, 1964

Loan	Amount (in millions)	Discussion of loan began—	Formal application received
Argentina:			
1. Secondary agricultural schools (Institucion Salesiana).	$6.8	December 1962	March 1963.
Ecuador:			
2. Consortium Road	13.3	1961	November 1963.
India:			
3. Program loan	50.0	December 1963	Mar. 6, 1964.
Pakistan:			
4. Turbogeneration, Karnafuli Dam	3.8	1960	October 1963.
5. Thermal power station (Siddherganj)	8.5	1960	Do.
6. Thermal power station (Lyallpur)	18.1	1962	Feb. 18, 1964.
7. Malaria eradication	10.4	1963	December 1963.
Tunisia:			
8. Program loan	10.0	July 1963	Apr. 17, 1964.
9. Electricity distribution	7.4	September 1962	Sept. 16, 1963.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Is it not a fact that this program was cut by President Johnson to the extent of practically $1 billion before it came to the Appropriations Committee?

Mr. MAHON. This is the point we have made, that in order to get in a better position for a tax cut, in order to comply with the will of Congress which has been expressed—last year—that we would support a program of $3.5 billion, the President submitted his request. In effect, he said, "Let us be realistic." I am not using his exact words. He sent down a budget estimate which is approximately the amount we appropriated last year, and with our cuts we are providing less in the bill this year than was provided last year in total obligational availability. So it seems to me that we are in good position.

My friend from Louisiana made reference to the fact that I had said I would not have supported the bill on one occasion if certain cuts had not been made. I must frankly say that if President Johnson had sent down a program the size of the one which came down in 1957, for example, of $4.860 billion, or the one of $4.275 billion in 1961, or of the $4.775 billion, which was requested in 1962 or the $4.961 billion requested in 1963; I would have, in all probability, supported a greater reduction. Yet, those who oppose the committee position strangle at a bill which provides $1 billion less in total funds than they themselves permitted in conference reports in those previous years. The recommended total available for obligation in this year—1965—is lower than that available last year. This is the reason why I say I can support this bill, though I have always looked with a jaundiced eye upon foreign aid programs and wanted to make reductions and save everything possible by making suitable reductions.

Under leave to extend, I include a table showing total funds available for obligation for the last 9 years and for fiscal year 1965 as reported by the Appropriations Committee:

Mutual defense and development programs—Statement of availabilities, fiscal year 1956 through fiscal year 1965

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget estimate [1]	Appropriation	Unobligated carryover	Transfers, reimbursements and receipts	Recoveries	Total available for obligation
1956:						
Military	1,442.2	1,022.2	33.9	+2.1	395.0	1,453.2
Economic	1,824.4	1,681.1	14.7	+6.4	[2] 160.6	1,862.8
Total	3,266.6	2,703.3	48.6	+8.5	555.6	3,316.0
1957:						
Military	3,000.0	2,017.5	195.5	+4.5	188.7	2,406.2
Economic	1,860.0	1,749.1	142.6	+.8	127.8	2,020.3
Total	4,860.0	3,766.6	338.1	+5.3	316.5	4,426.5
1958:						
Military	1,600.0	1,340.0	538.8	−22.7	206.0	2,062.1
Economic	1,786.9	1,428.8	225.4	+29.1	144.1	1,827.4
Total	3,386.9	2,768.8	764.2	+6.4	350.1	3,889.5
1959:						
Military	1,800.0	1,515.0	21.5	+27.8	222.9	1,787.2
Economic	2,375.1	1,933.1	44.6	+3.4	170.8	2,151.9
Total	[3] 4,175.1	[3] 3,448.1	66.1	+31.2	393.7	3,939.1
1960:						
Military	1,600.0	1,300.0	52.1	+57.2	208.3	1,617.6
Economic	2,830.0	1,925.8	42.3	−26.1	163.8	2,105.8
Total	4,430.0	3,225.8	94.4	+31.1	372.1	3,723.4
1961:						
Military	2,000.0	1,800.0	50.9	+2.4	120.6	1,973.9
Economic	3,025.0	2,631.4	66.9	+30.0	146.4	2,874.7
Total	[3] 5,025.0	[3] 4,431.4	117.8	+32.4	267.0	4,848.6
1962:						
Military	1,885.0	1,600.0	58.1	−8.5	240.7	1,890.3
Economic	2,890.5	2,314.6	657.0	+6.3	104.7	3,082.6
Total	[4] 4,775.5	3,914.6	715.1	−2.2	345.4	4,972.9
1963:						
Military	1,500.0	1,325.0	64.2	+79.3	250.0	1,718.5
Economic	3,461.3	2,603.9	89.5	+27.5	134.5	2,855.4
Total	4,961.3	3,928.9	153.7	+106.8	384.5	4,573.9
1964:						
Military	1,405.0	1,000.0	22.3	+50.0	127.7	1,200.0
Economic	3,120.3	2,000.0	376.5	−44.6	91.8	2,423.7
Total	4,525.3	3,000.0	398.8	+5.4	219.5	3,623.7
1965 (appropriation bill):						
Military	1,055.0	1,055.0	25.0	------------	135.0	1,215.0
Economic	2,461.7	2,261.6	28.1	+3.6	59.5	2,352.8
Total	3,516.7	3,316.6	53.1	+3.6	194.5	3,567.8

[1] Represents executive requests as reflected in "House documents" and summarized in "Budget estimates" column of annual HAC reports adjusted to include supplementals.

[2] Estimated.

[3] Breakdown between regular and supplementals is as follows:

	Fiscal year 1959		Fiscal year 1961	
	Estimate	Appropriation	Estimate	Appropriation
Economic:				
Regular	2,150.1	1,783.1	2,275.0	1,916.4
Supplemental	225.0	150.0	[a] 750.0	[a] 715.0
Total	2,375.1	1,933.1	3,025.0	2,631.4
Military	1,800.0	1,515.0	2,000.0	1,800.0
Total	4,175.1	3,448.1	5,025.0	4,431.4

[a] Includes $600 for special Latin America program.

[4] Excludes $6 million requested for State administrative expense since request was originally in State's budget estimates; $3 million was subsequently appropriated in foreign aid legislation.

Source: Prepared by the Agency for International Development, June 29, 1964.

As has been said here, it is hard to exactly measure this matter of fund requirements, but let us bear this in mind. My friend from Louisiana keeps talking about this program in the last 18 years having cost, including the interest on the public debt, about $125 billion. What did we get for it? All of Western Europe was saved. This is valuable beyond estimation. What did we get for the $125 billion? Well, we stopped Russia from obtaining warm-water ports in Greece and Turkey, and we did not permit them to make the Mediterranean Sea a Red lake, which would dominate Africa and dominate southern Europe. Was that worth anything?

The foreign aid program has had an important part in preventing world war III. Is that worth anything? World war III would cost 20 times in money what foreign aid has cost in the last 20 years. It would certainly cost more in money and it could cost a half billion lives in the contest.

It may be that as expensive as foreign aid has been and as objectionable as it has been to many of us, it has been almost chicken feed when compared to what the situation would have been had we not invested this money in national defense and American security.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. To put it another way, the amount contained in this bill would not carry us for 3 days in a war.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. There has been talk about the carryovers from year to year after the congressional cuts in bills for previous years. Is it not a fact that we cut this bill so deeply last year that the estimated carryover for this year is the lowest since 1956? It is only $53,100,000. The committee bill appropriates approximately the same amount, or less than was appropriated last year.

Mr. MAHON. If we want to abandon Nationalist China and if we want to quit helping support troops in Greece and Turkey and other areas of the world where we are helping to pay for troops, then this could be done. But we dare not do it.

I am sure many Members of the House, while they do not agree with everything involved in foreign aid any more than I do, if their vote meant that there would be no program and meant complete abandonment to communism of key areas of the world—those who in the past have voted against foreign aid would now stand up and say, "Yes, I now vote for it." We have to have some kind of program and that is just what we are working on here today.

Now, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN], as I said, probably knows more about the intimate details of foreign aid budgetary justifications than anybody in the legislative branch. But he is not called upon to use or administer this program. He has never felt the muscle of foreign economic or military aid in a contest where the stakes were war or peace. He has not felt the muscle of it because he is in the legislative branch. But when our President is required to sit down and talk to the representatives of Greece and Turkey and to try to prevent the beginning of what could become world war III, he, the President, feels the muscle of military and economic assistance to other countries and he knows whether or not the program is an instrument for peace and security.

Only the President really understands this. Mr. Johnson as a U.S. Senator supported foreign aid reluctantly upon some occasions and voted for some cuts while in the Senate. When he went to the White House he must have discovered that this program was an ally, that it was a weapon, it was a tool which had been given to him to help him succeed in preventing world war III and spare the lives of American citizens.

Yes, and these people who have had the experience of dealing with the program from the standpoint of negotiating with foreign countries—and under the Constitution the President is our spokesman as to our foreign policies and is the Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces—seem to favor it strongly.

What have they done and said about it? What did Mr. Eisenhower do? With all of this partisan talk being reported in the New York Times, what did Mr. Eisenhower do? He felt so strongly about the importance of continued and adequate support of a foreign aid program—of course, he conceded that Congress can do as it thinks best—but as a private citizen he said he felt a program of foreign aid of $3.5 billion—and I quote—"represents a level of mutual assistance that cannot be drastically reduced without damaging the vital interests of the United States." That comes from the highest authority who administered our foreign policy for 8 years.

This is not a partisan program. It has not been a partisan program before. But there have been those who have been seeking here in recent days to make it a partisan program. Tomorrow, when the vote comes, those who have voted for much higher figures in recent years on the other side of the aisle, I hope will vote for the lowest figure that has been presented in the last 9 years and so give to President Johnson, who apparently has the confidence of the people, a chance to do the job. The President has the job to do. He has asked for the tools. We made some changes and reductions. But substantially let us give him the chance to perform for freedom and for the American people.

I, for one, will be voting for this bill and against further amendments.

The President cut $1 billion. We cut $200 million and put an additional $300 million on the shelf. I shall not go further. And I have as my authority such men as President Eisenhower, who used to administer the program, and our own President at this time.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE].

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I want to take this opportunity to commend the gentleman from Texas, the chairman of our full committee, for the wonderful message that he has given us here today. I would like to make two observations. I am not going to answer many of the things that the gentleman from Louisiana has said here. But he opened up his statement by stating the ones who signed the minority report were the ones who were in attendance most at the committee. This is a dastardly lie. I was at that committee and the gentleman from Kentucky was at that committee as long as anyone on that committee. We sat there patiently, along with the gentleman from Arizona, day in and day out. Of course, the attendance was bad—one of the poorest attendance records in the Congress. The major reason was because members could not stand the tactics of the chairman of that committee and the way he carried on day after day.

And there is one other point that I would like to make. He mentioned two books. One of them was a small book of 1956 and the other was a voluminous book of 800 hours.

Let me tell you the name of the chairman for that small book. John Taber. No greater chairman ever came out of the Congress of the United States. John Taber could say more in 5 words than the gentleman from Louisiana could say in 10 weeks.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. I wish to say that I also was in attendance at those meetings. I was certainly present when every principal witness testified. For a chairman of a subcommittee to come on the floor and condemn the members of his own subcommittee—well, that is all I will say.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. It is my personal opinion that the new chairman of the committee, in attempting to assess the value of foreign aid around the world in the past few years, has been looking in the looking glass of the adventures of Alice in Wonderland, written by Lewis Carroll.

Mr. Chairman, a long time ago a man by the name of Lewis Carroll wrote a book entitled "Adventures of Alice in Wonderland."

I have watched and listened to the arguments being advanced by the advocates of the theory how to buy friends and make enemies. If Lewis Carroll were alive today, I believe he could write a sequel to "Alice in Wonderland" and it would be entitled "Alice in Congress," for what we are doing here today must surely find a thousand parallels in Wonderland. What strange things are happening to the English language. What were shameful and extravagant handouts last year are prudent, moderate, minimal needs today. I thank heaven that men like George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, and Patrick Henry were neither "prudent" nor moderate," but were so radical and so extreme that they dared pledge their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor for matters of deep principle. But then King George III had no "rose garden" to tempt their favor.

The Mad Hatter in Lewis Carroll's fictional story wore only one large hat, but concealed beneath it were 17 smaller hats. So it is here today. The one massive hat concealing $3.3 billion in new foreign aid appropriations which it is alleged will strengthen the free world. But remove the big hat and a whole Pandora's box reveals itself, handouts of every size and description for three-fourths of the nations of the world. And if we include the additional countries that will benefit from the funds in this bill for the special U.N. programs such as the Special Fund and the expanded technical assistance program, we must conclude that most of the remaining fourth also will go to the trough provided by our taxpayers.

And I cannot escape the parallel between the tea party in Wonderland and the attempt to engage in meaningful debate here. For even while we talk and while the issue is debated, we know full well that no matter what arguments are presented, no matter what logic is brought forth, the heavy hand of politics and political pressure has predetermined a substantial number of votes. The empty seats in this Chamber reflect that obvious fact just as there were many empty seats at the Mad Hatter's tea party.

And what parallels can be found between the bizarre events in Wonderland and the inconsistencies that mark our deliberations here today.

We have a national debt which exceeds the debt of all the countries in the world, and yet we are asked to approve the largest foreign aid program of any country in that same world.

In our own earthquake-ravaged State of Alaska, according to correspondence I have received from a Democrat who represents that State in the other body, it is impossible to obtain an SBA Government loan at an interest rate of less than 3 percent. And yet in this bill we are approving loans for friend, foe, and wishy-washy neutral, which charge no interest at all up to 10 years. If its for over 10 years the country fortunate enough to be designated, "underdeveloped," pays only 2 percent—1 percent less than the citizens of Alaska must pay in order to borrow back their own tax dollars to help rebuild their shattered economy.

American men are fighting and dying for their country as advisors in Vietnam. And yet, as the gentleman from Wisconsin pointed out yesterday, wheat which we sell under our foreign aid program to Mexico and France eventually ends up in Red China and Vietnam where it sustains and strengthens the very hands responsible for our rising casualty rates in southeast Asia.

We hear a great lament from the White House about the poverty which afflicts one-fifth of our population, and yet we are asked to bestow on the poverty stricken in other countries over three times the amount advocated to be spent here. I doubt whether the $3 billion in this bill will cure poverty overseas any more than the $1 billion will cure it here.

Mr. Chairman, I will not take part in our foreign aid tea party. I will not cast a vote in favor of dispensing tax dollars from the hard-working citizens of southwest Missouri over the four corners of the world, including 99 nations and 9 territories.

I will vote against this appropriation bill and in favor of all amendments to reduce it. If there are any in this Chamber who can resist the temptations of the rose garden, or the Hatter's party, I urge them to do the same.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLAGHER].

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, I have heard some of the remarks, during which the gentleman from Louisiana cited himself as the outstanding authority in the House, and remarks about there not being too many people who know very much about this program.

I have just listened to the words of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE].

In the past we who serve on the Foreign Affairs Committee have held voluminous hearings, taking many days and many hours, yet in references to us it has always been said, "Well, you do not really understand the program."

But we do understand the program. When we have witnesses before our committee we listen to them and we read the hearings.

This year I read the hearings of the gentleman from Louisiana's subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations. The distinguished chairman of the appropriations Committee, Mr. MAHON, just made one of the most outstanding talks I have ever heard on this very vital question.

One of the reasons why the subcommittee has not had an opportunity of acquiring the information, perhaps, which we acquire, has been the fact that the witnesses have never had much of an opportunity to talk. It is sort of like a lawyer who only asks questions and refuses to allow answers but urges that the witness be convicted for not being responsive. Perhaps the House would find of interest some notes I made.

I should like to point out that Mr. Macomber, Assistant Administrator of AID, is the chief authority for the area where a predominant amount of this money goes, the Near East and south Asia. Mr. Macomber, in the committee hearings, had 1,665 lines to say.

Assistant Secretary of State Talbot, who is entrusted with making policy in this area, had 256 lines to say.

Mr. Tennant had 96 lines to say. He is Comptroller of AID.

Mr. Walsh 44 lines. Mr. White 15 lines.

Mr. Funari, legislative programs coordinator, the gentleman who has been the liaison between the White House and the Congress, who appeared as a witness, had two lines to say

This was all they could get to say, even though these people were available for weeks and weeks. These people were entrusted with supplying information and answers to questions. They were the people called to testify.

How many lines did the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] have? He had 3,388 lines to say.

This was the time it took to ask the questions. All of these witnesses were given an opportunity not to testify but to listen.

I might say that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE], who is a very knowledgeable man, a man who is a student of the program, and who, I might add, felt as strongly about the program when he fought for the program under President Eisenhower in which we joined, is certainly entitled to his beliefs for what he feels is in the best interest of the United States.

We made a little compilation of this whole thing. All the witnesses combined were allowed 2,078 lines. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN], total lines in all these hearings were 3,388 lines, about 1,300 more than all these witnesses who appeared before that subcommittee.

There are many people in this House who know the program and who have worked for the program and who support the chairman's Appropriations Committee to the hilt. He thinks that we must entrust the responsibility for the conduct of our foreign affairs to the President, and so do we. He thinks that this program serves the best interest of the United States, and so do we. If we share this concern then we should support the bill proposed by the very able gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY]. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. I am anxious to know who had the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLAGHER] had the floor.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. The gentleman from New Jersey had the floor?

Mr. HALLECK. I did not hear anybody yield time to him.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] yielded to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLAGHER].

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, how much time did the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. As much time as he required.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Chairman, we are told that our foreign aid is saving the world from communism. This is not true.

The United States is supporting and aiding communism by money, by food, by arms, by moral support, by trade, by cultural exchange, by giving them our military and nuclear secrets. We are pretending that communism and Communists mean no harm. We are aiding them as they aid other Communists and eliminate any vestige of freedom in the subjugated countries.

Why? Because there is profit to be made by some businessmen in foreign aid, military expenditures, and big government spending.

We now jeapordize the very currency of our country. In 5 years, 1958 to 1963, we gave $12½ billion to 57 countries who promptly bought $7 billion of our gold with the dollars we gave them.

Now we propose to give them $3.7 billion more. Already foreign goevrnments hold $26 billion in money which can be redeemed in our gold, except we have only $15½ billion gold left to give away.

Further, there are $7 billion now in the "pipeline" of unexpended accumulated funds, whether we appropriate any more now or not. Here is all of this money earmarked for specific expenditures. As a matter of fact large amounts can be deobligated and spent for new and other programs.

I want to commend the members of the subcommittee who joined in the minority report, and I share their views. Part of these views I would like to include at this point as a part of my own views:

Minority Views

We, the undersigned, firmly believe that the accompanying bill would provide funds far in excess of the real needs of many of the programs which it funds. The bill does not reflect the facts that were brought out in the long and searching hearings In our opinion, the appropriation of funds in the amount carried in the bill is, very definitely, not in the best interests of our Nation.

The limited time available for the preparation of minority views does not permit documentation in great detail. However, such detail is not necessary to illustrate the validity of the foregoing statements.

The foreign aid program is an amazing program. It is hard to believe, but it is true, that we are financing over 4,000 foreign aid projects scattered all over the fact of the earth. This includes prime, sub, and related projects. It is hard to believe, but it is true, that there are now 71,416 people, including participants, on its payroll—an increase of 7,000 during the last year. It has reached such proportions that even the confusion is confused.

The foreign aid program has no counterpart in any other program operated by the U.S. Government. The legislative authority specifies that funds shall be spent for programs which are outlined in the broadest possible terms. While funds are authorized and appropriated for these purposes, up to 10 percent of the funds appropriated for any purpose may be used for other purposes. In addition, a contingency funds is provided which the President may use for any purpose authorized under the act. Military assistance also has its own contingency fund provided by law in the amount of $300 million.

The foregoing facts would serve to bolster the statement that "This is the most flexible program known to man." But there are other factors than flexibility which have caused the program, in the words of Chairman PASSMAN, to be "uncontrolled and uncontrollable." The executive department justifies its request for appropriations on an "illustrative" basis. In other words, it tells the Appropriations Committee what it intends to do with money when it is appropriated. However, it can do something entirely different with the funds, once it comes into possession of them. For instance, it would be entirely possible for the Agency to justify the appropriation of money for the construction of a dam in Tunisia, and then use it to build a bridge in Iran.

Any budget prepared for the foreign aid program must, of necessity, be an estimate of the wildest sort. From start to finish, it is based on conjecture as to (1) the number and extent of projects which will be approved by our Government and the host governments, (2) development of worldwide situations, and (3) the physical ability to spend money appropriated. Further, it is impossible for the Appropriations Committee to ascertain with any degree of accuracy the amount of unobligated funds which are left at the end of the fiscal year. It has been stated that these figures for any fiscal year are not available until October of the following year. Since it has been the custom of the Appropriations Committee to ask the House to reappropriate unobligated funds for this program, this factor adds uncertainty to the proper level of appropriations in the following fiscal year.

With these uncertainties, vagaries, and other built-in flexibilities of this program, it seems strange that each year the Executive attempts to tell people of the country that unless a certain figure is appropriated by the Congress that (1) the foreign aid program will falter and die, (2) our foreign relations wil be damaged irreparably, and (3) we will be known as a tightwad around the world. Instead, it should be obvious that the matter is a guess at the very best and that there are only a few people who have gone into the matter well enough to be thoroughly informed. Not all of those people are in the executive department. In fact, the chairman of this subcommittee, the Honorable OTTO PASSMAN, has spent over 800 hours in this program during 1963 and over 300 hours in calendar year 1964 in research and in conducting hearings, and he has given the same dedicated service to the subcommittee for the last 10 years. Over the years all of the members who have signed this minority report have been regular and diligent in their attendance at the hearings.

In other words, we feel that as legislators (1) we are disinterested judges, looking only at the facts as we see them; (2) we are interested in saving money for the taxpayers of the United States; and (3) we are interested in furthering the purposes of the foreign aid program as set forth in authorizing legislation, because it is the law of the land and not necessarily because we are advocates of it.

GOLD OUTFLOW

We are concerned about the "gold outflow" problem. Even though the latest Treasury reports indicate that the outflow has been somewhat arrested, our gold stockpile stood at only $15,596 million on December 31, 1963. This compares with the gold stockpile of $22,857 million on December 31, 1957. Against this gold stockpile, which is the source of the strength of the dollar, there are short-term due bills held by foreign nationals, and by foreign governments which use them as support for their own currency, which is estimated to be in the neighborhood of approximately $26 billion. Consequently, it is within the power of our oversea friends to literally bankrupt the U.S. Treasury.

The table below is an updating—through December 31, 1963—of the gold outflow chart contained in the committee report of last year.

Net sales of U.S. gold to foreign aid program recipients

[In millions of dollars. Negative figures represent net sales by the United States; positive figures represent net purchases]

Country	1958	1959	1960	1961	1962	1963	Total
Algeria						−$15.0	−$15.0
Argentina	+$67.2		−$50.0	−$90.0	+$85.0	−30.0	−17.8
Austria	−84.2	−$82.7	−1.1		−142.5	−32.1	−342.6
Belgium	−329.4	−38.5	−140.9	−144.4	−63.0		−716.2
Burma			−3.8		−20.9		−24.7
Cambodia			−12.0	−3.1	−1.7	+3.2	−13.6
Cameroon Republic						−1.9	−1.9
Central African Republic						−.7	−.7
Ceylon		−7.5					−7.5
Chad						−.7	−.7
Chile	+3.0	−1.3	−2.0	−6.6			−6.9
Congo (Leopoldville)						−3.1	−3.1
Costa Rica				−2.3	−.5		−2.8
Cyprus				−2.0			−2.0
Dahomey						−.8	−.8
Denmark	−17.0	−15.0	−15.0	−35.0	+15.0		−67.0
Dominican Republic				−3.0			−3.0
Ecuador					−3.2	−2.3	−5.5
Egypt			−7.5	−7.8	−1.2	−2.2	−18.7
Country A		−4.7	−3.0				−7.7
France		−265.7	−173.0		−459.1	−517.7	−1,415.5
Gabon						−.7	−.7
Germany (West)			−33.8	−22.5			−56.3
Ghana			−5.6				−5.6
Greece		−15.0	−47.0	−10.2	−19.1		−91.3
Guinea						−2.8	−2.8
Honduras			−.8				−.8
Indonesia		−11.0	−24.9				−35.9
Iran	−2.3		−.4	−16.1		−5.9	−24.7
Iraq			−29.8				−29.8
Israel		−4.4			−10.0	−7.0	−21.4
Italy	−348.8			+100.0			−248.8
Ivory Coast					−1.5		−1.5
Japan	−30.1	−157.4	−15.2				−202.7
Korea		−1.6					−1.6
Laos				−1.9			−1.9
Lebanon				−21.0	−32.1		−53.1
Mauritania						−.8	−.8
Mexico		−30.0	−20.0			−4.0	−54.0
Morocco			−21.0				−21.0
Netherlands	−260.9	−29.9	−249.4	−24.9			−565.1
Niger						−.8	−.8
Nigeria				−20.0			−20.0
Pakistan			−12.5				−12.5
Peru			−15.0	−5.0	−.6	−10.6	−31.2
Portugal	−20.0	−10.0					−30.0
Saudi Arabia			−11.3	−47.5	−12.6		−71.4
Senegal						−1.7	−1.7
Somalia					−1.9		−1.9
Spain	+31.7		−113.7	−156.2	−146.1	−130.0	−514.3
Surinam	−2.5		−2.5		+2.5		−2.5
Syria			−2.1		−1.3	−.4	−3.8
Tunisia			−.5		−.5	−.5	−1.5
Turkey			−6.1	−2.5	−1.1	+2.0	−7.7
United Kingdom	−900.0	−350.0	−550.0	−305.7	−387.0	+329.3	−2,163.4
Upper Volta						−.8	−.8
Yugoslavia		−1.5	−15.9		−1.5	−1.9	−20.8
Net sales of gold	−1,893.3	−1,026.2	−1,585.8	−827.7	−1,204.9	−439.9	−6,977.8

The 57 countries included in the above table have received $12,436,400,000 in military and economic assistance from the United States during the period covered by the table. During the same time—January 1, 1958, through December 31, 1963—these 57 countries purchased $6,977,800,000 of our gold.

UNEXPENDED BALANCES

The table below indicates the "pipeline" of unexpended funds under title I on hand at the end of each of the last 5 fiscal years:

	Amount of funds in pipeline
1960	$4,830,600,000
1961	5,975,400,000
1962	6,629,500,000
1963	7,044,200,000
1964 (estimate)	6,613,762,000

The following table is a breakdown by program of the estimated unexpended funds for 1964:

Unexpended funds, June 30, 1964

TITLE I

1. Military assistance	$2,050,751,000
2. Development grants	324,856,000
3. American schools and hospitals abroad	20,080,000
4. Surveys-investment opportunities	1,420,000

Unexpended funds, June 30, 1964—Con.

TITLE I

5. International organizations and programs	$99,640,000
6. Supporting assistance	308,723,000
7. Contingency fund	170,052,000
8. Chilean reconstruction	9,765,000
9. Alliance for Progress	1,232,507,000
10. Development loans	2,106,694,000
11. Administrative expenses, AID	11,929,000
12. Administrative expenses, State	865,000
13. Acquisition of property	3,284,000
14. Investment guarantees	273,196,000
Subtotal, title I	6,613,762,000

TITLE II

15. Peace Corps	$52,041,000
16. Army: Ryukyu Islands	3,200,000
17. State: Migrants and refugees	4,743,000
18. HEW: Cuban refugees	6,875,000
19. Inter-American Development Bank	200,000,000
20. International Development Association	252,840,000
Subtotal, title II	519,699,000
Grand total, titles I and II	7,133,461,000

Theoretically, these funds represent firm obligations for goods and services on order but not yet delivered. However, the table below indicates that both the economic and military assistance programs have been able to deobligate or dereserve these so-called firm obligations in an amount sufficient to cause considerable concern:

Fiscal year	Economic assistance deobligations	Military assistance and dereservations and/or deobligations	Total deobligations
1956	[1] $111,000,000	$395,000,000	$506,000,000
1957	127,800,000	188,700,000	316,500,000
1958	144,078,000	206,000,000	350,078,000
1959	153,260,000	222,900,000	376,160,000
1960	160,970,000	208,300,000	369,270,000
1961	69,532,000	120,600,000	190,132,000
1962	93,211,000	240,700,000	333,911,000
1963	83,019,000	250,000,000	333,019,000
1964 [1]	91,800,000	127,700,000	219,500,000
Total	1,034,670,000	1,959,900,000	2,994,570,000

[1] Estimated.

SPENDING MILLIONS ON PROJECTS NEVER PRESENTED TO CONGRESS

The committee has had confirmed this year, as it has in prior years, the "illustrative" nature of the entire foreign aid program. During fiscal year 1964 the AID initiated 60 projects throughout the world which were never presented or justified to the Congress. The fiscal year 1964 cost of these 60 projects is $7,202,000, and the cost to complete them is presently estimated to be $21,967,000. A table showing the distribution, by area, of these unjustified projects follows:

Area	Number of unjustified projects	Fiscal year 1964 cost	Present estimate of cost to completion
Africa	26	$3,044,000	$9,169,000
Far East	2	271,000	407,000
Near East and south Asia	6	973,000	5,104,000
Latin America	26	2,914,000	7,287,000
Total	60	7,202,000	21,967,000

Cambodia recently requested that we withdraw our aid program from that country. We have done so, but the committee was surprised to find that the AID on April 29, 1964—5 months after we had been requested to get our aid program out of the country—obligated funds to continue the training of Cambodian participants through fiscal year 1968 at a total cost of $1,650,000.

HISTORY OF FOREIGN AID APPROPRIATIONS

The following table sets forth the last 9 years' budgets for foreign aid and the action of Congress thereon:

Total economic and military assistance

Fiscal year	Budget estimate	Passed House	Appropriation	Reduction below estimate	Percentage appropriation below budget estimate
1956	$3,266,641,750	$2,701,275,000	$2,703,341,750	−$563,300,000	17.24
1957	4,859,975,000	3,425,120,000	3,766,570,000	−1,093,405,000	22.50
1958	3,386,860,000	2,524,760,000	2,768,760,000	−618,100,000	18.25
1959	3,950,092,500	3,078,092,500	3,298,092,500	−652,000,000	16.51
1960	4,429,995,000	3,186,500,000	3,225,813,000	−1,204,182,000	27.18
1961	4,275,000,000	3,584,500,000	3,716,350,000	−558,650,000	13.07
1962	4,775,500,000	3,657,500,000	3,914,600,000	−860,900,000	18.03
1963	4,961,300,000	3,630,400,000	3,928,900,000	−1,032,400,000	20.81
1964	4,525,325,000	2,801,700,000	3,000,000,000	−1,525,325,000	33.71
Total	38,430,689,250	28,589,847,500	30,322,427,250	−8,108,262,000	21.10
ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE ONLY					
1956	$2,141,641,750	$1,996,275,000	$1,998,341,750	−$143,300,000	6.69
1957	1,859,975,000	1,690,120,000	1,749,070,000	−110,905,000	5.96
1958	1,786,860,000	1,274,760,000	1,428,760,000	−358,100,000	20.04
1959	2,150,092,500	1,563,092,500	1,783,092,500	−367,000,000	17.07
1960	2,829,995,000	1,886,500,000	1,925,813,000	−904,182,000	31.95
1961	2,275,000,000	1,784,500,000	1,916,350,000	−358,650,000	15.76
1962	2,890,500,000	2,057,500,000	2,314,600,000	−575,900,000	19.92
1963	3,461,300,000	2,330,400,000	2,603,900,000	−857,400,000	24.77
1964	3,120,325,000	1,801,700,000	2,000,000,000	−1,120,325,000	35.90
Total	22,515,689,250	16,384,847,500	17,719,927,250	−4,795,762,000	21.30
MILITARY ASSISTANCE ONLY					
1956	$1,125,000,000	$705,000,000	$705,000,000	−$420,000,000	37.33
1957	3,000,000,000	1,735,000,000	2,017,500,000	−982,500,000	32.75
1958	1,600,000,000	1,250,000,000	1,340,000,000	−260,000,000	16.25
1959	1,800,000,000	1,515,000,000	1,515,000,000	−285,000,000	15.33
1960	1,600,000,000	1,300,000,000	1,300,000,000	−300,000,000	18.75
1961	2,000,000,000	1,800,000,000	1,800,000,000	−200,000,000	10.00
1962	1,885,000,000	1,600,000,000	1,600,000,000	−285,000,000	15.12
1963	1,500,000,000	1,300,000,000	1,325,000,000	−175,000,000	11.67
1964	1,405,000,000	1,000,000,000	1,000,000,000	−405,000,000	28.83
Total	15,915,000,000	12,205,000,000	12,602,500,000	−3,312,500,000	20.81

All who have followed this program through the years will recall that, in the 9 years set forth above, the administration then in power has, without exception, reacted with horror at the mention of a significant cut in the budget estimates, and has predicted the direst consequences to our Nation and the free world if such action were to be taken by the Congress. Without exception, these nine budget were cut. As is documented in the preceding material, there also were no exceptions to the fact that the amount appropriated by Congress proved to be excessive to actual needs. Congress has saved $8 billion by not being taken in by the cries of "wolf." We do not intend to be taken in this year, and trust that will be the reaction of the majority of the Members of Congress.

We have history on our side. We have the current facts on our side.

Otto E. Passman.
George W. Andrews.
John J. Rhodes.
Gerald R. Ford.
William E. Minshall.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I ask that we proceed with the reading of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further requests for time? If not, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, namely:

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. Price, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that the Committee, having had under consideration the bill H.R. 11812, had come to no resolution thereon.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to revise and extend their remarks in the Record today on the foreign assistance appropriation bill and that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Mahon] may be permitted to include a table in his remarks and that other extraneous matter may be included in the Record by the Members.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11376) entitled "An act to provide a 1-year extension of certain excise-tax rates."

CONCURRENCE OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES TO THE SENATE AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 7152

Mr. MADDEN, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 789, Rept. No. 1527), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution the bill (H.R. 7152) to enforce the constitutional right to vote, to confer jurisdiction upon the district courts of the United States to provide injunctive relief against discrimination in public accommodations, to authorize the

Attorney General to institute suits to protect constitutional rights in public facilities and public education, to extend the Commission on Civil Rights, to prevent discrimination in federally assisted programs, to establish a Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendment thereto, be, and the same is hereby taken from the Speaker's table, to the end that the Senate amendment be, and the same is hereby agreed to.

TO GRANT ADDITIONAL TRAVEL AUTHORITY TO THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. YOUNG, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 792, Rept. No. 1528), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That, notwithstanding the provisions of House Resolution 38, Eighty-eighth Congress, the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives is hereby authorized to carry out the committee's statutory responsibility for legislative oversight of Public Law 480, Eighty-third Congress, by designating and directing not to exceed five members and not to exceed two employees of the committee to conduct studies and investigations of operations under Public Law 480 between the dates of July 5 and July 20, 1964, in Brazil and while en route to and from Brazil in such other Central American and South American countries as the chairman may direct.

Notwithstanding section 1754 of title 22, United States Code, or any other provisions of law, local currencies owned by the United States shall be made available to the members of the committee and employees engaged in carrying out their official duties under section 190(d) of title 2, United States Code: *Provided*, (1) That no member or employee of said committee shall receive or expend local currencies or appropriated funds for subsistence in an amount in excess of the maximum per diem rates approved for oversea travel as set forth in the Standardized Government Travel Regulations, as revised and amended by the Bureau of the Budget; (2) that no member or employee of said committee shall receive or expend an amount for transportation in excess of actual transportation costs; (3) no appropriated funds shall be expended for the purpose of defraying expenses of members of said committee or its employees in any country where counterpart funds are available for this purpose.

That each member or employee of said committee shall make to the chairman of said committee an itemized report showing the number of days visited in each country whose local currencies were spent, the amount of per diem furnished, and the cost of transportation if furnished by public carrier, or if such transportation is furnished by an agency of the United States Government, the identification of the agency. All such individual reports shall be filed by the chairman with the Committee on House Administration and shall be open to public inspection.

WATER RESOURCES RESEARCH CENTERS

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York (on behalf of Mr. Aspinall) submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (S. 2) to establish water resources research centers at land-grant colleges and State universities, to stimulate water research at other colleges, universities, and centers of competence, and to promote a more adequate national program of water research.

AGITATORS HIT BY GRAHAM

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the Members of the House to a United Press article, datelined New York (UPI), which appeared in the Clarion-Ledger, Jackson, Miss., Saturday, June 27, 1964. The article which was captioned "Agitators' Wisdom Hit by Graham," states:

> Evangelist Billy Graham said Friday he doubts the wisdom of civil rights workers going into the South this summer to help Negroes gain equal rights because of the present situation.
>
> "I'm not sure this is the proper method of dealing with racial attitudes," he said.
>
> The evangelist spoke to newsmen in the auditorium of the Billy Graham Pavilion at the World's Fair where Billy Graham Day was observed. Asked to comment on the disappearance of the three civil rights workers in Philadelphia, Miss., the evangelist said he has been "praying that these people will be found alive." He said the Nation should not "convict Philadelphia" until all the facts are in.
>
> Graham said that since he arrived in New York on Tuesday he had read of at least three murders.
>
> "I don't convict New York City when I read of crime," he said. He said that civil rights workers going into the South were idealistic.

Mr. Speaker, if this statement by Dr. Billy Graham, one of the great religious leaders of this country, had been derogatory to Mississippi, it would have been widely quoted on radio and TV and in the northern press. I have personally failed to find any reference to the Billy Graham statement in any newspapers in this area, nor have I heard it mentioned on radio or television. This, however, should come as little surprise to those of us who have viewed the hour-long television programs since the so-called civil rights workers have gone, or have been sent, into Mississippi and since the incident which is alleged to have happened in my hometown, Philadelphia, Miss. I especially call attention to the hour-long television program by the National Broadcasting Co. last Saturday evening in which the Governor of Mississippi, the ex-Governor of the State and one other citizen were given 7 or 8 minutes to present the viewpoint of our State. I believe you will agree this was the most ridiculous and prejudiced report ever to be presented to the American public. I say, Mr. Speaker, that we will have trouble in this country as long as NBC and the other network stations continue to be so warped in their reporting. Under these conditions there is no way on earth for the true facts to be known to the people of the country.

The citizens of Philadelphia and Neshoba County are peace loving. The white people have long worked together in harmony with the Negroes and the Choctow Indians for the welfare of all three races. It is indeed a bitter pill to swallow to have to tolerate the activities of agitators and troublemakers who are invading my State for the apparent purpose of creating disturbances and, in my opinion, to take the attention of the American people away from deplorable situations which exist in such places as Vietnam, as well as in New York, Chicago, Ohio, and California. The integrity of the citizenry of my hometown and county, as well as that of the law enforcement officers, has been questioned by the northern press and on network programs. I would like, therefore, to call on anyone in the United States to come forward with any information relative to the missing trio which might be helpful to the law-enforcement officials in my hometown, or to the Governor and other officials of the State of Mississippi.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK PROCLAMATION

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCormack] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the Captive Nations Week proclamations issued each year by the President as a result of a resolution passed by Congress in 1959 which I had the honor to introduce in the House of Representatives, and which was passed in the House by a unanimous vote of Democratic and Republican Members, is a matter of great significance and importance.

The proclamation designating this year the week beginning July 12, 1964, as Captive Nations Week, helps keep alive the hopes and confidences of tens of millions of persons in the countries named in the Joint Resolution of 1959, and hundreds of thousands here and elsewhere throughout the world of the ultimate independence of their respective countries and restorations of their liberty.

In my remarks, I include the proclamation of President Lyndon B. Johnson, designating the week beginning July 12, 1964, as Captive Nations Week.

As President Johnson eloquently said in this year's proclamation:

> I invite the people of the United States of America to observe this week with appropriate ceremonies and activities and I urge them to give renewed devotion to the just aspirations of all people for national independence and human liberty.

Captive Nations Week, 1964—A Proclamation by the President of the United States of America

Whereas the joint resolution approved July 17, 1959 (73 Stat. 212) authorizes and requests the President of the United States of America to issue a proclamation each year designating the third week in July as "Captive Nations Week" until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world; and

Whereas the cause of human rights and personal dignity remains a universal aspiration; and

Whereas this Nation is firmly committed to the cause of freedom and justice everywhere; and

Whereas it is appropriate and proper to manifest to the people of the captive nations the support of the Government and the people of the United States of America for their just aspirations: Now, therefore, I, Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States of America, do hereby designate the week beginning July 12, 1964, as Captive Nations Week.

I invite the people of the United States of America to observe this week with appropriate ceremonies and activities, and I urge them to give renewed devotion to the just aspirations of all people for national independence and human liberty.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

Done at the city of Washington this 18th day of June in the year of our Lord 1964, and of the Independence of the United States of America the 138th.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

By the President:

DEAN RUSK,
Secretary of State.

RETIREMENT OF LT. GEN. A. T. McNAMARA, DIRECTOR OF DEFENSE SUPPLY AGENCY

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, in view of the longstanding interest in supply management of the Military Operations Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations, I would like to say a few words on the occasion of the retirement of an officer who has done outstanding work in his field. I refer to Lt. Gen. Andrew T. McNamara, U.S. Army, first Director of the Defense Supply Agency, who retires on June 30 after more than 36 years of distinguished service.

According to my information, General McNamara became Quartermaster of the II Corps in North Africa during World War II, where he was awarded the Legion of Merit for exceptional service in providing supplies to fast-moving U.S. forces in Tunisia.

He was named Quartermaster of the First Army in September 1943, winning the Bronze Star Medal for his part in planning Quartermaster support of the invasion of Normandy. For directing quartermaster operations of the First Army during its drive across France, Belgium, and Germany, he was awarded the Distinguished Service Medal.

He was commended for developing a system to reclaim and adapt captured enemy materiel for use by U.S. forces, and for personally directing evacuation of a huge U.S. supply dump only 1 mile ahead of the advancing enemy during the German counteroffensive in December 1944.

Following a series of increasingly important assignments during the next decade, General McNamara became the Quartermaster General of the U.S. Army on June 12, 1957. After 4 years of service in this key position, he was designated Deputy Commander of the Eighth U.S. Army in Korea. On October 1, 1961, he became the first Director of the Defense Supply Agency.

My subcommittee has reviewed the conditions in military supply management and the steps leading up to the establishment of the Defense Supply Agency in several reports during the 86th and 87th Congresses, the latest of which was "Defense Supply Agency," House Report No. 2440, 87th Congress, 2d session. The DSA took over the military single manager agencies for food, clothing, medical and petroleum supplies, and transportation, and later added general, automotive, industrial, construction, electronics supplies, and logistics services. In later stages, automotive supply was returned to the Army, and an industrial plant equipment center and the Defense Documentation Center was added to DSA's assignments. The assimilation of these units into one organization and the constant change and expansion has required strong, confident leadership.

Under General McNamara's direction, a fine spirit of cooperation was nurtured between the Military Departments and DSA which resulted in increasing economies in supply management. He participated in the effort to achieve integrated management of common services and supplies. His expert leadership in this difficult and complex area has been aimed at making more efficient the response to the material needs of our armed forces, and at the same time at saving many millions of dollars for the taxpayer. During his tenure of almost 3 years, a large number of significant decisions on supply installations, procedures and items have had to be made on a coherent basis in order to mould DSA into an effective organization.

As an indication of the Defense Department's confidence in his command, DSA has just been assigned a new and major mission. It will be in charge of administering contracts of all military services. I hope to have our subcommittee review the significance of this assignment in the near future.

On his departure, General McNamara leaves behind a well trained staff of military officers of all four military services and civilian personnel. In Rear Adm. Joseph M. Lyle, Deputy Director, who has been nominated for Vice Admiral, the Agency has a worthy successor to step up as the new Director of the Defense Supply Agency.

SALUTE TO THE HONORABLE CARL VINSON

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on Friday last, June 26, 1964, the various branches and services of the Defense Department paid a richly deserved honor at a joint service review at Fort McNair upon our beloved and distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

At the review, and at the order of President Johnson, the Distinguished Service Medal was conferred on Chairman VINSON.

For his 50 years of dedicated service to our country in the Halls of Congress, there is no person who deserved this honor and medal more than CARL VINSON of Georgia.

As I recently said, and I repeat:

> CARL VINSON is a man's man, an American's American, a legislator's legislator. He's Georgia's notable contribution to the great men of American history.

I hope someday some qualified person will write the life of CARL VINSON; such a book would be an inspiration for all others to follow.

While CARL VINSON will retire from Congress at the end of the 88th Congress, his wonderful spirit as a human being, and his dedicated service as a legislator for a half a century will always be an integral and important part of American history.

In my remarks, I include an article on the joint service review honoring CARL VINSON written by Ruth Dean, and appearing in the Washington Star of June 27, 1964.

[From the Evening Star, Washington, June 27, 1964]

THE MILITARY JOINS IN SALUTE TO VINSON

(By Ruth Dean)

The slight, familiar figure of a Southern gentleman who has served his country for 50 years stood alone in the sunlight yesterday, his hand over his heart as they played the national anthem, surrounded by the military might he helped build for the Nation and now paying him a farewell tribute.

Later, speaking from the reviewing stand from which he had witnessed an unprecedented joint-service military review in his honor, Representative CARL VINSON said: "I shall treasure the memory of this evening, all the days remaining to me."

SECRETARIES AND CHIEFS

Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara, the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force and the Joint Chiefs of Staff cohosted the review at Fort McNair honoring the 80-year-old Georgian, chairman of the powerful House Armed Services Committee, who is retiring at the end of this session of Congress.

For Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, Ambassador-designate to Vietnam, it was his last military review as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and for his successor, Gen. Earle G. Wheeler, as Army Chief of Staff.

Senate confirmation of their new appointments is expected within a week, both officers revealed at a reception after the review, and General Taylor hopes soon after to be on his way to Vietnam.

The armed services pulled out all the stops yesterday to honor the Congressman whose concern for their welfare has commanded their respect and affection.

Service rivalries and differences which had been thrashed out many a time before that House committee were forgotten in a united effort to show "Uncle CARL" (as he is known to secretaries, congressional colleagues, and servicemen alike) how much they'll miss him and wish him a happy retirement.

Secretary McNamara led the tribute with presentation to Mr. VINSON of the Distinguished Service Medal "at the order of the President."

"We meet on an occcasion such as this primarily to honor our great men. CARL VINSON is a great man," the Secretary declared. "He leaves us wiser than he found us."

Deputy Secretary of Defense Cyrus R. Vance read the citation accompanying the Distinguished Service Medal which hailed Mr. VINSON's "knowledge of military affairs without parallel" and his championing of "legislation which has progressively strengthened the Armed Forces of the Nation."

SOME HUMAN TOUCHES

The review had something more to it than the customary ceremonies. It had heart.

As Mr. VINSON arrived in a limousine at the Fort McNair gate with Secretary McNamara, the first sight to greet him was the mounted ceremonial detachment from Fort Myer. This was in deference to the now-famous stand he took when former Secretary of Defense Charles Wilson banned horses from the Army. He won his plea "to keep some horses, because I can't bear to think of all those service people being buried in Cadillacs."

As the limousine proceeded slowly toward the receiving stand, the honoree's next sight was of an Armed Forces honor guard of soldiers, sailors, marines and airmen, who lined the route on both sides with bayoneted rifles at parade rest.

Once again at the review's end, in respect to Mr. VINSON's wishes to keep horses in the Army, he and Mr. McNamara were transported to the reception at the officer's club in a horse-drawn carriage. Leading the procession was the colorfully clad 3d infantry fife and drum corps, dressed in Revolutionary War red coats and tricorn hats. They had played a band concert before the parade along with the Air Force pipe band and the U.S. Marine drum and bugle corps because Mr. VINSON's favorite music is band music.

Special tape recordings of these service bands were later presented to him along with a number of other gifts from the services, including a color film of the review and a huge scrapbook containing letters, some of them illuminated scrolls of tribute, from the major service commands.

The parade itself also had some surprises. When the moment came to review the troops, two army jeeps drove up to transport Mr. Vinson, Secretary McNamara, General Taylor and Maj. Gen. Philip C. Wehle, commanding general of the military district of Washington, around the parade ground. There also was a 17-gun salute for the honoree.

RECEIVES SERVICE FLAGS

One of the review's heart-warming moments was the presentation of the flags of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force to Mr. VINSON. As Army Secretary Stephen Ailes expressed it best: "This is a gift rarely given, but the giving signifies the esteem and high respect in which the Army holds you." Similar sentiments were expressed by Secretary of the Air Force Eugene Zuckert and Secretary of the Navy Paul Nitze when they presented the flags for their service departments.

Appropriately the parade ended with the Navy Band playing "Auld Lang Syne."

Only one thing was missing—the flyover of planes from the Air Force and the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps air arms. It was later revealed at the reception that Mr. VINSON himself had vetoed this "because it would cost the taxpayers too much."

Top officials from the military and Capitol Hill, past and present, attended the afternoon's events, including House Speaker and Mrs. John W. McCormack, former Secretary of the Army and Mrs. Robert Stevens, who came down from New York; former Chief of Naval Operations and Mrs. Arleigh Burke, most of the 37 members of Mr. Vinson's committee and their wives as well as legal counsels for the committee, Gen. and Mrs. Omar Bradley and former Army Chief of Staff George Decker.

A small boy walking away from the parade and his father, an Army general, best expressed the feeling of the afternoon, "It was a good show, Dad," the boy said. His father replied: "Anyone who's served in Congress for 50 years certainly deserves it, son."

RESOLUTION DESIGNED TO PROHIBIT FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION OVERSTEPPING ITS AUTHORITY WITH REFERENCE TO THE TOBACCO INDUSTRY

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a resolution designed to prohibit the Federal Trade Commission from overstepping its authority and interfering with the tobacco industry in a manner that should be reserved only to the Congress.

The Trade Commission's ruling that every package of cigarettes must bear a label warning that smoking is a health hazard is to me one of the most outrageous regulations ever issued.

It condemns without proper consideration one of our most important sources of revenue, a highly developed tobacco leaf which has played a major role in the survival of this Nation even from its earliest years.

I deplore the action of the Commission as premature, for scientific research has yet to prove that smoking is a cause of cancer, but I resent it more because it is an obvious grab for power. If this agency is permitted to exercise such sweeping authority, no industry will be safe from its domination.

Under the legislation I propose, the Commission would be enjoined from enforcing any requirement calling for the labeling of cigarettes with respect to their effect on human health.

No person is more aware than I of the security involved in keeping our people healthy, but the findings to date involving hazards in the use of tobacco are not comprehensive and conclusive enough to point such an accusing finger at cigarettes as this labeling would imply. If tobacco is found a definite health hazard, then proper steps should be taken for the protection of the public, but these steps should be decided on by Congress and not by an agency of government.

While health is important, there is another side that deserve serious consideration before any action, however inconsequential or however drastic, is taken. That is the effect upon our economic pattern.

Today, tobacco is grown in 21 of our 50 States. Hundreds of thousands of farm families earn a major portion of their income from growing tobacco. Throughout the Nation, 96,000 workers in 550 factories are engaged in the manufacture of tobacco products. One and a half million businesses in every State earn some portion of their income from the sale of these products. Taxes on them amounted to $3.3 billion in 1963. The United States led the world last year in the export of cigarettes.

From these facts it may be seen that such an important element of our industry deserves a fair and exhaustive trial. Before the industry is condemned and trampled as the FTC would trample it, let us give the research program now in progress a chance to produce definite evidence, if such evidence does exist. And then let the Senate and the House of Representatives do the deciding as to what is in the best interest of the public.

IS COMMUNIST WORLD LIBERALIZING?

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, daily we see more evidence of the basic administration policy of coexistence and accommodation of the Soviet Union. The folly of this policy should be clear to all of us but for short-term political purposes and even more so, because of compatibility of philosophy, the administration is intent on moving closer and closer to deals with Communist governments.

The question we must ask is, Is the State Department correct when it states that the Communist world is liberalizing?

I submit as part of my remarks an article which appeared in the April 17 edition of the New World, the Chicago Catholic archdiocesan paper, which tells of the persecution of the church in Lithuania:

NO CHURCH PERSECUTION? ASK THIS REFUGEE

VANCOUVER, BRITISH COLUMBIA.—Communist publications circulated here boast occasionally that the Soviets do not prohibit religious worship, nor are churches, synagogues and mosques closed in Russia.

When that happens Zita Kaulius, 70, smiles wryly. Her memories and a packet of tear-stained letters, smuggled somehow through the Iron Curtain, tell another story.

Mrs. Kaulius, is now a Canadian housewife. She was born in Kenkimai, Lithuania, a farming community. When she married Adam Kaulius, they moved to Kartena where he was a policeman.

She remembers well June 17, 1940, when Russian troops and tanks swept into Kartena.

The stunned people watched while the Soviets in a matter of hours took over all privately owned stores and set up one collective state controlled store; when Adam Kaulius lost his job as a Russian police force took over; when church property was confiscated, schools and universities were taken over by the Reds and religion courses banned; when banks and lands were nationalized; the press Sovietized, civil marriages replaced church ceremonies.

Mrs. Kaulius remembers well that in a country 83 percent Catholic, a systematic course of persecution began with the advent of the Russians. And by mid-July 1940, the Soviets completed the grab of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania as a result of the 10-year "peace" treaty negotiated between Soviet Russia and Nazi Germany.

She remembers that she and her huband hid in the home of non-Catholic friends and escaped the first deportation of 40,000 Lithuanians to Siberia. The "peace" treaty lasted just a year, then the Nazis invaded Lithuania.

"The Germans were angels compared to the Communists," Mrs. Kaulius said. "Persecuted Christians came out of hiding. My father, who had been arrested, was released by the Germans. He came home with his hands raw.

"The Communists had tortured him by plunging his hands into pots of boiling water until the skin came off like gloves."

Zita Kaulius remembers, too, watching with a group of townspeople while the Germans excavated a mass grave of 66 Lithuanian civil leaders, police officials, shopkeepers, and other "enemies of the people" slain by the Reds.

Some of the victims had their tongues slit for refusing to talk before they were killed. Searching also disclosed bodies of men who had been tied to trees and burned to death.

She remembers that other graves were uncovered and more than 5,000 Lithuanians were found slain in the factory district of Pancvezys—that documents were found which disclosed Soviet plans to transport 700,000 Lithuanians, a fourth of the country's population, into Russian slave labor camps.

Mrs. Kaulius said the Reds succeeded in sending 200,000 into Russia replacing them with Soviet citizens so the overall population would show no decrease.

After 3 years of Nazi rule, the World War II tide changed again.

Russian tanks and troops, in 1944, rumbled toward Kartena. Adam and Zita Kaulius with their two children piled clothing and some household articles into a wagon, and followed the retreating Nazis. Mrs. Kaulius remembers that Russian bullets and shrapnel hit the wagon, tore into the bedding.

At the Nemunas River on the German border, thousands of refugees waited to cross a narrow bridge. Among the last to cross was the Kaulius family before the Nazis blew up the bridge.

The Kaulius family lived for 6 years in a displaced persons camp in Bavaria, Germany. In July 1949, Adam Kaulius got a chance to come to Canada. Zita Kaulius and their two children followed in March 1950, and the family began life anew here.

The tear-stained letters tell the story of Lithuania's continued persecution under the Soviets. The letters tell of relatives murdered, of priests and bishops slain and persecuted, churches turned into museums, seminaries closed.

One letter related that in 1961 funds were raised in the United States to build a church dedicated to Our Lady of Peace in Klaipeda.

The pastor, Father L. Povilonis, had obtained Soviet permission for the building. In January 1962, when the church was completed, the pastor and his assistant were arrested, the church seized by the Reds and turned into a movie theater.

So when Zita Kaulius hears Communist boasts of no religious persecution in Russia, she smiles wryly. Her memories and the tear-stained letters tell a different story.

Further, Mr. Speaker, I include an editorial from the March 23 edition of the Knoxville Journal, which I have held in my files in order to test its accuracy after passage of time, and it especially dramatizes the issue today as it did 3 months ago:

DON'T OFFEND THE RUSSIANS

Under the prodding of the then President Dwight D. Eisenhower, Congress was moved several years ago to enact an annual resolution deploring the plight of the captive Communist nations in Eastern Europe and holding out to these oppressed people some hope for their ultimate liberation. The first of these resolutions was passed subsequent to the barbarous slaughter of Hungarian freedom fighters in 1956 and in successive years during the Eisenhower regime. As a matter of fact, Congress had passed one of these resolutions shortly before the U–2 incident, a fact that was believed to have contributed to Khrushchev's torpedoing the Paris summit conference in a fit of rage.

Since 1960, or since coexistence or appeasement became the official Washington policy, such notice as the captive nations have received by congressional resolution has been of the milk and water variety. "Don't offend the Russians" has been the viewpoint pushed by the State Department and acceded to by Congress.

Now there are reports that the State Department has under consideration to actually exchange ambassadors with some of the more important Communist satellites of Russia, including Hungary, Rumania, and Bulgaria. This action is contemplated even though prior to World War II no diplomat higher than a legation officer was ever sent to these countries. Now if we send ambassadors, our action may be cited as an enhancement of the standing of these countries under their Communist oppressors.

Hearing these reports, Senator BARRY GOLDWATER some weeks ago addressed a letter to the State Department asking if they were true. The response to that letter from a State Department officer read as follows:

"The British and French and certain other European governments have recently raised the level of their diplomatic missions in Bucharest, Budapest, and Sofia to embassy status, and most other governments maintaining diplomatic missions in those capitals are also represented by ambassadors. The United States," the letter continued, "does not rule out the possibility that circumstances at some later stage might render such a step desirable in one or more of these countries."

The "later stage" referred to will no doubt on an occasion in the future when the State Department determines that some further appeasement of the Communist is, in its judgment, desirable.

If the captive nations of Eastern Europe feel that they have been deserted by the U.S. Government, if not by the people of this country, it would appear they have every justification for holding such an opinion.

I wish to point out to the Members that the legitimate spokesmen for the oppressed victims of communism are their political leaders in exile, who truly represent their people, in contrast to the Soviet-imposed dictatorships of Eastern Europe. I include here as part of my remarks a resolution adopted by Council of the Republic of Poland relative to free speech in that country:

RESOLUTION CONCERNING THE FREEDOM OF SPEECH IN POLAND

The publication abroad of the letter of leading Polish scholars and writers addressed to the chief of the Warsaw regime has once more presented to the free world the fact that Poland, along with other countries thrust into the Soviet colonial empire, is governed by means of a totalitarian Communist dictatorship depriving the citizens of liberty in their material and intellectual life. The different ways of resistance put up by the population of Poland are a proof of the moral health of the nation and must be encouraged. This resistance thwarts to some extent the totalitarian oppression and sometimes enforces temporary tactical concessions, but it does not change the nature of the Communist system of governing. Above all, however, this attitude of the nation and especially of its intellectual leaders forces the Communist masters of Poland to abandon the hypocritical pretence of false liberalism and to show their real identity as stooges of the Moscow totalitarianism.

The Council of the Republic of Poland, mindful of the thousand-year-old tradition of Polish liberty and rights of citizens, most solemnly protests against the oppression and chicaneries to which the scholars and writers are subjected in Poland.

Mr. Speaker, the dubious value to the United States of subsidizing the Rumanian Communist Government is recognized by all but the blindest partisans of the State Department. I wish to include as part of my remarks an article from the June 6, 1964, edition of the Shreveport Times on this subject:

ON BRIDGES TO THE EAST

In late summer of 1944, Soviet Communist troops occupied Rumania in Eastern Europe. The Russian troops brought with them Rumanian prisoners of war "retrained" in Moscow to act as a puppet government, but the Red army ruled. Rumania thus passed from the brown tyranny of Nazi-dominated dictatorship to get the Red tyranny of Communist dictatorship. There was no real difference.

After the war, several democratic, non-Communist parties in Rumania struggled to assert themselves, but by 1947 they were crushed and Rumania was firmly integrated into the Soviet East European Empire. In Churchill's words of that same year, an Iron Curtain had clanged down over Rumania and the rest of that part of the world.

This week, the United States extended liberal trade terms to that Communist regime in Rumania and agreed—soon—to up the level of representation between the two countries to the ambassadorial level. That will amount to outright American recognition of a nation, Rumania, won and held by Russian troops.

The arguments for such a move were put forth first under the Kennedy administration and have been elaborated upon by President Johnson: U.S. "bridges to the East" will somehow weaken Moscow's grip on the captive nations, encourage an independent policy on their part, and ultimately lead to their final liberation. As a matter of fact, the State Department no longer refers to Eastern European countries as "satellites."

The fact is that, despite small concessions, these often withdrawn shortly after their inception, Rumania remains as devotedly Communist—and as tightly controlled by the Kremlin—as it was 20 years ago. The same can be said of the other captive nations of Eastern Europe. Surely nothing could be more indicative of Soviet control than the presence of Soviet troops.

The idea that Rumania has loosed its Kremlin collar a bit may satisfy some liberals who believe in Marxist economics anyway, but a tiny measure of national autonomy does not alter the fact that the Rumanian Government is Communist and is a dictatorship.

No doubt the American trade terms will benefit the Red government of Rumania. The satellite regimes share the economic difficulties of their masters in Moscow. Russia will gladly acknowledge any American aid to Eastern Europe; it's that much less out of Moscow's pocket.

The real effect of the U.S.-Red Rumania agreement will be upon the Rumanian people. For those frustrated patriots who still hope for a free and non-Communist Rumania, the deal with their masters perhaps will mark the end of hope. And these patriots do exist, despite State Department hints that the Red government has the confidence of the people.

Less than a year ago the magazine Current History, in an authoritative study of Eastern Europe, made this comment about Poland, which supposedly is more "liberal" and independent than Rumania:

"The current regime in Warsaw seized power with the aid of the Red (Russian) army and continues to be dependent upon the U.S.S.R. for its very existence. * * * Even today Golmulka's (ruler of Poland) position would be endangered if Soviet power declined or retreated."

The same can be said for Rumania and the rest of Eastern Europe. A withdrawal of Soviet power would spark a series of "Hungaries" that would bring down the Moscow-dominated regimes in blood and ruin. But American recognition of those Red regimes can only dilute the spirit of 1956 and strengthen the Communists in power.

If such American recognition is a cup of bitterness for Rumanian anti-Communists, it could be the final push into the Communist maw for the indifferent generations, reared on Red propaganda, oblivious to any brief heritage of freedom and national pride.

For all purposes, the American-Communist Rumanian agreement confirms the Red grip on Eastern Europe. It says we accept communism there; that we approve the savage Red takeovers of the immediate postwar years; that we uphold the Red dictatorships forced on once free peoples.

But Rumania is not the beginning of Washington's acceptance of Communist dominance in large areas of the world—nor is it the end of such acceptance. Is it logical to think that an America that officially sanctions illegal Communist rule—indeed rewards it with trade and aid—will long fight a war in southeast Asia against another batch of Communist aggressors with a different name?

Mr. Speaker, the country in the last 3 years has witnessed the tragic deterioration of our foreign policy and the people of the United States have witnessed an administration which deliberately embraces a colonial power that is determined to destroy us. How shortsighted can we be?

TARAS SHEVCHENKO—UKRAINIAN FREEDOM FIGHTER

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. RIEHLMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, it was not possible for me to attend the unveiling of the statue of Taras Shevchenko a few days ago, so I would like to pay my respects now to this great fighter for freedom.

The Congress recognized the greatness of Taras Shevchenko when it passed Public Law 86–749, authorizing the erection of a statue. President Eisenhower approved the legislation on September 13, 1960.

Taras Shevchenko was a man of many talents, not the least of which was his ability as a poet. Through his poems, he expressed the longing of the Ukrainians for their lost freedom and statehood.

More than a century ago, he advocated a "Ukrainian George Washington," believing that the Ukrainian people, then under the rule of czarist Russia, would obtain freedom and emancipation under such a leader as was our George Washington.

Shevchenko remains today a symbol of freedom for 45 million Ukrainian people who are under the domination of Soviet communism.

His statue will stand for all time as a rallying point for friends of freedom. It will also serve to remind us how fortunate we are to live in a democracy.

A PORTRAIT

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McDADE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, there is a portrait of a Russian writer, Zhukovsky, painted by Vryulov in 1838. It is a modest portrait, a man seated with hands folded on his lap. It is indeed as undistinguished as 10,000 other portraits are, for seldom does the mere picture of a man in painting arouse more than a passing interest in us. With your eyes open you will see only the colored canvas, the face, the body, the hands, the chair. But if you close your eyes there is a glow, a golden glow, and forever men will point to that portrait with a certain solemn awe. For it was a portrait that was sold to free a man from slavery. It was part of the price paid to give a man his soul, so that out of that soul the whole world should become richer. It was part of the ransom that gave all of us a painter, a poet, a patriot, a man—Taras Hryhorovich Shevchenko.

He was born to death, a serf, a slave. He was worth slightly more than a poor dog, far less than a good horse. He owned neither himself, his family, nor the land of his birth. He was owned, the property of a master, a piece of human chattel whose worth would be measured only in terms of service to that master.

The name of that master was Pavel Vasilyevitch Engelhardt. We remember him today only because he was the master of Shevchenko.

It would be pointless to recount the whole life story of Shevchenko. He grew as a serf, but his mind was a restless mind. He tended the cares of his master by day, but in the night he pored over the paintings and etchings he saw all about him, and laboriously copied what he saw—until he was flogged for daring to aspire to that great art. He was discovered by a fellow Ukrainian, Ivan Soshenko, and when the friends of Soshenko realized what a talent there was in this serf, they raised the unbelievable sum of 2,500 rubles to buy his freedom.

He was free to live and to paint. He studied at the Imperial Academy of Arts at St. Petersburg. He was brilliant, distinguished in painting, and graduated with honor in 1845. But he had learned more than painting. He had come into the lives of men who were filled with learning, with poetry, with music, and he drove himself day and night to give himself the education he had been denied. Then, having filled himself with the learning, with the language, with the magic of literature, having proven himself a painter of first magnitude—he began to write poetry.

It was nostalgic poetry at first. He remembered the fields of the Ukraine and was filled with the hunger of the homeless for the land he knew so well. He wrote sad poems to the old tunes he had learned as a small boy. He remembered most of all the good things, and all the evil was hidden in a veil of nostalgia when he remembered the evil. He named the book of verses after the wandering singers of the Ukraine, "Kobzar."

From its first publication the book was a major literary contribution. The old songs of Ukraine had been brought to a new life, and a bridge had been built across the countless ages of Ukrainian folk songs to the literature of Shevchenko's own day. He was the Burns, the Longfellow of his land. Through his voice, the voice of a major poet, the old songs became the new, and a whole world of possibilities was opened in Ukranian literature.

But he was not to live and to die in nostalgia. He returned to his old home, and there the evils of serfdom were real, were terrible. He sat down in the midst of the terror and wrote of it. He rebelled against every institution in Ukraine, and his "Three Years" became a rallying cry for everyone who sought freedom in Ukraine.

He paid a price. He was arrested in 1847 and Tsar Nicholas I took personal pleasure in sentencing him to serve as an ordinary soldier in a penal battalion in Novopetrovsk. But though the 10 years were terrible, desolating, he came out of servitude the same courageous man he was when he was arrested. He wrote a bitter poem comparing the Tsar to Nero—a most apt comparison.

He continued to write until he died. The volume of his prose and his verse is enormous, and is just now being translated into English, as it has been translated into so many other languages of the world. We will be richer for his words when all of us can hear them, even in this language.

He died in 1861. He had lived only 47 years, and had lived in freedom only 13 years. But in those 13 years he had set in motion not only a new spirit of revolution, of freedom, but a whole new language. His position is secure, not only as a father of Ukrainian poetry, but as a father of Ukrainian prose.

There is a nobility about this man that is towering. He was purchased from slavery and was given a life of ease, where he could have enjoyed the friendship of the mighty and the adulation of the intellectuals for his great talent in painting. He chose to put this behind him. He chose to speak in words, not merely in pictures, knowing that death or prison would wait for him if his words displeased. He spoke, and saved his greatness in the prison that closed around him.

It is somewhat sardonic to think of his grave. For years the Tsars kept the people away from it, lest it be a rallying point for the independent spirit of the Ukranians. Today the Tsars are forgotten, and the grave of Taras Shevchenko is honored.

We have honored him with a monument, and this is fitting. But long after the metal and stone of that monument have crumbled, the true monument will last—his words, his poems, his prose. The world will save and long remember the cry for freedom that he sounded. As long as freedom lasts, so too will last the name and the memory of Taras Shevchenko.

INTERNATIONAL CROSSROADS SUNDAY MORNING BREAKFAST

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak of a subject which is of special interest to many of my colleagues here today. I refer to the International Crossroads Sunday Morning Breakfast of the YMCA here in Washington. My interest in this unique organization is well known as I have spoken of its work before this body each year for the past 4 years. Many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle are just as much interested and have given liberally of their time and talents to address the breakfast sessions and answer questions on the important issues confronting our world today. It is the best hope of many that additional Members of the House will assist in this effort as their time and energy permits.

It is important that these young men who come here should be received with hospitality and given an opportunity to see and understand the better side of America. I am thinking of America as the great bastion of freedom of thought and action—where a boy of humble beginning may rise to his highest potential—where an idea has a chance to grow, compete, and possibly excell. These are the seeds of greatness that lead to a more perfect fullness of life on this earth.

The International Crossroads Sunday Morning Breakfast has on May 3, 1964, celebrated its 18th anniversary, which is a remarkable achievement for an organization conducted entirely by voluntary leadership. Every Sunday for 939 consecutive sessions there has assembled around the breakfast table an average of 50 to 60 interesting personages whose very presence is a contribution to better understanding and appreciation of the best in others.

About half of the visitors at an average session are from abroad and represent the more promising of the rising generation, who will have a great deal to do with the decisionmaking in the years ahead. Friendships have been formed with almost 16,000 persons of 122 geographical countries. Contact is maintained by correspondence with about 1,500 members who have returned to their homes abroad. Many of these have sent expressions of appreciation and encouragement to the 18th anniversary celebration. These were read or narrated by W. L. Robinson, an official of the American Automobile Association, who was assisted by Juan Villaverde, of Argentina; Raya Helou, of Venezuela; Henri Ellenberger, of Canada; Harold Linder, of Sweden; Ahmad Mir Hakkok, of Iran; John R. Thompson, of England; and Nubar Bohceli, of Rumania.

Others who spoke briefly were Dr. Harry W. Seamans, organizational liaison officer, Department of State; Dr. Raymond W. Miller, president, Public Relations Research Associates and public relations lecturer at Harvard University; Alfred C. Rogers, General Secretary of the Metropolitan Washington YMCA; and Allen Shimmel, my administrative assistant, expressed my greetings and encouragement to the committee of voluntary workers who have so faithfully maintained this important crossroads of world contacts. The chairman of this committee is Paul L. Brindle, a Washington attorney, who has over the years given an increasing proportion of his time to the organizing and high-level consummation of each weekly session, and he is surrounded with others of equal dedication.

You will be interested in the many splendid expressions and heart-warming messages coming from these fine forward-looking persons in other countries and observe their great contribution to human betterment. A number of representative extractions from the many messages received at the 18th anniversary are as follows:

From Jacques C. J. Dunselman, a textile engineer of Arnhem, Holland: "Through the help of Eric Freeborn of England and yourself, I have started an exchange of thoughts by correspondence. I am writing now with two French breakfast members. I strongly believe that we as breakfast members have to keep contact with each other, and by exchange of thoughts by writing we will have a better understanding in the world. If we could set up such a thing, we will gain a lot. I believe that we have to consider the breakfast as a spark, that ignites the friendship between thousands of people of all nations, but that correspondence will keep the fire burning. I send my congratulations to the 18th anniversary of the International Breakfast Club. God bless you and the work you are doing."

From Hans Joachim Hollander, of Danischenhagen, Germany: "I am sure nobody will forget your International Crossroads Sunday Morning Breakfast, who has felt this real welcome, has taken it home as one of the great traditions of the American people. On my whole 30,000-mile trip around the United States, I have never had such a nice meeting on Sunday morning. When other people sleep, you are in activity and I wish these meetings could go around the world. Wherever youth is meeting youth there's no problem to discuss everything. But the youth needs the initial activators, men like you."

From Dr. Manuel C. Magboo, surgeon and member, National YMCA Board of the Philippines: "I would like to congratulate you personally on the achievements that the International Crossroads Sunday Morning Breakfast has reached around the far corners of the world. It really would be nice if chapters could be developed in other places, but it is quite difficult to start and take the job seriously.

"In our YMCA in Manila, we have a semblance of your crossroads. We have the Manila breakfast group, which meets every Wednesday morning, with speakers from our cosmopolitan group speaking on various subjects."

From a young man from New Zealand, Maurice McGregor: "Leadership was the theme of the Honorable L. J. BURTON's talk on the morning I attended the breakfast. Two things he said particularly impressed me. They were, that a leader should not be afraid of right, and he should be a builder and not a wrecker. Not only was I impressed by his talk but I was challenged by the statement that both the speaker and the chairman made that we, who had the privilege to travel, also have the responsibility of leading our respective countries in whatever field of work we were engaged in. None of us sitting around the table that morning discussing the role of leaders in the changing generation could have foreseen that in a month's time President Kennedy was to have lost his life so tragically, and that countries like mine were to wonder about the future role of the United States as a leader in the Western World. It is good that these doubts are now dispelled.

"Back home here in Christchurch, New Zealand, the memory of the sadness of those November days is lightened by the memory of the friendliness of the people I met while in the United States in such places as the ICSMB in Washington."

From Ephran D. Nyange, Veterinary Department, Mombasa, Kenya: "I am happy to learn that I was registered a life member abroad for the breakfast, and would like to give my personal appreciation in stating how the breakfast applies to my life today.

"This now gives me a clear picture of the organization's performances in trying to bring men together in His name; and it's a very notable service to God.

"Through such occasions, I agree that there is a big chance of understanding between men and better cooperation in His name.

"I remember on the 24th of January 1963 when we sat for the breakfast, I had a wonderful experience of meeting the peple I never expected, and as our speaker, Dr. Raymond W. Miller emphasized more on communication of ideas as was the topic, I came to the light of understanding the value of such occasions which try to gather us together in His name and give us closer understandings.

"I therefore pray God the Almighty to give you more power and will in your hard job and make it a success."

From Oswaldo Vianna, of the Ministry of Education, Rio de Janeiro: "Unhappily it will be so difficult for me to be there but at this day at 9 a.m., I will be begging God for the happiness of all of you and particularly of this great association that is the YMCA."

From Dr. P. G. Gollerkeri, professor of bacteriology, Kasturba Medical College, Mangalore, India: "Usually your sincere, heartwarming letters are a rare joy to the soul to receive, the inner conviction becoming more and more confirmed, that we are all one human family under our skins—white, brown, black, or yellow.

"It is over 12 years that we could meet briefly for a few days, and yet your letters continue to bring back the enduring memories of the goodness that you and your people showed to me wherever I went in your great country. This opinion is confirmed by my two children: my son, who returned from the States about 8 months ago, and my daughter, who went there about that time. The latter is a medico. Dr. (Mrs.) Jyoti R. Rao is now in Boston, Mass., and her husband, Dr. B. R. Rao, M.S., Ph. D. (Harvard), a research scientist (nonmedical) at Harvard University. Mrs. Rao is enrolled as a postgraduate student of pediatrics, in the Childrens' Hospital and Medical Center of the same university at Boston, Mass.

"However, in spite of our long personal distance (12,000 miles) for so many years, it is amazing how the heart refuses to forget character, personality, and the good human nature from the handwritten letters of yours to me during these several years. But there is still a possibility, though somewhat remote, of my being able to visit the States in about a year's time. This time my visit, if it materializes, would be a sort of cultural one, unlike my last short professional one; I may even be beholden to you and other cultural organizations like the YMCA to make the 3 months' program a spiritual success of international friendship, good will, and mutual uplift of our two countries."

From Robert M. H. Chen, of the Taiwan Power Co.: "During the last several years we had some friends from Vietnam, Thailand, Okinawa, and some new countries in Africa to visit us for observation training in industry, education, agriculture in Taiwan. We are trying to set up an organization something like 'Washington International Center' here in order to provide warm welcome and general information of China for those people from far away. You must be glad to hear that the spirit of the crossroads is extending to the other corner of the world with your encouragement."

From Dr. Ugo M. Colombo, director of public assistance, city of Milan: "On writing to you my heart is full of joy, encouragement, and appreciation because I remember with a strong feeling of sympathy the morning when I had the pleasure to meet with so many distinguished fellows coming from everywhere in the world and I would have the possibility to come again as soon as possible.

"Highly appreciable is indeed every initiative, as yours is, which implements cohesion, solidarity, and comprehension among people of different race and opinion. Whatever may be the personal situation of each one of us, unique is the faith in the justice and in the universality of God and in the supremacy of spiritual values."

From John Rooney, general secretary, YMCA, Durban, South Africa: "On Sunday, May 3, I shall be thinking of you gathered together from all parts of the world with the common purpose of peace and good will among men. May your example be copied in many parts of the world and your efforts richly blessed."

John L. Handley, a student of Birmingham, England, who made a special trip to return for the 16th anniversary, writes for the 18th anniversary: "The world today is changing with a rapidity that would have dismayed our forefathers, and bewilderment is not uncommon among young men and women. Consequently, we must examine all sincerely held views critically and sympathetically which may point the way toward international understanding and cooperation. Prejudice is a great danger which we must all be on guard against, nor should toleration of an opposing point of view be necessarily regarded as a sign of weakness.

"Through the time-honored process of discussion and argumentation, as exemplified by those great democratic assemblies, the U.S. Congress, and the House of Commons, let us confidently expect decisions formulated for the 1960's. In this respect, I believe the Crossroads Sunday Morning Breakfast provides an essential service in the great work of promoting international friendship. My thoughts will be with you on May 3, 1964."

From Lt. Col. G. M. Safdar (retired) of Kohat, Pakistan, who wrote last year from the Congo where he was commanding the Pakistan troops, and has since gone into business: "The news that you are going to celebrate your 18th anniversary has thrilled me. How I desire to be physically with you on that auspicious occasion. As it is well nigh impossible, I am soul and heart with you mentally on that grand day. The need for understanding human beings was never so great as it is today. And I am proud that your association is doing its best to fulfill that. I feel proud to be a member of that organization. Dear sir, consider me to be beside you at this juncture and I request you to convey my heartiest felicitation to all the members around you. I wish you luck and Godspeed in your stupendous task."

From Zee Sheng-Shee, of Taiwan, China: "Your organization is benefit for all people around the world, if he or she has a chance to visit Washington, D.C. A mutual understanding will be achieved.

"I had a chance to attend the breakfast table meeting several years ago. It is a good day in my life. I sincerely hope I could have another chance to attend such meeting in the near future."

From Dr. J. B. Barclay, of the University of Edinburgh: "On May 3 at 2 p.m., our time, in my home in Scotland, I shall remember you all and visualize the room with its map and everyone sitting down to breakfast. My visit to your International Breakfast, was one of the highlights of my American visit.

"International brotherhood has been a theme we have dreamt of in Scotland for a long, long time and has, of course, been expressed so well by our national poet, Robert Burns, in that song whose last verse may not be so well known as the first:

" 'Then let us pray that come it may
As come it will for a' that,
That sense and worth o'er a' the earth
May bear the gree, and a' that.
For a' that, and a' that
It's comin' yet for a' that
That man to man, the world o'er
Shall brothers be for a' that.'

"And with this prayer of brotherhood I think we ought to couple the other two great phrases that we repeat so often but so often fail to appreciate fully: 'Thy Kingdom come: Thy Will be done.'

"May your anniversary be a blessing to all present and to all of us who shall remember."

From Rev. Jonas Villaverde, D.D., president of the Lutheran Church in Argentina: "May our Lord continue blessing your heart and your work and give you many satisfactions in your laudable efforts for the better understanding between the peoples.

"It would have been a great pleasure and honor for me to be able to attend the Crossroads' 18th anniversary but the distance is too great—I mean the territorial distance; in my mind and in my prayers I will be with you on May 3.

"The Crossroads is now in its 'blooming teens' and I am sure its grownup years will be still more fruitful and better remembered by all those many thousands who have had the deep satisfaction of participating in its activities in various opportunities."

From Michael K. Belshaw, student engineer of Northern Ireland: "When I read your list of 1963 speakers and their subjects, and know firsthand of the uniting bond experienced at the Crossroads, I cannot but congratulate you and the committee on this achievement. The fact that the Crossroads Breakfast has continued for 18 years is surely sufficient proof, if proof be needed, that it is valuable and fills a need. I hope it may long continue.

"Perhaps my most vivid impression was the awareness that someone was interested enough in helping others to care for, as it were, the strangers in their midst. In addition to the Crossroads satisfying the body, it strengthens the spirit and stimulates the mind. For many visitors, including myself, it was a personal oasis in a desert of impersonalness. It is very encouraging to know that scattered through the world are members of the Crossroads, and I would certainly hope that because of this the causes of world peace and prosperity for all peoples, through Christian action, will be furthered. I send you my good wishes, and ask that God shall prosper your work."

From Santiago Rodriguez Mendez, general secretary of YMCA at Mexico City: "I cherish the memory of my experience when I attended one of your forum breakfasts during my visit to Washington, D.C.

"It was greatly inspiring for me to meet the persons from different parts of the world who, on that occasion, shared the ideals and purpose of the YMCA. When members of this association plan to visit Washington I highly recommend that they attend your meetings if they have the opportunity."

From C. S. Parthasarathy, official of Planning Commission, Government of India: "Memories of my visit to the International Crossroads early in 1957 are still fresh and green as ever and often come floating on the surface of my mind. I need hardly express how immensely charmed and delighted I was to be in the midst of you all that Sunday morning at Washington, D.C. It has been of very great value to me and one which I have no doubt would in the years ahead assist me. My only regret is that it has not been possible to see more of you all and your wonderfully beneficial activities there. My heart will be there when you celebrate the anniversary on May 3, 1964. Your report on the anniversary celebration will be eagerly awaited by me as usual.

"May God bless you and the Crossroads on the pursuit of your high ideals and noble endeavors, that you and your organization may keep growing with an ever-increasing measure of success and satisfaction."

From Edward Booth Hadwen, a water engineer of Halifax, England: "My attendance at the Crossroads was on July 21, 1963, when the meeting was addressed by the Honorable WILLIAM E. BROCK, III, who gave his impressions of a 'freshman in Congress.' American politics to an Englishman are, to say the least, bewildering—so it was with the greatest of interest that I listened to the Congressman for enlightenment. I found that the Americans were just as anxious to know about our own ideas, as we who attended the Crossroads were anxious to know about America and the American people. This healthy curiosity among people must lead to better relations among the various national groups, and it pleased me a great deal to know that this curiosity is not only alive at your breakfast table, but throughout your great country."

From R. N. Chawla, Director of Flood Control, India: "My appreciation for you and for the purpose has increased with the years when I think of the steadfastness with which this program is being pursued week after week. You would be the first person I would like to meet, if and when I happen to visit the United States of America again.

"Keep on, Paul. You and your colleagues are doing a good job, with a good purpose. This fits in very well with God's designs. I am sure this work brings peace of mind to you and your colleagues."

From Olindo Parachini, national secretary of YMCA of Italy, at Rome: "I remember with pleasure the Sunday morning breakfast of August 25, 1963. As a matter of fact, it was the best introduction I could expect to your country's Capital and its YMCA. I have given a detailed report on your program to my colleagues of the Italian staff and to lay leaders of our movement. All best wishes to you and to those who help you keep alive the breakfasts, on the occasion of your 18th anniversary. I hope to have the privilege again of sitting at your table."

From John Schwarzenbach, professor of mechanical engineering, the University at Leeds, England: "May I wish you at the breakfast another even better year. If any of our students or staff are going to the United States of America, I will mention your meeting."

From Akira I. Ohsawa, high school principal in Tokyo: "Time is like a mist which hinders sometimes our sights and makes me miss the shape and form of things. In 1960, on September 11, I took for a first time an honorable seat at the International Crossroads Morning Breakfast table. Years are now long enough for us to forget its excitement and happiness.

"Your personal letter, however, calls back its memory. It is now so heart touching and it breaks pressure of time. As Mount Fujiyama, which I can see, can show her gorgeous style above the horizon, so the memory of it becomes clear even in the mist of time. I whisper to myself and friends and my students as follows, celebrating the 18th anniversary of ICSMB:

> "So may honor of it be shown,
> As the top of Mount Fuji is seen
> In the mist of spring morn."

From Henrico Jorger, of Switzerland, a student of automobile engineering in London: "I always remember the 11th of November 1962, when I was a visitor at Crossroads Breakfast. I think it was very nice how each person individually introduced himself to the others by saying a few words. I said: 'I come from Switzerland and my name is Henrico Jorger, I work for a Swiss travel agency in New York City. Since I was a boy I wanted to go to America and now with 23 years of age my wish came true.'"

From Toshihiko Suzuki, of Japan: "I have been a distribution section foreman of Kansai Electric Utility Co. since last June. I have 25 people in my section, and have realized how difficult it is to understand individual persons. I applied to my section your ICSMB's spirit of mutual understanding, and our section is doing very good business. We really hope all the people in the world must endeavor hard to understand each other. It is no doubt that the morning breakfast is sharing a big portion for this purpose. We now live in Nara, one of the ancient capital cities of Japan and famous as well as Kyoto. We shall be very happy to introduce our city when you or your friends visit our country.

"I pray to God the day will come soon when we can meet again."

From Princess D. Narendra, Sawan Ashram, Ruhani Satsang, Delhi, India: "I thank you for the welcome you gave His Holiness Sant Kirpal Singh Ji and us, on our visit to the States. It was really very heart warming and brought us, the people of India, to the people of America closer through the ties of friendship which you showed us.

"* * * This organization is most helpful to bring better understanding among all nationalities. The psychological effect of being a member of an 'international' organization is very effective, and on top of that your love for everyone was very relaxing in which the strangeness of meeting strangers was taken away by your sincere welcome to all."

From Dr. S. V. Desai, Agronomist, Bombay: "When I became a member of the ICSMB I had not visualized the far-reaching effects it would have in fellowship of international good will and the happy thought of being remembered by someone with a feeling of love is one of the precious assets of life. The good will with which the members of the ICSMB meet and the memories they cherish are almost unique, and the good that can result from these feelings of mutual esteem even in a few cases is a sufficient reason for continuing the activities. Even after 17 years I feel happy to remember my association with the institution and its active members."

From Prof. Dr. von Rauchhaupt, professor of space law, Heidelberg University: "I had been to your Sunday morning breakfast once before, in autumn of 1961. Last month I came to the U.S.A. in order to continue our space law studies. As a guest of the Georgetown University, I gave an introductory lecture on space law in their law center, and following an invitation by Prof. Wernher von Braun I visited the world famous George C. Marshall Space Flight Center in Huntsville, Ala., and the John F. Kennedy Space Center, National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA), Cape Kennedy, Fla. Everywhere we had the liveliest intercourse of technical and scientific questions and answers. The technical and scientific achievements are marvelous. It really is a marvel before our eyes that the astronauts, as pioneers of all mankind, can be shot through the thick layer of air into the airless space and whirl like small moons round our mother earth and soon even further toward the moon, and safely come back to our earth. These daring undertakings are most expensive, but at the same time these moneys increase the output of the industry, because 90 to 92 percent of the material and machines needed will be ordered from the big firms. All the people included in the performance of these imposing works are very modest. They live in the spirit of the duties that are their part. I deeply admire the work done and the men and women who are privileged by their participation in its production. I only wish that these centers of space research were not so far away and could be reached quicker from the crossroads, and even more so from our national homes."

From Atelio Romero, pharmaceutical chemist, Caracas, Venezuela: "Again my thoughts go to you, wishing this time a very happy 18th anniversary of a marvelous movement that Sunday after Sunday is creating invisible ties among people of good will from all over the world. Warm-hearted congratulations to you and all the friends who are attending the Sunday morning breakfast on May 3. I am sure you will keep in your hearts, as a treasury, the serene emotion of this significant event of human confraternity."

From C. Rajagopalan, professor of geology, Alagappa College, Karaikudi, India: "In my professional capacity, I had to go to Madras quite frequently. During these visits I often call on the American Information Service and the people with whom I had been in contact all these years. Looking back, it is such contacts with people that make personal and international relations happy. Being one of the most frequently visited countries, I am happy to see that you have this crossroads breakfast meeting, where everybody gets the much-needed opportunity to meet people and exchange viewpoints. In the ultimate analysis, it is the people who count. I am happy you are continuing this good work. My one and constant prayer is that God should give you long life for this venture, so that on my next visit to the United States I shall again have the pleasure and privilege of meeting you and taking part in the crossroads breakfast meetings."

From Leonard E. Taylor, civil engineer, London, England: "It is now nearly a year since I left London for a month's visit to the United States and my brief stay in Washington was one of the highlights of a memorable month.

"Your international breakfast is an example of the unity that the world so sorely needs and which our Lord must surely wish to see."

From Daniel Trajtenberg, certified public accountant, Buenos Aires: "I want to send you my kindest congratulations and best wishes for your 18th anniversary.

"Really, during my short visit on June 16 last I could appreciate better something I already knew—how good it is to feel the warmth and kindness of friends when you are far from home. I am quite convinced that such weekly meetings help people from all countries to better understanding which is so necessary and important nowadays."

From Hans-Joachim Kohler, student of philosophy, Tubingen University, Germany: "I know from my own pleasant experiences how much good your organization has been doing during all these years, and how badly we need this opportunity to sit down and try to understand each other's language while different ideologies tend to make communication between people from different countries exceedingly difficult.

"To you and to all the other people of good will, who may be present in Washington when these lines arrive there, I extend my best wishes for many more years of fruitful work ahead.

"To close this message, let me quote President Kennedy: 'Let them know—friend and foe alike—that the torch has been passed.' Let's all of us accept the torch of openmindedness and carry it on in our race toward the common goal of mutual friendship, freedom, and the well-being of all nations."

From Raymond Issid, a Lebanese graduate in engineering from the University of Montana, teaching at Khartoum, Sudan:

"Mysterious but of common nature is the 'small spirit' of God existing in every human being in every land on this earth. The ground is fertile of men of good will; even the evil man could become good because there is still a trace of this 'small spirit' of God—once directed he could regain the right way that leads to the door of Heaven. This could be accomplished if there were more new centers like that one directed by the famous Paul Brindle, of Washington, D.C.—new centers starting in every country to share the fellowship and the study for the better understanding among all nations, and serve mankind to the best under the shadow of the Great Creator.

"Of course, there shall be other 'Paul's' and other ICSMB's in many countries that will follow the same steps of the mother one of Washington, D.C.

"If any move shall be taken in this direction I shall be the first to serve under your instructions for the good of all mankind."

From Robert H. Orgill, electrical engineer, electronic engineer and inventor, inventor of the Orgill Aircraft Safety Unit, Perth, Australia: "It does not seem like 5 years since I visited the International Crossroads Breakfast. I remember your saying to me in Washington, D.C., one day that if I find the right key, the lock will open easily in connection with the invention of the aircraft-safety unit.

"I am about to make the front page again, since I have invented and technically perfected a musical invention whereby it is possible to reproduce steel or nylon strings in any stringed instrument, such as the steel guitar, guitar, violin, cello, harp, piano, etc. It will reproduce not only the nylon strings but also in multichannel stereo sound (six channel).

"The May 3 anniversary will be a gathering of young men from all parts of the world, and I only hope on this day my letter will be of great encouragement to other inventors, who will eventually pioneer other inventions for the good of all mankind."

From C. S. Rao, scientific officer, Department of Atomic Energy, India: "While sitting in calm and cool surroundings in a tropical country like mine, my thoughts have traveled 7,000 miles away to Washington. The picture of your Sunday breakfast gathering with its elite is before my mind's eye.

"True, your assemblies are the gathering place of God's men from different parts of the world. These meetings can achieve much more than what governments of the countries can, in fostering the brotherhood of man. It is given to few to organize and continue such good work, and I am really happy that you have not only taken this lead but are continuing to maintain the same tempo with ever-growing enthusiasm.

"I wish your Sunday Morning Breakfast 18th anniversary all success and pray God to give you many more happy years of life to continue carrying on this self-imposed sacred task of bringing all such men from many parts of the world together under one roof."

From K. M. Bashir, of New Delhi, who was present at both 16th and 17th anniversary celebrations: "It is nearing a year since I left the United States. I was treated with warmth, affection, and consideration throughout my 16 months' stay in your great country. I have made friendship with many and still in touch with a few. Of all the persons whom I came across in the United States, two persons stand out whom I greatly respect. They are Paul Brindle and Mr. Lloyd A. Procknow, of the BLS. As regards international understanding, no single individual has done as much as yourself.

"I still remember vividly how I stumbled upon you on one Sunday morning. It was my first week in Washington. The American way of life was still unknown and I was trying to do as the Romans do. The previous day I got a room on F Street. On Sunday morning I was on the lookout for a drugstore to have some breakfast. When I saw the YMCA I just walked in with the hope of finding some canteen, and there came a man with open arms and an inviting and infectious smile, and invited me for the breakfast meeting. At first the word 'breakfast' alone interested me. I thought of suffering through the meeting for having the breakfast. When more and more guests came, as if from all corners of the earth—the atmosphere began to change. From indifference I became curious. While the function was going on, many thoughts passed through my mind. It had become a real crossroad—visitors from all corners of the world who hold strategic positions in different cultures converge and pass through. Here is a man who is instrumental for this crossing—crossing of mind. Week after week he does this. He brings to this crossroad the best from American society: politicians, social workers, university professors, etc. Unless there is a passion for service, unless there is an inner compulsion, it is not possible to keep up the spirit and vigor of the crossroad meetings. These were the thoughts that went through my mind on that day. Like Goldsmith's 'Village Parson.' 'Those who have come to scoff remained to pray.' I went with that feeling. As you know, I participated in the Sunday breakfast meeting many times.

"I don't know what message I can find for such a dedicated soul like you, except 'May God bless you with a very long and active life for promoting international understanding and happiness. I wish every success for the 18th anniversary of the ICSMB. From this distance let me send my heartiest greetings to all the participants.'"

From Mats Blom, Norrkoping, Sweden: "I sincerely hope you can keep up with the high standards you have for your crossroads activities.

"Here in Sweden things run very well and we enjoy a commercial and industrial boom. We have no real unemployment and have what we call overemployment. That means lack of labor and, which you probably cannot believe, two Swedish car factories have received contingents of skilled auto workers from the United States of America who come here to work on a 2-year contract. There used to be a proverb: to carry coal to New Castle. Unemployment is an evil but overemployment is too, as it forces inflation very much."

From Dr. Carlos Henrique Mayr, physician and secretary of the International College of Surgeons at Rio de Janeiro: "I was going to make you a real surprise by being present at the commemoration of the anniversary of the crossroad breakfast. Unfortunately, due to our political situation in Brazil, my trip to the United States was delayed and I will not be able to be present at your wonderful celebration.

"Will you please, in my name, give a message of happiness, friendship, and loyalty to the YMCA.

"When, on the beginning of my career as a doctor I went to the United States for postgraduate studies, the first positive reaction was to find a group of friends at your Sunday morning breakfast. This was then the beginning of an everlasting friendship toward others, and the fact that the time was connected with Christmas and the new year made me overcome the sense of loneliness, being away from wife and children, by finding people with the same ideals and forward-looking persons.

"I strongly recommend that any professional who goes to the United States start in a surrounding like yours. It will tighten the links between the English-speaking population and make you feel as being one in a big family."

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE NATIONAL CATHOLIC YOUTH ORGANIZATION

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BECKER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD today, for all to read, the resolution adopted by the National Catholic Youth Organization, at their convention in November 1963. This was just received by me and sent by the executive secretary, National CYO Federation.

Anyone saying the tide is turning against an amendment to permit prayer and Bible reading in the public schools is out of touch with the people of this country.

I am also inserting, following the above resolution, another one adopted by 540 ministers of the Assembly of God Churches of Pennsylvania and Delaware. This resolution was just adopted at their convention held May 14, 1964. This was a convention of the Eastern District Council of the Assemblies of God.

Both resolutions follow:

RESOLUTION 3

Whereas several proposals for amending the United States Constitution to permit the traditional right of prayer in public schools have been submitted to the Congress; and

Whereas all such proposals are currently in the hands of the House Judiciary Committee for consideration; and

Whereas the House Judiciary Committee has not called for public hearings on any of the proposed amendments; and

Whereas proponents of the proposed constitutional amendments explain that a discharge petition signed by 218 Members of the House of Representatives will release the proposals from committee and send them to the House for debate and a vote: Be it

Resolved, That members of the National CYO Federation be urged to ask their Congressmen to sign the Becker discharge petition, in order that the proposals be taken out of committee and brought to the floor of Congress for action.

Whereas civil government is ordained of God, and He requires the Nation to acknowledge Him as the source of its authority, and His Son, the Lord Jesus Christ, as the One through Whom His blessings are bestowed (Psalms 2, Psalms 9: 17, Romans 13: 1); and

Whereas this country was founded by Pilgrims, who believed in God and framed their compacts of civil government, submitting themselves, their lives and estates unto our Lord Jesus Christ, the King of kings and Lord of lords; and

Whereas in our Declaration of Independence we appealed to "the Supreme Judge of the world * * * with firm reliance on the protection of divine providence"; and

Whereas God and Christianity are not once acknowledged in our National Constitution, although it is itself "the product of a Christian civilization and purports to represent the mind of a Christian people" (William Strong, Associate Justice of U.S. Supreme Court, 1871); and

Whereas the Supreme Court, as the result of this "unnecessary and most unfortunate omission," in a recent decision has ruled that Bible reading and prayer in the public schools of the land are unconstitutional; and

Whereas that decision, favoring a very small minority of citizens, denies the great majority of Americans their constitutional right to express in our public schools their belief in Almighty God, the reading of the Bible and prayer, and forbids the public schools from teaching that ours is a nation "under God"; and

Whereas atheists are seeking to eliminate all Christian practices from our government, basing their efforts on the above-mentioned omission of any acknowledgment of Almighty God in our Constitution: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Eastern District Council of the Assemblies of God go on record as approving the Christian Amendment Movement, 804 Penn Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa., We further encourage our ministers and churches to support it in every way possible; and be it further

Resolved, That the Eastern District Council of the Assemblies of God memorialize the Congress of the United States to support and adopt the proposed Christian amendment (H.J. Res. 57, H.J. Res. 61, H.J. Res. 235, H.J. Res. 314, H.J. Res. 325, H.J. Res. 332, and H.J. Res. 341), thereby giving legal support to the many Christian practices of a public nature which are being undermined or ruled illegal because of the Supreme Court's recent misinterpretation of the first amendment.

C. EUGENE BELL,
District Secretary.

THE KING CITY COUNCIL SEEKS HELP

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. TALCOTT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, the following letter directed to the President deserves reading by every Member of Congress. It is from all of the elected members of the City Council of the City of King in my congressional district. These men represent not just farmers—they represent city people, farmworkers, workers in all industries dependent upon farmers, union members, transporters, retailers, wholesalers; they also know the problems related to education, government, welfare, and the consumer.

They can only look to Congress for help. They, and their constituents, are desperate. They are speaking up for and on behalf of every worker and consumer in America. These councilmen know, as well as any public official in America, the problems and the prospects.

If you really want to know what the discontinuance of the bracero program will mean to agricultural America, please take a few minutes to read this knowledgeable and informative letter:

THE CITY OF KING,
King City, Calif.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: As of now, after December 31, 1964, this State, and many others, will no longer have braceros to help them raise and harvest their costly and highly perishable crops. They are thus faced with problems and prospects frightening not only to those employing braceros, but to all of us, especially their fellow citizens in the smaller agricultural communities. This fact compels us, the elected representatives of this city, to address ourselves directly to you.

The discontinuation of the bracero program, in continual existence, in one form or another, since 1942, is based on the assumption that the unemployed of this Nation, if only paid better than braceros, would do the work now done by braceros. The whole idea stands or falls with that assumption, even though now braceros can be employed only when and where the local labor is not available.

The development of agriculture during the last two decades in the States using braceros has been predicated upon their availability. The crops now grown are highly perishable and agricultural operations during their raising, especially harvesting, must be done within a very short period of time. Time thus is of the essence and a steady supply of able, willing and reliable labor is indispensable. So far only braceros have filled these requirements. The unemployed in these parts of the country have—almost without exception—shown that their stoop work is of short duration. Replacements are costly, hard to get, and impossible to get fast enough to save crops.

Economically, the elimination of braceros would, in agriculture, turn the clock back. The farmers would have to switch back to cheap crops not requiring stoop labor—the only work braceros are allowed to perform—and the end result would be a net increase in unemployment; people now employed directly in connection with braceros or indirectly in hauling, processing, distributing the fruits and vegetables grown or harvested with the help of braceros will all have nothing more to do. New varieties of vegetables, now harvested by stoop labor, would be developed that can be mechanically harvested. Mechanization and automation in agriculture, even where uneconomical, would be speeded up, thus still further eliminating the jobs now occupied by local labor. They would increase the already high investment in equipment necessary for efficient farming, increase the minimum acreage that can be farmed successfully and thus eliminate thousands of small, but now efficient, successful and independent farmers. In addition, the housewives throughout the Nation will have to pay so much more for fresh fruit and vegetables, so essential in the diet of everybody that many poorer families would have to manage without them, which again would affect the national health.

Socially, problems would be created that challenge imagination. Braceros come as single men and stay only as long as they are needed. The unemployed of the Nation, who are supposed to replace them, would come with their families, bringing thus problems of accommodation of whole families instead of single workers, of education for their children, of hospitalization for their sick, of welfare assistance and police protection for numbers of people that would exceed the total population of the majority of the towns concerned, and the additional, less palpable, but even more important and less soluble question of adjustment of two large and different groups of people living together, yet too big to assimilate one another.

Financially, with or without Federal and State assistance, the burden of building housing to accommodate double the number of present population of small agricultural communities, of building and staffing new schools, hospitals, police stations, etc., of supplying welfare funds for 8 to 9 months of the year when there is no work, the stress of adjusting and myriad of other big or small problems attendant upon any mass movement could only lead to financial ruin and general chaos and an end to the present way of life in hundreds of small communities. And that is more than should be asked from any community for any cause, let alone for, at the best, an untested and untried one. The consequences, in their many ramifications, are impossible to foresee and might—in the light of subsequent experience—make the whole plan unwise and unworkable. Why then try before more is known?

The magnitude of the proposed undertaking is such that it is felt the fullest caution before its implementation is imperative. The replacement of braceros cannot be achieved with local labor, it would have to be done by bringing people from distant parts of the Nation, with no guarantee that they would want, or even be able, to settle in the new communities. There is a great risk of creating a huge quicksand of humanity moving on wheels, strangers everywhere, home nowhere any longer.

No compelling, or even valid, reason has been advanced publicly so far why a pilot or test project of the whole idea should not, or could not, be made first. A small, representative area could be selected where no braceros would be allowed and all ideas now mentioned in connection with their replacement put into operation. It would show whether local labor is willing and able to replace braceros and under which conditions it would work best. It would save us all many mistakes and unnecessary expense in time, thought, and money. It would show, beyond argument, before the full implementation would take place, whether braceros are indispensable and, if not, under which optimal conditions they can be replaced.

It would go beyond the immediate scope and the specific concern of this council to mention the international aspects of the bracero program and the Public Law 78, bringing Mexicans to this country to see, learn, admire and—let us hope—adopt both political institutions and economic practices which made this country both great and stable. And all that, at no expense to the taxpayer of our country and a great deal of free foreign exchange to theirs.

We urge you, therefore, to delay the elimination of braceros—by extension of the Public Law 78 or some other adequate legislation guaranteeing the necessary supplemental foreign labor under present conditions—until such time that more is known of the ways and possibilities for their replacement and the attendant problems and their solutions are better thought over, discussed, and especially, tested in practice.

Respectfully yours,

EMIL C. MEYER,
Mayor.
WILLIAM J. CLARK,
J. A. PETIT,
W. C. GOENNE,
DUSAN M. PETROVIC,
Councilmen.

LOTTERIES IN AFRICA GROSS OVER $4 MILLION

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. FINO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, while we, in the United States, close our eyes to the fiscal advantages of a Government-run lottery, almost three-fourths of the nations of the world legally recognize, accept, and capitalize on the gambling spirit of its people.

Throughout the globe, 81 foreign nations, young and old, utilize government-operated lotteries not only to tap this source of revenue but to cope with the instinctive gambling urge of its people.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I am happy to list seven comparatively new African nations which recognize that gambling is a fact of life and that it should be regulated and controlled for the public good.

In 1963, out of the seven countries, listed below, five of them took in gross receipits of over $4 million. The net income to the government came to over $1 million, which was used for welfare purposes, development programs, the poor, medical research, and other good purposes.

Why can we not face up to the fiscal facts of life and also capitalize on the natural gambling spirit of the American people? Why can we not be as smart as these new African nations which recognize the fiscal advantages of government-operated lotteries?

Why can we not make the billions of dollars now gambled in the United States work for the public good rather than against it? A national lottery in the United States can painlessly pump $10 billion into our own Treasury. Is it not time we stopped being reckless with the tax and revenue advantages offered by a national lottery? When are we going to get smart?

Country	Gross receipts	Net income	Purpose used
1. Cameroon [1]			
2. Ethiopia	$1,340,000	$300,000	Welfare purposes.
3. Ghana	1,274,000	560,000	General fund.
4. Libya	840,000	280,000	Poor.
5. Nigeria	369,490	100,812	Medical services and development programs.
6. Republic of Congo [2]			
7. Sierra Leone [3]	440,000	154,000	Development programs.
Total	4,263,490	1,094,812	

[1] Legally established Sept. 17, 1963. No figures available.
[2] Started March 1963. No figures available.
[3] 1963 1st year of operation.

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. RIEHLMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a joint resolution which proposes to amend the Constitution. It provides that States would have the authority to apportion one house of their legislatures on the basis of factors other than population.

Enactment of this resolution and subsequent ratification by the States could nullify the Supreme Court decision of June 15, 1964, but only after the people of each State had a chance to vote on apportioning one chamber of their legislatures.

The decision provides that in both bodies of State legislatures, every member must represent substantially the same number of people. The Court decided this issue under the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment.

I disagree with the decision of the Court. I think this is a further example of the Court legislating, thus usurping the power of Congress.

My bill is an attempt to reverse the Court's position.

There is a comparison, I feel, between membership in Congress and membership in State legislatures.

In the House of Representatives, membership is primarily on the basis of equal representation for all people. Redistricting will soon provide more exact equality.

In the U.S. Senate, each State has two Members regardless of population.

This arrangement has brought balance to Congress and has prevented, in many instances, one sector of the population being too influential and thus causing harm or unfairness to others.

The Supreme Court calls for apportionment on the theory of "one man, one vote." This is a slogan which cannot take the place of logic in the case of State legislatures.

It is proper that one body of a State legislature represent the general interests of the majority. On the other hand, one body should protect the interests of minorities and geographic areas.

Some people may live in areas of high employment, others in depressed areas with high unemployment. Some may be lumbermen, miners, fishermen, or farmers. Some may be of one religion or national origin peculiar in need or consideration from those of another religion or national origin.

Some may live in rural areas or small towns while others live in metropolitan areas or suburban expanses. Some may direct their needs toward secondary roads or superhighways while others are more concerned about rapid transit systems. Some may require priority consideration of irrigation projects while others demand consideration of water systems.

Between each group, conflicting interests of varying degree develop, with each producing a majority and a minority. Certainly the majority must have effective rule, but the minority, too, is entitled to adequate representation.

PRESIDENTIAL DISABILITY AND VICE-PRESIDENTIAL VACANCY

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. BROTZMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, this Nation can no longer indulge in the luxury of inaction on the subjects of vice presidential vacancy and presidential inability.

In this age of pushbutton war, when 12 or 15 minutes may make the difference between survival and destruction, we must have a Vice President fully briefed and competent to act in case our President is assassinated or in the event he is unable to act for other reasons.

We have been skating on thin ice in both these areas for many years. The office of Vice President is vacant for the 16th time. The illnesses of Garfield, Wilson, and Eisenhower should remind us of the fact that Presidents are subject to the same disabilities as other mortals.

Accordingly, I am today introducing a constitutional amendment providing as follows:

First. In the event of vice-presidential vacancy, the President will nominate a Vice President subject to approval by both Houses of Congress.

Second. If the President declares his own disability, the Vice President becomes acting President.

Third. If the President is unable to declare his disability, the Vice President with concurrence of a majority of the Cabinet can determine that the President is disabled in which event the Vice President becomes acting President.

Fourth. If there is a dispute between the President and the Vice President on the question of disability, then it is referred to the Congress and a two-thirds majority will be required to declare the President disabled.

The stakes are too high and the challenges too great to permit further procrastination. I do not maintain my amendment is the only solution or the perfect solution—only that it is a logical, workable plan that will serve the national interest.

HAPPY ANNIVERSARY TO MY FRIENDS OF THE PAN AMERICAN AIRWAY

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. DEROUNIAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to join the many friends of Pan American in congratulating such an outstanding airline on the 25th anniversary of transatlantic air service.

I am proud to claim Port Washington—the takeoff point of the Pan American clipper—as part of my congressional district.

May Pan American have many more fruitful years of service to the world. It is a glittering example of American private enterprise at its best.

A STATUE IN WASHINGTON OF TARAS SHEVCHENKO, EUROPE'S FREEDOM FIGHTER

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FRIEDEL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, a very imposing statue of Taras Shevchenko, Ukraine's poet laureate and national hero, has been erected here in Washington at 22d and P Streets NW., and was appropriately dedicated last Saturday, June 27, 1964. It is fitting that we in the Congress of the United States should take note of this auspicious occasion.

Former President Harry Truman is honorary chairman of the national sponsoring committee, which includes 58 of our colleagues in the House of Representatives, 15 U.S. Senators, and a number of Governors and mayors.

We may ask, Why is this such an important event? Is it not the erection of another monument in a city full of memorials? The reply to such queries can be found in the pages of world history and in the annals of great literature.

This statue is not just a likeness of a man carved in stone, it is far more. It is more than just a memorial to a truly great man. It is more than a reminder of someone who lived in a far country more than a century ago. It is, in fact, a lasting source of inspiration for all who hold freedom dear. It stands as evidence of American recognition of a kindred spirit who espoused the cause of freedom of his people against the tyranny of a czar, Nicholas I of Russia. It will stand as the symbol of man's fight for freedom to millions of people now behind the Iron Curtain.

Taras Shevchenko was born in the Kiev district of Ukrainia on February 25, 1814. At an early age he become interested in paintings, and after he was released from serfdom he completed formal studies at the academy of art. His fame and, indeed, world renown was won by him not in the field of painting, but in poetry.

From his earliest writings, Shevchenko was the patriot of Ukraine. The sad fate and misfortunes of his unhappy people under the Russian yoke of the czar was the motivating factor behind his writings which made him the national poet of his native land.

The importance of Shevchenko cannot be overemphasized. He was the first writer purely and thoroughly Ukrainian, who dared to dream of a Ukrainian language and literature apart from the hated Russian. His great writings have indeed made him the immortal poet of the Slavonic world for he aspired for freedom of all enslaved non-Russian nations.

Ukrainia is a land of over 40 million people, the largest non-Russian nation behind the Iron Curtain, the second largest nation within the U.S.S.R. itself.

It is of special interest to us that Shevchenko was inspired by George Washington. In a poem entitled "Jurodyvyj," he wrote:

> When will we receive our Washington
> With a new and righteous law?
> And receive him we will some day.

The entire world acclaimed Shevchenko as Eastern Europe's champion of liberty and as a gifted and talented writer.

Because of Shevchenko's heroic efforts on behalf of his country, the Russian authorities moved savagely to suppress him. Out of the 47 years he lived, he had only 9 years of freedom. He was a serf for 24 years, in the Russian Army for 10, and was under strict police supervision for 3½ years. On February 26, 1861, he died.

Shevchenko's works are still a source of genuine inspiration to all mankind. This statue, which was authorized by Public Law 86-749, is tangible proof of our sympathies for the people of Ukrainia. We join with them in the fervent hope that in the not too distant future their land will be liberated and become a member of the world's family of free and independent nations.

THE NEW FRONTIERS OF EDUCATION

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, during this period of graduation ceremonies throughout the Nation, many Members of the Congress have been invited to participate in such exercises and lend their encouragement to our youth as they prepare themselves to meet the problems of the years ahead. The importance of adequate educational preparation for our young people and for our country cannot be overemphasized.

I had the privilege on June 15 of speaking at the graduation exercises of the Wawaloam School in Exeter, R.I. I was impressed by the quality of instruction and the promise of the boys and girls whose clarity of expression was most gratifying. The compositions of David Lewis, Linda Rudgers, and Lucille Thornley were extremely interesting and provide an example of the high value placed on education by these youngsters.

I would like to call attention to the presentations of these three young people and my speech on "The New Frontiers of Education," as given at the Wawaloam School:

OUR NEXT STEP

(By David Lewis)

A group of persons could not live together peacefully for any length of time unless they agreed to act in a certain way. The process by which they learn to act in these ways is education. In today's world, people could not exist without being educated, and the more the people are educated the more the world would prosper. In fact, the knowledge of the people of any country of the world depends on education. We began our education when we learned to talk. We learned words and then sentences. Tonight's graduation signifies that we have completed the first step of our education. In September, we will start our second step. After high school and college we will still learn things that we didn't know. You have heard the old adage, "You learn something new every day." This proves that you are never too young or too old to learn.

If the whole world was educated there wouldn't be any fighting or quarreling. A person learns better when he understands the reason for learning. If two countries were fighting and they were looking for a way to stop war, a good suggestion would be to spend 5 minutes a day for a week jotting down all your enemy's good traits. Then see how silly war is. The young people of this and the following generation to come should be told about the world and that peace is the answer to a more friendly nation.

When we leave here tonight we will be looking forward to enlarging our education. In time of war we should let our conscience be our guide and direct our minds and make peace. Tonight we are all friends—why couldn't the whole world be like us? By furthering our education a new nation will be found—a peaceful nation.

THE HISTORY OF OUR CLASS

(By Linda Rudgers)

In September of 1956, we the class of 1964, boarded our schoolbuses for the first time. Some of us were eager to try this new way of life; others were reluctant to leave home for the first time.

We soon settled down to the routine of school life and found that our years of grammar school were passing quickly.

The number of students has greatly increased since we entered school. In 1958, we added four rooms to our school which have now become overcrowed, and the use of this auditorium as classrooms has become necessary.

Also, while we have been here, great improvements have been made on the school grounds. Such things as audiovisual equipment for classrooms, playground equipment, shrubs, the grass surrounding the school, and the hardtop have been added. Even though all these things have been added, there is still much needed.

And now we come to September 1963. We returned to Wawaloam for our final year. At last we were the eighth grade, and this would be our year. In the fall we met to decide where we would go for our class trip. We set our sights high. We would be the first class able to attend a world's fair. Our next problem was how to begin raising money for such a project. We thought a good way to do this would be to sell candy, and sell candy we did. (I wonder how many of our parents still have several pounds of candy stowed away?)

On June 5, 6, and 7 we took our planned tour of the World's Fair and had the time of our lives.

And now we come to the time we all have awaited—our graduation.

Important as it is to us tonight, we know that our education is just beginning. Ahead of us all is high school and, for some, college.

We can look back on these past 8 years as but another step in the "stairway to the stars."

Our class would like to thank the town for making our use of this school possible and for sending us to high school in the next few years.

EDUCATION—OUR "STAIRWAY TO THE STARS"

(By Lucille Thornley)

We could say that education is our "stairway to the stars." Every one of us have dreams of what we'd like to be when we get older. In this country most children have an opportunity of achieving their goal. But some of the children of the United States because of the color of their skin or the way they talk aren't given the same opportunity. In England your family name and wealth determines how far you can go. In Africa it is even more difficult. There over half the children aren't even given a chance to go to school.

Most children in the United States can choose what they'd like to be and if they work hard enough they can achieve their goal. Even if they come from the most backward part of town. Take, for example, Abraham Lincoln, who was born in a log cabin. He had less than a year of schooling. So that he could learn more he would walk miles to borrow some books. Through his hard work he rose to become President. Abraham Lincoln took advantage of the opportunity offered to him.

If only everyone in this country had the same opportunity, this would be a better place to live in. I can see the day when everyone, no matter what color skin or no matter how they talk, will have the same and equal opportunity. When that day comes everyone will be able to climb their "stairway to the stars."

My address on "The New Frontiers of Education" was as follows:

THE NEW FRONTIERS OF EDUCATION

I am glad to be here tonight to talk for just a few minutes to the graduating class of this exceptional Wawaloam School. It is always a pleasure to speak to the young people who are going to inherit the problems which my generation will inevitably leave behind. We have shown the way. But you will have to solve the problems of poverty, pollution, overpopulation, urban planning, automation, and a host of others. You will succeed simply because you must if mankind is to survive and prosper.

You will have many new tools in your war against ignorance, ugliness, poverty, and discrimination. These tools are being forged in the libraries and laboratories of the world. Mankind is on the march for knowledge. Our mental frontiers are expanding even more rapidly than our new physical frontier in so-called outer space. Knowledge is like a candle in the darkness: the brighter the light, the greater the perimeter of the unknown which is revealed. There seems to be no limit to what can be found out by the mind of man. Each new fact triggers the discovery of additional facts in an unending chain reaction.

Nowadays, in fact, knowledge is piling up so fast that even the experts can't keep up with it—though they have a lot of fun trying. This process is most obvious in science, but it is happening in many other areas of scholarly work. We need tens of thousands of educated people just to assimilate this new information and make it available to those who need it. There is more room in the job market for writers, teachers, and librarians as well as for the social and natural scientists who reveal new truths and the engineers who apply them.

But there is no room for anyone who is not willing to work harder with his brains than anyone has ever had to work before. That's something we often forget in this age of leisure and automation. There is going to be fierce competition just to master the new knowledge I've been talking about, let alone apply it on the job. Our high schools are becoming tougher and more selective all the time. So are the colleges. Twice as many young people will be applying for college 10 years from now, yet many will not be able to get in because they will not have prepared themselves by diligent efforts in the high school classroom. Don't forget that college admissions officers pay more attention to your high school record than anything else in deciding the merits of your application.

Is college really important or is it just fashionable? I think it is genuinely important.

In the old days education was an option—a take-it-or-leave-it proposition. Unless a boy or girl were going to be a doctor, lawyer, or teacher, it really wasn't necessary to know much more to get a job or be a good citizen than how to read, write, and count. A fine grade school education such as you have received was enough. However, times have changed. These days a high school diploma is the very minimum to get any kind of a decent job, and college training of 1 or 2 years is necessary for most technicians' and semiprofessional jobs. What's more, if you want to get a professional position in business, science, engineering, or government, you must usually have at least one college degree.

As 8th grade graduates, therefore, you are beginning the most crucial period in your lives. You must take learning seriously, because it will determine your future income and your effectiveness as citizens. Most important of all, what you learn will determine what kind of persons you become, and whether you can release the potential that is within you.

At this point you may be asking, "What is education all about and what do they mean when they say someone is an 'educated man'?" Well, of course, an educated man is one who is well informed about the facts. But he knows much more than dates in history or quotations from the "experts." The educated person knows how the facts relate to each other and what they mean when viewed as a whole. He is not so much a warehouse full of mental goods as he is an analyst of everything around him. Like the prophets of the Old Testament, he is a conscientious critic of himself and of his society.

The educated man is also openminded about new developments. He finds that his ideas change with the passage of time. He discards the beliefs which do not work and gives more weight to those that do. In other words, he tries to be objective. He does not accept anything on hearsay or because it is handed down to him as an unquestioned inheritance from the past. At the same time, he doesn't let his obligation to keep an open mind prevent him from reaching conclusions and acting in practical matters where action is required.

But the importance of education goes even beyond the need to be knowledgeable or openminded. The educated person should be creative; that is, able to put the facts together to reach new conclusions, to see things in new ways, and to question what everyone else takes for granted. The educated man should also be able to communicate his findings to others. This is how human societies are held together. The ability to communicate in verbal or mathematical language is what distinguishes man from the animals and accounts for most of his extraordinary power over nature.

Your knowledge of English is particularly important and will determine your future more than anything else you study in all your years in school. Only slightly less vital in this day of scientific research and instantly applied technology is an ability to communicate with mathematical language. If you master these two languages—the English language and the language of mathematics—you will benefit from unlimited opportunities. You will be prepared for the widest possible variety of civic and intellectual roles. This level of performance is not easy to achieve, but it can be attained and it is worth almost any sacrifice.

Of course, none of these desirable goals can be reached unless your elders give education top billing on our list of national priorities. However, I think they will. Brains are going under forced draft everywhere in the world because they are the most valuable national resource. Everybody is going to have to learn more just to survive in an age of automation, let alone to ensure the further progress of civilization.

Education already ranks second as a major human activity. Only working for a living takes more of our time. Sixty billion dollars are being spent on world education every year and more than 300 million people are in school or taking courses. As technology shortens our working hours, education is going to become our principal activity. In an age of science, as the philosopher Whitehead put it, there is "no appeal from the judgment * * * pronounced on the uneducated."

I know you will make the best of the new world that is opening up for you. My congratulations on your commencement and my best wishes for a successful career in school and at work.

CAPT. GEORGE S. BULLEN

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, Capt. George S. Bullen, an outstanding naval officer and dedicated American, retires today as Director, Congressional Inquiry and Liaison Division, Office of Legislative Affairs.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely regret to see the Navy lose this capable and highly regarded officer.

I have known him for the past 5 years and scarcely has a day passed but that his efficient services have been of benefit to my office.

Though quiet and unpretentious, George Bullen typifies the kind of officer whom we are proud to know. In his official capacities, he rendered excellent service; in his personal relationship with members of my staff and other congressional offices, he effected such a warm regard for himself that his retirement will be marked with deepest regret and more than a few honest tears.

You could call on George Bullen at any time of the day or night and he was always ready and willing to be of assistance. In my opinion, his work reflects very favorably on the Navy and the office of legislative liaison.

And, I am quite certain, the high regard George Bullen holds for the Congress is equally returned. No member of the Congress who has had occasion to know George Bullen fails to respect him.

Though often unnoticed in the whirl of activity on Capitol Hill, this type of naval officer should not go unsung and I would like to personally congratulate him for his excellent work and to wish him well in the future.

In closing his distinguished naval career and his work for the Congress, Capt. George S. Bullen more than deserves the Navy's traditional "well done."

THE TRADE EXPANSION ACT OF 1962

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday of last week a number of my colleagues spoke on the need to amend the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 and introduced legislation to this effect, including H.R. 11761 and similar bills. I commend these colleagues for their vigor in giving support to specific industries they believe deserve modifications in the 1962 trade act. I regret that I cannot join them in their proposed amendments to that act. I supported the Trade Expansion Act when it was passed by Congress, in 1962. Perhaps it needs some modification, but I believe H.R. 11761 goes so far as to defeat the main purposes of the act.

I have sympathy for those industries which fear that tariff negotiations might jeopardize their domestic or foreign markets. Both capital and labor have interests which must be considered in any revision of tariff schedules. In our efforts at achieving the great goal of free trade we must recognize the importance of proceeding with prudence and caution. We are a nation of consumers, and consumers have an interest in lower tariffs, but we are also a nation whose consumers derive their purchasing power from the profits of production. The two go hand in hand.

In my district, the Second Congressional District of Arizona, copper is becoming increasingly important. Southwest of Tucson today one finds the world's most important new copper mining area. Northeast of Tucson is one of the world's largest copper mines, a marvel of modern technology. What the copper industry is doing in developing these great new properties illustrates how important it is that we "make haste slowly" in adjusting or revising our tariff structures.

Several of this Nation's largest copper companies have invested huge sums in this one small area in the past several years. Only recently new expansion plans have been announced. These plans are going forward in order to meet the increasing demand for copper and copper products in this country and throughout the world. However, I think we can be misled by all these signs of prosperity. The delicate balance between profit and loss is critical in this industry, which mines the lowest grades of copper and pays the highest wages of all the world's copper producers. Hasty and ill-considered tariff revisions could upset that balance.

There are two highly significant factors relative to the copper industry which deserve our attention.

First, I want to speak of the price of copper. This is no industry trying to get what the traffic will bear. On the contrary, leaders of the copper industry realize that they will be hurt in the long run if copper prices rise too sharply or too far. They are working now, not to push the price of copper higher, but to keep it down to a level where it is competitive with other materials. Thus, imports actually are a help to our domestic industry by helping meet excess demand.

The second factor I want to mention is the record of the copper industry in the payment of wages to its workers. It is a commendable record. A report recently issued by the Arizona Employment Security Commission confirms this. For example, last year, in Arizona, copper miners averaged $133.81 a week compared to $129.29 a week in 1962 and $64.20 a week in the base period of 1947–49. The report reveals that hourly wage rates in the copper mining industry in Arizona have increased annually at a much greater rate than the consumer price index, tribute to improved technology and advances in employee productivity and the benefits they produce.

This is an outstanding record, and I trust we will continue to see this pattern of wage gains in the years ahead. But this will happen only if the copper industry remains healthy and free from disruptive forces which might be precipitated by unwise or hasty tariff revisions.

What effect a downward revision of our copper tariff might have would be hard to predict. However, I think it is significant that in the last several years there has been a trend toward increased imports and decreased exports of primary copper. In 1961, imports amounted to approximately 39 percent of U.S. production. Last year, they had advanced to more than 44 percent. This is not a frightening or astronomic rise, but it is a trend to be watched.

Mr. Speaker, I do not endorse sweeping changes in the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, but I do join in the expression of concern that tariff negotiations proceed with caution, prudence, and attention to the interests of America's producers as well as its consumers. Among these producers the copper industry stands high for responsibility and attention to the interests of this Nation.

HIGHWAY DISASTER

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ROONEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise to address the Members of the House today on one of the saddest missions of my life in public office.

This past Friday morning—at approximately 4:10 a.m.—a trailer loaded with explosives blew up on a heavily traveled highway in my district. It took the lives of six persons and seriously injured three others. It caused property damage estimated at nearly a million and a half dollars.

I spent all of this past Saturday afternoon in the area where the explosion occurred and I tell the Members of this House today, without equivocation, that nothing I saw as a member of the Armed Forces during World War II was more terrible and more tragic than the scenes of devastation and havoc which resulted from the occurrence in Monroe County, Pa., early last Friday morning.

The loss of life was unbelievable for an accident of this kind—but the sobering thought is that it could have been worse—much, much worse.

For this accident occurred in a sparsely populated region of our area. If it had happened just a few scant miles further west, it would have blown up a large section of the boroughs of East Stroudsburg or Stroudsburg and dozens of persons would have been killed and scores of human beings injured.

Three of the men who were killed Friday morning were members of the Marshalls Creek Fire Co., one of the best of its kind in the State of Pennsylvania, with an outstanding record of safety throughout its long years of service to the eastern end of Monroe County. Despite the thousands of hours of service they have given to their communities, incidentally, this is the first time since 1890 that a Monroe County fireman has lost his life in the line of duty.

On Saturday I visited the homes and the families of the three firemen who were killed.

Nothing I could say then—nothing I can do now—nothing this Congress can do or say, will return Earl Miller or Leonard Mosier or Edward Hines to their wives and their families.

But we can—and we do—recognize the extraordinary courage and valor of men such as these, who are volunteers, who lay down their lives, day after day, night after night, in service to those who live around them—and, who, far too often, give up their lives in the aftermath of someone else's negligence and callous disregard for the safety of human beings.

These three men were experienced firefighters. They were men who were noted for their devotion to public safety. They were not the kind of men who took unnecessary risks, either with their own safety or with the safety of others.

They are dead, today, as a result of one of the most tragic—and, I believe, senseless—manmade catastrophes ever to strike a quiet, peaceful community.

Three others are dead, also.

One of these, apparently, was the man who stopped at the scene of the abandoned trailer to turn in a fire alarm so that others might be protected. He was Joseph J. Horvath, Jr., of Lackawanna County, Pa. He was 24 years old.

The blast killed John Regina, 23, of Marshalls Creek, the son of one of my good friends, Theodore Regina, who is the owner and operator of a small hotel near the scene of the explosion. John Regina was a teacher in the Middletown, N.Y., public schools. He was to be married in a few weeks.

The sixth—and, hopefully, the last—death as a result of the explosion was Mrs. Lillian Paesch, 33, of Baltimore, Md. Mrs. Paesch was en route to a vacation with her husband. They happened to be passing the scene of the disaster at the time the explosion occurred.

Three other persons were seriously injured. Two of them were firemen. I talked with both of them last Saturday and I want to testify on the floor of this House today that I have never encountered greater and more inspiring examples of personal courage and dedication in my years in public life.

I speak here today, in their behalf as well as that of the dead. For it is to Robert Heid and Richard McDonough that we owe every bit of vigilance, as well as to the dead firemen and the others and to Mrs. Marion Sherman and Mrs. Ruth Livingston, both of whom were also injured in the catastrophe.

I want to say, now, on the public record, that I believe the investigators assigned to this case by the Interstate Commerce Commission have done an exemplary job of collecting evidence under the most difficult possible circumstances.

When I tell you that only the smallest bits and pieces of the exploded vehicle were visible when I toured the area, I must say, at the same time, that I have every confidence the ICC will be able to put together an accurate and possibly damning reconstruction of what actually happened last Friday morning on Route 209 in Monroe County.

For purposes of the record, I want to point out that this tragedy need never have taken human lives at all.

The fact is that the driver of this vehicle left the scene of the accident, allegedly to get help in changing two rear tires which he states had blown out on the trailer. The driver has been identified as Albert Koda of Port Carbon, Pa. He is an employee of the American Cyanamid Co. of Pottsville, Pa., to whom the tractor-trailer loaded with explosives belonged.

The trailer Koda was driving is reported to have contained 6,000 pounds of nitrocarbonitrate and 4,000 pounds of 60-percent gelatin dynamite, according to State police investigators on the scene. There are also reports, which have not been officially confirmed, that the trailer was also carrying a quantity of blasting caps.

Whether or not there were, in fact, blasting caps on board the trailer is a matter we must wait for the ICC hearing to clear up.

I am delighted, today, to say that the Commission has moved rapidly to expedite those hearings. They will be held on July 23 and 24 in the main courtroom of the Monroe County courthouse at Stroudsburg, Pa.

Commissioner Rupert L. Murphy will be in charge of the hearings which will be conducted, and Mr. Henry Vinskey will be the official hearing examiner.

When the hearings open, I am fully confident that the examiners will have the widest possible collection of information and evidence. The field investigation team, under the direction of Mr. Frank W. Doyle, the acting district director of the ICC office in Philadelphia, has been on the job at Marshalls Creek since a scant 4 hours after the blast occurred.

The hearings will present—and, I hope, clarify—matters of grave concern and serious consequence for all American citizens who use our public highways and live near them. It will be of the utmost importance, also, to many of our most vital manufacturing industries who use, and must continue to use, those highways to transport commodities safely.

No one who has studied this case can escape the astonishing and deadly similarities between it and what happened in Roseburg, Oreg., nearly 5 years ago.

On that date—August 7, 1959—a tractor-trailer loaded with almost the same identical commodities—nitrocarbonitrate, dynamite and blasting caps—but in much smaller quantities—completely devastated eight city blocks when it was left unattended near the scene of a fire and exploded.

In the court hearings which resulted from that explosion and the ICC investigation, the court found that the ICC did not have full enough jurisdiction, within the framework of the enabling laws passed by the Congress, to prosecute.

This legal flaw was remedied, however, with the passage of Public Law 86–710 on September 6, 1960. Under provisions of that law, a fine of $10,000 and a sentence of 10 years in jail can be levied when death results as a consequence of proven negligence.

It is now against the law for the driver of a truck loaded with explosives to leave it unattended, no matter what the circumstances may be. If he has a helper with him, he is allowed to leave the helper behind while he goes for assistance.

But, under no conditions whatever, is an explosives-laden trailer to be abandoned.

The law seems absolute on this point.

Yet there is no provision in ICC regulations that such loads must be accompanied by anyone other than the driver, himself.

This, it seems to me, is a shortcoming in present regulations and should be quickly remedied.

I want to make it perfectly clear that I am not embarking on any irresponsible tirade against the responsible shippers who use America's public highways. Nothing could be further from my mind.

The shipment of explosives on public highways is an economic factor which has become an absolute necessity in our Nation. Two years ago there were 632 million pounds of explosives handled by trucks on public highways.

Explosives are used in countless ways by virtually every heavy and advanced industry known in our economy today.

We cannot restrict their use or their shipment without adequate investigation and proper precaution.

We can, however, insist that the shipment of any explosive be carried out with the absolute maximum amount of security and the greatest possible safety precautions.

We do not want—and we must not have—a recurrence of what happened in Marshalls Creek, Pa., last Friday morning or what happened in Roseburg, Oreg., 5 years ago.

I do not care how great the amount of care which goes into shipments of this kind. The protection and salvation of human life should be, and must be, our first concern in the Congress and in the regulatory commissions which it authorizes to take steps to protect the American people.

I urgently suggest that this body undertake a thorough review of existing laws governing the shipment of explosives on public highways. There should be room in such a study, also, for a review of the relationships which exist, or do not exist, between the laws of the several States and the Federal regulations covering explosives shipments.

In Pennsylvania, for example, the Public Utility Commission has no regulatory power over private carriers transporting explosive commodities, but does maintain some controls over hired carriers used for this purpose.

The Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission has been invited to sit in on the hearings which will be conducted next month in Stroudsburg and I am personally hopeful that they will avail themselves of the opportunity.

I shall look toward the hearings with great anticipation.

I believe, with all my heart, that the Interstate Commerce Commission, in these proceedings, will have an opportunity to perform one of the greatest and most signal public services in its long and distinguished history.

If those hearings do not produce the recommended actions and the evidence which should be forthcoming, I feel that the Members of this Congress must join together in a unified effort to place upon the law books the kind of regulations which will make a repetition of the Marshalls Creek disaster absolutely impossible.

I am grateful to you, Mr. Speaker, and to my colleagues for your patience in this matter.

Nothing I have experienced in my lifetime has so deeply moved me as the terrible tragedy in my own district this past weekend.

TARAS SHEVCHENKO

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate that we pause in these closing days of June to pay tribute to the memory of Taras Shevchenko, illustrious Ukrainian man of letters and freedom fighter. This weekend his statue was unveiled in our city, so that our children and visitors from all nations might be reminded of this great man, and of the causes to which he dedicated his life.

Shevchenko lived in an age of political and social turmoil. Always in the main stream of the drive for human and constitutional rights, he, like other deeply concerned and oppressed Europeans, took a leading role in the revolutions which rocked that continent at midcentury. His immediate, personal goal was Ukrainian independence. The year of his death, 1861, marked a watershed in the history of the causes he defended, for it was in that year that the Czar Alexander finally liberated the Russian serfs.

In this era, when we are acutely aware of the plight of millions of our fellowmen held captive behind the Iron Curtain, the example of Taras Shevchenko stands out as a symbol of the continuing struggle for human liberty throughout this world. That the Shevchenko Memorial Committee has so honored him reaffirms our understanding for the people of Eastern Europe, though they may be separated from us by walls of states and oppressive governments.

Taras Shevchenko's genius was many sided; he is remembered as a model Ukrainian patriot, a pioneer who rekindled and revitalized the Ukrainian national spirit in poems, songs, and stories about Ukrainian national heroes. A man of the arts in the fullest sense, he was recognized in his lifetime as the bard, the poet laureate, of his people.

The hold of Taras Shevchenko on the descendants of his countrymen—on the 2 million Americans of Ukrainian origin—is so well illustrated by their determined, longstanding effort to establish a memorial in his honor in their National Capital. This attachment and veneration led more than 50,000 of them to assemble here in Washington this weekend to celebrate the heritage of this towering 19th century human being—the principles of individual dignity for which he fought, and the enriched Ukrainian culture which he left as a legacy to future generations.

I congratulate the Taras Shevchenko Memorial Committee for erecting this historic monument, and I say to the people of his native land that, with more men like Taras Shevchenko among all of us, we may unite our ideas and efforts to make the freedom he sought a present reality.

TARAS SHEVCHENKO

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MURPHY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, this weekend witnessed a most touching series of events that showed the affection and esteem with which Ukrainian-Americans regard their national hero, the great poet Taras Shevchenko. Many thousands of them marched to the memorial site here in Washington to watch the dedication of his statute. They came from all over the United States. Some of them had helped realize this memorial.

One might ask, why a statue to Shevchenko in our Capital? The answer is simple. Shevchenko was more than just a local patriot fighting for his people's liberation. Shevchenko was and is today a universal figure that personifies the struggle for freedom and democratic rule which is and has been waged by so many suppressed nationalities. His writings and his actions inspired many other peoples who along with the Ukrainians found themselves under a foreign autocracy.

One hundred years ago Ukrainia was part of the Russian czarist empire. Ukrainians had no freedom and no democracy. Shevchenko deeply felt their crying need and set about to remedy the situation. For his efforts he was sent to Siberia in the Russian Army and forbidden to write. Even after his return he was never really a freeman.

Today the Ukraine and many other lands still find themselves under foreign domination. This memorial reminds us of this injustice and also reminds us that there are men like Taras Shevchenko who are working to realize their nation's freedom. As shown in the erection of this statue, our hearts are with them. Long may the spirit of Shevchenko live on.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF CLAIMANTS COUNCIL OF AMERICA

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MURPHY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, the decision to allow television cameras to record the verdict in the trial of Jack Ruby served to revive heated controversy over whether or not to allow TV in a courtroom.

During a recent appearance on the WNBC radio program, Speak Up, Jacob D. Fuchsberg, president of the National Association of Claimants Counsel of America—NACCA—the Nation's largest trial bar association, presented a spirited argument against permitting televised courtroom trials, contending that this could serve to deprive participants of their right to privacy which is the basic liberty of individuals living in a democracy.

Here is the substance of the remarks of Mr. Fuchsberg who is considered to be one of the most articulate spokesmen for his profession:

> If millions were looking in through the medium of television, the search for justice could be impeded, regardless of how well equipment could be obscured from view, in that litigants would be reluctant to discuss highly personal matter in the glare of TV.
>
> The constitutional guarantee of a public trial is intended for the benefit of those involved, and it is the protection of their interests which must be the primary concern of our courts.
>
> In an accident or a divorce case, personal and sensitive subjects frequently must be revealed and allowing millions of people to observe the proceedings could do irreparable harm to a litigant or a defendant charged with, but not yet convicted of a crime.
>
> Moreover, if trials were televised, the reputation of many people could be damaged, regardless of the outcome of a trial, in that countless viewers might form an incorrect opinion of an individual, based solely on what they see in their homes.

Mr. Fuchsberg stressed that he was not questioning the right of a free press, the integrity of broadcasters, nor their ability to make electronic equipment as unobtrusive as possible.

He said that if a witness, or a juror, however, is aware of the fact that he is "on camera," his behavior is likely to be affected, in some cases to the detriment of justice.

NEGROES STAGE RAMPAGE

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WAGGONNER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I doubt if most people in and around Washington heard of a recent race riot in Chicago, since the Washington Post condensed the story into a squib and hid it under a story of manufactured violence in the South.

As usual, one has to turn to one of the responsible newspapers to get the true story. I happened to find it in the Baton Rouge Morning Advocate, although I hasten to add that the story is the Associated Press story, not one written by a southerner for southern consumption.

The story of about 50 Negro teenagers running wild in the streets of Chicago, ravaging stores, assaulting police, and civilians alike, pillaging and stabbing and, in fine, reverting to savages, is a sickening tale to read. Hiding it from the public, however, is not the answer.

This is the whirlwind the Nation will reap after passage and signature of the so-called civil rights bill. By enacting into law the platform of the 1928 Communist Party of the United States, we can expect no less.

The full story of the savage rampage in Chicago follows:

NEGROES STAGE RAMPAGE—NINE PERSONS ARE ASSAULTED IN CHICAGO

CHICAGO.—A group of about 50 North Side high school students started their summer vacation Friday with a 2-hour rampage in which they assaulted at least 9 persons, including 2 police officers.

Police said the victims were treated and released from a nearby hospital.

Police seized 17 persons, 6 of them juveniles. All those arrested were Negroes, but police said the attackers included Negro, Puerto Rican, and white boys. The victims were all white.

Detective Joseph Bongiorno said there appeared to be no racial reason for the assault.

"They were just looking for kicks," he said.

The melee began following dismissal of classes at Waller and Cooley High Schools for summer vacation.

The gang first descended on a grocery store, where police said they tossed groceries and pop bottles on the floor. They fled with $40 from the cash register.

The students then split into smaller groups and fanned out in the area.

Linden Pillath, 23, said he was struck from behind and beaten and kicked by eight of the youths. He apparently suffered a broken jaw.

CUT IN ABDOMEN

Victor Sawczenko, 17, suffered a minor knife wound in the abdomen when he was attacked in an underpass.

Stanley Piwowarski, 15, said about 30 gang members "surrounded us and we couldn't get out."

"They started kicking and one guy grabbed me by the hair," he said. He suffered a bloody nose and a bruised left arm and lost a portable radio.

Policeman Raymond Kappel was burned on the face with a flipped cigarette when he tried to stop a group of youths from throwing pop bottles at a bus.

Another policeman, Joseph Trifone, 32, suffered a cut right index finger as he attempted to break up the disturbances.

Two other youths, Terry Schlott, 15, and Kenneth Lavorate, 18, were beaten and their radios were stolen. Ben Maggio, 17, was struck several times.

Charles Tilson, 27, was threatened by 15 youths while he was changing a tire in front of his home. He said he was hit by a brick thrown at him.

Asked to explain the riot, one policeman said, "They were just going around looking for something to do."

REPORT ON THE INTERNATIONAL LABOR ORGANIZATION CONFERENCE

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, it was a great honor for me to be designated a congressional adviser to the International Labor Organization Conference in Geneva, Switzerland. I surely appreciate having this opportunity to learn firsthand the operation of this organization, to gain a better understanding of international organizations, to promote the ideals of the United States, and to discuss firsthand with representatives of various countries of the world the problems which confront each one in particular in their own country and generally as serious crises affect us all.

I attended the early part of the Conference leaving Geneva on July 24. The Conference continues through July 29, but I felt it was unwise to leave the work in Congress for more than a week to 10 days.

The big issues confronting the ILO Conference while I was in attendance were: First, apartheid, which is a carryover from previous years and was especially noteworthy last year when the African delegates walked out when a South African delegate attempted to speak in the plenary session; second, the erosion of the tripartite structure as it is practiced by the Western World; third, the efforts to give the Conference dominance over the governing body and the Director General; and fourth, the new alliance of 75 developing nations of Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

The main purposes of the ILO are to work out recommendations or conventions for various nations designed to establish standards for working conditions, health and safety codes, freedom of association, special employment problems of women and youth, equality of opportunity, and the recognition of basic human rights. The ILO itself administers programs of industrial and rural development, vocational training, and technical assistance. The ILO supposedly does not concern itself with political issues, but leaves these to the United Nations. However, as the four issues which I have just mentioned imply, a great deal of political controversy and propaganda are injected into the discussion of the Conference. This is usually generated by the Communists.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

The ILO was organized in 1919 under the League of Nations. However, the United States did not become a member until 1934. Presently, there are 110 members. It has a permanent office in Geneva, and the Director General is David A. Morse, an American. It is under his supervision that the program is carried out throughout the year. If we were to compare the ILO to a parliamentary form of government, he would be in the position of the prime minister. The parliament or legislative group is the governing body which changes its chairman each year. This year Emilio Calderon Puig, of Mexico, is Chairman; last year, Alexandre Parodi, of France; the year before that, Shambhu T. Merani, of India, and in 1960–61, George C. Lodge. The governing body is selected by the ILO Conference and consists of 10 government members from the 10 most industrial nations and the other 14 selected at large from the remaining member nations. There are also 12 worker and 12 employer members elected. Again, using the parliamentary system for an analogy, the annual Conference tends to be the constituency of the governing body.

STRUCTURE

In the Conference there are one employer delegate, one labor delegate, and two government delegates for each member nation. This works exceptionally well in all countries where a free labor union movement flourishes, where a free private enterprise system dominates the economic system, and where the government is responsive to the will of the people. Our Government representatives to the ILO Conference this year are the Hon. George L-P Weaver, Assistant Secretary, International Affairs, Department of Labor; and Mr. George P. Delaney, special assistant to the Secretary, Department of States. The employer delegate is Mr. Richard Wagner, chairman of the executive committee, Chamber of Commerce of the United States; and our labor delegate is Mr. Rudolph Faupl, international representative, International Association of Machinists. These four men were delegates last year, and as I watched them perform their duties, I could tell that they were experienced with the ILO process and their exceptional ability enabled them to represent the United States very well.

Backing these men in an advisory capacity for the Government were: Mr. John F. Skillman, special assistant to the Secretary, Department of Commerce; Hon. Roger W. Tubby, Ambassador, U.S. representative to the European Office of the United Nations and other International Organizations; Hon. Pat McNamara, U.S. Senate; Hon. Kenneth B. Keating, U.S. Senate; Hon. Adam C. Powell, House of Representatives; Hon. James Roosevelt, House of Representatives; Hon. Robert P. Griffin, House of Representatives; Hon. Albert H. Quie, House of Representatives; Mr. John L. Hagan, Office of International Conferences, Department of State; Mr. John E. Lawyer, Acting Director, Office of International Organizations, Department of Labor; Mr. Irvin S. Lippe, attaché, U.S. Mission, Geneva, Switzerland; Mr. Edward B. Persons, Office of International Economic and Social Affairs, Department of State; Mr. Harold D. Snell, labor attaché, American Embassy, Beirut, Lebanon; Mr. Robert W. Grant, Chief, Division of International Cooperation, Bureau of Labor Standards, Department of Labor; Mr. Alfred L. Green, executive director, Division of Employment, Department of Labor, Albany, N.Y.; Mr. James M. Nabrit, president, Howard University; Mr. John P. O'Neill, Division of Programing and Training, Bureau of Labor Standards, Department of Labor; Hon. Esther Peterson, Assistant Secretary of Labor, Department of Labor; Mr. Donald L. Ream, Chief, Workmen's Compensation Branch, Bureau of Labor Standards, Department of Labor.

Serving in an advisory capacity to the employer delegate were: Mr. Arthur W. Brown, manager, employee relations department, Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey), 30 Rockefeller Plaza; Mr. Richard P. Doherty, president, Television-Radio Management Corp., Washington; Mr. Harry J. Lambeth, labor attorney, labor relations and legal department, U.S. Chamber of Commerce; Mr. Philip D. Moore, manager, Management Development and Employee Relations Services, General Electric Co., New York; Mr. Edwin R. Niehaus, director, industrial relations, the Great Western Sugar Co., Denver; Mr. George J. Pantos, international representative, commerce and foreign policy department, Chamber of Commerce of the United States; Mr. Charles H. Smith, president, the Steel Improvement & Forge Co., Cleveland.

Serving in an advisory capacity to the worker delegate were: Mr. George H. Harrison, chief executive officer, Brotherhood of Railway Clerks, Cincinnati; Mr. Edward J. Hickey, attorney, Mulholland, Hickey & Lyman, Washington; Mr. John McCartin, assistant general president, United Association of Journeymen and Apprentices of the Plumbing and Pipe Fitting Industry of the United States and Canada, Washington; Mr. James McDonald, directing business representative, International Association of Machinists, District Lodge No. 8, Chicago; Mr. George Meany, president, American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, Washington; Mr. Ralph Rieser, president, United Glass and Ceramic Workers of North America, Columbus, Ohio; Mr. Bert Seidman, European economic representative, American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, Geneva, Switzerland; Mrs. Maida Springer, representative, international affairs department, AFL–CIO, Washington; and Mr. Miles C. Stanley, president, West Virginia Labor Federation (AFL–CIO), Charleston, W. Va.

ISSUES OF THE CONFERENCE

APARTHEID

Due to the publicity caused by the walkout of the African delegates in the 1963 Conference, similar emotional action was expected in this session. However, South Africa did not send a delegate to the Conference, and therefore, a decision over seating was not necessary. The whole question of apartheid is before the United Nations and at the time of the beginning of the Conference, the U.N. Security Council issued the following resolution:

United Nations Security Council Resolution on South Africa, June 9, 1964

The Security Council recalling General Assembly resolution 1881XV (xviii) of October 11, 1963, which condemns the Government of the Republic of South Africa for its failure to comply with the repeated resolutions of the General Assembly and of the General Council and it requests it to abandon the arbitrary trial in progress and forthwith to grant unconditional release to all political prisoners and to all persons imprisoned, interned, or subjected to other restrictions for having opposed the policy of apartheid; and

Further recalling that the Security Council in its resolutions of October 7, 1963 (S. 5386), and December 4, 1963 (S. 5741), called upon the Government of South Africa to liberate all persons in prison, interned, or subjected to other restrictions for having opposed the policy of apartheid; and

Noting with great concern that the arbitrary Rivonia trial instituted against the leaders of the antiapartheid movement has been resumed and the imminent verdict to be delivered under arbitrary laws describing long terms of imprisonment and the death sentence may have very serious consequences; and

Noting with regret that the Government of South Africa has rejected the appeal of the Secretary General of March 27, 1964: (1) Urges the South African Government (a) to renounce the execution of the persons sentenced to death for actions resulting from opposition to the policy of apartheid, (b) to end forthwith the trial in progress instituted within the framework of the arbitrary apartheid laws, (c) to grant an amnesty to all persons already imprisoned, interned, or subjected to other restrictions for opposing apartheid and particularly to the defendants in the Rivonia trial; (2) invites all states to exert all their influence in order to induce the South African Government to comply with the provisions of this resolution; (3) invites the Secretary General to follow closely the implementation of the resolution and to report thereon to the Security Council at the earliest possible date.

Discrimination on the continent of Africa by Europeans was an issue, however, to Portugal with regard to Angola and Mozambique. The seating of delegates sent by Portugal was in appeal at the time when I was in attendance, and there may be objection later on in the Conference. Either they would be seated or if denied participation, the delegates from Portugal would rise to speak in opposition—a demonstration of delegates from African nations could easily be forthcoming.

Two committees are presently functioning to first, draw a resolution or declaration concerning apartheid; and, second, propose a constitutional change providing for expulsion. It is hoped that these two would give a member nation an opportunity to appraise itself and take whatever action is necessary within the prerogatives of the structure of the ILO.

Proposed Declaration Concerning the Policy of Apartheid of the Republic of South Africa

Whereas all members of the International Labor Organization have, by the Declaration of Philadelphia embodied in the Constitution as a statement of the aims and purposes of the Organization, solemnly affirmed that "all human beings irrespective of race, creed, or sex, have the right to pursue both their material well-being and their spiritual development in conditions of freedom and dignity, of economic security and equal opportunity"; and

Whereas by an instrument of ratification of the Constitution as amended in 1946, signed by the Prime Minister of the Union of South Africa at Pretoria on June 12, 1947, the Government of South Africa has undertaken "faithfully to perform and carry out" all the stipulations of the Constitution; and

Whereas the constitution provides that the International Labor Organization exists for the promotion of the objects set forth in the Preamble thereto and in the Declaration of Philadelphia; and

Whereas the Government of the Republic of South Africa has not merely failed to cooperate in promoting the objects set forth in the Preamble to the Constitution and in the Declaration of Philadelphia but has adopted discriminatory policies wholly incompatible therewith, thus creating an alarming situation; and

Whereas the Declaration of Philadelphia affirms that the principles set forth therein are "fully applicable to all peoples everywhere" and recognizes that their progressive application is a "matter of concern to the whole civilized world"; and

Whereas the application of the principle of equal opportunity for all human beings, irrespective of race, has therefore ceased to be solely the domestic concern of the Republic of South Africa; and

Whereas the Republic of South Africa persistently and flagrantly violates this principle by means of legislative, administrative, and other measures incompatible with the fundamental rights of man, including freedom from forced labor, freedom of association, and freedom of choice of employment and occupation; and

Whereas such persistent and flagrant violation of the principle has been established by the International Labor Organization by inquiries relating to forced labor, freedom of association and freedom from discrimination in respect of employment and occupation; and

Whereas for instance, the United Nations-International Labor Organization Ad Hoc Committee on Forced Labor has found that there exists in South Africa "a legislative system applied only to the indigenous population and designed to maintain an insuperable barrier between these people and the inhabitants of European origin," that "the indirect effect of this legislation is to channel the bulk of the indigenous inhabitants into agricultural and manual work and thus to create a permanent, abundant, and cheap labor force" and that in this sense "a system of forced labor of significance to the national economy appears to exist in the Union of South Africa"; and

Whereas, moreover, the Freedom of Association Committee of the governing body has found that the provisions of the Industrial Conciliation Acts and Native Labor (Settlement of Disputes) Act involve discrimination against workers on grounds of race which is incompatible with the principle that workers without distinction should have the right to establish and, subject only to the rules of the organization concerned, to join organizations of their own choosing without previous authorization and that all workers should enjoy the right of collective bargaining; and

Whereas the committee of experts on the application of conventions and recommendations has likewise found, on the basis of information furnished by the Government of South Africa and the relevant legislation, that the legislation and practice of South Africa establish extensive discrimination in employment and occupation on grounds of race; and

Whereas the International Labor Conference, by a resolution adopted on 29 June 1961, condemned the racial policies of the Government of the Republic of South Africa and called upon the Republic of South Africa to withdraw from the International Labor Organization until such time as the Government of the said Republic abandons apartheid; and

Whereas South Africa, having declined the invitation of the International Labor Conference to withdraw from membership of the Organization, has by continuing her membership maintained, but continues to violate, her undertaking to respect the right of "all human beings irrespective of race, creed or sex" to "pursue both their material well-being and their spiritual development in conditions of freedom and dignity, of economic security and equal opportunity"; and

Whereas the United Nations declaration on the elimination of all forms of racial discrimination has called for an end to "be put without delay to governmental and other public policies of racial segregation and especially policies of apartheid as well as all forms of racial discrimination and separation resulting from such policies"; and

Whereas the Security Council of the United Nations by resolutions S. 5471 adopted unanimously on December 4, 1963, expressed "the firm conviction that the policies of apartheid and racial discrimination as practiced by the Government of the Republic of South Africa are abhorrent to the conscience of mankind and that therefore a positive alternative to these policies must be found through peaceful means" and condemned the noncompliance by the Government of the Republic of South Africa with the appeals contained in the resolutions addressed to it by the General Assembly and the Security Council.

The general conference of the International Labor Organization,

Determined to fulfill its responsibility to promote and take its part in securing the freedom and dignity of the people of South Africa,

Acting as spokesman of the social conscience of mankind.

Reiterating that a government which deliberately practices apartheid is unworthy of the community of nations but nevertheless making another appeal to the Government of South Africa to abandon its disastrous policy and to cooperate with employers' and workers' organizations in placing the relations between the various elements of the population of South Africa, and the relations between the people of South Africa and the rest of the world, on the basis of the equality of man, justice for all, good neighborliness and mutual respect:

1. Emphatically reaffirms its condemnation of the discriminationary racial policies of the Government of the Republic of South Africa which are incompatible with fundamental human rights and with the aims and purposes of the International Labor Organization.

2. Calls upon the Government of South Africa to recognize and fulfill its undertaking to respect the freedom and dignity of all human beings, irrespective of race, and to this end,

To renounce the policy of apartheid and repeal all leigslative, administrative and other measures incompatible with the freedom and dignity of the people of South Africa and the principle of the equality of man,

To promote equality of opportunity and treatment in employment and occupation irrespective of race,

To repeal the statutory provisions which provide for compulsory job reservation or institute discrimination on the basis of race as regards access to vocational training and employment,

To repeal all legislation providing for penal sanctions for contracts of employment, for the hiring of prison labor for work in agriculture or industry, and for any other form of direct or indirect compulsion to labor, including discrimination on grounds of race in respect of travel and residence, which involves racial discrimination or operates in practice as the basis for such discrimination,

To repeal the statutory discrimination on grounds of race in respect of the right to organize and to bargain collectively, and the statutory prohibitions and restrictions upon mixed trade unions including persons of more than one race, and so to amend the Industrial Conciliation Acts that all workers, without discrimination of race, enjoy the right to organize and may participate in collective bargaining.

3. Invites the governing body to exercise its constitutional power under article 19(5) (e) and (6)(d) of the Constitution by requesting the Government of South Africa to report annually the position of its law and practice in regard to the matters dealt with in the Forced Labor Convention, 1930, the Abolition of Penal Sanctions Convention, 1955, the Abolition of Forced Labor Convention, 1957, the Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right to Organize Convention, 1948, the Right to Organize and Collective Bargaining Convention, 1949, and the Discrimination (Employment and Occupation) Convention and Recommendation, 1958.

4. Decides to consider each year a special summary of such reports to be submitted to the conference by the Director General in pursuance of article 23 of the Constitution or, in default of such reports, such information as the Director General may be in a position to assembly and submit by any other procedure approved by the governing body and any recommendations which he may submit therewith, and on the basis of such consideration, to recommend such further action as may be appropriate.

5. Reaffirms its resolve to cooperate with the United Nations in seeking and guaranteeing freedom and dignity, economic security and equal opportunity for all the people of South Africa.

AMENDMENT OF ILO CONSTITUTION TO PERMIT EXPULSION OR SUSPENSION FROM MEMBERSHIP OF ANY MEMBER WHICH HAS BEEN EXPELLED OR SUSPENDED FROM MEMBERSHIP OF THE UNITED NATIONS

6. The general conference of the International Labor Organization may, at any session in the agenda of which the subject has been included and by a vote concurred in by two-thirds of the delegates attending the session, including two-thirds of the government delegates present and voting expel from membership of the International Labor Organization any member which the United Nations has expelled therefrom or suspend from the exercise of the rights and privileges of membership of the International Labor Organization any member which the United Nations has suspended from the exercise of the rights and privileges of membership; suspension shall not affect the continued validity of the obligations of the member under the constitution and conventions to which it is a party.

It was interesting to note the reference to apartheid, the use of slave labor and the abolishment of colonialism in the speeches of the delegates from Communist bloc nations. The Communists are the colonialists of today and surely do not permit the freedom of labor and labor organizations which we enjoy in the Western World.

TRIPARTITE STRUCTURE

The very basis of the ILO has been its tripartite structure. There are particular and peculiar interests which workers have and they express them through their free trade unions. We make very certain in the United States, as do countries of Western Europe, that worker delegates are never interfered with and can freely express their views on various things which the ILO does. This is also the case with employer delegates where free enterprise and private enterprise flourish.

When Communist nations become members of the ILO, we found that representatives in all three parts of the ILO have a common authority—the Communist Party itself. Since the party and the government are completely intertwined, there was no objection to the seating of these delegates by our Government delegates.

While the labor delegates object to the fact that trade unions are merely the Communist Party in the industry in Communist countries, they have permitted the worker delegates from Communist countries to be seated feeling that they can constantly outvote them. Employer delegates, however, from the Western World have strenuously objected to the seating of employer delegates from Communist nations.

When the ILOC organizes each year, the employer delegates in the organization leave out the individuals whom Communist countries attempt to have seated as employer delegates. The Communist nations then appeal and their proposed delegates are finally seated. This certainly does violence to the tripartite structure and whereas we find the labor delegate, employer delegate, and government delegates from free countries are divided on many issues, the worker, employer, and government delegates from the Communist nations always vote together giving proof to their monolithic authority. As a good example of the willingness to flaunt the traditional concept of employer, I can quote from the plenary speech of Mr. Kucherov, employer delegate from the Ukraine. He claims that "the employers' group in the governing body expresses the social structure of the world as it was at the beginning of this century, if you like, but not at all today's structure."

He continues:

> The capitalist employers trying to justify their discriminatory attitude toward the socialist employers generally refer to the fact that the socialist employers are in the service of their governments. Well, I am proud that I am serving a people's government, that I am serving my people, and the profits of the undertaking that I manage go to meet the needs of the sole proprietor, the people. At the same time, I am free to earmark part of these profits to extending the enterprise, and to improving the living conditions of the workers. I feel legitimate pride when I see how happy the workers are when they move into their new apartments that have been constructed out of the profits of our factory. I am happy that thousands of children of our workers are brought up in the crèches and kindergartens, and rest in Black Sea health centers also built out of the profits of our plant, this plant which my people's government has put me in charge of. My joy and enthusiasm can only be understood by people who have themselves experienced these emotions, but you so-called free employers will never understand this.
>
> That is why production must be developed, and not in order to give employers the freedom to exploit the workers and act without control. The socialist employers have an undoubted advantage over private capitalist employers in that they are free from greed for gain. The very fact that we directors represent here in the ILO the most progressive socioeconomic system, the socialist system, explains why the representatives of "free enterprise" are prepared to bar the way to the governing body in order to keep out the legitimate representatives of socialist management. However, whether or not the representatives of private enterprise like it, public, nationalized, socialized, expropriated, call it what you will but state-controlled industry is the thing of the future.
>
> The state sector in industry is characteristic not only of the Socialist countries but of many developing countries as well. Progress is following the line of nationalization of industry, the setting up of a decisive state-controlled sector and transformation of society. The facts demonstrate clearly that nationalized industry is the industry of the future, because only nationalized industry makes for the economic and social flowering of a nation.
>
> In the process of adapting the ILO to modern conditions, it is necessary radically to change existing practice with respect to the composition of the employers' and workers' groups in the governing body and in other organs of the ILO.

All one has to do is to look at the industrial and productive strength of the Atlantic community to know what free private enterprise and free trade unions have been able to do for the betterment of not only the peoples in their own countries but also other peoples all over the world. You can tell by this one quotation the difficulty which we have in an organization like the ILO where the Communist countries participate.

Another example of the breakdown of tripartite structure occurs in some of the new and developing nations. The comments of Mr. Diarra, government delegate from Mali, show this. Mali is one of the new Socialist countries of Africa. He stated that 100 percent of the people of Mali are workers. As a government delegate he could just as well be present in the conference as a worker delegate since he is a worker and a member of the Mali Federation of Trade Unions. The employers in Mali are directors of nationalized industry, and therefore, there is no difference in point of view between the employer, worker, or government delegates from Mali.

I can see a consistent erosion of tripartite structure in ILO, and if the present trend continues, it is doubtful that a majority of nations would look on free labor unions and private enterprise the way we do.

As we consider the future of the ILO and the possibilities of delegates having different views finding unity of purpose, I think it is well for you to read the speech of Willard Wirtz, our Secretary of Labor, as he addressed the plenary session of the International Labor Conference on Friday, June 19.

Mr. WIRTZ (Secretary of Labor, United States). Many years of infinite, if remote, respect for the ILO contribute to the personal feeling which attends now my entry upon its living tradition.

How very far the ILO has come since that organizational meeting in Washington in 1919, 45 years ago. It was then that President Woodrow Wilson said: "I am intensely interested in seeing that the First International Labor Conference under the league shall be a complete success. The Labor Conference is in the nature of the first breath of this newborn babe." If he were here today it would be to say: "My, how that baby has grown."

One of the footnotes to that 1919 record is that there was, then unknown, an Assistant Secretary of the Navy who did a good deal to make that meeting possible at all. His name was Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

You will permit me one other personal note. The distinguished Director General of the ILO and I came to our present responsibilities through the same office of the Under Secretary of Labor. I was the beneficiary in that office of the distinction with which he had endowed it. It is a pleasant confusion today to be not quite able to separate the formalities of official comment upon the report of the Director General from the impulse to hail the work of a close and valued friend.

The United States subscribes fully to the central proposal in the director general's report that the ILO action be concentrated so as to be made more effective on a limited number of comprehensive program areas. The areas identified—human resource development, labor relations, a policy for incomes, and technological change—correspond with the structure of our own current national concern.

It is in response to the director-general's emphasis on the development of a strategy for human resources development that we urge favorable consideration by the general conference of a resolution, which we have submitted, which would have the ILO assume even more active leadership in this critical area. There are 45 years here of cumulative understanding of the application in peoples' lives of the ideals of social justice, human freedom, and the integrity of the individual.

The members of the U.S. delegation return to this 48th session of the International Labor Conference with a searing lesson—how a nation finds in its hour of ultimate crisis the elements of its essential continuity. We came to know in last November's anguish, neighboring on disbelief and even bitterness, that these elements are leadership and loyalty—but that both leadership and loyalty are vital and sufficient only to the extent that they have deep roots in the lifegiving soil of great and honest faith in unifying ideals and principles.

History will conjecture and perhaps wonder how it was that there were enacted in the United States, during her period of mourning, three companion pieces of legislation, larger in their moment than any since our depression of 30 years ago; a tax reduction—and jobcreating—bill, which is already effective; a civil rights bill on which the critical vote was taken in the Senate of the United States last week; and the economic opportunity, or "war on poverty" bill, which is moving forcefully through Congress.

Part of the explanation lies in the magnificence of John F. Kennedy's inspiration and the extraordinary effectiveness of Lyndon B. Johnson's implementation. But part of it lies, too, in the fact that at that moment of unbalancing shock last November, the United States was intent on the purposes of perfecting the human ideal, of developing human resources. Had there been at that time basic divisiveness within our Nation, serious alinements of conflicting interests, I do not know how we would have met our testing.

I speak of this only for its larger meaning. Most of the world's development has come from the clashing and competition of adverse interests. Yet, a beloved Washington clergyman was to say, several years ago: "The world is rapidly becoming too dangerous for anything except the truth, and too small for anything except brotherhood."

Only part of the past is relevant prolog. It is a basic issue in contemporary world dynamics how far the previous assumptions regarding diversity and difference have been made obsolete by a technology that is often reckless, by a swelling population, and by an awakening of human hopes.

This issue abides at this conference. The agenda is heavy, and the process of decisionmaking clogged, with divisive subjectmatter.

So far as this reflects continued unresolved basic differences of principle and belief, no one would have it otherwise. We mean to put conflicting notions strongly against each other, without using gloves, which would only prolong the dispute by softening the difference. Freedom and equality and opportunity, as well as security and peace, are human desires, and they have the same essential meaning for humans everywhere. They involve truths as universal as those of natural science. The free forum is our laboratory, and argument our catalyst. There are not necessarily two right sides to every question. We want no false peace in the arena of ideas.

Yet, disagreement between honest, informed and independent men and women—tough-minded enough to be independent even of their own bias—can only be temporary, transient.

We understand the director general's report to suggest the taking of an inventory of ILO processes to assure that they are effective not only in exploring difference but in catalyzing agreements when its elements are present.

We endorse the various suggestions that research procedures should serve more directly to uncover the areas in which agreement is most likely to lie.

We assert the importance of carefully conserving the process of the ballot. Voting is no substitute for persuasion. Arrival at a consensus, at a sense of the meeting, is infinitely superior to a sharply divided vote. Even a majority is capable of tyranny. There must be finality in our decisionmaking process, but that process will be weakened if the discussion which precedes it is aimed from the start at winning a vote, rather than finding the area of common acceptance of what is true and what is right. But principles will always be more important than process, for one is a matter of ends and the other a matter of means.

We urge that the debate of the Conference proceed from the suggestions in the report to a clearer identification of the principles that unite us.

It is appropriate here only to suggest the areas in which these principles lie. One involves the reconciliation of the importance of economic and social development. This was best put in Luis Muñoz-Marín's inaugural address in 1949 as the first elected Governor of Puerto Rico. He stood there that day amidst poverty; his was the authentic voice of those in want. He said, on the one hand: "A political status * * * does not exist in an economic vacuum. * * * If a community does not develop an economy which is founded, or has hopes of being founded, on a victorious productive effort, it will see other forms of its life and liberty impeded, or decayed, or destroyed. * * * It is not a mere material convenience to be free from want." Yet, he asserted, "above all," the need exists in all people for "a high ideal of the spirit," a readiness and a desire "to create an understanding of deep and clean human fraternity. * * * To give root to attitudes that lead man to be more creative than acquisitive * * * and to destroy bitterness of race, language, and culture."

In addition to the revolution in the world today for human dignity and fundamental freedoms, there is the persistent cry for the development not only of the human spirit, but of economic man as well.

Surely it is essential to develop social values tough enough and right enough to match and control the results of technological advance. Our understanding must keep up with our knowledge. It must be completely established that one human being's rights are as important as another's. Where there has been discrimination because of the inhuman relevancy of race, belief, or color, the obligation is not just to stop overt acts of discrimination; it is to compensate for the disadvantage which is the accumulated fallout effect of decades of discrimination. No longer is it enough to assert that all men are created equal. The obligation today is for men to neutralize the inequalities which man created and which too many children draw in as their endowment with their first breath.

I suggest in conclusion our pragmatic recognition, as we seek to state our common purpose, that the future is often clearer today in the soft lantern light of faith than in the glaring headlight of reason. Eternity has already shrunk, in the illumination of logic, to a matter of minutes: that little time that can run while men live their lives a single spark away from ultimate destruction, their knowledge of power daily outstripping their wisdom about its use.

Yet to care about the future only as it will see the ascendancy of human over material values is to watch with a fascination that fights against fear a generation of machines, maturing more rapidly than any generation of human beings ever has, so that at any moment now some clanking robot in one of our countries may pull itself erect and announce: Cogito, ergo sum. Yet we remain children of unfathomable mystery, surrounded still by secrets that dwarf to insignificance what is so far known.

The only dangers, except for cataclysmic accident, are that we shall build our syllogisms too much on experience and too little on vision; that we shall forget that "the inevitable is only what we don't resist" and the unattainable only what we don't attempt; that we shall stumble and fall and be destroyed on the sword of our own stupidity. It is not the stupidity of the ignorant that threatens so much as the stupidity of the successful—who seek to protect their petty conceits behind Maginot lines of race, religion or geography, content with the little innovations of their own dubious piety, fighting change because the status quo has been good to them. The divine right of the successful is as false a notion as the divine right of kings.

We look ahead knowing the future is still infinite if we will stretch our minds far enough and fast enough to keep ideals abreast of ideas; if we will reassess, under technology's pressure, the revolutionary new relationship between war and peace and between work and leisure; if we will seize that sense of the future that will let us stand on a clear night and look up at a heaven full of more stars than the number of all the men and women who have ever lived, and realize that those stars are now very close to our reach and are part of our children's future.

The charge upon the International Labor Organization was put to us in Washington last year by President Radhakrishnan of India. "We must remember," he said, in a

> phrase that I shall never forget, "that man is an unfinished being."

The question arises as to how much dialog should the worker, employer, and Government individuals from the United States engage in. I believe it would be possible for the U.S. position to be developed with more communication between these three groups. Even though we strongly oppose monolithic authority and want to protect the individual initiative of free trade unions, representatives of private enterprise, and the representatives of the Government, an effort to find areas in which they are united, which I believe are more prevalent than the differences, would not necessarily harm the tripartite structure of the ILO. Along this line, I would especially want to quote from the speech of Secretary Wirtz which already has been placed before you:

> We assert the importance of carefully conserving the process of the ballot. Voting is no substitute for persuasion. Arrival at a consensus, at a sense of the meeting, is infinitely superior to a sharply divided vote. Even a majority is capable of tyranny. There must be finality in our decisionmaking process, but that process will be weakened if the discussion which precedes it is aimed from the start at winning a vote, rather than finding the area of common acceptance of what is true and what is right. But principles will always be more important than process, for one is a matter of ends and the other a matter of means.
>
> We urge that the debate of the Conference proceed from the suggestions in the report to a clearer identification of the principles that unite us.

With the difficulty the United States is having with the Communist nations in particular, some people recommend that we withdraw from the ILO. I think this would be unwise. No matter how difficult we find the going in international organizations like the ILO, I think it is important that we remain a member and aggressively promote our views and beliefs. In this regard, I should point out that the National Association of Manufacturers has withdrawn from participation in the ILO due to the admittance of employer delegates from Communist countries. The chamber of commerce has chosen to continue to participate. I believe this is the wise action to take since the developing nations can be compared to children who many times seem brash in finding their way in the adult alliance of nations.

CONFERENCE DOMINANCE OF THE GOVERNING BODY AND THE DIRECTOR GENERAL

As I pointed out in the historical background, the Conference meets for 3 weeks once each year to develop resolutions, elect members to the governing body, and act as a general discussion and debate organization for representatives of the 110 members of the ILO. The main work of the ILO is done by its executive officers under the direction of the Director General and policy considerations throughout the year are determined through the assistance of the governing board which appoints the Director. The Communists in particular, have been urging the change in the structure giving primary authority to the Conference. An example of this is evidenced by excerpts of a speech by Mr. Dzunov, Federal Secretary for Labor, Yugoslavia, before the plenary session on Monday, June 22:

> The Conference should be the main and supreme authority of the ILO, a forum in which the policy and activities of the Organization would be determined in a fully democratic way. Past experience has in fact shown that, owing to the restricted competence of the Conference and the unsolved problems in regard to the composition of the other main bodies of the ILO, the majority of countries have so far been practically deprived of the possibility of exercising an effective influence on the orientation, program and forms of activity of the ILO.
>
> The Conference should determine the activity of the Organization as a whole and be responsible for the drawing up of its agenda.
>
> The Conference should have an effective insight into the practical implementation of its decisions and resolutions, and be regularly and fully informed about the implementation of its decisions left to the care of the governing body or of another of its organs.
>
> The Conference should decide on the election of the Director General.

The present situation is described in the following quote from the report of the Director General:

> ### Relationship Between the Conference and the Governing Body
>
> Any discussion of the future role of the Conference necessarily poses in some degree the question of the relationship between the Conference and the governing body, a matter of which there has been some discussion in recent years. The question comprises three elements, the representative character of the governing body, the part played by the governing body in the work of the Organization as a whole, and the manner in which the Conference, as the only body representative of the whole membership of the Organization, is kept informed of, and when necessary associated with, decisions taken by the governing body.
>
> The need for a wider representation in the governing body of the growing membership of the Organization has recurred at intervals in the course of the development of the Organization. The governing body originally consisted of only 24 persons. By an amendment to the constitution adopted in 1922, which did not enter into force until 1934, the number was increased to 32. By a further amendment adopted in 1953, which entered into force in 1954, the size of the governing body was again increased from 32 to 40 persons. By a still further amendment adopted in 1962, which had received on March 8, 1963, 45 of the 71 ratifications necessary to bring it into force, provision is made for increasing the size of the governing body a third time from 40 to 48. There is also provision for 10 elected deputy members in each group; the employers' and workers' groups also elect substitute members, of whom there are at present 11 in the employers' group and 10 in the workers' group. In these circumstances, the number of places should certainly be large enough to permit of the election of a fully representative governing body.
>
> Questions have been raised in the Conference and representations made to the Director General concerning the extent to which the governing body as at present composed is in fact reasonably representative of the Organization as a whole. The general principle that the governing body should be fully representative in character does not appear to be open to discussion, but the application of this principle is essentially a matter for the electoral colleges of the government, employers' and workers' groups respectively.
>
> While it is important that the governing body should be fully representative of the Organization as a whole, the need, particularly in a tripartite organization, for a strong governing body with real authority and the full confidence of employers and workers must not be underestimated.
>
> The Conference delegation on constitutional questions in its report on the work of its first session (January–February 1946) defined the position in the following terms:
>
> "75. The unique strength of the International Labor Organization derives from the manner in which the tripartite system makes it representative of workers and employers as well as governments. It is this strength which has made it a power in the world, has enabled it to survive the disruptive influences of war, and gives it the vitality to confront with a bold freshness of approach the problems arising from the war. All ILO action derives from a chain of a representational character. The foundation of the Organization is the member States which appoint their delegates to the Conference. The delegates to the Conference, acting through the electoral colleges, appoint the elective part of the governing body, the nonelective part being representational in another way. The governing body appoints the Director of the International Labor Office who, subject to the instructions of the governing body, is responsible for the efficient conduct of the International Labor Office and for such other duties as may be assigned to him. It is the existence of this chain of responsibility which gives its distinctive character to the International Labor Office, the work of which grows out of and in its turn contributes to the formulation of policy by the responsible representatives of the peoples of the world, acting through their governments and their employers' and workers' organizations.
>
> "76. In this chain of responsibility the governing body is a vital link * * *."
>
> This characterization of the position is the more interesting and significant in that it was not the handiwork of a governing body committee but that of a body appointed by and responsible to the Conference itself. The same general conception was more fully developed in the first report of the International Labor Organization to the United Nations, which describes the role of the governing body in the Organization as follows:
>
> "The governing body plays a key role in the International Labor Organization. It has a general responsibility for coordinating the activities of the Organization into an overall program which can be fulfilled within the limits of the financial resources available and modified rapidly when necessary to take account of changing needs or priorities.
>
> "Under the constitution and constitutional practice of the Organization, the governing body has the primary responsibility for fixing the formal agenda of the International Labor Conference. This responsibility is not exclusive, since the Conference itself also has authority to decide at any session to include a question in the agenda of the following session. It is, however, unusual for the Conference to exercise this power except for the purpose of including in the agenda of the second session of the Conference questions being considered by a double discussion procedure which have already been placed on the agenda of the Conference for a first discussion by a governing body decision. This concentration in the governing body of effective responsibility for determining the agenda of the Conference has been of inestimable value in enabling the Conference to concentrate its energies at each successive session on a limited number of well-defined subjects, on which it is called upon to take definite decisions. The Conference also has an opportunity, on the occasion of the discussion of the Director General's report, to undertake a broad survey of the whole field of social policy and thus to bring into focus further issues which call for

detailed consideration by appropriate procedures.

"Under the established constitutional practice of the Organization, the governing body is also responsible for convening other meetings held under the auspices of the International Labor Organization, fixing the dates and duration of such meetings, determining their agenda, and deciding what action shall be taken on the basis of the reports or resolutions adopted by them. These functions of the governing body make it possible to integrate the work of the various conferences and committees, including the work done on an industrial or regional basis by the industrial committees and by regional conferences, within the framework of the general activities and policy of the Organization.

"The financial regulations of the Organization assign to the governing body important functions in connection with the budget of the Organization. It examines annually the proposed budget submitted to it by the Director General, and approves the estimates submitted to the Conference for adoption. The close supervision exercised by the governing body over all the activities of the Organization makes it singularly well qualified to judge of the financial resources necessary to permit the economical and efficient discharge of the responsibilities assigned to the Organization by its members."

The General Assembly of the United Nations, the Economic and Social Council and governments generally have been increasingly and rightly concerned with better coordination in international organization. In the International Labor Organization the governing body is the linchpin of such coordination, both as regards the multifarious activities of the International Labor Organization itself and as regards the relationship of these activities with those of other members of the United Nations family and of other organizations, international and regional. As the 1946 Conference delegation said (report on the work of its first session, par. 79), "in order that the International Labor Organization may continue to operate efficiently it requires a strong governing body which continues to enjoy the full confidence of the members of the Organization." It is therefore vital that the steps which may become necessary from time to time to revitalize such confidence in changing circumstances should never have the effect of impairing the capacity of the governing body to fulfill the central coordinating responsibility which the efficient conduct of the work of the International Labor Organization requires.

One important element in the necessary balance of authority between the governing body and the Conference is that the Conference should be kept fully and regularly informed of matters of general interest and in particular of the manner in which effect is given to its own decisions. With this end in view the 1962 session of the Conference adopted unanimously a resolution requesting the inclusion each year in the Director General's report to the Conference of a chapter setting out the steps taken to give effect to the resolutions of previous sessions and the results achieved. This may help the Conference to enjoy the fullest opportunity to play vigorously and effectively the major role in adjusting the work of the Organization to the needs of a changing world which clearly belongs to it as the only body representative of the whole membership of the organization.

I think it would be extremely unwise for the Conference to have the kind of authority which the Communist bloc nations have been proposing and which many of the developing nations seem to have joined in urging. The Conference is a huge body meeting for 3 weeks once each year. The largest number of delegates have never been in attendance before, and therefore, spend much of their time learning the structure of the operation. They have particular axes to grind concerning their country and their region and do not have a firm grasp of the overall purposes and possible accomplishments of the ILO. This group can be moved by emotional appeals and not have an opportunity to be thoroughly appraised of the ILO work. Many of them do not make the decisions themselves but must be in constant touch with their government at home as to the actions they should take. Therefore, we should constantly guard against a breakdown in the authority of the Director General and the governing body.

THE NEW ALLIANCE OF 75 DEVELOPING NATIONS

When I arrived at the ILO Conference, the first order of business on the opening day was the election of the president of the Conference. Due to the policy of rotation, it was Latin America's turn to select the man for president. They had chosen Mr. Aguilar, of Venezuela. The Communist bloc countries had made a deal with the Asians to support Mr. Raza of Pakistan this year in return for support for a Communist bloc president next year. It appeared that Africa was going to go along with the Asians, and Mr. Aguilar whom the West was supporting would be defeated. However, during the trade conference which had just completed its work when the ILO Conference convened, an alliance of 75 nations of Asia, Africa, and Latin America was formed. This was the alliance of developing nations counteracting the views of the industrial nations.

You can see the probability of such an alliance in a trade conference. However, when the ILO Conference met, speakers referred to this alliance, and some of the Africans bemoaned the fact that they were seeing a breakdown in the spirit of the 75 in the first order of business in this Conference. In what appeared to me to be an unprecedented action, the African, Asian, and Latin American delegates asked to have the hall cleared. Delegates from all other nations and spectators were asked to leave.

In the session that ensued, the 75 met alone and agreed to support Mr. Aguilar, of Venezuela this year and Mr. Raza, of Pakistan next year. With 75 out of the 110 delegates, you can see the strength which these developing nations have. This surely did not appeal to the Communist bloc, and Mr. Borisov of the U.S.S.R. stood up immediately after this action was announced and stated that he wanted it to be known that no agreement such as this was acceptable to them.

The first action in the conference of the 75 was a success for the West. The group who most aggressively pursued the alliance within the Organization were the Africans. This was evidenced in the selection of officers of some of the committees of the Conference. I think this alliance should be watched closely. Undoubtedly, there will be more causes for a breakdown of such an alliance than there will be to hold it together. However, if the alliance should hold up and flourish, not only in the ILO but in other organizations, even the United Nations itself, this could have a very important effect on international organizations, and it may be detrimental to the United States.

Mr. Speaker, this pretty well covers my report on the actions as I viewed it in the short period of time I was at the Conference. The comments of the delegates from the United States will be on record as will the final results of this year's Conference after July 9.

I might point out in conclusion that just as in the United Nations, the United States pays the lion's share of the ILO—25 percent. We have been overgenerous not only in financial participation but in the few votes which we have. Russia is represented by Byelorussia, Ukraine, and the U.S.S.R. Byelorussia pays 0.45 percent of the ILO budget; Ukraine, 1 percent; and U.S.S.R., 10 percent; making a total of 11.45 percent, while the United States pays 25 percent. They have three sets of delegates and we only have one set. In other international organizations, as well as the ILO, I think we should have constant efforts to adjust the financial participation and voting participation of the United States to a more equitable basis.

PAN AMERICAN CELEBRATES ITS SILVER ANNIVERSARY OF TRANSATLANTIC SERVICE

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, commercial air service across the Atlantic, inaugurated by Pan American Airways 25 years ago, observed its silver anniversary on June 28.

The departure of the silver anniversary flight from Pan Am's glistening umbrella-shaped terminal at John F. Kennedy International Airport, New York, was vastly different from the takeoff of history's first flight of paying passengers across the Atlantic on June 28, 1939.

On that day, 5,000 spectators cheered and a brass band played as 22 passengers filed out on a yacht-type pier in Manhasset Bay at Port Washington, Long Island, N.Y., to board the *Dixie Clipper*, an appropriately named flying boat capable of the then considerable cruising speed of 150 miles per hour.

That plane, a Boeing 314, took 42 hours and 10 minutes to fly to Marseille via the Azores and Lisbon. It was in the air a total of 29 hours and 20 minutes.

The Boeing 707–321 fan-jet clipper, which operated the silver anniversary flight, cruises four times as fast and can carry as many as 161 passengers. In the same amount of time its predecessor required to reach Marseille, it was more than three-quarters of the way around the world.

Mr. Speaker, 42 hours and 10 minutes after taking off from New York, the Boeing jet clipper was two-thirds of the way from Tokyo to Honolulu, having stopped at London, Frankfurt, Vienna, Istanbul, Beirut, Karachi, Calcutta, Rangoon, Bankok, Hong Kong and Tokyo.

That pioneering venture of June 28, 1939 has grown into the world's most heavily traveled international tourism and trade route. The first flight was followed by twice-weekly Pan Am flights and at the end of 1939, Pan Am proudly announced that it had crossed the Atlantic 100 times. In the ensuing years the pace quickened, and on June 28, 1955, 16 years after the first flight, Pan Am crossed the Atlantic its 50,000th time. There were 1,175,000 passengers on those 50,000 flights.

In the next 7 years, the number of crossings and passengers leaped forward spectacularly. On July 2, 1962, Pan Am's 100,000th flight crossed the Atlantic and the airline anounced that 3,590,000 passengers had flown on those 100,000 flights.

The second 50,000 flights were operated in half as many years and carried more than twice as many passengers as the first 50,000 flights.

And that growth continues, Mr. Speaker. The silver anniversary flight, one of Pan Am's two daily round-the-world flights, was the airline's 120,443d flight across the Atlantic. The number of Pan Am passengers across the Atlantic reached 4,900,000 by June 28, 1964. Pan Am now flies the Atlantic 222 times every week as part of its service to 114 cities in 86 lands around the world.

Behind these statistics is the story of the Pan Am people who helped realize the vision of the airline's founder and president, Juan T. Trippe, who foresaw aerial conquest of the oceans.

For every employee of Pan Am—mechanic, salesman, engineer, pilot, designer, stewardess—June 28 was a very significant date. And for one member of the crew of the silver anniversary flight, the date has added importance. Purser Kenlynn Williams Grisim was born in Janesville, Wis., the day the *Dixie Clipper* made time fly.

Mr. Speaker, in my capacity as chairman of the Aviation Subcommittee of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, I take great personal pride in congratulating Pan American on the anniversary of this historic event. Pan American's contributions as a pioneer in international air transportation have been so extensive that hardly a day goes by without the observance of one anniversary or another, of major or minor consequence. But, Mr. Speaker, when an air carrier has been flying the Atlantic Ocean for 25 years it is certainly an event which should be marked by all Members of this body.

Mr. BOLAND. Will the gentleman from Mississippi yield, please?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I will be glad to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND].

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the profiles in courage that engulf the airline industry are very great indeed. Pan American Airways began flying the Atlantic Ocean in 1939. This, and the jet era that ultimately followed, has been a most consequential period in the aviation history of the United States.

However, I like to think of Pan Am in its contributions to this Nation's supply line during World War II, the Korean airlift and the Berlin crisis. Many thousands of this airline's employees were unsung heroes during these periods of national concern. Whatever situation may face us, however soon, in regard to international logistics, I, and I am sure all Americans, take comfort in the proximity and dedication of Pan Am.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SIBAL].

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to join with the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi, chairman of the Aviation Subcommittee of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, in celebrating the 25th anniversary of commercial air transport across the North Atlantic by Pan American Airways.

It is my objective, Mr. Speaker, not only to congratulate Pan American on this historic occasion, but to salute so many of my constituents who live in the Fourth Congressional District of Connecticut and who work for this great international air carrier.

For example, Sam Pryor, of Greenwich, has been a vice president of Pan Am since 1941 and the history of his contributions to Pan Am and the United States is well known. The airport development program, by which many hundreds of airports were created for the allied cause during World War II all over the world, was a Pan American operation directed by Sam Pryor.

President Truman, Mr. Speaker, saw fit to bestow upon Sam Pryor the Medal of Merit for his contributions to the war effort. This is particularly significant considering that for a considerable period of time Mr. Pryor was Republican National committeeman from Connecticut and also vice chairman of the party.

From my home town, Norwalk, comes Roger B. Doulens, an officer of Pan Am's in Washington. Roger was an outstanding athlete and newspaperman and creative writer in our district before joining the Armed Forces and rising from buck private to major in the Army Air Force on the staff, in China, of Gen. Albert C. Wedemeyer.

There are many more, Mr. Speaker, including Norm Blake, a vice president of Pan American living in Greenwich; John S. Woodbridge, the company's comptroller and a resident of Darien.

Harley Mead, Don Thomson, Jim Fox, Vice President John Gates, Dick Smith, Paul Velte, Sam Kauffman, vice president of engineering; Ev Goulard, vice president of industrial relations; Bob Crassweller, Norman Seagrave, Bob Bell, Pete Cornwall, Clif Cooke, John Paine, George Politi, John Ogilvie, Spence Garrett, Paul Rennell, Russ Morey, Pete Haaren, Dick Blair, and Jack Lillis are only a few of the many Pan Am employees who reside and vote in my congressional district.

To them I extend a special message of congratulations on a continuing job well done.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FRIEDEL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, it is always a pleasure to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Mississippi who is also the most distinguished chairman of our Subcommittee on Transportation and Aeronautics.

Pan American's history, insofar as the city of Baltimore is concerned, is of both old and recent vintage. In the early days of Pan Am many a flying boat departed from Baltimore headed for European ports. In recent years, Pan American's development of a Latin American market for the city of Baltimore and the State of Maryland has been most successful. When Friendship actually became an international airport many years ago, Pan American was pioneering with direct service between Friendship and San Juan, Puerto Rico, and on to the important trade markets of the Caribbean and South American areas.

Ultimately, Pan American began service out of Friendship to London and Paris and beyond. Friendship International Airport is an interesting base of operations for most of our air carriers. It is unfortunate that Friendship does not enjoy the amount of service that the population and the enthusiasm of the community indicate.

Left to its own devices and resources, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that Pan American could do more than is now being done to improve service from Friendship Airport and to keep its prestige intact. It goes without saying that I am a fierce proponent of Friendship Airport and a great believer in the system of free enterprise which has made the continuing development of Pan Am possible.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I have known and respected numerous Pan American personnel, especially its great president, Mr. Juan T. Trippe, for many years. I think that perhaps our evaluation of Mr. Trippe in this colloquy has been all too modest. The creation of Pan American has been the result of the tremendous vision of one man plus the unqualified and devoted loyalty of many tens of thousands of employees. In Florida alone, at the present time, there are more than 7,000 Pan American employees and their families living in the Greater Miami area. They are proud of their company and we are proud of them. They have been with us a long time and I anticipate that they will remain for many years to come. On this occasion of the celebration of the 25th anniversary of Pan American's crossing of the Atlantic, I salute Mr. Trippe and his great corps of personnel who have contributed so much for nearly 40 years to the preeminence in international air transport of the U.S. flag.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I am well aware of the accomplishments of Pan American over the past 37 years since inauguration of service from Key West in 1927. However, I have always been impressed with other manifestations of public service by its one and only president, Mr. Juan T. Trippe.

Many of our colleagues may not be aware, Mr. Speaker, that education is of consuming interest to Mr. Trippe. He has been, for a considerable period of time, a trustee of the Yale Corp. which guides the financial destinies of Yale University.

He is also a director of the National Fund for Medical Education and is a director of the Committee for Corporate Support of American Universities.

Mr. Trippe's contributions to the world of aviation are well known, Mr. Speaker; I think it important that his participation in the world of education be likewise illuminated.

THE IMF CREDIT TO NASSER: FURTHER COMMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LIBONATI). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, on May 26 the International Monetary Fund announced a standby arrangement with the United Arab Republic authorizing drawings up to $40 million for 1 year. The approval came in response to the evident efforts of the Egyptians to stabilize their economy.

The United Arab Republic reportedly has agreed to increase taxes on imports, increase social security taxes, and initiate a new tax on payments "for certain invisible transactions." All this, according to the Fund management, established the basis for Egypt's eligibility.

The fact that approval was given to the arrangement immediately after Khrushchev's lengthy visit, and immediately before the American visit of Israel's Prime Minister, should not blind us to the reality, that this transaction was negotiated over a period of months in accordance with normal IMF criteria and procedures.

At the same time, it should be pointed out that the conditions under which the grant was approved are extremely liberal. The United Arab Republic has been permitted to draw to the limit, under repeatedly revised prescriptions, and it is legitimate to question the basis for these transactions which inevitably must amount to an expressed confidence in the ability and purpose of the Egyptian Government.

At the beginning, there are certain specifics involving the mechanics of this standby credit which should be digested. The United Arab Republic requested that its IMF quota be increased from $90 to $120 million. Egypt had fully exhausted her drawing power under the $90 million quota. This request was approved by the Board of Governors, after which, in the verbiage of the Fund, the Egyptian Government "expressed its consent" to the approval of its request.

The United Arab Republic, previous to its new quota, had drawn the full 200 percent allowable. This involved a drawing within its first credit tranche and a $42.5 million standby arrangement, under which the entire amount was drawn in 1963. This latter arrangement was negotiated in accordance with the Egyptian Government's introduction of a "stabilization" plan.

The increase in the United Arab Republic quota to $120 million automatically established eligibility for further loans. The recently announced $40 million agreement, upon which Egypt can draw throughout the next 12 months, again represents the full 200 percent of her receiving power.

It is my understanding that this new arrangement is aimed at strengthening the Egyptian international payments position. It was tendered for foreign exchange purposes.

The credit extension was recommended by the management of the Fund following the usual analysis and review accorded all such requests.

Nonetheless, I am advised that there was considerable opposition to the agreement from both French and British quarters. Nor can we suppose that the strong American support for the loan was totally lacking in political motivation. It would be misleading to believe that a foreign economic policy is disconnected from political objectives, regardless of whether these objectives are bilaterally sought or channeled through an international organ.

This, of course, is no reflection upon the professional competence and integrity of the Fund's staff. They are a highly skilled group. The management applies its fiscal and economic criteria in the process of recommending action. It is, finally, the member governments who register approval or disapproval, and I cannot conceive of a government decision in this context, or any other, which does not blend with its general foreign policy perspectives. Any international being is, in the final analysis, a creature of the member states and accordingly reflects their often diverse wills.

In the matter of the recent $40 million standby agreement, I cannot agree with the U.S. action in support of the arrangement. It does not seem to me that the Egyptian Government has genuinely established a groundwork which could warrant such a liberal credit extension.

I have said this before. The Nasser regime has been engaged in an awesome weapons procurement program which is consuming valuable foreign exchange. Moreover, there is no rational basis for this program; no state is willfully set upon attacking the United Arab Republic. Colonel Nasser's arms buildup is the direct source of the instability in the Middle East, and as long as the United States permits the Egyptian Government by its action to divert large internal resources toward that buildup, the instability can only increase.

This is the basis for my judgment. An underdeveloped country is, I believe, eligible for bilateral and multilateral assistance if it demonstrates that it is genuinely and overwhelmingly committed to its own economic self-improvement. Many factors must be weighed in coming to this conclusion. I cannot believe that the Egyptian Government is justifying the American support which has been rendered.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mrs. HANSEN (at the request of Mr. ASPINALL), for 30 minutes, on July 1; to revise and extend her remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MONAGAN, for 30 minutes, July 1, 1964, vacating his special order of today.

Mr. HALPERN (at the request of Mr. MOSHER), for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan (at the request of Mr. MOSHER), for 60 minutes, on July 1.

Mr. BOW (at the request of Mr. MOSHER), for 60 minutes, on July 1.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. WHITE.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MOSHER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. JENSEN.

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan and to include tables.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MATSUNAGA) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. POWELL.

Mr. CAMERON.

Mr. NIX.

Mr. ST. ONGE.

Mr. FASCELL.

Mr. EDMONDSON.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 388. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Nebraska midstate division, Missouri River Basin project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1186. An act to amend the act authorizing the Crooked River Federal Reclamation project to provide for the irrigation of additional lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 9876. An act to amend the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act of 1961 by extending its provisions for 2 additional years and providing for a special project and study;

H.R. 10053. An act to amend section 502 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, relating to construction differential subsidies;

H.R. 10314. An act to further amend the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended, to extend the expiration date of certain authorities, thereunder, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 11376. An act to provide a 1-year extension of certain excise-tax rates, and for other purposes.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on the following dates present to the President, for his approval, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On June 29, 1964:

H.R. 3941. An act to amend section 902 of title 38, United States Code, to eliminate the offset against burial allowances paid by the Veterans' Administration for amounts paid by burial associations;

H.R. 5514. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain public lands in the State of Arizona;

H.R. 6777. An act to amend section 712 of title 38 of the United States Code to provide for waiver of premiums for certain veterans holding national service life insurance policies who become or have become totally disabled before their 65th birthday;

H.R. 6920. An act to amend section 715 of title 38, United States Code, to authorize, under certain conditions, the issuance of total disability income provisions for inclusion in national service life insurance policies to provide coverage to age 65;

H.R. 8462. An act to authorize the conveyance of certain real property of the United States heretofore granted to the city of Grand Prairie, Tex., for public airport purposes, contingent upon approval by the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, and to provide for the conveyance to the United States of certain real property now used by such city for public airport purposes;

H.R. 10000. An act to extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, and for other purposes;

H.R. 11499. An act to amend section 14(b) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, to extend for 2 years the authority of Federal Reserve banks to purchase U.S. obligations directly from the Treasury; and

H.J. Res. 1041. Joint resolution temporarily extending the program of insured rental housing loans for the elderly in rural areas under title V of the Housing Act of 1949.

On June 30, 1964:

H.R. 9876. An act to amend the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act of 1961 by extending its provisions for 2 additional years and providing for a special project and study;

H.R. 10053. An act to amend section 502 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, relating to construction differential subsidies; and

H.R. 10314. An act to further amend the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended, to extend the expiration date of certain authorities, thereunder, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, July 1, 1964, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2237. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting supplementary report of the earthquake reconstruction and rehabilitation program for Chile, Agency for International Development, Department of State; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2238. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to encourage and facilitate details and transfers of Federal employees for service with international organizations"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2239. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on a review relating to unnecessary costs to the Government in the leasing of electronic data processing systems by the Goodyear Aerospace Corp., Akron, Ohio, Department of Defense; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2240. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report relating to unnecessary costs incurred in the procurement of aircraft engine ring and vane assemblies from the Allison Division of General Motors Corp., Department of the Navy; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2241. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on a review relating to deficiencies in the administration of the earthquake reconstruction and rehabilitation program for Chile, Agency for the International Development, Department of State; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2242. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting the report of the Attorney General pursuant to section 2 of Public Law 88–115, the joint resolution of September 6, 1963, consenting to the renewal of the interstate compact to conserve oil and gas; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2243. A letter from the Clerk, U.S. Court of Claims, relative to House Resolution 739, 87th Congress, dated August 20, 1962, relating to the decision in the *Glidden Co.* v. *Zdanok* (370 U.S. 530); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2244. A letter from the Clerk, U.S. Court of Claims, relative to House Resolution 797, 87th Congress, dated September 18, 1962, relating to the decision in *Glidden Co.* v. *Zdanok* (370 U.S. 530); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BONNER: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. S. 1006. An act to amend the act of June 12, 1960, for the correction of inequities in the construction of fishing vessels, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1524). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HOLIFIELD: Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. H.R. 11832. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, the Atomic Energy Community Act of 1955, as amended, and the Euratom Cooperation Act of 1958, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 1525). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ASPINALL: Committee of conference. S. 2. An act to establish water resources research centers at land-grant colleges and State universities, to stimulate water research at other colleges, universities, and centers of competence, and to promote a more adequate national program of water research (Rept. No. 1526). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. MADDEN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 789. Resolution to provide for the concurrence of the House of Representatives to the Senate amendment to H.R. 7152; without amendment (Rept. No. 1527). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. YOUNG: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 792. Resolution to grant additional travel authority to the Committee on Agriculture; without amendment (Rept. No. 1528). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H.R. 11832. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, the Atomic Energy Community Act of 1955, as amended, and the Euratom Cooperation Act of 1958, as amended; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 11833. A bill to amend the Trade Expansion Act of 1962; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHENOWETH:

H.R. 11834. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Florissant Fossil Beds National Monument in the State of Colorado, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 11835. A bill to increase from 2 to 2½ percent the computation factor used in the determination of annuities under the Civil Service Retirement Act of employees engaged in criminal investigation and detention duties; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HAWKINS:

H.R. 11836. A bill to authorize the commissioning of a sculpture or other work, to be placed at the Capitol, representing the contribution of minority groups to America; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. REID of New York:

H.R. 11837. A bill to amend titles I, II, III of the Immigration and Nationality Act and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 11838. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to extend its protection to additional employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H.R. 11839. A bill to provide for the designation of a national flower; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BROTZMAN:

H.R. 11840. A bill to provide for the designation of a national flower; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CHENOWETH:

H.R. 11841. A bill to provide for the designation of a national flower; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H.R. 11842. A bill to provide for the designation of a national flower; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MacGREGOR:

H.R. 11843. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code, so as to provide for the appointment of one additional district judge for the district of Minnesota; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11844. A bill to require the establishment, on the basis of the 19th and subsequent decennial censuses, of congressional districts composed of contiguous and compact territory for the election of Representatives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11845. A bill relating to the tariff treatment of parts designed for use or chiefly used in agricultural or horticultural implements or in tractors suitable for agricultural use; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MAY:

H.R. 11846. A bill to amend the act of August 19, 1958, to permit purchase of processed food grain products in addition to purchase of flour and cornmeal and donating the same for certain domestic and foreign purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MONTOYA:

H.R. 11847. A bill to provide for the transfer of receipts of the Colorado River development fund to the Upper Colorado River Basin fund, commencing with fiscal year 1967 and as long thereafter as necessary to reimburse said basin fund for its contributions to Hoover Dam powerplant deficiencies; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RIEHLMAN:

H.R. 11848. A bill to amend the Trade Expansion Act of 1962; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROGERS of Texas:

H.R. 11849. A bill to protect consumers by requiring that imported meat and meat food products made in whole or in part with imported meat bear a label showing the country of origin of such imported meat; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 11850. A bill to amend title I of the Housing Act of 1949 to require, as a condition of assistance thereunder, that a community have an effective minimum standards housing code and make certain expenditures for general code enforcement programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.R. 11851. A bill to repeal the provisions of the Railroad Retirement Act which reduce the annuities of the spouses of retired employees, and the survivors of deceased employees, by the amount of certain monthly benefits payable under the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 11852. A bill to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil service retirement and disability fund; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 11853. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that annuities awarded for disability under the Civil Service Retirement Act shall not be subject to the income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 11854. A bill to indemnify dairy farmers; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CAREY:

H.R. 11855. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish a Court of Veterans' Appeals and to prescribe its jurisdiction and functions; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.J. Res. 1085. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEGGETT:

H.J. Res. 1086. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McLOSKEY:

H.J. Res. 1087. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.J. Res. 1088. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TUCK:

H.J. Res. 1089. Joint resolution prohibiting the Federal Trade Commission from promulgating or enforcing rules or regulations requiring the labeling of cigarettes with respect to their effect on human health until duly authorized by the Congress; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RIEHLMAN:

H.J. Res. 1090. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H.J. Res. 1091. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SECREST:

H.J. Res. 1092. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CEDERBERG:

H.J. Res. 1093. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BETTS:

H.J. Res. 1094. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRAY:

H.J. Res. 1095. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEVINE:

H.J. Res. 1096. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATTHEWS:

H.J. Res. 1097. Resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROTZMAN:

H.J. Res. 1098. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to succession to the Presidency and Vice Presidency and to cases where the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H.J. Res. 1099. Joint resolution authorizing and directing the National Institutes of Health to undertake a fair, impartial, and controlled test of Krebiozen; and directing the Food and Drug Administration to withhold action on any new drug application before it on Krebiozen until the completion of such test; and authorizing to be appropriated to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare the sum of $250,000; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CLEVELAND:

H.J. Res. 1100. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MacGREGOR:

H. Res. 797. Resolution establishing a Special Committee on the Captive Nations; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Pennsylvania, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting Governor Scranton to intercede in behalf of the people of Pennsylvania in regard to the mushroom industry, which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARRY:

H.R. 11856. A bill for the relief of Napoleon and Panagiota Tsounis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRADEMAS:

H.R. 11857. A bill for the relief of Luigi Giovani Borelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GURNEY:

H.R. 11858. A bill for the relief of Charlotte Schulz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 11859. A bill for the relief of the children of Margaret Wint; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H.R. 11860. A bill for the relief of Bianchina Franceschini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OLSON of Minnesota:

H.R. 11861. A bill for the relief of Arthur Noel John Pearman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama:

H.R. 11862. A bill for the relief of John William Daugherty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN of New York:

H.R. 11863. A bill for the relief of David A. Senior; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:

H.R. 11864. A bill for the relief of Antonio Gerardo Pinto, Rosalia Reale Pinto and minor child, Miguel Antonio Pinto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

947. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to opposition to H.R. 11650, House Joint Resolution 1046 and House Joint Resolution 1047; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

948. Also, Petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to take necessary steps to refer the southeast Asia affair to the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

949. Also petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to the action of the Supreme Court of the United States relative to the present structure of the Florida Legislature; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Congo Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 30, 1964

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, today the Republic of the Congo—Léopoldville—celebrates the fourth anniversary of her independence. We would like to take this opportunity to extend warm felicitations to His Excellency the President of the Republic, Joseph Kasavubu; and to the Congolese Chargé d'Affaires to the United States, Mario Cardoso.

The Republic of the Congo—Léopoldville—is situated in the heart of Africa. With only a small window on the Atlantic Ocean at the mouth of the Congo River, the country covers most of the Congo River basin, one of the great river systems of the continent. Its inland waterways are the main means of transportation in the country, although roads and railways are needed to circumvent its waterfalls and cataracts.

To the east, the Republic extends to the lakes of the Great Rift Valley: Lake Tanganyika, Lake Kivu, Lake Edward, and Lake Albert. Thus, its eastern area with its fairly temperate weather in the higher territory borders on East Africa and the headwaters of the Nile. This region is in contrast to the tropical rain forest which covers one half of the Republic's area. Lying in or near the equator, the air is tropically hot and humid and the land rich in tropical flora and fauna.

It was across East Africa from Zanzibar, Lake Victoria, and Lake Tanganyika that Henry Stanley made his historic trans-African trip in the mid-1870's that established the source of the Congo River. As he traveled up the Lualaba River and then down the Congo, this hardy explorer had to fight for practically every mile as he and his party struggled over the river's natural obstacles.

The Belgian king quickly sensed the economic possibilities of the Congo and took control of it. In 1908 the region became the Belgian Congo. After agitation in the late 1950's, Belgium agreed to grant the Congo its independence on June 30, 1960. On September 20 of that year the Congo was admitted to the United Nations. Since that time the government has made valiant efforts to solve the problems that have faced the newly independent country. The United Nations has been of great assistance, as has our own Government.

The country is economically well endowed. Its mineral wealth, particularly in copper, diamonds, cobalt, and uranium, is already contributing greatly to the revenue of that country. It also has a great potential in hydroelectric power.

On its 4th anniversary, we salute the Republic of the Congo and wish it well for the future.

Corning Glass Donates to Project Hope

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 30, 1964

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, the success of our people-to-people programs overseas—particularly the great work carried on by Project Hope—is only possible with the support and cooperation of individual Americans and U.S. business and industrial concerns.

I was proud to learn that one of our Nation's leading glass manufacturing companies, Corning Glass, recently donated more than 70,000 individual pieces of laboratory glassware for use on the SS *Hope* hospital ship's forthcoming mission to Africa.

I am particularly proud because much of this laboratory glassware was manufactured in Corning's Muskogee, Okla., plant.

As an original supporter of Project Hope and similar people-to-people programs, I take this opportunity to congratulate and express my appreciation to the Corning Glass Works Foundation, and also to congratulate the many Muskogee employees of Corning who worked on this project.

The Corning donation is most significant and worthwhile. It will bring direct benefits to thousands in the form of improved health and sanitation, on the troubled African Continent where communism is fighting daily to subvert and overthrow free governments.

The donation undoubtedly will bring long-range benefits to every citizen of the United States by helping to create a bond of friendship and understanding between the people of America and the emerging nations of Africa.

Every Muskogeean and every other Corning employee who worked on this project can be proud of the part they have played in exporting American know-how and friendship to the underdeveloped countries of the world. They have certainly earned a debt of gratitude for being responsible and worthwhile citizens, aware of the challenging nature of today's world and the burden of responsibility upon the people of our great Nation.

A Salute to a Great American—the Honorable Marvin Jones, of Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 30, 1964

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, on last Tuesday night a reception was given by the members of the University Club here in honor of the Chief Judge of the U.S. Court of Claims, the Honorable Marvin Jones, who recently announced his retirement.

A large crowd was in attendance, a dozen or so of them being Members of Congress. I was honored to be one of them.

A number of those present were introduced and made short talks voicing their high esteem for this great and good man. I was also among those.

It was my good fortune to serve in Congress with Marvin. I learned very soon to honor and respect him as a statesman of the highest order. Early in World War II, Marvin Jones was appointed by the President to be Food Administrator for War. He served in that very important assignment with great distinction and honor to himself and his country.

During that time he cooperated fully with Members of Congress from farm districts in all things beneficial to our farmers in producing feed, food, and fiber to feed and clothe the homefront, our own military forces as well as to help feed and clothe our allies across the seven seas.

After the war ended he was appointed by the President as a member of the U.S. Court of Claims and soon became Chief Judge. His service there as a lawyer of outstanding ability and sense of justice has endeared him in the hearts of all who know him well, as do I.

At the reception for him last Tuesday night it was my great pleasure and privilege to touch on these fine qualities in his presence. Then on last Friday I received the following letter, which I shall value and cherish so long as I shall live:

CHAMBERS, U.S. COURT OF CLAIMS,
Washington, D.C., June 26, 1964.

DEAR BEN: I want to thank you for the generous words you spoke at the dinner last Tuesday evening.

Nothing has ever been said that pleased me more. We have been friends for many years, and this fact made the tribute all the more pleasing.

You have been a great Representative, not only for your native State but for the entire Nation—able, industrious, and unafraid. I hope you may remain in public service many years.

With every good wish.
Your friend,
MARVIN JONES.

Silver and the Coin Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE, JR.

OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 30, 1964

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, since the repeal of the Silver Purchase Act last year there has been increased interest in the silver and coin shortage prevalent in this country. I have spoken many times on the floor and to the committees in the Congress about the critical need for a thorough and enlightened study of this problem. Today I was encouraged by the fact that the Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations is conducting hearings on this problem. I insert a copy of my testimony before the subcommittee and the observations of a very astute expert on monetary problems, Mr. Harry Magnuson.

STATEMENT OF HON. COMPTON I. WHITE, JR., BEFORE THE LEGAL AND MONETARY AFFAIRS SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS, JUNE 30, 1964

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, I was delighted to learn that you had called this hearing on a subject I have been studying for many years. It is a pleasure and an honor for me to present to you my views on the coinage problem in the United States and to offer some of my ideas for your consideration.

Other witnesses will document the need for speedy action on our general coinage problems so I will address myself to but one facet of it; namely the silver content of the dollar and our subsidiary coins. At the present time the silver dollar contains 412.5 grains of silver at a monetary value of $1.29 per ounce. Our subsidiary coins, the dime, 25- and 50-cent pieces contain 7 percent less silver content than the dollar, so the monetary value of the silver in them is $1.38 per ounce. The world market price of silver is equal to the monetary value contained in silver dollars or obtainable through the redemption or retirement of silver certificates. The willingness of the U.S. Treasury to sell its silver at $1.29 per ounce places a ceiling on the market price and prevents the operation of the law of supply and demand with regard to silver. Last year free world consumption of silver was about double free world production, 210 million ounces produced and 419 million ounces consumed. In the United States production lagged behind consumption by 147 million ounces; 37 million produced and 184 million consumed.

The gap between silver consumption and production is presently being filled by sales of Treasury silver. Last year the net reduction in the U.S. Treasury silver stocks was 182 million ounces according to Handy and Harmon. At this rate the entire stock of U.S. Treasury silver will soon be depleted and we will have to eliminate silver from our coins and buy our strategic silver from other nations at a price three and four times higher than the present monetary values. Time is of the essence if we are to correct this situation, because silver consumption is steadily increasing, while production continues to dwindle.

I have offered a legislative solution to our critical silver shortage. The bills which I introduced, H.R. 10559 and H.R. 10560, would stop silver bullion sales by the Treasury and double the monetary value of the precious metal. Quite frankly, I don't know whether doubling the monetary price will bring production and consumption into line, but it certainly will allow silver to seek its true value in the marketplace and hopefully close the gap between production and use. When the market price of silver went from 90 cents per ounce in 1961 to $1.29 in 1963, there was but a 2-percent increase in silver production. I hope that this percentage will increase substantially by removing the present ceiling price.

After months of consideration and study I proposed doubling the monetary value for two reasons. I believe the increase will be sufficient to conserve the U.S. Treasury stocks for coinage and strategic uses. Secondly, by using the factor of 2 in adjusting the monetary value, the horrendous problems of immediately calling in all our outstanding coins and reminting them will be avoided. The doubling of our coins' value has its problems admittedly, but it certainly is superior to the prospect of having our coins melted down. Briefly, I ask that the subcommittee bear in mind the need for reduced silver content in our coins, while studying this overall problem of our coin shortage.

The large increase in the use of silver has been for coinage purposes. This is probably due to the increase in population and the increased use of vending machines, as well as in the increase in our standard of living. This use of silver could conceivably be eliminated if our country were to commence using metal slugs or buttons for coins. Handy and Harmon have sent up a trial balloon proposing that the silver content in coins be eliminated. Historically, sound governments have been based upon sound money. Silver is an emblem of sound money and I doubt very much if our people will want to see it completely eliminated from our coins.

I am of the opinion that unless something is done with respect to the relation of silver and our coinage in the very near future, conceivably within the next 12 months, that we are going to have a serious crisis. This ultimately could be very detrimental to our economy and to the silver industry.

A year ago when Congress amended the silver laws and provided for $1 paper certificates, it was commonly stated in Washington, D.C., that we had a supply of 15 years of silver for coinage and industrial purposes. In 1963, 200 million ounces were sold by the Treasury or consumed in coinage. Hence, the present supply of silver backing our Federal Reserve silver certificates could be consumed in 7 years providing the present rate continues. However, the present rate is going to accelerate at a much faster rate unless something is done with respect to our coinage problem.

It is a matter of record that the silver dollars in the U.S. Treasury have decreased from about 200 million on January 1, 1962, to about 96 million on January 1, 1963, and to about 24 million at the present time. For all intents and purposes, the silver dollar is extinct.

The U.S. Treasury could perhaps solve this problem by minting another hundred million or two hundred million silver dollars. There have been no silver dollars minted since 1935. However, as soon as these new silver dollars were minted, they would merely become collectors items and this would merely aggravate the situation and not solve the coin problem.

The Treasury made another mistake with respect to the coinage problem by seeking approval for the Kennedy 50-cent piece. In doing this the U.S. mint quit making Ben Franklin half dollars, after making them for 17 years. Hence, all the Ben Franklin half dollars made in the last 2 or 3 years are going into the hands of collectors and out of circulation. The new Kennedy half dollar will never be a coin. It will be a symbol or medal of President Kennedy and I would venture to say they would go out of existence faster than they can be minted. Every individual in many of the underprivileged nations of the world, for example, India, Africa, South America, will all want a Kennedy 50-cent piece as a remembrance of the President. As a consequence, our Government can mint the half dollars and they will go out of circulation as fast as they are minted. This will merely further the silver coins problem.

With the large pressure on the half dollars, the stress is now increasing on the 25-cent pieces and 10-cent pieces and smaller coins. In many areas it is becoming very difficult to make small change and banks are rationing their small coins. I understand that many of the coins are being hoarded or are going out of the country since our coins now have sufficient silver that they can be sold on the open market at any time in the form of silver. Hence, this provides a hedge for the person hoarding silver.

I am fearful that if we do nothing about our coinage problem, that as this silver situation deteriorates, that our coins will literally disappear and that we will wake up some morning in the not too distant future and not have any coins. Utter chaos could result. This could bring about a complete lack of confidence in our Government and its financial policies. When people lose confidence in the money, anything might happen. Previously the Government printed paper 25-cent pieces and 50-cent pieces. This may have to happen again.

Here is where, in my opinion, the silver producers can be of benefit. Rather than waiting until this situation gets really critical, I think that we might come forward with some proposals at this time while the problem can still be solved.

I would suggest—(1) that the quantity of silver placed in our coins be reduced by 50 percent. This in effect would be increasing the monetary price of silver from $1.29 to $2.58 an ounce; (2) call in all Federal silver certificates and conserve the silver for future coinage needs and for backing of our currency; (3) to eliminate the sale of silver by the U.S. Treasury and retain this silver for coinage and monetary purposes with one exception. This exception would be one suggested by A. J. Teske to me yesterday and would provide for the Treasury selling a certain amount of silver to U.S. industry for a period of 5 years. It is our thought that this might be phased out over a 5-year period; for example, we could sell 50 million ounces the first year, 40 million the second, 30 million the third, etc. The effect of this would be to eliminate any tremendous fluctuation in the price of silver upon the cessation of sales by the U.S. Treasury.

I think that going to Congress and to the public, we could well explain that the content of silver in our silver coins has remained the same since 1793, that in view of the industrial needs and consumption of the metal, that we are decreasing it by 50 percent. I think if this is done at this time, before the situation gets real critical, the public will not become really over aroused and hence, this will not adversely affect our financial or physical condition. The new coins can be gradually circulated in with the old coins and as the mint gets additional capacity, the old coins can be melted down and converted into new coins. If this is done, gradually, no crisis will come about. However, if all the old coins go underground overnight, because of lack of action, then the problem is much more acute. This transition must be done very smoothly and the sooner, the better.

I think the mining industry should take the lead and advance these proposals as soon as possible in view of the forthcoming coinage crisis.

Cameron Voting Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RONALD BROOKS CAMERON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 30, 1964

Mr. CAMERON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my 4th congressional voting report for the 2d session of the 88th Congress. Covering the period from May 13 through June 30, it contains my comments on the International Development Association, raising of insurance coverage provided by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, foreign aid, the Federal pay bill, excise taxes, and the mass transit bill.

Rollcall No.	Date	H.R. No.	Vote				Brief description
			R.B.C.	Yea	Nay	Not voting	
125	May 13		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Derwinski, Republican, of Illinois. (62 Members absent.)
*126	May 13	S. 2214	Nay	132	247	49	Motion to recommit bill authorizing the United States to participate in an increase in the resources of the International Development Association. (3 Members answered "present.")
127	May 18	1020	Yea	150	143	138	House joint resolution authorizing issuance of a gold medal to Henry J. Kaiser. (Measure failed; ⅔ vote needed for passage.)
128	May 19		Absent				Quorum call by Mr. Hall, Republican, of Missouri. (78 Members absent; R.B.C. at Vietnam briefing with Secretaries Rusk and McNamara and General Taylor.)
129	May 20		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Gross, Republican, of Iowa. (47 Members absent.)
130	May 20	11202	Nay	181	198	51	Amending agricultural appropriation bill to provide funds for constructing a peanut research plant. (1 Member answered "present.")
131	May 20	11202	Nay	187	186	56	Motion to recommit agricultural appropriation bill. (2 Members answered "present.")
132	May 20	11202	Yea	311	64	56	On passage of agricultural appropriation bill.
133	May 20		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Ashbrook, Republican, of Ohio. (106 Members absent.)
134	May 21		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Beermann, Republican, of Nebraska. (108 Members absent.)
135	May 26		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Springer, Republican, of Illinois. (102 Members absent.)
136	May 26	11369	Yea	340	5	66	On passage of military construction appropriation bill.
137	May 27		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Gary, Democrat, of Virginia. (93 Members absent.)
138	May 27	724	Yea	218	115	98	To permit consideration of H.R. 5130, amending Federal Deposit Insurance Act.
*139	May 27	5130	Yea	197	142	91	Motion to recommit bill amending Federal Deposit Insurance Act relating to the insurance of savings and loan accounts.
140–7	June 3–4		Absent				During this period R.B.C. was in California for the primary election. There were 5 quorum calls, 2 motions to adjourn, and 1 rollcall on a noncontroversial bill.
148	June 9		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Haley, Democrat, of Florida. (73 Members absent.)
149	June 9		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Gross, Republican, of Iowa. (74 Members absent.)
150	June 9		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Collier, Republican, of Illinois. (69 Members absent.)
151	June 10		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Berry, Republican, of South Dakota. (40 Members absent.)
*152	June 10	11380	Nay	193	211	27	Motion to recommit Foreign Assistance Act.
*153	June 10	11380	Yea	230	175	26	On passage of Foreign Assistance Act.
154	June 11		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Hall, Republican, of Missouri. (48 Members absent.)
*155	June 11	11049	Yea	243	157	27	On passage of Federal pay bill. (4 Members answered "present.")
156	June 16		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Beermann, Republican, of Nebraska. (68 Members absent.)
157	June 16	11579	Yea	360	11	58	On passage of public works appropriation bill. (2 Members answered "present.")
158	June 17		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Gross, Republican, of Iowa. (56 Members absent.)
159	June 17		Absent				Quorum call by Mr. Hall, Republican, of Missouri. (R.B.C. attending reception for the Los Angeles Angels.)
*160	June 17	11376	Nay	185	207	43	Motion to recommit bill extending excise tax rates for 1 year. (1 Member answered "present.")
161	June 18		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Devine, Republican, of Ohio. (47 Members absent.)
162	June 18	11375	Yea	203	182	43	On passage of 1-year increase in debt ceiling. (3 Members answered "present.") For R.B.C. position on debt, see rollcalls 51 and 52, 1st sess., 88th Cong.
*163–170	June 18–25		Absent				During this period R.B.C. was in California attending to district matters. There were 5 quorum calls and 3 rollcall votes on the mass transit bill.
171	June 30		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Haley, Democrat, of Florida. (54 Members absent.)
172	June 30		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Waggonner, Democrat, of Louisiana. (66 Members absent.)
173	June 30	793	Yea	222	162	47	To permit consideration of H.R. 11812, foreign assistance appropriation bill.
174	June 30		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Dorn, Democrat, of South Carolina. (48 Members absent.)

*Items so marked are considered to be of greater significance, and a brief explanation is included herein.

ROLLCALL NO. 126, INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

In February, much to my concern, the House voted to recommit—in effect, kill—a bill calling for continued U.S. participation in the International Development Association. The bill had my strong support and in an earlier rollcall report I pointed out that IDA, which was initiated during the Eisenhower administration, had always received bipartisan backing. I was thus dismayed that the Republican Party fought the measure on partisan grounds.

My concern was apparently shared by former President Eisenhower, for after defeat of H.R. 9022 he and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce joined with President Johnson in an effort to save IDA. Mr. Eisenhower had this to say in a letter to the Republican leadership:

> I note with concern the action of the House of Representatives on the International Development Association measure and am hopeful that this unfavorable action can be reversed. * * * I do believe the fundamentals which we had in mind when we created this venture are still eminently worthy. That is, wherever possible we should favor a loan in place of grants and, to the degree possible we should encourage other nations to join us in carrying the foreign aid burden.

Mr. Eisenhower's admonishment subsequently prompted Republicans to take a more responsible stand on the foreign affairs front. When the House reconsidered the IDA proposal, this time under Senate bill 2214, 36 Republicans switched their votes and supported the Johnson administration.

WORTHWHILE CAUSE

The President called the House action "a major victory for the American people, for an effective foreign policy and for commonsense in our international dealings. This measure is bipartisan in its origins, and I congratulate those Members of both parties who joined in advancing it a step closer to reality. It may have taken two tries, but a worthwhile cause has won a significant success. We will always continue to try when the cause is just."

The International Development Association represents the direction in which I am sure taxpayers want the United States to move in the area of assistance to underdeveloped countries: A sharing of the aid burden by the wealthier nations of the free world, nations such as Germany, Italy, Japan, Great Britain, and Canada.

Under the agreement for replenishing the resources of IDA, an affiliate of the World Bank—which has an unequaled record of never having had a defaulted loan in 18 years—16 other countries will put up $1.40 for every dollar provided by the United States. Such multinational participation of course reduces the amount required for our own bilateral aid program.

NATIONAL INTEREST

The $312 million which the United States will loan to IDA over a 3-year period will in turn draw from other countries $438 million which might otherwise be lost if the program were allowed to lapse, and it would lapse without our participation. As Secretary of State Rusk has pointed out, this would be profoundly contrary to the national interest.

Critics of IDA have charged that the $438 million to be contributed by other member nations will merely be a rechanneling of American aid, and, therefore, not a genuine contribution of their own. The charge is false. There have been no new commitments for economic aid to these countries since 1963, and an amendment prohibits any new military commitments to these countries after July 1964.

Critics also allege that participation in IDA hurts the U.S. balance of payments. This charge, too, is false. The future IDA procurement pattern will quite likely follow that of the World Bank's: about 80 percent of the U.S. contribution would be spent in the United States.

REPAID LOANS

Another important point in IDA's favor is that contributions are loans, not grants. All borrowed funds are repaid. By no stretch of the imagination can this be called a "giveaway" program, or as critics are quick to charge, "pouring money down a rathole."

There are several other points which encourage support of the International Development Association. No Communist nation will receive IDA funds. The association will not lend to nations which expropriate foreign investments without adequate compensation. IDA has never made any loans to Government-owned industrial enterprises that would compete with private enterprise, nor will it do so in the future. It will not lend to countries which are unwilling to carry out needed economic and social reforms. IDA is managed by the World Bank, which is renowned for its high technical standards. Strict policies are followed in determining priorities, appraising projects, and negotiating credits. No loans are made until the plans are fully approved, and all procurement is by public bidding.

EXCELLENT PROGRAM

In short, the association represents an excellent approach to foreign aid. As I pointed out following IDA's earlier defeat in the House, it presents our best opportunity to pursue a program of meaningful assistance to developing countries, and to share with other affluent peoples the burden of securing economic strength for starving millions who are haunted daily by the specter of communism. I am pleased that many Republicans, on IDA's second trip to the House, acknowledged support of this point of view.

ROLLCALL NO. 139—FEDERAL INSURANCE COVERAGE

Although I was the only California Democrat to stand with a majority of Republicans in sending H.R. 5130 back to the Banking and Currency Committee for reconsideration, my vote reflected support for the Treasury Department, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Bureau of the Budget, the Federal Reserve Board and the Federal Home Loan Bank Board.

To fully understand the issues involved in this rollcall some background information is needed. Last summer, at the request of the Kennedy administration, the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee introduced H.R. 7404. The proposal called for a 50-percent increase in the maximum amount of insurance coverage for bank deposits and savings and loan accounts; it also contained provisions to protect further the safety and liquidity of insured institutions, to strengthen safeguards against conflicts of interest, and to set up standby controls over dividend rates. Unfortunately, the committee chairman never held hearings on this bill.

NO SAFEGUARDS

Some 6 months later, however, he held hearings on H.R. 5130. This measure proposed a 100-percent increase in Federal insurance coverage, but it contained none of the regulatory safeguards included in H.R. 7404. The administration was particularly concerned over H.R. 5130 because it felt that increasing insurance coverage from the present $10,000 per account to $20,000—without adequate safeguards—would tempt weaker institutions to compete more aggressively on the basis of interest rate alone, and would weaken existing incentives to careful and responsible management of the public's funds. Regrettably, the administration was not given an opportunity to present its views to the Banking and Currency Committee in formal testimony on the bill.

In voting to recommit H.R. 5130 it was my belief that the questions of increased insurance and adequate safeguards should be considered at the same time—the cart should not be put before the horse. This approach should be reflected in committee action. I believe it is important that legislators remain open-minded on matters which come before them, and I think that committee members—and the Congress—should be given every chance to listen to and consider the views of the executive agencies which are close to any given situation. I do not believe in legislating in the dark.

In addition to the lack of safeguards and irregular committee procedure, I have yet to be convinced that a 100-percent increase in deposit and share account insurance is justified. Recent figures provided by the FDIC indicate that 98 percent of all deposit accounts in insured banks have balances of less than $10,000 and are therefore fully protected by existing coverage. The figures for savings and loan associations indicate that 95 percent of all accounts are under $10,000, also presently protected.

DANGER CITED

Raising the insurance limits to $20,000 would affect perhaps only an additional 1 percent of all deposit accounts in insured banks and savings and loan institutions. In my judgment, this might be achieved at the expense of healthy competition between established institutions in the lending business. Institutions which advertise and pay high dividend rates would capitalize on the increase in insurance coverage in their efforts to attract savings from other lending institutions. To quote the Treasury Department:

> The danger in a substantial increase in insurance coverage, taken alone, is that it could encourage competitive and other practices among promotionally minded institutions that would tend to undermine their safety and solvency, since more depositors or account holders would be inclined simply to look to the Federal Government for protection in the event difficulties arose, instead of prudently assessing the management and performance of the institution concerned.

It is for all the reasons cited here that I voted against H.R. 5130.

Mr. Speaker, during the past year more and more Americans have become aware of the great need for continued support of our Nation's mutual assistance program—if the free world is to prevail in the long twilight struggle against communism. This fact was dramatically demonstrated when, for the first time in the 17-year history of the program, the House approved, without cuts, the entire administration aid request. Most observers interpreted this action as strong congressional approval of President Johnson's approach to foreign aid.

ROLLCALLS NOS. 152, 153—FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT

The President's request was stripped of all fat, and if an effective assistance program is to be maintained cuts cannot be tolerated. This view was reflected on rollcall No. 152 when a motion to recommit the bill for a $222 million cut was defeated. As passed by the House, H.R. 11380 authorizes $2.041 billion in new foreign aid appropriations for fiscal year 1965. Coupled with existing foreign aid authority, this sum brings the total authorization to $3.5 billion, a figure equal to last year's appropriation.

Designed to bolster the economies of recipient nations and foster needed social and political changes, the bill also contained these features which had my strong support: More than $1 billion for military assistance, with $200 million earmarked solely for use in Vietnam; assistance to American schools, libraries, and hospitals abroad; authorization for the President to guarantee U.S. companies against political and credit risks of nonpayment in connection with privately financed sales of U.S. defense equipment and services to friendly countries or international organizations; expressed the sense of Congress that the Agency for International Development should encourage the use of private U.S. engineering and professional services in connection with capital projects financed by AID funds; continued a prohibition on grant assistance to nations capable of sustaining their own defense burden and economic growth; and authorized the President to deny U.S. assistance to a foreign enterprise if it would result in depriving similar U.S. enterprises of their reasonable share of world markets.

During debate on the bill I delivered a speech supporting the mutual assistance program, and I include it in my remarks at this time for the benefit of my constituents:

HOUSE SPEECH

When I was first elected to the California legislature a few years ago, a very dear friend of mine gave me a little book of satire which I am sure many of the Members have read. The book, "Parkinson's Law," had a chapter describing a meeting of a corporation board of directors where the board in 2¾ minutes approved a $10 million expenditure to build an atomic reactor and then spent a half hour on a $2,300 expenditure for a bicycle shed, and over an hour on a $4.75 expenditure for refreshments for the board meeting.

I believe that the debate described in "Parkinson's Law" is not dissimilar to what has happened to the debate on foreign assistance over the last 17 years. It appears to me that so much emphasis has been put on whether the high "muckymuck" of some remote spot did or did not abscond with a book from the local library that the American public has nearly lost sight of the objective of foreign assistance.

Applying Parkinson's law, it is easy to see why the taxpayer wonders what foreign assistance is all about. It is difficult to visualize the abstract—and you can be sure that the headline of the "Morning Bugle" will not help to clarify the situation—but will lay emphasis on that stolen library book.

For my part, I hope no books are stolen. I hope that the program will run so efficiently that every last dime provided will be used for the intended purpose. But just as I know my church in Whittier has wasted funds in the past—just as I know my professional society, though it be of accountants, has been guilty of errors in judgment, so I know economic assistance will continue to be plagued with the stolen library book.

To me this minutia is not of major importance. What is of crucial importance is the accomplishment of our real objectives. There can be no question that the United States is engaged in a death struggle with communism—a cancerous growth in the universal body politic. To remove this condition, as in most dangerous body growths, we have two alternatives—one is radical surgery, the other is a program of intensive treatment—treatment designed to arrest and ultimately to eliminate the foreign growth. A good physician will, of course, advise his patient of the consequences of both actions and will take all possible steps to protect the life of the patient.

We, sitting here as the Nation's physician, are doing just that. We will provide over $55 billion this year to take care of surgery—should it become necessary. Now, what we are about to do today is provide less than 7 percent of that amount for treatment.

The treatment will be flexible. It will be completely successful on some growths, less so on others, and, for the moment, it may fail on still others. But it is the best and only program of treatment we know today. As with any arresting and preventive medicine, as new facts and techniques are developed, they will be incorporated into the program for the good of the patient.

I believe that it is the destiny of the United States to show the world the wonders of a free, democratic, capitalistic society—to show mankind, by example and by deed, that it is possible to live under a government of laws, not of men—to build not just a nation, but a world free from fear, to use the wonders of science for the benefit of all mankind, and to develop a universal philosophy of brotherhood of man.

As imperfect as it may be, the Foreign Assistance Act is our only current means to accomplish these lofty objectives, and the United States is the only country with the resolve and the ability to meet the challenge.

A vote to cut, or a vote against, this bill is a decision for radical surgery and surely fatal surgery on a very sick world.

A vote for the bill in its present form is a decision for prolonged treatment of a patient that has the latent strength to survive.

ROLLCALL NO. 155—FEDERAL PAY BILL

With passage of H.R. 11049 the House reversed its negative attitude toward a Federal employee pay raise and concurred with the position I took when an earlier pay bill was defeated. At that time I urged adoption of increases to remedy gross inadequacies in the Federal pay scale, and to comply with a legal mandate that Government career employees be paid salaries comparable to those in the private sector.

A majority of the House, however, incorrectly anticipating voter reprisals because of proposed increases in congressional salaries, rejected H.R. 8986 with hollow arguments that it was not economical. Faced with a rollcall vote, they allowed their fears to overcome their judgment. For it is clear that the greatest economy lies in attracting our Nation's best minds and talent into important Government positions. As President Johnson declared in warning against false economy, the dollars paid to attract brains and ability to the Federal service will come back to the American people many times over in more economical and effective Government. Only first-class managers can tighten organizations, simplify procedures, trim waste, and inspire maximum effort.

VOTE SWITCH

Widespread and sharp protests from public and private sources followed the defeat of H.R. 8986 and created strong demand for passage of H.R. 11049. When the rollcall was taken on this measure an almost equal number of Republicans and Democrats switched their previous positions and voted for passage.

There is no question that the Federal pay structure needs overhauling. Congress has received no pay increase since 1955, and Federal executive employees have not had a raise since 1956. During the Eisenhower administration a committee representing industry, labor, education, and Government recommended salary increases far above the provisions of either H.R. 8986 or H.R. 11049. The aim was to put Government pay scales on par with those of private enterprise.

Without a pay increase, Government workers in both high and low income brackets will continue to suffer financial penalties. For example, 56 executives of General Motors drew in salaries and bonuses a sum greater than the salaries of all the following combined:

All 435 Representatives, all 100 Senators, all Cabinet officers, the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Supreme Court Justices, and the Governors of all 50 States.

COMPARABLE PAY

As passed by the House the pay bill increases by $7,500 the salaries of Members of Congress, Federal judges, and Cabinet officers, effective January 1, 1965. The principle of comparability of governmental salaries with those of private enterprise for equal levels of responsibility will also be automatically maintained. A fair and rational approach to Federal salary adjustment, this will avoid in the future the erratic and unsatisfactory methods used in the past.

Of the $533.2 million which H.R. 11049 provides, only 2.2 percent will go toward congressional salaries. The total expenditure is $11 million less than what has already been provided in the budget for Federal pay increases.

I voted for the pay bill with the conviction that it does much to assure the future competence, vigor, and smooth functioning of our National Government.

ROLLCALL NO. 160—EXCISE TAXES

H.R. 11376 proposes to extend until June 30, 1965, certain excise taxes which were scheduled to be reduced or expire on July 1, 1964. The levies on alcoholic beverages, cigarettes, passenger cars, auto parts and accessories were increased during the Korean war, and without annual congressional extensions the rates would revert to their pre-1951 level. Five years ago general telephone service and air transportation were added to the excise tax list.

I supported the bill, a position endorsed by the highly respected chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, Wilbur Mills. However, we shared a consciousness of the many objectionable aspects of these taxes: the harassing inconsistencies and contradictions in their application, so burdensome to the local businessman; the anachronism of taxation evolved in response to the demands of wartime; and their discriminatory effect on particular groups in our economy. Opponents of the bill voiced concern over such aspects of this taxation, but their haphazard solution called for recommitting the measure with instructions for phasing out an arbitrarily favored few of these taxes.

HEARINGS NEEDED

Only the majority position reflected a responsible approach to the problem, one which could genuinely redress grievances—holding up change until the Ways and Means Committee completes a detailed and comprehensive examination of the entire excise tax structure. In view of the more than 200 bills for excise tax reform now pending in the House, and the fact that the taxes with which H.R. 11376 is concerned cover but $1.8 billion of the $14.7 billion in Federal excise tax revenues, I felt that only a complete review of the whole system could adequately meet public demand. A piecemeal approach could result only in rash and inequitable decisions. The Ways and Means Committee, which initiated the studies that finally led to enactment of the tax cut bill, has already begun hearings on the excise tax structure. As Chairman MILLS said, "When the Committee on Ways and Means undertakes one of these studies, the committee seriously intends to achieve results."

FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY

From the standpoint of fiscal responsibility—ironically the favorite cry of those who seem willing to abondon it here—I believe that present excise taxes should be extended through fiscal 1965. As the Secretary of the Treasury pointed out when the tax cut bill was being considered, a reduction in income taxes rather than excise taxes followed a thorough review of the various components of our Federal tax system to determine where reductions might most stimulate the growth of our economy and increase the overall equity of the tax system. The predicted returns of the unprecedented $11.6 billion income tax cut are already being fulfilled, but time must be given without interference to allow the full gains to be realized. To cancel expected excise tax revenues at this time would upset the administration's planned program of economic progress for the coming year, and increase the budget deficit by $1.8 billion. I am sure most people would agree that these effects are undesirable.

Thus, from consideration of the budgetary situation for the next fiscal year, and anticipating sound recommendations for a more equitable and up-to-date excise tax structure—which I am confident the Ways and Means Committee will present to the next Congress—I agreed to extend present excise tax rates for 1 more year.

The Senate, however, subsequently voted to cut $503 million in revenue by repealing the 10-percent tax on jewelry, furs, toilet articles, and luggage selling for $100 or less. A proposal to repeal the 10-percent levy on local telephone service was rejected.

In a House-Senate conference designed to resolve differences between the two legislative bodies, the wisdom of Chairman MILLS prevailed and Senate conferees agreed to eliminate all amendments which would have provided for excise tax reductions this year.

ROLLCALLS NOS. 168–170—MASS TRANSIT BILL

Because district business kept me in California when the mass transit bill was before the House, I am recorded as "not voting" on the measure. Had I been present I would have voted against passage and did so advise the bill's proponents who solicited my support. I would also have voted to recommit or kill the bill on rollcall No. 169, but would have supported the amendment on rollcall No. 168 which prohibits the Federal Government from regulating rates and fares of transit systems which receive grants under the bill.

There are many reasons why I opposed H.R. 3881. I have consistently advocated that private and municipal transit systems should be self-sustaining through revenue received at the fare box. The mass transit bill contained no such provision. Instead, it called for $375 million in taxpayers' money to bolster faltering public transit systems throughout the country. This sum, in outright Federal grants on a matching basis, represents only a drop in the bucket if the Nation's transit problems are to be solved by the National Government. The bill merely opens the door for larger Federal grants in the future, grants which, according to conservative estimates, would reach about $15 billion in a relatively short time.

I am convinced that large and wealthy cities such as Los Angeles, San Francisco, New York, and Chicago are capable of solving their own transit problems without Federal help. Not only are they able to devise sound, economical systems, but they can do it cheaper than the Federal Government. Local government jurisdictions, for example, can sell bonds in the private market at 3-percent interest. The Federal Government would pay 4 percent.

MEETING PROBLEM

California's efforts to cope with complex transit problems in the southland are reflected in the State's 1964 Rapid Transit Act which will go into effect next August. When a comprehensive plan has been perfected it will be submitted to the voters for approval. Along with many local officials and transit experts I am confident that a good plan will draw wide citizen support and that transit difficulties can be ironed out without Federal grants.

Under provisions of H.R. 3881 the Los Angeles area would receive practically no benefits. The $375 million to be doled out over a 3-year span could go to any city of 2,500 or more people. There are 6,000 such communities in the Nation. Simple division shows what would accrue to Los Angeles.

In arguing their case, supporters of the proposal used the false analogy of Federal aid for highway construction. They failed to point out, however, that highways are not local, that they link all sections of the country. And highway users pay for highways—not the general taxpayer. Mass transit systems, on the other hand, are strictly local in scope. I see no reason why taxpayers living in rural communities should finance urban transit facilities which they will never use.

My views were apparently shared by my constituency for I did not receive one letter from a commuter asking me to support the mass transit bill. It is regrettable that it passed by a substantial margin.

Bringing Government Closer to the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES HARVEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 30, 1964

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I believe firmly that one of the very urgent needs in our Nation is to bring the Federal Government closer to the people. As a Member of this legislative branch of that Government I have tried to accomplish that purpose each year by traveling throughout the Eighth Congressional District of Michigan with my mobile office, a 22-foot house trailer, making as many as 35 to 40 stops in a 10-day period. Over the years I believe this office on wheels has not only afforded the residents of my district an opportunity to discuss personal problems and to express themselves on national issues, but equally important it has helped to stimulate their interest in our Federal Government. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith for the interest of my colleagues my July 1, 1964, newsletter and mobile office schedule:

WASHINGTON NEWSLETTER

(By Congressman JIM HARVEY)

With Congress scheduled to recess for at least a 10-day period this month, I intend to take advantage of the brief legislative lull to personally visit 39 communities in the new Eighth Congressional District with our mobile trailer office. This annual tour is an effort to bring Washington and the Federal Government closer to the people. We will begin on July 10 and make twice as many stops as we did last October, including six stops in Saginaw County, seven in Huron, eight in St. Clair, and nine each in Tuscola and Sanilac Counties.

This is my fourth annual tour with our office on wheels. I hope you will drop by at one of the stops closest to where you live to express your views on current national affairs, to discuss any personal problem you may have, or just to visit. No appointment is necessary. Our complete mobile office schedule is listed below.

ECONOMY CAMPAIGN—FACT OR FICTION

Recently in a letter to the President, Senator BYRD, Democrat, of Virginia, referred to the need for restoring the Federal Government to a sound fiscal condition and said, "No need is more urgent." The 1964 fiscal year came to a close yesterday and with it the fifth consecutive deficit (some $8 billion). A sixth deficit for fiscal 1965 is already in sight. The last time the books were balanced was in 1960, when it cost $77 billion to run our country. Our budget is now $100 billion annually, with little hope of cutting costs. In June the administration succeeded in raising the limit on the national debt from $309 billion to $324 billion, the seventh time the limit has been

raised since I came to Congress in January 1961.

As the election draws near, it is no doubt tempting for the administration to urge the enactment of even more spending bills, folowing the philosophy of "something for everyone." These bills include the antipoverty program ($963 million as a starter); Appalachian economic relief ($4 billion); accelerated public works ($1.5 billion); Area Redevelopment Administration ($355 million expansion); housing and urban renewal ($8 billion); and the food stamp program ($375 million). It is quite a load for our taxpayers.

Perhaps, because of the tax cut, the American people are not as alarmed about Government spending and our fiscal condition as a year ago. But our weakened fiscal standard today is as much a danger and threat to our Nation's well-being as armed conflict. It is time for facts and an honest approach to economy. We cannot afford fiction and slogans, for if our Government cannot live within its means in this period of prosperity, what sort of a future do we offer our children?

ANOTHER LOSS OF FREEDOM

Americans everywhere, whether they make their home in a city, a village hamlet, or on a farm suffered a loss on June 15 when the U.S. Supreme Court handed down its decision on State legislative apportionment. They lost the right to decide for themselves how they shall be represented in their State legislatures. It is a substantial loss of freedom and choice, which is not made smaller simply because the "one person, one vote" theory enunciated by the Court appears on the surface to be a fair guideline. In the Colorado case, for example, not only a 2-to-1 majority of all the voters in the State, but also a majority of the voters in each county, expressed themselves by voting in favor of a plan giving some weight to geography in selecting their State legislators, and turned down overwhelmingly a plan based solely on the "one person, one vote" theory. Yet, the Supreme Court says that neither Colorado nor Michigan can do this, and thereby appears to have forgotten that the people are the ultimate source of power in Government. I agree with Justice Potter Stewart who, in his dissent, stated: "The rule announced today is at odds with long-established principles of constitutional adjudication under the equal protection clause, and it stifles values of local individuality and initiative vital to the character of the Federal Union which it was the genius of our Constitution to create."

VISITING WASHINGTON?

If you will let us know when you are coming, we can furnish literature and helpful hints on places of scenic and historic interest. When the House of Representatives is in session, we can provide passes to see your Congress in action. My office is in the Longworth Building right across from the Capitol. Stop in and visit and if your feet are tired, rest awhile.

MOBILE OFFICE SCHEDULE IN YOUR AREA

Friday, July 10

Frankenmuth: 9:30 to 10:15 a.m.
Chesaning: 11 a.m. to noon.
St. Charles: 1 to 1:30 p.m.
Merrill: 2:15 to 2:45 p.m.
Hemlock: 3 to 3:30 p.m.
Freeland: 4:15 to 4:45 p.m.

Monday, July 13

Brown City: 9 to 9:30 a.m.
Marlette: 10 to 10:30 a.m.
Sandusky: 11:15 to noon.
Deckerville: 1:30 to 2 p.m.
Carsonville: 2:30 to 3 p.m.
Port Sanilac: 3:15 to 3:45 p.m.

Tuesday, July 14

Lexington: 9 to 9:30 a.m.
Croswell: 10 to 10:30 a.m.
Peck: 10:45 to 11:15 a.m.
Yale: 11:45 a.m. to 12:15 p.m.
Emmett: 1:30 to 2:15 p.m.
Capac: 3 to 3:30 p.m.

Wednesday, July 15

Algonac: 9:30 to 10 a.m.
Marine City: 10:30 to 11 a.m.
St. Clair: 11:30 a.m. to noon.
Marysville: 1 to 1:30 p.m.
Port Huron (downtown on Military Street): 2 to 3 p.m.

Thursday, July 16

Harbor Beach: 9:30 to 10 a.m.
Port Austin: 11 to 11:45 a.m.
Bad Axe: 1:30 to 2:30 p.m.
Elkton: 3 to 3:30 p.m.
Pigeon: 4 to 4:30 p.m.

Friday, July 17

Bay Port: 9 to 9:30 a.m.
Sebewaing: 10 to 10:45 a.m.
Unionville: 11 to 11:30 a.m.
Cass City: 1:30 to 2:30 p.m.
Kingston: 3:15 to 3:45 p.m.

Saturday, July 18

Mayville: 9:30 to 10 a.m.
Millington: 10:30 to 11 a.m.
Vassar: 11:15 a.m. to noon.

Monday, July 20

Caro: 9:30 to 10:30 a.m.
Fairgrove: 11 to 11:30 a.m.
Reese: 1 to 1:30 p.m.

Statement on Immigration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 30, 1964

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD the statement I submitted to the Subcommittee on Immigration, House Committee on the Judiciary, which is currently holding hearings on legislation to amend our immigration laws. Among these bills is also my bill, H.R. 8106.

My statement is as follows:

STATEMENT BY CONGRESSMAN WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE TO SUBCOMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION, HOUSE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE, ON H.R. 8106, JUNE 29, 1964

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, I am gratified that your committee is considering legislation for the revision of the laws governing the immigration policy of this country.

The distinguished chairman of the House Judiciary Committee has introduced a bill, H.R. 7700, embodying the principles and provisions of a new policy of immigration and naturalization based upon the recommendations to the Congress by the late President Kennedy. President Johnson has also urged Congress to endorse these proposals. I have chosen to indicate my support of the suggested revisions by submitting an identical bill, H.R. 8106.

The basic principle of the current immigration laws—the so-called principle of national origins—is offensive to many of our citizens. It is also harmful to our relations with other countries.

Save for the American Indians, all citizens of this country are immigrants or the descendants of immigrants; and all are Americans, regardless of their place of birth or national origin. To discriminate among persons seeking residence or citizenship in this country on the basis of their national or racial origins is, therefore, to discriminate among persons accordings to a principle repugnant to the traditions of our country and offensive to the great majority of the American people.

The inequities of the current law are extreme. The immigration quotas are based on the national origins of the United States population of 1890, at which time immigration from southern and eastern Europe had hardly begun. The Italians and Poles, for example, are particularly slighted. From Italy, with a total population of 46 million, we can accept only 5,666 immigrants annually; from Poland, with a population of 25 million, only 6,488 persons are permitted to enter the country each year. The same applies to Greece, Hungary, France, Czechoslovakia, and other European countries. I am privileged to have experienced the loyalty and diligence of these people who have vastly enriched our country. I am, therefore, baffled by the inequities imposed upon their kinsmen by this law and I share their resentment of it.

The principle of the current immigration laws also stands as an insult to many countries abroad. The allocation of quotas among nations cannot but be interpreted as an evaluation of the relative worth of their nationals. That this is not in fact our intention should be obvious; so too, however, should be the fact that our good intentions are discredited by the reality of our laws. It should also be recalled that a central tenet of our foreign policy is respect for the equality of all nations; the unfortunate inconsistency of our immigration laws with this principle should also be apparent. Inconsistency in our principles and misunderstandings of our intentions—these are the effects upon our foreign policy of our immigration laws.

The principle of the 1924 legislation is, therefore, unacceptable. I seek its revision in this bill. All considerations based upon national or racial origins are to be abolished. Though representing a major departure from the current laws, this provision does not, in fact, represent a great departure from actual practice. For the multiple revisions of the law of 1924 have eroded to the point of abolition the actual implementation of the rule of national origins.

The new bill, recognizing the inadequacies and inequities of the old, applies the categories and priorities hitherto used for single countries to a worldwide quota, as specified in amended section 203 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. First priority to the first 50 percent is given to persons whose admission, because of exceptional skill, training or education, is advantageous to the United States. First priority on the next 30 percent, plus any part of the first 50 percent not filled, is given to unmarried sons and daughters not eligible for nonquota status. First priority on the remaining 20 percent, plus the unfilled portion of the additional 80 percent, is given to the spouses and children of aliens lawfully admitted for permanent residence. No country would be allowed to receive more than 10 percent of the quota available in any year, with certain exceptions.

These principles are to replace the old system over a 5-year period. During this period, a worldwide quota of 164,582 immigrants will be fashioned from the present national quotas, and the complex administration of our immigration policies will be revised accordingly.

The bill has other important provisions. Nonquota status is extended to all the natives of the independent countries of the Western Hemisphere. The parents of U.S. citizens are also given nonquota status, thus alleviating a longtime source of inconvenience and grief. The methods of issuing visas are amended to obviate potential procedural means of countering the provisions of the bill. And flexibility is insured by granting the Attorney General, the Secretary of State, the Surgeon General, and the proposed Immigration Board the power of revising immigration policy in the face of new political needs, foreign or domestic.

All the above revisions represent clear improvements in our immigration laws. The provisions replacing the principle of national origins, I again stress, represent long-needed departures from a principle inconsistent with the central tenets of our Nation's political tradition. I, therefore, strongly endorse the revision of our immigration and nationalization laws. I urge the subcommittee's approval of this measure. And I look forward to the privilege of voting for it in our full Committee on the Judiciary.

The Plight of the Negro in Mississippi

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT N. C. NIX

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 30, 1964

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, it has been truly said that man cannot deny the humanity of his fellow man without ultimately destroying his own.

Apparently, this truth is clearly demonstrated by the people of Mississippi. It is the poorest State in the Union, even in this age of affluence. Of the 915,000 Negroes, an infinitesimal number are permitted to vote. Many have been jailed, lynched, shot, beaten, and subjected to cruel and inhumane treatment when they sought to register.

The record of violence toward the Negro, the record of lynching and murder in Mississippi, beginning before 1898, transcends in brutality that of any other southern State, and certainly equals the brutality in any country in the world, during the twentieth century. This violence toward the Negro, this hatred for the Negro has been nurtured by the political leaders of the State of Mississippi. They have fanned this antipathy into a force so corrosive that it touches and distorts the lives of even the children in Mississippi, and the people who are responsible, are those who hold public office from the Congress to the county courthouse. Their leadership is and has been morally bankrupt.

As far back as 1890 when the constitution of Mississippi was revised, the avowed purpose for the revision was stated as follows:

> The policy of crushing out the manhood of the Negro citizens is to be carried on to success.

Mr. Speaker, I conceive it to be the duty of every responsible citizen in this country to point the finger of blame at the leaders of the State of Mississippi, at the leaders of the State of Louisiana, at the leaders of the South, and assert unqualifiedly that they and they alone must take the full responsibility for the attitude of those poor and ignorant people whom they have misled, deceived, and denied leadership to over the years. I say nothing of the incomparable and inexcusable plight to which they have subjected the Negro. History has already condemned them for that, and I suspect that God, too, has taken note of it.

Speaking further of the plight of the Negro, it cannot be denied that he is mired deep in poverty, terrorized by white policemen and State troopers, kept in shackles of ignorance.

As of a year ago, not a single Negro high school in segregated Mississippi had been accredited by the regional association.

As to the poor whites in Mississippi, their hard labor produces a miserable living. So much so that Mississippi is lowest of all States in per capita income. The figure in 1961 was only $1,229 by comparison with $2,672 for Illinois, and $2,780 for California.

These leaders tell their white constituents, "We must fight for our way of life," which can only be interpreted to mean the impoverishment of the poor whites, which includes heavy mortgages, unending debt, religious revivalism, evangelical preaching, county fairs, and always the howling political stump orators. Typical of this group have been the late Senators Bilbo and Vardaman. Of course, along with all of this, the Negro is kept in the ditch. Of course, these spellbinders and these leaders whom I condemn today often remain aloof from the violence they encourage and abet. A part of this "way of life" doctrine that they have disseminated is the spurious doctrine that anyone who comes into the State to teach and help the Negro are agitators, radicals, and Communists, and, like the Negroes, are not entitled to the protection of the law.

Mr. Speaker, I wish further to call the attention of my colleagues to the fact that these so-called leaders have time and again stated to the people of Mississippi that these young students, now in Mississippi and those traveling to Mississippi in ever-increasing numbers, are agitators who are coming into the State to make trouble. These statements have been made and repeated despite the fact that there is not one scintilla of evidence to support the assertion. The utter irresponsibility of such statements and of such doctrines serve to create the impression that anyone from the outside should be arrested, beaten, intimidated, and as in the horrible case of the three missing young civil rights workers, spirited away.

This is nothing new. There is the case of the native Mississippian, Mack Charles Parker, in which they have confessions of murder; yet, the grand jury will not indict.

Mr. Speaker, in closing these remarks, I say to my colleagues that Allen Dulles served no purpose in Mississippi. His report offers nothing new or constructive. The Governor of that State, who now asks the citizens to search their own farms, contributes nothing. He has already created the atmosphere of violence and lawlessness. He has already given the people justification for withholding information. The only hope for the people of this unfortunate State is the use of the power of the Federal Government to supply Federal agents, soldiers, and other personnel in sufficient numbers to cover every inch of the territory, to flush out, arrest, and punish the offenders, and thereby expose to the world, the duplicity and falsity of those in positions of leadership.

To this end, I appeal for the active support of my colleagues.

Pan American World Airways—$7 Million Jet Overhaul Facility in Miami, Fla.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 30, 1964

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, just recently Pan American World Airways, a pioneer in Latin America, dedicated a $7 million jet overhaul facility in Miami. This dedication took place on the site of the United States first permanent international air terminal. It was my pleasure to have been present and to take part in the ceremonies.

Mr. Speaker, this new pioneering job instituted by Pan American is further indication of the tremendously close cooperation existing between the airline and the Dade County Port Authority with whom Pan American has signed a long-term lease to pay off the entire cost of construction. When the $7 million obligation on the part of Pan American has been liquidated, the building complex will become the property of the Dade County Port Authority.

The new Miami facility is the biggest jet overhaul base in the Pan American system and has the mission of keeping flying the airline's fleet of 129 airliners, 79 jet and 50 propeller aircraft.

Included in the big base complex are the huge maintenance building and an adjacent strikingly modern, gold-grilled headquarters building for the Latin American division, as well as several small satellite buildings.

The maintenance building consolidates under one 7-acre roof, 18 special shops, supply warehouse, engineering and production offices that have been dispersed in various locations around the airport, often several miles apart.

Stretching the equivalent of more than two city blocks along Northwest 36th Street, 372 feet deep, the building contains 660,000 square feet of hangars, shops, and offices. Two huge jet clippers can be positioned simultaneously in the hangar area.

The maintenance unit is big enough to contain more than 50 buildings of the size of Pan American's original Miami base, built in 1929, which launched Miami as the country's first international air gateway.

Pan Am's new Miami base represents a jet age overhaul complex as modern as any to be found anywhere in the world, Executive Vice President Wilbur L. Morrison, in charge of the Latin American division, has told me.

In addition, it has been carefully planned and engineered so that it can be expanded easily. Pan Am is confident that expansion will be needed to meet the growing air travel of the next few years, as well as the 2,000-mile-an-hour supersonic age which the next decade will usher in.

The overhaul base represents a modern industrial version of the mountain coming to Mahomet—the shops come to the plane, instead of vice versa.

When a jet clipper is rolled into the hangar for overhaul, nestled over, under, and around its sweptback wings and half-block-long fuselage are the repair shops, various special rooms, engineering and production offices, and vast supply warehouse necessary to support it.

A worker, for example, can remove a delicate and complicated piece of radio or electronic gear in the two-story-high cockpit of a jet clipper and step directly outside onto a ramp which leads to the radio or instrument shop less than 50 feet away.

Previously, and in less modern bases, these and similar components would have to be removed from the aircraft, loaded on trucks and be transported often several miles to the proper shop. Once overhauled, the part would have to be transported back to the plane. This uses up valuable extra time and poses problems of having components damaged or thrown out of adjustment during transit.

All the shops and offices in the maintenance building are air conditioned except the propeller shop, welding shop and plating shop. In these three areas a special ventilation system is provided. Air cooling also is provided in the cavernous supply warehouse, where fans and power roof ventilators furnish a complete change of air every 6 minutes.

The air conditioning required units totaling 1,000 tons capacity, sufficient to air condition 300 average-size homes.

Two 350-seat cafeterias, a medical department, industrial relations offices, base security offices and credit union offices also are housed in the maintenance building.

The administration building, Mr. Speaker, of contemporary design, is patterned after the prize-winning design of the U.S. Embassy in New Delhi, India. It contains some 32,000 square feet of executive offices, in the form of a hollow square with an interior patio open to the sky. In the patio are a fountain, reflecting pool and colorful tropical plantings.

Exterior walls of the two-story administration building are of bronze-pierced grilles with gold-anodized trim.

The building is set 225 feet back from the street and twin driveways leading to the entrance are centered by a landscaped 150-foot reflecting pool.

Forming an impressive column marching up to the front entrance are 24 flagstaffs from which will fly the flags of the United States and Latin American Republics.

In addition to the buildings, 3 separate employee parking areas have been established around the base, with spaces for 2,100 cars. A 785-foot covered, lighted walkway leads from the maintenance building entrance to the main parking lot.

Some $25,000 has been spent on landscaping the entire complex, designed to make it an attractive adjunct to the area.

Construction of the base has required 18 months from the time the first spadeful of earth was turned on November 17, 1962.

The entire project was under the auspices of the Dade County Port Authority, with whom Pan American has signed a lease sufficient to pay off the entire cost of construction. At the termination of the lease, the port authority owns the buildings free and clear.

Architects for the Pan Am complex were a joint venture team of Maurice Connell, Inc., architects-engineers, and Steward-Skinner Associates, architects, of Miami. Both firms have done considerable work on other Miami International Airport facilities.

Contractors were H. C. Beck Construction Co. of Dallas, for the Maintenance Building, and Witters Construction Co. of Miami, who built the Administration Building.

Mr. Speaker, an impressive list of "firsts" in international aviation history have been racked up at Miami by Pan American World Airways over the years. Here are some of them:

First U.S. airline to operate a permanent international air service, initially out of Key West, then for many years, Miami.

First U.S. airline to operate landplanes over water on regularly scheduled flights, initially between Key West-Miami and Havana.

First U.S. airline to operate multiengined aircraft permanently on scheduled transportation.

First U.S. airline to use radio communications, starting with the Miami-Havana flights in 1928.

First U.S. airline to carry emergency lifesaving equipment.

First U.S. airline to carry multiple-flight crews.

First U.S. airline to develop an airport and airways traffic control system, originated at the Miami base in 1928.

First airline to order and purchase aircraft built to its own specifications, the Sikorsky S-38 used by Col. Charles Lindbergh on the first Miami-Panama flight.

First airline to develop and use instrument flying techniques, begun on the long overwater flights between Miami and the Caribbean.

First U.S. airline to develop a complete aviation weather service.

First airline to employ cabin attendants and serve meals aloft.

First U.S. airline to offer international air express service, inaugurated in Miami.

First U.S. airline to develop and use four-engine flying boats, the glamourous luxury airliners which made Miami's Dinner Key base one of the most famous air terminals in the world.

First airline to sell all-expense international air tours, starting with Miami-Caribbean-South America junkets in 1932.

First airline to operate a scheduled transpacific service, in 1935, and transatlantic passenger and mail service, in 1939, using lessons learned in the Caribbean laboratory on flights out of Miami.

First airline to operate a scheduled commercial around-the-world service, again using overwater navigation and other techniques developed in the Miami-Caribbean-South America flights.

First U.S. airline to fly a commercial jet flight, between Miami and San Juan, P.R., on August 23, 1958.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JULY 1, 1964

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Psalm 133: 1: *Behold how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity.*

Almighty God, of all holiness and righteousness, may we now with humility approach Thy throne of grace where none have ever been repelled or sent empty away without Thy needed blessings.

Show us how we may meet and master the problems of human relationships and seek to find a satisfactory solution to those attitudes which we know are basically and morally wrong.

May we daily put our trust in Thee and be joyously confident that all our longings and hopes are never too lofty to be fulfilled by Thy divine wisdom and power.

Inspire us with a deepening sense of human solidarity and our social responsibility. Help us to cultivate a spirit that is more considerate and compassionate, more gentle and gracious, more magnanimous and unselfish.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on June 30, 1964, the President approved and signed bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1608. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide that certain aircraft engines and propellers may be exported as working parts of aircraft, and for other purposes;

H.R. 2652. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the duty-free importation of certain wools for use in the manufacturing of polishing felts;

H.R. 4198. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of soluble and instant coffee;

H.R. 6308. An act for the relief of Gerard Puillet;

H.R. 6843. An act for the relief of David Sheppard;

H.R. 7480. An act to suspend for a temporary period the import duty on manganese ore (including ferruginous ore) and related products;

H.R. 8230. An act to amend section 24 of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 371) to liberalize the conditions of loans by national banks on forest tracts;

H.R. 8268. An act to prevent double taxation in the case of certain tobacco products exported and returned unchanged to the United States for delivery to a manufacturer's bonded factory;

H.R. 8673. An act to amend title V of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to provide that the validity of an instrument the recording of which is provided for by such act shall be governed by the laws of the place in which such instrument is delivered, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8975. An act to provide for the tariff classification of certain particleboard;

H.R. 9090. An act for the relief of Mrs. Audrey Rossmann;

H.R. 9688. An act to extend the period during which responsibility for the placement and foster care of dependent children, under the program of aid to families with dependent children under title IV of the Social Security Act, may be exercised by a public agency other than the agency administering such aid under the State plan;

H.R. 10000. An act to extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, and for other purposes;

H.R. 10314. An act to further amend the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended, to extend the expiration date of certain authorities thereunder, and for other purposes;

H.R. 10466. An act to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to extend the period during which temporary assistance may be provided for U.S. citizens returned from foreign countries;

H.R. 10468. An act to continue until the close of June 30, 1966, the existing suspension of duty on certain copying lathes;

H.R. 10669. An act to extend the Renegotiation Act of 1951, and for other purposes;

H.R. 10945. An act to authorize appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes;

H.R. 11499. An act to amend section 14(b) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, to extend for 2 years the authority of Federal Reserve banks to purchase U.S. obligations directly from the Treasury;

H.R. 11376. An act to provide a 1-year extension of certain excise tax rates, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 1041. Joint resolution temporarily extending the program of insured rental housing loans for the elderly in rural areas under title V of the Housing Act of 1949.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 10222. An act to strengthen the agricultural economy; to help to achieve a fuller and more effective use of food abundances; to provide for improved levels of nutrition among economically needy households through a cooperative Federal-State program of food assistance to be operated through normal channels of trade; and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. JOHNSTON, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. AIKEN, and Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 6. An act to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems, both public and private, in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1123. An act to provide for the construction of the Lower Teton division of the Teton Basin Federal reclamation project, Idaho, and for other purposes;

S. 1509. An act to authorize reimbursement to owners and tenants of certain lands or interests therein acquired by the United States for certain moving expenses, losses, and damages, and for other purposes; and

S. 2281. An act to amend the Alaska Omnibus Act to provide assistance to the State of Alaska for the reconstruction of areas damaged by the earthquake of March 1964 and subsequent seismic waves, and for other purposes.

AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS TO THE NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT, CONSTRUCTION OF FACILITIES, AND ADMINISTRATIVE OPERATIONS, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. MILLER of California submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 10456) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and administrative operations, and for other purposes.

ALASKA TREATED SHABBILY

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, reluctantly, I have been forced to the conclusion that in the overall, Alaska has received rather shabby treatment in relation to her reconstruction needs arising out of the damage due to the earthquake of March 1964.

The executive agencies of our Government certainly responded promptly and with sincere sympathy, and I am not unmindful of Federal assistance rendered. In fact, I obtained a table from the Federal Reconstruction and Development Planning Commission for Alaska and the estimates indicate authorized amounts for relief of one kind or another will amount to between $300 and $400 million.

But, Mr. Speaker, this seems to me rather meager in view of the losses and it is slow.

On the other hand, compare what the Federal Government did under foreign aid toward earthquake relief.

To Communist Yugoslavia we gave immediate relief of $450 million, with no strings. Then we added another $70 million.

Chile received an immediate $100 million special appropriation.

But with Alaska, and our fellow American citizens, we raise all kinds of technicalities. We do little for the private sectors of the economy.

Yesterday, I regret, the Senate rejected some liberalizing amendments to the Alaska Omnibus Act (S. 2881). I do not like to complain, but I had hoped more could have been done. As I say, compared to foreign aid, in my opinion, Alaskans have received rather shabby treatment.

REPORT OF NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 314)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Science and Astronautics and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, as amended, I transmit herewith a report of the projects and progress of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for the period of January 1, 1963, through June 30, 1963.

This report covers 6 months of significant and encouraging activity in the national space program. The breadth of performance promises subsequent periods of even greater accomplishment in meeting the challenge of space.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 1, 1964.*

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 175]

Ashley
Avery
Bass
Bennett, Mich.
Bolling
Bolton, Frances P.
Bruce
Davis, Ga.
Diggs
Evins
Forrester
Hanna
Hoffman
Holifield
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Pa.
Kilburn
Lankford
Lesinski
Lloyd
McFall
Miller, N.Y.
Morrison
Moss
Norblad
Pilcher
Powell
Rains
Robison
Rogers, Tex.
St Germain
Senner
Sisk
Smith, Calif.
Staggers
Tollefson
Williams
Wilson, Bob

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 390 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

HEARING BEFORE A SELECT PANEL ON MISSISSIPPI AND CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my remarks which appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 15, 1964, at pages 13857–13860 be included in the body of the permanent RECORD during the special order of the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN] to follow the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. NIX], and to precede the remarks of the gentleman from California [Mr. EDWARDS]. Mr. RYAN's special order appears in the RECORD of June 16, pages 13996–14012.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1965

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 11812) making appropriations for foreign assistance and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H.R. 11812, with Mr. PRICE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday, the Clerk had read through line 5, page 1 of the bill.

If there are no amendments at this point, the Clerk will read.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to make an announcement to the Members of the House, one in which all Members are interested. Following the disposition of this pending legislation and the resolution dealing with civil rights, and probably the conference report on the NASA authorization bill tomorrow—and there may be another conference report or two—it will be our intention to move to adjourn at the close of business tomorrow over until July 20. There is a possibility that votes on some of these matters could come up today, if they are ready.

Mr. Chairman, I would like also to state in this regard that we feel these extra few days of recess are in order. The House has been proceeding with business while the Senate has been debating for many days the civil rights bill. Today we will have finished the last of the regular appropriation bills which I believe is a pretty good record in itself. It is the first time, I believe, that we have done this this early in the year in several years. So I know we have the time. I know that the Senate has to catch up with us and I for one am very happy that we are able to do this.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I want to say to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT], the very distinguished majority leader, that I certainly appreciate this information, as I am sure all Members on both sides of the aisle appreciate the information.

I further want to say to the gentleman that as far as I am concerned, and I am sure I speak for all of the Members on my side of the aisle, I appreciate the consideration and the courtesy that has been shown us in connection with this matter since it particularly involves us on this side of the aisle in respect to our convention, the opening sessions of which will be coming on next Monday out in San Francisco.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say further, so there will be no misunderstanding, that in the discussions we have had looking to the accomplishment of this announcement, I have found the leadership on the majority side of the aisle to be most desirous of being helpful and understanding of the position in which some of us found ourselves. I have known from the beginning what the desires of the Speaker and the majority leader and others in a position of leadership on the Democratic side of the aisle have been and what their position has been. So, I thank the gentleman.

If the gentleman will yield further, could I put this one further question? As I understand it, a recess resolution will be offered as we come to the conclusion of business tomorrow?

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. HALLECK. So that except in the event of some emergency under which the President could call us back, we would know that there would be no business on the floor of the House of Representatives until this date, July 20?

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman is correct. Of course, we will have to wait until the Senate acts on the resolution.

Mr. HALLECK. I understand that.

Mr. ALBERT. I want to say to the gentleman and to the other Members of the House that we have had to make this announcement contingent upon the disposition of certain very important bills, as all Members I am sure know.

We could not come to this conclusion until our House was in order in that regard.

Mr. HALLECK. Will the gentleman yield for just one further observation?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I certainly appreciate that fact, and so far as we could on our side of the aisle we have attempted to cooperate in bringing about action on those measures in respect to which the gentleman referred.

Having said as much, may I again thank the majority leader and the Speaker for the consideration that they have shown us. This is the earliest the announcement could be made. Many had hoped it might be made earlier, but I think it is made in time so that Members who want to can avail themselves of the opportunity that will be presented for us on our side to go to our convention and for Members not going to the convention and certainly Members on the gentleman's side who want to do certain things during the 2 weeks' recess will have an opportunity to make their plans accordingly.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, it has come to my attention that those who desire to offer the main amendments to this bill would like to offer them en bloc. Personally, I think that would be a very good way to consider the matter. It would save time, it would expedite proceedings, but in order to do so it becomes necessary that I make a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I should like to propound a question of the gentleman from Virginia:

May I ask him as to his attitude on cutting off debate on these amendments? It strikes me, with the amendments being offered en bloc, we should be generous with time, we should be generous with those Members on the committee, and the subcommittee, particularly, who might desire to have an extra period of time for debate. All in all, we want to make sure those Members who have not had a chance to express themselves will have that opportunity.

Mr. GARY. I am certain that the gentleman is asking that question for the benefit of the House, not for himself. The gentleman is well enough acquainted with me to know that I have never had any desire to cut off reasonable debate. I believe these matters should be fully debated and everyone should have an opportunity to express himself. Sometimes, of course, as debate drags on it does become necessary to offer a motion; but I assure the gentleman that before offering a motion of that kind I will consult with him and it will not be offered without his approval.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. The gentleman from Virginia is always fair. He is absolutely correct. I merely asked the question for the information of the Members of the House, and not for myself.

Of course, I knew what his attitude would be.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. PASSMAN

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in six parts.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendments offered by Mr. PASSMAN:
>
> On page 2, line 9, strike out "$204,600,000" and insert "$175,000,000";
>
> On page 2, line 15, strike out "$134,272,400" and insert "$124,272,400";
>
> On page 2, line 17, strike out "$405,000,000" and insert "$354,000,000";
>
> On page 2, line 19, strike out "$150,000,000" and insert "$100,000,000";
>
> On page 2, line 23, strike out "$425,000,000" and insert "$400,000,000";
>
> On page 2, line 26, strike out "$782,200,000" and insert "$700,000,000".

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I have been a Member of this body for 18 years. In debating various issues, I have never dealt in personalities. And, I have always tried to present my case as forthrightly and factually as I could.

I believe the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD], a member of the subcommittee which handles the foreign aid money bill, has served on the subcommittee for 12 years, and I believe he is supporting my position this year.

Mr. FORD. That is correct. I went on the subcommittee in January 1953.

Mr. PASSMAN. I believe the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES], the ranking minority Member, has been on this subcommittee for 6 years.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. That is correct.

Mr. PASSMAN. I believe he is supporting my views. Is that not correct?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. That is correct.

Mr. PASSMAN. I have been on this subcommittee for 12 years; 12 plus 6 is 18, plus 12 is 30.

The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ANDREWS] I believe has been on this subcommittee for 8 years. He, too, is supporting my position.

So that is 38 years for the four of us.

Mr. Chairman, yesterday I made this statement:

> Let me say, Mr. Chairman, that most of the members of the subcommittee who attended the hearings the longest are today most assuredly supporting my position the strongest.

I knew we had these members with years of seniority who were supporting my position.

In considering the amendment before you, Mr. Chairman, if we consider it completely factually, and go according to the record, there should not be opposition to it. That, however, is too much to expect.

May I ask this question of the distinguished gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES]. The aggregate of the amendment I have offered is $247,800,000. Is that the gentleman's understanding?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. The answer to the gentleman's question is in the affirmative. That is correct.

Mr. PASSMAN. In the event the amendment should be adopted, then the new appropriation in this bill for fiscal 1965, title I only, will be $3,068,772,400?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. That is the figure I have.

That would be the correct figure for new obligational authority in the next fiscal year for projects under title I.

Mr. PASSMAN. Does that sum compare with $2,801,700,000 which the House approved last year at this point?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. That was the figure which the House passed last year.

Mr. PASSMAN. So in the event this amendment should be adopted, we would still at this point be appropriating $268,702,000 more than the House appropriated at this point last year?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. That is correct as I understand it.

Mr. PASSMAN. Is it also true that there was a $135 million nonrecurring article in this bill last year?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I believe that was the bill for last year.

Mr. PASSMAN. That is true.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Yes.

Mr. PASSMAN. There was $135 million last year in the bill for the Inter-American social economic cooperation program, for which no funds are requested this year; is that correct?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. That is correct. That was a nonrecurring item last year.

Mr. PASSMAN. If we should add that item to the $268 million, the bill at this point, with the proposed amendment, is approximately $400 million more than the House appropriated last year?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. PASSMAN. I thank the gentleman.

That clears up a lot of confusion. I want to make these figures completely accurate. So, with the proposed reductions, the sum appropriated would be about $400 million above last year at this point.

Mr. Chairman, all of us remember the point 4 technical aid program which was started under former President Truman as bilateral technical aid.

We have as the first item in my amendment the category of development grants. Last year the Congress appropriated $155 million for this purpose.

I want to ask the distinguished minority member whether it is not true that the development grants item is basically the bilateral technical aid program with a new name? And that 90 percent of the money for this category is for technical aid?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. That fact has been testified to repeatedly in the hearings before the subcommittee.

Mr. PASSMAN. I thank the gentleman.

Development grants—it is purely and simply technical aid. And they have a leadtime of about 12 months. It is a payroll account.

I want to ask also if it is not true that since April 6 in this category the economic aid people have deobligated and reobligated funds from 236 projects in the amount of $50 million?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. That is my understanding. I have not gotten the figures myself, but it is my understanding the report submitted to the Committee on Appropriations indicates that.

Mr. PASSMAN. The information is in the minority report; 236 projects are involved amounting to $50 million. But, not a word has been said about it. That is an extra $50 million—from April 6—of money that has been deobligated from projects and obligated in excess of the cost of the program in previous years.

Now, as to the proposed amendment, it simply means that if the House reduces this item as proposed we would still provide the Agency with $194 million for this purpose. Is that your understanding?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Yes.

Mr. PASSMAN. And that is $17 million more than was appropriated last year?

Let me say, Mr. Chairman, that in this one item, as of June 30, 1964, there was to be an estimated $324,856,000 in unliquidated funds, which means that if my amendment is adopted, they will have a half billion dollars for use in this technical aid program.

I do not believe the leadership wants this kind of situation. I do not believe the Congress wants it.

I have summarized this matter accurately, have I not?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. That is correct.

Mr. PASSMAN. This program is administered by the State Department, and it involves some 71,000 personnel scattered all over the world.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. FRASER. Is it not true that 33,000 of those are not administering this program?

Mr. PASSMAN. I have given the figure for personnel.

Mr. FRASER. They are training.

Mr. PASSMAN. I did not say anything about them administering the program. There are 71,416 people drawing a check every month.

Mr. FRASER. If I am not mistaken, the gentleman said they were administering the program.

Mr. PASSMAN. Do they have 71,416 on the payroll?

Mr. FRASER. No, sir.

Mr. PASSMAN. They do have. That information is in the hearings. Look at the figures AID gave.

Those figures are verified. There are 71,416, including the participants, who are getting a check every month from the program.

Mr. FRASER. If the gentleman will yield, there are 33,000 personnel who are in training. They are not on the payroll. They are not getting salaries. All they get are their expenses, while we train them to fight Communist subversion, and train them so that they can help to build their countries.

Mr. PASSMAN. Let me say that there are 71,416 drawing some kind of monthly compensation from the Agency. That is the record. All the debate we might engage in would not change this fact.

I will ask the gentleman from Michigan to verify the figure. Is that correct?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, regardless of how we label them they cost money.

Mr. PASSMAN. Yes.

Mr. FORD. The figures shown on page 132 of part 2 of the hearings for fiscal year 1965 show that participant costs are $93,300,000. Regardless of the title we give, it is a substantial element of the cost to the taxpayers of the United States.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I will not yield further to the gentleman at this point.

I ask the distinguished gentleman from Michigan whether it is not true that we established in our hearings that 71,416 people received a monthly compensation from the aid program?

Mr. FORD. There is a chart on page 121 of part 2 of the hearings for fiscal year 1965. This is a chart which was inserted by the agency itself.

This shows that the grand total, including foreign national trainees for fiscal year 1964—dated April 30, 1963—was 70,212. That is their own chart.

Mr. PASSMAN. I will say to the gentleman that when I put out this letter I stated accurately—and this information is verified—that 71,416 people, including participants, draw monthly compensation. I do not care what category you place them in.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the second item of the proposed amendment deals with the international organizations and programs. At this point last year our committee recommended $100 million for this purpose, and this House approved that figure. In conference we went up to $116 million, and that was the final appropriation. Under my amendment reducing this item by $10 million, we would still give the international organizations $124,272,000, which is in excess of $8 million more than Congress actually appropriated last year.

Now, in supporting assistance last year this House approved $300 million. When the bill went to conference we came out of the conference with $330 million. If you approve my amendment, you are still going to give this agency $350 million, $20 million more than was appropriated last year.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The objection is withdrawn.

Mr. PASSMAN. I thank the gentleman.

Moving into the contingency fund, last year we appropriated in new funds only $50 million. Without the administration asking for reappropriation of about $117 million we also reappropriated that money. We know now, however, that we made a mistake, because they are using it for reasons that are different than we thought they would. So my amendment, if the House approves it, simply means you would give the contingency fund $100 million.

In development loans—or, rather, credits—for the Alliance for Progress, at this point last year the House approved $350 million. In the final bill, $375 million in new funds was appropriated. If you approve my amendment, you would still give $400 million in new funds, which is $25 million more than the final appropriation last year.

Now, in development loans—or credits—at this point last year the House approved $600 million. In conference there was approved $687.3 million, which was the sum appropriated. If you approve my amendment, you are still going to give this item $700 million, which is $100 million more than you approved at this point last year and approximately $13 million more than the final appropriation.

So, Mr. Chairman, should we not take into account that the hassle going on here today is no different than the other 9 years it has been my privilege to work this bill as chairman of the subcommittee.

This bill, at best, is a blank check from the time we give it to them until we bring them back in the following year. Every program is illustrative.

Now, the same arguments would be advanced against my proposals this year as the arguments which have been advanced in previous years. But, the situation is a little different this year. There is no use, however, to elaborate on that matter. But the facts of the program are the same; make no mistake about that.

As I said on yesterday, if you defeated this bill and did not give the agency a dime there would be sufficient money on hand to discharge every legal commitment out of funds which are unliquidated. So it is a question of how much you want to give away in this fiscal year 1965.

We pulled the curtain down yesterday on the approximately $7 billion deficit. We will pull it down next June 30 on another deficit in the fiscal year 1965.

These proposals are most reasonable.

Finally, let me state that the total cost of the foreign aid bill will be in excess of $10 billion this year; slightly in excess of $7 billion when you pick up the 16 spigots from the same 26 agencies handling phases of foreign aid, and then if you add to that sum the interest that we pay on the money which we have borrowed to give away, it is in excess of $10 billion.

I certainly hope that this year you will manifest the same type of confidence in me that you have in the past. I have always given you accurate and dependable figures.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendments offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN]. This may come as a surprise because I have often opposed the foreign aid program and prior to my service on the Committee on Appropriations often opposed the mutual security appropriation bill considered in previous years as this one is now being considered now. My opposition, vocal, and otherwise, has been because I have had some doubts and some reservations about the philosophy of the mutual security program. But, Mr. Chairman, once the Congress acts and the mutual security program is extended year after year it then becomes my obligation to myself and to my country in conformity with the oath which I have six times taken in the well of this House to do my best to uphold the laws of this country, to make them work as best as they can work, and to make this program a success.

It is with that thought in mind, Mr. Chairman, that I ask this committee to sustain the action of the subcommittee and to sustain the Committee on Appropriations by voting to reject the amendments offered by the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of the foreign assistance program is to promote the security of the United States by providing assistance and encouragement to other nations of the world so that they can grow in political freedom, national independence, and economic security.

> As these objectives are realized, the likelihood of such nations coming under the influence of our enemies is lessened and their ability to assist us in shouldering the burdens of the free world is increased. As they grow in economic strength, international trade, essential to the prosperity of the United States and to the employment of American citizens, will increase.

Mr. Chairman, I have quoted a paragraph from the majority portion of the report which accompanies this bill, H.R. 11812.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Georgia yield?

Mr. FLYNT. I gladly yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. The gentleman from Georgia supported the majority of the subcommittee and the majority in the full committee that recommended an appropriation in title I of $3,316,572,400, and in title II, a figure of $422,677,000, or a total appropriation in fiscal 1965 of $3,739,249,400.

Do I gather from the gentleman's previous support in the subcommittee and in the full committee that he intends to vote for the bill at that figure?

Mr. FLYNT. I hope that the gentleman from Michigan for whom I have a very high and warm regard——

Mr. FORD. I appreciate the gentleman's thoughts.

Mr. FLYNT. Certainly understands the gentleman from Georgia in his remarks to say that the gentleman from Georgia will support the bill as reported by the committee, if these amendments are rejected.

Mr. FORD. If the gentleman will yield further, has the gentleman in the past supported the foreign aid appropriation bill?

Mr. FLYNT. I will say to the gentleman from Michigan if he had listened to my opening remarks, he would have heard me say there have been times when I have opposed it and there have been times when I have supported it. When I have opposed it I have done so because I had some doubts and some reservations about the philosophy behind it. But once it is enacted into law and becomes the law of this country, then if I am to be true to the oath that I take in the well of this House at the beginning of every Congress, then it is my responsibility, as it is the responsibility of the gentleman from Michigan, to make it work and to make it a success, because if it is the foreign policy of this country then it is necessary that it be a success.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Chairman, let there be no doubt, as I just replied to my good friend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD], that I am going to support this bill.

The Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union will have the full opportunity to work its will under the processes and rules and procedures of this great body in which we serve.

Mr. Chairman, I have been the subject of a personal attack, of vituperation by the gentleman from Louisiana. He has charged everyone who disagreed with him on this measure with being actuated by lack of integrity and by a lack of motivation.

Mr. Chairman, it is almost this simple: We are confronted with the choice of letting the President of the United States set the foreign policy of this country or letting the gentleman from Louisiana set it.

Mr. Chairman, as far as motivation, integrity, and character are concerned, when the gentleman from Louisiana stands on one side, and the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], and our great President of the United States stand on the other side, then to paraphrase Joshua of the Old Testament, as for me and my house I choose the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] and the President of the United States, and by them I shall stand.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, I have just handed to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES], who is now in the well of the House, a five-page document, and I would like to ask the gentleman about it. It carries a total of $1,057 million in loans to various and sundry nations on the earth that have been made in the last 12 months.

I would like to ask the gentleman to explain to me for the benefit of the Members of this House what is included, the time limit on these loans, and the amount of interest that is paid on these loans.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. The document the gentleman refers to, which he handed to me, is headed "Loans Made by the Agency for International Development to Foreign Countries During Calendar Year 1963 at Three-fourths of 1 Percent for 40 Years."

The source of material is "Status of Loan Agreements—W–224, Agency for International Development of March 31, 1964."

To answer the question specifically, this is a list of loans that were made in 35 different countries throughout the world. The terms are 40 years for repayment. I might add for the gentleman's benefit there is also a 10-year grace period before any repayment begins.

The interest rate is three-fourths of 1 percent per annum.

I may say to the gentleman parenthetically that the use of the word "interest" is a misnomer when applied to a rate of three-fourths. This is a service charge, and there really is no interest paid on these particular loans.

These loans are called soft loans, because they are not loans of a high quality which could be made by private banks or by the Export-Import Bank, or by any of the other lending institutions. There is doubt about the collectability of these loans. May I again say that the word "loan" is a misnomer. Maybe it would be better to say they are gifts with three-fourths of 1 percent service charge. There is that much doubt about repayment.

Mr. HALEY. They also cover practically every conceivable thing in the world that this money is to be used for—roads, colleges, various and sundry things. We do not know where they are, when they will be built, or anything about them. Is that correct?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. That is correct. Neither the Appropriations Committee nor the legislative committee have any way of knowing what projects these loans are to finance. We only know what the loans will finance after they are contracted, and the funds obligated.

Mr. HALEY. I include this document in the RECORD so that the American people can see what is happening to their hard-earned dollars:

Loans made by the Agency for International Development to foreign countries during calendar year 1963 at ¾ of 1 percent for 40 years[1]
(repayable in dollars)

LATIN AMERICA

Country	Borrower purpose	Date of loan agreement	Number of years repayment	Interest rate	Amount of loan
Argentina	Government of Argentina, Central Housing Bank	June 3, 1963	40	¾	$12,500,000
Do	Government of Argentina, Route 12 road project	Jan. 21, 1963	40	¾	6,700,000
Do	Government of Argentina, road program loan	Mar. 18, 1963	40	¾	30,500,000
Do	Government of Argentina, feasibilities studies	June 3, 1963	40	¾	3,000,000
Do	Government of Argentina, grain storage facilities	Oct. 10, 1963	40	¾	21,700,000
Bolivia	Government of Bolivia, access roads	Aug. 1, 1963	40	¾	7,200,000
Do	Government of Bolivia, La Paz-El Alto Highway	Aug. 17, 1963	40	¾	3,400,000
Do	Government of Bolivia, El Alto customs center	do	40	¾	2,200,000
Do	Banco Industrial, S.A., assist in financing subloans	do	40	¾	2,400,000
Do	Government of Bolivia, agricultural bank	do	40	¾	3,700,000
Brazil	Credito E Financiamento S.A., development bank	Mar. 6, 1963	40	¾	4,000,000
Do	CIA. de Carbonos Coloidois, carbon black plant	Mar. 11, 1963	40	¾	2,000,000
Do	Government of Brazil, emergency stopgap assistance	Apr. 24, 1963	40	¾	25,500,000
Do	Super Desenvolvimento, N.E., emergency electric power	Oct. 29, 1963	40	¾	2,400,000
Chile	Government of Chile, development program	Jan. 31, 1963	40	¾	35,000,000
Colombia	Government of Colombia, feasibility studies	June 26, 1963	40	¾	4,000,000
Do	National Housing Institute of Colombia, self-help housing	do	40	¾	7,500,000
Do	Colombian Institute of Agrarian Reform, supervised agricultural credit	do	40	¾	10,000,000
Do	Government of Colombia, mineral resources survey	Sept. 18, 1963	40	¾	2,000,000
Costa Rica	Banco Nacional de Costa Rica, agricultural development	July 23, 1963	40	¾	5,000,000
Do	Republic of Costa Rica, slum replacement housing	do	40	¾	2,000,000
Do	Republic of Costa Rica, Cachi hydroelectric project	do	40	¾	1,500,000
Do	Republic of Costa Rica, metro emergency water supply	do	40	¾	1,400,000
Do	Republic of Costa Rica, IBRC/AIC highway program	do	40	¾	2,100,000
Do	C.O. F.I.S.A., financing subloans	Dec. 23, 1963	40	¾	5,000,000

See footnote at end of table.

Loans made by the Agency for International Development to foreign countries during calendar year 1963 at ¾ of 1 percent for 40 years[1] *(repayable in dollars)*—Continued

LATIN AMERICA

Country	Borrower purpose	Date of loan agreement	Number of years repayment	Interest rate	Amount of loan
Dominican Republic	National Housing Bank, Savings and Loan Association	Jan. 2, 1963	40	¾	$2,100,000
Ecuador	Government of Ecuador, Quito, Quevedc Rd	Sept. 1, 1963	40	¾	2,700,000
Do	Government of Ecuador, economic and engineering studies	Sept. 4, 1963	40	¾	2,000,000
Do	Government of Ecuador, administrative and fiscal reform	Sept. 2, 1963	40	¾	1,600,000
El Salvador	Republic of El Salvador, primary school construction	Sept. 18, 1963	40	¾	2,400,000
Do	Republic of El Salvador, agricultural loan program	do	40	¾	8,900,000
Do	Republic of El Salvador, INSAFI	do	40	¾	4,500,000
Honduras	Government of Honduras, small water systems	Aug. 22, 1963	40	¾	1,050,000
Jamaica	Government of Jamaica, project assistance	Nov. 29, 1963	40	¾	1,500,000
Nicaragua	Government of Nicaragua, Las Mercedes Airport	July 25, 1963	40	¾	1,000,000
Panama	Instuto de Acuedictos, water supply and sewerage system	Feb. 6, 1963	40	¾	6,000,000
Peru	Government of Peru, Lima, water sewerage	Mar. 15, 1963	40	¾	8,600,000
Do	Government of Peru, feasibility studies	do	40	¾	3,000,000
Uruguay	Banco Hipotecaric del Uruguay, home construction	Feb. 28, 1963	40	¾	6,000,000
Venezuela	Central American Bank for Economic Integration, feasibility studies	Nov. 29, 1963	40	¾	2,500,000
Do	Central American Bank for Economic Integration, home loan department	do	40	¾	10,000,000

FAR EAST

Country	Borrower purpose	Date of loan agreement	Number of years repayment	Interest rate	Amount of loan
Korea	Government of Korea, Changsong Coal Mine District	Dec. 7, 1963	40	¾	$9,500,000

NEAR EAST AND SOUTH ASIA

Country	Borrower purpose	Date of loan agreement	Number of years repayment	Interest rate	Amount of loan
Afghanistan	Government of Afghanistan, Ariana Afghan Airlines	Mar. 23, 1963	40	¾	$2,625,000
Do	Government of Afghanistan, transport equipment	Dec. 3, 1963	40	¾	2,000,000
India	Government of India, Ramagundam thermal power	May 21, 1963	40	¾	8,400,000
Do	Government of India, Delhi C thermal power	Mar. 8, 1963	40	¾	16,000,000
Do	Government of India, Satpura thermal power	do	40	¾	25,100,000
Do	Government of India, central ropeway F project	Oct. 21, 1963	40	¾	7,700,000
Do	Government of India, nonproject imports	Feb. 25, 1963	40	¾	240,000,000
India	Government of India, Chandrapura thermal stage II	Oct. 21, 1963	40	¾	16,000,000
Do	Government of India, fifth railway loan	Oct. 21, 1963	40	¾	15,850,000
Do	Government of India, Cucga coal washery plant	Nov. 29, 1963	40	¾	5,100,000
Do	Government of India, Tarapur nuclear power	Dec. 7, 1963	40	¾	80,000,000
Nepal	Government of Nepal, Nepal Industrial Development Corp	Dec. 8, 1963	40	¾	1,000,000
Pakistan	Government of Pakistan, sawmill and timber extraction	Oct. 23, 1963	40	¾	2,200,000
Do	Government of Pakistan, malaria eradication program	Feb. 28, 1963	40	¾	3,800,000
Do	Government of Pakistan, airport and airways equipment	Mar. 22, 1963	40	¾	2,100,000
Do	Government of Pakistan, saline scontent and reclamation project No. 2	do	40	¾	10,800,000
Do	Government of Pakistan, general commodities, 2d	Mar. 27, 1963	40	¾	30,000,000
Do	Government of Pakistan, Chalna anchorage project	Mar. 22, 1963	40	¾	3,600,000
Do	Government of Pakistan, feasibility studies	Mar. 27, 1963	40	¾	2,000,000
Do	Government of Pakistan, CPS and maintenance, Rechna DCAB project	Aug. 15, 1963	40	¾	750,000
Do	Government of Pakistan, coastal embankment project	do	40	¾	6,500,000
Do	Government of Pakistan, general consultants	do	40	¾	4,400,000
Do	Government of Pakistan, 3d commodity loan	Sept. 28, 1963	40	¾	70,500,000
Do	Government of Pakistan, general services in public health	Dec. 9, 1963	40	¾	1,500,000
Do	Government of Pakistan, investigative services	Nov. 20, 1963	40	¾	5,600,000
Do	Government of Pakistan, 5th railway loan	do	40	¾	14,500,000
Do	Government of Pakistan, telecommunication expansion	Oct. 23, 1963	40	¾	4,700,000
Do	Government of Pakistan, machinery pool organization, WAPCA	Dec. 9, 1963	40	¾	5,000,000
Do	Government of Pakistan, mechanical equipment	Nov. 20, 1963	40	¾	1,500,000
Turkey	Government of Turkey, Keban and Ciceroz feasibility studies	July 15, 1963	40	¾	350,000
Do	Government of Turkey, feasibility studies	Oct. 15, 1963	40	¾	3,000,000
Do	Government of Turkey, general commodities	Sept. 11, 1963	40	¾	35,000,000
United Arab Republic, Egypt	Government of United Arab Republic, Cairo west power project	Feb. 20, 1963	40	¾	30,600,000
Do	Government of United Arab Republic cardboard project	Nov. 12, 1963	40	¾	5,700,000

AFRICA

Country	Borrower purpose	Date of loan agreement	Number of years repayment	Interest rate	Amount of loan
Cameroon	Government of Cameroon, extension of railway system	Aug. 27, 1963	40	¾	$9,200,000
Ethiopia	Government of Ethiopia, 3d highway program	Dec. 2, 1963	40	¾	4,000,000
Ivory Coast	Government of Ivory Coast, highway equipment	Nov. 29, 1963	40	¾	1,700,000
Liberia	Government of Liberia, national medical center	Dec. 5, 1963	40	¾	5,300,000
Do	Monrovia Power Authority, MT Coffee hydroelectric project	Sept. 26, 1963	40	¾	24,300,000
Do	Government of Liberia, Monrovia Junior-Senior High School	Oct. 23, 1963	40	¾	1,700,000
Mali	Government of Mali, teachers training college	Dec. 4, 1963	40	¾	2,100,000
Do	Government of Mali, central veterinary laboratory at Bamako	do	40	¾	1,100,000
Niger	Government of Niger, development bank	do	40	¾	500,000
Nigeria	Government of Nigeria, Ibadan water supply	do	40	¾	12,100,000
Do	Government of Nigeria, Calabar-IKCM road	do	40	¾	8,600,000
Somalia	Government of Somalia, Chisimaic port	do	40	¾	3,600,000
Sudan	Government of Sudan, industrial development bank	July 14, 1963	40	¾	2,000,000
Do	Government of Sudan, Khartcum sewerage	Dec. 7, 1963	40	¾	3,800,000
Tanganyika	Government of Tanganyika, Cares Salaam water supply system	May 20, 1963	40	¾	2,200,000
Do	Government of Tanganyika, urban water supplies	Dec. 4, 1963	40	¾	1,300,000
Do	Government of Tanganyika, university college	Oct. 9, 1963	40	¾	800,000
Do	Government of Tanganyika, teacher training college	Dec. 4, 1963	40	¾	800,000
Do	Government of Tanganyika, commodity development training center	do	40	¾	250,000
Do	Government of Tanganyika, agricultural college	do	40	¾	1,250,000
Do	Government of Tanganyika, program loan	Dec. 6, 1963	40	¾	1,000,000
Do	Government of Tanganyika, electrical equipment	do	40	¾	300,000
Tunisia	Government of Tunisia, water and irrigation projects	Feb. 15, 1963	40	¾	2,400,000
Do	Government of Tunisia, commodity assistance	June 20, 1963	40	¾	15,000,000
Do	Government of Tunisia, construction of university	Oct. 31, 1963	40	¾	1,800,000
Do	Government of Tunisia, agricultural equipment	do	40	¾	6,500,000
Uganda	Government of Uganda, development bank	Oct. 4, 1963	40	¾	2,000,000
Do	Government of Uganda, secondary schools	Oct. 11, 1963	40	¾	2,400,000
Grand total for all countries					1,057,925,000

[1] Source: "Status of Loan Agreements" (W-224), Agency for International Development, as of Mar. 31, 1964, Office of the Controller, AID.

Country and total amount	
Argentina	$74,400,000
Bolivia	18,900,000
Brazil	33,900,000
Chile	35,000,000
Colombia	23,500,000
Costa Rica	17,000,000
Dominican Republic	2,100,000
Ecuador	6,300,000
El Salvador	15,800,000
Honduras	1,050,000
Jamaica	1,500,000
Nicaragua	1,000,000
Panama	6,000,000
Peru	11,600,000
Uruguay	6,000,000
Venezuela	12,500,000
Korea	9,500,000
Afghanistan	4,625,000
India	414,150,000
Nepal	1,000,000
Pakistan	169,450,000
Turkey	38,350,000
United Arab Republic (Egypt)	36,300,000
Cameroon	9,200,000
Ethiopia	4,000,000
Ivory Coast	1,700,000
Liberia	31,300,000
Mali	3,200,000
Niger	500,000
Nigeria	20,700,000
Somalia	3,600,000
Sudan	5,800,000
Tanganyika	7,900,000
Tunisia	25,700,000
Uganda	4,400,000
Total	1,057,925,000

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, as I am quite sure everyone here knows, I started with these kinds of programs back in 1947 when I was majority leader of the 80th Congress. I have voted for these programs since that time. There have been times when I voted for cuts in the amount of money to be provided.

A number of Members have spoken to me about what my position might be in respect to the pending amendment. There is some question about it, apparently.

I want to say to the gentleman, for whatever it is worth, that I expect to support the amendment that is presently pending.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, it is very important to keep the record straight. My friend from Georgia knows very well I have never spoken an unkind word about him.

I read verbatim from the gentleman's proposed amendment to our committee's bill. I am going to quote him again:

> Mr. Chairman, this amendment is proposed and offered for two purposes:
>
> First. To write into law that the mutual security program shall not be paid for by deficit financing; and
>
> Second. To make another genuine attempt to balance our national budget, bring an end to deficit financing and make some payments on the existing national debt.

I am going to refuse to get into personalities.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I have already mentioned in the colloquy with the gentleman from Florida the category known as development loans. We mentioned that these are soft loans. They are made around the world for purposes for which it would be impossible to get regular loans. These loans are now repayable in dollars, but those made prior to 1961 were repayable in local currencies. In other words, we loaned dollars and were repaid in the currency of the country to which the loan was made.

We are asking that the appropriation for this category of aid in the next fiscal year be $700 million. In the bill you have before you the figure is $782,200,000. The request from the administration was $922,200,000.

Mr. Chairman, it is always well to look at each of these programs and see what the pipeline is, how much money is left to pay for the items which have been contracted for and the programs which are underway. I should like to say to you now that the pipeline for development loans as of June 30, 1964, is estimated to be the sum of $2,106,694,000. In other words, Mr. Chairman, at the rate that the administration apparently intends to obligate funds for the next fiscal year, it now has a pipeline which without any addition whatsoever would carry this program for the next 3 fiscal years.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arizona has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. RHODES of Arizona was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. The program must be considered in toto. It is not enough to ask merely what the appropriation is for this year. When we consider the proper level for new obligational authority for this year, it is necessary to see what has been appropriated, what has been expended, and what is left unobligated. I remind the Members of the House that when they consider this amendment, that compared to a $2,100 million pipeline, a cut of some $82 million is picayunish. We probably should apologize for not trying to cut it more, but we think this is a reasonable figure and a figure every Member of the House should be delighted to support. It errs on the side of generosity.

Another category which I should like to mention, because this is a category in which we do not make deep cuts, is the Alliance for Progress. There is no amendment to be offered to cut the category known as "development grants for the Alliance for Progress." That is a figure of some $85 million. This is the budget estimate. We will ask that the House appropriate the full amount. This is an amount for the purpose of grant aid in the areas of South and Central America which are our back door. It is needed down there. It is needed to help prime the pump of many of the economies down there. We have not asked for any cuts whatsoever in that particular category.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Whether the amendment is adopted or not, but certainly if the amendment is not adopted, would the gentleman not think that this bill would contribute to the debt and deficit of this country?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Of course, the gentleman from Iowa knows full well it will contribute to the debt and deficit of this country. We have noticed in the papers the last few days the probable deficit for this fiscal year will be some $8 billion. The figures for the projected deficit for the next fiscal year, so far as I know, are not available. But certainly this program, along with the other programs which the Government has, contribute to the deficit.

Mr. GROSS. It seems strange that one of the now strong supporters of this bill, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FLYNT], made the statement that he could not support the foreign handout program until the budget is balanced and there is an end to deficit spending. I just do not understand how a man could make that statement and still support this bill.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. Is it not a fact that the $50 billion we are spending for the defense of this country also adds to the deficit of the country?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I tried to make it clear that each expenditure of the Federal Government adds to the deficit in some measure. I have never thought that you could pick out any one item and say that it alone is responsible for the deficit.

Mr. GARY. I say it contributes to the deficit. I did not say that it was responsible for the deficit. But it does contribute as do all other expenditures. I agree with the gentleman thoroughly.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Was not the statement directed exclusively to the foreign aid bill, and I am referring to the statement that was read here?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I have to confess to the gentleman from Iowa that at the time the statement was read I was trying to prepare my own remarks.

Mr. GROSS. Maybe we ought to have the statement read again.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ICHORD. Can the gentleman give us any of the specific projects which this amendment will eliminate if it is adopted?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. It would be impossible to give the gentleman any specific projects which this amendment would eliminate. I will tell you why. We never know what the projects will be until they tell us what they have been. It is not necessary for them to come in and justify this $700 million in advance. They do not know for sure themselves what the money will be for. They give us illustrative projects because the authorizing legislation allows them to do so. In other words, they give us some idea or, as I say, present illustrative projects for which they may obligate this money. They never really know.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Would the gentleman from Arizona also like to include in the concept of the pipeline the fact that there is a pipeline exceeding $3 billion so far as the military pipeline is concerned and in the agricultural pipeline there is an amount of about $5 billion?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. If the gentleman from New Jersey feels that that is relevant, he has just put it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and I see no reason why any Member should object to it being there.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I do not want anyone to think that the pipeline concept is exclusively the property of the foreign aid program.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. There certainly are other pipelines. I think it is up to the Members of the Congress to look at each and every one of them to make sure that there is not too much latitude being given to the executive department.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I would also like to mention the fact that the cut which we propose for the development loan section for the Alliance for Progress is only in the amount of $25 million. Four hundred and sixty-five million dollars was asked for. The bill contains $425 million. We proposed to make it $400 million. However, with the contingency fund, Mr. Chairman, it is a little bit different. The amount appropriated last year was $50 million. The request is $150 million.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arizona has again expired.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. We will be asking for an appropriation of $100 million.

It has been said that there was a large carryover of funds available for the contingency fund last year, and that is correct. With the amount appropriated and the amount of carryover there was $177 million available for expenditure from the contingency fund in this fiscal year.

It has been said—and, so far as I know, the figures are accurate—that practically all the available funds have been used. But how were they used, Mr. Chairman?

This contingency fund, under the law which set it up, is a contingency fund for economic assistance only. It is not for military assistance, but for economic assistance. The military assistance has its own contingency fund of $300 million in military equipment which can be transferred at the request of the President of the United States, without reference to Congress or to anyone else to the military assistance program.

However, the circumvention of the intent of Congress was accomplished in the following way: $75 million was transferred from the contingency fund to other categories of economic assistance. I do not know whether the money went to development loans or to supporting assistance or to development grants. That is irrelevant. The money was transferred to some categories of economic assistance. Then, using the 10-percent transferability, which is another portion of the law, the same money was transferred out of these categories and into the military assistance fund.

Mr. Chairman, let me pose a question to the Members of the House. If this is not a very bald circumvention of the intent of Congress—in fact, the clear meaning of the law—I have never seen one.

This is not anything new. It has been done before. This is not a castigation of the present administration. This is merely another instance in which once again the intent of Congress has been flouted by people who have done so because they believe they know better how to set up this program than the Members of Congress elected by the people. I believe they are wrong, and it is my hope that by adopting the amendment we will show them that the House also believes they are wrong.

What will be the effect of this? We will appropriate $100 million for this particular fiscal year. Taking the $75 million which I claim was misused out of the funds for last year, the administration had available $102 million. So the amendment, in effect, would only cut the administration by $2 million compared to the amount of money available for the contingency fund in the past fiscal year.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. FRASER. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I was interested in the point that the gentleman felt that the transfer of funds out of the contingency fund to replenish economic funds which in turn were transferred to the military was improper, and perhaps an illegal use of the funds. At least, he felt it was improper.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I believe I said that it was against the manifest intent of Congress.

Mr. FRASER. I wanted to call to the attention of the gentleman the minority views filed in connection with the authorization bill. The following Members signed the minority views: ADAIR, GROSS, BERRY, DERWINSKI, BATTIN, and THOMSON.

In effect they expressly approved that practice, by itemizing the fact that transferability was available into the military assistance funds in precisely the manner the gentleman is now characterizing as wholly improper. I wonder if the gentleman has had an opportunity to read those views?

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana. His name was used in vain.

Mr. ADAIR. I say to the gentleman that the minority members mentioned certainly did not approve of this method of using the contingency fund.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I thank the gentleman from Minnesota for bringing up this subject, so that the implication could be refuted by the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. FRASER. May I read the language?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I am sorry; I do not have enough time for that.

Mr. Chairman, in closing I should like to reiterate something that the gentleman from Louisiana said. The category of development grants is nothing more than the technical assistance program we have known in the past. It is a program with certain merits, but certainly it is one which, in the time we live—a time of deficits, a time of outflow of gold and the like—we should watch very carefully.

The amendment asks for an appropriation of $175 million.

The amount requested was $224 million. The amount in the bill was $204.6 million. We feel it is a very reasonable cut, and we ask you to support us on that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arizona has again expired.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Chairman, the annual international giveaway program is before the House once again. The already overburdened taxpayers of the United States are once more being asked to shell out their hard-earned dollars in support of most of the rest of the world.

President Johnson has the cynical effrontery to term his foreign aid request of this year of $3.5 billion, as a "bare-boned" kind of giveaway. I shudder to think what he might term as a "fattened" proposal.

I believe that this proposed foreign aid spending of $3.3 billion plus an additional $422 million in other programs of foreign aid is spending in the most reckless manner. It is not in the best interests of this Nation.

It is incredible to believe that with the President proposing a war against American poverty on the one hand, he seriously urges on the other that the United States spend $3¾ billion for foreign aid.

This whole program is a kind of Alice in Wonderland business. Sometimes I question whether the persons responsible for the program do not live in a dreamworld all their own.

For example, this Nation is presently financing over 4,000 separate projects scattered all over the face of the earth. Over 71,000 persons are on the payroll. Here is a wonderful example of burgeoning bureaucracy. Although last year the Congress finally managed to cut the foreign aid program back by a big amount, nevertheless the number of employees increased by 7,000 over the year before.

No Federal Government program has ever been administered so irresponsibly. Congress is almost without control over the spending of the money. The program is so flexible, it is like a piece of spaghetti. For example, the AID can justify the appropriation of money for the building of a dam on one continent and use this requested money to build a bridge on another continent.

The minority committee views this year accurately term the foreign aid estimates "of the wildest sort."

Every year, the President comes to the Congress shedding great crocodile tears that unless we spend more billions on stocking this international gift shop that we will get to be known as a tightwad around the world, and that our foreign relations will be irreparably damaged.

The facts show otherwise. Last year, President Kennedy made an initial request of $4,945 million using these same "last ditch stand" arguments. The Congress appropriated $3 billion. This year witness after witness, including Secretary of State Rusk, AID boss Bell and his key assistants all testified that the $3 billion carried on an adequate program.

If last year's program of $3 billion was adequate, why do we need three-fourths of a billion more for this year?

What is tight about the budget figure? It strikes me the belt is so loose here the foreign aid pants are about to fall off.

We are now aiding the fantastic total of 99 foreign countries. I say it is time to start aiding the American taxpayers by stopping this nonsense.

We have a serious gold outflow from our Nation which is dangerously undermining our whole monetary structure. If foreign countries called upon us tomorrow to pay up their gold claims, it could bring us to our financial knees—to bankrupt us. The foreign aid program contributes mightily to this gold outflow. In the 5 years ending December 31, 1963, 57 countries who received $12½ billion of foreign aid from the United States bought approximately $7 billion of our gold.

Although again this year there was the anguished cry, we must continue the aid else the world will be in dire straits, there is today $7 billion of unexpended foreign aid from other years.

We have even forced foreign aid upon nations who have refused it. In 1964 Cambodia rejected our aid. Five months later AID obligated $1.65 million in funds in that country.

The foreign aid program is supposed to be an economic weapon against the spread of communism. Again and again we are confronted with the evidence that the people of the particular foreign nation have no idea that the United States is aiding them.

There is abundant evidence that much of our money is pocketed by the foreign politicians and does not reach the people.

Indonesian President Sukarno is a striking example of how ineffective foreign aid is as an arm of foreign policy. Ever since 1957, when Sukarno announced his "guided democracy"—or inclusion of Communists in his government, he has been playing both sides of the street. An inkling of what was to come was displayed by Sukarno at that time. After a spectacularly publicized visit to the United States, and solemn pledges of friendship, Sukarno flew off to Red China and Russia, where he denounced U.S. "imperialism."

More recently, however, Sukarno has grown bolder. To Ambassador Howard Jones' face, Sukarno barked: "You can go to hell with your aid." What did this public slap accomplish? Did it draw a stinging rebuke by our Government? Of course not. It drew the response the wily Sukarno knew it would. Our State Department is scurrying around trying to mollify Mr. Sukarno. And Mr. Sukarno is taking our aid, and Russia's aid, and everybody's aid, and turning it against newly formed Malaysia to satisfy his insatiable thirst for power. I might add that this is an old tact Sukarno employs to divert his people's attention from internal strife. He did the same in demanding possession of West Irian. He rattled his swords and temporarily distracted attention from his faltering economy. As for threats to invade West Irian, one Indonesian official summed up the situation thusly: "How would we get there, with water wings?"

It is high time we took the real fat out of this foreign aid program. Last year, the House took a good whack out of it and it improved the program. I say let us take another healthy whack out of it this year—and we will improve it some more.

This Nation cannot continue to be Santa Claus to the rest of the world—99 foreign countries. We are seriously injuring our own financial structure. We are taking dollars from our people who can ill afford to give them—to help in many instances nations who not only are unfriendly to us but who actively side with the Russians.

The old saying "You cannot buy friendship" was never truer than in the foreign aid program. It is not even gaining this Nation respect.

I say it should be cut down drastically.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we are certainly now living in a great day and age. Who would ever think that a certain Member of the other body would already have a majority of the delegates sewed up for the coming Republican National Convention?

Who would think that the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] who was majority leader, if you please, in the 83d Republican Congress, would take the position that he takes today when he says that he will vote to adopt the pending amendment to further cut this bill by almost a quarter billion dollars.

Well, let me tell you this, and I say this particularly for the benefit of the newer Members of this body. It was in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 99, part 7, page 9560, that the distinguished gentleman from Indiana, then the majority leader of this body, in opposing an amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT] to reduce and curtail the amount carried in the then pending appropriation bill for foreign aid or mutual security said:

> Mr. Chairman, I think this program is improperly called a foreign aid program. It is not that. It has to do with the military security and defense of the United States, at least in its principal effects.

And do you know what the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] was doing at that very time? He was sustaining an appropriation bill such as this and opposing any further reduction in regard thereto. The bill he was supporting carried not the amount of money to wit: $3.3 billion plus today contained in this bill but $4.428 billion plus $1.758 billion of unobligated carryovers, a total availability then recommended by my friend the distinguished gentleman from New York, Mr. Taber, then chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations, of $6.186 billion.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman from New York yield?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I shall be delighted to yield to my distinguished friend from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. Of course, in 1953 the gentleman from New York well knows that we were not putting into the foreign aid program, as we are at the present time, over $1.5 billion per year in Public Law 480 funds. He also well knows that in 1953——

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Did the gentleman oppose enactment of Public Law 480?

Mr. FORD. I am sorry. I did not understand the question.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Did the gentleman oppose enactment of Public Law 480?

Mr. FORD. Of course I do not. I am only trying to make a point here.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Not you "do not"; you did not.

Mr. FORD. I am trying to make the point here that in 1953 you did not have the benefit of $1.5 billion where you have it today in Public Law 480 for the foreign aid program.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. The distinguished gentleman from Michigan misses the main point. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], his leader, said:

> That this program is improperly called a foreign aid program. It is not that. It has to do with the military security and defense of the United States.

I say that the very same situation prevails today. Who knows better than the distinguished gentleman from Michigan what is going on militarily in southeast Asia today and what is presently going on in the island of Cyprus in the Mediterranean between the Greeks and the Turks? Who knows better than the distinguished gentleman from Michigan the turbulent situation caused by the Communists all over the world?

Mr. FORD. I am very grateful for the kind comments by the gentleman from New York about my alleged knowledge.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Well, the gentleman is an admitted military strategist.

Mr. FORD. All I am trying to say is that the foreign aid program is sound but there can be an honest difference of opinion any year.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Of course, I well recall the distinguished gentleman from Michigan coming out here on the floor and offering an amendment or amendments to increase this foreign aid bill, which were opposed by the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN]. The gentleman recalls that, does he not?

Mr. FORD. That is correct. And may I say I can vividly recall on this particular occasion that the gentleman from New York opposed it.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. That is correct.

Mr. FORD. And the very distinguished and honored speaker on the same occasion followed the lead of the gentleman from Louisiana in opposing my amendment.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I am sure I voted along with the gentleman from Michigan in the subcommittee and the full committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] has expired.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, my mind is brought back to the fact that the gentleman from Michigan ran out on an agreement that was made at that time with regard to that particular part of the bill. Does the gentleman recall that? I am sure the gentleman from Louisiana will.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Surely.

Mr. FORD. There never was an agreement that year between the gentleman from Louisiana and myself. The only agreement that the gentleman from Louisiana had was on the Democratic side.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I do not think the gentleman from Louisiana would say that I ever ran out on an agreement.

Mr. PASSMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I should like to point out that the pending amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana would make drastic and unwarranted reductions in six of the items of economic assistance at page 2 of this bill. I should like to describe each of these six categories which would be slashed to ribbons by the terms of the pending amendment. They are as follows:

First. Development grants: These grants are used in less developed countries to; first, provide the advisers, teachers, equipment, and supplies required for the improvement of human resources, especially in administrative, educational, technical, and professional skills; second, assist in the control and eradication of major diseases and other menaces to health; third, establish and improve institutions which further economic and social development; fourth, assist in planning and surveys of development programs and projects; fifth, establish or improve basic physical facilities such as communications and transport, in those relatively few countries where the economies are unable to carry the obligations entailed by development loans; sixth, pay transportation charges on shipments of supplies by approved American nonprofit voluntary agencies; and seventh, finance research concerning the problems of economic development.

Second. International organizations and programs: Funds requested under this account are to cover voluntary contributions of the United States to international programs sponsored by an agency of the United Nations as well as regional organizations and special purpose international financial institutions.

Decreases in the amount anticipated to be required for these programs are the result of several factors, most importantly; first, the major channel of U.S. support of economic assistance to the Congo has been shifted from the multilateral to the bilateral program; second, several programs, including the NATO science and malaria eradication have been absorbed in the regular assessed programs of the respective organizations; and third, contributions to regional organizations and to regional programs of international organizations in the fields of economic and technical assistance are included in the estimates for development grants and Alliance for Progress grants. The above decreases are offset by a scheduled increase in our contribution to the Indus Basin Development Fund and an increase in U.S. contributions to the United Nations Expanded Program of Technical Assistance and the Special Fund due to an increase in other member nations' contributions.

Third. Supporting assistance: In furtherance of U.S. national security and foreign policy objectives support is provided through this account to countries which need help in maintaining defensive forces or in attaining economic and political stability. Provision is usually made on a grant basis and, to the extent feasible, supporting assistance funds are used for purposes which also contribute to development. In several cases country situations have recently stabilized sufficiently to permit significant reductions in supporting assistance and increased concentration on development. Fifty-five percent of present supporting assistance requirements are in Korea and Vietnam, countries on the immediate periphery of the Sino-Soviet bloc.

Fourth. Contingency fund: This fund is used to meet urgent requirements which cannot be foreseen at the time the budget is prepared. It is available not only to provide emergency assistance in disasters, but also to meet important international situations which create a need for immediate response in the U.S. national interest.

Fifth. In 1961, the Alliance for Progress was formed to launch a hemispheric effort, in which the United States joined as partner, to stimulate and accelerate the development of the Americas through programs of social and economic reform. In support of this effort, the United States makes loans to finance the development activities necessary to achieve self-sustained growth. The nations of Latin America have subscribed to the Charter of Punta del Este and are pledged to seek reforms and institute self-help measures contributing to the development effort. U.S. assistance is supplemented by assistance from other nations, international organizations, and our own private investors, foundations, and educational institutions.

Sixth. Development loans are repayable in U.S. dollars. Under the provisions of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1963, interest charged on all loans with the exception of those covered by special provisions relative to the use of the facilities of the International Development Association and those funds already committed to be loaned, will be at a rate of interest of not less than 2 percent per annum commencing not later than 10 years following the date on which the funds are initially made available under the loan. During the 10-year period the rate of interest shall not be lower than three-fourths percent per annum.

Development loans are made to promote the economic development of less-developed countries and areas, with emphasis upon existing long-range plans and programs designed to develop their economic resources and to increase their productive capacities. Before a loan is made, the Agency for International Development must take into account; first, whether financing could be obtained in whole or in part from other free world sources on reasonable terms, including private sources within the United States; second, the economic and technical soundness of the activity to be financed, including the capacity of the recipient country to repay the loan at a reasonable rate of interest; third whether the activity gives reasonable promise of contributing to the development of economic resources or to the increase of productive capacities; fourth, the consistency of the activity with, and its relationship to, other development activities being undertaken or planned, and its contribution to realizable long-range objectives; fifth, the extent to which the recipient country is demonstrating its determination to take effective self-help measures; and sixth, possible effects upon the economy of the United States. Development loans will not be made unless there is a finding of a reasonable prospect of repayment. Additional loan criteria and standards are established by an interagency Development Loan Committee chaired by the Administrator of the Agency for International Development.

The program proposed for 1965 reflects the growing need for development assistance as a result of: first, an increase in effective development planning in many countries; second, the increasing ability of countries previously receiving aid grants to utilize dollar repayable loans for long-term economic development purposes; and third, an enlarged capacity among expanding economies to utilize new development capital.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, the most important office in the world today so far as the future of this country and the freedom of mankind is concerned is the office of the President of the United States. The occupant of that office has responsibilities which extend beyond those of any other individual or organization, public or private, so far as our international relations are concerned.

Mr. Chairman, the voice of the President of the United States is the voice of America around the world. It seems to me that the overriding issue in this debate is whether we are going to give the President of the United States the tools he needs to do his job. I know that the President of the United States believes that he needs every dollar that he requested in his budget request. I know that he cut that budget request by more than $1 billion, over the objections of his advisors in this field.

But I also know that he feels in his dealings with the heads of state around the world that he needs the minimum that this great Committee on Appropriations has recommended for the consideration of the House.

As far as I am concerned, when it comes to upholding the hand of the President of the United States, I would prefer to err on the side of too much than on the side of too little, on the side of strength rather than on the side of weakness.

The committee has made cuts here. The subcommittee and the full committee are made up of some of the most distinguished Members of the House. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. Mahon] has been a member of the Committee on Appropriations for more than a quarter of a century. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Armed Services, he has brought up almost 50 percent moneywise of the supply bills passed on by the House for many years.

The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Gary] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. Rooney], have been members of this subcommittee, I believe, longer than any other member now serving. Certainly this is not downgrading any member, but reference has been made to the length of time various members have served on this subcommittee.

Certainly by any standards the gentleman from New York and the gentleman from Virginia are outstanding Members of the House.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot help but be impressed by the fact that all of the great men, and they have all been great men, who have been Presidents of the United States since the inauguration of the Marshall plan, have considered foreign aid one of the most important instruments of foreign policy at their disposal.

President Eisenhower repeatedly urged congressional support of this program. In 1953 he said:

> This is the best way to defend successfully ourselves and the cause of freedom.

In 1954 he said:

> Our foreign aid is based on the sound premise that there can be no safety for us except in the cooperative efforts to build and sustain the strength of free peoples.

In May 1957, he said:

> Supplementing our country's defense with tested and proven foreign aid programs gives the American people more security per dollar invested than any other expenditure they make.

In February 1960, he said:

> The overwhelming support of the vast majority of our citizens leads us inexorably to foreign aid as a fixed national policy.

In a telegram to our distinguished minority leader, and the minority leader of the Senate, only a few days ago, former President Eisenhower again stressed the importance of adequate funds for this purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

(By unanimous consent (at the request of Mr. Albert) he was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. ALBERT. In his telegram he stated that $3.5 billion represents a level of mutual assistance that cannot be drastically reduced without damaging the vital interests of the United States.

Time and again during the Eisenhower administration a majority of the Democrats supported the President in his foreign aid request. This has been in the past a truly bipartisan program.

Support of our friends on the other side of the aisle has dropped very sharply in recent years. Only 22 Republican Members supported the authorization bill on the motion to recommit. By contrast, on key votes during the past several years there were 34 Republicans in 1962, 90 in 1961, 100 in 1958, 124 in 1956 and 127 in 1954.

The distinguished minority leader was one of the principal architects of the Marshall plan. He was one of the principal spokesmen for the Eisenhower administration, not only in the Congress but in the Nation. As long ago as June 20, 1954, the minority leader said:

> I have heard enough in the last few weeks and months to convince me this situation in southeast Asia, and in the western Pacific, as it has developed, is of such vital interest to the national defense of this country and to our security and welfare, that it would be a terrible mistake to strike out this money.

It was in this same year, 1954, if I am not mistaken, that President Eisenhower inaugurated our policy in southeast Asia. That policy has been followed implicitly by both President Kennedy and President Johnson, and it is the policy of the United States in southeast Asia today.

Ambassador Lodge has just returned from southeast Asia, and every statement he has made since his arrival back in the United States repeats in substance the warning of the distinguished minority leader on June 20, 1954, regarding southeast Asia, that it would be a terrible mistake to strike this money from the bill.

As recently as June 17, 1960, the distinguished gentleman from Indiana again said this is not a partisan matter. I hope the distinguished minority leader will support the committee. I am sure he will vote for the bill whether the committee is sustained or whether the amendment is adopted.

Today, Mr. Chairman, the world needs and the Nation requires that this program be given the bipartisan support that it has enjoyed in the past. President Johnson says emphatically and with more knowledge, I am sure, of his requirements as President in his negotiations with heads of state around the world than any other individual in the world, including any individual in this body, that he needs this program, that it is a "barebones" program, and that it is essential in the interests of our country and of the free world in the years ahead.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished majority leader yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. I wonder if the gentleman from Oklahoma would refer to his quotation of the statement by former President Eisenhower, I think he said in 1954. Was that on the appropriation bill for fiscal year 1954?

Mr. ALBERT. The statement I first quoted was made in May 1963.

Mr. FORD. Would the gentleman read it again?

Mr. ALBERT. He said:

> This is the best way to defend successfully ourselves and the cause of freedom.

Mr. FORD. I think the Record ought to show that that year the Congress cut $400 million from the program. Would the gentleman read the next quotation from President Eisenhower?

Mr. ALBERT. In June of 1954 he said:

> Our foreign aid is based on the sound premise that there can be no safety for us except in the cooperative efforts to build and sustain the strength of all free peoples.

Mr. FORD. That was 1954?

Mr. ALBERT. Yes.

Mr. FORD. That year the Congress cut from the appropriation bill $600 million.

Mr. ALBERT. May I say in response to the gentleman that the request was much smaller than in the years 1953 and 1954 than it was this year, if I am not mistaken. May I also say to the gentleman that the committee has already cut $200 million from the budget estimate and has put $300 million in deep freeze. The request has already been cut. I hope the House will sustain the committee.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Is it not a fact, as was pointed out yesterday, that President Johnson had already pared the program by $1 billion before it came up to the Appropriations Committee?

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman is correct. I pointed this out earlier in my remarks. The President cut the request by $1 billion and the committee has cut it $200 million more. The House should vote down any further cuts in this program.

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Passman] and in opposition to this foreign aid appropriation bill. Never before in the history of mankind has there been demonstrated such shortsighted generosity as our expensive, badly executed, unrealistic, uncontrolled, and uncontrollable foreign aid giveaway program.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to express my support of the amendment to cut the funds in this bill by $247 million and to ask some simple, but very important questions regarding this bill. I should like to ask the questions of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Passman], the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, or the ranking minority member, the distinguished gentleman from Arizona [Mr. Rhodes]. Will they answer these questions for me:

Is it true that other countries receiving our foreign aid have now initiated foreign aid programs of their own?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. That statement is absolutely correct, in that some nations which were Communist nations or neutralist nations were giving aid around the world while they were still receiving our aid.

Mr. FOREMAN. Is it a true fact that we let these countries have money interest free and that they then charge and receive interest on their loans that they put out on their own foreign aid loans?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I think that certainly would be correct in certain instances. It certainly is correct that the nations of Western Europe, for instance, have almost always given their aid in the form of hard loans—loans with fairly high commercial-type interest rates. Whereas they get loans from us at very low rates.

Mr. FOREMAN. Is it a true fact that in this foreign aid program being considered here today, we are now approving or considering aid for 99 countries and 9 territories around the world?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. That was true of the program for the last fiscal year. I believe it is approximately true for this program.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOREMAN. I am pleased to yield to the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Passman].

Mr. PASSMAN. During the fiscal year 1965 the United States will be disbursing aid to some extent in 99 nations and 9 territories.

Mr. FOREMAN. Does the gentleman feel that it is consistent with sound fiscal policy for the United States of America to borrow money to give away in these loan programs, thereby allowing other countries to have a foreign aid program of their own?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I think certainly if a country is prosperous enough to have a foreign aid program of its own, we should be very careful about letting them be recipients from our program, particularly, as the gentleman has said, during a time when we are in a deficit position and obviously must borrow money to lend them money.

Mr. FOREMAN. Is it a true fact that we are now paying approximately $3 billion a year in interest on the money that we have borrowed to give away?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. The total of foreign aid is somewhat in excess of $100 billion since its inception. If we assumed that all of the $100 billion was borrowed, then the figure would be accurate. However, as I stated before, I feel that we should prorate the expenditures for foreign aid with other expenditures of the Government to determine that. Even so, you would get a very considerable figure even if you did.

Mr. FOREMAN. Is it a true fact that in spite of the fact that Sukarno in Indonesia told us just 3 months ago, on March 25, 1964, to be exact "To hell with U.S. aid," that we have included some $10 million in technical aid in this bill for Mr. Sukarno's Indonesia?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. The specific answer to that question would probably be classified. But the answer is that we do still have a program in Indonesia.

Mr. FOREMAN. Is it a true fact that in spite of the fact that Cambodia has requested that we withdraw our aid program from that country and told us to take our marbles and go home, we are continuing to dish out foreign aid to them, and have projected aid through 1968 to Cambodia?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Yes, that is true. Cambodia recently requested that we withdraw our aid program. But the Department has obligated funds to continue the training of Cambodian participants through fiscal year 1968 at a total cost of $1,650,000. Now, we do not know whether the Cambodians will want to spend that money or not. But we have obligated it just in case they are very nice and allow us to give it to them.

Mr. FOREMAN. Is it a true fact that the U.S. foreign aid is now financing 10 foreign embassies for the country of Laos?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. That is correct.

Mr. FOREMAN. Is it a true fact that under our foreign aid operation, appropriations for a dam in Tunisia could later be reobligated, without the consent of the Congress, and be spent to build a bridge in Iran or a swimming pool in Kuwait or almost anything else somewhere on another project in another country?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. FOREMAN. Is it a true fact that 57 countries receiving over $12.5 billion of our aid over the past 6 years have purchased approximately $7 billion of our gold from the United States?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Those are the figures which I have. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. FOREMAN. Is it a true fact that if we defeated this bill entirely, there would still be more than enough funds in the foreign aid pipeline, appropriated but not expended, and in many instances not even obligated, to continue our obligations, commitments, and our foreign operations for some considerable time into the future?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. There is plenty of money in the pipeline to run this program for a period of 2 years without any more money being added, and, as the gentleman from Louisiana stated, to take care of any legal obligations we might have.

Mr. FOREMAN. Is it a true fact that there are 7,000 additional employees on the AID payroll this year, over the 1964 operations?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. That is correct. The round figures are 64,000 for last year and 71,000 for this year.

Mr. FOREMAN. Is it a true fact that the gentleman and his committee have saved some $8 billion over the past several years by reductions from the requests of AID, through such amendments as are offered here today on the floor?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Through amendments and also through cuts made in the committee and later sustained by the House.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOREMAN. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Passman].

Mr. PASSMAN. It was not the committee, but the Congress. In setting out the fact sheets, we show the budget estimates. It is always that way, to keep the record straight. That is why I have not gotten into any trouble with this bill for 10 years.

We show the budget estimates. We show the appropriations. We show the reductions; that is, the reductions made by all the committees of the Congress. It deals with all net reductions.

The committee does not take credit for anything. We show that the Congress made these reductions, and include all the reductions made at all points.

Mr. FOREMAN. I thank the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, and I should like to ask him one more question. Does the gentleman believe that it is sound business economics for this country to continue to tax its people and borrow money to give away to countries—in fact, Communist countries—who initiate foreign aid programs of their own?

Mr. PASSMAN. Is the gentleman suggesting that we proceed on a business basis here, in running the people's business?

Mr. FOREMAN. That is exactly what I am suggesting, but I suppose I would be out of order to do so.

Mr. PASSMAN. Certainly I agree with the gentleman that this practice is bad.

Mr. FOREMAN. Does the gentleman believe it would be out of order, in view of the fact that we have all the money in the foreign aid pipeline that we have there today, to offer an amendment to this bill which would cut out all foreign aid grants and economic aid, except our military assistance programs, until we have balanced our national budget?

Mr. PASSMAN. I have said many times in the past, and I say again today, that it has never been my objective to kill this program. It has been my objective to try to contain the program. This thing was running wild. We have been trying only to bring sense into this program.

Mr. FOREMAN. At the appropriate time I will, in fact, offer my balanced budget amendment. It is a sound simple amendment that states that we will not continue to borrow money to give away, irresponsibly as we have in years past, until we have balanced our national budget.

This amendment leaves in the military assistance portion of the bill. It would withhold funds only for the grants and economic aid portions of this program. As has been clearly pointed out, this would not stop the foreign aid program, because of the approximately $7 billion that is already available in the foreign aid pipeline.

Gentlemen, I simply and clearly say, we should not continue to borrow money to give away. We need to balance our own domestic budget, get our own house in order and pay our own debts.

To those who ask me, "Don't you care about the poor or the hungry people of Africa or India," I reply, of course, I am concerned about them, but I am more concerned about the poor overburdened taxpayers of America who are stuck with the bill for irresponsible waste involved in these aid programs. At a time when we have millions of hungry and uneducated Americans in our own country, according to the administration, how about feeding them and educating them, first? Why do we not look after our own family before we start trying to raise the living standards of the world?

PROPOSED SOLUTION

We must initiate drastic reductions in foreign aid in all instances, except where technological and military assistance is necessary to the defense of the free world and is economically advantageous to the United States. We must initiate some tough-fisted management over it. We must use commonsense in our administration of it and curb its waste and mismanagement.

We can do this by restricting grants to the careful distribution of surplus farm products to friendly underdeveloped countries to feed the hungry, by providing needed medicines to the sick and by providing technological assistance and instruction to those who show a willingness and desire to help themselves. Our money and equipment sent to countries needing help should be only to non-Communist countries, and this should not be grants, rather it should be in the form of sound, hard, reasonable interest-bearing loans, backed up with collateral, and to be repaid according to a specified sensible, businesslike schedule.

Mr. Chairman, it is an unforgivable disgrace, indeed, for a country with a national debt greater than all the countries of the world combined, to continue to tax our people, and in fact borrow money, to give away our goods to try to buy friends among people who readily turn against us when the till goes empty and the chips are down. Any supporter of this wasteful throwaway program, who has one hungry child or one depressed business in his district, should hang his head in shame if he continues to vote funds that are to be so irresponsibly spent. How absurd, how foolish, how ignorant can we get when we throw our money away to our enemies?

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman yield briefly?

Mr. JOELSON. Yes. I will yield briefly to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I wish to say to my distinguished friend from Texas [Mr. Foreman] that his "Are you still beating your wife" questions addressed to the gentleman from Arizona remind me of one of his loaded questionnaires.

Mr. FOREMAN. Are you asking or are you telling me? If the gentleman will yield to me——

Mr. JOELSON. I yield no further.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOELSON. I will yield briefly.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I would like to point out one more fact, since the gentleman from Texas is interested in facts. If the amendment is agreed to and adopted, we would be shifting the emphasis back from hard loans to grants. All of the loans that the gentleman has been referring to are loans that create credit, and the money is spent on products right here in the United States. If this amendment is adopted, we go back to the grant business. The guidelines of the Congress has been to get into the hard loan rather than grants, which is what we have been doing under this bill.

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from New Jersey yield?

Mr. JOELSON. I am sorry, but I have not yet opened my mouth on my own. I cannot yield any further.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman asked me a question.

Mr. JOELSON. Do I want to ask you a question?

Mr. PASSMAN. I wish you would. I thought someone told me you did want to ask me a question.

Mr. JOELSON. No, I do not want to ask you a question.

Mr. PASSMAN. I am sorry I wasted your time.

Mr. JOELSON. Except to say I do not feel I am a political prostitute or any other kind of prostitute, since you used that expression regarding other Members of the House the other day.

Mr. PASSMAN. You do not? I do not go around admitting those things. I just ignore them.

Mr. JOELSON. I do not yield any further.

I merely want to say that pretty soon the Fourth of July is coming and we are all going to go back to our constituencies and we are going to vie with one another about our implacable opposition to tyranny and communism. Then the political conventions will come about and we will all make stirring speeches about how strongly we are opposed to the Communist menace.

However, I would like to remind my friends that communism cannot be fought with oratory and we are childish if we think it is going to melt in the blast of our own hot air. The way to fight communism is the hard way, the difficult way, the mature way, the responsible way, and that takes money. I know there is a candidate now for the Presidency who wants to abolish the income tax and in the same breath says he wants to fight communism, just as my friend over here wants to fight communism and at the same time balance the budget. I would love this to be done, but I am a practical man. I do not live in the never-never world of fantasy. I am willing to accept my responsibility. The simple fact is we cannot fight the Communists without money, without cash, without loans, and the American people, in my opinion, want this.

I have always been a supporter of foreign aid. In my reelection campaign, I told the people that they have to be mature and responsible. Thank goodness I am back here and I am willing to wage the fight again. I urge my colleagues to be responsible and not to cut this necessary program, because if you do so, you are playing right into the hands of the potential enemy.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from the committee, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. Natcher], would yield, I asked him to yield when he was speaking some time ago, and I would like to ask him a question to see if I understood him.

A while ago when you were discussing the cuts that had been made by the committee, you stated you were willing to vote for further cuts. May I ask where and in what amounts you would be willing to vote for them?

Mr. NATCHER. I would like to say to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri that when bills are presented in the future for the foreign assistance program, additional reductions can be and should be made.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. You were not referring to this bill?

Mr. NATCHER. I was referring to future bills.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. But I understood you to say you would vote for other cuts. I am sorry I misunderstood the gentleman.

I think here today we have been trying to put this thing on the basis of a popularity contest vote. I do not think this is a popularity contest, or a partisan issue, and I would like to get back to the facts in this bill.

I supported for about 13 years the foreign aid program, trying desperately and as hard as I knew how to bring some reality, some commonsense into the administration of it. I have gotten up here on this floor and tried as hard as I knew how to get some amendments adopted that would cause the administrators of this program to have some conscience about spending the taxpayers' money.

Last year for the first time I voted against the foreign aid authorization and I voted against the appropriation bill; not because I do not think it is necessary to have a foreign aid program. We must have a foreign aid program. But I do say that we must bring about greater economy, we must bring about greater efficiency than we have had in the past. I want to point out that over the years I have followed very closely what I think has been an outstanding job done by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN]. I think he knows more about the foreign aid program than any other man in the United States. I really believe that. I think that he has brought to us the facts of this program, and pointed out where cuts could be made without jeopardizing the program.

I have every respect for the President of the United States but I do know from experience that the President of the United States has had the wool pulled over his eyes. He has had people in the State Department who have not been loyal to him. He has had people who were tending to destroy the program by their refusal to put common sense into it. There is no man in the House for whom I have greater respect or affection than the Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON]. With all respect to him I must say, because of the work that he has been doing on the defense program, that he has not had the opportunity to get as close to this program as has the gentleman from Louisiana; and I do not think that he knows as much about it as the gentleman from Louisiana. I say that with all respect for my friend from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Certainly I yield to the gentleman from Texas, the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, the Speaker appointed me on the so-called Herter Committee, as the gentleman from Missouri will remember, in 1947, I believe. We went to Europe and made a study of the foreign aid program. I have worked on this bill from time to time. But what counts most here, as I see it, is how, in this program, we can implement our defense and foreign policy; and I yield to no one in that area and I do not think the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES] should yield to anyone. Knowledge of the details of some construction project in Pakistan is one thing, but how can the President best use this implement of foreign aid in our national defense and in our foreign policy is another. It is a decision which cannot be made peculiarly by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] or by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] or by anybody else. All of us are somewhat on the same basis in that area. And that is the area which counts the most.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I want to make one other point. If this bill were predicated upon the defense of this Nation particularly the military assistance program, there is no one whose word I would accept sooner than that of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON]. I would go along with him blindfolded, so to speak, because of the confidence that I have in him. But when we talk about some of these other programs, I do not think other Members are as familiar with them as is the gentleman from Louisiana.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri, Mr. JONES, has expired.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I think everyone in this House realizes that in the Department of State we have had people—and I have made this point time and time again and I hope you will bear with me for being repetitious; we have had these people before our Committee on Agriculture, and one of the people who had been elevated time and time again in the Department came to our committee and said that he violated the law, he did not follow the law or the intention of Congress because he said Congress did not know what it was doing.

Mr. Chairman, I know what I am doing. I am trying to save the taxpayers some money. I am going to vote for these amendments today. I do not know whether all of the items in the amendment are going to do it, but this is the only way we can impress these people in the Department of State and the administrators of the program.

The money, their pocketbook, is the only place you can affect them. You cannot talk to them. You can talk until you are blue in the face and they will come back arrogantly and tell you that Congress does not know what it is doing.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. I believe President Johnson impressed the people in the State Department when he submitted a budget far below that submitted last year and whacked money from the request that had tentatively been proposed for submission to the Congress this year.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Let me make this point clear. The President has great power, and I appreciate it. I like to go along with the President every time I can. I think I know a little bit about the psychology of these people in the State Department. The only way they will be impressed with the fact that Congress means business is when you cut this bill some more. I say that with the money that is in the pipeline, as a backup if it is necessary, we are not going to do any damage to this program. We are not going to curtail or prevent any necessary program being carried out. But we are going to give notice to the people administering this program that Congress means to do the only thing we can do, and that is to cut this bill. This is the only way we can make ourselves heard, to vote for this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is the time. The members of the committee are going to have to act now.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I have not much contribution to make to this debate. It is unnecessary. The management of the bill could not be in abler hands. However, I am a little curious. Before the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES], spoke I had been listening to one of the newer Members. He talked for a long time. He asked unanimous consent to speak for 3 additional minutes and I agreed to that. He kept repeating the words, "a true fact." I think he must have used the term a dozen times, "a true fact."

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am just a simple little country boy. I thought that a fact was a fact. I wonder what "a true fact" is.

So, Mr. Chairman, I am just curious. That is why I asked for this time. I thought I should not overlook the chance to get educated on the meaning and mystery of "a true fact."

There is one other matter, Mr. Chairman. I shall vote against this amendment. I am standing with the President of the United States. But I do not like attacks which are made upon the gentleman from Louisiana. I am not in agreement with him in this matter but I do know that he is one of the hardest working Members of this body. We may not agree, and certainly we do not in the present debate, but when he reaches a conclusion I know that he does so conscientiously. I have lived with him at the Congressional Hotel for a long time. I know that every Sunday he goes to his office at 8 o'clock in the morning and does not get back until 8 o'clock in the evening. That is true on Saturday and every night of the week he works at his office until midnight or later.

Mr. Chairman, whether I agree with him or not—and I repeat, I do not agree with him in this—I respect industry and integrity. The gentleman from Louisiana is rich in the possession of both those virtues. I believe everyone including those who will vote against his amendment has a lot of respect for the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. PASSMAN. I want to thank the distinguished gentleman from Illinois for his compliment.

I have heard it said that if you cannot swim, stay out of the water. I am going to stay out of personalities.

I thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I do esteem the gentleman from Louisiana as a fine, able, dedicated, and patriotic American. However, I do not agree with him at all in his concept of foreign policy and the part therein of our mutual assistance program.

Mr. Chairman, I am even thankful that the very atmosphere of this historic chamber teaches us how friends can disagree agreeably.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, there is no controversy among many of us as to the need and the necessity for an adequately financed, properly executed foreign aid program. That includes sufficient funds for the military assistance and the economic assistance programs.

The record is very clear that since 1949 on every occasion I have voted for the foreign aid authorization bill, and on every occasion I have voted from that time to the present time for the appropriation bill to finance the authorization bill. The record will also show that on more occasions than not I have disagreed with the gentleman from Louisiana. These were honest, conscientious differences of opinion.

In 1960 I joined with Mr. Taber, Mr. Rhodes, and Mr. Conte in signing a minority report because the recommendations of the subcommittee and the full Committee on Appropriations were too small.

In 1961 I offered an amendment to the appropriation bill for the foreign aid program that would and eventually did restore $300 million to the recommendations of the subcommittee and the full committee. This amendment was over the protest of my good friend from Louisiana. He thought he was right. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. Mahon] supported him, and I know he felt he was right.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. Back for fiscal year 1961 Congress appropriated $4.4 billion instead of the $3.567 billion provided in the pending bill and the total availability back in 1961 as a result of the action by Congress was $4.8. The request this year is for $1.2 billion less.

Under those circumstances the gentleman from Michigan will remember that in the minority report for 1961 he, Mr. Taber, Mr. Rhodes, and others, said, in denouncing the reduction made in such bill, the following:

> We cannot condone and cannot remain silent in the face of the heavy and, we believe, unconscionable cuts imposed by the majority in military assistance and defense support. These cuts are not justified by the testimony heard by our subcommittee, particularly in view of the most urgest requests and warnings by the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, and the Secretary of Defense.
>
> * * * * *
>
> They will force serious reductions in economic help to struggling nations at the very moment when the Communist bloc is accelerating its efforts at economic penetration and control of these hundreds of millions of people who constitute the balance of power in the world. They will undermine the security of the United States at one of the most critical times in the history of our country.
>
> This is no time to kowtow to Khrushchev or be soft on communism.

That is what my friend said when the bill was 1.2 higher in 1961. It seems that the request this year is down to earth, and is somewhat of a bare-bones approach.

Mr. FORD. The point I was seeking to make is that this program from its inception has been supported by four Presidents, to my knowledge, one Republican President and three Democratic Presidents. The program has been supported by the majority and minority leadership. However, there have been occasions where the leadership on one side or the other supported a lesser figure. Each of us in our own judgment each year has the responsibility to analyze the presentation, to make up our own independent mind and act accordingly. We are not here this year, nor have we been here in the past, to rubberstamp any recommendation from any President. With all deference to the great men who have served as President, and the President today, these Presidents do not know the details of any budget program submitted for foreign aid.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. Ford was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. FORD. I might add parenthetically, on too many occasions the witnesses who seek to justify the programs are not too well informed, either. The best evidence of this fact is to read the Record.

Let us talk for a minute about some of the programs here that I think can be honestly and justifiably reduced. Let us refer to the development loan program. President Johnson asked for $922 million, almost a billion dollars, for development loans. This was $235 million more than Congress gave him for the current fiscal year.

Let us see how this program is being administered. I have in my hand a document entitled "Department of State, Agency for International Development, Washington 25, D.C. Drafted March 13, 1964, initialed March 16, 1964." The subject is "Status of Dollar Loans Authorized to Intermediate Credit Institutions as of December 31, 1963."

Under the heading of "Development Bank Loans," subtotal, Latin America, a total loan amount of $38,500,000. The last column in this agency document shows, percent of loan amount distributed, 2.3 percent distributed. They had 97 percent plus of the funds available unloaned, undistributed, as of December 31, 1963.

Is that good management? Can you not honestly argue under that set of facts that there was no need to add more to the pipeline? If you add more, instead of $37 million being unused, they might have $60 or $70 million unused in this program. Can you imagine only 2 percent of the loan money available being distributed?

Now let us turn to another item, the same document. Here is the subtotal, Latin America, under the total loan amount available for a number of countries, $135,100,000 available. Percent of loan amount disbursed, 24.6 percent. Seventy-five percent of the funds available that Congress has given them in the past have not yet been distributed.

You could go down through this document line item by line item—their document, not our document—and you could find instance after instance where they have not carried out the program they initially justified, maybe in some instances for good reason, but in the light of these circumstances, 2 percent of the money made available disbursed, 24 percent of the money made available disbursed, can we not in our own wisdom and judgment make a decision that we do not have to pile more dollars on more dollars and more dollars? I refuse to hand over extra unneeded, unwarranted money into their hands under these circumstances.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. FRASER. May I call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that in 1961 with an increased amount of military funds the pipeline on military funds was $2.5 billion. Today the pipeline is only $2 billion. I am surprised that the gentleman would have supported an increase in military funds at a time when the pipeline was even larger than it is today just as I am surprised that the gentleman makes no comment about the $30 billion pipeline in the defense budget.

Mr. FORD. In the military program there is a longer period for the letting of the order and the delivery, as the gentleman, I presume, knows. This accounts for the pipeline. I see nothing wrong with a pipeline of $1,800 million or $2 billion under current circumstances and I did not believe in 1961 that there was anything sinister about the pipeline at that time. The facts are that in the economic aid program the circumstances are different. Let us take the loan program where only 2 percent of the money has been disbursed and 98 percent of the money is still piled up.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has again expired.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. FORD. In the case of bank loans or loan programs, here you have 98 percent of the money just standing idle. In the military assistance program where you have the pipeline an order has been placed and an actual contract has been made and all you are waiting for is delivery so that you can pay for it. In the case of a loan program to a loaning institution the circumstances are quite different.

Mr. FRASER. I think the gentleman is aware of the fact that the problem with a foreign aid loan program is very essentially the same problem described with respect to military procurement. That is, if we provide a loan to another country for a project, that money is obligated but we do not want to disburse it until they have proceeded along the path of building the project in compliance with our conditions.

But I would just like to make this other point. That is, that we have moved away from a grant program into a loan program at the insistence of the Congress and this has been one of the reasons why the pipeline has built up. Because as we move into other programs, we find there are more and more pipelines built up just as there is in the military procurement program.

Mr. FORD. My response to the gentleman from Minnesota is, when he talks about loan programs as we operate them here and tries to compare those programs with grant programs, I think he would have to concede honestly that there is a distinction without a difference. The gentleman knows under the so-called loan programs what are called loan programs, they are 40-year loans with a 10-year grace period, with less than 1 percent interest, and in most of the cases the repayment is in local currency and not in dollars. So, in effect, there is virtually no difference between a loan and a grant.

Mr. FRASER. Would the gentleman prefer that the money be granted or provided on a soft term loan basis?

Mr. FORD. I think there is probably some psychological benefit. But from the standpoint or the point of view of the U.S. Treasury, there is no difference.

Mr. FRASER. If I may just say to the gentleman, it seems to me if we want to move away from a grant program, the next step is to give a soft loan and then try to increase and harden the terms as we move along. We are making progress in this direction.

Mr. FORD. And you have a long way to go because I have not seen very significant progress along that line.

Mr. FRASER. In 1959 the total in grants was $1,291 million. In 1963 it was down to $953 million. That is only over a span of 4 years. I think this is a commendable trend and I would think the gentleman would want to encourage it.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GARY. The gentleman says he does not see anything wrong with the unexpended funds in the pipeline for the military. Is it not true that $2,050,751,000 of the present pipeline is in the military part of this program?

Mr. FORD. I think that is correct.

Mr. GARY. And is it not also true that $519,699,000 is in title 2 which is only indirectly connected with foreign aid and that $205.9 million is money for the Inter-American Development Bank which is held in the Treasury as a reserve fund and may not be used at all?

Mr. FORD. May I say to my good friend, the gentleman from Virginia, first, there is not a penny reduced in the military assistance program. The President asked for $1,055 million. The subcommittee and the full committee made available every nickel requested in new obligational authority for the military assistance program.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I believe the gentleman made the statement that there was no basic difference between grants and loans under this program, so far as the taxpayers are concerned; but under a grant we get no return, and when we consider the loans, 60 percent of the loans made under this program are hard-dollar loans which will be repaid, whether it takes 40 years or not. Many of these loans are beginning to be paid right now.

Further, the gentleman made the assertion that much of this money is presently held back and is not being used. I believe this results from some of the conditions which the gentleman himself set out, which the Congress has attempted to follow, by requiring conditions on loans of fiscal reforms, tax collection reforms, and some other necessary and basic reforms within the countries themselves.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has again expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. FORD was given permission to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.)

Mr. GALLAGHER. The reason why we have been withholding the use of the money under commitments we have made is that some of the nations have not met the conditions. The conditions have been set out by this body. We have required fiscal reforms. The money is not used until such time as the countries meet the conditions of the loans. This is the reason why the money remains unused, even though we do have basic commitments to many of these countries.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. PASSMAN. I recall when Secretary Dillon came before our committee, when we were considering these so-called loans, I asked the distinguished Secretary, "Would you call these things loans?" He said, "No. They are development credits." I feel sure the gentleman remembers that colloquy. It has been mentioned in the RECORD many times.

In addition, is it not true that, up to now, if there should ever be any repayment on these credits that the money would go back into the aid program and not back into the U.S. Treasury?

Mr. FORD. It is anticipated that will be the case, but I believe our committee took action this year to force it back into the General Treasury.

Mr. PASSMAN. That is true. It would have to be reappropriated. The basic legislation says it will go back into the aid program.

Mr. FORD. That is correct.

Mr. PASSMAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for one brief moment further?

Mr. FORD. Can the gentleman assure me that I shall have no trouble in getting some time to finish my own remarks?

Mr. GALLAGHER. If the gentleman does not, I shall be glad to obtain some time.

Mr. FORD. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I believe the significant point is that the money does go back into a revolving fund, but cannot be used until the committee here reappropriates the money.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, not too much has been said about the proposed part of the amendment affecting international agencies. I should like to take a few minutes to discuss this part of the amendment, which proposes a $10-million cut in the funds for the international agencies.

The President's budget request for fiscal year 1965, based on the authorization for international organizations, was $134,272,400. The cut we are recommending would reduce this by $10 million. Despite the fact that our cut would call for a $10 million reduction, the dollar amount made available for fiscal year 1965 would be approximately $8 million more than Congress gave to these agencies in 1964.

In fiscal year 1964 the late President Kennedy requested that Congress make available for international organizations $130,900,000. The House version of the bill reduced this by $30.9 million, to a figure of $100 million.

The Senate upped the figure and in the final version $116 million was made available for the program. You might have the impression that this program, because of this reduction in this current fiscal year, would be suffering very badly and would be handicapped because of this $14 million cut in the program last year. There is testimony in the hearings by Mr. Harlan Cleveland, who is our Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs, that the program they are executing this year in this area is a very satisfactory one despite a $14 million cut.

As a matter of fact, if you look at the record, you can understand very clearly why he has to say that. Last year when they came up and asked for $130 million for international organizations Mr. Cleveland said to the committee that we anticipate that we will obligate on the Indus River Basin program $43 million. This was $43 million out of the $130 million. You know what they are actually going to obligate this year? Not $43 million but $12 million. In other words, there was $30 million in the international organizations account for fiscal year 1964, approximately 25 percent of the total that they requested, that they did not obligate the way they planned, or they programed, or they justified to the Congress.

Now let me add one comment about the Indus River Basin program.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, back in 1960 when the Indus River Basin program was organized and commitments were made, the anticipated cost of that program or that project was about $1 billion, of which the United States was to pay about $550 million or slightly over 50 percent. We found out in the hearings this year, based on their own justification, that the cost of the Indus River Basin program is no longer estimated to be $1 billion but it has now ballooned and it has expanded in cost to $2 billion. This is a 100-percent increase in the estimated cost. Now, they will not tell us whether or not we are going to pay the same percentage that was anticipated when the cost was $1 billion, but they honestly concede, because it was in their justification books, that the cost has gone up 100 percent. I am only pointing this out because I am more than fearful that next year we are going to be faced with a substantial increase in our commitment to this program or this project.

Now I would like to point out another thing. I have indicated, one, that the Indus River Basin program last year was estimated to be $43 million and they could only obligate $12 million. You might honestly ask, "Well, what did they do with the rest of the money?" Well, here is one illustration. This is in the overall program on international organizations.

Last year they contemplated they would obligate $51 million in what they called an expanded program of technical assistance and special fund under the United Nations; but because they had this extra money floating around they decided to increase this program from $51 million to $59 million. There was no notification to the Congress, no justification to the Congress for the increase of $8 million in this program. But they had the money. They had not used it on one part of the program so they decided that they were going to use it in another, and they did.

All I am trying to say is that there is all kinds of flexibility in this program, in this account, as well as in others.

Mr. Chairman, may I conclude by a few final comments. We have before us a budget request by the President for $3,958 million. This is not a $3.5 billion request as some would lead you to believe. This is a request for almost $4 billion in title I and title II. The amount that the President asked for is more than was made available by the Congress last year, actually $694 million more than Congress appropriated in fiscal year 1964. The amounts that are included in the bill if our amendment is approved, when you look at the record, are fully satisfactory to carry out our military assistance program, our economic assistance program. They are fully adequate. If this amendment is approved our foreign policy and our military programs can be honestly and effectively executed and implemented for the benefit of the United States. I say this with the deepest sincerity because I have constantly supported the program in the past. These reductions will in no way injure or be harmful to the best interests of this country.

I hope and trust that the amendments offered by the gentleman from Louisiana will be approved by the Committee.

Mr. OLSON of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. OLSON of Minnesota. Is it the gentleman's suggestion that we can rely on pipeline funds for flexibility? Are pipeline funds available for the program if it is cut too severely? Is that what the gentleman is saying?

Mr. FORD. No; if the gentleman had been listening I am sure he would have understood that I was not arguing that pipeline funds are a justification for a reduction. The justification for these reductions in the amendment is the fact that last year what they told us they were going to carry out in their programs was not carried out. You can only judge the future by what they have done in the past. And in more areas than not AID's record in the past does not justify the money that they want for the future.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and in support of the Committee on Appropriations. I think the debate here in the last 2 days has been a tremendously helpful debate. It is one which has been to the issue and it has been very well attended by the Members of the House. It is very obvious that we shall vote on this proposal in the next few minutes, and I would hope that we would recognize the fundamental issues involved before we do so.

No. 1, I think most people—I know it is true of my distinguished colleague from Louisiana—have supported this program.

Mr. Chairman, we have had arguments about the amount of money which should be appropriated. However, the program has had bipartisan support since its inception a good many years ago.

Mr. Chairman, as has been so well pointed out here during the last few days, this program has been supported by President Truman, President Eisenhower, President Kennedy, and President Johnson. The program has had, I might say, a rather long career. We started, first, with what was called piecemeal economic aid. Then we moved into the Marshall plan. Then we saw the need for military assistance, particularly when the Korean war came along.

Mr. Chairman, many of our fellow Americans said to us, "Why do we not arm the Koreans? Why do we not perfect a system whereby we can utilize the tremendous manpower which exists elsewhere in the world and thereby conserve our own young men?"

So, Mr. Chairman, we came up with a military assistance program. I believe it can be demonstrated and has been demonstrated that the military assistance program has helped this country immeasurably. Without the military assistance program, I suspect that the entire history of southeast Asia would be quite different from what it is; and, while there may be criticism, some of it objective and some of it not, about policies there, no one has criticized the fact that the people who live there should bear the brunt of the fighting. That is the entire essence of the military assistance program.

Mr. Chairman, I heard the discussion a minute ago about loan programs. I believe it is elementary that a program which relies basically on the notion that you will repay is a more fundamentally sound program than one based upon grants. While some of these loans may not be repaid, at least we are moving away from grants and toward loans.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I believe it could be well argued that this program has been a good investment. I know that there are many people who argue that this program has not been a good investment, but as I examine the economic strength of our own country and as I look at what has happened elsewhere in the world, I cannot help but believe that this program has made a fundamental contribution to the economic advancement of the United States of America.

Now people say that we are going bankrupt in a hurry. Yet, since the inception of this program our gross national product has increased from about $300 billion to over $600 billion.

In the areas where we have conducted these programs the amount of trade between this country and those countries we have aided has increased phenomenally. As a matter of fact, we enjoy today the heaviest balance of trade in our own favor in the history of the United States. If we did not have that favorable trade situation, our balance-of-payments problem would be acute indeed.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not have to be any economic expert to demonstrate this.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] may proceed for 5 additional minutes

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. It is fundamental that unless the economic capacity exists in a given area, that country cannot trade with the United States of America. I could cite to the members of the Committee so many examples of this.

Mr. Chairman, I have worked for years on these problems. I serve as chairman of the Foreign Trade Subcommittee of the Joint Economic Committee studying this very issue. However, I can leave my hometown and get in an airplane and fly for 1 hour—not 2 hours or 3 hours—but just 1 hour, and I have traveled from an area where the per capita income is about $2,000 per year to an area where the per capita income is less than $200 a year.

Mr. Chairman, I can prove to each member of the Committee that as that per capita income goes up in the underdeveloped areas, the demand for American-manufactured goods, for American agricultural products, for American textiles, for the products of our machines, our citizens, and our workers, increases proportionately. That is exactly what has happened all over the world.

I say to you, Mr. Chairman, that this program is not only a good program from the point of view of humanitarianism, that it represents the spirit of the American Revolution, the spirit of freedom and the spirit of Christian living, but, in addition to that, it has been good military policy, and it has been good economic policy, as has been demonstrated time and time again.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I ask defeat of the pending amendment as a matter of public policy. President Johnson has been in the White House for a little over 6 or 7 months. When he submitted this budget to this body he said, and I take his word for it, that this is a barebones budget. When the authorization came before the House of Representatives a few weeks ago and the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania, Dr. MORGAN, chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, argued the case, he convinced the Members of this body that the President of the United States was right and that he deserved the support of the people of the United States and their Representatives in this body.

The question here is a simple one: Whether or not we are going to trust this man who has been there for just a few months, and in that period of time has been confronted with crisis after crisis. Everybody knows that when Brazil was teetering on the verge of communism, it was the strength of this man in the White House that prevented that takeover which would have made Castro's Cuba look like a Sunday afternoon picnic. There was about to be a raid on Cyprus, and it was the strength of the President of the United States which prevented that. Everyone knows we have had a crisis in Vietnam, but the Ambassador who has just returned from there, a distinguished member of the opposition party, their candidate for Vice President only 3½ years ago, has affirmed that policy, and said it is the best policy we can pursue.

So I say the issue is a very simple one: whether or not, after full examination by the Bureau of the Budget, by the President of the United States, and by the House authorizing committee, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, we should support this recommendation. It is up to us now to support the President of these United States in this barebones request.

I hope that the pending amendment will be defeated, and that the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], will be supported, and that the bill will be passed without amendment.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I shall certainly not dwell on personalities. I would like to discuss, if I may, where these cuts are going to be made, and what effect they will have on the program as a whole.

Already the Congress should know that $200 million has been cut by the committee. The proposed cuts by the former chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN], amount to $247 million—$29 million in development grants, a cut of $10 million in the U.N. international organization, a $51 million cut in supporting assistance, a $50 million cut in the contingency fund of the President, and an additional $25 million cut in the Alliance for Progress and Development Loan Fund, an additional $82 million cut in development loans, making a total cut of $247 million.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I yield.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. The gentleman did not intend to indicate that all of these cuts were additional, because, as the gentleman realizes, in international organizations and development grants and supporting assistance and the contingency fund the majority did not make any cut, so there would not be any additional cut.

Mr. CONTE. It is clear that the $247 million is an additional cut to the $200 million cut that has been made by the subcommittee and the full committee.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. The gentleman has just stated that the proposed amendment would cut development loans $82,200,000 more than the committee recommends. Is it not true the committee has already recommended a $140 million cut in that item?

Mr. CONTE. Yes; the gentleman is absolutely right.

Mr. GARY. That would make a cut of $222 million.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, in regard to supporting assistance which the minority wants to cut $51 million here today, if you could close your eyes and just listen to this debate in 1960 under this same category, then known as defense support, when the President asked for $600 million, not the figure of approximately $400 million as in this bill but $600 million, $200 million more than this bill provides, on page 13117 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 106, part 10, a speaker said at that time:

> Defense support provides economic assistance and budgetary assistance for 11 countries that are on the immediate periphery of the Soviet Union, plus 1 other country, Spain, where we have today 2 highly important Air Force bases and 1 vital Navy installation. This defense support program helps to provide over 600,000 Formosan or Taiwanese military forces, it assists in the implementation of the South Korea military organization, providing something like 600,000 active duty South Koreans. It also goes to support the military forces that are part of NATO in Turkey and in Greece. In other words, this defense support program to a very substantial degree assists us in providing the necessary deterrent to keep the Soviet Union and Red China from undertaking any aggressive action in a military way.
>
> In contrast to the program that we just discussed, military assistance, where we have had an increase in fiscal 1961 over previous fiscal years in defense support, actually the defense support program is going downward. This tends to reflect that the economies of these 12 countries are improving; that they are better able to handle their own economic responsibilities.
>
> I say to you with conviction that this figure of $600 million that appears in the bill is too low. It is $124 million less than the President requested and it is $75 million less than the authorization figure which we enacted into law very recently.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. CONTE was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. CONTE. This speaker further stated:

> I say to you with conviction that this figure of $600 million that appears in the bill is too low. It is $124 million less than the President requested and it is $75 million less than the authorization figure which we enacted into law very recently.

Mr. Chairman, these are the words of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD], one of the minority members who signed this report and was standing in the well of this House today asking that we cut $51 million from the supporting assistance, when it is already $200 million lower than it was in 1960.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Is it not a fact that the item of supporting assistance was strongly justified before the subcommittee by the Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara?

Mr. CONTE. It certainly was.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. And it is an elemental part of the defense structure?

Mr. CONTE. That is exactly right.

As was mentioned in that debate to which I referred a moment ago, defense support dovetails with the military assistance program, and one depends on the other. Things have not changed since 1960 in southeast Asia. Eighty-two percent of the supporting assistance funds today go to countries in southeast Asia.

If you are going to cut this budget $51 million, I ask you where? Where in southeast Asia are you going to make these cuts?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FORD. I think the gentleman from Massachusetts failed to mention two significantly different circumstances between the 1961 fiscal year bill and the bill at the present time. In 1961 the President asked for $724 million and we were debating whether $600 million following the $124 million cut was too great. In this bill before us today neither the authorization or the appropriation bill calls for any reduction whatsoever in the supporting assistance program.

Mr. CONTE. Except that you are proposing a $51 million cut.

Mr. FORD. That is correct. There is one other fact that I think is somewhat significant. At the time we were considering the fiscal year 1961 appropriation, the program had been in effect for 4 or 5 years in southeast Asia. We are now considering the fiscal year 1965 appropriation bill. Four years have elapsed. Is it not fair to assume that in a 4-year period there ought to be some gradual economic improvement on the part of the beneficiary country? Is it not fair to assume that they ought to be making a bigger effort on their own part? Is it not fair to assume that as they make a bigger effort and are able to do so, we could honestly and legitimately phase down our own contribution? After all, in a 4-year period they ought to be standing better on their own feet without our help.

Mr. CONTE. I agree wholeheartedly with everything the gentleman from Michigan has said. I agree wholeheartedly and this is just what the administration has done. In 1960 it was $600 million, that they were asking for. Today the administration is asking for $405 million which is a decrease of $200 million which shows sincerity on the part of these countries, in doing everything they can to work out their difficulties, and stand on their own two feet.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. I am a little perplexed at the kind of logic we hear coming from the gentleman from Michigan. He says things ought to be better and he proposes to cut today when, if I can read his statement correctly, only 2 days ago he issued a policy paper in which he said things were worse and that we had a "why win" policy and all of that. Things must have gotten really better in the last couple of days.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to compliment the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts on his performance on the floor today and yesterday and to stand with him in opposition to these amendments.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the full appropriation for foreign aid and in opposition to the amendments offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] to cut the bill. Let us remember that the authorization which this appropriations bill is supposed to support, is the second smallest in its 16-year history.

Now let us examine some of that history. Our experience since World War II is that our foreign aid programs have been beneficial to the vital interests of the United States. It has, perhaps, been the key factor in our ability to build a world in which all men might move toward freedom and in which our own freedom might remain secure.

This bill should be debated against that experience, not in terms of worn and oversimplified criticisms.

The Marshall plan was a solid and unquestioned success in helping the countries of Western Europe and Japan to full economic recovery. It did not bankrupt us. It did give us strong allies and greater export markets than we could have dreamed of before the plan began.

We have the solid success of our assistance program in converting aid receivers into aid givers. Our developed and recovered allies in Western Europe have already provided more assistance to the underdeveloped countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America than the $13 billion we provided them under the Marshall plan.

We see today our first successes in the developing world, as 14 countries approach the transition to economic self-support and the end to their need for extraordinary assistance from us. Economic aid to Taiwan under the Foreign Assistance Act will end next year. Greece, Israel, Mexico, the Philippines, are approaching self-supporting growth.

It is easy to forget that just a little over a decade ago, the Republic of China on Taiwan was as heavily dependent on U.S. assistance to stay afloat as Vietnam is today. It is easy to forget that Greece, 15 years ago, was still fighting for its life against Communist guerrillas. It is easy to forget that Korea, just 5 years ago, was still a war casualty surviving on U.S. supporting assistance and, to most observers, with little prospect for the kind of vigorous economic development activity being carried out there today.

We have behind us the successful conversion of our assistance programs into a unified, rational, and businesslike operation. Our programs are concentrated today; two-thirds of development loans go to seven countries, 80 percent of our supporting assistance to just four countries, nearly 90 percent of all our economic assistance to just 25 countries.

We have seen the orderly shift from grants—90 percent of our program during the Marshall plan period—to loans, which finance nearly 70 percent of our economic assistance to other countries today. In the face of an American balance of payments problem, we have seen the AID program shifted to minimize any effect. More than 80 percent of AID funds today are spent in the United States for U.S. goods and services, and the AID program can no longer be counted a significant drain on our dollar balances. In fact, repayments on past assistance are now aiding our balance of payments.

We have witnessed a steady decline in the burden of our aid program on the U.S. economy. In 1949, the amounts appropriated by the Congress for military and economic assistance were approximately 2 percent of our gross national product. President Johnson's request of $3.5 billion for fiscal year 1965 represents 0.6 percent of our gross national product. Even including Public Law 480, the 1965 program amounts to 0.8 percent of GNP. In 1949, the foreign aid appropriation was 11.5 percent of the Federal budget. The request for 1965 represents less than 4 percent of the budget.

A decade ago, the United States was the only important source of aid to the developing countries. Today, 17 free world countries other than the United States, many of them former aid recipients, conduct substantial assistance programs. There has been a significant growth in the programs of other donors. Nonetheless, the question remains, Are others doing enough?

In 1962 the official bilateral aid commitments of the other DAC countries combined amounted to six-tenths of 1 percent of their GNP. This compares with the U.S. figure I just mentioned, including Public Law 480, of eight-tenths of 1 percent. Performance varied considerably between countries. France provided 1.26 percent of its GNP in bilateral aid commitments, most of it on a grant basis. The average for the other DAC countries, excluding France and Portugal, was four and one-half tenths of 1 percent.

The relationship of aid effort to GNP is meaningful as a rough indicator of performance. However, in making a judgment about this performance, we must keep in mind the difference in per capita GNP between ourselves and the other DAC countries. In 1962 per capita GNP in the other DAC countries averaged $1,135. This is only about 40 percent of the $2,974 per capita GNP for the United States in 1962.

On balance, the comparison suggests that the other DAC countries except for France and Portugal could reasonably be expected to increase their aid commitments. Some are doing so. Canada, the United Kingdom, and Japan have taken steps to increase their aid effort. Some others—notably Germany—have not shown signs of increasing their aid.

The efforts of this Government to get other free world nations to increase their aid through the DAC and on a direct bilateral basis have been impressive. More needs to be done and more is being done, both in amounts and terms.

The AID program finances about a billion dollars a year in exports from American factories to the developing countries—countries that will become tremendous export markets as they develop and as their people get jobs and money.

In some fields, the AID-financed export share is substantial: one-third of all U.S. exports of railway equipment, a third of our fertilizer exports, 21 percent of our exports of iron and steel products. These goods are needed for development projects: power dams, irrigation, roads to open up new lands, and the like. But they are also introducing American products into new markets and our past experience has shown what that means.

Our biggest present export customers are the developed countries of Western Europe and Japan. Our exports to Europe have doubled since 1950, our exports to Japan tripled in the same period. The coal exporters tell us that nearly $300 million in 1962 coal exports is directly traceable to Marshall plan shipments of American coal to European markets previously unfamiliar with our coal. Japan, where U.S. agricultural surpluses kept starvation away after World War II, got acquainted with our farm products through aid and is today our biggest single cash customer for agricultural exports.

The same thing is happening now in the developing countries. Trade is following aid, as it did in Europe and Japan. Over the past 5 years, there have been increases in U.S. commercial exports—not AID financed—of 14 percent to Taiwan, 28 percent to Colombia, and 76 percent to Israel.

Mr. Chairman, obviously this program cannot carry on without public understanding and acceptance. I do not deny that the country has chafed at the program. It is difficult to see its benefits in our daily lives.

But it is not fair to say that our foreign aid program has no public support. This has been demonstrated by recent public opinion polls which have demonstrated that the appeal of foreign aid as a practical instrument of foreign policy is stronger than is commonly realized.

Results of Gallup polls on attitudes toward foreign aid have shown an impressive growth in supporters of the program since 1958. The percentage of persons in favor of the program rose from 51 percent in 1958 to 58 percent in 1963, while those opposed declined from 33 to 30 percent.

The more recently conducted "Minnesota poll"—a highly respected index of Midwestern opinion—showed a 2-to-1 majority in favor of the view that our foreign aid program has benefited the United States.

Particularly revealing are the views of the Nation's businessmen toward our foreign aid program. When the Research Institute of America conducted an opinion survey among 1,400 representative business executives, it discovered that three out of four were opposed to eliminating foreign aid. Eighty-nine percent agreed fully or generally with the proposition that the prime objective of our aid program should be economic, and that "a community of self-supporting free nations is in the best interest of the United States."

Various private organizations of Americans—church groups, civic associations, business, labor—are also committed to the continuing support of foreign aid. In 1963, nongovernmental organizations which testified on behalf of the administration's request represented some 50 million members.

But perhaps the most significant success of this program over the years, and the most important success to keep before us as we conduct this debate, is our unbroken tradition of bipartisanship in considering the foreign assistance program.

We have continued this program, carefully narrowing it in progress, regardless of the party in power in the executive or the legislative branches. Members on both sides of the aisle have joined hands to assure passage of the foreign aid requests of Presidents Truman, Eisenhower, and Kennedy.

Very recently, the Republican study group, the Critical Issues Council, issued a statement on the foreign assistance program. The council's report differed on details of administration, on emphasis in policy. But the report voiced my own belief in stating:

> On balance, the aid program has been a solid success in achieving its primary purpose of helping to keep the free world free.

We have before us the appropriations bill to continue this vital program. It is the second lowest request in the program's history. It has already been cut to the minimum.

Gen. Lucius Clay, who last year advocated sharp cuts in the foreign aid program, last week endorsed the full amount reported by the committee. General Clay said: "If we are to succeed in our foreign policy objectives, and if we are to continue in our role of leadership in the free world, we should not cut back further now in foreign aid. As it is being administered now it is essential in our own interests, and to reduce it further would be to weaken our world position."

Even more recently, former President Eisenhower asked that the full amount be voted "without partisanship." The amount, he said, "cannot be drastically reduced without damaging the vital interest of the United States."

In a spirit of true bipartisanship I urge support for the bill and the defeat of the amendments.

Mr. CONTE. I would like to point out further that in that debate one of the Republican leaders on my side of the aisle agreed with the gentleman from Michigan when he said that defense support goes hand in glove with military assistance and without defense support, military assistance aid that we give in many places would not really be worth very much.

I agree with that wholeheartedly and, yet, here today in committee and in the full committee we did not cut one penny from the military program.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has again expired.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. We are providing the entire $1 billion asked for by the administration and, yet, every member of the committee admits that this dovetails in with the military assistance program and that one goes with the other. Yet, they are attempting to cut $51 million from the supporting assistance program.

These amendments are to be voted on en bloc. So you will not have an opportunity to vote on each amendment separately. Therefore, if you vote in favor of the amendment, you will be voting for a cut of $51 million in supporting assistance which is vitally needed in those countries that are situated in the underbelly area of the Sino-Soviet bloc, countries like Taiwan, South Korea, Vietnam, and Thailand. Are we going to let these people down in a time of need?

It is highly important that these amendments be defeated and the only way that we can keep America strong and the free world strong is by defeating all of the amendments, otherwise if you vote for the amendments en bloc you will be cutting $51 million from the supporting assistance program.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BARRY. I wish to support the gentleman in what he has said. I point out to the committee that which I pointed out with respect to the authorization bill, which was before us during the past few weeks; namely, if there are those who want to cut the program, they should step up to the desk and get hold of the books which show where all of the money under the bill, except the contingency fund, is programed, and then say where they want to make these cuts.

I have gone over the figures for the various countries. I believe we would do a disservice to our entire program to make the kinds of cuts which are asked for in the amendments.

We should be responsible instead of using a meat ax and saying that in other years we have done this thing. We now have a responsible bill, tailored to meet the needs. I believe it should be passed without the amendments reducing the amounts.

I commend the effort which is made to retain the bill as presented to the Committee.

Every year, regardless of the foreign aid authorization bill passed by Congress, certain critics of the program insist upon drastic reductions in appropriations, regardless of how these cuts will jeopardize our foreign policy. Today these critics again call for further aid cuts, even though the foreign aid program already has been pared to the fundamental essentials.

The foreign aid program is the foremost aspect of our foreign policy because of its great influence on the relationship of our Government to other nations of the world. Although the means of carrying out our foreign assistance program have changed, certainly the ends have not: the preservation and fostering of democratic institutions and principles. The United States cannot stand alone as an isolated island—a future outpost of democracy surrounded by Sino-Soviet bloc satellites.

The foreign aid program has been altered over the years from emphasis on military aid to a greater concentration on economic aid. Grants have largely been replaced by loans. Furthermore, it is no longer solely an American effort as evidenced by the assistance of our allies and the multilateral agreements through the World Bank, Export-Import Bank, OECD, and other international organizations.

Some critics have called the foreign aid program a one-way street. It is their belief that our country pours billions of dollars into economies of the developing nations and receives nothing in return. Because of foreign aid, world markets have greatly expanded for U.S. private investors and for U.S. commercial enterprises. As nations become more fully developed, capital increases and with it the demand for U.S. goods. Last year American business profited by $900 million of exports alone due to the foreign aid bill.

Of the gravest importance is the fact that the survival of the United States and the free world is dependent on deterring Communist influence and aggression throughout the world. If democracy is to survive it must be fostered and abetted through the efforts of the combined aid of all industrialized free nations.

If we believe strongly in freedom, we must be willing to preserve republican institutions. In the past we have sent our men and women to fight for democracy in other lands. American armed manpower is now being replaced by materials and equipment, by trained agronomists and educators, by dollars and grains. Foreign assistance has changed—and at a much lower cost to the American people. Would those who advocate reduction in the foreign assistance budget to the point of ineffectiveness prefer to follow up their convictions by sending men instead of dollars to fight Communist takeovers?

Sir Winston Churchill once said of the U.S. aid program:

> There is no other case of a nation arriving at the summit of world power, seeking no territorial gain, but resolved to use her strength and wealth in the cause of progress and freedom.

Since 1948, our foreign aid program has undergone many changes—some of them subtle, others actual reversals of former policies. Fifteen years ago, primarily through the auspices of the European Recovery Plan, 86 percent of our assistance was disbursed to Western Europe and Japan. Today, the majority of our aid is directed to Latin America, Africa, and Asia. Ten years ago, 60 percent of the foreign aid program was devoted to expenditures for military equipment and training. Today, economic aid totals 70 percent. Five years ago, two-thirds of economic aid was in the form of grants. Today assistance is financed through loans repayable in dollars. These changes denote a willingness to keep abreast of the world situation and to improve methods of implementation as we learn from experience over the years.

Seventeen of the nations which once received the assistance of the United States have moved from economic aid to self-support. More and more industrialized countries of the world are following the leadership of the United States and developing full-scale foreign aid programs of their own, as well as contributing through international organizations. Twenty other nations are now contributing their resources and technical skills to developing countries.

Estimates place free world aid, other than that from the United States, as totaling more than $12 billion. In 1956, grants and loans from the free world states totaled only $900 million. It rose in 1961 to $2.5 billion. Today, contributions exceed $6 billion annually and are still expected to increase. This clearly indicates the conviction of former U.S. aid recipients that foreign assistance on a world scale insures world freedom through economic development.

The grand object, therefore, of American foreign aid policy is the strengthening of democratic influence. U.S. assistance allows the developing countries an alternative to grow in the direction of stable and mature societies and to resist arbitrary, lawless, personal government through totalitarian influences. We do this through a program pared to fundamental needs, based on loans, and one which augments U.S. commercial enterprises through which the U.S. Government benefits indirectly.

The newly emerging states need assistance for internal economic growth. They demand modernization, industrialization, and progress. We of the free world must feel obligated to help them attain their goals. In many ways their future is in our hands. To fail them now is to fail ourselves and democracy. Let us hold the line by approving today the smallest annual foreign aid budget ever requested, as well as a bill highly responsive to Congress repeated requests of the past.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REID of New York. I rise to compliment the gentleman from Massachusetts and in opposition to the several amendments.

I believe the gentleman has touched succinctly and clearly on what some of the cuts might mean in a number of areas. I should like to touch on one or two others he did not mention.

If we should substantially cut development grants, we would go to the heart of the point 4 program. If we should cut the technical cooperation program, we would affect schools, agricultural extension agents, technicians, health workers and teachers in some 48 countries in Asia, Africa, and the Near East.

As the gentleman knows, if we do not spend the amount of money necessary, for example, for teacher training for 100 teachers, which might be only $100,000, we might in turn cost 50,000 students, over a period of 20 years, their opportunity for a better education.

I would add that adequate funds for international organizations and programs are important. UNEF, on the Sinai border; UNRWA, which affects refugees; or UNICEF are vital programs. If we cut them, we will be doing something harmful, in my judgment. We should fully support the peacekeeping machinery in the Near East, and certainly we should support children's programs through UNICEF.

The gentleman from Massachusetts was convincing about supporting assistance and the dangers of $51 million slash. It is quite true that 82 percent of these funds will go to sustain the necessary endeavors in defense support of Korea, Laos, Vietnam, and Thailand. Counterinsurgency and road construction funds for example for the northeast section of Thailand bordering Laos—are obviously important in the light of recent events.

Finally, there are development loans under the Alliance for Progress. Now that Brazil is perhaps starting to turn the corner is hardly the time to cut back one-fifth of this program. This could affect also the Central American Integration or common market, which can be a basis for economic and social progress in Central America—in Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, and Nicaragua. In addition, cuts of $25 million on top of an earlier reduction of $40 million could affect key projects in Chile and Colombia.

I stand with the gentleman in bipartisan support of this program and in bipartisan support of former President Eisenhower and President Johnson. It is a vital program. It should not be trimmed. The amendments should be defeated. This is a time for statesmanship and responsibility and not politics.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

(By unanimous consent (at the request of Mr. McCORMACK), Mr. CONTE was given permission to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.)

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MORGAN. I want to congratulate the gentleman from Massachusetts for his strong stand in support of the bill and against the amendment.

I remember vividly the situation in 1961, when the gentleman from Michigan offered an amendment on the floor to increase military assistance by $300 million. On that occasion he made a well documented and moving speech in behalf of his amendment. He ended up the debate with a persuasive paragraph.

After hearing the explanation he made a moment ago of his views on the cut he now proposes of $51 million in supporting assistance—then called defense support—I wonder why he does not follow what he said in 1961. He said:

> We follow the military budget recommendations of our own Army, Navy, and Air Force experts, our Secretaries of Defense, whether they are Tom Gates or Robert McNamara. We just appropriated $6 billion for fiscal 1962 more than we appropriated for fiscal 1961 for our own Army, Navy, and Air Force. We followed their advice when they asked us for money for our own Army, our own Navy, and our own Air Force, and then we do not follow the same advice they give us for military assistance for our allies, for our own mutual security.

Now, I just cannot see why there would be such a change in his position from 1961, when he took this floor and fought very hard for the additional money for military assistance. I think supporting assistance is now, as it was then, just as vital and just as important as military assistance. They are tied in together. You cannot operate an army in South Vietnam on military assistance alone, but you must have supporting assistance or what we formerly called defense support.

I think including a cut of $51 million to the minority amendment would weaken the position of the minority, because I think this weakens our military posture in every place we are confronting international communism face to face today.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. It is true I offered an amendment to increase the appropriation bill by $300 million in calendar 1961 for fiscal year 1962 and the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN] rose on the floor of the House, as he is doing today, but in that instance he was complimenting me for the attitude I expressed at that time.

Mr. MORGAN. I certainly was.

Mr. FORD. I appreciated his remarks then and I appreciate his remarks now, because I think they help to make the point. I say that because there is not one dollar cut in this bill today for military assistance, and the amendment in 1961 was for military assistance.

Mr. CONTE. There was also an amendment for defense support.

Mr. FORD. Not in 1961.

Mr. CONTE. I am talking about 1960. The gentleman supported it and he said—this is the gentleman from Michigan:

> May I add this: In 1957 this defense support program totaled $1,161,700,000. To restore money to the program, taking the figure of $650 million for the fiscal year 1961, we find that the program from 1957 to 1961 would have gone down $500 million.

My argument here today is this administration trimmed another $200 million, and for doing that you are trying to hit them on the head and say you should not bring in such a tight budget but bring in a fat budget so we can cut it and let the House get credit for it. This is wrong and I am going to oppose it.

Mr. FORD. Will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. CONTE. Yes.

Mr. FORD. He mentioned my name a moment ago. Despite this alleged tight budget, you must concede that the budget request this year for fiscal 1965 is more than Congress made available in fiscal 1964.

Mr. CONTE. We could get into an argument here that will last all day. Last year we had a carryover of approximately $400 million. This year that estimated carryover will be only $53 million. Therefore, without the supplemental for Vietnam for military and economic assistance, this budget is about the same as the budget we passed last year.

Mr. FORD. If there was such a large carryover a year ago, I think this casts considerable adverse reflection on the management of the program a year ago.

Mr. CONTE. Why, we have had, and the gentleman knows it as well as I do, carryovers from time immemorial. When the gentleman from Oklahoma got up here to speak and read off a letter from the President, you asked him the question in regard to fiscal year 1954. You said we had cut the program $600 million, and yet the President complimented the gentleman from Oklahoma for his stand. But what he failed to say is in fiscal year 1954 the President asked for $5,475 million, which is one of the largest foreign aid budgets ever requested of the Congress of the United States.

EFFECTIVE FOREIGN AID—PEOPLE-TO-PEOPLE TECHNICAL COOPERATION

Mr. Chairman, I am deeply disturbed by this amendment to cut additional funds from the technical cooperation program.

A key element of the U.S. foreign aid program is the technical assistance effort going forward in many emerging countries around the world. In more than 20 countries technical assistance constitutes almost our entire foreign assistance effort. In other countries it is carefully coordinated with other forms of assistance to insure that our help gets to the people.

In many countries a small number of devoted Americans are working among the people to transfer American know-how and skills. They are not living in luxury as is often charged. Rather, they are working side by side with the people of the developing countries getting a job done. It is a challenging, often frustrating profession.

These are people from the backbone of America—from Vermont, Indiana, California, from all over the United States. These are people with the kind of pioneering spirit which built America.

Because of them, and the rest of our aid effort, U.S. foreign assistance is reaching the people of the underdeveloped world. It is making a constructive impact.

The evidence of this impact is not often dramatic. Nevertheless, change is occurring at an increasingly rapid pace. For every constructive change in the traditional way of life that is visible, there are many others that are spreading more slowly but which will ultimately transform the society of the underdeveloped nations in the decades to come.

It is clear that if there is to be substantial development in these nations it will have to come from changes generated and accepted within the framework of their own societies. This is what self-help really means—not simply that we would like to have developing nations pay a fair share of the cost of development, but rather that we and they realize that lasting development must be built from within.

It is within this framework that U.S. technical assistance plays such a basic and vital role. Technical assistance helps the individual in an underdeveloped country to help himself and to help build his society. It enables the campesino, the peasant, the tribal farmer to adapt the technical know-how and expertise of the modern world to the realities and confines of his own primitive conditions.

Modern communications, independence, the education of a few native leaders are causing an awakening in the developing countries. In some places it is an emotional demand for modern social legislation or educational facilities; in other places it is a less articulate but no less pressing demand for improved health practices or for the right to own the land that the people work; in still other places—perhaps the majority—it is a slowly growing realization that things need not necessarily be as they have always been. This, for many, is the one dynamic new idea: that change is possible; and that the pattern of life of the last 2,000 years need not be the pattern of life for the next 2,000 years.

American technical assistance is helping to insure that the changes which will inevitably occur in the developing countries are changes for the better; that all people share in the opportunity for a better life.

How effectively are we achieving this goal? Let me give you a few examples from one area of our foreign assistance program—agriculture. These examples could be repeated many times in other areas such as public health and education.

In Nigeria, 170,000 farmers will be reached by AID-assisted and trained extension workers in 1963. More than 100 Young Farmers Clubs with a total membership of more than 7,000 Nigerian youth have been organized under the guidance of a single AID technician.

In the Sudan, 325,000 people are being reached this year by agricultural extension programs sponsored by AID.

In South Korea, counterpart funded loans from members of the National Agricultural Cooperatives Federation provided more than 724,000 individual agricultural credit loans for crop production during 1962. Fifteen thousand loans were made to village cooperatives to assist in procurement of materials and marketing.

In Ghana last year, 180,000 farm families were reached directly by AID-sponsored agricultural extension farm programs. These programs included demonstrations and training in livestock development, vegetable production, construction and use of minor irrigation works, and the uses of fertilizer and pesticides.

In Turkey, 31,000 of the total of 40,000 rural communities will be reached this year by AID trained and assisted agriculture extension workers. In the last 2 years, 246,000 new acres of farmland have been prepared for irrigation. Almost 17,000 potential farm leaders from 3,500 villages have received water and soil conservation training under a program financed by Public Law 480 commodities.

In Chile, 215,000 farmers were reached last year by AID-sponsored extension activities. Twenty rural training centers are reaching 2,000 students each year in basic agricultural techniques.

In Taiwan, 80,000 agricultural credit loans were made last year under the sponsorship of AID-supported National Agricultural Cooperatives Federation. Also, 637,000 farmers are benefiting directly from AID-generated farm and home economic extension work. More than 80 percent of farm families in Taiwan are now being reached by extension workers.

In Vietnam, in the midst of a shooting war, rapid strides are being made in increased agricultural production; 300,000 people are being reached by extension work in basic agricultural techniques. A million and a half people have been reached by a plant production program designed to provide training and demonstration in the protection of plants and harvests from rodents and insects.

These specifics are impressive and I am afraid not very well known, but they are not unusual. They are typical of the way in which the U.S. foreign assistance effort is getting directly to the grassroots of the developing nations.

Our foreign aid program is effective; it is doing a job.

This is no time for us to slacken our efforts.

I urge that the House approve the foreign aid bill as reported by the full Appropriations Committee and reject any effort to cut the heart out of this program—technical cooperation.

Mr. Chairman:

> Men should stop fighting among themselves and start fighting insects.—LUTHER BURBANK.

One significant and major feature of this program is designed to eradicate malaria.

This terrible disease which multiplies and destroys red blood cells has ruined scores of men, women, and children around the world.

We cannot hope to create a healthy climate in various parts of the world if we refuse to join in a worldwide quest for health.

Our technical cooperation is people-to-people assistance. It is the kind of assistance which gets to the root of a situation and is directed at the people themselves. This money does not go toward wall-to-wall carpeting in plush embassies.

A cut in this program would be a cut in malaria prevention. Can we say that it would be in the best interests of the United States or the free world to stop a program of worldwide malaria eradication that is freeing tens of millions from this disease and, at the same time, opening up hundreds of acres to productive use?

No, Mr. Chairman, this technical cooperation program, studied closely, would please even the most severe and bitter of the opponents of foreign aid for the simple reason that it is designed to help people, here and now. Any cut would be disastrous.

MILITARY ASSISTANCE

As a member of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, it has been my privilege again this year to participate in the hearings on the administration's request for the appropriation of $1.055 billion for the fiscal year 1965 military assistance program. Both the testimony presented by executive branch witnesses and a careful review of the supporting documents have fully convinced me that the action already taken by this House in authorizing the appropriation of the full amount requested was clearly in the national interest, and that it is equally incumbent upon us to provide the funds which will give substance to our previous action.

There are a number of valid reasons why I continue to support military assistance as an extension of our own defense posture and an instrument of U.S. foreign policy, any one of which I consider ample justification for advocating appropriation of the full amount requested for the fiscal year 1965 program. My purpose on this occasion, however, is to emphasize two basic considerations upon which I rest my contention that any reduction in that amount is not in the national interest.

First, then, I submit that prior year cuts in fund availability for military assistance have adversely affected—despite vociferous claims to the contrary on the part of some among us—the defense posture of the free world and that any further reduction in the combat effectiveness of allied and friendly armed forces would be entirely inconsistent with the reliance we place upon such forces to help us hold the line against further Communist aggression. So long as the forward strategy of the United States draws that line at the edge of the Iron and Bamboo Curtains, there is an urgent and obvious need to insure that the defensive strength on the free world side is adequate to balance and deter the use of the offensive potential of the Communist forces on the other side.

As a result of reduced appropriations for military assistance in recent years, this need is not being met. Consider, for example, the situation on NATO's southern flank where the Greek and Turkish forces which we count upon to protect that flank confront massive Soviet and Bulgarian military power poised along their borders. The very fact that there are U.S. forces stationed in Europe and the Mediterranean bespeaks the importance of preventing an imbalance between the capabilities of the allied forces which help defend the area and those of the Communist bloc which threaten it. Unfortunately, however, force improvement and modernization of Soviet and Bulgarian forces has proceeded apace, while equipment of several types in the Greek and Turkish forces is not only deficient in quantity but is subject to a rapidly increasing rate of obsolescence.

Since 1959, the Bulgarian Army structure has changed from one consisting of 10 rifle divisions with limited defensive strength to one consisting of 7 motorized and 3 tank divisions with strong offensive capabilities. Bulgarian forces are now equipped with all the latest materiel essential to mobility and effective striking power. By contrast, the Greeks and Turks are seriously handicapped by shortages in many categories of weapons and equipment; and much of the materiel they do have is so old as to be of marginal usefulness. The danger inherent in such deficiencies is self-evident, but action to remedy the situation has been repeatedly postponed by lack of adequate funds to complete modernization.

Some of the most vital requirements could have been met within the $1.4 billion request for the fiscal year 1964 military assistance program if a 29-percent cut in last year's appropriation for military assistance had not necessitated a reduction of 20 percent in the programs for both Greece and Turkey. Further deferment of the force improvement items which had to be eliminated in fiscal year 1964 as a result of such program reduction would seriously jeopardize both our military posture and our security interests in Western Europe and the Mediterranean area.

This single example of the adverse effects of previous cuts in fund availability for military assistance is typical of similar problems which plague the common defense effort in other key areas on the periphery of the Communist bloc where we have drawn the first lines of our own defense. It is problems such as these which prompted the Secretary of Defense, in a recent public address, to warn:

> Unwillingness to devote sufficient resources to military assistance will weaken the national forces of our friends and thereby weaken the combined forces of the free world on which we rely for defense and for the credibility needed to prevent Communist miscalculation in showdowns.

I choose to heed that warning by voting, and urging you to vote, for the appropriation of $1.055 billion for the fiscal year 1965 military assistance program. I believe that, in so doing, we shall well serve the national interest.

I also believe that the money we are asked to appropriate represents a sound and productive investment in the peace of the world and the security of the United States. And that is the second basic consideration I wish to emphasize today.

Everything I have learned during the course of successive annual hearings conducted by the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, and from personal study of the presentation documents, supports my conviction that the dividends which accrue to this Nation and its taxpayers from the funds used for military assistance provide a better than average return on our money. I know, for example, that the 11 so-called forward-defense nations which are scheduled to receive two-thirds of the proposed fiscal year 1965 program maintain a total military strength of 3½ million men, which is more than that of the United States. I know that, whereas the estimated annual cost of each U.S. soldier overseas—just for his pay, allowances, subsistence, and clothing—is almost $4,000, the average comparable cost of the 3½ million men under arms in the 11 forward-defense countries ranges from $200 to $750 per soldier. The only conclusion I can draw from this comparison is that it is good sense and good economics to provide this free world manpower with the equipment and training essential to insure its maximum contribution to the common defense.

I also accept the conclusion drawn by Secretary McNamara that if we failed to realize upon this great potential asset of allied and friendly forces already in position throughout the frontier nations and familiar with local conditions—if we tried to do for ourself what they can best do—"the cost in men and other resources could increase by a factor of 5, 10 or 20, if we could do it at all." There is no valid reason for us to attempt any such foolhardly and expensive undertaking. It is far cheaper, wiser and safer to provide the military assistance which enables indigenous forces to assume as large as possible a share of the burden of collective security. Not only do they substantially lighten our load but, even more important, their ability to deter aggression substantially reduces the risk of escalation inherent in direct intervention by the United States in support of its mutual defense commitments.

Recent history teaches us that an ounce of prevention is indeed worth a pound of cure. Even at 12-year-old prices, the direct cost of our engagement in the Korean conflict was $18 billion; and there were 157,000 American casualties not assessable in terms of dollars. The administration is asking slightly more than one-eighteenth of that amount in fiscal year 1965 for a program which is specifically designed to minimize the possibility of another such requirement for the full commitment off American troops to active participation in open war—limited or otherwise.

The administration is asking us to appropriate an amount equivalent to approximately 2 percent of our total national defense expenditures for the military assistance essential to maintain and, where necessary, strengthen the capability of millions of allied and friendly fighting men who represent an extension of our own armed force and contribute substantially to the combined free world military posture which gives substance to both national and collective security. The some $33 billion we have already invested in the development of that power for peace has paid us excellent dividends in the past. Let us then protect that investment and insure continuing dividends therefrom by making available the funds necessary for optimum use of the military assistance program to promote the foreign policy, security and general welfare of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am one of the newer members of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee. It is also my honor to serve on the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee. I do not set myself up as an expert on military affairs or on the foreign aid program per se, but I have been exposed to the facts. We sat in closed door sessions for the past 6 months, in the Foreign Operations Subcommittee, and spent many hundreds of hours in session. I want to say to the Members of this House that if they had heard the testimony we heard and seen the exhibits we saw they could not in good conscience support what this administration has asked for in this bill.

I also want to say that I have the highest regard for the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, my good friend, George Mahon. He conducts extremely fair hearings. I do not always agree with him but respect him for his views. I also want to say the same about my good friend, Otto Passman. Otto Passman has forgotten more about the foreign aid than many of the Members on the floor of this House, including myself, will ever know about it. He is the outstanding authority on the subject.

We know that there is still a lot of fat in his so-called "barebones" bill. That is a phony expression if I ever heard one. I want to pay tribute to Otto Passman for his strength of purpose and, as I said yesterday, his fortitude and his courage. He is truly a great American.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MINSHALL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, the inference has been left by some, and some people have made the categorical statement, that these are firm estimates, that the proposed dollars are lined up, item by item, with specific projects. I have here in my hand the justification books submitted to the Foreign Aid Subcommittee on Appropriations. I am looking through the justifications book under the item of economic assistance. I shall not designate the area and I shall not designate the country, because under the procedures I may not talk about the country and the dollars simultaneously. However, let me refer to the first three countries which I shall designate A, B, and C. These are the precise figures from the justification book submitted to the committee.

Country A: Fiscal year 1965—program proposed, lower figure $41,800,000, and the highest figure $61,800,000. There is a $20 million difference between the lower figure and the higher figure. I say to you, is this a solid, concrete justification of specific dollars against firm programs?

Country B: The lower figure $41 million, the higher figure $66 million. There is a difference of $25 million between the lowest justified figure and the highest justified figure.

Country C: The lower figure $116 million, the upper figure $166 million.

There is a $50 million difference between the lower figure and the upper figure. Fifty million dollars of flexibility in one country is quite a bit of flexibility.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MINSHALL. I yield.

Mr. GARY. Is it not true that the budget estimate is based on the lower rather than the higher figure?

Mr. FORD. I am reading from their own justifications.

Mr. GARY. I understand, but the budget requests are based upon the lower rather than the higher figure.

Mr. FORD. This is what the justification proposed.

Mr. GARY. The best authority I know tells me that that is true. I refer to Frank Merrill, the clerk of our subcommittee.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MINSHALL. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. PASSMAN. Is it not true that in supporting assistance there has been no recommendation that a reduction be made in the figure of $405 million?

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I asked a question.

Mr. CONTE. I want to answer the question.

Mr. PASSMAN. I am asking the acting chairman of the subcommittee if there has been any reduction made in the supporting assistance item.

Mr. GARY. No; not by our committee, because most of these funds are for the Far East area.

Mr. PASSMAN. I know what the funds are for.

Mr. GARY. That is where the President——

Mr. PASSMAN. I want an answer to the question.

Mr. GARY. I am answering your question. That is where the President requested $70 million additional for Vietnam.

Mr. PASSMAN. I asked the gentleman a direct question.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. PASSMAN. I want to ask the gentleman if it is not true that there is one country in the Far East, for which you have a slug of money in supporting assistance for a highway, and they say, "We cannot accept the money; it is incompatible with our philosophy." So they are declining this money, which is in supporting assistance, and you have made no adjustment for that fact.

If I have $1,000 in bank 1 and $1,000 in bank 2, and I take $300 out of bank 1 and put it in bank 2, I then have $700 in bank 1 and $1,300 in bank 2; is that correct?

Mr. GARY. I do not understand which question the gentleman wants answered.

Mr. PASSMAN. I will ask my friend the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Minshall], if I have two bank accounts with $1,000 in bank 1 and $1,000 in bank 2, and I transfer $300 out of bank 1 over into bank 2, that gives me $700 in bank 1 and $1,300 in bank 2, does it not?

Mr. MINSHALL. That is correct.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, we are losing sight of the fact that this is an inflated bill. This is not any "barebones" appropriation.

I want to ask the acting chairman this question: If we put together title I, title II, and title III in this bill—that is a limitation on the Export-Import Bank—title II where we have about $200 million more this year than last year, is it not true that if the bill that is pending before the House at this time is approved there will be $696,318,400 more in titles I, II, and III than was in the bill at this point last year?

Mr. GARY. If the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Minshall] will yield further, let me say to the gentleman from Louisiana that in discussing title III we realize that it is not an appropriation, and the gentleman well knows it.

Mr. PASSMAN. That is what the gentleman from Virginia is discussing.

Mr. GARY. All the gentleman from Louisiana is doing now is trying to confuse the issue. It is a limitation.

Mr. PASSMAN. If the gentleman does not care to give a factual answer, I shall ask someone from the other side of the aisle the question. May I ask the gentleman from Michigan, if we take titles I, II, and III of the bill, including the limitation on the Export-Import Bank as printed on the sheet, at this time last year the total of the three titles amounted to $4,396,772,000?

Mr. FORD. If the gentleman from Ohio will yield to me, that was the House version of the bill.

Mr. PASSMAN. That is true. If the bill presently under consideration, without my proposed amendment, should be approved in all three titles, including the limitation on the Export-Import Bank, the amount will be $696,318,000 above last year?

Mr. FORD. Would the gentleman from Louisiana repeat that lesser figure, please?

Mr. PASSMAN. In the event the bill that is being considered at this time, without my amendment, should be adopted, including the limitation on the Export-Import Bank, the amount of the increase this year over the same stage last year will be $696,318,400.

Mr. FORD. That is correct.

Mr. PASSMAN. If my proposed amendment to title I only is adopted, the House will still have a bill of approximately $400 million above that of last year at this point, if we take into account the nonrecurring $135 million item of last year.

Mr. FORD. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. PASSMAN. And, if you take——

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. These figures are accurate and the members of the Committee are entitled to know about them. Let us not try to confuse the issue.

Mr. GALLAGHER. No; I want the facts.

Mr. PASSMAN. I want the gentleman to answer my question.

If the House adopts my proposed amendment, we would still take a bill to the other body with $448,518,400 more than was sent over there last year?

Mr. FORD. Those figures are correct.

Mr. PASSMAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate close in 10 minutes, with 5 minutes reserved for the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I would like to observe that most of the debate is being conducted by members of the committee, but there are matters that Members and those under other committee jurisdiction would like to discuss. I have been waiting, trying to contribute something to this debate, and I think I can. At this time it is a little early to cut off debate.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment close at 4 o'clock.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman mean the pending amendment?

Mr. GARY. On the pending amendment close at 4 o'clock, with the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee, and my request includes all amendments thereto.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, if the limitation is made, are those who are standing, who have already debated this question, going to be permitted to speak, or will it be limited to those who have not spoken on the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. If objection is raised, it would be limited to those who have not previously spoken on the amendment.

Mr. BOW. I thank the chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, is this 10 minutes or 20 minutes?

Mr. GARY. At 4 o'clock, 22 minutes from now.

Mr. GROSS. I take it there are about 20 Members standing.

Mr. GARY. I do not know. I have not counted them.

Mr. GROSS. And the gentleman wants to reserve 5 minutes to the committee?

Mr. GARY. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto end at 4 o'clock.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY].

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BOW, Mr. HORAN, Mr. FORD, Mr. CONTE, and Mr. CHAMBERLAIN yielded their time to Mr. CURTIS.)

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my colleagues for yielding their time to me. I know the House is impatient on this matter. We all have been sitting here, including myself, for 2 days trying to absorb the meat of this very important and serious debate.

The reason I take this time to support the amendments, is that throughout the debate I have heard no reference to one of the very critical and important factors that concerns us in the foreign aid program and that is the international balance-of-payments problem. It was the balance-of-payments problem that brought about the Clay report. I have heard very little about the Clay report, not about what the chairman, Mr. Clay, reportedly might have said since the report was issued. I am talking about the Clay report itself. Because it was so very difficult to get the Clay report, incidentally, I put pertinent portions of it in the RECORD so others could read them.

The Clay report recommended not only a cut of $500 million in the first year to the then present level from $3.9 billion, not the $4.9 billion the administration suggested last year, but to the present level, but then a successive cut in the next year and a cut in the third year.

What is the balance-of-payments situation? Today is July 1. We do not have the final official figures on the balance of payments for the second quarter, which ended yesterday, but those figures are pretty well known, and it is interesting now to notice that no one from the administration's side of the aisle has been down here to talk about the balance of payments. The first quarter picked up very nicely, but I can tell you, and I do not have the complete figures, that the second quarter is not a good figure at all, and it is concerning this administration deeply.

What does this balance-of-payments picture mean? It means that we are in a serious problem over which we do not have control. Every economist will tell you, whatever his conclusions are, that this is the kind of money, right here in the foreign aid program, that is most vital in the balance-of-payments program. We can talk about balancing the budget on domestic issues and other expenditure programs, and they do have an indirect bearing on the balance of payments because the overall deficit in our Federal balance bears on it, but the foreign aid money bears directly. It is blood money, you might say, as far as the balance-of-payments problem is concerned.

Here is how far this administration has gone in trying to improvise to protect against the dire consequences involved in continued negative balance of payments, and, in their own words, the administration says, to buy time.

But if you do not use that time that we have bought to move in to hit at the basic problems in the balance of payments, the time and the payments you have made to buy that time put us in a worse position.

This House earlier this year passed an interest equalization tax. I refer to it, and it is true, as the first time in our history that we have ever imposed a barrier against the flow of capital investment, private investment. It is shameful that the United States should come to this pass that we should impose this kind of barrier on the free flow of investment funds. Better to meet the balance-of-payments problem head on by cutting the foreign aid program to levels we can afford. Here is where the imbalance occurs initially.

This backward-looking bill is sitting over in the Senate right now being pushed by the administration. This is how far we have gone astray to meet the balance-of-payments problem.

Now I have been impressed with the minority views in this committee report in hitting in a reasonable way at what the level of expenditures should be in this program. I was pleased with Chairman MORGAN's statement during the debate on the authorization bill when he said:

> It is not a question largely between those who are for foreign aid and those who are against, because most of us are for foreign aid. We are trying to talk about what the level should be.

And this is what the debate is about and this is what the minority of the committee has been doing, in my judgment in an excellent way to point it up.

I would observe, and there is no getting away from it, when President Johnson calls a request for $3.5 billion a barebones budget when last year only $3 billion was granted that these words become meaningless. Because, of course, it is not a barebones budget. In the light of the Clay report it is not barebones. The Clay report refers directly to the fact that this program should be cut back in three stages to a level of around $2 billion. Last year we cut it back some and it should receive a further tapering off this year. This is what we are talking about.

The gold flow problem lies in this legislation too. Also the devaluation of our own dollar which has come about partly because of these excessive amounts that have been put into the foreign aid program is involved here. Our balance of trade is excellent. It is a plus figure. Our return on private investment abroad is excellent. It is a plus figure. The minus figure in the balance of payments is the foreign aid program.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

(By unanimous consent (at the request of Mr. RHODES of Arizona), the time allotted to him was granted to Mr. CURTIS.)

Mr. CURTIS. In order to get around the balance-of-payments problem, one of the improvisings of the administration is to sell U.S. Government bonds to foreign countries not repayable in American dollars but repayable in the currencies of those foreign countries. And, of course, the foreign nations gobble them up. That is their way of hedging against the devaluation of the U.S. dollar.

Finally, I remind everyone of what I refer to as Curtis' law, an amendment to Gresham's law, that Federal money, Government money, drives out private money. That is exactly what has been occurring in this foreign aid program. South America is a typical example. Since U.S. Government money came in under the Alliance for Progress program, there has been a dwindling away of U.S. private investments in South America.

If we are going to move the nations abroad forward, we had better get back to the principles that made this country great which are embodied in the private enterprise system.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR].

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, on at least two previous occasions this year the committee and this House have been told, "If you want to effect economies in foreign aid, wait until the appropriation bill comes along." We were told that the second time we voted on IDA. We were told the same thing when we voted on the authorization bill for foreign aid.

Now we have reached the time referred to by those who said, "When the appropriation bill comes along, let us exercise economy."

I urge and beg you to exercise reasonable economy by supporting this amendment. There is "fat" in the bill. This will make it a better bill. It will restore a measure of legislative control if we adopt the amendment. I urge Members to do so.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN].

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as I have been renominated, without opposition, to the 89th Congress by the fine people of the 5th District of Louisiana, I shall reserve my 50 seconds until 1965.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLAGHER].

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, President Johnson has been honest with the Congress; he has asked for a bare minimum of funds for foreign aid, and we in turn should do no less than appropriate the committee's recommendations.

I firmly believe that the U.S. foreign aid program is one of the critical elements of our overall national security effort. I am impressed, as we all must be, that since World War II, four Presidents, all the Secretaries of State and Defense, and all the Chiefs of Staff have recognized foreign aid to be one of the basic tenets of our policy.

As President Johnson recently said:

> We now know that the progress which others make in satisfying their own desire for a better life will ultimately affect our own prospects, for we are now a part of a single world community and you no longer can confine your activities or your influence to your local county seat.

A world community of free and stable nations, willing and capable of resisting tyranny, aggression, and subversion—of Communist or any other origin—is the kind of world in which our own freedom and aspirations will best flourish.

It is unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, that the Communist threat to the security of the free world will not abate simply because we would wish to ignore it. The Communist challenge is not only military but involves every area of human endeavor—it is political, it is economic, it is ideological and scientific.

As Chairman Khrushchev warned us more than 3 years ago, the Communists, while rejecting global nuclear wars and even local wars, fully support the use of wars of national liberation, and the application of increased economic and political pressures to extend Communist control over larger and largers areas of the world.

It is ironic, Mr. Chairman, that there are some in this House who support reductions in the President's requests at the very time the Communists accelerate their own worldwide activities. We are now anxiously aware of Communist guerrilla warfare, insurrection, and covert aggression—not only against their neighbors but elsewhere in the world. We also know that so far this year, the Communist bloc has already made new commitments to extend $800 million in economic aid.

We cannot diminish our own efforts in this same arena; we must not default to our adversaries. It is not enough to meet this challenge through military might alone, either nuclear or conventional. Our response must fit the challenge.

It is not difficult to understand the reasons for our military assistance program. We have based our strategy since World War II on collective defense throughout the free world. It is clear that if we failed to support and assist those free nations which need and want help to maintain their own independence, it would be necessary to supply our own forces to prevent expansion. The military assistance program is the best means for keeping our own soldiers out of combat.

The attack by Communist China on India in October 1962, offered further demonstration that military weakness tempts the Communist adversary to attack, to seize for the quick, jolting victory. The United States has responded to India's belated recognition of the necessity of military strength. We shall continue to assist India in modernizing her forces in fiscal year 1965.

This coming fiscal year, our military assistance will be heavily concentrated in 11 "forward defense" countries which border the Sino-Soviet bloc—Greece, Turkey, Iran, Pakistan, India, Thailand, the Philippines, Taiwan, Korea, Laos, and of course, South Vietnam. These countries maintain more than 3½ million men under arms.

The military assistance program is surely our front line of defense against Communist expansion through aggression.

The strategic role of economic assistance in our foreign policy is less obvious, although equally important. How, people ask, does a housing project in Colombia, a rural school in Nigeria, or a farm credit program in Iran—how do any of our far-ranging assistance programs serve to diminish the Communist threat, and increase U.S. security?

The answer, Mr. Chairman, is that the United States is committed to the basic proposition that sustained economic and social progress in the underdeveloped regions will give independence and political freedom—not communism—the better chance of survival.

A staggeringly large number of the world's people exist in circumstances of utter and complete poverty. They are hungry, ignorant, and often diseased. They are discontent and restless. They are on the move.

While communism naturally spawns and thrives among the despairing and the frustrated, the United States can and must convince these people, by encouragement and assistance, that they need not adopt or imitate the Communist system; that they need not resort to or acquiesce in Communist leadership in the hope of changing their lives. We must assist these people in achieving the orderly progress, the stability and independence which are vital to the interests of the United States.

Through foreign aid, in the words of Secretary of State Rusk, we strive to "make the world safe for freedom." AID contributes to the efforts of underdeveloped countries to build the thriving economies and social institutions essential for free societies—societies willing and capable of repelling Communist propaganda and subversion; societies which look forward with hope, not back in anger.

The United States engages in this worldwide war on poverty for a variety of reasons, not the least of which is the generous American impulse to aid the needy and less privileged.

But because the foreign aid program is also such a necessary and vital element of our foreign policy, I believe that in these troubled days this is an ill-advised time, indeed, to deprive AID of any of the resources it needs to move ahead in what President Kennedy called the long twilight struggle for freedom.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

(By unanimous consent, Mr. MAHON yielded his time to Mr. GARY.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

(By unanimous consent, Mr. ROONEY of New York yielded his time to Mr. GARY.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. DEVINE].

(By unanimous consent, Mr. DEVINE yielded his time to Mr. TAFT.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Chairman, a few minutes ago we heard from the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana as to the differences between this bill and the amendment. The gentleman pointed out the increases resulting from the bill, which will result even if the amendment is adopted.

One item not mentioned came to my attention as I was looking through the committee report. The only area in which there is a sizable saving, comparing the two, is in the inter-American social and economic cooperation program which is discontinued. For that reason I took a second look, and I found that there is a gimmick here. In other words, we are not getting the full bill today that we can expect before the end of this session.

On April 14 of this year the Secretary of the Treasury, made a talk in Panama, in which he proposed adding to the fund for special operations some $750 million, from the United States, over the next 3 years. Apparently $250 million of that will apparently come to the Congress in this session.

I should like to take this time to inquire of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY], the acting chairman of the subcommittee, whether or not this is the case so that the committee can understand this in making its decision in its vote upon the amendment.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I will say to him that I have absolutely no information on that point whatever. There has been no request or suggestion on the part of anyone, so far as the committee is concerned, with reference to any additional funds.

Mr. TAFT. In that connection I would call to the gentleman's attention the words of the Secretary of the Treasury at that time. He stated:

> I hope that we can agree at this meeting to seek the commitment of our governments to a 3-year program to enlarge the fund for special operations by an amount equal to $300 million per annum of which the United States would contribute $250 million, and other members of the bank, $50 million, all in our own national currencies.

We should not let this slip by. We will face it later, I am sure, if the Secretary of the Treasury is good to his word and the commitments made at that time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS].

(By unanimous consent, Mr. HAYS yielded his time to Mr. MCCORMACK.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the distinguished Speaker of the House [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, the President of the United States, Lyndon B. Johnson, in submitting his budget estimate on this bill, cut it at least a billion dollars from what was submitted to Congress the preceding fiscal year.

The budget estimate he submitted is the smallest submitted in any year since 1948, with the exception of 1 year. President Johnson has kept faith with the Congress of the United States. He submitted what he considered to be a minimum budget. This is the first budget submitted by him since the unfortunate and tragic death of President Kennedy on this particular subject. The committee has reduced it $200 million. The effect of the pending amendment is to make a further reduction of $247 million.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] very effectively and eloquently called attention to the significance of this in terms of supporting assistance; that is, a reduction of 51 million. I call attention to another aspect of the pending amendment, which would reduce the contingency fund of the President of the United States by a sum of $50 million. Both of these items are of vital importance in connection with combating international communism throughout the world—the supporting assistance and the contingency fund of the President of the United States.

We heard last night one of the most dramatic speeches ever made in the Halls of Congress, the speech made by the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], which was a speech that gripped the Members of this body whether they are for the bill or against the bill, because they recognize the sterling leadership that he evidenced last night when he made his eloquent and dramatic speech. This is the first bill that has come out of the Appropriations Committee in the field of foreign assistance since the gentleman from Texas has been chairman of that committee. Are we going to support him? Are we going to support the President of the United States? Or are we going to support those who oppose the effective means by and through which the President of the United States in the field of foreign affairs, so far as foreign assistance is concerned, can perform his duties and his responsibilities? It seems to me that the minimum we should give to the President of the United States is the amount voted out by the subcommittee and the full committee in order for the President to assume the full responsibilities of his office.

This is the affirmative side of our country in the battle against international communism. This legislation and this appropriation has held back communism. This legislation is not negative but it is affirmative and it is vitally necessary for the national interests of our country.

I urge that the amendment be defeated and that the bill as reported out by the subcommittee and the full committee be enacted into law.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes to close debate the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY].

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. GARY. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, the future of the world is being fashioned by our actions today. The future of our children and of their children will be affected by the decisions we make today in the Congress of the United States as we vote on bills such as the one presently before us.

During these days when the harsh realities of poverty, disease, hunger, and ignorance rules two-thirds of this planet and when the threat of international communism continues to feed on the discontent which springs from these realities, we cannot afford to weaken or destroy virtually the only means we have with which to influence the course of world events.

The minority would have us believe that the foreign aid program is an unnecessary luxury which we could easily do without. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] has implied this by his statement that we would not lose a thing by refusing to appropriate additional funds and instead rely on the funds already appropriated and in the foreign aid pipeline. This would not only greatly weaken the hand of the President in his conduct of foreign policy, but would also prevent the United States from shaping the course of events in the world.

Mr. Chairman, this House has been presented with a minority report on the pending bill which ignores the real dangers we face today and which reaches several conclusions which are at variance with the facts as I see them.

Minority charge: Let me detail the basis for this conclusion: The United States is financing over 4,000 foreign aid projects scattered all over the face of the earth.

Fact: The total number of active aid projects is 2,358. There is no foundation in the hearings for the higher figure of 4,000 projects.

Minority charge: There are 71,416 people on the AID payroll, and this represents a 7,000 increase over 1963.

Fact: The number of direct hire personnel in the AID economic aid program is 16,406, down 249 from 1963. In the military aid program the number of direct hire personnel is 12,163, down 3,398 from 1963. There are 9,653 personnel working for AID contractors and for other assisting agencies, an increase of 142 over 1963. The United States is helping to train 33,212 foreign nationals—either in the military training program or in the economic aid program—an increase of 4,709 over 1963. These foreign nationals are not paid wages or salaries and are not employees of the U.S. Government.

Minority charge: The foreign aid program has no counterpart in any other program operated by the U.S. Government. The legislative authority specifies that funds shall be spent for programs which are outlined in the broadest possible terms.

Fact: A number of Federal programs, including the Higher Education Facilities Act, the Small Business Administration, manpower retraining, the Area Redevelopment Act, accelerated public works, and many other programs are administered without specific congressional approval for each project.

Minority charge: The Administrators of the aid program, including Secretary Rusk, expressed satisfaction with a $3 billion program authorized for 1964.

Fact: The total authorized for fiscal 1964 included the amount reappropriated from 1963, giving a total of approximately $3,602 million. This carryover figure was known to the conference committee at the time the new money was agreed upon. The amount of carryover this year is expected to be far less. Further, the minority report cites language from Secretary Rusk suggesting he was satisfied with the 1964 program level, but the minority report omits the following question and answer found on the same page of the hearings—part I, page 276:

> Mr. PASSMAN. I am speaking of the amount of money on hand and the programs you presently have planned that you will supplement out of this year's appropriations. I am speaking of the overall program. I ask, do you believe we have a satisfactory program going?
>
> Secretary RUSK. There are some situations, Mr. Chairman, where we would like to be able to move faster than we are on such things as the modernization of arms among certain of our allies. We have to try to make a prudent judgment between what ought to be done and what can be done with the resources available. I would not say, looking historically at the program, each year's program has been all it might be in our interest; no, sir.

Minority charge: The minority report reproduces a table and makes accompanying statements implying that the outflow of U.S. gold has been accomplished with U.S. aid money given to countries purchasing this gold.

Fact: Ninety-one percent of this gold was purchased by countries who repaid more to the United States during the period in question than they received in aid. The use of this table represents one of the most misleading errors contained in the entire report—especially since the falseness of these conclusions was called to the attention of the gentleman from Louisiana since last year when his committee report attempted to make the same argument.

Minority charge: The amount of deobligation of pipeline funds is so large as to cause considerable concern.

Fact: The amount of economic assistance which has been deobligated during fiscal 1964 is about $92 million, representing only 2 percent of the total pipeline. The deobligation of military pipeline funds is 6 percent, but the minority report proposes no cut in military funds. Deobligation of funds is a conservative, sound practice when needs or conditions have changed.

Minority charge: The minority report charges that the budget for the foreign aid program is "an estimate of the wildest sort."

Fact: The AID budget, just as with any other budget for a Federal agency, is based upon detailed analyses and preparation. The budget process begins about 18 months before the presentation is made to Congress and this process continues until each project is completed. Information is collected and the analysis conducted both in Washington and in the field.

Decisions as to whether to proceed with a specific project are based upon the importance of the project to American foreign policy, the soundness of the project, the performance of the recipient country, and the availability of funds.

Minority charge: The foreign aid program is, in the words of the gentleman from Louisiana, "uncontrolled and uncontrollable."

Fact: This program is subject to the same congressional review and controls as are the other programs of the Federal Government. The flexibility that exists in the program was specifically placed there by the Congress, to enable our foreign policy to respond to the changes that take place daily in the world.

Each year AID must justify its request for funds by grant project and by anticipated levels of spending before four committees of the Congress. It is foolish and wasteful to argue that once a project is approved by the Congress it must be completed and never canceled. This is simply poor management. If a given project turns out to be unnecessary, or if the recipient country does not take the necessary measures to insure the success of the project, the project is not and should not be initiated.

Twice each year AID reports to the Congress under provision of the authorizing legislation on any major changes in its programs in each country and in each funding category.

On the basis of a complete analysis of the facts concerning our foreign aid program, I do not believe that any of my colleagues will want to cripple or weaken this important tool of foreign policy.

President Johnson has submitted a request for the minimum amount of money necessary to carry out the aid program in an effective and meaningful way. The Foreign Affairs Committee, on which I have the honor of serving, approved the request intact.

I ask my colleagues in the House to join with me in supporting the bill as it was reported by the Appropriations Committee. This is, as the chairman of the Appropriations Committee has pointed out, a small price indeed to pay for our security and the prevention of world war III.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I want to deny emphatically that this bill carries more money than the bill last year. It is true that last year the bill appropriated $3 billion, but it also reappropriated $399 million of unobligated funds. Otherwise they would have gone back into the Treasury and they would not have had the money to use. Therefore, the appropriation last year was $3,399 million for foreign aid. Now they have said, "Do not pay any attention to those unobligated balances." But that is just as much a part of the appropriation under this bill as the rest of the money. Then in desperation include title II and title III and also claim that limitation on the expenditures of the Export-Import Bank should be included. Why, that is absolutely absurd, gentlemen, and it is pure desperation.

I say to you that the President of the United States has cut this bill to the very bone. I really think it has been cut too much, because I agree with General Taylor and Secretary McNamara that there ought to be more than $1 billion in the bill for military assistance. I think it ought to be $1.4 billion.

The claim has been made that the President violated the law last year by transferring funds to military assistance. That is not true. Under section 614 the President has the right to transfer from economic funds to military funds.

I am in hopes if we pass this bill as reported by the committee it will give him sufficient leeway to take care of the military assistance funds which I think are now lacking.

I ask the House to support our committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN].

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. PASSMAN and Mr. GARY.

The Committee divided and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 151, noes 171.

So the amendments were rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FINDLEY

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. FINDLEY: Page 17, line 14, strike the comma and all the remaining language on lines 14, 15, 16, and 17, and insert a period.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, if this amendment is accepted, this appropriation bill will contain precisely the same provision which the House of Representatives twice voted to include in last year's appropriation bill. You will recall that during the week before Christmas last year the House, on two separate rollcalls, voted to prohibit the use of Export-Import Bank funds to finance sales to Communist countries.

The other body objected, and a compromise was finally adopted which retained the restrictive language but permitted the President to set it aside when he determined such action to be in the national interest.

If my amendment is accepted, the set-aside authority will be deleted, and the language will read exactly as the House twice voted to have it read last December.

The House of Representatives is clearly on record in opposition to financing the Communists. This is as it should be. This is the people's branch of government, the branch intended to be most responsive to the will of the people. If there is one issue on which the people of the United States have been clear and unyielding, it is in opposition to giving aid and comfort to the Communists. Aid can take many forms: a grant of money or commodities or an extension of credit. All increase the resources of the recipient countries.

If this amendment is rejected, this body will be reversing its position so wisely taken in two separate rollcalls in December. This body would be rejecting an amendment to protect U.S. taxpayers from financing sales to Communists.

The implications of this action would be loud and clear; loud enough to be heard around the world, even behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains where the hope of freedom from Communist rule still flickers on. Clear enough to deepen the doubts of those Frenchmen and West Germans who wonder if we really would use our nuclear weapons to defend their homes if the Communists act aggressively in Europe.

Clear enough to bring dismay and anguish to the families of the 161 American boys who have already died fighting the Communists in South Vietnam, and to the families of the 37,000 American boys who died fighting the Communists in Korea.

If you vote against this amendment, it will be interpreted one way and one way only. Its meaning will be deadly clear. A "no" vote is a vote to permit financial aid to the Communists.

On this vote you cannot hide behind presidential coattails. The restrictive language placed in last year's appropriation bill did not deter the President from using taxpayer funds to finance the Communists.

President Johnson made his determination. He publicly and officially determined it be in the national interest to finance the Communists. He did so in letters to the Speaker dated January 28, 1964. Here is the text of one of them:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, January 28, 1964.
The Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: In compliance with title III of the Foreign Aid and Related Agencies Appropriations Act of 1964, this is to inform you that I have determined that it is in the national interest for the Export-Import Bank to issue guarantees in connection with the sale of U.S. agriculture products to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, and Rumania. The Bank will report the individual guarantees to the Congress as they are issued.

Sincerely,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

The other letter extended the same determination in regard to Yugoslavia. In passing out credit cards to the Communists, the President apparently momentarily overlooked Yugoslavia. Hence the separate communication.

Then on June 23 came further news, the executive announcement that, pursuant to the President's January 28, determination, U.S. taxpayers are financing cotton sales to Hungary, sales amounting to $760,000. This action benefits the same bloodthirsty Communist regime headed by Janos Kadar which was placed in power by Khrushchev to crush the freedom uprising in Budapest in 1956.

So it is no avail to hide behind the President's coattails on this amendment. You cannot honestly explain to your constituents that you voted to let the President make these decisions, confident that the President would not use their money to finance the Communists. You cannot because the President has already made his determination. He has already acted to aid the Kadar regime in Hungary. And he has already publicly determined that it is in our national interest to extend similar aid to Communist Bulgaria, Communist Rumania, Communist Czechoslovakia, Communist Poland, Communist Yugoslavia, and the very heartland of communism—the Soviet Union.

The issue is clear.

A "no" vote on this amendment, in effect, is a vote to finance the Communists.

A "yes" vote is a vote to protect the taxpayers from such folly.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINDLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. FEIGHAN. This aid would go to the regime, not to the people specifically?

Mr. FINDLEY. That is correct.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, first of all, there is a lack of germaneness in this amendment to the bill. There is no aid whatsoever involved in this bill to the Communist countries. On the other hand, I do not come from a wheatgrowing city. We have only one victory garden left from World War II.

The fact of the matter is that this could not be reduced to the simple terms the gentleman used, a vote to finance communism and a vote against the American taxpayer. The adoption of this amendment would be primarily a vote against the American farmers, most of whom rightly support the proposition of selling this wheat. As to the concern for the balance of payments, this has added materially to our balance-of-payments situation in that these have been sales for cash on the barrelhead or short-term-loan propositions wherein they have met their terms. Otherwise the United States would be in no position to compete with Canada or any of the other wheatgrowing countries. We are not trying to finance communism. What we are trying to do is bring about trade in order to reduce the balance-of-payments problem. We are adding gold to the U.S. reserve. We are not giving any aid whatsoever. We are encouraging trade on terms favorable to the United States.

I quote from a letter from a grain company to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate:

> The sale was of considerable benefit to the U.S. farmers and U.S. shippers.

Among other things it said:

> The Russian Government is currently able to buy wheat from Canada, Argentina, France, and other Western countries. Therefore, there is no question as to whether or not they will be able to obtain wheat. This is simply a question of whether or not they buy from the United States or elsewhere.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GALLAGHER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MAHON. Is it not true that the Soviet Union has paid gold for every bushel of wheat bought and that the Soviet Union has not financed any of its purchases through the Export-Import Bank, and that a vote for this amendment would be a vote of no confidence in the President of the United States and a repudiation of the position which the Congress took after a long battle on this issue last December?

Mr. GALLAGHER. The distinguished chairman is absolutely right and it would be a vote against the farmers of America who have supported this.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GALLAGHER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALLECK. I cannot resist saying at this point with respect to this amendment that we were kept here until Christmas Eve about this business of Export-Import Bank financing for wheat to the Communists. If you will take a look, you will find that we have not sold one single bushel of wheat under that arrangement. The gentleman from Texas, the chairman of the committee, just now has told us that we have been selling wheat for gold. So those of us who thought that that decision was wrong have now been proven to be right in our convictions.

And I am moved to inquire what was all the shooting about? Why were we kept here until Christmas Eve? Nothing has come of that arrangement—not a single bushel of wheat has been sold to Communist Russia under that arrangement. Will anybody dispute that statement?

Mr. GALLAGHER. No one will dispute it. I think the gentleman has made the case against this amendment.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise in favor of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe I will take the 5 minutes, but I simply want to respond to the remarks that the gentleman from New Jersey made. Indeed, it is so. Selling wheat to Russia has helped our balance of payments. But what I would like us to consider is the extent to which this country has been driven because of our balance-of-payments problem so that, as I pointed out, we are selling Government bonds repayable not in U.S. dollars but in foreign currencies. Now in addition we have sold wheat to our enemies. Is this the preferable course? Or is the preferable course to try to get the foreign aid program down to a level that our economy can afford. Now I am for foreign aid and I have voted for appropriation bills in the past, those that I thought met proper standards, as well as for authorization bills. I think this debate has to do with the levels of our foreign aid programs, and obviously this level is too high. I will say the gentleman has established this fact. Unless he thinks and unless it is his opinion that this kind of improvising is the proper course where the United States is forced to the point of selling wheat to an avowed enemy, not because it is going to feed starving people in Russia because it will be used as a weapon in their world battle against us. Is that the preferable course or is it not the right thing to do to exercise a little bit of self-discipline to get these foreign aid programs down to what we can afford?

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALLECK. Getting back to the discussion that we were having about the Export-Import Bank financing. As I remember it, we all argued that if the Russians were to buy wheat—and some people did not even like that—but if they bought it for cash on the barrelhead, it would help our balance-of-payments situation and it would reduce the capacity and ability of the Communists to cause trouble around the world. We also argued that if you advanced credit then you not only did nothing for the balance-of-payments situation, but you increased the ability and the capacity of the Communists to cause trouble around the world.

Mr. CURTIS. I will say that the gentleman from Indiana is certainly correct. I took the course and some others did too that it was not wise—even though we had a balance-of-payments problem that was of a serious size, to actually assist an enemy like Soviet Russia by giving them this commodity which they could use so effectively in their struggle to attain world domination.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I believe what is significant in the argument made by the distinguished minority leader is the fact that the Export-Import Bank was used to extend the credit—short-term financing—but they in turn were repaid in gold. Therefore, using the gold or credits they have established, which we obtained, this deprived the Russians of the use of it, for building up armaments or further using it to cause trouble throughout the world.

I believe this is a worthy cause. The gentleman has stated it. The amendment should be defeated.

Mr. CURTIS. I believe this is clear. The dialog has clarified the issue before us. I hope the House will support this amendment.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Is it not a fact that some of the gentlemen on the other side have tried to refer to this amendment purely on the basis of a grant, but the actual fact is that the amendment goes to the heart of whether we, through the Export-Import Bank, will lend the credit and faith of our country to trading in any commodities with Communist countries?

Mr. CURTIS. Yes.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Therefore, it boils down to a basic decision of whether we wish to permit the administration to follow a line of freer trade with the Communist bloc, or whether we feel that decision should be made by this House.

Mr. CURTIS. The gentleman from Ohio makes a basically sound point. Wheat is only a good example of what can occur.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. BELCHER. I should like to answer the gentleman who has only one picture garden in his whole district.

I represent one of the finest wheat districts in the United States. We can store 75 million bushels of wheat in my hometown, yet I did not receive three letters from farmers out there who favored selling the wheat. Do not blame the farmers as to this trade with Russia. The farmers are patriotic enough so that they are not willing to build up Russia, even for the benefit of an increased price of wheat.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Of course the people there would rather store their wheat. They are getting storage fees. We want to sell it and save some money for the American taxpayers.

Mr. BELCHER. Do not blame this on the American farmers. They would vote against it. There is not a single farmer for this.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate close in 5 minutes.

PREFERENTIAL MOTION BY MR. GROSS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Mr. Gross moves that the Committee now rise and report the bill to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Gary], for carrying out his agreement earlier in the day to permit unlimited debate.

Mr. GARY. I say to the gentleman——

Mr. GROSS. I do not yield to the gentleman. The gentleman has had the floor time after time yesterday and today. I do not yield.

Mr. GARY. The gentleman has accused me of breaking an agreement.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, earlier this afternoon someone stated—I believe it was the minority whip—that the question before the House this afternoon is simple. Yes, it is simple. It is a question of whether you are going to load another $3.5 billion-plus upon the backs of the taxpayers of this country, upon the backs of your children and mine. It is a question of whether you are going to put another $3.5 billion mortgage plaster on the backs of generations yet unborn. That is how simple this question is.

I supported the amendment to cut out $247 million. It ought to be far more and I am opposed to this bill. I can find no better words to support my position against adding to the debt and deficit than those of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Flynt], in the Congressional Record of July 28, 1959, when he said, of his amendment at that time:

> Mr. Chairman, this amendment is proposed and offered for two purposes:
>
> First. To write into law that the mutual security program shall not be paid for by deficit financing; and
>
> Second. To make another genuine attempt to balance our national budget, bring an end to deficit financing and make some payments on the existing national debt.

Beautiful words. I wonder where the gentleman from Georgia stands today on this bill.

Mr. Mahon in the Congressional Record of October 6, 1962, said in connection with consideration of the foreign handout bill at that time:

> Mr. Mahon. If the gentleman would yield further, I wish to commend the gentleman from Louisiana for the magnificent job which he has done on this bill. I think the gentleman has done as good or a better job this year than in previous years. He has performed a service to the country and I support him. I am glad that the reductions were made.

Mr. Passman said, "I thank the gentleman."

Then Mr. Mahon put the real dressing on the cake when he said less than 2 years ago:

> Had the reductions not been made, I do not think I could have voted for this bill.

Where does the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Mahon] stand today?

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. No. The gentleman had all kinds of time on this bill. This is the first 2 or 3 minutes that I have had on this bill that I can recall, and I had to offer a motion to strike out the enacting clause in order to get this time.

I think I know what the gentleman's answer is going to be; that the bill considered in 1962 was a larger bill in terms of money and this is a smaller bill. Well, as far as I am concerned, and recognizing my responsibility to the taxpayers of the Third District of Iowa, this is still far too much money to hand over to foreign leeches. Maybe it is a different story down in the State of Texas. I doubt that it is. I have been in your State and I do not think that the people of Texas—if you put this foreign handout to a vote in the gentleman's district in Texas, or elsewhere, I do not think that they would support for 1 minute the outpouring of another $3.5 billion on this lousy program.

The gentleman from Texas talked yesterday evening about this bill saving the peace of the world. Well, I have been voting for $50 billion a year or thereabouts that is contained in the gentleman's bills for defense that he brings to the House for the Military Establishment of this country. I guess I have been voting wrong. Perhaps I should have been voting for $3.5 billion or $4 billion a year for foreign aid and against the military. And how did foreign aid effectively contain communism when 90 miles off our shores, in Cuba, there is a spawning ground of communism, a country where we dumped some $2¼ billion in foreign aid in 10 recent years. Now we permit Castro and his outfit to operate down there and spread communism through South and Central America and then turn around and throw out millions upon millions of dollars each year into Central and South America by way of the foreign giveaway program and expect that to stop the spread of communism.

This is ridiculous and it makes us the laughingstock of the entire world.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, the amendment upon which we will be voting within a very short time should have the support of every Member of this House who has sincerely evaluated the arguments, both pro and con, this afternoon.

It has been repeated on several occasions during the course of this debate that the administration cut the budgetary request of the AID. However, I do not know how anyone can draw solace from this fact. The Agency certainly is aware of the fact that its full request for funds would not be granted for it never has been in the past. It is hard for me to believe that any Member of this House is so naive as to accept the budget request of the Agency on any basis other than its being higher than either needed or expected. It is not unusual for agencies of government to recognize that they will rarely get the sum they request. Thus, they merely ask for more than they say is necessary knowing full well that the cut will be made and the final budgetary request compromised on that basis. The gentleman from Louisiana who has handled this bill on the floor of the House many times in the past has repeated that the foreign aid funds in the pipeline today are more than enough to cover every legal commitment we have in the world today without appropriating another single dime. The opposition has not once challenged this statement.

The fact that many Members of Congress support foreign aid authorizations and appropriations reluctantly is in no small measure due to the fact that the taxpaying public has become disenchanted with the program and particularly the manner in which it has been administered.

Because every conceivable argument and fear has been injected into this program by those who have strong feelings about it, nearly any statement which is made in opposition to the appropriation request of the administration will be discounted as partisan. For this reason, it might be well to turn to the statements made by Eugene R. Black, former President of the World Bank, just a few months ago. I think it strips some of the arguments made by proponents of this bill of their validity. Justification for the size of this appropriation bill is fantasy.

At this point I shall quote Mr. Black when I say "I would like to suggest that we approach Congress in a direct way and stop pretending that foreign aid is a sure cure for the political ills that plague us at the moment. Foreign aid should be presented to Congress as a means of promoting economic growth and nothing else."

Our foreign aid program, according to Mr. Black, has been unsuccessful as an instrument for bartering with the Communists for favor of governments of the undeveloped countries or for short-term political advantage in those countries. Foreign aid is just not suitable as a means of inoculating governments against communism or bringing about instant conversion for that political religion.

Despite these observations by a man who is very astute in the field of monetary, economic, and political affairs, Members of this House persist in the trite argument that foreign aid has been a deterrent to communism. The history of the spread of communism since the inception of this program hardly bears out the facts. Instead, the desperation of the proponents to pump more and more tax dollars into aid programs, some good and many bad, is reflected in the almost blind reasoning which has no basis of fact and is contrary to the history of the program in so many areas of the world. That Congress has lost control of the foreign aid pursestrings cannot be denied. That the program has either had too much money or has not properly expended the funds made available to it through these annual appropriations has again and again been documented.

It is regrettable that even after these many years that the United States has poured nearly $130 billion into foreign aid, the majority of the Members of this Congress are not willing to face the facts. The taxpayers of this country are entitled to better treatment by their elected representatives, the political pressures notwithstanding. We have been promised a reevaluation of the program with changes to correct the waste and extravagance and even irresponsibility that has characterized its administration for the past 16 years. Yet we pursue the same course year after year, a course which I am certain the vast majority of the American people do not approve but feel helpless to do anything about.

Consistent with my position in the past, I will not support the foreign aid appropriation bill in the form that it is presented to us today anymore than I found myself in a position to do so on seven previous occasions since I have been a Member of the House of Representatives. Until such time as this Congress faces up to its prime responsibility in the prudent handling of American tax dollars which flow into foreign countries—some of which are Communist—I shall pursue this position. And, until the majority of the Members of this House do likewise, we can expect nothing more or less than a continuation of the inefficiency which has punctuated the aid program in the past and has contributed to a fiscal situation in this country which leaves us with an aggregate public debt in excess of those of all other nations combined, along with the frightening balance-of-payments problem for which no sound solution has been offered.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the preferential motion.

Mr. Chairman, I would be glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa if he desires more time.

Mr. GROSS. I have had enough.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I would like to explain to the gentleman from Iowa and the House that in my opinion the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Gary], has been completely accurate and thoroughly frank in keeping the agreements which he made with me. It was agreed between the gentleman and myself that we would close all debate on the amendment which was pending before at a quarter of 4, and the gentleman did not do it until 4. If the gentleman from Iowa is referring to the attempt of the gentleman from Virginia to cut off debate on this amendment, I was on my feet when the preferential motion was made. I was going to ask the gentleman from Virginia to defer his request until the gentleman from Iowa had had his time. I am very sure that the gentleman from Virginia would have agreed to it.

Mr. GARY. I was asking for unanimous consent that the gentleman have ample time to object.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. The gentleman from Virginia and I do not agree on the bill, but we do agree on the way we should handle it.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that after the vote on the preferential motion all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the preferential motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

The preferential motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN].

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY]. As a matter of fact, the policy which was announced by the administration under which we would guarantee credit to Soviet Russia and other Communist countries in the matter of wheat sales was one of the major arguments used against us when we endeavored to stop the sale of British buses to Cuba. The argument was that if we, ourselves, authorize the sale of commodities to Soviet Russia and other Communist countries on a credit-guarantee basis, how could we object to one of our allies selling buses to Cuba? The fact of the matter is that Soviet Russia has been providing a tremendous amount of monetary aid to Cuba and there are still Soviet troops and Soviet advisers in Cuba.

It seems to me it is completely inconsistent for us to be guaranteeing Soviet Russia's credit when they are the biggest single factor in Cuba's ability to remain a Communist country and to provide training for subversive forces which are working against us all over South America. I believe the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois should be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN].

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I merely asked for this time because I do not believe this debate would be complete without some reference to the national debt. I know there are a lot of Americans who realize the effect of the national debt upon the value of their currency and the effect on the value of the dollar of all of the other things that we have discussed here. There are a lot of Americans who feel that we are carrying more than our share of the load. They are aware that we have just raised our own debt limit. Roughly our national debt exceeds that of all the countries of the world by $24 billion and our debt exceeds the combined debts of all the free countries of the world by $105 billion. It is about time, I think, that some of our companion nations started carrying their end of the plank, their proportionate part of the burden.

When we get back in the House I shall ask permission to place in the RECORD the latest compilation that I have seen of the gross debt of central governments of the free world. The Library of Congress has attempted to put these debts into table form, in as accurate a fashion as is possible.

The matter referred to follows:

Gross debt of central governments, free world countries

[Millions of dollar equivalents]

Region and country	Total gross debt outstanding		
	Date	Amount	Percent of GNP
NEAR EAST			
Cyprus	Dec. 31, 1963	41.0	14.6
Greece	do	640.0	14.8
Iran	Mar. 20, 1963	624.0	13.7
Iraq	Sept. 30, 1963	272.0	18.8
Israel	Mar. 31, 1963	1,396.0	64.8
Jordan	Mar. 31, 1964	44.0	12.0
Lebanon	Dec. 31, 1962	30.0	4.3
Syrian Arab Republic	Dec. 31, 1957	42.0	5.3
Turkey	Feb. 28, 1963	1,737.0	28.4
United Arab Republic	June 30, 1963	2,240.0	66.5
SOUTH ASIA			
Afghanistan	Mar. 21, 1962	220.0	23.2
Ceylon	Sept. 30, 1963	721.0	48.1
India	Mar. 31, 1963	16,151.0	43.8
Nepal	July 15, 1963	3.0	.5
Pakistan	June 30, 1962	1,781.0	24.0
FAR EAST			
Burma	Sept. 30, 1963	494.0	34.9
Cambodia	Dec. 31, 1962	26.0	3.9
Hong Kong	Mar. 31, 1963	22.0	1.8
Indonesia	Dec. 31, 1961	1,746.0	21.7
Japan	Oct. 31, 1963	[1] 3,688.0	6.1
Korea (South)	Dec. 31, 1963	301.0	10.6
Laos	June 30, 1963	23.0	15.9
Malaya	Dec. 31, 1962	577.0	30.4
Philippines	June 30, 1963	539.0	13.3
Singapore	Dec. 31, 1962	66.0	8.9
Thailand	Sept. 30, 1963	546.0	18.1
Vietnam	Dec. 31, 1963	363.0	23.4
AFRICA			
Cameroon	June 30, 1962	41.0	11.0
Ethiopia	July 7, 1962	84.0	9.4
Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland	June 30, 1962	788.0	51.5
Ghana	Sept. 30, 1963	358.0	22.9
Kenya	June 30, 1963	229.0	31.2
Liberia	Sept. 30, 1962	89.0	65.4
Mali	Dec. 31, 1961	47.0	19.2
Morocco	Dec. 31, 1963	690.0	32.5
Nigeria	Mar. 31, 1964	[2] 315.0	8.6
Somali Republic	Dec. 31, 1962	.8	1.0
South Africa	June 30, 1963	[3] 3,988.0	45.1
Sudan	June 30, 1963	89.0	7.4
Tanganyika	June 30, 1962	69.0	11.4
Tunisia	Dec. 31, 1962	310.0	41.3
EUROPE			
Belgium	Nov. 30, 1963	8,842.0	65.0
Denmark	Mar. 31, 1964	1,063.0	13.5
France	Aug. 31, 1963	18,001.0	22.9
Germany	Sept. 30, 1963	7,518.0	8.2
Iceland	Dec. 31, 1960	24.0	12.8
Italy	June 30, 1963	9,578.0	22.6
Luxembourg	Dec. 31, 1962	176.0	35.0
Netherlands	Dec. 31, 1963	5,413.0	38.4
Norway	do	1,745.0	32.0
Portugal	do	890.0	31.2
United Kingdom	Mar. 31, 1964	85,497.0	104.3
Austria	Dec. 31, 1963	918.0	12.0
Finland	Dec. 31, 1962	636.0	12.0
Ireland	Mar. 31, 1963	1,782.0	83.7
Spain	Dec. 31, 1963	2,024.0	14.1
Sweden	do	3,689.0	24.1
Switzerland	Dec. 31, 1962	1,274.0	11.8
Yugoslavia	do	1,088.0	19.2
LATIN AMERICA			
Argentina	Oct. 31, 1962	1,970.0	21.2
Bolivia	Dec. 31, 1962	259.0	54.4
Brazil	do	1,900.0	13.5
Chile	do	890.0	25.2
Colombia	do	652.0	15.2
Costa Rica	do	103.0	21.9
Ecuador	do	[4] 234.0	27.3
El Salvador	Dec. 31, 1963	108.0	18.5
Guatemala	June 30, 1963	88.0	12.3
Haiti	Sept. 30, 1962	71.0	23.3
Honduras	Dec. 31, 1962	51.0	12.1
Mexico	June 30, 1962	1,175.0	10.1
Nicaragua	do	22.0	6.1
Panama	Dec. 31, 1963	121.0	23.1
Paraguay	Dec. 31, 1962	29.0	12.2
Peru	do	326.0	13.0
Uruguay	do	318.0	22.2
Venezuela	Dec. 31, 1963	525.0	8.5
OCEANIA			
Australia	June 30, 1963	3,618.0	20.5
New Zealand	Mar. 31, 1963	2,707.0	67.4
NORTH AMERICA			
Canada	Mar. 31, 1964	25,872.0	65.3
United States	June 30, 1963	306,500.0	53.9
Total of countries listed		539,128.0	
Total (excluding the United States)		232,628.0	

[1] Does not include obligations to social security institutions.

[2] Federal Government only.

[3] Includes estimates for protectorates.

[4] Includes debt of public entities.

GROSS DEBT OF CENTRAL GOVERNMENTS

General note

1. The debt figures in this table are on a gross basis, i.e., no deductions are made for reserves or Government securities held in sinking or reserve funds.

2. These debt figures of the Central Government exclude:

(a) Domestic debt of Government-owned enterprises not financed by the Government's tax sources, whether or not guaranteed by the Central Government.

(b) Other guaranteed debt, i.e., debt incurred by local units and other Government agencies which carry a guaranty by the Central Government to assure debt servicing in case of default by the borrowing unit.

(c) Dormant debt, i.e., debt which is not serviced.

3. Domestic debt and debt to the United States repayable in national currency has been converted into U.S. dollar equivalents by use of official exchange rates in most instances; where official exchange rates were not applicable, effective rates were used. These dollar equivalents do not reflect the substantial variations in the purchasing power of the dollar from country to country and exact comparisons of gross debt among countries are subject to limitations.

4. Debt repayable in foreign currencies is included on the basis of the original currency with nondollar debt converted at dollar cross rates.

5. Debt as a percentage of gross national product has been added as an indicator of the burden of the debt on the economy. The size of the debt service may be a better indicator of the debt burden. However, reliable data on debt service, i.e., the amount of interest and debt retirement, are not available.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Chairman, for the benefit of those who perhaps were not here when the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] offered his amendment I think it should be made entirely clear that it goes only to prohibiting credit sales to Communist countries. It has nothing to do with cash sales.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman for pointing this up and also say that when we started this, the balance of payments was running in the other direction, as far as the United States was concerned. But today it has turned around and so here we are with this debt of $105 billion more than all the rest of the free world and we are having the balance of payments running against us.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLAGHER].

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to my distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN].

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, I do not see why the Members on the other side of the aisle are getting alarmed about this question. Everyone knows that President Eisenhower made the determination in 1957 and the Export-Import Bank loaned Poland $61 million with which to buy a tin mill and other machinery and equipment. I did not hear a single word in opposition to that from the other side when that happened in 1957. Also, in 1957, 1958, and 1959 we sold Poland $185 million worth of surplus food under Public Law 480 for Polish zlotys.

Mr. Chairman, today we have $523 million in Polish zlotys lying over there from Public Law 480 sales. I did not hear one single protest from the other side of the aisle during these negotiations with Poland during 1957, 1958, 1959, and 1960.

Mr. GALLAGHER. And, furthermore, I might add that the chamber of commerce has approved of this type transaction. It is normal business in commercial terms. The chamber of commerce has approved it and the American Farm Bureau has approved it. It is totally in keeping with our decision to try and trade rather than giving away money.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES].

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I would like to announce at this time that at the proper time I shall offer a motion to recommit which will be the substance of the six amendments which were offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] and were put en bloc earlier during the deliberations on this bill.

Briefly, Mr. Chairman, the motion to recommit would cut the amounts in the bill as follows: Development grants, from $204.6 to $175 million; international organizations, from $134,272,400 to $124,272,400; supporting assistance, from $405 to $354 million; the contingency fund, from $150 to $100 million; development loans for the Alliance for Progress program, from $425 to $400 million; and development loans, from $382.2 to $300 million, or a total of $247.8 million, leaving the amount appropriated for title I at $3,068,772,000. This is more money than was in the foreign aid bill at this stage of the appropriations process last year.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Chairman, a hue and cry often goes up that Congress is hamstringing foreign policy "flexibility" of the executive branch. This slogan is particularly popular lately in discussing East-West trade. Policymakers seek to imply that export control laws restricting trade with Communist countries are out of date and the administration "flexibility" in relations with the Soviet bloc is needed.

For example, Under Secretary of State W. Averill Harriman gave the Eastern European Affairs Subcommittee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee this sample on March 10, 1964:

> The United States is maintaining the greatest possible flexibility of means for exerting our influence to promote developments favorable to the goal of independent self-government and an open society for the peoples of Eastern Europe. We think expanding trade in peaceful goods is a useful and desirable means of drawing these nations into practical contact with the free world.

As an example of the appalling way this is interpreted in practice, the Department of Commerce announced May 22, 1964, that a license had been granted authorizing the reexportation of U.S. wheat valued at $12,589,400 from the Soviet Union to Rumania. This reexport decision, which I discussed with the House of Representatives previously on June 8 and 10, 1964, is illustrative of the inconsistency of purpose which marks the administration policy on the question of East-West trade.

Efforts to obtain answers to questions remaining about this deal only seem to bring more evidence underscoring the seriousness of the situation.

I inquired of the Department of Commerce as to how real was the U.S.S.R. need for wheat if they could now afford to transship this large amount—about 160,000 metric tons, or nearly one-tenth of the entire U.S. wheat sales to the U.S.S.R. Also, I inquired about whether the U.S.S.R. is making a profit on this transaction which involves subsidized U.S. wheat. You would think that the Commerce Department would possess complete, detailed information on these and other questions for reference in connection with determining whether the reexportation license should be granted.

In response to my request for answers, however, the Department of Commerce merely cited a Department of Agriculture publication which states that the Soviets encountered a crop failure, that they would need to import rather than export wheat, and that some of it "will be reexported to the satellites."

On the question as to whether the U.S.S.R. is making any profit, the Department states:

> The Department has no information regarding any profit to accrue to the U.S.S.R. in connection with this transaction.

The Commerce Department also said in response to another of my questions that it had no information as to the actual transshipment of wheat by the U.S.S.R., concerning the method of transshipment or the route.

Furthermore, it seems that the Department of Commerce complied with almost miraculous speed in issuing the necessary reexport authorization when the Soviets requested the American exporter to obtain such permission from the Department of Commerce. While the export license was not granted until May 22, 1964, there are strong indications that an informal OK was actually given by the Commerce Department during the early days in May, soon after such permission was sought by the Soviets.

Brazenly enough, the Soviets wanted to reexport the 160,000 metric tons of U.S. wheat to partially pay off a 1963 Rumanian wheat "loan" to them of 400,000 metric tons. The Rumanians had reportedly loaned the Russians wheat last year to tide the U.S.S.R. over a worse than usual harvest year. Thus, not content with bailing the U.S.S.R. out of its agricultural morass, it appears that the administration has now helped Khrushchev make good on his wheat debt to Rumania.

This has helped to strengthen Soviet-Rumanian economic ties and runs counter to the administration's professed policy of encouraging less satellite reliance on the U.S.S.R. What makes the action all the more ironical, it came at the same time the Department of State was negotiating with the Rumanians, discussing expanding trade and diplomatic relations, on the basis that Rumania was following a course independent of the U.S.S.R. in matters of economic policy.

In those negotiations the United States reportedly has promised Rumania that it could buy complete plants from the United States to manufacture strategic goods. This means we would sell them such facilities as oil refineries, petro-chemical and synthetic rubber plants. Even the possibility of selling a nuclear reactor to Rumania has been discussed, according to reports. On June 15 the President declared that it is in the national interest for the Export-Import Bank to issue credit guarantees in connection with sales of such products to Rumania.

In essence, therefore, the same Rumanian "independence" the administration cites in claiming justification for granting Rumania highly significant trade benefits is being undermined by policies which tend to bolster Soviet-Rumanian ties.

Certainly here is a classic example of conflicting actions, what could be called talking out of both sides of ones mouth at the same time.

This sort of contradictory, drifting policy, which generally means that the only "winner" is the Communist bloc, is of great concern to me and I know it is to many Americans.

We need policies positively designed to protect our interests and a firm carrying out of those policies. History has shown countless times that there is no other way to deal with the Communists.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FINDLEY. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Gallagher] indicated that the Farm Bureau Federation had placed its stamp of approval on the extension of credit to the Communist countries. I believe if the gentleman would check the record of the decision of the Farm Bureau Federation, he will find his information is erroneous.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia to close debate on the amendment.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, all I have to say about this amendment is that last Christmas it spoiled a vacation in Florida for me. I was on the conference committee that tried to work out this matter with the other body. Everyone will recall that we worked on the language for days and days. Finally we adjourned, I believe it was Christmas Eve about 4 o'clock in the morning, after about three conferences that night with the other body.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we have in the bill the exact language that was agreed on at those conferences.

The gentleman from Illinois seeks to strike out of the bill the very paragraph that we put in which made it acceptable to both sides.

Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that this matter has been thoroughly thrashed out. Everyone knows what it is all about.

I simply ask that the gentleman's amendment be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired. All time on the amendment has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Findley].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Findley) there were—ayes 93, noes 140.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. Gary and Mr. Findley.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 119, noes 151.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we have just had three votes on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

I want the Record to show, and I want every voter in my district to know, that I voted "no" on all three occasions.

I have listened to this debate for 2 days. I admire the proponents and the opponents. I think there is a proper area of debate in which the opponents may say that the proponents are unwise. They may say they are wasteful. They may say many sharp things. But there is a limit in debate, Mr. Chairman, and that limit is reached when any Member of this House no matter who he may be claims the right to decide whether a particular vote is patriotic or unpatriotic.

A few moments ago we were told that a "no" vote—and I again repeat, I voted "no" three times—was a vote to give aid and comfort to the Communists.

Mr. Chairman, in this country today there are too many people going around with little personal rubberstamps and applying the stamp of "patriotic" or "communistic" to people who happen to disagree with them. I say that no Member of this House has the right directly or indirectly to describe the vote of any other Member of this House as patriotic or unpatriotic—I resent it.

And if anyone desires to send in to my district, which is an old district that has been sending a Member here since the founding of the Republic, my vote and accompanying it with a charge that I voted to give aid and comfort to the Communists, I will meet him or anyone else on every street corner in my district and throw the lie back into his teeth.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FOREMAN

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Foreman: On page 18, immediately after line 24, insert the following:

"Sec. 404. Limitation on Appropriations for Economic Assistance.—Notwithstanding any provision of this or any other Act, no provision of this Act appropriating funds to carry out any program of assistance under this Act (other than a provision for military assistance as described in this Act and in the amount of $1,055,000,000) shall become effective until the tax receipts of the United States Government for the preceding fiscal year are equal to or greater than the expenditures of the Government for such fiscal year."

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the bill on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Chairman, I feel like any time we are appropriating the taxpayers' dollars, we certainly should take into consideration the question as to whether or not we are putting the people further in debt. This is a very important question. It is a legal question, a legislative question, and even more importantly, a moral question.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment goes to the question of spending or not spending of these funds, the limiting of making funds available.

It does not legislate as to how they are going to be spent, or not be spent, the bill itself does not even do that.

But as suggested earlier in our debate, perhaps this amendment is indeed too sensible and entirely too practical to be applied to our foreign aid giveaway program. Yes, Mr. Chairman, perhaps fiscal responsibility, at this point and in this day in time, may be out of order.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Price). The Chair is ready to rule.

On the face of it, this amendment appears to go far beyond the scope of the bill.

The subject of the amendment is not covered or referred to in the proposed legislation and, therefore, the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Chairman, not too long ago there was a musical show on Broadway entitled "Stop the World, I Want To Get Off."

All of us agree, I am sure, that there have been times and there have been occasions when many citizens of the United States, and most particularly Members of Congress, have wished that it were possible to pull a switch, stop the world and place the United States in its own orbit around the sun free and independent of the rest of the world and our sometimes troublesome neighbors.

So far, Congress has been unable to find any such switch to pull, and it does not seem likely that one will be found in the foreseeable future.

Consequently, the United States is going to have to forego existing in the sterile vacuum of space and continue to exist side-by-side with its neighbors.

Now all of us realize that not all these neighbors are perfect. Some of them are destructive of property. Others are boisterous and noisy. Some show a patent disdain for keeping their own houses in order. A few are openly belligerent and make no bones about the fact that they wish we would find that switch in the sky and get off the earth so they can take it over.

The fact is that we are stuck with the world. It is the only one we have, and the quicker this is realized the better off all of us will be.

The fact is that we have to live with our neighbors in the world one way or another. For protection against those who would take what we have or who would threaten weaker neighbors, we have to build elaborate and costly fences.

For those who are yet too poor to provide their own protection and to provide the wherewithal for their own progress, we have to give a hand.

We are not attempting this task alone. We have friends of influence and power who are helping us and the world. Perhaps they could do more, and perhaps they will do more in the future.

But what should concern us today in our consideration of H.R. 11812 is whether we are doing what we can and what we must do to continue to be good citizens in the world, and whether we have sufficient protection from those who would harm us.

The bill we are considering today provides the necessary funds to supply these ingredients. Of the $3,316,572,400 recommended by the House Appropriations Committee in his bill, some $1,055 million is for military assistance to indirectly supplement our own defense budget and to provide those closest to belligerent neighbors with the means of defending themselves.

The great bulk of the remainder of these funds are for loans to assist our neighbors, and particularly our neighbors to the south, with the means to bring about better standards of living and build hope in the hearts of those who have no hope for tomorrow.

I urge the adoption of H.R. 11812 without further cuts as a minimum program our Nation should pursue in our efforts to preserve peace and freedom in the world.

Every indication we have is that things are going to get worse before they get better in such trouble spots as southeast Asia. If we are to cope with these future threats, if we are to use economic and political weapons as well as the force of arms to reach our objectives, then we must provide these funds and this appropriation.

Let us face it. We cannot stop the world. We cannot get off this planet earth without being blown off by atomic bombs.

Our only alternative is to live with what we find here in the world in freedom and to further the fight for freedom everywhere we can.

To ignore reality is suicide. To cringe from it is cowardice. To face it and to use it to further the great hope and promise of freedom is the only course a free nation can take.

Mr. WHARTON. Mr. Chairman, we have listened attentively for the past 2 days to the accomplishments alleged in behalf of foreign aid and heard that it has strengthened our own economy, maintained peace of a kind throughout the world, and built up underprivileged nations. In view of the tremendous expenditure of American tax dollars and loss of many American lives, this would be a sorry spectacle indeed if it were not true to some degree, but to what degree? Conditions have changed considerably throughout the world since the inception of our foreign aid program and the new problems with which we are now confronted were unforeseeable at that time.

May I call attention to something from the recent columns of the Washington Post, generally recognized as an ultraliberal local publication and an avid supporter of the program in the past, and I quote:

> American aid has often corrupted and weakened the men it was supposed to build up.
>
> The United States has poured millions into the jungle kingdoms of South Vietnam, Laos, and Thailand. This was supposed to make them bulwarks against the spreading Red tide, which threatens to engulf all Asia.
>
> Youths were taken out of the rice paddies, put into American-made uniforms, and elevated to sudden affluence. With their U.S.-guaranteed paychecks, they were able to buy luxuries they had never known existed: wrist watches, transistor radios, fun in town.
>
> Now there often seems to be more fun than fight in them. They dislike giving up their new living standards for the dangers and discomforts of jungle combat.
>
> The taste of luxury has also corrupted many of their officers. They like to have orderlies serve them tea in bed in the mornings. They prefer to ride in jeeps on their patrol missions; they disdain the thought of slogging through the jungle in pursuit of guerrillas.
>
> A few have found they can increase their comforts merely by accumulating more of those wonderful dollars. By failing to report casualties and deserters, for example, officers discovered they could pocket the missing men's pay. Others sell U.S. supplies on the black market in the happy conviction that there's more where those came from.
>
> The generals and politicians who have handled American aid have also had a dismaying habit of growing rich in their jobs. The new South Vietnamese leader, Gen. Nguyen Khanh, has found it necessary to shoot embezzlers.
>
> Yet he has been remarkably fortunate in his own finances; indeed, he has boasted that he is worth $10 million.

Certainly things of this nature add nothing to our economy, nor to the stature of the world. No one has come forward to refute these claims, much less that $7 billion of unexpended funds from past appropriations are still in the pipeline. Since promises of management reform, which have been forthcoming annually, have again failed to materialize, and now appear impossible, then the only remaining solution is a curtailment of funds. Congress, in my opinion, must depart from the unsavory practice of appropriating large sums in this manner to be spent promiscuously and without restraint—all of which accounts for my opposition to the bill.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, in the report on H.R. 11812, Foreign Assistance and Related Agencies Appropriations Act of 1965, the Committee on Appropriations stated:

> The purpose of the Foreign Assistance Program is to promote the security of the United States by providing assistance and encouragement to other nations of the world so that they can grow in political freedom, national independence, and economic security. As these objectives are realized likelihood of such nations coming under the influence of our enemies is lessened and their ability to assist us in shouldering the burden of the free world is increased. As they grow in economic strength, the international trade essential to the prosperity of the United States will increase.

From the point of view of U.S. security, Latin America, because of its very proximity, is one of the more important world areas. For this reason, I would like to augment the committee report with a brief discussion of the urban dilemma in Latin America and how the effective flow of U.S. assistance helps the Latin Americans to establish open, participant societies with sufficient economic security to exist as independent, modern states.

An open society is characterized by social mobility—movement between classes and occupational groups. The participant society is one in which the people are politically conscious; have an active respect for civil institutions as the ultimate arbitrators of all disputes. But unless representative, responsible political institutions can produce the results—provide relief for the overwhelming economic problems and the frustrating social injustices which burden the Latin Americans, especially the urban lower class—these people may reject an open, participant society for a totalitarian government.

The U.S. foreign assistance program, working with the Alliance for Progress, is designed to eliminate those factors which obstruct economic and social progress in Latin America. The purpose of the Alliance for Progress is not to give temporary relief in time of crisis but to set into motion a fundamental change in the whole structure of Latin America's economic and social institutions. The goal is to create a favorable climate for progress and the political stability of Latin America.

The rapid urbanization and the impatience of the urban masses poses one of the great threats to stability in many Latin American nations. That the population growth of Latin America is one of the highest in the world, 2.8 percent annually, is an accepted fact. Not to be overlooked is the fact that the growth rate in urban areas is three times that in rural districts. Latin America has a higher rate of urbanization than any other underdeveloped area of the world with almost 46 percent of the people living in cities. About 25 percent of the population is concentrated in 10 cities, each having a population of well over a million, and migration from rural districts continues at an ever-increasing pace.

The subsistence agriculture of most rural districts cannot provide food for the city dweller nor is there sufficient housing. Water supplies are limited, electricity rationed, and sanitation systems inadequate. The high level of unemployment could be reduced by the growth of industry, but companies are not easily attracted to these areas where skilled laborers are scarce and the utilities necessary for industrial production are minimal. The discontent of the unemployed and of all who have substandard living conditions is characterized by an impatient desire for the better life which they know other men enjoy. Such discontent can be harnessed by radicals of either the right or the left. Faith in gradualism can only be maintained when there is evidence of progress.

The construction of more than 200,000 houses in the fiscal year 1964 and the scheduled completion of another 100,000 houses in 1965, which can be attributed directly to U.S. assistance, has helped to alleviate some of the explosive conditions in urban Latin America. U.S. aid has also trained over 22,000 teachers, built 23,000 classrooms, and produced 6,700,000 books to prepare both children and adults for the responsibilities of a modern, industrial society. More than 24 million people have benefited from the newly constructed water and sewage systems, and 900 credit unions have encouraged the efforts of private entrepreneurs.

The multiplier effects of these physical achievements cannot be overestimated. They have changed the physical appearance of the cities, have altered the economic, social, and psychological condition of many individuals, and have encouraged both local and foreign investment in industry. The construction projects supplied jobs as well as the needed housing. They stimulated industry by increasing the consumption potential and subsequently raised the standard of living for over a million people directly and innumerable others indirectly.

Although U.S. assistance is a necessary component in these projects, it is matched by effective efforts on the part of the nations themselves. For example, in Peru, People's Savings & Loan Association, established March 1961, is capable of extending credit up to three times its savings as a result of a grant from the Home Loan Bank of Peru, which in turn has received a loan of $7,500,000 from the Alliance for Progress. Within a year the association's membership grew from 25 to 2,590, and it granted first mortgage and improvement loans of about $60 million while lowering the prevailing Peruvian interest rate from 12 to 10.8 percent simple interest and also paying 6-percent dividend. Projects such as this have the same multiplier effects as direct U.S. assistance, but also encourage the Latin Americans to establish the machinery for progress.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Chairman, few men in public life are as knowledgeable in the field of foreign aid legislation as our colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana, Representative OTTO PASSMAN. Even those who most oppose his position on foreign aid must admit Congressman PASSMAN's mastery of the facts, figures, and details in that complex area of Government affairs.

Thus, despite the vociferous and often unfair opposition of the doctrinaire liberal press, OTTO PASSMAN over the years has been proven correct in his judgment of our foreign aid obligations and needs. Time and experience have vindicated his position on the many foreign aid bills that have come before his subcommittee. Here again, even the most vocal proponent of foreign aid must concede that in instance after instance and year after year, OTTO PASSMAN has succeeded in trimming unnecesary and wasteful items and expenditures from annual foreign aid budgets submitted to the Congress.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs, I have always understood the vital need to support those foreign aid programs which strengthen the free world's position in the cold war against communism in areas such as Latin America, southeast Asia, and Western Europe. At the same time, I have consistently stood with those who believe that foreign aid should not and does not mean foreign waste. In this regard, Congressman PASSMAN has been a watchdog for the American taxpayer's interests and for the national interest generally. Thus, while the administration this year made an effort to trim its foreign aid request to a minimum, I, for one, could not lightly disregard the opinion of Congressman PASSMAN and others of his subcommittee, who believed that further cuts were possible without endangering the Nation's oversea commitments.

The people of this country, while recognizing the necessity for maintaining our defenses against communism throughout the world, are tired of carrying the burden of foreign aid expenditures that they consider wasteful. It is therefore my hope that Congress will continue for many years to have the sound advice of men like OTTO PASSMAN when we consider the provisions of any foreign aid program.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Chairman, for the past 2 days I have listened with great interest to the debate that has been going on on the foreign aid appropriations bill now under consideration. While it may appear presumptuous on my part as a freshman Member to gain the ear of the House after all that needs to be said appears to have been spoken, I wish to call the attention of the House to an aspect of foreign aid which has probably not gained the attention it deserves.

The opponents of foreign aid generally have argued that this is a give-away program, that we have been in effect "suckers" to the world. Has it not occurred to the gentlemen who oppose the measure that we Americans have been as much benefited by our foreign aid program as have been the intended beneficiaries? An estimated 75,000 American workers would be put out of their jobs were we to cut out foreign aid altogether. To cite a specific example, had it not been for an 11th-hour order for steel rails placed by AID, a steel mill in Birmingham, Ala., would have been forced to close last November, adding 1,150 breadwinners to the unemployed list. Eighty percent or more of all money expended in the foreign aid program is spent right here in our own United States. This is indeed not a cash give-away program.

Experience has shown too that by shipping American equipment and goods abroad under our aid program, we create a demand for American parts for such equipment and for more American-made goods after the aided country has gotten on its feet economically and is able to pay for them.

Japan is a good example of this. Although at one time a recipient of assistance from us, today she is one of our best customers for American goods and products. The entire European continent might be cited as another example. Had it not been for our assistance, they would not today be enjoying an economic status which permits them to buy American goods. By helping the underdeveloped nations of the world and elevating the standard of living of their peoples, we are insuring our own economic future by creating vast new markets for our own products.

Furthermore, the opponents of the measure now under consideration argue that we have spent billions upon billions of dollars in the last 18 years and have gained nothing by such expenditures. As it was so ably and eloquently pointed out by the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], it was through our foreign aid program that all of Western Europe was saved. It was through our foreign aid program that we stopped Russia from obtaining the warm-water ports in Greece and Turkey and halted Russia from turning the strategic Mediterranean Sea into a Red lake. Africa and southern Europe would certainly have fallen under the domination of the Communists had the foreign aid program not been extended into those areas.

It cannot be denied that our foreign aid program prevented World War III—a war which would have cost billions more in money than what foreign aid has cost us in total in the last 18 years and millions in irreplaceable lives.

Can it be denied that had it not been for our foreign aid program we would not today be enjoying the position of world leadership that we have been able to maintain? I am convinced, Mr. Chairman, that this program is a necessary tool which we as responsible representatives of the American people must give to our President so that he may pursue the course toward world peace with the power of persuasion and flexibility.

The opponents of this bill claim to have greater detailed knowledge of the program than the proponents. After listening to the debate, I can see the opponents in the role of a master mechanic who knows every detail about the construction and mechanical features of an automobile but who refuses to supply the missing carburetor or furnish the gasoline for the doctor who is intent on using the automobile to rush to save a sick brother of the mechanic. Let us not, under the claim that we know all about the car while the doctor does not, deny him the carburetor or the gasoline and keep him from going places where he is truly needed. Let us, for our own sake, as well as for the sake of our world brothers in need, support the President's foreign aid program.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of the foreign aid bill. I urge that the Appropriations Committee recommendation of $3,739,249,400 be approved by the House, and that no further cuts be made in this most important program which provides a vital tool to the President of the United States in the execution of foreign policy. This bill is $219,127,600 below the budget estimates.

The purpose of the foreign assistance program is to promote the security of the United States by providing assistance and encouragement to other nations of the world so that they can grow in political freedom, national independence, and economic security. As these objectives are realized, the Appropriations Committee report points out, the likelihood of such nations coming under the influence of our enemies is lessened and their ability to assist us in shouldering the burdens of the free world is increased. As they grow in economic strength, international trade, essential to the prosperity of the United States, will increase.

Mr. Chairman, our hope is that this program will enable the underdeveloped countries of the world to substitute strength and confidence for fear and insecurity and take their places with the world alliance of free nations. Many of the free nations of the world today could not have maintained their freedom if the United States had not provided aid when they were beset by internal problems and external pressures.

The Appropriations Committee recognizes that programs, consisting of thousands of individual projects scattered throughout many parts of the globe, are not consistently perfect in every respect. I agree with the sentiments expressed yesterday by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] that there has been waste, inefficiency, and mistakes made in this program, but members of the committee have striven to eliminate the mistakes of the past. It is apparent that projects initially well planned can, by virtue of international political developments or other factors, later appear to have been ill advised. It is obvious that there have been some errors of judgment and some plain mismanagement and waste. While the committee cannot and does not condone ineptness and inefficiency, it realizes that some blunders are inevitable in a program of this magnitude.

Mr. Chairman, the President requested $1,008,625,000 less for the foreign assistance program for fiscal year 1965 than was requested for the previous fiscal year, 1964. The committee further reduced the budget estimates by $219,127,600. I do not think that any further cuts should be made by the House today. In view of the conditions existing throughout the world the President should have adequate funds available to honor our commitments abroad and to provide for eventualities of the coming year.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to record my opposition to the foreign aid appropriation for fiscal 1965. Last Christmas Eve, it will be recalled, when we were considering last year's bill we were promised by the administration a streamlined aid program in the future. At that time I registered my protest against this unstreamlined program in the hope it would encourage the promised reforms. But here we are today asked to pass a new aid bill not only continuing to disburse funds to some 99 countries and 9 territories throughout the world, but in addition calling for a $694 million increase in new obligational authority.

I do not deny that there are some desirable aspects of the aid program. Furthermore, I wish to make it absolutely clear that I would support, as a separate item, all the funds requested and recommended to prosecute the efforts against Communist activities in South Vietnam as I believe the fate of southeast Asia is vital to the free world.

However, the aid program as a whole, I remain convinced, is in basic need of rethinking and reorientation. Its purpose remains unclear and often contradictory. The aid program as in the past continues to be justified as being a necessary weapon against the spread of communism. And yet under it we continue to aid Communist countries and we continue to aid those who trade with Communist Cuba. Furthermore, under the administration's new Communist trade policy we, with one hand, presumably seek to aid those countries trying to bolster themselves against Communist subversion while with the other hand we trade and aid Communist countries through the sale of U.S. taxpayer-subsidized agricultural products. Until such time, therefore, that an administration presents a consistent foreign assistance policy I believe I must out of concern for the national interest continue to protest the aid and trade policies currently being pursued.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I want to take this opportunity to register my unqualified opposition to the foreign aid appropriation bill for fiscal 1965. My record against the passage of foreign aid appropriation bills has been consistent for many years. I have long been sick, tired, and disgusted with the way this country has been shoveling the taxpayers' money into the coffers of countries around the globe—many of which are downright hostile to the United States, are ruled by dictators or are Communist or Communist dominated.

The list of foreign countries and territories feeding at the U.S. taxpayers' trough during fiscal 1965 will reach the fantastic total of 99 countries and 9 territories—countries and territories which I doubt could be identified by even 1 out of every 100,000 American citizens.

Our foreign aid hand-out program, in my opinion, has been a dismal failure for many, many years. It has been poorly planned, poorly directed, and poorly administered and has failed to attain its announced objectives. Its expansion has become so broad that it has completely gotten out of hand.

Under certain conditions, I might favor some form of assistance to countries which have demonstrated friendliness to the United States, but I would have to be convinced that to do so would be in the best interest of the United States. Some of the countries which would be aided by the enactment of this bill might well fall into the category of those deserving assistance. However, as long as deserving countries are included in the same bill with those known to be undeserving, I cannot in good conscience support such legislation.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Iowa asked where I am today. It was surely a rhetorical question, because he knows where I am and he heard what I said.

The reason for my vote against the amendments offered by the gentleman from Louisiana and my vote in favor of final passage is a bona fide effort on my part to keep this country out of war and to make an effort to save southeast Asia for the people of the free world.

If my vote and my position today can help prevent a war and to maintain stability in the world, then I believe with all sincerity that it is worth many, many times the monetary amount which the gentleman from Louisiana would delete by his amendments. The monetary difference between the two versions is $247,800,000. One day of nuclear war would cost much more than that.

I have no occult powers nor crystal ball; only time will prove the wisdom of the judgment I have made today.

My reply to the gentleman from Iowa is not to be construed by him or anyone else as any disrespect to him. While we sometimes disagree, I like to think that we do so without being disagreeable. I have a high regard and great respect for the gentleman from Iowa, as he well knows. And, that regard and respect are not diminished.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PRICE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 11812) making appropriations for foreign assistance and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. RHODES of Arizona moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 11812, to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report it back forthwith with the following amendments:

On page 2, line 9, strike out "$204,600,000" and insert "$175,000,000".

On page 2, line 15, strike out "$134,372,400" and insert "$124,272,400".

On page 2, line 17, strike out "$405,000,000" and insert "$354,000,000".

On page 2, line 19, strike out "$150,000,000" and insert "$100,000,000".

On page 2, line 23, strike out "$425,000,000" and insert "$400,000,000".

On page 2, line 26, strike out "$782,200,000" and insert "$700,000,000".

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 198, nays 208, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 176]

YEAS—198

Abbitt
Abele
Abernethy
Adair
Alger
Anderson
Andrews, Ala.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Auchincloss
Ayres
Baker
Baring
Bates
Battin
Becker
Beermann
Belcher
Bell
Bennett, Fla.
Berry
Betts
Bolton, Oliver P.
Bonner
Bow
Bray
Brock
Bromwell
Brotzman
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Burleson
Burton, Utah
Byrnes, Wis.
Casey
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Chenoweth
Clancy
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland

Collier
Colmer
Corbett
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtin
Curtis
Dague
Derounian
Derwinski
Devine
Dole
Dorn
Dowdy
Downing
Ellsworth
Findley
Fino
Fisher
Ford
Foreman
Fountain
Fulton, Pa.
Fuqua
Gathings
Glenn
Goodell
Goodling
Grant
Griffin
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Hagan, Ga.
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Henderson
Herlong
Hoeven
Horan
Hosmer
Huddleston
Hull
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jarman
Jennings
Jensen
Johansen
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Mo.
Keith
Kilgore
King, N.Y.
Knox
Kornegay
Kunkel
Kyl
Laird
Langen
Latta
Lennon
Lipscomb
Long, La.
McClory
McCulloch
McDade
McIntire
McLoskey
McMillan
MacGregor
Marsh
Martin, Calif.
Martin, Nebr.
May
Meader
Michel
Milliken
Minshall
Moore
Morton
Mosher
Nelsen
Ostertag
Passman
Pelly
Pillion
Pirnie
Poff
Pool
Quillen
Randall
Reid, Ill.
Reifel
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rich
Riehlman
Rivers, S.C.
Rogers, Fla.
Roudebush
Roush
Rumsfeld
St. George
Saylor
Schadeberg
Schenck
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Scott
Secrest
Selden
Shipley
Short
Shriver
Siler
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Va.
Snyder
Springer
Stafford
Stinson
Taft
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Thompson, La.
Thomson, Wis.
Tuck
Utt
Van Pelt
Waggonner
Watson
Weaver
Westland
Whalley
Wharton
Whitener
Whitten
Williams
Willis
Wilson, Ind.
Winstead
Wydler
Wyman
Younger

NAYS—208

Addabbo
Albert
Ashley
Aspinall
Baldwin
Barrett
Barry
Beckworth
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Brademas
Brooks
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Buckley
Burke
Burkhalter
Burton, Calif.
Byrne, Pa.
Cahill
Cameron
Carey
Celler
Chelf
Cohelan
Conte
Cooley
Corman
Daddario
Daniels
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Dulski
Duncan
Dwyer
Edmondson
Edwards
Elliott
Everett
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Finnegan
Flood
Flynt
Fogarty
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Tenn.
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gary
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gill
Gonzalez
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Hagen, Calif.
Halpern
Hansen
Harding
Hardy
Harris
Hawkins
Hays
Healey
Hechler
Holifield
Holland
Horton
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Wis.
Jones, Ala.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee
Kelly
Keogh
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Landrum
Leggett
Libonati
Lindsay
Long, Md.
McDowell
McFall
Macdonald
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Martin, Mass.
Mathias
Matsunaga
Matthews
Miller, Calif.
Mills
Minish
Monagan
Montoya
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Morse
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Natcher
Nedzi
Nix
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O Hara, Mich.
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill
Osmers
Patman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Poage
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Rains
Reid, N.Y.
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, Alaska
Roberts, Ala.
Roberts, Tex.
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Roosevelt
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roybal
Ryan, Mich.
Ryan, N.Y.
St. Onge
Schwengel
Senner
Sheppard
Sibal
Sickles
Sikes
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Staebler
Staggers
Steed
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Teague, Tex.
Thomas
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Toll
Trimble
Tupper
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vinson
Wallhauser
Watts
Weltner
White
Wickersham
Widnall
Wilson, Charles H.
Wright
Young
Zablocki

NOT VOTING—25

Avery
Bass
Bennett, Mich.
Bolton, Frances P.
Bruce
Clark
Davis, Ga.
Evins
Forrester
Hanna
Hébert
Hoffman
Kilburn
Lankford
Lesinski
Lloyd
Miller, N.Y.
Norblad
O'Konski
Pilcher
Powell
Rogers, Tex.
St Germain
Tollefson
Wilson, Bob

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Clark against.

Mr. Rogers of Texas for, with Mr. Evins against.

Mrs. Frances P. Bolton for, with Mr. Powell against.

Mr. Norblad for, with Mr. Bass against.

Mr. Bennett of Michigan for, with Mr. Hanna against.

Mr. Bob Wilson for, with Mr. St Germain against.

Mr. Kilburn for, with Mr. Davis of Georgia against.

Mr. Miller of New York for, with Mr. Lankford against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Pilcher with Mr. Hoffman.

Mr. Forrester with Mr. Bruce.

Mr. Lesinski with Mr. Tollefson.

Mr. WILLIS changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 231, nays 174, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 177]

YEAS—231

Addabbo
Albert
Arends
Ashley
Aspinall
Auchincloss
Ayres
Baldwin
Barrett
Barry
Bates
Beckworth
Bell
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Brademas
Brooks
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Buckley
Burke
Burkhalter
Burton, Calif.
Byrne, Pa.
Cahill
Cameron
Carey
Celler
Cleveland
Cohelan
Conte
Cooley
Corbett
Corman
Curtin
Daddario
Daniels
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Downing
Dulski
Duncan
Dwyer
Edmondson
Edwards
Elliott
Everett
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Finnegan
Fino
Flood
Flynt
Fogarty
Ford
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gary
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gill
Gonzalez
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffin
Griffiths
Grover
Gubser
Hagen, Calif.
Halleck
Halpern
Hansen
Harding
Hardy
Hawkins
Hays
Healey
Hechler
Holifield
Holland
Horton
Hosmer
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Wis.
Jones, Ala.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee
Keith
Kelly
Keogh
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Kunkel
Landrum
Leggett
Libonati
Lindsay
Long, Md.
McDade
McDowell
McFall
Macdonald
MacGregor
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Martin, Mass.
Mathias
Matsunaga
Matthews
Meader
Miller, Calif.
Minish
Monagan
Montoya
Moorhead
Morgan
Morrison
Morse
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nix
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill
Osmers
Ostertag
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Pirnie
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Rains
Reid, N.Y.
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Riehlman
Rivers, Alaska
Roberts, Ala.
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Roosevelt
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roybal
Ryan, Mich.
Ryan, N.Y.
St. Onge
Schweiker
Schwengel
Selden
Senner
Sheppard
Sibal
Sickles
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Springer
Staebler
Stafford
Staggers
Steed
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Teague, Calif.
Thomas
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Toll
Trimble
Tupper
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vinson
Wallhauser
Watts
Weltner
Whalley
White
Wickersham
Widnall
Wilson, Charles H.
Wright
Wydler
Young
Zablocki

NAYS—174

Abbitt
Abele
Abernethy
Adair
Alger
Anderson
Andrews, Ala.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Baker
Baring
Battin
Becker
Beermann
Belcher
Bennett, Fla.
Berry
Betts
Bolton, Oliver P.
Bonner
Bow
Bray
Brock
Bromwell
Brotzman
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Burleson
Burton, Utah
Byrnes, Wis.
Casey
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Chelf
Chenoweth
Clancy
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Collier
Colmer
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtis
Dague
Derounian
Derwinski
Devine
Dole
Dorn
Dowdy
Ellsworth
Findley
Fisher
Foreman
Forrester
Fountain
Fuqua
Gathings
Glenn
Goodell
Goodling
Grant
Gross
Gurney
Hagan, Ga.
Haley
Hall
Harris
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Henderson
Herlong
Hoeven
Horan
Huddleston
Hull
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jarman
Jennings
Jensen
Johansen
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Mo.
Kilgore
King, N.Y.
Knox
Kornegay
Kyl
Laird
Langen
Latta
Lennon
Lipscomb
Long, La.
McClory
McCulloch
McIntire
McLoskey
McMillan
Marsh
Martin, Calif.
Martin, Nebr.
May
Michel
Milliken
Mills
Minshall
Moore
Morris
Morton
Mosher

Murray
Passman
Pillion
Poage
Poff
Pool
Quillen
Randall
Reid, Ill.
Reifel
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rich
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts, Tex.
Rogers, Fla.
Roudebush
Roush
Rumsfeld
St. George
Saylor
Schadeberg
Schenck
Schneebeli
Scott
Secrest
Shipley
Short
Shriver
Sikes
Siler
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Va.
Snyder
Stinson
Taft
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, La.
Thomson, Wis.
Tuck
Utt
Van Pelt
Waggonner
Watson
Weaver
Westland
Wharton
Whitener
Whitten
Williams
Willis
Wilson, Ind.
Winstead
Wyman
Younger

NOT VOTING—26

Avery
Bass
Bennett, Mich.
Blatnik
Bolton, Frances P.
Bruce
Clark
Davis, Ga.
Evins
Hanna
Hébert
Hoffman
Kilburn
Lankford
Lesinski
Lloyd
Miller, N.Y.
Norblad
O'Konski
Pilcher
Powell
Rogers, Tex.
St Germain
Tollefson
Tuten
Wilson, Bob

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Hoffman against.

Mrs. Frances P. Bolton for, with Mr. Kilburn against.

Mr. Bob Wilson for, with Mr. Norblad against.

Mr. Evins for, with Mr. Bruce against.

Mr. Miller of New York for, with Mr. Bennett of Michigan against.

Mr. Clark for, with Mr. Rogers of Texas against.

Mr. St Germain for, with Mr. O'Konski against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Tollefson.

Mr. Bass with Mr. Avery.

Mr. Hanna with Mr. Powell.

Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Lankford.

Mr. Lesinski with Mr. Pilcher.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'KONSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, due to a long, outstanding speaking engagement, I regret that I cannot be present today to vote on the foreign aid bill.

If I had been here I would have voted "aye" on the motion to recommit to reduce the appropriation.

Also if I had been present I would vote "no" on the final passage as I believe that our foreign aid program is responsible for most of the ills in the world, and certainly most responsible for the economic ills at home.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks and to include extraneous matter on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

APPROPRIATION BILLS PASSED BY THE HOUSE TO DATE

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter and tables with reference to appropriation bills as passed by the House to date.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, with the passage of the appropriation bill for foreign assistance, the House has processed the main appropriation business of the session. All the regular annual supply bills have cleared through the House. So it is timely to include for the information of Members and others who may be interested, a summarized tabulation, in the usual form, of the appropriation bills of the session thus far. Deficiency bills for the fiscal year 1964, ended yesterday, are segregated from the regular bills for the new fiscal year 1965.

The House has moved the appropriation bills with dispatch. Not in 4 years have all the bills been cleared to the other body as early as the first of the new fiscal year.

OVERALL SUMMARY

In all the bills of the session, the House has considered budget requests for appropriations aggregating $96,306,679,844, against which, in the bills as passed, $87,431,365,329 has been approved, an apparent—and striking—reduction of $8,875,314,515. But I hasten to add that this is a gross distortion; you will recall that the entire $5,200,000,000 reported for the National Space Agency for 1965 was stricken on a point of order from the floor. Assuming the House had approved that amount or something approximating it—and I take it we can all agree on the reasonableness of that premise—the House totals, in perspective, would show appropriations for the session to date of $92,631,365,329, an aggregate reduction from the budget requests—in the 1964 deficiency and supplemental bills and the 1965 bills—of $3,675,314,515—not an inconsiderable total reduction. The House approved some reduction below the budget in every regular bill for 1965 and on the general deficiency bill for 1964.

Mr. Speaker, there is a significance about these totals in another respect. On a fiscal year basis—that is, comparing the amounts in the House bills for fiscal year 1965 with the appropriations to date for fiscal year 1964, including those in deficiency bills of this session—on that basis, the House has approved total appropriations which are somewhat lower than the fiscal year 1964 total; a preliminary comparison shows approximately $1,209,000,000 less.

Not every single dollar of reduction in appropriations requested would necessarily retrench an equivalent expenditure. There are, as in virtually every session, a handful of reductions more in the nature of financing adjustments, or made because the item lacked the necessary legislative authorization, or perhaps because of a difference in view as to the precise amount otherwise required to meet a given commitment. Nonetheless, in a time of an exploding population requiring more public services and generating a higher level of economic activity, a reduction below the previous year's appropriations is noteworthy.

The other body is now moving with dispatch. In addition to the 1964 deficiencies, it has cleared 2 of the 12 bills for 1965 and 1 of those—Interior—has also cleared conference. The other one—Treasury-Post Office—is in conference. The Committee on Appropriations of the other body is hard at work readying the remaining bills for floor action. But not enough have cleared to disclose any meaningful totals.

Mr. Speaker, I suppose I should make one special note at this point. We have passed all the bills now in hand, but I must make the usual reservation about the possibility of a last-minute supplemental. I have not heard about one, but rare is the session when there is not a last-minute, catchall bill.

THE 1964 DEFICIENCY ESTIMATES

Congress, in this session, has considered budget estimates of appropriations from the President aggregating $1,817,865,743, for additional funds for fiscal year 1964, in connection with several special money resolutions and the general deficiency bill cleared last month; $1,718,375,143 was appropriated, a reduction of $99,490,600. These figures are included in the session totals I have given previously. With relatively minor exceptions, few in number, for the first time in some years these bills were confined to amounts for emergencies or for purposes of meeting obligations arising from new laws or other uncontrollable circumstances qualifying the regular appropriation, under the antideficiency law, for accelerated spending in anticipation of deficiency appropriations to cover. This year, the supplemental requests—which we can roughly say are those where the House had considerably more discretion as to approval or rejection—were handled in connection with the 1965 requests and in the 1965 bills.

The House laid a heavy hand to these supplementals. Out of budget requests of $688,510,700, only $33,330,000 prevailed in the bills on final House passage.

PERMANENT APPROPRIATIONS UNDER PRIOR LAWS

Mr. Speaker, to fill out the appropriations picture at this stage, there will also be available for the fiscal year 1965 sums aggregating roughly $11,800,000,000—perhaps more—for various items of expenditure such as interest charges on the public debt, diversion of surplus nonbasic agricultural commodities, administration of the National Wool Act, wildlife management and improvement projects—duck stamp fees and taxes on certain sporting goods—interest on Internal Revenue refunds, payments to States for certain receipts of the national forests, and sundry other purposes enumerated in the annual budget. These items, some 75 in number, are commonly called permanent appropriations. They flow from basic laws, carrying permanent arrangements, enacted in years past. Thus, the appropriation is automatic in that Congress is not required to reenact them in the annual appropriation bills each session. By far the largest is interest on the debt—tentatively estimated in the January budget at $11,000,000,000.

Total appropriations of all kinds have exceeded $100,000,000,000 in each of the last 2 years. They will, undoubtedly, again do so.

I include a table showing the bills of the session down to date, with appropriate comparisons:

Summary of totals of the appropriation bills, 88th Cong., 2d sess., as of July 1, 1964

[NOTE.—Loan authorizations not in this summary but are noted on the more detailed table]

A. House actions:	
1. Budget estimates considered (both 1964 deficiencies, supplementals, and regular 1965)	$96,306,679,844
2. Amounts passed by the House—both 1964 and 1965 items (see item 4)	87,431,365,329
3. Gross reduction below budget estimates (but this is a distortion—see next item)	−8,875,314,515
4. Add back the amount in the reported bill for NASA which was stricken by point of order from the floor (thus putting the figures in better perspective)	5,200,000,000
5. Gross reduction below budget estimates as adjusted by item 4	−3,675,314,515
6. Appropriations to date for fiscal 1964 (total of 1st column of following table; total of 1964 deficiencies as finally approved, less portion thereof already in 1st column figures; and 1964 supplementals in House-passed 1965 bills)	92,160,719,939
7. Appropriations as approved by the House for 1965 (including, to remove the distortion, the $5,200,000,000 for NASA)	90,951,433,640
8. Reductions by the House, amounts for fiscal 1965 below appropriations to date for fiscal 1964	−1,209,286,299
B. Senate actions:	
1. Budget estimates (on all bills considered)	9,122,517,743
2. Amounts approved	9,000,974,543
3. Reductions below budget estimates	−121,543,200
4. Increases above House	+119,777,254
C. Final actions:	
1. Amounts enacted (1964 deficiencies and 1 regular bill for 1965)	2,746,652,343
2. Amounts enacted below budget estimates related thereto	−107,174,400

The appropriation bills, 88th Cong., 2d sess., as of July 1, 1964

[Does not include any back-door appropriations or permanent appropriations [1] under previous legislation. Does include indefinite appropriations carried in annual appropriation bills]

Title and bill number	Prior year appropriations	House					
		Budget estimates to House	Date passed	Amount as passed	House action compared with—		
					Prior year appropriations	Budget estimates	Amount reported
1964 DEFICIENCIES							
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (H.J. Res. 875):							
Original resolution, 88th Cong., 1st sess.[2]		$41,886,000	Dec. 19	$41,886,000			
Subsequent consideration, 88th Cong., 2d sess.[3]		[4] 247,802,000	Jan. 28	[5] 247,802,000			
Total, H.J. Res. 875		289,688,000		289,688,000			
Department of Labor (H.J. Res. 962)		42,000,000	Mar. 24	42,000,000			
Disaster relief (H.J. Res. 976)		50,000,000	Apr. 6	50,000,000			
Deficiency, 1964 (H.R. 11201)		1,307,380,789	May 11	1,264,913,689		−$42,467,100	
Total, 1964 deficiencies		1,689,068,789		1,646,601,689		−42,467,100	
1965 APPROPRIATION BILLS							
District of Columbia (H.R. 10199)	($313,115,662)	(357,702,300)	Mar. 3	(338,205,200)	(+$25,089,538)	(−19,497,100)	
Federal payment, 1965 regular	40,368,000	53,220,000		40,720,000	+352,000	−12,500,000	
Loan authorization	(19,300,000)	(14,400,000)		(26,400,000)	(+7,100,000)	(+12,000,000)	
Interior (H.R. 10433)		1,035,678,000	Mar. 17	1,009,175,600		−26,502,400	
1965 regular appropriations	954,412,500	998,903,000		976,475,600	+22,063,100	−22,427,400	
Loan authorization	(6,000,000)	(20,000,000)		(14,000,000)	(+8,000,000)	(−6,000,000)	
1964 supplementals		36,775,000		32,700,000		−4,075,000	
Treasury-Post Office (H.R. 10532)			Mar. 24				
1965 regular appropriations	6,045,466,000	6,271,991,000		6,225,420,000	+179,954,000	−46,571,000	
1964 supplementals (by transfer)		(1,675,000)		(1,100,000)		(−575,000)	
Legislative (H.R. 10723)		222,587,355	Apr. 10	173,626,640		−48,960,715	−$290,270
1965 regular appropriations	183,620,694	[6] 222,375,655		[6] 173,446,640	−10,174,054	−48,929,015	−290,270
1964 supplementals		211,700		180,000		−31,700	
Labor-HEW (H.R. 10809)		7,561,968,000	Apr. 14	6,908,063,000		−653,905,000	
1965 regular appropriations	5,795,436,500	7,104,782,000		6,908,063,000	+1,112,626,500	−196,719,000	
1964 supplementals		457,186,000				−457,186,000	
Defense (H.R. 10939):							
1965 regular appropriations	47,220,010,000	47,471,000,000	Apr. 22	46,759,267,000	−460,743,000	−711,733,000	
1964 supplementals (by transfer)		(6,000,000)		(6,000,000)			
State, Justice, Judiciary (H.R. 11134)		1,957,764,700	May 6	1,702,627,800		−255,136,900	
1965 regular appropriations	1,838,467,000	1,915,089,700		1,702,177,800	−136,289,200	−212,911,900	
1964 supplementals		42,675,000		450,000		−42,225,000	
Agriculture (H.R. 11202)		5,588,922,600	May 20	5,182,665,000		−406,257,600	
1965 regular appropriations	6,242,297,215	5,582,259,600		5,182,665,000	−1,059,632,215	−399,594,600	
Loan authorization	(855,000,000)	(753,000,000)		(795,000,000)	(−60,000,000)	(+42,000,000)	
1964 supplementals		6,663,000				−6,663,000	
Independent offices (H.R. 11296)		14,244,653,400	May 21	8,118,965,500		[7] −6,125,687,900	[7] −5,200,000,000
1965 regular appropriations	13,228,818,050	14,099,653,400		8,118,965,500	[7] −5,109,852,550	[7] −5,980,687,900	[7] −5,200,000,000
1964 supplementals		145,000,000				−145,000,000	
Military construction (H.R. 11369)							
1965 regular appropriations	1,585,880,000	1,879,000,000	May 26	1,599,014,500	+13,134,500	−279,985,500	
Public works (H.R. 11579):							
1965 regular appropriations	4,405,503,700	4,372,449,000	June 16	4,325,969,200	−79,534,500	−46,479,800	
Foreign assistance (H.R. 11812):							
1965 regular appropriations	3,264,023,137	3,958,377,000	July 1	3,739,249,400	+475,226,263	−219,127,600	
Total, 1965 regular	90,804,302,796	93,929,100,355		85,751,433,640	−5,052,869,156	−8,177,666,715	−5,200,290,270
Total, 1964 supplementals (included in 1965 bills)		688,510,700		33,330,000		−655,180,700	
Total, all appropriations		96,306,679,844		87,431,365,329		−8,875,314,515	−5,200,290,270
Total, loan authorizations	(880,300,000)	(787,400,000)		(835,400,000)	(−44,900,000)	(+48,000,000)	

See footnotes at end of table.

The appropriation bills, 88th Cong., 2d sess., as of July 1, 1964—Continued

[Does not include any back-door appropriations or permanent appropriations [1] under previous legislation. Does include indefinite appropriations carried in annual appropriation bills]

Title and bill No.	Senate					Final appropriation		
	Budget estimates to Senate	Amount as passed	Senate action compared with—			Amount as approved	Final action compared with—	
			Prior year appropriations	Budget estimates	House action		Prior year	Budget estimates
1964 DEFICIENCIES								
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (H.J. Res. 875):								
Original resolution, 88th Cong., 1st sess. [2]	$41,886,000	$258,090,000		+$216,204,000	+$216,204,000			−$41,886,000
Subsequent consideration, 88th Cong., 2d sess.[3]	[4] 247,802,000	[5] 31,598,000		−216,204,000	−216,204,000	[8] $289,688,000		+41,886,000
Total, H.J. Res. 875	289,688,000	289,688,000				289,688,000		
Department of Labor (H.J. Res. 962)	42,000,000	42,000,000				42,000,000		
Disaster relief (H.J. Res. 976)	50,000,000	50,000,000				50,000,000		
Deficiency, 1964 (H.R. 11201)	1,436,177,743	1,349,637,143		−86,540,600	+84,723,454	1,336,687,143		−99,490,600
Total, 1964 deficiencies	1,817,865,743	1,731,325,143		−86,540,600	+84,723,454	1,718,375,143		−99,490,600
1965 APPROPRIATION BILLS								
District of Columbia (H.R. 10199)								
Federal payment, 1965 regular								
Loan authorization								
Interior (H.R. 10433)	1,035,961,000	1,029,226,400		−6,734,600	+20,050,800	1,028,277,200		−7,683,800
1965 regular appropriations	998,903,000	993,554,400	+$39,141,900	−5,348,600	+17,078,800	994,069,200	+$39,656,700	−4,833,800
Loan authorization	(20,000,000)	(14,000,000)	(+8,000,000)	(−6,000,000)		(14,000,000)	(+8,000,000)	(−6,000,000)
1964 supplementals	37,058,000	35,672,000		−1,386,000	+2,972,000	34,208,000		−2,850,000
Treasury-Post Office (H.R. 10532)								
1965 regular appropriations	6,268,691,000	6,240,423,000	+194,957,000	−28,268,000	+15,003,000			
1964 supplementals (by transfer)	(1,675,000)	(1,100,000)		(−575,000)				
Legislative (H.R. 10723)								
1965 regular appropriations								
1964 supplementals								
Labor-HEW (H.R. 10809)								
1965 regular appropriations								
1964 supplementals								
Defense (H.R. 10939):								
1965 regular appropriations								
1964 supplementals (by transfer)								
State, Justice, Judiciary (H.R. 11134)								
1965 regular appropriations								
1964 supplementals								
Agriculture (H.R. 11202)								
1965 regular appropriations								
Loan authorization								
1964 supplementals								
Independent offices (H.R. 11296)								
1965 regular appropriations								
1964 supplementals								
Military construction (H.R. 11369)								
1965 regular appropriations								
Public works (H.R. 11579):								
1965 regular appropriations								
Foreign assistance (H.R. 11812):								
1965 regular appropriations								
Total, 1965 regular	7,267,594,000	7,233,977,400	+234,098,900	−33,616,600	+32,081,800	994,069,200	+39,656,700	−4,833,800
Total, 1964 supplementals (included in 1965 bills)	37,058,000	35,672,000		−1,386,000	+2,972,000	34,208,000		−2,850,000
Total, all appropriations	9,122,517,743	9,000,974,543		−121,543,200	+119,777,254	2,746,652,343		−107,174,400
Total, loan authorizations	(20,000,000)	(14,000,000)	(+8,000,000)	(−6,000,000)		(14,000,000)	(+8,000,000)	(−6,000,000)

---

[1] Tentatively estimated in January budget at about $11,800,000,000 for fiscal year 1965.

[2] This resolution passed both Houses in 88th Cong., 1st sess. House bill included $41,886,000 for activities to combat mental retardation; Senate bill added $216,204,000 for "Payments to school districts." Resolution not finally adopted in 1st sess.

[3] Action renewed in 88th Cong., 2d sess.

[4] Estimates submitted to Congress in H. Doc. 203, dated Jan. 21, 1964, considered as follows: "Payments to school districts," $216,204,000 (previously added by Senate); "Defense educational activities," $31,168,000; "Compliance activities, Mexican farm labor program," $430,000.

[5] Resolution not actually reported by Appropriations Committees for House or Senate consideration. Figures shown for balancing purposes. Amounts shown as reported and passed by Senate include $31,168,000 for "Defense educational activities" and $430,000 for "Compliance activities, Mexican farm labor program."

[6] Excludes Senate items.

[7] Amount of $5,200,000,000 reported for National Aeronautics and Space Administration eliminated on point of order due to lack of legislative authorization.

[8] Final amount appropriated includes $41,886,000 for activities to combat mental retardation; $216,204,000 for "Payments to school districts"; $31,168,000 for "Defense educational activities"; and $430,000 for "Compliance activities, Mexican farm labor program."

NOTE.—Totals reflect amounts approved and comparisons at latest stage of congressional action on each bill.

EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE 1964 TOBACCO ALLOTMENT LEASES

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Joint Resolution 1026 to amend section 316 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to extend the time by which a lease transferring a tobacco acreage allotment may be filed.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the House joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (g) of section 316 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by striking out "1962" wherever it appears in said subsection and substituting therefor "1964".

SEC. 2. Subsection (h) of said section 316 is hereby repealed.

The House joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means may have until midnight Tuesday, July 7, to file a report, including any supplemental views there may be, on H.R. 11865.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what is this bill all about?

Mr. MILLS. It is a bill ordered reported by the committee today. This request was agreed to in the committee by all members present that the committee have until midnight Tuesday, July 7, to file a report. It has to do with social security.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

AMENDING THE ALASKA OMNIBUS ACT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order tomorrow, Thursday, for the Speaker to recognize a Member for the purpose of moving to suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 2881, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what is that bill?

Mr. ALBERT. It is a bill to amend the Alaska Omnibus Act to provide assistance to the State of Alaska for the reconstruction of areas damaged by the earthquake of March 1964, and subsequent seismic waves, and for other purposes.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I had understood that certain further negotiations were to be had in respect to this matter. I must be constrained to object at this time. I do not understand that we have reached that point in agreement.

Mr. ALBERT. I had understood that the minority leader agreed to have it set down for suspension tomorrow.

Mr. HALLECK. No; I never made any such agreement.

Mr. ALBERT. I did not get the agreement directly from the gentleman, although I did discuss it with him.

Mr. HALLECK. I have as much solicitude for the people of Alaska as anybody. This bill passed in the other body, and there were some suggestions made that possibly adjustments could be made. But there has been no discussion, so far as I know, with Members on our side. There might have been, I do not know. But I would hope that the majority leader will not press the request at this time.

Mr. ALBERT. If the gentleman will yield, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] spoke to me and said the only reservation he had was that it would be brought up with amendments, and with amendments that had been agreed to, and I told him that was my understanding.

Mr. HALLECK. As far as I am concerned, I have had no opportunity to check with anybody about the amendment or generally with the members of the committee on our side. I have understood there were substantial changes made in the other body. As to just what the amendments are to be, in respect to the suspension, if it is ordered here, I do not know. I must say that until we can have some better understanding on our side about it, and I do not know what can transpire tomorrow and do not want to be standing in the way unnecessarily, I just feel we ought to have a little better understanding of what we are undertaking to do.

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. May I say to the gentleman that I processed this with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR]. Senator ANDERSON discussed it with me on the phone and said he was going to call the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] and that I was to clear the matter with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR]. We went over the amendatory material and fully agreed, exactly as Senator ANDERSON prescribed. Mr. SAYLOR was going to speak to the gentleman from Indiana. Otherwise, I never would have passed this on to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is not here at the moment. I think he did speak to me, now that the gentleman has mentioned it. It is true that the Senator did call me, because originally he had some serious misgivings about some of the provisions. I knew about that. I understand some changes were made, but I have had no opportunity to go over the matter. If this request is made for tomorrow, it will be in order tomorrow as well as today. All I am undertaking to do is determine just what the situation is about this special order for a suspension.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my request.

PUBLIC LAW 480, 83D CONGRESS

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 792 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That, notwithstanding the provisions of H. Res. 38, Eighty-eighth Congress, the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives is hereby authorized to carry out the committee's statutory responsibility for legislative oversight of Public Law 480, Eighty-third Congress, by designating and directing not to exceed five members and not to exceed two employees of the committee to conduct studies and investigations of operations under Public Law 480 between the dates of July 5 and July 20, 1964, in Brazil and while en route to and from Brazil in such other Central American and South American countries as the chairman may direct.

Notwithstanding section 1754 of title 22, United States Code, or any other provisions of law, local currencies owned by the United States shall be made available to the members of the committee and employees engaged in carrying out their official duties under section 190(d) of title 2, United States Code: *Provided,* (1) That no member or employee of said committee shall receive or expend local currencies or appropriated funds for subsistence in an amount in excess of the maximum per diem rates approved for oversea travel as set forth in the Standardized Government Travel Regulations, as revised and amended by the Bureau of the Budget; (2) that no member or employee of said committee shall receive or expend an amount for transportation in excess of actual transportation costs; (3) no appropriated funds shall be expended for the purpose of defraying expenses of members of said committee or its employees in any country where counterpart funds are available for this purpose.

That each member or employee of said committee shall make to the chairman of said committee an itemized report showing the number of days visited in each country whose local currencies were spent, the amount of per diem furnished, and the cost of transportation if furnished by public carrier, or if such transportation is furnished by an agency of the United States Government, the identification of the agency. All such individual reports shall be filed by the chairman with the Committee on House Administration and shall be open to public inspection.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I have no request for time. I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I merely wanted an opportunity to say that this had been cleared with the minority leader of the Committee on Rules. It has been cleared in the usual form. It contains the usual provisions with respect to the expenditure of counterpart funds.

I did want to yield briefly to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Do I correctly understand that this resolution gives authority to the Committee on Agriculture to go to Brazil, to investigate what?

Mr. YOUNG. The resolution does give authority to the Committee on Agriculture to go to Brazil to investigate matters pertaining to their responsibility in connection with the oversight of the Public Law 480 program.

Mr. GROSS. What, specifically, does that mean, oversight in connection with the Public Law 480 program?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

Mr. POAGE. The Committee on Agriculture has responsibility for Public Law 480. Under that program we spent $1,900 million last year. It will run something like that this year. Approximately $2 billion of American goods are shipped out of this country each year under what is called Public Law 480.

There are questions and many of them. I am sure the gentleman from Iowa is as familiar with those questions as any man on the floor of the House. There is the question of how these commodities are handled—whether they are actually serving the purposes that were intended—why we should continue some of the programs that are being conducted—whether for instance we should continue the program of making grants rather than loans which the committee feels was probably a perversion of the original legislation.

There are a whole multitude of questions of that kind. We are spending the second largest amount of money in the world in Brazil. India is the largest recipient of our gratuities at this time.

For a long time the Committee on Agriculture has felt and it feels now, rather than be precluded from knowing what is going on, we ought to spend a great deal of time trying to know what is going on and that we are to follow these $2 billion and know something more about it than we do now. The Members of the House properly asked us about all these things and we find ourselves saying—Yes, I said so and so—the same as you did.

Mr. GROSS. Is the committee going to go into the situation whereby we have been peddling wheat at bargain prices for Brazilian currency and other currencies in South America? Now we find that under the International Coffee Agreement the consumers of this country are being gouged by rocketing coffee prices. Is the committee going to give any attention to this situation?

Mr. POAGE. I would not say we are going into the coffee situation because that does not come under Public Law 480.

Mr. GROSS. That may be, but it is certainly related to these wheat transactions.

Mr. POAGE. I would say we are going into the wheat and sugar situation because we think they do come under our jurisdiction. We have felt for years past, and our committee did raise the question, that without any ability to have any firsthand knowledge, we are at a disadvantage. We know that last year, for instance, we authorized Brazil to sell us 225,000 pounds of sugar.

Mr. GROSS. Will the committee find out why we do not trade our wheat for their coffee?

Mr. POAGE. That is exactly one of the things we would like to know. I am not going to tell you at this time that we will find out, but we will get somebody's answers.

Mr. GROSS. I will give the gentleman one answer because I asked the former Finance Minister of Brazil that question when he appeared before the Foreign Affairs Committee. The Finance Minister of Brazil at that time said his government would not trade coffee for wheat because "We have to have your dollars for our coffee."

Mr. POAGE. Yes, I understand that.

Mr. GROSS. Of course, this afternoon we made it possible, with passage of the foreign handout bill, to dish out more millions of dollars to South America while they are gouging us with their coffee prices. Let me ask the gentleman another question. Will the committee try to find out what happened to the thousands of tons of American wheat that disappeared en route to Austria and Vietnam and various other places? When is this administration ever going to tell us what happened to those thousands and upon thousands of tons of wheat that have disappeared in the Public Law 480 export program; wheat that never reached its destination?

Mr. POAGE. We are not going to find that out in Brazil because Brazil is a long way from the destination or from the shipping point of that wheat. We hope to get some better understanding as to whether anything of that kind might be about to develop in Brazil. We believe that the near appearance of a committee of the Congress in an area like that probably delays or prevents—we hope prevents—the occurrence of these very kind of things the gentleman has referred to. We do know that if there is no evidence of supervision whatsoever that the invitation to engage in this kind of practice that the gentleman refers to is a great deal more inviting than if there is somebody dropping by periodically to at least ask questions and at least show that there is somebody who is interested in knowing what is going on.

We believe it is worth while to let the policeman be seen walking around the block, even if he does not see any crime committed.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman suppose that if we put Billie Sol Estes on the job he could find out what happened to the millions of dollars worth of wheat that disappeared?

Although President Johnson says he respects the "integrity" and "independence" of Congress, he has given demonstrations time after time of his ability to arm twist and put pressure on the Members, and, I wonder when he is going to put the proper pressure upon the proper committee of Congress or agency of Government, including the Department of Agriculture, to find out what has happened to the disappearing wheat. This is not merely a few bushels or tons. I say again it is thousands upon thousands of tons, worth millions of dollars.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. The gentleman ought to know that this wheat disappeared in 1957, before Mr. Johnson became President or Vice President of this country.

Mr. GROSS. I do not care when it disappeared. You Democrats happen to be in charge these days of the machinery for finding out what happened. If Republicans are guilty of contributing to the disappearance of the wheat, let the chips fall where they may. Put it right on their backs, if they are responsible for it, but get busy and tell us what has happened to the disappearing wheat.

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. BEERMANN. If I may, I make the observation that they did not have a ZIP code on the wheat shipment at that time.

I should like to ask a question of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE], the vice chairman of the committee, if I may, on the time of the gentleman from Iowa.

The gentleman mentioned 225,000 tons of sugar we bought from Brazil. It is my understanding, from information brought before our Committee on Departmental Oversight and Consumer Relations, that Brazil came up to trade 500,000 tons of sugar for 500,000 tons of wheat. We paid for this, and sold no wheat. A deal for 225,000 tons of sugar was consummated. We paid for this, and sold no wheat.

In discussions of this with the Department of Agriculture and the Department of State, I do not believe we ever got a satisfactory answer as to why we sold no wheat. There was action taken at 7 o'clock in the morning of Christmas Eve, last year, 1963, when we authorized action by the Export-Import Bank. We had a discussion of that on the floor today. That was to help pay for wheat sales to Russia.

I wonder if the committee, in going to Brazil, might be able to find out if they used our sugar money to buy wheat from Russia. This is pertinent information for me, as a member of the Committee on Agriculture, since I come from a wheat State and a beet-sugar-producing State.

I wonder if Brazil took our sugar money and bought wheat that we sold to Russia.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEERMANN. I am asking the question of the gentleman from Texas on the time of the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Iowa yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Texas. I promised that I would yield to him.

Mr. POAGE. I believe the gentleman is somewhat in error in his description, but basically there were considerable errors in judgment in connection with the wheat and sugar sale, as the gentleman knows from my questions in the Committee on Agriculture. The gentleman has heard me express myself on that.

As to answering the question of whether we will come up with answers, there is no way for me to tell the gentleman whether I can come up with an answer, any more than I can tell him I could walk down the street and find an answer to a certain robbery that took place. I know that unless someone does walk down the street no answer will be found. I cannot say that there will be an answer found, no matter who makes a trip to Brazil, but I know that without any effort nothing will be done.

We would like to make such effort as is possible within the limited time available.

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Iowa yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. BEERMANN. I believe we ought to make the observation that in discussing this problem with the State Department, a member of the State Department said that Congress did not specifically specify in the law what they should do. Mr. JONES, the chairman of the subcommittee, said that we would definitely specify the intent of the Congress and write it out, because the gentleman in the State Department refused to recognize the intent of the Congress.

I think we made it very plain to him. I think we ought to review that discussion or those hearings by our Committee on Agriculture of the Department of Agriculture and the Department of State before going down there, because I believe the real trouble in this particular instance is in the Department of State.

I do not blame a Brazilian for selling us 225,000 tons of sugar and not having to buy anything in return and then turning around and maybe getting a better deal from Russian and probably on our money, too.

I thank the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. Snyder].

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, normally I am not too strong on these trips around the world, but I would like to say that since the Committee on Agriculture is going to Brazil to look into the use of Public Law 480 commodities, I would heartily endorse the trip. If they would have their committee staff get in touch with my office, I think I might have some real information that you might look into. I have some pictures of our commodities stacked, not to be sold or exchanged, in newspapers, with goods from Brazil. They are apparently being used as wages, which is, in effect, selling the products. I would just suggest that you have your staff get in touch with my office and we will dig this stuff up for you. We will be very interested in seeing what you find out.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION'S BRANDING OF CIGARETTES AS HEALTH HAZARD

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, the American tobacco industry has been placed in serious jeopardy in recent months because of the Surgeon General's far-reaching, yet inconclusive report on "Smoking and Health." The most serious and the most unfair threat, however, has come from the Federal Trade Commission which has proposed that every package of cigarettes be branded as a health hazard.

Since my first reading of the "Smoking and Health" report to the Surgeon General, my contention has been that a crash program of research is needed to clear the name of American tobacco or to pinpoint any health hazards in tobacco and to find the means of eliminating them. Regardless of this need for additional research, the Federal Trade Commission has acted in haste and unwisely in promulgating rules to brand cigarettes.

Mr. Speaker, I take my exception to the Federal Trade Commission's rules in behalf of the thousands of Americans who earn all or part of their income from tobacco, and in behalf of the 70 million Americans who enjoy a good smoke. For these reasons or for other reasons I have been joined in my opposition to the rules by numerous others in all parts of our Nation.

One of the fine arguments against the Federal Trade Commission rulings was the lead editorial in Washington's Sunday Star, on Sunday, June 28, 1964. In this editorial the editor points to the absurdity and the inconsistency of the action proposed by the Federal Trade Commission. The editorial follows:

Smoke Signals

Having renounced cigarette smoking some 10 years ago, we yield to no one in pious opposition to this dangerous and profitless habit.

An occasional cigar or pipe—perhaps. Otherwise, it would of course be a better world if nobody smoked. One of the major duties of parents must be to dissuade their children from getting hooked by the weed.

But having said this, it has also to be said that the Federal Trade Commission's ruling that cigarette packages must carry a warning about coffin nails is the silliest in a long time.

In the first place, what is the fairness of this proposition? If each package of cigarettes must remind us that the contents may induce cancer, why should not each bottle of liquor proclaim the dangers of alcoholism? Shouldn't automobiles be forced to advertise the fact that they kill thousands of Americans every month? Airplanes? Swimming pools? Cakes of soap, on which so many of us tend to slip in the shower? The only fundamental difference in the case of cigarettes is that the tobacco danger is newly discovered.

In the second place, what is the point of such a routine warning? There may be, it is true, some deterrent shock effect in the initial announcement that the FTC has decided to force cigarette companies to stamp each pack with a message about the dangers of smoking. But a smoker, hardened or incipient, who gets past that shock is hardly likely to pause as he opens each pack to consider the message anew. Who notices what is on a pack of cigarettes? Do you know, without looking, what is now written on the pack you are carrying?

Finally, what is the consistency of this ruling? It puts the Government in the ridiculous position of helping to support an industry the product of which it brands harmful. True, the tobacco price support program is not a direct subsidy. But without those helpful Federal controls it would be much harder to make a living by growing tobacco. It would be consistent with this FTC ruling for the Government to ban cigarettes. The previous experience with prohibition was not, however, encouraging in this regard. It is all too easy to foresee bootleg cigarettes, the advent of "smoke easies" and a soaring increase in lung cancer.

If the smokeless millennium ever materializes, it must result from effective education that dissuades nonsmokers from starting to smoke, or else from really tough Government measures that accomplish in this case what could not be accomplished in the prohibition of alcohol.

The pack stamping plan contributes precisely nothing in either direction.

THE FORGOTTEN 30,000

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the Boston Globe in an editorial on Tuesday, June 23, made a very worthwhile suggestion which I think has merit and should be considered by the Army.

The Globe's suggestion is that the Army grant an early release to some 30,000 married draftees who had been inducted, and therefore did not benefit from the Executive order signed by President John Fitzgerald Kennedy last September 10 deferring all married men. The Executive order saved some 340,000 classified as 1–A from the draft. But the forgotten 30,000 who were already in the service were not included in the general 14-percent pay increase for the Armed Forces passed by Congress last October.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the Boston Globe editorial with my remarks in the Record:

The Forgotten 30,000

The mills of the brass hats, like those of the gods, grind slowly. Yet drastic changes in our system of military conscription, and even the complete elimination of it, could result from Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara's approval of a $1 million program of manpower studies.

But the administration's target year is some time away, in 1967, when the present draft law expires. President Johnson had anounced plans for the review last April. In the meantime, and without waiting for the study, there is an immediate, practical, and humanitarian action that might be taken. It concerns the forgotten 30,000.

They are the married draftees. And they are forgotten, or all but forgotten, because they had already been inducted last September 10 when the late President John F. Kennedy, after reports of draft inequities, signed his Executive order deferring all married men.

At that time there were 1,300,000 single men classified 1–A, ready for duty. A reporter asked Pierre Salinger, now a candidate for the U.S. Senate in California, why these single men had not been called before the married men were.

"That's exactly the question the President asked," Salinger replied. The Executive order brought profound relief to the 340,000 married men who had previously been classified 1–A. But for the 30,000 married draftees already inducted, they and all other draftees less than 2 years in the service were not included in the general 14 percent pay increase which Congress voted for the Armed Forces October 2, 1963.

Their situation, moreover, makes no sense economically. These married privates and privates first class, are paid about $185 a month, or $2,220 a year, well below the "poverty line" of $3,000 set by the Johnson administration.

But not without reason did Lt. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, the head of Selective Service, tell a congressional hearing early this month that "a married man in the grade of private is more expensive than a noncommissioned officer who is single."

A few days before he testified, the Army Times, in an article published May 27, reported that if "a high-level Defense plan now under study goes through" there will be "an all-bachelor force in the lower enlisted grades." Marriage would be discouraged, it said, by removing the financial inducements toward that institution, such as the so-called Q allotments and subsistence payments.

Whether or not this plan goes through (and it would work an injustice unless it were phased out gradually so as not to deprive any married servicemen of its benefits), something can be done right now for the forgotten 30,000.

Their extra cost to the taxpayer is approximately $32 million a year for their allotments, not their pay. It would take 16 weeks (half of them in basic, and half in advanced training) to furnish their replacements. Why not, then, an Executive order releasing all married draftees in 4 months?

The Army already releases personnel 3 months early to return to school. It ought to do something now for the forgotten 30,000.

FOREIGN POLICY STATEMENT BY PREMIER KHRUSHCHEV

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday in Oslo, Norway, Russian Premier Khrushchev made a highly significant and very disturbing foreign policy statement.

The Washington Post of this morning reported:

> He [Khrushchev] has authorized Cuba to shoot down American reconnaissance planes overflying the island.

The article further added:

> If Cuba should destroy an American plane and the United States should retaliate against Cuba, the Soviet Union would come to the aid of the Castro Government.

Now, what does this dangerous talk mean?

If you asked those pantywaist experts down at the State Department, I am sure that they would dismiss it as idle chatter.

Khrushchev and the Communists never make idle chatter.

I say they are obviously pushing us again, testing the mettle of the new administration.

Having bluffed the Kennedy administration out of on-site inspection; having fully consolidated communism in Cuba right under our noses; having established Cuba as the base of subversion in Latin America, with a thumb-to-the-nose gesture in our direction, now what do they propose to do?

They intend to bluff us out of our reconnaissance overflights. For what purpose? I ask, what other purpose than to reestablish the nuclear missile state of affairs that came within an eyelash of succeeding in 1962. The end result? They will have us over the nuclear barrel which has been their purpose all along.

Now, I challenge the administration to tell us what they intend to do about this whole Cuban mess. First, Khrushchev, Castro, and the world should be notified at once what our reconnaissance policy will be. Second, and of more importance, this Nation and the world wants to know what this administration intends as affirmative action in Cuba. Will it be a Fulbright accommodation plan of "let us go along, they are really just boisterous little boys who will mature tomorrow into fine young men," or are we going to see some definite policy.

President Kennedy at least used to repeat again and again that Castro and communism must go from Cuba.

Mr. Johnson has not said anything we can hang our hats on.

Now, the President can grope around in the dark down at the White House if he wants to. It is his home temporarily, but it is high time that the dark be dispelled and a little light, nay a searchlight brilliancy, be shed on this Cuban business.

And, by the way, I think it is also time for the peaceful coexisters to explain Mr. Khrushchev's latest gesture of friendship toward us in Oslo.

This Nation has been led down a rose-strewn path of an about face in foreign policy this last year, selling wheat and trading with the Communists, feeding and strengthening our enemies, on the theory that they are changing their attitudes toward the United States and the West.

Now, Khrushchev proposes that this Nation cease its surveillance over this criminal, irresponsible bully Castro, and if we do not, then he urges Castro to take a poke at us with his Russian supplied antiaircraft rockets, and if we should protect our interests, in turn, he promises that Russia will come to the aid of Castro.

Well, Mr. President, and your architect planners of peaceful coexistence, it is your move. Russia, the world, and especially the American people are watching and waiting.

PACKING OF THE COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, there are still some Members who attempt to justify their vote to pack the Rules Committee by pretending it had no effect on curbing liberal, extreme legislation. After yesterday's disgraceful railroading of the so-called civil rights bill through that committee, there is no defense left for having made that vote.

The liberals who were placed in full control of the Rules Committee by the packing ran roughshod over the distinguished chairman, the Honorable Howard Smith, of Virginia. The liberal coalition took the unprecedented action of naming the committee member who is to handle the resolution on the floor. By stripping the chairman of his prerogative to assign the member, the "coalition" demonstrated a total lack of respect for the chairman and for committee tradition.

By a vote of 7 to 4, the packed committee allowed only a single day of gagged hearing and then railroaded the bill to the floor of the house with only 1 hour allowed to read and discuss more than 80 Senate amendments. Clearly, there will not even be time to read the amendments, much less debate or understand them. Thus, the packing has paid off like a jackpot on a rigged slot machine.

With 60 minutes allowed to read and discuss over 80 amendments, not only the public will have no idea what this bill contains until it has passed, but not even the Members of Congress will know. The chickens have come home to roost and I, for one, am proud still of my vote not to pack the Rules Committee.

INTERNATIONAL LABOR ORGANIZATION REPORT

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Quie], yesterday, made his report concerning his visit to the International Labor Organization Convention in Geneva. It is rare that as comprehensive and thoughtful a report is given by individual delegates, and I merely wish to congratulate the gentleman and express my appreciation to him.

As I leave for Geneva to attend the sessions of the closing week of the ILO meeting, I feel that this report will mean a great deal to me in terms of being as fully prepared as possible, and it will enable me to make full use of the remaining time at the ILO.

DECLINE IN FARM PRICES

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, the farm parity ratio which stood at 75 percent during the months of April and May has now dropped to 74 percent, according to the Agricultural Prices publication put out by the Statistical Reporting Service of the Department of Agriculture.

This is a far cry from the 100 percent of parity which the Secretary of Agriculture talked so much about back in 1960. With the parity ratio now standing at 74 percent—a new low even for the Freeman administration—it is little wonder that Mr. Cochrane saw fit to give up and leave the Department to return to private life. The trouble is the farmer who has to live with 74 percent of parity in the face of high costs and low prices has to stay with it, even though he is discouraged to find practically all farm prices lower on June 15 of this year as compared to a year ago. It is my understanding that Secretary Freeman now claims that this does not really represent a loss of income to the farmers but it is instead a reflection of a situation brought about by virtue of a transition period and lowering of price support in the new wheat legislation. Soybeans have dropped from $2.48 to $2.35; hogs from $16.10 to $14.90; beef from $19.70 to $17.40; turkeys from 21.7 cents to 20.9

cents. The one ray of hope in the Agricultural Prices report is the increase in milk prices from $3.72 to $3.77.

Mr. **NELSEN**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include an article from the Washington Post of July 1, 1964.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

FARM PRICES DECLINE 1 PERCENT IN MAY–JUNE

Farm product prices declined 1 percent between mid-May and mid-June, the Agriculture Department reported.

Mainly responsible for the decline were lower prices for wheat—associated with the changes in the Government's price-support program—oranges, grapefruit, wholesale milk, and calves.

The decline would have been larger had there not been substantial increases in prices for potatoes and hogs.

The farm price level in mid-June was 4 percent below June last year and the lowest for the month since 1946.

Prices paid by farmers for commodities and services used in production and living remained unchanged during the month but about one-third of 1 percent higher than a year earlier.

Prices dropped to 74 percent of the parity goal of Federal farm programs. This compared with 75 percent in mid-May and 77 percent in mid-June last year. The mid-June parity level was the lowest since August 1939.

ATTORNEY GENERAL ROBERT KENNEDY RECEIVES A TUMULTUOUS WELCOME IN POLAND

Mr. **PUCINSKI**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. **PUCINSKI**. Mr. Speaker, the press today carried a story from Warsaw, Poland, reporting the tumultuous reception that Attorney General Robert Kennedy and his wife received from the people of that great nation when they arrived in Warsaw. The Polish Government-controlled press did not report he was expected to arrive in Poland nor did the press mention anything about his schedule. Yet, despite the news blackout about the visit of this great American in Poland, the people of Poland learned about his arrival there through the grapevine, and thousands upon thousands of people greeted Mr. Kennedy and his family. The imposing reception which these noble people, who have lived under Communist oppression since World War II, gave Mr. and Mrs. Kennedy, reflects the strong feeling of affection that the Poles have for all Americans. I think those who earlier today argued that by helping these captive nations with our surplus crops and our surplus commodities, we in some way are helping the Communists, just do not understand the people of these captive countries. The enormous reception given Attorney General Kennedy clearly demonstrates that the people of these captive nations are America's best friends. Surely we Americans are mature enough to draw a distinction between the spirit of these people and their rulers. I doubt if one-tenth of 1 percent of Poland's population is or ever will be Communist. Only the present rulers of Poland are Communists, but I can assure my colleague, the masses of Polish people never will accept godless communism. No one knows this better than Gomulka and Khrushchev, even though there are those in this Chamber who still cannot distinguish between the people of a nation and her rulers.

The reception given Attorney General Kennedy was the Poles' way of showing the high regard; the love, the admiration they had for his brother, our late President Kennedy. And it also shows how much these Polish people respect, admire, and revere President Johnson.

Attorney General Kennedy's visit to Poland gave the Poles an excellent opportunity to demonstrate their devotion for America. No matter what anyone says, the fact is clear that if the Poles had a free choice between America and the Soviet Union, they would unanimously choose the United States.

The people of these captive nations are indeed our best friends. No one knows better than Mr. Khrushchev that if he ever was foolish enough to disturb the peace of the world and move against Western democracies, the gallant Poles would be marching eastward toward the Kremlin to crush communism and never against our Western allies.

So I would like to call attention and include in my remarks this excellent report by the United Press of Attorney General Kennedy's massive reception by the people of Poland. I think this speaks more eloquently than anything I could say, for the fact that the spirit of freedom among the people who must live under communism against their will is demonstrated repeatedly when Americans visit that country. This huge reception given Mr. Kennedy can make us all confident that Poland and all the other captive nations will again soon join the family of the free nations of the world.

The article referred to follows:

NATION URGED TO HELP EASE EAST-WEST TENSIONS: R.F.K. BOOSTS POLES' ROLE

WARSAW, July 1.—Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy concluded his visit to Communist Poland today by urging it help ease Soviet-American tension and end the East-West division in Europe.

At a press conference at the end of a hectic 3-day unofficial visit which raised the eyebrows of Communist officials but left thousands of Poles cheering, Mr. Kennedy said Poland enjoys a special position in the world for it has political ties with the Soviet Union and personal ties with the United States.

He added:

"Poland, therefore, has a unique opportunity to contribute to European security and the easing of tension between the United States and the Soviet Union.

"This is the only sure guarantee against nuclear war, whether by design or accident * * *.

"As President Kennedy said in his inaugural address, 'Let us begin.' Just because we cannot see clearly the end of the road, that is no reason for not setting out on the essential journey."

Mr. Kennedy, his wife Ethel, and their three oldest children who arrived in Warsaw Saturday night, took off for London in a special U.S. Air Force plane. They planned to leave London for home tonight.

He called East-West reconciliation the surest means of fostering the common prosperity.

ACCLAIMED

The Attorney General, acclaimed everywhere he went in Poland, returned in the press conference to his theme of reunification of Germany.

"Europe is now divided by a deep and unnatural division—the division of Germany," he said. "That division is reinforced by a legacy of uncertainty for no one now sees clearly the path ahead.

"I believe now is the time to work earnestly on the great problems ahead—the security of Poland and other countries of Eastern Europe, of Germany, and Western Europe, of the Soviet Union and the United States, for these problems will not go away by themselves."

The Kennedy visit was considered unprecedented in postwar Poland. The controlled Communist press and radio gave it only scant coverage.

But hundreds of thousands of Poles learned of it by word of mouth, and everywhere they went they turned out to greet Mr. Kennedy with wild enthusiasm.

They sang "Sto Lat," a traditional song that wishes its listener 100 years of life, so often that yesterday Mr. Kennedy was able to sing it back in Polish.

One of the highlights of the tour occurred yesterday when the family drove 177 miles to Czestochowa to visit Stefan Cardinal Wyszynski, Roman Catholic primate of Poland.

He gave Mr. Kennedy a 1-hour private audience. Later the Attorney General said they discussed matters thoroughly and generally.

THIS WAS THE WEEK THAT WAS ON CAPITOL HILL

Mr. **MOSHER**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. **ASHBROOK**. Mr. Speaker, this was the week that was on Capitol Hill. The camera picked up many interesting scenes and the American people have been presented with a glimpse of their Government at work, the political processes of our great Republic and the personalities thereof. Will they survive all of this? Tune in next week.

First, we see Henry Cabot Lodge, known in TV relief roles as Henry Sabotage, arriving again on these shores, sort of a Diem voice from Vietnam, telling the American people what's what. "We need a President who is not impulsive," Mr. Lodge said impulsively. He now joins the east coast firing squad in their assault on the man from the West, B.G.

Walter Lippmann, experiencing political DT's worrying about the future of the Republican Party comes into view. Ever since his days as the first president of the Harvard Socialist Club, Mr. Lippmann's solicitude for our party has been touching.

The Supreme Court vacates its legislative chambers until October. How we will get by so long without them telling us what to do is not certain. They bring to mind the statement of the great Senator from Missouri, Jim Reed, who once said:

> Roosevelt failed in packing the Supreme Court so he polluted it.

The next figure is that of Senate minority leader, EVERETT M. DIRKSEN. Asked the question "Do you believe presidential candidates should hold TV debates?" he replied:

> I don't care. This is my indifferent day—I have a terrible chest cold, so, when I have this terrible chest cold why should I worry about TV debates unless it can help me? Maybe if I didn't have this terrible chest cold I would care more.

Thank you, Senator DIRKSEN, now we know.

Then, we study an attractive brochure which crosses our desk. It depicts the Governor of Pennsylvania with the caption "The Man Who Gets Things Done." On the back it lists his qualifications thusly:

> In a technical sense, this man is a most attractive political property. What one sees in the flesh is a six-foot-two of lean American man, the body slender and muscular from skiing in winter, tennis in summer. The face is thin and boyish; the hair silvering without a trace of balding; the voice is robust, Hudson Valley rather than Ivy League—and sexy. From Washington, Pa. to Washington, D.C., when William Warren Scranton moves through a room, the eyes of the dowagers caress him as a son, and young girls wriggle.

Whoopee! Maybe next time we can run Charles Atlas or Miss America with a topless bathing suit. Oh well, this was the week that was and we probably will survive anyway.

WHOSE TRADE PACT?

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, under the superb misdirection of that great architect of appeasement of communism, Averell Harriman, the State Department and the White House have again agreed to subsidize a Communist government so that it may perpetuate tyranny over its people. I refere to the recent agreement with the Red Government of Rumania. I include as part of my remarks and as typical of comments substantiating my point, two editorials; one, of June 11 from the San Diego Union, the other of June 15, from the Philadelphia Bulletin:

[From the San Diego (Calif.) Union, June 11, 1964]

IS WEST BEING DUPED BY RUMANIA?

The all-front Communist offensive is many faceted. It can be grim, as in southeast Asia, or it can be exceptionally misguiding, as it was intended to be.

The latter type of offensive was demonstrated most recently by the Communist Government of Rumania, which announced it was releasing thousands of political prisoners. In addition there supposedly will be a general pardon in August for nearly all jail inmates.

There has been an intensive effort in the last year to create the impression that Rumania was feuding with the Soviet.

Recent signing of a trade pact between the United States and Rumania heightened concern among our allies that this country is being taken in by Communist blandishments.

Rumania has yet to renounce communism Until that time comes, we still should regard any appeasement effort on the part of the Reds as only a carefully calculated move to inspire faith in communism.

The link between Bucharest and Moscow still is solidly welded. It is not likely to be broken.

Western enthusiasm for Rumania's release of political—or anti-Communist—prisoners, therefore should be curtailed. The move is designed solely to lull the West into the feeling that conditions, after all, aren't so bad in the Communist world.

Rumania still is enslaved by communism. When the yoke of enslavement is broken, the free world can regard that Government's actions as sincere.

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Bulletin, June 15, 1964]

WHOSE TRADE PACT?

(By Alessandro Gregorian)

Rumania signed her recent economic and diplomatic agreements with the United States in complete understanding with Moscow, according to reports gathered from reliable diplomatic sources in Vienna, Rome, and Bonn.

In spite of some hasty speculations foreseeing an economic and even political wedge between the Soviet Union and Gheorghe Gheorghiu-Dej's government in Bucharest, the reports say, Rumania is still strongly controlled by Nikita Khrushchev.

There are Russian advisers and technicians placed in key positions of the Rumanian economy in Bucharest; there are Russian liaison men at the headquarters of the Rumanian Communist Party, and Russian officers mastering the Rumanian Army and security network.

A direct Russian pipeline from Ploesti to Reni and Odessa on the Black Sea has been in operation since 1948, pouring out more than a half of the 12 million tons produced annually by the Rumanian oil industry.

Uranium extracted in west Rumania in substantial quantities is entirely exported to the U.S.S.R. Immense quantities of natural gas tapped in Transylvania is absorbed by Russian industry.

HAVE NO CHOICE

Under such circumstances, it is stressed, Rumania, which shares a lengthy border with the gigantic Soviet empire, hardly could afford any gesture of independence.

American travelers returned from Rumania agree that Rumanians—who are 95 percent anti-Communist—are very much upset by their humiliating colonial status. But for the time being they have no choice but to try to get along with Khrushchev and his pro-consul in Bucharest, Gheorghiu-Dej.

Rumania, like other European captive countries, is economically exhausted. Russian exploitation plus a chaotic industrialization and a sterile agrarian policy, have drawn all the blood from that once rich nation. The country represents now a heavy burden for the Comecon (the uneconomical Red Common Market) and for the Soviet Union itself.

The situation could easily become explosive, especially in a time when the Soviet economy itself is facing many difficult problems aggravated by last year's disastrous crop.

At this critical turning point the rulers in the Kremlin, according to the diplomatic sources, decided that it was in their own interest to encourage their satellites to extend trade with the West. At the end would be the same Soviet Union which, within the closed circuit of the Comecon, would take the edge off it. This kind of logic seemed more profitable than any ideological intransigence.

MOSCOW PLAYS GAME

There was voiced some criticism in Moscow after Rumania and the United States of America signed the accords in Washington. Radio Moscow stated that trade linking members of the Comecon with the capitalistic world results in a drain of Soviet rubles to the "imperialists."

However, this kind of artificial criticism sounds rather as a part of a staged game. If Khrushchev were really unhappy with the deal, he could have easily stopped the bargain with a simple "Nyet."

Now, how will the Rumanian People's Republic manage to pay for the merchandise she intends to buy on the American market? Since her squeezed economy offers in exchange of heavy industrial equipment only walnuts, caviar, glassware, and plywood, it follows that the payment for American products ought to be made in gold.

And that gold is entirely in the Kremlin. Rumanian gold mines are exploited by the Soviet Union and the Rumanian State Bank has no gold reserves of its own. In other words, the real purchaser who on May 31 signed the trade pact in Washington was the U.S.S.R., and the occasional criticism murmured in Moscow was nothing more than the usual propagandistic doubletalk.

The diplomatic agreement elevating the legations in Washington and Bucharest to embassies gave rise to legitimate apprehensions among the Rumanian leaders in exile and the American citizens of Rumanian descendancy.

They interpret this move as another step toward the consolidation of the Ccmmunist dictatorship in Bucharest, which could have a demoralizing effect upon 20 million of their enslaved brothers.

BUYING FREEDOM

For one thing, they have in mind a cold war black market that the Red Rumanian Government has dealt in for some time. Rumanians living in America and other parts of the free world are invited to "buy" their relatives or friends blocked behind the Iron Curtain. The sums vary from $4,000 to $10,000 a head depending upon the political condition of the person to be "purchased."

In fact, during the negotiations with the Red delegation in Washington, a group of American citizens representing all civic and religious Rumanian organizations handed to President Johnson a strong memorandum. "The Rumanian people," they stated in the memorandum, "are fully entitled to national independence. They have the inalienable right to live under a government and institutions of their own choice."

The leaders expressed the fear that any further concession made to the Red dictators would have disastrous consequences upon the destiny of the Eastern European nations.

Mr. Speaker, American military personnel are dying in Vietnam fighting communism. Billions of dollars are being spent on maintenance of our forces in Western Europe, presumably as a deterrent to Communist aggression. It it not the height of irony to subsidize any Communist country? Is it not the height of irony to subsidize Communist countries which, in turn, help keep Castro afloat?

It is also interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, in this area of accommodation of communism that the decision has been made by the administration to postpone Senate ratification of the Consulate Treaty with the Soviet Union until after the election. That treaty will become a vehicle of espionage activity in the Soviet Union to be conducted under the cloak of diplomatic immunity.

This administration is claiming many labels but the one that suits it best is the label of the lucrative deal with Communist governments. With men such as Mr. Harriman so dedicated to appeasing communism, it is not surprising that our foreign policy continues to take a tragic turn of events.

PENNSYLVANIA MUSHROOM INDUSTRY

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAGUE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, some 70 percent of the mushrooms produced in America are raised in Chester County, Pa., the county where I reside.

Mushrooms are a completely unsubsidized crop and the success our producers have enjoyed over the years attests to the wisdom of keeping their operation on a completely free enterprise basis.

In recent years, the last 3 to be exact, we have been faced with an evergrowing threat posted by the importation of mushrooms grown in Formosa. What troubles us most in this connection is the fact that the production of foreign-grown mushrooms has been subsidized with American dollars.

The General Assembly at Harrisburg, Pa., has taken cognizance of this situation and on June 8, last, adopted House Resolution No. 53 which is appended to and made a part of these remarks.

THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF PENNSYLVANIA, HOUSE RESOLUTION 53

Whereas the mushroom growing and canning industry is one of the foundation stones of Pennsylvania's agricultural economy, gainfully employing thousands of workers who produce a useful and unique product consumed throughout the Nation; and

Whereas the continued existence of this great Pennsylvania industry as a viable force in our economy is now in dire jeopardy due to a torrential flood of low-priced imports from a single cheap labor country which have mounted to nearly 50 percent of domestic production in less than 3 years; resulting in wholesale bankruptcies and hardship to Pennsylvania farmers and canners; and

Whereas every factor indicates even greater future onslaughts which will surely sound the death knell of a great American industry located primarily in the State of Pennsylvania: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania requests his excellency, William W. Scranton, Governor of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, to intercede on behalf of the people of this Commonwealth and the mushroom industry with the President of the United States and the U.S. Tariff Commission to impose tariffs on the import of mushrooms of a sufficient amount to make them competitive with the domestic mushroom industry; and be it further

Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania memorialize Congress to take whatever steps may be necessary to protect the weakening and declining domestic mushroom industry, and restore the same to a competitive market; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to Gov. William W. Scranton; President Lyndon B. Johnson; U.S. Tariff Commission; the presiding officer of each House of the Congress of the United States; and to each Senator and Member of the House of Representatives from Pennsylvania in the Congress of the United States.

EFFECTIVE LOCAL ENFORCEMENT OF HOUSING CODES IS THE ESSENTIAL BUT OFTEN MISSING ELEMENT IN PREVENTING THE SPREAD AND RECURRENCE OF SLUMS

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, effective local enforcement of housing codes is the essential but often missing element in preventing the spread and recurrence of slums. I have introduced bill H.R. 11850, to improve and strengthen the enforcement of good housing codes by local officials.

My interest in effective enforcement of local housing codes, as a major weapon in preventing the spread and recurrence of slums, is of several years' standing. As author of the workable program provisions of the Housing Act of 1954, I have long believed that enforcement of good housing codes by city officials is vital to any sound and realistic program of slum and blight prevention.

However, through the years, certain deficiencies have become apparent in the workable program provisions of the National Housing Act, and the time has come to deal forthrightly with these deficiencies. As we all know, urban renewal grants are made conditional on community maintenance of a workable program of minimum housing code enforcement. However, as Senator PELL said, on June 4 this year:

> There is no reasonable criteria of what a workable program should be.

He said that Providence, R.I., does much better than most cities in enforcing the local housing code, spending an average of 46 cents per resident on the administration of housing codes, while other cities spend as little as 3 cents per resident. He commented:

> Obviously, there is a wide interpretation as to what constitutes a workable program of code enforcement when there is such a wide disparity in administrative costs.

Senator PELL would improve the workable program by providing in his bill, S. 2889, that 5 percent of the funds granted for an urban renewal project shall be expended for code enforcement, to help insure that adequate standards of health, sanitation, and safety are met. The 5 percent figure seems reasonable enough, but the bill provides, in addition, that the Federal Government, and the American taxpayers as a whole, shall pay up to three-fourths of the cost of local housing code enforcement.

In my view, there is no justification for saddling the Federal Government with the costs of code enforcement except in urban renewal project areas where they would be part of the total project cost. The cost of code enforcement throughout the city outside of urban renewal project areas should be borne by local municipal governments. The Federal Government and the taxpayers are already bearing up to three-fourths of the cost of local urban renewal projects. To add to this cost the cost of local code enforcement would simply open the floodgates and lead to saddling the Federal Government with the cost of other programs which cities should rightly bear.

While there is general agreement that the enforcement of local housing codes by local officials would make a major contribution to ending slums and blighted conditions in our cities, there is little agreement as to who is to pay the costs of such code enforcement.

Interest in my own bill for strengthening housing code enforcement has been expressed by the National Association of Real Estate Boards, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, and Americans for Democratic Action.

Hugh Morris, author of the Washington Housing Report, which is published by a number of newspapers, including the Boston Sunday Globe, wrote on June 14, 1964, that:

> Other groups also favoring local housing code enforcement contend that cities do not have either manpower or the money, without Federal assistance, to undertake systematic enforcement citywide or even over entire urban renewal areas.
>
> Their argument is that residential areas which do not need clearance or major rehabilitation can be kept up to minimum standards through code enforcement and delay need for urban renewal later on, if not avoid it altogether. Among groups advocating such a course through Federal assistance are the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials, U.S. Conference of Mayors, ADA, National Housing Conference, and American Municipal Association.

There is, however, as I have said, a legitimate role for the Federal Government in aiding code enforcement in those areas declared to be urban renewal areas. This has been recognized by the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania, Senator CLARK, and I have incorporated into my bill his suggestion that the Federal Government pay a share of the cost of code enforcement in urban renewal project areas.

I have also included in my bill a suggestion which I offered as an amendment to the Housing Act of 1961. This provision would require that the community with respect to which an application for Federal urban renewal financial assistance is made must have had in effect for at least 1 year prior to the filing of such application a minimum standards housing code, related but not limited to health, sanitation, and occupancy requirements, which is deemed adequate by the Housing Administrator and which he determines has been satisfactorily enforced from the time of its adoption or for at least 1 year prior to the filing of such application. An added proviso in this section of my new bill states that "nothing in this section shall authorize the Administrator to establish a uniform national housing code."

In order to fully protect the autonomy of local governments I have offered an amendment to the National Housing Act to provide that when the Housing and Home Finance Agency has approved the workable program for a locality the criteria used to determine substandard housing in a proposed urban renewal project area shall be no more restrictive than the housing standards of the locality. The inclusion of this safeguard became necessary when it was shown that local planning and urban renewal officials in such cities as Washington, D.C., have used special housing standards, more restrictive than those normally used by the cities involved, to classify sound housing structures as substandard in order to provide the quantity of existing substandard housing needed to qualify good residential areas as urban renewal project areas.

My amendment to strengthen housing code enforcement, which I offered in 1961, was turned down by the Democratic majority. It is obvious from the efforts now being made by the members of the majority party in Congress to improve housing code enforcement that strengthening amendments such as I offered in 1961 were then, and are now, necessary, and I hope, on behalf of the slum dwellers, that it will receive more favorable treatment at this time.

The late President Kennedy was known to be interested in the problems of social security recipients living in substandard housing. The problems involved in the subsidy of slum lords through Federal public welfare payments to the elderly, dependent children, and others is one that has plagued conscientious Federal, State, and local officials for years. In his February 21, 1963, message on the elderly citizens of our Nation, President Kennedy said, in part:

> Adequate housing is essential to a full, satisfying life for all age groups in our population. The elderly have special needs for housing designed to sustain their independence even when disability occurs, and to promote dignity, self-respect, and usefulness in later years. Yet millions of older people are forced to live in inferior homes because they cannot find or afford better. Nearly half of our people 65 and older, it has been estimated, live in substandard housing or in housing unsuited to their special needs.

I have included in my bill, therefore, a provision which is similar to section 4 of S. 1358 introduced by Senator Smathers, and also similar to section 4 of H.R. 5839, introduced by our distinguished colleague, the chairman of the House Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Mills].

Mr. Speaker, I include as part of my remarks the text of my new bill, H.R. 11850:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 101 of the Housing Act of 1949 (42 U.S.C. 1451) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(e) No contract shall be entered into for a capital grant under this title unless such contract requires that an amount not to exceed 5 per centum of the financial aid to be provided in such contract will have been expended by the locality during the preceding year, and an amount not less than 5 per centum of such Federal aid shall be expended by the locality during each year covered by the contract, for the correction of substandard housing conditions and for the enforcement of housing, zoning, building, and other local laws, codes, and regulations relating to land use and adequate standards of health, sanitation, and safety for buildings, including the use and occupancy of dwellings; and the amount of such expenditures by the locality may not constitute a part of the Federal grants-in-aid or the local contribution under this title. When the Housing and Home Finance Administrator has approved the workable program for a locality the criteria used to determine substandard housing in a proposed urban renewal project area shall be no more restrictive than the housing standards of the locality."

Sec. 2. (a) Paragraph (5) of the second sentence of section 110(c) of the Housing Act of 1949 is amended by striking the phrase "a program of" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "Programs of code enforcement and".

(b) Any contract for a capital grant under such Act executed prior to the effective date of this Act, may be amended to incorporate the provisions of subsection (a) for costs incurred on or after that date.

Sec. 3. Section 101(c) of the Housing Act of 1949 (relating to the requirement that a community have a workable program for effectively dealing with the problems of urban slums and blight) is amended by striking out "and (2)" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "(2) the locality with respect to which an application for assistance under this title is made has had in effect for at least one year prior to the filing of such application a minimum standards housing code, related but not limited to health, sanitation, and occupancy requirements, which is deemed adequate by the Administrator and which he determines has been satisfactorily enforced from the time of its adoption or for at least one year prior to the filing of such application, whichever is the lesser, but nothing in this section shall authorize the Administrator to establish a uniform national housing code, and (3)".

Sec. 4. Section 101(c) of the Housing Act of 1949 is further amended by inserting after "for effectively dealing with the problem of urban slums and blight within the community" the following: ", for requiring that the use of Federal funds (under this title, under title I, IV, VII, X, XI, XIV, or XVI of the Social Security Act, and under any other law) for the payment, including rents, for housing accommodations be conditioned upon the establishment or designation of a State or local authority or authorities which shall be responsible for developing and maintaining standards of health and safety for such housing accommodations and upon such accommodations conforming to the minimum standards housing code, laws, and regulations relating to health, sanitation, and safety for buildings required by section 101(a),".

STATE LEGISLATIVE DISTRICTS AND THE FEDERAL COURTS

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Meader] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, in recent decisions regarding district boundaries for State legislatures and the U.S. House of Representatives, the U.S. Supreme Court has in effect taken from the American people their power to determine the composition of their representative legislative bodies.

All can agree that there have been inequalities and inequities in legislative districts, some of which were intentionally created by the party in power to perpetuate itself, such as gerrymandering, and others which have occurred as a result of economic trends and population shifts. Over the decades the United States has been gradually transformed from a predominantly agricultural economy to a predominantly industrial urban economy with huge concentrations of population in metropolitan areas. Legislative districts which originally may have been fair for rural America have not been altered in keeping with the shifts in concentration of population.

No one can gainsay the proposition that it has at all times been within the power of the electorate, if sufficiently aroused, to demand reforms. By making representative inequality an issue in campaigns for legislative bodies, the people have had the capacity to elect those pledged to reforms. The fact that the people have seen fit not to do so may well proceed either from a general satisfaction with the system as it exists, indifference, or at least a lack of strong conviction or interest on the part of the people.

The power of the people is not alone to decide rightly or wisely. It also is the power to make mistakes or decide foolishly.

A majority of the Supreme Court, not elected by anybody and in no way responsible to the people for its action, have taken unto themselves this discretion of the electorate and have decided for citizens what the Court believes would be a desirable system through which the people can express their will on national policy.

The legislative bodies, including the House of Representatives, have lost their autonomy and vitality by being subjected to judicial decree. Individual members and individual communities have lost immeasurably by a cataclysmic shakeup of existing relationships through court disturbance, but by far the greatest losers are the American people who, if the doctrine stands, no longer are sovereign to determine, whether rightly or wrongly, how their legislative bodies are to be composed.

These court decisions are an arrogant usurpation of naked power at the expense of the people and legislative bodies, asserted through specious and farfetched interpretations of constitutional phrases. Unless the disastrous doctrine of the Supreme Court decisions, followed and possibly expanded by lower Federal courts, is dealt with swiftly and effectively by legislative bodies and the people they represent, a system of government which has provided not only the maximum of happiness and well-being but the maximum of liberty and self-determination of any system of government in history will be a thing of the past.

Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill to withdraw the jurisdiction of Federal district courts and the appellate jurisdiction of the U.S. Supreme Court with respect to laws establishing the boundaries of State legislative districts. The text of the bill is as follows:

> That (a) chapter 85 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:
>
> "§ 1361. Legislative districts
>
> "A district court shall not have jurisdiction of any action to enjoin, suspend, or modify the operation of any law respecting the boundaries of, or the number of persons to be elected from, any district from which persons are elected to the legislature of any State."
>
> (b) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 85 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:
>
> "1361. Legislative districts."
>
> Sec. 2. (a) Chapter 81 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:
>
> "§ 1259. Exception to appellate jurisdiction in cases involving legislative districts
>
> "The Supreme Court of the United States shall not have appellate jurisdiction of any action of any type described in section 1361 of this title."
>
> (b) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 81 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:
>
> "1259. Exception to appellate jurisdiction in cases involving legislative districts."

Wednesday, July 22, 1964, Subcommittee No. 5 of the House Judiciary Committee will commence hearings on bills and resolutions relating to State legislative districts. Some of the resolutions provide for an amendment to the Constitution of the United States aimed at permitting one house of a State legislature to be based upon factors other than population alone. Some of the bills, like the one I have introduced, are aimed at withdrawing jurisdiction of Federal courts with regard to the apportionment and districting of State legislatures. The committee, of course, will consider which of the two approaches should be adopted.

Those advocating a constitutional amendment argue that the Supreme Court would either hold a withdrawal statute unconstitutional or would in some fashion circumvent it. I am not willing to believe that the Court will disregard the power expressly and plainly vested in the Congress under article 3, section 1 to create "such inferior Courts as the Congress may from time to time ordain and establish," nor the provision in article 3, section 2, clause 2, that "the supreme Court shall have appellate Jurisdiction, both as to Law and Fact, with such Exceptions, and under such Regulations as the Congress shall make."

I chose to follow the course of withdrawal of Federal court jurisdiction for the following reasons:

First. It is clearly within the power of the Congress under the provisions of the Constitution quoted above.

Second. It will require only a majority vote of both Houses of Congress rather than the two-thirds vote required to amend the Constitution.

Third. The law can become effective immediately whereas a constitutional amendment would not become effective until ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States.

Fourth. It will put the Congress squarely on record in defending its power, its prerogatives and its influence as one of the tripartite branches of Government and repudiating judicial intrusion into the legislative process.

Fifth. Acting by statute rather than constitutional amendment will avoid adding amendments to the Constitution, a document which defines the basic structure of our Government and which in the 175 years of our history has been successfully amended no more than 14 times.

Mr. Speaker, the issue presented in the bill I have just introduced is basic and historic. Every one of the 50 States and their inhabitants and every one of the 435 Members of this body should give this issue No. 1 priority. I invite my colleagues to join with me either by introducing companion bills or otherwise indicating their support in defending our representative system of government and repelling the attack made upon it by the Federal judiciary.

PRAYER IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Becker] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting herewith an article which appeared in the Torch, in June 1964, written by the national chaplain of the Veterans of World War I. The words of Father Montagna, in this article, very clearly point out that the word of God, of a Supreme Being, has been a part of our national tradition for over 175 years. This is only one of the many articles, letters, petitions, and resolutions I am receiving regularly which are certain evidence there is nothing to back up statements being made that "the tide is turning" against any amendment to permit prayer and Bible reading in public schools. More mail is coming in now in support of an amendment; more groups, clergymen, and organizations are joining in support every day.

I hope that Members will sign Discharge Petition No. 3, and bring this matter to the floor as quickly as possible, now that we have waited 2 years for the Judiciary Committee to act, and they have not.

[From the Torch, June 1964]

Chaplain's Corner

(By Rev. Joseph Montagna, national chaplain)

Dear buddies, attention.

What many citizens may lose sight of, is the fact that the cornerstone upon which our national structure was built—and whether you believe in Him or not, the truth is that we always refer in our official documents, and we have on the cornerstones of all public schools and buildings: in the "year of our Lord."

Now, following up my articles on the Bible, prayer, and an amendment to the Constitution, I have heard and read statements saying that God is not mentioned in the Constitution. In case you hear this statement repeated by some atheist, you should ask him what makes up a formal legal document and if he does not recognize the name of the Lord, why pick up a copy of the Constitution and show him the location and the date of document which reads as follows:

"Done in convention the seventeenth day of September in the Year of our Lord, one thousand seven hundred and eighty-seven."

There you have the profession of faith, subscribed to by all of the signers, and it is this fact which you may say, is the source, from which has sprung up all of the moral principles and the law of the land as placed in the Constitution.

It is this profession of faith which is the "foundation stone" upon which rests not only our national edifice and our American way of life, but the religious and the whole social structure of Western civilization.

So, let me repeat, if the Founding Fathers subscribed to this profession of faith in God and we do find the holy name on the cornerstone of most of the public schools and buildings and also on all official documents, I ask, why cannot we mention and pray to God in the public schools?

Dear veterans, please write to your Congressman immediately. Let someone speak out for our Lord and may He bless you all.

MEN OF DECISION NEED OUR PRAYERS

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Becker] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting herewith an article by the Most Reverend Bishop Fulton J. Sheen.

I believe this article, from its beginning to the very end, offers a message to the Members of Congress which should not go unheeded.

Men of Decision Need Our Prayers

(By Bishop Fulton J. Sheen)

I wonder how many ever think of praying for the President, or for those in authority. The higher the apple is on the tree, the more sticks are thrown at it, and the more eminent the position, the greater the critics.

Praise there is for those eminent in position, but generally this is not consoling, because such men have had to bear the slings and arrows of outrageous fortune. Applause means little anyway, because it is something that lies wholly in the hands of other men. But how many ever think of praying for the chief magistrate of a nation, or for Governors, Members of Congress, and the like?

Whether such persons be Christians, pagan, Jewish, or persecutors does not in any way minimize their need of guidance and light. When St. Paul wrote to his friend, Timothy, he said: "First, supplications, prayers, intercessions and thanksgivings should be made on behalf of all men: for kings and rulers in positions of responsibility, so that our common life may be lived in peace and quiet, for the proper sense of God and of our responsibility to Him for what we do with our lives." When St. Paul wrote this letter, all of the kings were pagans, and many of them were persecutors. Despite this, he made no appeal for revolution, nor did he suggest that thrones be upset; only that centers of power be purified. Even if we are convinced that the rulers are not the best, this is no reason for refusing to intercede.

When our Constitution was being drawn up, George Washington wrote to Benjamin Franklin despairing at the slowness of the proceedings, and repenting at the slowness of the proceedings, and repenting that he ever had "any agency in the business." Franklin wrote back to Washington asking why there had been no prayer among the framers of the Constitution, and suggesting that they be offered at once:

"In this situation of this assembly, groping as it were in the dark to find political truth and scarce able to distinguish it when presented to us, how has it happened, Sir, that we have not hitherto once thought of humbly applying to the Father of lights to illuminate our understandings. In the beginning of the contest with Great Britain, when we were sensible of danger, we had daily prayer in this room for Divine Protection. Our prayers were heard and they were graciously answered, Sir * * * To that kind of providence we owe this happy opportunity of consulting in peace on the means of establishing our future national felicity, and we have now forgotten that powerful Friend. Or do we imagine we no longer need His assistance? I have lived a long time and the longer I live, the more convincing proofs I see of this truth: that God governs in the affairs of men and if the sparrow cannot fall to the ground without His notice, is it probable that an empire can raise without His aid."

When Lincoln was leaving Springfield for Washington, he addressed his friends and neighbors from the platform of the train: "Well, friends and neighbors, there is one thing you can do for me, that I ask you to do, and that is—pray for me."

Men in authority frequently need prayers more than other men need them, partly because of the heavier burdens which fall upon their shoulders, or because of the need of guidance of a spirit beyond the human to direct their decision, and also that they may become more conscious that the power they have must be exercised in the Name of Him Who gave it. I would even suggest that the schoolchildren of the United States pray especially for the Supreme Court of the United States who told them that they should not pray in school.

OPEN BIBLE STANDARD CHURCHES ENDORSE PRAYER AND BIBLE READING IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BECKER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I am taking the liberty of inserting herewith a resolution adopted by the Open Bible Standard Churches in their annual conference held in St. Petersburg, Fla., June 25–28, 1964.

This resolution is indicative of the fact that church groups and organizations throughout this country are deeply concerned that a constitutional amendment to permit prayer and Bible reading in public school be adopted.

Every day these resolutions are reaching my office, and anyone who states that the "tide has turned" to opposition to any amendment is just "whistling in the dark."

I sincerely hope that Members of the House will sign Discharge Petition No. 3 and permit this subject to be discussed on the floor, amended if necessary, and voted on. There is no doubt in my mind what the outcome would be.

Certainly it does not seem reasonable that anyone would want to prevent the American people, through their State legislatures, from voicing their opinions on the matter of ratification of such an amendment.

To the Honorable Members of the House of Representatives of these United States of America:

Whereas on June 17, 1963, the U.S. Supreme Court declared unconstitutional State laws requiring Bible reading and recitation of the Lord's Prayer in the public schools; and

Whereas suits are being filed in some of the States requesting the words "Under God" to be deleted from the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag of the United States, and to take away tax exemption privileges from the churches; and

Whereas the atheistic minority has as future targets the abolition of Government-paid military chaplains, courtroom oaths, our national motto "In God We Trust," and other God-honoring practices in connection with our national life: be it

Resolved by the Open Bible Standard Churches, Inc., with headquarters at 851 19th Street, Des Moines, Iowa, in their 32d annual convention, convening in St. Petersburg, Fla., June 25–28, 1964, with 400 ministers and delegates from 20 States and 5 foreign countries in attendance:

First: That this convention respectfully refers the 435 Members of the U.S. House of Representatives to House Joint Resolution 693 regarding a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States, presented by Representative FRANK J. BECKER of the Fifth Congressional District of the State of New York, September 10, 1963.

Second: Since we understand that Discharge Petition No. 3 has been filed and requires 218 signatures of Members of the House of Representatives to bring this bill to the floor and that presently there have been 166 signatures to this petition, that, if you have not already done so, we urge you to sign Discharge Petition No. 3 at the Clerk's desk while the House is still in session.

Respectfully submitted.

OPEN BIBLE STANDARD CHURCHES, INC.,
K. B. MITCHELL,
General Chairman.

AUTHENTIC REPORT ON BRACERO CHAOS

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. TALCOTT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, recently the State Board of Agriculture of the No. 1 agricultural State of the Nation held an inquiry concerning the alarming prospects facing California agriculture without adequate supplemental labor to prevent crop spoilage.

The California State Board of Agriculture is gravely concerned about the irreparable injury crop spoilage will cause to allied industries and consumers across the Nation.

The Grower-Shipper Vegetable Association of Central California, Salinas, has made extensive and thorough studies of the supplemental labor supply situation.

Jack E. Bias, executive vice president, made a partial, but up-to-date, report to the board of agriculture. It is the most informative and accurate statement concerning the bracero program which has come to my attention. For members genuinely interested in America's food supply, I insert the testimony of Mr. Bias and commend it to your reading.

California agriculture is faced with a momentous problem in determining its future destiny due to the impending agriculture labor shortage which will occur when Public Law 78 is terminated December 31, 1964.

California agriculture produces a gross annual income in excess of $3 billion of new wealth, and if a substantial labor shortage occurs, this gross income will be drastically reduced. This will not only force many agricultural producers into bankruptcy but will directly affect the multitude of allied businesses and industries which sell to and service, or are otherwise dependent upon agricultural interests.

If agricultural fieldworkers are not sufficiently available, then there will be many thousands of domestic workers who will find themselves out of employment due to the growers' inability to produce agricultural crops for processing and other related allied industries. Every segment of California's economy is dependent directly or indirectly on the ability of growers to produce foods and fibers which is the lifeblood of the general economy.

California agriculture has grown and prospered over the years for several reasons, one of which is the wonderful soil and weather conditions with which California is endowed. We are able to grow almost 200 different foods and fibers, and in many cases, California produces well over 50 percent of the national consumption of these crops. Contrary to the impression of many, California agriculture is not highly subsidized. As a matter of fact, only 2 to 3 percent of California agriculture receives any subsidization, and much of this small percentage is returned to the Government following the marketing of the commodity, such as with sugarbeets. We wish to emphasize that our fruit and vegetable industries do not receive any subsidy in any way.

I believe it would be appropriate to review the early and current sources of agricultural farm labor. At the turn of the century, many of the workers were of Chinese or Hindu origin, however, until the early twenties, not too many were required because most of the agriculturists were operating small family farms. As California grew in population, more land was developed for agricultural purposes and, for the first time, many Japanese were employed. By 1940 it has been estimated that there were around 35,000 Japanese working in agriculture. It was also during the late twenties and early thirties that approximately 15,000 Filipinos were brought into California to meet the then shortage of agricultural workers. Agriculture continued to grow, and it required more and more agricultural workers. Our friends from Mexico were called upon. By the early forties is has been estimated that there were between 100,000 and 150,000 so-called "wetback" Mexican workers in California.

We are all regretfully aware of what happened to the Japanese agricultural workers following the declaration of World War II. They were sent out of California. Thousands of the Filipinos entered the armed services and other thousands returned to the Philippines when the Philippines were given their independence. Although there are many thousands of Filipinos and Japanese in California today, most have taken advantage of our educational opportunities and are presently professional or business people. There are comparatively few now employed in agriculture.

During 1949 to 1951 agriculturists depending on supplemental workers agreed and worked with the U.S. Immigration Service and the U.S. Department of Labor to eliminate Mexican "wetbacks" from California. Agriculturists supported requests for larger appropriations to the Immigration Service to police the Mexican border and, in return, had the assurance of the Immigration Service, the Department of Labor, and the State Department, that supplemental agricultural workers would be available to agriculture. The highly regulated Mexican national program, Public Law 78, was accepted.

In 1947 those employers depending upon and using the Mexican national program agreed with and supported the philosophy that the Government should not finance the recruiting and placement of Mexican nationals. It was at this time that users agreed to pay the recruiting, transportation, and subsistence costs to bring Mexican agricultural workers into the United States. Presently, the grower-user pays to the U.S. Department of Labor $15 for each man recruited, and in addition, pays the transportation and subsistence costs of each worker brought into the United States.

It is unfortunate and beyond the growers' comprehension that many people think the bracero, or Mexican national, is recruited or brought into the country at the will and whim of the grower-user. This certainly is not the fact or the truth. Before a grower can have the services of one bracero, he first must place an order for his required number of domestics with the California Department of Employment specifying the acreage and type of crop in which workers are needed, the rate of pay, working conditions, and the period for which he will need agricultural workers.

Not until the California Department of Employment has made wage surveys to determine the prevailing rate in the area, and not until the department has determined there are not sufficient domestic agricultural workers available will they certify a need for Mexican national supplemental workers; and even after a certification is given, domestic agricultural workers have the first opportunity for the work. For example—if a grower has need for 10 workers and he receives a certification for 10 Mexican nationals and he pays for their recruitment and transportation to his place of employment, and then 10 domestic workers become available, the grower is required to release his Mexican nationals and employ the domestic workers, provided they are able, willing, and qualified.

The Mexican nations can only be contracted for a limited period of time not exceeding 6 months, with the exception that 15 percent may be recontracted for a period not exceeding 3 months. Actually the Mexican national program makes maximum employment available to domestic agricultural workers because they have the opportunity for any job a Mexican national has to the extent of the elimination of the Mexican national.

It might be pointed out at this point that even if supplemental domestic agricultural workers were available there would be many sociological problems created that are not present with the bracero program. I refer to additional relief programs, housing, medical and educational facilities which will be needed for the many thousands of children that would be brought into California by agricultural workers. I will not take the time to go into detail on this subject. Even though it is a momentous one, I am sure you gentlemen are already familiar with the implications.

This problem has not existed under the Mexican national program because the braceros are repatriated as soon as the job for which they are certified is completed or as soon as there are sufficient domestic workers available to take their place. It is surprising to growers that the State department of employment and the U.S. Department of Labor have not emphasized and made known the facts related above as well as the fact that the Mexican national program is highly regulated. All agricultural housing in which braceros or domestic workers are to be housed must first be inspected by the State housing authority, the U.S. Department of Labor compliance personnel, and the local health authorities. Menus must be regularly posted and strict supervision is provided for the type of food to be fed to Mexican nationals. Growers must furnish them a pint of milk a day, provide a regulated amount of meat and other foods, the kitchens and appurtenances must be kept in a very clean and sanitary condition and are regularly inspected.

I have taken the time to review some of these facts as I am sure many people do not appreciate or know the actual operation of the bracero program.

The big question is, Who are the growers going to use for labor in 1965? We know the need exists for supplemental labor. According to our State Department of Employment's figures there were the following number of Mexican nationals under contract in California as of June 13, 1964. Let us look at these figures for a moment and compare them with those of 1 year ago.

	1964	*1963*
Desert	3, 140	5, 980
South coast	12, 530	13, 500
Central coast	12, 880	12, 280
North coast	0	0
San Joaquin	6, 720	6, 270
Sacramento	2, 600	1, 230
Total	37, 870	39, 260

In addition to these, it can be estimated that this year there will be 60,000 to 70,000 Mexican nationals recruited and working in agriculture in California by September, usually our peak month of need. Where are growers going to recruit and obtain domestic agricultural workers to replace these braceros? The California Department of Employment and the U.S. Department of Labor would not be certifying for braceros now and during the year if there were sufficient domestic workers available in this State. Why do not these agencies make this clear and plain to the State and Federal administrations and to the public? The U.S. Department of Labor has informed some growers that there are plenty of available agricultural workers in the southeastern part of the United States. Why, then, is the U.S. Department of Labor certifying and permitting Florida and the east coast to bring in agricultural contract workers from the British West Indies and Puerto Rico? If there are sufficient agricultural workers in the Northeastern United States and the Northwest, why is the Department of Labor certifying as to the need for and permitting growers to bring in supplementary workers from Canada?

One California grower has recently written to the State employment offices in 18 different States in an attempt to find available, qualified workers for his requirements. Some of the answers are as follows:

Ohio: "Ohio agricultural employers and this agency find themselves in approximately the same situation you are experiencing. Basically, Ohio is a labor demand State, and we depend almost entirely upon the domestic labor source States for seasonal workers. Any surplus of intrastate workers is usually available only for local commitments."

West Virginia: "We regret to inform you that West Virginia is a demand State instead of a supply State for agricultural labor. We recruit hundreds of workers from Southern States, especially Florida, for our crop harvests. During the past 11 years we have also found it necessary to utilize foreign workers from the British West Indies."

Arkansas: "Since Arkansas has been a user of Mexican national farm labor in our fruit, vegetable, and cotton crops, we know that you will readily recognize that we, too, are faced with a severe shortage of seasonal farm labor which will be greatly intensified with the termination of Public Law 78."

New Mexico: "We will be glad to expose your jobs to applicants contacting our offices; there is no known source of farmworkers available for recruitment in this State. We do not anticipate that any significant number of workers can be referred for employment with you."

Kansas: "In reply to your recent letter regarding farm labor, we find it necessary each year to bring in workers from other States to cultivate sugarbeets."

Oklahoma: "With reference to your letter requesting assistance in the recruitment of contract farm labor, this is to advise it has been our experience that the recruitment of contract farm labor for out-of-State movement has been very unproductive."

Georgia: "We do refer Georgia agricultural workers to other States when they are not needed for work in Georgia. These workers usually prefer work in Florida and up the eastern seaboard. It is therefore questionable whether any would be interested in working in California due to the distance involved."

Iowa: "There is no identifiable supply of qualified agricultural labor in Iowa that is available for or interested in seasonable work in other States."

South Dakota: "For your information, South Dakota has also relied on Public Law 78 for foreign labor. This labor is necessary to our sugarbeet fields."

Virginia: "We in Virginia are also feeling the effects of the expected termination of Public Law 78. This agency is attempting to develop areas of recruitment outside the State for our growers. Of course, Virginia does not have the need for or the great number of workers that California requires, but we too must recruit in other areas for our workers."

Utah: "For many years, Utah has also been supplementing its domestic farm labor requirements (both local and interstate workers) with Mexican national workers under the migrant labor agreement. This year we are finding it more difficult to recruit interstate farmworkers and it definitely appears that it will again be necessary to import some Mexican nationals."

Oregon: "During much of the year, Oregon has need for a large number of seasonal agricultural workers. The biggest percentage of these workers come from local sources, while a smaller but a very important number come from the migratory labor work force. We are in the process, as in the past, of recruiting laborers from all sources to meet our agricultural labor demand, therefore, during the summer months we do not have a supply of labor for recruitment into other areas."

Colorado: "For your information, the anticipated labor demands for vegetable workers in Colorado will far exceed their supply."

Several California growers and grower organizations have been and are presently attempting to recruit agricultural workers from Texas. Although there have been limited numbers available, the experience has been deplorable. Some of the workers are qualified and are working out very well, however, it is safe to say that at least 70 percent of the workers recruited are not satisfactory for the reasons—they either leave the job a few hours or days after employment, or just are not capable of doing the type of work required.

Some growers have recruited workers from other States, such as, Mississippi and Alabama, but again the experience has been very unsatisfactory as the workers are not able or willing to do the required tasks or they leave the job for other reasons. It should be pointed out that many workers recruited to work in areas far from their home become homesick and yearn for their friends. This is a major reason why many workers do not wish to leave their area for employment elsewhere, or if they do, they soon quit their jobs to return home. There are also many cases of "travel seekers" who don't intend to work when they reach California at our growers' expense.

It is wondered by many, if the so-called sociologists who have urged the termination of the bracero program, realize that there are not sufficient domestic workers willing and able to do the tasks required in this type of agriculture. Isn't it surprising that West Virginia and other Appalachian States must recruit supplemental workers to harvest their crops when there is so much poverty and unemployment in those same areas?

There is an additional fact, too, that the public and the adversaries of the Mexican national program apparently do not realize nor understand. It is that there is not a continuity of employment in agriculture, particularly in those jobs which have been performed by the Mexican nationals. These people apparently do not recognize that crops are perishable and must be harvested at their maturity date, nor that in the majority of cases 2 or 3 days, or as little as a few hours, may be the difference in harvesting a crop or seeing it deteriorate to the extent that it is not marketable.

Somehow the general public must be made to understand that supplemental workers in most areas only work for a few weeks or at the most a few months. The supplemental workers are normally only needed during the cultivation and harvesting period. It must also be understood that in some crops, domestics are not as adaptable as they are in others. Consider vegetable crops for example. Domestics just don't like the continuous kneeling and stooping type of work that is required. But the work must be done because the vegetable industry is one of the major commodity groups in the State of California today. The citrus industry is another which requires large numbers of supplemental workers. However, just because citrus trees are pleasant to look at does not mean that workers like to harvest the fruit. Citrus trees are very thorny and sticky and domestics do not like the work.

It is confounding to the growers to have agencies of government and other people asking them what they are going to do. It is not soothing for the grower to face bankruptcy, nor a decrease in his already low net income. They cannot set prices in the marketplace. They are subject to the law of supply and demand and to the hazards of weather. It is not easy for them to read of additional restrictive governmental regulations week after week, and they cannot presume that comforting legislation or other appropriate action will be taken to alleviate the impending shortage of farm labor.

They have before them nothing but questions, and the most important one is this: Why does not the State Department of Employment and the U.S. Department of Labor, with all the facts and statistics before them, and with knowledge of the facts that there are not sufficient numbers of supplemental workers available in the United States, take action to alleviate the problem?

Even in the face of these problems, agriculture is again ready to take action. You may be sure the growers and grower organizations will do everything they can to recruit agricultural workers from whatever source available; they are willing and wish to cooperate by doing whatever they can in conjunction with governmental agencies to use all available qualified domestic agricultural workers, and to improve their working conditions; and all of agriculture wants to work with our governmental agencies and the State and Federal administrations in an honest and conscientious effort to work out some program that will assure the public a plentiful food supply.

We are sure that a respected and appropriate program can be developed which will avoid certain disaster if action is not taken soon.

PARITY RATIO HITS 25-YEAR LOW

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Agriculture's parity announcement of June 30 shows more progress in reverse for the farmer.

The parity ratio—which shows the relationship between prices received and prices paid by farmers—last month hit a 25-year low at 74, down 1 point from the month before. The last time it sank that low was August 1939.

When Secretary Freeman took office, parity ratio was 81. Since then it has dropped each year.

For wheat farmers, the news was even worse. The same Department announcement showed wheat prices at only 56 percent of parity.

The Department's lame apology was that parity ratio would be higher if Government payments to farmers had been included in the computation.

Apparently, American agriculture has been transformed so radically under Secretary Freeman that Government payments are now an essential ingredient to farm income. The USDA announcement raises disturbing questions. Is permanent dependency on Government handouts the fate of the American farmer? Can the farmer survive otherwise?

TEACHERS

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. BROTZMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill today to clarify a problem confronting the teachers of this Nation. The Treasury Department has taken a restrictive approach as to what educational expenses of a teacher may be deducted as a business expense. It is clear that general educational expense is not deductible.

An educated citizenry is our greatest national resource. This resource can best be augmented by insuring that our teachers have a fair opportunity to improve their own education.

My bill would amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and would authorize a deduction from gross income by teachers of the expense of education undertaken by them, and provides that if an authorized school official makes a statement in writing that the teacher was employed for not less than 6 months in his taxable year, and if the teacher undertook and completed his education after becoming so employed, and if such education was undertaken primarily for the purpose of maintaining or improving the taxpayers skills as a teacher or meeting express requirement of his employer, then this statement will be accepted as proof of the fact that the expenses were trade or business expenses, unless there is clear proof to the contrary. The bill will apply to taxable years subsequent to 1961.

This bill has the effect of stating a truism—that is, the education of a teacher to earn his livelihood is a business asset rather than a personal one. Accordingly this expense should be deductible.

THE EXPERIMENT IN INTERNATIONAL LIVING: A PROVEN EXPERIMENT

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, the Experiment in International Living, with headquarters in Putney, Vt., annually sponsors the exchange between the United States and foreign countries of students, teachers, and other persons. In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on February 13, 1964, pages 2866–2867, and on May 26, 1964, page 9453, I told about the experiment's successful story and excellent work since its founding in 1932. Instrumental in the impressive development of the program founded by Dr. Donald B. Watt has been our colleague, FRANCES P. BOLTON, and, of course, Dr. F. Gordon Boyce, the president of the experiment. Its program has been copied by many other nations and has been most helpful to Sargent Shriver and the Peace Corps.

The Nashua Telegraph in New Hampshire recently published an editorial on June 22 entitled "A Proven Experiment," which commended the experiment's three decades of invaluable international people-to-people programs. I would like to share this editorial with my colleagues.

It reads as follows:

A PROVEN EXPERIMENT

We were reminded, after reading a news story of the departure of a group of young Americans from New York the other day, that in the past several Nashua youth have benefited from such trips over the "Big Pond" as part of a program known as the experiment in international living.

This first group is just the vanguard of many more who will take part in this project during the summer months.

In the last half dozen years or so a dozen or so Nashua area college youth have benefited from this project, living in with families and becoming part of the social and economic life of small towns and villages in Germany, France, Italy and some of the other nations with American ties.

By the end of 1964, some 2,300 American college and high school students, teachers and others will have visited 40 countries around the world, and 2,700 counterparts from 85 countries will have come to America.

At the same time, exchanges between countries other than the United States will involve hundreds more students. All told, 29,000 people on six continents are involved annually in the program.

The word "experiment" is somewhat of a misnomer, for the little publicized experiment in international living has been sending young people abroad since 1932, when it was founded by Dr. Donald B. Watt (now retired) as a nonprofit organization devoted to international, cross-cultural understanding.

For the exchangees, though, it is truly an experiment—an opportunity to live, for a few weeks or months, in a typical household in a foreign land as a member of a native family.

With United States and international headquarters in Putney, Vt., the experiment is involved in a growing number of programs besides its own exchanges.

It works closely with American and foreign universities, the State Department and numerous public and private groups, both here and abroad, where its three decades of experience in international people-to-people cooperation are invaluable.

The measure of its success is shown not only by its growth in America but by the fact that it has been adopted by so many other nations.

APPORTIONMENT OF STATE LEGISLATURES—HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 1100—TO AMEND THE CONSTITUTION

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced House Joint Resolution 1100. It is my understanding that more than 50 of my colleagues have introduced substantially similar resolutions in reaction to the Supreme Court decision on June 15, 1964, requiring that both bodies of all State legislatures must be apportioned solely on a population basis.

My resolution is as follows:

H.J. RES. 1100

Resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"ARTICLE XXV

"SECTION 1. Nothing in the Constitution of the United States shall prohibit a State, having a bicameral legislature, from apportioning the membership of one house of its legislature on factors other than population, if the citizens of the State shall have the opportunity to vote upon the apportionment.

"SEC. 2. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission to States by the Congress."

My resolution is simple and self-explanatory. It is my hope that before we adjourn this year, this resolution or one similar to it will be brought to the floor of the House and approved.

At the time of our Nation's birth, a great compromise was worked out between small and large States which allowed each State to have two Members in the U.S. Senate. It was believed by our Founding Fathers in their wisdom that population alone should not be the only factor on which representation in legislative bodies should be decided. If the Constitution permits representation such as we have in the U.S. Senate, it seems unfair to prohibit the States from adopting such a system or one similar to it, if they so desire.

States should not be required to all conform to one pattern. That the Constitution intended absolute uniformity in all of our States with their diverse social, economic, and political characteristics is open to doubt. The genius of our Federal system and much of its success rests squarely on the freedom of the States to meet problems of government on a free and competitive basis within the framework of the Constitution. Each State should be allowed to develop, for at least one house of its legislature, a system of representation which suits its particular needs. It is unwise to impose a rigid legislative formula on each of the 50 different States which make up our United States.

Historically, it appears doubtful that the 14th amendment was intended to prevent a State from apportioning at least one house of its legislature on a basis other than population. A majority of both the Northern and Southern States which ratified the 14th amendment had legislatures with at least one body not apportioned strictly on population. All the original States which ratified the Constitution had at least one body of their legislature apportioned on a basis other than population.

CAPTIVE NATIONS

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McDADE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, each year at this time the Congress of the United States has taken time to pause in the work of this deliberative body to contemplate the Captive Nations. We have watched, over many years, always with concern and with horror the oppression of people who had fallen under the yoke of the Soviet Union. We have, indeed, watched half the world fall under her shadow. We can recall the day, and it was not too long ago, when it was remarked that all Stalin needed to cheer him in the morning was a map of the world with the areas he dominated marked in red. It extended from Poland in the west to Albania in the south to the distant Pacific shores of China in the east.

There was a time indeed when that evil old man laughed in the face of God, thinking that the name of Stalin would go down in history as the greatest of heroes of communism.

Well, he has gone down. He has not gone down as a hero. He has gone down as a butcher. He has gone down accursed by his own comrades as he is accursed by those he oppressed. The men who danced his dance in life danced on his grave in death. The men who kissed his feet in fear while he lived kicked his body out of his new grave when he died. He had supped with many devils in life and had learned to wield the long spoon. He did not know that they would wield shovels in his death.

Now it is the long eternal turn for God to laugh—and His laugh is terrible to contemplate.

Stalin is dead. His memory is desolate, despised, dishonored.

And what of his empire?

His tyranny once encompassed a solid block of nearly three-quarters of a billion souls. His empire was the hugest empire the race of man has ever known, an empire before which the empires of Genghis Khan and Alexander the Great pale to insignificance. With a far smaller empire, Hitler had contemplated a 1,000-year Reich. Stalin contemplated one much longer than that.

It has scarcely endured his passing.

Even before he died the signs of cracks in the texture were evident. His captives in many nations had risen up in a bloody but futile rebellion and had died, their hands the only weapons against tanks.

Now the cracks are no longer merely cracks. Now the pieces lie all over Europe and Asia.

China has risen roaring against the Soviet Union. It is no longer in the writings of the "capitalistic presses" that the Soviet Union is flayed daily. As a matter of fact, that most despised of all words in the Soviet Union, the Wall

Street Journal, is singularly unperturbed over the machinations of the Soviets. No, it is in Peiping, in Nanking, in Shanghai that violent vituperations pour forth daily in an unbroken stream of venom. Once the voice of Churchill rang out with denunciations of Hitler. But nothing Churchill ever said would compare with the opinions of the Soviet Union recently mouthed by Mao Tse-tung. And Mao Tse-tung is the favorite target today for the vilifications of Pravda, of Izvestia, and the personal vilifications of Khrushchev.

Poland has slowly roused herself from the terror of Hitler and the terror of Stalin, and Poland is moving slowly to a position of independence, a position her Eastern European neighbors are encouraging mightily. Yugoslavia partitioned herself off from the empire even before Stalin's death.

Hungary, where the bloodiest hands of Europe strangled the last hopes of freedom, is not dead, but is rising slowly again, and is seeking her soul once more.

Rumania has cut herself off with one quick sweep of the knife from COMECORN, has clearly asserted that what is good for Rumania is what is going to be sought, has stepped out of the long-range planning of the Soviet Union for Eastern Europe, and has decided that she can go it alone agriculturally and industrially.

Even Albania has punched the nose of the Great Bear of the Soviet Union.

In every country of Eastern Europe, the nations that once lay beneath the guns of the Soviet tanks, there is a new freedom rising. They have come to know what we knew at the end of the Second World War, that the Soviet Union was the most imperialistic nation in the history of the world, that she would destroy any other nation to feed her own power, that she would help any other nation only to the extent that that help would redound to her own credit and glory.

Stalin was not a Communist. He was a completely evil dictator whose only glory was his self-flattery, his self-aggrandizement. And the lie that his work was for the glory and peace of the world could not endure his life, let alone his death.

The empire has crumpled. But there is no time for complacency. There is yet a vast task to perform.

In Asia the evil is snaking down and covering all of southeast Asia. In China the evil is more deeply embedded than ever before. In America the evil has come to roost in Cuba, and the malevolence flows out of that island every minute of the day, every day of the year.

A tremendous opening wedge has been pushed into Eastern Europe. But it is only a wedge. We must establish a Captive Nations Committee here in Congress that would explore and exploit every inch of freedom that has been won and that can be won for all the peoples of these countries. We cannot forget that in Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, there is deadly persecution of people whose independence was once their most cherished possession and who still are held in slavery. We cannot forget that in Ukraine there are 40 million souls who were a nation before Russia was a word.

We are the great repository of freedom in the West. The nations of all the world have looked to us since that day 188 years ago when the Continental Congress boldly proclaimed their Declaration of Independence. We have kept faith at least with the memory of freedom among the peoples of Eastern Europe. We must continue to hold high the torch of freedom to all the captive nations of the world.

TRAGEDY OF GEN. WLADYSLAW SIKORSKI

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, on July 4, 1963, the commander in chief of the Polish Armed Forces, Gen. Wladyslaw Sikorski, met his untimely death in a plane crash in the Strait of Gibraltar.

His death was one of the great tragedies that befell the people of Poland in World War II, the greatest tragedy of all being their betrayal by President Roosevelt at the Yalta Conference.

I feel that the Members of the House should be reminded of the great contribution of General Sikorski to the allied cause in World War II, and I take this time to remind you of some of his accomplishments.

General Sikorski was one of the great Polish leaders of the 20th century. In 1922, after Poland attained her independence and freedom, in which he played an important role, General Sikorski assumed the office of Prime Minister. Just as his able leadership and gallantry distinguished his military career, his tenure as Prime Minister was marked by his abilities as a gifted and astute statesman. Thus he was well equipped to lead the people of Poland in one of their darkest perods in modern history when, in 1939, the Nazi invasion of Poland began. With sympathetic support of the Western Allies and the undying loyalty of his own people, General Sikorski was performing a difficult task when he was suddenly struck down and his untimely death was a serious blow to the cause of Poland.

It is noteworthy, Mr. Speaker, that Americans of Polish descent continue their persistent efforts to obtain restoration of freedom to Poland. We must remember that our own freedom and that of all peoples remains threatened as long as communism is permitted to maintain its colonial control over any portion of the globe.

MEMORANDUM OF THE POLISH AMERICAN CONGRESS ON POLAND AND EAST-EUROPEAN PROBLEMS IN THE COLD WAR

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KLUCZYNSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alaska?

There was no objection.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, a delegation from the Polish American Congress headed by Mr. Charles Rozmarek, president, was in Washington on May 11, 1964. Other members of the delegation were Rev. Valerian S. Karcz, general secretary; Attorney Stanislaw R. J. Suchecki, director of the Polish American Congress from Boston, Mass., Mr. Edward Kurmel, director of the Polish American Congress from Brooklyn, N.Y., Congressman ROMAN C. PUCINSKI, director of the Polish American Congress from Chicago, Ill., and Mr. Karol Burke, Washington representative of the Polish American Congress. They were at the White House, where they were joined by the Postmaster General of the United States, John A. Gronouski, had a conference with the President of the United States, Lyndon B. Johnson, and presented the following "Memorandum of the Polish American Congress on Poland and East-European Problems in the Cold War":

MEMORANDUM OF THE POLISH AMERICAN CONGRESS ON POLAND AND EAST-EUROPEAN PROBLEMS IN THE COLD WAR

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Aware of fundamental changes that are taking place within the fabric of international affairs, and deeply concerned with establishment of a just and durable peace and the permanency of American security, we submit the following observations which reflect the thinking of a decisive majority of nearly 10 million Americans of Polish origin:

The peace offensive, proclaimed in your New Year's address to the Nation, reasserted in your state of the Union message, and implemented at the Geneva disarmament negotiations, has our wholehearted support.

Your statement, Mr. President, in the telegram sent to the 1964 May 3 observance in Chicago, that "when Postmaster General Gronouski goes to Poland next month, he will be more than my representative. He will be a symbol of my personal determination to bring the people of our two great nations even closer together has dispelled lingering and uneasy suppositions that the problems of east-central Europe, vitally important to European stability, have been relegated to a "conspiracy of silence."

We are in full agreement with the Secretary of State, Mr. Dean Rusk's declaration of February 24, 1964, in Washington, expounding the three objectives of American policy toward international communism: (1) to prevent Communists from extending their domain; and to make it increasingly costly, dangerous and futile for them to try to do so; (2) to achieve agreement and understanding which reduce the danger of a devastating war; and (3) to encourage evolution within the Communist world toward national independence, peaceful cooperation and open societies.

We submit, however, that the first two objectives can be gained largely by a determined pursuit of the third objective.

THE CASE IN POINT

The case in point is Poland.

As early as 1876, Karl Marx, wrote in a penetrating commentary on Russia: "Poland is the great instrument in the execution of Russian design on the world, but it is also an invincible obstacle to them, until such time as the Poles, worn out by betrayals from the West, become a whip in the hands of the Muscovite."

Applied to the current realities of the cold war, these words do not lose their essential value as the most powerful and least understood argument for helping the Polish nation in its present travails, by "encouraging freedom and pressuring tyranny"—to use your words, Mr. President, in your address to May 3d observance in Chicago in 1963.

The Poles betrayed at Teheran and Yalta, deprived of their rightful eastern territories, and forced to live under, to them ideologically abhorrent and detested Communist system, are admirably enduring these misfortunes. However, their staying power is not inexhaustible.

To us, the importance of Poland's psychological resistance to communism, in religious, cultural and economic matters, should be of paramount importance.

Encouraging freedom and pressuring tyranny in Poland can be executed in many ways: Through economic aid and cooperation, continued granting of the most-favored status in commerce, and utilization of counterpart funds for humanitarian and educational projects; through cultural exchanges, which, however, should be worked out on a more equitable basis—guaranteeing more opportunities to American students and scholars in Poland and bringing to the United States Polish students and scholars on the basis of merit and free choice, without interference of Communist regime; also by equalization of the exchanges of American and Polish newspapers, periodicals, and other publications; heretofore such exchanges are weighed heavily on the Communist side; and finally, through continued declarations that Poland must be free and independent.

It can be argued that in the current situation there is no possibility of restoring full freedom and independence to Poland. It might be true to a certain extent. But it also should be borne in mind, that Russia rejects all the demands of the West, that the status of Berlin should be redefined and that Germany is fully entitled to reunification. Yet these two demands are repeatedly set forth in all discussions of European problems with Russia. The same method should be applied to the Polish question.

The separation of the German problem, from the return of freedom to Poland, Czechoslovakia and Hungary, is unrealistic and brings propaganda benefits only to the Soviet Union.

GERMAN INTRANSIGENCE

No other single act of American diplomacy could strengthen the Polish nation more and renew the faith of millions of people in East Central Europe in American world leadership, than a U.S. initiative in recognizing the Polish-German boundary along the Odra-Nysa Rivers.

We submit, that the American policy of postponement of the final and irrevocable settlement of this vital European question until some indefinite day of a general peace treaty, forces the Polish nation into an unwanted reliance on Russia, as the sole guarantor of territorial stability of 31 million Poles.

In addition to freeing the Poles from constant blackmail on the part of the Soviet Union, it would also: (a) form a basis for a normalization of Polish-German relations, and would bring about a proper balance in European structure; (b) form a realistic condition for future reunification of Germany; (c) strengthen the West in its negotiations with the Soviet Union; (d) be received by all Poles as the proof that the United States understands their vital and justified postulates.

We have had the honor of presenting more exhaustive studies of this problem to the former Presidents and to the Department of State.

Today, we wish to reassert that German intransigence in this vital European matter, expressed by West Germany's Chancellor, Ludwig Erhard, his former Minister of Expellees, Hans Krueger; his Minister without Portfolio, Heinrich Krone, and his Minister of Foreign Affairs, Gerhard Schroeder, keep the uncertainty of the future, and the fear of a new German Drang nach Osten alive in the peoples of East-Central Europe, constantly adding anti-Polish propaganda fuel to revisionistic demands.

RUSSIAN CRISES

We do not subscribe to the theory that Russian confidence and good will can be won with patience and kindness.

In Communist vocabulary, these human values are signs of weakness and irresolution.

It is our deep and well-founded conviction, that if the free world is to come to the aid of the Moscow tyrants in their present difficulties, it should do so not alone for monetary and commercial considerations, but above all, with the aim and purpose of regaining the intrinsic values of human freedom and dignity now suppressed in the satellite countries.

We believe that the present Soviet predicament presents to the United States and to other nations of the free world signal opportunities for gaining far-reaching concessions from Moscow for the benefit of freedom and democracy.

We believe, that the time is opportune for bold and imaginative efforts on the part of the West toward the settlement of dangerous and explosive problems of the cold war, that is, liberalization of political systems within subjugated nations; cessation of Communist hostilities against the church in Poland and other captive countries; complete withdrawal of Soviet forces from Poland and Cuba; new, properly safeguarded and binding definition of the status of Berlin; meaningful disarmament with ironclad provisions for international inspection and control, and so forth.

If current exigencies demand some form of accommodation to the Soviet Union, we respectfully submit, that such accommodation or lessening of international tensions, should not be made at the expense of the people of East-Central Europe.

The proposed agreement or declaration of nonaggression between NATO and the Warsaw Pact should not be construed in such manner as to perpetuate Soviet-Communist tyranny over nations which rightfully belong to the western world of freedom and democracy.

We fervently hope and trust, that this historic and timely opportunity of extracting just and rightful concessions from Russia will be fully explored and properly availed of.

Mr. President, we support with utmost sincerity your great and truly inspiring peace offensive.

Yours very respectfully,
Charles Rozmarek,
President,
Rev. Valerian S. Karcz,
General Secretary
(For the Polish American Congress).

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. Grabowski] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alaska?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to participate in the sixth annual Captive Nations Week. This yearly observance was first authorized in 1959 by an act of Congress and will be continued until every captive nation has achieved its independence. This commemoration is certainly a worthy endeavor. The United States has long advocated the freedom of all peoples and their right to determine their own destiny. These ideals are clearly enunciated in our Declaration of Independence whose anniversary we celebrate at the end of this week. More recently, President Woodrow Wilson caught the imagination of the world with his 14 points which spelled out the right of every nation to determine its own destiny and which blazed the trail for the lifting of diplomatic relations from the practice of realpolitik that had led to the subjugation of so many peoples. The Atlantic Charter, of which one of the prime movers was President Roosevelt, carried on this tradition.

A look at the map will show that many lands are currently not only under foreign domination, but also under alien systems of government. A closer look will disclose that many of these places lie in Eastern Europe under the guiding hand of the Russian state. These nations have had a sad history in the last few years. Some have found themselves under Russian domination for the past centuries, others regained their liberty for a few years, while the rest have been left the semblance of independence, but not its essence.

No matter what the form, all share a common fate, namely, the loss of their independence and the imposition of a foreign economic, political, and social dictatorship whose aim is to snuff out freedom and individualism. Just as the seizure of power varied from country to country, so does the method of control differ today.

It has been the policy of our Government to wean these nations away from Communist central control and to weaken the hold of Russia over them by giving them an alternate source for trade and in a few cases very limited aid. This objective has been successful in the case of Poland and very recently Rumania. Their turning to us shows the world that the Communist system lacks something.

Equally important is the continual reminder to the world and to the subjugated peoples that we know of their plight and that we keep the flame of liberty burning in their hearts. This goal is exactly what ceremonies connected with Captive Nations Week do. I am proud to raise my voice with others here in once again enunciating the unalienable rights of every nation to its own freedom and self-determination.

PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Fascell] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alaska?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the twin problems of what to do when Presidents are disabled or die at a time when there is no Vice President to succeed them have been the source of unending concern since the founding of the Republic. Despite intense concentration devoted at irregular intervals throughout our history to seeking some way out of the dilemma created by these problems, a practicable and efficacious solution has heretofore eluded our grasp. The shock caused by the dreadful event at Dallas, Tex., on November 22, 1963, has alerted the American people to the problem as never before. This in turn has sparked a genuine determination on the part of the Congress to legislate practical solutions.

The age-old controversy surrounding the related questions of presidential succession and presidential inability arise because of certain ambiguities and certain procedural omissions in the U.S. Constitution. The sixth clause of section 1 of article II of the Constitution reads:

> In case of the removal of the President from office, or of his death, resignation, or inability to discharge the powers and duties of the said office, the same shall devolve on the Vice President, and the Congress may by law provide for the case of removal, death, resignation, or inability, both of the President and Vice President, declaring what officer shall then act as President, and such officer shall act accordingly, until the disability be removed, or a President shall be elected.

It will be noted that this provision outlines four occasions when the Vice President may be required to act in some other capacity. Three of these—namely, removal from office, death, or resignation—obviously contemplate the permanent exclusion of the President for the balance of the term. But what of the fourth instance? Did the framers intend that "inability to discharge the powers and duties of the said office" should exclude the President from discharging those powers and duties even after his recovery?

Another question arises from the language of the clause which provides "the same shall devolve on the Vice President." To what do the words "the same" refer? In other words, what is it that "devolves" on the Vice President? Is it the office or the powers and duties of President? Under the first interpretation, the President would be precluded from resuming the chief executiveship in the case of disability as in the other three instances. Under the second interpretation, the Vice President would be Acting President during the period of disability solely.

Although no piece of legislation the human mind is capable of drawing up will offer a perfect solution to the problems in this area, I believe that an acceptable proposal must embody three basic objectives. These include:

First. To fix once and for all the office in the Vice President upon the removal from office, death, or resignation of the President. This will quiet the recurrent controversy concerning whether the Vice President in these circumstances becomes President or Acting President.

Second. To provide, in the fourth circumstance—namely, inability—that the Vice President shall succeed only to the powers and duties of that office as well as a method for implementing a temporary succession to such powers and duties when the President refuses to concede his inability to carry on in office.

Third. To provide for filling the Vice-Presidency when that office becomes vacant.

The proposal that I have introduced today represents one of the most salutary attempts to deal simultaneously with the questions of succession and inability that have come to my attention. This joint resolution would amend the Constitution of the United States to provide as follows:

Section 1 provides that the Vice President become President for the remainder of the term of a President who dies, resigns, or is removed from office. It further provides that the new President shall nominate a new Vice President within 30 days, and that the new Vice President would take office upon confirmation of a majority of both Houses of Congress.

Section 2 provides for filling the office of Vice President in case of a vacancy caused by the removal, death, or resignation of the Vice President.

Section 3 provides that if the President declares his inability in writing, the Vice President shall become Acting President.

Section 4 provides that if the President fails to declare his inability and the Vice President is satisfied of the existence of same, the Vice President shall become Acting President upon written approval of a majority of the Cabinet.

Section 5 provides that in case of dispute as to whether the President has recovered, the Vice President retains his office as Acting President only with the written approval of the majority of the Cabinet plus the concurring vote of two-thirds of the Members present in both Houses of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution which I am introducing today represents a bill incorporating the recommendations of the American Bar Association's Conference on Presidential Inability and Succession which was held on January 20–21 of this year. Mr. Walter E. Craig, president of the American Bar Association, has said on this subject:

> Congressional leaders, constitutional scholars, and many others are in complete agreement that something must be done to eliminate the possibility of chaos in the event of the President's disability. It is also considered highly desirable that the office of Vice President be filled at all times. Unfortunately, no action has been taken by Congress because of the many differing views. In an attempt to develop a consensus among several distinguished lawyers most knowledgeable on this subject, the American Bar Association convened a conference on Presidential inability and succession on January 20–21 of this year.
>
> Attending the conference in Washington were: Herbert Brownell, president, Association of the Bar of the City of New York, and a former Attorney General of the United States; John D. Feerick, attorney, New York; Paul A. Freund, professor of law, Harvard University; Jonathan C. Gibson, chairman, Standing Committee on Jurisprudence and Law Reform, American Bar Association; Richard H. Hansen, attorney, Lincoln, Nebr.; James C. Kirby, Jr., associate professor of law, Vanderbilt University, and a former chief counsel to the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments, Senate Judiciary Committee; Ross L. Malone, past president of the American Bar Association, and a former Deputy Attorney General of the United States; Charles B. Nutting, dean of the National Law Center; Lewis F. Powell, Jr., president-elect, American Bar Association; Sylvester C. Smith, Jr., past president, American Bar Association; Martin Taylor, chairman, Committee on Federal Constitution, New York State Bar Association; Edward L. Wright, chairman, house of delegates, American Bar Association, and myself.
>
> The 2-day deliberations of this highly distinguished group were intense and thorough. Proposals of this and past Congresses were reviewed in detail. Although there was not absolute agreement by each conferee on all points of the final consensus, there was general agreement on the statement. On the question of action to be taken in the event of the President's inability, it was the consensus of the conference that:
>
> 1. Agreements between the President and Vice President or person next in line of succession provide a partial solution, but not an acceptable permanent solution of the problem.
>
> 2. An amendment to the Constitution of the United States should be adopted to resolve the problems which would arise in the event of the inability of the President to discharge the powers and duties of his office.
>
> 3. The amendment should provide that in the event of the inability of the President the powers and duties, but not the office, shall devolve upon the Vice President or person next in line of succession for the duration of the inability of the President or until expiration of his term of office.
>
> 4. The amendment should provide that the inability of the President may be established by declaration in writing of the President. In the event that the President does not make known his inability, it may be established by action of the Vice President or person next in line of succession with the concurrence of a majority of the Cabinet or by action of such other body as the Congress may by law provide.
>
> 5. The amendment should provide that the ability of the President to resume the powers and duties of his office shall be established by his declaration in writing. In the event that the Vice President and a majority of the Cabinet or such other body as Congress may by law provide shall not concur in the declaration of the President, the continuing inability of the President may then be determined by the vote of two-thirds of the elected Members of each House of the Congress.
>
> On the related question of Presidential succession it was the consensus that:
>
> 1. The Constitution should be amended to provide that in the event of the death, resignation, or removal of the President, the Vice President or the person next in line of succession shall succeed to the office for the unexpired term.
>
> 2. It is highly desirable that the office of Vice President be filled at all times. An amendment to the Constitution should be adopted providing that when a vacancy occurs in the office of Vice President, the President shall nominate a person who, upon approval by a majority of the elected Members of Congress meeting in joint session, shall then become Vice President for the unexpired term.

The consensus was reviewed thoroughly by the association's committee on jurisprudence and law reform. The committee members agreed unanimously in recommending favorably the consensus to the association's house of delegates on February 17, 1964. The house of delegates adopted a resolution recommending that the Constitution of the United States be amended in accordance with the principles of the consensus.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to read the recommendations of the American Bar Association's Committee on Jurisprudence and Law Reform.

The recommendations are:

Be it resolved, That the American Bar Association recommends that the Constitution of the United States be amended in accordance with the principles set forth in the consensus of the special conference convened by the American Bar Association in Washington, D.C., January 21, 1964, as follows:

1. In the event of the inability of the President, the powers and duties, but not the office, shall devolve upon the Vice President or person next in line of succession for the duration of the inability of the President or until expiration of his term of office;

2. The inability of the President may be established by declaration in writing of the President. In the event that the President does not make known his inability, it may be established by action of the Vice President or person next in line of succession with the concurrence of a majority of the cabinet or by action of such other body as the Congress may by law provide;

3. The ability of the President to resume the powers and duties of his office shall be established by his declaration in writing. In the event that the Vice President and a majority of the Cabinet or such other body as Congress may by law provide shall not concur in the declaration of the President, the continuing disability of the President may then be determined by the vote of two-thirds of the elected Members of each House of the Congress;

4. In the event of the death, resignation, or removal of the President, the Vice President or the person next in line of succession shall succeed to the office for the unexpired term; and

5. When a vacancy occurs in the office of the Vice President the President shall nominate a person who, upon approval by a majority of the elected Members of Congress meeting in joint session, shall then become Vice President for the unexpired term.

II

Be it further resolved, That the American Bar Association reaffirm in principle the support of the need for interim statutory clarification of the problem after the constitutional proposals have been submitted by Congress for action by the State legislatures, such legislation to provide a remedy while the constitutional proposals are under consideration.

Be it further resolved, That, in view of the manifest need for a prompt solution by constitutional amendment of the problems of presidential succession and inability, the American Bar Association urges that State and local bar organizations support by all appropriate means an amendment to the Constitution of the United States in accordance with the principles set forth in the recommendations of the committee on jurisprudence and law reform.

Mr. Speaker, the problem of presidential succession caused national concern; it has created discussion among many local groups throughout the country. In response to this urgent national problem, the Dade County Bar Association on **March 5, 1964, passed a resolution incorporating** the recommendations of the American Bar Association. I wish to commend the Dade County Bar Association and its responsible and public-spirited officers for their efforts to provide a method for the orderly transfer of power in case the President is unable to fulfill his duties and responsibilities.

Following is the resolution:

RESOLUTION OF BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF DADE COUNTY BAR ASSOCIATION

Be it resolved, That the Dade County Bar Association recommends that the Constitution of the United States be amended in accordance with the principles set forth in the consensus of the special conference convened by the American Bar Association in Washington, D.C., January 21, 1964, as follows:

1. In the event of the inability of the President, the powers and duties, but not the office, shall devolve upon the Vice President or person next in line of succession for the duration of the inability of the President or until expiration of his term of office;

2. The inability of the President may be established by declaration in writing of the President. In the event that the President does not make known his inability, it may be established by action of the Vice President or person next in line of succession with the concurrence of a majority of the Cabinet or by action of such other body as the Congress may by law provide;

3. The ability of the President to resume the powers and duties of his office shall be established by his declaration in writing. In the event that the Vice President and a majority of the Cabinet or such other body as Congress may by law provide shall not concur in the declaration of the President, the continuing disability of the President may then be determined by the vote of two-thirds of the elected Members of each House of the Congress;

4. In the event of the death, resignation or removal of the President, the Vice President or the person next in line of succession shall succeed to the office for the unexpired term; and

5. When a vacancy occurs in the office of the Vice President the President shall nominate a person who, upon approval by a majority of the elected Members of Congress meeting in joint session, shall then become Vice President for the unexpired term: Be it further

Resolved, That the Dade County Bar Association reaffirm in principle the support of the need for interim statutory clarification of the problem after the constitutional proposals have been submitted by Congress for action by the State legislatures, such legislation to provide a remedy while the constitutional proposals are under consideration.

Dated at Miami, Fla., this 5th day of March 1964.

DADE COUNTY BAR ASSOCIATION,
CHARLES A. KIMBRELL,
President.

Attest:

LYLE D. HOLCOMB, JR.,
Secretary.

Mr. Speaker, we should act now. The need for legislation clarifying the latent ambiguities and supplying the significant omissions in the Constitution's scheme of succession have never been more apparent. Public interest in this matter has never been higher.

Finally, I scarcely need point out that the 1960's no longer afford us the luxury of delay. In this age of nuclear bearing missiles, a hiatus of 20 minutes in the Presidency may spell the critical difference between survival and total annihilation.

THE MISSISSIPPI PROJECT—I: RIFT BETWEEN RIGHTS WORKERS

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRASER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alaska?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, this summer's Mississippi civil rights project will have two major purposes. It will not only aim to acquaint Mississippi Negroes with their rights and help them register to vote; it will aim also to acquaint the rest of the country with the flagrant abuse and misapplication of the law by Mississippi law enforcement agencies.

Minneapolis Tribune Reporter Dick Cunningham began to publicize the project in a series of front page articles in the Tribune from the time civil rights volunteers from Minneapolis arrived at Oxford, Ohio, for their orientation sessions.

He and other newspapermen like him are performing an invaluable service by keeping the rest of the country constantly aware of events in Mississippi.

In the following article, Mr. Cunningham describes a misunderstanding between veteran and novice civil rights workers during the training program at Oxford, Ohio:

CIVIL RIGHTS MISSIONARIES TRAIN FOR MISSISSIPPI—TENSION RISES BETWEEN VETERANS, NOVICES

(By Dick Cunningham)

OXFORD, OHIO.—The first blow at the Mississippi summer project was struck by a burst of laughter—not by a policeman with a cattle prod.

It was laughter from the predominantly white, college-age volunteers who will work on voter registration and education in Mississippi during the next 2 months.

It stung the predominantly Negro group of veterans of the civil rights efforts who are trying to make volunteers learn in 1 week of classes what it is like to be a Negro in the deep South.

The classes are being held at Oxford's Western College for Women.

Robert Moses, 29-year-old New York City Negro anthropologist who conceived the project, had warned of potential trouble the first day. He brought it up in a welcoming speech to the 195 volunteers.

"The very minimum we can expect of the volunteers," Moses said, "is that they will attempt to understand the inner feelings of the staff."

"Many of us were brought up to hate the white man," Moses said. "We are victims of a plague."

But no trouble occurred during 3 days of educational sessions on such subjects as history of the Negro, history of the South, politics of Mississippi and attitudes of the white community.

Then came the movie.

It was a documentary on voter registration in Mississippi. First there were pictures of Theron Lynd, Forest County registrar since indicted for discriminating against Negroes.

Lynd has a huge stomach and the after-dinner audience tittered.

Then Lynd's attorney appeared on the screen. In answer to a question about why

Negro teachers with masters' degrees had difficulty with literacy tests, he said:

"Now, you're assuming something as a fact that I don't necessarily concede. However—" and then he went into a ludicrous racial explanation.

The audience howled with laughter.

And while they howled, very quietly, a half-dozen people got up and walked out.

All were Negroes. All were young. And all were members of the 80-member training crew brought in from the battle lines in Mississippi, Maryland, and Virginia for the orientation program which is being conducted by the National Council of Churches.

Few in the audience noticed the walkout. But when the light came up after the movie, a bearded Negro stood in the front of the auditorium.

He was Francis Mitchell, 38, former managing editor of the respected Norfolk, Va., Negro weekly, the Journal & Guide, and long an editor for Johnson Publications, publishers of Ebony and Jet.

Mitchell gave up a successful free-lance career 3 weeks ago to handle press relations for the Mississippi project—for nothing.

His voice shook with emotion:

"I came here to say something in behalf of six black people I just met walking away from this building.

"They can't understand why you laughed. I don't know what made you laugh. Maybe what made you laugh you can't help.

"But I hope that if you are able to leave Mississippi this summer, when you see something that is somebody else's peril, you can never laugh again."

As they left the building and trudged up through the centuries-old oaks and elms to the main building, everybody buzzed with the incident.

"But the lawyer was so stupid, and it was a misuse of the language. We've all been to school," said a Dartmouth student defensively.

"We were only laughing because it was so ridiculous," said a Harvard student in blue jeans and work boots.

"Some of the Negroes laughed, too," said a Califorinan.

On the other side, a pretty Negro girl in the pigtails and denims of the female civil rights activists, stood under a terrace light and blinked back tears of frustration.

"Mississippi's no party," she said. "We counted so much on these kids, and now it's just going to happen all over again."

"Ignorance is dangerous," said a girl who had walked out. "They laughed because it was unreal to them. In a few days they will come up against that reality, and they might get stubborn.

"That way, one of us could get killed."

A boy from Kenya, who had walked out, shook his head.

"What's the use of talking about it," he said. "They don't understand."

One group after another drifted into the comfortable main lounge of the college.

"A lot of the Negroes in the movie are here or are close friends of people who are here," said the Rev. Edwin King, white Methodist chaplain at integrated Tougaloo Southern Christian College, Mississippi.

"You volunteers must realize you look at the problem intellectually, not in the framework of the Southern Negro involved in the battle," said a Negro minister attached to the National Council of Churches.

"We may not have been in Mississippi, but we're Americans and we've gotten this far," said an indignant white volunteer.

"No, it's their movement, and we should feel privileged that they let us take part," said Myles Horton, head of the Highlander human relations training center at Knoxville, Tenn.

"Why is the staff so remote?" asked a white student. "Why don't they socialize with us?"

"We had just as much right to laugh as some of the staff people have to stay up late singing and carrying on and some of them missing section meetings," said a Negro junior college student from Chicago, Ill.

"We may not socialize with you but we are trying to love you," said Bruce Gordon, young troubleshooter from Georgia. "We are trying to reach out, but it is not easy."

It was nearly 1 a.m. then and suddenly there was singing outside, loud enough to cut off further talk.

"Is that freedom train a'comin'?" came the voices.

The french doors swung open and in marched half-a-hundred staff people hand-in-hand.

Black hands joined white. Scarred hands of young veterans joined smooth hands of young volunteers. Arms went over shoulders, and the big room was nearly filled with a singing, swaying circle.

It was clear that something had happened, but few people outside the staff knew about:

The angry staff meeting in the auditorium after the movie.

The meeting at which they went over what everybody knew, that you could not teach in classrooms what the volunteers needed to know; that maybe some of it would rub off on contact, but that the staff was finding it difficult to initiate the contact.

The meeting at which complaints were aired about wine bottles on campus and late hours.

The meeting at which staff members defended their right to privacy and fun after months on the battleline.

The meeting at which some reiterated their resentment that the volunteers could go home after the summer, and at which some admitted their just plain fear of going back to Mississippi again.

The meeting that wound up when Moses, the originator, the rock, the leader, the young scholar who had donned overalls and T-shirt to cast his lot with Negroes in Mississippi—when Moses wept.

"I guess the only thing to do is go up and sing with them," someone had said at that point.

And in the littered lounge they sang "Go Tell It on the Mountain," "Oh, Freedom," and the other songs they had learned in battle and the volunteers had learned at concerts.

Nearly everyone sang. But there were a few who did not join the circle, and there were a few in the circle who only hummed and looked worried.

FORUM CONDUCTED BY NEW YORK STATE OSTEOPATHIC SOCIETY

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MURPHY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alaska?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, the Osteopathic Society of the City of New York, an organization which works diligently to foster improved health care programs for the community, has frequently conducted public forums on topics of vital interest to people everywhere. The most recent forum, on heart care, was held on June 24 and was cosponsored by the New York State Osteopathic Society.

In a message to the Osteopathic Society of the City of New York in regard to this event, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Anthony J. Celebrezze, noted that, "the diffusion of medical knowledge through such forums as yours, helps bring the fruits of research into practical lifesaving use and advances the health of the American people."

There is one characteristic about the membership of the Osteopathic Society of the City of New York which I believe is extremely laudatory. That is that these physicians believe that their responsibilities do not end at the door to their offices. Rather, they strive to keep the public as well informed as possible about the latest advances in the unceasing struggle to conquer disease and suffering. The vigor and enthusiasm the Osteopathic Society of the City of New York brings to its information programs is most praiseworthy, and the community it serves is indeed fortunate to be able to enjoy the benefits of the leadership this organization provides.

As Mr. Celebrezze so eloquently stated in his message to the Osteopathic Society of the City of New York:

> Medical research has led to the development of important new knowledge in the fight against heart disease and other killing and crippling illnesses.
>
> But this knowledge must be disseminated and applied if its benefits are to be fully realized.

Mr. Speaker, I think the Osteopathic Society of the City of New York and its distinguished officers and board of directors are to be commended for being in the forefront of efforts to alert the public to the newest advances in medical science for emphasizing the need to maintain good health practices.

INEQUITABLE TAX ON TRAVEL FROM UNITED STATES

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MURPHY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alaska?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill intended to remove an inequity which exists affecting travel from the United States to destinations overseas. I am persuaded that the inequity exists through inadvertence, and I am convinced that all fair-minded people will support my proposal.

At the present time a traveler from any part of the United States en route abroad may go to an airport for the oversea leg of the journey and if he arrives at that port of embarkation by air, the domestic travel tax for the domestic leg of his total journey is not paid if his layover between the domestic leg and the foreign leg is 6 hours or less.

However, if this same passenger originating at the same interior point and going to the same destination abroad, chooses to use a ship for his oversea journey but arrives at an ocean port from his home by air, that identical domestic air leg of his journey is taxable.

It is somewhat difficult to ascertain how many travelers are deterred from using a ship to go abroad on account of this tax inequity. On the face of it, an inequity does, however, exist which should be promptly corrected. I am not suggesting nor even implying what means be used for journeys abroad by the American traveler. I do think, however, that the Federal tax structure should be corrected so that both air and sea journeys are treated alike, neither encouraging nor discouraging one over the other. My bill, I am persuaded, will achieve this purpose.

ROBERT KINTNER, PRESIDENT OF NATIONAL BROADCASTING CO.

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ROONEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alaska?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, a recent article in Variety by George Rosen has come to my attention. Mr. Rosen is a highly respected writer on affairs related to the entertainment world and mass media.

Since the subject of his article is one of the most brilliant spokesmen the broadcasting industry has ever had, I would have found it interesting and informative.

But the fact that it concerns the career of Robert Kintner, president of the National Broadcasting Co. and a native of Stroudsburg, Pa., in my district, makes it especially meaningful to me.

Stroudsburg and Monroe County are deeply proud of Bob Kintner. As a young man growing up in the beautiful Pocono Mountains, he earned a reputation for intelligence and hard work which has marked his entire career.

Mr. Kintner worked as a reporter for the Stroudsburg Record and as public relations director for The Inn at Buck Hill Falls, one of many gracious and beautiful resort hotels in our magnificent vacation region.

When he left Stroudsburg, he went on to earn fame as a journalist working with Joseph Alsop for the New York Herald Tribune. He is now celebrating his 20th year in broadcasting and those years span the entire history of the great revolution in communications. Robert Kintner, as much as any man in America, has left his stamp upon television and helped it evolve into the tremendous force for human education, enlightenment, and entertainment it has become.

With all the fame and honors his chosen profession has bestowed upon him, Mr. Kintner certainly does not need any from me. But I speak for all the residents of my district when I say that Bob Kintner remains one of its most outstanding favorite sons.

His loyalty and genuine devotion to his neighbors at home remains strong, I might add. Each year his alma mater, Stroud Union High School, awards a $1,200 scholarship provided by Mr. Kintner in memory of his beloved mother, Mrs. Lillian Kintner.

I consider it a privilege, at this point, to insert the text of Mr. Rosen's excellent and perceptive article from Variety into the RECORD of these proceedings.

TWENTY YEARS OF K RATIONING—KINTNER'S SCORE IN BROADCASTING

(By George Rosen)

This week (Monday, June 15, to be exact) one of the TV industry's few—very few—statesmen quietly observed the 20th anniversary of his entry into broadcasting. He's Robert Edmonds Kintner, president of the National Broadcasting Co., who, in characteristic R.E.K. style, did everything possible to conduct the working day on a strictly routine basis—from his well before 9 a.m. arrival (loaded briefcase in tow) through his rounds of dictation to three secretaries, phone calls and conferences with top level associates to whom he articulated his latest policy decisions and the operational procedures to implement them.

And while he was concerned (as always) with TV's present and future, perhaps—just perhaps—he indulged in a few secret thoughts of nostalgia and reminiscence.

Had he given range and freedom to such memory proclivities, virtually the entire history of television would have been vividly reenacted in his lightning mind and spirit.

For if any man epitomizes television from its post World War II birth until today, that man is Kintner. In that 20-year span, certainly no other TV figure has worked so hard, suffered such sharp reversals, rebounded with such redoubtable resilience, analyzed or thought through problems so thoroughly and clearly, earned so much respect and stature, or made more meaningful and fundamental contributions to television's public service.

CREDOS AND ACCOLADES

The latest of the encyclopedic evidence to this effect was provided just 2 weeks ago (June 3) in Beverly Hills, Calif., when Kintner, at the conclusion of his extemporaneous address to NBC affiliates, was rewarded by one of the most rousing ovations ever witnessed at such affiliate convocations.

In that address, Kintner, with effortless ad lib verbal dexterity and without once consulting a written note, literally spellbound the entire affiliation and guest assemblage with a spellout of his TV philosophy and principles. As Kintner ticked off his six salient points, the NBC affiliates gained new insights into his character and integrity and how the Kintner credo and crusading spirit separates NBC from the other webs.

His prime point was that NBC is obligated to "maintain a profitable and stable company so that adequate resources will be ever available for tremendous and hazardous risks." In this connection, Kintner was not allowing himself to be deluded by the fact that NBC profits have broken records for seven consecutive quarters. Well does he remember the deficit operations of ABC when he served as president of that fledgling network in the days when it was owned by the late Ed Noble, who originally brought Kintner into broadcasting from his highly successful role as a Washington political columnist (with Joe Alsop) for the New York Herald Tribune. Also the deficits of Kintner's least happy and most frustrating days after ABC's merger with Paramount Theaters.

But even without "adequate resources," it was Kintner who induced a reluctant Leonard Goldenson to assume the "tremendous and hazardous risk" of a 7-year contract with Walt Disney for the "Disneyland" program, whose spectacular success did so much to build ABC to subsequent popularity (the network's evening shows actually reached No. 1 in the National Nielsens in 1960.)

After Kintner was fired by Goldenson and hired by NBC—first in the role of executive vice president in charge of color—he continued to maintain warm, friendly relations with Disney while the latter's rapport with Goldenson escalated into the Disney vs. AB-PT lawsuit which freed Disney once again to supply his weekly evening program to the Kintner network, which by this time was NBC.

As shrewd TV observers have noted, the Disney ABC-to-NBC switch in the fall of 1961 was a key factor in the audience shift from ABC, which had been well ahead of NBC in audience since 1958. Advertiser dollars and resultant profits were to follow. And thus Kintner emerged as the only man of many fired as president of one network to rebound as the president of another.

The Disney-Kintner relationship, now well over 10 years old, epitomizes how Kintner rebuilt NBC with basically the same talent, associates and manpower he had selected and organized to launch ABC well on the road to success. Many of those responsible for helping REK build news and public affairs to the best in the history of TV were with him at ABC—Chet Huntley, Martin Agronsky, Pauline Frederick, to name a few. Ditto many of today's NBC Kintner aids: Lee Jahncke, Don Durgin, Chick Abry, Dean Shaffner, et al. And with Kintner went some key affiliates, as for example, Otto Brandt, who had operated two of ABC's most successful affiliates in Seattle and Portland.

All of which illustrates the strong and enduring loyalties which extend to and from Kintner to decisive sectors of the TV program, affiliate and manpower fronts. They are loyalties which, through Kintner's 20 years in broadcasting, have matured into a degree of confidence, respect and stature which, in the view of most broadcast observers, is vested in perhaps no other broadcasting executive.

It's a respect which extends to the highest levels of government, business, and finance—a respect which Kintner began to earn in his midtwenties as a Wall Street reporter for the New York Herald Tribune, which he joined in the middepression after 2 years out of Swarthmore College and intermittent jobs which included publicity director of the Buck Hill Falls Inn in Pennsylvania's Pocono Mountains a few miles up in the resort hills from the Delaware River town of Stroudsburg, where Kintner was born and raised.

The early Wall Street experience was to provide Kintner with a know-how and wealth of contacts which have served him well ever since. For example, it was years ago that he came to the favorable attention of Lehman Bros. senior partner Paul Mazur, a close friend of General Sarnoff and key member of both the NBC and RCA boards. When Goldenson negotiated the Kintner "resignation" from ABC in 1956, it was Paul Mazur who served as the catalyst for Kintner's quick rise to larger responsibility at NBC.

In his journalism days, Kintner was best known to press insiders for his ability to acquire "intelligence" from which he scored many an exclusive "beat." Gifted with a photographic memory and the instincts of a master detective, he early demonstrated his superior ability to be first with the facts and inside information about future trends and developments. And still today in broadcasting—no one rivals his "intelligence" and "inside" information about who's doing what and where. As one of his key aids remarks: "Kintner has an X-ray mind." It's a mind which now, and since he joined the Sarnoffs, pere and fils, in 1957, after more than 12 years of helping to build

ABC, is dedicated to constant improvement of NBC.

And it's a mind now focusing more than ever on improving the appeal and enlarging the audiences of NBC programing. For Kintner is well aware that the NBC evaluation in certain Nielsen-oriented agencies is less than flattering.

And thus Kintner, in a new crusade to forge ahead in entertainment programing without sacrificing those loftier NBC attributes, launches the 21st year of one of the busiest and most significant careers in the history of television.

DESECRATION OF INDEPENDENCE DAY BY SIGNING OF CIVIL RIGHTS BILL

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. WATSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alaska?

There was no objection.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, today America stands proud and strong as the greatest bastion and champion of freedom this world has ever known. But a short 188 years ago, the America of our ancestors was a group of Colonies, subject to a sometimes benevolent, sometimes tyrannical Great Britain, whose empire spanned the entire globe.

However, our hearty, rugged, freedom-loving ancestors could not content themselves with anything short of absolute personal, governmental, and religious independence, after having fled from the tyranny and despotism of a monarchist, oppressive Europe. Thus the colonial leaders, destined to inscribe the most revered document of freedom set forth by the hand and mind of man, decided upon a bold and vigorous step.

On July 4, 1776, colonial representatives met and signed the Declaration of Independence. Each man present on that momentous day realized that he had committed a handful of colonists to a life-and-death struggle with the most formidable power on earth—the British Empire. But each man knew he could not be true to the dictates of his heart were he to do otherwise.

In a very few days, we in America shall do honor to that auspicious document and the brave and daring men who signed it. We shall recall with tears in our hearts the blood-stained, often ragged, but always determined men of courage who waged a desperate and successful battle to make that document a reality. This day, July 4, will, as long as America stands free, symbolize their torture, agony, and suffering, as well as the precious treasure for which they fought—freedom for all men.

Mr. Speaker, such a day must stand alone, destined only for honor and reverence. Nothing must ever be allowed to defame its symbolic meaning.

It is a pitiful, pathetic, and ironic thing that, just as our ancestors of yesterday fought and died to make us free, today a number of Americans, many with Communist affiliations or backgrounds, are fighting a battle of bitterness to destroy that very freedom.

Although many of my colleagues and I fought this movement with all the strength at our command, the so-called civil rights bill was approved by this body and subsequently, after an equally hard battle, approved by the other body. Now we are called upon to put our final stamp of approval upon the revised version of this bill.

Although I, and I hope other like-thinking Congressmen, shall under no circumstances change our negative votes, it is obvious that the die is cast. However, I offer one last-minute plea in behalf of all free Americans: Do not allow July 4, a day of declaration, dedication, and democratization, to be transformed into a day of degredation, desecration, and defamation by the signing into law, during its hallowed hours, of this abominable bill.

This legislation is the greatest abridgement of individual freedom ever proposed in the United States. Purported to eradicate discrimination against the minority by the majority, this bill will in fact only give legality to discrimination against the majority by the minority. Such a bill can but go down in history alongside the Spanish Court of Inquisition and the infamous British star chamber. The day of its passage will indeed be a black one for true lovers of freedom, not only in the United States, but throughout the world.

I beseech each of you here today, as descendants and fellow countrymen of those fearless men who shed their precious blood for our priceless heritage of independence, to let the Fourth of July stand unto itself. Do not allow the passage of this cheap, politically oriented, railroaded bill of inequality and Federal tyranny to share the same day in history that we honor as the formal beginning of freedom and independence in America.

Let July 4 always remain, in our eyes and those of our children, a day of independence, not a day of infamy.

THE SAN ANTONIO HEMISFAIR FOR THE AMERICAS

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alaska?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to report on the progress of the HemisFair project which is scheduled to be opened in my hometown of San Antonio, Tex., in 1968.

Last Monday, June 29, 1964, the formal dedication ceremonies for HemisFair executive headquarters were conducted, highlighted by a flag-raising ceremony representing 21 countries participating in the fair. Also, on that day the HemisFair executive committee met with members of the armed services and Assistant Secretary of Defense Nils A. Lennartson for the purpose of coordinating the fair activities with the military and laying the groundwork for further military cooperation and assistance.

The HemisFair is progressing smoothly and according to schedule, and with the continued efforts of those local, State, and Federal officials directly involved, and the full cooperation and support of the San Antonio community, we look forward to the opening of the fair in 1968 marking the tremendous strides toward better pan-American relations, which this fair is designed to foster and encourage.

With the unanimous consent of this House I would like to insert in the RECORD four newspaper articles from our local newspapers, the San Antonio Light and the San Antonio News and Express, relating some of the details of the events I have outlined.

[From the San Antonio (Tex.) News and Express, June 28, 1964]

FAIR HEADQUARTERS WILL BE DEDICATED

An address by U.S. Representative HENRY B. GONZALEZ and a presentation of flags of 19 Latin American nations will feature dedication ceremonies of HemisFair executive headquarters here at 5 p.m. Sunday.

The headquarters are at 421 South Alamo, site of the historic German-English School.

GONZALEZ will speak on national and international aspects of the HemisFair. Representatives from Latin American nations will present their countries' flags for a flag-raising ceremony. Invited are representatives of Argentina, Brazil, Bolivia, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Peru, Paraguay, Uruguay, and Venezuela.

H. B. Zachry, chairman of the board of HemisFair, will welcome guests. HemisFair President William R. Sinkin will introduce guests. Ewen C. Dingwall, HemisFair executive vice president, will speak on the history of the German-English School.

Following the flag-raising ceremony, a reception is scheduled on the school patio.

[From the San Antonio (Tex.) Light, June 28, 1964]

CEREMONY TO MARK HEMISFAIR MILESTONE

Dedication ceremonies at 5 p.m. Sunday at the German-English School, 421 South Alamo, will officially mark the site as the HemisFair headquarters.

The Air Force Band of the West will provide music for the ceremonies. H. B. Zachry, HemisFair board chairman, will give the welcoming address, and Rabbi David Jacobson, Temple Beth-El, will give the dedicatory prayer.

William R. Sinkin, HemisFair president, will introduce the guests and speak on the renovation program, while Ewen C. Dingwall, executive vice president, will speak on the history of the school.

Representative HENRY B. GONZALEZ, honorary cochairman with Mayor McAllister, will speak on the national and international aspects of the HemisFair. Following his talk, representatives of Latin American countries will present their flags.

A reception will be held on the patio following the ceremonies.

[From the San Antonio (Tex.) Light, June 28, 1964]

HEMISFAIR HUB—200 AT CEREMONIES

About 200 persons attended dedication ceremonies for the HemisFair executive headquarters at 421 South Alamo Sunday.

Representative GONZALEZ, principal speaker, said the 1968 exposition "can be one of the most significant events in the history of this area."

HemisFair Executive Vice President Ewen C. Dingwall noted about 70 buildings will be restored on the fair grounds, in order that the fair "will be a link between the great past of San Antonio and its greater future."

William R. Sinkin, HemisFair president, traced the history of the fair and said GONZALEZ first advanced the idea in 1962. He also pointed out the HemisFair emblem was designed by GONZALEZ' son.

A flag-raising ceremony cited representatives from 21 countries participating in the fair. Consuls from several Latin American countries and military commanders were present for the ceremonies.

Music was furnished by the Lackland Air Force Base Band of the West.

[From the San Antonio (Tex.) Light, June 29, 1964]

HEMISFAIR PLANS—HELP FROM MILITARY

San Antonio's military commanders were feted at a noon luncheon Monday by the HemisFair Executive Committee at the Menger Hotel.

HemisFair President William R. Sinkin told the 15 officers present that the 1968 fair depends greatly on military cooperation and assistance.

He also quoted a letter from Nils A. Lennartson, Assistant Secretary of Defense, who said, "The Department of Defense appreciates this opportunity to take part in the early planning of HemisFair, and asks that you provide us with information concerning the form of military support required so we can reach a clear and common understanding."

FROM SOLON

Sinkin also read a telegram from Senator YARBOROUGH expressing his gratitude and appreciation to the area commanders for their support and assistance to the HemisFair.

Ewen C. Dingwall, executive vice president of HemisFair, told of the forms of military cooperation at the Seattle Century 21 Exposition, and outlined possible forms of cooperation in the San Antonio area.

Among those he discussed was advice and coordination on the proposed military or aviation museum which will be a part of HemisFair.

WILL PLAN

In the near future, assigned project officers from various commands will meet with the HemisFair staff for detailed planning and coordination of coming events.

Attending the luncheon were Maj. Gen. William A. Harris, commanding general of Ft. Sam Houston; Maj. Gen. H. K. Mooney, vice commander, Air Training Command; Maj. Gen. Prescott M. Spicer, commander, Lackland Military Training Center; Maj. Gen. Richard P. Klocko, commander, Air Force Security Service, and Brig. Gen. J. L. Riley, 4th Air Reserve Region, Randolph Air Force Base.

FACTS BEHIND THE "FAILURE" OF ATLAS-CENTAUR LAUNCHING

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. VAN DEERLIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alaska?

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, my long years as a working newspaperman before election to Congress should have prepared me for the headlines and text in newspapers here and throughout the country following yesterday's research and development flight of the Atlas-Centaur launch vehicle from Cape Kennedy. A malfunction cut the burning time of the Centaur second-stage engines, and the empty rocket casing was not thrust into orbit. Orbiting the empty rocket casing was not a part of the test, though it would have occurred if there had been a full burn of the second-stage engines.

This partial failure of one of six primary flight objectives led to headlines and stories that "Centaur Fails To Achieve Orbit" and "Centaur Fails in an Orbital Attempt."

These headlines and stories are in keeping with the undying news tradition that trouble of any sort makes news, while the achievement of an announced goal is generally worth nothing more than an editorial ho-hum.

While generally it is impossible to catch up with a news story and give it a more accurate emphasis, I would like my colleagues to know that this third test launch of the Atlas-Centaur launch vehicle, built with the help of many of my constituents at the General Dynamics-Astronautics plant in San Diego, Calif., achieved all but one of its flight objectives. Fully attained flight objectives included successful jettisoning of insulation panels and nose fairing, the verification of the structural integrity of the Atlas and Centaur vehicles during all phases of powered flight, the separation of the Atlas and Centaur stages, and the demonstration of the operation of the guidance system.

The primary flight objective that was only partially achieved was start of the Centaur engines in flight and a burn of the programed duration. Project officials said the cutoff of the Centaur engines 127 seconds short of their programed 380 seconds burning time resulted from a failure of a pump in the hydraulic system which actuates the mechanism for swiveling the engines to maintain control of the Centaur stage during powered flight.

When this failure occurred at about 4 seconds after second-stage ignition, the stage was able to maintain its trajectory, but it began to roll. As the rotations increased, the propellant was forced to the side of the tanks uncovering the outlet feeding liquid oxygen to the engines. They cut off after 253 seconds of burn time for lack of fuel.

At the programed cutoff time, 127 seconds later, the stage's attitude control system regained roll control and remaining inflight events went as planned. The engine boost pumps were restarted to obtain data necessary to development of Centaur for missions in which the engines are shut down and restarted. It was not planned to restart the engines on this flight. This successful continuation of the test flight following the partial failure of one of the test objectives is, I think, a clear demonstration of the overall success of the flight from an engineering point of view.

It also should be noted clearly that this flight in no way suggests a delay in either the Centaur development program or operational flights of Surveyor, a prime mission of the Atlas-Centaur launch vehicle.

And a further, final note of positive thinking as opposed to "news" is that this flight was the 14th consecutive NASA-USAF Atlas space booster success, a confidence factor of great significance for this program.

THE NATIONAL ECONOMIC CONVERSION COMMISSION IS NEEDED NOW

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alaska?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, according to several studies published recently by close observers of the defense program, the findings of several hearings held by congressional committees on the subject of defense spending and the U.S. economy, and numerous public statements made by officials closely associated with the program, it appears that we are nearing a point where defense spending will no longer increase at the rate that it has over the past several years.

As you know, defense spending after the termination of the Korean conflict fell sharply by about $10 billion. However, after reaching a low of $40.7 billion in fiscal 1955, such spending began to rise again and continued to increase fairly steadily through the current fiscal year to a level of $55.3 billion. This substantial increase in defense spending since fiscal year 1956 came mainly as a result of a marked pickup in the arms race with the Soviet Union. In order to meet the many new Soviet military challenges, it was necessary for our Nation to devote many billions of dollars toward the development of many new and highly sophisticated weapons systems, especially in areas of missile and submarine warfare.

Recently the Congress has heard many statements made by officials of the Defense Establishment which strongly indicate that this "big push" to develop new weapons systems needed to place the United States in a position of unquestioned military superiority is now coming to an end.

In November of last year, former Deputy Secretary of Defense Roswell Gilpatric in an appearance before the Senate Subcommittee on Manpower and Employment made a statement which I believe provided a very strong indication of what is in store for us in the next few years as far as defense spending is concerned. Mr. Gilpatric stated:

> Unless some currently unforeseen change takes place in the nature of military threats which the Nation faces, we do not see the need * * * of a recurrence of the rapid increase in defense spending that has been necessary in the past 3 years.
>
> Instead, we anticipate a relatively stable overall military budget, but with conditions which should create economic problems for certain industries that would then have to find alternative, nondefense uses for their resources.

In an article which appeared in the April issue of Foreign Affairs, Mr. Gilpatric stated further that it was entirely possible that the United States might be able to cut defense spending by as much as 25 percent by 1970, if the current deténte is successfully maintained between the Soviet Union and the United States. Based on the amount given for fiscal year 1964, $55.3 billion, defense spending could therefore fall by as much as $13.8 billion by 1970 if this assumption holds true.

Moreover, we should not overlook the fact that CARL VINSON, the distinguished chairman of the House Armed Services Committee has also apparently reached a similar conclusion on this matter. In a speech given on the floor of the House on February 20 of this year, he stated:

> Simply stated, we are reaching a point in several areas, principally missiles, where we are coming up pretty close to our total needs. And we simply do not need to buy as many of the items as we did before. As a matter of fact, we are stronger in our defense today than we have ever been in any peacetime period before.

Hence, based on these observations I firmly believe that the Congress of the United States, along with those industries and individuals whose livelihood have depended in part or in full upon the boom in defense expenditures over the past several years, must now face the fact that the boom, at least for the time being, is coming to an end. In making this observation, I do not mean that the bottom has fallen out of defense spending. Nor am I assuming or anticipating a sharp drop in the level of defense spending as a result of the signing of a workable disarmament agreement with the East. I am just simply stating that, barring any serious or catastrophic breakdown in our relations with the Soviet Union, it is most likely that defense spending could fall by a fairly substantial amount over the next few years.

Moreover, within the past few months we have witnessed several events which further support my contention that the Congress of the United States now has a mandate to set in motion, through its legislative machinery, plans designed to help defense contractors, communities, the various States, and the Nation as a whole adjust to a sharp reduction in defense spending in general or to major changes in the needs of our defense program.

The first event came on December 12 of last year when Secretary McNamara announced the scheduled closing or consolidation of 33 military installations located in 14 States and in several foreign countries. Moreover, on April 23 of this year the Secretary announced additional actions affecting 63 installations and administrative offices located in 26 States and 4 foreign countries. These two announcements bring the number of actions initiated since March 30, 1961, to a total of 556. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that this is not the last word that we will have from the Defense Department on the matter. The Secretary has already indicated that more actions will be announced in the near future. A good number of the actions already announced have been completed, while others will be completed at various times from now until fiscal year 1967. Furthermore, according to officials at the Department of Defense, it has been estimated that these 556 actions will result in annual savings of approximately $553 million, and in the elimination of 81,599 jobs—48,835 military and 32,764 civilian.

Since the Civil Service Commission is bound by law to obtain employment for all displaced Government workers wishing to continue working with the Government, most of the individuals affected by these actions will find new employment. And, moreover, the Government must pay the cost of retraining and the cost of moving displaced individuals to a new location. Unfortunately, however, there is little that the Government can do for many communities whose economies had depended so heavily on the activities of those installations which have now been closed down. This situation, Mr. Speaker, is already becoming one of our most pressing national problems.

Second, the President in his budget message before Congress in January of this year announced to the surprise of many that the administration has planned to reduce defense spending in fiscal year 1965 $1.3 billion below that estimated for fiscal 1964. This marks the first substantial reduction in defense expenditures in over a decade. According to the latest available estimates, procurement in fiscal year 1965 will be reduced by a little over $1.5 billion and research and development expenditures will fall by approximately $363 million. For the other remaining major expenditure categories it is estimated that some will show modest increases while others will decline slightly.

Also in January of this year President Johnson announced in his State of the Union Message that we would cut the production of enriched uranium by 25 percent beginning in fiscal year 1965. Immediately following the President's announcement, the Atomic Energy Commission issued a press release which stated that this reduction would mean that "a total of 4 of the Commission's 14 plutonium-producing reactors at the Hanford plant near Richland, Wash., and the Savannah River Plant near Aiken, S.C., will be shut down, and the combined electric energy usage in the gaseous diffusion plant operations at Oak Ridge, Tenn., Paducah, Ky., and Portsmouth, Ohio, will be curtailed by about 25 percent below the current level."

In a speech given in New York City on April 20 of this year President Johnson announced that the United States would decrease its production of enriched uranium by another 15 percent, beginning in fiscal 1966. When these reductions are completed, the production of enriched uranium will be 40 percent below the July 1, 1964, production level. To accomplish this additional curtailment, the AEC will reduce by an additional 25 percent the electric power usage in its gaseous diffusion plants. As I understand it, these further power cutbacks are expected to take effect gradually, beginning in 1966, with completion in 1968. With this action it is estimated that total annual savings will result in an annual savings of $50 million by fiscal 1965 and a little under $90 million in annual savings by fiscal year 1968.

According to current estimates of the AEC it is estimated that about 1,800 workers directly engaged in the production of nuclear materials will have lost their jobs by fiscal year 1965. By fiscal year 1968 it is estimated that the cutback in jobs will have increased to 3,400. The community which will feel the major impact of this cutback is Richland, Wash. By fiscal year 1967 it is estimated that employment at AEC facilities will fall by 2,000 or 24 percent of the present employment level at this location.

Also in April of this year, Secretary of Defense McNamara, in an appearance before the Subcommittee on Defense Procurement of the Joint Economic Committee, announced that the cost reduction program initiated by the Department early in 1961 has to date been highly successful in reducing costs in the defense program.

In short, this program has sought maximum coordination and cooperation among all of the various agencies of the Defense Establishment in order to insure that major steps would be taken toward, first, buying only what we need; second, buying at the lowest sound price; and third, reducing operating costs. To date, the program has been remarkably successful in meeting its goals. In his statement, the Secretary stated:

> Estimated savings actually realized in fiscal year 1963 totaled almost $1.4 billion and savings of almost $1.9 billion have been reflected in the budget plan for the current fiscal year. And, we were able to identify and reflect a total of almost $2.5 billion in cost reduction savings in the fiscal year 1965 budget request.

Mr. McNamara, stated further that as far as the program stands now he is confident that annual savings will reach a level of some $4 billion by the end of fiscal year 1967. Many close observers of the defense program have indicated that they believe that the success of this program was the major factor in enabling the Department to plan a reduction in defense spending for fiscal year 1965.

Finally in a recent study prepared by the Department of Defense for Senator GEORGE MCGOVERN, who has been a leader in the movement to get the Congress to pay greater attention to the pressing problems of the economic adjustment to defense cutbacks, it was shown that 50 major suppliers in 20 States will be affected by those major military procurement programs not funded beyond fiscal year 1963 and those not funded beyond the first half of fiscal year 1964. Moreover, Prof. Seymour Melman, of Columbia University, recently made a sample study of 19 major defense contractors located in six States—New Jersey, New York, Massachusetts, California, Colorado, and Washington—and found that there will be a total loss of some 67,000 jobs because of a decline in defense spending.

Mr. Speaker, in my State alone, Professor Melman's survey of five firms—RCA, ITT, Bendix Aviation, Curtis-Wright, and General Precision—showed that recent and pending layoffs by these firms will amount to 10,460 workers, because of reduced business with the Pentagon.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted it to be clearly understood that these observations which I have just made concerning the current status of the defense program and its relationship to the economy should in no way be interpreted as being a criticism of the policies and programs instituted by Secretary McNamara. I would be the first to advocate that the Department of Defense should strive at all times to eliminate all nonessential and wasteful expenditures in the program. The burden of our program of national defense is heavy enough as it is, and in instances when our national security is not at stake, everything should be done to cut such spending so as to reduce the burden on the American taxpayer and to make more funds available to Federal, State, and local programs which so desperately need funds to fulfill many unmet civilian needs, especially in such areas as health, education, welfare, transportation, community development, and so forth.

Since Secretary McNamara has been in office, he has been successful not only in instituting and carrying out a program which has placed this Nation in a position of unquestioned military superiority, but, through his excellent management of the Defense Establishment, he has also been remarkably successful in eliminating many unnecessary programs and reducing the costs of many other existing programs in the Department, resulting in great savings to the American taxpayer. Based on his record to date, I believe that most of us would agree that Secretary McNamara has been indeed an outstanding public servant.

Furthermore, I wish to make it absolutely clear that I do not believe that we should expect that the Department of Defense should have to concern itself with the problems associated with the adjustment of the economy to reduction in defense spending and/or shifts in the composition of such spending following major changes in the defense program. On this subject, Secretary McNamara in a recent statement before the House Armed Services Committee aptly stated the Department's position when he said:

> The Defense Department cannot and should not assume responsibility for creating a level of demand adequate to keep the economy healthy and growing. Nor should it, in developing its programs, depart from the strictest standards of military need and operating efficiency in order to aid an economically distressed company or community.

Although I wholeheartedly subscribe to this view of the Secretary, I think most Americans would agree that the Government of the United States must shoulder much of the responsibility in assuring all interests adversely affected by the phaseout of military installations and/or the termination of defense contracts, that it will do everything in its power to minimize the economic impact of such actions.

Thus, in light of recent developments, I wish to state again that now is the time for Congress to enact legislation which will provide the Federal, State, and local communities with the means to carry out this very difficult task of effecting a smooth transfer of defense resources to the civilian sector of our economy.

After studying the various agencies of the Federal Government which might have a direct interest in the problem of economic conversion, I have come to the conclusion that none of these agencies by themselves possess the resources to cope with this very difficult problem. Therefore, since I believe that the matter of conversion is such an immediate and compelling problem, I introduced a bill, H.R. 10650, on March 26 of this year, which would provide for the establishment of an agency known as the Economic Conversion Commission in the Executive Office of the President. This Commission, to be headed by the Secretary of Commerce, will include: the Secretaries of Defense, Agriculture, Labor, and Interior, the Chairmen of the Atomic Energy Commission and the Council of Economic Advisers, and the Directors of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. In short, this bill seeks to fulfill three objectives:

First. The Commission will be instructed to institute a comprehensive study of the appropriate policies and programs to be carried out by the departments and agencies of the Federal Government to facilitate conversion. The findings of this study should be submitted to Congress and the President within 1 year after the enactment of this legislation.

Second. The Commission should also consult the various State Governors and all interested local officials on the subject of conversion and convene a National Conference on Industrial Conversion and Growth within a year after the enactment of the act. This conference would consider the problems arising from a conversion to a civilian economy, and to encourage appropriate planning and programing by all sectors of the economy to facilitate the Nation's economic conversion capability.

Third. This act provides that all defense contractors who have more than 25 percent of their employees engaged in work under any defense contract, must establish an industrial conversion committee, which shall be charged with planning for conversion to civilian work arising from possible curtailment or termination of such contract or grant.

In addition to these three major provisions, the act would provide the Commission with the authority to appoint a full-time staff which would be large enough to provide the Commission with the assistance to effectively coordinate a national plan for economic conversion. Since such a staff should shoulder much of the burden of the program, the Commission should be provided with the necessary funds to appoint the most highly qualified personnel, including an adequate number of professional, administrative, and clerical personnel.

As you know, Senator GEORGE McGOVERN introduced an identical bill, S. 2274, in the Senate on October 31 of last year. Not long after the introduction of this bill in the Senate, President Johnson announced, on December 21, the establishment of a Committee on the Economic Impact of Defense and Disarmament which currently is under the chairmanship of Gardner Ackley of the Council of Economic Advisers.

At first, I think that all us, who have become quite concerned about the problem of conversion, were hopeful that this Committee would incorporate most, if not all, of the provisions of the proposed legislation into the Committee's program. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to say that to date very little visible progress has been made by the Committee in implementing the programs outlined in the legislation which Senator McGOVERN and I, along with several other colleagues in both the House and Senate, have proposed. In fact, Gardner Ackley, the present chairman of the President's Committee, stated on June 22 before the Senate Commerce Committee, which was holding hearings on the McGovern proposal, that although he agreed in principle with the objectives of the bill, he did not believe that the legislation was necessary, especially since it was his belief that the purposes outlined in the proposed legislation were now being fulfilled by the present arrangement. Two other administration officials appearing before the committee on the same day, Deputy Secretary of Defense, Cyrus Vance, and the Assistant Director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, Archibald Alexander, both concurred with the views stated by Dr. Ackley.

During the course of his testimony before the committee, Dr. Ackley revealed that the President's Committee had just recently appointed three subcommittees to conduct three major studies. He said that the first committee will conduct "a careful survey and evaluation of existing policies and programs which are available to mitigate the impact on a local community the closing of a military installation or the cancellation or termination of a defense contract."

A second committee will survey and evaluate "the various techniques and programs which have been suggested to encourage and facilitate conversion—with special attention given to the highly developed research and development resources."

And a third will prepare "an analysis of the overall fiscal policy adjustments which might be appropriate should there be significant changes in the level of defense outlays."

Although I am sure that these studies will be most helpful in providing us with a better understanding of many aspects of the conversion problem, I must say that I wholeheartedly disagree with the administration's view that the President's Committee on the Economic Impact of Defense and Disarmament is possessed with either the authority or the means to fulfill the purposes outlined in the proposed legislation.

First, the Committee is composed of individuals who already have more responsibilities than they can handle. In a recent statement before a Senate committee, Senator McGovern revealed that he sent an inquiry to the President's Committee to see if they could make a study of the impact that the closing of a particular base in South Dakota would have on the community in which it was located. Or, if this could not be done, could a staff member be sent to the community to determine if something could be done to help this distressed community? Senator McGovern stated:

> I was informed that no Committee member could go because they "all have full-time jobs in other areas," and no staff member could go because the Committee has no staff, and even if it did it has no funds from which to pay transportation.

This situation, Mr. Speaker, clearly indicates that the President's Committee at the present time is not equipped with the resources necessary to meet the needs of many communities and States which are now confronted with the very real and immediate problem of conversion.

It is true that the Commission, as proposed in my bill, will be composed of numerous high Government officials. However, these individuals will be called upon mainly to pass on recommendations pertaining to the operation and direction of a program of economic conversion. The bulk of the work and responsibility for the program will fall on the shoulders of a full-time staff of experts who will plan and execute the program under the supervision of the Commission. Moreover, a primary purpose of this legislation is to provide the Commission with the means to avoid unnecessary duplication of activities in the conversion field among various interested Federal agencies participating in the program.

A second reason why I believe that the President's Committee does not fulfill the objectives of this legislation is the fact that the administration has gone on record as opposing one of the most important provisions of the bill—that dealing with the establishment of industrial conversion committees. In his statement before the Senate Commerce Committee on June 22, Mr. Ackley states the administration's position as follows:

> Defense contractors are not prevented from establishing committees of this sort at the the present time, or from organizing in whatever other way may be most effective to plan for that conversion to nondefense work. I am confident that many defense contractors are aware of the need to take strenuous and positive action to prepare themselves to adjust to shifts in defense procurement, and are already doing so. Unfortunately, there are some who are not doing so. * * * But I doubt that requiring them to set up conversion committees would mean that their preparations would become any more intense or effective.

Contrary to the stand taken by the administration, I believe that advance planning on an industry level is absolutely essential to the successful execution of a nationwide program of economic conversion. Last summer, the New York Times conducted a survey of the 25 largest defense contractors which at that time accounted for about 50.8 percent of all defense work being done by firms in this country. Upon the completion of the survey, it was concluded that very little in the way of advance planning was being done by most of these contractors. Only a small number of them indicated that they had done any long-range planning in the area of conversion. Others, according to the Times article, seemed "to simply refuse to consider a sizable cutback in arms reduction as any kind of possibility in the forseeable future."

Mr. Speaker, such an attitude is indeed deplorable. The defense industry today is the largest single sector of the economy and therefore plays a major role in affecting the livelihood and destinies of many communities throughout the country and millions of individuals whose jobs depend either directly or indirectly upon the activities of defense-oriented firms. I would certainly prefer that the industries take the initiative themselves in planning for conversion to civilian activities. However, if this attitude continues to persist throughout the industry, I see no reason why we should not compel all firms which depend a great deal on defense contracts to make a constructive effort to find ways that they might convert into nondefense activities in the event of major reduction in defense business.

Before concluding my remarks on the subject of conversion, I would like to outline just briefly a few other major problems which will make long-range planning by local communities, States, and the Federal Government absolutely necessary.

First. We know that the major portion of defense production is concentrated in only a few States. Of the more than $25 billion in prime contracts awarded to firms and nonprofit organizations in fiscal year 1963, close to 60 percent of the money went to contractors located in just eight States, with more than 23 percent going to California alone. Moreover, according to a recent survey made by the Department of Labor, it was shown that nine States in 1962 had more than 20 percent of their manufacturing work force employed in defense related industries, the highest being Washington State with 34.8 percent engaged in defense related activity.

Second. Defense business has become highly concentrated. For fiscal year 1962 the Department of Defense estimates that of the $25 billion in prime contracts awarded to defense contractors, more than 67 percent of this total was awarded to firms for the procurement of missiles—27.3 percent; aircraft—20.6 percent; electronics—13.4 percent; and ships—6.2 percent.

We also know that reduction in defense spending will not only affect the livelihoods of production workers engaged in defense related activities. Such a development will also affect many highly trained scientific personnel. Today it is estimated that approximately two-thirds of the Nation's scientists and engineers are engaged in activities associated with defense effort. Over the past year there have been numerous articles which show that already there are a considerable number of highly trained individuals being laid off, especially engineers, and that such persons are finding great difficulty in finding new positions. In an article appearing last month in the U.S. News & World Report, it was stated that layoffs affecting engineers, scientists, technicians, and highly skilled craftsmen have "reached into the tens of thousands" following recent cutbacks in defense spending. In my State alone the article states that "more than 20,000 engineers, technicians, and production workers in defense industries have lost their jobs in the last 14 months." Moreover, I understand that many scientific personnel will find difficulty locating jobs in the nondefense sector because their training and background obtained in the defense field are of little use in the civilian field. Thus, many highly skilled individuals will have to engage in some form of retraining in order to qualify for civilian jobs.

Finally, we should not overlook the fact that the economy today is still operating at well below full capacity and unemployment is still a most serious and persistent problem. Thus, these two conditions alone certainly make it all the more necessary that we establish now a comprehensive and effective system of planning for conversion as a hedge against a substantial reduction in defense spending.

In citing these additional problems associated with recent developments in the defense field, I wish not to leave the impression that these problems cannot be resolved. Already there have been many studies published on the subject of conversion, most of the experts in the field seem to be in general agreement that we possess the know-how, the resources and policy instruments to combat the problem effectively once the Nation has committed itself to a well-coordinated and comprehensive national program for conversion. Thus, it is my hope that the Congress, as a result of what I have said here today, will act without further delay to take a first major step in the direction of achieving a goal which I have just stated, by enacting legislation providing for a National Economic Conversion Commission which would supplant the present Presidential Committee. This new agency will not only be backed by a legislative mandate, but it will also be provided with the necessary funds and staff to handle a most difficult task.

HOSPITAL CARE FOR THE AGED

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Minish] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues from New Jersey and I wish to address the House today on the grave problem of meeting the medical care needs of our retired citizens. Our distress and dismay at the decision last week of the Ways and Means Committee to defer action on the King-Anderson bill is shared by the millions of our fellow citizens who are confronted with this very real and tragic problem.

We are faced with three choices in meeting this problem: We can continue to ignore it; or we can subject our older citizens to the humiliation of public charity and the means test; or, thirdly, we can adopt the sensible and practical medicare plan. I am convinced that the overwhelming majority of Americans favor the third approach, and I deplore the failure of the Ways and Means Committee to approve the King-Anderson bill. We are left with the first two approaches, and countless families must bear an unwarranted, unpredictable, and often unmanageable burden in paying the cost of diseases of advancing age.

In his stirring state of the Union message, President Johnson stated:

> Let this session of Congress be known as the session which finally recognized the health needs of our older citizens.

He was referring, of course, to the proposal to provide for the cost of their hospital and related care under social security.

I emphasize the word "finally" because the patience of our senior citizens has been sorely tried by delaying tactics and counterproposals, culminating now in the decision of the Ways and Means Committee to postpone action indefinitely. Let us look, for a moment, at the record. When the bill was first proposed back in 1952, its opponents took the position that there was really no cost problem for medical care for older people which could not be handled at the local level. For the 8 years of the Eisenhower administration there was mulling and maneuver but no action. One thing, however, was accomplished. In reporting the 1958 amendments to the Social Security Act, the Committee on Ways and Means expressed its great concern with the problem and asked the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to study the situation and suggest several alternatives in January 1959. Three months after the due date, on April 2, 1959, this report appeared with the startling statement that there did, after all, appear to be a problem. It read:

> There is a general agreement that a problem does exist. The rising cost of medical care, and particularly of hospital care, over the past decade has been felt by persons of all ages. Older persons have larger than average medical care needs * * *. A larger proportion of the aged than of other persons must turn to public assistance for payment of their medical bills or rely on free care from hospitals and physicians. Because both the number and proportion of older persons in the population are increasing a satisfactory solution to the problem of paying for adequate medical care for the aged will become more rather than less important.

But having taken this stand, it came up with no solution or recommendations.

The year 1960 was an election year and John F. Kennedy had made it quite clear that a social security health care program was a major plank in his platform. Still the incumbent administration held back. Early in 1960 a news story in the New York Times—February 20—stated:

> Arthur S. Flemming, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, has been trying since last July to draft a plan for medical care for the aged that would be acceptable to the Budget Bureau.

On March 23, 1960, the Washington Post reported:

> Welfare Secretary Flemming, reported to have been rebuffed on one proposal, appealed anew yesterday for President Eisenhower's support of some kind of Federal program to help the aged meet their medical bills.

Finally, on May 5, 1960, Mr. Flemming appeared before the Committee on Ways and Means with a Federal-State program so excessively complicated and awkward in its administrative structure that one member of the committee described it as a "Townsend-Plan Rube Goldberg" scheme. Subsequent hearings in both the House and the Senate brought out the weaknesses of this all-out effort to find a better method than social security financing and it was abandoned. This Congress did adopt the Kerr-Mills law, but the Democratic platform made it quite clear that this important legislation was a supplement to, rather than a substitute for, a program of adding health care to the social security system.

It is particularly noteworthy, I believe, that three key officials in the Eisenhower Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, who tried hard during this period of fiddling and frustration to find an alternative to the social security method for meeting the problem, have since come out unequivocally in its favor. Charles M. Schottland, a Commissioner of the Social Security Administration during part of this period has appeared before congressional committees in support of the Kennedy administration's proposal since he left the Department. On January 9, 1961, Marion B. Folsom, an Eisenhower Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, reversed his former opposition and stated flatly that he had finally concluded that "the logical plan, and one which is endorsed by most students of the subject, is to finance and administer a program of health insurance for retired people through the old-age and survivors and disability program." He pointed out that the tested administrative mechanism of social security—run at a cost of only 2 percent of benefits—would be more effective than 50 separate State systems, and that "a contributory system of this type would fit more naturally into the philosophy of our whole system, than would one based on a means test."

Just last November there was another switch when former Secretary of HEW Arthur S. Flemming, serving as Chairman of the National Committee on Health Care of the Aged—the so-called Javits committee—endorsed the social security method, along with other members of the committee, after more than a year's exhaustive study.

I call these facts to the attention of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle because I think it is safe to say that no three men have tried harder, or for a longer period, to find a better way than the social security method than these fellow party members of theirs. They are thoughtful, knowledgeable, and deliberate men but all of their deliberations led finally to the conclusion that the social security way was, after all, the best way to do part of the job.

I urge all Members who have not done so to study this report of the National Committee on Health Care of the Aged—also signed by former Secretary Folsom and Arthur Larson, Eisenhower's Under Secretary of Labor—for it is a thoughtful and careful document. It points out that hospital care costs constitute about one-third of the total annual medical bill for the aged; that another third goes for physicians, surgery, and similar emergency care; and that the final one-third is made up of numerous other, but generally less urgent, types of medical care. The Committee's proposal, very briefly, is that the one-third constituting hospital care be covered by social security financing, the second third by private insurance on a nonprofit, tax-exempt pooled basis, and that the final third be reserved for other methods. They endorse the Kerr-Mills law as one method of meeting part of these costs for welfare clients.

While the report may be too optimistic in estimating what private insurance can do, it is very clear on what private insurance cannot do. I am in full agreement on this and I also endorse the Kerr-Mills Act as a necessary supplement to a Federal insurance program. Both Kerr-Mills and private health insurance are important adjuncts to the proposed program, but neither nor both are satisfactory substitutes for it. Both would be made much more useful by passage of the King-Anderson bill.

In the light of all the evidence, who can claim that voluntary health insurance can alone meet the health needs of the aged? It is past time that we recognize—and act upon—the facts. In the words of the late Dr. Basil MacLean, the former president of the Blue Cross Association:

> A lifetime's experience has led me at last to conclude that the costs of care of the aged cannot be met, unaided, by the mechanism of insurance or prepayment as they exist today. The aged simply cannot afford to buy from any of these the scope of care that is required, nor do the stern competitive realities permit any carrier, whether nonprofit or commercial to provide benefits which are adequate at a price which is feasible for any but a small proportion of the aged.

I represent an urban district, containing every economic bracket from the poverty stricken in slums to great wealth in suburbs. The vast majority of my constituents lie between the two extremes. They, the great majority, are the ones who are concerned about medicare. As the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Anthony J. Celebrezze, told the Committee on Ways and Means in hearings conducted last November:

> The costs of serious illness in old age can wipe out the slender savings of a lifetime and turn security into poverty.

He went on to point out that, by allowing medical expense deductions for income tax purposes, the Government now helps those among the aged who are relatively well off. The very wealthy person has 91 percent of his medical bills taken care of in this way. But because only one-fifth of the aged have incomes high enough to pay income taxes, the remaining four-fifths cannot benefit by this provision at all. He noted that Government action has also been taken to help the very poor. He, therefore, urged enactment of the administration's bill on the ground:

> It is the great majority of people, who are neither wealthy nor very poor, who have been left out. These are people who have been self-supporting all their lives and want to continue to be—who do not want welfare even if it were adequate. What is needed is a system under which all workers can, during their productive years, pay contributions toward protection against the high health costs that will beset them in later years. Social security, and only social security, offers a ready-built, thoroughly tested mechanism that would make this desirable arrangement available to practically everybody.

I receive letters almost daily from retired constituents who are worried about medical expenses and disillusioned about benefits received from private hospitalization policies. These are mostly people who have always maintained a nice standard of living and have prided themselves on their thrift and foresight. I hear from families with children to educate who are faced with the care of an aged, often senile, parent who is a burden and whom they cannot let become a public charge. White collar groups and blue collar groups who are confronted with the problem of hospital expenses for themselves or their parents are equally enthusiastic about medicare. There is no other issue which appeals so strongly to the people in my area. This deals with a concrete problem which is of very real concern to them. Either they or their neighbors or friends have been involved with it. To have modest savings depleted by illness, to have public welfare the only resort, is repugnant to people who have always earned their own way.

There is scarcely a family above the poverty level and below the top brackets—from the modest wage earner to the executive—that does not have a direct stake in the medicare program. They are anxious for themselves or for their parents. They are troubled about discharging their duty to their aged ill family members and at the same time fulfilling their obligations to children who must also be cared for adequately.

I should like to quote from a few of the letters from constituents. The remarks of the first quoted, a widow with devoted children to whom she dreads becoming a burden, summarizes the general sentiments. "It is sad to grow old." Is it not beyond comprehension that the dedicated members of the medical profession are apparently so indifferent to the peace of mind of the very persons whom the advances in geriatrics are supposed to benefit?

As our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Missouri, Congressman **Bolling**, recently observed:

> What a cruel paradox it is therefore to find that the very men who have created the means by which we can hope to live longer are at the same time almost entirely united in a bitter attempt to keep those very means from the people for whom they were meant.

A longer life is meaningless if one must live it in constant dread that unpreventable and unpredictable illness will shatter one financially.

To quote from the lady's letter:

> I took out hospitalization insurance in 1957 at $16.50 payable every 3 months, then in December of 1962, I took out another policy $11.20 payable every 3 months. On January 29, 1963, I had to enter the hospital to be operated on at the age of 65. I made a fine and speedy recovery but am still paying for all this, as they claim my policy did not cover all, at the price the hospital charged. All in all, my doctor's fee and hospital ran near $900 and I received from said insurance company less than half this amount. I wonder how many older people like myself are in this same situation? It is sad to grow old.

Others write as follows:

> My husband and myself have social security only to help us in rent, food, and medical care for my husband, which comes pretty high. We have $148.20 in the month to do it all, so you see it is hard for us.

> I get $61 a month social security, pay $32 rent. What is left to do anything else? I have been paying Blue Cross, I can't any longer.

> As a senior citizen (76 years old) and a U.S. voter for 55 years, I wish to register my grievances in regard to the deplorable conditions surrounding medical aid for the elderly. My wife, also 76 years old, and I are being financially strangled by the extremely high rate of medical insurance. This insurance is for my wife only—I cannot, because of poor health, obtain insurance of this type. We have most recently been given a 30-percent increase in premium with no increase in benefits. For an elderly couple living on a meager annual income, this extra expense is an added burden to our overburdened existence. We know we can do nothing about the increase—we are compelled to keep the insurance—however, we want our plight to be known so that you, through extended efforts may be able to do something to alleviate a situation which is making living to a ripe old age a disadvantage.

Again, that refrain, "It is sad to grow old."

> For the retired senior citizen any long or severe illness can become a major disaster. Even with a pension in addition to social security it can seldom be met from income. In all but a very few cases it can destroy the standards of living of both man and wife and make their remaining years a desperate struggle. In a recent Saturday Evening Post article written by a doctor the statement is made that the elderly could procure insurance. Where? Very few companies will write health or hospital insurance after age 65. If they do the cost is very high. I have found one company which writes it but it is cancellable at the option of the company. At age 75 it is automatically canceled. Then a policy of extremely limited coverage with a very high premium can be obtained if one is still in perfect health.

> I am a widow of World War I—living on a small veteran pension, $50.40 a month; social security, $54.70; total $105.10 a month. I had a serious operation 2 years ago and need another. It cost me a lot of money for operation and care in hospital. Cannot afford any more operations. My few dollars my husband left me are gone.

> I am mailing you this letter from the Continental Casualty Co. giving you one more reason why you should support the late President Kennedy's bill to finance medical care for the aged under social security. I bought this policy when I became 65 to afford myself some protection. Now, after I have paid on this policy for 2 years without any cost to them, they have decided to raise the premium. What protection does the policyholder have other than take it or leave it.

> I am writing you to ask your support to vote for the bill, H.R. 3920. My husband and I both live on social security and I have read about the King-Anderson bill. There is every indication in both of our minds that our President knew what he was advocating to the people about our needs. As we are very grateful for the social security but when it comes to being hospitalized I am talking from experience as I have been in that predicament and no one came to my rescue, so if our people had my experience, they would surely realize that we need hospital insurance for the aged.

These poignant letters remind one of the dictum of the noted historian, Arnold Toynbee:

> The moral tone and lifespan of a civilization can be measured by the respect and care given its elderly citizens.

The anxiety and heartbreak of America's elderly citizens are a shame and disgrace to the richest, most powerful nation in the world. Yet, old age health care financed through the social security system would tax each individual less than the cost of a pack of cigarettes each week.

To those who contend that an increase in social security taxes to finance the program would place too great a burden on the working population, I submit the following letter. In my opinion, the great majority of wage earners would agree with her views:

> This is an appeal to you regarding the hospital insurance act under social security as proposed in the bill H.R. 3920. My mother is an ailing woman over 65 years of age. Of course, time does not stand still for any of us, and this prompts me to think when my children will say the same thing about my husband and me. We are in the middle bracket income status. The income which we will obtain from social security when the time comes will not be that great that we can ignore the fact that life will go on and necessities will be a must. Illness is a great extravagance. We don't want it but when it comes we must buy our cures and care whether we want to or not, even though we may be able to afford it. Maybe something like the above bill will alleviate those big dents that come into our meager incomes. My mother requires the attention of a doctor every 2 weeks. So does my father-in-law. This is a must.

As the National Council of Senior Citizens for Health Care Through Social Security has pointed out:

> The King-Anderson program is essentially a workingman's health insurance program reaching into three generations with each generation seeking to achieve independence with dignity by paying its own freight. The 20 to 42 age group supports the King-Anderson approach because it liberates them from the anxiety and burden of paying for hospital and nursing home costs incurred by their parents. The 42 to 64 age group welcomes the social security approach because

it will insure them from becoming burdens to their children who have their own burdens and responsibilities bringing up their families. Those 65 and over need this sort of health insurance to give them a measure of economic independence so that they, in turn, will not become burdens to their children. And thus the cycle is completed.

As my constituents' letters reveal, the Kerr-Mills program cannot be considered a satisfactory substitute for the medicare program. People who have made their own way, have lived useful lives, have a strong aversion to a program associated with public welfare and the means test. They need and want medical care as a right, not as charity. How can anyone maintain that personal freedom is extended under the Kerr-Mills program where only people who can prove their destitution can get help in obtaining medical care, while liberty and our democratic values are endangered by a system under which people would contribute during their working years, when they can best afford it, and then have health insurance protection in old age? The social security-financed program would provide the aged with precisely the freedom that the vast majority of the working population enjoy as a direct result of having health insurance.

The success of the prepayment plans for active workers reflects the self-reliance and independence of Americans who have always prided themselves on paying their own way. It is cruel that the men and women who have taken pride in their independence must in their old age, when they can no longer afford adequate health protection, be told they can get all the medical care needed, provided they become public charges; provided they have exhausted modest savings and sold precious possessions; and also provided they have spent the resources of relatives in an effort to meet the costs themselves. It is an insult to our people.

I can vouch from personal experience how enormous have been the benefits of the social security system through the past 25 years. I grew up in a small town in Pennsylvania where misery and anxiety were the common lot and fathers fell ill and died at early ages from the rigors of mining coal under hardship conditions. I know what life was for families without the social security retirement system we take for granted nowadays—benefits for widows and children, protection against temporary unemployment, old age pensions. The workers of today are glad to pay adequate social security taxes to give themselves and their dependents the kind of protection very few knew in their own childhood. They do not want that hard earned economic security of retirement destroyed by medical expenses. Is it not logical that the social security system that now protects the aged against total loss of income in their years of retirement also protect them against medical catastrophe?

Mr. Speaker, with each day that passes the problem is becoming more acute. The American Hospital Association reported August 1, 1963, that the average cost to hospitals for each day a patient spends in the hospital has more than doubled in the last 10 years, increasing from $18.35 to $36.83 a day. The total expenses of an average stay in the hospital—slightly more than a week—increased during the same periods from $148 to $279 the association revealed.

The high cost of medical care is clearly a very great economic force of the times. Professor Emeritus Seymour E. Harris, of Harvard University, in his book entitled "The Economics of American Medicine" discloses that medical care of all kinds will cost Americans an estimated $33 billion this year, a whopping jump from $14 billion in 1950. Of each dollar spent, hospitals amount to 27 cents, and the hospital share has been rising fastest of all. Hospital daily charges have risen 2½ times as much as has the average income of patients, after taxes, since 1948. Moreover, Harris predicts another 50 percent increase in hospital costs by 1970. With auxiliary services, included, costs may mount to as much as $100 a day. However Harris says the average stay in hospitals has been steadily reduced.

The committee has regrettably rejected the administration's medicare plan, but it has not disposed of the need out of which the proposal arose. That need will continue to exist and to grow. Those wishful-thinkers who are hoping it will go away are overlooking the really tragic circumstances of those of our older men and women who, having been self-sufficient for all of their lives, wish neither to seek charity or to become a burden on their children with growing families when illness strikes. Sooner or later we will plug this gap in the self-financed social insurance system we adopted over 25 years ago. The people want it. They have evidence for it in their own families and in their friends. Americans who have suffered the burden of medical expenses today will not be put off by cliches and bogeyman labels. They are as devoted to American principles as are those who argue against medicare on the false grounds it is socialistic, antiprivate enterprise, and so forth. As the Denver Post stated:

> This newspaper believes that the provisions in the Anderson-King bill are generally sound. We oppose as vigorously as anyone the provisions that are not in the bill, the one its enemies are using to scare away support.

There is nothing in the medicare bill that would affect the American system of free medicine. The plan deals only with how hospital bills are paid for those over 65. The same arguments used against the proposed enlargement of the social security system were used against the original Social Security Act and, indeed, were used 132 years ago by opponents of tax-supported public school education. The arguments advanced 132 years ago by opponents of public school education have a very familiar ring. Consider what the forerunners of the AMA, the NAM, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, and so forth, were saying 132 years ago against public school: "if public funds are utilized political bureaucracy will be rampant." "A scheme of universal, tax-supported coverage at the expense of the state is socialism." "Standards will be lowered." "Requiring people to pay under universal coverage is dangerous." Even those who would abolish the whole social security system seem willing to accept the public school system. We cannot afford to wait another 100 years for the rightness of the concept of medical care as a social right—and not a "charity" public assistance benefit—to become clear to all parties concerned. The members of the medical profession who dedicate themselves to curing the physical ills of humanity have an intimate knowledge of the personal tragedies that result from catastrophic medical costs in old age. Surely, they wish to prevent these personal tragedies that compound physical suffering. Millions of older people are faced with the cruel choice of going without needed health care, of accepting aid from hard-pressed sons and daughters, or of seeking public charity. It is tragic that these conditions exist when there is such a practical and financially sound alternative—a comprehensive program of hospital insurance for the aged, as part of the social security system, paid for, in pennies a week, by those who will reap its benefits. I should think the logic and the humanitarianism of this proposal would appeal to physicians who surely must be troubled about the inadequate and insufficient medical care now available to most of our elderly due to financial reasons. It is most unfortunate that the men who are trained to diagnose physical ailments refuse to look this intensely human problem in the eye and continue to recommend inadequate potions for its cure.

Mr. Speaker, our social security system has demonstrated both administrative ingenuity and soundness of principle. It is ready to go with a network of offices throughout the country already operating and capable of taking on this additional duty. It must be understood, too, that the present proposal of the administration has been improved and strengthened during the years. Two main objections against the earlier proposals—that several million people could not qualify for social security benefits and would, therefore, be disqualified, and that only one benefit package was used—have been met in the present proposal. In addition to the hospital, nursing home, diagnostic outpatient and home health services provided in earlier versions, the bill would, first, extend health benefits to noninsured persons age 65 and over—except those covered for health benefits under the Federal civil service retirement system—with the cost of the benefits for this group coming out of the General Treasury; second, provide three alternative hospital benefit packages, one subject to a deductible of $10 per day for the first 9 days but covering 90 days per benefit period, another covering 45 days but with no deductible, and another providing 180 days of hospital care, with the patient paying either the national average cost for 2½ days or the hospital's customary total charge for the care provided, whichever is less. Thus, the beneficiary can select the plan that he thinks is best suited to his needs. To avoid the heavy cost of adverse selection, there may, however, be only one selection and it is irrevocable.

Mr. Speaker, the November hearings last year were interrupted by the assassination of the man who had, for many of our older men and women, epitomized their hopes that medical-care-for-the-aged legislation would be enacted this year. It is our responsibility, finally, to act in this matter for, as our new President said, with the opening of this session:

> Let us carry forward the plan and programs of John Fitzgerald Kennedy—not because of our sorrow or sympathy—but because they are right.

The problem of the health of the aged is one that should command the attention and consideration of all of us. A realistic and humanistic solution is provided in the medicare program. I shall continue to press for its enactment, and I urge the membership to join in a concerted effort to obtain action in this Congress.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MINISH. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLAGHER].

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey who has done such great work in this field.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress has a most creditable record of service. We have accomplished much, but we have not yet provided a medical care program for the older citizens of this great Nation, those who contributed so much to our greatness. It is imperative that we do so.

Few legislative proposals have been under study by as many, and certainly not by more agencies, both government and private, over a longer period of time than have been the various proposals for health care for the aged, especially the bills now being considered.

Few programs are of greater urgency, yet have progressed at such a painfully slow pace.

It is my impression that massive amounts of statistical data have been compiled and studied, the far greater portion of it supporting the need for sound and comprehensive programs for medical care for persons 65 years and older.

So often has the case for a medical care program been stated, so conclusive is the evidence, so clearly evident is the need for such a program, in my opinion, that I hope for and urge expeditious action.

Medical care for persons 65 years of age and more is, in my judgment, the most urgent matter now before the Congress. This is a program that would ease the remaining years of a great percentage of the 17 million Americans—1 of every 11 citizens—who are now 65 years or older. It would provide an orderly future means of providing such care.

We must be mindful, gentlemen, that these are the generations that contributed so much to the greatness of America. These are men and women who suffered through our greatest financial depression. In this group are many thousands who fought in the First World War. It was the personal sacrifice of these Americans that contributed so much to the education and advancement of the generations that followed.

It is true that many persons over 65 are able to provide for their own medical services. However, a vastly larger number in that group live on meager incomes, many such incomes having been reduced by virtue of being fixed in a period of inflation. The very great percentage of these older citizens need financial help in order to assure proper medical care.

I, for one, feel that we owe a great debt to the Americans of those generations. I feel we have a moral obligation to help provide the minimum medical service and other necessary care.

I feel strongly that we are obligated to act on this measure with great urgency.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MINISH. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I would also like to commend the gentleman for making this timely statement and calling the attention of the Members of the House to this very important and urgent measure that should be considered at this session of the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, there is no more pressing need before this Congress than that to provide hospital care for the aged. And I am privileged to rise in support of my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey.

We have seen many alternative plans suggested and considered—and abandoned. And we return to the conclusion that the social security method is the best method of providing that care for our older Americans.

But until we pass this legislation, the economic resources of the elderly are continuing to be daily drained.

In my own State, less than 7 percent of those 65 and over are protected under the existing legislation. We cannot rest until 100 percent are protected. We will achieve the 100 percent if we act now in line with the President's recommendation.

The arguments of those who oppose it is that private insurance companies can do the job. But in the recent hearings held in the other body, we have seen more and more evidence of the constant upward spiral of private policies, and the inability of older people to bear these costs.

Let us remember that two Secretaries of Health, Education, and Welfare in the Republican administration—Marion B. Folsom and Arthur S. Flemming—now agree that the social security method is the best and most equitable method, though, each, while Secretary, opposed this view.

Let us remember the number of our citizens who each day join the list of the elderly. Let us act in their behalf. Let us act now.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. MINISH. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I also would like to associate myself with the gentleman's remarks.

I would like to state that we have all made campaign pledges on this question of medical care for the aged. To those of us who take our campaign pledges very seriously, it is very frustrating not to have the right to vote "yea" or "nay."

Mr. Speaker, I say it is a shame that the great Committee on Ways and Means is depriving us of this privilege. This is an issue in which the public is vitally concerned and the public is entitled to have us stand up and be counted.

Yes. Mr. Speaker, it is a maxim that civilization is judged by the way it treats its older citizens. Based upon this yardstick, we do not have much right to take pride in ourselves on this subject. I hope we do take some action in meeting the needed care for the aged, because it is long overdue.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MINISH. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to compliment the gentleman in the well from New Jersey [Mr. MINISH] for his stand on this legislation which is of extreme importance to our senior citizens; that is, the matter of passing legislation to provide hospital and medical care to our older citizens through the social security system.

During my service in the House, I have always supported legislation of this kind. In fact, I am the sponsor of H.R. 5015 in this session. This bill is needed to meet absolute essential needs of our older citizens.

We all know that when illness strikes older people, it strikes with greater frequency and is of much longer duration than ailments in younger people.

We also know that such illnesses are a burden and a severe financial drain upon the children of our older citizens who must contribute moneys to meet the ever-increasing costs—the staggering costs of hospital, doctor, nursing, and incidental bills—which occur at a time when these children are faced with the rising costs of bringing up their own children, and saving for their education in later years.

The social security system, which now enables a great many people of our country to face the future with confidence, is a sound program.

This legislation would not weaken that system. It would be financed by a slight increase in the contributions—one-fourth of 1 percent on employers; one-fourth of 1 percent on employees; and three-eighths of 1 percent for the self-employed. The taxable earning base would be increased from $4,800 to $5,200. Raising the earning base would improve the benefit structure of the system generally and would also provide additional income.

I strongly recommend this legislation. I am convinced that hospital care of our aged under the social security system would preserve the dignity of our older citizens and strengthen their sense of security.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MINISH. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I am happy that my colleague from New Jersey has taken this time to talk about the acts of the Committee on Ways and Means, and lack of our opportunity to vote on some bill for medicare.

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate my colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MINISH]. I wish to add a few thoughts on the subject of medical care for our older citizens.

The Ways and Means Committee has conducted many executive sessions on the subject of medicare which is generally known to most people as a law which operates under the social security system to provide help for our senior citizens along medical and hospitalization lines.

The Kerr-Mills program of medical assistance for the aged was passed in 1960 and has been in operation for about 3 years. A Senate Special Committee on Aging has emphatically stated this program has proved at best to be an ineffective and piecemeal approach to the health problems of this Nation's 19 million older citizens.

Some of the problems which have arisen out of this program are that after 3 years there is still no national program, since only 28 States now have the program in operation, and also, the severe tests which must be passed resulted in such a curtailment of participation that as of July 1963, only 148,000 people received MAA assistance—or less than 1 percent of the Nation's older citizens. In other words, except where States have their comprehensive programs—and there are only four—the benefits have been nominal, nonexistent, or inadequate. Due to the application of the means test the number of people who could receive help is severely limited and the involvement of the members of the family is most disruptive of the family relationship. This aspect has also contributed greatly to the program's difficulties. This I know from my own practical experience.

Many of us have studied with great concern the objections raised by the AMA and we understand the point that the AMA makes in its argument—however, everybody agrees that this is not the solution to the care of the elderly.

We are also interested in the effects upon the solvency of the social security system of the real cost of a law such as the King-Anderson bill proposed in 1962. I have found it very difficult to get real figures. I say this because I never felt that a one-fourth-percent increase in the social security tax could take care of the cost. I know the Ways and Means Committee has new information with up-to-date figures which would indicate that the cost of the program will be more at the end of 3 years than has heretofore been published, to the best of my knowledge. It is also true that the members of the committee felt it would be more equitable if the Federal Government paid the cost out of the general income tax so that the burden would fall upon millions of taxpayers instead of just employers paying one-half of the cost as is now the practice under the social security system. I am certain that many employers fear the cost of the program as envisioned under the King-Anderson bill.

I waited until now to speak on this subject because I thought we would get a report in depth from the Ways and Means Committee. However, it is obvious that the committee is not going to propose any medical care bill this year. Yet the fact remains that I feel it is the No. 1 issue for thousands of people in my district and they have very earnestly pressed me to support the original plan which our late President Kennedy so urgently recommended and which President Johnson has so strongly supported.

Most of mankind is surrounded by sickness and is made helpless by disease. Whoever will provide the tools to fight this problem will earn the gratitude and the allegiance of the multitude. The question is unanswered as to what solution will be acceptable to the majority of the Members of the Congress. And I might say that I feel that Congress will quickly approve an increase in the social security benefits which has been recommended by the committee after more than 3 months of closed-door meetings. To pursue this thought a little further, I am glad to note that one provision which I have always felt most desirable will be in the new bill shortly to come before this body—that is the provision to include tips as income for social security purposes. Presently, although workers must report tips for income tax purposes, they do not receive social security credit toward retirement benefits. I certainly know that this will help many people in my district to receive a more adequate social security payment.

To return to the enormous problem of medical care—this is going to grow more every year. In fact medical care of all kinds will cost the American people an estimated $33 billion this year, which is a tremendous jump from the $14 billion spent in 1950. Further, hospital charges have risen 2½ times as much as the average income of the patients, after taxes, since 1948 and it has been predicted by Professor Harris of Harvard that another 50-percent increase in hospital costs can be expected by 1970 so that with auxiliary services included, the costs may mount to as much as $100 a day. The average prescription prices, too, which have been estimated at 93 cents in 1941, have gone up to over three times that figure.

I see no hope of this problem being solved on the local or State basis and anyone who argues from that point is just not being realistic.

I often wonder, and am perplexed by this problem—there have been so many great advances made in medical research and with the wonderful service which many people of a country like ours receive from a vast increase of hospital service. Since 1944 the death rate has decreased as follows:

	Percent
Whooping cough	83
Influenza	88
Polio	100
Tuberculosis	87
Maternal deaths	85
Dysentery	71
Acute rheumatic fever	90
Appendicitis	85
Syphilis	82
Acute nephritis	62
Hypertensive heart disease	40
Asthma	42
Infant deaths	36
Pneumonia	25
Anemias	23

Another area where our research has been so telling is among the State mental hospital patients where a sustained annual reduction has been achieved since 1950 because of the use of tranquilizing drugs—in 1955 there were 148,922 resident patients in our mental hospitals but by the end of 1963 even though the admissions had increased, there were only 94,947 resident patients, a decline of 53,975 and we were having more net releases.

The great strides in medical care, hospitalization, and medical research prolonged our life 20 years from a life expectancy of 49 years in 1900 to age 70 in 1963. This has resulted in a larger percentage of our population or about 18 million people living past 65 years of age and that is why we must face this problem—a problem which did not exist 100 years ago.

Now we are given to thinking in narrow terms—petty terms, if you like—about the cost of medical care. But I ask you, What good is your money if your feet hurt? Although we concentrate on physical and financial capital, we are inclined to forget our human capital. Beyond dispute the truth is that as we take stock of our human capital we find this is a terrific economic gain, for the production of our workers over 60 years of age in this country far exceeds the value of any money we may spend to prolong life. Our great gross national income is made possible because 18 million people in America over 65 not only produce but they are the consumers that keep our economy at our new high figures. The money spent by those older people, whether from pensions or from social security, is vital to the great accumulation of wealth in a capitalistic society. Our attitude toward this older age group could be decisive in the fight against communism throughout the world.

Estate and gift taxes in 1962 totaled almost $13 billion. Better medical care has resulted in almost 3 million more people still being employed as compared to 1944. One million people in senior age group in 1 year would earn about $7 billion and would have paid about $881 each in Federal income taxes or almost $1 billion a year. If we add the gift and inheritance taxes one can easly figure it is good business for the U.S. Treasury to do everything in our power to improve the health and welfare of our older citizens. The manpower of this age group will be most necessary according to the Manpower Commission in the event of another war.

As we measure the value of our leadership in industry and universities, we look to the brilliant contributions made by the men and women over 65 to science, education, religion, culture, and every other phase of our life. There is no question but that our older people are a tremendous and wonderful asset. Right here in Congress I have the greatest respect for the ability and experience of some great Americans who have served many years in both Houses and who carry on the work of these United States. We could not get along without the services of these erudite men and achieve the same results. Most of these men have no physical handicaps, and their years have made them wise and knowledgeable. Thus, America is the richer because of their great service. I, for one, would like to work harder toward a solution of the problem of keeping our elder people healthy and productive. I want them to have the medical care they need. This is a Nation which can spend $12 billion on alcoholic beverages a year, $7 billion on tobacco, almost $4 billion for traveling abroad. We spend almost $1 billion a year on greeting cards and chewing gum and we spend over $25 billion for other items which are not necessary to live. I have no quarrel to make with these expenditures—but I do say that above all we can well afford to see that our older people are given the medical care which is not consumed and then ceases to be—but results in productive people who add so much to the wealth of our Nation.

I would like to vote for a medical care bill because it is sound economically, and because I know we have a moral obligation to do a better job now than we have been doing as a Nation.

COMPULSORY SOCIAL SECURITY TAXATION

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, the gentlemen from New Jersey have marched to the rostrum and back again to complain of the fact that the distinguished and able Ways and Means Committee of the House has decided not to approve a program under which all people in this Nation over a certain age would receive limited hospital and medical benefits financed through compulsory social security taxation.

Alternate solutions to the problem of meeting health care costs of the elderly are dismissed. Private health insurance cannot do the job, they say. It would be too expensive. Kerr-Mills is not the answer because it has a test under which persons who have ample financial means are not allowed to receive free care at the taxpayers' expense.

It is always puzzling me to encounter the argument that private enterprise coupled with limited aid of the Federal Government for those who need help cannot solve a social problem. When proponents of a massive and very expensive Federal program are asked why people of working age cannot set aside money for their retirement health care needs through nongovernmental insurance channels, the blunt answer by these advocates is something to the effect that people are not wise enough to do this; that the only effective program is one that forces them to do so. In other words, "big brother" knows best. I have even heard the reply that people cannot afford to protect themselves in their old age. Yet, who is being asked to pay for King-Anderson? Is it the great corporations of the land, or the wealthy individuals? No. It is a tax on the first $5,400 of income, a tax which hits hardest those of limited income.

If private health insurance is too expensive, how can a Federal program with its inevitable bureaucratic mushrooming be less expensive? Somebody is going to have to pay the bills.

Kerr-Mills, financed out of general revenues, represents the proper role of Government. It is geared to provide all needed medical and hospital care for those elderly who are not on public assistance but who have limited financial resources. This Federal-State plan is not perfect, yet, by a long shot, and one of the reasons is the obvious lack of enthusiasm on the part of the administration which is afraid it might prove King-Anderson unnecessary.

The phenomenal growth of private health insurance coverage of older persons, now some 60 percent, within the past 15 years proves that the problem is a diminishing one, and one that will require less Federal expenditures as the years go by, not the uncontrollable expansion of outlays that would stem from a King-Anderson program.

The argument has been made on the House floor a few minutes ago that our Government is not humane in its treatment of the elderly. Yet Government figures reveal that more than $1.5 billion is being spent annually for their health care, alone. All told, from trust funds and public funds, the Nation's aged receive more than $17 billion a year from the U.S. Government.

I believe it is unfair for these gentlemen in effect to castigate the medical profession in the United States by saying that we have nothing to be proud of for the care we have given our people when life expectancy has dramatically increased, when medical students study here from all over the world to learn the latest techniques, when our medical research is by far the best in the world. There are many of us who would not be here on the floor today if it were not for the skill and dedication of our medical profession, which probably devotes more time and effort in helping the aged than any other group in the Nation.

I believe it is also unfair to criticize the majority of the members of the Ways and Means Committee who have studied the problems for years and are experts in the field. They know that a King-Anderson program grafted onto social security would jeopardize the fiscal soundness of the entire social security program and make the overall social security taxes so outrageously high there would be a public rebellion.

I find it difficult to believe that the humane approach to the problem of health care of the aged is one that could wreck social security.

Proponents of King-Anderson are not taking cognizance of the fact that outcries for compulsory taxation of this type would lead to ruining the finest system of medicine anyone has ever known.

THE 1964 CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LIBONATI). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to revise and extend my remarks, to include a copy of Public Law 86-90 of the 86th Congress, and to include a copy of a Presidential proclamation of June 20 of this year; also a statement from the magazine, Ukrainian Quarterly, as well as a copy of my House Resolution 14 on the captive nations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who speak on this subject today be permitted to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on this subject.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the week of July 12-18, 1964, is Captive Nations Week. This year's observance will be the sixth. Americans throughout the country will conduct weeklong activities designed to impress upon our Government and the world that the American people will never acquiesce to the permanent captivity of the nations behind the Iron, Bamboo, and Sugar Curtains. Moreover, the American people will call upon our Government to put an end to the growing illusion of interdependence with the Communist empire and to adopt a positive program aimed at the liberation and freedom of the captive nations rather than the entrenchment of their oppressive, unrepresentative governments.

OUR INDEPENDENCE AND THEIRS

It is most appropriate that on the eve of our own Independence Day the Members of Congress should take the lead in observing the 1964 Captive Nations Week. As close representatives of the people, we properly advance the universalization of our own Declaration of Independence. The spirit and substance of our American Revolution have moved the oppressed nations of the world, and today are the prime movers of the captive nations and peoples in Central Europe, in the Soviet Union, in Asia, and in Cuba.

This fundamental truth is stressed in **Public Law 86-90, the Captive Nations**

Week resolution which Congress passed in July 1959. It is important for all Americans to remind themselves continually of this truth and of the bondage in which close to a billion people find themselves today. For this paramount reason I should like to read the contents of this law:

Joint resolution providing for the designation of the third week of July as "Captive Nations Week"

Whereas the greatness of the United States is in large part attributable to its having been able, through the democratic process, to achieve a harmonious national unity of its people, even though they stem from the most diverse of racial, religious, and ethnic backgrounds; and

Whereas this harmonious unification of the diverse elements of our free society has led the people of the United States to possess a warm understanding and sympathy for the aspirations of peoples everywhere and to recognize the natural interdependency of the peoples and nations of the world; and

Whereas the enslavement of a substantial part of the world's population by Communist imperialism makes a mockery of the idea of peaceful coexistence between nations and constitutes a detriment to the natural bonds of understanding between the people of the United States and other peoples; and

Whereas since 1918 the imperialistic and aggressive policies of Russian communism have resulted in the creation of a vast empire which poses a dire threat to the security of the United States and of all the free peoples of the world; and

Whereas the imperialistic policies of Communist Russia have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation of the national independence of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, and others; and

Whereas these submerged nations look to the United States, as the citadel of human freedom, for leadership in bringing about their liberation and independence and in restoring to them the enjoyment of their Christian, Jewish, Moslem, Buddhist, or other religious freedoms, and of their individual liberties; and

Whereas it is vital to the national security of the United States that the desire for liberty and independence on the part of the peoples of these conquered nations should be steadfastly kept alive; and

Whereas the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of the people of these submerged nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to war and one of the best hopes for a just and lasting peace; and

Whereas it is fitting that we clearly manifest to such peoples through an appropriate and official means the historic fact that the people of the United States share with them their aspirations for the recovery of their freedom and independence: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating the third week in July 1959 as "Captive Nations Week" and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities. The President is further authorized and requested to issue a similar proclamation each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world.

Approved July 17, 1959.

THE PRESIDENTIAL PROCLAMATION

Mr. Speaker, our President has issued a Captive Nations Week proclamation several weeks in advance to inspire and encourage our people to prepare for the most successful and resounding week yet. Moreover, President Johnson's proclamation is a strong one in that he addresses himself to all the captive nations, which means the dozen and more in the Soviet Union itself. I believe it is fitting at this time to read the President's proclamation of Captive Nations Week of 1964:

Whereas the joint resolution approved July 17, 1959 (73 Stat. 212), authorizes and requests the President of the United States of America to issue a proclamation each year designating the third week in July as "Captive Nations Week" until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world; and

Whereas the cause of human rights and personal dignity remains a universal aspiration; and

Whereas this Nation is firmly committed to the cause of freedom and justice everywhere; and

Whereas it is appropriate and proper to manifest to the people of the captive nations the support of the Government and the people of the United States of America for their just aspirations:

Now, therefore, I, Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States of America, do hereby designate the week beginning July 12, 1964, as Captive Nations Week.

I invite the people of the United States of America to observe this week with appropriate ceremonies and activities, and I urge them to give renewed devotion to the just aspirations of all people for national independence and human liberty.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

Done at the city of Washington this 18th day of June in the year of our Lord 1964, and of the independence of the United States of America the 188th.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

By the President:

DEAN RUSK,
Secretary of State.

THE WEEK AND A SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON CAPTIVE NATIONS

This occasion is a fitting one also, Mr. Speaker, to urge immediate consideration and a vote by our members in the Committee on Rules on my resolution, House Resolution 14, and the 41 other resolutions calling for the creation of a Special Committee on the Captive Nations. The majority of members on this committee are in favor of this measure, but for some inscrutable reason and despite the chairman's approval of such consideration, the passage of the measure has been blocked. I have no doubt that the majority of our Members in this Chamber are enthusiastically behind this proposal and will vote for it when it is reported out favorably.

I join now with my colleagues in this demand for action by the Rules Committee. Aside from all the constructive and truly innovative work that it promises for us, a Special Committee on the Captive Nations will have enormous symbolic institutional value for our Nation and all the captive nations. Its very existence will symbolize America's determination to keep alive and to assist the aspirations of the captive nations for freedom and national independence. It will let Moscow and Peiping know that the American people are not and will not be fooled by the strategem of "peaceful coexistence."

Mr. Speaker, this is our task in this Congress. Indeed, it is our grand opportunity to transmit the will of our people by implementing Public Law 86-90 with a Special Committee on the Captive Nations. I can assure you it will be a great contribution and achievement of our Congress to the security interests of our Nation. Let us then be fair and just in a completely democratic process by considering and voting now in the Rules Committee on the proposal for the creation of this committee.

THE CAPTIVE NATIONS, WHO'S NEXT?

A good portion of our people is unaware of the long list of captive nations. Those who are continually raising the question "who's next?" I request that the list prepared by the National Captive Nations Committee be printed as part of my remarks. For our citizens, I also ask that the release by NCNC on "What You Can Do To Implement the Captive Nations Week Resolution, Public Law 86–90," be appended to my remarks. And, as an indication of the new dimensions of thought and ideas that a Special Committee on the Captive Nations would develop, I wish to introduce as part of my remarks the instructive article on "Marx and the Prison House of Nations," written by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky of Georgetown University and published in a recent issue of the Ukrainian Quarterly, an authoritative journal of East European and Asian affairs.

Also, Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks I would also like to include a copy of the aforementioned resolution, House Resolution 14.

THE CAPTIVE NATIONS: WHO'S NEXT?

Country and people:	*Year of Communist domination*
Armenia	1920
Azerbaijan	1920
Byelorussia	1920
Cossackia	1920
Georgia	1920
Idel-Ural	1920
North Caucasians	1920
Democratic Republic of Far East (Siberyaks)	1920
Ukraine	1920
Turkistan	1922
Estonia	1940
Latvia	1940
Lithuania	1940
Albania	1946
Bulgaria	1946
Outer Mongolia	1946
Serb, Croat, Slovene, etc. in Yugoslavia	1946
Poland	1947
Rumania	1947
Czechoslovakia	1948
North Korea	1948
Hungary	1949
East Germany	1949
Mainland China	1949
Tibet	1951
North Vietnam	1954
Cuba	1960

Who's next? Laos? South Vietnam? British Guiana? Algeria? Tanganyika? Zanzibar?

WHAT YOU CAN DO TO IMPLEMENT THE CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK RESOLUTION, PUBLIC LAW 86–90

1. Obtain copies of Public Law 86–90 from the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C. (Single copies may be obtained from your Congressman.) Distribute to interested friends.

2. Form a local Captive Nations Committee in your community composed of leaders in the fields of religion, business, colleges and universities, civic and fraternal organizations, veterans groups, women's clubs, and of course, your city and State officials.

3. Have your committee appoint members to subcommittees to handle specific functions and have these functions well defined to avoid duplication of effort (e.g., finance, speakers, publicity, advertising, rally, parade, church services, public displays in hotels and stores, civic-service-fraternal organizations, women's clubs, veterans groups, schools, youth groups, essay contest).

4. Brief all members of committee on Captive Nations Week resolution, past Presidential proclamations, 1963 Week theme, scope of observance in your community.

5. Advise your Senator, Governor, and Congressman of your plans and progress and invite their attendance (as speakers if you desire).

6. Call on your Governor and mayor to issue State and local Captive Nations Week proclamations well ahead of the week (July 14–20, 1963).

7. Set date or dates for major highlights of week (rally, breakfast, dinner, etc.), select speaker or speakers desired, and issue invitations to selected speakers.

8. Decide on method of fundraising to support program and have finance committee immediately start fundraising program.

9. Have subcommittee on church services contact local churches, synagogues, and mosques requesting that one day of the week be dedicated to the captive nations with appropriate services and prayers.

10. Have publicity subcommittee send press releases, background material, and suggested editorials to local newspapers and radio and television stations. Try to arrange for participation of committee members on local radio-TV programs.

11. Have publicity and advertising subcommittees plan and carry out effective program to insure communitywide attendance at functions.

12. Upon the conclusion of the week's ceremonies, write a report on your activities and send it, together with clippings, releases, etc., to the National Captive Nations Committee, suite 107, 1000 16th Street, NW., Washington, D.C., for inclusion in committee's national report. Your cooperation in this regard will be deeply appreciated.

[From the Ukrainian Quarterly, Autumn 1963]

MARX AND THE PRISON HOUSE OF NATIONS

(By Lev E. Dobriansky)

In the preceding issue of this journal, General Willoughby contributed an incisive article on "Karl Marx: Apostle of Communism, Feared and Hated Russia." From a cold war viewpoint some of its contents deserve to be elaborated upon. For the time will arrive when we'll literally be forced to accept and meet the full challenge of Moscow's cold war operations. One of our chief ideological weapons would then be the crass Russian perversion of Marx.

Up to now the United States has relied chiefly on economic and military power in what has deteriorated into a policy of patched-up containment. Captive Cuba stands as a living symbol of the longrun bankruptcy of this policy. At the rate we are going there will be more of such symbols in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. A point will then be reached when we shall have to consider seriously the complete spectrum of cold war engagement. The methodic debunking of the philosophy of Marxism-Leninism, with particular stress on traditional Russian imperio-colonialism, would be a cardinal objective.

There is no more befogging conception of the Soviet Union and its motivations than the belief that under it all rests the ideology of Marxism-Leninism. This is what Moscow has wanted the free world always to believe. In great measure it has succeeded. Its success has been our failure to determine the real nature of the enemy. For this failure we have paid heavily, not only since World War II but actually since the end of World War I. Wilson espoused the principle of national self-determination, which, however, was not applied to many areas of the dissolved czarist Russian Empire. This failure, born of ignorance, permitted the first Soviet Russian aggressions against independent non-Russian states that in a few years were forcibly incorporated into the political sham known as the Soviet Union. Roosevelt's fatal mistakes 25 years later allowed for the further expansion of Russia's Empire. These mistakes stemmed from the same cause. Are we to repeat them again, seeking accommodation and coexistence to prop up a failing policy of patched-up containment?

MARXIAN INSIGHTS INTO THE RUSSIAN EMPIRE

A study of Marx on Russia can help immensely in guarding against these repeated mistakes. Fortunately, much literature is appearing today to show how un-Marxian and truly totalitarian Russian the policy and practices of Moscow are. A substantial portion of this literature is based on Marx's own insights into the Russian Empire. Besides gradually demolished the superficial and erroneous notion that Marx is the source of our troubles with communism, this cumulating literature prepares a groundwork for our eventual ideological use in turning Marx against the reality of Soviet Russian imperiocolonialism.

"The Russian bear," Marx wrote, "is certainly capable of anything, so long as he knows the other animals he has to deal with to be capable of nothing." To a large extent these words are as applicable today as they were in the 19th century. Perhaps more than any other Western writer of his day, Marx displayed a deep perception into the traditional forces of the Russian Empire. Viewing the policy of imperialist Russia as changeless, he warned: "Its methods, its tactics, its maneuvers may change, but the polar star of its policy—world domination—is a fixed star."[1] Earlier, Karamsin, the Russian historian, noted "nothing changes in our (Russian) external policy." In effect, behind the mask of communism Russia's methods, tactics, and maneuvers have not changed substantially, though the actors and the scenes are constantly changing, and its polar star, as Marx predicted, remains fixed.

Above all others, Marx saw the Russian Empire as a "prisonhouse of nations." If he were alive today, there can be no doubt about his describing the core of the present Russian Empire—the Soviet Union—as a prison house of nations. The writings of Marx on Russia, its empire, its past, and its future, make far more sense for a current understanding of the threat facing the free world than the mountains of literature built about communism, sovietism, Marxism-Leninism, and bolshevism in the U.S.S.R. over the past four decades. They reveal far greater insights into the uncementable cracks in the prison house of nations, whether the jailer is white or red, than can be obtained from private writings and also most official statements in the capitals of the West.

To be sure, Marx's terminology with regard to the various nations in the Russian Empire is found wanting. Ukraine, White Ruthenia, and other nations in the empire are referred to in categories arbitrarily set up in Russian historiography. Yet there can be no question about his sensing a compound of conquered nations under the heel of the Russian autocrats. His emphatic empire concept attests to this. In the present situation, where Moscow itself is compelled to recognize the individuality and distinctiveness of these nations, Marx's interpretations would remain the same, although his terminology would now conform with the non-Russian conception of these captive nations in the Soviet Union.

His treatment would be a far cry from the fallacious and misleading handling of this basic material by too many of our contemporary analysts. You could almost pick them at random. Take, for example, a biography of an American millionaire, William Boyce Thompson, who served on the American Red Cross mission to Russia. In 1918, he advocated prompt U.S. recognition of Soviet Russia and close ties with it. Both the author and his subject waxed the illusion of there being "160 million individual Russians, hungry, resentful, bewildered, and sick of war."[2] This, in 1917. There aren't even that many today, over four decades later.

Similar examples abound in the academic and official realms. A textbook used in our universities introduces the subject of the U.S.S.R. this way: "Its population was estimated in 1940 to be more than 192 million, and though representatives of over a hundred nationalities contributed to this total, more than 150 million, or nearly four-fifths, are ethnically Russian."[3] Red Moscow is even more truthful in its 1959 census. There are probably no more than 115 million ethnic Russians in the U.S.S.R. This sorry state of American scholarship on the U.S.S.R. is compounded when officials in our State Department, who also circulate academically, are possessed with the notion that "the Ukraine is economically as much a part of Russia as Pennsylvania is a part of the United States."[4]

Judging by his uncanny insights into the Russian empire and the processes of Russification, Marx would consider such observations as bordering on the ludicrous. He would also deplore our incapacity to understand the built-in cold war apparatus of this empire, now Red rather than white. For he also understood well the cold war techniques and operations of the Russian imperio-colonialists in his day. He knew that these techniques of bluff, cunning, blackmail, conspiracy, divide-and-conquer, ideologic deception, "eternal peace," and a host of other psychopolitical tools were the products of Russian empire building, stretching from the 15th century to his time.

Marx's refreshing writings in the New York Tribune and other organs pierced the ideologic smoke screens behind which the cold war operators of the czarist Russian empire advanced the world domination interests of Muscovy. Here, too, on the basis of Marx's explicit writings on this subject, there can be no doubt that if he were alive today, he would be a chief proponent urging the psychopolitical castration of the Russians.

---

[1] Marx, Karl and Engels, Friedrich. "The Russian Menace to Europe." Glencoe, Ill., 1952, p. 106.

[2] Hagedorn, Herman, "The Magnate." Reynal & Hitchcock, New York, 1935, p. 183.

[3] Vernadsky, George. "A History of Russia," 3d rev. ed. Yale University Press, New Haven, 1951, p. 1.

[4] Kennan, George F. "American Diplomacy, 1900–50." The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Ill., 1951, p. 135.

A Marxian orchiectomy, i.e., the operation of psychopolitical sterilization, on the Soviet Russian totalitarians is no play on words. In sharp contrast to many of our own contemporary experts, Marx gives every evidence of a working knowledge of these two major phenomena—the prison house of nations and the traditional cold war diplomacy of Russian tyrants, whether native or Russianized. Whatever else may be said of Marx, no scholar can deny his perception of and feeling for historical movement and change. Time and time again, Marx senses the concrete experiences and drives of the Polish, Ukrainian, Lithuanian, Georgian, Moslem, and other inmates of the colonial Russian prison. He perceives also the basic psychopolitical ways and means by which these peoples were driven into the Russian Empire. In short, the institutional furniture of Russian imperialism from Ivan III to the present—developed, refined, and expanded, to be sure—is properly cast in Marx's analyses of Russia and its empire.

It is little wonder that a collector of Marx's writings on Russia sums up these contributions as follows: "Whether the Russian czar bears the name of an Alexander or a Nicholas, a Stalin or a Khrushchev is of minor importance. Trenchant as was the 1917 break with the traditional Russian social system, the goal of conquest and thirst for acquisition intrinsic in her foreign policy remain unchanged, whether embellished as in czarist times with the pretext of protecting Eastern Christendom or the Slavic world or camouflaged under the Red Soviet banner of 'liberation of society and the world from the capitalist yoke.'"[5]

This overall conclusion of Marx's works on Russian should be carefully pondered over. By harsh experience its meaning is known by all the captive nations and peoples bordering ethnic Russia today. Without such experience, those in the West and Far East must depend on their intellectual insights into these forces and avoid momentary blandishments emanating from Moscow. As a matter of fact they should read Marx to deepen their insights. Doubtlessly they will in time arrive at the same conclusion that this editor of Marx's works has: "Even the form of government, constitution, and social structure are irrelevant in the long run. The significant and crucial factor is Russia's age-long drive westward, a drive that is perfectly understandable from the Russian point of view. That is why it has been common ground to all Russian governments and has outlasted every evolutionary change up to the present."[6]

What quite rightly is implied here is that the ultimate solution is the final and decisive break-up of the Russian Empire, whether Red, white, or whatever hue. Wishful thinking for a peaceful evolution of the Soviet Union, a happy coexistence between West and East, a non-Communist, Democratic government in Moscow is a pursuit of an intellectual mirage. This has become a favorite sport today. It's an old story that fits neatly into Moscow's cold war plans. Indubitably, tomorrow we shall pay for repeating today the mistakes of yesterday.

The great irony of our time is that the Soviet Russian totalitarians predicate part of their ideologic authority on Marxism. In its entirety the Marxian system has really little to do with the colonial make-up of the U.S.S.R. economy. Actually certain of its parts as, for instance, the concept of surplus value, can be effectively used to demonstrate the immense exploitation of labor in this essentially cold war economy.[7] But the facades of Marxist ideology and communism are only additional measures of the extent to which the Russian bear will go in pursuit of his polar star. As one writer accurately states it, "Perhaps the greatest error that the Western world has made in its dealing with the Soviets is continuing to believe that Russian communism is closely allied with the basic Communist philosophy."[8]

Increasing numbers of students dealing with the Soviet Union are recognizing the basic irrelevance of Marxism to both the policy and the practices of Moscow. However, in many cases the realities of Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism and the captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. still elude them. For example, a work which has been advertised as a text on communism but is shot through with these defects, nevertheless makes the worthwhile point that the Russian totalitarian conspirator Lenin turned Marx' ideas upside down.[9]

Briefly, if, as some claim, we must go back to Marx in order to comprehend the motivations and operations of the men in the Kremlin, then the only instructive areas in Marxism are its penetrating analysis of the perennial Russian empire.

THE PRISON'S FIRST COLLAPSE

Although too many of our leaders have yet to understand the sources and nature of the Soviet Union, Marx was uniquely cognizant of these long-run historical sources. In the case of Poland and the other subjugated non-Russian nations he recognized the force of nationalism and the drive for national independence. He well-nigh predicted the inevitable collapse of the Russian colonial empire. Even Lenin, a thorough Russian by political breed, foresaw at the turn of the century the first collapse of this empire.

The supreme irony in this regard was the totalitarian reestablishment of the Russian prison house of nations by Lenin himself, the supposed heir of Karl Marx. A professed Marxist turned into a Russian jailer. The Russian empire collapsed in World War I not so much because of the two Russian revolutions in 1917 but chiefly of the sweeping non-Russian revolution for national freedom and independence. This inevitable revolution raged from one corner of the imperial jail to another, from Poland to the Far Eastern maritime Provinces, from Finland to the Caucasus. Every non-Russian inmate broke out into freedom and independence.

But Lenin, the professed Marxist, soon emerged as the new czar over a reestablished empire. This stupendous feat should by itself indicate the capabilities of the Russian bear. When the authors of a constructive work tell us that "Even Lenin, we might say, was only an unconscious imperialist," we cannot but question their familiarity with the facts of 1917–22.[10] Or when an utterly confused product of the Life World Library describes Lenin as "an ardent Marxist," the facts of his crass opportunism belie such a characterization.[11]

As a matter of fact, Lenin and Leninism make little theoretic sense in terms of systemic Marxism. The new Russian czar manipulated Marxism to mean whatever he wanted it to mean. The backward Russian Empire was the last place Marx had in mind to substantiate his "laws of history." And the historical accidents surrounding Lenin's emergence to power, not to mention his political actionism, have actually no place in the determinist prognoses of Marxist thought.

On the other hand, Lenin and Leninism make complete practical sense in terms of revolutionary and conspiratorial Russian activity in the 19th century. Lenis assumes intelligible form in line with the conspiracy of professional revolutionists led by the populist Peter Tkachev, the revolutionary activities of Sergei Nechaiev, the tactics of the Blanquists, and the cold war ideas of Von Clausewitz, the Prussian general who acquired these ideas in the Russian Empire at the beginning of the 19th century. Indeed, Leninism is a codification of the methods and techniques carved out in the growth and development of the Russian Empire over the past five centuries.

Yes, Marx truly provides us with a genuine cold war perspective when he stresses, "The Russian bear is certainly capable of anything, so long as he knows the other animals he has to deal with to be capable of nothing." At their birth in 1917–22 most of the independent non-Russian nations could scarcely have been expected to protect themselves adequately against the resharpened claws of the Russian bear. But there was every reason to expect that the developed nations of the West would be capable of caging the bear. In his day Marx always saw the necessity of this if the values of Western civilization were to be preserved. Wrong as it is in its reasoning and conclusions, Marxism is nevertheless founded on these values.

Lenin played it right. For the Western nations proved to be capable of practically nothing in securing their own freedom in the long run by literally securing the newly won freedom of Georgia, Armenia, Ukraine, and the other non-Russian nations. In the case of Ukraine, for example, an astute historian of Soviet Russian politicomilitary development sums it up this way: "The cause of Ukrainian independence itself crumbled away before the onset of the Russian Bolsheviki, the imperialist claims of the Russian anti-Bolsheviki and the vacillations of the Allied Supreme Council."[12] What's more, Lenin played every trick in the handbook of traditional Russian cold war policy to rape and subdue one nation after another.

Unfortunately, few of us are acquainted with the early history of Soviet Russian imperialism. What we do know about Soviet Russia and its primary empire, the Soviet Union, has been largely acquired from history texts which ultimately depend on Russian sources. Conditioned by a long tradition of censorship, these sources can hardly be relied upon for objectivity and truth, particularly as concerns the original non-Russian nations imprisoned by Moscow. Yet, with emphasis on the new red prison house of nations, a studious reading and rereading of this early history provides us with extremely valuable clues for a psychopolitical evisceration of the Russian bear in the cold war.

It is vitally important for us Americans to come to grips with these essential historical facts bearing on the Soviet Union and its threat to our Western civilization—many of which were fully grasped by Marx. First, communism is but another ideologic form of traditional Russian imperialism. Extending Marx's insights into this centuries-old East European cancer, we can soundly underscore this perceptive observation given by a British analyst: "The notion that Russian imperialism * * * has a sacred mission in pursuing its conquests is centuries old, and the notion of Moscow as 'the third Rome' and of its ruler as a sort of holy

---

[5] Doerig, J. A., ed. "Marx Versus Russia." Frederick Ungar, New York, 1962, p. 11.

[6] Ibid., p. 2.

[7] See Lichtheim, George. "Marxism, a Historical and Critical Study." New York, 1961, p. 398.

[8] Bray, William G. "Russian Frontiers: From Muscovy to Khrushchev." The Bobbs-Merrill Co., New York, 1963, p. 32.

[9] Miller, William J. "The Meaning of Communism." Silver Burdett Co., Morristown, N.J., 1963, p. 30.

[10] Overstreet, Harry and Bonaro. "What We Must Know About Communism." W. W. Norton & Co., New York, 1958, p. 276.

[11] Thayer, Charles W. "Russia." Life World Library, New York, 1960, p. 19.

[12] Erickson, John. "The Soviet High Command." Macmillan & Co., London, 1962, p. 85.

God-King, though no longer expressed in that fashion, has been taken over unchanged by the present regime."[13]

Second, as Marx himself saw, world domination has always been a Muscovite-Russian goal, regardless of the regime in power. The poet laureate of Catherine II, Derzhavin, capsulizes this basic fact in these words: "Of what use are allies to thee, O' Russian? Stride forth, and thine is the whole world."[14] It is absurd to think that only with the deceptive ideology of communism and its materialistic base has the goal of world domination by the Russians arisen. For the ages in which they were launched, the ideologies of religious orthodoxy and racist pan-slavism played similar roles.

The third essential fact is the crucial importance of the peripheral non-Russian nations in the primary empire of Russia. Without White Ruthenia, Ukraine, Georgia, Turkestan, and others Russian imperialism could not exist. It would have no immediate colonies to exploit and feed on for further thrusts outward. Speaking of the imperial Russian power, one longtime analyst of Russian imperialism states this cogently: "This is true in the Soviet as it was in the Czarist empire; the locus of political decisions is Moscow and Russians rule over non-Russians."[15] The notion that Red Moscow first commenced its imperiocolonial ventures in 1939 smacks of historical myopia. The prevalence of this fallacious idea obstructs our view of the total picture of Soviet Russian imperialism, extending back to 1917–23. With this picture one can easily understand why Moscow cries out "no interference in our internal affairs" when concern is shown for these primary captive non-Russian nations. Without them its expansionist base would be severely reduced.

Finally, as we concentrate on the experiences and fates of the non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R., we Americans shall progressively understand the real nature of the enemy, his centuries-long background, his policy of conquest, and his developed techniques and stratagems. Needless to say, communism has been a riddle for millions in the free world. But this can be easily dissipated. For, as one writer accurately puts it, "in the light of historical events * * * Bolshevism has not proved so great a riddle to the nations which have been subjugated by Russia * * * these nations have from the beginning assumed the most realistic attitude toward it."[16] In short, there is no substitute for experience. We must profit by such experience.

In this period of "negotiations for peace" we might take another leaf from Marx. "Russia," he wrote, "only throws out so many notes to the Western diplomats, like bones to the dogs, in order to set them at an innocent amusement, while she reaps the advantage of further gaining time." Since 1954 a mountain of such bones has been created by Moscow. Action that should have been taken by our Government in pursuit of the policy of liberation and for the expansion of freedom was not taken. Instead, we have been virtually brainwashed by familiar Russian propaganda on "peace, coexistence, or codestruction," and "the might of the Soviet Union." So much so, that we have now succumbed to accommodating the enemy who, while we amuse ourselves diplomatically, gains time and its precious advantage.

The Khrushchev of the 1960's is no different from the Khrushchev of the 1950's. His words of 1956 in Warsaw apply in his policy today as then. "But of course," he said, "we must realize that we cannot coexist eternally. One of us must go to his grave. We do not want to go to the grave. They don't want to go to their graves either. So what must be done? We must push them to their graves." Pope Pius XII was perfectly correct in describing our state as "the mirage of coexistence."

But there is time yet for us to learn—from Marx, from the captive nations, from the declarations of the Soviet Russian imperiocolonialists themselves. The very first lesson is on the nature of the enemy. Much progress has been achieved in this respect. However, nothing less than precision in thought can be desired. One of our outstanding American journalists emphasizes that "Our enemy is not communism per se, but Soviet imperialism."[17] True, but not completely. It isn't the Soviet Union that is imperialistic, but rather Soviet Russia which is only a part of the Union. As Marx observed, the fixed star of world domination is a Russian star.

H. Res. 14

Whereas on the issue of colonialism the blatant hypocrisy of imperialist Moscow has not been adequately exposed by us in the United Nations and elsewhere; and

Whereas two Presidential proclamations designating Captive Nations Week summon the American people "to study the plight of the Soviet-dominated nations and to recommit themselves to the support of the just aspirations of the people of those captive nations"; and

Whereas the nationwide observances in first anniversary of Captive Nations Week clearly demonstrated the enthusiastic response of major sections of our society to this Presidential call; and

Whereas following the passage of the Captive Nations Week resolution in 1959 by the Congress of the United States and again during the annual observances of Captive Nations Week, Moscow has consistently displayed to the world its profound fear of growing free world knowledge of and interest in all of the captive nations, and particularly the occupied non-Russian colonies within the Soviet Union; and

Whereas the indispensable advancement of such basic knowledge and interest alone can serve to explode current myths on Soviet unity, Soviet national economy and monolithic military prowess and openly to expose the depths of imperialist totalitarianism and economic colonialism throughout the Red Russian empire, especially inside the so-called Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; and

Whereas, for example, it was not generally recognized, and thus not advantageously made use of, that in point of geography, history, and demography, the now famous U-2 plane flew mostly over captive non-Russian territories in the Soviet Union; and

Whereas in the fundamental conviction that the central issue of our times is imperialist totalitarian slavery versus democratic national freedom, we commence to win the psychopolitical cold war by assembling and forthrightly utilizing all the truths and facts pertaining to the enslaved condition of the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba, and other subjugated nations; and

Whereas the enlightening forces generated by such knowledge and understanding of the fate of these occupied and captive non-Russian nations would also give encouragement to latent liberal elements in the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic—which contains Russia itself—and would help bring to the oppressed Russian people their overdue independence from centuries-long authoritarian rule and tyranny; and

Whereas these weapons of truth, fact, and ideas would counter effectively and overwhelm and defeat Moscow's worldwide propaganda campaign in Asia, Africa, the Middle East, Latin America, and specifically among the newly independent and underdeveloped nations and states; and

Whereas it is incumbent upon us as free citizens to appreciatively recognize that the captive nations in the aggregate constitute not only a primary deterrent against a hot global war and further overt aggression by Moscow's totalitarian imperialism, but also a prime positive means for the advance of world freedom in a struggle which in totalistic form is psychopolitical; and

Whereas in pursuit of a diplomacy of truth we cannot for long avoid bringing into question Moscow's legalistic pretensions of "noninterference in the internal affairs of states" and other contrivances which are acutely subject to examination under the light of morally founded legal principles and political, economic, and historical evidence; and

Whereas in the implementing spirit of our own congressional Captive Nations Week resolution and the four Presidential proclamations it is in our own strategic interest and that of the nontotalitarian free world to undertake a continuous and unremitting study of all the captive nations for the purpose of developing new approaches and fresh ideas for victory in the psychopolitical cold war: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That there is hereby established a committee which shall be known as the Special Committee on the Captive Nations. The committee shall be composed of ten Members of the House, of whom not more than six shall be members of the same political party, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Sec. 2. (a) Vacancies in the membership of the committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original selection.

(b) The committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members. In the absence of the chairman, the vice chairman shall act as chairman.

(c) A majority of the committee shall constitute a quorum except that a lesser number to be fixed by the committee, shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of administering oaths and taking sworn testimony.

Sec. 3. (a) The commitee shall conduct an inquiry into and a study of all the captive non-Russian nations, which includes those in the Soviet Union and Asia, and also of the Russian people, with particular reference to the moral and legal status of Red totalitarian control over them, facts concerning conditions existing in these nations, and means by which the United States can assist them by peaceful processes in their present plight and in their aspiration to regain their national and individual freedoms.

(b) The committee shall make such interim reports to the House of Representatives as it deems proper, and shall make its first comprehensive report of the results of its inquiry and study, together with its recommendations, not later than January 31, 1964.

Sec. 4. The committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times within or outside the United States to hold such hearings, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, and to take such testimony as it deems advisable.

---

[13] King-Hall, Stephen. "The Communist Conspiracy." Constable & Co., London, 1953, p. 75.

[14] Doerig, J. A. op. cit., p. 184.

[15] Baczkowski, Wlodzimierz. "Russian Colonialism." Beirut, Lebanon, 1959, p. 32.

[16] Nanuashvili, Vano Jan. "The Strength and Weakness of U.S.S.R." Boston, Mass., 1956, p. 128.

[17] Sulzberger, C. L. "What's Wrong With U.S. Foreign Policy." Harcourt, Brace & Co., New York, 1959, p. 136.

SEC. 5. The committee may employ and fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, and other employees as it deems necessary in the performance of its duties.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleague Daniel J. Flood on the observance of the sixth Captive Nations Week and urge the establishment of a Special House Committee on the Captive Nations.

Every evidence available to me indicates that the people in the captive nations are possessed with a patriotic nationalism and that they are not in support of the nonrepresentative forms of government forced on them by the Communists.

Last Sunday I met with the Polish Veterans in Exile Association, Post 40, Perth Amboy, N.J., which celebrated the 20th anniversary of the battle of Monte Cassino for which so many Polish soldiers gave their lives. Many of the wounded were with us Sunday. They were delighted to hear that our Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy had visited Poland and was wildly welcomed and acclaimed by the people.

There was no doubt in my mind that all of these men who served in the Polish army in Italy under General Eisenhower state the case correctly when they say over 95 percent of the Polish people are praying for their day of freedom.

I am happy to include in my remarks the copy of a letter sent by Gen. Mark Clark, retired, on the behalf of these great men and for the valor they showed 20 years ago at Monte Cassino. The letter follows:

FOR THE POLISH VETERANS IN EXILE

(Statement of Gen. Mark Clark, U.S. Army, retired on the 20th anniversary of the seizure of Monte Cassino)

When I think of patriots, I picture them fighting for their homeland and I see them eventually happily restored to the land for which they fought. For this reason I regret the "Exile" in the title of your organization because it emphasizes that you are not residing in your noble country. Nevertheless, since you are not there, we are happy that you are in America where you can stage a commemoration such as this.

Your Gen. Wladyslaw Anders who commanded the Polish Corps in my 5th Army during the rugged fighting in Italy was one of the most capable and courageous generals with whom it has been my privilege to serve. The officers and men of that corps reflected his ability and his patriotism and without the splendid fighting of the Polish Corps, the capture of Cassino would have been extremely difficult, prolonged and perhaps long delayed.

As members of that corps you performed brilliantly each time you were called upon, and the Polish Corps will always have a special niche in my memory of gallant fighting organizations and your brotherhood of men who bear arms. I salute the memory of your accomplishments in Italy and I salute each of you on this significant occasion.

MARK W. CLARK,
General, U.S. Army, Retired.

On Saturday we were visited in Washington by thousands of descendants of the Ukraine and again we heard their strong plea for freedom for their kinfolk in the Ukraine. Let us continue the work that our Captive Nations Committee could do in the House—to collect information and pass it on to the American people so that they can know the whole truth about this situation.

I introduced a resolution in the House calling the attention of Congress to the treatment of the Jews by the Communists in Russia. This gross injustice must be curtailed immediately. If we can establish the Captive Nations Committee here in the House and get a proper staff where we can assemble information, it will be a great force in molding opinion in the United States to see that the concepts of justice, brotherly love and the moral law are carried out in all parts of the world.

Dr. Zbigniew Brzenzinski, director of Columbia University's Research Institute on Communist Affairs, believes there is a new kind of challenge—illustrated by Attorney General Kennedy's visit to Poland—which would indicate a breakup of the unified bloc of communism. He believes that the split taking place will bring the Eastern satellites closer to Western Europe and the free world than to Russia; eventually, even Russia will have a closer relationship with Europe.

He believes also that the most explosive situation which might develop in Eastern Europe would be a rebellion in East Germany. Dr. Brzenzinski further foresees the possibility that there will be political coups occurring in Bulgaria and Poland within the ruling parties. This would develop into greater political instability and fluidity and, ultimately, perhaps make it possible that popular pressure might gradually force the Communist regimes to become more pro-Western Europe so as to do more business with the West.

Certainly this seems to be having an effect on Rumania and Hungary and the recent trade discussions between those countries and the United States. All these changes are, of course, being encouraged by the split between Russia and Red China.

In any event, the tumultuous reception afforded the Attorney General in Poland should be looked upon as a harbinger of things to come in Eastern Europe.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I am very pleased to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, because his presence here reminds me that a number of years ago when I was acting as the chairman of a special committee of this House for the investigation of the Katyn massacre, which was the investigation, you might recall, directed by this House of the massacre in the Katyn Forest of some 15,000 Polish officers by Communist Russia, the distinguished gentleman from Illinois served as my chief investigator on that committee. Since we held hearings in Germany, Italy, France, England, and this country for many months, certainly we would not have had the success we did have had it not been for his great help. We were all happy, especially I, to see the people of Illinois subsequently send him here as a Member of Congress and reelect him. He is still with us, and I am sure in their good judgment he will be returned. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PUCINSKI. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood] is most gracious and generous in his compliments. I thank him for his kind remarks.

I join the gentleman from Pennsylvania in this observance of Captive Nations Week because of the importance of this occasion. I also rise to express my personal gratitude in seeing the gentleman from Pennsylvania in the well of the House today, robust and back to his health again, ready to continue the great fight he has carried on for so many, many years here in this House for the captive people of the world.

I congratulate the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood] for taking this time today to pay tribute to Captive Nations Week.

When we speak of the captive nations, perhaps it would be wise to see which are the captive nations of today, because every one of these nations has seen the gentleman from Pennsylvania who is now in the well, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood], raise his voice in their behalf and plead their cause so eloquently over the years.

If today, indeed, this country by public law and by public proclamation of our great President, Mr. Johnson, is reminding the people of the world that we have not forgotten the peoples of the captive Nations it is because men like the gentleman now in the well, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood], and men like the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCormack], had the vision and the courage to pass the resolution which establishes the observance of Captive Nations Week in America.

The nations we include as captive nations are Armenia, Azerbaijan, Byelorussia, Cossackia, Georgia, Idel-Ural, North Caucasians, Democratic Republic of Far East (Siberyaks), Ukraine, Turkistan, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Albania, Bulgaria, Outer Mongolia, Serb, Croat, Slovene, and so forth in Yugoslavia, Poland, Rumania, Czechoslovakia, North Korea, Hungary, East Germany, Mainland China, Tibet, North Vietnam, and Cuba.

Mr. Speaker, I mention all these nations merely to impress upon my colleagues the importance of the occasion which the gentleman is today commemorating in this House of Representatives.

When we speak of the captive nations, we are indeed speaking of vast numbers of the world's population who today are being held in Communist bondage. I think when we realize the tremendous number of people whose liberties and freedoms are being denied by despotic communism, then we can fully appreciate what America means when we observe Captive Nations Week in this country.

We are, indeed, trying to impress on these peoples that there must come a day of reckoning. There must come that great day when men, women, and children throughout the world will be able to join the family of free nations. Our American effort during Captive Nations Week is to remind these people of the heritage that we in this country enjoy as freemen and freewomen and that that heritage must be shared sooner or later by all of these enslaved people.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am grateful that the gentleman has taken this time today. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood] mentioned the Katyn Forest massacre investigation. Here again this Nation and the world was fortunate in having a man like the gentleman now in the well, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood], as a Member of this Congress who, back in 1952, joined in sponsoring the resolution which created the committee that conducted this investigation. I had the privilege of serving as chief investigator of that committee and I say this as a tribute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Madden] who was the distinguished chairman of that committee and all the other members of the committee, because it was this committee which, after a very thorough investigation, wrote the first formal indictment against the Soviet Union for committing crimes in World War II against our allies. It was the Soviet Union that massacred 15,000 of Poland's great officers ranking from generals down to lieutenants. It was the Soviet Union that destroyed or tried to destroy the intelligentsia of Poland. Way back in the spring of 1940, the Soviet Union planned the destruction of Poland's intelligentsia so that these intellectuals would not survive to rise in protest against the occupation of that country by the Communists.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood] has performed a tremendous public service. History alone will have to evaluate the great contribution that he has made over the years in investigating the Katyn massacre and bringing to light the fact that World War II could not have been started if the Communists had not conspired with the Nazis in the infamous Ribbentrop-Molotov agreement.

Mr. Speaker, these are the things that we must be reminded of over and over again. It is gratifying that this country will observe Captive Nations Week. Only 25 years have passed since the beginning of World War II. That is a short span of time as time flies and yet today in the Soviet Union we are again seeing the very same things we saw happen 25 years ago in Germany—the persecution of minority groups.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, those who have participated in this captive nations observance in America are performing a great public service because the conscience of the world cannot be permitted to rest until these people are again free and until those who would deny man his freedom are brought to justice.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am indeed grateful that I have had this privilege to join today in commending and congratulating my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood].

God grant that he may remain in full health for many, many years to come and God grant that the people of his district return him to this Congress so that his great and persuasive voice in this struggle for freedom for all peoples shall be heard in this Chamber for many years to come.

Mr. FLOOD. As always, the gentleman is very eloquent, and, of course, very kind.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, the beginning of the Captive Nations Week observance on July 12 is an important occasion in the life of our Nation and for the millions living in bondage to Soviet communism in Eastern Europe.

Although nearly a generation has passed since the Iron Curtain fell between the Baltic and the Adriatic Seas, the hopes for liberty still thrive in the earnest hearts of the people of Eastern Europe. The observance of Captive Nations Week is a singular way in which we as Americans nurture those hopes and keep alive the dreams of a better—and free—tomorrow.

Captive Nations Week offers us a special opportunity, moreover, to recall that freedom is won only with sacrifice and determined effort. The forces of totalitarianism are ever present, seeking to extinguish the bright flames of liberty.

Our determination to safeguard our own freedoms and to extend them to others must never be relinquished.

In our efforts, we have the inspiration and example of the Ukranian freedom fighter, Tara Schevchenko, to guide us. The memorial to this patriot, unveiled in Washington last week, symbolizes the determined resistance of freedom-loving persons everywhere against tyranny.

The proclamation of Captive Nations Week and the dedication of the Shevchenko Monument illustrate and proclaim to the world the deep and widespread concern of the people of the United States for the people in the Communist-dominated nations.

This concern is not limited to one national hero or to one captive nation but is extended to all as spiritual and moral encouragement in their struggle against an alien bondage.

In this spirit may we give renewed life and purpose to observance of Captive Nations Week, and may our observance be a landmark on the road to freedom.

During Captive Nations Week, July 12–18, it is my hope that all Americans, regardless of race or national origin, will rededicate themselves to continue our united determination to carry our crusade to a final victory of freedom for all men.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, the period July 12–18 marks the sixth observance of Captive Nations Week. It is at this time each year since 1959 that we have reaffirmed our dedication to the cause of freedom in all nations. It is at this time that we again remember that there are millions of enslaved people throughout the world who are deprived of rights and freedoms which we in the United States consider essential yet are prone to take for granted.

This observance is a reminder to the people of the captive nations, the American people, and the people of the world. It recalls the historical development within formerly free countries of conditions of tyranny and foreign domination. It recalls the progressive loss of freedom and individual rights among the people of these nations. It is a reminder that these conditions still exist, that there are nations where the importance of the individual is subordinated to the state so that ideological and dogmatic ends might be achieved.

Captive Nations Week also has an educational purpose. This observance is an occasion to reiterate the policy of the United States toward the nations of Eastern Europe. This policy has been clearly stated by Assistant Secretary of State William Tyler, who told the Subcommittee on Europe of the Committee on Foreign Affairs:

> The United States desires to see in Eastern Europe fully independent nations enjoying internal freedom and normal relations with all countries.

It is important that we remind not only the people of Eastern Europe, but our own citizens as well of our policy toward captive nations. There is a growing awareness that the Soviet Union is not a monolithic entity, but a collection of several nations with individual identities, many of which are unwilling partners to the union. This lack of information about conditions in other nations and our own foreign policy can be eliminated only by repeated statements and affirmations of our benefits. This observance is one such statement.

It is particularly appropriate that we should pause during the hectic moments of the 1964 political campaigns to remember that so many of the American institutions and rights we take for granted as inherent essentials of freedom and democracy are unknown to the people of the captive nations. The excitement of a political convention, the precious freedom of political belief and expression, and the invaluable right of the vote are all absent in these nations ruled by terror, force, subjugation, and exploitation.

We are now in a period of apparent relaxation in the United States-Soviet conflict. Yet we must not relax our efforts to preserve and foster freedom. This captive nations observance is evidence of the fact that we are not relaxing these efforts. It is proof that, as President Johnson said in his proclamation, "This Nation is firmly committed to the cause of freedom and justice everywhere."

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, the observance of Captive Nations Week is the time for reflection on the plight of the people of these enslaved countries who have fallen victim to the Communist conspiracy. It is a time to rise and speak out of the American interest and concern that the people of these captive nations, as well as the Russian people themselves, are denied the right of self-determination and the basic and precious individual freedoms.

The basic concept of Captive Nations Week is enmeshed in the American tradition—the principle of the consent of the governed. By our observance of this week, we not only express our concern, but our willingness to assist them by peaceful means in their present plight and in their aspiration to regain national and individual freedoms. We demonstrate our continuing belief in the power of freedom to prevail and overcome the forces of totalitarianism.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, beginning July 12, men and women throughout our country will reaffirm their dedication to the ideals of national independence and individual liberty by observing Captive Nations Week.

The captive nations of Europe represent a crucial pivot in today's persistent cold war. The attainment of the freedom which is rightfully theirs would be a welcome beacon in a worldwide ideological battle. And so we pause this month to underscore once again our fellowship with these tens of millions of enslaved peoples, and to repeat our commitment to their struggle against forces of oppression.

There now stand before the Committee on Foreign Affairs several resolutions, including my own, directing the President to ask the United Nations to expedite Soviet withdrawal from the Baltic Republics of Lativa, Lithuania, and Estonia, and to facilitate the self-determination of peoples in these countries. It is my hope that swift congressional action on this resolution may open in the coming year new possibilities for a true realization of freedom by these and other captive peoples in all of Eastern Europe. What better way could there be to move decisively toward our ultimate goal: A world where people uphold the laws of nations, and where those laws enshrine the most sacred right of all, the right of human liberty and free choice for all men everywhere.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, the Congress of the United States has by joint resolution, which became Public Law 86-90, made it crystal clear to all the world that it fully sympathizes with the serious plight of enslaved peoples in captive nations everywhere. These unfortunate men, women, and children are suffering tyranny and oppression under the ruthless and atheistic heel of brutal Communists in Albania, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bulgaria, Byelorussia, China, Cossackia, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Estonia, Georgia U.S.S.R., Hungary, Idel-Ural, Latvia, Lithuania, North Caucasia, North Korea, North Vietnam, Outer Mongolia, Poland, Rumania, Siberyaks, Tibet, Turkestan, Ukrania, and Yugoslavia.

In the implementation of Public Law 86-90, President Lyndon B. Johnson issued a formal proclamation designating the third week in July as Captive Nations Week and invited the American people to observe it with appropriate ceremonies and activities. The President also urged the giving of renewed devotion to the just aspirations of all people for national independence and human liberty.

Captive Nations Week, coming as it does in the same month when we in the United States celebrate our own Independence Day on July 4, is evidence of our concern for our fellow man. We treasure freedom, liberty, and independence and deeply appreciate the blessings of divine providence. That is the reason for our compassion for the innocent victims of the Soviets who live in lands overrun by agents for the Kremlin who have extinguished the light of liberty.

The captive nations behind the Iron Curtain look for guidance and leadership in their struggle for the right of self-determination and national independence. The United States of America is their inspiration and by the observance of Captive Nations Week we give them renewed hope for the future. Such observance serves also to remind the Red aggressors that we in the United States have the courage of our convictions, not only for ourselves, but also for others. In addition, it carries with it an implication of our strength.

The National Captive Nations Committee was established in accordance with the terms of a joint congressional resolution passed in 1959. Former President Herbert Hoover is honorary chairman and Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, a distinguished professor at Georgetown University, is chairman. Thirty Members of the U.S. Senate and 158 Members of the House of Representatives are on its advisory committee. May their good work continue on behalf of the many millions of people in these captive nations.

By our taking note here in the Congress of the United States of Captive Nations Week, we are letting the hapless people in those countries know that they have friends, that they should not despair, and that they have reason for hope in the not too distant future that someday they, too, will be free and enjoy the blessings of liberty and independence.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, there is a growing restiveness in the huge Communist empire which indicates that the tides of history may be shifting more and more toward the free world, free men, and free and unfettered ideas.

The Soviet Union's difficulties with Communist China have multiplied, and are growing more difficult of solution every day. The point of no return may be approaching, when the leaders of these Communist nations may find that their own self-interests, and the internal forces of these nations demand a complete rupture.

In the satellite nations, too, the forces of history seem to be marshalling new energies, and providing new hopes. The newspapers only yesterday reported that the sister of the Communist boss of Cuba had taken refuge in flight, and that, in fact, she had been working against the Communist masters of that unfortunate island for 4 years.

There are signs of unrest in other nations in the supposedly monolithic bloc of nations which we would be unwise to ignore. We must do what we can to encourage these peoples toward more open expression of dissatisfaction and toward more open demands for greater freedom and for more of the good things which free nations and free peoples have.

The policy of the United States is to support the just aspirations of peoples everywhere, including the 800 million people who have fallen victim to Communist aggression since the end of World War II. We can do no less than this for we are unalterably committed to the freedom of people everywhere, not just to those fortunate enough to live in freedom-loving countries. The United States has refused, and will continue to refuse, to accept the status quo of Communist dominations of the peoples of the captive nations. It has insisted, and will continue to insist on the right of these peoples to live under institutions and governments of their own choice. The United States is deeply concerned that all nations shall be free and fully independent, with their peoples in control of their governments and not vice versa. Perhaps our greatest tradition is our dedication and devotion to the principle of self-determination for all peoples, for it is on the bedrock of this principle that our own nation was founded.

We must, therefore, continue to do all that we can to encourage the spirit of resistance and independence among the captive peoples, as well as among the peoples of the Soviet Union who have been a subject people since the days of the Communist seizure of power.

Among the steps we are taking is to demonstrate our own steadfast faith in freedom, and to develop trade with those nations in the Communist sphere which have shown independence of spirit. By thus lessening their economic dependence on the Soviet Union, we can encourage and assist their independent economic development and growth.

Our own great surge toward freedom was manifested not only in the American Revolutionary War, but in our own economic growth in the years that followed. Our economic growth fostered and strengthened our ability to defend our freedom from those who would destroy it from without as well as from within. Keeping our own history in mind will help us understand the needs of other peoples today, and will assist us to develop and sustain policies which will help other nations and their peoples to find the road to freedom in our day and time.

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to join in the observance of Captive Nations Week. Begun in 1959, this solemn commemoration is as relevant today as it was 5 years ago; for ours is an age of liberation for subjugated people.

The Western nations have—in most cases voluntarily—granted freedom and independence to some 50 nations in the 20 years since World War II. The uncertainty, drama, and excitement of this transition to independence has permanently affected the politics of our era.

By contrast, in the years since World War II, an increasing number of nations have been victimized by Communist imperialism. These captive nations continue to endure the degrading, enervating experience of servitude to a foreign power. It is dramatically apparent that every effort is being made to increase the scope and degree of Communist domination.

It is therefore fitting that we focus our attention and the attention of the world on the nature and aims of the Communist empire. Recent history shows that, contrary to the shibboleths of the Communist leaders, the cause of national freedom has prospered in the Western World and suffered under Communist rule.

This truth enhances our position with respect to our adversaries. On the one hand, to those most concerned with imperialist rule—the newly emerging nations—it offers a significant and flattering point of contrast between the Western and Communist systems. On the other hand, to those still subject to totalitarian domination, it indicates that the way to national freedom lies in closer affiliation with the Western World and in less intimate ties with their authoritarian masters.

Let our observance of this commemoration demonstrate our determination to support the liberation of all captive nations subject to Communist rule. Let it encourage these people to nourish their aspirations for civil freedom and national self-determination. And let it serve as an encouragement—to them and to ourselves—to devise effective, responsible means of fulfilling these aspirations.

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the Second World War has left human wreckage everywhere, in all parts of the world, but in some countries freedom and independence were perhaps its most significant casualties. It is true the people died by the tens of millions, and hundreds of millions suffered, but in a life and death struggle on a global scale, that seemed inevitable. But what was the great shock—and we in the free world have not fully recovered from that shock—is that, paradoxically, while the war was waged in the name of freedom, in the end we had to witness the loss of freedom by more than 100 million people in Europe alone. That sad and stunning fact was the most heartrending and mournful event in Europe's modern history. Captive nations in Central and Eastern Europe were trapped and now are being throttled by the forces of Communist totalitarian tyranny in their homelands.

The Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians in the Baltic countries, Poles, Czechs, and Hungarians in Central Europe, the Bulgarians and Rumanians in the Balkans, had been living under freedom and had been sovereign, independent nations before the last war. Most of them had regained their freedom at the end of the First World War, and all of them had become respectable members of the community of free nations.

Many of them had become definite assets to free Europe's growing civilization, and all of them had become, during the relatively short inter-war years, inseparable part of free Europe. Even though at times during those two eventful but in some way blissful decades some of these peoples lived in fear of losing their freedom, but probably none of them could have envisaged the sad fate that was to be theirs at the end of the last war.

Soon after the outbreak of the war their freedom was in grave jeopardy. One of them, the Czechoslovak Republic, was already dismembered and had lost its independent status on the eve of the war. Then, in the course of the war all others shared a similar fate: Estonians, Latvians, Lithuanians, Poles, Czechoslovaks, Hungarians, Bulgarians, Rumanians, all these peoples were engulfed in the war. All of them and many others endured sufferings during the war and then suffered the consequences of that war.

Towards the end of the war as the armies of Western democracies were crushing the Nazis in Europe and there they were preoccupied in this primary battle arena, in the east the Soviet Union was carrying out its carefully prepared plan of conquest of eastern Europe, and the enslavement of its peoples. And that is exactly what Soviet authorities did with the effective aid of the mighty Red army. As that army advanced into these countries, they were followed by Soviet agents whose sole duty was to establish Communist totalitarian regimes in all these countries and isolate these peoples from the free West. Unfortunately these events took place before the West was fully aware of such ominous deeds by the Soviet Government. By the end of 1945 democracy and freedom had vanished from these once free and independent countries, and more than 100 million peoples—including 17 million Germans—had been enslaved behind the Soviet-imposed Iron Curtain.

Since the end of the war leaders of the free world, headed by the Government of this great Republic, have done everything humanly possible—of course, short of war—to free or at least to help improve the status of these captive nations. But all their efforts have failed because of the refusal of Soviet authorities to relax their stranglehold on these nations. And since the West is not willing to risk atomic war, it has relied on moral force, and has limited its efforts to diplomatic negotiations, though these have been almost totally fruitless. In line with this moralistic approach, 6 years ago a joint congressional resolution empowered the President of the United States to proclaim the second week in July of each year as Captive Nations Week. The Congress then hoped, as we still do, that in this way we could give an immense amount of encouragement to these captive nations in Europe, and at the same time keep this human issue constantly alive in this country. On the sixth year of Captive Nations Week celebration, let us all hope and pray that without war and by peaceful means it will be possible to have these peoples freed from Communist totalitarian tyranny in their homelands.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, the week of July 12–18 has been designated to observe the sixth Captive Nations Week. We are all aware of the work done by the Assembly of Captive European Nations in providing a voice for the freedom aspirations of the peoples of East-Central Europe. All of us recognize that these countries and their problems are of strategic importance to our interests in the cold war. From a humane and moral standpoint, we cannot accommodate Communist dictatorship by accepting the permanent captivity of these peoples behind the Iron Curtain. It is particularly significant as we in this country prepare to celebrate our own Independence Day that we extend our very best wishes to this committee, which plays such a crucial role in securing and disseminating information pertaining to all captive nations, so that we might be more grateful for the blessings of liberty we enjoy and more sympathetic and concerned for our less fortunate brothers.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to join with other Members of the House today in their remarks upon the sixth observance of Captive Nations Week, which originated with the captive nations resolution unanimously approved by Congress a little over 5 years ago.

This resolution has had a remarkable effect upon the Communist hierarchy. Khrushchev and his Kremlin associates have gone to extreme lengths to portray the United States as a colonialist and imperialist nation, and to create the impression that the captive nations enjoy more freedom than we do.

But the 19 years of Communist oppression behind the Iron Curtain has, if anything, stiffened these peoples' determination to be free. This is a fact which Khrushchev understands better than anyone else.

Our observance of Captive Nations Week has served to focus attention on the plight of the captive nations throughout the world. And we, as Americans, are reminding the people behind the Iron Curtain that our hope and desire for their ultimate liberation does not and will never falter. It should also serve to remind those uncommitted nations that the most despicable aspects of colonialism and imperialism are still existent within the Communist empire.

There is no question that the revolutionary spirit which carved out a new concept of human dignity and freedom in America nearly 180 years ago has inspired the people of these captive nations. As we scan the names of the heroic people who fought for freedom in our own country during the Revolution, we find that they came from nearly every one of the European nations which are now held in bondage by the Soviets. The spirit of freedom among the people of Eastern Europe is made of such tough fibers that neither time nor oppression will destroy it. It exists in the captive nations today.

The United States will never compromise with liberty and freedom, and it is important that the people of these captive nations know the free world will not waiver in its determined stand for their liberation.

Our annual message, in the observance of Captive Nations Week, encourages these captive people to hang on, and reassures them that we will not forget them. Together we will work to retain the freedom of those now free and to regain freedom for those who have been deprived of it. Let it be said to these 100 million again, and still again: "You are not forgotten."

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, over 1 billion unfortunate people in 23 different countries are suffering today under the yoke of Communist rule. Perhaps it is a misnomer to refer to these entities as "countries" because they are virtual "colonies" in the Russian Empire.

We share a common heritage with these subjugated peoples, for we were once a colony struggling for our independence against foreign troops and alien domination. America won its independence with strong help from nations across the seas. Let us not now forget the people of Poland, Hungary, and the other captive nations in their own hour of misery; but let our assistance be to the open hand of freedom and not to the closed fist of dictatorship, domination, and tyranny.

The so-called relaxation by Khrushchev has drawn a cloak over the repressions, mass deportations and murders of the Stalin regime. But the people of Budapest in Hungary and the Poles in Poznan have no misconceptions. They remember the "butcher of Budapest" for what he was in 1956, and what he is today.

Now is the time and now is the hour for us to stand by our principles and encourage our friends across the waters as they fight for independence and to rid themselves of the heavy yoke of oppression.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, as we pause this Fourth of July weekend to reflect upon the crucible of courage in which our freedom was forged, we have cause for concern.

While we enjoy the individual liberties of a free society, others less fortunate than ourselves must wend their way through life under the ruthless regimentation of totalitarian government.

Wracked with fear and frustration, they have seen the spark of freedom stamped out by the heavy boot of communism. But their will to live once again as free men remains undaunted. Despite years of oppression, they are as dedicated as ever to the restoration of the liberties they once knew.

In times such as these, we in the United States must sustain the hopes of these peoples by affirming and activating our own deep dedication to the return of freedom to their lands. There is no room for complacency, no reason to lower our guard.

Twelve years ago, President Eisenhower underscored the need "to bring hope and every peaceful aid to the world's enslaved peoples." Later, Secretary of State Dulles made even more clear the responsibility we bear when he declared:

> The captive peoples should never have reason to doubt that they have in us a sincere and dedicated friend who shares their aspirations.

But unfortunately, some doubt does exist among those who look to us in hope and expectation. Our foreign policy seems marked by confusion rather than clarity. Is there a preoccupation in high places with accommodation rather than action?

Now is the time to make our position clear, forcefully and fearlessly.

To our adversaries, we must make it known beyond question that we are dedicated to the cause of freedom throughout the world—that we will use every means within reason to spur its growth where it is unknown and speed its restoration where it has been suppressed.

To our allies, we must make it known beyond question that we regard this mission as the most important which confronts us and we will look with disfavor upon national selfishness when it is an impediment to progress.

To our friends who live under communism, we must make it known beyond question that we are steadfast in our allegiance to their cause and we will never desert them.

This declaration of policy must come from the President of the United States.

By focusing the prestige and power of his office on this tremendously important issue, he can remove any doubt which might exist. By definitive and decisive action, he can give new meaning to instinctive American humanitarianism.

He must make it clear that relations will not improve and trade will not increase until some steps are taken to insure the autonomy of currently captive nations.

He must make clear that we will not rest until human rights and personal dignity are restored to those now denied them.

During the observance of Captive Nations Week, July 12–18, the friends and relatives of those still living under the domination of communism should marshal the forces of public opinion to impress upon the President the need for a forthright declaration of policy.

Fervently, these new Americans have promoted the establishment of a House Committee on Captive Nations. Enthusiastically, they have strengthened the traditions of Captive Nations Week. Eagerly, they have supported the creation of a Freedom Academy to train key personnel in the complexities of Communist ideology and practice.

Now, with equal dedication, they should turn to the Congress and the White House and lobby for liberty.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, history's swift pursuit of the present is so rapid and quiet that, many times, we stop and reflect on recent history with new respect and some insight into the turn of events.

It is by this process that we gain wisdom from experience and perspective for the future. With this perspective, we can move forward into the future with confidence. This is not stone-age thinking or even 19th-century thinking, but just plain commonsense.

It is with such perspective that we must aid the needy and/or developing countries of the world. We know how to do it. A look at our own Nation's relatively short history makes it clear that individual liberty, initiative, and profit is the key to our people's unparalleled economic success and happiness.

Our help to the people of the world must be keyed to this formula for success. The freedom-loving peoples in bondage behind the Iron Curtain have been intolerably suppressed from seeking their own happiness and well-being in their own way. We have seen the Communist pattern time and again move into new areas by military force or by political coup, followed by overwhelming military control and brainwashing programs until the people are under full subjugation. One after another, areas, and countries of Eastern Europe fell to this pattern—and now Cuba in this hemisphere is under the Communist yoke and other Latin American countries are threatened.

The Soviets and other advocates of the Communist doctrine promote accommodation and peaceful coexistence—on their terms. The people of these captive nations look to America as their only hope for the restoration of their freedom. We must stand united with our allies and firm in our commitments to the nations of the free world.

Mr. Speaker, our goal must be complete freedom and self-determination for all peoples of the world. Our aim must be complete victory over communism to achieve this goal.

On this day, I pledge renewed dedication to worldwide freedom and justice, to encourage, and help the peoples of the world to achieve this by whatever necessary means, to the conviction that this can be accomplished by peaceful means if we maintain a position of strength and to the knowledge that freedom and happiness can fill the life of everyone if the greedy world conquerors can be stifled.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson has proclaimed the week of July 12, 1964, as Captive Nations Week. This is an occasion which bids us all refresh our minds and renew our energies on behalf of the more than 100 million citizens of the captive European nations who live behind the Iron Curtain as prisoners under the rigid grip of the Communist regime.

Twenty years ago Europe was torn by a horrible war. The Europeans fought for their homes, their families, and their lives, guided by the hope that at the end of their struggle they might find the freedom for which men instinctively hunger. Yet while most of the Western European nations now enjoy this freedom, the captive nations have instead been subjected to a yet more ruthless tyranny under Soviet domination.

In two decades these people have not yet lost hope of one day attaining their independence. The enthusiastic receptions with which the peoples of Berlin and Cracow have greeted Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy and his family are indicative not only of this hope, but also of the responsibility which we of the United States hold as the foremost guardians of liberty in the world today.

This Congress has not been remiss in meeting the complex demands of a foreign policy which must aid these captive people without at the same time strengthening the oppressive Red regime. Our recent negotiations with Rumania indicate not only that it is possible for us to work out trade agreements which benefit these people, but that the nations themselves will courageously depart from Moscow when offered the opportunity.

The worst thing we could do at this point would be to relax our efforts, having given to the captive peoples new cause for hope. For while progress has been made, there is still an ugly wall in Berlin; Russia continues to exploit economically each of the captive nations; religion is suppressed; freedom of expression does not exist; culture is made a tool of the state; and order is enforced by Russian troops and tanks which remain on European soil as an ominous reminder of the bloody streets of Budapest.

It is for us to support the just aspirations of these people to be free. Each year Captive Nations Week has infuriated Chairman Khrushchev, who is confronted anew with the fact that it is the Soviet Union, and not the West, that is the imperialist oppressor of nations.

It requires courage for an enslaved people to keep up their determination after 20 years of oppression, and with no immediate prospect of liberation. It is not easy when the nature and quantity of the assistance which this country can give them toward attaining their liberty is necessarily restricted by the precarious world situation which has resulted from Russian brinkmanship. Therefore, it is imperative and it is altogether fitting, in this month of July when we celebrate the independence of our own Nation, that we redouble our efforts in the cause of our friends behind the Iron Curtain who would likewise be free.

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, we can all be proud that Congress established Captive Nations Week as a moral commitment of America to the ideal of independence for enslaved nations.

It is good for our conscience to be nudged, and reminded, that we should give support to the goal of freedom others desire. Ours was won so long ago that we sometimes take it for granted. It is a precious commodity.

It is singularly appropriate that we observe Captive Nations Week near the observance of our own Fourth of July. We must never forget we celebrate that day as the anniversary of our Declaration of Independence.

We do have the power here in the United States to bolster the spirits of our friends abroad. In the process we can renew their faith in democracy and their allies in the West.

We can demonstrate to the world that we are strong and unified in our constant struggle against the Communist menace.

We can also show, by purposeful political and diplomatic actions that independence and freedom abroad are part of our continuing and strong objectives. Those objectives should be an integral part of our national policy and not merely a subject of occasional oratory.

Once again when Captive Nations Week comes around, we are forcefully reminded of the stifled cries of freedom in the Communist bloc—in East Germany in 1952 and in Poland in 1956.

And, who can forget the blood-drenched street of Budapest during the uprising there? The patriots who died there should be enshrined in our memories forever.

Those few instances should not obscure the flame of freedom which shines in the other unfortunate countries—in Albania, Bulgaria, and Czechoslovakia; in Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and Rumania.

Some of those countries have been subjugated longer than others, but the eternal desire for freedom cannot be extinguished.

I am sorry to say that many of the outstanding spokesmen of our country do not participate with us in these observances.

The reason they do not is that they are too busy seeking accommodations with Communist rulers. They continue to espouse the idea that communism may be mellowing—that it no longer seeks to bury us.

They have arranged the sale of immense quantities of our surplus farm products to the Communists.

Communism has had many giant failures, but none more spectacular than its collectivized agriculture.

Year after year the Communist system has failed, even with immense outlays of men and money, to provide its people with the basic foods.

From our great stores of food, grown by free men, we have bolstered the godless ideology which threatens us. Our democratic institutions will not receive credit for assistance. On the contrary, through suppression of communications, it will be made to appear that the Communist system is once more the savior of mankind.

Nevertheless, we have much to be grateful for in our continuing struggle with communism.

We must be thankful that nearly all the men of influence and power in our country insist on maintaining great military strength. That is the one and only peacekeeping factor that the Communists know and respect.

Without that strength we would be powerless to cope with the threat of international communism.

We must also be grateful that there are signs of discontent in the Communist world. I refer to the deepening rift between China and Russia. We can only hope that this will continue and eliminate for all time the possibility of united action by those two giants against the rest of the world.

Again, let me say that our dear friends abroad are much in our minds and we hope and pray for their eventual release from the evil hands that hold them.

Those of us who gratefully live here in this citadel of democracy have obligations to our unfortunate brothers—those obligations are also to truth, to justice, and to liberty.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, through military force, subversion, infiltration, and economic pressure, the Soviet Union occupied the countries of East Europe and continues to hold captive the peoples of this area. Comprising a half-million square miles and 100 million persons, these nations, when free and independent, contributed greatly to the progress of civilization and the cause of liberty and justice. The Communist effort to control these people continues, but the spirit of resistance and the hope of freedom remain strong in the hearts of these captive peoples. In observing the Sixth Captive Nations Week today, in accordance with Public Law 86-90 enacted by the U.S. Congress, the American people seek to fortify this spirit of resistance and to reaffirm their commitment to the cause of freedom and independence.

So long as there remains in the world the forcible suppression of the right of self-determination, we cannot hope for a secure and durable peace. We must keep faith with the hopes of the captive peoples for the restoration of their independence. We must not yield to the illusion that the victory of communism is inevitable. We must continue to fight communism with every weapon of truth at our command and reaffirm our conviction that communism's threat to the independence of men and nations can best be met by making our free institutions work better. We must rededicate ourselves to the principles of human dignity and freedom. We must never forget that freedom is man's birthright and that its survival and triumph are inevitable.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, as we observe the sixth Captive Nations Week we once again renew our determination to never forget the people of the captive nations in their determined struggle to free themselves from their Soviet oppressors.

Each year we see more and more evidences of cracks within the foundation of the Soviet Empire but we must not mistake the clever moves of the Soviet captors who attempted to make the regimes more acceptable by removing unnecessary irritants without any real loss to the Kremlin.

However, there have been some real fissures in the Iron Curtain that we can note:

Economic crisis in Czechoslovakia caused in large part by growing apathy among the workers resulting in accidents and defective manufactures costing the country some $400 million in 1963.

Czech economists posing the question whether capitalism might be less wasteful than the status quo.

Poland's economic ills caused by overinvestment in unfinished factories.

The failure in the Soviet grain crop forcing the Communist leaders to turn to the West for supplies they could not produce themselves.

Polish, Bulgarian, and Rumanian workers being forced to spend more than 50 percent of their paychecks on food.

Polish intellectuals being scored by Gomulka for basing their work on West European and American sources and bypassing even the Marxist classics.

A writer's rebellion erupting in Czechoslovakia, running against the party's edicts and questioning the Marxist-Leninist dogma.

Dissatisfaction and unrest among the Polish students manifesting itself in idealization of life in the West.

Complaints of Polish bishops about the confiscation of church property and other punitive measures against the church.

These events show that in many instances whenever troubles arose it was due to the pressure of the captive populations, which expressed itself most obviously in agriculture. The Soviet leaders are worried about this resistance to their programs. We in the West can help add to these worries and we do as we reaffirm the ideals embodied in Captive Nations Week.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, the sad fate of the captive nations in Europe is the most heartbreaking legacy of the last war. That war, besides ruining and ravaging the homes of these 100 million unfortunate and unhappy souls, robbed them of their freedom. These peoples, living in their historic homelands extending from the Baltic to the Balkans, including Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Hungary, Bulgaria, and Rumania, enjoyed freedom which they had regained (except for the Germans) at the end of the First World War, and were relatively content and hopeful for the future during the interwar years. But the outbreak of the war spelled disaster and tragedy for them, and tragedy has been their fate since then.

Toward the end of the war the Soviet Union's evil design began to unfold itself as the Red army advanced into eastern and central Europe. One by one these countries were overrun. Soviet agents quickly instituted a Soviet form of government. The people were thus enslaved and placed under the unrelenting Communist totalitarianism. These ominous activities went on before the Western democracies were aware of them. Soon after the war the governments of the West, including the Government of this Republic, began to work and undo some of the mischief done by the Soviet Union. These governments have worked conscientiously and constantly at this task, but unfortunately they have not succeeded in attaining even a part of their goal, to better the lot of these nations and to have the Soviet Government allow some freedom to these peoples.

Six years ago, the United States went on record as the leader of Western democracies unwilling to abandon the cause of these nations. By a joint congressional resolution the Congress of the United States empowered the President to proclaim the second week in July of each year as the Captive Nations Week. That was the least and unfortunately the most we could do for the very living cause of these captive nations in Europe. Today on the sixth annual observance of Captive Nations Week, I ardently hope that through peaceful means a way will be found for the liberation of these captive nations from the Kremlin-imposed Communist totalitarian tyranny.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, the list of captive nations forcibly subjugated by the Soviet Union is a long one—27 by one count. Each has been robbed of its freely chosen government by force and treachery, and today is ruled by Communist governments which could never remain in office in a free election. The Communist governments of the captive nations constitute a fraud and a mockery of human freedom.

It is important for all peoples of the world to keep those truths in mind and it is very appropriate that we remind the world of the true nature of Communist imperialism during the sixth observance of Captive Nations Week later this month. I trust there will be many public observances of this important occasion.

For many years the Communist movement sought to present a monolithic front to the remainder of the world and give the impression that the captive nations were united with the Soviet Union in spirit and deeds. The 1950's saw large ruptures develop in this contrived unity and the 1960's have brought further conflicts within the Communist bloc. To continue this trend our Government must provide strong opposition to Communist expansion and subversion, and not seek ways to accommodate it. Our goal must be to force communism to abandon its present policies of expansion and oppression, and to provide self-determination for the people of all the captive nations.

We in the United States shoulder great responsibilities as leader of the free world. We understand and support the aspirations of the peoples in the captive nations for liberty and freedom. We know the trials of maintaining freedom, and we pledge our support anew for the struggle for freedom of those nations who have fallen behind the Iron Curtain and of those threatened today by continuing Communist deceit and aggression.

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, the observance annually of Captive Nations Week is just one way that our country can demonstrate its disapproval of Communist takeovers in Eastern Europe and Asia and its determination to defend the rights of these subjugated peoples who cannot voice their opinions in favor of their own independence and way of life. The record of Russia, possibly the greatest expansionist power of all times, is alarming indeed. From small beginnings this state has relentlessly pursued the path of territorial acquisition until its borders now encompass one-sixth of the earth's land in addition to actual control of many satellite states.

Even as far back as Peter the Great and Catherine the Great, Russian rulers dreamed of controlling the Baltic and Black Seas. Catherine chose the name Constantine for her grandson because she wanted to see him ruler of the Bosphorus, not because she liked the name. As the Ottoman Empire weakened, the Russian Empire saw itself the heir of many of its former provinces. At the same time it participated in the partition of Poland which led to the erasure of this nation and the Baltic States from the map. In the 19th century czarist Russia was an active participant in the scramble for the Asian territories which lay on its border. Turkoman tribes were now added to the growing list of foreign ethnic groups drawn into the empire.

In Russian eyes World War I might have seemed a temporary setback in the acquisition of territory, but to us and the millions of people concerned it was a moment when freedom, democracy, and self-determination triumphed. The autocratic rule of czarist Russia was swept away as these people battled Red armies. In some cases, such as that of Byelorussia, the people were again subdued, but in others, such as the Baltic States, the will of the people prevailed and the Russians were driven out and republics established.

While outwardly all appeared well, Russia was only biding its time until it had gained internal strength and external conditions would once again favor Russian expansion. Russian leaders did not have to wait long. World War II provided the opportunity. Although an ally of the Western democracies who were dedicated to the principles of equality and self-determination, Russia was bent on pursuing its own policy, only this time armed with a doctrine which proclaimed its eventual triumph over all of the world; namely, communism. As German armies retreated, the Russians entered. They were first hailed as liberators, but their true nature soon became apparent, as they took over government after government. Some, including its small Baltic neighbors, Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia, were annexed outright. In others puppet regimes were installed and in still others, such as Czechoslovakia, coups were engineered. By the end of the 1940's Russian influence extended further into Europe than it had in a long time.

This brief rundown of Russian expansionist policy gives an idea of how Russian influence came to engulf so many different nations. Equally important is the policy that Russia has pursued to hold these territories. While giving the satellite states the appearance of independence in their governmental form, the Russians have in effect controlled their direction. The "Russification" programs of the 19th century have given way to the "communization" programs of the 20th. As might be expected, the youth have been a prime focus for the Communists. They have been systematically indoctrinated with Communist teachings and the Russians have hoped to replace family loyalties with a blind allegiance to the state. Meanwhile, Communist economic theories have been put into practice, even when the citizens have openly resisted as in the case of the German population to the collectivization of agriculture. Industries have been nationalized as have trade and transportation. Even more, the liberty of the people has been curtailed. This action is even more a travesty of justice because it is done in the name of the people.

But they are not fooled. They know that their government is an imposed order and that it is alien to their way of life. For proof of this statement we need go back no further than the German and Hungarian uprisings and the continual exodus of East Germans to the West through Berlin until Herr Ulbrecht erected the Berlin wall to plug up this embarrassing loophole. Even that act did not stop the world from witnessing how the East Germans feel. Every week we hear of some heroic and hair raising escape over or under the wall which proves that freedom is worth the risk of one's life.

Thus, what we object to most in the Russian Communist order is expansionism at the expense of and against other people. We can disagree with a regime, but when it tries to force itself and its ideology on others, then it is for the world to object. The United States, as the leading power in the free world, has shown its determination to stop Communist aggression—in Greece, in Korea, in South Vietnam. Our country will maintain its strength so that it can stop communism anywhere.

And that is what this Captive Nations Week does. It shows the world our intent to defend freedom and it also shows the oppression which today reigns in the Communist satellite states.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. I am proud to add my voice to so many others here in commemorating Captive Nations Day. This day is set aside every year so that we will not forget those nations in Eastern Europe who were taken over by Communist Russia during or immediately after World War II either by deception or force and who have since been held under the tyrannical rule of dictatorial regimes whose main prop is the Red army. We, who have been the world leader in the crusade for national self-determination, cannot let these injustices go unnoticed.

The people in these countries have announced their dissatisfaction to the world. Let us just recall the demonstrations in East Germany in 1953, the Polish uprisings in 1956, and most dramatic and pathetic of all the Hungarian revolt in 1956. Underground, the fight goes on.

Their cry has not gone unheeded. We have heard them and our sympathy goes out to these countless freedom fighters who know the value of liberty because they have been forced to live under tyranny. Thus, in this sixth observance of Captive Nations Day we pay tribute to their courage and tenacity and proclaim once again the right of every nation to determine its own destiny.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, there could be no more fitting time to pause here on the floor of the House to reaffirm our devotion to the cause of freedom in the unfortunate captive nations than the week preceding our own celebration of the anniversary of the Declaration of Independence. The same spirit which uplifted the American patriots 188 years ago this week has persisted despite the most cruel and unwarranted oppression.

There are hopeful signs to which we can point this week. The tremendous welcome which the Attorney General received from the Polish people in Warsaw and Cracow is a magnificent demonstration of the strength and attraction of freedom and liberty in that nation. We are seeing increasing signs of dissent and discord within other captive nations. The Rumanian action at the Geneva disarmament talks in opposing a Soviet Union proposal is perhaps the most notable example of this trend.

We must assure all the peoples of the captive nations that we are alert to their stirrings for freedom and sympathetic to their every move toward greater independence and self-determination. Our statements here today should tell these gallant people that despite our seeming preoccupation in the other corners of the world, we have not forgotten that their struggle for freedom goes on day by day and we stand ready to encourage the decline of a monolithic political bloc.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join with other Members of Congress on the floor of the House of Representatives in observance of Captive Nations Week.

I have joined with other Members of the House of Representatives in asking for the creation of a Special Committee on the Captive Nations. I think it would be fitting that such a committee be established during this observance. Such a committee could provide the means by which the United States can assist these nations in their efforts to regain their national and individual freedoms.

Many Nebraskans and I are concerned with freedom in Eastern Europe. We Americans too often take our liberty for granted. We live and work in one of the freest nations in the world and I am afraid we sometimes forget that everyone does not.

Unfortunately, many nations do not today enjoy even a vestige of independence, though they once may have been leading figures in international affairs. The Baltic nations, for instance, once had freely elected governments. They were respected members of the League of Nations. And they enjoyed high living standards as trading partners with the Western European nations and America. Today the Baltic nations are destroyed. They have been depopulated by murder and cruel deportations. Their governments are Communist puppets. Their farmers are vassals of the state. And they are allowed no independent contact with the outside world.

Many of these same conditions are evident in all that tremendous expanse in Eastern Europe conquered by Russia and in those satellite nations under Chinese domination.

It is our duty as free men and American citizens to be concerned with the welfare of our fellow men. Americans and Christians have always lived by that principle. Bulgaria, Poland, Lithuania may seem far away from the peaceful land and peaceful lives that Americans know. But they are no further away than your next-door neighbor, because they are nations of people with the same needs and the same aspirations as all other men. They are suffering under a cruel alien tyranny. They need to be encouraged by American history and principles, and assured of American interest in their well-being.

It is appropriate that Captive Nations Week should come in the month of July when we celebrate two great milestones in the history of freedom—Independence Day and Bastille Day. It is an appropriate time to send our encouragement to Eastern Europe and other lands struggling to throw off communism.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson by proclamation has set aside July 12 to the 18th as the time for Americans to recall the plight of the captive nations. In his memorable speech in Fulton, Mo., in 1946, Sir Winston Churchill said:

> A shadow has fallen upon the scenes so lately lighted by the allied victory. From Stettin on the Baltic to Trieste on the Adriatic an iron curtain has descended across the continent. Behind that line lie all the capitals of the ancient states of Central and Eastern Europe—Warsaw, Berlin, Prague, Vienna, Budapest, Belgrade, Bucharest, and Sofia.

Today they are still behind the Iron Curtain. As the leader of the free peoples of the world, we must be ever mindful of the plight and the problems of the enslaved peoples of Eastern Europe. We must seek ways and means to assist them. We must keep alive here and behind the Iron Curtain the hope that one day there will be no Iron Curtain.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Captive Nations Week of 1964 opens on Sunday, July 12, and ends on Saturday, July 18. This year's week promises to be the most stirring and enthusiastic one observed yet. Americans in all parts of our country are making preparations to observe this week in a manner that will impress upon the world America's firm determination to liberate the over two dozen captive nations in the Soviet Russian and Red Chinese imperial networks. The week's observances will stress the true nationalism of the captive nations—the peoples themselves—as against the socialist patriotism of their imposed and oppressive governments.

A SPECIAL HOUSE COMMITTEE ON THE CAPTIVE NATIONS

Once again, the Republican Members in this Chamber call upon the leadership to permit favorable consideration by the Rules Committee of the 42 resolutions proposing the establishment of a Special Committee on the Captive Nations. Over the past 3 years, the Republican Congressional Policy Committee has unanimously endorsed this desperately needed measure. We cannot, as some would have us do, play down and even ignore the captive nations and peoples in order to appease their unrepresentative governments. For legislative and other constructive purposes, a special committee is necessary to concentrate on all the captive nations inside and outside the Soviet Union, in Eastern Europe and in Asia, and also in Cuba.

On the eve of this sixth Captive Nations Week observance, we in this Congress have a wonderful opportunity to make our productive contribution toward the eventual freedom and independence of all the captive nations by establishing this special committee. Even its symbolic value is incalculable. I assure all here that the work and performance of such a committee would be of immense, constructive value to the Congress and to our national interest. Because of the unfortunate prevalence of official and popular myths concerning the U.S.S.R. and the captive nations in toto, there are important and vital areas that have yet to be thoroughly explored; and only such a properly constituted committee could do this.

GERMANY, EASTERN EUROPE, AND THE FREE WORLD

Speaking of these myths, they evidently enjoy a broader circulation than one would suspect. It was my privilege to attend last fall the Second German-American Congress, held in Weisbaden, the Federal Republic of Germany. This invaluable congress deals in part with the captive nations. As here, myths regarding the U.S.S.R. and the captive non-Russian nations within this state were uttered by participants who should know better. For an analysis of this example, I request that an article written by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, professor at Georgetown University, be appended to my remarks. Titled "Germany, Eastern Europe and the Free World," the article appeared in the winter issue of the authoritative journal on the captive nations, the Ukrainian Quarterly, and shows clearly the myths that blind free world understanding of the Soviet Russian Empire, with consequences in the field of operations.

I also request that an interesting article titled "Russian Colonialism and an American Response," written by Sam Zelden in the April 1964 issue of Georgetown University's Courier, be printed in the Record. The article treats the proposed Special Committee on the Captive Nations:

[From the Ukrainian Quarterly, Winter 1963]

GERMANY, EASTERN EUROPE AND THE FREE WORLD

(By Lev E. Dobriansky)

In the past 2 years American scholars, writers, and public officials have been meeting with their counterparts in the Federal Republic of Germany, France, Great Britain, Italy, and other West European countries to discuss the problems of Western European integration and the future of Eastern Europe. The assemblies last several days and have assumed the form of a German-American congress chiefly because of their major sponsorships. The Studiengesellschaft fuer Fragen mittel-und osteuropäischer Partnerschaft, headed by Prof. Gotthold Rhode, and the Foundation for Foreign Affairs in Chicago, of which Dr. Eugene Davidson is president, have been jointly sponsoring these highly productive sessions.

The 1962 congress took place in Chicago, and the second congress was held for a week in September 1963, in Wiesbaden, West Germany. Both meetings offered a broad range of topics that stimulated considerable thought in a rather lively exchange of ideas. Nothing can possibly match such occasions for communion of thought and interest bearing on a subject that is of crucial importance to the position and stakes of the free world. The results of such intellectual exchange are priceless and enduring, especially when one considers the impact made on both private and official participants in the conferences. The ideas discussed and digested cannot but have an indefinite range of circulation.

It is not my intention here to indulge in any criticism of the meetings as such. For the plain fact is that there is really little to criticize on this score. The unique educational opportunities afforded by the annual assemblies are evidence enough of their inestimable worth. However, it has been obvious to most participants that so far an unfortunate imbalance has been struck in both the programing and ensuing discussions. Whereas the problems of West European integration, entailing the Common Market, French-German relations, the position of Britain and numerous other aspects, have received adequate coverage and treatment, the future of Eastern Europe has remained a subject of secondary and less than equal consideration.

Yet the three general areas—Western Europe, Eastern Europe, and the free world—are fundamentally interwoven in the real context of an interplay of forces that cannot be sufficiently understood without a thoroughly balanced analysis.

A GERMAN VIEWPOINT ON EASTERN EUROPE

A good example of the need for such an analysis and also representative of a trend of thought in Western Germany is the paper read by Dr. Boris Meissner at the Weisbaden meeting. Dr. Meissner is a professor at Kiel University, who in the eyes of many Germans is regarded as a top-ranking Sovietologist. Apparently his thinking wields some influence in certain circles at Bonn. A number who listened to his presentation were favorably impressed and with some measure of justification spoke highly of his reputation.

The title of Dr. Meissner's disquisition is "Soviet Russia's Foreign Policy: Ideology and Power Politics." At the Second German-American Congress this presentation was really the only comprehensive treatment given to the subject of Eastern Europe. However, it is a significant piece of writing because it schematizes some of the main preconceptions and ideas prepossessing the minds of uncounted German intellectuals who are concerned with Eastern Europe. One must hasten to state that the outlook depicted in this paper is certainly not shared by all German intellectuals. It represents, thus, a German viewpoint on Eastern Europe.

Should this viewpoint become more generalized and perhaps more effective in the councils of the free German state, then it would undoubtedly lead to certain policy changes that may undermine further the cold war position, not only of the Federal Republic but also of the free world. The theoretic generalizations expressed in this paper, as indeed in any such presentation, necessarily engender within themselves the seeds of certain operational ideas and courses of action that virtually predetermine an outcome for better or for worse. From word to deed, from thought to practice, the road is not as indiscernible as some are wont to believe.

In conveying his viewpoint on Eastern Europe, the professor divides the treatment into five sections. The first deals with what he calls the transformation of Soviet foreign policy since World War II. The next three sections consider in successive order the world revolutionary, nationalist, and world political aspects of this policy. The final one is devoted to the interdependence of Soviet domestic and foreign policy. As one should rightly expect of a German scholar, the arrangement of his topics is neatly ordered and logically constructed, and the dissertation is heavily footnoted in the appendix. What is of determining interest to us, however, is his structure of thought and lines of reasoning in connection with one of the most basic oi aspects—Germany, Eastern Europe, and the free world.

Turning now to the thesis that Soviet foreign policy has undergone a transformation since World War II, it should first be noted that a critical reader cannot be sure of Dr. Meissner's concepts. The title and several passages in the discourse underscore Soviet Russia's foreign policy. In reality, there is complete justification for this usage. Unquestionably, the Russians are in command in the empire state known as the Soviet Union, and what passes for Soviet foreign policy or the policy of the Soviet Union is realistically Soviet Russia's foreign policy. Except for individual non-Russian collaborators, this policy, in whatever form, can scarcely be placed in functional association with the captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R., which themselves became early victims of this policy.

To pursue this a step further in the order of historical existence and operation, it can be easily maintained that what is interpreted as Moscow's domestic policy in relation to the non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. is, in actuality, the first dimension of Soviet Russia's foreign policy. The second dimension is oriented toward legalistic state entities and sovereign powers beyond the Soviet Union. Precisely speaking, then, Moscow's domestic policy pertains to affairs encompassing the subjects of the R.S.F.S.R.; i.e., Soviet Russia.

My criticism here is not a package of nominal niceties but rather expresses a position of working conceptions arrived at by historical analysis and perceptions that are conspicuously at variance with those suggested and later substantiated by the Meissner exposition. There is an element of conceptual errancy in any unwarranted confusion of the terms "Soviet Russia," "the Soviet Union," and "the Soviet." Moscow, of course, profits heavily by such protracted confusion, for out of it no decisive cold war measures on the part of the free world could possibly emerge. Such confusion permeates Meissner's reflections on the subject. It indicates not only a fundamental unawareness of the scope and power of non-Russian nationalism in the U.S.S.R., but also a pithy familiarity with the origin and genesis of the present imperial Russian state. It is strange, to say the least, that in the light of German experience in two World Wars this confused outlook should persist. Moreover, this point of criticism goes a long way in illuminating the many acute limitations of this particular German school of thought.

One of these limitations is immediately seen in Meissner's view of a transformed "Soviet foreign policy" since World War II. According to him, this policy is "an amalgam of world-revolutionary expansionism and national-imperial power politics." Since the war it is supposed to have assumed a new aspect: "the need for a global balance-of-power policy to maintain the position as a world power gained under Stalin." The "basic transformation" he speaks of is this: "it has become a policy of worldwide scope, which in addition to flexibility of style exhibits a trait of adventurousness that—except for the Berlin blockade and the Korean war—was missing in Stalin's policy.[1]

As we shall see more clearly later, in Soviet Russian foreign policy there is really no substantial amalgam of the two cited ingredients, which possess meaning only in Meissner's logical construction. The centuries-old nature of Russian imperio-colonialism has always been expansionist and worldwide. Even Marx perceptively recognized this fundamental truth over a century ago. As attested to by Lenin and others, for the Soviet Russian rulers communism has long ceased to be a practicable end in ideal social reorganization and, instead, has degenerated into another ideologic tool of conquest that today finds its widest application in the so-called underdeveloped areas. In addition, the new aspect of a "global balance-of-power policy," with emphasis placed on globality, is by far more the result of advanced technology and fantastic Western diplomatic errors than any new stature of a "world power" gained under Stalin since the last war. Apart from the accounted globalistic feature, surely the imperial Russian state in the form of the U.S.S.R. was a "world power" before World War II and was also then concerned with balance-of-power policy. A little refreshing of memory would also enable us to recall Moscow as the center of a worldwide Communist conspiracy then.

---

[1] Meissner, Boris. "Soviet Russia's Foreign Policy: Ideology and Power Politics," p. 1.

Concerning the "basic transformation," these points of criticism are enough to show the misuse of words here. Instead of any substantive transformation of policy, what has transpired on the basis of the fortuitous combination of scientific technology and uncanny Western obtuseness is an extension of already well-defined goals that are more realizable today than they were 30 or 40 years ago. Moreover, when one recalls Soviet Russian operations in the League of Nations, in all Western countries during the depression years, in Finland and China, and in a pact with Hitler, just to mention a few episodes prior to World War II, adventurousness and flexibility are then not the exclusive features of Khrushchev's handling of the same basic policy. In any such comparisons we must always and studiously bear in mind the shifting scales of imperialist enterprise as determined chiefly by relative technologic advances and the opportunities provided by the opponent's weaknesses. These factors account for the marked extension, not transformation, of Soviet Russian foreign policy.

IDEOLOGY AND SUBSTANCE

When we turn to the so-called world revolutionary aspect of Soviet foreign policy, the misinterpretations abounding in the Meissner paper show not only that history can be badly misread but also that higher notions about Communist ideology can lead to some heavy wishful thinking in the cold war—this, again, to the benefit of the Soviet Russian enemy. The German sovietologist seeks to conjure into a driving force of reality the phantasms of Communist ideology. The mask of the enemy is to become part of his substance. If one ponders well our criticisms of the first section, he can perceptively appreciate the reasons for them in this second section of the Meissner thesis.

The fallacious premise of this and other sections is instantly seen in this opening statement: "Insofar as Soviet foreign policy expresses a territorially limited power policy determined primarily by specific Russian national interests, it has much in common with czarist foreign policy. A decisive difference, however, lies in the fact that Soviet policy is dominated by an ideologically motivated basic drive to expand, which was unknown in czarist Russia."[2] This is a fantastic statement, contradicted both by fact and theoretic insight. Though the scales of the civilized world were smaller four centuries ago and in the last century, yet the Russianized ideologies of Supreme Orthodox and Pan-Slavism played similar roles of ideologic deception as communism has under the Soviet Russian imperialists. They, too, were sources of self-legitimation for messianic Russian aspirations, but drawn along narrower religious and racist lines, they were obviously less effective than the tool of Communist ideology, with its materialistic, millenarian basis. Significantly, both Von Clausewitz and Marx saw the previous ideologies of traditional Russian imperiocolonialism in this substantial light, undimmed by accidents of geographical expanse and technologic inefficacy.

What Meissner and many other sovietologists fail to understand is the historical continuity of the basic identity of Russian nationalism and Russian imperialism, with ideologies serving as the smokescreens for the expansionism inherent in the identity. The history of the Russian nation has been the history of the Russian Empire, whether czarist or Soviet, and totalitarian control, not ideology, has been the principle of cementation underlying the imperial hold and maintenance. When our analyst states that "Soviet foreign policy differs fundamentally from the foreign policy of traditional powers, not only in its goals and methods, but also in its dependence upon the internal totalitarian power structure," he is quite correct.[3] Just substitute czarist for Soviet, and the statement would still be correct.

In support of his misinterpretation Meissner offers a variety of authoritative and empirical points, all of which can be interpreted with entirely different meaning. He quotes, for example, Mr. George Kennan, criticizing Roosevelt and others for underestimating "the ideological seriousness of the Russian Communists." It is noteworthy that Meissner leans on Kennan for his essential authoritative punctuation. I don't know of any American observer of "Russia" who has been wrong so often and so eloquently as Kennan. Quite simply, in this case Roosevelt and other Western leaders failed to know, let alone understand, the historic fabric of Russian imperiocolonialism and its traditional baggage of cold war techniques. More captive nations were added to the Soviet Russian list, not because of the immediate presence of Russian soldiers or empowered native collaborators in their countries, but because of this fundamental weakness in the Western armor that made such conquest possible.

Further, to point out that all "Communists who claim adherence to the Marxist-Leninist ideology—which is just as true of Tito and Gomulka as it is of Khrushchev and Mao Tse-tung—share a common belief in a perfect ultimate society, as the final stage of history within this world" is no proof of the supposed motivating force of Communist ideology. Except for the Russian, we know how the others attained to their seats of power and also, despite their attempted exercise of "independence" either through revisionist or dogmatist utterances, we know, as indeed does Khrushchev, how in ultimate terms they depend on imperial Russian power for their very own survival. While they seek to entrench and widen their own power positions in the farflung imperium, one can hardly expect them to babble anything but the Marxist-Leninist ideology, the self-legitimating theme song of the club.

The curious feature of Meissner's construction is its unreasonable imputation of deep doctrinal belief on the part of the so-called Communists. This shows up especially in his own reflections on Marxism and Leninism, much of which this writer agrees with. Briefly, Marxism is shown to have been turned upside down by Lenin, and with Stalin "a perverted variety of Marxism is involved."[4] Not only is the perversion of Marxism underscored, but also emphasis is placed on "the Russification of Marxism in its Leninist version."[5] Aside from their operational significance in the cold war context, these reflections make far more sense in our interpretative framework, where communism is prominently a tool of ideologic deception and for the totalitarian rulers a necessary badge of doctrinal self-legitimation, than they do in the sovietologists construction, where allegedly communism is both a source of faith and the motivating force of revolutionary expansionism.

How brittle the historical and conceptual grounds are for this sovietological construction can be seen in Meissner's elaborations. For example, concerning Lenin's political opportunism, we are told that in "a multinational state such as Russia, the oppressed peoples represented an additional auxiliary force."[6] The multinational state referred to is the Russian Empire and not Russia, where indeed many other peoples reside. Also, what Meissner overlooks is the Leninist prostitution of the principle of national self-determination to attract this "auxiliary force." Another example is this narrow observation: "A drive for mastery of the world in the conventional sense, such as we encounter in history, would never have required such a thoroughgoing standardization of internal structures. It is obvious that in the case of Bolshevik Russia we have to do with a very specific form of the urge to rule the world—one which has its roots in the foreign-policy theory of Marxism-Leninism."[7] The experiences of the Baltic States and East Germany are cited for the standardization process. For those who are familiar with the institutional standardizations pursued by the Russian czars, bringing serfdom, Russification, genocide, etc. into conquered non-Russian areas, this observation appears rather myopic. It also illustrates an inability to perceive the traditional Russian sources of so-called modern Communist practices.

THE EXCESSES OF UNREALISTIC DUALISM

An unrealistic dualism pervades the Meissner outlook and beclouds his own analysis with ambiguities and definite excesses. Toward the close of his presentation our sovietologist speaks of the Soviet Union as "a universal power," "the sense of mission of which is nourished from two different intellectual and ideological sources: Marxism-Leninism and all-Russian nationalism."[8] He goes on to say that "Soviet imperialism, a synthesis resulting from the amalgamation of these two divergent elements, thus presents two faces."

Well now, it appears that at this stage of the analysis Russian nationalism (only the Lord knows what "all-Russian nationalism" is) also feeds the dubious "universal power" with a "sense of mission." Before this seemed to be restricted to Marxism-Leninism in the dualized amalgam. Also, in this scheme Soviet imperialism, as against Soviet Russian imperiocolonialism, is a synthesis, a new political being with two faces, rather than one face with a variety of ideologic masks; e.g., communism, pan-Slavism, peacemaker, liberator, anticolonialist and anti-imperialist, advocate of freedom and independence.

This is a case that fittingly deserves the application of Occam's razor—"Entia non sunt multiplicanda praeter necessitatem." To simplify his conjurations, Meissner refers to Klaus Mehnert's simile of an airplane provided with two kinds of motors. "The pilot is free to use one motor, the other, or both, depending on the conditions encountered."[9] Strangely enough, nowhere does he ask himself the obvious question, "Who's the pilot?" Behind all the philosophical contraptions, cockpitted in the global contrivance of world revolution is the Soviet Russian totalitarian. Without the Moscow center, all else evaporates as an apparition.

It isn't possible here to examine all the excesses of poor interpretation committed by the German sovietologist, but the following should be sufficient to indicate the logical consequences of a historically unfounded construction. Before accounting for these, it should be emphasized that in contrast to numerous other sovietologists Dr. Meissner has moved in the right direction of assigning considerable weight to Russian nationalism as a source of what he calls "Soviet imperialism." I feel quite certain that in time he will place it in proper perspective, especially by virtue of a growing appreciation of non-Russian nationalism in the U.S.S.R., and thus avoid the excesses which presently mar his outlook.

---

[2] Ibid., p. 2.

[3] Ibid., p. 2.

[4] Ibid., p. 6.

[5] Ibid., p. 5.

[6] Ibid., p. 4.

[7] Ibid., p. 6.

[8] Ibid., p. 16.

[9] Ibid., p. 16.

Taking cognizance of some of the other masks used by the Russians, he states, for example, "The Soviet expansion program as explained by Molotov was one of the factors inducing Hitler to make his disastrous decision to attack the Soviet Union."[10] Now, plainly, the decision as such was not disastrous; what was disastrous was Hitler's spurning of the very non-Russian nationalism that, theoretically, Meissner himself minimizes in this paper.

As another example—and far worse still for cold war operational purposes—is his fantastic belief that the "traditional expansionist goals of czarist Russia had never extended so far to the west, nor was there any discernible Russian interest in extending the borders of the Soviet Imperium to the Elbe and the Werra."[11] With uncanny wishfulness of thought, not to say glaring naivete, he says further that "National Russian interests would doubtless have been satisfied with a safety zone of friendly states in the east-central European region, and with a neutral attitude on the part of the other states, including Germany." Ergo, appease Russian nationalism, which he fails to see as being historically coincident with worldwide Russian imperialist expansionism, and "the partition of Germany may be eliminated by assurance that the east-central European countries will not fully escape from their relation of dependency."

Yet, what sort of an outcome could one expect from a basically confused analysis that wallows in its own uncertainties. For instance, we are told, without historical justification: "The objectives of national Russian imperialism are more modest than those of the Soviet Communist variety. This does not mean, however, that protagonists of Russian nationalism are in agreement as to whether the Soviet Imperium should be considered saturated in view of its territorial gains in World War II."[12] Were they after World War I, and why should they be where the goals are one and the prospects of future cold war victories are brighter than ever? Meissner's observations on Cuba, the "priority of domestic policy" in the U.S.S.R. and on the cold war generally also leave much to be desired.

What amazes an American analyst is how little some German intellectuals have learned from the experiences of two wars in Eastern Europe. Many American scholars who have had no such direct experience can, with reservations, be excused for their muddled analyses of "Soviet behavior" and "Soviet foreign policy."

No matter how characterized, conferences such as the German-American Congress make their solid contribution in this respect to the winning of the cold war.

[From the Georgetown University Courier]

RUSSIAN COLONIALISM AND AN AMERICAN RESPONSE

(By Sam Zelden)

The cause of freedom was paramount among issues provoking the last world war, yet the freedom of many countries such as Poland and Hungary was lost to Soviet colonial expansion. Even before the war states like Ukraine and Byelorussia had fallen beneath Soviet domination.

Today, almost 20 years after the war, the condition of these states remains almost the same—they are still subjugated to Soviet totalitarian tyranny. The bright flame of man's self-determination that once burned brightly in these nations is no more. Now only the burning embers remain. In order to help keep these embers alive, the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States adopted in 1959 a resolution calling for the President to proclaim 1 week a year as Captive Nations Week to indicate awareness of the plight of these people. This week not only takes note of Soviet colonialism, but is also a valuable instrument in the propaganda battle of the cold war, for it provides the United States with a chance to capitalize on a Soviet weakness.

This weakness has dramatically manifested itself many times. In 1941 it occurred in the Ukraine when a large element of the population put hatred of their Soviet masters above hatred of the German invaders. Since the war it has shown itself in the flood of refugees that have come from behind the Iron Curtain. The Hungarian revolution of 1956 was still another demonstration of this soft spot.

The basic nature of this weakness is easily recognized in reference to several fundamental facts. First, the Soviet Union itself is an empire in which a 54-percent majority of the people belong to the captive non-Russian nations. Secondly, without these economically rich non-Russian areas, the Soviet Union would be only a second-rate power. Finally, the Soviet colonial empire actually consists of two sections. One part is made up of the countries nominally independent, but they are so tangled in the military, political, and economic power that they cannot act with true independence. Some of these States are Poland, Hungary, Rumania, and Bulgaria. The other section consists of the territory which was first conquered by the czars, incorporated into the Russian state and then reconquered by Lenin and Stalin. Among these states are Ukraine, Byelorussia, Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia.

This contrifugal force of the Soviet empire has long been recognized by its leaders. Thus, to correct this deficiency, Stalin's policy was to hold these states in subservience by terror and brute force. On the other hand, Khrushchev's policy is to win them over with a wide variety of favors and concessions, as demonstrated by his permitting a limited freedom of national cultural expression for the various nationalities in the Soviet Union proper. He has also tried to obscure this centrifugality by propaganda which has two basic themes. One type is to create the image in the West that there is a brotherly relationship between the Russian and non-Russian people of the empire. The other type is to shift attention away by creating the image that only the Western Powers practice colonialism.

In the 88th Congress to demonstrate in further deed that the United States will not acquiesce to the permanent captivity of these nations, a proposal has been introduced in the House of Representatives for the creation of a Special House Committee on Captive Nations. The precedent for such an action has been well established by the Special House Baltic Committee and its successor, the Select Committee on Communist Aggression. The aim of the Special Captive Nations Committee would be to provide reports, studies, and inquiries in a regular, consistent, and objective manner so that worldwide attention and opinion can be formed from the true facts on the Soviet colonial system. Furthermore, the periodic findings of this committee would help provide the necessary information for making well-informed, rational decisions by the Congress as to what practical action may be needed in Soviet-American relations. Its information could also be used in making of broad legislative outlines for the future day when these countries will be free. At the very least the creation of such a committee would bring pressure to bear on a vulnerable spot of the Soviet world. After all, the captive peoples, despite the tactics of the Soviet police state, still have strong aspirations for freedom. Encouragement must be given and recognition must be granted these aspirations in order to advance the cause of these peoples and, at the same moment, that of the West.

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to join my colleagues in observing Captive Nations Week.

In this fifth annual observance by Congress we are helping to dramatize the plight of the captive nations of Eastern Europe. By our action, we emphasize the right of self-determination by all peoples and we are speaking for freedom against the imposition of alien rule.

The situation in the captive nations cannot be accepted as unalterable and hopeless. On the contrary, the events of the past few years have shown the tremendous endurance of deep-rooted nationalism and the spirit of independence.

In my judgment, we must reject the notion that Russia's conquest of the nations of Eastern Europe should be accepted in the name of political realism. The fact is that the Soviet Union leads not from strength but from weakness as far as these nations are concerned. Does anyone doubt that, if genuinely free elections were held in such nations as Poland, Ukrainia, Rumania, Hungary, Lithuania, Latvia, and the others, the forces of independence and democracy would prevail?

Historically and psychologically most of the nations of Eastern Europe have a strong attachment to the West. When the opportunity arises, as in the case of Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy's visit to Poland this week, the people will demonstrate their affection for the western way of life.

With this observance by Congress, we give encouragement and hope to 100 million restive and unhappy people who yearn for the day when their nations will become free nations and they, once again, will have control of their own destiny.

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure for me to join with the many others who are this week commemorating Captive Nations Week. The plight of these poor countries who during and since World War II have found themselves under an alien and rigid Communist rule is indeed heartrending.

But freedom fighters in these suppressed countries have risen time and again to show that all is not well behind the Iron Curtain and that the people are not satisfied or willing to let a group of foreign-backed stooges trample on their rights and attempt to impose a foreign economic doctrine on them.

The world gasped at the daring and courage of the East Germans in 1953, the Poles in 1956, and the Hungarians in the same year. Young people sacrificed their lives that freedom might reign once again in their countries. This same spirit has motivated more than one East German to attempt the escape to West Berlin in the face of the imposing Berlin Wall and the surrounding armed guards. Many have made it, but some of their more unfortunate comrades have been killed or dragged back, bleeding from bullet wounds.

---

[10] Ibid., p. 11.

[11] Ibid., p. 13.

[12] Ibid., p. 16.

But their spirit lives on, smoldering underground. Their sacrifice has not been in vain, for they will rise again, followed by others who have been inspired by their example, just as today we are inspired.

No finer explanation of the meaning of Captive Nations Week can be found than that set forth in a letter from Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, chairman of the National Captive Nations Committee, dated June 26, 1964. It follows:

> The week will emphasize that (1) on the psychopolitical front, no breather be given with the U.S.S.R. itself being no monolith, the Russians in their time of troubles; (2) we concentrate on the dozen non-Russian nations in this inner empire; (3) we carefully distinguish between the true patriotic nationalism of the captive nations as against the mythical "patriotic socialism" of their imposed and representative governments; (4) our Congress create a Special Committee on the Captive Nations; and (5) we adopt a policy of Emancipation that will insure no psychopolitical sanctuary for Moscow and Peiping in their imperial systems.

With these objectives I wholeheartedly concur and promise my continued support in the future.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have this opportunity to join with my colleagues in observing Captive Nations Week. We are gratified that President Johnson issued the Captive Nations Week proclamation which calls attention to the sad fate of the millions of persons who have been brought under the oppressive rule of the Soviet Union—whose freedom and fundamental rights have been wrested from them. I wish to commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] for his tireless efforts in bringing the problems of these enslaved people to our attention and in urging action in their behalf.

I take this opportunity again to urge our Committee on Rules to report out favorably the measure creating a Special Committee on the Captive Nations. I introduced a bill providing for the creation of such a committee and I feel it is imperative that the Congress take action as soon as possible so the important work can go forward. We must ever keep in mind that the captive nations and peoples have not lost hope, they have not lost their desire for freedom and independence, and they deplore as much as ever the fact that they have been enslaved. They pray for the day of deliverance and true independence and self-government. They have kept alive in their hearts the democratic ideal.

It is our duty and privilege to give them the moral support they desperately need; to let them know we have not forgotten them, to say that we hold out the hand of friendship and understanding and that we will continue to do all we can to hasten the day when they can take their rightful place in the world's family of free nations.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, Captive Nations Week, July 12–18, 1964, reminds an all-too-forgetful world that there has been no lessening of the chains put around these enslaved countries.

We have been brainwashed to believe that communism headed by Mr. Khrushchev is changing its spots. Surely it must never be forgotten that Stalin chose Khrushchev because of his innate cruelty to institute and carry out the food shortages in the Ukraine and caused the death of at least 8 million people.

Moscow has tried for years to make the free world believe it no longer follows the terrorist measures of Stalin. Certainly the Hungarians and Poles in 1956 along with all the captive peoples have experienced Communist brutality.

Supported by the Red army in 1945 the national Communist parties have established effective control over the economic, political and social life of 100 million people. A systematic campaign has been underway these past years to nationalize industry and trade, collectivize agriculture and enforce state economic planning. Characteristically the Communists have been tireless in their efforts to destroy all forms of individual liberty as well as religious worship and education. In turn an insidious program was introduced to indoctrinate the youth and destroy family loyalties by requiring blind obedience to the state.

As Americans it is part of our tradition and heritage to stand clearly for freedom for all nations on all continents. Today we salute the inalienable right of these captive people to decide their own destiny in freedom, under God.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the tragedy of our century lies in the suppression of those people who fought so bravely against one form of totalitarianism only to find themselves victims of another. More than 800 million people have found themselves in this condition since the conclusion of World War II. It is the story of Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Lithuania, and other nations of Eastern Europe and the Balkan Peninsula.

For the sixth time the President has issued a proclamation observing a Captive Nations Week. This year, the solemn observance of our concern and sympathy for the more than 100 million people of the 9 captive nations will be commemorated July 12–18.

The fate of our fellow human beings in the captive nations has been a constant concern of the people and the Government of this country. Fortunately, enlightened policies pursued by President Kennedy and President Johnson, including efforts to foster national independence and some degree of economic self-sufficiency through broadened trade with the free world, have encouraged a greater desire and expression for freedom in several of the captive nations. But we in America must not forget their continued enthrallment by Russian imperialism and their unquenchable desire for freedom.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, for those of us in the United States who have been concerned with Soviet subjugation of the freedom-loving people of Eastern Europe, continuing faith in these peoples' desire to be free has not diminished.

One of this Government's primary failings in its obligations to the captive peoples of the satellite nations has been its failure to realize that the "governments" with which we deal do not represent the people they claim their citizens.

While these leaders are "puppets" their people remain proud. They refuse to yield an inch of their own conviction and principle to accommodate the impositions made upon them by a Moscow-controlled regime, and pray that the United States, whose people understand the meaning of freedom as their own governments do not, will never fail in the obligations placed upon us by our Creator and theirs—to insure freedom of choice for all peoples everywhere, under an ethical and moral system which recognizes, above all else, the rights of the individual.

So as we commemorate this Captive Nations Week, let us not be content with repeated remonstrations about how "our hearts bleed" for these captive peoples. Let us instead, as the leaders of the free world and the hope of those not free, offer concrete plans to discourage this Communist tyranny over the hearts and minds of some of the world's greatest patriots—the peoples of Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, and Rumania.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, July 12–18 marked the sixth year observance of Captive Nations Week throughout the Nation. July is the month in which Americans celebrate their 188th anniversary of independence and the French celebrate Bastille Day—both milestones of freedom. Over 100 million people are forcibly living under Soviet tyranny to date and many more are threatened by Communist aggression; they look to America for inspiration and guidance. The ring of Russian domination and oppression extends to the citizens of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukrainia, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, East Germany, Bulgaria, and Armenia.

Ironically, the Eastern European satellites were once free and sovereign independent states between the two World Wars. They were vital assets to free Europe, demonstrating their capability and desire to remain free to the rest of the world. Yet their freedom was doomed to be short lived. Ruthlessly, our World War II ally, Russia, seized their independence and substituted totalitarianism for democracy. Despite the adverse odds, the captive peoples have rebelled time and time again against tyranny, exhibiting extreme tremendous courage and faith in their conviction for freedom.

Russia is unable to quell all the intersatellite rebellions; outbursts of impassioned citizens erupt within Soviet ranks with often tragic results. Deadly efficient tanks and armies leave a wake of terror and bloodshed as Poland, East Germany, and Hungary can bluntly testify. The Katyn Forest massacre of 1943 led to the deaths of 15,000 Polish officers at the hands of the Russians; this led to a thorough investigation and the first formal indictment of U.S.S.R. for committing crimes against our allies by a special House committee under the leadership of the distinguished gentlemen from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN]. Yet these uprisings are only manifestations of rebellion brought to the attention of the world; much more lies undetected beneath the surface.

Due to international and internal pressure, Soviet Russia cannot afford such open and brutal methods of suppression. There is a growing awareness among the captive nations that Russia is not a monolithic entity and it is up to the free world to encourage the fight for freedom through economic aid and moral support. The battle has been waged for 25 years, since the end of World War II, and must continue to increase its efforts to make the dream of freedom a concrete reality for these captive nations. The past few weeks have witnessed the assertions of many such nations for independence from Soviet tyranny.

The Rumanians have snubbed a Russian proposal at the Geneva disarmament talks. They have openly defied the Soviet plans for incorporating them into the Danube program, insisting on their economic sovereignty. Instead, Rumania has entered into a trade agreement with the United States and will confer with France on possible trade ties next month.

The overwhelming enthusiasm for Robert Kennedy in Cracow is a vidid demonstration of the strength and freedom aspirations of Poland.

The Taras Shevchenko monument stands in Washington as a memorial to the Ukrainian freedom fighters who are still struggling for those rights we Americans tend to take for granted.

These are only a few of the events that remind us that freedom is won through sacrifice and determination. We must encourage the captive nations all over the globe to fight for their independence and combat communism relentlessly. We must show strength through our example and action in order to further their rightful cause for freedom. Captive Nations Week is but one way we show the world the extent of Soviet oppression in its satellite countries and our intention to alleviate their plight. We must encourage the peoples of captive nations to resist their oppressors; to keep alive their traditions and patriotism which were once able to express themselves freely, yet are now so forcibly curbed.

THREAT TO THE DOMESTIC OIL INDUSTRY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEED] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, summer is traditionally the "silly season" and we have come to expect some strange statements and behavior on these hot days. Ordinarily, the best policy is to ignore this "summer madness" because it will pass.

But I think one recent example of this seasonal behavior deserves some comment for two reasons: One, it included a threat to the domestic oil industry, one of the important bulwarks of our national economy and security; and two, it clearly implied that the votes of a rather sizable group of our colleagues in this and the other body could be controlled and manipulated by a registered lobbyist.

Mr. Charles W. Colson, Washington counsel of the New England Council, spoke last week before a meeting of the Rocky Mountain Petroleum Institute at Boulder, Colo.

Mr. Colson was unhappy with the domestic petroleum industry, because of its support of a program to control and regulate imports of oil. He was particularly unhappy because the domestic producers and refiners of oil support a limitation on imports of residual fuel oil, as well as import controls on crude oil.

According to the Oil Daily, Mr. Colson warned the oilmen at the meeting that their continued support of residual oil controls has become so irksome that it could lead New England Members of both Houses to retaliate by reassessing their historical support of the depletion allowance, which is a necessary and long accepted tax adjustment for extracting industries as they "deplete" their reserves.

Mr. Colson was reported as saying the resentment our colleagues from New England feel on this subject is becoming so intense, "some of them, I know for a fact, are beginning to reassess their historic position in support of legislative programs—such as tax depletion—which are of extreme importance to the oil industry."

It seems to me, Mr. Colson's message is as direct as it is blunt. Straighten up, he has said to the domestic oil industry, and fly right, or suffer the consequences.

Mr. Colson tried to make it explicitly clear, without directly saying so, it further seems to me, that he can manipulate our colleagues from New England on this issue. He seems to be saying, "I have got these votes in my pocket and you oil boys had better play ball or else."

Mr. Colson's threat to end the depletion allowance unless the domestic oil industry follows his wishes is as empty as it is silly. No lobbyist, however powerful he may think himself to be, can commit a group of our colleagues on any legislation. I am sure that these New England legislators, including some of our most distinguished colleagues, resent such statements. I know that I do.

For decades now we have seen critics of the oil industry use the catchphrase "tax loophole" to apply to the depletion allowance. They act as if there is something unique about percentage depletion in oil, as if this were not just one among many of our natural resources with such a tax provision.

Far from being a loophole, percentage depletion is vital to the security of our country. If it did not provide some offset against the tremendous risks and high percentage of dry holes in drilling, capital would go elsewhere and our domestic oil reserves would not be developed. Already this activity, so essential to our national defense, is becoming marginal because of the competition of imported oil. We cannot afford further blows to the domestic independent oil industry, which does 80 percent of the exploring, since this could soon result in our becoming dependent in time of war on foreign oil that we could not get, simply because our own domestic reserves would be untapped.

Mr. Colson took it upon himself to educate the oil men at the Boulder meeting in the economics of the industry. I am sure they all appreciated his efforts to set them straight. He made it clear that, in his opinion, import controls on residual fuel oil do not help the domestic industry.

Unfortunately, his lesson in petroleum economics does not seem to have been well heeded. Mr. H. A. True, Jr., who is president of the Independent Petroleum Association of America, took an absolutely opposed position on residual imports at this same meeting.

Mr. True pointed out that if import controls were removed a flood of imported residual would enter the country and undoubtedly reduce the price. This would be true if we permitted unlimited tariff-free imports of shoes, textiles, and the other products on which Mr. Colson and his colleagues are seeking strict import controls.

Mr. True pointed out that if the price of residual should decline by 50 cents a barrel because of unlimited imports, the realizations by the refinery would be cut by 5 cents a barrel for each barrel or crude oil put through. Mr. True warned that thus, "any decrease in refinery realization results in further pressure on crude oil prices."

Mr. True was absolutely correct when he told the meeting that national security is the primary justification for limiting oil imports but, "even without the need to maintain a strong defense energy base, the tremendous economic contributions made by the petroleum industry would argue for an import policy which would maintain a healthy domestic petroleum industry."

I am confident that the domestic oil industry will continue to follow the leadership of men such as Mr. True, rather than this self-appointed expert from New England. I am equally certain that Mr. Colson's implied threats that he can influence the New England delegation to desert their "historic support" of the fully justified and necessary tax allowance for depletion of an industry's—or a company's—natural resources was an empty one, which my distinguished colleagues from the Atlantic seaboard will, at the least, simply ignore.

APPORTIONMENT OF ONE HOUSE ON FACTORS OTHER THAN POPULATION BY ANY STATE HAVING BICAMERAL LEGISLATURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HARVEY] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a resolution today for the purpose of amending the Constitution of the United States so that any State having a bicameral legislature may apportion one house on the basis of factors other than population. This resolution specifically provides that the citizens of the State must have the opportunity to vote upon such apportionment.

I believe the decision of the U.S. Supreme Court on June 15, 1964, is wrong and is in conflict with the historical background of both our Federal Government and its Constitution. The majority opinion of the Court, written by Chief Justice Warren, is wrong not because the one-man, one-vote theory is necessarily wrong, but rather because the majority view denies to the people of a State the right to decide for themselves how they wish to be represented in their State legislature. Chief Justice Warren says he found "no significance" in a referendum vote on apportionment in the Colorado case, although in that State the voters, by a 2-to-1 margin, approved a plan which gave some weight to areas as well as population in making up the legislature. The same Colorado voters—not only by a 2-to-1 ratio but by a majority in every county of the State—overwhelmingly voted against a one-man, one-vote plan.

In Michigan, the voters specifically approved an amendment to an earlier State constitution in 1952 which provided senatorial districts, giving considerable weight to area as a factor. Again, in 1963 the Michigan voters were given an opportunity to vote on this question and approved an entirely new State constitution which provided a formula of 80 percent population and 20 percent area in setting up the State senate districts. In ignoring these referendums, the Court is forgetting that the people themselves are the ultimate source of power under our system of government. The Court is saying that a majority of the people cannot choose for themselves the system of State government under which they desire to live.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, I believe the June 15 decision is clearly in conflict with the history of our Government and our Constitution. Justice Warren says that:

> It is established that the fundamental principle of representative government in this country is one of equal representation for equal numbers of people.

This is simply not true. As Justice Stewart pointed out in his dissent, this was not the colonial system; it was not the system chosen for the National Government by the Constitution; it was not the system practiced by the States before or at the time of adoption of the 14th amendment; nor is such a system practiced today. Justice Stewart, in his dissenting opinion, reflected my own views completely when he said:

> To put the matter plainly, there is nothing in all the history of this Court's decisions which supports this constitutional rule. The Court's draconian pronouncement, which makes unconstitutional the legislatures of most of the 50 States, finds no support in the words of the Constitution, in any prior decision of this Court, or in the 175-year political history of our Federal Union. With all respect, I am convinced these decisions mark a long step backward into that unhappy era when a majority of the members of this Court were thought by many to have convinced themselves and each other that the demands of the Constitution were to be measured not by what it says, but by their own notions of wise political theory. The rule announced today is at odds with long-established principles of constitutional adjudication under the equal protection clause, and it stifles values of local individuality and initiative vital to the character of the Federal Union which it was the genius of our Constitution to create.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that this Congress will speedily adopt my resolution or one of similar effect so that the States may also have the opportunity to ratify such an amendment and it can swiftly become a part of our Constitution. Only then will the power be returned to the people to select for themselves the type of State government under which they wish to live.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I rise to voice my strong support for the resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution which my colleague from Michigan is sponsoring.

I believe the Supreme Court made a grave error in the first instance when it ventured into the political thicket of legislative apportionment. However, its recent decisions in that field are all but incredible. It would not have been so surprising or so disturbing if the Court had held that the people of a State must have an opportunity to vote, even at reasonable intervals, upon any redistricting plan not based strictly on a population factor. However, when it held unconstitutional the Colorado case, in which a majority of the people of each county of Colorado had approved the apportionment, I believe it went beyond judicial interpretation and actually the Supreme Court has amended the Constitution.

I wish also to commend my colleague from Michigan for his leadership not only on this particular issue but also on many other legislative issues which have come before Congress. He has been an able and effective member of committees. His colleagues from Michigan, as well as his other colleagues in the House, listen to his words of wisdom and are glad to follow his leadership on many occasions.

I commend the gentleman for taking time to discuss this important subject today.

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his kind remarks.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HARVEY] for his statement on a very important matter before the country. My colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HARVEY], is one of the hardest working and most dedicated and able Members of the House of Representatives.

In support of his position taken here today I would like to include a statement recently made by me for the joint House-Senate Republican leadership on this subject. It confirms the position taken by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HARVEY].

STATEMENT BY REPRESENTATIVE HALLECK

For the past week since the Supreme Court's decision on apportionment of State legislatures, Republicans have been working on a proposed constitutional amendment to nullify the edict. We have done so in the conviction that sober examination of the facts points directly to the existence of a constitutional crisis.

The issue can be stated simply. If the Supreme Court, with neither clear constitutional language nor precedents to guide it, can upset 175 years of legislative tradition in unmistakable violation of rights specifically vested in the States, then what is the future of the historic Federal-State relationship in these United States?

Some 44 of the 50 States must revise their legislative apportionment to comply with this decision based on a sentence in the 14th amendment which Justice Harlan, in a dissenting opinion, showed by exhaustive historical citation, was never intended to be applied in such fashion.

The Founding Fathers, by their determination that the membership of the U.S. Senate be geographic, evidently thought highly of the system that has been upset by the Court's decision.

As Justice Stewart said, "What the Court has done is to convey a particular political philosophy into a constitutional rule, binding upon each of the 50 States * * * without regard and without respect for the many individualized and differentiated characteristics of each State * * * stemming from distinct history, distinct geography, distinct distribution of population, and distinct political heritage."

Does not the majority decision potentially challenge the very foundation of municipal and county government? It is a question that confronts us.

We Republicans believe the historic geographic-population legislative balance which has protected minority rights and interests for 175 years should be maintained. We intend to support a constitutional amendment if necessary to rectify the Supreme Court's decision.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HARVEY] on taking this special order and I join with him in requesting early and prompt action upon the proposed constitutional amendment to permit one house of any bicameral State legislature to be apportioned on a basis other than population. It is consistent with the gentleman's deep knowledge of American history and of the vital importance to our Nation of strong and truly representative local and State government. Both in committee and on the floor he has been a constant guardian for the preservation of the powers and rights reserved to the people under the U.S. Constitution. The creeping intrusion of the Federal Establishment, to a great extent, through unwise and unlegal action of the Supreme Court, constitutes one of the most serious threats to continued freedom in America today. The gentleman in his votes and by his leadership has demonstrated his total commitment to preserve that freedom.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Harvey] for his sponsorship of a proposed amendment to the Constitution which would limit the recent decision of the U.S. Supreme Court on State legislative apportionment. The Supreme Court decision is unwise and extremely serious. It could well undermine one of the basic foundations of our Republic. Immediate remedial action is mandatory. Jim Harvey is acting promptly and he should be congratulated.

I should also indicate that I have sponsored a similar proposal to correct the deadly serious ramifications of this Supreme Court decision. The Congress should move immediately because the American people deserve the right to vote immediately on this proposed amendment. Jim Harvey deserves special commendation and I am glad to join many others in praising his efforts.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the gentleman from Michigan on his cogent remarks. I would also like to take this opportunity to express my own appreciation for the work he has done on the Special Housing Committee and on the Banking and Currency Committee. As the ranking Republican on the Housing Subcommittee, I have had the opportunity to serve with my distinguished colleague and friend from Michigan since he first came to Congress. No one has contributed more to the development of sound legislation, and to the advancement of the national interest. His district and his country can be rightfully proud of his dedicated service.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, when I came to Washington 4 years ago one of the first persons to attract my attention was Congressman James Harvey of the Eighth District of Michigan. He quickly became a dominant member of the freshman Republicans. He easily exhibited exceptional ability while serving upon the Committee on Banking and Currency. His commonsense in dealing with some of the Nation's greatest problems has made a significant contribution to the welfare of our country.

Throughout the 4 years of his service in the House of Representatives he has worked hard and made difficult decisions with courage. The people of the Eighth Congressional District have been lucky to have representation of such distinction. I hope they will continue him for another term—they need him, the country needs him.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Harvey] for his knowledgeable and effective discussion of the reapportionment questions posed by the recent Supreme Court decision. This is a matter which will have significant impact upon government in most States. The gentleman from Michigan has performed a service for all of us in highlighting the problems which the Court's decision pose.

It is an honor for me to serve with Jim Harvey in the House of Representatives. We came to Congress together in 1961. I have found him to be a responsible and dedicated Representative of his congressional district, the State of Michigan, and our Nation. His counsel and assistance in regard to legislation emanating from his Committee on Banking and Currency is respected by his colleagues. Only a week ago he took a leading part in debate of the Mass Transportation Act, H.R. 3881, in which he endeavored to point up the threat to private enterprise and to the private transit companies posed by this new spending program.

Jim Harvey has been helpful to me. On April 30 of this year, Congressman Harvey took time out from his busy schedule to speak in my congressional district before the National Association of Supervisors of State Banks. I have received enthusiastic reports from Mr. J. O. Wilson, Kansas bank commissioner, Hollis W. Burt, executive vice president of the national association, and from many others regarding the informed presentation on banking and finance which he made.

I welcome this opportunity to commend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Harvey] for his service in the Congress and for his discussion here today.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I join in paying tribute to the outstanding qualities of our colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Harvey]. His courage, his intellect, and his personality have made him one of the most popular and effective men in this Congress. His legislative leadership is known by all—his reputation was firmly established in his fight for the International Development Association.

In addition to that, he has been especially attentive to the responsibilities we all have to the widows and orphans of our war veterans, and to the veterans themselves. Through my work on the Veterans' Affairs Committee, I have come to know and respect Jim Harvey's constant attention to the legitimate needs of those who have preserved this Nation's freedom by fighting in our wars. He confers and consults with me regularly about veterans' affairs.

Jim Harvey is a credit to his district, to this Congress, and to the Nation. I look forward to working with him for years to come.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me as I want to take a minute to express my great admiration for him and for the contribution which he has made to the deliberations of this House.

It is my privilege to serve with him on the Banking and Currency Committee where his experience and knowledge is so valuable. The gentleman from Michigan is a Member who does his homework, who combines hard work with a broad understanding of the problems we face, with the result that his position on the matters at hand and the opinions which he expresses are greatly respected and carry real weight.

Jim Harvey is known as a fighter for what he determines to be in the best interests of our country. He approaches each matter with an open mind, studies it diligently, and after sifting the wheat from the chaff, arrives at a conclusion which he then advocates with force and real ability.

It is a great pleasure to work closely with him, and I look forward to his remarks today, as I know they will be of great interest to all of us.

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Michigan, Congressman Jim Harvey, for bringing this matter to the floor. It is important to all of us and to the country as a whole. Of course, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Harvey] has done an outstanding job since he has been here in Congress. His work on the Banking and Currency Committee and the Public Works Committee is well known. His advice is sought by Members on both sides of the aisle.

He has been a leader, and I am proud to be associated with him here in the Congress. It is not surprising to me that he is taking the lead today and is heading up the discussion. Seldom does a Member have the opportunity to publicly thank a colleague for an outstanding job and I certainly do not want to let this time pass without saying thanks of a job well done and to encourage him to continue in his efforts.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Harvey], for bringing this very important subject to the attention of the House today. I share the sentiments he has expressed. His concern for the best interests of the citizens he represents is well known to all of us who serve with him. As a member of the Appropriations Committee I am well aware of his persistent efforts in behalf of the Sebewaing River project. His understanding of the sugar-beet and beangrowers problems in our part of Michigan is known to me as we have worked together toward needed legislation in this area. I trust that every citizen of the Eighth District will realize the contributions he has made toward their best interests.

RESOURCES AND THE FUTURE: ENERGY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman for Ohio [Mr. Bow] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, the Critical Issues Council of the Republican Citizens Committee has issued a highly significant paper on energy. The paper was prepared by a distinguished task force headed by Mr. Lewis L. Strauss. The other members were: Dr. W. F. Libby, Mr. Robert L. L. McCormick, and Mr. Louis Roddis.

If Congress and the Executive were to implement this report strongly, there could result huge savings to the taxpayers, major improvements in the operations and conduct of Federal agencies concerned with electrical energy, and a resolution of much of the incessant conflict between public and private areas of interest. Such a resolution of basic policies is long overdue.

In 1963, the Federal Government spent approximately $1,643 million on water, power, and related activities, including the Rural Electrification Administration. Of this, around $828 million was spent on electrical energy in one form or another. If these recommendations were put into effect and strongly implemented, it would not be unrealistic to expect eventual annual Federal savings of 20 to 25 percent, or between $165,600,000 and $207 million.

I am certain all Members of the House and many hundreds of other readers of the RECORD will find new facts, new information, and sound conclusions in this paper, and I commend it to their attention:

RESOURCES AND THE FUTURE: ENERGY

Our economy, which is based upon the employment of energy in its various forms, has in recent decades demonstrated a rapid growth in energy requirements.

At the present time, most of our energy is derived from fossil fuels in which the accumulated solar radiation has been stored by plant and animal life over countless millennia. These are the deposits of coal, petroleum, and natural gas. While they are finite in amount, exhaustion is not an imminent peril and, in the case of coal, is very far off indeed. We are holding our own (use versus new finds) in petroleum, although it might be argued that in time we may have to reduce usage for stationary energy sources to provide reserves for automotive and aircraft purposes. Any shortage and accompanying price increase might, however, stimulate the production of liquid fuel in large quantities from coal. Therefore, no case for urgency can be made with respect to the short-term supply of fossil fuels.

Energy derived from falling water and converted into the form of electricity has been developed in the United States to about the practical limit of its economic and geographic possibilities as will be discussed in more detail later.

The waves, tides, winds, and direct solar radiation all are possible sources of useful energy, but all are either undependable, diffuse, inefficient, low grade, or locality limited. They represent an insignificant part of the presently consumed energy (other than solar radiation in the production of crops), and hence they will not be discussed.

The fuel cell, an interesting development, is not a new source of energy, but a fuel use promising higher efficiency. Present high temperature steamplants approach 40 percent thermal efficiency, a very great improvement over the past 30 years. Fuel cells may be developed eventually to operate at greater efficiencies than this but, to be significant, the capital cost per installed kilowatt would have to be lower. At present the contrary appears more likely.

Finally, we have nuclear-powered generators of electricity. Only 22 years have elapsed since the first controlled fission chain reaction, and only 10 years since the first plant to produce electrical energy for civilian consumption from nuclear fission was initiated (Shippingport). In view of the striking and continuous reduction in the installed cost per kilowatt of capacity and in the production costs per kilowatt hour—to the point where in several parts of the U.S. nuclear plants are today competitive with conventional coal-fired plants—it is not unreasonable to expect further reduction in the cost of electricity from atomic fission. Nuclear powerplants will be competing, of course, with more efficient steamplants burning coal. In 1920, it required 3 pounds of coal to produce 1 kilowatt-hour; in 1940, 1.4 pounds; and in 1960, only 0.7 of a pound. Thus, in the last 40 years, the amount of electricity which could be generated by the same amount of coal has more than tripled. Continued improvement at this rate can hardly be expected, however, whereas nuclear technology is at its beginnings.

Atomic power from the fusion of the nuclei of light elements is a development with vast and revolutionary potentials for the future. Whether the necessary breakthrough in technology is imminent or far distant is unpredictable. Most authorities agree that the principle is theoretically feasible.

THE RECORD

1. Dams for energy and reclamation: In 1902, Republicans established the Bureau of Reclamation and vigorously carried out Federal reclamation of arid lands. Of major reclamation projects today, some two-thirds were created by Republican administrations. These include the gigantic multi-purpose Hoover Dam, on the Colorado River. Republicans approved and were engaged in the final stages of engineering plans for the Grand Coulee Dam on the Columbia River and Central Valley of California developments, when the Democratic administration took over in 1933. The Grand Coulee, key to the whole Bonneville Power Authority, is the largest dam in that hydroelectric complex.

2. Water and power for the Southwest: The Glen Canyon and Flaming Gorge Dams brought forward the Colorado River storage projects under the Eisenhower administration. This enormous project, one of the most extensive water programs for arid areas yet undertaken by man, will not be completed until after the year 2000.

3. Power on the Niagara: Pursuant to the treaty of 1950 and the subsequent statute, licensing arrangements were made with the New York State Power Authority for developing the electrical resources of the Niagara River and were consummated by the Eisenhower administration. This source supplies power for New York and much of New England.

4. Oil as an energy source is conserved: In 1924, Republicans established the Oil Conservation Board; and, in 1929, oil beneath the free public lands was withdrawn from private entry. The same year a Republican administration initiated the major interstate compact for conservation of oil, which has since come into being among 21 States.

5. Petroleum on the Continental Shelf: Our vast new development of petroleum on the Continental Oceanic Shelf of the United States was initiated and methods for its supervision established under the Eisenhower administration.

6. Self-liquidation policy for public works: A Republican administration established the policy of Federal loans for self-liquidating public works, then financially not feasible by private captial or State funds. Diverting the Colorado River water supply to the Los Angeles area is an instance. Those loans made by a Republican administration are repayable to the Federal Government.

7. Water and energy from the Mississippi into the Rockies: The so-called Fryingpan project on the Arkansas and Red Rivers, while finally authorized in 1962, was engineered by the Eisenhower administration and repeatedly proposed to Democratic Congresses without avail. This enormous project will assist all South-Central States from the Mississippi to the Colorado Rockies.

8. Atomic energy: The Eisenhower administration made historic contributions toward effective use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes. In 1953, it proposed the establishment of the International Atomic Energy Agency. The Republican Congress of 1954 amended the Atomic Energy Act liberating the development of this great new power source from the heavy hand of Government monopoly. The administration emphasized the uses of the atom in medicine, industry, agriculture, and especially the generation of electricity. The first reactors for commercial civilian power date from the Eisenhower administration.

DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The wise production and use of electrical energy calls for sound working relationships between private enterprise and Government. While public oversight is necessary it must not paralyze private initiative. It is this unique relationship of public to private endeavor which has helped make our country the stronghold of freedom. This relationship is delicate, and judgments on its precise applications can vary among men of good will. For example, the extent of Federal support for TVA financing is an open question among many citizens of each party. So too, in a free society, one man's yardstick can be another man's goad—depending upon who wields it. For these reasons, this paper will deal with clear-cut actions, facts, and issues. It will not overstress the realm of judgmental hairsplitting.

Our objective is not an indictment of Democratic policy as a whole. We recognize that within both parties there is room for difference of opinion on the responsibilities of the public and private sectors in the generation, transmission and distribution of energy—and the relationships of each to the other. We seek, therefore, only to make reasonable criticisms and to emphasize constructive recommendations for the solution of energy problems which the Nation faces.

With respect to some of the key electrical energy questions today facing our people, we think the present and previous Democratic administrations have been deficient, through action in some cases, inaction in others. Moreover, Democratic Congresses, from 1955 to the present, have been unwilling to accept a number of the constructive approaches which we propose.

Fourteen specific subject areas merit discussion:

1. Improvements in energy technology

Vast technological developments have recently occurred in the efficiency of electrical generation plants, but the Federal Government seems inadequately aware of the facts. New steamplants, especially those using coal, generate electricity by the most advanced methods. This is of vital importance in the coal-producing Appalachian area, where attention is now focused on the poverty problem. Private industry has initiated a technological revolution in the generation of electrical power; and new methods of transmission now permit electricity to be sent over long distances with negligible line losses.

By the strategic placement of generating plants (e.g., at the coal mine pitheads), by improved methods of mining and distilling coal, and by enormously increased efficiency of generation, tremendous savings to consumers are possible. Yet the administration continues to place heavy emphasis on what appear to be economically questionable hydroelectric projects and on providing subsidized REA loans to build small steam generators, many of which are unnecessary.

Small plants are relatively inefficient producers. Studies made 8 years ago clearly demonstrate that the cost of producing electricity by steam varies significantly with the size of the generating plant employed. For example, a 25,000-kilowatt plant will produce power for 13.6 mills per kilowatt-hour, a 100,000-kilowatt plant can produce it for 9.3 mills; a 200,000-kilowatt plant for 8.3 mills; a 400,000-kilowatt plant for 7.7 mills; and a 1 million-kilowatt plant for 7.4 mills. Thus a 1 million-kilowatt plant can produce power at a little more than half the cost involved in a 25,000-kilowatt plant.

The amount of heat required to produce a kilowatt-hour has declined significantly. In 1926, it was 23,600 B.t.u. per kilowatt-hour, in 1962, it was only 10,493. The portion of power produced by steam rose from 62.6 percent in 1926 to 79.7 percent in 1962. During this same period, the average cost of electricity for residential use fell from 7.00 cents per kilowatt-hour to 2.41 cents.

This technological revolution is pertinent to the question of power hydroelectrically produced, especially on marginal Federal projects, for the kilowatt hour costs on some of these planned projects are high to start with.

Recommendation No. 1

We recommend a detailed study of the relative efficiency of methods for generating electric power within the United States and the development of a new and constructive Federal power policy which will give due consideration to the demonstrated achievements of private industry in this area of power cost reduction.

2. The scarcity of economically feasible hydroelectric projects

For all practical purposes, the United States is virtually running out of feasible hydroelectric projects—that is, projects which are economically competitive when compared to power generation by the new processes mentioned above. One example is the Knowles Dam project in Montana; the electrical generation costs are expected to run from 10 to 20 mills per kilowatt-hour. Another example is the Devils Jumps Dam project on a tributary of the Cumberland River in Tennessee and Kentucky on which the cost would approximate 12 mills per kilowatt-hour, computed on a comparable basis with privately financed plants and normal amortization. (Compare these with the new steam generation costs of 7.4 mills per kilowatt-hour for large installations.)

While these projects doubtless have agricultural, recreational or aesthetic benefits, their overall economic advantages in electrical generation are marginal, and they can be justified only by placing exaggerated emphasis on criteria other than cost. It would be possible to build dams in every river in the United States for hydroelectric purposes and justify them, if the standards are loose enough. This characteristic taints the economic justifications for proposed hydroelectric projects on which the taxpayers' dollars may be imprudently expended.

Recommendation No. 2

We recommend that the study mentioned in No. 1 be completed and the criteria therein developed in judging the economic justification as well as the feasibility of hydroelectric projects before contracts are let on pending proposals.

3. Standards for determining the feasibility of justifying multiple-purpose projects

The present administration has rewritten the standards for justifying new multiple-purpose hydroelectric projects, thus permitting justification for marginal projects such as those described above.

The previous standards for justifying multiple-purpose hydroelectric projects had been in existence for a decade; and were far from stringent. Yet, in 1962, the administration felt it necessary—presumably in order to open the gate for more projects—to draw up a new set of standards. The old standards were loosened by extending the period of projecting costs and benefits (the cost-benefit ratio) from 50 to 100 years.

Extending the standards to apply 100 years hence raises obvious questions. It is no more possible today to foresee conditions in 2064 than it would have been to project 100 years forward in 1764 or 1864. Technological and population changes are certain to render any 100-year projection completely obsolete. Furthermore, since Federal Power Commission licenses to private concerns are limited to a maximum of 50 years, a private company cannot even calculate on a 100-year amortization, and there is thus a built-in discrimination against private capital.

Recommendation No. 3

We recommend that the present standards for justifying multiple-purpose projects be discarded in favor of a new and realistic set of criteria. We recognize that certain elements, such as recreation, navigation or flood control, are not readily susceptible to so-called user charges; nor can such benefits be estimated with accuracy under present standards. But the present procedure which often compares the "cost" of apples with the "benefits" of bananas is so loose that almost any project can be "justified."

4. A nationwide electrical transmission grid

Congress has never authorized an electrical transmission grid across the Nation. Yet, segment by segment, Federal agencies appear to be working to accomplish this. The proposed 900-mile high voltage interconnection between the Bonneville area and the Hoover Dam is one example.

If the Congress wishes to authorize a nationwide transmission grid, or a series of regional grids, we believe it should say so. Certainly this objective should not be accomplished by bureaucratic subterfuge, or in unplanned bits and pieces.

Recommendation No. 4

The Congress should express a national policy on high-voltage, cross-country transmission grids for electrical energy to be adhered to by all Federal agencies.

5. Executive differences with the views of the Federal Power Commission

The Democratic members of the Federal Power Commission are appointees of the Democratic administration, yet, the executive branch often works at cross purposes with the recommendations of the Commission. This seems to us unfortunate. There should be unified Federal policy on the development of the Nation's electrical energy resources, worked out on an impartial basis. The Department of the Interior, as owner of land or as a special pleader, should not set the policies.

An example of harmful policy conflict is the effort of the Interior Department to prevent private industry from developing the high Mountain Sheep Dam in Idaho. The Federal Power Commission evidently held a contrary view. In substance, the Federal Power Commission found it necessary to disagree with the Interior Department for trying to spend public funds when private resources were available to achieve approximately the same purposes.

Recommendation No. 5

The policies for Federal development, transmission and distribution of electrical energy and the rates charged to the consumer therefor should be decided primarily by a bipartisan Federal Power Commission. It is detrimental to the public interest that the viewpoints of the Federal Power Commission and the Interior Department should be uncoordinated. This subject should have the prompt attention of the Congress.

6. Uncertainties facing private industry as the present Federal 50-year hydroelectric licenses come up for renewal

Many existing important hydroelectric plants operated by private industry are under 50-year licenses, some of which will come up for renewal by 1970. Private industry is in a dilemma concerning further investments in the generation, transmission, and distribution facilities, because of uncertainty over license renewal. This uncertainty is a deterrent to new industries which might locate in areas where they could contribute to employment and local prosperity.

Recommendation No. 6

The Congress should promptly establish a Federal policy on such license renewals, and this policy should not discriminate against private industry over Government ownership.

7. Veto power on the dispatch of electrical Transmission lines on public lands

Since the Eisenhower administration left office, the Interior Department has sought to establish control over the terms, conditions and uses of electrical power transmitted by lines across land owned by the Federal Government. The Federal Power Commission has taken issue with this position of the executive branch. We believe the Federal Power Commission is right in its contentions.

In the 17 Western States the supervision of vast public lands by the Interior Department results in virtual control over all aspects of long-distance transmission of electrical energy. The extent of Federal ownership of western land is frequently not realized. The chart below indicates the percentage of land owned by the Federal Government in five States:

	Percent
Nevada	85.5
Utah	68.4
Oregon	51.9
Idaho	64.6
Wyoming	48.2

Since the Interior Department administers the land, private companies, which may wish to transmit power over any large area in the West, are in a position (under the Interior Department's indicated policies) where they can operate only by submitting to conditions imposed not by the Federal Power Commission but by the Department of the Interior.

Recommendation No. 7

We recommend that the Federal Power Commission, free of dictation by the Interior Department, deal with the private transmission of power in the public land States. The Interior Department should not have veto power in such matters.

8. The lack of adequate hydrological studies

It has now been more than a decade since the first Hoover Commission strongly recommended that more Federal emphasis be placed on obtaining better hydrological data in the United States. The Eisenhower administration, through the President's Advisory Committee on Water Resources Policy, made strides in this direction. Since 1961, this effort has received inadequate encouragement.

The recent, outstanding study of the task force on coordinated water resources research of the Federal Council for Science and Technology has made a valuable contribution to the Nation in this respect, but the recommendations of the study have not been implemented. The task force, under its distinguished chairman, Dr. Roger Revelle, of the University of California, was concerned with water primarily for its use by human and industrial consumers. However, the recommendations for better hydrological information apply in a parallel way to the need for more information in this area in connection with the generation of hydroelectric energy.

Recommendation No. 8

We endorse the proposals of the Revelle task force, since obtaining more data about water will apply to its usefulness in generating electrical energy. We believe the Federal system for obtaining hydrological data should be materially expanded and the agencies involved better coordinated.

9. Coordination among Federal agencies

Under the Eisenhower administration, a significant step forward was taken in coordinating the numerous Federal agencies concerned with generating electrical power, through the creation of the President's Advisory Committee on Water Resources Policy.

Under the President's Advisory Committee on Water Resources Policy, policy differences were greatly reduced, in marked contrast to the problem of the Missouri River during the late forties, when it became necessary to organize an ad hoc coordinating group for the Missouri River Basin alone. The so-called Pick-Sloan plan for the Missouri River Basin was then developed and hailed as evidence that Federal agencies could work together and reconcile the views of two organizations with different objectives. In this instance, one was concerned primarily with flood control and navigation, the other mainly with irrigation. There was not enough water in the Missouri Basin to supply all needs, and bureaucratic compromise could not alter that fact. Yet, the Pick-Sloan plan demonstrated a need which was met in considerable degree in the Eisenhower administration, though nothing since has been done along this line.

Recommendation No. 9

The President should insist upon coordination among executive agencies concerned with generating and transmitting electrical energy.

10. The new emphasis in REA on transmission and generation facilities

The Norris-Rayburn Act, establishing the Rural Electrification Administration (the REA), was approved by Congress in 1936, with the announced purpose to bring the advantages of electricity to rural areas. A "rural area" was defined as any portion of the Nation which was not included within the boundaries of a city, village, or borough with a population of more than 1,500 persons. This definition of area is now construed to cover much of "suburbia" or "outer suburbia."

Senator George Norris, of Nebraska, author of the act, convinced the Congress that the law was needed to make electricity available to farms and at reasonable prices. The private power industry had naturally concentrated where the need per capita was greatest and where the demand would make the financing of facilities feasible.

It is amazing to realize that only four decades before the enactment of the Norris-Rayburn Act virtually all of the United States was lighted and fueled by coal, gas, kerosene, and the like. The private electrical generating industry rose during the first three decades of the 20th century from insignificant beginnings into the most important industry in the United States.

Like all of our dynamic fields, the electrical power industry had severe growing pains. It did not have enough trained people to service the entire United States, and high-population-density areas were stressed. Private industry serviced major rural areas where the load was adequate, such as central New York State, with its power requirements for dairying, and California, with its irrigation pumping needs. But the general farming area was not so served in 1936 when the REA was created. Senator Norris correctly pointed out that this was because adequate "loads" did not exist in most rural areas.

In 1936, 89 percent of all farms were without central service electricity. In 1964, the situation has completely reversed itself; 98 percent of all American farms are electrified through central station service, and most of the remaining 2 percent could be so serviced readily. In this respect, we believe the REA has realized its purpose.

In recent years, however, the REA has placed major emphasis on the building of transmission and generation facilities and on supplying eletrical energy to suburbia and outer suburbia. This was not the purpose of the Norris-Rayburn Act. Now that nearly all of the farm population has been supplied with electricity, the REA, as is the common experience with bureaucracies, has sought ways of perpetuating and expanding itself. In the few years since the Eisenhower administration left office, borrowings from the REA to set up facilities for generation and transmission of electrical energy have greatly increased and the trend is sharply upward.

If rural areas are lacking in generation and transmission facilities, they should by all means have them, but we believe it unwise to finance such facilities with Federal funds where adequate and existing private facilities already exist. Numerous examples bear out this point; for instance, the Patuxent area of Maryland and in south Indiana. In both cases, taxpayers' money was unnecessary since private facilities were available. These recent policies of the REA are not the purposes of the law as expressed by its original congressional sponsors.

Recommendation No. 10

We recommend that the Congress by resolution or the President by Executive order establish a competent objective body to review the original purposes and present activities of the REA. Farmers are entitled to reasonably priced electrical power, but we do not believe that long-term money borrowed by the United States at about 4 percent and then reloaned through the REA at 2 percent should be used to promote competition with private citizens. Efficient private producers have proven that they can provide electricity at low cost to the consumer even against competition taking advantage of the artificially low-interest rates of REA loans.

11. New steam-generating plants of the REA bypassing Congress

As mentioned in item No. 10, the REA appears to have changed its emphasis from servicing farmers to the generation and transmission of electrical energy for consumers not engaged in agriculture. One aspect of this is certainly open to question. On repeated occasions, the Congress has refused to appropriate funds for steam-generating plants as supplements to Federal hydroelectric power projects because private facilities were available. The Congress was obviously unmindful of the fact that hydroelectric power is often sporadic, depending upon rainfall, and that therefore hydroelectric power usually needs to be supplemented with standby steam-generated power. The questionable point is that REA loans have been made apparently to build steamplants for which the Congress had refused to grant funds. Here are examples:

1. Colorado-Ute Cooperative—1962: The REA provided $21,602,000 toward financing a 150,000-kilowatt steamplant to firm up power from the Colorado River storage project.

2. Basin Electric Power Cooperative—1962: A $36,600,000 loan was made to build a 200,000-kilowatt steamplant, most of the power from which will be disposed of to firm up Missouri Basin power.

3. Upshur Rural Electric Cooperative—1963: A REA loan of $9,170,000 was made to build a 33,000-kilowatt steamplant and transmission lines. The Southwestern Power Authority will buy most of the power and lease the transmission lines.

Recommendation No. 11

The Congress should, by suitable legislation, restrain the REA from financing the construction of steamplant power-generating facilities as supplements to hydroelectric projects in cases where the Congress itself has refused to appropriate funds specifically for such facilities.

12. Comparable rates

Consumers located where they may buy power from Federal projects usually obtain it at a price well below its true cost of production. This is unfair to power consumers who are not so fortunately situated, yet who pay taxes to subsidize the power for others. This inequity to taxpayers and to privately owned utilities is a consequence of several factors.

First, Federal power projects are usually tax exempt. Consumers of electricity supplied by investor-owned electric companies must bear through their electric bills a significant tax burden. In most instances, this amounts to about 23 to 25 percent of the cost of electricity, yet those who obtain their power from Federal projects, in most instances, do not have to pay such taxes.

Second, rates charged to consumers for power from most Federal projects are intended by law to return interest on the unamortized power investment at only 3 percent or less per year. Since it costs the Federal Government about 4 percent to borrow money of a comparable maturity, the result is a subsidy given a few power consumers at the expense of many others.

The Comptroller General of the United States, an agency of Congress, found that the Missouri Basin power projects, from their inception to the end of fiscal 1960, had lost a total of $51,778,000. The Southwestern Power Administration and its appended power projects, from its inception in 1944 through 1961, had lost $50,105,000. The Columbia River Power System, on its power operations, had lost $53,320,000 from 1958 through 1963. The Southeastern Power Administration, on its power operations from 1955 through 1960, had lost $20,400,000. The sum of these losses was a gift to the users of this power, paid for by taxes collected from citizens in other areas.

Thus, the General Accounting Office has found that major Federal power projects in general do not charge rates sufficient to cover the modest interest charges imposed on them.

Recommendations No. 12

The rates charged to users of Federal power should be adjusted so that the users of such power do not receive an unfair advantage as opposed to those who do not receive their power from federally subsidized projects.

13. The fossil energy source materials

Coal: In terms of tonnage, the coal industry is unique in that it has remained relatively static for years. In 1962, the use was as follows: industry, 24 percent; coke, 20 percent; electricity, 48 percent; retail, 8 percent; remainder, ammonia and other special chemicals. Recent U.S. production of coal is 440 million tons per annum (1962), about one-seventh of the world production. Coal and natural gas are almost perfectly competitive for the cost of electricity production, about 25 cents per million B.t.u., averaged over the United States (local factors favor one over the other of course). Oil is about one-third higher in cost.

Coal reserves are calculated on the assumption that 50 percent of the known quantities in the ground are recoverable, depending on technology and economic demand. On the basis of this 50 percent, the present reserves in the United States are 83 times 10^{10} tons. At 1962 rates, we are then mining 0.05 percent per annum. In other words, at 10 times the present rate of use and with no new finds, we have a 200-year supply; i.e., no case can be made for an imminent shortage of coal.

Natural gas: Probably one of the fastest growing areas of energy source is natural gas, which is increasing at 5 percent per annum. In 1962, a total of 13.9 times 10^{12} cubic feet were sold. In 1960, the breakdown was 6.5 times 10^{12} industrial, 4.1 times 10^{12} residential and commercial, and 1.8 times 10^{12} field (i.e., losses, etc.)

In the year 1961, proven reserves (economically and technically recoverable) were 275 times 10^{12} cubic feet. Under present use rates, this is a 20-year supply but both use rates and new finds are increasing so rapidly that this figure does not have much meaning, as is also true in the coal industry.

Petroleum: In 1962, the petroleum use picture was:

Gasoline, 1.6 times 10^{9} barrels.

Distillate, 74 times 10^{7} barrels.

Residual, 5.6 times 10^{7} barrels.

Kerosene, 16 times 10^{7} barrels (mostly jet fuel).

Other, 74 times 10^{7} barrels including losses, export, etc.

The total demand was 3.8 times 10^{9} barrels and the world supply was 8.8 times 10^{9} barrels so that U.S. use runs around 40 percent. Net U.S. imports are around 70 times 10^{7} barrels per year or less than 8 percent of use.

The present U.S. proven reserves (under present technology and price structure) are 31.4 times 10^{9} barrels.

It is generally believed that large reserves of both oil and gas probably lie elsewhere awaiting discovery on this continent and on the coastal shelf.

If an equitable relationship of imports to domestic production is maintained, these energy resources should remain adequate for the foreseeable future. The Eisenhower administration worked out such a policy of balanced relationships in 1959.

Recommendation No. 13

The Federal Government should maintain a constant surveillance over primary sources of energy and revise its import or other regulations whenever necessary to maintain exploration, adequate supplies, and equitable prices.

14. Atomic energy

As previously noted, the Eisenhower administration gave particular encouragement to the peaceful uses of atomic energy, and notable successes were achieved. The first nuclear reactor to produce electrical energy for commercial use was initiated during the Eisenhower administration and built at Shippingport, Pa., with large contributions from private industry.

The cost per kilowatt-hour of electrical energy derived from the fission of uranium, which was estimated at 3 to 10 times the cost of conventional power in 1954, had been reduced by the ingenuity of American scientists and engineers until at the end of the Eisenhower administration plants were under construction whose output was competitive with steam generating plants in the same areas of the Nation.

Thus, while no early exhaustion of fossil fuels appears to threaten us, and while technology is continually reducing the cost of electrical energy derived from fossil fuels, the remarkable strides in the reduction of power costs from nuclear energy will stimulate a healthy competition to make electricity still cheaper for consumers.

An important research project in the area of nuclear power development is the theoretical feasibility of producing electrical energy from the fusion of light elements such as hydrogen and deuterium. This project, research upon which was meagerly supported until 1953, was given the encouragement of needed appropriations beginning in that year. Very great progress has been made since, but a breakthrough in technology is yet to be achieved. Both the British and Soviet Governments are now believed to have come abreast of our former position of leadership in this area of research. The British effort is said to exceed ours, whereas the Soviet effort is reported to be 200 percent greater than ours.

The significance of power from fusion, if it can be achieved, is (a) the fuel supply is unlimited since it exists in all bodies of water, and (b) the cost of power so produced would be a fraction of present power costs. We understand that this line of research in our own laboratories has been reduced both in priority and support. We believe this to be shortsighted.

Recommendation No. 14

We recommend a new review of the peaceful uses of atomic energy to determine the areas in which research can be effectively and increasingly supported and to restore the sense of urgency which seems to have yielded to the more glamorous and costly demands of space exploration.

MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL

Milton S. Eisenhower, chairman.
James M. Clark, Jr., assistant to the chairman.
Elliott V. Bell.
Arleigh A. Burke.
Arthur F. Burns.
Albert L. Cole.
James H. Douglas.
Marion B. Folsom.
Thomas S. Gates.
T. Keith Glennan.
Oveta Culp Hobby.
Walter H. Judd.
Mary P. Lord.
Clare Boothe Luce.
Deane W. Malott.
James P. Mitchell.
Lauris Norstad.
Don Paarlberg.
C. Wrede Petersmeyer.
Samuel R. Pierce, Jr.
Charles S. Rhyne.
Raymond J. Saulnier.
Lewis L. Strauss.
Walter N. Thayer.
Henry C. Wallich.

TRUSTEES OF THE COUNCIL

Dwight D. Eisenhower, honorary chairman.
Don C. Grey, executive director.
George C. S. Benson, California.
James B. Black, Jr., California.
H. Boeschenstein, Ohio.
Willard Brown, Ohio.
Arthur F. Burns, New York.
Albert L. Cole, New York.
James S. Copley, California.
J. E. Corette, Montana.
Brownlee Currey, New York.
J. Doyle DeWitt, Connecticut.
Peter M. Flanigan, New York.
Arthur S. Flemming, Oregon.
Willard W. Garvey, Kansas.
John J. Gilhooley, New York.
B. Bates Gunderson, South Dakota.
John W. Hanes, Jr., Virginia.
G. (Tim) Herrmann, Illinois.
C. A. Herter, Jr., New York.
Mrs. Edwin I. Hilson, New York.
Mrs. C. P. Howard, Massachusetts.
J. Alan James, New York.
L. J. Kalmbach, Massachusetts.
Paul F. Keye, New York.
Addison Lanier, Ohio.
Peter A. Larkin, North Carolina.
James A. Linen III, Connecticut.
John L. Loeb, Jr., New York.
Mrs. Oswald B. Lord, New York.
David O. Maxwell, Pennsylvania.
Thomas McCabe, Pennsylvania.
S. G. McCampbell, Florida.
C. H. Mellon III, New Jersey.
Robert E. Merriam, Illinois.
William E. Miller, New York.
Charles Moore, Massachusetts.
Malcolm Moos, New York.
E. Frederic Morrow, New York.
Arthur H. Motley, New York.
James L. Murphy, California.
Aksel Nielsen, Colorado.
Arthur C. Nielsen, Illinois.
John M. Olin, Illinois.
C. W. Petersmeyer, New York.
William H. Peterson, New Jersey.
Samuel R. Pierce, Jr., New York.
Raymond Pitcairn, Pennsylvania.
Raymond Plank, Minnesota.
Homer M. Preston, California.
Gordon W. Reed, Connecticut.
James Reynolds, California.
Charles S. Rhyne, Washington, D.C.
William E. Robinson, Connecticut.
Rodney W. Rood, California.
Robert A. Rowan, California.
S. M. Rumbough, Jr., New York.
L. R. Schilling, Ohio.
Joseph E. Sheffield, South Carolina.
Maurice Stans, California.
Anna Lord Strauss, New York.
Lewis L. Strauss, Virginia.
Walter N. Thayer, New York.
Austin Tobin, Jr., New York.
R. C. Van Dusen, Michigan.
Hugh Wallace, Delaware.
Henry M. Watts, Jr., New York.
James C. Worthy, Illinois.

THE GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, it was just 15 years ago, on July 1, 1949, that the General Services Administration became an agency of the Federal Government.

The creation of the new agency was the result of long efforts by persons convinced of the need to provide uniform and efficient direction for property management and supply programs which, over the years, had been scattered throughout the executive branch.

President Franklin Roosevelt had recommended such a move in the thirties; President Harry Truman had pressed for similar action early in his administration. Late in the forties, an interagency committee studied the problem and prepared a draft bill known as the Federal Property Act of 1948 which, although it did not achieve final passage, served as a precursor for the legislation later enacted.

The Congress had recognized the need for reorganization of certain executive branch functions in the late forties when it created the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch, with the full approval of President Truman. That Commission, which became popularly known as the Hoover Commission after its Chairman, former President Herbert Hoover, included in its first report on February 5, 1949, a recommendation for the establishment of a General Services Agency.

It was in June of that year that the Congress enacted the basic law creating the General Services Administration: the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949. I introduced the bill and, as chairman of the Executive and Legislative Reorganization Subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures in Executive Departments, explained and supported the legislation on the floor of this House.

The act was signed by President Truman on June 30, 1949, and he immediately proceeded to appoint an Acting Administrator for the new agency, writing in his letter of appointment that:

> An important responsibility is vested in the Administrator of General Services to achieve effective and economical results in the property management field and to insure that the General Services Administration affords the operating agencies the type of service requisite for the successful conduct of their programs.

And thus, 15 years ago, the General Services Administration came into being.

On this anniversary, it would seem appropriate that we reflect on whether the high hopes held for this new agency in 1949, to bring order and economy to a basic and important area of government, were warranted. Furthermore, it would appear timely to take a new look at the potentialities for the future of the General Services Administration.

GSA today is in charge of Federal assets totaling $12.2 billion. Even in this age, that is not a figure to be lightly considered. But I find more important than the figure indicating size and responsibilities, another figure appearing in testimony given 2 months ago before a subcommittee of the Joint Economic Committee. It was estimated then that savings and economies directly resulting from operations of the General Services Administration since its inception in 1949 total $5 billion.

It is this latter figure, and the facts behind it, which indicate the real worth of the General Services Administration to the Federal Government and to the taxpayer. GSA has proved over the first 15 years of its existence that the concept of a central management agency providing good service with economy of operation was not an idle one. Through its six operating arms—the Federal Supply Service, the Public Buildings Service, the National Archives and Records Service, the Utilization and Disposal Service, the Transportation and Communications Service, and the Defense Materials Service—it is a well equipped and versatile business manager for the executive branch.

Because of my continuing interest in GSA, first as an idea and then as a reality, I have followed its progress closely and would like to comment on what I consider some of its most important accomplishments:

In the area of supply, GSA has increased its volume of procurement for Federal agencies from $197 million in fiscal year 1950 to $1.4 billion in the fiscal year just ended—seven times the original volume. Moreover, through price economies resulting from consolidation of agencies' requirements, reduced inventories and improved contracting techniques, taxpayers have been saved about $2 billion in the supply area alone in the first 15 years of GSA. The agency's volume prices average about 20 percent less than other agencies would have to pay if they bought the same supplies on their own.

It is pleasing to learn that GSA and DOD are cooperating closely in efforts to eliminate duplication in procurement, leading the way to establishment of a true national supply system, long urged by the Congress. I was particularly gratified to see that just last year, by mutual agreement, the entire supply management responsibility for military requirements for paint and handtools was transferred from the Department of Defense to GSA with the result that GSA is now providing these commodities to the entire Government. GSA and DOD are also now working jointly on eliminating unneeded items from the Federal catalog system. They are cooperating as well to help stem gold flow losses; through close liaison with military agencies, GSA has shipped to oversea posts and agencies $135 million in domestically produced supplies this fiscal year compared to $33.5 million back in 1950. GSA has given a helping hand to several departments and agencies in improving their internal supply management and has pointed the way toward greater savings through their participation in the national supply system. The success of the GSA-DOD cooperative effort should dispel any fears reluctant civilian agencies may have in becoming full participants in this precedent-setting forward step toward greater economy and efficiency in Federal supply management.

Another important field in which GSA is making a significant contribution to good procurement practices is through the constant development and publishing of Federal procurement regulations, which provide uniform purchasing and contracting policies, methods, and procedures. The FPR system is heavily used by industry as well as Government agencies.

The magnitude of GSA's responsibilities in the construction and management of public buildings is truly impressive. The agency manages some 169 million square feet of building space and has more than $1 billion in building projects in the design or construction stage. Again, this is not a tribute to bigness. The building program has been greatly needed, because for long years the Federal Government was without a real construction program, mainly because of World War II and the Korean war.

Federal construction needs pyramided. But now GSA, under the Public Buildings Act of 1959, is reducing the backlog. And, for the first time in this century, care is being taken to provide contemporary architectural expression in Federal buildings; the old "monumental pile" concept is at long last being replaced, thanks principally to the work of an ad hoc Presidential Committee 3 years ago.

At the same time, the economy yardstick is also in full use. Through improved space utilization, GSA has trimmed more than 5 feet in the past 2 years from the average space occupancy per employee—and that means an annual saving approaching $10 million. An order issued by President Kennedy in 1962, strengthening GSA's hand in controlling space, was principally responsible.

The other side of the coin from procurement and construction is disposal of unneeded Federal property—whether it be personal property or real property—and GSA is vitally involved. GSA, I am told, expects to receive more than $100 million from the sale of surplus personal and real property when the figures for the just-ended fiscal year are all in. On the real property side, sales not only put money in the Treasury but also place property back on the tax rolls. Equally important, too, is that many of the properties are sold to user-buyers who return payrolls to communities. In the past 3½ years, for instance, GSA sold 69 facilities—most of them World War II plants—to user-buyers, furnishing employment for more than 47,000 people with a total annual payroll of about $325 million.

In addition to these obvious benefits, GSA also conveys many surplus real properties for public use. And, of course, it sees to it that Federal property excess to one agency's needs is checked out with other agencies for possible continued Federal use. The recent transfer of the Army Plum Brook Ordnance Works at Sandusky, Ohio, to NASA for research on missile propulsion systems for the future Apollo program is a good example of such use.

Substantial savings to the Government accrue from the rehabilitation of personal property. GSA arranges to have it refurbished and agencies who use the "like new" items can save up to 50 percent of the cost of new purchases.

I was pleased to learn from testimony before congressional committees that GSA and DOD have agreed to the consolidation in GSA of the function of selling DOD surplus personal property. I must add that it is about time. Back in 1954, I wrote the then Administrator of GSA protesting what I considered an "abdication of responsibility" by GSA at that time by delegating authority to other agencies, principally DOD, for surplus property disposal. I said then that such a delegation was understandable when an agency was new, but that in permitting this escape hatch the Congress had no intention of making it a permament one. Now that GSA is of age and is handling real property disposals, it should—by every logic—handle all personal property disposals too. I understand the GSA-DOD agreement on this point is before the Bureau of the Budget, and I sincerely hope that the Bureau will act promptly so that this function can be placed where it so obviously belongs.

The records management expertise of GSA is rightly recognized by most agencies as extremely helpful in carrying out their own missions.

Starting from scratch in 1950, GSA has built its records management program to a point where the contributions to paperwork efficiency and economy are affecting all segments of Government. Through emphasis on the scheduling of useless records for prompt disposal, the continued growth of Government records holdings has been checked. Annual disposals for the past several years have equaled the annual creation of records.

The Federal records center system, now storing over 7,750,000 cubic feet of records, has not only introduced order into the keeping of noncurrent records, but since the establishment of the system in 1950 has produced over $46 million of savings in space and equipment alone.

The consolidation of 27 agency centers in the GSA system resulted in the reduction of almost 700 employees, an annual savings of $3,500,000.

Records management audits and surveys have been equally successful. In addition to intangible savings of time in paperwork processing, the surveys have accounted for savings in manpower, space, and equipment of over $18,750,000 in the past decade. GSA workshops, of which 11 have been developed thus far, are a combination of actual problem solving and training in improved techniques. All told, the workshops have produced savings of over $13 million since their inception, less than a decade ago. One workshop devoted to the automation of office paperwork, called Source Data Automation, accounted for over $4 million of savings in the past 18 months. The prospects for economy and efficiency in the field of paperwork are almost unlimited.

The savings that are derived by Government from common use of facilities are amply demonstrated in the communications and transportation fields. The new Federal Telecommunications System managed by GSA, linking together Federal activities around the Nation, is expected to produce up to $28 million in economies in the coming fiscal year. Interagency motor pools operated by GSA since their establishment in 1955 have generated savings of $52 million. And, since 1950, transportation savings to Federal agencies through GSA efforts are estimated at $160 million. Additionally, in negotiations with utilities and by representing the Federal Government as a consumer before regulatory bodies, GSA has been instrumental in saving the Government some $110 million.

Among its many charges, GSA has the management responsibility for nearly 52 million tons of strategic and critical materials for use in the event of possible emergencies. Because the tonnage objectives for nearly all of the materials have been reached—many, in fact, surpassed because of a reduction in requirements in recent years—the emphasis in the stockpiling programs has shifted from buying to selling. From reports to the Congress, and testimony by GSA officials, it appears that fiscal year 1964 disposals will total $162 million and the new fiscal year disposals about $200 million.

In overall management techniques, it is clear GSA is in the forefront. It has been among the earliest of Federal agencies to use computers effectively and has taken long strides toward increased employee productivity and improved manpower utilization. From what I have learned, this can be credited to an energetic New Hampshire man, Bernard Boutin, who has raised GSA to new heights of accomplishment in the 3 years that he has been Administrator.

I am pleased to be able to report to the Congress today that both Presidents Kennedy and Johnson have given full support to the programs currently being carried on by Administrator Boutin and his staff. GSA is definitely fulfilling its missions better than ever before. I do hope that its programs will be expanded throughout Government so that GSA may extend its professional skills even to those agencies which have continued to hoard "general services" functions even though they have no bearing on their primary statutory responsibilities. And I think that on this 15th anniversary of the creation of GSA, it is timely that the Congress review the progress that has been made under the legislative charter it provided in 1949 for the conduct of the internal business affairs of the Government, to examine critically the acts of legislative omission and commission which mitigate against the assumption and performance of the logistical support functions which properly belong in GSA, and to set about providing GSA with the tools it has ably demonstrated that it can use properly in advancing the cause of efficiency and economy in the business affairs of the Government.

BERLIN NATIONAL FISH HATCHERY, NEW HAMPSHIRE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, the senior Senator from New Hampshire was highly critical of me during the Senate debate Monday, June 30, on the conference report on the Department of the Interior and related agencies appropriation bill for fiscal year 1965. He stated that I had insisted in the conference on deleting the unbudgeted item of $203,600 which had been added by the Senate for improvement to the Berlin National Fish Hatchery in New Hampshire in order to punish him as he "dared and presumed, according to the dictates of his best judgment and conscience, to vote against a fish aquarium in the city of Washington that happened to be a pet project of the distinguished Member of the House."

The fact that I was not discriminating against the senior Senator because of his voting record is best evidenced by the fact that just a few minutes prior to taking this item up in the conference, we agreed to include another unbudgeted item added by the Senate in the amount of $200,000 for initiation of a research program on North Atlantic lobsters. This is the only item that the House conferees were aware that the senior Senator was interested in. The Senate hearings indicate that the senior Senator was "deeply interested" in the problems of the North Atlantic lobster industry and we assumed that this was his top priority unbudgeted request. There is no evidence in the Senate hearings that he appeared in support of funds for the Berlin National Fish Hatchery, nor did he make any request of our committee. We generally follow the rule on the House side of not adding projects in which the Members of Congress concerned have not at least evidenced an interest to the committee. In this connection, our committee, when it considered the bill in the House, had no request, written or verbal, from the Member concerned in the House. Based on the Senate hearing record and our own analysis, the House conferees assumed that the initiation of a research program on the North Atlantic lobsters was more important to New Hampshire than the rehabitation of a fish hatchery which is currently in operation. The House conferees could see no real urgency in making the improvements at this hatchery. In fact, there are numerous hatcheries in this country with equal or greater justification for modernization.

Further evidence that I have not discriminated against the senior Senator for his voting record is the fact that in the 1965 public works bill which just passed the House on June 17, 1964, one of the 19 unbudgeted construction items added to the bill by our committee was the Hampton Beach erosion project in which it was my understanding the senior Senator was vitally interested. I might say that I personally included this item in the mark-up of our Subcommittee on Public Works.

I might also add that the junior Senator from New Hampshire not only requested in the Senate hearings the provisions of funds for the lobster research program but also appeared in support of the request for the budgeted request for an additional $800,000 requested by the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation. The Senate made a reduction of $378,000 in this request and the House conferees insisted on restoration of the full budget estimate, providing the increase of $800,000. So the effect of the conference action was to provide the two high priority actions requested by the Senators from New Hampshire.

Although the senior Senator's remarks did not so indicate, I believe that the little State of New Hampshire fared quite well in our 1965 appropriation bill for the Department of Interior and related agencies. In addition to the unbudgeted increase we allowed of $200,000 for lobster research, we allowed the full budget request for the geological survey, the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, the Office of Saline Water and the U.S. Forest Service, totaling $2,132,300.

I can assure the senior Senator that his fish hatchery will be given consideration in future bills, and I regret that it was not possible to include provision for it in this year's conference action. As I think he knows very well, being a member of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, it is just not possible for the House conferees to agree to every unbudgeted increase added to the bills by the Senate. In this instance, the Senate increased the House bill by over $33 million and we did our best in conference to work out a reasonable compromise among the numerous unbudgeted projects added by the Senate. In this case we chose initiating a program of lobster research over a going hatchery which did not appear to be too essential at this time. I believe that the senior Senator will agree that we selected the item that will be of most benefit in the immediate future to the State of New Hampshire.

POWER TO TAKE PREVENTIVE POLICE ACTION IN MISSISSIPPI?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday a group of distinguished professors of law of the faculties of Columbia, Harvard, New York University, Pennsylvania, and Yale Law Schools released a joint statement to the effect that, in their opinion, under present U.S. law, the Federal Government has the power to take preventive police action in Mississippi to secure the safety of persons who are aiding the civil rights movement in that State.

The Attorney General of the United States has stated that the Government lacks such power.

The law professors point to sections 332 and 333 of title 10 of the United States Code. Section 332 of the code reads as follows:

> Whenever the President considers that unlawful obstructions, combinations, or assemblages, or rebellion against the authority of the United States, make it impracticable to enforce the laws of the United States in any State or Territory by the ordinary course of judicial proceedings, he may call into Federal Service such of the militia of any State, and use such of the Armed Forces, as he considers necessary to enforce those laws or to suppress the rebellion.

Section 333 of the code reads as follows:

> The President, by using the militia or the Armed Forces, or both, or by any other means, shall take such measures as he considers necessary to suppress, in a State, any insurrection, domestic violence, unlawful combination, or conspiracy, if it—
>
> (1) so hinders the execution of the laws of that State, and of the United States within the State, that any part or class of its people is deprived of a right, privilege, immunity, or protection named in the Constitution and secured by law, and the constituted authorities of that State are unable, fail, or refuse to protect that right, privilege, or immunity, or to give that protection; or (2) opposes or obstructs the execution of the laws of the United States or impedes the course of justice under those laws.
>
> In any situation covered by clause (1), the State shall be considered to have denied the equal protection of the laws secured by the Constitution.

The professors make the following point:

> Doubtless some creditable considerations of expedience could be cited to support a decision against now taking vigorous Presidential action under section 333 in Mississippi. Surely, however, the Attorney General's position would be less misleading and therefore less perilous if he would acknowledge that the President today has power to act but believes that police action under section 333 of title 10 is inadvisable.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me there is merit in the point made by the professors. I have today written to the Attorney General asking for his comment on the statement issued by the law professors and on receipt of his reply I will bring it to the attention of the House and of the chairman of the House Committee on the Judiciary. I think it highly important that the point be clarified.

Mr. Speaker, under prior unanimous consent order I am including with these remarks a copy of my letter to the Attorney General and a copy of the statement released by the 29 law professors.

JULY 1, 1964.

Hon. ROBERT F. KENNEDY,
Attorney General,
Department of Justice,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: I enclose a copy of the statement issued by 29 professors of law from six universities which is critical of the Department of Justice for its interpretation of existing law relating to the powers of the Federal Government to extend protection to persons in Mississippi.

The law professsors state that, "Violence, combination and conspiracy in Mississippi are unquestionably obstructing the execution of the civil rights laws of the United States—the provisions, that is, of sections 1981 and 1983 of title 42 and the provisions of the acts of 1957 and 1960 with respect to voting rights." The law professors, reading these sections together with sections 332 and 333, find a Federal power applicable to the situation actually existing in Mississippi.

According to reports in the press, you have maintained that the Federal Government lacks power to take "preventive police action" in Mississippi. Is this correct? If the professors are correct and the Justice Department does not lack power, but considers its powers inappropriate to the existing situation, this point should be made clear. In this connection the law professors make this point:

"Doubtless some creditable considerations of expedience could be cited to support a decision against now taking vigorous Presidential action under section 333 in Mississippi. Surely, however, the Attorney General's position would be less misleading and therefore less perilous if he would acknowledge that the President today has power to act but believes that police action under section 333 of title 10 is inadvisable."

I would appreciate your comment on the professors' statement.

Sincerely,

JOHN V. LINDSAY,
Member of Congress.

It has been reported in the press that the Attorney General has stated that the Federal Government lacks power to take "preventive police action" in Mississippi to secure the safety of persons who have come into that State to aid its colored residents in the effective exercise of their rights as citizens of the United States. The undersigned students of public law are troubled by the misleading simplicity of this reported pronouncement, and believing that the Federal power to take protective action in the circumstances that now prevail in Mississippi is clear, are moved to make this statement.

Under section 332 of title 10 of the United States Code the President is authorized to use the State militia and the Armed Forces of the United States "whenever he considers that unlawful obstructions, combinations, or assemblages * * * make it impracticable to enforce the laws of the United States * * * by the ordinary course of judicial proceedings." Should the President be persuaded that judicial processes are not able to secure the rights of Negro voters in Mississippi, or should he consider that those processes are not effectively safeguarding the rights of other Americans as they are defined in existing Civil Rights Acts (e.g., sections 1981 and 1983 of title 42) the quoted section would clearly authorize him to use Armed Forces to secure the rights referred to.

Of course, the Attorney General knows this, for it was under section 332 that President Kennedy took military action at the University of Mississippi in 1962. Quite probably two considerations are factors in the Attorney General's determination that section 332 has no immediate relevance. He and the President may be convinced that the time has not yet come to send military forces into Mississippi—that other processes should be exhausted before that most drastic of all remedies is pursued. If that judgment is a crucial element in the decision one wishes that it had been reported, for it would have made it clear that it is not lack of Presidential power to act but the absence of a conviction that action is now called for that explains nonaction. Furthermore, the Attorney General may, with some justification, feel that when military action is taken under section 332 it is not fairly to be described as "police action"—the type of action which he has denied the Federal Government is empowered to take. These considerations, which may explain the Attorney General's rejection of the current relevance of section 332, seem far less applicable to the provisions of section 333 of title 10.

Under the terms of that section the scope of the presidential power to take protective and preventive action is not confined to the use of the militia or Armed Forces. Though section 333 mentions specifically the power to use those forces it also empowers him "by any other means (to) take such action as he considers necessary to suppress, in a State, any insurrection, domestic violence, unlawful combination, or conspiracy, if it (1) so hinders the execution of the laws of that State, and of the United States within the State, that any part or class of its people is deprived of a right, privilege, immunity, or protection named in the Constitution and secured by law, and the constituted authorities of that State are unable, fail, or refuse to protect that right, privilege, or immunity, or to give that protection; or (2) opposes or obstructs the execution of the laws of the United States or impedes the course of justice under those laws."

Surely there is reason to believe that violence and combination are now so hindering the execution of the laws of Mississippi and of the United States as to deny to the Negroes of Mississippi rights secured by the Constitution and laws of the United States. Whether the deplorable circumstances are such as to make the provisions in subsection (1) of the quoted section now operative is not important, for there can be no question but that the provisions of subsection (2) fit the present circumstances precisely. Violence, combination, and conspiracy in Mississippi are unquestionably obstructing the execution of the civil rights laws of the United States—the provisions, that is, of sections 1981 and 1983 of title 42 and the provisions of the acts of 1957 and 1960 with respect to voting rights.

Doubtless some creditable considerations of expedience could be cited to support a decision against now taking vigorous presidential action under section 333 in Mississippi. Surely, however, the Attorney General's position would be less misleading and therefore less perilous if he would acknowledge that the President today has power to act but believes that "police action" under section 333 of title 10 is inadvisable.

In the year 1879 it was argued in the Supreme Court of the United States that when Federal marshals sought to enforce the electoral laws of the United States their conduct infringed the prerogatives of the States—that the Nation, in other words, could not, through the authority of its agents, take "police action" within the borders of any State. "It is argued," said Mr. Justice Bradley, "that the preservation of peace and good order in society is not within the powers confided to the Government of the United States, but belongs exclusively to the States. Here again we are met with the theory that the Government of the United States does not rest upon the soil and territory of the country. We think that this theory is founded upon an entire misconception of the nature and powers of that Government. We hold it to be an incontrovertible principle, that the Government of the United States may, by means of physical force, exercised through its official agents, execute on every foot of American soil the powers and functions that belong to it. This necessarily involves the power to command obedience to its laws, and hence the power to keep the peace to that extent." *Ex parte Siebold*, 100 U.S. 371, 394–395.

Unless the Attorney General disregards or somehow emasculates this pronouncement of the Supreme Court he cannot rest his case for executive inaction on the facile pronouncement that the Federal Government and the President of the United States are not empowered to take "police action" in Mississippi. It is at once disappointing and ironic that the Department of Justice, which has been bold beyond precedent in successfully urging the Supreme Court that the judiciary possesses the broadest powers to enforce the constitutional assurances of equality, should now discover nonexistent barriers to executive action.

Marvin E. Frankel, Arthur W. Murphy, Maurice Rosenberg, Michael I. Sovern, Columbia University Law School; Paul Bator, Vern Countryman, Charles Fried, Mark DeW. Howe, Louis Loss, John Mansfield, Henry Steiner, Arthur E. Sutherland, Harvard Law School; Charles E. Ares, Norman Dorsen, Henry Foster, Jr., Robert B. McKay, Gerhard O. W. Mueller, New York University Law School; Caleb Foote, Jefferson B. Fordham (reservations as to phrasing), Alexander H. Frey, Noyes Leech, Clarence Morris, Louis B. Schwartz (reservations as to phrasing), Bernard Wolfman, University of Pennsylvania Law School; Boris I. Bittker, Charles L. Black, Jr., Thomas I. Emerson, Louis H. Pollak, Yale Law School.

REPUBLICAN PARTY-TO-PEOPLE AGRICULTURAL FORUM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, on April 28, 1964, the third regional meeting of the party-to-people program of the Republican National Platform Committee was held in Kansas City on the topic of agriculture.

The party-to-people forums have been held throughout the United States under the auspices of the 1964 Republican Party's Convention Platform Committee. I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD at this point the transcript of this meeting in Kansas City.

THIRD REGIONAL MEETING OF THE PARTY-TO-PEOPLE PROGRAM HELD BY REPUBLICAN NATIONAL COMMITTEE, HOTEL MUEHLEBACH, KANSAS CITY, MO., APRIL 28, 1964

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

The meeting commenced at 2 p.m.

Mr. WILLIAM O. BUFFE. Ladies and gentlemen, welcome to the third regional meeting of the party-to-people program.

In my opinion the party-to-people program is one of the most outstanding efforts of the 1964 Republican Campaign Committee.

It is my pleasure to introduce the former deputy assistant to President Dwight Eisenhower who at the present time is the national coordinator of the party-to-people program.

Ladies and gentlemen, Mr. Robert Merriam.

Mr. ROBERT E. MERRIAM. Thank you very much, Mr. Buffe and ladies and gentlemen.

I thought a word might be in order about the party-to-people program and particularly about the format for our various meetings.

The concept of the party-to-people program was proposed and submitted by former President Eisenhower last January. Basically it was his suggestion that between February and July when the Republican Party meets at its convention in San Francisco there should be a series of activities throughout the land designed to develop from the people ideas which might be of use and value in the formulation of the Republican Party platform and to exchange with them ideas about important national issues.

To carry out this program, the Republican National Committee has been engaged in three types of activities.

First of all we are having six additional meetings, of which this is, as Mr. Buffe said, the third. We had one in Los Angeles on the problems of peace and security. We had one 2 weeks ago in Miami on questions of Latin American affairs. This one of course today is on the farm problems. We are having one in Chicago next week on problems of automation, jobs, and the paycheck. We are having one in Memphis on human needs at the end of May and a final one in Philadelphia on June 15 on the general subject of foreign policy.

In addition we are encouraging and stimulating and working with groups all over the country in the development of local forums. The Republican National Committee and my office in particular have developed a kit of information and materials for people in any State or community or byway who care to engage in a forum discussion of their own telling them how to set up and organize and run such a meeting.

Quite obviously in one afternoon it is impossible to hear from all of the people who might like to be heard with reference to the farm question or with reference to any of the other questions we are discussing, but we are hopeful that as a result of the stimulus of this meeting perhaps some of you will want to hold party-to-people forums in your own communities.

If you do, if you will write me at the Republican National Committee, 1625 I Street NW., in Washington, we will help you in every way we can, and the information and the ideas and suggestions from this meeting and all other such meetings will be presented at the platform committee of the Republican Party.

The third part of the party-to-people program consists of the issue questionnaire, which I believe all of you received as you came in the room. We are engaged in what we think is the largest sampling of people's opinions ever conducted in this country—some 400,000 of these are already in circulation—and we encourage those of you who are here today to take these with you and to mail them to us at the party-to-people forum in Washington.

Also, for those who are interested in conducting various kinds of activities in your own communities, this particular questionnaire is of value and we do have supplies available to you—I might say at no charge.

Now, just one word as to the format for this particular meeting. We have had a large number of people send in questions. Some have sent in statements to us. We will encourage all of you who have statements to leave them with us and they certainly will be forwarded to Congressman LAIRD, the chairman designate of the platform committee of the Republican Party.

We have deliberately not invited national organizations to present their views at this meeting because most of them if not all of them will be present before the platform committee at its hearings in San Francisco.

I do want to emphasize that this meeting is in no way a substitution for the plaform committee hearings. However, from a number of the questions that have been presented to us we have selected a few people who will address their questions directly to the audience.

We have also given to each of you a card. If anyone who cares to ask a question of the panel as the discussion goes on will fill out his questionnaire card and hold up his hand, an usher will collect it. As many of your questions as possible will be addressed directly to the panel.

With this very brief background, I would like to introduce a gentleman who was a longtime resident of Kansas City, who was president of the Rothschild's stores in Kansas City, who went to Washington during the Eisenhower administration and served a very distinguished career as Under Secretary of Commerce, the gentleman who is now president of the Intermediate Credit Corp., in Washington, a very distinguished Kansas City citizen, Mr. Louis Rothschild.

Mr. LOUIS ROTHSCHILD. Ladies and gentlemen, it is my privilege to introduce to you this afternoon the distinguished members of the panel to whom your questions should be addressed.

From Springfield, Mo., the Republican nominee for the U.S. Senate, Mr. Jean Paul Bradshaw.

From the State of Iowa, a fourth-generation farmer, a cattle raiser, a hog raiser, and a corn producer, Mrs. Glenn Pardun.

From the State of Kansas, a Representative in Congress from the First District and a member of the Agriculture Committee of the House of Representatives, the Honorable ROBERT DOLE.

From the State of Oklahoma, a lifetime wheat raiser and presently Governor of that wonderful State, the Honorable Henry Bellmon.

From the State of Minnesota and Representative in Congress from its First District and a lifetime dairyman, the Honorable ALBERT QUIE.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, will you please rise for the national anthem?

Congressman MELVIN LAIRD. Thank you very much, Mr. Rothschild.

As you know, we have these questionnaires which have been circulated, and thus far we have had several hundred thousand returned to the national committee. We will call on your questions just as rapidly as we can.

The first questionnaire which was returned was from Mr. Lowell Hummel, of Fairbury, Nebr., whom we shall call on to ask the first question.

I understand he is still available.

As free as Mr. Freeman—the question of cross compliance clearly illustrates another breach of faith by this administration. Another thing many farmers are finding out now is that they do not get certificates except on normal yield. In my own Russell County, where the average is slightly over 20 bushels to the acre, if a man produces 30 bushels an acre he is going to have a rude awakening.

This isn't a $2 wheat program either. Instead of talking about a return of $400 million income, we should remind wheat producers of $200 million less income they are going to have under the new wheat-cotton bill than they received in 1963.

Governor BELLMON. Your mentioning Billie Sol Estes understanding the present farm program makes me think that that's the problem with the Secretary of Agriculture: He doesn't understand about farming. He didn't have a chance to learn about farming until he got to Washington, and as far as I am concerned that's a poor place to break in a new man.

Mrs. Glenn Pardun. I feel you people should know that in Iowa we just completed our State presidential convention and one of the resolutions adopted at this convention was, just as the Governor described to you, that those of us who make our living from agriculture—and I am one; we have no outside source of income other than from the farm, so I understand the problems very well—we feel definitely that we need people running our Department of Agriculture who know at least the basic problems involved in this particular thing.

Congressman Laird. Mr. Bradshaw, do you care to comment on that?

Mr. Jean Paul Bradshaw. Nothing more than I think they put their fingers on the problem when they say the difficulty comes chiefly from having people in charge of a solution who don't even understand the problem, let alone the solution.

Congressman Laird. Congressman Al Quie is a dairy farmer in Minnesota, the State of the present Secretary of Agriculture, and I think we ought to have a comment from Dairy Farmer Quie.

Congressman Albert Quie. We have seen that the Democrats are long on words and short on actions. They are living in the past; they are living in the 1930's. They promised parity of income and 100 percent of parity, but they haven't produced.

What has happened is that they don't believe in people. They believe in control programs.

The first program that was offered to Congress in 1961 would have controlled all the farmers in every commodity. They would have made the decisions as to how much a farmer should raise and what he should raise. The origin of this came from Dr. Cochrane, who believes that every farmer should be franchised. That the farmer should be told he could produce so many beef cattle and how many acres of wheat he could plant, etc. The farmers turned this down.

Then they thought they would try one commodity at a time. They thought the dairy farmers and turkey raisers would fall for this. The dairy farmers raised such a fuss that the Congress wouldn't pass a dairy control program, but they did get the turkey program through. Then they took a referendum and, to their shock, the turkey farmers turned it down.

In the wheat referendum last year they found that the wheat farmer didn't like the wheat program, and they got around that by twisting the arm of Congress to get them to pass the certificate wheat program even though the farmers voted 52 percent against it.

If they would get to know the farmers like I do, by talking to them, they would find these kinds of control programs just aren't acceptable to the farmers.

Mr. Lowell Hummel. Thank you, Congressman Laird.

I am Lowell Hummel. I farm in southeast Nebraska at Fairbury.

I noticed the other day as I looked through the Democratic platform of 1960 that the accusation was made in this platform that the Republican farm policies were unimaginative and outmoded and that they were not utilizing the productive capacities of the Nation's agriculture.

At that time the Democrats promised to change this situation and utilize once again the full production capacity. I have not felt personally this general prosperity that I am told that I am sharing.

How about it, Congressman Laird? Have they produced?

Congressman Laird. First I would like to say that as far as the Democratic platform of 1960 is concerned the Democratic Party has a control in the U.S. Senate of almost 2 to 1 and in the House of Representatives a control of 3 to 2.

Not a single platform pledge which was made to agriculture in the 1960 Democratic platform has been carried out by the majority party as far as the Congress is concerned and as far as the administration is concerned.

The record is that the Democratic majority in the House and in the Senate and the administration of Secretary of Agriculture Freeman have not delivered on one single pledge in that platform document.

I think it's important for us as Republicans as we build on our 1960 platform and as we go forward to our 1964 platform to look at agriculture on the basis of what is good for agriculture from one generation to the next generation rather than from one election to the next election.

I believe if we keep this as our principal guide in building our 1964 platform we will be able to count on the support of farmers throughout the Midwest and throughout the United States.

Governor, would you care to comment on that question?

Gov. Henry Bellmon. It seems to me that the whole effort of the Democratic administration has been to turn us back about 30 years. As a wheat farmer and one who has spent his whole adult life in the farming business, I particularly resent the double-cross they pulled on the wheat farmers during the past few weeks by passing a wheat bill which is very similar to the one which we farmers turned down.

In my own case and in the case of my neighbors, we now face the prospect of buying up the wheat we planted last fall because the administration changed the rules just a few weeks before harvest time.

This is going to hurt a lot of small farmers badly, and this is certainly not in keeping with the platform pledges which the Democratic Party made when they were asking the people of the United States to give them charge of the administration back in 1960. I feel farmers are fed up with this sort of breach of faith, and I think they are not going to stand for it any more.

I have a wire that came in this morning from a farmer in Stillwater, Okla., that says that Freeman's new wheat cross-compliance is a breach of faith that is going to cost him $2,000, and he urges that this program be revoked.

As Governor of Oklahoma, I hope soon to communicate with the Secretary of Agriculture and urge that the program be revoked and that the Secretary seek authority of the Democratic leaders of Congress to give the farmers the opportunity to vote again to see whether or not we want to submit ourselves to this sort of administration control.

Congressman Laird. Congressman Bob Dole, do you care to comment on the first question?

Congressman Robert Dole. I certainly agree with the words of Governor Bellmon and, in fact, received a letter the other day suggesting that Billie Sol Estes be appointed Secretary of Agriculture because here was one man who really understood the program.

Congressman Laird. The next question is from J. F. Killackey of St. Joseph, Mo.

Will you come up and take one of these microphones, please.

Mr. John F. Killackey, Jr. Thank you, Congressman Laird.

I would like to direct my question to Congressman Dole because he comes from a wheat State.

I am Jack Killackey. I handle agricultural credits for the First National Bank in St. Joseph, and we handle a lot of loans for cattle feeders and grain farmers.

You have already mentioned, almost all of you up here, your opinions of the present administration of your Department of Agriculture, and I concur wholeheartedly in that.

One of the things that concerns me and has concerned me for some time is the—as far as I am concerned—unethical actions of the Department in the last year's wheat referendum in using so many of the Department of Agriculture career personnel.

One thing that concerns me is that when you analyze all of the people in the United States who are connected with the Department of Agriculture in one way or another it's one of the major branches of the Government.

I would like to know your thoughts on what can be done in restricting its activity.

Congressman Laird. Congressman Dole?

Congressman Dole. The first thing to do would be to elect a Republican Congress in 1964.

That is a very good question. While we should not spend all our time rehashing what happened in the referendum, because Republicans want to move forward, many USDA practices were improper.

I want to point out that our mail was very heavy following the referendum, and it was clear to me—and I will make the letters available if you want them—that many, many farmers voted their irritation and resentment because they were upset about the very thing you mentioned.

Here was some paid bureaucrat from the USDA in Washington or some other governmental agency, telling the farmer what to do and how to vote.

The obligation of any administration agency is to administer the program, give the farmer the facts, and let him make the decision freely.

I received a letter from a lady prior to the referendum saying, "I am sending you just half the mail I received on the wheat referendum." She sent me 20 letters; only half the number of letters she received. She was so confused she voted "no."

It is a serious question. What has Mr. Freeman done? Instead of reducing the payroll he expanded it. He added enough in the first 3 years to outfit a full field division in the Army.

Congressman Quie. I might add also that in a Congress which, as Congressman Laird mentioned, the House is 3-to-2 Democratic, the Appropriations Committee in reporting out the agricultural appropriations bill wrote into it that none of the money shall be used by Department of Agriculture employees to influence referendums in the future. The Democrats felt it was wrong to use USDA's own employees to influence the referendum.

Congressman Laird. Congressman Dole, we have a question sent to us that has no name on it. I will repeat the question. "Why isn't the 15-acre man cut like the rest?" It's directed to you, Congressman Dole.

Congressman Dole. Well, I recognize we are in an area where we have some 15-acre men. I happen to represent primarily a non-15-acre district, and this is a sore spot in our area.

One thing which happened after the referendum last year was how the so-called Anfuso amendment should be interpreted. The Secretary and USDA General Counsel ruled that if a man in western Kansas or anywhere had over a 15-acre allotment and if he overseeded and overharvested—he would lose 6 to 8 percent of the history—even though he didn't receive price support he would still lose this very valuable property right.

As far as I am concerned this action is unconstitutional, but how many farmers can afford to fight it.

The 15-acre producer was protected. He could have a 15-acre allotment or less and plant as much land as he wanted—a thousand acres if he had the land. Yes, he could plant and harvest a thousand acres without losing any history.

This is rank discrimination, and many people in western Kansas will lose a very valuable property right without receiving any price support unless they destroy the excess acreage. Farmers in Mississippi overplanted 100 percent last winter because they couldn't lose. Kansas farmers planted about the same as they did the year before. In certain areas in Missouri they have been overplanting because they will not be penalized under this special provision protecting the "15-acre" man.

Congressman LAIRD. We have with us today a very distinguished visitor who is assistant to the chairman of the 1960 platform committee. He is here as an observer of this party-to-people panel discussion. He is a member of the House Education and Labor Committee. He is the author of the current Manpower and Training Act, the present act under which we are proceeding on manpower-training programs throughout the United States.

He is assistant to the chairman in charge of domestic affairs of the platform committee, which includes agriculture.

I would like to call on him for just a few comments in regard to the poverty program which is being considered by his committee and especially the sections of that which have to do with Agriculture and the Farmers Home Administration.

Congressman CHARLEY GOODELL of upstate New York.

Congressman CHARLES E. GOODELL. Thank you, MEL.

It is a great pleasure to be here. I want to emphasize that I am from upstate "rural" New York State.

My hometown, Jamestown, is closer to Washington, D.C., than it is to New York City.

I was on a television program with Senator DOMINICK of Colorado some time back, in Denver, a city of some 600,000 people. He introduced me as Congressman GOODELL of New York and after that they had a headline in the paper, "DOMINICK and the City Slicker."

In my area, the largest city has a population of 64,000, and we do have a rural area.

I would like to make just a quick comment about the poverty program. It has been referred as the ad hoc Poverty Committee, of which ADAM CLAYTON POWELL is chairman. I am a member of that committee.

There is one title, title III, which is directed completely at agricultural poverty. It has been referred to the Education and Labor Committee for disposition. It has three major parts.

One of them will permit a grant of $1,500 to the poorest farmers. You have to be almost a complete failure as a farmer to qualify for it. You can supplement this with a $2,500 loan.

To give you an example of the type of farmer they can help, a man living outside Chicago or New York City with 11 children and making $1,100 a year can with the $1,500 grant buy some cows and supposedly double his income. It is a completely unrealistic program.

In addition, a third section of this poverty title directed to agriculture will set up a new agrarian-reform type of program. A rural development agency will buy up land and sell it to the poor farmers who are presumably not making a living now, to permit them to have a large enough acreage to go on and make a living.

I don't want to take any more time from your distinguished panel except to tell you it's a pleasure to be here, and I think there are better ways of solving the farm problem than referring it to ADAM CLAYTON POWELL.

Congressman LAIRD. Our next questioner will be Mr. David Livingston, a farming farmer from Washington, Iowa.

Mr. DAVID LIVINGSTON. I am Dave Livingston. I am from Washington, Iowa. I raise hogs and feedcattle.

I don't know a cockeyed thing about wheat, but I would like to know why it was necessary for the administration to call on these big-city Democratic machines like Mayor Daley in Chicago to cram that wheat bill down the throats of the wheat farmers of the United States.

Congressman LAIRD. Do you want to start on that, AL?

Congressman QUIE. Well, it's good to get a question from Dave Livingston again. I remember when he was before the Committee on Agriculture, and he really showed he was a farmer who understood farming. He also has a sense of humor, which anyone who has talked to him knows.

I think any farmer would be incensed when he realizes that the big city machine politics is what put this cotton and wheat bill through. There was no effort whatsoever to work out a logical and sound wheat program.

It is just that in machine politics they have control over their votes. They found this was necessary for passage of the wheat bill. It isn't a good program for the constituents of city Congressmen, just as we know that it isn't a good program in the wheat area, but the machine city votes were delivered.

This is what we are up against. If we can sit down and logically work out farm programs, I think we would have something that would be at least beneficial to the farmers. But when it is done completely with power politics—this is the way it was all the way through—we know we are going to have a bad piece of legislation for the farmers.

This is the experience you have when the Democratic Party is in control.

Governor BELLMON. To me this is one of the real evils and one of the weaknesses in the Democratic administration. They very seldom are interested in what is right or good for the country. Their first consideration is always politics, what they feel is good for their own cause.

To me this is one of the greatest problems and one of the greatest evils we face in our government today. This is the thing that caused the Republicans to win in Oklahoma; the people got fed up with the way the Democrats ran the government in our State.

Mrs. PARDUN. Congressman LAIRD, I would like to tell Dave Livingston that I believe Secretary Freeman when he says that the city will write the farm legislation—and I don't want any part of it.

Mr. BRADSHAW. Governor, what would you say was the affinity between those who are interested in the cotton bill and those who are interested in the wheat bill?

Governor BELLMON. To me this was a shotgun marriage, sure enough.

Congressman DOLE. I think it was more than a marriage. We have only seen about half of the play. It's really a four-act play.

The first act was the food stamp plan. This was arranged so the southerners would support the expensive and political food stamp plan in return for city Democrats' support of the wheat bill. We didn't pass the food stamp plan until late the evening of April 7, 1964.

The Democrat leadership apparently didn't trust the city Democrats overnight, so they brought the cotton-wheat bill up at midnight saying it was emergency legislation. We had 1 hour to debate the bill and at 12:21 a.m., Thursday, April 8, it was rammed through the House.

I happen to represent the largest wheat-producing area in the country but was allowed only 1 minute. Now, it took me a little while to stand up and sit down, so I had about 45 seconds to discuss this complex bill, but the skids were greased and it passed on a vote of 211 to 203.

This ended the first half of the four-act play.

The next part will be passage of a research bill and authorization to appropriate millions of dollars apparently to prove smoking and cancer aren't linked together.

The fourth act will see some of the southerners changing their votes on the pay raise bill, including a big raise for Congressmen.

It's a four-act package, and we have had only half of it. This is why city Democrats passed the farm bill.

Mr. BRADSHAW. That was the thing I wanted to bring out, the fact that before it all would have been in one play, and you weren't getting the thing decided on its merits.

Congressman DOLE. We weren't even able to discuss the wheat bill, for example. It was handled by the Rules Committee, not by the Agriculture Committee. There wasn't any opportunity to offer an amendment on the House side.

I might point out that the Senate debated the bill for a week. I think it's an insult to the American farmer that he must take it or leave it as it comes from the Senate, that he doesn't have a right through his representatives in Congress to offer even an amendment, or even a right to debate it on the floor. "Take it or leave it"—this was the strategy.

Members of the House of Representatives were denied the right to even discuss this bill.

Congressman LAIRD. We have a question from Paul A. Nelson. "What are the chances of getting down to earth on a farm program represented by a majority of farmers as shown by the 1963 wheat vote?" Congressman DOLE?

Congressman DOLE. I think there is some possibility of this. I am a member of the Wheat Committee, AL QUIE is a member of the Feed Grains Committee. In fact, we worked together with about 19 other Members of Congress and introduced a bill in May 1963 providing for a voluntary program based on the supply-and-demand theory. DON SHORT is another sponsor of this bill along with other members from Iowa and the Midwest.

We worked hard. It wasn't a political expedient, or a stopgap after the referendum, because we worked for weeks and weeks prior to the referendum. We soon recognized we were miles apart in the Wheat Subcommittee and weren't getting full hearings. But in the subcommittee nearly everything I suggested in our legislation was agreed upon informally by the members of the subcommittee. When politics entered the picture any serious consideration of our bill was forgotten by Freeman and others.

Of the 13 members of the Wheat Subcommittee, 8 are Democrats and 5 are Republicans. The five Republicans represent about 27 million allotted acres of wheat and the eight Democrats represent about 10 million acres—but they write wheat legislation.

The subcommittee did reach a basic agreement on several things. First, on raising the support price to 65 percent of parity from the 50 percent of parity which it would have been on July 1. Second, raising the resale price of commodity stocks to 115 percent of the prevailing support price plus carrying charges. These were just a couple of things that could have been done to produce a reasonable bill simply and quickly.

Congressman DOLE. This was fine. We finally got down to the point where Mr. Freeman announced he would take a so-called voluntary certificate plan or nothing. Then there was a straight party line vote—8 to 5.

mind you—out of our Wheat Subcommittee "without recommendation."

This is hardly a ringing endorsement for any legislation, whether it comes from Republicans or Democrats. By a party line vote of 8 to 5 it was passed by the subcommittee "without recommendation."

Congressman QUIE. I just want to add one other point, that what the Wheat Subcommittee agreed on was also a complete interchange of feed grains and wheat.

All three of these points were in the bill Congressman DOLE and I introduced. These were worked out logically by the Wheat Subcommittee, but when the chairman pulled out of his pocket the bill the administration wanted there was no complete interchange of feed grains and wheat.

Why is it important that there be complete interchange of feed grains and wheat? We have seen in the past that when you control wheat acres by requiring a wheat farmer to reduce wheat acres and out in other parts of the country—my own, for one—they raise 15 acres without controls, you don't reduce wheat; the programs of the past just juggled production around the country. It's economical to raise wheat in Colorado; that is where it should be raised. It's economical to raise corn in southern Minnesota, and this we should raise.

There should be a complete interchange so that the farmer can make his own management decisions. If it's best for him to raise wheat out there, let him grow wheat; if it's best for him to raise corn, let him raise corn.

This is the biggest point Republicans demand in farm programs; let the farmer make his own management decisions.

Congressman LAIRD. That particular point was covered in the 1960 Republican platform. On all of the platform pledges that were contained in the 1960 Republican Party platform, each one of them was introduced in legislative form by Republicans in the House Agriculture Committee.

The same statement cannot be made for the opposition party. They didn't introduce and carry out a single one of the pledges in the 1960 Democratic national platform.

Congressman LAIRD. We are getting questions up here, but I would like to remind the audience that if you do have a question and want to send it up here just raise your hand and the usher will pick it up.

We have a question here, and perhaps Mr. J. C. Johnson, president of the Missouri Farmers Association would come forward and use one of the microphones to give us his question. Mr. Johnson, president of the Missouri Farmers Association.

Mr. J. C. JOHNSON. I would like to correct that, Congressman LAIRD. I am not president of the Farmers Association. I am associated with the MFA Milling Co., a farmers' cooperative organization. This is in Springfield, Mo.

However, I would like to ask a question as a farmer. I do have a bit of a dairy operation, beef operation, cow and calf operation, and I raise some hogs.

Our great south Missouri country is primarily interested in animal agriculture, primarily dairying, beef cattle, and the cow and calf operation, and of course we are fast becoming one of the leading hog producing areas of the entire Nation.

Primarily this is a family sized operation all across that country. That's the way we like it; that's the way we love it. That's the way we trust it will continue.

So I would like to direct my question to the very distinguished and capable candidate for the U.S. Senate from Missouri, Jean Paul Bradshaw.

What do you think is the future for, and what are the possibilities of, preserving the so-called family farm operation—whether it's a dairy or a general farming operation—that we would like to see? We would like to know what you think, Jean Paul, and what we can do about it.

Mr. BRADSHAW. I think, Mr. Johnson, as you said, we not only like it that way down there in southwest Missouri but we intend to keep it that way.

There is definitely, we think, in the future a place for the family farm—not the subsistence family farm as it's known, but that isn't what we recognize as the family farm. The true operation which is economically sound and run by the family we think has a definite place in the future in the economy of this country and in the farming operation here in Missouri.

As many of us know in the general area around Springfield for some 60 miles around Springfield, we will say, in a radius there, we have one of the longest grass growing seasons in the world and therefore one of the most milk producing areas in the world.

Now, we know that we have got our problems, but they are problems that affect not only the family sized farmer but the entire operation.

They deal with questions of the dumping of beef in here in the country. You have got to recall that within the last year there was over 1,750 million pounds of beef dumped in the United States. I don't know another place in the world where that could happen, but it happened throughout the country here.

That's the equivalent, I might add, of 4 million steers—which if fed would require about 18 million pounds of feed; and if that feed were made or its equivalent it would amount to about 100 million man-hours at a time when this administration says we are facing unemployment.

Now, those things it's true have affected the family farmer, but they have affected everyone.

They have also affected the dairy industry because you have got to recall, as you and I know, that about a fourth of all the meat supply comes from retired dairy cattle. So that this thing is interwoven together with it.

I think the family farm is here to stay. I certainly hope it is; that is the sound farm.

Governor BELLMON. I think we are going to have to rethink what the family farm is. A lot of the noise that has been made about the family farm operations goes back to the old cow-sow-hen-type operation, which certainly can't exist in this time of mechanization in agriculture.

To me any family that intends to stay on the farm is going to need to be fairly well employed. They can't expect to operate or to work on a very short work year or even a short workday and expect the price of agricultural commodities to be high enough to return them a decent living.

In my feeling, the only lasting type of agriculture this country will have to have is the family farm, but it means a large enough farm to be commercial and efficient.

Congressman LAIRD. I might add that during the period of the last 3 years we have lost almost 400,000 farmers and we have increased employment in the Department of Agriculture by 15,000.

Now we can't increase employment in the Department of Agriculture fast enough to keep up with the number of farmers that Secretary Freeman is retiring from the farms.

This is a difficult problem, but as far as the family farm outlook is concerned I think we can have a bright future for the family farmer if we let the family farmer have a little more to say about how he runs the operation.

Mr. BRADSHAW. May I say one thing more.

Here in the State of Missouri at the present time out of 114 counties in Missouri we are losing population in 88 of those counties.

There is another thing, Governor, that affects your State of Oklahoma and our State of Missouri. That's the fact that when we have a milk hearing, say, out here these examiners who come out of Washington to hold the milk hearings apply one rule to us out here in the Middle West, in your State of Oklahoma and our State of Missouri, and they apply an altogether different rule in New England and in the East.

For example, they have got their price structure tied to the cost of production, which will pull you through. Out here we don't get the benefit of that.

So we are particularly hard hit out here in the Middle West in a farm State and a dairy State like Missouri.

It seems to me that it is just as simple as it can be. If you are going to have one rule apply to all the country, don't penalize us out here in Missouri.

Congressman LAIRD. Would you care to comment, Mrs. Pardun?

Mrs. PARDUN. I would like to say I suspect that I am the only member of the panel actually here today who represents directly the family size farm. That's the kind of operation we have where my husband and our three children, our family, exist.

The family size farm I think is very difficult to define today. It depends on the farm of course. It depends on the family. It also depends on the efficiency of the farmer.

Management is the key to the whole thing today. If we could get a farm program that would allow efficiency to grow, I am sure that the family size farm would be here for many, many generations to come—and I hope it is, because my 17-year-old son wants to farm.

Congressman LAIRD. AL, do you care to comment on that?

AL operates a farm, is a past member of the board of directors of the Twin City Milk Producers Federation, and knows more about dairying than I think any other Member of the House of Representatives.

Congressman QUIE. Just to comment, I could use my own experience as a farmer to show why you need flexibility and to let the farmer make his own management decisions.

When I started farming in 1948 I took over a farm that had dairy cows, hogs, and chickens—it had a parent flock of chickens. I wanted to specialize in dairying, so I made the transition through the years.

First I got rid of the chickens, then the hogs, put in some sheep to make the transfer and use the grass. Finally I got into an all-dairying operation.

If we had a control program on each of those commodities I would be stuck with my quota of chickens and hogs and cows and wouldn't be able to transfer over without having to buy the right to dairy.

You could see the change that was made. I have a good dairy operation, and it's a modern farm. I think of the fact that when I started farming in 1948 I paid less for my whole haying operation than I pay now for a hay conditioner—and there wasn't a hay conditioner then, and we can't put up decent hay now without a hay conditioner.

The farmer used to look up at the weather every morning because he had to beat the weather, but now he has got to look at the Government too because he has to beat the Government.

Congressman LAIRD. The next question comes from Mr. Loren Schmidt, who is a Nebraska cattleman.

Mr. LOREN SCHMIDT. Thank you. My name is Loren Schmidt. I am a farmer and I feed a few cattle in David City, Nebr. I am president of the board of directors of the Columbus Board of Credit Association, and we are engaged in the business of loaning money to farmers for cattle and farming operations. In the last year or so we haven't exactly done very well out there. I have a question for Congressman Laird.

I heard Congressman Goodell sort of describe me. He missed it by two children—I only have nine children—but I have perhaps enough debts to make up the difference. So I want to see Congressman Goodell before he leaves.

Congressman Laird, Senator Hruska up there we think has been helping us out on the beef importation. What can the Republicans do about importation of foreign beef in this country?

Congressman Laird. On this beef import question we have about seven or eight questions along this particular line. First I would like to say that the Republicans tried to deliver on this problem by voting in favor of the Hruska amendment in the U.S. Senate. This amendment was defeated by two votes. This would have set up quotas on the basis of a 5-year average of beef imports in the United States.

This amendment was opposed by the administration very vigorously. It was opposed by Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Freeman, opposed by the Secretary of State, opposed by the majority leader of the U.S. Senate, and it was defeated by two votes as an amendment to the cotton-wheat bill when it was up for consideration.

I think if you look at the rollcall record vote you will see where the Republicans were on this particular issue in the U.S. Senate.

I don't think we should give up just because we were defeated in our attempt in the U.S. Senate for positive action in this area.

The voluntary quota which was agreed to was based on the 2-year average and is not adequate. We are in a position where the livestock producers and where our dairy producers are all concerned about this problem. We are being hurt and they are being hurt badly by this importation of cheap beef from abroad.

Let me just take the dairy area. I don't want to limit this just to livestock, but last year if you will take a look at the total purchases of the Commodity Credit Corporation of dairy products you will find that the imports of dairy products into this country made up 40 percent of the total purchases of the Commodity Credit Corporation of dairy products.

Our price support under the dairy price support bill is about 50 to 75 percent higher than the world market price on dairy products. We require that dairy products be produced under the most stringent sanitary regulations of any country in the world, and our production costs for our farmers are going to be much higher here in the United States.

Yet we are using the price support program to serve as an economic aid program throughout the world by using it as a magnet to attract dairy products from all over the world. With the price support program in dairy products under the administration—the lax administration—of section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act by Secretary Freeman and the Department of Agriculture, I think here again we have the imports raising its ugly head and hurting the family farm and hurting agriculture generally.

We have already had comments as far as beef imports are concerned. I believe that the 5-year average program which Republicans are supporting in the House of Representatives and in the U.S. Senate is the manner in which we should proceed, and it has the support of the Republican policy committee.

Bob or Al, or anyone else wish to comment?

Mr. Bradshaw. Congressman, don't you think there may be another approach to it too? You know as it comes in now, as I understand it—this beef that's dumped in the United States—the processor knows where is comes from, but at that point it loses its identity. The result is that when the consumer buys the product, when the housewife goes down to buy it, she doesn't know where it came from.

I think that one possible solution is to stamp the country of origin right on the package and follow it right on through—not only to the processor.

Not only to the processor but right on down to the housewife who buys it.

Just as you pick up an article saying "made in Japan" or some place else, when you pick up a package of meat and you find out it has been dumped here from Australia or New Zealand, then you know you are buying second-class beef. I think if you tell them that, it will have a great impact.

Congressman Laird. This has had a good effect as far as Iowa is concerned. I would like you to comment, Mrs. Pardun, on the activities of the Iowa Legislature. I think they could be extended to Federal legislation and be worthwhile.

Mrs. Pardun. We raise beef in Iowa and on our farm. We raise one-eighth of all the beef in the Nation. I am from beef country, and I can tell you what we did in Iowa.

The legislature made it mandatory not for beef to be labeled so that it refers to the country but to be marked "imported." It certainly had a drastic effect on the amount of beef that was sold. The customers complained bitterly and refused to buy it. So I certainly recommend this be done on a national level.

Congressman Laird. This is one of the considerations for your platform document, and one of the members of our panel has legislation to bring this about.

Congressman Quie.

Congressman Quie. Yes. I introduced a bill which would require the labeling of "imported" on all imported meat, even though it was a manufactured product and only a portion of it was imported, because I felt the American people and the consumer would like to help out the beef farmer. It was surely indicated in Iowa where that was the case, where some stores have refused to handle any beef that was imported any more because the consumer is so incensed at seeing packages of imported meat.

I didn't require in my bill that it be stamped with the country of origin, because for instance if a person's grandfather came from that country he might think it would be good to eat some beef that was strictly an import from the old country.

We have some problem about labeling with the Department of Agriculture. They don't consider the ultimate consumer as the consumer. They consider the store as the consumer, and I think we have to teach the Secretary of Agriculture not only something about agriculture but who the consumer really is.

Mr. Bradshaw. Don't you think that if it's fair to the producer to have the management decision on what he is going to produce it's just as fair for the consumer to have the decision as to what he buys and consumes? It's just that simple.

Congressman Laird. We have a recommendation from the Cattle Industry Committee for Legislative Action. Bob Buffington, from Iowa, has gotten in touch with the platform committee already recommending some very good programs of action in this particular area, and our platform committee is giving this proposal very serious consideration.

But I do think the labeling and the quota legislation are things that should be considered and should be made a part of our Republican policy platform position as we go into the 1964 campaign. Do you have a comment, Governor?

Governor Bellmon. There is only one comment I would like to make. Largely because of the high level of imports, the price of cattle—in Oklahoma at least—has gone down sharply.

In my own case I bought some calves, put them in a feed pen, and sold them for $500 less than I paid.

Even though cattle have gone down sharply, the price the consumer has paid at the meat counter has not gone down. This is ridiculous. If there is any effect of the law of supply and demand I believe beef consumption would go up, and that would solve part of the problem.

Until we get the effect at the retail level of the lower prices the farmers and producers receive—our feeders in Oklahoma are losing about $40 a head, and certainly we are not going to be able to stay in business until we do get some recovery, and I don't believe recovery will come unless such provision like the Hruska amendment is passed.

We feel here in Oklahoma that we have a great opportunity to further expand meat production. We have more than 4 million acres of land that is now in brush or worthless timber which could become ranch and rangeland. As long as beef is down we are not going to be able to develop this land, we are not going to have the expansion we deserve. To me this is a great damper on our State and the country.

Mr. Bradshaw. Governor, don't you think it's an unusual situation when at the same time the producer's price is going down 18 percent the cost to the housewife in Kansas City, say, is going up 29 percent? Now, the farmer is losing on one end and the consumer is being penalized on the other.

Now, there is a reason for that, and if the Republican Party would point that up you have got a good chance to attract the attention of not only the producer but also of the consumer, because in reality they are both being made victims of the same thing.

Where you have got the cost of processing the meat and it can be put onto a large number of people, whether producers or consumers, there is a tendency to spread that cost out. That's what has been going on. They have been shifting part of it back on the farmer and they have actually been shifting more of it up on the consumer. So that while the price to the farmer has gone down 18 percent the price to the consumer, the housewife, has gone up 29 percent.

Congressman Dole. I think there is a point.

Congressman Laird. Bob, we have got several questions along that line. I don't know which one to take first here.

They have to do with improving the marketing procedures for agriculture and how the farmer can enjoy a better position as far as bargaining for the sale of his commodities.

Congressman Dole. We discussed this somewhat earlier. I will touch on this. I think it is serious, as far as I am concerned, being a Republican Member of Congress and a member of the Agriculture Committee.

There is always a tendency by the majority party, much of the press and radio to paint Republicans as obstructionists, as being against everything that might be proposed by this administration.

Let me point out a measure concerning livestock we opposed. You will remember back in 1961 H.R. 6400. In that omnibus or "ominous" bill—whichever you want to call it—Mr. Freeman sought authority to impose quotas on livestock. With the help of Republicans this was taken out of the bill.

This is just one example where we have taken positive, not negative, action. Certainly we opposed it, and we oppose it today on this platform. We don't think the livestock producers want controls. Maybe they do, but I don't think so. This is important to point out.

In that same measure—H.R. 6400—there was also a request by the Secretary to penalize dairy farmers who didn't keep proper books and records—in fact, it provided jail sentences of up to 2 years and also provided fines and jail sentences for wheat producers.

These things we oppose. Too often Republicans are put in a bad light because of opposition to things of this nature.

Congressman Laird. Do you want to comment on this other question? We have 7 or 8 other questions that have to do with improving marketing procedures on farm commodities.

Congressman Quie. Just the comment that farmers make up one group that has never fully developed its bargaining power, and it will take the concentrated effort and best thoughts of every one of them to do it. I think this is one way the farmers could do something by themselves.

The Government can't do it for them. We have been watching farmers depend on the Government since 1933, and you wonder how well they have done. I think any benefit from improved bargaining power is going to come from the farmers developing this on their own hook.

Mr. Bradshaw. Mr. Moderator, I know time is getting short but I am still looking for this answer to how the farmers are going to solve this problem.

While their prices go down, the price goes up to the consumer.

It's just as basic as it can be. That's the very, very important question, and it has to be solved.

Until we find the answer to that question, how do you solve that?

How do you get more money for the farmer and at the same time pull the price down for the housewife?

Now, doesn't it go back to the proposition of how you market that product?

Are we saying in other words that it points up the need for a cooperative marketing enterprise by the farmer? Is that what we are saying?

If so, shouldn't we say it? If it's something else, shouldn't we say that?

Now, we aren't going to line up people to vote the Republican ticket by dodging the question. What is the answer to that?

If we know the answer to that, then we have got the answer to everything we have said here today, and if we don't have the answer to that too many times we are just pointing up the problem without finding the solution.

Congressman Laird. I certainly think we should comment on the question. I think you have to take it by commodity, however.

As far as the dairy farmers are concerned I happen to represent the district of Wisconsin that produces more milk and cheese than any other congressional district in the United States.

Of course we have six farm organizations that have strong voices in Wisconsin. Each of the six came down to Washington, and each testified in favor of a different approach as far as agriculture was concerned and as far as the dairy farmer was concerned.

This made it a little confusing for those of us representing dairy districts—and there are some 40 to 45 Members of Congress that do have dairy districts—when we find the major farm organizations all going off in different directions. They all seem to have a second choice of program.

The self-help dairy stabilization program that I have introduced for the last 5 years provides for a nationwide marketing cooperative for the marketing of milk and milk products. At the present time there is not much of a chance of any legislation like that being passed when you have your major farm organizations all running off in different directions, all advocating different programs.

It sometimes seems to me that they are more interested in setting membership goals than they are in solutions for their members, and I have had some problems, over the 12 years I have represented a dairy area in Congress, trying to get these groups together.

Now, I have insisted they all meet in Madison, Wis., on May 11, and in that meeting we are going to have a closed door session with three representatives of each of the groups and we are going to stay there until we get some unanimity of conclusions and some unanimity of opinion as far as the dairy program is concerned. This is about the only way I can see to do it.

Al, do you want to comment on that?

Congressman Quie. I wish there was some answer. I wish there was some panacea to solve all our problems, but there isn't.

It's just going to take the best judgment of the farm people. I have confidence in the farm people's ability to make sound judgments; they are able to do it.

The way we do it up where I produce milk is that we get together through the proceedings of the Milk Producers Association and we bargain for the price of our milk. We control about 85 percent of the market, and we do a pretty good job of bargaining.

We come from a surplus producing area; we share this with Wisconsin. Because of this we don't get $6 a hundred or any figures of that nature, but we are making an effort as farmers to bargain. It's unfortunate to see farmers fighting each other so much, but farmers have a tendency to do this.

I don't see any way the Government could go out there and solve these problems for us; I think it's impossible for that to happen. So we develop and develop and work and negotiate, and as our organization evolves we develop the ability to negotiate for the price of our product. That's what we are trying to do up there in my area of Minnesota.

Congressman Laird. In regard to this question, though, I am on the Appropriations Committee, and we have given the Department of Agriculture during the last few years in the neighborhood of $5 million to study the problem of the cost-price spread, the spread between the consumer and the farmer.

They made a study as far as the dairy products were concerned. In this particular study if water was put in the milk containers and delivered on the steps of the housewife in the city of Chicago, if water was used instead of milk, this study showed that it would cost the consumer 14 to 15 cents a quart.

This didn't help us very much, this study. It pointed up some of the problems that we have as far as wage scales in some of the cities are concerned and the fact that certainly some of the Teamsters in the Chicago area are doing much better than some of the farm families that I represent up in my area of Wisconsin.

But I don't think that this study, on which we spent a considerable amount of money, really pointed up a solution. That's why I feel we have to go through and work out a marketing program on a nationwide basis if we are going to increase the position of the farmer and be in a position where the farmer can run his own program.

Mr. Bradshaw. Mr. Moderator, don't you think right there you have put your finger on the answer to the problem, that the position of the Republican Party should be that the decisions must be made by the farmers themselves and not by the Government, and the greatest contribution we can make to the farm program and to good government is to keep the Government out of the farm program as much as we can?

If it does stay out of it and leaves it to the farmer, I think, as you say, the people have good intentions and are knowledgeable in the field and will work out a solution to the whole problem. But the only way they can do it is in the meantime for you men who are in Congress and who are doing such a splendid job on the Republican side to keep the Government off the backs of the farmers as much as you can.

Congressman Laird. Congressman Dole, we have a question here from the president of the Oklahoma Board of Agriculture, Louis Miberger.

He asks if there are any other meat products being imported other than beef, pork, and mutton.

Congressman Dole. I am not certain, but perhaps Governor Bellmon can respond.

Governor Bellmon. There are different forms in which these products are brought in. As I understand it, the system or the quota system agreed to by the State Department and Australia and New Zealand applies only to fresh meat; it doesn't apply to processed meat.

Congressman Laird. That is the way it is. That happens so often. We have got a quota established in the dairly industry on products having 45 percent or more butterfat. Within 2 weeks some of our importers had devised a new name for a product at 44 percent butterfat. So that this can be done in a very short period of time and the definitions that are used are not going to be very effective unless you really establish quotas by legislation.

Governor Bellmon. There seems to be a great paradox in the whole problem. Here we are in the United States with a tremendous abundance and surplus of food, and we find ourselves bringing in meat from other countries.

I read the other night that something like half or at least more than a third of the world's population goes to bed hungry every night, and here in this country where we have food running out the ears they keep bringing it in. Things certainly don't fit right.

Mr. Bradshaw. The strange thing of it is that the United States has a treaty by which the meat producers in Australia and New Zealand have what the lawyers know as a vested interest in the open meat market in the United States.

Now, when you put this 5-percent restriction on, do you know that those people in New Zealand and Australia can come up here and collect damages from the Treasury of the United States because we have done——

Congressman Dole. They couldn't collect it because we don't have that much money in the Treasury.

Mr. Bradshaw. It's a very serious thing. It can be done. The question is, how long will that continue under the treaty? The answer is, in perpetuity unless somebody can do for the United States what De Gaulle did for the Common Market and did for France and the countries of Western Europe.

That is a strange situation. Incidentally, that treaty went in, as I recall, in the Truman administration and has been in effect ever since.

Congressman Laird. We have a question here today addressed to Representative Dole from James Ramey, president pro tempore of the South Dakota Senate.

"Is there any chance of action by Congress in cutting back imports?"

I thought we more or less handled that, but——

Congressman Dole. I believe the question has been covered, but very positive action has been taken by Republicans. Way last year Republicans started setting the stage for action in this area. Now Democrats are falling all over themselves trying to grab headlines and introduce bills doing the same thing.

We have visited with Secretary Freeman and have asked the Ways and Means Committee to conduct hearings, but nothing has been done. There has been sort of a footdragging contest in Congress by the administration.

New Zealand and Australia are very pleased with the voluntary arrangements they made and I feel the arrangements were made with the sole purpose of blocking any effective action by Congress.

Congressman Laird. I would like Al Quie to comment on this. We haven't had any questions on it, but, in addition to the import problem, I think the new wheat legislation is going to have a tremendous effect as far as livestock prices are concerned because of the feed costs. Would you comment on that, Al?

Congressman Quie. I think you all realize that imports are a problem, but not all the problem. Part of it is the great increase in the production of beef.

In 1961, when the feed grain bill was being considered, many of us took the floor and pointed out what was going to happen with the so-called section 3—which gave the Secretary of Agriculture authority to buy feed grains high and sell low—that cheap feed means cheap livestock.

In the marketing year of 1961–62, which went into 1963, the Secretary had this authority and utilized this authority, so he sold feed grains on the market at a real cheap price, and this is just what it turned out to be; livestock prices went down.

Now we have a wheat program in which the price support loan base is going to be $1.30. It's less than the world market price of wheat. This means that all of the surplus wheat is going to be on the market competing with feed grains at a low price and is again going to be a glut on the market and going to cause more difficulty for the livestock farmers.

You might say it is hard to believe that the Secretary would do that; he already announced he would do it. He did it in the market year 1961–62 in feed grains. We are sure this is going to happen; it's just as obvious as can be.

To show how little the Secretary of Agriculture knows what is going to happen, just last year he was trying as best he could to get a bill through Congress which would permit all of the soil bank acres to be grazed and get a new program to put more land into grazing because he said in his prediction we would need a greatly increased production of beef in this country. He has proven so wrong in just a few months.

This is what we are up against with this kind of program.

Governor Bellmon. The authority of the Secretary to dump the stocks of the Commodity Credit Corporation to me makes it absolutely impossible to consider this new wheat program as voluntary. Any wheat producer knows full well that if he doesn't go into the program, and isn't eligible for the certificates he will receive if he is in compliance, the Commodity Credit Corporation will dump the wheat and hold the market so low he is likely to go broke.

So there is nothing voluntary that I can see about the program from the economic standpoint. It is about as voluntary as paying your income tax.

Congressman Laird. I haven't been calling all of these people up here, but I think it's kind of a nice break to have someone else come up and ask a question.

We have a question here from Harold Hunter, of Waukomis, Okla.

Mr. Harold Hunter. I am Harold Hunter.

Congressman Laird. The Governor tells me you are a wheat farmer and a beef raiser.

Mr. Hunter. I might specify that I raise polled Hereford cattle. I might find a customer somewhere in here. If I am going to put food on the table——

Congressman Laird. The Governor just added that you are also a member of the State legislature. I should have had the Governor introduce you.

Mr. Hunter. I am a member of the legislature as of 2 years ago. Before that time I had had no connection with politics—and I am not bragging about it; I am ashamed of it.

I do feel we need an awakening of the people's interest in politics—or government, if you would rather go to a better word—if you are going to have an effective government in our democracy. Perhaps I shouldn't use the word democracy, because if reflects a party, of course.

However, if I am going to put food on the table for my family, if I am going to put clothes on my children and my grandchildren and buy a new hat for my wife, the money does have to come from wheat and from polled Hereford cattle, because the legislature doesn't pay enough to help much along that line.

I still live within a mile of the place where I was born. It's over 6 miles from my town, so I am definitely rural. I am country, and I am proud of it.

I have been in that area all my life, been closely associated with country people, and I realize that there is one thing very evident in their thinking now; they are very disturbed about the lack of integrity in the government. They were so disturbed in Oklahoma that 2 years ago for the first time since statehood a Republican Governor was elected.

To get on to the question, Congressman Dole, I have a question for you. This deals with the area of integrity in government.

What are the latest developments in the Billie Sol Estes case, and has any relationship been established between Billie Sol and Bobby Baker?

Congressman Dole. We are trying to determine if there is any relationship in some of their associations. In fact, I wrote a letter to Senator Williams about this just recently. You will remember Senator Williams is the one who keeps bringing out affidavits and about the time the Democrats get ready to put the lid on the Baker case, he finds another one. He is a tremendous man, and a tremendous American.

I feel as you do, that the stakes here are more than the affairs of Billie Sol and Bobby. The stake is the integrity not only of the U.S. Senate but of the entire Congress and the legislative branch of our Government.

It is unfortunate, but this is another very good reason—and I say it very seriously—that we should have a Republican Congress. If we had a Republican Congress we would be investigating not only the Baker case but the Estes case.

The same brush is being used to whitewash the Baker case they used in the Estes case. You will recall that after months and months of footdragging in the Estes case they finally had Billie Sol come to Washington. He pleaded the fifth amendment about 30 times and went back home. Bobby Baker was called and did the same thing.

There is a clear case of perjury involved in the Baker case. Don Reynolds, the insurance salesman, went before the committee and testified. Either he committed perjury when he testified before the committee or Mr. Walter Jenkins, who is now in a key position in the White House and a long-time associate of Mr. Johnson, committed perjury in an affidavit to the Senate committee.

It's about time this was cleared up by the committee regardless of party. The lid has been blown off the Baker case, and I think it could stand a lot of fresh air.

Congressman Laird. We have a question from Ray D. Wilson, of Abilene, Kans., directed to Al Quie. "Is there any chance that something resembling the conservation reserve program can be placed back in force?"

Congressman Quie. Not the way the Secretary of Agriculture is operating now. We tried our best to at least extend the conservation reserve contracts that were to expire, because there is no sense in letting all that land which has built up fertility go up in production again.

He absolutely refused to consider any way of extending the contracts. He wants the crop land conversion program to be expanded, which he says will be used for three purposes: To provide recreation on the land, provide trees, and provide grazing.

In the last Congress we gave him $10 million for that program, and when he came back to report he said grazing amounted to 96 percent and the trees 4 percent of the acres. We asked where the recreation came in and he said that it was so infinitesimal that he couldn't get a percentage of it.

It doesn't make any sense now to increase the grazing and put in more cow herds out there or graze any calves on that or even increase our dairy production. That's what it would entail when you pay people to graze their land.

The deadlock in Congress comes from the Secretary of Agriculture and many Democratic Members of the House who are trying to stimulate grazing land when we are trying to get land out of production.

Congressman Dole. And you will remember that they are paid a lump-sum price to take out acres, and the man is trying to make it on his own. I couldn't see any savings as far as the cost was concerned.

Congressman Quie. The farmer would agree to take his land out of production for 5 years and the Government would pay him one lump sum to do it. Then the man would go out and buy cattle to graze it.

Congressman Laird. We have a question from Bill Theiss.

Do you want to come up and direct your question to the panel personally to kind of give us a breather?

Mr. William Theiss. My name is Bill Theiss, and I am a member of the Simonds-Shields-Theiss Grain Co.

My direct question is to the panel. It will just take a couple of minutes to read it to you.

The free market concept is recommended to the Republican platform committee for adoption. The reason for the question is that I believe that any agricultural policy and animal policy should be developed, approved, and accepted safeguarding free marketing and a marketing system developed under the free enterprise and competitive system.

I regard the preservation and strengthening of the free market as the prime objective of any Government administration. One should often remind himself of the benefits derived from the maintenance of such a system. The system rests on the freedom of farmer and consumer choice, profit motive, and keen competition for the buyer's dollar. With these economic forces at work the following benefits will derive:

First, the system tends to produce the types of varieties of grains that the consumer wants in amounts and volume desired. The marketplace is thus acting as the gage and barometer.

Second, the system tends to minimize waste. The efficient producer and the efficient farm unit shall prevail and displace the inefficient into more worthy pursuits.

Third, the system instills competition which creates new ideas as to farming and brings about technological exchange and advancement.

The free market system is a prime mover in our economic system. The free market is not only more efficient than even the wisest man but, even more important, it keeps economic power widely dispersed. It is one of the backbones of our democratic system.

If any commodity program is necessary, then it should be approved under the basis that a wide price range be set between Government loan levels and sales price, permitting a maximum of market price determination and freedom.

I believe that the desire and ultimate goal for the general public, the grain producers, and the grain industry is a return to farming and marketing systems with neither controls on production nor support of prices. Under such conditions, the laws of supply and demand would insure the efficient allocation of resources of each and every segment of agriculture.

The governmental expenses involved in current grain programs could then be utilized to retain and relocate the labor displaced by these changes. The return to a free market would provide more incentive for the efficient production of grain, and therefore the Nation and the world would realize the potential benefits from the technological advances which have and would be achieved not only in the growing of grain but also in the marketing.

I hope your panel agrees.

Congressman DOLE. I listened very carefully to the question, and I certainly agree with it.

I particularly agree with the point made with reference to a free market. This is true with everyone I have talked to, even some of those who might have supported or might have endorsed the so-called wheat-cotton bill.

Under the present setup there will not be a chance for the free market to operate because the Secretary can, as the farmers know and the people in the grain industry know, dump wheat at 105 percent of the prevailing support price plus carrying charges.

This is wrong in its original concept. It gives the Secretary control of the market because he sits there with the surplus hanging over the heads of the farmers and the grain industry. He is the one who will determine the market price.

It doesn't make the program voluntary. Like Governor Bellmon says—it's like paying income tax or when someone is sticking a gun in your back and you say, "Don't shoot. I will give you my wallet." It's not a voluntary farm program because you have to participate or else.

Mrs. PARDUN. The only thing I could say, if being here today has any purpose at all, is that I surely feel that we should support a free market system and free enterprise in America today. We certainly do not want socialized agriculture.

Congressman LAIRD. Governor Bellmon, we have a question for you. "Secretary of Agriculture Freeman said that the beef producers have already begun to profit with the beef import agreements from New Zealand. Would you comment?"

Governor BELLMON. I sure would. I can't see how anybody—I am not sure about the Australians, but certainly no one in the United States—is reaping any benefit from this, neither the producer nor the consumer.

I have been watching the Oklahoma City market closely because I have some more cattle to sell, and every day I look at it it goes down. So if Mr. Freeman believes this he is even more out of touch than I thought he was, and that's a pretty bad situation.

The fact is, of course, that any of us who has been in the beef business any length of time knows we have cycles in the prices and in the supply of beef, and you expect once in a while to have the market get a little rough. But the fact is that in this case a lot of the damage that's being done—the low price—is not being caused by our own production but by the production of other countries.

I am not sure that the market will recover until we are able to get back on at least a reasonable level of imports, because they can simply send it in here cheaper than we can produce it under our own economic setup. I would say the Secretary is entirely wrong.

Congressman LAIRD. We have prepared statements which have been submitted by the Kansas Farm Bureau to the members of the panel for transmission to the Republican platform committee.

We also have a statement from the Pure Milk Association of Chicago, Ill., supporting the class I base plan, which is for transmission to the platform committee. Of course, it's my hope that this will be acted on before this session of Congress adjourns one way or the other, but we will see that the platform committee considers this. We also have statements submitted by the National Milk Producers Federation on the class I base plan.

We have several other statements—one from Paul Peterson, one from Roland Bass, one from Paul G. Williams—which will be considered by the platform committee.

Perhaps we will have to call on someone to come up and present the next question.

The next question is from Walter Pierce, of Hutchinson, Kans.

Mr. WALTER PIERCE. Congressman LAIRD, as president of the Kansas Farm Bureau, I did submit this statement, and I hope the committee will consider these general statements.

In addition to that, I have a specific question for Congressman QUIE regarding the food stamp plan.

I might say before that that I am, as you mentioned before, from Hutchinson, Kans. I have a wheat farm with a cattle operation, so I am quite concerned about the price of cattle at the present time.

The question is: Will the food stamp plan help the cattleman? I might phrase that in two different ways. Is it going to help the price of beef? The other question is: If these beef imports continue, will the cattlemen be able to get some food stamps?

Congressman QUIE. If your county wants a food stamp operation you may be able to qualify for the food stamps.

I don't see how the cattlemen are going to be helped, because there is no prohibition in the bill preventing the recipient of the food stamps from buying imported beef with their stamps—unless, of course, it's labeled in the store, and we don't have any national labeling law and most of the States don't have a State labeling law.

Here is one thing as far as cattlemen are concerned. These people could buy imported beef. You can expect that people receiving food stamps would buy the lower priced beef or specially processed beef and hamburgers and that sort of thing, and this is what most of the imports are going into. I don't see that the food stamp plan is any assistance to the beef man at all.

I might say about the whole food stamp plan that I think the whole operation is unwise. The surplus commodities, due to our price support programs, are presently distributed to the needy in institutions and the Veterans' Administration and the school lunch programs, and we have direct distribution programs.

There is also a pilot food stamp program which is in operation right now. This new program would be a nationwide feeding program, a welfare program, and the whole cost would be put on the Agriculture Department, a $400 million cost to the Department of Agriculture.

The USDA is getting into the business of feeding people overseas, in this country, and the entire cost is budgeted against the farm program. I think the whole thing is unwise.

Congressman LAIRD. From the standpoint of the dairy producer, too, in the 43 pilot operations that were in existence we found the food stamps were used to purchase anything but dairy products when the purchaser went to cash in their stamps. I think that levying the cost onto the Department of Agriculture is unwise. This is a welfare program that should have been funded through the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare rather than putting the cost on the backs of American agriculture.

Congressman QUIE. That's true. When you see the survey of the food stamp plan, where they had distributed a great amount of butter in the direct distribution plan it went down to nil in the food stamp plan. The people were buying margarine, a substitute, when they went to the store, instead of butter. This is bound to happen in any kind of food stamp operation.

Congressman LAIRD. We have had several discussions on the platform committee that the cost of such programs as food distribution abroad, the food-for-peace program which was started under the Eisenhower administration, the school milk program, several of these programs, be funded separately and not be a charge to the Department of Agriculture, and we are giving that consideration in the drafting of our 1964 platform. I think we can come up with a good plank in that particular area.

I think I might mention that another serious mistake in this program is that the Federal Government pays 100 percent of the cost. The time-tested system of the Federal Government is that the State bears part of the cost and the Federal Government a part. On all of the welfare programs except this stamp plan the State pays a portion and the Government a portion. The average is 60 percent Federal and 40 percent by the State.

This would break down that time-honored and time-tested Federal-State relation we have. I think it is terribly unfortunate that it breaks a precedent of that kind and gives control to the Federal Government over the State.

If any of you have questions that we were unable to handle—and we have some here that were not completely covered—Mr. Nelson and Mr. Merriam and others will be here to receive your suggestions following the meeting. If you have any, you are welcome to come forward and make them to us. We don't want to run this program more than 2 hours because we want to come back to Kansas City again. You have been a very fine audience.

Let's have a few more questions. We have a question from the president of the Farmers Union of the State of Kansas. Will he come forward?

I will let Representative DOLE introduce him.

Congressman DOLE. This is Martin Byrne from Topeka, the president of the Kansas Farmers Union.

Martin, glad to have you here.

Mr. MARTIN BYRNE. I believe this question should be directed to you, Congressman LAIRD. I think it's probably been over half answered, but it might be well not to be concerned about repetition so that we can get everything in continuity and focus.

My question is: If the Republican Party was now in office what would they propose as a solution to our farm problems?

Congressman LAIRD. I think we all should add something on that particular question. I will start with AL QUIE and we will alternate as we go down the line.

Congressman QUIE. As I mentioned, I think if the Republican Party were in control we would make certain that in every program the farmers would make the management decisions themselves. I think this would be basic in anything we would do.

I think we would also look over the laws and see if there is anything that prevents farmers from developing their own organizations or representation in order that they could develop their bargaining power. There are some steps to be taken that I would have to go into at some length but we don't have the time now.

I think also that the Republicans recognize that the Government has gotten the farmer into some trouble and the Government has a responsibility thereby.

I was talking to a farmer who was across the table from me at lunch today, and he mentioned that he bought a farm and checked on it to be sure that it had a good wheat allotment and I think he also said it had a good feed grain base. When people have purchased farms they have purchased more than land; they have purchased the right to produce on that land too, when quotas, allotments or bases have been assigned to the farm. After they have done that we can't immediately take away from them what they have paid for.

So I think that we would point toward adequate prices in the marketplace, but I don't think we would pull the rug out from under the farmers. We would give them a transition period, because we should plan on producing in the 4 years of a Republican President a program that would leave the farmer in a stronger economic position. I will let the others add to this.

Congressman Laird. Governor, do you want to comment?

Governor Bellmon. To me the thing that's needed in agriculture and the thing which Mr. Eisenhower demonstrated when he was President is that we have faith in our farmers. The Democratic administration back since the 1930's have always shown they don't think farmers are smart enough to run their own business unless they get a lot of direction from Washington.

I believe the Republican Party, as they did under President Eisenhower, would again change the direction we are going. Under the Democrats we are moving further and further in the direction of complete control. I believe, as President Eisenhower did, that we would again move in the direction of giving the farming business back to the farmers without wrecking the economy of the country.

I believe the program we began thinking about back under President Hoover would help farmers into orderly marketing and stop this business of gluts at harvest time—that much of the program we should try to maintain. But to try to plan the farming program of every farmer and what goes on every acre I know will never work in this country, and the Russians are proving it won't even work over there.

So the statement of Congressman Quie about letting the farmers make the management decisions should be the basic purpose of the Republican Party.

Mr. Bradshaw. I think that the farmer gets into trouble just as the other groups do when there are questions that remain unsolved. They can't remain unsolved. You can't walk away from these problems and think they in turn will walk away from you.

Another thing to think about is that the laws governing the farmer aren't being enforced in such a way as to insure the protection of the farmer. Someone mentioned a while ago that you don't accomplish anything by changing the name of the product. You take milk for example. You have got to have control of that milk either on a butterfat basis or on solid butterfat or some system without calling it a name; there are too many ways of evading it.

Another thing, when you apply one formula to milk here and up in the New England States you have another altogether different formula from out here in the Midwest, it's things of that nature where I think we could at this time see that the farmers out here are adequately protected along with the rest of the country.

Mrs. Pardun. I jotted down a remark I would like to read because I don't want to leave out a word. This is the way I feel about it in regard to agriculture and the way the Republican Party should move.

I don't feel that we as farmers should make any tremendous national appeal for sympathy. I think we should ask for the support of an aggressive program designed to get widespread understanding on the part of every citizen of his or her State for a healthy, efficient, dynamic and prosperous agriculture. We all have a stake in agriculture. We all must work toward this goal.

Congressman Dole. I can only add a few specific things because time is short.

First of all we will have sugar legislation hearings starting soon. I believe we should increase the domestic marketing quota of sugar by 750,000 tons.

Second, we are in agreement here that we would restrict beef imports.

Last, I believe it is time we took a realistic look at our foreign policy and stopped bailing the Russians out by the sale of our surplus commodities.

Let me point out there has been a lot of misinformation about this so-called sale of wheat to Russia and other Iron Curtain countries. The Republicans in Congress on Christmas Eve did a tremendous service to the country in calling attention to what was being done. Certainly it should not be done. Either Russia is our friend or our enemy, and it's more than a little inconsistent to fight communism with one hand and feed it with the other.

It's inconsistent to bury an American who has been killed in Vietnam fighting communism one day and to feed communism the next day. I frankly can't reconcile it.

Governor Bellmon. There is something about this farm program that seems to have escaped a lot of attention. That is that during the 1960 presidential campaign practically every farm State endorsed the Republican handling of the farm program by giving Mr. Nixon the majority vote. I don't believe the Democrats carried any of the farm States, and this should be taken as a repudiation of the big schemes that the Democrats always come up with. I feel certain the farmers are in accord with what we tried to do for agriculture.

Our problem doesn't lie with the farm areas at all; it lies rather with the strong Democratic machines that run our big cities.

I believe that having been a farmer all my life I understand farmers, and most of them would rather be let alone as much as possible, and they are not looking to Government for any grandiose plans trying to give us all a utopia here on earth.

Congressman Laird. I would just like to add my comment in answer to Martin Byrne's question, which was a very good question.

First. I think we as Republicans in drafting our policy statement must accept the abundance of agriculture in the United States as a source of real strength. I think that it can be developed into a greater source of strength in our battle in the cold war than it is under the present administration where they are handing it out on both sides. I think our friends should be given first consideration in dealing with this abundance and using it as a real cold war weapon, cold war tool.

Second. I think that we have to give consideration to better land use adjustment programs. I think that this administration has swept this problem under the rug. We find ourselves in a position where more land in each of the last 3 years has gone into production in the United States, and it seems to me that we as Republicans in our platform declaration, in setting the policy for this campaign, should give consideration to positive programs in the use of land and the adjustment of land use in the United States.

Third. I believe the whole question of imports and the dumping of agricultural commodities in one section of our economy onto another section of our agricultural economy and its adverse effects has to be given real consideration.

We can build a party platform for 1964 with your help. We would like your continuing suggestions.

As you know, two members from each State will be elected to the Republican Party platform committee by the delegates from each of our 50 States—one man and one woman. The committee hearings will start on July 6 in San Francisco.

During that period of time we are soliciting the views of individuals throughout the United States. We hope that you will help us in gaining the best kinds of views, the best kinds of suggestions, so that we can build a positive program for American agriculture and a positive program for building a better America.

I think it's important that we as Republicans look at this agricultural problem to determine what is best from one generation to the next generation in agriculture instead of from one election to the next election.

I started out with that statement, and I would like to close the meeting today with that statement. Thank you.

The meeting was adjourned at 4 p.m.

LET FREEDOM RING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Halpern] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, last year at this time we were successful by concurrent resolution in resolving that each year on July 4 the Nation should observe its independence by the ringing of bells across the land.

I hope that together we shall not forget this patriotic endeavor. The resolution provided that each year on July 4, at 2 o'clock p.m., bells in government buildings, church bells, and carillon bells in colleges and universities throughout the land will ring for 4 minutes to memorialize the exact time of freedom's victory 188 years ago. Radio stations would broadcast the sounding of bells followed by the reading from the Declaration of Independence.

"Let freedom ring" is to be emphasized as the theme of this bell-ringing and should effectively serve as a reminder that the Liberty Bell first boomed out the news of America's birth. By adopting this resolution both Houses of the Congress have helped to revive the oldtime spirit of America.

It shall constitute a fitting memorial to the meaning of freedom and independence that we join in public reminder that our rights were fought for and won by brave men and women, and that we must do all in our power to preserve and extend these fundamental principles.

I hope that all houses of worship, schools, colleges, public buildings, and private organizations will join in the bellringing. Radio and television stations should share in the ceremonies by broadcasting the sounding of bells. I urge all public officials in Federal, State, and local governments to apply the provisions of the resolution if possible.

It is unfortunate that through the years this traditional American holiday has lost some of its historic importance in the public mind. We have much to be thankful for, and we tend to forget how much of this privilege and good fortune as a people is directly rooted in the events of our founding. Independence Day, as a matter of fact, is not only of American importance; it was, and remains, a tumultuous occasion of monumental significance throughout the world. The Declaration of Independence sowed the seeds of popular, representative government which has been patterned in country after country throughout the world.

And so I hope that with a nationwide ringing of bells we can in some measure recapture the spirit of freedom and independence which is our essential treasure. Especially now, the tumultuous ringing of the Nation's bells, on the anniversary of our emergence as a force for freedom, will remind all of us that we must preserve, protect, and extend these rights to all our citizens.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. CLARK, for July 1, 2, 3, on account of death in immediate family.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. PATMAN, for 60 minutes, Monday, July 20, 1964; Tuesday, July 21, 1964; and Wednesday, July 22, 1964; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOLIFIELD (at the request of Mr. PRICE), for 30 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. KIRWAN, for 1 minute, today; and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mrs. HANSEN, for 30 minutes, tomorrow.

Mr. LINDSAY, for 10 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. LAIRD (at the request of Mr. MOSHER), for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. HALPERN (at the request of Mr. MOSHER), for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. DENT (at the request of Mr. RIVERS of Alaska), for 30 minutes, on July 2; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ROSENTHAL (at the request of Mr. RIVERS of Alaska), for 60 minutes, on July 2; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. COOLEY.

Mr. HUDDLESTON and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HALEY (at the request of Mr. RHODES of Arizona) immediately following the remarks of Mr. RHODES of Arizona on the Passman amendments and to include a table prepared by the Agency for International Development.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MOSHER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HOSMER.

Mrs. MAY.

Mr. GROVER.

Mr. SIBAL.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. RIVERS of Alaska) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HOLIFIELD.

Mr. MONAGAN.

Mr. PEPPER.

Mr. POWELL in four instances.

Mr. FRASER.

Mr. PUCINSKI.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1123. An act to provide for the construction of the Lower Teton division of the Teton Basin Federal reclamation project, Idaho, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1509. An act to authorize reimbursement to owners and tenants of certain lands or interests therein acquired by the United States for certain moving expenses, losses, and damages, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 2664. An act to amend section 6(o) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act to provide an exemption from induction for the sole surviving son of a family whose father died as a result of military service; and

H.R. 10433. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 6. An act to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems, both public and private, in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on the following dates present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

On June 30, 1964:

H.R. 11376. An act to provide a 1-year extension of certain excise-tax rates, and for other purposes.

On July 1, 1964:

H.R. 2664. An act to amend section 6(o) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act to provide an exemption from induction for the sole surviving son of a family whose father died as a result of military service.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 54 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, July 2, 1964, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2245. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Commodity Credit Corporation, Department of Agriculture, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1963, presents the Corporation's financial statements for the year, together with our comments on the Corporation's activities and operations during that period (H. Doc. No. 315); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

2246. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report relating to overcharges to the Government for change orders issued under Navy contracts awarded to the Ingalls Shipbuilding Corp., a division of Litton Industries, Inc., Pascagoula, Miss., Department of the Navy; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2247. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report relating to an examination of the economic assistance program for Turkey, which from 1958 through June 30, 1962, aggregated $1.2 billion in direct economic aid and $550 million in other forms of aid (including sales of surplus agricultural commodities), showed that the program was not carried out within the context of any overall development plan relating to Turkey's resources and highest priority needs, Agency for International Development, Department of State; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2248. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on a review of public information activities of the Department of Labor, shows that we noted that the Department spent $140,000 on the 50th anniversary celebration, although the statement of the managers on the part of the House in the conference report on the Department of Labor appropriation for fiscal year 1963 indentified $80,000 for this purpose, hence about $60,000 was expended over the amount that was intended for this purpose; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2249. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on a review disclosed that about $112,000 had been expended unnecessarily by the General Services Administration because timely action was not taken in the administration of construction of the Museum of History and Technology, Smithsonian Institution; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2250. A letter from the Director, Legal Aid Agency for the District of Columbia, relative to furnishing additional material relating to the Fourth Annual Report of the Legal Aid Agency for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2251. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Defense, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the act of February 28, 1958, relating to the withdrawal, reservation, or restriction of public lands, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2252. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to broaden the vessel exchange provisions of section 510(i) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to extend such provisions for an additional 5 years, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

2253. A letter from the Administrative Assistant Secretary, Department of the Interior, transmitting the report for this Department covering grants made during calendar year 1963 to nonprofit institutions and organizations for support of scientific research programs, pursuant to Public Law 85-934; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

2254. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to provide that the Federal Government shall share in the revenue from the lease, use, or disposition of airspace on the Federal-aid highway systems"; to the Committee on Public Works.

2255. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated May 20, 1964, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a letter report on the Delaware River at Camden, N.J., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted June 11, 1952; to the Committee on Public Works.

2256. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated May 7, 1964, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a letter report on the DeGray Reservoir, Caddo River, Ark., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted July 13, 1954. The project is economically feasible and construction is underway. No additional authorizing legislation is recommended; to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MILLER of California: Committee of Conference. Conference report on H.R. 10456. An act to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and administrative operations, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1529). Ordered to be printed.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 8050. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide tax-exempt status for nonprofit nurses' professional registries operated by nurses' professional associations; with amendment (Rept. No. 1530). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. NIX from the delegation of the U.S. House of Representatives to the Fourth Conference of the Mexican-U.S. Interparliamentary Group (Rept. No. 1531). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SELDEN: Committee on Foreign Affairs. S. 994. An act to provide for the presentation by the United States to the people of Mexico of a monument commemorating the independence of Mexico, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1532). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SELDEN: Committee on Foreign Affairs. S. 2370. An act authorizing maintenance of flood and arroyo sediment control dams and related works to facilitate Rio Grande canalization project and authorizing appropriations for that purpose; with amendment (Rept. No. 1533). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SELDEN: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H.R. 7419. A bill to authorize the conclusion of agreements with Mexico for joint construction, operation, and maintenance of flood control works on the lower Colorado River, in accordance with the provisions of article 13 of the 1944 Water Treaty with Mexico, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1534). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ZABLOCKI: Committee on Foreign Affairs. S. 1627. An act to enable the United States to contribute its share of the expenses of the International Commission for Supervision and Control in Laos as provided in article 18 of the protocol to the declaration on the neutrality of Laos; without amendment (Rept. No. 1535). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H.R. 10485. A bill to provide for adjustments in annuities under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system; without amendment (Rept. No. 1536). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H.R. 11754. A bill to amend the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926, to authorize additional appropriations, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1537). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 11865. A bill to increase benefits under the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system, to provide child's insurance benefits beyond age 18 while in school, to provide widow's benefits at age 60 on a reduced basis, to provide benefits for certain individuals not otherwise eligible at age 72, to improve the actuarial status of the trust funds, to extend coverage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H.R. 11866. A bill to amend the Trade Expansion Act of 1962; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 11867. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to authorize and facilitate the deduction from gross income by teachers of the expenses of education (including certain travel) undertaken by them, and to provide a uniform method of proving entitlement to such deduction; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H.R. 11868. A bill to amend the Trade Expansion Act of 1962; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHALLEY:

H.R. 11869. A bill to indemnify dairy farmers; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BRAY:

H.R. 11870. A bill to amend the Trade Expansion Act of 1962; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROTZMAN:

H.R. 11871. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to authorize and facilitate the deduction from gross income by teachers of the expenses of education undertaken by them, and to provide a uniform method of proving entitlement to such deduction; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOLE:

H.R. 11872. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to abolish the renewal requirement for licenses in the safety and special radio services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H.R. 11873. A bill to amend section 79 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the amount includible in gross income by reason of group-term life insurance purchased for employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KNOX:

H.R. 11874. A bill to amend section 79 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the amount includible in gross income by reason of group-term life insurance purchased for employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OSTERTAG:

H.R. 11875. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to abolish the renewal requirement for licenses in the safety and special radio services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SICKLES:

H.R. 11876. A bill to amend the act concerning gifts to minors in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. YOUNGER:

H.R. 11877. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to abolish the renewal requirement for licenses in the safety and special radio services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.R. 11878. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide for the inclusion in the computation of accredited service of certain periods of service rendered States or instrumentalities of States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MEADER:

H.R. 11879. A bill to provide that courts of the United States shall not have jurisdiction to enjoin or modify the operation of laws respecting State legislative districts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 11880. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the tax on transportation of persons by air shall not apply to uninterrupted international combined air and sea transportation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WYMAN:

H.R. 11881. A bill to limit jurisdiction of Federal courts in reapportionment cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.J. Res. 1101. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHALLEY:

H.J. Res. 1102. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.J. Res. 1103. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to succession to the Presidency and Vice Presidency and to cases where the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

H.J. Res. 1104. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARVEY of Michigan:

H.J. Res. 1105. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRIFFIN:

H.J. Res. 1106. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H. Con. Res. 318. Concurrent resolution commending the President for his recent statement with respect to aggression in the Middle East and expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to such aggression; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. Con. Res. 319. Concurrent resolution commending the President for his recent statement with respect to aggression in the Middle East and expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to such aggression; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. Con. Res. 320. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of the Congress on disposal from the national stockpile of certain materials; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama:

H. Res. 798. Resolution to name the national wildlife refuge located at Walter F. George Dam and Reservoir project, Alabama; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America to restore to the citizens of the several States their sovereign right to determine the form and the manner of their legislative representation in State government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Pennsylvania, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to H.R. 1794, relating to providing social and educational conditions for certain American Indian tribes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BALDWIN:

H.R. 11882. A bill for the relief of Le-Shiu Du and Chen Chin-Lan Tu (also known as Mr. and Mrs. R. S. Tu); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BELL:

H.R. 11883. A bill for the relief of Haiguhi Sarkis Seringul; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHENOWETH:

H.R. 11884. A bill for the relief of Angela Nemec; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MINSHALL:

H.R. 11885. A bill for the relief of Mr. Lothar A. Koeberer, his wife Mrs. Agnes Koeberer, and his minor child Agnes Koeberer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORE:

H.R. 11886. A bill for the relief of Dr. Amparo Gonzales Castro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 11887. A bill for the relief of Sehimi Aktschura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 11888. A bill for the relief of Lauren F. Teutsch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H.R. 11889. A bill for the relief of the JE-IL Brick Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 11890. A bill for the relief of Antonios Jabbour Mikhail, his wife, Ivette Jabbour Mikhail, and Jabbour Antonios Mikhail and Mikhail Antonios Mikhail; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H.R. 11891. A bill for the relief of Adolfo Lopez Mendez, M.D.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas:

H.R. 11892. A bill for the relief of Guido Aquilini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

950. Mr. SNYDER presented a petition of Clarence L. Frazier of Lexington, Ky., relative to prayer and Bible reading in our schools, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

Wednesday, July 1, 1964

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. Metcalf).

Rev. Richard T. Bray, Jr., pastor, Claybrook Baptist Church, Weems, Va., offered the following prayer:

Our Father and our God, who hast been our help in ages past, and art our hope for years to come, we bless Thee for Thy faithfulness, of which there is no end. We praise Thee for the gift of life, which only Thou canst bestow, and for Thine unfailing goodness that overarches all our days.

Grant us grace, we beseech Thee, amid the confusion of the world and the disappointments of human hope to be still long enough to hear Thy voice speak unto our souls. May we open our hearts; may we surrender our wills; may we dedicate our thoughts to Thee. Correct us where we are wrong; confirm us whenever we may be right; grant us wisdom to discern Thy will, and courage to do it.

At this season, O God, we are mindful of Thy dealing with us as a nation. By Thy hand Thou didst prepare this land for human habitation; by Thy spirit, our forefathers were moved to seek its shores; by their trust in Thee, our Founding Fathers made declaration of the rights of men to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Forgive us our national and personal sins. May we be humble in the acceptance of our heritage. Keep us loyal to the high aims which have been set before us. Grant us great sympathy with all the people of the earth in their quest for life and liberty. Help us to share our blessings with others. Enable us to stand for righteousness and truth, and lead us in the pathways of peace.

We ask these things in the blessed name of our Redeemer and Thy Son, Jesus Christ. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request by Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, June 30, 1964, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

REPORT OF NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 314)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, as amended, I transmit herewith a report of the projects and progress of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for the period of January 1, 1963, through June 30, 1963.

This report covers 6 months of significant and encouraging activity in the national space program. The breadth of performance promises subsequent periods of even greater accomplishment in meeting the challenge of space.

Lyndon B. Johnson.

The White House, *July 1, 1964.*

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H.R. 2664) to amend section 6(o) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act to provide an exemption from induction for the sole surviving son of a family whose father died as a result of military service, and it was signed by the Acting President pro tempore.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

On request by Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request by Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Finance and the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly, of the Judiciary Committee, were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

AUTHORIZATION TO RECEIVE MESSAGES AND SIGN BILLS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the adjournments or recesses of the Senate for the remainder of this week, the Secretary may receive messages from the House, and that the President pro tempore or the Acting President pro tempore be authorized to sign bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to consideration of executive business, to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Wilson Cowen, of Maryland, to be chief judge of the U.S. Court of Claims.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

AMBASSADORS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of ambassadors.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am delighted with the Presidential appointment of Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor to be our Ambassador to the Republic of Vietnam.

I believe that in this statesman-soldier we have a man of extraordinary ability and integrity who well understands the situation in that area, and who will represent us with great patriotism and great devotion. I believe this is a truly outstanding appointment of which this country can well be proud.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a newspaper article in regard to the appointment of General Taylor.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CLOSEUP: OUR NEW MAN IN SAIGON, GEN. MAXWELL TAYLOR

(By William H. Rudy)

A distinguished Army career stretching over more than four decades has produced eight rows of decorations on the uniform of Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor. One of them could well be "for imagination beyond the call of duty."

Max Taylor has often been the man called on when the situation needed something more than the routine response. Now, at 62, when his retirement had been expected in the not too distant future, he has been named Ambassador to South Vietnam.

As commander of the 101st Airborne Division in World War II, Taylor dropped into Normandy on the eve of D-day. If assignment in Saigon in 1964 lacks the same degree of personal danger, it is nevertheless the hottest of current trouble spots.

Taylor is a military brain without the "military mind." Back in 1922 when not yet 21, he graduated from West Point, fourth in his class, he was saluted by the class yearbook, the Howitzer, as "the most learned" of the class.

Gen. Douglas MacArthur, who was commandant of the academy at the time, years later was quoted as calling Taylor "promising * * * but a man who will never do anything to jeopardize his career."

But there came a day in 1959 when Taylor, as Army Chief of Staff, disturbed by the administration's policy of massive retaliation and outvoted by the other chiefs on 20 of 23 major issues, submitted his resignation to President Eisenhower. It was accepted. Taylor had been an Army man 41 years. He was 3 years shy of the normal retirement age for officers of his rank.

As articulate as he is courageous, he sat right down to write "The Uncertain Trumpet," a condemnation of existing U.S. military policy.

It was a book sharply critical of the Eisenhower-Dulles policy of massive atomic retaliation and forceful in its arguments against the plan advocated by Admiral Radford, chairman of the Joint Chiefs, to cut military costs by placing increased reliance on atomic weapons.

Taylor, correctly foreseeing that wars of the immediate future, at least, would be "brush fires" falling short of world conflagrations, advocated "flexible response."

"I have undertaken to write this book because of my conviction that the defense of the United States is presently controlled largely by nonmilitary factors which have become outmoded," he said. "While there are strong arguments for a cooling period after leaving the post of Chief of Staff before committing my views to writing, I have the deep feeling that there is no time to wait.

"We are faced with declining military strength at a time of increasing political tension. To arrest this trend before it goes too far requires certain immediate actions to be taken. * * * The permanent remedy calls for a complete reappraisal of our strategy by the responsible agencies of our Government."

Having sounded with "The Uncertain Trumpet" a clear signal that values existed for him above that of not jeopardizing his Army career, Taylor showed his own flexible response by becoming later in 1960 the president of the Lincoln Center for the Performing Arts, succeeding John D. Rockefeller III, who became chairman of the board.

But one of those whose attention was attracted to "The Uncertain Trumpet" was another thinker who rejected easy answers—and when John F. Kennedy was elected President, Maxwell Taylor was called back to duty.

He served first as the young President's White House military adviser and eventually, in July 1962, became Chairman of the Joint Chiefs by Presidential appointment. It was the post he held when President Johnson chose him for Saigon.

As the most influential of military advisers in the Kennedy administration, Taylor is able to go off to Saigon with the argument of massive retaliation versus flexible response resolved for the present in his favor.

In Vietnam he finds the prime example of the type of localized war to be contained and then resolved by more subtle and complex means than all-out military operations and atomic attack.

Max Taylor, who was to have such an impact on world military strategy and who was to head Lincoln Center, was born in little Keytesville, Mo., the son of a lawyer for the Katy Railroad. He graduated from high school in Kansas City and attended Kansas City Junior College for a year before going to West Point.

Taylor was sufficiently skilled in science and particularly in languages to have made a name for himself in academic life. He taught Spanish and French at the Academy for 5 years.

In 1926 he had married Lydia Happer, of El Paso, Tex., and in 1935 they arrived in Tokyo with two young sons. Captain Taylor was attached to the U.S. Embassy with the primary task of learning Japanese by going to school 8 hours a day. He stayed 4 years.

Anti-American feeling was running high in those pre-Pearl Harbor days, and Mrs. Taylor has recalled it's a wonder her husband wasn't arrested as he traveled by streetcar across the city to classes, studying Japanese calligraphy on little cards he kept in his pocket.

Taylor was able to read, write, and converse in Japanese when he returned to the Army War College in 1939. Even the most difficult languages were relatively easy for him, his wife has explained, partly because language study relaxes him and becomes a form of recreation. For most of his life he has concentrated on a language for at least an hour a day.

This language facility took him off on a special Army mission to South America just before World War II, but with Pearl Harbor the officer sought the active life.

Taylor was in on the birth of the Nation's airborne strength when he helped after the outbreak of war to convert the 82d Infantry into the 82d Airborne. He went overseas in 1943 as the division's artillery commander and took part in the African, Sicilian, and Italian campaigns, getting his first opportunity for wartime heroics, though the incident was a top secret at the time.

Just before the Allied landings in Italy, secret efforts were started to arrange with Italian authorities for the surrender of their forces. Major General Taylor and Col. William T. Gardiner, a former Governor of Maine, left Sicily in a British PT boat, rendezvoused with an Italian corvette and were landed south of Rome disguised as U.S. airmen picked up from a wrecked plane.

As ostensible prisoners they were taken into Rome under the noses of the German forces and conferred for 24 hours with Italian leaders. Discovery would have meant certain execution. They left just before the Allied landings at Salerno, but the arrangements they made later were abandoned because of changing circumstances.

In "Crusade in Europe," Eisenhower said "the risks he ran were greater than I asked any other agent or emissary to undertake during the war."

His second outstanding exploit was dropping into France on the eve of D-day to help prepare the way for the invasion. He was the first general officer to land in Normandy, and later received the Distinguished Service

Cross "for extraordinary heroism in action against the enemy."

Some weeks later he dropped with his 101st, "the Screaming Eagles," into Holland. When the division was trapped late that year at Bastogne in the Battle of the Bulge, Taylor was on a mission into the beleaguered town with the first armored relief forces.

There were few Allied decorations he did not hold at the end of the war.

Taylor's first peacetime assignment was as Superintendent at West Point, where he broadened the curriculum to provide more liberal arts courses.

"Cadets should not live in mental cloisters," he said. "Their interests must be catholic, avoiding the small horizons sometimes attributed to the military mind."

Taylor's horizons were broad enough and the posts he subsequently was chosen for were those requiring such a man. He commanded both the American Military Government and Army forces in West Berlin at a time of great turmoil, and in 1953 was assigned to the most troublesome post of all—commander of U.S. forces in Korea.

Service at such distant points under such difficult circumstances reinforced his view that the United States must be equipped with sufficient conventional forces to cope with limited and varying situations.

There followed his first tour as Army Chief of Staff, which ended with his differences with the Eisenhower administration and his first retirement, during which he was for a time chairman of the Mexican Light & Power Co. and lived in Mexico City.

On his return to Washington with President Kennedy, Taylor was frequently assigned to troubleshooting jobs—a report on the Bay of Pigs fiasco, missions to Pakistan and India, negotiations in Indonesia.

As Chairman of the Joint Chiefs he argued for ratification of the limited nuclear test ban treaty and for the Kennedy foreign aid programs, and with Defense Secretary McNamara visited the Far East to study the frustrating Vietnam conflict.

The Taylors' two sons have careers of their own now. John Maxwell Taylor, 34, a Government civilian employee, is married and lives with his wife and children in Falls Church, Va. Thomas Happer Taylor, 29, an Army captain, is stationed at Ft. Lewis, Wash., where his father once was.

The general, nearing 63, is a handsome, erect 6-footer, trim and fit from years of tennis, his consuming athletic interest. He was captain of the team at West Point and is now a director of the National Lawn Tennis Hall of Fame at Newport, R.I.

But he has had some annoying bronchial attacks recently, and considering the demands of a 14-hour day in the Pentagon, had indicated he might ask to be freed soon for a second retirement, probably after the November elections.

Now the call has come from President Johnson to go to Saigon. It is a problem that needs a man of broad horizons—and he has accepted.

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, the appointment of Gen. Maxwell Taylor as Ambassador to the Republic of Vietnam has come at a difficult and perilous time for southeast Asia. It is a moment of challenge for the protection of the free world.

I know I speak for all of us when I say that Maxwell Taylor will take to Vietnam our deepest hope that through strength, perseverance, and patience peace will be established for the embattled people of South Vietnam.

No one who has watched the long career of Maxwell Taylor can doubt that President Johnson has selected a leader who will serve with wisdom and caution, discipline and hard work.

Maxwell Davenport Taylor was born in Keytesville, Mo., August 26, 1901, the son of a railroad lawyer. When he graduated from Kansas City High School at age 15, he was known as both an athlete and a scholar.

He had the best education the Army could offer, beginning at West Point. By the time he was appointed Assistant U.S. Military Attaché in Peiping, in 1939, he had become fluent in French, Spanish, and Japanese.

After a distinguished World War II service record—which included parachuting into Normandy on D-day with his troops—and a period as Superintendent at West Point, General Taylor became Chief of Staff for the Armed Forces in Europe, and Commander of the American Military Government and Army Forces in Berlin, 1949–51. He spent 18 months face to face with Soviet pressure on Germany, before he returned to be an Army Deputy Chief of Staff, in the Pentagon.

In 1953 he was sent to Korea, where he commanded the 8th Army. Then as Commander of the U.S. Army Forces in the Far East, and United States-United Nations Commander in the Far East, General Taylor rounded out his knowledge of Communist strategy and tactics in Asia.

In 1961, President Kennedy acknowledged General Taylor's abilities, and invited him to join his administration. As military representative to the President, and then as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Taylor has had a broad and intimate acquaintance with the foreign policies of the Kennedy and Johnson administrations.

There is no doubt that the man we are sending to Vietnam is unusually endowed with an understanding of American policy and an ability to meet the problems of implementing that policy. For 3 years he has been in the day-to-day handling of our effort in South Vietnam. He has gained the confidence of military and political leaders, both at home and abroad. Ambassador Taylor is firmly committed to keeping South Vietnam and southeast Asia from falling to Communist insurgency.

It is a long way from Keytesville to Saigon, but it is a path which Maxwell Taylor has traveled with distinction. On behalf of his native State of Missouri, I congratulate our new Ambassador, and wish him Godspeed.

U.S. CIRCUIT JUDGE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Walter Ely, of California, to be a U.S. circuit judge, for the ninth circuit.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

U.S. DISTRICT JUDGES

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of U.S. district judges.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BOARD

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations for membership on the Subversive Activities Control Board.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

On motion by Mr. MANSFIELD, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

Broadening of Vessel Exchange Provisions of Merchant Marine Act, 1936

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to broaden the vessel exchange provisions of section 510(i) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to extend such provisions for an additional 5 years, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

Report of Legal Aid Agency for the District of Columbia

A letter from the Director, Legal Aid Agency for the District of Columbia, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Agency, for the period June 1, 1963, to May 31, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Provision for Federal Government To Share in the Revenue From the Lease, Use, or Disposition of Airspace on the Federal-Aid Highway Systems

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide that the Federal Government shall share in the revenue from the lease, use, or disposition of airspace on the Federal-aid highway systems (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

Report on Scientific Research Grants

A letter from the Administrative Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on scientific research grants, for the calendar year 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Unnecessary Costs Incurred in Construction of the Smithsonian Institution Museum of History and Technology

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on unnecessary costs incurred in the construction of the Smithsonian Institution Museum of History and Technology, General Services Administration, dated June 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Costs Incurred in Excess of Those Intended and Necessary in the Administration of Public Information Activities

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on costs incurred in excess of those intended and necessary in the administration of public information activities, Department of Labor, dated June 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Examination of Economic and Technical Assistance Program for Turkey

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on examination of economic and technical assistance program for Turkey, Agency for International Development, Department of State, fiscal years 1958–62 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Overcharges to the Government for Change Orders Issued Under Certain Navy Contracts

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on overcharges to the Government for change orders issued under Navy contracts awarded to the Ingalls Shipbuilding Corp., a division of Litton Industries, Inc., Pascagoula, Miss., Department of the Navy, dated June 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Audit Report on Commodity Credit Corporation

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Commodity Credit Corporation, Department of Agriculture, fiscal year 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Amendment of Act Relating to the Withdrawal, Reservation, or Restriction of Public Lands

A letter from the General Counsel of the Department of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of February 28, 1958, relating to the withdrawal, reservation, or restriction of public lands, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Report on Interstate Compact To Conserve Oil and Gas

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the interstate compact to conserve oil and gas, dated June 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore:

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Finance:

"Whereas the mushroom growing and canning industry is one of the foundation stones of Pennsylvania's agricultural economy, gainfully employing thousands of workers who produce a useful and unique product consumed throughout the Nation; and

"Whereas the continued existence of this great Pennsylvania industry as a viable force in our economy is now in dire jeopardy due to a torrential flood of low-priced imports from a single cheap labor country which have mounted to nearly 50 percent of domestic production in less than 3 years; resulting in wholesale bankruptcies and hardships to Pennsylvania farmers and canners; and

"Whereas every factor indicates even greater future onslaughts which will surely sound the death knell of a great American industry located primarily in the State of Pennsylvania: Therefore be it

"*Resolved,* That the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania requests his excellency, William W. Scranton, Governor of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, to intercede on behalf of the people of this Commonwealth and the mushroom industry with the President of the United States and the U.S. Tariff Commission to impose tariffs on the import of mushrooms of a sufficient amount to make them competitive with the domestic mushroom industry; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania memorialize Congress to take whatever steps may be necessary to protect the weakening and declining domestic mushroom industry, and restore the same to a competitive market; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to Governor William W. Scranton; President Lyndon B. Johnson; U.S. Tariff Commission; the presiding officer of each House of the Congress of the United States; and to each Senator and Member of the House of Representatives from Pennsylvania in the Congress of the United States."

Two petitions of C. R. Mead, Westport, Conn., praying for a redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Sundry communications of Henry Stoner, of Avon Park, Fla., relating to matters within the jurisdiction of the Senate; ordered to lie on the table.

RESOLUTION OF CONFERENCE OF UPPER NEW YORK STATE REGION OF HADASSAH

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, a letter addressed to me embodying a resolution adopted at the conference of the Upper New York State Region of Hadassah, relating to human rights. I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Upper New York State Region,
Women's Zionist Organization
of America,
June 3, 1964.

Hon. Jacob Javits,
U.S. Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Javits: The following resolution was adopted at the conference of the Upper New York State Region of Hadassah:

"Whereas the three human rights conventions approved by the U.S. representatives to the United Nations and by the President of the United States, are now before the Foreign Relations Committee—these conventions calling for: (1) The abolition of enforced labor; (2) the abolition of slavery; (3) political rights of women; and

"Whereas the Government and citizens of the United States have consistently thought to enhance the dignity of the individual and safeguard the civil rights of human beings everywhere, which objectives the human rights conventions are designed to further: Therefore be it

"*Resolved,* That Hadassah supports the request of many American organizations and citizens to the chairman and members of the Foreign Relations Committee that this matter be brought to the Senate for ratification at the earliest possible date, thus adding the prestige and support of the United States to the sponsorship of the human rights conventions."

We know you are giving this measure positive support.

Yours very truly,
Mrs. Karl Goldman,
Regional President.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. DIRKSEN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

H.R. 9094. An act to authorize the President to declare July 9, 1964, as Monocacy Battle Centennial in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the Battle of the Monocacy (Rept. No. 1153);

H.R. 9234. An act to incorporate the Little League Baseball, Inc. (Rept. No. 1154);

H.R. 10437. An act to incorporate the National Committee on Radiation Protection and Measurements (Rept. No. 1155); and

H.J. Res. 475. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim December 7, 1966, as Pearl Harbor Day in commemoration of the 25th anniversary of the attack on Pearl Harbor (Rept. No. 1152).

By Mr. DIRKSEN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

H.R. 4732. An act to change the name of the United States Olympic Association to the United States Olympic Committee (Rept. No. 1151).

By Mr. DIRKSEN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

H.R. 8590. An act to incorporate the Aviation Hall of Fame (Rept. No. 1150); and

H.J. Res. 658. Joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President to proclaim 1964 as "See America Year," and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1149).

By Mr. KEATING, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

S.J. Res. 23. Joint resolution to designate the second Monday in April as National Teachers' Day (Rept. No. 1148).

By Mr. McNAMARA, from the Committee on Public Works, without amendment:

H.R. 5478. An act authorizing a survey of the Frio River in the vicinity of Three Rivers, Tex., in the interest of flood control and allied purposes (Rept. No. 1157); and

H.R. 6923. An act authorizing a survey of Cedar Bayou, Tex., in the interest of flood control and allied purposes (Rept. No. 1158).

By Mr. McNAMARA, from the Committee on Public Works, with amendments:

S. 1347. An act to provide a residence for congressional and Supreme Court pages (Rept. No. 1156).

By Mr. RANDOLPH, from the Committee on Public Works, without amendment:

S. 1282. A bill to permit a State to increase the mileage of its Federal-aid primary system when provision is made for the completion and maintenance of 75 percent thereof (Rept. No. 1159);

S. 1593. A bill to amend section 14 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1954 concerning the interstate planning and coordination of the Great River Road (Rept. No. 1160); and

H.R. 10392. An act authorizing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to locate a portion of a vehicular tunnel under parts of the U.S. Capitol Grounds and the U.S. Botanic Garden Grounds, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1161).

Mr. RANDOLPH subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier today, from the Committee on Public Works, I reported favorably, without amendment, House bill 10392, relating to the location of a portion of a vehicular tunnel under parts of the U.S. Capitol grounds. I ask unanimous consent that the individual views of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper] be printed as a part of that report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

By Mr. RANDOLPH, from the Committee on Public Works, with amendments:

H.R. 10503. An act to authorize appropriations for the fiscal years 1966 and 1967 for the construction of certain highways in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1162).

AMENDMENT OF RULE XXV, RELATING TO JURISDICTION OF COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 1147)

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 338) amending rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate relative to the jurisdiction of the Committee on Rules and Administration, and submitted a report thereon; which report was ordered to be printed, and the resolution placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the Standing Rules of the Senate are amended by adding at the end of paragraph 1(p) of rule XXV (relating to the jurisdiction of the Committee on Rules and Administration) the following new subparagraph:

"(3) Such committee shall have jurisdiction to investigate every alleged violation of the rules of the Senate, and to make appropriate findings of fact and conclusions with respect thereto after according to any individual concerned due notice and opportunity for hearing. In any case in which the committee determines that any such violation has occurred, it shall be the duty of the committee to recommend to the Senate appropriate disciplinary action, including reprimand, censure, suspension from office or employment, or expulsion from office or employment."

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. COTTON:

S. 2967. A bill to amend the Textile Fiber Products Identification Act and the Wool Products Labeling Act of 1939 in order to require that imported woven labels must have woven into them the name of the country where woven; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. METCALF (for himself and Mr. Mansfield):

S. 2968. A bill to amend subsection 120(f) of title 23, United States Code; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Metcalf when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. GORE:

S. 2969. A bill establishing a Department of Consumer Affairs; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. Gore when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CHURCH (by request):

S. 2970. A bill to restore to the heirs of the Indian grantor certain tribal land of the Iowa Tribe of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

S. 2971. A bill for the relief of Fay Lun Mar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RESOLUTION

AMENDMENT OF RULE XXV OF STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE RELATIVE TO JURISDICTION OF THE COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 338) amending rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate relative to the jurisdiction of the Committee on Rules and Administration, which was placed on the calendar.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. Jordan of North Carolina, which appears under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENT OF SUBSECTION 120 (F) OF TITLE 23, UNITED STATES CODE

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, on behalf of the majority leader, the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. Mansfield], and myself, I introduce a bill for appropriate reference. I ask unanimous consent that a statement in explanation of the bill be printed in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Walters in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 2968) to amend subsection 120(f) of title 23, United States Code, introduced by Mr. Metcalf (for himself and Mr. Mansfield), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The statement presented by Mr. Metcalf is as follows:

Statement of Justification for Bill To Increase the Federal Share Payable for Emergency Relief in Certain Cases

Under the existing provisions of section 120 of title 23, United States Code, the Federal share of emergency relief for highways seriously damaged by a disaster is limited to 50 percent. In those States containing little or nothing in the way of public lands, no hardship results from this limitation. However, those States which contain large areas of Federal lands have come to rely heavily, for ordinary Federal-aid highway construction, upon the so-called sliding scale of Federal participation under Section 120. The sliding scale takes into account the nontaxable Indian lands, individual and tribal, and public domain lands—both reserved and unreserved—exclusive of national forests and national parks and monuments, exceeding 5 percent of the total area of all lands in any State in arriving at the Federal share payable. Consequently, computations under this section may raise the Federal share payable for primary, secondary and urban highway construction from the regular 50 percent to nearly 95 percent in certain public lands States.

Under these circumstances, the same type of disaster could affect two States, one with public lands and the other without, in an entirely different manner. The former would receive as emergency relief a payment for reconstruction which might amount to little over half of the Federal share paid for original construction, while the latter would receive a Federal payment for its damaged highways representing the same Federal share used in their original building. For this reason, it appears most desirable to apply the same Federal share to emergency relief as is payable for original construction in order to avoid inequities among the States in case of widespread disaster.

ESTABLISHMENT OF A DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to establish a Department of Consumer Affairs. The function and purpose of the Department shall be to protect our public interest, with particular emphasis on consumer interest. In connection therewith, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record an article from the current issue of the Nation, written by Mr. Desmond Smith, entitled "Chain Squeeze: The Power of Big Food."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the article will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 2969) establishing a Department of Consumer Affairs, introduced by Mr. Gore, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

The article presented by Mr. Gore is as follows:

Chain Squeeze: The Power of Big Food

(By Desmond Smith)

Big food, the $70 billion a year supermarket industry which has wiped out 140,000 family-owned grocery stores since the end of World War II, is now drawing a bead on its suppliers. Tomato growers in Texas, food canners in California, poultry farms in Alabama are among a dozen or so producing groups that have succumbed to the python-like embrace of the food chains in recent years. But the latest group marked for extinction, the western livestock producers, have proved more difficult to swallow. The battle for control of the stockyards, to the chagrin of big food, has suddenly shifted from the boardrooms of the giant supermarket chains to the White House. President Johnson, a cattleman himself, has asked Congress to move quickly on a bill that will provide funds and authority for a national commission "to study and appraise the changes taking place in the American food industry." Chainstore officials have yelled "election year politics," but will find it hard to sustain the charge. The President has deliberately emphasized the bipartisan makeup of his proposed commission.

The importance President Johnson attaches to this inquiry reflects, to some extent, a concern for the administration's farm program—where the matter of surpluses still awaits the logic of a Keynesian solution. But at least as urgent a motive is President Johnson's knowledge that (as he mentioned earlier this year in his message on agriculture) "while there are 200,000 retail grocery stores in the United States, $1 out of every $2 spent for groceries goes to fewer than 100 corporate voluntary or cooperative chains."

The market power of Big Food has been growing for some time; the plight of the livestock producers gave it the status of a national problem. The $8 billion a year beef cattle business is today in the middle of a slump that is being compared to the worst days of the depression. Cattlemen put the blame on the chainstores which, they claim, have moved in on the feedlot and the cattle range with a big stick. They point out that retail beef sales through the chains now represent about 85 percent of the total retail sales of beef. The big stick carried by the food chains is their "take it or leave it" buying power. As Senator ALBERT GORE, Democrat, of Tennessee, noted in Congress recently, "Something is wrong when livestock values drop by something like 25 percent over a period of about 15 months, without any appreciable drop in the prices paid for meat by housewives."

Ever since the supermarket came to maturity in 1948, the great fight for the consumer's food dollar—the biggest item in the family budget—has found the chains engaged in an economic war. Ironically, food chains such as the A. & P. were late in changing over to the supermarket concept. It was, in fact, the independent grocer, looking for a way to beat the chains in the 1920's, who pioneered the idea of the self-service store. By the early 1950's the change from neighborhood shopping to automobile shopping created the shopping center, and the chains switched to supermarkets. How successful that policy has been is spectacularly demonstrated by America's biggest food chain, the A. & P. In 1946, the company operated 15,000 colonial-trimmed grocery stores. Today, the number has been cut back to 4,500 brick-faced, no-nonsense supermarkets. Despite the reduction of outlets, profits bounded. In 1962, the A. & P. earned $60 million after taxes.

In 1920, anyone with a couple of thousand dollars could start a small (1,000-square-foot) supermarket. In the postwar decade the average supermarket covered 9,000 square feet and required an investment of at least $300,000. And even when the local food store operator had the necessary cash he often found himself shut out of the shopping center. The answer was always the same. The center's developer needed long-term financing; the finance agency—usually an insurance company—considered a national chain a more desirable tenant than a local merchant.

By the mid-1950's, phase one of the war—the removal of the corner grocer—was over except for minor pockets of resistance. Phase two was to prove a much more deadly battle. The chainstores began to cut into one another's markets. When all else failed, that old standby of big business, the merger, was used. The Federal Trade Commission noted in a complaint against the Kroger Co.: "Twenty percent of the grocery stores in the United States account for over 72 percent of the total grocery store sales in the country. From 1954 to 1957 some 36 corporations absorbed 88 grocery chains and thereby acquired * * * over $1½ billion in total sales."

It would be wrong to conclude that the supermarket revolution is without its supporters. Whatever sociologists may feel about the disappearance of the cracker barrel, the housewife has few regrets. She appreciates such features as refrigerated counters, prepacked "convenience" foods, frozen orange juice, and the enormous improvement in sanitary food-handling methods that are part of the big change in food retailing. But even though the food chains deserve much of the credit for these gains, one still asks whether it has been prudent to leave the shaping of this marketing change entirely in the hands of the big food chains. More specifically, one wonders how long this country can muddle along without a Department of Consumer Affairs.

Congressional inquiries have turned up damaging testimony against the food chains. Deceptive food packaging, misleading labeling, misrepresentation, fictitious sales and the widening practice of substituting food-chain grading for Federal grading in meat (most people understand what "Prime" signifies on a slab of beef, but what on earth is "superrite quality"?) make a pattern of sharp merchandising. But the great weakness of congressional publications is that the public rarely gets to read them. Consumer Reports is one of the few magazines that regularly uncover consumer fraud, for few national magazines or big city newspapers (dependent as they are upon food advertising) are eager to expose so sensitive a topic.

We live in an economy of abundance; production is no longer the problem. Increasingly our concern is going to be with the problem of marketing that abundance. What is required is a permanent branch of the Government that will speak for the unorganized majority in America, conduct inquiries in cases where there is widespread public dissatisfaction, and do so with the minimum of political prejudice. Mrs. Esther Peterson, assistant to the President for consumer affairs, is doing a job that is a good deal more than a political sinecure. Now we need to recognize that the job deserves an office.

And this is required the more obviously because of the strange economic conditions under which the food chains have prospered. Since it was the cattlemen's cry of pain that alerted the President and Congress, it is worth examining the chainstore's defense in this situation. Chain officials admit that the drop in cattle prices may have cost the livestock producers more than $1 billion. But they insist that, according to their own marketing studies, the chains have been losing a penny a pound on the retail sale of beef. Following this line, they note that last year beef consumption was more than 95 pounds per person in the United States, and suggest that a saturation point may have been reached. But the livestock producers argue that U.S. Department of Agriculture figures on retail beef prices are far more significant than partisan studies. And these show that beef prices have remained stable in the food chains and have not reflected the catastrophic drop in stockyard prices. Beef consumption, they insist, could go a good deal higher. Plenty of Americans, cattlemen point out, are eating "tube" steaks—frankfurters—instead of cube steaks. If the food chains would reduce beef prices, a large untapped market would soon reveal itself.

Whatever the merits of these conflicting statements, it would be naive to suppose that they provide the real answer to the current debate. The prime cause of the present economic disruption can be found in the supermarket wars over the last decade. Before 1955, the main objective of the food chains was to wrest the neighborhood market from the local grocer. When a chain had gained a virtual corner on the customers, the savings made by mass-volume merchandising were often shared with the housewife. But as the local grocer quit—or merged into a cooperative—rival chains moved in to fight for a share of the market. Once the market had been split, true low-cost selling was abandoned. In its place came a surge of trading-stamp promotions and other customer-financed incentive schemes. Simultaneously, the chains stepped up the pressure on their suppliers. A supplier who would not come into line was reminded of Sears, Roebuck, and Montgomery Ward. Most suppliers got the hint; the mail-order houses had met supplier opposition by creating their own sources.

With the local grocer disposed of, the next to go was the wholesaler. The chains took to buying direct wherever possible. This move had great consequences for the food producers and the processors. For one thing, they learned that Big Food—once it had banded together as a loose buying combine—disliked competition as much as Big Steel. Contrary to chamber of commerce theology, most businessmen dislike competition in their own fields. The history of antitrust actions from Theodore Roosevelt's day to the present is melancholy testimony to this observation.

Having disposed of the wholesalers, the supermarket chains could put the arm directly on the food processors. This pressure has taken many forms. Price-off deals, "advertising" allowances (which not only paid for the chain stores' local advertising but also became a price reduction), free merchandise, and even cash allowances for preferential shelf space (eye level instead of knee level). All such devices have become woefully familiar to the food producer or packer who wants to do business with Big Food.

It is clear that, for all the infighting among the supermarket giants, and for all the squeezing of the foodgrowers and processors, the public has gained little or no benefit. According to Department of Agriculture comparisons, a market basket of food that cost the housewife $10 in 1947 would cost her $11.83—nearly a fifth more—in 1963. True, by comparison with other items in the family budget, food prices have remained relatively stable. But in the same years that the cost of retail food has been rising slowly, the price to the farmer has been dropping fast: Since 1947 (again USDA statistics), the price farmers receive for Choice lamb is down 16.5 percent; for pork, 37.9 percent; for choice beef, 13.8 percent; for eggs, 36.3 percent; for potatoes, 44.7 percent. During all these years, the food chains have been perfectly aware of our fertile acres and heavy granaries; they know that food is a buyer's market, but have been careful not to pass the word to their customers.

When the big food chains began to gang up on the livestock producers 18 months ago, the cattlemen hollered monopoly. When the meat buyers from the chains bypassed the stockyards and bought directly from the feed lot, the cattlemen went to Washington. The powerful National Association of Food Chains protested their charges, but the equally powerful National Farmers Union sided with the cattlemen. James Patton, president of the NFU sent a short note to the White House and a detailed letter to the Attorney General. The key section of his letter to Robert Kennedy urged the Department of Justice "to carry out an investigation of retail food chainstore buying practices, their degree of vertical integration into packing plants, feed lots, and ranches, their power to influence and subvert competitive free enterprise, and their power to increase the spread between producers and consumers without regard to supply and demand."

Meanwhile the Senate Commerce Committee got busy. By early April, spurred by the President's interest, the first important hearings on a joint resolution to establish a National Commission on Food Marketing to study the food industry from the farm to the consumer were being conducted by Senator GALE MCGEE, Democrat, of Wyoming.

The Senate recently approved the joint resolution; the House is expected to follow suit. Some time this fall the National Commission should begin its study. All this will take time, and whether Congress will eventually enact legislation that can provide the farmer, distributor, and consumer with some desperately needed countervailing power must await the recommendations of the National Commission. But Big Food is clearly scared. As Senator MCGEE noted last month, there has been a sudden rise in weekend "hotshot" beef sales at the supermarket.

RESOURCES AND THE FUTURE ENERGY

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a release and report by the Republican Citizens' Committee Critical Issues Council, headed by Dr. Milton S. Eisenhower, reassessing the energy requirements of the United States for its future.

There being no objection, the release and report were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOURCES AND THE FUTURE: ENERGY

The Republican Citizens Committee's Critical Issues Council, headed by Dr. Milton S. Eisenhower, today called for a reassessment of the Nation's energy policies and suggested recommendations to meet the energy problems which the country will face in the coming decades.

The council report was drafted by a task force under Mr. Lewis L. Strauss, former Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. The other members of the group were Dr. Williard F. Libby, of the University of California; Mr. Louis Roddis, president of the Pennsylvania Electric Co.; and Mr. Robert L. L. McCormick, former assistant to Mr. Herbert Hoover.

The report stated that "the wise production and use of electrical energy calls for sound working relationships between private enterprise and government. While public oversight is necessary, it must not paralyze private initiative.

"With respect to some of the key electrical energy matters today facing our people, we think the present and previous Democratic administrations have been deficient. * * * Democratic Congresses, from 1955 to the present, have been unwilling to accept a number of the constructive approaches which we propose," the report stated.

"We recommend a detailed study of the relative efficiency of methods of generating electrical power within the United States and the development of a new constructive Federal power policy which will give due consideration to the demonstrated achievements of private industry in this area of power cost reduction."

The report also recommended that the Congress, or the President by Executive order, establish a competent objective body to review the original purposes and present activities of the Rural Electrification Administration (REA), adding:

"Farmers are entitled to reasonably priced electrical power, but we do not believe that long-term money borrowed by the United States at about 4 percent and then reloaned the REA at 2 percent should be used to promote competition with private citizens.

"Efficient private producers have proven that they can provide electricity at low cost to the consumer even against competition taking advantage of the artificially low interest rates of REA loans."

The paper went on to say that the REA appears to have changed its emphasis from servicing farmers to the generation and transmission of much of its electricity for "suburbia" or "outer suburbia." It pointed out that the Norris-Rayburn Act which established the REA in 1936, was designed to help bring electricity to rural areas not served by private companies, and was not intended to promote competition with private enterprise.

The report also said that the General Accounting Office had found that major Federal power projects in general do not charge rates sufficient to cover the modest interest charges imposed on them, and recommended that rates charged to users of Federal power be adjusted so that they do not receive an unfair advantage over those receiving their power from private industry.

Other recommendations by the council included:

The Congress should express a national policy on a nationwide electrical transmission grid.

Congress should immediately set a policy on the renewal of licenses for private industry to operate hydroelectric plants.

The Federal Power Commission should be given full authority to deal with private transmission of power on public-land States. The Interior Department now has veto power in such matters.

The Federal Government should maintain a constant surveillance over primary sources of energy; and revise its import or other regulations whenever necessary to maintain exploration, adequate supplies, and equitable prices.

A new review of the peaceful use of atomic energy to determine the areas in which research can be effectively and increasingly supported and to restore the sense of urgency to the development of atomic energy for peaceful purposes which has been forced to yield to the more glamorous and costly demands of space exploration.

Private industry has initiated a technological revolution in the generation of electrical power. Between 1926 and 1962, the average cost of electricity for residential use fell from 7 cents per kilowatt-hour to 2.41 cents. Also, new large generating plants developed by private industry can produce power at a little more than half the cost of small plants.

For all practical purposes, United States is virtually running out of hydroelectric projects that are feasible—that is, economically competitive when compared to power generation by the new processes mentioned above. Yet the Democratic administration continues to place heavy emphasis on what appear to be economically questionable hydroelectric projects.

The text of the report follows:

RESOURCES AND THE FUTURE: ENERGY

Our economy, which is based upon the employment of energy in its various forms, has in recent decades demonstrated a rapid growth in energy requirements.

At the present time, most of our energy is derived from fossil fuels in which the accumulated solar radiation has been stored by plant and animal life over countless millenia. These are the deposits of coal, petroleum and natural gas. While they are finite in amount, exhaustion is not an imminent peril and, in the case of coal, is very far off indeed. We are holding our own (use versus new finds) in petroleum, although it might be argued that in time we may have to reduce usage for stationary energy sources to provide reserves for automotive and aircraft purposes. Any shortage and accompanying price increase might, however, stimulate the production of liquid fuel in large quantities from coal. Therefore, no case for urgency can be made with respect to the short term supply of fossil fuels.

Energy derived from falling water and converted into the form of electricity has been developed in the United States to about the practical limit of its economic and geographic possibilities as will be discussed in more detail later.

The waves, tides, winds, and direct solar radiation all are possible sources of useful energy, but all are either undependable, diffuse, inefficient, low grade, or locality limited. They represent an insignificant part of the presently consumed energy (other than solar radiation in the production of crops), and hence they will not be discussed.

The fuel cell, an interesting development, is not a new source of energy, but a fuel use promising higher efficiency. Present high temperature steamplants approach 40 percent thermal efficiency, a very great improvement over the past 30 years. Fuel cells may be developed eventually to operate at greater efficiencies than this, but, to be significant, the capital cost per installed kilowatt would have to be lower. At present the contrary appears more likely.

Finally, we have nuclear-powered generators of electricity. Only 22 years have elapsed since the first controlled fission chain reaction, and only 10 years since the first plant to produce electrical energy for civilian consumption from nuclear fission was initiated (shippingport). In view of the striking and continuous reduction in the installed cost per kilowatt of capacity and in the production costs per kilowatt hour—to the point where in several parts of the United States nuclear plants are today competitive with conventional coal-fired plants—it is not unreasonable to expect further reduction in the cost of electricity from atomic fission. Nuclear powerplants will be competing, of course, with more efficient steamplants burning coal. In 1920, it required 3 pounds of coal to produce 1 kilowatt hour; in 1940, 1.4 pounds; and in 1960, only 0.7 of a pound. Thus, in the last 40 years, the amount of electricity which could be generated by the same amount of coal has more than tripled. Continued improvement at this rate can hardly be expected, however, whereas nuclear technology is at its beginnings.

Atomic power from the fusion of the nuclei of light elements is a development with vast and revolutionary potentials for the future. Whether the necessary breakthrough in technology is imminent or far distant is unpredictable. Most authorities agree that the principle is theoretically feasible.

THE RECORD

1. Dams for energy and reclamation: In 1902, Republicans established the Bureau of Reclamation and vigorously carried out Federal reclamation of arid lands. Of major reclamation projects today, some two-thirds were created by Republican administrations. These include the gigantic multiple-purpose Hoover Dam, on the Colorado River. Republicans approved and were engaged in the final stages of engineering plans for the Grand Coulee Dam on the Columbia River and Central Valley of California developments, when the Democratic administration took over in 1933. The Grand Coulee, key to the whole Bonneville Power Authority, is the largest dam in that hydroelectric complex.

2. Water and power for the Southwest: The Glen Canyon and Flaming Gorge Dams brought forward the Colorado River storage projects under the Eisenhower administration. This enormous project, one of the most extensive water programs for arid areas yet undertaken by man, will not be completed until after the year 2000.

3. Power on the Niagara: Pursuant to the treaty of 1950 and the subsequent statute, licensing arrangements were made with the New York State Power Authority for developing the electrical resources of the Niagara River and were consummated by the Eisenhower administration. This source supplies power for New York and much of New England.

4. Oil as an energy source is conserved: In 1924, Republicans established the Oil Conservation Board; and, in 1929, oil beneath the free public lands was withdrawn from private entry. The same year a Republican administration initiated the major interstate compact for conservation of oil, which has since come into being among 21 States.

5. Petroleum on the Continental Shelf: Our vast new development of petroleum on the continental oceanic shelf of the United States was initiated and methods for its supervision established under the Eisenhower administration.

6. Self-liquidation policy for public works: A Republican administration established the policy of Federal loans for self-liquidating public works, then financially not feasible by private capital or State funds. Diverting the Colorado River water supply to the Los

Angeles area is an instance. Those loans made by a Republican administration are repayable to the Federal Government.

7. Water and energy from the Mississippi into the Rockies: The so-called Frying Pan project on the Arkansas and Red Rivers, while finally authorized in 1962, was engineered by the Eisenhower administration and repeatedly proposed to Democratic Congresses without avail. This enormous project will assist all South-Central States from the Mississippi to the Colorado Rockies.

8. Atomic energy: The Eisenhower administration made historic contributions toward effective use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes. In 1953, it proposed the establishment of the International Atomic Energy Agency. The Republican Congress of 1954 amended the Atomic Energy Act liberating the development of this great new power source from the heavy hand of Government monopoly. The administration emphasized the uses of the atom in medicine, industry, agriculture, and especially the generation of electricity. The first reactors for commercial civilian power date from the Eisenhower administration.

DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The wise production and use of electrical energy calls for sound working relationships between private enterprise and Government. While public oversight is necessary it must not paralyze private initiative. It is this unique relationship of public to private endeavor which has helped make our country the stronghold of freedom. This relationship is delicate, and judgments on its precise applications can vary among men of good will. For example, the extent of Federal support for TVA financing is an open question among many citizens of each party. So too, in a free society, one man's yardstick can be another man's goad—depending upon who wields it. For these reasons, this paper will deal with clear-cut actions, facts and issues. It will not overstress the realm of judgmental hairsplitting.

Our objective is not an indictment of Democratic policy as a whole. We recognize that within both parties there is room for difference of opinion on the responsibilities of the public and private sectors in the generation, transmission, and distribution of energy—and the relationships of each to the other. We seek, therefore, only to make reasonable criticisms and to emphasize constructive recommendations for the solution of energy problems which the Nation faces.

With respect to some of the key electrical energy questions today facing our people, we think the present and previous Democratic administrations have been deficient, through action in some cases, inaction in others. Moreover, Democratic Congresses, from 1955 to the present, have been unwilling to accept a number of the constructive approaches which we propose.

Fourteen specific subject areas merit discussion:

1. Improvements in energy technology: Vast technological developments have recently occurred in the efficiency of electrical generation plants, but the Federal Government seems inadequately aware of the facts. New steam plants, especially those using coal, generate electricity by the most advanced methods. This is of vital importance in the coal-producing Appalachian area, where attention is now focused on the poverty problem. Private industry has initiated a technological revolution in the generation of electrical power; and new methods of transmission now permit electricity to be sent over long distances with negligible line losses.

By the strategic placement of generating plants (e.g., at the coal mine pit-heads), by improved methods of mining and distilling coal, and by enormously increased efficiency of generation, tremendous savings to consumers are possible. Yet the administration continues to place heavy emphasis on what appear to be economically questionable hydroelectric projects and on providing subsidized REA loans to build small steam generators, many of which are unnecessary.

Small plants are relatively inefficient producers. Studies made 8 years ago clearly demonstrate that the cost of producing electricity by steam varies significantly with the size of the generating plant employed. For example, a 25,000-kilowatt plant will produce power for 13.6 mills per kilowatt-hour, a 100,000-kilowatt plant can produce it for 9.3 mills, a 200,000-kilowatt plant for 8.3 mills, a 400,000-kilowatt plant for 7.7 mills, and a 1-million-kilowatt plant for 7.4 mills. Thus, a 1-million-kilowatt plant can produce power at a little more than half the cost involved in a 25,000-kilowatt plant.

The amount of heat required to produce a kilowatt-hour has declined significantly. In 1926, it was 23,600 B.t.u.'s per killowatt-hour; in 1962, it was only 10,493. The portion of power produced by steam rose from 62.6 percent in 1926 to 79.7 percent in 1962. During this same period, the average cost of electricity for residential use fell from 7.00 cents per kilowatt-hour to 2.41 cents.

This technological revolution is pertinent to the question of power hydroelectrically produced, especially on marginal Federal projects, for the kilowatt-hour costs on some of these planned projects are high to start with.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1

We recommend a detailed study of the relative efficiency of methods for generating electrical power within the United States and the development of a new and constructive Federal power policy which will give due consideration to the demonstrated achievements of private industry in this area of power cost reduction.

2. The scarcity of economically feasible hydroelectric projects: For all practical purposes, the United States is virtually running out of feasible hydroelectric projects—that is, projects which are economically competitive when compared to power generation by the new processes mentioned above. One example is the Knowles Dam project in Montana; the electrical generation costs are expected to run from 10 to 20 mills per kilowatt-hour. Another example is the Devils Jumps Dam project on a tributary of the Cumberland River in Tennessee and Kentucky on which the cost would approximate 12 mills per kilowatt-hour, computed on a comparable basis with privately financed plants and normal amortization. (Compare these with the new steam generation cost of 7.4 mills per kilowatt-hour for large installations.)

While these projects doubtless have agricultural, recreational, or aesthetic benefits, their overall economic advantages in electrical generation are marginal, and they can be justified only by placing exaggerated emphasis on criteria other than cost. It would be possible to build dams in every river in the United States for hydroelectric purposes and justify them, if the standards are loose enough. This characteristic taints the economic justifications for proposed hydroelectric projects on which the taxpayers' dollars may be imprudently expended.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 2

We recommend that the study mentioned in No. 1 be completed and the criteria therein developed in judging the economic justification as well as the feasibility of hydroelectric projects before contracts are let on pending proposals.

3. Standards for determining the feasibility of justifying multiple-purpose projects: The present administration has rewritten the standards for justifying new multiple-purpose hydroelectric projects, thus permitting justification for marginal projects such as those described above.

The previous standards for justifying multiple-purpose hydroelectric projects had been in existence for a decade; and were far from stringent. Yet, in 1962, the administration felt it necessary—presumably in order to open the gate for more projects—to draw up a new set of standards. The old standards were loosened by extending the period of projecting costs and benefits (the cost-benefit ratio) from 50 years to 100 years.

Extending the standards to apply 100 years hence raises obvious questions. It is no more possible today to foresee conditions in 2064 than it would have been to project 100 years forward in 1764 or 1864. Technological and population changes are certain to render any 100-year projection completely obsolete. Furthermore, since Federal Power Commission licenses to private concerns are limited to a maximum of 50 years, a private company cannot even calculate on a 100-year amortization, and there is thus a built-in discrimination against private capital.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 3

We recommend that the present standards for justifying multiple-purpose projects be discarded in favor of a new and realistic set of criteria. We recognize that certain elements, such as recreation, navigation, or flood control, are not readily susceptible to so-called user charges; nor can such benefits be estimated with accuracy under present standards. But the present procedure which often compares the cost of apples with the benefits of bananas is so loose that almost any project can be justified.

4. A nationwide electrical transmission grid: Congress has never authorized an electrical transmission grid across the Nation. Yet, segment by segment, Federal agencies appear to be working to accomplish this. The proposed 900-mile high-voltage interconnection between the Bonneville area and the Hoover Dam is one example.

If the Congress wishes to authorize a nationwide transmission grid, or a series of regional grids, we believe it should say so. Certainly this objective should not be accomplished by bureaucratic subterfuge, or in unplanned bits and pieces.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 4

The Congress should express a national policy on high-voltage, cross-country transmission grids for electrical energy to be adhered to by all Federal agencies.

5. Executive differences with the views of the Federal Power Commission: The Democratic members of the Federal Power Commission are appointees of the Democratic administration, yet the executive branch often works at cross purposes with the recommendations of the Commission. This seems to us unfortunate. There should be unified Federal policy on the development of the Nation's electrical energy resources, worked out on an impartial basis. The Department of the Interior, as owner of land or as a special pleader, should not set the policies.

An example of harmful policy conflict is the effort of the Interior Department to preevent private industry from developing the high Mountain Sheep Dam in Idaho. The Federal Power Commission evidently held a contrary view. In substance, the Federal Power Commission found it necessary to disagree with the Interior Department for trying to spend public funds when private resources were available to achieve approximately the same purposes.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 5

The policies for Federal development, transmission and distribution of electrical energy and the rates charged to the consumer therefor should be decided primarily by a bipartisan Federal Power Commission. It is detrimental to the public interest that the viewpoints of the Federal Power Commission and the Interior Department should be uncoordinated. This subject should have the prompt attention of the Congress.

6. Uncertainties facing private industry as the present Federal 50-year hydroelectric licenses come up for renewal: Many existing important hydroelectric plants operated by private industry are under 50-year licenses, some of which will come up for renewal by 1970. Private industry is in a dilemma concerning further investments in the generation, transmission, and distribution facilities, because of uncertainty over license renewal. This uncertainty is a deterrent to new industries which might locate in areas where they could contribute to employment and local prosperity.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 6

The Congress should promptly establish a Federal policy on such license renewals, and this policy should not discriminate against private industry over Government ownership.

7. Veto power on the dispatch of electrical transmission lines on public lands: Since the Eisenhower administration left office, the Interior Department has sought to establish control over the terms, conditions, and uses of electrical power transmitted by lines across land owned by the Federal Government. The Federal Power Commission has taken issue with this position of the executive branch. We believe the Federal Power Commission is right in its contentions.

In the 17 Western States the supervision of vast public lands by the Interior Department results in virtual control over all aspects of long-distance transmission of electrical energy. The extent of Federal ownership of Western land is frequently not realized. The chart below indicates the percentage of land owned by the Federal Government in five States:

	Percent
Nevada	85.5
Utah	68.4
Oregon	51.9
Idaho	64.6
Wyoming	48.2

Since the Interior Department administers the land, private companies, which may wish to transmit power over any large area in the West, are in a position (under the Interior Department's indicated policies) where they can operate only by submitting to conditions imposed not by the Federal Power Commission but by the Department of the Interior.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 7

We recommend that the Federal Power Commission, free of dictation by the Interior Department, deal with the private transmission of power in the public-land States. The Interior Department should not have veto power in such matters.

8. The lack of adequate hydrological studies: It has now been more than a decade since the first Hoover Commission strongly recommended that more Federal emphasis be placed on obtaining better hydrological data in the United States. The Eisenhower administration, through the President's Advisory Committee on Water Resources Policy (PACWRP), made strides in this direction. Since 1961, this effort has received inadequate encouragement.

The recent, outstanding study of the Task Force on Coordinated Water Resources Research of the Federal Council for Science and Technology has made a valuable contribution to the Nation in this respect, but the recommendations of the study have not been implemented. The task force, under its distinguished Chairman, Dr. Roger Revelle of the University of California, was concerned with water primarily for its use by human and industrial consumers. However, the recommendations for better hydrological information apply in a parallel way to the need for more information in this area in connection with the generation of hydoelectric energy.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 8

We endorse the proposals of the Revelle Task Force, since obtaining more data about water will apply to its usefulness in generating electrical energy. We believe the Federal system for obtaining hydrological data should be materially expanded and the agencies involved better coordinated.

9. Coordination among Federal agencies: Under the Eisenhower administration, a significant step forward was taken in coordinating the numerous Federal agencies concerned with generating electrical power, through the creation of PACWRP (see above).

Under PACWRP, policy differences were greatly reduced, in marked contrast to the problem of the Missouri River during the late forties, when it became necessary to organize an ad hoc coordinating group for the Missouri River Basin alone. The so-called Pick-Sloan plan for the Missouri River Basin was then developed and hailed as evidence that Federal agencies could work together and reconcile the views of two organizations with different objectives. In this instance, one was concerned primarily with flood control and navigation, the other mainly with irrigation. There was not enough water in the Missouri basin to supply all needs, and bureaucratic compromise could not alter that fact. Yet, the Pick-Sloan plan demonstrated a need which was met in considerable degree in the Eisenhower administration, though nothing since has been done along this line.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 9

The President should insist upon coordination among executive agencies concerned with generating and transmitting electrical energy.

10. The new emphasis in REA on transmission and generation facilities: The Norris-Rayburn Act, establishing the Rural Electrification Administration (the REA), was approved by Congress in 1936, with the announced purpose to bring the advantages of electricity to rural areas. A "rural area" was defined as any portion of the Nation which was not included within the boundaries of a city, village, or borough with a population of more than 1,500 persons. This definition of area is now construed to cover much of suburbia or outer suburbia.

Senator George Norris, of Nebraska, author of the act, convinced the Congress that the law was needed to make electricity available to farms and at reasonable prices. The private power industry had naturally concentrated where the need per capita was greatest and where the demand would make the financing of facilities feasible.

It is amazing to realize that only four decades before the enactment of the Norris-Rayburn Act virtually all of the United States was lighted and fueled by coal, gas, kerosene, and the like. The private electrical generating industry rose during the first three decades of the 20th century from insignificant beginnings into the most important industry in the United States.

Like all of our dynamic fields, the electrical power industry had severe "growing pains." It did not have enough trained people to service the entire United States; and high population density areas were stressed. Private industry serviced major rural areas where the load was adequate, such as central New York State, with its power requirements for dairying, and California, with its irrigation pumping needs. But, the general farming area was not so served in 1936 when the REA was created. Senator Norris correctly pointed out that this was because adequate loads did not exist in most rural areas.

In 1936, 89 percent of all farms were without central service electricity. In 1964, the situation has completely reversed itself; 98 percent of all American farms are electrified through central station service, and most of the remaining 2 percent could be so serviced readily. In this respect, we believe the REA has realized its purpose.

In recent years, however, the REA has placed major emphasis on the building of transmission and generation facilities and on supplying electrical energy to suburbia and outer suburbia. This was not the purpose of the Norris-Rayburn Act. Now that nearly all of the farm population has been supplied with electricity, the REA, as is the common experience with bureaucracies, has sought ways of perpetuating and expanding itself. In the few years since the Eisenhower administration left office, borrowings from the REA to set up facilities for generation and transmission of electrical energy have greatly increased and the trend is sharply upward.

If rural areas are lacking in generation and transmission facilities, they should by all means have them, but we believe it unwise to finance such facilities with Federal funds where adequate and existing private facilities already exist. Numerous examples bear out this point; for instance, the Patuxent area of Maryland and in southern Indiana. In both cases, taxpayers' money was unnecessary since private facilities were available. These recent policies of the REA are not the purposes of the law as expressed by its original congressional sponsors.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 10

We recommend that the Congress by resolution or the President by Executive order establish a competent objective body to review the original purposes and present activities of the REA. Farmers are entitled to reasonably priced electrical power, but we do not believe that long-term money borrowed by the United States at about 4 percent and then reloaned through the REA at 2 percent should be used to promote competition with private citizens. Efficient private producers have proven that they can provide electricity at low cost to the consumer even against competition taking advantage of the artificially low interest rates of REA loans.

11. New steam-generating plants of the REA bypassing Congress: As mentioned in item No. 10, the REA appears to have changed its emphasis from servicing farmers to the generation and transmission of electrical energy for consumers not engaged in agriculture. One aspect of this is certainly open to question. On repeated occasions, the Congress has refused to appropriate funds for steam-generating plants as supplements to Federal hydroelectric power projects because private facilities were available. The Congress was obviously unmindful of the fact that hydroelectric power is often sporadic, depending upon rainfall, and that therefore hydroelectric power usually needs to be supplemented with standby steam-generated power. The questionable point is that REA loans have been made apparently to build steamplants for which the Congress had refused to grant funds. Here are examples:

1. 1962—Colorado-Ute Cooperative: The REA provided $21,602,000 toward financing a 150,000-kilowatt steamplant to firm up power from the Colorado River storage project.

2. 1962—Basin Electric Power Cooperative: A $36,600,000 loan was made to build a 200,000-kilowatt steamplant, most of the power from which will be disposed of to firm up Missouri Basin power.

3. 1963—Upshur Rural Electric Cooperative: A REA loan of $9,170,000 was made to build a 33,000-kilowatt steamplant and transmission lines. The Southwestern Power Authority will buy most of the power and lease the transmission lines.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 11

The Congress should, by suitable legislation, restrain the REA from financing the construction of steamplant power-generating facilities as supplements to hydroelectric projects in cases where the Congress itself has refused to appropriate funds specifically for such facilities.

12. Comparable rates: Consumers located where they may buy power from Federal projects usually obtain it at a price well below its true cost of production. This is unfair to power consumers who are not so fortunately situated, yet who pay taxes to subsidize the power for others. This inequity to taxpayers and to privately owned utilities is a consequence of several factors.

First, Federal power projects are usually tax exempt. Consumers of electricity supplied by investor-owned electric companies must bear through their electric bills a significant tax burden. In most instances, this amounts to about 23 to 25 percent of the cost of electricity, yet those who obtain their power from Federal projects, in most instances, do not have to pay such taxes.

Second, rates charged to consumers for power from most Federal projects are intended by law to return interest on the unamortized power investment at only 3 percent or less per year. Since it costs the Federal Government about 4 percent to borrow money of a comparable maturity, the result is a subsidy given a few power consumers at the expense of many others.

The Comptroller General of the United States, an agency of Congress, found that the Missouri Basin power projects, from their inception to the end of fiscal 1960, had lost a total of $51,778,000. The Southwestern Power Administration and its appended power projects, from its inception in 1944 through 1961, had lost $50,105,000. The Columbia River Power System, on its power operations, had lost $53,320,000 from 1958 through 1963. The Southeastern Power Administration, on its power operations from 1955 through 1960, had lost $20,400,000. The sum of these losses was a gift to the users of this power, paid for by taxes collected from citizens in other areas.

Thus, the General Accounting Office has found that major Federal power projects in general do not charge rates sufficient to cover the modest interest charges imposed on them.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 12

The rates charged to users of Federal power should be adjusted so that the users of such power do not receive an unfair advantage as opposed to those who do not receive their power from federally subsidized projects.

13. The fossil energy source materials:

Coal: In terms of tonnage, the coal industry is unique in that it has remained relatively static for years. In 1962, the use was as follows: industry 24 percent; coke 20 percent; electricity 48 percent; retail 8 percent; remainder, ammonia and other special chemicals. Recent U.S. production of coal is 440 million tons per annum (1962), about one-seventh of the world production. Coal and natural gas are almost perfectly competitive for the cost of electricity production, about 25 cents per million B.t.u., averaged over the United States (local factors favor one over the other of course). Oil is about one-third higher in cost.

Coal reserves are calculated on the assumption that 50 percent of the known quantities in the ground are "recoverable," depending on technology and economic demand. On the basis of this 50 percent, the present reserves in the United States are 83×10^{10} tons. At 1962 rates, we are then mining 0.05 percent per annum. In other words, at 10 times the present rate of use and with no new finds, we have a 200-year supply—i.e., no case can be made for an imminent shortage of coal.

Natural gas: Probably one of the fastest growing areas of energy source is natural gas, which is increasing at 5 percent per annum. In 1962, a total of 13.9×10^{12} cubic feet were sold. In 1960, the breakdown was 6.5×10^{12} industrial, 4.1×10^{12} residential and commercial, and 1.8×10^{12} field (i.e., losses, etc.).

In the year 1961, proven reserves (economically and technically recoverable) were 275×10^{12} cubic feet. Under present use rates, this is a 20-year supply but both use rates and new finds are increasing so rapidly that this figure does not have much meaning, as is also true in the coal industry.

Petroleum: In 1962 the petroleum-use picture was—gasoline, 1.6×10^{9} barrels; distillate, 74×10^{7} barrels; residual, 5.6×10^{7} barrels; kerosene 16×10^{7} barrels (mostly jet fuel); other, 74×10^{7} barrels, including losses, export, etc.

The total demand was 3.8×10^{9} barrels, and the world supply was 8.8×10^{9} barrels, so that U.S. use runs around 40 percent. Net U.S. imports are around 70×10^{7} barrels per year or less than 8 percent of use.

The present U.S. proven reserves (under present technology and price structure) are 31.4×10^{9} barrels.

It is generally believed that large reserves of both oil and gas probably lie elsewhere awaiting discovery on this continent and on the coastal shelf.

If an equitable relationship of imports to domestic production is maintained, these energy resources should remain adequate for the foreseeable future. The Eisenhower administration worked out such a policy of balanced relationships in 1959.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 13

The Federal Government should maintain a constant surveillance over primary sources of energy and revise its import or other regulations whenever necessary to maintain exploration, adequate supplies, and equitable prices.

14. Atomic energy: As previously noted, the Eisenhower administration gave particular encouragement to the peaceful uses of atomic energy, and notable successes were achieved. The first nuclear reactor to produce electrical energy for commercial use was initiated during the Eisenhower administration and built at Shippingport, Pa., with large contributions from private industry.

The cost per kilowatt-hour of electrical energy derived from the fission of uranium, which was estimated at 3 to 10 times the cost of conventional power in 1954, had been reduced by the ingenuity of American scientists and engineers until at the end of the Eisenhower administration plants were under construction whose output was competitive with steam-generating plants in the same areas of the Nation.

Thus, while no early exhaustion of fossil fuels appears to threaten us, and while technology is continually reducing the cost of electrical energy derived from fossil fuels, the remarkable strides in the reduction of power costs from nuclear energy will stimulate a healthy competition to make electricity still cheaper for consumers.

An important research project in the area of nuclear power development is the theoretical feasibility of producing electrical energy from the fusion of light elements such as hydrogen and deuterium. This project, research upon which was meagerly supported until 1953, was given the encouragement of needed appropriations beginning in that year. Very great progress has been made since, but a breakthrough in technology is yet to be achieved. Both the British and Soviet Governments are now believed to have come abreast of our former position of leadership in this area of research. The British effort is said to exceed ours, whereas the Soviet effort is reported to be 200 percent greater than ours.

The significance of power from fusion, if it can be achieved, is (a) the fuel supply is unlimited since it exists in all bodies of water, and (b) the cost of power so produced would be a fraction of present power costs. We understand that this line of research in our own laboratories has been reduced both in priority and support. We believe this to be shortsighted.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 14

We recommend a new review of the peaceful uses of atomic energy to determine the areas in which research can be effectively and increasingly supported and to restore the sense of urgency which seems to have yielded to the more glamorous and costly demands of space exploration.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, this is pursuant to my considered practice of having introduced all of their reports into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

THE SITUATION IN VIETNAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a group of outstanding Republican leaders in the other House has recently seen fit to deliver themselves of a tirade on policy in Vietnam. I am not surprised that the partisan political knives should be drawn on this issue. What amazes me is that they have come out of the sheaths so early. I can only conclude that they are intended to be used in a preliminary rumble in San Francisco as a warmup for the political war later on.

Let me make clear, Mr. President, that I am not deploring discussion of the Vietnamese situation. It is a serious situation. Any light which can be shed upon it by serious discussion in the House, in the Senate, or anywhere else, for that matter, is to be welcomed.

But a statement which labels the effort being made by thousands of Americans in South Vietnam, and at a cost of many American lives, a "why win" policy is not serious discussion.

Any statement which classifies the complex problem of Vietnam, which has confronted us through the Eisenhower, the Kennedy, and the Johnson administrations, as one peculiarly associated with the latter alone, is not serious discussion.

Any statement which describes a policy that has seen 16,000 American troops, vast naval and air forces deployed in southeast Asian waters, and billions of dollars spent in a region of limited unilateral American interest, as a policy of "pervasive softness," is not serious discussion.

Any statement which assumes that this Government can take operational control of the forces of another nation without assuming, at vast cost in lives and resources, total responsibility for what happens in that nation—in short, any statement which assumes that the purposes of freedom can be achieved in an alien land with an army of foreigners and some bargain-basement techniques of command, is not serious discussion.

Any statement which, in the manner of Colonel Blimp, assumes, from a map, that the mountains, sea, jungles, and rivers—thousands of miles—of the external South Vietnamese borders and of the borders of Vietcong-held areas within that nation can be sealed off, not with tens of thousands, if not hundreds of thousands of U.S. forces, but with a wave of a statement, is not serious discussion.

Fortunately, Mr. President, there are Republicans who understand the situation in Vietnam from a firsthand experience with it. I refer particularly to our recent Ambassador in Saigon, Mr. Henry Cabot Lodge. He knows the meaning of what we are attempting in Vietnam and in southeast Asia. He knows the realities of the situation which confronts us. He knows the course of policy which offers the best hope of success. We shall not hear from him any comment about "why win" or "pervasive softness." Here is what we shall hear from him—and I quote from Associated Press dispatch No. 52, on June 30, 1964:

> In Vietnam the aim of the struggle is to create a proper political atmosphere. That's how you beat the Communists there. The minute you've created a proper political atmosphere the war is over. That's why I was encouraged by the report I received just before I left Saigon that people are no longer feeding the Communists. I don't see the need for more troops in Vietnam. I think our policy there of relying on the Vietnamese to win with our help is the right policy.

Mr. President, the statement of the House Members to which reference has been made is not an invitation to serious discussion. It obscures the real questions with respect to Vietnam which confront the people of the United States. These questions do need, and should have, discussion. We do need public clarity on rational objectives of policy, not only for Vietnam, but also for all of southeast Asia. We do need public discussion of the means for achieving these objectives—of the military and the diplomatic channels which may be open or can be opened for dealing with the problems of that region which involve not only the United States, but, first and foremost, the people of the region itself, and, in a larger sense, the Chinese, the Russians, the Australians, the British, the French—indeed, in an ultimate sense, all of the people of the world.

That sort of discussion would be helpful to any President, Republican or Democrat, in this serious situation, as he strives, for all of us, to pursue a course which will safeguard our national interests, bring about peace, and preserve the opportunities for freedom in southeast Asia, at the lowest possible cost in American lives.

That is what President Johnson is attempting. Can any President attempt less? Can any President do more?

Mr. President, the Republican task force also made a statement about the weakness of the Nation's military position. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a news release by the Secretary of Defense, Robert S. McNamara, dated June 29, 1964, in reply to that segment of the statement, and also a portion of the remarks made by the President of the United States at the Coast Guard Academy, at New London, Conn., on June 3, 1964.

There being no objection, the news release and the excerpt from the President's remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[News release, Office of Assistant Secretary of Defense (Public Affairs), Washington, D.C., June 29, 1964]

Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara today issued the following statement:

"I read with regret the partisan attack on our Nation's military program contained in the report of the Republican policy committee's task force on American strategy and strength.

"The national defense has always been a bipartisan activity of the U.S. Government. To date Republicans as well as Democrats have supported the national defense program of the Kennedy-Johnson administration. Such support was given to our very first actions in 1961, which were to submit supplemental budget requests that increased the defense budget of this country by $6 billion for fiscal year 1962. From the beginning of this administration through our current request for fiscal 1965, there has been an increase of $28 billion over the level of spending that prevailed during the last year of the previous administration. These much needed increases have received bipartisan support throughout the country as a whole as well as in the Congress.

"As a result of these increases, the national security of this country has been greatly enhanced. Since January of 1961, there has been—

"A 150-percent increase in the number of nuclear weapons available in the strategic alert forces.

"A 50-percent increase in our strategic bombers on alert.

"A 60-percent increase in the tactical nuclear force in Western Europe.

"A 45-percent increase in the number of combat-ready divisions.

"A 75-percent increase in airlift capability.

"A 100-percent increase in funds for general ship construction and conversion to modernize our fleet.

"A 175-percent increase in the procurement of airlift aircraft.

"A 100-percent increase in the procurement of tactical aircraft.

"A 44-percent increase in the number of tactical fighter squadrons.

"An 800-percent increase in the Department of Defense Special Forces trained to deal with counterinsurgency threats.

"A 15,000-man increase in the strength of the Marine Corps.

"Since 1960, the intercontinental ballistics missiles and Polaris missiles in our arsenal have been increased from less than 100 to over 1,000 and the number of Polaris submarines in commission from 2 to 21.

"Today the intercontinental ballistic missile force of the United States is more than four times that of the Soviet Union.

"As for the future, our research and development program has laid the foundation for a continuing increase in our military strength. Since 1961, there has been—

"A 50-percent increase per year in the total funds expended on research and development over that prevailing during the last 4 years of the previous administration.

"An addition of 208 major new projects. These include 77 weapons programs with costs exceeding $10 million each, including such major ones as the medium range ballistic missile, the F-111 fighter-bomber and the new main battle tank.

"An increase in expenditures for the development of counterinsurgency weapons and equipment from less than $10 million in 1960 to over $103 million requested for fiscal year 1965.

"A 54-percent increase in our antisubmarine warfare research and development program in our fiscal 1965 budget request over 1961.

"This tremendous increase in strength could not have been accomplished without the closest cooperation between military and civilian leaders. As Gen. Lyman L. Lemnitzer said when he was Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff: 'I am in constant touch with the Secretary, and through me, or in direct consultation with the Chiefs themselves, he obtains the views of the Joint Chiefs of Staff,' and 'I would like to reiterate it here, there is the closest possible working relationship between the civilian officials in the Defense Department and the Joint Chiefs of Staff.'

"Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, who succeeded General Lemnitzer as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, reaffirmed the existence of this intimate working relationship between the military and civilian leadership in the Pentagon in February of this year. And in June of 1963, General Taylor said, 'the voice of the American soldier is entitled to a serious hearing in our national councils—and I am happy to report that he today receives that hearing.'

"I am confident that there will continue to be the closest of working relationships between the military and civilian leaders of the Pentagon."

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT THE COAST GUARD ACADEMY, NEW LONDON, CONN.

We, as well as our adversaries, must stand in awe before the power our craft has created and our wisdom must labor to control. In every area of national strength America today is stronger than it has ever been before. It is stronger than any adversary or combination of adversaries. It is stronger than the combined might of all the nations in the history of the world.

And I confidently predict that strength will continue to grow more rapidly than the might of all others.

The first area of this increasing strength is our ability to deter atomic destruction. In the past 3 years we have increased our nuclear power on alert 2½ times, and our nuclear superiority will continue to grow until we reach agreement on arms control.

We have more than 1,000 fully armed ICBM's and Polaris missiles ready for retaliation. The Soviet Union has far fewer, and none ready to be launched beneath the seas. We have more than 1,100 strategic bombers, many of which are equipped with air-to-surface and decoy missiles to help them reach almost any target. The Soviet Union, we estimate, could with difficulty send less than one-third of this number over targets in the United States.

Against such force the combined destructive power of every battle ever fought by man is like a firecracker thrown against the sun.

The second area of increasing strength is our ability to fight less than all-out war. In the past 3 years we have raised the number of combat ready divisions 45 percent. They can be moved swiftly around the world by an airlift capacity which has increased 75 percent. Supporting tactical aircraft have been increased over 30 percent, and the number of tactical nuclear warheads in Europe has been raised 60 percent. We, and our NATO allies, now have 5 million men under arms. In addition we are now ready to mobilize large reserves in the event of conflict. Six divisions, with all supporting units, can be moved into action in a few weeks.

And we are continuing to build our forces. In a few years our airlift capacity will be five times what it was in 1961. Advanced weapons and equipment are flowing to our armies. Our fleet is being modernized through a decade-long shipbuilding program. And new tactical aircraft are being built.

A third area of increasing strength is the struggle against subversion. Our adversaries, convinced that direct attack would be aimless, today resort to terror, subversion and guerrilla warfare. To meet this threat we began a large effort to train special forces to fight internal subversion. Since January 1961 we have increased these specialized forces eight times. We have trained more than 100,000 officers in these techniques. We have given special emphasis to this form of warfare in the training of all military units.

Our Army now has six Special Action Forces on call around the world to assist our friendly nations. They are skilled in the languages and problems of the area in which they are stationed. The Navy and Air Force have several thousand men whose abilities, training, equipment and mission are designed to combat clandestine attack. And behind these groups are five brigade-size backup forces ready to move into instant action.

But just as subversion has many faces, our responses must take many forms. We have worked to increase and integrate all the resources, political and social as well as military and economic, needed to meet a threat which tears at the entire fabric of a society.

But success in fighting subversion ultimately rests on the skill of the soldiers of the threatened country. We now have 344 teams at work in 49 countries to train the local military in the most advanced techniques of internal defense.

Subversive warfare is often difficult, dirty, and deadly. Victory comes only to those with the desire to protect their own freedom. But such conflict requires weapons as well as will, ability as well as aspiration. And we will continue to increase this strength until our adversaries are convinced that this course too will not lead to conquest.

The fourth area of increasing strength is in the development of new weapons for deterrence and defense. In the past several years we have begun many important new weapons systems. Minuteman II will have twice the accuracy of the first Minuteman. The new Nike X, when its development is completed, will give us the option to deploy, if national security requires it, the best antiballistics missile available to any nation. We are developing a new aircraft, the F–III, with much greater range, payload, and ability at air combat than present tactical bombers or fighters.

The Lance missile, the EX–10 torpedo, the A–7A attack aircraft, a new main battle tank, new antitank missile systems, are the emerging products of development that we are carrying on. And that effort is without parallel in all the world. We will continue to carry forward new projects which offer hope of adding substantially to our strength. I can assure the American people that the United States is, and will remain, first in the use of science and technology for the protection of the people.

DEPLORABLE FINANCIAL STATUS OF CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I offer for the RECORD a brief statement describing the deplorable financial condition in which the Children's Hospital of Washington, D.C., finds itself as a result of inadequate funds being made available to it, both through charity and through public sources.

The story is relatively complicated, but I have prepared a chronology as of Friday, June 26, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORANDUM RE FINANCIAL CONDITION OF CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL: CHRONOLOGY AS OF FRIDAY, JUNE 26

1. The Senate added $110,000 to the deficiency appropriation for the District of Columbia for fiscal 1964 for reimbursement increases to Children's Hospital for care of indigents.

2. The House knocked this out in conference, and the conference reports were approved in both Houses. (See Washington Post story of June 4.) But the statement of the managers on the part of the House said: "Deletes the proposal of the Senate to increase the rates paid to Children's Hospital. The managers on the part of the House feel this matter should be the subject of consideration in connection with the regular District of Columbia appropriation bill for 1965."

3. In an excellent editorial, the Washington Post on June 15 called upon the Commissioners, the administration, and Congress to save the Children's Hospital.

4. Thereafter, on June 17, President Johnson sent a message to the Congress containing an amendment adding $160,000 to the District of Columbia appropriation request for fiscal 1965 to increase reimbursement rates to Children's Hospital for care of indigents. (See text of message, and Washington Post story of June 18.)

5. This money is desperately needed, and it is crucial that the Appropriations Committee act promptly to meet the request.

But the $160,000 is only part of the story and will not solve the problems of the Children's Hospital created by its service without charge to indigent children in the community.

What is needed is to redefine the term "indigency" so that the hospital can be reimbursed for caring for those who are in fact unable to pay, although they do not meet the present legal criteria of "indigency." (See the excellent Washington Post editorial of June 19.)

6. The true plight of Children's Hospital is hard to appreciate for anyone who is not closely familiar with the situation. A real insight is supplied by President Kauffmann's memorandum, which is attached.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent also to have the following items printed at this point in the RECORD:

First. A news story from the Washington Post of June 14, 1964, entitled "Hill Conferees Reject Plea for Aid to Deficit-Hit Children's Hospital."

Second. An editorial, also from the Washington Post of June 15, entitled "Unpaid Bills."

Third. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an amendment to the budget for the District of Columbia.

Fourth. A news story from the Washington Post of June 18, entitled "L.B.J. Seeks Funds for Children's."

Fifth. An editorial under date of June 19, published in the Washington Post, entitled "To the Rescue."

Sixth. A copy of a proposed draft of a special report to the board of directors on the state of the Children's Hospital.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, June 14, 1964]

HILL CONFEREES REJECT PLEA FOR AID TO DEFICIT-HIT CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL

(By Dorothy Gilliam)

House-Senate conferees rejected a bid for help to financially ailing Children's Hospital yesterday despite pleas from House Speaker JOHN W. MCCORMACK, Democrat, of Massachusetts.

Their action dashed hopes for relief for the hospital during the current fiscal year.

It was understood that House conferees argued during the closed meeting that additional money for the hospital would constitute payment of a subsidy to a private institution and might create a precedent for other District hospitals.

Senator JOHN O. PASTORE, Democrat, of Rhode Island, reportedly made a strong plea for the $110,000 request—part of the $1.4 billion deficiency bill approved earlier by the Senate—which would have permitted the city to increase payments to the hospital for the care of needy children.

The House-Senate conference referred the matter to the District Appropriations subcommittees of both Houses for action in the city's budget for the fiscal year beginning July 1.

The House earlier denied the Commissioners' $110,000 request, but the Senate approved funds to help in the hospital's financial emergency. Rejection by the House-Senate conference came as a surprise because of House Speaker MCCORMACK's endorsement earlier this week.

The hospital has a current operating deficit of $476,000. The hospital board has authorized an emergency fund raising campaign to keep the institution open. Dr. Robert Parrott, hospital director, yesterday expressed "surprise and disappointment" over the conference action and said the board would now have to "examine very closely" what the hospital can do for needy children over the summer.

"I would hope that the Appropriation Committees of Congress," he said, "will examine the entire situation and take action in the upcoming fiscal year to allow the District government to assume a fuller part of its responsibility for the care of District youngsters."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, June 15, 1964]

THE UNPAID BILLS

Under the lash of hard necessity, the District Commissioners are at last considering the simplest and most obvious solution to the impending disaster at Children's Hospital. The city must reform the crabbed and perverse rules that govern a child's eligibility for medical aid.

Children's Hospital loses about $300,000 a year in the unpaid bills of children who are indigent by every definition but the Health Department's. Unlike the city's own clinics, the hospital cares for sick children regardless of their eligibility for medical aid. The hospital's deficit is currently running above half a million dollars a year, and within a few months the hospital will be as destitute as the least prosperous of its patients.

Out of over 100 children whom the hospital admits as indigents, the Health Department considers only about 50 to be eligible for public medical aid. The hospital cares for the others, certainly, but the whole cost of that care is borne by the hospital itself.

Thirty out of every hundred indigent patients are ineligible because the Department's family unit rule creates a void of responsibility. Under the law, a child's parents are responsible for the hospital bill. Under the family unit rule, any relative living in the same house is responsible. In a typical instance, the hospital discovers that a child's mother, abandoned and penniless, lives with relatives. The city then refuses to pay the child's bill becaues the relatives have incomes. But the law gives the hospital no right to recover from the relatives. Since neither the city nor the relatives will pay, then, the hospital bears the whole cost of caring for the child.

Another 5 or 10 cases in every 100 are ineligible because of the man-in-the-house rule. The man is not the child's father and cannot be made to pay; the city refuses to pay in the name of what it calls morality.

In the remaining 10 or 15 cases, the child is ineligible because his family's income exceeds the permitted levels. A family of five is permitted to earn only $260 a month to be eligible for public aid. Since slum families in Washington characteristically pay extortionate rents, it is quite possible for parents with three children to earn more than $260 a month and yet remain totally incapable of paying large hospital bills.

All three of the District Commissioners are kindly men, and no doubt they would like to help Children's Hospital. Certainly the Health Department is most anxious to reform its regulations. But Congress has insisted upon the old eligibility rules, and the Commissioners have been notoriously reluctant to press Congress on the point. It is a particular misfortune that Commissioner Duncan, who is charged with questions of health and welfare, should have shown so little interest in them over these past 3 years. In the present emergency, the initiative seems to be coming from the White House and the Budget Bureau. Perhaps the great distress of Children's Hospital will finally force the Commissioners, the administration and Congress all to realize the dangerous and mindless unreason of the city's medical aid regulations.

AMENDMENT TO THE BUDGET FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—COMMUNICATION FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES TRANSMITTING AN AMENDMENT TO THE REQUEST FOR APPROPRIATIONS TRANSMITTED IN THE BUDGET FOR 1965 IN THE AMOUNT OF $160,000 FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

(June 17 (legislative day, March 30), 1964.—Referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed)

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, June 17, 1964.

THE PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE OF THE SENATE.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith for the consideration of the Congress an amendment to the appropriation request made in my 1965 budget for the District of Columbia in the amount of $160,000.

This proposal is intended to provide assistance to Children's Hospital, which has for many years been much more than a valued community resource. Talents and devotion have brought the hospital to a position of leadership in research and in the development of programs covering all aspects of child care. The hospital has borne a large burden in caring for children whose parents were unable to pay sufficient sums to meet the cost of services rendered. The District government must assume a proper share of the cost of caring for these District children. This budget amendment is an appropriate step in that direction, and I am instructing the District officials to continue their study of other appropriate measures.

The details of this amendment, the necessity therefor, and the reason for its submission at this time are set forth in the attached letter from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, with whose comments and observation thereon I concur.

Respectfully yours,
LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D.C., June 17, 1964.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House.

SIR: I have the honor to submit herewith for your consideration an amendment to the request for appropriations transmitted in the budget for 1965 in the amount of $160,000 for the District of Columbia:

District of Columbia funds

Budget page (District of Columbia volume)	Heading	Request pending	Proposed amendment	Revised request
33	Health and welfare (Delete the paragraph under this heading and insert in lieu thereof the following:) Health and Welfare, including reimbursement to the United States for services rendered to the District of Columbia by Freedmen's Hospital; [and] for care and treatment of indigent patients in institutions, including those under sectarian control, under contracts to be made by the Director of Public Health; *and purchase of three passenger motor vehicles, including two for replacement only;* [$70,526,048] *$75,656,000: Provided*, That the inpatient rate and outpatient rate under such contracts, *with the exception of Children's Hospital*, and for services rendered by Freedmen's Hospital shall not exceed $34 per diem and the outpatient rate shall not exceed $5.75 per visit [,]*; the inpatient rate and outpatient rate for Children's Hospital shall not exceed $40 per diem and $6.75 per visit;* and the inpatient rate (*excluding the proportionate share for repairs and construction*) for services rendered by Saint Elizabeths Hospital for patient care shall be [at a rate of $9.49] *$9.74 per diem: Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be available for the furnishing of medical assistance to individuals sixty-five years of age or older who are residing in the District of Columbia without regard to the requirement of one-year residence contained in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1946, under the heading "Operating Expenses, Gallinger Municipal Hospital," and this appropriation shall also be available to render assistance to such individuals who are temporarily absent from the District of Columbia: *Provided further*, That the authorization included under the heading "Department of Public Health," in the District of Columbia Appropriations Act, 1961, for compensation of convalescent patients as an aid to their rehabilitation is hereby extended to the Department of Vocational Rehabilitation.	$75,496,000	$160,000	$75,656,000

This proposed supplemental appropriation is to adjust the per diem and outpatient rates payable to Children's Hospital to more closely reflect audited costs. It will also enable the District of Columbia to relieve existing overcrowding in the pediatrics ward of District of Columbia General Hospital through the transfer of healthy babies, who are wards of the city, to Children's Hospital for care on a reimbursable basis.

I recommend that the foregoing amendment to the budget for the fiscal year 1965 be transmitted to the Congress.

Respectfully yours,
KERMIT GORDON,
Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, June 18, 1964]

LBJ SEEKS FUNDS FOR CHILDREN'S—ASKS HILL TO VOTE $160,000 TO MEET HOSPITAL NEEDS

President Johnson sent to Congress yesterday a proposal to award hard-pressed Children's Hospital $160,000 in the 1965 budget.

The President, in his message, said in part: "The District government must assume a proper share of the cost of caring for these District children. * * * I am instructing the District officials to continue their study of other appropriate measures."

In doing this, the President thus endorsed a plan worked out by District Commissioners and Charles A. Horsky, White House adviser on District affairs, with the help of the Budget Bureau and hospital representatives.

Horsky said yesterday he was delighted with the President's action. Study will continue on ways to help all District hospitals give more and better care to families who need treatment but can't afford it.

OPERATING AT A LOSS

Deep in financial trouble Children's Hospital has been operating at a loss for 3 years. It is operating at a deficit of $470,000 in the current fiscal year.

Hospital officials have warned they may have to close the doors to indigent children or even shut down altogether.

The budget amendment endorsed by the President would provide a total of $160,000 in the 1965 budget. Of this, $90,000 would go to cover the District's cost of reimbursing the hospital at a rate of $40 a day for inpatients and $6.75 a visit for outpatients.

The District is presently limited to paying $34 a day for inpatients and $5.75 for outpatient visits. The proposed increases will more closely reflect audited costs to the hospital, the Bureau of the Budget said.

AID TO PEDIATRICS WARD

The remaining $70,000 of the $160,000 will enable the District to relieve existing overcrowding in the pediatrics ward of District of Columbia General Hospital by transferring healthy babies who are wards of the city to Children's Hospital on a reimbursable basis.

At any given time there are about 20 babies under the age of 6 months who have become wards of the city either through abandonment or because they have no suitable homes.

Horsky said study will continue on the cost of easing the city's stringent standards governing hospital care for indigent children. This proposal would affect all hospitals here, including District of Columbia General and Children's.

This District is forbidden presently to reimburse hospitals—for treatment of persons from families above certain income levels. These levels have been criticized as too low.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, June 19, 1964]

TO THE RESCUE

President Johnson has accurately perceived the value of Children's Hospital to this community, and he has acted swiftly and effectively to rescue it from financial disaster. He has asked Congress to permit the District to spend an additional $160,000 on the care of indigent patients there. The hospital's desperate circumstances are wholly due to its tradition of treating all children who require it, regardless of their ability to pay.

The city has systematically paid the hospital less than it costs to care for these children; the President proposes to raise the public payment much closer to the actual price of treatment. He also proposes to have the hospital care for some of the healthy infants, abandoned or orphaned, who are now crowded into District of Columbia General Hospital.

But even if Congress appropriates the entire $160,000 requested, that sum represents only one-third of the hospital's current annual deficit. The greatest part of its loss is incurred in caring for children who are indigent in fact but not in law. The city's definition of medical indigence is a catalog of irrelevancies, and it must be completely rewritten if the hospital's deficit is to be ended. Very clearly, the city ought to pay for those children whose parents cannot. Perhaps the President can find the opportunity in a supplemental appropriation bill later this year to provide the city with a just and businesslike rule of responsibility for its sick children.

SPECIAL REPORT TO THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS ON THE STATE OF CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL

(By Rudolph Kauffmann II, president)

The time has come to state frankly and bluntly that the National Capital area community, including the Government, must find some means during the year of 1964 to relieve Children's Hospital of the District of Columbia of the mounting financial deficits which are incurred on behalf of indigent infants and children and which present revenues from all sources are incapable of meeting.

The alternative is that the community will lose its major child health resource at the time of its fullest potential as a complete child health center.

Unless: (1) The Government proves willing to provide substantially increased support for the care of indigent patients and to broaden its definition of indigency; or (2) private citizens come forward with more than twice the annual sustaining funds they are now providing, or both, the directors and corporate members of the hospital must:

1. Close its doors to all but patients able to pay for their care, or, if this does not suffice;
2. Offer its facilities to some larger institution such as a university or general hospital;
3. Hand over the institution to the Government; or
4. Seek dissolution of the institution employing whatever assets it possesses to satisfy its creditors.

CHILD HEALTH PROGRAM AT STAKE

These rather stark alternatives, paradoxically, are faced at a time when the hospital has developed and is offering a fully rounded child health program such as that demanded by the responsible citizens of most other major communities in the country. One of thirteen such institutions in the Nation and the third oldest such institution in the Nation, Children's has never in its history been in a position to provide as high caliber of hospital care to children as it is at the present time. For example:

Its director is a nationally recognized pediatrician.

Its active and courtesy staffs of practicing physicians in the Washington area include recognized leaders in their professions.

Its full-time research and teaching staff supplies a diagnostic team that supplements and complements the skills of the community's practicing physicians and that has few peers in the Nation.

Research grants, under which many of the hospital's physicians are developing new tools to prevent and cure the diseases and defects of children, now total in excess of $1 million annually.

Its teaching program, under which resident physicians from many parts of the Nation and countries overseas, students at George Washington University and Georgetown University Medical Schools, and student nurses from more than 16 schools of nursing, injects a steady stream of qualified practitioners into the life of the community, of the Nation, and of the world. Thousands of sick children benefit as a result.

Special organizations affiliated with the hospital, such as the Child Welfare Society, which specializes in keeping the well child well; the Hearing and Speech Center, which treats and schools children with hearing and speech defects; and the Hillcrest Center for Emotionally Disturbed Children, under the medical direction of the hospital's Department of Psychiatry, add their special skills to round out the hospital's ability to minister medically to children.

LARGE INVESTMENT

To support the work of this many-sided and many-skilled professional team, without which the hospital would be little but bricks and mortar, the corporate members and directors of the hospital have in the last two decades invested $5,800,741 of privately donated funds, matched by $2,220,406 of public funds made available under congressional authority to create the facilities that modern medical knowledge must have to implement itself, and to provide the quality of hospital care that the public is entitled to and that it has a right to expect.

But, to state the positive side of the question, to boast of the professional progress of Children's Hospital, immediately raises a question: Why the problem?

Why, with so much in the way of facilities and medical know-how, does Children's Hospital present a paradox? Why is it that the better it gets the more nearly it approaches what in the case of a business institution would be bluntly called bankruptcy? Why must it be said bluntly and frankly that the institution stands with its back to the wall?

Stated simply the answer to this question is to be found in the fact that all costs of hospital care are increasing and that the reimbursement sources for the care of charity patients have not kept pace. Approximately half of the patient days of care in the hospital and 90 to 95 percent of the children admitted for treatment in its clinics are charity cases falling into one or another of several categories. A majority of these cases reside in the District of Columbia. In the case of just 40 percent of these District of Columbia charity cases the hospital is reimbursed, but in part only, by government. But the rest, or more than half of the District of Columbia charity cases are in effect treated free as the following will illustrate:

Proportion of medically indigent District of Columbia children found to be eligible for District of Columbia government reimbursement on admission to Children's Hospital

Ineligible: "Family unit rule"	25
Ineligible: Supplemental income from "man in house"	12
Ineligible: "Over income"	23
Eligible for Government reimbursement	40

In these cases, the ones for whom no reimbursement from any agency or government source is received, the unfortunate fact is brought about by the application of welfare-type eligibility standards set by Congress for the District of Columbia. These require that if the earnings of a "family unit" or "man in the house" computed collectively with the income of actual parents, are in excess of certain arbitrary maximums, no tax support for the medical care of children involved in such situations may be obtained. The maximum gross allowable income level itself in most instances is hardly sufficient to cover the cost of food, shelter, and clothing, much less medical or hospital care. For example, the maximum monthly income for a family of four to qualify for tax supported medical care is $230 per month.

When such standards involve medical care and when they affect in concentrated form a large number of patients at a single institution such as Children's Hospital, their application has a devastating effect on the financial operation of the institution. It is hard to believe that those who support these standards and implement them intend either to destroy the city's major child health institution through their application or to abandon the health care of thousands of infants and children.

Even in the instance of patients who qualify for government reimbursement the funds allocated provide reimbursement only at a rate far below the actual cost. Thus, 40 percent of the District of Columbia charity cases admitted to the hospital are cared for at a substantial loss because the rates of reimbursement for such care do not meet the cost of care and the remainder of charity cases are cared for at what amounts to a total loss.

This remains true although every effort is made to obtain part payment for care given patients ineligible for support from a third party. However, even in cases where some family income might be available it is impossible to hold responsible for payment individuals who bear no legal responsibility for the existence of or for the support of a child. Certainly it is impossible to repossess the health of the child to whom care has been given and for whom payment on a budget plan has not or cannot be made.

The following statistics will illustrate in specific detail how losses occur, particularly on children eligible for public support:

TABLE I.—*Operating income and expenses for the last 5 fiscal years*

Year ending—	Operating income after allowance and free service	Operating expense	Operating loss
June 30, 1963	$2,656,317	$3,240,885	($584,568)
June 30, 1962	2,518,280	2,689,089	(170,809)
June 30, 1961	2,048,266	2,331,423	(283,157)
June 30, 1960	1,855,229	2,186,553	(331,324)
June 30, 1959	1,740,618	2,159,641	(419,023)

TABLE II.—*Losses on Health Department eligible indigent patient services for fiscal year 1963*

	Children's cost	MAD reimbursement rate	Units provided	Loss
Inpatient	$40.15	$32	10,556	$86,031
Outpatient	10.55	5	26,857	149,054

TABLE III.—*Projected losses incurred on Health Department eligible patient services fiscal year 1964*

	Children's cost	MAD reimbursement rate	Units provided	Loss
Inpatient	$46.07	$34.00	7,548	$91,104
Outpatient	11.13	5.75	30,255	162,772

But to this loss is added an additional estimated loss on care of indigent patients not eligible for government or agency support—

an amount just under $300,000 in fiscal year 1963, for example.

HOW LOSSES HAVE BEEN MET IN PAST

There is nothing new in Children's Hospital operating at a deficit. It has done so, with minor exceptions brought about by windfall donations, throughout its modern history, and presumably throughout its entire history. After all, it was founded as a charitable institution. And it has tried to conduct itself as one, its board of directors having been guided by the statement in its original charter below:

"Be it known to all whom it may concern, that we, * * * citizens of the United States, and of the District of Columbia, have associated ourselves together pursuant to the provisions of the 3d section of the act of Congress, approved May 5, 1870, entitled "An act to provide for the creation of corporations in the District of Columbia by general law," for the purpose of establishing a charitable institution in said District, to be used as a hospital and dispensary for the treatment of the medical and surgical diseases of children, where all such may be treated gratuitously: *Provided, however,* That the board of directors may provide for the admission of sick children whose parents or guardians may be willing and able to defray the expenses thereof."

To implement this policy, and to fulfill its obligation to the community as set forth in its charter, it has sought and obtained from generous friends and supporters substantial funds. Also it has received specific endowments and unrestricted bequests, made to it because it was a charitable institution.

In the period covered by the statistics above, for instance, it sought and obtained annual donations through its annual sustaining fund appeal and its annual Christmas card appeal as follows:

TABLE IV.—*Gifts and donations from sustaining fund and Christmas card appeal*

Year ending—	Card appeal	Sustaining fund	Total
June 30, 1963	$31, 163	$116, 446	$147, 609
June 30, 1962	27, 698	103, 599	131, 297
June 30, 1961	75, 806	102, 206	178, 012
June 30, 1960	53, 556	91, 018	144, 574
June 30, 1959	61, 828	------------	61, 828

And it received in this same period unrestricted bequests totaling $837,642, more than half of which was required for day-to-day operations.

To meet its deficits it has, of course, spent the revenues from these appeals. It also has spent to finance its day-in-day-out operations not only the income from an endowment fund of $1,243,479, but also all of the income from and $445,000 of the capital of funds that have come to it in the form of unrestricted bequests.

To sum up, it has been ready, willing, and able to spend nonoperating income and capital in the period under review as follows:

TABLE V.—*Expenditure of nonoperating income and capital for recent 5 years*

Year ending June 30, 1963	$440, 821
Year ending June 30, 1962	389, 080
Year ending June 30, 1961	407, 282
Year ending June 30, 1960	367, 549
Year ending June 30, 1959	243, 075

But the hard fact of the matter is that taking nonoperating income and capital from all available sources into account, it now finds itself with only $143,000 to meet deficits that are averaging $40,000 each month.

STOPGAP APPROPRIATION REQUIRED

To find some way to avoid the inevitable financial collapse of the hospital, the officers of the board of directors have taken their case to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia who have agreed to ask Congress for a supplemental appropriation of $110,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964. The amount of this request is based on reimbursement for units of service which the hospital provided solely for patients ruled eligible for tax support at a rate somewhat greater than that presently provided but less than the hospital's audited cost of care. If this is granted it will provide only temporary relief.

The hospital is informed that the Government of the District of Columbia is precluded from making exception to the prevailing strict rules of eligibility for health care. Presumably only Congress itself can order relief from losses in this category by specifically exempting the medical care of children from the eligibility rules. If the hospital is to survive, or at least survive in its present form, relief of both sorts is necessary.

INDIGENT CARE VITAL PART OF CENTER

This immediately suggests an important question which the community not only has every right to ask but should ask:

Why not send the patients who are causing these losses and who in many communities would be the responsibility of the taxpayer, to the city's public hospital, the District of Columbia General Hospital?

The answer to this question also falls in several parts:

1. District of Columbia General Hospital already is caring for a capacity patient load of children.

2. Except under emergency conditions, the thousands of indigent children who are not eligible for Government reimbursement at Children's Hospital are not eligible for care at District of Columbia General Hospital. In fact, without Children's Hospital, there is no place to provide their health care needs under present regulations.

3. Thus, Children's Hospital cares for as many, and in some cases more, sick children who cannot pay for their care than does District of Columbia General Hospital. It serves the northerly sections of the city for Government-eligible patients in the same way as District of Columbia General serves the southerly sections of the city. It is, therefore, the other half of facilities for such care and traditionally has been treated as the privately operated half of a public-private partnership devoted to caring for the city's sick poor children, having been expanded and modernized to do the job by the investment of over $2 million of matching Government funds in recent years. There is no "third" place for them to go in any important numbers.

4. Children's Hospital has been planned and staffed and its plant has been financed to do this job. In fact it was doing it as the sole such institution in the District of Columbia before the creation of a children's unit at District of Columbia General Hospital. Perhaps it should be compared to an eight-cylinder automobile; its operation could hardly be cut in half by removing four of the cylinders, and it is doubtful it would run at all in such a condition. To put it another way, Children's Hospital's ability to perform the charity task is built into its total function as a children's medical center providing the finest of health care for all types of patients, including those who can pay. Thus, if the institution remains prepared to meet fully the child health needs of the community, it is doubtful that important savings could be realized from simply turning away sick children even if they arrived at the door properly tagged "eligible" or "ineligible" which, of course, they do not.

5. In order to carry out the care of the charity patients at less expense and to provide a stimulus to improved care for all patients and to fulfill a responsibility as a complete medical center, the hospital has, over the years, developed some of the country's best recognized training and research programs in child health. While the presence of teaching programs allows the charity care to be carried out at lesser cost, it is also true that the presence of charity or "ward" patients allows a stronger teaching and research program. A significant cutback in charity patients would in proportion diminish the strength of the teaching and research programs as well as narrow the spectrum of available health care services. And, at some point, it could no longer serve as well the purpose of educating young doctors and nurses. It might no longer attract and hold highly skilled specialists who gravitate to an institution because of teaching and research opportunities thus concentrating for the benefit of the entire community in one place a central pool of specialized medical skills. If Children's Hospital were bereft of this concentrated team of specialists there would be little real justification for its existence. That function could just as well be fulfilled by adding beds for children at each of the general hospitals of the community.

Thus a specialty hospital like Children's is a meld of complex and interdependent parts. Take one part away and the whole tends to fall apart and become, relatively speaking, a nonessential community asset.

PROGRAMS GEARED FOR PAYING PATIENTS AS WELL AS INDIGENT

At this point another question suggests itself: Why does not the hospital make more of an effort to attract more paying patients to meet the competition of the general hospitals, particularly suburban hospitals conveniently located in higher income areas?

The answer to this is that all of the programs are intended to meet the needs of infants and children in the best possible way and thus to "attract" paying patients whose parents wish the best of medical and surgical care for their infants and children despite certain inconveniences of travel.

Since World War II the facilities of the hospital, including a new main building, research center and a modern diagnostic and treatment center (together costing $5,800,741, $3,580,335 of it privately donated and $2,220,406 of it in matching Government funds) have been improved and expanded because the hospital recognized that changing times made it imperative that it equip itself to care for difficult and highly specialized cases in addition to routine cases that would gravitate inevitably to neighborhood hospitals. Thus, it has laid the groundwork for maintaining a reasonable increase in private patient load. But such a program bears fruit slowly.

The medical board of the hospital is active in bringing to the attention of referring physicians the importance of having available an institution qualified to cope with the difficult and complex ailments of children; also the importance of supporting such an institution despite considerations of convenience.

BROADER PUBLIC GIVING WOULD MATCH GOVERNMENT SUPPORT

And, still another question is: Since Children's Hospital is a charitable institution, and, since private givers in the Washington area have proven themselves willing to support it through their donations and bequests, why doesn't the hospital increase its efforts to obtain more such support from the community?

Once again, the answer must be complex rather than simple:

The hospital has indeed increased its efforts over the past 3 years to solicit funds from individuals on the basis of a list of known friends and supporters of the institution. The list of contributors now includes the majority of those individuals who traditionally and in the light of the trend toward unified appeals to support community charity can be expected to support such an institution in addition to their support of unified fund drives and their responsibility to the many other demands made upon their incomes by other worthwhile charitable, educational and cultural institutions and organizations. The next step in any effort to supplement present private support for Children's Hospital charitable work would have to be either a request for an increased level of giving by those who have traditionally supported the hospital or a much broader, public type, appeal. The board of directors of the hospital believes that such an additional appeal would receive much greater reception if the effort were to be matched closely by the Government's assuming its fair share of the financial burden for the medical care of the poor.

CAN NATIONAL CAPITAL AFFORD NOT TO HAVE MAJOR CHILD HEALTH CENTER?

In the final analysis there are the questions: Can the Nation's Capital continue to afford a specialized institution devoted to the all around medical care of children? Also, what will happen if Children's Hospital ceases to exist in its present form?

The answer to these questions lies at the heart of the matter.

Of all places in the world, the Nation's Capital should feel that it can afford to travel first class in this respect. Children deprived of the corrective health measures that modern medicine is capable of providing may grow up to cause the community vast expense in terms of institutional care for adolescents and adults, in terms of delinquency and crime, in terms of unemployment brought about by physical and mental handicaps. Such ills can be prevented if the skills represented by the core of dedicated men and women brought together on a team basis such as those at Children's Hospital are brought to bear on a solution to these problems at an incipient stage.

This kind of child health care is available and needed and used at Children's Hospital now, not only by the indigent family but by families at all income levels, including those on the Government payroll. It is used, for example, by the families of Members of Congress and of the diplomatic corps.

The hospital and its various programs have been selected for visits by royalty, visiting statesmen and professional persons from all over the world.

Infants and children in families who may not even have heard of the hospital have benefited indirectly from its presence by and through the fact that it is training doctors and nurses in the finest of child health practice, is carrying out research to understand and combat children's problems.

But the Nation's Capital is beset by many problems. It may be that the specific problems of the future existence of Children's Hospital in its present form—a children's medical center, evolved through nearly a century of devotion to child health into the force for good in the community that it now is—cannot be salvaged in the context of life as it exists in the Nation's Capital today.

This statement of the situation represents what amounts to a last resort. If it fails of response, the corporate members of and directors of Children's Hospital will be forced to make such adjustments and to adopt such solutions as the hard realities of the situation dictate.

RUDOLPH KAUFFMAN II,
President, Children's Hospital of the District of Columbia.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I invite the attention of my colleagues to the desirability of the Congress rallying to the rescue of this splendid institution which may be forced to close its doors unless finances are provided for it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business?

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the rule of germaneness be waived for a very minor remark.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Is there further morning business?

REPUBLICAN STATEMENT OF AMERICAN POLICY ON VIETNAM

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, a few minutes ago the distinguished majority leader [Mr. MANSFIELD] commented upon the statement made by some 55 Republicans in the House on Vietnam.

I have read the statement. I do not agree with one portion of it, at least. That portion is, as I remember, that it recommended that American commanders should take command of the Vietnamese troops. I rise nevertheless to say—as I happen to be one of the few Republicans on the floor at this time—that I believe this statement, whether the Senator agrees with it or not, or I do, brings into play the very debate that he, himself has recommended, that Vietnam should be discussed, and discussed openly and objectively.

I might also say, without any attempt to compare this particular statement with other statements that have been made in the Senate, that policy in Vietnam has been discussed on the floor of the Senate for months. Some Members of the majority have been, almost daily, very critical of the administration's position on Vietnam. The majority leader, himself, has an alternative to the program of the administration in Vietnam.

I would not want to stop by making these comments. I believe that it is necessary to maintain the strength of our troops in Vietnam, a strength capable of maintaining our position.

I believe also that every possible alternative should be considered which would be helpful. I would advocate a convocation of the Geneva Conference, not with the purpose of agreeing to neutralization, but with the purpose of seeing if there is any possibility of any agreement that would recognize two separate, sovereign countries, and support for the position, and support against the continued aggression and subversion of North Vietnam. Thus could lead, I hope, to the establishment of multilateral patrols along the borders.

I think such a convocation might involve the possibility, however doubtful it may be, of staying increased military movements which could lead to escalation and final confrontation of the United States and Communist China.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. COOPER. I do not agree with the entire statement made relating to American command of the Vietnam forces, but the House Members have the right to state their positions.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the Senator may be extended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so agreed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am not at all averse to a reconvening of the Geneva Conference to consider the situation in Laos. I am not at all averse either, under certain circumstances, to a reconvening of the Geneva Conference of 1954 covering the situation in Vietnam and the other parts of what used to be known as French Indochina. But I certainly cannot imagine the Senator from Kentucky, with his wide experience as a diplomat, as a member of the State Department, and as a member of the U.S. delegation to the United Nations, agreeing to a proposal which would make that a war under direct American military command and control in a foreign country.

Mr. COOPER. I just said that I did not agree with such a suggestion. I said that the majority leader took occasion to criticize the proposal, which I do not agree with; but I must say that almost every day Senators, on his side, are disagreeing with the administration position.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct.

Mr. COOPER. The majority leader himself has offered alternatives, constructive proposals, I believe that alternatives should be constructive.

Mr. MANSFIELD. As I said in my remarks, I welcome discussion. All I hope is that the discussion will be constructive. I do not care for opposition on the part of either Republicans or Democrats for the sake of opposition. If a Senator is going to oppose, he should come forth with a constructive alternative, if he finds fault with a policy which the Nation has in effect at the time he makes his remarks or offers his solution.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I wish to address myself to the subject under discussion. I am grateful to the majority leader for remaining while I do so. It is interesting that the report of the task force on the part of the Republican Party in the House is side by side with the report of Ambassador Lodge to the people of the United States and to the President. I wish to identify myself with that group which believes, regardless of party, that we must stick it out in Vietnam. I do not believe that we ought to pull out. I believe there is too much at stake for us to pull out. Also I do not believe that we should overtly extend the war into North Vietnam, which has been recommended by some. I feel that while Senators, as the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] has said, have every right to speak and should be encouraged to speak and have been encouraged to speak their views, I cannot accept the proposition that any American President would not wish to win a struggle in which American lives and the destiny of freedom are concerned. I do not believe that there should be any implication in their statement, much as they may differ with the policy which is involved.

The majority leader has called for constructive suggestions.

First, there is no question about the fact that a U.N. role in the problem is essential. In my judgment, we should press for a U.N. role—at least some role along the borders which are allegedly being infiltrated, as Vietnam is an independent and sovereign country.

Second, there is a complete inadequacy of cooperation with us by allies who ought to be as deeply interested as we. I do not make that statement in any sense of remonstrance, but it is a direction for activity by the United States. The war is Australia's war as much as our own. It intimately threatens Australia's future freedom and security. The war is Malaysia's war. It is a war of the Philippines. It is also a war of Taiwan, or the Republic of China on Taiwan. It also deeply involves Japan. Those are at least some of the nations. It is next door to Taiwan, one of our strongest and firmest allies in that area of the world. An American overture of the most urgent kind is required to obtain cooperation from other nations in Asia.

Third, the success of freedom is involved. Therefore, the job of economic reconstruction in the country of India, the Government of India, and its security against the Chinese Communist incursions—all of these are critically important, just as is the defeat of the effort to subvert the new Government of Malasia. It is critically important that we make a success in those struggles because they reflect on the whole position in southeast Asia.

Finally, I have great pride in the bipartisan foreign policy forecast practiced by Arthur Vandenberg, and followed by Eisenhower, Nixon, and the other leaders of our party up until today. I am deeply pledged to it. I intend to stand with it in the policy I have outlined which, I believe, with respect to Vietnam, I am following in the finest traditions, offered for us and our allies, and which has also been joined in on our other side by the late Secretary Cordell Hull and other leaders, along with the late President Kennedy and President Johnson.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record communications I have received from people across the country who thoroughly disagree with U.S. policy in Asia.

There being no objection, the communications were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

New York, N.Y., *June 24, 1964.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Building, Capitol Hill,
Washington, D.C.:

Keep up fight against Vietnam fiasco. Your words make sense.

Mike Spector.

Tacoma, Wash., *June 29, 1964.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

You have done a world of good already by your masterful responses to interrogators Scalley and Rawlson on "Issues and Answers" yesterday. No acknowledgment necessary.

Rex S. Roudebush.

San Francisco, Calif., *June 29, 1964.*

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We applaud and support your courageous and well reasoned stand on American policy in southeast Asia.

Dr. and Mrs. Raymond.

Los Angeles, Calif., *June 28, 1964.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on your appeal for legality, commonsense, and peace on "Issues and Answers."

Sidney Meyer.

Brooklyn, N.Y., *June 17, 1964.*

Hon. Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

My Dear Senator Morse: The country and the world owe you and Senator Gruening a debt which it will never be able to fully repay. Attacking official U.S. policy is many times not only irresponsible but impossible. Irresponsible because those people making policy have access to information not generally known which may greatly influence the solution picked for the problem in question. Impossible because the President, Secretary of Defense, and Secretary of State are always on the front pages of newspapers and magazines and always on the radio and television news broadcasts. Their opinions and ideas are generally known. The other side often goes unnoticed. We do not always think about the unthinkable. Thus, the administration can much more easily build up their support than can the opposition.

This is the case presently with Vietnam. Here, opposition has been impossible but not irresponsible. As a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee you have had access to all the administration's information—or at least whatever they have been willing to let you see. Even so, until recently only the Congressional Record and a very few newspapers presented the opposition point of view. The first time that the TV mentioned that you were making speeches on Vietnam was when a channel two reporter, speaking on the progress of the civil rights bill, said that you again interrupted the "debate" to speak on McNamara's war. No mention was made of your reasons for this opposition. Indeed, the way he made mention of your speech was in a contemptuous way—as if you were wasting the time of the Senate.

Recently, however, several newspapers have, at least, mentioned your name. This is a beginning. More people are now talking about Vietnam and when the Senate takes up the foreign aid bill the Vietnam debate will really get going.

I do not support present U.S. policy in Vietnam. I do support taking the issue to the United Nations where it belongs. The war is probably a civil one since not many Communist Chinese or North Vietnamese are directly involved but this may be debatable. How important the war really is to our security and in terms of such intangible things as American lives and material things such as money and arms may also be debatable. But what is not debatable is that our policy toward this war in Vietnam is a part of the larger issue of whether we want for ourselves and our children a world of law, or "liberty and justice for all" or as President Kennedy said in his inaugural address: "A new endeavor, not a new balance of power, but a new world of law where the strong are just and the weak secure and the peace preserved." Or whether we want a world based on the jungle law of military might with "the intoxication of power, constantly increasing and constantly growing subtler. Always at every moment * * * the thrill of victory, the sensation of trampling on an enemy who is helpless. If you want a picture of [this] future, imagine a boot stamping on a human face—forever." (George Orwell in "1984".)

The one depends on nations forever taking arms to settle disagreements, the other on an expanded use of international organizations such as the United Nations—to talk, to settle disputes by reason and facts, not force and arms.

At a time when we are extending the boundary of law at home must we leave it in Vietnam? Daniel Webster once said that "whatever government is not a government of laws is a despotism, let it be called what it may." Today, I say that whatever world is not a world of laws is a despotism, let it be called what it may.

To you, Senator Morse, and to Senator Gruening I say please continue to speak out against our unnecessary, illegal, and immoral actions in Vietnam.

Sincerely,

Neil M. Horwitz.

Brooklyn, N.Y.

I would also like to take this time to commend you, Senator Morse, for your stand on civil rights. Few people have ever been as consistently right on so many important issues as you have been. When history records these days it will be seen that you were one of the Senators most responsible for so strong yet just a bill being passed by Congress.

I would like to pose several questions:

1. Under cloture, I thought that only the civil rights bill would be discussed and that, for example, there would be no morning hour or no nongermane speech, even on the Senator's time, would be allowed. Which of these was the intent of the Senate?

2. On Thursday, June 11, 1964 a modified Ervin amendment was passed 80 to 16. It added a new section 1102 to the bill. Under this amendment, if a man commits a crime and has his day in court and then later commits the same crime can he be tried again? If originally he was tried for say, contempt arising under his first crime, can he, for the second crime, be tried for the crime itself?

3. Briefly, if possible, what was the Motorola case?

4. On "The Making of the President, 1960" last week it mentioned your running for President against the then Senator Kennedy. I presume that this was in the Oregon primary. Is this correct and what was the results?

Thank you, Senator Morse, for letting me take some of your so valuable time. Once again, please continue speaking out against our policy toward the war in Vietnam. Again, thank you very much.

Neil M. Horowitz
(Again).

Los Angeles, Calif., *June 14, 1964.*

Hon. Senator Wayne Morse.

Dear Senator: I want to congratulate you on your remarks concerning the southeast Asia area and situation.

I hope we listen to your advice and bring neutrality and peace to that area instead of destruction.

Keep up your remarks in the interest of peace.

Yours truly,

Gary Alexander.

San Francisco, Calif.,
June 14, 1964.

Dear Senator Morse: I have read some of your remarks on our foreign policy in southeast Asia. I believe you are doing a great job. Someone in the Senate has to try to bring some sanity to our policy in that part of the world. If we continue as we are going, South Vietnam will turn, at best, into another Korea.

We are getting in a position of no return. Please keep up your vigorous attacks on our policy in Asia. I, like you, feel we should take our problem to the U.N. If the U.N. isn't good enough for us, it won't be good enough for anyone else. It takes much more than money to keep the U.N. as an effective force. It takes the U.N.'s faith in its machinery, or the U.N. will become just a sightseeing attraction in New York and follow the footsteps of the League of Nations. George Bernard Shaw either said or quoted someone else who said, "The only thing we learn from history is that we don't learn from history." The time in southeast Asia is growing short.

Please keep up your magnificent efforts. Many Americans are behind you.

Very truly yours,

Gilbert B. Friedman.

Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada.

Senator Wayne Morse,
The Senate,
Capitol Hill,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: I live in Vancouver, Canada, and heard your interview with Station CJOR, Monday, June 4. If I was a praying man I would flop down on my knees and thank God that there is a little spark of sanity yet in the United States. Everything you said was exactly according to facts and your estimation as to the solution right now also squares with the development and stage that the world is in, re the newly emerging nations and those waiting to be born, South America, etc.

Your interviewer is still befuddled by cold-war semantics and brainwash. Communism won't overrun or move into any country, no matter how small, until the present way of life has broken down and the people themselves want a change. I'm afraid time is running out on us and we need many more voices like yours with courage and understanding to let their fellow Americans realize that they do not have this holy mission bestowed upon them to force their way of life on the rest of the world. It wasn't humanly possible to make more blunders and mistakes than U.S. internal and foreign policy has and if they pursue this line, we surely face annihilation.

Once more the thanks of many, many thousands of Canadians and surely men of good will all over the world for your brave stand against such great odds.

Very sincerely yours,

Mr. E. Engle.

Algonac, Mich., *June 10, 1964.*

Dear Senator Morse: I compliment you on your true and courageous statements re: our activities in Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos, etc., today.

It is many a day believe me since we have heard a Senator in U.S. Congress stand up and tell the truth as you did.

It is a terrible thing when any people can no longer trust their government to tell the truth. We are being lied to all along the line.

Scully's argument was really something to behold—i.e., that we should not take the time to take on disgraceful adventure in Vietnam, etc., to the United Nations as that would give "the Communists time to take over."

If the people of Vietnam think communism more suitable to their needs than our famous "free enterprise" which is a polite name for monopoly today, then all our vicious war against those poor people will never change their minds but will only strengthen their hatred of United States as indeed it should.

Scully's assertion that we have not violated our international agreements was sickening and idiotic—he can lie so brazenly because he knows how brainwashed the average American is by monopolistic control of all means of communications.

As for that pathetic creature, Stevenson, how can you adequately express the contempt any citizen can feel for him?

But thoughtful people are profoundly thankful for men like you and Senator Gruening and a few others (how pitifully few) and I'll bet your words today will be heard around the world.

More power to you my dear sir, if we survive as a nation with any self-respect at all it will be because of men like you, not little bootlickers like Adlai Stevenson. What a figure he cuts before the U.N.

In sincere appreciation of your honest efforts on behalf of country.

D. Florence Fagg.

Santa Barbara, Calif.

Senator Morse.

Dear Senator: I enjoyed your viewpoint on Vietnam on "Face the Nation."

Would like to see you appear on other networks.

Mrs. Katherine Berman.

San Francisco, Calif.,
June 16, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: I should like to thank you for the fine stand you have taken on the Vietnam situation that we are now unfortunately involved in. To begin with, our Government (or CIA) has no right infringing on other people's rights of self-determination. Then, to claim that there are foreign invaders, that the people ask for defense, and to go ahead and perpetuate a war fraught with dictatorships, torture, lies, and misinformation to the American people is a terrible disgrace. Please continue your fine work.

Sincerely,

Drew Langsner.

Santa Monica, Calif.,
June 15, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Hon. Senator Morse: We fully support your views as expressed on "Face the Nation" with regard to the war we are conducting against South Vietnam. We believe that in view of the pressures exerted for our Government greater participation in South Vietnam (as witness program of June 14, Marguerite Higgins, etc.), it is imperative that you repeat your talk on TV in the very near future before we as a nation become embroiled beyond recall in a nuclear all-out war.

In profound appreciation for your humanity and sanity.

Respectfully,

Mrs. G. Bloom.

Philadelphia, Pa.,
June 27, 1964.

Dear Senator Morse: I admire the moral patriotic stand you have taken on the dirty little war in Indochina. Long may you teach the people.

James Dugan.

Moorestown, N.J.

Dear Mr. Morse: I heard your broadcast on ABC radio June 28 and am in agreement with your thoughts on the Vietnam situation. I support your efforts to advance your foreign policy philosophy and as a private citizen will be glad to aid you in any way I can.

Sincerely,

Emalie M. Smith.

Dear Senator: I listened to you on the TV program today. You were great. Now if you could be seen by more people on TV or be quoted in the managed press.

With best wishes.

Zack Korn.

Andover, Mass.,
June 29, 1964.

Dear Senator Morse: Do keep plugging for meeting at United Nations to help keep the peace.

Very truly,

Edith Kitchin.

P.S.—Saw you on TV last night.

June 28, 1964.

Dear Senator Morse: As a former resident of the Pacific Northwest I am proud to congratulate you on your civilized stand on the Vietnam war.

Regards,

D. S. Herskowitz.

Newton Pueblo, Colo.

Sir: Admiring your talk on today's program, please keep up the good work. It was with the keenest appreciation that I listened to you. Somebody has to speak out and trust you will continue to do so. I'm no pacifist nor the other way either although I have 10 years' service under my belt. I see no earthly use of sending more troops to Saigon or any other place over there.

J. E. Wickeryou.

June 25, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

I listened to your interview with Nancy Dickersen of NBC's "Today" program this morning—subject of "The War in Vietnam," and I want to say my husband and I agree with every word you spoke.

More power to you and may you have some influence to stop our country from trying to police the entire Asian Continent.

We can't dictate to our neighbors and I think as a country (of which we are proud) we should quit trying to dictate the policies of other nations.

Mrs. Wm. Schuchart.

Dearborn, Mich., *June 26, 1964.*

Hon. Senator Wayne Morse,
The U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: May we congratulate you on your stand on South Vietnam. We listened to you on the "Today" show and also Frank Church with the opposite view. We need more people like you to point the way back to our country's basic principles and our Constitution, especially to younger people in public office—Frank Church. Our Constitution perhaps should be read in its entirety to each Senator every 6 months or so.

We are with you all the way too on the failure of the United States to utilize the United Nations. Most smaller nations and most Americans probably wonder why it hasn't been used.

Congratulations again and best wishes for great success in your stand.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. Ray E. Goeboro.

Pittsburgh, Pa.,
June 27, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: I have been wanting to congratulate you for quite some time concerning your enlightened opinions on foreign policy. I certainly hope you continue to work as effectively as you know how towards a more realistic Vietnam policy, and other policies.

It is a pleasure to read your speeches in various magazines. It is indeed a shame that the newspapers don't hardly give you any coverage.

You have my deepest gratitude for your courageous work.

Sincerely yours,

STEPHEN FREEMAN.

SANTA BARBARA, CALIF.,
June 27, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We hope you keep pounding away at the idea of bringing the Vietnam situation before the United Nations.

I am occasionally asked to speak before groups on behalf of the U.N. The question that is often put to me—even by U.N. skeptics—is:

Here is a threat to world peace. Can't the U.N. at least discuss the issue?

My best wishes.

D. L. MARTIN.

JUNE 22, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am very much in agreement with the stand you took with regard to the war in Vietnam.

I doubt very much if we are making any true friends there in Vietnam and around the world by our presence there. Many people are shocked by our indiscriminate bombing with napalm and threats of atomic warfare. We have defended the tyranny of Diem and bought our way in at that. The people are tired of war and by our presence there it will prolong the strife and agony for years to come.

We should remember what France paid in lives and money for years without any gain. I doubt if we will get any other countries to go along with us in this war.

Let's take a long-range look at the situation. As you have said, the best thing we can do now is go to the U.N. This makes sense to me and the only wise move we can make at this time.

We need more men of stature to stand up to the hotheads and the uninformed. We need to make some long-range plans and "think the unthinkable."

Sincerely,

DON LINDERMAN.

P.S.—I am an ex-constituent of yours, 28 years in Oregon.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.,
June 26, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: This is to tell you that we heard you on the "Today Show" and we appreciate your stand on the Vietnam problem. If we had 99 more men like you in the Senate and 435 in the House with your convictions the rest of us humble citizens could rid ourselves of our national guilt and shame.

We should understand that communism is an ideology and cannot be detained with bullets. The Romans tried to suppress the Christians and failed. The Christians tried to suppress the Moslems and they flourished faster than ever. Now the Christians are trying to suppress communism and for every Communist they detain abroad, four Communists in sympathy are generated at home.

For many long years these poor people in southeast Asia have tried to rid themselves of foreign impostors and now we, the most destructive of them all, are in there to ruin their land and homes. If we don't get out our Democratic Party is going down to defeat this fall election.

Please Senator, more of the same, you have millions of right-thinking people back of you.

Yours sincerely,

E. P. LEVINE.

GLENDALE, CALIF., *June 25, 1964.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have listened to your courageous talks against war several times with great admiration, but have not been courageous enough myself to write to you. Your views on this unbelievable action in Southeast Asia and mine seem to be alike.

Not only do I object to sending young American men there to die, but I object to their (or our) killing and burning those poor miserable people of Vietnam and Laos. Like you, I am very critical of my Government, and certainly do not support President Johnson's actions. I believe that President Kennedy grew with his position as President and would never have gone this far—even under pressure.

I am not only critical of this vicious behavior—not only in Southeast Asia, but Cuba and South America—I am downright ashamed of it. But, thank God, in you we have a man who is not afraid to speak out. I hope everyone heard you speak on NBC today. Bless you, sir, and good heart to you.

Very sincerely,

MARGARET DORNHAUSER.

STONEWALL, OKLA.,
June 25, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I do not know how many people, I have heard say amen to every word that you said on NBC's "Today." I suggested we write and tell you how proud we had a man in the Senate that would stand on his two feet and tell the American people the truth about this (Vietnam) situation. Get our boys out of there, but they all said that it would be paper for your wastebasket.

This is one thing that could defeat President Johnson.

Sincerely yours,

FRED MCKEEL.

GENEVA, N.Y., *June 25, 1964.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
House of Senate,
Washington, D.C.

HON. AND DEAR SIR: Thank you for your forthright and courageous statement about the situation in southeast Asia. We are certainly going headlong into something which will lead to disaster and a war which can be unending, and become a worldwide conflagration. What has become of President Kennedy's assertion, "that we do not fear to negotiate but we will not negotiate out of fear." The conference table is the place of wisdom. I am convinced now before it is too late. Some way must be found to organize minority opinion on this grave matter. Can you get someone to take the lead? Keep up your efforts.

Faithfully yours,

MELVIN ABSON,
Retired.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SENATOR: A foolish woman once insulted you by saying you had been kicked in the head by a horse. If I could offer one suggestion for the future of American foreign policy, it would be: Find that horse and set him loose in the Department of State.

I listened to your presentation on the ABC television program "Issues and Answers" earlier this afternoon and then tuned in the NBC "Open Mind" program entitled "The Crisis in Vietnam." In your half hour you made more sense on Vietnam and southeast Asia generally than the whole gang on "Open Mind"—including a Princeton professor, a pair of journalists (one foreign, one domestic), a foreign policy scholar, and the Special Assistant to the Secretary of State for Vietnamese Affairs—were able to achieve in 60 dreary minutes. Particularly valuable was your suggestion for combining a SEATO peacekeeping force with an emergency United Nations meeting, to be followed by a special UN force in that troubled land. Here is a way for us to oppose a Communist takeover without resorting to a dime-store Machiavellianism that flouts our charter commitments to the United Nations, defies moral principle, offends Africa and Asia and Latin America, alarms our allies, tantalizes our enemies, and threatens a nuclear holocaust.

Who can tell whether your suggestions will be followed? I for one am grateful that they have been given.

Whether this Nation hears or whether it forbears, keep speaking up. Robert M. La Follette, who came into the Senate 60 years ago next January, had to entitle one chapter of his autobiography "Alone in the Senate." A giant can stand alone when necessary.

Persist.

Yours sincerely,

GEORGE KOSKI.

CLEVELAND, OHIO.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am sending you this page from the Cleveland Plain Dealer to let you know that there are a good many people throughout this country who think as you do about the Vietnam question, and who back you 100 percent in your effort to prevent a war over there.

Keep on expressing yourself in this matter. More power to you.

Sincerely,

ADA N. LEFFINGWELL.

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer]

OPEN LETTER AD ASKS VIET NEGOTIATIONS

An open letter to the State Department, signed by 69 Clevelanders from all walks of life and urging negotiations instead of stepped-up war in Vietnam, is published in the Plain Dealer today as a paid advertisement.

The letter's publication has been timed to coincide with a foreign policy conference here today in which the State and Defense Departments are participating.

"The signatures are of those persons we could readily reach within the last 10 days," said Sheldon D. Clark, Cleveland lawyer and initiator of the open letter.

"In my talks with fellow Clevelanders it was felt that a statement to the officials of the two Departments at this time afforded the best means of expressing ourselves as forcibly as we know how," Clark said.

Scheduled to attend the all-day conference in Hotel Sheraton-Cleveland are George W. Ball, Under Secretary of State, and John T. McNaughton of the Defense Department, Acting Assistant Secretary for International Affairs.

Among the signers of the open letter are Dr. Benjamin Spock of Western Reserve University, an authority on child development; the Reverend Alan J. Davis, pastor of Aldersgate Methodist Church; the Reverend Dennis G. Kuby, pastor of Unitarian Society of Cleveland; Paul Olynyk of Fenn College, an advocate of a sane nuclear policy; Harold J. Quigley, leader of the Cleveland Ethical Society; Jack G. Day, lawyer, active in civil rights cases; Sam Sponseller, retired labor leader, and Oscar H. Steiner, businessman.

Money for the ad was raised by those who signed the open letter, Clark said.

[From the Plain Dealer, June 18, 1964]

AN OPEN LETTER TO THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE—NEEDED: AN APPROACH TO END THE WAR IN VIETNAM

The United States is a foreign party to a civil war in Vietnam. Fifteen thousand U.S. uniformed personnel have been committed to the battle. Casualties include American soldiers.

Acceleration of the American war effort in South Vietnam invites increased aid by China to the Communist Vietnamese. Stepping up the war effort risks the use by either side of nuclear arms. Nuclear war offers no victory. What is the alternative?

Negotiation is urged by Senator Wayne Morse, Senator Ernest Gruening, Columnist Walter Lippmann and others. Recognizing it takes both sides to make peace, we urge our Government to initiate a conference of nations to guarantee a neutral Vietnam. We support U.S. efforts to insure enforcement of agreements. The United Nations can assist direct negotiation. Inspection teams must be free to operate wherever needed. They can be backed by frontier patrols. The best guarantee of enforcement is the mutual advantage of the agreement. The goal is a Vietnam whose independence is guaranteed and respected.

Robert R. Archer, Professor; Raymond S. Beard, Business Counselor; Marguerite S. Bellamy, Housewife; Keith C. Billman, Social Worker; Evelyn A. Blackburn, Insurance Agent; Isabel N. Bliss, Homemaker; William M. Bliss, Engineer; Edith O. Brashares, College Instructor; Edwin A. Brown, Minister; Rilma Buckman, Sociologist; Bronson P. Clark, Businessman; Sheldon D. Clark, Lawyer; Lila Cornell, Homemaker; Marie F. Cotton, Homemaker; Wendell P. Cotton, Salesman; Natalie C. Crouter, Housewife; Elfrieda S. Daiber, Secretary; Alan J. Davis, Minister; Hortense M. Davis, Teacher; Jack G. Day, Lawyer; Steven Deutsch, University Faculty; Mort Epstein, Designer; Gail R. Gann, Homemaker; Donald S. Gann, Surgeon; Joel M. Garver, Lawyer; Paul Gitlin, Social Worker; Henry Gluck, Psychologist; William F. Hellmuth, Jr., professor; Arnold A. Herzog, Lawyer; Fred Husa, Office Worker; Sidney D. Josephs, Businessman; Mrs. Harry Kirtz, Homemaker; Waldo H. Kliever, Consultant; Dennis G. Kuby, Minister; Jerome Landfield, College Professor; Ada N. Leffingwell, Homemaker; George Levinger, Educator; John P. Marhevka, Male Hair Stylist; Mrs. Edward A. Marshall, Homemaker; Charles R. Miller, Lawyer; Paul I. Miller, Professor; Hans F. Mueller, Retired; Laura Mueller, Homemaker; Sarah B. Nenner, Housewife; James M. Newman, Advertising; Paul Olynyk, Professor; Clyde Onyett, Public Relations; William W. Outland, Order Analyst; Samuel Prellwitz, Industrial Research; Harold J. Quigley, Minister; Willard C. Richan, Educator; Eldon P. Roe, Merchant; Marian Rosenberg, Social Worker; Ralph Rudd, Lawyer; Audrey Sabadosh, Librarian; Nicholas Sabadosh, Teacher; Wilmer L. Satterthwait, Painter; Vera A. Schwartz, Legal Secretary; A. L. Sherwin, Lawyer; Frank Spigel, Lawyer; Benjamin Spock, Physician; Sam Sponseller, Retired; Vera Smisek, Teacher; Oscar H. Steiner, Businessman; Helen Stewart, High School Counselor; Edward A. Taubert, Photographer; Warren E. Thompson, Educator; Hugh Tyson, Graduate Student; Harry O. Way, Bacteriologist.

(This statement paid for by the signers.)

LITTLE ROCK, ARK.,
June 24, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: May I express my deep appreciation for the position you have consistently taken on the Vietnam situation? It seems you are one of very few in the Senate who have taken this position, yet I believe most of the American people stand with you.

It seems, sometimes, that the administration has been goaded into its position by the Birchites, etc. It can't be good politics and it certainly is not good foreign policy. The U.N. may have some business there but not the United States. If these people are to be saved from communism what are they to be saved for? Another Madame Nhu?

In our country's foreign policy does every other country have to be either capitalist or Communist? What's wrong with letting them decide. If they decide to try some socialistic form of government then that is their business. I simply cannot subscribe to the thinking that our system is synonymous with right and that their system is synonymous with wrong. Why do we want to keep on being ugly Americans in the eyes of most of the citizens of the world? We have been unsuccessful in making law-abiding citizens out of Mississippians (and others). Who do we think we are in telling southeast Asia how to live? A war there may never be lost but it is certain it would never be won.

Please continue to do all in your power to let the President and others in positions of responsibility know what you think is right for America during these times.

In appreciation,

TED H. CRABTREE.

P.S.—My typing is at least as good as my spelling.

ALLEGAN, MICH., *June 26, 1964.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Have seen you many times on TV but the issue of the Vietnam war June 25 was right to the point; we are all with you here. Why do they use this issue as a political football during this election campaign? We are certainly losing ground that all America was founded on. Don't we have enough red-blooded American Senators that would take a stand with you? Have you ever thought of running for the Presidency? I believe you would do a good job for us—would like to see more of you on TV.

Sincerely,

MARIE C. SMITH.

JUNE 25, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: You are right in everything you said about the war in Vietnam. This is a United Nations and SEATO problem—not ours. We have no business policing Asia. My son is over there and I want him home. I hope you win your point and I am not alone. I can produce dozens of families that feel as I do. We are sticking our nose into other people's troubles and have enough of our own. God bless you.

PATRICIA M. FRAZER.

P.S.—I saw you on "Today Show" this a.m. You were wonderful but makes my heart bleed to think of another war.

BROOKLYN, N.Y., *June 25, 1964.*

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: So many of my friends and I want to commend you on your stand on "our" war in Vietnam and Laos.

There is enough to work for here at home besides interfering in civil wars on the other side of the world.

Keep up the good work.

With best wishes,

Sincerely,

MRS. FRANCES G. BERLIN.

JUNE 25, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Your appearance on the "Today" show, Thursday, June 24 was sensational. I wish every man and woman in America could have heard you. In the past I have seldom agreed with you, but today I stood up at my breakfast table and cheered. Thank you, sir.

MRS. E. J. KESSLER.

JUNE 26, 1964.

Senator MORSE.

DEAR SIR: After hearing you talk on the "Today" show, June 25, I just want to tell you what you said makes sense in my opinion. I hope and pray that more Congressmen take the same position.

On the "Today" show they announced after your interview that Senator CHURCH would be on the next day to give a different view of the situation but after hearing Senator CHURCH this morning it seems to me that he has just about the same opinion of the situation in southeast Asia that you have. With all the problems in this country that we don't seem to be able to cope with I don't think we should be over on the other side of the world trying to solve problems.

Jack Lescoulie on the "Today" show said it was surprising to him that people didn't seem to know or care about this problem we have taken on as ours in southeast Asia, of course those are not his exact words but that was the general idea he was talking about. It is a shame that more of our people cannot be awakened to the need to be actively interested in what their lawmakers are doing. I am very thankful to the "Today" show for trying to help in this matter.

Sincerely,

MRS. GLADYS BRANDHUBER.

SAN DIEGO, CALIF.,
June 24, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I agree with your position opposing the present involvement of the United States in Southeast Asia and further extension of such involvement.

I urge you to carry your opposition and viewpoint aggressively to the people via every means of communication possible. It is only such voices as yours that can prevent the United States from further violation of international law and treaties.

Respectfully yours,

D. W. MILLER.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *June 24, 1964.*

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to express my sincere gratitude for your courageous efforts in opposing our Government's policy in South Vietnam.

Your vocal expressions are the only optimistic note in this unbelievable mess.

MRS. ALLAN F. SKLADER.

GRAND HAVEN, MICH.,
June 24, 1964.

Hon. Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I surely agree with your talk over the "Today" program on the talk you gave over the air. You are a 100-percent American and you are certainly right on your Red China stand.

Stop and think what it will mean to have any war of any kind.

Keep up the good work.

Respectfully yours,

ROBERT L. DICK.

PLAINFIELD, N.J.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I heard you this morning on "Today" and I think you are absolutely right. It is an outrage to send our boys to be killed in Asia. We stick our noses in too many countries and the money we pour into Communist countries is outrageous. If I had a son, I think I would rather he died a natural death than to send him to Vietnam. Do keep up your work and try and curb the ridiculous spending of life and money outside of the United States.

Sincerely,

HELEN STIRTSMAN.

P.S.—My husband was mayor of Plainfield in 1929 and judge of the district court; were he alive, he would agree with you.

Cleveland, Ohio,
June 24, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: My husband and I have just finished listening to you on the "Today" television show. We are so grateful to find we still have a statesman in our Government, and not just all individuals striving for their own political gain.

I have never been able to understand why the world seemed to condone the fact that we got up in arms when Cuba based another country's warmaking machinery on Cuba's soil, when the United States is parked on practically everyone's doorstep. This to me is just not fair reasoning.

We have two sons serving in the Armed Forces at the present time. One a young ensign on the U.S.S. *Dominant,* in the Mediterranean, and the other a private first class, in Germany. Our young next door neighbor is now in Valley Forge Hospital from injuries received in Vietnam, so these scattered "bonfires" are very real to us.

If there is anything that you know of that average citizens can do to help you get this problem into the United Nations and on into the right channels, we shall be very glad to help.

Thank you again for sharing your enlightened wisdom with us.

Very truly yours,
Kathryn Broadman
Mrs. David Broadman.

Excelsior, Minn., *June 25, 1964.*

Hon. Wayne E. Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

My Dear Senator Morse: I just want to tell you how gratifying it was to hear your brave words on the "Today" program this morning. I agree with every word you said, and I only wish that your voice could reach the White House and the State Department.

Sending General Taylor as Ambassador to Vietnam is certainly not a step toward peace.

Sincerely,
Mrs. Paul F. Kiesel.

Withee, Wis., *June 25, 1964.*

Senator W. Morse,
U.S. Senate.

Dear Senator Morse: I have just heard your wonderful talk on the "Today" program over NBC. I heartily agree that our boys should not be in Vietnam. A little 4-year-old said to me "if you vote for a Democrat it means war." How can we change that picture and idea? I have voted Democratic since F.D.R. and I would like to be proud of my party, but how when we do the things that you outlined in your talk. May you have the courage, money, and stamina to keep airing these views.

My heart is in this. I have a son leaving for Korea in July.

Sincerely,
Mrs. Martin Keskimaki.

University of Pittsburgh,
Pittsburgh, Pa., June 25, 1964.

Dear Senator Morse: I have a feeling that yours must be a bitter and lonely lot—now in the first aftermath of the Asian crisis and your sublime response to it. I put these few words on paper because I hope to dilute by an infinitesimal amount the abuse probably inflicted on you. I hope that you understand that at least in the academic communities that you are a prophet with honor. Also that yours is not the ephemeral kind that comes and goes with political campaigns. It is of the type that will be deeply engraven in the records of the history of our times. I do not and cannot speak for the existing guild of historians, but I have sufficient experience to know that if there is a future—better than radioactive debris, you will be recorded as one of its major achievers. You may be pleased to know that at least among my colleagues, each new crisis evoked by our insane stance leads us to say, almost instinctively that "Senator Morse will take a stand."

I with that there was some simple, direct way to convey to you the admiration that I feel for your discharge of your high office. Were I a deeply religious person, it could be put as: "Thank God for Wayne Morse." As it is, there is only the statement, the historians will write your name in the lot of those who deserved the most of the countrymen.

Respectfully,
Robert G. Colodny,
Associate Professor, History.

Fort Wayne, Ind.,
June 25, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse.

Dear Sir: Heard part of your discussion of South Vietnam and southeast Asia and TV this morning in answer to questions by newscasters.

Most erudite, most reasonable, most logical, and factual discussion I have heard and the most authoritative devoid of emotionalism and politics.

It was also a brave explanation. You will be accused of everything and a lesser light might even be accused of aiding the Communists if he had said the things you did.

Also, your solutions are based on the Christian spirit of which our country boasts.

I want to say that I wish we had more men and women fearless enough and intelligent enough and moral enough to fight for the things in southeast Asia and our role there as you have done.

Sincerely,
John Conley, M.D.

Hinsdale, Ill., *June 25, 1964.*

Hon. Senator Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: Congratulations on your position and public statement relative to the Vietnam situation.

It is indeed disturbing in time of peace, in a country in which "only Congress shall declare war," to have our Communist riddled State Department "arrange the war," as I firmly believe they also did with Japan prior to Pearl Harbor.

Is China such a threat to Russia that our pink darlings feel that it is our duty to take them "off the hook," or are they afraid that if Russia became entangled with China, that the Red satellites may get an opportunity to free themselves?

For God's sake, do all possible to put the management of our country back in the hands of our representatives, and out of the hands of our damnable State Department.

Again, my thanks for men of your courage.

Sincerely,
George H. Rediehs.

Los Angeles, Calif.,
June 28, 1964.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: It was very good hearing you today on "Issues and Answers."

Thank you for representing the American people's side on the war in Vietnam.

With all good and kind wishes.

Lucille Oston.

Philadelphia, Pa.

Senator Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate.

Dear Sir: I would like to thank you for your courageous stand on South Vietnam. Most people that I know think it is a messy situation, but say they don't know enough to write or sign petitions. There is a news blackout here, and your views are not heard. Continue the good work.

Miss Charlotte Grant.

Pittsburgh, Pa.,
June 28, 1964.

Mr. Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senator.

Sir and Gentleman: According to Pittsburgh Press, "Washington Calling," column, June 28, 1964, printed the following statement: "Senator Wayne Morse, Oregon Democrat, who disagrees with administration's Vietnam policy, is getting close attention from Communist news agencies. When he said he was convinced 'the greatest threat to the peace of the world is the United States,' the Communists broadcast his remark."

Mr. Wayne Morse, when I enter the voting booth I vote independently of party labels or tags. But I do say, and have said ever since World War I, that the United States, as today's reading of events and actions since World War I, to the present day and time proves such a charge as most correct in all details. And, Mr. Morse, you don't have to be a Communist to see that.

Instead of maintaining and expanding not only our respectability and leadership among the nations of the world's people, we as a nation have, and are, becoming a nation that is despised and hated by the world's exploited, robbed, and murdered peoples, that was and is being accelerated by the hour, by and through the "cloak and dagger" organization—the CIA.

Our Constitution which may not be the acme and omega of perfection, nevertheless, is being torn asunder and our personal liberties being obliterated one by one, every day. We do not legislate by law today. We legislate by committees, witch hunters, and inquisition, and thereby traveling the very same highway that Rome trod, and will meet the same destruction.

In other words, we are fiddling while the United States burns.

In closing, be prepared to be maligned, ridiculed, slandered, and reviled, even impeached, if not murdered, if you stand by your guns, which is a fact.

America as a country, is great, grand, and beautiful. But surely is badly managed. And the present management better soon be changed to a better one. Or there won't be anything worth, or to manage.

I have been watching—and remonstrating—at the hypocritical, wasteful destruction of this country's resources and produced wealth since the year 1884 and the only difference from then to now is we are traveling down the slope to chaos faster than logs down a mountainside.

These are times that try men's souls. Are you and some others just summer soldiers, or are you made up of the materials that stand the heat of battle? I hope so, but time will tell.

Most respectfully yours,
Chas. A. Francis.

Passaic, N.J.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: I heard you on TV Sunday and I want you to know how wholeheartedly I agree with you on foreign policy and especially on the trouble in Vietnam.

I was alarmed when I read in the New York Times this morning that President Johnson said in Minneapolis that the United States, "when necessary," would not hesitate to "risk war" to preserve the peace.

In my opinion that would be no peace.

Thank you for the wonderful work you are doing in the Senate. I only wish there were many more like you, Senator Humphrey and Senator Fulbright, and others.

Very sincerely yours,

Miss Hertha Lingg.

Elizabeth, N.J.,
June 28, 1964.

Dear Senator Morse: I just heard WABC's "Issues and Answers" and several weeks ago, I watched WCBS's "Face the Nation." I am certainly pleased that somebody in your position has the "guts" to expound your philosophy of foreign policy even though many of your colleagues will not publicly approve of your comments and evaluations. I certainly agree with practically everything you mentioned on both programs. I am not too sure that the United Nations is the complete solution; however, I feel it would be superior to the current U.S. unilateral military action in Vietnam and elsewhere, including the U.S. planes in Laos.

It is comforting to know that we share the same opinions on the use of volunteers in McNamara's war, using SEATO allies in a peacekeeping role in Vietnam and the realization that the Vietnam puppets "we" set up are not as effective as the Nhu family. It was certainly a shame to see Madame Nhu's predictions about coups, etc., during her visit to the United States last year, become tragic realities several months later.

I am quite concerned about the outcome of the Far Eastern situation since I have very dear friends in the Philippines who occasionally travel in Thailand, Japan, etc. on U.N., Philippine Government and Philippine atomic energy matters. However, I repeat that I feel the U.S. actions are wrong and illegal.

Sincerely yours,

James S. McKarns.

New Rochelle, N.Y.,
June 29, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse: With General Taylor going to South Vietnam it can mean one thing only.

I would like to know why Americans are the only ones sent to Vietnam?

Why are not other countries trying to help out over there?

Generals want war to add to their glory, but the mothers, wives and sweethearts of the American men do not want war.

Can you do something to stop the warmongers from exploiting our men over there.

We have lost too many men already.

Thank you for your consideration,

J. Mimnaugh.

June 28, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senior Senator of Oregon,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator: It was with great interest that I listened to your statements on today's "Issues and Answers." I share your opinion concerning our actions in southeast Asia 100 percent and I hope that enough people will have listened to you so that they snap out of their blind indifference and complacency to tolerate the brinkmanship of the Pentagon.

I understand that the Senate has the right to vote for or against the appointment of an ambassador. Why then don't you show through your vote that you disapprove strongly this newest move of appointing the Chief of Staff of our military forces to an ambassadorship, a move which throughout the world can have only one meaning? I suppose that Senator Fulbright has similiar views.

If you two and some other reasonable men who like you, watch with deep concern our slithering into a new war, would take an energetic stand maybe it could stop Mr. Johnson to put his trust so completely in Mr. McNamara.

Very sincerely yours,

Louis F. Lucas.

Glenview, Ill.,
June 28, 1964.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: Thank you for your remarks on the television program, "Issues and Answers," today. While we believe in the ideals of the Democratic Party and have long voted for its candidates, my family and I have been greatly disappointed in the policy being used in the Far East. We have had a part in and have seen what happens in war, especially since the Second World War, and we believe in and support as we can the United Nations with all its operations as our best hope for the world. We have never been able to understand why the United States has not tried the United Nations for the Far Eastern troubles. We hope that there is still a chance for President Johnson to change his course and try. Surely, at this point, he is carrying us more slowly than the Republicans would, but nevertheless, into war without trying the United Nations' machinery for keeping the peace.

Thank you again for your remarks today. I am writing our great Senator, Paul H. Douglas, to this effect.

Respectfully yours,

Ruth M. Felton
Mrs. Ruth M. Felton.

June 27, 1964.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: Among many other concerned Americans I am deeply grateful to you for your forthright questioning of our self-defeating un-American policies in southeast Asia. It is hard for me to understand how our Government can be so shortsighted as to believe that our prestige and influence in Asia can be increased by policies of a sort that were discredited even before World War II, and which—as you note—have been declared illegal under a variety of international agreements.

Has it ever occurred to you that by designating our regional alliances as specifically against "Communist" aggression and expansion that we have unconsciously reproduced the pre-World War II Axis "anti-Comintern Pact"? The U.S. Government condemned this Axis Pact as designed to hide their own aggressive and expansionist aims. I very much fear that our own anti-Communist pacts seem similarly aggressive and expansionist to many governments which reject communism for their own societies. During the formation of the SEATO, for example, the Asian governments deplored the U.S. emphasis on military force to "contain communism" and urged policies for economic development.

I am venturing to enclose some letters to the Times I've written on this issue. Some have been published, some not. Our Government's distortions of the record are truly shocking. Please keep pressing the issue. We, the American people, seem increasingly to be pushed into the role of robot—rather than the informed electorate on which our democracy rests.

With appreciation.

Sincerely,

Helen Mears.

April 17, 1964.

To the Editor of the New York Times:

A Times' editorial (April 16), headed "Blood Sport" began: "A deranged youth steps out on an Albany hotel ledge. Twelve stories below, crowds urge him to jump. Not to a net's safety. To death. What kind of people can become such a mob? How can adults yell 'chicken' and 'yellow' to another human dangling on the lip of danger?"

Yes. But a more urgent question is how can some of our leading citizens cry chicken to our Government and urge it to carry out bombing attacks against North Vietnam? How can our Government, in effect, say yellow to the Vietnamese who want a U.S.-maintained fratricidal slaughter stopped? Not long ago the Times published a wirephoto from South Vietnam showing a small child hideously burned by napalm supplied by the United States, and dropped from a U.S.-supplied plane, piloted by a young American. Many of our most respected citizens tell us we must continue such activities or lose prestige. Others calmly debate whether a bombing attack against North Vietnam would be good or bad as an election gimmick.

The Times editorial concluded: "Disregard for another's life—by inertia or, worse, by goading—takes civilized people back to the cave. Does the attitude of that Albany mob bespeak a way of life for many Americans? If so, the bell tolls for all of us."

The Times says it better than I can, but it addresses its feeling of shock at the gnat. The lesser evil. It is the camel, national policy, that is truly frightening. If disregard for human life is ugly for the man-in-the-street, it is infinitely uglier at the level of national policy. Whether consciously or unconsciously our attitudes are influenced by those of our Nation's leaders. Our leaders have chosen the caveman's club, rather than the civilized men's tools of negotiation, arbitration, conciliation. In Vietnam our whole nation is the mob. And the bell is tolling.

Helen Mears.

June 15, 1964.

To the Editor of the New York Times:

In his column of June 3, C. L. Sulzberger declared that the SEATO alliance was no help in carrying out U.S. policy in Vietnam, and concluded that: "We must therefore face the problem of salvaging our Indochina crisis on the basis of what we consider right * * *. In southeast Asia we must honor our commitments and respect our interest."

Most Americans would surely agree with Mr. Sulzberger that the U.S. Government should "honor our commitments." The difficulty is that by now the U.S. Government has made so many directly conflicting commitments that it literally cannot be faithful to all of them.

The United States is committed, under the U.N. Charter, not to use force save in the common interest. No U.N. resolution has ever requested, or authorized, U.S. military aid in South Vietnam.

The U.S. Government was further committed by the Geneva Accord of 1954 not to send modern military equipment, not to send additional military advisers, and certainly not to send 16,000 "miscellaneous military, many of them to actual combat, disguised as "advisers." Mr. Sulzberger actually quotes the late Secretary of State Dulles as telling him, in February 1955 that: "The Geneva * * * accord bars the importation into Indochina of new military aid. The United States of America can't increase the number of its military advisers."

The United States was, at least morally, committed to accept the result of a nationwide election to be held throughout Vietnam in 1956. The United States backed the decision of Ngo Dinh Diem not to hold the election.

The United States was committed to support Diem as the "legally elected President of the Republic of Vietnam." When Diem was overthrown by a military coup—with at least indirect encouragement from the United States, the United States at once committed itself to the new regime. When that regime was overthrown by another military coup the United States at once committed itself to it.

Increasingly since late 1960, the U.S. Government has committed itself to the war effort in South Vietnam. Of all the commitments this appears to be the one the U.S. Government chooses to honor.

Is a commitment to a war effort in Vietnam the sort of commitment Americans in general would choose to honor above prior commitments to seek solutions by negotiation, arbitration, mediation, and by techniques spelled out in the U.N. Charter?

In a presidential election year, in a democracy, isn't this the sort of question that should be debated?

HELEN MEARS.

RUSK DISPUTED ON VIETNAM—GENEVA ACCORDS FORBID INDEPENDENT ENTITY IN SOUTH, WRITER STATES

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

In his press conference (the Times, Nov. 9) Secretary of State Rusk, responding to a question about Vietnam, said: "The other side was fully committed—fully committed—in the original Geneva settlement of 1954 to the arrangements, which provided for South Vietnam as an independent entity."

This is a puzzling statement. The record seems to prove that not only did the Geneva agreements of 1954 not provide for South Vietnam as an independent entity, but expressly forbade such a development. Article 6 of the final declaration says of Vietnam that "the military demarcation line should not in any way be interpreted as constituting a political or territorial boundary * * *." The 17th parallel was chosen merely as a cease-fire line to separate the opposing military forces.

The agreements specifically provided that Vietnam should be unified by nationwide elections in 1956. These facts are acknowledged in a State Department pamphlet "A Threat to the Peace," published in December 1961, which gives the U.S. official position about the Vietnam problem at that time. The pamphlet explains why the Diem government refused to carry out the agreement to hold the scheduled election, and why the U.S. Government backed Diem's position. The State Department wrote: "It was the Communists' calculation that nationwide elections scheduled in the accords for 1956 would turn all of Vietnam over to them."

It is profoundly disturbing to find our own Government rewriting history. It is not easy to see how our Government can encourage adherence to international agreements by ignoring them.

HELEN MEARS.

NEW YORK, *November 11, 1963*.

VIETNAM WITHDRAWAL URGED—EVENTS BELIEVED TO INDICATE NEITHER LEADERS NOR PEOPLE WANT OUR HELP

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Reporting to the House Armed Services Committee on January 27, Secretary of Defense McNamara said:

"In the case of South Vietnam our help is clearly wanted, and we are deeply engaged in supporting the Vietnamese Government and people in their war against the Communist Vietcong."

Surely Secretary McNamara meant to say "our help is clearly not wanted," for almost as he was speaking the Government which presumably wanted "our help" to keep fighting was overthrown by another military coup, and the Times reported this event in headlines which read: "Vietnam Junta Ousted by Military Dissidents Who Fear 'Neutralism.' "

In other words, the generals whom our Government supported in their coup to replace the Diem government which was beginning to "flirt with neutralism" began in turn to incline toward the same policy. If anything seems "clear" in this grim situation it is that our Government is finding it increasingly difficult to find even military leaders who "clearly want our help" to continue their fratricidal strife.

As for the Vietnamese people, it has never been their war. If reports in the Times (and our newsweeklies) have made anything clear, it is that the Vietnamese people have supported the war so little that a ruthless policy of forcing them into fortified villages was introduced to prevent them from helping the guerrilla fighters. And the so-called Vietcong may or may not be Communists, or pro-Communist, but they are unquestionably Vietnamese.

LACK OF OUTCRY

The situation in Vietnam is so unworthy of us that the apparent lack of popular outcry against it suggests a condition of indifference and moral callousness few of us would have believed possible only a few years ago. It is this growing apathy and callousness that is the true enemy of the "values we hold dear."

The U.S. Government should at once present the problem of Vietnam to the U.N. Security Council, and should withdraw our military advisers and stop providing millions of dollars a day to keep a war going.

If our leadership means only destruction and death for the people who live in distant areas our commentators call "strategic real estate," our Nation will go down in history as just another rampaging great power, self-convinced that our might makes right. And it will not be the Communists who will have betrayed us. It will have been ourselves.

HELEN MEARS.

NEW YORK, *January 31, 1964*.

AFRICAN-AMERICAN
HERITAGE ASSOCIATION,
Chicago, Ill., June 24, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE SIR: Our association has directed that we commend you on your firm and critical stand against the policies of our Government in Vietnam and southeast Asia. Our organization associates itself with you in the proposition (1) that the role of our Government played in the South Vietnamese situation endangers world peace and the whole of mankind itself; (2) should be immediately referred to the United Nations.

Moreover, sir, we think it strange that the Government of the United States can involve itself in police action for "freedom in South Vietnam" and cannot involve itself in Mississippi and the Southern States with police action to preserve freedom, the Bill of Rights, and the right of every citizen to vote. We are certain that Afro-Americans, people of African descent, colonial peoples everywhere look with grave misgivings on this strange contradiction. We are certain that more and more democratic-minded people everywhere will question the role of our Government and the American people as representing a nation devoted to preserving freedom and democracy in the world.

A copy of this letter in support of your views is being forwarded to the President of the United States and to the representatives in Congress. We urge you to hold fast and endure to the end that our Nation and its people not become the perpetrators of a world thermonuclear war.

Yours truly,

ISHMAEL FLORY,
Director of Organization.

(Cc: Lyndon Johnson, President of the United States, Washington, D.C., Robert F. Kennedy, Attorney General of the United States, Washington, D.C.; Senators Paul Douglas and Everett Dirksen; Congressmen William L. Dawson, Charles Diggs, Augustus Hawkins, Robert Nix, Adam Powell.)

JUNE 25, 1964.

DEAR SIR: Heard you on the "Today" show this morning. You voice the stand that I have thought we should take. What can we do to stop the present program? Are we big enough to say we made a mistake?

E.J.D.

NORTH HOLLYWOOD, CALIF.

DEAR SIR: How wonderful your stand on Vietnam—saw you on TV program "Today." I thoroughly concur with you and hope for more Americans to know the truth about this.

MISS SAKI DIKRAN.

NEW YORK CITY, N.Y.

Thank God for Senators like you and the work you are doing toward stopping the horrible war in Vietnam.

Mrs. ESTHER METLIZ.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: At a meeting of 100 women held at Mapleton Park Synagogue, Brooklyn, on June 25, 1964, it was firmly stated that we agree wholeheartedly with your stand on Vietnam. We should never have gone there. We urge your further demonstration of good will to bring our boys home and negotiate a peace through the U.N.

Mrs. R. GOLDHEIME.

GLENDALE, CALIF., *June 25, 1964.*

DEAR SENATOR: You were great on Today NBC program subject of the President's private war in southeast Asia. But many think the king can do wrong, another F.D.R. image and look where its got us?

You should have been a Republican—yes—we shoot at Communists over there and coddle them here at home. Speak at colleges, etc.

Yours truly,

H. BANKY.

JUNE 24, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR: I agree with everything you said about our policy in Asia, on the "Today" show.

Glad to hear you express your opinion. We need more like you in the Government. Hope others who agree with you, will write you. As I am sure you will hear from the GOLDWATER followers, and Pentagon friends.

Keep talking.

Very truly,

Mrs. MILTON H. ROGERS.

OAK PARK, MICH.

DEAR SENATOR WAYNE MORSE: We agree with you that President Johnson has no power to make or declare war in Vietnam but only Congress has.

We heard you on the "Today" program, June 25, 1964, and thank you for telling us the best way to settle the Vietnam situation is in the United Nations as I and most American people I am sure agree. We want peace and not men killed—that is what the United Nations is for.

MARY and SOL HAMMERSTEIN.

DEAR SENATOR WAYNE MORSE: Thank you for expressing the truth on the "Today" program on TV channel 4, on June 25, 1964. It is indeed unconstitutional to have a President of United States make war or declare war instead of Congress. We do not want war and have American boys killed in Vietnam. We want things settled peacefully in the United Nations.

Thank you,

Mr. and Mrs. ABE GOLDBERG.

JUNE 26, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR: We listened to your brilliant speech on South Vietnam on "Today" TV. It is refreshing to have a Democrat pick flaws in the present administration's policy with concrete knowledge of our Constitution.

We don't want another Korea, or Bay of Pigs mistake.

If we are at war let Congress declare it. Am proud that our 18-year-old son enlisted in World War II—as did his father in World War I—both after Congress declared war.

We try to help other countries, yet are blind to our own small civil war.

Respectfully,

H. Brice.

Dear Senator Morse: It was good to hear your strong voice in opposition to the Vietnam war. I have been disturbed over it from the beginning and feel powerless to do anything about it. I agree thoroughly with you.

Sincerely,

Sara Lowrey.

Dear Senator Morse: Keep up your vehement protest against stepped-up, undeclared dirty war in Vietnam where American casualty list enlarges daily.

Show up the wickedness of a statement from some underling in authority in Washington that no protection assured to those brave young people helping to register in Mississippi, followed that day or next by total disappearance of three heroic young people. Place Army where needed.

Admiringly yours,

A. C. Dart.

June 24, 1964.

Dear Senator: Confucius said the first step toward peace and order is "to rectify the names"—to call things for what they are—a spade a spade, a thief a thief, etc.

We are greatly encouraged by your boldness in calling a spade a spade and warmongering, warmongering. For the future of your country and the future of mankind, we hope you will continue to do it just as you are doing.

Our sincerest support for your effort.

Dr. and Mrs. Harold Bass.

Friday, June 26, 1964.

We are backing your stand to get out of Vietnam. Keep the good work up. Good luck and best wishes.

The Dorsdy Family.

Tucson, Ariz.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: My congratulations to you for the courage you have shown in speaking out on the situation in Vietnam.

Sincerely yours,

Loretta Smith.

June 25.

Dear Senator Morse: I deeply appreciated your thought-provoking statements on TV this morning and am thoroughly in accord with them. Many women in Maryland will agree with you.

Laura C. A. La Foe.

Tacoma, Wash., *June 24, 1964.*

Dear Senator: Cheers for your statement re U.S. position as the world's No. 1 warmonger.

The recent statements made by the administration regarding increasing the war is quite frightening. I urge you to do all you can to influence more Senators to your position.

Yvonne Braune.

Tacoma, Wash.

Senator Wayne Morse: I congratulate you on the courage and good sense you have shown on the Vietnam situation.

I fear though that there will not be enough to take the stand you have taken.

You have never done, in my opinion, what was expedient but dared to do what you thought was right.

Mark H. Anderson.

New York, N.Y.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: I want to express my appreciation for your stand regarding the involvement of the United States in South Vietnam.

Respectfully,

I. Martin.

Lubbock, Tex.

Dear Senator Morse: We heard you on the "Today" program this morning and we think you are 100 percent right and under God, why we the people are sitting idly by, I do not understand.

Please make a speech on TV and rally the people behind you. Another mistake Johnson made is appointing Earl Warren to head the committee on the President's death and now sending Dulles to Mississippi.

Mr. and Mrs. Hendrix.

Dear Senator: We fully agree with you in stating that the United States should stay out of Vietnam and to try and prevent war and leave the problem up to the United Nations. Our community are all for your statements.

The 85 Club.

Gloversville, N.Y., *June 25, 1964.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Congress, Washington, D.C.

This morning I heard you on channel 6 about 8 a.m. Your voice was expressed truthfully against our policy in Asia. I think I should rush to tell you I support you 100 percent. I am going to send a card to the President and tell him I support you and hope he changes the policy to give the U.N. the case.

Sincerely,

S. R. Nestle.

Claremont, Calif., *June 25, 1964.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: I lived in Peiping 1916–40. I heard you on "Today." We sure agree with you 100 percent. Keep talking and good luck.

Flora Wilson.

Palo Alto, Calif., *June 23, 1964.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: I support your efforts to have United States find new approaches to southeast Asia problems—and I support you in your opposition to unilateral military power that short-circuits the United Nations or other international means for peaceful, creative solution to these problems.

Sincerely,

Oliver Henderson., M.D.

Stockton, Calif., *June 25, 1964.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Sir: Congratulations on your Vietnam speech.

What can we do to help you?

Wilda Huffman,
California State Democratic Central Committee, President, Democratic Women's Club.

June 28, 1964.

Dear Senator Morse: We support and commend your position regarding our involvement in Vietnam. It is time more of us expressed our opinions on this vital issue. We feel sure that many other Americans think as you do.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. Paul Kerber.

Alvin, Tex.

Dear Mr. Morse: Thank you for speaking for peace. I have wondered for a long time what my boys and others could do about peace and dying in Vietnam. It seems that we all want to know more good reasons for dying in Vietnam. The climate would kill a lot. Let's settle the problems without killing our boys.

Thanks,

Mrs. J. E. Burge.

Lamoni, Iowa.

Dear Senator Morse: Your "Today" appearance was good. You presented our case well. I agree with all you said, sir. And I urge you to continue saying it with the same clarity and reason and restraint and hard-hitting truth and patriotism that you showed in your "Today" appearance.

Perhaps the policies in Asia are devices to last through election; but the danger is that they will get out of hand, or into the wrong hands—and we may not be able to stem the tide. Even, without that, to play politics with the lives of men seems very wrong. But it is probably no bluff—and we need your voice—and that of other good liberals or we may well lose the respect of the world.

Truly, and with great thanks,

Gladys Martin.

West Palm Beach, Fla.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.

Honorable Sir: Heard you this morning over the "Today" program. Very thankful we have a Senator like you. I am very much in agreement with your convictions. And the average U.S. citizen is also, I believe. The layman is discussing, and seriously, politics, these days and the present administration would be surprised at the amount of commonsense he has

I am neither a Democrat or from Oregon, but heartily endorse your standpoint on this issue (Vietnam).

Respectfully yours,

Mrs. Grace Cloer.

Dear Sir: I'm glad to hear your views on Vietnam on TV. I agree with you. I've lived in Japan for 2 years, the news there presents only the views of the administration, yet I've only talked to one person who believed we ought to be in Vietnam. I would like to hear interviews of the common soldier, both for and against the war in Vietnam. I've heard them, but never see them in print.

Mrs. D. R. Nichols.

June 25, 1964.

Dear Senator Morse: I heard that you will oppose confirmation of General Taylor as Ambassador to Vietnam. Thank God for a few like you.

I asked Senator Hart to send me the Congressional Record just so I can follow what you and your friends are saying about Laos and Vietnam. I told him why, too.

Yours respectfully,

Mrs. Mildred Franklin.

Dear Sir: You are the only one with any sense in Washington. I hope they put all the warmongers in the firing lines in Asia, as the rest of us people don't care who rules Asia. We have enough to take care of our own troubles, and so has all other people of the world no matter who rules them, and for God's sake we would like to know the truth from the State and Defense Departments for a change before we lose all the faith in our Government.

Appreciate your outspokenness on stopping the terrible war in Vietnam. No more American boys must be killed there.

Mrs. B. Raind.

Burt, Mich.

Dear Sir: Keep up the good work. I wish you luck in stopping Maxwell Taylor from becoming Ambassador to that terrible jungle mudhole called South Vietnam. We Americans, including little Caroline and John John do not want a nuclear devastation war for our America over that Vietnam mudhole. It is insane.

E. J. Schramm.

June 2, 1964.

Dear Wayne Morse: Hearty approval from us and many of our friends for your stand against U.S. war in Vietnam (we have just heard your brilliant presentation on "Today" show). Somebody has got to stand for sanity—keep it up.

Ben and Daisylee Fuson.

Loudonville, N.Y.

Sir: On "Today," June 25, you spoke the truth. It had never appeared to us in that light. We trust you will continue to press and stress your convictions.

Mrs. Robert S. Hart.

June 25, 1964.

Dear Senator Morse: I heard your interview on the "Today" program and only wish, as a mother of two sons (volunteers, one Army, one Air Force) that we had more good men like you representing our Government and interests.

A Mother of Two Servicemen.

Honorable Morse: You are absolutely right about the Asian situation. I have been concerned about our policy there for a long time.

Please keep talking and attempt to get the people here to protest.

M. F. Frichser.

June 24, 1964.

Senator Morse: When you speak out for us, for our sons, you revive our hopes, bolster our faith, help us believe that somehow, somehow simple sanity will prevent our Government from forcing our finest young men into a hell that would be even worse than Korea. Do those who would vote for a horror of this kind have no sons, no grandsons? Have they become bloodless, heartless, conscienceless? I say, let them go and face the misery, degradation, abuse, torture—that has been the lot of our boys who were sent to fight battles for people who would not fight for themselves. Yours may seem a lone voice, Senator Morse, but the people are listening. Would to God those in power were before it's too late. We honor and respect you because you speak out for us—and say what we believe.

Los Angeles, Calif.,
June 24, 1964.

Dear Senator Morse: Thank you for your opposition to our asinine policy on Vietnam. Your voice is like a bit of fresh air coming out of Washington these days.

Yours truly,

Norman Jensen.

June 27, 1964.

Dear Senator: I am one of many citizens grateful that you are making every effort to preserve the good image of our country. I have been in the Far East and southeast Asia and know how "we" are hated. Your stand on the Vietnam situation has my wholehearted support.

Helen Blair.

Los Angeles,
June 26, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse: Your stand on the situation in Vietnam is courageous and expresses the feeling of most of my friends and myself. Keep up your good work.

Ruby Rosenthal,

June 26, 1964.

Dear Senator: It seems that the South Vietnam government are unpopular with its citizenery, and that our soldier advisers are getting themselves killed, apparently they are being killed in warfare instead of safely acting as advisors.

Respectfully,

Allen Kendel.

June 25, 1964.

Dear Senator: We heard your interview on the "Today" show this morning and thoroughly agree with everything you said. We have followed your career with a great deal of interest through the years and only regret that we are unable to vote for you.

We wish to thank you for representing our views in the Senate.

Edna and Arnold Klein.

Bellevue, Ill.

Senator Wayne Morse: I listened to your interview on the "Today" show. I congratulate you for your "unpopular position" of disagreement with this administration's position on Vietnam. I also feel this matter should be in the United Nations hands. Please pursue this standpoint—many Americans agree, I am sure. You were very forceful on the interview.

Tacoma, Wash.,
June 23, 1964.

Dear Senator: By some happy miracle the TV carried your toxin alarm. Please take this to the U.N. The Congress has plainly abdicated its power to declare war or peace.

Paul Browne.

Houston, Tex.,
June 25, 1964.

Dear Senator: Many times I do not agree with your ideas. But I do want to give you a big pat on the back for your feelings and for your courageous statements as expressed when you appeared on "Today's" program this a.m. Too many acts have been by Executive action.

Louis B. Armbrecht,
A Legionnaire and a 40 et 8'er.

New York, N.Y.

I support your stand on our getting out of South Vietnam which would save the world from a dangerous war.

Mrs. F. Elkins.

Caldwell, N.J.,
June 26, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We wish to commend you for your speech on South Vietnam on "Today" show June 25. Keep fighting for public interest because it is the only way to bring attention to our representatives in Congress as to the dire needs of men dying in a disorganized war of the rice paddy in South Vietnam. You have the heart of the American Eagle.

Very truly yours,

Thomas J. Mooney, Jr.
James Phillips.

Topanga, Calif.,
June 27, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We support your position regarding southeast Asia. Keep up good work.

Ian and Jane Thiermann.

Brooklyn, N.Y.,
June 28, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations to your brilliantly spoken words on "Issues and Answers."

Morris Berkowitz.

Detroit, Mich.,
June 26, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Bravo your stand on Vietnam et al. Many are behind you—keep pressure on.

Rose and Milton Schwartz.

Edinburg, Tex.,
June 26, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Your statement on TV "Today" show Wednesday was most courageous and genuinely American. We need more national integrity and less gun-boat diplomacy in our foreign policy. Congratulations.

Andrew Ostrum.

Lomita, Calif.

Dear Senator: I heard you on "Meet the Press." And I was so happy when I heard you being opposed to our fighting in Vietnam.

All my life I've been a Democrat. But why must our party always get into a war? (Ike stopped Korea.) But here we're in another.

Yours sincerely.

E. O. Rogetad.

Pasadena, Calif., *June 26, 1964.*

Dear Senator Morse: I am heartily in accord with your condemnation of the present policy of the U.S.A. in South Vietnam.

I have used your suggestions which appeared in our daily newspaper in a letter to our President.

I am hopeful that the State Department will change its policy before more blood is spilled for our own selfish purposes.

Very truly yours,

Miss Grace M. Lealtad.

Morrison Hotel, Chicago.

Mr. Morse: Congratulations on your views as distributed into the public domain on "Issues and Answers."

You are right. The United States of America has too long violated the Geneva Charter. Red China can be "mellowed." But not if we continue to be an aggressor in southeast Asia.

Tony Lavelli.

Ann Arbor, Mich.,
June 27, 1964.

Dear Senator Morse: The enclosed letter, which appeared in the Ann Arbor News of June 26, should be of interest to you. We have reason to believe that a number of Ann Arbor women share our uneasiness about the course our country seems to be taking in southeast Asia.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Converse.

HEADED FOR WAR IN ASIA?

Editor, the News:

Last Tuesday President Johnson said, "War is obsolete because there can be no winner." On the same day, Senator Morse warned, "The United States is headed for war in Asia and will be hated for the next 500 years by the majority of mankind."

Reading the news these past weeks has given us the uneasy feeling that we, along with the rest of the American public, were being carefully prepared for a new U.S. policy in southeast Asia. The "new look" has been unfolded in a steady flow of announcements: redeployment of service personnel to more strategic bases; new military shipments (oh, just routine replacements of wornout equipment); then the sudden emergency—full-blown—of a jet air base just south of the 17th parallel in South Vietnam; and now the appointment of a military authority on guerrilla fighting as our Ambassador in Saigon, when a civilian with U.N. experience withdrew. We gather that the administration expected us and many others to be hard to sell on the new policy unless we were gradually conditioned for it.

Well, this time we are going to stay hard to sell. We are told that we must honor our commitment in southeast Asia, even though as knowledgeable a person as Walter Lippmann has called the commitment a blunder. Now the United States is "honoring" this commitment (1) by increasing it and (2) by violating other commitments. Our country is publicly commited to leadership in the world's quest for peaceful solutions of complex problems. Our new southeast Asia policy violates this high commitment. Our new jet base in South Vietnam clearly violates the Geneva agreement of 1954.

It's easier to build a military base in a foreign country than to withdraw it once it's there. Khrushchev withdrew his missiles from Cuba but we still have Guantanamo and have sworn to hold on to it. Now it seems we've established a little bit of "American" territory in South Vietnam and will be asked to defend it to the death. Ah, whose death? Who and how many will die for that aircraft base in Vietnam, built with our tax dollars and without our knowledge?

We appear to be proceeding in disregard of the honest reservations of our allies and of Senator Morse's "majority of mankind" to come. In so doing, do we exhibit an unseemly arrogance which closes doors we can ill afford to close in a world where "war is obsolete?"

Gail W. Kellum.
Elizabeth Converse.

Kennebunk, Maine,
June 25, 1964.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: Your conviction, expressed on the NBC "Today" program this morning, that the whole question of Vietnam and the rest of southeast Asia should be taken to the United Nations for decision meets with my hearty approval.

I, as only one individual, and a woman at that, have long felt that we were conducting a war illegally without the voted approval of Congress.

We cannot talk of peace out of one side of our mouths, and conduct an illegal war with justification, out of the other side.

Like many others (I presume), I feel frustrated, listening and reading day after day about all these many problems that face humans all over the world, and not being able to do anything about them.

If there is any way that I can support you in your efforts to have the U.S. Government take this southeast Asia problem to the U.N. for action, instead of the United States of America drifting into a unilateral war with Communist China, I'd be glad to do my bit.

Sincerely,

Marion E. Cole.

Chicago, Ill.,
June 28, 1964.

Dear Senator Morse: After hearing your views expressed on the program "Issues and Answers" today, I must agree with your proposal to let the U.N. solve the Vietnam crisis.

Sincerely,

Patricia M. Condon.

Lynchburg, Va.,
June 29, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: I heard you last night on "Issues and Answers." I had wondered why we were not working through United Nations in Vietnam. Why aren't we? I agree with you we should, and I hope we do.

Sincerely,

Miss Elsie W. Gilliam.

Manhattan Beach, Calif.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Building, Washington, D.C.:

Today I wrote to President Johnson and Dean Rusk taking issue with them with the present U.S. policy in Vietnam and Laos. I have little understanding of our unilateral policy of force there for issues which seem political and not military ones. I too, counsel the President to use his policy of settling problems with words of reason rather than actions of force and destruction.

Frankly, I am filled with fear that this little dirty war will be escalated to a big dirty war. I hope you will continue to speak out loud and often as you see this issue.

If there is anything further you feel I can do, I shall be most happy to give it consideration.

Sincerely yours,

Manuel Siegel.

Washington, D.C.,
June 29, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse.

Dear Senator: For several weeks I have been following your statements on Vietnam, and the President's handling of the war there, with great surprise.

I really didn't think any Member of the Senate had the political courage that you show. But in the long run I think you may find that the majority of the American people would support your view over the administration view on Vietnam if presented the issues and allowed to choose.

Certainly I agree with you completely and urge you to keep on. You set an example for other Members of the Senate and, I hope, may keep us from some hideous consequence.

Best wishes.

George Spencer.

Chicago,
June 28, 1964.

Dear Senator Morse: I watched the interview you gave this afternoon over ABC and I was gratified to see that there are still responsible people that are sane.

I am a foreign student from Greece. I am a bit at ease because I know that "your man from Washington" will have a landslide. I would be more than honored if I had the chance to shake your hand. I am certain that if you will happen to visit Chicago, I will not miss the opportunity to do so.

Respectfully yours,

John Pavlidis.

Lindsborg, Kans.,
June 29, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on your splendid television interview yesterday. Your presentation was lucid and convincing. Keep plugging.

Mrs. Charles P. Greenough.

Tenaha, Tex.,
June 25, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse.

Dear Sir: We just saw and heard you on the "Today" program, and we just must write and tell you how very much we agree with you, I do hope you continue to tell the people what it will mean if we do get into a war, I wish everyone in the United States could hear you.

Congratulations again and please keep it up.

Respectfully,

Mr. and Mrs. Marion Stone.

Bethesda, Md.,
June 29, 1964.

President Lyndon B. Johnson,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

Dear President Johnson: In your address in Minneapolis you renewed the pledge to protect the freedom of South Vietnam and to use the force necessary to that end. However, the applause of listeners was reserved for your pledge to continue your quest for peace.

We do not believe that our foreign policy should be determined by a popularity poll but it is evident that there is no enthusiasm for escalating the civil war in South Vietnam into an international conflict. We agree with your remarks praising the United Nations and so we ask, "Why that organization has not been used in the present conflict?" Is the present government any more than the Diem regime one of the peoples' own choice?

We are not experts but it seems to make good sense to us to ask for a plebiscite of South and North Vietnam under U.N. auspices and with all foreign troops, including our own, withdrawn. If we cannot win, we might achieve neutrality at least.

This course should remove the implication that under the guise of "protection" we are helping to impose an unwelcome government on the people of South Vietnam and taking sides in a civil war. It should further your quest for peace, and still retain our honor.

Sincerely yours,

L. D. and Alice MacIntyre.

Hyattsville, Md.,
June 28, 1964.

Dear Senator Morse: After listening to "Issues and Answers" I had to write to you to say that I am completely in accord with your views on the war in Vietnam. I have been increasingly more disturbed about our policies in southeast Asia. I feel that we do have a responsibility to the world to advance democracy and freedom. However, I also feel we have no right to make war. When we adopt Communist tactics we have already lost because our goal is for people to choose freely. Freedom cannot and should not be advanced by U.S. force.

Cuba is a glaring example of our setting up a dictator in the name of democracy and how it has ended is not what our leaders foresaw.

Please keep up your plea to keep us fighting for peace and for a strong United Nations.

Sincerely,

Bonnie L. Walker,
Democrat From Maryland.

Los Angeles, Calif.,
June 28, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senior Senator from Oregon,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: Allow me to join those who heartily endorse your stand on our Government's attitude toward the situation in southeast Asia.

Sincerely yours,

Hamilton S. Cloud, D.D.S.

June 9, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: Please send me your speeches and whatever else you can on Vietnam. I have been guardedly speaking to friends and writing my representatives urging a review of our policy there. You might say that I have lacked the courage to come right out and condemn the role our Government is playing. I appreciate all the more your forthrightness.

Now I am really ready to speak out, and keep speaking out. I don't care what my neighbors may think. One stands the chance of being called a traitor, and all the rest, but it now seems abundantly clear to me that my country's best interests, and our national honor, depend upon us coming to our senses. To continue as we have is to morally disgrace ourselves.

But I do need all the facts I can get. It is difficult to piece the news together—the omissions are so gross, however, that the phrase "news management" seems wholly justified. Your speeches are weakly reported even in the New York Times. So please send me what you can even though I am not your constituent.

Most sincerely,

EDWARD CRAWFORD.

NEW YORK, N.Y.

MEMPHIS, TENN.,
June 24, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I just listened to you speak on Vietnam on the "Today" show, and you gave me heart. You said many things that badly need saying. Please continue your fight. What you are saying is vastly important, but just as important is that someone is saying it. We in this country, I maintain, are not inherently aggressive and impractical, but we are unbelievably ignorant, especially where our relationship to and standing in the world are concerned. Thank you for the forthright expression of views—and facts—which will perhaps reduce this ignorance.

Sincerely,

MRS. GEORGE D. DAVIS.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
June 12, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I greatly admire the courage you have shown in your outspoken attitude toward the bloody mess in South Vietnam. I think that your position, more than that of any other prominent American, will be vindicated when all the facts are known.

As a young man of draft age it would provoke a crisis of conscience if I were conscripted to fight in a war so senselessly brutal and self-defeating.

Sincerely,

ROBERT H. BATEMAN, Jr.

P.S.—I would appreciate receiving a printed copy of each of your speeches on the Vietnam problem.

INTERNATIONAL LONGSHOREMEN'S & WAREHOUSEMEN'S UNION, LOCAL 14,
Eureka, Calif., May 26, 1964.

Hon. Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Our membership at their regular meeting of May 20, 1964, voted to commend you and Senator GRUENING, of Alaska, for your courageous injection of truth and reason into the foreign policy debate. We feel we are being sucked into a full-scale war in South Vietnam without all the facts being told the people. We would like to know what the State Department calls a "constitutional government" when in South Vietnam our soldiers are dying to protect what they call a constitutional government, while in Brazil an elected constitutional government was overthrown and these same people fell all over themselves to congratulate the "brass" there for their success in the overthrowing of the government there.

Would you kindly send us a copy of your speeches on South Vietnam and on foreign policy?

Sincerely yours,

O. L. DEARINGER,
N.C.D.C. Representative,
I.L.W.U. Local 14.

LA HABRA, CALIF.,
June 11, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: The brief news reports I hear of your speeches the past few months concerning Vietnam are very interesting and timely. You seem to be the only one talking any sense on this critical issue in public, although I think there is a lot of public sympathy for making a realistic settlement in southeast Asia.

I would very much appreciate receiving copies of previous or future speeches by you on this subject.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM T. HOLSER.

JUNE 9, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am sorry there are not more politicians to speak with your realism and courage. I would feel we had a much safer world and better future for our country and its people.

Is it possible to send me a copy of the speech you made in the Senate, Thursday, June 4, with reference to the southeast Asian situation? What can those of us who feel you speak for us, do?

Thank you.

MRS. ROBERT SHERMAN.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
June 16, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have read some of your recent speeches in the Senate on our foreign policy and must express my hearty agreement. Your forthright stand is courageous beyond words and must eventually influence others to look at the world more objectively.

Sincerely yours,

EARL BUDIN, M.D.

UNIONTOWN, OHIO,
June 19, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Congress of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am writing to you to tell you that I am wholeheartedly in agreement with your views on our involvement in southeast Asia. Though I am a college instructor and a scientist, I have have an active interest in politics and world affairs. I believe that the United States should get off the southeast Asia mainland altogether—including both Laos and South Vietnam. The State Department should realize that the United States cannot win a war on the mainland of Asia. Is this President Johnson's idea of prosperity—an artificially created prosperity based on building war materials for a war in Asia? If the President doesn't soon get us disentangled from that mess, he will not get my vote in November, even though I agree with his domestic policies otherwise.

Keep up the good work.

Sincerely,

CONRAD GUTERMUTH.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Anyone who has had the experience of standing in the lonely trenches of fighting for what conscience dictates can only commend you and Senator GRUENING for the splendor of your courage.

Anyone who has read the whole spectrum of thought involved in this southeast Asia problem can only come out in one place—in your corner.

MARIE HITCHEN.

WILMINGTON, DEL., *June 19, 1964.*

JUNE 14, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to thank you for your heroic stand you have taken in the Senate, especially in regard to stopping the war in Vietnam. I do hope more and more Congressmen will follow your humane and democratic ideas.

Yours respectively,

MRS. BETSY DAVENPORT.

DEAR SENATOR: I want to give you my sincere congratulations for your stands in the Senate against the war in Vietnam. Please keep up the good work. Turns are certainly needed in most phases of our foreign policy. Senator FULBRIGHT and yourself have certainly been the mainstays for any attempt to overhaul this country's stands.

Sincerely,

MEYER FASMAN.

NORTH PLATTE, NEBR.,
June 19, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR: Please vote to cut the foreign aid bill deeply. Let the people vote on it and we would do away with it entirely. No reason in the world why we should support the rest of the world. Thank you.

W. W. KELLY.

P.S.—It has not made us any friends and note the "go home Yank" after taking our money.

JUNE 18, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Again, let me tell you how very much I appreciate your efforts to disengage our military in southeast Asia.

I am enclosing our local and current effort to help you (and our "Nation under God.").

With sincere encouragement.

LOIS D. WARREN.

This enclosure is going to each member of Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate.

Washington Post, March 29, 1964: "Two recent South Vietnamese napalm bombings, which fell into the brutal category, have grieviously hurt the U.S. image throughout the world. One was widely dramatized by the publication of an Associated Press photograph on March 20 which showed a child in his father's arm, badly burned by air-launched, jellied, gasoline bombs which had fired a Vietnamese village * * * Publication of the AP photo resulted in the (U.S.) Defense Department's acknowledging for the first time that napalm has been furnished South Vietnam—under the military aid program, and that it has been dropped by Vietnamese planes provided by U.S. assistance plan."

DO YOU APPROVE?

Senator WAYNE MORSE, Oregon, March 25, 1964: "We should never have gone in there. We should not have stayed in. We should get out now."

Senator ERNEST GRUENING, Alaska: "The time has come to reverse our policy of understanding to defend areas such as South Vietnam * * * A return of troops to our own shores should begin."

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, Montana: "There has not been and there does not exist today a basis in our national interest which would justify the assumption of primary American responsibility in this situation which might well involve the sacrifice of a vast number of American lives * * *"

Senator WAYNE MORSE, Oregon, March 30, 1964: "By what right did the Secretary of Defense go over to South Vietnam and pledge U.S. support for a 'thousand years, if necessary,' in behalf of the American people. He had no such right. The American people should answer him in no uncertain terms."

Whittier Peace Council recommends immediate withdrawal of all American forces from southeast Asia and urges settlement of the war by the 14-nation Geneva Conference of 1962 under the auspices of the United Nations.

Write President Johnson, Senator Kuchel, Senator Engle today.

This message is brought to you by the Whittier Peace Council and the following groups: Whittier Chapter American Association for the United Nations, Peace and Service Committee—First Friends Church, Whitleaf Monthly Meeting of Friends, Whittier Friends Unprogramed Meeting, Whittier Area Women Strike for Peace, Whittier La Mirada Unitarian Fellowship.

For further information—or to help defray cost of this ad—please send requests and contributions to: Whittier Peace Council, 821 East Sunrise Drive, Whittier, Calif.

Takoma Park, Md.,
June 20, 1964.

President Lyndon B. Johnson,
White House, Washington, D.C.

Dear President Johnson: We are gravely concerned with the situation in Vietnam. There is considerable feeling that we had no right to intervene in the first place, and our apparent plans to escalate the fighting there could develop into a war with China. Several Senators, such as Senator Wayne Morse, have made serious suggestions for negotiating a peace in Vietnam and withdraw our troops. We urgently ask you to consider their proposals, stop the fighting, and begin negotiating immediately before it is too late.

Sincerely,
Dr. and Mrs. Rex V. Naylor.

Seattle, Wash.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator: I'm with you in your campaign to get U.S. troops recalled from Vietnam. This is a senseless war, in which we have no business.

Thanks for speaking out.

Sincerely yours,
(Miss) Elizabeth Yates.

June 20, 1964.

Kendall, Fla.,
June 18, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: I view as most distressing the "feelers" appearing throughout our news media citing the need for stepped-up military action in southeast Asia. If, as I believe, these are designed to test public response to such an eventuality, I feel I would be derelict in my duty as a citizen if I failed to express my strong opposition to it. It is my firm opinion that we have no moral or legal right to inflict our will on the people of southeast Asia, and that if action of any kind is indicated, we should not take it unilaterally upon ourselves, but should bring the matter before the United Nations for solution.

Respectfully submitted.
Reynolds Moody,
Lieutenant Colonel U.S. Marine Corps, Retired.

Rochester, Mich.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C

Dear Senator Morse: I am hoping for a negotiated settlement of the Vietnam "mess." The U.N., the Geneva Conference, any alternative to escalating the war or even continuing it.

Let us spend that million and a half a day on assuring every one the right to vote in this country or lessening poverty here.

Sincerely,
Margaret Duffield.

San Francisco, Calif.,
May 26, 1964.

Hon. Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: Thank you for your very excellent speech on "Meet the Press," May 24, 1964.

What a pity that the public do not know the facts about such matters and must depend on the muddled reports that our newspapers print.

The Christian Science Monitor, New York Times, and the Wall Street Journal seem to do better reporting than most others.

Please appear on the TV as often as possible to give us, the public, the facts.

Senator Morse, my thinking is that before peace of any kind can be attained it is necessary to bring China into the United Nations. My understanding of the United Nations is that it imposes an obligation on member governments to observe the provisions of the charter and the resolutions of the membership, and the important opportunity of behind-the-scenes discussions.

We need more speeches like yours and more men who are not afraid to speak the truth about facts as they exist.

Sincerely yours,
Erma Rapp.

P.S.—I too felt very badly about the speech of Ambassador A. Stevenson. Twice I have heard him give speeches that I felt were from his lips and not his heart; they made me very sad.

Canoga Park, Calif.,
June 15, 1964.

Dear Senator Morse: A few hours ago I sat down in a barbershop and casually thumbed through a recent issue of Life magazine which contained excellent photographs of the Vietnamese war. With my heart pounding I saw our side torturing young men in the Vietcong to extract confessions. The full horror of what we are doing suddenly dawned upon me.

Should the Asiatic multitudes achieve a dominant position in the world of tomorrow it will be a very difficult thing to be an American. All Americans will be held accountable for these crimes. We cannot plead ignorance when Life magazine so clearly has presented all of us with the facts as they are. Our Government has illegally committed American troops to a foreign war. Congress was not consulted nor was the U.N.

Please Senator Morse, keep plugging for a cessation of our foul, filthy war in southeast Asia.

There are so few men who can do the honest, courageous thing that you have done. May you have the strength to continue.

Sincerely,
Harold Schneier.

University of South Carolina,
Columbia, S.C., June 16, 1964.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: I completely agree with your position on Vietnam. Our troop involvement there violates every precept of international law, just as it violates every precept of the existential morality of Christ.

As a Democrat, I am especially heartened by your willingness to criticize a Democratic administration. We need desperately in this country some opposition to the bipartisan warmongering which has kept the cold war going and stifled a realistic peace program. On the issue of Vietnam you are supplying it, with matchless eloquence and logic.

Sincerely,
Emmett J. Durant.

Mesa, Ariz.,
June 20, 1964.

Dear Mr. Morse: We hear with grave concern from Mr. Brinkley on the news what the State Department intends to do in Vietnam—send 200,000 of our boys in there to get killed and start a war with China that would never end. You could tell by the looks on Mr. Brinkley's face that he is worried, and I and all the people I've talked to are worried.

Just why does our State Department think they have the power to declare war? Is that not still the power of Congress? Of all the people I've talked to, I can't find one who knows of any reason why we are messing around down there in the first place.

Mr. Bundy, of our State Department, states we are going in there and extend the war to the north. MacArthur tried that in Korea thinking the Chinks would do nothing. We got run out of there by the hordes of Chinese and lost a lot of boys.

We are wondering how many sons Mr. Bundy has of military age. I think Mr. Bundy had better go up to the Bay of Fundy and get lost.

Mr. Brinkley gave us one ray of hope when he said you were going to demand the withdrawal of our troops, as they were in Vietnam illegally, and cut out all aid to that country. Those people in Vietnam are so busy fighting each other that they don't have time to worry about the Commies.

A. J. McGinn.

Long Beach, Calif.,
June 15, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator: You seem to be one of the few humanitarians in Congress. That's the reason we are writing to you. If we lived in Oregon our family of six voters would support you in full. The only request that we have to make is read June 12 issue, 1964, and see the pictures under the caption "But this is my duty," in Life magazine.

Please tell Congress that at least in this area our people are sick and tired of this senseless war.

Are we a nation of barbarians?

Thank you, Senator and the best of luck.

Very sincerely,
Lester W. Denevan.
Wilda A. Denevan.
Lester M. Denevan.
Terry L. Denevan.

Longview, Wash.,
June 19, 1964.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: Just a line to you to encourage you in your attacks on foreign aid to corrupt, unreforming governments and on our policy in Vietnam.

I realize, as I'm sure you do, that such independent statements can be dangerous to you politically; it takes a strong and courageous personality to point out the harsh facts to the administration and the American public as you have been doing so effectively in recent months.

Best of luck to you, and I hope to keep hearing your strong, liberal voice on the major issues confronting the United States today and in the future.

Very sincerely,
William J. Gaboury.

Los Angeles, Calif.,
June 28, 1964.

Hon. Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Wayne Morse: Your work for peace is greatly appreciated.

War cannot bring victory, will not destroy communism, can only destroy people, property to the American image. Would like to have your material on the questions of peace. Thank you in advance.

Sincerely yours,

MRS. VERA BACHMAN.

JUNE 28, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I agree wholeheartedly with your views regarding our "outlaw" activities in southeast Asia and particularly in Vietnam. I began to rethink our participation in these countries this past week when you expressed yourself following one committee meeting with the Secretary of Defense and General Taylor.

I truly believe that a U.N. functioning "peace force" should be the position being expounded by our Government and not the unilateral military force as is presently being employed.

I support your views and will make known my acceptance of them to my own representatives.

Yours truly,

HOWARD RATCLIFFE.

MARTINSBURG, W. VA.

CARMEL, CALIF.,
June 25, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I have just listened to your remarks on Vietnam on the NBC "Today" program. I have spent considerable time in that area in the U.S. Navy and feel closer to the situation than the average citizen.

Let me thank you for enlightening the public with your knowledgeable comments. I agree with you and hope you are successful in blocking our military entry into war in Asia.

Sincerely yours,

HUNTER W. STEWART.

JUNE 25, 1964.

Senator MORSE,

DEAR SIR: I saw and heard you on the "Today Show", and I believe you are 100 percent right. I have always admired you, you have more brains in your little toe than those generals who sit safely in Washington. While the kids go and get killed, to satisfy who? The generals of course.

The United Nations was born to settle wars, I am for President Johnson too, but he is letting the wrong people advise him.

I hope you convince these tinheads to change their minds.

Sincerely,

MRS. R. DAVIS.

JUNE 25, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Please, Senator MORSE, use whatever persuasion you can to stop the tide of aggressors in public office before we have another major war.

We in Florida cannot turn to our own Representatives; they are not fair to our own citizens, how can they be otherwise toward other nations.

Why is it so many people feel that they are entitled to tell other countries how to run their affairs when our own is about the most immoral in every way. Would any people be anxious to join our ways unless paid or coerced?

For a short time we had hopes in Governor Scranton till he came to Florida with the usual belligerent talk against Cuba.

I can look till I'm cross eyed but see only that they should settle their affairs inside Cuba by their own people. Will he spread communism to our neighboring countries? I think we are doing a better job of it by our example, by what is happening here in America and what we are doing to others.

Sincerely,

MRS. J. STOWE.

MIAMI, FLA.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
June 25, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I hope that I am correctly informed that you question present U.S. policies in Vietnam and favor our making an earnest effort to negotiate a settlement.

To me it seems urgent that negotiations begin promptly before the fighting is extended and that they include all the nations involved in southeast Asia. Enclosed is a copy of a letter similar to one I have just sent to President Johnson.

Will you please exert every effort to extricate us and the world from a struggle which has the effect of preventing completion of a revolution and which may readily get out of control?

Sincerely yours,

GELSTON MCNEIL.

P.S.—This letter should have been modified for you. I do thank you, Senator MORSE, for your courageous and outspoken efforts in behalf of a more sane policy.

For months I've been intending to thank you for a fine presentation of constructive ideas with regard to Cuba which I heard in an interview-type program on station WGMS.

Keep up the good work.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
June 24, 1964.

President LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR PRESIDENT JOHNSON: "The people of the world, I think, prefer reasoned agreement to ready attack." Does not this statement of yours (March 23, 1964) call for a sharp change in our course in southeast Asia? For not only is it true that people prefer reason to violence: it is also true that negotiation on the basis of equality holds the only hope for life in a nuclear age.

Since 1945 war in South Vietnam has been killing and starving and maiming with terrible suffering thousands of women and children as well as guerrilla flighters (who are also human). None seems to know or care just how many. At a meeting last week I heard a Government spokesman, while rightly lamenting the over 1,000 American casualties, speak with gusto of "wiping out the guerrillas."

We should be demonstrating that we are friends of the world's poor by aiding their "revolution of rising expectations" in Vietnam and everywhere. There can be no stability until this revolution is accomplished.

Instead, by supporting military juntas and other corrupt, oppressive governments, by supplying napalm and helicopters and barbed wire and cropdestroyers and other accouterments of modern war, we are opposing the revolution. Whether or not we intend to do so makes little difference. We appear to the oppressed, underdeveloped, war-sick people to be just another white, colonial power replacing the French who, we ourselves admit, were denying the people their sacred right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

I agree with Walter Lippmann (New York Tribune, May 28) and with Senator MORSE that American troops never should have gone into Vietnam. These men point out that we must correct our error by substituting negotiation for force. In this Senators CHURCH, GRUENING, BEALL, and others agree—as do I.

Stepping up the war in Vietnam would not only increase and prolong sufferings of the Vietnamese people and delay the revolution, it would drive Ho Chi Minh completely into the arms of China (even as our starvation policies toward Cuba have driven Castro into dependence upon the great Communist powers). Extending the war will also cause U.S.S.R. to support China and thus destroy what improvement in relationships has been painstakingly and precariously worked out between the Soviet Union and the United States.

Mr. Johnson, instead of aggravating animosity between China and the United States of America, is it not time that we develop toward that great country a creative approach which offers some possibility of peaceful solution of problems and resumption of our traditional friendship? Would it not be wise to consider President de Gaulle's proposals? On the other hand, continuing our arrogant and self-righteous policies toward China tends to lose us friends, to solidify our enemies and thereby to lessen the possibility of rapprochement.

A year ago at American University President Kennedy pointed to the truth that conditions and attitudes in all kinds of societies change and that we must recognize and encourage changes in others and be open to change ourselves. It is also imperative, though extremely difficult for a nation—as for an individual—to admit its mistakes and change its course. Failure to do so will leave our country behind the march of history at best, and, at worst, can make our beloved country an instrument for the destruction of civilization.

Yours sincerely,

GELSTON MCNEIL.

METROPOLIS, ILL.,
June 25, 1964.

WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Thanks to you, for the words spoken over TV, when you said that our boys should not be dying in South Vietnam. I think its so shameful for the United States to have our boys there, when there has been no war declared. Why don't our so-called allies go in there too. They know its wrong. Here we have Cuba, right at our door, and no attention is given to what goes on there. But they risk their necks million miles away.

We cannot police the entire world. What would we say, when other countries sent military force over here to change our method?

I am for a peaceful country. The same should be followed with integration. We can't do anything by force. But people will understand each other as time goes on. We have no trouble here with a racial problem. All get along together and that good will, will spread if they would keep agitators out.

Thanks again to you. Will you appear on TV more often?

We need a House full of Members like you in Washington.

Yours very sincerely,

MRS. RAYMOND MITCHELL.

P.S.—The feed-grain program should be scrapped. It does more harm than good. The voluntary soil bank did so much more and cost less when people take their entire farm out of production. This feed grain the big farmers take out the less fertile ground and draw Government pay and use that money to buy fertilizer and livestock to produce more on remaining acres, and therefore the surplus gets greater.

HOUSTON, TEX.,
June 29, 1964.

YOUR HONOR SENATOR MORSE: Just listened to you on the "Today" show. I think you are so right. Did we not learn anything from Korea.

Yours very truly,

MRS. EDNA J. DALY.

FORT LAUDERDALE, FLA.,
June 25, 1964.

Senator MORSE.

DEAR SIR: At last we have someone on Capitol Hill who has given me and many of my neighbors the inside on this Vietnam subject. This a.m. on program "Today," I stopped my breakfast to sit and listen to you; so clear was your explaining this dogfight we are in, and cannot do one thing except pour our men and dollars to destruction.

I am a widow but our country is, as you just about put it, carrying the load that is not ours alone. Do keep up your clear, precise speaking; you will get others to see also.

I do thank you for your brief talk.

I am,

Mrs. Claire V. Heberle.

Coffeyville, Kans., *June 25, 1964.*

Senator Morse,
U.S. Senator of Oregon,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: I heard your talk on "Today" TV today concerning the action of the United States, directed by President Johnson, in southeast Asia.

I agree in detail with all you said in your TV interview.

Too much of our actions are based on wishful thinking and self-deception—based mostly on an infantile messianic complex that we have that we are the chosen people to lead the rest of the world into the land of milk and honey—while we are disintegrating here at home. We cannot understand that the rest of the world and no part of it see us as we see ourselves looking through our Alice in Wonderland looking glass of wishful thinking, self-deception, and messianic complex.

Sincerely,

A. A. Baker.

June 24, 1964.

Dear Senator: I have been watching this Asiastic situation and try and take a fair approach to our position there and what we should do about it. I have come to the definite conclusion that you have the right answer. We do not want to get mixed up in a hot war with China, and it looks right now as though we are headed in that direction. The French fought in that area for over 7 years with top-flight troops, coupled with material aid from us, and they were decisively beaten. Are we about to travel the same road? Such a stupid course would deplete our resources and manpower almost to a point of no return. It will be another Korea. It seems that the Democratic Party (I am independent) is as frequently labeled, "the war party."

Your position is, and will receive the support of the right-thinking citizen. Keep up the good work.

Respectfully yours,

Clayton E. Digg.

San Bernardino, Calif., *June 24, 1964.*

Mr. Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senator.

Dear Mr. Morse: You have been a hundred percent right since you have been in the U.S. Senate.

As you say that the United States is sticking its nose in too far in other countries business. That nose might be punched and bleed for several years at the expense of all Americans.

Mr. Morse, you will have my vote and I know many more will vote for you.

I remain a true Democrat.

Yours sincerely,

Frank H. Spicer.

West Hartford, Conn.,
June 25, 1964.

Dear Senator: Please say what you said on "Today" about Asia—loud and long until it is heard. Thank you, sir.

Respectfully,

Helen Shive
Mrs. John J. Shive.

Flushing, Mich.,
June 25, 1964.

Dear Senator Morse: Your hard-hitting remarks that we heard on the "Today" show this morning concerning the situation in southeast Asia certainly made a lot of commonsense. What a deep insight you have into this serious problem.

You have my husband's and my complete concurrence in the matter and there must be multitudes of people all over the country who feel the same.

It is to be fervently hoped that there is a possibility that you and others of your colleagues on Capitol Hill who share your views, might do something about all this before it is too late. Your straightforward talk on television this morning was certainly a step in the right direction.

Most respectfully yours,

Mrs. Theodore Buell.

Lorain, Ohio,
June 25, 1964.

Mr. Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: I wish to state that I agree with your position on the dangerous situation in Vietnam and in southeast Asia in general.

I respectfully ask you that you do all in your power to prevent any war in southeast Asia involving the United States.

Respectfully yours,

Charles J. Browne.

Oskaloosa, Iowa,
June 25, 1964.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: Thank you for being willing to speak out concerning Vietnam. It is sad that our country should be the one to bypass the U.N. and not give it a chance at the peacemaking efforts for which it was instituted.

Further, I feel that the news media has allowed false ideas to guide public opinion because it is not pleasant to criticize. Where are our courageous news reporters? Thank you again.

Most sincerely,

Zena Grubb
Mrs. Charles E. Grubb.

Warsaw, Ind.,
June 25, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: This is to add my voice of approval to your stand on current Government issues.

Thank you for your courageous and truthful comments on the TV program of "Today," as well as those made previously.

I am among those who feel that our only hope for avoiding a national disaster is by following policies such as you have expressed, and I urge you to continue with increasing vigor.

Yours sincerely,

L. G. Bailey.

Sandusky, Ohio,
June 25, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senator of the State of Oregon,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: Heard you being interviewed on the "Today" show this morning, and was very interested in what you had to say, as I and my husband and sons have been thinking the same thoughts. Thank God for men like yourself who are not afraid to speak out, for your honesty, your forthrightness, and also your clarity. What in the name of heaven is happening to this country of ours, and who do you think President Johnson thinks he is, God? Do you understand how small and helpless a person like myself feels in the face of what is going on in Washington. I don't want my two clean young boys fighting in that stinking hole for a ridiculous cause—besides, according to those brainy intellectuals in government now, it isn't the fashion to "win" a war anymore. If we had permitted General MacArthur to go on in Korea, this war may not have been necessary. I am one of those Americans who believe everything he wrote. And, according to many of my friends, they believe also, only most of them are too apathetic to write.

I compliment you on your honest criticism of President Johnson. All this makes me more of a fervent Goldwater admirer than ever. He is being criticized for his complaints about the United Nations. He is being honest, too.

Thank you again.

Mrs. Gerald Lutz.

St. Paul, Minn.,
June 25, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.

Sir: Bravo for you on the "Today" show this morning. I hope you get much backing for your stand on Vietnam. We need more men of your caliber who will speak out for the good of this country.

Faithfully yours,

Myrtle G. Ostergren
(Mrs. Herbert L.).

Minneapolis, Minn.,
June 24, 1964.

Dear Senator Morse: I want you to know that I am in full agreement with your views on the situation in southeast Asia.

If it will help to show President Johnson that we want your ideas of carrying this problem to the U.N., I hope this letter will be used in that behalf.

I only hope it is not too late to save us from getting into another holocaust.

May God bless you in your efforts.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Thor Meagher.

Lima, Ohio, *June 25, 1964.*

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Member of the U.S. Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator: I am not one to write letters but after reading the attached editorial I got so mad about some of the thinking of the powers in Washington that you wonder. It looks to me that they are trying to do everything possible to get in a fight with China. Then we will have another Korea on our hands, only a great many times worse.

My reason for writing you is to let you know I like your stand on this matter and many more.

Thanks for your time in reading this note.

Respectfully,

Ray W. Barnett,
Treasurer, Allen County.

St. John Church,
Greensburg, Ind., June 25, 1964.

Dear Senator Morse: I heard your viewpoint of the South Vietnam war.

I agree with you 100 percent.

What can we do to further your program?

Sincerely,

Rev. A. J. Schneider.

Wiscasset, Maine,
June 28, 1964.

The Honorable Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: No one could deny the tremendous influence exerted on the foreign policy of the United States by the Pentagon. Just why a military department of our Government should be adjudged to be in possession of infallible wisdom in the area of peaceful international relations is beyond my understanding. With specific reference to this Nation's unilateral action in southeast Asia—which bids fair to represent the worst bungling by this country in international relationships for all time—I consider it to be absolutely shameful, utterly appalling, and entirely inconsistent with the policies of a nation presumably working toward world peace. Apart from our participation in the matter as a part of a duly appointed United Nations force sent to restore peace, the United States has no military business in the area.

Speaking as a private citizen, I most heartily commend you in your stand on the issue. Let us put the problem before the United Nations for its judgment and action. This is where it belongs, and is the only place it belongs. Our saying one thing and doing another will yet be the death of us. If peace be the aim of this Nation, then in the name of God let us be about it.

Yours truly,

SCOTT D. KITTREDGE.

CINCINNATI, OHIO,
June 25, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: May I congratulate you being a true American, being elected and holding a political office in our Government, upholding and not ignoring the Constitution of the United States, that reads, there shall be no foreign entanglements. As other politicians seem to ignore though sworn into office over a Bible.

Referring to your very true conversational talk over NBC–TV program, this is "Today."

It is a pleasure to hear you talk as a true American, who knows what you are talking about, a type of an American like President George Washington. And thinking deeper perhaps if the United States had stayed out of World War II, there would not be communism.

Sincerely yours,

Mr. J. ZINSMEISTER.

STUART, FLA., *June 25, 1964.*

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Let me congratulate you on your fearless opinion expressed on the "Today" show, as I have the same idea about our boys in Vietnam. Please do everything to stop this unconstitutional war. I agree with you that this is a McNamara war and that we should not send a military man as our Ambassador into that area (Taylor).

Having had four brothers in the First World War, while I was trained as a nurse, and then three nephews in the Second World War on the German side, and three nephews here on the American side, I know what families are sacrificing. I lived in Germany during the first war and as an American citizen here in the second war, doing nursing and social work.

While I do a lot of traveling in different countries now, I know how we are almost despised for meddling in everybody's business. We should let other countries decide for themselves what they want to be, but guard our own country, according to our Constitution.

More power to men like you.

Sincerely,

Mrs. THOMAS DARLING.

SANTA ROSA, CALIF.,
June 25, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MORSE: I have been in sympathy with your thinking on the problem in Vietnam right along, but your pronouncements this morning on the "Today" program makes me want to shout it from the rooftops that the United States should get out of southeast Asia and "rejoin" the United Nations. It seems to me that of all nations we should not desiccate the sanctuary of peace. Keep up your good work, Mr. MORSE. Your voice may be the keystone to the arch.

Sincerely,

Mrs. LEORA D. SURRYHNE.

EVANSVILLE, IND.,
June 25, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: A breath of fresh air this morning when I heard your fine comment on television. I personally think you're one of the smartest or most intelligent men in Washington, D.C. Keep up the good work.

Yours truly,

W. E. HALL, Jr.

SPRINGFIELD, OHIO,
June 25, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I salute you on your courageous stand on American involvement in southeast Asia. We cannot correct the mistakes of 19th century imperialism by sacrificing American lives. Nor can we hope to persuade the Asians—in the throes of a colonial revolution captured by the Communists—that we are any different from their former white masters and that our brand of freedom will be any better than what they have hitherto known at the hands of the whites; that is to say, exploitation and humiliation.

I wholeheartedly support your position that our only recourse is the United Nations. Only if we direct our efforts through the United Nations can we avoid the onus of being considered the aggressor out there by the Asiatics and the other noncommitted peoples of the world. To do otherwise is to go it alone, setting our course on disaster. America has long been in need of such straight-from-the-shoulder advice as you gave this day on the "Today" show. Godspeed.

Cordially yours,

GEORGE TEHAN FISCHER.

HADDONFIELD, N.J.,
June 24, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you. Thank you. Thank you for your fine, brave statements on South Vietnam. It takes great courage to speak out against the foreign policy as you and others have done. I wish that the American newspapers would publish your statements found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, for surely the American public is just uninformed about the true conditions in southeast Asia.

I consider you one of the finest patriots, because you are not afraid to speak out when you see we are not living up to our democratic ideals (and the freedom to voice opinions is a hallmark of our democracy but which should not be censored by the press).

We must try to educate the public to see that the proper place to solve international crises is in the United Nations.

Wish you would run for President.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. SALLY PRYOR.

NEWBURGH, N.Y.,
June 26, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Your forthright remarks heard a few days ago on the NBC "Today" show certainly pointed up the issues—and dangers—in the Vietnam situation.

As you so rightly said, the appointment of General Taylor to the vacated Lodge post does not augur well for a peaceful settlement of the situation. The deep involvement of this country in the south Asia area and the "policing" action we have undertaken seems very paradoxical in view of our own inability to control our citizens in Mississippi and Florida.

It would seem sort of like people in glass houses throwing stones—or don't do as I do, do as I say.

Please Senator, keep speaking out against further action that commits thousands of American youth to lose their lives to support regimes that are wholly unpopular with the citizens of the country.

Cordially yours,

EDWARD B. SALINGER.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
June 22, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I would like to commend you for your courageous and intelligent position and stand against the present reckless U.S. involvement in Vietnam and Laos which, if allowed to pursue its present course, will surely lead to full-scale war and hatred of the whole world against us.

I have just written to President Johnson to tell him that I fully concur with your position in regard to our foreign policy in Vietnam and Laos.

It's pathetic that Congress has so few men of your caliber and stature. You will be remembered in history by your compassion and unusual degree of intelligence.

Wishing you continued success in your efforts to achieve peace for mankind.

Sincerely yours,

JACK KRIEGER.

EAST ORANGE, N.J.,
June 25, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Your ready suggestions for the Vietnam situation show, as always, the long, deep thought that has gone before. Your interview on the program "Today," this morning, brought me the only comfort I have had on that situation.

I, like you, am voting and working for President Johnson this fall. I admire him very much. I feel that now at this very moment is the time that he could well adopt your plan and map out a program for our beloved country which would save the United Nations and finally solve our problem in Asia. That might take years, but we would be on the right track.

For years I have been your respectful admirer.

G. V. RAFE.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.,
June 24, 1964.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to let you know of my wholehearted support for your critical stand on the situation in Vietnam. Several weeks ago I heard you speak about this on the radio and was impressed by your ideas. Up until this time, I had no notion that anyone in Congress was at all opposed to our provocative and shortsighted policy in the Far East.

It is my understanding that the general goal of American foreign policy should be that of insuring the world peace and at the same time striving for the collapse of world communism. At times our efforts toward both these goals go hand in hand, but sometimes they do not. Since the advent of the nuclear age, the possibility of a military solution is considered out of the question by any thinking person. If so, then it seems the most promising opportunity for victory would consist of swinging the uncommitted peoples of the world over to our side. If we could do this, then we would have innumerable advantages over the Communists, e.g., economically, tradewise, and not the least, the sheer number of people who would be alined with us.

These uncommitted multitudes in Asia and Africa are just beginning to throw off the shackles of colonialism, ignorance, and the effects of racial and economic exploitation. Communism, as taught in Moscow and Peking, lures them economically from one side. Democracy, and all of the advantages which go with personal freedom, should have at least equal appeal. But does it really? To use the Madison Avenue phrase, just what is our "image" in the eyes of the world. I wonder what sort of glowing impression our Government makes by support of a military dictatorship which is primarily engaged in the business of killing peasants. Does this really add to the stature of the world's number one power? I fear that to the many little people of the world this must take on the features of a David and Goliath struggle. This feeds beautifully into the Communist propaganda line that we are aggressive warmongers. By point of fact, in Vietnam we are doing just that.

History teaches, and teaches bitterly, that revolutionary activity cannot be effectively put down unless the Government's effort has the strong support of the people behind it. Military rulers and petty dictators of all sorts lack this popular support since by definition their rule is self-imposed and maintained by repression of the opposition. Often this is bulwarked by American dollars.

Now let us take stock of some of our supposed "allies" and "comrades in arms" in the struggle against world communism. Of what possible benefit is it to the American people to be associated with creatures such as Chiang Kai-Shek, Franco, Madame Nu, or the present military junta in Saigon, to name but a few. In time of peace, we absorb all of the rotten aspects of their reputations by the simple fact that we support and condone them. In time of war, does anyone honestly think that any of these small-time Hitlers will stand gallantly by our side. More likely than not they will flee the country with the gold we have given them as many others have before.

This letter is already much too long. But again I would say that your position in this vital issue is important, even if it is not popular at the moment. Neither are many other positions popular where real courage is required. Too often, basic political and philosophical change must be made by individuals like yourself who stand for a time alone in opposition to the compact majority.

Very truly yours,

Sidney L. Copel, Ed. D.,
Clinical Pathologist.

Senator Wayne Morse, of Oregon,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Wayne Morse: We see you on TV. You are right about going to war with Red China.

It should be taken to the United Nations. We don't want war; it should be solved in some peaceful way. We don't want our sons to die for such a fool cause. If they go to war with Red China it will make us weak and then Russia will step in. I think we should keep our nose out of foreign affairs. Let the United Nations do the job.

A Friend From Ohio
(With Three Sons,
not willing to see them die).

June 25, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: We want you to know how we admired you for your outspoken comments on the "Today" program this morning.

You have given us a small feeling of security, but what has us baffled is that more men, supposed to be the leaders of our country, just follow along.

Frankly we are very concerned about our Nation and its future—the TV and magazines and press distort the facts of what is really happening and the average person in our country today will not dig in and try to find the truth. They would prefer to watch a murder mystery or hillbilly program on TV.

As an individual there seems to be so little we can do—so many of our young people have been completely brainwashed.

Our America is not what it once was, or what it should be. Everyone is out for his own gain and what he can get for himself with the least amount of effort.

One of the main troubles in our world today stems from greed.

We both had the feeling that the program panel was somewhat awestruck by your comments, and we seriously doubt that had they known, you perhaps would never have been asked to appear. These are the things they are trying to hide from the people.

Please keep the courage of your convictions as we need more men in Washington, like yourself, to fight these battles.

Yours truly,

Mrs. Marvin S. Cochrane.

Torrance, Calif.
June 22, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: I want to thank you for the position you have taken against the continued and increasing undeclared war in Indochina. It is a small comfort that we have at least one Senator with some decency left.

I suppose the theory is that village-burning and the rest of it was legalized long ago by the British and such modern improvements as we may add are only natural, the people being "natives" who put no value on human life. Besides, they haven't any aircraft and we have a deal with the Russians.

Admiral Felt announced this weekend that we are going to risk war with China, but that China would be afraid to risk war with us, since they know we are too strong. This sounds like the thinking of Douglas MacArthur, who ended up wanting to use cobalt bombs.

Presumably Felt's statement is policy, since he is commander in chief. And presumably this is the policy of the President, the State Department, and the Government.

All I know is, we never voted for it. What seems to be the case is that the war-happy generals and the CIA invasionmakers are running the show and this business of democracy and an election is nonsense and just for the papers.

It seems hopeless to try to do something about it since it is not subject to vote or to control by elected representatives. The whole thing proceeds as though Goldwater had won—and he's not even nominated yet.

Sincerely,

John V. Manning.

(Copy to President Lyndon B. Johnson.)

Knoxville, Tenn.,
June 25, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: Not being a constituent of yours I write as an American citizen to say that I fully agree with your position stated on the TV "Today" program this date that our President does not have the constitutional right to prosecute war in South Vietnam.

However, you also said that you were going to the Democratic convention and support the President and do all you could to insure his reelection.

This is the second time recently that I have heard a U.S. Senator seriously disagree with and oppose the President on an issue of tremendous importance—this time you say real war could result—and then heard the Senator announce that he will help reelect the erring one. The logic of such a course escapes the ordinary person, and I should like to ask how we in a democracy can hope to secure the good government and peace we so earnestly desire if we continue to vote for, support, and reelect those whom we say oppose such? I hope the answer is not the old worn out one that all the other prospective candidates, both Democratic and Republicans, would do worse things.

With assurance of my esteem, I am,

Very respectfully,

N. W. Bowden.

P.S.—The above inquiry from one born and reared a Democrat will probably seem to ignore party loyalty when the issue transcends it in importance. It is a sincere inquiry.

Palo Alto, Calif.,
June 24, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: We are writing to let you know that we agree with your views on Vietnam, and we admire you for your courageous and forceful expression of them. We hope you will continue to find it possible to talk sense even when this touches on the sensitivities of people in high places. We are confident that good sense will prevail, and that in the long run the course of world events will be determined by those who are prepared to face issues realistically and with human understanding.

Sincerely yours,

Margaret Finn.
Robert Finn.

(Copies President Lyndon B. Johnson and Secretary Robert S. McNamara.)

June 24, 1964.

Dear Senator Wayne Morse: I agree with you every time you open your mouth. On the situation in Vietnam you make sense.

The ominous appointment of General Taylor to ambassadorship is extremely alarming. I have written the President, also.

You are, I know, a man of stature among men of a ludicrous political specie.

We cannot afford the luxury of playing this war game, lest the world be launched in a third world war, directed (I might add) at the North American Continent, as well as engulfing the entire world.

Please, take continued courage to speak out in the Halls of Government for what is politically and morally right. My husband also agrees with you.

I know you have had many well-wishers.

Sincerely,

Pat R. Stackovich.

Los Angeles, Calif.,
June 26, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: Please let me congratulate you on your outspoken and courageous stand with regard to Vietnam. I am wholeheartedly in agreement with you, and I am sure that many, many, who, like you, are in possession of the facts, know that you speak the truth but lack your courage, and would endanger America and the future of the world rather than risk political careers.

I should think that even those who do not agree with you would have great admiration for your integrity. The tragic truth is that history, I am sure, will prove you were right, but, I am afraid, too late to save us.

My profoundest respects to a true American.

Sincerely,

Mildred Rogers.

(Copy to President L. B. Johnson.)

June 24, 1964.

Dear Senator Morse: Your talk on TV about the U.S. policy I'm sure is shared by many—why don't they stand up and be counted.

This policy will continue only as long as the mass of the people are ignorant, or for one reason or other afraid to speak up.

Your referral to the 30 Australians doubling to 60 was an eye opener, although we should know by now how such things work.

Please, Senator Morse, try to get on TV and radio oftener—make the people realize it's their lives and the lives of their loved ones that are at stake.

I wish there was some organization I could join to help others to wake up and be counted, as it really is later than they think—much later—maybe even too late.

Sincerely,

Peggy Klempner.

June 25, 1964.

Dear Mr. Morse: Just heard you on the "Today" program, and you are the first one I have listened to that has made any sense. I have always thought that the Congress made the decision if we were to have war, but President Johnson seems to be the one to decide. Like you I don't think Red China can be bluffed with our threats, and just might fool us, if we think they will back down.

They have 700 million people as you say; they don't care about human life and they could send waves and waves of men against us. Khrushchev would love us to have war with them that would save their men and fighting with them, and in the meantime when we were fighting China they would start something in Berlin, and also in Cuba. You're right we are the only ones in South Vietnam where are our Allies?

They are smart they are staying out. Will you please go on Meet the Press and tell the people about this mess we got ourselves in. Fighting thousands of miles away, and forgetting all about Cuba right at our doorsteps.

Mr. Morse I have always voted Democratic but at this time I feel like thousands more people not to vote for anyone. If you were running for President I would vote for you as you are the only one I ever heard that thought the same as I do.

We are at war in Vietnam, as sure as the sun will rise tomorrow, and sending an Army man to take Lodge's place does not look good to me. What good does it do to have a United Nations if the problems can't be brought to them to settle, I have also wondered what they are doing all along about this crisis in South Vietnam? Can one man, the President, make this decision to have our boys killed as they are every day over there (he has two girls) and talk so brave we will fight to the finish.

As you said we cannot police Asia, maybe Russia (Khrushchev) is pretending to be angry at China and provoke a war with us then go in with China. Its easy to start a war, but to stop it and get out of it is another thing. Our Allies as you say are sitting on the sidelines, and saying what fools.

De Gaulle sees the folly of us doing what we are doing, and he is not going along with us in our decisions to make a fool of ourselves. That "Washington Pipeline" column the other day said Russians are installing a new missile in Cuba that doesn't need a launching pad. Capable of being launched from a tank-type vehicle, the missile's range from 600 to 1,100 miles.

Mr. Morse, please shout from the hilltops we are doing wrong to stay in Vietnam, also where are the Natioalist Chinese (I spelt that wrong) but will you ask will Chinese fight Chinese? Years ago when I was a kid I read a book called "Carpenter's Asia" about the yellow peril to come some day.

When Japan started the war I then figured maybe the yellow races would get together then. You never hear anything any more about Red China and Russia being at odds since we took over and are fighting Khrushchev's battles. Boy, is he jumping with glee? Just what he wanted, things couldn't be better for him. Playing right into his hands.

Please, Senator Morse, you are the most intelligent man yet to go on TV and tell the people "wake up, America" before its too late, and gets out of hand, and brings us to war.

ALONE

Our allies are not with us in spirit. Sometimes I feel like a voice in the wilderness; there are so many things I seem to feel that are not right, but what can I do?

China? There lies a sleeping giant. Let him sleep. For when he wakes, he will move the world.

Napoleon said that years ago. Will close this letter, and don't remain quiet; Mr. Morse, you have the right answers.

Mrs. A. Ensko.

St. Louis, Mo.

P.S.—Please excuse this typewriting; its this crazy machine.

North Newton, Kans.,
June 24, 1964.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: We are grateful to you for what you are doing in the Senate and on television to change U.S. southeast Asia policy. The enclosed copy of my letter to the Secretary of State expresses my views.

Very respectfully yours,

W. F. Unruh.

P.S.—You need not take the trouble to answer this letter. I am writing to let you know how glad we are for men like you in our Senate.

The editor of the Correspondent quotes a Japanese intellectual of Tokyo who has been in touch with some Chinese intellectuals as follows:

"My friend, there is one thing I fear more than anything else. It is that the United States may carry the Vietnam war into the North. There is absolutely no question but that the Chinese would then enter the war against the Americans. They are desperately afraid of America. Chinese on all levels see it as the aggressive and expansionist center of world imperialist reaction. They would enter the Vietnamese war as a matter of national survival. This is as certain as that we sit here."

North Newton, Kans.,
June 24, 1964.

Hon. Dean Rusk,
Secretary of State,
State Department,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Secretary Rusk: The news release that our President has appointed Gen. Maxwell Taylor, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, to replace Henry Cabot Lodge in South Vietnam, and that our Government is considering going into war with China by military action against North Vietnam is frightening to us. To go to war with China I feel would be a tragic blunder because it would cost millions of lives and would turn the world against us. A professed Christian nation surely should not do what many believe will lead to a world war.

Why does not our Government allow the United Nations to seek a solution to the southeast Asia problem? Through the United Nations world opinion would discipline China and help bring about a solution. The solution might not suit us in every respect, but it would likely be the best solution possible at this time. I feel strongly that U.S. unilateral military action is inexcusable when we have the United Nations organization to help keep the peace.

Therefore, I wish to make another plea that our Government bring the South Vietnam problem to the United Nations Assembly or to the Geneva Conference for solution.

Our Government has not lived up to the Geneva Agreements of 1954 and the world knows this. We will need to bring U.S. policy into line with the peaceful purposes of the United Nations, and respect the longing of mankind for peace. I, for one, feel that China would respect world opinion as expressed through the United Nations.

Very respectfully yours,

W. F. Unruh.

Philadelphia, Pa.,
June 26, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: I would like to take just a moment to tell you how much I have admired, over the years, your courageous and often single-handed fight for principle, truth and right.

Specifically I want to encourage you to continue in your opposition to our unconscionable involvement in Vietnam. This, and the Cuba business, have made me ashamed of my country, ashamed in a fundamental and permanent manner. These issues are crucial to what we as a nation believe and stand for, and if they represent the real answer, then—well, then I shall remain ashamed.

I would like to describe myself as a young college graduate—well, 32 years old—a civil servant, father, property owner and generally unexceptional. Sometimes the source of support is as important as the support itself.

Please keep up your efforts. I think you have demonstrated that the voters will support this kind of politics even more than the usual kind.

Sincerely yours,

Robert H. Hansteen.

Alhambra, Calif.,
June 26, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator: I listened to your broadcast this morning on the "Today" TV program, and I am writing as an American citizen in support of your position that war is not the solution to the problems that face our government in southeast Asia.

My wife and I have spent our lives as Baptist educational missionaries in China and of late years in Japan. Our purpose has been to teach the Christian way of life to students and to the people.

We have often found ourselves unable to support our commercial and industrial interests of the United States who have too often looked upon the Chinese labor and resources as an opportunity to make money by use of cheap labor and cheap raw materials. This system also made a small number Chinese of the compradore class rich, while the lot of the farmer, the intellectuals, and the craftsmen became worse and worse.

The occupation of China by the U.S. Armed Forces during 1945-48 did nothing to help the common Chinese, indeed their lot became worse.

Since 1948 the great western powers have given up their colonial policy so-called except the United States who are now engaged in a war with Vietnam to prevent the people of Vietnam from having political and economic control of southeast Asia.

Senator CHURCH of Idaho, on the "Today" show stated in his broadcast that large scale armed intervention in southeast Asia by American Armed Forces may result in the union of all the people of Asia into a race war against the white Americans, and at the same time may result in drawing the Chinese and Russians together against the United States.

Today the Asahi paper published in Tokyo stated and I quote, "A war between United States and China would be of truly great concern to us Japanese who also live in Asia," unquote.

The hour is very late maybe too late to avoid a great war in the Pacific, but I know you will do your best to get the issues before the American people and what they face if they try to use raw military power against the nearly 2 billion people of Asia.

Please do your best Senator in this time of crisis to help us.

Respectfully your,

STERLING BEATH.

JUNE 26, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Yesterday I saw and heard you on the "Today" program of NBC. What you said is important, not only for the United States but for the whole world and I hope you will continue your fight to have this brought to the U.N.

If we fought a war in southeast Asia, the problems there would still be unsolved, just as they are in Korea. These problems are compounded, rather than reduced by war.

Also, I hope you can help to see that the laws of the United States apply also to the State of Mississippi. Our son Douglas is among the young voter registration educators there. The rights of citizenship must be extended to all Americans.

Greetings to TERRY OLSON.

Sincerely yours,

HARVEY F. BATZ.

P.S.—Formerly from Montana and still remembering our discussion on the plane going to India (in 1958).

CEDAR RAPIDS, IOWA,
June 25, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Although I have written you before, sir, my admiration and gratitude for and to you are of such dimension that I must let you know again.

I'm grateful to providence that we have men of your caliber. You are my favorite Senator and have been for many years; may God bless you, sir.

My view runs parallel with yours, sir, from alpha to omega.

Knowing that God is just, I often tremble over my country's behavior; but I know that you intrepidly endeavor to retard the trigger-happy ones. Again Senator MORSE, "It may make a difference to all eternity whether we do right or wrong today."

May I also ask you, sir, to convey my gratitude to your fellow Senators HUMPHREY, CHURCH, and others of good will.

As for the vultures—let them shrill. Thanks again and again, sir.

Respectfully and gratefully yours,

HJALMAR JOHNSON.

ADRIAN, MICH.,
June 25, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I've just heard you on the "Today" show.

You have given me hope, as you undoubtedly have millions of others who heard you express your views so daringly and so clearly—that someone in Washington is aware of what is going on and even though it is going against the actions of leaders in his own party, has the courage to ask what the majority of your countrymen are asking—Why are we acting alone? Why are we bypassing the United Nations? Why are we sending our soldiers to die in the Far East?

We are rebelling against what those in high office are doing to our country—the Supreme Court making our laws and scrapping the Constitution. Taking away the rights of the majority and catering to a minority resulting in chaos. Getting us into a war which we cannot win and for which we have no heart.

Those in the highest offices have lied to us until we have no confidence in what we are told—the latest, denial of the resignation of Lodge when we know, now, he had resigned when the denial was made. The replacements weren't decided overnight.

The administration making a fool of itself to its countrymen and the whole world—Johnson expecting plaudits for trying to "settle the crisis in Cyprus" while preparing for a real war in Asia. Stating that Russia "agrees" to stay out of a war with Red China, expecting it to break a pact with Red China, but not to break that agreement.

Why have GOLDWATER and Wallace gone over so dramatically? The people see what is taking place and will vote for anyone who will promise to reverse the present trend.

Sincerely,

SESTA T. MATHEISON.

BUFFALO, N.Y.,
June 25, 1964.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you very much for explaining on the "Today" show, why our southeast Asian war problem, has not been taken to the United Nations. It is a unique experience today to be told the truth, and I am most grateful to you, as are all of my neighbors, with whom I have spoken this morning.

Yours truly,

LUCY CHURCHILL.

DETROIT, MICH.,
June 26, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I certainly want to congratulate you on your stand regarding the expansion of our military activities in southeast Asia. I can't see where the administration is trying to save anything but face; and believe me I don't think the administrative face that they will save is worth the lives of our boys who already have been killed there. Much less the lives of the many thousands more who will be killed with an expanded war.

I further think, that it's too expensive a lesson in lives for our military to obtain practical experience in this manner. I was under the impression that the Congress had the power to declare war. Are you, worthy gentlemen, of these two legislative bodies going to surrender this responsibility to the administration?

It seems to me that too many legislative prerogatives are being surrendered to the administrative branch.

I'm sending a copy of this letter to Senators MCNAMARA and HART of Michigan, and Congressman BROOMFIELD from my district.

Yours very respectfully,

J. M. ROBINSON.

(Copies to Senator HART, Senator MCNAMARA, and Congressman BROOMFIELD.)

JUNE 25, 1964.

Senator PHILIP A. HART,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I heard Senator MORSE this morning on the "Today Show" and agree with him completely, as far as our foreign policy in the Far East is concerned. I'm sending you a copy of the letter I've written him today. I certainly solicit your activity in support of his attitude.

It seems to me that thinking men, who remember Korea, and the thousands upon thousands of American men and women who lost their lives or were otherwise maimed or severely crippled, do everything possible to avoid another conflict.

Not only did we not win the war in Korea, but we are continuing to lose the peace there; and we are destined to the same experience in southeast Asia, if we stay there.

You will notice that our European allies, with 100 years experience in Far Eastern matters, are offering little help.

I fully appreciate that the executive department has the responsibility of foreign policy but the legislative department are the ones that vote the money and can control the situation.

Very respectfully yours,

J. M. ROBINSON.

(Copy to Senator MORSE.)

JUNE 24, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SIR: We are very proud of you to stand up and speak against the sending of Americans to South Vietnam. I cannot understand how we have a right to risk any kind of a war anywhere. We think you are a very wise man and know it takes rare courage to speak up in the way that you have.

Sincerely yours,

EMILY PARKER.

NORTH HOLLYWOOD, CALIF.

BEVERLY HILLS, CALIF.,
June 25, 1964.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I am the costar of what has become a popular American television series, "McHale's Navy". I tell you this for purposes of identification because I know it matters little to you.

What I did want to say is that there are those of us that sleep better at night knowing you are in the U.S. Senate.

Please keep up the good fight. You represent not only Oregon, but all of us.

My deep regards,

JOE FLYNN.

OMAHA, NEBR.,
June 25, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: When I watched you this morning on the "Today" show on NBC, when you voiced your opinion on Vietnam I was glad about the clear way you explained about a sad point in our present-day history.

Sorry that this is but the stand of a minority but we can grow. I say "we," because I fully share your viewpoint on the situation.

Wishing you success.

ILSE RUTH KUTTNER.

Flint, Mich.,
June 26, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: After wondering aloud the last few weeks not knowing where I stood concerning South Vietnam, I now find myself compelled to urge you to continue your lonely battle against the U.S. Senate.

The American public is being pushed into a war which could feasibly ruin the United States, the United Nations, and the world—and they will have no conception of why we will be fighting.

Any assistance I, as a citizen of the United States and of this world, can do to help in your fight, I will gladly do.

Sincerely,

Leroy A. Lott, Jr.

Canoga Park, Calif.,
June 25, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: Every effort should be made to fight against the confirmation of Gen. Maxwell Taylor.

The appointment of the military to a diplomatic post in this critical area at this critical time is an exposure of our intention to escalate the war.

This could well lead to a nuclear conflict and should be opposed with every energy at your disposal.

Respectfully yours,

Paul Stone.

June 23, 1964.

Dear Senator Morse: Thank goodness for the voice of Wayne Morse raised against the Vietnamese fiasco. That sorry, sorry war—with all those pitiful people embroiled in all that "modern" savagery.

What can the administration be thinking of—election, I suppose—and God help us if the Republicans get elected though sometimes I can't see much difference between them and us.

Of course the United Nations should be taking care of this matter.

And now—well I can't go into Cuba—this is to say—all of my friends agree with you.

Sincerely,

Mary Gwen Owen.

South Fort Mitchell, Ky.,
June 25, 1964.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: I would be lax as an interested American and as one of your most ardent admirers and supporters, if I did not express my views on your appearance on "Today" this date.

It is a regrettable fact, but a few of us know that the policy being pursued today, is still Dulles brinkmanship, and only a new administrator, and it is far more regrettable that you, one of the best qualified supporters of a better America and world, has to get on your high horse and take out after the one leader who too stands for in most part the things you stand for, as you and I know this is the very thing the GOP, who cannot think of anything good or constructive to propose, so they spend their time trying to pick up a scrap of any difference within the Democratic ranks and exploit it using the press, and TV which they in 98 percent control.

I want to compliment you and your honest and forthright "Morse Manner" disagreeing, caused by honest differences of opinion, which I feel is too right for comfort, as I clearly understand you and from listening to you back on radio, as Republican, then Independent, and as Democrat, also in our convention, as I work as a representative of the International Association of Machinists AFL–CIO and am away from home trying to assist those who struggle to make ends meet to feed, house, educate, and clothe their families.

You know and I too know that this appearance had great impact on millions who will not write, and so the GOP syndicated columnists who decry everything will use this expression for their own selfish and for most part stupid partisan purposes to try and gain political jobs, for those who would make fast GOP war.

Excuse typing as I am better machinist, rather than typist, using the hunt and peck system.

Your admirer and supporter,

Matthew Carr.

Philadelphia, Pa.,
June 26, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: Listening in on your television interview yesterday, I am proud to know that we have men of your caliber in Washington.

I am 100 percent behind your suggestion to take our Vietnam problem to the United Nations.

Please continue your efforts for the good of our Nation.

Yours very truly,

Mrs. John Felgenhauer.

Birmingham, Mich.,
June 25, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse.

Honorable Sir: I want to complement you on your views, expressed on the "Today" show concerning our foreign policy in southeast Asia.

I am the average American; voiceless, and concerned about the "American image" throughout the world. We have enough sense to know something is rotten in Denmark, judging by the gaseous bubbles emanating from the cesspool, but confused by the doubletalk. We don't know what it is.

You straightened out the string for us this morning. Let's call a spade a spade, and proceed to dig with it. America deserves better representation than some of our people are offering.

More power to people who think and speak as you do. I am a working man, 70 years old, have been a Democrat all my life. I don't have to worry about eating any more, but am still a Democrat.

I'd like to shake your hand.

Winfred Kollars.

June 25, 1964.

Dear Senator Morse: I want you to know how grateful I am to you for trying to keep us out of a war. The nuclear weapons today, in case of a war, will destroy our civilization that took centuries to build.

Fannie Lander.

Chicago, Ill.

Dear Senator Morse: Keep up the resistance to Johnson's brinkmanship. This alleged war for self-determination once seemed ridiculous and now seems disgusting. Clearly the people of Vietnam, north and south, are quite determined that their future shall not be dictated to them by the United States. I don't know what the Bhuddists in Saigon want, or what Ho Chi Minh wants, or what the prisoners in those "free" and fortified hamlets want, nor do I think they are sure of their aims either, but I am pretty damn sure that they do not want more U.S. generals, advisors, planes, guns, murder, and mayhem.

Please push for U.N. guaranteed neutrality, U.N. border patrols and inspectors, etc., for the whole of southeast Asia. A neutral buffer belt around China seems to be our best hope.

Why don't you and Senators Gruening, Mansfield and any other rational or semi-rational Senators put together a policy statement, get signatures from both Houses, publicize it, embarrass people (L.B.J., Taylor, Lodge, et al.) with it.

See if you can't hold up Senate approval of Maxwell's appointment. Will there be hearings first? Then grill him on his "unique" qualifications for the ambassadorial job.

What can be done to curtail L.B.J.'s power in this area? How best to expose the hypocrisy of our southeast Asia policy?

Yours,

Charles Keil.

Sarasota, Fla.,
June 25, 1964.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Until today, when I listened to what you had to say about our policy in Asia, I thought you were a maverick, but now I'm one of the millions who are behind you 100 percent.

When will Congress take inventory, and start taking back many of the powers it has delegated to the White House and put the executive branch of our Government in the right constitutional perspective.

As you so aptly put it, why not use the United Nations. It is our money that runs most of that debating club, and if it no longer serves any worthwhile purpose, let's get out of it.

My hat's off to you sir, for saying what few, if any other Senator, would have the courage to say. There is still hope for us with men like you on the Hill. I was almost ready to fly my flag at half mast come the 4th, for all the freedoms and constitutional rights I have lost.

F. J. Jakes.

P.S.—Written in person, and since I have no sight, I hope you will forgive any misspelling, and/or typographical errors. Thanks.

Sherman Oaks, Calif.,
June 24, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: Yeah, man.

You said a mouthful.

Pour it on.

In the great tradition of Abraham Lincoln, you have dared stand up and say that the Government of the United States is warmongering and must stop. You perform an inestimable service to the American people. Believe that we people, though confused, disoriented, and scared (not only by fear of war, but by fear of persecution if we voice our fear of war) will stand up and support a man of your stature who will carry a consistent fight to the people on this question.

What can I do to help?

Sincerely,

Frederic I. Rinaldo.

Afton, Wyo.,
June 25, 1964.

Dear Senator Morse: If we only had more Senators like you the world would be a better place.

We could expend our energies on China and be a pushover for Russia. We do not want war. We should pull out of Vietnam.

God bless you.

Mr. and Mrs. Roy Gardner.

P.S.—Keep speaking up for that which is right.

BENTONVILLE, ARK.,
June 25, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Some "unthinkable thoughts" which should be publicized.

We (the United States) refused to sign the 1954 Geneva Conference Agreement on Far Eastern Affairs which stipulated that a plebiscite be held in North and South Vietnam in 1956.

We instead strengthened our ties with Ngo Dinh Diem (later recognized as a fraud and murdered).

We sent a general in civilian clothes to assist the Diem regime "as an adviser."

We sent more than 16,000 armed men without the necessary approval of Congress to carry on a war.

We now call it a war and decorate casualties accordingly.

We now send another general, presumably in civilian clothes, as Ambassador to South Vietnam.

We now threaten to attack North Vietnam from South Vietnam and the South China Sea and Laos from Thailand.

We call the rebels of South Vietnam and Laos Vietcong or Communists, not "Washington rebels."

Congress has not declared war and the mass of people of the United States do not want war.

Who is running this country? Is it McNamara who represents the capitalistic interests?

The voices of Senators MORSE, FULBRIGHT, and GRUENING must be louder and persistently echoed throughout the land. Let no one be so greedy or puerile and fail to be aware that, if the United States attacks North Vietnam and China, Soviet Russia will not remain idle. Our own treatment of the Negroes and Asians will limit aid and friendship from the African and Asian Continents.

This is the nuclear age where dollar diplomacy is on the wane because the Baruch plan failed which left the United States without a monopoly of nuclear power.

Just as the industrial-military complex assumes the privilege of issuing almost daily press releases which promote the interests only of the industrial-military complex so should our Foreign Relations Committee, our elected Senators and Representatives, who represent the people and not special interests, issue as many releases which reveal a deep concern for our country as a whole, without ulterior motives limited to a powerful minority.

With best wishes.
Sincerely yours,
WM. P. ENGEL.

NORTH NEWTON, KANS.,
June 25, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We were downright relieved to hear the ideas you expressed on the "Today" show this morning. We wish these convictions were more widespread. It seems to us, too, our military activities in Vietnam are just for nothing—for nothing. We have high regard for President Johnson and we can't understand why he and Dean Rusk and MacNamara, etc., are for going on with this futile war. How can we bring about a change in policy? It's so tragic to see what's happening.

Respectfully,
Mr. and Mrs. WILLIS RICH.

P.S.—South Vietnam should be a United Nations problem.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Congratulations for a rare and courageous voice speaking out for a sane and sober approach to our South Vietnamese policy.

As you mentioned, the Vietnamese war is McNamara's war—but it also seems true, as a reporter questioner put it to you—whether the forthcoming election was not a reason for the President's warlike activity?

I believe it is true, that with cessation of war, our economy will suffer, unless our economic planners work out a program of reconversion to peacetime industrial production—the future does not look too bright.

We all look forward to your good health and clear thinking.

Sincerely,
ROSE KARSHMER.
LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

BERKELEY, CALIF.,
June 24, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We have written President Johnson urging him not to extend the war in Vietnam, but we also want to thank you for your tremendous efforts in preserving peace in the world. Your stand moved us to write to the President and I am sure that it will serve as a rallying point—indeed it already seems to be doing so—for those who want to live in peace. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Mr. and Mrs. JERRY RICHARD.

OSKALOOSA, KANS.

SENATOR MORSE: I turned on the TV program June 25, "Today" and must say keep up the good work for peace.

I have felt all along it is such a mistake to send our boys to Vietnam to mix in that war. Our poor boys sent all over the world to fight in other nations, it's time someone tells the folks who are responsible for it. What is wrong with our U.N. representatives? I sent a son to the Second World War and I know what it means for a mother to send her dear sons to fight on foreign soil. He started in North Africa and got clear around to France. Was gone 3 years. I think we mothers might put a stop to it if we would fight a little too. I've been a Republican but when a see a Democrat who gets things done I'm for him. I don't want to see my grandsons have to go and fight in other nation's wars. Keep up the good work.

Sincerely,
Mrs. RAY ENGLE.

PROVIDENCE, KY.,
June 26, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: It was with a great deal of pleasure that I listened to your interview yesterday.

Please talk this over with other Senators, the U.N., and President Johnson.

Thanking you.
Most sincerely,
Mrs. ORVILLE G. WITHERS.

INK, ARK., *June 26. 1964.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: These few words to compliment you on your stand in South Vietnam. The whole blame country and all the American capital invested there isn't worth the life of one American soldier. Sooner of later we are going to have to get out and the sooner the better.

Sincerely yours,
W. A. GILBERT.

NEWTONVILLE, MASS.,
June 27, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE of OREGON,
Foreign Relations Committee,
U.S. Government.

DEAR SENATOR: Thank you for speaking the truth so openly about the mistaken policy of the United States of America in South Vietnam.

The International League for Peace and Freedom founded by Jane Addams and Emily Balch is working as hard as we know how for the change in policy that you advocate.

All the forces there should be under the U.N. as you suggest. Ho Chi Minh tries to run a socialistic government in North Vietnam. He does not want to be ruled by the Chinese Communists.

Mr. Chakravarty, an Indian intellectual, who teaches at Boston University, recently spent 3 weeks in and about Saigon. He says that it is a reign of terror there, that these gentle people had a good agriculture on their fertile soil, but you said, I think that U.S. Army troops occupy the peninsula, which contained the best ricefields.

Yes, we are letting the Pentagon and the arms manufacturers run our foreign relations. When Japan's military clique got power, they brought Japan into the war on the side of Hitler.

The "Today" show is watched by millions all across the country. I am writing to congratulate them on having such an able, forthright speaker on their program as Senator MORSE, from Oregon.

I have cousins living in the beautiful city of Portland, Brener, and Snowhill, and Dee.

Gratefully yours,
ALICE L. MURDOCH.

GLEN ELLYN, ILL.,
June 27, 1964.

VOICE OF THE PEOPLE,
Chicago Tribune, Chicago, Ill.:

Senator MORSE's suggestion that the Vietnam problem be placed before the United Nations is an excellent one.

I hope this can be done, and quickly, too.

KATHARINE K. MOORE.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: You can always be depended upon for sensible suggestions with regard to our ever-increasing problems.

I hope you will continue to grace the Senate for many years to come.

Sincerely yours,
KATHARINE K. MOORE.

FOXBORO, MASS.,
June 27, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I congratulate you on your efforts to bring the Senate to a meaningful consideration of the space authorization bill.

In the past—Telstar, Vietnam—in your role as devil's advocate you have indeed proven yourself a statesman.

I do wish I were a constituent of yours that this letter and my feelings on your performance would be of tangible value.

Best wishes for your future efforts.

Sincerely,
JOHN G. AYLWARD.

SCHWEIZ, SWITZERLAND.

To Ambassador Adlai Stevenson, Senator Morse, Senator Fulbright, Kiplinger Washington Letter, Stone's Weekly Letter:

One of the best European newsletters, Zuericher Wirtenhaftsbrief, who has excellent sources of information, reported from Paris that De Gaulle fears President Johnson might be forced, still before elections, into a "strike of violence" against China (perhaps to prove that he is as "hard" as GOLDWATER).

One of the two leading Swiss weeklies, Zuericher Woche of Zuerich, published on June 26, 1964, an editorial with the title "America's Janus Head," comparing America's policy in Cyprus and in southeast Asia.

After a positive comment on America's policy in Cyprus, it comments on America's policy in southeast Asia with the following sentences which are doubly remarkable because Switzerland is the most anti-Communist country in West Europe:

"In the last 14 days the American warnings, or rather threats, against North Vietnam and China have been so frequent that it is not too early to speak of a dangerous situation. The former commander in Saigon, General Harkins, could publicly declare, without being reprimanded, that it would be very advantageous to risk war with China, in order to protect South Vietnam against a Communist takeover. Between May 17 and June 21, American planes, in undisputable violation of the Laos agreements, made more than 200 reconnaissance and bombing flights over the Pathet Lao territory.

"The appointment of the Chief of the General Staff, Maxwell Taylor, as Ambassador of the United States of America in Saigon shows who commands in South Vietnam and what is planned. What would the Americans say if Marshal Malinowski would be appointed as Ambassador in the German Democratic Republic (East Germany)?

"Obviously, the American circles who decide policies, concluded the rift between Moscow and Peiping became so deep and irreparable that China can be treated the hard way without Moscow considering this as need to assist its ally. Perhaps these people assume even a silent Russian consent. One must warn against this. Similarly, as the Soviet Union went into a trap in Cuba, so Washington can get into a trap in southeast Asia. Such action could end very badly."

In 1939, the German Government risked war with Poland, assuming that England would stay out. This error has cost the lives of 30 million men, women, and children. A similar error about China might cost the lives of 300 million people in America, Asia, and Europe.

K. KAUFFMANN,
Citizen of the United States of America, Democratic Voter, Never a Communist or Member of Any Communist-Front Organization.

HOUSTON, TEX.,
June 24, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: We have tried to the best of our abilities to follow the developments in South Vietnam and find ourselves constantly at odds with the concept of a military solution.

It is therefore with particular pleasure that we have followed your repeated requests that the problems of southeast Asia be put before the United Nations.

We sincerely hope that you will continue to pursue this course.

Sincerely,
Mr. and Mrs. M. A. ZUCK.

(Copies to the President of the United States and the Honorable RALPH YARBOROUGH.)

ROGERS PARK COMMITTEE FOR A SANE NUCLEAR POLICY,
Chicago, Ill., June 10, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Rogers Park Chapter, National Committee for a SANE Nuclear Policy wishes to praise the courageous and enlightened stand you have taken on Vietnam.

In the struggle of rival ideologies it is often difficult to think in terms of what is best for humanity as a whole. We would like to encourage your work in hopes of changing the devastating course which our administration has embarked upon in Vietnam.

Please continue your efforts in this field.

Very truly yours,
MELVIN KATZ,
Chairman.

JUNE 25, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have just written the President opposing the appointment of General Taylor as Ambassador to South Vietnam and opposing our dangerous role in that area. I urged him to support your position placing the entire matter before the United Nations and letting that body solve this problem.

I want to express my wholehearted support to you and to your colleagues in the Senate for speaking out and alarming the American people to this grave threat to the peace of the world and to the United Nations. I congratulate you and wish you good health and the strength to carry on.

Sincerely yours,
Mrs. ANNETTE CIMRING.
LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

SANTA CRUZ, CALIF.,
June 26, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: With reference to the press interview on the TV "Today" show that was broadcast at 7:30 a.m., P.s.t. on June 25, 1964.

We most heartily agree with you on all points. The Vietnam situation should be the function of the United Nations to resolve. We as a nation have no business whatsoever to send our boys to be killed in what is really a domestic affair of another nation. That wornout slogan, "To Fight Communism" was used by Hitler as the excuse for the Germans to conquer the entire world.

No nation need have any fear of communism, unless, the people of a nation are suffering injustices, such as: unemployment, racial discrimination, military dictatorship, or the tendency thereto, economic inequalities where a portion of the nation live in luxury and a portion live in dire poverty.

Our country is fortunate indeed to have a Senator with your courage and rationalism, and to fearlessly state the facts as you have. We are proud of your, Sir. We regret that we do not have a greater number of Senators with the same attributes.

Sincerely yours,
J. W. and NEVA BOURNIER.

JUNE 26, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wholeheartedly support your position that we should not get involved in a war on the mainland of southeast Asia, and should withdraw our military forces from South Vietnam.

Keep up the good work. I have just finished writing to President Johnson supporting your position, and am going to write my Congressmen and Senators.

Sincerely,
BEN W. ANDERSON, Jr.
MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

STATE COLLEGE, PA.,
June 26, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I'm sure that a great number of concerned people were relieved and given fresh hope by your views on yesterday's "Today" show of NBC.

More strength and courage to you and others who have now for months given us subscribers to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD hope that the U.N. may be brought into a peace settlement in Asia. It seems as if the press and news media of all kinds have guessed wrongly that your views and points in favor of legal action through U.N. should be suppressed. May the new awareness be heightened also by a more tolerant view of U.N. by Senator CHURCH's remarks on "Today" this morning.

Thank you and blessings on your vigorous stand for some way to have world authority replace U.S. military domination in a new world which will not accept the latter.

Sincerely,
MERWIN HUMPHREY.

JUNE 25, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SIR: Just to let you know we are behind you in your effort to open the eyes of the American people on what is happening in southeast Asia.

We will do our part to bring your message to the people of California.

Sincerely,
Mr. and Mrs. CARLTON MOSS.

JUNE 25, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

SIR: Listening to you on the "Today" program.

Am only an old woman, but I do now and have always admired you. You talk like I feel. But what can we little people do. I do not like McNamara and never have, he even looks too stern. Our Senator YOUNG is also a good man and does not like this business in Asia. It bothers me because of our boys getting killed out there. Does our country want to rule the world. Thought we were for peace. Also, I know plenty of people who do not like to have our country and our boys over in Asia. But we are nothing. It does not matter how we feel or talk, in Washington, they will go ahead and do just whatever they like. I wish they in Washington would get rid of the war mongers. This is not a fine letter, but this Asian thing bothers me a lot.

And please do all you can to help our boys. And we talk about Russia. Who are we to say anything.

Respectfully,
Mrs. J. DUARANT.
CLEVELAND, OHIO.

JUNE 27, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Congressional Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

SENATOR MORSE: Enclosed is a carbon of a letter I sent to President Johnson today with regard to the dangerous situation in southeast Asia. I want you to know that I will do what little I can to see that the U.S. military presence is removed from that part of the world and that I am grateful for the stands that both you and Senator GRUENING have taken on that U.S. presence.

Sincerely,
HENRY KLEIN.
WANAQUE, N.J.

JUNE 27, 1964.

President JOHNSON,
White House,
Washington, D.C.

MR. PRESIDENT: The increasing involvement of U.S. money, equipment, and troops in southeast Asia is for me a source of rising apprehension. It troubles me that when the Attorney General of this country can say, with regard to three civil rights workers in Mississippi, that there is little he can do under existing laws, that this same country, in southeast Asia, can pursue a policy in blatant disregard of the law, the Geneva Accord, as well as the sentiments of the peoples of both South Vietnam and Laos.

What can the justification be when the Vietcong are fighting a legitimate civil war with popular support in South Vietnam, and the situation in Laos arises out of the right-wing coup d'etat earlier this year rather than the withdrawal of the Pathet Lao from the coalition government which the coup made inevitable. There can be no justification for a policy that risks total war in an area in which we have no rights save that in withdrawing we might lose face. Do we not have a greater obligation to all mankind to preserve peace?

If I am called up to fight in southeast Asia, I cannot with conscience do anything else but refuse. I will not help to bolster a regime so terribly repressive as that of South Vietnam, and though I would not hesitate to fight for the legitimate defense of our own country, I will not fight in Southeast Asia.

Sincerely,

HENRY KLEIN.

WANAQUE, N.J.

OLNEY, TEX.,
June 26, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Yesterday I saw you on the "Today" program and I believe you are right in your thinking on the southeast Asia question. I hope you can put your program over and if there is anything that we Americans can help, let us know.

Yours Truly,

R. N. LUNN.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
June 22, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I heartily endorse and applaud your valiant efforts to extricate this country from the war in South Vietnam. I am appalled that this administration publicly admits plans for extending the conflict into another sovereign state, and am even more appalled by the degree of apathy and resignation in this country, that approves by its silence all the monstrous machinations of genocidal war.

God bless you.

STEPHEN LEIPER.

LANSING, MICH.,
June 25, 1964.

Senators GEORGE D. AIKEN and WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: Please accept our support for your courageous position on American policy in the Far East as expressed in your recent TV news statements. We hope other Senators, including our own, will have the courage to join you.

Unless our completely bankrupt brute force approach to Far East problems is reversed we may find that our country will have to pay dearly for the widespread tendency to put political considerations above all else. We can see no other honest explanation for our so obviously ineffective (not to mention immoral) Far East policy.

Sincerely,

ROBERT WASSERMAN.
MARGARET L. WASSERMAN.

(Copies to Senators HART and MCNAMARA.)

Mr. MORSE. I shall speak at greater length on the subject today outside the morning hour, but I wish to say that the war should not be made our war in Asia. We have no right to make it our war in Asia. We have no right to kill American boys in Asia. There is no basis for the United States not to have taken it to the United Nations long ago. That is our treaty obligation. There is no basis for our allies not having taken it to the United Nations. I am sad to see my country putting itself in the image and the posture before the world that we are going to exercise our military might first, and then after everyone has surrendered, to us, we shall be willing to negotiate.

Mr. President, we could not make a greater historic mistake than that. One of the great mistakes being made is that we have leaders in this country talking about this as our war in Asia. Who made it our war in Asia? How did it become our war in Asia? It happens to be a threat to the peace of the world, and it ought to be a subject of concern to all peace-loving nations in the world. We ought to be trying to keep the peace in Asia and not make war.

I disassociate myself from all the talk about the war being our war, because we have no right to be making war in Asia.

URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1964

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, yesterday the Senate passed the bill (S. 6) authorizing the subsidy of mass transportation systems throughout the United States. Other Senators as well as I voted against the measure primarily, I believe, in the fear that the program would grow interminably and involve a cost far in excess of what anyone could now imagine.

Some discussion took place about the construction of the Interstate Highway System in connection with the bill. We know that the Interstate Highway System has been financed through a trust fund into which moneys have flowed. Those moneys coming from excise taxes imposed specifically for the purpose of financing the program. Yesterday I stated that in 1962 the Congress directed that a study be made as to ways and means of solving the mass transportation problems of our metropolitan communities. The report on that study is to be made on January 1, 1965. Whether or not in the study the establishment of a mass transportation system trust fund will be contemplated, I do not know.

I am having prepared a resolution which will direct the Secretary of Commerce to make a study of the feasibility of establishing a trust fund to finance the mass transportation system. My resolution will specifically request that a study be made to ascertain whether, out of the fares of each community that is being helped, there may be taken a one-cent or a two-cent charge, to be paid into the trust fund, so as, at least in part, to finance the subsidy. I shall have that resolution ready for introduction sometime within the next week.

I make this statement to call the attention of my colleagues to the advisability of studying whether or not we can, in part, make self-sustaining this huge new subsidy.

I yield the floor.

CHEROKEE TRIBE PRAISED

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, the Cherokee Indians over many years have made a vital contribution to the development and culture of Oklahoma. Recently the Kansas City Star, of June 7, 1964, published a full-page story on William W. Keeler, principal chief of the Cherokee Tribe and a top official of the Phillips Petroleum Co. As an accompaniment to the biography of Keeler as "a big chief, both of oil and Indians," the Star devoted an article to the traditions and culture of the Cherokee's. The tribe's religion, laws, education, and customs are described with such interest that I ask unanimous consent to insert the article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The author says that the Cherokee culture is revered by Cherokee descendants. I also admire it, as do most other Oklahomans.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROGRESS OF FAMED INDIAN TRIBE A SOURCE OF PRIDE IN OKLAHOMA

The traditions and culture of the Cherokee Indians are revered by their thousands of descendants, but by none more than their present principal chief, William W. Keeler, Phillips Petroleum executive who is the subject of the accompanying article.

Keeler's ancestors were among the more than 13,000 Cherokees who were forced to leave their homes in Georgia in the 1830's by a white man's government that, in retrospect, appears to have been singularly unenlightened. More than 4,000 of the Indians, men, women, and children, died on the tortuous 1,000-mile march on the "Trail of Tears" to Oklahoma Territory.

Signifying changes wrought by the passing years, it was 2 years ago that the eastern capital of the Cherokees at New Echota, Ga., restored at a cost of $95,000, was dedicated at a special homecoming program attended by Keeler and other distinguished members of the ancient tribe.

Although Keeler does not worship in the Seven Clan religion of his ancestors, he believes it is a source of inspiration for the full-blood Cherokees who do. In the ritual of the Seven Clan, the members stand at seven points around an eternal fire (the supreme great spirit).

Young members of the clan respect and treat one another as brothers and sisters and consider all of the older members as their mothers and fathers and pledge to protect and care for them.

The "eternal flame," fed by fuel of wood, is brought forth from a hiding place for regular worship ceremonies. Believers say it was lighted back in antiquity, when lightning probably was the only source of fire, and has been kept alive by the tribe ever since.

The flame was borne along the Trail of Tears in a brazier or earthen vessel from a hiding place in the fastness of Georgia hills. It has a tribal significance the Cherokees do not divulge. Only faithful keepers know its hiding place.

In the Civil War, the Cherokee Nation fought on the side of the Confederacy. Members of the tribe owned slaves, but emancipated them February 18, 1863.

Long before Columbus discovered America, the Cherokees, one of the five civilized tribes, possessed tribal customs preserving the rights of property ownership and providing punishment for crimes. Tribal customs served with the force of law until 1808, when the written statutes first came into existence.

The tribe's first organic law, patterned somewhat on the U.S. Constitution, was adopted in 1817. Ten years later it was broadened to set up legislative, executive, and judicial branches of the government. As far back as the 1820's the tribe members were building roads and schools.

From the beginnings, Cherokee laws characteristically encouraged education. Compulsory attendance of schoolchildren was pioneered by the Cherokees. They elected their chieftains by popular vote.

Intermarriage of relatives, extending to cousins, was prohibited. A complete system of courts, corresponding to our courts today, included a supreme court and an attorney general. Until 1875, most crimes were punishable by whipping. Hanging was the penalty for murder and rape. Larceny of stock was a serious offense, the punishment being 50 lashes upon the bare back for the first offense and 100 for the second. On their third conviction, the culprits were hanged.

The Cherokees held truth in high regard, and perjury was one of the most serious offenses under their laws.

The Cherokee Advocate, the first newspaper in Oklahoma, was established in 1845 and printed in both Cherokee and English. The first long distance telephone west of the Mississippi River was between Tahlequah and Fort Gibson. Greek and astronomy were in the curriculum of tribal seminaries operating in 1851.

When statehood was granted to Oklahoma in 1907, the Cherokees and the other four civilized tribes—Chickasaw, Choctaw, Creek, and Seminole—ceased to exist as political entities because their property passed into the domain of the 46th State.

ALLEGHENY AIRLINES, A CARRIER SERVING WEST VIRGINIA, STUDIES ACQUISITION OF JET-PROP AIRCRAFT

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, Allegheny Airlines is one of three local service air carriers which bring benefit to the citizens of West Virginia. Serving three major cities and areas of the Mountain State—Huntington, Parkersburg, and Wheeling—this progressive company provides vital airfreight, airmail, and passenger transportation capability on a daily scheduled basis. As a partner in West Virginia's drive toward increased prosperity and growth, Allegheny has consistently exhibited a spirit of cooperation which is reflected in its own expansion and in rising levels of commerce for our businessmen and the traveling public.

An indication of the importance of effective travel by air can be gained from examinations of data compiled and made available by company officials. They point out that in March of 1964, Allegheny Airlines boarded 31 percent more passengers in Parkersburg, W. Va., than during the same month in 1963. Huntington showed a rise of 20 percent, and Wheeling figures were up by 15 percent. Here is ample proof that more and more of our men, women, and children are learning to rely on local service carriers for fast, dependable, and reasonably priced transportation.

Mr. President, I am pleased to report that Allegheny Airlines has progressed even further in its eagerness to contribute to the public interest. In order to bring about faster, more frequent nonstop service at communities on its 38 airport system, Allegheny is studying a new type of jet-prop aircraft.

Referring to it as "the first airplane ever designed specifically to serve the smaller traffic hubs" able President Leslie O. Barnes said the company's board of directors has authorized management to undertake a detailed study leading to the purchase of 10 such aircraft.

Without naming the candidate models, Barnes indicated that those selected will "significantly benefit the small and medium-sized communities, the passenger, the taxpayers, and the airline."

The positive influence of such a purchase in West Virginia is obvious since the new pressurized jet-prop will be smaller but considerably faster than the aircraft now in use.

President Barnes says that "because the airplane will operate with fewer passengers on board than are required for break-even operations with airplanes in local service today, we will be able to schedule more flights, often flying nonstop to and from primary cities, at the intermediate airports."

He forecast that the introduction of this new plane "can have a major impact in reducing the dependence of these smaller communities on Federal subsidy for their needed air services."

Mr. President, I heartily commend the management and personnel of Allegheny Airlines for their progressive and constructive attitudes, and for the manner in which they have worked with West Virginians in the building of a better way of life for citizens of the Mountain State.

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, earlier this month Mr. Samuel F. Pryor, one of our outstanding Connecticut citizens, made what I consider to be a very fine address before the Meriden, Conn., Boys' Club.

Sam Pryor has devoted many hours of his life to good causes and perhaps the most important of these activities has been his work as a director of the Boys' Clubs of America for 30 years.

So Sam Pryor spoke with a firm knowledge of his subject when he discussed the need for proper guidance in the home and in the community for American boys, so that they will be ready and willing to assume positions of leadership in the United States when they reach maturity.

The Meriden Boys' Club, which has been in continuous operation for 76 years and similar clubs throughout the United States are doing an excellent job helping combat juvenile delinquency and preparing boys for the responsibilities of adulthood.

Juvenile crime has increased dramatically during the last 10 years, but in the words of J. Edgar Hoover:

> I shudder to think what the juvenile crime rate would be without such organizations as the Boys' Clubs of America.

I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted at this point in the RECORD Sam Pryor's speech, a letter he received from J. Edgar Hoover, and a column entitled "Frankly Speaking," by Frank R. Corkin, Jr., which appeared in the Meriden Journal on this subject.

There being no objection, the speech, letter, and column were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY MR. PRYOR

Since December, because of the nature of my business, Mrs. Pryor and I have been to 5 continents—visiting 26 of the capital cities of our world. We in business have long ago learned that we must face facts—that difficult problems can be put aside but can never be dismissed. Travel around the world brings facts into sharper focus. World travel opens our eyes to new horizons, to new understanding, to exchange of ideas. But above all, world travel also often opens our eyes to dangers which lie at our very feet.

Looking objectively at human life in these many world areas, one must come to the conclusion that the most important subject before us, not only in Meriden, in Connecticut, in the United States—but in the world, is—boys.

The world—whether it be our city, our town, our State, our country, or any country—is desperately hungry for leadership.

In this country we should include girls as well as boys for leadership because, sadly, only in this country do girls have an equal responsibility with boys to be future leaders.

So, when we talk about world leadership, we must confine our thoughts to boys. I spoke a few weeks ago to the girls of the Junior League about the position of women around the world. I told them I did not think they would like the position of women inside or outside the Iron Curtain—facts are that in the Near East they are penned up like livestock there; in Africa a woman is worth 4 goats; a chief Mrs. Pryor and I talked with this winter had 132 wives; in India girls are married off by their parents at ages of 8 or 9; and in the Far East baby girls are disposed of still today like unwanted girl puppies here in America.

Regretfully we must say it will be boys who will have greater responsibility for leadership in the world of tomorrow unless girls get aroused again as they were here in the 1920's.

Just a few weeks ago, during a trip to Japan, I spent some time with a prominent Japanese Government official who said to me, "Mr. Pryor, the United States will survive another 10 years because your generation has inherited strength. But what about 15 years from now, when the children who are now 9 or 10 years old become men? Mr. Pryor," he went on, "unless you do something to make them strong morally, physically, and spiritually, your Nation can be destroyed—not from without, but from within."

Arnold Toynbee has documented, in the case of civilization after civilization, that complete destruction comes from within. Egypt, Babylon, Crete, Greece, Assyria—and in our own hemisphere the Mayas and the Incas were not destroyed from without. In each case the conqueror found a civilization that had begun its self-destruction from within.

It has been my privilege to visit many ancient cities now in ruins or buried under desert sands. Some of these civilizations have been dead more than 2,000 years. Each at its peak stood at the forefront of civilized achievement and accomplishments. Each asserted its influence throughout the then known world. Each was the leader of its time. Pondering over these ruins caused me to wonder about ourselves.

I called my secretary last Friday from the Island of Maui and asked her to get the latest youth crime report from J. Edgar Hoover. Let me read you his personal letter to me in answer:

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION,
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, D.C., June 5, 1964.

Hon. SAMUEL F. PRYOR,
Greenwich, Conn.

DEAR SAM: In response to the request from your secretary, I am enclosing some material. The complete statistics on juvenile crime in 1963 are not available as yet; however, I can give you the following information:

During the last 10 years arrests of persons under age 18 have increased 121 percent while our juvenile population has gone up only about 43 percent. In other words, juvenile crime is growing almost three times faster than juvenile population.

In 1963, juveniles were involved in 46 percent of all arrests for serious crimes. Juveniles were involved in 8 percent of the arrests for murder, 18 percent for forcible rape, 26 percent for robbery, 14 percent for aggravated assault, 50 percent for burglary, 51 percent for larceny of $50 or more and 63 percent for automobile theft.

I certainly wish we could spread the good influence of Boys' Clubs of America to reach all children, and I shudder to think what the juvenile crime rate would be without such organizations.

With best wishes.

Sincerely,

EDGAR.

This last year I had the privilege of addressing the graduation class of our Connecticut State police, and may I say, as a citizen, I am very proud of our State police. I addressed them because I am adviser to the Narcotics Bureau of the U.S. Treasury Department and have graduated from their advanced narcotic training school, and 2 years ago represented our Commissioner at the Interpol Convention in Copenhagen. Narcotics are a major problem in the world—so much so that Communist countries have taken an active part in its distribution. While they have our eyes directed to the heavens for nuclear weapons, they are sowing heroin on earth—not in their own countries but in ours and other free countries. Not only does a teenage boy who experiments with the "kicks" of addiction become a potential dangerous criminal, but government officials and adult leaders can and have become traitors through drug addiction. Narcotics and crime go hand in hand and are truly a world problem—particularly for youth.

The average person today does not realize that we are actually living in the one world that Wendell Willkie so vividly described 20 years ago. No place today is farther than a day from Meriden—and this is nothing to what will happen within 6 years.

Pan Am has already placed an order with the French-British group that is developing a prototype 1,450-mile-per-hour mach 2 plane. We expect delivery of our first Concorde supersonic jet sometime in 1969. We are also at work with our Government in helping design, develop, and produce a mach 3 supersonic jet. At mach 3, this plane, built of steel and titanium, would have a cruising speed of 2,000 miles per hour and carry 200 passengers up to 5,500 miles.

For an idea of mach 3 flying times from New York, here are a few figures:

To:	*Statute miles*
Buenos Aires (6 hours 49 minutes)	5, 305
Rio de Janeiro (4 hours 45 minutes)	4, 804
London (2 hours 31 minutes)	3, 443
Paris (2 hours 37 minutes)	3, 625
Rome (4 hours 22 minutes)	4, 282
Tokyo (7 hours 31 minutes)	6, 757
New Delhi (14 hours 16 minutes)	7, 299

Even more dramatic, not long after the availability of mach 3, we shall have flights to the moon and to the planets beyond. It took our ancestors longer to come from London to Boston than it will take to reach the moon. These pilgrimages into space will come. Rocket engines to make these voyages possible are already under construction. The same is true of space capsules, which will be the forerunners of large space planes. We are truly about to live in one world.

Last month I had the privilege of being briefed for 2 days at our SAC base in Omaha, Nebr.

It does something strange to your thinking to sit by a gold telephone far underground that is in instant communication with 52 military bases in the world, to say nothing of the surveillance planes continually aloft day and night, and the red telephone over which, on one command from our Chief Executive and no one else, our guided missiles could be released, missiles that can travel at 18,000 miles per hour, then pinpoint the target over 5,000 miles away. The 100-ton megaton bomb has a destructive power equivalent to 100 million tons of TNT. If it exploded in New York, it would obliterate all the city of New York, most of New Jersey, all of Westchester County, and all of lower Connecticut, including Meriden.

Anywhere a nuclear bomb explodes radiation will bar human beings from the area for many years.

The call on this red telephone could destroy every city in Russia within 26 minutes, which is the most dramatic example of the mechanics of the leadership through which our United States has kept the peace of the world today. Winston Churchill said that except for the power of this force and our ability to control it, all of Europe would have been communized today.

Besides the guided missiles ready to go any minute of the day are the bomber squadrons. These bomber squadrons have a much greater total power than the power of all the missiles. I saw them go into the air in 8 minutes after the go signal. These bomber squadrons are strategically located around the world. The Soviets are also likewise equipped but with no comparison to our strength. Today we are stronger than all our known enemies put together—but how about tomorrow? We must face the facts about the present tensions of Saigon, Laos, Cuba, Berlin, India, and the dozens of other potential trouble spots all over the globe.

World leadership, with the exception of Great Britain and the Scandinavian countries, is today in the hands of tough hard-boiled politicians—highly educated—many of whom have attained their leadership through brutal power, but fortunately now know that if they are to maintain their position, they must have law and order. Prime Minister Kenyata of Kenya said this to me in person—that is why he called for the British paratroopers at the first sign of rebellion against his government.

We must guide our youngsters in our homes, even before their boys club training, toward knowing that the beginning of life in any community in the world, whether it be in Meriden or the Congo, is to have law and order. We must guide our youngsters to believe that they must play their part some day in Government—that politics is not a dirty mess, that it is the business of governing ourselves. The only way to good government is through practical politics—if you make politics right, you make government right.

Then we will develop the leadership so desperately needed; then we can continue to fight and settle our world battles politically—not with nuclear weapons.

Having been a director of the Boys' Club of America for 30 years, I can enthusiastically join in with Edgar Hoover—the greatest proponent for law and order in the world—and say there is no better influence for these objectives than the Boys' Clubs of America. You have done a splendid job here in Meriden. Joe Coffey has been an excellent leader of boys. If we can only continue here and spread our boys club gospel further around the United States—yes, and around the world—I can tell my Japanese friend not to worry about our country 15 years from now—that we are developing world leaders.

Thank you and may God bless your work for boys.

Sickness, Decay, and the Boys Club

(By Frank R. Corkin, Jr.)

J. Edgar Hoover, America's real-life gang buster, wrote a letter to the Meriden Boys Club.

It was delivered personally by Samuel F. Pryor, Jr., vice president of Pan American World Airways, to the directors at the club's annual meeting at Frank O'Brien's 1711 Monday night.

G-man Hoover said teenagers were causing more trouble and at a faster rate than ever before. Serious trouble, like murder and rape. Boys Clubs, and the teachings of Boys Clubs, said Hoover, offer the best therapy to cure the mental and moral and physical and emotional sickness of juveniles.

"Tell the story of Boys Clubs, and spread the good influence of Boys Clubs," wrote Hoover.

On the debit side of the ledger, Hoover wrote, arrests of teenagers under 18 increased 121 percent last year, while the population in the same age bracket rose only 45 percent. The crime rate, he said, is moving ahead three times faster than the population. Forty-six percent of all arrests on the books in 1963 were charged to youngsters under 18, and 8 percent were for murder.

Pryor, who commutes to Europe and his home in Hawaii with the nonchalance of an insurance employee driving to an office in Hartford, related the warning told him personally by a friend in Japan.

"America," said the Japanese, "will remain strong for the next 10 years because it has inherited strong leadership. But will it survive after that? That is when your young people will have grown up, and your destruction will come from within."

Decay from within has been a repeated theme in history—Egypt, Greece, Rome. Internal rotting.

Pryor echoed a warning which has been voiced with alarming consistency by respected authorities in the sports world. Athletic dominance by the United States is nearing the end of the line. Russia has already embarrassed Americans in recent Olympics in athletic combat with the eyes of the world on the games that were propagandized as miniature wars. Cuba whipped representative baseball teams from the United States with humiliating ease.

This week Bob Cousy, the accepted Mr. Basketball of the professional ranks, returned home from a sweaty tour of Europe and solemnly predicted that American basketball teams in the future were in serious danger of getting their collective ears pinned back. Earlier gentlemanly Ray Oosting, a brilliant player before he turned to coaching at Trinity, reported the same warning.

In the wake of our Olympic defeats we rationalized and said it was the European girls who defeated our American girls in events that were foreign to our dolls. But there is nothing foreign about basketball or baseball. We claim the patent on these sports. If we lose face in games we boast that we invented, the cancerous decay may be beyond therapy.

"The most important subject before us," Pryor told the hushed corporators, "not only in Meriden but in the United States, is boys."

Although women play a dominant role in the affairs of this Nation, it is on the shoulders of boys that world leadership rests. "Only in America do women have equal rights," said Pryor. In the Far East, girl babies are discarded like unwanted puppies and kittens.

The subject of boys is of vital importance to the Meriden Boys Club, too. The local club is the fourth oldest in the United States. Its growth to 1,300 members, and its expansion into its handsome facilities on Lincoln Street, are a tribute to civic leaders in the community who recognize its value, and to Joe Coffey, who is a living symbol of the club's greatness.

Eighty-three of the members are over 16 years of age; 211 are in the 14 to 15 bracket, and 468 in the 11 to 13 range. These are formative years, critical years. The Boys Club is a forceful, molding influence. Interested, understanding parents are still the primary influence.

The local club has been in continuous operation for 76 years. It began in a single room in the Turner Hall on Veteran Street. Even in these humble, shabby beginnings, it made good boys out of potentially bad ones; better ones out of the average. For 30 of these 76 years, the lives and the futures of countless thousands of boys have been in the hands of Joe Coffey. His have been strong hands, guiding hands, friendly hands, capable hands.

Pan American Pryor referred to narcotics as one of the most crucial problems in the world today. "While the Communists direct our attention to the heavens in the race for control of space, they plant heroin on the ground."

"Today," he said, "we are stronger than all our known enemies combined, but we must teach our youth respect for law and order because law and order are the fundamentals of all successful governments."

Our success in sports is an element in our total strength and, as flaws develop in our athletic strength, flaws in our moral and spiritual and physical strength will follow.

Once we dominated the Olympics as if we had invented the games, and this superiority was accepted by the weaker nations as evidence that our way of life was the best, and the example to be followed by the smaller countries.

Now our athletic supremacy is slipping. There is increasing evidence that the Communists can run faster, jump higher, throw weights farther than American athletes, and this physical weakness on the athletic field is interpreted by some as a weakness in the American way of life. It is a simple rule of survival that the smaller and weaker nations must aline themselves with the most powerful. They cannot afford to support the second best. We cannot afford to be second best.

The Meriden Boys Club has already performed near miracles in the past. It has even greater responsibilities and a more difficult assignment in the future.

SOVIET ANTIRELIGIOUS CAMPAIGN

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, discrimination against religious minorities is a persistent feature of life in the Soviet Union. The widespread campaign against religious worship and practice in Russia is abhorrent to this legislative body, to all Americans, and indeed to all men of the free world.

For a number of years, there has been an alarming increase in the Soviet antireligious campaign. And tragic as it is for the history of mankind, anti-Semitism has been a key element in this wretched campaign.

Why is it, Mr. President, that in the third quarter of the 20th century we must again witness hate and derision against the Jews? Why is it that men cannot shed the blind chains of their inhumanity toward men?

The Soviets, of course, have their answer. They say they cannot tolerate the free expression of the Jewish faith because a tenant of Russian communism is atheism.

Yet, just as other Communist principles have failed so the principle of atheism and antireligion will fail. The question is how long must we wait until the Russians realize the fantastic horror of their mistaken efforts to exterminate religion? I, for one, cannot stand quietly by to wait for time and history to take their course. I join today, with thousands of Missourians and millions of Amerians, who are protesting the Soviet anti-Semitic program.

We appeal to the Soviet Government to reexamine history, reexamine the misery of anti-Semitism under Czarist Russia, reexamine the consequences of Nazi persecution of the Jews, reexamine the sheer inhumanity of Stalin's postwar anti-Semitic campaign.

We appeal to the Soviet people who are seeking increased social, economic, and political freedom. We hope that the process of declining restrictions in some areas of Russian life will not come at the expense of rising curtailment in freedom of religion.

And finally, we appeal to our own Government to continue "to support moves designed to bring about an improvement in the lot of Soviet Jewry, reduce the negative pressures on their religious life, and restore their opportunities to enjoy their rich cultural heritage."

We must continually remind the Soviet Government of the urgent humanitarian concern of the American people for religious and ethnic tolerance in the Soviet Union.

The United States has too much invested in the cause of individual and international freedom, too much invested in the fundamental principles of equality and democracy, too much invested in the hope of a peace without hate and persecution, to fail to take all steps that are appropriate to alleviate the oppressive anti-Semitic campaign now underway in Soviet Russia.

SYNTHETIC POVERTY

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, it is indeed regrettable that in our Nation, so blessed with wealth and plenty, there are some who are and have been unable to enjoy these fruits and who are living in true poverty. Those unfortunate citizens have been very much in the minority, however, and their burdens have been substantially lightened and corrective opportunities offered them by philanthropic individuals and organizations, together with local, State and Federal governments.

While those in true poverty have been exceedingly in the minority, now comes the Federal Government with its $3,000 yardstick and as a result places 9.3 million families, one-fifth of the total number of families in the United States, in the category of poverty.

Mr. President, this is purely "synthetic" poverty and places a stigma upon millions of proud and independent families—proud because they have been able to provide, although not luxuriously, their daily needs. Placing them in synthetic poverty, is striking fear into their hearts. They are beginning to realize, especially those living on pensions or other small fixed incomes, that eventually as the Federal Government continues to spend so far beyond its means, their limited dollars will be worth less and less and they will be forced from synthetic poverty to actual poverty.

Mr. President, this feeling is well-expressed in a letter received by me from a retired railroad brakeman residing in Cincinnati, Ohio, whose name and address I will not reveal. I ask unanimous consent that this letter be printed in the body of the Record as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Cincinnati, Ohio,
June 1, 1964.

Hon. Frank J. Lausche,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Lausche: I am appealing to you because I am both hurt and frightened by President Johnson's statement that his "Appalachian program" will place all families, whose income is below $3,000 per year, in the poverty class.

I am a retired railroad yard brakeman (40 years on the B. & O.) and I receive $174.70 from the Railroad Retirement Act and $36.15 from my B. & O. Railroad annuity each month, which will make a yearly total of $2,530.20.

Now, I have always prided myself on being a good provider and have been able to possess a small home in the suburbs—with garden, fruits, and chickens—and had expected these annuities to be altogether adequate for my wife and I. She does not receive an annuity because she is only 53 years of age.

I will admit that the constant rise of expenses such as Blue Cross (we cannot afford Blue Shield) and our real estate taxes—caused by the ever-increasing school population—do make us wonder at times.

We are aware that all of labor is "straining at the leash" for a wage increase and this will again start the vicious spiral of product prices, which will help those who are working but will surely play havoc with those who have a fixed income.

Now, I can find no other interpretation of President Johnson's classification of $3,000 as the poverty line except that he expects labor's demands to be made, complied with, and the resulting cost of living going high enough to make the poverty a reality.

Will greatly appreciate your opinion and information of what is being planned in Washington that should increase the cost of living this much.

LETTER SHOWS NEED FOR COLLEGE AID BILL

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, many people have written to me since I introduced the comprehensive college student assistance bill, S. 2490, in which so many of my colleagues have joined as cosponsors. Often these letters have gone into specific detail about the situation of the family whose member is writing in support of the bill. They confirm by case study, as it were, the need which exists for assistance to higher education by aid directly to the student.

One of these reached me some time ago from a rural delivery address in a town on the Indiana-Illinois border in the northern part of Indiana. It is from the mother of a typical American family with two boys and one girl. She begins:

> I want to say that we are for your bill to finance students' college education. We have three children aged 22, 21, and 17. The boys are 22 and 21 and our daughter is 17. All of the children went to Catholic schools.

She continues to say that the older boy graduated a year ago from John Carroll University in Cleveland:

> He received $2,800 in Government loans. He also borrowed $1,000 from a bank his last year. When he graduated he went to work for Western Electric in Chicago as an engineer. February 6 he was drafted into the

> Army and is now stationed at Fort Sill, Okla., taking officer training. He is paying the bank loan, but will be allowed to wait until he is discharged to pay the Government loan.

Here is an illustration of the tremendous assistance the National Defense Education Act loans have been to the completion of college education. From the size of the loan, and from the circumstances of the family, whose father is a welder, it is probable that this young engineer, now training for leadership as an Army officer, would have had great difficulty otherwise. As Senators know, my bill provides for extension and enlargement of the National Defense Education Act loan provisions as one of its features.

The mother continues concerning the situation of the second son:

> Our second son is a junior at St. Ambrose College, Davenport, Iowa. He received $700 the first 2 years from Government loans. However, last year he had low grades because he had to work part time during the school year, because he couldn't get a good paying summer job. He didn't get a Government loan. We had to carry the burden of his education. He had to work part time this year and probably will have low grades again.

Low grades because of the necessity for unrelated work in order to pay expenses—this is the story of countless numbers of college students who are hampered in their education by the effort to do more paid work on the side than they are justified in doing from a scholastic standpoint. When their education suffers, they are losing something from their own potential qualification, and society is likewise losing. The work-study provisions of my bill would allow productive course-related work for remuneration, assisting an estimated 330,000 students to learn as well as earn on such jobs. And where requirements of the National Defense Education Act cannot be met scholastically, the guaranteed bank loan would be an alternative at reasonable rates. Mrs. Sallak continues:

> Our daughter would like to go to school also. She is a junior in high school. We live in a rural area and have to have two cars. It's also difficult for our children to get summer work. It takes most of their father's salary to keep the children in school. My husband and I are in our fifties. We have never had a vacation and don't know what golf or bridge clubs are. The only trips we make are the ones taking our children back and forth to college each year. We have a home but feel we need something for our future. My husband is a mild diabetic and must have medicine. Still he makes a good salary and our children are never eligible for scholarships. We are the inbetween class.

"We are the inbetween class." This is the group of people who in some ways are the hardest put to finance college education. It cannot be done without help of some kind, usually including student earnings and loans, but as in this case they do not qualify for scholarships.

Here, Mr. President, is a typical case study in the mother's own words, of a family where there is need for the kind of aid my bill will furnish. I trust it will be reported as soon as possible, and that this body will pass it.

LEGISLATIVE APPORTIONMENT IN ARIZONA

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, the Supreme Court decision on apportionment seriously affects my State, as I am sure it does nearly every State in the Union. Our Governor, Paul Fannin, has taken immediate steps to solve this problem and has announced his intention to appoint a special commission of citizens of Arizona to study, analyze, and submit recommendations in time for the 1965 Arizona legislative session in order to arrive at the best solution to this problem.

So that my colleagues may know the steps which are being taken in Arizona I ask unanimous consent that the June 22 statement of Governor Fannin be inserted in the RECORD at this point. In addition to this I also ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD a memorandum prepared by the assistant attorney general of Arizona, Philip Haggerty, and John P. Frank and Robert Kelso, special counsel for Arizona Secretary of State Wesley Bolin on the subject of legislative apportionment decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court.

There being no objection, the statement and memorandum were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY GOVERNOR FANNIN

The recent decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court on legislative redistricting present serious problems for Arizona.

I have consulted concerning these problems with the president of the senate, the speaker of the house, and the attorney general, and we have all received such other legal advice as can be quickly obtained.

We must proceed at once to solve the problems created by the decisions. At first glance, a complete revision of our constitutional system for electing not only the senate, but to a lesser degree the house as well, may be required. The problems are so large that we cannot solve them speedily, but they are so pressing that we must certainly start speedily.

It is my intention to appoint a special commission of representative citizens of Arizona to study, analyze, and bring in recommendations in time for the 1965 session for the best solution to this problem. This special commission, it is contemplated, would be a dedicated group of people who would require no payment of salaries, such as, select people from the universities and perhaps citizens with legislative and judicial experience, as well as lay citizens who might be especially qualified to consider the problems involved—the whole purpose being not only to get the benefit of what they might suggest, but as well to give substance to the effort on the part of the State to come to a solution of this matter with speed.

The legislature began work on the congressional redistricting this spring, and a measure passed the house. Substantial progress was made, but the issue was then referred to the legislative council and its staff for final recommendations. The president of the senate and the speaker of the house and I are directing that this work proceed at full speed until done.

We must, at the same time, deal with the problem of legislative districting. I am requesting information from other States in addition to conferring with other officials and vitally interested citizens of Arizona. I am requesting the attorney general to make his staff fully available to assist in this project.

If funds are needed, we shall find ways to procure them. We are determined that Arizona shall solve its own problems. We shall get at them at once.

JUNE 18, 1964.

Memorandum to: Senators Clarence Carpenter, and Harold Giss.
From: Assistant Attorney General Philip Haggerty; John P. Frank, and Robert Kelso, special counsel for Secretary of State Wesley Bolin.
Subject: Legislative apportionment decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court.

I. THE DECISIONS

The Supreme Court has decided cases on legislative apportionment from Alabama, Colorado, Delaware, Maryland, New York, and Virginia. The opinions run well over 200 printed pages. The essence of them is that in State senates as well as in State houses of representatives, representation must be essentially proportional. The Court holds that there must be "equal participation by all voters in the election of State legislators" and that the weight of the voters cannot be affected by the "place of residence." The clearest single portion of the holding is that "the weight of a citizen's vote cannot be made to depend on where he lives. Population is, of necessity, the starting point for consideration and the controlling criterion for judgment in legislative apportionment controversies."

The Court considers and rejects the Federal analogy by which one house is constructed according to population and the other according to geographical and traditional considerations.

While there are strenuous dissents, the foregoing is clearly what the Court is saying. In the case arising from Colorado, a geographical system had been approved by the voters themselves only a year or so ago and had not only been approved but had been approved by the voters in every single area of the State, urban as well as rural. Moreover, Colorado has a good working initiative system, so that the people can readily change the pattern if they want to. With reference to the initiative, the Court says,

"Except as an interim remedial procedure justifying a court in staying its hand temporarily, we find no significance in the fact that a nonjudicial, political remedy may be available for the effectuation of assserted rights to equal representation in a State legislature * * *. While a court sitting as a court of equity might be justified in temporarily refraining from the issuance of injunctive relief in an apportionment case in order to allow for resort to an available political remedy, such as initiative and referendum, individual constitutional rights cannot be deprived, or denied judicial effectuation, because of the existence of a nonjudicial remedy through which relief against the alleged malapportionment, which the individual voters seek, might be achieved."

II. REMEDIES

A. The 1966 elections: The next Maryland election will not be held until 1966. The Court notes that "sufficient time exists for the Maryland Legislature to enact legislation reapportioning seats in the general assembly prior to the 1966 primary and general elections. Since primary responsibility for legislative apportionment rests with the legislature itself, and since adequate time exists in which the Maryland General Assembly can act, the Maryland courts need feel obliged to take further affirmative action only if the legislature fails to enact a constitutionally valid State legislative apportionment scheme in a timely fashion after being afforded a further opportunity by the courts to do so. However, under no circumstances should the 1966 election of members of the Maryland Legislature be permitted to be conducted pursuant to the existing or any other unconstitutional plan."

B. The 1965 elections: The next Virginia election will not occur until 1965. The Court holds that therefore "ample time remains for the Virginia Legislature to enact a constitutionally valid reapportionment scheme for purposes of that election. After the district court has provided the Virginia Legislature with an adequate opportunity to enact a valid plan, it can then proceed, should it become necessary, to grant relief under equitable principles to insure that no further elections are held under an unconstitutional scheme. Since the district court stated that it was retaining jurisdiction and that plaintiffs could seek further appropriate relief, the court below presumably intends to take further action should the Virginia Legislature fail to act promptly in remedying the constitutional defects in the State's legislative apportionment plan."

C. The 1964 elections: To appreciate the possible impact of the decisions on 1964 elections, some attention must be given to rules 58 and 59 of the Supreme Court. A mandate is in effect an order to a lower court that it is supposed to act in compliance with what the Supreme Court has said. Under rule 59, mandates issued after the expiration of 25 days from the day the judgment is entered. Petitions for rehearing may be filed under rule 58 within 25 days after a decision. This means that the mandate cannot come down until July 10, which is the final day for filing here. Moreover, when, as will now be the case, a time for a petition for rehearing comes during the summer vacation, a motion can be presented to the Court permitting a stay until the Court itself can act on the petition for rehearing in the fall. The attorney general of Arizona is taking immediate steps to get in touch with the attorneys general in the six pending cases to file a motion for such a stay.

On the question of remedies, the Court says:

"It is enough to say now that, once a State's legislative apportionment scheme has been found to be unconstitutional, it would be the unusual case in which a court would be justified in not taking appropriate action to insure that no further elections are conducted under the invalid plan. However, under certain circumstances, such as when an impending election is imminent and a State's election machinery is already in progress, equitable considerations might justify a court in withholding the granting of immediately effective relief in a legislative apportionment case, even though the existing apportionment scheme was found invalid. In awarding or withholding immediate relief, a court is entitled to and should consider the proximity of a forthcoming election and the mechanics and complexities of State election laws, and should act and rely upon general equitable principles. With respect to the timing of relief, a court can reasonably endeavor to avoid a disruption of the election process which might result from requiring precipitate changes that could make unreasonably or embarrassing demands on a State in adjusting to the requirements of the court's decree."

The Court expressly approved the approach of the court in Alabama, which it commended for having correctly recognized that legislative reapportionment is primarily a matter for legislative consideration and determination, and that judicial relief becomes appropriate only when a legislature fails to reapportion according to Federal constitutional requisites in a timely fashion after having had an adequate opportunity to do so. The Court especially commended "the proper judicial restraint" shown by the Alabama court in not jumping in too quickly.

In the New York case the Court simply left it to the lower court to determine "whether, because of the imminence of (the 1964) election and in order to give the New York Legislature an opportunity to fashion a constitutionally valid legislative apportionment plan, it would be desirable to permit the 1964 election of legislators to be conducted pursuant to the existing provisions, or whether, under the circumstances, the effectuation of appellants' right to a properly weighted voice in the election of State legislators should not be delayed beyond the 1964 election."

As noted above, in the Colorado case the Court did treat the availability of initiative and referendum as a reason for which a court "might be justified in temporarily refraining from the issuance of injunctive relief in an apportionment case in order to allow for resort to an available political remedy."

In the Colorado case, the actions had been originally filed in March and July of 1962. The three-judge court gave its opinion on August 10, 1962, holding that, in view of the immediate imminence of an election, no change would be required at that time. At that same time two initiative proposals were pending to deal with apportionment. The Supreme Court held that "because of the imminence of the November 1962 election and the fact that two initiated proposals relating to legislative apportionment would be voted on by the State's electorate at that election, the district court properly stayed its hand and permitted the 1962 election of legislators to be conducted pursuant to the existing statutory scheme."

The Court thereupon remanded the matter for the district court to decide whether the constitutionally required system under its decision "can practicably be effectuated in 1964."

Conclusion as to timing: Taking the opinions as a whole, we conclude first, that our legislature must be given a fair chance to deal with this problem; and second, that in view of the imminence of the 1964 election, that fair chance comes in 1965. Finding the proper solution will take the very best thought of which the legislature is capable, and it is too soon to know what that solution will be.

III. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. We cannot possibly solve these problems prior to the 1964 election. The candidates are already in the field and we could not conceivably get a fair and sound constitutional amendment drafted and offered in time for this year. In light of all the circumstances, we recommend against proposing a special session at this time but rather recommend that we proceed affirmatively, as suggested in the two next paragraphs, as evidence of our complete good faith. Fortunately, article 21, section 1, of our constitution permits us to amend our constitution by special election; and if it appears necessary to have such an election in 1965, we can do so.

2. The present work on congressional reapportionment should be pressed to completion at full speed. At the earliest possible date, this report should be published.

3. The president of the senate, the speaker of the house, and the Governor should meet immediately to establish a procedure to prepare recommendations for a proper adjustment to the decisions in the light of the history and needs of our own State and our own people. Tentatively, we recommend a special joint commission. We can best demonstrate that we do not need to have a three-judge court do our thinking for us by doing it for ourselves.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed; and, without objection, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES SALARY REFORM ACT OF 1964

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11049) to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That this Act may be cited as the "Government Employees Salary Reform Act of 1964".

TITLE I—FEDERAL EMPLOYEES SALARY SYSTEMS

Short title

SEC. 101. This title may be cited as the "Federal Employees Salary Act of 1964".

Classification Act employees

SEC. 102. (a) Section 603(b) of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (76 Stat. 843; 5 U.S.C. 1113(b)), is amended to read as follows:

"(b) The compensation schedule for the General Schedule shall be as follows:

"Grade	Per annum rates and steps									
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
GS-1	$3,385	$3,500	$3,615	$3,730	$3,845	$3,960	$4,075	$4,190	$4.305	$4,420
GS-2	3,680	3,805	3,930	4,055	4,180	4,305	4,430	4,555	4,680	4.805
GS-3	4,005	4,140	4,275	4,410	4,545	4,680	4,815	4,950	5,085	5,220
GS-4	4,480	4,630	4,780	4,930	5,080	5,230	5,380	5,530	5,680	5,830
GS-5	5,000	5,165	5,330	5,495	5,660	5,825	5,990	6,155	6,320	6,485
GS-6	5,505	5,690	5,875	6,060	6,245	6,430	6,615	6,800	6,985	7,170
GS-7	6,050	6,250	6,450	6,650	6,850	7,050	7,250	7,450	7,650	7,850
GS-8	6,630	6,850	7,070	7,290	7.510	7.730	7,950	8,170	8,390	8,610
GS-9	7,220	7,465	7,710	7,955	8,200	8,445	8,690	8,935	9,180	9,425
GS-10	7,900	8,170	8,440	8,710	8,980	9,250	9,520	9,790	10,060	10,330
GS-11	8,650	8,945	9.240	9,535	9,830	10,125	10,420	10,715	11,010	11,305
GS-12	10,250	10,605	10,960	11,315	11,670	12,025	12,380	12,735	13,090	13,445
GS-13	12,075	12,495	12,915	13,335	13,755	14,175	14,595	15,015	15,435	15,855
GS-14	14,170	14,660	15,150	15,640	16,130	16,620	17,110	17,600	18,090	18,580
GS-15	16,460	17,030	17,600	18,170	18,740	19,310	19.880	20,450	21,020	21,590
GS-16	18,935	19,590	20,245	20,900	21,555	22,210	22,865	23,520	24,175	
GS-17	21,445	22,195	22,945	23,695	24,445					
GS-18	24,500									".

(b) Except as provided in subsection (d) of section 504 of the Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962, the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees to whom the compensation schedule set forth in subsection (a) of this section applies shall be initially adjusted as of the effective date of this section, as follows:

(1) If the officer or employee is receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this section at one of the rates of a grade in the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, he shall receive a rate of basic compensation at the corresponding rate in effect on and after such date.

(2) If the officer or employee is receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this section at a rate between two rates of a grade in the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, he shall receive a rate of basic compensation at the higher of the two corresponding rates in effect on and after such date.

(3) If the officer or employee is receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this section at a rate in excess of the maximum rate for his grade, he shall receive (A) the maximum rate for his grade in the new schedule, or (B) his existing rate of basic compensation if such existing rate is higher.

(4) If the officer or employee, immediately prior to the effective date of this section, is receiving, pursuant to section 2(b)(4) of the Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1955, an existing aggregate rate of compensation determined under section 208(b) of the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1111), plus subsequent increases authorized by law, he shall receive an aggregate rate of compensation equal to the sum of his existing aggregate rate of compensation, on the day preceding the effective date of this section, plus the amount of increase made by this section in the maximum rate of his grade, until (i) he leaves his position, or (ii) he is entitled to receive aggregate compensation at a higher rate by reason of the operation of this Act or any other provision of law; but, when such position becomes vacant, the aggregate rate of compensation of any subsequent appointee thereto shall be fixed in accordance with applicable provisions of law. Subject to clauses (i) and (ii) of the immediately preceding sentence of this paragraph, the amount of the increase provided by this section shall be held and considered for the purpose of section 208(b) of the Act of September 1, 1954, to constitute a part of the existing rate of compensation of the employee.

(5) If the officer or employee is in a position in grade 16 or 17 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, to which he was promoted on or after the first day of his first pay period beginning on or after January 1, 1964, and if he holds such position, or another position in the same grade, on the effective date of this section, his rate of basic compensation shall be adjusted, as of such effective date, to that rate of basic compensation to which he would have been entitled if the compensation schedule in subsection (a) of this section had been in effect on the date of his promotion.

SEC. 103. (a) Section 801 of the Classification Act of 1949 (5 U.S.C. 1131), relating to new appointments, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 801. All new appointments shall be made at the minimum rate of the appropriate grade, except that in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Commission which provide for such considerations as the candidate's existing salary, unusually high or unique qualifications, or a special need of the Government for his services, the head of any department may, with the approval of the Commission in each specific case, appoint individuals to positions in grade 13 and above of the General Schedule at such rate or rates above the minimum rate of the appropriate grade as the Commission may authorize for this purpose.".

(b) Section 505(b) of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (5 U.S.C. 1105(b)), relating to the limitation on numbers of positions in grades 16, 17, and 18 of the General Schedule of such Act, is amended by inserting "(i)" after the words "in addition to", and by striking out "which may be placed in such grades" and inserting in lieu thereof ", and positions placed under this Act pursuant to section 309 of the Federal Executive Salary Act of 1964, which may be placed in such grades, and (ii) two hundred and forty examiner positions under section 11 of the Administrative Procedure Act (60 Stat. 244; 5 U.S.C. 1010) which may be placed in grade 16 and nine such positions which may be placed in grade 17".

(c) Section 604(d)(3) of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended (5 U.S.C. 944(c)(3)), is amended to read as follows:

"(3) All rates shall be computed to the nearest cent, counting one-half cent and over as a whole cent.".

Postal field service employees

SEC. 104. Section 1 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by striking out the period at the end of such section and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and the following:

" 'revenue unit' means that amount of revenue of a post office from mail and special service transactions which is equal to the average sum of postal rates and fees received by the Department during the fiscal year for 1,000 pieces of originating mail and special service transactions determined in accordance with section 2331 of this title.".

SEC. 105. Section 702 of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 702. Classes of post offices

"(a) Effective at the beginning of each fiscal year the Postmaster General shall divide post offices into four classes on the basis of the revenue units of each office for the second preceding fiscal year. He shall place in the first class those post offices having 950 or more revenue units. He shall place in the second class those post offices having 190 or more revenue units, but fewer than 950 revenue units. He shall place in the third class those post offices having 36 or more revenue units, but fewer than 190 revenue units. He shall place in the fourth class those post offices having fewer than 36 revenue units.

"(b) The Postmaster General shall exclude from the revenue credited to a post office for the purposes of this section money received at that office for—

"(1) setting meters for patrons beyond the area served by the office unless authorized by the Department;

"(2) stamps, stamped envelopes, and postal cards sold in large or unusual quantities to be used in mailing matter at other offices; and

"(3) stamps, stamped envelopes, and postal cards sold for mailing matter diverted from other offices and mailing of matter so diverted without stamps affixed.

"(c) Whenever unusual conditions pervail at a post office of the fourth class, the Postmaster General may advance such office to the appropriate class based on his estimate of the number of revenue units which the office will have during the succeeding twelve months. Any office so advanced need not be relegated to a lower class before the end of the second fiscal year after the advancement. At that time, the office shall be assigned to the appropriate class in accordance with subsections (a) and (b) of this section."

SEC. 106. Section 704 of title 39, United State Code, is amended by deleting "of the first, second, or third class" appearing therein, and inserting in lieu thereof "(other than one for which the postmaster furnishes quarters, equipment, and fixtures on an allowance basis)".

SEC. 107. Subsection (b)(1) of section 2102 of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(1) for post offices at which the postmaster does not furnish quarters on an allowance basis;".

SEC. 108. (a) Section 3501 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by inserting a new subsection (c) following subsection (b) as follows:

"(c) The Postmaster General shall determine and, effective at the beginning of the first pay period in each calendar year, shall adjust the rankings of all positions for which the number of annual revenue units of a post office or its class is a relevant factor of the ranking, using the revenue units of the preceding fiscal year and the class in which the office will be placed at the beginning of the next fiscal year. The Postmaster General also may adjust rankings of such positions at other times of the year based upon substantial changes in service conditions.".

(b) Chapter 45 of title 39, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) In subsection (c) of section 3513—

(A) Change the catchline to read "POST-OFFICE CLERK. (KP–4)"; and

(B) Add the following new sentence to the end of paragraph (1): "This office has fewer than 190 revenue units annually.".

(2) In subsection (e) of section 3516—

(A) Change the catchline to read "POSTMASTER. (KP–18)";

(B) Delete "third class" in the first sentence of paragraph (1); and

(C) Delete "annual receipts of approximately $1,700" in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof "approximately 40 revenue units annually".

(3) In subsection (b) of section 3517—

(A) Change the catchline to read "POSTMASTER. (KP–20)";

(B) Delete "third class" in the first sentence of paragraph (1); and

(C) Delete "annual receipts of approximately $4,700" in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof "approximately 110 revenue units annually".

(4) In subsection (b) of section 3518—

(A) Change the catchline to read "POSTMASTER. (KP–22)";

(B) Delete "third class" in the first sentence of paragraph (1); and

(C) Delete "annual receipts of approximately $6,000" in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof "approximately 140 revenue units annually".

(5) In subsection (b) of section 3519—

(A) Change the catchline to read "ASSISTANT POSTMASTER. (KP–24)"; and

(B) Delete "annual receipts of approximately $63,000" in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof "approximately 1,490 revenue units annually".

(6) In subsection (c) of section 3519—

(A) Change the catchline to read "POSTMASTER. (KP–25)";

(B) Delete "second class" in the first sentence of paragraph (1); and

(C) Delete "annual receipts of approximately $16,000" in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof "approximately 380 revenue units annually".

(7) In subsection (b) of section 3520—

(A) Change the catchline to read "POSTMASTER. (KP–27)";

(B) Delete "first class" in the first sentence of paragraph (1); and

(C) Delete "annual receipts of approximately $63,000" in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof "approximately 1,490 revenue units annually".

(8) In subsection (b) of section 3521—

(A) Change the catchline to read "POSTMASTER. (KP–29)";

(B) Delete "first class" appearing in the first sentence of paragraph (1); and

(C) Delete "annual receipts of $129,000" in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof "approximately 3,060 revenue units annually".

(9) In subsection (b) of section 3522—

(A) Change the catchline to read "POSTMASTER. (KP–31)";

(B) Delete "first class" in the first sentence of paragraph (1); and

(C) Delete "annual receipts of $314,000" in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof "approximately 7,450 revenue units annually".

(10) In subsection (b) of section 3523—

(A) Change the catchline to read "POSTMASTER. (KP–33)";

(B) Delete "first class" appearing in the first sentence of paragraph (1); and

(C) Delete the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof: "This office has approximately 110 employees, approximately 14,350 revenue units annually, 13 government-owned vehicle units, one classified station and 42 carrier routes within its jurisdiction.".

(11) In subsection (b) of section 3524—

(A) Change the catchline to read "ASSISTANT POSTMASTER. (KP–35)"; and

(B) Delete "annual receipts of $2,700,000" in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof "approximately 64,000 revenue units annually".

(12) In subsection (c) of section 3524—

(A) Change the catchline to read "POSTMASTER. (KP–36)";

(B) Delete "first class" in the first sentence of paragraph (1); and

(C) Delete "annual receipts of $1,000,000" in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof "approximately 23,700 revenue units annually".

(13) In subsection (a) of section 3525—

(A) Change the catchline to read "ASSISTANT POSTMASTER. (KP–37)"; and

(B) Delete "annual receipts of $8,460,000" in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof "approximately 200,000 revenue units annually".

(14) In subsection (b) of section 3525—

(A) Change the catchline to read "POSTMASTER. (KP–38)";

(B) Delete "first class" in the first sentence of paragraph (1); and

(C) Delete "annual receipts of $2,700,000" in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof "approximately 64,000 revenue units annually".

(15) In subsection (a) of section 3526—

(A) Change the catchline to read "ASSISTANT POSTMASTER. (KP–39)"; and

(B) Delete "annual receipts of $16,900,000" in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof "approximately 400,000 revenue units annually".

(16) In subsection (b) of section 3526—

(A) Change the catchline to read "POSTMASTER. (KP–40)";

(B) Delete "first class" in the first sentence of paragraph (1); and

(C) Delete "annual receipts of $4,470,000" in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof "approximately 106,000 revenue units annually".

(17) In subsection (b) of section 3527—

(A) Change the catchline to read "ASSISTANT POSTMASTER. (KP–42)"; and

(B) Delete "annual receipts of $48,000,000" in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof "approximately 1,000,000 revenue units annually".

(18) In subsection (c) of section 3527—

(A) Change the catchline to read "POSTMASTER. (KP–43)";

(B) Delete "first class" in the first sentence of paragraph (1); and

(C) Delete "annual receipts of $8,460,000" in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof "approximately 200,000 revenue units annually".

(19) In subsection (b) of section 3528—

(A) Change the catchline to read "ASSISTANT POSTMASTER. (KP–45)"; and

(B) Delete "annual receipts of $140,000,000" in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof "approximately 2,500,000 revenue units annually".

(20) In subsection (c) of section 3528—

(A) Change the catchline to read "POSTMASTER. (KP–46)";

(B) Delete "first class" in the first sentence of paragraph (1); and

(C) Delete "annual receipts of $16,900,000" in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof "approximately 400,000 revenue units annually".

(21) In section 3529—

(A) Change the catchline immediately preceding paragraph (1) to read "POSTMASTER. (KP–47)";

(B) Delete "first class" in the first sentence of paragraph (1); and

(C) Delete "annual receipts of $48,000,000" in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof "approximately 1,000,000 revenue units annually".

(22) In section 3530—

(A) Change the catchline immediately preceding paragraph (1) to read "POSTMASTER. (KP–48)";

(B) Delete "first class" in the first sentence of paragraph (1); and

(C) Delete "annual receipts of $140,000,000" in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof "approximately 2,500,000 revenue units annually".

SEC. 109. Section 3542(a) of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows—

"(a) There is established a basic compensation schedule for positions in the postal field service which shall be known as the Postal Field Service Schedule and for which the symbol shall be 'PFS'. Except as provided in sections 3543 and 3544 of this title, basic compensation shall be paid to all employees in accordance with such schedule.

"POSTAL FIELD SERVICE SCHEDULE

"PFS	"Per annum rates and steps											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1	$3,945	$4,075	$4,205	$4,335	$4,465	$4,595	$4,725	$4,855	$4,985	$5,115	$5,245	$5,375
2	4,270	4,410	4,550	4,690	4,830	4,970	5,110	5,250	5,390	5,530	5,670	5,810
3	4,615	4,770	4,925	5,080	5,235	5,390	5,545	5,700	5,855	6,010	6,165	6,320
4	5,000	5,165	5,330	5,495	5,660	5,825	5,990	6,155	6,320	6,485	6,650	6,815
5	5,345	5,525	5,705	5,885	6,065	6,245	6,425	6,605	6,785	6,965	7,145	7,325
6	5,735	5,925	6,115	6,305	6,495	6,685	6,875	7,065	7,255	7,445	7,635	7,825
7	6,140	6,345	6,550	6,755	6,960	7,165	7,370	7,575	7,780	7,985	8,190	
8	6,650	6,870	7,090	7,310	7,530	7,750	7,970	8,190	8,410	8,630		
9	7,190	7,430	7,670	7,910	8,150	8,390	8,630	8,870	9,110	9,350		
10	7,830	8,095	8,360	8,625	8,890	9,155	9,420	9,685	9,950	10,215		
11	8,650	8,945	9,240	9,535	9,830	10,125	10,420	10,715	11,010	11,305		
12	9,570	9,895	10,220	10,545	10,870	11,195	11,520	11,845	12,170	12,495		
13	10,575	10,940	11,305	11,670	12,035	12,400	12,765	13,130	13,495	13,860		
14	11,660	12,065	12,470	12,875	13,280	13,685	14,090	14,495	14,900	15,305		
15	12,885	13,330	13,775	14,220	14,665	15,110	15,555	16,000	16,445	16,890		
16	14,240	14,735	15,230	15,725	16,220	16,715	17,210	17,705	18,200	18,695		
17	15,755	16,305	16,855	17,405	17,955	18,505	19,055	19,605	20,155	20,705		
18	17,450	18,060	18,670	19,280	19,890	20,500	21,110	21,720	22,330	22,940		
19	19,345	20,020	20,695	21,370	22,045	22,720	23,395	24,070				
20	21,445	22,195	22,945	23,695	24,445							".

SEC. 110. Section 3543(a) of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows—

"(a) There is established a basic compensation schedule which shall be known as the Rural Carrier Schedule and for which the symbol shall be 'RCS'.

"RURAL CARRIER SCHEDULE

	"Per annum rates and steps											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Carriers in rural delivery service:												
Fixed compensation per annum	$2,240	$2,345	$2,450	$2,555	$2,660	$2,765	$2,870	$2,975	$3,080	$3,185	$3,290	$3,395
Compensation per mile per annum for each mile up to 30 miles of route	82	84	86	88	90	92	94	96	98	100	102	104
For each mile of route over 30 miles	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25".

SEC. 111. (a) Section 3544 of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 3544. Fourth Class Office Schedule

"(a) There is established a basic compensation schedule which shall be known as the Fourth Class Office Schedule and for which the symbol shall be 'FOS', for postmasters in post offices of the fourth class which is based on the revenue units of the post office for the preceding fiscal year. Basic compensation shall be paid to postmasters in post offices of the fourth class in accordance with this schedule.

"FOURTH-CLASS OFFICE SCHEDULE

"Revenue units	Per annum rates and steps											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
30 but less than 36	$3,769	$3,894	$4,019	$4,144	$4,269	$4,394	$4,519	$4,644	$4,769	$4,894	$5,019	$5,144
24 but less than 30	3,485	3,600	3,715	3,830	3,945	4,060	4,175	4,290	4,405	4,520	4,635	4,750
18 but less than 24	2,877	2,974	3,071	3,168	3,265	3,362	3,459	3,556	3,653	3,750	3,847	3,944
12 but less than 18	2,258	2,331	2,404	2,477	2,550	2,623	2,696	2,769	2,842	2,915	2,988	3,061
6 but less than 12	1,628	1,680	1,732	1,784	1,836	1,888	1,940	1,992	2,044	2,096	2,148	2,200
Less than 6	1,313	1,355	1,397	1,439	1,481	1,523	1,565	1,607	1,649	1,691	1,733	1,775".

"(b) The basic salary of postmasters in fourth-class post offices shall be readjusted for changes in revenue units at the start of the first pay period after January 1 of each year. When a post office is restored to a revenue unit category held by it prior to relegation to a lower revenue unit category, the postmaster's basic salary may be adjusted to the highest salary step held by him when the post office was in the higher revenue unit category. In all other cases, in adjusting a postmaster's basic salary under this section, the basic salary shall be fixed at the lowest step which is higher than the basic salary received by the postmaster at the end of the preceding fiscal year. If there is no such step the basic salary shall be fixed at the highest step for the adjusted revenue units of the office. Each increase in basic salary because of change in revenue units shall be deemed the equivalent of a step increase under section 3552 of this title and the waiting period, for purposes of advancement to the next step, shall begin on the date of adjustment.

"(c) The basic salaries of postmasters at newly established offices of the fourth class shall be fixed at the lowest salary rate. Whenever unusual conditions prevail at any post office of the fourth class the Postmaster General may advance such office to the appropriate category based on his estimate of the number of revenue units which the office will have during the succeeding twelve months. Any fourth-class office advanced to the appropriate category pursuant to this subsection shall not be reduced in category until the start of the first pay period after January 1 of the calendar year following the calendar year in which it was so advanced, at which time it shall be assigned to the category indicated by the revenue units for the preceding fiscal year.

"(d) Persons who perform the duties of postmaster at post offices of the fourth class where there is a vacancy or during the absence of the postmaster on sick or annual leave, or leave without pay, shall be paid the same basic salary to which they would have been entitled if regularly appointed as postmaster.

"(e) The Postmaster General may allow to postmasters in fourth-class post offices additional compensation for separating services and for unusual conditions during a portion of the year, in lieu of an allowance for clerical services for this purpose.

"(f) At seasonal post offices of the fourth class, the Postmaster General may authorize the payment of the basic salary prorated over the pay periods the office is open for business during the fiscal year.

"(g) Where the revenue units of a post office of the third class for each of two consecutive fiscal years are less than 36, or where in any fiscal year the revenue units are less than 33, the post office shall be relegated to the fourth class and the basic salary of the postmaster shall be fixed in the manner provided in subsection (b) of this section.

"(h) When required by the Postmaster General a postmaster at a fourth-class office shall, and any other postmaster in PFS level 5 when permitted by the Postmaster General may, furnish quarters, fixtures, and equipment for an office on an allowance basis. The allowance for this purpose shall be an amount equal to 15 per centum of the basic compensation for the postmaster at the office."

SEC. 112. (a) Subsection (a) of section 6007 of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The Postmaster General shall pay to persons, other than special delivery messengers at post offices of the first class, for making delivery of special delivery mail such fees as may be established by him not in excess of the special delivery fee.".

(b) Section 2009 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by deleting "at any price less than eight cents per piece" and inserting in lieu thereof "at any price less than the fees established pursuant to section 6007(a) of this title.".

SEC. 113. Section 3560 of title 39, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking out "gross receipts" in subsection (a)(3) and inserting in lieu thereof "revenue unit"; and

(2) by striking out "gross receipts" in subsection (f)(1) and inserting in lieu thereof "revenue unit".

SEC. 114. (a) Section 3552(a) of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(a)(1) Each employee subject to the Postal Field Service Schedule, each employee subject to the Rural Carrier Schedule, and each employee subject to the Fourth Class Office Schedule who has not reached the highest step for his position shall be advanced successively to the next higher step as follows:

"(A) to steps 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7—at the beginning of the first pay period following the completion of fifty-two calendar weeks of satisfactory service; and

"(B) to steps 8 and above—at the beginning of the first pay period following the completion of one hundred and fifty-six calendar weeks of satisfactory service.

"(2) The receipt of an equivalent increase during any of the waiting periods specified in this subsection shall cause a new full waiting period to commence for further step increases."

(b) Section 3552 of title 39, United States Code, is further amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

"(d) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsections (a), (b), and (c) of this section, the Postmaster General is authorized to advance any employee in PFS level 9 or below who—

"(1) was promoted to a higher level between July 9, 1960, and October 13, 1962; and

"(2) is senior with respect to total postal service to an employee in his own post office promoted to the same position since October 13, 1962, and is at a step in the level below the step of the junior employees.

Any increase under the provisions of this subsection shall not constitute an equivalent increase and credit earned prior to adjustment under this subsection for advancement to the next step shall be retained."

SEC. 115. (a) Section 711 of title 39, United States Code, is repealed.

(b) The table of contents of chapter 7 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by deleting

"711. Method of determining gross receipts.".

SEC. 116. The basic compensation of each employee subject to the Postal Field Service Schedule, the Rural Carrier Schedule, or the Fourth Class Office Schedule, immediately prior to the effective date of this section shall be determined as follows:

(1) Each employee shall be assigned to the same numerical step for his position which he had attained immediately prior to such effective date. If changes in levels, receipts categories, or steps would otherwise occur on such effective date without regard to enactment of this Act, such changes shall be deemed to have occurred prior to conversion.

(2) If the existing basic compensation is greater than the rate to which the employee is converted under paragraph (1) of this section, the employee shall be placed in the lowest step which exceeds his basic compensation. If the existing basic compensation exceeds the maximum step of his position, his existing basic compensation shall be established as his basic compensation.

Employees in the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration

SEC. 117. (a) Section 4103 of title 38, United States Code, relating to the appointment and annual salaries of certain staff positions in the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 4103. Office of the Chief Medical Director

"(a) The Office of the Chief Medical Director shall consist of the following—

"(1) The Chief Medical Director, who shall be the Chief of the Department of Medicine and Surgery and shall be directly responsible to the Administrator for the operations of the Department. He shall be a qualified doctor of medicine, appointed by the Administrator.

"(2) The Deputy Chief Medical Director, who shall be the principal assistant of the Chief Medical Director. He shall be a qualified doctor of medicine, appointed by the Administrator.

"(3) Not to exceed five Assistant Chief Medical Directors, who shall be appointed by the Administrator upon the recommendation of the Chief Medical Director. One Assistant Chief Medical Director shall be a qualified doctor of dental surgery or dental medicine who shall be directly responsible to the Chief Medical Director for the operation of the Dental Service.

"(4) Such Medical Directors as may be appointed by the Administrator, upon the recommendation of the Chief Medical Director, to suit the needs of the Department. A Medical Director shall be either a qualified doctor of medicine or a qualified doctor of dental surgery or dental medicine.

"(5) A Director of Nursing Service, who shall be a qualified registered nurse, appointed by the Administrator, and who shall be responsible to the Chief Medical Director for the operation of the Nursing Service.

"(6) A Chief Pharmacist and a Chief Dietitian, appointed by the Administrator.

"(7) Such other personnel and employees as may be authorized by this chapter.

"(b) Except as provided in subsection (c), any appointment under this section shall be for a period of four years, with reappointment permissible for successive like periods, except that persons so appointed or reappointed shall be subject to removal by the Administrator for cause.

"(c) The Administrator may designate a member of the Chaplain Service of the Veterans' Administration as Director, Chaplain Service, for a period of two years, subject to removal by the Administrator for cause. Redesignation under this subsection may be made for successive like periods. An individual designated as Director, Chaplain Service, shall at the end of his period of service as Director revert to the position, grade, and status which he held immediately prior to being designated Director, Chaplain Service, and all service as Director, Chaplain Service, shall be creditable as service in the former position.".

(b) The table of contents of chapter 73 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out

"4103. Appointments and compensations."

and inserting in lieu thereof:

"4103. Office of the Chief Medical Director.".

(c) Section 2 of the Act of July 31, 1894, as amended (5 U.S.C. 62), shall not apply to any individual appointed, before January 1, 1964, as Chief Medical Director under section 4103 of title 38, United States Code; but section 212 of the Act of June 30, 1932, as amended (5 U.S.C. 59a), shall apply, in accordance with its terms, to any such individual.

SEC. 118. Section 4107 of title 38, United States Code, relating to grades and pay scales for certain positions within the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 4107. Grades and pay scales

"(a) The per annum full-pay scale or ranges for positions provided in section 4103 of this title, other than Chief Medical Director and Deputy Chief Medical Director, shall be as follows:

"SECTION 4103 SCHEDULE

"Assistant Chief Medical Director, $24,500.

"Medical Director, $21,445 minimum to $24,445 maximum.

"Director of Nursing Service, $16,460 minimum to $21,590 maximum.

"Director, Chaplain Service, $16,460 minimum to $21,590 maximum.

"Chief Pharmacist, $16,460 minimum to $21,590 maximum.

"Chief Dietitian, $16,460 minimum to $21,590 maximum.

"(b)(1) The grades and per annum full-pay ranges for positions provided in paragraph (1) of section 4104 of this title shall be as follows:

"PHYSICIAN AND DENTIST SCHEDULE

"Director grade, $18,935 minimum to $24,175 maximum.

"Executive grade, $17,655 minimum to $23,190 maximum.

"Chief grade, $16,460 minimum to $21,590 maximum.

"Senior grade, $14,170 minimum to $18,580 maximum.

"Intermediate grade, $12,075 minimum to $15,855 maximum.

"Full grade, $10,250 minimum to $13,445 maximum.

"Associate grade, $8,650 minimum to $11,305 maximum.

"NURSE SCHEDULE

"Assistant Director grade, $14,170 minimum to $18,580 maximum.

"Chief grade, $12,075 minimum to $15,855 maximum.

"Senior grade, $10,250 minimum to $13,445 maximum.

"Intermediate grade, $8,650 minimum to $11,305 maximum.

"Full grade, $7,220 minimum to $9,425 maximum.

"Associate grade, $6,315 minimum to $8,205 maximum.

"Junior grade, $5,505 minimum to $7,170 maximum.

"(2) No person may hold the director grade unless he is serving as a director of a hospital, domiciliary, center, or outpatient clinic (independent). No person may hold the executive grade unless he holds the position of chief of staff at a hospital, center, or outpatient clinic (independent), or the position of clinic director at an outpatient clinic, or comparable position.".

Foreign Service officers; staff officers and employees

SEC. 119. Section 412 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended (22 U.S.C. 867), is amended to read as follows:

"FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS

"SEC. 412. There shall be ten classes of Foreign Service officers, including the classes of career ambassador and of career minister. The per annum salary of a career ambassador shall be at the rate provided by law for level IV of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule. The per annum salary of a career minister shall be at the rate provided by law for level V of such schedule. The per annum salaries of Foreign Service officers within each of the other classes shall be as follows:

"Class 1	$22,650	$23,440	$24,500	--------	--------	--------	--------
Class 2	18,295	18,930	19,565	$20,200	$20,835	$21,470	$22,105
Class 3	14,860	15,375	15,890	16,405	16,920	17,435	17,950
Class 4	12,075	12,495	12,915	13,335	13,755	14,175	14,595
Class 5	9,945	10,290	10,635	10,980	11,325	11,670	12,015
Class 6	8,295	8,580	8,865	9,150	9,435	9,720	10,005
Class 7	7,010	7,245	7,480	7,715	7,950	8,185	8,420
Class 8	6,050	6,250	6,450	6,650	6,850	7,050	7,250".

SEC. 120. Subsection (a) of section 415 of such Act (22 U.S.C. 870(a)) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) There shall be ten classes of Foreign Service staff officers and employees, referred to hereafter as staff officers and employees. The per annum salaries of such staff officers and employees within each class shall be as follows:

"Class 1	$14,860	$15,375	$15,890	$16,405	$16,920	$17,435	$17,950	$18,465	$18,980	$19,495
Class 2	12,075	12,495	12,915	13,335	13,755	14,175	14,595	15,015	15,435	15,855
Class 3	9,945	10,290	10,635	10,980	11,325	11,670	12,015	12,360	12,705	13,050
Class 4	8,295	8,580	8,865	9,150	9,435	9,720	10,005	10,290	10,575	10,860
Class 5	7,480	7,735	7,990	8,245	8,500	8,755	9,010	9,265	9,520	9,775
Class 6	6,755	6,980	7,205	7,430	7,655	7,880	8,105	8,330	8,555	8,780
Class 7	6,205	6,410	6,615	6,820	7,025	7,230	7,435	7,640	7,845	8,050
Class 8	5,490	5,675	5,860	6,045	6,230	6,415	6,600	6,785	6,970	7,155
Class 9	5,010	5,175	5,340	5,505	5,670	5,835	6,000	6,165	6,330	6,495
Class 10	4,480	4,630	4,780	4,930	5,080	5,230	5,380	5,530	5,680	5,830".

SEC. 121. Foreign Service officers, Reserve officers, and Foreign Service staff officers and employees who are entitled to receive basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this section at one of the rates provided by section 412 or 415 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, shall receive basic compensation, on and after such effective date, at the rate of their class determined to be appropriate by the Secretary of State.

Agricultural stabilization and conservation county committee employees

SEC. 122. The rates of compensation of persons employed by the county committees established pursuant to section 8(b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act (16 U.S.C. 590h(b)) shall be increased by amounts equal, as nearly as may be practicable, to the increases provided by section 102 of this Act for corresponding rates of compensation in the appropriate schedule or scale of pay.

Miscellaneous provisions

SEC. 123. Section 504 of the Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962 (76 Stat. 842; 5 U.S.C. 1173) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) The rate of basic compensation, established under this section, and received by any officer or employee immediately prior to the effective date of a statutory increase in the compensation schedules of the salary systems specified in subsection (a) shall be initially adjusted on the effective date of such new compensation schedules in accordance with conversion rules and regulations prescribed by the President or by such agency or agencies as he may designate."

SEC. 124. Subsection (b) of the first section of the Act entitled "An Act to provide retirement, clerical assistants, and free mailing privileges to former Presidents of the United States, and for other purposes", approved August 25, 1958 (72 Stat. 838; 3 U.S.C. note fol. 102), is amended by striking out "$50,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$65,000".

Absorption of costs

SEC. 125. (a) The cost of not less than 10 per centum of the aggregate amount of the increases in compensation provided by this title for the fiscal year 1965 shall be absorbed by the departments, agencies, establishments, and corporations in the executive branch; and no amount beyond the additional sum for such compensation increases proposed in the budget for the fiscal year 1965 is authorized to be appropriated by any provision of this Act. The total amount of such absorption shall be allocated by the Bureau of the Budget among such departments, agencies, establishments, and corporations in such manner and to such extent as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget deems appropriate in the light of their essential functions.

(b) Pursuant to the objective of this section, heads of the executive branch activities concerned are directed to review with meticulous care each vacancy resulting from voluntary resignation, retirement, or death and to determine whether the duties of the position can be reassigned to other employees or whether the position can be abolished without seriously affecting the execution of essential functions.

(c) Nothing contained in subsection (a) of this section shall be held or considered to require (1) the separation from the service of any individual by reduction in force or other personnel action or (2) the placing of any individual in a leave-without-pay status.

TITLE II—FEDERAL LEGISLATIVE SALARIES

Sec. 201. This title may be cited as the "Federal Legislative Salary Act of 1964".

Sec. 202. (a) Each officer or employee in or under the legislative branch of the Government whose rate of compensation is increased by section 5 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1946 shall be paid additional compensation in an amount equal to the greater of the following amounts, as applicable:

(1) an amount equal to 3½ per centum of his gross rate of compensation (basic compensation plus additional compensation authorized by law) in effect immediately prior to the effective date of this section plus 1 per centum of such gross rate for each whole multiple, or part of a multiple, of $500 basic compensation; or

(2) an amount equal to 5 per centum of such gross rate.

(b) The total annual compensation in effect immediately prior to the effective date of this section of each officer or employee of the House of Representatives, whose compensation is disbursed by the Clerk of the House of Representatives and is not increased by reason of any other provision of this title, shall be increased by an amount which is equal to the amount of the increase provided by subsection (a) of this section in that gross rate which is nearest in amount to the total annual compensation of such officer or employee.

(c) Each of the limitations on gross rate per thousand and gross rate per hour per person provided by applicable law on the effective date of this section with respect to the folding of speeches and pamphlets for the House of Representatives shall be increased by 7 per centum. The amount of each increase under this subsection shall be computed to the nearest cent, counting one-half cent and over as a whole cent.

(d) The additional compensation provided by this section shall be considered a part of basic compensation for the purposes of the Civil Service Retirement Act (5 U.S.C. 2251 and the following).

(e) Section 202(e) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended (2 U.S.C. 72a(e)), is amended—

(1) by striking out "$8,880" where it first appears in such subsection and inserting in lieu thereof "the highest amount which, together with additional compensation authorized by law, will not exceed the maximum rate authorized by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended,"; and

(2) by striking out "$8,880" at the second place where it appears in such subsection and inserting in lieu thereof "the highest amount which, together with additional compensation authorized by law, will not exceed the maximum rate authorized by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended".

(f)(1) This subsection is enacted as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the House of Representatives with full recognition of the constitutional right of the House of Representatives to change the rule amended by this subsection at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of the House of Representatives.

(2) Clause 28(c) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended—

(A) by striking out "$8,880" where it first appears in such clause and inserting in lieu thereof "the highest amount which, together with additional compensation authorized by law, will not exceed the maximum rate authorized by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended,"; and

(B) by striking out "$8,880" at the second place where it appears in such clause and inserting in lieu thereof "the highest amount which, together with additional compensation authorized by law, will not exceed the maximum rate authorized by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended."

(g) The basic compensation of each employee in the office of a Senator is hereby adjusted, effective on the effective date prescribed by section 501(a), to the lowest multiple of $60 which will provide a gross rate of compensation not less than the gross rate such employee was receiving immediately prior thereto, except that the foregoing provisions of this subsection shall not apply in the case of any employee if on or before the fifteenth day following the date of enactment of this Act, the Senator by whom such employee is employed notifies the disbursing office of the Senate in writing that he does not wish such provisions to apply to such employee. In any case in which, at the expiration of the time within which a Senator may give notice under this subsection, such Senator is deceased such notice shall be deemed to have been given.

(h) Notwithstanding the provision referred to in subsection (i), the rates of gross compensation of the Secretary for the Majority of the Senate, the Secretary for the Minority of the Senate, the Official Reporters of Debates of the Senate, the Parliamentarian of the Senate, the Senior Counsel in the Office of the Legislative Counsel of the Senate, and the Chief Clerk of the Senate are hereby increased by an amount which is equal to the amount of the increase which would be provided by subsection (a) of this section in that gross rate determined without regard to the provisions referred to in subsection (i) of this section which is nearest in amount to the total annual compensation of such officer or employee.

(i) The paragraph imposing limitations on basic and gross compensation of officers and employees of the Senate appearing under the heading "SENATE" in the Legislative Appropriation Act, 1956, as amended (74 Stat. 304; Public Law 86–568), is amended by striking out "$18,880" and inserting in lieu thereof "$22,945".

(j) The limitation on gross rate per hour per person provided by applicable law on the effective date of this section with respect to the folding of speeches and pamphlets for the Senate is hereby increased by 7 per centum. The amount of such increase shall be computed to the nearest cent, counting one-half cent and over as a whole cent. The provisions of subsection (a) of this section shall not apply to employees whose compensation is subject to such limitation.

(k) The gross rate of compensation of the Postmaster of the Senate shall be $18,420, and the gross rate of compensation of the Assistant Postmaster of the Senate shall be $14,570. The provisions of section 106 of the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1963, shall not hereafter apply to employees referred to in this subsection.

Sec. 203. (a) The compensation of the Comptroller General of the United States shall be at the rate of $30,000 per annum.

(b) The compensation of the Assistant Comptroller General of the United States shall be at the rate of $28,000 per annum.

(c) The compensation of the General Counsel of the United States General Accounting Office, the Librarian of Congress, the Public Printer, and the Architect of the Capitol shall be at the rate of $26,000 per annum.

(d) The compensation of the Deputy Librarian of Congress, the Deputy Public Printer, and the Assistant Architect of the Capitol shall be at the rate of $24,500 per annum.

(e) The compensation of the Second Assistant Architect of the Capitol shall be at the rate of $22,500 per annum.

(f) The compensation of the Chaplain of the House of Representatives shall be at the rate of $12,500 per annum.

(g) The compensation of the Secretary of the Senate, the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, and the Legislative Counsel of the Senate shall be at the rate of $27,500 per annum.

(h) The compensation of the Chaplain of the Senate shall be at the rate of $15,000 per annum.

Sec. 204. Section 601(a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended (2 U.S.C. 31), is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The compensation of Senators, Representatives in Congress, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico shall be at the rate of $30,000 per annum each; and the compensation of the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall be at the rate of $43,000 per annum."

Sec. 205. No officer or employee subject to section 202(a) or 202(b) of this title shall receive, by reason of any provision of this title, an increase in gross rate of compensation (basic compensation plus additional compensation authorized by law), or in total annual compensation, which is in excess of the amount of the increase in basic compensation provided by the amendment made by section 102(a) of title I of this Act for positions in grade 18 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

TITLE III—FEDERAL EXECUTIVE SALARIES

Sec. 301. This title may be cited as the "Federal Executive Salary Act of 1964".

Sec. 302. There is hereby established for offices and positions to which section 303 of this title applies a basic compensation schedule, to be known as the "Federal Executive Salary Schedule", which shall be divided into five salary levels.

Sec. 303. (a) Level I of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule shall apply to the following offices and positions, for which the annual rate of basic compensation shall be $35,000:

(1) Secretary of State.

(2) Secretary of the Treasury.

(3) Secretary of Defense.

(4) Attorney General.

(5) Postmaster General.

(6) Secretary of the Interior.

(7) Secretary of Agriculture.

(8) Secretary of Commerce.

(9) Secretary of Labor.

(10) Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

(b) Level II of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule shall apply to the following offices and positions, for which the annual rate of basic compensation shall be $30,000:

(1) Deputy Secretary of Defense.

(2) Under Secretary of State.

(3) Administrator, Agency for International Development.

(4) Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

(5) Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

(6) Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

(7) Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency.

(8) Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission.

(9) Chairman, Council of Economic Advisers.

(10) Chairman, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

(11) Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

(12) Director of the Office of Science and Technology.

(13) Director of the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

(14) Director of the United States Information Agency.

(15) Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice, so long as the position is held by the present incumbent: *Provided*, That thereafter the position shall be placed in level III.

(16) Director of Central Intelligence.

(17) Secretary of the Air Force.

(18) Secretary of the Army.

(19) Secretary of the Navy.

(c) Level III of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule shall apply to the following offices and positions, for which the annual rate of basic compensation shall be $28,500:

(1) Deputy Attorney General.

(2) Solicitor General of the United States.

(3) Deputy Postmaster General.

(4) Under Secretary of Agriculture.

(5) Under Secretary of Commerce.

(6) Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation.

(7) Under Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

(8) Under Secretary of the Interior.

(9) Under Secretary of Labor.

(10) Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs or Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs.

(11) Under Secretary of the Treasury.

(12) Under Secretary of the Treasury for Monetary Affairs.

(13) Administrator of General Services.

(14) Administrator of the Small Business Administration.

(15) Deputy Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

(16) Deputy Administrator, Agency for International Development.

(17) Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board.

(18) Chairman of the United States Civil Service Commission.

(19) Chairman, Federal Communications Commission.

(20) Chairman, Board of Directors, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

(21) Chairman of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board.

(22) Chairman, Federal Power Commission.

(23) Chairman, Federal Trade Commission.

(24) Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission.

(25) Chairman, National Labor Relations Board.

(26) Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission.

(27) Chairman, Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

(28) Comptroller of the Currency.

(29) Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

(30) Director of Defense Research and Engineering, Department of Defense.

(31) Deputy Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

(32) Deputy Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

(33) Deputy Director of Central Intelligence.

(34) Director of the Office of Emergency Planning.

(35) Director of the Peace Corps.

(36) Director of Selective Service, so long as the position is held by the present incumbent: *Provided*, That thereafter the position shall be placed in Level IV.

(37) Chief Medical Director in the Departmetn of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration.

(38) Director of the National Science Foundation.

(39) Deputy Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

(40) President, Export-Import Bank of Washington.

(d) Level IV of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule shall apply to the following offices and positions, for which the annual rate of basic compensation shall be $27,000:

(1) Administrator, Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs, Department of State.

(2) Deputy Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency.

(3) Deputy Administrator of General Services.

(4) Associate Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

(5) Assistant Administrators, Agency for International Development (6).

(6) Regional Assistant Administrators, Agency for International Development (4).

(7) Under Secretary of the Department of the Air Force.

(8) Under Secretary of the Department of the Army.

(9) Under Secretary of the Department of the Navy.

(10) Deputy Under Secretaries of State (2).

(11) Assistant Secretaries of Agriculture (3).

(12) Assistant Secretaries of Commerce (4).

(13) Assistant Secretaries of Defense (7).

(14) Assistant Secretaries of the Air Force (3).

(15) Assistant Secretaries of the Army (3).

(16) Assistant Secretaries of the Navy (3).

(17) Assistant Secretaries of Health, Education, and Welfare (2).

(18) Assistant Secretaries of the Interior (4).

(19) Assistant Attorneys General (9).

(20) Assistant Secretaries of Labor (4).

(21) Assistant Postmasters General (5).

(22) Assistant Secretaries of State (11).

(23) Assistant Secretaries of the Treasury (4).

(24) Chairman of the Federal Maritime Commission.

(25) Chairman of the National Mediation Board.

(26) Chairman of the Railroad Retirement Board.

(27) Chairman of the United States Tariff Commission.

(28) Commissioner, Community Facilities Administration.

(29) Commissioner, Federal Housing Administration.

(30) Commissioner, Public Housing Administration.

(31) Commissioner, Urban Renewal Administration.

(32) Director of Civil Defense.

(33) Director of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service.

(34) Deputy Chief Medical Director in the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration.

(35) Deputy Director, Office of Emergency Planning.

(36) Deputy Director, Office of Science and Technology.

(37) Deputy Director of the Peace Corps.

(38) Deputy Director of the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

(39) Deputy Director of the United States Information Agency.

(40) Associate Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice.

(41) Assistant Directors of the Bureau of the Budget (3).

(42) General Counsel of the Department of Agriculture.

(43) General Counsel of the Department of Commerce.

(44) General Counsel of the Department of Defense.

(45) General Counsel of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

(46) Solicitor of the Department of the Interior.

(47) Solicitor of the Department of Labor.

(48) General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board.

(49) General Counsel of the Post Office Department.

(50) Counselor of the Department of State.

(51) Legal Adviser of the Department of State.

(52) General Counsel of the Department of the Treasury.

(53) First Vice President, Export-Import Bank of Washington.

(54) General Manager of the Atomic Energy Commission.

(55) Governor of the Farm Credit Administration.

(56) Inspector General, Foreign Assistance.

(57) Members, Atomic Energy Commission.

(58) Members, Civil Aeronautics Board.

(59) Members, Council of Economic Advisers.

(60) Members, Export-Import Bank of Washington.

(61) Members, Federal Communications Commission.

(62) Members, Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

(63) Members, Federal Home Loan Bank Board.

(64) Members, Federal Power Commission.

(65) Members, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

(66) Members, Federal Trade Commission.

(67) Members, Interstate Commerce Commission.

(68) Members, National Labor Relations Board.

(69) Members, Securities and Exchange Commission.

(70) Members, Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

(71) Members, United States Civil Service Commission.

(e) Level V of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule shall apply to the following offices and positions, for which the annual rate of basic compensation shall be $26,000:

(1) Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture.

(2) Administrator, Agricultural Research Service, Department of Agriculture.

(3) Administrator, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, Department of Agriculture.

(4) Administrator, Farmers Home Administration.

(5) Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, Department of Agriculture.

(6) Administrator, Rural Electrification Administration, Department of Agriculture.

(7) Administrator, Soil Conservation Service, Department of Agriculture.

(8) Administrator, Bonneville Power Administration, Department of the Interior.

(9) Administrator of the National Capital Transportation Agency.

(10) Administrator of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation.

(11) Deputy Administrators of the Small Business Administration (4).

(12) Associate Administrator for Administration, Federal Aviation Agency.

(13) Associate Administrator for Development, Federal Aviation Agency.

(14) Associate Administrator for Program, Federal Aviation Agency.

(15) Associate Administrator for Advanced Research and Technology, National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

(16) Associate Administrator for Space Science and Applications, National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

(17) Associate Administrator for Manned Space Flight, National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

(18) Associate Deputy Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

(19) Deputy Associate Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

(20) Associate Deputy Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

(21) Archivist of the United States.

(22) Area Redevelopment Administrator, Department of Commerce.

(23) Assistant Secretary of Administration, Department of Agriculture.

(24) Assistant Secretary for Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

(25) Assistant Secretary for Administration, Department of the Interior.

(26) Assistant Attorney General for Administration.

(27) Assistant Secretary for Administration, Department of Labor.

(28) Assistant Secretary for Administration, Department of the Treasury.

(29) Assistant General Manager, Atomic Energy Commission.

(30) Assistant and Scientific Adviser to the Secretary of the Interior.

(31) Chairman of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission.

(32) Chairman of the Military Liaison Committee to the Atomic Energy Commission, Department of Defense.

(33) Chairman of the Renegotiation Board.

(34) Chairman of the Subversive Activities Control Board.

(35) Chief Counsel for the Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury.

(36) Chief Forester, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture.

(37) Chief Postal Inspector, Post Office Department.

(38) Chief, Weather Bureau, Department of Commerce.

(39) Commissioner of Customs, Department of the Treasury.

(40) Commissioner, Federal Supply Service, General Services Administration.

(41) Commissioner of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

(42) Commissioner of Fish and Wildlife, Department of the Interior.

(43) Commissioner of Food and Drugs, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

(44) Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, Department of Justice.

(45) Commissioner of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior.

(46) Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission.

(47) Associate Commissioners, Indian Claims Commission (2).

(48) Commissioner of Patents, Department of Commerce.

(49) Commissioner, Public Buildings Service, General Services Administration.

(50) Commissioner of Reclamation, Department of the Interior.

(51) Commissioner of Social Security, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

(52) Commissioner of Vocational Rehabilitation, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

(53) Commissioner of Welfare, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

(54) Director, Advanced Research Projects Agency, Department of Defense.

(55) Director of Agricultural Economics, Department of Agriculture.

(56) Director, Bureau of the Census, Department of Commerce.

(57) Director, Bureau of Mines, Department of the Interior.

(58) Director, Bureau of Prisons, Department of Justice.

(59) Director, Geological Survey, Department of the Interior.

(60) Director, Office of Research and Engineering, Post Office Department.

(61) Director, National Bureau of Standards, Department of Commerce.

(62) Director of Regulation, Atomic Energy Commission.

(63) Director of Science and Education, Department of Agriculture.

(64) Deputy Under Secretary for Monetary Affairs, Department of the Treasury.

(65) Deputy Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Department of the Treasury.

(66) Deputy Director, National Science Foundation.

(67) Deputy Director, Policy and Plans, United States Information Agency.

(68) Deputy General Counsel, Department of Defense.

(69) Deputy General Manager, Atomic Energy Commission.

(70) Associate Director, Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service.

(71) Associate Director for Volunteers, Peace Corps.

(72) Associate Director for Program Development and Operations, Peace Corps.

(73) Assistants to the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice (2).

(74) Assistant Directors, Office of Emergency Planning (3).

(75) Assistant Directors, United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency (4).

(76) Federal Highway Administrator, Department of Commerce.

(77) Fiscal Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

(78) General Counsel of the Agency for International Development.

(79) General Counsel of the Department of the Air Force.

(80) General Counsel of the Department of the Army.

(81) General Counsel of the Atomic Energy Commission.

(82) General Counsel of the Federal Aviation Agency.

(83) General Counsel of the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

(84) General Counsel of the Department of the Navy.

(85) General Counsel of the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

(86) Governor of the Canal Zone.

(87) Manpower Administrator, Department of Labor.

(88) Maritime Administrator, Department of Commerce.

(89) Members, Foreign Claims Settlement Commission.

(90) Members, Maritime Commission.

(91) Members, National Mediation Board.

(92) Members, Railroad Retirement Board.

(93) Members, Renegotiation Board.

(94) Members, Subversive Activities Control Board.

(95) Members, United States Tariff Commission.

(96) President of the Federal National Mortgage Association.

(97) Special Assistant to the Secretary for Health and Medical Affairs, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

(f) In addition to the offices and positions listed in subsections (d) and (e) of this section, the President is authorized from time to time to place offices and positions held by not to exceed twenty persons in levels IV and V of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule when he deems such action necessary to reflect changes in organization, management responsibilities, or workload in any Federal department or agency. Any such action with respect to an office to which appointment is made by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate shall be effective only at the time of a new appointment to such office. Each action taken under this subsection shall be published in the Federal Register, except when it is determined by the President that such publication would be contrary to the interest of the national security. No action shall be taken under this subsection with respect to an office or position the compensation for which is fixed at a specific rate by this title or by statute enacted subsequent to the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 304. (a) Section 104 of title 3, United States Code (relating to the compensation of the Vice President), is amended by striking out "$35,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$43,000".

(b) Section 105 of title 3, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 105. Compensation of secretaries and executive, administrative, and staff assistants to President

"The President is authorized to fix the compensation of the six administrative assistants authorized to be appointed under section 106 of this title, of the Executive Secretary of the National Security Council, of the Executive Secretary of the National Aeronautics and Space Council, and of eight other secretaries or immediate staff assistants in the White House Office at rates of basic compensation not to exceed that of level II of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule.".

Conforming changes in existing law

SEC. 305. The following provisions of law are hereby repealed:

(1) The Federal Executive Pay Act of 1956, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2201–2209), establishing rates of basic compensation for heads of executive departments and other Federal officials.

(2) Section 3012(h) of title 10, United States Code, providing compensation of $22,000 a year for the Secretary of the Army.

(3) Section 3013(b) of title 10, United States Code, fixing the annual salaries of the Under Secretary and each Assistant Secretary of the Army at $20,000 a year.

(4) Section 5031(d) of title 10, United States Code, providing compensation of $22,000 a year for the Secretary of the Navy.

(5) Section 5033(c) of title 10, United States Code, providing the annual salary of $20,000 a year for the Under Secretary of the Navy.

(6) Section 304 of Public Law 87–651, approved September 7, 1962 (76 Stat. 526; 10 U.S.C. 5034, note), providing compensation of $20,000 a year for Assistant Secretaries of the Navy.

(7) Section 8012(g) of title 10, United States Code, providing compensation of $22,000 a year for the Secretary of the Air Force.

(8) Section 8013(b) of title 10, United States Code, fixing the annual salaries of the Under Secretary and each Assistant Secretary of the Air Force at $20,000 a year.

(9) Section 137(c) of title 10, United States Code, fixing the compensation of the General Counsel of the Department of Defense at the rate prescribed by law for assistant secretaries of executive departments.

(10) (A) The last sentence of section 22 a. of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (68 Stat. 924; 71 Stat. 612; 42 U.S.C. 2032 (a)), relating to the annual salaries of the Chairman and members of such Commission, which reads: "Each member, except the Chairman, shall receive compensation at the rate of $22,000 per annum; and the member designated as Chairman shall receive compensation at the rate of $22,500 per annum.".

(B) That part of the first sentence of section 27a. of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 926; 42 U.S.C. 2037(a)), relating to the salary of the Chairman of the Military Liaison Committee which reads: ", and who shall receive compensation at the rate prescribed for an Assistant Secretary of Defense".

(11) That part of Reorganization Plan Numbered 1 of 1958 (72 Stat. 1799 and 861; 75 Stat. 630; 5 U.S.C. 133z–15, note)—

(A) In section 2(b), relating to the annual salary of the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning, which reads: "and shall receive compensation at the rate now or hereafter prescribed by law for the heads of executive departments";

(B) In section 2(c), relating to the annual salary of the Deputy Director of such Office, which reads: "shall receive compensation at the rate now or hereafter prescribed by law for the under secretaries referred to in section 104 of the Federal Executive Pay Act of 1956 (5 U.S.C. 2203),"; and

(C) In section 2(d) relating to the annual salaries of three Assistant Directors of such Office, which reads: "shall receive compensation at the rate now or hereafter prescribed by law for assistant secretaries of executive departments."

(12) (A) That part of the second sentence of section 202(a) of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 429; 42 U.S.C. 2472(a)), relating to the annual salary of the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, which reads: ", and shall receive compensation at the rate of $22,500 per annum".

(B) That part of the first sentence of section 202(b) of such Act (72 Stat. 429; 42 U.S.C. 2472(b)), relating to the annual salary of the Deputy Administrator of such Administration, which reads: ", shall receive compensation at the rate of $21,500 per annum,".

(13) (A) That part of section 201(f) of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 428; 42 U.S.C. 2471(f)), relating to the annual salary of a civilian executive secretary in the National Aeronautics and Space Council, which reads: "and shall receive compensation at the rate of $20,000 a year".

(B) That part of section 204 of such Act (72 Stat. 431, 432; 42 U.S.C. 2474(a)(1), and (d)), relating to the annual salary of the Chairman of the Civilian-Military Liaison Committee, as follows:

In subsection (a)(1), that part which reads: ", and shall receive compensation (in the manner provided in subsection (d)) at the rate of $20,000 per annum".

In the second sentence of subsection (d), that part which reads: "fixed by subsection (a)(1)".

(14) (A) That part of the second sentence of section 2(a) of the Act of May 26, 1949 (63 Stat. 111; 5 U.S.C. 151b(a)) as amended, relating to the rank and salary of the Counselor and of the Legal Adviser of the Department of State, which reads: "and shall receive the same salary as".

(B) The last sentence of section 2(a) of the Act of May 26, 1949 (63 Stat. 111; 5 U.S.C. 151b(a)) as amended, relating to the rate of basic compensation of the Deputy Under Secretaries of State, which reads: "Unless otherwise provided for by law, the rate of basic compensation of the Deputy Under Secretaries of State shall be the same as that of Assistant Secretaries of State.".

(C) That part of the second sentence of section 2(b) of the Act of May 26, 1949, as amended (73 Stat. 265; 5 U.S.C. 151b(b)), relating to the annual salary of the Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs or for Economic Affairs, as designated by the President, which reads: "shall receive compensation at the rate of $22,000 a year and".

(15) The last sentence of section 210(a) of title 38, United States Code, relating to the annual salary of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, Veterans' Administration, which reads: "He shall receive a salary of $21,000 a year, payable monthly.".

(16) (A) The last sentence of section 201(a)(2) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 741; 49 U.S.C. 1321(a)(2)), relating to the annual salaries of the Chairman and members of the Civil Aeronautics Board, which reads: "Each member of the Board shall receive a salary at the rate of $20,000 per annum, except that the member serving as Chairman shall receive a salary at the rate of $20,500 per annum.".

(B) That part of the second sentence of section 301(a) of such Act (72 Stat. 744; 49 U.S.C. 1341(a)), relating to the annual salary of the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, which reads: ", and who shall receive compensation at the rate of $22,500 per annum".

(C) That part of the second sentence of section 302(a) of such Act (72 Stat. 744; 49 U.S.C. 1342(a)), relating to the annual salary of the Deputy Administrator of such Agency, which reads: "shall receive compensation at the rate of $20,500 per annum, and".

(17) (A) The last sentence of section 22 of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act (75 Stat. 632; 22 U.S.C. 2562), relating to the annual salary of the Director of the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, which reads: "He shall receive compensation at the rate of $22,500 per annum.".

(B) The second sentence of section 23 of such Act (75 Stat. 632; 22 U.S.C. 2563), relating to the annual salary of the Deputy Director of such Agency, which reads: "He shall receive compensation at the rate of $21,500 per annum.".

(C) The second sentence of section 24 of such Act (75 Stat. 632; 22 U.S.C. 2564), relating to the annual salaries of the four Assistant Directors of such Agency, which reads: "They shall receive compensation at the rate of $20,000 per annum.".

(18) Section 3 of the Act of March 2, 1955 (69 Stat. 10; 5 U.S.C. 294, 293, 295a), relating to the annual salaries of certain officials of the Department of Justice, which reads:

"SEC. 3. (a) The compensation of the Deputy Attorney General shall be at the rate of $21,000 per annum.

"(b) The compensation of the Solicitor General shall be at the rate of $20,500 per annum.

"(c) The compensation of each Assistant Attorney General, other than the Administrative Assistant Attorney General, shall be at the rate of $20,000 per annum.".

(19) (A) The last sentence of section 102(c) of Reorganization Plan Numbered 7 of 1961 (75 Stat. 840; 5 U.S.C. 133z–15, note), relating to the annual salaries of the Chairman and members of the Federal Maritime Commission, which reads: "The Chairman of the Commission shall receive a salary at the rate of $20,500 per annum, and each of the other Commissioners shall receive a salary at the rate of $20,000 per annum.".

(B) That part of section 201 of such reorganization plan (75 Stat. 842; 5 U.S.C. 133z–15, note), relating to the annual salary of the Maritime Administrator in the Department of Commerce, which reads: "shall receive a salary at the rate of $20,000 per annum,".

(20) That part of the fourth sentence of section 4(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended (74 Stat. 408 and 913; 15 U.S.C. 78d(a)); relating to the annual salaries of the Chairman and Commissioners of the Securities and Exchange Commission, which reads: "shall receive a salary at the rate of $20,000 a year, except that the Chairman shall receive additional salary at the rate of $500 a year and".

(21) Section 8 of the Food Additives Amendments of 1958 (72 Stat. 1789; 5 U.S.C. 2205, note), fixing the annual salary of the Commissioner of Food and Drugs at $20,000 per annum.

(22) That part of the first sentence of section 3 of the Area Redevelopment Act (75 Stat. 48; 42 U.S.C. 2502), relating to the annual salary of the Area Redevelopment Administrator in the Department of Commerce, which reads: "who shall receive compensation at a rate equal to that received by Assistant Secretaries of Commerce".

(23) The last sentence of section 203(b)(1) of the National Security Act of 1947 (72 Stat. 520; 5 U.S.C. 171c(b)(1)), relating to the annual salary of the Director of Defense Research and Engineering in the Department of Defense, which reads: "The compensation of the Director is that prescribed by law for the Secretaries of the military departments.".

(24) In section 303(a) of title 23, United States Code,

(A) That part of the second sentence, relating to the annual salary of the Federal Highway Administrator in the Department of Commerce, which reads: "shall receive basic compensation at the rate prescribed by law for Assistant Secretaries of executive departments and"; and

(B) The last sentence, relating to the annual salary of the Deputy Federal Highway Administrator in such department, which reads: "The Deputy Federal Highway Administrator shall receive basic compensation at a rate $1,000 less than the rate provided for the Federal Highway Administrator.".

(25) The last proviso in the paragraph under the heading "IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE" and under the subheading "SALARIES AND EXPENSES" in the Department of Justice Appropriation Act, 1959 (72 Stat. 251; 5 U.S.C. 2206, note), relating to the annual salary of the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, which reads: ": *Provided further,* That, hereafter, the compensation of the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service shall be $20,000 per annum".

(26) The second paragraph of section 3 of title 35, United States Code, relating to the annual salary of the Commissioner of Patents which reads: "The annual rate of compensation of the Commissioner shall be $20,000.".

(27) That part of section 4(a) of the Peace Corps Act (75 Stat. 612; 22 U.S.C. 2503(a)), relating to the annual salaries of the Director and of the Deputy Director of the Peace Corps, which reads: ", whose compensation shall be fixed by the President at a rate not in excess of $20,000 per annum," and ", whose compensation shall be fixed by the President at a rate not in excess of $19,500 per annum".

(28) (A) Section 308 of title 39, United States Code, fixing the annual rate of basic compensation of the position of Chief Postal Inspector in the Post Office Department at $19,000.

(B) That part of the table of contents of chapter 3 of title 39, United States Code, which reads as follows: "308. Chief Postal Inspector.".

(29) That part of the first sentence of section 4 of the International Travel Act of 1961 (75 Stat. 130; 22 U.S.C. 2124), relating to the annual salary of the Director of the United States Travel Service in the Department of Commerce, which reads: "who shall be compensated at the rate of $19,000 per annum,".

(30) Section 14(b) of the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 (73 Stat. 716; 5 U.S.C. 3013(b)), which fixes the compensation of the Executive Director of the United States Civil Service Commission at $19,000 per annum.

(31) That part of the first sentence of section 107(c) of the Renegotiation Act of 1951, as amended (73 Stat. 211; 50 U.S.C. App. 1217(c)), relating to the annual salary of the General Counsel of the Renegotiation Board which reads: ", and shall receive compensation at the rate of $19,000 per annum".

(32) (A) That part of the third sentence in section 201(a) of the National Capital Transportation Act of 1960 (74 Stat. 538; 40 U.S.C. 661(a)), relating to the annual salary of the Administrator of the National Capital Transportation Agency, which reads: ", and who shall receive compensation at a rate equal to the maximum rate for grade 18 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, plus $500 per annum".

(B) That part of the first sentence of section 201(b) of such Act (74 Stat. 538; 40 U.S.C. 661(b)), relating to the annual salary of the Deputy Administrator of such Agency, which reads: ", and who shall receive compensation at a rate equal to the maximum rate for grade 18 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended".

(33) The last sentence of section 624(d)(1) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (75 Stat. 447; 22 U.S.C. 2384(d)(1)), as amended, fixing the compensation of certain officials in the Department of State, which reads: "The Inspector General, Foreign Assistance, shall receive compensation at the rate of $20,000 annually; the Deputy Inspector General, Foreign Assistance, shall receive compensation at the rate of $20,000 annually, and each Assistant Inspector General, Foreign Assistance, shall receive compensation at the rate of $19,000 annually.".

(34) That part of section 202 of the Act of July 1, 1960 (74 Stat. 305; 5 U.S.C. 623g), relating to the annual salary of the Administrative Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, which reads: ", and whose annual rate of basic compensation shall be $19,000".

(35) That part of the Public Works Appropriation Act, 1963, under the heading "DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR" and under the caption "BUREAU OF RECLAMATION" and the subheading "ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS" (76 Stat. 1223; 43 U.S.C. 373a–1), relating to the annual salary of the present incumbent of the position of Commission of the Bureau of Reclamation, which reads:

"After September 30, 1962, the position of Commissioner of Reclamation shall have the annual rate of compensation as provided for positions listed in section 2205(a) of title 5, United States Code, so long as held by the present incumbent.".

(36) That part of the Public Works Appropriation Act, 1962, under the heading "DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR" and under the caption "BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION" and the subheading "CONSTRUCTION" (75 Stat. 728; 16 U.S.C. 832a–1), relating to the annual salary of the present incumbent of the position of Administrator, Bonneville Power Administration, which reads:

"After October 1, 1961, the position of Administrator, Bonneville Power Administration, shall have the same annual rate of compensation as that provided for positions listed in section 2205(b) of title 5, United States Code, so long as held by the present incumbent.".

(37) Section 205 of the Public Works Appropriation Act, 1958 (71 Stat. 423; 5 U.S.C. 483–1 note, 2206 note), as amended, relating to the salary of the present incumbent of the position of Administrator of the Southwestern Power Administration in the Department of the Interior, and to the salary of the Administrative Assistant Secretary of such Department, which reads:

"SEC. 205. After August 31, 1957, the salary of the Administrator of the Southwestern Power Administration shall be the same as the salary of the Administrator of the Bonneville Power Administration, so long as held by the present incumbent; and the salary of the Administrative Assistant Secretary of the Department shall be the same as the Solicitor of the Department of the Interior.".

(38) The proviso in the first paragraph under the heading "FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION" and under the subheading "SALARIES and EXPENSES" in the Department of Justice Appropriation Act, 1964 (77 Stat. 782; Public Law 88–245), relating to the annual salary of the present incumbent of the position of Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, which reads: ": *Provided*, That the compensation of the Director of the Bureau shall be $22,000 per annum so long as the position is held by the present incumbent" and provisions to the same effect contained in other appropriation Acts enacted prior to the effective date of this section relating to the annual salary of the present incumbent of the position of Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

(39) That part of section 7801(b)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as amended, relating to the annual salary of the Assistant General Counsel of the Treasury Department who shall be the Chief Counsel for the Internal Revenue Service, which reads: "and shall receive basic compensation at the annual rate of $19,000".

(40)(A) Sections 3018, 5014, and 8018 of title 10, United States Code, relating to the compensation of the general counsels of the military departments.

(B) The respective tables of contents of chapters 303, 503, and 803 of title 10, United States Code, are amended by striking out

"3018. Compensation of General Counsel.";
"5014. Compensation of General Counsel.";
and
"8018. Compensation of General Counsel.".

(41)(A) That part of section 2(a) of Reorganization Plan Numbered 2 of 1962 (76 Stat. 1253; 5 U.S.C. 133z–15, note), relating to the compensation of the Director of the Office of Science and Technology, which reads: "and shall receive compensation at the rate of $22,500 per annum".

(B) That part of section 2(b) of such reorganization plan (76 Stat. 1253; 5 U.S.C. 133z–15, note), relating to the compensation of the Deputy Director of the Office of Science and Technology, which reads: "and receive compensation at the rate of $20,500 per annum".

(C) That part of section 22(a) of such reorganization plan (76 Stat. 1255; 5 U.S.C. 133z–15, note), relating to the compensation of the Director of the National Science Foundation, which reads: "shall receive compensation at the rate of $21,000 per annum and".

(42) That part of section 624(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (75 Stat. 447; 22 U.S.C. 2384(a)), relating to the compensation of twelve officers in the agency primarily responsible for administering part I of such Act, which reads: "of whom—

"(1) one shall have the rank of an Under Secretary and shall be compensated at a rate not to exceed the rate authorized by law for any Under Secretary of an Executive Department;

"(2) one shall have the rank of Deputy Under Secretary and shall be compensated at a rate not to exceed the rate authorized by law for any Deputy Under Secretary of an executive department; and

"(3) ten shall have the rank of Assistant Secretaries and shall be compensated at a rate not to exceed the rate authorized by law for any Assistant Secretary of an executive department,".

(43) That part of the first sentence of section 104(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 174; 8 U.S.C. 1104(b)), relating to the rank and compensation of the Administrator, Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs, which reads: "and compensation".

SEC. 306. (a)(1) Section 508 of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 508. Salaries

"Subject to subsection (f) of section 303 of the Federal Executive Salary Act of 1964, the Attorney General shall fix the annual salaries of United States attorneys, assistant United States attorneys, and attorneys appointed under section 503 of this title at rates of compensation not in excess of the highest rate of grade 18 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.".

(2) Subject to section 303(f) of this Act, each incumbent United States attorney and assistant United States attorney shall be paid compensation at a rate equal to that of attorneys of comparable responsibility and professional qualifications, as determined by the Attorney General, whose compensation is prescribed in the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

(b) Section 411 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended (70 Stat. 704; 22 U.S.C. 866), relating to the per annum salaries of chiefs of mission, is amended by striking out the second sentence of that section and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "The per annum salaries of chiefs of mission within each class shall be at the rate provided by law for the levels of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule as follows: class 1, the rate for level II; class 2, the rate for level III; class 3, the rate for level IV; and class 4, the rate for level V.".

(c) That part of section 201(f) of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 428; 42 U.S.C. 2471(f)), fixing a limit of $19,000 on the compensation of seven persons in the National Aeronautics and Space Council, is amended by striking out "compensated at the rate of not more than $19,000 a year," and inserting in lieu thereof "compensated at not to exceed the highest rate of grade 18 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended,".

(d) Clause (A) of section 203(b)(2) of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 429; 42 U.S.C. 2473(b)(2)), as amended, is amended to read as follows: "(A) to the extent the Administrator deems such action necessary to the discharge of his responsibilities, he may appoint not more than four hundred and twenty-five of the scientific, engineering, and administrative personnel of the Administration without regard to such laws, and may fix the compensation of such personnel not in excess of the highest rate of grade 18 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, and".

(e) Section 6(f) of the Act of September 24, 1959 (73 Stat. 706; 5 U.S.C. 2376(f)), relating to the maximum compensation payable to employees of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, is amended by striking out "at a rate in excess of $20,000 per annum" and by inserting in lieu thereof "at a rate in excess of the highest rate of grade 18 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended".

(f) The Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, is further amended as follows:

(1) In the last sentence of section 24 a. (68 Stat. 925; 71 Stat. 612; 42 U.S.C. 2034(a)), relating to the annual salary of the General Manager of such Commission, (A) by inserting "and" immediately before "shall be removable by the Commission" and (B) by striking out that part which reads: ", and shall receive compensation at a rate determined by the Commission, but not in excess of $22,000 per annum";

(2) In the last sentence of section 24 b. (71 Stat. 612; 42 U.S.C. 2034(b)), relating to the annual salary of the Deputy General Manager of such Commission, (A) by inserting "and" immediately before "shall be removable by the General Manager" and (B) by striking out that part which reads: ", and shall receive compensation at a rate determined by the General Manager, but not in excess of $20,500 per annum";

(3) In the last sentence of section 24 c. (71 Stat. 612; 42 U.S.C. 2034(c)), relating to the annual salaries of the Assistant General Managers (or their equivalents) of such Commission, (A) by inserting "and" immediately before "shall be removable by the General Manager" and (B) by striking out that part which reads: ", and shall receive compensation at a rate determined by the General Manager, but not in excess of $20,000 per annum";

(4) In the second sentence of section 25 a. (68 Stat. 925; 71 Stat. 612; 42 U.S.C. 2035(a)), relating to the annual salaries of directors of program divisions of such Commission, by striking out that part which reads: "and shall receive compensation at a rate determined by the Commission, but not in excess of $19,000 per annum";

(5) In section 25 b. (68 Stat. 925; 71 Stat. 612; 42 U.S.C. 2035(b)), relating to the an-

nual salary of the General Counsel of such Commission, by striking out that part which reads: "and shall receive compensation at a rate determined by the Commission, but not in excess of $19,500 per annum";

(6) In the first sentence of section 25 c. (68 Stat. 925; 71 Stat. 612; 42 U.S.C. 2035(c)), relating to the annual salary of the Director of the Inspection Division in such Commission, by striking out that part which reads: "and shall receive compensation at a rate determined by the Commission, but not in excess of $19,000 per annum";

(7) In the last sentence of section 25 d. (71 Stat. 612; 42 U.S.C. 2035(d)), relating to the annual salaries of certain executive management positions in such Commission, (A) by inserting "and" immediately before "shall be removable by the General Manager" and (B) by striking out that part which reads: ", and shall receive compensation at a rate determined by the General Manager, but not in excess of $19,000 per annum"; and

(8) In the second sentence of section 28 (68 Stat. 926; 42 U.S.C. 2038), relating to the compensation of the active member of the Armed Forces serving as Director of the Division of Military Application in such Commission, by striking out that part which reads "and the compensation prescribed in section 25" and inserting in lieu thereof, "and the compensation established for this position pursuant to section 303 or section 309 of the Federal Executive Salary Act of 1964".

(g) Section 2 of the Act of July 30, 1946, as amended (60 Stat. 712; 70 Stat. 740; 22 U.S.C. 287n), relating to the compensation of the United States representatives and alternates at sessions of the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, is amended by striking out "Such representatives and alternates shall each be entitled to receive compensation at such rates, not to exceed $15,000 per annum, as the President may determine," and inserting in lieu thereof "Such representatives and alternates shall each be entitled to receive compensation at such rates provided for Foreign Service officers in the schedule contained in section 412 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, as the President may determine,".

(h) The third sentence of section 2 of the Act of May 29, 1959 (73 Stat. 63; 50 U.S.C. 402, note), is amended to read as follows: "Except as provided in subsection (f) of section 303 of the Federal Executive Salary Act of 1964, no officer or employee of the National Security Agency shall be paid basic compensation at a rate in excess of the highest rate of basic compensation contained in such General Schedule.".

(i) (1) Sections 2 and 3 of the Act of July 25, 1958 (72 Stat. 414; D.C. Code, secs. 1–204a and 1–204b), relating to the compensation of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, are amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. Except as otherwise provided by this section and section 3 of this Act—

"(1) the compensation of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall be at the rate of $25,500 each per annum; and

"(2) the Commissioner detailed from the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army shall receive an annual compensation which, when added to any compensation he receives as an officer of the United States Army, will equal the compensation authorized by paragraph (1) of this section.

"SEC. 3. Notwithstanding any other provision of law—

"(1) the compensation of the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall be at the rate of $26,000 per annum; and

"(2) if the Commissioner detailed from the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army is chosen President of the Board of Commissioners, he shall receive, as President of the Board, an annual compensation which, when added to any compensation he receives as an officer of the United States Army, will equal the compensation authorized by paragraph (1) of this section.".

(2) Section 11–702(d) of the District of Columbia Code (77 Stat. 484; Public Law 88–241), relating to the rates of annual salary of the chief judge and the associate judges of the District of Columbia Court of Appeals, is amended—

(A) by striking out "$19,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$25,000"; and

(B) by striking out "$18,500" and inserting in lieu thereof "$24,500".

(3) Section 11–902(d) of the District of Columbia Code (77 Stat. 487; Public Law 88–241), relating to the rates of annual salary of the chief judge and the associate judges of the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions, is amended—

(A) by striking out "$18,000" and inserting in lieu therof "$24,000"; and

(B) by striking out "$17,500" and inserting in lieu thereof "$23,500".

(4) The first sentence of the second paragraph of section 2 of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1937, as amended (D.C. Code, sec. 47–2402), relating to the compensation of the person appointed to the District of Columbia Tax Court, is amended by striking out "$17,500" and inserting in lieu thereof "$23,500".

(5) That part of the salary schedule in section 1 of the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955, as amended (76 Stat. 1229; D.C. Code, sec. 31–1501), relating to the compensation of the Superintendent of Schools, and Deputy Superintendent of Schools, of the District of Columbia, which reads:

"Class 1: Superintendent of Schools	$19,000
Class 2: Deputy Superintendent	16,500"

is amended to read as follows:

"Class 1: Superintendent of Schools	$25,000
Class 2: Deputy Superintendent	21,000"

(6) That part of the salary schedule in section 101 of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 480), as amended (sec. 4–823, et seq., D.C. Code, 1961 edition), relating to the compensation of the Fire Chief and the Chief of Police, which reads:

"Class 10 Fire Chief. Chief of Police."	17,000	17,400	17,800	18,200	-----	-----	18,600	19,000	-----

is amended to read as follows:

"Class 10 Fire Chief. Chief of Police."	20,000	20,500	21,000	21,500	-----	-----	22,000	22,500	-----

(j) (1) The catchline of section 3012 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking out "; compensation".

(2) The table of contents of chapter 303 of such title 10 is amended by striking out

"3012. Secretary of the Army: powers and duties; delegation by; compensation."

and inserting in lieu thereof

"3012. Secretary of the Army: powers and duties; delegation by.".

(3) The catchline of section 5031 of such title 10 is amended by striking out "; compensation".

(4) The table of contents of chapter 505 of such title 10 is amended by striking out

"5031. Secretary of the Navy: responsibilities; compensation."

and inserting in lieu thereof

"5031. Secretary of the Navy: responsibilities.".

(5) The catchline of section 5033 of such title 10 is amended by striking out "; compensation".

(6) The table of contents of chapter 505 of such title 10 is amended by striking out

"5033. Under Secretary of the Navy: appointment; duties; compensation."

and inserting in lieu thereof

"5033. Under Secretary of the Navy: appointment; duties.".

(7) The catchline of section 8012 of such title 10 is amended by striking out "; compensation".

(8) The table of contents of chapter 803 of such title 10 is amended by striking out

"8012. Secretary of the Air Force: powers duties; delegation by; compensation."

and inserting in lieu thereof

"8012. Secretary of the Air Force: powers and duties; delegation by.".

Changes in position titles

SEC. 307. Whenever reference is made in any law or reorganization plan to the—

Administrative Assistant Attorney General,

Administrative Assistant Secretary of the Interior,

Administrative Assistant Secretary of Agriculture,

Administrative Assistant Secretary of Labor,

Administrative Assistant Secretary of the Treasury,

or

Administrative Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare,

such reference shall be held and considered to mean the—

Assistant Attorney General for Administration,

Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Administration,

Assistant Secretary of Agriculture for Administration,

Assistant Secretary of Labor for Administration,

Assistant Secretary of the Treasury for Administration, or

Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for Administration,

respectively.

Limitation on salaries fixed by administrative action

SEC. 308. Except as provided by this Act and notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the head of any executive department, independent establishment, or agency in the executive branch who is authorized to fix by administrative action the annual rate of basic compensation for any position, officer, or employee shall not fix such rate in excess of the highest rate of grade 18 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended. Nothing contained in this section shall be construed to impair the authorities provided in the Central Intelligence Agency Act of 1949, as amended (50 U.S.C. 403a and following), in section 3 of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933 (16 U.S.C. 831b), in section 9 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1819), in section 11 of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 248), or in section 5240 of the Revised Statutes (12 U.S.C. 481, relating to the Comptroller of the Currency).

Positions placed under Classification Act of 1949

SEC. 309. Each office or position in the executive branch specifically referred to in, or covered by, any conforming change in law made by section 305 of this Act, or any other office or position in the executive branch for which the annual salary is established pursuant to special provision of law enacted prior to July 1, 1964, at a figure of $18,500 or above, which is not placed in a level of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule pursuant to section 303 of this Act, shall receive pay equivalent to a grade and step of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended. All actions taken under this section shall be reported to the United States Civil Service Commission and published in the Federal Register, except when it is determined by the President that such report and publication would be contrary to the interest of national security.

Saving provisions

SEC. 310. (a) Except as provided by this Act, the changes in existing law made by this Act shall not affect any office or position existing immediately prior to the effective date of any such changes in existing law, the compensation attached to such office or position, and any incumbent thereof, his appointment thereto, and his entitlement to receive the compensation attached thereto, until appropriate action is taken in accordance with this Act or other law.

(b) Notwithstanding any provision of this Act, the rate of basic, gross, or total annual compensation received by any officer or employee immediately prior to the effective date of this section shall not be reduced by reason of enactment of this Act.

TITLE IV—FEDERAL JUDICIAL SALARIES

SEC. 401. This title may be cited as the "Federal Judicial Salary Act of 1964".

SEC. 402. (a) The rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in or under the judicial branch of the Government whose rates of compensation are fixed by or pursuant to paragraph (2) of subdivision a of section 62 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 102(a)(2)), section 3656 of title 18, United States Code, the third sentence of section 603, sections 672 to 675, inclusive, or section 604(a)(5), of title 28, United States Code, insofar as the latter section applies to graded positions, are hereby increased by amounts reflecting the respective applicable increases provided by title I of this Act in corresponding rates of compensation for officers and employees subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended. The rates of basic compensation of officers and employees holding ungraded positions and whose salaries are fixed pursuant to section 604(a)(5) may be increased by the amounts reflecting the respective applicable increases provided by title I of this Act in corresponding rates of compensation for officers and employees subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

(b) The limitations provided by applicable law on the effective date of this section with respect to the aggregate salaries payable to secretaries and law clerks of circuit and district judges are hereby increased by amounts which reflect the respective applicable increases provided by title I of this Act in corresponding rates of compensation for officers and employees subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

(c) Section 753(e) of title 28, United States Code (relating to the compensation of court reporters for district courts), is amended by striking out the existing salary limitation contained therein and inserting a new limitation which reflects the respective applicable increases provided by title I of this Act in corresponding rates of compensation for officers and employees subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

(d) Section 40a of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 68(a)), as amended, relating to the compensation of full-time and part-time referees in bankruptcy, is amended by striking out the existing compensation limitations contained therein and inserting new limitations of "$22,500" and "$11,000", respectively.

SEC. 403. (a) Section 5 of title 28, United States Code, relating to the salaries of the Chief Justice of the United States and of the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States, is amended by striking out "$35,500" and substituting therefor "$43,000", and by striking out "$35,000" and substituting therefor "$42,500".

(b) Section 44(d) of title 28, United States Code, relating to circuit judges, is amended by striking out "$25,500" and substituting therefor "$33,000".

(c) Section 135 of title 28, United States Code, relating to district judges, is amended by striking out "$22,500" and substituting therefor "$30,000", and by striking out "$23,000" and substituting therefor "$30,500".

(d) Section 173 of title 28, United States Code relating to judges of the Court of Claims, is amended by striking out "$25,500" and substituting therefor "$33,000".

(e) Section 213 of title 28, United States Code, relating to judges of the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, is amended by striking out "$25,500" and substituting therefor "$33,000".

(f) Section 252 of title 28, United States Code, relating to judges of the Customs Court, is amended by striking out "$22,500" and substituting therefor "$30,000".

(g) The first paragraph of section 603 of title 28, United States Code, relating to the compensation of the Director and the Deputy Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, is amended to read as follows:

"The Director shall receive a salary of $27,000 a year. The Deputy Director shall receive a salary of $26,000 a year."

(h) Subsection (b) of section 792 of title 28, United States Code, relating to the compensation of commissioners of the Court of Claims, is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Each commissioner shall receive basic compensation at the rate of $26,000 a year, and also all necessary traveling expenses and a per diem allowance as provided in the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended, while traveling on official business and away from Washington, District of Columbia."

(i) Section 7443(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (68A Stat. 879), as amended, relating to judges of the Tax Court of the United States, is further amended by striking out "$22,500" and substituting therefor "$30,000".

(j) Section 867(a)(1) of title 10, United States Code, relating to judges of the Court of Military Appeals, is amended by striking out "$25,500" and substituting therefor "$33,000".

TITLE V—EFFECTIVE DATES

SEC. 501. (a) Except to the extent provided in subsections (b) and (c) of this section, this Act and the increases in compensation made by this Act shall become effective on July 1, 1964.

(b) Section 204 of this Act, relating to increases in compensation for Members of Congress, shall become effective at noon on January 3, 1965.

(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act (but except as otherwise provided in subsection (b) of this section)—

(1) no rate of compensation which is equal to or in excess of $22,000 per annum shall be increased in any amount, by reason of section 202 of this Act, until the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after January 1, 1965; and

(2) no rate of compensation which is less than $22,000 per annum shall be increased to an amount per annum in excess of $22,000. by reason of section 202 or 203(g) of this Act, until the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after January 1, 1965.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the precedents of the Senate, the committee substitute for this bill is considered as original text for the purpose of amendment, and is therefore subject to amendment in two degrees. Amendments to the House text or any amendment thereto has precedence over the committee substitute or any amendment to it.

The vote on the substitute, whether amended or not, will not come until after all perfecting amendments, either to the original bill or the substitute itself have been disposed of.

The committee amendment, when agreed to, is not subject to further amendment.

OIL IMPORT PROGRAM

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the rule of germaneness be waived for the duration of my comments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, last Thursday afternoon, nearly a week ago, the Secretary of the Interior announced the Government's decision on the level of oil imports under the mandatory oil import program for the last half of 1964.

This decision came after strong appeals from dozens of U.S. Senators and Members of the House of Representatives, 20 Governors, and strong grassroots support for a substantial reduction in the level of crude oil imports.

What was the decision?

Instead of a substantial reduction, the program announced increased oil imports into the United States for the last half of 1964 by more than 100,000 barrels per day over the same period of last year. This was done in spite of the Department's conclusion in its Thursday announcement that:

> The Department also announced the preliminary results of a review of the basic economic position confronting the domestic producing industry. The tentative conclusions from the study indicate that there has been a gradual erosion in the crude price structure throughout the United States, and that despite moderate increases in crude production, domestic producers are being confronted with increasing difficulties.

Mr. President, I find this action incomprehensible in light of the seriously depressed conditions now prevailing in this vital domestic industry.

Why did 16 Senators, including myself, and my colleague from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] join in a strong bipartisan appeal to the President for a substantial reduction in oil imports?

Why did dozens of other Senators and Members of the House address individual appeals to the President, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Secretary of Defense, imploring them to greatly reduce the levels of oil imports into this country?

Why did 20 State Governors send a telegram to President Johnson declaring:

> Governors of several oil States request your assistance in the establishment of oil import quotas which comply with the congressional mandate aimed at insuring continued domestic exploration and the development of domestic supplies adequate to meet the needs of our national security.

Why did the Independent Petroleum Association of America, representing 10,000 oil and gas producers, joined by more than 30 State and local associations, petition the President and the Secretary of the Interior for prompt relief from this evergrowing tide of foreign oil?

Mr. President, I will tell you why.

This Nation is facing a steady deterioration of one of the basic industries—an industry which in my mind is the most important national security tool this Nation has.

It is even more important, relatively speaking, to my own State of Wyoming, where it constitutes by far the largest segment of our State's economy. Wyoming ranks fifth among the oil-producing States.

We are witnessing the continual decline of an industry which in the past has been called upon to produce the petroleum so vital to successfully prosecute wars, stand off and deter war threats, help other friendly nations in time of crisis, and also supply at reasonable prices the petroleum products needed for an ever-expanding national economy.

What do I mean when I refer to a declining industry? Picture this, if you will.

Since 1956, the year the industry did such a marvelous job during the Suez crisis, we have seen the following:

First. Exploratory drilling for new oil and gas reserves last year was down 34 percent from 1956.

Second. The number of rotary rigs operating last year, the vehicle by which the drill bit finds new oil and gas reserves, was down 43 percent from 1956.

Third. Additions to crude oil reserves last year, for the third time in the past past 4 years, were less than this Nation produced. Our reserves declined 369 million barrels in 1962 and 419 million barrels in 1963—not because there is insufficient oil to find, but because the incentive for drilling is dying because of sour economic conditions in the industry brought on principally by this glut of foreign oil flowing into the United States at the rate of more than 2 million barrels per day.

The domestic oil-producing industry is finding more oil per well drilled today than in years past; but the trouble is we are drilling fewer and fewer wells.

Fourth. Add to this the fact that the purchasing power of a barrel of crude oil today is 50 cents a barrel less than it was a short 15 years ago. This has taken place in spite of the fact that the general economy has, during this period, increased very substantially.

Fifth. Employment in the petroleum producing industry has also been on the decline—having gone from 344,000 employees in 1957 to 293,400 last year, a drop of more than 50,000 or 15 percent.

Mr. President, the "whys" for the many petitions to our Government are overwhelming. The real question is, Why has this matter been treated as it has by our Government? What more evidence of concern is needed? What more basic facts are needed? What more can Senators, Congressmen, Governors, and citizens do to bring this matter home to those who can do something about it?

Mr. President, I recognize that our Government, in view of our international commitments and for good cause, must not turn this Nation's back on our friendly neighbors to the south of us, to our Middle East friends, and to other important factors affecting international relations. But when one looks at the facts, the only conclusion that can be reached is that this domestic oil producing industry has already done and is doing more than its fair share of meeting this Nation's obligations to our friends overseas.

As a matter of fact, this Nation's oil producing industry has been asked for the past decade to move over more and more to make room for unneeded foreign oil to such an extent that since 1956 we have seen our domestic production remain almost static while crude oil production in Canada has increased 50 percent, in Venezuela by 32 percent, and other Western Hemisphere countries have increased during this period by 70 percent. Oil production in the Middle East has gone up 98 percent since 1956, as has the Soviet Union by 136 percent. Other Eastern Hemisphere countries have increased their production by 284 percent during this period.

In terms of barrels per day, the figures show actual production gains as follows:

Change in crude oil production worldwide 1956–1963

	Barrels per day
1. United States	+391,000
2. Canada	+236,000
3. Venezuela	+791,000
4. Other Western Hemisphere	+450,000
5. Middle East	+3,382,000
6. Soviet Union	+2,555,000
7. Other Eastern Hemisphere	+1,543,000

Mr. President, the real point of the table is the overwhelming rise in the production of oil in other portions of the globe.

Mr. President, of course not all of this great increase in worldwide oil production has sought a market in the United States. However, we see that 42 percent of all the oil produced in Venezuela comes into the United States, 35 percent of the oil in Canada comes here, and 15 percent from all other Western Hemisphere countries.

I realize that providing a market for foreign goods in the United States is an important factor in this Nation's bid to strengthen the free world in its fight against communism. However, I feel the time is long overdue that our leaders ask themselves this question, "Just how much does an industry, one so vital to our survival, have to give up in this cause?"

The value of petroleum imports into the United States since 1947–49 have quadrupled, while the value of all other commodities have doubled.

Last year oil imports increased to a value of in excess of $1.7 billion.

These constant inroads into U.S. markets must be stopped if we expect to have a domestic petroleum producing industry capable of doing the job our Government and citizenry expect of it at all times.

Mr. President, back in 1957 a Presidential Committee made up of the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Secretary of Labor, studied the matter of oil imports and at that time concluded:

> It is clear that there is a direct relationship between the Nation's security and adequate and available sources of energy. Oil and gas account for two-thirds of all the energy that is consumed in this country. Furthermore, there is no adequate substitute in sight for the foreseeable future. Therefore, we must have available adequate supplies of oil.
>
> We have concluded, for reasons that are set forth later in this section of the report, that if we are to have enough oil to meet our national security needs, there must be a limitation on imports that will insure a proper balance between imports and domestic production.

The Committee also stated:

> In summary, unless a reasonable limitation of petroleum imports is brought about, your Committee believes that:
>
> (a) Oil imports will flow into this country in ever-mounting quantities, entirely disproportionate to the quantities needed to supplement domestic supply.
>
> (b) There will be a resultant discouragement of, and decrease in, domestic production.
>
> (c) There will be a marked decline in domestic exploration and development.
>
> (d) In the event of a serious emergency, this Nation will find itself years away from attaining the level of petroleum production necessary to meet our national security needs.

Later in 1959 when the President of the United States established the mandatory oil import program, he declared:

> The new program is designed to insure a stable, healthy industry, in the United States capable of exploring for and developing new hemisphere reserves to replace those being depleted. The basis of the new program, like that for the voluntary program, is the certified requirements of our national security which make it necessary that we preserve to the greatest extent possible a vigorous, healthy petroleum industry in the United States.
>
> In addition to serving our own direct security interests, the new program will also help prevent severe dislocations in our own country as well as in oil industries elsewhere which also have an important bearing on our own security. Petroleum, wherever it may be produced in the free world, is important to the security, not only of ourselves, but also of the free people of the world everywhere.

Mr. President, the mandatory oil import program has been a great help in stemming the rising tide of foreign oil, but it is now all too clear that the program as it is now operating is not serving its national security goals as laid down by our Government when it was first established.

Also it can readily be seen that in view of the deteriorating conditions in the industry, which I outlined earlier, proves all too conclusively the truth of the Cabinet Committee statement as to what would happen "unless a reasonable limitation of petroleum imports is brought about."

Mr. President, it has happened, although there is a 3-million-barrel-per-day shut-in capacity in the United States for lack of a market, the program has operated to cause the far western part of the United States, including the State of California, which is the site of one of this Nation's largest military complexes, to become increasingly dependent on foreign oil.

Ten years ago imports into the west coast were equal to less than 6 percent of the local crude oil production. At that time, California was the second largest oil producing State in our Nation. Today, a short 10 years later, under the program just announced, imports will amount to almost 60 percent of local crude oil production. Can anyone be heard to say that the program is achieving its national security goals in view of such facts?

Mr. President, a thumbnail sketch of the existing situation shows:

First. Total U.S. oil imports—crude and all products—to have continued to increase in relation to domestic crude oil production.

	Percent
1954	16.6
1959	25.2
1964 (estimated)	30.0

Second. Total U.S. oil imports, excluding residual fuel oil, also have continued to increase in relation to domestic crude oil production.

	Percent
1954	11.0
1959	16.6
1964 (estimated)	18.6

Third. Total imports, excluding residual fuel oil, into districts I–IV—United States east of the Rockies—have remained at approximately the same ratio to domestic production for the past 5 years. Yet drilling and other domestic activity has seriously declined during this period indicating that the present level should be reduced.

Fourth. Total imports, excluding residual fuel oil, into district V—United States west of the Rockies—have increased very rapidly under the present program. In 1954, imports were 5.8 percent of crude oil production in that area but now are over 50 percent.

Fifth. The military purchases over 200,000 barrels daily of jet fuel and gasoline, about 35 percent of their requirements, are from foreign sources. Of this total purchased abroad, 35,000 barrels daily are imported into the United States where these same products are already available here.

Mr. President, my real concern is: How long can we continue to turn our backs on our domestic industry and invite foreign oil to share more and more of our U.S. market?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. McGEE. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. One of the interesting points about this problem is that the Government is still maintaining a high interest rate on the national debt, on the theory that to do otherwise would invite the flight of American dollars away from this country.

Sometime next month we shall be asked to vote for legislation that would tax money that goes overseas for investment purposes, in order to slow down the flight of American dollars. This would be no problem if we could export a sufficient amount over and above what we import.

The Senator from Wyoming well knows that one of the principal causes of the gold drain is the tremendous amount of money our Government spends in buying oversea oil and hauling it to this country, all of which tends to displace the domestic industry, which is fully capable of producing our needs.

Mr. McGEE. The Senator is entirely correct. I salute him not only as one of the leaders in understanding all the implications of the forces now preying on the oil industry of this country, but also as an effective leader in the Committee on Finance. I fully appreciate the consequences of the added burden of these imports as we are trying to slow down the outflow of dollars from our country at this time. I thank the Senator for his comment.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator knows that a law was enacted in the previous Congress, if I recall correctly, limiting American tourists to bringing back only half of what they could bring back tariff free previously. Once again, that law was aimed at the same problem, the problem of curtailing our unfavorable balance of payments. Compared with what is being lost through oil imports, the amount that would be saved from the tourist traffic by such measures would be only a drop in the ocean. The Senator is aware of that, because we have figures that show what is saved by cutting down on what American tourists may bring back. That amount would pale into insignificance by comparison, if we consider what the oil imports mean so far as our balance of payments is concerned.

Mr. McGEE. Oil imports consume the entire impact of the shift in tourist dollars.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, having cited some of the factors that are depressing conditions in the oil industry, I should like to turn to some suggestions as to what can be done and ought to be done.

I have tried to show that foreign oil has taken the lion's share of growth in United States and world markets in the last 8 or 10 years. I have tried to show the great dollar value of oil imports into the United States. I have tried to show what is happening to our domestic oil industry. I have tried to show what our national leaders have concluded concerning the importance of a strong and healthy domestic oil-producing industry. I have told you of the Interior Department's recognition of conditions now existing in the industry. What more needs to be said?

Mr. President, reasonable men, in view of what I have outlined here today, certainly should be willing to take a hard look at these facts with a view to promptly correcting this serious situation.

I suggest that a minimum revision in the program to reverse the serious adverse conditions would include the following steps:

First. A realistic import level is of first importance in returning the domestic oil-producing industry to the vigor and health so vitally needed for national security.

Second. Reduce the present ratio of 12.2 percent of domestic production to a ratio no higher than existed prior to the declining trends in the domestic industry—at or below 10 percent in districts I–IV, east of the Rocky Mountains.

Third. Include within the allowable relationship of all nonresidual imports such as shipments from Puerto Rico, bonded imports of distillate fuel, and bonded imports of jet fuel for commercial use.

Fourth. Eliminate estimating procedures by basing import relationships on actual production during prior periods.

Fifth. Base the quantity of overland imports on certification from importing companies, rather than estimates by the Interior Department.

Sixth. Eliminate imports of light finished products that are unnecessary and should be supplied by domestic oil.

Seventh. Eliminate nonresidual imports for military use, with a corresponding reduction in total imports.

Eighth. Eliminate the importation of unfinished oils which were developed as a means of circumventing the voluntary import program.

Ninth. Use the full capacity of all pipelines from other domestic areas in determining available supply in setting district V imports allowable; provide incentives for additional district V production, additional movements from districts I–IV, and new pipelines into district V; and eliminate excess shipments from district V to districts I–IV as a part of the demand on which district V imports are based.

Tenth. Treat U.S. military purchases of light petroleum products from foreign sources as imports which would be deducted from the total permissible import level.

These recommendations would:

First. Reduce total districts I–IV imports, exclusive of residual fuel oil, by about 300,000 barrels daily from current levels, by reducing the overall import ratio from 12.2 to 10 percent of actual production and by including within the program those imports now excluded.

Second. Result in diversion to U.S. sources of at least 100,000 barrels daily of present U.S. military purchases of light petroleum products in foreign areas.

Third. Treat as imports the remainder of foreign military purchases amounting to about 100,000 barrels a day, by deducting these purchases from total imports permitted under the 10-percent ratio.

The aggregate effects of these changes would be to increase the market for domestic petroleum liquids by about 500,000 barrels daily, which would go far in providing the funds and incentives needed by the domestic industry if our security as to energy is to be maintained.

Mr. President, I urge that our Government take the necessary steps promptly to revise the mandatory program as just outlined.

Then, too, Mr. President, I call on the importing companies, each of which is well acquainted with the serious conditions existing in the domestic oil producing industry, immediately to voluntarily reduce their import quotas by at least 25 percent. This action would be a first but important step in returning health and vigor to our domestic oil producing industry. I feel this is a reasonable suggestion and I would hope it will not be necessary for Congress to look into the necessity of a stronger import quota and the tax provisions dealing with income earned abroad.

Mr. President, I hope Senators will join me in urging those in the executive department in charge of the oil import program, as well as the importing companies, to do all within their power to promptly and substantially reduce the flood of foreign oil into this Nation. Failure to do this will serve to further aggravate an already critical situation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks an excellent statement on this situation by Mr. H. A. True, Jr., of Casper, Wyo. Mr. True serves as president of the Independent Petroleum Association of America and operates an oil drilling company in Casper. He is a good friend of mine and an outstanding citizen of our State of Wyoming. He has rendered excellent service as president of the Independent Petroleum Association of America through his far-seeing leadership.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement on Imports by H. A. True, Jr., Casper, Wyo., President, Independent Petroleum Association of America, June 25, 1964

The administraton's decision announced today that oil imports (excluding residual fuel oil) into the United States for the next 6 months are to be increased more than 100,000 barrels daily over the same period of last year and 70,000 barrels over the current level, is not only discouraging, but wholly unacceptable in view of the seriously depressed conditions of the domestic petroleum industry.

A strong and meritorious case for a substantial reduction in imports was presented to the Department of Interior on May 25 by a united group of independent producing associations. Since that time, the recommendations for a reduction have received widespread support from Governors, Members of Congress, and the Interstate Oil Compact Commission.

It is an established fact that the domestic oil producing industry is in a serious and deteriorating condition which is now recognized by the Interior Department. The situation can only worsen in the absence of Government action to strengthen the import program.

In spite of this convincing evidence, the action to increase imports shows more concern for the possible effects of the import program on Venezuela and other foreign producing countries than on the 32 oil-producing States of this Nation.

The import program has one purpose and one only—to maintain a strong domestic oil industry in the interest of national security. It, therefore, is shocking to find that the apparent primary concern of our Government is for the foreign producing countries which have enjoyed continued substantial increases in imports into the United States.

Independent domestic oil producers with their backs to the wall will find the action by the administration today a bitter pill, difficult to comprehend.

It is all too clear that the program as now constituted is not serving its security objective. Although there is a large surplus producing capacity in the United States which is shut in for the lack of market, the program has operated to cause the entire western part of the United States to become increasingly dependent on imports. Ten years ago, imports on the west coast were equal to less than 6 percent of local crude oil production: Currently, they are equal to almost 50 percent and under the new program, will be almost 60 percent. It is difficult to see how this trend of dependency can be justified.

Even though the mandatory import program has undoubtedly prevented the complete collapse of the domestic industry, exploration, drilling, development, and employment have gone constantly down. Crude oil price erosion has been constant and is intensifying. These conditions are resulting in declining U.S. oil reserves.

While we are discouraged, we are not defeated. We will continue through every proper means and every available forum to advocate the changes which we believe necessary to serve the national security. We have by our efforts gained some recognition. There is increased evidence of understanding of the problems and position of the domestic industry. Our further immediate efforts for corrective action will include:

1. A petition to the President of the United States to take whatever steps are necessary to provide an oil import program under which the domestic producing industry can perform its essential function of supplying adequate petroleum for an expanding economy and national security.

2. A petition to Secretary Udall for reconsideration of our recommendation for a substantial reduction in the level of imports for the last half of 1964, including the encouragement of the use of domestic oil in the west coast States rather than increased imports.

3. A petition to Secretary of Defense McNamara urging that, pending decisions from current discussions with Interior, actions be taken as follows:

(a) During the last half of this year the Defense Department forego the exercise of its import quota of 35,000 barrels daily of jet fuel and gasoline which are readily and abundantly available within the United States; and

(b) That the Department of Defense take steps to divert as soon as feasible to domestic sources a minimum of 65,000 barrels daily of light petroleum products now being purchased from oversea sources.

It remains our conviction that a substantial reduction in imports is not only justified but increasingly necessary. We believe the plain facts as to the conditions now existing in the domestic industry require that something more be done. In addition to our petitions to the administration, we will continue to bring these facts to the attention of Governors, the Congress, and all others concerned with preserving the domestic petroleum industry. The future security of our Nation demands corrective action.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, the able and distinguished Senator from Wyoming has made an irrefutable case for limiting further the imports of foreign petroleum products into this country. His statement is one of the best documented and most factual presentations I have heard in a long time.

At a time when the Russian oil industry is growing by leaps and bounds, when its production has become a major factor in the world of oil commerce, we are imposing policies permitting excessive imports that are practically stopping the exploration and development of new oil sources. We are eliminating from our economy the vital element of independent producers.

It is not as if this problem were unnoticed. All of the members of the Oklahoma delegation recently signed a letter to Secretary Udall urging that foreign oil imports be restricted. I joined with 15 other Senators from oil-producing States in writing to the President and urging that proposals along the line advocated by the capable Senator from Wyoming be adopted and put into effect immediately. However, instead of even a token surcease from the inhibiting influence of foreign oil, we were answered with an increase in imports amounting to over 100,000 barrels a day.

The power to alleviate this problem rests not only in the Secretary of the Interior, but also in the Secretary of Defense, as the Senator from Wyoming has so perceptively noted. The military has been steadily increasing its purchases overseas of light petroleum products. The purchase of kerosene, gasoline, and distillate fuel oil overseas has risen from 46,000 barrels a day in 1954 to 212,000 barrels a day last year. The military is purchasing 35 percent of its total requirements abroad.

In this connection, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a letter I wrote to Secretary McNamara on June 5, 1964, urging that he give serious consideration to the proposals which the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee] has so eloquently advocated today. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a copy of a letter I received from Lt. Gen. W. O. Senter, Director of Petroleum Logistics Policy, replying on behalf of Secretary McNamara to my letter of June 5, and a copy of my letter to General Senter dated June 29.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

June 5, 1964.

The Honorable Robert McNamara,
Secretary of Defense,
Washington, D.C.

My Dear Mr. Secretary: One factor which has contributed to the difficulties of the domestic petroleum industry in recent years has been the steadily increasing purchases overseas of light petroleum products for military use. I am advised that military purchases of kerosene, gasoline, and distillate fuel oil from abroad have risen from 46,000 barrels daily in 1954 to 212,000 barrels per day last year.

These purchases abroad represented 35 percent of the 1963 total military purchases of these products. My figures come from the Office of Oil and Gas at the Interior Department.

I have been advised further that the Independent Petroleum Association of America has previously been in touch with you concerning this problem and has requested that you reduce these purchases from abroad at least 100,000 barrels a day, in order to bolster our domestic industry.

I am sure that so far as you are concerned the importance of a strong domestic petroleum industry to our national defense posture needs no substantiation. I take this means of expressing my own deep concern over the growth of these purchases from abroad and respectfully request that you give all appropriate consideration to the IPAA's request.

With kindest regards and best wishes, I am,

Very truly yours,

——— ———.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D.C., June 15, 1964.

The Honorable MIKE MONRONEY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONRONEY: This is in reply to your letter of June 5, 1964, addressed to Secretary McNamara, requesting that appropriate consideration be given to the recommendation of the Independent Petroleum Association of America that the Department of Defense (DOD) reduce its offshore procurement of petroleum products in order to bolster the domestic industry.

The recommended diversion to the United States of such offshore procurement has long been, and continues to be, a matter of careful study in connection with our gold flow problem. Undoubtedly, any return of our offshore procurement will inure to the benefit of the domestic industry in both the production and refining areas and, at the same time, might in some degree, improve our balance of payments. However, there are other factors which play an equally important part in the consideration and evaluation of this matter. Some of these are:

(1) Logistical facts of life (e.g., no Government-owned transportation and/or storage facilities in some oversea areas).

(2) Advantageous long-term contracts, principally to supply our Pacific naval special fuel oil requirements while recognizing the need to procure from the same supplier those light petroleum products which represent the output of a balanced refinery yield.

(3) Impact on potential worldwide sources of supply required to fulfill DOD's global commitments.

(4) Disproportionately higher domestic procurement costs.

In this connection, the Secretary of the Interior has requested the Oil Import Administrator to confer with representatives of this Department in order that further study and evaluation can be made of our offshore procurement activities. We welcome this opportunity and wish to advise that arrangements are now underway for the new analysis. You may rest assured that our offshore procurement will be diverted to the United States wherever practicable.

Your interest in this matter is appreciated.

Sincerely,

W. O. SENTER,
Lieutenant General, USAF, Director of Petroleum Logistics Policy.

JUNE 29, 1964.

Lt. Gen. W. O. SENTER,
Installations and Logistics,
Department of Defense,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR GENERAL SENTER: Thank you for your letter of June 15, 1964, concerning the procurement overseas of petroleum products by the Department of Defense. I was pleased to learn that representatives of both the Department of Interior and the Department of Defense are conferring on this matter.

I would hope, however, that the study of the Department's procurement policy will take into account not only the balance-of-payments problem, but other factors as well which are equally important.

While I am aware that the Department certainly cannot bear the responsibility for maintaining a healthy domestic petroleum industry, the Department's policy, in my opinion, should be to purchase domestic petroleum products where logistics permit and where disparity between the price of the foreign and domestic product is not unreasonably high. In this regard, I understand that the Department has an imports allocation under which it has been importing into the United States 35,000 barrels a day of jet fuel and gasoline. Would you please advise me why this is being done when domestic products are readily available? This is one particular instance where I feel the Department could cut its oversea purchases without detriment to the Department and with corresponding benefit to the domestic industry.

I would appreciate being advised of the results of your conferences with the representatives from the Interior Department.

With best wishes, I am,

Very truly yours,

——— ———.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, at the present time, the Department of Defense has an imports allocation from the Interior Department under which it has been importing into the United States itself 35,000 barrels a day of jet fuel and gasoline. There is certainly no logistical benefit or requirement for importing this oil. Any other alleged justification, in my opinion, must be secondary to a policy of purchasing domestic oil when such purchases are necessary, in order to preserve our domestic producing capability. There is certainly precedent for this policy. The military in recent months has reduced its purchases of beef overseas and has bought instead substantial quantities of domestic beef. The same policy and the same action should be applied to the domestic oil industry.

The purpose of the Government's mandatory oil import program is to help the domestic industry so that we shall always have an industry capable of meeting the Nation's emergency oil requirements on short notice. There is nothing sacrosanct about the overall import level which was estabilshed at the inception of the mandatory program. It was thought at that time that the level set was reasonable and would contribute to the economic well being of the domestic producers. After 5 long years' experience, we now know that this imports level is not doing the job. It is not fulfilling the objectives which were sought. While a decrease in military purchases overseas will help, there can be no substantial relief of the magnitude required until the overall imports level set some years ago is reduced. If it is not, the economic condition of the domestic oil industry will continue to decline and it will no longer be able to supply our peacetime and emergency petroleum requirements.

The Interior Department and the Defense Department have advised that they are going to confer on this problem and make a study. I say that the time for studies is past. The plight of the domestic industry is apparent and openly admitted. The program outlined today by the Senator from Wyoming is reasonable, practical, and most urgently needed. I strongly urge that action along the lines proposed by him be adopted.

Mr. McGEE. I thank the Senator from Oklahoma for his comments, along with those of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG]. The Senator from Oklahoma has long been noted as one of the most decisive minds in the Senate. He fully understands the many complexities and the importance of the oil industry to the country as a whole. On the basis of what he has just said, it should come as some measure of relief to Senators that we are plagued with problems everywhere around the world which seem to be insoluble, and here we are confronted with an elementary question as to what is wrong with the oil industry. We know what to do about our oil difficulties. It does not require any complexity of negotiations in order to solve them.

It seems to me that it behooves all Senators to join hands and insist that every department of the Government move in the areas which we have indicated, that Senators show a spirit of cooperation and move in the areas which I have intimated in my remarks. I believe that with determination to act and knowing the facts as we know them, we can arrive at a solution to this question before it is too late.

It is much later than we would wish it to be right now.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. McGEE. I am very glad to yield to my colleague.

Mr. SIMPSON. I wish to comment on the statement made by my colleague from Wyoming. I compliment him on the research which he has done, and on his excellent statement, which is irrefutable—as the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] has just stated.

I would ask the Senator from Wyoming, with his permission, if I might insert in the RECORD at this point—if it has not already been done—the letter which 16 Senators signed and sent to the President, dated June 15, 1964, with respect to this problem. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUNE 15, 1964.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The undersigned are very much concerned about the serious decline in activities suffered by the domestic petroleum industry in recent years. For this reason, we believe that the recommendations which have been submitted to Secretary of Interior Udall by independent producers for a reduction in the import level and the revision in the policy of the military in purchasing petroleum from foreign sources, are justified and urgently needed. It is our understanding that these recommendations would result in an increase in domestic production of about 500,000 barrels daily. It is our considered judgment that an increase of this magnitude is essential if the declining trends in the industry are to be reversed.

Total oil imports (excluding residual fuel oil) into districts I–IV (United States east of Rockies) for the past 5 years have been fairly well stabilized at a ratio to production of about 13 percent. Even so, industry activity has continued to seriously decline. This to us strongly suggests that the present ratio must be substantially reduced.

In district V (United States west of Rockies) a most serious situation has developed which is gravely adverse to the national security. In 1954, imports (excluding residual fuel oil) into this area were equal to less than 6 percent of petroleum production. They are now 43 percent. This increased dependency on foreign oil in this large and important portion of the United States has developed while there is a large shut-in producing capacity in other areas of the United States. It seems to us that the dependency of this area on foreign petroleum has reached a dangerous degree which warrants and strongly suggests that corrective action is in order.

In 1955 a Presidential Cabinet Committee found that if imports exceed the 1954 ratio the national security would be endangered. In 1954, total imports (excluding residual fuel oil) into the United States were less than 10 percent of production. Currently, imports are more than 16 percent.

If imports were reduced by 300,000 barrels daily as recommended to Secretary Udall by independent producers, the ratio would still be almost 12 percent. It seems, therefore, that the recommendations before the Secretary are reasonable and justified.

It is our understanding that recommendations have also been submitted to Secretary Udall and to Secretary of Defense McNamara for a change in the policy with respect to military purchases of petroleum from foreign sources. It is our information that the military purchases over 200,000 barrels daily of jet fuel and gasoline from foreign sources. This constitutes 35 percent of the military's total requirements for these products. In 1954, only 13 percent of requirements were purchased abroad. These products are readily available in the United States where there is a large surplus of crude oil and substantial unused refinery capacity. The policy of the Defense Department of purchasing more and more of that requirement from foreign sources runs directly contrary to the objective of the oil import program. It is particularly significant and seemingly completely unjustifiable that the Defense Department import into the United States 35,000 barrels daily of these products.

It is our understanding that it has been recommended to Secretary Udall and Secretary McNamara that 100,000 barrels daily of these foreign purchases be diverted to domestic sources and that the remaining 100,000 barrels daily be treated as imports.

If the recommendations which have been submitted by independent producers to Secretaries Udall and McNamara concerning both the import program and military purchases are accepted, total imports into the United States (excluding residual fuel oil) would still be about 11 percent of domestic production; whereas this ratio in 1954 was less than 10 percent.

In view of the widespread importance of the domestic petroleum industry to both the peacetime economy and the national security, it is most respectfully urged that this matter be given your consideration.

Respectfully yours,

Milward L. Simpson, Republican of Wyoming; Gale W. McGee, Democrat, of Wyoming; Wallace F. Bennett, Republican, of Utah; Peter H. Dominick, Republican, of Colorado; Gordon Allott, Republican, of Colorado; Frank Carlson, Republican, of Kansas; Milton R. Young, Republican, of North Dakota; James B. Pearson, Republican, of Kansas; Carl T. Curtis, Republican, of Nebraska; Frank E. Moss, Democrat, of Utah; Roman L. Hruska, Republican, of Nebraska; John G. Tower, Republican, of Texas; Russell B. Long, Democrat, of Louisiana; J. Howard Edmondson, Democrat, of Oklahoma; Clinton P. Anderson, Democrat, of New Mexico; A. S. Monroney, Democrat, of Oklahoma.

Mr. SIMPSON. My colleague well knows that the foundation for approximately 50 percent of the tax base in the State of Wyoming is based upon the oil industry.

I concur in what the Senator from Louisiana, the Senator from Wyoming, and the Senator from Oklahoma have said. I assure them all, as Dave True said in his recent release, to which the Senator has referred, that we are discouraged but we are not defeated.

Mr. McGEE. I thank my colleague for his contribution. He is close to this question. As a former Governor of the State of Wyoming, and now as Senator, he has been of great help in trying to unravel the many perplexing aspects of this question, in order to get at the hard facts and to get at the truth, and arrive at a sensible solution in the national interest.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. McGEE. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I congratulate the Senator from Wyoming on the excellent address he has made on the subject of oil imports.

Some time ago, I analyzed the balance of trade between this country and foreign nations, and reached the conclusion that if we leave out of consideration those items which we do not produce in this country, such as coffee and bananas, if we leave out those items which we are incapable of producing, such as tin, and various scarce materials, which we must stockpile for security reasons, if we leave out of consideration those items with respect to which we have never had a domestic industry because we were always a high-cost producer, and then consider those items which America does produce, which we can produce in competition with the rest of the world, and once again take out those items which we export more than we import, what do we find?

We find that of all the industries, the oil industry represents approximately two-thirds of our entire imports in dollar volume.

If that same formula were to be applied to the textile industry, that industry could not survive. If the same thing were done to the beef industry, we would hear the complaints which we are presently hearing increased 100-fold.

Mr. McGEE. I can hear them right now.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes; and we can hear them very loudly. The beef industry is really bellowing these days—and for good cause.

If the same thing were done to almost any other industry in America, Senators would be in the Chamber protesting even more loudly than Senators are concerning the oil industry. We are taking a real beating on oil imports. The profits being made in the oil industry today are overseas—in Venezuela, in Saudi Arabia, elsewhere than in the United States.

Fortunately, I suppose, the State of Louisiana is doing as well as any oil-producing State because of the vast holdings on the Continental Shelf. Some of those holdings have vast deposits, but they are what we call security oil; in other words, if we have to fight a war short of an atomic war of extermination, which might be over in 48 hours with everyone in the world, practically, killed, if we had to fight a war such as World War I, World War II or the 20-odd wars we have fought in various stages since, a war in which the two sides would still survive after a military decision had been reached, we would have to have a vast supply of oil.

The Senator knows what happened when England found its shipping lines cut at the time of the Suez Canal crisis and they realized the significance of having their fuel cut off in the Near East and were ready to go to war about it.

We all remember the old song, "You Never Miss the Water, Till the Well Runs Dry." Then we realize how important it is.

This particular industry will be compelled to ask all of its friends to join in any restrictive trade program necessary to survive, and to join with others to protect their industry, unless the President does for the oil industry what has been done for the textile industry, and what has been done for other industries to give them sufficient control over imports so that the domestic industry will remain healthy.

I am very much disappointed that the President, who well understands this problem, is being far too timid with regard to his old friends whom he once represented on the floor of the Senate—and he represented them very well while he was a Senator from the great State of Texas.

He represented them very well while he was a Senator from Texas, in not demanding for them what would be done and has been done for other industries.

I hope that the press reports will recognize their responsibility. This responsibility that rests over in the Pentagon, in the event it is called upon to defend this great Nation, would simply mean that they would take from this Nation all its oil. Those who would take the oil from the country remind me of the fellow who goes a mile down the road to buy from the supermarket until the war comes along. Then, when the butcher has to ration meat, he goes to the fellow next door that he has been bypassing. He says: "My friend, I am your neighbor. I want to buy some meat." That is when the butcher wants to say, "All during the time when it was in plentiful supply, you would not deal with me. You went to the supermarket and let them take care of you. As far as I am concerned, you would not do business with me when times were good. I would just as well bypass you and take care of the fellow who was dealing with me before."

The same principle is involved on the question of oil. They propose to buy it from foreign countries, from Communist countries. Then, when the emergency hits them, they will be back on the doorsteps of the same American domestic producers who are being crushed by the imports.

I think it is unfair for the Defense Department to want to trade with the foreign nations during good times, and buy all of the oil that they can get over there in good times, and expect those people to pay their bills and keep themselves in a position to see them through an emergency. I think it is unfair. The Defense Department ought to buy their requirements, or the major portion of them from those at home on whom they would have to rely in an emergency.

The Defense Department expects them to be present and help in an emergency. The Defense Department should be prevailed upon to keep this industry in a healthy condition so that it could provide for a need in the event an emergency occurs.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record a number of suggestions that occurred to me along that line.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

STATEMENT ON OIL IMPORT SITUATION

RECENT ACTION UNFORTUNATE

The recent action of Secretary of Interior Udall increasing oil imports for the last half of this year is most unfortunate. There is strong evidence that there is urgent need for a substantial cut-back in imports. Instead, however, we are now faced with a further increase in imports and further cut-backs in domestic production. Independent oil producers throughout the Nation joined together in a united request to the Secretary of Interior seeking a cut-back in imports of 300,000 barrels daily. The order of the Interior Department issued last Thursday completely ignores these pleas and disregards the serious economic position of the domestic industry. The order covering the last half of this year calls for an increase in imports of 100,000 barrels daily over the same period of last year and 70,000 barrels daily over the level that existed during the first half of this year.

It seems to me that this action constitutes a serious mistake. An analysis of the pertinent facts seems clearly to call for some emergency action if this vital domestic industry is to avoid irreparable harm. This becomes an important national question because of the essentiality of this industry to our national security.

EVIDENCE CALLS FOR REDUCTION

Ten years ago the Congress became concerned about the high level of oil imports and the rapid increase that was taking place. As a result, the Defense Amendment was first enacted in 1954 and then strengthened by amendments in 1955 and in 1958. Concern about increasing oil imports was one of the principal reasons for this action by the Congress. At that time, total U.S. oil imports, including crude oil and all products, were equal to 16.6 percent of domestic crude oil production. Currently, imports are about 30 percent of domestic production and now we are faced with a further increase.

It should be made clear that the Senator from Wyoming and I today are talking about oil imports, excluding residual fuel oil. Residual fuel oil imports are under a separate program. The order of the Secretary of Interior issued last week, therefore, covers crude oil and all products, except residual fuel oil.

The historical trend of increasing imports of crude oil and products, excluding residual fuel oil, however, is equally impressive. Even eliminating residual fuel oil, the increasing trend since 1954 is alarming, having increased from about 11 percent to almost 20 percent. In view of the seriously depressed conditions throughout the oil-producing areas of the Nation, I do not see how a continuation of this increasing trend can be justified. Under the present program the United States is divided into two parts which have separate import programs. An examination of both of these programs seems to me to demonstrate clearly a need for a reduction—not an increase in the import level.

Looking first at the United States east of the Rockies, we find that the level of imports has been fairly well stabilized for the past 5 years. This is under the Presidential proclamation which requires that imports into this area be held to 12.2 percent of domestic production. Despite this fact the domestic industry has continued to decline seriously during this 5-year period which demonstrates that the present level is too high and should be reduced. Independent producers have requested that this ratio of imports to domestic production be reduced from 12.2 percent to 10 percent, and in view of the circumstances, it seems to me that this is a reasonable request. Certainly, experience shows that the 12.2 ratio is too high.

Now looking at the other program which covers the United States west of the Rockies, we find an even more alarming picture. Imports have increased very rapidly under the mandatory oil import program. In 1954 when there was much concern about the then existing level of imports and the dangers of growing dependency on foreign oil, we find that imports into this western part of the United States were equal to about 6 percent of crude oil production. What has happened under the program is shocking. Currently, imports into that important part of the Nation are now equal to about 50 percent of local production and under the new program which Secretary Udall announced last week, this ratio will go to about 60 percent.

The whole purpose of the defense amendment enacted by Congress and the mandatory oil import program now being administered by the Interior Department is to serve the national security. Yet it can be seen that since 1954 imports have continued to increase, thereby placing our Nation more and more dependent upon uncertain sources for its oil supply. It seems to me that the record is clear, strong, and persuasive for early corrective action.

MILITARY PURCHASES FROM FOREIGN SOURCES

Another matter which concerns me gravely and seems to call for immediate corrective action is the policy of the Department of Defense in purchasing military requirements of petroleum from foreign sources.

Currently, the military purchases over 200,000 barrels daily of jet fuel and gasoline, about 35 percent of their requirements, from foreign sources. Again here, like imports, we find a record of more and more reliance upon foreign sources. Whereas, 10 years ago, the military purchased 10 to 15 percent of these requirements from foreign sources. Today, they are purchasing over one-third of their requirements for these products. There is no justification for this trend in view of the readily available jet fuel and gasoline within the United States.

Even more incredible is the fact that the military imports 35,000 barrels daily of these products into the United States where there is a surplus of petroleum and depressed conditions throughout the domestic industry in all the producing areas.

This policy of the Department of Defense seems to me to be completely indefensible. Of all the departments of Government which should be sensitive to the national security requirements of the Nation and the national security purpose of the oil import program, it seems the Department of Defense should be first. Yet, here we find that their policy with respect to military purchases is running directly contrary to the purpose of the import program.

Here is a situation which calls for the immediate attention of the administration. The policies of the military and the oil import program should be coordinated. They should not be permitted to continue to operate in opposite directions.

BALANCE-OF-PAYMENTS PROBLEM

Oil imports and also the policy of the military in purchasing more and more of its requirements overseas both serve to aggravate the serious balance-of-payments problem which has faced this Nation for the past several years.

The deficit in U.S. petroleum trade is a significant item in our balance-of-payments problem. Despite a staggering oil surplus in the United States, oil is now our No. 1 import, dollarwise. For the last 6 years, the oil trade deficit has exceeded a billion dollars annually. In 1963, the excess of U.S. petroleum imports over exports amounted to $1.3 billion. This does not include payments to foreign tanker owners for transporting the oil and it likewise does not include more than $300 million which the military spends for foreign purchases of petroleum. If these two items are added, the total petroleum factor in our balance-of-payments deficit nears the $2 billion mark out of the total payments deficit for 1963 of $2.7 billion.

This shows that there is a need on the part of the administration to coordinate its programs with respect to the balance-of-payments problem, the import problem, and military purchases of petroleum.

EMERGENCY ACTION NEEDED

I am deeply concerned. The independent oil producers are in serious trouble. Industry activity is depressed. The oil producing States and localities are drastically affected. The economies of the local communities are disrupted and the tax revenues are down. It is a widespread problem.

I do not believe we can wait for another 6 months to study and review the situation.

Emergency action is called for.

The oil producing States are faced with further cutbacks. Already, during the past 2 months oil States have been forced to curtail production. For example, Louisiana has cut back 50,000 barrels daily; Kansas 25,000 barrels daily and just recently Texas reduced July production rate by 50,000 barrels daily.

At least as a temporary emergency measure, imports should share this burden.

Action is needed now during the next 3 months. Surely a way under the present program can be found to do this and I hope that Secretary Udall will do so without delay.

In addition, the Defense Department should take steps to assist in this crisis.

As a temporary matter, at least, the military should forgo the importation of 35,000 barrels daily of jet fuel and gasoline.

The military should also immediately take steps to cut back its foreign purchase of jet fuel and gasoline to not more than 100,000 barrels daily.

The Defense Department can assist materially in this situation and by doing so it would also contribute some $125 million annually to the balance-of-payments problem. I urge Secretary McNamara to take these actions.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Louisiana for his interest. I pay tribute to him. It should be made clear, since it is something that many of the people in our great Nation may not realize, that the exploration for oil is largely and overwhelmingly in the hands of the small independents. They are the ones who are being pushed to the brink of disaster. They are the ones who are going out of business. It is not a matter of being fair. It is not a question of whether one is going to do business with someone in an emergency, or whether we shall go along with the policy of the Pentagon or the administration. It is a matter of whether we shall have oil.

We cannot produce oil merely because Congress passes a law saying that we should produce. We must find it. We have to know whether the reserves are. We are protesting against a policy now that discourages us from finding adequate oil reserves.

I say to my colleague from Louisiana that it behooves us all to face this question now, before we threaten ourselves with national suicide at a time of great national crisis in the future.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I congratulate the Senator for the fine statement that he has made. I also congratulate those who joined with him. I assure the Senator that I will use my best interests, and I hope he shall do likewise, to see that the President reads what he has said. I think he is correct. I believe the President knows it.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McGEE. I yield.

Mr. DOMINICK. I had the pleasure of cosponsoring the letter by the junior Senator from Wyoming, which was addressed to the President, in an effort to do something for this industry. I believe we all receive the same expression from the President. He said he appreciated our expression of views and would turn the problem over to the Secretary of the Interior for some study. The Secretary of the Interior indicated that he had received the communication and that he would try to reduce oil imports. It developed that he not only did not reduce the oil imports in the next 6 months, but expanded them.

It is the most completely contemptuous attitude, as far as I am concerned, toward the position of legitimate American industry trying to do something for the defense of the country that I have seen in some time.

This is not a single instance. It is a pattern that has existed. We have it in the livestock industry, as has been said, and in the lead and zinc mining business. As the Senator from Wyoming knows, we have been almost completely wiped out.

There is a problem in the steel industry. The various industries are vital to the economy of the country. The position taken seems to be that we must take care of the nations overseas before we do anything for the people in our own country. This is the same problem that we have facing us in the question of the oil imports.

I subscribe to what the Senator has said. I am glad that he brought the matter to the floor. I hope it will result in obtaining some action that will be helpful to our defense and economy.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McGEE. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I believe it should be made clear that the oil industry is in need of help in more areas than oil imports. That makes it even more imperative that some additional consideration be given to this industry.

As the Senator knows, the American producers have really led the way in improved refining methods to the extent that we now get more gasoline from a barrel of oil than we used to—more gasoline, and more jet fuel. We have more and better methods of refining. We get better results and more high-quality fuel.

It should be pointed out that, contrary to the popular conception, gasoline is the one thing that we can buy as cheaply now as we could 30 years ago, back before World War II. People get the mistaken notion that the price of gasoline has gone up because we pay 32 cents and 34 cents a gallon for gasoline at the gas station.

This is occasioned because of taxes that the State and Federal legislators put on the fuel. If we look at the price, we discover that gasoline is one of the few important items that we can buy today, at the same price that we were paying 30 years ago. In other words, When the product is put on the tank the price at the refinery gate is the same. truck, it sells for the same price now as it did 30 years ago. That is one instance where automation, refinement, and improved methods of producing this fuel have caused the price to stay down, while values went up.

The industry does not get credit for that. The Federal, State, and local governments, in need of revenue, have placed fantastic taxes on this fuel.

As the Senator knows, gasoline carries a heavier excise tax in dollar value to support the Government than anything else in the entire economy, both for the Federal and State government. It is a tremendous revenue bearer for the support of the State and local government. That is the reason that people get the impression that they pay more for oil than they did before. The price has actually been kept down, but we do not get credit for it. Every time the price goes down, someone else puts an extra tax on it.

Mr. McGEE. The Senator is correct. He made the statement that the number of consumers has multiplied many times and the methods have been improved. We have more automobiles, and higher standards have been set. Yet, the price is still being held at the same level as when it started. I think it is a real tribute to the industry.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McGEE. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator is well aware of the fact that in addition to discovering new wells—very few of which have been found during this period of high imports—there is also the danger of the premature closing of wells. I am sure the Senator finds that existing in his own State, does he not?

Mr. McGEE. The Senator is correct. That is another factor depressing the industry.

Mr. MONRONEY. Once these stripper wells—small producers—that cannot economically produce against the threats of foreign oil—are closed and shut down, millions, if not hundreds of millions, of valuable natural resources will be lost forever, because once they are closed down, water takes over and the wells lose the ability of ever being able to produce oil again from the same wells. Therefore we get a double impact from loss of future production that we may have as well as loss of current production which is denied to us.

Mr. McGEE. What the Senator has said is very true. His statement further emphasizes that we dare not depend upon outside sources to make up the differences or to supply our needs. The moment we permit our domestic exploration to sag, we bring into jeopardy the whole national need.

Mr. MONRONEY. I agree with the Senator completely. We cannot merely turn on a spigot and suddenly find a supply of oil.

Mr. McGEE. Not even with an edict from the Congress.

Mr. MONRONEY. That cannot be done in the control of oil. It requires year-by-year progressive drilling, exploration, and wildcatting in order to develop the reserves that are necessary. It has always been a rule of thumb that we must discover more new sources of oil each year than we have produced in that year or we will be in a dangerous position. During almost all the years in our great history of production of oil we have been able to do that. Now with the threat of imports we find that the number of exploratory wells is decreasing and we are not discovering new sources to replace the oil presently produced.

Mr. McGEE. As I indicated in the closing part of my remarks, in the past 2 years in particular, our oil discoveries have fallen short of our production. Thus we are already lagging behind in meeting the standard of our historic formula.

Mr. MONRONEY. On the other hand, world competition is becoming stiffer. We may find ourselves with a dollar outflow to buy foreign oil because we have failed to develop sources at home, and in the dollar exposure for the fuel to keep America's economy on wheels, we can very well run into a most serious financial condition in relation to the imbalance of our dollar earnings. Is that not a correct statement?

Mr. McGEE. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the Senator for his taking the time in making the effort which he has made in relation to this most important subject.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McGEE. I am glad to yield to my friend from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I have been privileged to hear a part of the address of the able Senator from Wyoming, and I assure him that I will read it and the remarks of the diligent senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] when printed in the RECORD. West Virginia has a vital interest in the subject so cogently discussed by our colleagues. Although our principal prominence in the field of fossil fuels production is associated with the mining of bituminous coal, we also have a long history of oil and natural gas exploration, production, finishing, and marketing.

So, Mr. President, I associate myself in general with the informative and well-reasoned remarks of Senators McGee and Monroney. And I believe it is appropriate, too, that I broaden the discussion to include the problem posed by ever-increasing quotas being established for the importation of foreign residual fuel oil as a direct competitor of our domestic fossil fuels, especially coal.

I have consistently advocated and supported a program to control imports of residual fuel oil. This is because I am convinced that excessive imports of this waste product from foreign refining operations are detrimental to the domestic fuels industries and to the national security. Colleagues from the Atlantic seaboard disagree.

The implications of the oil import control program are so important to the domestic economy and the national security that the subject must be debated with candor at appropriate times.

Mr. President, there has been injected into the debate the argument that, by maintaining controls on residual fuel oil imports, there is an impairing of our Nation's relations with one of our friendly South American neighbors, Venezuela. It is even claimed that residual import controls tend to undermine the economic and political stability of Venezuela.

As I said in addressing this subject here last February 19, no one holds the democratic regime of Venezuela in higher regard than does the Senator now speaking. I would not advocate any program or any legislation which would seriously affect Venezuela in an adverse way. The oil import control program for both crude and residual has not had and will not have such an effect.

The period since 1959, when import controls on crude and residual were invoked by Executive proclamation, has been one of sustained and heartening economic growth for that South American country. I shall repeat for the Record some facts I brought to the attention of the Senate on February 19:

> Venezuela has continued, during the life of the program, to increase its sales of residual oil to the United States for much needed American dollars. In 1959, total export of this product to the United States, including residual processed in the Netherlands West Indies from Venezuelan crude, amounted to 91.4 million barrels. By 1962, the latest year for which statistics are available, these exports had increased to 162.1 million barrels, an increase of 77.3 percent.
>
> Here are some other pertinent economic facts about Venezuela, 5 years after oil import controls became effective: Its gross national product in 1962 was exceeded in Latin America only by Mexico and Brazil. In 1963, according to the Venezuelan Central Bank, there was a 20-percent increase in per capita income, unsurpassed in Latin America. The bank also stated that international reserves stood at $750 million in 1963—highest since 1956–57—and that there existed a $150 million surplus in international balance of payments.
>
> Venezuela ranks first among its Latin American neighbors in total foreign trade. In 1962, its exports totaled $2.6 billion, and it had imports aggregating $1.1 billion.
>
> This foreign trade, incidentally, both export and import, is and has been predominantly with our country. In 1962, the United States accounted for 52.6 percent of total Venezuelan imports and purchased about 34 percent of total Venezuelan exports, excluding Venezuelan exports of petroleum to the Dutch West Indies which are refined and largely exported to the United States.
>
> Petroleum constitutes the bulk of Venezuelan sales to the United States. Of its exports to this country in 1962, which totaled $882 million, nearly 95 percent—$839,667,585—was for petroleum and petroleum products, according to the U.S. Bureau of the Census.
>
> As might be expected, Venezuela enjoys a favorable balance of trade with the United States, due almost entirely to the huge amount of oil it exports to us. In fact, in every year but one since 1955, Venezuela has enjoyed a favorable balance of trade with the United States. In 1962, the balance in its favor was $305,500,000.
>
> I am sure that all of us are pleased to know of the significant economic gains accomplished by Venezuela during the past 5 years under a free and democratic government. Also, it is pleasing that trade with the United States has constituted an essential element in the expanding Venezuelan economy.
>
> In view of the sustained economic growth of Venezuela, I do not see how anyone can seriously contend that the oil import control program—including the residual quota system—has served to weaken Venezuela economically, or to threaten its future. Today, it has a sturdy economy which has contributed significantly to political stability. Surely, this condition of economic and political strength could not prevail today if, over the course of the last 5 years, the residual oil import control program has been operating to the detriment of Venezuela, as some persons allege.

Under the oil import control program instituted by Presidential proclamation in March 1959, imports were permitted by the Department of the Interior to increase from a rate of 343,000 barrels per day at the beginning of the program to 575,000 barrels per day last year and then to jump even higher to 636,000 barrels daily in this quota year. Almost all of this too-accelerated increase has been filled by residual oil produced in Venezuela or from Venezuelan crude oil refined in the Netherlands West Indies.

Mr. President, oil is vital to the economy and the security of this Nation. So is coal. In times of emergency, the country must have domestic sources of fuels capable of meeting any contingency. Continuation of the building up of allowable imports of both crude and residual will destroy the capacity of both domestic petroleum and domestic coal to meet this emergency requirement.

Earlier this year, the Secretary of the Interior was quoted as having stated:

> When the national security contribution of the residual oil program is measured in the broader terms of the overall petroleum import control system, it is apparent that in order to maintain the integrity of the control program it is necessary to retain controls on all of the principal derivatives of crude oil, including residual fuel oil.

That policy enunciated by the Secretary of the Interior is a sound one for the Nation in the light of the urgent necessity for maintaining strong and expanding domestic fuels industries capable under all circumstances of meeting our country's energy requirements. Certainly this is a prerequisite of a sound national security status.

It is imperative that there be a holding of the line against increases in crude and residual oil import quotas. An element of stability must be added to the control system. I have introduced, with 29 colleagues cosponsoring, a measure (S. 2185) to give legislative sanction to the oil import control program in such a way as not to work to the detriment of Venezuela. At the same time, it would induce more stability into the program for domestic interests. In effect, this legislation would create a condition in which domestic fuels—coal and domestically produced residual oil—would have a fair opportunity to compete for a share of the growth market for industrial fuels along the Atlantic seaboard. We seek to strike a balance between imports important to friendly nations such as Venezuela and to domestic fuels industries.

A residual oil import control program continued on this basis would not damage Venezuela. It could continue to sell petroleum and petroleum products to this country in volumes and at values far in excess of commodities purchased from us. It would enable Venezuela to continue its heartening economic growth and political stability.

Likewise, it also would assure the domestic fuels industries of conditions under which they could plan for further growth and development while competing for a fair share of the growth market for industrial fuels in the eastern coastal area. The present oil import control system needs more built-in stabilizers. I agree with the Independent Petroleum Association of America that the situation growing out of the unstable oil import control system can only worsen in the absence of Government action to strengthen it. I believe that this program needs a better legislative foundation and realistic formulas to measure allowable imports. I recommend that there be action on S. 2185 and companion measures currently in the House Ways and Means Committee.

We believe that there is an inequity which continues to exist. I bring it to the attention of the Senate in connection with the very comprehensive discussion by the Senator from Wyoming on the subject of the importation of oil.

Mr. McGEE. The senior Senator from Wyoming is very mindful of the impact of imports of residual oil on the domestic coal industry. West Virginia is one of our great giants in the coal industry. My State of Wyoming, I believe, has the largest known reserves of coal left in this part of the world. Many of our mines are closed at the present time. Few of them are in full operation. We feel very keenly in respect to that aspect of the problem. I thank the Senator from West Virginia for his comments.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I extend my congratulations to the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee], who I believe has performed a service in laying before the Senate the difficulties which confront the independent domestic oil industry. I have been in contact with both the President and

Secretary Udall on the subject of imports. I hope that the discussions entered into by the two Senators from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE and Mr. SIMPSON], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], and others who have participated will be read with great interest downtown. I thank the Senator.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] will proceed very shortly under a unanimous-consent order. I hope that when he is through it will be possible for the Senate to observe the Pastore rule of germaneness and get down to the business at hand, which is quite important.

COUNCIL FOR A LIVABLE WORLD

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the Senate on a subject which is not pertinent to the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOMINICK. I am glad to yield.

Mr. McGOVERN. I should like to propound an inquiry to the majority leader. I understand that the Senator from Colorado intends to make some mention of me in the course of his remarks. I would hope that the unanimous-consent agreement would cover my right, if I so desire, to make a brief reply.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Of course.

Mr. DOMINICK. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. President, taking the time of the Senate for this purpose is not what I would consider the most pleasant prospect that I have ever had, but I think I shall be speaking on a subject which I believe is of some importance. I have alerted the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGOVERN] of my intention to talk on this subject, and my staff has notified the staff of all other Senators who may be involved in the particular situation that I am about to discuss.

Approximately 3 weeks ago, on June 8, a statement was made on the floor of the Senate which caused me some concern and to which I feel obliged to take exception. The statement to which I refer was made by the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGOVERN] and it had the net effect, intentional or otherwise, of casting doubt upon the motives and intelligence of a friend of mine and a distinguished Member of the other body, Mr. E. Y. BERRY, of South Dakota, and a widely read and highly respected syndicated columnist, Mr. Holmes Alexander.

I should like to take a moment again to repeat that I am glad that the junior Senator from South Dakota is on the floor of the Senate, and I hope that other Senators who may become involved will also be able to get here.

The attack upon these two men was particularly strong, I believe, and was apparently brought about by a series of articles written by Holmes Alexander and placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on successive days by Representative BERRY. The articles, which I shall ask to have printed in the RECORD during the course of my remarks, deal with a relatively new lobbying organization called the "Council for a Livable World," which concerns itself primarily with the issue of disarmament. An integral part of the council's operational program is providing substantial financial support toward the election campaigns of those Senators or senatorial candidates whose philosophies are or seem to be sympathetic to those put forward by the council. For example, members of the council contributed $20,091.55 to the campaign of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGOVERN] in 1962. The council itself contributed another $2,000 from its general fund in the closing days of that campaign.

The council, in its Washington Bulletin dated January–February 1963, claimed that these contributions "represented a substantial fraction of the total campaign expenditures and were a critical factor in the election," which, of course, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGOVERN] won by less than 600 votes.

Such financial assistance is most helpful in any political campaign. The purpose of my relating the figures which the Senator from South Dakota has already released is merely to indicate the measure of support that the council gives to those whom it favors. I have no intention of criticizing the right of any organization or group to work for and to provide financial support for the campaigns of candidates whose beliefs parallel their own in some areas, provided, of course, that they do it within the terms of the law; nor do I find fault in any way with Senator McGOVERN's connection or association with the council. My criticism is directed at what I consider to be an unwarranted and unfair attack upon Representative BERRY and Mr. Holmes Alexander. I might also add that I have contacted both these gentlemen regarding this attack and have secured their permission and approval to make a statement on their behalf.

With regard to Representative BERRY, Senator McGOVERN said:

> It is not necessary for me to ask that [Holmes] Alexander's many articles attacking the council and numerous Members of the Senate be printed in the RECORD, because Mr. E. Y. BERRY, of the other body has already taken care of that. It is appropriate that Mr. BERRY, like Robert Welch of the Birch Society, should sponsor Mr. Alexander's articles, because Mr. BERRY was one of only two Members of Congress who accepted an invitation to attend a Birchite organizational meeting in Washington some months ago.

I am not exactly sure what my colleague is attempting to prove in this connection, but I believe he is the victim of some false information and to the extent it implies guilt by association, which the liberals so deplored in other days, it should be challenged. Representative BERRY, whose integrity is beyond repute, just as is the integrity of the junior Senator from South Dakota, has authorized me to place in the RECORD the following concise statement of rebuttal:

> There isn't a scintilla of truth in this statement that I attended a Birchite or any other organizational meeting or have ever attended a John Birch Society meeting anywhere or at any time.

It would appear in the face of such a categorical denial by Representative BERRY that the relationship implied by my colleague between Mr. BERRY and Mr. Welch of the John Birch Society not only does not exist now, but has, in fact, never existed. Mr. BERRY has effectively demolished any possible misunderstanding on that account.

The attack against Holmes Alexander was no less baseless than that launched against Representative BERRY, but it was longer and much more emotional. After stating the general areas of disagreement between Mr. Alexander and himself, Senator McGOVERN launched into the following tirade of unsubstantiated and misleading information:

> But what of Holmes Alexander's connections? For whom does he speak? Why his strenuous effort to discredit the conscientious patriotic citizens who comprise the Council for a Livable World?
>
> I think the clue is that Holmes Alexander is married to the John Birch Society and is spouting the Birch line.
>
> Beginning in March 1958, Alexander wrote a long series of 12 articles for the magazine American Opinion, edited by Robert Welch, head of the John Birch Society. In 1961, Welch copyrighted and published these articles as a book entitled "How To Read the Federalist" by Holmes Alexander.
>
> Robert Welch, Mr. Alexander's publisher, who doubtless paid him handsomely for his articles and his book, is the same man who called the late Republican Secretary of State John Foster Dulles "a Communist agent." He is the same man who said President Eisenhower was a "dedicated, conscious agent of the Communist conspiracy whose whole purpose was treason."

Senator McGOVERN then goes on to quote some of these statements by Mr. Welch at some length after referring again to him as "Mr. Alexander's publisher."

Finally, he concludes his attack on Mr. Alexander as follows:

> Mr. President, I consider myself to have made the honor roll when I am attacked by men who "reason" in the way Robert Welch and Holmes Alexander do. Their muddleheaded nonsense does not worry me, as far as my personal peace of mind is concerned; but I do resent their attacks on the Council for a Livable World, because we need to encourage, rather than discourage, the political participation of good citizens who love their country and the world enough to invest in the cause of peace.

The implications here, just as in the case of Representative BERRY, that Holmes Alexander should be associated with the statements of Robert Welch, or that Robert Welch is "his publisher" to the exclusion of all others, or that Mr. Alexander is guilty of promulgating "muddleheaded nonsense" and is not a "good citizen" who loves his country because he strongly disagrees with what he believes the Council for a Livable World represents, are absolutely preposterous. I am amazed at this obvious attempt to discredit a respected journalist on such meager, meaningless, and unrelated trivia that falls apart with even the most cursory examination.

Mr. Alexander is a journalist, and as such, sells his writings to those who publish. Mr. Welch edits American Opinion which did in fact carry a series of articles by Holmes Alexander, and there the story ends. Mr. Alexander has no personal relationship with Mr. Welch nor any involvement with the John Birch Society. He has, in fact, never even seen Mr. Welch in person. What Senator McGovern neglected to say was that Mr. Alexander has also had his writings published in some 30 magazines including the Saturday Evening Post, Collier's, Harper's, Scribners, the Saturday Review of Literature, Esquire, Country Life, Country Gentleman, and Town and Country, to mention only a few. In addition, he writes a column for the McNaught Syndicate which is published in 150 newspapers across the country 5 days a week. He has written five books published by Harper's, one published by Rinehart, one published by Regnery, and another by Fleet. He is the author of "The Famous Five," a book about Senators Clay, Webster, Calhoun, La Follette, and Taft, whose portraits decorate the walls of the Senate reception room. The introduction to this book was written by then Senator John F. Kennedy, who subsequently became friendly enough to correspond with Mr. Alexander on a first-name basis. During the 1959 unveiling ceremony of the pictures in the Senate reception room, Mr. Alexander was praised for his literary contribution by Lyndon B. Johnson, who was at that time the Senate majority leader. He also received congratulations on his work from then President Eisenhower. All of this, it should be noted, took place a year after his articles appeared in Mr. Welch's periodical.

I venture to say that Mr. Alexander has the respect of a great many Members of this body, from both sides of the aisle. Proof of this fact is evident in the number of distinguished personages who have filled in as guest writers when Mr. Alexander goes on vacation. Among these are Senator Hubert Humphrey; the minority leader, Senator Dirksen; Attorney General Robert Kennedy; Secretary of Labor Wirtz; and others. A typical example of this can be seen in the column dated September 11, 1961, which was written by then Congressman and now Senator Daniel Brewster. As an example of the high esteem to which Mr. Alexander was held by the man whom President Johnson chose to stand in for him in the 1964 Maryland primary, I request unanimous consent that the column by Mr. Brewster be included at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

(Note.—Holmes Alexander has left on a brief European vacation. During his absence a number of prominent and interesting guests will contribute columns. By Congressman Daniel Brewster, Democrat, of Maryland, second district, now U.S. Senator)

Washington, D.C.—A distinguished columnist runs a great risk when he turns this space over to an old friend. Let me tell you about this learned man of letters. I know him well.

Holmes Alexander is a man with many and diverse interests. "Who's Who in America" lists his books—three biographies, four novels and the highly praised work on American air power, "Tomorrow's Air Age"—but this is only part of the man. His quest for excitement has known few limits.

Among other hazardous undertakings, Holmes was once an amateur steeplechase rider. I remember one dark night in May 1930 when Holmes won the moonlight steeplechase on a horse named Red Dragon. Just imagine racing in the middle of the night, hoping your horse would see the white-painted fence in time to jump. Holmes won other races—I know, as I rode against him—but there were many times when he ended up in a crashing, splintering fall, with horse, fence, and Holmes all in a heap.

Holmes also turned his hand to politics. At the age of 24, he was elected to the General Assembly of Maryland. In days of bossism and recognized political machines, independence was his motto. In fact, one backrow countryman said the last time he saw such an independent operation was when his boar hog got loose on the frozen mill pond. Holmes was not a "go along" man.

I later succeeded to the legislative seat when held by Holmes and heard many legends about him. After one particular political machination, in which one of our most distinguished columnist's colleagues lied to him, Holmes swore he would try to kill him, and set about to do it. The story I heard from Annapolis was that Holmes quickly took the startled professional politician by the throat and undoubtedly would have proceeded with the work at hand had he not been pulled off by his friends. These men later commented that they would not have missed the man who broke his word, but it would have been a shame for Holmes to go to jail—he would have been missed. Holmes has never been afraid to fight.

At the end of his tour of duty in office, Holmes reported to Marylanders in an article entitled, "I Hold Office," which was published in Harper's magazine in 1933. Sacred cows were butchered, windbags deflated, and spades called spades. The big country boss was dubbed "Old Rolling Thunder." When the boss read this, he thundered even louder. Holmes did not run for reelection.

In World War II, Holmes went in as an Air Force ground officer, but he flew as an aerial photographer on the very first mission of the 392d Bomber Group (H) and decided to be a flyer. Although overage for such things, he went to gunnery school and earned his air crew member's wings. He flew over Germany and France as a gunner-photographer, and over the North Sea as air-sea rescue officer of the 2d Air Division. He wrote about it all. The Baltimore Evening Sun carried his "History of a Bomb Squadron," and the Saturday Evening Post ran his "Fishers of Men." He came home with a major's commission, with the Air Medal, four battle stars and the Distinguished Unit Award.

I will always remember one of Holmes' letters to his children from overseas. It was published in the Saturday Evening Post under the title, "Dispatch From Dad"—it might have been called, "My Children, This Is Why We Are Fighting."

This son of a distinguished, successful family forsook a goldplated seat in the Alexander business firm for a reporter's pencil. His pencil has been golden in a different sense. We can see in his books, stories and columns the result of the physical violence and smashing falls of racing days, the tension of the bomber crew, the understanding and sentimentality of a son and father, and the scholarship of a historian. All this comes through in our favorite reporter's writings.

On my return from duty in the South Pacific with the Marine Corps, I went to see Holmes Alexander, my friend and neighbor. Mission—advice on politics. I will always remember the wise counsel he gave me. It summed up to this: "Be independent." This good advice has taken me through 8 years in the General Assembly of Maryland and into my second term in the Congress of the United States.

Long ago, at the Gilman School, Holmes wrote something for the school magazine which I still remember. It has served as his motto down the years:

> "It's true in life and race and hunt
> The place to die is out in front."

Well, Holmes, here is to the old days, but also here is to tomorrow. We all hope there will be better days—but if we die, let us do so "out in front."

Mr. DOMINICK. I have a couple of comments to make on this column that may be entertaining and of interest to Members of the Senate. It is under the byline of Representative Brewster, and starts:

> A distinguished columnist runs a risk when he turns this space over to an old friend. Let me tell you about this learned man of letters. I know him well.

He then goes into remarks about Holmes Alexander. I recommend this as reading material for anyone who has enjoyed some of the writings of Holmes Alexander, as have I.

As one more item concerning the ridiculous charges leveled at Mr. Alexander by the junior Senator from South Dakota, I have an Alexander article written for release on April 3, 1961, entitled "Their Eyes Have Seen the Glory." In this article Mr. Alexander points out how he ended up on Mr. Welch's blacklist because, as he states it: "A column of mine spoke well of President Eisenhower." I ask unanimous consent that this article be included in the Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THEIR EYES HAVE SEEN THE GLORY

(By Holmes Alexander)

Washington, D.C.—Whether from independence of viewpoint, or inferiority of talent, I have never been invited into the conservative establishment—an ostracism which has its advantages when I write about the conservative movement.

To make myself clear—you do not find this column on the rightwing "must" lists, or my name on the speakers' roster of the rightist rallies, or among those given awards and testimonials as guardsmen of the old order. This, I repeat, could be because I have no party line on the "gut issues" such as McCarthyism and the John Birch Society, or it could be because almost everybody is brighter than I am.

Either way, I am not suspect of buttering up my own lodge brothers in trying to appraise what is manifestly a rolling wave of conservatism in our time.

Much in the news today is Robert Welch, founder of the John Birch Society. I never met Welch, but I used to write for his magazine, American Opinion, until one day a column of mine spoke well of President Eisenhower—and there I was, with a good many others, on Welch's blacklist.

This gives me a grudge, but I don't intend to indulge it by joining the mixed-up mob that is howling around Welch and his society. Like Joe McCarthy, Welch alienates his natural friends and serves as a supply sergeant for his enemies' artillery. Fine newspapers and dedicated patriots, believing in constitutional action, are driven off when Welch seems to propose a coup d'etat against communism. Preposterous hypocrites of the left are afforded the chance to open their veins and bleed at Welch's "smear tactics" of calling Dwight and Milton Eisenhower Communists.

What Welch means, of course, is that everybody who is less than a 24-hour, all's-fair-in-war Red-hater is a cold war slacker, hence, giving comfort to the enemy. Welch is a wild talker, an untrammeled thinker, but in America we don't ordinarily punish people for what they say and think. Until Welch is caught giving military secrets to the enemy, or conspiring our overthrow, he's going to get my hurrah as a good American.

Capt. Eddie Rickenbacker writes me to recommend the organization Young Americans for Freedom, representing conservatives in 115 colleges and universities, covering most of the States. I already know two of its prime movers, David Franke and Lee Edwards, and I hope the country knows of young Americans' brilliant sortie last January when they out picketed a Red demonstration against the Un-American Activities Committee.

Another youth movement shows up in the periodical called Advance, published out of Cambridge, Mass., by Bruce Chapman. Although oriented toward the Republican Party, its line appears to be "progressive" and is certainly nebulous. My observation about this kind of Republicanism is similar to Dr. Johnson's comment about a dog walking on its hind legs or a woman preaching a sermon—remarkable as the feat may be, it is not well performed.

For example, a modern Republican Senator whose "liberalism" has Advance's endorsement, once used the influence of his office to kill an article in a national weekly magazine because he was afraid of what the author might say of him. This is how bleeding hearts too often practice freedom of speech which they rhetorically uphold—and how they guard the equality of opportunity which they put to such useful purposes in their oratory. It's going to take a lot of savvy by Advance to learn that all who cry "liberalism, progressivism" aren't going to heaven with Theodore Roosevelt and Robert La Follette.

William F. Buckley, Jr.'s latest book, "Up From Liberalism," has recently been promoted to the broader popularity of a paperback edition. Bill Buckley joins Senator BARRY GOLDWATER in showing that the curtain called (by John Chamberlain, I think) the averted gaze can be smashed by talented and determined conservatives.

We can be sure that the leftist literati did their best to prevent Buckley and GOLDWATER from being noticed and heard. And, although each of these eloquent and tony fellows sometimes pulls a boner or strikes a stained-glass attitude, I wouldn't know how to name two Americans in the postwar period who better deserve their country's thanks.

These are not all the dynamic conservatives of the day, and I don't mean to exclude anybody by omission. The cause has many defenders, the mute and inglorious, as well as these above.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I do not argue in this particular instance in favor of any specific statements made by either Representative BERRY or Mr. Alexander, although I also share their concern with the activities and direction of the Council for a Livable World. I do, however, feel compelled to speak out against charges garbled on the winds of innuendo rather than ennunciated by the "sweet voice of reason" the Council refers to in its literature. I believe I have already shown that the charges are unwarranted, arbitrary, lacking in substance, and insulting to both Representative BERRY and Holmes Alexander. I welcome the opportunity to express my concern with a situation wherein unsubstantiated criticism is heaped first upon a respected Member of the other body and then upon one not accorded the privilege of a personal rebuttal in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

In order that the articles causing such harsh criticism may be read in context, I request unanimous consent that the seven referenced articles by Holmes Alexander, as introduced by Representative BERRY, as well as an eighth Holmes Alexander article entitled "Business-Bossing Bureaucracy Farce" and a June 12 editorial from the Charleston (S.C.) Evening Post on this subject be included in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 28, 1964]

JACKSON PROBES BOMBER LAG

(Extension of remarks of Hon. E. Y. BERRY, of South Dakota, in the House of Representatives, Thursday, May 28, 1964)

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, the noted syndicated columnist, Holmes Alexander, recently carried a series of articles dealing with the organization known as the Council for a Livable World, one of the groups espousing unilateral disarmament which has contributed generously to the campaign coffers of candidates it has endorsed. Mr. Alexander brings out astounding facts regarding the objectives and activities of this group which I think will be of general interest.

Under unanimous consent, I include Mr. Alexander's syndicated column for March 3, 1964:

"[From the Wheeling (W. Va.) Intelligencer, Mar. 3, 1964]

"JACKSON PROBES BOMBER LAG

"(By Holmes Alexander)

"WASHINGTON.—Senator HENRY (SCOOP) JACKSON, a skeptical supporter of the test ban treaty, has been visiting our nuclear laboratories to check up on our nuclear vigilance in the wake of the treaty which the Senate ratified last autumn.

"JACKSON is asking the Preparedness Subcommittee, of which he is a member, to follow up his check with a full-scale investigation of the four safeguards which the Kennedy-Johnson administration is pledged to observe. In convenient shorthand, the safeguards are:

"1. Stepped-up underground testing to compensate for the ban against atmospheric testing.

"2. Maintenance of high efficiency and morale among scientists entrusted with our nuclear armament.

"3. Readiness to resume atmospheric testing if the national interest requires it.

"4. Improved detection to insure against Soviet cheating on the treaty.

"JACKSON, a member of both the Armed Services and Atomic Energy Committee, has 'majored' in atomic legislation since coming to the House of Representatives in 1940, with time out for wartime Army service. His skepticism is that of an informed and concerned patriot who believes that the United States should keep a definite superiority, not a parity, in nuclear arms. Here are some of the factors that are wrinkling his studious brow:

"Coming from Washington State, where much of the employment depends upon the defense industries, JACKSON is up for reelection with no strong opposition, except from the various peacemongering organizations which like to tag him as a minion of the munications lobby.

"In 1962, one of these unilateral disarmament groups, the Council for a Livable World, endorsed and financially supported the election of two Democratic Senators, MCGOVERN, of South Dakota, and CLARK, of Pennsylvania. The Livable (with communism) Worlders, I am told by their executive director, Col. Henry Aston Crosby, have endorsed four other Democrats for reelection this year: MCGEE, of Wyoming; BURDICK, of North Dakota; MOSS, of Utah; and MCCARTHY, of Minnesota. The Livable Worlders have also supported the liberal Republicans, JAVITS, of New York, and KUCHEL, of California. Thus there is in the Senate a perceptible and respectable nucleus of men who are beholden to a group that favors disarmament in the face of the enemy.

"Specifically, Dr. Leo Szilard, chairman of the Livable Worlders and a noted pacifist-physicst, has testified on Capitol Hill against making the safeguards too safe. He told the Foreign Relations Committee that 'an extensive program of underground bomb testing' (safeguard No. 1) would not be 'furthering the cause of peace' but that it would 'be likely to do just the opposite.'

"Again, as part of the background for JACKSON's skepticism, are charges by Congressman CRAIG HOSMER, Republican, of California, that the Defense Department is spending only 'peanuts' in keeping up the safeguard. HOSMER has peppered both J.F.K. and L.B.J. with demands for hard information, but up till now is not satisfied either with the general or detailed material that has been sent him.

"HOSMER has a set of figures which show that the four safeguards require a round figure investment of $1 billion, plus annual operating outlays of about $250 million. Secretary McNamara has asked for a total safeguard investment of only $279.2 million for the coming fiscal year—far below HOSMER's calculation of what is required.

"At the moment the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee is going into Senator GOLDWATER's charges that our long-range missiles are unreliable. After that, says JACKSON, the safeguards."

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 2, 1964]

COLD WAR COMES INTO WYOMING

(Extension of remarks of Hon. E. Y. BERRY, of South Dakota, in the House of Representatives, Tuesday, June 2, 1964)

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD another in the series of articles by Holmes Alexander on the Council for a Livable World.

Mr. Alexander's article is as follows:

"[From the Boston Herald, Mar. 9, 1964]

"COLD WAR COMES INTO WYOMING

"(By Holmes Alexander)

"WASHINGTON, D.C.—Wyoming is only one of 35 States to elect a Senator in 1964, but a case can be made to call it a microcosm, an America-in-miniature.

"This is true because the incumbent, Senator GALE MCGEE, Democrat, has run up distress signals, claiming himself under attack by the John Birch Society. He has gotten some mileage out of this claim—it has attracted the sympathetic attention of liberal columnists and of the antiextremists.

"That in itself could not make the Wyoming election a national incident, but MCGEE's candidacy is now being backed with his avowed approval by an extremist outfit on the opposite end of the ideological spectrum, the Council for a Livable World.

"For perfect laboratory conditions of the test case, it would help if MCGEE, who's a professional rather than political type, were further identified. For example, at President Johnson's first 'live' television press conference, the question arose as to whether reporters should give their names before asking questions.

"GOOD GUY OR BAD GUY

"It was jocularly proposed among us that the questioner, instead of bothering with his name, should merely say whether he was a good guy or a bad guy. So, as a true word, though spoken in jest, let us say at the outset that McGee is a good guy, whose worthiness is strictly a local issue. But the head-on clash in Wyoming between the Birch Society and the Livable World Council should bear some wider examination.

"The society is headed by Robert Welch, whose ideas are too well known to need expatiation here. The council is headed by Dr. Leo Szilard, actually its cochairman, who is not less outspoken than Welch, but who has yet to become a household word for polemic politics. Yet a candidate who accepts Welch's backing should not, I think, be held more responsible for the company he keeps than one who accepts Szilard's backing.

"Leo Szilard, Hungarian born, is one of many intellectuals who were refugees from Hitler. Like others of his bent, Szilard participated in making the A-bomb to incinerate Fascists, but he doesn't feel the same way about incinerating Communists. While the Axis was intolerable to Dr. Szilard and to others holding his views they are willing to tolerate a worse evil in communism. They aim to make the world not free, but 'livable.' They are among the first to condemn anti-Communists for asserting that any 'means' are justified if they achieve the 'end' of exposing and defeating the Red menace. But some of the 'means' by which Dr. Szilard would make the world 'livable' with communism will leave Americans aghast.

"Specifically, there is the disarmament plan that Dr. Szilard put before the so-called 'Pugwash Conference of Free World and Communist Scientists' which met in September 1961 at Stowe, Vt. Among his ideas for policing a nuclear peace are these:

"1. An informer system among Americans: The President would post a $1 million tax-free award to any American who reported nuclear treaty violations to a U.N. Control Commission. To enable the squealer to become happily adjusted, Szilard adds that 'the recipient of such an award who wishes to enjoy * * * a life of leisure and luxury abroad * * * would not be hampered by currency restrictions.'

"2. A head-hunt system: A U.N. Peace Court, following a barbaric precedent of the Middle Ages, would pass the death sentence upon any American citizen or Government official deemed guilty of violating 'peace' In almost incredible savagery Szilard told this international group, which included some vicious enemies of America, that:

"'The court could deputize any and all Americans to try and execute the sentence. An American citizen killing an 'outlaw' could not be legally tried for murder in an American court, inasmuch as the treaty * * * would be law of the land.'

"SITUATION CAN BE REMEDIED

"Whether this sort of gabble comes from an unbalanced mind, or from a kindly scientist talking of matters out of his field, or from a genuine 'hater' of the American Constitution and people, or from a gargantuan hoaxster, it is about to be injected into the Wyoming campaign.

"The situation could be remedied if McGee would repudiate the support of Dr. Szilard and the Council, just as many candidates have repudiated the support of the Society and Robert Welch. This McGee has declined to do in an interview with me. Or, if the Council members could publicly dissociate themselves from Dr. Szilard, just as many Birch members have done in regard to Mr. Welch.

"But in the absence of such repudiation and dissociation, Wyoming will show what could happen (and, under the surface, may be happening) in many States where the desperate conflict of the cold war has come home to America."

[From the Congressional Record, June 3, 1964]

Disarmament Propaganda at a Price

(Extension of remarks of Hon. E. Y. Berry, of South Dakota, in the House of Representatives, Wednesday, June 3, 1964)

Mr. Berry. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the Record another in the series of articles by Holmes Alexander on the Council for a Livable World.

Mr. Alexander's article is as follows:

"Disarmament Propaganda at a Price

"(By Holmes Alexander)

"Washington, D.C.—Dr. Leonard S. Rodberg, a physicist, is employed by the State Department's Arms Control and Disarmament Agency—and thereby hangs a detective story.

"As a suspicious reporter, I have worked up some curiosity about an outfit in Washington known as the Council for a Livable World. The council began life under the name of the Council To Abolish War. Its founder and cochairman is Dr. Leo Szilard, a noted Hungarian-born physicist. He made a splash at the Pugwash Conference of 1961 by proposing his personal nuclear peace treaty. Under its terms, any American who violated the treaty would be declared an 'outlaw' to be shot on sight, and any American who informed on an 'outlaw' would be given a $1 million tax-free award.

"After this extravagant keynote, the council in 1962 set about to pour money into the campaigns of Senators who would support its program, among other things, to reduce Defense spending and 'to work toward bringing (Red) China into the family of nations.' The amount of $22,000 was given by council members to finance the South Dakota campaign of George McGovern, Democrat, who had lost the 1960 Senate race to Senator Karl Mundt. This time McGovern, with the council supplying 20 percent of his funds, won by 600-odd votes, and he soon began introducing unilateral disarmament legislation.

"I recently discovered that the council membership in 1963–64 had donated $14,351.84 (thus far) to the campaign of another little-known western Senator—Quentin Burdick, Democrat, of North Dakota, and that Burdick was expected by the council to make a speech to its Syracuse chapter on May 5.

"Burdick tells that he did not actually accept the Syracuse engagement, but that the council sent him around a speech manuscript on approval. I managed to acquire a draft of the manuscript. Since it read like a disarmament tract, I surmised that it had been prepared by the State Department, or its Disarmament Agency.

"When I called the Disarmament Agency to ask if somebody there had prepared a speech entitled, 'Prospects for Controlling the Arms Race,' I received a flat denial. But after some sleuthing, I called again and, with some choice remarks on 'managed news,' I disclosed my information that the speech had indeed been prepared by the man whose name leads this column—Dr. Leonard Rodberg. This time, the State Department's Disarmament Agency followed through and asked Dr. Rodberg. He admitted he'd written the speech at home in his private capacity, at the request of the council.

"There is my detective story, or part of it. When Senator Burdick declined to make the speech, although under a campaign fund obligation of better than $14,000, Senator McGovern (a $22,000 beneficiary) contacted Senator Edmund Muskie, Democrat, of Maine, to whose reelection campaign the council members have thus far given $372.30. Muskie's name was substituted on the speech draft, but he declined to use it—and ended up making a speech of his own at the Syracuse meeting.

"Well, what goes on here? A disarmament lobby is getting Senators on the financial hook. It is offering them prepared progaganda that is written by a State Department employee who is 'moonlighting' for the council. Do the Senators who take this campaign money know their sponsors?

"'I hereby dissociate myself from Dr. Szilard,' Burdick told me after thinking it over. And I am making inquiries which may lead to renouncing the council's support. I don't want to be unfair. I want to give the council a chance to reply to my questions."

"This seems a good note on which to end a chapter of the strange story on the council, which wants us to inhabit a 'livable' world with communism."

[From the Congressional Record, June 4, 1964]

Disarmament Propaganda at a Price—II

(Extension of remarks of Hon. E. Y. Berry, of South Dakota, in the House of Representatives, Thursday, June 4, 1964)

Mr. Berry. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the Record another in the series of articles by Holmes Alexander on the Council for a Livable World.

Mr. Alexander's article is as follows:

"Disarmament Propaganda at a Price—Part 2

(By Holmes Alexander)

"Washington, D.C.—Propaganda shops are all over Washington, and most of them are self-supporting—but not so the State Department's Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, which is tax supported.

"In a previous installment of this column series, I reported on a speech entitled, 'Prospects for Controlling the Arms Race.' It took some gumshoeing for me to discover that its author was Dr. Leonard Sidney Rodberg, who works in the Science and Technology Division of this State Department Agency. The speech was offered first to Senator Burdick, Democrat, of North Dakota, and later to Senator Muskie, Democrat, of Maine, for delivery before a Syracuse (N.Y.) chapter of the Council for a Livable World, which is a ban-the-bomb outfit.

"Dr. Rodberg assures me that he wrote the speech on his own time. Senators Burdick and Muskie both, to their credit, declined to use the tailored document, which is full of the hair-raising horrors of nuclear war and calculated to scarce Americans into pacifism.

"I will take Dr. Rodberg's word that he moonlighted the ghostwritten speech, but I hope to find out whether other speeches for other campaigning politicians (both Burdick and Muskie are up for reelection) have been written in the Disarmament Agency at the taxpayer's expense. Meanwhile, there is plenty of hard evidence that this State Department Agency is using public money to peddle special pleading that could very well serve the purposes of those who would like to see America stand naked to her enemies.

"Congressman Glenard P. Lipscomb, Republican, of California, in a House speech, pinpointed 127 speaking trips made by Disarmament Agency personnel between July 1962 and January 1964. Of these, 23 were on an expense account basis for which the taxpayer coughed up $3,138.71. Another 84 trips were not charged to the taxpayer, but the personnel were away from their desks while on Government salaries.

"One of the ways in which propaganda shops operate is by flinging parties at which the guests, often influential writers or politicos, are softened up on charm and entertainment. This State Department Agency which is supposed to explore the practicalities of international control of weapons and of disarmament, has requested—although denied—$4,000 for 'official reception and representation expenses.' When questioned on these aspects of his job, the Agency Director, William C. Foster, said:

"'Mr. Chairman, this is consistent with one of the four functions with which our Agency is charged; namely, of disseminating information about arms control.'

"In its budget request for 1965, the Agency asked for $11 million, an increase of 46 percent over its last year's stipend, but the amount requested does not deflect additional sums for arms control and disarmament that are 'hidden' in other departmental budgets such as Defense, Atomic Energy, Space, and the U.S. Information Agency, the last-named having recently gone in for subsidizing propaganda books issued by commercial publishers.

"Lipscomb gets a figure of $150 million of hidden money that is going into various projects for controlling and reducing American armament. How much of all this is a wise and responsible effort? An unnamed spokesman for the Joint Chiefs of Staff, speaking before the House Appropriations Committee in a recorded statement, said this about proposals made by the Disarmament Agency:

"'As a matter of fact * * * quite a sizable portion of the proposals they have sent over have not been looked on with much favor by the Joint Chiefs.'

"Taken together, the doings of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, plus those of the Council for a Livable World, seems to add up to a pacific lobby. Some of it is supported by the taxpayer, some of it is being huckstered around the country by reelection-seeking politicians who know not what they do.

"At the risk of being disrespectful, I note that the majority of Senators and Representatives who take campaign money from the Livable World outfit are men who have not 'majored' in the complexities and dangers of cold war disarmament. I would be surprised if anyone recognized Senators Burdick, Muskie, Hart, of Michigan, McGee, of Wyoming, and Moss, of Utah, or Representatives Montoya, of New Mexico, and Harding, of Idaho, as knowledgeable persons in this field, although competent in other fields.

"Why have these men been politically subsidized by the pacifist lobby? Their colleagues in the Congress, and their constituents back home, ought to ask these men if they know what the score is."

[From the Congressional Record, June 8, 1964]

Disarmament Propaganda at a Price—III

(Extension of remarks of Hon. E. Y. Berry of South Dakota, in the House of Representatives, Monday, June 8, 1964)

Mr. Berry. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the Record another in the series of articles by Holmes Alexander on the Council for a Livable World.

Mr. Alexander's article is as follows:

"Disarmament Propaganda at a Price—Part 3

"(By Holmes Alexander)

"Washington, D.C.—On February 27, 1964, Senator McGovern, Democrat, of South Dakota, who took $22,000 in campaign funds from a ban-the-bomb group called Council for a Livable World, introduced an amendment to cut $17 million out of Defense Department funds for aircraft, missiles, research, tests, and evaluation of military weaponry.

"Without going into the usefulness of the items which the McGovern amendment would abolish (a near impossibility for a layman), I note that 4 of the 20 Senators who supported the amendment are financially beholden for campaign funds donated by the membership of the Livable World Council. They are Clark, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, Burdick, Democrat, of North Dakota, McGee, Democrat, of Wyoming, and McGovern himself.

"Of these four, not one is on either the Armed Services or Joint Atomic Energy Committees which study military affairs and the Nation's need for weapons. But among the 64 Senators who opposed and defeated the McGovern amendment are all the ones which most of us reporters use as checkpoints on these complex matters of military readiness: Senators Russell, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Cannon, the Byrds of Virginia and West Virginia, and Margaret Chase Smith.

"I am very slow to attach wrongful motives to men in responsible office, and I don't believe for a moment that any of these four Senators for the McGovern amendment would willfully cast a vote that he believed to be harmful. Clark is cantankerous (his new book is sarcastically entitled, 'Congress: The Sapless Branch'), and he enjoys twitting the Senate Establishment with contrary votes. Burdick, a country lawyer, admittedly has very little knowledge or experience in military matters. McGee, a former history professor, has a hungry, searching mind which loves to savor 'ideas,' and he has reached an intellectual and creditable conclusion about experimental disarmament. McGovern, a World War II bomber pilot and a thoughtful idealist, deeply believes that the United States should take a chance, and take the lead, on world disarmament.

"But, giving them full credit for sincerity and singularity (in Clark's case), I see these Senators and some others as the nucleus of a Peace Party in Congress, backed by a pacifist lobby, the Livable World. Other Democratic Senators whom the Livable World commends to its membership are McCarthy, of Minnesota, Moss, of Utah, Hart, of Michigan, and Gore, of Tennessee. The Republican Prouty, of Vermont, seems to have been added as a gesture of bipartisanship. Two Representatives, both Democrats, are on the recommended list. They are Harding, of Idaho, and Montoya, of New Mexico.

"Just to see how other analysts than myself would rate these men whom the Livable World appears to be collecting into a Peace Party, I have checked their ratings in the voting index compiled by Americans for Constitutional Action on the subject of 'national sovereignty.' The Americans for Constitutional Action says it is 'for strengthening our national sovereignty and against surrendering control of our foreign or domestic affairs or our national security to any other nation or to any international organization.' I don't regard these ratings as infallible, but they do provide an arbitrary either/or indication of overriding philosophy. They show, in aggregate, how much importance a Member of Congress puts on national sovereignty as against 'peace,' internationalism, and concern for the 'world' instead of for this country.

"Astonishingly, I think, Muskie, Hart, McCarthy, Burdick, Moss, Clark, and McGee get zero in this rating. Gore gets 6 percent, and Prouty gets 50 percent. In the House, Harding gets zero and Montoya gets 43 percent.

"As a footnote, I think it worth adding that the Livable World has sent out a memorandum to its membership urging support of Harding as 'the logical choice of the Democratic Party to run for the Senate against Senator Jordan in 1966.' In striking contrast to Harding's zero rating on national sovereignty, Americans for Constitutional Action rates Jordan, Republican, of Idaho, at 100 percent.

"Unless I'm wrong, the pacifist lobby is trying to build up a Peace Party in the Senate, where foreign relations are decided. Respectability, of course, is an essential in an undertaking of this sort, and it's pertinent to note that the Livable World has as its executive director, in charge of the Washington office, a genuine war hero in Col. Ashton Crosby, U.S. Army, retired. His standard answer to criticisms of the Livable World is to write or say:

"'I have 14 combat decorations, including 3 silver stars, a Croix de Guerre in lieu of a fourth silver star, and 4 Purple Hearts.'

"This seems a bit of a non sequitur, but Colonel Crosby told me in a telephone interview that he was sticking with the Livable World chiefly to keep its membership from going off the deep end. Maybe he'll soon leave the Livable World and dedicate his patriotism to a concern for freedom rather than to cohabitation with our enemies."

[From the Congressional Record, June 9, 1964]

The Livable World Again

(Extension of remarks of Hon. E. Y. Berry, of South Dakota, in the House of Representatives, Tuesday, June 9, 1964)

Mr. Berry. Mr. Speaker, I have inserted in the Record a series of articles by Holmes Alexander to bring to light the political activities of the Council for a Livable World. I am today inserting another in this series of articles.

I was real interested in the statement of Senator McGovern, of South Dakota, appearing on pages 12972 and 12973 of the June 8 Congressional Record in which he defends the Council for a Livable World and defends a contribution made by the council to him in the amount of $22,000.

As is usually the case, when anyone is being attacked for not following the radical left, Holmes Alexander was attacked as being a Birchite and having some connections with Robert Welch. Going a step further, the junior Senator from South Dakota says that it is appropriate that I should insert these articles in the Record because, he says:

"Mr. Berry was one of only two Members of Congress who accepted an invitation to attend a Birchite organizational meeting in Washington, some months ago."

If the junor Senator's facts are all as deliberately distorted and unfactual as this statement, his many pages almost daily in the Congressional Record are an absolute waste of the taxpayer's money.

An additional article by Holmes Alexander follows:

"The Livable World Again

"(By Holmes Alexander)

"Washington, D.C.—Toward the end of 1963, the directors of the Council for a Livable World, a ban-the-bomb outfit, began preparing a document entitled, 'Draft of Program Action,' in which there occurred the interesting phrase 'old myths rather than current realities.'

"On April 25, 1964, Senator Fulbright gave his memorable foreign policy speech in which there occurred exactly the same phrase—'old myths rather than current realities,' and there is internal evidence that the action report predates the Fulbright address. The full quotations are:

"Council for a Livable World: 'In too many cases we are handicapped by policies based on old myths rather than current realities.'

"Senator Fulbright: "This divergence has in certain respects been growing, rather than narrowing; and we are handicapped, accordingly, by policies based on old myths, rather than current realities.'

"Well, funny coincidences do occur. I would think nothing of this one except that the Livable World seems to go in for supplying Senators with speeches and ideas that promote disarmament. As reported here in a column series beginning May 12, the Livable World prepared and offered a flesh-creeping speech to Senator QUENTIN BURDICK, Democrat, of North Dakota, and later to Senator EDMUND MUSKIE, Democrat, of Maine, for delivery in Syracuse on May 5. The address, as I learned after considerable sleuthing, was written by an employee of the State Department's Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, Dr. Leonard S. Rodberg, in his spare time, as he assures me.

"I have not established that the Fulbright speech was ghosted or inspired. I do not know the exact date of the Livable World's Action Report, except that Col. Ashton Crosby, the Council's Executive Director, tells me the inception was 'about 6 months ago,' and this is borne out by some internal evidence. I have asked Senator FULBRIGHT whether the funny coincidence of an exact repetition of phrase was collaboration or circumstance.

"'It is circumstance,' the Senator replied firmly.

"There is no doubt, however, that disarmament propaganda and campaign contributions have formed a liaison here. The Livable World had provided, by its own accounting, $14,351.84 to the reelection chest of BURDICK and $372.30 to that of MUSKIE. Back in 1962 the Livable World, while operating under the name of Council of Abolishing War, gave $2,500 to the Fulbright campaign fund of that year.

"The Livable World was founded by Dr. Leo Szilard, a militant peacemonger whose fantastic speech before Cyrus Eaton's Pugwash Conference in 1961 has been previously digested in this place. The outfit's officers, headed by Dr. Bernard T. Feld of MIT, include biologists, physicists, psychiatrists, film directors, a do-gooder attorney, and a left-leaning labor leader. I have requested the entire membership list of the Livable World, but am not encouraged to believe it will become available.

"In a transgression of conservatism, I previously understated a disarmament vote in the Senate. I gave the proposed slash in defense procurement of weapons and research as $17 million and neglected to include Senator FULBRIGHT as a slash supporter. Actually the key figure was $52 million. At least five Senators, who accepted Livable World campaign money, voted for the cut. In addition to FULBRIGHT ($2,500), there were McGOVERN ($22,000), BURDICK ($14,000), McGEE ($8,000), CLARK (unknown).

"One ray of hope for the Livable World seems to be Colonel Crosby, its executive director. The early action program called for unilateral nondeployment of our antiballistic missiles and for bomber disarmament. Crosby was able to insert 'mutual' into the first category and 'by both sides' into the second. But these appear to be semantic concessions, much like changing the council's letterhead from Abolishing War to Livable World. The outfit's name was changed—but not its nature."

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 10, 1964]

DISARMAMENT: RESPONSIBLE AND IRRESPONSIBLE

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD another in the series of articles by Holmes Alexander.

The article is as follows:

"DISARMAMENT: RESPONSIBLE AND IRRESPONSIBLE

"(By Holmes Alexander)

"WASHINGTON, D.C.—In the unfinished business which President Johnson took over from President Kennedy is action to prevent the national atomic energy enterprises from highballing down the same track that nearly wrecked the American railroad system.

"One of the Atomic Energy Commissioners who served under J.F.K. tells me that he discussed this matter with the late President in terms of the following analogy:

"Like the railroads, the Atomic Energy Commission has been on the point of getting itself committed to an open-ended supply of services: that is, doing research and providing materials at large costs to the Defense Department, NASA, and private industries.

"Like the railroads, the AEC is committed, through its contractors, to scores of labor contracts that reach far into the future, as well as to contracts with many universities and research corporations.

"Like the railroads, the AEC is a multi-billion-dollar institution and has accumulated manifold and complex fiscal obligations which are threatening to become an impediment to free and wise choice of action.

"Against this background of thinking, President Johnson, last January, announced a reduction in the production rate of plutonium and uranium. In part, this was a disarmament decision, for the military uses of nuclear power take a large hunk of the AEC's $2.6 billion budget.

"The point I am creeping up on is that here is a careful, phased, responsible form of disarmament, the very opposite of the ignorant, meat-ax, irresponsible disarmament which is being attempted by ban-the-bomb scientists, do-gooders, and dubious characters, two of whom I shall name in this piece.

"The President, the Defense Department, the AEC, and the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy all had a part in determining that the cutback in production of uranium-plutonium could be safely made. The Joint Committee, consisting of Senate and House Members of long experience in these fields, decreased last year's nuclear weapons program by $11.1 million, and knocked another $22.1 million off last year's figure for plant and capital equipment in the weapons program.

"In contrast to these reductions in nuclear arms production by men who know what they're doing, we get political scheming by an outfit that ought to be politically blacklisted—the Council for a Livable World. This pacifist group, with a secret membership, has invested sometimes over $80,000 in the reelection funds of Senators who are nonmembers of the Atomic Energy and Armed Services Committees, but who vote for meat-ax disarmament. At least two members of the Scientists' Committee of the Livable World can be called suspect of not having the Nation's best interests at heart. They are:

"Dr. Halsted Reid Holman, born 1925, a California physician, a president and vice president of groups cited by the Un-American Activities Committee as Communist fronts, a campaign fund contributor as recently as 1962 to the Livable World. In testimony before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, 1951–52, Dr. Holman pleaded the fifth amendment and declined to answer several questions, including:

"'Are you a member of the Communist Party? In November 1946, you were a member of the Communist Party in Connecticut, were you not?'

"Dr. Herman J. Muller, born 1890, a Nobel Prize winner in medicine and physiology, author of an avowedly Marxist book, 'Out of the Night.' Dr. Muller testified in closed hearings of the Un-American Activities Committee, 1953. The committee records show him as a member of the advisory committee of the Book Union (1944) and member of the national committee of the Student Congress Against War (1944), both cited by the committee as being subversive organizations. In justice to Dr. Muller, he resigned his post (1933–39) as senior geneticist at the Soviet Academy of Sciences Institute of Genetics, and also his membership to the U.S.S.R.'s Academy of Sciences (1948) because of disagreements arising from the Stalinist dictatorship. He says he is not an 'orthodox Marxist' but believes Marx rates with Darwin as a man who gave the world 'revolutionary truths.'

"The Livable World, into whose affairs I am prying, is financially backing the reelections of Democratic Senators BURDICK, of North Dakota; McGEE, of Wyoming; and MUSKIE, of Maine. In 1962, it backed Democratic Senators CLARK, of Pennsylvania; FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, and McGOVERN, of South Dakota. Four Republicans who have been either offered or given campaign backing—KUCHEL, JAVITS, PROUTY, and FONG—have backed off.

"Thus we have an organization, difficult to research because of its secrecy but showing at least two dubious official advisers, trying for a foothold of influence in the U.S. Senate."

[From the Charleston (S.C.) Evening Post, June 12, 1964]

COUNSEL FOR AN UNLIVABLE ONE

(Robert M. Hitt, Jr., editor; William P. Cheshire, associate editor)

Not that he requires any help from us. Still, we should like to offer a word or two in defense of Holmes Alexander, the conservative columnist. Mr. Alexander, it seems, is in hot water again with the ban-the-bomb crowd.

Hostilities erupted shortly after Mr. Alexander inspected the record of a group called the Council for a Livable World and reached the conclusion, subsequently expressed in his syndicated column (which appears in the News and Courier), that the world the council has in mind is not the sort of world in which Mr. Alexander particularly cares to live.

Senator GEORGE McGOVERN, an admitted beneficiary of the council's campaign purse, quickly took to the floor of the Senate to denounce Mr. Alexander as a "mad hatter" who is "married to the John Birch Society." (In point of fact, Mr. Alexander is neither mad nor a hatter and is married to the former Mary Barksdale, a charming Virginia lady as far removed from the JBS as Mr. Alexander is himself.)

"The council," said Senator McGOVERN, "is none of the things Mr. Alexander said it was" (a pacifist group that seeks unilateral disarmament). "Rather," he said, "it is a group of distinguished scientists, teachers, and scholars led by a decorated war hero that encourages its members to act like responsible citizens"—the Senator by implication, being a notable example of the product.

"Alexander says that shortly after my election and support of the council," complained the Senator, "I began introducing unilateral disarmament legislation. This is pure poppycock. I have never introduced any such legislation." Thus spoke Senator McGOVERN last week. But hearken to the words of the same Senator as spoken to the Senate on September 24 last year:

"The nuclear arms race is a dead-end street. Would Mr. Khrushchev respond to a systematic, step-by-step arms race in reverse? I think he might."

The first of these steps, Mr. McGovern suggested in the form of an amendment, should be to lop $5 billion from the U.S. defense budget. Later, he added cautiously, more cuts could be made. In a colloquy with Senator Douglas on the subject, Senator McGovern spoke of "the unilateral steps I proposed." So much for Senator McGovern.

What of the Council for a Livable World, which he supports? According to its own publications, the council: (1) makes "substantial contributions" to the campaigns of Congressmen willing to "press for improvements" in current defense policies and maintains in Washington a lobby to bombard Congress with what the council describes as the sweet voice of reason. This sweet reasonableness the council is so anxious to promote, is set forth in the council's immediate action program:

"The council proposes that the United States renounce, at the earliest possible date, any intention of achieving a strategic nuclear weapons capacity sufficient for substantially destroying in a single massive attack the Russian retaliatory forces."

However much Senator McGovern may protest, the council is honest enough to make no secret of its aims. It would have this country abandon its nuclear strike force as a demonstration of good faith, after which our diplomats presumably could draw up some sort of treaty with the Russians specifying that they would do the same.

If the council believes in such folly, then goodness knows it has every right to lobby to its heart's content and to enlist the aid of every like-minded Congressman it can find. But it is uncalled for, we submit, for Mr. Alexander to be vilified because he has bad dreams in which Mr. McGovern is casting a deciding vote on the defense budget.

The council's program is a program that invites disaster of the worst kind, both nuclear and political. And Mr. Alexander just happens to believe, as we do, that it is better to be free than slave—even in an unlivable world.

Business Bossing Bureaucracy Farce

(By Holmes Alexander)

Washington.—Ordinarily when a politician puts in a bill to create a new Federal agency to do what three or more Federal agencies are already doing, you say to yourself: "There is a real empire builder."

But the case of Senator George McGovern, Democrat, of South Dakota, may be a little different. He has, indeed, offered such a bill (S. 2274). The McGovern measure would set up a ponderously named bureaucracy called the National Economic Conversion Commission which, among other things, would "require" defense industries "to plan their own conversion to civilian production." It is Federal enforcement legislation out of the same drawer that gave us the business bossing blueprints within the civil rights bill.

McGovern's conversion commission for beating our national sword into a plowshare (peaceful competition with the Communists) is hardly necessary unless you think a new agency should be added either to supplement or replace several others in the same field. The other sword into plowshare bureaus are:

1. The Defense Department's Office of Economic Adjustment which is supposed to help communities recover from the loss of military installations and contracts.

2. The President's Committee on the Economic Impact of Defense and Disarmament. This group is one of L.B.J.'s own brain children. It sprang full born from his forehead last December when he first started cutting back military bases. It does its business through the very competent Council of Economic Advisers which reports directly to the President.

3. The State Department's Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. Its Assistant Director has the assigned duty of researching the economic impact of military disarmament.

4. The Departments of Labor and Commerce, as well as the Atomic Energy Commission, also have small offices at work on conversion.

McGovern is an earnest, touched in the conscience World War II bomber pilot. He is also a $22,000 taker of campaign funds from a secret membership ban-the-bomb outfit known as the Council for a Livable World. I have to confess to planting spies within the Livable World, and that is how I have learned why the peacemongers favor a parallel program of unilateral disarmament and unilateral conversion. The following is a brief paraphrase of their argument:

The Communist doctrine, and Communist leaders of today, hold that capitalism lives by the sword of conquest. Soviet economists believe that the United States would collapse were it not for its imperialistic programs. There are two ways in which we Americans can "take the lead for peace" and can prove ourselves peace lovers to the Russians.

One way is by unilateral disarmament, for which McGovern had made several Senate speeches and legislative proposals. The other is by unilateral conversion of arms into ice boxes, as envisioned in S. 2274. When the Russians see that we are really dismantling our weapons industry, they will (the peacemongers say) run as fast as they can to do likewise.

This summary I have given is roughly in the language of Prof. Seymour Melman of Columbia, who is one of McGovern's authorities and a disarmament propagandist in his own right.

It may be asked how American peacemongers seem to know so well what the Russians would like us to do. I cannot speak for Professor Melman, but I have learned a good deal about the Livable World, which has been supplying campaign funds and/or campaign speeches to disarmament-voting Senators McGovern, $22,000; McGee, $8,000; Burdick, $14,000; Fulbright, $2,500; Muskie, $300; and Clark, unknown; but perhaps as much as $20,000.

The Livable World's founder, Dr. Leo Szilard, who died last week, conducted a correspondence with Khrushchev and may have known how the Russians think about us. Drs. Halstead R. Holman and Hermann J. Muller, both scientific advisers to the Livable World, are on record by congressional committees as having been members of Communist fronts. They, too, may know how the Communists think concerning American disarmament.

In any event, unilateral disarmament and unilateral conversion go together in the peacemongers' plans.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, anyone taking the time to read the Alexander articles must admit that they are written in straightforward, unequivocating language. Whether one agrees with the conclusions drawn therein or not, there can be no doubt that Mr. Alexander has indeed raised some interesting questions which should certainly not be shunted aside with irresponsible and meaningless charges. Whenever we have an organization that hopes to be able to spend $20 million each year in campaign contributions or $30 million over a 4-year period, we have a powerful force which is bound to be highly controversial. And when such an organization has as one of its general aims the removal of the main obstacles to disarmament, that controversy is bound to be heightened.

After having read the council's so-called action program as well as some of their very recent literature, I am sure we have just begun to scratch the surface of this controversy.

Those connected with the council deny its tendencies toward unilateral disarmament, but it is difficult to be sympathetic toward their protestations in view of the statements published by the council. While there is no flat statement of adherence to a policy of unilateral disarmament, there certainly are statements that leave room for doubt. For example, the council's action program states that:

> Unilateral initiatives in arms control and in partial disarmament measures can help to create a more favorable atmosphere for fruitful disarmament negotiations, as, for example, if the United States were to adopt a strategic policy of using its nuclear weapons only for retaliation in kind, or if we were to dismantle vulnerable missile bases in Europe.

For the purpose of protecting both the council and myself from any misquoting or quoting out of context, I request unanimous consent to include in the Record at this point in my remarks the immediate action program of the Council for a Livable World.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Is there objection?

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, if the statement to which the Senator has referred is reasonably brief, I wonder if he would mind reading it into the Record, so we can hear the program to which he has referred.

Mr. DOMINICK. I shall be glad to do so. It is a one-page document. It should not take me very long to read it. It reads:

> The council will pursue these aims by identifying and pressing for specific objectives which appear to be currently attainable. The action program will be limited to measures for which it appears possible to generate support within the administration and Congress. The program may omit certain objectives considered by many individuals and groups to be eminently desirable and which, in the long run, may indeed be necessary. However, the council is restricting its action program to objectives it believes have reasonable prospects for realization in the near future and—to be effective—it must be selective even with respect to these.

THE IMMEDIATE ACTION PROGRAM

> 1. Toward removing obstacles to a disarmament agreement, the council proposes—
>
> (a) To take the initiative in establishing a nongovernmental joint Russian-American staff study on the problem of maintaining and securing the peace in a disarmed world.
>
> (b) To seek the cooperation of labor and industry in promoting the passage by Congress of legislation which would facilitate the orderly transition of our economy from high arms expenditures to low ones. Such legislation would include measures providing for Federal retraining of labor; for Federal housing for relocated workers; and for substantial compensation to industry for losses from such causes as canceled contracts, retooling and reconversion for nonmilitary production during the period of transition.
>
> 2. Toward halting the arms race before it reaches the point of no return and promoting a first-stage arms reduction agreement, the council proposes that—
>
> (a) The United States renounce, at the earliest possible date, any intention of

> achieving a strategic nuclear weapons capacity sufficient for substantially destroying in a single massive attack the Russian retaliatory forces.
>
> (b) U.S. Government agencies concerned with the disarmament negotiations concentrate on attaining a workable first-stage disarmament agreement with the Soviet Union aimed at the substantial reduction of nuclear weapons delivery capabilities.
>
> 3. Toward diminishing the risk of war and promoting cooperation between nations, the council proposes that—
>
> (a) U.S. delegations to the United Nations and other international bodies shall treat each issue separately rather than as an element of cold war, and shall base their negotiations on the merits of each case rather than upon the desire to win essentially meaningless diplomatic victories, and that this policy shall be clarified to the American people.
>
> (b) The United States lift all geographical restrictions on foreign travel by American citizens, and that the prohibition against travel in certain countries, currently printed in American passports, be replaced by a simple listing of countries where the United States does not have diplomatic facilities and where, accordingly, the passport is useful for identification purposes only.
>
> (c) The United States seek, if possible, under the auspices of the United Nations, the establishment of a nuclear-free zone (with a prohibition against installation of offensive missile bases and offensive nuclear weapons delivery systems) in Latin America and in other regions of the world where nuclear weapons technology has not yet been independently developed, such as Africa and the Near East.
>
> 4. Toward reducing the likelihood of escalation in the event of a war, the council urges that—
>
> (a) In order to be in a position at the earliest possible date to renounce the first use of tactical as well as strategic nuclear weapons, the United States shall take all possible steps to redress the current imbalance in conventional armed forces between the Warsaw Pact and NATO countries. The most desirable method of achieving this end would be to include in a first-stage disarmament agreement a provision for the reduction of conventional arms and forces in-being. In the absence of such an agreement, the United States should make every effort to convince our NATO allies to increase their conventional forces to adequate levels, at the same time discouraging by all means possible, the development of an independent NATO nuclear capability.
>
> (b) American nuclear warheads and bombs shall be withdrawn from advanced positions in West Germany, that they shall not be located, stockpiled, or distributed to troops in any area of confrontation with opposing forces or in zones of actual conflict and that, wherever located, they shall be retained in American hands under effective American control.

That is as much of the action program as I have available at the moment.

As I indicated earlier in my remarks, the Council for a Livable World has adopted a highly practical route toward achieving its goals. This route is a political one wherein the council provides financial support to those candidates it feels adhere to its policies, and an indication of the scope of their effort can be seen in the following excerpt from a letter to a council supporter from the executive director, H. Ashton Crosby. The letter, dated May 5, 1964, reads in part as follows:

> The council further recommends that, unless you have specific desires relating to the support of some particular candidate, that contributions now be given to the following priority candidates according to the following recommended alphabetical apportionment: Montoya, A—D; McGee, E—K; Muskie, L—P; Moss, Q—S; Harding, T—Z.
>
> This means that if your last name begins with a letter A through D you are to make your contribution check out directly to Mr. Montoya.

Mr. Montoya is presently engaged in a campaign against Senator Mechem.

If it begins with a letter E through K, the check should be made out to Mr. McGee, and so forth. I continue to read:

> You will note that, with its recommendation of Congressman Harding for support, the council is departing from the precedent of soliciting support only for candidates for the Senate. However, we feel that in this case, the reelection of Mr. Harding is the first step toward our support of this outstanding young legislator for election to the Senate in 1966.

I presume that is when Senator Jordan of Idaho will come up for reelection.

We have here, then, a new organization bringing to bear on Congress, and particularly the Senate, new pressures on matters of armament and defense policies. It is highly organized, apparently well financed, and obviously an articulate exponent of a particular philosophy which has every right to be heard. By the same token, when its pressures are being brought to bear in such an important sphere of our national security, it cannot expect to foreclose reasonable debate regarding the wisdom and efficacy of its programs and proposals. I am sure the Members of this body will hear more of the Council for a Livable World and I look forward to learning more about its goals, achievements, operational techniques and personnel as the weeks pass.

At present, the tendency on the part of those who advocate disarmament to underplay the aggressive intentions of the Communists and overemphasize the foibles and shortcomings of the free world nations has me deeply concerned. Try as we will to attribute reasonable, rational, and peaceful gestures to the Communists, the words of the House Committee on Un-American Activities come back to haunt us. In discussing the changes in the Communist Party line they state in House Document No. 398 of December 1, 1961, after this administration had taken office:

> There has never been a change in one basic Communist purpose from 1918 to the present date, however—the eventual elimination of non-Communist governments and the establishment of world hegemony for the Soviet Union.

In August of 1959, Mr. Arthur Baker, for 22 years chief of the parliamentary staff of the Times of London, outlined current Communist strategy to divide Europe. I hope Senators will listen to this, because it is quite pertinent. He stated the following steps:

> First, divide Britain from Germany, France, and the United States.
>
> Second, promote Western trade with Russia and China to the detriment of trade with free nations.
>
> Third, encourage steady organized breakdown of moral standards and so weaken Britain's moral fiber.
>
> Fourth, advocate the abolition of nuclear weapons and promote a concept of peaceful coexistence that will mean death.

The obvious conclusion is that in spite of Soviet peace talk and apparent ideological difference between Russia and China, world communism has and is continuing to advance in the less developed areas of the world. We must not confuse words with action and talks of peace with peace itself.

While it is all very well to talk of elimination of first strike capability, cessation of development of any ballistic missile defense system and unilateral steps designed to show good faith, it is certainly not a pragmatic approach to the hard realities of the day. There is no doubt about America's intentions in the minds of the leaders of the Communist movement. It is in fact this knowledge that gives them the audacity to start brush fires in remote areas of the world. It is also this knowledge that makes them pull up short of a full scale showdown. It is the paradoxical nature of our time that it is this very thing which the disarmers would take away from us that has prevented world war. As Sir Winston Churchill pointed out, it has been the overwhelming nuclear superiority of the United States that has kept the peace.

I pray that we may never lose that superiority.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield.

Mr. SIMPSON. I compliment the distinguished junior Senator from Colorado upon his courageous and restrained remarks. The Senator from Colorado has made an important, articulate speech, and I wish to associate myself with each and every one of his statements, particularly those concerning my friend the eminent journalist and author, Holmes Alexander and Congressman Berry—an able legislator and a man of unimpeachable integrity. Senator Dominick and I are of like mind on the merits of these two gentlemen. Holmes is a gentleman noted in the world of those who live by the pen as a man of unassailable probity, integrity, and character. I am confident that the attacks upon him by the Council for a Livable World and its spokesmen will produce no blot on his escutcheon for he is established as a man who has spent a lifetime in the pursuit and reporting of the truth.

As anyone who follows Holmes Alexander's columns can verify, he is what journalism regards as a "fact man." He does not deal in sensationalism or inuendo. His columns concerning the Council for a Livable World have reported factual names, dates, and places and incidents and brought to the public's attention the existence of an organization which has become a significant power in the process of congressional elections.

As Senator Dominick has pointed out, Holmes Alexander has a long and distinguished career in journalism. He is author of 8 books and he has a syndicated column which is carried in well over 150 newspapers throughout the United States. He is known as a shoeleather journalist who gets his information by going out and asking questions. At the ripe young age of 24, Holmes was elected on the Democratic ticket to the Maryland House of Delegates where he served until 1935 and in the words of our colleague, Senator Brewster, "In days of bossism and recognized political machines, independence was his motto."

So there will be no lingering doubt as to the qualifications of Holmes Alexander to comment on the issues of the day, I should like at this juncture in my remarks to have printed in the Record a portion of a biography on the columnist.

There being no objection, the biography was ordered printed in the Record, as follows:

A nationally syndicated column with Holmes Alexander's comments on national and foreign affairs has been appearing 5 days a week since 1947 in about 100 newspapers—among them the Houston Chronicle, Los Angeles Times, New Orleans States, Salt Lake City Tribune, Boston Herald, and Philadelphia Bulletin. He is recognized as one of the most astute reporters of political activities in Washington, D.C.

Alexander's long and varied career in journalism began in 1932 when his articles were first published in national magazines. In 1946 he was senior editor of Kiplinger's magazine. He is the author of three novels published by Harper and two biographies (of Martin Van Buren and Aaron Burr), and "Tomorrow's Air Age: A Report on the Foreseeable Future" (Rinehart, 1953). On March 6, 1956, he was a guest on Lynn Poole's television program, "Tomorrow's Careers," during which he discussed his career as a newspaper columnist and author.

Holmes Moss Alexander was born on January 29, 1906, in Parkersburg, W. Va., one of four children of Charles B. and Margaret (Moss) Alexander. His father was in the insurance business. He was educated at the Gilman School in Baltimore and at Princeton University, where he majored in English and received his B.A. degree in 1928. He took postgraduate work in England at Trinity College, Cambridge University.

On returning to the United States after his study in England, Alexander took a post at the McDonogh School, in McDonogh, Md. There he taught English and coached wrestling and polo. In 1931 he gave up teaching to embark on a political career. At the age of 24 he was elected on the Democratic ticket to the Maryland House of Delegates, serving until 1935.

Politics proved to be a stimulating but essentially a disillusioning experience for the young legislator. In two magazine articles, "The Case for Skepticism," published in Scribner's magazine in December 1932, and "I Hold Office," published in Harper's in September 1933, Alexander described his brief political career. "I charged into the political lists wearing white plumes of idealism," he wrote in Scribner's. "I was able to accomplish election because I was drafted onto an organization ticket, and because I mustered the patience to play that part until the votes were cast. Once firmly seated in office, I took a short and altruistic fling at lonewolfing it, but soon I was back in the fold participating in one transaction after another which a brief while before I would have considered outrageous and beneath me."

Renouncing public life, Alexander turned to writing. Ever since childhood, he confessed in an article, "So You're Going To Be a Writer," in the Writer (October 1942), he had been addicted to "an overfondness for words," a habit acquired, he thinks, in his boyhood while listening to sermons in the Episcopal church.

From 1934 until 1941, Alexander wrote fiction and fact articles for Country Life, Collier's, and the Saturday Evening Post. A publisher who had seen his two articles on his experiences in the State legislature invited him to submit a political novel. Alexander made several unsuccessful attempts at writing one. Ultimately, he produced not a novel but a political biography. He writes (in "The Wrong Ways To Write Biography," in A. S. Burack's the Writer's Handbook, 1949): "I became a biographer only because it was the next best thing to being a novelist. * * * In short, biography was for me a reprieve from the madhouse of literary frustration."

The biography was "The American Talleyrand: The Career and Contemporaries of Martin Van Buren, Eighth President," published in 1935. It was an unsympathetic portrait, presented, as Reviewer Avery Craven remarked in the New York Herald Tribune books (July 7, 1935), "in a crisp, dramatic way." The historian Allan Nevins commented in the Saturday Review of Literature (May 4, 1935): "The author is not interested in national policies, but in the tricks, the wiles, the disappointments, and the victories of a politician. It is not a high mark, but the book hits it."

A second biography, "Aaron Burr: The Proud Pretender," followed in 1937. Alexander interpreted the complex character of Burr in a way that was neither apology nor condemnation. He saw his subject as a man motivated by the Nietzschean philosophy of the superman. The result, Henry Steele Commager observed in Books (Feb. 7, 1937), was that "he has illuminated our understanding of Burr." Writing in the Saturday Review of Literature (Feb. 13, 1937), Allan Nevins commented: "On the whole, this is an accurate, comprehensive, and vividly written biography."

Three novels have been written by Alexander: "American Nabob" (Harper, 1939), "Dust in the Afternoon" (serialized in the Saturday Evening Post in August 1940 and published by Harper in the same year); and "Selina" (Harper, 1942). Of "American Nabob" the New Yorker reviewer wrote: "A carefully done American historical novel of the middle 1800's in Virginia and West Virginia. The hero is the strong, unscrupulous entrepreneur type." Of "Dust in the Afternoon," a story of a boy who wanted to be a professional ballplayer and a girl who wanted to be an actress, Books commented: "As a report of what goes on in the training camp and the ball park, it is vivid and highly entertaining. It is written with feeling and without flourish in a swift, slangy economy of style." Of "Selina," the New York Times observed: "The story (of one of the first families of Maryland and the descendants of a tugboat captain) is well written and entertaining with plenty of incident and an exciting horse race to give it zest." The Springfield Republican reviewer called Alexander's style "smooth and facile."

In 1942 Alexander enlisted in the Army Air Forces and received the rank of first lieutenant. He was discharged in 1945 with the rank of major and was awarded the Army Air Medal. He described his wartime experiences training Air Force men in lifesaving techniques and in the actual rescue of survivors of plane crashes at sea in an article in the Saturday Evening Post, January 13, 1945, called "Fishers of Men."

When he returned to civilian life after World War II, Alexander resumed his freelance writing and began concentrating in his articles on national and international affairs. He continued to contribute to the Saturday Evening Post and to Collier's. In addition, he wrote regularly during 1951 for Nation's Business, contributing articles on the Congressional elections of that year, on present-day American relations with small nations, on trends in management and labor. He also wrote book reviews and covered political news for the Baltimore Sun. In 1953 Rinehart published his book, "Tomorrow's Air Age: A Report on the Foreseeable Future." The New York Herald Tribune Book Review (Dec. 20, 1953) commented: "This is not so much a study of aviation as it is the examination of man's potential adjustment to the frightening environment just ahead * * * a stimulating report."

Alexander came to newspaper writing via a position which he took in 1946 as senior editor of Kiplinger's magazine in Washington, D.C. At about the same time he began contributing a weekly newsletter on Washington affairs to a small Maryland weekly. These letters came to the attention of the McNaught Syndicate, and in June 1947, his column began appearing in newspapers throughout the country. He calls himself a "shoeleather" type of columnist who gets his information by going out and asking questions.

Holmes Alexander and Mary Barksdale, a schoolteacher, were married on June 24, 1933. They have three children—Hunter Holmes, Peter Barksdale, and Mary Madge. For 15 years the Alexanders lived on a farm in McDonogh, Md., which they had bought as a small-scale operation, intending only to raise enough to meet their family needs. As Alexander described it in an article, "I Sold My Farm—Hooray" in the American Mercury (Mar. 1955), they found farming a costly and profitless operation. They now live in Washington. The columnist is 5 feet 8 inches tall, weighs 175 pounds, and has reddish hair and gray eyes. His favorite recreations used to be steeplechase, polo, and foxhunting, but at present he describes himself as a "sedentary baseball fan." He also enjoys reading in American history.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, no American journalist is less deserving than Holmes Alexander of the villification and abuse from an organization, the stripe of the Council for a Livable World. I have had occasion to read his columns on that lobby group and I can attest to the dispassionance of his writing and his obvious attempts to be objective and factual in every respect.

Mr. President, from what I know of the Council for a Livable World I would say that it is very much the image of the John Birch Society. Both of them have secret membership lists, each of them is headed or was headed by an extremist. The council's founder, the late Dr. Leo Szilard, had proposed before Cyrus Eaton's Pugwash Conference, the destruction of American civil liberties before the law. This is at least on all fours with Welch's attacks upon the Supreme Court. The Council for a Livable World supported the political campaigns of men who openly support unilateral disarmament.

I am advised that Holmes Alexander has, in his possession, a draft of "program action" papers in which the council proposes nuclear disarmament and unilateral destruction of part of our bomber fleet. I understand that this part was reedited after Alexander's first articles appeared but the changes appeared to be of a semantical rather than substantive nature. The council has a speech factory which leans on the moonlighting predilections of arms control and disarmament functionaries to grind out reams of disarmament material. It is a tribute to various Senators who have been approached to espouse these writings that very few of them have chosen to do so.

The Council for a Livable World and its chief protagonist, its executive director, Col. H. Ashton Crosby, hesitate not for a moment to discredit their critics by trying to tie them to the coattails of the John Birch Society. In a letter which appeared recently in a Wyoming newspaper, Colonel Crosby sought to justify his smear attack on Holmes Alexander on the grounds that "I have 14 combat decorations." The council takes great delight in employing the same tactics that were called "McCarthyism" a decade ago.

I reiterate, Mr. President, that the Senator from Colorado has made a very important speech, a speech which should be read by Members of both sides of the aisle and by the public, for the Council for a Livable World, whatever its true intent and identity may be, is advocating the "unloaded rifle" and the "sheathed sword" in the face of an armed and aggressive opponent. I hope that this discussion on the Senate floor will prove the spark for a thoroughgoing and very comprehensive investigation into the activities of the Council for a Livable World.

I congratulate the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. DOMINICK. I appreciate the colloquy and the comments which have been made by the distinguished Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. DOMINICK. I am glad to yield to my colleague.

Mr. ALLOTT. I compliment my colleague for what he has said today. It seems to me that there is nothing more important in this day and age than that we try to preserve persons of integrity who do have integrity. No one can attack the integrity of either Representative Berry, of South Dakota, or Mr. Alexander.

Second, I believe that the Senator has pointed out there are influences at work which most Senators believe to be contrary to the interests of the country. I can imagine nothing more than starting upon a course of unilateral action on disarmament. Of course, this is what is advocated in the statements of principle.

I congratulate my colleague. He has rendered a very great service, not only in coming to the defense of those who have been so bitterly and so unjustly attacked, but also in pointing out the real purposes of this organization, and the depths to which it reaches into our Government.

Mr. DOMINICK. I appreciate the comments of my distinguished colleague. The first time I ever heard of the Council for a Livable World was when it wrote to me asking for my comments on two questions. The questions related to the best method of preserving peace. Both questions assumed that disarmament would promote and preserve peace. I wrote back that the questions were misdirected. Not knowing anything about the organization, I suggested that what they should think about was the best way to preserve peace from its historic standpoint. From then on, I started hearing from them. It was rather interesting.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. DOMINICK. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I listened with interest to the names of the men who were being included for political contributions by the Council for a Livable World in this coming election. I am shocked to realize that four of the five come from the Mountain States, the theory being, I suppose, that either the people of the Mountain States are more gullible and more willing to buy this false doctrine of peace by weakness, or else the Mountain States are poor and sparsely populated States and it is possible to elect a Senator from a State of that kind with a smaller investment of the council's funds.

The list includes Representative Montoya who is running against the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Mechem], and my own colleague, the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss], who is running for reelection in Utah, and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee], who is running in Wyoming. I was very much interested in the pious hope of the council that Representative Harding from Idaho—also a Mountain State—would be able to defeat the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Jordan] in 1966.

I wonder how the Senator from Maine [Mr. Muskie] and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGovern] got on this list, because Maine and South Dakota are not Mountain States. I assume, however, that since they are small States and that the principle thus still applies, that the council could probably try to "buy" a Senate seat from a small State more cheaply than from one of the larger States.

I suppose if both Senators from Colorado were running this year, there would be an entry in that race from Colorado.

The same type of group contributed generously to the campaign of my opponent in 1962, David S. King.

I should like to warn the members of the Council for a Livable World that we in the Mountain States are not that kind of people. We believe in maintaining the strength of the United States. We believe in electing Members of Congress who believe in a strong America and I am afraid they are doing my colleague and these other candidates a real disservice in alining them and identifying them as men who accept the support of an organization of this kind.

Mr. DOMINICK. I very much appreciate the comments made by the Senator from Utah.

Senators might be interested in knowing that in one of Holmes Alexander's articles which will appear in the Record of my whole speech, which I introduced by unanimous consent, there appears a list of the amount of money that was contributed in the last election—the 1962 elections on the various candidates. There may be more of it, as I recall—either the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGovern] or the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Burdick], or the Senator from Maine [Mr. Muskie] came out with $342.50. I do not know what happened to the Senator from Maine [Mr. Muskie], but he certainly did not receive the support of the rest of them.

Mr. BENNETT. Then I have misunderstood the Senator's comments. The Senator from Maine [Mr. Muskie] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Burdick] have been supported. Theirs is a past story. But Representative Montoya, from New Mexico, the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee] and Representative Harding will be supported in this present election, or the elections to come.

Mr. DOMINICK. It is my understanding that this is correct, and also that the Senator from Maine [Mr. Muskie] is being supported in the election to come.

Each of these articles written by Mr. Alexander, as I understand, referred back to the previous election.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I congratulate with all the vigor and sincerity that I possess the junior Senator from Colorado on the speech which he has just made.

Those of us who know Holmes Alexander and know something about his background and follow his writings, know that he is one of the most honest, objective, and vigorous members of the fourth estate—and he has been that for many years. He writes facts. He does not speculate or philosophize based upon strange theories which he may desire to pontificate upon. He writes facts. He is objective. He supports those facts with the evidence whenever it is necessary. He is one the great, objective journalists contemporary with our times.

Mr. President (Mr. McIntyre in the chair), the Senator's exposition of the activities of this interesting and, I believe in the main, confused and muddled organization called the Council for the Livable World—I say in the main confused and muddled, because I believe that the directors or the organization and those responsible for its format and its advancement are not confused and know exactly where they are going—are going down the line to collectivism under the banner of peace. They have solicited many muddled people to join the organization under a false impression that they really stand for an honorable and a reliable peace, which in my judgment is not the case.

It is a strange thing that over the years there has been one red flag which has always called attention to organizations and has laid the basis or the reason for inquiry as to just what is the genesis of this particular organization or that—that is, when it includes in its title the word "peace."

It has been a standard format for Communist infiltration into organizations in this country. The word "peace" has been used to intrigue many well-meaning people who wish peace; but one will find that so many of those organizations are Communist-front organizations in which perhaps the majority of the membership are not aware of it, but where the insidious management of that organization through its executive secretariat or its publicity directors, or something else, weave their way into the control propaganda mechanism of those organizations.

Not every organization which has the word "peace" in its title, of course, is Communist oriented or fellow-traveler oriented. However, it is interesting to note that as we go down the list of the organizations cited by the various official bodies in this country as being fellow-traveler organizations, it is interesting and fascinating to note in many of them the use of this word "peace" as an attractive element to gain adherence from people who really earnestly and zealously desire peace.

If we follow the philosophy of this organization in saying that it is for a livable world; if we follow its philosophy on the disarament of the country, we might as well follow the philosophy of "peace to the grave." The grave is peace. There is no question about that. Their philosophy would lead us down the road to not only material, but spiritual and political destruction in this country.

The Senator should be commended. I commend him for bringing this matter to the attention of the Senate, and for canvassing the situation as it exists, stimulated as it was by the unjustifiable criticism of Holmes Alexander, who should be praised by every freedom-loving American, rather than condemned.

Mr. DOMINICK. I agree with the Senator. Holmes Alexander has done a great deal of investigation of this subject. In one of his articles, which I have included in the Record for the information of my distinguished colleagues, we were told that there are two members of the Scientists Advisory Committee to this council who have been cited for being members of pro-Communist or fellow-traveler organizations, which have been listed on the Attorney General's list.

So, there are two people at least on the Scientists Advisory Committee, according to the article, who have been influential in part on this group. How many more there are, of course, we cannot tell. But this is a good organization. It is a part of the problem that we face.

As I was concluding, the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson] came by and informed me, which I am sure is correct—and I have no reason to doubt it—that Senator Burdick returned the contribution he received from the Council for a Livable World. I do not know whether that is true or not. But I wanted to state it for the Record.

I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I thank my colleague, and I want to thank him for performing a service this afternoon in bringing to the attention of the Senate and the general public how one of these organizations is operated, and also for having printed in the Record information in perspective regarding the very able and distinguished Representative from South Dakota, Mr. Berry, and the distinguished, hard-working, and thorough Columnist Holmes Alexander. It has been my observation in reading the writings of Holmes Alexander that he is factual and objective. I have observed that he does much independent digging for himself in the true tradition of the school of journalism. He is loath to swallow handouts. He would much prefer to dig out the facts for himself. As a result, those who read him have derived considerable benefit in getting the facts which we need to have an informed general public. Had it not been for Holmes Alexander, I believe there are a great many people who would not have known anything about the Council for a Livable World. Had it not been for the Senator from Colorado bringing this matter to the attention of the Senate, there are a great many others who would not have become acquainted with this organization.

I think that the point that should be drawn from this colloquy this afternoon and the excellent speech of my colleague is that the American people should appreciate the importance of having a fair and objective, factual-reporting press. Unless the American people receive the facts from reporters such as Holmes Alexander we cannot possibly have an enlightened and informed public opinion. Unless they know about the existence of certain organizations, unless they know how these organizations operate, how can they possibly evaluate the activities of some members of our legislative bodies?

I can think of no more effective way of doing away with the American way of life—as I am afraid some would like to do—than to have it legislated away. This would not be done in the name of doing away with the American way of life. It would be done in the name of preserving and enhancing the American way of life. But I am not talking about the label. I am talking about what would actually result from some of the legislation which would occur. I venture to say that there are some organizations—and I am not saying that the council, to which the Senator from Colorado alluded, would be among these—which would like to see the U.S. Congress not appropriate any money at all for national defense.

Mr. DOMINICK. I am positive of that.

Mr. MILLER. How better to get the job done than to exercise influence through campaign contributions and otherwise to elect people to Congress who are friendly to this idea? This is the insidiousness of this type of approach. It is difficult to draw a line. Members of many organizations are there because of conscientiously held beliefs—under the direction, however, of people who are deliberately and calculatingly going in a devious direction.

We all know that many members of organizations which are labeled "subversive" are well meaning—but they are well meaning dupes. I think that what my colleague, Senator Hickenlooper, had to say about the directors of some of these organizations was very well put.

Mr. DOMINICK. Yes. There seems to be little or no question that Mr. Crosby, who was an executive director of the Council for a Livable World, was an extraordinarily heroic American citizen in World War II on behalf of our own forces.

It is my understanding that he received three Silver Stars, a Croix de Guerre, and a variety of other medals. I do not think there is any doubt that he was a real fighter in World War II. There is also little or no doubt that in some instances, he has tried to use his influence to attempt to change some of the wording and tenor of the policy of the council. It would not seem, in view of the program which the Senator from South Dakota actually read into the Record, that he is being very successful in the overall objective of being sure that any disarmament that may come about is consistent only with our ability to repel attack from our enemy.

Mr. MILLER. I think it is very fair for the Senator from Colorado to bring that point out. This, of course, raises another interesting question. How can it be that some of the heroes who received many decorations and performed outstanding service for our country during wartime end by being linked with organizations which are questionable in their objectives? No one knows. But we know that there are examples of such people who have changed. People's philosophies can change from that of being dedicated to the service of the American way of life to being dedicated to the service of communism, and vice versa. But the mere fact that one has had an outstanding war record does not mark him forevermore as one who should never be questioned.

Mr. DOMINICK. That is correct. I wanted to see that it was printed in the Record.

Mr. MILLER. There is much unrealistic thinking on the question of dealing with Communist aggression. The Senator from Colorado has joined me in criticizing the accommodation policy of dealing with Communist aggression, which I regret to say is what we have been generally operating under for the last 3½ years. The line between that and something worse is very difficult to draw.

A service has been rendered on the floor of the Senate this afternoon by bringing these points to the attention of the Senate, not with any axes to grind—not that approach at all—but objectively, thoughfully setting forth facts from which the people can draw their own conclusions. That is the type of service that should be rendered not only by Members of the Senate, but also by members of the press. Let the people have the facts, and then let them draw their own conclusions, and I think our country will get along very well.

Mr. DOMINICK. I appreciate the comments and the colloquy of my distinguished friend. One of the things that impelled me to speak on the subject was my own personal friendship for Mr. E. Y. Berry, with whom I served for a term in Congress. I not only served in Congress with him but also I served on committees with him. So I know his ability and his reputation. I know his conscientious performance of his duties.

I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I congratulate the Senator from Colorado on his very timely and appropriate remarks in connection with Mr. Holmes Alexander and his series of articles on the Council for a Livable World. I have followed Mr. Alexander's writings in newspapers, magazines, and books for some years and have learned to respect both his judgment and objectivity.

From what I have learned of the Council for a Livable World, Mr. Alexander's columns on this organization were accurate and objective, but restrained. He did a real service to his country by pointing out the growing influence of so-called pacifist organizations which are advocating unilateral disarmament by the United States. As the Senator from Colorado has so ably pointed out, the Council for a Livable World despite its evasive denials has unquestionably advocated and urged what it calls "unilateral initiatives in arms control and in partial disarmament measures." Such organizations by their misleading propaganda could jeopardize the security of the United States and Mr. Alexander, by calling attention to this organization and its purposes in his series of articles, has performed a significant service to his country and, I hope, contributed to the national security of the Nation by exposing the council's program for unilateral disarmament.

Mr. President, I can imagine nothing more detrimental to this country than unilateral disarmament. That is exactly what Mr. Khrushchev and the Communists would like to see us do. Can we be so naive as to feel that we can disarm, hoping that the Communists are evolving and changing into a nonaggressive society which can be trusted? Lenin laid down the goal of the Communists in 1917, when he took over Russia, and at that time said:

> The aim of the Soviets is to be the gravediggers, the heirs, and the successors to the governments of the world.

That goal has never changed. It is their goal today. The goal of the Communists today is to take over the world. The only country that stands in their way is the United States. If we disarm unilaterally, the Communists will take over us and the rest of the world. If we unilaterally disarm, they will then be in a position to say, "Do you now wish to surrender, or do you wish to be destroyed?" It will be one or the other. If we disarm, we shall be forced to surrender or be destroyed.

Mr. President, the most asinine course that our country could follow would be to disarm. Yet prominent people in Government and in private life are today advocating disarmament, even without requiring inspections. There are organizations in this country advocating disarmament, and the Council for a Livable World is one of those organizations. I am proud that Holmes Alexander had the foresight, the wisdom, and the courage to expose this Council for a Livable World for the dangerous organization it is. Again, I compliment the able Senator from Colorado for the timely and pertinent remarks he made on this subject today.

Mr. DOMINICK. I appreciate the comments of the Senator from South Carolina. I fully agree with his analysis of the need for continued defense on our part to prevent the takeover of the world by the Communist conspiracy.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, first, I thank the Senator from Colorado for his courtesy in notifying me yesterday, and again today, of his intention to discuss the subject that he has taken up in considerable detail this afternoon. I have no quarrel whatsoever with the Senator from Colorado. He and I have served together on the same committee—the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs—and when he was recently attacked in a most unfair and, I thought, unethical manner, I was among those who joined in protesting the attack that was made on the junior Senator from Colorado.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McGOVERN. I yield.

Mr. DOMINICK. I very much appreciated the Senator's support at that time. As I said earlier in my speech, I am not in any way impugning the integrity, the patriotism, the reliability, or anything else of the junior Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. McGOVERN. I appreciate that. The Senator has taken issue with me this afternoon because of the brief statement which I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which I made on the floor of the Senate on June 8. In that statement I attempted to defend myself and other distinguished Members of the Senate, and the Council for a Livable World against what I am convinced today, as I was then, were unjustified attacks by a Washington journalist. Those attacks in turn were inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by the senior Representative from South Dakota in the House of Representatives, and I felt constrained to make some explanation of his connection with this attack.

I wish to stress that I did not initiate the exchange that was responsible for the controversy that has developed this afternoon. I did not reply to Mr. Holmes Alexander until he had printed a series of articles casting doubts on my judgment, casting doubt on an organization and a group of fine people who supported my candidacy, and casting doubt on the judgment and the integrity of other Senators. Only after a series of such articles appeared in the press of the Nation did I see fit to take the floor of the Senate and offer a brief reply.

The Senator from Colorado has said that he felt constrained to take the floor this afternoon to speak out against what he called charges garbled on the winds of innuendo rather than enunciated by the sweet voice of reason.

It was for exactly that same reason that I took the floor to try to set the record straight with regard to the charges that had been leveled against me, the Council for a Livable World, and other Senators. We have heard numerous statements made by distinguished Republican Members of the Senate as to the accuracy and the reliability of Mr. Alexander's charges, and the care with which he approaches the subjects that go into his syndicated column. I should like to take a very few minutes to comment on a few of the factual errors as well as gross distortions that have gone into the columns of this distinguished journalist. In his column of April 9, he said that—

> Senator MCGOVERN won his election by 200 votes.

I especially take exception to that statement, because I had such a hard time winning that election that I wish to get credit for every last vote that I compiled in my margin. It should have been 597. This may not seem very consequential to Members of the Senate, but to me the 397 votes Mr. Alexander overlooked amount to 197 percent error—which is a pretty big margin of error and not very factual, carefully checked reporting. I wish to set that one factual error straight today.

Mr. Alexander also said, in this first column in criticism of me, that the council contributed $12,000 to my campaign. I want to correct that error, because I had at least as much trouble getting financial support for my campaign as I had getting a majority of votes. I want to be sure I get credit for the financial support that was given. Actually, the amount stated should have been $22,000, not $12,000. Actually, the bulk of the money was not from the council but from individuals acting on the council's recommendation. I am eternally grateful to the people who contributed that $22,000. Most of that amount came in the form of contributions of $25, $15, $10, some up to $100, from teachers, professors, scientists, engineers, people from all over the country who believe in some of the things in which I believe. So I want to correct this misimpression. The error in amount is not so serious, because Mr. Alexander straightened it out in a subsequent article.

But now to come to a more serious error, he refers to the council as a pacifist lobby and as a unilateral disarmament group. Members of the Senate here today have repeated these charges, relying on his statement. Those charges are totally false. They are 100 percent in error. Distinguished Senators on the Republican side of the aisle who have talked about the aims and objectives of the council in terms of unilateral disarmament do not know what they are talking about. They do not know the objectives of the council. They have accepted Mr. Holmes' inaccuracies and they consequently are completely wrong in their interpretation of what the council stands for.

There is basically no difference in the aims and objectives of the Council for a Livable World and the aims and objectives of the Eisenhower administration, the Kennedy administration, and the Johnson administration.

All those administrations have been dedicated to a reduction of tensions in the world, to a reduction of unnecessary armaments, and to trying to arrive at some kind of agreement with our competitors and with our potential enemies to reduce the overall level of the armament buildup, not only in our country, but in the enemy camp. There is no basis for the statement that the Council for a Livable World, as has been suggested, is for pacifism or for unilateral disarmament.

I shall take the time to read into the Record a very brief letter from the director of the council, in order to set forth the objectives, the philosophy, and the aims of this organization, which has contributed to Senators on both sides of the aisle in their election campaigns.

The letter to which I am referring was sent to Members of the Senate on May 13. At least, I received a copy, and I know a number of other Members of the Senate did, too. The letter is over the signature of H. Ashton Crosby, executive director of the council.

Before I read the letter, I want to say that Mr. Crosby is a strange pacifist, indeed, when we consider that he has spent a lifetime in military service. He is a retired Army colonel. He stepped out of uniform a few months ago. He won the Silver Star, the Purple Heart, and numerous other decorations for bravery. I would put his patriotism and judgment in matters of peace and war up against those of any Member of the Senate. The letter reads:

> Dear Senator McGovern: I have been asked by a number of Senators within the past few months as to what precisely the council stands for and what it is trying to do. Essentially the council is striving to further the development of interest between the scientific and political communities in the area of foreign affairs and, by recommending financial support to intelligent and thoughtful persons running for the Senate, contribute in some measure to constructive U.S. foreign and defense policies.
>
> The council is an organization devoted to developing realistic and practical programs in the fields of arms control and the easing of international tensions, taking into consideration the national and international political climate. The council stresses the concept of responsibility and is well aware of the practicalities and limitations inherent in disarmament negotiations and the necessities of safeguarding our national security. Our programs are advanced within this context.
>
> During the past few months the council has been under attack by columnist Holmes Alexander. His remarks have included the following statements:
>
> That the council is an extremist group favoring unilateral disarmament.
>
> That the council favors disarmament in the face of the enemy.
>
> That the council backed Stuart Hughes in the 1962 Massachusetts Senate election.

Then, coming back to Mr. Crosby's statement:

> The council never, at any time, recommended or solicited support for Mr. Hughes. The council has never at any time advocated unilateral disarmament or disarming in the face of the enemy.
>
> The council is not a pacifist organization. Neither the directors nor I as a retired regular officer with the well-being and security of our country foremost in mind, would ever advocate pacifism or unilateral disarmament.
>
> As the council becomes more effective in its operations, it will come under attack increasingly from those groups or individuals who for one reason or another are opposed to all measures leading to the easing of international tensions and arms limitations. The council recognizes this as a measure of its success.

Without in any way going into the motives of those who are attacking the objectives of the Council for a Livable World here today, I take note of the fact that this is an election year. We are approaching the 4th of July—the fireworks, and all that sort of thing. We are getting ready to go home and reaffirm our patriotism, which is fine. We are limbering up on issues that may be of value to us in the coming campaign. Perhaps that sheds some light on the enthusiasm with which numerous Members of the Senate have participated in the attack on the council this afternoon. Perhaps we are getting a preview of things to come.

I do not believe that the American people can be convinced that peace is a dirty word, or that efforts to bring about a worldwide reduction in armaments and arms expenditures, as Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson have all tried to do—to reduce danger and save money—are unpatriotic.

For my own part, I welcome the participation of distinguished scientists, engineers, technicians, teachers, professors, students, and others who are participating in the Council for a Livable World.

One of the men who was instrumental in establishing the council was the late Dr. Leo Szilard. There have been some innuendoes about Dr. Szilard, the great scientist, who died a few weeks ago. He was one of the men who were instrumental in persuading Dr. Albert Einstein to talk with President Roosevelt about the possibility of building the atomic bomb, and the danger of our enemy building it. Had it not been for the intervention of Dr. Szilard and Dr. Einstein, it is quite possible that the atomic bomb would have been built by our enemies rather than ourselves, and that the outcome of World War II would have been vastly different. These men foresaw and forewarned our Nation of its greatest peril in history.

Leo Szilard and the scientists and scholars who worked with him are men who know and understand most clearly the awful dangers of nuclear war. I think it is to their credit that they are demonstrating some degree of political responsibility, having brought this terrifying weapon into being. They have demonstrated their love for country and they are demonstrating their love for mankind when they participate in the democratic political processes, in free elections, to endorse candidates of their choice.

With regard to the charges that I have made against Mr. Alexander, what I have tried to do in my earlier remarks is to set the record straight with regard to the council's purpose and with regard to my own integrity as a Senator. I have not at any time introduced unilateral disarmament legislation, as charged by Mr. Alexander. I did not introduce any legislation at the request of the Council for a Livable World. What I try to do as a Member of the Senate—and I believe this is true of other Members of the body as well—is done out of my own conviction and because of my judgment that it is in the national interest.

With regard to what the Senator from Colorado has called unfair innuendoes about Mr. Alexander, I have drawn attention to his close affiliation with prominent members of the John Birch Society.

I have before me a book entitled "How To Read the Federalist," authored by Mr. Alexander. It was copyrighted in 1961 by Robert Welch, Inc. Everyone knows that Robert Welch is the prime mover, founder, president, chairman of the board, and everything else of the John Birch Society. There must have been some kind of conversation, some kind of negotiation, for Mr. Alexander's book to be copyrighted by the head of the John Birch Society.

If we consult back issues of the American Opinion magazine, which is the journal of the John Birch Society, edited by Mr. Robert Welch, we find in the issues for 1958 and 1959 a series of articles by Mr. Alexander, which later comprised the book to which Robert Welch, Inc., owns the copyright.

I have not suggested that Mr. Alexander is a member of the society. But I think it is a fair supposition, when his views, as expressed in his columns, so closely parallel many of the things advocated by the John Birch Society, that his articles are published in the journal and published as a book. That there is at least some degree of a meeting of the minds, some collaboration.

I think, too, that it is perfectly legitimate for me to draw attention to the fact that Representative Berry, who inserted the articles in the Appendix of the Record, was one of two Representatives who attended a meeting in Washington on March 20, 1962, called by Billy James Hargis who, if he is not a Bircher, is cheating somebody out of dues, a man who has referred to the National Council of Churches as a Communist-front, who has referred to the brotherhood of man as "hogwash," and who has made various other statements that seem to put him in very close identification with extreme rightwing, Birch-type organizations.

Let me stress again the fact that I did not initiate this quarrel with Mr. Alexander or with Mr. Berry. I replied to what I thought were unfair, untruthful, and distorted attacks on me and other Members of the Senate.

I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, first of all, let me say that when I came here this afternoon I had not intended to get into a fight, or even into an argument. But, as I sat here and listened to the statements, made largely on the other side of the aisle, about the Council for a Livable World, it became clear that I would remiss in my duty to my own conscience if I did not speak my mind.

It is unfortunate that we have come to the point in this country where one cannot speak up for peace without first reciting his credentials for patriotism.

Yet that is, in fact, the case, as so much of the discussion on the floor of the Senate today makes evident.

So, if a litany of loyalty is required, let me commence by saying that I am not a pacifist. I fought as an enlisted man and as an officer in the Second World War, in India, Burma, and China. I am not an advocate of unilateral disarmament. My voting record in the Senate ought to make it clear, beyond any doubt, that I have supported enormous appropriations of money each year for the maintenance of our military forces, and that I would be the last to say that we should disarm in any manner which would endanger the security of this country, or which would enfeeble us in our commitment to support our allies in the world at large.

I am also as much opposed to communism as anyone who has spoken on this floor this afternoon. But I recognize that no final settlement will be reached in our struggle with communism, that no durable victory will be won, under a mushroom cloud.

The awful aftermath of thermonuclear war will not stifle tyranny; it will spread it. Those who have been closest to these weapons have been the first to tell us that nuclear war is an insanity which cannot possibly further the rational interest of this country or any other country that becomes involved in it.

I think we are alert enough to know the delicate balance upon which the peace of the world now rests—what Churchill called the balance of terror. I think we are all conscious of the fact that this balance could be tipped at any time, and that if the missiles ever go off, there will not be a livable world for any council to function in; that the cause of freedom will not be served, nor even the cause of human survival.

So, Mr. President, I find it difficult to become alarmed at the fact that there are citizens in this country, including some of our prominent physicists and nuclear scientists, men more conscious, perhaps, of the witchcraft of these awesome weapons than any of the rest of us, who are doing what they can to bring about a saner, safer world.

I do not agree with all of their proposals. In fact, I have disagreed publicly with some of the proposals that some of them have made. But their existence does not alarm this Senator. I do not think it is going to have any fatal disabling influence upon the judgment of any Senator. Indeed, it seems to me that we get this whole discussion out of perspective, when we suggest that a group of this character is either so large in size, or so pervasive in influence, as ever to threaten or undermine the Military Establishment of the United States.

I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from South Dakota if it did not occur to him as being somewhat ironic that most of the speakers this afternoon are men who like to say from the public platform that the great danger facing America today is big government. That is a basic part of their credo, is it not?

Mr. McGOVERN. The Senator makes an excellent point. The Senator from Idaho has been among those who have reminded us in recent years that the growth of big government, and the growth of big Federal budgets, however necessary they may be—and I think they are necessary to the defense of our country—has been brought about largely through programs that can be associated with warfare, rather than welfare.

Conversely, each time anyone raises a question about the possibility of some modest, carefully thought out reduction in some aspect of our military budget, we are immediately set upon as the enemies of security.

I suspect that one of the reasons why the junior Senator from South Dakota has been accused by Mr. Alexander of advocating a unilateral disarmament is that I have tried as best I could as a new Member of the Senate—and a very inexperienced one—to suggest a few areas in which minor reductions might take place in our Military Establishment without in any way jeopardizing our national security.

It has been my view that we would be a stronger country, better able to meet the challenge of international communism; and we would be a healthier society at home and more capable of meeting our commitments to our own people and to those overseas who depend on us, if we would find a reasonable way to divert a small amount of what is going into military purposes into constructive purposes at home.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. McGOVERN. I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. First of all, the fact that the Senator from South Dakota has been one of the few Members of the Senate to stand up and call for a more careful examination of our military budget is in itself a symptom of the affliction that ails us; indeed, of the political timidity and conformity that have come to plague the country.

As the Senator points out, we have big Government on the Potomac today primarily because of warfare, past, present, and future, not because of welfare. The welfare state, which is the bogey of these self-styled conservatives, and which oils their political spook show, now on the road from coast to coast, is largely the hobgoblin of their own imagination. If one would analyze today's Federal budget, he would discover that only 7 cents out of each Federal tax dollar is allocated to what are called welfare programs, while almost 80 cents of that dollar is paid out, in one way or another, to programs associated with national security, whether the payment be for past wars; for interest on the public war debt; for the space race, the arms race, the spy race; for our present involvements, or for foreign aid and dollar diplomacy; for preventive intercontinental ballistic missiles or our vast nuclear arsenal.

So, when political spokesmen go out across the country and in one and the same breath call for a shutdown of government at home and a showdown with communism abroad, we ought to have the commonsense to laugh them off the political stage.

I remind the Senate that it was not a Democrat, but the foremost figure of the Republican Party, one of the most honored men in the Nation today, Dwight David Eisenhower, one who spent his whole life in the Army, who was commanding general of the American forces in Europe, and whose understanding of the military role is certainly not subject to question, who said, after 8 years in the Presidency of the United States, in a remarkable, candid, forthright, farewell address, that the thing which concerned him most, at the end of his Presidency, was the power and the influence—not of the Council for a More Livable World, of all things—but of the military-corporate complex that, to so large a degree, he felt might come to dominate the life and times of this Nation.

President Eisenhower warned us that this was the overshadowing problem with which we would have to cope in the future, based upon his 8 years of experience as President. Is not that the case?

Mr. McGOVERN. The Senator has made an eloquent statement of the crux of the issue that is before us today. He has gone beyond that to pose the chief problem of our times, which is to find some way to save our society and our civilization from nuclear catastrophe, from nuclear destruction.

The Senator from Idaho referred to former President Eisenhower. In a speech that President Eisenhower delivered when he was in the White House, he said:

> I hate war as only a soldier who has lived it can, only as one who has seen its brutality, its futility, its stupidity.

That was not a statement by the Council for a Livable World, those people who have been described as "fuzzy thinkers." That was a statement by a great general in wartime, a former President of the United States who, during the time he was in the White House, used his influence on the side of peace rather than war.

The same thing can be said of the late President Kennedy and of our great President Johnson, both men who understood from firsthand experience the terror, the brutality, and the senselessness of war, and who were willing, while keeping us strong in this dangerous world, to do whatever they could to move this country and the world a little closer to conditions of peace.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. McGOVERN. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CHURCH. Is it not true that when President Eisenhower made the final speech of his term of office, warning of the military-corporate complex, he had in mind the extent to which its power and influence might dominate the thinking and the policy decisions within any future administration?

Mr. McGOVERN. That is my understanding.

Mr. CHURCH. Has the Senator from South Dakota heard any Member of the Senate, since that time, discuss in the terms of alarm we have heard this afternoon, the political activities, the campaign donations, or the other well-known lobbying efforts of the weapons manufacturers on behalf of candidates of their choosing? Has the alarm been sounded in this Chamber about that kind of influence or that kind of lobbying in our contemporary life? If so, I have not heard it.

Mr. McGOVERN. I have not heard such a discussion. I was beginning to think, after listening to the way in which campaign contributions were deplored a while ago, that perhaps some Members of the Senate had found a way to be elected through the power of prayer.

I had called to my attention some weeks ago an editorial that appeared in the Idaho Observer of January 2, 1964, a newspaper published in the State of the distinguished Senator from Idaho, in which the journalist who has been under discussion today was taken to task for suggesting that there is some kind of special virtue about war, that man derives vigor from participation in war, whereas peace has a tendency to corrupt us with ease and somehow destroy the real muscle of a man; and that the only way we can really be men who can walk upright is to participate in combat with our fellow men.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial printed in the RECORD at this time, because I believe the editor does an excellent job of laying that silly case to rest, reminding us again of the importance of what William James called, a good many years ago, the moral equivalent to war. I believe that we are still engaged in a search for the moral equivalent of war and that is, really, in my judgment, the hope and promise of most of the people who make up the Council for a Livable World.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WAR HAS NO VIRTUES

(By Dwight Wm. Jensen)

There is a man of limited prudence and judgment named Holmes Alexander who writes columns that are printed by the Idaho Daily Statesman.

A few weeks ago he did a piece on the virtues of war. He quotes a one-legged Medal of Honor winner who was headmaster when he went to school and who said war improves the breed. Any war which Holmes Alexander survives cannot be said to have improved the breed.

Alexander refers to "bilious propaganda about the idiocies of war and the cloying virtues of everlasting peace." He speaks of "the brine and bilge of contemporary peace-mongering."

He sneers at writers who write about ways to end all war, and he says it is "the nature of man" to make war, and that "it is not to be altered by any power less than our Maker."

A better mind than Holmes Alexander's—and the 1960 census revealed that in Idaho alone there are nearly 700,000 better minds than Holmes Alexander's—Winston Churchill, who has some experience with war, said, "War is little more than a catalog of mistakes and misfortunes."

So war can be eliminated only by our Maker? You recall the cliche "God helps those who help themselves." We remember also the late President Kennedy's words that, "On earth, God's work is ours."

But Holmes Alexander would probably not care to quote Kennedy. The column we question appeared in the Statesman the day after that man's assassination and was a mocking sort of reflection upon Kennedy's search for peace.

Alexander is one of those great patriots who does such things as criticize the Supreme Court for its decision about Bible reading in the public schools. If he had read the Bible, in the public schools or elsewhere, he would have come across some words by the Son of our Maker:

"Blessed are the peacemakers."

Mr. CHURCH. I commend the Senator for the stand he has taken. I know him to be a man of great and good conscience—and of courage.

I close by restating I do not believe that the United States—which budgets 80 percent of its national revenue to programs related to warfare, past, present, or future, which spends more than half its annual operating budget to maintain its Armed Forces, where a vast corporate complex has a vested interest in armaments, where hundreds of societies and veterans' groups constantly side with the military viewpoint—is a country which has much to fear from a small association of scientists, college professors, professional people, and ordinary parents who are alarmed about the fact that we have raised a stockpile of weapons of such nightmarish power, that, if ever detonated, would be the equivalent of exploding a 20-ton bomb against the head of every inhabitant on this planet.

These citizens, the target of attack this afternoon, are merely trying to do what they can to effect a disarmament program, with enforcement controls and mutual inspection procedures, which might, one day, make it possible for the human race to live free from fright, beyond the shadow of a reckoning coming swift and final in the night.

I cannot believe that theirs is a pernicious influence, set upon the destruction of the United States of America. I do not, of course, stand on the floor of the Senate this afternoon to underwrite everything that any of these advocates may have said or may propose, because I reserve the right to make my own judgment.

Mr. McGOVERN. I reserve the same right, also.

Mr. CHURCH. I know the Senator from South Dakota does. I believe that the position he takes is a sound and sensible position. I commend him for it. Once again he renders his country a fine service, as he always has before, from the moment he first became a Senator of the United States.

Mr. McGOVERN. I thank the Senator from Idaho for his invaluable contribution.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. McGOVERN. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator from South Dakota for yielding to me.

First, I should like to commend him, as well as my dear friend the Senator from Idaho, for the fine comments they have made in rebuttal to the quite extraordinary statements made by a number of Senators earlier this afternoon.

I endorse everything that the Senator from South Dakota and the Senator from Idaho have said. I wish I could have said it as eloquently and as convincingly.

I should like to pay my respects, briefly, to Mr. Holmes Alexander, who I note has been in the gallery while this series of speeches has been made.

I know him of old. His writings are syndicated, for reasons which have always escaped me, in one of our great metropolitan Pennsylvania newspapers.

I shall not deal in innuendo. I should like, rather, to deal in provable facts. As the Senator from South Dakota amply demonstrated from the record a few moments ago, Mr. Alexander is and has been for years a rightwing radical whose political philosophy, if adopted, would clearly take us back to the jungle and remove many, if not all, of the benefits of civilization.

Those are rather strong words, said in part, perhaps, in lighter vein. But, nonetheless, I firmly believe that Mr. Alexander has for years represented a philosophy on education exemplified by the one room, little red schoolhouse which has a rather supreme contempt for intellectualism and for eggheads, which would like to revert, in short, to the happy days of the early 19th century, turning its back on everything that has happened in the world since that date.

I am amazed that any Senator would take seriously these ridiculous and downright silly charges of Mr. Alexander against the Council for a Livable World.

I am proud to have received in the campaign of 1962, when I ran for reelection, rather significant contributions from members of the Council for a Livable World, who were encouraged to make contributions in my behalf by Mr. Leo Szilard, now unhappily dead, but one of the great scientists of the modern world and one of the inventors—as the Senator from South Dakota has said—of the atomic bomb, a man who devoted the declining years of his life, after he knew that he had incurable cancer, to the cause of peace and to the cause of a livable world.

I often wonder why Mr. Alexander, who follows that rightwing line of his, does not attack the real advocates in this country of general and complete disarmament under enforcible world law.

Why does he not attack Christian Herter, who was Secretary of State, and the first American of prominent office to advocate general and complete disarmament under enforcible world law?

Why does he not attack our late beloved President John F. Kennedy, who in three magnificent speeches, two of them in the United Nations, and the third at American University in the District of Columbia, laid it on the line that the foreign policy of our country was to advance the same cause which the Council for a Livable World has been advancing, and for advancing which it has come under attack by Mr. Alexander and his rightwing cohorts.

Why does he not attack John McCloy? Why does he not attack Arthur Dean? Why does he not attack William Foster?

Indeed, why does he not attack President Lyndon Baines Johnson, who advocates the same principles of foreign policy and disarmament which the Council for a Livable World is proud to espouse, to recommend, and to support?

What disturbs me is the attitude in the Senate toward the cause of peace, a just and enduring peace, negotiated from strength. For I believe, to borrow the words of the late President Kennedy, "that we should never negotiate out of fear, but we should never fear to negotiate."

We saw some rather ugly things in the Senate during the debate on the test ban treaty last year. The belligerence in the Senate which was referred to by the Senator from Idaho, is the same spirit of belligerence which was attacked by President Dwight D. Eisenhower in the last public address he made while still President of the United States. I do not like to see that spirit of belligerence in the Senate. I do not like to see that archaic and obsolete attitude toward the problems of the modern world. I would hope, perhaps, that some mild change in that climate might be created by the action of the Senator from South Dakota and the Senator from Idaho, who have shown the courage to rise on the floor of the Senate and state their own supreme convictions and their strong support of the policies of three Presidents of the United States—Eisenhower, Kennedy, Johnson—in support of a just and a livable world.

I thank my friend from South Dakota for yielding to me.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania and the Senator from Idaho for their moving, eloquent, and informed statements here today. I was assured of my position before I took the floor this afternoon. But I am more assured of it after listening to the persuasive eloquence of those two Senators who have done so much in the cause of peace.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I did not hear all of the discussion on the Republican side this afternoon, as I was in and out of the Chamber. But I did hear the names of certain Members on this side mentioned. I am afraid that the implications were such as to make it difficult for them in their personal and political careers.

I am quite sure that was not the intent. I wish to say publicly, as majority leader of the Senate, that insofar as I am concerned, I have no doubt about the patriotism, integrity, and the devotion of men like the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGovern], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Church], and others. They have performed capably, well, and in the highest traditions of this body since they first became Members of the Senate. So as far as being for unilateral disarmament is concerned, as one Senator seemed to indicate, I do not know of a Senator on either side who is in favor of unilateral disarmament.

The Senator from South Dakota has a distinguished war record as a bomber pilot in World War II. He is the holder of the Distinguished Flying Cross.

The distinguished Senator from Idaho [Mr. Church] served with distinction in the China-Burma-India area. I do not know of a Democratic or Republican Senator whose integrity, patriotism, or devotion to his country should be impugned in any way, even by implication.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if the Senator from South Carolina is willing, I would ask the Chair to make sure that the Chamber is kept fairly clear during this debate. The Senate will be in session until a relatively late hour this evening because of circumstances which are apparent to all.

I thank the Senator from South Carolina for yielding.

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES SALARY REFORM ACT OF 1964

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11049) to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, as chairman of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee, I am proud to report to the Senate the committee's unanimous approval of H.R. 11049, with amendment, the Federal Employees Salary Act of 1964.

This legislation is a broad and all-inclusive pay adjustment measure which, in my view, will rank among the most important actions of the Congress in recent years to strengthen the Federal Government and increase its efficiency.

I particularly emphasize that the committee's report is a unanimous report. Members of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee on both sides of the aisle, working harmoniously and with nonpartisan objectives, have together studied and discussed H.R. 11049, title by title, section by section, and, in some cases, line by line. The work of the members of the committee has been diligent, conscientious, and devoted. They have responded to word from the President of the United States that this measure is one of the most important in his legislative program for the 88th Congress, and their response, consisting of hard work in long daily meetings, has been made at a particular time in the history of the Senate when many other important demands were being made upon their time and energies. I congratulate the committee on the spirit in which the members have undertaken to improve H.R. 11049 as passed by the House of Representatives, and as chairman I thank them each individually for their intelligent and effective cooperation with the President and with me.

This bill, as reported, is directed toward accomplishing four purposes which will remedy a number of inequities and will establish pay relationships resulting in greater efficiency in the Federal civilian service and increased economy throughout all Government operations. The purposes of H.R. 11049 are:

First. To reaffirm the commitment of the Congress to the policy of adjusting the civilian career salary systems in accordance with the principle of comparability. This policy, one of the most reasonable and far-reaching determinations ever made by the Congress in the field of Federal pay, was declared in the Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962, which clearly states the sense of the Congress that—

> Federal salary rates shall be comparable with private enterprise salary rates for the same levels of work.

Second. To establish a new, consistent, and rational salary structure for positions of the highest level in the Federal Government.

Third. To provide for the first time a logical relationship between career salaries under the civilian statutory pay systems and the salaries of top positions in the legislative, executive, and judicial branches.

Fourth. To adopt a salary structure which will respond to the present-day needs of the Federal Government, to the end that recruitment and retention of personnel of the very highest level—from the bottom to the top—can be accomplished.

Perhaps the most widely discussed section of H.R. 11049 is its provision for an increase in the annual salaries of the Members of the Congress from $22,500 to $30,000 a year. Increases in congressional pay constitute a touchy and controversial problem always. Ignoring this problem will not make it go away.

The committee, recognizing the constitutional injunction that the Senate and House must establish the rate of pay for its own Members, has tried to abide by its responsibility. It is our judgment that the compensation of Senator and Congressmen ought to be increased by $7,500 per annum. No one who serves in the Congress can be unaware that our duties and responsibilities have increased substantially since 1955, when congressional pay was raised from $15,000 a year. We are all thoroughly familiar with the costs incurred in maintaining two homes and with the necessity for frequent trips to our home States, where we can listen to the views of those who sent us here. We all know that the days of midsummer adjournment are probably gone forever, and that ours has become more than a full-time job. In my opinion, these facts of life must be squarely faced and reckoned with, not only for the benefit of present incumbents, but also for those who follow us in the Senate and the House.

I say again that the congressional increase endorsed by the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee is intended for the office and not for the present Member. It reflects not only the financial realities of running and serving, but also the prestige, dignity, and status of the Congress and its Members. I am confident that when H.R. 11049 comes to a vote, the Senate will face forthrightly its difficult responsibility for establishing equitable pay for its Members.

This action to adjust Federal compensation up and down the line comes none to soon. The Salary Reform Act of 1962 provides that the President shall report annually to the Congress his recommendations—based upon studies conducted by the Bureau of Labor statistics—for any Federal salary adjustments he deems advisable. In accordance with the 1962 act, President Kennedy more than a year ago recommended comparability pay increases similar to those provided for in H.R. 11049; and suggestions for executive, legislative, and judicial pay have been before the Congress since the report last year of the President's advisory panel on Federal salary systems, the Randall report.

The fact that Congress did not act in 1963 to adjust Federal compensation has resulted in many unfortunate inequities and an alarming departure of Federal pay from the comparability pay line. The fact that the recommendations of the Randall report have not been interpreted into Federal legislation until now has resulted, furthermore, in serious difficulty for the President in obtaining and keeping the services of men of high caliber for the topmost executive positions in the Government.

The President has told me on more than one occasion that this is true.

The salary provisions for executive pay have been scaled down from the Randall recommendations, in recognition of the fact that in the upper levels of the Federal service—both career and executive—the Government can never financially reward its top officials in such a way as to compete with private enterprise. In other words, while the committee endorses—and trusts that the Senate will continue to endorse—the principle of comparability in all ranks other than those at the top, we are aware that those who serve their country in positions of high rank in all three branches of the Government must be willing to accept far less than their counterparts in the private economy.

This fact is recognized as part and parcel of our national life. Nevertheless, it is my view that the sacrifice that many of our leaders in the legislative, executive, and judicial branches have been asked to make are too great. The increases provided in this measure will go a long way toward rectifying a situation which all recent Presidents, particularly Presidents Kennedy and Johnson, have deplored and which they have time and again asked the Congress to correct. The report of the President's advisory panel is most pertinent on this subject. The panel makes these points:

It is not uncommon in the history of our country to ask our citizens to give up a high income to accept a lesser one in a responsible Federal office. But the sacrifice ought to be of a kind which many capable men—not just a few—are financially prepared to make. Furthermore, there are many able young men who have had no time to accumulate financial reserves. The country should not be denied the services of these men because of inadequate Federal pay scales. The Nation cannot afford to depend only upon rich men to run its affairs.

One of the most reasonable and beneficial provisions of title III, the Federal Executive Salary Act of 1964, is the establishment of an orderly series of five levels of executive compensation. Over the years through the various executive pay acts and organic legislation establishing new Federal agencies, some 19 different executive pay levels have sprung up within the Federal service. On occasion, the need for increased compensation has been reflected in the salaries paid the directors of newly created agencies, while similar top officials of older agencies have been overlooked. The prominence of some agencies as opposed to the inconspicuousness of others has also sometimes resulted in unjustifiable executive salary differentials.

This bill for the first time brings together an orderly and rational system of five levels, in which positions of equal rank and responsibility receive equal compensation. This arrangement is the result of intensive study and close cooperation between the committees of the Senate and House on the one hand, and the Bureau of the Budget on the other, and the administrative agencies, also.

As passed by the House, H.R. 11049 established six pay levels of executive compensation. The top three levels—levels 1, 2, and 3—are listed by position. The lower three levels—levels 4, 5, and 6—would be filled under the House bill through placement which the President would be authorized to make in accordance with standards spelled out in the act.

The Senate committee, on the recommendation of the Budget Bureau, has eliminated level VI entirely. This level was composed of a limited number of executives who could be most appropriately placed, it was felt, in level 5 or, for pay purposes, in the top grades of the general schedule. This arrangement also relieved the pay compression which existed between the executive salary schedule and the general schedule when there were six executive levels.

The committee has further amended the House bill to provide for statutory listing of the positions in levels 4 and 5, as opposed to granting placement authority to the President. The committee noted, however, that the President ought to have additional authority with regard to the executive schedule, so that he may respond to changes in organization, management responsibilities, or work apportionment in the executive branch. Accordingly, the bill as reported gives authority to the President to add 20 additional positions within levels 4 and 5.

Perhaps some of them would come from the regular classification list below, and some could be adjusted between level 4 and level 5.

In general, the committee endorsed the rationale of the executive salary schedule established in the House bill. Certain changes, however, were made. The compensation of Cabinet members is increased from $32,500 to $35,000, this change taking into account the heavy responsibilities of Cabinet officers and the prestige which accompanies these high positions and the necessary spending of money by Cabinet officials.

The $30,000 salary for the deputies of Cabinet members has not been changed. These are the second highest Administrators in the executive branch, in many cases the directors of the daily operations of the Nation's departments and agencies. Accordingly, they should be adequately compensated, but at a rate reflecting the differences between their duties and those of Cabinet members. The committee's action in endorsing $30,000 a year for deputy department heads and the same salary for Members of the Congress follows the traditional pay alinement in which Cabinet members are the only group paid more than Members of Congress.

The committee has reduced slightly the salaries for executives in levels 3, 4, and 5; from $29,000 to $28,500 for level 3; from $28,000 to $27,000 for level 4; and from $27,000 to $26,000 for level 5.

These are the changes in the bill as reported from the House.

It is my view that the Senate schedule more nearly reflects the responsibilities of the three lower levels and their relationship to levels 2 and 1.

The Randall panel makes clear the need for pay increases in judges, officers, and employees of the judiciary.

The committee accepted the salary scales for Federal judges enacted by the House, taking note of the fact that the increases are in the neighborhood of $7,500, the same amount of increase which was approved for Members of Congress. The committee changed the annual salary of the Director of the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts from $28,000 to $27,000 and the salary of the Deputy Director from $27,000 to $26,000, in recognition of the fact that these salaries were alined with levels 4 and 5 of the executive salary schedule established at $27,000 and $26,000. Additionally, the committee reduced the salary of commissioners of the court of claims from $27,000 to $26,000.

In its discussions of compensation for the judiciary, the committee took into account the constitutional provision that Federal judges are appointed for life and that their salaries are discontinued only in the event of death, resignation, or impeachment. Thus, when Federal judges become inactive—optionally after 15 years at age 65 or after 10 years at age 70—they may, in effect, retire on full salary. It was noted also that many judges, upon reaching retirement age, continue their duties on a part-time basis while drawing full compensation.

H.R. 11049 provides pay increases for employees under the Classification Act ranging from approximately 3 percent in the lower grades, where comparability has been achieved, through 22.2 percent for grade 18, where the comparability pay line and the Classification Act pay line are still widely separated. It will be recalled that grades 16, 17, and 18, which will receive substantial pay increases under this bill, received no pay increases in January 1964 as did all other grades of the schedule.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question at this point?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It has been said that a large increase will be allowed to the classes just mentioned by the Senator, grades 16, 17, and 18, and that is because the last time there was a pay raise these classified workers were not included. My question is whether the large increase which is now being granted is justified. What would have been the percentage increase if it had been granted when the last increase was made and the increase that these people would be entitled to now? In other words, does the large increase now exceed what the combined increase would be if it had been granted 3 years ago and again now.

Mr. JOHNSTON. If you refer to grades 16, 17, and 18 the answer is "Yes."

Mr. LAUSCHE. What is the percentage of the pay raise for this classification?

Mr. JOHNSTON. The highest would be approximately 22 percent for grade 18. However, percentage increases in the lower grades are much smaller.

Mr. LAUSCHE. 22 percent. That 22 percent compares to what in the low classification?

Mr. JOHNSTON. GS-1 gets 3.1 percent. This grade has had many increases in the years past, when the higher grades were not increased.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Class 1 would require seven increases of 3 percent to bring it up to the 22 percent that would be granted to the highest. Is that correct?

Mr. JOHNSTON. In that class the Government employs only 1,356 persons. Those are the charwomen, custodial laborers, and others in similar work categories. Their pay compares favorably with what they would get in private enterprise for similar work. That was all taken into consideration when the percentage increase was determined.

Mr. LAUSCHE. When was the pay raise granted that did not include the high classified people?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Grades 16, 17, and 18 received no increase in January of this year, when all other grades received an increase previously enacted.

Mr. LAUSCHE. When did it happen prior to that time? Was that about 1962?

Mr. JOHNSTON. October 1962.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Were the high grades included in the 1962 pay raise?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Yes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. If the low grade received an increase of 3 or 4 percent in January of this year, how can we justify granting a 22-percent increase 5 or 6 months later to the high grade? I cannot follow that.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Because it is the committee's view that these top officials under the Classification Act deserve an increase. The administration has advocated it. The Bureau of the Budget has advocated it. That is what we are here for.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is it on the basis of comparability in private industry that this high 22 percent has been granted?

Mr. JOHNSTON. That is correct. Even with the increase, grade 18 would be below comparability. The Bureau of the Budget, the Civil Service Commission and the President of the United States have advocated attempting to attain comparability. The House has already acted by a big majority. We are here trying to do what we think is right and just. That is what I am here to do.

Mr. LAUSCHE. In addition to the increase of 22 percent, will the high classified employees in the course of time also become the beneficiaries of increased retirement pay on the basis of the new schedule?

Mr. JOHNSTON. They will, but that will be over a term of years. The retirement system provides that the 5 highest years be taken into consideration. It is the average for the 5 highest years.

A bill is pending in committee, on which some hearings have already been held, in connection with which the administration is advocating that certain changes be made in regard to the financing of the retirement system, to provide that it will be fiscally sound. The Government will have to pay more into the fund for the reason that for over two-thirds of the years of the existence of the retirement fund the Government has not been paying its full share. Another reason is that many of the employees of the Government are ex-servicemen, and they did not have to contribute toward retirement for the years of military service, but they are credited toward retirement for those years of service with the armed services. The Civil Service Commission has asked that we amend existing law to reform the method of financing the retirement fund. The committee is working on that bill.

Mr. LAUSCHE. To get back to the other point, the increase that would go to Members of Congress, from $22,500 to $30,000, would also provide a new remuneration to the Members of Congress in the form of an increase in retirement pay at the end of each year. Is that correct?

Mr. JOHNSTON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. We will go into that at a later time.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Yes.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I have been working on an amendment that I hope will appeal to the Senator. It would provide, first, that a Member of Congress, in order to obtain his increase, must certify that he is of the opinion that his services are worth that much money; second, that he believes the increase is necessary in order to provide for the essential expenses of rendering the services that are essential to his constituents and for the living expenses for himself and his dependents.

Does the Senator from South Carolina really think it is necessary to provide a pay raise for persons who feel that they might not want it, such as those who do not have children in college and do not incur expenses which might justify an increase in pay?

Mr. JOHNSTON. That is a good question. I do not want to amend the bill along these lines; but I have thought at times that anyone who thinks he does not deserve the pay increase should be glad to give it back to the Government. The Government is there, waiting. That person could give back the amount of his increase. If he did not think he was worth it, he could give it back.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I am aware of the position of one Member of Congress, who says that after he pays his taxes, he donates to the church whatever he has left. I do not see any particular point in giving a person a pay raise so that he can give more money to his church. In a way, that conflicts with the doctrine of the separation of church and state, if all we are doing is paying money by way of a pay raise to enable the recipient to give it to a church.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Members of the Senate and House will give back about 42 percent of the pay raise.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. In income taxes?

Mr. JOHNSTON. In income taxes.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I would hope that we could work that out. If any Member of Congress really believes that his services are not worth the amount of the increase, he should not take it out of the Treasury; it ought to stay in the Treasury. The people ought to have an opportunity to elect some cutrate representatives, if they wish. One could say in his platform, "I am not worth as much as another fellow. I am not worth that much salary"; and he could make his case on the basis that he is not worth that much for his services.

I hope the Senator from South Carolina will feel kindly toward my amendment. I do not feel that we should force on people money that they think is not necessary. That would be wasteful.

With that qualification, I am willing to vote for the Senator's bill.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I thank the Senator.

The substantial precentage increases for the upper grades are, in my opinion, warranted and deserved.

The committee acted to rectify what it considered an inconsistency in the House-approved general schedule, with respect to the so-called middle grades. Grades 9, 10, 11, and 12 were reduced from the President's recommendations to rates which reflect salary increases of less than 3 percent of present salary rates. Taking into account the contribution to the Federal service which is made by this important middle-management group, the committee increased the compensation of these grades to a 3-percent level. Similar increases were given the middle grades in the Foreign Service and the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration.

The bill has been amended to provide for 1-year step increases through step 7 for all levels of the PFS schedule. Under the 1962 act, 1-year increases through step 7 were limited to the first six levels, with 2 years being required in steps 6 and 7 for levels 7 and above. This has resulted in pay inequities caused by the longer service periods required—particularly in levels 7, 8, and 9—in steps 6 and 7 of the PFS schedule. The result has been rapidly diminishing salary differentials between level 7 on the one hand and levels 5 and 6 on the other, resulting from the fact that personnel in the lower levels advance more rapidly through the steps of the schedule.

The committee amendment will remedy these inequities and will materially benefit important groups of personnel in the postal service—supervisors, postmasters, inspectors, and others—many of whom spend the greater part of their postal careers in levels 7, 8, or 9.

The committee is in agreement with the Post Office Department that postmasters of fourth-class offices are, in general, being inadequately compensated under schedule II of the 1962 act. The Department's proposal to substitute a new schedule based upon PFS–5 and the number of service hours required on the part of the postmaster was carefully studied. It was the committee's view, however, that this proposed schedule, providing increases averaging approximately 27 percent, overcompensated for the deficiency. Accordingly, the act has been amended to provide for a new fourth-class office schedule, based upon six levels of revenue units. The percentage increases vary in general within the range of 10 to 15 percent, with increases substantially higher than 15 percent for postmasters of fourth-class offices in the lower levels, where increases are most urgently needed.

This modification of the Department's original proposal represents an equitable solution to the problem of marginal pay for fourth-class postmasters with low receipts, and provides significant and deserved salary increases for all other postmasters of fourth-class offices. The House-passed schedule would cost approximately $12.7 million, while that of the Senate schedule would cost approximately $4.8 million.

We took this up with the Post Office Department, too, and were informed that this would be agreeable to them.

The last pay raise granted congressional employees was an across-the-board increase of 7 percent in 1962. They received no schedule 2 increase, which, Senators will recall, was the second increment of the 1962 pay increase, becoming effective for employees of the executive branch in January 1964.

The committee has endorsed the pay-increase formula for congressional employees as set forth in the House measure. It provides for graduated raises ranging from 5 percent in the lower levels to 21½ percent in the upper. It is my belief that this schedule recognizes the principle of comparability and satisfactorily alines the pay for our congressional employees with that of officials of their rank and responsibility in the executive branch.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Do I correctly understand that in the previous pay bill, the increase in salaries for congressional workers was 7 percent?

Mr. JOHNSTON. It was 7 percent across the board.

Mr. ELLENDER. That was in 1962, was it not?

Mr. JOHNSTON. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. Under that pay bill, the top salary of an administrative assistant to a Senator could be fixed at $18,884.

Mr. JOHNSTON. That was for one person in the office.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand that; but others would get similar raises.

In the bill which the Senator now proposes to have enacted, the base pay of $8,880 and a gross rate of $18,884 would result in a 21½ percent increase for administrative assistants and cause their salaries to go up $22,945.

Mr. JOHNSTON. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is more than the salary Senators receive today.

Mr. JOHNSTON. That is true. We propose to raise the salaries of Senators in the bill, by 33 percent.

Mr. ELLENDER. How can they justify raising the salary, let us say, of the Sergeant at Arms, who now receives $21,500, to $27,500, an increase of $6,000? How can that be justified? In addition, the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, as I understand, is provided with the use of an automobile and a chauffeur.

Mr. JOHNSTON. That is what the Appropriations Committee lets him have.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand that; but how can the committee justify that? How can the Senator from South Carolina go back home and tell his people that the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate has been raised in salary from $21,500 to $27,500, or an increase of $500 a month, and is provided with an automobile and a chauffeur to drive it?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Regarding the chauffeur and the automobile, it must be remembered that there are some occasions when the Sergeant at Arms is required to go out and advise Senators that they are needed back in the Chamber.

Mr. ELLENDER. There is a car pool across the street which can be used for that purpose.

The salary of the Secretary of the Senate is to be raised from $21,500 to $27,500 or the same increase as the Sergeant at Arms—$500 a month, or $6,000 per year. How can the committee justify such an increase when an increase of 7 percent has already been given in 1962 and this increases the amount to 27.9 percent?

Mr. JOHNSTON. All this was based upon grounds of comparability.

Mr. ELLENDER. Of what?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Along lines comparable to salaries paid on the outside. Remember that this is for the whole of the Federal Government. Go to New York and see what the chief of police up there is paid.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator compare the Sergeant at Arms to the chief of police of New York City?

Mr. JOHNSTON. This position must be compared to that of those performing jobs of a similar nature, yes. I do not limit it to New York, of course.

Mr. ELLENDER. I notice that the salary of the Architect of the Capitol would be raised from $20,700 to $26,000, or 26.1 percent.

Mr. JOHNSTON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. Only 2 years ago, we gave him an increase of 7 percent. I am wondering how the committee could present the Senate with a bill of this kind. District judges will be paid $30,000, an increase of 33⅓ percent. Judgships are life appointments which is a valuable consideration in itself.

Mr. JOHNSTON. The Senator will notice that we have reduced many salaries below those approved in the House measure.

Mr. ELLENDER. Some of the what?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Some of those salaries have been cut below those approved by the House.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am talking about the Senate carrying out its responsibility. I know what the House did. It did a bad job. But I did not expect the committee to come before the Senate and try to duplicate what the House did—more or less, because that is just what the committee did.

Will the Senator from South Carolina tell us, assuming that every Senator will increase his force according to the tables laid out in this bill, how much it will cost a year; does the Senator know?

Mr. JOHNSTON. In this particular bill, there will be a certain amount of money which can be spent; and the Senator can spend as much of it as he wishes, in accordance with the provisions of the bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator knows what happens, of course.

Mr. JOHNSTON. That is what any Senator would be able to do in his office. Not a year has gone by that I have not turned back money in my own office.

Mr. ELLENDER. The same applies to me.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I believe that many Senators have done so. However, each Senator will be given a certain amount of money to operate his office.

Mr. ELLENDER. Why give it? Why arrange the scale so high that a Senator's administrative assistant will be constantly dissatisfied from here on out until he is paid the highest salary permitted under the bill? Some Senators give the raises automatically and this creates dissatisfaction among the assistants of those who do not.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Because many Senators cannot get the people with the abilities they need for their offices from their own particular States without paying them salaries such as will be found in this bill, and which are in relation to their abilities. That is the reason we put them in.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator mean to say that it is hard to get an assistant to help in his office?

Mr. JOHNSTON. The Senator from Chicago and the Senator from New York and other places——

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON. The Senator does not have to pay it, unless he wishes to do so.

I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is true that the city of New York has the same name as the State of New York——

Mr. JOHNSTON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am very proud to come from the city of Chicago but I also come from the great State of Illinois.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Illinois. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I hope that "Illinois" will be substituted for "Chicago."

Mr. JOHNSTON. Of course—Illinois.

Mr. ELLENDER. When I first came to the Senate, as I recall, our little pages—and I love them all—were given $5 a day for the days they worked. In this bill, their pay will be raised to more than $5,000 a year. I hope they make that much money when they get out of college.

I believe that we have gone to an extreme on this subject. I am hopeful that a good look will be taken at this bill and that the Senate will make an attempt to trim it down, because I believe it is absolutely wrong, particularly when we consider that we just lowered taxes and increased salaries in 1962. Here we are, preparing to slap on the backs of the American people an additional burden which will cost in excess of half a billion dollars a year.

Mr. JOHNSTON. The Senator will notice in the bill that many of the salaries in the Senate version are below those of the House.

Mr. ELLENDER. That does not make it good for the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSTON. But we must keep them somewhat in line. Does not the Senator agree with that?

Mr. ELLENDER. Keep whom in line?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Salaries in the two Houses. If we do not have similar pay scales many people now working in the Senate will wish to go over and work in the House.

Mr. ELLENDER. I did not know there was that much competition.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. I address myself to the distinguished Senator, the chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee [Mr. JOHNSTON]. As the chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, I notice that there have been two changes made in the Senate bill as against the House bill.

Let me emphasize that it is not so much the money involved as much as it is the principle that concerns me. The reason I bring it up now is that I am hopeful the Senator will give some thought to the colloquy we are going to engage in, so that when I bring up my amendment we can be in accord as to what is meant.

I notice that the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission has been placed in level 2. The other four members of the Commission have been placed in level 4.

The House placed the chairman in level 2, but it placed the other members of the committee in level 3.

The Senate committee dropped it down a further level.

The point I wish to make, and I believe it should be brought to the attention of the committee, is the fact that in 1954 and again in 1955—and I believe I shall be substantiated in this by my distinguished colleague from the State of Tennessee—there was a serious question which came up in committee as to what authority, prerogative, and responsibility each of the five members should have. In considering the 1954 amendments to the Atomic Energy Act there was a proposal that the Chairman be the principal officer of the Commission. After much debate that was not accepted.

The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and the Congress repudiated that philosophy.

We wrote in the law specifically at that time:

> Each member of the Commission, including the Chairman shall have equal responsibility and authority in all decisions and actions of the Commission and shall have one vote.

Then in 1955 so there would be no uncertainty as to the intent, the Joint Committee recommended and the Congress amended the law to read:

> Each member of the Commission, including the Chairman, shall have equal responsibility and authority in all decisions and actions of the committee, and shall have full access to all information relating to the performance of his duties or responsibilities, and shall have one vote.

Mr. President (Mr. INOUYE in the chair), the point I wish to make is that this Commission spends more than $2.5 billion a year in keeping up the nuclear and thermonuclear posture of the Nation. It is a very responsible Commission. There are some who believe, possibly, that if we had one administrator as against the commission setup, as it is in the Space Administration, perhaps it might work more effectively, but I do not believe we need to debate that question this afternoon.

What I am intending to do—and I should hope that this would be amenable to the thinking of the distinguished Senator from South Carolina—is to bring it back to where the House had it.

I do not say that all members of the Commission should be at level 2. I believe that the Chairman should be at level 2, as the spokesman for the Commission, but I would hope the Senator would revert back when I bring up my amendment to the bill. As it was reported by the House, other members of the Commission would be put in level 3 instead of level 4.

I repeat, that it is not so much the matter of the money as it is the matter of the responsibility. If we are going to put the Chairman two grades above the other members of the Commission, we shall be downgrading the prestige and the responsibility of the other members.

I do not believe that should be allowed because I believe that would do the whole program irreparable harm.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I am glad to have these remarks from the Senator from Rhode Island, and shall be glad to look into them.

Mr. PASTORE. That is the reason why I bring up the question now. I hope the Senator will take it up with his staff.

There is another point I should like to make; and I hope he will consider this, too.

I shall propose this amendment. And I hope that here again his thinking will be amenable to mine. Under the atomic energy law, we specify three Assistant General Managers. We say "no more than three." And the AEC under this statutory authority today has three Assistant General Managers. But the language of the bill, on page 127, line 5, is "Assistant General Manager, Atomic Energy Commission." That is in the singular. The only trouble is that we have three Assistant General Managers today at the equal salary level of $20,000. But the Senator provides for only one Assistant General Manager. What shall we do with the other two? We will have to downgrade them as well as others to the level of their division heads. We must treat these three General Managers alike.

I hope the staff will look into that and make this correction as well.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I shall be glad to look into that question. For the information of the Senator, we left it up to the Bureau of the Budget. The recommendation came from them.

Mr. PASTORE. I do not know where they get their notions. The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy watches this operation. It is not that we are trying to grab anything for anyone on the committee. But it would throw the whole organization out of kilter. We have three Assistant General Managers operating on an equal footing. It is proposed to provide for only one. What shall we do with the other two? Bury them?

The House made provision for it by leaving it to the Executive to fill an unspecified number of positions which the AEC understands would leave these three positions equal in level 5. In line 5, we could make "Manager" plural, and put "three" in parentheses. That would answer the question.

I shall make those two amendments. I hope the staff will look into that.

Mr. JOHNSTON. We shall be happy to look into it. We do not claim that the bill is perfect in every sense. But we did try to do as good a job as we could, working with the departments, and with the Bureau of the Budget, and with the staff of the House.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I make no criticism of the Senator. He and I have fought shoulder to shoulder on some of these measures. At one time, I had the honor of serving on the committee. I know how assiduously the Senator has worked, and how vigorous he is in his presentations to the committee.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I appreciate that. I discovered when the Senator was on the committee that he was one of the most active members. He did an excellent job there.

The committee amended the House bill by imposing a ceiling of $22,945 on the schedule for employees on Senators' staffs and Senate committees. The House version sets a limitation of $24,500 on employees of House committees.

The House bill further provides that the effective date of all increases in excess of $22,000 would be withheld until the effective date of the increase for Members of the Senate and House, January 3, 1965. The Committee decided that since increases in excess of $22,000, particularly in the executive salary schedule, are of vital and immediate importance, it would be unwise to postpone the date of their disbursement. Accordingly, the bill is amended to provide that amounts of salary in excess of $22,000 per annum shall be postponed until January 3, 1965, only in the case of officers and employees of the Senate and House.

When this measure was considered on the floor of the House, Representative UDALL introduced an amendment, which was adopted, to provide that congressional pay increases would automatically go into effect in percentage amounts related to pay increases enacted for employees and officers of the executive branch. I believe that this provision is a good try at solving a hard problem, but it is my view that it would not accomplish its apparent purpose. The committee was in agreement that this provision should be deleted from the bill.

If the proposed arrangement prevailed, the Congress would in effect be acting to raise its own salaries whenever it approved executive-branch pay increases, and those who criticize Congress whenever congressional pay is considered could once again raise their hue and cry, and the problem would be at hand once more.

I believe further that if congressional and executive pay were tied together by statute, the result might be a slowing down of consideration of warranted pay increases for employees of the executive branch.

Mr. President, a question has been raised with respect to the economic effects of this measure. I would remind those who express this concern that the comparability principle requires the Federal Government as an employer to follow the moves of the national economy—certainly not to lead it. The established procedure is for review and adjustment to determine whether salary scales have lagged too far behind those of the private economy as a whole, and to bring them up to business levels, but not above business levels, if a substantial lag has developed.

Productivity in the Federal service has been on the rise, just as it has in other sectors of the economy. For example, in the Division of Disbursement of the Treasury, production increased 13 percent from 1960 to 1962, but the manpower utilized was actually reduced by 11 percent. In the Department of Insurance of the Veterans' Administration, manpower was reduced by 22 percent between 1960 and 1962 as the result of a 23-percent increase in productivity.

It is my understanding that these reductions in manpower were accomplished through attrition and that the executive branch is continuously taking action to assure that productivity increases continue to be the rule.

It has been stated that the average weekly earnings of Federal employees are approximately $22 higher than those of employees of the States. This comparison, however, fails to take into account the differences in the employment categories involved. The functions of State governments differ markedly from those of the Federal Government. The Federal payroll at the present time includes thousands of some of the most highly trained individuals in the country. No State has a space program, for example; no State has a department of defense. Therefore, in my view it is erroneous to attempt to find a meaningful relationship between such entirely different types of groups as Federal and State employees.

Economy and efficiency in the Federal service are dependent upon the quality of Federal management, and the maintenance of high-quality management can be assured only by salary levels that will permit competent managers to remain in the service. A recent editorial in the New York Times expressed the situation in this way:

> Those who oppose waste and extravagance in Government spending argue that raising the level of Federal salaries would be unjustified and inequitable. Yet the biggest single cause of waste, in Government or in private industry, is inefficient management. The Nation has been fortunate that so many skilled people have been willing to accept the financial penalties involved in Government service. But with the pay scales and fringe benefits available to high caliber personnel in private industry constantly rising, the Government will find it increasingly difficult to attract and keep executives with the talent and the training required for formulating and carrying out policy.

Mr. President, I now call to the attention of the Senate the cost of H.R. 11049, as reported. I regret to advise my colleagues that there are typographical errors in the chart displayed on page 4 of the committee report, but I am happy to point out that the erroneous figures overstate rather than understate the cost of the bill.

The total cost figure for this salary bill—verified by the Bureau of the Budget and the Civil Service Commission—is $556,836,341. The major reason for the difference in this cost estimate is that the net cost of title I should read $536,036,341 rather than the $543 million figure shown in the table. These estimates include the cost of Government contributions to the various fringe benefit programs Federal employees enjoy.

This is less than $13 million in excess of the amount included in the President's budget for fiscal year 1965. I have been advised that in line with the administration's policy this additional cost will be absorbed by employment attrition and efficient management of Federal agencies.

Mr. President, I have a letter from the Bureau of the Budget which I wish to read at this time:

> BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
> *Washington, D.C., June 29, 1964.*
>
> Hon. OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
> *Chairman, Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.*
>
> DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: As requested by you, the Bureau of the Budget has examined the cost estimates of H.R. 11049, as reported to the Senate. When table 4 is corrected to take into account typographical errors in title I figures, the situation is substantially as follows:
>
> Disregarding minor adjustments which approximately cancel each other out, the aggregate costs of the Senate bill have been increased approximately $14 million over the President's maximum budget figures of $544 million for the cost of pay legislation. The additional cost is attributable to the Senate committee's action in raising the middle grades of the Classification Act, Foreign Service, and Bureau of Medicine and Surgery schedules so that they will receive a 3-percent increase. The Bureau supports this amendment in the interest of equity and closer comparability between Government positions affected and the same level of work in private enterprise.
>
> We must point out, however, that the President's budget allowance was a maximum allowance. The fiscal year 1965 cost of the bill must be held within that figure. Accordingly, it will be necessary through attrition, nonfilling of vacancies, and other actions to increase the amount of absorption required of the agencies so as to cover the excess costs.
>
> Subject to the foregoing understanding, the costs of the Senate version of H.R. 11049 are without objection.
>
> Sincerely,
>
> ELMER B. STAATS,
> *Acting Director.*

Mr. President, I strongly believe that Americans everywhere will support the provisions of this measure as representing equity and fairplay. I urge the Senate's favorable consideration of H.R. 11049.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I wish to address myself very briefly to the pending bill. First, I commend the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] on the manner in which he conducted long and thorough hearings on the proposed legislation. I also commend the members of the staff for their valuable assistance in writing the pending bill.

H.R. 11049 as it passed the House was a bill of six titles. The very nature of the proposed legislation required thorough study.

I saw with a great deal of pride and frankness that every member of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee gave long and sincere study to this legislation. They were determined that if a bill were to be reported, it should be reported after each member of the committee had a chance to study and discuss all titles of the bill.

The Senate committee made some changes in the House bill. We believe they were changes which make for better legislation and eliminate certain inequities.

The Senate bill gives a small increase over the House bill in four middle grades in the general schedule. This change more nearly reaches comparability and will affect grades 9, 10, 11, and 12. Many of these employees are managers and engineers. The percentage of increase will run about 3 percent.

I believe an inequity was removed from the postal field service by permitting an annual step increase through step 7 from level 7 up. Annual step increases were permitted in previous bills for the first six levels through step 7.

These are only two changes which it seems to me are significant in that they help the employees in the middle or lower brackets.

Some salaries were reduced in the executive pay schedule and a few were raised a little.

It is very difficult in a bill like this to establish a schedule entirely equitable in all instances.

Mr. President, I want to assure all my colleagues that a lot of study and effort was put forth to bring out a bill that was as nearly equitable as possible. It is now up to the Senate to cast its decision.

I shall support the bill, H.R. 11049 as reported by the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

Mr. President, one of our colleagues, a very valuable member of the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, is unable to be present today. He has left with me a statement in which he strongly urges passage of the measure. I have reference to the senior Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG]. I ask unanimous consent that his statement be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR FONG

H.R. 11049, the measure presently before this body is one which I fully support. As a member of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee, I know from first experience the hard work and long hours the committee spent to bring to the floor of the Senate as equitable a bill as was possible.

I commend the committee chairman, Senator OLIN D. JOHNSTON, and the minority leader on the committee, Senator FRANK CARLSON, for their effective leadership and patience in hammering out a bill acceptable to all members of the committee.

It is only fair and equitable that the Congress pass the Federal Salary Act of 1964 at this time. In fact, it is overdue. In the Federal Pay Reform Act of 1962 the Congress wrote into law for the first time what is commonly referred to as the comparability principle. This provision meant that Federal salaries should be comparable to those being paid for similar work in private industry.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics was directed to make annual review of private industry salaries and report to the President its findings and comparison of Federal salaries with those prevailing in private industry.

H.R. 11049 is the first step since the comparability principle was written into law in which Congress is asked to keep faith with the provision it approved in 1962.

The committee held extensive hearings over a period of approximately 8 months on Federal pay. Upon completion of the hearings the committee met in executive sessions for over 2 months in an effort to write a fair, equitable, and just salary act.

H.R. 11049 covers the full scope of Federal salaries—from executive to clerks. It is a comprehensive measure which, while bringing most Federal salaries into comparability with those in private industry, also corrects certain inequities in the Federal pay structure.

The average salary increase for Federal employees under the Classification Act is approximately 4.2 percent and under the postal field schedule 5.6 percent.

In the higher pay levels the committee admits that comparability cannot be followed, and in other levels the Federal pay scale continues to lag 2 or 3 years behind private industry pay. However, H.R. 11049 is as equitable a bill as can now be written. It is a good bill and will assist greatly in retaining highly trained and qualified personnel in the Federal service.

I strongly urge the passage of this measure.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I have wanted to vote in favor of the pending bill to increase the pay of Federal employees. I have consistently supported such measures in the past, and hope to do so again in the future. If it were possible to evaluate this bill on its own merits alone, without regard to any other consideration, I would approve it and vote for it.

But it is not possible, in my judgment, to separate this bill from other action that Congress has taken in this session. Just a few months ago, we enacted the largest income tax cut in history. This was done to combat unemployment, stimulate investment, and enhance the rate of our economic growth. The tax reduction, which had the effect of increasing everybody's take-home pay, was carefully designed to promote the growth of production and employment, so that Federal revenues, collected at a lower rate from an expanding economic base, might rise to balance the budget and eliminate further deficit spending.

On the basis of the evidence already in, we have reason to believe that the objective we sought, in enacting the tax cut, is achievable, providing we hold the line on Federal spending and avoid further cuts in tax revenue. We pledged ourselves to do both, when we cut the income tax a few short months ago. I believe we should keep that pledge today.

Last week, I kept the pledge by voting against all reductions of Federal excise taxes, even though I know these taxes to be a nuisance and harassment to the small businesses of my State. I have asked the merchants of Idaho, who so strongly desire the repeal of these excise taxes, to wait until a balanced budget is in sight. This year the deficit may run to $9 billion; next year, if we hold the line, it should be much reduced. In these prosperous times, we have to strive to restore a balanced budget, for we cannot continue indefinitely to spend more money than we take in.

I know that my stand against the repeal of the excise taxes, at the present time, was not popular with the businessmen of Idaho, and I fully appreciate that my vote against this bill will not be popular with Government employees, including the postal workers, who need the pay raise most, and who have been my special friends.

But I cannot, in good conscience, apply one standard to some of the people I represent, while applying a different standard to others. With the Government operating so much in the red, this is not the proper time to vote, either for further reduction in revenue, or for further increases in pay.

I hope that all those affected may understand that I take this position for the purpose of upholding fiscal responsibility. If we keep our pledge to hold the line, the day will soon come when Federal salaries can be adjusted, and Federal excise taxes can be repealed, without adding to the debt, or enlarging its burden upon future generations. Then is the time to do it.

I intend, of course, to apply to myself, the same standard I am asking all the people I represent to accept for themselves. Accordingly, I shall vote to strike the proposed congressional pay raise from the bill, and I shall vote against the bill itself.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, it is with some reluctance that I shall vote against this pending bill. My firm belief in the principle of comparability between salaries paid civil servants and those paid in private industry is evidenced by my previous votes on Federal pay legislation.

I would be pleased to vote now for salary increases for the lower and middle brackets of the classified service and for postal workers. I cannot, however, support this legislation primarily because it contains large increases for the Members of the Congress and, secondarily, because of the unfairly generous treatment of the higher grades in the classified service.

It is true, Mr. President, that congressional salaries were last reviewed a decade ago and perhaps a case can be made for some adjustment.

During the period from 1945 to 1960 there were seven across-the-board raises which averaged out annually 4.1 percent for classified and 4.9 percent for postal employees. That is a total percentage raise of 61.5 percent for the classified employees and 73.5 percent for postal.

Considering only the period since 1955 when the last congressional increase was made in Members' salaries, the percentage raise for postal and classified aggregated 51 percent. But such reasoning completely overlooks the fact that the people of this country, in the very week that the Congress has been forced to raise the legal limit of the national debt, deserve better than to have that Congress vote for ourselves a large salary increase. They deserve leadership by example. This is the time for restraint, not for new and greater expenditures.

The cost of this bill would exceed half a billion dollars. It tends to be inflationary. Both in the interests of economy and in stemming the upward spiral of living costs, it should be rejected.

This administration professes to be economy minded, yet we are continually confronted with new spending proposals, each of which contains the elements for expansion in future years. Instead of approving such measures, now is the time to reverse the trend. Yet the pressure by the administration for more and more such spending schemes continues unabated.

As the able Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] pointed out in his recent letter to President Johnson, despite claims by the administration that stringent personnel ceilings have been imposed, the facts are the Federal payroll is running at the rate of $16 billion a year, and going up; Federal employment is still approximately 2.5 million. This is well above the 2,352,000 jobs existing when President Eisenhower left office, after trimming 201,000 jobs from the payroll in his 8-year administration.

The Johnson administration, despite its economy claims, continues to push for more and more employees. In his fiscal 1965 budget, the President asked for new positions in 13 out of 24 major agencies.

The President must be willing to exercise restraint in his own requests both for spending and for new jobs. Then he will have earned the right to ask the people of America to reward those who make this Government operate.

Justification for higher salaries for the Congress, the top grades in the classified service, and for appointive positions is based on the argument that it is difficult to attract and maintain competent men and women in high Government posts when industry and business pay much better salaries.

Mr. President, the motivation for Government service at these levels must be based on more than dollars and cents. A Cabinet officer undeniably is paid less than a business executive with comparable responsibilities. But, we could never expect to pay the Secretary of Labor, for example, what the giant unions pay their presidents, or to match the salary of the Secretary of Defense with the multi-hundred-thousand-dollar salary of a huge manufacturing firm.

It is reported that Gov. LeRoy Collins is leaving a $75,000 a year job as president of the National Association of Broadcasters to accept a Government post paying less than a third of that. These people come to Government positions because they are motivated by a desire to serve, not because of the salary. The same is true of the Members of the Congress.

It is unfortunate, Mr. President, that we are not allowed to consider a bill giving increases to those Government workers who unquestionably deserve them. On balance, however, the bad in this bill outweighs the good; accordingly, I shall vote against it.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, in my opinion, we have a solemn obligation to act favorably on this very commendable and very necessary pay bill.

When the Senate passed the Salary Reform Act of 1962, only three Members of this body voted against it. That measure committed Congress to the very sensible and reasonable proposition that Federal employees and postal employees should be relieved of the necessity of incessantly petitioning Congress to keep them abreast of the Nation's economic parade. The act, as it was passed, introduced into the Federal pay structure, for the first time, a scientific and dignified apparatus for adjusting Federal salaries whenever they fell significantly behind the accepted norm for similar jobs in private industry.

The late President Kennedy, using the apparatus we had approved, told us, on April 29 of last year, that postal employees' pay and Federal employees' pay had fallen considerably below accepted standards in private industry. We were morally committed to do something about that situation, but today, 14 months later, we are getting our first opportunity to live up to our obligation.

It was for this reason, Mr. President, that in committee I offered the amendment which was agreed to, and which will make this pay raise for the postal employees and the classified employees effective on July 1, 1964, instead of in the first pay period following the enactment of the legislation.

The fine people who man our postal service and our classified service have waited long enough for their comparability pay raise. With each passing month, they have been slipping behind the economic parade. When we pass this bill today—and I feel confident that we shall—there will have to be a conference, and then consideration by both Houses of the agreement reached by the conferees. All this adds up to more and more delay. In my opinion, it would be unconscionable for us to ask the Federal workers and the postal workers to take a further financial beating, just because in our legislative processes we have been somewhat dilatory.

Mr. President, I doubt that there can be any serious argument against the pay raises which this bill provides for Federal employees in the upper echelons of the service. All responsible authorities, both those in Government and those in private industry, agree that these positions must be more attractively compensated.

The U.S. Government is the largest and the most important business operation in the world. The Government is filled with positions calling for great intelligence, great judgment, great learning, and great moral courage. The decisions such men must make, as all of us know, often affect millions upon millions of human beings, both at home and abroad. Their decisions involve enormous sums of the taxpayers' money. They could conceivably involve the peace and security of the free world.

We simply cannot continue to compensate such positions with a wage that would be considered, in private industry, inadequate for an office manager or an assistant to a very junior vice president.

President Johnson has pointed out that we must prevent our Federal pay structure from becoming one that will repel the talented and will attract only the mediocre. We are perilously close to that point now. I think it is a miracle that we have been able to attract and retain the high caliber of men and women that we have today in the Government. But already the signs are becoming all too apparent that too many of the best and most talented people in the Government are finding the Federal service a luxury in which—in fairness to their families—they cannot continue to indulge. We are losing topflight people every day; and the only way we can stop this expensive exodus of talent is to make the positions more attractive than they are now.

If our huge and complex Federal Government is ever dominated by second-rate managers, we shall then be in serious danger of becoming a second-rate country.

We must repair the flaws in the present pay structure, and we must plan boldly for the future. This bill does both.

It is a good bill. Under the able leadership of our chairman, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], our committee deliberated over its provisions in depth and at length. When we approved it, we did so without a dissenting voice or vote.

The bill deserves the same enthusiastic support from the Senate as a whole; and I sincerely hope and trust that it will receive it.

It is our moral duty to pass this bill; and it is a matter of enlightened self-interest to provide for a Federal pay structure that will attract and retain the best available talent in the land.

FREE ENTRY OF CERTAIN MASS SPECTROMETERS

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 4364) to provide for the free entry of one mass spectrometer for the use of Oregon State University and one mass spectrometer for the use of Wayne State University, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment and agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. BYRD of Virginia, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, and Mr. CURTIS conferees on the part of the Senate.

MEAT IMPORTS

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I am pleased to announce that the Senate Finance Committee has just approved the Mansfield amendment, No. 465, to limit beef imports. The committee approved this amendment with a modification offered by Senator CURTIS. Under the amendment adopted, imports of fresh, chilled, or frozen beef after 1964 will be limited to 674 million pounds annually. This is generally the average annual amount which was imported in the 5-year period ending with December 31, 1963. Restrictions were also placed on importation of mutton, lamb, and certain prepared meats, on a pound basis.

The amendment provides for increases in the stated quotas whenever the average price in the United States for that meat equals or exceeds 90 percent of the average parity price provided the semiannual production of cattle in this country exceeds 7,352 million pounds.

The amendment was adopted to H.R. 1839, a House-passed bill relating to the importation of wild birds and wild animals.

The bill will be reported to the Senate tomorrow.

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES SALARY REFORM ACT OF 1964

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11049) to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I shall call up my amendment. Before I do so, I point out that I am very anxious to obtain the yeas and nays on the amendment. I talked with the majority leader about it. At the present time it appears that there are not enough Senators in the Chamber to order the yeas and nays. So I ask unanimous consent that there may be a quorum call with the understanding that I shall not lose my right to the floor, for the purpose of bringing a sufficient number of Senators to the Chamber so that I may ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin wish first to offer his amendment?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment be called up and that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. PROXMIRE's amendment (No. 1084) is as follows:

Beginning with line 23 on page 108, strike out over through line 8 on page 115.

Redesignate titles III and IV as II and III, respectively; redesignate sections 301 to 310 as 201 to 210, respectively; and redesignate sections 401 to 403 as 301 to 303, respectively.

Beginning with line 4 on page 166, strike out over through line 2 on page 167 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"TITLE IV—EFFECTIVE DATE

"SEC. 401. This Act and the increases in compensation made by this Act shall become effective on July 1, 1964."

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I believe there are enough Senators present to have the yeas and nays ordered.

I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MILLER. If the yeas and nays are ordered on the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin, will it be open to amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will be open to amendment, but not modification.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, this amendment is simple. It would delete from the bill, title II, "Federal Legislative Salaries." It would eliminate that part of the bill which provides pay increases in salaries for Members of the House and the Senate and employees of the House and the Senate.

A congressional pay increase is unjustified. When I say "unjustified," I mean exactly that word. It has not been justified in the hearings or in the Randall report.

During the hearings there was a little discussion of congressional pay, but very little, indeed. I challenge any Senator to go through the hearings and find—the only one I could find was by the distinguished minority leader, Senator DIRKSEN—a statement in favor of a congressional pay increase. And even this eloquent statement is an undocumented generalized approval. The Randall report confines its justification to executive salaries.

I think a strong case was made, and a persuasive case so far as I am concerned, for an increase in salaries of executive and judicial employees. The testimony is voluminous and the comparability criterion that was introduced is most convincing. The fact is that this Government cannot hire people to serve in responsible and onerous jobs of our Federal Government if they are not paid on a basis comparable to what they can earn in private employment.

Since there last was a substantial increase for members of the Cabinet and judicial officials, there has been a great increase in salaries all over the country, but particularly in the highest salaries.

I feel very strongly that the need for a pay increase in those categories has been fully justified. It has been fully documented. It would be false economy if Congress should refuse to permit the Federal Government to pay sufficient salaries to enable the Government to hire some of the best administrators in the Nation to serve in responsible and important positions, in which persons could exercise their judgment in securing efficiency and economy.

But the same argument cannot be made for Members of the House and the Senate. This is a most difficult issue to debate, because we are all involved. It is difficult for us to argue against a pay increase for Members of the House and Senate.

I cannot think of anything that would make one lose popularity among one's colleagues more than to argue against a pay raise for them. In fact, I am having trouble with my wife on this issue. I am sure that those who vote for my amendment will find they may have trouble with their wives, children, or other members of their family who disagree. So it is not easy to make this argument. But the fact is that a pay increase is not necessary for Members of the House and Senate.

A Member of the House or Senate now receives $22,500 a year. That pay is three times as high as the income of the average American family. Only 1 family out of 50 in the Nation receives as much as $22,500 or more.

When one is paid this handsomely in any line of work, really the only justification to pay more is that we must pay more if we are to get the people to do the job. That is the justification for the increase for Cabinet officers and judicial officers. But the same justification cannot be made for Members of the House and Senate.

We all recognize the great expense involved in running as a candidate for the House or Senate. Why? Because there is great competition for the job. Candidates for the House and their supporters are willing to contribute, typically, $25,000 or $30,000, for a single campaign. In many States candidates for the Senate will conduct campaigns that cost $250,000 or $300,000, and some Senate campaigns cost $1 million or more.

On the basis of competence and efficiency, I should say that the services of virtually all Members of the Senate could be valued abstractly at $50,000 or $100,000, or even more. Most Members of this body could make more on the outside than we make here. We have chosen to serve in this body because we like it, because the nonmonetary rewards are far greater than the monetary rewards. There is no question of the satisfaction that comes from serving in the Senate, in being one's own boss, in not being an administrator appointed by somebody else, of being able to work in accordance with one's own conscience, of, in effect, choosing one's own field, and devoting time and attention to it and meeting the great challenges that face our country in being a top American policymaker. That is the real compensation. Whether the salary were increased to $30,000, or $50,000, or $100,000, the incentive to run as a candidate for the Senate or the House in my judgment, would not be substantially increased.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I have a tabulation in my hand showing the pay increases that were granted generally to the Federal employees beginning in 1955. If I am incorrect in this statement, those who are experts in the matter may challenge me.

In 1955 a 7.5-percent pay raise was granted to the general employees.

In 1958 a 10-percent increase was granted.

In 1960 a 7.7 percent increase was granted.

In 1962 a 5.5-percent increase was granted, effective in 1962, with the provision for a 4.4-percent increase effective in 1964.

These figures show that since 1955 the general employees have received, in the aggregate, pay raises amounting to 35.1 percent.

I come now to the pay raises granted to Members of Congress.

In 1955 the pay was raised from $12,500 to $22,500.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. The salary was $12,500, with an allowance of $2,500 for expenses, but the salary was $12,500, according to the report submitted.

Mr. MONRONEY. If the Senator will yield for a correction, the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 established a $15,000 salary for Members of the Senate and House. At that time, in 1946, Members were enjoying a salary of $10,000 plus a $2,500 allowance. When the Legislative Reorganization Act was passed a $15,000 salary superseded the old salary, and that was the salary until the time it was raised to $22,500 in 1955.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is, it was $12,500, with $2,500 for an allowance. What does the Senator from Oklahoma say it was then?

Mr. MONRONEY. Then it was $15,000 salary, and the expense allowance ceased to exist.

Mr. LAUSCHE. In 1955 the salary was $15,000. Then it was raised to $22,500. That is a 50-percent increase. It is now proposed to raise it from $22,500 to $30,000. That is a 33⅓-percent pay raise over 1955. If we take the $15,000 pay in 1955 and compare it with the $30,000 in 1964, the pay raise is 100 percent. How can we go back to the taxpayers and voters and say that we have granted, in the aggregate, a 35-percent pay raise to the general employees, but have granted to ourselves a 100-percent pay raise? I should like to ask the Senator from Wisconsin how he can answer conscientiously anyone who challenges him on the basis that he gave a 100-percent pay raise in 9 years to himself and gave the little postal carrier and the janitor and the washwoman 35 percent in the aggregate?

Mr. PROXMIRE. In general, I agree with the distinguished Senator from Ohio. But I do think that on the basis of the Randall report and on the basis of the hearings, it is possible to justify a substantial increase for members of the Cabinet and some of the other leading administrators in our Government, on the comparability basis. It is a matter of judgment, but I think the Randall people were efficient. I think they were honest. I think they were objective. I believe that when they said that if we wish to have the kind of people who are competent to do important administrative and judicial work, it is necessary to pay them appropriately, they were right. I accept that.

Some of the increases are very substantial. I reject the principle that it is not possible to increase the salary of a Cabinet officer, and the salary of the other people in the Federal Government with responsible jobs, without at the same time increasing the salaries of the Members of Congress by the same amount. The jobs are entirely different. There is no comparability.

No member of a State legislature gets anything like the salary that we do.

It is true that when we get into the area of administrative jobs, we find that in California and in Illinois and in Pennsylvania, for example, in some cases 90 or 100 people get more than $25,000 a year. They are administrators. Those States have found that the only way they can get competent people is to pay them an additional sum.

For ourselves, I do not find any justification for the proposed increase.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I cannot find any justification for the disparity that exists between the aggregate pay raises that were granted in 10 years to the general employees, amounting to 35 percent, while we are granting to ourselves an increase of 100 percent. We are in no different category so far as want and need are concerned.

Mr. PROXMIRE. On the basis of want and need there is no question about it. I feel strongly, and I have felt very strongly for years, that the rank and file Federal employees deserve better pay. We can justify it on the basis of justice and need, and that it is necessary to do it in order to get people who fill comparable jobs outside the Government. But the only way we can justify paying more than $20,000 a year is that a pay increase is necessary to pay that amount to attract qualified officials. The argument can be made, on the basis of the Randall report, that it is necessary to pay the additional amount to get the people who are competent to handle the important sub-Cabinet and Cabinet jobs.

That argument cannot be made with regard to Members of Congress.

If I run for reelection this fall I will have a very strong opponent, and most Members of Congress will also. All of us are well aware of the fact that there is plenty of competition when it comes to these jobs we hold.

Mr. LAUSCHE. If the Senator lost all of his staff members, does he think there would be others available in Wisconsin to work for him on the basis of the pay that he is now paying his staff members, without an increase?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I believe so.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I believe that is true in my case, too. I believe every Member of Congress has 10 applicants for every job he has available in his office. I should like to ask the Senator one more question. In addition to this pay raise of 100 percent in 10 years, I have before me a tabulation of what my retirement pay and the retirement pay of the Senator from Wisconsin will be. He has served 6 years. At the end of 6 years it is $281.25 a month. With the increase in the salary from $22,500 to $30,000, the retirement pay would be $406.25. That is for that 6 years' service. At the end of 12 years, on the basis of $30,000, my retirement pay would be $30,000 times 2½ percent times 12 years. It would be $6,000 a year. The point I am trying to make is this: Is it not a fact that in addition to the increase in pay, we would eventually become the beneficiaries of a liberal increase in our retirement pay?

Mr. PROXMIRE. There is no question about that. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. We would become the beneficiaries of a liberal increase in retirement pay without having to pay anything into the retirement fund to support that increased pay.

Mr. PROXMIRE. There would be some increase, but nothing in proportion to what we would get out.

Mr. LAUSCHE. We would pay in nothing on the basis of past service. We would pay on the basis of future service.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, is it not a fact that we pay in about 7½ percent?

Mr. CARLSON. Yes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. But only on the future salary. We do not pay it on the past salary.

Mr. MORTON. The Senator has found a different way of doing it. Apparently he has a new way of doing it, because I have been paying into the fund for 18 years.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Let us make this point clear. A person who goes to work for the Federal Government at $5,000 a year and pays in 2½ percent on his $5,000, and finally works himself up to a $15,000 salary, has his retirement calculated on the $15,000, on which he did not, through his entire service, pay 2½ percent, and not on the basis of the $5,000.

Mr. MORTON. That does not apply alone to Members of Congress. That applies to the entire Federal pension plan. It is figured on the basis of the average of the top 5 years.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is why the Federal pension fund is in the red in the sum of $39 billion.

Mr. MORTON. If that is so, let us rewrite the law.

Mr. MONRONEY. It is not $39 billion.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It is underfunded in the sum of $39 billion.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Kansas, for a clarification of this point.

Mr. CARLSON. I do not want to get into an argument between the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Wisconsin. However, readers of the RECORD should have the facts stated accurately. The Senator is really a little low in some of his figures.

Since 1955 there have been six salary increases for Federal employees, including increases of 7.5 percent in 1955, 8.1 percent in 1956, 10 percent in 1958, 7.7 percent in 1960, 5.5 percent in 1962, and 4.1 percent that became effective on January 1, 1964. That aggregates more than 51 percent.

The distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] has mentioned congressional increases in salary. The salary in January 1955 was $22,500. Therefore, a salary of $30,000 would not be a 100-percent increase; it would be an increase of 33 percent.

Mr. LAUSCHE. No; I stated that clearly. If it was $15,000 in 1955, and would become $30,000 in 1964——

Mr. CARLSON. It was $15,000 in 1946.

Mr. MONRONEY. The salary of Members of Congress was changed in March 1955. It is necessary to compare the salaries correctly by using the same base period; for example, the increase in 1955. It will be found that about the same amount of increase, about 35 percent, has been given to all Federal workers regularly throughout the 10-year period.

Under the committee's proposal, Members of Congress would receive an increase of about 33 percent effective January 1, 1965. Members of Congress did not receive an increase in 1956, 1957, 1958, 1959, or 1960. Their salaries were increased in 1955. So let us keep the figures straight. The percentage is approximately concomitant between the starting figure in 1955 and the amounts by which Federal workers in the civil service have been raised during the intervening period and what is now proposed to be effective in 1965, a 33-percent increase.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Do I correctly understand that the Senator's amendment is designed to correct all the inequities in the bill?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am sure there are many inequities in the bill at which the amendments of other Senators are aimed. My amendment is aimed at the title dealing with Federal legislative salaries, title II.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Are we to assume that if the Senator's amendment were adopted, he would favor the bill?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Yes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I do not understand the Senator's reasoning.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I shall favor the bill whether my amendment is adopted or not. I hope the amendment will be adopted; but I shall vote for the bill anyway, because I think it is so badly needed to get and retain the kind of efficient people needed in the Federal Government. I am for the bill.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I disagree with the Senator so far as he says it is necessary to raise salaries in order to get efficient personnel for the Government. People are running over themselves wanting to get into the Government, just as they are running over themselves trying to be elected to Congress.

I do not disagree with the Senator in the main; but if his amendment is adopted and the bill is passed, he will be voting a pay raise for his administrative assistant to a limit that is higher than the Senator's own salary now.

Mr. PROXMIRE. No; that is not correct. I would delete all of title II, which affects administrative assistants and all other Senate employees.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thought the Senator said his amendment affected only Senators and Representatives.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I was misunderstood. The amendment affects not only Members of the Senate and House; it would not permit an increase in pay for congressional staff members and would not permit increases in pay for Members of the House and Senate.

The Senator from Arkansas makes a good point. I think it is necessary to keep salaries in line.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The salaries of members of the Senate staff, under the bill, would be higher than salaries Senators now receive.

Mr. PROXMIRE. But my amendment would prevent that.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Would the Senator's amendment apply to all Members of Congress?

Mr. PROXMIRE. It applies to the salaries of Members of the Senate and House and to all other legislative salaries. All legislative salary increases are deleted by my amendment.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Under the Senator's amendment, would the members of the staff, from the lowest to the highest paid, receive no increase at all, whether in the House or the Senate?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The answer is no. No increase. Of course, there is the possibility that a Senator who now has extra clerk hire available might increase his staff members, but my amendment would not by itself provide an increase in salaries for employees of the legislative branch.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Would the Senator's amendment allow the $7,500 increase for Cabinet officers?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Yes.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. PROUTY. As I understand, the Senator's amendment would preclude any increase in salaries for Members of the House and Senate.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Members of the Senate and House and the staff.

Mr. PROUTY. I am sympathetic toward the Senator's position with respect to congressional salaries; but I believe some justification can be made for a reasonable increase in staff salaries. So at the proper time I shall offer a substitute which would eliminate the provision for an increase in congressional salaries; and if that should be adopted, I shall offer a second amendment, which would permit an increase in staff salaries up to $22,000. In other words, the staff would not receive more than Members of Congress receive.

Mr. McCLELLAN. It would be $500 less.

Mr. PROUTY. That would be up to the Senate to determine.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I believe the committee did its work carefully, as it has always done in the past, to try to bring the salary payments, not only of the staff of other employees of the Senate, in proper relationship to what Senators receive. So we either must cut out the whole thing or, in effect, cut out nothing. Otherwise there will be a large number of employees of the Senate and of Senators who will receive, under the amendment the Senator from Vermont proposes to offer, more than Senators receive.

Mr. PROUTY. I wish to ask the Senator another question. A Senator does not have to grant an increase to his staff members if he does not wish to do so, does he?

Mr. PROXMIRE. No; but there are doorkeepers and others, who are not responsible to any one Senator, who would be paid more than Senators are paid under the Prouty amendment.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE I yield.

Mr. TALMADGE. I compliment the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin for offering his amendment. I have been a Member of the Senate for a relatively short time—7½ years. In that time, I have consistently supported and voted for legislation designed to update the pay scale and fringe benefits of our Federal workers to insure them a standard of living equal to and commensurate with their counterparts in private industry.

Specifically, since 1957, Congress has passed three pay-increase bills which have increased the pay of Federal employees by a total of 27½ percent. These included a 10-percent increase in 1958, a 7½-percent increase in 1960, and a 10-percent increase in 1962, a part of which took effect only on January 1 of this year.

We are now informed that the pay of Federal workers is again lagging behind that of those in private life who are doing similar work and, therefore, are being called upon to further increase these salaries. In addition to classified and postal employees, the bill includes increases, some as high as 33 percent, for Members of Congress and leading members of the executive branch and the judiciary, including members of the Supreme Court.

My inquiry has verified the fact that the bill would increase the salaries of the pages sitting in front of us to $5,004 a year. I do not see how anyone can justify that.

The bill comes to us in revised form after a previous bill, which provided even larger increases for high officials in the executive branch and Members of Congress, was defeated in the House earlier this year.

I support the principle of comparability between Government and industry and of paying a salary which is sufficient to attract qualified people to serve the Federal Government. I believe that the bill, in providing a one-third increase for Members of Congress, with similar increases for the executive and judicial branches, goes far beyond that point and, in fact, is completely unreasonable in this respect.

I point out that in addition to our salaries, the Government contributes 7½ percent toward our retirement benefits, which is a fringe benefit vested after only 5 years of service. The able Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], in an earlier colloquy with the Senator from Wisconsin, stated in detail how beneficial this is to all Members of Congress. If the salary of $30,000 is retained in the bill as it came to the Senate, 7½ percent of that, in addition, will be contributed by the taxpayers of the country toward our retirement benefits, and it will be vested after only 5 years of service.

Only last week, this body voted to increase the national debt ceiling to an all-time high of $324 billion.

In the past 34 years, we have balanced the Federal budget only about six times. It has been unbalanced 28 times. Although the exact figures will not be available for some time yet, I am informed that the fiscal year which ended at midnight last night, will probably show a deficit in excess of $8,800 million. It is estimated to be approximately $6,600 million for this fiscal year.

In the face of this kind of national financial picture, I cannot in good conscience vote for a bill which, among other things would increase my own salary by one-third, and in its present form would cost the taxpayers over one-half billion dollars annually.

I hope that the amendment which has been offered by the Senator from Wisconsin, to strike the exorbitant increases for Members of Congress and to bring into reasonable proportion the increases for other Federal officials, will be adopted.

In the event that it is, I shall be glad to support the bill.

In the event that it is not approved, I cannot vote for it.

I thank the Senator from Wisconsin for yielding to me.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator from Georgia very much.

Before I yield to the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], let me say that the point the Senator from Georgia makes about the effect of this proposal on responsible fiscal policy is particularly important. Not only have we the problem of the national debt, but only a few months ago we voted the biggest tax cut in the history of the Nation, a tax cut which certainly will deepen the deficit for this year, at least. There is no question about that.

The tax cut not only benefited many Americans, but it also benefited Members of Congress. It benefited Members of Congress far more handsomely than most Americans.

My staff people have computed that a typical Member of Congress, if he has no outside income, received the benefit from the tax cut of increased take-home pay of $18 a week, or $900 a year, which is a far greater increase than the overwhelming majority of the American people received from the tax cut.

It will be remembered that when we voted for the tax cut, it was made explicit that we would do everything we could to cut down Federal spending. How in the world can we honestly say we are working to keep Federal spending down if we vote ourselves a 33⅓ increase in salary?

There might be a time for this kind of increase later, but not this year, not in a year when we have already voted a heavy tax cut, when we have deliberately planned to unbalance the budget to the extent that we have.

I am now glad to yield to the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON].

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I wish to participate in this debate, because the salaries of the very young men who serve us on both sides of the aisle have been mentioned. These boys receive $387.11 a month. They serve during the sessions of the Congress. They serve an entire year at their present salary—12 months. At $387.11 a month, the total for the year is $4,655.40.

This bill would increase the salaries of these young men, following the pattern of other salaries, by $29 a month. It is true that it would total a little over $5,000—$5,004.60.

The record should be made clear that these boys are serving by the month. If the session lasts 12 months, that is the salary they would get.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I wish to express my support for the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin. There should be no question in the minds of the American people and those of us in this body on the justification of the proposed pay raises for the postal workers and the classified employees. Whether based on merit, comparability, or cost-of-living increases, Federal employees who are legally denied the opportunity to use the bargaining techniques of their counterparts in private industry, deserve fair and thorough consideration at this bargaining table. We should be directing our attention to this question and this alone.

Inclusion of the congressional pay raise in this bill is totally inappropriate. Any such increase for Congress involves entirely different considerations and should be voted up or down on its own merits. If there is no justification for an increase at this time, then it certainly should not ride through on the legislative coattails of merited increases.

Entirely apart from the merits of whether we are entitled to more money or not, the fact is that there is virtually nothing in the hearings record dealing with the question of congressional pay raises. Whether the figure of a 33⅓-percent increase was picked out of thin air and whether it may be justified or not is unknown.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is correct. That is exactly what this congressional raise is—legislative coattail riding.

Look at the hearings. There is virtually no justification for a congressional increase. There is some justification for an increase in the executive and judicial departments. Many prominent organizations and persons have appeared and documented the case for executive and judicial pay increases. However, there is no justification for the increase for Members of Congress. It has been argued that if we increase the salaries of the executive and the judicial branches, we should also increase the congressional. Why? Why?

We increase the salaries of the executive and the judiciary, therefore we have to do it if we are to get competent people to do the job in those two branches of our Government. That argument does not apply to Congress.

Mr. KEATING. The Senator is correct. Let me add one comment. I would prefer to have this amendment apply only to Members of Congress. I understand the problems to which the Senator's amendment is directed. But, in my judgment, the staff members as employees of Congress are deserving of increased compensation now. It would be preferable to adopt the substitute proposal of the Senator from Vermont, which is limited to Members of Congress.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator from New York. I am now glad to yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I am strongly in favor of increasing the pay for postal and classified personnel, and also for the judiciary. But I shall support the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin to eliminate legislative salary increases. Nevertheless, I believe it should be realized that the actual take-home pay of a Senator or Representative is very much less than commonly believed, after he meets the necessary political expenses of his office. I do not believe that any Senator who votes for an increase in pay should be singled out by the voters, or by anyone else, for condemnation. Nevertheless, for a number of reasons, I am opposed to this increase for Members of Congress. I shall vote for the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. President, I am keenly aware of the difficulties of living on our present congressional salary after meeting the necessary costs of such items as: First, trips back home and travel inside the State, plus, second, the cost of radio and television reports, third, the entertainment in Washington of constituents; fourth, donations to charitable organizations and causes which are expected, and, indeed, almost demanded of public officials; and, fifth, contributions to party funds and to the campaigns of other candidates. After these deductions together with income taxes and contributions to the retirement fund are subtracted from the salary of $22,500, my actual take-home pay in nonelection years is almost never above $7,000 and in election years even less.

All this is a strong argument for an increase in congressional salaries and I do not have the slightest criticism either expressed or implied for those of my colleagues who so vote. But I cannot bring myself to do so for the following reasons:

First. We in Congress have some opportunity for legitimate outside earnings. It is true that the work in Congress is steadily increasing and is at times almost crushing. But there are still opportunities, on weekends, and when Congress is not in session, to earn additional modest amounts in law practice, business, writing, and lecturing. Any danger of a consequent conflict of interest with one's duties as a Congressman can largely, if not entirely, be averted by requiring full disclosure of outside income and ownership as Senator MORSE and I advocated many years ago and as is now being urged by Senators CASE, NEUBERGER, CLARK, and KEATING.

Second. We should remember that with all our financial difficulties we in Congress are still in a very favored economic position. We should never forget that at least 40 million Americans, or slightly over 20 percent, are living in poverty and that 90 percent of American taxpayers have incomes under $10,000 a year. Probably less than 2 percent have an income of $30,000 for which we are now asked to vote. And yet we are supposed to represent the great bulk of the American people. The danger is that if we provide a salary of $30,000 for ourselves, then it will be easy for us to think as $30,000 a year men customarily do—and to forget what it feels like to live as do the overwhelming majority of our fellow Americans whose interests we should have at heart.

Third. Finally, I resent esthetically being put in a position where I must vote on my own salary. No one with any personal dignity likes to exercise the power he possesses to vote himself an increase. I am willing to vote for an increase to others, and, indeed, I favor the other portions of the pay bill, but I would prefer that any increases in congressional salaries should come primarily from others, such as on the recommendation of an impartial committee. I know that in the present instance this is almost impossible to effect and that we are now compelled to decide on our own condition. In addition to the reasons which I have stated, I would therefore have a certain squeemishness in voting myself an increase, however justified this might be on other grounds.

For these reasons I shall support the motion to eliminate congressional salary increases from the bill. But I wish to add that in my judgment there should be no condemnation of those Senators who do vote for the increase and against the amendment. For I know from experience just how difficult the problem is for those without large private resources and that this is particularly hard for those with large families to support and educate.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina, chairman of the committee, who has been patiently waiting for a long time. I apologize to him.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I should like to follow up what the Senator from Illinois has just stated. When we put the $7,000 on top of the present salary rate, we find that we would receive only 58 percent of the increase. The rest of it will be taken out for income taxes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I may seem to be arguing in part against myself, but, as I stated, if we deduct the expenses of trips back home, travel inside our States, the cost of radio and television reports, entertaining our Washington constituents, donations to charitable organizations, the cost of which is expected—indeed, is almost demanded of public officials—and legitimate and proper contributions to party funds, and to the campaigns of other candidates, there is not much left. I believe that this does make a strong case for an increase. Nevertheless, I am opposed to the increase. I am not given to self-flagellation, but I am opposed to the increase, the reasons for which I have explained.

Mr. PROXMIRE. May I say to the Senator from Illinois that although he is supporting my amendment, he has made the strongest argument against it that has been made yet.

Mr. DOUGLAS. There is much to be said for such an increase since this is a complicated question.

Mr. PROXMIRE. It is, indeed, but this extraordinarily judicious and judicial cast of mind is typical of the senior Senator from Illinois. It is typical of his approach to all questions.

In reply, however, our TV, newsletter, and other reporting to our constituents is strictly voluntary. Certainly it is voluntary in the view of those against whom we run. This reporting is a fine thing in democracy. But it is construed by many as self-serving. Some Senators do not ever make a TV or newsletter report to their constituents.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator is perhaps the greatest traveler in the Senate. I do not know any Senator who is more energetic than he in getting back home to see his constituents. I shall not inquire what his travel bill is, but it must be very large judging from my own travel bill which amounts to approximately $3,000 a year. I think all these items should be taken into consideration. But, nevertheless, since we can have legitimate outside occupations in which to increase our income we Senators are still in a very favorable economic condition in comparison with other citizens of the United States. It is humiliating to be forced to increase one's own salary. There is an esthetic objection which I have to that.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, about a half hour ago I was challenged rather vigorously as to the correctness of my statement with regard to when the pay raises were put into effect.

Since that time, I have had copies of the acts brought to me. I submit that the acts will demonstrate without any question that the salaries of Congressmen in 1946–57 was $12,500. I have here Public Law 601 of the 79th Congress, chapter 753, 2d session. This law was passed as the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. That is the act which the Senator from Oklahoma said provided for a salary of $22,500.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator from Oklahoma said nothing of the kind. I stated it provided a salary of $15,000.

Mr. LAUSCHE. All right. Let me read what it states:

> Effective on the day on which the 80th Congress convenes, the compensation of Senators, Representatives in Congress, Delegates from the Territories, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico shall be at the rate of $12,500 per year.

That is what I said. The language of the act definitely establishes the correctness of what I said. I further stated that it was in 1955 that the salaries were raised from $12,500 to $22,500.

I have here Public Law 9 of the 84th Congress, chapter 9, 1st session, House Resolution 3828. The act was approved by the President on March 2, 1955. This provides:

> The compensation of Senators, Representatives in Congress, Delegates from the Territories, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico shall be at the rate of $22,500 per annum.

A half hour ago I stated that the salaries in 1946 were $12,500. They were raised in 1955 to $22,500. They are now intended to be raised to $30,000. These laws speak for themselves.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEC. 4. (a) Section 601(a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The compensation of Senators, Representatives in Congress, Delegates from the Territories, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico shall be at the rate of $22,500 per annum each; and the compensation of the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall be at the rate of $35,000 per annum."

(b) Section 601(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended (relative to expense allowances of Members of Congress), is hereby repealed.

(c) Section 104 of title 3 of the United States Code (relating to the compensation of the Vice President) is amended by striking out "$30,000" and substituting therefor "$35,000".

SEC. 5. The provisions of this Act shall take effect on March 1, 1955.

TITLE VI—COMPENSATION AND RETIREMENT PAY OF MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Compensation of Members of Congress

SEC. 601. (a) Effective on the day on which the Eightieth Congress convenes, the compensation of Senators, Representatives in Congress, Delegates from the Territories, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico shall be at the rate of $12,500 per annum each; and the compensation of the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Vice President of the United States shall be at the rate of $20,000 per annum each.

(b) Effective on the day on which the Eightieth Congress convenes there shall be paid to each Senator, Representative in Congress, Delegate from the Territories, Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico, an expense allowance of $2,500 per annum to assist in defraying expenses relating to, or resulting from the discharge of his official duties, for which no tax liability shall incur, or accounting be made; such sum to be paid in equal monthly installments.

(c) The sentence contained in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1946, which reads as follows: "There shall be paid to each Representative and Delegate, and to the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico, after January 2, 1945, an expense allowance of $2,500 per annum to assist in defraying expenses related to or resulting from the discharge of his official duties, to be paid in equal monthly installments.", is hereby repealed, effective on the day on which the Eightieth Congress convenes.

(d) The sentence contained in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1947, which reads as follows: "There shall be paid to each Senator after January 1, 1946, an expense allowance of $2,500 per annum to assist in defraying expenses related to or resulting from the discharge of his official duties, to be paid in equal monthly installments.", is hereby repealed, effective on the day on which the Eightieth Congress convenes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I repeat that from $12,500 to $30,000 is a $17,500 increase since 1945, or 140 percent.

If those who challenge me—and I see them on the floor—can find any written law, and not their memory, I wish they would find it and show it to me.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, before I yield further, in order that we might have some order in this debate, I would ask other Senators who ask me to yield, to make their statements brief, if they would, or wait until I yield the floor. Then, if they want to carry on a debate, they can carry it on themselves. The way this debate is being conducted now, with this Senator farming out the floor, is not an orderly way to proceed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, would the Senator consider a time limitation on a vote on the amendment?

Mr. PROXMIRE. If the Senator from Ohio is willing.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I object.

Mr. MANSFIELD. We will be here late on this one amendment.

Mr. LAUSCHE. No. I object because I found myself running out of time on every occasion when an important vote was up.

Mr. PROXMIRE. If the Senator from Ohio would yield for a minute, I think the Senator from Montana only mentioned a time limitation on my amendment. Is that correct?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct. As far as I am concerned, it does not make a bit of difference to me. I know what I shall do. The Senators can speak from now until doomsday. I shall still vote the same way. We shall stay late tonight. If the Senators do not want to get on to a vote on the amendment, it is no skin off my nose.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I will accept any limitation that the majority leader wants to impose. Would the Senator from Ohio be amenable?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I would be willing to talk about it.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Would the majority leader propose a time limitation on this one amendment alone?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I would like, on this one amendment, to propose that we vote on this amendment at 6 o'clock.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I have a substitute to this amendment. I do not like to delay it. It will not take me very long. But I want to protect myself.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Excuse me.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, on page 217 of the Senate hearings on the Federal pay legislation, it is shown that the pay scale of **1946** was $15,000, the total compensation being $15,000. According to footnote 5, this includes a $2,500 expense allowance which was tax free until 1953, when it was made taxable under the provision of the Revenue Act of October 20, 1951.

This allowance was discontinued effective March 1, 1955, by the same legislation which increased the salary rate for Members of Congress to $22,500. So, the record is absolutely clear that the pay that Members received was a total of $15,000, $2,500 of which was tax free at that time.

It was tax free at that time and it was changed by the Revenue Act of 1951 and made subject to the normal income tax. So we are talking about a salary of $15,000 up to 1955, at which time it was changed to $22,500.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I rise briefly in order that the record may be corrected in connection with the statements made by my distinguished colleagues, from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] and New York [Mr. KEATING], to the effect that the hearings disclose no compelling arguments for increases for the Members of the Congress of the United States.

I refer to May 18 of this year when the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], appeared before our committee.

Mr. PROXMIRE. If the Senator will permit an interruption, I should like to say that the Senator from Wisconsin specifically mentioned the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and said that he did make an appearance on congressional salary increases. As usual, it was a very effective and eloquent appearance. But I said that that was the only appearance in favor of the congressional increase that I could find. And that appearance was not documented. So far as I can find, no organization appeared to document and support specifically the proposed congressional pay increase.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The Randall Commission had done so. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] referred to that study. I did not hear all of the Senator's prepared speech of today. I only heard him say in his colloquy with the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] that there had been no argument advanced during the hearings for a congressional pay increase. I heard that only a few moments ago. I repeat a very valid argument was made by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] before our committee. President Lyndon Johnson has effectively and energetically advocated an increase for Members of Congress. Perhaps there are a few Senators who voted to decrease their salaries while they were Members of the Congress of the United States. In 1933 I served with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], as Members of the House. I voted to decrease our salaries to $8,500 a year. So from time to time we have the opportunity and the responsibility to act. We are charged by the Constitution of the United States with setting our salaries. It is a task we must meet by law.

I find no fault with any Senator who disagrees with our committee in its bill. However, I remind the Senate that the Senator from Illinois advocated not the $7,500 increase included in the recommendation of the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and as contained in the measure. He recommended an increase to $10,000. I think that point should be included as a part of the record. I emphasize that I have no disposition to argue with a colleague on this subject. It is a challenge that, very frankly, we should vote on. The Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] has said, in essence, that in a few minutes or a few hours we will vote as we believe. I believe any Senator knows whether he or she will vote for or against an increase.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is perfectly right when he says that the committee did exercise discretion in not going as high not only as the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] recommended but as high as the Randall Commission recommended.

The President of the United States also recommended a $10,000 increase for Members of Congress. I am not saying that the committee was particularly excessive, but I do say that neither in the hearings nor in the report of the Randall Commission—and I have the report beginning on page 12 of the hearings—could I find any justification for the proposed congressional increase except, as the Senator from New York so well said, it was a free ride on the increase for the executive and the judicial branches. There was no specific justification for the proposed congressional pay increase.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Is it not true that in the opinion of the Senator from Wisconsin each and every Senator knows exactly whether he or she will vote for or against the proposed congressional pay increase?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Yes, indeed. That is why I was ready to vote on the question some time ago and why I was ready to agree to a request for a time limitation on the debate as proposed by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD].

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I believe the proposed pay raise is justified, and I shall vote for it.

I have in my hand my income tax return, which Senators are free to look at. The return has been checked by representatives of the Federal Government. I have been one of the guinea pigs.

In my 1960 return I have itemized my deductions. The Government looked over the return. They disallowed about $100 or $200, I believe, by the time they got through examining the returns.

On the return I have listed such expenses as my home office expenses; additional telephone and telegraph; public service broadcast, in connection with which I paid for the film, although the station ran it free of charge as a public service; publication clipping service, so that I could see what a low rating I have been getting from the newspapers in my State, and occasionally a complimentary remark; photographs sent out to someone who thought enough of me as to wish a picture that they could hang on the wall; petty cash for the office staff, and that sort of thing; entertaining constituents; dues to professional organizations; unreimbursed office expenses that I incurred.

All of those expenses add up to $28,078. My salary was not exactly $22,500 because I received some additional allowances, such as postage, on which I made a little money. Some allowance should be made for that. I grossed $24,000 and my expenses were $28,078. So the best I can make of it is that I was $4,000 in the red.

Those figures demonstrate that I have not allowed anything to send my daughter to college. No allowance has been made to operate my home in Louisiana. The figures did not allow for transportation back and forth from home to office and personal expenses. Nothing of that sort is included.

What I have stated is what I can deduct because I had the expenses that go with being a U.S. Senator.

Last year I made out better. I think I actually came out better by about $3,000. But I am the lowest paid man in my office. In other words, by the time the expenses are considered, the boy who runs errands between my office and the Senate Chamber is paid twice as much in terms of net income, as I am paid.

Mr. President, I believe I should make a few dollars out of the job. It is most difficult for the Senator from Louisiana to explain to his wife why he is serving for a minus income. I am donating my services because I love the country and the job.

Some Members of Congress are bachelors and some have children who are away, supporting their own families, and are doing so adequately.

Mr. President, I am having prepared an amendment which I shall offer, which will provide that before a Member of Congress receives the proposed pay raise, he will sign a statement, first, that he is of the opinion that his services justify his receiving the proposed pay raise.

Second, that unless he receives the pay raise, he will not be able to meet his essential expenses of providing the services that he is trying to provide for his State, his constituents, and his Nation as a Senator. If he really did not believe that, and if he could not subscribe to that statement, he would not receive the increase. For example, he may be like my friend on the House side, whose name I shall not mention, even though he makes no secret of his attitude. According to his own statement, he gives his entire salary to the church. After he pays his taxes, whatever he has left over he gives to the church. He is working for God and the country. If all we are doing is acting upon a proposed pay increase in order that Members of Congress may donate more to the church, I could not go along with the proposal because it would violate the principle of separation of church and state. [Laughter.]

We should not pass a pay raise bill which would merely put more money into a church's till.

But if some Member of Congress has need of the increase in order to provide the service that is expected of him and that he would like to provide for his constitutents, then he should be able to state that he is worth that amount of money to the country for the services he is rendering and that the expenses he incurs actually justify his receiving the increase. I would not require that a man make money in his private endeavors in order to carry the expenses of being a U.S. Senator. The salary should be adequate so that one could give up his law practice, if that were his sole source of income, in order to serve his country as a Senator. On that basis I expect to vote for the bill.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Senator from Louisiana has said that in 1960 his expenses were $28,000. Obviously the proposed $7,500 increase would not be nearly enough. On that basis it could be argued that if our salary were $40,000 it would not be sufficient.

We are outgoing people. We love to entertain our constituents, to serve our constituents, and to report to our constituents. We would find ways of spending that much and more. But this kind of spending is voluntary. It is usually political. And it is frequently self-serving.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. My amendment would make it possible for my friend from Wisconsin to be a cutrate Senator. He could say, "If the people up there don't want me, they can vote for someone else, but I come cheaper." [Laughter.]

Let us consider some Members who are not really worth the money paid. They attend only about half the rollcalls. They would not need to certify that they were worth the money. They could then do their job at a lower figure. They could say, "I have not done much. I have not been very constructive, but look at all the money you are saving with me in Congress. It will not cost you much to have me around." A man could be a cutrate Member of Congress under my amendment. [Laughter.]

I hope there will be some. I am satisfied that there are some Members of Congress who are not worth that money.

On the other hand, the last two Presidents of the United States have been Members of the Senate. My guess is that as Senators they worked as diligently to discharge their duties to our country as they did when they were President. When President Lyndon B. Johnson was sitting in the seat now occupied by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], he tried to serve his country as well as he is now doing in the White House, although now he receives in pay several times what he made then as a Senator.

Mr. President, unless I miss my guess, though it is the same man, he is worth a great deal more money because it was the decision of the people to put him where he is.

Some of these people are being very inadequately paid, while other people are being paid too much. I am going to offer an amendment that will leave it to the conscience of Members of Congress as to whether they should get such pay or not.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I shall be delighted to vote for the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana. I am sure all 100 Senators will feel free to vote for it. When it becomes law we can cheerfully sign to the effect that our services justify our salaries, and that our services are essential to the Nation.

I said before that I thought the services of Senators are worth $50,000 or $100,000, but we know that we do not have to increase the pay of Senators to persuade them to serve here. There is much competition, outstanding competition—too strong competition—for this office. Therefore, there is no justification for paying a salary increase of a whopping one-third when a Congressman already makes more than what 98 percent of the people of America receive.

The Randall Commission made the case for the executive department. It did not make a case for Members of Congress.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Perhaps the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana, instead of providing that a Member should certify as to what he thinks he is worth, should provide that the people back home should say how much they think he is worth.

Mr. PROXMIRE. That would be a dangerous amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I want to support the Senator from Wisconsin in his pending amendment. I think a pay raise for Members of Congress should be decided on its own merits, without being a coattail rider to this bill. Some employees of the Government will be getting less than a 1.6-percent increase. I do not know why we should hook on a 33⅓-percent increase for Members of Congress as a rider to this bill. I think a pay raise for Members of Congress should be considered as a completely separate bill. I would like to support portions of the pending bill.

There is nothing in the law which requires a Member of Congress to spend $8,000, $10,000 or $15,000 to advertise himself and to help get himself reelected. If Members of Congress want to be reelected they should pay for it out of their own pockets, the same as our opponents are required to do.

I am in favor of the cost-of-living increase proposed in this bill for the postal workers and other civil service workers. This amounts to a raise of from 2 to 5 percent.

If the pay for Members of Congress is increased by 33⅓ percent it also has a mathematical effect of increasing the retirement benefits by 6½ percent for each year for the next 5 years. This should certainly be taken into consideration when the retirement fund already is insolvent.

Certainly the proposal to raise salaries of Members of Congress should be dealt with in a separate bill rather than hooked onto this bill as a coattail rider.

In line with what the Senator from Ohio has said, there seems to be an argument as to what the congressional salaries were in prior years. In 1946 congressional salaries were $10,000, beginning in 1947 the congressional salaries were $12,500 plus $2,500 expense allowance, the latter item being tax free.

In 1953 I introduced the amendment which made that $2,500 allowance taxable. This made the whole $15,000 salary taxable.

In 1954 there was another increase of 50 percent, to $22,500.

So, mathematically, Members of Congress had a 50-percent increase in dollar income in 1947 and another 50 percent increase in 1954, and the present proposal would be a 33⅓ percent on top of that, which means that if the bill is passed Members of Congress will be receiving a 300 percent increase over and above what they were receiving in 1946. Congressional retirements are increased at an even larger percentage under these bills.

I think these facts should be dealt with and pointed out when an attempt is being made to hook an increase onto a pay bill which increases the pay of the average Federal employees from 2 to 5 percent. This proposal should be separated and made on its own merits. If it cannot be supported on its own merits it should not pass.

I shall support the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin which would strike from the bill all proposed increases for the legislative branch. If this is successful I will support the other provisions of the bill. But if they are kept tied together I shall not vote for the bill.

When Congress has balanced the budget but six times in the past 35 years I do not think we merit a raise of the proportions suggested here.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator from Delaware. He is correct when he says that this congressional salary increase is strictly a coattail rider. There is no question that if a congressional pay raise were proposed by itself, it might face quite a different fate than what is now proposed.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may suggest the absence of a quorum, without losing the floor.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 457 Leg.]

Aiken
Allott
Beall
Bennett
Burdick
Carlson
Church
Clark
Cotton
Douglas
Fulbright
Gore
Hart
Hickenlooper
Holland
Hruska
Inouye
Johnston
Jordan, Idaho
Keating
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, La.
Mansfield
McClellan
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Mechem
Miller
Monroney
Morse
Morton
Moss
Mundt
Nelson
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Scott
Sparkman
Thurmond
Walters
Williams, Del.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** (Mr. Nelson in the chair). A quorum is not present.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay Mr. Anderson, Mr. Bartlett, Mr. Bible, Mr. Brewster, Mr. Byrd of Virginia, Mr. Byrd of West Virginia, Mr. Cannon, Mr. Case, Mr. Cooper, Mr. Curtis, Mr. Dirksen, Mr. Dodd, Mr. Dominick, Mr. Eastland, Mr. Ellender, Mr. Goldwater, Mr. Gruening, Mr. Hartke, Mr. Hill, Mr. Humphrey, Mr. Javits, Mr. Jordan of North Carolina, Mr. Long of Missouri, Mr. Magnuson, Mr. McCarthy, Mr. McGee, Mr. Metcalf, Mr. Muskie, Mrs. Neuberger, Mr. Pastore, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Russell, Mr. Simpson, Mrs. Smith, Mr. Stennis, Mr. Symington, Mr. Talmadge, Mr. Tower, Mr. Williams of New Jersey, Mr. Young of North Dakota, and Mr. Young of Ohio entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Edmondson], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Ervin], the Senator from Washington [Mr. Jackson], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pell], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Ribicoff], the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers], the Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough], and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Hayden] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from California [Mr. Engle], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Bayh], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy] are absent because of illness.

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. Boggs] is absent to attend the funeral of a relative.

The Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Fong], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Pearson] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Saltonstall] are necessarily absent.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** A quorum is present.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment in the nature of a substitute and ask that it be read and given immediate consideration.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

In lieu of the language contained in the pending amendment, insert the following:

"On page 114, strike out lines 17 to 24, inclusive.

"Beginning with line 5 on page 166, strike out over through line 2 on page 167 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"'Sec. 501. This act and the increases in compensation by this Act shall become effective on July 1, 1964.'"

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, on my amendment, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I wish to advise Senators that I intend to speak briefly. If they will remain in the Chamber, perhaps we can vote in the near future.

The amendment would merely strike from the bill the provisions permitting increases in congressional salaries. There is much logic in some of the arguments to the effect that an increase in congressional salaries is needed. I remember reading in the New York Times magazine several months ago an article by a Member of the other body who was serving his first term in Congress. Formerly he had been a professor in a university. He said, if I recall the article correctly, that his university salary, which was about half the amount of his congressional salary, enabled him to get along much more comfortably and to save more at the end of the year than he could possibly have saved as a Member of Congress. There is much merit in that argument.

Yet people throughout the country have a feeling that the salaries which we receive as Members of Congress are high enough to enable us to live luxuriously. They fail to realize and appreciate the tremendous burden of expenses which the average Member of Congress must assume in his campaigns, his entertainment of constituents, his travel, and in many other ways—expenses which no business or professional man is faced with.

Despite these things, we cannot blink the fact that we knew what the office paid when we sought it. Nor can we deny that millions of other Americans are forced to live, day by day, on the tiniest fraction of our own incomes.

The disabled worker, the unemployed family man, retired folks living on meager pensions—all of these know what it means to tighten their belts and to go without things they might like to have or which they actually need.

At present, however, the Federal budget is far out of balance. It is likely to be out of balance for some time. Should we not in such circumstances establish some list of priorities, some catalog of claims and rights, that ought to take precedence over our own?

Let there be an increase in congressional pay, but let it come on that day when social security benefits, compensation for the disabled, and aid to the unemployed are at adequate levels of decency.

Let it come when our Federal financial house is in order and when we have taken care of first priorities first.

Many Members of the Senate and House feel that they need and can justify a pay increase; but who among us would deny that there are others who need help much more than we do?

The argument may be made that if my amendment in the nature of a substitute were adopted, it would make it possible for members of the legislative staffs to receive greater compensation than is paid to Members of Congress. However, if my amendment in the nature of a substitute is approved, I shall offer a second amendment which would make it impossible to increase staff salaries beyond $22,000. Thus, staff would not be entitled to more compensation than is being paid to Members of Congress.

That is all I wish to say. I am ready to vote at any time.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROUTY. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Do I correctly understand that the Senator's amendment in its present form would limit all staff increases to the maximum of the salaries paid to Members of the Senate and House?

Mr. PROUTY. No; the second amendment would do that.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The first amendment, however, would bar an increase for Members of the Senate and House. In other words, their salaries would remain at $22,500. It would permit the compensation of the Librarian of Congress, the Public Printer, and the Architect of the Capitol to go to $26,000; it would permit the salary of the Deputy Librarian of Congress to go to $24,500; and would permit the compensation of the Secretary of the Senate, the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, and the legislative counsel of the Senate to go to $27,500?

Mr. PROUTY. The Senator is correct; but, as I have explained, I shall offer a second amendment, in case my amendment in the nature of a substitute is approved.

Mr. PROXMIRE. If the amendment of the Senator from Vermont were rejected, it would mean that the entire legislative title of the bill, title 2, could be eliminated, and no increases would be provided for members of the legislative branch?

Mr. PROUTY. No, indeed.

Mr. PROXMIRE. If the amendment of the Senator from Vermont, which is a substitute for the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin, does not prevail, the Senate will have before it the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin, which simply deletes title 2 and eliminates legislative increases. Is that correct?

Mr. PROUTY. That is correct.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I think we are putting the cart ahead of the horse with respect to the amendment. If we adopt the Prouty amendment in the nature of a substitute, and if we then defeat the second Prouty amendment, we shall be in a rather ludicrous situation.

Furthermore, if we adopt the Prouty amendment in the nature of a substitute and then adopt the second Prouty amendment, or if we adopt the Proxmire amendment, consider the situation that will confront us.

On page 115 of the bill, provision is made for the salaries of Cabinet officers at $35,000.

On page 116, salaries of $30,000 are provided for such persons as the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, and the Director of the U.S. Information Agency.

On page 117, salaries of $28,500 are provided for the Deputy Postmaster General and, among others, the Deputy Administrator of Veterans' Affairs and the Director of the Peace Corps.

Beginning on page 20, salaries of $27,000 are provided for the Deputy Administrator of General Services; six Assistant Administrators of the Agency for International Development; four Regional Assistant Administrators of the Agency for International Development; the Deputy Director of the Peace Corps; Counselor of the Department of State; Legal Adviser of the Department of State; Governor of the Farm Credit Administration; Inspector General, Foreign Assistance; members of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority, and many others.

I note that, beginning on page 124, salaries of $26,000 are provided for other types of Federal appointees, such as the Administrator of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, Department of Agriculture; the Administrator of the National Capital Transportation Agency; four Deputy Administrators of the Small Business Administration; Associate Deputy Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration; Deputy Associate Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration; Chief Forester, Forest Service; Chief Postal Inspector; Chief, Weather Bureau, Department of Commerce; Commissioner of Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior; Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission; two Associate Commissioners, Indian Claims Commission; and such other persons as Associate Director for Volunteers, Peace Corps; Associate Director for Program Development and Operations, Peace Corps.

One would think there would be a few volunteers in the Peace Corps headquarters.

Another such position is that of Fiscal Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

Hundreds of such people would be drawing salaries considerably higher than the salaries of Members of Congress.

This is a very unfair, unwise, and stupid move. Do not think that we shall be fooling the folks by taking such a step. I doubt whether any votes would be gained by such a move as this.

If Senators do not want to ride in on the coattails of the Post Office and Civil Service employees, the thing to do is not to provide salary increases for the judiciary and executive branch, including the hundreds of people to whom I have been referring, and for all Members of Congress. Then take up a separate bill. Let those stand on their own merits. I have not had the floor very long. Many Senator will please face it and not suggest a vote at this time because I am perfectly capable of going for a long time; but I am going to say something on this subject, because I believe there is much——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NELSON in the chair). The Senator will suspend. The Senate will be in order.

The Senator may proceed.

Mr. MILLER. I thank the Chair.

I believe there is a little bit of what we might call, very politely, window dressing in the Chamber, in discussing this bill.

The Senator from Ohio pointed out a certain position for Members of Congress that has occurred in the past few years. I wish that the Senator from Ohio had given us a comparable list of increases in salaries of the various officials which I have read off, as well as the Federal judiciary.

Let us treat everyone alike, instead of singling out Members of Congress.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield?

Mr. MILLER. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Examination of the record will show that pay raises have gone on in extravagant fashion with all except the lower class of employees. The proportion of the increase may not be so great for commission members, board members, judges, and others, as it is for Senators.

Mr. MILLER. In many cases, it will be found to be about the same. I believe that the RECORD should show this.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I directed my remarks to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin because it dealt only with the legislative branch, but I believe that my remarks are just as effective against the judiciary, board members, and others.

I read in the newspaper the other day that an exhibitor of a foreign country at the New York World's Fair had to pay $150 to get a clogged sink loosened.

If we keep passing this kind of pay raise, how will we ever stop the inordinate and extravagant demands that will come in from all over the country?

If we begin to give ourselves this huge pay raise, will anyone dare to open his mouth against inflationary measures?

We recommend 3.2 percent as a general pay increase, but we are going to give ourselves 33⅓ percent over the $10,000 which we gave ourselves in 1955.

I agree with what the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] said 2 hours ago: How can we do it?

This haste for a vote, this shouting to vote, seems to me to be an indication that we wish to drop the curtain as quickly as we can so that our voices will not go out to the country on what we are doing here.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield?

Mr. MILLER. I am happy to yield to the distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD].

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I find it a little difficult to understand why we are so anxious to pick on ourselves all the time, and so loath to say anything about the executive branch downtown which will get the large raise that is contemplated in this bill. They have got cars and chauffeurs.

How many Senators in the Chamber have cars and chauffeurs?

What kind of people are we?

Do we have a position of importance, or do we not?

Do we have to fight for a job, or are we appointed?

There are too many Senators who are picking on Members of their own body, finding fault with ourselves.

We are all for the "little guy." No one wishes to do anything to hurt him. But, now we have something directed against us. We are getting too much. We knew what the salary would be when we ran for office. Of course we did.

The responsibility for raising our pay, or as the Senator from West Virginia said, for lowering our pay, lies with us. We have to make that choice. We have to go back home and tell the people what we did or did not do.

I wonder what kind of people we are.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield?

Mr. MILLER. I am glad to yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I rise only because of what the majority leader has just said. I should like to sustain him. I shall vote against these amendments. I shall be happy to explain it to my people.

With respect to an increase in salary, as a Senator, I have always spent more than I have received in salary. I probably always will, due to the requirements of this position.

As a Senator from New York, with the manifold accompanying duties imposed, many of which, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] has listed, I have incurred substantial expenditures for research, living in Washington, and travel.

Mr. President, our job as U.S. Senators, is to earn what we receive. We should make no apology for it. We are entitled to a decent living. I have been on many boards of corporations. I was a lawyer representing substantial businesses long before I was a Senator or Representative. During those days, we would be delighted to pay $30,000 or $35,000 a year to a good branch manager of a bank, or to a vice president, or to the manager of a modern industrial plant provided that he did a good job.

The majority leader is absolutely right, we should not be apologizing. We should be determined to stand up in a refreshing way, which the American people will like, and respect. We should say "yes," we are going to pass this pay bill as it was reported by the Post Office and Civil Service Committee because on the scale of salaries paid modern business executives, we are worth it.

I am 60 years old. I have been a successful lawyer. I have earned three times what I shall receive as a Senator at $30,000 a year. I need apologize to no one. There is no need for any other Member of this body to do likewise.

What we should resolve is that we will do a good job, and that we will do the job which is fully worthy of the pay we shall receive.

I am sure that the American people will be refreshed by the fact that we will face our responsibilities in that way.

A Senator is entitled to a decent and a dignified living.

It is impossible to earn a decent and a dignified living unless we do something about a pay adjustment in light of modern conditions.

One other point: We have a major role in the operation of the $100 billion business of the running of the Federal Government. Let no one forget that. We and the other body are the "board of directors" of that business. It is the greatest business mankind has ever conjured up.

It seems to me that we should be able to make ourselves worthy of this salary increase to the American people.

We must not compare ourselves with those earning $4,000 to $5,000 a year, as the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] propose, and that we reduce our pay to that level. Of course not. We demean ourselves in the eyes of the country.

We need only compare ourselves with those of commensurate responsibility.

I believe that $30,000 a year is a very fair salary—very fair. I am fully prepared to justify it to any fairminded jury of Americans in my State—or in any other State of the Union.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield?

Mr. MILLER. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Illinois

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I believe that the whole case is misstated in discussing congressional salaries.

We are not appropriating money or authorizing it for EVERETT DIRKSEN or for BARRY GOLDWATER or for JACOB JAVITS or for WIN PROUTY. This authorizes the money that shall be paid for the office that we occupy.

If the people back home do not believe we are worth it, it will not take them very long to haul us back from Washington.

It is about time for us to recognize the fact that this authorizes pay for an office which is set up under the Constitution of the United States.

Tragically enough, this is one of the unsolved problems in the Constitution of the United States, because it provides that the remuneration of Senators and Representatives shall be ascertained by law.

What is the lawmaking body? Congress is the lawmaking body.

We have no choice. We have authority over the President's salary. We have authority to fix the salaries of judges, except that we cannot reduce them. We have authority over the salaries in Government, and we have the vexing task of fixing our own salaries.

It is about time for us to face the issue.

What is the Senate going to look like, when the House of Representatives by a majority of 87 has put this pay raise for Representatives in the bill—and if I had it to do, it would be larger—believe me. But what is going to be the comparison?

It will be said, "They have some guts in the House of Representatives, but the Senate would not stand up to it."

I had something to do with this bill twice before. The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] will remember that in 1946 in the formulation of the Reorganization Act, when he was vice chairman of the committee, a pay raise and a retirement system were provided. Did we receive any backlash? Certainly we did not. I offered a resolution in 1954 to set up the Segal Committee of 18 persons.

They made their report. And then we had to discount their report. I am sorry I ever let it happen without making a protest. But timid people said, "Cut it $2,500." And I let them talk me into it, for which I am sorry. We have the same thing now. It is said, "If we cut it just a little, maybe you can take it." I did not find that the electorate took any exception to it particularly. Then we raised it. Now, I suppose, judging from the remarks of my distinguished friend from Ohio, we are far ahead of the game.

Will my friend from Iowa bear with me a few minutes?

Mr. MILLER. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. We started in 1789, when Representatives and Senators received $6 a day when they attended a session. A farmer receives five times that much today.

In 1815, 26 years later, an annual salary of $1,500 was finally set. We had to wait 26 years to catch up. Think of it. We do not see workers doing that when collective bargaining is involved.

In 1817, the rate was placed at $8 a day.

In 1855—38 years later—there was a change in congressional salary. It then became the munificent sum of $3,000 a year.

In 1865, the last year of the war, it was placed at $5,000.

Six years later, it was set at $7,500. They never did catch up.

Then, in 1874, what was done? The rate was reduced back to $5,000.

In 1907—31 years later—the salary of Members of the House and Senate was raised. Then, it went back to $7,500.

In 1925—they had to wait 18 years for the next pay raise—the salary was set at $10,000.

So there have been only four increases since the Civil War—a period of 99 years. Just think of it. When we talk about reducing our salaries, or removing them from the bill, we demean our own bodies. I will not do it. If my people want to drag me back home, they can do so. I have defended these pay raises before. And I intend to do so again.

The Senator from Ohio raised the question about how this proposal compared with the situation of employees in Government. I have a statement from the Budget Bureau. They took as a base the postal clerks, and, taking grade 4, carried through a comparison with congressional salaries from 1935 to 1964.

That is a period of 29 years. And what was the aggregate? The employees received a total increase of 194 percent. The Representatives and Senators received a 170 percent increase. We never did catch up. And it is about time for us to catch up.

If we want to put it on a base of productivity and take 3.2 percent as a productive level from 1955 to 1964, even on that basis, our pay ought to be $31,000.

In 1935, when I was in the House, our pay was $10,000. How much income tax did we pay? $188. So, after taxes we had about $9,800 left.

The purchasing power of the dollar then was 100 percent. So we can say that out of our salary in 1935 dollars, we had a purchasing power of $9,800.

What was it in 1955? We went up to $22,500. Deductions for living expenses were $3,000. The net salary was $19,500. The income tax was—not $188—but $3,954. After taxes, what did we have left? $15,500. The purchasing power of the dollar had dropped to 51.3 percent. So, how much did we have left out of $22,500 in terms of 1935 dollars? We had $7,975 left—infinitely smaller by nearly $2,000 than we had in 1935.

In this bill, a salary of $30,000 is proposed. There would be deductions of $3,000 and a net salary of $27,000. The income tax will be—not $188—but $5,532. After taxes, what have we left out of $30,000? $21,468.

The purchasing power of the dollar as of now is 44.4 percent. The purchasing power of our salary in 1935 dollars is $9,532. We are $400 behind what we received at $10,000 in 1935.

If one questions the figures, call up the Deputy Director of the Budget, call up the Director of the Civil Service Commission. They will supply a copy of the figures.

Any way we take it, this increase for Members of Congress ought to be larger than that which is provided for in the bill. I am not going to modify it. But I hope we shall not face this issue with a degree of timidity and let the ballot-box scare anyone. Joe Evins, of Tennessee, made a count of every House Member who voted for the House increase in salary in 1955. Not a Member who voted for it who was defeated was at the polls.

Is it not about time that we assert our own prestige and take our place in the sun of government?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. We do not hear the executive branch mentioned. The opponents take on their own branch. It will not pay off at all.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let me tell Barkley's story and then I shall yield.

It will be remembered that when Barkley went home, an old fellow told him: "I voted for you. I am not going to vote for you again." He said, "Why not?" The fellow said, "I am not going to vote for a stupid guy who voted not to increase his salary when he was entitled to it."

Now I yield.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I have the floor.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator might yield to me for one brief statement.

Mr. MILLER. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator from Illinois mentioned a comparison of the situation in 1964 with that existing back in 1935. The Senator did not mention that in 1935 Congress stayed in session for 5 months on an average in the year. The Members of Congress had 7 months in which to practice law. Two-thirds of the Members of the Senate were lawyers. My father made a lot more money as a lawyer than as a Senator. As a matter of fact, as I remember it, my mother told him that he could not afford the job. He replied: "Congress is going to raise the pay." The first thing they did was to cut the pay when they got in.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I remember that. I was on a couple of investigating committees, and from one end of the year to the other, I was scarcely at home. This is a 12-month job, any way we take it.

Go back home and see what happens. Constituents will make a beaten path to the offices or to the homes of Senators, or wherever they can find them, because the world is full of business which is somehow localized and centralized in this body.

Every amendment that has been offered—and there are 8 or 10 of them—ought to be voted down by the Senate, because they degrade this body. We ought to have short shrift of it and take some pride in the fact that we are attaching a paycheck to a job and not to the person who is in it. Let the people decide whether he has earned it or not. I am sorry. I thank my friend.

Mr. MILLER. The Senator need not be sorry, because he has said as eloquently as any Senator why we should vote against the pending amendment. I repeat that all we have to do is to look at the pages in the bill to which I referred and look at the hundreds of Federal employees who would be drawing more pay than a Member of the U.S. Senate if the Prouty amendment and the Proxmire amendment are adopted.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, after careful thought, I have decided to vote against the congressional pay raise. I cannot in good conscience vote to increase my salary at a time when many of my constituents are financially pinched. So I will support the amendment to eliminate the increase in congressional salaries from the bill.

It is true that the cost of living in official Washington is very high. It is true that with five children to rear and educate, I have some financial anxieties with my present income. Each year, I must reach heavily into my salary, to cover the cost of travel to and from my State. Each year, I must devote a part of my salary to postage, television films, radio tapes, and the entertainment of constituents, not covered by the office allowance.

But I cannot bring myself to vote to raise my pay, when thousands of farmers, ranchers, cattle feeders, businessmen, and working people are under as much or more financial pressure than I am. If the congressional pay raise is eliminated from the bill, I could then vote to raise the salary of other Federal workers and postal workers who are hard pressed to make ends meet. If the amendment to remove the congressional pay raise fails, however, I will vote against the entire Federal pay raise bill.

So far as I am concerned, I would rather see Congress provide adequate allowances for the operation of our offices, including travel allowance. We would not be in need of a salary increase if we did not find it necessary to devote so much of our salary to traveling back and forth to our States and to financing such costs as telephone calls, telegrams, and other costs that may run to several thousand dollars a year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Prouty] in the nature of a substitute. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Ervin], the Senator from Washington [Mr. Jackson], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pell], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Ribicoff], the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers], the Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Edmondson], and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Hayden], are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from California [Mr. Engle], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Bayh], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy], are absent because of illness.

On this vote, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Ribicoff] is paired with the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers].

If present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut would vote "nay" and the Senator from Florida would vote "yea".

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Washington [Mr. Jackson], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pell], would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. Boggs] is absent to attend the funeral of a relative.

The Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Fong], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Pearson], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Saltonstall] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Saltonstall] would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 25, nays 60, as follows:

[No. 458 Leg.]

YEAS—25

Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Cannon
Church
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Ellender
Fulbright
Hartke
Holland
Hruska
Keating
Lausche
Mechem
Morton
Moss
Mundt
Prouty
Robertson
Scott
Simpson
Symington
Thurmond
Williams, Del.

NAYS—60

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Bartlett
Beall
Bennett
Bible
Brewster
Byrd, W. Va.
Carlson
Case
Clark
Dirksen
Dodd
Dominick
Douglas
Eastland
Goldwater
Gore
Gruening
Hart
Hickenlooper
Hill
Humphrey
Inouye
Javits
Johnston
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kuchel
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalf
Miller
Monroney
Morse
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Proxmire
Randolph
Russell
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Talmadge
Tower
Walters
Williams, N.J.
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—15

Bayh
Boggs
Edmondson
Engle
Ervin
Fong
Hayden
Jackson
Kennedy
Pearson
Pell
Ribicoff
Saltonstall
Smathers
Yarborough

So Mr. Prouty's amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Proxmire] and the attention of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Johnston], for a moment, because I need a little help and clarification. There are some aspects of this bill that disturb me very much, but, at the same time, I think most of the increases are justified.

Am I correct that, so far as the civil service workers are concerned, the increase for them is at a much lower percentage—somewhere between 3 and 5 percent—as compared with the percentage of increase for Cabinet officers, judges, and others in the so-called higher pay brackets?

Mr. JOHNSTON. That is true. It is higher.

Mr. MORSE. What is the difference?

Mr. JOHNSTON. The increase is about 33⅓ percent for Members of Congress and of the Cabinet. Does the Senator want the figures all the way to grade 1? The increase for that low grade is 2 or 3 percent, because those employees have received more frequent increases in the past.

Mr. MORSE. They have been receiving many increases, but the increases give those in the lower brackets an annual income of approximately how much?

Mr. JOHNSTON. For the classified employees, the grades go all the way down to 1, and the increase there is very low.

Mr. MORSE. Many of them are in the salary bracket of $8,000 or $9,000, as compared with $20,000 or $30,000 in the upper brackets. Is that correct?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Yes.

Mr. MORSE. We must act on proposed legislation as it comes off the calendar. Sometimes the order in which it is considered is not what we would prefer. It is too bad that the Senate does not have before it the legislative appropriation bill ahead of the bill it is now considering. I have listened to some very interesting debate this afternoon about problems that confront Members of Congress in regard to salaries and costs and expenses of the job.

The so-called political expenes of the job certainly should not be borne, directly or indirectly, by the taxpayers. We sought the job, and we should be expected to pay the so-called direct and indirect political expenses of the job. Yet some of the speeches this afternoon surprised me a little in that they seemed to imply that we ought to give some consideration to the fixing of salaries based on what we have to pay for so-called political expenses.

However, there is a type of expense connected with the job that is based upon a formula which is applied that works many inequities within the Senate. I refer to the allowances that are granted for so-called office expenses, using as the determining factor the population of a State as compared with others, with not too much weight given to geographical distances, nor too much weight given to the actual difference in the business done as compared with other offices.

I do not want to engage in any personal discussion other than to say, for example, that some of us who come from States with relatively small populations are greatly limited in the expense allowance to our offices, but are put to much heavier expenses than are other Senators, for a variety of reasons. I suppose such a matter is determined to a great extent by the discussion of Senators.

I shall be brief when I make this statement, but for many years on the floor of the Senate I have said that I think the taxpayers are perfectly willing to pay for the legitimate expenses of a Senator's office in transacting Senate business.

I have not kept records on this matter, except for the past 12 years.

I plow back into my desk, and have for years, the equivalent of three honorarium speeches to pay the extra cost of transacting business in connection with long-distance telephone calls, telegrams, and airmail stamps, which run to $800 to $900 out of my own pocket.

I mention it now only because I hope that when the Senate considers the legislative appropriation bill this year, the Appropriations Committee will take a long look at the formula. I have insisted for years that if more money were to be allowed for the expenses of a Senate office, it should be on an accountable basis, and that accounting should be published for the benefit of the public.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I invite his attention to the fact that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] is present? He happens to be chairman of the subcommittee that handles the matter the Senator from Oregon is discussing. I merely wanted to call to the attention of the Senator from Oklahoma what the Senator from Oregon is discussing.

Mr. MORSE. It is important that we take care of the actual official Senate expenses of our offices rather than put Senators in the position where they do the business but pay for it out of their own pockets. I do not think the taxpayers expect that.

I wanted to make that point in this discussion. It does not have a direct bearing on the issue before us; it has an indirect one.

I do not know why there is this reticence to allow an accounted expense allowance which actually covers the official cost of operating the office of a Senator in serving the people of a State and of the Nation.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I merely wish to say that I agree 100 percent with the Senator from Oregon. He is absolutely correct. In fact, I go further and say that a Senator from Hawaii or Alaska or Washington or Oregon has an enormous travel expense. The present allowance is for only three trips home. Under those circumstances it is very unjust. The way to handle the situation is not by way of a general salary increase but, as the Senator has implied, by permitting a Senator to be compensated for all the legitimate expenses of his office.

I shall support such a proposal in any way, shape, or form with regard to telephone and telegraph expenses. I agree that the taxpayers would understand such a proposal.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Senator is correct. There is some confusion between official duties and political interests. I recognize that fact. However, following the course of action that I follow in the Senate, if I did not go home at least one weekend a month, I would not have any political boards left on my fences back home. One does not go home one weekend a month free of expense.

I see my good friend the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] smiling. That is why, through his good offices or the good offices of the Senator's assistant in Chicago, I will stop off in Chicago and make a speech, which will cover the expenses, or perhaps make a speech in San Francisco or Seattle or somewhere else.

Let us face the realities when we get to the legislative appropriation bill, and see to it that we take a good, long look at the problem.

That leads me to my next point. We should make very clear that with respect to expenditures for telephone calls and telegrams and for air mail stamps, there should be a public accounting once a year.

My next point is that in due course—not tonight—I shall offer an amendment to the bill. I have several amendments, but I shall offer one which will be the old 1946-as-revised-from-time-to-time Morse full public-disclosure bill. A Senator came to me a few minutes ago and said:

> One of the things that I like about your public disclosure bill is that it does not limit itself to Members of Congress, but covers the judiciary and the Cabinet and other officials in the high income bracket.

I shall press that amendment later. Those are factors we ought to consider in connection with the pending bill, rather than speed the bill through very quickly, as there is at present—and I say this most respectfully and noncritically—pressure in the Senate.

I am always unhappy when I cannot accommodate myself to certain proposals. Some amendments ought to be considered. I cannot accommodate myself to proposals that have been made in the past hour for a unanimous-consent agreement to fix a time, to limit debate on amendments, and to limit debate on the bill.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I thank the Senator from Oregon for bringing to the attention of the Senate some of the matters we have considered in committee in recommending an increase in congressional salaries.

If Senators will look at pages 116 and 117 of the bill, they will note that we brought the compensation of Members of the Senate and the House in line with those of Under Secretaries of the executive departments. They have traditionally been in that bracket. So far as additional expenses are concerned, we did not consider the expenses that the Under Secretaries have either. I do not believe that the Members of the Senate and of the House ought to be in a lower bracket than the Under Secretaries of the executive departments.

There are about 19 who have the same salaries as Members of the House and of the Senate.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The Senator from Iowa proposes to strike lines 2, through 6 of the Proxmire amendment No. 1084 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "through line 3 on page 166"; on page 2, line 1, change "title IV" to read "title II".

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of the Members of the Senate, very briefly, all the amendment would do would be to transform the Proxmire amendment, which eliminates legislative salary increases into an amendment which would eliminate salary increases for the legislative, judicial, and executive branches of the Government. It keeps intact the classified employees' salary increases.

It seems to me there ought to be a choice offered to the Senate. The choice the Proxmire amendment presently offers is really no choice at all. If we were to support the Proxmire amendment we would be singling ourselves and our staff members out for a discriminatory type program as against the executive and judicial sides of the Government.

If my amendment is adopted, the Proxmire amendment will be before us to vote on, and we can decide whether we wish to take care of only the classified employees or whether we wish to take care of the employees of all branches of the Government.

That is the choice we would have.

Mr. MANSFIELD. In other words, everybody would be stricken out except the voters.

Mr. MILLER. May I say to the majority leader that I have no intention of doing anything like that with my amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is what it amounts to.

Mr. MILLER. To evaluate my amendment in that fashion is very much to oversimplify the problem.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It takes in millions and leaves out a few thousand.

Mr. MILLER. That oversimplifies the point. The Proxmire amendment in its present form singles out the legislative branch. I do not think that is the choice we ought to be offering the Senate. It seems to me we ought to be given the choice of taking care of the classified employees and nobody else, or taking care of the classified employees and not singling out the legislative, judicial, and executive branch.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I agree in that respect. If we are to do anything with respect to Congress, we had better do it to the other branches of the Government, too.

Mr. MILLER. The majority leader now states my proposal exactly. I am happy that he gets the point.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, while the amendment can be excused on the ground that, if we are going to strike against Congress we should also strike at those employees in the executive and judicial branch of the Government who are supposed to use their brainpower to make plans in an atomic age for a future that we hope America can have, I think we would be killing the very thought behind the kind of bill President Kennedy and President Johnson, and most students of government, have urged us to pass. The crisis in the executive branch of this great Government in the atomic age, with a hundred billion dollar budget, with a burgeoning population, automation, and all the various problems that are on our doorstep, must be solved by the best minds money can obtain.

Surely; we would save some money. We would save $20 million out of a cost of $556 million, by taking this step. We would reduce the prospect of having the best people that can be found in the field to fill the jobs in the executive department. Yes, we will appeal to a lower class of people to run for Congress, because they will know it will not be possible to manage and pay expenses and put anything aside to educate their children. They will know there will be no opportunity to hold their heads up in respectability in carrying on the duties of office, as we are expected to carry them on by our constituents back home.

Four million one hundred thousand dollars is the cost of congressional pay. That is 0.7 percent of the total cost. We will pay the legislative employees and other officers $9,600,000. In this great Government of ours, with more than 2 million employees trying to supply the services, including the military and other needs, only 536 Members of Congress plus 2 other officers are elected. That is the total elective complement of our great democracy: 435 Members of the House, 100 Members of the Senate, plus the President and Vice President. The rest are all appointed.

Is it worth anything to preserve, to attract, to try to bring into the elective system men of competence? Perhaps we do not need them; but I have never found that a good salary, a salary that would help a man to pay his expenses and live in respectability, denied qualified persons the opportunity to run for office.

Why did the people support the Reorganization Act of 1946? It was because they wanted Congress to amount to something. They wanted to have competent persons working on our staffs, not retired mail carriers acting as secretaries for the Committee on Banking and Currency, or an inexperienced person from back home acting as the secretary or chief staff member of the most important committee of Congress, the Committee on Foreign Relations. No; they wanted good staffs, so they directed Congress to pay to the staffs of Members of Congress salaries equivalent to those paid in private business. That is what we did. That is why Congress has been measuring up to its responsibility in trying to meet the challenge of the new problems of today. We have been able to have just as good members of the staffs working and assisting us to pass legislation as the executive offices downtown have in administering it. Let us not downgrade our staffs.

The majority leader and the minority leader have described Congress as the people's branch of the Government. We will get what we pay for. Members of Congress must have decent salaries if they are to pay their own expenses in entertaining friends at lunch. In trying to maintain the positions we are expected to maintain as Senators, both here and at home, we must have a suitable standard of living. We try to provide for education, to maintain our libraries, to have the things we need. I think this is worth bringing the pay of Members of Congress up to parity. Parity was not set for us by a committee or by Congress or by members of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of either House. It was set after a careful study and as a result of executive leadership. It has been urged upon us by both President Kennedy and President Johnson.

We have tried to establish parity with the Federal judges. Our pay will come out even with theirs at $30,000. We will have parity with the under secretaries of the departments at $30,000. If Senators will look through the bill, they will see that we have tried to establish parity of service and qualifications.

We provide a higher salary for Cabinet members; but historically Members of Congress have been linked with the pay of Federal judges, which have been less than that paid to the Cabinet.

Let us not downgrade the branch of the Government in which we serve, because millions of people throughout the world would be willing to give their right arms to have a legislative body such as ours—staffed with personnel such as that which serves the Senate and the House.

I hope the Senate will defeat the Miller amendment and the Proxmire amendment and will then move on to pass the pay bill, which has been so long in coming to us.

Mr. MILLER. The Senator from Iowa would agree with much of what the Senator from Oklahoma has said, but I cannot quite understand why he made the statement he has made against the Miller amendment.

Mr. MONRONEY. I am against the Proxmire amendment. I would be forced to say that if we adopted the Proxmire amendment, we would be doing ourselves a disservice by downgrading ourselves far below the current going rate. We have praised the value of the staffs in the executive department.

I do not choose to vote for the amendment of the Senator from Iowa, because I am against the Proxmire amendment. I favor the bill as it has been reported. It is a good bill. It will serve the country well. I think the civil service employees are entitled to a pay increase. So are the executives and other officials who have not had a raise for 10 years, while the other employees have had a 30- or 35-percent increase. The schedule works out fairly.

I shall have to oppose the amendment of the Senator from Iowa because I do not believe in cutting out the very heart of the bill.

Mr. MILLER. Why not support the Miller amendment to the Proxmire amendment and then vote against the Proxmire amendment as amended? If the Senator does not do that, he will not afford the Senate a decent choice on which to vote. If the Proxmire amendment carries, the Senator would be demeaning the legislative branch as against the executive and judicial branches. If the Senator votes for the Miller amendment, he will not have to demean himself in that way.

Mr. MONRONEY. Then I would have voted for an amendment that would destroy at least a great portion of the bill, the portion that would attract efficient, effective executives. I shall not vote for this amendment. If I am to be against the Proxmire amendment, I must also be against the amendment of the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. MILLER. The Senator from Oklahoma would have plenty of opportunity to vote against the principle he is talking about, once my amendment and the Proxmire amendment were adopted. I am trying to give the Senate a reasonably fair choice as to whether it wants to provide a general salary increase for executive, legislative, and judicial officers, along with the classified civil service, or wants to let those three groups stand by themselves in a separate bill. That is a fair choice. But under the Proxmire amendment, unless it is modified by my amendment, the Senate will not have a fair choice.

Mr. MONRONEY. I should say that the Senator's amendment, if adopted, would put on record many Senators as being against an excessive pay bill. Therefore, they would be asked to vote for the Proxmire amendment, because the funds for the brainpower we are hoping to attract to the legislative and executive branches would have been stricken from the bill.

Mr. MILLER. I intend to vote for the Miller amendment as a modification of the Proxmire amendment. I think I could in clear conscience vote against the Proxmire amendment as modified.

I think the Senator from Oklahoma could vote for my amendment to give the Senate an adequate choice, and then turn around and vote against the Proxmire amendment, as modified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, on this amendment, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] are absent because of illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS] is absent to attend the funeral of a relative.

The Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 21, nays 64, as follows:

[No. 459 Leg.]

YEAS—21

Bennett
Byrd, Va.
Cannon
Church
Cotton
Curtis
Dominick
Ellender
Jordan, Idaho
Lausche
McClellan
Mechem
Miller
Mundt
Robertson
Simpson
Smathers
Talmadge
Thurmond
Williams, Del.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—64

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Bartlett
Beall
Bible
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Carlson
Case
Clark
Cooper
Dirksen
Dodd
Douglas
Eastland
Fulbright
Goldwater
Gore
Gruening
Hart
Hartke
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Humphrey
Inouye
Javits
Johnston
Jordan, N.C.
Keating
Kuchel
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalf
Monroney
Morse
Morton
Moss
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Russell
Scott
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Tower
Walters
Williams, N.J.
Young, N. Dak.

NOT VOTING—15

Bayh
Boggs
Edmondson
Engle
Ervin
Fong
Hayden
Jackson
Kennedy
McCarthy
Pearson
Pell
Ribicoff
Saltonstall
Yarborough

So Mr. MILLER's amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE]. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the Clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] are absent because of illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS] is absent to attend the funeral of a relative.

The Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 32, nays 53, as follows:

[No. 460 Leg.]

YEAS—32

Allott
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Cannon
Church
Cotton
Curtis
Dominick
Douglas
Ellender
Gore
Hartke
Holland
Hruska
Keating
Lausche
McGovern
Mechem
Moss
Mundt
Prouty
Proxmire
Robertson
Simpson
Smathers
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—53

Aiken
Anderson
Bartlett
Beall
Bennett
Bible
Brewster
Byrd, W. Va.
Carlson
Case
Clark
Cooper
Dirksen
Dodd
Eastland
Fulbright
Goldwater
Gruening
Hart
Hickenlooper
Hill
Humphrey
Inouye
Javits
Johnston
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kuchel
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalf
Miller
Monroney
Morse
Morton
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Randolph
Scott
Smith
Sparkman
Tower
Walters
Williams, N.J.

NOT VOTING—15

Bayh
Boggs
Edmondson
Engle
Ervin
Fong
Hayden
Jackson
Kennedy
Pearson
Pell
Ribicoff
Russell
Saltonstall
Yarborough

So Mr. PROXMIRE's amendment was rejected.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I announce that my colleague, the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], is unavoidably detained on official business. But if he had been present he would have voted "nay" on the last amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I call up my amendment. The cosponsors to the amendment are Mr. CURTIS, Mr. LAUSCHE, Mr. THURMOND, and Mr. BENNETT.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] proposes amendment No. 1078, reading as follows: At the appropriate place insert a new section as follows:

> Nothwithstanding any other provision of this bill the effective date of any increase on any salary of $20,000 or over, shall be the first day of the first month after the close of a fiscal year with a balanced Federal budget.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO TOMORROW AT 11 A.M.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. There will be no further votes tonight.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION TOMORROW

On request by Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Armed Services was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate tomorrow.

CONFERENCE ON ROLE OF FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IN THE WAR ON POVERTY

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the so-called Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 or war on poverty legislation is before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. It will be considered next week by the full committee. I shall have some amendments to the legislation at that time. In the meantime, I should like to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that at my instance, there was a conference on the role of the Federal Government in the war on poverty, called at New York University on May 11, 1964.

The conferees were headed by cochairman Dr. Miguel A. de Capriles, dean of the School of Law of New York University, and Dr. Alex Rosen, dean of the School of Social Work of New York University. The conferees included some of the most distinguished men and women in the country, men and women from great foundations, governmental agencies, and universities interested in this particular field.

Mr. President, my office has developed a digest from the stenographic transcript of the ideas and concepts which were developed there. I believe that this information from so many experts is worthy of the consideration of every Senator both now and when we finally come to consider this very important measure. As it develops in a very interesting way the lines of an editorial in the New York Times of June 24, 1964, headed "War On Poverty," I ask unanimous consent that in the body of the RECORD there may appear the digest of the conference to which I have referred, followed by the editorial from the New York Times of June 24.

There being no objection, the digest and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DIGEST OF CONFERENCE ON THE ROLE OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IN THE WAR ON POVERTY, NEW YORK UNIVERSITY, MONDAY, MAY 11, 1964

CONFEREES

Senator JACOB K. JAVITS and staff, Mr. Allen Lesser.

Cochairmen of the conference: Dr. Miguel A. de Capriles, dean, School of Law, New York University; Dr. Alex Rosen, dean, School of Social Work, New York University.

Others:

George Brager, Mobilization for Youth, New York City.

Ersa H. Poston, State division for youth.

Anne M. Montero, city commission on human rights.

Benjamin H. Lyndon, dean, School of Social Welfare, State University of New York, Buffalo, N.Y.

James R. Dumpson, department of welfare, New York City.

Clark Tibbitts, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

John J. Hurley, Bureau of Family Services, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

Father Joseph P. Fitzpatrick, D.J., Fordham University, Bronx, N.Y.

Henry H. Foster, Jr., professor, School of Law, New York University.

Winslow Carlton, group health insurance, New York City.

John P. Walsh, U.S. Department of Labor, Washington, D.C.

Ben Zimmerman, mayor's commission for youth, Syracuse, N.Y.

Peter Kasius, State department of social welfare.

Willard Heckel, dean, Rutgers School of Law, New Brunswick, N.J.

Felician Foltman, New York State School of International Labor Relations, Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y.

Edward W. Foss, Department of Agricultural Engineering, Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y.

Marjorie Buckholz, Graduate School of Social Work, New York University, New York City.

Melvin Hermann, Mobilization for Youth, New York City.

Alexander Allen, Urban League of Greater New York, New York City.

James E. McCarthy, Mobilization for Youth, New York City.

John M. Martin, Fordham University, Bronx, N.Y.

Edward Feitelberg, office of the president of the council, New York City.

Elma L. Greenwood, National Council of Churches, New York City.

Bernard Lander, professor, Hunter College, New York City.

William F. Walsh, mayor, Syracuse, N.Y.

The conference directed its attention to three major areas of the war on poverty—youth, unemployed workers, and the aged—and their relationship to the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

Opening the discussion, Senator JAVITS made the points that the war on poverty should be regarded as a long-term war which requires bipartisan support, that it calls for a selective approach rather than a one-shot omnibus attack, that it should be waged jointly with State and local governments, and that it is more than a one-man job and should be guided by a board of strategy with an executive director which would enlist the cooperation of civic and community leaders and organizations. He further emphasized that the unemployed should not be lumped with the endemic poor, and that in any comprehensive program there should be provision for close coordination with numerous existing Federal programs.

I

Dr. Melvin Hermann, who heads the youth and work program of Mobilization for Youth, made a sharp distinction between youth unemployment and youth poverty, stressing that they are different problems. Among the former there are those who are unemployable, those who are employable but have no jobs, and those who are underemployed because suitable jobs for their capabilities are not available.

Reduction of the school dropout rate, though highly desirable, is no panacea for youth unemployment, Dr. Hermann said, adding that graduation from high school is no guarantee of employability. Worth exploring, however, is the possibility of extending school counseling and guidance services for youth beyond 18 or 19 and until they are placed in jobs. Related to employability is the health of youth and Dr. Hermann said that in 1 group of 100 youths under 21 in his program about 50 percent had serious medical problems. He emphatically approved continued heavy involvement of local and State agencies in Federal program of vocational education, and raised a number of questions arising from training programs in which allowances are paid, which directly affect local welfare program considerations.

Turning to title I, part A, of the Economic Opportunity Act, Dr. Hermann asked how we can recruit and train the personnel needed to man this and other projected programs in light of the present extreme shortage of professional personnel. He described as a "frightening notion" the prospect of turning young recruits over to forest rangers for training and teaching. He also asked how we could insure that youth are selected and guided into appropriate programs; who would take the responsibility of directing youth who already had experienced long periods of failure, into programs where they could succeed.

Answering a question by Dean de Capriles on the problem of providing jobs, Dr. Hermann warned that there was a danger of placing too much emphasis on motivation without assurance that jobs would be available for the youths who were being encouraged in this way. In the discussion that followed, Commissioner Dumpson added that many youth were rejected for jobs because they were Negroes or Puerto Ricans, and Winslow Carlton said that the youth's experience of failure was often reinforced by the fact that his parents had the same experience, thus making this a problem of the whole community rather than of just one individual.

Peter Kasius of the New York State Department of Social Welfare, commented on the need to involve State and local agencies intimately with the Federal programs so that there could be continuity after the Federal authorization had ended. Senator JAVITS said that the consent of the State must be obtained in any relationship between the Federal Government and local governments. Commissioner Dumpson cited the risks in this limitation and suggested that where the State refuses to act, the Federal Government then be given authority to proceed without its consent.

The discussion then touched on possibilities of rehabilitating rejected draftees and holding the draft examination at 18 years of age rather than 22 or older as at present in order to clear up health and training problems. Professor Lander cited objections to using the draft or the Department of Defense because it was not set up to become an educational institution. Both George Brager, of the Mobilization for Youth, and Dean Rosen questioned whether industry would have jobs for these young people after they had been trained. Professor Lander pointed out that in view of the development of automation, education now had the responsibility of projecting its training program for jobs of tomorrow rather than those now available. In this connection industry would have to cooperate and come up with some indication of its future needs. Dr. Hermann said schooling had to be made relevant—just to "upgrade the unemployed" was not enough; and Mrs. Anne Montero, of the city commission on human rights, suggested a national census or inventory of unfilled jobs.

II

Winslow Carlton, of Group Health Insurance, summarized the problem of poverty as it applies to the aged. He said there was practically nothing in the legislation for the older citizens, and cited the general need in this group for more income, including an increase in social security benefits and old-age assistance payments.

An income survey in 1962 for those over 65 showed a median income for nonmarried persons of $1,130 per year, and $2,875 for married couples. Families headed by a person of 65 or more made up one-third of all the families counted as poor on the basis of the 1964 annual report of the Council of Economic Advisers. In the OAA program where the range of benefits was from $34 a month in Mississippi to $111 in New York, the problem was how to increase benefits in the poorer States.

Another problem area defined by Mr. Carlton concerned workers between 50 and 65, and the difficulties they face when plant closings and other factors lead to their unemployment. Not unrelated to the general problem is the fact that many in this group have children under 18.

The relevance of a Federal program of health care insurance for the aged in this problem was also stressed by Mr. Carlton, who touched on some of its economic consequences on retired persons. Dean Benjamin H. Lyndon suggested the possibility of developing a single package of assistance incorporating all current programs of aid to the aging.

Senator JAVITS emphasized the essential role of the local community in assuring success of an antipoverty program and in this connection suggested making use of the accumulated experience and knowledge of the older citizens in various capacities. Miss Greenwood suggested that the 50-year-old group with technical knowledge be used as teachers, and Senator JAVITS added that he had always been an advocate of early retirement and that this might be an answer where it would be uneconomic to retrain people so close to regular retirement. He urged that business be asked to cooperate more fully in this as well as all other aspects of the war on poverty; suggested that business be asked for money, teaching personnel, and jobs.

His suggestion was supported by Father Fitzpatrick who underlined the cause-and-effect relationship between business and welfare. Business can never be called efficient, he said, when it is eliminating jobs through automation for which we then have to inaugurate make-work programs in order to keep the people alive.

Another major point was raised by Dean de Capriles over the question of the transferability of pension rights, and Senator JAVITS urged that a study be undertaken that would develop ways of establishing some form of Federal banking system for pensions.

In connection with the Economic Opportunity Act, Dean Lyndon said that the 2-year limitation on Federal Government participation was too short a period, and Professor Foss suggested a phasing out operation to be built into the act to insure some continuity after that period.

III

The afternoon and concluding session of the conference was opened with Prof. Bernard Lander's presentation on unemployment. He saw the situation as highly explosive now and even more so in the next decade unless Federal, State, and local governments along with the private sector proceeded to plan ahead in a systematic and organized fashion.

Delinquency is one problem and research indicates that as many as 20 percent of all youth in the United States will be in the juvenile courts before they reach adulthood. Another even more serious problem is the 5.4 percent unemployment rate, and the challenge which automation presents. Professor Lander offered a projection that in the next 15 years 50 percent of the present labor force will be able to do the job that 100 percent of our present labor force is doing. At the same time, he noted, 50 percent of our population in that period will be under 25 years of age. We face a real cultural lag resulting from the creation of new social problems as the result of technology and the resolution of those problems by new social and educational techniques. He warned against the danger of development of a welfare subculture in which generations of families live under welfare with destructive consequences for society.

Emphasizing the vital need for systematic future planning, Professor Lander welcomed the project of a war on poverty but cautioned against the belief that the bill before Congress would solve the problems of poverty. Even if passed in its entirety, he said, its impact would be very slight. He was critical of the lack of coordination on the Federal level of programs concerned with youth such as delinquency, vocational rehabilitation, and education.

The relative nature of poverty and how it differs from poverty 50 years ago was discussed by Dean de Capriles, and Winslow Carlton added that racial inequality and denial of equal opportunity as well as unemployment were also problems in the war on poverty. Miss Buckholz raised the question of women in the employment picture and the consequences for them of automation as well as the problem of discrimination against women who have children.

Dr. Lander drew the conclusion that we need to rethink our entire educational program and its goals, and it should be done in conjunction with our economists. His research shows that delinquency is not merely a consequence of economic deprivation but a consequence of moral deprivation. Professor Foster suggested using panels of qualified retired persons to work with delinquents and other social problems, including marriage counseling.

The farm section of the Economic Opportunity Act was called into question by Professor Foss who asked why we should try to put people back on the farm when we have now about 30 percent of the farm work force producing what 100 percent produced a decade or so ago. Father Fitzpatrick, however, said that we should try to meet the challenge of making small farms feasible.

In this connection Senator JAVITS presented the question of what to do with the diminishing number of farm families as part of the larger question of how to join the problem of unemployment with the war on poverty. The Senator also referred to the need to stimulate the economy, but Miss Greenwood offered the view that no matter how much the economy was stimulated there would not be a place for unemployables. She said that what was needed was not only a short-range plan such as the present legislation but also a long-range program.

Mayor Walsh, of Syracuse, offered area statistics to demonstrate how 1 egg-producing farm was able to produce today what it took 100 to do years ago. His point was that no matter how many people were put in jobs there would always be a large group of unemployables caused by various social problems. Professor Lander reiterated this view but emphasized the role of the local community.

Senator JAVITS concluded from his statement that (1) he believed the community action program would be a good start and should be retained in the bill; (2) people receiving unemployment compensation should not be eligible for aid under this program but (3) become eligible when they have exhausted their benefits. He favored the use of advisory boards locally patterned on those used by the National Institutes of Health; that is, a board that can veto but cannot initiate or order action. Mr. Carlton pointed out that similar boards were recommended by the National Social Welfare Seminar in connection with the proposed National Service Corps.

After the Senator had left, Professor Martin led a discussion of the meaning of unemployed in relation to poverty, citing examples of persons who were employed but nevertheless have such a low income that they must be classed among the poor. And on this discussion of the "employed poor," the conference ended.

[From the New York Times, June 24, 1964]

WAR ON POVERTY

President Johnson's declaration of war on poverty has served as a compelling reminder to many Americans that millions of their fellow citizens are existing in a bleak netherland of hopelessness in the midst of unprecedented prosperity. The very fact that the United States has produced mass affluence while maintaining something close to mass poverty is an uncomfortably formidable challenge.

This crusade can be won, but the sheer magnitude of poverty cautions against a quick or inexpensive victory. Taking an annual money income of $3,000 a year for a family as a minimum level, the administration estimates that there are 9.3 million families, or over 30 million Americans, living in want. This calculation may not be entirely accurate, but by any economic yardstick the number is intolerably large. Hidden in rural wastelands or submerged in urban squalor are a potentially explosive force, posing both a reproach and a constant threat to the stability of our society.

Given the large sums and extensive efforts, public and private, already being expended many are skeptical about the President's plans. Some insist that the poor will always be with us, that nothing can be done to transform the shiftless and the lazy into useful citizens; in their view, handouts are the only answer. Others think that the only solution lies in speeding up growth. Pointing out that the third of the Nation living in poverty during the 1930's has been reduced to one-fifth, they are confident that poverty will shrink as the economy expands.

But neither handouts, which would be exceedingly costly, nor a sustained period of full employment, which has yet to be attained, will solve the problem. At best, they can alleviate it. For poverty is not simply a matter of money or jobs. Most of the currently unemployed live well above the poverty line; many of the poor are now employed, but lack the skills or the discipline to command decent wages or steady work.

Economic growth has bypassed the poverty stricken, who are untrained rather than lazy, alienated rather than shiftless. A faster pace is essential to provide the means for the struggle, but it also adds to the numbers unable to adjust to our increasingly complex society. Whether or not the administration is correct in asserting that poverty is inherited—that the children of the poor are doomed to remain poor—it is clear that new ways must be found to eliminate the self-perpetuating nature of poverty.

President Johnson recognizes the need for a wholly new kind of attack that can reach the hard core of poverty. The administration's plans for "opening up the gates of opportunity," however, amount to little more than a cautious and piecemeal reconnaissance. In terms of expenditures, it is requesting additional outlays of just $500 million, which will be used mainly to duplicate or expand existing programs.

The administration wants to establish an Office of Economic Opportunity to supervise and coordinate the antipoverty effort. The manpower retraining program already in operation would be supplemented with a job corps designed to give basic education and work experience to the most underprivileged young men and women and a work-study program enabling those of greatest promise to acquire a college education. The administration also favors Federal assistance to communities mounting local action campaigns, plus a special fund to help individual farm families and small businesses. In addition, it plans to enlist 5,000 volunteers who will provide help on many fronts.

Sargent Shriver, who is to serve as the President's chief of staff, has emphasized that these are practical programs. This is true politically, for the program represents an attempt to muster widespread popular support by covering every obvious target at the least possible expenses. Its practicality lies primarily in its emphasis on conventional methods and limited objectives.

The most promising of its plans is the Job Corps for teenagers who have yet to become mired in the pit of the poverty; in contrast, its assistance to improve the lot of marginal businessmen and farmers is inadequate. Flaws in the community program will distort its impact. Under the proposed legislation, localities with specific plans are certain to get help, even though they are in a position to obtain funds locally or from existing Federal programs. The danger is that there may be little or nothing flowing to the backward communities where poverty is most entrenched.

For all its shortcomings, the administration's program does symbolize its commitment to wipe out poverty. Its plans can provide valuable intelligence in establishing priorities for the larger and more extensive battles that must come.

The promise of these initial skirmishes depends on establishing adequate criteria to assess them. The first need is for comprehensive statistical evaluation of all undertakings. This is especially important in the redevelopment of Appalachia lest vast sums be spent without raising incomes and living standards.

Winning the war on poverty calls for a multiple offensive employing all the measures now available. It is essential to sustain economic growth that can help open up new opportunities, and to prevent any rise in the numbers below the poverty line. The Government's housing and welfare programs must be expanded, and the plan to provide medical care for the aged enacted.

Success also will demand special measures requiring more imagination and larger resources than the administration is deploying. If the campaign is to be more than an appealing battle cry in an election year, it will have to make a much more intensive effort to improve educational facilities and enlarge needed public services. These can open up opportunities for the young, create jobs, and enhance individual dignity.

Even then the administration will be conducting only a partial war. It has completely overlooked the plight of those aged 65 or older who head 3.2 million families in the ranks of the poor. They cannot be removed from poverty by schooling or retraining or public works; but they can be elevated above the poverty line without any lengthy reconnaissance or elaborate strategy. It will take direct cash payments—a solution that the administration has not yet contemplated, despite its propaganda barrage.

The President's sincerity is manifest. But the war against poverty cannot be won on the cheap. It will take a concerted attack, involving long and costly battles. There is no question that we possess the means to win; but our willingness to employ them has yet to be demonstrated. Mr. Johnson has fired the first shot. He has not mounted a program with promise of total victory.

AUTHORIZATION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE OF COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY TO MEET DURING SESSIONS OF THE SENATE THIS WEEK AND NEXT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Housing Subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency be authorized to meet during the sessions of the Senate the remainder of this week and next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON COMES TO MINNESOTA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the State of Minnesota was paid a singular honor the past weekend by a visit from the President of the United States and Mrs. Johnson. It was a weekend we in Minnesota shall never forget, for the people of my State poured out their hearts to the President and our First Lady in one of the warmest welcomes it has been my privilege to witness.

The President and Mrs. Johnson responded to this welcome by providing new inspiration, not only to the people of Minnesota, but also to the people of the entire Nation and the free world.

A holiday atmosphere surrounded the President's visit; large crowds and some 20 bands turned out along the parade route to greet him and Mrs. Johnson in St. Paul and Minneapolis. There was enthusiasm and joy in the faces of the thousands of men, women, and children who lined the route to see and greet our President and First Lady.

The President and Mrs. Johnson spoke on Saturday at the State convention of our Democratic-Farmer-Labor Party in the St. Paul Auditorium, and paid tribute to the progressive spirit of our party.

Later that evening President and Mrs. Johnson attended a large reception held in Minneapolis, in his honor, by the President's Club, and addressed more than 2,000 persons at a "Salute to President Johnson" dinner in the Minneapolis Auditorium. It was notable that certainly as many Republicans as Democrats were on hand to meet and listen to the President, and the applause was vigorous and bipartisan.

The culmination of the President's visit was his address on Sunday afternoon, before a crowd of more than 100,000 persons attending the Svenskarnas Dag, or Swedish Day, celebration in Minnehaha Park, in Minneapolis.

Svenskarnas Dag is one of the great holidays of the Upper Midwest, and this year it became a historic event, for President Johnson chose the occasion to deliver a major foreign-policy address, with a stirring message of peace.

The President told us that—

> After decades of war and threats of war, we may be nearing a time of peace.

His message was a pledge of peace with freedom and honor.

But he also warned:

> Today, as always, if a nation is to keep its freedom it must be prepared to risk war. When necessary, we will take that risk.

But then the President served notice on the world:

> As long as I am President, I will spare neither my office nor myself in the quest for peace.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the speeches and the remarks of President and Mrs. Johnson during their visit to Minnesota.

There being no objection, the speeches and remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT UPON ARRIVAL AT MINNEAPOLIS-ST. PAUL INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

I want to thank the band and all the good people who have come out here to give us such a warm welcome. I like your weather, I like your Governor, I am very fond of your Senators and your entire congressional delegation in Washington.

Secretary Freeman is my strong right arm. As a matter of fact, I know of no State in the Union that supplies better public servants than the State of Minnesota. And aside from all of that, I like this good Texas weather.

I want to particularly thank the band for coming out and giving us such good music.

I hope all of you have tickets to the dinner tonight. And if so, I will see you down there.

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT TO THE DEMOCRATIC-FARMER-LABOR PARTY, ST. PAUL, MINN., JUNE 27, 1964

Chairman Farr, Governor Rolvaag, my friend and ally, Senators Gene McCarthy, my long-time friend and one of the great leaders of the U.S. Senate, Hubert Humphrey, Congressman Joe Karth—I appreciate that wonderful introduction—John Blatnik, Mrs. Joseph, George Farr, my fellow Americans, I came here this afternoon to express the Nation's thanks for the work of the Democratic-Farmer-Labor Party. Your members man the highest posts of this National Government. Your programs have shaped the policies of this national administration. Your ideals and imagination have inspired this entire Nation with new purpose, with renewed vitality, and with a fresh sense of our national destiny.

A few years ago you stood almost alone in the Midwest—a symbol of hard-hitting, progressive, imaginative leadership. Today, as we meet here, the entire Midwest is filled with the ferment of progress that you began. Your National Capital is afire with the principles and programs that you stand for. You no longer stand alone. You are part of a great national forward march, and I am here to tell you that as long as I am President of the United States you will never be alone.

In the past 4 years we have moved farther and faster toward the goals that we share than at any time in our country's history. All America can be proud of that record. And you can be proud of the part that you played in making that record. But we are not going to the American people and tell them that they never had it so good, or don't rock the boat, or let's keep what we have, or stand pat, or keep cool. No, that is not the kind of a party you are, and that is not the kind of country this is.

We are going to tell the people that the progress of the last 4 years is only the beginning. It is the first step toward the greatness that is within our grasp.

We are going to tell them that this is not the end of the road. It is only the beginning of the journey. We have a long way to go before we wipe out racial injustice and give every American of every color equal opportunity to vote, to go to school, and to share in American society. But that is the road that we are going to take. We have a long way to go before our Nation faces up to its responsibility to give its farmers a fair reward for the enormous abundance they have created. But that is the road we are going to take. We have a long way to go before every child in this world can grow up free of the threat of nuclear war. But that is the road that we are going to take. We have a long way to go before we wipe out poverty in America and give every man a chance to find a job. But we are going to wipe out poverty and we are going to reach full employment.

Everywhere we look there are tasks more towering, challenges more complex, than your country ever faced before. They will not be faced easily and painlessly and without risk. But you have proved in your own State, and we have shown in America in the last 4 years, that the only limit to our possibilities of the future is our vision of the present. In 1960, John Fitzgerald Kennedy came here and asked you to help him get America moving again. You answered his call. America began to move. And this year, you and I are going to keep America moving. It is a long way from the fields of Minnesota or the hills of my native Texas to the center of government in Washington. But it was Woodrow Wilson who reminded us that: "No matter how humbly a youngster is born, no matter where he is born, no matter what circumstances hamper him at the outset, he has got a chance to master the minds and lead the imaginations of the whole country."

Many of us here today can testify to the truth of that observation. This State has supplied to Washington some of our greatest Democrats. Orville Freeman and Walter Heller are two of my strongest right arms. And no State in the Union has two better Senators than Gene McCarthy and Hubert Humphrey. And in your congressional delegation in the House, of which Joe Karth is a very fine example, you have great quality but you need better quantity.

Yes, we are proud of the opportunity that is given to all Americans, and we are going to use all the skill and all the energy that God has given us in order to keep these doors of opportunity open for every child in the land. It is wonderful to be here with you today. I am proud of this great welcome I have received in Minnesota. I hope you will invite me back.

Thank you very much.

Remarks of Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson to the Democratic-Farmer-Labor Party, St. Paul, Minn., June 27, 1964

Friends, it is wonderful to be back in Minnesota again. I remember when we were here in the campaign of 1960. It was Turkey Day in Worthington. It was raining in sheets and there were thousands of turkeys in the streets. But in spite of all of those hazards of campaigning, you hard working Democratic-Farmer-Labor workers brought this State through for the Democratic Party.

Now we are back, the sun is shining, and the streets are full. Instead of turkeys they are full of what I think must have been Democrats by the way they were cheering and waving.

I want to say a word of thanks to the women from Minnesota who work so hard for our party. I don't know three better campaigners than Muriel, Jane, and Abigail. I just want to say that we are very proud, Lyndon and I, of the work that all of the women in this State do for the party, and we know that you are proud, too.

I am so glad I got to come along.

Remarks of Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson at Fundraising Dinner, Minneapolis, Minn., Municipal Auditorium, June 27, 1964

Friends, I would like to say two things. When Lyndon told me about coming to Minnesota, I was quick to want to sign up to come, too, because I wanted to thank you all for the caliber of people you sent to Washington, and I wanted to say that when you elect a Senator you just don't send Hubert Humphrey but you send his wife and family, all working for your State; and when you send Gene McCarthy there is Abigail there, too, and the family, working for the State. And when the Secretary of Agriculture, Orville Freeman, is there, Jane is right there with him, helping him so much. We think a great deal of them down there.

And another thing, it is easy for Lyndon and me to fly in here and enjoy a big, gay, successful dinner like this, but I have some concept of how much hard work went into making it so, all the details and the generalship, and the telephoning, the real effort. To each of you who had a part in that, for Lyndon and me, may I say a very warm thank you.

Remarks of the President at Fundraising Dinner, Minneapolis, Minn., Municipal Auditorium, June 27, 1964

Governor Rolvaag, esteemed Governor Rolvaag; my old friend and one of the great leaders of the Senate, Hubert Humphrey; my good friend and patriot, Senator Gene McCarthy; distinguished Secretary of Agriculture, Orville Freeman; my indispensable Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, Walter Heller; your own outstanding congressional delegation, my friends, John Blatnik and Joe Karth, Don Fraser, Alec Olson; my fellow Americans, every year, for more than 40 years Minnesota has cast its vote for the winning side on election day, and this year you are going to keep that record. Minnesota can be pleased with its contribution to the growth and the wisdom of our country. The men that you have sent to Washington are your proudest assets, men like Hubert, Gene, Orville, Walter Heller, Lee Loevinger, Gene Foley, and the able Congressmen in your delegation. As Lady Bird has already done and I want to repeat, I thank each of you and the Nation thanks you for men like these.

Someone asked Mr. Rayburn one time why Texas had so much influence and power in the House when they had a Vice President back in the early Roosevelt period, they had a majority leader of the House, they had 8 of the 15 chairmanships. He said, "We have a very simple formula. We pick 'em young, we pick 'em honest, we sent 'em there and we keep 'em there."

In the past 4 years, you good people of Minnesota have seen your principles and your beliefs shape the course of an entire Nation. The result has been unmatched progress for all the people of this country. Minnesota believes in growing opportunities for all Americans. In the past 4 years, under Democratic leadership, we have reached new heights of prosperity. Since 1960, in your State alone, personal income, your income, has gone up more than $1 billion. Wages, your wages, under Democratic administration, have gone up 10 percent. And taxes, under the leadership of Gene McCarthy on the Finance Committee, have gone down. This tax cut, and we probably wouldn't have had it except for a Minnesota legislator on the Finance Committee in the grueling days when one vote and one voice meant the difference—this tax cut this year will return more than $100 million to the people of Minnesota, and will create thousands of jobs for the people of Minnesota. And that is just the beginning as we enter our 41st straight month of expansion free from any semblance of recession, the longest period in this decade.

Minnesota believes in human rights. Under the leadership of Hubert Humphrey and with an assist every now and then from some of the rest of us, we are about to pass the strongest and best civil rights bill in this century. We are going on from this bill to give every American citizen, of every race and color, the equal rights which the Constitution demands and justice directs. This will not be a simple task. The events of the past few days again illuminate how painful can be the path to racial justice. No law can instantly destroy the differences that are shaped over centuries. But that is not the question. For once a law is passed, no man can defy it, and no leader can refuse to enforce it. For if our laws are flouted, our society will fail. And I would remind you good Americans tonight that there is a law more hallowed than the civil rights bill, more hallowed than even the Constitution of the United States. That law commands every man to respect the life and dignity of his neighbor; to treat others as he would be treated. That law asks not only obedience in our action, but it requires understanding in our heart. And may God grant us that understanding.

Minnesota also believes in peace. In the last few years, we have moved a long way down the road to peace. We signed a treaty ending nuclear tests in the atmosphere. We have called a halt to the spreading poison of radioactive fallout. We have cut back on our nuclear production and persuaded our adversaries to cut back on theirs, too. We have signed agreements increasing the exchange of men, of ideas, and of scientific knowledge. And this year, I can assure you neither the acts of enemies or the demands of elections will cause us for a moment to cease our constant search for a world at peace. I want to repeat again to you good people who have made this sacrifice to come out here this evening, in all of these fields your principles, Minnesota principles, have helped to shape the progress of all America.

But we will not let the record of the last few years lull us into confidence or complacency, or contentment. For most important of all, Minnesotans have always believed in the future, and that future contains battles to be fought, enemies to be faced, and victories to be won. The problems are new, but their solution rests tonight, as it has always rested, on the resources of our land and on the strength of our people.

Only 7 percent of our people feed the rest of us better and cheaper than in any land in the world. Yet for years we neglected the men and women whose toil and talent worked this wonder. Well, since 1961 we have begun to move toward giving them a fair reward for their labor under the leadership of one of the greatest Americans I know—Orville Freeman.

Since 1960, our farmers have realized an income gain totaling $2 billion. Farm income is 16-percent higher on a per farm basis. And the farmer has been rescued from the despondency and the despair of the fifties. And we are going to continue to give the farmer his rightful place, his rightful share in American society. And I am going to keep looking to the men of Minnesota to lead the way.

We will not limit our efforts in rural areas to commodity programs. We are pledged to an all-out effort to create more jobs and greater prosperity for all the inhabitants of the countryside. Our commitment to eliminate poverty is a total commitment, in the countryside as well as in the city. We can never be content with anything less than parity of income and full participation in the great society for all our farm families and their neighbors.

I have lived most of my life close to the soil. I know the doubts and the toil of seeking sustenance from the land. But I have also been to every part of this Nation. And I also know that modern America was possible because of the produce of our farms. I have traveled to the capitals of far countries, and I know how our country is the envy and the wonder and the model of all the world.

I do not yet know the answer to all the problems of agriculture, but I have good men to help me and a good many of them are at this table tonight. And I do have an immovable intention that those who sacrificed to create America—and who sustain it still—shall never be shut out from the triumphs of its success. Partnership is the path to the future. For tonight, progress does not come from being antibusiness or antilabor, anticonsumer or antiproducer. More and more, all Americans are realizing that programs which fairly benefit one group usually benefit all. And as long as I am your President, this Government will not set one group against another. We will build a creative partnership between business and labor, between farm areas and urban centers, between consumers and producers. And this is what I mean when I choose to be a President of all the people.

Next year, and years ahead, contain new and vast challenges. But we still have an important job to do this year. We must help complete one of the most dynamic, progressive sessions in the history of the Congress. We have already passed the largest tax cut in the history of any Congress. We have already passed and signed into law the most comprehensive education program in history. We are about to pass the most hopeful, comprehensive civil rights bill in the history of our land. And after coming out here and getting the inspiration and stimulation that comes from looking into your good faces and shaking your hands, we are going back to Washington to fight for a poverty program, a program which will launch an all-out war to end poverty in this rich country once and for all. And I ask you now: Will you help us?

We are going back to Washington tomorrow to fight for hospital care for older Americans, under social security, so that our senior citizens will not be rewarded for a lifetime of labor with a nighttime of fear. Will you help us?

We are going back to Washington to fight for a food stamp program so no American will ever go hungry; a housing bill to give every American a decent roof over his head; an extension of Hill-Burton to provide hospitals for the sick. Will you help us?

And we are going back to fight for more than 20 other bills, each of which will help some of our fellow human beings to ease their burden and improve their life, and move America forward. We will move toward our new problems, guided by a great tradition. Under Franklin Delano Roosevelt, we established the principle that it was every American's right to share in the progress of his Nation. The result has been the highest standard of living in the history of the world. Some say that this standard has restricted freedom. But the fact is because of it, every American is freer to shape his own activities, set his own goals, do what he wants with his own life, than at any time in the history of man in any country in all the world. And in the future we are going to enlarge that freedom. But in some ways our problems are more difficult than those of Roosevelt. Then the need for action was plain. Tonight, the primary task of leadership is not only to solve problems, but to alert the Nation to the need to solve them. We will undertake that task, too.

We will use this year to set before the American people both the danger and the opportunity that lie ahead. Because, with their understanding support, no job, no program, no height of greatness is beyond the grasp and the hope of this Nation.

We are a very fortunate few, 190 million Americans, in the sea of a world that is made up of 3 billion people. As I said, we have more freedom than any society has ever known. We have more to eat and more to wear, and more luxuries to enjoy—television, automobiles—more recreation, more free time, than any people have ever known. We have much to preserve and much to protect. We have a system of government that is the envy of men around the globe; a system where the capitalist can put in his capital and have a reasonable expectancy to get it back with a fair return and without fear of going to bed tonight to wake up and see it confiscated or burned the next morning.

We have a system where the manager of that capital can get up at daylight and work to midnight, developing stomach ulcers trying to manage money and men and bring them together, but he still has the hope of retiring at 65 and sharing in the profits that he helped to create. And finally we have the producers, the men, the horny-handed sons who get out and produce a better mousetrap at less cost than can be produced anywhere in the world. And capital and management and labor divide the fruits of their joint effort. If your future depended on our numbers, our adversaries could defeat us tonight. If our future depended solely on our resources, I can look to another land that has more acres, that has more people, that has more resources, water, oil, than we have. But our future doesn't depend on that and that is not the strength of our future. Our forefathers left us a system of government, and it is from that system that we get our strength, from that system that provides an incentive to every person, that says give to the world the best you have and the best will come back to you.

I never for a moment entertain a doubt that there is any commissar or any regimented slave labor anywhere in the world that can outproduce or outsurpass or outlive our system of capital, management, and labor in the good old U.S.A. But our job is to let our own people know that we not only never had it so good—we have to make it better. We must not be content to sit back in our rocking chair and let the rest of the world go by, because we must have objectives, we must have ambitions, we must have the pioneering spirit today that came to this Nation 200 years ago. And we have to move it further in the next two centuries than it has moved in the last two.

And that is saying something, isn't it? And how are we going to move it? Not by eating on ourselves, not by blaming each other, not by dividing up in harassing groups that can find something wrong with what their fellow man does. We are going to build it by uniting our people, by bringing our capital and our management and our labor and our farmers all under one great Democratic tent, and saying to all of them, "Contribute your part, do your share, and you will share in the fruits that are ours."

I know there is not a man and woman in this hall tonight that doesn't want to move America forward. And you have moved it forward, by coming here and giving us this inspiration, in addition to that $100. And just to show you how much I appreciate it, and I want each person in that chair tonight to know that I realize you could have taken that $100 and gone to a cool spot to spend a 2-weeks summer vacation—you could have taken that $100 and bought some things for your family that they needed; you could have found many uses for that $100, but you decided you would invest it in leadership for your country. Whether you are Republicans, Independents, Democrats, or Farm Laborites, whatever you are, you are good Americans and we are going to try to justify your expectations.

I am not like Al Smith was, when he was making a great campaign speech in New York one time. I am not like Hubert Humphrey is when he is speaking with unlimited debate rules in the Senate where he can speak all evening. I am just somewhere in between. But maybe some of you will ask me how was Al Smith. I will tell you. Al was out speaking one night on the sidewalks of New York and he had a pretty enthusiastic crowd. One old boy stepped out of a bar, kind of unfriendly to Al—he had had himself a beer or two—and he said, "Al, tell them all you know. It won't take you very long." And Al said, "I will tell them all we know and it won't take any longer."

Well, I haven't told you all I know or all that we all know. But I do want to tell you this: You have so much to be proud of. Don't go home tonight with a martyr complex feeling sorry for yourself. Think about how the less fortunate in this country and in the world are, and count your blessings. Resolve tonight to do unto others as you would have them do unto you, and let's all leave here thankful for what we have and determined to leave this world a better place than we found it.

Remarks of the President at Swedish Celebration at Minnehaha Park, Minneapolis, Minn., June 28, 1964

Senator McCarthy—thank you very much—Governor Rolvaag, Senator Humphrey, Members of the Congress, the chairman of the day's event. Mr. Johnson and all the other Johnsons in the crowd, ladies and gentlemen, the Bible counsels us: "To everything there is a season, and a time to every purpose under the heaven * * * a time of war and a time of peace."

So I come today to speak to you in the hope that, after decades of war and threats of war, we may be nearing a time of peace. Today, as always, if a nation is to keep its freedom it must be prepared to risk war. When necessary, we will take that risk. But as long as I am President, I will spare neither my office nor myself in the quest for peace. That peace is much more than the absence of war. In fact, peace is much the same thing in our world community as it is here in your community, or in the small community of Johnson City, Tex., where I grew up.

If, in your town, every morning brings fear that the serenity of the streets will be shattered by the sounds of violence, then there is no peace. If one man can compel others, unjustly and unlawfully, to do what he commands them to do, then your community is not a place of peace. If we have neither the will nor a way to settle disputes among neighbors without force and violence, then none of us can live in peace. If we do not work together to help others fulfill their fair desires, then peace is insecure. For in a community, as in the world, if the strong and the wealthy ignore the needs of the poor and the oppressed, frustrations will result in force. Peace, therefore, is a world where no nation fears another, or no nation can force another to follow its command. It is a world where differences are solved without destruction, and common effort is directed at common problems.

Such a peace will not come by a single act or a single moment. It will take decades and generations of persistent and patient effort. That great son of Sweden, Dag Hammarskjold, once said: "The qualities it requires are just those which I feel we all need today—perseverance and patience, a firm grip on realities, careful but imaginative planning, a clear awareness of the dangers—but also of the fact that fate is what we make it."

With these qualities as our foundation, we follow several goals to the single goal of peace. And what are those goals? First is restraint in the use of power. We must be, and we are, strong enough to protect ourselves and our allies. But it was a great historian who reminded us that: "No aspect of power more impresses men than its exercise with restraint."

We do not advance the cause of freedom by calling on the full might of our military to solve every problem. We won a great victory in Cuba, because we stood there for many days, firm without using force. In Vietnam we are engaged in a brutal and a bitter struggle trying to help a friend. There, too, we will stand firm to help maintain their own freedom, and to give them counsel and advice and help as necessary.

Second is the search for practical solutions to particular problems. Agreements will not flow from a sudden trust among nations. Trust comes from a slow series of agreements. Each agreement must be fashioned as the products of your famous craftsmanship are fashioned, with attention to detail, with practical skills, with faith in the importance of the result.

And so, even while we are caught in conflict in one part of the world, we labor to build the structure of agreement, which can bring peace to all the rest of the world. In this way we have signed a treaty already ending nuclear tests in the atmosphere. Already we have cut back our production of atomic fuel and weapons. Already we have established a hot line between Washington and Moscow. Already we are meeting with the Soviets to pool our efforts in making fresh water from the oecans. These agreements, by themselves, have not ended tensions or they have not ended war. But because of them we have moved much closer to peace.

And the third point that I want to bring up is respect for the rights and fears of others. We can never compromise the cause of freedom. But as we work in our world community we must always remember that differences with others do not always flow from a desire for domination. They can come from honest clash of honest beliefs of goals. And in such cases our strength does not entitle us to impose our interest. Rather, our desire for peace compels us to seek just compromise. And we must also recognize that although this is very hard to do, that other nations may honestly fear our intentions or the intentions of our allies. There is no need for such fear. For we in America seek neither dominion or conquest. But where it exists, we must work to dispel that fear.

The fourth point that I want to make is cooperation in solving the problems which are greater than immediate conflicts. Most of our neighbors in the world live in the midst of hunger and poverty. Most of our neighbors live in the midst of disease and ignorance. We are proud of the fact that here in America, across the world, American workers and American food and American capital are building industry, and are expanding farms, are educating the young and are caring for the sick, and are feeding the hungry.

We will continue to seek such cooperation. No peace and no power is strong enough to stand for long against the restless discontent of millions who are without hope. For peace to last, all must have a stake in its benefits.

Fifth, is the ability to adjust disputes without the use of force. It is, in short, the pursuit of justice. We can find guidance here in our own country's historic pledge to the rule of law. That is a pledge to abide by the law and to accept its settlements. It is a pledge to submit to courts and to be satisfied by court decisions. It is a pledge to respect, uphold, and always obey the law of the land. For if any take grievances and disputes into their own hands, the safety and the freedom of all is in peril. "Due process" is the safeguard of our civilization. As a President of the United States and as an individual citizen, I stand totally committed to the integrity of justice and the enforcement of the law. But legal government depends upon law-loving and law-abiding citizens. Today, the key to peace in our own land is obedience to the great moral command that no man should deny to another the liberties the Constitution creates, as the law defines these liberties. And it rests on the even more hallowed rule that, whatever our disagreements, we treat others with the peaceful respect that we reserve and desire for ourselves. So, too, we seek a world community in which answers can win acceptance without the use of force. For this purpose, all the machinery of the international justice is useless unless it is infused with the good faith of nations. On a worldwide basis, we place much hope in the United Nations.

Twenty years after World War I the League of Nations was discredited. Twenty years after World War II the United Nations is, thank God, a stronger force for peace than ever before. Our support, the steadfast support of nations like Sweden, has made that possible. And let any of those who might choose to criticize the United Nations always remember that where the United Nations has gone, from Iran to the Congo, the Communists have not conquered. This is not because the United Nations supports our cause or because it exists just to help us against our enemies. It is because the United Nations is on the side of national independence, on the side of peaceful justice, of self-determination, of human freedom, and that is the side that we are on, too.

These are the several tasks—these are the several paths that we take to peace. At times in the solitude of my office, peace seems discouragingly distant. My days are often filled with crisis and conflict. Yet each time that I come here among the people of my country I feel new hope and renewed faith. There was a legendary figure who, each time his feet touched the earth, redoubled his strength. Your friendship and your warmth and your wishes are equally the source of my strength.

I know that all the power of my great office will never bring peace unless you want it, unless you are willing to work and fight and die for it. For with you not me—not even the members of your great delegation in the Congress, and I should say now that no State in the Union has a right to be prouder of their Senators or their Congressmen than the great State of Minnesota—and in the Senate with Hubert Humphrey and Gene McCarthy—no State has a better or more gifted reputation.

As President and as leader of your country, I want to thank you for those Congressmen, too, and I want to express the hope that we will not only have all those four Democratic Congressmen back next time, but you will give us some additions to help us along the way. I am proud of your progressive, young, great Governor, my old long-time friend, Governor Rolvaag.

I want to remind you finally, as I finish, that it is with the people and not with their leaders that the final question whether the liberties and the life of this land shall be "preserved to the latest generations." If you can do this, if you do do this, then our children's children will gladly remember us in the ancient phrase: "Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the children of God."

Please take care of things out here in Minnesota for Gene McCarthy so he can help me take care of things in the Nation.

Remarks of Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson at Swedish Celebration at Minnehaha Park, Minneapolis, Minn., June 28, 1964

Friends, I am so glad I got to come along because on this gay, festive holiday, I look around and see the flag that belonged to the country from which many of your ancestors came, and every now and then I will catch a glimpse of somebody in a costume that may have come from Sweden. I will bet if I had gotten to join some of those families' picnics I might have gotten a good bite of Swedish food.

I feel I have seen a very colorful, strong, wonderful thread that goes into making up the fabric of America and, therefore, I understand Minnesota better by being here, and I understand my country better.

May I just say one more word? We in Washington, the women, have come to know the wives of the officials that you send there with so much admiration and liking.

Jane Freeman and Muriel Humphrey, and Abigail McCarthy are people that you can be so proud of, and they work right shoulder to shoulder with their husbands.

Thank you. I am glad to have shared this day with you.

AFL–CIO PRESIDENT GEORGE MEANY HAILS SENATE PASSAGE OF CIVIL RIGHTS BILL

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have just had an opportunity to read the excellent statement delivered by AFL–CIO President George Meany to the opening session of the NAACP annual convention, in which he hailed the Senate's passage of the civil rights bill.

In this address, Mr. Meany termed passage of the civil rights bill "a truly historic legislative victory—a victory, not just for Negro Americans, not just for the oppressed minorities, but for the Nation." I surely share these eloquent sentiments.

I ask unanimous consent that the press release containing the full text of George Meany's speech be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

News From the AFL–CIO

AFL–CIO President George Meany today hailed Senate passage of the civil rights bill as "a truly historic legislative victory—a victory, not just for Negro Americans, not just for oppressed minorities, but for the Nation."

In a letter of greeting to the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, opening its convention in Washington's Statler-Hilton Hotel today, Meany extended credit to the leadership of both parties in the Senate saying that America could be "proud that this was not a partisan victory."

He added, "But let us recognize that a law is the beginning of justice, not its fulfillment."

To translate the principles of the civil rights bill "into the daily life of the Nation more than a law is needed," he said. "There must be from this point on a far more intensive effort, in every phase of community life, to build new bridges of understanding, so that the law reflects the affirmative will even of those who feared it.

"If this effort is to succeed, other steps must be taken. We in the AFL–CIO have repeatedly insisted that for equal opportunity to be realized we must have full opportunity. And full opportunity means jobs at good wages for all.

"The principles and purposes of the bill, now so close to final enactment, will not otherwise be realized. This battle was not waged to win equal rights to unemployment, or an equal distribution of poverty."

Meany concluded, "One battle is all but won; the even greater one lies ahead. All of us must enlist for the duration and I pledge to you that the AFL–CIO will never abandon this fight."

The full text of Meany's letter follows:

"You meet on the threshold of a truly historic legislative victory—a victory, not just for Negro Americans, not just for oppressed minorities, but for the Nation.

"As Americans we can all be proud that this was not a partisan victory. An overwhelming majority in both political parties united to make it possible, expressing, through their votes, the overwhelming consensus of the American people.

"It seems to me entirely right that the credit is shared by Senators MANSFIELD and HUMPHREY, on one side of the aisle, and Senators DIRKSEN and KUCHEL, on the other; and not only by them, but by the many others who steadfastly supported them. And while the Senate victory is fresh in our mind, we must never forget the great leadership of Congressman CELLER and Congressman MCCULLOCH in the House of Representatives who rose above party rivalry in order to serve the national interest.

"This broad based unity in Congress came about, in turn, from unity on another front—the unity represented by the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights, of which we of the AFL–CIO are proud to be a part. Through this conference the veterans of the fight for freedom—your own NAACP, the other civil rights organizations and the labor movement—enlisted the invaluable support of the church groups and others, welding a force for progress which has few parallels in the annals of our country. In particular, you in the NAACP can take pride in the indispensable role of Roy Wilkins, who as chairman of the conference did so much to strengthen the bonds of unity. And thus the cause of justice has prevailed.

"The cause has prevailed—or will shortly prevail—as a matter of law. This is right; this was necessary. But let all of us recognize that a law is the beginning of justice, not its fulfillment.

"A law is written in words. A law can reinforce a principle. But for that principle to be translated into the daily life of the Nation, more than a law is needed. There must be from this point on a far more intensive effort, in every phase of community life, to build new bridges of understanding, so that the law reflects the affirmative will even of those who feared it.

"If this effort is to succeed, other steps must be taken. We in the AFL–CIO have repeatedly insisted that for equal opportunity to be realized we must have full opportunity. And full opportunity means jobs at good wages for all.

"The principles and purposes of the bill, now so close to final enactment, will not otherwise be realized. This battle was not waged to win equal rights to unemployment, or an equal distribution of poverty.

"The true goals of the civil rights bill will be attained only when the education and the income of Negro citizens are on a par with those of the community as a whole. These goals cannot be reached by the wave of a magic wand; they must be woven, strand by strand, throughout the fabric of American society.

"To really translate this new freedom into true equality, at every level of American life, requires educational parity and economic parity in fact as well as in the law of the land.

"We in the AFL–CIO are deeply dedicated to the full realization of equality in America. Therefore we call upon all who joined in the great campaign to enact the civil rights bill to join with equal fervor in a broader campaign that is essential for its final accomplishment—the campaign to translate the bill's promises into reality; the campaign for full employment, for decent wages, for adequate housing, for assured medical care, for unlimited educational opportunities, for all Americans everywhere in America.

"Only in this way can the great concepts on which this country was founded, the great concepts which will soon be reaffirmed and reinforced by law, truly become living reality in the day-to-day life of our Nation.

"One battle is all but won; the even greater one lies ahead. All of us must enlist for the duration and I pledge to you that the AFL–CIO will never abandon this fight."

NORTH VERNON, IND., REFUTES READER'S DIGEST ON ARA

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, a great deal of public opinion is undoubtedly influenced by a magazine with the millions of copies in circulation which the Reader's Digest has. Such a magazine should be doubly aware of its public responsibility for fair and accurate presentation of facts. But, as has been noted by others in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and on the floor of the Senate, the attack on the Area Redevelopment Administration published in that magazine's May issue was a biased presentation, whose effect was to alienate many people from support of a program which, in truth, has made many genuine contributions to hard-pressed communities involved in the program.

One of those communities, and one which was specifically mentioned as an example of the alleged faults and failures of the ARA, is North Vernon, Ind. After reading what the article stated in the context of his personal knowledge of his own community, the editor of the North Vernon Plain Dealer and Sun, Dick Mayer, was incensed. He wrote an editorial on the subject, which appeared in his paper under date of May 28. In it, he not only cited chapter and verse on the distortions he found in the magazine's mention of North Vernon, but he also went on to a positive recital of the values which the ARA has given to that community.

Mr. President, in this editorial is an eloquent case study of the benefits of the Area Redevelopment Administration to be found in many a North Vernon throughout the Nation, the Reader's Digest notwithstanding. In fact, President Lyndon Johnson, on receiving a copy of the editorial from the Plain Dealer, replied in a letter whose contents the paper noted in its issue of June 13. The letter included the following:

> Your town is a shining example of what can happen to make life better and more hopeful through the cooperation of local people and the Federal Government.

Mr. President, I request unanimous consent that this editorial, entitled "We Can't 'Digest' It," be printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the North Vernon (Ind.) Plain Dealer and Sun, May 28, 1964]

WE CAN'T "DIGEST" IT

It's scant moments of their precious time, you can bet, that the powers-that-be at Reader's Digest spend on worrying about whether or not there are enough jobs to go around for our people here in Jennings County. We, and the needs and goals of our community are an abstraction to them, that got flickering recognition in a kind of backhanded way in the May issue of this magazine.

North Vernon was mentioned in an article in this issue entitled "Is This the Way to Fight the War Against Poverty?" It was a hatchet job against the ARA. And, rather peculiarly, we thought, it contained some of the data that had previously appeared in another "wreck the ARA" article that was in the Indianapolis Star several months ago.

We, of course, have no way of knowing what goes on or has gone on in other communities that have received ARA help. But, we do know something about the work done here. The article in question was wrong in the data it did present about North Vernon, and it was "wronger" in what it chose not to say about the ARA accomplishments here.

In contrast to this magazine, the leaders of our community, many of them conservatives, do care deeply about the economic well-being of our community and have spent time and energy trying to increase the number of jobs available for our people. They have found that there were benefits that were gained through ARA that could not possibly have been achieved any other way. We, for one, deeply appreciate these leaders' efforts, and in fairness to all concerned—especially to those from the outside who helped Jennings in a time of need, we think the true and complete story should be told.

For one thing, the passing magazine reference to North Vernon was inaccurate. It referred to the forge fire and said that ARA lied about the number of employees at the North Vernon Processing Plant Co. here, the jobs of which were in serious jeopardy if the ARA hadn't come through with an emergency loan so quickly after the fire. The article said there are only 50 employed. Fifty jobs would be worth saving, don't you think? But the fact is that the employment is around 100. Or it was last Saturday when we checked the plants here.

Untold in the North Vernon story, even though they knew it, was the fact that WoodCarv is now in operation here in North Vernon, through an ARA loan. The payroll—again around 100. And while a hundred jobs, give or take, may be an abstraction in its editorial offices at Pleasantville, N.Y., the difference here is like the one between skim milk and cream.

It is a $162,500 loan that ARA will make on it. In this community our two banks helped in this with a $50,000 loan. The North Vernon Building Co. loaned $25,000. This was not a case of our community sitting back and doing nothing. We did all that we could.

In addition, adding to our industrial potential, we got from ARA a $128,000 grant to improve our water facilities. We locally matched this sum. And not only has this aided our industrial development, but we now find another golden economic door opening in Butlerville and Scipio asking us for water, which if it can be done, will result directly in great growth in two directions from our central city.

Add to this the work now in progress on the swimming pool at the park. Without ARA, and let us not kid ourselves, we wouldn't have had the pool. And if that swimming pool does not add to the many advantages of our community, then we don't know what would.

This is raw data. And has it worked? Well, let us turn a few gears and see what you think. Last year, North Vernon Division of Thompson Industries expanded. WoodCarv was so pleased with the results of its plant here, it doubled its size. Triad Steel doubled, thanks directly to the North Vernon Building Co., which incidentally never could have raised the money to finance this expansion, if it had had to ante up more for WoodCarv. Right now, work is underway on an expansion at Regal Rug. Again, with financing from the North Vernon Building Co. that would not have been there if they had had to up more money for WoodCarv.

Add them up. That's one, two, three, four plant expansions in less than a year's time. That, as you well know, doesn't leave too many plants here that have not expanded.

At the minimum, it can truly be said that ARA didn't hurt us. At the maximum, much more pleasant words can be said.

Errors can be found any place, if you look hard enough. Poverty, it seems to us, has some unexpected allies. Why is it somehow all right to spend American money abroad, but it is something awful when it is spent at home to help ourselves? Indeed, to us, this entire program seems to be merely the natural act of the neighborhood helping a neighbor who temporarily is down on its luck. If this isn't Americanism at its best, then we don't know what it is. If it doesn't work, then why are we witnessing in Jennings today so many undeniable signs of rich and robust good economic health?

MARIO NOTO HONORED BY NEW JERSEY STATE BAR ASSOCIATION

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute to one of Washington's distinguished citizens, Mario T. Noto. Mr. Noto, Associate Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, was recently honored by the New Jersey State Bar Association, and was selected as the recipient of the 1964 Amerigo Vespucci Award for "distinguished community service by Americans of Italian descent."

I have known and worked with Mr. Noto for several years. He is an outstanding and dedicated public servant, and I am proud to add my congratulations to the many he has already received for his fine record of public service.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the resolution by the New Jersey State Bar Association, honoring Mr. Noto, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Resolution of the New Jersey State Bar Association

Whereas the section on immigration and nationality law of the New Jersey State Bar Association, has a specific interest in the operation and procedures of immigration and nationality law; and

Whereas the members of this section have appeared before county bar associations' meetings as well as before patriotic and civic groups to discuss various phases of the law; and

Whereas the membership of this section participates actively in furthering the understanding of the immigration and nationality law among leading organizations in this State; and

Whereas the Honorable Mario T. Noto, Associate Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, has been invited to receive the 1964 Amerigo Vespucci Award for "Distinguished Community Service by Americans of Italian Descent"; and

Whereas this section regards this merited award with high favor in recognition of the dedicated public and community services rendered by the Honorable Mario T. Noto: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the section on immigration and nationality law of the New Jersey State Bar Association extends to Associate Commissioner Mario T. Noto, its congratulations and best wishes for continued success in all his endeavors.

Done at the city of Newark on the 27th day of April 1964.

Amerigo D'Agostino, *Chairman.*
I. Arthur Levy, *Secretary.*

VIETNAM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the Record a column appearing in tonight's Evening Star by Max Freedman, entitled "Three Senators Agree on Vietnam."

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Evening Star, Washington, D.C., July 1, 1964]

Three Senators Agree on Vietnam—Fulbright, Humphrey, Church Believe U.N. Should Defer Any Intervention

(By Max Freedman)

In the Senate the other day Senator Church started a debate that soon spread to a discussion of the United Nations and the war in Vietnam. He did not intend to provoke such a discussion; he really wanted to speak up in support of the United Nations and to protect it from attack by people like Senator Goldwater. But the mere mention of Vietnam was enough to stir a lively debate.

The first point to be noted about this discussion was that only Democrats took part in it. Senator Goldwater has tried to break the Republican Party into organized opposition to the way the Johnson administration has been behaving in Vietnam; but thus far his success has been negligible. The Republicans cannot shake out of their minds the warning by Ambassador Lodge that America's involvement in Vietnam dates back to the Eisenhower administration and since then has been supported by both parties. It is utterly unconvincing for Senator Goldwater to pretend now that he or any other Republican has a solution which is being willfully ignored by the folly of Washington.

As the debate showed, most Senators are not concerned with the morbid review of wrong turnings and past mistakes. They are more eager to prevent a bigger and more ruthless war, and nowhere is this anxiety stronger than in the Democratic Party.

That was the theme common to Senators Church, Fulbright, Humphrey, Pell, Proxmire, and Morse. An exception, however, must be made of Senator Morse. He has advanced the grave charge that the American program in Vietnam "violates one international commitment after another." He commands no support for this view which is a libel on America advertised with all the authority that belongs to a senior Senator. Regardless of what else may have gone wrong, it is perverse and mischievous to regard the United States as the bandit nation in Vietnam. Senator Morse should drop this argument before it sinks him incurably in the respect of the American people.

It is more useful to concentrate on Senator Fulbright and Senator Humphrey. In Senator Fulbright's judgment, the essential task now is to stabilize the military situation as the prelude to any political initiatives that may yet be taken. At present he sees no great role for the United Nations in putting an end to the struggle. But he does not exclude a possibility later. "If conditions should arise," Senator Fulbright told the Senate, "in which it would be feasible for the United Nations to take over and maintain order, I would be in favor of that." Senator Humphrey, trying to put at rest all fears of a larger war, said "I do not favor accelerating the war. I believe I can say this Government does not." He agreed with Senator Fulbright that one day the influence of the United Nations might well be both timely and constructive.

Quite plainly Senator Church had impressed his colleagues by his warning against any new policy that would commit the United States to military attacks on Vietnam and military decisions that might also provoke a clash with China. No one dissented from his warning that we must ponder our next steps very carefully "if we are to avoid a tragic trail of casualties in Asia out of all proportion to the vital interests of the United States."

Some weeks ago great interest was taken in the announcement that Harlan Cleveland, who is in charge of United Nations affairs for the State Department, would attend the Honolulu Conference to review the problems of Vietnam and southeast Asia. It was generally felt that his presence in Honolulu would focus attention on what the United Nations could do to end the danger of a spreading war.

As it turned out Mr. Cleveland was unable to leave Washington because sudden anxieties over Cyprus kept him here. But that does not mean that he and his officials are avoiding the close and continuous study of what the United Nations can do, at the right time, to promote stability and peace in this whole restless area.

Mr. MORSE. I shall proceed to answer that column by Mr. Freedman in respect to its references to the senior Senator from Oregon. In the course of the column Mr. Freedman says:

> As the debate showed, most Senators are not concerned with the morbid review of wrong turnings and past mistakes. They are more eager to prevent a bigger and more ruthless war, and nowhere is this anxiety stronger than in the Democratic Party.
>
> That was the theme common to Senators Church, Fulbright, Humphrey, Pell, Proxmire and Morse. An exception, however, must be made of Senator Morse. He has advanced the grave charge that the American program in Vietnam "violates one international commitment after another." He commands no support for this view which is a libel on America advertised with all the authority that belongs to a senior Senator. Regardless of what else may have gone wrong, it is perverse and mischievous to regard the United States as the bandit nation in Vietnam. Senator Morse should drop this argument before it sinks him incurably in the respect of the American people.

Mr. President, Mr. Freedman should get out to the hustings. Mr. Freedman should acquaint himself with American public opinion. For the benefit of Mr. Freedman, I incorporate by reference now every criticism that I have made of American foreign policy in southeast Asia, including the criticism to which he takes exception.

In his column today in the Washington Star Max Freedman undoes all the sound commentary he offered the American people last week when he warned:

> Not even in his worst moments was John Foster Dulles ever guilty of such a crude and reckless act of brinkmanship as the one in which the Johnson administration has now stumbled.

Of course, he published that column in the Washington Evening Star, which contained the editorial paying its disrespect to the senior Senator from Oregon. I answered it some days ago on the floor of the Senate. In my reply to the editor of the Washington Star, I said that he should have read the column by Max Freedman published in the same issue that contained its editorial attacking the senior Senator from Oregon.

It is interesting to note this complete change of journalistic coloring on the part of Mr. Freedman in so short a time.

I wonder why. Could it be that his editors did not like the fact that in that column he took the position of the senior Senator from Oregon? As I pointed out, in that column Freedman laid down the major thesis of the criticism by the senior Senator from Oregon of shocking American policy in southeast Asia which, I repeat, in all probability, if it is not reversed, will lead us into a major war in Asia.

Today Mr. Freedman sounds frightened of his own analysis of our foreign policy in South Vietnam, which he published only a few days ago. On June 25 he pointed out that the threat of war made by administration officials against China "is more likely to divide and worry American opinion than it is to frighten Peiping or to serve the cause of peace." But that is the only logical end to a policy we are now following in southeast Asia. Our policy of military buildup and overwhelming economic aid to South Vietnam has failed to halt rebels successes. The next step was to threaten expansion of the war if the Communists did not voluntarily retreat.

The Government of the United States is threatening war in Asia. Let those who believe it is not stand up and deny it, for we cannot read the statements of this Government, from the President on down, and fail to recognize that those statements add up to a threat to war prosecuted by the United States in Asia unless Red China, Laos, North Vietnam and other areas do the bidding of the United States.

Having made the threat, we will have no choice but make good on it when the Communists decline to retreat. This entire policy depends upon Ho Chi Minh and Mao Tse-tung backing down before a threat that if they do not, their territory will be attacked by the United States.

One may as well expect the United States to leave Vietnam upon threat of dire consequences if we do not.

Mr. Freedman is also frightened of the concept that the United States is itself violating international agreements in southeast Asia. And we are. He does not deny that we are. He does not try to show that our actions are in conformity with the Geneva accords of 1954, or 1962, or with the United Nations Charter, because that is impossible. He merely puts a nasty label on anyone who does point out the bitter truth of the U.S. illegal action in southeast Asia—illegal action in southeast Asia that violates the United Nations Charter in articles 33, 36, 37, and 51—to mention only four specific instances of our violation.

Let Mr. Freedman or anyone else deny it. They cannot deny it if they can read the English language. The language is perfectly clear as to the obligation of any signatory to that Charter and the course of procedural action that should follow whenever peace is threatened anywhere in the world. Peace is seriously threatened in southeast Asia, and the responsibility of the United States is clear. We should take the threat to the United Nations, and not set ourselves up as the policeman of the world, self-appointed, to enforce our interpretation of existing treaties such as the Geneva accords.

Mr. Freedman may as well try to prove that the United States has the legal right to enforce a treaty between Russia and China as to prove that we have a unilateral right to enforce the Geneva accords of 1954, when we are not a party to them.

Who are we to set ourselves up as the enforcement country of the Geneva accords of 1954 when we did not even sign the accords, and when John Foster Dulles used his influence to prevent South Vietnam from signing them?

When we recognize that a violation of a treaty is threatening the peace of the world, this country has a clear duty to file charges before the United Nations. That the United States has not done. I wonder why. I wonder if it might be that if the United Nations took jurisdiction it would find plenty of illegality on the part of the conduct of the United States to date in the course of action it has been following in southeast Asia?

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Alaska.

Mr GRUENING. I will confess I was also surprised at the abrupt about-face change in the attitude of Mr. Freedman from his previous article, in which he supported the view that the senior Senator from Oregon and I have been advocating, that we should stop our participation in the war in southeast Asia and try to wage peace; that it was a war we could not win militarily; that it was a war in which we should not have engaged in the first place; and that we should go to the United Nations and try to find a solution there.

Mr. Freedman published a column earlier, which either the senior Senator from Oregon or I put in the RECORD, to that effect. I am interested in the sudden change. What happened in between the publication of the two articles?

Mr. MORSE. We have our suspicions.

Mr. GRUENING. I can think of various explanations.

Mr. MORSE. But they would not redound to the credit of Mr. Freedman.

Mr. GRUENING. I do not know that I can comment on that; but, in any event, I think it is a regrettable change of attitude and an inconsistency that it would be useful for the columnist to explain to his readers.

Mr. MORSE. For the edification of Mr. Freedman, I repeat again that the United States is violating one international agreement after another by our policy in southeast Asia. We have already violated the 1954 Geneva agreement, and have been found in violation by the International Control Commission. We have admitted to violations of the Geneva accords of 1962, with the excuse that some one else violated them first.

This country has even sent into Laos armed military planes that have dropped bombs, which constitutes an act of war and aggression. It is a clear violation of the Geneva accord of 1962, which this country signed, and which I believe thereby constitutes an even more serious reflection on the United States. We have freely admitted to these violations, pointing out only that North Vietnam violated them first.

Our violations of the United Nations Charter, as I have pointed out time and time again in the past several weeks, have been many, and they are continuing up to the moment I speak.

The very assumption of Freedman and those he quotes that someday, sometime, somehow, and under some other circumstances, the United States will seek United Nations action is evidence that all of them know the issue is one of U.N. jurisdiction.

What they are all saying is only that they do not think that to adhere to the U.N. Charter now would serve American interests.

Are we to take the position that this country is being a peace-abiding nation; that we are going to resort to its obligations under treaties and international law only when we think to do so would serve our interests? If every country takes that position, that is the end of international law. International law then ceases to be of any force or effect in maintaining peace in the world, and becomes nothing but a sham and a shibboleth.

But when, under that type of international expediency, would this country ever take such a matter to the United Nations? Would we do it when war has engulfed North Vietnam? Do we think that when China is faced with the same situation she was faced with in Korea she will do what we have refused to do, and take the issue to the United Nations?

If we set such an example, we set the precedent for other nations to defy their obligations under international law.

Do we think that Red China will be willing to go to the U.N. or to the bargaining table when the war goes against her, although we refused to do so under the same circumstances?

What a folly! What a poor, lame, pathetic excuse for a war in Asia! "Now is not the time to negotiate; wait until we dominate the battlefield and then we will negotiate." If countries follow that course of action, there will be no sense in talking about resorting to the rule of law for settlement of issues that threaten the peace of the world. We shall then prove that our objective is to return to the jungle law of American military might.

I can see the United States going to the United Nations or the conference table had Russia come to dominate the Caribbean in 1962.

Mr. President, if we are going to take the position that the time to negotiate does not exist until we dominate the battlefield, then when we dominate the battlefield of southeast Asia, Red China will throw all she has into southeast Asia.

Remember this about our policy in Asia: A nation does not have to commit the first violation in order to be in violation of the Geneva accords. And it does not have to commit aggression in order to be in violation of the United Nations Charter; and all the journalistic squirming and weaseling by the Freedmans cannot change that ugly fact and that sad indictment against the United States.

We have violated these accords and the United Nations Charter time and time again. We are pursuing neither law nor peace in Asia. We are not even pursuing freedom. We are maintaining a military, tyrannical dictatorship over the South Vietnamese, headed by an American puppet to whom we give the orders, and who moves only under our orders.

Mr. President, whoever fights a war without taking the matter to the United Nations, is in violation of the charter, whether that party started the war or not.

The United States cannot hide itself behind the alibi that we are not the only ones who are violating the Geneva accords and the United Nations Charter. Of course we are not. The Communists in Asia are violating international law, too; but since when can the United States justify an act of illegality because someone else is committing an act of illegality? The fact that North Vietnam and the Communists in Laos and Red China are also threatening the peace in Asia does not justify our walking out on our international obligations. To the contrary, it makes it more important that we lay the charges before the United Nations, or go to a 14-nation Conference, or seek to get SEATO to come in and exercise peacekeeping policies until the United Nations can take over jurisdiction.

That has been the thesis of the Senator from Oregon for weeks. It will continue to be my thesis so long as my country follows its course of outlawry in southeast Asia. "Outlawry," I remind Max Freedman, means outside the law, and our policy in Asia today is outside the law.

Mr. Freedman's column today somehow carries all the overtones and pathos of the diplomats and generals who led their countries into World War I. It was always going to be the other side that was going to back down in the face of a magnificent navy or army or military machine, and any treaty that was inconvenient to national interests became "just a scrap of paper."

I never thought the time would come when my country would treat existing treaties as scraps of paper. My country's violation of the Geneva accords, of the United Nations Charter, and the Constitution itself, reflect the attitude of treating international obligations and constitutional obligations as scraps of paper.

Some of us have liked to think that the championing of the League of Nations by Woodrow Wilson, and later our active sponsorship of the United Nations marked an American commitment to the rule of law in world affairs, including our own interests in world affairs.

What we are doing in Asia is setting the United States above all that. Once we have decided an American interest was at stake, we have ignored our treaty obligations and our obligations to the United Nations. We have cranked up the American military machine to move into Asia.

The apologists who piously deplore spreading the war, but who in the meantime want to continue it in South Vietnam and Laos, rather than negotiate, are scarcely different from those who want to expand it. The war in South Vietnam is not going to get better for us. Perhaps it will not get any worse but I see no chance that it will get better. And the longer it continues under those circumstances, the more certain it is that the war will be expanded.

If a nation wants to live up to its international commitments, it must live up to them and not find excuses for avoiding them. The only policy in the world I am advocating for the United States is that we live up to the Geneva Accords and the U.N. Charter.

For Mr. Freedman's benefit, I repeat the language to which he takes such exception: The United States is violating one international commitment after another.

So we are.

GEN. MAXWELL D. TAYLOR, U.S. AMBASSADOR TO SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the last point I wish to make deals with the action taken by the Senate today in confirming the nomination of General Taylor as American Ambassador to South Vietnam.

When the Senate took that action—and I understand there were only a few Senators on the floor when it took place—I was downstairs in the Committee on Foreign Relations presenting an argument against a shocking waste of taxpayer funds in a foreign aid program that is in need of drastic revision.

I was not aware that the Taylor nomination was to be brought up at that time. It was well known that I voted against the confirmation of the Taylor nomination in committee. I wish briefly to say for the record that I think nominating General Taylor as American Ambassador to South Vietnam was a most unfortunate mistake, and for the following reasons:

First, it is known around the world that General Taylor was one of the architects, along with McNamara and Rusk, of the war plans of the United States in Vietnam.

It is unfortunate that we should send as our Ambassador to South Vietnam a military leader—and a very able military leader he is, too—when all the world has its eyes turned to the hope for peace. The appointment of General Taylor as Ambassador to South Vietnam increases the possibility of our going into a full scale war in Asia if the Red Chinese and the North Vietnamese do not back down under American threats.

I am also satisfied that General Taylor will not hesitate to advocate the escalating of that war into North Vietnam and into Red China and into Laos if the Red Chinese do not quiver and quake and retreat.

I have great regard for General Taylor as a military leader. If we get into a war, I believe we shall find that most military experts in this country will agree with the observation I now make, namely, that we probably have a no more able potential theater commander for that war than General Taylor. But he has no place behind the desk of an Ambassador.

There is a growing trend in this Republic for the military to take over more and more policy determinations. I had hoped that we would make it more clear than it has been made to date that under our constitutional system it is not for the military to determine policy, but to carry out orders; and that American foreign policy should be determined by the civilian branch of the Government—by the President, his chief agent, the Secretary of State, and the Congress.

The symbolism of putting this general behind an Ambassador's desk in South Vietnam is uncalled for and unfortunate. It will be subject to great misunderstanding, and will accrue to the great disadvantage of the standing of the United States in many parts of the world, particularly in the so-called underdeveloped nations. I am satisfied that great fear is developing toward the United States in the underdeveloped nations. They are beginning to see great differences between our preachments and our practices, and are beginning to raise questions about the hypocrisy of the United States in the field of foreign policy.

Furthermore, I have heard General Taylor as a witness before the Foreign Relations Committee over a period of years. He has demonstrated his great ability, his wide knowledge, and his expertness in the field of military affairs. But he has never instilled any confidence in his ability in the field of foreign policy.

How well I remember the stunning shock that I suffered at the time of the Berlin crisis when, listening to General Taylor and General White, I came to realize that I was listening to two American military leaders who would not hesitate to drop the nuclear bomb, as though that would settle any issue involving the peace of the world.

General Taylor is among those in the Pentagon who have itchy trigger fingers when it comes to the use of nuclear power in case we are challenged and our bluff is called. I want to avoid those challenges. I think one of the best ways to avoid those challenges is to have the United States stop bluffing, because we may have our bluff called.

The sad thing is that if we do, a nuclear war will be on, and there will be no victory. I have no confidence whatever in General Taylor in the field of American foreign policy. Taking his uniform off and putting him behind an Ambassador's desk will not change the fact that his orientation is the orientation of the military, not the orientation of civilian foreign policy.

The symbolism of his appointment is most unfortunate. My President should have selected someone such as the man he selected as Deputy Ambassador, Mr. Alexis Johnson, or some other outstanding career officer in the Foreign Service of the State Department, rather than to dip into the Pentagon and take a military general to direct American foreign policy in southeast Asia.

As I said to Mr. Lodge in person yesterday, when he appeared before the Committee on Foreign Relations, it is unfortunate that a former U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, the former Ambassador of the United States to South Vietnam, should return to the United States and tell the American people, in effect, that the time is not propitious for us to take the southeast Asia crisis to the United Nations. I shall never be able to understand how a former Ambassador to the United Nations could demonstrate such a complete failure to uphold our obligations under the United Nations Charter. If it were not so tragic, it would be amusing, when one considers the answer he has given to the proposal to go to a 14-nation conference, as recommended by the President of France, Mr. de Gaulle. What are we afraid of? No one is suggesting that while we are at that 14-nation Conference we should abandon southeast Asia. No one is suggesting that while the Security Council and, if necessary, the General Assembly consider the United Nations jurisdiction, we remove ourselves from southeast Asia, although I wish we would desist from our warmaking in southeast Asia and start a policy of peace keeping.

I would, as I have said so many times, while the matter is before a 14-nation Conference, as recommended by De Gaulle, or before the Security Council or before the General Assembly, call upon our alleged—and I underline the word "alleged"—SEATO allies to join us with a sufficient body of men to patrol the area, to keep the adversaries separate, and to stop the killing and warmaking until the procedures of the United Nations can be brought to work upon the threat to the peace of Asia and, potentially, the peace of the world.

The position taken by Henry Cabot Lodge cannot be reconciled to any degree with the clear international obligations of the United States under the United Nations Charter.

I did not expect that the stature of the President of France for peace keeping would rise above the stature of the President of the United States; but at this hour, that is exactly what is happening. The President of France is becoming recognized in many areas of the world as more determined and dedicated to the cause of peace than the President of the United States, because the President of France is calling for negotiation. The President of France is calling for the conference table. The President of France is calling for the application of the rule of law to the threat of peace in Asia.

The President of the United States is rattling the saber and telling the world that we are willing to risk war with Red China unless Asia accepts American policy in southeast Asia.

I cannot understand why my Government cannot see, before it is too late, that that kind of warmaking policy on the part of the United States spells trouble. Let me make it clear, as I close, that there is no question that we are joined in our outlawry by South Vietnam, by North Vietnam, by the Pathet Lao Communists in Laos, and by Red China.

Does that justify our outlawry? Does that justify the policy of expediency applied to international affairs which best describes American policy tonight in Asia? Does the end-justifies-the-means principle square with American precepts of foreign policy?

Since when do two wrongs make a right?

Never before has that been our policy. I pray again that my country will see the horrendous mistake it is making in Asia as a matter of policy, before it is too late.

I close by saying, for the benefit of those who do not like my speeches and for the benefit of such journalists as Mr. Freedman, "You had better check it with the American people."

I am satisfied that millions of fellow Americans, as they begin to understand the issue at stake in southeast Asia, will support my position.

I can now say, along with the Senator from Alaska, that my mail is running better than 100 to 1 in support of my position. My mail is coming in from coast to coast, as Senators will see from some samples placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD from time to time. I placed a large quantity in the RECORD today. It is coming from the leaders of many communities in this country.

I wish to state to President Johnson that I am satisfied that the American people do not approve of America's warmaking policy in Asia, and that the American people wish the President of the United States to join with the President of France and other advocates of negotiation, that we go to the conference table and seek to apply the rule of law to the crisis which exists in Asia.

I say most respectfully to my President, whom I shall continue to support on most issues, that I oppose him on this issue only because I owe a greater trust to my country than I owe to him.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

APPOINTMENTS BY THE PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McGOVERN in the chair). The Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore, announces the appointment as members on the part of the Senate of the National Commission on Food Marketing, created by Senate Joint Resolution 71, the following Senators, namely, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA].

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION TOMORROW

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] is in the Chamber; and we have discussed the problem presented to the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Judiciary Committee in meeting tomorrow, in view of the time set for the beginning of the session of the Senate.

We have cleared this with those involved, and I ask unanimous consent that the subcommittee be permitted to sit during the session of the Senate tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, not only is there no objection, but I also concur in the request of the Senator from Michigan and wish to confirm that there has been clearance on this matter with the minority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRANSACTION OF ADDITIONAL ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following additional routine business was transacted:

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Acting President pro tempore:

S. 6. An act to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems, both public and private, in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 10433. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes.

ADDITIONAL BILL INTRODUCED

Mr. HART by unanimous consent, introduced a bill (S. 2972) for the relief of Dr. David J. Sencer, U.S. Public Health Service, which was read twice by its title and referred to the Comimttee on the Judiciary.

ADJUSTMENT OF RATES OF BASIC COMPENSATION OF CERTAIN OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES IN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT—AMENDMENTS

Mr. MORSE submitted two amendments (Nos. 1089 and 1090), intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 11049) to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. LAUSCHE submitted an amendment (No. 1091), intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 11049, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. KEATING (for himself and Mr. JAVITS) submitted an amendment (No. 1092), intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to House bill 11049, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. ELLENDER submitted amendment (No. 1093), intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 11049, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954, TO IMPOSE A TAX ON ACQUISITIONS OF CERTAIN FOREIGN SECURITIES—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENT NO. 1094

Mr. JAVITS submitted an amendment, in the nature of a substitute, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 8000) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to impose a tax on acquisitions of certain foreign securities in order to equalize costs of longer term financing in the United States and in markets abroad, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT NO. 1095

Mr. JAVITS also submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 8000, supra, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TOMORROW AT 11 A.M.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move, pursuant to the order previously entered, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 8 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Thursday, July 2, 1964, at 11 o'clock a.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 1, 1964:

AMBASSADORS

Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, U.S. Army, retired, of Missouri, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Vietnam.

Sam P. Gilstrap, of Oklahoma, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Malawi.

U. Alexis Johnson, of California, to be promoted from the class of career minister to the class indicated. Career Ambassador.

U.S. CIRCUIT JUDGE

Walter Ely, of California, to be U.S. circuit judge, ninth circuit.

U.S. DISTRICT JUDGES

Spottswood W. Robinson III, of the District of Columbia, to be U.S. district judge for the District of Columbia.

Edmund Port, of New York, to be U.S. district judge for the northern district of New York.

SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BOARD

Leonard L. Sells, of Virginia, to be a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board for the remainder of the term expiring August 9, 1964.

Leonard L. Sells, of Virginia, to be a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board for a term of 5 years, expiring August 9, 1969.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Iron Imports Continue To Feed the Fire of Unemployment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 1, 1964

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, pig iron and cast iron soil pipe imports continue to feed the fire of unemployment and ever-decreasing workloads in one of our basic American industries. Many of our plants in iron and steel areas are now working far below capacity. It just does not make sense for us to allow pig iron and cast iron soil pipe imports to come flooding in when so many of our hard-hit areas are suffering from lack of orders.

This situation in the first quarter of this year has become increasingly worse as compared with the first quarter of 1963. To support this contention and to further point out the factors contributing to this already deplorable situation, I submit herewith substantiating figures derived from U.S. Department of Commerce statistics:

Pig iron imports by customs district	1st quarter, 1964	1st quarter, 1963	Change, 1964 versus 1963
			Percent
Atlantic coast	33,414	17,684	+88.9
Gulf coast	32,217	10,259	+214.0
West coast	2,718	7,032	−61.3
Canadian border and inland	16,200	11,464	+41.3
Offshore	346	248	+39.5
Total pig iron imports	84,895	46,439	+82.8

Mr. Speaker, the dollar value of pig iron imports for the first quarter of 1964 totaled $3,352,618 versus $1,942,561 for the same period in 1963, or an increase of 73 percent, or $1,410,057. Pig iron exports for the same period totaled $421,461 in 1964 versus $1,191,510 for 1963, or a decrease of 65 percent, or $770,049 in 1964. The total outflow of dollars for pig iron imports and the decrease in dollars for exports represent an increase in dollar loss to the United States of $2,180,106 for the first quarter of 1964 over 1963.

Cast iron soil pipe imports, by customs district	1st quarter, 1964	1st quarter, 1963	Change, 1964 versus 1963
			Percent
Atlantic coast	2,502	3,323	−24.7
Gulf coast	527	87	+505.7
West coast	6,910	4,225	+63.5
Offshore	120	320	−62.5
Total cast iron soil pipe imports	10,059	7,955	+26.4

Mr. Speaker, in 1964 the dollar value of the above pipe imports was $1,114,978; in 1963, $821,243, or an increase of 36 percent. As a matter of information, cast iron pressure pipe imports are no longer identified.

Burundi Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 1, 1964

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, Burundi today celebrates the second anniversary of her independence. We take this opportunity to extend warm felicitations to His Majesty King Wmambutsa IV; and to His Excellency the Burundi Ambassador to the United States, Leon Ndenzako.

Burundi is a small kingdom situated in the mountains and plateaus which separate the Nile and Congo River Basins. Its many rivers, two of which are the southernmost sources of the Nile, rise in these mountains to begin their long twisting journey to the sea. The capital, Usumbura, which is a bustling city of 50,000 inhabitants, overlooks Lake Tanganyika, the longest fresh-water lake in the world. Most of the trade between this landlocked country and the outside world travels down this body of water to be taken either to Atlantic or Indian Ocean ports.

Three different ethnic groups in Burundi live harmoniously together. A small number of pygmies remain, while the overwhelming number are Hutus, who form 85 percent of the population. These industrious people have traditionally been farmers, an occupation that most in Burundi still follow. Since the fifteenth century, their overlords have been the Tutsi, a nomadic, pastoral people of Hamitic origins who migrated to this area from Ethiopia.

European influence came late to this land which is nestled far from the oceans. Visits by the great explorers, Speke, Stanley and Livingstone, were soon followed by those of Germans and in the 1880's Germany was given control of Burundi. This rule lasted until World War I when Belgian troops occupied the country for the Allies. Under their rule, health measures, schools and new crops were introduced, as well as other improvements.

With Belgian preparations for independence, Burundi has enjoyed a stable government since its independence. The Mwami, or leader of the Tutsi, heads the government, while a national assembly is elected by direct universal suffrage from among the competing political parties.

On this second anniversary of Burundi independence, we send our best wishes to the Burundi people and their government and look forward to watching them solve the many problems that have and will face them as they grow within the world community.

Somali Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 1, 1964

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, the Somali Republic today celebrates the fourth anniversary of her independence. We take this opportunity to extend warm felicitations to His Excellency the President of Somali, Osman Abdulla Aden; and to His Excellency the Somali Ambassador to the United States, Omar Mohallim.

Somalia lies on one of the crossroads of the world. On the north it faces the Gulf of Aden, the gateway to the Red Sea and the Suez Canal. On the east, which is the easternmost area on the African Continent the Republic looks out over the Arabian Sea to Iran, Pakistan, and India. To the southwest lies the Indian Ocean. This strategic location has made the country an interest point for foreigners from the Arabs of antiquity who came for myrrh to the powers of the 19th century—Great Britain, France, Italy, and Egypt—who sought to control the vital trade routes to the east which passed by Somali territory or the hinterland beyond.

Considering its position it is not surprising that the Somalis were known for their fierceness and ability to fight. Theirs was a rough environment with mountains, plateaus, and deserts and a tropical climate. Most of these Somalis were and are still pastoralists.

On July 1, 1960, Somalia received its independence from Italy which had administered the country under a United Nations trust. Four days earlier British Somaliland to the north had received its independence, too. These two territories joined together in the Somali Republic. Although natural difficulties have arisen over integrating these two parts of the country that were so long under different rule, the Somalis are confident that these problems can be overcome. They hope that some day they can be joined by their brethren residing outside the Republic.

In the meantime Somalis are concentrating on their economic and social development. They can be well pleased with what they have accomplished so far. Port facilities are being expanded and improved, roads constructed, airlines inaugurated, and radio communications installed. Because of the country's dependence on agriculture, this field has not been neglected. An agricultural experimental station and training center for farmers has been established—with American aid. Some industries to process local products have also been started, as well as electrical generating projects. Meanwhile, educational and health facilities have been improved. Local personnel are being trained at home and abroad and institutions are being built.

All of this progress is very heartening, but it has not been able to come to pass without foreign assistance. In line with its policy of nonalinement, the Somali Government has accepted aid from all sources. Our own Government has been generous with its offers and we can be proud of the technical and economic aid that we have extended to Somalia.

Thus, on the fourth anniversary of its independence, I salute the Somali Republic and wish it well in the future.

Honorary Award to the City of Norwalk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 1, 1964

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, today as never before the peoples of the world yearn for peace. They fear war because they instinctively feel nuclear war will be so destructive that hundreds of millions will die and the cities of the world will be destroyed.

The diplomatic leaders of the different nations also have this feeling of deep concern, based on secret information regarding the quantity and deliverability of these fearsome atomic and hydrogen weapons. President Kennedy, President Johnson and even Chairman Khrushchev have repeatedly renounced the use of nuclear weapons and are constantly seeking peaceful solutions to the international controversies and tensions which might plunge us into war.

The leaders of nations, however, cannot solve the problem of establishing peace by their efforts alone. They must have the power of public opinion solidly behind them, in order that they may be supported by the combined moral strength of their citizens in their negotiations. Public opinion, therefore, must be mobilized for peace.

One of the most potent forces in mobilizing public opinion for peace and friendship between nations is the programs of visitation and friendship being established under the people-to-people program. This is also sometimes called the sister city program.

In this program a city in the United States contacts a city in a foreign country and the two agree to engage in alternate visits and in some instances, they sponsor community projects in their sister city.

I am pleased to report that California cities are very active in this people-to-people program of developing friendship with cities in other countries. I am also pleased to report Norwalk, Calif., one of the cities in my congressional district, has been given a special award for developing the best single project in competition with all cities in the population category of 75,000 to 150,000.

The mayor of Norwalk, Hon. D. A. Apodaca and City Councilmen Peter Fogarty, Macuen Freeman, and John Zimmerman, visited the town affiliation convention in Washington, D.C., June 30, 1964, to receive the presentation of the award by the Reader's Digest, sponsors of the movement.

The mayor and city councilmen were also accompanied by the mayor of Hermosillo, Sonora, Mexico, the Honorable Eduardo Loustanau, the sister city of Norwalk, Calif., and a group of Norwalk's prominent citizens including Mr. Frank Grieshaber, Mr. John Echeveste, Mr. Jess Vela, Mr. and Mrs. Richard Kahanek, and Mark Fogarty, son of Councilman Fogarty.

Following is a brief description of the single project program and pertinent information regarding the event.

A film on the subject of international understanding was shown to an international audience Sunday evening, June 28, 1964, in the Pan-American room of the Statler-Hilton Hotel, Washington, D.C.

The 27-minute sound and color motion picture was prepared by the city of Norwalk, Calif., and depicts its sister-city program in action. Written and narrated by Norwalk's director of public information, Richard Kahanek, the film additionally covers Norwalk's counterpart in the town affiliation movement, Hermosillo, State of Sonora, Mexico.

The standing room only audience Sunday evening saw a series of behind-the-scenes color slides prior to the film showing. The slides numbering 36 in all showed the city's cameramen in action in various scenes taken on location in Hermosillo. Purpose of the slide series will be for educational use in the many schools of the city of Norwalk—thus giving youngsters the opportunity to become better acquainted with the land of Mexico and the city of Hermosillo in particular.

Norwalk's film was shown as the first order of programed business as a part of the town affiliation conference, currently being held in Washington, D.C., sponsored by the American Municipal Association in conjunction with the Reader's Digest Foundation. Norwalk, Calif., had previously been named winner in international competition as having the best single project for sister-city programs in cities of 75,000 to 150,000 population. Norwalk, with a population of 94,000 received the coveted top award during a State Department banquet Tuesday evening, June 30.

Persons attending the film showing received a dollar-sized commemorative medallion struck in both English and Spanish commemorating Norwalk's affiliation with Hermosillo and a vast people-to-people exchange of visitors which took place last year in October. In this exchange of citizens from both communities, the entire Norwalk business and civic community joined in making possible a 4-day fiesta—a fiesta which, in the words of the visiting Hermosillo mayor, "has brought us together and made possible the building of strong ties between us."

Norwalk affiliated with Hermosillo in May of 1961 following former President Eisenhower's plea for communities to develop bonds of friendship with foreign nations on a citizen level; thus the name of the program, sister city or people to people. Norwalk's affiliation is 1 of 278 such programs now in action within the United States.

Suffolk Rehabilitation Center for the Physically Handicapped, Commack, Long Island, N.Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES R. GROVER, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 1, 1964

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, how many people find existence one long struggle to overcome or to accept their physical disabilities? It is a moot question. Yet for those in suburban Long Island, the Suffolk Rehabilitation Center for the Physically Handicapped has brought a ray of light, a helping hand.

Now, however, that helping hand seeks to grow to provide a wider range of services and facilities. It is proposed to build a new wing with approximately 30 treatment areas in all spectrums of physical therapy. Also projected are special facilities to teach the patients to help themselves. Among these are a model apartment and various craft shops. The wing will also provide a professional research library.

Most of the treatment rooms and equipment are of highly specialized design and construction which of course makes them very expensive. Normally, the cost of materials and labor would make such an addition as this an almost insurmountable financial barrier. But fortunately for the people of Long Island, providence, in the form of a man called "Buddy" Long, intervened.

One often hears the noble thought, "it is more blessed to give than to receive," but it is seldom given such concrete reality as that constructed by the Nassau-Suffolk Building and Construction Trades Council on Long Island. Under the presidency of John E. "Buddy" Long this labor union group has donated a conservatively estimated 470,000 man-hours to the construction of six major public welfare projects.

Not only do these knights of labor serve unpaid, they also sacrifice their free time. As a reporter in Construction Craftsman magazine wrote:

> Saturdays—and even Sundays and holidays—have been "big days" on the * * * job.

President Long himself has served almost without a vacation since the idea was conceived in 1947. His one "break" resulted from a fall from scaffolding at one of the projects. After a short rest he returned, still in pain, but determined to finish the job.

Inspired by the contribution of labor, management and building supply firms have followed suit. They have given a skilled guidance and large amounts of material to the various projects. Similar action can be expected in connection with this project. This is a community effort, a heart warming experience not only for the participants and benefactors but also for the community as a whole, Long Island may indeed take pride in this work.

This dedication of those who built this center is only matched by the devotion of the dozens of volunteer ladies and gentlemen who operate its facilities with a zeal and worth which is inspiring and which insures its continued success.

Captive Nations Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 1, 1964

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join my colleagues today in observing the celebration of Captive Nations Week. It is well for us to pause in our legislative duties to remind ourselves of the fate of over 100 million people in the world today. These citizens of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, and Cuba are being denied the basic freedoms which at one time they all possessed, and which we hold so dear. Through the use of the most ruthless tactics the Soviet Union has subjected these peoples to economic, political, and intellectual slavery. Freedom of speech, religion, association, and expression are only memories to the older generations of these unfortunate nations.

One of the purposes of this special observation is to call attention to the love of freedom which continues to burn in the hearts of these brave peoples. The demonstrations by workers in East Germany in 1953, the uprising of the Polish people in 1956, the Hungarian revolution in October of that same year—all these are indications of how the captive peoples feel about their rulers. We all must feel a sense of loss and alarm when we read recently about the attempts of the Polish intellectual class to obtain just a minimum of freedom of expression—a sense that is magnified when we realize that the activities we read about are only a few of the thousands that take place each day behind the Iron Curtain. These attempts to regain liberty excite our admiration and respect.

Captive Nations Week must serve as a reminder to us all that the love of freedom and liberty does not die—deprivation of freedom does not in any way eliminate the desire for it. The respect we have for these men and women is matched by our horror of the deceitful tactics which their oppressors have employed in order to reduce these millions of people to poverty, hardship, and slavery. It is important for us to remember that the desires of the people and those of their governments are completely opposed. It is crucial that today we recognize this vital fact, for Captive Nations Week is a recognition of the hope of the U.S. Government that some day the wishes of the captive peoples of Europe and their governments may be one.

The citizens of the State of Florida are particularly conscious of the plight of the captive nations, for one of them lies just 90 miles from our shores. Weekly, dozens of refugees arrive in our State with stories of the plight of the peoples subject to Soviet oppression. Such a situation makes Florida especially conscious of the need of U.S. support for all the captive peoples around the globe.

Finally, it is fitting that this week we reflect on the duties of each American in the drive for the eventual release of these peoples who are denied the very rights for which we fought the Revolutionary War.

This Saturday we will celebrate the signing of the Declaration of Independence, a landmark in the struggle for the liberties which these captive peoples lack. Today, we reiterate our moral and spiritual support for these valiant people and support the avowed intention of our Government to bring freedom to all men in the world. Until this goal is reached—while these brave peoples are subjugated—peace can never be a permanent reality in our world.

Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABNER W. SIBAL

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 1, 1964

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, it is fitting that we take this time each year to renew our expressions of deep concern for the victims of communism on behalf of the American people.

Each of us, whatever our individual heritage, shares in the common heritage of liberty. This heritage comes to us as a gift of the Creator, a gift which we have brought to life in America, a gift which we must constantly defend.

Today, as for many years, the threat to this heritage is Communist imperialism, which has already blighted half the world, and which recognizes no individual rights but seeks to shackle humanity to the will of a soulless state.

Until the tide of Red oppression has been turned back and the peoples of the captive nations can decide their destinies for themselves, no freemen anywhere can rest secure.

As one of the sponsors of the proposal to create a Select Committee on the Captive Nations in this House, I am proud to take part in these ceremonies today. I also take this opportunity of urging once more that the Rules Committee act at the earliest possible moment to send this legislation to the floor.

Rwanda Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 1, 1964

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, Rwanda today celebrates the second anniversary of her independence. We take this opportunity to extend warm felicitations to His Excellency the President of Rwanda, Gregoire Kayibanda; and to His Excellency the Ambassador of Rwanda to the United States; Pierre Canisius Cyicarano.

Rwanda, a country of mountains and plateaus, lies in the very heart of Africa on the divide between the great Congo and Nile River Basins. Most of its territory has a tropical, highland climate and is covered with savanna grassland. Agriculture remains the basis of the economy, although deforestation and erosion, scourges against which the Rwandans are making valiant efforts to amend, has long hampered production in this densely populated African country.

Because of its remote position, Rwanda was one of the last regions in Africa to be visited by the explorers of the 19th century. John Speke, on his tortuous journey which lead to the discovery of Lake Victoria, was probably the first European to cross its terrain in 1858. He was followed over a decade later by Stanley and Livingstone on their famous trip together around Lake Tanganyika and its environs. Later German explorers, who were a prelude to control by their country, arrived. German rule passed to the Belgians after World War I. Under the Belgians, a 10-year program to improve all aspects of Rwanda's economy, social services, and education was launched in 1952.

Even before independence, the Rwandans exhibited their love of democracy and rule by the majority. By an overwhelming vote in 1961, the monarchy was replaced with a republican form of government. Rwanda also voted against independence with Burundi, the kingdom to the south, also under Belgian tutelege. Today Rwanda has a president and legislative assembly which was elected by direct universal suffrage. Officials of local government are also democratically elected.

Two years is a short time in the history of any nation, but already much has happened in Rwanda. On September 18, 1962, it became a member of the United Nations. Rwanda is also a member of some of that organization's specialized agencies.

Today Rwanda, which was once considered an exotic country in central Africa, is a recognized and accepted member of the family of nations. We salute Rwanda on its second anniversary of independence and wish it the best in its fight to realize social equality, economic advancement, and political stability.

Law-Abiding Americans Have the Constitutional Right Not To Be the Victim of Criminals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 1, 1964

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, enactment of the civil rights bill will please some Americans and displease others. Nevertheless, it will be the law of the land and all are bound to obey it. We have no privilege to decide which laws we will obey and which we will not.

Questions have been raised about the constitutionality of some of the law's provisions. Until the Supreme Court decides these questions, all provisions must be obeyed. Under the Constitution, the individual citizen has no power to determine constitutionality. That is a function solely of the courts.

This law assures those among us who believe they have received less rights than other Americans that they will have equal rights according to due process of law. In so doing it clearly signals an absolute halt to disobedience of law in efforts to deny those rights. It equally clearly signals an absolute halt to disobedience of law in efforts to attain them.

But the civil rights law is only one of thousands of the laws of our land. It is high time that vigorous enforcement of all laws be pursued. The rights of the majorities must be protected as well as the rights of the minorities. One of the most important of these rights for all Americans is protection against criminal acts involving either their persons or their property. One of the primary purposes of our Constitution, listed in its preamble, is to "assure domestic tranquillity."

Yet, in the recent past, the citizen's right to protection against criminal acts has steadily eroded. Effective law enforcement has steadily declined. The crime rate has increased alarmingly. Recent FBI figures disclose a drastic 19-percent rise in serious crimes in the United States during the first 3 months of 1964 over 1963. Even in the Nation's Capital neither women nor men are safe on the streets at night or even in their homes and churches.

Part of this shame is due to the Supreme Court decisions hampering law enforcement officials. The Court inexplicably follows a philosophy holding the criminal's so-called right to a fair trial more dear than the honest citizen's right not to be the criminal's victim. Congress shares the blame in failing to move more swiftly to restore absolutely essential powers to law enforcement officers.

Another part of the rise in crime can, with equal validity, be ascribed to the actions of President Johnson and Attorney General Robert Kennedy. Although it has not been their intention to do so, the constantly publicized zeal of these highest officials of our land in the matter of civil rights laws unfortunately has given the impression that obedience to other laws is, somehow, less necessary and important. They have created a feeling that use of law enforcement resources in instances when a "cause" is involved has priority over their use when only ordinary law-abiding citizens are concerned.

Events during recent weeks in the forests of Mississippi and the jungles of New York City are cases in point. Three civil rights workers disappeared in Mississippi. Their station wagon was found burned. In New York City scores of subway riders have been maimed and terrorized by lawless gangs. Innocent people have been murdered on the streets and in the elevators of their apartment houses. Large numbers of Federal law enforcement agents have been mobilized in Mississippi. No similar action has been taken in New York City.

Is an American's life less precious, less to be protected, in New York than in Mississippi? Is an American's right not to be the victim of a criminal act greater in Mississippi than in another State? Are some individuals in some locations on some pursuits more entitled to the full protection of the law than other individuals in other locations on other pursuits?

Under the Constitution of the United States and the traditions of our country the answer to these questions is "No."

I therefore call upon the President, the Attorney General and all State and local law enforcement officers for the equal enforcement of the law, for the relentless pursuit of all criminal offenders, irrespective of race, color, creed, or other irrelevant considerations. I call upon the courts of the land for swift, sure and equal punishment of all who disobey the law. I demand that the American citizen's right to protection against criminal acts be held in greater dignity than the criminal's opportunities to avoid punishment for his crimes.

Unless we act with determination and vigor to restore respect for and obedience to the law in our Nation the consequence will be fatal. We shall as surely perish as any other society which exchanges the principle of law and order for the anarchy of force and violence.

To Amend the Immigration Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

Wednesday, July 1, 1964

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, with leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the RECORD my statement before the Subcommittee on Immigration and Nationality of the House Committee on the Judiciary, in support of H.R. 10990. I have introduced this bill, and may I add that other Members have introduced similar bills, for the purpose of effecting a much-needed revision of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

My statement follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN, DEMOCRAT, OF CONNECTICUT, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 10990

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I appear today in support of H.R. 10990, the bill which I have introduced to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The demands and pressures which existed when the basic law was enacted some 40 years ago have become radically different. The countries which provided the bulk of our immigrants in times past now barely use the quotas available to them, while the needs of other countries far exceed their allotted number. The subsequent McCarran-Walter Act was at best a patch-up job which has since proven woefully inadequate.

The bill for which I now speak is similar to that which President Kennedy sponsored a year ago. Its passage has likewise been formally urged by President Johnson. The purpose of the bill is to liberalize the existing national origins quota system which has worked such hardship upon members of the families of American citizens who have been compelled to remain abroad. It has been the peoples of Mediterranean and southern European origin, particularly from Greece, Italy, and Portugal, who have suffered most under the existing law. A law which permits large numbers of families to remain broken can only work misery on both sides of the ocean. As Mr. CELLER has already pointed out, the criterion for admissibility to this country must no longer be "What is your race or origin," but rather "Who are you and what can you do for the country in which you have chosen to live?"

H.R. 10990 provides for gradual elimination of the quota system over a 5-year period. During this period it further provides for the allocation of unused quota numbers to oversubscribed countries. While the minimum number admissible from each country is raised to 200, the total quota figure for each country is to be reduced by 20 percent each year. These places by which the national totals are reduced are placed in a "pool," from which admissions are to be allocated on a first-come, first-served basis in order of the established preferences.

The issuance of visas is rendered considerably more flexible. Each year foreign citizens seek to visit this country on business or pleasure. Likewise increasing numbers of students from abroad want to attend our universities. The inordinate difficulty which they now encounter in obtaining visas tends only to deter qualified foreigners from visiting the United States. Whereas under the existing law the quotas provide for order of preference only within each individual country, my bill will now determine the priority between nationals of different countries throughout the world. In addition to this, the broad discretion to be vested in the President and in the Immigration Board allows the free allocation of previously unused quotas to applicants from any nation, so that the basic provision of a 10-percent maximum monthly allocation of visas does not prevent the subsequent issuance of visas which were not used up during a previous month. The bill further eliminates the waste of quota numbers by those who apply for visas and then never apply for admission, thereby depriving others of the right. To the same end, quotas may not be used up by people of nonquota status.

The nonquota status itself is to be extended to several important groups, including parents of U.S. citizens and all natives of independent Western Hemisphere countries. Likewise, at the discretion of the Attorney General, certain mentally afflicted members of the immediate family of a U.S. citizen, barred from admission under the existing laws, may be admitted as nonquota immigrants.

There are several significant changes in the preference system. Further latitude is allowed for immigrants with special skills, or with the ability to perform a job for the filling of which a shortage exists in the United States. Also, in addition to the three existing categories, a new fourth preference is created in favor of the parents of aliens lawfully admitted for permanent residence. The process of applying for a preference is simplified as well. Replacing the existing and often harsh requirement that an applicant for a "special skills" preference submit an affidavit from a U.S. employer is a provision that allows the Attorney General to grant the preference upon affidavit from the immigrant, plus any further documentary evidence which the Attorney General, having consulted the Secretary of Labor, may require.

To administer our immigration policy, this bill provides for the establishment of a seven-member Immigration Board, three members of which would be appointed by the President, two by the President of the Senate, and two by the Speaker of the House. The function of this Board would be to study the conditions here and abroad which bear on our immigration policy. The members would consult with the Secretaries of Labor, State, and Defense and would then in turn make recommendations to the President and the Attorney General as to the allocation of quotas and admissions such as will best serve the purposes of this act.

A more flexible, up-to-date immigration law has long been a necessity. Our Chief Executive has urged this reform. Our citizens demand it, as evidenced by each day's mail, which brings new pleas from those suffering from the inequity of the existing laws. I believe we have a moral obligation to answer their call.

Vote, and the Choice Is Yours—Don't Vote, and the Choice Is Theirs—Register, or You Have No Choice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD M. FRASER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 23, 1964

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the right to vote in free elections is the mark of a democratic society—a right which is denied to the citizens of many other nations. Yet millions of Americans each election year forgo their right to vote.

Soon, however, our citizens will be reminded:

> Vote * * * and the choice is yours. Don't vote * * * and the choice is theirs. Register * * * or you have no choice.

This is the reminder which the American Heritage Foundation and the Advertising Council of America is bringing to the attention of the citizens of our Nation. It is an important message, urgently needed to arouse our people to the full use of their democratic rights.

CITY OF MINNEAPOLIS AIDING VOTERS

In my own city of Minneapolis the city council has recognized that an obstacle to increased voting is the difficulty in registering to vote. This year our city council will open special registration places at fire stations in each of the city's 13 wards. They will be open during the last 10 days before voter registration is closed for the primary election and again for the general election. This is the first time that the city council has provided these additional registration places before the primary election.

Minnesota citizens have to reregister if they have not voted in the last 4 years, or if they have moved since they last voted.

AMERICAN HERITAGE FOUNDATION HELPING

The American people are indebted to the American Heritage Foundation and the Advertising Council of America for their efforts to enlarge the citizen role in our elections. The vigor of our democracy will be impaired if we do not strive at every election to get as many voters as possible to assume their full responsibilities as free American citizens.

VOTERS DETERMINE OWN FUTURE

The votes of millions of responsible citizens across the Nation next November 3 will determine the actions of government touching every citizen's life for the next 4 years—and, for that matter, scores of years in the future.

Future decisions of government will not be made by "happenstance," for our future is not determined by the stars in the heavens. Rather, as Shakespeare's Cassius counseled Brutus, "men at some time are masters of their fates."

A national election is certainly one time when men are unquestionably masters of their political fate. Who else are responsible for the decisions of those who are elected to lead this country now and in the years ahead? In the words of the late President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy:

> Today, the implications of national policy necessarily make politicians of all of us. Today, every citizen regardless of his interest in politics "holds office," every one of us is in a position of responsibility; and, in the final analysis, the kind of government we get depends upon how we fulfill those responsibilities. We, the people, are the boss, and we will get the kind of political leadership, be it good or bad, that we demand and deserve.

EACH VOTE COUNTS

Some citizens may say, "Let us be practical. What effect will my one vote have on the outcome of an election when millions of votes are cast?"

In answer it can be said that, although the effect of one vote appears to be small, it truly is not. Recall the story of that one piece of straw that broke the camel's back. It certainly was not just that one straw that brought the camel down; every one of the 999,000 other pieces of straw contributed equally to his fall. If we equate each piece of straw with one vote, the point becomes readily clear.

A FEW VOTES HAVE DETERMINED ELECTIONS

In 1916, the outcome of a presidential election was determined by less than one vote per precinct in a single State. In that year, one more vote cast in favor of Charles Evans Hughes in every precinct in the State of California would have given him the election and denied the Presidency to Woodrow Wilson. The margin was only 3,806 votes of a total of nearly 1 million cast in over 5,000 of the State's precincts.

In the election of 1948, President Truman carried the important States of California and Ohio by a margin of less than one vote per precinct and was thereby elected to a full term in the White House.

Again in 1960 the presidential election was determined by a margin of one-half of 1 percent in the same two key States.

In our own State of Minnesota the last election for Governor was determined by a margin of 91 votes out of a total of almost 1,240,000.

EVERY MEMBER SHOULD HELP

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that every Member of this House will heed the urging of Mr. Richard Scammon, chairman of the President's Commission on Registration and Voting, to help provide the constituents of the Member's district with information about the requirements for registration and voting. In this way we can aid the efforts of the Republican and Democratic Parties which are joining with the American Heritage Foundation and the Advertising Council of America as they work to chip away the apathy which is now so widespread.

Beet Sugar Quota Must Be Increased

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CATHERINE MAY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 1, 1964

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday of last week I addressed the House on the subject of the need of American consumers for ample supplies of sugar at reasonable prices. This consumer need will be met through enactment of legislation embodying the provisions of some 30 bills now pending in the Committee on Agriculture to raise the basic marketing quota for beet sugar producers by 750,000 tons. This is the production level achieved at Government urging because of a shortage of foreign sugar supplies. In my speech, Mr. Speaker, I outlined the surprise and shock I felt when, a few days earlier, I had noted in the press a report that the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture favored a simple 1-year extension of the foreign quotas in the present sugar act, with no regard for the domestic quotas in the law.

Mr. Speaker, I am far from being alone in my concern. Last Saturday, two of my colleagues on the Committee on Agriculture also took strong issue with the advisability of a simple 1-year extension of the foreign quotas that would not increase marketing quotas for domestic sugar producers. The gentleman from California [Mr. HAGEN] and the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. SHORT] both spoke at the annual summer convention of the National Association of Television and Radio Farm Directors at Cherry Hill, N.J. Their speeches were concise and clearly demonstrate the reasons that marketing quotas for domestic sugar producers must be increased this year.

Under unanimous consent, I include the remarks of the gentleman from California [Mr. HAGEN] and the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. SHORT] at this point in the RECORD:

REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN HARLAN HAGEN, OF CALIFORNIA, PREPARED FOR DELIVERY AT ANNUAL SUMMER MEETING OF NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF TELEVISION AND RADIO FARM DIRECTORS, CHERRY HILL INN, CHERRY HILL, N.J., JUNE 25, 1964

Mr. Chairman, farm broadcasters, ladies and gentlemen, Congressman SHORT has very effectively explained why beet sugar production is now considerably above the beet sugar marketing quota in the Sugar Act—because the Government appealed for increased production to meet the needs of consumers for more sugar at reasonable prices, and the sugarbeet producers responded to that appeal. He has also shown why, because of the continued uncertainty of the world sugar picture, it is in the consumer interest to place greater reliance on the domestic sugar-producing industry.

It also would be a matter of simple justice to raise the basic beet sugar quota by 750,000 tons. The Government asked for increased production, and the beet sugar industry delivered; it is only just, therefore, as well as logical and in the public interest, that the industry be permitted to market the additional sugar it is producing at the urging of the Government.

Why, then, doesn't the Congress go ahead and increase the beet sugar quota and be done with it? Unfortunately, it is not as simple as that.

I am confident that before Congress adjourns, the beet sugar quota will be increased, but it will not be until after a struggle. For I have learned in nearly 12 years in Congress that even the best causes, even the most logical and just measures, can have their opponents and can become matters of great controversy.

The opponents of adjusting the beet sugar marketing quota to present levels of beet sugar production are the cane sugar refiners, and their vociferous and bitter opposition has indeed made sugar quotas a matter of great controversy.

A distinction must be drawn between cane sugar producers and cane sugar refiners. Cane sugar on the market is almost always the result of two steps in processing, that normally takes place in two different plants. The first phase takes place close to the sugarcane fields, and consists of the extraction of the sugar juices from the cane, purification, crystallization, and the production of what is called raw sugar. This is crystallized sugar which is almost, but not quite, ready for the consumer market. It still has 1 to 2 percent of the molasses clinging to the crystals. The raw sugar is then shipped to the cane refineries, where this small amount of molasses is removed and the sugar—then called refined cane sugar—is offered to consumers.

The cane sugar refiners, therefore, are not sugar producers. They do not add an ounce to the world's supply of sugar. They merely convert, from raw to refined, sugar that someone else has produced, and into which most of the labor has already gone.

This is in contrast to the methods of beet sugar production in the United States. Here, all the extraction, purification, and refining processes take place in each plant—the sugarbeets go into one end, and completely refined sugar comes out of the other end of a beet sugar processing plant. Obviously, the amount of labor required is greater per hundred pounds of sugar—and therefore the contribution to the American economy is greater—for the complete beet sugar extraction, processing, and refining operation than for the cane refining operation alone.

In addition, there is the tremendous contribution which sugarbeet production makes to the well-being of American agriculture in scores of communities in some 27 States. The cane sugar refiners not only make no contribution to the welfare of American agriculture—their operations have a negative influence on the American farmer, because more than half their raw sugar supplies, under the present law, come from foreign nations. Every ton of sugar the cane refiners import is a ton of sugar that American farmers are prevented from producing. And let me remind you that sugarbeets are a nonsurplus crop. We now import about 40 percent of our annual sugar needs—and the cane refiners extract their toll, collect their margin, on virtually every ton of it. The present law permits less than 75,000 tons of refined sugar to be imported, including 60,000 tons from the Philippines; all the rest must come in as raw sugar, for further processing in the plants of the cane sugar refiners. To put this in perspective, let me point out that at the present consumption level, foreign imports this year will amount to around 4 million tons—and all but about 75,000 tons, as I have said, are required to come in as raw sugar for the express benefit of the U.S. cane sugar refiners. In addition, nearly all the sugar shipped to the continental United States from our own offshore cane producing areas—Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands—must also come in as raw sugar, for the express benefit of the continental cane refiners.

Under the present law, the cane sugar refiners have about 70 percent of the total U.S. sugar market. They are the dominant market influence on the high side. It is a reflection of a simple fact of competition under such circumstances that beet sugar never sells for more than cane sugar in the same market, and usually sells for less—although, as the home economists among you ladies know, beet sugar, and cane sugar are identical products, of equal purity and identical chemical composition, equally suited for all food uses.

Although I obviously cannot and would not want to attempt to speak for the cane sugar refiners, it seems obvious that their bitter opposition to a beet sugar quota increase stems from two reasons: they want to maintain their present stranglehold on 70 percent of the U.S. sugar market, and they fear beet sugar competition.

It is significant that where the cane refiners normally have the market all to themselves, such as in the Northeast States, base sugar prices for many years have been the highest in the United States—while in the Chicago-West marketing territory, where beet sugar competition is particularly intense, base sugar prices have been the lowest in the United States. When some beet sugar moved here to the East last year, and earlier this year, and sold at prices considerably under cane prices, the cane refiners squealed like stuck pigs.

The cane refiners have no valid argument for preventing sugarbeet producers from being permitted to sell the sugar they have produced at the urging of the U.S. Government. And so the refiners have resorted to raising a lot of false arguments, a smokescreen by which they hope to confuse the real issue. If I had the time today, I would be delighted to knock down each of those false arguments with the facts. You will find them all answered in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 8, beginning on page 12891. I had the privilege of joining with a number of my colleagues on the floor that day, in a thorough discussion of the whole situation, and I believe you will find it interesting as well as enlightening.

While the arguments are going on, of course, the days roll by, the political conventions are coming up, and some day this session of Congress will be over. Since the foreign quotas in the present act expire at the end of this year, some action on sugar will be taken. Otherwise, all the foreign imports will be lumped in a single "global" quota, except for the Philippine quota, and there will be no prohibition against imports of refined sugar. I am sure neither the foreign sugar interests nor the can refiners want that to happen.

Although they have not yet come out publicly for it, I am equally sure the cane refiners would support the proposal that has been made for a stopgap 1-year extension of the foreign quotas, with no increase in domestic quotas. This would solve none of the pressing problems facing the domestic sugar-producing industry, and would benefit only some foreign sugar interests and, principally, the cane sugar refiners by preserving for them for another year their present monopoly of 70 percent of the American sugar market. I am firmly convinced that a majority of the House Committee on Agriculture would vote against such a proposal.

Some 30 bills, introduced by Members of both political parties, are now pending in the House committee which would increase the beet sugar quota to the industry's current level of production. A similar bill is pending in the Senate, with the sponsorship there also of Members of both sides of the aisle, including the majority leader and the majority whip. There is no legitimate reason why the House Committee on Agriculture could not begin sugar hearings tomorrow.

To delay further is merely to postpone settlement of an issue which should, in all justice and by all logic, be resolved in favor of the American sugar consumer and American agriculture.

Remarks of Congressman Don L. Short, of North Dakota, Prepared for Delivery at Annual Summer Meeting of National Association of Television and Radio Farm Directors, Cherry Hill Inn, Cherry Hill, N.J., June 25, 1964

Mr. Chairman, farm broadcasters, ladies and gentlemen, I am most appreciative of the opportunity to visit with you for a few minutes this morning about the present situation in Congress on sugar legislation. I am especially pleased to see the ladies and children here. It is inspiring to see a group in which the whole family not only has an interest in what dad's job is, or in his paycheck, but also joins with him in important activities in connection with that job. This is something that is good for the family, and when families work and play together as a unit, that is good for America.

It is for this reason that when we on the House Agriculture Committee develop and consider legislation for agriculture, I for one—and I believe this holds for most members of the committee—weigh and measure the merits of such legislation on the basis of how it would help to preserve the family farm, as well as how it would help the total agricultural and economic well-being of the Nation. In this respect our goals are similar to your goals as television and radio farm directors, for the information on better farming methods, and the day-to-day farm news, which you have brought to rural America through the years, have contributed immeasurably to improving the competitive position of the family farm in this country, and, therefore, you have contributed significantly to a better America. I strongly feel that the family, whether urban or rural, is the foundation of our entire society and the fundamental source of the strength of our Republic.

To the ladies of the family—to you ladies as consumers—I particularly wish to address my brief comments this morning.

You will remember that early last year when you went to the grocery store, you noticed—especially if you lived here in the East—that the price of sugar was going up. The underlying cause was that the world sugar situation had completely reversed itself since the Communist takeover in Cuba. Instead of a world surplus of sugar, there was a world shortage. With Cuban sugar quite properly barred from the United States, we no longer had a foreign sugar bowl upon which we could draw, as we had in the past, to fill our own sugar bowl, and so we had to scour the sugar bins of the world, a world short of sugar, in an attempt to find enough for our consumers.

In this emergency, the cane sugar refiners showed very clearly that they were not able to obtain enough foreign sugar, in the amounts and at the times required, at reasonable prices, to meet the needs of our consumers. As a result, prices of imported sugar went up sharply, and affected our entire sugar market.

During this critical period, our Government called upon the domestic sugar producers, and particularly the sugarbeet industry, to increase production to the full extent of their capacity, and to increase that capacity by making additional investments in processing equipment, in order to make more sugar available to American consumers at reasonable prices. The Government turned especially to sugarbeet producers, because sugarbeets are a 6-month crop, from planting to harvest, and offered not only the closest source of sugar geographically but also the quickest potential for substantial increases in sugar production.

As incentives for making the necessary investments in farm machinery and increased processing facilities, the Government announced that there would be no controls in sugarbeet acreage through the 1965 crop year. The sugarbeet industry responded to the pleas of their Government, in behalf of consumers, by increasing sugar production in 1963 by some half million tons over 1962; and the crop now in the ground is expected to yield another quarter million tons more sugar than the 1963 crop. Moreover, the beet sugar industry sold its sugar during the emergency at from $1 to $3 per hundred pounds less than cane sugar, refined from high priced foreign raw sugar, was selling for in the same markets.

The stellar performance of the sugarbeet producers and the beet sugar industry generally, in behalf of American consumers, undoubtedly kept cane sugar prices from going even higher than they did.

Now you would expect that the sugarbeet producers, and the beet sugar industry generally, would receive wholehearted approval for its performance in behalf of consumers—or, at the very least, that it would not be penalized for this performance.

Well, the industry's performance has received widespread recognition and approval—by officials of the Government, by various consumer and farm groups, and by a large number of Members of Congress, in both the House and the Senate. But, strangely enough, the industry will be penalized for its performance—and penalized severely—unless the Congress translates words into action, and amends the present Sugar Act to permit the industry to market the additional sugar it is producing.

You ladies may well ask why Congress enters the sugar picture. Well, Congress is right in the middle of the sugar picture because that's where we belong. For some 30 years, the marketing of sugar in this country has been regulated by a Federal law. In this respect, we are no different from almost every other country in the world, because nearly every nation has some kind of sugar law to assist its own sugar producers and to help assure supplies for its consumers. The law in the United States is called the Sugar Act. The basic feature of the Sugar Act is a pattern of marketing quotas—which determine how much sugar each part of the domestic sugar producing industry, beet or cane, may sell in a year, and how much a long list of foreign countries may market in this country in a year. The formula for setting these marketing quotas, at any given level of sugar consumption, is established by the Congress.

One reason the Sugar Act has worked so well over the years, for the benefit of consumers as well as for producers, is that Congress has reviewed the act frequently and made changes as necessary to fit changing conditions. When we last amended the act, in July of 1962, neither the Government nor the sugar trade recognized that an explosive world sugar situation, with world supply falling short of world demand, was ahead of us. Consequently, the quota pattern established by the Congress then, which fit the situation then, is now already out of date and does not fit the drastically changed situation that exists today. The present quota pattern does not sufficiently protect American consumers.

For example, under the present law, the beet sugar marketing quota for this year is 2,700,000 tons. That is the amount of sugar the beet sugar industry is permitted to sell this year. Yet, because of the insistent urging of the Government to produce more sugar for consumers at reasonable prices, the production of the beet sugar industry has far outstripped the beet sugar marketing quota. The crop now in the ground is expected to yield from 3,350,000 to 3,400,000 tons of sugar—and the expansion of processing facilities, urged by the Government, is expected to result in still greater beet sugar production next year.

An increase of 750,000 tons is needed in order to bring the basic beet sugar marketing quota up to date, in line with the industry's current production level. Unless the marketing quota is increased, the beet sugar industry will not be permitted, under the law, to sell the additional sugar it is producing at the request of the Government. Drastic acreage reductions will be inevitable. The prospect for new beet sugar mills in areas urgently needing an alternative cash crop will be dark. And American sugar consumers will be forced to depend to too large a degree—as they have to, today—on supplies from a world in which nearly a third of the sugar production is in Communist hands, a world in which production is still running below consumption, a world in which many sugar-producing nations are threatened with revolution.

As long as 3 months ago, a number of bills were introduced in Congress which would provide the necessary 750,000-ton increase in the basic beet sugar marketing quota. No action has yet been taken. Now it has been proposed that the only action practical this session would be a 1-year extension of the foreign sugar quotas, which expire at the end of this year, and no increase in the basic beet sugar quota. Such a stopgap measure would be grossly unfair both to producers and consumers. It would severely penalize the domestic sugarbeet producers who have increased production at the Government's request, would put an effective roadblock on establishment of new beet-sugar mills, and would threaten consumers with sugar shortages and high prices.

Ladies and gentlemen, I hope in these few minutes I have been able at least to explain the background of the sugar situation as it is today, and why it is in your interests as consumers to see the law changed to permit greater marketing of beet sugar produced on our own farms. My distinguished colleague from California, I believe, will help to complete the sugar picture for you. Again I wish to express my appreciation for the opportunity to be with you today.

Senator Muskie Pays Tribute to Polish Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 1, 1964

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague from Maine, Senator EDMUND S. MUSKIE, delivered an eloquent address at the Polish Constitution Day observance in Cleveland, Ohio, on May 3.

It is a pleasure to call Senator MUSKIE's inspiring message to the attention of my colleagues. Senator MUSKIE's speech has universal significance, for it reaffirms and acknowledges the cherished ideals of freedom and independence which burn in the hearts of Poland's captive people.

Mr. Speaker, Senator MUSKIE's speech follows:

ADDRESS OF SENATOR EDMUND S. MUSKIE, DEMOCRAT, OF MAINE

I consider it a great personal privilege to be with you today, on the 173d anniversary of the Polish Constitution of 1791. May 3, 1791, was a day of significance for all freedom-loving people. For on that day, a group of brave and visionary Poles wrote an important page in the never-ending book of freedom.

Few events in Polish history match the drama of the May 3 constitution. The partition of 1792 had once again imposed the yoke of foreign domination upon the people of Poland. But in 1786, Frederick the Great of Prussia died, and Prussian policy became one of opposition to Russia and friendship with Poland. Russia was distracted by war with Turkey, and Austria by the French Revolution of 1789. Thus—for one brief moment in history—the Poles were free to fashion a future for themselves.

In 1791 the spirit of freedom was sweeping across the globe like a fresh spring breeze. The American Declaration of Independence and Constitution were new and noble documents. The French declaration of the rights of man made an important impression upon the members of the Polish Diet. And concern over renewed Russian interest in Polish affairs added a sense of urgency to the deliberations of that spring of 1791.

Finally, on May 3, amid wild excitement throughout Poland, the constitution was approved. Its noble purpose was stated in these words:

"All power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the preservation and integrity of the state, the civil liberty and good order of society, on an equal scale and on a lasting foundation."

The Constitution changed the Government of Poland from an absolute monarchy to a hereditary monarchy, with regular meetings of the Parliament, and responsible Ministers. The Third of May Constitution reorganized the life of Poland, providing for political, economic, and social reforms. The powers of king and nobility were reduced, and relations between peasants and landlords were placed under the rule of law. The schools were reformed, and the new organization of her society would have enabled Poland to develop her resources and gain a new sense of democratic national consciousness.

As we all know, the Constitution was never put to work, and the Polish people were again subjugated by force. But the spirit which gave birth to that great document cannot be subjugated by force. It has lived through centuries of conquest and oppression. It lives on today, in the hearts and minds of Poles everywhere. It is the spirit of freedom.

Every person of Polish ancestry who came to America in later years brought with him a part of that Constitution. They brought with them the burning desire to be free, and we are all richer in spirt today because of it.

Being here with you today, seeing many old friends and acquaintances, brings back memories of my father and of a trip I took to his birthplace a few years ago. In 1959 I made a 27-day tour of the Soviet Union. At the end of that trip, I took advantage of the opportunity to spend two all-too-brief days in Poland.

As you may know, my father was born in Poland. He left it 64 years ago at the age of 17 in search of freedom and opportunity. He found both, not only for himself, but also for his children—and for that we will be eternally grateful.

At the same time, he always spoke to us warmly of his homeland, the loveliness and the scenes of his childhood.

Remote as the possibility seemed, I wanted to find the village where he was born, in order that I might tread, in his name, the soil to which he never found it possible to return in his lifetime.

I found it—a tiny rural village called Jasiomowka, 20-odd miles north of Bialystok, not too far from the Russian border, in what was described to me as the saddest part of Poland.

To reach it, I drove 75 miles northeasterly from Warsaw. The main roads in Poland are excellent and we made good time—thoroughly enjoying the flat but pleasant and attractive countryside and the mild and sunny autumn day. As we approached the village, we passed, of all coincidences, a lake with a familiar name, Augusta. At this point, I became profoundly moved as I considered that in a matter of minutes my eyes would see fields, streams, and trees, and possibly even faces, that my father's eyes had last seen more than half a century before.

We had left the main road and were driving over a narrow, cobbled country road. As we topped a slight rise, there came into view in the distance a large white building, somewhat shabby, but clinging to the shreds of an ancient dignity, which I instinctively felt must be the manor house of a nobleman's estate which my grandfather had managed at the turn of the century. And so it proved to be, now converted to a state farm with a new barn, some battered older buildings, ruins of others, and a small duck pond which may have been a favorite spot for children in my father's day. A short distance beyond, the pitiful unpainted, weather-beaten homes of the villagers were clustered about a broad square, dominated by the stately white church which my father attended.

In sharp contrast to the Soviet Union, the folks are devout in their belief in God and extremely conscientious in discharging their religious duties. It was heartwarming to see them swarming to the churches on Sunday morning, walking, on bicycles, or in spotless wagons, behind their horses. Their extremely difficult economic and political circumstances seem simply to strengthen their faith in God's purposes.

With little more than an hour at my disposal, my first objective was to find some trace of my father's family. We proceeded to the local presidium and almost immediately located a friendly girl who recalled an old lady bearing the family name. She escorted us to a drab little house on one of the side streets. We knocked on the door and entered. In a dark little cubbyhole of a kitchen, I met the widow of my father's brother, tiny and stooped under the weight of almost 80 years. With her was my father's niece, herself a widow with a young child, her husband killed in the war. Having grasped the almost incomprehensible fact of my identity, my cousin quickly showed me pictures of my father and my mother which he had sent her long ago, and letters he had written. They did not know of his death and accepted his silence over the past 3 years as just another of the burdens which filled their daily lives.

By this time, the local grapevine had spread the word and the street in front of the little house swarmed with villagers. They were obviously delighted to welcome me and wanted to know all about me and my family. A surveillance team had picked us up on the border of Bialystok Province and followed us. The villagers were highly amused when these two representatives of the state police rather shamefacedly refused my invitation to pose for pictures which I said I wanted to show the Deputy Foreign Minister when I met him that afternoon.

It is difficult to comprehend the economic circumstances of the people in that little village—the bareness of their lives. They have no meat; they stand in line for bread. Their diet appears to consist of potatoes and cabbage. The monthly wage is roughly the equivalent of $10 to $20. Their personal possessions are almost unbelievably meager. This is indeed the saddest part of Poland. But for my father's dream of freedom and opportunity this would be my life—the life of my children.

And what of the people who live this life? They have courage. They have their belief, and their faith in God. They value friendship, and love, and family ties, and derive such happiness as they know from these. Sadly, however, they have no hope that their lot will be improved. And the result is a deep apathy which stifles ambition and interest in the public issues which will shape their future.

Poland is a country in an almost hopeless political and economic dilemma. Its people historically have cherished independence and freedom and love of country above all else. Geographically, today, they find themselves in such proximity to the Russian colossus that like the turtle they are forced to withdraw into the shell of their obvious security alliances. Were they free to do otherwise, their hearts and their traditions would take them elsewhere.

Economically, following the war, the Russians in their own interests, developed an industrial complex in Poland, notably steel and textiles, which make the country almost irrevocably committed to the Soviet Union for the necessary raw materials. It must rely upon coal and agriculture for the exports to balance its international payments, and its agricultural lands are fragmentized into small holdings which are committed to ancient unmechanized methods and practices which fall far short of the production necessary to meet domestic needs and export requirements. These current difficulties, which I have probably oversimplified for the sake of brevity, plus centuries of living in the crossroads of war in Eastern Europe, have made my father's village what it is today.

The past and the present time created a far different, more comfortable, and better world for me than they have for my cousins.

Must this be?

What does the future hold?

We speak constantly of a just peace. We pray for it. But what would a just peace mean to my cousins? And there are many, many more millions in the world, living in circumstances, no better, and indeed, far worse than they.

Before I left the village, I visited the cemetery in search of my grandparents' graves. There was no trace. As is so often the case in Europe, they are probably at rest two or three layers deep. People have lived and died for many, many centuries in this part of the world—some with their grinding misery and their fleeting happiness—some with flaming hopes, and others with forlorn hopelessness—some, with lives of abundance and more with lives of emptiness.

Europe is an ancient civilization. We are an outgrowth of it, and, out of this deep past, its lessons and experience, as well as its aspirations, we seek the promise of a brighter future for all mankind. Can we find it? May God will it so.

As we drove away from the village, I caught a last chance glimpse of the white church, gleaming as it shed its shabbiness in the sunlight in the distance. Suddenly and hauntingly, I felt myself to be a second generation bearer of the dream of freedom and opportunity which prompted my father to leave his home behind him.

When I returned to America, I knew, as I never really knew before, why my father left his home. I knew, as I never really knew before, the meaning of freedom of choice and freedom of expression. I knew, as I never really knew before, the meaning of freedom for the individual.

On this memorable day, each of us has much to be thankful for.

New Wheat Program Adds Half Billion Dollars to Income of Producers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 1, 1964

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, misunderstandings and some confusion have developed in the operation of the new voluntary certificate wheat program.

Some wheatgrowers are raising questions concerning the market price of wheat and the income of wheatgrowers under the program which is effective for the 1964 crop. Some of the questions and statements imply that the new program imposes a tax against wheat and that the market price is lower as a result. Other questions indicate the wheatgrowers are being given misleading information—or information far from the facts. Some growers are complaining that they did not know when they seeded their wheat last fall that those farmers planting within their production allotments would receive substantially higher income than those who did not comply with their allotments.

Mr. Speaker, the new voluntary wheat program takes not one cent away from any wheat producer, and adds substantially to the income of those farmers who are cooperating in this program to hold down surplus and wasteful output of this food grain.

The fact is that even farmers who are not cooperating in the voluntary program are profiting by its operation.

In the May 1963 referendum wheat farmers rejected the marketing quota certificate program offered to them. If two-thirds of the producers had approved this marketing quota approach, all producers would have complied with production adjustments to prevent market gluts and wasteful surpluses, and all producers would have received substantial price supports through Commodity Credit Corporation loans and through certificates adding to their income.

But this program was disapproved, and this left in force only the law already on the books which provided a price support for the 1964 crop of wheat at 50 percent of parity, or about $1.25 or $1.26 a bushel, with the only growers receiving such support being those who stayed within their farm wheat allotments.

The situation threatened disaster for the wheat country. Wheat producers confronted a reduction in their 1964 income of over a half a billion dollars, as compared with 1963, when the wheat crop was supported at 82.6 percent of parity.

Congress could not permit such a catastrophe to befall the wheat country. Not only the income of wheat farmers would be slashed, but the well-being of hundreds of towns and cities in wheat States and the Nation's general economy were involved.

When wheat was being planted last fall there was widespread discussion of the prospects for Congress enacting a new wheat law that would add to the income of producers cooperating in efforts to hold down production.

Immediately after the May 1963 referendum, bills were introduced in the Congress proposing new wheat programs. The first bill embracing a voluntary certificate program was introduced on July 29. As early as December 11, the Wheat Subcommittee of the House Committee on Agriculture, headed by Hon. GRAHAM PURCELL, held public hearings to survey the thinking among wheat producers, and the public generally, on a new program.

Farmers were aware of the possibilities of new legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the prevention of a disastrous drop in wheat prices and in the purchasing power of wheatgrowers was the basic reason for enactment of the new wheat legislation that became law last April 11. This is what the new wheat program is doing for farmers:

First. The farmer who exceeds his wheat allotment and even the one who is growing wheat from fence to fence is not subject to marketing quota penalties. He can sell his wheat without any interference whatever and whenever he wants to, just as he would have done had Congress not enacted the new voluntary program. In fact, because so many others growers are producing within their allotments and the loan rate has been increased 4 cents a bushel, his market should be about 4 cents a bushel higher than it would have been without the new program.

Second. The average loan level for wheat produced in 1964 was increased from $1.26 a bushel to $1.30. These price support loans are available to farmers who are within their allotments.

Third. Farmers participating in the voluntary program will receive, in addition, certificates valued at 70 cents a bushel on 45 percent of the normal production of the farm allotment, and certificates valued at 25 cents a bushel on another 45 percent of their normal production. Thus, when the value of the certificates is added to the price-support loan the wheat for domestic food will return the participating producers on the average $2 a bushel, and the wheat going into export will return to the producers $1.55 a bushel.

Fourth. Moreover, farmers who actually have taken acreage out of wheat production are receiving diversion payments, based upon normal yields.

In summary, this is the present situation:

Noncomplying farmers: There has been only one change, which is an improvement in their market by a 4 cents a bushel increase in the price-support loans to compliers and by a reduction in the overall wheat supply by those who are participating in the program.

Cooperating farmers: Those who are complying with the production adjustment features of the voluntary program are receiving in 1964 around half a billion dollars more in income than would have been the case had not Congress enacted the voluntary wheat certificate program.

Mr. Speaker, of course, in a new program so vast, there will be some errors in administration. I am confident that the county ASCS committees and the program administrators in Washington will promptly correct such errors as they are brought to their attention.

The main thing to remember, in appraising this new program, is that it placed no penalty whatever against the marketing of wheat by those farmers who are not complying with the program, and it increases substantially the income of those farmers who have cooperated by not exceeding their farm allotments.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that farmers will not be misled by some people who already are trying to destroy this program, as they destroyed the old wheat program which worked for so long and so well in the past. The new program was enacted entirely for the purpose of improving the income of wheat producers, which in turn will maintain business stability in hundreds of towns and cities in the wheat country, and in the economy generally.

Mr. Speaker, I, today, issued a press statement pertinent to these remarks. This press release follows:

COOLEY EMPHASIZES FARMER PROFITS IN NEW WHEAT PROGRAM

Chairman HAROLD D. COOLEY of the House Committee on Agriculture said today the new voluntary wheat program "takes not one cent away from any wheat producer, and adds substantially to the income of those farmers who are cooperating in this program to hold down surplus and wasteful output of this food grain."

Mr. COOLEY made the statement in response to numerous inquiries about the operation of the voluntary certificate program effective for the 1964 wheat crop.

"Some wheat growers are raising questions concerning the market price of wheat and the income of wheat growers under the new wheat program," he said. "Some of the questions and statements imply that the new wheat program imposes a tax against wheat and that the market price is lower as a result. Other questions indicate the wheat growers are being given misleading information—or information far from the facts."

The fact is, he pointed out, even farmers who are not cooperating in the voluntary program are profiting by its operation.

"With the disapproval of marketing quotas in the May 1963 referendum," Mr. COOLEY said, "the law required that the price support for the 1964 crop of wheat be reduced to 50 percent of parity, or an indicated support of $1.25 or $1.26 a bushel, and the only growers receiving such support would be those who stayed within their farm wheat allotments.

"The prevention of a disastrous drop in wheat prices and in the purchasing power of wheat growers was the basic reason for the new wheat legislation that became law last April 11. This is what the new wheat program is doing for farmers:

"1. The farmer who exceeds his wheat allotment and even the one who is 'growing wheat from fence to fence' is not subject to marketing quota penalties. He can sell his wheat without any interference wherever and whenever he wants to, just as he would have done had Congress not enacted the new voluntary wheat program. In fact, because so many other growers are producing within their allotments and the loan rate has been increased 4 cents a bushel, his market should be about 4 cents a bushel higher than it would have been without the new program.

"2. The average loan level for wheat produced in 1964 was increased from $1.26 a bushel to $1.30. These price-support loans are available to farmers who are within their allotments.

"3. Farmers participating in the voluntary program will receive, in addition, certificates valued at 70 cents a bushel on 45 percent of the normal production of the farm allotment, and certificates valued at 25 cents a bushel on another 45 percent of their normal production. Thus, when the value of the certificate is added to the price-support loan the wheat for domestic food will return the participating producers on the average $2 a bushel, and the wheat going into export will return the producers $1.55 a bushel.

"4. Moreover, farmers who actually have taken acreage out of wheat production are receiving diversion payments, based upon normal yields.

"In summary, this is the situation:

"Noncomplying farmers: There has been only one change, which is an improvement in their market by a 4 cents a bushel increase in the price-support loans to compliers and by a reduction in the overall wheat supply by those who are participating in the program.

"Cooperating farmers: Those who are complying with the production adjustment features of the voluntary program are receiving in 1964 around half a billion dollars more in income than would have been the case had not Congress enacted the voluntary wheat certificate program."

Mr. COOLEY said that farmer rejection of the marketing quota certificate program in the 1963 referendum threatened disaster for the wheat country, with wheat producers confronting a reduction of their 1964 income by over a half a billion dollars as compared with 1963.

"Congress could not let such a catastrophe to befall the wheat country," he said, and he pointed out that immediately after the May referendum last year bills were introduced in the Congress proposing new wheat programs. He emphasized that when the 1964 wheat crop was planted last fall farmers were aware of the possibilities of new legislation.

"Of course, in a new program so vast," he said, "there will be some errors in administration. He voiced confidence that the county ASCS committees and the program administrators in Washington would promptly correct such errors as they are brought to their attention.

"I hope that farmers will not be misled," he said, "by some people who now are trying to destroy this program, as they destroyed the old wheat program which worked for so long and so well in the past. The new program was enacted entirely for the purpose of improving the income of wheat producers, which in turn will maintain business stability in hundreds of towns and cities in the wheat country, and in the economy generally."

Salute to Ghana Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 1, 1964

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, today, Ghana celebrates the seventh anniversary of her independence. We take this opportunity to extend warm felicitations to His Excellency the President of Ghana, Kwame Nkrumah; and to His Excellency the Ambassador of Ghana to the United States, Miguel A. Ribeiro.

Once again we salute Ghana on its national day, July 1. It is now 7 years since Ghana received its independence from Britain and led the surge to freedom which the African Continent has recently witnessed. Just as Ghana was a leader in the independence movement, so Ghana has remained a leader on the African Continent. Ghana's successful development program, of which the monumental Volta Dam project is one of the most striking achievements, has set the example for the rest of Africa.

Ghana is, in fact, rapidly becoming a bustling modern nation. The difficulties of developing all segments of the economy at once have been staggering, but through intelligent planning and flexible policies Ghana has successfully met and overcome them. The economy is still overbalanced toward a single crop, cocoa, an unstabilizing factor since world cocoa prices tend to fluctuate considerably, but important strides have been made toward crop diversification and industrialization. Bananas, coffee, copra, kolanuts, coconuts, rubber, tobacco, oranges, limes, lemons, and tomatoes are quickly becoming important secondary crops. Ghana's fishing industry is expanding rapidly. Exports of timber and timber products from Ghana's hardwood forests, among the finest in the world, are contributing significantly to export earnings. Ghana has the good fortune to be abundantly endowed with natural resources—gold, diamonds, manganese, and bauxite.

The key to Ghana's successful development program is planning. A new 7-year development plan destined to run through 1970 is designed to speed up economic development with maximum economy and efficiency. The plan projects an annual rate of increase in national income of 5.5 percent, or a total of 42 percent over the 7-year period. The Government, wisely realizing that it could not finance a development plan of this scope alone, has called on private investors to finance a significant portion of the plan. In order to encourage foreign investment, a little over a year ago the Ghanaian Parliament passed a Capital Investments Act protecting investments from expropriation and allowing the free transfer abroad of profits after tax liabilities have been satisfied.

Although at times relations between the United States and Ghana have been strained, the basic good will between the countries seems always to succeed in patching up differences. After Ghanaian newspapers last winter criticized U.S. officials as a result of a series of misunderstandings, the Ghanaian Government sent official apologies to the U.S. State Department. Perhaps a better indication of relations between the two countries is the extent of U.S. investment and Government sponsorship of investment in Ghana. The United States is one of the major contributors of loans to the Volta River Dam project. Backed by the U.S. Government, the Volta Aluminum Co., an American consortium, is to build a $110 million aluminum smelter to use power produced by the Volta Dam. Another U.S. firm, Unilever, is already operating a soap factory in Ghana.

Thus, on this Ghana's national day, we in the United States rejoice with the people of Ghana in their fruitful development over the past 7 years. This success is a measure of the people themselves—their determination, their industry, their intelligence and resourcefulness. We are confident that the next 7 years will witness as much progress as the last 7 in a country which already has one of the highest standards of living in Africa.

SENATE

Thursday, July 2, 1964

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. Metcalf).

Rev. William E. Smith, Th. D., vice president, Wesley Theological Seminary, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Infinite God, our Father, we pause in these moments to invoke Thy blessings upon our lives and upon our Nation. We give Thee thanks for the great cloud of witnesses that surrounds us, the Members of this body, now numbered with the immortal, who laid the foundations upon which we build today. Help us to be true to their vision of a great and good land, and to give of ourselves, as did they, to see their dreams come true.

For this day, and in this hour, we pray Thee, grant us wisdom to know what is right, and the courage to do it. Above all, give us an unfailing sense of Thy presence in our lives, that we may be led by Thee to achieve high purposes and noble ends to the benefit of our Nation and of the world.

Grant us wisdom,
Grant us courage
That we fail not man nor Thee!

Into Thy hands we commend not only our lives, but also the lives of all the citizens of this land, wherever they may be.

Long may our land be bright
With freedom's holy light;
Protect us by Thy might,
Great God, our King.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request by Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, July 1, 1964, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bill and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 11812. An act making appropriations for foreign assistance and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 1026. Joint resolution to amend section 316 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to extend the time by which a lease transferring a tobacco acreage allotment may be filed.

HOUSE BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following bill and joint resolution were each read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H.R. 11812. An act making appropriations for foreign assistance and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H.J. Res. 1026. Joint resolution to amend section 316 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to extend the time by which a lease transferring a tobacco acreage allotment may be filed; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Armed Services was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I serve notice that at the conclusion of the morning hour I shall object to any Senator seeking to bypass the rule of germaneness, so that the unfinished business may be laid before the Senate and the Senate can devote itself to the proposed legislation under the Pastore rule of germaneness. I express the hope that the Chair will observe my objection in case any attempt is made to forgo it.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider a nomination on the Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no reports of committees, the nomination on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

U.S. COURT OF CLAIMS

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Wilson Cowen, of Maryland, to be Chief Judge of the U.S. Court of Claims.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of this nomination.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

On motion by Mr. Mansfield, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Finance and the Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution of the Committee on Public Works were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

Clarification of Responsibility for Marking of Obstructions in Navigable Waters

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to clarify the responsibility for marking of obstructions in navigable waters (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

Amendment of Inter-American Development Bank Act

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Inter-American Development Bank Act to authorize the United States to participate in an increase in the resources of the Fund for Special Operations of the Inter-American Development Bank (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Report on Overcharges for Aircraft Products Liability Insurance Under Various Contracts

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on overcharges for aircraft products liability insurance under various contracts awarded to Pratt & Whitney Aircraft Division of United Aircraft Corp., East Hartford, Conn., Department of the Navy, dated June 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

RESOLUTION OF LONG ISLAND FEDERATION OF WOMEN'S CLUBS ON S. 387, TRUTH-IN-PACKAGING BILL

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, a resolution adopted by the Long Island Federation of Women's Clubs, Inc., at their 118th Convention on May 15, 1964. This resolution urges enactment by Congress of Senate bill S. 387, commonly known as the truth-in-packaging bill.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the text of the resolution be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Resolution in Support of Passage by the Congress for the Truth-in-Packaging Bill, S. 387, Proposed by Senator Philip A. Hart, of Michigan

Whereas there is now no comprehensive statute regulating the packaging on the nearly 8,000 items on the average supermarket shelves; and

Whereas such legislation would protect consumers, guaranteeing them the right to know what they are buying and for how much, removing many of the psychological traps, confusions and outright deceptions confronting them in the supermarket; and

Whereas under the truth-in-packaging bill, absurd qualifying adjectives and misleading illustrations are prohibited; and

Whereas the truth-in-packaging bill will provide for the standardization of nomenclature on an industry-wide basis, returning to the standards of size terminology, small, medium, large; and

Whereas this bill would require that the net quantity of content be stated upon the front panel of packages and labels: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Long Island Federation of Women's Clubs, Inc., in convention assembled this 15th day of May 1964, requests support of this proposed legislation which directs the Food and Drug Administration and the Federal Trade Commission to promulgate regulations that will require packages to give essential product information accurately and clearly and fairly represent the contents; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to Hon. Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States; Senator Philip A. Hart, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.; Senator Jacob Javits, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.; Senator Kenneth B. Keating, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.; Mrs. Esther Petersen, special Presidential assistant for consumer affairs; Mr. George P. Larrick, Commissioner, Food and Drug Administration, Washington, D.C.; Mr. Paul Rand Dixon, Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, Washington, D.C.

WOMAN'S CLUB OF GLEN COVE,
MRS. ARTHUR D. BERGER,
President.
MRS. KENNETH REIZES,
Current Legislation Chairman.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. SYMINGTON, from the Committee on Armed Services, without amendment:

H.R. 11004. An act to authorize the sale, without regard to the 6-month waiting period prescribed, of zinc proposed to be disposed of pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (Rept. No. 1165);

H.R. 11235. An act to authorize the disposal, without regard to the prescribed 6-month waiting period, of approximately 11 million pounds of molybdenum from the national stockpile (Rept. No. 1163);

H.R. 11257. An act to authorize the sale, without regard to the 6-month waiting period prescribed, of lead proposed to be disposed of pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (Rept. No. 1164); and

H. Con. Res. 300. Concurrent resolution authorizing the disposal of approximately 98,000 long tons of pig tin from the national stockpile (Rept. No. 1166).

(See reference to the above reports when reported by Mr. SYMINGTON, which appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BYRD of Virginia, from the Committee on Finance, with amendments:

H.R. 1839. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of wild animals and wild birds which are intended for exhibition in the United States (Rept. No. 1167).

By Mr. LONG of Missouri, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

H.R. 4811. An act for the relief of Mrs. Marjorie Curtis (Rept. No. 1168).

By Mr. BURDICK, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 2334. A bill for the relief of Leo M. Mondry (Rept. No. 1169).

By Mr. HRUSKA, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 2339. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the U.S. Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Sarpy County, Nebr. (Rept. No. 1170).

REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—FEDERAL EMPLOYMENT AND PAY

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, I submit a report on Federal employment and pay for the month of May 1964. In accordance with the practice of several years' standing, I ask unanimous consent to have the report printed in the RECORD, together with a statement by me.

There being no objection, the report and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL PERSONNEL IN EXECUTIVE BRANCH, MAY 1964 AND APRIL 1964, AND PAY, APRIL 1964 AND MARCH 1964

PERSONNEL AND PAY SUMMARY

(See table I)

Information in monthly personnel reports for May 1964 submitted to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures is summarized as follows:

Total and major categories	Civilian personnel in executive branch			Payroll (in thousands) in executive branch		
	In May numbered—	In April numbered—	Increase (+) or decrease (—)	In April was—	In March was—	Increase (+) or decrease (—)
Total [1] [2]	2,476,791	2,480,346	—3,555	$1,364,138	$1,362,977	+$1,161
Agencies exclusive of Department of Defense	1,442,575	1,443,081	—506	787,414	782,399	+5,015
Department of Defense [2]	1,034,216	1,037,265	—3,049	576,724	580,578	—3,854
Inside the United States	2,311,976	2,313,856	—1,880			
Outside the United States	164,815	166,490	—1,675			
Industrial employment	548,917	553,544	—4,627			
Foreign nationals	145,716	148,815	—3,054	26,513	26,588	—75

[1] Exclusive of foreign nationals shown in the last line of this summary.

[2] The Department of Defense has advised the committee that for security reasons personnel information for "classified activities" is omitted.

Table I breaks down the above figures on employment and pay by agencies.

Table II breaks down the above employment figures to show the number inside the United States by agencies.

Table III breaks down the above employment figures to show the number outside the United States by agencies.

Table IV breaks down the above employment figures to show the number in industrial-type activities by agencies.

Table V shows foreign nationals by agencies not included in tables I, II, III, and IV.

TABLE I.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during May 1964, and comparison with April 1964, and pay for April 1964, and comparison with March 1964*

Department or agency	Personnel				Pay (in thousands)			
	May	April	Increase	Decrease	April	March	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):								
Agriculture	102,413	99,542	2,871		$52,142	$51,591	$551	
Commerce	32,181	31,538	643		21,156	21,060	96	
Health, Education, and Welfare	82,540	82,576		36	45,710	46,005		$295
Interior	65,443	63,896	1,547		37,285	36,778	507	
Justice	31,982	32,004		22	22,494	22,272	222	
Labor	9,248	9,287		39	6,229	6,081	148	
Post Office	586,638	588,327		1,689	292,842	290,160	2,682	
State [1] [2]	41,639	41,821		182	23,021	22,991	30	
Treasury	89,865	93,425		3,560	56,863	55,546	1,317	
Executive Office of the President:								
White House Office	342	341	1		251	253		2
Bureau of the Budget	487	488		1	474	469	5	
Council of Economic Advisers	39	45		6	34	36		2
Executive Mansion and Grounds	76	76			44	46		2
National Aeronautics and Space Council	25	25			25	26		1
National Security Council	42	42			37	36	1	
Office of Emergency Planning	356	351	5		325	317	8	

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE I.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during May 1964, and comparison with April 1964, and pay for April 1964, and comparison with March 1964*—Continued

Department or agency	Personnel				Pay (in thousands)			
	May	April	Increase	Decrease	April	March	Increase	Decrease
Executive Office of the President—Continued								
Office of Science and Technology	109	77	32		$44	$45		$1
Office of the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations	26	25	1		25	25		
President's Commission on Registration and Voting Participation						5		5
President's Commission on the Assassination of President Kennedy	21	21			27	27		
President's Committee on Consumer Interests	9	9			4	2	$2	
President's Committee on Equal Opportunity in Housing	6	6			5	6		1
Independent agencies:								
Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations	40	34	6		27	26	1	
American Battle Monuments Commission	438	438			99	93	6	
Atomic Energy Commission	7,248	7,221	27		5,908	5,843	65	
Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System	611	614		3	438	447		9
Civil Aeronautics Board	834	834			707	698	9	
Civil Service Commission	3,875	3,913		38	2,427	2,507		80
Civil War Centennial Commission	5	5			4	4		
Commission of Fine Arts	6	6			6	6		
Commission on Civil Rights	81	85		4	48	48		
Delaware River Basin Commission	2	2			2	2		
Export-Import Bank of Washington	287	293		6	228	218	10	
Farm Credit Administration	232	236		4	187	183	4	
Federal Aviation Agency	45,261	45,299		38	34,439	34,486		47
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review	7	7			5	5		
Federal Communications Commission	1,467	1,471		4	1,130	1,130		
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,256	1,259		3	969	885	84	
Federal Home Loan Bank Board	1,270	1,236	34		850	993		143
Federal Maritime Commission	232	235		3	191	201		10
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	410	409	1		390	384	6	
Federal Power Commission	1,061	1,062		1	827	823	4	
Federal Radiation Council	4	4			4	4		
Federal Reconstruction and Development Planning Commission for Alaska	6	1	5		(3)			
Federal Trade Commission	1,131	1,138		7	886	895		9
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	195	197		2	110	104	6	
General Accounting Office	4,237	4,292		55	3,077	3,104		27
General Services Administration	34,395	34,309	86		17,867	17,511	356	
Government Printing Office	7,317	7,339		22	4,540	4,614		74
Housing and Home Finance Agency	13,729	13,771		42	9,276	9,254	22	
Indian Claims Commission	21	21			22	22		
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,366	2,373		7	1,779	1,779		
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	31,582	31,345	237		25,450	25,409	41	
National Capital Housing Authority	443	443			215	199	16	
National Capital Planning Commission	58	58			43	45		2
National Capital Transportation Agency	44	47		3	43	46		3
National Gallery of Art	314	314			145	145		
National Labor Relations Board	1,990	1,993		3	1,533	1,528	5	
National Mediation Board	134	132	2		130	130		
National Science Foundation	990	955	35		707	768		61
Panama Canal	14,752	14,819		67	5,347	5,533		186
President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity	61	61			43	40	3	
Railroad Retirement Board	1,850	1,855		5	1,141	1,147		3
Renegotiation Board	207	209		2	190	190		
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	161	163		2	103	103		
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,347	1,354		7	1,030	1,021	9	
Selective Service System	7,092	7,069	23		2,436	2,299	137	
Small Business Administration	3,309	3,311		2	2,353	2,338	15	
Smithsonian Institution	1,491	1,497		6	833	836		3
Soldiers' Home	1,101	1,096	5		369	374		5
Subversive Activities Control Board	26	27		1	25	25		
Tariff Commission	269	270		1	217	221		4
Tax Court of the United States	155	156		1	138	139		1
Tennessee Valley Authority	17,593	17,163	430		11,079	10,872	207	
U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency	156	169		13	163	140	23	
U.S. Information Agency	11,896	11,936		40	5,366	5,724		358
Veterans' Administration	173,395	173,469		74	82,574	[4] 82,833		259
Virgin Islands Corporation	648	1,144		496	261	248	13	
Total, excluding Department of Defense	1,442,575	1,443,081	5,991	6,497	787,414	782,399	6,611	1,596
Net change, excluding Department of Defense			506				5,015	
Department of Defense:								
Office of the Secretary of Defense	2,069	2,095		26	1,787	1,823		36
Department of the Army	370,950	370,298	652		199,837	201,620		1,783
Department of the Navy	331,521	332,948		1,427	194,212	193,708	504	
Department of the Air Force	296,498	298,748		2,250	162,919	163,363		444
Defense Atomic Support Agency	1,951	1,969		18	1,037	1,037		
Defense Communications Agency	865	850	15		635	645		10
Defense Supply Agency	29,836	29,826	10		15,987	17,129		1,142
Office of Civil Defense						931		931
U.S. Court of Military Appeals	39	40		1	36	36		
Interdepartmental activities	7	8		1	5	7		2
International military activities	55	55			45	50		5
Armed Forces information and education activities	425	428		3	224	229		5
Total, Department of Defense [5]	1,034,216	1,037,265	677	3,726	576,724	580,578	504	4,358
Net decrease, Department of Defense			3,049				3,854	
Grand total, including Department of Defense [5] [6] [7]	2,476,791	2,480,346	6,668	10,223	1,364,138	1,362,977	7,115	5,954
Net change, including Department of Defense			3,555				1,161	

---

[1] May figure includes 15,882 employees of the Agency for International Development as compared with 16,122 in April and their pay. These AID figures include employees who are paid from foreign currencies deposited by foreign governments in a trust fund for this purpose. The May figure includes 4,141 of these trust-fund employees and the April figure includes 4,161.

[2] May figure includes 1,151 employees of the Peace Corps as compared with 1,131 in April and their pay.

[3] Less than $500.

[4] Revised on basis of later information.

[5] The Department of Defense has advised the committee that for security reasons personnel information for "classified activities" is omitted.

[6] Exclusive of personnel and pay of the Central Intelligence Agency and the National Security Agency.

[7] May figure includes 574 employees of the Interior Department employed under the Public Works Acceleration Act (Public Law 87-658), as compared with 499 in April.

TABLE II.—*Federal personnel inside the United States employed by the executive agencies during May 1964, and comparison with April 1964*

Department or agency	May	April	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	101,217	98,346	2,871	-------
Commerce	31,509	30,877	632	-------
Health, Education, and Welfare	81,877	81,912	-------	35
Interior	64,814	63,259	1,555	-------
Justice	31,630	31,650	-------	20
Labor	9,142	9,206	-------	64
Post Office	585,065	586,753	-------	1,688
State [1] [2]	10,784	10,820	-------	36
Treasury	89,201	92,768	-------	3,567
Executive Office of the President:				
White House Office	342	341	1	-------
Bureau of the Budget	487	488	-------	1
Council of Economic Advisers	39	45	-------	6
Executive Mansion and Grounds	76	76	-------	-------
National Aeronautics and Space Council	25	25	-------	-------
National Security Council	42	42	-------	-------
Office of Emergency Planning	356	351	5	-------
Office of Science and Technology	109	77	32	-------
Office of the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations	26	25	1	-------
President's Commission on the Assassination of President Kennedy	21	21	-------	-------
President's Committee on Consumer Interests	9	9	-------	-------
President's Committee on Equal Opportunity in Housing	6	6	-------	-------
Independent agencies:				
Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations	40	34	6	-------
American Battle Monuments Commission	7	7	-------	-------
Atomic Energy Commission	7,211	7,185	26	-------
Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System	611	614	-------	3
Civil Aeronautics Board	834	834	-------	-------
Civil Service Commission	3,872	3,909	-------	37
Civil War Centennial Commission	5	5	-------	-------
Commission of Fine Arts	6	6	-------	-------
Commission on Civil Rights	81	85	-------	4
Delaware River Basin Commission	2	2	-------	-------
Export-Import Bank of Washington	287	293	-------	6
Farm Credit Administration	232	236	-------	4
Federal Aviation Agency	44,166	44,201	-------	35
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review	7	7	-------	-------
Federal Communications Commission	1,464	1,468	-------	4
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,254	1,257	-------	3
Federal Home Loan Bank Board	1,270	1,236	34	-------
Federal Maritime Commission	232	235	-------	3
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	410	409	1	-------
Federal Power Commission	1,061	1,062	-------	1
Federal Radiation Council	4	4	-------	-------
Federal Reconstruction and Development Planning Commission for Alaska	6	1	5	-------
Federal Trade Commission	1,131	1,138	-------	7
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	161	158	3	-------
General Accounting Office	4,159	4,213	-------	54
General Services Administration	34,369	34,283	86	-------
Independent agencies—Continued				
Government Printing Office	7,317	7,339	-------	22
Housing and Home Finance Agency	13,526	13,569	-------	43
Indian Claims Commission	21	21	-------	-------
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,366	2,373	-------	7
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	31,568	31,330	238	-------
National Capital Housing Authority	443	443	-------	-------
National Capital Planning Commission	58	58	-------	-------
National Capital Transportation Agency	44	47	-------	3
National Gallery of Art	314	314	-------	-------
National Labor Relations Board	1,958	1,960	-------	2
National Mediation Board	134	132	2	-------
National Science Foundation	984	947	37	-------
Panama Canal	169	169	-------	-------
President's Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity	61	61	-------	-------
Railroad Retirement Board	1,850	1,855	-------	5
Renegotiation Board	207	209	-------	2
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	161	163	-------	2
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,347	1,354	-------	7
Selective Service System	6,940	6,917	23	-------
Small Business Administration	3,253	3,257	-------	4
Smithsonian Institution	1,474	1,480	-------	6
Soldiers' Home	1,101	1,096	5	-------
Subversive Activities Control Board	26	27	-------	1
Tariff Commission	269	270	-------	1
Tax Court of the United States	155	156	-------	1
Tennessee Valley Authority	17,592	17,162	430	-------
U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency	156	169	-------	13
U.S. Information Agency	3,378	3,377	1	-------
Veterans' Administration	172,414	172,482	-------	68
Total, excluding Department of Defense	1,378,945	1,378,716	5,994	5,765
Net increase, excluding Department of Defense	-------	-------	229	
Department of Defense:				
Office of the Secretary of Defense	2,018	2,043	-------	25
Department of the Army	320,471	319,531	940	-------
Department of the Navy	308,090	309,236	-------	1,146
Department of the Air Force	269,344	271,225	-------	1,881
Defense Atomic Support Agency	1,951	1,969	-------	18
Defense Communications Agency	815	801	14	-------
Defense Supply Agency	29,836	29,826	10	-------
U.S. Court of Military Appeals	39	40	-------	1
Interdepartmental activities	7	8	-------	1
International military activities	35	33	2	-------
Armed Forces information and education activities	425	428	-------	3
Total, Department of Defense [3]	933,031	935,140	966	3,075
Net decrease, Department of Defense	-------	-------	2,190	
Grand total, including Department of Defense [3]	2,311,976	2,313,856	6,960	8,840
Net decrease, including Department of Defense	-------	-------	1,880	

---

[1] May figure includes 2,843 employees of the Agency for International Development as compared with 2,884 in April.

[2] May figure includes 770 employees of the Peace Corps as compared with 747 in April.

[3] The Department of Defense has advised the committee that for security reasons personnel information for "classified activities" is omitted.

TABLE III.—*Federal personnel outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during May 1964, and comparison with April 1964*

Department or agency	May	April	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	1,196	1,196	-------	-------
Commerce	672	661	11	-------
Health, Education, and Welfare	663	664	-------	1
Interior	629	637	-------	8
Justice	352	354	-------	2
Labor	106	81	25	-------
Post Office	1,573	1,574	-------	1
State [1] [2]	30,855	31,001	-------	146
Treasury	664	657	7	-------
Independent agencies:				
American Battle Monuments Commission	431	431	-------	-------
Atomic Energy Commission	37	36	1	-------
Civil Service Commission	3	4	-------	1
Federal Aviation Agency	1,095	1,098	-------	3
Federal Communications Commission	3	3	-------	-------
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	2	2	-------	-------
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	34	39	-------	5
General Accounting Office	78	79	-------	1
General Services Administration	26	26	-------	-------
Housing and Home Finance Agency	203	202	1	-------
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	14	15	-------	1
National Labor Relations Board	32	33	-------	1
National Science Foundation	6	8	-------	2
Panama Canal	14,583	14,650	-------	67
Selective Service System	152	152	-------	-------
Independent agencies—Continued				
Small Business Administration	56	54	27	-------
Smithsonian Institution	17	17	-------	-------
Tennessee Valley Authority	1	1	-------	-------
U.S. Information Agency	8,518	8,559	-------	41
Veterans' Administration	981	987	-------	6
Virgin Islands Corporation	648	1,144	-------	496
Total, excluding Department of Defense	63,630	64,365	4	782
Net decrease, excluding Department of Defense	-------	-------	735	
Department of Defense:				
Office of the Secretary of Defense	51	52	-------	1
Department of the Army	50,479	50,767	-------	288
Department of the Navy	23,431	23,712	-------	281
Department of the Air Force	27,154	27,523	-------	369
Defense Communications Agency	50	49	1	-------
International military activities	20	22	-------	2
Total, Department of Defense	101,185	102,125	1	941
Net decrease, Department of Defense	-------	-------	940	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	164,815	166,490	48	1,723
Net decrease, including Department of Defense	-------	-------	1,675	

---

[1] May figure includes 13,039 employees of the Agency for International Development as compared with 13,238 in April. These AID figures include employees who are paid from foreign currencies deposited by foreign governments in a trust fund for this purpose. The May figure includes 4,141 of these trust fund employees and the April figure includes 4,161.

[2] May figure includes 381 employees of the Peace Corps as compared with 384 in April.

TABLE IV.—*Industrial employees of the Federal Government inside and outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during May 1964, and comparison with April 1964*

Department or agency	May	April	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	3,900	3,894	6	
Commerce	5,804	5,770	34	
Interior	9,255	8,987	268	
Post Office	260	263		3
Treasury	5,339	5,339		
Independent agencies:				
Atomic Energy Commission	269	268	1	
Federal Aviation Agency	2,717	2,704	13	
General Services Administration	1,919	1,942		23
Government Printing Office	7,317	7,339		22
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	31,582	31,345	237	
Panama Canal	7,357	7,411		54
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	160	158	2	
Tennessee Valley Authority	14,418	13,999	419	
Virgin Islands Corporation	648	1,144		496
Total, excluding Department of Defense	90,945	90,563	980	598
Net increase, excluding Department of Defense			382	

Department or agency	May	April	Increase	Decrease
Department of Defense:				
Department of the Army:				
Inside the United States	[1] 134,411	[2] 136,718		2,307
Outside the United States	[1] 4,462	[2] 4,655		193
Department of the Navy:				
Inside the United States	187,335	188,023		688
Outside the United States	1,275	1,276		1
Department of the Air Force:				
Inside the United States	127,823	129,618		1,795
Outside the United States	1,008	1,017		9
Defense Supply Agency: Inside the United States	1,658	1,674		16
Total, Department of Defense	457,972	462,981		5,009
Net decrease, Department of Defense				5,009
Grand total, including Department of Defense	548,917	553,544	980	5,607
Net decrease, including Department of Defense				4,627

---

[1] Subject to revision.

[2] Revised on basis of later information.

TABLE V.—*Foreign nationals working under U.S. agencies overseas, excluded from tables I through IV of this report, whose services are provided by contractual agreement between the United States and foreign governments, or because of the nature of their work or the source of funds from which they are paid, as of May 1964 and comparison with April 1964*

Country	Total		Army		Navy		Air Force	
	May	April	May	April	May	April	May	April
Canada	9	4					9	4
Crete	86	86					86	86
England	2,762	2,811			109	114	2,653	2,697
France	17,667	18,124	14,288	14,636	9	9	3,370	3,479
Germany	72,690	74,036	61,640	62,869	82	82	10,968	11,085
Greece	271	274			35	33	236	241
Japan	45,556	46,358	15,353	15,364	13,276	[1] 13,500	16,927	17,494
Korea	5,661	5,968	5,661	5,968				
Morocco	655	672			655	672		
Netherlands	56	56					56	56
Trinidad	348	426			348	426		
Total	145,761	148,815	96,942	98,837	14,514	14,836	34,305	35,142

[1] Revised on basis of later information.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HARRY F. BYRD, DEMOCRAT, OF VIRGINIA

Executive agencies of the Federal Government reported civilian employment in the month of May totaling 2,476,791, as compared with 2,480,346 in April. This was a net decrease of 3,555, including a net increase of 75 in temporary employment under the public works acceleration program authorized by Public Law 87-658.

Civilian employment reported by the executive agencies of the Federal Government, by months in fiscal year 1964, which began July 1, 1963, follows:

Month	Employment	Increase	Decrease
1963—July	2,518,857	9,149	
August	2,515,033		3,824
September	2,492,170		22,863
October	2,494,175	2,005	
November	2,493,379		796
December	2,487,856		5,523
1964—January	2,473,546		14,310
February	2,468,430		5,116
March	2,470,045	1,615	
April	2,480,346	10,301	
May	2,476,791		3,555

Total Federal employment in civilian agencies for the month of May was 1,442,575, a decrease of 506 as compared with the April total of 1,443,081. Total civilian employment in the military agencies in May was 1,034,216, a decrease of 3,049 as compared with 1,037,265 in April. (Totals exclude Defense Department figures for "classified activities," beginning with February.)

Civilian agencies reporting larger decreases were Treasury Department with 3,560, and Post Office Department with 1,689. The larger increases were reported by Agriculture Department with 2,871, and Interior Department with 1,547. The changes in the Departments of Agriculture, Interior, and Treasury were largely seasonal.

In the Defense Department the largest decreases in civilian employment were reported by the Air Force Department with 2,250 and the Navy Department with 1,427. The largest increase was reported by the Army Department with 652.

Inside the United States civilian employment decreased 1,880 and outside the United States civilian employment decreased 1,675. Industrial employment by Federal agencies in May totaled 548,917, a decrease of 4,627.

These figures are from reports certified by the agencies as compiled by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

FOREIGN NATIONALS

The total of 2,476,791 civilian employees certified to the committee by Federal agencies in their regular monthly personnel reports includes some foreign nationals employed in U.S. Government activies abroad, but in addition to these there were 145,761 foreign nationals working for U.S. agencies overseas during May who were not counted in the usual personnel reports. The number in April was 148,815. A breakdown of this employment for May follows:

Country	Total	Army	Navy	Air Force
Canada	9			9
Crete	86			86
England	2,762		109	2,653
France	17,667	14,288	9	3,370
Germany	72,690	61,640	82	10,968
Greece	271		35	236
Japan	45,556	15,353	13,276	16,927
Korea	5,661	5,661		
Morocco	655		655	
Netherlands	56			56
Trinidad	348		348	
Total	145,761	96,942	15,514	34,305

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 2973. A bill to amend section 1212(a) of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SCOTT:

S. 2974. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Hertha L. Wohlmuth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. NEUBERGER:

S. 2975. A bill for the relief of Oh Wha Ja (Penny Korleen Doughty); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELL (for Mr. KENNEDY):

S. 2976. A bill for the relief of Charles N. Legarde and his wife, Beatrice E. Legarde; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. PELL when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself and Mr. McCARTHY):

S. 2977. A bill to further amend the transitional provisions of the act approved September 6, 1958, entitled "An act to protect the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to prohibit the use in food of additives which have not been adequately tested to establish their safety, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

CHARLES N. LEGARDE AND HIS WIFE, BEATRICE E. LEGARDE

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, on behalf of the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill for the relief of Charles N. Legarde and his wife, Beatrice E. Legarde. I am sorry the Senator from Massachusetts is not here to do this himself, but I am exceedingly happy to hear that he is getting better. He is not only much missed by me, but by all our colleagues, and I know we all wish him the quickest possible recovery.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2976) for the relief of Charles N. Legarde and his wife, Beatrice E. Legarde, introduced by Mr. Pell (for Mr. Kennedy), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

FOOD ADDITIVES TRANSITIONAL PROVISIONS AMENDMENT OF 1964

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague, the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCarthy], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill entitled "Food Additives Transitional Provisions Amendment of 1964."

Several weeks ago Senator McCarthy and I sought the advice of Health, Education, and Welfare on the problems dealt with in this bill. Following this the Department has given great consideration to this problem and has given technical advice on the drafting of this legislation. I ask unanimous consent that a letter prepared by that Department, setting forth its viewpoint on this bill, be printed in the Record. It should be noted that this bill merely extends the effective date of section 3 of Public Law 85–929 to December 31, 1965, and then only in those few cases where a finding is made by Health, Education, and Welfare that the postponement is necessary and involves no undue risk to the public health.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 2977) to further amend the transitional provisions of the act approved September 6, 1958, entitled "An act to protect the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to prohibit the use in food of additives which have not been adequately tested to establish their safety," and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Humphrey (for himself and Mr. McCarthy), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The letter presented by Mr. Humphrey is as follows:

Department of Health,
Education, and Welfare,
Washington, D.C., June 30, 1964.
Hon. Hubert H. Humphrey,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Humphrey: This is in response to the joint letter, dated May 21, 1964, from you, Senator McCarthy, and Congressman Blatnik, requesting that we comment on an enclosed copy of a draft bill to "further amend the transitional provisions of" the Food Additives Amendment of 1958 "and for other purposes." The draft bill would have the short title "Food Additives Transitional Provisions Amendment of 1964."

The draft bill proposes, under safeguards described below, to extend from June 30, 1964, to June 30, 1966, our authority to postpone on an ad hoc basis—with respect to chemicals that were in commercial use before 1958—the effective date of section 3 of the Food Additives Amendment of 1958 (Public Law 85–929), which amended the adulteration provisions of the Food and Drug Act so as to deem a food additive adulterated unless its use has been cleared for safety. The bill would likewise extend from June 30, 1964 to June 30, 1966, our authority to postpone the effective date of the changes made in the adulteration provisions of the Food and Drug Act by the pesticide chemicals amendment (Public Law 83–518), as applied to those chemicals in commercial use before 1958 that were classified as "pesticide chemicals" (instead of "food additives") by the Nematocide, Plant Regulator, Defoliant, and Desiccant Amendment of 1959 (Public Law 86–139). During any such postponement the adulteration provisions of preexisting law under the Food and Drug Act would continue to apply.

As you will recall, the Food Additives Amendment of 1958 (Public Law 85–929) contained transitional provisions authorizing us to postpone until March 5, 1961, the effective date of the provisions above referred to, as applied to additives in commercial use before 1958, if we found that this was necessary and that it would involve no undue risk to the public health. Similarly, when the Nematocide, Plant Regulator, Defoliant, and Desiccant Amendment of 1959 (Public Law 86–139) brought certain agricultural chemicals—about 30 in number—under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act and thus indirectly transferred such chemicals from the purview of the food additive provisions of the Food and Drug Act to that of the pesticide chemicals provisions of that act, it contained parallel transitional provisions, meshing with those of the food additives amendment, with respect to those chemicals in commercial use before 1958.

When it became apparent that the March 5, 1961, limitation on the period for which we could thus extend the final effective date involved under these two amendatory laws, as applied to chemicals on the market before 1958, was insufficient to permit resolution of all the complex scientific problems which arose, Congress, by the Food Additives Transitional Provisions Amendment of 1961 (Public Law 87–19), authorized us to grant further postponements, but not beyond June 30, 1964, on an ad hoc basis, in the case of any such chemical in commercial use for which we had previously granted a postponement to March 5, 1961 (or had a request for an extension pending on that date), if, in addition to making the findings required as a basis for the prior postponement, we found (i) that bona fide action to determine the applicability of the clearance requirements of the food additives amendment or pesticide chemicals amendment to such use or to develop the scientific data necessary for action thereunder was commenced before March 6, 1960, and thereafter pursued with reasonable diligence and (ii) that in our judgment such further postponement was consistent with the objective of carrying the necessary scientific investigations to completion in good faith as soon as reasonably practicable. At the time of the enactment of Public Law 87–19 in 1961, over 3,000 uses of chemicals were covered by postponements to March 5, 1961, that we had granted.

The draft bill enclosed with your letter would amend the earlier legislation to authorize us to grant a further postponement, but not beyond June 30, 1966, in any case in which we had previously granted a postponement with respect to a use of a chemical until June 30, 1964. Such a postponement beyond June 30, 1964, could, however, be granted under the terms of the draft bill only if we again made the same findings as are described above under (i) and (ii). The June 30, 1964, cutoff date had been inserted by Congress at the time of the 1961 amendment (Public Law 87–19) because it then was estimated that the bulk of the cases could be finally dealt with in about 3 additional years. It was understood that if that estimate proved overly optimistic, legislative authority to grant additional extensions might have to be sought.

While it has been possible for both the industries concerned and this Department to complete the work involved on most of the 3,000 extensions, there are still some 250 uses of food additives and pesticide chemicals on which we are not yet prepared to take final action. The problems on most of these will be resolved within the next 6 to 12 months. However, there are a few cases in which scientific work now in progress could not be completed and evaluated by us within 1 year. In our opinion, the cases pending can be resolved finally within 18 months if pursued with diligence and the expiration date stated in the bill should therefore be December 31, 1965.

We would not object to the enactment of the proposed legislation if amended as above suggested. We do not envision circumstances which would require any further extension beyond December 31, 1965.

We are advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the presentation of this report.

Sincerely,

Anthony J. Celebrezze,
Secretary.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, July 2, 1964, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 6) to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems, both public and private, in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes.

SHABBY TREATMENT OF SENATOR GOLDWATER

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, on June 29, 1964, there was published in the Des Moines Register of Des Moines, Iowa, a reprint of an editorial written by John S. Knight in the Detroit Free Press. This editorial is entitled "Shabby Treatment of Goldwater."

This editorial is a concise and pointed discussion of the treatment which the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Goldwater] has received around the country by certain groups, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Shabby Treatment of Goldwater

To avoid any misunderstanding of what I am about to say, let me declare that Barry Goldwater is not my candidate and I have done nothing to promote his presidential aspirations.

But I do think the Arizona Senator is getting shabby treatment from most of the news media.

Day after day, there are loud lamentations from the newspaper columnists to the effect that a Goldwater nomination will destroy the Republican Party.

Their deep concern for the GOP's future would be more persuasive if any considerable number of them had ever voted for a Republican nominee, or, perhaps, ever voted at all.

LIPPMANN'S CONCERN NOW

Last summer, Walter Lippmann said on "CBS Reports" that BARRY GOLDWATER was the logical Republican presidential candidate for 1964 if the Republicans really wanted to test the issues and give the voters a real choice.

It was not long before Lippmann had a change of heart and declared GOLDWATER to be a "radical reactionary." He said GOLDWATER'S views "are a vast confusion and a recipe for panic. The Republican Party would be a shambles after a Goldwater nomination."

Lippmann now declares that the Goldwater adventurers want "to seize and use the old historic name and the political assets of the Republican Party to take over and make over the party."

This is an idle charge since GOLDWATER'S Republican colleagues in the Senate selected him as chairman of their campaign committee for 5 years. In 1960, GOLDWATER made 200 speeches for the Nixon-Lodge ticket.

GUTLESS WONDERS

The record would indicate that BARRY GOLDWATER is less of an "adventurer" than the gutless wonders who were willing to let Nelson Rockefeller take him on singlehanded while they stood by hoping to pick up the marbles.

Of the syndicated columnists, I can think of only a few who are not savagely cutting down Senator GOLDWATER day after day.

DEPICTED AS NEANDERTHAL

Some of the television commentators discuss GOLDWATER with evident disdain and contempt. Editorial cartoonists portray him as belonging to the Neanderthal age, or as a relic of the 19th century.

It is the fashion of editorial writers to persuade themselves that GOLDWATER'S followers are either "kooks" or Birchers.

This simply is not so. The Goldwater movement represents a mass protest by conservatively minded people against foreign aid, excessive welfare, high taxes, foreign policy, and the concentration of power in the Federal Government.

These people are, as Don Shoemaker of the Miami Herald has said, those many Americans who are "weary with the present, fearsome of the future, and enamored of the past."

They are also those Americans who yearn for solutions to what are actually insoluble problems. They are those Americans who tend to oversimplify issues and demand an end to our ever-recurring crises.

GOLDWATER'S adherents may fail to understand the nature of world change and the significance of our social revolution at home.

Yet their love of country and patriotism cannot be impugned. If they are mistaken in their concepts of modern times and like not what they see, this is their undeniable right.

RIGHT TO BE HEARD

And so it is with GOLDWATER. His vote against the civil rights bill and his public attitudes on TVA, the United Nations, relations with Russia and the war in South Vietnam may give us pause, but he has the right to be heard on these questions.

The superior attitude displayed toward GOLDWATER by so many columnists and commentators is already resulting in a backlash of sympathy toward the man from Arizona.

When these "opinion makers" refer disdainfully to "the kind of people" who were for GOLDWATER in California, they insult the intelligence of more than a million voters who said with their ballots that they didn't want Governor Rockefeller as the Republican candidate.

The pundits who are presently proclaiming that a GOLDWATER nomination will hopelessly divide the Republican Party should be fair enough to concede that precisely the same division will occur if he is not nominated.

And they couldn't care less.

SCRANTON A HERO?

Gov. William Scranton's challenge to GOLDWATER is to be welcomed. His belated bid for the nomination insures discussion of all issues prior to the convention.

But I fail to understand why the hesitant gentleman from Harrisburg is suddenly the hero of the hour in most of the press, and GOLDWATER the party leper.

There was certainly nothing in Governor Scranton's performance at the recent Governors' conference which would suggest that he is the strong, decisive character now being portrayed in the public print.

Some editors are disturbed because BARRY GOLDWATER is teeing off on the newspapers and other news media for failing to present the news of his candidacy fairly and objectively.

I can't say that I blame him.

He hasn't had a fair shake.

SOVIET UNION NOW SUPPLYING MODERN WEAPONS TO INDONESIA

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I believe that the administration should give careful scrutiny to the report that the Soviet Union is now supplying what a Soviet official termed "very modern" weapons to Indonesia.

It should also minutely assess the export of Russian experts into that country for the reported purpose of training troops in the use of these weapons.

If these "very modern" weapons are missiles, as the New York Times of June 26 speculated, and if Russian experts are being sent into that nation, then we very well could have the beginning of another Cuba.

This situation is laden with danger for the free world, for Indonesian President Sukarno is now making good his threat of turning to the Communist bloc. The question is: How soon will he be swallowed up?

I ask unanimous consent to have the New York Times article, entitled "Indonesia Getting New Soviet Arms," printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDONESIA GETTING NEW SOVIET ARMS—MIKOYAN REVEALS SHIPMENT OF MODERN WEAPONS FOR USE AGAINST MALAYSIA

DJAKARTA, INDONESIA, June 25.—Anastas I. Mikoyan, a First Deputy Premier of the Soviet Union, said today that his country was supplying Indonesia with very modern weapons to aid the Indonesian fight to crush Malaysia. He added that Russian experts would be sent to train the troops in the use of the arms.

Mr. Mikoyan said at a rally here that the new weapons were far better than the weapons possessed by the British in this area.

He did not specify what types of weapons the Russians were sending to Indonesia, but there was speculation that they might be missiles.

At the same rally, President Sukarno said that Indonesia would not withdraw her guerrillas from Malaysian territory until political issues between Indonesia and Malaysia had been settled.

Mr. Sukarno said Indonesia was "not afraid even if the whole of Malaysia overflowed with weapons."

Mr. Mikoyan made his disclosure of Soviet arms aid in the wake of the breakdown of Tokyo talks called to try to settle the bitter dispute between Indonesia and Malaysia.

BRITISH AIDING IN DEFENSE

The Indonesians charge that the creation of Malaysia last year from Malaya, Singapore, Sarawak and Sabah was a British intrigue to retain influence in the region. British troops are assisting in the defense of Malaysia against Indonesian guerrillas.

Mr. Mikoyan said the supplying of weapons to Indonesia did not contradict the Soviet Union's policy of peaceful coexistence because, he asserted, the Indonesian struggle against Malaysia is just.

"The people of the Soviet Union give full support to the people of Indonesia in their fight against neocolonialism," Mr. Mikoyan told thousands of Indonesians gathered in a Soviet-built sports complex on Djakarta's outskirts.

He called for the withdrawal of all British forces and personnel from southeast Asia and charged that Malaysia was a federation of make-believe countries for the interests of the British capitalists.

Mr. Mikoyan called for the convening of a meeting of neutral nations to determine whether the peoples of Sarawak and Sabah wished to join Malaysia.

NEED FOR MILITARY PAY RAISE

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, at this time when the Congress is approving legislation to provide across-the-board pay raises for Federal civilian employees, it is important to affirm our concern for the plight of military personnel. Shocking as it may seem, Mr. President, there are tens of thousands of men in the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marines, who are forced to live on less than $3,000 a year. The situation of enlisted men in the armed services is becoming increasingly serious; $3,000 for a family of four is considered the poverty line. The situation has become so desperate that in the Air Force alone there are 5,000 enlisted men who have had to turn to welfare programs to provide for their families. At the same time, there are efforts to reduce the benefits that have been available to servicemen, such as commissaries and full medical care upon retirement.

Figures released in the Air Force Times after studies disclose that about 70.000 airmen and 1,000 Air Force officers, mainly heads of families, are moonlighting—that is, holding part-time jobs to supplement their service pay. Although there are no comparable figures available which include the Army and the Navy, it is estimated that as many as one-third of the 2,694,000 servicemen have incomes of less than $3,000 to provide for a family of four.

I have received a great many letters over the last few months, primarily from enlisted men, who find it impossible to make ends meet in the service. Bitter and disillusioned, they are getting out of uniform as fast as they can.

Although I am not a member of the Armed Services Committee, I hope that action will be taken in the very near future to meet these pressing needs of the men and women in our armed services. They are skillful, trained, hard working, and loyal employees of the Federal Government. Yet they are as badly off financially as unemployed or unemployable persons in the civilian economy. In my judgment, this is a disgraceful reward for those who have sworn to defend our country at home and abroad.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the text of an editorial which was published in the Air Force magazine emphasizing these GI pockets of poverty and urging prompt congressional action to provide our servicemen with their rightful recompense.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GI POCKETS OF POVERTY

(By Allan R. Scholin)

How much water can you put in your gas tank before your engine stops running?

The Congress, abetted by the Department of Defense and the Bureau of the Budget, is trying this approach in terms of pay, allowances, and fringe benefits of military personnel.

Military compensation is steadily being diluted in relation to that of U.S. civilians and to Federal civil service employees.

A bill to provide a modest pay increase of 3 percent for officers and 2.4 percent for enlisted men has not yet been acted upon by the House Armed Services Committee. There has been no appreciable pressure for its approval by members of that committee or its Senate counterpart.

Why not?

There is more than one answer. Some Congressmen say "we took care of the boys" in the 1963 pay raise. Many feel that the military can be expected to suffer in silence. And there is no real pressure by the voters.

The printed program for the national Armed Forces Day dinner in Washington, May 8, carried a joint statement from the sponsors—the Army Association, Navy League, and Air Force Association—which said in part:

"In a world grown weary of crises and tension, we too often forget the dedication of those who man the weapons, the planes, and the ships that protect our way of life."

The Nation has even forgotten the words of the late President Kennedy when he signed the 1963 military pay bill. He pledged that his administration would "use its best efforts to assure that in the future military compensation will keep pace with increases in salaries and wages in the civilian economy." And, he added, "I think I speak for all of us when I say that is a pledge we intend to keep."

President Kennedy is gone. Was his promise buried with him?

President Johnson has declared war on poverty. The target is those families who make less than $3,000 a year. Sixty percent of all enlisted personnel are in this category. True, unmarried men get room and board. But more than half of all enlisted men are married. Many are struggling to raise families on incomes that clearly qualify them as inhabitants of so-called pockets of poverty.

The last real effort to restore military pay to levels comparable with the civilian economy was in 1958—the Cordiner Committee raise. The 1963 act gave substantial increases at key retention points, though even these fell short of civilian increases. But in other grades the 1963 raise was far from adequate, and it ignored entirely those in their first 2 years of service.

In the last 6 years, civilian salaries have jumped 25 percent, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics and the U.S. Census Bureau. In 1964 they are expected to go up another 3 percent.

In contrast, since 1958 the pay and allowances of first lieutenants, captains, and E–4's with more than 4 years' service have, as a result of the 1963 act, increased by slightly more than 20 percent. In other grades, the increases range from 11 to 17 percent—except that recruits in their first 2 years of service have gained only 1.1 percent and general officers only 6.5 percent.

The 1964 bill would match only the 3-percent increase in civilian pay in the past year, and then only for active-duty personnel with more than 2 years' service. The cost is about $200 million a year.

To bring men in their first 2 years of service up to 1964 levels would cost another $234 million. To restore all military pay to its 1958 relationship with the civilian economy would cost $1.5 billion a year—about the same price tag as the 1963 raise.

In comparison, the Federal civil service received pay raises in 1958, 1962, and January 1, 1964. Another civilian raise has already been approved by the House Civil Service Committee. With that boost, the average increase in civil service pay since 1958 will range from 20 percent for GS–4s to 40 percent for GS–18s.

The pay of a staff sergeant, for example, has gone up only 8.4 percent since 1958, and would increase another 2.4 percent under the 1964 bill while that of a GS–5, GS–6, or GS–7—his counterparts in civil service—will have jumped more than 22 percent. The pay of a major general has increased 6.4 percent, with another 3 percent in the 1964 bill; that of a GS–18, the comparable civilian grade, will go up 40 percent.

Under these conditions, it is small wonder that, as Jerry Kluttz, veteran columnist on civil service for the Washington Post, has pointed out: "A wedge is being driven between Uncle Sam's 2.5 million civilian and 2.7 million military personnel. Military people and their families feel strongly that civilians are the favored group. I found numerous civilians who agree with them."

The Congress is not merely cold to the serviceman's claim to an equitable income. Voices are being raised in the House and Senate that such fringe benefits as commissaries and base exchanges should be abolished as well. There are demands that the military should contribute to their retirement fund, that allowances should be taxed along with base pay.

As NBC's Hugh Downs, master of ceremonies for the Armed Forces Day dinner on May 8, said:

"We quibble about the pay scales and the so-called fringe benefits of military service as if we were in a buyer's market, as if the supply of top-quality men exceeded the demand, as if the record of retaining bright young men for military careers was good—which it decidedly is not.

"The military can contract outside for many of its requirements—but as Gen. Nate Twining, former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, has said: 'There are two things in this life you can't delegate, no matter how good an executive you may be—your lovemaking and your fighting.' "

Our military men are proving today, as throughout our history, that they will fight heroically for this Nation. But they aren't supposed to be good at fighting for their own needs. That's a job for the people they defend. And that can't be delegated either.

GREECE'S ECONOMIC POLICY

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, on June 26, 1964, the Greek Minister of Coordination, Andreas Papandreou, gave an address on the economic policy of Greece at the Hotel Plaza in New York City to a group of leaders of the American business and financial community. His remarks stand as a reaffirmation of Greece's commitment to free enterprise and the important role of foreign capital in Greece's economic future.

Minister Andreas Papandreou is the son of the Prime Minister of Greece. He has a long and distinguished academic career in the United States, having served in his last post as chairman of the department of economics at the University of California at Berkeley.

I ask unanimous consent to have his address printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH BY HIS EXCELLENCY ANDREAS PAPANDREOU

Last February 16 the Greek people elected the Center Union Party to office with an impressive 53 percent majority, the largest mandate given any Greek Government in modern times. It is only natural that other nations and individuals concerned with international affairs and international business will want to know what this Government stands for.

First, the new Greek Government stands for political democracy on the Western pattern. Every citizen is guaranteed the free expression of his opinions and the exercise of his political rights.

Second, the Government is committed to fostering a rapid rate of growth of the Greek economy. Within a limited number of years Greece must fully adapt to the economic and social conditions of the Common Market and, indeed, all the free societies of the West in general. The gap between Greece and the rest of the West is wide, and must be narrowed as rapidly as possible.

Third, economic growth, to be meaningful, must be shared by all. The Government must work for the greater participation of the various regions and economic groups in the fruits of progress. This is not only necessary for political and social reasons, but is important in order to create a wider market in Greece for industrial products.

Fourth, the Government intends to complete within the earliest possible period of time the basic infrastructure of the economy, such as roads, transportation facilities, power, etc.

Fifth, this Government places great emphasis on the development of human capital. A country with limited natural resources must develop to the fullest the one resource it has in abundance, namely, its people. There are vast deficiencies in the educational system which must be made up. Our institutions must be organized on a modern basis and full advantage must be taken of modern research methods. In particular, the Government is planning a major program to improve technical skills of the Greek labor force. Modern management techniques will be introduced through the educational system and in cooperation with private business.

You will want to know our philosophy and intentions with respect to relations between the public and private sectors. Fundamentally, we make a distinction between planning and bureaucracy. We plan to develop a national economic strategy which will be formulated in conjunction with all of the concerned interests in the country. Specifically, a Supreme Advisory Council, consisting of government leaders, businessmen, educators, the press, and others as appropriate, will review and discuss the plans of the Government with a view to gaining a national consensus. Once we have identified our aims on the broadest scale, we intend to pursue them in a rational manner, minimizing red tape and bureaucratic procedures. The specific responsibility of the Government will lie mainly in the field of creating the infrastructure and environment necessary for the most rapid development of the private sectors.

In the process we intend to create a competitive framework with stable rules for the performance of the private sectors. Government interference will be minimized, but so will protection and special privileges.

Greece is facing a great challenge and an equally great opportunity in its forthcoming full association with the Common Market. For a number of years Greece will have substantial advantages in the Common Market. We can freely sell our industrial products there, and only gradually are we required to give our Common Market associates free access to the growing Greek market. New industries will thus have ample time to become established without fear of ruinous competition.

We regard foreign investment as an important and indeed critical factor in our plans to transform the Greek economy, both in terms of contributing to the industrial structure, as well as in bringing to Greece the latest technology and managerial methods. We need and welcome foreign investment which is willing to go to Greece on mutually beneficial terms and which can help us create a competitive industrial structure.

For this kind of foreign investment we offer all the cooperation the Government can give, and all the advantages the law permits. I think it is important for you to understand that we recognize the sanctity of contracts and the need to deal fairly with those who have enough faith in the Greek economy to put their money there.

Let me give you a concrete example about which there has been much misunderstanding. A voluntary renegotiation recently took place on the Esso-Pappas contract, a contract which covered many phases of the Greek economy and which involved many special concessions. The best evidence of the continued attractiveness of Greece as a place to invest was the voluntary decision of Esso to increase its investment from $110 million to $190 million. This decision, by one of the world's largest and most forward-looking corporations, should allay any suspicion about the reliability of Government of Greece commitments.

In recent years Greece has been increasingly successful in attracting foreign investors, and the number of applications and approvals is increasing all the time. Direct investment under law 2687 (protection of foreign capital) rose from $14.4 million to $28.5 million from 1962 to 1963. There are vast opportunities to be exploited and I know Americans will increasingly take advantage of these opportunities as the Europeans are now doing.

Permit me to enumerate a few of the advantages of investing in Greece and some of the ways we propose to make Greece even more attractive to the foreign investor.

First, Greece has easy access to the markets of Europe, the Middle East, and Africa. I have already mentioned the special advantages we enjoy in the Common Market. In addition, Greece occupies a special position in the Middle East and Africa, by virtue of its long and noncontroversial association with these areas and because of the highly respected resident Greek communities in these areas.

Second, Greece has an abundant labor force with a high sense of motivation and capable of learning quickly. The cost of labor in Greece is low by European standards, and should remain so for some time.

Third, the laws protecting foreign investment are as comprehensive as any in the world. Productive foreign investment can receive protection under a law which has constitutional validity. In order to facilitate foreign investments the administrative apparatus of the Ministry of Coordination is being reorganized. The Industrial Development Corporation and the Economic Development Financing Organization will be merged into a new institution designed to contribute capital to foreign and domestic firms in areas where private financial institutions cannot normally go. In addition, the new organization will produce studies and provide assistance whenever requested. Our investment budget will shortly contain a program for establishing industrial estates in various parts of Greece which will greatly simplify the problem of setting up factories.

Fourth, Greece is a politically stable country, organized on democratic lines. The present Government will have a 4-year mandate to carry out its programs. The peaceful change in administration which took place last February implies no change in the country's basic commitment to the free enterprise system and, in particular, toward the position of the foreign investor in Greece.

Lastly, the foreign investor will find in Greece a Government which is development minded in the most responsible sense of the word. We intend to mobilize the resources of the economy within the framework of sound financial policies and a free enterprise system.

In conclusion, I would like to mention our New York office for the promotion of the U.S. investment in Greece. This office, under the able direction of Messrs. Sismanidis and Mahon, is at your disposal, with no obligation. It offers free information and free guidance. It can establish contacts for you in Greece and help you to understand the legal and economic advantages of investing in Greece.

BALTIC STATES RESOLUTION

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the Baltic States of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania were among the first people in the 20th century to lose their freedom to Soviet colonialism. Through political, religious, social, and economic persecution, however, they have clung to the hope that freedom might one day be theirs.

To the free world, and particularly to the uncommitted new nations, these three lands serve as a painful reminder of the aims of the world Communist movement, which is the conquest of all free peoples.

The delegates of the Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian organizations of New York have endorsed a resolution commemorating Soviet occupation of the Baltic States in June 1940 and the mass deportation of their compatriots which began in 1941.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this resolution, signed on June 14, 1964, printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The delegates of the Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian organizations of New York, representing 60,000 loyal citizens and permanent residents of the United States of America, gathered on this 14th day of June 1964, at 29 West 57th Street, New York, to commemorate the anniversary of the Soviet occupation of the Baltic States in June 1940 and the mass deportation of their compatriots to Siberia beginning in 1941;

Recalling Soviet aggression against the Baltic States resulting in the suppression of their independence and freedom;

Considering that the continuation of Soviet colonial rule in the Baltic States is the denial of the right to self-determination and the prolongation of the Soviet genocide policy;

Remembering that the program of the Soviet Communist party is to Russianize the peoples of the Baltic States;

Reminding that large numbers of Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian people are still being forcibly detained in Soviet labor camps regions:

Resolved—

1. To renew their solemn protest against the usurpation by the Soviet Government of the sovereign rights of the Baltic nations and the transformation of the once progressive and prosperous Baltic States into colonies of the Soviet Union.

2. To ask the governments of the free world, and especially that of the United States, to undertake all ways and means to restore the exercise of the rights of self-determination in the Baltic countries and in the rest of East-Central Europe.

3. To request the U.S. delegation to the United Nations to demand that the abolishment of Soviet rule in the Baltic States be included in the agenda of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

4. To request the U.S. delegation to ask the United Nations to put an end to inhuman practices of the Soviet Government in the Baltic States.

5. To draw the attention of newly emerged nations of Africa and Asia to the evils of Soviet colonialism in the Baltic States.

6. To renew the dedication of the peoples of the Baltic nations to the cause of liberty and to reaffirm their determination to continue together with other captive nations of East-Central Europe the struggle against Soviet occupation and oppression.

HEIKKI LEESMENT,
President of the Estonian National Committee in the United States.
KARLIS V. BALODIS,
President of Council of American Latvian Organization of New York, Inc.
ALBERT OSLAPAS,
President of Lithuanian American Council of Greater New York.

NEW YORK, N.Y., *June 14, 1964.*

RESOLUTION REQUESTING REMOVAL OF JORDANIAN MURAL AT WORLD'S FAIR

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the World's Fair is an exciting display of the products and culture of the world's nations. This year's fair in Flushing, particularly dramatizes the spirit of international cooperation exemplified in the United Nations.

Yet an outrageous display of defiance of this spirit, in the mural at the Jordanian pavilion is in flagrant violation of the rules of the fair. The fair is no place for hate literature or hate propaganda of any kind.

In view of this, the conference committee of National Jewish Women's Organizations has drafted a resolution for removal of the Jordanian mural.

I ask unanimous consent to have this resolution printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION REQUESTING REMOVAL OF OFFENSIVE MURAL DISPLAY AT THE NEW YORK WORLD'S FAIR

Whereas the theme of the New York World's Fair is "Peace Through Understanding," and this evidence of evil propaganda is inconsistent with that spirit and intent; and

Whereas this act also violates one of the rules of the New York World's Fair Corp. which reads: "The Fair Corp. will not permit the operation of a concession or an exhibit which reflects discredit upon any nation or state or which bears a misleading geographic appellation": Therefore be it

Resolved, That the conference committee of National Jewish Women's Organizations, at its meeting on May 4, 1964, unanimously urges the officials of the New York World's Fair and the mayor of New York City, Hon. Robert F. Wagner, to act on this matter at the earliest possible date and cause this controversial object to be removed. Such action on the part of these responsible officials will be in keeping with the high standards of decency and regard for all peoples which has made New York City a beacon light for the civilized.

The conference committee of National Jewish Women's Organizations represent 10 national constituent organizations which include over 1 million American Jewish women. These member organizations are: B'nai B'rith Women, Hadassah, Mizrachi Women's Organization of America, National Council of Jewish Women, National Federation of Temple Sisterhoods, National Women's League of the United Synagogue, Pioneer Women's Organizations, Women's American ORT, Women's Branch, Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America, and Women's Division, American Jewish Congress.

HOW RELIABLE IS INFORMATION SUBMITTED TO CONGRESS?

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the shocking story of how the American public is being misled by the administration is contained in a report of the Comptroller General of the United States.

The information as related in the June 3 report, I am afraid, will cast suspicion on every program initiated on the premise that it will alleviate the unemployment problems of the Nation.

The Comptroller General's report examines the accuracy and reliability of information submitted to the Congress by the Area Redevelopment Administration on its accelerated public works program.

The information reported to the Congress by the Area Redevelopment Administration can be summed up in one word—"unreliable."

Let me read some excerpts from that report:

> In our examination in the accuracy and reliability of selected information pertaining to the accelerated public works program * * * we found that the reports contained significant overstatements of jobs estimated to be created by accelerated public works projects approved by the Community Facilities Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency.
>
> As the Community Facilities Administration projects account for almost one-half of all funds appropriated for the accelerated public works program, these overstatements take on added significance.

Incidentally, the total funds appropriated for this program are just shy of $900 million.

Here is what the investigation turned up:

First. A comparison of the estimated 21,814 man-months of work reported for the 190 projects reviewed with the 9,553 on-site man-months actually worked shows that the estimates were overstated by about 128 percent.

Second. If what was found in the 190 projects holds true for the other projects, the estimated 55,300 onsite man-years of work for the 2,842 projects approved would appear to be overstated by about 31,000 man-years.

Third. Of the 50,853 on-site man-months reported as having actually been worked, it is estimated that they were overstated by about 83 percent.

Fourth. In projecting this percentage of overstatement to the 1,228 projects under construction last November, indications are that the reported 131,942 actual on-site man-months of work were overstated by about 60,000 man-months.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have an additional minute.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, if this program of accelerated public works is providing the needed impetus in taking up the slack in the unemployment, then it should stand on its merits. There is no need to fool the people.

But if the program is failing, then the public is entitled to this knowledge. The Congress should be furnished the true facts so that it can initiate measures of corrective action.

A demonstrated waste of taxpayers' money, a demonstrated attempt to pull the wool over the eyes of the Congress and the public, can only result in souring the Congress and the public toward any such programs in the future.

I ask unanimous consent that the introduction to the report of the Comptroller General be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the introduction to the report of the Comptroller General was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C., June 3, 1964.

To the SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

The PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE OF THE SENATE.

In our examination into the accuracy and reliability of selected information pertaining to the accelerated public works program reported to the Congress and other interested parties by the Area Redevelopment Administration, Department of Commerce, we found that the reports contained significant overstatements of the number of jobs estimated to be created by accelerated public works projects approved by the Community Facilities Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency. We found also that the reports contained overstatements with respect to the number of actual man-months of work created by Community Facilities Administration-approved projects already under construction.

A comparison of the estimated 21,814 man-months of work reported by the Area Redevelopment Administration for the 190 projects included in this review with the 9,553 on-site man-months actually worked on these projects shows that the estimates were overstated by 12,261 man-months, or about 128 percent. If what we found in the 190 projects is true for the other Community Facilities Administration projects, the estimated 55,300 on-site man-years of work for the 2,842 projects approved by the Community Facilities Administration as of November 1, 1963, would appear to be overstated by about 31,000 man-years. The total number of man-years of work estimated to be created by all projects approved by the various participating departments and agencies as of November 1, 1963, was 93,400. Our examination also disclosed that the 50,853 on-site man-months reported as having actually been worked on 497 Community Facilities Administration projects were overstated by 23,008 man-months, or about 83 percent. Projecting this percentage of overstatement to that agency's 1,228 projects under construction at November 1, 1963, indicates that the reported 131,942 actual on-site man-months of work were overstated by about 60,000 man-months.

The overstatements resulted from inaccurate estimates by the applicants for grants and from the Community Facilities Administration's use of these inaccurate estimates, rather than contractor payroll information, to calculate the amount of actual on-site employment. As the Community Facilities Administration projects account for almost one-half of all funds appropriated for the accelerated public works program, these overstatements take on added significance.

The Community Facilities Administration and the Area Redevelopment Administration separately reviewed project payrolls and arrived at basically the same results as we did concerning the overestimates. Neither agency believes, however, that the projects reviewed are representative of all the Community Facilities Administration projects. The reviews covered almost all that agency's projects completed at the time, included large and small projects in large and small communities, accounted for about 15 percent of all the agency's projects under construction, and accounted for over 6 percent of all the agency's projects approved as of November 1, 1963.

After being advised of the nature and extent of our findings, the Area Redevelopment Administration revised the format of its report so that it no longer shows the cumulative number of man-months of on-site work created by individual projects. In addition, the Area Redevelopment Administration changed the method of determining on-site man-months of employment from the actual basis previously prescribed to a basis using the number of workers on the project site on one given day of the month.

We believe the change in the format of the directory and the change in the basis for determining on-site employment will not result in a meaningful report of the progress and accomplishments of the accelerated public works program with respect to the creation of employment. Accordingly, we are recommending that the Administrator of the Area Redevelopment Administration devise a reporting system which can be used consistently to provide meaningful cumulative information on actual on-site man-months of work created by accelerated public works projects.

We are also recommending that the Administrator of the Area Redevelopment Administration take steps to improve the reliability of the information reported in the directories of approved accelerated public works projects by periodically verifying information reported and evaluating procedures used to obtain such information. We are also recommending that the Commissioner, Community Facilities Administration, take steps to provide that procedures followed by that agency result in accurate reporting on its portion of the program. The Administrator has informed us that the Area Redevelopment Administration is giving serious consideration to our recommendation.

JOSEPH CAMPBELL.

SOLICITATION ACTIVITIES OF DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE AMONG GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, last January 23, I called attention to solicitation activities of the Democratic National Committee among career Government employees.

I declared at that time that the Democratic National Committee has other sources from which to draw upon without placing Government employees in the untenable position of being forced to attend a $100 a ticket Democratic fundraising event on May 26. I felt then, as I still do, that such action is highly unethical and unfair—whether it be the Democratic Central Committee or the Republican Central Committee.

I hoped that this pressure tactic would be repudiated by Mr. Johnson and the responsible leaders of the Democratic Party. But it seems I hoped in vain.

According to an article appearing in the Washington Sunday Star of May 17, under the respected byline of Columnist Joseph Young, the Democratic National Committee stepped up its drive to get career Government employees to attend the affair on May 26. And, in fact, the drive apparently took on new facets—which, if permitted to continue, could very well spell the death knell of the civil service system as we know it today.

I quote several paragraphs from that column:

> During the past week employees of grade 13 and above in the Agency for International Development, which is seeking to select out employees without regard to civil service laws, received invitations.
>
> The invitations they more or less expected. But what chilled them was their civil service grade number written in ink on the corner of the invitation cards.
>
> AID employees feel this is a not-too-subtle way of telling them their Agency expects them to attend if they hope to avoid the fate of being selected out of their jobs, should AID get this authority.

Mr. President, if AID furnished the Democratic National Committee the names of these employees, it is a clear violation of the law. It appears that the Agency did do so since, as Mr. Young put it:

> The situation regarding AID employees and the fact that their grades were written on their invitations suggest the information may have come from AID.

AID officials have denied the information came officially from the Agency. But as anyone knows who has been around Washington for any time, it is rare when anything comes officially from any agency. But whether or not AID supplied the names, an investigation should be conducted to ascertain the sources from whence the names came.

If this situation is permitted to continue, it will spread—if, in fact, it already has not. To point this up, Mr. Young wrote a followup article on May 20 indicating that other Government agencies took the hint and, through various means of pressure of their own, brought pressure on employees to attend the affair.

As spelled out by the columnist, these agencies include the General Services Administration and the Rural Electrification Administration.

The civil service system should not be used as an instrument through which pressure of any kind can be exerted upon employees for political ends. Veiled threats undermine the system itself, and it brings discredit upon both the employees and the system.

These tactics of pressuring career employees must be halted. And President Johnson can do much to restore the good name of the Civil Service if he would publicly repudiate what has been occurring.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the articles, entitled "Drive Stepped Up To Sell Employees $100 Tickets to Affair for Johnson," and "Pressure on U.S. Employees To Buy $100 Dinner Tickets Protested," be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Star, May 17, 1964]

DRIVE STEPPED UP TO SELL EMPLOYEES $100 TICKETS TO AFFAIR FOR JOHNSON

(By Joseph Young)

The Democratic National Committee is stepping up its drive to get Government career employees to attend the $100 a plate affair in honor of President Johnson on May 26 at the District of Columbia Armory.

Thousands of career employees in grade 9 and above have received invitations from the Democratic National Committee in the past few weeks. Many thousands of others had received invitations and followup letters during the past 3 months.

And the Democratic National Committee apparently has devised a new wrinkle to pressure Government careerists into attending.

During the past week employees of grade 13 and above in the Agency for International Development, which is seeking legislation to select out employees without regard to civil service laws, received invitations.

The invitations they more or less expected. But what chilled them was their civil service grade number written in ink on the corner of the invitation cards.

AID employees feel this is a not too subtle way of telling them their agency expects them to attend if they hope to avoid the fate of being selected out of their jobs, should AID get this authority.

While letters sent to Government employees at their homes, soliciting funds for political purposes, are not a violation of Federal laws, it is a violation if names of employees were furnished by the agencies for which they work.

It long has been taken for granted that many agencies do furnish such information to political organizations, but this is very difficult to prove.

However, the situation regarding AID employees and the fact that their grades were written on their invitations suggest the information may have come from AID.

AID officials emphatically deny the information came officially from the agency.

They acknowledge there are hundreds of organizational charts bearing the names of AID employees, their grades, job duties, etc., that are intended for official use only, and that someone at AID could have furnished a chart to the Democratic committee. They declare, however, that if this happened it was without the approval of AID.

[From the Washington Star, May 20, 1964]

PRESSURE ON U.S. EMPLOYEES TO BUY $100 DINNER TICKETS PROTESTED

(By Joseph Young)

Increasing pressure is being brought to bear on Government career employees to attend Tuesday's $100 a ticket testimonial affair for President Johnson at the District of Columbia Armory.

Some agencies are following up the Democratic National Committee's mailed "invitations" to attend the affair by various means of pressure of their own to get their employees to buy tickets.

General Services Administration career employees have complained that in some instances their immediate bosses have emphasized the agency's desire to make a "good record" in regard to ticket buying and urged that they purchase the $100 ducats.

Representative NELSEN, Republican, of Minnesota, charges that Rural Electrification Administration employees are being coerced into buying the $100 tickets.

In a letter to President Johnson, Mr. NELSEN, who formerly was REA administrator, charged that REA officials are selling the tickets to the employees on the agency premises in violation of civil service rules which prohibit solicitation of political funds or selling of political party tickets in Federal buildings.

Mr. NELSEN said he has received complaints from REA employees in grades 13 and above that they are being called to the office of their boss and told to buy the $100 tickets. In some cases their checks are being accepted right in the building.

Many thousands of Government career employees here in grades 11 and above have received invitations to attend the $100 affair from the Democratic National Committee. Now, as the affair draws near, some of the agencies are getting into the act to "persuade" their employees to accept the "invitation."

CEASE-FIRE CALLED FOR IN LAOS—WHY NOT IN SOUTH VIETNAM?

HOW MUCH BETTER THAN GOP SOUTHEAST ASIA ALL-OUT WAR POLICY

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I rise to congratulate President Johnson and Secretary of State Dean Rusk on their joining Britain, Canada, Thailand, and South Vietnam in calling for a cease-fire in Laos.

So far so good, and a most hopeful sign of possibly a new orientation in our southeast Asia policy.

But our action in calling for a cease-fire in Laos should be extended to include a call for a cease-fire in South Vietnam.

On June 3, 1964, I stated on the floor of the Senate:

> A United Nations sponsored cease-fire in South Vietnam is needed now.
>
> It is becoming increasingly evident to more and more people in the United States—as well as to our allies around the globe—that the undeclared war in South Vietnam into which the United States has needlessly injected itself, can and will ultimately be settled only at the conference table. It cannot and will not be settled by military might.

In the more than 3 weeks that have elapsed since then, we have seen an increase in bellicose talks about what we are prepared to do to escalate the undeclared war in South Vietnam; we have read about more deaths of U.S. fighting "advisers" in battle, and have witnessed a complete shifting of the U.S. command in South Vietnam.

And, in recent days, we have read about a Republican policy work-group recommendation on what we should do in South Vietnam that is so unrealistic and so "far out" as to be positively frightening. The GOP policy statement—if adopted by the Republican Party—would make it truly a war party and is in sharp contrast to the President's recent move to contain the conflict in Laos by calling for a cease-fire to stop the senseless loss of human life there, to stabilize the situation, and to bring the issues to the conference table.

This is the policy I continue to urge be extended to South Vietnam.

One thing that can be stated with certainty with respect to our military excursion into South Vietnam: we are not there to subjugate the people of that country to our will and to make of that country an American colony. It is not now and never has been the policy of the United States to conquer foreign countries.

The GOP would-be foreign policymakers would now have the United States reverse its traditional principles and seek to conquer other nations militarily and hold them subjugated by military might.

What is the proposed GOP foreign policy vis-a-vis South Vietnam?

The final report of the Republican task force on "American Strategy and Strength" has this to say about South Vietnam:

> The United States must make a full-scale commitment to halt Communist China's military expansion and subversion in Asia and in the Pacific.
>
> A victory in South Vietnam over the military and subversive threats of communism is urgently required. We must repeal today's complacent commitment "to prevent a Communist victory" and substitute a commitment to insure a victory for freedom. And, once southeast Asia is free to pursue the development of democratic institutions of its own choice, the United States should then be prepared to help stabilize the area and to protect it from the Communist virus.

This belligerent Republican statement is alarming enough when one realizes that its main emphasis is on war rather than peace. It becomes even more frightening in the context of the interpretation given it by the chairman of the task force, Congressman Gerald R. Ford, of Michigan.

When questioned by reporters, Congressman Ford stated that the following steps should be taken immediately:

> American forces must take command of the forces in Vietnam and not simply remain advisers. He called the present policy one reason why we haven't done as well as we should have done.
>
> U.S. strategy ought to be aimed at sealing off South Vietnam, preventing the infiltration from North Vietnam. Mr. Ford said this could be done by sending more U.S. special forces to Vietnam.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire account in the New York Times for June 30, 1964, dealing with the GOP report be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Nelson in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, these two suggestions are patently absurd, unrealistic, and dangerous. Even in a political year and to serve political ends they should not be made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator may have 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, theoretically, there is a legitimate government in South Vietnam—however much it may be our puppet government. At least we consider it sufficiently legitimate to utilize its request for assistance as justification for our military operations there.

Now come the GOP would-be foreign policymakers and suggest that General Westmoreland push General Khanh aside and take over the running of South Vietnam. Presumably the South Vietnamese—after fighting and dying for years to drive the French out of the country—would cheer loudly as the U.S. conquerors usurped their government.

Our able and distinguished majority leader, Senator Mike Mansfield, is to be highly commended for his remarks yesterday in which he accurately pointed out the utter folly of the GOP proposal for the U.S. takeover of the South Vietnamese Government. With his intimate knowledge of events in southeast Asia, Senator Mansfield correctly labeled the GOP proposal as a purely political statement designed to drag South Vietnam into the forthcoming presidential campaign as a political issue.

What makes the GOP would-be foreign policymakers believe that the Vietnamese officers would take orders from U.S. officers?

And, if we forcibly deposed those officers, what makes the GOP would-be foreign policymakers believe that the Vietnamese soldiers would obey the commands of U.S. officers to go out and fight when the Vietnamese officers are having difficulty making them do so?

And, if the Vietnamese soldiers refused to fight on the orders of U.S. officers would we punish them? If we did, what would we be punishing them for? For treason against the Government of South Vietnam, which we deposed?

Or would we be punishing them for treason against the United States, to which they owe no loyalty?

We would soon find that the South Vietnamese soldiers were staying behind while U.S. soldiers went out to fight the Vietcong.

This would amount to U.S. soldiers fighting against Vietcong soldiers—many of them brothers, and fathers, and cousins of the South Vietnamese soldiers who were no longer fighting.

Of course there is always the difficulty of recognizing a Vietcong from a Vietnamese. They wear no distinguishing marks. Their thoughts and loyalties do not appear in their appearance.

But then look at the world position of the United States if we followed the advice of the Republican foreign policymakers. The world would see U.S. soldiers—and only U.S. soldiers—fighting a war of conquest in Vietnam. It would again be white men pitted against the Vietnamese.

But suppose we won an apparent temporary military decision. Suppose we succeeded in identifying all the Vietcong and containing them behind barbed wire. Suppose we threw all the North Vietnamese out of South Vietnam, sealed the borders with U.S. soldiers, and had the country all to ourselves.

Where would we be then?

We would have the hundreds of thousands of Vietcong men, women, and children behind barbed wire. We would have to fed and clothe them well into the future.

We would have to continue to govern the remaining South Vietnamese well into the future.

We would have to seal off the borders with U.S. soldiers well into the future. And we would have a U.S. colony in southeast Asia.

This might have been considered an accomplishment in the 15th or 16th centuries, but not in the 20th century where the rule of international law should be given at least lipservice.

What about the South Vietnamese people not behind bars as suspected Vietcong? Would we have instilled in them a love of the United States as the great peacemaker who killed or imprisoned their fathers, brothers, and cousins? Would we have to remain in that country forever to insure that the prisoners were not released? Is this the way to spread the light of democracy abroad?

It most assuredly is not.

The GOP would-be policymakers are advocating war and the perpetual colonization of South Vietnam and its peoples.

The action to be taken with respect to South Vietnam is to wage peace—to call for a cease-fire immediately and to take the matter before the United Nations.

The United States and some of its allies have taken the first step along that road in Laos. The time has come to call for an immediate cease-fire not only in Laos, but in South Vietnam as well. And it should be within, not outside, the auspices of the United Nations.

Those who oppose this logical and peaceful approach to a potentially dangerous situation attempt to find objections wherever they can.

First of all let us repeat that we are not adhering to article 33 of the charter which states:

> The parties to any dispute, the continuance of which is likely to endanger the main-

> tenance of international peace and security, shall first of all, seek a solution by negotiation, enquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, judicial settlement, resort to regional agencies or arrangements, or other peaceful means of their own choice.

There also are those who say that the United Nations is not a proper forum because Red China and North Vietnam are not members of the United Nations. Article 32 of chapter V of the United Nations Charter makes specific provisions for such a situation when it states:

> Any member of the United Nations which is not a member of the Security Council or any state which is not a member of the United Nations, if it is a party to a dispute under consideration by the Security Council, shall be invited to participate, without vote, in the discussion relating to the dispute. The Security Council shall lay down such conditions as it deems just for the participation of a state which is not a member of the United Nations.

The charter of the United Nations thus clearly contemplates that the Security Council will have before it disputes involving both member and nonmember states.

But, say the detractors from this peaceful approach, the Soviet Union in the Security Council will surely veto any call for a cease-fire.

There are two answers to these detractors.

In the first place, let us at least try this route and see. If the Soviet Union does veto the proposal in the Security Council it will be held up before all the world as blocking a peaceful solution to a threat to the security of the world.

In the second place, if the Security Council route is blocked, we can proceed to the General Assembly. Under the "uniting for peace" resolution adopted by the General Assembly on November 3, 1950—at the time of the Korean crisis—it is provided:

The General Assembly—

> *Resolves,* That if the Security Council, because of lack of unanimity of the permanent members, fails to exercise its primary responsibility for the maintenance of the international peace and security in any case where there appears to be a threat to the peace, breach of the peace, or act of aggression, the General Assembly shall consider the matter immediately with a view to making appropriate recommendations to members for collective measures, including in the case of a breach of the peace or act of aggression the use of armed force when necessary, to maintain or restore international peace and security. If not in session at the time, the General Assembly may meet in emergency special session within 24 hours of the request therefor. Such emergency special session shall be called if requested by the Security Council on the vote of any seven members, or by a majority of the members of the United Nations.

There are ways to a peaceful solution in Vietnam and in all southeast Asia if we would but pursue them.

James Reston in the New York Times on July 1 put his finger on the difficulties inherent in heeding the warlike utterances of the GOP would-be foreign policy makers when he stated:

> Something very odd is happening here to the Republican Party, when responsible leaders of the GOP like Ford, who for years have been contrasting the Republicans as the "party of peace" with the Democrats as the "war party," are now calling for instant victory in a jungle war 8,000 miles from home, right up against the borders of China which commands the allegiance of almost a quarter of the human race.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Reston's entire column be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the United Nations route is the only route to follow in southeastern Asia. President Johnson and Secretary Rusk, having taken the first step in that direction with respect to Laos, should be encouraged to take the next step to bring the South Vietnamese problem before the United Nations.

The advice given by the GOP would-be foreign policymakers should be recognized and labeled for what it is—a political attempt to drag into the presidential campaign an issue which should be above politics and to take a stand which, even though unrealistic, impractical, and dangerous, sounds alluring to the unknowing.

But this siren call of the GOP would-be foreign policymakers will not prove alluring to the vast majority of the American people faced with the loss of their loved ones in the steaming jungles of far-off South Vietnam. The mail I have been receiving proves that. It is running better than 100 to 1 in favor of my stand that we should take the Vietnam issue out of the battlelines and place it on the conference table in the United Nations.

[From the New York Times, June 30, 1964]

Exhibit No. 1

GOP Bloc Scores Policy in Vietnam—House Group Says United States Has "Why Win?" Stance—Urges Stepped-Up Fight on Reds

Washington, June 29.—A group of Republican Representatives, opposing the views of Henry Cabot Lodge, thrust the Vietnam war further into the political arena today.

It accused the Johnson administration of following a "Why win?" policy in South Vietnam and recommended a more active U.S. role in an intensified effort against Red guerrillas.

The Republican House group, headed by Gerald R. Ford, of Michigan, made its attack on Vietnam policy part of a general criticism of what it called the Democratic administration's pervasive softness against the worldwide threat of communism.

"The administration's tragically misguided reading of Soviet intentions has become the impetus for a new mood of misplaced trust and accommodation," the group's report said. "We are letting down our guard."

TWO STEPS SUGGESTED

Pressed for an explanation of how the Republicans would wage war in South Vietnam, Representative Ford told a news conference that these steps should be taken immediately:

"American forces must take command of the forces in Vietnam and not simply remain advisers." He called the present policy one reason why we haven't done as well as we should have done.

U.S. strategy "ought to be aimed at sealing off South Vietnam, preventing the infiltration from North Vietnam." Mr. Ford said this could be done by sending more U.S. Special Forces to Vietnam.

Special forces are units trained intensively in guerrilla combat.

Mr. Ford said Republicans would wait to see how these worked before suggesting other steps. Other steps that have been advocated by critics of the administration have included the bombing of Communist supply lines in Communist North Vietnam.

Mr. Lodge, who has resigned as Ambassador to South Vietnam to help Gov. William W. Scranton, of Pennsylvania, fight Senator Barry Goldwater, of Arizona, for the Republican presidential nomination, told newsmen today that "I don't see how it is practical to make this (the war in South Vietnam) a political issue."

"Obviously there is no victory yet," Mr. Lodge said. "But I believe that if we persist, there isn't any question at all that there will be a victory in South Vietnam.

Asked about the difference between the task force and Mr. Lodge, Mr. Ford replied:

"We are worse off there (Vietnam) than we were 4 years ago. If Lodge believes we have been successful, we are in opposition."

Mr. Ford, however, declined to assign any responsibility for any lack of success to Mr. Lodge.

"Lodge has been carrying out policies enunciated by the White House," Mr. Ford said.

Asked whether Vietnam should be a campaign issue, Mr. Ford replied:

"The problem of South Vietnam will be a legitimate area of political discussion from now until November."

The task force was composed of some of the most influential Republicans in the House. Mr. Ford is chariman of the House Republican Conference.

Some others on the task force are:

Melvin R. Laird, of Wisconsin, who will head the platform committee at the Republican National Convention; William E. Miller, of upstate New York, the Republican national chairman; Leslie C. Arends, of Illinois, the assistant Republican leader in the House and the ranking Republican on the House Armed Services Committee; and Frances P. Bolton, of Ohio, the ranking Republican on the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

Exhibit No. 2

[From the New York Times, July 1, 1964]

How To Make Things Worse Than They Really Are

(By James Reston)

Washington, June 30.—The first major foreign policy issue of the election campaign is developing over Vietnam, and it illustrates the dangers of letting campaign rhetoric influence fundamental decisions on peace and war.

The Republicans are insisting, quite rightly, that Vietnam is a proper subject for criticism and debate between the parties, but they are also insisting that the policy of the United States in that country must be to achieve total victory.

The Johnson administration is less adventuresome. Its stated aim there is to prevent a Communist victory, but lately, under the pressure of events in Saigon and of politics here, it has been talking rather more boldly about winning the war there, and Secretary of State Rusk has even gone as far as to suggest that the defense of Vietnam is as vital to the security of the United States as the defense of Berlin and West Germany.

FRANCE'S AGONY

Before we confuse what is good politics with what is good policy or even good sense, maybe we should take a look at the history of that melancholy peninsula. The French were in control there for 70 years, except during the Japanese occupation during World War II.

They finally gave up and left just 10 years ago this coming month, at 0340 Geneva time, July 21, 1964 to be exact. They were not merely advising the anti-Communist Vietnamese against Ho Chi Minh's Communist Vietminh guerrillas. They had 400,000 of their best troops directly involved in the struggle and they were beaten, though even the French received considerable aid from the United States in the last years of the struggle.

Over a period of 8 years, that war cost France 172,000 casualties. The Vietminh lost a quarter of a million. Economically, from 1945 to 1955, France lost 10 times the total value of its vast investments in that country, and as Bernard B. Fall reports in "The Two Vietnams," "The French Army came out of the war a gaunt ghost of its former self, the cream of its regular officers dead and crippled, the rest of them embittered."

It is true that conditions there are not the same. The United States is guiding a counterinsurgency war there primarily to gain time to create a counterrevolution, but this is a slow business, and this is precisely the issue the Republicans are raising.

It is not only Senator GOLDWATER who is calling for a strategy of total victory, but the House Republican policy committee issued a detailed report this week that puts the point in more specific terms.

"A victory in South Vietnam over the military and subversive threats of communism," it said, "is urgently required. We must repeal today's complacent commitment to prevent a Communist victory and substitute a commitment to insure a victory for freedom."

But how is this to be done? Who is to repeal it? The committee does not tell us, but Representative GERALD R. FORD, of Michigan, the chairman of the House Republican conference and ranking Republican on the Defense Appropriations Committee who issued the report, wants the United States itself to take over the conduct of the war.

Something very odd is happening here to the Republican Party, when responsible leaders of the GOP like FORD, who for years have been contrasting the Republicans as the party of peace with the Democrats as the war party, are now calling for instant victory in a jungle war 8,000 miles from home, right up against the borders of China, which commands the allegiance of almost a quarter of the human race.

The Republican Party has managed to occupy the White House for only 8 out of the last 32 years, and it got there then only because General Eisenhower was regarded rightly as a prudent, experienced, and peaceful man.

Yet his successors in the party that is supposed to have unusual respect for history are now complaining, not that we are doing too much, but that we are doing too little; not that we should limit our objectives and our risks but that, as the Ford committee says, we should take the initiative in effecting a revolution of liberty throughout the world.

KENNAN'S WARNING

When George Kennan, who is one of our most experienced and articulate students of foreign affairs, came at the end of his diplomatic career to sum up his views of America's diplomatic blunders of the past, he blamed in particular:

"The American tendency to view any war in which we might be involved, not as a means of achieving limited objectives in the way of changes in a given status quo but as a struggle to the death between total virtue and total evil."

The United States has slowly, very slowly, come to ponder the wisdom of this observation in Vietnam, but in the emotion of the campaign, this limited exercise will be savagely attacked, and all we can hope is that the administration will not be pushed in the process into political promises it will not want to redeem in the future.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF U.S. CHAMBER OF COMMERCE ON ECONOMY PROGRAM FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 1965

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a communication from the U.S. Chamber of Commerce in which the economy program for the fiscal year 1965 is outlined.

There being no objection, the recommendations were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ATTACHMENT A

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE UNITED STATES RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE FISCAL 1964 (SUPPLEMENTAL) AND FISCAL 1965 BUDGET REQUESTS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND RELATED AGENCIES

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

Conservation operations:

Budget request	$98, 750, 000
Recommended reduction	707, 000

This program should not require additional funds. According to the budget request, all but $707,000 of the estimated $2.2 million increased costs for 1965 are to be offset by savings through increased efficiency. The budget indicates a reduction of 140 in the average number of employees for this program, a reduction of 3 million acres subject to conservation and no increase in the number of landowners and operators assisted. Further savings should be possible from additional district consolidations and increased financial support from established districts. Increased local contributions could also help overcome the backlog of unpublished survey reports, for which $300,000 has been requested.

Great Plains conservation program:

Budget request	$14, 744, 000
Recommended reduction	1, 127, 000

An annual increase in Federal funds is not essential to apply soil-conserving practices to an ever-increasing acreage of cropland. The requested increase is based primarily on the accumulation of applications for cost-share assistance, in which the Government shares up to 80 percent of the cost. It stands to reason that if the Government's percentage share was reduced, particularly on the less expensive conservation practices, the same amount of funds would provide assistance to more ranchers and cut down on the backlog of applicants. The number of applicants may decline very little, if any. In fact, the acreage treated would increase. Furthermore, participants would be more inclined to respond to the Department's suggestion that they "use other available sources of assistance," such as the nationwide agricultural conservation program under which the average cost-share portion of the Federal Government is only 50 percent.

POVERTY PROGRAM

The drive on poverty will trigger a variety of additional programs for congressional consideration. Duplication of services, benefits, and expenditures among the various programs will be inevitable on such a scale. There is already excessive overlapping among existing Federal programs of this type.

It is therefore especially important that a thorough and objective review be made to ascertain the extent and adequacy of existing poverty-type programs for rural areas before superimposing new ones. A number of these Department of Agriculture programs have been in existence for many years. However, there are several new ones in the developmental stage and more are being proposed. It is incomprehensible that consideration is being given to establishment of still more programs before those already in existence have been subjected to a searching analysis to determine their impact, if any, upon the problems they purport to solve. Such analysis would suggest necessary changes in existing programs and whether or not additional programs are needed.

Specific budget recommendations and related justifications for each program follow:

Soil Conservation Service

Resource conservation and development:

Budget request	$2, 044, 000
Recommended reduction	2, 044, 000

This is a new program which is just in the "project investigation and planning" stage. It is estimated that only $421,000 will have been spent by June 30, 1964. It is recommended that no additional program activity be authorized, subject to the comprehensive study referred to above.

Agricultural Marketing Service—Removal of surplus agricultural commodities

Food stamp program:

Budget request	$51, 125, 000
Recommended reduction	51, 125, 000

This program was initiated on a pilot basis to obtain an evaluation of its administrative feasibility and to determine if it would attain its stated objective. The experience gained from the 43 areas currently participating should be adequate for Congress to decide whether or not to enact specific enabling legislation for this purpose. Therefore, the national chamber recommends that this experimental program be terminated.

AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION AND CONSERVATION SERVICE

Cropland and conversion program

	1964	1965
Budget request:		
Under existing legislation	$10, 000, 000	$10, 000, 000
Under proposed legislation	40, 000, 000	40, 000, 000
Recommended reduction	50, 000, 000	50, 000, 000

This is another new program for which funds should be withheld pending more convincing justification of its value. No funds were appropriated for a 1964 program. The national chamber recommends against approval for funds, either under existing or proposed legislation. Projects through which the Secretary of Agriculture assists farmers to enter other competitive business enterprises should be appraised to determine economic soundness of such new ventures. There is no evidence to date that this is being done or is contemplated.

Farmers Home Administration

	Budget request	Recommended reduction
Salaries and expenses	$40, 284, 000	$1, 453, 000
Salaries and expenses (proposed legislation)	3, 000. 000	3, 000, 000
Rural renewal	2, 190, 000	990, 000
Rural housing for the elderly revolving fund	5, 000, 000	1, 500, 000
Rural housing insurance fund (proposed legislation)	100, 000, 000	100, 000, 000

The recommended reductions for these programs are likewise based on the need to conduct a comprehensive and coordinated study of all economic assistance programs pertaining to rural poverty. There is also substantial duplication between these programs and other existing governmental assistance programs.

Rural Electrification Administration

Loans (authorizations to expend from debt receipts):

Budget request	$495,000,000
Recommended reduction	181,600,000

The rural electrification loan program should be reduced to an amount which would make available approximately $183 million. This would result in a $116.6 million reduction from the planned $300 million program. Furthermore, there is no need to provide the $65 million reserve requested for fiscal year 1965.

The loan authorization requested for fiscal 1965 exceeds the amount needed to provide adequate electrical service for the Nation's farms. The continuation of a program at a level to provide electrical service on the basis of the needs of 1936 is no longer necessary nor desirable.

Rural electrification loan reductions could also be made by a more careful evaluation of loan applications and the financial resources of applicants. Additional reductions of funds requested can be achieved by reducing the number of loans granted for generation and transmission facilities when existing electric power suppliers are available to provide wholesale electrical energy to local electrical cooperatives.[1]

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS (PUBLIC LAW 480)

Titles I and II of Public Law 480 will expire December 31, 1964, unless extended by Congress. Title I authorizes sale of surplus agricultural commodities for foreign currencies. Title II provides emergency famine relief to friendly people in foreign countries.

The national chamber has recommended an alternative approach to the permanent extension of the Public Law 480 program. Attachment C is a copy of this recommendation as submitted to the Subcommittee on Foreign Agricultural Operations, Committee on Agriculture, U.S. House of Representatives, February 27, 1964. Until Government stockpiles are disposed of, however, we support the necessary interim extension of titles I and II if amended to make the use of counterpart funds for grants subject to specification in appropriation acts by the Congress.

Our budget recommendations under existing authority are as follows:

[In millions]

Title I, Public Law 480:	
Budget request	$1,893
Recommended reductions	481

The remaining authorization of $1,412 million would provide the $612 million needed to reimburse CCC for unrecovered 1964 costs and $800 million for additional sales under existing authority which terminates December 31, 1964.

Title II, Public Law 480:	
Budget request	$264,000,000
Recommended reductions	93,547,000

The remaining $170,453,000 would provide $20,453,000 to reimburse CCC for unrecovered 1964 costs and $150 million for additional emergency famine relief assistance under existing authority terminating December 31, 1964.

Summary table

Recommended reductions	1964	1965
SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE		
Conservation operations		$707,000
Great Plains conservation program		1,127,000
Resource conservation and development		2,044,000
AGRICULTURAL MARKETING SERVICE		
Food stamp program		51,125,000
AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION AND CONSERVATION SERVICE		
Cropland conversion program	$10,000,000	10,000,000
Do	[1] 40,000,000	[1] 40,000,000
FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION		
Salaries and expenses		1,453,000
Do		[1] 3,000,000
Rural renewal		990,000
Rural housing for the elderly revolving fund		1,500,000
Rural housing insurance fund		[1] 100,000,000
FOREIGN ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS		
Title I, Public Law 480		481,000,000
Title II, Public Law 480		93,547,000
RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION		
Electrification loan		116,587,000
Reserve account		65,000,000
Total (under existing legislation)	10,000,000	825,080,000
Total (under proposed legislation)	40,000,000	143,000,000

[1] Under legislation proposed for separate transmittal.

Thus the national chamber's combined recommended reductions on the Department of Agriculture and related agencies budget proposals for 1964 supplementals and for 1965 total $1,018,080,000. Of this total, $835,080,000 relates to appropriation requests before this subcommittee.

Attachment B

Manipulations in the Federal Budget for Agriculture

A review of U.S. Department of Agriculture budgets reveals this interesting and almost unbelievable fact: During 10 of the 12 years (1953–64) new budget requests were for less money than had been appropriated for the previous year. Yet the level of actual appropriations increased fivefold during the 12-year period.

The most common procedure for accomplishing this feat is through the use of a supplemental appropriation the following year to make up the deficit in the original appropriation request. This technique thus has the double effect of minimizing the level requested for the coming year and maximizing the current year's level. Thus, an apparent decline in a new budget request may end up as an increase when the supplementals are completed.

Other methods are employed to adjust (usually downward) the requests without affecting the amount actually being spent. A few of the techniques used in the 1965 budget are explained below. Some of these practices are not new. Others are. Although there may be other reasons for applying these techniques, they give the appearance of minimizing the NOA in the 1965 agriculture budget as compared to 1964.

1. COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

(a) Reimbursements: CCC has borrowing authority to provide funds for operation of the various price-support, export, supply, and related programs. Congress is then asked to appropriate the money to reimburse CCC for its net realized losses. The appropriation requested for fiscal year 1965 (which begins July 1, 1964) is to cover losses incurred by CCC during fiscal year 1963 (which ended June 30, 1963). The budget shows a request for $1,124,068,000 to reimburse CCC "for a portion of its 1963 realized losses." The total loss for 1963 was $2,654,900,000. The budget includes another request for $600 million under "appropriation to liquidate contract authorization" (which will be explained below). With this amount included, however, the total appropriation request of $1,724 million still falls short of the 1963 losses by $930.9 million. This deficit will have to be accounted for sooner or later in subsequent budget estimates.

(b) Contract authorization: The use of this device is complicated. Briefly, CCC has statutory authority to commit itself via contractual arrangements for more expenditures than its statutory capital limit of $14.5 billion. The Defense Department and the Atomic Energy Commission have required and used such contract authority to insure fulfillment of their specialized responsibilities. CCC has not been using this exceptional authority. However, an opportunity has been found in this provision to make it appear to the uninformed that the funds needed for CCC are considerably less than is the actual case.

Since CCC must be reimbursed with at least enough funds to meet its expected obligation, the budget request cannot shrink below this minimum, which is estimated to be the $1,724 million referred to above. But the NOA request for 1965 is for only $1,124,068,000. The difference of $599,932,000 is entered in parentheses under "appropriation to liquidate contract authorization." It is actually a part of the total request of $1,724 million. But it is listed in the budget as a partial liquidation of a previous contractual commitment. Such a commitment was, from all indications, a retroactively conceived "paper entry" within the legal limits of CCC's authority. Suffice it to say that CCC did not actually use this authority to contract. There are no real contracts to liquidate. It is merely an accounting technique to show a lower NOA value in the budget request and at the same time theoretically commit CCC to an obligation in excess of its $14.5 billion statutory limitation on its borrowing authority.

(c) Interest-free borrowing: A proposed revision in appropriation language, if approved, would relieve CCC from paying interest on borrowings from the Treasury. The interest-free borrowings would begin with fiscal year 1964 and apply to the amount of realized losses "sustained by the Corporation (1) during the fiscal year 1964 and succeeding fiscal years, and (2) in prior fiscal years, for which the Corporation has not been reimbursed by appropriations." This would limit interest expenses to borrowings for current operations and would avoid increasing future appropriation requests by interest charges resulting from past postponements in appropriations to reimburse CCC for previous losses.

The savings in appropriations resulting from this procedure would begin with fiscal year 1966. In addition to writing off the interest charges on CCC's unreimbursed losses up to June 30, 1963, no interest payment would be required for CCC's net borrowings from the Treasury for the current fiscal year (1964), which is estimated to be $3,811,900,000. At 3.75 percent that is a savings in CCC's budget for fiscal year 1966 of $143 million. This will help to offset the $931 million shortage in the proposed fiscal year 1965 reimbursement for CCC's realized losses. The net effect of interest-free borrowing is to conceal further the true costs of these programs.

---

[1] Report to the Congress of the United States on the "Possibilities for Reducing Federal Expenditures Under the Electrical Loan Program and Other Matters Pertaining to the Rural Electrification Administration Department of Agriculture" by the Comptroller General of the United States, November 1963.

2. SPECIAL MILK PROGRAM

The special milk program has now joined the growing list of privileged exceptions to the normal deductions from new obligational authority in the Agricultural Marketing Service account—"Removal of Surplus Agricultural Commodities." An amount equal to 30 percent of customs receipts (Public Law 320, sec. 32, 74th Cong.) is available each year as a permanent appropriation for expanding domestic and foreign markets for perishable agricultural commodities other than those receiving price supports. Special acts have subsequently permitted exceptions to those limitations, so long as the exceptions account for less than half of the total use of funds. The account is then set up to permit deducting from total customs receipts those exceptions (including the special milk program, part of the school-lunch program and two smaller items) before entering the remaining funds as available for NOA. Consequently the size of the NOA figure for 1965 ($173,727,000) under "Removal of Surplus Agricultural Commodities (sec. 32)," is reduced bv the amount of the special milk program—$99,831,000. It is another device for reducing the 1965 NOA figure without changing the amount of money to be obligated and spent. Furthermore, this is another general and continuing expenditure not subject to Appropriations Committee appraisal.

3. CROPLAND CONVERSION PROGRAM

The budget for this new program under the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service demonstrates how it is possible to ask for an increase in new spending authority of $80 million without showing any increase in NOA from 1964 to 1965. This can be done simply by requesting an increase in NOA by $40 million for both 1964 and 1965.

The agency charged with administration of this program has refrained from making contracts with farmers which commit the expenditure of funds in excess of the amount actually authorized in the appropriation bill. The law has been interpreted as giving the Secretary of Agriculture authority to make contractual commitments in advance of appropriations (similar to the contract authority privilege under CCC). Thus the request for new contract authority is shown as NOA and includes parenthetically the amount of the actual request for appropriated funds. By including the authority proposed under separate legislation, the Department is really seeking authority to spend $54,350,000 in 1964 ($11,350,000 of which is already spent) and $57 million in 1965.

4. MEAT AND POULTRY INSPECTION

The budget estimates a reduction of $49,472,000 for 1965 based on proposed legislation which would place the mandatory poultry and meat inspection services on a self-supporting basis. The budget also proposes to convert other minor regulatory programs to a voluntary and self-supporting basis. This would result in an estimated savings to the Government of roughly $30.1 million for meat inspection, $16.7 million for poultry inspection, and $2 million for other regulatory activities. The estimated savings are contingent upon proposed legislation.

5. RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

An attempt is again being made to change the basic legislation to permit financing REA loans from loan receipts on a revolving fund basis and thereby to reduce the appropriation from the Treasury. But if Congress does not change the legislation the appropriation request would be $347 million larger. On the other hand, if Congress does change the law, two effects are worth noting insofar as this subcommittee is concerned: (1) The "saving" will be a one-time shot; (2) congressional review of REA lending will be reduced to a review of only the amount requested in excess of loan repayments.

Adjusted budget totals

The following table contains only the major adjustments that should be made to USDA budget estimates to reflect more accurately the new obligational authority requested for 1965. Each of these adjustments serves to:

(1) Delete budget assumptions based on proposed changes in substantive legislation;

(2) Correct for postponement of obligations properly due in 1965; or

(3) Correct for accounting procedures which serve only to lower the 1965 NOA figures.

The number adjacent to each of the items in the table corresponds with the criterion above.

U.S. Department of Agriculture—New Obligational authority

[In thousands of dollars]

Items	1964	1965	Change
Total NOA (as reported in the budget)	7,264,900	5,955,952	−1,308,948
CCC: Reimbursements, to liquidate contract authority (3)		+599,932	
CCC: Reimbursement, NOA (2)		+930,900	
REA: Loan authorization (1)		+347,000	
FHA: Rural housing insurance fund (1)		−103,000	
ASCS: Cropland conversion program (1)	+14,350	+17,000	
ARS: Meat inspection (1)		+30,837	
ARS: Poultry and other inspection (1)		+18,635	
AMS: Removal of surplus agricultural commodities (special milk program) (3)		+99,831	
Total adjustments	+14,350	+1,941,135	
U.S. Department of Agriculture adjusted NOA	7,279,250	7,897,087	+617,837

Rather than effecting a reduction of $1.3 billion, the new obligational authority for 1965 exceeds 1964 by more than $600 million. The practical effect of this is to understate the 1965 NOA by nearly $2 billion.

ATTACHMENT C

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C., February 27, 1964.

Hon. W. R. POAGE,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Foreign Agricultural Operations, Committee on Agriculture, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. POAGE: We are submitting herewith a statement by the national chamber on the extension of Public Law 480, titles I and II, on which your subcommittee held hearings last week and for which permission was given to us to file this statement.

This statement was drafted last week by our agriculture committee and adopted by our board of directors on February 22.

We appreciate this opportunity to express the national chamber's views and to have them included in the record of your examination on this matter.

Sincerely,

THERON J. RICE,
Legislative Action General Manager.

STATEMENT OF THE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE UNITED STATES ON EXTENSION OF TITLES I AND II, PUBLIC LAW 480, UNDER CONSIDERATION BY THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL OPERATIONS, COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, FEBRUARY 27, 1964

The Chamber of Commerce of the United States, in recent appearances before the Congress to testify on wheat and cotton legislation, has recommended that the Federal Government be phased out of farm commodity purchases and disposal. In keeping with this position, the national chamber recommends that Public Law 480, popularly known as the Surplus Disposal Act, be eliminated and that in its place there be instituted a new program, built on these criteria:

1. Funds to provide famine relief and economic assistance to foreign nations should be authorized and appropriated directly by Congress. We believe the American people will continue to support, by this method, the humanitarian sharing of our agricultural abundance.

2. Distribution of agricultural commodities to foreign nations should be programed on the basis of the food and fiber needs of these nations. This will eliminate the attitude now held by some recipient nations that they are doing the United States a favor by accepting surplus agricultural commodities and thus relieving us of the "burden" of acquiring and maintaining surplus stocks.

3. Agricultural commodities aid to foreign nations under this program should be on the basis of purchase by the Federal Government of commodities on the domestic market at market prices. This would have a more salutary effect on farm income than the present program and would include commodities, other than those in surplus, needed to fulfill the requirements of recipient nations. Furthermore, this aspect of the program would eliminate the feeling that this part of our national policy is merely a subterfuge to get rid of surpluses which we can't use anyway, rather than a truly national concern for the welfare of others.

It should be noted that this new approach would remove from farmers the onus that Public Law 480 is just another farm program, chargeable to farm program costs.

The national chamber recognizes that the existing program under titles I and II of Public Law 480 cannot be changed overnight. Therefore, we support temporary extension of titles I and II if amended to make the "soft currencies" accumulated under title I subject to specific appropriation by the Congress, such as is proposed in H.R. 9993.

TRIBUTE TO JOAN KENNEDY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in the New York Post of June 28, there appears an article on Mrs. Ted Kennedy written by Paul Hoffman.

It is an exceptionally well done piece which provides an insight into the courage, the warmth, and the dedication of Joan Kennedy to her distinguished husband, our colleague, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

It is not often, Mr. President, that there comes to public view the immensely important role which a wife plays in the life and work of a Senator. In this instance it is in consequence of a near tragedy that attention has focused on Mrs. Ted Kennedy.

Those of us who know Joan Kennedy will recognize the accuracy of the portrait of her which is presented in the article previously referred to. She is a woman who has the beauty of character to see her husband through this period of pain to full recovery. She is a woman who has the intelligence and the strength and the energy to carry on in his behalf until he is able to resume. She is a fine and dedicated woman. She is, in short, an outstanding American—a Kennedy.

I ask unanimous consent that the article previously referred to be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Woman in the News—Mrs. Ted Kennedy

(By Paul Hoffman)

Early last Friday, Joan Kennedy flew from Washington to the Massachusetts Democratic convention in Springfield. She went alone. Her husband—Edward Moore Kennedy, 32, youngest son of former Ambassador Joseph P. Kennedy, youngest Member of the Senate—had stayed behind to vote for the civil rights bill.

As so often before, Joan Kennedy stood up at a party banquet and said a few words in her husband's behalf. She recalled the convention in Springfield 2 years before—a down-to-the-wire race for the Senate nomination between Kennedy and Edward McCormack. Then she told the delegates:

"I hope you'll be as generous with your votes tonight."

The line drew a big laugh. In 1964 there wasn't a Democratic delegate from Provincetown to Pittsfield who'd vote against Kennedy, who was up this time for the full 6-year term. The Senator, hooked up to the proceedings by a direct line from the Capitol in Washington, realized this too—but realized also it might be another Kennedy.

"I hope you don't nominate Joan before I get there," he told the Bay State Democrats.

Joan Kennedy left the banquet and went to a friend's house to relax and view the convention over television. And that was how she learned that her husband's plane had crashed in a nearby apple orchard.

No one would have predicted that Joan Bennett—the green-eyed, blond daughter of advertising executive Harry Wiggen Bennett—would have wound up in, much less relished, the rough-and-tumble world of the Kennedy family.

In the first place, she was an indoor girl and her interests were musical. Blessed with absolute pitch, she devoted herself to the piano—not to water skiing, horseback riding, touch football, and the other Kennedy sports.

Worse yet, her family were all Republicans.

The willowy debutante, raised in the social whirl of Westchester, went to her hometown school, Manhattanville College of the Sacred Heart—and there fate intervened to introduce her to Teddy Kennedy.

Several of the Kennedy girls had also gone to Manhattanville, and through the Kennedy Foundation, the Ambassador donated a new gymnasium to the school. Teddy—then a law student in Virginia—came up to represent the family at the dedication in 1957. During the ceremonies, his sister Jean (Mrs. Stephen Smith) introduced him to Joan.

They were engaged a few months later and married by Cardinal Spellman in November 1958—after a courtship which found Joan Bennett coffeeklatching from Beacon Hill to the slums of Brockton, along with all the Kennedy women. For 1958 was an election year, and Teddy was managing John Fitzgerald Kennedy's race for reelection to the Senate. By the time Kennedy racked up the widest margin in Massachusetts history, Joan had become both a Democrat and a seasoned campaigner.

There was more campaigning in 1960, during John Kennedy's bid for the Presidency. Then back to Boston and a home on Beacon Hill while Teddy worked as a $1-a-year assistant district attorney. And in 1962 there was another campaign—this time Teddy's.

The Kennedys added a home in Washington's Georgetown and a summer house on Squaw Island near the family compound in Hyannis Port, to their Boston townhouse and settled down to a life of politics and raising their children—daughter Kara, 4, and Edward, Jr., 3.

She had shared in the travails of the Kennedy family—a family marked for great heights and violent death—and the tribulation of two miscarriages, but last week, as the campaign of 1964 built up steam, the future looked rosy for Joan Kennedy.

Then came Friday's tragedy.

Throughout the long hours of her bedside vigil, there was little Joan Kennedy could do—except wait.

She was allowed to see her husband, immobilized in a Foster frame with his broken back, only for a few minutes at a time. But she was seldom out of earshot.

On Sunday afternoon, Jacqueline Kennedy arrived at the hospital. After visiting with Senator Kennedy and with Senator and Mrs. Bayh, less seriously injured in the crash, Jackie and Joan slipped into the doctor's room in the intensive care unit. What they talked about—sipping tea together in those private moments—is not known.

But Jackie's spirit showed in Joan Kennedy. Like her sister-in-law, she never let her face display the strain she must have felt inside. She bore up stoically as she moved through the crowds of the curious and concerned who clustered at the hospital entrance and as she sat, television cameras focused on her, at the funeral of Kennedy Aid Edward Moss, who was killed in the crash.

And there were moments when she demonstrated that she, too, had the Kennedy touch.

Mrs. Jacqueline Brown, night supervisor at Cooley Dickinson Hospital, told of one such moment. On Sunday Mrs. Brown had escorted Joan Kennedy to the hospital chapel. Mrs. Kennedy remained there for a few moments of solitary meditation. The next morning, by direction of Joan Kennedy, 3 dozen long-stemmed roses were delivered there.

And she shared the gifts the Nation sent her ailing husband. The baskets of flowers and boxes of candy which kept arriving for the injured Senator were delivered—again at Joan's direction—to patients at Cooley Dickinson and other nearby hospitals.

The sufferings of Teddy Kennedy touched a chord in the world's heart. Sacks of mail and stacks of telegrams poured into the hospital all week long. "And you know," such an aid to the Senator, "she'll answer every one of them personally. That's the Kennedys."

It was also like a Kennedy to forget politics even in a moment of personal crisis.

By Monday, when it was certain that the Senator was on the road to recovery, Joan Kennedy sat down for a round of political planing with Representative Boland, State Democratic Chairman Doherty, and Kennedy's press aid, Edwin Martin.

It was not disclosed what role Joan will play in her husband's reelection campaign. But with the Senator confined to bed for several months, it's certain to be a big one—and the Massachusetts Democrats are confident she can handle it.

For Joan Bennett is a Kennedy—and like the Kennedys, she'll carry on.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate turn to the consideration of Calendar Order No. 1071, House Joint Resolution 950, and that the following measures on the calendar be considered in sequence. This has been cleared on both sides. There is no objection to these measures.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Robertson in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The calendar measures referred to will be stated.

AMENDMENT OF COMPACT RELATING TO PYMATUNING LAKE

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 950) granting the consent of Congress to an amendment to the compact between the State of Ohio and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania relating to Pymatuning Lake was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

POLLY ANN MUTZ KAMPOURIS

The bill (S. 2164) for the relief of Polly Ann Mutz Kampouris was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading; read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Polly Ann Mutz Kampouris, who lost United States citizenship under the provisions of section 401(a) of the Nationality Act of 1940, may be naturalized by taking, prior to one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, before any court referred to in section 310(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act or before any diplomatic or consular officer of the United States abroad, an oath as prescribed by section 337 of such Act. From and after naturalization under this Act, the said Polly Ann Mutz Kampouris shall have the same citizenship status as that which existed immediately prior to its loss.

ANGELINA MARTINO

The bill (S. 2452) for the relief of Angelina Martino was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212(a) (1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Angelina Martino may be issued a visa and be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that Act: *Provided,* That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the Immigration and Nationality Act: *And provided further,* That the exemption granted herein shall apply only to a ground of exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this Act.

NORA CHIN-BING

The bill (S. 2584) for the relief of Nora Chin-Bing was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of

America in Congress assembled, That Nora Chin-Bing may be naturalized upon compliance with all of the requirements of title III of the Immigration and Nationality Act, except that—

(a) no period of residence or physical presence within the United States or any State shall be required in addition to her residence and physical presence within the United States since June 7, 1961; and

(b) the petition for naturalization may be filed with any court having naturalization jurisdiction.

DENISE HOJEBANE BARROOD

The bill (S. 2599) for the relief of Denise Hojebane Barrood was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Denise Hojebane Barrood may be classified as an eligible orphan within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of that Act, and a petition may be filed in behalf of the said Denise Hojebane Barrood by Mr. and Mrs. Abraham Barrood, citizens of the United States, pursuant to section 205(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act subject to all the conditions in that section relating to eligible orphans.

LIGIA PAULINA JIMENEZ

The bill (H.R. 2735) for the relief of Ligia Paulina Jimenez was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PEDRO AGUINALDO

The bill (H.R. 2737) for the relief of Pedro Aguinaldo was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JACKIE BERGANCIA SMITH

The bill (H.R. 5408) for the relief of Jackie Bergancia Smith was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WIESLAWA MARIANNA BORCZON

The bill (H.R. 5501) for the relief of Wieslawa Marianna Borczon was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (H.R. 6385) for the relief of Wolfgang Seidl was announced as next in order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H.R. 10407) for the relief of Keith Hills was announced as next in order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

DEBRA LYNNE SANDERS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2673) for the relief of Debra Lynne Sanders which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, on page 1, line 8, after the word "Act", to insert a colon and "*Provided,* That if the said Debra Lynne Sanders is not entitled to medical care under the Dependents' Medical Care Act (70 Stat. 250), a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the Immigration and Nationality Act."; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (1) of section 212(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Debra Lynne Sanders may be issued an immigrant visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such Act: *Provided,* That if the said Debra Lynne Sanders is not entitled to medical care under the Dependents' Medical Care Act (70 Stat. 250), a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. This section shall apply only to grounds for exclusion under such paragraph known to the Secretary of State or the Attorney General prior to the date of the enactment of this Act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LINUS HAN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2698) for the relief of Linus Han which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, in line 8, after the word "since", to strike out "January 21, 1963" and insert "April 9, 1953"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Linus Han may be naturalized upon compliance with all the requirements of title III of the Immigration and Nationality Act, except that no period of residence or physical presence within the United States or any State shall be required in addition to his residence and physical presence within the United States since April 9, 1953.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2730) for the relief of Dr. Jorge A. Picaza was announced as next in order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2205) for the relief of Guiseppe Di Censo was announced as next in order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

MR. AND MRS. LOWARD D. SPARKS

The bill (H.R. 6473) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Loward D. Sparks was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The bill (H.R. 394) to amend sections 1, 17(a), 57(j), 64(a)(5), 67(b), 67(c), and 70(c) of the Bankruptcy Act, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H.R. 3438) to amend the Bankruptcy Act with respect to limiting the priority and nondischargeability of taxes in bankruptcy was announced as next in order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Over, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The resolution (S. Res. 338) amending rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate relative to the jurisdiction of the Committee on Rules and Administration, was announced as next in order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be passed over.

NATIONAL TEACHERS' DAY

The Senate proceeded to consider that joint resolution (S.J. Res. 23) to designate the second Monday in April as National Teachers' Day which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments, on page 1, line 4, after the word "April," to insert "of each year"; so as to make the joint resolution read:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating the second Monday in April of each year as National Teachers' Day in honor of the teachers of America and inviting the people of the United States to display their esteem and respect on such day in schools and other suitable places with appropriate ceremonies.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement relative to Calendar No. 1090.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The statement submitted by Mr. KEATING is as follows:

The importance of education to the well-being of our Nation is amply demonstrated by our accomplishments of the past. So, too, the challenges of today will be met and overcome and the hopes for an even better tomorrow will be achieved through the high standards of our educational system.

Education is no cold and impersonal discipline. It is an interesting, lively, exciting process made so by the dedicated teachers of America who tingle the imaginations of our youth and instill in them a fervor for learning. It is they who so often plant the seeds of interest and expanded vision which bear forth fruits for the students and the Nation.

All too frequently we accept the daily contributions of our teachers without a word of gratitude. Recognition of teachers' endless dedication to their tasks and striving for new standards of excellence in our educational system is long overdue. As one who has long sponsored resolutions for a National Teachers' Day, I hail the Senate's approval of this resolution and hope the other body will take immediate action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The preamble was agreed to.

The title was amended, so as to read: "A joint resolution to designate the second Monday in April of each year as National Teachers' Day."

SEE AMERICA YEAR—1964

The Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 658) authorizing and requesting the President to proclaim 1964 as "See America Year," and for other purposes which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments, on page 1, after the enacting clause, to strike out "That the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating 1964 as 'See America Year,' and inviting private industry and interested public and private organizations to undertake in 1964 a nationwide effort which will encourage the American people to see the United States, and to use and enjoy the scenic, historical, and recreational areas and facilities throughout the United States of America, its territories and possessions, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico." and, in lieu thereof, to insert "That the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating the years 1964 and 1965 as a period to see the United States and its territories and to invite private industry and interested private organizations to begin in 1964 a nationwide effort which will encourage the American people to explore, use and enjoy the scenic, historical, and recreational areas and facilities throughout the United States of America, its territories and possessions and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico."

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the joint resolution to be read a third time.

The joint resolution was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "Authorizing and requesting the President to proclaim 1964 and 1965 as a period to 'See the United States,' and for other purposes."

AVIATION HALL OF FAME

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 8590) to incorporate the Aviation Hall of Fame which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments, on page 2, line 4, after "John W.", to strike out "Kerchner" and insert "Kercher"; in line 14, after "Ohio", to strike out "A. M. Pride, Dover Foxcroft, Maine;"; and, at the beginning of line 21, to strike out "Truner" and insert "Turner".

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

U.S. OLYMPIC COMMITTEE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 4732) to change the name of the U.S. Olympic Association to the U.S. Olympic Committee which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, in line 6, after "1950", to strike out "54" and insert "64".

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

PEARL HARBOR DAY, DECEMBER 7, 1966

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 475) to authorize the President to proclaim December 7, 1966, as Pearl Harbor Day in commemoration of the 25th anniversary of the attack on Pearl Harbor was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MONOCACY BATTLE CENTENNIAL

The bill (H.R. 9094) to authorize the President to declare July 9, 1964, as Monocacy Battle Centennial in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the Battle of the Monocacy was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LITTLE LEAGUE BASEBALL, INC.

The bill (H.R. 9234) to incorporate the Little League Baseball, Inc., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

NATIONAL COMMITTEE ON RADIATION PROTECTION AND MEASUREMENTS

The bill (H.R. 10437) to incorporate the National Committee on Radiation Protection and Measurements was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, that concludes the call of the calendar.

FISH VERSUS DAMS: THE BENEFICIAL EFFECTS OF ALASKA'S RAMPART CANYON DAM: A SOUND CONSERVATIONIST VIEW

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, on October 21, 1963, I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a press release from the Department of the Interior reporting the great increase in waterfowl and game which has occurred at major river development projects sponsored by the Bureau of Reclamation. At that time I pointed out that the development of recreational values and the enhancement of habitat for wildlife is good news for supporters of construction of Rampart Dam on the Yukon River in Alaska. Recently, various conservation societies and the Fish and Wildlife Service have raised many questions about the value of Rampart Dam on the grounds that the construction of the dam would be harmful to wildlife.

Nevertheless, it seems that experience with other great river development projects has shown an improvement of wildlife habitat and of recreational values as a result of these programs. This experience would seem to be a sound basis for expecting the same results at Rampart.

On June 21, 1964, another release of the Department of the Interior reported the opening of new fishing areas at Bureau of Reclamation reservoirs throughout the West. As this encouraging news is of great interest to all who would conserve and increase supplies of our natural resources, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the Department of the Interior press release be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. GRUENING. Another report on the predicted impact of Rampart Dam on fishery resources is contained in a speech delivered by Mr. Anthony Netboy before the annual meeting of Yukon Power for America at Fairbanks, Alaska, on June 20, 1964. Mr. Netboy, who is a distinguished conservationist and biologist, gives an analylsis in his remarks of procedures which have been applied in other countries to reduce or eliminate possible damage to salmon resources as a result of the construction of hydroelectric power dams. Mr. Netboy describes measures that have been taken in a number of European countries to insure the preservation of fishery resources when dams are constructed.

While the economic value of fishery resources of the Yukon is insignificant in comparison with that of other Alaskan waters, nevertheless, all who support Rampart construction are determined that no resources that can be preserved be damaged.

Mr. Netboy's remarks are of special interest in planning means by which the fish of the Yukon River may be conserved when Rampart Dam is constructed.

Mr. Netboy's address is a presentation of major importance. It should be read and pondered by all who desire a sound, well-balanced, constructive development of our Nation's natural resources. I recommend it particularly to my fellow conservationists.

I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

EXHIBIT 1

NEW FISHING AREAS OPENED AT BUREAU OF RECLAMATION RESERVOIRS IN WEST; RECREATION USES SHOW LARGE INCREASE

New Bureau of Reclamation reservoirs first opened to the public during 1963 supported a 20-percent increase in fishing on Bureau-created water-storage areas, the Department of the Interior announced today. A comparable gain is expected during the 1964 season now underway, the Department added.

Fish and wildlife aspects of reclamation's water resources programs are planned and developed in cooperation with Interior's Bureau of Sport Fisheries and with State fish and game agencies.

Commissioner of Reclamation Floyd E. Dominy said that fishing at 198 reclamation reservoirs and waterways had increased from 5,010,000 visitor days' use in 1962 to 6,185,000 days in 1963, an increase of more than a million fisherman-days. The estimated fish catch increased correspondingly, from 11.2 million fish in 1962, to 13.2 million fish in 1963.

"A major factor in this unusually heavy increase in fishing in reclamation's manmade lakes has been the large number of new reservoirs completed by the Bureau in its accelerated construction program," said Commissioner Dominy. "Other contributing factors have been the general increase in outdoor recreational activity by the American people and the careful preparations made to manage the fisheries in cooperation with the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife and the concerned States."

Fishing and other recreational activities at Bureau of Reclamation reservoirs are managed and administered by other Federal, State, and local agencies, including the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, the National Park Service, Forest Service, State fish and game agencies, and other State and local public agencies.

Highlights of fishing areas offering the most promise to sportsmen in the current vacation season are summarized from Bureau of Reclamation field reports as follows:

Columbia River Basin: The newest reclamation fishing hole to be developed in this area is Bully Creek Reservoir on the Vale project in eastern Oregon. Sports fishing is still not fully developed at this new reservoir (dedicated in August 1963), but trout plantings are being made by the Oregon State Fish Commission and good results are expected in the near future. Preimpoundment removal of nongame fish was financed by Federal funds.

Exceptional catches have been reported at another new spot—Howard Prairie Reservoir on the Rogue River Basin project in southwestern Oregon. Total catch of rainbow trout at this new manmade lake, which started filling in 1958, was 625,000 during the 1963 season.

Outstanding fishing opportunities are reported at an older site, Owyhee Reservoir in southeastern Oregon (crappie and bass), and at the new Prineville Reservoir on the Crooked River project in central Oregon (rainbow trout, catfish, and bass).

A planting of trout fingerling was made in 1962 on the new Hyatt Prairie Reservoir on the Rogue River Basin project, and legal-size plantings were made in 1963. The bass and bluegill fishery in this reservoir has not developed as hoped, but good fishing is expected in the 1964 season.

Nearly a score of lakes and waterways on the vast Columbia Basin project in central Washington have become one of the greater fishing attractions in the Pacific Northwest. More than 1¼ million fish were caught during roughly 240,000 fishing visits to the 18 project waterways during the 1963 season. Most of these areas are managed by the Washington Department of Game. Species caught included rainbow trout, crappie, sunfish, yellow perch, bass, and ling. Nearly half the fish were taken on the 38,000-acre Potholes Reservoir.

A new area reported in 1963 was the Winchester Wasteway Extension, which yielded 36,000 fish from its 1,250 acres of water surface. The State operates two cold-water fish hatcheries in this area. Part of the construction costs of one was provided by the Grant County Public Utility District. The other was financed by Federal funds.

Reclamation reservoirs on the older projects in the Pacific Northwest continue to support important fishing use. Outstanding examples are Island Park Reservoir on the Minidoka project and Cascade Reservoir and Lake Powell on the Boise project. All are in Idaho.

California and western Nevada: Approximately 2½ million fish were caught during 1,630,000 visits to 22 reservoirs and other fishable waterways in this region during 1963. Three new areas are being opened to fishing this season, as follows:

(1) Whiskeytown Reservoir on Clear Creek, about 10 miles west of Redding, Calif. This 3,220-acre manmade lake has been planted by the California Department of Fish and Game with 608,000 fingerling rainbow trout; 23,000 legal-size rainbow; 19,200 catchable German brown trout; 9,000 rainbow brooders, 16 to 18 inches long; 100,000 largemouth bass and 10,000 smallmouth bass. Whiskeytown Lake, which promises to be the best fishing spot in northern California this season, is now open year around to angling.

(2) Sections of the Delta-Mendota Canal in California's Stanislaus and Fresno Counties. White catfish, channel catfish, and striped bass fishing can be enjoyed along this canal, which has been closed to fishing since 1959 because of safety hazards, subsequently eliminated on the portions reopened in 1964. These fish enter the canal as larvae and small fingerlings are produced in the rich waters of the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta.

(3) Prosser Creek Reservoir, about 30 miles west of Reno, Nev. Following removal of a large population of competing rough fish, some 150,000 rainbow trout fingerlings were planted in this reservoir during 1963 by the California Department of Fish and Game. It promises to be the best fishing spot on the east slope of the Sierra Nevada Mountains this year. The construction of this dam should enhance fishing in Truckee River, which now has guaranteed sustained flows from Lake Tahoe under an agreement between the Bureau of Reclamation and downstream water users.

Fishing prospects at other major reclamation lakes in California managed in cooperation with the State and other local interests are forecast as follows:

Trinity Reservoir, good fishing, year around, for rainbow and German brown trout and kokanee salmon, but the fish are more wary than they were when the lake first opened in 1962; Shasta Lake, fair to good fishing year around, with anglers taking trout and kokanee salmon in deeper water and bluegill and bass near the shore; Folsom Reservoir, prospects good for all-year fishing for black bass, bluegill, catfish, perch, and trout; Lake Natoma, an all-year trout lake, which yielded 100,000 fish last year; Millerton Lake, bass, crappies, and bluegill are plentiful and trout and green sunfish in lesser abundance in the lake, which is open year around; Lake Berryessa, an all-year fishing lake which consistently provides full-creel fishing for black bass and other species; Solano Lake, year-around fishing for rainbow trout; Lake Cachuma, good to excellent fishing for bass, crappie, bluegill, and catfish; Lake Casitas, good to excellent fishing for bass, crappie, and channel catfish.

Fishing has been improved on two California streams by the construction of reclamation projects: The Clear Creek tributary of the Sacramento River has developed into a good trout stream because of the coldwater releases from Whiskeytown Dam, which also support salmon and steelhead runs. The Sacramento River has been improved as a fishery by the operation of the Bureau's new Spring Creek Debris Dam, which was planned in cooperation with State and local agencies and the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife. It dilutes formerly toxic flows of water from mineral areas drained by Spring Creek.

Lower Colorado River Basin: More than 1 million fish were taken from 10 reservoirs and waterways on the lower Colorado River in 1963.

Newest fishing area in the basin is the clear water of the Colorado below Glen Canyon Dam. This cold-water area is developing into a good trout fishery and is aided by intensive stocking from hatcheries of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife.

Fishing in Havasu Lake, which last year attracted 850,000 visitors, is expected to increase 10 percent this year. Results should be as good as last year, when 750,000 fish—mostly largemouth bass, channel cats, crappie, and bluegills—were taken. Striped bass were planted in the lake 2 years ago by the California Department of Fish and Game and rainbow trout, released in the Colorado River near Needles, Calif., by the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife are showing up in the creels with increasing frequency.

Trout fishing has been increasing each year in Lake Mohave and below Davis Dam, with very good results reported in 1963. Out of a catch of 168,000 pounds of game fish at Lake Mohave, four-fifths were trout.

Upper Colorado and Bonneville Basin: Some 1,711,000 trout were reported taken during 593,000 fisherman-days at 22 reclamation reservoirs in parts of Utah, Arizona, New Mexico, Colorado, and Wyoming in these two basins. New areas adding to fishing opportunities in this large area include:

Lake Powell on the Colorado River, Arizona and Utah: Fishing is open year around on Lake Powell, above Glen Canyon Dam. Fish stocking, which started in April 1963 under direction of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, resulted in the planting of 9 million fingerling trout, 2½ million bass, and 600,000 kokanee salmon. Another 50,000 catchable trout were planted in the river below the dam. Early reports indicate the reservoir is an excellent fishery and the planted fish are making excellent growth. Some 5,000 fish were taken by 7,300 fishermen below Glen Canyon Dam in 1963. An additional 4 million fingerling trout and 2 million bass will be dropped into Lake Powell from airplanes this spring and summer.

Flaming Gorge Reservoir, Utah and Wyoming: Fishing has been excellent in this 184,000-acre recreation area, which was stocked with 3½ million trout and ½ million kokanee salmon fingerlings during 1963. Fishing is year around, and many fishermen caught their limits last winter, when 15,000 sportsmen tried their luck at ice fishing on the reservoir. Fish and game agencies of Utah, Wyoming, and the Federal Government plan to add 4 million trout and ¾ million kokanee to the reservoir this spring. Flaming Gorge promises to become one of the great reservoir fisheries of the West.

Navajo Reservoir, N. Mex. and Colo.: Fish toxicants were used to eliminate rough fish from this reservoir and Flaming Gorge Reservoir prior to filling. After storage began at Navajo in mid-1962, the reservoir was adequately stocked by Federal and State fish and game agencies with trout and other game fish. During 1963, the reservoir attracted 45,000 visitors and a total catch of 270,000 trout was reported. Open year around, the reservoir is proving to be an excellent fishery.

Paonia, Crawford, and Vega Reservoirs, Colo.: These reservoirs have been stocked with trout by the Colorado Department of

Game, Fish, and Parks, and already are developing into productive fisheries. Vega Reservoir, on the Collbran project in western Colorado, yielded 140,000 trout last year, its third year of fishing.

Steinaker Reservoir, Vernal unit, Utah: In 1963, its second year as a fishery, this reservoir proved productive and popular. It sustained 5,000 fishermen-days' use and yielded a total catch of 45,000 trout. The lake is stocked by the Utah Fish and Game Commission.

Lower Rio Grande and Arkansas River Basins: During 1963, 14 reclamation reservoirs in this area attracted 449,450 visitors, and reported a catch of 866,840 game fish. The two relatively new reservoirs in this area showing promise as fisheries are:

Foss Reservoir, Washita Basin project, Oklahoma: Fishing should be excellent during the 1964 season. First stocked in 1961 by the Oklahoma Wildlife Conservation Commission, the reservoir has yielded good catches of warm-water species of fish such as bass, crappie, bluegill, perch, and catfish.

Fort Cobb Reservoir, Okla.: Fishing has been good since the initial opening in 1961 and is expected to remain good. Water storage in the reservoir continues to be excellent.

During the spring months, fishing is average to excellent at Elephant Butte Reservoir, Rio Grande project, New Mexico. Trout fishing is usually excellent during June and July at Platoro Reservoir, San Luis Valley project, Colorado, and El Vado Reservoir, Middle Rio Grande project, New Mexico.

At the Norman Reservoir, Norman project, Oklahoma, under construction, the University of Oklahoma will establish a biological research station for the study of marine life in impounded fresh water. The data collected will assist in the improvement of fisheries in the State.

Some promising areas for 1964:

Ocean Lake, Riverton project, Wyoming, has been described as one of the best crappie fishing areas in the country. A good bass fishing area is Lake Cameahwait, also on the Riverton project. Excellent trout fishing is found at Buffalo Bill Dam on the Shoshone River and at Deaver Reservoir, both in Wyoming.

Trout fishing in Deerfield and Pactola Reservoirs in the Black Hills of South Dakota improved considerably in 1963, following rough fish eradication in 1959 and 1961. In 1963, 180,000 rainbows were caught at Pactola, and 40,000 at Deerfield, both stocked by the South Dakota Game, Fish, and Parks Department.

Walleye ranging up to 14 pounds and northern pike in the 20-pound class have been taken from Heart Butte Reservoir (Lake Tschida) in North Dakota. During the past two seasons, 45,000 walleye fingerlings have been stocked in the reservoir from two natural rearing ponds constructed on two adjacent coulees. Flushing the 5- to 7-inch fingerlings from the natural rearing ponds directly into the reservoir has resulted in a higher survival rate than occurs in stocking from tank trucks.

Fishing is still coming back in the Dickinson Reservoir (Edward Arthur Patterson Lake), also on the Heart River in North Dakota, where all fish life was eradicated from the reservoir in 1958. It was restocked in 1959 with walleye, northern pike, white bass, crappie, and bluegills from two natural rearing ponds which were constructed by the North Dakota Game and Fish Department. About 5,000 fish were taken here in 1963.

Missouri River Basin: Fishing has been excellent during recent years at Jamestown Reservoir on the James River, N. Dak. The 1963 catch of 35,000 included walleye, northern pike, bluegills, crappie, and white bass.

Fishing also has been rated excellent, winter and summer, at Tiber Reservoir, near Chester, Mont. Trout, perch, sauger, and catfish have been taken, and silver salmon have been planted recently by the Montana Fish and Game Commission.

Trout fishing has been good on three reservoirs of the Sun River project, near Great Falls, Mont.—Gibson, Willow Creek, and Pishkun Reservoirs.

Each spring, about 400,000 trout are planted in Canyon Ferry Lake on the Missouri River, near Helena, Mont. The reservoir is normally open to boat fishing from mid-April through November, and ice fishing is good to excellent January through March. For the first time this summer, a commercial fishermen will remove rough fish from the reservoir, using seines and assorted traps, such as wing nets. This program and other fish and wildlife activities at Canyon Ferry Lake are administered by the Montana Fish and Game Commission.

Fishing opportunities at Reclamation's nine reservoirs and six diversion dams in the Kansas River projects will be the best ever in 1964. A renovation and stocking program at Hugh Butler Lake, newest of the reservoirs, has resulted in fish growth and reproduction exceeding all expectations. Each of the nine reservoirs has been stocked with more than a million fish, including crappie, largemouth and smallmouth bass, northern pike and walleyes, bluegill, and catfish. An eradication and restocking program is being planned for Norton Reservoir on Prairie Dog Creek, and next spring, as soon as there is adequate water in the reservoir, it will be restocked with sport species.

Newest impoundment on the Republican River in Nebraska—Red Willow Reservoir near McCook—offers attractive fishing prospects this season. Renovated by rough fish eradication chemicals in the fall of 1961, the 1,600-acre lake was restocked with largemouth and smallmouth bass, channel catfish, bluegill, and crappie, which have shown phenomenal growth.

A renovation program was conducted on the Snake River in Nebraska last summer above Merritt Dam, which started impounding water early this year. After eradication of the rough fish, the river was stocked with rainbow and brown trout. Public facilities for this new reservoir will be completed this year.

Fishing was opened in January, for the first time, at Sherman Reservoir near Loup City, Nebr. Species stocked during the past two seasons include channel catfish, northern pike, walleye, largemouth and smallmouth bass, bluegills, and crappie. Excellent fishing is expected.

More than 2 million fingerlings were planted in Bureau of Reclamation reservoirs on the North Platte River in Wyoming during 1963. This river gets the highest public fishing use of any river in Wyoming, summer and winter. New facilities are being provided this summer at Gray Reef and Glendo Reservoir areas. The Wyoming Fish and Game Commission will construct a boat-launching ramp below Gray Reef Dam for river float trips, and will maintain a public access road below Glendo Dam for use by fishermen.

EXHIBIT 2

FISH VERSUS DAMS—A NEW LOOK AT RIVER DEVELOPMENT

(Speech delivered by Anthony Netboy before annual meeting of Yukon Power for America, Inc., Fairbanks, Alaska, June 20, 1964)

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen. I appreciate very much the privilege of addressing your annual meeting on the subject of fish versus dams as it relates to river basin development. I have studied this problem for many years in the Pacific Northwest, and during the year 1963 I traveled 19,000 miles on the Continent of Europe, mainly investigating the salmon, the species most affected by the construction of dams everywhere in the world.

My travels took me to all the European countries where salmon now provides—or has provided—a major fishery, extending all the way from northern Spain and southern France to Germany, Norway, the Baltic countries and the British Isles. Dams have had an impact on the salmon fisheries in all these countries.

While I have never been to Alaska before, I have read a great deal about the Yukon watershed and its fabulous resources. I have studied the excellent report of the Development & Resources Corp. on the power and industrial benefits which the Rampart project would bring to the people of Alaska and the Western United States. It almost staggers the imagination to visualize this dam, 4,700 feet along the crest, rising 530 feet above bedrock, with a hydraulic height of 445 feet, and a powerplant of 5-million-kilowatt capacity, 2½ times that of Grand Coulee. No water development project of this magnitude has ever been undertaken in the world, with the exception of the Bratsk Dam now under construction on the Angara River in eastern Russia.

Incidentally, construction of Rampart, in my opinion, would be far more beneficial to the American people than putting a few men on the moon—and involve only a small fraction of the investment. Furthermore, Rampart would pay for itself and bring continuous economic benefits, while the moon project may have military significance but hardly any visible economic values.

Since there is no question of the engineering and economic feasibility of Rampart Dam, the next step is to plan it so that all the resources of the Yukon River are fully exploited. Thus you have an opportunity here in Alaska to develop this great river basin rationally, not ignoring the nonpower resources and uses of the river in addition to the power, but putting each into place in a sound overall plan. To do so will require statesmanship of the highest order, and the willingness of all affected interests to work together for the greatest good of the greatest number of people.

As you know, some of the special interests that would be affected by the project are making themselves heard loud and clear. The duck and goose hunters, aided and abetted by the small arms and ammunition manufacturers and their mouthpieces, are screaming about the loss of ducks and geese if the dam is built, although little scientific evidence has been presented that any sizable losses of this kind would occur or that compensating measures are not available.

The fishery interests predict dire consequences to the salmon runs. For example, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service in its report of April 1964 states that construction of Rampart "would eliminate the valuable runs of anadromous fish that spawn upstream from the damsite," thus ignoring the fact that there seems to be plenty of technology available in the world to handle salmon runs at high dams.

The wilderness enthusiasts see red whenever Rampart Dam is mentioned, especially those who have never been to Alaska, and who are totally unfamiliar with its problems and potentials.

This negative approach, in my opinion, is not justified. In view of the population boom in the United States—it is estimated that there will be about 345 million people by the year 2000—antagonism to a project capable of producing such vast economic benefits is simply untenable. I might say it is irrational.

By the time the Rampart powerplant is completed and the reservoir filled, Alaska and the western part of the United States and Canada will urgently need its 5 million kilowatts of low-cost electricity. The entire west coast, Alaska to California, will be connected by high voltage transmission lines; the various regional power systems will provide mutual support, with firming energy flowing in both directions.

With all these tremendous benefits in the offing, it would seem obvious that all those interested in the resources of the Yukon River would jump at the opportunity of promoting the Rampart project—not downgrade and deride it.

On the European Continent I found a more sensible approach to river basin development than generally prevails in the United States. In Sweden, Norway, Scotland, and Ireland, where major hydroelectric projects have been built since the end of the last war, integrated and coordinated plans are formulated at the start. Full consideration is given to fishery, wildlife, navigation, and other resources of the river as well as power, and experts in each field work together from the word "go."

In Europe there is neither piecemeal jurisdiction of natural resources nor piecemeal planning when a river basin is developed. In the United States, a clear overall plan or joint responsibility for the river basin is unknown. The fish and wildlife agencies often work at cross-purposes with whatever bureau is designated as the construction agency for a multipurpose project. When an agreement is finally reached, it is likely to be a "shotgun marriage."

Each agency usually seems to be more interested in preserving the particular resources it administers than in accepting a comprehensive basin plan, or the project as a whole. Its vision is distorted. It may see the trees but not the forest. And its biased point of view then infects a loud sector of the public.

The point I want to make is that, in Europe, the fishery biologists, wildlife management people, and others involved in river basin development, work with the power engineers, not against them. This I noticed in Sweden, Norway, Scotland, and Ireland, which are democratic countries. In Russia, a totalitarian country, such teamwork, I am told, is taken for granted—or else.

Here, in the United States, professional views are perhaps unduly affected by employment status. Opponents of a power program may go over to the other side after they leave Government employment, or retire from it. In 1953, when I started to do research on a fish versus dams book, many salmon biologists I interviewed said we didn't need any more dams on the Columbia and that they endangered the fish runs. These views are understandably colored by a concern for the fishery. Yet they were made at a time when the shortage of hydrogeneration actually created a dimout in the Pacific Northwest, and we consumers had to pay a surcharge on our electric bills because high-cost steam generation had to be used.

Many years later, I noticed that some of the biologists who had voiced their opposition to further power development of the Columbia in 1953 were working for organizations seeking licenses for high-dam power projects in that river basin.

I would like to discuss the problems of passing fish over dams as they have been handled in Europe. Perhaps they do such things sometimes better than in the United States. The assumption may be argued, but at least we can learn from the European experience when planning the Rampart Dam and the beneficial uses of the Yukon River's resources.

To begin with, what are the size of the salmon runs involved at Rampart? The Fish and Wildlife Service's report of April 1964 says that "on the basis of known facts and reasonable estimates, construction of the Rampart Canyon project would result in the loss of a total annual catch of 231,000 to 430,000 chinook, chum, and coho salmon."

Ignoring for the moment the unwarranted pessimism displayed here, we may note that these runs are equivalent to only 1½ to 3 percent of the average annual salmon catch in southeastern Alaska. We may also note that no compensating allowance is made by the Fish and Wildlife Service for possible enhancement of salmon runs through positive measures for fishery improvement, including the increase of salmon production on the Yukon below Rampart.

While the difficulties of handling salmon runs at a dam the size of Rampart cannot be minimized, there is reason to believe, on the basis of knowledge developed in Europe and America on the behavior and biological needs of the salmon, that the problem is by no means insuperable. In other words, the pessimism of the Fish and Wildlife Service is unjustified.

Let's look for a moment at Scotland. Scotland produces more salmon than any European country except Norway and the Scotch are quite proud of this resource. Therefore, when a program of hydro development was launched after the war on the lovely rivers and lochs in the highlands, preservation of the salmon received the most careful attention. Some of these waters had been fished by sportsmen for centuries, and at least one, Loch Tay, by the Lake Dwellers 15,000 years ago.

Thirty-five power dams have been built in Scotland since 1950. While none are comparable in size to Rampart, the technology used to pass fish over them—both ways—might be adaptable, at least in part, here in Alaska. All but a few of the Scottish dams are provided with fish ladders, bypasses, or Borland lifts (a hydraulic tank with submerged orifice which lifts the salmon onto the reservoir).

Scotland is probably doing more research on the problems of getting fish over dams than any country in the world except the United States. Some of their inventions have not yet been adopted in this country. For instance, Pitlochry Dam on the Tummel River watershed has a fish ladder equipped with an automatic counter and underwater camera which photographs every fish going by. In the hydraulic laboratory nearby, a Scottish engineer showed me advanced models of similar gadgets scheduled for installation at new dams. Upstream migrants will not only have easier going, but work is being done to facilitate the downstream journey of the smolts who now usually go through the turbines. In Ireland, by the way, on the River Shannon, they have perfected a system of guiding young fish around the dam by electronic means.

Studies published in the past 10 years by the Freshwater Laboratory at Pitlochry have been quite useful to dam builders in Scotland and Ireland. This literature is available in American libraries, but whether it has actually been used I cannot tell.

In discussions with European engineers and fishery biologists, I had the impression they felt Americans generally assume a monopoly of know-how in this complex field. I never heard of any European expert being called in by an American agency to help design fish passage facilities. Such experts are available in Scotland, Ireland, and elsewhere, and are willing to come and help us. Perhaps this is the time to avail ourselves of this knowledge.

Although I did not visit any powerplants in Russia, I was interested to find in the excellent report by the U.S. Senate committees which visited Russia a few years ago that they observed considerable progress in passing fish over dams. For instance, the committee saw at Stalingrad (now Volgograd) Dam on the Volga's main stem, "a fish elevator and unique fish locks under construction. * * * The elevator will be approximately in the center of the main structure. The fish locks are actually the navigation locks. * * * The chief design engineer * * * (said) * * * this is the first time they are trying to get the fish and boats into the same lock. He said they plan to attract the fish to the two parallel locks by a current of water. * * * Fish can be taken both upstream and downstream by this device."

The committee actually saw a fish elevator in operation, at Tsimlyanskaya Dam on the Don River. Dimensions of the elevator were 15 by 21 by 105 feet. It could lift a ton of fish at a time. During the peak season, July and August, the lift completed one cycle every 1½ to 2 hours. Here, too, the fish are attracted to the elevator by a current of water, then moved by net to the tank, which is lifted to the level of the reservoir above the dam—where they swim free.

I was surprised, by the way, to learn from the Committe's report that the cost of the fish lock at the huge Stalingrad Dam was estimated as only 1 percent of the total cost of the project. You may contrast this with the $260 million which the Fish and Wildlife Service estimates as the cost of fish facilities at Rampart—or 25 percent of the total.

It is logical to conclude that we can learn some things from the Russians as well as from the Scotch and Irish about handling salmon runs at dams—and perhaps save money too. European engineers generally think that sometimes American engineers like to do things the most expensive way, not the most economical or practical way.

The Swedes have shown the world that it is possible with the use of imagination and scientific knowledge, to have fish and power too.

Sweden has no oil or large deposits of coal. Its predominant sources of energy are the lovely, rapid-strewn rivers that flow into the Baltic Sea. Nearly every one of these streams once had rich stocks of salmon. Now, many of them have been dammed for hydro generation, yet total salmon production from the Swedish rivers has been maintained. What is the secret behind this impressive achievement?

After World War II, when Sweden launched a program of intensive river development, which necessarily affected the valuable salmon fisheries, the decision was made not to attempt to maintain natural runs but to rely instead on artificial production. This avoided the necessity of expensive fish ladders or locks, and led to the perfection of the art of salmon rearing on a large scale.

The impetus behind this decision was not so much economic, since it is quite expensive to rear salmon in hatcheries, but was the directive of the Swedish Water Courts under the water law of 1923; namely, that the company or agency building the powerplants must not only pay the owners for loss of fishing rights but replace the natural runs in the river from artificial production. In fact, the Water Courts determine the number of smolts (young salmon) that must be released into every stream blocked by a dam.

There are now 15 salmon hatcheries in Sweden; more modern in some respects than any in the United States. Last year they produced over 1 million smolts. The target is 1,500,000 smolts by 1970. If this goal is reached, and the biologists are confident of reaching it, about half of all Swedish salmon will be artificially bred. Hundreds of thousands of smolts, which are only a few inches long, are trucked as much as 500 miles from the rearing stations for release in far northern rivers. Here is an idea that might be used on the Yukon.

Proof of the pudding is in the eating. Proof of the success of Sweden's artificial fish propagation is that the salmon catch in the estuaries of the Swedish rivers and on their feeding grounds in the southern Baltic has been on a plateau in recent years, while salmon populations in this part of the world generally are in a down cycle which lasts from 8 to 11 years. Ironically, the Swedish program has helped the Danish fishermen (who take some 60 percent of the Baltic catch) more than the Swedish fishermen.

I have gone into detail about the Swedish experience because it shows that the prophets of gloom and doom about the possible impact of a high dam like Rampart on the salmon runs ignore many facts. The scale is smaller, of course, than in our North Pacific river systems, but the principles and procedures are valid and offer something for us. Artificial production as the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service admits, might save the upstream spawning Yukon salmon if other means prove impractical or unsuccessful.

I would like to point out another fallacy in the Federal Government's report on the Yukon fisheries: its assertion that anadromous fish would not survive in the vast reservoir or lake created by the Rampart Dam. The Columbia River is now virtually a series of lakes from Bonneville to Grand Coulee, yet the salmon are still there, even if their numbers are reduced—for as yet not clearly determined reasons.

On the whole, it seems to me that such studies as those published which have been by Federal agencies to date are not only unduly pessimistic, so far as the fisheries are concerned, but at times read more like propaganda designed to kill the Rampart proposal than scientific and objective investigations. In fact, no real research was conducted by fishery agencies along the Yukon until 1955. Only in 1961 and 1962 were investigations that could be related to the management of the Yukon fisheries started by the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries at river mile 756, and by the Alaska Department of Fish and Game at the mouth of the river. As of now, knowledge of salmon spawning in the interior of Alaska and Yukon territory is quite sketchy.

What is urgently needed are research and planning in depth—on all the nonpower resources of the river basin. It should be carried on while preliminary engineering on the Rampart project is going forward. Such a program was conducted in planning the John Day project on the Columbia River and resulted in a satisfactory program for handling the wildlife and fishery resources affected by the dam.

Research and planning for the best development of the Yukon should be international in scope, taking advantage of experiments and experience in other parts of the world. It should be approached from a cooperative point of view, with consideration of the multiple purposes and benefits of river development. So far, scarcely a start has been made in this direction except the Development and Resources Corp. report on the power potential of the Yukon. We can no longer afford to solve natural resource problems by means of divided jurisdictions, bickering government agencies, and the play of vested interests.

I hope you will take my remarks as those of an outsider who is vitally interested in the progress of the State of Alaska, and who would like to see—for once—all those interested in the great and varied resources of your rivers bury their hatchets and work together for the greatest good of the greatest number of people. Thank you.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session for the purpose of considering a nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

CIRCUIT JUDGE

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield to my colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott].

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I submit a report of the Committee on the Judiciary recommending that the nomination of Abraham L. Freedman of Pennsylvania to be U.S. circuit judge, third circuit, vice Herbert F. Goodrich, deceased, be confirmed forthwith.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Johnston].

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I acted as chairman at the hearing at which the nomination of Abraham L. Freedman to be U.S. circuit judge for the third circuit was considered. Mr. Freedman is well qualified for the position. All the witnesses so testified. They included both Senators from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark and Mr. Scott]. The State bar sent to us their approval of the nomination.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, it is a very happy day in my life to be able to participate in the brief proceedings confirming the nomination of Judge Abraham L. Freedman, who is presently judge of the district court for the eastern district of Pennsylvania, to be a judge of the Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

Judge Freedman is eminently qualified for this position, as the record will amply show. In addition, he happens to be an old personal friend of mine. It is rare indeed that those two qualifications coincide.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, in the interest of brevity, I shall not repeat what I have said for the record before the Committee on the Judiciary, sitting with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Johnston], this morning, but there is no question that Judge Freedman is eminently qualified and has been certified by the American Bar Association as exceptionally well qualified, which is the summa cum laude award of our profession.

I am most happy to move to proceed with the request that the nomination be concurred in.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Nelson in the chair). The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination? Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate return to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

The Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

GEN. MAXWELL D. TAYLOR, AMBASSADOR TO REPUBLIC OF VIETNAM

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I take the floor for only a moment to express my gratification at the unanimous confirmation of the nomination of the distinguished Chief of Staff of the Army, Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary from the United States to the Republic of Vietnam.

General Taylor has won distinction in many phases of military life. He distinguished himself as a wonderful educator when he was head of the West Point Academy. He was an active leader in the Department of Paratroop Divisions during World War II. He had a heroic distinguished military career both in World War II and in Korea, and later as Chief of Staff of the Army. He was an outstanding military man in that field.

It is significant that he had the courage to resign his appointment as Chief of Staff of the Army under the previous administration when it was impossible to secure the appropriations which he felt were necessary to modernize the Army, including its airlift, its transport, its weapon systems, and other things vital to making America secure. The record is well known to the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Since his appointment by the late President Kennedy he has raised American military standards, military equipment, and our military power many times.

Mr. President, General Taylor is not only a great military genius, but also he is a man of great accomplishments in the same pattern as that of the late Gen. George C. Marshall. General Taylor is also a statesman of the first order. His appointment and his willingness gladly to accept the roughest and toughest ambassadorial post marks him to the same degree that General Marshall was marked in accepting an appointment by President Truman in the Asian theater during the close of World War II.

I wish General Taylor the best of luck. I am happy to see that the Senate has unanimously confirmed the nomination of General Taylor to this very important task that lies ahead.

DIGNITY OF MAN AND WORTH OF THE INDIVIDUAL

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, 18 years ago in San Francisco, the Soviet Union and the United States were signators to a rather unique and hope-filled document—the Charter of the United Nations. We pledged ourselves, among other goals, to "reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person." The United States and the Soviet Union adopted as a common purpose the promotion of universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion.

These United States were founded upon a real and basic awareness of the dignity of man and the worth of the individual. I believe our history shows that, before this charter embodied the hopes of men around the world, we have conscientiously worked toward the reduction of discrimination, the guarantee of individual rights and respect for human dignity. We have known times and instances of discrimination—ignorance—prejudice—directed at various groups because of religious beliefs or because of the color of their skin. But most of it has been overcome and we are working on the problems that remain. This is important. We are working on our own internal problems.

Our fellow signator, the Soviet Union, has time and time again during the past decades aired and condemned the strife and controversy engendered by our racial differences. But, Mr. President, while we have acted to solve our problems, what has happened in the Soviet Union?

The people of Russia have been through the ages a deeply religious people and communism did not change that. However, communism is changing that today. Priests and rabbis have died and have not been replaced. Great cathedrals are now museums to Russia's material and technological progress. The Jewish, Protestant, Catholic and Orthodox faiths all have new rosters of martyrs.

Because I know my colleagues are well aware of how such fundamental rights are nurtured and protected in the Soviet Union, I shall not review in detail, for example, the numerous casts of anti-Judaism so frequently reported in our newspapers. A few items will suffice. Yeshivahs have been closed. One remains open in Moscow, but there is only one seminarian there. Out of 3,000 synagogues in 1917, when the czar was overthrown, less than 80 remain today. For the alleged economic offense of baking matzoh at Passover, Jews are imprisoned or executed. The internationally respected Jewish schools, theaters, magazines, and other institutions—where are they now?

Our Judeo-Christian heritage is the cornerstone for our civilization's recognition of the God-given dignity of man and the true worth of the individual—and this, in turn, is in direct opposition to the cornerstone of communism as practiced in the Soviet Union.

Mr. President, I recognized that this persecution of the Jewish people is an internal problem as far as the Soviet Union is concerned and a formal protest might well endanger those who must continue to work out their existence in the shadow of the Kremlin. However, I also feel very strongly that all of us must, as a personal declaration of conscience, stand up and protest against this smothering of Jewish religion, heritage, and culture in the Soviet Union.

Since our nations signed the Charter of the United Nations, the Soviet Union has taken great pride in challenging the United States around the globe through military pacts, through economic aid programs, through space shots, through nuclear stockpiles, through every weapon in the diplomatic stockpile.

Mr. President, I now challenge the Soviet Union to match our progress in the field of human rights.

ACTIVE-DUTY TRAINING FOR NATIONAL GUARD

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, at this time of year thousands of our Nation's men and women undergo a brief but drastic change in their lives.

One day they are going about their normal work and family living. The next day they are in uniform and on military maneuvers.

In short, the period of active-duty training for members of the National Guard and Reserve forces is upon us. I know that Delaware units, for instance, are training near the Atlantic coast below Bethany Beach. But they are not going there for a vacation. Their program is intensive. In order to keep the units in first-rate readiness, it is necessary to take full advantage of the summertime training.

A member of the National Guard or the Reserve forces is truly "twice a citizen." An integral part of his civilian community, he is at the same time a vital part of the Nation's armed might.

His is a proud heritage. It goes back to the earliest days of our country, when able-bodied citizens recognized the privilege and responsibility of being ready at all times to bear arms for the common defense.

Gen. George Washington underlined this principle of military service in speaking to the First Continental Congress.

> Every citizen who enjoys the protection of a free government—

He said—

> owes not only a portion of his property but even of his personal services to the defense of it.

The various Colonies organized militia bands, and later the framers of the Constitution recognized the importance of these forces by empowering the Congress to "provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia."

These units of citizen soldiers were the forerunners of our present National Guard and Reserve Forces.

In today's fast-moving world our citizen-soldier units must keep in peak condition. Emergencies can spring up overnight. The 1961 callup of Reserve Forces to prevent a war illustrated the need for readiness, and those who responded served their country well. Because they had trained weekly and had undergone rigorous 2-week training programs in the summer, they were prepared when their country needed them.

Our at-home military strength today is made up of the Army National Guard and the Air Force National Guard, along with the Army Reserve, the Naval Reserve, the Marine Corps Reserve, the Air Force Reserve, and the Coast Guard Reserve.

The National Guards of each State remain State-administered military forces. They have a State mission of providing organized, trained and equipped units for protecting life and property and preserving peace, order and public safety. Their Federal mission is to provide trained units capable and ready for mobilization in time of war or national emergency to support the Army and Air Force.

The Reserve Forces have a Federal mission. They are subject to active duty in time of national emergency proclaimed by the President as well as in time of war or national emergency declared by Congress.

But whether Guard or Reserve, these citizen soldiers, sailors, and marines are serving their country with distinction. Too often their contribution is forgotten or overlooked, as well as the contribution of their families.

At this time when many of the Guard and Reserve units are at camp, for the first time this year, let us salute them all for the great work they are doing.

We are all in their debt. The country is immeasurably stronger because of their devotion to duty. We are proud of them and appreciate their sacrifice.

LEO SZILARD

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, on Saturday, May 30, this country and the world lost a man dedicated to the conservation of human resources and the preservation of peace. Leo Szilard was preeminent among the generation of scientists who discovered and developed the power of the atom.

Early to conceive of the atomic chain reaction, and instrumental in hastening the genesis of the Manhattan project, Dr. Szilard served effectively and with dedication in the dual capacity of scientist and citizen in support of America's World War II effort. He and Enrico Fermi were awarded the first American atomic patent; and subsequently they collaborated on the letter to President Roosevelt, signed by Albert Einstein, urging the birth of the Manhattan project. It is evident that Leo Szilard was a theoretician, but not merely an idea man in an ivory tower. He was an experimenter, but not solely a technician.

Because of his position, he felt deeply his and his colleagues' responsibility for, as President Kennedy put it, releasing the genii from the bottle. Instead of continuing to use his brilliant mind and imagination primarily for the formulation and definition of scientific truths, he turned to the examination of literally thousands of schemes for the propagation of peace. No avenue was too narrow or no course too improbable for study; and all were viewed in the light of reason. Leo Szilard was a rational crusader.

Dr. Szilard deserves our thanks, for by whatever sensible measure those who are strongly committed to a stand endeavor to fulfill their commitment, they aid their fellows in forming of that stand an opinion that can be acted upon. Dr. Szilard and others like him have assisted all mankind in fashioning our nuclear reprieve.

As long as we live in the shadow of the atom, we shall remember Leo Szilard.

S. 2490 HEARINGS NOW AVAILABLE

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, over the past 5 months, I have made several statements about, and frequently have called attention to, my bill, S. 2490, the college student assistance bill. Hearings were held on the bill by the Education Subcommittee, under its most able chairman, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse] on February 20; March 10, 11, 18, and 25; and April 9 and 15. During the course of the hearings, the subcommittee heard approximately 25 witnesses, and received about 15 additional prepared statements.

The record of these hearings has now been published by the subcommittee. The hearings comprise two volumes, totaling more than 800 pages. In addition to the testimony, which was remarkable in its near unanimity of approval of the proposed legislation, the published record includes reprints of several pertinent articles and, in addition, letters addressed to me, in support of the bill, from no less than 60 college presidents, plus a large number of letters both to me and to Chairman Morse from other college officers and professors.

I call attention to the publication of these hearings, in order that Senators, especially the 21 Senators who are cosponsors of the bill, may be sure to secure and examine this bulk of opinion, which, generally speaking, supports the favorable consideration of the bill.

HOUSE RECEIVES COMPANION BILL TO S. 2490

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, earlier today I noted that the hearing volumes on the Hartke college student assistance bill, S. 2490, are now available. I have now been informed of another significant development in the progress of that bill.

Congressman Joe L. Evins, of Tennessee, has today introduced in the other body a House-numbered bill identical to S. 2490. I do not yet have the information as to the number it will bear; but I take this opportunity to apprise my cosponsors and colleagues of the existence of this companion bill under House sponsorship, so they may take note and may check the Congressional Record for this day. I am personally gratified at this development, and all the more so because it has been done entirely on the initiative of Mr. Evins, who, in complete independence, examined the Senate bill, found himself in agreement with it, and took this action simply because he joins many others in seeing it as a needed measure.

THE FAIRNESS DOCTRINE OF THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Dan Smoot report for June 29, 1964, discusses in detail the Federal Communications Commission and its recent actions under the so-called fairness doctrine, which, unfortunately, tends to be most unfair to programs which try to present to the public a conservative political viewpoint. This is a subject which deserves much attention by the Congress, because it is concerned directly with the question of freedom of speech and an opportunity for the American public to receive all sides of any political question, so that they can make their own independent judgments, after hearing all sides of any political question.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at the conclusion of these remarks Mr. Smoot's excellent report, entitled "The FCC and Fairness," together with the footnotes to the article.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE FCC AND FAIRNESS

Under the Federal Communications Act of 1934, the Federal Communications Commission regulates the broadcasting industry. It is doubtful that Congress had constitutional authority to enact the Communications Act. Ostensibly, the authority was in the interstate commerce clause (art. I, sec. 8): [1]

"The Congress shall have power to * * * regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes."

The pertinence of this authority is clouded by a provision of the act itself. In section 3(h) of the Communications Act, Congress provided that a person engaged in radio broadcasting shall not be deemed a common carrier.[1]

If broadcasters are not in the legal category of common carriers operating in interstate commerce, how can the Federal Government assume authority under the Interstate Commerce clause to regulate broadcasters? Legally, it cannot; but it did. While giving the Federal Communications Commission regulatory power, Congress tried to confine that power to keep it from violating the first amendment which sternly prohibits Congress from doing anything to abridge freedom of speech. Section 326 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, says: "Nothing in this chapter shall be understood or construed to give the [Federal Communications] Commission the power of censorship over the radio communications or signals transmitted by any radio station, and no regulation or condition shall be promulgated or fixed by the Commission which shall interfere with the right of free speech by means of radio communications." [1]

Note also some key passages from a report by the FCC itself:

"The Commission's regulatory authority is limited to its licensing function.

"While the Commission may inquire of licensees what they have done to determine the needs of the community they propose to serve, the Commission may not impose upon them its private notions of what the public ought to hear.

"The Commission in administering the act and the courts in interpreting it have consistently maintained that responsibility for the selection and presentation of broadcast material ultimately devolves upon the individual station licensee, and that the fulfillment of the public interest requires the free exercise of his independent judgment. Accordingly, the Communications Act 'does not essay to regulate the business of the licensee. The Commission is given no supervisory control over programs, of business management or of policy. The Congress intended to leave competition in the business of broadcasting where it found it.' " [1]

It turned out that the power to license is the power to destroy.

In its Mayflower Broadcasting Co. case of 1941, the FCC decided it was in the public interest to prohibit broadcast station officials from expressing their own opinions, over their own stations, on any controversial subject. In a nation whose Constitution prohibits Congress from abridging anyone's freedom of speech, an agency created by Congress flatly ordered certain responsible people who owned and operated broadcast stations not to speak at all, over their own stations.[2] The broadcasting industry did not resist. Networks and most stations did circumvent the FCC ruling by various means—usually by hiring commentators to present "their" viewpoints; but not one industry leader tried, directly and legally, to challenge the FCC's lawless usurpation of power.[3] Thus, the industry itself implicitly endorsed the principle that the FCC had limitless, absolute power.

On June 1, 1949, the Federal Communications Commission issued a report, "In the Matter of Editorializing by Broadcast Licensees" (FCC docket No. 8516). With dissenting views, this report fills 32 typed, single-spaced pages, and makes very little sense. It is a typical bureaucratic fulmination meaning anything which bureaucrats assert it means. The FCC claims it states a "fairness doctrine" for the broadcasting industry. It does not revoke the Mayflower decision of 1941 which silenced licensees. In fact, it refers favorably to that decision. Yet, it says that licensees who editorialize (express their own views) on controversial issues have an affirmative obligation to afford reasonable opportunity for the presentation of contrasting viewpoints.

One member of the FCC at the time, Commissioner Jones, dissented from the "fairness doctrine" report of June 1, 1949. Commissioner Jones called the report a "formless policy statement," presenting a vague concept of a broadcaster's duty to be fair, impossible for broadcasters to use as a policy guide. Commissioner Jones said the June 1, 1949, fairness doctrine statement revealed either a "reluctance to admit the error of the earlier [Mayflower] decision or a desire to perpetuate its evil effect." [2]

The 1949 fairness doctrine not only perpetuated, but augmented, the evil effect of the 1941 Mayflower doctrine. No one can operate a broadcast station without a license from the FCC. The license must be renewed every 3 years. The FCC has power to grant or withhold, renew or not renew, a license on the basis of the Commission's finding that "public interest, convenience, and necessity would be served." One striking example of how the FCC uses its power, "in the public interest," can be found in Austin, Tex., a big city, the capital of a big State, which has one television station. The FCC has rejected all applications for license to operate a competing television station in Austin. The station with a monopoly in Austin, Tex., is owned by the Lyndon B. Johnson family.[3]

Broadcast stations (particularly television) require heavy capital investment. Some television stations are valued in millions of dollars. The FCC can render the investment nearly worthless by deciding not to renew the broadcast license. Most station managers wait in anxiety for the renewal period. The bigger the investment, the greater the anxiety. Courage generally decreases as investment increases. The owner of a small station costing a few thousand dollars may have fortitude to run his station as he thinks best, in compliance with law and good taste, but in defiance of whims and illegal rulings of the FCC. The manager of a $10 million station, or of a network, is often an employee, running the business for investors anxious to avoid trouble with the Federal Government. Broadcast policy conforms with known desires of the reigning bureaucracy, even when those desires are not overtly expressed as orders.

---

[1] "Report and Statement of Policy Re: Commission En Banc Programing Inquiry," FCC Public Notice B, July 29, 1960.

[2] "In the Matter of Editorializing by Broadcast Licensees," FCC report, docket No. 8516, June 1, 1949.

[3] For details on skulduggery involved in Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson's acquiring station KTBC in Austin, see J. Evetts Haley's "A Texan Looks at Lyndon: A study in Illegitimate Power," pp. 55 ff., published June 1964, by the Palo Duro Press, Post Office Box 390, Canyon, Tex.; $1.

The FCC's 1949 fairness doctrine gave no comprehensive definition of fairness. One cannot be given. What seems fair to some, may seem unfair to others. So, in effect, the FCC's 1949 fairness doctrine ordered broadcasters to editorialize but warned that they had better do it to suit the FCC. One chief result: many broadcast facilities of the Nation have become controlled disseminators of Government-approved news.[4]

Government control is not overt, direct, and formal. It is largely imposed by broadcasting officials themselves. Some anticipate what Federal officialdom wants, merely to avoid trouble; but foremost leaders of the industry are swayed by the same forces which set major policies of the Federal Government itself. For example, Irving Levine (NBC news official and commentator); William S. Paley (chairman of the board, CBS); David Sarnoff (chairman of the board, Radio Corp. of America—NBC, Victor); Gardner and John Cowles (whose Cowles Magazine Co. owns Look, Minneapolis Star and Tribune, Des Moines Register and Tribune—and at least one major broadcasting company); and Leland Stone (head of news reporting for Radio Free Europe)—are some of the broadcasting industry leaders who belong to the Council on Foreign Relations.[5]

The Council on Foreign Relations is the controlling center of a vast complex of tax-exempt organizations whose key officials have become the invisible government of the United States. Members of the council (and of interlocking tax-exempt organizations) occupy controlling positions in government, in educational institutions, in labor unions, in major industries, in communications, in finance. The tentacles of their power are wrapped around levers which control political decisions in Washington and the molding of public opinion throughout the Nation. The aim of the invisible government is to convert the United States into a socialist province of a one-world Socialist system.[5]

Major broadcast networks are largely controlled by men who belong to, or are influenced by, the invisible government, just as the Federal bureaucracy is. Hence, network managers know, and generally approve, the slant which Federal officialdom wants given to the news; and networks dominate news reporting. As the FCC says: "Network programs * * * are the principal broadcast fare of the vast majority of television stations throughout the country."[1]

MORE FAIRNESS

Implementation of the 1949 FCC fairness doctrine was effected, to the general satisfaction of the FCC, by voluntary efforts of the network;[4] but total control was never achieved. There are few areas where local commentators present national news as they see it, without regard to the wishes of Washington officialdom. There are a few who reach regional audiences by syndicating transcribed broadcasts to individual stations. But constitutional conservatives are totally excluded from broadcasting in many areas of the Nation. Elsewhere, they are submerged by the overwhelming preponderance of managed news from the networks.

The President in one televised press interview reaches more people with arguments for his programs than all strong critics of the programs can reach in months. The combined coverage of all uncompromising conservative broadcasters is less than the daily coverage of one network commentator. Nonetheless, Socialists, who call themselves liberals, are in a frenzy because the conservative viewpoint is broadcast at all. Their determination to silence constitutional conservatives is revealed by the so-called Reuther memorandum, and by what happened after it was written.

On December 19, 1961, Walter Reuther presented to Attorney General Robert Kennedy a memorandum (which had been prepared by Walter's brother, Victor) on "The Radical Right in America Today." Reuther said "radical rightists" are all Americans as conservative as Senator BARRY GOLDWATER. He acknowledged that there are millions of them and that their numbers are increasing. Alleging that the radical right is more dangerous than communism, Reuther asked the Attorney General to put radical right organizations on the subversive list. He also suggested that the Federal Communications Commission do something to banish the radical right from radio and television.[6]

Nineteen months and one week later, the Federal Communications Commission did something. On July 26, 1963, the FCC sent a public notice to all radio and television stations, advising them of their "Responsibilities under the fairness doctrine as to controversial issue programing."[7] The FCC says this notice does not change, but merely clarifies, the 1949 fairness doctrine. The clarification is apparent to all who understand the semantics of liberal officialdom.

The FCC (wrapping its language in ambiguity to provide defense against congressional criticism) indicates (section "c" of the July 26, 1963, notice)[7] the kinds of programs it wants carefully watched: those dealing with "Americanism," "anticommunism," and "States rights"; those dealing with racial matters in a way not pleasing to organized Negro and other civil rights groups. The FCC notified stations that if they carry such broadcasts they must aggressively seek means to provide equal opportunities for spokesmen of opposite views. The FCC notice was an open invitation for extremist liberal groups to harass broadcast stations with demands for rebuttal time to answer every conservative broadcast displeasing to liberals. Liberals and broadcast stations got the message readily.

The nuclear test ban treaty (signed in Moscow, July 25, 1963) was on its way to the U.S. Senate for ratification when the FCC's July 26, 1963, fairness doctrine notice was on its way to all broadcast stations. Since it fosters unilateral American disarmament and impairs American sovereignty, the treaty was a giant stride toward the ultimate goal of the invisible government—converting the United States into a socialist province of a one-world Socialist system.[8] Hence, Senate ratification of the treaty was, at the time, the primary objective of totalitarian liberals. For several months (from prior to actual signing of the treaty until Senate ratification on September 24, 1963), the American public was heavily bombarded with propaganda favorable to the treaty. Broadcast time devoted to all arguments against the treaty was probably less than one-tenth of 1 percent of time devoted to arguments for it. Yet, an organization calling itself Citizens Committee for a nuclear test ban treaty wrote to stations carrying my broadcasts and those of Dean Manion, demanding free time to answer our sponsored broadcasts which criticized the treaty. The committee implied that the public had had no opportunity to hear arguments in favor of the treaty.

---

[1] See footnote 1 on page 15801.

[4] "Why Speech on Television Is Not Free: An Ambiguous Government regulation, and broadcasters' cautious interpretation of it, are giving the American television viewer an incomplete—and perhaps dangerously distorted—picture of his world," article by staff writer Edith Fron, TV Guide, Apr. 11, 1964.

[5] Ch. X, "Communications Media," "The Invisible Government," by Dan Smoot, published by the Dan Smoot Report, Inc., June 1962; $3.

[6] The Christian Beacon, Aug. 15, 1963; the Dan Smoot Report, Sept. 16, 1963, and Apr. 6, 1964.

[7] Text of FCC Public Notice B, July 26, 1963:

"Several recent incidents suggest the desirability of calling the attention of broadcast licensees to the necessity for observance of the fairness doctrine stated by the Commission in its opinion of June 1, 1949 in docket No. 8516. The Commission adheres to the views expressed in that opinion and continues to apply that policy, namely, that the licensee has an affirmative obligation to afford reasonable opportunity for the presentation of contrasting viewpoints on any controversial issue which he chooses to cover.

"The Commission has undertaken a study to consider what actions, perhaps in the form of a printer or rules, might be appropriate better to define certain of the licensee's responsibilities in this area. Without undertaking at the present time to specify all, or the most important, applications of the policy, it is appropriate to call attention to the Commission's view of its application in three currently important situations:

"(a) When a controversial program involves a personal attack upon an individual or organization, the licensee must transmit the text of the broadcast to the person or group attacked, wherever located, either prior to or at the time of the broadcast, with a specific offer of his station's facilities for an adequate response (Clayton W. Mapoles, 23 Pike & Fischer, R.R. 586, 591; Billings Broadcasting Co., 23 Pike & Fischer, R.R. 951, 953).

"(b) When a licensee permits the use of his facilities by a commentator or any person other than a candidate to take a partisan position on the issues involved in a contest for political office or to attack one candidate or support another by direct or indirect identification, he must immediately send a transcript of the pertinent continuity in each such program to each candidate concerned and offer a comparable opportunity for an appropriate spokesman to answer the broadcast (Times-Mirror Broadcasting Co., 24 Pike and Fischer, R.R. 404, 405).

"(c) When a licensee permits the use of his facilities for the presentation of views regarding an issue of current importance such as racial segregation, integration, or discrimination, or any other issue of public importance, he must offer spokesmen for other responsible groups within the community similar opportunities for the expression of the contrasting viewpoints of their respective groups. In particular, the views of the leaders of the Negro and other community groups as to the issue of racial segregation, integration, or discrimination, and of the leaders of appropriate groups in the community as to other issues of public importance, must obviously be considered and reflected, in order to insure that fairness is achieved with respect to programing dealing with such controversial issues.

"In determining compliance with the fairness doctrine the Commission looks to substance rather than to label or form. It is inmaterial whether a particular program or viewpoint is presented under the label of 'Americanism,' 'anticommunism' or 'states' rights' or whether it is a paid announcement, official speech, editorial or religious broadcast. Regardless of label or form, if one viewpoint of a controversial issue of public importance is presented, the licensee is obligated to make a reasonable effort to present the other opposing viewpoint or viewpoints.

"The Commission does not seek to prevent the expression of any viewpoint by any licensee on any issue. It does seek to prevent the suppression of other contrasting viewpoints by any licensee on any issue when licensed broadcast facilities have been used for the presentation of one view of the issue. This is required by the public interest standard of the law."

Some broadcast station managers used the free-time demand as an excuse to cancel broadcasts critical of the treaty. Others used it as an excuse to eliminate all strong conservative commentary from their facilities. Many yielded to the pressure to avoid trouble. The Citizens Committee's demand letter was mailed on August 23, 1963, to more than 300 broadcast stations. By August 29, it had received grants of free time from about 150 stations. Some stations wrote the FCC, asking whether they must give free time to answer conservative broadcasters whose time had been bought at regular rates. An FCC official was quoted as saying the Commission "couldn't answer the question, since the Commission had never settled the issue."[9]

The Commission has not yet answered the question clearly, and probably never will. It is obvious (in the public notice of July 26, 1963, and in subsequent FCC statements and letters "explaining" the notice) that the FCC wants broadcast stations to eliminate strong conservative commentary, and wants them to grant free time for liberal rebuttal of any sponsored program displeasing to liberals; but the FCC does not have authority to order such discrimination. If it gave such orders, it would be in trouble with Congress. Hence, the FCC resorts to ambiguous jargon, depending on a majority of broadcasters to interpret as the FCC desires—leaving for itself another interpretation if necessary.

In the July 26, 1963, public notice, the FCC mentioned religious broadcasts among those to be watched for "fairness."[7] It is clear that FCC means only conservative evangelists who preach the Gospel and criticize the theology and politics of liberals. The April 1, 1964, issue of Concern (publication of the General Board of Christian Social Concerns of the Methodist Church) published an article by Glenn D. Everett, a Washington correspondent for religious periodicals, who, for years, has had close liaison with the FCC, reporting on FCC activities of interest to religious broadcasting. From Mr. Everett's article:

"The Federal Communications Commission is preparing to send a document to * * * radio and television stations * * * [which] will indicate the FCC means business in imposing stringent curbs on Protestant evangelists who fill the air with diatribes against other theologians and church groups.

* * * * *

"Evidence has been mounting for some time in Washington that the Commission had reached the end of its patience with Dr. Carl McIntire, whose 'Twentieth Century Reformation Hour' is currently carried as a paid religious broadcast by 442 radio stations * * *. His repeated thesis is that the leaders of all major Protestant denominations, because of subversive socialistic teachings absorbed during seminary education, are engaged in a clandestine conspiracy to turn America toward communism and atheism.

* * * * *

"Ultimately, some answer had to be found for this type of abuse over the airwaves * * *. The occasion arose early in 1963 when the FCC began to take a look at the operation of a 50,000-watt privately owned international shortwave broadcasting station located in Red Lion, Pa. It was licensed to the Reverend John N. Morris, a minister of the Independent Fundamentalist Churches of America, and a close friend of McIntire. The principal programing being beamed to southern Europe and Middle East by this station * * * seemed to be McIntire's tirades, supplemented by some of (Billy James) Hargis' broadcasts, and 'news broadcasts' by various rightwing commentators.

* * * * *

"The U.S. Information Agency and American embassies abroad began to take alarm. The USIA warned that many Europeans could not understand why such broadcasts were allowed if they were not true, and had begun to fear that a rightwing revolution was taking place in America * * *. The FCC decided it had better make some rules for these stations.

* * * * *

"As soon as the FCC began to frown at Dr. McIntire's oversea broadcasts, the evangelist * * * began to shout censorship * * *. At the same time, some local stations carrying Dr. McIntire's domestic broadcasts, finding that the programs poisoned their community relations with the majority of Protestant churches, started to show reluctance to sell him any more time. The evangelist professed to see in this a conspiracy of the Washington bureaucracy to pressure him off the air.

"A barrage of more than 25,000 letters, a volume unprecedented in FCC history, bombarded the Commission. * * * The Commissioners found it difficult to make any reasonable response to such distorted criticism.

* * * * *

"But, as is often the case, when a Government agency finally decides to crack down, the blow falls with great force when at last it comes.

* * * * *

"While Dr. McIntire, Dr. Hargis, and the others will be free to continue carrying on their 'evangelistic' messages in the same familiar format, it is obvious that the stations carrying the broadcasts will be put to considerable trouble. The prospect of 442 radio stations writing a letter each morning to the Council of Bishops of the Methodist Church to inform them that they have been attacked by Dr. McIntire, enclosing a copy of the transcript, with an offer of free time for reply, is an intriguing one.

"The stations will quickly get tired of writing such letters and the free time they would have to offer * * * will make the operation uneconomical, to say the least.

* * * * *

"As soon as the new guidelines from the FCC make it clear that compliance with the 'fairness doctrine' is to be examined at the end of each 3-year license renewal period, the resistance to this type of religious broadcasting will sharply increase.

"Thus, the fundamentalist evangelists who have thrived so well by creating an atmosphere of fear and ill will seem to be facing the end of the trail."

COUNTERATTACK

Actually, neither conservatives nor liberals are legally entitled to free time for rebuttal of broadcasts which they dislike. If a station broadcasts obscene or libelous matter, court (not the FCC) is the proper place to seek remedy. If a station's programing defies good taste or the desires of the public, the free market is the proper place for correction: people can refuse to patronize the station and all business firms that advertise on it.

Yet, since liberals use the FCC fairness doctrine as a weapon, I have suggested that conservatives also try to use it, hoping that the broadcasting industry and Congress might thus be jarred into awareness of what is happening. In this report, September 16, 1963 ("Darkness Is Descending on the Land"), I suggested that conservatives request free time on stations carrying a preponderance of liberal commentary. Following this suggestion, conservatives have tried to use the FCC fairness doctrine as a two-edged sword; but it does not cut both ways. A classic case occurred in Dallas.

On October 23, 1963, former Maj. Gen. Edwin A. Walker spoke at the Memorial Auditorium, criticizing the United Nations. This meeting was given practically no advance publicity by the press or broadcasting media. Walker's speech was not broadcast. The next night, Ambassador Adlai E. Stevenson spoke at the Memorial Auditorium, praising the U.N. This meeting had received an enormous amount of free, advance publicity, through all communications media. The CBS television outlet in Dallas (KRLD) gave the pro-U.N. group 1 hour of premium time for the broadcast of Ambassador Stevenson's speech. Walker's anti-U.N. audience was about the same size as the audience at Stevenson's widely publicized pro-U.N. meeting.

These facts indicate: (1) that the U.N. is "an issue of public importance" and a "controversial issue" in Dallas, within the meaning of the FCC fairness doctrine notice;[7] (2) that at least half the Dallas community is opposed to Stevenson's views on the U.N.; and (3) that anti-U.N. spokesmen had not had "opportunities," to broadcast their views, "similar" to those given pro-U.N. spokesmen (in compliance with sec. "c" of the fairness doctrine notice).[7]

KRLD rejected demands by conservatives for free time to answer Stevenson's pro-U.N. broadcast. Conservatives wrote to the FCC. FCC replied with a two-page letter, quoting passages from its own fairness doctrine, concluding that "it does not appear that any Commission action is warranted"—in the matter of KRLD giving 1 hour of time for a pro-U.N. speech, none for an anti-U.N. speech.

Nonetheless, I hope conservative demands for free time to answer liberal broadcasts continue and increase. They dramatically reveal (as in the KRLD case) the hypocrisy and unfairness of the FCC fairness doctrine. There are encouraging signs that many station managers have already been prodded into resisting the drive to convert their facilities into controlled outlets for the expression of views by government-favored pressure groups.

In the April 6, 1964, issue of this report (COPE), I reported on AFL–CIO use of the FCC fairness doctrine in an unsuccessful effort to harass conservative commentary off the air in Montana. In June 1964, two ultraliberal groups in Washington, D.C., initiated a nationwide attack which seems concentrated on my broadcasts.

On June 12, 1964, Mr. Arnold Aronson, secretary of the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights, 704 174th Street NW., Washington, D.C., 20006, wrote radio stations in all areas carrying my broadcasts, citing the FCC fairness doctrine, demanding 13½ minutes of free time for an already prepared tape to answer one of my 12-minute sponsored broadcasts which criticized the Civil Rights Act. Mr. Aronson implied that the public had had no opportunity to hear arguments in favor of the act. On June 15, 1964, Mr. Philip McMartin, assistant public relations director of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C., 20009, wrote radio stations demanding 13½ minutes of free time for an already prepared tape to answer my 12-minute sponsored broadcast which criticized the President's war-on-poverty program. Mr. McMartin implied that the public had had no opportunity to hear arguments in favor of the President's program.

---

[7] See footnote 7 on page 15802.

[8] For full text of the test ban treaty, and discussion, see the Dan Smoot Report, Aug. 5, 1963.

[9] Broadcasting, Sept. 2, 1963, pp. 61–62.

One station manager told me that the Aronson and McMartin demand letters were the last straw. He is canceling all conservative commentary, and will run only commentary which has the approval of Washington officialdom or of groups supporting administration programs. He is canceling all religious broadcasts except those approved by recognized leaders in the National Council of Churches or in major denominations. The religious broadcasts he is canceling were all made on time sold at regular rates. He gives time for most of the approved religious programs. He would rather suffer the financial loss than endure the pressures exerted upon him for carrying conservative programs.

All other station managers who have communicated with me about the Aronson and McMartin demand letters are resisting. Most merely tell Aronson and McMartin that arguments for the Civil Rights Act and for the President's antipoverty program have been fully aired. They are not protecting me or my viewpoint: they are reading handwriting on the wall. The FCC and ultraliberal pressure groups are working hand in glove to control and monopolize broadcasting—to force upon all broadcasters sterile conformity with officially approved views.

THE REMEDY

By innuendo, veiled threats, and vague rulings, the FCC has exercised controls which lack legal authority, because broadcast stations have complied without resisting. Congress can give no relief in such cases, because the FCC can always refer to its own ambiguities as proof that it did not issue orders which it had no right to issue. If broadcast stations will stand firm, they will force the FCC either to stay within the limits of granted authority, or to exercise openly an authority not granted. If the latter should happen, it is almost certain that Congress would act to protect the broadcast industry.

To give adequate protection, Congress should repeal the Communications Act and abolish the FCC. Local and State laws and free-market competition could protect the public against clearly harmful broadcasting. Local and State laws could regulate traffic on airwaves, as they regulate traffic on highways.

THE SUPERSONIC TRANSPORT

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, a most interesting colloquy on the subject of the supersonic transport was conducted in the Senate Appropriations Independent Offices Subcommittee on June 4 of this year. This discussion of the 2,000-mile-an-hour jet aircraft was conducted by subcommittee chairman, Mr. MAGNUSON, the senior Senator from my State of Washington, and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT]. George Nelson, International Association of Machinists legislative representative, participated. It was republished in the Machinist on June 18. I submit, and ask to have printed in the RECORD, this portion of the official transcript of the subcommittee hearings, as I believe this colloquy does much in outlining the status and the need to move ahead with the supersonic transport program. Mr. Nelson, in his testimony, warned the subcommittee that the United States is now 2 years behind Britain, France, and Russia on this project. I am pleased to bring to the attention of my colleagues the remarks made by Senator Magnuson and Senator Allott and Mr. Nelson.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the hearings were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHERE IT STANDS: OUR SUPERSONIC TRANSPORT

Senator MAGNUSON. I appreciate just what you say. This is true, that we must keep American superiority in the air and as technological changes come along, we should keep up with them.

Now, when you speak about the delay in this field, there would have been probably a year and a half to 2 years' delay if the Senator from Colorado and I had not, 3 years ago, insisted on research on this program. Every year, for 3 years, we did give the Federal Aviation Agency money to go ahead with this research.

We are now in phase 2. I think the total was around $32 million.

Senator ALLOTT. Thirty-one million dollars prior to this year.

Senator MAGNUSON. We were the only ones who wanted to proceed. We had an argument every year with the House Members to get this program going.

Now, we are in what they call phase 2 in which they asked the aircraft manufacturers and the engine manufacturers for prospectuses as to how they could go ahead on this matter. Only yesterday the FAA Administrator formally told two companies, Boeing and Lockheed, to proceed in phase 2.

In phase 1—they had three engine companies and three airframe companies submit their plans. A committee appointed by the President—it was an interagency committee—felt that the specs did not quite come up to what they thought they should be in the supersonic field. So they have asked them to go back and beef up. Halaby said that the proposals did look so good that he would feel safe in saying that we should proceed.

Now, there has been no decision made yet, actually, whether we should go ahead with phase 3. You get into the big money then. We are talking about a billion and a half dollars if we should go ahead and build the supersonic plane. I think the desire on the part of this committee, and I am sure the administration, because I have discussed this [with the President] only in the last 10 days, is to go ahead if we think it becomes economically feasible, engineeringly feasible, and so on and so forth. So they are working with due dispatch on this second phase. We are hopeful that they will come up with some further answers to the problems.

RUSSIAN CAPABILITY

In the meantime, Great Britain and France have gone ahead. They pulled back because they had some of the problems that our people anticipated. Russia has announced that she is in this field. The plane that she is talking about is going to be used inside Russian territory. As far as we know to date, it would not be capable of getting into world airplane competition. But in time it will; we know that.

The supersonic transport is not yet economically feasible. We have to have a plane that the airlines can fly economically, that they can make a profit on or break even, such as the 707 and other jets.

We can do that. But before we ask the Congress to commit itself to over a billion dollars, the President and Mr. Halaby, and all of us feel that we ought to be real sure that we can deliver what we say we can deliver. And we are proceeding, we hope, with as much dispatch as the situation justifies. I wish we had gone further. We had about a year in there where the only thing that was being done in this field was at the insistence of this committee.

Mr. NELSON. We are aware of that.

Senator MAGNUSON. I think personally that this can be done. America's superiority is going to be challenged if we do not go ahead in this field. But we want to do it right when we do it. We want to know what we are doing. Now, on the matter of the Government versus the private cost, I think you put it very well in your statement here when you say, "It isn't so much what the industry wants to underwrite, it is what they can underwrite."

This is the problem. You take companies that are working on this now, like Boeing and Lockheed, with a net value of $300 million. I suppose that is based on the theory that if they closed business tomorrow, they would have $300 million. When they start talking about committing themselves to something 8 or 9 or 10 years in the future for over a billion dollars, they had better be sure where they are. If something happened and we didn't engineer this thing correctly, the sheriff would be out to see both of them.

And thousands of machinists would be out of work. So I know your organization appreciates the necessity of not too much caution, but to know what we are doing.

Mr. NELSON. We have a deep respect for this committee and what this committee has done.

Senator MAGNUSON. There was a great deal of public concern when the President of the United States appointed that interagency group, but that was again a matter of being sure. He wanted some other group in the administration to pass on this as well as the FAA. And they have acted with dispatch. I think that it was a matter of 30 or 40 days.

They finally agreed to go ahead. The formal announcement has been made. I think it was well that these people looked at it. Mr. Halaby (FAA) and Mr. Webb (NASA) were in that group, as were two members of the committee, previously appointed by President Kennedy to look into the matter of sharing costs.

It is going to take them 4 or 5 more months to get up to the specifications. Mr. Halaby laid out what was wanted. They were thinking about the economics of the situation, so that if an airline buys one of these things for $22 million or $25 million—you point out very well that it is difficult to know the exact cost—they will be able to operate them and pay for them. This is their concern. I think we are very wise in this. Without going into details, something happened to the British and French plane and they had to call it back and start all over in certain phases. And the Russians are really going into the field slowly. It is a kind of half way military plane.

MILITARY FALLOUT

Then another thing should be understood, that we have given the Defense Department, the Appropriations Committees of the Senate and the House on two occasions, some money to start a military supersonic project, and they decided not to go ahead. But I do think now, and I am speaking generally, that they feel that there is going to be a great deal of military fallout with this particular plane. As a matter of fact, we are kind of reversing it. The 707 is a fallout of the military B-52. Now, what we are having is a commercial plane that we are hoping we will get military fallout from. We are reversing. I am sure they will find this is true.

So I think the situation is moving as well as can be expected considering that we are talking about a great deal of money.

Senator ALLOTT. You stated my position and I know that Mr. Nelson is aware of my own interest in this for the last few years—not just a few years, but several years. There are a couple of things I would like to mention. First of all, overwhelming testimony on this committee and the committee on defense has been that except for the fallout of electronics, the know-how of doing electronics, the fallout of a certain design features and structural materials, you cannot design a bomber and make a supersonic transport out of it.

You cannot design a supersonic transport and make a bomber out of it. So the Russians are going to have to do more than they have done before they would be in a position to be competitive with either the Concord or our SST. This is the first point I would like to make.

Senator MAGNUSON. Could I just interrupt there? I want to state for the record again so this is clear, so there will not be this fear of the Russians. The Russian plane, the supersonic plane, is still basic. If we proceed with the same plan that we have and we hope to proceed with, I can state categorically the Russian plane is not going to be commercially competitive with the Concord or the American plane.

DOMESTIC USE OF SST

Senator ALLOTT. Now, one other thing which raised a question in my mind in your statement, Mr. Nelson, and I would just like to state my own view about it. The testimony before this committee, and we have been through this many, many times, is that it is doubtful if the supersonic jet would be used in this country at all except on coast-to-coast flights. All of the testimony we have had so far would indicate that you just do not get this kind of fallout, you do not get this kind of economic feasibility from a short-range flight, as, for example, from San Francisco to Denver. What good does it do you to travel 2,000 miles an hour when you can make the trip in a couple of hours in a commercial jet now? Or 3 hours, or 3½ hours, from Denver to Washington; Denver to New York, or this sort of thing?

The general impression in the testimony we have had is that it is doubtful if it would be used except on flights of that distance and then, of course, from the United States overseas.

So that this statement, your statement that they will scramble to replace subsonic with supersonic jets implies that we might have the whole jet system replaced with supersonics and I do not think the economics of the situation would quite indicate that. I like to think that when we are ready to put the ship in the air, there will be a demand for it, just as there was the demand for our present flight of jets. Everybody said, well, you can not afford to pay $6 million for a jet and ever hope to have it pay off, but we are doing it. And it is paying off.

One other thing which I am not sure is quite clear from the Senator's statement. That is, as you know, we put a limitation in the report language last year as to the appropriation which we made for the fiscal year 1964.

Mr. NELSON. This was to the FAA, you mean?

Senator ALLOTT. To FAA. I think I can say for the record that just quite recently the chairman and myself met with Mr. Halaby, and as a result of that meeting—and of course, he made proper clearances, too—we have gone ahead now with this second design phase, which is a more specific design phase. We feel, although we have not resolved this basic problem which you have come up with and which is a tough one, we feel that we are proceeding now with all due caution and yet with the prospect of not making this a billion dollar boondoggle. You do not want that, nor do we.

Mr. NELSON. That is the reason we are here with a statement like this. We were very encouraged with the announcement by FAA just the other day that they are going ahead with the design now. And for the power units, too. Then we will know a little more specifically what we are talking about, instead of just talking in these generalities.

Senator MAGNUSON. I do not think there will be any problem once we know that we are going to say "all right, we are going ahead." On any problem there will be some discussion, I guess, but we shall resolve this participation cost ratio.

I have suggested that one other thing we might do to make sure that financially we are all right in this is that maybe some place the Government takes a chance, as it were, and guarantees that a company would sell so many of these planes or that they would be responsible for so many. I do not know what the break-even point will be but they have to sell over two hundred of these airplanes and maybe we can say, all right, we will guarantee that you can do this. Because they would be in awful shape if something happened and they could not sell them. Then we would really be out of jobs.

I think we can work this out. I do not think this will be any problem at all when we finally start to go ahead. And I am sure that we are going ahead.

Mr. NELSON. I thank you, Mr. Chairman, for this explanation, and also Senator ALLOTT, because I know this is going to be helpful in explaining this to the public.

THE DENIAL OF VISAS TO CRITICS OF THE STATE DEPARTMENT

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, the decision of the Department of State, apparently acting on the recommendation of Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge, to refuse admission to Mme. Ngo Dinh Nhu or to her 18-year-old daughter, is, I believe, most unfortunate.

Some of Mme. Nhu's statements have unquestionably been outrageous. Moreover, the past cannot be resurrected; and I cannot conceive of Mme. Nhu's statements contributing to the stability of the Khanh government, which is essential to the prosecution of the war. But it is not a matter of agreeing or disagreeing with her views. Both the New York Times and the Washington Post, while differing sharply with Mme. Nhu, have criticized the denial of a visa to Mme. Nhu on grounds both of principle and tradition. They have taken the stand that the American people should be permitted to hear what she has to say and to make up their minds for themselves.

What disturbs me particularly about this incident is that it appears to be another episode in a pattern about which I have already had occasion to complain.

In the name of free speech, the Department of State has permitted leftist nationalist African leaders, in rebellion against our NATO allies, to enter the country and present their views to the American press and to the American TV and radio audiences. They have even granted admission to known pro-Communists, and the Department has requested waivers on their behalf because their admission otherwise would have been in violation of the law.

But the Department repeatedly denied a visa to President Moise Tshombe of Katanga, when he sought to come here to present his case, and even when he sought to come here in the fall of 1962 to meet with Prime Minister Adoula for the purpose of discussing a settlement. Tshombe was not considered a subversive. It was simply that the Department considered his views inimical to their own views on the Congo situation, and for this reason, apparently, decided that they should not be presented to the American public. And it was probably the same reasoning that motivated their decision to try to lift the visa of Tshombe's representative in this country, Mr. Michel Struelens.

Now, ironically enough, the man who was three times denied a visa by the Department of State, is certain to emerge as one of the top leaders of a government of national reconciliation in the Congo, and, according to the newspapers, there is a very good chance that he may emerge as Prime Minister.

I hope the State Department will reconsider both its decision in this case and its general attitude.

I would like to suggest to the Department, as I have in the past, that it does itself and our national reputation a disservice by arbitrarily denying visas to members of the free world coalition whose views—rightly or wrongly—it finds offensive, while it grants visas, apparently without restriction, to those who are committed to the subversion and destruction of the free world.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert into the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks the text of the New York Times and the Washington Post editorials to which I refer.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, June 26, 1964]

WHY KEEP OUT MRS. NHU?

The State Department's refusal to let Mrs. Ngo Dinh Nhu come to the United States to talk about the war in South Vietnam is poor policy and poor politics. We hold no brief for Mrs. Nhu. We believe her waspish tongue and her insensitivity to the oppression of her people contributed materially to the overthrow of the Vietnamese Government headed by her brother-in-law, Ngo Dinh Diem. We have no delusion that much truth would come out of the speech she was invited to make at a "truth rally" to be conducted by the Conservative Party in Queens, July 7.

But none of these considerations causes us to doubt the appropriateness of granting Mrs. Nhu a visa. The war in South Vietnam is one in which this country is heavily involved. Our interest there is to preserve freedom; we do not show our devotion to freedom's cause by circumscribing its exercise here at home. Whatever Mrs. Nhu has to say we can hear, confident that the American people will be most willing to support the war's cost in manpower and money if they feel they are being allowed fullest possible access to all the facts and all points of view about what the facts mean.

Denying Mrs. Nhu a visa will not cut off the expression of her views. On the contrary, it will give them an interest and an audience they would never receive if she were permitted to speak without hindrance.

Suppression is its own worst enemy; it would merely defeat itself in this case.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, June 26, 1964]

FEMME FATALE

Mrs. Ngo Dinh Nhu is an extremely pretty woman with a sharp tongue given to expressing opinions critical of the U.S. Government. She wants to come to this country but has been refused a visa by the Department of State. The refusal makes us eager to meet her. She must be a wonderfully seductive and enchanting woman, a kind of contemporary Circe capable of transforming diplomats into swine and overpowering the minds of ordinary mortals, to make the State Department so fearful of her very presence. Secretary Rusk apparently does not dare trust any of us, not even himself, alone with her.

And yet we wonder if she can really be such a menace. She thinks that American officials played a baneful role in the politics of her unhappy country, South Vietnam, where her family was thrown out of power and put to death by a military junta. The State Department is quite mistaken if it supposes that it can refute these charges by silencing them; it merely gives them amplification. We hope, however, that they can be answered effectively by reason and fact.

In any case, no useful purpose can be served by having the United States behave like a southeast Asian satrapy or police state. This is supposed to be an open society—open to officially disapproved as well as officially approved ideas. Mrs. Nhu kept out of the country is far more dangerous to its values than Mrs. Nhu let in and left free to say whatever she wishes.

SOVIET RESALE OF AMERICAN GRAIN TO RUMANIA

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, it has come to my attention that the Department of Commerce has granted permission to the Soviet Union to reexport to Rumania $12,589,000 worth of the grain which it has recently purchased from the United States. I consider this a most strange and disturbing development.

It was part of the original contract of sale to the Soviet Union that the Soviet Government would not reexport to other countries any portion of the grain which she received from the United States. The American public was led to believe that this was a firm commitment. But when the Soviet Government requested a waiver of this clause so that it could reexport American grain to Rumania, the waiver was granted forthwith.

I was amazed to discover from the Commerce Department that, in permitting the resale, it had not even sought to ascertain the terms of the Soviet-Rumanian transaction. It could not tell me whether the Soviet Government had charged the Rumanian Government more than it had paid the United States, or less than it had paid the United States.

And when I asked the Commerce Department why the waiver had been granted, I was told that we would in any case have granted permission to American exporters for the sale of wheat to Rumania, and the Department therefore saw no reason why we should not permit the Soviet Union to resell American wheat to Rumania.

I find this explanation completely unsatisfactory.

The chief argument advanced in favor of our unconditional sale of wheat to the Soviet Union was that we had a large surplus, and that the sale was, therefore, good business. If we were seriously interested in reducing our surplus, it seems to me that we should have refused the Soviet Government permission to reexport our wheat, thus obliging the Rumanian Government to purchase its wheat from the United States.

Moreover, the Department of State has recently taken a series of measures designed to encourage a more independent attitude on the part of the Rumanian Government by broadening her contacts with the United States and by giving her greater access to American markets. The Commerce Department, by its action, appears to be undercutting the declared policy of the Department of State, because it makes Rumania more dependent, not less dependent on the Soviet Union, when she is obliged to purchase American wheat from the Kremlin rather than directly from the United States.

I believe that the Department of Commerce owes Congress and the American people a full explanation of this disturbing development.

DEAN ROSCOE POUND LEAVES RICH HERITAGE

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the death of Dean Roscoe Pound has brought a feeling of profound sadness to all America, a feeling particularly sharp for those of us who are proud to call him a fellow Nebraskan.

Dean Pound died at the age of 93 in his sleep last night in the infirmary at Harvard University, near to the office from which for nearly 55 years he offered the world great insights into the law and the philosophy underlying it.

He was a man of legendary energy and ambition, carrying through his life these qualities which are characteristic of his native State. Although in failing health in recent months, this patriarch of the law continued to work actively and constructively almost to the day of his death. His faith in our system of jurisprudence and his efforts ever to improve it will prove an inspiration to all of us in these days when there are open sores of lawlessness and scorn for the rule of law.

There is nothing which can be said or written which will add to the honors which this distinguished man received. In his lifetime, he was recognized as the "greatest student of the common law of all time." Honoring Dean Pound on his 92d birthday, the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court said:

> His devotion to the law, his contributions to the education of members of both bench and bar, and his great contributions to the jurisprudence of our country have not been excelled in our history.

As a representative of the people of Dean Pound's native State, to whom he always remained close, I express our profound sense of loss. At the same time, we must be grateful that much of his wisdom is preserved for us all not only in his extensive writings but in the enduring and viable impression on the law, the bar, and the American philosophy which he leaves as his most impressive monument.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, an article from this morning's Washington Post reporting Dean Pound's death.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOTED LAW DEAN ROSCOE DEAN POUND IS DEAD AT 93

CAMBRIDGE, MASS., July 1.—Roscoe Pound, 93, former dean of the Harvard Law School and known as the grand old man of the law to generations of lawyers, died tonight in the Harvard infirmary.

Although in poor health in recent months, the legendary legal scholar, until recently, strolled from his infirmary quarters to his office in Langdell Hall at Harvard.

In 1961, an association of lawyers in Spain voted him "worldwide patriarch of comparative law." And Mr. Pound's associates in the legal profession called him the man whom lawyers recognize as the greatest student of common law of all time.

On his 92d birthday—October 27, 1962—Chief Justice Earl Warren said of Mr. Pound: "His devotion to the law, his contributions to the education of members of both bench and bar, and his great contributions to the jurisprudence of our country have not been excelled in our history."

TWENTY HONORARY DEGREES

Dean Pound held some 20 honorary degrees from universities in this country and abroad. In 1940, he was awarded the golden medal of the American Bar Association for "conspicuous service to the cause of American jurisprudence."

Born in Lincoln, Nebr., he was the son of Stephen B. Pound, who eventually became a lawyer and a judge. His mother, Laura Biddlecombe Pound, a native of New York, was Mr. Pound's first teacher.

At the University of Nebraska, he majored in botany and did graduate work in plant geography, ecology, and parasitic fungi, earning a B.A., an M.A., and a Ph. D. in the field. He was the first director of the Botanical Survey of Nebraska.

Although he attained far greater prominence in the law, Dean Pound never received a bachelor of laws degree. Admitted to the Nebraska bar in 1890 after a year's law study at Harvard, he practiced for a time in Lincoln, served as commissioner of appeals in the Supreme Court of Nebraska, taught jurisprudence and Roman law at the University of Nebraska, and became dean there in 1903.

After further stints of teaching at Northwestern University and at the University of Chicago, he returned to Harvard in 1910 as Story professor of law. Six years later, still one of the newest members of the Harvard faculty, he was appointed dean.

NOTABLES ON FACULTY

On his faculty over the years were such men as Edward H. Warren, James M. Landis, and Felix Frankfurter. The number of students rose from 791 to a peak of 1,440 in 1925. Among them were Thomas Corcoran, David E. Lilienthal, and Dean Acheson.

Witty, a great storyteller, and a powerful, yet matter-of-fact, speaker who never lost his Nebraska accent, Pound was one of Harvard's most popular lecturers.

In his teaching, he followed the traditional case method, adding others of his own out of his philosophies of sociological jurisprudence. He often turned to illustrations from actual practice, and he treated the ideas of his students seriously.

When he resigned as dean in 1936, Mr. Pound became Harvard's first roving professor, entitled to teach in any faculty of the university he wished.

During the New Deal and afterward, Dean Pound assailed what he called administrative absolutism, contending that the new administrative agencies were seeking exemption from judicial scrutiny.

His critics recalled that in the celebrated speech of 1906 he had condemned the "spectacle of law paralyzing administration." He continued to attack the agencies even after a conservative Congress had enacted the Administrative Procedure Act to rectify the very shortcomings of which he had complained.

HIS LEARNING IS VAST

Dean Pound was renowned for his encyclopedic mind and his vast learning. At 76, already a master of French, German, Italian, Spanish, Sanskrit, Greek, Latin, and Hebrew, he took up Chinese for a trip to China.

A prolific author, he was revising two articles on labor unions and the law when he flew west to be honored by the American Judicature Society, of which he was the only surviving founder.

Heavy framed, standing 5 feet 10 and weighing 200 pounds in his prime, Dean Pound was long possessed of great physical stamina. According to one story, he could still run a mile in less than 5 minutes at the age of 50

He was variously chairman of the section of legal education of the American Bar Association, president of the Association of American Law Schools, as a member of the standing advisory committee for the juristic section of the International Institute of Intellectual Cooperation (a League of Nations instrument), and a member of the celebrated Wickersham Commission, whose report to President Hoover in 1931 on the prohibition question caused a national furor.

Mr. Pound sided with the majority in urging a further trial of prohibition but in the individual reports, which the several members of the Commission appended, declared his belief that the more important gains, such as the closing of the saloons and the establishment of Federal control over the liquor business, ought to be safeguarded by a revision of the 18th amendment to permit adaptation to local conditions where it was demonstrably futile to expect total abstinence.

Dean Pound, who was twice a widower, met his second wife as a member of the Wickersham Commission.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business. If not, morning business is closed.

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES SALARY REFORM ACT OF 1964

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate and made the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11049) to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending question is on the amendment of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NELSON in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the third time, I reiterate that the Senate is now operating under the Pastore germaneness rule, and for the next 3 hours, at least, I hope Senators will confine themselves to the pay bill.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I yield for 2 minutes to the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], with the understanding that I shall not lose the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, in 1932 the Democratic Party adopted what, in my opinion, was the best party platform since I have been active in politics. That platform stated:

> We believe that a party platform is a covenant with the people to be faithfully kept by the party when entrusted with power.

In 1932 I was elected to the House of Representatives on that platform, and I have never left it, although the party left it a long time ago.

The statesmanship of my predecessor, Carter Glass, can be observed in such planks as these in the 1932 platform:

> We favor maintenance of the national credit by a Federal budget annually balanced on the basis of accurate executive estimates within revenues, raised by a system of taxation levied on the principle of ability to pay. * * * We advocate the removal of government from all fields of private enterprise except where necessary to develop public works and natural resources in the common interest.

And this is what those of us who were elected on that platform promised to do to their own pay:

> We advocate an immediate and drastic reduction of governmental expenditures by abolishing useless commissions and offices, consolidating departments and bureaus, and eliminating extravagance to accomplish a saving of not less than 25 percent in the cost of the Federal Government.

Promising the splendid voters of the Seventh Congressional District to carry out that platform, one of my first official votes was to vote to cut my own pay from $10,000 to $7,500.

As I have indicated, it did not take the Democratic New Dealers very long to leave the 1932 program. And what has been the result? We now have a debt created by reckless spending of over $300 billion, the annual interest on which is nearly three times the total cost of government when I entered the House 31 years ago.

Instead of abolishing useless commissions and reducing Government employees, we have created a plethora of commissions and we have more than doubled the number of Federal employees. And in recent years, Congress votes in every election year, and sometimes in between, to raise the pay of those employees. The amount involved has become so large that every time Congress raises the pay of Federal employees by 1 percent it costs the taxpayers $100 million.

Throughout my service in the Congress, I have consistently advocated and consistently voted for the economy principles enunciated in the platform on which I was first elected. Never during those 31 years have I ever voted to raise my own pay, and I do not intend to vote for H.R. 11049 which raises the pay of all Members of the Congress by $7,500 per year.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the RECORD at this time our party platform of 1932, with the hope that its sound provisions will be considered by those who write the platform in Atlantic City next August.

There being no objection, the party platform was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEMOCRATIC PLATFORM FOR 1932

In this time of unprecedented economic and social distress the Democratic Party declares its conviction that the chief causes of this condition were the disastrous policies pursued by our Government since the World War, of economic isolation, fostering the merger of competitive businesses into monopolies and encouraging the indefensible expansion and contraction of credit for private profit at the expense of the public.

Those who were responsible for these policies have abandoned the ideals on which the war was won and thrown away the fruits of victory, thus rejecting the greatest opportunity in history to bring peace, prosperity, and happiness to our people and to the world.

They have ruined our foreign trade; destroyed the values of our commodities and products, crippled our banking system, robbed millions of our people of their life savings, and thrown millions more out of work, produced widespread poverty and brought the Government to a state of financial distress unprecedented in time of peace.

The only hope for improving present conditions, restoring employment, affording permanent relief to the people, and bringing the Nation back to the proud position of domestic happiness and of financial, industrial, agricultural and commercial leadership in the world lies in a drastic change in economic governmental policies.

We believe that a party platform is a covenant with the people to have [sic] faithfully kept by the party when entrusted with power, and that the people are entitled to know in plain words the terms of the contract to which they are asked to subscribe. We hereby declare this to be the platform of the Democratic Party:

The Democratic Party solemnly promises by appropriate action to put into effect the principles, policies, and reforms herein advocated, and to eradicate the policies, methods, and practices herein condemned. We advocate an immediate and drastic reduction of governmental expenditures by abolishing useless commissions and offices, consolidating departments and bureaus, and eliminating extravagance to accomplish a saving of not less than 25 percent in the cost of the Federal Government. And we call upon the Democratic Party in the States to make a zealous effort to achieve a proportionate result.

We favor maintenance of the national credit by a Federal budget annually balanced on the basis of accurate executive estimates within revenues, raised by a system of taxation levied on the principle of ability to pay.

We advocate a sound currency to be preserved at all hazards and an international monetary conference called on the invitation of our Government to consider the rehabilitation of silver and related questions.

We advocate a competitive tariff for revenue with a factfinding tariff commission free from executive interference, reciprocal tariff agreements with other nations, and an international economic conference designed to restore international trade and facilitate exchange.

We advocate the extension of Federal credit to the States to provide unemployment relief wherever the diminishing resources of the States makes it impossible for them to provide for the needy; expansion of the Federal program of necessary and useful construction effected [sic] with a public interest, such as adequate flood control and waterways.

We advocate the spread of employment by a substantial reduction in the hours of labor, the encouragement of the shorter week by applying that principle in government service; we advocate advance planning of public works.

We advocate unemployment and old-age insurance under State laws.

We favor the restoration of agriculture, the nation's basic industry; better financing of farm mortgages through recognized farm bank agencies at low rates of interest on an amortization plan, giving preference to credits for the redemption of farms and homes sold under foreclosure.

Extension and development of the Farm Cooperative movement and effective control of crop surpluses so that our farmers may have the full benefit of the domestic market.

The enactment of every constitutional measure that will aid the farmers to receive for their basic farm commodities prices in excess of cost.

We advocate a Navy and an Army adequate for national defense, based on a survey of all facts affecting the existing establishments, that the people in time of peace may not be burdened by an expenditure fast approaching a billion dollars annually.

We advocate strengthening and impartial enforcement of the antitrust laws, to prevent monopoly and unfair trade practices, and revision thereof for the better protection of labor and the small producer and distributor.

The conservation, development, and use of the Nation's waterpower in the public interest.

The removal of government from all fields of private enterprise except where necessary to develop public works and natural resources in the common interest.

We advocate protection of the investing public by requiring to be filed with the Government and carried in advertisements of all offerings of foreign and domestic stocks and bonds true information as to bonuses, commissions, principal invested, and interests of the sellers.

Regulation to the full extent of Federal power, of (a) holding companies which sell securities in interstate commerce; (b) rates of utilities companies operating across State lines; (c) exchange in securities and commodities.

We advocate quicker methods of realizing on assets for the relief of depositors of suspended banks, and a more rigid supervision of national banks for the protection of depositors and the prevention of the use of their moneys in speculation to the detriment of local credits.

The severance of affiliated security companies from, and the divorce of the investment banking business from, commercial banks, and further restriction of Federal Reserve banks in permitting the use of Federal Reserve facilities for speculative purposes.

We advocate the full measure of justice and generosity for all war veterans who have suffered disability or disease caused by or resulting from actual service in time of war and for their dependents.

We advocate a firm foreign policy, including peace with all the world and the settlement of international disputes by arbitration; no interference in the internal affairs of other nations; and sanctity of treaties and the maintenance of good faith and of good will in financial obligations; adherence to the World Court with appending reservations; the Pact of Paris abolishing war as an instrument of national policy, to be made effective by provisions for consultation and conference in case of threatened violations of treaties.

International agreements for reduction of armaments and cooperation with nations of the Western Hemisphere to maintain the spirit of the Monroe Doctrine.

We oppose cancellation of the debts owing to the United States by foreign nations.

Independence for the Philippines; ultimate statehood for Puerto Rico.

The employment of American citizens in the operation of the Panama Canal.

Simplification of legal procedure and reorganization of the judicial system to make the attainment of justice speedy, certain, and at less cost.

Continuous publicity of political contributions and expenditures; strengthening of the Corrupt Practices Act and severe penalties for misappropriation of campaign funds.

We advocate the repeal of the 18th amendment. To effect such repeal we demand that the Congress immediately propose a constitutional amendment to truly represent [sic] the conventions in the States called to act solely on that proposal; we urge the enactment of such measures by the several States as will actually promote temperance, effectively prevent the return of the saloon, and bring the liquor traffic into the open under complete supervision and control by the States.

We demand that the Federal Government effectively exercise its power to enable the States to protect themselves against importation of intoxicating liquors in violation of their laws.

Pending repeal, we favor immediate modification of the Volstead Act; to legalize the manufacture and sale of beer and other beverages of such alcoholic content as is permissible under the Constitution and to provide therefrom a proper and needed revenue.

We condemn the improper and excessive use of money in political activities.

We condemn paid lobbies of special interests to influence Members of Congress and other public servants by personal contact.

We condemn action and utterances of high public officials designed to influence stock exchange prices.

We condemn the open and covert resistance of administrative officials to every effort made by congressional committees to curtail the extravagant expenditures of the Government and to revoke improvident subsidies granted to favorite interests.

We condemn the extravagance of the Farm Board, its disastrous action which made the Government a speculator in farm products, and the unsound policy of restricting agricultural products to the demands of domestic markets.

We condemn the usurpation of power by the State Department in assuming to pass upon foreign securities offered by international bankers as a result of which billions of dollars in questionable bonds have been sold to the public upon the implied approval of the Federal Government.[1]

And in conclusion, to accomplish these purposes and to recover economic liberty, we pledge the nominees of this convention the best efforts of a great party whose founder announced the doctrine which guides us now in the hour of our country's need: equal rights to all; special privilege to none.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, two questions were submitted to me by my colleague from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND]. I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD the questions he asked, with my answers to those questions.

There being no objection, the questions and answers were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Question. At the present time, I believe that the salary of the Chief Benefits Director of the Veterans' Administration is $20,000, the same salary as is now received by many listed in the bill to be under level 4 of the new pay schedule, including, for instance, the Commissioner of Community Facilities Administration. Could the Senator tell me whether the Chief Benefits Director of the Veterans' Administration is listed in either level 4 or 5 of the new bill?

Answer. No, the Chief Benefits Director of the Veterans' Administration is not listed in level 4 or 5 of the executive salary schedule. Under H.R. 11049, this position will continue to be a GS–18 position.

Question. What effect will the failure to include the Chief Benefits Director of the Veterans' Administration, in either level 4 or 5 of the new pay schedule, have on field positions of the Veterans' Administration?

Answer. It will have no effect. The Chief Benefits Director is rated at grade 18 and the 67 regional field managers are set at grades 15 and 16. Grades 15, 16, 17, and 18 all receive substantial increases under H.R. 11049.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, we are ready to vote.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President——

Mr. JOHNSTON. I yield for a question. Does the Senator wish me to yield for a question?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am about to ask unanimous consent to have certain bills considered.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I yield for that purpose to the Senator from Missouri.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will call attention to the fact that the majority leader, 3 minutes ago, called attention to the germaneness rule and requested that Senators confine themselves to remarks concerning the bill.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I appreciate that, but I would hope the distinguished Senator would let me call up four bills that are important to industry. They will take very little time.

---

[1] Inadvertently omitted from the reading of the platform, and later included, was the following statement: "We condemn the Hawley-Smoot tariff law, the prohibitive rates of which have resulted in retaliatory action by more than 40 countries, created international economic hostilities, destroyed international trade, driven our factories into foreign countries, robbed the American farmer of his foreign markets, and increased the cost of production."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION FOR DISPOSAL OF CERTAIN MATERIALS FROM NATIONAL STOCKPILE

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, from the Committee on Armed Services I report House Concurrent Resolution 300, H.R. 11235, H.R. 11004, and H.R. 11257, and I ask unanimous consent for their immediate consideration. These measures, which relate to the disposal of surplus pig tin, molybdenum, zinc, and lead from the national stockpile, were unanimously approved by the Subcommittee on the National Stockpile and by the Committee on Armed Services.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Hearing none, the clerk will state the bills by title.

Is the Senator from Missouri asking for their immediate consideration?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Yes; I ask for their immediate consideration. In explanation, let me say that industry is very anxious to receive this material. It is all heavily in excess of stockpile requirements. The administration is anxious to sell it. The measures have been passed by the House. They have been approved unanimously by the subcommittee and by the full committee. We are receiving calls from steel companies and others every day now, urging that the measures be passed, because there is a critical shortage in industry.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I have no objection to these bills, but I wonder if the Senator will withhold his request? We are trying to locate members of the committee. I do not think there will be any objection. I personally have no objection.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I will say to my good friend from Delaware that I would not think of asking for immediate consideration if they had not been approved unanimously by the subcommittee, including all members on the other side of the aisle, and by the full committee, where the ranking Republican member of the appropriate subcommittee was present at the meeting this morning.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I am sure it was approved. I did not know whether some Senators wanted to make statements in connection with the bills. That is the real reason I make the request. We are trying to get in touch with them. I am sure there will be no objection. I have none. If the Senator will withhold his request——

Mr. SYMINGTON. I withhold the request.

I thank the Senator from South Carolina for yielding to me.

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES SALARY REFORM ACT OF 1964

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11049) to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, we are ready to vote on the bill, if there are no further amendments to be offered.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I have an amendment that I hope the chairman will take. I send it to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Delaware is the pending amendment. The Clerk will state that amendment.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I did not realize that there was an amendment pending.

The Chief Clerk read the amendment, as follows:

> At the appropriate place insert a new section as follows:
>
> "Notwithstanding any other provisions of this bill, the effective date of any increase on any salary of $20,000 or over shall be the first day of the first month after the close of a fiscal year with a balanced Federal budget."

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I cannot conceive of there being any objection to the amendment. It merely provides for the temporary postponement of the effective date of the salary increases of those who now are paid $20,000 a year until such time as we balance the budget.

If the administration was really serious when it said that it would balance the budget this is a way to help to accomplish that end. We were told earlier this year that the $11 billion tax cut would stimulate the economy. We were told that the purpose of the tax cut was to stimulate the economy to the extent that it would bring more money into the Treasury than if we did not pass a tax cut.

There have been several increased spending bills. The administration also said these would stimulate the economy. We were told that by increasing our spending and by cutting taxes at the same time we would stimulate the economy and thereby increase the revenue of the Government so that we could balance the budget and pay off our debt.

Personally I have never agreed with the philosophy that we could make ourselves rich by taxing less and spending more while financing ourselves with borrowed money.

I do not believe our Government can spend itself into prosperity on borrowed money any more than a drunkard can drink himself sober.

However, for the moment, I am not quarreling with that newfangled theory on the frontier. If the people on the frontier believe it, we should give them an opportunity to express that belief by supporting this amendment. The amendment would apply only to those who receive $20,000 or more a year. It would postpone that increase for that brief period according to their own statements or until such time as all those spending the money can curtail their spending and balance the budget.

Unless the chairman is willing to accept the amendment I shall ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I cannot accept the amendment. I am sure the Senator realizes that I cannot accept it, because my acceptance would indicate my approval of an arrangement by which no one in the Federal Government under this bill could have his salary increased above $20,000. It would involve hundreds of people in the executive branch, all the heads of departments, and all the top executives, and it would involve all employees in the career service who would receive more than $20,000. It would throw the whole civil service establishment out of gear. It would knock two or three gears out of the machinery. It would not work. The Senator must realize that if the amendment is adopted there would be perhaps 300 or 400 high-ranking Federal executives who would be adversely affected.

We have studied this bill very carefully and closely, in trying to determine equitable salary scales.

Very shortly there will be coming before us a bill involving not a few million dollars, but a few billion dollars. If the Senator wishes to balance the budget, he can wait until the foreign aid bill comes before us, and he can go to work on that bill.

We already have $6 or $7 billion in the pipeline for foreign aid. He can take some of that money he wishes to save out of the foreign aid. He can balance the budget in that way, if he wishes to do it.

Furthermore, the amendment would result in the stacking of hundreds of employees at the same salary level. Are we going to say to the civil service employees, "We are not doing our duty in balancing the budget, and because we are not doing our duty, you shall not have the increase that you are entitled to"?

I do not believe the Senator from Delaware wants to do that. I say to the Senator that if other Senators had followed me in regard to foreign aid, we could balance the budget today.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I have supported cuts in foreign aid and shall be supporting them again this year. I agree with the Senator from South Carolina that a great deal of money is wasted in that program; however, there has been a great deal of wasting of money on domestic programs, too. I am not pointing the finger entirely at foreign aid because those who are the beneficiaries of that program do not vote in this country. We waste a great deal of money on many domestic programs which affect the State of the Senator from South Carolina and my own State.

We must recognize the fact that we must cut the entire budget.

Furthermore, Mr. President, the average civil service employee, for whom the Senator expresses so much sympathy, would not be affected by the amendment. The amendment would affect only those who are in the top supervisory status whose salaries are already in excess of $20,000.

I agree that it would result in the stacking up of a great many people. However, let us think of the incentive those people would have who are in a supervisory capacity in the Congress, in the Cabinet, or at the head of an agency. They would have an incentive to eliminate inefficiency in their departments. They would have an incentive to stop the wasting of the taxpayers' money. If they had that incentive and if they cooperated in reducing expenses of the Government, what would they get? They would have their salaries increased that much sooner.

In private industry the incentive plan is used a great deal.

I would not mind labeling this plan as the Johnston incentive plan if the Chairman wants the honor. I have no pride of authorship, even though I am proud of offering this plan. It could be called either the Senator Johnston incentive plan or the President Johnson incentive plan.

President Johnson said that he would balance the budget. If that is so, why would he complain about waiting a brief time before putting these increases into effect? If he is only talking for political propaganda purposes to the American taxpayer, which I really think he is doing, and if he has no intention of balancing the budget Senators should reject the amendment and say that if it were accepted these people would never get a salary increase.

I am not accusing the President of bad faith, even though he has asked for an appropriation which is $5½ billion more than President Kennedy received in the preceding year.

He talks loud about economy, but actually he is proving to be the most extravagant President ever to occupy the White House.

We will cut these appropriations if our salary increase as well as the salary increase for top executives in the Government were contingent upon our balancing the budget I venture to say that we would find a great deal of enthusiasm in Congress, in the Cabinet, and throughout the executive branch to trim down expenses, especially if we all felt that our own pocketbooks were affected.

Certainly there is no justification for increasing our salaries by 33⅓ percent and telling the American people that for an indefinite period in the future we intend to borrow the money with which to pay for our salary increases.

If that were done by a corporation in private industry that corporation would soon have a new board of directors. I am not too sure that there will not be a new board of directors in Government, too. The taxpayers may change it in November.

So long as the Senator from South Carolina cannot accept this most sensible amendment I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the request sufficiently seconded?

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be 30 minutes of debate allowed on the amendment, with 15 minutes controlled by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] and 15 minutes by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, if the amendment were adopted we would find that employees in the GS–16, GS–17, and GS–18 grades would all be compressed in one place at $20,000. The same thing would apply to heads of departments and others in positions of responsibility, earning more than $20,000; they also would be stacked together at the $20,000 level.

Anyone who understands the structure of the Federal service will realize that this would be a bad situation, because it would wreck the salary systems set forth in this bill.

Why penalize the employees, the people who would be affected by the amendment? The Senator from Delaware would provide that only when the budget had been balanced would many of these receive their pay increases. Does he expect the employees to balance the budget? Whose job is it to balance the budget? Have the civil service employees as a body responsibility to do that? No. It is the job of Congress to balance the budget. Yet it is proposed by the amendment to shoulder them with the responsibility for something that Congress should be doing.

As I see it, the amendment has no merit whatsoever at the present time. If it is desired to balance the budget, let it be done when the big appropriation bills come from the Committee on Appropriations.

We cannot expect to balance the budget if we continue to give away billions of dollars in foreign aid and spend billions of dollars for defense. But is there anyone who does not want us to defend our country? I do not believe so.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Perhaps the Senator from South Carolina recalls that a similar amendment was offered by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] to the tax-reduction bill. The amendment provided that the tax cut should not become effective until after the budget had been balanced.

The Senator knows that this is the kind of amendment that is repeatedly offered to bills that might cost the Government some money. Such amendments always provide that the programs are not to become effective until after the budget has been balanced.

This issue involves a simple matter of priority. If Senators desire to provide a pay raise for Government employees, they should vote against the amendment. If they do not want the Government employees to receive a pay raise, they should vote for the amendment.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma as much time as he may desire.

Mr. MONRONEY. If there is any logic to the proposal of the distinguished Senator from Delaware, it would be to save enough money by not passing the pay raise bill to contribute to a balanced budget. That is one way in which to read the amendment. But I do not believe that any of us are waiting to be ransomed in order to effect reductions or economies in the public debt, veterans' benefits, the farm program, or anything else. We will use a sharp ax whenever we can, but we do not intend to accept a bribe by denying Federal employees pay raises in order to save money; by saving the money the Senator from Delaware intends to cut out of the pay bill.

We all desire a balanced budget; but we cannot deny justifiable pay raises until the budget has been balanced.

The bill provides for a net cost in pay increases of $556,836,341. The benefits would flow to 1,732,602 employees.

Among the employees who would be affected by the Senator's amendment would be the small cadre of executives—377—that the President has asked for, whose salaries would be raised by the bill to the new executive pay levels at a cost of about $2,800,000.

At the very most, the cost of the raises for classified workers in the civil service brackets and for postal workers would be in the neighborhood of $555 million. Less than $4 million of that cost would be saved by the amendment of the Senator from Delaware.

While judges have little or nothing whatever to do with the economy or with effecting cuts in the budget, the amendment would withdraw the much needed pay raise for district judges, circuit judges, other judges of the Federal courts, and the members of their staffs. Again, there would be a saving of $4,900,000, roughly, out of $556 million.

When we come to Members of Congress and the staffs, who would receive salaries in excess of $20,000, there would be a saving of $4,500,000.

Therefore, the amendment, in full effect, would postpone for several years the much needed raises and, at the same time, would deny the right of the Executive to choose and the employ of personnel of great ability in the executive department to work for all the economy possible in Government. There would be a saving, roughly, of only $16,200,000. Deducting that from the total cost of the bill, $556 million, would still leave as the cost of the bill approximately $540,600,000.

I disagree with the Senator from Delaware about the wisdom of denying a pay increase. If the Senator is serious about desiring to balance the budget, all he need do is to vote "nay" on the pay bill, and he will vote to effectuate a total saving to the Government of $556 million. If it is desired to effect a saving, that is the way to do it, rather than to suggest that by withholding $16 million of salaries, there will be a balanced budget.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I contemplate supporting the amendment of the Senator from Delaware. I shall do so principally on the basis that it is some evidence of a sentiment in the Senate that we ought to start thinking about balancing the budget.

It is true that if the bill is passed, the savings will not be of great consequence. But the savings will, at least, convey a message to the people of the United States that there are some Members of Congress who are convinced that we cannot proceed interminably with unbalanced budgets.

We talk about unbalanced budgets. In the Foreign Service retirement fund, 30-percent contributions of the workers' salaries will be required to keep that fund solvent. At present, the employees are contributing 6½ percent. If the fund is to be kept solvent, there will have to be a contribution by the Government of 23½ percent of the amount of the salary.

The obligations of the retirement fund for civil service employees are $49 billion. There is $14 billion in the fund. Unfunded is $35 billion. That unfunded obligation is owed by the Federal Government.

But what are we doing about it? With $35 billion unfunded, every time Congress raises salaries, it also raises, eventually, the obligation of the Government in the retirement operation. When this pay raise bill is passed, there will be a new obligation of $1,300 million upon the retirement fund. That will be an obligation that has not been funded at all. The taxpayers will have to meet that obligation.

The beneficiaries, each year for 5 years, will be entitled to 6 percent more of retirement pay, as stated by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. Williams] yesterday. My question is: Can we be rationalizing if we believe that this kind of activity can continue? My answer to that question is that we cannot be. It is against the law of nature. Nature will not tolerate it. The time will come when there will be an accounting; and the worse we make the condition the more painful the accounting will be.

I repeat that the amount of money which would be saved by the amendment of the Senator from Delaware would be inconsequential, but his proposal is of great importance because at least it would send out word to the country that there are some in Congress who are beginning to worry about where the country is heading.

In my judgment, we are running downhill madly——

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, on whose time is the Senator from Ohio speaking?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I am speaking on the time of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. Williams].

Mr. JOHNSTON. Good.

Mr. LAUSCHE. We are running downhill madly, with the brakes loose.

I wish to give an example of where we are heading. The exhibitors of foreign countries at the New York World's Fair are in need of service for their pavilions, and I wish to read what is happening to the reputation of the United States which is being damaged by——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Ohio has expired.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 3 additional minutes, if the Senator from Delaware will permit me.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I am happy to yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. President, how much time have I left?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware has 10 minutes remaining. How much time does the Senator from Delaware yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized for 3 additional minutes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I read:

> The reputation of the United States is being damaged by a shakedown of countries which accepted invitations to participate in the fair. The principal subcontractor on the fairgrounds is charging exhibitors $17 an hour for plumbers, $11 for carpenters, $10 for painters, and $8 for unskilled laborers.
>
> At one such pavilion, the operator was charged $150 for work on a stopped sink, and then he reported the job was botched.

Keep on with this policy and we shall be adding fuel to what is happening throughout the country on the inordinate demands being made upon those people who wish to buy goods and services.

I thank the Senator from Delaware for allowing me to have the floor for these 7 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I disagree completely that the savings under the amendment can be measured by the dollar amounts involved. There may be only approximately $30 million of real reduction under this amendment, but this will be an incentive on the part of Members of Congress who vote for these appropriations and on the part of the executive branch and the heads of these agencies, who recommend the appropriation or approve the expenditures, to cut down expenses and appropriations and eliminate some of the unnecessary waste and extravagance which we all know does go on in the Government and which every Member of Congress will admit goes on in the Government.

Certainly if we have the top officials of the Government placed in the position that they cannot get their salary increases until they have demonstrated that they are worthy of them, this would be a greater incentive on them.

It is true that there will be some stacked up at the top, but in order to get them unstacked let us balance the budget. If anyone believes that we are really going to balance the budget then the postponement is only for a temporary period of time.

There are those who have been telling the taxpayers that they are going to balance the budget, and they should support the amendment. If they do not believe what they are saying they should vote against the amendment and admit to the taxpayers that they are speaking for political purposes only. I do not believe we will ever balance the budget under the present administration policies.

I am not unmindful that since 1930 we have never balanced the budget but 6 of those 34 years—28 of those years we have lived beyond our income.

I am also not unmindful of the fact that since 1900, with the exception of 3 years, the Democratic Party has never operated the Government with a balanced budget.

I have no faith whatever in the promise of this administration to balance the budget, particularly under this newfangled theory that we can cut taxes and increase spending, all at the same time, and end up in a couple of years with enough money to make it possible to balance the budget. We cannot do it in private business, we cannot do it in private families, and we cannot do it in the Government.

Let them tell the taxpayers what is meant. Let them tell them the truth.

This amendment is merely to separate the truth of the matter. Do we really believe we are going to balance the budget? If we do then vote for the amendment and go home and say that we shall have a salary increase in a very short period of time. But if we do not believe it then go ahead and vote against it.

Certainly this amendment can be justified. Certainly no Member of Congress can go home to his constituents and justify having voted for a 33⅓-percent salary increase when he tells them that that increase is being financed solely out of borrowed money.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Out of the 3 minutes I have left, I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, first let me say to my good friend, the Senator from Delaware [Mr. Williams], that there is much merit in his amendment.

I should like to inquire of him when he refers to the Federal budget, does he mean the administrative budget? I believe the legislative history should show that.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct. As certified by the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. MILLER. Second, suppose that there is a Federal balanced budget, let us say, for the next fiscal year, and the salary went into effect the following fiscal year and there was an unbalanced budget, would the salaries still stay in effect?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The salaries would stay in effect under the amendment, but if we can ever get this Government's spending controlled perhaps we can hold it. I am concerned over the fact that there is no evidence that in the near future we shall be able to control spending in the Government.

We had the Director of the Budget before our committee, who bragged of the fact that deficits did not just happen, he said that they were planned that way.

In other words, they brag and say that there is virtue in a "planned deficit." I am concerned about this new idea on the Potomac frontier that there is virtue in spending more than we have and that the Director of the Budget claims that he plans these deficits because they thought they would stimulate the economy. We were told that they have no prospects of balancing the budget until 1968, which by the way happens to be another presidential campaign year. I suppose they will then be promising to balance the budget.

The American taxpayer is getting tired of living on these promises.

If the administration means what it says, let us vote for this amendment and say that these salary increases for Congress and top executives will not go into effect until we actually bring about what has been promised—a balanced budget.

Mr. President, how much time have I left?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield for 1 minute?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I will be glad to yield to the Senator from Iowa for a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator from Delaware yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I have 5 minutes left—I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Iowa.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. MILLER. I thank the Senator from Delaware.

The significance of this is not so much in balancing the budget as in its impact on inflation. It does not necessarily follow that because we have a deficit of a billion dollars that we have inflation of a billion dollars. But, in the present structure of the economy, and under the present monetary policy of the administration, it works out that way.

For example, during 1961, 1962, and 1963, while we were going $20 billion deeper into debt, we had $21 billion of inflation.

This, I believe, is the significance of the amendment of the Senator from Delaware. It is designed to stop this continued inflation, which some so-called economists are trying to discount, but, nevertheless, is hurting many people in the United States.

I commend the Senator from Delaware on his amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Before the rest of my time expires I point out again that this amendment does not affect the average civil service employee one iota, nor does it affect the postal workers, and so forth. This amendment affects only those top officials of the Government whose salaries are in excess of $20,000 and who are directly responsible for whatever excess spending goes on in the Government.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I respectfully suggest that if the senior Senator from Delaware wants economy, if he wants to go a half billion toward balancing the budget, he should take a direct, affirmative course and vote against this bill, which he has every right to do. I do not intend to do it. The bill provides only $16.2 million for those, roughly, falling in the $20,000 and above class.

The very men whose responsibility and training are needed and who must be procured by the Bureau of the Budget, are needed to effect the economy—not the meat-ax kind of economy, but the general economy. They cannot be hired at $20,000. We cannot get a comptroller or a good finance man. We cannot pull this type of man into the Government service at $20,000 a year—the men who can effectuate the kind of economy we seek in order to balance the budget.

We have to bring in more talent, more young men, more people of ability, CPA's, and auditors to reach down deep into the departments and effectuate economies, consolidation, and deletion of various programs if we expect to come within the terms of a balanced budget. And cutting $16.2 million out of this bill will not do it.

If we want to make a substantial start, then the Senator should—and I expect he will—vote against the entire pay bill. But I call attention to the fact that those receiving above $20,000 a year, who would be affected by his amendment, are largely judges, and high-level civil service and postal employees. They have not had a pay raise in the past 4 or 5 years. Pay raises have gone to those who receive below $20,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Oklahoma has expired.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION FOR DISPOSAL OF CERTAIN MATERIALS FROM NATIONAL STOCKPILE

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield 30 seconds?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I yield 30 seconds to the Senator from Missouri.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri is recognized for 30 seconds.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, earlier today, I reported four measures to authorize the disposal of four materials held in the national stockpile. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of these four measures. I also request that appropriate excerpts from the committee reports be printed in the RECORD in connection with the consideration of these measures.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DISPOSAL OF PIG TIN

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request for the immediate consideration of the four measures referred to?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 300) authorizing the disposal of approximately 98,000 long tons of pig tin from the national stockpile was considered and agreed to.

The excerpts from the report (No. 1166) presented by Mr. SYMINGTON are as follows:

PURPOSE

This resolution would grant congressional consent to the disposal of 98,000 long tons of pig tin now held in the national stockpile.

TIN

A notice of a proposed disposal of 98,000 short tons of pig tin was published in the Federal Register on March 27, 1964, 29 F.R. 3838, and the Congress was asked to approve the disposal.

On July 26, 1963, the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning established a revised stockpile objective for tin at 200,000 long tons. As of May 15, 1964, the quantity of tin in inventory in excess of this objective, after sales commitments, was 123,541 long tons. Of this excess quantity 25,541 long tons remained to be sold from a disposal program of 50,000 long tons approved by House Concurrent Resolution 473, which was agreed to by the House on June 1, 1962, and by the Senate on June 21, 1962. Hence the quantity of tin in the national stockpile that is excess to requirements and that has not been previously approved for disposal is approximately 98,000 long tons.

Consumption of tin within the United States declined from 83,000 long tons in 1929 to about 55,000 long tons in 1963. Consumption throughout the free world has shown a steady increase in the last 5 years—from 136,000 long tons in 1958 to 158,500 long tons in 1963. This free world consumption is estimated to increase to 175,000 long tons annually by 1968. Free world production of tin has increased over that of 5 years ago, but it has not kept pace with consumption. The output has increased from 121,124 long tons in 1958 to 146,700 long tons in 1963 and this is expected to increase to 158,200 long tons by 1968. The estimate consequently is that there will be a deficit of about 20,000 long tons annually over the long term.

The disposal plan for tin contemplates that the 25,541 long tons that are the remaining unsold balance under House Concurrent Resolution 473 of the 87th Congress will be merged with the 98,000 long tons that are the subject of this resolution. The total excess will be disposed of over a period of approximately 6 to 8 years. The General Services Administration has announced that it expects to dispose of approximately 20,000 long tons of tin during the first year of the program and that the disposal plan will be reviewed at least annually by the Administrator of General Services in consultation with other interested departments and agencies.

LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE

The objective of this resolution is similar to Senate Concurrent Resolution 77, introduced by the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON].

FISCAL DATA

The average acquisition cost of the pig tin in the national stockpile was $1.0855 per pound. The average return to the Government from the disposal action authorized by House Concurrent Resolution 473 of the 87th Congress has been $1.26 per pound. The current market prices for pig tin are in the range of $1.50 to $1.56 per pound. The

General Services Administration estimates that the price for pig tin will continue to remain favorable for this disposal action.

DISPOSAL OF MOLYBDENUM FROM THE NATIONAL STOCKPILE

The bill (H.R. 11235) to authorize the disposal, without regard to the prescribed 6-month waiting period, of approximately 11 million pounds of molybdenum from the national stockpile was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The excerpts from the report (No. 1163) presented by Mr. SYMINGTON are, as follows:

PURPOSE

This bill would (1) grant congressional approval for the disposal of 11 million pounds of molybdenum now held in the national stockpile, and (2) waive the 6-month waiting period ordinarily required before disposals of strategic and critical materials may be made from the national stockpile.

MOLYBDENUM

Molybdenum is a basic industrial raw material used chiefly in the manufacture of alloy, steels, and chemicals. An uninterrupted supply of this material is essential to the economies of highly industrialized nations.

The United States is the largest producer and consumer of molybdenum in the world. U.S. production was 66 million pounds in 1963. The only other significant supplies of molybdenum available to the free world are in Chile, which now produces about 5 million pounds annually.

U.S. consumption of molybdenum has increased from 24 million pounds in 1958 to 48 million pounds in 1963. Although production in the United States exceeds domestic consumption, the strong demand for molybdenum by other industrialized countries of the free world has created pressure upon the supplies of the U.S. producers.

The committee was informed that U.S. producers of molybdenum are taking steps to meet increased demands from ample molybdenum ore reserves but that because of the lag between consumer demand and production a balance between demand and supply is not immediately foreseeable and the present shortage may continue for some time. This gives the Government an opportunity to dispose of some excess molybdenum and also to satisfy an urgent immediate need for the material in our domestic industry.

If this bill is approved the General Services Administration plans an initial sales offering of 2 million pounds on a competitive basis. Subsequent offerings would be made periodically, depending upon the evaluation of previous sales and of existing market conditions. Disposals would be limited to domestic consumption.

The current stockpile objective for molybdenum is 68 million pounds. The inventory in the national stockpile is slightly more than 79 million pounds. This bill would permit the disposal of all the molybdenum that is surplus to stockpile objectives.

FISCAL DATA

The average acquisition cost of molybdenum in the national stockpile was $1.06 per pound. Current market prices are approximately $1.55 per pound. Disposals under House Concurrent Resolution 473 of the 87th Congress resulted in an average return to the Government of $1.448 per pound.

SALE OF ZINC

The bill (H.R. 11004) to authorize the sale, without regard to the 6-month waiting period prescribed, of zinc proposed to be disposed of pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The excerpts from the report (No. 1165) presented by Mr. SYMINGTON are, as follows:

PURPOSE

This bill would (1) grant congressional approval for the disposal of approximately 75,000 short tons of zinc now held in the national stockpile, and (2) waive the 6-month waiting period ordinarily required before disposals of strategic and critical materials may be made from the national stockpile.

ZINC

Zinc that would be disposed of under this bill is excess to present mobilization requirements of the Government. The current stockpile objective for zinc is zero. The inventory of zinc in the national stockpile is 1,580,643 short tons.

Within the last 2 years U.S. consumption of zinc has reached near record levels—1,013,821 short tons in 1962, and 1,081,354 short tons in 1963. The year of record consumption was 1955, when 1,119,812 short tons were used.

The consumption of zinc in the United States is primarily by the automotive industry, which uses the material in dye castings and for galvanizing. Use of zinc in the production of automobiles is increasing and the present estimate is that zinc consumption in 1964 will surpass the record year of 1955.

Domestic mine production of zinc ore is insufficient to meet our requirements. As a result, the United States depends upon foreign sources of supply for almost one-half of the smelting ores needed here. The U.S. consumption of zinc has exceeded domestic production by about 100,000 short tons a year for the past 2 years. Consumers in the United States are experiencing difficulties in securing needed supplies. The excess zinc in the national stockpile is more than adequate to satisfy consumer needs that the producing industry is now unable to fulfill. This condition affords the Government an opportunity to dispose of surplus zinc from the stockpile without an unfavorable impact upon the market and it also meets an important industrial need.

LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE

The objective of this bill is similar to that of S. 2768, which was introduced by the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG].

FISCAL DATA

The average acquisition cost of zinc in the national stockpile was $0.1449 per pound. Current market prices range from $0.1350 to $0.1475 per pound. The General Services Administration estimates that the price of zinc will continue to remain favorable during the period of the proposed disposal action.

SALE OF LEAD

The bill (H.R. 11257) to authorize the sale, without regard to the 6-month waiting period prescribed, of lead proposed to be disposed of pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The excerpts from the report (No. 1164) presented by Mr. SYMINGTON are, as follows:

PURPOSE

This bill would (1) grant congressional approval for the disposal of 50,000 tons of lead now held in the national stockpile, and (2) waive the 6-month waiting period ordinarily required before disposals of strategic and critical materials may be made from the national stockpile.

LEAD

Consumption of lead in the United States has been increasing in recent years, with the available supply being exceeded by nearly 40,000 short tons in both 1962 and 1963. The total U.S. consumption of 1,154,300 short tons in 1963 was the highest since 1957 when consumption was 1,138,115 short tons.

The stockpile objective for lead was reduced by the Office of Emergency Planning from 286,000 short tons to zero on June 17, 1963. As a consequence the inventory of 1,378,453 short tons of lead is in excess of estimated stockpile requirements. The committee was informed that the developing lead shortage in the commercial market may become serious during 1964. Consequently the present circumstances seem more favorable for an orderly disposal of lead surpluses than they have in recent years.

LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE

The objective of this bill is similar to that of S. 2933, introduced by the junior Senator from West Virginia, [Mr. BYRD], and S. 2867, which was introduced by the senior Senator from West Virginia, [Mr. RANDOLPH].

FISCAL DATA

The average acquisition cost of the lead in the national stockpile was $0.1445 per pound. Current market prices for lead, the highest in several years, are about $0.13 per pound.

Mr. MONRONEY. Would the Senator tell us how much lead and zinc is involved?

Mr. SYMINGTON. There are 75,000 tons of zinc; and 50,000 tons of lead.

Mr. MONRONEY. Can the Senator state whether the committee is satisfied it will have no adverse effect on the commodity?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Let me say to the Senator from Oklahoma that those who are most eager to have the disposals approved are the users of the materials. There is a critical shortage.

Mr. MONRONEY. It would not adversely affect the current market, in the judgment of the Senator?

Mr. SYMINGTON. In the opinion of the disposal experts of the General Services Administration, and in the judgment of the committee, it would not.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the Senator. I know of his great interest in this subject. His State is an important producer of the material.

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES SALARY REFORM ACT OF 1964

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11049) to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I should like to know whether the pay increase would also apply to retired judges who are drawing full pay for life.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, inactive judges drawing full pay are not specifically mentioned in this bill. But under the law that is already on the statute books, they would.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That means that a judge who is retired would also get the benefit of this pay increase?

Mr. JOHNSTON. That is true.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and I ask unanimous consent that the time not be charged against the time on either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President——

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield briefly to me?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Montana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I understand that the next amendment will be one to be offered by the Senator from Oregon.

I ask unanimous consent—and I hope this meets with the approval of the Senate—that, from now on, there be a time limitation, on each amendment, of one-half an hour, with 15 minutes to be allotted to the proponents and 15 minutes to be allotted to the opponents, and with the time to be controlled, respectively, by the mover of the amendment and the Senator from South Carolina, respectively; and that 2 hours be available on the question of the passage of the bill, with the time to be controlled by the majority leader and the minority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator from South Carolina for yielding to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time, and to whom? Do Senators who are in charge of the time on the Williams amendment yield back the remaining time under their control?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, how much time remains available to each side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware has 4 minutes remaining; the Senator from South Carolina has 6 minutes remaining.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President——

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does either side yield time to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I wish to have only about 1 minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, if I cannot get any time now, I shall offer an amendment of my own.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I shall try to get the time for the Senator from Arkansas. I have yielded almost all the time I have.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I do not know on which side the Senator intends to speak. I am willing to give him 1 minute of my time. I suggest that the Senator from Delaware yield him 1 minute.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, to resolve the issue, I yield 1 minute on the bill to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I wish to make one statement. One of the reasons why I cannot support the bill is that the Government is operating at a continuous deficit. Later I shall make a short statement on the bill, but that is one of the reasons why I cannot support the bill.

When the tax reduction bill was before the Senate, I offered an amendment which would link the reduction to a balanced budget. In a sense, my position now is comparable. The same principle is involved as was involved in the previous amendment.

I commend those who have offered the amendment. I shall support it. I do not believe—and I will repeat the statement again in my remarks—that we have any moral right to raise our salaries and charge the cost to future generations. We should not increase the deficit under which the Government is now operating.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield 2 minutes?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I yield 2 minutes to the minority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I hope that the amendment will not prevail. Very simply, it provides that there shall be no salary increase in the case of those whose salary is now $20,000 or over, until the Federal budget is balanced.

I sat through all the tax hearings held by the Senate Committee on Finance. Some of the best testimony we had was from none other than Arthur Burns, the economist and chairman of economic advisers in the Eisenhower administration. It was his opinion, contrary to that of some others, including the Secretary of the Treasury, that we could not see a balanced budget until 1972. That is 8 years from now.

I should like to invite attention to what is involved. It touches an amount equal to one quarter of 1 percent of the money that is carried in the bill. That is the total sum. It is in the neighborhood of about $16 million. If there is any virtue in that kind of attitude on the bill, we ought to start reducing every appropriation by half if we are to make any progress in that direction. In my judgment, at best the proposal is only a gesture; therefore I trust that the amendment will be rejected.

FARM PARITY DOWN—NO TIME TO RAISE CONGRESSIONAL SALARIES

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I wonder if the minority leader would yield me an extra minute on the bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield 1 minute on the bill to the Senator from South Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I shall support the Williams amendment. It seems to me that if nothing else can be said about the proposed pay raise bill, it can be recorded as the masterpiece of bad timing of the 20th century.

A 33-percent increase in our salaries has been proposed at a time when we have recently increased, once again, the national debt limit, at a time when we have denied the people a reduction in excise taxes which the Senate voted and surrendered in conference and at a time when the whole agricultural economy of our country is in the doldrums. I do not believe that anyone could have conceived a worst time in which to propose this kind of bill to propose increasing congressional salaries.

However, with the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] it seems to me that we could in good conscience support the proposed legislation.

First. The amendment would not delay for one single second increasing the salary of anyone in the Federal Government who is receiving less than $20,000. I am strongly in favor of the legitimate pay increases suggested for these lower income Federal employees.

Second. The proposal would afford an inducement to the policymakers of our country—who are the people in Congress and in the executive department who are getting over $20,000—to develop some economic programs which will stimulate our economy so that we can have a balanced budget.

I see nothing in the record of expenditures on the part of the policymakers thus far that should give them a 33⅓-percent increase in salary, because they have consistently kept our country in the red. Surely the policymakers in the executive and legislative branches of Government deserve no bonus in the form of pay increases for a record of that kind.

Mr. President, I point out what has happened to the agricultural economy as an example of our failures. This morning in my office I received the release from the Department of Agriculture for June on agricultural prices. The release shows that parity for farmers in this country has dropped to 74 percent. That is the lowest since August 1939. It represents another full point drop from a month ago.

The proposal comes at a time when those engaged in the beef industry in this country are going broke because of imports and poor prices, and at a time when farmers generally are receiving prices which are only 74 percent of parity. It seems to me highly logical and persuasive that we should defer the proposed increase in salaries for ourselves, for judges in retirement, and for policymakers who are earning over $20,000 a year until such time as we have produced programs—and we have enacted them—which will provide for a balancing of the budget.

This New Frontier idea of voting ourselves a 33⅓-percent increase in salaries out of borrowed money does not add up as sound or right in anyone's arithmetic book. We ought to consider the Williams proposal seriously and say to the policymakers, "All right. Your policies have failed. You have been consistently putting this country into the red, in this time of peace and prosperity. You have submerged the agricultural economy to 74 percent of parity. Come forth with something worthwhile. Come forward with some economies. Come up with some stimulus and incentive to industry, business, and agriculture so we can produce the money to balance the budget. Then will be the time to increase the salaries of those in the higher salary brackets who hold the responsibility for policymaking in our Government. Perhaps the inducement of a pay raise predicated on a better performance record will help get the sensible solutions our problems require."

Our present Federal policies, Mr. President, are failing our American farmers and ranchers very seriously. This administration was elected on the promise of "parity prices for agriculture." Instead, import practices and Department of Agriculture policies forced through a Congress which this administration dominates by a 2-to-1 majority have put parity prices so low they are averaging from 8 to 10 percent lower than during the Eisenhower Republican years. Look at the record. In June of 1960 under Eisenhower, parity stood at 78 percent; and in June of 1961 was still 78 percent; in June of 1962 it remained at 78 percent with no progress toward the promised goal of 100 percent parity prices for farmers. By June of 1963 parity had dropped in fact to 77 percent and in June of this year—as of today—it has sagged to 74 percent. Policymakers paid over $20,000 or more per year surely deserve no pay increase for that type of record and neither do the Members of this Congress.

I should add that during every other June of the Eisenhower administration parity ranged from 81 to 92 percent, so we have had a total drop from the first year of the Republican administration parity level of 92 percent for farm prices in 1953 to 74 percent of parity today—a total drop during these past 11 years of 18 percent. As a Senator from a farm State I cannot in good conscience vote for a pay-increase bill raising by some 33⅓ percent the salaries of policymakers now receiving over $20,000 per year in the face of such a sorry record of performance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me 1 minute on the bill to ask the Senator from South Dakota a question?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, retired Supreme Court Judges are receiving $35,000 for life. They are inactive. We have also inactive judges of the circuit courts of appeals and the district court of the United States. Does the Senator know that everyone of those inactive judges who are presently receiving, respectively, $35,000 a year, $25,500, and $22,500 would have the benefit of the proposed increase?

Mr. MUNDT. Yes, the Senator knows that. In addition the Senator from South Dakota knows something else. He knows that the judges' plush lifetime pension of full salaries is a noncontributory pension to which the judges contribute not one single dime. It is paid for entirely by the taxpayers. I do not think that now is the time to reward them with an increase in retirement benefits paid for by borrowed money.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, as a cosponsor of the amendment, I wish to speak briefly on it.

Yesterday many Senators who were supporting the bill referred to the U.S. Government as the largest corporation in the world. They said that, therefore, we ought to pay the executives commensurate salaries and bring them up to the levels proposed in the bill.

I submit to the Senate that if we actually had a corporation with a board of directors which had consistently operated that corporation in the red for many years, and is now programing a period of continuing activity to run it in the red for the next 7 or 8 years, there would be short shrift for the members of the executive department who were operating that corporation.

The amendment would provide an incentive for those who are operating the so-called corporation—the Members of the House, the Senate, and the executive department downtown—to change the operation from one which is in the red to one which is in the black in order to try to get some kind of balanced budget.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Who yields time? The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. Williams]. The yeas and nays have been ordered——

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I will take the 1 minute remaining on my amendment.

I call attention to the fact that only last week the Congress rejected the repeal of retail excise taxes on the theory that we could not finance the deficit on borrowed money. How can we tell the people that we could not cut taxes because we cannot finance the deficit on borrowed money but that we can increase our own salaries by 33⅓ percent and do not mind doing it with borrowed money?

We were told last week that $7 billion of the $9 billion request for an increase in the debt ceiling this year is to make up the loss in revenues resulting from the tax cut of last January. Here is another $500 or $600 million increase in salaries.

I am proposing, under the amendment, to postpone the effective date of the increase of salaries in excess of $20,000 until we can demonstrate to the American people that we are worthy of it and can earn it.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an editorial which appeared in the Washington Daily News of Tuesday, June 30, in which it was pointed out that the Senate of the United States cannot recover its prestige solely by increasing the salaries of its Members.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Prestige?—Dignity?—Status?

Senator Olin Johnston, Democrat, of South Carolina, and his colleagues of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee have now formally recommended in a written report that all Senators and Representatives be paid an additional $7,500 a year.

Their bill, scheduled for Senate action this week, also provides pay increases for all other Federal employees, judges, congressional help, and postmasters. It follows the pattern of the one passed by the House and ups the lawmakers' pay from $22,500 to $30,000 a year.

The Johnston report argues that the "increasing cost of serving in Washington" is one reason for the pay increase, not mentioning that no Congressman ever was hogtied and made to take his job. He sought it of his own free will, and was glad enough to get it.

But when the report says that "also involved (in the proposed pay increase) is the prestige, dignity, and status of the Congress and its Members," it is indulging in as ridiculous a bit of sophistry as we've ever seen in a congressional report.

Senators should know money won't buy prestige. If it's prestige they want, let them write a law (and obey it) to end congressional conflicts of interest and set up a rigid and honest congressional code of ethics.

If it's dignity they want, more pay won't assure it, but an end of nepotism might.

And if it's status they so greatly desire, they should know that raiding the Treasury in their own behalf won't achieve it. Let them seek status by putting an end to sponging on the Federal Treasury with lush Government-paid junkets disguised as fact-finding or investigative trips, and let them pass an honest clean elections law to assure complete and instant disclosure of all campaign contributions and expenditures.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Delaware has expired.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Johnston] has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I yield back my time, and I ask for a vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment has been yielded back.

The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Edmondson] is absent on official business.

I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Bayh], the Senator from California [Mr. Engle], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy] are absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers] and the Senator from Texas

[Mr. YARBOROUGH] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 26, nays 65, as follows:

[No. 461 Leg.]

YEAS—26

Bennett
Boggs
Byrd, Va.
Church
Curtis
Dominick
Ellender
Goldwater
Hruska
Jordan, Idaho
Lausche
McClellan
McGovern
Mechem
Miller
Mundt
Pearson
Proxmire
Robertson
Russell
Simpson
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, Del.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—65

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Bartlett
Beall
Bible
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va
Cannon
Carlson
Case
Clark
Cooper
Dirksen
Dodd
Douglas
Eastland
Ervin
Fulbright
Gore
Gruening
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Johnston
Jordan, N.C.
Keating
Kuchel
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGee
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalf
Monroney
Morse
Morton
Moss
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Prouty
Randolph
Ribicoff
Scott
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Walters
Williams, N.J.
Young, N. Dak.

NOT VOTING—9

Bayh
Cotton
Edmondson
Engle
Fong
Kennedy
Saltonstall
Smathers
Yarborough

So the amendment offered by Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, for himself and other Senators, was rejected.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

By Mr. RUSSELL, from the Committee on Armed Services, reported the following nominations:

Gen. Earle G. Wheeler, U.S. Army, for appointment as Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff;

Gen. Barksdale Hamlett, U.S. Army, to be placed on the retired list in the grade of general;

Lt. Gen. Harold Keith Johnson, U.S. Army, for appointment as Chief of Staff, U.S. Army, in the grade of general; and

Lt. Gen. Creighton Williams Abrams, Jr., Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army), to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President, in the grade of general while so serving.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate may consider the nominations of certain Army officers, whose nominations I have just reported.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations will be stated.

IN THE U.S. ARMY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Gen. Earle G. Wheeler, U.S. Army, for appointment as Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Gen. Barksdale Hamlett, U.S. Army, to be placed on the retired list in the grade of general.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Lt. Gen. Harold Keith Johnson, U.S. Army, for appointment as Chief of Staff, U.S. Army, in the grade of general.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Lt. Gen. Creighton Williams Abrams, Jr., Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army), to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President, in the grade of general while so serving.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES SALARY REFORM ACT OF 1964

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11049) to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 1087.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk proceeded to state the amendment.

Mr. MORSE. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with, and that it be printed in the RECORD at this point. I can explain it very quickly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, is as follows:

TITLE VI

That each Member of the Senate and House of Representatives (including each Delegate and Resident Commissioner); each officer and employee of the United States who (1) receives a salary at a rate of $10,000 or more per annum or (2) holds a position of grade GS–15 or above, and each officer in the Armed Forces of the rank of colonel, or its equivalent, and above; and each member, chairman, or other officer of the national committee of a political party shall file annually with the Comptroller General a report containing a full and complete statement of—

(1) the amount and resources of all income and gifts (of $100 or more in money or value, or in the case of multiple gifts from one person, aggregating $100 or more in money or value) received by him or any person on his behalf during the preceding calendar year;

(2) the value of each asset held by or entrusted to him or by or to him and any other person and the amount of each liability owed by him, or by him together with any other person as of the close of the preceding year; and

(3) the amount and source of all contributions during the preceding calendar year to any person who received anything of value on his behalf or subject to his direction or control or who, with his acquiescence, makes payments for any liability or expense incurred by him.

SEC. 2. Each person required by the first section to file reports shall, in addition, file semiannually with the Comptroller General a report containing a full and complete statement of all dealings in securities or commodities by him, or by any person acting on his behalf or pursuant to his direction, during the preceding six-month period.

SEC. 3. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b), the reports required by the first section of this Act shall be filed not later than March 31 of each year; and the reports required by section 2 shall be filed not later than July 31 of each year for the six-month period ending June 30 of such year, and not later than January 31 of each year for the six-month period ending December 31 of the preceding year.

(b) In the case of any person required to file reports under this Act whose service terminates prior to the date prescribed by subsection (a) as the date for filing any report, such report shall be filed on the last day of such person's service, or on such later date, not more than three months after the termination of such service, as the Comptroller General may prescribe.

SEC. 4. The reports required by this Act shall be in such form and detail as the Comptroller General may prescribe. The Comptroller General may provide for the grouping of items of income, sources of income, assets, liabilities, and dealings in securities or commodities, when separate itemization is not feasible or not necessary for an accurate disclosure of a person's income, net worth, or dealings in securities, and commodities.

SEC. 5. Any person who willfully fails to file a report required by this Act or who willfully and knowingly files a false report shall be fined $2,000 or imprisoned for not more than five years, or both.

SEC. 6. (a) As used in this Act—

(1) the term "income" means gross income as defined in section 22(a) of the Internal Revenue Code.

(2) The term "security" means security as defined in section 2 of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended (U.S.C., title 15, sec. 77b).

> (3) The term "commodity" means commodity as defined in section 2 of the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended (U.S.C., title 7, sec. 2).
>
> (4) the term "dealings in securities or commodities" means any acquisition, holding, withholding, use, transfer, disposition, or other transaction involving any security or commodity.
>
> (5) The term "person" includes an individual, partnership, trust, estate, association, corporation, or society.
>
> (b) For the purposes of any report required by this Act, a person shall be considered to be a Member of the Senate or House of Representatives, an officer or employee of the United States and of the armed services as described in the first section of this Act, or a member, chairman, or other officer of the national committee of a political party, if he served (with or without compensation) in any such position during the period to be covered by such report, not withstanding that his service may have terminated prior to December 31 of such calendar year.
>
> SEC. 7. The Comptroller General shall have authority to issue, reissue, and amend rules and regulations governing the publication of reports, or any part of them. He shall prescribe fees to cover the cost of reproduction. In formulating such rules and regulations, he shall seek to maximize the availability of reports for purposes of informing the public and agencies and officials of the Federal and local government, and to minimize use of such records for private purposes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, this is the Morse full disclosure bill offered as an amendment to the pending bill. I first introduced it in 1946. For many years I could not even obtain a hearing on the bill. However, last year hearings were held on the bill, along with hearings on other disclosure bills which had been introduced from time to time in the intervening years, particularly in recent years.

The essence of the bill covers these points:

Anyone in Federal employment receiving $10,000 or more a year shall be required to make a full disclosure once each year in accordance with regulations drawn and on forms supplied by the Comptroller General on the matters found at page 2 of the bill, starting at line 3:

> (1) the amount and resources of all income and gifts (of $100 or more in money or value, or in the case of multiple gifts from one person, aggregating $100 or more in money or value) received by him or any person on his behalf during the preceding calendar year;
>
> (2) the value of each asset held by or entrusted to him or by or to him and any other person and the amount of each liability owed by him, or by him together with any other person as of the close of the preceding year; and
>
> (3) the amount and source of all contributions during the preceding calendar year to any person who received anything of value on his behalf or subject to his direction or control or who, with his acquiescence, makes payments for any liability or expense incurred by him.

The penalties are set out at the bottom of page 3 as follows:

> SEC. 5. Any person who willfully fails to file a report required by this Act or who willfully and knowingly files a false report shall be fined $2,000 or imprisoned for not more than five years, or both.

Mr. President, Senators know the position I have taken on this matter. I have told the majority leader that I shall not consume much time on the amendment. He has agreed to my having a yea or nay vote on it. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Working for the Federal Government or receiving one's livelihood from the Federal Government is not a matter of right, but a matter of privilege and opportunity.

The American people are entitled to know the sources of all income of officials of the Government so that they can be the judges of what may be, if any, the relationship between the sources of income and the course of action that Federal employees may take in any particular matter.

I first introduced the bill in 1946 when I became disturbed by what was recognized at that time, namely, certain Members of Congress taking advantage of their position, and taking advantage of certain privileged information that they had, to profit thereby financially.

That danger always lurks, although I am proud to tell the American people that in my 20 years as a Member of the Senate I have served with an overwhelming majority of honorable men and women who are dedicated public servants and who are entitled to the trust of the American people.

But I also know the importance of surveillance. I know the importance of having a procedure that will protect the honorable and the honest. The full-disclosure bill, for which I have fought for so many years, involves a matter of right—the right of the American people to know.

In essence, that is my case, I rest my case. I reserve whatever time I may have remaining, should I decide to yield any of it.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. On page 2, line 3, the text of my copy reads "amount and resources."

Mr. MORSE. It should be "sources."

Mr. MONRONEY. Should it be "sources"?

Mr. MORSE. "Sources." That is a typographical error. It should be "sources."

Mr. MONRONEY. I am glad to have that correction, because that would include the identification of all income, whether it be employment, private business, farming, speechmaking, or anything of that kind.

Mr. MORSE. That is correct; it is all encompassing. The error in the amendment is a printer's error; it is not my error.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 3 minutes?

Mr. MORSE. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. It is true that the Senator from Oregon was the first Member, especially in this body, to propose a conflict-of-interest bill. There are a number of us who have come to the Senate more recently who share in general, although not in particular, his views.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], and I have had pending for some time before the Committee on Rules and Administration a somewhat similar bill. It is perhaps a matter of undue pride of authorship that we believe our bill is a little more artistically drawn. It has been revised a little more frequently in light of modern conditions and is perhaps a slightly better bill than that of the senior Senator from Oregon. Nevertheless, the provisions of the Senator's bill adequately raise the important question of conflict of interest. I support it fully.

I had intended to make a rather substantial speech in support of my amendment, but I shall not do so because of the unanimous-consent agreement which has curtailed our time. I ask the senior Senator from Oregon for the privilege of cosponsoring his amendment, and I shall vote for it.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have always considered the Senator from Pennsylvania a cosponsor with me in spirit and intent. I am delighted to have his name added to the amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Ohio; then I shall yield 1 minute to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Within a few weeks after I took my oath in this Chamber in 1959, I filed with the Secretary of the Senate a complete statement of my financial holdings at that time. Because I was a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I sold certain sugar stocks that I owned; and because I was also a member of the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, I sold some Pan American World Airways stock, which I suspected might conflict with my service on that committee I made a complete disclosure of my financial holdings at that time, so that the citizens of Ohio, whose servant I am, could judge from my votes and my work as their Senator whether or not I was motivated by any selfish purposes in casting any votes.

I compliment the senior Senator from Oregon on the fact that he was a pioneer in proposing conflict-of-interest legislation.

I am somewhat proud of the fact that I was the very first Senator to file a complete statement of assets and financial holdings.

Earlier this year and on other occasions between January 1959, and the present time, I have filed similar reports with the Secretary of the Senate and have made them public.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Ohio has expired.

Mr. MORSE. I yield 3 additional minutes to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. This year I filed with the Secretary of the Senate, in addition, certified copies of the income tax returns filed last year and the year before by Mrs. Young and me.

Mr. President, the pending pay raise bill will cost taxpayers more than $564 million a year. Furthermore, as the Federal bureaucracy grows, the price tag for this increase will grow with it.

I cannot in good conscience support the bill in its present form. At least four separate legislative proposals were arbitrarily lumped together in this bill providing a pay increase for: postal employees, classified civil service employees, all other members of the executive branch of our Government; also the Federal judiciary; also employees on the staffs of Members of the Congress; and finally Members of Congress.

I had hoped that a separate bill would be introduced for letter carriers, postal clerks, and in fact all postal employees who I feel are the most deserving of an increase in pay at this time. Legislative proposals to accomplish this should be debated and acted upon separate and apart from the pending bill. Such a legislative proposal, I believe, would pass overwhelmingly. I would like to vote for that part of this bill relating to letter carriers and other postal workers in the lower pay brackets. Frankly, I do not believe that a valid argument has been made for increasing the salaries of all civil service employees. There may be—and undoubtedly there are some—positions for which competent people cannot be found because of the salaries offered. For those positions I suggest that specific legislation be enacted to correct the problem. I do not see why American taxpayers should have to foot the bill for king-size salary increases for over a million civil service employees just to lure a comparatively few highly skilled people into Government service.

It is my observation that most Government employees in Washington and elsewhere are and have been well paid in comparison with those doing the same work in private industry. Furthermore, those in the classified civil service have job security, sick leave and fringe and retirement benefits far superior to employees in private industry.

Mr. President, regarding the salary increase for Members of the Congress, it is my view that we must set an example by holding the line on wage costs. The President has urged a maximum hold-the-line raise of 3.2 percent in wages and prices. This bill will give Representatives and Senators a 33⅓-percent increase. Frankly, I do not believe that an increase of this magnitude is warranted at this time. I seriously doubt whether there would be any additional candidates for election to the Congress because of the proposed pay raise. No doubt the same men and women would be elected or returned to the Congress. The fact is that very few men and women of high achievement in private life would refuse appointment or certain election to the Senate of the United States, or practically certain election to the House of Representatives.

Mr. President, I am glad to note that the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee deleted the so-called Udall amendment to the bill as passed by the House of Representatives. In my view it would be unconscionable to tie the salaries of Congressmen and top Federal officials to future pay increases for Federal employees in general. I commend our colleagues on the committee for voting unanimously to delete this provision from the proposed legislation.

As for the staffs of Members of the Congress, and of committees of the Congress, I see no valid reason whatsoever for a salary increase at this time. Senators and Representatives receive ample allowances to hire personnel. These are among the most sought after jobs in Washington. As a matter of fact, every summer we are besieged with requests from young people attending our finest colleges and universities who wish to work without salary for the experience of participating in governmental activities. I am sure that many of my colleagues at this time have interns, so-called, on their staffs who are not drawing pay. I say this merely to emphasize the fact that congressional staff positions do not go begging because of present salary levels.

Frankly, I have not heard any of my colleagues express the opinion that they are unable to obtain qualified personnel for their staffs because of present salary limitations. Nor have I heard the chairmen of various committees of the Congress complain that they are unable to staff their committees because of salary limitations. It should be remembered that employees on senatorial staffs do not have to maintain a residence in their home State as well as one in Washington as Senators do. Frankly, I do not believe that the great majority of our assistants are overworked or underpaid. Many of them—for the most part those on committee staffs—seem to have plenty of time to line the walls of the chamber and watch proceedings out of curiosity when business is being conducted and when Senators are working and voting on legislation of great public interest. Most receive liberal vacations, are not limited by civil service sick leave requirements, and at the same time are entitled to all civil service fringe benefits. I seriously question whether a pay increase is required for congressional staff employees. Are any of them required to spend money campaigning for the well-paid positions they hold? Of course not.

Whenever there is a vacancy on the Federal bench, many, sometimes hundreds, of competent lawyers seek the appointment. There are at most but a few hundred lawyers in our Nation, who, if offered an appointment to the Federal bench, would not accept. Very few lawyers would refuse appointment as U.S. judge at $22,500 a year but would agree to accept were the salary to be increased to $30,000. I would like to know the name of one man in the Nation who would refuse appointment to the U.S. Supreme Court, the highest honor a lawyer may receive, solely because this position pays $35,000 a year and not $42,500.

There are Federal judges today in Ohio and in most other States who have reached retirement age and could have retired years ago. Evidently, they do not feel that they are being underpaid as many continue to serve actively well beyond the retirement age of threescore and ten. Furthermore, it would be dead wrong to increase the salaries paid to those judges who have retired. This bill would do that.

Mr. President, our Government cannot afford to depend upon men and women born to great wealth or who have acquired great wealth to run its affairs. None of us wants that. On the other hand, the Federal Government cannot be absolutely competitive with private industry.

Our Government's only source of income for paying salaries is the taxpayer who already is bearing a heavy burden. The purpose of Government is service whereas the purpose of industry is profit. If the goal is to try to match the pay scale of private industry, then we must accept the fact that the proposed bill is only the first installment. We should realize that the Federal Government should not match the salaries of private industry. We shall always have to rely to a marked degree on many citizens who desire to serve their Government as a public service.

Mr. President, in my judgment this legislation proposes salary increases which are overly generous and in some instances outrageous. It appears to me that there should be separate legislative proposals for the different categories of Federal employees involved. Then the needs of each could be carefully studied and a pay raise considered on the merits of each.

This is not the time to indulge in self-indulgence, to indiscriminately fatten the already well-larded Federal payroll. Our national economy simply cannot afford the luxury of this bill at this time. Therefore, after full and thorough consideration, I cannot, in good conscience, vote for the pending bill.

This bill to which I object proposes a raid on the Public Treasury. Long ago it was written:

> Enter ye the strait gate: for wide is the gate, and broad is the way that leadeth to destruction, and many there be which go in thereat; because strait is the gate, and narrow is the way, which leadeth unto life, and few there be who find it.

The gate to the Public Treasury is wide, and broad is the way.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Ohio has expired.

Mr. MORSE. I have many times highly commended the Senator from Ohio. I commend him again for his leadership in the Senate in trying to bring an end to conflict-of-interest problems.

Mr. President, I now yield 1 minute to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to join the distinguished Senator from Oregon as a cosponsor of his amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Thirteen years ago, when I was chairman of the Committee on Ethics in Government, this was the recommendation our committee made. I have tried to follow through with the recommendations of that committee by voluntarily submitting this year a detailed statement of my holdings and income from various sources.

Mr. MORSE. I have always been greatly indebted to the Senator from Illinois for the help that he has given and for the leadership he has extended to the Senate on this issue.

I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may join the Senator from Oregon as a cosponsor of his amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. I am happy to have the Senator from New Jersey as a cosponsor.

Mr. CASE. What the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark] said is, of course, true. We have been less long in the Senate than the Senator from Oregon, but almost as long, in relation to our service, as sponsors of almost identical bills ourselves.

My own inspiration comes largely from the work done by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Douglas] some years ago in connection with the committee which he headed, and which looked into the matter of making recommendations, the key of which was disclosure.

It is clear from both old and modern history in this body that the Senate will not police itself, and there is no outside body adequate to do it. It is necessary to rely on the principle of disclosure. I think it is essential that we adopt it as quickly as possible.

I am happy to join the Senator from Oregon in the offering of his amendment.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield 2 minutes?

Mr. MORSE. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from New York.

Mr. KEATING. With the consent of the distinguished Senator from Oregon, I ask unanimous consent that I may be joined as a cosponsor of his amendment.

I feel it is most important that we adopt conflict-of-interest legislation before voting any pay increase for ourselves.

I fully support the amendment of the Senator from Oregon and if it should not succeed, I shall offer my amendment, No. 1092, thereafter, in an effort to at least deal at this time with the problem of outside income and investments for Members of Congress and their staffs.

It is unfortunate that the congressional pay raise provisions have been tied to the proposed pay raises to our postal workers and classified employees.

There is no question as to the merit of these increases for the employees in the postal and civil service. It would be completely false economy to keep their salaries at present levels. This Nation is most fortunate in having the highest caliber of employees in the classified service and the postal system. We cannot expect these talented and dedicated employees to remain in Government service at bargain basement wages.

Pay raises to postal workers and classified employees will not, in my judgment, be inflationary. They are an investment in Government efficiency and morale which will pay rich dividends in improved public service.

Congress has an obligation to live up to the promises of the Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962. We adopted what I consider to be an eminently fair and reasonable approach to the problem by providing that Federal salaries would be as comparable as possible with those paid in private industry for the same type of work.

We are now on the threshold of the first test of this enlightened policy. It is incumbent upon us to prove our good faith to those who have worked for the Federal Government in reliance upon this promise. Postal workers and classified employees have not reneged on their obligation to give an honest day's work for a day's pay. We in turn must not renege on our compensation promises of 1962 to give an honest day's pay in return.

Be it merit, comparability or cost of living increases, these Federal employees who are legally denied some of the means of redress enjoyed by their counterparts in private industry to secure wage increases, deserve fair treatment at this bargaining table. Despite other defects in the Government Employees Salary Reform Act of 1964, there can be no withdrawal from our obligation to approve the reasonable salary increases to the postal and classified employees. I shall, therefore, support the bill.

We have already enacted broad conflict-of-interest legislation applicable to employees in the postal and civil service. What we want to do now is remove any suggestion of a double standard by applying similar obligations to the legislative branch. I commend the Senator from Oregon for his efforts and am pleased to join with him.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from New York. I appreciate his support.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Nelson] be added as a cosponsor of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I wish to ask a question of the Senator from Oregon. After the Comptroller General received the reports, what would be done with them? Would they be reported back to the Senate, or would they be made public?

Mr. MORSE. They would be published as a public document.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. MORSE. I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Oregon a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does someone yield time to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. MORSE. I shall be happy to answer the Senator's question.

Mr. MILLER. I invite the Senator's attention to the limitations on disclosure in his amendment.

I am wondering whether the Senator's amendment really would get the job done. With respect to page 2, the first subsection, what about cases; an individual's spouse or his children, or his brothers or sisters, or his parents, or a trust over which he has control, of which he is the beneficiary?

Mr. MORSE. I understand the problem; we have discussed it many times. This is a good start. I am for going this far now.

Mr. MILLER. I wonder if the Senator would agree to expand the coverage.

Mr. MORSE. Not at this time. We will do that next year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Iowa has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON. How much time does the Senator from Montana wish?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Five minutes.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Montana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to this amendment, not that I am not in accord with it, because I am. The fact is, the distinguished Senator from Oregon is the "granddaddy" of all these bills, although many others get credit for what he started about 18 years ago. It was his inspiration while I was a Member of the House which caused me to introduce similar legislation in that body. I believe that I have introduced bills of that nature in the Senate as well.

I believe I made a public statement that I have no outside interests; I am not engaged in dealing in any properties. The only income I receive is on the basis of my service in this body.

I point out to Senators that there is a resolution now on the calendar, Senate Resolution 337, reported by the Rules Committee, which may not go so far as some Senators wish, but I believe that I am correct in stating that there will be amendments to the resolution when it is reported to the floor.

I assure Senators that Senate Resolution 337 will come up in the Senate, and enough time can be taken to discuss the subject so that all facets of it can be explored.

I do not believe that this is an appropriate bill to which to attach this amendment. I believe more in the way of discussion is needed, and will be forthcoming. I would hope, therefore, that on the basis of the promise made that the resolution will come up—and it was going to come up, anyway; it will be subject to amendments—the proposal will not be accepted at this time.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield for a question?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. Does not the Senator agree that the really substantial difference between the Morse amendment and Senate Resolution 337, which was started as the result of the Bobby Baker investigation, is that the Morse amendment deals not only with the Senate, but also with the House, the executive arm of the Government and the armed services, requiring reporting by the Comptroller General. Therefore it is a comprehensive disclosure amendment;

whereas, the Bobby Baker resolution—if I may call it that—to which my friend the Senator from Montana refers, is confined strictly to the operations of the Senate, and it would be difficult, indeed, by appropriate amendment, to expand and take care of the other body and the executive arm.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Difficult, but not impossible; and what the Senator has said otherwise is correct.

But, I would hope that the Senate would spend more time on this most important subject. I repeat, the "granddaddy" of all those who have introduced amendments of this kind is the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. CASE. I wonder whether we could inquire at this time whether Senate Resolution 337 is technically subject to amendment by the provision of the Morse amendment or similar legislation. It is a Senate resolution as opposed to a bill, which the Senator's amendment really is.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I suggest, on my time, that the Senator make inquiry of the Chair on that point.

Mr. CASE. May I inquire of the Parliamentarian, through the courtesy of the majority leader, whether Senate Resolution 337, when it comes to the floor, could be subject to amendment by offering it either as an amendment or a substitute to the provisions of the Morse amendment now pending?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Parliamentarian informs the Chair that legislative amendments would not be in order on the resolution.

Mr. CASE. So, the Morse amendment would not be in order as an amendment to Senate Resolution 337?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It would not.

Mr. CASE. I thank the Chair.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That was brought out by the Senator from Pennsylvania in his colloquy earlier. But, amendments would be in order——

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield at that point?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. Is it not a fact that the report of the Rules Committee and the bill they have reported, being a mere resolution of the Senate, would not be subject to amendment involving the House. It would have to be changed to a Senate resolution in order to effectuate that, which would merely mean a reintroduction of any amendment that could offer an opportunity to both Houses to work their will on legislation specifically dealing with this most important subject.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct. There is a good deal of merit in this kind of resolution because of its genesis. It applies primarily only because of the incident which brought about the inquiry and, therefore, it may be a good place to start.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield to me for 2 minutes?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, this amendment, and similar amendments, to me, seem to be——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Montana has expired. Who yields time to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I am glad to yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Will the Senator from South Carolina yield the time?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I yield 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I do not wish to take more than a couple of minutes.

I am against this resolution. I am against all resolutions of this kind, because it is pretended that they are surrounded by an atmosphere of alleged righteousness. I do not believe they are.

I have seen many self-righteous declarations of affluence, or lack of affluence, filed by persons involved in public life. With the exception of one or two, they are not detailed, they are not informative, and they do not disclose the facts; yet, they fly under the banner of disclosure.

I am completely disgusted with the claim that some of these things have met the test of disclosure, of affluence, of property rights.

Mr. President, so far as I personally am concerned, I probably am about the least affluent Member of this body. I do not own one share of stock. I do not own any bonds, except a very few Government bonds which I have managed to "scratch out" once in a while. I have not been able to accumulate any property which amounts to anything in approximately 34 years of public life, except that my house is paid for, and perhaps I have a few dollars in the bank.

Probably one of the reasons why I might be opposed to this amendment is that I am ashamed to tell the truth that in my lifetime I have not become more affluent than I have. I have not done a single thing to be ashamed of. If any Senators wish to come and look at my assets, they are welcome to come and look at them.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator refers to his disgust at some who have undertaken to reveal their assets on the floor of the Senate.

Let me ask this question, as one who did: Did the Senator refer to me and to the others who did so, and is he remaining within the confines of rule XIX, section 2?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I did not express disgust with people. I expressed disgust with the form of the alleged disclosure that occurred in a number of cases in public life.

I said that I did not confine my remarks to this body, or to any other body. There have been many occasions before committees on which people have disclosed assets in a manner which I believe does not meet the test of full disclosure. My remarks were made in general.

Mr. CLARK. I take it that the Senator does not refer to any Senator; therefore, I am happy to accept his apology.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The Senator may interpret my remarks any way he wishes. I made my remarks generally about people in public life. I have not circumscribed it or limited it.

Again I say that so far as I am personally concerned I probably could be charged with being a little ashamed of the fact that during my lifetime, which has largely been spent in public office, I have failed to accumulate any great amount of this world's goods.

I will say, furthermore, that I have never inherited a dollar in my life, so whatever I do not have is because I do not have it based on my own efforts.

In a way, this creates a special aura of demagoguery. I do not think Senators of the United States, or any respectable citizens in the country should be forced to engage in a full disclosure of all his private affairs, business or otherwise. The people of his State pass on those things. They are the ones that judge the propriety or lack of propriety in his election. If any Member is guilty of shortcomings, maladministration of his office, or anything else, this body has the right to kick him out. This body has the right to police itself now.

We have gone through some hearings which I think failed to go into many things that should have been gone into.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. But I think this particular proposal and this series of proposals do not merit support. They are singling out special groups for special odium.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 2 more minutes to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. They are singling out for special odium or special consideration a certain group of people who should deserve the consideration of the respect given them by the voters of their State when they were sent here. If they have done wrong, let them be punished in the orderly way. If they violate the responsibility, the honor, and the dignity of this great office, let the Senate act on those particular occasions.

From my standpoint, I have no hesitancy in saying that any Senator who wants to come and look at what I have is welcome to do it. And I will apologize because of my lack of ability to establish, create, and accumulate affluence during the period of my public life.

I have nothing to conceal. But it is a matter of basic principle. I am not going to vote to have every businessman of this country disclose his assets, or all of his reports on income tax, either. We have had a policy along that line for a long time. I do not think it is good legislation. I think it is belittling legislation.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MILLER. Is the amendment of the Senator from Oregon open to amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Sentaor from Oregon is open to amendment.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state it for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. Mr. MILLER proposes an amendment to the Morse amendment. On page 2, strike the semicolon in line 8 and insert the following: ", by his spouse, children and their spouses, brothers and sisters, father and mother, and any trust or fiduciary arrangement under which any of said individuals is a beneficiary or over which he or she exerts any control: *Provided*, That if said Member, officer, or employee is unable to file any information required hereby with respect to any of the individuals or entities specified, other than his spouse and minor children, because of their refusal to provide such information, he shall file a statement, under oath, setting forth the name and relationship and the fact of such refusal."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa has 15 minutes.

Mr. MILLER. I yield myself such time as I require.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I suggest to the Senator from Oregon that while the amendment he proposes has the semblance of merit to it, it does not go far enough. I do not think that the general public will be fooled one little bit.

We all know that if one wants to avoid or evade some of the purposes that are set forth in the Senator's amendment, that this can readily be done through the vehicle of using one's spouse, one's children, father, mother, brother, or sister, or a trust, or the establishment of a fiduciary arrangement.

Let us do a job if we are going to do a job. I do not think we ought to say, "We will do it tomorrow, or next year." If we are going to do it, now is the time. I do not think we are going to raise the stature of the Senate or of Congress one bit by the adoption of an amendment which goes only as far as the amendment of the Senator from Oregon. But if we are willing to couple with it various individuals who, as a matter of common knowledge, are tied in with people who want to cover up—then I think we can get a job done that will cause the general public to have confidence in the integrity of those we are trying to cover by this measure. If we do not do it, I think we are going to be attempting to fool them. And I do not think they are going to be fooled, either.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it is not necessary to have the amendment of the Senator from Iowa in order to accomplish the purpose sought by the Senator from Iowa. My amendment would require disclosure of income tax returns of public officials and public employees that fall within the category stated. If we obtain that disclosure, that is all we need.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Kentucky.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I agree that the Senator from Oregon is the father of all resolutions requiring disclosure. I remember that in 1947 he was advocating disclosure. Nonetheless, I shall vote against this amendment.

I should like to give my reasons. I was a member of the Committee on Rules and Administration when we investigated the Baker matter for months. At the end of our rather futile investigation, we took up the question of disclosure resolutions. One was voted out and is now on the calendar.

Senator CLARK introduced a substitute which, in my opinion, is a more effective resolution that the one reported. I voted for the Clark resolution. Senator MANSFIELD has said that the committee resolution will come before the Senate. We shall have an opportunity to vote on it, the Clark resolution, the Case resolution, the Morse resolution, and others. There can be a thorough discussion.

The reason I shall vote against the pending amendment is, with all due deference to my colleague, whom I admire for his leadership in the disclosure field, is first, that it has no chance of acceptance by the House.

We are trying to tell the House of Representatives what its rules should be. We know the conferees are not going to accept this. The resolution applies to every employee of the United States making over $10,000 annually. I think we should consider whether we want to make every such employee in the United States subject to this drastic procedure.

Let us clean our own house and provide a rule of disclosure for the Senate. I will vote for it. My disclosure would be about like Senator HICKENLOOPER's.

Let us act here, and do something that would apply to the Senate first, instead of trying to apply a rule to all employees in the United States.

By voting, a Senator can say that he is in favor of disclosure. I will vote for a disclosure resolution when I have a chance to vote for one that would be meaningful.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield to me 1 minute?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Nevada.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. CANNON. I concur in what the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] has said. The Senate Committee on Rules and Administration has reported a resolution to the Senate, and the resolution will be considered. In general, with a few exceptions, I support the terms of the amendment. I have drafted and propose to introduce at a later date a bill directed toward the very end sought, with some minor changes, in the amendment proposed by the Senator from Oregon. But there will be an opportunity to consider the resolution covering the Senate itself. If we were to enact an amendment of the type proposed, we would really sound the death knell for the pay bill at this particular time for many who are entitled to pay consideration. I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. MILLER. I do not wish to prolong the discussion. I merely wish to repeat that if we really wish to do a job in this connection, the Morse amendment would not do it. It would not go far enough. We know it does not go far enough, and the people will know that it does not go far enough. Other categories of individuals who have close personal relationship with the Member of Congress, the officer, or the employee, must be covered. Make no mistake about it. We shall not raise the prestige of our body in the eyes of the American people by limiting the coverage as the Morse amendment would do.

The Senator from Oregon has said that it is not necessary. We know it is necessary. There are ample instances in which people have covered up some of their financial transactions by using their spouses, their children, their parents, their brothers or sisters, or have entered into some fiduciary arrangement.

All my amendment would do is to make sure that we do an adequate job of coverage. If the Senate does not think that this is the time to deal with such a problem as this—and personally, I do not believe it is—Senators may vote against the Morse amendment, as amended by the pending amendment. But if Senators think they are going to fool the American people by voting the amendment down, and then voting for the Morse amendment, I believe it will be a very unfortunate and unhappy experience.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield to me 1 minute?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I yield 1 minute to the majority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. MANSFIELD. To the best of my knowledge, no Member of this body is trying to fool the American people. I believe that we are sent here to exercise our judgment in the best way we know how. If anyone has the idea that because we vote for or against a certain amendment or an amendment to an amendment that we are trying to fool the American people, I wish he would disabuse his mind of the idea, because that is a mark against the Senate as an institution and against Senators individually.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield 2 minutes to me?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Oklahoma.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. MONRONEY. I appreciate what the majority leader and the minority leader have said. The bill deals with the pay scales of approximately 1,732,000 Government employees. It has been before the Congress last year and this year. It is up today for final passage.

I believe that we should have disclosure. The work that has been done in the investigating committees by the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration and by others will produce and give us a genuine and proper disclosure bill when the time comes, and we shall have an opportunity to take up the question as we should in a full day, 2 days, or 3 days, if necessary, in an attempt to find proper means and methods to have a very tight disclosure system for the Senate, for the House, or for both.

But I am now telling the Senate that, knowing the House conferees as we do, if the amendment is put in the bill as a Senate amendment which would include the House, we shall have very great trouble saving the bill, because the historic comity between the Houses of Congress permits each House to be the judge of its own rules.

The proposal in effect would be a rule that the Senate would like to vote upon itself for disclosure of whatever income we may have. I think most of us are for it. I certainly am. I am only ashamed that it cannot be enough to seem important. But the House would resent it and probably break up the conference if we included it in a rule that we properly believe should be a part of the operations of the Senate. We are two individually distinct and independent bodies. Throughout history one body has not tried to impose its opinions or morals on the other body. We have got into some very important fights, as Senators well know, over such subjects as the use of the frank. Each body claimed it had the right to determine the question for itself.

It is for that reason, at this late hour, with 15 minutes on a side, that I say it is a poor time to rush into proposed legislation of so great importance. If the subject is brought up in the right way as a bill, doing that one thing, it would undoubtedly receive the unanimous or nearly unanimous support of the Senate.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to have 10 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I yield my remaining time to the Senator from Illinois.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina has 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes under the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It seems to me that we are living in an age of snoopers. We are now proposing to enlarge the field in this very body. I think it is time to come to grips with the problem and to assert our rights, because the fact that one is in public service certainly does not divest him of his rights as a citizen of the United States. If it is desired to tack up every income tax blank on every courthouse door in the country and put us all on a par, that is a different thing. But it is proposed to require every Member of this body file three reports a year. First, a report with respect to such things as resources and income would be filed with the Comptroller. Section 2 would require the filing, semiannually with the Comptroller, of a report containing a full and complete statement of all dealings in securities.

If a Senator should buy one share of stock, he must make a return to the Comptroller of the United States. If he buys another share in the next 6 months, he must make another report.

The amendment would make bookkeepers out of Senators, and they would have scant time left to pursue their duties as Members of the U.S. Senate.

My distinguished friend the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] began by saying that he was somehow impressed with the fact that the Members of this body were honorable. I agree with him. But the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] rose to mention the fact that although we were honorable Members, we had to be policed.

Mr. President, I do not go in for such policing operations. If I cannot go back and justify my conduct with the people back home, where candidates for office are screened, I have no business being here in the first place. We would cover a large segment of the Government, including every Representative, every Senator, and every employee in this entire governmental establishment who receives $10,000 or more. Everyone over the rating of GS–15 would be within the reporting requirement. Every Army officer over the grade of colonel would be included, as well as all the generals. That is what the Morse amendment would do. The Senator from Oregon shakes his head affirmatively.

Finally members of the national committees would be included. How they got in I do not know. They are not officials of the Government.

The proposal has about it the old prohibition aura. How did it start? There is a large building over here that attests what finally happened. There were those who said, in the language of the Book:

> Wine is a mocker, strong drink a brawler.

We heard, "Alcohol is a curse. It must be stopped. I am pure, holy, and undefiled. No alcohol has ever seeped through my lips. But that is not enough. Somehow, I have to save others and make sure they are holy, purified, and righteous, too." Everybody becomes a crusader.

That crusade mounted to proportions that finally put the 18th amendment into the Constitution of the United States. I is the one amendment that was contrary to the spirit of that document. What does the Bill of Rights provide? It provides that Congress shall make no laws abridging freedoms, and so forth. But when we got to the 18th amendment, we said, not that the Congress shall not, but that the people shall not. They shall not manufacture. They shall not transport. They shall not import. They shall not drink. We added the implementation of the Volstead Act. Then the snoopers went over the country. What an amazing thing.

My friend from Iowa spoke a moment ago about the image of the Senate. I remember a very distinguished rabbi, whose name was Joshua Liebman. I remember when he offered the invocation in the House of Representatives. He wrote a book called "Peace of Mind." Walking down LaSalle Street in Chicago one time, I saw the book in the window, and I picked up a copy. In the first chapter there was the challenging statement that "You cannot reconstruct society on the basis of unreconstructed individuals."

The image of the U.S. Senate will take care of itself. Just be sure that our own images are correct and that they are not under compulsion. What is an image worth if it is under compulsion of a law? No; the Senate image will be all right if we guard our individual conduct.

To pass something such as is here proposed is somewhat of a confession that there must be some dishonor here, although we start by saying that every Member of this body is honorable.

For the life of me, I cannot understand the logic that goes with it. I am not going to vote to police another Member of this body. Every Senator is free to make a statement of his assets, liabilities, and income, and put it into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. He can see that his income tax return is published in the RECORD, if he wants to do it. But why should one have to do it? Why does another person become my moral mentor because I refuse to do it under that kind of compulsion? Congress does not give the Internal Revenue Service the right to publicize the return of anyone. Any individual Member of Congress can publicize it, himself, and put it in the RECORD. But that is not enough for some. They say, "I am righteous, I am holy, I am undefiled, I am pure in spirit, I am honorable. But I must make my neighbor in the same image, and I must compel him to come up to the line."

Look out, for when we start moving that way, we are going in a dangerous direction.

Mr. President, there has been much snoopery in this country. God willing, it will never happen again.

Why do we point the finger of scorn at countries behind the Iron Curtain? Because the people in those countries are afraid of the knock on the door at midnight. Because they are afraid of wiretapping. Because they are afraid of snooping. Because they are afraid of talking.

Committee after committee of Congress has undertaken to run down espionage and spying in our own country. It is proposed now to get into the swim and spirit of that, and to say, "We have to put a mantle upon our fellow Members," as if it were not enough to have individual Members do it.

Let any man stand in his place; if he wants to do it, he is free to do it. There is nothing in the law to inhibit him.

It is like the pay bill. I do not know of anything to inhibit a Senator from introducing a bill to give back a pay increase. All he has to do is authorize the Treasury to take it. Until it is done, it cannot go back to the Treasury. The Treasury does not have authority to take any money except what goes anonymously into the conscience fund.

This is the worst thing the Senate could do, and it would be a tortuous path from here on out. It certainly will not be consummated by my vote.

The Miller amendment, the Morse amendment, the Keating amendment, the Clark amendment—all of them should be voted down by an overwhelming vote. Let us show the country that, in our own image, we will do the honorable thing. Then, if the image of this institution must be retrieved, it will be done, and not before.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield myself 1 additional minute.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator take 2 minutes on the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. From whose side is the time to be taken?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield myself 1 more minute.

Mr. President, I end where I started, with the statement by that eloquent rabbi who died at the age of 84, when he said, "You do not reconstruct a society on the basis of unreconstructed individuals." That is where we start, and I am not worrying about the image of the Senate. Let each Member worry for himself, and not undertake to exercise the power of compulsion to have others report and report and report, in order to retrieve an image, if one confesses that that image is tarnished. I make no such confession.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 more minute.

I shall be proud to go back home and stand on any platform and let any one of the 10½ million people, young or old, in the State of Illinois ask me, "Do you want now to tell us what you own, what your resources are?" I shall say, "I will tell you the day that every other taxpaying citizen in the country makes an equal disclosure. I am not a class B citizen."

Mr. President, I yield back whatever time I have remaining.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield 3 minutes on the bill?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I cannot subscribe to either the Miller amendment or the Morse amendment. If I have to file an affidavit to prove that I am honest, then I am practically morally bankrupt. I have been in public life for 30 years. I am a lawyer. Ever since I left the bench I have not had a law office. I have nothing to hide. I have not had any $100 plate dinners for me. I refuse to receive contributions for my campaign from individuals who do business with government.

I know within myself what the status of my conscience is.

If this proposal is to be made, why not propose that everybody's income tax report should be available for examination? I think this is a situation that cannot be justified. Why should I be presumed to be dishonest? Why will not my honesty be established until I file an affidavit?

I wish to repeat that if I am in that condition, I should abandon public office and drop my head in shame.

I have never filed an affidavit. I did make a disclosure of my assets when a newspaper columnist charged me, erroneously, about a matter. He subsequently withdrew and retracted his charges.

I cannot vote for the proposal, not because I fear to disclose. I think I could disclose with much greater ease and propriety than many of those who are supporting the proposal.

In my whole lifetime, except for that one attack made here in Washington 4 years ago, my integrity has never been challenged.

My life is my affidavit. My life is my proof. The people know it. After 30 years of service, in 1962 the people of Ohio elected me by 700,000 votes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That was the highest majority ever given a candidate. I did not have to file any affidavit to prove my honesty.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I oppose the Morse amendment and all similar amendments. They are not in the public interest. As to Senators, I doubt if there is any State in the Union in which voters cannot ascertain for themselves who is engaged in the production of a supported crop, who is engaged in manufacturing, who has interests in banking, and so on.

The amendment affects a great many other people. It affects every member of the Armed Forces of the rank of colonel and above. It affects the fine men and women in Senators' offices, if they receive more than $10,000 a year.

What does it require them to do? It requires them to file a report twice a year. What must they show? They must show how much money they owe. That is what we would do to the people who work for us. The amendment includes even the mothers of our armed services people who are fighting in Vietnam. They would become criminals if they did not file a report twice a year, showing whether or not someone gave them as much as $100, or the amount of each liability owed by them.

How ridiculous can we become?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. CURTIS. Whom does it cover? It covers the Armed Forces, and it covers the people who work in our offices.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield 1 more minute to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I have had something to do with certain investigations. It is my honest belief that the amendment would not do one thing to stop corruption. A small minority, whether elected or appointed to office, are corrupt, follow secret and devious means, and make false reports, concealing their assets. They use a third person to hold their assets.

The amendment will not end or deter corruption.

The amendment would be a blow at the good people who work for the Government. It is harassment of the honest and conscientious. It is unfair and unjust.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, it seems to me that this amendment proposes an ex post facto law. The Constitution of the United States sets forth the conditions under which a man may be elected to the Senate. He must be 30 years of age, and on the day of his election he must reside in the State. The persons who have run for election to the Senate under those conditions were not required to make the kind of disclosure that the amendment would require. If the supporters of the disclosure idea would like to offer a constitutional amendment, setting forth the type of disclosure Senators must make if they are elected to the Senate, let the Senate, the House, and the States of the Union decide whether such disclosure is necessary. Then I believe we would be approaching the problem properly.

People who take jobs in the executive department know in advance whether they will be required either to disclose or divest, and that fact may influence their decision to take the job.

My friend, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], is a great constitutional lawyer. I am surprised that he has not realized that the constitutional amendment processes are really the only sound basis on which to approach this kind of problem.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENNETT. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Senator from Utah could not be more wrong as a matter of constitutional law than the fallacious argument he has just made.

Mr. BENNETT. I will leave it to my colleagues in the Senate to decide that question.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, how much time have I remaining.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa has 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, all that my amendment would do, so far as my friend from Illinois and my friend from Ohio are concerned, would be to put the Morse amendment into shape so that if perchance it were adopted we would not have to hang our heads and admit that we were not doing a job.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLER. With respect to my friend from Nebraska, all that my amendment would do would be to put into the Morse amendment the third parties to which he referred in his statement. Covering the mother of an officer and forgetting the third parties, so far as I am concerned, is a once-over-lightly, superficial approach. People would know it to be so. What I am trying to do with my amendment is to put the Morse amendment into shape so that if it should be adopted, the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Ohio, who would vote against the amendment anyhow, at least would realize that we had not done a superficial job.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLER. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. If the Senator's amendment is adopted and if the amendment of the Senator from Oregon is adopted, is it not true that the brothers and sisters and mothers and fathers of every colonel fighting in Vietnam will have to file a report or be guilty of being a criminal?

Mr. MILLER. If my amendment were adopted I would hope that we would have some further amendments to the Morse amendment adopted.

Mr. CURTIS. I am not asking the Senator about his hopes. Is that not what would happen if the two amendments were adopted?

Mr. MILLER. And nothing more; yes. But that does not meet the actualities of the situation.

Mr. CURTIS. I should like to ask the Senator about one further situation. Suppose a lady worked in this building and her gross income, which means before expenses and before deductions for dependents, was $10,000. The adoption of the Senator's amendment would require a financial statement to be filed by her showing all gifts of $100 or more, and it would require a showing on her part of all of her debts, and a similar report of her brothers and sisters and her mother and her father. Is that correct?

Mr. MILLER. No; that is not correct. The Senator has not read my amendment. It relates only to the first subparagraph on page 2. What the Senator is talking about is the second and, I believe, the third paragraphs on page 2.

Mr. CURTIS. The Senator's amendment applies to everyone covered by the bill.

Mr. MILLER. It relates only to the first subsection on page 2.

Mr. CURTIS. That would include the people involved.

Mr. MILLER. It does not include debts at all. It includes income and gifts.

Mr. CURTIS. The Senator would require brothers and sisters and mothers and fathers and everybody with a gross income of $10,000 to file the report. Is that correct?

Mr. MILLER. It would require an official to file a statement. I should like to clear this up for the Senator from Nebraska by asking the clerk to read the proviso clause of my amendment, because I wish him to understand that we are not being unreasonable.

Will the clerk read beginning with the proviso?

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Provided, That if said Member, officer, or employee is unable to file any information required hereby with respect to any of the individuals or entities specified, other than his spouse and minor children, because of their refusal to provide such information, he shall file a statement, under oath, setting forth the name and relationship and the fact of such refusal.

Mr. MILLER. What is so unreasonable about that?

Mr. CURTIS. It is very unreasonable. It does not deter dishonesty. It harasses the innocent. It does not touch the people who proceed in a devious and secret manner. That is where the corruption comes.

Mr. MILLER. The Senator from Nebraska and the Senator from Iowa usually see eye to eye on things of this type. A few minutes ago, he criticized the failure to cover the very persons that my amendment covers, the very persons he thinks ought to be covered.

Mr. CURTIS. No; the Senator places impositions on relatives with respect to filing reports when there is no evidence whatever of dishonesty, even on the part of the principals.

Mr. MILLER. I do not wish to labor the point. The Senator from Nebraska, the Senator from Ohio, the Senator from Illinois, and other Senators know that if one wants to be devious, the Morse amendment will not handle the situation at all. If my amendment were adopted, it would be possible to touch base with those people who are in such close and intimate relationship with those individuals. This is the way to catch up with the deviousness.

If Senators want to take the risk of having the Morse amendment adopted, an amendment, which, as I said, is superficial, and is an empty gesture, they can reject my amendment. They can still vote for my amendment and then vote against the Morse amendment, as amended.

Mr. President, I move the adoption of my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield back the remainder of his time?

Mr. MILLER. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Iowa to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now recurs on the amendment of the Senator from Oregon. The Senator from Oregon has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, after listening to this interesting argument, I merely say that those who would be covered are servants of the people. The people are entitled to know the facts about the subject covered by the amendment.

I am more convinced than ever that it is in the public interest to proceed as I propose.

I yield back the rest of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded back. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCarthy] is absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Bayh], the Senator from California [Mr. Engle], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy] are absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough] are necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers] is paired with the Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough]. If present and voting, the Senator from Florida would vote "nay" and the Senator from Texas would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Cotton], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Fong], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Saltonstall] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Saltonstall] would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 25, nays 66, as follows:

[No. 462 Leg.]

YEAS—25

Case
Church
Clark
Douglas
Gore
Hart
Hartke
Jackson
Javits
Keating
Kuchel
Magnuson
McGee
McGovern
Morse
Moss
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Proxmire
Smith
Symington
Thurmond
Williams, N.J.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—66

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Bartlett
Beall
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Cooper
Curtis
Dirksen
Dodd
Dominick
Eastland
Edmondson
Ellender
Ervin
Fulbright
Goldwater
Gruening
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Humphrey
Inouye
Johnston
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Mansfield
McClellan
McIntyre
McNamara
Mechem
Metcalf
Miller
Monroney
Morton
Mundt
Muskie
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Randolph
Ribicoff
Robertson
Russell
Scott
Simpson
Sparkman
Stennis
Talmadge
Tower
Walters
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.

NOT VOTING—9

Bayh
Cotton
Engle
Fong
Kennedy
McCarthy
Saltonstall
Smathers
Yarborough

So Mr. Morse's amendment was rejected.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 1089 and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Ribicoff in the chair). The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The Legislative Clerk. On page 157, in the table following line 21, strike out:

Class 1: Superintendent of Schools	$25,000
Class 2: Deputy Superintendent	21,000

and insert in lieu thereof:

Class 1: Superintendent of Schools	$26,000
Class 2: Deputy Superintendent	22,000

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. This amendment seeks to increase the salary of the Superintendent of Schools of the District of Columbia from $25,000 to $26,000, and for the Deputy Superintendent from $21,000 to $22,000. My amendment raises the salary of these two officials to the figure contained in the House-passed bill.

I have this amendment and another one immediately following, which can be disposed of quickly on the basis of the understanding I have with the chairman of the committee. The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] tells me that it will go to conference, anyway. He desires the maximum flexibility in conference and he is not opposed to it, as I understand, but I do not seek to bind the committee in conference.

He gives me the assurance that the committee will be in conference, and the amendment will receive very careful consideration of the Senate conferees; but I should like to have him make a brief statement on the floor of the Senate as to his position.

Mr. JOHNSTON. This amendment will go to conference. The Senate figure is $1,000 lower than that of the House. The House gave $26,000 and the Senate gave $25,000, so that will go to conference. Regarding the Deputy Superintendent of Education, the House figure is $22,000 and the Senate figure is $21,000, so that item will also go to conference.

I appreciate the Senator's taking this matter up at this time, to let us decide that matter in conference.

Mr. MORSE. On the basis of my conversation with the Senator from South Carolina, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Oregon is withdrawn.

Mr. MORSE. I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a table showing the amount and rank of salaries currently paid to superintendents of schools, 1962–63.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMOUNT AND RANK OF SALARIES CURRENTLY PAID TO SUPERINTENDENTS OF SCHOOLS, 1962–63

Cities over 500,000 in population

1. Chicago	$48,500
2. New York	37,500
3. Los Angeles	35,000
4. Detroit	33,000
5. Dallas	33,000
6. San Francisco	31,000
7. Pittsburgh	30,000
8. San Diego	29,400
9. Philadelphia	27,500
10. Houston	27,500
11. Milwaukee	27,000
12. Baltimore	25,000
13. St. Louis	25,000
14. Boston	25,000
15. San Antonio	25,000
16. Seattle	24,000
17. Buffalo	24,000
18. Cincinnati	24,000
19. Cleveland	$23,000
20. New Orleans	21,000
21. Washington	19,000

Suburban systems

1. Montgomery County	$23,000
2. Arlington County	21,500
3. Prince Georges County	21,000
4. Alexandria	20,000
5. Fairfax County	20,000
6. Washington	19,000
7. Falls Church	12,100

Prepared by Department of General Research, Budget, and Legislation, Feb. 12, 1963.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I now call up my amendment No. 1090 and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. INOUYE in the chair). The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 118, after line 25, insert the following——

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 118, after line 25, insert the following:

"(26) Chairman, National Mediation Board.

"(27) Chairman, Railroad Retirement Board."

On page 119, renumber items (26) to (33) as (28) to (35), respectively.

On page 119, between lines 12 and 13, insert the following:

"(36) Director of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service."

On page 119, renumber items (34) to (40) as (37) to (43), respectively.

On page 121, strike out lines 12 and 13.

On page 121, renumber items (27) to (32) as (25) to (30), respectively.

On page 122, strike out lines 1 and 2.

On pages 122, 123, and 124 renumber items (34) to (68), inclusive, as items (31) to (65), respectively.

On page 124, between lines 11 and 12, insert the following:

"(66) Members, National Mediation Board.

"(67) Members, Railroad Retirement Board."

On page 124, renumber items (69) to (71) as (68) to (70), respectively.

On page 132, strike out lines 6 and 7.

On page 132, renumber items (93) to (97) as (91) to (95), respectively.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, this amendment proposes to eliminate the unwarranted distinctions in grade level drawn by the bill between the agencies of the Federal Government immediately concerned with the administration of the national labor policy. These agencies have historically and traditionally been equal rank with equal compensation and under my amendment this parity of treatment would be maintained.

Section 303(c)(25) of the bill recognizes that the Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board performs a function equal in significance to that performed by the chairmen of other commissions, such as the Civil Aeronautics Board, Federal Communications Commission, Federal Power Commission, Federal Trade Commission, Interstate Commerce Commission, and the Security and Exchange Commission. The chairmen of these agencies are placed on a parity with the Deputy Attorney General and the Solicitor General of the United States and with the various Under Secretaries of the Departments.

This is as it should be.

These key officials in the executive branch of the Federal Government have been placed in level III of the Federal executive salary schedule and, if this bill is enacted, will receive basic compensation at $28,500 per year.

However, section 303(d)(25) of the bill, for some purpose which is not altogether clear to me, downgrades the Chairman of the National Mediation Board to the next lower level of the Federal executive salary schedule, carrying an annual rate of basic compensation at $27,000 per year, or $1,500 less than his counterpart on the National Labor Relations Board.

Section 303(d)(26) of the bill provides for the similar downgrading of the Chairman of the Railroad Retirement Board.

I now turn to section 303(d)(33) of the bill and find that the Director of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service has been given the same treatment. He, too, is considered to be somewhat inferior to the Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board and has been relegated to level 4 in the pay scale.

I have no quarrel with the judgment of the committee in identifying the National Labor Relations Board as a grade A agency and rewarding its Chairman with the level 3 scale of compensation. Throughout most of my professional life, I have been intimately acquainted with the nature of the work of this Board, and I think that it is fair to say that I understand its function as well as any other Member of Congress. In my judgment, the Labor Board plays a most significant role in the administration of the national labor policy and throughout the greater part of its 28-year history has played this role well. I may say that during the course cf the past 3 or 4 years, it has played this role substantially better than in the period immediately preceding that point of time. Indeed, many of us are well acquainted with Chairman of the Labor Board, Frank McCullough, from his years of devoted and outstanding work in the Senate, and I can say without reservations that Chairman McCullough's outstanding service on the Board entitles him to every cent of the compensation proposed by this bill. However, it is not my intention to personalize this aspect of the pay bill, nor should it be. Our concern is with the function and not with the incumbent performing that function.

But the Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board plays only one of a number of the roles performed by the executive branch in the administration of the national labor policy. Of no less importance is the role played by the Director of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service.

Indeed, in one sense, the Director of the Mediation Service is positioned in the very center of the system through which the national labor policy is administered. I need not remind you that this policy for the past quarter century has been the encouragement, promotion, and preservation of a system of free and voluntary collective bargaining. We recognized long ago that free collective bargaining was an indispensable element of an economic democracy. Reaffirmation and rededication to this policy becomes increasingly important in this period of our history, faced as we are by unparalleled tensions in the world about us.

Free collective bargaining means, of course, the development of policies and procedures to insure that labor and management remain free to arrive at voluntary solutions of their problems. The development and improvement of methods to enable the parties to work out their differences and to arrive at voluntary agreements which are compatible with the interests of the community as a whole without work stoppages is a necessary corollary to the basic national policy of promoting and encouraging free and voluntary collective bargaining.

It is at this central point in the administration of the national labor policy that the Mediation Service plays its role. It operates as the yeast, the catalyst, the peacemaker, the directional finder, the midwife—call it what you will—in assisting the parties in defining the precise points of their differences and in identifying the common ground upon which reconciliation may be found.

This is the process by which the parties are aided and encouraged to rely upon reasoning and persuasion in arriving at good faith resolutions of their disputes and, at times, in dissipating the fog of suspicion that may otherwise obscure the field markers outlining the area upon which agreement may be found.

Of course, in the nature of things, the work of the Mediation Service must proceed quietly, anonymously, and without publicity. But its contribution in the 17 years of its existence to the development of rational and effective labor-management relations policies, in promoting and preserving free collective bargaining and in maintaining industrial peace has been invaluable.

Let us examine its record. It receives 100,000 notices under section (8)(d) of the National Labor Relations Act each year covering all cases within the scope of the act in which it is proposed to modify collective bargaining agreements on contract termination or otherwise.

Twenty thousand of these cases are assigned to Federal mediators.

In 7,000 cases the mediator moves directly into the dispute. The period of joint meetings may range from a single meeting to as many as 80 or more in the complex and difficult cases. On the average, four meetings are required in each case.

The principal objective of the Mediation Service is to provide useful and meaningful service to the parties in assisting them to arrive at voluntary solutions to the disputes without work stoppages. Thus, the maintenance of industrial peace is, in a very real sense, the measure of the success of the Service. If we look at the record, we will find that during the past 4 or 5 years strikes have been at an alltime low, ranging from fourteen one-hundredths of 1 percent to seventeen one-hundredths of 1 percent of man-hours lost compared to total man-hours work.

Most of us will agree, I am sure, that we do not want the Federal Government or the State government meddling or intervening into labor relations. We know that compulsory arbitration means the end of free collective bargaining. We also know that the various forms of governmental regulations of labor relations short of arbitration inhibit and eventually undermine the freedom of choice in this area which is so essential to the preservation of our system of government.

The key factor in the prevention of inroads and invasions by the Government into this precious institution of free collective bargaining is the mediation function. The Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service performs this function extraordinarily well and I challenge anyone to deny that its contribution to the maintenance of the national labor policy is one iota less important than that of the National Labor Relations Board.

If the Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board belongs in level III of the Federal executive salary schedule, so does the Director of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service.

I should emphasize at this point in my remarks that these officers are now rated on the same scale of magnitude.

When the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service was created as a result of the incorporation of my bill into the Taft-Hartley Act in 1947 the compensation of the Director was fixed at precisely the same level as the compensation of the Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board.

Some years later on July 31, 1956, when these salaries were adjusted the two offices continued to be recognized as having equal magnitude. The Director's salary, like the Chairman's salary, was raised to $20,500.

And so it is today. These men are treated in the same way under the Classification Act.

There is not the slightest justification for making a distinction between the importance of these jobs at this time.

Indeed, if anything, it is more important than ever to underscore the essential nature of the work of the Mediation Service. The administration has recognized this and has made efforts to raise the professional status of the Federal Mediation staff in order to permit it to function more effectively. This policy of the administration was cited with approval by the President's Advisory Committee on Labor-Management Policy in its report of a few years ago.

My amendment would maintain the equal status which has traditionally and historically been accorded to these two offices. Each should be established within level III of the salary schedule as my amendment proposes.

A third element in the execution of the national labor policy is the National Mediation Board which performs for the railroad and airline industries precisely the same function that the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service performs for the rest of the economy.

In examining the pay bill, I find that the Chairman of the National Mediation Board has been downgraded in the same manner as has the Director of the Federal Mediation Service. The remarks which I have made thus far, apply with equal force to the National Mediation Board.

The National Mediation Board has the responsibility for the administration of the Railway Labor Act. This Board over a period of some, almost 30, years has maintained a unique record for the preservation of the stability of labor management relations in this field. In addition the National Mediation Board has the responsibility, under the State statute, for labor management relations among carriers by air and their employees.

In this relatively new field of burgeoning employment, now exceeding 500,000 employees, the Board's record over the past 25 years has been equally successful. The maintenance of the flow of commerce along these vital arteries requires the highest degree of responsibility and application by the members of this Board. In addition its agents and employees are in constant touch with the leaders of labor and management in these fields on almost a daily basis to prevent a disruption in the flow of interstate commerce. The National Mediation Board has the additional responsibility of administering the affairs and budget of the National Railroad Adjustment Board in Chicago. This latter agency faces the task of adjusting thousands of minor disputes during the course of each year. In all, the stability of the employment relationship of over a million and a quarter wage earners in the United States are affected by the operations of the National Mediation Board.

Thus, my amendment proposes to restore the balance between these various functions which has been recognized for so long and which reflects the actual facts. The Chairman of the National Mediation Board, like the Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board and the Director of the Federal Mediation Service should be placed in level 3.

Next, we come to the Railroad Retirement Board. Here again, for some reason, the committee has downgraded the Chairman of this Board to the level 4 category. He, too, has historically and traditionally been recognized as performing a function, equal in status and worth to that of the other officials whom I have described above.

The railroad retirement system provides important protection to railroad employees, their dependents and survivors. The railroad unemployment insurance system provides nationwide unemployment and sickness protection for railroad employees.

The Railroad Retirement Board employs about 2,000 employees. During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, the Railroad Retirement Board paid more than $1,200 million in benefits to 1,200,000 beneficiaries under the two systems. The total amount paid out by the Board through fiscal 1963 is about $14 billion.

The Railroad Retirement Board has an excellent record of performance in the administration of the two systems, and I feel very strongly that, considering the importance, responsibility and size of the systems the Board administers, the downgrading of this agency which the bill proposes is clearly unwarranted.

The Congress has always regarded the railroad retirement and railroad unemployment insurance systems, and their administration, as of particular and primary concern to the employees and employers in the railroad industry and has always attached great weight to any recommendation upon which representatives of the employers and employees have been in agreement.

I ask for unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point of my remarks a joint letter signed by Earl Leighty, chairman of the Railway Labor Executives' Association and Gregory S. Prince, executive vice president and general counsel of the Association of American Railroads addressed to the Honorable Tom Murray, chairman of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, describing the work of both the Railroad Retirement Board and the National Mediation Board and urging that these agencies be maintained at their present levels of parity with the National Labor Relations Board in the Federal pay system.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Washington, D.C.,
March 18, 1964.

Hon. Tom Murray,
Chairman, House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: We, the Association of American Railroads and the Railway Labor Executives' Association, are vitally interested in the administration of all statutes affecting our operations including our labor relations handled by the National Mediation Board and the railroad retirement system and the railroad unemployment insurance system handled by the Railroad Retirement Board. These latter two systems are financed by payroll taxes on the railroad industry and the costs of administration including salaries, are also paid from these payroll taxes. Both of these latter systems are administered by the Railroad Retirement Board, a tripartite agency, one member of which is selected upon the recommendation of the railroads, one upon the recommendation of labor organizations representing railroad employees and the Chairman without recommendation by either group. The National Mediation Board, by statute, is a bipartisan board, not more than two of the three members shall be of the same political party.

We are concerned about the salary levels provided for the three members of the Railroad Retirement Board and the three members of the National Mediation Board, in H.R. 10444 and related bills which were filed on March 16, 1964. Section 302 of title III of these bills establishes a "Federal executive salary schedule" to be divided into six salary levels. Level III of this schedule, which is contained in section 303(c), includes the chairmen of a number of Federal agencies to which the Railroad Retirement Board and the National Mediation Board compare very favorably, either in importance, size, or responsibility, but the Chairmen of the Railroad Retirement Board and the National Mediation Board are not included. Further, while the language with respect to positions in level IV "such other offices and positions the duties and responsibilities of which [the President] deems appropriate for this level" would warrant placing the members of the Railroad Retirement Board and the National Mediation Board in this level, there is similar language with respect to positions in levels V and VI. In view of this we respectfully recommend amendments to these bills which would specifically include the Chairmen of the Railroad Retirement Board and the National Mediation Board in level III and the other members of the Board in level IV.

The railroad retirement system which the Board administers is the nationwide retirement system for employees in the railroad industry. It provides important protection to railroad employees and their dependents and survivors. Employees receive annuities upon their retirement for age or disability. Annuities are paid to their spouses and other dependents and annuities or lump sums are paid to the survivors of railroad employees. The railroad unemployment insurance system which the Board administers provides nationwide unemployment insurance protection for railroad employees in the form of unemployment, sickness, and maternity benefits.

During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, the Railroad Retirement Board paid more than $1,200 million in benefits to 1,200,000 beneficiaries under the two systems. The total amount paid out by the Board through fiscal 1963 is about $14 billion.

The Board employs about 2,000 employees. Among the Government agencies included in section 303(c) of the bill is one with about the same number of employees and 11 with considerably less than this number. In at least 10 of the agencies included in section 303(c), the present salaries of the chairmen and other members of the agencies are $20-500 and $20,000, respectively, the same as of the Chairman and members of the Railroad Retirement Board.

The Railroad Retirement Board has an excellent record of performance in the administration of the two systems, and we feel very strongly that, considering the importance, responsibility, and size of the systems the Board administers, the failure to include specifically the Chairman of the Railroad Retirement Board in section 303(c) is unwarranted. The same is true of the failure clearly to include the members of the Railroad Retirement Board in level IV.

The Congress has always regarded the railroad retirement and railroad unemployment insurance systems, and their administration, as of particular and primary concern to the employers and employees in the railroad industry and has always attached great weight to any recommendation upon which representatives of the employers and employees have been in agreement. We have an especially notable record of having been in agreement virtually at all times for more than 25 years on matters pertaining to the administration of the two systems.

The National Mediation Board has the responsibility for the administration of the Railway Labor Act. This Board, over a period of some almost 30 years, has maintained a unique record for the preservation of the stability of labor management relations in this field. In addition, the National Mediation Board has the responsibility, under the same statute, for labor management relations among carriers by air and their employees. In this relatively new field of burgeoning employment, now exceeding 500,000 employees, the Board's record over the past 25 years has been equally successful. The maintenance of the flow of commerce along these vital arteries requires the highest degree of responsibility and application by the members of this Board. In addition its agents and employees are in constant touch with the leaders of labor and management in these fields on almost a daily basis to prevent a disruption in the flow of interstate commerce. The National Mediation Board has the additional responsibility of administering the affairs and budget of the National Railroad Adjustment Board in Chicago. This latter agency faces the task of adjusting thousands of minor disputes during the course of each year. In all, the stability of the employment relationship of over a million and a quarter wage earners in the United States are affected by the operations of the National Mediation Board.

As representatives of those who, in effect, pay the salaries of the three members of the Railroad Retirement Board and who are vitally concerned with the ability of the National Mediation Board to effectively administer its program, we respectfully request that section 303 of the bill H.R. 10444 be amended by inserting in subsection (c) after line 13 on page 42 the following:

"(45) Chairman of the Railroad Retirement Board.

"(46) Chairman of the National Mediation Board."; and by inserting in subsection (e) in line 2 on page 43 after the word "positions" the following:

"(including, but not limited to, members of the Railroad Retirement Board and members of the National Mediation Board)"

We shall appreciate it if you will see that our proposed amendments and the reasons therefor are made available to and given consideration by the committee.

Sincerely yours,
By Gregory S. Prince,
Executive Vice President and General Counsel, Association of American Railroads.
By G. E. Leighty,
Chairman, Railway Labor Executives' Association.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, my amendment would remove this threatened inequality and would restore the Railroad Retirement Board to the high level in Government in which it belongs.

Finally, I must point out that the reported bill discriminates against the members of the National Mediation Board and the Railroad Retirement Board in the same way in which it discriminates against their Chairmen. In each case, the members have been downgraded to level 5 of the Federal executive salary schedule whereas the members of the National Labor Relations Board have been placed in level 4. This is precisely the same kind of downgrading which the bill imposes on the Chairmen of these agencies and constitutes, in my judgment, rank discrimination against the members of these important agencies. My amendment proposes to repair this injustice.

In closing my remarks, I should like to point out that the House bill, recognizing the realities of the role of these various agencies in the Federal Government, accorded to each of them the same rank and dignity which they have always enjoyed.

There is not a shred of evidence to justify that these agencies are no longer entitled to the class A status which they have so long merited. Each continues to perform in its own way the same significant and effective role in the administration of the national labor policy. The House bill, in recognition of these facts, continues to classify the agencies in the same way.

The chairman of the Senate committee has assured me that this amendment will go to conference and will receive the very careful consideration of the

Senate conferees. I understand that the chairman himself is not opposed to it, but I should like to have it go to conference without any binding commitment upon the Senate conferees.

My respect for and confidence in the conferees of the Senate is such that I am perfectly willing to enter into that understanding, if it can be implemented—and I am sure it can be—under the able leadership of the Senator from South Carolina, though I should like to have him make a brief statement of his position.

Mr. JOHNSTON. What the Senator has said is absolutely true. We have discussed this subject, and the amendment will go to conference. These amounts were left to the President, it will be recalled by members of the committee, to put them in whatever class the President desired to put them into. That being so, it will be a matter for the conferees.

Mr. MORSE. With that understanding, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Oregon is withdrawn.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, we have before us a vitally important bill, H.R. 11049, the Federal Employees Salary Act of 1964. It is important that those who work for the Federal Government receive compensation nearly the approximate equivalent of that received by their counterparts in responsibility in the business world.

Recently, a number of top Government officials regrettably have had to leave their jobs because their salaries were not adequate to meet their personal needs. The loss of outstanding men and women and the inability to attract top-flight talent leave our Government in a serious predicament. The ability to run a government efficiently and well depends in large part on the caliber of those who fill responsible positions. When we fail to retain or to bring such persons into the Federal service, all of us suffer the consequences—and particularly the taxpayers, who have every right to demand that their tax dollars be used in the most effective and efficient manner possible.

Some have criticized Congress for raising the salaries of its Members. This I consider unjustified and unwarranted by the facts. While I personally am fortunate enough not to need this raise, the fact remains that a very large percentage of Senators and Congressmen have as their sole source of income, their salaries. They are faced with high, but inescapable, expenses, of which the public is often unaware—the need to maintain a residence in Washington and in the home State, travel and entertainment expenses, and certain office costs that exceed the allotments granted Members. To demand of Members of Congress—and rightfully so—the very highest standards, but then to deny them an adequate salary, strikes me as somewhat hypocritical.

The arguments I have advanced apply equally across the board, whether in reference to a postal clerk or a judge on the Supreme Court. Good men deserve good treatment, and one of the indicators is an adequate salary.

I am particularly pleased that the Senate committee revised the scale of wages for those in the middle grades of the classified service. This is extremely important, for it is in these grades that we bring in the bright young men and young women who eventually will occupy the top positions in Government. We cannot attract them if we are not willing to pay them adequate salaries.

For instance, in my own State of Rhode Island, nearly 12,500 civilians are working for the Federal Government. They are productive, and do an excellent job. But, like everyone else, they are affected by rises in the cost of living, educational expenses, and the many other responsibilities that confront the average American family.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 1093 and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Louisiana will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 109, beginning with the word "in" in line 4, strike out through line 14 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "at the rate of 6 per centum of his gross compensation (basic compensation plus additional compensation authorized by law)."

On page 109, beginning with the word "an" in line 20, strike out through line 23 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "6 per centum."

On page 112, beginning with the word "an" in line 17, strike out through line 23 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "6 per centum."

On page 113, line 4, strike out "$22,945" and insert in lieu thereof "$20,000".

On page 114, line 3, strike out "$26,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$22,500".

On page 114, line 6, strike out "$24,500" and insert in lieu thereof "$20,500".

On page 114, line 8, strike out "$22,500" and insert in lieu thereof "$20,500".

On page 114, line 13, strike out "$27,500" and insert in lieu thereof "$22,500".

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the purpose of this amendment is to reduce the amount to be paid to the legislative employees of the Senate as provided in the bill and to provide for salary increases of 6 percent. As the Senator from South Carolina stated yesterday, in 1962 we had an across-the-board raise of salaries for legislative employees of 7 percent.

Here we are 2 years later, and under the provisions of this bill, the salaries of Senate employees are raised as much as 21½ percent.

What I seek to do is to put a maximum of 6 percent on the salaries which, together with the 7 percent that Congress granted last year, will total a 13-percent increase since 1962. Under the bill that was enacted in 1962, with a base pay of $8,880, an administrative assistant received $18,880. Under this bill, that same base pay would increase to a pay of $22,945, a sum in excess of what Senators are now receiving. And the same rate practically goes on up to a base pay of, say, $6,005, where an increase of 16½ percent, down to the 21½ percent for the highest pay for the administrative officer.

The amendment covers the salaries of the Secretary of the Senate, the Sergeant at Arms, the Architect of the Capitol, and his administrative assistant.

Under the present law, the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate receives $21,500. If this bill were enacted, that same official would receive $27,500—an increase of $500 a month, or a percentage increase of 27.9 percent.

In addition to that, the Sergeant at Arms is furnished an automobile. He is furnished a chauffeur. He will be better off than a Senator, if the Senator receives the increased amount that is now provided for in the bill. If this bill were enacted by the Senate, as presented by the distinguished Senator from South Carolina, the Sergeant at Arms would receive $27,500—only $2,500 less than a Senator.

On yesterday, my good friend compared the work of the Sergeant at Arms to that of the police chief of the city of New York. Of course, this is not a valid comparison. The Sergeant at Arms is a nice fellow, but this job is more or less political. And to increase his salary overnight by $500 a month cannot be justified by anyone.

The same thing holds true for the Secretary of the Senate, who now receives $21,500. The increase would raise his salary to $27,500, or an increase of 27.9 percent.

We furnish the Secretary of the Senate with an automobile and a chauffeur. I would say that the Secretary of the Senate is getting more money than a Senator would if the bill were passed as presently written.

The Architect of the Capitol now receives $20,700. If this bill were passed, we would grant him an increase to $26,000, or an increase of 26.1 percent.

Mr. President, that is unconscionable. An administrative assistant would be raised from $18,880 to $22,945, or a raise of $4,065, or 21.5 percent of what he is now receiving.

My amendment is very simple. What it would do is give an across-the-board increase, the same as we did in 1962. That year, we gave an across-the-board increase of 7 percent. My amendment would give an additional 6 percent. The Secretary of the Senate is now receiving $21,500. Under this amendment, he would be increased to $22,500, the amount that the Senators now receive.

The Sergeant at Arms would receive the same increase. He now receives $21,500, and he would receive $22,500 under this bill. I think it is ample.

The legislative counsel would receive $22,500, an increase of 6 percent, from $21,500.

The General Counsel of GAO now receives $20,000. My amendment would provide for him $22,500.

Now the administrative assistants of Senators would be increased from the total that they can now receive of $18,-

880, to $20,000. Mr. President, I think that is ample.

This 6-percent increase, together with the 7-percent increase that we allowed last year, is ample for those workers.

Mr. President, I wish to place in the RECORD at this point two tables that indicate how much the legislative employees are receiving now, and what they will receive under this bill.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. Senate—Effective Oct. 15, 1962

Basic per annum	*Gross per annum*
$60	$1,020.72
$120	1,162.11
$180	1,303.50
$240	1,444.89
$300	1,586.28
$360	1,727.67
$420	1,869.06
$480	2,010.44
$540	2,151.84
$600	2,293.23
$660	2,434.61
$720	2,576.01
$780	2,717.39
$840	2,855.64
$900	2,968.75
$960	3,081.86
$1,020	3,194.98
$1,080	3,308.08
$1,140	3,421.20
$1,200	3,534.31
$1,260	3,638.01
$1,320	3,741.69
$1,380	3,845.37
$1,440	3,949.07
$1,500	4,052.75
$1,560	4,167.47
$1,620	4,285.68
$1,680	4,403.88
$1,740	4,525.43
$1,800	4,655.47
$1,860	4,785.46
$1,920	4,915.49
$1,980	5,045.53
$2,040	5,175.54
$2,100	5,305.58
$2,160	5,435.56
$2,220	5,565.59
$2,280	5,695.63
$2,340	5,825.64
$2,400	5,955.67
$2,460	6,085.68
$2,520	6,215.70
$2,580	6,345.74
$2,640	6,475.75
$2,700	6,605.79
$2,760	6,735.82
$2,820	6,865.81
$2,880	6,995.86
$2,940	7,125.87
$3,000	7,255.90
$3,060	7,385.93
$3,120	7,515.94
$3,180	7,645.97
$3,240	7,775.96
$3,300	7,906.00
$3,360	8,036.03
$3,420	8,166.04
$3,480	8,296.07
$3,540	8,426.08
$3,600	8,556.11
$3,660	8,686.14
$3,720	8,816.15
$3,780	8,946.19
$3,840	9,076.20
$3,900	9,206.22
$3,960	9,336.25
$4,020	9,466.27
$4,080	9,596.30
$4,140	9,726.31
$4,200	9,856.33
$4,260	9,986.36
$4,320	10,116.37
$4,380	$10,246.39
$4,440	10,376.42
$4,500	10,506.43
$4,560	10,636.46
$4,620	10,764.52
$4,680	10,888.64
$4,740	11,012.73
$4,800	11,136.85
$4,860	11,260.97
$4,920	11,385.08
$4,980	11,509.18
$5,040	11,633.30
$5,100	11,757.41
$5,160	11,881.53
$5,220	12,002.36
$5,280	12,115.18
$5,340	12,228.01
$5,400	12,340.85
$5,460	12,453.66
$5,520	12,566.49
$5,580	12,679.33
$5,640	12,792.16
$5,700	12,904.99
$5,760	13,017.82
$5,820	13,130.65
$5,880	13,243.46
$5,940	13,356.29
$6,000	13,469.14
$6,060	13,581.97
$6,120	13,694.79
$6,180	13,807.62
$6,240	13,920.44
$6,300	14,033.28
$6,360	14,146.10
$6,420	14,258.93
$6,480	14,371.76
$6,540	14,484.59
$6,600	14,597.42
$6,660	14,710.25
$6,720	14,823.08
$6,780	14,935.89
$6,840	15,048.73
$6,900	15,161.57
$6,960	15,274.41
$7,020	15,387.22
$7,080	15,500.05
$7,140	15,612.88
$7,200	15,725.71
$7,260	15,838.54
$7,320	15,951.37
$7,380	16,064.19
$7,440	16,177.01
$7,500	16,289.86
$7,560	16,402.68
$7,620	16,515.51
$7,680	16,628.34
$7,740	16,741.16
$7,800	16,854.00
$7,860	16,966.84
$7,920	17,079.65
$7,980	17,192.48
$8,000	17,230.10
$8,040	17,305.31
$8,100	17,418.16
$8,160	17,583.97
$8,220	17,643.80
$8,280	17,756.63
$8,340	17,869.44
$8,400	17,982.29
$8,460	18,095.12
$8,520	18,207.94
$8,580	18,320.77
$8,640	18,433.60
$8,700	18,546.43
$8,760	18,659.26
$8,820	18,772.09
$8,880	18,880.00

LEGISLATIVE SALARY INCREASES

This is designed to provide percentage salary adjustments for legislative employees comparable to those provided for employees under the Classification Act. The increases are provided in an amount equal to 3½ percent of the employee's gross rate plus 1 percent of his gross rate for each whole multiple, or part of a multiple of $500 basic compensation; or an amount equal to 5 percent of such gross rate, whichever is greater.

Multiple	Base	Present gross	Proposed amendment	
			Percent increase	New gross
0	$5	$891	5.0	$935
0.1	60	1,020	5.0	1,071
	500	2,057	5.0	2,160
1	505	2,069	5.5	2,183
2	1,000	3,157	5.5	3,330
2	1,005	3,166	6.5	3,372
2.4	1,200	3,534	6.5	3,764
3	1,500	4,052	6.5	4,316
3	1,505	4,061	7.5	4,366
3.6	1,800	4,655	7.5	5,004
4	2,000	5,088	7.5	5,470
4	2,005	5,099	8.5	5,533
4.8	2,400	5,955	8.5	6,461
5	2,500	6,172	8.5	6,697
5	2,505	6,183	9.5	6,770
6	3,000	7,255	9.5	7,945
6	3,005	7,266	10.5	8,029
7	3,500	8,339	10.5	9,215
7	3,505	8,350	11.5	9,310
7.2	3,600	8,556	11.5	9,540
8	4,000	9,422	11.5	10,506
8	4,005	9,433	12.5	10,613
9	4,500	10,506	12.5	11,819
9	4,505	10,517	13.5	11,937
9.6	4,800	11,136	13.5	12,640
10	5,000	11,550	13.5	13,109
10	5,005	11,560	14.5	13,237
11	5,500	12,528	14.5	14,345
11	5,505	12,538	15.5	14,481
12	6,000	13,469	15.5	15,556
12	6,005	13,478	16.5	15,702
13	6,500	14,409	16.5	16,786
13	6,505	14,418	17.5	16,942
14	7,000	15,349	17.5	18,035
14	7,005	15,359	18.5	18,200
14.4	7,200	15,725	18.5	18,635
15	7,500	16,289	18.5	19,303
15	7,505	16,299	19.5	19,477
16	8,000	17,230	19.5	20,590
16	8,005	17,239	20.5	20,773
17	8,500	18,170	20.5	21,895
17	8,505	18,179	21.5	22,088
17.7	8,880	18,884	21.5	22,945

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as I said, it ranges from 5 percent for the employee getting $891 a year—and we have very few of those now—to those receiving a 21.5-percent increase.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What is the present-day maximum pay allowable for administrative assistants?

Mr. ELLENDER. Eighteen thousand eight hundred and eighty dollars.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What would the bill do as it now stands?

Mr. ELLENDER. The bill as it now stands would provide $22,945.

Mr. LAUSCHE. And what will the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana provide?

Mr. ELLENDER. $20,000. I say that we should use a little sanity on these wage hikes.

I am very hopeful that the Senate will vote for my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments will be considered en bloc.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana. The yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, could I ask the Senator from Louisiana a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana is recognized.

Mr. MANSFIELD. All the employees' salaries were not listed. Were they?

Mr. ELLENDER. In what?

Mr. MANSFIELD. In the Senate.

Mr. ELLENDER. It covers all of the legislative employees.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It covers all of the legislative employees, the Chaplain, and so forth?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes, even the little pages here. As I said yesterday, when I came to the Senate, the pages were getting $5 a day. This bill increases it to $5,000 a year. I think this is unconscionable.

We gave a cut this year on income taxes. And with all of that, we are proposing to raise these legislative employees, as I said, from 5 to 21½ percent. That cannot be justified, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina is recognized.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, the salaries referred to are in keeping with the salaries that have been requested by the administration for executive branch employees and approved by the House.

If this amendment is agreed to, we will find that the House employees and officers will have substantial increases, and our officers and employees will not have any increase but the 6 percent.

It is in the higher brackets that we are having trouble in securing the qualified men, both downtown and here.

I do not think any Senator wishes to pay an executive branch employee more than our own employees in the Senate are paid for a position of equivalent rank and responsibility.

The Senator has spoken of the Sergeant at Arms. At the present time there is only $1,000 difference between the salary of the Sergeant at Arms and the salary of a Senator. When the bill passes, there will be a difference of $2,500. So the proposal is in keeping with what we have done in the past. We have tried to regulate salaries so that inconsistencies will not cause a great deal of trouble. I hope that the Senate will reject the amendment.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I have been unable to ascertain whether the Comptroller General's rate would be reduced by the amendment of the distinguished Senator. I know that the Counsel would be reduced.

Mr. ELLENDER. Those included are the Secretary of the Senate, the Sergeant at Arms, the Legislative Counsel, the General Counsel of GAO, the Librarian of Congress, the Public Printer, the Architect of the Capitol, the Deputy Librarian, the Deputy Public Printer, and the Assistant Architect of the Capitol.

Mr. MONRONEY. The head of the GAO would not be included in the proposed reductions?

Mr. ELLENDER. No.

Mr. MONRONEY. He is on that list of officers generally associated together.

Mr. ELLENDER. What I sought to do was to include employees in the legislative branch of the Government. As the Senator knows, the bill would increase the salaries of all employees who are members of the staffs of the millions of subcommittees and special committees that we have.

Mr. MONRONEY. Not necessarily. The Senator knows that only those employees whose salaries were increased by their employer would receive the increase.

Mr. ELLENDER. Certainly, but the Senator knows what would happen.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator from Oklahoma has never used anywhere near the maximum amount of salary allowance. I am sure that the Senator from Louisiana has not.

Mr. ELLENDER. I have not.

Mr. MONRONEY. I am sure that the Senator from South Carolina has not. The maximum is an amount which very few employees ever attain. If a Senator chooses to use his pay allowance in order to keep his administrative assistant at $22,945, which is the tiptop of the grade of those fine young people who serve and make a lifetime job of their service, then he has a right to do so. As early as 1946 the top staff men of the Senate committees were so classified that they would be able to attract the same quality of men. We would prevent raids upon our staffs of our good men. Otherwise they would be attracted downtown at higher employment wages.

If we are going to pay more to those in the top level of civil service—those in grade 18 in the executive department downtown, who have less hard work to do than our own staff people—we should at least raise the salaries of our own staff people to $22,945 as well.

The ratio has been well kept. We have tried to maintain the differences. There has been a difference of $1,000 between the salary of a Senator and the salary of the Sergeant at Arms and that of the Secretary of the Senate. Under the bill the difference would be $2,500.

As to the Architect of the Capitol, neither of us might agree that he is an excellent architect, but the job—and that is what we are trying to classify—is a job that certainly demands a person of capability. It demands someone who would have that much earning capacity, in order to be able to supervise the myriad things that have to be done in this gigantic Capitol plant, including all the buildings on Capitol Hill.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator has tried to compare the salaries of the Secretary of the Senate and the Sergeant at Arms with the salary of a Senator. The Senator knows that in the last few years those two officers have received increases in pay whereas Senators have not. That is why the salaries are so close together.

Mr. MONRONEY. I beg the Senator's pardon. We have not increased the salaries of those employees.

Mr. ELLENDER. In 1962 there was a 7-percent across-the-board increase.

Mr. MONRONEY. If my memory serves me correctly, the Sergeant at Arms did not——

Mr. ELLENDER. All employees received an increase.

Mr. MONRONEY. They did not get the full 7 percent. The limitation cut them off.

Mr. ELLENDER. They did get an increase in 1962.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator is more correct than I am, because they did receive an increase. But a differential exists. We would now make the differential $2,500, which I believe is a proper differential between the salaries of those two officers and the salary of a Senator.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator mean that a differential of $2,500 between the salaries of the Sergeant at Arms and the Secretary of the Senate and a Senator is proper?

Mr. MONRONEY. I believe the Senator will find that that has generally been the range of the difference.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is that the way the Senator evaluates it?

Mr. MONRONEY. The difference between the salaries of the Sergeant at Arms and a Senator?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. The Secretary of the Senate has an automobile, and a chauffeur, and I believe this would amount to, if he is given the $27,500 which is provided in the bill, more than a Senator's salary.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator knows that the $2,500 differential is one that represents the difference between the two jobs. But those are the two principal officers of the Senate. We need efficient men in those offices. They spend a great deal of money running the housekeeping functions on our side of the Capitol.

I believe the scale is proper and ought to be maintained. I ask that the amendment be rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield back the remainder of his time?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana. All time having expired, and the yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] are absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] is paired with the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Ohio would vote "yea," and the Senator from Florida would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 25, nays 63, as follows:

[No. 463 Leg.]

YEAS—25

Aiken
Allott
Burdick
Church
Cooper
Curtis
Dominick
Ellender
Goldwater
Gore
Jordan, Idaho
Lausche
Mansfield
McClellan
McGovern
Miller
Morton
Moss
Mundt
Simpson
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—63

Anderson
Bartlett
Beall
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Case
Clark
Dirksen
Dodd
Douglas
Eastland
Edmondson
Ervin
Fulbright
Gruening
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Johnston
Jordan, N.C.
Keating
Kuchel
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
McCarthy
McGee
McIntyre
McNamara
Mechem
Metcalf
Monroney
Morse
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Russell
Scott
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Tower
Walters
Williams, N.J.

NOT VOTING—12

Bayh
Byrd, Va.
Cotton
Engle
Fong
Hruska
Kennedy
Robertson
Saltonstall
Smathers
Yarborough
Young, Ohio

So Mr. ELLENDER's amendments (No. 1093) were rejected.

GOOD GOVERNMENT NEEDS GOOD MEN: GOOD MEN MUST BE PAID

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, the House of Representatives has passed, and the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service has favorably reported, with amendments, the Government Employees Salary Reform Act of 1964, H.R. 11049. I now urge Senate passage.

Enactment of this bill would be a significant step toward updating and making equitable the Federal pay scale. Present levels of payment represent poor economy in several respects. They do not give Government workers fair and reasonable pay. They make it increasingly difficult to recruit and retain top-flight men and women for Government service. They undercut Congress' declared principle that Government workers shall be paid wages comparable to those paid in analogous private positions. Their failure to provide adequate incentives or to attract a sufficient number of capable workers undermines our efforts to achieve efficiency and economy in Government.

The pay adjustment bill would provide salary increases for some 1,700,000 Government employees, including over 7,500 Federal workers located in Alaska.

Over 1 million civil servants, including 6,822 in Alaska, are presently covered by the Classification Act of 1949. The Alaska figure includes 1,323 Army employees, 1,158 with the Air Force, 1,105 with the Department of the Interior, and 1,434 with the FAA. The Classification Act also covers 692 Alaskans working with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 334 with the Department of Agriculture, 268 with the Department of Commerce, 166 with the Navy, and 145 with the Department of the Treasury.

Salary increases granted by the proposed bill to Classification Act employees would be effective at all GS levels. They would average 4.2 percent. Workers at the GS-4 to GS-5 levels would receive boosts of over 6 percent; GS-3 and GS-6 employees would be raised by more than 5 percent. GS-7 to GS-8 increases would average around 4 percent, while those in grades 9 through 12 would run approximately 3 percent.

Another 600,000 of the Federal employees covered by the present bill are now classified under the postal field service, rural carrier, and fourth-class office schedules. This involves 669 Alaskans, including 144 postmasters of fourth-class post offices. Employees covered by the postal field service schedule would receive an average salary increase of 5.6 percent. The boost would be over 6 percent for employees at PFS levels 1 through 4, 5.2 percent at PFS-5, 4 percent at PFS-6, and approximately 3 percent at PFS levels 7 through 11.

A new basis of computation would be used in determining the salaries of postmasters of fourth-class post offices.

The formula for "revenue units," upon which salaries would be based, would consider the amount of mail handled and the service transactions carried out, as well as the gross receipts. This promises to establish a more realistic wage scale for those postmasters, long underpaid, in our small or seasonal offices.

Other sections of the pay adjustment bill increase salaries in the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration, in the Foreign Service, and in county ASC offices. Increases are also provided for legislative employees and officers, Members of Congress, Federal executives, District of Columbia executives and officers, judicial employees, and Federal judges.

The bill is thus a comprehensive one, attempting to remedy inequities at various wage levels. It acknowledges that top Federal officials cannot expect salaries absolutely commensurate with lucrative private positions; but it still recognizes the need for appreciable increases, in light of the many responsibilities these officials must fulfill and the hardships to which present salary scales subject them.

At the same time, the bill attempts to establish equitable rates down the line, and to set up meaningful ratios between the various grade levels. Thus, we are attempting not only to provide for much-needed increases, but also to establish wage levels that will encourage maximum effort and will provide incentives for continuance and advancement in the Federal service.

It is all too easy, Mr. President, to underestimate the services rendered by Federal employees working throughout the country—from the highest official levels to the smallest post offices in our Alaska villages. We also tend to underestimate the salaries which these public servants deserve and need. These are the people who must administer the many Federal programs and services; they are the people on whom, in large measure, our domestic welfare and our security and leadership in the world arena are dependent. It is simply not fair for these employees to be underpaid, nor can the country afford it. It is false economy to pay inadequate wages to those upon whom Government efficiency depends. We must attract and hold our most capable citizens to public service. If we are to do so, we must give them adequate compensation and incentive.

Mr. President, I urge the passage of H.R. 11049 as reported by the Senate committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I offer an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the amendment as follows:

> At the end of line 2, page 167, add the following:
>
> "TITLE VI
>
> "Any compensation, honorarium, or other payment received by any Member of Congress for any lecture, appearance, speech, or article written over and above the actual expenses involved shall be turned over to the Treasury of the United States."

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7152) to enforce the constitutional right to vote, to confer jurisdiction upon the district courts of the United States to provide injunctive relief against discrimination in public accommodations, to authorize the Attorney General to institute suits to protect constitutional rights in public facilities and public education, to extend the Commission on Civil Rights, to prevent discrimination in federally assisted programs, to establish a Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity, and for other purposes.

CIVIL RIGHTS—ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H.R. 7152) to enforce the constitutional right to vote, to confer jurisdiction upon the district courts of the United States to provide injunctive relief against discrimination in public accommodations, to authorize the Attorney General to institute suits to protect constitutional rights in public facilities and public education, to extend the Commission on Civil Rights, to prevent discrimination in federally assisted programs, to establish a Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield to me for one moment?

Mr. MORTON. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, we have just heard the historic announcement to the Senate that the House has passed finally the civil rights bill, the most momentous piece of legislation, in my judgment, which has come out of the Senate since the declaration of war in World War II.

I thank the Senator for the opportunity at least to call it markedly to the attention of the Senate.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORTON. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I merely wish the RECORD today to note that the act which has just been passed by the House, to which the Speaker has affixed his signature, the Civil Rights Act of 1964, is not only one of the most important pieces of legislation of our time, but it has had amazing bipartisan support. The vote in the House was 289 to 126.

I salute the Members of the House and commend Members of the Senate. I believe we have performed a noble public service.

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES SALARY REFORM ACT OF 1964

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11049) to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the Senator from Kentucky if his amendment would apply to Members of the Senate while Congress was in recess.

Mr. MORTON. Yes; it would apply.

Mr. McCLELLAN. It would apply the year round?

Mr. MORTON. It would apply the year round. We are on the payroll the year round.

Mr. McCLELLAN. In other words, we should devote all our time to the business here, and we could not devote any of our time to making public speeches. Is that what the Senator means?

Mr. MORTON. I have no objection to making public speeches.

Mr. McCLELLAN. But they should be made free of charge. Is that it?

Mr. MORTON. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORTON. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Would the Senator include in his amendment all income from legal fees and fees collected as directors and also income from dividends? Would he provide that all such sums should be turned over to the Treasury of the United States?

Mr. MORTON. If the Senator wishes to offer such an amendment in his own right, it might be considered. I do not see why a person must be destitute of all property to be able to serve in this body.

My point is this. I made speeches in the 1930's, long before I became a Member of Congress. I was never paid for those speeches. Now, merely because I happen to be a Member of the Senate, people offer me x dollars to come and make a speech. This is only because I happen to be a U.S. Senator, on the public payroll. When I did it in the 1930's, I was not on the public payroll. I therefore think that anything that is offered to me in this connection because I happen to be a U.S. Senator, while being paid by the taxpayers of the United States, should be turned into the Treasury of the United States. I feel that I am an employee of the Government.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Would the Senator include legal fees? Does he believe they should be turned over to the Treasury? I know of various lawyers whose incomes increased after they had become U.S. Senators.

Mr. MORTON. I am not a lawyer, and I am therefore not qualified to respond to the Senator's question. When I was an officer of the U.S. Government, in the State Department, I was not permitted to accept any sort of honorarium. I was not even permitted to allow the associations that asked me to speak before them to pay my expenses. Either I paid the expenses myself, or the Government paid for them.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Would the Senator amend his amendment so that all legal fees should go to the Treasury?

Mr. MORTON. I should like to have the Senator offer his own amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator wants to be fair, I am sure and make his amendment apply equally.

Mr. MORTON. Yes. What is it that the Senator wants me to do?

Mr. DOUGLAS. To include also legal and directors' fees in his amendment.

Mr. MORTON. In other words, the Senator wants to "louse up" my amendment so that it cannot be adopted. Is that it?

Mr. DOUGLAS. No. I am asking him whether he would be willing to include directors' fees and legal fees, and any amount received from private business, and also I think dividends from whisky stocks.

Mr. McCLELLAN. And cigarettes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And from cigarette stocks, too.

Mr. PASTORE. And from writing books.

Mr. MORTON. I understand that the Senator wants to say that anything that any Member receives, aside from his salary as a Member of Congress, should be reported and turned in to the Treasury. Is that correct?

Mr. DOUGLAS. If we follow the precedent of the Senator's amendment, that is what we should do.

Mr. MORTON. In other words, he would have us turn over our dividends from whatever source they were received?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Also especially from whisky and cigarette stocks, because those items, according to the doctors, are very injurious to the human race.

Mr. MORTON. Cigarette stocks have been rather sick lately, I can tell the Senator. I cannot accept the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois. I suggest that he offer it in his own time as a separate amendment.

I yield to the Senator from New Jersey such time as he may desire to take.

Mr. CASE. I believe there is a germ of rightness in this amendment. However, logically the amendment should include not only income from speeches and writings, but also earnings from any source. If a person is a director of a bank, undoubtedly it is because he is a Member of the Senate. I see no reason why a bank director's fees should not be turned over to the Treasury. I would not have the amendment apply to earnings from securities or property owned by the person. However, I believe any other kind of earnings ought to be included. I ask the Senator if he would accept this serious suggestion to amend his amendment accordingly.

Mr. MORTON. The Senator means fees collected as a director of a bank.

Mr. CASE. I mean any earned income as opposed to income from securities, for example. Any fees a lawyer may earn due to his being a Member of the Senate should be included. I do not believe that only one kind of earning should be included.

Mr. MORTON. I cannot agree with the Senator. Suppose I decide to do some moonlighting by babysitting or raking leaves. Should those earnings be included?

Mr. CASE. I cannot imagine anyone trusting the Senator from Kentucky with a daughter of impressionable age.

Mr. MORTON. At 57 years of age, I can.

Mr. CASE. Any earned income might well be due to the fact that one holds the position of Senator.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, may I respectfully suggest that the amendment be withdrawn?

Mr. MORTON. In an effort to be helpful to my colleagues, and to get this measure on the road, I will accede to the suggestion of my distinguished leader. But before I withdraw the amendment I should like to respond briefly to the remarks of the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. CASE. I withdraw my remarks.

Mr. MORTON. I am a director of a bank. When I go to a directors' meeting I am paid $35. I do not get to more than two such directors' meetings a year, because of the long sessions the majority party has been holding in the Senate. I happen to be a director because my grandfather started a little bank, and this ultimately developed into the bank of which I am presently a director.

When I attend a meeting as a director I am paid $35. I get to about two meetings a year. I think my responsibility is far greater than my compensation. If something happens to the bank because I am not there, I can be sued for I do not know how much.

Mr. PASTORE. It might be the very best excuse the Senator could have if he wished to resign from the directorship. The amendment would give him that excuse.

Mr. MORTON. I have tried to resign. Every time I try the president comes to me and say, "Please don't resign." So I stay as a director.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator should accept the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey, because that would be the best reason he could have for resigning.

Mr. MORTON. Very well, I will resign from the bank, and I withdraw the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 1079, and ask the clerk to report it as it has been modified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be read.

The legislative clerk read the modified amendment, as follows:

> At the end of the bill add a new section as follows:
>
> "SEC. . (a) Section 2(a) of the Act entitled 'An Act to prohibit payment of annuities to officers and employees of the United States convicted of certain offenses, and for other purposes,' approved September 1, 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2283(a)), is amended to read as follows:
>
> "'(a) There shall not be paid to any person who, on, or after September 26, 1961, has refused or refuses, or knowingly and willfully has failed or fails, to appear, testify, or produce any book, paper, record, or other document, relating to his service as an officer or employee of the Government or Members of Congress in any proceeding before a congressional committee, for any period subsequent to September 26, 1961, or subsequent to the date of such failure or refusal of such person, whichever date is later, any annuity or retired pay on the basis of the service of such person (subject to the exceptions contained in sections 10 (2) and (3) of this Act) which is creditable toward such annuity or retired pay.'
>
> "(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of such section 2 (a), as amended no person shall be required, by reason of the amendment made by this section, to refund any annuity or retired pay paid to such person prior to the date of enactment of this Act."

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the amendment as it has been modified merely provides that any public official or former public official who since September 1961 has been requested to appear before a congressional committee to answer questions in line with his official conduct, elected to take the fifth amendment rather than answer the questions would be allowed to receive a refund of all of his contributions to the retirement fund, plus interest, but he would not be eligible for retirement benefits. In 1954 Congress enacted a similar law. On September 26, 1961, the law was repealed, over my objection.

Recently there was an instance in which a former public official took the fifth amendment rather than answer questions that were directed to him about his conduct as a public official.

The amendment does not deal with the right of an individual to take the fifth amendment, but if one who is or has been a public official took the fifth amendment, rather than answer questions which were properly asked concerning his official duties, he would forfeit his right to any further contributions so far as the taxpayers were concerned.

He would have the right to withdraw all of his own contributions, plus interest. There is no question about that. He would be entitled to them. But I do not believe that the portion of his retirement fund which would normally be paid by the Federal Government—by the taxpayers—should be allowed him. That should be forfeited. That is all that my amendment provides.

Congress enacted such a law in 1954, and it was in effect for 7 years. It was repealed in 1961. This amendment would reinstate the act as of the date of repeal.

The amendment as originally printed referred, as did the act of 1954, to taking the fifth amendment before courts. I have stricken that provision upon the suggestion of the Senator from Illinois. The amendment now deals only with employees or former employees of the Federal Government who take the fifth amendment, rather than testify before a congressional committee.

I hope that the chairman of the committee will accept the amendment. If he will not I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from Delaware a question. How broad is the amendment? Whom would it cover? What kind of cases?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It would cover any employee or former employee of the Federal Government who was called before a congressional committee to answer questions concerning his official activities as a public servant if he took the fifth amendment or had taken it since the repeal of the act in 1961.

Mr. JOHNSTON. The fifth amendment, which many persons have invoked, is a part of the Constitution. Would the Senator's amendment be in violation of a person's right under that amendment?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I did not hear the Senator's question.

Mr. JOHNSTON. If an employee appeared before a committee and refused to answer some question because to do so might incriminate him—which he would have the right to do under the fifth amendment—would his annuity be taken away from him?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. If the question were directed to the person's conduct as a public official, yes. Why should it not?

Mr. JOHNSTON. The Senator's amendment would penalize him and might possibly cause him to disclose some knowledge concerning national security. He might be asked to disclose information of that nature, and be penalized unjustly for not doing so.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. No. The amendment merely provides that if an employee of the U.S. Government wished to invoke the fifth amendment rather than answer proper questions asked him by a congressional committee concerning his conduct as a public official, he would merely forfeit any further right to the contributions so far as the taxpayers' part is concerned. Why should he not forfeit it?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Would we not be taking away from him the annuity on which he had paid, and as to which the Government had entered into a contract with him, because he refused to answer a question and invoked the fifth amendment?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is done in the armed services now. The Senator voted for that. Every Member of the Senate approved it.

Under existing law if one has served in the armed services for 20 years and has established his full eligibility for a pension, and then reenlists, and in the course of his reenlistment is dishonorably discharged, an additional penalty is imposed on him. He loses all the retirement benefits for which he would have been eligible had he not reenlisted. That is the law.

What is wrong with providing the same requirement with respect to civil employees of the Government? Anyone who is affected by the amendment can return the next day and say, "I am willing to talk and answer the questions," and can reinstate himself. He would have complete control with respect to answering the questions.

I am not suggesting that the amendment applies to questions about his outside activities; but certainly an official of the U.S. Government should be required to answer before a congressional committee questions that are asked of him in connection with his official activities. That is all I am proposing. If a penalty is to be suffered he will impose it on himself. If he wishes to remove it he can advise the committee the very next day that he is willing to answer.

Mr. JOHNSTON. But a question of internal security might be involved in his refusal to answer.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It could be a question of personal security as far as the law is concerned. So far as the armed services are concerned if a man goes off and gets drunk or creates an incident on the outside, completely nonrelated to the armed services, he may receive a dishonorable discharge and thus will forfeit his pension rights.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Would the amendment apply to Members of Congress?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. It would apply to Members of the Senate?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes; to any public official who refused to testify before a committee and took the fifth amendment on the ground that to respond to questions of the committee would incriminate him.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I merely thought that if such a provision were to be included in the bill, it should apply to Members of Congress, as well as to members of the staff and other employees.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Oh, yes. It would apply to any officer or employee of the Government. This question was raised once before.

Mr. President, to avoid any misunderstanding I ask unanimous consent that I may modify my amendment on page 2, after the word "Government" in line 1, to include "or Members of Congress." Then there will be no misunderstanding. I am sure they are already covered, but I ask unanimous consent that the words "Members of Congress" be inserted at that point because we want to be certain they are covered. I thought they were covered, but I want to be certain.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the amendment is modified accordingly.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I yield.

Mr. ERVIN. The amendment is clearly unconstitutional under the decision of the Supreme Court in the Slochower case. In that case, a professor of the College of the City of New York was called before the House Committee on Un-American Activities and interrogated concerning his official conduct as a teacher. He took the fifth amendment. An ordinance of the city of New York provided that whenever an employee of the city of New York took the fifth amendment when he was being interrogated about his official conduct, he was automatically discharged.

When that case was brought before the Supreme Court of the United States, the Court ruled that it was unconstitutional to penalize a man for exercising his constitutional right or constitutional privilege not to incriminate himself. That is exactly what the amendment offered by the able and distinguished Senator from Delaware would do. The amendment is a flagrant, brazen violation of the Constitution, as interpreted by the Supreme Court.

Mr. MUNDT. I invite the attention of the Senator from North Carolina to the fact that he is talking about a case involving a teacher in a college in New York appearing before a Government committee. That is not a relevant case to the argument, because we are talking about the right of the Government to deal with its employees and to establish criteria and rules and regulations concerning employee benefits while working for Uncle Sam.

It is about time that Congress did take some action to be sure that those who have important information that the country needs will get it, because our employees of the Government are not permitted to lurk behind the fifth amendment and continue to enjoy all of the benefits that they would have if they were responsive to the needs of the country and gave Congress the information it requires.

We enacted the legislation one time before. It was never ruled unconstitutional by any court. Congress, in a moment of exuberance, or carelessness, or something, repealed it without adequate debate.

I am glad that we have this issue before us again and that we have a rollcall vote ordered on it. I believe that it is time Congress asserted itself, as to whether it has the right to establish criteria governing employment of those working for it, and if Congress has that right, it has every right in the world to establish whether they will get employment benefits or retirement benefits.

I support the amendment and I hope it will pass overwhelmingly on the rollcall vote.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield me 30 seconds?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to yield to the Senator from North Carolina for 30 seconds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from North Carolina is recognized for 30 seconds.

Mr. ERVIN. I would say to my good friend, the Senator from South Dakota that I have been talking about a case on all fours with the amendment of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS]. I was talking about a case in which the Supreme Court held that whenever the Government undertakes to penalize a man for exercising rights conferred upon him by the Constitution, the action of the Government is unconstitutional.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I yield myself 30 seconds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware is recognized for 30 seconds.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I concur in what the Senator from South Dakota has pointed out, that there is no comparison between these two cases. The case mentioned involves an employee of the State of New York who was directed to come before a committee of Congress.

In this instance, these are employees of the U.S. Government, asked to come before a committee of the Congress. We are dealing here solely with Federal Government operations and nothing else. As I stated before, we passed this legislation in 1954. It stayed on the statute books until 1961. It was not declared unconstitutional—it was repealed by Congress.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield for a question?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Is it not a fact that under the Senator's amendment, if such a person does take the fifth amendment, he can and does get back the amounts which he has paid in to date with whatever interest is allowed?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Government pays a refund, yes.

Mr. KEATING. That is the important distinction between this and the case referred to by the Senator from North Carolina. In that case the man was fired without a refund; in other words, he was penalized. In this case, he is not penalized. He gets back what he has paid in, with interest.

He simply does not thereafter reap further benefits from the taxpayers of the country.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct. He can reinstate this on 24 hours' notice by offering to appear before the committee. We have been doing this for years with the armed services. It is the law today. Each member of the armed services has accumulated retirement benefits eligible after 20 years. If he then elects to reenlist for 1 year or 5 years and during the course of that reenlistment he is dishonorably discharged or receives a discharge other than honorable he forfeits all of his privileges and retirement benefits. This is true even though he could have retired prior to a second enlistment and received such benefits. That is the law. There is nothing unusual in this procedure. It has never been declared unconstitutional. It was on the statute books for 7 years. Let us face it—this could be called the Bobby Baker amendment.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield me another 30 seconds?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I am glad to yield 30 seconds to the Senator from North Carolina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina is recognized for 30 seconds.

Mr. ERVIN. This amendment is not only unconstitutional on the grounds I have mentioned, in that it constitutes an attempt to penalize a man for the exercise of his rights under the Constitution but it is also unconstitutional on another ground. The amendment is retroactive to September 1961 and penalizes a man for an act already committed and therefore is in violation of the provision of the Constitution which prohibits passage of ex post facto laws.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield briefly to me?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I intend to vote for the amendment offered by the distinguished senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS]. This amendment simply provides that any Government employee who claims the privilege against self-incrimination pursuant to the fifth amendment to the Constitution would thereafter be deprived of any retirement benefits due to him from a Government retirement plan. The amendment in no way prohibits a person from invoking the provisions of the fifth amendment.

The provisions of the pending amendment differ from the situation which existed and led to the Supreme Court decision of Slochower against the Board of Higher Education of New York City, which was handed down in 1955. In that case, the individual who claimed the fifth amendment before a Senate committee was automatically discharged from his job as professor at Brooklyn College, in New York. A contractual employment relationship existed between the city of New York and the appellant Slochower, in that case. However, Mr. President, there is no contractual obligation on the part of Congress to provide retirement benefits. Such benefits are modified from time to time and may be withdrawn by Congress at will. Under these circumstances, it is clear that Congress may provide for denial of retirement benefits in individual cases upon such grounds as it may determine valid. Under the provisions of the pending amendment, if an individual took refuge in the fifth amendment, he could still retain his position, but he would forfeit his retirement pay; and the amount he had already put in would be returned to him.

It is argued that the retroactive feature of this amendment makes this proposal an ex post facto law. In the 1798 case of Calder against Bull, the Supreme Court of the United States held that the prohibition against ex post facto laws contained in the Constitution applied only to penal and criminal statutes. This amendment does not make it a crime to invoke the fifth amendment, and, therefore, does not violate the prohibition against ex post facto laws as contained in the Constitution. It is essential to the proper functioning of the Government that it be able to secure from its employees information concerning the performance of their official duties. Refusal by Government employees to disclose pertinent facts and records concerning their official duties constitutes a serious disservice to the Government and the Nation. Employees who do refuse to make such disclosures should by no means be beneficiaries of rewards, over and above their salaries. They should be denied retirement benefits. I strongly support adoption of the Williams amendment.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. METCALF. Is it the understanding of the Senator from Delaware that this amendment is prospective, or would it be retroactive and apply to a pension which has already been earned?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The amendment is both. There is not a single Senator who does not know what the purpose of this amendment is. Let us vote on it accordingly.

Mr. METCALF. Would it not be open to the legal objection that if it were retroactive and applied to pensions already earned, would it not?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The amendment provides in this last paragraph that it would not require a refund of any annuities which have been collected prior to the enactment.

It does stop the benefits prospectively but it does not require retroactive payment back into the Government if a man has retired prior thereto and has drawn in excess of the amount to which he would be entitled. Thus there is no retroactive payment.

It does say that if he takes the fifth amendment that from that time on, from that day forward, he would not be eligible to any further benefits of the taxpayers' money. Congress passed such a bill once; it repealed it in 1961. This would reinstate it, and we all know what the purpose of it is. Let us vote on it.

Mr. METCALF. This would only apply to pensions previously earned after the amendment is adopted?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It would apply to all pension privileges.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Delaware has expired.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania 3 minutes. It happens that he held hearings on this particular matter in 1961.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I hope very strongly that this amendment will be soundly defeated. It is an old chestnut and goes back to the hysteria surrounding the attack on Government employees during the height of the McCarthy scare some 10 years ago when Federal employees were quite literally in fear of their lives or of their jobs or of their pay. It was a time when the name Alger Hiss was bruited about this Chamber and everyone quivered with fear when that name was mentioned, because of the idea that if they did anything that might conceivably support Alger Hiss—who was, it is true, a traitor to his country—they would be damned by guilt by association with the same unfortunate public reputation.

On September 1, 1961, as chairman of the Retirement Subcommittee, it was my good fortune to report a bill dealing with H.R. 6141, proposing to forfeit civilian annuities and military retirement pay.

We made a most comprehensive study of that particular bill and we concluded that it was not in the national interest, that it was probably unconstitutional, that it violated the civil liberties of employees of the United States and in the end, I am happy to say, the report of that committee was upheld by the Senate and the so-called Hiss bill was not passed.

We are now dealing with the spiritual successor of that particular piece of legislation.

The fifth amendment is enshrined as a part of that Constitution. It is not a particularly popular amendment but it is an essential part of the civil liberties of American citizens, determined by our forefathers when they framed the Constitution to be essential to that freedom for which they had fought the war of the Revolution.

This is an effort to whittle away at the sacred right given to all Americans to take their liberties, to speak their piece, and to assert the right against discrimination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 1 additional minute.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I yield 1 additional minute to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized for 1 additional minute.

Mr. CLARK. If they so felt, the question as to whether they should forfeit their annuities or not would not be decided in advance of the fact. This is a matter that we should leave on an ad hoc basis as to the situation if it should arise at some time. I think this is fundamentally an un-American amendment. I hope it will be defeated.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield me 2 minutes?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield the Senator from New Jersey 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. CASE. I think there is some question as to whether this may or may not be within the constitutional power so far as it relates to service heretofore rendered and rights already accrued. I do not really have any doubt but that this would not be separable, or that service hereafter rendered and rights for services hereafter rendered would be constitutional.

The Senator from Pennsylvania said that it goes back to Alger Hiss. I suggest that it goes back to at least a generation before that. I remember as a young man in New York when Governor Roosevelt required that public employees who failed to waive immunity before grand juries in regard to their official acts would have to leave the public service. And Jimmy Walker was one of those. And this is how it happened. It is a direct precedent, I think, for the action which we seek to take here.

I do not think it really has anything to do with punishing a person. I think this has to do with the Senate's proper efforts to police itself and its employees. I wish that the Committee on Rules and Administration had exhibited the kind of energy and diligence in the matter still before it—although it claims now to have finished—that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] exhibited in regard to giving us the tools with which to do the job.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 2 minutes on the bill?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, we have been looking backward. There is clear evidence of an effort to confuse the nature of the amendment by talking about Alger Hiss and times long past.

I do not regard this amendment as particularly concerning Alger Hiss, or concerning this body. This is not what this amendment is directed at. Let us bring it out in the open.

This amendment is not directed against those from whom we might seek to recover retroactively nearly as much as it is designed to cover a situation which will no doubt happen in the future—perhaps in the near future.

This amendment, if adopted, would return to Bobby Baker whatever investment he has paid in, with the interest allowed by the Government on the refund. It would make it impossible for Bobby Baker to draw a pension in reward for the disservice which he has rendered to the Senate and to the people of the United States.

If we want to go on record as saying that Bobby Baker is to be rewarded, that Bobby Baker is to be treated as if he had not defied the Senate, and a Senate committee—one of their most trusted employees—if we want to say, "Let us shovel out the Government money to Bobby Baker," we should join the friends of Bobby Baker. But I will not do it. I will support the Williams amendment for the reasons that I stated.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the

House had agreed to the following concurrent resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 321. Concurrent resolution establishing that when the House adjourns on Thursday, July 2, 1964, it stand adjourned until 12 o'clock noon on Monday, July 20, 1964;

H. Con. Res. 322. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions until July 20, 1964; and

H. Con. Res. 323. Concurrent resolution requesting the President to return the enrolled bill (H.R. 10053) to the House of Representatives, and for other purposes.

HOUSE ADJOURNMENT FROM JULY 2 TO JULY 20, 1964—SENATE ADJOURNMENT FROM JULY 10 to JULY 20, 1964

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending business be laid aside temporarily, for not to exceed 2 minutes, probably less.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears no objection. It is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I ask that the resolution be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. House Concurrent Resolution 321:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the House adjourns on Thursday, July 2, 1964, it stand adjourned until 12 o'clock noon on Monday, July 20, 1964.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the resolution, it is proposed to add the following resolving clause:

Resolved further, That when the Senate adjourns on Friday, July 10, 1964, it stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridan, July 20, 1964.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, is the resolution subject to amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution is subject to amendment.

Mr. MUNDT. I do not want to prolong a controversy. But I have an amendment to suggest if the majority leader would be willing to accept it and make it a part of the resolution. I suggest adding the words, "also the U.S. Senate."

Mr. MANSFIELD. We are included, beginning on the 10th.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senate is covered?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes. That is what I wanted to be sure of.

The amendment was agreed to.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 321), as amended, was agreed to.

AUTHORITY TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS DURING ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I send to the desk another resolution, to make sure that we are not caught shorthanded this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the resolution for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. House Concurrent Resolution 322:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That notwithstanding any adjournment of the two Houses until July 20, 1964, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate be, and they are hereby, authorized to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 322) is agreed to.

REQUEST TO PRESIDENT FOR RETURN OF ENROLLED BILL (H.R. 10053) TO THE HOUSE.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the next concurrent resolution coming over from the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the concurrent resolution.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. House Concurrent Resolution 323:

The President of the United States is requested to return to the House of Representatives the enrolled bill (H.R. 10053) to amend section 502 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, relating to construction differential subsidies. If and when said bill is returned by the President, the action of the Presiding Officers of the two Houses in signing the bill shall be deemed rescinded; and the Clerk of the House is authorized and directed, in the reenrollment of said bill, to make the following correction:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That the proviso in the second sentence of subsection (b) of section 502 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (46 U.S.C. 1152 (b)), is amended by striking out 'June 30, 1964,' and inserting in lieu thereof 'June 30, 1965,'."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. HOLLAND. I object. It is important and excellent legislation. There may be amendments. We do not have anything in the RECORD on it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I withdraw the resolution. We can go back on limited time and attend to that later.

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES SALARY REFORM ACT OF 1964

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11049) to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, my judgment is that Congress can place a condition upon employees. I believe if some people believe that this will not affect anyone retroactively, they will be disappointed.

Mr. CARLSON. I yield 3 minutes to the Sentor from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, Congress has already retroactively taken away the retirement benefits of Alger Hiss. The senior Senator from Pennsylvania did not include a repeal of that proposal in his bill. He exempted it from repeal in the bill in 1961. The provision of the 1954 act had taken away the retirement benefits of Alger Hiss retroactively. No man or court has ruled against it. We have done it once. We can do it again.

The only reason that the law was repealed in 1961 was, in my opinion, for the sole purpose of making eligible for retirement benefits every crook and scoundrel who has been convicted in court for acceptance of bribes or embezzlement of Government funds under the exposures of the Internal Revenue scandals.

That was the 1954 act, of which I was a cosponsor. It was designed to deny retirement benefits to all crooks and scoundrels who had been found to have accepted bribes in connection with their official activities or who were convicted of the embezzlement of Government funds. Those people were reinstated on Government retirement rolls by the 1961 legislation sponsored by the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK].

My amendment here today would reinstate the provision of the 1954 act relating to the fifth amendment. Senators know why it is being done; it is to prevent Bobby Baker from collecting a Government retirement pension of nearly $10,000 per year while taking the fifth amendment before a congressional committee.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield 2 minutes?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Oklahoma.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Oklahoma for 2 minutes.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, the purpose for repealing the act in 1961 was because the act covered every phase of Government. Dozens of cases of letter carriers that were caught in the arms of the law without having been guilty of any crime remotely connected with the faithful performance of their duties as Government employees came to the attention of the committee.

The bill would not affect one man, as the Senator would have us do. It would provide for retroactive punishment. We would not only enact a law covering a case which had already occurred, but also we would bring into a state of fear, I believe, every one of our nearly 2 million Government employees. They would not be subject to normal prosecution or penalties. They would be subject to a penalty assessed against them for failure to divulge everything they knew in response to a question asked by a congressional committee. The amendment does not even provide that the committee must be a regular committee. It could be an ad hoc committee. It could be a subcommittee. There are many such committees. But every Government employee would be subject to the punishment of discharge from his position.

If it were the decision of the Senate to pass a bill which would effect the cessation of employment of such an employee, I would be wholly in favor of imposing such a penalty of the loss of one's job. I should be perfectly willing to see any law that applies to any one of the 190 million people in this Nation applied to Government employees. But I hardly think that taking away a retirement fund that a letter carrier or someone working in a Government department has acquired through faithful performance is proper legislation. Such an employee has put his money up. He was not putting it in a savings bank; he was buying an insurance policy for his retirement, and that policy was signed by the Government of the United States at the time he bought it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 1 additional minute?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I yield the Senator from Oklahoma 1 more minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. MONRONEY. It is now proposed to attach to a pay bill that involves a thousand different items, without 1 minute's hearings before any committee, an amendment of the nature of the one proposed.

I do not believe our committee would be the proper committee to hear the testimony, but the Senator did not even appear before our committee to present his amendment. In less than 30 minutes we are asked to pass on a question that does not involve a job status that an employee would have to forfeit. The amendment would compel him to sacrifice the contract that he had and on which he had been paying. Of course, he would receive back his money with interest.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield 1 additional minute?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I yield 1 more minute to the Senator from Oklahoma.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. MONRONEY. Whom would we punish? The full range of Federal law to put him in jail is available if the employee could be convicted before a jury of his peers. Full action can be taken on that question. But whom would we damage by the amendment? We would damage the wife or the children who would be the beneficiaries of the insurance policy that the employees had bought in good faith.

I am not ready to vote for the amendment of the Senator from Delaware because I do not believe it is in the American tradition.

I respect the statement of my friend the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Ervin], who is a great lawyer, that the amendment would be unconstitutional.

I believe the thing to do is to pass the bill, and permit the proper legislative committee to conduct hearings on the proposal. It should not be added, at this late hour, as a rider to the bill, for it would jeopardize the pension and retirement funds that have been created over the years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. Mundt] on the bill.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, there is not a rural mail carrier who could be brought under the bill unless that rural mail carrier were called before a congressional committee and refused to disclose before that committee some important information he had vital to the hearing, in which case he should not be entitled to the benefits of the pension program.

By the adoption of the Williams amendment, we can at least keep the bill from being labeled as a bill for the relief of Bobby Baker. That is what it adds up to. That is the instant case. We have taken care of his case. The question is, should we perpetuate the benefits of Government service for a man who has refused to come before a congressional committee or should we not? I believe we should not. At the same time, I think we should make clear to other faithless employees of the Federal Government that they will be expected to testify when they are called upon.

I recommend adoption of the Williams amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. Williams]. On this question all time has expired, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Talmadge] is absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from California [Mr. Engle], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Bayh] are absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Cotton], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Fong], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Saltonstall] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Saltonstall] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 38, nays 52, as follows:

[No. 464 Leg.]

YEAS—38

Aiken
Allott
Beall
Bennett
Boggs
Byrd, Va.
Carlson
Case
Church
Cooper
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Douglas
Eastland
Goldwater
Hickenlooper
Javits
Jordan, Idaho
Keating
Kuchel
Lausche
McClellan
Mechem
Miller
Morton
Mundt
Pastore
Pearson
Prouty
Scott
Simpson
Smith
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—52

Anderson
Bartlett
Bible
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Clark
Dodd
Edmondson
Ellender
Ervin
Fulbright
Gore
Gruening
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Hill
Holland
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Johnston
Jordan, N.C.
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalf
Monroney
Morse
Moss
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pell
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Robertson
Russell
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Walters
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—10

Bayh
Cotton
Engle
Fong
Hruska
Kennedy
Saltonstall
Smathers
Talmadge
Yarborough

So Mr. Williams of Delaware's amendment, as modified, was rejected.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, while the majority leader is in the Chamber, I should like to ask him if he can clarify for the Members of the Senate what the schedule is likely to be starting with Monday, and whether there will be any yea and nay votes, or whether any major items will come up for consideration before the recess on Friday, July 10.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the distinguished minority leader and I have discussed this matter, and we expect appropriation and other bills of worthwhile significance to come up next week. The Senate is not remaining in session until the 10th of July for the fun of it. We intend to conduct business of the Senate. We are very hopeful that there will be legislation available Monday which will be taken up, and very likely there will be some legislation which may cause a little controversy, and therefore raise the possibility of quorum calls and votes.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Does the Senator from Montana include in that statement the possibility of votes on Monday?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES SALARY REFORM ACT OF 1964

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11049) to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 1091.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the amendment (No. 1091), as follows:

> At the end of the bill add the following new section:
>
> "SEC. 502. Section 1(e) of the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2251 (e)) is amended to read as follows:
>
> "'(e) The term "average salary" shall mean the annual rate resulting from averaging over all periods of civilian service used in the computation of an annuity under this Act a Member's or an employee's rates of basic salary in effect during such periods, with each rate weighted by the time it was in effect'."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order. Senators will take their seats or retire to the cloakrooms.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, during the discussion of the bill mention was made of the adverse impact which the passage of the bill would have on the retirement fund for public employees. It is admitted that the impact would be in the sum of $1,250 million. The figure is completely separate and apart from the $550 million cost of the bill by way of increased salaries.

When the Public Employees Retirement Fund was established, it was predicated upon an actuarial structure which was sound.

The amount of the contributions made, respectively, by the Government and by the employees, was adequate to sustain the fund. However, since the establishment of the fund, it has been increasingly weakened by various things which have been done by Congress. I have before me a report of the hearings before the Subcommittee on Retirement of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of the Senate. The hearing was conducted on August 14, 1963, and, I believe, on several days thereafter. At the hearing, Mr. Macy, of the Civil Service Commission, testified. He stated that as of the beginning of the fiscal year 1965—that would be the first of July of this year, yesterday—the obligations of the fund would be $49 billion, the money available would be $14 billion, and the unfunded liability would be $35 billion.

May we have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. LAUSCHE. For the benefit of those who are listening, I should like to have order.

Mr. RUSSELL. Would the bill increase the contributions to the fund?

Mr. LAUSCHE. It would not, but it changes the base upon which the retirement pay is to be calculated.

Mr. RUSSELL. In other words, it increases the amount to be paid out, but does not do anything to replenish the fund. Is that correct?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes. The bill would increase the amount that would be paid out, but it would do nothing to finance the increase in the obligation.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is where the billion and some odd dollars that the Senator has referred to is involved.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes.

The adoption of the increased pay would impose an added obligation on the fund of $1,250 million. No increased contributions are provided with which to finance the increased obligations.

Mr. Macy testified that there are several reasons why the fund has become actuarially unsound. He said:

> The second factor has been periodic liberalizations which have been made by Congress without payment to cover past service liability. These liberalizations are of four different types: Annuity increases for those already retired, such as those enacted last year. Pay increases for active employment, such as those enacted last year. These pay increases have a future liability impact upon the annuity rate and the annuity fund.

It is thus clear, Mr. President, that as we increase the annuities, and as we increase the pay, and as we bring other persons within the coverage, we increase the burden of the obligations that are put on the fund.

The consequence of these liberalizations, in part, and the failure of the Government to pay its share on a pay-as-you-go basis, have created this shocking situation: $49 billion of obligations, $14 billion of money available to pay those obligations, and $35 billion of unfunded liabilities.

With the passage of the bill the obligations would be increased by $1,250 million, without any financing of the obligation, as indicated by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

Senators might ask me what I propose to do. When the retirement fund was originally established, the actuarial calculation was sound. The formula for establishing the base was that we shall take the average salary of the employee through his whole career. Later that formula was changed, and the formula that was adopted provided that we would take the 5 years of the highest salary in fixing the base. With that formula of 5 highest years, any one of us, at the end of 5 years, would have our lifetime annuity established on the basis of 5 years at $30,000 without any regard of the former years that we served either at $22,500 or at $12,500.

I have made a calculation. Let us assume that I have served 12 years at $22,500 a year. My annuity pay would be $6,750 a year or $562.50 a month. That is on 12 years of service with a salary of $22,500.

If we raise the salaries to $30,000, and I have served 12 years, 7 of which was at $22,500 and 5 at $30,000, my retirement pay would be $9,000 a year, or $733 a month, that being $61 a month more.

Under my formula, we would take the average pay received through the 12 years, 7 years at $22,500, and 5 years at $30,000, added together, and then establishing what the average wage would be over the 12 years.

Under my formula, the pension would be $7,187 a year.

To recapitulate, under the existing formula, with a $22,500 a year salary, the pension is $562.50 a month. Under the bill if it is passed, without my amendment, it would be $733 a month. If my amendment were adopted, it would be $718 a month.

All I ask is that we should not count the 5 highest years, but the average of all the years of employment.

My amendment applies not only to Senators, but also to every employee of the Government. To illustrate further, let us consider the civil service employee who has served 20 years—the first 10 years at $5,000, the next 5 years at $8,000, and the last 5 years at $15,000. His retirement pay under present law is calculated on the $15,000 a year salary, without regard for his service of 10 years at $5,000 and 5 years at $8,000.

In addition, when he began at $5,000, he paid a premium on the basis of $5,000. In the next 5 years, at a salary of $8,000, the premium was based on the $8,000. In the last 5 years, when he was earning $15,000, the premium was on the basis of $15,000. So it can readily be seen that the amount of the contribution made is not adequate to sustain the fund.

I feel very keenly about this. I do so because I think it can be clearly demonstrated that the fund must go into bankruptcy eventually, unless Congress does something to remedy the wrong. I read further from Mr. Macy's statement:

> As I have already indicated, in 1965, the fund would be $14 billion; the unfunded liability, $35 billion. In 7 years the fund would be $17 billion; the unfunded liability, $41 billion. In 1975, the fund would be $16 billion. In other words, it would have fallen off in that period, and the unfunded liability would have grown to $49 billion from the present level of $35 billion.

Mr. Macy goes on to state that by 1990 the fund would be broke. My question is: Can we tolerate that situation? We cannot. We should approach the problem on a realistic, sound economic basis.

It is true that we would expect that the Government eventually would pay the $35 billion due now and probably the $49 billion that would be due at a later date; but if and when it does, those amounts will have to be paid out of the taxpayers' money.

Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, the Senator's amendment would provide that a person who has been with the Government 25 or 30 years, who started at $1,500 a year, and who is now receiving $15,000, would have to go back and include the years during which he was paid $1,500 and reach a general average of all the years. Is that correct?

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Under the retirement system, it has always been the practice that when a person was employed he had to sign for retirement benefits. When he did so, he knew how much he would have to pay into the fund, and he also knew how much the Government would pay in to match his contribution. He signed up in the system with the understanding that his retirement would be based on the average of the 5 highest years' salary. That would be the basis of the computation of his retirement annuity. Is not that true?

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is true; but the Senator's statement demonstrates the fallacy of the law as it is now written.

The Senator admits that the retirement pay of the person who signed up when he was earning $1,500 a year and subsequently received $15,000 annually for his last 5 years would be predicated on the 5 years at $15,000, completely forgetting that for the previous years he was earning $1,500.

Mr. JOHNSTON. With one proviso: Provided he had been drawing $15,000 annually for 5 years.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is correct; but I ask the Senator from South Carolina: What will become of the fund under the formula which he is urging? It is now growing constantly bigger. If the Senator says it is not, then I shall read to him what Mr. Macy said about the subject.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Annually the fund has been growing. It now has approximately $14.5 billion. Last year it was $13 billion. We were told years ago what would happen.

The Civil Service Commission takes into consideration all employees and assumes that they will all remain with the Government for the full term. But all employees do not do that. At present, the turnover of Government employees is at the rate of 18 percent each year. When they leave the Government, what do they receive? They receive only the amount of money they contributed. The Federal contribution remains with the fund.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Does the Senator from South Carolina claim that the fund, on the present basis of operation, will not be bankrupt, according to the words of Mr. Macy, in 1990?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. Macy appeared before our committee. The committee has before it a bill to reform the financing of the retirement system that it will report to the Senate. It will be found that when the Government contributes to the fund, the contribution begins to draw interest. The Government borrows from the $14.5 billion in the fund and pays 3 percent interest, the lowest it pays anywhere in America.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I can only say that I am shocked and cannot believe that a sound argument can be made to justify the horrible condition that exists in the retirement fund. No words can refute the facts. No words can refute what every actuary will say about the present status of the fund.

If 2 years from now we again increase salaries, we shall further weaken the fund, unless we adopt a formula to provide for the base of annuities being established on the average salary received throughout the years.

I know I have used up my time. I have nothing further to say on the subject. I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, the only reason why the fund is not sound now is that the Government has failed to pay into it its proper share over the years. If 20, 25, or 30 years ago the Government had made its obligated contributions, the fund would be in sounder condition today.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. The question may be irrelevant and immaterial; it may also be slightly unethical. But would not the result of the amendment of the Senator from Ohio be to reduce the pension of every Member of this body?

Mr. LAUSCHE. No, it would not. It would not reduce the pension. It would allow the beneficiaries to receive the benefit of an increased pension without having in the past paid in a share of the premium adequate to sustain the fund.

My proposal would be absolutely just. It would be based on the average salary over the whole career of a Senator or of an employee of the Senate.

Mr. CLARK. I did not ask the Senator from Ohio; I asked the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON. There are Members of this body who have served 28 or 30 years, when Members' salaries were lower their annuities at retirement age would be reduced substantially by this amendment. They would have to do this down through the years in order to get the $12,000.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I notice that the Senator from Pennsylvania asked questions only of those who will answer according to his wishes, but that comment might not be agreed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McGovern in the chair). Does the Senator from South Carolina yield back the remainder of his time?

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the amendment. There have been three versions of the amendment. The first one that came in would have made Members of the Senate exclusive victims of a rather deep cut in their retirement benefits, leaving out the legislative employees and leaving out the Government workers. This amendment was tabled on the opening of debate on the bill. Today, we have a new amendment which applies to the systemwide governmental retirement system. Frankly, I know of no established retirement system by industry, or others, which does not relate retirement pay for years of service which the worker has accumulated under a retirement system to the salary at the time he retires. To do otherwise would be to bring Members of the Senate back to the level of the $7,500 salary, for perhaps a fourth of their service, $10,000 for another fourth, and then perhaps up to $22,500. Today Members' salaries on which they pay 7½ percent retirement benefits is $22,500, contrary to the impression left by my distinguished friend, the Senator from Ohio, which I am sure he did not intend to create.

We pay the 7½ percent not on the $22,500, when the salary goes up, but on the $30,000. Those in the other grades would pay on their higher salaries. When we took this up in 1956, in order to be sure that we were not going to put in a lesser amount or too small an amount, we obtained an estimate from the Civil Service Commission as to the proper rate, and took the 5-year average. We were told we had to raise it from 6 to 7½ percent—which we did.

The distinguished Senator from Ohio will find that on November 1, 1956, in order to meet the 5-year average, we raised the assessments to 7½ percent.

By the same token, on Government employees, as their salaries have gone up, the percent has increased from the original rate of 2½ percent per year which was in effect on August 1, 1920, to 3½ percent which became effective on July 1, 1926, to 5 percent which became effective on July 1, 1942, to 6 percent which became effective on July 1, 1948, and to 6½ percent which became effective November 1, 1956.

I have heard it explained time and time again, that the purpose is to let the employee pay half the retirement, in much the same established custom as social security, which was modeled after this program.

The annual payment to the Commission, as civil service retirement, has done better than that, because the employee has paid more than his half. Although there is a deficit in the systemwide reserves on the entire civil service system, it is because the Government—in order to reach such political accommodations as "totaling" budgets in certain years—failed to put up, during those years, the portion that the Civil Service Commission intended, planned, and had under program. Those funds should have been invested. So it has been the Government, and not the employees, that has been shortchanging the fund. The employees have maintained their contributions and have increased their contributions.

To go back now and assent to pulling these men down to a 1920, a 1915, or a 1930 salary base, perhaps one-third of their employable time, and roll them back, rather than meet the salary which today—with inflation and the cost of living—the increase requires, would mean that 1.7 million civil service workers would go back, back, back, and would have their benefits greatly reduced.

I am surprised that the Senator, who has always been a friend of the Government worker, would do this to all Federal employees. If it was the original plan to do this to Senators and Representatives, we could perhaps stand it. It would be unfair—but we could stand it. But I do not believe it is the purpose to lower salaries back to the cost of living standard before World War II, which was low. But now, to roll them back and figure it in their base, means that the Government has not kept faith by putting its share of the money into the retirement fund.

I believe that this is an unwise amendment which would cause a great deal of distress among Government employees who have calculated for years on the basis of this high, 5-year average.

Now the Senator from Ohio comes in and with one swoop, in 1 day, reverses what he had on the table.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I am not reversing it at all. I have gone the full limit to be fair with all.

I might answer the Senator from Oklahoma by saying that I am the friend of the worker because I wish this fund to be kept sound. Those who are opposing my proposal are urging a course of action which would bankrupt the fund and eventually deprive every worker.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator well knows, or should know, that every year the Appropriations Committee is putting back more of the money of the Federal contribution.

Did the Senator from Ohio believe that the old base for the retirement system of Federal employees was going to be the employees contribution?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Never. The initial objective was to have it equally big.

Mr. MONRONEY. But the Government has not carried out its contract.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It certainly has not paid into the fund.

Mr. MONRONEY. That is correct—that is why the fund is in the red.

Mr. LAUSCHE. But today we are going to put upon the Government a new obligation of $1,250 million, for which there has been no payment into the fund.

Mr. MONRONEY. I do not believe that is going to freeze permanently all salaries in the system. I believe that there will always be a variation. When the worker increases his percentage to 7½ percent, that is about as high as any contributing employee can possibly go. Government workers are now paying 6½ percent. They are carrying their part of the load. If the congressional retirement to which the Senator has referred had been kept on a separate bookkeeping system, the Senator would find that since 1946 the fund collected more from the Members than was paid out.

The annual contribution of Members is $1,750,000. This does not include service credit, deposits, or voluntary contributions. Annuities paid out annually are $1,233,333, leaving an annual surplus on a cash basis of $416,000.

This is the way our congressional retirement system has worked. We do not like to retire early. No Member likes to retire at the earliest possible date in the Senate, nor in the House. So, we find that there are dozens of Members who serve long past the retirement fund age, and continue to pay into the fund; and when they retire they draw back very much more than what they have been able to put in, without regard to the interest rate.

This amendment, I believe, would work great hardship on our Government employees. It has not been carefully thought out.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the distinguished Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I rise in support of the position so effectively advocated by the Senator from Oklahoma in opposition to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE].

The Federal employee is in no way responsible for the financial difficulties of the civil service retirement and disability fund. Indeed, it is the Federal Government which has created the deficit in this fund. The employee, since the act of origin in 1920, has contributed between 2½ percent, in the beginning, to 6½ percent of his gross salary to the retirement fund. It has been the Government which has failed again and again to contribute adequate funds. The Government made a promise and it has failed to live up to that promise. Do we therefore penalize the loyal Federal employee for Congress failure in breach of contract? I believe not, and I feel that the Members of the Senate will overwhelmingly defeat the pending amendment.

Mr. President, the Senator from Ohio speaks of Members of this Chamber who make $22,500 a year. I speak in behalf of 378,000 loyal workers in the Post Office Department who carry our mail and who earn a salary of slightly more than $5,000 a year.

I might be willing to accept the Senator's suggestion if the only persons involved were the Senator from Ohio and myself. We have, however, promised the Federal employees, the overwhelming majority of whom are in the lower grades of the Classification Act and the postal schedule, and it is these people we would hurt. It is these citizens who have earned a retirement based on "high 5" average and multiplied by their years of service.

I can never support a proposal to tell a clerk or stenographer or a letter carrier that after 25 or 30 or 40 years of toil, we will not pay that employee what we promised more than 40 years ago that we would pay.

Mr. MONRONEY. The argument of the Senator from West Virginia is valid. His conviction in this matter is appreciated.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I should like to address a question, through the Senator from Oklahoma, to the Senator from Ohio. Does this apply to those presently on the rolls?

Mr. MONRONEY. I do not believe the amendment is clear.

Mr. MORTON. To those presently on the retirement rolls.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator has not provided for reducing those already on pension. It does not say.

Mr. MORTON. The point I wish to make is that a lady retired from my office after 17 years. She is retired now, and her pension is set, based on her highest 5 years of service. I have another employee who expects to retire, perhaps 3 years from now. Will those two employees be treated differently?

Mr. LAUSCHE. As to the one retired, her pay is fixed. It would not affect her at all.

Mr. MORTON. The first one was the beneficiary of the 5 highest years.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes—over 5 years.

Mr. MORTON. She received retirement based on the highest 5 years. Should I treat someone differently from one who has worked for me and my predecessor, who has been on Capitol Hill since 1930, and give preferential treatment to someone who has worked for me, say, 15 years?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has now expired.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Let the Chair put the question.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I yield time on the bill to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Let me read what Macy said:

> We find that in 7 years by 1972, the outgo in the form of benefit payments under the retirement act will exceed the income. From that date on, this unfavorable situation continues to add to the fund balance so that in 25 years, by 1990, the retirement fund balance is zero.
>
> I realize, Mr. Chairman, that this appears to be many years ahead, but we feel as the responsible administrators of this fund that we must look that far ahead.

We are going to continue on the way we are going, and run into this situation. Or we are going to meet the problem head on now.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, if the Senator from Oklahoma will yield further, let me point out that provided Senators stand up and appropriate what they are supposed to appropriate to this fund, that contingency will not come about. What disturbs me is that someone who retired last year who worked for me or for some other Senator, or anyone on Capitol Hill, would be treated in one way under the amendment of the Senator, and persons who plan to retire in 2 or 3 or 4 years from now, or next year, will be treated in an entirely different way.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Unless we find a remedy, the employee of the Senator who retires after working for 30 years will be in trouble. This employee of the Senator who retires, if she lives for 30 years, will be in trouble. But I do not suppose she will live that long.

Mr. MORTON. That is not because she worked for me.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, the Senator brought up a very important point. It would not be so effective as to Members of Congress. But, historically the Government employees off Capitol Hill have enjoyed the advantage of having the highest 5-year count for their retirement benefits. Suddenly, the Lausche amendment provides that people who retire subsequently will be subject to a different retirement pay. Those who come along after the passage of this amendment would be cut back to the Senator's example of the $5,000 a year clerk and the $2,000 a year clerk for 5 years. That would affect the average. Perhaps the person would be receiving a salary of $10,000 or $15,000 a year when he retired, but he would be entitled to only a third of the pay in the last 5 years that can be credited to his retirement.

I think it is a very cruel system to put into effect. It is very unwise. It is self-defeating.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the retirement system at best does not provide too large an annuity or pension to the pensioner. The pensioners on Government pensions, today, have a very difficult time, in many instances, meeting their expenses. It is very difficult for a person who is nearing $8,000, $7,000, $10,000, or $6,000 a year—a family person, even if a second person in the family works—to save up anything, except to possibly pay for a home; to put Federal employees on two standards, one group whose retirement is based on the average of the last 5 years' earnings, and the other group on a different average would, I say most respectfully, not be proper.

I have not had the experience that the Senator from Ohio has in this matter. But I served on the teachers' retirement fund in my city, the municipal employees' retirement fund and the police and firemen's retirement fund. The only answer is to appropriate the money that we are obliged to appropriate.

What we did in most instances, and what Congress has done; namely, to take out a certain percentage of the worker's pay. Then Congress "takes it on the lam" and does not put up the money. If we do that, of course, the problem will not be solved. The only way to solve it is to have Congress perform its duty and provide its share of the funds.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I point out that the amount of raise that the workers will receive, with the 6½ percent that they will be paying in addition, will bring in something like $32 or $33 additional to the fund. It will stay in there for many years at 4 percent interest to help pay for this program. But the Government must put up its share, and be fair. To use the Government's failure as an excuse to tear down the amount that the workers will receive in 20 or 30 years, expecting and believing that they would receive it, I think, is a cruel system.

Mr. LAUSCHE. May I have 2 minutes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator from Ohio has pointed out that many annuitants are not in a position to maintain themselves the way they expected when they went on retirement.

I point out that many Members of the Senate are responsible for the plight of the retirees when they raise salaries 32 percent for the Members of the Senate, for judges, for board members, for board chairmen. We will take more and more bread out of the mouths of the annuitants.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I associate myself with the remarks just made by the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY]. If we want to penalize Federal employees who have served for years in this body, who have served in the Government for years, we should adopt the Lausche amendment.

If a Member of Congress is elected to Congress after 1956, in 6 years he can retire at full benefit, at the highest pay. But a Member who has served for many years, if we adopt the Lausche amendment, would receive much less in retirement. The same system would prevail in our Government.

I do not believe the Senate will adopt the amendment. I admit that Congress has been negligent in preserving this fund. It is our fault.

I have a statement, and instead of reading it, I would like to have it made a part of my remarks at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> Annuity benefits under that system are based on years of service and the highest 5-year average salary. Annuities do not reflect the full effect of pay increases until such increases have been in effect 5 years. However, only about 10 percent of present employees will retire within the next 5 years, so it is apparent that a general increase in pay results in a material increase in the liabilities of the civil service retirement system. The Foreign Service retirement system is also affected, since the pending legislation proposes salary increases for members of that system.
>
> In its budget submission for fiscal year 1965, the Civil Service Commission estimated the unfunded liability of the civil service retirement system at about $33¾ billion as of June 30, 1964. The Commission estimates that pending pay legislation, if enacted, would increase this liability by $1¼ billion, raising it to $35 billion.
>
> I would like to emphasize that the increase of $1¼ billion is a onetime figure. It is not an annual amount, but is, in effect, an estimate of the present value of all future increases in benefits based on service performed prior to the pay increase. The cost of greater benefits for future service would be met by contributions of employees and their employing agencies, based on the higher salaries.
>
> One of the salient features of the civil service retirement system is the relationship of promised benefits to current pay levels. This is essential if the system is to fulfill its role in the personnel program of the Government. Justified pay increases carry with them justified increases in retirement benefits. The cost involved is a necessary and valid cost of operating the Government.
>
> The effect on the civil service retirement system of the pending pay legislation underscores the need for early consideration of methods to improve the financing of the system. In May 1963, the Commission submitted to Congress a proposal which would accomplish this objective by gradually increasing the contributions made by employing agencies until the growth of the unfunded liability had been arrested.
>
> I support proposed pay increases for officers and employees of the Federal Government because I am fully convinced of their justification and their need. I recognize their effect in necessarily increasing retirement liabilities, and I urge that this issue be squarely met by early adoption of a plan to improve the financing of the civil service retirement system.

Mr. CARLSON. I sincerely hope that the Senate will not be carried away and support the Lausche amendment. I also hope that we, as Members of the Senate, assume our responsibility and adopt the recommendation of the Civil Service Commission, submitted in the report to Congress.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Does the amendment of the Civil Service Retirement Act embodied in the Lausche amendment, apply to all Federal employees, or only legislative?

Mr. CARLSON. It applies to everyone, postal workers, and everyone else.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. I am not on the particular subcommittee of which we are speaking, but I am on the Subcommittee on Independent Offices, of the Appropriations Committee.

I would urge that Senators do not support this amendment. There is much that is available to Congress and the Members of the Senate. When that bill comes up, we can support putting an amount in that bill which will contribute to the fund and make it entire, and make it sound. That is the only logical way to go about it.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, the problem has been caused by the Congress of the United States, and by the administration when they failed to pay into the funds—not 1 year, but for many years, they refused to pay money into the fund to match that which was paid in by the employees.

That of course reduced the amount in the fund. That went on for many years. The House and the Senate during the war said that any soldier boy who went into the service would be given credit when he came out of the service on his civil service retirement without paying anything in, even if he were in for 3, 4, or 5 years. And the Government did not pay anything for them, either. One can see that builds a big deficiency in that field.

We have a bill at the present time, and we are making a study of it in the committee. It is recommended by the administration, and by the Civil Service Commission. It is expected to take care of the situation that we find ourselves in, as far as that is concerned. But the amendment which is pending before us at the present time is not equitable. It treats the people who have been in service many, many years unfairly. I hope it is voted down. I wish to submit this statement with respect to the bill, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> Federal salary legislation has a direct effect upon the financial condition of the civil service retirement fund. Retirement annuities of Federal employees are computed on the basis of the employee's average salary over 5 years of employment at the highest salary he earns during his career. We call this the "high five" average. Naturally, increasing salaries automatically increases the "high five" average. In crediting the employee for past service at the time of retirement, the system gives the employee a benefit a certain portion of which he has not paid for.
>
> As the Senate may know, the Post Office and Civil Service Committee is presently considering legislation to improve permanently the financial condition of the fund. I am hopeful that favorable action will be taken on this legislation during this session of Congress. The deficit of the fund is caused by the Government's failure to contribute adequate funds in the past. Until the Retirement Act of 1956, a systematic method of agency contribution did not exist. The result has been a continuously growing unfunded liability.
>
> This pay bill will add to that liability, but at the same time additional money will come

into the fund because of the systematic contribution by both the agencies and the employees at the new, higher salary rates. When the Senate has an opportunity to act upon S. 1562, the funding legislation, a permanent method for improving the financial condition of the fund will be established.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment has expired. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FULBRIGHT (when his name was called). On this vote, I have a pair with the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Ellender]. If he were present and voting he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." Therefore I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Ellender], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Talmadge] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from California [Mr. Engle], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Bayh], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy] are absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting the Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Cotton], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Fong], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Saltonstall] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. Goldwater] is detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Saltonstall] would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 6, nays 79, as follows:

[No. 465 Leg.]

YEAS—6

Douglas
Gore
Lausche
Russell
Walters
Williams, Del.

NAYS—79

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Bartlett
Beall
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Case
Church
Clark
Cooper
Curtis
Dirksen
Dodd
Dominick
Eastland
Edmondson
Ervin
Gruening
Hartke
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Johnston
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Keating
Kuchel
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Mechem
Metcalf
Miller
Monroney
Morse
Morton
Moss
Mundt
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Robertson
Scott
Simpson
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, N.J.
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—15

Bayh
Byrd, Va.
Cotton
Ellender
Engle
Fong
Fulbright
Goldwater
Hart
Hruska
Kennedy
Saltonstall
Smathers
Talmadge
Yarborough

So Mr. Lausche's amendment was rejected.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MUNDT. I have an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the amendment, as follows:

On page 110, beginning with line 12, strike out through line 20 on page 111, as follows:

"(e) Section 202(e) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended (2 U.S.C. 72a(e)), is amended—

"(1) by striking out '$8,880' where it first appears in such subsection and inserting in lieu thereof 'the highest amount which, together with additional compensation authorized by law, will not exceed the maximum rate authorized by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended,'; and

"(2) by striking out '$8,880' at the second place where it appears in such subsection and inserting in lieu thereof 'the highest amount which, together with additional compensation authorized by law, will not exceed the maximum rate authorized by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended'.

"(f)(1) This subsection is enacted as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the House of Representatives with full recognition of the constitutional right of the House of Representatives to change the rule amended by this subsection at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of the House of Representatives.

"(2) Clause 28(c) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended—

"(A) by striking out '$8,880' where it first appears in such clause and inserting in lieu thereof 'the highest amount which, together with additional compensation authorized by law, will not exceed the maximum rate authorized by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended,'; and

"(B) by striking out '$8,880' at the second place where it appears in such clause and inserting in lieu thereof 'the highest amount which, together with additional compensation authorized by law, will not exceed the maximum rate authorized by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.'"

Redesignate subsections (g) to (k) as (e) to (i), inclusive.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of Members of the Senate and of the committee, I hope Senators may reach an agreement on this amendment without necessitating a rollcall. I speak as one who served for many years as a member of the Legislative Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, where, largely under the guidance, recently of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore], but before that of Senator Styles Bridges and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Saltonstall], we worked for a long time in an effort to try to bring about an equitable relationship between the salaries paid employees of the House and those paid employees of the Senate.

Great progress has been made. Many sources of irritation have been eliminated.

For some strange reason, the bill now before the Senate raises those same sources of aggravation and irritation again, because, as will be noticed on page 17 of the committee report, in dealing with employees of the House of Representatives, a new maximum rate is established of $24,500. On the next page, dealing with the identical employees in the Senate, the new maximum rate is established of $22,945.

I am not arguing particularly whether the greater or the lesser amount is the logical one, but it will create nothing but unhappiness to have one rate established for House staff members and another rate for Senate staff members.

Personally, I am inclined to believe that the lower of the two rates would be the better decision in this instance, because it would keep them, percentagewise, in conformity with the increase of pay of Government employees generally; but whether the higher or the lower rate is fixed, it should be the same for both Houses.

My amendment would have the impact of cutting back the maximum House increase to the extent of the increase for Senate employees, and would put the matter in conference. The conference could either accept the Senate version or the House version, or a figure in between. The two certainly should be the same, to eliminate irritation and aggravation.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. As the Senator well knows, having served on the Appropriations Subcommittee, the bills come over to the Senate without any figures for the Senate, after the House figures are fixed. The same is true in this bill. The bill came over with figures for the House employees which the House chose to put into the bill.

The committee went over the figures and came to the conclusion that the $24,500 top limitation provided for the House employees was too much. We felt it would be much better to have the lower figure.

Mr. MUNDT. And which the Senate has provided for Senate employees.

Mr. MONRONEY. That is correct. However, we are not in a position to tell the House what it should do. We would only aggravate the Members of the House if the Senate told them what they should pay their top clerks or committee staff members. It so happens that their chief secretaries, who correspond to administrative assistants on the Senate side, receive lower pay. So there will always be that difference.

As a matter of comity, it would be well for the Senate not to try to tell the House what it should pay its employees. I hope it will take the cue from the Senate and adjust the figure downward.

Mr. MUNDT. There is quite a difference between adjudicating what the legislative subcommittee does, in which the Senate ought not to undertake to adjust what the House has done or try to interfere with the House functions, and fixing the rates under a law at two different levels, because the latter method would create an irritating and aggravating situation.

If my amendment were adopted, the Senate and the House conferees could arrive at either of the two figures or a figure in between.

To adopt the House language would not put the matter in conference without my amendment. There would be nothing to discuss. In effect, the pay scale for the House employees would be fixed at a different scale than for the Senate employees.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. There is much to be said for what the Senator from South Dakota has said as well as for what the Senator from Oklahoma has said. Traditionally the House has set the salaries of its own employees and the Senate has not interfered with it. But here the House has sent the Senate a bill in which the Senate has chosen to cut the top Senate salaries without the House having cut the top House salaries.

I see no great disturbance if the House salaries were cut down to the level of the Senate salaries. If there were an insistence on that level, the conferees could agree to it, or could come to another agreement. I see no great disturbance inasmuch as the Senate has taken unto itself to provide cuts for comparable positions.

Mr. MUNDT. I appreciate what the Senator has said. May I say to my peacefully inclined friends in the Senate that there is no way to stop the disturbance, because this matter will come back to plague us. If we let it remain as is, it is going to cause all sorts of irritation. I think we should face the issue now, accept the amendment, take it to conference, and work out something that is not inimical to all concerned, rather than not act and let the matter come back to plague us and create embarrassment and irritation.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I shall be glad to take this amendment to conference, but, having been in many conferences, I point out that the House Members are very touchy and sensitive. Senators know that. I cannot promise what the result will be, but I shall be glad to take it to conference.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, in light of the action taken by the Senator from South Carolina, I have nothing to add. I think this difference should be in conference in some way. The difference should not exist. It is my hope that something can be arrived at, either at the higher or lower figure, or something in between, which will make the two scales comparable.

Mr. JOHNSTON. There should not be any difference between the two kinds of positions.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I appreciate very much the service the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] has performed in raising the question, and the Senator from South Carolina in accepting the amendment. I hope heed will be taken of what the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] has said. We hope the House will take the cue. However, nothing could be done about it at this time, unless, as the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] has pointed out, an opportunity were given to do something about it by amending the provision in some way so that the matter can be considered further in conference. I think it is fair that it be done. I am grateful to both Senators for having made this possible.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Do Senators yield back the remainder of their time?

Mr. MUNDT. I appreciate the action of the Senator from South Carolina. I believe it was a wise decision to bring the matter to a head. As the author of the amendment I express the hope that the conferees on the part of the Senate will be able to induce the House to accept this pro rata increase, so that we can continue the matter on an equitable basis. I hope the conferees will not discontinue their negotiations until such time as there has been an equalization and a parity of relationship established between salaries of employees of both bodies.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I had prepared a statement on this subject. I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CARLSON

There is one other point I would like to mention. That is the variation between pay for House committee staff members and the Senate committee staff members.

A House committee, under the current law has only one base pay for House committee employees. That base pay is $8,880, and is not mandatory.

The language in the new House bill, H.R. 11049, lifted that base and permits the chairman of a House committee to set committee salaries not to exceed a gross of $24,500.

In the Senate, under the current law, the base pay is for one committee employee at $8,880, two committee employees at $8,460, three committee employees at $8,040.

The top base pay in a Senator's office for his staff is the same as the top base pay on a Senate committee, $8,880—also, the other employees in a Senator's office are set up on a base pay schedule.

In reporting H.R. 11049, the Senate committee used the same formula for pay increases as did the House committee. But, since the House committee had only a base of $8,880, under previous legislation, the House language of the bill lifted that pay and permits a committee chairman to pay a gross salary not to exceed $24,500 for committee staff employees. Where a base pay structure is used, that gross salary would require a base pay of about $9,475.

Since the Senate employees are paid on a base salary, the entire Senate pay structure would have needed to be revised.

The Senate committee, therefore, chose to use the House formula but, did not change the base pay schedule—this means that the top employee on a House committee might draw more gross pay than the top employee on a Senate committee, or a top employee in a Senator's office. That is because the base pay—the top—of $8,880, under the formula used gives a gross salary of $22,945.

I would not want to infringe upon the privilege of the House to set up its own pay structure. However, it does seem to me that these pay structures should be brought closer together even if the Senate pay structure of base pay were necessarily revised.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time for debate has been yielded back or has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 164, line 10, it is proposed to strike out "$43,000," and insert in lieu thereof "$38,000"; on line 11, it is proposed to strike out "$42,500," and insert in lieu thereof "$37,500."

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, for the benefit of Senators, I am prepared to make a reasonably short statement, with the hope that the Senate can vote on the amendment shortly. There is nothing complicated about the amendment. It is merely an attempt to bring into some semblance of equity a situation of inequity which has existed for some time; namely, the inequity between the salaries of members of the Supreme Court and the salaries of the Members of Congress and members of the Cabinet.

As we all know, at the present time the salary of Associate Justices of the Supreme Court is $35,000 and of the Chief Justice $35,500. Both the Senate committee and the House committee have proposed to raise these salaries to $42,500 for Associate Justices and to $43,000 for the Chief Justice. The next highest judicial salaries are for the Court of Appeals, which are boosted to $33,000.

This body has resorted to more self-flagellation in the last few days than I have heard in a long time. I am not proud of the things which have happened in the past few months, and which have brought so much discredit upon this body. I do not believe that Members of the Senate have brought that discredit upon themselves. Therefore, I shall not discredit myself or Members of the Senate with respect to the service we render, and demean ourselves with respect to the Supreme Court. Neither do I offer the amendment in the spirit of criticism of the decisions of the Supreme Court.

I have always thought, and I think now, that the difference between the $22,500 and the $35,000 salary is out of all proportion to the services rendered, the intelligence required, the skill required, and the responsibility that Members of Congress must assume every day and that the members of the Supreme Court must assume.

I do not concede that they bear a greater responsibility. I do not concede that it requires a higher sense of integrity. I do not concede that they have to work harder. None of these things is true.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, may we have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. ALLOTT. What I propose is an increase of $2,500 for the Justices of the Supreme Court, which would still leave them a salary $7,500 higher than a Member of Congress receives.

There is a reluctance upon the part of Senators to discuss where they actually come out in their salary. I point out two or three things. First, there is not a Member of the Senate who makes as much as his administrative assistant. If there is, I should like to have him stand and tell me that he does. We are involved in trips home, political responsibility, entertainment of constituents, and a thousand other items. We are constantly pressed to make donations to this and contributions to that. It becomes a very great burden.

The Supreme Court is exempt from most of these things. The Justices do not have to maintain two homes. They do not have to make trips back home. They sit here in a home of their own, and they do not bear the expenses that we must bear every day.

It would appear now that our salary has been raised to $30,000. However, I will wager that there is not a Member of the Senate who will have 50 percent of that left for himself to live on, when everything is toted up.

That is not the case with members of the Supreme Court. They are here for life. Seven and a half percent of our salary goes into the retirement fund, and we earn it. We get what we have earned of that 7½ percent at the time the good people of our State decide to retire us or we retire ourselves.

With the Supreme Court it is different altogether. They have life tenure, and their salaries continue completely until they die. They contribute not 1 cent to a pension fund.

Therefore, the compensation of the members of the Supreme Court is far above that of a Senator, even if the salary of the Senator is fixed at $30,000.

I have not sought to slap them in the face, or anything of that sort. I am trying to bring some semblance of equity into the situation between the salaries, to reflect in the minds of the people of this country, to some extent, the responsibilities which we bear. We have an opportunity to indicate how Senators feel about the importance of their jobs. Apparently we have fixed the salaries of Senators. I think we should fix the salaries of the Supreme Court Justices in the same way.

Does the Senator from Rhode Island wish some time?

Mr. PASTORE. No. I merely held up my two fingers. It was not a sign of victory but to show that we must maintain two homes.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Colorado for offering his amendment, which I think should be adopted. It should be remembered that the Congress is a coordinate branch in our tripartite system of government with the Supreme Court of the United States. It should be further noted that Members of Congress are responsible to the people they serve. They are elected by those people, and are accountable to them. The Supreme Court is not. It should be further noted that since the Supreme Court seems to reason it should legislate and amend the Constitution, perhaps members of the Supreme Court should receive a salary no higher than that received by the legislators.

Mr. ALLOTT. I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I oppose the amendment. It is, of course, difficult to try to appraise the proper salaries for all the members of the executive department or all the members of the Supreme Court, and the other parts of the judiciary. The committee spent much time trying to determine what it believed was fair and equitable in the light of the responsibilities, the importance, and the constitutional duties of the three branches of the Government.

We are likely to err in many ways; but I hardly feel that this is the time to downgrade the Supreme Court by bringing the salaries which are proposed in the bill—$42,500 for the members and $43,000 for the Chief Justice—below that level. What is proposed in the bill is a simple addition of a $7,500 stepup, such as Congress is about to vote itself to the $30,000 figure.

I think the most controlling point that led to the $30,000 figure is that the salaries of Members of Congress is about on a level with those of U.S. district judges. Our salaries have traditionally been compared with the salaries of district judges.

As the Senator from Colorado has said, the salaries of district judges will become $30,000, as will the congressional salaries. The salaries of circuit judges will be $33,000. These increases are stepups toward the salaries of members of the Supreme Court, which is the highest court of all.

The Supreme Court is composed of only nine members. The increase does not involve a great impact on the budget. I feel that with the great volume of work and the very important function of the Supreme Court, whether we always agree with their opinions or not, the members of the Court are entitled to the salary proposed in the bill—$42,500 for the members and $43,000 for the Chief Justice.

As we have said countless times, we are not applying the salary to the man. The salary goes with the position. We hope that by paying an adequate salary, we will continue to draw the very best persons to all branches of the Government—the executive, the legislative, and the judicial.

I believe that the alinement of salaries of judges, as we have provided in the bill, is right and proper. I would dislike to see those salaries changed at this time without any further justification than has been made.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I shall be brief and shall yield back the remainder of my time when I have concluded.

I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Oklahoma. I know they are made in all good faith.

The Supreme Court is now in recess and will be in recess until October. That tells a good story in itself.

So far as concerns the ability that is required for positions on the Supreme Court, I can think of at least two dozen Members of the Senate who, I am sure, would grace the Supreme Court and would even add luster to it. So, while it may be invidious to compare abilities, I say that there are Members of the Senate who could and would be a credit to the Supreme Court.

I cannot understand the argument that the salaries of Supreme Court Justices should be raised $10,000 over the salaries of members of the courts of appeals. That is unreasonable. Let Senators try to reason it out with their constituents when they return home. Let them try to reason with their constituents the payment of $43,000 a year to Supreme Court Justices, when all they have to do is stay in Washington the entire year round, and take a vacation every summer.

Three branches of our Government are established by the Constitution. One is the executive, at the other end of the avenue. Another is this body. The third branch is the judiciary. The Lord willing, not one of those branches will ever dominate this Government. They are coequal. There is nothing that indicates that the Supreme Court is of greater importance or is worth more than the Members of this branch of the Government or the members of the executive branch. We need to remember that they are equal, and that if we provide salaries of $37,500 for the Justices and $38,000 for the Chief Justice, we shall be more than evidencing our generosity and more than evidencing the fact that we are a coequal branch of the Government.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I urge the adoption of the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado. Congress puts itself on a lower plane than it ought to be on when it makes so great a difference between the salaries of Senators and Representatives and the salaries of members of the Supreme Court. The members of the Supreme Court have a vacation of about 3 months a year. If a Senator has a vacation, I have never found out when it comes.

I have served as a member of an appellate court. I appreciate the importance of the work of such courts. But Members of the Senate and House have to work all the time. They have campaign expenses. The members of the Supreme Court never run for office; they hold their offices for life. Automobiles are furnished them at the expense of the Government. They pay nothing toward their retirement; and they can retire at full pay at the age of 70. It is my understanding that they pay nothing toward the retirement benefits for their wives.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ERVIN. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. The members of the Supreme Court do pay for the retirement benefits of their wives, but not for themselves.

Mr. ERVIN. I thank the Senator from Oklahoma. While they make contributions for the retirement benefits of their wives, they make none for themselves. They can retire at full pay at age 70 without making a single contribution toward their own retirement. Congress places itself on a plane lower than it should be when it makes such great discrepancies between the emoluments of its Members and those of members of the Supreme Court. It is likewise unwise to make such differentials between the pay of members of the courts of appeals and the district courts and the pay of the members of the highest court of the land.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield me 3 minutes?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Missouri.

GEN. WILLIAM F. McKEE

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, last Tuesday the able Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] paid tribute to a distinguished American, Gen. William Fulton McKee, Vice Chief of Staff of the Air Force, who will retire July 31, 1964.

I was not here at that time, and want to take this occasion to add a word of appreciation for the many years General McKee devoted to the service of his country. Beginning with graduations from West Point and the Coast Artillery School, the general's 35-year career is marked by an outstanding degree of competence, integrity, and loyalty.

During my days with the Air Force, General McKee was of invaluable assistance. His ability to analyze and solve problems and to work out solutions which saved the Government money, with fewer man-hours, impressed us time and time again.

The country has been fortunate to be the beneficiary of this man's many talents. It is a privilege to take this opportunity to express deep appreciation for all he has done for his country, and to wish him and his gracious wife the best of everything in his retirement.

LOUIS B. McGEE

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, a few days ago the people of Missouri lost one of their outstanding citizens—Louis B. McGee.

Louis McGee probably had as many friends as anyone in my State. This was because of his warm and delightful personality; and also because of the effective manner in which he worked for the betterment of the people of his community, his State, and the Nation.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD an article and an editorial published in the Kansas City Times, the latter entitled "Louis B. McGee."

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Kansas City (Mo.) Times, June 15, 1964]

LOUIS B. MCGEE, 62, IS DEAD IN ARIZONA—INSURANCE MAN AND DEMOCRATIC LEADER APPARENTLY HAD HEART ATTACK—ACTIVE IN MANY FIELDS—HE WAS KNOWN AS A PARTY FUNDRAISER AND BOOSTER OF ROCKHURST COLLEGE

Louis B. McGee, insurance executive and civic and Democratic political leader, died yesterday in Scottsdale, Ariz. He was 62.

He apparently suffered a heart attack during the morning while resting in his room at the Mountain Shadows resort.

When Mr. McGee did not appear for a luncheon date with Frederick G. Betts, a former Kansas Citian, Betts went to McGee's room and found the body on the bed.

A HEART VICTIM

Mr. McGee had been in Arizona about 6 weeks. He had been afflicted with arthritis in recent years and had suffered heart attacks previously.

Mr. McGee was a partner in the firm of Thomas McGee & Sons and was treasurer and a director of the Old American Insurance Co.

He was born in San Francisco in 1902. His father, Thomas McGee, established the insurance firm in Kansas City in 1910. Thomas McGee died in 1953.

As a business leader in Kansas City, Louis McGee served in many civic organizations, served the Catholic Church in various capacities and was a nationally active member of the Democratic Party.

Of his service to the city, Former Mayor H. Roe Bartle said last night:

"Kansas City and the State of Missouri have lost a real participating citizen of the highest order. Louis McGee always had a progressive spirit and a willingness to work for the city in many, many activities. He was an effective leader who did not want credit for the work he did."

CITED AS A BUILDER

"He was a strengthening force in our program of international relations and trade with Latin America. Kansas City has lost one of its real builders."

An alumnus of Rockhurst College, McGee was presented the institution's pro meritis award in 1960. He was cited as "a rare man who can organize as well as execute. He has given time and again of his energy and experience for worthy projects."

Mr. McGee served as chairman of the Rockhurst board of regents from 1957 to 1959 and later was chairman of the community relations committee of the board.

CITED AS A GIVER

He was a past president of the Council of Catholic Men, a member of the advisory board of St. Mary's Hospital, and a contributor to numerous charities and organizations.

In the Democratic Party he served as a fundraiser and promotional worker for party events. He was active in the Adlai Stevenson presidential campaigns and was a friend of Stevenson. On the county level he worked with all factions of the party.

Mr. McGee was a bachelor who each year was host for a reunion of the McGee family. At an Easter reunion this year 158 members of the clan gathered at the Old American Building at Volker Boulevard and Oak Street.

In World War II he served in the Coast Guard from 1942 to 1945.

He was a Knight of St. Gregory, appointed in 1948 by Pope Pius XII.

A HOSPITAL DIRECTOR

He served as finance officer of the department of Missouri of the American Legion from 1945 to 1949, was a member of the downtown committee of the chamber of commerce, of the White House Committee on Education Beyond the High School Level, was a past president of the Armed Forces Council, and a director of the Kansas City General Hospital and Medical Center.

He was vice president of the Kansas City Commission for International Relations and Trade, a member of the board of governors of the American Royal, the committee for study of higher education of the State of Missouri, the capital improvements commission of Jackson County, the Kansas City Club, and the Carriage Club.

Mr. McGee lived at 5049 Wornall Road.

Surviving are two brothers, Joseph J. McGee, Sr., 5405 Wornall, and Frank McGee, 635 West Meyer Boulevard, and three sisters, Mrs. Catherine M. Soden, 6848 Cherry; Mrs. Jerome J. Burke, 433 West 69th; and Mrs. John R. Lillis, 4545 Rockhill Road, and 21 nieces and nephews.

[From the Kansas City (Mo.) Times, June 16, 1964]

LOUIS B. MCGEE

To walk with Louis B. McGee through a hotel lobby in downtown Kansas City was a heartwarming experience. It also involved slow progress because Louis McGee, the friendliest of men, knew so many people. He had to pause and chat with everyone he recognized. Always he had a quip or a story. For strangers there would be a big smile.

But his affable manner was only one part of Louis McGee's makeup. He was a constructive, effective civic leader. "Let's get it done" and "Why wait?" were his usual quick responses when someone spoke of problems obstructing a goal. Being imaginative and progressive, Louis McGee usually could see a way to overcome the problems. He could persuade people to work together and like it.

Kansas City business knew Louis McGee as a partner in the large McGee insurance interests founded by his father, the late Thomas McGee. Louis McGee was the company's public contact man and there was none more astute. But he spent as much or more time on widely ranging civic interests as he did on his business career. Louis McGee developed a great zest for politics. His keen mind became a factor in the strategy and financing of the Democratic Party.

Mr. McGee was an outstanding lay leader of the Catholic Church. Rockhurst College was a special interest. He served that Jesuit institution as chairman of the board of regents and as the driving force in numerous college projects. A bachelor, Louis McGee was devoted to the numerous clan McGee and delighted in the family reunions he personally organized.

Louis B. McGee spent the last third of his 62 years in physical suffering. But he was never known to complain. Prolonged illness never made a dent in his courage or his energy. Louis McGee, fine and generous-spirited citizen that he was, accomplished a great deal for Kansas City.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, when the editorial says "Louis McGee, fine and generous-spirited citizen that he was, accomplished a great deal for Kansas City," that is only too true.

Louis McGee was the kind of citizen who can never be replaced—his personal charm, his gracious manner, his consistent effectiveness when it came to carrying out constructive community plans and programs.

In that connection, I ask unanimous consent also that a memorial broadcast from Station KCMO in Kansas City be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the memorial broadcast was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Louis B. McGee

Missouri and Kansas City will be a long time recovering from the loss of Citizen Louis B. McGee. He was a natural. Everything held unusual interest to the personable insurance executive, and it was his exceptional interest in the world around him that must have led McGee into the multitude of State and community activities where his image became a permanent impression. Few men have such a rare ability to give outstanding service to so wide a variety of activities. Louis McGee was equally effective in veterans affairs as in top-level business activities or within his church. Although he held no public office, he was the kind of man whose interest in people could easily have been a dominant force in government. Instead of seeking office, McGee turned his tremendous organizational ability to the political party of his choice. Many a candidate can see the McGee touch in whatever success emerged from the campaign; Senators, Governors, and even Presidents sought out McGee for the kind of practical assistance that was touched with genius at times.

There are those who recall Louis McGee's straightforward approach to problems, how on many occasions a deadlocked meeting was put back on the track with the down-to-earth advice from the affable insurance man. We can't vouch for the absolute quotation attributed to McGee about his friendliness yet we suspect it is true that he remarked, "With a clan as big as the McGees, you have to know how to get along with everyone." He showed every indication of the truth of this statement. To know Louis McGee was indeed a valued experience. It was difficult not to know him if one had the chance to meet up with him. Perhaps this personal magnetism spilled over into his community and State associations. Not an opportunity was lost by this man to show enthusiasm for his home grounds wherever he went, whether to Washington or to foreign lands. Kansas City and Missouri need many more Louis B. McGees.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, beyond all else, Louis McGee was loyal; loyal to his friends, loyal to his church, loyal to his country. We who were devoted to him shall sorely miss him.

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield me 30 seconds?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. LONG of Missouri. I wish to associate myself with the remarks made by the senior Senator from Missouri about Mr. McGee, who was a good friend of mine and was one of the outstanding citizens of Kansas City.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank my able colleague. I know he was devoted to Mr. McGee, as Mr. McGee was also devoted to him.

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES SALARY REFORM ACT OF 1964

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11049) to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the remaining time yielded back?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded back. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Colorado. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Ellender], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Hayden], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Talmadge] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Bayh], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy], and the Senator from California [Mr. Engle] are absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers] are necessarily absent.

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Cotton], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Fong], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Saltonstall] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 46, nays 40, as follows:

[No. 466 Leg.]

YEAS—46

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Bennett
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Church
Curtis
Dodd
Dominick
Eastland
Ervin
Fulbright
Goldwater
Gore
Gruening
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Johnston
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Lausche
Long, La.
Mansfield
McClellan
McGovern
Mechem
Miller
Mundt
Pearson
Prouty
Randolph
Robertson
Russell
Simpson
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Thurmond
Tower
Walters
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—40

Bartlett
Beall
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Carlson
Case
Clark
Cooper
Dirksen
Douglas
Edmondson
Hartke
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Keating
Kuchel
Long, Mo.
Magnuson
McCarthy
McGee
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalf
Monroney
Morse
Morton
Moss
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Proxmire
Ribicoff
Scott
Williams, N.J.

NOT VOTING—14

Bayh
Byrd, Va.
Cotton
Ellender
Engle
Fong
Hart
Hayden
Hruska
Kennedy
Saltonstall
Smathers
Talmadge
Yarborough

So Mr. Allott's amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I move to lay the motion to reconsider on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 1092.

I ask unanimous consent that the reading be dispensed with.

The amendment offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. Keating] reads as follows:

On page 167, line 2, insert the following:

"TITLE VI—DISCLOSURE OF OUTSIDE ASSETS AND EARNINGS

"Sec. 601. On April 15, 1965, and annually thereafter, every Member, officer, and employee of Congress, whose gross congressional compensation is $10,000 or more, shall file with the Comptroller General in accordance with such regulations as shall be prescribed by the Comptroller General: (1) a statement of any financial interest having a value of $5,000 or more in any activity subject to the jurisdiction of a regulatory agency; (2) a statement of the amount and source of all compensation and income which he has received from outside sources in excess of $100. Such statements filed with the Comptroller General shall be held as public records and shall be available for public access thereto at any time during the regular business hours of the office of the Comptroller General.

"Sec. 602. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, no increase in compensation for any Member, officer, or employee of Congress provided in this Act shall be paid after April 15 of each year until such Member, officer, or employee has filed the statements required by section 601 of this Act."

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes. I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, may we know what the amendment is? We do not know what it is.

Mr. KEATING. I shall be glad to explain it. Have the yeas and nays been ordered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have not been ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Will the Senator explain what the amendment is?

Mr. KEATING. I planned to be very brief, but I can be longer if the majority leader insists on it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. We do not know what the yeas and nays are for.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, it might be called a little Morse amendment. I shall point out the difference between this and the Morse amendment. The principal difference is that the Morse amendment was a full disclosure amendment. I supported the Morse amendment. I regret that it did not pass. But this is only a partial disclosure amendment.

This amendment adds a conflict of interest title to the bill. It requires all Members, officers, and employees of Congress whose compensation is $10,000 or more to annually file statements of all financial interests of $5,000 or more in activities subject to Federal regulation and a statement of the amount and source of all outside income in excess of $100. This should be a minimum prerequisite to any action on a congressional salary increase.

One of the reasons the prestige of Congress has fallen in the eyes of the public is our refusal to come to grips with the problem of conflict of interest. Year in and year out proposals are introduced, but no action is taken. Once again in this session we have had a number of bills introduced, and yet there is no assurance that this Congress will adopt such legislation despite the public's wide support for a legislative code of ethics.

I know that most Members of Congress are conscientious, dedicated public servants. But a few bad cases can cause immense damage to the whole institution. My objective is to build up, not weaken, public confidence in the legislative branch, and I am convinced that this can best be done if Congress demonstrates a willingness to set its own house in order.

Nothing weakens confidence in Government as much as the appearance of favoritism, inside dealings, and the use of public office for personal economic advantage. The public suspicion of the existence of misuse of office because of our failure to adopt conflict-of-interest legislation weakens confidence as much as actual misdeeds.

It has never been more important then it is today—when we are engaged in a life and death struggle with tyranny—to maintain confidence in our Government and to strengthen the moral fiber of our Nation. Even though the abuses are infrequent, the danger from low ethical standards in any branch of government has never been more serious.

Conflict-of-interest legislation is designed to encourage confidence in the operation of government. Obviously, there is as much need for promoting such confidence in the workings of Congress as in any other branch of government.

Congress has been willing to impose standards of ethics on the members of the executive branch. It is important that we repudiate the impression that we are following a double standard by now adopting legislation applicable to ourselves and our employees. It is the most effective step we can take to restore lagging public confidence.

Members of Congress are the only group in the present bill who are not required to be full-time employees. Whatever may have been the situation originally, anyone who accepts service in Congress or as an employee of Congress should do so with an awareness that it probably will be a full-time commitment.

This amendment is directed toward the accomplishment of two purposes. It is an acknowledgement that service as a Member, officer, or employee of Congress is virtually a full-time job. The disclosure provisions will make it apparent whether we are giving it full-time service or, if not, to what extent. Secondly, by requiring disclosure of assets and outside income by those who receive more than $10,000 a year we are closing a conflict gap. It will be readily apparent whether one is taking advantage of a public trust to benefit himself. Of all the proposals which have been made, this one appears most closely related to determining whether Members of Congress are giving the kind of time and attention to their duties which would merit a raise in pay.

The other primary difference between the Morse amendment and this one—and I am shortening this as I know it is the desire of Senators to get on with the work—the other primary difference is that this one is self-executing. In order to obtain the increase in pay, it is necessary to file the required statement. Under the Morse amendment, there were penal provisions. A fine and imprisonment were provided for failure to file, or for filing a false statement. There is no such provision here.

However, it does provide that in order to get the increase, one must file with the Comptroller General in accordance with such regulations as he may prescribe.

I could go into more detail if necessary.

I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield 2 minutes?

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to my colleague from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, this amendment seeks what we have been trying to have enacted for a long time. It merely requires what many of us voluntarily do already; namely, file a record of our investments and the principal source of our income. It leaves it to the public to decide whether there are conflicts of interest for which we should be taken to task.

It is the simplest and most proper way to deal with the many ethical questions. Many persons have worked on this problem. I am personally grateful to the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] for having an opportunity to join with him in it.

I think it is very worthy of approval by the Senate. It is self-operative. It commends itself very highly by all standards, as the proper way in which a Senator should account to his constituents.

Mr. KEATING. I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. Does one have to file with the Comptroller General whether he does or does not?

Mr. KEATING. It requires filing only if one is to receive it.

Mr. PASTORE. How does that work out so that one can get his raise? One has to file that he does. Does he not have to file that he does not? Otherwise, how does one get his raise?

Mr. KEATING. This amendment provides that one must file a statement of any financial interest in one of these activities, and a statement of the amount and source of income received from outside sources. That part is the same as in the Morse amendment. A statement to the disburser's office that one held no such holdings and received no such outside income would probably be sufficient. One would not be required to file such a statement, but there would be nothing to prevent one from filing it.

Mr. PASTORE. I do not mean to be critical. But I think there is an awkwardness in the statement that ought to be clarified. I think if before one can receive the increase, he has to file a statement, he should have to file a statement to the effect that he does not have such interest. Otherwise, I do not see how it would work out. The Senator is making it conditioned upon his getting the increase in salary.

And yet it would provide that only those who have an interest must file. If that is so, how would the Comptroller know? How would the disbursing office know, unless we were to say so in the amendment?

Mr. KEATING. I think I shall have to explain the amendment in greater detail to the Senator.

The amendment would provide, in the first section, that on April 15, 1965, and annually thereafter, every Member, officer, and employee of Congress whose gross congressional compensation is $10,000 or more shall file the two required statements with the Comptroller General; and in the next section it is provided that no increase in compensation for any such Member, officer, or employee shall be paid after April 15, of each year, until the Member has filed the statements required by the first section.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator elaborate on what is meant by filing a statement of the amount and source of all compensation and income which he has received from outside sources in excess of $100?

Mr. KEATING. I do not know how to make it more explicit.

Mr. CURTIS. It would include everything?

Mr. KEATING. It would include everything.

Mr. CURTIS. Wages?

Mr. KEATING. Wages.

Mr. CURTIS. Dividends?

Mr. KEATING. Dividends.

Mr. CURTIS. Interest?

Mr. KEATING. Interest.

Mr. CURTIS. That is all included?

Mr. KEATING. That is correct. In that regard, it is like the Morse amendment.

Mr. CURTIS. Would this be a public record?

Mr. KEATING. It is provided in the next sentence that such a statement shall be held as a public record and be available for access to the public.

Mr. GOLDWATER. How would the States that have community property laws be affected in that situation? Would not one have to report his wife's income, too?

Mr. KEATING. I suppose if one had any financial interest in an activity that was subject to a regulatory agency, whether one had it individually, or as a part of the community property, one would have to report it. Although, it does provide that he shall file a statement with the Comptroller General in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Comptroller General.

I would assume also that he would be able to eliminate community property, if he saw fit.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Would it be proper, in your opinion, to eliminate the community property?

Mr. KEATING. I think a person who has any financial interest in an activity subject to the jurisdiction of a regulatory agency, no matter how he acquired that interest, should file such a statement.

Mr. GOLDWATER. That is one of the questions in my mind about the entire reporting argument. Does not the Senator think that in any reporting legislation that is passed, it should be required that income of the whole family, the wife, father, mother, brothers, and sisters should be reported? In my family, my wife has an income outside of what I can provide. The same applies to my mother. If we are to be suspect of devious thinking in this body, I think we can consider our families.

Mr. KEATING. First, I do not believe any Member of this body is to be suspect of devious thinking. However, we have already debated an amendment like the one to which the Senator refers. I supported that amendment. I agree with the Senator in that regard. But the amendment was not adopted.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I wonder if what the Senator has proposed would not have the practical effect of requiring every Senator to apply in writing to become eligible for the pay increase, in which case he would have stolen a leaf out of a chapter of the Senate Building Commission, which provided the rugs for the private offices of Senators. We required each Senator to apply for a rug. Some Senators got them, some did not. If that is what the Senator is asking, it should be made clear. The Senator is asking each Senator to say "I qualify for the pay increase. I wish to put in my application."

Mr. KEATING. The amendment does not have anything to do with rugs.

Mr. MUNDT. It has to do with the proposed pay increase.

Mr. KEATING. The amendment provides that a Senator will get the increase if he files the required statement with the Comptroller General. It is very simple. Admittedly it does not go as far as the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] sought to go in his amendment, which I was happy to support. But it would be a first step in laying the cards on the table as to holdings of Members of Congress.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. I know what the Senator has in mind, but I am thinking of the Federal Trade Commission.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, we cannot hear a word that is being said.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order. The Senator may proceed.

Mr. ALLOTT. What the Senator had in mind is that people who have income from activities such as electric companies, power companies, and things like that that go over State lines would be required to report it. But there is almost no business in our country today that is exempt from the jurisdiction of the Federal Trade Commission. So in the manner in which the amendment is written, the Senator's amendment would place in that category even grocery stores and supply houses within a State.

Mr. KEATING. No; that is the reason for the provision in the amendment that the activity shall be subject to regulations prescribed by the Comptroller General. In other words, the Comptroller General would determine what was covered by the phrase "regulatory agency." I agree with the Senator that to a degree any corporation in almost any line of business could be said to be subject to some regulatory agency. As good an illustration as any is the one that the Senator has stated—the Federal Trade Commission. Although the determination would be left to the Comptroller General to make the final decision, it is not my intention, and I wish to state this as a part of the legislative history, that it apply to interests in all types of business activity. Specifically, it should apply to, in my judgment, holdings in radio and television companies and holdings in companies under the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission and the ICC, such as interstate pipeline companies, railroads, motor carriers, water carriers, freight forwarders, and so forth. There is no reason why those covered by the amendment could not hold such interests, but if they do hold them, it seems to me that they should be a matter of public record.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes under the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. If anything, the amendment of the Senator from New York is worse than the Morse proposal. If a Senator had income or compensation from outside sources amounting to $100, he would be required to report everything he receives.

If a Senator owned some stock in a company under regulation by a Federal agency, he would come under the purview of the amendment. A Senator could own shares in General Motors and escape the provisions of the amendment. He could not own an interest in a power company and escape. He could own 100 shares of Caterpillar Corp. and be outside the purview of the amendment, but if he should own 100 shares of Columbia Gas, he would be on the inside.

Mr. President, the amendment makes less sense to me than the Morse amendment. In addition, the amount at which a Senator would report would be reduced to $100.

We have heard that the amendment contains no penalty clause. Certainly not. It would be self-enforcing. If loss of a $7,500 pay increase is not a penalty, I give up. That is true particularly if one has a conviction as to whether the proposed procedure is the way to go about policing the world's greatest deliberative body.

Mr. President, the amendment ought to be roundly defeated.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I agree with the minority leader. If anything, the amendment is worse than the Morse amendment. I hope the Senate will vote it down as it voted down that amendment and another amendment.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield 3 minutes?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, in this world of modern merchandising the old adage that you get what you pay for still applies. And it applies equally well to the process of government. There is no doubt in my mind that the civil servants of the United States of America, much maligned by both innocent and vicious jest and held up to undeserved ridicule, are performing valuable and efficient service for the people of our Nation.

The legislation we are considering today would raise the pay of these civil servants. I support this increase in salary for several reasons. In the first place, I do not believe that Government service should be a form of economic second-class citizenship. Those who work for the Government should be paid on a scale comparable to similar jobs in private industry. This is not simply equitable treatment but is the only policy by which we can attract and keep the best qualified and most dedicated people.

There are millions of Americans whose dedication is such that they are quite willing to make sacrifices, both economic and personal, in order to serve their Nation. And in many instances we have called upon them to make those sacrifices. But now, in the midst of an onrushing prosperity with all economic indicators setting new records as a matter of course, it is an inequitable and penurious government that will not provide adequate salaries for those it employs.

The results of existing niggardly pay rates are now being felt throughout the ranks of Government, and especially in the higher management levels, as many men find that, in consideration of the needs of their families, they must take higher paying jobs outside of Government. Mr. President, it is a poor form of economy indeed to replace efficient and effective workers with less efficient personnel because we are unwilling to pay a decent wage.

It is a curious thing that many of those who are the most vitriolic in their criticisms of the Federal Government and of those who work for it and who complain the most about the type of service provided by the Government are the same people who are opposed to any increase in Federal salaries. Many of these people have found that the Government which they so detest has provided an economic climate which has enabled them to make a very comfortable living for themselves and for their families. These people often are intimately acquainted with the tenets of employment in the business world and are prepared to pay top prices for the talent they need to make their enterprise a success. This is what is called good business. But when the Government attempts the same thing, it is—in their minds—boondoggling and bureaucracy. Well, to paraphrase an old quotation, what is good business for business is good business for the Government.

One of the most controversial aspects of this legislation is that which concerns proposed salary increases for Members of the Congress. I realize full well, Mr. President, that too many people think our salaries are already too high. The hidden costs of congressional service are not apparent to many people, but I have yet to talk to a Senator or Congressman who is able to salt away any appreciable amount of his salary for those proverbial rainy days. The pinch is especially felt by those of us from the West who find that the jet airplane is the one way of providing the best service and establishing the best and closest relationships with our constituents but is also a rather expensive means of commuting. I believe that this salary increase is completely in line with the increasing cost of living and is commensurate with the duties and obligations of the office we hold.

But, in accepting the necessity for this salary increase, I believe we must also accept the reality of space-age government. And that is the reality that governing the most powerful and richest nation in this complex time is a full-time occupation. We have in recent years discovered that our adjournment dates regularly approach the winter solstice, but we cling to the idea that this is an abnormal situation. Mr. President, I believe that we must finally accept the fact that the Senate is a full-time, year-round job. And that the sooner we learn to live with that fact, the sooner will we be in a position to develop more orderly legislative processes.

Mr. President, I believe that among the obligations held by a Member of the Congress is the obligation to afford his constituents the knowledge that he is serving them without conflicts of interest and in the best interests of the State and Nation. Those who receive their employment in the higher echelons of Government with our "advice and consent" are required by us to be free of conflict of interest. It is only just that we are equally free from such conflicts.

Mr. President, I have already outlined my contention that a congressional pay raise is not undeserved. But if we are going to take the action of increasing our own pay, I think it behooves us—at the same time—to indicate that we are keenly aware of our responsibility to avoid even the suspicion of conflict of interest. In order that we approach this pay increase in good conscience, I would hope that each of us would reveal publicly his outside financial holdings and other sources of income.

I do not believe for one moment that such an action would embarrass any Senator. I know that some of my colleagues have had distinguished careers in other fields and can be justifiably proud of their success and equally reluctant to reveal its details to the public. However, we are not in the position of a private individual. We have accepted a public trust and, to hold to that trust, we must take positive action to demonstrate that we honor that commitment. A disclosure of our financial holdings is such a positive action.

Mr. President, in light of these beliefs, I made, on April 3, 1963, a full disclosure of my financial situation. And I note that a number of other Senators have done the same—both before and since my statement. One of these Senators, the junior Senator from New York [Mr. Keating] is offering an amendment to the bill now under discussion to make the pay increase for Members of Congress conditional upon their making public their outside interests and income. Mr. President, I consider this to be an equitable and meritorious amendment, and I shall support it.

The legislation we are considering today will do much to provide more equitable compensation for those who would serve their country by carrying out the functions of Government. We cannot afford to have a second-best Government, and we cannot afford to have second-rate Government employees. By assuring adequate salaries, we can assure that we will have the best minds to assist us in meeting the challenge of the space age. To fail to do this in the name of economy would be a sad case of being "penny wise and pound foolish" and would be an error which would cause us great harm in coming years. We must provide an investment in quality personnel that will bring us returns in good Government for many years to come.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield 1 minute?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Montana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The pending amendment is truly a junior Morse amendment. There was much more to the Morse amendment than there is to the pending amendment.

As stated earlier, a resolution on the subject has been reported by the Committee on Rules and Administration. That resolution will be brought before the Senate, and would have been brought up whether or not the proposal was before us at the present time. At that time there will be opportunity enough for discussion, instead of spending only a few minutes on it during the consideration of the pending bill, a bill in which it really has no place.

I hope that the Senate will reject the amendment and that the arguments that have been made will be brought up when the resolution which has been reported by the Committee on Rules and Administration comes before the Senate for consideration.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I yield myself one-half minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized for one-half minute.

Mr. KEATING. The essential difference between my amendment and the resolution which is now at the desk is that the resolution would apply only to the Members of this body. The amendment would write that provision into law for all Members of Congress. I believe conflict-of-interest rules are the kind of thing that should be treated by a statute and have the force and effect of law. They are, in my judgment, inappropriate to be treated simply by a Senate resolution. When the Senate resolution is brought up, however, it could be strengthened in such a way as to be meaningful.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. Carlson], who is the ranking member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the indications are that we shall not reach a final vote on the bill before I must leave in order to keep a prior commitment. I wish the Record to show that if present and voting, I would vote for the bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished Senator from Iowa.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, earlier today I offered an amendment to the Morse amendment. I had prepared an amendment which I had intended to offer to the Keating amendment, but in view of the rejection of my amendment to the Morse amendment by the Senate, I shall not offer the one I have prepared, but I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. Miller to the amendment by Mr. Keating, No. 1092, is as follows:

On page 1, line 10, insert after the word "agency" the following: "and owned within the immediately preceding twelve months by such Member, officer, and employee, his or her spouse, children and their spouses, brothers and sisters, father and mother, and any trust or fiduciary arrangement under which any of the said individuals is a beneficiary or over which he or she exerts any control".

On page 2, strike lines 1 and all of line 2 through the period and insert in lieu thereof the following: "amount and specific source of each item of compensation and income in excess of $100 received during the immediately preceding calendar year by such Member, officer, and employee, his or her spouse, children and their spouses, brothers and sisters, father and mother, and any trust or fiduciary arrangement under which any of said individuals is a beneficiary or over which he or she exerts any control."

On page 2, line 12, strike the period and insert in lieu thereof the following: ": *Provided*, That if said Member, officer, or employee is unable to file any statement pertaining to the financial interest, compensation and income of any of the individuals or entities listed in section 601 other than his or her spouse and minor children because of their refusal to provide such information, said increase in compensation shall nevertheless become effective upon the filing of a statement, under oath, by said Member, officer, or employee that his or her failure to comply with all of the requirements of section 601 is due to such refusal."

Mr. MILLER. What I had to say about the Morse amendment is equally applicable to the pending amendment. The proposal will not get the job done. It will not satisfy the public if the public wants disclosure. The disclosure of what a Member, an officer, or employee's contacts are with federally regulated agencies, or his own income, will not satisfy the problems that the Senator from Arizona pointed out. If we wish to have disclosure that will satisfy the situation, we shall have to bring in the spouse, the brothers and sisters, the father and mother, and any trust or fiduciary arrangement, not to mention the children.

The amendment fails to do that. If some Senator wishes to offer an amendment to perfect the pending amendment, I shall be happy to support it. Senators have spoken on my previous amendment, and I shall not push them on the question at the present time. In view of that, I shall have to vote against the Keating amendment.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield a half minute to me?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I yield a half minute to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DODD. Do I correctly understand that the Senator from Iowa will not offer his amendment?

Mr. MILLER. That is correct.

Mr. DODD. I believe that is regrettable. I am sorry that the Senator did not press for a yea-and-nay vote on his amendment earlier, when the Morse disclosure amendment was being discussed. I believe his amendment goes to the heart of the problem. We are not fooling ourselves or anyone else by howling down with a voice vote the amendment of the Senator from Iowa, as was done earlier this afternoon. Everyone knows of devices in which a wife's name is used, or a child's name, a sister's name, a brother's name, or when a trust is established.

I agree with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen], the distinguished minority leader, and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller], who have spoken against these disclosure amendments. If we are going to be honest, we should include the amendment of the Senator from Iowa, too. It is regrettable that the amendment was not offered so we could have a rollcall vote on it this time. I want the Senate to know that I will offer an amendment similar to the Senator's at a later date, when we are discussing the Rules Committee resolution.

I am voting against the Keating amendment, as I did against the Morse amendment, not because I am against disclosure but because I want to wait until the Rules Committee resolution is taken up.

This is the proper way to take up an important matter on the floor of the Senate, not as an amendment to a bill concerned with an entirely different subject, considered under a one-half hour time limitation.

The distinguished majority leader [Mr. Mansfield] has given assurances that we will have an opportunity to discuss this soon and I think we should wait until then to decide the issue.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield back his time?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment has been yielded back. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Ellender], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Hayden], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Talmadge] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from California [Mr. Engle], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Bayh] are absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers] would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Cotton], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Fong], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Saltonstall] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. Dominick] is detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Saltonstall] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Fong] is paired with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Dominick]. If present and voting, the Senator from Hawaii would vote "yea" and the Senator from Colorado would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 25, nays 61, as follows:

[No. 467 Leg.]

YEAS—25

Burdick
Case
Church
Clark
Cooper
Douglas
Gore
Hartke
Jackson
Javits
Keating
Kuchel
Magnuson
McGee
McGovern
Morse
Moss
Nelson
Pastore
Proxmire
Scott
Symington
Thurmond
Williams, N.J.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—61

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Bartlett
Beall
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Curtis
Dirksen
Dodd
Eastland
Edmondson
Ervin
Fulbright
Goldwater
Gruening
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Humphrey
Inouye
Johnston
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McIntyre
McNamara
Mechem
Metcalf
Miller
Monroney
Morton
Mundt
Muskie
Neuberger
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Randolph
Ribicoff
Robertson
Russell
Simpson
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Tower
Walters
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.

NOT VOTING—14

Bayh
Cotton
Dominick
Ellender
Engle
Fong
Hart
Hayden
Hruska
Kennedy
Saltonstall
Smathers
Talmadge
Yarborough

So Mr. Keating's amendment was rejected.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MONRONEY. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I have an amendment, which has been agreed to by the committee. It deals with the inclusion of the Deputy Inspector General, Foreign Assistance, in level 4 of the Federal executive salary schedule.

The bill had passed through the House and had not yet reached us before we had marked up the bill. Consequently no provision was made for the salary of Deputy Inspector General position, which had been created.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The Chief Clerk. On page 123, between lines 19 and 20, it is proposed to insert the following:

(57) Deputy Inspector General, Foreign Assistance.

On pages 123 and 124, it is proposed to renumber (57) to (71) as (58) to (72), respectively.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to state the amendment.

Mr. MILLER. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with, and that it be printed in the Record at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment, ordered to be printed in the Record, is as follows:

On page 113, line 20, strike "$30,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$27,500", and in line 23 strike "$28,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$25,500".

On page 114, line 3, strike "$26,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$23,500"; in line 6 strike "$24,500" and insert in lieu thereof "$22,000"; in line 8 strike "$22,500" and insert in lieu thereof "$20,000"; in line 13 strike "$27,500" and insert in lieu thereof "$25,000"; in line 22 strike "$30,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$27,500"; and in line 24 strike "$43,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$40,000".

On page 115, line 20, strike "$35,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$30,000".

On page 116, line 8, strike "$30,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$27,500".

On page 117, line 15, strike "$28,500" and insert in lieu thereof "$26,000".

On page 120, line 2, strike "$27,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$24,500".

On page 124, line 20, strike "$26,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$23,500".

On page 155, line 20, strike "$25,500" and insert in lieu thereof "$24,000".

On page 156, line 7, strike "$26,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$25,000"; in line 22, strike "$25,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$24,000"; and in line 24, strike "$24,500" and insert in lieu thereof "$23,500".

On page 157, line 6, strike "$24,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$23,000"; in line 8, strike "$23,500" and insert in lieu thereof "$22,500"; and in line 14, strike "$23,500" and insert in lieu thereof "$22,500".

On page 164, line 4, strike "$22,500" and insert in lieu thereof "$20,000"; in line 14, strike "$33,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$30,500"; in line 17, strike "$30,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$27,500"; in line 18, strike "$30,500" and insert in lieu thereof "$28,000"; in line 21, strike "$33,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$30,500"; and in line 25, strike "$33,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$30,500".

On page 165, line 3, strike "$30,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$27,500"; in line 9, strike "$27,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$25,000"; in line 10, strike "$26,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$24,500"; in line 16, strike "$26,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$24,000"; and in line 24, strike "$30,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$27,500".

On page 166, line 3, strike "$33,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$30,500".

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I shall be brief in explaining the amendment.

Mr. PASTORE. Will the Senator raise his voice so we can hear him?

Mr. MILLER. I shall as soon as the Chamber has quieted down.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senate will be in order.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, what the amendment does is as follows: In section 203 on pages 113 and 114, the increases are cut back by $2,500. In section 204, on page 114, the salary of the Members of Congress are increased by $5,000 instead of $7,500. The Speaker's pay is increased by $5,000, instead of $8,000.

In section 303, on page 115, the salaries of Cabinet members are increased by $5,000, instead of $10,000.

The rest of the salaries in the executive and judiciary and the District of Columbia are cut by $2,500. In effect, that means an increase of $5,000 instead of $7,500, with the exception of the President of the District of Columbia Commissioners, who would have an extra $500.

The Allott amendment is preserved in my amendment. That is all the amendment does.

It seems to me that an opportunity ought to be given to the Senate to reflect whether it wishes to establish a pattern of a $10,000 increase for Cabinet members and a pattern of $7,500 for most of the other people involved, instead of $5,000.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa [putting the question].

The amendment was rejected.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on the engrossment of the committee amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The committee amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the passage of the bill.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute on the bill to the distinguished Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I shall, of course, support the bill. It is long overdue justice to Federal employees.

THE CONTINUING FEDERAL RESPONSIBILITY IN MISSISSIPPI

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the Federal Government has actively searched since June 21 for the 3 missing men in Mississippi, yesterday stepping up to 400 the number of U.S. service personnel aiding the Federal Bureau of Investigation in the search. In my judgment, this search should be continued until some clue to their fate has been discovered, even if it takes all summer to do it.

This is the least we can do to keep faith with the Federal guarantee to every citizen of freedom to travel and exercise other constitutional rights in every State of the United States. I note with great interest a report in yesterday's New York Times to the effect that, during the search, intimidation and harassment of civil rights workers in Mississippi have been materially reduced. The report goes on to state, however, that it is expected by those in the area that, once the searchers leave, the reign of terror against the youthful civil rights workers will resume.

How can a recurrence of this event be prevented during the long hot summer of civil rights activities and racial discord, which has undoubtedly only just begun in Mississippi?

Now that the Federal Government has made the commitment, after the fact, to resolve the awful tragedy of these three missing men, it would be doubly tragic if the Government of the United States did not protect the remaining students against further recurrences. Continuing the search is one way to help this. Another way is for the President to announce, contemporaneously with the signing into law of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, that the enjoyment in Mississippi of rights of American citizens will be safeguarded with the full authority of the United States.

Citizens who travel from State to State for lawful purposes, such as these students who seek to educate Negroes to exercise their constitutional right to vote, deserve the protection of the U.S. Government. Nor should the Government insist that death or serious injury befall them before it extends its protection.

I note also that yesterday 29 professors of law in 6 universities expressed public disagreement with Attorney General Kennedy's flat assertion that the Federal Government lacked the power to take effective action in Mississippi.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the statement of the 29 law professors.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement

It has been reported in the press that the Attorney General has stated that the Federal Government lacks power to take preventive police action in Mississippi to secure the safety of persons who have come into that State to aid its colored residents in the effective exercise of their rights as citizens of the United States. The undersigned students of public law are troubled by the misleading simplicity of this reported pronouncement, and believing that the Federal power to take protective action in the circumstances that now prevail in Mississippi is clear, are moved to make this statement.

Under section 332 of title 10 of the United States Code the President is authorized to use the State militia and the Armed Forces of the United States "whenever he considers that unlawful obstruction, combinations, or assemblages * * * make it impracticable to enforce the laws of the United States * * * by the ordinary course of judicial proceedings." Should the President be persuaded that judicial processes are not able to secure the rights of Negro voters in Mississippi or should he consider that those processes are not effectively safeguarding the rights of other Americans as they are defined in existing civil rights acts (e.g., sec. 1981 and 1983 of title 42) the quoted section would clearly authorize him to use armed forces to secure the rights referred to.

Of course the Attorney General knows this, for it was under section 332 that President Kennedy took military action at the University of Mississippi in 1962. Quite probably two considerations are factors in the Attorney General's determination that section 332 has no immediate relevance. He and the President may be convinced that the time has not yet come to send military forces into Mississippi—that other processes should be exhausted before that most drastic of all remedies is pursued. If that judgment is a crucial element in the decision one wishes that it had been reported, for it would have made it clear that it is not lack of Presidential power to act but the absence of a conviction that action is now called for that explains nonaction. Furthermore, the Attorney General may, with some justification, feel that when military action is taken under section 332 it is not fairly to be described as police action—the type of action which he has denied the Federal Government is empowered to take. These considerations which may explain the Attorney General's rejection of the current relevance of section 332, seem far less applicable to the provisions of section 333 of title 10.

Under the terms of that section the scope of the Presidential power to take protective and preventive action is not confined to the use of the militia or Armed Forces. Though section 333 mentions specifically the power to use those forces it also empowers him "by any other means (to) take such action as he considers necessary to suppress, in a State, any insurrection, domestic violence, unlawful combination, or conspiracy, if it (1) so hinders the execution of the laws of that State, and of the United States within the State, that any part or class of its people is deprived of a right, privilege, immunity, or protection named in the Constitution and secured by law, and the constituted authorities of that State are unable, fail, or refuse to protect that right, privilege, or immunity, or to give that protection; or (2) opposes or obstructs the execution of the laws of the United States or impedes the course of justice under those laws."

Surely there is reason to believe that violence and combination are now so hindering the execution of the laws of Mississippi and of the United States as to deny to the Negroes of Mississippi rights secured by the Constitution and laws of the United States. Whether the deplorable circumstances are such as to make the provisions in subsection (1) of the quoted section now operative is not important, for there can be no question but that the provisions of subsection (2) fit the present circumstances precisely. Violence, combination, and conspiracy in Mississippi are unquestionably obstructing the execution of the civil rights laws of the United States—the provisions, that is, of sections 1981 and 1983 of title 42 and the provisions of the acts of 1957 and 1960 with respect to voting rights.

Doubtless some creditable considerations of expedience could be cited to support a decision against now taking vigorous Presidential action under section 333 in Mississippi. Surely, however, the Attorney General's position would be less misleading and, therefore, less perilous if he would acknowledge that the President today has power to act but believes that police action under section 333 of title 10 is inadvisable.

In the year 1879 it was argued in the Supreme Court of the United States that when Federal marshals sought to enforce the electoral laws of the United States their conduct infringed the prerogatives of the States—that the Nation, in other words, could not, through the authority of its agents, take police action within the borders of any State. "It is argued," said Mr. Justice Bradley, "that the preservation of peace and good order in society is not within the powers confided to the Government of the United States, but belongs exclusively to the States. Here again we are met with the theory that the Government of the United States does not rest upon the soil and territory of the country. We think that this theory is founded upon an entire misconception of the nature and powers of that Government. We hold it to be an incontrovertible principle, that the Government of the United States may, by means of physical force, exercised through its official agents, execute on every foot of American soil the powers and functions that belong to it. This necessarily involves the power to command obedience to its laws, and hence the power to keep the peace to that extent." (Ex parte Siebold, 100 U.S. 371, 394–395.)

Unless the Attorney General disregards or somehow emasculates this pronouncement of the Supreme Court he cannot rest his case for Executive inaction on the facile pronouncement that the Federal Government and the President of the United States are not empowered to take police action in Mississippi. It is at once disappointing and ironic that the Department of Justice, which has been bold beyond precedent in successfully urging the Supreme Court that the judiciary possesses the broadest powers to enforce the constitutional assurances of equality, should now discover non-existent barriers to executive action.

SIGNERS OF STATEMENT

Columbia University Law School: Marvin E. Frankel, Arthur W. Murphy, Maurice Rosenberg, Michael I. Sovern.

Harvard Law School: Paul Bator, Vern Countryman, Charles Fried, Mark DeW. Howe, Louis Loss, John Mansfield, Henry Steiner, Arthur E. Sutherland.

New York University Law School: Charles E. Ares, Norman Dorsen, Henry Foster, Jr., Robert B. McKay, Gerhard O. W. Mueller.

University of Pennsylvania Law School: Caleb Foote, Jefferson B. Fordham (reservations as to phrasing), Alexander H. Frey, Noyes Leech, Clarence Morris, Louis B. Schwartz (reservations as to phrasing), Bernard Wolfman.

Yale Law School: Boris I. Bittker, Charles L. Black, Jr., Thomas I. Emerson, Louis H. Pollak.

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES SALARY REFORM ACT OF 1964

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11049) to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes on the bill to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, during the course of the debate on the bill, many amendments were offered. I voted either for or against them—that is most of them—because I anticipated that the measure would be enacted into law. I recognize that the issues we are dealing with and the principles that are involved in the proposed legislation address themselves primarily to the discretion, the good judgment, and the conscience of each individual Member of Congress.

I have weighed carefully all of the considerations involved, and I have concluded that I cannot vote for the enactment of the bill. I feel it my duty, therefore, to state for the RECORD my reasons for opposing it. I state them primarily for the RECORD, without any thought that I can influence the vote of any other Member. I do not seek to do so, because I expect each Member to vote his own judgment and his own conviction.

Mr. President, I must reluctantly vote against the bill. First, because it covers some employees whose salaries should be increased—postal employees and others. I vote against it reluctantly because by doing so I vote against my own financial interest, against my own profit, and against a gain to myself, to the extent of $7,500 a year increase in my salary, and after taxes, possibly to the extent of about $350 a month additional income.

Also, Mr. President, I am voting against my own interest because if the bill were enacted it would probably enhance my retirement pay by about $150 to $200 a month. The proposal is attractive and it is appealing, and is just as tempting to me, I am sure, as it is to any other Member of the Senate. Therefore I should like to support it. In voting against it, I wish the RECORD to show that I am hurting myself financially more, denying myself more, inflicting a greater financial loss on myself than I am denying to any constitutent of mine who is covered by the bill.

I cannot vote for it because we have a national debt, or will soon have one, of about $324 billion—the new debt limit. The Federal debt is rapidly increasing. I must ask myself, if I vote for it, where are we going to get the money with which to pay the additional $500 million annual cost of Government that it will incur.

We cannot get it from the Federal Treasury. It is not there to get.

We do not have the money. We must borrow it. That is the only way we can get the money. We must borrow it at interest. We cannot borrow it free of interest.

Therefore, we are increasing the deficit that will occur hereafter each year by about $500 million when we vote for the bill. The deficit in the past 4 years has aggregated about $26.4 billion, or about $6.5 billion annually.

Is a balanced budget in sight? The answer is "No." I believe there is a slight suggestion, or a vague suggestion, from the Secretary of the Treasury that we may be able to balance the budget in 1967. But I take that prophecy with a large grain of salt. I heard the minority leader today quote a distinguished authority on his side of the aisle who indicated that it will not be balanced until 1972.

I do not believe it will be balanced again at any time in the foreseeable future. There is nothing to indicate that it will be.

We are not now on the right track to balance it on either of those dates, or at any future date because we are continuously increasing the cost of Government.

Last year we reduced taxes by $11 billion. Last week the Senate voted further to reduce taxes by about $600 million. The House did not go along with that reduction. Therefore we will not immediately sustain that loss.

However, we are increasing the cost of Government continuously.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point tables which show that this Congress, the 88th Congress, has already enacted legislation, which will increase the cost of Government by $7,216 million the first year following its enactment. Over the first 5-year period following its enactment the cost will be $26,706 million annually.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

ESTIMATED COST OF MAJOR LAWS ENACTED DURING THE 88TH CONGRESS AND ADDITIONAL RECOMMENDED BY THE ADMINISTRATION AWAITING ACTION

Summary statement of total estimated cost of major laws passed and of others sponsored by the administration that are still awaiting action

	1st-year cost	5-year cost
Public laws:		
Nondefense programs already public law will cost	$2,547,000,000	$3,592,000,000
Additional defense spending now public law will cost	3,243,000,000	16,215,000,000
Space technology increase over fiscal 1963 for fiscal 1964	1,426,000,000	7,230,000,000
Subtotal of spending already public law	7,216,000,000	27,037,000,000
Awaiting Senate or House action:		
Administration nondefense proposals awaiting action will cost	7,186,000,000	24,346,000,000
Space technology increase for fiscal 1965 over fiscal 1964	590,000,000	2,360,000,000
Defense increases largely offset by decreases	----------	----------
Subtotal of nondefense and defense and spending programs awaiting action	7,776,000,000	26,706,000,000
Grand total of both defense and nondefense spending proposals, both public law and awaiting action	14,992,000,000	53,743,000,000

NOTE.—These estimates are reasonably accuiate, although they are not, of course, exact.

Nondefense spending increases

COST OF MAJOR BILLS PASSED AND WHICH ARE NOW PUBLIC LAWS

Public law number and objective	1st-year cost	5-year cost
1. Public Law 88-25, area redevelopment program, added funds	$450,000,000	$450,000,000
2. Public Law 88-101, increase in resources of Export-Import Bank	2,000,000,000	2,000,000,000
3. Public Law 88-129, health program, medical facilities and personnel	34,000,000	750,000,000
4. Public Law 88-136, immunization program for children	13,000,000	63,000,000
5. Public Law 88-156, mental health and retardation and maternal health	50,000,000	[1] 329,000,000
Total nondefense spending programs now public law	2,547,000,000	3,592,000,000

COST OF PROPOSALS SUPPORTED BY THE ADMINISTRATION THAT ARE STILL BEFORE CONGRESS

Bill description and number	1st-year cost	5-year cost	Present status of proposal
1. Food for Peace, increase in program (S. 2687)	$500,000,000	$500,000,000	
2. Urban mass transit (S. 6)	100,000,000	375,000,000	Passed Senate Apr. 4, 1963. Passed House June 25, 1964.
3. Federal employees' salary adjustment (H.R. 11049)	533,000,000	2,660,000,000	Passed House June 11, 1964.
4. Area redevelopment (S. 1163)	455,000,000	455,000,000	Passed Senate June 26, 1963 (House Rules Committee).
5. Housing and urban renewal [2] (H.R. 9751, S. 2468)	1,631,000,000	1,631,000,000	In hearings.
6. Fallout shelter (H.R. 8200; S. 844)	300,000,000	300,000,000	Passed House Sept. 17, 1963.
7. Food stamp extension of pilot program (H.R. 10222)	25,000,000	400,000.000	Conference June 30, 1964.
8. Aid for Appalachia (H.R. 11065; S. 2782)	252,000,000	3,000,000,000	In hearings.
9. Conservation funds (H.R. 3846; S. 859)	60,000,000	300,000,000	H. Rept. 900, Nov. 14, 1963.
10. Medical care for aged under social security (H.R. 3920; S. 880)	1,100,000,000	5,500,000,000	Hearings in House.
11. Poverty program (H.R. 11377; S. 2642)	962,500,000	[3] 2,887,500,000	H. Rept., June 3, 1964.
12. Education omnibus program—Federal aid (H.R. 3000; S. 580)	1,215,000,000	6,075,000,000	
13. Extension and increase in Hill-Burton (H.R. 10041)	52,500,000	262,500,000	Passed House May 25, 1964.
Total nondefense spending pending	7,186,000,000	24,346,000.000	

[1] 4-year program.
[2] Supposedly a 1-shot program.
[3] 3-year program.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Now I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the Senator from Arkansas referred to measures that would further unbalance the budget. I noticed he did not refer to the fact that the Budget also suggests pay increases for the members of the armed services amounting to between $250 million and $300 million a year.

The armed services do not have unions. They do not have legislative representatives in Washington. They are unable to lobby among Members of Congress. Therefore, they always await action on the increases in pay for civilian employees.

I must also say that the members of the Armed Forces do not work a 40-hour week. Some of them are being killed in Vietnam now—and I am confident that some of them do not know exactly why. But they render great services in protecting this country.

When the bill is passed—as I am confident it will be—I shall regard it as my duty to hold hearings to at least equalize the position of the members of the armed services with that of civilian employees, who have a safe assignment at home, a 40-hour week, and substantial increases in pay, but are not required to places their lives in jeopardy by defending their country.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the Senator from Georgia. The bill does invite further increases in the cost of government. Not only that; it invites a break in the hold-the-line policy in industry with respect to wages and profits. Negotiations are now underway in one of our vital industries—the automobile industry—for a large increase in wages. That will also mean an increase in prices of new automobiles. They propose to go beyond the yardstick that the President has suggested is necessary to hold the line in order to prevent inflation.

If we pass this bill and add another $500 million to the cost of government by raising our salaries by 33⅓ percent, and grant the other salary raises it provides, then where is that yardstick which the President established at about 3 percent as being all that could be justified? We shall be inviting everyone to say that he shall have to have higher wages and salaries—more money. The primary responsibility rests upon Congress to set an example and not break the barrier, a barrier which, if broken, can lead to great inflationary pressures—and thus to a dangerous inflationary spiral.

Mr. RUSSELL. Does the Senator from Arkansas believe that it would be fair to grant these increases but deny an even more modest increase to the members of the armed services?

Mr. McCLELLAN. No; if we grant this increase, I think the wage earner is entitled to come in through bargaining channels and say, "We are entitled to more. What will the barrier mean if we break it? What does the guideline mean if Congress itself is not going to respect it?" If the administration itself is not going to observe it, why should we single out labor and business, and try to say that they should not have similar increases?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am happy to yield.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, it is difficult for one to face objectively the issue of a pay increase for the many employees of the Government in an election year. It seems that this question is before us in almost every election year.

Difficult as it is, I shall vote against the bill for several reasons. First, the bill contains many unjustified benefits, including an increase in excess of $600 a month in the compensation of already inactive Federal judges, an increase in the salary of the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate from $21,500 to $27,500, an increase in the salary of Senate pages to approximately $5,000, and a substantial increase in the pay of rural carriers, whose short hours already make that position among the most sought after in the country.

Moreover, as the Senator has said, with the tax cut, it will be necessary to borrow every dollar to pay this more than $500 million increase in the Federal budget.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the Senator from Tennessee. There are two other points I wish to make. In the first place, the argument has been made that this Government is the biggest corporation or business in the world and that we, the Members of Congress, are its directors. That we ought to have compensation that is somewhat comparable to that of the directors of large corporations in private enterprise. I am not arguing against that. I have received—as I am sure other Senators have—many letters saying that Senators and Representatives are not worth that much. I do not agree with that at all. That is not the reason why I oppose the bill. Any Member of Congress who is competent and capable of meeting the responsibilities and fulfilling the duties of a United States Senator, and who is worthy of serving in either body of Congress, is worth $30,000 a year, and possibly more, as compared with the level of our economy and what is paid in business and industry. That is not the reason for my opposition to this bill. But if we want to think in terms of private corporations, let me ask this question: What board of directors of a private corporation would vote themselves a 33⅓-percent ($7,500) increase in salary with a record of deficits year after year after year, such as has occurred in the operation of the Federal Government under the direction of the Congress? Such a board of a corporation would not last at all. The corporation would soon go bankrupt, and the directors would be fired by the stockholders. So a sound argument for this bill cannot be put on that premise. It cannot be made to stand.

I wish to make one final observation. Sacrifice, if there is to be any, should begin with us. If we sincerely desire to pursue sound fiscal policies and balance the budget; if we mean to best serve our country, we should be willing to make some sacrifice. We are doing it on our present salary; I do not think there is any question about that. I think sacrifice is involved here. But I think the times call for it. They demand sacrifice on our part. We in this body should set the example. We ride herd on administrative agencies to economize so that we might not go into debt so much, so fast, and so deep. So, we should exercise due restraint ourselves.

If we pass the bill, we will not be asking, "What can I do for my country?" We will be asking, "What can my country do for me?" We shall be writing a ticket that will be reversing what the great President Kennedy said in his inaugural address. We shall be rephrasing and in practice reversing his famous remark—admonition.

I cannot go along with the bill. That is the way I feel about it. I do not believe that I am morally justified in voting a pay increase for myself under these circumstances and charging that increase into the national debt for some future generation to pay. No, I do not think they will pay it if we do pass the bill; but it will be an added burden on the next generation. I do not believe that we of this generation should charge that character of expense to the next generation.

I therefore cannot vote for the bill. I shall be compelled to vote against it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Caution Light," published in the Washington Evening Star of July 1, 1964.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAUTION LIGHT

This is D-day for the beginning of a test which will make or break President Johnson's effort to hold the line against inflation.

With the opening of contract talks between the United Automobile Workers and the big three in the automobile industry, the issue is clearly drawn.

Mr. Johnson is committed to a guideline which would hold wage increases within the limits of higher productivity—generally 3.2 percent. But George Meany, president of the AFL–CIO, is openly defiant. If we think a higher wage rise is justified, he has said, we "will not be stymied by guidelines." Walter Reuther, UAW head, is calling for a 4.9 increase for his union members, along with other substantial boosts in benefits. And the AFL–CIO executive council has formally proclaimed that "neither wage nor price restraints are tolerable in a free society except in the gravest national emergency and then only when coupled with restraints upon excess profits."

What will emerge from all this remains to be seen. But it could be of crucial importance.

President Johnson says he has set up an early warning system and that he will draw public attention to any excesses by unions or management. To us, this sounds as though he is thinking in terms of a slap on the wrist. Henry Ford II is taking a tougher line. He told a business audience last month that willingness on the part of the public, Government, and management to accept a strike, if necessary, is part of the price we must pay for the preservation of free and responsible collective bargaining—whether that willingness is ever put to the test or not.

Well, we'll see. The industry has been prospering, and it may take a strike rather than see the guideline broken. But it is doubtful that either the union or the industry is really thinking seriously in strike terms.

The big threat is an excessive wage increase followed by a price increase. Doubtless big labor and big business would survive. But the little fellows, especially those living on more or less fixed incomes, will face ruin if the monster of inflation is turned loose again in this country.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I have only one more request for time. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Oregon; then I shall yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have decided to vote for the bill. I wish to say to the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] that I shall support a substantial increase in pay for the members of the armed services, at least those in the lower and medium pay brackets. In no case will I support a percentage figure for members of the armed services less than the lowest percentage increase provided in this bill.

So long as we cannot do away with the excise taxes, we need to stimulate the economy for the purchases of civilian goods. We should repeal the excise tax and I shall do all that I can to achieve that objective.

Also, before Congress adjourns, I shall offer legislation by way of a rider on the floor of the Senate that will increase social security payments by at least 10 percent more than the largest percentage increase in pay provided in this bill, and probably more.

But so long as Congress can continue to waste money on the foreign aid bill, at least half of the money that the Foreign Relations Committee authorized this afternoon, and throw that money down the ratholes around the world, not only without justification but also to the long-time detriment of the United States, I am not going to be too concerned about passing a pay bill that will enter into the economic stream of American life.

I am a strong believer in taking care of our problems at home before we waste our money abroad. Because we have been following this unsound course of action in regard to not decreasing excise taxes, not increasing social security benefits, and not giving a fair deal to those members in our armed services, I have decided to vote for the bill in the hope that in the long run the increase in pay may result in making the Government service more enlightened within those who have been following the mistaken policy which now characterizes the legislative process.

So, Mr. President, I shall vote for the bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I am opposed to H.R. 11049, the Pay Raise Act of 1964, in the form in which it is now before the Senate. My newsletter of June 22, 1964, to my constituents outlines my reasons for opposing the bill. I ask unanimous consent that this newsletter, entitled "On Increasing Pay," be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the conclusion of these remarks.

There being no objection, the newsletter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ON INCREASING PAY

(By Senator STROM THURMOND)

The Senate will be soon called on to vote on a pay increase for all Federal Government employees. The bill would cost an additional $534 million per year. It covers all Government employees, including members of the Supreme Court, the Congress, and executive branch officials up to and including the Vice President. For most Government employees, this would be the third pay increase in 21 months, the first having gone into effect in October 1962, the second in January 1964, and this one would be effective on being signed into law, except for Members of Congress who would wait until January.

In the past I have voted for most Government pay increases. I want to see Federal workers adequately paid. In fact, I would be willing to support a cost-of-living increase this year. However, this legislation goes far beyond providing a cost-of-living increase for the higher level jobs. Members of Congress would, for instance, receive an increase of 33⅓ percent or even more if the Senate pushes the congressional boost from $22,500 to $32,500.

It is my conviction that individuals offering for elective office should not be looking for financial gain. Public office is a public trust, and the chief aim of those in public office should be service to the public.

One of the reasons the congressional increase is being pushed is so that high-level employees can be raised. Many of them are now almost on a pay par with the Congress. There is a general understanding that they will not be paid as much or more than the Members of Congress, thus the invitation for the Congress to raise its own pay.

The spread in pay increases for Government employees would range from 3 to 33⅓ percent. The lower percentage figures would be made applicable to the lower pay grades where the increases are most needed. Many top-level administrative jobs would be boosted by as much as $4,500 per year. This is more than many people in America make each year. This hike for the upper levels is sought to be justified on the plea that good employees are leaving Government because they cannot live off $20,000 per year. One of those who recently left Government for greener pastures was Walter Heller, former Chairman of the President's Board of Economic Advisers. He is the man who tried to sell the country on the false economic theory that deficit spending is not only necessary for our country, but is actually better for us in time of war and peace.

Recently President Johnson announced that "He (Heller) has gone $16,000 into debt because of Government service and has been forced to leave." Heller could not survive in Washington for a few years off $20,500 per year and the very type of deficit spending which he charted for our Government. Instead of being an argument for this bill, the Heller story constitutes one of the most essential reasons for voting against the bill, especially if more of these impractical apostles of big spending follow his example and get out. Several have already done so.

One of the principal reasons this bill in its present form should be defeated is simply because the U.S. Treasury cannot afford to add another $500 million annually to our deficits. The Congress is being asked now to raise the debt limit to $324 billion, and the deficit for this fiscal year is estimated to be $8.8 billion.

Both psychologically and as a practical matter, this gigantic pay boost would set the stage for an inflationary spiral through increased wage and price demands in industry at a time when the President has called for restraint and responsibility in wage and price demands.

Even if the President is unwilling to heed his own advice, the Congress should be willing to set the example of restraint and responsibility for the Nation, especially with regard to its own proposed pay increase of $7,500 or $10,000 per year.

No company of stockholders would permit its board of directors to spend billions more than the company's income in 29 of the last 35 years and then vote itself a pay raise of 33⅓ percent or more to add to the company's growing indebtedness. The stockholders of our government, the taxpaying public, should take this same attitude. The public should demand that big spending in government be stopped and that the Congress set the example for "restraint and responsibility" in spending and all spheres of government activities.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the defeat of the Proxmire motion to eliminate congressional salaries from the pay increase bill places me, as it does many others, in a cruel dilemma as regards the proper vote which I should cast on the question of passage of the bill.

I believe in increasing the pay in the postal service, the pay for the judiciary, and the pay for those in the classified civil service. I accept an increase in the pay of the top administrators as probably necessary in the society in which we live; although I hope the joy and honor of public service, rather than material emoluments, may be the main motivation for them, as indeed it should be for all others.

I recognize that the public administrators do not have the opportunity for legitimate outside earnings which we in Congress possess. I also know that they and their families predominantly live and move in the social circles of the so-called "managerial elite," where the prestige of the family depends in large part upon the salary which the head of the household receives. These are the realities; and, as a realist, I accept them. An increase in the salaries of these men and women is probably necessary if we are to retain them in public service, although I hope—somewhat wistfully—that money will not be the main incentive for their work.

I am, therefore, in favor of all parts of the present bill except that which provides for an increase in congressional salaries. Some of us have failed in our efforts to eliminate this feature; and we are now confronted with the question of how we should vote on the bill as it now stands. I believe that three lines of action are open to me and to others in the same position.

First. We can vote for the bill, in order to show our support for the salary increases for the million and three-quarter others, and can swallow our scruples at voting for an increase for ourselves.

Second. We can vote against the bill, in order to emphasize our opposition to the congressional pay increase. But this would help to deprive the army of Federal workers of salary increases which are justly theirs.

Third. We can ask to be excused from voting, because of a conflict of interest. In ordinary situations, where such conflicts of interest are confined to a few Members, this might well be the proper thing to do. But in connection with a matter such as this, in which the interests of all Members are involved, such a course could not be universalized, since then the entire Congress would be immobilized. The granting of such immunity from voting by the Senate could therefore only be an act of indulgence to the specific individuals, and could not be universalized.

None of these alternatives is perfect. Each and every one has vital flaws. I have no certainty that my own final decision is correct; but I have reluctantly decided to vote for the bill, in order not to deprive a million and three-quarters others of the salary increases which I believe are necessary and desirable. If I am criticized, on the ground that this does bring with it an increase in my own pay, I can only say that I supported and voted for the amendment to strip from the act any special benefits for myself.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in 1962 the U.S. Congress passed the Federal Salary Reform Act, and went on record in favor of comparability between pay for Government employees and pay for private-enterprise employees at the same levels. Once taken, even such a fundamental change has a way of looking inevitable. It now seems to us only proper that the Government should be prepared to compete for able employees, and that these employees should not be stigmatized with consistently lower salaries than those of their counterparts in private industry.

The policy was accepted by Congress for valid and compelling reasons. The bill we are now considering is the first effort to apply in a thorough and comprehensive fashion the announced policy. Its details have been hammered out during months of work by the respective Post Office and Civil Service Committees of the House and Senate and during debate on the floor of the House. The Senate committee has made several significant improvements over the House version of the bill, including an increase in the salary of middle-management career employees.

The bill does not merely reflect the sentiment in favor of salary increases, although this sentiment is apparent and strong. The pay increases for career employees have been taken out of the realm of whim and pressure politics, and have been placed on a sound statistical basis. Our duty is to verify the facts and figures presented and to determine whether the bill under consideration does indeed apply fairly the comparability principle, and whether we can afford to make good our commitment.

I believe we cannot afford to ignore it. We must offer Federal employees a guarantee of financial security and an incentive to remain with the Government and to increase their skills. The career employees of the Federal Government are a great force for stability and continuity. They watch elected and appointed officials come and go, and they faithfully serve each new administration. They are the capacious hold of the ship of government, and their expertise and experience are the machinery which keep that ship afloat, in whatever direction the helm is turned.

The news in this bill is its reappraisal of executive, judicial, and legislative salaries. These provisions are largely based on study and recommendations by the Advisory Panel on Federal Salary Systems. This panel was charged with the task of bringing order out of a chaotic salary structure, fraught with contradictions and inadequate to the task of attracting and keeping the high-quality executives our Nation needs and deserves. The Randall report has carried out its mandate to recommend appropriate levels of salaries, and to establish proper relationships between the salaries of executives, career employees, Members of Congress, and the judiciary. The panel did an outstanding job; and its recommendations, in modified form, are reflected in the present bill.

This bill is controversial. But at the moment we are not engaged in a popularity contest. We are seeking a reasonable and effective solution of a problem that long has plagued the Government.

Mr. President, the 88th Congress has been neither timid nor indolent in facing its tasks and responsibilities. We have frankly settled a legislative issue that has bedeviled Congress for decades, by passing a Civil Rights Act based firmly on the principle of equal rights under the Constitution for every American citizen.

The bill now before us is not so sweeping in its scope or so morally imperative; but it has deep significance for the future, and deep practical importance for the present. It embraces the question of whether we shall demand and reward excellence in the men and women who hold high positions of trust in our Government. It confronts the problem of keeping these posts open to talent from all income strata, and not making them, by default, the private preserve of the wealthy.

Of course, those of us charged with upholding the dignity and the quality of these top positions are the temporary beneficiaries of our own action. This rsponsibility cannot be made impersonal. We are men and women much like our successors, and most of us welcome a boost in salary which will allow us to meet from our salaries the unusual expenses of our office.

I do not think Congress has shown undue liberality in its own behalf. It has been almost a decade since we have considered a raise in our salaries. In that decade, we have involuntarily acquired the expensive habit of commuting. There was a time when political pulses could be felt and political fences mended during a long and leisurely summer and fall at home; but those days are irrevocably departed, and the precedent of a long session is well established.

Times have changed dramatically; and it is appropriate that we modernize a pay structure which not only has kept congressional salaries unrealistically low, but also has depressed the entire pay scale of Government officers, which traditionally is governed by congressional pay.

The bill before us recognizes the enormous recent expansion in recent decades of the responsibility in top levels of Government. No other comparable period has witnessed such a multiplication of the demands upon Federal officers. Not only have these years brought a vast increase in population, and sweeping changes in our domestic economy and social structure; they have also confirmed our inescapable obligation to active participation in international and interspatial affairs. Our top Government officers are not only leaders of the richest and most powerful Nation on earth; they also exercise unparalleled influence in world affairs. No valid comparisons can be drawn between the responsibilities of these men and those who hold positions in private industry; and this bill rightly makes no attempt to establish strict comparability.

Public service has traditionally, and proudly, been associated with certain material sacrifices. But the compensation must be sufficient to encourage men and women of ability and dedication to seek Federal service, knowing they can meet the financial obligations of their office and their responsibilities to their families. If this standard is met, we may confidently expect that the honor, the challenge, and the opportunity for Government service will continue to provide the intangibles that outweigh the inevitable disparity which will persist between governmental salaries and industrial salaries.

Finally, the point should be made, and reiterated, that a rational and realistic pay structure is not nearly so costly as incompetence, apathy, and chronic turnover. Competence and high morale are essential ingredients for true economy.

As our President—an indisputably frugal man—well understands, good Government depends on good people. The U.S. Government is not a machine which operates only on abstract principles. It is an organization of men and women. The availability and willingness to serve of outstanding and conscientious men and women determine to a large degree the effectiveness and accomplishments of our Government. We have a President who knows how to use a first-class organization; let us make sure that is what he has.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I shall vote against the pay increase bill. I would have supported the salary increases for the classified civil service employees, many of whom in the lower income brackets are finding it difficult to support their families and educate their children in a manner befitting our Federal employees. Plentiful statistics on the Federal employment situation reflect a serious problem of turnover in jobs, and show that numerous employees leave the service, for higher paying jobs in private industry. This turnover problem is costly to the taxpayers, and is even more costly than will be the cost of additional compensation in order to put these employees on a basis comparable with private industry.

But unfortunately the leadership of the House and Senate decided, over the opposition of the Government employees' representatives, to tack on very large salary increases for hundreds of presidential appointees, members of the judiciary, and Members of Congress—apparently with the idea that such increases could not stand on their own merits in a separate bill. If, indeed, they are justifiable, why were they not placed in a separate bill? But they were not.

It would not have been so bad if these increases for others in the high-income brackets had not been so great. I believe that a $10,000 a year increase for the members of the Cabinet is excessive. I believe that a $7,500 a year increase for Members of Congress is somewhat excessive, particularly in the face of rejection by a majority of the Members of the Senate of the amendment, offered by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], which would have prevented the Executive appointee and legislative increases from going into effect until after completion of a year in which we had a balanced budget. The adoption of such an amendment would have had a salutary influence on members of the executive branch and Members of Congress toward keeping faith with the purchasing power of the peoples' hard-earned money, which is steadily being eroded by the inflation which multibillion dollar deficit spending is causing.

I believe that a majority of the taxpayers would have supported a modest increase in salary for these presidential appointees, judges, and Members of Congress. Such an increase runs to the office—not to the individuals who occupy the office today, and may be gone tomorrow. My amendment to provide for increases of $5,000 for these various positions was rejected by a majority of my colleagues. Such being the case, they must bear the responsibility for the passage of this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the bill has now been yielded back. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass? On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FULBRIGHT (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea"; if I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

Mr. WALTERS (when his name was called). Mr. President, on this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay"; if I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware (when his name was called). Mr. President, on this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. CHURCH (after having voted in the negative). Mr. President, on this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I withdraw my vote.

Mr. MANSFIELD (after having voted in the affirmative). Mr. President, on this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay"; if I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I withdraw my vote.

Mr. PEARSON (after having voted in the negative). Mr. President, on this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea"; if I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I withdraw my vote.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] are absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] are detained on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] is paired with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "yea" and the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "nay".

The respective pairs of the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], and that of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] have been previously announced.

The result was announced—yeas 58, nays 21, as follows:

[No. 468 Leg.]

YEAS—58

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Bartlett
Beall
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Case
Clark
Dirksen
Dodd
Douglas
Edmondson
Ervin
Goldwater
Gruening
Hartke
Hayden
Hill
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Johnston
Jordan, N.C.
Keating
Kuchel
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
McCarthy
McGee
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalf
Monroney
Morse
Morton
Moss
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Scott
Smith
Sparkman
Symington
Williams, N.J.
Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—21

Bennett
Byrd, Va.
Cooper
Curtis
Eastland
Gore
Hickenlooper
Holland
Lausche
McClellan
McGovern
Mechem
Miller
Mundt
Robertson
Russell
Simpson
Stennis
Thurmond
Tower
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—21

Bayh
Carlson
Church
Cotton
Dominick
Ellender
Engle
Fong
Fulbright
Hart
Hruska
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy
Mansfield
Pearson
Saltonstall
Smathers
Talmadge
Walters
Williams, Del.
Yarborough

So the bill (H.R. 11049) was passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendment to H.R. 11049, and ask for a conference with the House, and that the Chair be authorized to appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Chair appoints the following conferees: Mr. JOHNSTON, Mr. MONRONEY, and Mr. CARLSON.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I do not have to run for election, if ever, until the year 1968. I have had no inhibition with respect to the votes which I have cast. They have been motivated solely for the purpose of serving the people of the country.

In my opinion, what has happened on the floor of the Senate today and yesterday is inimical to the security of the country.

Under the bill which has been passed, I shall be entitled to a raise in my salary of $7,500. If other Senators are entitled to it, I believe that I am.

I am conscientiously of the opinion that I have tried to preserve the security of my country. I have subordinated my interest in every instance where I thought that subordination was necessary.

I now announce that although others have done far more harm to my country than I have—and on that basis I am far more entitled to the $7,500 pay increase—I will not accept it. I will inform the paying officer that, in my judgment, what has been done is erroneous. It is not in the interest of the country. It is a theft upon savings of annuitants and pensioners. And therefore, I will not take this increased payment.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 179, 88th Congress, the Speaker had appointed Mr. FALLON, of Maryland, and Mr. CRAMER, of Florida, as members on the part of the House of the special committee to convey to the members of the American Association of State Highway Officials an expression of appreciation by the Congress of the praiseworthy accomplishments under their leadership.

The message announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2) to establish water resources research centers at land-grant colleges and State universities, to stimulate water research at other colleges, universities, and centers of competence, and to promote a more adequate national program of water research.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6455) to amend subsection (b) of section 512 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (dealing with unrelated business taxable income).

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8590) to incorporate the Aviation Hall of Fame.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10456) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and administrative operations, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 321) establishing that when the House adjourns on Thursday, July 2, 1964, it stand adjourned until 12 o'clock noon on Monday, July 20, 1964.

REQUEST OF PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES TO RETURN TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES ENROLLED BILL (H.R. 10053) TO AMEND SECTION 502 OF THE MERCHANT MARINE ACT OF 1936

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I send to the desk a concurrent resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the concurrent resolution.

The legislative clerk read the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 323), as follows:

> The President of the United States is requested to return to the House of Representatives the enrolled bill (H.R. 10053) to amend section 502 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, relating to construction differential subsidies. If and when said bill is returned by the President, the action of the Presiding Officers of the two Houses in signing the bill shall be deemed rescinded; and the Clerk of the House is authorized and directed, in the reenrollment of said bill, to make the following correction:
>
> Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That the proviso in the second sentence of subsection (b) of section 502 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (46 U.S.C. 1152(b)), is amended by striking out 'June 30, 1964' and inserting in lieu thereof 'June 30, 1965.'."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was considered and agreed to.

WATER RESOURCES RESEARCH CENTERS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2) to establish water resources research centers at land-grant colleges and State universities, to stimulate water research at other colleges, universities, and centers of competence, and to promote a more adequate national program of water research. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of July 2, 1964, pp. 15904–15906, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a colloquy on the conference report on S. 2.

There being no objection, the colloquy was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COLLOQUY ON S. 2 CONFERENCE REPORT

Question. I have a question or two about the changes in S. 2 as agreed upon in conference. In section 100(b) it is provided that a Water Resources Research Institute may arrange for research by a component or components of the college or university with which it is affiliated.

This language indicates that the institute is intended to be collegewide or universitywide and not attached to a single component, or school, like the engineering school or the agricultural section, of the college or university.

Answer. That is correct. Water involves nearly all disciplines in the field of knowledge and all should be available to a water resources research center. The original Senate bill said the institutes should be collegewide or universitywide. In conference we agreed the words were not necessary since the institute is clearly to be a part of the whole college or university, not a part of a single department within it.

Question. The second part of my question involving this same subsection. The bill encourages the colleges and universities in two or more States to unite in a single center. Elsewhere it encourages the college or university selected for the center or institute to seek cooperation of other educational institutions in the State. Where two or more schools are working together in a single institute, would it not be proper to allow for research jobs, to be done in a component or components of more than one of the colleges or universities—components of any of the colleges or universities with which the institute is affiliated? The bill uses the singular "college or university" instead of the plural.

Answer. That is correct, and we also discussed that a little in conference. We decided use of the plural is not necessary. In title I of volume 1, section 1 of the United States Code the first sentence, which is instruction on how to read and interpret law, it says: "In determining the meaning of any act of Congress, unless the context indicates otherwise—words importing the singular include and apply to several persons, parties or things." I am sure the singular "college or university" in question can properly be read to mean the plural, as well, under this rule.

Question. The House has deleted, and you have accepted the deletion, of language which would have permitted the use of section 100(a) funds for construction and equipment of structures. Does this mean that none of the research funds would be available to construct a model of a floodgate, or that building a wavemaker to study bank erosion would not be permissible, or that you couldn't buy thermometers to take the temperature of water, or vessels to contain the water, out of such funds?

Answer. It was not intended to prevent doing the necessary construction of models or things necessary to a specific research project. The deletion was aimed at using, the $75,000 to $100,000 annual grant to pay installments on a permanent campus building—structures like that. The agricultural experiment program permits supplies, instruments and things necessary to a specific research project to come out of the matching funds—but not permanent buildings or structures that ought to be financed from the university building fund. I do not believe that, following the precedent of the long established agricultural research program under the Hatch Act of 1877—now over 75 years old, there will be any difficulty with the language.

The House committee and the Senate committee want this Federal aid money to buy research—not buildings. All the legitimate expenses of research projects can be met with the matched State and Federal funds. We did unsuccesfully attempt to permit provision for employee retirement contributions out of section 100(a) grants. The House felt that since the employees would be employees of the college or university, it should handle provision for their retirement. While I prefer the authorization in the Senate bill, which parallels agricultural research arrangements, I do not believe this will impede the program. If it does, we can reconsider the matter later.

Question. Section 101(a) of S. 2 provides for matching grants in support of research projects, and it uses the phrase "to match, on a dollar-for-dollar basis". Is this language intended to exclude from the universities' matching, a fair value of the services, facilities, or other contributions a university may make toward carrying on the research?

Answer. Not at all. When a university contributes such costs they are recognized as part of its matching in agricultural research and will be in this program.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate agree to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have a portion of the conference report (No. 1526) printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the extract was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2) to establish water resources research centers at land-grant colleges and State universities, to stimulate water research at other colleges, universities, and centers of competence, and to promote a more adequate national program of water research, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the text of the bill, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "That (a) this Act may be cited as the 'Water Resources Research Act of 1964.'

"(b) In order to assist in assuring the Nation at all times of a supply of water sufficient in quantity and quality to meet the requirements of its expanding population, it is the purpose of the Congress, by this Act, to stimulate, sponsor, provide for, and supplement present programs for the conduct of research, investigations, experiments, and the training of scientists in the fields of water and of resources which affect water.

"TITLE I—STATE WATER RESOURCES RESEARCH INSTITUTES

"SEC. 100. (a) There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of the Interior for the fiscal year 1965 and each subsequent year thereafter sums adequate to provide $75,000 to each of the several States in the first year, $87,500 in each of the second and third years, and $100,000 each year thereafter to assist each participating State in establishing and carrying on the work of a competent and qualified water resources research institute, center, or equivalent agency (hereinafter referred to as 'institute') at one college or university in that State, which college or university shall be a college or university established in accordance with the Act approved July 2, 1862 (12 Stat. 503), entitled 'An Act donating public lands to the several States and territories which may provide colleges for the benefit of agriculture and the mechanic arts' or some other institution designated by Act of the legislature of the State concerned: *Provided*, That (1) if there is more than one such college or university in a State, established in accordance with said Act of July 2, 1862, funds under this Act shall, in the absence of a designation to the contrary by act of the legislature of the State, be paid to the one such college or university designated by the Governor of the State to receive the same subject to the Secretary's determination that such college or university has, or may reasonably be expected to have, the capability of doing effective work under this Act; (2) two or more States may cooperate in the designation of a single interstate or regional institute, in which event the sums assignable to all of the cooperating States shall be paid to such institute; and (3) a designated college or university may, as authorized by appropriate State authority, arrange with other colleges and universities within the State to participate in the work of the institute.

"(b) It shall be the duty of each such institute to plan and conduct and/or arrange for a component or components of the college or university with which it is affiliated to conduct competent research, investigations, and experiments of either a basic or practical nature, or both, in relation to water resources and to provide for the training of scientists through such research, investigations, and experiments. Such research, investigations, experiments, and training may include, without being limited to, aspects of the hydrologic cycle; supply and demand for water; conservation and best use of available supplies of water; methods of increasing such supplies; and economic, legal, social, engineering, recreational, biological, geographic, ecological, and other aspects of water problems, having due regard to the varying conditions and needs of the respective States, to water research projects being conducted by agencies of the Federal and State Governments, the agricultural experiment stations, and others, and to avoidance of any undue displacement of scientists and engineers elsewhere engaged in water resources research.

"SEC. 101. (a) There is further authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of the Interior for the fiscal year 1965 and each subsequent year thereafter sums not in excess of the following: 1965, $1,000,000; 1966, $2,000,000; 1967, $3,000,000; 1968, $4,000,000; and 1969 and each of the succeeding years, $5,000,000. Such moneys when appropriated, shall be available to match, on a dollar-for-dollar basis, funds made available to institutes by States or other non-Federal sources to meet the necessary expenses of specific water resources research projects which could not otherwise be undertaken, including the expenses of planning and coordinating regional water resources research projects by two or more institutes.

"(b) Each application for a grant pursuant to subsection (a) of this section shall, among other things, state the nature of the project to be undertaken, the period during which it will be pursued, the qualifications of the personnel who will direct and conduct it, the importance of the project to the water economy of the Nation, the region, and the State concerned, its relation to other known research projects theretofore pursued or currently being pursued, and the extent to which it will provide opportunity for the training of water resources scientists. No grant shall be made under said subsection (a) except for a project approved by the Secretary, and all grants shall be made upon the basis of the merit of the project, the need for the knowledge which it is expected to produce when completed, and the opportunity it provides for the training of water resources scientists.

"SEC. 102. Sums available to the States under the terms of sections 100 and 101 of this Act shall be paid to their designated institutes at such times and in such amounts during each fiscal year as determined by the Secretary, and upon vouchers approved by him. Each institute shall have an officer appointed by its governing authority who shall receive and account for all funds paid under the provisions of this Act and shall make an annual report to the Secretary on or before the 1st day of September of each year, on work accomplished and the status of projects underway, together with a detailed statement of the amounts received under any of the provisions of this Act during the preceding fiscal year, and of its disbursement, on schedules prescribed by the Secretary. If any of the moneys received by the authorized receiving officer of any institute under the provisions of this Act shall by any action or contingency be found by the Secretary to have been improperly diminished, lost, or misapplied, it shall be replaced by the State concerned and until so replaced no subsequent appropriation shall be allotted or paid to any institute of such State.

"Sec. 103. Moneys appropriated pursuant to this Act, in addition to being available for expenses for research, investigations, experiments, and training conducted under authority of this Act, shall also be available for printing and publishing the results thereof and for administrative planning and direction. The institutes are hereby authorized and encouraged to plan and conduct programs financed under this Act in cooperation with each other and with such other agencies and individuals as may contribute to the solution of the water problems involved, and moneys appropriated pursuant to this Act shall be available for paying the necessary expenses of planning, coordinating, and conducting such cooperative research.

"Sec. 104. The Secretary of the Interior is hereby charged with the responsibility for the proper administration of this Act and, after full consultation with other interested Federal agencies, shall prescribe such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out its provisions. He shall require a showing that institutes designated to receive funds have, or may reasonably be expected to have, the capability of doing effective work. He shall furnish such advice and assistance as will best promote the purposes of this Act, participate in coordinating research initiated under this Act by the institutes, indicate to them such lines of inquiry as to him seem most important, and encourage and assist in the establishment and maintenance of cooperation by and between the institutes and between them and other research organizations, the United States Department of the Interior, and other Federal establishments.

"On or before the 1st day of July in each year after the passage of this Act, the Secretary shall ascertain whether the requirements of section 102 have been met as to each State, whether it is entitled to receive its share of the annual appropriations for water resources research under section 100 of this Act, and the amount which it is entitled to receive.

"The Secretary shall make an annual report to the Congress of the receipts and expenditures and work of the institutes in all States under the provisions of this Act. His report shall indicate whether any portion of an appropriation available for allotment to any State has been withheld and, if so, the reasons therefor.

"Sec. 105. Nothing in this Act shall be construed to impair or modify the legal relation existing between any of the colleges or universities under whose direction an institute is established and the government of the State in which it is located, and nothing in this Act shall in any way be construed to authorize Federal control or direction of education at any college or university.

"TITLE II—ADDITIONAL WATER RESOURCES RESEARCH PROGRAMS

"Sec. 200. There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of the Interior $1,000,000 in fiscal year 1965 and $1,000,000 in each of the nine fiscal years thereafter from which he may make grants, contracts, matching, or other arrangements with educational institutions (other than those establishing institutes under title I of this Act), private foundations or other institutions with private firms and individuals; and with local, State and Federal Government agencies, to undertake research into any aspects of water problems related to the mission of the Department of the Interior, which may be deemed desirable and are not otherwise being studied. The Secretary shall submit each such proposed grant, contract, or other arrangement to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and no appropriation shall be made to finance the same until 60 calendar days (which 60 days, however, shall not include days on which either the House of Representatives or the Senate is not in session because of an adjournment of more than three calendar days) after such submission and then only if, within said 60 days, neither the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives nor the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the Senate disapproves the same.

"TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

"Sec. 300. The Secretary of the Interior shall obtain the continuing advice and cooperation of all agencies of the Federal Government concerned with water problems, of State and local governments, and of private institutions and individuals, to assure that the programs authorized in this Act will supplement and not duplicate established water research programs, to stimulate research in otherwise neglected areas, and to contribute to a comprehensive, nationwide program of water and related resources research. He shall make generally available information and reports on projects completed, in progress, or planned under the provisions of this Act, in addition to any direct publication of information by the institutes themselves.

"Sec. 301. Nothing in this Act is intended to give or shall be construed as giving the Secretary of the Interior any authority or surveillance over water resources research conducted by any other agency of the Federal Government, or as repealing, superseding, or diminishing existing authorities or responsibilities of any agency of the Federal Government to plan and conduct, contract for, or assist in research in its areas of responsibility and concern with water resources.

"Sec. 302. Contracts or other arrangements for water resources work authorized under this Act with an institute, educational institution, or non-profit organization may be undertaken without regard to the provisions of section 3684 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 529) when, in the judgment of the Secretary of the Interior, advance payments of initial expense are necessary to facilitate such work.

"Sec. 303. No part of any appropriated funds may be expended pursuant to authorization given by this Act for any scientific or technological research or development activity unless such expenditure is conditioned upon provisions determined by the Secretary of the Interior, with the approval of the Attorney General, to be effective to insure that all information, uses, products, processes, patents, and other developments resulting from that activity will (with such exceptions and limitations the Secretary may determine, after consultation with the Secretary of Defense, to be necessary in the interest of the national defense) be made freely and fully available to the general public. Nothing contained in this subsection shall deprive the owner of any background patent relating to any such activity of any rights which that owner may have under that patent.

"Sec. 304. There shall be established, in such agency and location as the President determines to be desirable, a center for cataloging current and projected scientific research in all fields of water resources. Each Federal agency doing water resources research shall cooperate by providing the cataloging center with information on work underway or scheduled by it. The cataloging center shall classify and maintain for general use a catalog of water resources research and investigation projects in progress or scheduled by all Federal agencies and by such non-Federal agencies of government, colleges, universities, private institutions, firms, and individuals as voluntarily may make such information available.

"Sec. 305. The President shall, by such means as he deems appropriate, clarify agency responsibilities for Federal water resources research and provide for interagency coordination of such research, including the research authorized by this Act. Such coordination shall include (a) continuing review of the adequacy of the Government-wide program in water resources research, (b) identification and elimination of duplication and overlaps between two or more agency programs, (c) identification of technical needs in various water resources research categories, (d) recommendations with respect to allocation of technical effort among the Federal agencies, (e) review of technical manpower needs and findings concerning the technical manpower base of the program, (f) recommendations concerning management policies to improve the quality of the Government-wide research effort, and (g) actions to facilitate interagency communication at management levels.

"Sec. 306. As used in this Act, the term 'State' includes the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico."

And the House agree to the same.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I do not wish to unduly delay the conference report, except that I do wish to take advantage of this opportunity to congratulate the Senator for the magnificent job that he has done in handling this legislation from the very beginning.

This Senator was especially interested in seeing to it that Federal research money under this program could not be used under conditions under which certain private monopolists could use the Federal money for private patents and obtain monopoly rights that would cost the people of this Nation perhaps tens and hundreds of millions of dollars, which would be paying for a second time for research that they had already paid for.

The distinguished chairman of this committee studied this matter. He resisted the House position, in which the House tried to make us give away potentially valuable rights to private monopolists. He stood his ground in the conference. He even went to the extent of importuning House Members to study the merits of the amendment.

I congratulate the Senator. It was a magnificent job. The entire Nation is in the debt of the Senator.

Mr. ANDERSON. I thank the Senator from Louisana for his comments.

WHAT CHIEF JUSTICE WARREN SAID IN 1948

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an editorial entitled "What Warren Said in 1948," published in the Washington Daily News of today.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News, July 2, 1964]

WHAT WARREN SAID IN 1948

The U.S. News & World Report has dug up a speech Earl Warren gave in 1948, when he was Governor of California, directly opposing the views he and a majority of the Supreme Court have just written into law in the highly controversial State legislature reapportionment cases.

At the time, when Mr. Warren also was the Republican nominee for Vice President, California was considering a proposal to apportion the State senate by population—the procedure which the Warren Court majority ruled on June 15 of this year must be followed throughout the country.

Said Governor Warren on October 29, 1948, at Merced, Calif., according to U.S. News & World Report:

"Many California counties are far more important in the life of the State than their population bears to the entire population of the State. It is for this reason that I have never been in favor of restricting the representation in the senate to a strictly population basis.

"It is the same reason that the Founding Fathers of our country gave balanced representation to the States of the Union—equal representation in one house and proportionate representation based on population in the other.

"Moves have been made to upset the balanced representation in our State, even though it served us well and is strictly in accord with American tradition and the pattern of our National Government.

"There was a time when California was completely dominated by boss rule. The liberal election laws and legislative reapportionment of the system have liberated us from such domination. Any weakening of the laws would invite a return to boss rule which we are now happily rid of.

"Our State has made almost unbelievable progress under our present system of legislative representation. I believe we should keep it."

Governor Warren's views of 1948 made good sense, in our opinion, and still do—the 1964 U.S. Supreme Court decision to the contrary notwithstanding.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. He made more sense then than he does today.

NASA AUTHORIZATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1965—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10456) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and administrative operations, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of today.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, the total amount authorized by the House bill was $5,193,810,500. The total amount authorized by the Senate amendments was $5,246,293,250. This amounted to an increase over the House bill of $52,482,750. As a result of the action of the conferees the total amount agreed to is $5,227,506,000. This figure represented a total of $18,787,250 less than had been approved by the Senate amendments and $33,695,500 more than had been approved by the House bill. The final total is $76,494,000 less than the amount requested by NASA in its budget request.

Mr. President, I would like to ask unanimous consent to insert at this time in the Record a summary of the action taken by the conferees with respect to the amendments made by the Senate and a table showing the action of the conferees with respect to the individual amendments. I hope that the conferees report will be agreed to.

There being no objection, the summary and table were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Summary of Conference Action

Amendments Nos. 1 and 2: Amendments Nos. 1 and 2 are conforming amendments reflecting the total revised authorizations resulting from the actions of the conferees.

Amendment No. 3: NASA requested a total of $26 million to fund its advanced missions program which is designed to plan an extension of the national space capability. The House reduced this amount by $3,900,000 and this amount was restored by the Senate. The managers on the part of the House agreed to this restoration. Thus, the total amount approved for advanced missions program is $26 million.

Amendment No. 4: NASA requested $190,200,000 for the geophysics and astronomy program. The House bill reduced this amount to $174,200,000, representing reductions in the Orbiting Astronomical Observatory, Orbiting Solar Observatory and Orbiting Geophysical Observatory projects. The Senate amendment No. 4 concurred in the reductions in the Orbiting Astronomical Observatory and Orbiting Solar Observatory projects, but restored the full amount of the House reduction in the Orbiting Geophysical Observatory project. The House bill provided for a reduction of $6,500,000 for this project from a total request of $55,400,000.

The restoration was made by the Senate because of persuasive NASA testimony that the launching of two observatories each year was necessary for the timely and proper phasing of support to the Apollo program. The managers on the part of the House agreed to a limited restoration of $3,250,000, instead of the $6,500,000 included in the Senate amendment No. 4. The managers on the part of the House stipulated, and the Senate conferees agreed that this limited restoration would be used only for the sixth planned geophysical observatory and that action on subsequent observatories would be deferred until future year presentations.

Amendment No. 5: NASA requested $300,400,000 for the lunar and planetary exploration program. The House bill reduced this amount to $282,100,000, representing a reduction of $12,300,000 in the Surveyor project and $5 million in the Lunar Orbiter project. The Senate version of the bill restored $12,300,000 for the Surveyor project, but concurred with the House reduction of $5 million in the Lunar Orbiter project.

The Senate conferees, taking into consideration recent delays in scheduling, agreed to accept the lower authorization made by the House resulting in a $12,300,000 reduction from NASA's original request for the lunar and planetary exploration program.

Amendment No. 6: NASA requested $46 million for the sustaining university program. The House bill authorized the entire amount. The Senate amendment No. 6 reduced this amount by $6 million for the purpose of stabilizing this program at the funding level of fiscal year 1964; that is, $40 million.

The managers on the part of the House insisted on the restoration of this $6 million on the basis that the requested amount represented a very modest increase in the level of effort in this important program and that any reduction would result in disruption of long-term planning. The conferees on the part of the Senate receded and agreed to the original House action.

Amendment No. 7: NASA requested $267,900,000 for tracking and data acquisition. The House bill approved a total authorization of $255,900,000, reducing this item by $12 million. Senate amendment No. 7 restored $9,500,000 of this reduction. In view of additional NASA testimony presented to the Senate on this item, the managers on the part of the House agreed to a limited restoration of $6 million. Of these funds, $2,500,000 is to be applied to the equipments and components portion of the program, and $3,500,000 is to be applied to network operations. The total amount authorized for this item is $261,900,000.

Amendment No. 8: This is a conforming amendment which specifies the revised total authorization for construction of facilities resulting from the restoration of funds included in Senate amendments Nos. 9 and 11 through 16.

Amendment No. 9: NASA requested $2,630,000 for the construction of a flight simulator for the advanced aircraft facility at Ames Research Center. The House deferred this project. The Senate amendment No. 9 restored this item. Testimony taken by the Senate subsequent to the House action convinced the managers on the part of the House that a need exists for this simulator in order to conduct experiments in connection with supersonic transports and to meet requirements of FAA and DOD. Consequently, the managers on the part of the House receded and agreed to the restoration of this item.

Amendment No. 10: The Senate amendment specifies the location of the Electronics Research Center as the Boston, Mass., area.

Amendments Nos. 11 through 16: NASA requested $224,910,000 for the Office of Manned Space Flight for construction of facilities. The House reduced this amount by $21,491,000. The Senate amendments Nos. 11 through 16 restored $10,245,500 of this amount. In conference, the managers on the part of the House agreed that the House reduction was too severe because the major portion of the facilities are operational in nature and are in support of the flight schedules for Gemini and Apollo. Consequently, the House receded and agreed to the restoration of these construction items. Further, the conferees recognized the need for public facilities at the John F. Kennedy Space Center. It is the sense of the conferees that the restored funds will allow start of construction of the necessary public facilities.

An additional restoration of $1,670,000 for an Apollo Network Ground Station in the Northwest Pacific area contained in Senate amendment No. 16 was originally deferred by the House. Subsequently, NASA selected a site at Guam for this tracking station. Later testimony before the Senate showed that construction of this station must be started at once if it is to be operational when needed. In view of the foregoing, the managers on the part of the House receded and agreed to the restoration.

Amendment No. 17: NASA requested $641 million for administrative operations. The House approved $617,525,500. The Senate amendment No. 17 restored $11,737,250. The House conferees receded and agreed to a restoration of $6 million of this $11,737,250. The total reduction is therefore $17,474,500, resulting in an authorization of $623,525,500 for administrative operations.

Amendment No. 18: This is a conforming amendment which revises the ceiling related to construction of facilities in keeping with the actions of the conferees.

Action of conference committee on NASA authorization request for fiscal year 1965 (H.R. 10456)

	Budget request	House approved	Senate approved	Conference committee approved (June 30, 1964)
Research and development:				
Gemini	$308,400,000	$308,400,000	$308,400,000	$308,400,000
Apollo	2,677,500,000	2,677,500,000	2,677,500,000	2,677,500,000
Advanced missions	26,000,000	22,100,000	26,000,000	26,000,000
Geophysics and astronomy	190,200,000	174,200,000	180,700,000	177,450,000
Lunar and planetary exploration	300,400,000	283,100,000	295,400,000	283,100,000
Sustaining university program	46,000,000	46,000,000	40,000,000	46,000,000
Launch vehicle development	128,200,000	128,200,000	128,200,000	128,200,000
Bioscience	31,000,000	31,000,000	31,000,000	31,000,000
Meteorological satellites	37,500,000	37,500,000	37,500,000	37,500,000
Communication satellites	12,600,000	11,400,000	11,400,000	11,400,000
Advanced technological satellites	31,000,000	31,000,000	31,000,000	31,000,000
Basic research	21,000,000	21,000,000	21,000,000	21,000,000
Space vehicles systems	38,800,000	37,000,000	37,000,000	37,000,000
Electronic systems	28,400,000	27,000,000	27,000,000	27,000,000
Human factor systems	16,200,000	15,500,000	15,500,000	15,500,000
Nuclear-electric systems	48,100,000	47,100,000	47,100,000	47,100,000
Nuclear rockets	58,000,000	57,000,000	57,000,000	57,000,000
Chemical propulsion	59,800,000	62,800,000	62,800,000	62,800,000
Space power	13,000,000	12,500,000	12,500,000	12,500,000
Aeronautics	37,000,000	37,000,000	37,000,000	37,000,000
Tracking and data acquisition	267,900,000	255,900,000	265,400,000	261,900,000
Technology utilization	5,000,000	4,750,000	4,750,000	4,750,000
Total	4,382,000,000	4,327,950,000	4,354,150,000	4,341,100,000
Administrative operations	641,000,000	617,525,500	629,262,750	623,525,500
Construction of facilities:				
Ames Research Center	6,081,000	3,038,000	5,668,000	5,668,000
Electronics Research Center	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
Goddard Space Flight Center	1,300,000	1,221,000	1,221,000	1,221,000
Jet Propulsion Laboratory	3,714,000	3,582,000	3,582,000	3,582,000
John F. Kennedy Space Center	[1] 91,561,000	83,594,000	87,070,000	87,070,000
Langley Research Center	4,454,000	3,938,000	3,938,000	3,938,000
Lewis Research Center	810,000	770,000	770,000	770,000
Manned Spacecraft Center	25,166,000	22,649,000	23,907,500	23,907,500
Marshall Space Flight Center	15,288,000	13,759,000	14,523,500	14,523,500
Michoud Plant	6,534,000	5,881,000	6,207,500	6,207,500
Mississippi Test Facility	61,991,000	55,792,000	58,891,500	58,891,500
Wallops Station	1,804,000	1,749,000	1,749,000	1,749,000
Various locations	[1] 37,297,000	32,362,000	35,352,500	35,352,500
Facility planning and design	15,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
Total	281,000,000	248,335,000	262,880,500	262,880,500
Grand total	5,304,000,000	5,193,810,500	5,246,293,250	5,227,506,000

	Research and development	Construction of facilities	Administrative	Total
Total	$4,341,100,000	$262,880,500	$623,525,500	$5,227,506,000
Less than NASA request	40,900,000	18,119,500	17,474,500	76,494,000
Less than Senate approved	13,050,000	0	5,737,250	18,787,250
More than House approved	13,150,000	14,545,500	6,000,000	33,695,500

[1] Original budget request showed $300,000 less for John F. Kennedy Space Center and $300,000 more for various locations. House and Senate action include an Apollo network ground station in the John F. Kennedy Space Center budget item.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, I thank the able Senator from Missouri. I was detained in connection with the work in Alaska. I asked the able Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] to take charge of the hearings on the NASA authorization bill. With the assistance of the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] and others, he did a magnificent job. I thank him for the fine service which he rendered.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I deeply appreciate the remarks of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, the chairman of the Committee on Aeronautics and Space Sciences. Under his leadership, things are not difficult.

I should also like to express my appreciation to the senior Senator from Maine for her unvarying wise counsel and constructive thinking in respect to the bill.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I move that the conference report be agreed to.

The report was agreed to.

WOLFGANG SEIDL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1080, the bill H.R. 6385.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H.R. 6385) for the relief of Wolfgang Seidl.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

KEITH HILLS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1081, the bill H.R. 10407.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H.R. 10407) for the relief of Keith Hills.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

DR. JORGE A. PICAZA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1084, the bill S. 2730.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 2730) for the relief of Dr. Jorge A. Picaza.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, in line 8, after the word "since", to strike out "August 1962" and insert "June 19, 1944"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Doctor Jorge A. Picaza may be naturalized upon compliance with all of the requirements of title III of the Immigration and Nationality Act, except that no period of residence or physical presence within the United States or any State shall be required in addition to his residence and physical presence within the United States since June 19, 1944.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

GIUSEPPE DICENSO

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate to proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1085, the bill S. 2205.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 2205) for the relief of Giuseppe DiCenso.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments in line 7, after the word "by", to strike out "Mr. and", and in the same line, after the name "DiCenso", to strike out "citizens" and insert "a citizen"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Giuseppe DiCenso may be classified as an eligible orphan within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of that Act, upon approval of a petition filed in his behalf by Mrs. Antonio DiCenso, a citizen of the United States, pursuant to section 205(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, subject to all the conditions in that section relating to eligible orphans.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

FLOOD CONTROL SURVEY OF FRIO RIVER, TEX.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1099, the bill H.R. 5478.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H.R. 5478) authorizing a survey of the Frio River in the vicinity of Three Rivers, Tex., in the interest of flood control and allied purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1157), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF BILL

The purpose of the bill is to authorize the Secretary of the Army to cause a survey of the Frio River in the vicinity of Three Rivers, Tex., to be made under the direction of the Chief of Engineers in the interest of flood control and allied purposes.

GENERAL STATEMENT

The Frio River is one of the major tributaries of the Nueces River. It has a drainage area of about 6,750 square miles. The Atascosa River, a tributary of the Frio River, with a drainage area of about 1,200 square miles, enters the Frio River at the town of Three Rivers.

The town of Three Rivers, with a population of 1,932, suffers from flooding from rains on the watershed of the Frio River or the Atascosa River, and, immediately following a flood, suffers a water shortage. Due to the fact that the floor of the alluvial valley of these streams on which the town is located is very little above the bed of the streams, the flooding of either stream can cause flooding of the town, and coincidental flooding of the streams causes serious flooding, and heavy damage.

Local interests desire assistance to provide flood protection to the town by construction of a reservoir on the Frio River in the Tilden-Fowlerton area, and levees and flood control channels in the immediate vicinity. Secondary benefits include water supply.

NEED FOR LEGISLATION

The Chief of Engineers has never submitted a report on the flood problems in the basin to the Congress, thus a review of the basin for flood control cannot be authorized by a committee resolution, as is normally done in cases of this nature. The only procedure by which the Corps of Engineers can be directed to make the necessary study of this particular area for the purpose desired is by a legislative act.

COST TO THE UNITED STATES IF LEGISLATION IS ENACTED

Enactment of this legislation will result in a cost to the Federal Government of $75,000.

COMMITTEE VIEWS

It is the policy of the committee in instances where legislation is required to authorize survey reports, to include such items in an omnibus rivers and harbors and flood control bill. The committee desires to make it clear that in approving this legislation, it is not departing from this policy. However, since omnibus legislation is not scheduled for consideration this year, and in view of the constant flood threat that exists at the town of Three Rivers, Tex., the committee has taken favorable action on this legislation.

AGENCY COMMENTS

In testimony before the House Public Works Committee, the Corps of Engineers has recommended a study of the Frio River in the vicinity of Three Rivers, Tex.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

FLOOD CONTROL SURVEY OF CEDAR BAYOU, TEX.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1100, the bill H.R. 6923.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H.R. 6923) authorizing a survey of Cedar Bayou, Tex., in the interest of flood control and allied purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1158), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF BILL

The purpose of H.R. 6923 is to authorize the Secretary of the Army to cause a survey of Cedar Bayou, Tex., to be made under the direction of the Chief of Engineers, in the interest of flood control, navigation, major drainage, and related water uses coordinated with related land resources.

GENERAL STATEMENT

Cedar Bayou is a small coastal stream lying east of the Lower San Jacinto River Basin, and west of the Lower Trinity River Basin. The stream rises in the southwestern part of Liberty County and flows about 45 miles in a southerly direction to its mouth in upper Galveston Bay. Its drainage area is about 183 square miles.

A navigation channel 10 feet deep and 100 feet wide from the Houston ship channel across San Jacinto Bay and to a point about 11 miles above the mouth of Cedar Bayou was authorized in the River and Harbor Act of 1930. The portion across the bay, and about 1 mile above the mouth of Cedar Bayou, including brush and stone jetties at the mouth of the bayou, has been completed at a cost of about $25,000. The remainder of the project is inactive. Portions of the stream have been improved by local interests for flood control purposes.

A portion of the city of Baytown, Tex., with a 1960 population of 28,159, is the only urban area in the watershed. Development in the area is increasing and is encroaching on the flood plain. The flood control work performed by local interests to date consists of localized improvements, and does not constitute part of an overall coordinated plan. The rapid development of the area surrounding the city of Houston appears to justify the need for a thorough investigation of the Cedar Bayou watershed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

INCREASED MILEAGE BY A STATE OF ITS FEDERAL-AID PRIMARY SYSTEM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1101, Senate bill 1282.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 1282) to permit a State to increase the mileage of its Federal-aid primary system when provision is made for the completion and maintenance of 75 percent thereof.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection 103(b) of title 23, United States Code, is amended by deleting the figure "90" wherever it appears therein, and inserting in lieu thereof the figure "75".

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1159), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

S. 1282 would permit a State to increase its Federal-aid primary system mileage when provision is made for the completion and maintenance of 75 percent thereof, rather than 90 percent as prescribed by present statute.

HEARINGS

Hearings were held on S. 1282 on May 18 and May 20, 1964, by the Subcommittee on Public Roads of the Committee on Public Works, during which time testimony was received from Senator Mike Mansfield, Senator Lee Metcalf, Federal Highway Administrator Rex M. Whitton, and Maj. Gen. Louis W. Prentiss (U.S. Army, retired) of the American Road Builders Association.

The committee was informed of the need for extension of the primary system in Montana in order to provide a north-south road in the eastern part of the State, and it was indicated that perhaps some other Western States with large land areas and relatively small populations may experience similar problems.

The Bureau of Public Roads opposed the proposed measure on the grounds that the 90-percent limitation under the present statute has worked well since its enactment some 40 years ago, and that allowing a State to increase its primary mileage upon provision for completion of 75 percent of its system would "tend to dissipate Federal-aid funds over a substantially larger primary system, rather than concentrating them for maximum effectiveness on presently needed construction."

However, further testimony from the Bureau of Public Roads indicated that in practice such a tendency would probably not be evident. It was noted that the change in the criteria for expansion of the Federal-aid primary system from the present 90 to 75 percent as proposed by S. 1282 would permit approval of additional increments of mileage for most, if not all, of the States at the present time. However, such a change would have no significance to a large majority of the States because there now exist sufficient balances of unallocated mileage to accommodate system expansions without a change in this criteria. In all but five States the unused balance of allowable Federal-aid primary mileage exceeds 100 miles. The five States and their present unused balances of allowable mileage follow:

Montana	0
New Hampshire	21
Tennessee	48
Vermont	22
West Virginia	87

The committee was informed that applications for 1-percent increments under the present statute were approved by the Bureau of Public Roads for the State of Arizona in 1962, for the State of California in 1961, and for the State of Mississippi in 1957. All other applications from the States for mileage increases in their primary systems were concentrated during the 1930's and 1940's.

The committee was further informed by the representative of the roadbuilding industry that with the development of the Interstate System some States may need not only an acceleration of the construction program on the primary and secondary highways, "but also a realinement of the primary system to bring it into the best position to support the Interstate."

S. 1282 would authorize no additional funds, nor would it increase any State's apportionment.

COMMITTEE VIEWS

The committee finds that on careful examination of the balances of unallocated mileage available to all but five of the States, and in view of the infrequent applications by the States for additional increments, there is little reason to expect that enactment of S. 1282 would tend to dissipate Federal-aid funds. In fact, there is little likelihood that more than two or three of the States would take advantage of the proposed amendment.

However, for these States, enactment of S. 1282 would be of significant assistance by enabling the State to operate with greater flexibility within the present limitation of its apportionment of funds. The committee therefore recommends early enactment of the proposed measure.

FEDERAL COST

There will be no additional cost to the Government of the United States incurred by enactment of S. 1282.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

PLANNING AND COORDINATION OF THE GREAT RIVER ROAD

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1102, Senate bill 1593.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The bill will be stated by title.

The **CHIEF CLERK.** A bill (S. 1593) to amend section 14 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1954 concerning the interstate planning and coordination of the Great River Road.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 14 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 70), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"For the purpose of expediting the interstate planning and coordination of a continuous Great River Road and appurtenances thereto traversing the Mississippi Valley from Canada to the Gulf of Mexico in general conformity with the provisions of title 23, United States Code, and with the recommended plan set forth in the joint report submitted to the Congress November 28, 1951, by the Secretaries of Commerce and Interior pursuant to the Act of August 24, 1949 (Public Law 262, Eighty-first Congress), there is hereby authorized to be expended by the Secretary of Commerce from general administrative funds not to exceed $500,000; the amount expended under this section shall be apportioned among the ten States bordering the Mississippi River on the basis of their relative needs as determined by the Secretary of Commerce."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1160) explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of S. 1593 is to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to expend an additional $250,000 from general administrative funds, for Federal assistance to the States in planning the Great River Road. The bill would amend section 14 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1954 concerning interstate planning and coordination of the Great River Road, increasing the original expenditure authority from $250,000 to $500,000.

GENERAL STATEMENT

The Great River Road (Mississippi River Parkway) envisions a scenic parkway up the historic Mississippi Valley from the Gulf of Mexico to the lake country of Minnesota, which would connect the Trans-Canadian Highway leading to Alaska and the Atlantic seaboard with the great southern highway system around the Gulf of Mexico. Running along both banks of the Mississippi River for 2,470 miles, the route would link the extremes of the North and South American continents by following both shores of the Mississippi River.

The Great River Road would be a scenic parkway, not a high-speed turnpike. It will be designed to enhance the beauty of the Mississippi Valley by preserving the countryside and by restricting roadside development.

Federal assistance to the States has been conducted under authority of the act of 1954 in the form of studies and reports on general route locations. The original $250,000 was apportioned to the 10 States bordering the Mississippi River in proportion to the amount allocated by the respective States for the improvement and expansion of existing sections of the highway project as approved by the Secretary of Commerce and other public agencies involved. In certain States the studies have been completed or are in progress in delineating needed land acquisitions, scenic easements, and other needs appurtenant to the proposed parkway. This legislation provides that the $250,000 be allocated to the States on the basis of relative need in order to assure that the planning work will proceed in a uniform manner in pursuit of the objectives of the 1954 provision.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEARS 1966 AND 1967 FOR CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN HIGHWAYS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1104 (H.R. 10503).

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The bill will be stated by title.

The **CHIEF CLERK.** A bill (H.R. 10503) to authorize appropriations for the fiscal years 1966 and 1967 for the construction of certain highways in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code, and for other purposes.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Works, with amendments on page 3, line 6, after the word "highways,", to strike out "$3,000,000" and insert "$9,000,000"; in line 7, after the word "and", to strike out "$3,000,000" and insert "$9,000,000"; and on page 4, after line 5, to insert:

> (d) The first sentence of subsection (a) of section 205 of title 23, United States Code, is amended to read as follows: "Funds available for forest development roads and trails shall be used by the Secretary of Agriculture to pay for the costs of construction and maintenance thereof, including roads and trails on experimental and other areas under Forest Service administration."

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. RANDOLPH. This measure provides for the usual biennial authorizations for the A–B–C Federal-aid highway program, for fiscal years 1966 and 1967, as well as authorizations for these fiscal years for the several categories of Federal domain roads.

The President's request for the Federal-aid highway program was for $975 million for each of the fiscal years of 1966 and 1967. However, as Members of the Senate will recall from the legislative history of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 and subsequent legislation, it was the intent of Congress that there should be progressive increases of $25 million each year in funds authorized for the A–B–C program until an annual authorization of $1 billion is reached. The Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1962 authorized $950 million for this program for fiscal 1964 and $975 million for fiscal 1965. In accordance with the intent of Congress in prior Federal-aid highway legislation, the House of Representatives this year has passed legislation authorizing $1 billion for primary and secondary roads and their urban extensions.

Mr. President, I notice the presence in the Chamber of the able chairman of the Committee on Public Works, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNamara] who has given effective leadership to the committee, and the able Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller], who is a conscientious and always constructive member of the committee. The Committee on Public Works has concurred in this action and recommends the $1 billion authorization to the Senate.

The pending measure does not provide for authorizations for the Interstate System, inasmuch as the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1961 provided a revised schedule of authorizations for that system through fiscal year 1971.

The present bill does, however, draw from the same source of funds as that which finances the Federal share of the Interstate System—that is, the highway trust fund created by the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956. The Committee on Public Works was informed by officials of the Department of Commerce that the highway trust fund is in sound condition and that the highway program is on schedule in relation to the revenues available in the fund. Since July 1, 1956, revenues accruing to the fund have totaled $20,105 million, and expenditures have totaled $19,520 million. On May 1, 1964, the balance in the highway trust fund was $585 million.

The Federal-aid highways, for which authorizations are requested in this bill, extend into every county in the United States. The Federal-aid primary system comprises some 224,630 miles, exclusive of Interstate System mileage, of which 203,298 miles are in rural areas and 21,332 miles are in urban areas. The Federal-aid secondary system consists of 621,189 miles, including 587,659 rural miles, and 16,777 miles of urban extensions. Thus, the total mileage of highways covered under the A–B–C program is over 845,000 miles in systems which carry almost half of all the highway traffic in the Nation.

H.R. 10503 provides the customary formula of allocation for this program, 45 percent for projects on the Federal-aid primary system, 30 percent for projects on the secondary system, and 25 percent for urban extensions of primary and secondary roads.

Within these three categories, the projects which were underway or authorized on March 31, 1964, totaled $3.9 billion and included construction contracts for more than 21,000 miles. A State-by-State summary of current and completed projects is presented on page 48 of the printed committee hearings. I would also draw the attention of the Members to pages 49 and 50 of the same volume, for the approximate apportionments to each of the States of the funds authorized under S. 2520, a bill similar to H.R. 10503. Since the Committee on Public Works conducted its hearings on the Senate bill, which authorized $25 million less than the measure before us, the actual apportionments to each of the States will be slightly greater than the amounts listed on pages 49 and 50. The difference will be the increment of the particular State's portion of the additional $25 million.

In addition to the $1 billion authorization for the Federal-aid A–B–C program for each of the fiscal years of 1966 and 1967, H.R. 10503 authorizes funds for seven categories of public domain roads. These funds are not drawn from the highway trust fund, but from the budgets of the individual departments which have jurisdiction over the public lands traversed by the respective roads.

H.R. 10503 would authorize $33 million for forest highways for each of the fiscal years of 1966 and 1967. These are surfaced, generally two-lane highways, traversing the national forests and are incorporated in the systems of other Federal-aid, State, and county highways in and adjacent to the national forests. Funds available for forest highways are used by the Secretary of Commerce for construction and maintenance, though the individual State highway departments administer these highways in cooperation with the U.S. Forest Service. There are about 25,500 miles of roads on the forest highway system, which is widely used for recreational purposes as well as transporting forest products.

For forest development roads and trails, H.R. 10503 authorizes $85 million for each of the fiscal years of 1966 and 1967. Forest development roads provide access to national forest lands for the protection, resource development, and multiple-use management of the forests, including increasingly heavy recreational use. As of June 30, 1963, there were 186,241 miles of road and 104,522 miles of trails in the forest development system. It is estimated that when completed the system will consist of approximately 540,000 miles of access roads and about 80,000 miles of trails, with many of the trails having been upgraded to roads.

For public lands development roads and trails, $2 million is authorized for each of the fiscal years of 1966 and 1967. This is a new category of roads authorized by the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1962 and administered by the Bureau of Land Management of the Department of the Interior. H.R. 10503 authorizes the same amount as was authorized for these roads in 1964 and $2 million less than was authorized for fiscal 1965.

For roads and trails in national parks, H.R. 10503 authorizes $23 million for each of the fiscal years of 1966 and 1967, as compared with $25 million authorized for fiscal 1965. These roads and trails are under the jurisdiction of the National Park Service of the Department of the Interior.

Also under the jurisdiction of the Park Service, are parkways, for which H.R. 10503 authorizes $11 million for each of the fiscal years of 1966 and 1967. For fiscal year 1965, $16 million was authorized for parkways.

H.R. 10503 authorizes $18 million for each of the fiscal years 1966 and 1967 for Indian reservation roads and bridges. The road program for the Indian reservations is a vital component of the attack on Indian poverty and serves such diverse activities as the consolidation of schools and the development of mineral, timber, and cattle resources.

One of the two amendments made by the Senate Committee on Public Works was in raising the authorization for public lands highways, the last category of public domain roads. In the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1962, the Congress authorized $9 million for these roads for fiscal 1965. Your committee this year raised the authorization from $3 million to $9 million, thus restoring it to the level authorized for fiscal 1965. This amendment was offered by the distinguished junior Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss] after the Subcommittee on Public Roads and the full committee had considered carefully the information that there are requests from 30 highway departments requesting approval to finance eligible projects with an estimated total cost in excess of $66 million.

It was obvious to the committee that the $3 million originally requested would not even enable the highway departments to maintain activity on those projects already authorized and under construction, such as the Skyline Drive in Oklahoma and Arkansas, the Highland Scenic Highway in West Virginia, and the Tellico Plains-Robbinsville Road in Tennessee and North Carolina and others. Nor would the lesser figure allow us to meet the urgent needs of the State of Utah, as effectively presented in committee by Senator Moss, for the development of access roads to the newly created Glen Canyon Recreation Area in southeastern Utah. For these reasons the committee strongly recommends the authorization of $9 million for public lands highways for each of the fiscal years of 1966 and 1967.

Section 3 of the bill provides a technical amendment regarding the final completion date of the Interstate System, and would bring the language of that part of the United States Code in conformity with the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1961.

Section 4 provides technical amendments in paragraph (a) and in paragraph (c).

Paragraph (b) of this section would provide for the use of public lands highways funds for adjacent vehicular parking areas and for sanitary, water, and fire control facilities. This is an identical provision to those for forest highway funds and forest development road funds.

Section 4, paragraph (d), embodies the second of the two amendments which the Committee on Public Works has made on H.R. 10503 as it was received from the House of Representatives. This provision would allow the Forest Service to use forest development roads money on the national grasslands which are also under their jurisdiction. There are some 3.8 million acres in 19 national grasslands which are exposed to increasing recreational use and for which authority is needed to expend funds on roads. This amendment was sponsored by the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGOVERN] and was supported in the hearings by representatives of the U.S. Forest Service.

Mr. President, that completes the report from the Committee on Public Works on H.R. 10503. The committee recommends its passage without further amendments.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator obviously subscribes to the principle that a trust fund should be in existence, financed by those persons who use the highways.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I subscribe to the principle that user taxes should be committed to such a fund.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I would assume that on the basis of what has been said, the Senator from West Virginia would be loath to eliminate user taxes so long as they are used to improve the general service of the highway users.

Mr. RANDOLPH. That is correct. It is on the foundation of users taxes that our great highway program is able to proceed on a pay-as-you-go basis.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I agree with that completely. I should like now to ask the following question: If that principle is sound with respect to the use of highways, what is the Senator's opinion concerning the advisability of establishing a trust fund that would finance the mass transportation system of our country? If the Senator has not given study to that subject, I shall not press the question.

Mr. RANDOLPH. It is a very complex question and one on which I do not think I could give adequate answer to my cherished friend the Senator from Ohio or to myself which would be meaningful at this time. As the Senator from Ohio knows, the Congress deliberated at great length before arriving at the present formula for the highway trust fund which was established by the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I can understand that. I deeply admire the frankness of the Senator from West Virginia.

Yesterday I submitted a resolution providing for the establishment of a committee in the budgetary department of our Government to make a study to determine whether or not there could be established a trust fund financing the mass transportation system on the same basis that a trust fund was established for the development of the Interstate Highway System.

I am delighted at how my majority leader is looking at me——

Mr. MANSFIELD. With interest and pleasure.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I hope it is with affirmation, also.

Mr. RANDOLPH. It might be possible for the Senator from West Virginia to join the Senator, if he would permit, as a cosponsor of such a proposal. I had not known of the resolution until now, but I shall give careful study to its provision within the next few days. Transportation problems are becoming increasingly acute with the congestion in metropolitan areas and the constant increase in population.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I compliment him.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I commend the Senator from West Virginia for what I believe are intense efforts to serve the people of his State.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I thank the Senator from Ohio, who is one of the most conscientious Members of this body.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

CIVIL RIGHTS—A CONCISE EXPLANATION OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on Monday, May 25, I inserted in the RECORD "A Concise Explanation of H.R. 7152." The purpose of that statement was to provide Americans with a short and understandable explanation of the civil rights bill as it was passed by the House of Representatives.

The Civil Rights Act of 1964 will be the law of the land by today. I believe that the American people may find useful a similarly brief explanation of the act. On May 25, I said I would offer a revised and updated explanation of the act; and I do so now. I ask unanimous consent that this concise explanation of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A CONCISE EXPLANATION OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964

CHRONOLOGY OF CONGRESSIONAL ACTION

H.R. 7152 was reported to the House of Representatives on November 20, 1963, by the Committee on the Judiciary after one of its subcommittees had held 22 days of hearings with 101 witnesses and 17 days of executive sessions on a large number of proposals relating to the subjects covered by the bill and to still others not covered by it. The full committee, in turn, held 7 days of executive sessions. Title VII of the bill, relating to equal employment opportunity, is similar to bills which had been considered and reported favorably to the House by the Committee on Education and Labor in 1962 and 1963.

The House of Representatives debated H.R. 7152 for 9 days and passed the bill on February 10 by a vote of 290 to 130. The Senate began debating civil rights on March 9. The Senate Committee on Commerce and the Committee on the Judiciary had held hearings on similar measures during 1963. The Senate imposed cloture on debate on June 10 by a vote of 71 to 29 and passed the bill on June 17 by a vote of 76 to 18. The House of Representatives agreed to Senate amendments on July 2 and President Johnson signed the Civil Rights Act of 1964 on July 2.

WHAT THE ACT PROVIDES AND WHAT IT DOES NOT PROVIDE

Title I—Protection of voting rights

The title provides that tests, standards, etc., which are used to qualify voters in Federal elections may not be used to discriminate on the basis of race, that registration of voters in Federal elections may not be denied because of immaterial errors or omissions in applications, that literacy tests must be administered in writing except where special agreements are made between the Attorney General and State or local officials to administer nonwritten tests to blind or otherwise handicapped people, and that a copy of the literacy test and answers be maintained and given to the applicant upon request. Title I also authorizes the Attorney General or a defendant to ask for trial by a three-judge court in voting cases involving a pattern or practice of discrimination, with provision for direct appeal to the U.S. Supreme Court. Under this title, in any voting rights case a person is presumed to be literate if he has a sixth grade education, but this presumption may be challenged in court by the State—this is called a rebuttable presumption.

The title does not provide that persons not qualified to vote under State law may be permitted to vote. State control over voter qualifications is not impaired, except that those qualifications must apply equally to all citizens regardless of race.

Title II—Public accommodations

The title provides that discrimination because of race, color, religion, or national origin is prohibited in specified places of public accommodation, such as hotels, motels, and other lodging places for transients; theaters, motion picture houses, sports arenas and stadiums; restaurants, cafeterias, and other eating places; gas stations; specialty shops and barbershops in hotels covered by the title; and stores with eating facilities covered by the title. The title permits an aggrieved individual to enforce the right of equal access to places of public accommodation through civil suits for injunction. In the case of complaints arising in States which have laws or regulations prohibiting the types of discrimination covered by this title, the complainant must seek the remedies available under those State or local laws before he can initiate suit in Federal court. In the case of complaints arising in States without such laws, the individual may initiate suit immediately in Federal court and the court may refer the case to the Community Relations Service (created by title X) for voluntary settlement during a maximum period of 120 days. The title provides that complaints are to be settled voluntarily or under State or local law wherever possible. The Attorney General may initiate suit only in cases involving a pattern or practice of discrimination in places of public accommodation. He may request permission to intervene in individual suits which are especially important or far reaching. With provision for determining whether specific establishments are covered, the title applies generally to discrimination supported by State action or exercised by establishments whose business operations affect interstate commerce.

The title does not provide for coverage of small roominghouses with fewer than five rooms for rent and in which the proprietor lives. It does not apply to either the rental or sale of private homes, apartments, or other residential units. It does not apply to doctors', dentists', or lawyers' offices. The title does not provide for criminal penalties nor for suits for money damages. It does not provide for any invasion of a businessman's freedom to set his own standards of conduct, dress, and so forth, for customers except that he may not apply those standards in such a way as to discriminate because of race, color, religion, or national origin.

Title III—Desegregation of public facilities

The title provides that the Attorney General may initiate or intervene in suits to desegregate public facilities—that is, publicly owned, operated, or managed parks, hospitals, reading rooms, beaches, and so forth—other than schools where aggrieved persons are unable to sue because they are financially unable to do so or are unable to obtain effective legal representation, or because initiation or continuation of a suit might jeopardize the personal safety, employment or economic standing of aggrieved persons, their families, or their property.

The title does not provide for extension of Federal authority into any new areas; it simply improves the legal remedies designed to afford equal protection of the laws as guaranteed by the 14th amendment. It does not allow the Attorney General to act on his own initiative; he must first receive a written and signed complaint indicating that discrimination has occurred and that the complainant is unable to sue for reasons stated above.

Title IV—Desegregation of public education

The title provides that the Attorney General, after receiving a written complaint, and after having certified that local authorities have had a reasonable time to settle a complaint locally, may initiate or intervene in school desegregation cases where students or parents are unable to sue. The title allows the Commissioner of Education to provide technical assistance, grants, and training institutes to help communities prepare for school desegregation, but only if such assistance is requested by local school authorities. The title specifically excludes from the definition of "desegregation" any transportation or busing of students to end racial imbalance. The Commissioner of Education is directed to conduct a survey and report to the President, within 2 years from the enactment of the bill, on the lack of equal educational opportunities by reason of race, color, religion, or national origin in public educational institutions at all levels.

The title does not provide for any measure of Federal control over private schools or over the hiring and firing of public school teachers, the selection of textbooks, or the choice of curriculum. In fact, control of public school systems remains in the hands of local authorities. The title does not prohibit classification or assignment of pupils for reasons other than race, color, religion, or national origin.

Title V—Commission on Civil Rights

The title provides that the Commission, established by the Civil Rights Act of 1957, is extended for 4 years. The title also gives the Commission authority to serve as a national clearinghouse for information concerning denials of the equal protection of the laws and to investigate charges that patterns or practices of fraud or discrimination exist in Federal elections. Certain minor procedural and technical changes are also included in this title.

The title does not provide any enforcement powers for the Commission. It remains an information-gathering and investigative body, with extensive procedural safeguards for persons involved in investigations of discrimination. The title prohibits the Commission from investigating possible discrimination by fraternal organizations, fraternities, sororities, private clubs, or religious organizations.

Title VI—Nondiscrimination in federally assisted programs

The title provides that no person in the United States shall be excluded from participation in or otherwise discriminated against because of race, color, or national origin under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance other than contracts involving insurance or guarantee. Specifically, the title enables Federal agencies administering programs to terminate or to refuse to grant or to continue assistance under a program in which there has been an express finding of noncompliance by discrimination, but agencies may take such action only after they have attempted to bring about compliance by voluntary means, and only after a hearing. Agency actions to cut off funds may not take effect until 30 days after a report is filed with Congress, and agency actions are subject to judicial review. Any agency rules or regulations issued under this title must be approved by the President.

The title does not provide for action against individuals receiving funds under federally assisted programs—for example, widows, children of veterans, homeowners, farmers, or elderly persons living on social security benefits. The title is directed toward agencies administering such funds in a discriminatory way, not toward recipients themselves. The title does not provide for withdrawal of all Federal assistance to a State or community which discriminates in a particular program.

Title VII—Equal employment opportunity

The title provides that employers, labor unions, and employment agencies whose activities affect interstate commerce are prohibited from discriminating on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin. Discrimination prohibited by this title includes failure or refusal to hire, or fire; discrimination in pay or in terms and conditions of employment; referral, classification, or segregation of employee or of union members; exclusion or expulsion from union membership; discrimination in apprenticeship or training programs; printing or publishing job notices indicating preferences—all based on race, color, religion, sex, or national origin. Such discrimination is defined as unlawful employment practices. The enforcement of provisions dealing with unlawful employment practices is not authorized until 1 year after the act has been passed. During the first year of enforcement, coverage includes employers and unions with 100 or more employees or members, and proceeds in stages over 3 years to include those with 25 or more employees or members.

The title creates a bipartisan, five-member Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, to investigate complaints and to bring about voluntary settlement. If an individual complaint of discrimination occurs in a State or locality with laws prohibiting the same acts of discrimination covered by this title, the State or local enforcement agency must be given up to 60 days (120 days in places where the State or local law has been in effect less than a year) to adjust the complaint or to terminate proceedings on it. Thereafter the complainant may file a charge with the Commission, and the Commission must attempt to bring about voluntary settlement within from 30 to 60 days. Failing voluntary settlement, the Commission must notify the complainant, who then has 30 days to bring civil—not criminal—suit in Federal court.

The court may delay proceedings for up to 60 days pending final action under State or local law or further efforts at conciliation by the Commission. The court may, on application, appoint an attorney for the complainant and permit proceedings without payment of fees or costs. The burden of proof that discrimination has occurred rests with the complainant. The relief available is a court order enjoining the offender from engaging further in discriminatory practices and directing the offender to take appropriate affirmative action; for example, reinstating or hiring employees, with or without back pay. The Attorney General may intervene, with the court's permission, in an individual suit whenever he has reason to believe that a pattern or practice of discrimination prohibited by this title is taking place. The Commission may require employers, labor unions, and employment agencies to keep and preserve records and to make reports which will assist the Commission in carrying out the purposes of the title.

The title does not provide that any preferential treatment in employment shall be given to Negroes or to any other persons or groups. It does not provide that any quota systems may be established to maintain racial balance in employment. In fact, the title prohibits preferential treatment for any particular group. Any person, whether or not a member of a minority group, is permitted to file a complaint of discriminatory employment practices. The title does not provide for the reinstatement or employment of a person, with or without back pay, if he was fired or was refused employment or promotion for any reason other than discrimination prohibited by this title. The title contains no provisions which jeopardize union seniority systems, nor does the title permit the Government to control the internal affairs of employers or labor unions.

Employers continue to be free to establish their own job qualifications provided they do not discriminate because of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin. The title does not prohibit an employer from hiring persons of a particular religion, sex, or national origin where religion, sex, or national origin is a bona fide occupational qualification. The title does not apply to the employment of aliens outside a State, employment of individuals by religious corporations, associations, or societies for religious work, employment of individuals by educational institutions for educational work, employment of Indians by Indian enterprises on or near Indian reservations, nor to nonprofit private membership clubs. The title does not affect any laws creating special rights for veterans.

Title VIII—Registration and voting statistics

The title provides that the Secretary of Commerce shall conduct a survey to compile registration and voting statistics in geographic areas recommended by the Commission on Civil Rights. The survey will include a count of persons of voting age by race, color, and national origin, and a determination of the extent to which such persons are registered to vote and have voted in statewide elections in which Members of the House of Representatives have been nominated or elected since January 1, 1960. The title provides that no person may be compelled to disclose his race, color, national origin, political party affiliation, how he voted or why, and requires that information obtained in the survey be kept confidential.

Titles IX, X, and XI—Removal proceedings in civil rights cases, establishment of a community relations service, and miscellaneous

Title IX provides that the orders of Federal courts sending certain civil rights cases back to State courts shall be reviewable on appeal. The title also provides that the Attorney General may intervene in private suits brought by persons seeking relief from a denial of equal protection of the law because of race, color, religion, or national origin if the Attorney General certifies that the case is of general public importance.

Title X provides for the establishment of a Community Relations Service in the Department of Commerce. The Service will assist local communities in attempting to resolve disputes relating to discriminatory practices. Such assistance can be offered upon the request of local officials or upon the initiative of the Service, but no further powers are provided.

Title XI provides that in any criminal contempt proceedings arising in any cases under the act except voting rights (title I) cases, defendants shall be entitled to a jury trial, and that sentences under criminal contempt proceedings may not exceed 6 months' imprisonment and a $1,000 fine. The title provides that no person may be subjected to both criminal proceedings and criminal contempt proceedings in Federal courts for the same act or omission, and that no person may be convicted for criminal contempt unless it is proved that his act or omission was intentional. The title also provides several customary sections, including an authorization for appropriations to carry out the purposes of the act; a severability clause, which provides that if any provision of the act is held invalid the rest of the act will not be affected; and a standard preemption clause, which provides that nothing in the act shall be construed as indicating congressional intent to occupy the field to the exclusion of State laws on the same subject.

THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the United States has responsibilities and commitments which span the globe. Since the close of World War II, there has been a vast expansion of the American role in world affairs. This increased power, responsibility, and involvement in the affairs of the world have provided a great challenge to the men and women charged with the conduct of our foreign relations. These men and women must constantly be prepared to deal with situations of rapid and far-reaching change. Diplomatic relations today demand more than the classical tools of diplomacy; we need a broad range of skills and experience. The fact that the Foreign Service has been able to provide these needed skills and experience is due in large degree to the members of the Department of State and of the Congress, through whose efforts the modern Foreign Service has evolved.

I am pleased, therefore, to take part in this salute to the Rogers Act on this its 40th anniversary. I congratulate and commend our Foreign Service. Representative Rogers and Assistant Secretary Carr, the fathers of the act, clearly saw that the administrative inefficiency fostered by separate Diplomatic and Consular Services handicapped the effective conduct of our foreign affairs. The Rogers Act, in producing a unified Foreign Service whose members were to be selected and promoted on the basis of merit alone, corrected this problem, and laid the foundation of the dynamic, mobile Foreign Service which we know today. It has served America with competence, loyalty, and patriotic devotion.

This week we celebrate the 40th anniversary of the Rogers Act. It is most appropriate that this act receive our attention, since it forms the basis of the Foreign Service of modern times.

Until 1924 the diplomatic service and the consular service were separate entities—a situation which fostered inefficiency and waste of manpower. As a result of the Rogers Act, there emerged a unified, career Foreign Service with the coordination and spirit necessary to meet the increasing demands made on it.

Our Foreign Service stands as a monument to the efforts of Representative Rogers and former Assistant Secretary of State Carr in fostering the Rogers Act. Their nonpartisan efforts to guarantee the efficient and intelligent conduct of our foreign relations are indeed worthy of commemoration today.

At this time, I wish to quote from my remarks about the Foreign Service, as made in the Senate in November of last year, at the time of the debate on the foreign aid bill:

> In the Foreign Service there are men and women who have given their lives and also the lives of their families to their country. In fact, when the Government hires a Foreign Service officer, it generally gets two for one—both the Foreign Service officer and his wife; and the wives of our Foreign Service officers lead voluntary organizations and do excellent jobs in carrying the philosophy of this country to many parts of the world.
>
> Mr. President, I do not believe that we should "run down" the Foreign Service public servants. If I were a Foreign Service officer, I would deeply resent such an attack. Some of the Foreign Service officers go to parts of the world where a Senator would not be willing to go, even if he were paid 10 times his present salary. The Foreign Service officers go to their posts like soldiers: and I am not going to remain silent when attempts are made to rip the Foreign Service to pieces—to downgrade and attack and criticize it unfairly.
>
> If a Senator is going to criticize, instead of criticizing a whole class of Government employees, he should name the ones to whom he refers. However, I do not think Senators can name very many responsible Foreign Service officers who have "sold out" this country or have been guilty of mismanagement or misconduct or are incompetent.
>
> In the last few years we have done a great deal to elevate the Foreign Service and to improve and raise the standards.
>
> I have a son who hopes to enter the Foreign Service. At this time he is studying for the Foreign Service; and I resent having the Foreign Service criticized in such fashion. I do not believe that is the way to recruit good people for the Foreign Service. I do not want my son to read, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, charges that the Foreign Service is incompetent and wastes millions of dollars.
>
> I demand a bill of particulars. Until the Senator can show me the names of the individuals, and show me the people who have been guilty of the colossal waste charged because they were incompetent or stupid or untrained, I shall not be willing to buy the argument. Until then I resent it. I think it is an unfair argument.

THE PACIFIC NORTHWEST-SOUTHWEST INTERTIE PROPOSAL

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, for many years I have been an enthusiastic supporter of the concept of a Pacific Northwest-Pacific Southwest electric intertie. It is my firm conviction that a system of long-distance electric transmission between the Pacific Northwest and the Southwest must be constructed promptly. The proposals set forth in the report which was transmitted to the Appropriations Committees of Congress by the Secretary of the Interior deserve serious consideration. We cannot afford to waste the great benefits that we lose each day through water that spills over our multipurpose dams in the Pacific Northwest. We are now losing water which could generate electric power that is needed so urgently in nearby regions.

A system of electric power interties between these regions, if properly protected by a "yardstick" of federally generated and transmitted power, could act to eliminate or reduce the pressures for electric rate increases in the Pacific Northwest; it could facilitate our Canadian treaty on power transmission; and it could increase, by as much as 15 percent, the value of Federal investments in power and irrigation in the Western States. It could put to maximum use our power-producing resources, by bringing to a halt the present wastage of excess hydroelectric capacity, amounting to $12 million annually. It could reduce and practically eliminate the dangers of extreme seasonal power shortages in both regions, and could mean enormous economic benefits over the years to the States of these regions.

My present concern over the intertie proposals submitted by the Secretary of the Interior relates to the fact that there is a conspicuous absence of a provision for simultaneous construction by the Federal Government of at least one of the four proposed intertie lines. Heretofore, I have indicated that my preference would be for Federal construction and operation of all of these intertie lines; but I am aware that such construction may not now be politically possible. Accordingly, I am willing to settle for a cooperative effort involving certain private power interests, the city of Los Angeles, and the Federal Government. It is imperative, however, that any such cooperative effort be accompanied by the presence of Federal ownership and operation of the line from the Columbia River to Hoover Dam. Such a line would insure the prevention of monopolistic practices by the private electric utilities.

Prevention of private power monopoly activities necessitates simultaneous construction by the Federal Government of the line to Hoover Dam. According to the plans of the Secretary of the Interior, this particular line would be scheduled for completion in 1971—long after completion of the other three proposed lines into California. Being a realist, I fear that this line, if constructed after the private utility lines and after the completion of the city of Los Angeles line, would never be constructed by the Federal Government. This fear is based upon years of experience in dealing with the activities of private utilities. They have long sought to control, for profit, the transmission of public power generated at multipurpose dams built with the taxpayers' money.

My apprehension concerning the Columbia River-Hoover Dam line is heightened by this statement appearing in the fact sheet issued by the Secretary of the Interior:

> If the Congress desires that the Department of the Interior call for non-Federal proposals to build this line, as it did in the case of the lines to California, we can see no objection to such a procedure.

The same assertion was repeated in the question-and-answer sheet attached to the Secretary's press release accompanying the transmittal of his June 24 report. I note also that on page 25 of the report there appears a similar statement. These sentences can be construed as an escape hatch which could vitiate the merits of the proposed package.

The Senate Appropriations Committee can provide the safeguard I have just suggested if it will recommend that Congress appropriate and direct the expenditure of funds for the fiscal year 1965, to start Federal construction on the 750,000 volt direct-current line from the Columbia River to Hoover Dam.

I cannot overemphasize the importance of having proper electric power yardstick protection in connection with the intertie. In this respect, I am reminded that recently a top private power company executive of the Pacific Northwest was quoted quite candidly in the Wall Street Journal as saying, "Who controls transmission, controls the works." If we give the private utilities either direct or indirect control of the transmission of power under the proposed Pacific Northwest-Pacific Southwest intertie, we might just as well turn over to them at the bus bar the power generated at our great multipurpose dam.

One additional safeguard is needed in this instance: I allude to the importance of a giving to congressional committee an opportunity to examine in minute detail the contracts eventually worked out between the private electric utilities and the Government, relating to power generated over the proposed alternating current lines into California. Also, the committees should have an opportunity to give searching examination to the contract the Government eventually works out with the city of Los Angeles, for the direct-current transmission of power on the third intertie line. I suggest that these contracts be transmitted to the appropriate committees, and that a period of at least 60 days be given the committees to examine the contracts, to assure that proper safeguards for the taxpayers and electric power ratepayers are inherent in them.

In closing, I repeat what I said in the Senate on June 29—namely, that we should scrutinize any intertie proposal from this standpoint. What assurance do we have that the private utilities will give us fair agreements for the wheeling, over their transmission lines, of the power that is generated at dams owned by the American people? We are confronted with a legislative problem when we sanction an intertie arrangement, and leave for future negotiation with the private utilities the working out of the agreements in regard to the wheeling of the power and the protection of public-preference customers. We should carry out our full legislative responsibility in this respect.

TWO PART RETIREMENT SYSTEM FOR NEVADA UNDER SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1023, H.R. 287; and that it be laid before the Senate and made the pending business. There will be no action taken on it. It is merely for the purpose of having some business pending on Monday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill—H.R. 287—to amend title II of the Social Security Act to include Nevada among those States which are permitted to divide their retirement systems into two parts for purposes of obtaining social security coverage under Federal-State agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY NEXT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 32 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, July 6, 1964, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 2, 1964:

U.S. COURT OF CLAIMS

Wilson Cowen, of Maryland, to be chief judge of the U.S. Court of Claims.

U.S. CIRCUIT JUDGE

Abraham L. Freedman, of Pennsylvania, to be U.S. circuit judge, third circuit, vice Herbert F. Goodrich, deceased.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Gen. Earle G. Wheeler, U.S. Army, for appointment as Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 142.

U.S. ARMY

Gen. Barksdale Hamlett, U.S. Army, to be placed on the retired list in the grade of general, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3962.

Lt. Gen. Harold Keith Johnson, U.S. Army, for appointment as Chief of Staff, U.S. Army, in the grade of general.

The following-named officer, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in grade as follows:

Lt. Gen. Creighton Williams Abrams, Jr., O20296, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army), in the grade of general.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JULY 2, 1964

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

The words of Scripture inscribed on our Liberty Bell—Leviticus 25: 10: *Proclaim liberty throughout all the land, unto all the inhabitants thereof.*

O Thou who wert the God of our fathers and their succeeding generations, may our beloved Nation, conceived in sacrifice and dedicated to liberty, inspire and sustain us in our glorious mission of helping to release the hidden splendor of humanity and in leading all mankind into the radiant light of a brighter and better day.

Grant that our American democracy, with its patriotism and love of freedom, may continually bear testimony to that moral and spiritual truth that we must have the greatest respect for the dignity of man, whom Thou hast created in Thine own image and hast endowed with certain inalienable rights which we will safeguard.

On the coming day, may we remember with our tribute of gratitude and praise those great patriots who stated in verbal form their indomitable faith and deepest convictions by signing the Declaration of Independence, and by dedicating to the cause of freedom their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace and may the legislation which we enact here today be in accord with Thy divine will for our beloved country. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 4364) entitled

"An act to provide for the free entry of one mass spectrometer for the use of Oregon State University and one mass spectrometer for the use of Wayne State University," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BYRD of Virginia, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, and Mr. CURTIS to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

WORK PLANS APPROVED UNDER WATERSHED PROTECTION AND FLOOD PREVENTION ACT

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read and referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., July 1, 1964.

The Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the provisions of section 2 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended, the Committee on Public Works has approved the work plans transmitted to you which were referred to this committee. The work plans involved are:

State, watershed, executive communication number; and committee approval:

Georgia, Hiawassee River, No. 2228, July 1, 1964.

Kansas, Muddy Creek, No. 2228, July 1, 1964.

Maine, Presque Isle Stream, No. 2228, July 1, 1964.

Ohio, West Fork Duck Creek, No. 2228, July 1, 1964.

Sincerely yours,
CHARLES A. BUCKLEY,
Member of Congress, Chairman, Committee on Public Works.

CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 789 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution the bill (H.R. 7152) to enforce the constitutional right to vote, to confer jurisdiction upon the district courts of the United States to provide injunctive relief against discrimination in public accommodations, to authorize the Attorney General to institute suits to protect constitutional rights in public facilities and public education, to extend the Commission on Civil Rights, to prevent discrimination in federally assisted programs, to establish a Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendment thereto, be, and the same is hereby taken from the Speaker's table, to the end that the Senate amendment be, and the same is hereby agreed to.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 178]

Avery
Barry
Bennett, Mich.
Broyhill, N.C.
Burton, Utah
Clark
Davis, Ga.
Derwinski
Healey
Hébert
Jarman
Karth
Kilburn
King, Calif.
Lankford
Lesinski
Lloyd
Miller, N.Y.
Nedzi
Norblad
Pilcher
Powell
Purcell
Rogers, Tex.
St Germain
Staggers
Utt

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 402 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file certain privileged reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD after the debate on this resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. Speaker, today the House is about to vote on the first comprehensive and effective civil rights legislation in the history of our Government. House Resolution 789, reported Tuesday by the Rules Committee, presents in general the civil rights bill passed by the House several months ago. The other body made a few necessary major changes in the voting rights, public accommodations, educational, and employment sections of the House bill. These few important changes have been constructive and will greatly aid toward the practical success and enforcement of this legislation. Chairman CELLER, and the gentleman from Ohio, Congressman MCCULLOCH, ranking minority member of the Judiciary Committee, will present to the Members a concise and factual explanation of the Senate changes from the bill passed by the House in February.

Civil rights has been debated in the Congress, pro and con, for weeks, months and for years. Had the "skim milk" civil rights bill enacted in 1957 dealt with this problem as comprehensively, factually and completely as the bill now under consideration, we would have been saved from a lot of embarrassing situations like Little Rock, Birmingham, Jacksonville, and so forth. This bill will be effective and amply provides to make all sections of our Constitution a reality to all American citizens.

Presidents and American statesmen for generations knew in their own minds that civil rights legislation for all citizens had to be enacted some day. When this bill is signed into law it will be our first official start to aid in extending voting equality, educational equality, public facilities equality and citizenship equality to all American citizens. The issue we vote upon today has been neglected and postponed by lack of courage on the part of generations of American statesmen and leaders. Presidents Franklin D. Roosevelt, Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy and now President Johnson have pressed the Congress for action on effective civil rights legislation for a period covering almost 30 years.

Educational advancement of our people with the help of universities, newspapers, radio and television have aroused millions of our citizens to the fact that large sections of our population can no longer be denied all the citizenship privileges which our Constitution has promised for almost two centuries.

Enactment of this legislation will not bring on an immediate civic utopia for everyone tomorrow, next month or next year. It will give our Nation a start with the necessary laws to eventually eliminate second-class citizens in our Nation. Several months ago this legislative body voted 290 to 130 on practically the identical legislation that we are considering this afternoon. Possibly some criticism will be expressed here today concerning the action of the Rules Committee in so diligently and without unnecessary delay in reporting out the resolution last Tuesday. Our only task on Tuesday was to hear the testimony of Chairman CELLER, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCCULLOCH], and other members of the Judiciary Committee explain the changes made by the other body to our House bill. All the necessary testimony was taken from when we convened at 10:30 a.m. to 5 p.m. when the committee by a majority vote agreed to go into executive session and vote on the resolution. Our hearings lasted, with the exception of a couple of interruptions by two quorum calls, 6½ hours.

The records show that this legislation was considered and debated by the House Judiciary Committee, 22 days; by the Rules Committee, 7 days; on the floor of the House several months ago, 6 days, and by the Senate or other body, 83 days.

This bill has been considered by both bodies a total of approximately 114 days. If unnecessary delays, stalling tactics and filibusters were eliminated, this bill could have been disposed of in one-tenth of the time and also have given every Member of both bodies ample opportunity to be heard.

The comment has been made that a precedent was broken when the Rules Committee voted that a committee member in favor of Resolution 789 file the report and present the resolution to the House.

I want it to be understood that the members of the Rules Committee in my judgment were displaying no disregard or lack of confidence in the integrity of our chairman. The majority of our members decided that it was time to call a termination to some of the shenanigans and delays to which the progress of this legislation has been a victim.

I personally felt that our good chairman, by reason of his known and admitted intense opposition to this legislation, could not enthusiastically file the report that this resolution be considered and also bring it up on the floor of the House for debate. Possibly he could have accomplished this task, but not with jubilation or enthusiasm and with any hop-skip-and-jump hilarity. I firmly believe that down in his heart, our good chairman was very happy to let the committee confer this task upon somebody who was enthusiastic and in support of this legislation.

The time limit for debate on this resolution is 1 hour. I have extended 30 minutes to the minority member of the Rules Committee, the gentleman from Ohio, Congressman BROWN, and 30 minutes at my disposal. I am extending one-half or 15 minutes of my time to the chairman of the Rules Committee, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], and he can advise me as to how he wishes it allotted.

It is my opinion that the passage of this bill does not terminate the responsibility of the Congress from contributing some time, experience, and advice in the successful administering of this complex problem. Members of both bodies, experienced over the years in legislation, can well advise leaders of organizations and groups who have been active in the civil rights movement on practical methods to be followed in insuring the success of this legislation.

The support of the American public opinion is necessary for the success of civil rights legislation. Progress in the first months and possibly first few years of this legislation will determine its effectiveness. It is my earnest hope that some Members long experienced in legislative processes over the years will devote their time to meeting with and extending advice and counsel to the leaders of well-meaning civil rights organizations and groups on how to best secure and maintain public opinion and support on this important task to secure civil rights equality for all citizens.

It is my thought that the leaders of the Congress, primarily responsible for the passage of this legislation, to wit: Speaker McCORMACK, Congressmen HALLECK, ALBERT, CELLER, McCULLOCH; Senators DIRKSEN, MANSFIELD, HUMPHREY, and KUCHEL would be glad to sit and confer with leaders of any civil rights organizations and groups who have been active in bringing about this legislation and in civil rights activities. The exchange of thoughts and recommendations at a meeting or meetings with these legislative leaders might be the determining factor on the immediate success or failure of this great legislative adventure which is admittedly difficult and all advice and suggestions possible are needed for its success.

In conclusion, let me say that President Johnson last week gave this important message on civil rights:

> We are going on from this civil rights bill to give every American citizen, of every race and color, the equal rights which the Constitution commands and justice directs. This will not be a simple task. No law can instantly destroy the differences shaped over centuries. And there is a law more hallowed than the civil rights bill, or even the Constitution of the United States. That law commands every man to respect the life and dignity of his neighbor—to treat others as he would be treated. That law asks not only obedience in our action, but understanding in our heart. May God grant us that understanding.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1½ minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN], who is in charge of this rule, has explained that this rule or resolution which gives only 1 hour of general debate on the resolution—30 minutes to the side—and if approved will automatically take from the Speaker's table the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and agree to the Senate amendments. There will be no other vote, on any other resolution. Frankly, I do not like this method of legislating, but it has been used before. A precedent was established here early in the year, when we did the same thing on a very important piece of legislation. At that time the 435 Members of the House were not permitted to consider or debate in any way farm and wheat legislation, but forced to adopt a Senate amendment after only 1 hour of debate.

Mr. Speaker, there is a great demand, in view of the fact this legislation has been before the Congress for more than a year, and because there is a desire to conclude consideration of this measure quickly for other important reasons, that this perhaps is the only method which could be followed at this time, and still not greatly inconvenience most of the Members of the House. Voting on the issue today, instead of a few days from now, can in no way change the final result.

Mr. Speaker, for that reason, rather reluctantly perhaps, I am supporting this method of bringing this matter before the House today. I shall, of course, support the resolution so the Senate amendments may be adopted and this matter may be promptly disposed of.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include certain extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under the exercise of raw, brutal power of the majority of both the Democrats and Republicans, the opponents of the civil rights bill on this side are given only 15 minutes to debate a bill that has never been before the Judiciary Committee of the House or before the House itself before today. This is not the bill that the House passed. It is the substitute bill of the Senate with some 80-odd new and different provisions. Under the rule, there is no opportunity for the House to consider or amend the Senate bill. When the roll is called, you will vote this monstrous invasion of the civil and constitutional rights of all the 180 million people of this country into the law of the land. It will contain implements of oppression upon the people of this country unmatched in harshness and brutality and raw dictatorship never before witnessed since the tragic days of reconstruction following the War Between the States.

I deeply regret that out of the 15 minutes allotted to me I cannot assign time for protests to the many patriotic Members of this House who would like to express their distaste, dismay, and disgust at this invasion of the rights of American citizens.

The history of this legislation is one of heedless trampling upon the rights of American citizens from the time the first bill was introduced, marching ruthlessly through the Judiciary Committee with every opportunity denied to Members to either discuss the measure or offer amendments. You will recall that the only committee hearings held upon the bill upon which the House voted were those which I insisted upon, in the Rules Committee over strenuous opposition, at which hearing only Members of the Congress were permitted to be heard.

In the other body, the U.S. Senate, after months of what should have been illuminating debate, a handful of Members in that body devised a new bill differing in 80-odd particulars from the House bill, and under a cloture rule each Member was given less than 1 minute to debate each of the many and far-reaching changes in the House legislation.

It comes to the House under a rule forced through by the leadership that gives the House no opportunity to discuss the glaring inequities, the discrimination against millions of American citizens, the destruction of rights that have been a part of our system of Government since the formation of this Union. But the bell has tolled. In a few minutes you will vote this monstrous instrument of oppression upon all of the American people.

You have sowed the wind. Now an oppressed people are to reap the whirlwind. King, Martin Luther, not satisfied with what will then be the law of the land, has announced his purpose, with the backing of the executive department, to begin a series of demonstrations inevitably to be accompanied by mob violence, strife, bitterness, and bloodshed. Already the second invasion of carpetbaggers of the Southland has begun. Hordes of beatniks, misfits, and agitators from the North, with the admitted aid of the Communists, are streaming into the Southland on mischief bent, backed and defended by other hordes of Federal marshals, Federal agents, and Federal power.

Be forewarned that the paid agents and leaders of the NAACP can never permit this law to be gradually and peacefully accepted because that means an end to their well-paid activities. Let us still hope for a peaceful and gradual solution of this problem that has brought this country, north, east, west, and south, closer to disaster than anything that has confronted us in the past 100 years. With all allowable disrespect to the Supreme Court of the United States, may I still be permitted in this hall to utter the pious and prayerful words, "God save the United States of America."

Mr. Speaker, I include with my remarks the following newspaper articles:

King Plans Acts To Test Rights Law Compliance

(By George Lardner, Jr.)

St. Augustine, Fla., July 1.—The Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., spelled out his summertime program today for bringing the civil rights bill home to the South.

The head of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference said SCLC affiliates throughout the South will be asked to negotiate with leaders in their communities to secure compliance with the bill's provisions against discrimination in public accommodations.

Tests will follow. Businessmen will be notified in advance of plans by small groups to drop in to eat or to request a room, Dr. King explained. "Court suits will be filed against those who refuse to comply," he said.

For communities that resist the law with a united front, he predicted "massive direct action."

Dr. King singled out six southern cities already scheduled for direct action—Birmingham, Montgomery, Selma, Tuscaloosa, and Gadsden, all in Alabama, and Albany, Ga. "These are communities which have already said they won't comply," he said.

Attempts will also be made to turn Savannah, Ga., into a "model community."

He labeled the two phases of the program "Operation Dialog" and "Operation Implementation."

In St. Augustine, he said, the "dialog" has already begun. He said he was encouraged by appointment of a secret, four-member biracial committee to reduce racial tensions.

Civil rights demonstrations have been temporarily called off here to give the committee a chance to function.

The Negro civil rights leader said he understood President Johnson had "personally intervened" with Gov. Farris Bryant in the St. Augustine crisis.

Meanwhile, members of St. Augustine's Motor Court & Restaurant Association met jointly to pledge to obey the civil rights bill once it becomes law, "regardless of our personal feelings."

About 50 businessmen and women took part in the vote. Five opposed the pledge of obedience.

"We want all Americans to know we are unanimously opposed to the bill," said motel owner James Brock, spokesman for the group. "But the only thing we can do in public accommodation is obey the law."

Point of View: Civil Rights in History

President Johnson vetoed the civil rights bill. In his veto message to Congress, he spoke his mind:

"In all our history no such system as that contemplated by the details of this bill has ever before been proposed or adopted. They establish for the security of the colored race safeguards which go infinitely beyond any that the General Government has ever provided for the white race. In fact, the distinction of race and color is, by the bill, made to operate in favor of the colored and against the white race. They interfere with the municipal regulations of the States, with the relations existing exclusively between a State and its citizens, or between inhabitants of the same State—an absorption and assumption of power by the General Government which, if acquiesced in, must sap and destroy our federative system of limited powers, and break down the barriers which preserve the rights of the States. It is another step, or rather stride, to centralization and the concentration of all legislative power in the National Government."

Does this sound like Lyndon Johnson? Well, no. This commentator is quoting, of course, the words of President Andrew Johnson, with reference to the civil rights bill of 1866. But they seem apropos.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, this day will long be remembered by the American people. Their memory of it will not be pleasant. Forever and a day July 2, 1964, will be marked as the day on which greater violence was done to the U.S. Constitution than had ever been witnessed by Americans.

We can strip this so-called Civil Rights Act of the race issue and get down to the heart of it. When that heart is reached we find that it is about 10 percent civil rights legislation and 90 percent extension of the concept of further centralization of Government. This extended Central Government will, after the enactment of the bill, prove to be a curse to our people and a destructive assault upon the basic tenets which have made our system of government great.

Nothing in the legislation commends itself to me. The tactics employed in the House of Representatives and in the House Judiciary Committee in pressing this bad legislation upon the people are equally abhorrent to me. The hysteria of proponents of the legislation has been equaled only by their unwillingness to heed meritorious contentions made by thoughtful citizens on both sides of the civil rights issue. These misadventures in legislative procedures will rise to haunt some of those who have so happily employed them to accomplish what they consider to be a great legislative victory.

The American people are entitled to a better deal than they are getting today. We should give it to them.

Mr. Speaker, I close these brief remarks by invoking the sage counsel given to the Nation by President Woodrow Wilson, when he said:

> Moral and social questions originally left to the several States for settlement can be drawn into the field of Federal authority only at the expense of the self-dependence and efficiency of the several communities of which our complex body politic is made up.
>
> Paternal morality enforced by the judgment and choices of the central authority at Washington do not and cannot create vital habits or methods of life unless sustained by local opinion and purpose, local prejudice and convenience—unless supported by local convenience and interest; and only communities capable of taking care of themselves will, taken together, constitute a nation capable of vital action and control.
>
> You cannot atrophy the parts without atrophying the whole. * * * It is the alchemy of decay.

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Nix] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, events in Mississippi necessitated my inserting in the Congressional Record on yesterday an indictment of the past and present official leadership in the State of Mississippi. In that statement, I categorically accused the entire corps of public officials of that State of being responsible for the violent oppression of the masses of Mississippians, both white and Negro. That oppression, as I stated, has been and still is complete in regard to economic, political, and social conditions of the vast majority of the people of the State.

Mr. Speaker, today I wish to document further those charges and to insist again that Federal protection is a minimal necessity if the reign of terror is to be brought to a halt. On April 4, 1963, I called upon all of my colleagues in the Congress "to join me in protesting and denouncing the illegal activities on the part of the authorities of Mississippi" and I stated then that "these crimes cry out for positive and courageous action, not tomorrow, but now."

Mr. Speaker, what I said then is even more current now. And, to remind all the Members of Congress of the gravity of the situation—of the inhumanity of man to man in Mississippi—of the gross and brutal injustices being visited upon Americans there—of the complete breakdown of law and order within official ranks among the State's public officials—I ask permission to insert in the Congressional Record this article from the Philadelphia Inquirer, the issue for June 30, 1964, by M. W. Newman, which underlines my remarks of over a year ago and further documents my indictment of yesterday.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, June 30, 1964]

Mississippi: Land of Violence—Bloody Page in South's History

(By M. W. Newman)

On September 25, 1961, a Negro named Herbert Lee was shot to death in downtown Liberty, a sweaty Mississippi town. He had been active in trying to register Negro voters in the South's bastion State of white supremacy.

His slayer was State Representative E. H. Hurst. The authorities held that Hurst had shot in justifiable self-defense. A Negro logger, Louis Allen, was one of the alibi witnesses for Hurst at the inquest.

On January 31 of this year, Allen was killed by shotgun blasts in that same town.

Student civil rights workers say he admitted before his death that he lied to protect Hurst at the coroner's inquest under threat of death.

Murder—unsolved murder—has run like chain lightning around Mississippi as the voter-registration drive has threatened the centuries-old rule of Jim Crow.

Acts of terrorism against Negroes and their young white allies are everyday occurrences.

U.S. Justice Department investigators believe that five Negroes have been killed by racist terrorists in southern Mississippi in the last 6 months. Negroes say the figure may be far higher.

The record of shootings, beatings, jailings, bombings, cross burning, threats and terrorism is appalling. Federal officials believe there may be 60,000 armed white men in southern Mississippi, organized in virtual guerrilla units and primed for terror.

The Ku Klux Klan is on the prowl.

So are the Americans for the Preservation of the White Race, a "fight-now" hate group. And, apparently, so are policemen, often accused of beating, threatening, and shooting.

Some Negroes have been flogged. Some have been driven out of jobs and homes. Tossing of Molotov cocktails is a standard procedure. On the night of April 24, crosses were burned in 64 of the State's 82 counties.

The reign of violence was touched off by persistent campaigns to register the Negro and give him his simple rights as a citizen. These campaigns have not made great headway—no surprise in view of the bloody resistance—but have frightened many whites beyond reason.

Said the Greenwood, Miss., Delta Democrat-Times, one of the State's few moderate voices:

"Countless crimes, ranging from the burning of business establishments * * * and the bombing of a Negro barbershop * * * and motel, have been accomplished with frightening immunity.

"No one sees anything, says anything, or does anything."

Most of this violence passes almost unnoticed by the world at large. Only a few cases ever have made big headlines—the butchery of teen-aged Emmett Till, of Chicago, in 1956, the University of Mississippi mob riots of 1962, the murder of NAACP leader Medgar Evers in 1963.

The Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, consisting of young crusaders for civil rights, has kept book on scores of other incidents.

There have been dozens in just one Mississippi city—Greenwood—since the SNCC began a voter registration drive there in August 1962.

Two months later, the Leflore County Board voted to drop a surplus food program that had helped sustain 22,000 poor Negro farmers.

By 1963, arrests, arson, beatings, and shotgun blasts were the order of the day. SNCC worker James Travis was machinegunned by two white men. Eight SNCC workers were arrested for inciting to riot. Their crime consisted of marching 100 Negroes to the courthouse to register.

Registration workers were harried with traffic tickets and fines, tear gas, smoke bombs, cross burning, threatening phone calls, arrests and jailings. That they managed to get anyone registered is a tribute to their bravery and persistence—and to the determination of many Negroes to at last assert their rights.

The Greenwood Delta-Democrat Times of May 11 tells how the Americans for the Preservation of the White Race boycotts white businessmen who won't fire Negroes.

The publisher of this maverick Mississippi newspaper is Hodding Carter. The night after the recent death of his youngest son, a load of garbage was dumped on his lawn.

Here is just a sampling of some of the handiwork of the brothers in hate over the last 5 years as compiled by SNCC.

McComb, Pike County—Two white youths, Paul Potter and Tom Hayden, were dragged from their cars and beaten while accompanying Negro antisegregation marchers.

Jackson, Hinds County—Dion Diamond, a SNCC worker, was arrested for "running a stop sign." The arresting officer told the judge: "He is a freedom rider. Throw the book at him."

Diamond was refused legal counsel and fined $168, SNCC reported.

McComb—A mob of 30 to 40 whites attacked 5 Negroes seeking service at a bus terminal lunch counter. The mob kicked and beat and used brass knuckles. Other Negroes finally rescued the victims.

Tylertown, Walthall County—John Hardy, SNCC registration worker, took two Negroes to the courthouse to register. The registrar told them he wasn't registering voters that day. When they turned to go, Hardy was gun slugged on the head from behind, arrested and charged with disturbing the peace.

Shelby, Bolivar County—Aaron Henry, State NAACP president, was convicted of making advances to a white hitchhiker. He charged that he was framed and was sued for defamation by the prosecutor and police chief. A Mississippi white jury awarded $40,000 damages.

Henry's home also has been bombed and his drugstore shattered.

Columbus, Lowndes County—A Molotov cocktail was tossed from a speeding car into the home of Dr. James L. Allen. He is vice chairman of the Mississippi Advisory Committee to the U.S. Civil Rights Commission.

Canton, Madison County—Sylvester Maxwell, 24-year-old Negro, was found slain, his body mutilated.

Canton—A shotgun blast wounded five Negroes as they walked home from a voter registration meeting.

Clarksdale—A coroner's jury ruled the shooting of 21-year-old Ernest Jells, a Negro, was justifiable homicide. He had been shot by police, who said he pointed a rifle at them.

Jackson, Hinds County—Two SNCC workers, Jesse Morris and George Green, were shot by police during a demonstration February 3.

Meanwhile, Mississippi has beefed up both its State highway patrol and police forces in individual towns. New laws permit crackdowns on picketing, mass demonstrations, and "disturbances of the peace."

Jackson, the State capital, has a riot-trained force of 435 policemen, armored vehicles, and special equipment.

Mississippi is an armed State, waging violence against the nonviolent.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. Wyman].

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, there is no need for all the troubles we are having throughout America with civil rights. Negroes and whites can get along together in this Nation. They want to. The vast majority of our citizens of whatever color feel this way. They resent the violence, the bloodshed, the hatreds and the distortions that are the trademark of extremist groups of both races. What then is the difficulty?

It is that the present administration and its immediate predecessor have deliberately injected race relations into the political arena. The President of the United States seeks political gain by supporting this unsound and unconstitutional legislation. The civil rights bill now before us gives to the Federal Government the power to deny important civil rights of all Americans.

This civil rights bill is sloppy legislation. Its draftsmanship is poor, its meanings doubtful and its unconstitutionality obvious in at least two titles.

A vote for this bill, now 20 pages longer than the monstrosity that passed a submissive House on February 10, is not evidence of greatness of leadership. It is evidence of a demoralized Congress. Voting for this bill and thus creating a Federal police state is an outright surrender of the constitutional rights of all Americans to freedom in their private lives. It is abject abdication of congressional responsibility to preserve and protect the constitutionally required Federal-State balance in the face of political pressures such as Congress has never faced before; and knowing that the U.S. Supreme Court has, by its decisions, tortured the Constitution out of all rational historical proportion in disregard of the will of Congress and the intent of the Founding Fathers in the fields of law enforcement, sedition, religion, apportionment, civil rights, and what have you. Only Congress remains to protect the constitutional rights of our people.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 9 minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, when the American people realize the surrender of their private rights to a Federal "big brother" established by this bill, they will be dismayed to learn of their betrayal. They hear from the press, the commentators, and the columnists the misrepresentaticn that this is greatness of leadship—true statesmanship at its best. It is nothing of the sort. This legislation is capitulation to ultimatums from a militant minority that threatens violence. It is outright surrender of our cherished rights as free American citizens. It is a perversion of the Constitution.

A vote for this legislation is not a vote to be proud of, for it is a vote to undermine the Constitution of the United States. Perhaps in November the voters will elect a Congress with a majority that will stand firmly for upholding the clearly written mandates of the Constitution of the United States, even if the Supreme Court of the United States does not do so. Then perhaps at long last we can start this Nation on the governmental road upward from the depths of the near anarchy that judicial license and congressional indifference have led us into at this hour, toward a stable constitutional government once again. Perhaps all this is too much to hope for, but it is certainly something worth fighting for.

One hundred ninety million Americans, in living their private lives, have certain inalienable private rights under our Constitution. These include the right of free association and free disassociation, the right of free use of property both personal and real, the right to select customers in private business, the right to choose whom to patronize in private business and whom not to patronize, the right to hire and fire, the right of personal choice in respect to whom to wine with, whom to dine with and whom to work or be with in private affairs.

This bill, with its self-serving title of "civil rights," is nothing less than an act to establish a Federal license to deny private freedoms everywhere in our land by giving shotgun powers to a Washington Attorney General who, on his record and for political advantage, has shown again and again that he just cannot wait to help destroy these rights.

Stripped of its political hyprocrisy, this bill is a naked grasp for extreme Federal power over private business and private lives in the several States. In respect to public accommodations and equal employment opportunity, there is not a single word in the Constitution to support such Federal control. This legislation, in the name of civil rights, takes more civil rights away from all Americans than it confers on any minority group.

When the States wrote the Constitution, they were very careful to create a Federal Government of limited powers. The infringement of this bill on the police powers of the States is exactly what the 10th amendment to the Constitution was designed to prevent.

If we had a Supreme Court worthy of the name, there would be little to fear from this bill because its unconstitutional aspects would soon be struck down by the Court. Of this we could be confident. Unfortunately, it is otherwise, and has been virtually ever since the incumbency of the present Chief Justice.

It is truly a tragedy that so many of our people have lost faith in the U.S. Supreme Court. This loss of public respect is infecting our entire judicial structure. Decision after decision of the High Court has been on the basis of personal predilection and social attitude of a plurality of members instead of on a basis of law and precedent. Confusion has reached a point where even the most learned members of the bar in America are unable to advise their clients the course of the law or the prospect of decisions on issues affecting individual rights or Federal-State relations.

A majority of the U.S. Supreme Court as presently constituted will hold that digging a worm in your own backyard is interstate commerce should it be necessary to do so to uphold this bill. In this knowledge, the people's confidence in our system oozes away even further. Can it be that there are those in high places who want this to happen? That many Americans are beginning to ask this question contributes further to our uneasiness in the realization that there is no appeal from the U.S. Supreme Court.

By voting for legislation so loose, so reckless, and so unlawful as this so-called civil rights bill, Congress itself is compounding the difficulty. We in the Congress are not without our critics and deservedly so. Are we to be stampeded into voting for anything called "civil rights," good or bad, just because a majority of this body deems it politically inexpedient to vote against any package with such a label? It is not leadership but weakness when Members of Congress bow because of patronage commitments to an administration that demands that Congress should, by this law, "damn the Constitution, full speed ahead."

Mr. Speaker, what is the principal civil right sought to be protected here? It is the right to be free from discrimination in American living. In essence, it is the right to be treated equally regardless of race, color, or religion. There are limits in such assurance beyond which no Federal legislation can or should attempt to reach. Equal rights are not a guarantee of equality. There can be no such guarantee by act of Congress. Nowhere in this entire 75-page "new" bill is the word "discrimination" defined. It is used, again and again, but it is not defined. What it is to mean is left to the Attorney General and the courts.

Let me be specific. Let us talk of bread, butter, and jobs.

Do the workers of this country realize, for example, that if this bill becomes law and a white man applies for a job in competition with an equally qualified colored man, the prospect is that under this administration the policy will be to give preference to the colored man until certain quotas are met, even though quotas are not themselves included in this bill? Is this equal rights? It is not.

Or consider public accommodations: suppose you have a rooming house covered by the bill. A white couple with children comes to apply for rooms and you say, "I'm sorry. I don't rent to couples with children." This is your private right. Under this bill that is the end of it. The white couple must find another place. But, suppose it is a colored couple and you say the same thing, "No, I'm sorry. I don't rent to couples with children." What will happen? You will face a complaint that you discriminated. You'll have to pay for your own lawyers in any event and the complainant's lawyers if he prevails. You'll have to prove your claim of innocence with records. You'll be subject to one nuisance and harassment after another.

Is this equal rights? It is not.

Or suppose at a motel on a highway a white couple seeks lodging at 11 o'clock at night, only to be told truthfully that the lodging is not available, the place is full. That's the end of it for that white couple. They must find another place. A law suit? Of course not. But, suppose that couple is colored and the same truthful answer is given. If this bill becomes law that motel will face a complaint, a suit, unwarranted costs, harassment and all the rest.

The same type of illustrations of the practical effect of this bill can be carried right down the line into hiring and firing policies, seniority lists in unions, eligibility lists in employment agencies, and a thousand and one nooks and crannies of our private lives that this bill would control, without a single provision of our Constitution giving the Federal Government the power to so regulate.

The Federal Government, even in the cause of civil rights, has no authority to interfere in the private business affairs of persons or companies not aided by Federal funds and not engaged in interstate commerce. It was agreed as to child labor legislation that a constitutional amendment was required to enable the Federal Government to act in intrastate matters.

This legislation goes much further than merely making it unlawful to hire anyone under 16 years of age. Obviously, it requires a constitutional amendment to regulate private business in the manner that this bill provides. As purported to be established in this bill's titles II and VII, the provisions of this bill are sheer Federal decree without constitutional foundation.

If a businessman in Arkansas or in any other State does not want to hire, in his private business, a member of a particular race or religion, this is his undeniable constitutional right as a free American. It is his business, not the Federal Government's. Those who would legislate otherwise here today would literally surrender the constitutionally protected rights most cherished by all Americans to a Federal Caesar who plays the Pied Piper to the Congress of the United States from Maine to California. I want no part of a surrender of our rights to such political pressure.

What should be done with this legislation? The most offensive Titles are II and VII, Public Accommodations and Equal Employment Opportunity. How can they be amended to assure a reasonable amount of protection to all Americans in their proper civil rights without disregarding the plain language of the 10th amendment which provides that the powers not granted to the Federal Government in the Constitution are reserved to the States and to the people?

The Public Accommodations Title (title II) should be stricken from this legislation in its entirety and a simple provision substituted requiring that the sale of food, shelter, drugs, medicines, or other necessities of life by the Federal Government, or by persons or corporations engaged in interstate commerce, shall be without discrimination for reason of race, color, or religion. Title II of the present bill, seeking to define inns, hotels, motels, soda fountains, theaters, and the like as subject to Federal regulation because their operations "affect commerce," is a palpable deception, for on no rational basis can it be said that the mere serving of customers from other States is interstate commerce. The fact that the customers of a business move from State to State cannot constitute the business engaged in interstate commerce. Undeniably, such business in an oblique fashion "affects commerce." But if the phrase "affecting commerce" is to be a legal basis for the establishment of complete Federal police power over such activities, we shall indeed have established a Federal police state, for virtually everything any citizen does in his daily living "affects commerce," one way or another. "Affecting commerce" is not interstate commerce.

A simple amendment such as I have indicated above would prohibit discrimination in interstate commerce at restaurants located in transportation terminals, on railroad trains, on airlines and at airports, and in the myriad of other locations that are honest-to-goodness interstate commerce. This is as far as we may constitutionally legislate at the Federal level in the application of Federal police power to activities within the States.

The regulation of hotels, motels, and the like within the several States is for the States, not for the Federal Government under the Constitution. Let us face this fact squarely and honestly. Let us uphold the Constitution in this Congress despite the U.S. Supreme Court. It is inconceivable at this stage of debate, after the fullest and most complete exchange of views and information concerning this bill, that any Member is not aware of the patent unconstitutionality of the offensive titles. No matter the extent and depth of our respective sympathies toward any minority group, it is a violation of our oath of office and a perversion of the legislative function to steamroller an unconstitutional law onto the books at the expense of the reserved constitutional rights of all Americans.

Title VII, Equal Employment Opportunity, should be amended to apply only to the operations of the Federal Government and to persons or companies doing business for or with the Federal Government. To undertake by Federal law to police private business and private labor unions in the manner proposed by this bill unconstitutionally invades the private property rights of all free Americans, whatever their race or color. A business is not considered to be engaged in interstate commerce merely because its activities "affect commerce." But, even if it were, the only proper reach of this legislation should be to cover activities of the Federal Government, those contracting with it, and those engaged in interstate commerce. This would be a simple amendment and one that all people could understand. It would help make good legislation out of bad, for under the Constitution there just is no power in the Federal Government to police private business not engaged in interstate commerce nor doing business with or subsidized by the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, there is in this country at this moment in history a shameful need for good civil rights legislation. It is shameful because civil rights should come from the hearts of men and not from the printed page, the billystick, or the Marines. Yet this legislation, in the form in which it is presented to us today, is a serious mistake. If enacted into law and undertaken to be enforced throughout the land, this bill will set brother against brother and business and States against the Federal Government.

This is precisely what those seeking to further aggravate our domestic troubles wish to accomplish in America. It is exactly what the rabblerousers, the leftwingers, the fellow travelers and the Communists want us to do. It is the sort of legislation which will do more harm to our country if enacted than were there to be no legislation whatsoever.

Leaders in the Negro movement have made it clear that whether this bill passes or not their demonstrations will continue. In the light of such statements, one can only speculate as to what may lie ahead for our Nation.

One thing, however, is beyond dispute. The present administration has deliberately chosen to make this serious domestic problem a political issue. It encourages the setting of the national stage for violence while seeking to convey the false impression to colored people that it alone is their champion and those who oppose this particular unconstitutional bill would deny the proper rights of Negroes everywhere. If proof be needed of the truth of this, it is readily found in the actions of no less than a member of the President's Cabinet. The Attorney General of the United States, while seeking from Congress extraordinary and plenary powers, caused to be set up in his office, before dealing with the University of Alabama crisis, a complete television installation so that throughout the clash between Federal and State authorities in that unhappy affair, he and his deputy were "on camera." This was a deliberately staged performance for use as political propaganda without regard for the strength of the Union.

This Nation of 190 million people has approximately 170 million white and 20 million colored citizens. This civil rights bill steals private rights away from all 190 million Americans—rights of the most serious, the most fundamental, the most valuable type. These are the rights of association, of property, of privacy—even the right of personal choice—all to be prohibited by politically motivated, power hungry bureaucrats from faraway Washington.

When the full impact of this grievously unconstitutional and unwarranted invasion of all Americans' private rights is upon our people, I believe their support of those who stand firm and vote against this legislation will be in percentages even greater than 10 to 1.

I am proud that I am recorded, by my vote against this unconstitutional law, as working to protect the people of this country against a law that would create a Federal Frankenstein masquerading as civil rights.

I believe that the American people will remember who stood fast for their rights when the going was tough. One thing is certain—it will not be those who vote for this unconstitutional surrender to a Federal police state.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Poff].

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, two facts need to be understood.

First, the House has no parliamentary opportunity to amend the Senate bill. Neither can the amendments adopted by the Senate be acted upon individually. Under the rule, all of the Senate amendments must be voted up or down as a package, and if they are voted up, the bill as passed by the Senate goes straight to the President for his signature. This bill should have gone to conference.

Second, in the time allotted by the rule for House deliberation, there is less than 9 seconds for each of the 435 Members. It is difficult to find, count and read the 87 changes made by the Senate and almost impossible to evaluate their individual and collective effect in context with the countless statutes and court decisions involved. Parenthetically, it should be remembered that these 87 changes were made in a House bill which House civil rights leaders said could not and should not be amended at all, and none of these amendments have ever been afforded a committee hearing by either body of Congress.

Some of these 87 amendments may be good, some may be bad. Whether the net effect is good or bad, no two people can agree. Without attempting to make a complete inventory, here are some of the changes made by the Senate which I regard as bad:

First. In the House bill, the Attorney General was given no specific right to intervene in lawsuits brought by individuals under title II—public accommodations—and title VII—FEPC. Under the Senate amendment he is empowered to do so.

Second. In the House bill, the Attorney General was not specifically authorized to institute suit in the name of the United States on behalf of an individual under the FEPC title, but he is granted that authority under the Senate amendment.

Third. In the public accommodations title of the House bill, the Attorney General was expected to attempt conciliation through local agencies before bringing a suit against the businessman; and under the FEPC title, the Commission was required to do the same. Under the Senate amendments, the Attorney General can bring suit under both titles immediately. All he has to do is to allege that a pattern or practice of discrimination exists and the court will grant a temporary injunction which may later be made permanent if the Attorney General later produces evidence of a pattern or practice.

Fourth. In addition to originating suit or intervening in an individual's suit under the public accommodations and FEPC titles, the Attorney General may, under the Senate bill, ask the court to appoint private counsel for the complainant and waive any costs assessable against a complainant.

Fifth. Under the FEPC title of the House bill, all covered employers were required to keep records concerning job applications, hiring, firing, promotions, working conditions, pay policies, and so forth, and to make periodic reports to the Commission. Under the Senate amendment, employers in States which have State FEPC laws are to all intents and purposes exempt from Federal recordkeeping.

Sixth. Under the FEPC title of the House bill, an employer was permitted to refuse to hire an atheist. The Senate deleted this clause.

Seventh. The House bill placed a limitation of $2.5 million the first year and $10 million the second year on appropriations for the FEPC title. The Senate struck out the limitation and left an open end authorization.

Eighth. Under title X, the House bill limited the number of regular employees for the new Community Relations Service to six. The Senate deleted the limitation.

Ninth. Title X of the House bill permitted the new agency to utilize the services of public agencies at State and local levels. The Senate bill extends this permission to private organizations as well.

Tenth. The three-judge court provision was confined to title I—voting—in the House bill, and the option was granted to the defendant as well as the Attorney General. The Senate bill writes this concept into title II—public accommodations—and title VII—FEPC—for the first time. However, in these two titles, only the Attorney General has the option to demand a three-judge court. The businessman charged with discrimination has no equivalent option.

This recitation is not intended to convey the impression that all of the changes made by the Senate are objectionable. Some, like the double jeopardy amendment and the jury trial amendment—so bitterly condemned during House debate—are salutary. However, welcome as it is, the jury trial amendment itself is defective in part. It applies only to titles II through VII.

In section 302 of title III of the House bill, the Attorney General was empowered in the name of the United States to intervene in all suits brought by individuals "seeking relief from the denial of equal protection of the laws on account of race," et cetera. For some obscure reason, the Senate bill lifts this section from title III and places it in title IX. This places it outside the boundary of the jury trial amendment's application. The list of suits based on the equal protection clause is too long to itemize, but according to the Attorney General himself, it might include such subjects as legislative apportionment, commitments to mental institutions, State criminal proceedings and censorship.

Mr. Speaker, I realize that nothing said in this brief interval by proponents or opponents will change a single vote. The roll could with the same result have been called as well before the debate as after. It is regrettable that this is so, because the issue here involved is not so simple as some have pretended. It involves more than a question of justice or injustice, and votes on the rollcall cannot and by fairminded men will not be called moral or immoral. Many who acknowledge equality under law as the soul of morality will with perfect consistency reject as immorality statutory infidelity to the supreme law of the land. And this bill, in several parts, is clearly unfaithful to the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER].

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I, too, wish to spend this time discussing the principal subject matter before us, and that is should this rule accepting the Senate amendments and adopting the bill be passed or should this bill go to conference. That is the issue before the House now. There were some 90 changes made in the other body, many of which were very substantial in nature. Certainly there has been no bill before this House since I have been here, for 10 years, coming out of the Committee on the Judiciary, that has more effect on the basic constitutional property, business and personal rights of the individual in America than this one before us here today, which delegates to the Federal Government to a broader or greater extent new powers. Certainly a bill of this nature and magnitude and having this effect on the life of each and every one of us should properly go to conference rather than be considered for only one hour, under a gag rule, with no right to make changes in a situation where there are some 90 amendments to the bill.

If each Member of this body, with the time limit of 1 hour on this resolution, were given an equal opportunity to discuss the matter, each would have 9 seconds on it. If each Member were given an equal opportunity to discuss each of the amendments, he would have nine-tenths of a second to discuss each amendment. I say that this is a farce upon the proper and orderly legislative process particularly in consideration of a bill of this significance.

Why do I say that as it relates to what the other body did? I say that this bill is stronger than the bill that passed the House. I say that is true in many respects and in the very two areas where it was expected there would be some compromises made between this body and the other body, in the areas of accommodations and the FEPC. In fact, in many instances, in those two titles, this bill is stronger than the bill that left the House. It is my belief that the majority of the Members of this House felt that the bill that left the House was too strong, to say nothing of the bill that comes back from the other body.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what am I talking about? Let us look at the FEPC provisions. The appropirations were limited in the first year to $2½ million and to $10 million in the second year. That has been deleted. There is unlimited authorization for expenditures in the Senate version of the bill.

In the Community Relations Services section, I introduced an amendment in the committee that limited the personnel of the Community Relations Service to six people. The House approved it. What was the reason for that? Because they did not want the Community Relations Services on a Federal level to take over the proper functions of the community relations services which are now acting, I hope, effectively, for instance, in the city of St. Augustine. But instead now, when this bill becomes law, the Federal Community Relations Service is going to have unlimited personnel and it is going to take over the proper function of the local community relations services. And yet, as to the essential function, if this bill is going to be effective, if community relations are going to be favorable at all, it will be because the State and local communities are willing to accept this bill and to enter into agreements and to try to reach a better understanding with the Negro communities through local community relations services.

Mr. Speaker, what else am I talking about? This bill, as it comes from the other body, gives legislative sanctions—the House refused to give legislative sanction—to the President's regulations with regard to all Federal employees. Now, I am going to repeat that. They wrote into the bill these legislative sanctions as they affect all Federal employees. The bill as it left the House excluded Federal employees. That is a very significant change.

Returning to title VII dealing with FEPC, the House did not give the Attorney General the right to bring an action, but the Senate amendments provide for such action, and without the consent of the aggrieved parties or party, without first referring the matter to the State or local authorities where State or local FEPC laws exist, and without a finding by the Commission that discrimination in fact exists.

Thus, the Attorney General is not subject to the heralded Senate amendments in the FEPC section, in that he does not have to acknowledge State and local FEPC laws as does the Commission. Likewise the Attorney General can, on his own, determine that discrimination exists in labor practices on the part of the employer or the labor union.

Thus, the Senate claimed to take cognizance of State and local laws on one hand but wrote this concept right out of the bill again by permitting the Attorney General to ignore such laws.

The Attorney General, thus can also bring the action without consultation with or a finding by the FEPC beforehand.

The Attorney General can request a three-judge court be empaneled to process the case, thus permitting him to forum and judgeship, under the amended FEPC.

The Attorney General can bring an action and so can an individual without consultation with the FEPC. The House bill gave the Attorney General no right to bring such an action, and gave the individual such an action only if at least one of the Commissioners authorized it.

Under the amended FEPC provision, the court can provide attorneys fees, can provide an attorney, and can waive even filing fees and ordinary court costs required to be paid in every other type of litigation.

The Senate failed to rectify the crucial weakness in the FEPC of not requiring any type of a hearing before the Commission makes its findings of discrimination, affording the party complained against no opportunity to be heard on the matter.

Returning to title II, accommodations, the Senate provided that the court can make available counsel but only to the aggrieved person, and can waive initial court costs, provisions not in the House bill.

The Attorney General can ask for a three-judge court under title II as amended by the Senate.

The Attorney General can again waive the heralded amendment in the Senate on this title, recognition of local and State laws, by simply certifying that it is in the interest of the United States to do so or that to do so would be ineffective.

The Attorney General is not limited by the provision applicable to individual complainants under the accommodations section that the case may be referred to the Community Relations Service where such exists.

These examples I believe amply demonstrate, first, that this amended bill is stronger in many instances than the House bill and second, that the broad effect of many of them necessitates adequate consideration which can only be accomplished in this instance by voting down the rule.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY].

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, the Senate amendments that were attached to the House bill that was passed in February of this year are clearly acceptable by the majority of the House and the Judiciary Committee. No one will agree with all of them. I have some disagreements with some of them, but those are not overriding disagreements.

In title VII, for example, "Job Opportunities": My own opinion is that too much has been loaded onto the courts and yet at the same time the jury amendment diminishes the traditional equity powers of the Federal courts to safeguard the dignity of their own decrees.

In titles II and VII, "Public Accommodations and Job Opportunities," the device we used in the Civil Rights Act of 1960 of the finding of a pattern or practice has been incorporated. I should think those who are in opposition to this legislation and who were in opposition originally would find that this is a helpful amendment. This places to even a greater extent the cushion of the courts in between the Department of Justice and outside institutions. It requires that there be a finding of a general pattern or practice in any case involving an alleged discrimination in the area of public accommodation or job opportunities.

There is a greater emphasis in the Senate amendments on arbitration and voluntary compliance than there was in the House bill. In short, I would think in general, the Senate amendments would be more acceptable to those in opposition to the original House bill. The amendments do not do violence to that extraordinary bill that this House of Representatives wrote in February and sent over to the other body.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we as lawyers who serve on the House Judiciary Committee wish to reaffirm as strongly as we can that in our opinion this bill is constitutional in all respects.

Mr. Speaker, we wish to restate our conviction as lawyers and as Members of this great body and as members of the House Judiciary Committee charged with the problem of dealing with the Constitution and wishing constitutional legislation that this specific bill is constitutional in all respects.

Mr. Speaker, we wish to emphasize also that this bill does not require quotas, racial balance, or any of the other things that the opponents have been saying about it. The bill simply places a negative restraint on those in the public arena who would discriminate against people because of their color or their religion.

We emphasize further that the purpose of this bill is to safeguard individuals against denials of their constitutionally guaranteed rights. It insures that persons will be free of racial and religious discrimination in their relations with public institutions or private institutions which operate in the public arena.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me this additional time.

Mr. Speaker, what this bill does at this historic time and moment is to deliver on the promise that was made by the Constitution, and most especially those mighty amendments to the Constitution that were passed after the War Between the States.

The bill provides the framework under which grievances can be aired at the conference table and in the courts rather than in the streets.

The bill will lessen tensions, not increase tensions.

We ask that the bill be given a chance to work. We ask that all persons who have the most at stake exercise restraint and wisdom in the weeks and months to come in order to give the legislation a chance to work in the manner in which it should. And we ask that in this House of Representatives today, by our vote for this civil rights bill, the Civil Rights Act of 1964, that we do our job as we must and that we deliver on that promise which our forefathers made 100 years ago to the citizens of this great country.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. LINDSAY. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY] and associate myself with his remarks.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, at this historic moment, and in order that the record may not be forgotten, it is my privilege to call to the attention of my colleagues the fact that title VII of this memorable legislation would not be in the bill except for the foresight, the persistence, and the courage, in the face of much pressure, of a few individuals.

Equal opportunity in employment has long been discussed, but to the members of the general Subcommittee on Labor of the Committee on Education and Labor, fully supported by the chairman and other members of the full committee, goes the credit for having passed in a spirit of bipartisanship cooperation a practical and workable measure.

At the time it became obvious that only one civil rights bill was a feasible legislative objective, the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor gave his approval to my proposal to present the equal employment opportunity measure, approved by the Committee on Education and Labor, to the Judiciary Committee, and to ask for its inclusion in the package civil rights bill. There was much hesitance in many quarters because of the controversial character of the proposal. Thanks to strong leadership within the Judiciary Committee, particularly by Chairman CELLER and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCCULLOCH], Mr. RODINO, Democrat, New Jersey, and Mr. LINDSAY, Republican, New York, title VII was accepted by the Judiciary Committee and we were allowed to cooperate fully in securing and maintaining its acceptance on the floor of the House.

When the bill reached the Senate, there were again loud cries that the title would have to be eliminated if the bill were to be accepted. Again, it was only through the courage and insistence of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCCULLOCH] and others that the title, even though slightly modified, was retained as an integral part of this final bill which we are shortly to vote upon.

I want to pay my tribute to Judge MCCULLOCH for his integrity and to all of my colleagues on the subcommittee, Messrs. DENT, PUCINSKI, DANIELS, HAWKINS, GILL, AYERS, GOODELL, MARTIN, and BELL, and to the membership of this House for what I think, in the long run of history, will turn out to be the section which does more to eventually win the hearts and minds of all Americans for the broad principle of equality of citizenship that is inherent in this civil rights bill.

Mr. Speaker, no legislation can accomplish miracles, but we have set a standard and we have opened a door through which the people of America may march forward to a better day for all of its citizens, and into a bright light where they may face their fellow men and women throughout the world with a clear conscience that we recognize at last that in all aspects of life, every human being is an equal creature of his God.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINDSAY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I compliment the gentleman from New York on his remarks and join with him in strong support of the resolution and the civil rights bill wherein the Congress will be keeping covenant with the American dream; making possible a new birth of freedom and guaranteeing that rights inherent to all are a reality for all.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINDSAY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I compliment my friend, the gentleman from New York on his excellent remarks. I point out to the Members of the House that this civil rights bill is a bipartisan bill, and I support this civil rights legislation wholeheartedly.

There are excellent basic provisions in this civil rights bill which will give the basis for real progress in equal rights and equal opportunity for all of our people, without discrimination or segregation because of race, color, or religion. Success of this civil rights legislation must depend on people of good will and moderation to make the Civil Rights Act effective.

We who vote for this bill must emphasize the absolute need of good and fair administration of the Civil Rights Act in order to respect human rights of all of our people. Good administration of the Civil Rights Act will reduce extremist actions, and will insure fair and peaceable administration by the Government and acceptance by our people.

A test of proper administration of the Civil Rights Act will be the incidents, both as to severity and number, which occur after the passage of the civil rights bill.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINDSAY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I compliment the gentleman from New York.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to congratulate the gentleman on his superb statement. He has distilled the issues in a remarkably short period of time. We are indebted to the gentleman from New York and all of his colleagues on both sides of the aisle for all the dedicated work they did in making civil rights for all Americans a reality instead of a mere dream. In this historic hour, I would humbly ask to associate myself with the remarks just made by the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, today we have taken a long-awaited step toward fulfilling our obligations to our heritage and to our fellow Americans. A fundamental pledge of the Declaration of Independence is that all men are created equal; that they are endowed with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. This is a pledge guaranteed by our Constitution; it is a pledge which Americans have fought and died to defend; and it is a pledge which, until today, has been unkept.

Mr. Speaker, it is true that all individuals are not equal in ability, in motivation, or in talent. Unfortunately, it is also true that all individuals have not been recognized as equal before the law. And we as Americans can hardly deny that it ought to be possible in this great land of ours, where liberty, freedom, and justice are cherished rights, for all Americans to have equal opportunities to develop their resources and talents to the fullest degree, free from restraint because of the color of their skin.

The great significance of the passage of this legislation today is that it provides a strong legal foundation for the protection of these rights. While such legal protection in no way removes from each individual in this Nation the obligation to insure equal rights and opportunities to all, it is a step toward closing the gap which continues to exist between our hopes and reality. We, the Representatives of this Nation, elected to represent the people, and supported by the executive and judicial branches of the Government, have provided in this Civil Rights Act, a foundation upon which this Nation may build constructively and effectively.

Mr. Speaker, this is truly a great and historic day. But it represents a mere beginning of the struggle ahead of us. As God-fearing citizens, as Americans who believe deeply in the idea of human dignity, we must strive unceasingly to make this law meaningful and to bring to it the spirit of tolerance and understanding so necessary if it is to be the pillar of the great society and the model for democratic societies everywhere that it is intended to be. Let us in the spirit of the Great Emancipator go forth "with malice toward none—to bind up the Nation's wounds," to continue our Nation's march toward the noble goals and ideals of true freedom.

To the gentleman from New York, Chairman CELLER, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCULLOCH] and members of the distinguished Judiciary Committee who make this great piece of legislation possible, I wish to express my deep appreciation and thanks for this outstanding achievement.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, at this point I ask unanimous consent that all Members have at least 3 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on this particular measure.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, this is indeed a great day in the history of our Nation and in the history of the Congress of the United States. I am gratified to be a Member of this legislative body and to have the opportunity to cast my vote in favor of the most comprehensive civil rights bill ever passed by the Congress. To take part in this momentous occasion, when final action is taken on this long-awaited and vitally necessary legislation, is an experience I shall never forget.

My colleagues and I who have worked long and arduously for this bill greet this moment with much happiness and satisfaction. I wish to take this opportunity to commend my dear friend, our courageous and knowledgable chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], whose splendid leadership and unremitting efforts made this event possible. I also wish to thank and commend all those of my colleagues who worked for and supported the bill.

It is most fitting that this bill become a law at this time when we look forward to celebrating our Nation's Independence Day—the Fourth of July. True independence and equality for all our citizens are assured by this measure. Those denied their rights under our Constitution for more than a hundred years can now look forward to a new life, new hope, and we rejoice with them because the evils of discrimination based on color, race, or national origin, are now being ended.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, this is a sad day in the history of this country. H.R. 7152, the so-called Civil Rights Act of 1963, has passed both the House and the Senate. We are being called upon today to accept or reject the Senate-passed bill. From the history of this legislation, today's action by this body can be safely predicted.

In a lengthy House speech during the debate on this iniquitous bill, I emphasized, among other things, that this proposed legislation is unconstitutional, undesirable, unnecessary, and would invade States rights. Other Members of the House joined me in urging its defeat because of its evil and insidious nature. Despite our vigorous and determined efforts, we were unsuccessful in preventing its passage. Our best arguments fell on deaf ears.

The House-passed bill was then sent to the other body. It was debated there for nearly 3 months. The Senate supporters of States rights and constitutional government laid bare to the public the many bad features of this bill and its far-reaching effects. Likewise, their best efforts were in vain for it passed the Senate by a large majority.

I would like to take this opportunity to make some observations about the motives behind and the pressures used to secure the passage of this proposed legislation. The chief motive behind this legislation is obvious—political expediency. In this connection, I say that this country has reached a bad state when the leadership of both of its main political parties can be induced to give their unqualified support to such patently unconstitutional legislation as is this bill. Whatever their motive may be, there can be no justification for anyone taking constitutional rights away from all the citizens of this Nation so that rights may be given to a minority group.

Someone made the observation that had this evil legislation been voted on in secret, and its Members been free from possible political repercussions, it would not have passed the House. I concur with this observation.

The pressure exerted on Members of the House to support this legislation was the greatest I have seen during my long service in the Congress. It came from all directions and in varied degrees, but dubious credit must be given the National Council of Churches and to certain elements of the clergy for being the chief generators. They successfully gave the Congress, the public and much of the news media a "snow" job on this bad legislation.

When this legislation was first introduced, I believe that a majority of the House membership intended to consider it on its merits or demerits. About that time, certain elements of the clergy entered the picture. They began to raise the hue and cry that the Congress was "morally" obligated to pass this legislation. They offered no comments on the legality of this bill. They offered no opinions on the effect its passage would have on the constitutional rights of all of our citizens. They obviously did not know or did not care about this. Leftwing groups, much of the press and parts of other news media joined in the chorus. Pressure had been built up on House Members to such an extent, it was obvious when the bill came up for debate that a majority had been reached by this "snow" job. The pressure had reached its zenith. The steamroller began to move. Any provision was acceptable so long as was done in the name of civil rights. Any bill could be passed so long as it possessed the right label—civil rights. H.R. 7152 had this label so it passed the House.

I say this country has come to a bad state when the constitutional rights of all its citizens can be taken away from them by such legislation as H.R. 7152 just because some people believe it is "morally" right to do so.

I have some predictions to make on some of the end results of this so-called civil rights legislation. I foresee that some Members of this body who have been victimized by this "snow" job will involuntarily depart this scene when their constituents come to realize that their constitutional rights have been given away to placate certain minority groups. I predict that when the citizens of this country, in the North, South, East, and West, are awakened to the far-reaching effects of this vile legislation, they will rise up in righteous indignation against all those who had a hand in its passage.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, with the signing of this bill our country has come full cycle from the dream of independence, initiative, and individual freedom envisioned by those who wrote the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States. Pleas of those who seek to maintain reason and balance in government; of those who seek to respect the rights of the majority as well as of the minority, have been ignored and trampled underfoot. With the signing of this bill it can be said that the Constitution has been set aside. With the signing of this bill the foundations have been laid for the creation of a police state at any time those in power so desire.

The most far reaching civil rights bill in history is being passed by Congress. With its passage, the historic concept of democratic rule by the majority passes into oblivion. Henceforth, the Nation may be governed and run for the benefit of minority groups. If you are a businessman, you can no longer hire or promote on merit without the risk of being hauled into court. Your business establishment will no longer be yours to operate as you believe proper. An army of snoopers paid for by the Federal Government will be checking to see that you run your business in a way that appeases and satisfies anyone who demands service. The Federal Government will now be free to move into the operation of schools, welfare, and all other programs in which the Federal Government participates. This is what the new law provides. How far the administration is prepared to go toward bringing about this police state existence for America remains to be seen. That power will now be in the hands of the Attorney General, and any President who wishes to do so may put this fearsome monstrosity into effect.

When this bill was before the House I offered many amendments. So did other Members. All of them with one or two minor exceptions were defeated. They fared no better than the great majority of the amendments offered in the Senate. After the bill reached the Senate, I urged my friends there to seek among others the adoption of amendments making the Federal Government financially responsible for damages caused to American business firms and individuals by the application of the terms of the civil rights bill. If a man is put out of business because of this bill, he should be recompensed. Of course, the amendment was ignored along with nearly all others.

The civil rights bill offers the coercive approach, the compulsory approach, the police state approach, to the problems of integration. The passage of laws will settle no racial problems. The hired agitators and the imported demonstrators who have sought to panic this country will never work cooperatively for the solution of racial problems. They cannot afford to. Their stock in trade would be lost, their income cut off if racial problems were solved.

No, these matters will not be settled by passing laws. There is a way to deal with racial problems effectively and successfully. An example is to be found in my own State. There Gov. Farris Bryant is to be commended in highest terms for the calm and capable manner in which he has handled the problems arising from the racial conflict in St. Augustine. An extremely dangerous situation existed between hired agitators and imported demonstrators seeking to inflame Negro residents in St. Augustine and strong segregationists who flocked to St. Augustine from other Southern States. By refusing to yield to pressure from either side and insisting that law enforcement be retained in State and local hands, the Governor set an example which could well be noted in Washington. Even when confronted with unusual Federal judicial proceedings which sought to hold him in contempt, Governor Bryant preserved a rational demeanor and continued to work for a reasonable settlement of the problem. Now the demonstrations have ceased at least temporarily and local groups are seeking through a cooperative and understanding approach to solve the problems which have arisen.

No, the hired agitators and the impatient ones in Government are not interested in rational approaches. They demand extremism. This bill is the result. Those of us who have fought it have warned of the consequences. There will most certainly be a surge of bitter reaction if the civil rights bill is enforced. It will be nationwide. The people still have the last word. They can vote out those who placed such an unconstitutional act on the statute books, and they can vote in men who will have the courage to reestablish a democratic America. In the meantime, the Constitution is being set aside.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, in a few minutes we shall lift onto the penultimate step a bill that will be respected and cherished by this and future generations as the Declaration of Independence, our Constitution, the Bill of Rights, and the Emancipation Proclamation are now respected and cherished.

No longer will any of our citizens have to wonder if they are second-class citizens. No longer will they have to bear the responsibilities of citizenship without also enjoying the privileges.

We recognize that passage of this civil rights bill is not going to automatically solve all the many problems that have beset our Nation. But it establishes the framework for solution. Now it devolves upon every one of us to see that the spirit, as well as the letter, of this bill which will soon become law, extends to all our citizens throughout the Nation.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I cannot in good conscience support this civil rights measure because to me it violates the oath that I took to uphold the U.S. Constitution when I became a Member of Congress. I can see no constitutional grounds for taking property away from people who have built up their businesses and not recompensing them for it. I can see no justification of the Federal Government violating the explicit language of the Constitution which leaves the voting qualifications up to the individual States. It may be that some of these things require attention by our Government, but the attention should be given in the constitutional manner of amendments to the Constitution rather than by usurping the powers that were allowed to remain in the hands of the people. Nevertheless, I am conscious that the Supreme Court of the United States as now constituted is very likely to uphold almost any and all measures, if not all measures, which have the philosophical approach for the legislation before us. Under these circumstances, those who feel that this legislation is improper have only one practical way left to them to have their voices heard, and this is by amendments to the Constitution which would make it crystal clear that the will of the people of the United States will be obeyed because of newly enacted constitutional provisions stated precisely and clearly.

There has been much talk about the possibility of a referendum on the civil rights bill. I would favor a referendum on the civil rights bill. However, I would like to point out that even if such a referendum were possible and successful for the conservative point of view, the Supreme Court could still find some excuse for nullifying the desires of the people of the United States, or at least they would have a better chance of doing so than they would if the matter were handled by an amendment to the U.S. Constitution.

With these thoughts in mind, I urge the defeat of the bill before us and urge instead that support be given to the constitutional amendment which I have suggested. In the event that the House and Senate enact the current legislation called the civil rights bill, I would still hope that by some procedure the constitutional amendment which I have proposed could be brought before the American people in a way in which we could all legally express our opinion in this field so that the Supreme Court would not be in a position to overturn the will of the majority of Americans under the democratic processes as set out in the Constitution. The constitutional amendment which I have suggested reads as follows:

> Freedom of association shall be preserved. The Federal Government shall not compel association of persons in private businesses or in housing or in educational institutions; but may assist in programs to provide equal accommodations and facilities for all, including withdrawal of such Federal assistance when equal facilities are not in fact provided. Each State shall have exclusive jurisdiction over its public educational institutions and may separate students therein on the basis of sex or race when this is decided by it to be in the best public interest or to assist in preserving freedom of choice in individual associations, provided that equal facilities shall be maintained at all times.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, in voting for this resolution—House Joint Resolution 789—I do so in the firm belief that the civil rights bill (H.R. 7152) is consistent with our Federal Constitution.

It is my fervent hope that the effect of this legislation may be to promote harmonious relations among Americans, regardless of race or color.

The legal machinery provided in this legislation should be sufficient to put an end to mass demonstrations and racial conflict. Of course, laws alone will never end discrimination. Furthermore, if the principal benefit of this law is limited to those cases which are enforced by the courts, those who have supported it are destined to disappointment.

As in the case of all other laws, substantial voluntary compliance is necessary in order for such laws to be truly effective. This is doubly true in the case of the civil rights bill. Citizens of our Nation should recognize the scope, as well as the limitations, of this legislation. They should resolve within the provisions of this bill to make it work.

The civil rights bill of 1964 is and should be a most articulate expression of the Congress—and of the citizens of the United States in behalf of fairness and respect for all Americans, regardless of race or color.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, within a matter of a few minutes this House will give its final majority approval to the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

As long ago as last October 23 I said in a House speech:

> If any provision which I regard as unconstitutional is incorporated in the civil rights bill, I will have no choice but to vote against the entire bill—and I will so vote.

For better or worse, so far as the future verdict of the voters of Michigan's Third District is concerned, I am living up to that commitment.

These are the grounds on which I voted against the original House bill on February 10. Although improved in some particulars, I believe the Senate version, now before the House, still contains clearly and grievously unconstitutional provisions.

Accordingly, I shall vote "No" again today.

And now, for better or worse, so far as the future general welfare of the Nation and the American people is concerned, this sweeping measure becomes law. What of the days—and the problems—ahead?

First. It is the clear and inescapable duty of the President and the executive branch to implement and enforce the law—and of all citizens to obey it. I continue to reject the concept of civil disobedience.

Second. It is the function of the judicial branch to interpret the law, to adjudicate cases arising thereunder, and to pass on constitutional issues raised incident thereto. It is a corollary right of citizens to raise and press such issues.

Third. As experience or public sentiment may hereafter warrant, it is right and proper to seek future changes in the law in this area by legislative enactment, always subject to the Constitution. Congress has not closed up shop.

I do not expect either instant utopia or inevitable disaster in consequence of passage of this law. While stating certain clear responsibilities and obvious prerogatives of government and citizens, I venture also some hopes.

So far as the laudable objectives of the new law are concerned—and they are many—I hope they will receive maximum public acceptance and support, through voluntary compliance.

I hope our citizens will recognize and demonstrate that freemen can do what is right, what is just, what is decent and helpful, without waiting for the compulsion of law.

I hope that in large measure a good will "consent of the governed" will work to the constructive end that the harsh letter of the law will become a practical nullity and that the vast police powers created in this law will be little used, because little needed.

I hope that a maximum voluntary compliance will frustrate the big-government-social-planners' dream of new and mushrooming bureaucracies and powers.

I hope that use of the new law, and of the newly created governmental powers, will be for the good faith purpose of righting genuine wrongs and not for the purpose of creating more tension and turmoil.

I hope there will be an early and expanding moratorium on mass demonstrations and incitements to passion and violence.

I hope there will be a rediscovery of constitutional limitations and judicial self-restraint on the part of the courts—even as those courts gain unprecedented new powers.

I hope the "victors" in this long legislative controversy will be neither arrogant nor intolerant and that the "losers" will be neither defiant nor despairing in adherence to the constitutional principles in which they still believe.

And, above all, I hope the plea of President Lincoln will again be heard, and this time better heeded:

> We are not enemies, but friends. We must not be enemies.

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, I speak for the first time as a Member of this House. I do so on an occasion of great historical significance. The thread of history which runs through Runnymede and Magna Carta in 1215, through Independence Hall and the Declaration of Independence in 1776, through Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation of July 4, 1863, through every act of this great deliberative body which advances the cause of human dignity and freedom, binds our act today to all of these great events.

The Civil Rights Act of 1964 will take its place in history—not as an attempt to solve a regional issue but as a means of answering a national problem. This Congress has worked its will. Bipartisan efforts have produced this piece of legislation which proclaims to the world that a free society can adjust—can make amends for the wrongs of the past century—can and does reaffirm the ringing declaration of our national greatness which proudly proclaims that "all men are created equal." The passage of this civil rights bill is no panacea—nor is it a Pandora's box. It gives us a constructive framework within which to work. Only experience will indicate where we must strengthen or modify. It will call for adjustments in ways of life—but adjustment and change, to achieve harmony, are the blood and sinew of a democracy.

We have this day advanced the cause of freedom and equality.

We have moved to give those who hunger and thirst after justice, their fill.

We have given the rule of law an effective tool with which to cope with the problems facing our society.

We have demonstrated to the world that freedom, justice, equality, and the dignity of man are not concepts of our past—but goals of our future which we will secure for all of our people—goals which this Congress has achieved in part today in passing this Civil Rights Act.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, what we are doing here today will, in my opinion, put a blot of shame on the record of the U.S. Congress as an institution.

I say this not because I am opposed to this bill—not because we are passing legislation which is, I sincerely believe, unconstitutional on its face. We have in the past passed many bills which were unconstitutional and certainly many bills have been passed by this body to which I was opposed.

But these things are not shameful. The shameful thing about our action today is that we are passing this legislation—more drastic, perhaps, and more authoritarian than any measure to come out of this Congress in a century—under the pressure of the threats of a militant minority. In other words, we are acting with a political shotgun pointed at our heads in an election year.

I do not doubt the sincerity of many of the proponents of this legislation. Nor am I opposed to the protection of the civil and human rights of all individual Americans. But I cannot believe that it is less than shameful for this House—with its great heritage as an independent, courageous legislative body—to pass any legislation whatsoever, no matter how meritorious, no matter how necessary—simply because we do not have the courage to stand up before the threats of anyone. And that, to our shame, is what we are doing here this day.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, today in the closing hours of the 188th year of the signing of the Declaration of Independence, we are witnessing the civil rights bill of 1964 becoming law. You and my other colleagues know my position well on this matter, for during the last year while this bill has been before the Congress, I have risen here on the floor many times to express my opposition.

I have tried in every way I could to convince my colleagues of the apparent and hidden dangers of the civil rights bill, but I and others who opposed and still refute it, are much like Tantalus the Greek hero who could almost, but not quite, reach the fruit or the water outside his prison cell. We have almost been in reach of your understanding, but the tides of opinion have swept away the fruits of our labor.

The only recourse open for my dissent in this situation is by legislation to revoke the wrong that has been done. I have taken the first step in that direction today by introducing a bill that would require the civil rights issue to be submitted to the people of this land for advisory referendum.

Action to this end seems only right to me, for it is a grave issue and the people are the ones whose lives will be changed by it. And many, many people have written me urging opposition, while only a token few are for the bill. Below I am inserting a recent letter which expresses such opposition; a letter expressing how millions feel, yet who have not been able to express it nearly so well.

Atmore, Ala., *June 20, 1964*.

Hon. George W. Andrews,
Congress of the United States, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear George: With the passage of the civil rights bill by the Senate, our Nation has witnessed in a little more than two decades a second day of infamy. The fight on behalf of constitutional government waged by the small group in our Nation's Congress will be remembered and appreciated for many years by the people of your State and the Nation. It would be well for the chortling victors in this effront to constitutional government to pause in their revolting display of jubilation to ponder the sober words of John Locke in his "The Origin, Extent, and End of Civil Government," to the effect that a people owe no obligation to a government if force, not choice, compels them to submission.

In the long uphill fight waged by the small band in the Congress against the rape of the rights of all citizens of our Nation as blueprinted in this vicious legislation, the people of America have been reminded again and again of the words of our forefathers admonishing us not to sacrifice freedom and liberty on the altar of monetary passion or political expediency. However it has now been demonstrated again that none are so blind as those who refuse to see.

As we now abandon a government of laws to become a government of raw power, coercion and intimidation, it would be well for our people to be reminded of the words of a great American spoken in 1735. In that year Andrew Hamilton, a lawyer then 80 years of age, in defending Peter Zenger against false and malicious charges brought against this humble printer by a corrupt Governor of the State of New York and the Jerseys, said:

"The loss of liberty, to a generous mind, is worse than death. And yet we know that there have been those in all ages who, for the sake of preferment, or some imaginary honor, have freely lent a helping hand to oppress, nay, to destroy, their country. This brings to my mind that saying of the immortal Brutus when he looked upon the creatures of Caesar, who were very great men but by no means good men. 'You Romans,' said Brutus, 'if yet I may call you so, consider what you are doing. Remember that you are assisting Caesar to forge those very chains that one day he will make you yourselves wear.'

"Power may justly be compared to a great river. While kept within its due bounds it is both beautiful and useful. But when it overflows its banks, it is then too impetuous to be stemmed; it bears down all before it, and brings destruction and desolation wherever it comes.

"If, then, this is the nature of power, let us at least do our duty, and like wise men (who value freedom) use our utmost care to support liberty, the only bulwark against lawless power, which in all ages has sacrificed to its wild lust and boundless ambition the blood of the best men that ever lived.

"It is an old and wise caution that when our neighbor's house is on fire we ought to take care of our own. For though (blessed be God) I live in a Government where liberty is well understood and freely enjoyed, yet experience has shown us all (I am sure it has to me) that a bad precedent in one government is soon set up for an authority in another. And therefore I cannot but think it my, and every honest man's duty that (while we pay all due obedience to men in authority) we ought at the same time to be upon our guard against power wherever we apprehend that it may affect ourselves or our fellow subjects. Men who injure and oppress the people under their administration provoke them to cry out and complain, and then make that very complaint the foundation for new oppressions and prosecutions."

The smirking individuals presently representing the leadership of the majority, standing with jowls adrip with the life blood of wounded freedom, may well find themselves soon in the position of being hoisted with their own petard. The appalling thing to many thoughtful citizens in this land is that none of these people seem to realize that they have made a mockery and held for naught the constitution they swore to uphold when elected to high office. To add insult to grievous injury it is now being suggested that this involuntary servitude act of 1964 is to be signed by the President on Independence Day. What a hideous travesty.

With kindest personal regards I remain,

Very truly yours,

Douglas S. Webb.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, today will go down in history but I am afraid that historically it will be a day of gloom for the American people. The passage of this legislation, alleged to give impetus to the Constitution, in effect destroys the freedom of all men and the rights of the individuals.

The legislation has been debated both on the floor of this House and in the other body for a considerable length of time, and of course, if I had my way we would continue to debate it into eternity for certainly the passage of the bill today will destroy our heritage and the unalienable rights—life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

To pass this unwarranted and unnecessary legislation, which I am sure, if properly considered will be found unconstitutional, particularly on the eve of the day we celebrate the Declaration of Independence is unquestionably the greatest single mistake the Congress has ever made. It is the most far-reaching action that I can remember and will usher the people of the United States into a most dangerous and unpredictable era which can be compared only with the dark days of Reconstruction. The bill, to my mind, can never be enforced without turning our Nation into a police state and without cost of bloodshed and violence.

While the news media points up the various situations in the South giving the impression that our problems are in only a few of the States I can say to you that the problems we of the South have in this area are minor in comparison to those that now exist and will become manifold in the other States of the Union, particularly in New York.

Already, Mr. Speaker, persons are on the move for the sole purpose of inciting trouble. I believe it would be well for these persons to remain in their own back yard and clean up their problems at home before they attempt to assist others.

Mr. Speaker, I am firmly opposed to this legislation. It is unpalatable to me and to all of the good citizens that I have the honor to represent. I will, so long as I am able, strive to have this legislation stricken from the books for as I have previously stated I believe the major sections of the bill are unconstitutional and the implementation of the bill can do nothing but create strife and bloodshed and strip our people of their inherent rights.

Mr. Speaker I strenuously object to passage of this bill.

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, once again this House is faced with a decision of tremendous magnitude—a decision which may well mean another step toward the destruction of constitutional Government in the United States.

We are under the gun, as it were, and this is scheduled to be the next-to-the-last act in the "farce" which we have experienced in the past months, during which the so-called civil rights bill has been rammed through Congress in utter disregard of all proper legislative procedure.

Judging by the "schedule" outlined in this morning's Washington papers, the way is now greased for full implementation of the law, once it is signed and the proponents can now take their bows and enjoy the sunshine of victory, if that is their choice. However, I feel it is well for the American people to consider this legislation for what it is—not for what the propagandists call it.

This is a bad bill. Make no mistake about it. Much of it is of questionable constitutionality, to say the least. It is a political document—designed to garner the support of certain minority groups. Make no mistake about that. And, finally, make no mistake about the fact that this bill gives to the Attorney General of the United States more power over the lives of Americans than anyone in this Nation has ever had.

Under the bill, a man's business is no longer his own. He no longer will have the right to hire and fire employees without fear of reprisals from the Federal Government. He cannot operate his hotel, restaurant, theater, or amusement place according to the dictates of his own conscience. In short, he is no longer a free agent—in the land of the free and the home of the brave.

This bill attacks the foundations of our Constitution; it destroys the concept of private enterprise; it hands to minority groups a "blank check" to demonstrate, harass and agitate, and guarantees that the Federal Government will stand behind them in doing it. It gives to the Justice Department and the Attorney General powers which stagger the imagination. I fear what some occupant of that office might do with these powers at a time and under circumstances which we might now be unable to visualize.

However, I also mourn the passing of the democratic process in the enactment of this bill. The damage is now done but let the record show that it was done in the face of determined opposition by those who wanted to see proper legislative processes followed. This bill has been passed because a determined minority pressure group has forced a majority of this Congress to disregard the normal procedures in unprecedented manner. Never in the history of this Congress has a bill been railroaded as this one has.

The original administration bill came to the House Judiciary Committee and hearings were held. Then, because of pressures and political expediency, certain people conceived a substitute which was falsely labeled by the press as a "softer" bill and this was brought back to the committee and rammed through—without hearings and with opponents given no time to consider it.

When this "substitute" was sent to the Rules Committee, those who opposed the bill tried to discuss the bill on its merits and again on the House floor extensive debate showed conclusively that this bill will open a Pandora's box of problems which may well cause much more difficulty than the so-called ills which the legislation is designed to correct.

After House passage, the bill was sent to the Senate where it did not go to the Judiciary Committee for hearings, as is the usual procedure. It was brought to the floor direct, cloture was imposed and amendments were voted down in dictatorial fashion. However, I remind you that the bill which we are asked to approve today is not the bill which left the House. It is an entirely new bill. Hearings have never been held on this bill—nor on the bill which it replaced. We have come a long way from the original bill. Yet no conference committee has ever considered the differences in the bill which the House passed on February 10. The Rules Committee which considered the bill on Tuesday did not have time to adequately weigh the differences. Just as the majority of the Judiciary Committee overrode the minority last November, the majority on the Rules Committee railroaded this bill for consideration today.

This is more than an insistence on proper procedure—we are talking about an entirely different bill.

This is the most liberty-destroying bill that has ever come out of this Congress. It takes away more rights than it gives. It is labeled a "civil rights bill" but in fact it is a "civil wrongs bill" because it will foist upon the American people more wrongs than it will cure. It will create a power hungry army of Federal agents who will roam the countryside in search of litigation. It will establish a bureaucracy whose object will be to work against the majority of the people of this country at the behest of minority pressure groups. These groups will call the shots; they will choose the places where the bill is to be brought into use—but the American people will have to pay the price.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, in all the years during which I have been a Member of this distinguished legislative body, I have had occasion to support and oppose many thousands of items of proposed legislation. In common with the rest of you, my colleagues, I have repeatedly taken an oath to uphold the Constitution of the United States. I have attempted through these years to apply myself as conscientiously and painstakingly as my powers and my strength have permitted to the execution of my duties as a Member of this House.

Never in my years of service with this body, however, have I encountered a legislative proposal that calls out so compellingly for protest as the so-called Civil Rights Act of 1964. In my opinion, there is nothing either genuine or honest underlying this vicious proposal. It is a grotesque hoax upon all the people, particularly minority groups. This bill is a phony attempt to have the Federal Government twist arms, if need be to break arms, in order to attain undesirable and dangerous results. This so-called civil rights bill is the most vicious, ill-conceived, drastic, power-grabbing legislative travesty I have borne witness to in 24 years of service.

It embodies a cold, ruthless stab in the back at all the freedoms and liberties which we Americans have cherished throughout the ages. This bill foists upon the American people the overpowering burden of a powerful, undemocratic bureaucracy which is responsible to no one, least of all to the people whom we in this House represent.

If we allow this bill to pass we will have opened Pandora's box to an entire philosophy previously alien and foreign to our shores—a philosophy of the "Big Brother State": the obnoxious philosophy that it is better that a people be governed, than that they govern themselves.

This bill will place the Congress of the United States in the position of endorsing basic changes in American social relationships, the unjust and disruptive consequences of which we can only dimly foresee. I do not question the good intentions of the proponents of these changes; but I object vehemently to the methods that have been used to ram the bill through this House and the other body.

If I am to continue to call my conscience my own, I must rise in protest against this bill. We, as Members of Congress, no less than the President and the members of the Supreme Court, have a duty to act responsibly and within the confines of the Constitution of the United States. Reasonable men may differ on their interpretation of that great instrument. But those of us who oppose this bill take our position in the light of sound and long-settled interpretations of certain key provisions of the Constitution.

Few people object to the goal that all Americans should enjoy the fruits of constitutional liberty. But it is a major paradox of our time that the bill before us today, although ostensibly aimed at that noble goal, will have the effect of narrowing liberties that all Americans had heretofore taken for granted. In the name of expanded freedom for a comparative few, we are urged by the proponents of this ill-conceived legislation to shrink the freedoms of the many.

I cannot emphasize too strongly the impact on our fellow citizens of the choice confronting us. I plead with my colleagues, from North and South alike, to examine their consciences and to ponder gravely the decision they are called upon to make today.

The proponents of this measure have used every weapon in their power, both public and private, to insure passage of this legislation. Evils, many real and many imagined, have given inspiration to the proponents of this bill. It is true that in practice, we and our fellow citizens have not always measured up to the high ideals set forth in our Declaration of Independence and our Constitution. While I cannot and do not boast of our failure, I can plead only that it springs from the human condition which makes us limited and fallible. While we must be guided by our highest ideals, we must, as a practical matter, learn to live with our limitation and fallibilities. We must have the wisdom to know that the economic, political, and social ills that beset us cannot necessarily be righted by acts of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the bill before this House this afternoon is fraught with danger. Its provisions, to the extent that their vague language can be understood and put into practice, will work incalculable hardships on the vast majority of our citizens. Because of the vagueness of much of the language of the bill, its practical application will flood the Federal judiciary with test cases for generations to come. Within the lifetime of those of us sitting here today, I predict that the proponents of this misconceived legislation will come to regret it as much as those of us who oppose it do today.

Our Constitution, as Americans of widely differing pursuasions agree, has been and is the foundation stone of our American way of life. Yet today, we are asked to pass judgment on a measure that would radically alter that constitutional foundation, with far-reaching consequences for all of our citizens for no one knows how long.

Time does not permit an extended analysis of the provisions of this bill, nor does it permit any exhaustive examination of its implications for our future. I would, however, like to focus your attention on two titles of the bill which most conspicuously ignore free constitutional government as we have known it.

The first is title II, the so-called public accommodations title. This is based on the constitutional power granted Congress to regulate commerce among the several States. As chairman of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I can say that for many years it has been my responsibility to understand the scope of Congress' power under that clause of the Constitution. Over the years, my duties have brought me into confrontation with the application of the congressional commerce power to hundreds of practical problems. Yet never in my experience have I encountered a legislative proposal which goes as far beyond the granted power of Congress to regulate interstate commerce as is contained in title II of the bill before us today. Never before has Congress undertaken to trample so heavily on the rights of private property owners. Never before has it seemed necessary to expose the vast majority of our population to injunctive and criminal contempt assaults in order to appease a minority of their fellow citizens.

Mr. Speaker, this proposal attempts by legislative fiat what can only be accomplished by education, patience, and understanding.

We hear increasingly of a supposed distinction between "human rights" and "property rights." It has always been my feeling that property rights are human rights. The public accommodations provisions of this proposed legislation would profoundly alter our well understood laws and customs governing the ownership of private property. That a decision of such profound impact might be made with no more deliberation than has been given this bill is unthinkable.

I want to comment on another part of this bill that would have most drastic effect on the lives of our citizens.

Title VII, the so-called equal employment opportunity provision of the act, constitutes one of the most brutal, naked power grabs ever attempted on behalf of the Federal Government.

It provides that the long, clumsy arm of the Federal bureaucracy be extended into the minute-by-minute operations of the private businesses of our great country. In complete disregard of the precious constitutional rights previously guaranteed to businessmen, managers and workers, this bill gives "superbureaucrats" in the Capital the pernicious power to ordain who shall be associated with and who shall be employed by a private business enterprise which exists thousands of miles from the Capital.

I submit that these provisions correct no evils—they create them; they rectify no wrongs—they perpetrate wrongs; they create no freedoms—they deprive the hard toiling business community of its previously existing freedoms. These provisions take away the necessary authority and freedom of management and subject individual businesses to the beck, call, and command of the Federal bureaucracy.

I am constrained to ask, what is the real difference between the pernicious system created in these provisions and the police states that we have denounced and gone to war against throughout our history?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker:

> The tumult and the shouting dies,
> The captains and the kings depart,
> Still stands the ancient sacrifice—

Not with a contrite heart, but with the full and certain knowledge that a vital part of America has been thrown to the political wolves who stand lean and hungry, ready to demand their reward for participating in the destruction of a way of life.

An organized minority has once again proved that it is stronger than a confused, naive majority.

And if an organized minority can achieve what is about to be accomplished in this Nation, then those who love the America of their fathers and their forefathers had better heed the warnings of those of us who know what is contained in this so-called civil rights bill.

On the 4th day of July, we are told that the President may sign this bill into law. If so, what a travesty on the history of our independence.

On the same day when our Nation celebrates the declaration of our independence in a union of 13 sovereign States, we are told the President may sign into a law a bill that will destroy almost the last semblance of State sovereignty.

Do you recall the words of Richard Henry Lee who moved, in 1776, in the Continental Congress "that these united colonies are and of right ought to be free and independent States"? This was the resolution that was adopted; this is what we celebrate on the Fourth of July; and this is what may be destroyed on the Fourth of July 1964.

I can only express the fervent prayer that those charged with the responsibility for administering this law-to-be will recognize and respect the power that is vested in them. Every segment of American commerce, American industry, American agriculture, and even the customs and mores of the people are subject to the broad reaches of this bill that is about to become law.

Sensible, intelligent, patient, and understanding men may keep this law from becoming the poison of our own destruction—but sensible, intelligent, patient, and understanding men who are forced to submit to the tirades of success-drunken minorities, or to the plaintive pleas of propagandists, or pusillanimous politicians will destroy this Nation as surely as there will be a sunrise tomorrow.

Heed my words well—this is the most dangerous legislation ever enacted into law.

The South has once again been bludgeoned into submission—but this time the army of occupation will not confine its police activities to the South. Every State—or perhaps now our States should be called political subdivisions—will feel the weight and might of Federal power. The reaction from Wisconsin, Maryland, Indiana, South Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, and Maine may eventually lead to a new chapter of reconstruction.

Perhaps in the destruction of our way of life, perhaps in the sacrifice of the South, the American majority may awaken to the danger.

If this or any other administration does not take steps to keep agitators from the South; if the carpetbaggers who have invaded Florida and Mississippi and Alabama are allowed to continue their activities, they will extend their operations to every State in the Union.

Those who administer this law have a grave responsibility, but their responsibility is to all Americans and if they are carried away by their own power, Americans—the Americans of the majority—may react in a manner that may surprise some of the most outspoken advocates of civil rights.

To those who are about to assume the awesome responsibility of dictating the destinies of all Americans, I say—proceed with caution—call back your agitators—be humble in your victory—be modest in your exploitation—or the monster you have created may turn upon you.

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentleman from Virginia, Congressman HOWARD SMITH, 100 percent when he tells the American people that this civil rights bill is unconstitutional. I agree with him when he tells the people of these 50 States that this bill is a product of organized groups who are well paid for their activities and who will not permit the law to function successfully because they want to continue the strife and discord to maintain their jobs.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, extremists of the so-called civil rights movement already have threatened that, upon passage of this unnecessary, far-reaching, and dangerous legislation, they will begin massive agitation in cities of the South. It is clear that by so doing these race extremists seek to divert attention away from the festering lawlessness which increasingly plagues northern and eastern communities.

Never has the hypocrisy of the northern and eastern press in its coverage of racial incidents been so transparent as in its current handling of racial and crime news. For while reporters and commentators from New York City have descended by the planeload upon the State of Mississippi, the real violence of this long, hot summer is taking place right in their own Manhattan backyard.

As a prime example of this journalistic sham, I have here a copy of the June 24, 1964, edition of the ultraliberal New York Post. The front page and lead editorial of this edition of the Post are devoted to the current situation in Mississippi. Writes the Post, I quote: "There is neither law nor order in Mississippi." And on page 8 of the same edition appears a story headlined—I quote: "Philadelphia, Miss.—Violence is the Rule."

But while the Post's editors are self-righteously concerned about the state of law and order in Mississippi, well might they begin reading and comprehending their own local news coverage. For here, in this same June 24, 1964, edition of the

Post that rails about the intolerable legal and moral climate of Mississippi, we can read about the state of the most fundamental of human and civil rights—that is, protection of life and limb—in that purported paradise of law and order, New York City.

Let us open the June 24, 1964, edition of the New York Post—the same edition that says that there is no law and order and violence is the rule in Mississippi—to page 2. Here we have a story headlined: "DA Grilling Mitchell on Story of Beating." The story concerns the trial of a man accused of stabbing a 15-year-old girl half-a-dozen times while the girl slept in her own bedroom nearby her parents. According to the Post story, a defense witness called in this case was the Negro accused of having viciously killed a woman in full view of an entire neighborhood of onlookers. This latter case has been given national and even international attention, although the Post and similar journals have yet to be heard to complain about this aspect of New York City life damaging our Nation's prestige overseas, a frequent charge they direct at Southern States and communities.

Opposite page 2, on page 3 of this same edition of the New York Post, we have two headlines pertinent to the question of the state of law and order in New York City. Headline No. 1, and I quote: "Cops Ask Public's Aid in Hunt for the Sniper." This story concerns the sniper-killing of an 18-year-old girl in the parking lot near Times Square. An insert urges anyone who has information about the sniper-slaying to call a special police telephone number to relay it. Says the story: "The special phone will be manned 24 hours a day and all information will be kept confidential."

I do not have to detail what the New York Post would be saying if the same tragic incident had occurred in any southern community and the same plea for assistance to police had to be run in local southern newspapers. We would, no doubt, be reading in this ultraliberal journal about the reign of terror existing in the South, where citizens allegedly in fear of their lives had to be urged to call a special police number if they had information that might aid in the trackdown of the guilty party or parties. But the Post is not heard to comment about the growing reign of terror in its own community. Instead, it hypocritically and self-righteously denounces alleged violence and lack of law and order in distant Mississippi.

Yet, that is not all the news concerning New York's reign of terror appearing in this edition of the Post. Beneath this story of the sniper-killing, on page 3, the Post headlines: "Arraign Suspect in Park Slaying." This story concerns the fatal stabbing of a man, unidentified, in Central Park, and the arrest of a suspect.

And, on page 4 of the same edition of the Post, there is a story headlined: "Woman's Body in Burning Auto." This story concerns the discovery of the scorched body of an unidentified woman in a Canarsie auto junkyard. The automobile was burned. Let me quote from the story:

> "Asked if the fire was started by a burning cigarette, Captain Casill said: 'It looks much more suspicious than that'."

Thus, in four pages of the New York Post, June 24, 1964, edition, we read about no less than five violent deaths of a criminal nature. Yet, on this same page four, there is a two column headline, and I quote: "NAACP March in Capital Will Demand Mississippi Action."

That is the final ironic note appearing in this single edition of the New York Post. Were the situation not so tragic, we might comment of the absurdity of the civil rights extremists in their zeal to focus attention on other parts of the country and away from their own backyards.

I have read from a single edition of a single New York newspaper some of the news concerning violence and the breakdown of law and order in New York City. My purpose here has not been to gloat over the serious problems besetting the people of New York City, but rather to point out that those northerners and easterners who would reflect upon the efforts of Southern States and communities to solve our racial problems had best take a good look in the mirror at their own community problems. The insincere, the self-righteous, and the professional agitator will not do this, of course, for there are always those in our society more interested in exploiting problems for their own selfish ends than in solving them for the public good. Thus, the NAACP will march to demand Federal action in Mississippi—but there are no marchers to protest the senseless killings and muggings and acts of violence that every day transpire in New York City and infringe on the fundamental rights of decent citizens there.

The legislation being considered by the House today is the end product of this irresponsible philosophy. Its passage will create rather than solve problems, for it is one more effort—the greatest effort to date—to serve the selfish ends of professional agitators at the expense of the fundamental freedom and rights of the American people.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, many thousands of words, some eloquent, some irrelevant, have been said about the civil rights bill. As this misnamed and misunderstood legislation starts its final journey through the legislative process there appears to be nothing else bad or good that can be said which has not been said before.

Yet, at this time I feel that someone must voice the feeling of many Members of this body that this act will create an alien force in the lives of communities all across our land.

That force is no longer alien to the South: Racial tension and civil strife, born of dissatisfaction and nursed by professional agitators, have scarred towns and cities all over the southern part of our country. But, like any act of arson, these fires have now spread from the area of their original intent; they have spread to communities in parts of our Nation which never before knew racial discord. And, with the passage of this bill the problems will have just begun.

It appeared for a while that some sanity which did not react to the slogans of the race agitators might help remove the more harmful provisions from this bill on the floor of the Senate.

The presidential primary showings of Alabama Gov. George Wallace proved that there was a great feeling against this measure, because he made it clear that a vote for him was a vote against the bill.

Many of my colleagues in the House of Representatives, who voted for the bill in the belief that it would never pass the Senate without major changes, began to heave sighs of relief when it appeared public sentiment was going against the bill. There were signs that a great uprising of resentment among people who were just learning the true meaning of this bill would allow some Senators to vote for weakening amendments without fear of the vocal minority leaders who threatened them with political reprisals.

But those hopes died, and the thing that many men in this Chamber said would not happen has happened. We have before us a bill that is stronger and more repulsive than the measure President Kennedy asked for something over a year ago; stronger than the administration's bill which was sent to the House; certainly stronger than any of us sitting here today imagined could be passed.

What strange set of circumstances brought this about? Certainly there has been no great increase in the pressure by civil rights demonstrators; there has been no great outpouring of public sympathy on behalf of the bill. If anything, this bill has been on the defensive for some time. But this is a political year, gentlemen; and, at a time when the national elections could easily be decided on the issue of civil rights, this bill has become a tool for building the political fortunes of both parties. Thus was born the unfortunate alliance which resulted in the infamous piece of legislation we are now being asked to pass.

Looking back over the volumes of debate which have centered around this bill I find one voice curiously missing. As a matter of fact, in the whole area of racial problems, and certainly in the bill on which we are preparing to pass judgment, there is a missing element—and its loss may well be the most serious wrong yet inflicted upon our deliberative process and our society in general. I am speaking of the voice of reason; the voice which says, "Let us reason together, thoughtfully and intelligently to find the real answer to our problems;" the voice which believes that change does not require revolution; the reasonable voice which is interested in solving the questions which can be solved instead of fabricating easy answers which can only sow more seeds of strife and hate.

Last year I appeared before the House Committee on the Judiciary and made an appeal for considering what I considered the real problems, instead of the intangible and deeply embedded problems of man's attitude toward his fellow man. I would like to repeat that testimony, because I feel it even more keenly today as this bill comes close to being the law of the land:

> This is what I think Congress should be considering, if we really are going to help our people—white and Negro—to meet the challenges and problems that lie ahead of us:
>
> 1. In the field of education, we need to improve the opportunity for all to get the quality education that is so badly needed if this country is to continue to prosper and grow and meet the needs of this fast-moving space age. I feel strongly that our whole educational system needs upgrading—elementary, secondary, college, technical, and vocational training. I believe that this can best be done by the States and communities themselves because it is the local areas that know best what the educational needs and problems are and can best solve these at the local level. However, the States are seriously handicapped in their efforts for lack of enough funds. Most taxes collected now go to the Federal Government. It appears to me that there is no logical reason why the States cannot have the benefit of some of this great source of tax money within its own borders to handle its educational problems. It would eliminate the serious entanglement of Federal aid to education and it would remove education from the issue of race. Louisiana has made great strides in this whole area of providing equal educational opportunity for all citizens. There is still much to be done in my State—and I would suggest in your States as well. We have far to go, and we had best be getting on with the job.
>
> 2. There is a great need for advanced technical training for the unemployed—so that they can develop new skills for new jobs. There are millions of unemployed Americans who cannot find jobs because they are not equipped to take on jobs that are available. We know that there are twice as many Negroes unemployed as there are whites in this country—but passage of this legislation will not get them jobs.
>
> Only adequate training and personal initiative will do that. There is a growing demand for skilled workers in this country, and you cannot tell me that a businessman will not hire the skills that he needs for his business.
>
> 3. Millions of Americans still cannot read and write. We should be seeking new ways to help the States to meet this pressing problem.
>
> 4. Many Americans do not have their own homes in which to raise their children in decent, peaceful residential neighborhoods. They cannot afford to purchase a home. Is it not possible for Congress to help the States in setting up private housing programs that would provide for quality, low-cost housing with 40-year low-interest terms? At least every man who hopes for a home of his own will have a chance to fulfill those hopes. I stress a private housing program—not public housing. Such a program would allow a man to own his home and to develop pride in his private property. No reasonable man wants to be a ward of the community—he seeks help when he needs it—not charity.
>
> I stress these four areas, because it is these areas that I feel demand the greatest attention. I also stress the action of Congress, because the States have arrived at a position where they are financially unable to meet the burden of these pressing needs. Congress must redress the balance. The money, is at the Federal level. But it is money that comes from the citizens of my State—and your States. If the States, through action of Congress, could regain financial ability, they could do the necessary job. Why should the movement only be to Washington to do these tasks? The States have the talents and abilities to do this work just as well—if they had the resources. We consider Federal aid to the States as if Congress were aiding foreign countries—only there are ties on aid to the States. Why should the States be forced into either having to come to Washington—hat in hand—or having to fight the enactment of many programs because the Federal involvement that such programs would cause in its own affairs represents too great a danger? It is a frustrating affair—because the States want badly to provide for the needs of their people—but not at the expense of becoming no longer master of their own house.
>
> The programs that I mentioned would benefit all Americans—but the immediate impact would be greatest in the Negro community because the need is greatest there at the moment. But I emphasize again the benefit would be for all.
>
> Where is that spirit of amity and partnership—that atmosphere of mutual respect and friendship that characterizes a progressive, open society—that provides the fertile ground in which the seeds of progress grow? We do not find it today in this Congress. We do not find it in this summer of demonstrations, violence, threats and recriminations.
>
> Social movements based on mob action, fear and distrust carry the seeds of their own destruction. The lessons of history are plain—we can read it in the French Revolution of 1789—and we know what happened to the people of Cuba. I do not suggest that this is our lot. I do suggest that the freedom of one man can become the chains of another. We can insure that this does not occur by abiding by our constitutional principles—by protecting both property and human rights, because one is not the contradiction of the other—and by providing the States with the opportunity to care for the needs of all their people.

Despite the claims of its defenders, this bill will not solve those needs. Instead it will create a climate of distrust and enmity which will stifle the voices of those good people of all races who believe in fair play and independence of thought and action. I fear it may stifle those voices forever.

The leaders of the major civil rights groups have already declared war on reason and order. They have promised to spend this summer "testing" the willingness of communities across the land to obey this law. If any person needs proof that what they are interested in is riots, not rights, the statements of these self-appointed leaders should be ample evidence.

We will have reached a point of no return with the passage of this bill, a point beyond which our Constitution, our Congress, our very form of Western civilization will be forever changed. The Negro, who came from slavery a hundred years ago, can show himself a responsible citizen, take the gains which he has captured during these long, bitter months and become a better, more productive member of society. Or, joined by intellectual vagabonds and privateers, and protected by the might of the Federal Government, he can mount a 20th-century crusade against the "infidels" of the South and elsewhere, drawing tight the lines of bitterness and distrust.

If they choose to follow the urging of the fanatics in their ranks, the Negro citizens will find nothing but disillusionment as the fruit of their labors.

I, like most of my fellow Louisianians, do not justify injustice, under whatever banner it is committed. In my eyes the greatest injustice is the act that pits one man against the other. And, underneath the high-sounding words and phrases of this bill there is that terrible danger.

Gentlemen, no single piece of legislation in the past 100 years has been as crucial as the civil rights bill which is now before the Congress. For that reason, if for no other, the people should have a voice in whether it becomes law.

I am today appealing to the sense of fair play of this great deliberative body to submit this far-reaching legislation to a referendum in which all American citizens are entitled to participate.

This bill which I am introducing today provides that the great changes in our system of government and in the way of life of one-fourth of the people of this Nation shall be submitted to the electorate during the next national election.

The legislation which is about to pass will have as great an effect as any constitutional amendment which was ever put to a vote of the people. Therefore, the people have a right to express their opinion.

I am well aware of the fact that there is no clause in the Constitution of the United States for a referendum on a subject of this nature. However, there is certainly no prohibition against such a referendum. And, in the light of recent interpretations by the Supreme Court, and the action of the Congress on this bill, there is plenty of justification for taking this fair and necessary action.

Certainly there can be no doubt that there is a great variation of opinion on this bill; and any fairminded person should have no fear of such a referendum. Certainly if the Members of this body felt that the majority of their constitutents opposed the civil rights bill they would have been bound by conscience and their oath of office to oppose it.

This is not a delaying device. The Members of this body will still have an opportunity to vote on the civil rights bill and send it to the White House for the signature of the President. But this referendum of the people would be the final judge, the final deciding factor in the long history of this legislation.

If the referendum revealed that a majority of the people opposed the bill it would be a mandate to the House of Representatives and the Senate to repeal its provisions or soften them in the ensuing Congress.

I, for one, believe that the public debate on this measure would be a healthy thing for the Nation. If, as its backers claim, the people of the United States of America are ready and willing to submit themselves to the excesses of this monstrous bill, let us give them an opportunity to say so.

If I am willing to place my faith in the good judgment of the American people, why should those who claim to represent a majority opinion of the people be afraid to do the same?

I believe, also, that the prospect of a referendum would be a warning to the civil rights groups to conduct themselves in an orderly, lawful fashion or face a possible public rejection of their cause.

The request I am making is fair to everyone involved; and it is particularly needed in view of the important changes that the civil rights legislation will bring to our country. I hope my colleagues will see the justice of this plea and join me in allowing the people to exercise their right to cast a vote in a momentous national issue.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation which I am confident will pass today.

Final passage of the civil rights bill today is only the beginning, not the end. Enactment will increase, not abate, the demand for equal rights now.

Many citizens in this country believe that much of the lack of understanding, racial tension, and violence that have plagued this country in the past 10 years in the civil rights field stems from the fact that following the historic desegregation decision in 1954 no attempt was made to create a consensus of support. Had such an attempt been made, many tragic events might have been prevented.

The 1954 decision taught us that the mere judicial pronouncement of a rule of law is not enough. In 1964 mere passage of a bill, important though that may be, is not enough. As President Johnson said recently: "Laws do not create moral convictions."

But the enactment of the civil rights law will provide a historic opportunity to muster public opinion, awaken the conscience of America and create moral conviction in the hearts of the people of America.

It seems to me that the most effective way this great effort could be launched would be the calling by President Johnson of a White House Conference on Human Rights with representatives from each of the 50 States. Following this there should be conferences in the States and finally in the cities, towns, and villages across the Nation. It would be a vast national town meeting.

What would be the purposes of the conferences? I think they would be threefold:

First. To inform the people of what the bill does and, almost equally important, what it does not do.

Second. To give civil rights leaders across the Nation the opportunity to impress upon their followers the idea that, under the new law, the courts instead of the streets may be the best places for the redress of grievances.

Third. But to give to minority groups a forum in which to air grievances and to explain to majority groups the depth and intensity of their feelings and to permit members of majority groups to understand and fully accept the meaning of equality for, as President Kennedy said a little over a year ago, the problem "must be solved in the homes of every American in every community across our country."

In the great educational campaign now needed, different groups will have differing roles to play.

The universities and the foundations have a significant role to play. The universities can offer their facilities for the holding of civil rights conferences. The foundations can provide much of the needed financing.

Already the U.S. Conference of Mayors has given us a good example of a pattern for many civic associations to follow. In May of this year, the mayors' conference held workshop meetings on civil rights and what must be done after the law goes into effect. The mayors' conference and the American Municipal Association are considering including topics dealing with civil rights at the various State conferences held regularly by the State leagues of municipalities.

The efforts of the conference of mayors are consistent with President Johnson's statement that:

> This bill is intended to help our communities find peaceful solutions to problems of human relations. Many of these communities have asked for the provisions in this bill so that the same standards can be applied to all businesses serving the public, and so the taxpayers can be given assurance that public funds will be administered equitably. None of these provisions in this bill would create preferential treatment for one race or another. This would be a direct violation of the bill itself.
>
> All that this bill will do is to see to it that service and employment will not be refused to individuals because of their race or their religion or where their ancestors were born.

Other groups will have different roles in this great effort. For example, there will be specific things that labor and management can do jointly. As a Representative from a great steel center, I was pleased when 11 major steel companies and the United Steelworkers recently signed an agreement pledging continuing action to advance nondiscrimination in employment in the steel industry.

For some time, the steel industry and the United Steelworkers have been working on the problem of discrimination. This agreement was the work of a joint human relations committee cochaired by Mr. R. Conrad Cooper, executive vice president, personnel services, of the United States Steel Corp. and Mr. David J. McDonald, president of the United Steelworkers.

Educators and education have a vital role if we are to have a nationwide understanding of our responsibilities under the new civil rights law. The professional and academic organizations ranging from the Phi Beta Kappa Society to the county teacher organizations should aid in bringing us the intellectual comprehension that must permeate the country. It must be borne in mind that laws and government are at best inadequate instruments for remaking social institutions. Education must illuminate the dark places of the human heart. The law can guard against segregation in schools but it cannot prevent the thousands of incidents of discrimination and hatred which give lie to what is learned in the schoolroom.

Finally, we all recognize the great role that American churchmen of all faiths have played in the contemporary battle for civil rights. Perhaps more than any other single group in America, they will now have a continuing role to play. I think they should be represented in every conference. President Johnson recently spoke to a group of churchmen. He said:

> It is your job as prophets in our time to direct the immense power of religion in shaping the conduct and thoughts of men toward their brothers in a manner consistent with compassion and love. So help us in this hour. Help us to see and do what must be done. Strengthen our will. Inspire and challenge us to put our principles into action.

I think the task ahead is clear. Our historic experience teaches us that when the American people know and understand they will rise to the occasion of history.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, though the hour is late and the issue hardly in doubt, I cannot pass up this final opportunity to speak out against the misnamed "Civil Rights Act of 1964."

This bill grants dictatorial, gestapo-like authority to officials and agents of the Federal Government. They will be able to go out among the people, openly or incognito, there to select victims to be the objects of their police power. Having thus picked out a fit subject for chastisement, the Federal agent may then define the charges and proceed against him. Even Adolph Hitler had less legal sanction than the Attorney General will have under this bill.

In every respect, the bill is a drastic encroachment by the Federal bureaucracy upon fundamental rights of private citizens of every race and creed to hold and control private property and to choose his own associates in business as well as social institutions.

But there is an undercurrent, a backlash of fear and opposition in every State of the United States, particularly where there are large, concentrated Negro populations. Where there are no such Negro populations, there is less concern, but there is still some everywhere.

Several forces or factors have combined to generate this fear and concern. During the long debates in Congress the lawless demonstrations have continued, spread and intensified, making it increasingly apparent that legislation is not the answer and, indeed, will not be accepted as the answer by the very people who are agitating loudest for it. The people in every section of the country have had opportunity to learn and study the proposed legislation. They have come to realize that the Federal Government is about to poke its nose into every phase of their private lives, their businesses, their labor unions, their social institutions and their very homes.

Many of these citizens of the North and West have made known their concern by such means as was available to them. They have counterdemonstrated against the lawless, community-paralyzing, racial demonstrations. They have raised their voices and their votes against efforts of local authorities to tear down customary neighborhood patterns and school districts to accommodate local agitators. They have opposed block-busting housing ordinances which threatened or actually destroyed property values. They have written to their Congressmen. And many of them have voted for Alabama's courageous Governor, George Wallace.

I am aware that under the bill de facto segregation in the North will remain while Federal agents swarm over the South to force and enforce actual integration. This is because the bill permits Northern States to use as a defense against Federal invasion their so-called equal accommodations, fair employment laws, and open-school regulations, which in most cases merely serve to exempt the Northern States from the harsh effects of the Federal law.

I am also aware that many northern Representatives and Senators have assured their constituents by correspondence and newsletters that their fears are ungrounded because the bill will apply to the South only.

Thus it is an open secret, halfheartedly denied if at all, that this bill is directed at the South. Thus that greatest of all minority groups—the southern white—becomes the official scapegoat of the minority voting blocs in the big cities of the North, Midwest, and West.

There are some who feel that the element of hypocrisy has played an important role in the development and passage of this legislation. That may be true. But there is also a strong element of that strange human behavior which I call, for want of a better term, the psychology of distant misery. This unfathomable trait in human beings blinds them to problems at close range while magnifying those at a distance.

> And why beholdest thou the mote that is in thy brother's eye, but considerest not the beam that is in thine own eye?

This eye for distant misery could be amusing if it were not so often tragic. Nevertheless, it permits many of our meddling friends to overlook the jungles of the North, where savages run loose in the streets, parks, and subways, mauling and murdering innocent citizens, while making pious speeches about racial matters in the South.

Regardless of the intentions of those who wrote it, the so-called Civil Rights Act of 1964 is a punitive, oppressive measure aimed at the South. We have an opportunity to kill it now. It will be more difficult to repeal later.

There is hatred in this bill. All the bitterness and animosity of a 100 years is wrapped up in this package. The hatred of Thad Stevens, Ben Wade, and Charles Sumner that went into the civil rights bills of the 1860's is handed to the South in the civil rights bill of the 1960's. It is a new Reconstruction.

The South faced the old Reconstruction, persevered, survived, and prospered. Of all the qualities possessed by the southern people, perseverance is the deepest, strongest, and most enduring. The South will persevere.

According to reports President Johnson has considered the recordation of his approval and official signing of this force bill to take place on Independence Day, the 4th day of July. If this is an effort to make of our President a second Abraham Lincoln, let it be said that Lincoln not only would have refused to sign such a bill, but he would never have espoused it. In the light of this forthcoming ceremony, someone most appropriately said it is ironical that the people of the United States gained their independence on the Fourth of July and then had it taken away from them on an identical day in an identical month—I fully agree with the statement.

I suggest again, Mr. Speaker, that under this bill we are taking a long stride toward a police state and a Federal dictatorship. Our Government is being surrendered to political expediency.

May God have mercy upon and save this Republic.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, it is especially fitting that we should act on the civil rights bill of 1964 in this House and at this time. It was here in the House of Representatives that this historic legislation originated. It was here in this House, whose Members are so close to the people they represent, where the bill received its first resounding vote of approval—a vote which reflected the deepest convictions of our people. So it is right that it should be here in this House that the civil rights bill will receive the final expression of the people's sanction on its way to becoming the law of the land.

It seems appropriate, too, Mr. Speaker, that we should take this action virtually on the eve of Independence Day, the 188th anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence. What our forefathers began in Philadelphia on July 4, 1776—in the prelude to representative government on this continent—we are perpetuating today. It belongs to every generation to keep alive the fires of freedom, to extend the benefits of the liberty we inherited to all our people and thus to protect it for each.

As we all know in our hearts, Mr. Speaker, what we do today will not be the end of the struggle for human and civil rights in America. Just as with the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution, enactment of the civil rights bill marks the beginning of a new era in our life as a free people—an era which will test the adequacy of our resources of tolerance and good will and understanding and require from all of us the deepest commitment to the principles of freedom and justice.

This bill is a good and a just bill. I trust we can make it work.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, on February 10, 1964, I stated in the House of Representatives that the civil rights bill will not provide instant brotherhood, a room at every inn for every weary traveler, or a job for each according to his skill or strength, but it will multiply the chance. Our work is neither totally done or perfectly done, but it is well begun. In the passing of recent events and the adoption of this law, the country will not violently change. It is just getting better for more people.

Mr. WHITTEN. Truly, Mr. Speaker, this is a sad day. As a student of law, and a practicing lawyer, I never dreamed that the day would ever come when more than two-thirds of the Congress—Senate and House—would virtually destroy the Constitution, violating every intent of the founders of our Republic.

For 10 years the executive and judiciary departments have had a virtual partnership to set up a dictatorship. Here, today, the Congress gets in on the act, says, "Me, too," and ratifies the unconstitutional acts which have gone before.

Present conditions are so similar to the days just preceding the Civil War, we should pause to remember that heartbreaking conflict, which pitted brother against brother, and father against son—today, it is section against section, and those who need to straighten out their own sections, cover up by going to mine.

As we look back upon those troubled times we can see that sound leaders of both sides deplored any effort to settle the issue by armed conflict. Unfortunately, the radicals of that day prevented a peaceful solution. Then, as now, they were not satisfied to run their own local affairs, but insisted that all other sections conform to their pattern. A terrible war resulted.

The terrible days of Reconstruction were very similar to those we see in the Congo now, where all experienced leadership has been forced out, just as happened in the South.

Instead of forcing integration upon the Southern States, truly it would be well for the rest of the country to learn from the States of the South that the way for peace and harmony is to provide for separate but equal facilities and protect each race in the enjoyment of its own way of life.

OUR GOVERNMENT'S TACTICS

You may well ask why the Supreme Court rendered the unanimous decision in the Brown integration case. It was probably argued that if we do not bring about integration in the United States, we will lose the contest with Russia throughout the world; and if we do not do this, Russia will eventually conquer the world. It was said by the press, "If Russia takes over here, the first thing they will do is set up a dictatorship. If Russia takes over," they charged, "they will do away with the right to trial by jury." "Yes," they said, "if we do not integrate, Russia will force on us a system similar to Hitler's in Germany or Stalin's in Russia."

What did they do in Germany and Russia? What was the source of their absolute control of those nations? Why, they had the courts issue decrees, then they used troops and government officers to enforce the decrees.

Have we not done that here? We have seen the Supreme Court, unwilling to wait for constitutional amendment in the regular process, change the Constitution. We have seen the President send troops and Federal officials to enforce such decrees. Our Government does itself what we feared Russia might do.

We were told we have to integrate all the races of the United States or we cannot hold the friendship of the people of India, China, Japan, Africa, and all the rest. If that be true, why have China and Japan been at dagger's point throughout history? Talk about India—in spite of what you read, we know in many areas people of the same color cannot even touch each other.

The agitation is right here at home. People are using the threat of Russia here in the United States to accomplish their personal desires and actually to impose the Russian system of required conformity upon us.

My friends, history clearly shows an individual must have pride or he makes no real progress. A family must have pride or it goes down the scale. So it is with countries. So it is with race. Any race, whatever it may be, which feels it must be intermixed with another acknowledges its own lack. Such a race will not serve itself well, nor that with which it wishes to intermix.

Integration, where it has taken place, has only led to great turmoil. We all know that if you go into some sections of New York City at night you take your life in your hands; and you may be in danger there in the daytime. You can not go to certain areas of Chicago without danger to life and limb. The same is true of most of our major cities. Rape, murder, and robbery are commonplace in some areas of Washington.

THE FREEDOM BUSTERS

In recent weeks we have seen agitators deliberately go into areas of the South for the admitted purpose of violating laws of the States which have never been held to be beyond the power of such States, but rather have been held to be within the power; and then we have seen the Federal Government move its force in to protect such individuals in their avowed purpose of testing existing laws.

What if it were the law against murder they wished to test, or rape, or treason? Is there one rule in the Federal Government for laws the executive or the judiciary likes and another for the laws they do not like?

My friends, power breeds desire for power. No dictator ever stopped short of taking it all. This concentration of supreme power in our Supreme Court, backed by the Executive, will not stop with school and public facility integration, nor with race. Once seized, this power will be used to control industry, to control agriculture; yes, and eventually even labor.

In Russia everyone is supposed to own everything. However, for all practical purposes everything may as well belong to the Communist leaders, who control according to their own desires. In our country, if the present trend continues, it will not simply be the Chief Justice, the President, or even the Attorney General who issues orders, it will be everyone who speaks in the big chief's name. So it has been in history and so it will continue to be, for the basic traits of human nature do not change.

WEAKNESS

Several years ago I was at the opening session of the United Nations. I saw Khrushchev as he virtually ran the length of the floor to embrace Castro, though they had been together all morning. Yes, and I saw the representatives of Africa, the African Congo, each with a vote, though many of them represented virtually only a small tribe, recognized and seated there at our instance, another group for whose vote we must bid, not once and for all but on every issue as it arises.

Today the United States has moved into almost every country which would let us in. We have granted funds and goods to foreign governments, which in turn sold such goods to their own people for what the traffic would bear. We extended this foreign aid primarily on the promise, but many times merely in the hope, that incumbent governments would support our wishes. Through this means we have made a few persons rich here and abroad. In many of these nations we have forced them to take on our ways, to the point many countries are virtually defenseless, both from revolution within or from enemy attack from without.

Not since the Civil War have our people faced a more trying time. Our problems today call for the best within us. The attack on the Constitution and on our way of life is insidious.

It comes under the guise of government. It is offered with an appeal to the natural tendency of Americans to be law abiding. It appeals to religion, is presented in the name of world peace, but creates strife, dissension, and disturbance. It is said to be necessary to protect the rights of individuals, but is itself based on usurpation of power. We are told it is necessary in order to maintain our form of government; yet its starting point is the destruction by judicial decree of the rights of the States, of the Congress, and of the people. Yes, it begins with destruction of the Constitution iself. It can only lead to complete ruin.

Mr. Speaker, in the long run we must permit local self-government in our own Nation to reflect local views and meet local needs. We must return to a foreign policy which permits the peoples of other nations to run their own affairs. If we do not approve such a course in foreign fields, the peoples of foreign countries are going to do it anyway, and we will continue to be the loser. If we do not return to such a commonsense course in our own Nation, dictatorship will be followed by dictatorship, and all we hold dear will be gone, for no dictator can force the American people into a common denominator, Russian style, each of an exact shade of brown, each conforming to the dictates of an all-powerful Federal Government. Our people are too independent for that. We must allow for differences. If not, differences will destroy us.

Mr. Speaker, to those here who believe that passage of this act will satisfy present agitators, I say it will only begin agitation. To those who believe it will affect my section only, they need only to look to the dynamite and lighted fuse in practically every northern city.

I am proud that the people of my section are showing real self-restraint under trying circumstances. I hope time will show you who support this bill, that you are wrong; that those on the Supreme Court who have led this Nation down the road to state socialism are wrong; and that the present judicial dictatorship of the Supreme Sourt, supported by the executive branch, and here affirmed by this Congress, is all wrong and that this act will be repealed; that the rights of individuals to accumulate and control one's own property, the right to choose one's own customers, one's own companions and one's friends, regardless of color will be reestablished. Only then, Mr. Speaker, will our Nation endure.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, as a matter of supreme legislative conscience and duty I most earnestly urge and hope this Senate-amended version of the Civil Rights Act of 1963, which we passed here last February 10, will be unanimously accepted and approved.

The work the Senate performed on this measure follows the general lines of the House bill we acted upon here and there is no substantial alteration of the principles of equality embodied in the original measure. An overwhelming majority of both Chambers, as representatives of the American people, have already, in substance, approved this measure. In patriotic unity let us all close ranks and approve this bill.

For our inspiration toward this action we may timely remind ourselves of the immortal words of our late President John F. Kennedy when he urged us, just about a year ago, on June 19, 1963, to pass a comprehensive civil rights law. On that occasion President Kennedy appealed to the Congress with these words:

> Justice requires us to insure the pleas of liberty for all Americans and their posterity—not merely for reasons of economic efficiency, world diplomacy, and domestic tranquillity—but, above all, because it is right.

This measure will not, nor was it ever pretended that it could, resolve all of our racial problems. Such will not occur until each of us applies the lesson taught centuries ago, to do unto others as we would have others do unto us; only when we have universally adopted the practice of that divine law will discrimination, attitude, and oppression cease in this troubled world. History shows us the best intended legislation does not, overnight, change personal attitudes nor dissolve all animosities. Only human charity, love, respect, and consideration that come from the moral culture and religious heritage of a people can do that. On this score we, the American people, will certainly be on trial for a long time to come but at least we have begun this glorious journey with the proper legislative first step.

We have upon us now the promise of a new birth of freedom throughout every neighborhood in this Nation. To nourish this birth to maturity will require from all Americans everywhere great forbearance, great kindness, great understanding, great love for one another, and great patriotic dedication to America. This is the challenge of our time, this is the call of our destiny.

For God, for country, for our fellow Americans and for men everywhere, let us meet the challenge, let us heed the call, let us fulfill our destiny.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, this is a historic hour for the House. The enactment of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 marks the culmination of a prolonged legislative journey through procedural obstacles and roadblocks in both bodies. The journey has highlighted the need for congressional reform. When it takes over 1 year to enact urgent legislation, the need for change is obvious. I hope the public has been sufficiently aroused to demand it.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation will begin to redeem the pledge of our heritage—a pledge which guarantees equality and justice to all of our citizens. It is before us today because of the civil rights revolution which is sweeping America, a revolution which in the long run will make all men free regardless of race, creed, or color. The dedicated and courageous activities of thousands upon thousands of Americans, many of whom are young, have brought Congress to the point of enacting the most comprehensive civil rights bill in our history. The path to this point in our history is covered with the courage of those who were at Albany, Ga.; Oxford, Miss.; Cambridge, Md.; Birmingham, Ala.; and now Philadelphia, Miss., to mention only a few battlegrounds of the second American Revolution which will be recorded in history along with Lexington, Concord, and Bunker Hill. And let us not forget the countless citizens who have participated in the sit-ins, freedom rides, boycotts, rent strikes, picketing, and other civil rights demonstrations all over this land. Those who have put their liberties and lives on the line for freedom deserve special credit.

While it is a comprehensive bill, it is, in fact, a moderate measure which falls short of meeting the challenge of racial equality. As amended by the Senate, H.R. 7152 is both weaker in some instances and stronger in other instances than the House bill. I would like to mention briefly some of the major differences.

In title I, the House bill permitted the States to give oral literacy tests upon request of an applicant. The Senate bill requires that literacy tests be written unless the Attorney General enters into an agreement with a State permitting oral tests. Another Senate change permits a request for a three-judge court to be made only in suits in which the Attorney General has requested the court to find a pattern or practice of voting discrimination.

The House bill would have permitted such requests in any voting rights suit brought by the Attorney General. The first change probably strengthens the bill. The second weakens it to some extent.

In title II, the Senate left the coverage of the House bill unchanged reaching the same public accommodations. The same acts of discrimination are made unlawful.

The Senate bill still permits an aggrieved individual to sue but adds a provision authorizing the court to appoint an attorney for him, and to waive fees, costs and security. But it also requires an individual to wait 30 days after notifying the appropriate local agency before bringing suit if the offense occurred in a State with a law prohibiting the act of discrimination. Even after the 30 days, the court may stay Federal proceedings pending determination of local proceedings. The individual need not wait before suing in a State with no law prohibiting discrimination in public accommodations. However, the court may refer the matter to the Community Relations Service, if there is a reasonable possibility of obtaining voluntary compliance, for a maximum period of 120 days.

The House bill permitted the Attorney General to bring an action whenever a violation occurred. Instead, under the Senate bill, the Attorney General may initiate an action only if he has reasonable cause to believe, and pleads, that a person or group of persons is engaged in a pattern or practice of discrimination intended to deny the full exercise of title II rights. It is regrettable that this important title has been weakened, and I hope that it will be amended in the near future.

The section in title III permitting the Attorney General to intervene in equal rights suits was transferred to title IX.

The most significant change made in title IV was to eliminate a provision authorizing allowances for dependents of teachers attending desegregation training institutes.

There were many Senate amendments to title V, most of them technical, some of them imposing additional requirements on the Commission to publish details about their rules and operations in the Federal Register but none of them decreasing the powers of the Commission to carry out its important function.

Title VI, dealing with nondiscrimination in federally assisted programs was strengthened in the Senate. When the House approved an amendment which removed programs involving contracts of insurance or guaranty from the title, many commentators suggested that the President's order on nondiscrimination in federally assisted housing has been gutted. Although I did not agree, the Senate made it clear in section 605 that:

> Nothing in this title shall add to or detract from any existing authority with respect to any program or activity under which Federal financial assistance is extended by way of a contract of insurance or guaranty.

It would take a long time to describe all of the changes the Senate made in title VII, the equal employment opportunity title. The net effect of them is much like the changes made in title II. On charges filed with the Commission, States with fair employment laws are given up to 60 days to resolve them—or 120 days during the first year after a State enacts such a law. If the problem is not resolved during this period, an aggrieved individual may sue, and the court may permit the Attorney General to intervene upon timely application. Although the Commission is no longer authorized to bring a court action, the Attorney General is, whenever he has reasonable cause to believe that an individual or group is engaged in a pattern or practice of resistance intended to deny the full exercise of equal employment opportunities.

An amendment of major significance is the provision in title XI which allows the accused in any proceeding for criminal contempt, arising under any of the titles except the one on voting rights, to demand a jury trial. This will undermine the bill and the traditional powers of the Federal courts.

Mr. Speaker, the bill before us is a meaningful measure, but it should go further.

The voting rights title should extend to State elections and eliminate literacy tests, as I have advocated on previous occasions.

Title II should have a salutary effect on those establishments it reaches. But Congress, through the commerce power, can reach much farther than it has in title II. There is no reason to permit racial discrimination in any kind of establishment which has an effect on commerce.

It is shocking that, at this late date, so much of our racial strife is attributable to failure of communities to permit equal use of their public facilities, including parks, golf courses, public pools. St. Augustine and other communities should have realized before now that public facilities must be open to all the public regardless of race, creed, or color. Under title III the Attorney General must use his authority to sue to desegregate such facilities and use it freely, just as he must use freely his authority to intervene in or initiate actions under the education and employment titles of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I have outlined some of the differences between the bill before us today and the bill which passed the House. Neither version fully faces up to the enormous challenge of establishing racial equality in this Nation. We have a long way to go before the problems which the civil rights bill attempts to ameliorate are in fact solved. In fact, it may very well take further legislation to insure fully the right to vote, the right to enter all public accommodations, and the right to a job regardless of color.

This bill does not deal with the problems caused by the fact that the Negro has been disadvantaged for over 100 years—the problems of education, employment, and housing. These will be solved only by a massive commitment by our society to the elimination of poverty. The administration's antipoverty bill is a small and tentative beginning. But we must move our society much further toward the realization of our ideals. The day must come when all Americans share in the American dream. By voting for the civil rights bill today, we hasten that day.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, enactment of this bill will bring only grief to Negro Americans.

The die is cast and I realize the futility of my remarks at this late hour; but I cannot let the occasion pass without appealing once again to your judgment. If the veil of demagoguery were torn from the environment of this bill, there would stand revealed the stark fact that lust for power persuades the Congress of the United States.

Those who support this bill will carry the shame of the ages with them on the irreversible course charted by political exploiters of human freedom. The price for this collapse of reason will be paid in the streets, parks, and arenas in northern cities as well as in the South. The mobs, whipped to fanatical fervor by Negro racists, will extract their toll of life, liberty, and happiness among the white population.

With the passage of this misnamed civil rights bill, we are embarking on an era of mob rule—of mass emotion. Leaders of the mob will not be pacified. They will be back for more punitive legislation because their appetite is insatiable.

Mr. Speaker, in the Committee on the Judiciary, in the Rules Committee, and in the House, we have seen how a ruthless majority can crush a minority. When the full impact of this bill hits the American people, those advocating this desperate grab for power will be in the minority.

I think the House should reflect on the indisputable fact that the most ardent support of this legislation has come from the Communist Party. That, alone, bodes ill for our Nation. I suppose I am cynical enough, however, to doubt that constitutional arguments, logic, and reason will overcome the political appeal of this legislation.

Nonetheless, Mr. Speaker, I must protest this outrageous proposal which would hamstring local law enforcement officials, strip States of their sovereignty and make a civil rights czar of the Attorney General. Chaos will be the aftermath and racial strife will dominate the American scene for years to come.

This bill and the evils it incubates should be defeated.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, our freedom as a nation was won in 1776, on the Fourth of July.

The battle to achieve this great victory was not an easy one, and since freedom is something which has to be continually sought after, the battle goes on.

Freedom requires vigilance, and eternal courage.

When men fail, laws are necessary.

And we continue to be a nation of laws; not one established on the whims of individuals.

The passage by the U.S. Congress of this historic civil rights bill in 1964, approximately 188 years after the signing of the Declaration of Independence, is another example of how the United States must continue to put into effect its belief in the dignity and freedom of all men.

The civil rights issue is basic to everything that is American.

In the same manner that we fought our way West, we now reaffirm our strength in our great heritage, our freedom and faith in the inherent right of all men to secure life and liberty together with the pursuit of happiness.

I am pleased to once again offer my full support to this civil rights legislation, and to follow its course as law of the United States.

The battle—which is never ending—will continue to rage on. Let us hope that, as Abraham Lincoln once said, we can bind up the Nation's wounds and that, "whenever there is a conflict between human rights and property rights, human rights must prevail."

With millions of other Americans, I dedicate myself to this great and noble cause.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, I fully realize that in the name of civil rights, this travesty is about to be inflicted upon the American people. The manner in which it is coming before the House today can only forcibly remind us of the manner in which the bill, as passed by the House in February, was railroaded through the Judiciary Committee without discussion, debate, or possibility of amendment.

This so-called debate today, is a farce, and nothing else. One hour is allotted, and it is controlled by the proponents of the bill, who are here asking the House to vote for a new bill, without knowing what is in it—and obviously, the majority of the Members of the House are going to do so, in response to the jerk of a string, without consideration of the results following this action.

We have here an entirely new bill, which has not been considered by the House, or any committee thereof; it contains some 70 pages, and some 89 differences between it and the bill as passed the House in February. This new bill came to us from the Senate only last week, and now, its proponents callously limit the debate to 1 hour; this is less than 1 minute for each page of the bill, and, of course, a page cannot even be read in 1 minute, leaving aside the lack of discussion and explanation.

It is apparent that the majority of the House is willing to take this bill, sight unseen, and impose its totalitarian provisions upon the people of this country. Therefore, I want to use this time to register my objection to this highhanded dictatorial method of procedure.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, on February 10 last, indeed a black Monday, this House approved H.R. 7152, the misnamed Civil Rights Act of 1964. Today, we have before us a slightly modified version of H.R. 7152 approved by the other body after 83 days of debate.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 7152, as modified, remains the same sinister and evil bill which cannot but bring chaos and disaster to this Nation, both North and South.

It offers nothing but discord and strife to the American people no matter who they are, no matter what the color of their skin, no matter what their religious beliefs. Further, this measure will strip from all Americans basic constitutional rights and protections so carefully and laboriously spelled out by the illustrious framers of our Constitution.

Certainly this legislation places unlimited power in the hands of the executive branch of our Government and makes a mockery of the historic division of power between State and Federal Government. It undermines, perhaps critically, the time-honored and accepted concept of our Constitution which sets up the vital system of checks and balances among the three branches of the Federal Government.

This legislation, Mr. Speaker, does nothing but tear down and uproot. It is destructive, not constructive. It negates the great values which have been the nervous system of our American way of life.

It creates artificial solutions which will not solve the basic problems facing the Negro today.

In the name of what is alleged to be freedom for a minority, this legislation would destroy fundamental liberties of both minority and majority.

One section of this bill deals with "public accommodations." Under this section, the proprietor of a business will no longer have any choice to make with respect to whom he serves. The Federal Government will make this decision for him whether he operates a business in Washington, D.C., Lincoln, Nebr., or San Diego, Calif. Like an octopus, long Federal arms will reach out from Washington to each unit of the great American service industry and stifle what always have been sacred and inalienable property rights and individual rights.

Mr. Speaker, this section of the bill may well inflict chaos on this Nation. The control of business will be switched to Washington and the local customs and social traditions will be ignored by the bureaucrats in control in our Capital.

This section of the bill may indeed breed violence and bloodshed, Mr. Speaker, and I shudder to think of the possible consequences as it is enforced.

I see no alternative to this grim threat because each man or woman who operates a service business in this Nation is different one from the other. Now, each of them must suddenly discard his or her particular sensibilities, personal predilections and beliefs, personal ideas and emotions, and personal standards of human relationships. Yes, these freedom loving Americans will be ordered to conform to the ukase from Washington. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this situation may well bring about chaos.

Another section of this measure which I find particularly obnoxious and which I believe to be particularly dangerous concerns so-called fair employment practices. This is title VII.

Here again is involved an outrageous delegation of power to the executive branch by the legislative branch, a revolutionary abdication of responsibility by both legislative bodies of the National Government.

In simple terms, title VII of this act would permit the Government to establish the employment policies of private business concerns. A Federal agent would, in effect, tell each employer who he could hire, who he could fire, and who would get this or that job, or receive a raise or a salary cut.

Mr. Speaker, millions and millions of words have been written proclaiming the virtues of the free enterprise system and the importance of this system to the survival of our democracy. But with title VII in effect, it is certain that millions and millions of words will be written describing the death throes of this same system.

To implement title VII would require an army of Federal police officers to pry into the affairs of millions of businessmen and workers. Snoopers and informers would flourish in every community of our land. The conduct of businesses and labor unions would come under Federal dictation.

Mr. Speaker, the destiny of America, past and present, has been shaped by a working, healthy, free enterprise system. In some instances, there has been helpful governmental regulation but never, never such a gross invasion by Federal authority as is contemplated under title VII.

I should like to make direct reference, Mr. Speaker, to one more section of this act, title VI, although I should point out that I stand firmly opposed to each and every title of the proposed measure. Each is repugnant to me.

Title VI could properly be renamed the "blackmail title." In effect, this title says to each community and State of this Nation: You do as you are told by Washington or we will shut you off from all Federal funds. If you practice "discrimination"—and this broad term is not defined in the title—no more money.

Here, indeed, is a most vicious piece of legislation. It does not call for action against those local officials responsible for "discrimination" but would turn the Federal wrath against each man, woman, and child in the area concerned. The sick, the aged, and the infirm would be among the first to suffer. And the schoolchildren and the destitute.

Mr. Speaker, this is shameful legislation, totally un-American, totally ruthless, totally heartless.

Taking the so-called Civil Rights Act of 1964 as a whole, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make this final and vital point.

This act strikes at the heart of another minority—the white people of the South. Where is their protection? This act runs roughshod over the social customs and traditions of a great and loyal section of this Nation. It undercuts the sincere attempts by conscientious people of the South to find permanent solutions to the serious social and economic problems facing the Negro today.

The South seeks racial peace just as much as does the rest of the Nation. Unhappily, I do not believe that the Civil Rights Act of 1964 will achieve racial peace. And I believe this is the sad and bitter fact that all Americans must now face.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 7152, the civil rights bill. It is, without question, the most important piece of legislation considered during the 88th Congress. President Johnson's signing of this measure will culminate many years of struggle and disappointment. It will forge the last link in a chain of events which has brought torment, despair, and now success.

The insults and indignities suffered by those who have attempted to call attention to discriminatory practices were an exorbitant price to pay. For the opportunities being sought were of the kind our democratic theory demands as the simple rights of citizenship. This is a second Emancipation Proclamation in all but name.

And yet, just as it signifies the end of an era, it places a new perspective upon human relationships. Equal opportunity and equal protection of the law will henceforth be extended to all people regardless of race—as a matter of public policy. Recourse to the courts is provided in virtually every instance of systematic discrimination. We must make certain that these gains are not now dissipated by unreasoning emotion.

Doubtless some members of all races will ignore or seek to abuse the rights granted. I am confident that they will be insignificant in number; that those who have opposed the bill's adoption will now obey its moral and legal strictures; that those who have done so much to bring it about will rely upon the safeguards it provides.

Defiant protest is no longer in order. The time for street demonstrations has passed. The time has come for reliance upon, and orderly enforcement of, a measure which has been 100 years in the making.

I ask that all men make the most of it.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, I oppose the adoption of House Resolution 789. I oppose H.R. 7152 for a multitude of reasons.

There is no need for legislation of this kind at this time. In my opinion, it will increase rather than diminish the discord, strife and turmoil which is taking place in every section of the United States.

In my opinion, at least two titles of the civil rights bill are unconstitutional. It clearly strikes down or violates existing provisions of the U.S. Constitution. The Constitution as it was written and under which our country has achieved greatness, very carefully placed a limitation on the powers of the Federal Government. I believe that the 10th amendment to the Constitution still means what it says, although recent decisions of the Supreme Court have effectively rewritten the scope and the intent of the 10th amendment.

The bill taken in its entirety or section by section is an unwarranted grasp for power. It places powers in the executive branch of Government and specifically in the Attorney General that no good man would want and no bad man should have. In a different time and under changed or changing conditions, the powers granted to the office of the Attorney General could be used to destroy the rights and privileges and even the existence of the very same minority groups in whose name this legislation is being enacted into law.

This bill creates jurisdiction of subject matter which under our constitutional form of government could not be appropriately classified as properly within the scope of Federal jurisdiction. The Federal Government has enough major problems which are properly Federal in their character without undertaking to assume jurisdiction over matters which are clearly within the exclusive jurisdiction of State law or personal determination.

Experience should have taught us that any problems and issues which can be determined and handled at the local level can be best handled at the local level. When the Federal Government undertakes to involve itself in matters which are not properly Federal in nature, then it necessarily weakens the administration and the proper handling of many matters which are properly and exclusively Federal.

The powers contained in this bill are so broad and sweeping and unrestricted that if a would-be dictator should seek my advice on how to achieve totalitarian and dictatorial power in this country in all candor I would have to tell him to begin with this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the language in this bill is such that a willful and arbitrary enforcement of its provisions would undermine and destroy the structure of our Government as a government under law. It could be used as a weapon to destroy the rights, liberties, freedoms, and privileges of all Americans without regard to their race, creed, color or national origin. It could amount to a surrender of individual rights—personal and property rights—to an all powerful police state.

The bill with the language of the Senate amendments is just as bad, perhaps even worse, than the language of the bill which passed the House of Representatives in February of this year.

I opposed it then. I oppose it now, and by my vote I have done that which I could to prevent its enactment into law. Accordingly, I shall vote "No" on the pending resolution.

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, 20 or 30 years from now I know, and I think you do, too, that we will be able to say pridefully to our grandchildren that we were part of these historic times when America moved forward in the direction of guaranteeing constitutional rights and equality of opportunity to all of her citizens.

Americans then will remember the civil rights law of 1964 with the same historic importance we now give to the Emancipation Proclamation of 1864. Because our daily lives are deeply immersed in these times of change, tension, and turmoil, it is difficult for us to see the significance of the progress we are making.

In the long run, our children's children will probably look back on these times and wonder what all the fuss was about. They will wonder why some of their grandparents found it odd that every citizen should have the same rights and opportunities, and we will, too.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, our Union of States survived 188 years.

With hands bloody with the doing, we wrested freedom from a tyrannical motherland.

We survived the anguish of a fratricidal war.

We fought at Lexington and Concord, at Chickamauga Creek and the Bloody Angle, at Verdun and Ypres, at Guadalcanal and Bastogne to preserve for ourselves and all men the sacred freedom to choose.

This golden thread, this freedom of choice, was woven in the tapestry of our country in so tight a skein that it could not be unraveled without rending the whole cloth.

But it has now been unraveled with the passage of this bill and the cloth is rent.

On the eve of the 188th anniversary of our blessed, fruitful Union, it is being torn asunder by the choice, not of the people, but by a handful of men whose appetite for political power and for self-preservation in office drove them to the madness of bartering this freedom to choose for the bloc vote of the Negro.

How shoddy, cheap, and shameful an end for something that was so glorious.

They have not given "rights" to the Negro; they have sold him "special privilege" in return for his vote. Caveat emptor; let the buyer beware.

The tiger will not be satisfied with steak. His gluttony will not be sated until he has killed and gorged himself on the whole animal.

There are those who think they are done with this subject now that this infamous bill is made into law.

Not so; the curtain has only begun to rise.

The indignation of the people is yet to be heard. Slowly at first and then in an avalanche, they will learn what has been taken from them with this legislation. Their protest will roll over this Congress like a tidal wave.

I am glad I stand on the high ground; on the side of the people.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, with the passage of this bill now assured, we can only hope for the best but be prepared for the worst. Its enactment may very well trigger a wave of riots, bombings, racial clashes, and other outbursts inspired by the racial agitators who support this legislation. Threats have already been made by some of the leaders in the movement. Triggerhappy recipients of this new and preferred treatment may feel that the Government is on their side, no matter what they do.

There are many lawabiding Negroes who practice restraint and moderation. But unfortunately many members of that race are criminally inclined and prone to make trouble. Since the big sendoff for the drive that resulted in this bill's enactment, there has been a noticeable increase in crime committed by Negroes in many areas. Right here in Washington it has jumped up by more than 25 percent during the past year. Many other cities are having a similar experience.

We know that many of the agitators who arouse the passions of the Negro populace have openly encouraged disobedience to local laws. We know that these agitators, including such leaders as Martin Luther King, have gone into many communities and inspired criminal actions by members of their race. Many others have done the same thing. J. Edgar Hoover has said the Communists have had a hand in this.

But they have a good thing going. They are well paid. And now, with the passage of this bill they can be expected to intensify their actions, and inspire more and more disobedience and disrespect for law and order.

Mr. Speaker, let us not deceive ourselves. In a manner of speaking, everyone who has had a hand in the passage of this legislation must share some of the responsibility for the consequences of what they have wrought.

Mr. Speaker, the enactment of this bill will not create new jobs for Negroes, except for Federal enforcement jobs. The average Negro will still be dependent for employment on the good will and solicitude of white employers in his neighborhood. Will the enactment of this bill, with all the force and compulsion given to enforcement agents, encourage that good will? Or is it more likely to have the opposite effect? After all, jobs, better jobs, food for the family, and a decent house to live in, are the chief interests of the average American Negro. They already have good schools in practically every community in the country. The passage of this bill will naturally reduce rather than enhance good will and job opportunities in the average community, and make no mistake about it.

Aside from the unfortunate effects on job opportunities and the encouragement of lawlessness, the bill strikes a heavy blow at constitutional government. It will destroy a hundred times more rights and freedoms than it will protect. With this law on the books, America will never be quite the same again.

We have heard a lot about Mrs. Murphy's boardinghouse. Let us consider her problem for a moment. If she rents as many as five rooms, for any purpose, she is covered. Suppose Mrs. Murphy, who comes under the law, has a vacant room. The doorbell rings at 2 o'clock in the morning. She answers and is faced by a Negro man whose appearance raises doubts in her mind as to his intentions. If she denies him a room, what can happen under the terms of this law that is being enacted here today?

She may end up in jail. At least she will be subject to harassment if the Negro reports her and claims he was denied the room because of his race. She can be hailed into court, and if she persists in using her own judgment about the desirability of patrons, may end up in jail. The rejected room seeker is furnished a Government lawyer, at no cost, to prepare and prosecute his case against Mrs. Murphy. This bill so provides.

This is but one of the scores of boobytraps that are built into this legislation. Its enactment will open a Pandora box of court actions, court orders, injunctions, and prosecutions. This all smacks of the police state, certainly more so than we have ever experienced in free America before.

Mr. Speaker, I shall not belabor the issue. This bill has been thoroughly debated, at least in the Senate, although it has been steamrollered through the House, encumbered with scores of Senate amendments, under a gag rule that has allowed only 1 hour of debate.

As I said at the beginning, we can hope for the best but must be prepared for the worst. Let us hope that the Negro agitators, encouraged by Communist and radical forces, will be silenced by members of their own race. But that has not been the case in the past and we can hardly hope for it in the future.

It is my firm belief that the enactment of this bill will cause a serious setback of progress in racial relations in this country. And this is being done because of what appears to be an insatiable desire to corral Negro bloc votes. What a price to pay for political advantages. And both major parties share in this scramble for Negro votes.

VIOLATES FUNDAMENTAL CONCEPTS

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, today the House of Representatives is being called upon to pass a bill which violates my fundamental concepts of American constitutional government.

I have asked before, and ask again, for the Members of this body to study this proposal and its provisions. While it is glossed over in flowery tones by its proponents, this bill strikes at the very heart of our system of free enterprise.

When we tell a man how he must operate his private business, when we tell him how he will hire and fire his employees, then we are violating his fundamental rights under the Constitution. I have always felt that this was a government which recognized free enterprise. It has been accepted that a man had the right to operate his place of business, his private property, with a minimum of control.

The basic difference between our system of government and that of the Communist nations is that here we recognize the right to own and operate private property. Under communism, the government tells the individual how that private property must be handled and claims ownership.

We may not always agree with how a man operates or controls that private property, but we recognized up until this point that he had that right. On the highly dubious commerce clause of the Constitution, we have based a law which is absurd when reasonable legal standards are considered.

There may be imperfections in our system, but it has proven to be the soundest ever devised by man.

I predict that this bill will take away basic freedoms from men of all races, creeds, and colors. It is a bill which has been designed to make the South a whippingboy when the whole Nation has problems in race relations.

Passage of this bill will not solve those problems. They are deep rooted. Their solution will come with time and with emphasis on two areas—education and a healthy economy.

Education is needed to train and make useful citizens out of our deprived citizens, who for generation after generation, follow a pattern of ignorance and poverty. And after we have provided them with educations, we must have a healthy economy which can absorb them into productive and financially rewarding lives.

I believe that when we address ourselves to these two areas, then we will be making progress. And I do not believe that we will make any real progress until we meet these challenges.

I cannot with a clear conscience vote nor support this bill. The few changes that the Senate has made does not make it more palatable, it just makes it more pointed against the South. It, in my opinion, solves nothing.

Today we see mob rule substituted for the rule of law. We see outsiders pouring into a city like St. Augustine, Fla., to incite the people. Outsiders from both sides pour into a beseiged community and the local people are bewildered, incensed, maddened, and disgusted. But no voice is raised to help them—any charge made is accepted by the people in other areas.

As Senator RUSSELL said in a Senate speech last year, it has become a national disease for the people of the States outside our area to dispise the South. They know not what they are talking about, they never listen to the great areas of progress. The news media continually picture the South as an area of bumpkins, pointing out only the worst, and generally isolating very selected instances, and even inciting the incident themselves to get a picture of twisted story.

We have our problems to be sure. But other States have also. Race relations are a problem. This bill solves none of them. This bill in my opinion should be ruled unconstitutional, but I doubt if the Supreme Court as it is now constituted will do so. They interpret the Constitution just as they please, without regard to precedent, written law, the intent of the founders, or the will of the Congress.

My vote is only one. But it will be cast with a clear conscience for what I believe to be our constitutional way of life. I predict that the passage of this bill will be a serious mistake for this Nation and set us off on a dangerous path of government control and dictation. I urge that it not be passed.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, the question before the House is substantially "Will the House recede and concur with the Senate bill on civil rights?" If a bill identical to the Senate bill were before the House for initial passage, I would vote against it. In my opinion, it contains provisions of very dubious constitutionality, and in many instances will probably create more problems than it will solve.

However, the choice we make today is whether to have a civil rights bill or not to have one. Since this body and the other body have both adopted civil rights bills, there will be a law passed on this subject at this session of Congress. To me, it would be the most naive type of wishful thinking to believe that defeating this resolution and subsequently sending the bill to conference would keep it from becoming law. It has been well demonstrated that Congress will be kept in session until it passes a civil rights law.

A conference committee could only resolve the differences between the two bills. In my opinion, on balance, the Senate amendments make the bill more palatable than the House bill because they provide for trial by jury and the application of local laws where they are in existence.

I voted against the civil rights bill when it was before the House. As I have stated, I would vote against the Senate bill if it were here as an original bill. However, the choice I must make is between these two bills. Since I find the Senate bill to be more palatable than the House bill, or to put it another way—the lesser of two evils, I shall vote "aye" on the resolution.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, this is a historic moment in the House of Representatives. Today we are enacting legislation which goes to the very core and character of this Nation. By passing this bill we affirm ideals which were written into the Declaration of Independence, and we make it clear to ourselves and to the world that we mean to close the gap between promise and fulfillment.

This bill represents a very real victory not only because it assures a better America for more Americans but because the forces of a dynamic, forward-looking nation have defeated forces which in the past have been a blot on our national conscience. There are those who will continue to insist that this measure violates the traditional concept of property rights and represents an unlawful intrusion of the Federal Government into matters which are the concern of the several States. But the plain fact, Mr. Speaker, is that most Americans not only accept but insist that human rights are preeminent in our free society and are the proper concern and responsibility of the Federal Government.

The Congress can be proud of the action it takes today, but the special gratitude of Americans for generations to come must be reserved for our late President whose inspiration and dedication has stamped itself upon this work. In truth, this is his hour.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, with all due respect for the opponents of the civil rights bill, we who favor its passage know that it is a foregone conclusion that the measure will pass today and will be signed into the law of the land shortly thereafter. It is now too late to debate the issue. All that need to be said, pro or con, have been fully stated. The die is cast and no wiles or forecasts of doom is going to change one vote.

We should, therefore, give some thought to what follows after the bill is enacted into law. While this day will go down in history as eventful as the day Abraham Lincoln issued the Emancipation Proclamation over a hundred years ago, the days which immediately follow the signing of the bill by President Johnson will largely determine the success or failure of the law to serve its intended purpose.

The new law should not be used as an excuse for provoking civil disorders. If it is, we can expect violence and bloodshed through racial clashes in the years ahead. The new law should rather serve as a guide of conduct for all Americans, regardless of race, color, or religion. The white American must realize that the Negro American is going to fight for his rights, frequently in blind anger and bitterness, and must be treated with greater understanding. The Negro American, on the other hand, must exercise the patience of Job, and seek to remedy wrongs only through the peaceful means provided by the new law.

Through respect for the law, we who are fortunate to be able to call ourselves Americans must seek to avoid the ugly incidents of civil disorders. Unless we do this we shall have labored in vain to bring about justice and equality through the law.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER].

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, with regret, I must cast my vote against the resolution to accept the Senate amendments and enact the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

The Senate amendments, in some respects, did improve the bill passed by the House on February 10, 1964, which I opposed. Those amendments, however, do not go far enough and do not cure the excessive power or the oppressive sanctions the House wrote into the bill. I voted for the Civil Rights Act of 1957, the first major legislation in this field in nearly 100 years, and favored the provisions of the Civil Rights Act of 1960, except the voting referee provision, a device for the assumption of State power through the appointment of referees by a Federal court.

My regret stems from my belief that the Congress can and should take action within its constitutional powers to carry out our longstanding national policy that all citizens be treated alike. Congress should pass a fair, workable, effective civil rights law; but not one which extends the long arm of the Federal Government into every nook and cranny of our country; nor one which strips 190 million Americans of their sacred rights and protections written into our Constitution.

The Senate version of the bill did provide that the vast power vested in Federal officials with respect to public accommodations and equal employment should not be employed until remedies under State law were exhausted. The Senate version also provided for a jury trial of criminal contempt proceedings in Federal injunction suits except those relating to voting.

The Senate version, however, did not limit the authority of the Federal Government to what I regard as its proper sphere of activity, actually increasing the power of the Attorney General and did not remove the objectionable, oppressive sanctions of the injunction process for enforcement of the act.

It should be emphasized that the jury trial provided by the Morton amendment relates only to criminal contempt after a judgment has been entered by the Federal judge, and does not provide a civil rights defendant with a jury trial on the merits of the case.

A thug, a narcotics peddler, an assassin, is entitled to, first, presumption of innocence; second, proof of guilt by admissible evidence beyond reasonable doubt; third, freedom to refuse to testify against himself; fourth, jury trial; fifth, judgment expires when penalty has been paid.

Not so the defendant in a civil rights case if H.R. 7152 becomes law.

Worse yet, his offense—discrimination—is not defined in H.R. 7152, nor is it a term of art in legal terminology defined by court decisions.

A civil rights defendant, first, enjoys no presumption of innocence; second, proof, according to much less stringent rules of evidence, need be only by a preponderance of the evidence; third, he can be compelled to testify against himself under pain of being jailed for contempt of court; fourth, he is not entitled to a jury trial; fifth, the injunction against him hangs over his head for the rest of his life.

It was to protect individual citizens from abusive tyranny by its government and to avoid the evils and oppression practiced by the British monarchy, that our constitutional founders insisted upon the first 10 amendments as protections to all citizens.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Judiciary Committee and the subcommittee which held hearings on this measure, the Civil Rights Act of 1964 has absorbed the greatest part of my time and my efforts in this Congress. I sought in the subcommittee, and in the full Judiciary Committee, and on the floor of the House, to write a fair, workable bill. Some of the suggestions I made and amendments I offered were adopted, notably the nonpreemption provision which preserves the validity of present and future State laws and municipal ordinances in the field of civil rights. Other amendments I offered were rejected, notably one to strengthen the voting provisions of the bill by reducing representation in the House of Representatives for those States denying or abridging the right to vote on grounds of race or color as required by section 2 of the XIV amendment.

At the end of the legislative process, however, this bill contains such excessive Federal power and such harsh sanctions for enforcement that I could not in good conscience return to my constituents and say I helped fasten a yoke of tyranny on the American people.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Wilson].

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, when H.R. 7152 passed the House of Representatives, I voted for it but with great reluctance. On my way to the floor of the House that day and immediately before casting my vote, I remarked to my colleague, ranking minority member of the Judiciary Committee, Bill McCulloch, of Ohio, that this would be the worst vote I had ever cast. On the following day I remarked that I felt very bad about my vote in favor of that bill, and I threatened to go before the House to apologize for so doing and to suggest that perhaps I had outlived my usefulness as a Member of Congress.

At this stage of the game, I am sure my vote was wrong, and I am going to oppose the Senate version of the bill this afternoon. The bill is not a civil rights nor an equal rights bill, and it is going to encourage violence, incite mob rule, and bring about suffering to no end.

I have always been for equal rights—or civil rights if you care to call them that—and my record speaks for itself. As chairman of the District of Columbia Committee on Appropriations and as ranking minority member, I have initiated and supported an orderly integration program within the District of Columbia and without the aid of this legislation. All of our schools, theaters, hotels, and so forth were integrated without violence. That is the way it should be, and the way we went about it is the proper way.

The bill on which we are voting this afternoon is being used not to give equal rights to everyone, but to usurp the rights of one group in favor of another. The most flagrant example of such abuse exists right here in Washington today. Here people who have obtained rank in important positions and on employment rosters are being pushed aside and downgraded in order to favor people of other races.

I apologize for having voted for the bill in the first place. But long debate and much publicity, the results of which are already beginning to show, have caused me to see this picture in a different light. Yes, I have changed my mind, but only fools refuse to do so.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MacGregor].

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, like the gentleman from Virginia, who did not complain about his time allotment of 3 minutes, I shall not complain about my 2 minutes. I shall also not apologize for the vote I cast on February 10, 1964. I said "yea" then, and I am pleased to say "yea" today.

Mr. Speaker, what we are trying to do is to guarantee to all Americans an equal chance to vote, to get an education and a job, and to be served in historically public places of accommodation. Important as the scope and extent of this bill is, it is also vitally important that all Americans understand what this bill does not cover.

Your mail and mine, your contacts and mine with our constituents, indicates a great degree of misunderstanding about this bill. People complain about racial "balancing" in the public schools, about open occupancy in housing, about preferential treatment or quotas in employment. There is a mistaken belief that Congress is legislating in these areas in this bill. When we drafted this bill we excluded these issues largely because the problems raised by these controversial questions are more properly handled at a governmental level closer to the American people and by communities and individuals themselves. The Senate has spelled out our intentions more specifically.

Title IV, as amended by the Senate, provides:

> Nothing in this title shall empower any official or court of the United States to issue any order seeking to achieve a racial balance in any school by requiring the transportation of students from one school to another, or from one school district to another in order to achieve such racial balance—

The Senate laid to rest the fear that the Federal Government would begin to use GI and FHA mortgages to control home sales or rentals with the following amendment:

> Nothing in this title shall add to or detract from any existing authority with respect to any program or activity under which Federal financial assistance is extended by way of a contract of insurance or guaranty.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, in the difficult area of equal employment opportunities, the Senate has added this language to title VII:

> This title shall not be interpreted to require any employer, employment agency, labor organization, or joint labor-management committee to grant preferential treatment to any individual or to any group because of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin on account of an imbalance which may exist with respect to the total number or percentage of persons of any race, color, religion, sex, or national origin.

Mr. Speaker, the Senate has improved this bill in clarifying its scope and coverage. I urge each Member to search his own heart and conscience when he casts his vote today.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of the time on this side to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCulloch].

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, the time has come for us to again vote our conscience in the cause of civil rights.

The chairman of the Judiciary Committee will explain the major amendments adopted by the Senate. I approve them.

Five months ago, the House debated the civil rights bill for 10 days, and passed the bill by a vote of 290 to 130. The bill was then comprehensive in scope yet moderate in application, subject to effective judicial and administrative safeguards. The bill returns to the House, from whence it came, comprehensive in scope, with the individual States clothed with more authority and responsibility in the enforcement of the legislation, than when it left the House. In short, the bill comes back to the House tempered to and softened by the sober judgment of the Members of the other body, yes, even by the wishes of the people.

Much inaccurate information has been circulated about the legislation both as it left the House and as it is now before the House. In view thereof, I wish to negate only a few of the most glaring inaccuracies that have had such wide dissemination.

First. The bill now before the House does not permit the Federal Government to tell a bank, savings and loan company, or other such financial institution to whom it may or may not make a loan.

Second. The bill does not permit the Federal Government to tell any home or apartment owner or real estate operator to whom he must sell, rent, lease, or otherwise use his real estate.

Third. The bill does not permit the Federal Government to interfere with the day-to-day operations of a business or labor organization.

Fourth. The bill does not permit the Federal Government to require an employer or union to hire or accept for membership a quota of persons from any particular minority group.

Fifth. The bill does not permit the Federal Government to destroy the job seniority rights of either union or nonunion employees.

Sixth. The bill does not permit the Federal Government to interfere with a farmer's operation of his farm.

Seventh. The bill does not permit the Federal Government to impose minority quotas upon farmhands or tenants.

Eighth. The bill does not permit the Federal Government to interfere with membership in farm organizations.

Ninth. The bill does not permit the Federal Government to deny or interfere with an individual's rights to receive social security or veteran's benefits.

Tenth. The bill neither authorizes nor permits the Federal Government to interfere in a State's right to fix voter qualifications.

Eleventh. The bill does not permit the Federal Government to interfere with or destroy the private property rights of individual businessmen.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Indiana rise?

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, a point of order. The gentleman from Ohio who is now addressing us is one of the most able Members of the House of Representatives. He is one of the most dedicated, one of the most knowledgeable Members of the House in this particular field. There has been tremendous misrepresentation as to what is contained in this bill and I do hope, Mr. Speaker, that we could have order so that the gentleman's remarks may be heard.

The SPEAKER. The point of order is well taken. The House will be in order.

The gentleman from Ohio will proceed.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, twelfth, the bill does not permit the Federal Government to tell a lawyer, doctor, banker, or other professional man whom he must serve.

Thirteenth. The bill does not permit the Federal Government in any way to interfere with freedom of the press or freedom of speech.

Fourteenth. The bill contains no primary criminal penalties.

The bill does, however, seek to prohibit discrimination by every proper means, in accordance with the Constitution.

No statutory law will or can completely end the discrimination under attack by this legislation. Such discrimination will finally end only when the mind and heart and conscience of everyone of good will decrees it.

To create hope of immediate and complete success can only promote conflict, and result in brooding despair.

In the meantime I call upon—yes, I implore—leaders everywhere to shun violence of every kind, use our constitutional rights of freedom of speech and press, to peaceably assemble and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances, in the same fine spirit by which they became a part of our great Constitution.

In the same vein, I suggest that those charged with the enforcement of the law proceed with all deliberate speed and consideration during the time of adjustment to the new duties imposed thereby.

In the meantime 20 million Americans can, for the first time, dream some dreams and in due course see nearly all of them come true.

To my colleagues in the Congress as well as to people everywhere who believe in equality under the law, who support the Constitution, and who love liberty not only for themselves but for others as well, the civil rights bill now before us for final consideration is in accordance with the best traditions of America.

I call upon every one of you to vote for the resolution.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCULLOCH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my appreciation to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, the ranking minority member of the House Committee on the Judiciary, for rendering statesmanlike service over the years and for doing a job with dignity, with courage, with energy, and with great skill in a very difficult time on a very difficult subject. The country and the Congress owe him a debt of gratitude.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I shall try to paraphrase a sentence of that great Englishman, Sir Winston Churchill.

I say to my colleagues in the House and in the other body and to people all over the country: Never have so many of such ability worked so hard, and so effectively, for which so few received the credit.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary will close the debate, but before that I wish to grant the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WELTNER] 1 minute.

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, over 4 months ago, the civil rights bill came to this floor. Its stated purpose, equality of opportunity for all Americans, is a proper goal. But I questioned its means, and voted against passage. Now, after the most thorough and sifting examination in legislative history, this measure returns for final consideration. It returns with the overwhelming approval of both Houses of Congress.

Manifestly, the issue is already decided, and approval is assured. By the time my name is called, votes sufficient for passage will have been recorded.

What, then, is the proper course? Is it to vote "no," with tradition, safety—and futility?

I believe a greater cause can be served. Change, swift and certain, is upon us, and we in the South face some difficult decisions.

We can offer resistance and defiance, with their harvest of strife and tumult. We can suffer continued demonstrations, with their wake of violence and disorder.

Or, we can acknowledge this measure as the law of the land. We can accept the verdict of the Nation.

Already, the responsible elements of my community are counseling this latter course. And, most assuredly, moderation, tranquillity, and orderly processes combine as a cause greater than conformity.

Mr. Speaker, I shall cast my lot with the leadership of my community. I shall cast my vote with that greater cause they serve. I will add my voice to those who seek reasoned and conciliatory adjustment to a new reality.

And finally, I would urge that we at home now move on to the unfinished task of building a new South. We must not remain forever bound to another lost cause.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] to close debate.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, it is my fervent hope that all of the United States shall unite and work with patience and with harmony to achieve the objectives of this legislation. Let all of us of all regions, of all faiths, of all races move forward together to redeem the American pledge of equality of opportunity for all. No exhortation of mine should be necessary to bring this performance to a close. Further delay, I will say, would be fatal.

Cervantes once said. "By the street of by and by you reach the house of never."

No phase of the bill has been left unexplored, undefined, unexplained. The amendments offered by the Senate are not lethal. None of them do serious violence to the purpose of the bill. The country can live with them. Acceptance of the amendments is a reasonable price to pay to avoid a conference that might renew lengthy debate, open up old sores, encourage more bitter controversy. The country desires no more argument, no more speeches; the country demands action now. Action is eloquence.

As to the Senate amendments, first, conviction of criminal contempt under all titles of the bill, except title I, with respect to voting rights, will require a jury trial. Jury trial is provided irrespective of the severity of the penalty imposed, but in no event may it exceed $1,000 fine or 6 months' imprisonment. No person can be convicted of criminal contempt unless the contempt is intentional. No person shall be placed in double jeopardy. The Senate amendment requires increased resort to State and local law for the settlement of complaints involving racial discrimination in public accommodations or employment. Before the Attorney General may initiate an action under titles II or VII, he must have reasonable cause to believe that a pattern or practice of resistance to law exists. The Senate amendment to title IV, desegregation in public education, also provides for an increased resort to State and local machinery in the settlement of complaints respecting school desegregation.

The amendment further defines the intent of Congress with respect to the issue of racially balanced schools. Nothing in the bill empowers Federal courts to issue any order which seeks to achieve, by busing or other means, racial balance in the public schools.

The Senate amendment would assure that termination or refusal of Federal financial assistance under title VI is limited to the particular program or particular political entity in which discrimination is found after a hearing.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CORMAN. I would like to ask my chairman, what is the meaning of "pattern or practice" as it is used to limit the Attorney General's power to initiate suit under titles II and VII?

Mr. CELLER. A pattern or practice of resistance would exist, for example, where there is discrimination by several concerns in the same industry or line of business, where a chain of motels or restaurants discriminated in all or part of its branches, or where a single company regularly refused to treat Negroes without discrimination. There would be no authority for the Attorney General to sue a single firm for an isolated or sporadic act of discrimination. The words "resistance to enjoyment of the rights" under the act means no more than refusal to comply with titles II or VII of the act; that is, engaging in any prohibited discrimination. There is no requirement that the pattern or practice be pursuant to a conspiracy or a concert of action, and the Attorney General is authorized under titles II and VII to join in a single lawsuit all or some of the persons or companies whose conduct amounts to a pattern or practice, whether or not joinder would otherwise be appropriate.

Finally, the statute contains the usual directive to the Attorney General that he should have a reasonable case before he sues, but of course, he—not the court—decides whether reasonable cause exists, and the issue of reasonable cause does not present a separate litigable issue.

Mr. Speaker, I shall outline the substance of changes made by the Senate to the House version of H.R. 7152.

TITLE I (VOTING RIGHTS)

HOUSE

Title I of the House bill requires registration officials to apply uniform standards in registering voters and prohibits denial of registration because of immaterial errors or omissions on voting applications in Federal elections. It creates a rebuttable presumption that a citizen who has completed a sixth-grade education is literate for voting purposes. It further provides that where literacy tests are employed as a qualification for voting the tests must be conducted wholly in writing and certified copies maintained.

It also authorizes the Attorney General or a defendant to request a three-judge court to hear and dispose of voting cases. It is particularly important to settle voting cases promptly because the right to vote is of little value after the election has been held.

SENATE

The Senate added a provision which would permit the Attorney General to exempt from the literacy tests provisions those States which he determines are not discriminating in voting registration and procedure.

TITLE II (PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS)

HOUSE

Title II of the House bill provides that no citizen shall be subject to discrimination because of his race, color, religion, or national origin in certain places of public accommodation.

SENATE

Under the provisions added by the Senate, an aggrieved party involved in a dispute arising within one of those States or local jurisdictions with a public accommodations law must wait 30 days before filing civil action under the provisions of this bill. After 30 days, during which the State or local agencies can attempt to resolve the dispute, the aggrieved party may file an action in a Federal court. The court is authorized to receive the case without cost, may furnish an attorney for the complainant and may permit the Attorney General to intervene in the action if he certifies the case to be of general public importance.

The court may also stay the proceedings pending termination of State or local enforcement action. This extension authority is necessary because many State public accommodation statutes provide criminal penalties and the State courts must be allowed sufficient time to hear and decide the case.

Where a complaint arises in a State which does not have comparable public accommodation laws, the Federal court may receive the case and refer the complaint to the community relations service for a period of 60 days, which can be extended to not more than 120 days, in an attempt to obtain voluntary compliance with the law.

Under the Senate amendment, title II also authorizes the Attorney General to file action to secure compliance with the law when he has reasonable cause to believe that any person or group of persons is engaged in a pattern or practice of resistance to the law. In such actions, the Attorney General may request a court of three judges to hear and determine the case.

The new language of title II provides effective relief for aggrieved parties both in instances where there are individual violations of the law and in situations where there is massive resistance to the law requiring action by the Federal Government to protect the rights of all citizens.

TITLE III (DESEGREGATION OF PUBLIC FACILITIES)

HOUSE

Title III of the bill secures for all citizens the right of equal access to State maintained public facilities, such as parks, playgrounds, or libraries. It authorizes the Attorney General to initiate or intervene in suits to desegregate such facilities when individual citizens are unable to initiate or maintain appropriate legal proceedings.

SENATE

The Senate amendment adds language which clarifies the criteria which the Attorney General will use in determining whether to initiate suits authorized by title III.

The Senate amendment deletes section 302 from title III and places it in title IX. This section authorized the Attorney General to intervene in any Federal court action filed for the purpose of seeking relief from the denial of equal protection of the laws on account of race, religion, color, or national origin.

The Senate also added a new section 304 which classifies a complaint filed under this title as a writing or document under section 1001, title 18, United States Code. That section imposes criminal penalties for knowingly making a false or fictitious statement to a Government agency.

TITLE IV (DISCRIMINATION UNDER PUBLIC EDUCATION)

HOUSE

Title IV of the House bill authorizes the Attorney General to initiate and intervene in public school desegregation cases where students or parents are unable to institute and maintain legal proceedings. It provides for Federal technical and financial assistance when requested by school boards and communities to assist in the desegregation of their schools.

SENATE

The Senate amendment proposes several language changes to clarify the intent of this title. It provides that the Attorney General must receive a complaint in writing which charges that a school board is denying children equal protection and must determine that the complaint is meritorious prior to initiating action. The Attorney General must give notice to a complaint to the appropriate school board or college authority and give them a reasonable time to correct the situation. It deletes authorization for dependents' allowances when school personnel attend special training sessions. A new section 410 states that nothing in this title is intended to prohibit classification and assignment of schoolchildren for reasons other than race, color, religion, or national origin.

The amendment further defines the intent of Congress with respect to the question of racially balanced schools. New language added to section 407(a) provides that nothing contained in this title shall empower the U.S. courts to issue any order which seeks to achieve by busing or any other means racial balance in public schools. Simply stated, this means that this title does not grant to the Federal courts any power which they do not now have to insure the equal protection of the laws.

The Senate amendment also classifies a complaint filed under this title as a writing or document under section 1001, title 18, United States Code—same as Senate amendment to title III.

TITLE V (COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS)

HOUSE

Title V of the House bill extends the life of the Civil Rights Commission for 4 years and broadens and adds to its duties. The Commission will serve as a national clearinghouse for information in respect to equal protection of the laws, and is authorized to investigate civil rights for charges of fraud in State or Federal elections.

SENATE

The Senate amendment to title V relates primarily to the rules of procedure for Commission hearings. The new procedural rules will more nearly comply with those now in effect for other Federal administrative agencies.

TITLE VI (NONDISCRIMINATION IN FEDERALLY ASSISTED PROGRAMS)

HOUSE

Title VI of the House bill would permit the withholding of Federal funds from programs administered on a segregated basis. Final action to withhold such assistance will only be taken after efforts to achieve voluntary compliance with the law have failed.

SENATE

The Senate amendment makes clear that Federal funds will be cut off for only those political entities or particular programs or parts of programs in which discrimination is practiced. This means that all Federal aid to a State or aid to a particular program will not be cut off because one particular part of the program or institution is being operated in violation of the law.

The Senate amendment adds a new section 604 which provides that nothing in this title authorizes Federal department or agency action with respect to employment practices except where a primary objective of Federal financial assistance is to provide employment.

The Senate amendment adds a new section 605 which provides clarifying language.

TITLE VII (EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY)

HOUSE

Title VII of the House bill provides that certain employers, labor unions, and employment agencies whose actions affect interstate commerce are prohibited from discriminating on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin against an individual seeking employment.

SENATE

The Senate amendment to title VII, like the amendment to title II, requires increased resort to State antidiscrimination agencies where they exist. This is consistent with the intent of the House bill.

The Senate amendment provides that a charge of an unfair employment practice must be filed by the person aggrieved or by a member of the Equal Employment Opportunities Commission which is established by this title. In the case of an alleged unlawful employment practice occurring in a State or local community which have laws prohibiting practices comparable to what is provided in this bill, the person cannot file the charge with the Commission prior to 60 days after he has instituted proceedings under the State or local law, unless such action has been earlier terminated. The bill extends this period to 120 days during the first year after enactment of a comparable State or local law. Where a charge of an unfair practice is filed by a Commission member, the Commission shall notify the appropriate State or local agency and afford them the same period of time in which to resolve the complaint.

The Equal Employment Opportunities Commission is given a maximum of 60 days in which to obtain voluntary compliance with the provisions of the law. If they are not able to do so, the aggrieved party in the case may file an action in the Federal district court in which the practice has occurred. Like title II, the Senate amendment authorizes the court to accept the case without costs, furnish the complainant legal assistance, and permit the Attorney General to intervene in the action. If the court finds that the respondent has intentionally engaged in or is intentionally engaging in unlawful practices, the court may order such affirmative action as may be appropriate.

Again, under this title the Attorney General may bring a civil action where he finds a pattern or practice of resistance to the law and may request a three-judge court to hear the case.

In addition, numerous revisions were made in the recordkeeping section of this title. The substitute language provides that where records on employment practices are required by State laws or Federal Executive orders, any additional information required by this law may be added to what is already being kept.

The Senate amendment also—

First. Validates nondiscriminatory ability tests given by employers—section 703(h);

Second. Provides that compliance with the Fair Labor Standards Act as amended satisfies the requirement of the title barring discrimination because of sex—section 703(b);

Third. Deletes the provision exempting discrimination against atheists;

Fourth. Exempts corporations owned by Indian tribes—section 701(b);

Fifth. Subjects all employees of the Equal Employment Opportunities Commission to the provisions of the Hatch Act—section 705(j);

Sixth. Exempts educational institutions with respect to employment connected with their educational activities—section 702.

TITLE VIII (REGISTRATION FOR VOTING STATISTICS)

HOUSE

Title VIII of the House bill directs the Secretary of Commerce to make a survey of registration and voting statistics in geographical areas recommended by the Civil Rights Commission. A Census Bureau survey would include a count of persons of voting age by race, color, and national origin, plus statistics on the extent to which persons are registered to vote and have voted for Members of the House of Representatives since January 1960.

SENATE

The Senate amendment adds language to preserve the privacy of census information and provides penalties for disclosure violations. It provides that persons who do not wish to disclose their race, color, national origin, political party affiliation, or voting preference are not required to do so, and must be fully informed of their right to refuse to answer such questions.

TITLE IX

HOUSE

Title IX in the House bill provides the right of appeal from a remand of a civil rights case from a State court from which it was removed.

SENATE

The Senate amendment adds a section 902, which was formerly written as section 302 in title III.

TITLE X (COMMUNITY RELATIONS SERVICE)

HOUSE

The House bill establishes a Community Relations Service to assist State and local communities in the solution of racial problems arising out of discriminatory practices. The objective of this agency would be to secure voluntary compliance with the law through conciliation and mediation of these disputes.

SENATE

The Senate amendment deletes the limitation on the number of personnel to be appointed which was fixed in the House version, not to exceed six in number. Other Senate amendments are of a clarifying nature.

TITLE XI (MISCELLANEOUS)

HOUSE

Title XI of the House bill contains sections on separability, appropriations authority, and antipreemption provisions.

SENATE

The Senate amendment adds two new sections.

New section 1101 provides for jury trial in all cases of criminal contempt arising under the bill, except voting rights cases under title I. It further provides that to be punishable as a criminal contempt the disobedience must be intentional. Criminal contempt proceedings under title I would remain subject to the provisions of the 1957 Civil Rights Act.

New section 1102 guarantees that no person will be placed in double jeopardy by virtue of criminal contempt proceedings and criminal prosecution being undertaken against him for the same act.

Mr. Speaker, I hope we will have an overwhelming vote for this bill; that that vote will reverberate throughout the length and breadth of the land so that it can be said that Congress hearkens unto the voice of Leviticus, "proclaiming liberty throughout the land to all the inhabitants thereof."

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, there are others who have been paid deserved tributes for their great efforts in this very noble endeavor. I think all of us in this House, all of us who have labored on this great issue will recognize that there is one individual who has given such selfless dedication to this great cause, who has been so painstaking that he needed the patience of Job and who brought us to this fine hour when we now pass legislation which all of us feel is in the great interest of this great country. I refer to the gentleman from New York, EMANUEL CELLER, the great chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary to whom this great tribute should be paid.

Mr. CELLER. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] has expired. All time has expired.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 289, nays 126, answered "present" 1, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 179]

YEAS—289

Abele
Adair
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson
Andrews, N. Dak.
Arends
Ashley
Aspinall
Auchincloss
Ayres
Baldwin
Barrett
Barry
Bass
Bates
Becker
Bell
Betts
Blatnik
Boland
Bolling
Bolton, Frances P.
Bolton, Oliver P.
Bow
Brademas
Bray
Bromwell
Brooks
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Ohio
Bruce
Buckley
Burke
Burkhalter
Burton, Calif.
Burton, Utah
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Cameron
Carey
Cederberg
Celler
Chamberlain
Chenoweth
Clancy
Clausen, Don H.
Cleveland
Cohelan
Collier
Conte
Corbett
Corman
Cunningham
Curtin
Curtis
Daddario
Dague
Daniels
Dawson
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Derounian
Derwinski
Devine
Diggs
Dingell
Dole
Donohue
Dulski
Duncan
Dwyer
Edmondson
Edwards
Ellsworth
Fallon
Farbstein
Feighan
Findley
Finnegan
Fino
Flood
Fogarty
Ford
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Gallagher
Garmatz
Giaimo
Gilbert
Gill
Glenn
Gonzalez
Goodell
Goodling
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffin
Griffiths
Grover
Gubser
Hagen, Calif.
Halleck
Halpern
Hanna
Hansen
Harding
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Hawkins
Hays
Healey
Hechler
Hoeven
Hoffman
Holifield
Holland
Horan
Horton
Hosmer
Hutchinson
Ichord
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Pa.
Johnson, Wis.
Karsten
Kastenmeier
Kee
Keith
Kelly
Keogh
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Kunkel
Kyl
Laird
Langen
Latta
Leggett
Libonati
Lindsay
Long, Md.
McClory
McCulloch
McDade
McDowell
McFall
McIntire
McLoskey
Macdonald
MacGregor
Madden
Mailliard
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Mathias
Matsunaga
May
Michel
Miller, Calif.
Milliken
Minish
Minshall
Monagan
Montoya
Moore
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Morse
Morton
Mosher
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nix
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill
Osmers
Ostertag
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Pillion
Pirnie
Price
Pucinski
Quie
Randall
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Rich
Riehlman
Rivers, Alaska
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Roosevelt
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roudebush
Roush
Roybal
Rumsfeld
Ryan, Mich.
Ryan, N.Y.
St. George
St Germain
St. Onge
Saylor
Schadeberg
Schenck
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Schwengel
Secrest
Senner
Sheppard
Shipley
Shriver
Sibal
Sickles
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Springer
Staebler
Stafford
Staggers
Steed
Stinson
Stratton
Sullivan
Taft
Talcott
Teague, Calif.
Thomas
Thompson, N.J.
Thomson, Wis.
Toll
Tollefson
Tupper
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Wallhauser
Weaver
Weltner
Westland
Whalley
Wharton
White
Widnall
Wilson, Charles H.
Wydler
Younger
Zablocki

NAYS—126

Abbitt
Abernethy
Alger
Andrews, Ala.
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Baker
Baring
Battin
Beckworth
Beermann
Belcher
Bennett, Fla.
Berry
Boggs
Bonner
Brock
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Burleson
Casey
Chelf
Clawson, Del
Colmer
Cooley
Cramer
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Tenn.
Dorn
Dowdy
Downing
Elliott
Everett
Evins
Fascell
Fisher
Flynt
Foreman
Forrester
Fountain
Fuqua
Gary
Gathings
Gibbons
Grant
Gross
Gurney
Hagan, Ga.
Haley
Hall
Hardy
Harris
Harrison
Henderson
Herlong
Huddleston
Hull
Jarman
Jennings
Jensen
Johansen
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Kilgore
Knox
Kornegay
Landrum
Lennon
Lipscomb
Long, La.
McMillan
Mahon
Marsh
Martin, Calif.
Matthews
Meader
Mills
Morrison
Murray
Natcher
Passman
Patman
Poage
Poff
Pool
Purcell
Quillen
Rains
Reid, Ill.
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts, Ala.
Roberts, Tex.
Rogers, Fla.
Scott
Selden
Short
Sikes
Siler
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Va.
Snyder
Stephens
Stubblefield
Taylor
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, La.
Thompson, Tex.
Trimble
Tuck
Tuten
Van Pelt
Vinson
Waggonner
Watson
Watts
Whitener
Whitten
Williams
Willis
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Ind.
Winstead
Wright
Wyman
Young

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Wickersham

NOT VOTING—15

Avery
Bennett, Mich.
Clark
Hébert
Karth
Kilburn
Lankford
Lesinski
Lloyd
Miller, N.Y.
Norblad
Pilcher
Powell
Rogers, Tex.
Utt

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Clark for, with Mr. Wickersham against.

Mr. Karth for, with Mr. Hébert against.

Mr. Norblad for, with Mr. Pilcher against.

Mr. Miller of New York for, with Mr. Rogers of Texas against.

Mr. Powell for, with Mr. Kilburn against.

Mr. Lloyd for, with Mr. Utt against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Lesinski with Mr. Lankford.

Mr. MINSHALL changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK]. If he were present, he would vote "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 2735. An act for the relief of Ligia Paulina Jimenez;

H.R. 2737. An act for the relief of Pedro Aguinaldo;

H.R. 5408. An act for the relief of Jackie Bergancia Smith;

H.R. 5501. An act for the relief of Wieslawa Marianna Borczon;

H.R. 6473. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Loward D. Sparks;

H.R. 9234. An act to incorporate the Little League Baseball, Inc.;

H.R. 10437. An act to incorporate the National Committee on Radiation Protection and Measurements;

H.J. Res. 475. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim December 7, 1966, as Pearl Harbor Day in commemoration of the 25th anniversary of the attack on Pearl Harbor; and

H.J. Res. 950. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to an amendment to the compact between the State of Ohio and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania relating to Pymatuning Lake.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 8590. An act to incorporate the Aviation Hall of Fame.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL JULY 20, 1964

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a concurrent resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 321

Resolved, That when the House adjourns on Thursday, July 2, 1964, it stand adjourned until 12 o'clock noon on Monday, July 20, 1964.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE AND PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE OF THE SENATE TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS DULY PASSED BY THE TWO HOUSES AND FOUND TRULY ENROLLED

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolulows:

H. CON. RES. 322

Resolved, That notwithstanding any adjournment of the two Houses until July 20, 1964, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate be, and they are hereby, authorized to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO RECEIVE MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding any adjournment of the House until July 20, 1964, the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER TO ACCEPT RESIGNATIONS AND APPOINT COMMISSIONS, BOARDS, AND COMMITTEES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding any adjournment of the House until July 20, 1964, the Speaker be authorized to accept resignations and to appoint commissions, boards, and committees authorized by law or by the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING CALL OF CONSENT CALENDAR AND CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES ON TUESDAY, JULY 21, 1964

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the Consent Calendar and consideration of motions to suspend the rules, in order on Monday, July 20, 1964, may be in order on Tuesday, July 21, 1964.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding any adjournment of the House until July 20, 1964, all Members of the House shall have the privilege to extend and revise their own remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on more than one subject, if they so desire, and also to include therein such short quotations as may be necessary to explain or complete such extension of remarks, but this order shall not apply to any subject matter which may have occurred or to any speech delivered subsequent to the adjournment of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

MERCHANT MARINE ACT

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Concurrent Resolution 323, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 323

Resolved, That the President of the United States is requested to return to the House of Representatives the enrolled bill (H.R. 10053) to amend section 502 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, relating to construction-differential subsidies. If and when said bill is returned by the President, the action of the Presiding Officers of the two Houses in signing the bill shall be deemed rescinded; and the Clerk of the House is authorized and directed, in the reenrollment of said bill, to make the following correction:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That the proviso in the second sentence of subsection (b) of section 502 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (46 U.S.C. 1152 (b)), is amended by striking out 'June 30, 1964,' and inserting in lieu thereof 'June 30, 1965,'."

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURES

Mr. ELLIOTT, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 795, Rept. No. 1539), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

H. RES. 795

Resolved, That a special committee of five Members be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives to investigate and report to the House not later than January 3, 1965, with respect to the following matters:

(1) The extent and nature of expenditures made by all candidates for the House of Representatives in connection with their campaign for nomination and election to such office.

(2) The amount subscribed, contributed, or expended, and the value of services rendered, and facilities made available (including personal services, use of advertising space, radio and television time, office space, moving picture films, and automobile and any other transportation facilities) by any individual, individuals, or group of individuals, committee, partnership, corporation, or labor union, to or on behalf of each such candidate in connection with any such campaign or for the purpose of influencing the votes cast or to be cast at any convention or election held in 1964 to which a candidate for the House of Representatives is to be nominated or elected.

(3) The use of any other means or influence (including the promise or use of patronage) for the purpose of aiding or influencing the nomination or election of any such candidates.

(4) The amounts, if any, raised, contributed, and expended by any individual, individuals, or group of individuals, committee, partnership, corporation, or labor union, including any political committee thereof, in connection with any such election, and the amounts received by any political committee from any corporation, labor union, individual, individuals, or group of individuals, committee, or partnership.

(5) The violations, if any, of the following statutes of the United States:

(a) The Federal Corrupt Practices Act.

(b) The Act of August 2, 1939, as amended, relating to pernicious political activities, commonly referred to as the Hatch Act.

(c) The provisions of section 304, chapter 120, Public Law 101, Eightieth Congress, first session, referred to as the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947.

(d) Any statute or legislative Act of the United States or of the State within which a candidate is seeking nomination or reelection to the House of Representatives, the violation of which Federal or State statute, or statutes, would affect the qualification of a Member of the House of Representatives within the meaning of article I, section 5, of the Constitution of the United States.

(6) Such other matters relating to the election of Members of the House of Representatives in 1964, and the campaigns of candidates in connection therewith, as the committee deems to be of public interest, and which, in its opinion, will aid the House of Representatives in enacting remedial legislation, or in deciding contests that may be instituted involving the right to a seat in the House of Representatives.

(7) The committee is authorized to act upon its own motion and upon such information as in its judgment may be reasonable or reliable. Upon complaint being made to the committee under oath, by any person, candidate, or political committee, setting forth allegations as to facts which, under this resolution, it would be the duty of said committee to investigate, the committee shall investigate such charges as fully as though it were acting upon its own motion, unless, after a hearing upon such complaint, the committee shall find that the allegations in such complaint, are immaterial or untrue. All hearings before the committee, and before any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, shall be public, and all orders and decisions of the committee, and of any such subcommittee, shall be public.

For the purpose of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such public hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eighty-eighth Congress, to employ such attorneys, experts, clerical, and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, and to take such testimony as it deems advisable. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any subcommittee, or by any member designated by such chairman and may be served by any person designated by any such chairman or member.

(8) The committee is authorized and directed to report promptly any and all violations of any Federal or State statutes in connection with the matters and things mentioned herein to the Attorney General of the United States in order that he may take such official action as may be proper.

(9) Every person who, having been summoned as a witness by authority of said committee or any subcommittee thereof, willfully makes default, or who having appeared, refuses to answer any question pertinent to the investigation heretofore authorized, shall be held to the penalties prescribed by law.

That said committee is authorized and directed to file interim reports whenever in the judgment of the majority of the committee, or of a subcommittee conducting portions of said investigation, the public interest will be best served by the filing of said interim reports, and in no event shall the final report of said committee be filed later than January 3, 1965, as hereinabove provided.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask for immediate consideration of House Resolution 795, which I have cleared with the minority side.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the House will consider the resolution.

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE].

Mr. Speaker, the resolution before us simply authorizes the Speaker of the House to appoint a special committee to investigate where necessary and report on campaign expenditures of candidates for the office of Representative in Congress. This is customarily known as the Davis resolution in honor of its author. It was introduced by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DAVIS] who for several years past has headed this committee in each election year, and who has by common agreement of all who know about it done each year a careful and outstanding job. I had the privilege of serving for a few years on the Elections Subcommittee of the Committee on House Administration. In that capacity, I had the privilege and at times I might say the duty of looking into the work Mr. DAVIS' special committee had done in particular, it had investigated. I uniformly found that the quality of its work was high, and its approach thorough.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution provides that the special committee shall have jurisdiction to investigate the extent and nature of expenditures made by candidates for the House of Representatives in connection with their campaigns for nomination and election to such office, including the amount subscribed, contributed, or expended, and the value of services rendered and facilities made available.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, as I understand the purpose of this resolution, it is to give jurisdiction to a select committee to investigate expenditures and so forth in regard to the nomination and election of Members of Congress.

Does it mean when the word "nomination" is used that the Federal Government is assuming investigative jurisdiction over primary elections?

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I wish the gentleman from Tennessee, the author of the resolution, were here to answer the gentleman's question. However, it has been my understanding throughout all the years that the committee did not have that jurisdiction, or if it did have that jurisdiction it did not exercise it.

Now, as I understand it, this committee has been created each 2 years for approximately the past 20 years. If the committee has had such jurisdiction, I am told by the chairman of the Committee on Rules that it has never exercised it with respect to primaries.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, can he give me the assurance that this resolution does not give this committee the right to invade the province of the several States in regard to primary elections?

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BURLESON. Well, as I understand the functioning of this committee, as it has functioned in the past, in answer to the question of the gentleman from Mississippi, under the prevailing law, which we assume will be the law in the next few hours, I would say to the gentleman that this committee could exercise its jurisdiction over every primary campaign in every place where one is held.

Mr. Speaker, heretofore it has only assumed the responsibility of inquiring into irregularities, but not the conduct of the primary election as such. However, under the various laws of the various States governing primaries where there is unfairness or where the violations are such that they reach back into the constitutional processes of the election of Members of Congress, they are brought before the regular Elections Committee of the Committee on House Administration. But I repeat under the present law I believe that the committee could do just about what it wanted to do in this instance.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, in the State of Mississippi we have a Corrupt Practices Act, for instance, that provides a limitation upon the amount of money that a candidate can spend in seeking election in a Democratic or Republican primary.

Would this committee be given the authority to go behind the laws of the State of Mississippi to determine whether they have been obeyed? In other words, is this an attempt to preempt State laws in regard to primary elections?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I think I can reasonably assure the gentleman from Mississippi that it is not.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I would hope that the Federal Government is not going to extend its long arm further into the jurisdictions that belong exclusively to the several States.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I join the gentleman in the expression of that wish.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. I may say to the gentleman that I have had the privilege of serving on this committee, if it can be considered as a privilege in that it meets in December during adjournment and holds hearings. This has occurred on two occasions I know of as a participating member and I may say to the gentleman as a matter of fact to my knowledge on those two occasions relating to the last two sessions of Congress and the last two elections the committee has not seen fit to go into the question of nominations but, rather, only the question of elections. That has been the practice of the committee in the past, and I assume it will be the practice in the future.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, this resolution has been cleared with the minority. There was no objection to it, as far as I know, in the Rules Committee. However, there seems to be a certain amount of discrepancy in that statement now. Several Members on the floor of the House would like to express themselves on that. So I would like to yield more time to the gentleman from Florida, who is thoroughly familiar with this matter.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I wonder why we must have this select committee when we have a House Administration Committee that is empowered to go into elections? Why is this necessary?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I will say to the gentleman this has been functioning now for at least 6 or 8 years, to my knowledge. It is nothing new.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. I would like to suggest to the gentleman that the procedure of this committee, as I am sure the gentleman knows, is to investigate charges prior to the reconvening of the Congress. The committee to which the gentleman refers is out of business after the adjournment of Congress. So it is obvious some action has to be taken in the form of a select committee to sit during the adjournment of the Congress. The purpose of this is to give the select committee the opportunity to hold hearings, and use subpena powers, and thus fully investigate the matters and report to the very committee the gentleman refers to.

The subcommittee of the select committee makes a report to the full committee. Then, of course, that recommendation is acted upon by the committee the gentleman mentions.

Mr. GROSS. What is the budget, or is there a budget in connection with the operation of this committee?

Mr. CRAMER. It is very nominal. As I recall, it is approximately $30,000.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CRAMER. And the money is turned back by the select committee if it is not used up in full.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BURLESON. There are two questions involved in this issue. This committee is authorized to act both before and after the fact, in alleged violations in any election. It deals with the conduct of candidates and their representatives in the conduct of campaigns. It should be borne in mind this committee only recommends. It does not take any legislative action.

It recommends to the Committee on House Administration. The Committee on House Administration only assumes responsibility after the fact where there are alleged violations and a contest is filed. That is the distinction.

Mr. CRAMER. I thank the gentleman.

Another reason is these matters should be, from the investigative standpoint, at least preliminarily disposed of in a recommendation before the Congress convenes, so that Members being seated will not be questioned as to their right to be seated in the Congress.

Mr. GROSS. Is this to say that the House Administration Committee cannot seek out any evidence that may be necessary prior to the convening of a session of Congress?

Mr. CRAMER. No. I specifically used the term "preliminary investigation" for the purpose of emphasizing the idea that the House Administration Committee then has an opportunity and right to go into the matter in depth if it believes it is necessary and justified.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. May I ask the gentleman from Texas, who spoke in the well of the House awhile ago in answer to an inquiry as to the effect this ad hoc committee would have on the primaries, which law of the land was he referring to that might give this select committee power to inquire into primaries? Was the gentleman referring to the new civil rights law that just passed this House?

Mr. BURLESON. My inference was to the bill just passed the House. That is not to say it gives this committee any special or extra power, but because of it, they could assume a great deal more authority than they have ever exercised before.

Mr. HALL. Will the gentleman explain to the House by what mechanism under the authorization and the new civil rights law this committee might consider those things that went back beyond the original nomination of a Congressman?

Mr. BURLESON. It is not intended to emphasize or raise new issues in connection with the civil rights bill just passed, other than to point out that under the new impetus of a great many things, including the bill just passed, it seems that the Federal Government may go into fields which it has never touched before. This may be one of them; this unlimited power which has been given the Federal Government in elections; all these unpresented powers now given into the hands of Washington officials. Under the guise of protecting civil rights it seems that now the lid is off, and whatever the legislative branch, the executive branch, and certainly the judicial branch may assume in connection with local affairs, it can do so to a degree heretofore unimagined. That is my opinion.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER].

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask a question of the gentleman from Texas. If this applies only to the general election, then why all the hurry to get it through now? Why do not we proceed as we have in the past and pass this as one of the resolutions before we adjourn? Why all the hurry now?

Mr. BURLESON. I am not too sure I understand the gentleman's question, but from now on until November we are going to have primaries and conventions. This is not limited to the general election in November.

Mr. YOUNGER. That is different from what we hear so far as the Rules Committee is concerned. They assured us it is not to go into the primaries. We have already had our primaries in California.

Mr. BURLESON. As was stated by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT] and the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE], this is not a new procedure. This is a historical procedure. I have been on the other side on defending the creation of this committee a few years ago. I think it was to do the thing the gentleman from Iowa mentioned a while ago, to appoint a special committee.

But it would take an expansion of the work of the committee, that is if we did the things that have always been done heretofore—that we have a collection of the evidence of any violation in any election whether it be the primary or whether it be as to the election machinery or even by convention, I would assume, or whether it be with respect to the November election. This committee by its very nature is continuing through the recess of the Congress, assuming that we have one, and they accumulate such facts under allegations which may be made by any candidate or the representatives of any candidates. They submit that after the November election the House Committee on Administration would have a further investigation if it deems it proper and necessary and justified and so forth.

Now back specifically to the gentleman's question as to whether it is necessary and why it is necessary. I say it was not necessary and that the presently constituted machinery of the committees could take care of it. I am not too sure, but I have thought at the time that it was worth trying.

But this committee is empowered with a great deal more authority under this resolution than presently constituted committees are. Because, as I said, it is an after-the-fact thing—a fait accompli so far as the House Committee on House Administration is concerned. Only in cases where elections are contested for a seat in the Senate or a seat in the House of Representatives. So this committee does have a special function. There is always the question as to where the authority of this committee or any other committee for that matter stops, or when it should begin, in deference to State and local authority in these matters. That is the question, and as I said here a little bit ago, I did not intend to inject such an issue here because it is just speculation at this point. But at the same time I say that with the trend of events as of today, it would appear that the Federal Government is becoming all encompassing in all these matters anyway.

Mr. YOUNGER. Will the gentleman answer this question? Then is it your idea that we are hurrying to pass a resolution which normally comes a week or 2 weeks before the session is adjourned because it is necessitated by the bill we just passed?

Mr. BURLESON. No, I would not think that really has anything to do with it. I think if it is going to be done, it had better be done at this point than to put it off and wait until we are closer to the elections. If there are violations and if accusations are made of irregularities, a record is made, a file established to present to the Elections Committee of the House Administration Committee. Evidence so collected becomes a part of any contested election subsequently filed.

Actually this select committee is in the position of policing elections and it certainly includes primaries. It submits its findings with or without recommendations. That is really its mission and its function.

Incidentally, I would prefer to give this authority to this committee than for the Civil Rights Commission to exercise its powers over the same matter. I have my doubts that the creation of this committee is necessary and about 8 or 10 years ago proposed it not be done but my views did not prevail. I repeat, if this function must be performed I would rather see this committee do it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNGER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. I cannot understand why, if this committee is empowered to go into primary elections, the committee was not constituted at the beginning of this session of Congress and before many of the primary elections were held. If it is empowered to go into primary elections, why was this committee not established several months ago? It is not sufficient to try to justify this resolution simply on the grounds that it has been approved in the past.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNGER. I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. I am sorry I was momentarily off the floor, but I was called away.

This committee or rather the authority for the existence of this committee, goes back to about 30 or 40 years ago. About this time, almost to the day and the month, this committee is suggested by the Speaker of the House, whoever he may be who happens to be the occupant of the Chair.

This committee is not an investigative committee. But it was suggested first by the late Speaker Sam Rayburn. Some of you are not familiar with some of these names, but the late Percy Priest was chairman of the committee on one occasion. Then a Republican Member, the Honorable Runt Bishop, was chairman of the committee as it was constituted and authorized.

The late Congressman Mansfield from Texas was chairman, and there were a number of others whose names do not immediately come to my mind.

It so happens that I have been named as chairman of the last four committees.

This committee has the approval of the gentleman from Indiana, the Honorable CHARLES HALLECK, the minority leader, and has the approval of the majority leader, and the Speaker has always considered it of importance, because we must police the Corrupt Practices Act and lawful contributions received by candidates and make certain that laws relating to labor-management contributions are complied with.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. YOUNGER. I believe we understand the committee. I believe we understand what was done before.

We have never been required to file financial statements for primaries on a Federal basis. We are required to file them in the State.

This committee has usually been appointed near the end of the session each time, rather than in the middle of the session. We in California have already held our primary. We have not filed statements. We have not been required to file statements.

Is the committee going back into the primaries?

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Certainly not.

Mr. YOUNGER. That is what we are trying to find out.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman from New York yield to me?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. May I ask the gentleman from Tennessee whether the committee at this particular time wants to look into any primary which has been held?

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Not a single one.

Mr. HALEY. Would the gentleman answer another question?

In previous resolutions of this kind have the words "nomination and" been included? I asked the gentleman from Alabama, and he was not sure.

As I see it, the resolution would give authority never granted before. If you have had it, you have not exercised it. The authority would be to look into primary nominations of various parties. I do not believe that is any place the Federal Government should be.

Would the gentleman consider accepting an amendment to cut out the words "nomination and" and leave the word "election"? In other words, what I am trying to say is, would the gentleman consider an amendment that would merely grant the right to inquire into general elections rather than primaries, where men are nominated?

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Why, certainly. I have no objection. I say "I," because it so happens that I have been the chairman for the past 8 years, four times in a row.

The language of this resolution is the same language that has been in the resolution for the past 30 years. We have never gone into primary elections, and we do not intend to now, whoever may be the chairman of the committee. If it will make the gentleman feel easier, certainly I will accept an amendment to strike out the words he mentions.

Mr. HALEY. I say to the gentleman from Tennessee that everybody here knows he has had this responsibility for some time. He has been fair and impartial. Now we are also confronted with a slightly different situation, I say to the gentleman. So long as the gentleman from Tennessee is the chairman of that committee, I feel certain there would not be prying into primary elections or nominations by political parties, but we now have a little different situation. I believe that if the words "nomination and" were stricken from this resolution I could support it.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the "ayes" appeared to have it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

Mr. Speaker, I was seeking recognition to offer an amendment.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Alabama yield for the purpose of an amendment?

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I decline to yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I think I have the floor.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Mississippi withdraw his point of order temporarily?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I withdraw it temporarily.

Will the gentlewoman yield to me for that purpose?

The SPEAKER. For what purpose?

Mr. WILLIAMS. For the purpose of offering an amendment or several amendments.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I cannot, Mr. Speaker, because I am only working on the rule, as I understand it. We have to wait.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, if there is going to be further debate, then I think there ought to be some people to hear it. Therefore, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa makes the point of order that a quorum is not present, and evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 180]

Abbitt
Ashley
Ashmore
Auchincloss
Avery
Baker
Bass
Becker
Bennett, Mich.
Berry
Bolling
Buckley
Clark
Colmer
Davis, Ga.
Derounian
Diggs
Hansen
Healey
Hébert
Jensen
Jones, Mo.
Karth
Kee
Kilburn
King, Calif.
Kluczynski
Lankford
Lesinski
Lloyd
McFall
McMillan
MacGregor
Martin, Nebr.
Matsunaga
Miller, N.Y.
Morrison
Moss
Norblad
Ostertag
Passman
Patman
Pilcher
Powell
Rains
Rogers, Tex.
Rostenkowski
St Germain
Sibal
Sisk
Smith, Calif.
Teague, Calif.
Thompson, N.J.
Utt
Wharton
Willis
Wydler

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 375 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Speaker, I think there has been considerable confusion, I know there has been in my mind and I think there is in the minds of many of the Members, since this resolution came out of the Rules Committee. We were informed at the time that this was the resolution that had been passed every 2 years for a long period of time, the author of the resolution stated since 1940.

The next question that came up on the floor, and I think it is of the greatest importance, is why this great hurry to get this resolution through now? Why can we not wait as we always have in the past until the end of the session and then have this committee appointed and have it work while the House is no longer in session and have the committee bring in its report at the beginning of January for the new Congress?

Why this speed? Why must it come out in the month of July?

Well, there is one very good reason, it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, and that is if this committee is to go in and investigate primaries—and State primaries at that—we were informed and I am sure he had good reason for making the statement, by the distinguished author of the bill, that that is not contemplated.

However, I would like to call your attention to the wording on page 3, line 4, section (d):

> Any statute or legislative Act of the United States or of the State within which a candidate is seeking nomination or reelection to the House of Representatives, the violation of which Federal or State statute, or statutes, would affect the qualification of a Member of the House of Representatives within the meaning of article I, section 5, of the Constitution of the United States.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that simply because this clause has never been invoked, it does not mean that it is impossible to invoke it. I believe very firmly that the reason for rushing this resolution now is because there are certain reasons which I do not pretend to know anything about, for going into State primaries or having them investigated by this committee.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I would like to compliment the good gentlewoman on her talk because it is so much to the point. The real reason, of course, for bringing it up at this particular time is because of the passage of the civil rights bill. The question then is whether people whose nominations are equivalent to election shall have their nominations checked to see whether they have been elected. That means we should decide whether the civil rights bill applies to Congressmen- and Congresswomen-elect as well as to the people generally. This will be a good test of the civil rights bill we have just passed to see whether it applies to Members of Congress. If it does, let us have it apply. If it does not, we should vote against the resolution.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I am, of course, interested in the interpretation of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, but I would say that in view of the fact that there are so many of us who have not quite understood the import of this legislation, I would like to see this legislation held over for the present and brought up as it always has been toward the end of the session. If not, I believe the House should have the privilege and the right of voting it either up or down.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Regardless of what the gentleman from Pennsylvania just said, the past chairman of the committee, the sponsor and author of the resolution, says that this authority is not wanted for the purpose of going into a State primary. Are we supposed to believe the author of the resolution and past chairman of the committee, or the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. In my opinion, if I may say so to the gentleman, if the author of the bill feels that way he should then be willing to take out the part of the resolution I read on page 3, starting at line 4 and ending on line 10.

Mr. GROSS. I thoroughly agree with the gentlewoman. In the absence of an amendment to that effect I certainly would vote against the resolution. If the committee is to be given authority to go into State primary elections, that authority should have been requested several months ago and before any State primaries were held. There is no reason why this resolution cannot be recalled and made acceptable to all Members of the House.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I see that the gentleman from Pennsylvania is on his feet. Obviously he wishes to reply to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Of course the chairman of the committee previously is a fine gentleman. The gentleman from Tennessee has said that there has been no use to this date of the provisions of this legislation. But I must point out to the gentleman from Iowa that the provisions of the legislation, especially cover nominations as well as general elections.

Finally, with respect to this whole subject, this House itself has a right to say who is elected as a Member of this House, and no resolution such as this can derogate from or take away one fraction or 1 minute of that power.

I say, finally, that if we are appointing a committee which is simply an investigating committee we are not taking away from the House Administration Committee the right of action and recommendation to this body. This is merely an investigative committee while Congress is out of session, and has no legislative weight at all. Is that correct?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Only up to a point, I say to the gentleman, in my opinion. I believe that if this committee is going to start work next week, let us say, it will be working while the House is in session and it can do a great deal while the House is in session.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. It can also do a great deal of damage while this House is in session.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. The committee will act only if there is a complaint filed and if there is a contest. It will not act otherwise; I believe the chairman of the committee said that.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I agree with the gentleman, but there may well be complaints. There may be complaints in several primaries. I can think of a State primary in my own State as to which there may be quite a serious complaint.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Does the gentlewoman not believe that if a complaint is made or a contest is filed there should be a prompt investigation and examination by this House, or by a committee, to quickly save the evidence and to hold it, because we will not meet until next year?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I do not. I do not believe this committee has any right to go into a State primary.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania be kind enough to point out the language in the resolution which says that a complaint must be filed before the committee can go into a State primary election or any election, for that matter?

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I would cite to the gentleman the statement of the gentleman from Tennessee, if he was not on the floor at the time it was made.

Mr. GROSS. I have been here all of the time, and I heard him make no such statement.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. The gentleman said they will not act until a complaint is filed. Is the gentleman from Tennessee still on the floor?

Mr. GROSS. I still suggest that the gentleman tell us where in the resolution it provides that a complaint must be filed.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. In answer to the gentleman, this has been the practice ever since 1940. In the past 8 years, under the gentleman from Tennessee, as chairman he has followed that practice.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I repeat to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that I believe what he says is entirely true, but just because a thing has not happened does not mean it will not happen, and there is nothing in the resolution to prevent the committee from going into a State primary, as I read the language.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I agree with you thoroughly.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes to clear up some statements that have been made with respect to this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of the House to the fact that in 1956—and that is as far back as my research has been permitted to go in the short time that I have had this afternoon—on July 25, 1956, a similar committee was set up by action of the House. In 1958, on July 30, this committee, in words and figures the same as the resolution before us, with the exception of the dates and years involved, was set up by unanimous action of this House. I might add that in each instance the action of the House was unanimous.

On July 2, 1960, exactly 4 years ago today, July 2, 1960, by unanimous action of the U.S. House of Representatives, a special committee to investigate campaign expenditures was set up. That was followed on August 9, 1962, when a special committee was created by a resolution in words and figures the same as the resolution before us, with the exception of the year and dates involved. That resolution was unanimously considered and passed by the House. Let me say also that it has just been called to my attention that on June 19, 1956, this special committee was created in words and figures the same as that in the resolution before us today by action of the House of Representatives. I believe I have already refered to the actual appointment of the committee in 1956 which took place on July 25 that year. It has been further called to my attention that in recent years this committee has been chaired by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Davis], and, serving with him on the Democratic side has been the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Jones] and one other member of that committee. The member who served on the Republican side in those previous years was the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'Brien]. I believe the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Cramer] served also for the minority.

Mr. Speaker, at this point it is my privilege to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Davis].

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I shall not require the full 5 minutes. I simply want to make a very quick statement, if I may have the full attention of the House. I am so glad the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Elliott], who is handling this rule today made the statement clearing up the fact that there is no rush about this resolution. I said from memory just a few moments ago that there is no rush, and certainly he has read from the record showing that 4 years ago exactly to this day, on July 2, 1960, this was brought to the attention of the House of Representatives. I simply say for the benefit of some of the Members who were not present a few moments ago that this committee was instituted and was suggested by the late Speaker Sam Rayburn, who at that time was serving as majority leader. I am sure of the facts that far back. I think it is my recollection that this committee has been approved unanimously every 2 years in the exact language in which it has been brought to the House today.

I would remind the House that one of the early chairmen of this committee was the present distinguished occupant of the Chair, Speaker McCORMACK. The late Percy Priest was chairman one time. My good friend, the former Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], when he was presiding as Speaker, as you will recall, appointed the distinguished gentleman, Mr. "Runt" Bishop, of Illinois, as Chairman. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS], has been chairman. I have been appointed three times by the late Speaker Rayburn and once by Speaker McCORMACK to head this committee.

I can assure you it is a job you do not go out and seek but it has been worth while to the Members of this House because the committee polices corrupt practices. Some of you have found that some people go far afield from the Federal statutes, such as the Hatch Act, and the Labor-Management Act as they relate to campaign expenditures, and so on. So I am surprised that some of my friends on this floor today have become nervous about this situation, thinking that this committee will go into a primary.

I want you to know that the records will show that the committee has never gone into a primary election. I have been sitting here with some wonderful friends and associates and colleagues who have been on this committee with me before; the Honorable BOB JONES of Alabama, the Honorable LEO O'BRIEN of New York, and I see WILLIAM CRAMER and SAM DEVINE. I have never been associated with finer men on a committee. And they will tell you that never have we gone into a primary.

This committee has been fair. There is a great deal of staff work that has to be done. From the Secretaries of State we find the names of the nominees and they are advised of the written law governing elections. We have gone so far as to protect sitting Members and others. We have gone so far as to require a complaintant to file his complaint in writing of violations or any corrupt practices.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, may I point out the reason for the inquiry this time. I feel Members should have it pointed out—although I disagree—that the committee on page 3, paragraph 7 is authorized to act upon its own motion and upon such information as in its judgment may be reasonable or reliable.

There is this other provision that:

> Upon complaint being made to the committee under oath, by any person, candidate, or political committee, setting forth allegations as to facts which, under this resolution, it would be the duty of said committee to investigate.

And so forth.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask the Members to vote this resolution so that the committee in its time may go to work but in advance that the competent staff may advise the candidates for this office of their rights under the law.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DAVIS] has expired.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I cannot support House Resolution 795. My objection to the resolution primarily springs from a conviction that the supervision of primaries in which candidates are nominated should be reserved to the States. This resolution would appear to transfer that authority to the Congress.

My more serious objection, however, is to the provisions of subsection (8). There it is provided that the committee created by the resolution shall report promptly to the Attorney General of the United States all violations of any Federal or State statutes in order that "he may take such official action as may be proper."

This is a clear case of preemption of jurisdiction by the Federal Government. Under the decisions of the Supreme Court in recent years I am convinced that the Court would construe this language to deprive States of authority to prosecute violators of State election laws in cases where the election of Members of the House of Representatives is involved. This is not a desirable result. I suspect that even the proponents of the resolution would agree with this premise.

I would hope that in the future when such resolutions are drafted the proponents would engraft upon them a savings clause preserving to the States unquestioned authority to enforce the criminal laws of the States.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the "ayes" appeared to have it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 264, nays 92, not voting 76, as follows:

[Roll No. 181]

YEAS—264

Addabbo
Albert
Anderson
Andrews, N. Dak.
Aspinall
Baldwin
Barry
Beckworth
Bell
Bennett, Fla.
Blatnik
Boland
Bolton, Oliver P.
Bonner
Brademas
Bromwell
Brooks
Brotzman
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Burke
Burkhalter
Burleson
Burton, Calif.
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Cameron
Carey
Casey
Cederberg
Chelf
Clancy
Cohelan
Collier
Colmer
Conte
Cooley
Corbett
Corman
Cramer
Curtin
Daddario
Dague
Daniels
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Dent
Denton
Derwinski
Devine
Dingell
Dole
Dorn
Dowdy
Downing
Dulski
Duncan
Dwyer
Edmondson
Edwards
Elliott
Ellsworth
Everett
Evins
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Findley
Flood
Flynt
Fogarty
Ford
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gary
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gill
Glenn
Gonzalez
Goodell
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffin
Griffiths
Grover
Hagen, Calif.
Halpern
Hansen
Harding
Hardy
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Hechler
Henderson
Hoeven
Holifield
Holland
Horan
Hull
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jarman
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Karsten
Kastenmeier
Keith
Keogh
Kilgore
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
Kluczynski
Knox
Kornegay
Kunkel
Landrum
Latta
Leggett
Lennon
Libonati
Lindsay
Long, La.
Long, Md.
McClory
McCulloch
McDade
McDowell
McFall
McIntire
McLoskey
MacGregor
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin, Mass.
Mathias
Matsunaga
Meader
Miller, Calif.
Minish
Monagan
Moore
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Morse
Morton
Mosher
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Nedzi
Nix
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill
Osmers
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Pickle
Pike
Poage
Poff
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Quillen
Randall
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reuss
Riehlman
Rivers, Alaska
Roberts, Tex.
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Roosevelt
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roudebush
Roush
Rumsfeld
Ryan, Mich.
Ryan, N.Y.
St Germain
St. Onge
Saylor
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Scott
Secrest
Selden
Senner
Sheppard
Shipley
Shriver
Sickles
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Smith, Va.
Springer
Staebler
Steed
Stephens
Stinson
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Taft
Taylor
Teague, Tex.
Thomas
Thompson, N.J.
Tollefson
Trimble
Tuck
Tupper
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vinson
Wallhauser
Watts
Weltner
Whalley
White
Wickersham
Widnall
Willis
Wilson, Charles H.
Wright
Young
Zablocki

NAYS—92

Abele
Abernethy
Adair
Alger
Andrews, Ala.
Arends
Ashbrook
Ayres
Baring
Bates
Battin
Beermann
Belcher
Betts
Bow
Bray
Brock
Brown, Ohio
Bruce
Burton, Utah
Chamberlain
Chenoweth
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Cunningham
Curtis
Foreman
Fountain
Fuqua
Goodling
Grant
Gross
Gubser
Gurney
Hagan, Ga.
Haley
Hall
Harsha
Herlong
Hoffman
Horton
Hosmer
Huddleston
Johansen
Kyl
Laird
Langen
Lipscomb
McMillan
Martin, Calif.
Martin, Nebr.
Matthews
May
Michel
Minshall
Natcher
Nelsen
Ostertag
Pillion
Pirnie
Pool
Reid, Ill.
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rich
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts, Ala.
St. George
Schadeberg
Schenck
Schwengel

Short
Sikes
Siler
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.
Snyder
Stafford
Talcott
Teague, Calif.
Thomson, Wis.
Van Pelt
Waggonner
Weaver
Westland
Whitener
Whitten
Williams
Wilson, Ind.
Winstead
Wyman
Younger

NOT VOTING—76

Abbitt
Ashley
Ashmore
Auchincloss
Avery
Baker
Barrett
Bass
Becker
Bennett, Mich.
Berry
Boggs
Bolling
Bolton, Frances P.
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Buckley
Celler
Clark
Davis, Ga.
Delaney
Derounian
Diggs
Donohue
Finnegan
Fino
Fisher
Forrester
Gathings
Halleck
Hanna
Harris
Harrison
Hawkins
Hays
Healey
Hébert
Jensen
Johnson, Wis.
Jones, Mo.
Karth
Kee
Kelly
Kilburn
Kirwan
Lankford
Lesinski
Lloyd
Macdonald
Miller, N.Y.
Milliken
Mills
Montoya
Moss
Norblad
Passman
Patman
Philbin
Pilcher
Powell
Rains
Rhodes, Pa.
Rogers, Tex.
Roybal
Sibal
Sisk
Staggers
Thompson, La.
Thompson, Tex.
Toll
Utt
Watson
Wharton
Wilson, Bob
Wydler

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Kirwan with Mrs. Frances P. Bolton.
Mr. Donohue with Mr. Norblad.
Mr. Philbin with Mr. Jensen.
Mr. Macdonald with Mr. Auchincloss.
Mr. Boggs with Mr. Halleck.
Mr. Rogers of Texas with Mr. Derounian.
Mr. Hanna with Mr. Utt.
Mr. Finnegan with Mr. Sibal
Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Harrison.
Mr. Staggers with Mr. Fino.
Mr. Toll with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. Clark with Mr. Bennett of Michigan.
Mr. Delaney with Mr. Wharton.
Mr. Karth with Mr. Berry.
Mr. Ashmore with Mr. Miller of New York.
Mr. Barrett with Mr. Bob Wilson.
Mr. Bass with Mr. Broomfield.
Mr. Hays with Mr. Wydler.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Becker.
Mr. Moss with Mr. Milliken.
Mr. Montoya with Mr. Avery.
Mr. Rains with Mr. Harris.
Mr. Sisk with Mr. Healey.
Mr. Johnson of Wisconsin with Mrs. Kelly.
Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Celler.
Mr. Rhodes of Pennsylvania with Mr. Buckley.
Mr. Thompson of Texas with Mrs. Kee.
Mr. Abbitt with Mr. Roybal.
Mr. Gathings with Mr. Forrester.
Mr. Lesinski with Mr. Hawkins.
Mr. Lankford with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. Brown of California with Mr. Powell.
Mr. Mills with Mr. Watson.
Mr. Fisher with Mr. Passman.
Mr. Patman with Mr. Pilcher.

Mr. McMILLAN changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. DAGUE, Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. BROMWELL, Mr. COLLIER, Mr. SHRIVER, Mr. POAGE, Mr. PURCELL, and Mr. ROBERTS of Texas changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 days in which to extend their remarks on House Resolution 795 just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

TO INCORPORATE THE AVIATION HALL OF FAME

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 8590) to incorporate the Aviation Hall of Fame, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 4, strike out "Kerchner" and insert "Kercher".

Page 2, lines 14 and 15, strike out "A. M. Pride, Dover-Foxcroft, Maine;".

Page 2, line 20, strike out "Truner" and insert "Turner".

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

AMEND INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of Mr. MILLS, chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 6455) to amend subsection (b) of section 512 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954—dealing with unrelated business taxable income—with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, line 12, strike out "1962" and insert "1963".

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

FOOD STAMP PROGRAM

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 10222) to strengthen the agricultural economy; to help to achieve a fuller and more effective use of food abundances; to provide for improved levels of nutrition among economically needy households through a cooperative Federal-State program of food assistance to be operated through normal channels of trade; and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HOLLAND], I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Education and Labor have until midnight July 9 to file a report on the bill H.R. 11611, a matter which has been cleared with the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRUCE], who is the ranking member of the subcommittee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

WATER RESOURCES RESEARCH CENTER

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill S. 2 (to establish water resources research centers at land-grant colleges and State universities, to stimulate water research at other colleges, universities, and centers of competence, and to promote a more adequate national program of water research), and as unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1526)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2) to establish water resources research centers at land-grant colleges and State universities, to stimulate water research at other colleges, universities, and centers of competence, and to promote a more adequate national program of water research, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the text of the bill, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

"That (a) this Act may be cited as the 'Water Resources Research Act of 1964.'

"(b) In order to assist in assuring the Nation at all times of a supply of water sufficient in quantity and quality to meet the requirements of its expanding population, it is the purpose of the Congress, by this Act, to stimulate, sponsor, provide for, and supplement present programs for the conduct of research, investigations, experiments, and the training of scientists in the field of water and of resources which affect water.

"TITLE I—STATE WATER RESOURCES RESEARCH INSTITUTES

"SEC. 100. (a) There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of the Interior for the fiscal year 1965 and each subsequent year thereafter sums adequate to provide $75,000 to each of the several States in the first year, $87,500 in each of the second and third years, and $100,000 each year thereafter to assist each participating State in establishing and carrying on the work of a competent and qualified water resources research institute, center, or equivalent agency (hereinafter referred to as 'institute') at one college or university in that State, which college or university shall be a college or university established in accordance with the Act approved July 2, 1862 (12 Stat. 503), entitled 'An Act donating public lands to the several States and territories which may provide colleges for the benefit of agriculture and the mechanic arts' or some other institution designated by Act of the legislature of the State concerned: *Provided*, That (1) if there is more than one such college or university in a State, established in accordance with said Act of July 2, 1862, funds under this Act shall, in the absence of a designation to the contrary by act of the legislature of the State, be paid to the one such college or university designated by the Governor of the State to receive the same subject to the Secretary's determination that such college or university has, or may reasonably be expected to have, the capability of doing effective work under this Act; (2) two or more States may cooperate in the designation of a single interstate or regional institute, in which event the sums assignable to all of the cooperating States shall be paid to such institute; and (3) a designated college or university may, as authorized by appropriate State authority, arrange with other colleges and universities within the State to participate in the work of the institute.

"(b) It shall be the duty of each such institute to plan and conduct and/or arrange for a component or components of the college or university with which it is affiliated to conduct competent research, investigations, and experiments of either a basic or practical nature, or both, in relation to water resources and to provide for the training of scientists through such research, investigations, and experiments. Such research, investigations, experiments, and training may include, without being limited to, aspects of the hydrologic cycle; supply and demand for water; conservation and best use of available supplies of water; methods of increasing such supplies; and economic, legal, social, engineering, recreational, biological, geographic, ecological, and other aspects of water problems, having due regard to the varying conditions and needs of the respective States, to water research projects being conducted by agencies of the Federal and State Governments, the agricultural experiment stations, and others, and to avoidance of any undue displacement of scientists and engineers elsewhere engaged in water resources research.

"Sec. 101. (a) There is further authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of the Interior for the fiscal year 1965 and each subsequent year thereafter sums not in excess of the following: 1965, $1,000,000; 1966, $2,000,000; 1967, $3,000,000; 1968, $4,000,000; and 1969 and each of the succeeding years, $5,000,000. Such moneys when appropriated, shall be available to match, on a dollar-for-dollar basis, funds made available to institutes by States or other non-Federal sources to meet the necessary expenses of specific water resources research projects which could not otherwise be undertaken, including the expenses of planning and coordinating regional water resources research projects by two or more institutes.

"(b) Each application for a grant pursuant to subsection (a) of this section shall, among other things, state the nature of the project to be undertaken, the period during which it will be pursued, the qualifications of the personnel who will direct and conduct it, the importance of the project to the water economy of the Nation, the region, and the State concerned, its relation to other known research projects theretofore pursued or currently being pursued, and the extent to which it will provide opportunity for the training of water resources scientists. No grant shall be made under said subsection (a) except for a project approved by the Secretary, and all grants shall be made upon the basis of the merit of the project, the need for the knowledge which it is expected to produce when completed, and the opportunity it provides for the training of water resources scientists.

"Sec. 102. Sums available to the States under the terms of sections 100 and 101 of this Act shall be paid to their designated institutes at such times and in such amounts during each fiscal year as determined by the Secretary, and upon vouchers approved by him. Each institute shall have an officer appointed by its governing authority who shall receive and account for all funds paid under the provisions of this Act and shall make an annual report to the Secretary on or before the 1st day of September of each year, on work accomplished and the status of projects underway, together with a detailed statement of the amounts received under any of the provisions of this Act during the preceding fiscal year, and of its disbursement, on schedules prescribed by the Secretary. If any of the moneys received by the authorized receiving officer of any institute under the provisions of this Act shall by any action or contingency be found by the Secretary to have been improperly diminished, lost, or misapplied, it shall be replaced by the State concerned and until so replaced no subsequent appropriation shall be allotted or paid to any institute of such State.

"Sec. 103. Moneys appropriated pursuant to this Act, in addition to being available for expenses for research, investigations, experiments, and training conducted under authority of this Act, shall also be available for printing and publishing the results thereof and for administrative planning and direction. The institutes are hereby authorized and encouraged to plan and conduct programs financed under this Act in cooperation with each other and with such other agencies and individuals as may contribute to the solution of the water problems involved, and moneys appropriated pursuant to this Act shall be available for paying the necessary expenses of planning, coordinating, and conducting such cooperative research.

"Sec. 104. The Secretary of the Interior is hereby charged with the responsibility for the proper administration of this Act, and, after full consultation with other interested Federal agencies, shall prescribe such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out its provisions. He shall require a showing that institutes designated to receive funds have, or may reasonably be expected to have, the capability of doing effective work. He shall furnish such advice and assistance as will best promote the purposes of this Act, participate in coordinating research initiated under this Act by the institutes, indicate to them such lines of inquiry as to him seem most important, and encourage and assist in the establishment and maintenance of cooperation by and between the institutes and between them and other research organizations, the United States Department of the Interior, and other Federal establishments.

"On or before the 1st day of July in each year after the passage of this Act, the Secretary shall ascertain whether the requirements of section 102 have been met as to each State, whether it is entitled to receive its share of the annual appropriations for water resources research under section 100 of this Act, and the amount which it is entitled to receive.

"The Secretary shall make an annual report to the Congress of the receipts and expenditures and work of the institutes in all States under the provisions of this Act. His report shall indicate whether any portion of an appropriation available for allotment to any State has been withheld and, if so, the reasons therefor.

"Sec. 105. Nothing in this Act shall be construed to impair or modify the legal relation existing between any of the colleges or universities under whose direction an institute is established and the government of the State in which it is located, and nothing in this Act shall in any way be construed to authorize Federal control or direction of education at any college or university.

"TITLE II—ADDITIONAL WATER RESOURCES RESEARCH PROGRAMS

"Sec. 200. There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of the Interior $1,000,000 in fiscal year 1965 and $1,000,000 in each of the nine fiscal years thereafter from which he may make grants, contracts, matching, or other arrangements with educational institutions (other than those establishing institutes under Title I of this Act), private foundations or other institutions; with private firms and individuals; and with local, State and Federal Government agencies, to undertake research into any aspects of water problems related to the mission of the Department of the Interior, which may be deemed desirable and are not otherwise being studied. The Secretary shall submit each such proposed grant, contract, or other arrangement to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and no appropriation shall be made to finance the same until 60 calendar days (which 60 days, however, shall not include days on which either the House of Representatives or the Senate is not in session because of an adjournment of more than three calendar days) after such submission and then only if, within said 60 days, neither the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives nor the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the Senate disapproves the same.

"TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

"Sec. 300. The Secretary of the Interior shall obtain the continuing advice and cooperation of all agencies of the Federal Government concerned with water problems, of State and local governments, and of private institutions and individuals, to assure that the programs authorized in this Act will supplement and not duplicate established water research programs, to stimulate research in otherwise neglected areas, and to contribute to a comprehensive, nationwide program of water and related resources research. He shall make generally available information and reports on projects completed, in progress, or planned under the provisions of this Act, in addition to any direct publication of information by the institutes themselves.

"Sec. 301. Nothing in this Act is intended to give or shall be construed as giving the Secretary of the Interior any authority or surveillance over water resources research conducted by any other agency of the Federal Government, or as repealing, superseding, or diminishing existing authorities or responsibilities of any agency of the Federal Government to plan and conduct, contract for, or assist in research in its areas of responsibility and concern with water resources.

"Sec. 302. Contracts or other arrangements for water resources work authorized under this Act with an institute, educational institution, or non-profit organization may be undertaken without regard to the provisions of section 3684 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 529) when, in the judgment of the Secretary of the Interior, advance payments of initial expense are necessary to facilitate such work.

"Sec. 303. No part of any appropriated funds may be expended pursuant to authorization given by this Act for any scientific or technological research or development activity unless such expenditure is conditioned upon provisions determined by the Secretary of the Interior, with the approval of the Attorney General, to be effective to insure that all information, uses, products, processes, patents, and other developments resulting from that activity will (with such exceptions and limitations as the Secretary may determine, after consultation with the Secretary of Defense, to be necessary in the interest of the national defense) be made freely and fully available to the general public. Nothing contained in this subsection shall deprive the owner of any background patent relating to any such activity of any rights which that owner may have under that patent.

"Sec. 304. There shall be established, in such agency and location as the President determines to be desirable, a center for cataloging current and projected scientific research in all fields of water resources. Each Federal agency doing water resources research shall cooperate by providing the cataloging center with information on work underway or scheduled by it. The cataloging center shall classify and maintain for general use a catalog of water resources research and investigation projects in progress or scheduled by all Federal agencies and by such non-Federal agencies of government, colleges, universities, private institutions, firms, and individuals as voluntarily may make such information available.

"Sec. 305. The President shall, by such means as he deems appropriate, clarify agency responsibilities for Federal water resources research and provide for interagency coordination of such research, including the research authorized by this Act. Such coordination shall include (a) continuing review of the adequacy of the Government-wide program in water resources research, (b) identification and elimination of duplication and overlaps between two or more agency programs, (c) identification of technical needs in various water resources research categories, (d) recommendations with respect to allocation of technical effort among the Federal agencies, (e) review of technical manpower needs and findings concerning the technical manpower base of the program, (f) recommendations concerning management policies to improve the quality of the Government-wide research effort, and (g) actions to facilitate interagency communication at management levels.

"Sec. 306. As used in this Act, the term 'State', includes the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico."

And the House agree to the same.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the title of the bill, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Amend the title so as to read: "An Act to establish water resources research centers, to promote a more adequate national program of water research, and for other purposes."

Wayne N. Aspinall,
Walter Rogers,
James A. Haley,
John P. Saylor,
Laurence J. Burton,
Manager on the Part of the House.

Henry M. Jackson,
Clinton P. Anderson,
Alan Bible,
Thomas H. Kuchel,
Len B. Jordan,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

Statement

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2) to establish water resources research centers at land grant colleges and State universities, to stimulate water research at other colleges, universities, and centers of competence, and to promote a more adequate national program of water research, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the language agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report. The language agreed upon is the language of the House amendment except as herein noted.

LIFE OF PROGRAM UNDER TITLE I—STATE WATER RESOURCES RESEARCH INSTITUTES

The Senate-passed bill would authorize a permanent program of grants to establish water resources research institutes in each State and help finance research projects at such institutes. The House amendment limited the program to 10 years. The conference committee agreed to authorizing a permanent program with the understanding that the program will be reviewed periodically by the legislative committees to determine whether it is providing the water research expected, whether satisfactory results are being obtained, and whether modifications in the program are needed. The annual report of the Secretary of the Interior should be prepared with the objective of keeping the Congress fully informed with respect to this research program.

DESIGNATION OF INSTITUTIONS TO RECEIVE GRANTS

The Senate-passed bill would permit the designation of a land grant college and one or more other institutions in each State to receive grants for the establishment of research institutes. The House amendment provides for establishing a water resources research institute at only one college or university in each State, with such institute to be established at the land grant college unless otherwise provided by an act of the State legislature. The conference committee agreed that there should be not more than one water resources research institute in each State in order to prevent fragmentation of the funds available to conduct research work. The language agreed upon, differing somewhat with the House language, provides for the establishment of the institute at the land grant college or some other institution designated by act of the State legislature. Where there are two land grant colleges in one State the Governor, in the absence of a designation by the State legislature, may make the designation as between the two.

ADDITIONAL WATER RESOURCES RESEARCH PROGRAMS

The Senate-passed bill included, under title II, additional water resources research programs involving the appropriation of $5 million in the first year increasing to $10 million in the 6th year and thereafter. These funds would be appropriated to the Secretary to make grants, contracts, matching or other arrangements with educational institutions, private foundations, or other institutions; with private firms and individuals; and with local, State, or Federal government agencies, to undertake research into any aspects of water problems related to the mission of the Department of the Interior. The House amendment deletes this title entirely. The conference committee agreed to retain the additional water resources research programs in title II of the Senate-passed bill but to limit the amount authorized to be appropriated to $1 million a year for a period of 10 years, with the further provision that any proposed grant, contract or other arrangement financed under this title must be submitted to the Congress for the consideration of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of both the Senate and the House of Representatives and funds will not be appropriated for implementation thereof until 60 calendar days after such submission, and then only if, within said period, neither committee disapproves.

PATENT PROVISIONS

Section 203 of the Senate-passed bill, relating primarily to patents, provides that no part of the funds made available under the act may be expended for research work unless the expenditure is conditioned upon provisions which insure that all information, uses, products, processes, patents, etc. will be made fully and freely available to the general public. The House amendment deletes the language of this section and adds in lieu thereof language requiring the Secretary of the Interior to adhere to the Statement of Government Patent Policy which was promulgated by President Kennedy in his memorandum of October 10, 1963. The conference committee agreed to retain the Senate language.

In all other respects the conference committee agreed to language of the House amendment to the Senate-passed bill.

Wayne N. Aspinall,
Walter Rogers,
James A. Haley,
John P. Saylor,
Laurence J. Burton,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The **SPEAKER**. Without objection, the conference report is agreed to.

Mr. **WILLIAMS**. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The **SPEAKER**. The question is on the conference report.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the "ayes" appeared to have it.

Mr. **WILLIAMS**. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The **SPEAKER**. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 348, nays 0, not voting 84, as follows:

[Roll No. 182]

YEAS—348

Abele
Abernethy
Adair
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson
Andrews, Ala.
Andrews,
N. Dak.
Ashbrook
Aspinall
Ayres
Baldwin
Baring
Barry
Bates
Battin
Beckworth
Beermann
Bell
Bennett, Fla.
Betts
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolton,
Frances P.
Bolton,
Oliver P.
Bonner
Bow
Brademas
Bray
Brock
Bromwell
Brooks
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Bruce
Burke
Burkhalter
Burleson
Burton, Calif.
Burton, Utah
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Cameron
Carey
Casey
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Chelf
Chenoweth
Clancy
Clausen,
Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Cohelan
Collier
Colmer
Conte
Cooley
Corbett
Corman
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtin
Daddario
Dague
Daniels
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Derwinski
Devine
Dingell
Dole
Dorn
Dowdy
Downing
Dulski
Duncan
Dwyer
Edmondson
Edwards
Elliott
Ellsworth
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Findley
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Fogarty
Ford
Foreman
Forrester
Fountain
Fraser
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gary
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gill
Glenn
Gonzalez
Goodell
Goodling
Grabowski
Grant
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffin
Griffiths
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gurney

Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Halpern
Hanna
Hansen
Harding
Hardy
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Hawkins
Hechler
Henderson
Herlong
Hoeven
Holifield
Horan
Horton
Hosmer
Huddleston
Hull
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jarman
Jennings
Joelson
Johansen
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Karsten
Kastenmeier
Keith
Keogh
Kilgore
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
Kluczynski
Knox
Kornegay
Kunkel
Kyl
Laird
Landrum
Langen
Latta
Leggett
Lennon
Libonati
Lindsay
Lipscomb
Long, La.
McClory
McCulloch
McDade
McDowell
McFall
McIntire
McLoskey
McMillan
Madden
Mahon
Marsh
Martin, Calif.
Martin, Mass.
Mathias
Matsunaga
Matthews
May
Meader
Michel
Miller, Calif.
Minish
Minshall
Monagan
Montoya
Moore
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Morse
Morton
Mosher
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nix
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill
Ostertag
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Pickle
Pike
Pillion
Pirnie
Poage
Pool
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Quillen
Randall
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rich
Rielhman
Rivers, Alaska
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts, Ala.
Roberts, Tex.
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Roosevelt
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roudebush
Roush
Roybal
Ryan, Mich.
Ryan, N.Y.
St. George
St Germain
St. Onge
Saylor
Schadeberg
Schenck
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Schwengel
Scott
Secrest
Selden
Senner
Sheppard
Shipley
Short
Shriver
Sickles
Sikes
Siler
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Va.
Snyder
Springer
Staebler
Stafford
Steed
Stephens
Stinson
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Taft
Talcott
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thomas
Thompson, La.
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Tollefson
Trimble
Tuck
Tupper
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Van Pelt
Waggonner
Wallhauser
Watts
Weaver
Weltner
Westland
Whalley
White
Whitener
Whitten
Wickersham
Widnall
Williams
Wilson, Charles H.
Winstead
Wright
Wyman
Young
Younger
Zablocki

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—84

Abbitt
Alger
Arends
Ashley
Ashmore
Auchincloss
Avery
Baker
Barrett
Bass
Becker
Belcher
Bennett, Mich.
Berry
Bolling
Buckley
Celler
Clark
Curtis
Davis, Ga.
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Derounian
Diggs
Donohue
Everett
Evins
Finnegan
Fino
Frelinghuysen
Gathings
Harris
Harrison
Hays
Healey
Hébert
Hoffman
Holland
Jensen
Johnson, Wis.
Jones, Mo.
Karth
Kee
Kelly
Kilburn
Kirwan
Lankford
Lesinski
Lloyd
Long, Md.
Macdonald
MacGregor
Mailliard
Martin, Nebr.
Miller, N.Y.
Milliken
Mills
Norblad
Osmers
Passman
Patman
Philbin
Pilcher
Poff
Powell
Rains
Rhodes, Pa.
Rogers, Tex.
Rumsfeld
Sibal
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Staggers
Taylor
Toll
Utt
Vinson
Watson
Wharton
Willis
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Ind.
Wydler

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Fino.
Mr. Karth with Mrs. Baker.
Mr. Barrett with Mr. Arends.
Mr. Hays with Mr. Harrison.
Mr. Philbin with Mr. Jensen.
Mr. Donohue with Mr. Auchincloss.
Mr. Macdonald with Mr. Poff.
Mr. Evins with Mr. Norblad.
Mr. Finnegan with Mr. Sibal.
Mr. Rhodes of Pennsylvania with Mr. Osmers.
Mr. Rogers of Texas with Mr. MacGregor.
Mr. Willis with Mr. Bennett of Michigan.
Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Derounian.
Mrs. Kelly with Mr. Frelinghuysen.
Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Bob Wilson.
Mr. Clark with Mr. Alger.
Mr. Passman with Mr. Belcher.
Mr. Rains with Mr. Martin of Nebraska.
Mr. Patman with Mr. Rumsfeld.
Mr. Harris with Mr. Wydler.
Mr. Vinson with Mr. Smith of California.
Mr. Ashmore with Mr. Berry.
Mr. Bass with Mr. Curtis.
Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Utt.
Mr. Ashley with Mr. Wilson of Indiana.
Mr. Delaney with Mr. Mailliard.
Mr. Dent with Mr. Wharton.
Mr. Abbitt with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. Denton with Mr. Hoffman.
Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Becker.
Mr. Johnson of Wisconsin with Mr. Miller of New York.
Mr. Everett with Mr. Avery.
Mr. Gathings with Mr. Milliken.
Mr. Mills with Mr. Toll.
Mr. Pilcher with Mr. Celler.
Mr. Powell with Mr. Holland.
Mr. Staggers with Mr. Lankford.
Mr. Watson with Mr. Buckley.
Mr. Smith of Iowa with Mrs. Kee.
Mr. Lesinski with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. Jones of Missouri with Mr. Healey.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to explain briefly the changes in the House-passed language in S. 2 resulting from the agreements reached in the committee on conference. For the most part the House language prevailed. The House language was used as the basis for markup in the committee on conference and only four changes were made thereto.

The House-passed bill limited the life of the program under title I, which establishes State water resources research institutes, to 10 years in order that there might be a review of the program to determine whether it was providing the water research expected and whether modifications in the program were needed. The committee on conference agreed to authorizing a permanent program with the understanding that it would be reviewed periodically by the legislative committees. The statement of managers on the part of the House carries a direction to the Secretary of the Interior to keep the Congress fully informed with respect to the program.

The second change in House language involved the designation of institutions to receive grants. The Senate-passed bill would have permitted the designation of a land-grant college and one or more other institutions in each State to receive grants for the establishment of research institutes.

The House language provided for establishing water resources research institutes at only one college or university in each State, with such institute to be established at the land-grant college unless otherwise provided by an act of the State legislature. The committee on conference agreed with the House language limiting the number of institutes to not more than one in each State, but the language permitting the State legislature to designate some other institution in lieu of the land-grant college was changed somewhat to make it a little easier for the State legislature to assume this responsibility if it chose to do so. Under the language agreed upon the land-grant college would still be designated automatically unless the State legislature acted to designate some other institution. Where there are two land-grant colleges in one State, the Governor, in the absence of a designation by the State legislature, could make the designation as between the two.

The third change in the House-approved language relates to the additional water resources research programs that would have been authorized under title II in the Senate-passed bill. In the Senate-passed bill these programs involve the appropriation of $5 million in the first year, increasing to $10 million in the sixth year and thereafter. The House-approved language deleted this title entirely.

The committee of conference agreed to retain the additional water resources research programs described in title II of the Senate-passed bill but to limit the amounts authorized to be appropriated to $1 million a year for a period of 10 years, with the further provision that any proposed grant, contract, or other arrangement under the authority given in this title would have to be reported to the Congress for a 60-day review period and funds could be appropriated for implementation only if, during this review period, neither of the legislative committees disapproved.

The fourth change in the House-approved language relates to patents in connection with the research work authorized. The committee on conference accepted the Senate language providing that no part of the funds made available under the act could be expended for research work unless the expenditures were conditioned upon provisions which insure that all information, uses, products, processes, patents, and so forth, would be made fully and freely available to the public.

The committee on conference retained the language which the House added to the Senate-passed bill directing the establishment of some effective means for clarifying Federal agency responsibilities in water resources research and providing effective interagency coordination of such research. This provision in the House bill which goes to all water resources research within the Federal establishment was considered by our committee as one of the most important provisions in the bill. We believe it will result in substantial savings and will eliminate duplication of research effort.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to report to the House my satisfaction with S. 2 as it has emerged from the conference committee. The reasonableness with which the conferees approached their task and resolved the differences between the House and Senate versions of this bill is apparent in the results.

I am particularly pleased with two features of the bill as it will go to the President. First, in restoring a part of the bill that had been stricken, language was added which will make it possible for the Congress to exercise control over the carrying out of the program authorized in title II. Appropriations will not be made for any grant or contract under this title until the proposal has laid before the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House and Senate for 60 days, and either of these committees may disapprove the proposal if it finds reason to do so.

The second is the retention of the House-sponsored language relating to coordination of water resource research activities of the Federal agencies. We have altogether too many downtown agencies operating independently in this field. We want results and we need results from water research but we do not want a continuous scramble among the agencies—the Public Health Service, the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Soil Conservation Service, the Fish and Wildlife Service, the Geological Survey, the Forest Service, the Weather Bureau, the National Science Foundation, and a whole host of others—to outdo each other. We need to cover the whole field, to do so in a planful and systematic way, and to be sure that nothing is left undone that ought to be done and nothing done that ought not to be done. Above all we do not want wasteful duplication. Here is the nub of the problem. Section 305, I am glad to say, gives the President a tool to enforce order among the agencies. It gives him a power that must be used wisely and forcefully. If this is done, the benefits that will flow to the American people from S. 2 will be immeasurable and the pattern that is here set up for water research will be followed in other fields where similar problems exist.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentelman from Texas [Mr. PICKLE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in favor of the conference report regarding S. 2. The conferees have worked hard on this matter, and I believe have come up with what is the best we could hope for under the circumstances. When this bill was originally discussed in the House, I objected because the language was so strict that it made any grant for a water resources project automatically to be designated for a land-grant college. This would have practically eliminated the possibility of the University of Texas, which has an excellent water resources project underway now, to have participated in these grants. This conference report does soften that language some and makes these grants available to "land-grant schools or some other institution designated by act of the legislature." It also provides that one school can cooperate with another school in the same State to carry out the purposes of the act.

Title II has been reinserted in this bill and this provides at least $1 million per year for a total of 9 years wherein educational institutions—other than those establishing institutions under title I of this act—can undertake research into any aspect of water problems which may be related to the mission of the Department of Interior.

While this bill does not give those institutions other than land-grant schools throughout the country the exact language they want, I do believe it is a reasonable compromise. I can envision that Texas A. & M. University and the University of Texas, both excellent schools, can work together closely in this broad and important field of water research.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DADDARIO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed that the Water Resources Research Act of 1964, S. 2, agreed to by the conferees, contains the original Senate language with regard to patents.

You will recall that in passing the bill, the House amended S. 2 to delete this language and insert a provision calling for those administering research and development to adhere to the Statement of Government Patent Policy promulgated by the late President Kennedy last October, which is fully supported by President Johnson.

The controversy over the disposition of inventions made in the performance of Government-financed research is not a new one, and, in fact, has grown over the years as the Government has become involved in more and more technical effort.

From a position of not more than 4 years ago, when industry and Government were poles apart on their views, substantial progress has been made through the normal, although admittedly slow, legislative process, aided by changes in administrative regulations.

Largely through comprehensive hearings held by the Subcommittee on Patents and Scientific Inventions, which I had the honor to chair, on legislation to amend the patent provisions of the 1958 Space Act, and hearings on governmentwide patent policy before the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights, there evolved a much better understanding of the equities involved in Government research and development contracting with private industry, universities, and other research organizations.

One point on which there was general agreement is that Government patent policy must assure the Government of fulfilling objectives of its technical efforts, whether these be a new missile system, a large booster capability for space exploration, new processes of water purification, or methods of purifying the air we breathe, to mention but a few. In order that these, and other research and development objectives, may be accomplished quickly and at realistic cost the Government must be in a position to attract the best technical competence available, whether it be a private industry or the university. We must take into consideration the experience, background, knowledge, and technical capability required for the solution of highly complex technical problems.

It is generally recognized that patent ownership is a very complex subject and one that does not lend itself to easy solution. The varying equities involved in government-industry relationships require a great deal of flexibility and at times detailed negotiation.

Recognizing all these factors and being fully aware that a legislative solution to the overall problem of Government patent policy would be a long time developing, the President issued a statement of policy for the guidance of agencies not covered by law. The policy was developed with the advice of his Science Adviser, and with the cooperation of all Federal departments and agencies. I have spoken on this policy on several occasions in the past—to commend the President for issuing it and when the House rejected restrictive patent language in the Clean Air Act.

The President did not intend that the statement of policy would provide the final solution to the problem. He included a mechanism for review and revision, base on experience, after careful study by the Federal Council for Science and Technology. A patent advisory panel has been formed to work with agencies in the the promulgation of implementing regulations and to study the results of contractual experience. Even now every effort is being made to see that the intent of the President's policy is carried out, with due consideration of the varying governmental missions and research needs.

The Bureau of the Budget has asked that governmentwide patent policy legislation not be passed until Federal agencies have gained experience under the policy statement and a record of performance established.

It is my sincere conviction that progress in the development of reasonable and equitable Government patent policy will be retarded by the continued adoption of restrictive patent provisions such as contained in S. 2. This language is at best ambiguous. Legal authorities have argued since its first adoption in the Helium and Coal Research Acts that they could not understand what "fully and freely available to the general public" meant. The Department of Interior has interpreted this to mean outright Government ownership of all inventions, regardless of the equities involved or the amount of public as contrasted with private, investment involved. Moreover, it has been brought to my attention on several occasions that this language has also been interpreted by the Interior Department as justification for demanding background patents—in spite of the fact that this is specifically prohibited.

Adoption of the Senate language will lead to delay in much-needed water resources research and to increased cost to the Government. This has been the experience under other research programs in agencies bound by restrictive patent provisions. An example is the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. This was borne out in two separate reports by the Committee on Science and Astronautics in reporting legislation to amend the patent provisions of the Space Act. In 1960 the House, acting on the committee's recommendation, passed this legislation. The Senate failed to act.

Of even greater significance, this language is not in keeping with the President's policy. In a letter to the Chairman of the House and Senate Interior Committees, Mr. Phillip S. Hughes, assistant director for Legislative Reference, Bureau of the Budget, stated:

> As reported by your committee, the pertinent provisions of section 203 (section 303 of the bill) would inhibit the desirable flexibility of the administration's policy with respect to patent rights and we, therefore, recommend the deletion of those provisions from S. 2.

Mr. Speaker, the manner in which the conference report on S. 2 has been brought before the House, without opportunity to discuss the important patent provisions, is deplorable.

I do not want to belabor this point. I have stated my position on this matter as forcefully as possible under the circumstances in the hope that this will alert the Members of the House to the dangers of adopting the Senate patent language.

This is contrary to the traditional position of the House which has either initiated provisions consistent with the administration's flexible position or has rejected title provisions inserted by the other body.

The time will come when Congress will face up to its responsibilities and enact a governmentwide policy. Until this happens, I would urge that no further attempts be made to restrict Federal research programs and that the House support the President's efforts to arrive at a reasonable solution.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the Congress has finally taken action on the subject of water research legislation. I introduced one of the original bills in the House of Representatives on this subject and appeared before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in support of it. The bill, S. 2, when signed into law and implemented will meet two national needs—the acceleration of research in water problems and the acceleration of the training of hydroscientists, who are desperately needed to deal with the regional and national water problems that are growing so swiftly.

The bill is designed to enlist the competence of our university faculties and facilities in needed water research work and at the same time to develop and train new additional new scientists and engineers. It proposes to do this patterned after the original Hatch Act which created the system of State agriculture experiment stations. I do not believe there is a person in this Congress who has any knowledge of these facilities who could not attest to the fact of the fine work and contributions they have made to our everyday life.

Many schools throughout the country have done pioneer work in the field of water research and conservation. One of the leaders in this work is my own alma mater, the Texas A. & M. University located at College Station, Tex. Early in 1952, a water advisory council was organized at Texas A. & M. to study the water problems of Texas and to submit recommendations which would enable them to more effectively discharge the responsibility of education and research in the important area of water resources. Following this action on the part of Texas A. & M., the board of directors of the A. & M. University established the water research and information center. By this action, the board of directors directed that Texas A. & M. University take leadership in education and research programs in water resources. Also, the responsibility for publication and dispensing of research results to the public was emphasized. Since that time, A. & M. has developed an increasingly effective interdisciplinary program of cooperation between the many parts of the institution concerned with water problems. One specific result of the establishment of the water research and information center has been the successful conduct of eight Water for Texas conferences held on the campus with published proceedings available the country over.

Another result of past emphasis on water problems has been the bringing together of many documents on water and hydrology in the form of a collection. This collection, which includes many publications not available anywhere in the country, is housed in the Texas Professional Engineers Library located on the Texas A. & M. University campus.

In the field of research, over 100 Texas Agricultural Experiment Station research projects deal either directly or indirectly with water. In addition, many water projects are included in the research activities of the Texas Engineering Experiment Station and the Texas A. & M. Research Foundation. In the past 4 years, there have been over 100 graduate theses having some bearing on hydrology completed at the Texas A. & M. University. During the past year Texas A. & M. has become a member of the university council on hydrology, a voluntary organization of leading universities with a demonstrated interest in strong programs of teaching and research in the field of hydrology.

The Texas A. & M. University board of directors has just recently approved the renaming of the water research and information center to the water resources institute. At the same time the organization is being given added strength so that greater emphasis can be placed on research and education in water resources on a multidisciplinary basis. The institute will provide a focal point for concentrating the many aspects of A. & M.'s total resources effort toward a unified plan for the better understanding and solution of water problems.

The Texas A. & M. University is ready, willing, and able to assume the leadership for the research activities provided for this bill, Mr. Speaker, and I am glad that I had a personal part in its passage.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I renew my request, on behalf of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HOLLAND], that the Committee on Education and Labor may have until midnight July 9 to file a report on H.R. 11611. This matter has been cleared.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

TO INCORPORATE THE AVIATION HALL OF FAME

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 8590) to incorporate the Aviation Hall of Fame, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

> Page 2, line 4, strike out "Kerchner" and insert "Kercher".
>
> Page 2, lines 14 and 15, strike out "A. M. Pride, Dover-Foxcroft, Maine;".
>
> Page 2, line 20, strike out "Truner" and insert "Turner".

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I have been objecting to these late afternoon unanimous-consent requests for the passage of legislation, some of which has been minor legislation and some of which has been rather far reaching. The particular bill which is presently before the House, as I understand it, would merely grant a Federal charter to a group in Ohio; is that correct?

Mr. FORRESTER. That is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS. For the purpose of setting up an air museum into which there will be no Federal money. Is that correct?

Mr. FORRESTER. Not only no Federal money but let me say it has already been passed by the House. This is simply to concur in a Senate amendment which simply changes the name of a person erroneously placed in the bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The gentleman has previously explained the bill to me and I shall not object at this time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMEND INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Mills], chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 6455), to amend subsection (b) of section 512 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954—dealing with unrelated business taxable income—with Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, line 12, strike out "1962" and insert "1963".

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. A few moments ago I objected to the consideration of this bill in line with the statement that I just made. The bill has been explained to me as being one of an emergency nature. If it is not passed at this time I understand that damage may result. Therefore, I will withdraw my objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Mills] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, as the Members will recall, as passed unanimously by the House on April 14, 1964, H.R. 6455 provided an exemption from the tax on unrelated business taxable income in the case of labor unions and agricultural or horticultural organizations where certain conditions are met. These conditions were that, first, the income must be used to establish, maintain, or operate a retirement home, hospital, or similar facility for the exclusive use of aged and infirm members of the labor union or agricultural or horticultural organization; second, the income must be derived from agricultural pursuits conducted on ground contiguous to the home, hospital, and so forth; and third, this income may not represent more than 75 percent of the cost of maintaining and operating the home, and so forth.

The bill was passed by the other body with one amendment only, relating to the effective date of the bill. Under the Senate amendment, the provisions of the bill would apply with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1963, instead of taxable years beginning after December 31, 1962, as provided in the House-passed bill.

I urge that the House accept the amendment of the Senate.

NASA AUTHORIZATION FOR FISCAL YEAR 1965

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 10456) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and administrative operations, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

Conference Report (H. Rept. No. 1529)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10456) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and administrative operations, and for other purposes, having met after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 5 and 6.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 3, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, and 18, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following sum: $5,227,506,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following sum: $4,341,100,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following sum: $177,450,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following sum: $261,900,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following sum: $623,525,500; and the Senate agree to the same.

George P. Miller,
Olin E. Teague,
Joseph Karth,
Ken Hechler,
Joseph W. Martin, Jr.,
James Fulton,
J. Edgar Chenoweth,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Stuart Symington,
John Stennis,
Spessard L. Holland,
Margaret Chase Smith,
Clifford P. Case,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

Statement

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10456) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and administrative operations, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Total appropriations authorized by the Senate amendments were $5,246,293,250. This represented an increase over the House bill of $52,482,750. As a result of the conference this figure was adjusted so that total appropriations authorized are $5,227,506,000.

Amendments Nos. 1 and 2: Amendments Nos. 1 and 2 are conforming amendments reflecting the total revised authorizations resulting from the actions of the conferees.

Amendment No. 3: NASA requested a total of $26 million to fund its advanced missions program which is designed to plan an extension of the national space capability. The House reduced this amount by $3,900,000. The Senate amendment No. 3 restored this reduction. Since subsequent developments and NASA testimony disclosed that this funding will facilitate better programing and provide essential information for future program decisions, the managers on the part of the House agreed to the restoration. Thus the total amount approved for advanced missions program is $26 million.

Amendment No. 4: NASA requested $190,200,000 for the geophysics and astronomy program. The House bill reduced this amount to $174,200,000, representing reductions in the Orbiting Astronomical Observatory, Orbiting Solar Observatory and Orbiting Geophysical Observatory projects. The Senate amendment No. 4 concurred in the reductions in the Orbiting Astronomical Observatory and Orbiting Solar Observatory projects, but restored the full amount of the House reduction in the Orbiting Geophysical Observatory project. The House bill provided for a reduction of $6,500,000 for this project from a total request of $55,400,000. This reduction was justified by the House on the basis that the $6,500,000 pertained to the last three of a total of eight Orbiting Geophysical Observatories which NASA planned to launch during the period calendar year 1964 through 1968 and that the last three observatories might not be required during this period. The House was not convinced, in view of past launch experience, that the planned launching of two geophysical observatories each year was realistic or that the lifetime of an observatory would not be increased beyond the 1-year lifetime predicted by NASA. Therefore, the House recommended that the NASA launch schedule be amended to provide for the launching of one geophysical observatory each year, thereby rescheduling the launching of the last three observatories during the 1969–71 period. Under the House-recommended launch schedule, it was considered inappropriate to provide funds at this time for activities which would take place 5 to 7 years after the date that funds were provided. Therefore, the House recommended deferring any action on the last three observatories until future year presentations, at which time a more meaningful evaluation could be made of future geophysical observatory requirements. The restoration was made by the Senate because of persuasive NASA testimony that the launching of two observatories each year was necessary for the timely and proper phasing of support to the Apollo program. The managers on the part of the House agreed to a limited restoration of $3,250,000, instead of the $6,500,000 included in the Senate amendment No. 4. The managers on the part of the House stipulated, and the Senate conferees agreed that this limited restoration would be used only for the sixth planned geophysical observatory and that action on subsequent observatories would be deferred until future year presentations.

Amendment No. 5: NASA requested $300,400,000 for the lunar and planetary exploration program. The House bill reduced this amount to $282,100,000, representing a reduction of $12,300,000 in the Surveyor project and $5,000,000 in the Lunar Orbiter project. The Senate version of the bill restored $12,300,000 for the Surveyor project, but concurred with the House reduction of $5,000,000 in the Lunar Orbiter project.

The managers on the part of the Senate, noting that the Surveyor project has recently experienced delays in its schedule, and being convinced by the reasoning of the House regarding the last two of the lightweight, limited capability series of Surveyor spacecraft, receded and agreed to the original House action.

Amendment No. 6: NASA requested $46,000,000 for the sustaining university program. The House bill authorized the entire amount. The Senate amendment No. 6 reduced this amount by $6 million for the purpose of stabilizing this program at the funding level of fiscal year 1964; that is, $40 million.

The managers on the part of the Senate receded and agreed to the original House action. Accordingly, the full amount of the request is authorized. This action was taken on the basis that the requested amount represents a very modest increase in the level of effort in this important program over fiscal year 1964. Any reduction would result in disruption of long-term planning, particularly in the training grants part of the program which provides 3-year predoctoral opportunities for selected graduate students at qualified universities.

Amendment No. 7: NASA requested $267,900,000 for tracking and data acquisition. The House bill approved a total authorization of $255,900,000, reducing this item by $12 million. Senate amendment No. 7 restored $9,500,000 of this reduction. In view of additional NASA testimony presented to the Senate on this item, the managers on the part of the House agreed to a limited restoration of $6 million. Of these funds, $2,500,000 is to be applied to the equipments and components portion of the program, and $3,500,000 is to be applied to network operations. The total amount authorized for this item is $261,900,000.

Amendment No. 8: This is a conforming amendment which specifies the revised total authorization for construction of facilities resulting from the restoration of funds included in Senate amendments Nos. 9, and 11 through 16.

Amendment No. 9: NASA requested $2,630,000 for the construction of a flight simulator for the advanced aircraft facility at Ames Research Center. The House deferred this project. The Senate amendment No. 9 restored this item. Testimony taken by the Senate subsequent to the House action convinced the managers on the part of the House that a need exists for this simulator in order to conduct experiments in connection with supersonic transports and to meet requirements of FAA and DOD. Consequently, the managers on the part of the House receded and agreed to the restoration of this item.

Amendment No. 10: The Senate amendment specifies the location of the Electronics Research Center as the Boston, Mass., area.

Amendments Nos. 11 through 16: NASA requested $224,910,000 for the Office of Manned Space Flight for construction of facilities. The House reduced this amount by $21,491,000. The Senate amendments Nos. 11 through 16 restored $10,245,500 of this amount. In conference, the managers on the part of the House agreed that the House reduction was too severe because the major portion of the facilities are operational in nature and are in support of the flight schedules for Gemini and Apollo. Consequently, the House receded and agreed to the restoration of these construction items. Further, the conferees recognized the need for public facilities at the John F. Kennedy Space Center. It is the sense of the conferees that the restored funds will allow start of construction of the necessary public facilities.

An additional restoration of $1,670,000 for an Apollo Network Ground Station in the Northwest Pacific area contained in Senate amendment No. 16 was originally deferred by the House. Subsequently, NASA selected a site at Guam for this tracking station. Later testimony before the Senate showed that construction of this station must be started at once if it is to be operational when needed. In view of the foregoing, the managers on the part of the House receded and agreed to the restoration.

Amendment No. 17: NASA requested $641 million for administrative operations. The House approved $617,525,500. The Senate amendment No. 17 restored $11,737,250. The Senate conferees receded and agreed to limit the restoration to $6 million. The total reduction is therefore $17,474,500, resulting in an authorization of $623,525,500 for administrative operations.

Amendment No. 18: This is a conforming amendment which revises the ceiling related to construction of facilities in keeping with the actions of the conferees.

George P. Miller,
Olin E. Teague,
Joseph Karth,
Ken Hechler,
Joseph W. Martin, Jr.,
James Fulton,
J. Edgar Chenoweth,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the results of the conference on H.R. 10456, the 1965 space authorization bill, follow the policy of our House Science and Astronautics Committee in strictly evaluating NASA budgetary needs.

The House conferees went to the conference fully aware that the Senate conferees had been guided by the more lenient policy of the Senate Space Committee in the restoration to NASA of better than $52 million. NASA originally requested $5,304 million. The House on the recommendation and report of the House Science and Astronautics Committee reduced this by $110,189,500 to a total of $5,193,810,500, the amount passed by the House.

I should point out that the House committee action was based upon information given in testimony during the early part of this year. As the Members well know, technology moves at such a rapid pace today that considerable change in projects and programs can occur in a few months.

To some degree this is the case with regard to the Senate committee action. The Senate committee received testimony from NASA at a later date than the House Committee. This testimony contained new information that, to a modest degree, modified the House committee position.

The House conferees, therefore, agreed to restore to NASA $33,695,500 of the $110 million originally eliminated. Restoration mostly resulted from more specific planning and programing and introduction of new information pertaining to more recent progress in specific programs.

In any event, the original NASA request has been reduced by $76,494,000, which is a substantial saving, without hurting the space program. It is personally rewarding to me to have been part of the people in the House working to save this $76,494,000 during the coming fiscal year, for the American taxpayers.

We have attempted to provide NASA with the money adequate to fulfill its objectives. At the same time, we have tried to impress upon NASA the need for strict and economic procedures.

In a real way, NASA has been experiencing the critical review of the House Science and Astronautics Committee through its NASA Oversight Subcommittee. I need only to point to what the subcommittee has done to improve the Centaur program. More recently, its investigation into the Ranger program has already produced marked managerial improvements in NASA. Such activities inevitably result in efficiency and in the eventual reductions in cost. I cite these only to show the committee's continuing concern with the efficiency of NASA management and the judicious expenditures of its funds.

I believe the results of the conference are realistic and reasonable. The House in good conscience should have no difficulty in agreeing to the acceptance of the conference report. As a conferee, I signed the unanimous conference report, and favor passage of this conference report.

In order that the Members will have complete and adequate information on the legislative action taken at this time on the NASA fiscal year 1965 authorization, I submit to the House the following figures:

Action on conference committee on NASA authorization request for fiscal year 1965 (H.R. 10456)

	Budget request	House approved	Senate approved	Conference committee approved (June 30, 1964)
Research and development:				
Gemini	$308,400,000	$308,400,000	$308,400,000	$308,400,000
Apollo	2,677,500,000	2,677,500,000	2,677,500,000	2,677,500,000
Advanced missions	26,000,000	22,100,000	26,000,000	26,000,000
Geophysics and astronomy	190,200,000	174,200,000	180,700,000	177,450,000
Lunar and planetary exploration	300,400,000	283,100,000	295,400,000	283,100,000
Sustaining university program	46,000,000	46,000,000	40,000,000	46,000,000
Launch vehicle development	128,200,000	128,200,000	128,200,000	128,200,000
Bioscience	31,000,000	31,000,000	31,000,000	31,000,000
Meteorological satellites	37,500,000	37,500,000	37,500,000	37,500,000
Communication satellites	12,600,000	11,400,000	11,400,000	11,400,000
Advanced technological satellites	31,000,000	31,000,000	31,000,000	31,000,000
Basic research	21,000,000	21,000,000	21,000,000	21,000,000
Space vehicles systems	38,800,000	37,000,000	37,000,000	37,000,000
Electronic systems	28,400,000	27,000,000	27,000,000	27,000,000
Human factor systems	16,200,000	15,500,000	15,500,000	15,500,000
Nuclear-electric systems	48,100,000	47,100,000	47,100,000	47,100,000
Nuclear rockets	58,000,000	57,000,000	57,000,000	57,000,000
Chemical propulsion	59,800,000	62,800,000	62,800,000	62,800,000
Space power	13,000,000	12,500,000	12,500,000	12,500,000
Aeronautics	37,000,000	37,000,000	37,000,000	37,000,000
Tracking and data acquisition	267,900,000	255,900,000	265,400,000	261,900,000
Technology utilization	5,000,000	4,750,000	4,750,000	4,750,000
Administrative operations	641,000,000	617,525,500	629,262,750	623,525,500
Construction of facilities:				
Ames Research Center	6,081,000	3,038,000	5,668,000	5,668,000
Electronics Research Center	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
Goddard Space Flight Center	1,300,000	1,221,000	1,221,000	1,221,000
Jet Propulsion Laboratory	3,714,000	3,582,000	3,582,000	3,582,000
John F. Kennedy Space Center	[1] 91,561,000	83,594,000	87,070,000	87,070,000
Langley Research Center	4,454,000	3,938,000	3,938,000	3,938,000
Lewis Research Center	810,000	770,000	770,000	770,000
Manned Spacecraft Center	25,166,000	22,649,000	23,907,500	23,907,500
Marshall Space Flight Center	15,288,000	13,759,000	14,523,500	14,523,500
Michoud Plant	6,534,000	5,881,000	6,207,500	6,207,500
Mississippi Test Facility	61,999,000	55,792,000	58,891,500	58,891,500
Wallops Station	1,804,000	1,749,000	1,749,000	1,749,000
Various locations	[1] 37,297,000	32,362,000	35,352,500	35,352,500
Facility planning and design	15,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
Total	281,000,000	248,335,000	262,880,500	262,880,500
Grand total	5,304,000,000	5,193,810,500	5,246,293,250	5,227,506,000

	Research and development	Construction of facilities	Administrative	Total
Total	$4,341,100,000	$622,880,500	$623,525,500	$5,227,506,000
Less than NASA request	40,900,000	18,119,500	17,474,500	76,494,000
Less than Senate approved	13,050,000	0	5,737,250	18,787,250
More than House approved	13,150,000	14,545,500	6,000,000	33,695,500

[1] Original budget request showed $300,000 less for John F. Kennedy Space Center and $300,000 more for various locations. House and Senate action include an Apollo network ground station in the John F. Kennedy Space Center budget item.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, in a bill authorizing over $5 billion there were relatively few differences between the House and the Senate. As a matter of fact, there was approximately $52 million difference between the two Houses, and you can readily see that this represents only approximately 1 percent of the total.

After conference we have adjusted total appropriations authorized in H.R. 10456 to slightly over $5.2 billion. Permit me to take just a few moments to briefly advise the House of the results of the conference.

The first item to be considered was NASA's advanced missions program, for which it was asking $26 million. The House reduced this by $3,900,000 but receded in conference, because we became convinced that full funding for this program will facilitate better programing and provide essential information for future program decisions.

We compromised with the Senate on the geophysics and astronomy program. The House bill provided for a reduction of $6,500,000 for this program, and the Senate restored that amount. We agreed to a limited restoration of $3,250,000 instead of the $6,500,000 in order to provide for an additional geophysical observatory launch and obtained agreement with the Senate that action on subsequent observatories would be deferred until future year presentations.

The Senate amendment restored $12,300,000 for the lunar and planetary exploration program whereas the House had cut that amount from the NASA budgetary request. We were successful in maintaining our position, and the Senate receded and agreed to the full $12,300,000 reduction.

NASA requested $46 million for the sustaining university program. The House bill authorized the entire amount because this represented only a very modest increase in the level of effort of fiscal year 1964, and it was felt that the $6 million reduction provided by the Senate amendment would result in disruption of long-term planning, particularly in the training-grant part of the program, which provides 3-year predoctoral opportunities for selected graduate students at qualified universities. The Senate agreed with the House figure and thus the $6 million cut in the program was restored.

In the tracking and data acquisition program the House bill reduced this amount by $12 million. The Senate amendment restored $9,500,000 of this reduction. The House agreed to a limited restoration of $6 million and thus compromised with the Senate on this program.

The House eliminated NASA's request for construction of a flight simulator for the advanced aircraft facility at Ames Research Center. Testimony given the Senate subsequent to the House action convinced the managers on the part of the House that a real need exists for this simulator in order to conduct necessary experiments in connection with supersonic transports and to meet requirements of the Federal Aviation Agency and the Defense Department. For this reason the managers on the part of the House agreed to the restoration of this item.

Amendments 11 through 16 in the conference report all pertain to construction items. The House had reduced these items by $21,490,000 in order to require NASA to perform more austere construction. The Senate amendment had reduced the NASA budgetary request for these items by 5 percent, and the managers on the part of the House receded and agreed to the Senate figure, because it was felt that the House reduction had been too severe.

The major portion of these facilities are operational in nature and are in support of the flight schedule for Gemini and Apollo, and because of the fact take on added significance.

In an additional restoration the House receded and agreed to a $1,670,000 item for an Apollo network ground station in the Northwest Pacific area. When NASA appeared before the House Committee to justify its budget requests it was not known where this station would be located, and as a result the House committee felt it was justified in deferring the item until the selection had been made. Subsequently, testimony before the Senate fixed the location of the station at Guam, and consequently the managers on the part of the House receded and agreed to restore this item.

The House reduced NASA's request for administrative operations by approximately $24 million and the Senate, although reducing the request, restored about $11 million. The Senate conferees receded and agreed to limit the restoration to only $6 million. Therefore there is a total reduction in the administrative operations item of $17,474,500.

There are other amendments listed in the conference report but these are merely conforming amendments reflecting total revised authorizations resulting from the actions of the conferees.

Mr. Speaker, I believe we have reached a fair and equitable final authorization figure for NASA. Naturally it was necessary for us to compromise with the Senate conferees, but we found that on more than one occasion additional testimony given to the Senate after the House action on the bill had been completed changed the picture, and when we found this to be true, in all good conscience we felt that we should recede to the Senate position which was based on later information than had been available to the House. In other areas we found it necessary to recede when we were honestly convinced that we probably had been too severe in reducing some of NASA's budgetary requests. However, in other items we stood for the House position and were able to obtain substantial reductions in the overall Senate figure.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the conference report before the House today provides to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration approximately the amount requested by that agency to fulfill its programs for the next year. It provides for the orderly accomplishment of our important national space effort. The necessary funds for research and development, administrative operations and construction of facilities were agreed to by House and Senate conferees to assure these objectives.

It is notable among these items that a public facility at the John F. Kennedy Space Center is provided for, filling a much-needed gap in our ability to bring to the public the accomplishments and growth of the space program so graphically portrayed by the work of this Center.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD at this point on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the conference committee on H.R. 10456, I commend my colleagues who served as House conferees for the excellent work which they did in the House-Senate conference. The able and distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, the Honorable GEORGE MILLER of California, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE], the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KARTH], the able former Speaker of the House, the very distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON], and the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CHENOWETH] performed yeoman service in the conference.

There are several decisions of the conference committee to which I would like to call the attention of the House. The NASA request for tracking and data acquisition amounted to $267,900,000, of which the House initially approved $255,900,000. The Senate had recommended $265,400,000. The conference voted $261,900,000 because it was felt that the operation of the worldwide tracking network and more particularly the necessary equipment and components for that networks warranted the authorization of this amount.

I would like to mention that some increases were made in the conference over the House position in the area of construction of facilities. Under the heading of "Various locations," some increases were held to be necessary because at the time of our authorization hearings the site had not yet been selected for the Northwest Pacific Tracking Station, and the House committee had initially voted to defer this item when it was considered last March. However, a site was subsequently selected in Guam, and NASA has informed the committee that with the required operational date of March 1967, the year of authorization and funding became particularly critical for this station. This has been coordinated with the Department of Defense. The Senate, in the light of these developments, voted to retain funds for this station, and the conference committee decided because of this late information to support the funding of this Apollo tracking station.

Among the other items discussed in conference, Mr. Speaker, I want to call particular attention to NASA's program for aircraft noise abatement research. Thanks to the able work of the gentleman from New York [Mr. WYDLER] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RUMSFELD], we had some excellent hearings on this subject during which the point was forcefully made that more aggressive work needed to be carried forward on this subject.

For the fiscal year 1964, NASA programed $750,000. For the fiscal year 1965, NASA asked for only $485,000. Following our authorization hearings in the House, the House committee voted to require NASA to expend a total of $2 million out of the $37 million authorized in the field of aeronautics for the specific purpose of noise abatement research. The Senate felt that, after testimony by NASA, this additional amount could not be "expended efficiently." The House conferees felt very strongly that additional stress should be placed on this serious and growing problem, and as a result the conference voted to authorize NASA to expend $1,485,000 of the $37 million for noise abatement, and to report by January 15, 1965 on the progress made and the future plans for research in this vital area.

All in all, Mr. Speaker, I believe the conference report constitutes a constructive compromise and it is deserving of support by the House.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may have until midnight July 11 to file reports on the following bills: H.R. 4731, H.R. 11083, H.R. 11241, S. 1451, and H.R. 5673.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and concurrent resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 9094. An act to authorize the President to declare July 9, 1964, as Monocacy Battle Centennial in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the Battle of the Monocacy;

H.R. 11004. An act to authorize the sale, without regard to the 6-month waiting period prescribed, of zinc proposed to be disposed of pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act;

H.R. 11235. An act to authorize the disposal, without regard to the prescribed 6-month waiting period, of approximately 11 million pounds of molybdenum from the national stockpile;

H.R. 11257. An act to authorize the sale, without regard to the 6-month waiting period prescribed, of lead proposed to be disposed of pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act;

H. Con. Res. 300. Concurrent resolution authorizing the disposal of approximately 98,000 long tons of pig tin from the national stockpile; and

H. Con. Res. 322. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions until July 20, 1964.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a concurrent resolution of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 321. Concurrent resolution establishing that when the House adjourns on Thursday, July 2, 1964, it stand adjourned until 12 o'clock noon on Monday, July 20, 1964.

BROTHERHOOD OF MAN

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have lived through many years, and have seen many changes. Life is change and there is no enduring status quo. This is the second day of July and all about us are the signs and insignia of summer and ahead are weeks of the heat and the sunshine and the glory and the beauty of summertime. Yet for 11 days summer has been in the path of death. After June 21 the days started to shorten and even while we were in the midst of summer we had started on our course to fall and the chills of winter. Without change, constant change, that we fight from noticing and acknowledging there could be no life.

May I say to the Yankee from New Hampshire, who weeps and wails with my good and beloved friends from the Southland at the grave of the status quo of the yesteryear, that there will be a new today and a new tomorrow and that life will go on. May I say to him that life could not go on, because change is the very essence of life, if it remained handcuffed to a status quo as remote as the old slave days when the ancestors of many fellow Americans were brought to our shores, slaves to be bartered in as animals in the field.

Mr. Speaker, the old order has passed. Ours is a God-fearing and a God-respecting country. I am 82 and the farther I walk toward the western sunset the more I am confirmed in my own faith that all individuals and all nations are the instruments of a Divine purpose. That, Mr. Speaker, is my faith. That, Mr. Speaker, is my interpretation of my wide reading of the history of mankind in all the centuries as it has been recorded.

I have lived a long life. I am the oldest Member of this great, distinguished, and historic body. I regard today as one of the great and meaningful dates in the history of mankind in its long and tedious climb to the heights. Mr. Speaker, in the closeness we have come to the brotherhood of men with the purpose of the Divine, this has been one of the happiest and most soul-satisfying days of my life.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 321

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House, House Concurrent Resolution 321 with a Senate amendment thereto.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, after line 4, insert:

"*Resolved further*, That when the Senate adjourns on Friday, July 10, 1964, it stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian, July 20, 1964."

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR THE WEEK OF JULY 20, 1964

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I have taken this time for the purpose of inquiring of the majority leader concerning the program for the week of July 20, 1964.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ALBERT. In response to the inquiry of the minority leader, the program for the week of July 20 is as follows:

There is no legislative business on Monday, when the House will reconvene.

For Tuesday, we will have the Consent Calendar, the Private Calendar, and nine suspensions, as follows:

H.R. 11241, Nurses Training Act of 1964.

H.R. 11083, graduate public health training amendments.

H.R. 319, protection of postal patrons from morally offensive mail matter.

H.R. 11438, to amend the 1959 Alaska Omnibus Act.

H.R. 11611, to establish a National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress.

H.R. 10485, Foreign Service Annuity Adjustment Act of 1964.

H.R. 11754, amendments to Foreign Service Buildings Act.

H.R. 11832, amendments to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, the Atomic Energy Community Act of 1955, as amended, and the Euratom Cooperation Act of 1958, as amended.

H.R. 1341, safety standards for federally purchased vehicles.

For the balance of the week, H.R. 3846, Land and Water Conservation Fund Act.

There is an open rule, except closed for provisions of the bill dealing with gasoline taxes and provides 4 hours of general debate.

This statement is made, subject, of course, to the usual reservation that conference reports may be brought up at any time and any further program may be announced later.

PUERTO RICANS CONTRIBUTE TO AMERICAN CULTURE AS DEMONSTRATED BY THIRD ANNUAL SAN JUAN FESTIVAL IN SPRINGFIELD, MASS.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, ever since the English settlers landed at Jamestown, Va., and the Pilgrims at Plymouth Rock in Massachusetts, there has been constant migration of peoples from all over the world to America's shores, and they have been absorbed into the mainstream of American continental life. The latest group to come to our continental shores to work, thrive, prosper, and produce in the manner of good Americans are the Puerto Ricans.

There are many examples of successful Puerto Ricans in present-day American business, professions, and culture. He or she has an opportunity to achieve success in this land of opportunity and the Puerto Rican's will to win is certain to elevate him to a position of prominence on the American scene.

Already recognized as persons of great genius are several Puerto Ricans of superior ability. Of these, the outstanding examples are José Ferrer, the stage and screen star; Jesus Maria Sanroma, famous pianist; Graciela Rivera, of the Metropolitan Opera; Noro Morales, orchestra leader; and Mapy Cortes, Dioso Costello, Olga San Juan, Maria del Pilay, and Juano Hernandez, of Hollywood, and Brig. Gen. Pedro del Valle, of the U.S. Marines, decorated for bravery at Guadalcanal in World War II.

The Puerto Rican community also has produced doctors, dentists, social workers, lawyers, and businessmen of the highest caliber.

Mr. Speaker, many of the Puerto Ricans who have come to our continental shores have settled in my home city of Springfield, Mass. They are overcoming the language barrier problem and have become good neighbors. It is a joy to see these Puerto Ricans in Springfield absorbing the new continental culture while cherishing and maintaining some of the culture of their island homeland. This is demonstrated particularly during their annual San Juan festival in Springfield, which is a period of gaiety, sentimentalism, folk dancing, and religious observance. Under permission granted, I include with my remarks an editorial from the Springfield Daily News of June 27 entitled "San Juan Festival," and a news story about the festival taken from the Springfield Republican of June 28:

[From the Springfield (Mass.) Daily News, June 27, 1964]

SAN JUAN FESTIVAL

Springfielders of Puerto Rican origin are today launching their third annual 2-day San Juan festival.

The celebration is a reminder that this relatively new group of arrivals is becoming more and more firmly rooted in the city.

Living is by no means easy for perhaps the majority of Puerto Ricans who have decided to settle permanently in the continental United States. Certainly, they have many problems of adjustment in Springfield. There are cultural and language barriers to be removed before many Puerto Ricans can really feel at home here and in most of the other areas where they are newcomers.

However, we believe Springfield as a whole is conscious of these problems—and has the dedicated people of good will on hand to insure, by extending help, that, in the long run the transition will be successful. There has been marked progress in this direction already.

That it will continue, despite hindrances and handicaps, we are confident.

We salute this group of Springfielders on the occasion of their festival days.

[From the Springfield Republican, June 28, 1964]

PUERTO RICAN COMMUNITY OPENS SAN JUAN FESTIVAL

Puerto Ricans of Springfield, Holyoke, and other western Massachusetts communities brightened the downtown here Saturday night with a parade of lovely ladies, a queen enthroned on a float, and a group of children, clad in white, who recently received their first communion.

The occasion was the annual San Juan Fiesta, which is the Puerto Rican's special cultural contribution to Springfield area, echoing a gay traditional festival in Puerto Rico dedicated to St. John the Baptist.

STATUE IN PROCESSIONS

A statue of St. John was borne during the procession from Bond Street to Sacred Heart Church by Louis Jusino, Carmel Perez, Feliz Leon, and Nazario Gutierre.

The 2-day celebration was launched with the procession to Sacred Heart Church for a mass celebrated by Rev. Thomas McCarthy, assisted by Rev. Santiago Nunez. Both priests are closely associated with Puerto Rican activities in this area.

QUEEN IN PROCESSION

Following the mass, the queen for 1964, Miss Maria Perez, and her two attendants, Miss Luiz Olivera and Miss Josephine Rosario, and a flower girl, joined the procession on a colorful float.

The Mount Carmel Drum and Bugle Corps supplied a lively drum beat, flutes, and bugles for the procession as it went south on Chestnut Street to Bridge, then west to Main Street and north to Memorial Square where the dance plaza was set up in a parking lot between Bond and Carew Streets.

Miss Sarita Balles and Miss Olga Ramos led the procession carrying the flag of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. The commonwealth, Puerto Ricans are quick to point out, is a U.S. territory, and its citizens are U.S. citizens.

CROWDS CHEER

As the procession approached Memorial Square, the heart of the Puerto Rican district, hundreds lined the sidewalks and cheered for the queen and her entourage.

Riding in one of the shiny convertibles in the procession was Miss Maria Sylvester Romon, 75, of 79 Sargeant St., who will be honored today as the senior citizen of the Puerto Rican community.

The park and recreation department's mobile music shell was set up in the dance plaza but the coronation was delayed by two power failures. The first was apparently caused by children who kicked a wire loose.

GENERATOR STALLS

A portable generator was pressed into use, but it stalled a few minutes later, and refused to restart. Finally, the attendants got permission from Manuel Silva of the nearby "Famous Dog" restaurant to pick up the power from his establishment.

The queen was crowned by Miss Anna Burgos who was fiesta queen in 1962. The new queen, 21, is employed as a fitter for the American Linen Supply Co. and is the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Regustine Perez of 45 Holyoke St.

Genaro Medina was master of ceremonies for the coronation dance, and music was furnished by the Catala Trio.

TRIBUTES TODAY

Among those who will receive fiesta tribute today will be Mrs. Romon, Mr. and Mrs. Louis Deleon of 122 Clyde St., parents of the largest family in the Puerto Rican community with 11 children, and Victor Lopez and Daniel Diaz, best students of the year.

Also to be honored will be the queen's attendants and entourage, who were runners-up in the balloting for queen: Miss Rosario, Miss Oliver, Miss Myrta Jusino, Miss Alicia Gonzalez, Miss Aida Lopez, Miss Milta Garcia, Miss Gladys Rodriguez, and Miss Carmen Cordero.

The program will resume today at 2 p.m. with games for the children and a domino tournament for the men.

HAVERFORD COLLEGE STUDENTS AID AND ABET VIETCONG

Mr. **HUDDLESTON**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. **HUDDLESTON**. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks I have followed with increasing interest a situation at Haverford College, Philadelphia, Pa., involving a student group that has been organized to collect money to buy medical supplies for the Vietcong forces in southeast Asia.

The existence of such a student movement is an appalling commentary on the failure of certain segments of our educational system to instill in our youth a proper appreciation and understanding of their benefits and responsibilities as Americans. Fortunately, the Haverford movement is limited in scope. Yet the existence of such a movement, while other Americans are giving their very lives to defend Vietnam from Vietcong aggression, should not be permitted to go unnoticed.

The facts of the Haverford College movement are these: Four students announced in mid-April that they were collecting funds to purchase medical supplies to ship to what the leader of the group termed "The Front of National Liberation of South Vietnam." At that time they claimed that the movement was spreading to other colleges and universities and that the total membership of their group numbered 50. The name given the group was the "Student Committee To Send Medical Aid to the Front of National Liberation of South Vietnam."

The community response to the formation of this student group was best summed up by an editorial appearing in the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin, which stated in part:

> College students in the United States are traditionally free thinkers and free talkers, which is all well and good. As they go through the process of acquiring an education, many of them move through a phase of questioning the status quo, of rebelling intellectually against the mores of the times. * * * There is no harm in this—provided it is kept within reasonable bounds. But the American GI's in Vietnam, who understand the threat of communism, would be high on the list of those who believe that what these Haverford youngsters are doing constitutes aiding and abetting an enemy—an enemy not only of their country but of human freedom.

Further emphasizing this last point, the chairman of the Philadelphia Veterans Advisory Commission, Mr. William J. Lederer, stated:

> Over 200 American youths have died for their country in Vietnam. These (students') stupid utterances can cost many more lives in Vietnam.

Considering the nature and extent of this country's commitment in South Vietnam, any effort to furnish supplies of any kind to Communist forces in South Vietnam does indeed constitute furnishing aid and comfort to the Nation's enemies. In recent days high American officials, including the President, have made it known to the world that this country is prepared to risk a general war if necessary to defend the free world's interests in South Vietnam and southeast Asia. Not only the lives of our servicemen involved in South Vietnam, but the lives and the national interest of every American are therefore at stake in this war. Considering these factors, I am of the opinion that the activities of the Haverford students' group are not merely the actions of foolish youth, but dangerous and intolerable disloyalty to the country and the cause of freedom everywhere.

Yet, despite the paramount interests involved in this matter, it is regrettable, to say the least, that some highly placed Haverford spokesmen have in effect encouraged these misguided students in their pernicious conduct.

Mr. Speaker, the action of the Haverford Vietcong sympathizers can be neither excused nor justified in the name of academic freedom, as some college spokesmen would have us believe. We are in a deadly war in southeast Asia, just as deadly to those directly involved as was World War II to those of us who served our country two decades ago. Consider what would be said of a group of students who had organized in the mid-1940's to furnish medical supplies to the country's Nazi enemies. Yet Dr. Hugh Borton, president of Haverford, had this to say about his students' pro-Vietcong committee:

> Haverford College holds that openminded and free inquiry is essential to a student's educational development. Thus, the college recognizes the right of all students to engage in discussion, to exchange thought and opinion and to speak or write freely on any subject. The freedom to learn, to inquire, to speak, to organize, and to act with conviction within the bounds of law are held

> at Haverford College to be a cornerstone of education in a free society.

But, we may ask Dr. Borton, how long will the society stay free when the furnishing of aid and comfort to the enemies of our freedom is regarded permissively by our educational leaders? To categorize the activities of the Haverford Vietcong sympathizers as "openminded and free inquiry" is a new height not in academic freedom but in academic fatuousness. With this kind of attitude prevalent among their educational leaders, it is small wonder that some Haverford students are so misguided as to have embarked on such a misguided venture.

Dr. Borton refers to acting with conviction "within the bounds of law." In this regard, I have sent a letter of inquiry to the Department of Justice to ascertain pertinent laws covering the Haverford pro-Vietcong movement, and to ask what action, if any, is possible to curb this and similar movements to assist the Nation's enemies. While it is true that this country is not officially at war in southeast Asia, it is equally true that American lives and resources are involved in the defense of our national interests in that theater of the world. Call it what you will, it is war to the American fighting man engaged in the struggle against the Vietcong. And if laws sufficient to cover the Haverford situation are not presently on the books, I then propose to look into the feasibility of preparing legislation which will prevent the furnishing of aid and comfort to the Nation's enemies in those specific areas of the world where American lives and the national interest are directly threatened.

ROA HONORS CONGRESSIONAL LEADERS

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the Reserve Officers Association of the United States, under the leadership of the new national president, Adm. Edgar H. Reeder, of Montana, honored on today three congressional leaders for distinguished service to the national defense and Organized Reserve. Those honored are: KATHARINE ST. GEORGE, New York; DANIEL J. FLOOD, Pennsylvania; and HARRY R. SHEPPARD, California.

At a luncheon attended by Members of Congress, Reserve Officers Association officers and press representatives, the honorees were presented with honorary life memberships in the Reserve Officers Association. Col. John T. Carlton, well known on Capitol Hill, is the executive director of the Reserve Officers Association.

AMERICA SHOULD REMAIN A SANCTUARY FOR DIVERSITY

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, as persons and as a people, we construct our lives upon certain foundation principles.

When those principles change, the change should come as the result of painful decision, accompanied by clear recognition of the alteration and its significance.

I am deeply disturbed that we as a people are not cognizant of an alteration in basic American political theory which has taken place here in the early days of this midcentury summer.

Our Government, as our schoolchildren can recite, is based on a system of checks and balances. But the balance goes beyond the formal division of the Government into legislative, judicial, and executive branches, and even beyond the deliberate diffusion of powers to create natural jealousy of each branch toward growth of power of another.

Our system is based upon the belief, which Madison and Hamilton enunciated for us in the Federalist Papers, that government by the people could not long endure without checks upon the power of a numerical majority to override a minority.

Madison and Hamilton wrote:

> In a society, under the forms of which the stronger faction can readily unite and oppress the weaker, anarchy may as truly be said to reign as in a state of nature where the weaker individual is not secured against the violence of the stronger.

The tender balance of majority rule and minority right was to be maintained through the division of government into a many-layered structure. Its parts would be appointed in dissimilar manner, to give representation and voice to the diversity of groups, interests, factions, and sects which underline the American Nation.

The notion of a plebiscitary form of government, of a people speaking directly, through force of numbers alone, was rejected. To the founders, the people were not a mass, but collections of persons united into groups by their varying interests.

In Federalist 10, Madison wrote of the dangers of the plebiscitary form. When numerical majority elects directly, he warned:

> There is nothing to check the inducements to sacrifice the weaker party, or an obnoxious individual. Hence it is that such democracies have ever been spectacles of turbulence and contention, have ever been found incompatible with personal security, or the rights of property: and have, in general, been as short in their lives as they have been violent in their deaths.

On June 15, the U.S. Supreme Court altered this political theory drastically, through its decision that both houses of bicameral State legislatures must be elected on the same principle, that of population.

Both houses must be elected on the same basis, and diversity where it exists must cease. Numbers alone must rule, the Court has declared, taking still another step toward the plebiscitary form of government which the founders so greatly feared.

I shall not detail my objections to the Court's position that it has authority over a State's form of government. They are strong objections.

But I cannot let this decision pass without urging that we recognize its vast significance and the drastic change which it makes in our traditional American political theory. This change is too important to come about without great thought, debate and deliberation, and painful decision.

The premise upon which our Government was constructed must not be changed by an act of will on the part of a few who, no matter how fine their motives or character, do not represent the wonderful diversity of America which their decision works to injure.

CONSOLIDATED DEPOSITS OF SALARY CHECKS FOR FEDERAL OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Calfiornia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill to authorize the heads of departments and agencies of the Federal Government to deposit amounts due to military and civilian personnel as salary by means of single checks payable to banks and other financial institutions for the accounts of individuals. The bill is intended to facilitate such deposits to the accounts of employees at less cost to the Government, and with greater convenience to the employees, the agencies, and the financial institutions concerned.

The mailing of salary checks directly to banks is an entirely voluntary practice which may be requested by employees, and which is in fact used by many personnel for their convenience. In the military services, many officers and enlisted personnel have long requested this service, and frequently the disbursing offices have simply consolidated the amounts due to any individuals who use the same bank, and mailed a single check. Accompanying lists make clear the names and amounts due to each individual. The procedures save the time of distributing checks on the job, of cashing the checks, and the costs of handling and mailing individual checks instead of single ones to banks used by many employes.

The bill is necessary to overcome a technical objection of the Comptroller General that payments by this method appear to violate a section of law that requires that a check be written only in favor of the employee. The Comptroller is permitting the current practice to continue in the expectation that this legislation will bring the laws up to date with the improved financial practices that can be achieved with modern data equipment. If the bill is enacted to authorize these procedures by all the agencies of Government, it is expected that the savings in time, cost, and mailing will be available not only to the military departments, but to all agencies and their employees. In short, this is a bill to promote economy and efficiency in administration of the Government.

SENATE RINGS DOWN CURTAIN ON THE BOBBY BAKER SCANDALS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, according to the newspapers, the Rules Committee of the other body says the curtain has been rung down on the Bobby Baker scandals. There is no more ground to be covered, it is said.

That apparently means the rug under which it has been swept is big enough to cover all the ground.

What about the testimony of Don Reynolds, the Maryland insurance broker and the statements of Walter Jenkins, White House adviser? Either Reynolds or Jenkins committed perjury.

What about the expensive stereophonic set? President Johnson says it was a gift from his onetime protege, Bobby Baker. Reynolds testified under oath that he bought and paid for it.

Who caused Elly Rometsch, the German call girl, to be deported overnight. and why?

These and scores of other questions dealing with this sordid mess demand answers, not evasion and alibis.

MEMBERS ATTENDING THE INTERPARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to place the list of Members who are going to attend the Interparliamentary Conference in August in the Record at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

The list referred to follows:

W. R. Poage; Charles B. Hoeven; Thor C. Tollefson; E. Ross Adair; H. Allen Smith of California; Emilio Q. Daddario; Alexander Pirnie; Edward J. Derwinski; F. Bradford Morse; Robert McClory; and Katharine St. George, president.

Alternates: Paul C. Jones of Missouri and Gerald R. Ford.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO CONVEY EXPRESSION OF APPRECIATION BY THE CONGRESS TO THE MEMBERS OF THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF STATE HIGHWAY OFFICIALS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 179, 88th Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Special Committee To Convey to the Members of the American Association of State Highway Officials an expression of appreciation by the Congress of the praiseworthy accomplishments under their leadership, the following members on the part of the House: Mr. Fallon and Mr. Cramer.

DISPENSING WITH BUSINESS IN ORDER UNDER CALENDAR WEDNESDAY RULE, JULY 22, 1964

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday, July 22.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

THE AMAZING STORY OF THE TFX

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. Stinson] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, on November 24, 1962, some 6 weeks before I took office, the TFX supersonic airplane contract was awarded to the General Dynamics Co. in Fort Worth, Tex. Although I was not a Member of Congress in 1962 while the negotiations for the contract were being conducted, like many of the residents of Seattle, I was keenly interested. Since taking office, I have made an effort to determine the facts of the case. The amazing thing about the awarding of this contract was that the Boeing Co. proposed to build the supersonic TFX at an estimated $415 million less than did General Dynamics. At the same time, the Boeing design offered superior design and flight characteristics over the competing proposal.

It is my opinion that all the facts of this case should be made public so that the unjust methods of awarding this contract will never be used again. There are some who would prefer to sweep the whole TFX mess under the rug even though they know that this contract was awarded on an unfair basis. I feel that I have an obligation to bring the known facts of the case before the public so that they might judge the case for themselves.

The TFX supersonic fighter-bomber was originally conceived in 1959 by the Air Force Tactical Air Command. It will be a Mach III aircraft at high altitude and a Mach II aircraft at treetop level. It will have the capability of flying nonstop to Europe, carrying a nuclear weapon, and then it will have the capability of loitering over a given area at subsonic speed to conserve fuel. It will be able to land on a 1,700-foot strip.

Mr. McNamara, when he became Secretary of Defense, decided he would expand the concept of the TFX and make it available to both the Air Force and the Navy. This created a problem because the aircraft, as conceived, was much too long to fit into the elevators of aircraft carriers and it had to be redesigned to be made shorter and to have a beefed-up tail section to absorb the shock-landing. There were to have been 1,700 TFX aircraft built; 235 of which were to go to the Navy. That number has been expanded somewhat now in the light of Australia's order. The total contract will be worth about $7 billion. The fact that the TFX is the largest defense contract ever awarded makes this affair of national interest.

Now let us examine a chronology of the evaluations of the Military Source Selection Board made up of both the Air Force and the Navy and see to whom they would have awarded this contract. The source selection boards are the groups that are normally used to evaluate airplane contracts.

The source selection board made its first decision in January of 1962 when the board voted unanimously in favor of the Boeing design. Next, it was decided to reevaluate and the companies submitted new proposals. The source selection board made its second recommendation in May of 1962 and once again it was unanimous in favor of the Boeing Co. Another reevaluation was ordered and on June 21, the source selection board made its third recommendation, and once again it was unanimous in favor of the Boeing design. At this particular stage there was complete accord by both the Navy and the Air Force in favor of the Boeing design, and this design was considered to be fit for immediate production. But, once again, for some unknown reason the decision was made to reevaluate. Then an interesting thing happened. On October 24, 1962, a newspaper reporter by the name of Seth Kantor published an article in the Fort Worth Press that said that the General Dynamics Co. was going to be awarded the TFX contract. On November 2, 1962, the source selection board met once again and unanimously recommended that the Boeing Co. be awarded the TFX contract. The Air Force Council on November 8, 1962, recommended the Boeing Co. for the contract. The reasons for the recommendation of the Boeing Co. were that they had a superior design, superior performance and a price that was an estimated $415 million less than the General Dynamics bid. But then, on November 24, 1962, the Department of Defense announced that the award was to be made to the General Dynamics Co. of Fort Worth, Tex.

On February 26, 1963, the Senate Investigating Subcommittee began hearings on the TFX which have not been completed to this day. The hearings, though not complete have been enlightening. A gentleman by the name of Albert Blackburn, who was a former Marine major and test pilot, worked on the TFX evaluation for the Department of Defense. A New York Times article said that he had implied that General Dynamics copied most of the superior design features of the Boeing proposal. Then Colonel Gayle of the Air Force, in his testimony before the Senate Investigating Subcommittee, said that by constant reevaluation, both companies would eventually solve the problems and that this was the reason for having so many reevaluations by the source selection board.

The previous performance of the two companies is very revealing. I mentioned earlier that the Boeing price was an estimated $415 million under that of the General Dynamics Co. and in times past the price has been a rather significant factor in the awarding of a contract. This is especially true when the accompanying design has superior performance capabilities.

The terms of the contract provided that the builder was liable for all costs over 120 percent of the bid price. The contract provided that the excess costs over 100 percent of the bid and up to 120 percent of the bid would be shared 90 percent by the Government and 10 percent by the contractor. The Boeing bid was at least 22 percent less than the General Dynamics bid. If the Boeing Co. had actually been so far wrong in their estimates that they had gone over 120 percent of their bid price, the cost to the Government and the taxpayers still would have been less than the General Dynamics' bid. So there was no foundation to the charge that the Boeing costs were unrealistically low.

The General Dynamics Co. has built the F–102, the F–106, and the B–58. On these contracts, which are their major military airplane contracts, their performance cost was 4.8 percent over their bid price. This cost the American taxpayers $210 million more than they had planned on spending. On the other hand, the Boeing Co. in the same period of time has built the C–97, the B–47, the KC–135, and the B–52. We find that they had actually been 1.1 percent under their bid price. This saved the American taxpayers about $103 million. Obviously, the Boeing Co. had a history of completing their contracts at costs less than their bid price.

On March 5, 1963, on the floor of the House I proposed that we have a competition between the General Dynamics Co. and the Boeing Co. and that both companies would build prototypes. This has been done before in the awarding of airplane contracts. On May 1, 1963, Senator McCLELLAN became interested in this idea. After making an inquiry, he found that the Boeing Co. could provide four prototypes of the TFX for less than $200 million. The General Dynamics Co. never did come up with a definite cost proposal, but it was estimated that it would probably cost them something under $300 million. If we had had a prototype competition, we could still end up saving the American taxpayers quite a bit of money and still get a superior airplane for both the Air Force and the Navy. Just a small superiority in the air would mean a lot should the shooting actually start.

One of the results of the TFX award was that the Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral Anderson, was fired from office because he protested the overriding of the source selection board by McNamara, Gilpatric, Korth, and Zuckert, the civilian leaders in the Department of Defense. Chief of the Air Force, General LeMay, protested almost as hard and was put on probation for 1 year.

A very serious ramification of this new method of awarding military contracts is the morale factor of the military in the Pentagon. I have talked to military people who say that the morale of the mililtary is at an alltime low because of the method used in awarding the TFX contract.

Another ramification is the lowering of morale of American industry. In times past, in our free enterprise system, companies have felt that it was rewarding to bid on various defense contracts because the company that came up with the best design and had the lowest price was going to get the contract. We have reason to believe that now other factors may have some bearing on awarding defense contracts. If contracts are not to be awarded on a best performance basis and best price basis, then industry will question whether or not it should go to the bother and spend the time and the money that are necessary to make bids on large military contracts.

I would like to examine some of the principal overt characters who played major roles in the award of the TFX contract. The first of these is Secretary of the Air Force Zuckert. Mr. Zuckert admitted in his testimony that he had made a bad mistake in a memorandum that went to Secretary of Defense McNamara. In this particular memorandum, the Boeing bid was inflated by $77 million. Now, that was not a minor mistake, but during the hearings Mr. Zuckert argued that this actually helped the Boeing Co. because their bid was already too low. This is rather a difficult thing for most of us to understand in view of Boeing's performance on previous contracts. This error was corrected some time after the award was made. Then, the memorandum erred in four areas where the Boeing performance data was attributed to the General Dynamics design. The Boeing ferry range, the Boeing takeoff distance, the Boeing landing distance and the Boeing ability to handle certain intercept missions were incorrectly assigned to the General Dynamics design. Of course, these mistakes made the General Dynamics design look somewhat better than it was. Colonel Gayle of the Air Force, said that all errors in the memorandum favored the General Dynamics Co. design and that he just could not figure out how all of this had happened.

I would now like to get into the part played by then Secretary of the Navy Fred Korth. First of all, he was Assistant Secretary of the Army while a gentleman by the name of Frank Pace was Secretary of the Army. After Frank Pace resigned as Secretary of the Army he became president of General Dynamics in 1952. He now serves as a member of the board. Mr. Korth resigned and became president of the Continental National Bank in Fort Worth.

In 1955 Mr. Pace sent a man by the name of B. F. Biggers over to see Fred Korth and suggested that Mr. Biggers make Mr. Korth a board member of an insurance company that was being formed in Texas. Mr. Korth was to receive a portion of stock in the new company but was not required to put up any money for this stock. He had to sign a non-interest-bearing note for 3 years. The stock was to be purchased at 20 cents a share. It was predicted that the stock value would go up to about $5.25 a share in a relatively short period of time. Mr. Korth stood to profit by a quarter of a million dollars. The stockholders became somewhat suspicious of what was going on in the insurance company and they brought a conspiracy and fraud suit against Mr. Biggers, Mr. Korth, and another director by the name of Ben Jack Cage. Ben Jack Cage became a fugitive from justice in Brazil after having been convicted of another insurance scandal. Strangely enough, Mr. Korth had the conspiracy and fraud charge pending against him at the very moment he was appointed Secretary of the Navy. The case was settled out of court for nearly a million dollars. The judge said that the defendants did not admit guilt by settling it out of court.

There have been financial dealings between Mr. Korth's bank, the Continental National Bank of Fort Worth and the General Dynamics Co. For example, the General Dynamics Co. had a payroll account of between $25,000 and $40,000 on deposit in the Continental National Bank. That is perfectly legitimate. But, there was also an account at the time of the TFX award that ranged up to a half million dollars that was completely inactive and had no interest paid on it. The Continental National Bank was able to reinvest this money and they very probably made a considerable profit by so doing.

Fred Korth was the president of the Continental National Bank when it approved a loan for some $400,000 to the General Dynamics Co. after the General Dynamics Co. had suffered a $425 million loss on the Convair 880 transport. This is the largest loss of any private company in the history of the world. By coincidence this figure is amazingly similar to the estimated $415 million difference between the General Dynamics and Boeing bids. I might add that the second largest loss was that suffered on the Edsel while Robert McNamara was still with Ford Motors. This $400,000 loan was paid off in April of 1963 so that is completely out of the way. When Secretary Korth became Secretary of the Navy, he retained his stock in the Continental National Bank.

Fred Korth was active in behalf of the bank after he became Navy Secretary. On October 19, 1962, Leon Jordan, vice president and comptroller of the Continental National Bank, wrote Fred Korth as follows:

> While it is true that our deposits have shown very good increases, I happen to know that it has been you who has sent some of these deposits to us and I also happen to know that there could and would be a great many more if you were here under different circumstances than before you left.

On September 14, 1962, Mr. Jordan wrote to Mr. Korth:

> I note on today's new account list that you have secured a $25,000 account from the Nieman-Marcus Co. for us and only a few days ago another $25,000 savings account, the name of which I don't recall at the moment, but suffice to say that this is probably more

> business than the people who are primarily responsible for new business have gotten in the past 2 or 3 months. So may I add my thanks to you.

Mr. Korth also used the U.S. Navy yacht *Sequoia* to entertain officials of the bank and clients of the bank. A fellow by the name of Phil Reagan, who is quite a famous singer, I understand, deposited $50,000 in the Continental National Bank shortly after an excursion on the *Sequoia*. Reagan quipped in a letter to Korth:

> If you keep your fingers crossed and my good luck continues, my deposit might well be there until hell freezes over.

And Korth replied:

> We were indeed fortunate that we were able to have you and Jo aboard the *Sequoia* when you were here in Washington, and I hope you will let me know when you plan on having another visit with us.

If this is not a clear case of conflict of interest, then I doubt if one exists. Mr. Korth was allowed to resign his post as Secretary of the Navy.

Before becoming Under Secretary of Defense, Mr. Gilpatric was a partner in the law firm of Cravath, Swaine & Moore. Mr. Gilpatric said in his testimony that the law firm worked for both the General Dynamics Co. and the Boeing Co. This was denied and refuted by the Boeing Co. They said that all Mr. Gilpatric had ever done for them was to appear as a witness in a court case and had received no attorney's fees whatever from the Boeing Co.

Mr. Gilpatric was in charge of the General Dynamics account for his law firm. The interesting thing about the relationship was that Cravath, Swaine & Moore received $268,000 in legal fees from General Dynamics between 1958 and 1962. In the first quarter of 1963 they were paid $31,500. Obviously, General Dynamics was a very lucrative account for Cravath, Swaine & Moore.

When Mr. Gilpatric took a leave of absence from his law firm and became Deputy Secretary of Defense in 1961, Mr. Moore of that firm took over the General Dynamics account. Mr. Moore and the law firm were so highly thought of by General Dynamics that they made Mr. Moore a member of the board of directors of their company. Because of the closeness of the relationship between Mr. Gilpatric and the General Dynamics Co., I doubt very much if he could render an objective judgment on any contract in which they might be involved. I do not think there is any doubt that there is a clearcut case of conflict of interest on the part of Mr. Gilpatric.

Mr. Gilpatric was also allowed to resign and has returned to his law firm of Cravath, Swaine, and Moore.

The fourth character that we should examine is Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara. Mr. McNamara has not been fully examined by the subcommittee as yet, so all of the facts of his role are not known. That he was boss of the other three, there is no doubt.

One of his principal arguments against the Boeing design was that it used too much titanium. He indicated that titanium was untested and that he was not sure it would be satisfactory for use in supersonic airplanes. While he was making these statements, the top secret A-11 aircraft which utilizes large quantities of titanium was successfully flying. Either McNamara does not know what is going on in the Defense Department or he was deliberately trying to mislead the subcommittee.

McNamara also argued that the "commonality" of the Air Force and Navy versions proposed by General Dynamics was great. This myth has since been exploded and reports indicate that their Navy version will have to be drastically changed in order to be usable. The "commonality" of the two versions is less day by day.

Mr. McNamara should be recalled before the Senate Investigations Subcommittee for a full explanation of his past statements.

That there were highly irregular methods used in the awarding of the TFX, there is no doubt. Just how far out of line all of the characters wandered, we will not know until the matter is fully examined by the Senate Investigations Subcommittee. This committee has a responsibility to the American people to investigate completely and disclose their findings.

HEALTH CARE FOR THE AGED: 100,000 NEW NURSING HOME BEDS

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I have been interested in following the progress of medical facilities available to the general population of the United States. Here along with more trained people in the healing arts field and increased quality, quantity, and variety of health insurance are the areas where we really can best solve the problems that the success of our great health system has created by enabling people to live 10 to 15 years longer.

One facet of the facilities problem has been in the area of nursing homes. Just a little over a year ago I reported to the House of Representatives on the part being played by an agency of Government; namely, the Federal Housing Administration. I recalled to the House that I had initiated and sponsored legislation authorizing FHA to insure nursing home construction mortgages. I reported at that time that there was a possibility that FHA alone within the few years the program has been in effect might have been responsible for bringing 20,000 new nursing beds into being. I have just received new figures, as of May 31, 1964, which are as follows:

Projects finally endorsed, 108; mortgage amount, $48,811,389; beds, 8,551.

Projects initially endorsed, 132; mortgage amount, $84,356,337; beds, 12,899.

Projects with commitment outstanding, 86; mortgage amount, $56,130,400; beds, 8,431.

Projects with applications in process, 126; mortgage amount, $93,788,234; beds, 12,056.

If these projects materialize, then it might be said that within just 5 years the FHA program will have been responsible for the creation of 41,937 beds.

The FHA statistics, according to Mrs. Rush Holt, Special FHA Assistant for Nursing Homes, are only a part of the story. Publicity given the Federal program has aroused widespread interest in nursing home construction. Many applicants, after discussing FHA mortgage insurance, after having received FHA approval, have secured conventional loans instead. The Government's willingness to back up such loans has given lenders more confidence in both the future and the stability of the nursing home industry.

According to Alfred Ercolano, executive secretary of the American Nursing Home Association, Washington, D.C., only one out of every three beds currently being constructed are assisted in some way by the Government agency. So we can say with some confidence that within just a few years over 100,000 new nursing home beds have come into existence.

Mr. Ercolano reports that a 1957 study indicated that the average member of the American Nursing Home Association operated only 18 beds. A new study, just concluded, using 1964 data, shows that the average member now has a facility averaging 41 beds. There is no question that the newly constructed nursing homes designed as nursing homes are safer, more efficient, less costly to operate, more pleasant, more beneficial, and less costly to the patient than are the older homes.

I will continue to be interested in well-planned, properly staffed, and equipped nursing homes providing high-caliber medical and rehabilitation care beyond that available in the home, where conditions might not be appropriate for caring especially for those persons with incapacitating infirmities, who do not need the much more costly hospital care. Those interested in keeping down the cost of medical care to a reasonable level must keep alert to any opportunity to bring about facilities and other improvements which reduce those costs.

Now, if I may say so, it is about time the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare started reporting to the people and to the Congress the amazing progress being made in recent years in the improved, number and quality of medical facilities, the increased number, the increased productivity and the improved quality of skills of the people engaged in the healing arts field of endeavor, and in the extension of health insurance to cover more of our people with broader coverage and with a greater selectivity of the kind of policy best suited to the individual person or family needs.

To date the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and its supporting clique in the Congress and outside Government has not been accentuating the positive and eliminating the negative. On the contrary it has been accentuating the negative, messing with

Mr. Inbetween and in the process actually slowing down the positive.

Now that medicare has been put on the shelf, I hope for good, cannot the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and its allies get into the spirit of progress in our society to work with it and not against it? Let the Department start reporting what is good about America. Studying and reporting success is the best way to help to eliminate failure and put those in between up on the high road of better living.

In the next week or so the Health Insurance Council will be putting out its 18th annual survey of the extent of voluntary health insurance coverage in the United States and I will again take the floor to point up the amazing progress which has been going on in this field. I again want to emphasize that this progress is being made in spite of the activities of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare officials not with, which should be the case, their understanding and cooperation.

CHEMICAL INDUSTRY UNDERTAKES EXTENSIVE WATER RESEARCH PROGRAM

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the problem of water pollution, from all sources, has long been of major concern to our people. Long before there was legislation on the Federal level, State, and local efforts had been directed toward the control of water pollution. The earliest of these programs seems to have been the statute that was enacted in Pennsylvania in 1905. Even hasty research will disclose that about 14 different States had passed similar legislation before Congress, in 1948, enacted the Federal Water Pollution Control Act. This act declared a congressional policy of support and aid to States and municipalities conducting technical research in the field of prevention and control of water pollution. While these efforts have yielded significant results in the past, much more has yet to be accomplished.

Federal, State, and local governments are not alone in their concern for the preservation of water quality. For some time the American chemical industry has translated concern into action and embarked last month upon an extensive research program designed to determine how organic chemicals act in streams, lakes, and rivers and how treatment processes for sanitary sewage react upon these chemicals.

This research program, under the sponsorship of the Manufacturing Chemists' Association, will be under the direction of Dr. D. W. Ryckman, chairman of the environment and sanitary engineering division of Washington University at St. Louis. Dr. Ryckman, who is widely recognized as a specialist in biochemistry and bioengineering, is a graduate of Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, has a master of science degree from Michigan State University, and doctor of science degree from Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

This research project is expected to run from 3 to 5 years and has been developed into three basic activities. They are:

First. A compilation and critical examination of related technical data on organic chemicals;

Second. A laboratory research program on the degree and rate at which organic chemicals break down and disappear under biological action, and classification of bio-organisms with regard to their relative effectiveness in this regard;

Third. A field study to verify the laboratory program.

It is expected that the information developed from this research program will not only help chemical companies, but will help other industries plan their water resources management.

I think it might be well to note the remarks made by Gen. George H. Decker, president of MCA, when he announced this program. He said:

> This research project reflects a continuing effort on the part of the industry to help maintain a high degree of clean water both for the general public and for its own use. Results from this research should enable chemical companies to plan more soundly with regard to manufacturing wastes and also to better advise their customers concerning the handling and use of their products.

In this current research effort and in other programs, the chemical industry has been responsive to its responsibilities in the field of water pollution control. For more than 25 years, the industry, through the Manufacturing Chemists Association, has maintained a constant watch on water quality problems caused by chemical production. Just recently the MCA has undertaken a survey of the chemical industry's investment in water pollution control facilities at 875 chemical plants, involving 125 different chemical manufacturing concerns throughout the United States. I would like to include in the RECORD at this point the tabulation by States of the wastes treatment and water pollution control facilities of these responsible members of our private enterprise system:

TABLE NO. 1-A.—*Wastes treatment and water pollution control facilities, by States*

State	Number of reporting chemical plants	Number of different communities	Total employment represented	Capital investment to date [1]	Projected additional investment next 5 years [1]	Current annual operating cost [1]	Current annual manpower requirements (man-years)
Alabama	17	13	3,757	1,752,000	480,000	362,000	12.1
Alaska, Oregon, Washington	20	13	1,605	1,083,000	262,000	211,000	8.3
Arizona, Colorado, Kansas, Nevada, New Mexico, Oklahoma, and Utah	18	15	9,077	1,308,000	553,000	120,000	8.5
Arkansas	12	8	2,205	864,000	180,000	183,000	15.9
California	67	43	10,889	4,845,000	1,206,000	1,207,000	67.5
Connecticut	8	8	6,723	2,861,000	1,050,000	215,000	18.2
Delaware	17	8	11,226	2,684,000	130,000	279,000	18.6
Florida	17	11	11,279	7,051,000	2,894,000	1,636,000	61.1
Georgia	15	10	3,648	1,352,000	208,000	260,000	5.6
Idaho, Minnesota, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wyoming	12	10	2,469	1,361,000	890,000	160,000	11.6
Illinois	51	29	19,040	14,196,000	3,523,000	1,325,000	65.5
Indiana	14	10	2,364	2,381,000	660,000	302,000	9.4
Iowa	10	9	2,251	33,000	109,000	109,000	3.9
Kentucky	19	10	6,429	6,496,000	1,229,000	850,000	39.1
Louisiana	36	21	13,354	13,514,000	1,581,000	2,777,000	92.8
Maine, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Vermont	4	4	415	1,000	(2)	(2)	0
Maryland	18	5	6,726	2,351,000	1,468,000	313,000	24.3
Massachusetts	25	18	6,918	788,000	922,000	83,000	61.5
Michigan	33	21	18,806	14,726,000	2,303,000	2,379,000	87.8
Mississippi	6	6	1,254	248,000	227,000	21,000	2.8
Missouri	17	9	7,896	3,643,000	1,707,000	1,940,000	85.1
New Jersey	83	52	43,954	35,548,000	7,859,000	5,219,000	108.0
New York	51	28	51,823	28,300,000	7,423,000	2,182,000	85.5
North Carolina	16	14	2,949	565,000	344,000	89,000	11.8
Ohio	72	42	25,956	17,673,000	3,413,000	1,759,000	97.5
Pennsylvania	43	35	18,597	27,842,000	2,412,000	3,134,000	141.4
South Carolina	12	8	5,712	1,583,000	804,000	99,000	5.9
Tennessee	26	15	11,543	9,153,000	3,387,000	1,749,000	103.4
Texas	80	38	40,463	32,593,000	6,622,000	6,254,000	293.2
Virginia	24	19	22,698	12,593,000	3,079,000	1,183,000	72.1
West Virginia	23	16	19,099	10,400,000	10,405,000	3,257,000	137.3
Wisconsin	9	8	1,915	3,497,000	2,356,000	696,000	9.2
Total	875	556	393,040	263,585,000	69,686,000	40,353,000	1,764.9

[1] Rounded to nearest $1,000.

[2] Less than 1,000.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues will note that over $263 million has been spent in the past, and another $69.7 million is to be spent in the next 5 years. These same concerns are spending $5.5 million annually for research in this field alone. In Missouri, for example, capital investment by chemical facilities on waste treatment amounts to more than $3.6 million. In addition, 17 chemical plants in 9 Missouri communities plan to spend over $1.7 million during the next 5 years to improve water quality.

I have been saying over the years that private enterprise can and often does accept its responsibility in preserving our natural resources. This example of one industry in one specific field is not a mere isolated incident. The same is being done in many other fields which impinge on our American way of life. I think that the chemical industry is to be commended for its efforts in water quality preservation. Continued research and self-regulation by all industries, coupled with State and local programs, will do much to prevent the contamination of this valuable natural asset and preserve it for future generations.

HELLER-WALLICH CORRESPONDENCE ILLUMINATES CONCEPT OF THE FULL EMPLOYMENT BUDGET

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, during the recent debate over the tax cut the administration made widespread use of the concept of the "full employment budget" as a tool of analysis designed to demonstrate the magnitude of the "brake" on the economy exerted by Federal fiscal policy.

In simplest terms, the "full employment budget" is intended to show what the budget surplus or deficit—national income accounts basis—would be if the economy were operating at full employment, defined at a constant 4-percent unemployment rate. The surplus in the "full employment budget" is considered too large when Government spending, plus private spending, is insufficient to bring total output to the full employment level. This was the situation which the administration said existed prior to the recent tax cut .

The importance which the administration attached to the concept in the tax cut debate led me to believe that in the future it was likely to be used as an even more important guide to fiscal policy. For that reason I wrote Dr. Walter W. Heller, Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, on February 11, asking a number of questions about the concept and about the administration's assertion that its fiscal program would provide a greater net fiscal stimulus to the economy this year than in any other peacetime year in history. I also asked for estimates of the full employment surplus for 1962, 1963, and 1964.

Dr. Heller replied to my letter on April 27, setting forth the information which I requested. I then sent Dr. Heller's reply to Dr. Henry Wallich, professor of economics at Yale University and former member of President Eisenhower's Council, requesting his comment on Dr. Heller's letter.

I have now received a reply from Dr. Wallich which is critical of the statistical precision given to the "full employment budget" concept by the Council. After summarizing the weaknesses of the concept, Dr. Wallich concludes that it is "a very much less than adequate description of the effects of a particular budget."

Because of the light which this correspondence sheds on the "full employment budget," I believe it would be useful if it were brought to the attention of Members of Congress, economists, financial writers, and others. Under unanimous consent, I include my letter of February 11 to Dr. Heller, his reply to me of April 27, and Dr. Wallich's letter of June 25 in the RECORD at this point:

FEBRUARY 11, 1964.

Dr. WALTER W. HELLER,
Chairman, Council of Economic Advisers, Executive Office of the President, Washington, D.C.

DEAR DR. HELLER: In his economic report the President says that the administration's program will provide a greater net stimulus to the economy this year than in any other peacetime year in history. I would appreciate it if you would set forth the reasoning and the figures upon which this statement is based.

I am also curious about whether you consider the administration's expenditure policy this year stimulative or not. In the Council's economic report you state that "The tax and expenditure program will give a bigger fiscal stimulus in calendar 1964 than in any of the past 3 years." However, in reply to questions which I submitted to you at the Joint Economic Committee's annual hearings you say "the spending side of the Federal budget can hardly be considered stimulative in 1964."

Because of the importance of a correct understanding of the concept of the full employment surplus, I would also appreciate your setting down in detail the figures upon which the estimates of the full employment surplus for 1962, 1963, and 1964 are based.

With best wishes and many thanks for your cooperation,

Sincerely yours,
THOMAS B. CURTIS.

COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS,
Washington, D.C., April 27, 1964.

Hon. THOMAS B. CURTIS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CURTIS: I am pleased to reply to your letter of February 11, 1964, requesting us to set forth the reasoning and figures on which the President based his statement that the 1964 fiscal program will provide a greater net stimulus than in any previous peacetime year.

We delayed our reply because at the time of receipt of your request, there was underway a full-scale interagency review of the full employment budget estimates on the President's statement was based. This review was expected to produce new and more refined estimates of the full employment budget. This work is now completed, and I am pleased to report that the new estimates do not differ significantly from the previous ones.

As you know, the Council holds that the full employment budget on a national income accounts basis provides the best single summary of the impact of the Federal fiscal system on our national product and income. The expenditures side of this budget is an estimate of what, under conditions of full employment, would be the total of:

(a) Federal purchases of goods and services, and

(b) Federal transfer payments, interests, subsidies, and grants-in-aid—all of which add to the purchasing power of households, businesses, and State and local governments.

The revenue figures show the withdrawal of potential private purchasing power that would result from Federal tax collections at full employment.

Since the full employment budget is estimated at a constant 4-percent unemployment rate, it shows the impact of the Federal fiscal program independently of the strength or weakness of the forces (other than Federal expenditures and taxes) affecting private demand. Since the receipts and expenditures actually realized in any year are not independent of these forces, the actual budget outcome does not provide an adequate measure of the budget impact taken by itself. The basis for this analysis is set forth more fully in the 1962 and 1964 Economic Reports.

Under the Employment Act of 1946, responsible fiscal policy must—so far as practicable, and consistent with the strengthening of free enterprise—respond to the strength or weakness of private demand in such a way as to maintain "maximum employment" and "maximum production," in a context of reasonable price stability (needed to maintain "maximum purchasing power"). With existing labor-market conditions and with responsible price and wage decisionmaking, we believe that our interim objective, under this criterion, should be to bring the unemployment rate down to no more than 4 percent. (As habits of responsible wage and price making become entrenched and as structural imperfections in the labor market are reduced, we should find it possible to bring unemployment below this level.)

The long-standing problem of excessive unemployment that had persisted since 1957 clearly demonstrated the need for a Federal fiscal program considerably more stimulating than was in effect prior to 1964.

Making the Federal budget more stimulating requires either a substantial year-to-year increase in expenditures or reduction in tax rates, simply because of the large built-in revenues—as our potential gross national product grows.

If the constant-dollar potential GNP grows by 3½ percent a year, and the GNP deflator rises about 1½ percent a year, then the potential GNP in current prices will rise at about 5 percent a year. We estimate full employment revenues on a national income accounts basis to have been $122.4 billion for 1963. Since, with our present tax system, these revenues grow only slightly more than in proportion to GNP, a 5-percent rise of GNP would yield a rise of approximately $6 billion in Federal tax collections.

In order to avoid an increasingly restrictive budget under the 1963 tax laws, therefore, Federal expenditures—on national income account, including trust account outlays—would also have had to rise by about $6 billion. As a matter of economic arithmetic—not value judgment—this much expenditure rise would have been needed just to avoid an increasing fiscal restraint in a growing economy. Taken by itself, any smaller expenditure growth would contribute to a growing full employment surplus. However, with a reduction in tax schedules, it becomes possible to have a smaller expenditure rise (or even a decline), and still have the budget move toward a more stimulating position. This is what is being done by the Congress and administration in the 1964 program.

The two tables which follow set forth the movements in the full employment budget over the past few years and the projected movements in 1964.

Table 1 shows estimated full employment Federal revenues, expenditures, and surplus or deficit—estimated on the basis of the tax-rate structure that was in effect in 1960–61, on the actual contribution rate for the OASDI program, and on the contribution rate to the unemployment compensation system that would have prevailed under full employment conditions.

Table 2 differs from table 1 in that the revenue estimates reflect the effects of the 1962 Revenue Act, of the revised 1962 depreciation guidelines, and of the 1964 Revenue Act.

Since these numbers represent estimates of what would have happened if the economy had been operating at a 4-percent unemployment rate rather than the actual higher unemployment rates, the figures contain some element of conjecture. This is necessarily even more true for the 1964 estimates. Hence honest disagreement could arise over these numbers. However, we are confident that the margin for dispute would be small.

As these figures show, the budget became somewhat less restrictive in 1961 and 1962, somewhat more restrictive in 1963. The 1964 program involves a large shift—namely $8 billion—in the direction of fiscal stimulus. This is above the combined stimulus of the preceding 3 years and exceeds the stimulus of any other peacetime year.

I hope that this exposition and the accompanying tables will serve to answer your inquiry. If we can be of further help, please call on us.

Sincerely,

WALTER W. HELLER,
Chairman.

TABLE 1.—*Full-employment revenues, expenditures, and surplus or deficit under 1960–61 revenue system* [1]

[In billions of dollars]

Calendar year	Revenues	Expenditures	Surplus or deficit (−)	Net fiscal stimulus [2]
1960	104.4	92.0	12.4	----------
1961	110.2	100.6	9.6	+2.8
1962	116.5	108.7	7.8	+1.8
1963	125.0	115.2	9.8	−2.0
1964	131.2	119.2	12.0	−2.2

[1] Revenues estimated on the basis of the 1960–61 tax-rate structure, the actual contribution rate for the OASDI program, and the rate of contributions to the unemployment compensation system that was estimated would prevail under full-employment conditions.

[2] Reduction of surplus from preceding year.

TABLE 2.—*Full-employment revenues, expenditures, and surplus or deficit reflecting 1962 tax and 1964 changes* [1]

[In billions of dollars]

Calendar year	Revenues	Expenditures	Surplus or deficit (−)	Net fiscal stimulus [2]
1960	104.4	92.0	12.4	----------
1961	110.2	100.6	9.6	+2.8
1962	113.6	108.7	4.9	+4.7
1963	122.4	115.2	7.2	−2.3
1964	118.7	119.2	−.5	+7.7

[1] Revenue estimates reflect the effects of the 1962 Revenue Act, the 1962 new depreciation guidelines, and the 1964 Revenue Act.

[2] Reduction of surplus from preceding year.

JUNE 25, 1964.

Hon. THOMAS B. CURTIS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR TOM: I have read with great interest your correspondence with Dr. Heller bearing on the full employment surplus and the estimates related to it. In responding to your request for comments, I would like to make the following points:

1. The concept of the full employment surplus as a guide to fiscal policy has been in use for some time. One such use has been that made by the Committee for Economic Development in its policy statements on the budget, "Taxes and the Budget: A Program for Prosperity in a Free Economy" (New York, November 1947), which was analyzed in an article by Dr. Heller in the American Economic Review of September 1957. The statistical precision given to the full employment surplus by the Council of Economic Advisers, I believe, represents a new step in economic analysis.

This statistical precision nevertheless brings into focus various weaknesses of the concept. One weakness derives from the uncertainty of what constitutes "full employment," which the CEA today, as well as the CED in 1947, place at 4-percent unemployment. This has also been the target concept of the Eisenhower administration. We do not know, however, how far unemployment can be reduced without inflationary consequences. Recently, Senator CLARK's subcommittee came out in favor of a 3-percent standard. Personally I fear that, with unemployment of all but teenagers already close to 4 percent, and teenage unemployment at about 15 percent, constituting about one-fourth of the total, the noninflationary definition of full employment will have to be well above 4 percent, until a solution is found to the recent extraordinary bulge in teenage unemployment.

A difference of 1-percent unemployment, on the Council's calculation, means a difference of about 3 percent of GNP and a slightly larger percentage of Government revenues. Thus a change of 1 percent in the full employment standard, one way or the other, may mean a difference of 4 to 5 million in the full employment surplus.

2. The full employment surplus depends not only on the level of national income, given the expenditures of the Government, but also on the share of corporate profits in that income. Usually the share of profits rises sharply as unemployment falls from high levels. The Council's estimates have involved a 10-percent ratio of corporate profits to GNP at full employment. While this relationship has prevailed at certain times in the past, it has not recently been tested owing to our failure to reach full employment. At the present level of GNP and corporate profits, we are still well below 10 percent, and nevertheless it has been argued by some on the labor side that profits are already unfairly high. If in future periods of full employment the share of corporate profits, with their high tax yield, should be lower than in the past, the full employment surplus will also be lower. This uncertaintly is compounded by recent changes in depreciation techniques which have obfuscated the concept of corporate profits.

3. Dr. Heller in his 1957 article points out some further factors that interfere with a precise calculation of the full employment surplus:

(1) The Mills plan for speeding up corporate income tax payments, a new version of which was introduced with the recent tax cut. (But this does not affect the income and product account surplus.)

(2) Transfers of public expenditures from the budget into the banking system.

(3) Yearend manipulations to retard processing of taxpayments and accelerating present payments.

(4) The Federal credit programs.

4. The full employment surplus by itself is not an adequate way of describing the stimulating or restraining character of a given Federal budget. The absolute size of the budget also counts. That is to say, a full employment surplus of 5 billion when revenues are 95 and expenditures 90 is not the same thing as when revenues are 105 and expenditures 100. This is attributable to what economists refer to as the "balanced budget multiplier." In simplest terms, the "balanced budget multiplier" proposition says that because the Government does not, like the consumer, save a fraction of every marginal dollar of receipts, savings in the economy are not increased when the Government raises its receipts and its expenditures by the same amount. Assuming the presence of unemployed resources, it then follows that for a given level of private saving and investment, GNP will tend to be increased by the amount of the budget increase.

The Council of Economic Advisers takes account of the balanced budget multiplier by describing the full employment surplus as the "single most important" measure of the impact of the budget. But in order fully to describe the impact of a given budget, not only its full employment surplus but also its absolute magnitude would have to be considered. Very roughly speaking, an increase in both revenues and expenditures by some particular amount tends to be equivalent, in stimulating effect, to a reduction in the full employment surplus of one-half that amount. For example, if at any given moment Government expenditures were to be raised by $1 billion and matched by an increase in tax rates to produce $1 billion in revenues, this would have about the same effect upon the level of GNP as would a $0.5 billion increase in expenditures without an increase in tax rates.

Thus, budget A that has a larger full employment surplus than budget B may nevertheless be more expansionary if the absolute levels of revenues and expenditures are also higher than in budget B. Failure to emphasize this, and stressing only the full employment surplus, can mislead as regards the true impact of the budget. It also draws away attention from the magnitude of the budget which is important also for other reasons. The magnitude of the budget should, of course, always be viewed in relation to the level of GNP.

5. The use of the full employment surplus as a means of defining the stimulating or restraining character of a budget also abstracts from the monetary consequences of surpluses and deficits. Surpluses permit debt repayment, deficits must be financed. Following the logic of the full employment surplus, we are compelled to say that the budget with a larger full employment surplus is always more restraining than a budget with a smaller one. For instance, if budget A has a full employment surplus of $5 billion, but because of recession is currently producing a deficit of $10 billion, it is nevertheless more restraining than budget B that has a full employment surplus of $3 billion and, owing to better business conditions, is currently producing a surplus of $2 billion. Yet the financing of the deficit under budget A may have very stimulating effects, if bank credit is used. Debt repayment under budget B may contract the money supply, if bank held debt is repaid. The overall effects—income plus monetary—of deficit budget A may therefore be more expansionary than those of surplus budget B, despite their different full employment surpluses.

6. The distinction between the income and monetary effects of a budget would be appropriate, although practically difficult, if assurance could be had that in practice the Federal Reserve would be quite free to handle the monetary side. This, however, is uncertain. The politics as well as the economics of the full employment surplus tend to obscure the inflationary dangers of deficits with inadequately controlled financing. The financial aspects of deficits tend to be ignored. We are led to think in terms of surpluses that may be a statistical illusion.

7. Exclusive stress upon the concept of full employment surplus is likely further to con-

> fuse the discussion of fiscal policy in this country. A great deal of unreasoning prejudice exists against the use of deficits when they are appropriate, just as there exists, in other quarters, a lack of concern about them when they are not appropriate. If the full employment surplus is used as the principal guide, we shall at times find ourselves in the position of having to argue that a particular deficit is restraining and that a particular surplus is expansionary. It is more plausible to say that a particular deficit is not sufficiently expansionary or a particular surplus not restrictive enough. While the distinction is one of semantics, it also has an influence on people and on votes.
>
> 8. To summarize my remarks, I regard the full employment surplus as a valuable concept, but as statistically uncertain and as a very much less than adequate description of the effects of a particular budget. It would be regrettable if its elegance and seeming simplicity should tempt us to make more use of it than it can give.
>
> Sincerely yours,
>
> H. C. WALLICH.

CURB FCC

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JOHANSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I recently received a copy of correspondence between Mr. Philip McMartin, assistant public relations director of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, and Mr. Luther W. Martin, general manager and owner of radio station KTTR, operated by the "Show-Me" Broadcasting Co., of Rolla, Mo.

Mr. McMartin's letter under date of June 15 calls on radio station KTTR to broadcast a taped interview by Mr. McMartin with Clyde Ellis, general manager of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, a former member of this House and well-known lobbyist in Washington, and Mr. R. Sargent Shriver, director of the so-called war on poverty program.

The request—which includes no offer of payment for time for the broadcast—is based on the alleged grounds that station KTTR carried a commercially sponsored "Life Line" program "in which President Johnson's war on poverty legislation was attacked." In making this request, Mr. McMartin quotes a letter from the Federal Communications Commission under date of September 19 to two licensees, which reads:

> It is clear that the public's paramount right to hear contrasting views on controversial issues of public importance cannot be nullified by the inability of the licensee to obtain paid sponsorship of time for the broadcast of a view contrary to one already presented in a sponsored program.

In reply, Mr. Martin wrote Mr. McMartin stating, among other things:

> We still desire a more specific directive from the FCC before we provide free time in reply to commercial time.

I believe the position taken by the radio station owner, Mr. Martin, is eminently reasonable and proper.

I believe, however, that the answer to Mr. Martin—and to Mr. Ellis, and others as well—ought to come from the Congress of the United States.

I believe it ought to come in the form of enactment of the bill H.R. 9158, introduced by our able colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER], calling for an amendment to the Communications Act of 1934, as follows:

> If a licensee permits the use of his station for the broadcasting of any views regarding any controversial issue, for which use any charges are made by such licensee, he shall not be required to afford the use of such station for the presentation of contrasting views with respect to such issue without making comparable charges for such use.

Meanwhile, I have written Mr. Ellis the following letter, which, under permission to extend my remarks and include extraneous matter, I insert at this point:

> JUNE 24, 1964.
>
> Mr. CLYDE ELLIS,
> *General Manager, National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, Washington, D.C.*
>
> DEAR MR. ELLIS: I have had my attention called to a letter of June 15, 1964, from your Mr. McMartin to the program director of station KTTR, Rolla, Mo., and the reply thereto under date of June 16, of Mr. Luther W. Martin, general manager and owner of the station.
>
> Please be advised that I am directing this correspondence to the attention of the House of Representatives, and to the attention of the chairman and ranking minority member of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce which has legislative jurisdiction over the Federal Communications Commission.
>
> In doing so, I am urging the committee and the House to take prompt and effective action to counteract the iniquitous dictate in the FCC letter of September 19, quoted by your Mr. McMartin, and to counteract the equally iniquitous exploitation of this FCC ruling by you and your organization.
>
> The import of this FCC dictate clearly is to force the communications media to choose between silence on controversial issues, or bankruptcy.
>
> Yours very truly,
>
> AUGUST E. JOHANSEN.

CAPTIVE NATIONS, 1964

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARRY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, at this time many U.S. Representatives rise in this Chamber to address their remarks to the subject of Captive Nations Week. It is fitting that we do this, for the subject is close to the hearts of millions of Americans. The term "captive nations" applies to those European nations which the Communists seized in the relatively short time between 1940 and 1948. The largest part of this takeover resulted from Communist expansion following the last World War, a legacy most disheartening when we consider World War II was a great effort of mankind in behalf of freedom and democracy. The sordid record of Soviet deceit and inhumanity resulted in the denial of freedom for almost one-quarter of Europe's people, living on one-third of the territory of that Continent.

The word "captive" means something to us when we realize that the formerly independent countries of Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Rumania, and East Germany are now in total political and social captivity under an imposed totalitarian regime. The Iron Curtain, which separates these countries from their free brothers in Europe and elsewhere in the world, was forged by the strong arm of the Soviet Army under orders of the foreign government in Moscow.

For what purpose, then, do we make this proclamation in 1964, here in that great representative body—the U.S. House of Representatives? I believe there are two benefits from the words that echo through this body. First, it serves to focus worldwide attention on the fact that so many people live in political bondage. We must never forget that these once independent peoples lost their freedom by outside imposed force, terror, and violence. Secondly, this observance serves to remind Americans that millions have lost that cherished goal of mankind which we Americans live with every minute of every day—the freedom to think, say, and act as we wish.

America stands in striking contrast to life behind the Iron Curtain. We must never permit the Communists to overshadow or extinguish the light this contrast tells the world. We must continue to stir men's minds with the freedom we now own. Men have always fought for what we have. Mankind has always been pulled toward the light of freedom, and fences and walls have never been able to stop them.

Let us be solemn about this occasion and in our observance let us prayerfully hope that someday these peoples in the captive nations own what is rightfully theirs—the freedom to guide their own life.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARRY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, the civil rights problem is our Nation's greatest sickness which can only be cured by a moral revival.

Reestablishing that everyone is equal under the law by defining the rights guaranteed by the Constitution will help, but the only truly meaningful gain is when racial barriers are broken down by human hearts.

This will take some persuasion, but today, in our time, the civil rights bill paves the way for this eventuality. I hail its passage.

STATEMENT OF ROBERT TAFT, JR., ON SUBJECT OF APPORTIONMENT, JULY 2, 1964

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, Congressman WILLIAM McCULLOCH and other Congressmen have introduced joint resolutions calling for a constitutional amendment to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population. The necessity for this action arises from the opinions of the Supreme Court of the United States recently. These decisions have the effect of dictating to the States an inflexible and rigid formula of equally populated legislative districts. While the Supreme Court decision now becomes the law of the land, it is contrary to the principles of representative government upon which our Nation has been based. Just as the principle of territorial representation was incorporated into the Federal Constitution in the formation of the U.S. Senate, the principle of some degree of geographical representation, as well as considerations which give weight to common interests of the people represented, have been a part of our State and local governmental systems since the conception of this Nation. The strongest principle of our system of government has been that of representation on a fair and equal basis for all concerned, not merely majority rule. Protection of the rights of the minority is guaranteed by the Constitution. Conditions relating to fairness and equality of representation differ widely throughout the various States of the Nation, and can even differ widely within a particular State. For instance, to deprive southeastern Ohio of its present representation at a time when the problems of that area require direct attention under numerous State and Federal programs, would seem to me to be extremely unwise. Randall Metcalf, the Republican candidate for Congress in the 15th District in southeast Ohio, has been pointing out the threat of the Court decisions to any reasonable voice for that area in the State councils in Columbus. After discussions with him, I have renewed concern as to the implications of the Supreme Court decisions, and I believe that it is vital that we move with dispatch to correct them. My experience in the Ohio House of Representatives, where the southeast area is given voice related to geographic factors, concinces me that no undue favoritism was shown toward the problems of that area. By comparison, it was the Ohio Senate, elected on a straight population basis, that has defeated more proposals said to favor urban areas.

For these reasons, I have followed the lead of Congressman McCULLOCH and others and introduced on my own behalf a joint resolution differing slightly from the McCulloch proposal. It makes clear that population is one of the factors that can be considered, but not the exclusive factor. It also attempts to avoid the necessity for voter action statewide where that action has already taken place by constitutional amendment or initiative petition previously or where such a remedy is immediately available.

TARAS SHEVCHENKO STATUE

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday, June 27, Washington was the scene of a dramatic series of events revolving around the dedication of the Taras Shevchenko statue at 22d, 23d, and P Streets NW. The dramatic climax to this great day took place at the unveiling of the statue with a major foreign policy address delivered by Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I ask to have the full text of General Eisenhower's address printed in the RECORD at this point:

ADDRESS BY GEN. DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER AT THE UNVEILING OF THE MONUMENT TO TARAS SHEVCHENKO, WASHINGTON, D.C., JUNE 27, 1964

First, let me thank you for your generous welcome.

On September 13, 1960, when I signed into law a measure to authorize the erection of this statue, it was my expectation that you would arrange a ceremony of dedication commensurate with the greatness of Taras Shevchenko.

That day is here and you have come by the thousands from all over the United States; you have come from Canada, from Latin America, and Europe, and from as far away as Australia, to honor the memory of a poet who expressed so eloquently man's undying determination to fight for freedom and his unquenchable faith in ultimate victory.

This outpouring of lovers of freedom to salute a Ukrainian hero far exceeds my expectation.

But its meaning does not exceed my hope.

For my hope is that your magnificent march from the shadow of the Washington Monument to the foot of the statue of Taras Shevchenko will here kindle a new world movement in the hearts, minds, words, and actions of men.

A never-ending movement dedicated to the independence and freedom of peoples of all captive nations of the entire world.

During my boyhood it was confidently predicted that within the lifetime of my generation the principles of our free society would become known to all people everywhere and would be universally accepted around the world.

That dream has faded.

Within the past few decades, the concepts of liberty and human dignity have been scorned and rejected by powerful men who control great areas of our planet.

The revolutionary doctrines of our free society are far from universal application in the earth.

Rather, we have seen the counterattacks of facism and communism substitute for them the totalitarian state, the suppression of personal freedom, the denial of national independence, and even the destruction of free inquiry and discussion.

Tyranny and oppression today are not different from tyranny and oppression in the days of Taras Shevchenko.

Now, as then, tyranny means the concentration of all power in an elite body, in a government bureau, in a single man.

It means that the ultimate decisions affecting every aspect of life rest not with the people themselves, but with tyrants.

Shevchenko experienced this kind of governmental usurpation of decisions he believed he should make for himself.

And he was a champion of freedom not solely for himself.

When he spoke out for Ukrainian independence from Russian colonial rule, he endangered his own liberty.

When he joined a society whose aim was to establish a republican form of government in countries of Eastern Europe, he was jailed—even denied the right to use pencil and paper to record his thoughts about freedom.

Today the same pattern of life exists in the Soviet Union and in all captive nations.

Wherever communism rules there is forceful control of thought, of expression, and indeed of every phase of human existence that the state may choose to dominate.

The touchstone of any free society is limited government, which does only those things which the people need and which they cannot do for themselves at all, or cannot do as well.

Our own Nation was created as this kind of society in a devout belief that where men are free, where they have the right to think, to worship, to act as they may choose—subject only to the provision that they transgress not on the equal rights of others—there will be rapid human progress.

We believe also that when this kind of freedom is guaranteed universally, there will be peace among all nations.

Though the world today stands divided between tyranny and freedom we can hope and have faith that it will not always so remain.

Of all who inhabit the globe, only a relatively few in each of the captive nations—only a handful even in Russia itself—form the evil conspiracies that dominate their fellow men by force or by fraud.

Because man instinctively rebels against regimentation—he hungers for freedom, for well-being, and for peace, even though he may not, in some regions, always comprehend the full meaning of these words.

Yet the will of a few men thwarts the will of hundreds of millions and freedom stands aghast that this is so.

But let us not forget the ageless truth, "This, too, shall pass," and, until it does, we can be sure that this Nation will with its allies, sustain the strength—spiritual, economic, and military—to fill any ill-advised attempt of dictators to seize any area where the love of freedom lives and blazes.

In the nations of East and Central Europe, in the non-Russian nations of the U.S.S.R., and in Russia itself—where the poetry of Shevchenko is well known—there are millions of individual human beings who earnestly want the right of self-determination and self-government.

His statue, standing here in the heart of the Nation's Capital, near the embassies where representatives of nearly all the countries of the world can see it, is a shining symbol of his love of liberty.

It speaks to these millions of oppressed.

It gives them constant encouragement to struggle forever against Communist tyranny, until, one day final victory is achieved, as it most surely will be.

Most of you here today are of Ukrainian descent or origin.

All of us—if we go back 1 generation, or 2, or 10, find family roots in some other nation, some other continent.

But today, we stand together as Americans, bound by our common devotion to a system of self-government—a system that makes it possible for us to be different, and yet united; independent, yet interdependent; diverse, and yet inseparable.

To be successful in bringing peace with freedom and justice to the world, we must increase our joint efforts to make peoples around the world more aware that only in freedom can be found the right road to human progress, happiness, and fulfillment.

Shevchenko lived and taught this truth.

In unveiling this memorial to the great 19th century Ukrainian poet we encourage today's poets in Ukraine, in Eastern Europe, and around the world to embody in their poetry mankind's demands for freedom for self-expression, for national independence, and for liberty for all mankind.

Were he alive today, he would be in the forefront of that great struggle.

And now I recall the words of one of America's greatest sons, Abraham Lincoln.

Speaking here just 100 years ago he said:

"It is not merely for today, but for all time to come, that we should perpetuate for our children's children that great and free government, which we have enjoyed all our lives."

In the same spirit, it is not merely for today, but for all time to come that we today present to the world this statue of Taras Shevchenko, bard of Ukraine and freedom fighter, to perpetuate man's faith in the ultimate victory of freedom.

With incessant work, and with God's help, there will emerge, one day, a new era, an era of universal peace with freedom, and justice for all mankind.

Mr. Speaker, a representative group of Members of the House including the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, Michael A. Feighan, whose interest in the cause of oppressed peoples is internationally known; the gentleman from New York the Honorable Thaddeus J. Dulski, who has led the legislative battle for the issuance of a stamp commemorating Taras Shevchenko, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the Honorable Daniel J. Flood, the House sparkplug in the struggle for the creation of a special House Committee on the Captive Nations, and myself—all briefly addressed the huge gathering. I ask leave that our remarks be carried in the Record at this point:

Remarks of Congressman Michael A. Feighan at the Unveiling of the Taras Shevchenko Memorial

The unveiling of this memorial statue of Taras Shevchenko is a meaningful addition to the other memorials to human freedom which grace our Nation's Capital.

In this citadel of human freedom, the birthplace of representative self-government, we are proud of the grand memorials erected to the memory of George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, Abraham Lincoln, and other dedicated Americans who have blazed and enlightened the path of human freedom. We are equally proud of the memorials which stand in this citadel to such men as Lafayette, Kosciuszko, and Steuben, who gave their all to the winning of our national independence. The memorials to such great men as Bolivar, among others, attest to our close kinship with those in other lands who held high the torch of freedom and hope, lighted by our Founding Fathers. All of these memorials serve to remind us of the timeless and unending struggles of mankind to reject tyranny and oppression—to win freedom and to protect it as a priceless quality of life.

It is indeed fitting that we here should memorialize the poet patriot of Ukraine, Taras Shevchenko. For above all else, he demonstrated that in the long course of history, the pen is mightier than the sword.

Born into serfdom, at a time when the unique culture and national identity of his homeland was threatened with extinction, he rose up from his dismal beginnings to relight the torch of hope in his native land. At an early age the happy hand of destiny rested upon his shoulder, bringing him to St. Petersburg where he met a French Huguenot painter who recognized his talents and became his benefactor. From the time of his liberation from serfdom until his death in 1861, Shevchenko composed poetry and verse dedicated to the dignity of man and the hopes of his oppressed homeland for freedom and independence. The popular power of his poetry and verse as a sustainer of the spirit of his people is attested to by his banishment into exile under a ukase of Czar Nicholas I, that he be prohibited from writing or painting for an indefinite period.

A century has passed since the death of Shevchenko, but the message of his literary works burns even more brightly today in the hearts of his countrymen. The sword has been laid upon his homeland many times since his passing. A long line of despots have attempted to stamp out the spirit of Ukraine rekindled by the power of his pen. The despots have passed into the silence of history and while the sword still rests upon Ukraine, the spirit of her people remains in tune with the literary testament of Shevchenko.

We in our time are seeking to strengthen old bridges of friendship with central-east Europe and to build new ones where ever possible. The only lasting bridges between nations are those whose foundations are built upon the ideals and moral values which sustain the dignity of man.

The ancient bridge between the United States and Ukraine rests upon those foundations. It will endure forever. So, too, will the memory of Taras Shevchenko who, more than a century ago, expressed the hope of his people for a George Washington, with a new and righteous law. This statue will serve to remind all who visit our Nation's Capital that we, as a people, share that fervent hope, and pray that happy day may soon come.

Address of Representative T. J. Dulski, 41st District, New York, at Unveiling of Taras Shevchenko Statue, Saturday, June 27, 1964

We are here today to honor a poet who has become a national hero, and a universal inspiration.

For over 100 years he has been the champion of national independence for Ukraine. Today, he stands as a champion of liberty for all mankind.

The brave spirit and high aspirations of Ukraine can be seen clearly in the moving poetry of Taras Shevchenko. Yet, Shevchenko is not limited to Ukraine alone.

All those who struggle for freedom and against tyranny draw strength from his unwavering faith that—in his own words: "Our soul shall never perish * * * freedom knows no dying."

As we stand before this noble statue we can see that, were Shevchenko alive in the flesh today as he is alive in the spirit, he would tell the Russian Communist imperialists: You shall never bury us. The courageous spirit of millions of captive people who seek freedom will inevitably prevail.

Mankind hungers for national independence and personal freedom. Mankind will not be denied.

What cruel irony for Nikita Khrushchev to unveil a statue to Shevchenko in Moscow just 17 days ago. Those in Moscow who have imposed a new colonial rule on Ukraine, on Poland, on Hungary, on Latvia and on all the other captive nations, so fear Shevchenko's power to move men that they now seek to capture him, to tame him, and to distort his message of freedom to their aggressive ends.

They will never succeed. Never. It cannot be done.

Freedom is the spirit of Shevchenko. Freedom is the spirit of the statue unveiled to him on the free soil of the United States today.

Let this statue stand as a constant reminder to the world of mankind's unfinished struggle for national independence and freedom.

Let this statue be a pledge of all free people to work in peaceful ways so that one day people in all the captive nations may once again be free.

And, let those who view the statue of Shevchenko in Moscow ponder upon the messages of freedom projected by this statue of Shevchenko which we dedicate here today to the liberation of all captive nations.

Shevchenko and Universal Freedom

(Remarks of the Honorable Daniel J. Flood, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, at the unveiling of the Taras Shevchenko Monument on June 27, 1964, in Washington, D.C.)

President Eisenhower, Your Excellencies metropolitans, archbishops and bishops of the Ukrainian Catholic and the Ukrainian Orthodox Churches, distinguished guests, friends of freedom, and ladies and gentlemen, today we observe a great American holiday, the unveiling of the Taras Shevchenko Monument in the capital of the free world—Washington.

This is an event whose repercussion and significance reach far beyond the border of our beloved country—the United States of America.

Taras Shevchenko, whose 150th anniversary is observed this year by all Ukrainians and lovers of freedom, is more than just an outstanding Ukrainian bard and advocate of a free and independent Ukraine. Taras Shevchenko was an Abraham Lincoln of his time; he visualized a voluntary union of all Slavic nations in Eastern Europe. He was an ardent believer in the freedom of all peoples regardless of race, religion or nationality. In the large sense of the word, Taras Shevchenko embodied all these principles on which our own American Nation has been founded, and his political and social philosophy is reflected in the U.N. Charter on Human Rights.

We honor Taras Shevchenko today not only because he prayed for a Ukrainian George Washington who would bring "a new and righteous law" to the downtrodden and enslaved people of Ukraine, but also because of his unwavering faith in the right of all men to be free and independent.

It is a bit of irony that the Russian Communists suddenly became aware of the greatness of Taras Shevchenko. Mr. Khrushchev, in unveiling a monument to his honor in Moscow 2 weeks ago, assailed the free Ukrainians for alleged attempts to twist the essence of Shevchenko's works. But Mr. Khrushchev cannot fool either the Ukrainian people or, for that matter, the U.S. Congress, in stating that the Ukranians outside their enslaved Ukraine have been tampering with the works of the greatest of their sons—Taras Shevchenko. It was Mr. Khrushchev, an old master of ruse and trickery himself, who is guilty of gross ignominy and falsification of the works of Shevchenko. Under his iron hand, the Kremlin masters had consistently falsified the works of Shevchenko so as to make him a "precursor" of their tyrannical regime which they forcibly imposed upon Ukraine.

Now, when Americans of Ukrainian descent undertook to honor Taras Shevchenko in erecting a statue in his honor in this capital of freedom, the Kremlin decided to perform its old trick, to be the first in everything, so they unveiled a monument of the Ukrainian poet in Moscow on June 10, 1964, and Khrushchev made his usual attack on us for honoring Shevchenko here in Washington, a capital founded by a man to whom Shevchenko looked as ideal and inspiration of the Ukrainian nation.

My friends, Shevchenko belongs to you and to all of us who oppose the Russian Communist tyranny, because he opposed this ruthless and inhuman tyranny which oppressed Ukraine a hundred years ago.

Yes, Taras Shevchenko is ours because he is a symbol of human liberty and justice, and he will remain an eternal beacon for all humanity to follow. Thank you.

Speech by Congressman Edward J. Derwinski at the Unveiling of the Statue of Taras Shevchenko, June 27, 1964

Mr. Chairman, General Eisenhower, reverend fathers, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, it is especially appropriate that we dedicate this statue to Taras Shevchenko at a time when the Soviet Union is using propaganda and falsehoods to an unprecedented degree in the cold war. The Communists have persistently attempted to distort the voice of Shevchenko for their own diabolic purposes. The dedication of this statue and the international interest that it is receiving reduces the Red propaganda vehicle to shambles.

And it is especially appropriate that General Eisenhower has joined us in this dedication, just as Prime Minister Diefenbaker of Canada joined in the unveiling of a statue to Shevchenko which was erected by the citizens of Canada.

I direct your special attention to the fact as dramatized by the inscription on the statue, that Shevchenko was a brave and clear voice for freedom, not only for his native Ukraine, but for all the captive people of the czarist Russian Empire.

As the Soviet Union continues its colonial policy, which in Eastern Europe is immediately identifiable with czarist imperial policies, Shevchenko's historic role as a symbol of resistance to autocracy and as a prophet of liberty is as important today as it was in his day. Shevchenko was a patriot, a nationalist, a firm advocate of freedom and of national independence for the Ukraine, and for all the subjugated non-Russian nations. His voice, therefore, is as true and effective today as in his day.

Shevchenko was opposed to serfdom because he was an advocate of personal liberty and freedom. He was opposed to the tyrannical czarist regime because he was an advocate of human rights. Shevchenko was an advocate of freedom for all the people in the old Russian empire, and his voice contributed directly to the abolishment of serfdom and the eventual collapse of the czarist government. It is our hope that his voice will contribute effectively to the collapse of the present Russian Government.

The serfdom of his time in Russia has been replaced by Communist regimentation. The denial of human rights under the czarist regime is perpetuated today by communism. Denial of self-determination to the non-Russian people of Eastern Europe is practiced today as it was under the czar.

Therefore, the unveiling of this statue to Shevchenko in the free environment of Washington, the capital of the free world, is especially symbolic. In the Ukraine, the tomb of Shevchenko was marked by a huge iron cross to dramatize his belief in the hope of Christianity for his people. But, as you know, the Russian Communists removed the cross and replaced it with a monument, in a deliberate attempt to falsify the ideals of Shevchenko.

Here in Washington his ideals, his principles, and his message cannot be falsified. The erection of this statue is an especially dramatic step in the preservation of the true purity of Shevchenko's message, the hope that his voice continues to give to the oppressed people of the Ukraine.

This afternoon, as we all join together in honoring Taras Shevchenko, the prophet of liberty, I express a fervent wish that his dream of freedom for the people of Ukraine and all other captive lands will soon be realized.

Saturday evening, Mr. Speaker, a great throng that overflowed the District of Columbia Armory, attended a banquet and heard a major address by the Honorable THURSTON B. MORTON, of Kentucky, whose interest and relationships in the field of foreign affairs is widely recognized. I include at this point excerpts from a press release covering Senator MORTON's address:

Senator Thruston B. Morton Cites Shevchenko Statue as "A Promise of the Future Freedom and Self-Determination of Ukraine and All Captive Nations"

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Senator THRUSTON B. MORTON, Republican, of Kentucky, said here Saturday night that the unveiling of the memorial statue to Taras Shevchenko, 19th century Ukrainian poet and freedom fighter, is "a promise to the future freedom and self-determination of Ukraine and of all captive nations."

The statue was unveiled at 22d, 23d, and P Streets NW., here earlier in the day by Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, who had flown from Gettysburg to Washington by helicopter for the event. This year is the 150th anniversary of the birth of Shevchenko, who is the national hero of Ukraine.

Speaking at a Shevchenko Jubilee Banquet in Washington's National Guard Armory, Senator MORTON called the Shevchenko monument in Washington, D.C., "a political element which can well act as a catalyst to bring forth a new era of freedom to humanity."

Senator MORTON said:

"It makes me proud to be an American when I see the U.S. Congress with the support of the U.S. President make available U.S. soil where such a symbol of freedom, as this statue to Taras Shevchenko, is erected."

Commenting on Shevchenko's call for the coming to Ukraine of a Washington with his new and righteous law, Senator MORTON said:

"It is interesting indeed to learn that our Declaration of Independence and Constitution brought too much inspiration and encouragement to men like Taras Shevchenko who, in turn, inspired the Ukrainian people and all peoples in Eastern Europe to fight for freedom and independence."

"The price in blood and tears which so many have paid for freedom will not go unrewarded forever," he said. "The Russian Empire cannot forever escape the realities of history. It, too, will reap its retributions. The enslaved people and the captive nations will be free and independent."

Mr. Speaker, four outstanding Members of Congress attended the banquet and I ask leave to place into the RECORD at this point remarks of the Honorable WILLIAM G. BRAY, of Indiana, who is the author of a most significant book on the history of the captive nations; the Honorable RAY J. MADDEN, of Indiana, who has served on House committees of special significance; the Honorable AUGUST E. JOHANSEN, of Michigan, an outstanding member of the Un-American Activities Committee, whose interest in the liberation of captive peoples of communism is well known, and the Honorable BARRATT O'HARA, of Illinois, gave an eloquent "off the cuff" address which, unfortunately, was not recorded, and is lost to posterity.

The material follows:

Remarks of Hon. William G. Bray, Member of Congress, Before the Shevchenko Memorial Banquet, Saturday, June 27, 1964

Tonight we are honoring one of the greatest freedom fighters, Taras Shevchenko, an Ukrainian who typifies the very finest of those great characters who have spent a lifetime fighting against those tyrants who would destroy the freedom of man.

Shevchenko's story is typical of the courage and perseverance of the Ukrainian people. You come from one of the most fertile areas in the world and that very fertility of the soil through the ages has caused greedy and ambitious peoples to aspire to steal your heritage.

The Ukrainian people are second to none in determination and perseverance. The centuries of persecution of your people have perhaps made you of stronger character. You whose ancestors came from the Ukraine can teach the rest of us in America lessons in courage and perseverance, and you also can and should teach us not to trust the Russian bear.

In order to subjugate, enslave and break the will of the Ukrainian people you were mistreated under the czars. However, the real blood bath of the Ukrainian people took place under the commissars—under Lenin and Trotsky—under Stalin, and, yes, under Khrushchev.

More than 300 years ago the Ukrainians learned to their eternal sorrow that treaties with Russia are used as vehicles of enslavement. By taking advantage of a vague oral treaty made in 1654, the czars ultimately took over the Ukraine.

I have had occasion to do considerable research on Ukrainian history; I do not have time to go into this matter in any detail, but I do want to say that a documentation of Russian relations with the Ukraine provides a clear and concise proof of Russian duplicity and aggression. The same 300 years also provide a history of courage and dedication to freedom of the Ukrainian people that has not been excelled.

Today freedom has a great chance to achieve victory over Communist slavery if we of the free world do not falter. Today we are not only failing to push the great advantage we have over the Communist world, but I am sorry to say that many of our leaders apparently are fearful of victory.

Today freedom has a clear opportunity to win over communism if our leadership will only change our "no win" policy to a "will win" policy. Today the odds are on our side to win if we have the will to win. Today Russia is confronted with economic failure and growing dissension and deterioration between her captive peoples and satellite nations.

While the problems of the Communist world involve increasing scarcities, those of the free world involve increasing surpluses. The Berlin wall is only one symbol of Russia's worsening plight, which is so manifest to all that no further documentation is necessary.

Khrushchev is well aware that his Communist world is in serious trouble. He is fearful and bitter. Just this week in Sweden he taunted and threatened the fugitives from Russian-dominated lands that now live in Sweden. He bragged about the defeat of the Ukraine by Peter the Great of Russia in 1709. He is a man afraid and now is the time for America to be firm.

It is unthinkable to you and me that, as freedom is just ahead, we should allow a "no win" policy to lengthen Russia's police state control over her captive peoples and countries. Yet, a "no win" philosophy is coloring our national objectives and procedure.

Last year's annual report of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, submitted by President Kennedy, Congress refers to the studies made by that Agency. Quoting verbatim from one of these studies:

"Whether we admit it to ourselves or not, we benefit enormously from the capability of the Soviet police system to keep law and order over 200-million-odd Russians and many additional millions in the satellite states. The breakup of the Russian Communist empire today would doubtless be conducive to freedom, but would be a good deal more catastrophic for world order than was the breakup of the Austro-Hungarian Empire in 1919."

This is purely the philosophy of those who would surrender freedom to Communist tyranny to gain a temporary peace and tranquility.

Today the Kremlin goal is for the rest of the world to surrender to its rule and then we would have peace—peace with slavery. Mao Tse-tung has the same ambition only he would have us surrender to him.

Another startling example of our no win policy is that on December 20, 1962, the U.S. delegation to the United Nations caused the United Nations General Assembly to rescind the resolution creating a watchdog committee on Russian aggression in Hungary. It is unbelievable that our country could have taken such a step, but we did.

If today we in the free world will exploit the truth with the same fervor and dedication that the Communists exploit their lies, then freedom will win.

Speech of Congressman Ray J. Madden at Shevchenko Memorial Banquet, Washington, D.C., Armory, June 27, 1964

I wish to congratulate the Shevchenko Memorial Committee for this great day in which we are commemorating the memory of one of the world's great poets and freedom fighters.

Although the accomplishments of Taras Shevchenko, the Ukrainian hero of a century ago, are forgotten by many in this modern age, his messages in poetry and deeds of valor have been handed down to the generations and helped instill into the minds of millions of Ukrainians and all nationalities who believe in freedom that the price of liberty is eternal vigilance. The messages and teaching sent out by this historic Ukrainian have reawakened in the minds of millions the human desire to resist tyranny and continue the fight for liberty and self-government.

The Ukraine of Shevchenko's life was identical with the Ukraine of the last half century in patriotic spirit for freedom and self-government. A modern example of the spirit of the Ukrainian people was exemplified in December 1917. At that time the Congress of Soviet Delegates issued the ultimatum of submission to declare Ukraine a Soviet republic. Members of the Ukrainian plebiscite voted 1,198 to 2 to endorse the independent Ukrainian Government and resist Soviet Russia. To the everlasting credit of the Ukrainian people they fought and resisted Soviet Communist military aggression against overwhelming odds. Ukrainian people, to this modern day, have the determination to continue the battle for freedom and self-government.

This demonstration by the Ukrainian people was nothing but a continuation of the historic resistance which their ancestors demonstrated back in the days of Taras Shevchenko. All true historians place Shevchenko as a leader in the struggle for human liberty against all forms of tyranny. During his lifetime he did not retreat from the fight for his nation's independence and freedom from Russian tyranny.

In the 82d Congress I was a member of the special committee which was authorized by the Congress to investigate Communist aggression in the satellite nations of Europe. Testimony was presented to the committee exposing the deplorable tortures, tyranny, and food scarcity conditions inflicted upon the Ukrainian people by the Soviet Communist tyrants.

The committee heard extensive testimony on the manmade famine in the Ukraine during the years 1932–33 at a time when the harvest was better than average. Mr. Fedir Pihido, a Ukrainian national who provided extensive testimony and documentation for the committee, was asked how many people died as a result of this manmade famine.

He replied as follows: "according to unofficial statistics, the number of victims can be placed between 6 and 7 million."

Other witnesses testified about the way the Communists had confiscated and desecrated churches and turned them into warehouses where the grain was stored. Armed guards were placed around the churches and other buildings where stored grain was allowed to spoil while millions of people were starving. Mrs. Anna Kravchenko testified that approximately one-half of the people in the village where she lived perished from starvation, and that special brigades of Communists were sent from Moscow to her village to search out all food and to confiscate it. Another witness, who requested that his true identity not be disclosed because a number of his relatives still live in the Ukraine, gave vivid testimony of the way in which the Communists covered up the millions of deaths they caused by their planned famine.

Other witnesses testified that the purposes of the manmade famine was to break the national spirit in the Ukraine, to force the peasants into the collectivization program, and to enrich the Communist rulers by confiscation of grain and cattle. Regardless of overwhelming odds the spirit of Ukrainian resistance and desire for freedom has not changed over the centuries.

I mention the above because the highly organized worldwide propaganda machine of the Communist conspiracy has successfully covered up in the minds of too many people throughout the world the true facts about Communist tyranny and inhumanity inflicted on its conquered victims. As time passes, the people of the world are gradually learning the true facts and exposed Communist lies and propaganda concerning their barbarous methods of aggression. Their economy is proving a failure; their agriculture program in both Communist Russia and China is unsuccessful and starvation is rampant in Communist metropolitan areas.

Shevchenko served the cause of freedom with all his native talents and genius. He was a fighter for liberty and awakened the enslaved nations to fight for freedom against czarist, and later Communist, tyranny. In his poems and writings he appealed to God for a George Washington in the Ukraine who would lead his nation to independence. Poets and writers of all nationalities have paid tribute to Shevchenko over the years. His poems and writings have been translated into 50 different languages. His greatness has been noted by scholars of all nationalities throughout the world. Americans of Ukrainian descent strongly feel that a statue of Shevchenko has much to offer, not only to Washington but to all Americans and people from foreign lands who visit our National Capital. This statue which is unveiled today will always be a symbol of Ukrainian effort and mankind's desire to spread the ideals and messages of freedom, liberty, and self-government to all mankind.

His messages of continued resistance by liberty-loving people will encourage millions behind the Iron Curtain and, with the aid of the free world, some day restore liberty and freedom to Ukraine and other enslaved nations throughout the globe.

Address by Congressman August E. Johansen, Republican, of Michigan, Shevchenko Memorial Banquet, District of Columbia Armory

Across the miles and years, across the barriers of language and nationality, we return today the salute of a valiant champion and prophet of human freedom.

One hundred and seven years ago, Taras Shevchenko, poet-patriot of the Ukraine, wrote the lines:

"When shall we get ourselves a Washington?
To promulgate his new and righteous law."

Today, under authorization of the Congress of the United States, we have dedicated a statue of Taras Shevchenko in the Capital City which bears the name of his hero—Washington.

My personal pride in being privileged to participate in this observance is heightened by the knowledge that two distinguished Members of Congress from my own State of Michigan had a leading role in the congressional authorization for this statue voted by the 86th Congress in September 1960. I refer, of course, to my able colleague, the Honorable John Lesinski, and former Congressman Alvin M. Bentley.

Shevchenko and Washington alike knew what every tyrant has known—that national independence is merely individual freedom writ large, and that each is essential to the other.

The tyranny of international communism and Soviet imperialism can no more tolerate national independence than it can tolerate personal liberty and hope to survive.

That, I suspect, is the key to the always violent reaction of the Red Fascists of Russia to the Captive Nations Week resolution adopted by the Congress in July 1959.

One of the greatest rewards and personal satisfactions of my own service in the Congress was the opportunity to vote for this resolution July 9, 1959. In doing so, I warned on the floor of the House that we should match words with deeds, and I recalled the statement of Ralph Waldo Emerson that "What you do speaks so loudly that I cannot hear what you say." I called attention to the fact that we fall all over ourselves to extend hospitality to the visting leaders of Soviet Russia, the captors of the very peoples in whose behalf the resolution was drafted.

Only a few weeks later, on the eve of the shameful first visit of Khrushchev to the United States, that hangman of the Ukraine, in an article written for publication in this country, branded the Captive Nations resolution as an act of provocation. With a frankness American leadership has not always matched, Khrushchev described the resolution as contrary to the concept of "peaceful coexistence" and declared that "the policy of 'rolling back' communism can only poison the international atmosphere."

Despite this clear declaration of tyranny's intention, the invitation to Khrushchev was not withdrawn and Washington's city became his official host.

The lesson of that experience is still not learned.

We maintain cultural exchanges with the regime whose avowed and demonstrated purpose is further enslavement of nations and people.

The lesson is still not learned.

We continue to send businessmen to Moscow, even after one member of such a delegation had offered this commentary:

"What shocked me most about the meeting (with Khrushchev) was the complete disregard for facts. I went away with a sense of frustration. How do you deal with people who lie to you and to whom facts mean nothing?"

Obviously, we have not yet learned, or acknowledged, the true answer to that question: You don't.

The lesson is still not learned—and Congress was kept in session last year until Christmas Eve so that it might reverse itself and approve underwriting of credit for wheat sales to the Soviet captors of the Ukraine.

The lesson is still not learned—and only last week our highest Court held invalid the ban on issuance of passports to American partners of the Communist tyranny, thereby, in the powerful dissenting words of Mr. Justice Clark, enabling "the leaders of the world Communist movement in the Soviet Union to give orders to its comrades in the United States and to exchange vital secrets as well."

The lesson is still not learned—and by making "the lessening of tensions" the chief object of our foreign policy we invite and, indeed, assure nuclear blackmail. Thereby, we become captives of our fears and place ourselves at the mercy of our blackmailers.

We do well to honor Shevchenko.

For the sake of our own freedom—and the freedom of men and nations everywhere—let us honor him in deed as well as in word, in substance as well as in statuary symbol.

"When shall we get ourselves a Washington?"

Mr. Speaker, because of the unprecedented nature of the Shevchenko statue unveiling—the new records scored in our Nation's Capital, a tremendous parade of 36,000 participants and over 100,000 persons witnessing the unveiling of a statue—I believe all will agree that this event, in all its significant aspects, should become a permanent part of our Nation's history. I therefore request that the following items be printed in the RECORD: First, a short account on "Taras Shevchenko, Bard of Ukraine—Fighter for Human Liberty"; second, an article by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, of Georgetown University, on "America Hails Shevchenko," which appeared in the Shevchenko Jubilee Memorial Book; third, a brief background account on "Ukraine: History and Present Status"; fourth, a concise statement on the "Significance of the Memorial Statute to Taras Shevchenko, Bard of Ukraine, and Fighter for Human Liberty"; fifth, a UPI article by Neil A. Martin on "Controversial Statue—World Horizons"; sixth, another article by Dr. Dobriansky on "America Meets Shevchenko," which appeared in the leading Ukrainian Catholic newspaper America on June 25; seventh, a commentary in Freedom's Facts, the publication of the All-American Conference to Combat Communism, titled, "Memorial to a Great Fighter for Freedom"; eighth, a short background story on the "Ukrainian Immigration to America"; ninth, a most interesting article by Philip Love, feature editor of the Washington Star, on "Taras Shevchenko, Both America and Russia Claim Ukrainian Nationalist As Hero"; tenth, the significant roster of the National Shevchenko Memorial Honorary Sponsoring Committee, headed by the 33d President of the United States, the Honorable Harry S. Truman; eleventh, the penetrating article by Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain of the U.S. Senate, on the "New Statue of Liberty," which appeared in the June 28 Sunday Star; twelfth, an additional article by Dr. Dobriansky on "The 'Controversial' Statue," which was prepared for Svoboda, a major fraternal newspaper; thirteenth, a Washington Post article on "Unveiling Rites Set Today for Statue of Shevchenko"; fourteenth, a June 27 article in the Evening Star written by Robert J. Lewis on "Parade and Dedication Here To Honor Ukrainian Poet"; fifteenth, the opening address at the unveiling by Prof. Roman Smal-Stocki, of Marquette University; sixteenth, an article by Walter Dushnyck, editor of the Ukrainian Quarterly, on the "Shevchenko Monument: A Challenge to Moscow," which was published in the Ukrainian Catholic organ America; seventeenth, another article by Robert J. Lewis in the June 28 Sunday Star on "Shevchenko Statue Here Unveiled by Eisenhower"; eighteenth, two short reports that appeared in the June 28 Washington Post, "Ukrainians Make Eisenhower Feel 'Like I Were Back in Politics,'" and "Ukrainians Have History of Freedom-Seeking"; nineteenth, another Washington Post account on "36,000 Ukrainian-Americans March in Heat to Unveiling of Poet's Statue"; twentieth, a statement by the Honorable JOHN LESINSKI at the Shevchenko Memorial Banquet; twenty-first, a message from Senator HUGH SCOTT to the banquet; twenty-second, the commemorative scroll read in two languages at the unveiling ceremony by Joseph Lesawyer, executive director of the memorial committee, and Ignatius Billinsky, secretary of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America; twenty-third, the biography of Leo Mol, sculptor of the Shevchenko statue; twenty-fourth, the physical details of the statue; and twenty-fifth, the dedication inscription on the statue, which was written by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky:

TARAS SHEVCHENKO (1914–61), BARD OF UKRAINE—FIGHTER FOR HUMAN LIBERTY

Taras Shevchenko was born in serfdom in Ukraine in 1814.

He was orphaned at the age of 12.

In 1838, at the age of 24, he gained freedom and began to study art and write poetry in St. Petersburg.

His first volume of poetry, "Kobzar," was published in 1840. "Kobzar" marked an epoch in modern Ukrainian literature. It was written in Ukrainian about the fate of the Kozaks, the decay of old Ukraine, and the bitter struggles of Ukrainians for independence. In a short period of time more than 8 million copies of "Kobzar" were sold.

His longest and greatest poem, "Haydamaki," was published in 1841. This described the Ukrainian nature and the revolt of Ukrainians against their overlords.

Shevchenko returned to Ukraine a free man and a national hero in 1845. In this year he published the poem, "The Caucasus." From this poem has been taken the "Prometheus" theme for the memorial statue to Shevchenko in Washington, D.C.

Stirred by political currents which led to the revolutions that swept Europe in 1848, Shevchenko joined in forming the Society of Saints Cyril and Methodius. Their aim was to support a free union of Slavonic peoples under a republican form of government.

Shevchenko and his friends were arrested by the Czar's police. Shevchenko was sentenced to military exile in eastern Russia, where he met many Polish and Ukrainian exiles.

He was pardoned and returned to St. Petersburg in 1858.

On his release he wrote another great poem, "The Neophytes," a tale of ancient Rome and the persecution of the Christians. The parallel between the tyrannical Nero and the Russian Czar was unmistakable.

Shevchenko succeeded in freeing his family from serfdom in 1859.

He died February 26, 1861, on the eve of the liberation of the serfs for whose freedom he had fought.

SIGNIFICANCE OF SHEVCHENKO'S POETRY

Shevchenko began his writing career with the dream of perpetuating the memory of the old days when the free Kozaks carved out a precarious liberty for themselves and their people. He valued the positive ideals of liberty, and the courage and heroism of those who fought for it.

His revolutionary poems, the martyrdom of his life, contributed to the liberation of the serfs in Ukraine and throughout the Russian Empire. Shevchenko also defended freedom for the non-Russian people in the Russian Empire and called for their independence.

In his struggle for social justice and national independence, he was a champion of George Washington's just and righteous law, which he regarded as an ideal for Ukraine and for all nations seeking independence.

Taras Shevchenko, the son of a serf, with an unshakeable faith in the victory of democratic ideals, made himself one of mankind's most effective spokesmen for freedom for all, regardless of race, color, creed, or national origin, and, he became one of the world's great poets. His works have been translated from his native Ukrainian into 60 different languages.

EXCERPTS FROM THE POETRY OF TARAS SHEVCHENKO

From "The Neophytes":

"Ye sons of night,
Insensate dogs, deprived in truth of sight,
You cannot see at all! Flat on the ground
Your greasy, praying carcasses are found;
Behind a cross from devils you would hide,
And then beneath your breath a prayer of pride
Asks God to send the worst adversity
And every kind of plague in high degree
Upon your fellow Christians, doomed your foes—
May God appoint your condign overthrows,
All ye new pharaohs with your hearts of clay,
Rapacious Caesars of this later day!"

—Translated by WATSON KIRKCONNELL.

From "God's Fool":

"You were not fit,
Clad in laced liveries, toads, pharisees,
You were not fit to raise in the defense
Of justice and our sacred liberty!
You have been taught to torture your own brothers,
And not to love them! Ah, you miserable
And cursed crew, when will you breathe your last?
When shall we get ourselves a Washington
To promulgate his new and righteous law?
But someday we shall surely find the man."

(1858) Translated by Watson Kirkconnell.

From "O My Thoughts, My Heartfelt Thoughts":

"There is Ukraina;
From end to end, there, it is broad
And joyful like freedom
Which has long since passed away;
Broad as a sea, the Dnipro,
Steppe and steppe, the rapids roar,
And gravemounds high as mountains.
There was born the Kozak freedom,
There she galloped round,
With Tartars and with Polish lords
She strewed the plain about
Till it could take no more; with corpses
All the plain she strewed.
Freedom lay down to take her rest;
Meanwhile the gravemound grew,
And high above it, as a warder,
Hovers the Black Eagle,
And Minstrels come and sing about
The gravemound to the people."

(1839) Translated by Vera Rich.

From "The Dream":
"The desert wilderness has stirred
As from a coffin's narrow girth
For the Last Judgment-day of doom,
The dead are rising for the truth.
These are not the dead, the slain,
They come not seeking Judgment-day:
No! They are people, living people,
Put in irons, they draw
Gold up out of holes, to pour it
Down the Glutton's maw.
Among them, the old lags, in chains
Is the King of freedom,
The King of all the world, the King
Wearing a brand for crown.
In torment, in hard labor, he
Pleads not, nor weeps, nor groans
Once the heart is warmed by goodness,
Cold it will never grow.
Where, then, are your thoughts, your rosy-pink flowers?
Well-cared-for and brave, these dear children of yours?
To whom, then, to whom, my friend, did you give them?
Or perhaps in your heart for all ages you hid them?
Do not hide them, my brother! But scatter them far!
They will germinate, grow—and go into the world."

(1844) Translated by Vera Rich.

From "The Caucasus":
"Mountains beyond mountains, crags in stormclouds cloaked,
Wild heights sown with sorrow, soil that blood has soaked.
From the dawn of time, Prometheus
Hangs, the eagle's victim;
All God's days, it pecks his ribs,
Tears the heart within him.
Tears, but cannot drink away
The blood that throbs with life,
Still it lives and lives again
And still once more he smiles.
For our soul shall never perish,
Freedom knows no dying,
And the Glutton cannot harvest
Fields where seas are lying;
Cannot bind the living spirit;
Nor the living word,
Cannot smirch the sacred glory,
Of almighty God."

(1845) Translated by Vera Rich.

AMERICA HAILS SHEVCHENKO

(By Lev E. Dobriansky)

"We honor him for his rich contribution to the culture not only of Ukraine, which he loved so well and described so eloquently, but of the world. His work is a noble part of our historical heritage." John Fitzgerald Kennedy

These inspiring and well-founded words of our late President were expressed in March 1961. They epitomize the greatness of Taras Shevchenko and the immortality of his works not only for the people of Ukraine but for humanity at large. The historical heritage, of which the poet's accomplishments are indeed a noble part, is the precious heritage of freedom, of man's relentless fight for personal liberty and national independence. In this critical period of world history the people of the United States hail Shevchenko both as a cultural giant and one of Europe's earliest freedom fighters against the dark and barbaric forces of traditional Russian imperio-colonialism which today is masked by deceptive ideologic communism.

June 27, 1964, will be a day long remembered in the annals of American history. For the first time in the capital of any free world nation, the unveiling of a statue in honor of Ukraine's poet laureate signalizes the forging of bonds of freedom between our country and the 45-million Ukrainian nation, as well as all the captive nations in Eastern Europe, Asia, and elsewhere. The Shevchenko statue is singularly dedicated to the liberation, freedom, and independence of all captive nations. In truth, Washington is not only the capital of these United States but also of the free world. To crystallize the complete meaning and importance of Shevchenko, no more fitting environment of freedom and liberty can accommodate Shevchenko's statue than the spiritually rich soil of Washington.

As an everlasting symbol of world freedom, the Shevchenko monument is thus properly and compatibly situated. In this free environment it will constantly emphasize the universal spirit and substance of Shevchenko's thoughts in behalf of freedom in all of its dimensions. It will brilliantly reflect the true character and stature of the nationalist revolutionary and patriot himself. It will preserve without blemishes and distortions of any kind the majestic message of Shevchenko's writings toward the final liberation of all nations from the cancerous domination of imperialist Moscow. In short, the natural, spiritual habitat of Shevchenko today is Washington, which in every essential respect can and does claim him as its own. In colonialist Moscow, any fabricated tribute to him is sheer mockery; in captive Kiev, it is an exercise in national frustration and suppression.

Clearly, then, what does Shevchenko mean to us Americans? Why on this 150th anniversary of his birth do we pay national tribute to the poet's humanism and universal idealism? How does one perceptively assess the significance of this national hero and patriot of a distant land to the interests of the United States and the free world? What can we Americans look forward to in the long period beyond June 27?

These and other meaningful questions have been raised frequently as countless of our fellow citizens have become enamored with Shevchenko, his life, his writings, and his enduring message. To answer them succintly here, let us first look into the background of events leading to the Shevchenko status; then we can easily observe the meaning of Shevchenko to America; and lastly, Shevchenko as a promise for the future can be readily determined.

THE STORY OF THE MONUMENT

For a complete and detailed story of the legislation providing for the erection of the Shevchenko statue, the reader might well consult the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 107, part 1, pages 1174–1176, "Ukrainian Independence Day." It was quite appropriate for this story to be told on such an occasion. The legislative history of the monument will undoubtedly fascinate many researchers of the future. However, the highlights of this history should be recounted for any understanding of why America today meets Shevchenko.

The idea of a Shevchenko monument in Washington was often expressed in the decade of the fifties by numerous knowledgeable individuals and groups who sought to honor the poet with maximum effect. In many localities this had been concretely displayed in a variety of forms, including statues. In Canada, preparations had already been underway for a Shevchenko monument, which was unveiled in Winnipeg in July 1961, the year of the Shevchenko centennial. On the national level in the United States this idea of a statue had to be integrated into a broader idea of national recognition and purpose that would poignantly project the universal stature and functional symbolism of Shevchenko.

It was with this comprehensive idea in mind that this writer authored a laconic and yet elastic resolution providing for the erection of the poet's statue in the Nation's Capital. On March 17, 1959, the Honorable Alvin M. Bentley, of Michigan, sponsored the resolution in the U.S. House of Representatives, and the measure became known as House Joint Resolution 311. Soon, thereafter, the entire project for its successful passage was initiated by the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, a nationwide organization representing $2\frac{1}{2}$ million Americans of Ukrainian ancestry.

Action on the joint resolution was not really taken until a year later. Soon after its introduction, the Honorable OMAR BURLESON, of Texas, chairman of the House Administration Committee, indicated the desirability of holding hearings on the measure and referred it to the Honorable PAUL C. JONES, chairman of the Subcommittee on Library and Memorials. The procedure of receiving reports and recommendations from the Department of the Interior and the Commission of Fine Arts consumed so much time that the hearing was necessarily delayed until the 2d session of the 86th Congress.

On March 31, 1960, the hearing took place, and testimonies were submitted by representatives of various interested organizations. As pointed out in an article by this writer on "Public Law 86–749 and the Shevchenko Centennial" (the Ukrainian Quarterly, autumn, 1960, New York) the testimonies presented all the essential arguments in favor of the resolution, and their convincing character laid the grounds for speedy committee approval. Shevchenko's affinity to our own George Washington, the cultural and political prowess of his poetry and prose, his historical position as a powerful advocate of freedom in the very period of our own Abraham Lincoln, Poland's Mickiewicz, Hungary's Kossuth, Italy's Mazzini, and other freedom fighters, the idolization of Shevchenko by every patriotic Ukrainian down to this day, the tradition of freedom he represents in Eastern Europe and central Asia, the crucial importance of his works for the eventual liberation of all the captive nations in the present Soviet Russian Empire, the need to throw Moscow off balance in its calculated attempt to distort and disfigure the Ukrainian national hero—these and many other substantial arguments were advanced for the passage of House Joint Resolution 311.

As a matter of fact, this writer viewed the passage of this measure as the first implementation of the Captive Nations Week resolution which Congress passed the preceding year; and we all know, the ideologic contents of that resolution frightened the Russian Dictator Khrushchev. So deeply impressed were the legislators by the data and reasons given that the publication of a short biographical documentary on Shevchenko was strongly recommended. With the aim of benefiting as many citizens as possible, the Honorable JOHN LESINSKI, of Michigan, introduced House Resolution 524, calling for the official publication of the documentary.

Two months later, on June 1, the House Administration Committee approved both House Joint Resolution 311 and House Resolution 524 and ordered favorable reports on both to the House of Representatives. The authorization for the biography was passed first, and on June 24 the House passed House Joint Resolution 311 without any objection. In the foreword of the documentary biography "Europe's Freedom Fighter, Taras Shevchenko 1814–61" (House of Representatives, Doc. No. 445, 1960), the names of all legislators who were instrumental in this important legislation are listed. Among them are the present Speaker of the House, the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK of Massachusetts and also President Lyndon B. Johnson, then Senator from Texas and the majority leader.

It took another 2 months before the Senate passed the measure. The national conventions of the two parties necessitated a recess in Congress, and time was gained for a thorough staff examination of the approved House resolution by the Senate Rules Committee. In the meantime, popular reaction to the documentary biography was salutary and beneficial. When Congress reconvened, the stage was set for a favorable reception of the measure. Thus, on August 29 the Senate Rules Committee reported out favorably House Joint Resolution 311, and 2 days later, on August 31, the Senate voted for it without objection.

President Eisenhower signed the resolution into law on September 13, 1960. On the basis of this law the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America immediately proceeded to establish the Shevchenko Memorial Committee which would devote itself exclusively to plans and operations aimed at the erection of the statue. Furthermore, the law precipitated considerable discussion here and abroad. Although there were various press reports on the legislation in the course of its passage through Congress, the law now became an object of deep and curious interest to our press. Lengthly articles of a favorable nature soon appeared in the Washington Evening Star, the New York Herald Tribune, the Chicago Sunday Tribune, the Pittsburgh Family Magazine, and numerous other organs in the country. The Shevchenko symbolism had caught on.

The reaction from the Soviet Union was what we had anticipated. This act by our Government spoiled the propaganda plans of colonialist Moscow and captive Kiev, who were intent upon disfiguring Shevchenko as a mere social reformer, a democratic revoluntionary, and a precursor of the October Russian Revolution. The purity of a national symbol and spiritual force was to be polluted with familiar contaminative elements of Russian propaganda; the national heroism of Shevchenko was to be prostituted by the objectives of these detractors. Congress' action was like a bombshell in the Soviet Russian Empire. One need only read the vituperative absurdities about the work of Ukrainian bourgeois nationalists, real American business cynicism and a host of other mythical entities in the Sovietskaya Kultura, Kommunist, Literaturna Gazeta, and many other publications. Taking both the Captive Nations Week resolution and the Shevchenko Memorial resolution, the evidence on how to pulverize Soviet Russian psychopolitical maneuvers is indeed overwhelming.

Once the law came into being, the rest was a technical implementation of the intent and spirit of Public Law 86-749. The Shevchenko Memorial Committee, under the able administration of its executive director, Mr. Joseph Lesawyer, launched plans for the building of the statue speedily and smoothly. In the span of a year and a half, over a quarter of a million dollars were collected for the purpose. Also, a jury of prominent American sculptors, architects, and artists was established to select the proposed statue plan, which was that submitted by the Canadian Sculptor Leo Mol. Another Canadian, the Architect Radoslav Zuk, was selected to produce the architecture for the site at P and 22d Streets, NW., Washington, D.C. By the end of 1962, both the Commission of Fine Arts and the National Capital Planning Commission substantially approved the project as recommended by the Department of the Interior and the Shevchenko Memorial Committee.

Uppermost in the minds of the statue's sponsors has been the community about the Shevchenko site. From the very start, priority was given to criteria of beauty, restfulness, and utility. The statue and its surrounding architecture may well be viewed as an enhancement of the already existing qualities of the immediate environment. The Shevchenko Park is, in truth, a park of freedom and culture.

THE MEANING OF SHEVCHENKO TO AMERICA

In a way it is no accident that the Shevchenko statue stands in close proximity to the Church of the Pilgrims. One truly reinforces the other to give the entire area an atmosphere of value and sanctity to man's most precious right and God-given endowment—freedom. We all know and treasure the history of our early pilgrims and their courageous search for liberty, freedom, and genuine human happiness. With greatness of soul, rectitude of will, and intellectual certitude they laid the earliest foundations of this powerful Nation of ours. Significantly, and as though by act of providence, Shevchenko stands side by side with the Church of the Pilgrims, both symbolically radiating these ultimate and highest attributes of our temporal existence.

This fact in itself concretely conveys the meaning of Shevchenko to America. This crowning fact represents a complete circuit in modern history. The Pilgrims came to these shores to find freedom from the then oppressive institutions of Western Europe; they planted the seeds of liberal free existence here, the very existence we breathe and cherish today. To delve into this rich history is to look inward and to count our blessings. The symbol of Shevchenko, however, causes us Americans to look outward in this divided contemporary world toward the tremendous and challenging work that remains in bringing freedom to the nations of Eastern Europe, Asia, and elsewhere.

In short, the Shevchenko statue is a living symbol of our national determination to share the fruits of freedom with the captive nation of Ukraine and, in the universalist spirit of Shevchenko's historic message, with the peoples of all the captive nations. No other statue in the Capital of the free world bears this specific meaning and purpose. The Shevchenko statue is, of course, intimately related to the Washington Monument inasmuch as the poet revered the Founding Father of our Nation. With unique compatibility it is also related to our Declaration of Independence and our great tradition of national freedom and personal liberty. Over a hundred years ago this tradition rubbed off on Shevchenko and through him on all generations of Ukrainians and other subjugated peoples down to the very present. It is this supreme truth that Moscow and its colonial puppets seek to submerge. It is this supreme truth that the Shevchenko statue monumentalizes for eternity.

Without exaggeration, we are today the global pilgrims of freedom. Our men and women are scattered around the globe in defense of freedom and in search for its expansion. Shevchenko in America is a key to the success of this ceaseless search. He symbolizes the global pilgrim, sowing the seeds of liberation and permanent freedom in Eastern Europe and nurturing infinite hope and faith in the souls of millions who are held captive under Soviet Russian domination. His statuary presence here is a fixed reminder to millions of our own citizens that we have a moral and political responsibility toward the captive people of Ukraine and all other captive nations both within and outside the U.S.S.R. As the Statue of Liberty in New York bids all migrants welcome into the land of liberty, so the Shevchenko statue in Washington inspires faith in all captives in their destiny with freedom.

There are many other aspects of the meaning of Shevchenko to America. The unprecedented ground-breaking ceremonies on the Shevchenko site in September 1963 brought out in elaborate form the many fertile dimensions of the poet's life and works for American interests. These can be found in the book titled "Shevchenko, a Monument to the Liberation, Freedom, and Independence of All Captive Nations" (U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington 1964). In our country, as elsewhere, there will always be pockets of blind ignorance and even cesspools of prejudice for Moscow and its puppets to wallow in. This widely distributed book was published to fumigate these few cesspools, and the results have been exceedingly beneficial to the interests of our country. The reader will find this book quite illuminating and instructive.

A BRIDGE TO THE FUTURE

In his address on May 24, 1964, at the dedication of the George C. Marshall Research Library in Lexington, Va., President Johnson declared: "We will continue to build bridges across the gulf which has divided us from eastern Europe. They will be bridges of increased trade, of ideas, of visitors, and of humanitarian aid." It will require more than these bridges to defeat and eliminate the menace of Soviet Russian imperiocolonialism. However, as an idea and a dynamic symbolism, Shevchenko fits the President's prescription perfectly as a bridge into eastern Europe, truly as a bridge to our own future relations with the Soviet Russian Empire, which in its primary form masquerades today as the U.S.S.R.

Contrary to popular impressions, the erection of Shevchenko's statue in Washington is not the end, the omega, of American effort to broaden and deepen our outlook toward the Soviet Russian Empire. It is only the beginning, the alpha, of such concentrated effort. The monument does not point to the past, to a hundred and more years ago; it points primarily and exclusively to the future.

The whole significance of the Shevchenko statue is futural. Through all that it symbolizes—the continuum of freedom, longstanding spiritual affinity with our own revolutionary tradition, a humanism that rebelled against anti-Semitism, serfdom, Russian institutional barbarism, and the degradation of women, and the powerful ideas of national independence and self-determination of peoples—the statue will be a beacon for further free world enlightenment regarding the Soviet Russian prison house of nations, which is called the U.S.S.R.. Through Shevchenko, millions will deepen their knowledge about the largest captive non-Russian nation in Europe, Ukraine itself, and by this knowledge their appreciative awareness of all other captive nations in the U.S.S.R. will be intensified.

Not only will this bridge to the future serve this prime educational purpose, it will also guide us functionally in an unwavering concentration on the root cause of all the major problems bearing on war and peace in the world. And that cause is Soviet Russian imperiocolonialism, operating and interminably functioning behind the deceptive mask of world communism. Those who grasp and understand the revolutionary patriotism of Shevchenko—which partakes of the same spiritual substance as our American patriotic idealism—are under no illusions about peaceful coexistence with the Soviet Russian empire. The heavy price of our myopic policy with its omissions and errors today in not asserting this idealism throughout the captive world will most assuredly be borne tomorrow. The list of captive nations beginning in 1918 is a long one, and an evergrowing one. It is to reverse this disastrous trend that the dynamic idealism and real symbolism of Shevchenko point to the most powerful force for freedom in Eastern Europe and Asia, that of patriotic nationalism.

The summit of cynicism was reached in the Kremlin this past March when the Russian dictator Khrushchev received a Shevchenko award. The supreme irony, not to say mockery, of this event can be gaged by Khrushchev's indelible reputation as the hangman of Ukraine. It is like conferring a medal of Washington on Hitler. One need only read "The Crimes of Khrushchev," part 2 (Committee on Un-American Activities, U.S. Congress, 1959) to realize the depths the Soviet Russian totalitarians and their colonial puppets will go to distort the character and image of history's great personages. The names of Lincoln, Jefferson and scores of others have also been twisted to suit their propaganda purposes.

Shevchenko's statue in Washington mirrors with resplendent effect such lies and distortions on the part of colonialist Moscow and its colonial puppets. It stands as a monument of truth and a beacon of strength and enlightenment for American cold war victory over the reactionary forces of traditional Russian imperialism, which today seeks to legitimize itself under the ideologic cover of communism and under the pretense of monolithic Soviet power.

My colleague Dr. Roman Smal-Stocki, of Marquette University, has written a fascinating book "Shevchenko Meets America" (Milwaukee, Wis., 1964). For background material it should be read by all. It goes a long way to explain why on June 27, 1964, finally, America meets Shevchenko. And beyond this date the two will never part as the global pilgrims diffuse the power of freedom in the remaining empires in the world.

Ukraine: History and Present Status in Brief

Area: 289,000 square miles (larger than Poland and Yugoslavia combined).

Population: Over 42 million.

Location: A Republic in the U.S.S.R., bordering on Hungary, Rumania, Poland, the Black and Azov Seas, Byelorussia and Russia.

Periods of Independence: 9th to 13th century; 17th century up to 1654; 1917–21. Ukraine today is nominally an independent nation with its own representative in the United Nations.

Resources: Ukraine is one of Europe's richest countries. It is a great producer of wheat, and has been referred to as the "granary of Europe." Equally important are Ukraine's machine building, its heavy and light industry, its giant hydroelectrical powerplants on the Dnieper River, and the oilfields in western Ukraine.

HISTORY

Historically speaking, Ukraine has had three distinct periods of statehood and national independence:

1. From the 9th century when its history began under the name "Rus" until the 13th century when the country was plundered and occupied by the forces of Genghis Khan and his Mongol-Tartar successors.

The original name of Ukraine was "Rus." The name of the lands ruled by Moscow had been known as the Grand Duchy of Moscow or Muscovy. Peter the Great, the Muscovite empire builder, took over the name "Rus" and called his domain Russia. Ukrainians adopted the name Ukraine, whose origin derives from the Ukrainian word krai, or country. Since the end of the 17th century Ukraine has been divided between Poland and Russia and later between Russia and Austria until the outbreak of World War I and the establishment in 1917 of the free and independent state of the Ukrainian people.

2. During the 17th century the Ukrainian people overthrew the Polish rulers who had gained control of the country after the Mongol-Tartars were defeated. Independence began to wane in 1654 when Hetman Bohdan Khmelnytsky made a treaty with Moscow, on condition that Moscow would guarantee the autonomy of Ukraine. Muscovite troops settled in Ukraine ostensibly to protect Ukraine from the Poles but actually as occupation forces. During the occupation period the dream of an independent Ukraine was kept alive in literature. A leader in the revival of the spirit of Ukrainian national independence was Taras Shevchenko.

3. In March of 1917 the Ukrainians rose to freedom and established their own independent state by organizing the Ukrainian Central Rada, which became the nucleus of the Ukrainian sovereign State in modern times. On January 22, 1918, Ukraine declared its full independence and, as the Ukrainian National Republic, was recognized by a number of European states, including Soviet Russia. But immediately upon the recognition of Ukraine as an independent state of the Ukranian people, the Soviet Government dispatched powerful armies against Ukraine, and after more than 3 years of valiant opposition on the part of the Ukrainian nation, the Bolsheviks succeeded in destroying the Ukrainian national government and its armies and imposed a Communist puppet regime upon the country. In 1923, Ukraine was made an unwilling member of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. But control over foreign affairs and most domestic matters was taken over by the Soviet Government in Moscow, which was, in effect, the government of Russia.

PRESENT STATUS OF UKRAINE

The present status of Ukraine is that of a Soviet Socialist Republic; namely, the Ukrainian S.S.R. It is one of 16 constituent republics of the Soviet Union, and also a charter member of the United Nations. Theoretically, Ukraine is an independent country, with a separate Ukrainian government in Kiev. The separate Ukrainian Constitution assures the country the right of secession from the U.S.S.R. as does also the Soviet Constitution.

On April 11, 1963, the government of the Ukrainian S.S.R. was reorganized by the Supreme Soviet of Ukraine, a pseudoparliament. The following ministries were designated: Higher and Secondary Education, Power and Electrification, Foreign Affairs, Communications, Culture, Public Health, Agriculture, Finance, Automotive Transport and Highways, Construction, Communal Enterprises, Assembly and Special Construction, Education, Public Security, Social Security, Commerce.

Only the defense ministry and internal security affairs (Soviet police) are in the hands of the central Soviet (Russian) Government. Although Ukraine has a ministry of finance, there is no separate Ukrainian national currency, just as there is no separate Ukrainian army or police.

The legislative power of Ukraine is concentrated in the Supreme Soviet of Ukraine in Kiev, which is a replica of the central Soviet in Moscow. There is only one legal party, the Communist Party of Ukraine. This latter is a branch of the All-Union Communist Party of the Soviet Union. All candidates to the Supreme Soviet must have the endorsement of the Communist Party, which in turn takes orders from the Russian Communist Party and its emissaries in Ukraine.

The strength and numbers of the Communist Party of Ukraine is not well known, especially since the weeding out of inactive or insufficiently committed members. However, the number is estimated as close to 900,000. From the time of the establishment of the Soviet Union in 1923 all top level Communist leadership in Ukraine has been non-Ukrainian. After the death of Stalin in 1953 and the rise to power of Khrushchev, a more "liberal" course was introduced in Ukraine to the extent that the secretary general of the Communist Party of Ukraine was now a Ukrainian, Alexander Kirichenko. He in turn was succeeded by another Ukrainian, Mykola Podhorny, and the latter was replaced by a third Ukrainian, Petro Y. Shelest.

Despite these outward Ukrainian trappings, the Soviet power in Ukraine is in essence a Russian power, bent on domination of the Ukrainian people.

In general, the Soviet power in Ukraine, including also the post-Stalin period, is characterized by the following:

1. Russification: Aimed at Russifying the Ukrainian people and, at the very minimum, creating a "common Soviet man and language";

2. Drive against Ukrainian nationalism: This has included periodic attacks on Ukrainian independent culture, and on other manifestations which are in consonance with the Ukrainian national aspirations for freedom and independent statehood;

3. Religious persecution: Both the Ukrainian Orthodox Autocephalic Church and the Ukrainian Catholic Church have been the objects of persecution as well as other church bodies with constituencies in Ukraine;

4. Economic exploitation: Ukrainian natural resources, such as wheat, and the products of farms and mines, as well as of the machine-building industries, have been taken from Ukraine. Much has been sent to Cuba, and to countries of Africa and Asia, which the Kremlin is wooing to bring them to its side by promises of "help in their national liberation";

5. Genocide: Ukrainians have been victimized by every Soviet regime. The methods employed include manmade famine, forcible deportations to Asia, perennial "purges" and "liquidation of enemies of the people." Thus, the Ukrainian people have over the years lost many millions of their sons and daughters.

The sensitivity of Kremlin leaders over Ukraine and the other non-Russian nations enslaved by Communist Russia was well demonstrated in July 1959 on the occasion of enactment of the "Captive Nations Week Resolution" by the U.S. Congress. Thereupon, Khrushchev and his aids in Ukraine hastily proclaimed that Ukraine was a "free and sovereign country" and needed no helping hand from "American imperialists."

Ukraine is the largest of the non-Russian captive nations in the slave empire of Moscow. Without Ukraine, with its geopolitical position and tremendous wealth, Communist Russia could not have become a threat to the free world. Without Ukraine, Communist Russia would not be the threat to the free world that it is today.

Significance of the Memorial Statue to Taras Shevchenko, Bard of Ukraine and Fighter for Human Liberty

Taras Shevchenko embodied in his poetry the "holy ideas" of Ukraine, just as the American Declaration of Independence, and the words of Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln embody the highest principles and aspirations of America.

The ideals of Ukraine were human liberty and national independence. Shevchenko expressed the close tie between America and Ukraine over 100 years ago by calling for the coming to Ukraine of a Washington "to promulgate his new and righteous law."

The Statue of Liberty in New York harbor stands as a symbol of freedom for everyone entering the United States. The statue of Taras Shevchenko in Washington, D.C., will stand as a constant reminder of man's struggle for freedom in east-central Europe and around the world.

THE WORLD STRUGGLE OF FREEDOM VERSUS TYRANNY

Today, the United States and Soviet Russia are waging a serious struggle over the memory of Taras Shevchenko, whose 150th birthday anniversary is being celebrated around the world in 1964.

Communist propagandists claim that Shevchenko, having fought against serfdom, was a Bolshevik who died before his time.

In the United States and elsewhere, those who oppose tyranny of any kind emphasize that Shevchenko was a leader in man's struggle against tyranny and for human liberty, and that he specifically sought Ukrainian independence from Russian rule.

Shevchenko was a true revolutionary for human liberty who, were he alive today, would be a leader in the struggle against the totalitarianism and the tyranny of Soviet Russia.

ACTION OF THE U.S. CONGRESS

In commemoration of the 100th anniversary of Shevchenko's death, the U.S. Congress held hearings on Shevchenko's life and works. These resulted in production of House Document 445—Taras Shevchenko, Europe's Freedom Fighter—in 1960, and passage of a bill authorizing erection of a memorial statue of Shevchenko in Washington, D.C., without expense to the United States. Americans of Ukrainian descent and origin raised over one-third of a million dollars to cover the cost of the statue.

A competition was held to determine the statue design. This was won by Leo Mol, who had been born in Ukraine in 1915, had studied in Vienna, Berlin, and Holland, and was vice president of the Sculptors Society of Canada.

The erection of the memorial statue to Taras Shevchenko perpetuates the memory of his fight for national independence and freedom of all peoples, regardless of race, color, creed or national origin. It also is an expression of American devotion to the cause of independence and freedom everywhere in the world.

In the words of Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, president of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America: "The Communists cannot afford freedom, or even strong publicity about freedom. We in America cannot afford to be without freedom."

AMERICAN LEADERS COMMENT ON SHEVCHENKO

American leaders of both political parties have praised Taras Shevchenko as a poet and as a champion of liberty. A few comments follow:

The late President John F. Kennedy: "I am pleased to add my voice to those honoring the great Ukrainian poet Taras Shevchenko. We honor him for his rich contribution to the culture not only of Ukraine, which he loved so well and described so eloquently, but of the world. His work is a noble part of our historical heritage."

Senator Thomas J. Dodd, Democrat, of Connecticut: "Taras Shevchenko belongs in the first instance to the Ukrainian people. But, in a larger sense, he belongs to all mankind * * * We honor him as a fighter for freedom and as a champion of the persecuted and oppressed. We honor him as a universal hero and as one of the towering moral personalities of all time."

Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, Democrat, of Minnesota: "His [Shevchenko's] life and writings have played a great role in shaping the Ukrainian national spirit and culture. The ideals to which Shevchenko stubbornly clung—national self-determination and democratic rule—remain a guiding light today for Ukrainians and other oppressed nationalities of Eastern Europe."

Senator Jacob K. Javits, Republican, of New York: "Taras Shevchenko was a bard of freedom * * * It is fitting that the statue of such a national hero, who taught the American ideals of patriotism and service to man, should stand in the Capital of the United States."

Former Congressman Alvin Bentley, Republican, of Michigan: "In authorizing the erection of this memorial to Taras Shevchenko * * * Congress was paying tribute which was both well deserved and long overdue to a recognized champion of human liberty and freedom. We are all familiar with the inspiration which Shevchenko, a contemporary of Abraham Lincoln and an admirer of George Washington, has given the people of his native Ukraine and freedom-loving peoples everywhere."

Congressman Edward Derwinski, Republican, of Illinois: "The Ukraine represents the largest single anti-Communist nationalistic force within the present boundaries of the Soviet Union, and congressional support of the monument to Shevchenko represents a psychopolitical blow against the Soviet Union and its insidious propaganda operation."

Congressman Thaddeus Dulski, Democrat, of New York: "The coming Shevchenko statue will in every respect be a statue symbolizing world freedom. This is the most important aspect of the Shevchenko project. Shevchenko keynotes world freedom, especially for the captive nations in the U.S.S.R. itself."

Congressman Michael A. Feighan, Democrat, of Ohio: "Taras Shevchenko was a unique champion of freedom for all men and independence for all nations, just as he was the avowed enemy of tyranny, despotism, and imperialism."

Congressman Daniel Flood, Democrat, of Pennsylvania: "When Shevchenko's monument to world freedom will be unveiled next June, it will also be a monumental tribute to all Americans who, like the late President, have with knowledge and perception understood the universal symbol of Shevchenko for world freedom. Indeed, the statue will honor the understanding and vision of our late President."

Congressman John Lesinski, Democrat, of Michigan: "Taras Shevchenko * * * was distinguished as a man of letters, an eminent poet, and a fervent patriot of unblemished character. But more than that, he was a voice crying for freedom from the dark depths of slavery and serfdom. During his lifetime, the Ukrainian people were almost as severely oppressed by the czarist Russian regime as they are today under the Russian Communists in the Kremlin. Today, as 45 million Ukrainians enslaved by the Russian Communists work unceasingly to obtain their freedom, they look to Taras Shevchenko as the symbol of true liberty and take inspiration and incentive from his life and works."

From United Press International

(By Neil A. Martin)

Washington, June 20.—Controversy can take many strange shapes. Next week, for example, it will stand 14 feet high, weigh 3 tons, and be composed of pure bronze.

The controversy in this instance is a statue—a sculptured replica of Taras Grigoriyevich Shevchenko, 19th century hero and poet laureate of Ukraine. It is scheduled to be unveiled here next Saturday, with possible complications.

The bard is hailed by his American anti-Communist sponsors as "Europe's freedom fighter." Ironically, however. he receives equal commendation in the Soviet Union as a forerunner of modern bolshevism. And with both groups claiming Shevchenko as their hero, a tug of war has developed between Moscow and Washington.

The Soviet press is expected to react bitterly to the unveiling ceremonies. There will be reaction of a different type here between pro and anti-Shevchenko factions.

Led by the influential Washington Post, opponents have questioned the significance of a Shevchenko statue in Washington and have sought to persuade Congress to rescind its authorization of the memorial on varied grounds, including alleged anti-Semitism in the poet's writings.

Nevertheless, all efforts to stop the unveiling have thus far failed. The Shevchenko sponsors also have been able to muster influential supporters including two past U.S. Presidents, many Congressmen, and thousands of Americans of Ukrainian descent.

In 1961 the late President John F. Kennedy praised Shevchenko for his "rich contribution to the culture, not only of Ukraine which he loved so well and described so eloquently, but of the world. His work is a noble part of our historical heritage."

Also, former President Harry S. Truman has agreed to act as honorary chairman of the memorial's sponsoring committee, which includes former Vice President Richard M. Nixon.

The United Nation's Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) has dedicated this year to the observance of the 150th anniversary of the poet's birth.

If everybody loves Shevchenko, then why all the fuss?

The controversy began in 1960 when Congress authorized the memorial and donated a small triangular park in the center of the city for its erection.

The event was intended to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the poet's death the following year, but it also coincided with similar festivities scheduled in the Soviet Union where there are many Shevchenko memorials.

The Soviets have always considered Shevchenko as their own. They have tied his name to more than 160 institutes, libraries, and theaters, 340 collective farms, 15 industrial plants, 190 towns and villages, 140 memorials, and 775 streets and boulevards.

Through the efforts of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America and the Shevchenko Scientific Society more than $250,000 was collected for the memorial here. Ukrainian sculptor Leo Mol was hired to create the statue, and ground-breaking ceremonies took place in September 1963.

Then diplomatic fireworks began exploding.

The Soviet Embassy protested the appearance of an Interior Department official at the ceremonies, as well as a proposed Shevchenko memorial stamp. Later, L. Y. Kizya, chief of Soviet Ukraine's United Nation's delegation, charged the memorial was intended to "fan up animosity toward the Soviet Ukraine, and all the more to aggrevate the cold war."

Then the Soviet Union's strategy changed abruptly from harsh criticism to praise for the project. A delegation of leading Ukrainian scholars proposed to come here for the unveiling and even bring an urn of earth from the poet's grave.

Sensing subtle implications in the proposal the statue's sponsors declared they would have no part in such a deal.

Nevertheless, the U.S.S.R., Moscow's English-language publication distributed in this country, began running monthly articles on Shevchenko's legacy to the modern Soviet Ukraine. And Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev was given the Shevchenko award from the Ukrainian Government for his outstanding social-political contributions to Ukraine.

As the date for the statue's unveiling drew near unexpected opposition arose in the Capital. The Washington Post printed a series of editorials questioning Shevchenko's literary merits and his importance to Americans.

The National Capital Planning Commission, which must approve planned statue sites, was urged by the Interior Department to restudy plans for the memorial. But a review of the project produced no grounds for delaying the unveiling.

One of the more humorous offshoots of the controversy centered recently on a proposal in Trenton, New Jersey's Hamilton Township to change the name of a suburban street to Shevchenko Boulevard. The suggested rechristening was beat down by angry residents who complained they could not spell or pronounce "Shevchenko."

Just who was Shevchenko? Was he a Bolshevik or a Ukrainian George Washington? Actually he was a serf, a poet, a painter, a humanist, a contemporary and admirer of Abraham Lincoln, a friend of the noted American Negro actor, Ira Aldridge, and an ardent nationalist.

During the past 50 years, his many volumes have been translated some 400 times into 41 languages. About 12 million copies of his works, in foreign languages, have been distributed, while Ukrainian copies of his poems exceed 7 million.

Born a serf in 1814, Shevchenko's freedom was purchased by a St. Petersburg (now Leningrad) painter in 1838. His paintings and poems soon gained prominence. By the time of his death, the 47-year-old poet had become Ukraine's most outstanding literary figure.

Typical of Russia's fermenting 19th century intelligentsia, Shevchenko was enthusiastic about western democracy, abolition of serfdom, and an end to the czars. As a stanch nationalist, he also supported Ukraine independence.

For his activities in a secret Ukrainian nationalist society at Kiev in 1846, Shevchenko was arrested and sentenced to 10 years of imprisonment and exile. Pardoned in 1857, he managed to make a brief visit to his native Ukraine before dying in 1861.

Of his 47 years, he lived 24 in serfdom, 10 in exile, 3 under Russian police supervision, and only 9 as a freeman.

He is best remembered for these lines from his poem "God's Fool":

"Ah, you miserable
And cursed crew, when will you breathe your last?
When shall we get ourselves a Washington
To promulgate his new and righteous law?
But some day we shall surely find the man."

AMERICA MEETS SHEVCHENKO

(By Lev E. Dobriansky)

June 27, 1964, the day of the unveiling of the Taras Shevchenko statue in Washington, can truly be accepted as the day America meets Shevchenko. In response to an act of Congress, this towering symbol of freedom now stands permanently in the Capital of our Nation, reminding all Americans that there are countries and nations in the U.S.S.R. which look to the United States for understanding and support of their supreme goals of national independence and freedom. America meets Shevchenko and through him will progressively come to know the greatest weakness and potential vulnerability of our chief adversary, imperialist Soviet Russia.

Up to the recent period, the direction of events and developments pointed only to Shevchenko meeting America. In the middle of the last century the poet laureate of Ukraine himself met America. By word and in an ardent spirit of common ideals and aspirations Shevchenko turned to our Washington for just laws to prevail eventually in his Ukraine and, indeed, in all of the captive nations of the Russian Empire. Those who over the past 70 years and more wrote in this country about Shevchenko gave further expression to the tendency of the European freedom fighter meeting America.

In this century, groups of Americans of Ukrainian background who established statues and other remembrances of Shevchenko in various localities in this country also represented Shevchenko meeting America. As this tendency progressed, the idea of a Shevchenko monument in Washington was widely discussed during the fifties. Numerous groups and individuals properly felt that a statue in Cleveland or volumes in English about this heroic Ukrainian nationalist or organizations, such as the Shevchenko Scientific Society, bearing the name of this universal figure did not spell in the aggregate the condition of America meeting Shevchenko and profiting by his works, meaning, and vision. For many years, in the Ukrainian Congress Committee and elsewhere, this idea of a Shevchenko statue in our Nation's Capital was being prepared in anticipation of the Shevchenko anniversaries in the sixties, awaiting the proper time and circumstances. In Canada, the same idea took hold, and although it fell short of realization in the Canadian capital, a Shevchenko monument was unveiled in Winnipeg in July 1961. But, today, there is no question about Amercia meeting Shevchenko.

FROM DENIAL TO ACCEPTANCE

One would suffer from extreme delusion if he were to believe that the bridge from Shevchenko meeting America to America meeting Shevchenko was a smooth and easy one. An honest and objective recognition of the obstacles, hurdles, and also intrusions of nuisance value provides one with a solid perspective of the immense work that lies beyond June 27. The Shevchenko statue is just a part of a greater whole, and if the bard were alive today to witness all this, he would be the first to decry any insular idolatry and blindness to the universal issue of freedom and totalitarian slavery. Also, as one recrosses this bridge, he will observe that in a real and complete sense America met Shevchenko in 1960, when Congress legislated House Joint Resolution 311, the Bentley measure, providing for the erection of Shevchenko's statue in this Capital of the free world.

A detailed story of how this bridge was crossed appears in the article on "Public Law 86–749 and the Shevchenko Centennial" in the autumn 1960, issue of the Ukrainian Quarterly. Taking some of the pertinent highlights from this story, it should be pointed out that in March 1960, the Department of Interior rejected the simple idea of having another statue in Washington. When this writer met with the Department's officials to discuss this decision, he argued for favorable reconsideration on the basis of the leading points found in House Joint Resolution 311, which the Congress committee primarily advanced, rather than Senate Joint Resolution 54, an inept standardized memorial resolution that arose in an unfortunate episode of self-seeking ambition. It was the height of political naivete to believe that Congress would pass a measure for the Shevchenko statue when at that time few even knew about Shevchenko. The death of Senate Joint Resolution 54 in the Senate Rules Committee in June 1960, almost caused further embarrassment when in that same month the House of Representatives passed House Joint Resolution 311.

The generally held idea of a Shevchenko statue in Washington actually demanded a broader idea of national purpose, and this was afforded in the House resolution. It was the aim of this writer to have the component ideas of Shevchenko's cosmopolitanism, affinity to the American tradition, championship of liberty, and a binding spirituality between America and Ukraine lay the groundwork for meaningful argumentation in terms of the successful Captive Nations Week Resolution which Congress passed only a year before. The strategy worked and the Department of Interior reversed its original decision. The proposed statue had now a broader, functional significance and national purpose. Without this more comprehensive idea, placing the simple idea of a statue in the context of the contemporary struggle, there certainly would be no Shevchenko statue in Washington today; the bridge from Shevchenko meeting America to America meeting Shevchenko would never have been crossed.

Thus, the Shevchenko statue in Washington today is the prime result solely and exclusively of the initiative, effort, planning and operations of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America. We began to cross the bridge to America meeting Shevchenko when the Department of the Interior finally approved the broader idea. In the months following, we made rapid strides across the bridge as the House Administration Committee, on the basis of hearings on House Joint Resolution 311, passed the measure, as the House of Representatives passed House Resolution 524, which called for the publication of an official documentary biography of Shevchenko, and as the House passed House Joint Resolution 311 by June 24.

However, by this day only half of the bridge was crossed, and, as mentioned above, in turning to the Senate we were confronted by the embarrassing situation where only a few days before, the Senate Rules Committee killed the amorphous Senate Joint Resolution 54, which again threatened the success of the entire project. Happily, as though by providential design, Congress went into recess to accommodate the two political conventions, and time was gained to convince the members of the Senate Rules Committee on the merits of House Joint Resolution 311. The documentary biography, prepared by this writer, had in the meantime been published and proved to be a valuable and instructive medium. On August 29, the Senate Rules Committee reported out favorably House Joint Resolution 311, and on August 31 the full Senate passed the measure.

With the signing of House Joint Resolution 311 into law by President Eisenhower on September 13, 1960, the bridge from Shevchenko meeting America was completely crossed to America meeting Shevchenko. Soon thereafter, the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America established the Shevchenko Memorial Committee to implement the act of Congress and to bring the statue itself into concrete reality. Later attacks against the statue by two well-situated individuals were successfully met largely by the leadership of the Congress Committee. Briefly, then, in formal glory America meets Shevchenko on June 27, 1964, but in reality America met Shevchenko as far back as 1960.

DEDICATION TO THE CAPTIVE NATIONS

In full conformity with the theme and character of this short history of the monument, the statue is rightly dedicated to the liberation, freedom, and independence of all the captive nations. In the larger framework of contemporary issues and for the long future, the success of this UCCA-sponsored project is actually the first implementation of the Captive Nations Week Resolution. The basic argumentation for the statue was in terms of this resolution, and the very contents of the resolution are the ideas and ideals which Shevchenko as a freedom fighter fought for and died for.

The prime meaning of Shevchenko and his works in our time is the liberation and national freedom not only of Ukraine but of all the captive non-Russian nations both inside and outside the Soviet Union. And this means against Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism, the communist conspiracy, and all other Russian negations of freedom. Is it any wonder that America, the home of the free, has met and warmly embraced Shevchenko?

MEMORIAL TO A GREAT FIGHTER FOR FREEDOM

A memorial statue will be unveiled and dedicated in Washington, D.C., on June 27 to perpetuate the memory of a powerful fighter for freedom and stand as a constant reminder of captive peoples' struggle for freedom.

Former President Harry S. Truman is honorary chairman for the event. The National Sponsorship Committee includes such outstanding national leaders as His Excellency Patrick O'Boyle, Archbishop of Washington; Dr. Daniel A. Poling, editor of Christian Herald; Edmund Gulewitz, national commander, AMVETS; former Vice President Richard M. Nixon; Dr. Peter Lejins, president of the American Latvian Association; and 100 others.

The memorial statue will honor a 19th century Ukrainian poet and fighter for freedom, Taras Shevchenko. Shevchenko was born in serfdom in Ukraine, gained his freedom, and championed the cause of freedom and national independence for all peoples. He called for independence for Ukraine as the Founding Fathers of the United States called for independence for the colonies. Knowing of the American Revolution, he called for the coming to Ukraine of a Washington with "his new and righteous law."

INTERNATIONAL IMPORTANCE OF EVENT

The unveiling and dedication is an international event of great importance. This is the 150th anniversary year of Shevchenko's birth, and is being celebrated around the world. Russian Communists are trying to claim that Shevchenko—a national hero of Ukraine—was really a Bolshevik who died before his time.

The truth of his life and of his poetry is that he sought Ukrainian independence from Russian rule, and championed the rights of all men to be free. He is known as a champion of freedom to all who live in or trace their origin throughout east-central Europe.

From 40,000 to 60,000 or more people from all over the Western Hemisphere—from Canada in the north to the Argentine in the south—are expected to attend the dedication June 27. The new statue will strengthen the ties between people of the United States and all the peoples behind the Iron Curtain who yearn for and struggle for their freedom and independence.

Erection of the statue is predicated upon a resolution of Congress passed in 1961 and signed by then President Dwight D. Eisenhower. It is sponsored by the Shevchenko Memorial Committee of America, Inc., and the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, a participating organization in the All-American Conference.

UKRAINIAN IMMIGRATION TO AMERICA

There is evidence that some Ukrainians were in America during the colonial period and that some fought in the American Revolution.

The bulk of immigration, however, came between the years of 1890 and 1914, the period of the last great influx of European migration.

Approximately 75 percent of the over 1 million immigrants at that time came from western Ukraine—Galicia, Carpatho-Ukraine and Bukovina—which were part of the Austro-Hungarian Empire prior to 1914.

Another 100,000, approximately, entered the United States from displaced persons camps in Europe after World War II.

Today, more than 2 million Americans of Ukrainian descent or origin are embraced by the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America.

LOCATION OF UKRAINIAN-AMERICANS

Ukrainians who came to the United States in 1890–1914 settled in industrial areas—the coal mining areas of Pennsylvania, Ohio, West Virginia, and Illinois; the iron ore regions of Minnesota and Michigan; the gold and silver districts of Montana and Colorado; the farm States of Nebraska and the Dakotas.

Some settled in metropolitan areas of New York, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Detroit, and Chicago. Some went west to California, Oregon, and Washington. A few went to Texas, Oklahoma, and Louisiana.

UKRAINIAN-AMERICAN ORGANIZATIONS

The incoming Ukrainians formed a number of fraternal organizations to provide protection in the event of sickness or death. In 1894 appeared the first and largest of these, the Ukrainian National Association. Others followed, including the Ukrainian Workingmen's Association, the Providence Association of Ukrainian Catholics, and the Ukrainian National Aid Association.

Each publishes a Ukrainian-language newspaper. The earliest is Svodoba, established in 1893 and published by the Ukrainian National Association. The daily America is published by the Providence Association while the Workingmen's and National Aid Associations publish weeklies, Narodna Volya and Ukrainske Narodne Slovo, respectively. For the American-born generation there is the Ukrainian Weekly, published by the Ukrainian National Association, as well as English-language supplements of Narodna Volya, America, and Ukrainske Narodne Slovo.

UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE OF AMERICA

The absorption by Soviet Russia of western Ukraine at the time of the outbreak of World War II consolidated the Ukrainian immigration and its progeny in America. American-Ukrainians clamored for an assemblage which would speak out for ominously threatened Ukraine and for the menaced free world.

The first Ukrainian Congress Committee of America Congress was held in Washington, D.C., May 24, 1940. Delegates supported U.S. foreign policy, denounced totalitarian aggression, and appealed for help toward Ukrainian liberation from Russian Communist rule.

In succeeding years, UCCA instituted the publication, the Ukrainian Quarterly, urged Western support for the Ukrainian insurgent army which was waging underground war against Soviet Russia, and appealed for universal application of the four freedoms and Atlantic Charter principles to Ukraine and all enslaved nations.

The fourth UCCA Congress, Washington, D.C., November 1949, was warmly greeted by President Harry S. Truman. At this time the Voice of America announced that it would begin a Ukrainian language program in its oversea broadcasts. Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, professor of Soviet economics at Georgetown University, was elected president of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America.

President Truman sent a message to the Fifth UCCA congress in July 1952 urging Americans of Ukrainian descent and origin to tell their kinsmen abroad the "true story of democracy" and to appeal to them not to despair in their fight for freedom.

Following UCCA congresses urged the United States to follow an enlightened liberation policy for the captive nations, and to appeal to the Soviet Government to cease its persecution of religion in the U.S.S.R. At the seventh congress in February 1959, the erection of a memorial statue to Taras Shevchenko was discussed.

ORGANIZATIONS PARTICIPATING IN UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE OF AMERICA

The statue now has become a reality. It will stand as a constant reminder of the struggle of people of Ukraine, of East-Central Europe, and of all other nations for national independence and human liberty.

Organizations participating in the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America are:

1. Fraternal benefit associations

(1) Ukrainian National Association; (2) Ukrainian Workingmen's Association; (3) Providence Association of Ukrainian Catholics; (4) Ukrainian National Aid Association.

2. Political organizations

(5) Ukrainian American National Democratic Association; (6) Association of Ukrainians of Revolutionary Democratic Convictions; (7) Association of Friends of the Liberation Movement of Ukraine; (8) Organizations for the Defense of Four Freedoms of Ukraine; (9) Organization of the Rebirth of Ukraine; (10) Ukrainian National State Union; (11) Ukrainian Hetman Organization; (12) Ukrainian Free Society in the U.S.A.; (13) Friends of the OUN Abroad; (14) Association for the Liberation of Ukraine; (15) Association of Friends of the Ukrainian National Republic; (16) DOBRUS, Democratic Association of Ukrainians Formerly Oppressed in the U.S.S.R.

3. Scientific associations

(17) Shevchenko Scientific Society; (18) Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the U.S.A.

4. Cultural and relief organizations

(18) Self-reliance; (19) United Ukrainian American Relief Committee; (20) Catholic Academic Union of Ukrainian Intellectuals "Obnova"; (21) Ukrainian Golden Cross; (22) Carpathian Association; (23) Ukrainian Evangelical Association; (24) Organization for the Defense of Lemkivshchyna; (25) Ukrainian Orthodox League of America; (26) Alliance of Ukrainians from Bukovina; (27) Ukrainian Association of Former Political Prisoners; (28) Prolog Research and Publishing Association;

5. Women's organizations

(29) Ukrainian National Women's League of America; (30) Ukrainian American Women's Relief Association of Olga Basarab;

6. Veterans' organizations

(31) United Ukrainian Veterans in the U.S.A.; (32) Ukrainian American War Veterans; (33) Society of Veterans of Ukrainian Insurgent Army; (34) Brotherhoods of Veterans—First Ukrainian Division, Ukrainian National Army; (35) Former Members of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army; (36) Association Former Soldiers "Brody-Lev";

7. Foundations

(37) Scholarship Fund of O. Olzhych; (38) Ukrainian Student Fund; (39) Ukrainian Academy of Arts & Sciences Foundation.

8. Professional organizations

(39) Alliance of Ukrainian Artists in America; (40) Associations of Ukrainian Cooperatives; (41) Union of Ukrainian Cooperative Workers; (42) Association of Ukrainian Engineers in America; (43) Ukrainian-American Lawyers Association; (44) Association of Ukrainian Merchants and Industrialists; (45) Association of Ukrainian Veterinarians in America; (46) Ukrainian Professional Society of America; (47) Ukrainian American Medical Society; (48) Ukrainian Lawyers Association in America.

9. Youth organizations

(49) Federation of Ukrainian Student Associations of America (SUSTA); (50) Ukrainian Youth Organization "Plast"; (51) Ukrainian Youth Association of America (SUMA); (52) Ukrainian Youth League of North America (UYL-NA); (53) Ukrainian Student Association "Zarevo"; (54) Association of Ukrainian Democratic Youth (ODUM); (55) Ukrainian Youth Federation of America (MUN); (6) Ukrainian Student Association of M. Michnovsky (TUSM).

TARAS SHEVCHENKO: BOTH AMERICA AND RUSSIA CLAIM UKRAINIAN NATIONALIST AS HERO

(One of the most complex propaganda wars in years has been raging over a statue to be erected June 27 in Washington, D.C., to Taras Shevchenko, the great 19th century poet and freedom fighter who is the Ukrainian national hero. Russia is spending millions of rubles this year building up Shevchenko as a Communist before his time, while, paradoxically, some Americans are attacking Shevchenko as a nationalistic reactionary. Russian Communists insist Shevchenko was pro-Russian, while Ukrainians in America—and most historians—know that Shevchenko's dream was to liberate Ukraine from Russian rule and set up a democratic republic. The statue has been paid for by contributions from Ukrainians throughout America.)

(By Philip Love)

WASHINGTON, June 13.—It's a confused and confusing age we're living in. Alice could come back through the looking glass and—unless somebody like the walrus should tell her—never know that she'd left Wonderland.

What we know to be dictatorship Communists describe as "democracy." When Reds take over a country they say they're "liberating" it, and any nation that opposes them is an "aggressor." Although the Soviet Union maintains the largest military establishment on earth, any other country that tries to remain strong enough to defend itself is "militaristic." Any nation that refuses to give the Communists their way is "imperialistic," and protection of a country they covet is "colonialism."

Even more confusing, perhaps, is the Soviet claim that an American working class family, with its comfortable home, automobile, good clothes and well-rounded diet, is "exploited by capitalists," while its Red counterparts, with far less of everything, are better off in every way.

"The facts of the matter are," as President Kennedy reported after his Vienna meeting with Premier Khrushchev, "That the Soviets and ourselves give wholly different meanings to the same words: War, peace, democracy, and popular will. We have wholly different views of right and wrong."

NEW SOVIET "HERO"

Now, for reasons that only the upside-down jargon of communism can explain, the Soviets are hailing as a hero a 19th-century genius who would have been their natural enemy and are lambasting the United States for recognizing his greatness as a poet, an artist, and a fighter for human liberty.

Taras Shevchenko lived only 9 of his 47 years as a freeman. From his birth in 1814 until he was 24 years old, he was a serf. Even after his freedom had been bought, he spent 10 years in exile, and 3½ years under Russian police supervision. But in the brief time given to him he wrote so effectively and struggled so valiantly against serfdom that he is still acclaimed, 103 years after his death, not only as the greatest of Ukrainian poets but as "Europe's Freedom Fighter."

In 1961, Canadians of Ukrainian descent erected a statue of Shevchenko in Winnipeg, Ontario. And next Staturday (June 27) another statue of him will be unveiled (at 22d and P Sts. NW.) in Washington. It is the work of the Ukrainian-born Canadian sculptor, Leo Mol, and it stands on land made available by Congress for "A Monument to the Liberation, Freedom, and Independence of all Captive Nations."

To appreciate Shevchenko's greatness, one must know something of the history of his native Ukraine. Because Nikita Khruchchev boasts of being a Ukrainian, and Ukraine so long has been one of the "Republics" of the U.S.S.R., most Americans assume that its 45 million inhabitants are Russians. They are not.

HISTORY

Ukraine has had three periods of independence: (1) From the ninth century, when its history began under the name of "Rus," until the 13th century, when it was plundered and occupied by the forces of Genghis Khan and his Mongol-Tartar successors, (2) during the 17th century, when the Ukrainians overthrew the Polish rulers who had gained control of the country after the Mongol-Tartars were defeated; and (3) from 1917 to 1918 when they ousted their Russian overlords and established the Ukrainian National Republic (U.N.R.).

The second period of independence ended in 1654 when Hetman Bohdan Khmelnytsky (CQ) made a treaty with Moscow under which Muscovite troops occupied Ukraine to "protect" it from the Poles. They never left.

From the end of the 17th century until World War I, Ukraine was divided between Russia and Poland, and Russia and Austria.

Because it was the border and between the Russian, Polish, Lithuanian, and Austrian Empires for so long, the area came to be called Ukraine (from "krai," meaning "border").

RUSSIAN REOCCUPATION

When Ukraine finally won its independence in 1917, the newly established Soviet Government was quick to recognize it. But it was quick, also, to dispatch powerful armies to suppress the new government. This took more than 3 years of bitter fighting, but in the end the Russians imposed a puppet Communist regime on the Ukrainians.

Throughout the long years of their enslavement, the Ukrainian people's longing for independence and freedom was fanned by the writings of their patriots. But Shevchenko, more than any other, expressed the yearnings of the people and their utter contempt for their oppressors.

Shevchenko had every reason to be bitter. He was born into serfdom on the estate of Baron Vasily Vasilyevich Engelhardt, and his mother died when he was 9, and his father when he was 12. To be either an orphan or a serf was bad, but to be both was almost unbearable.

After pasturing cattle and working in the bakery, for neither of which he showed any talent, he was assigned to the baronial mansion as a page. This at least provided an opportunity to study the many beautiful paintings that it contained, but when he was caught trying to copy them, he was flogged.

FREEDOM BOUGHT

When the beatings failed to kill his love of art, his master apprenticed him to a painter in St. Petersburg. There he met Karl Petrovich Bryulov, the most fashionable painter of the day. Bryulov bought Shevchenko's freedom from Engelhardt for 2,500 rubles, raised by raffling off a portrait of the Russian poet Zhukovsky.

Shevchenko had been writing poetry for some time, but his poems did not begin to attract attention until he was set free. Then they attracted so much attention that, when he was arrested with other organizers of a movement to create a republican government for all the slavic peoples, Czar Nicholas I added a special dictum to his sentence.

The sentence made Shevchenko a private in the army serving on the distant Asian border, and the czar added that the young artist-poet be kept "under the strictest supervision with the prohibition of writing and drawing."

After the death of Nicholas I, Count and Countess Feodor Petrovich Tolstoy persuaded the new czar, Alexander II to pardon Shevchenko. He continued writing and working in the cause of freedom, but he did not live to see his dreams come true. On February 26, 1861, the day after his 47th birthday and on the eve of Czar Alexander II's liberation of the serfs, he died.

Yet he lives on today, more than a century later. His beloved Ukraine is still enslaved by the Russians, but they have claimed him as their own. The Soviet Government removed the huge iron cross from his grave at Kaniv, on the bank of the Dnieper River, and replaced it with a tall obelisk monument—thus, as Roman Smal-Stocki has pointed out in his "Shevchenko meets America," "directing its propaganda to a systematic falsification to Shevchenko's works and the ideals which burned within them."

ADMIRED AMERICA

To the free world, Shevchenko was a leader in the struggle for human liberty against all forms of tyranny and sought national Ukrainian independence from Russian despotism. He expressed his yearning for Ukrainian independence and for the American form of government in these lines:

"Ah, you miserable
And cursed crew, when will you breathe your last?
When shall we get ourselves a Washington
To promulgate his new and righteous law?
But some day we shall surely find the man."

But in Moscow and Kiev, Soviet propagandists have been trying to prove that Shevchenko, having been a leader in the fight against serfdom, was thus a Bolshevik born before his time.

They have carried on a bitter and incessant attack against the Washington memorial to Shevchenko because it promotes the independence of Ukraine from Russian overlordship.

Says Georgetown University's Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, president of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America:

"The Communists cannot afford freedom, or even strong publicity about freedom. We in America cannot afford to be without freedom."

But, according to the Soviet propaganda, we are already without freedom. In a typical example of Red doubletalk, the Kiev newspaper, Komunist Ukraniv, quotes Shevchenko's fervent lines about Washington and says:

"In these words, Shevchenko contrasted the reactionary, rotten, autocratic order of serfdom with the political order defended by George Washington. Today all the 'righteous laws' in the United States of America have been buried; there exists a reign of the most high-handed reactionary social forces, a ruthless enslavement of the workers, and racial and national discrimination. The American reactionaries and their hirelings, the Ukrainian bourgeois nationalists, will never succeed in turning the poet-revolutionary into a partisan of the American bourgeois order.

Yes, it's a confused and confusing age we're living in. Alice would find some of its language just as mixed up as any she heard in Wonderland.

National Shevchenko Memorial Honorary Sponsoring Committee

CHAIRMAN

The Honorable Harry S. Truman, 33d President of the United States.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

U.S. Senators

Hon. Everett McKinley Dirksen, Republican, of Illinois.

Hon. Gordon Allott, Republican, of Colorado.

Hon. Daniel B. Brewster, Democrat, of Maryland.

Hon. Quentin N. Burdick, Democrat, of North Dakota.

Hon. Thomas J. Dodd, Democrat, of Connecticut.

Hon. Peter H. Dominick, Republican, of Colorado.

Hon. Paul H. Douglas, Democrat, of Illinois.

Hon. Hiram L. Fong, Republican, of Hawaii.

Hon. Edward M. Kennedy, Democrat, of Massachusetts.

Hon. Thomas H. Kuchel, Republican, of California.

Hon. Hugh Scott, Republican, of Pennsylvania.

Hon. Strom Thurmond, Democrat, of South Carolina.

Hon. John G. Tower, Republican, of Texas.

Hon. Harrison A. Williams, Jr., Democrat, of New Jersey.

Hon. Ralph W. Yarborough, Democrat, of Texas.

Hon. Milton R. Young, Democrat, of North Dakota.

U.S. Representatives

Hon. John W. McCormack, Democrat, of Massachusetts.

Hon. Joseph P. Addabbo, Democrat, of New York.

Hon. Mark Andrews, Republican, of North Dakota.

Hon. Robert R. Barry, Republican, of New York.

Hon. William H. Bates, Republican, of New York.

Hon. Frank J. Becker, Republican, of New York.

Hon. William G. Bray, Republican, of Indiana.

Hon. Hale Boggs, Democrat, of Louisiana.

Hon. Joel T. Broyhill, Republican, of Virginia.
Hon. Charles A. Buckley, Democrat, of New York.
Hon. James A. Byrne, Democrat, of Pennsylvania.
Hon. Silvio O. Conte, Republican, of Massachusetts.
Hon. Robert J. Corbett, Republican, of Pennsyvania.
Hon. William C. Cramer, Republican, of Florida.
Hon. Glenn Cunningham, Republican, of Nebraska.
Hon. Paul B. Dague, Republican, of Pennsylvania.
Hon. Dominick V. Daniels, Democrat, of New York.
Hon. James J. Delaney, Democrat, of New York.
Hon. John H. Dent, Democrat, of Pennsylvania.
Hon. Edward J. Derwinski, Republican, of Illinois.
Hon. Charles C. Diggs, Jr., Democrat, of Michigan.
Hon. John D. Dingell, Democrat, of Michigan.
Hon. Wm. Jennings Bryan Dorn, Democrat, of South Carolina.
Hon. T. J. Dulski, Democrat, of New York.
Hon. George H. Fallon, Democrat, of Maryland.
Hon. Paul Findley, Republican, of Illinois.
Hon. Paul A. Fino, Republican, of New York.
Hon. Daniel J. Flood, Democrat, of Pennsylvania.
Hon. John E. Fogarty, Democrat, of Rhode Island.
Hon. Samuel N. Friedel, Democrat, of Maryland.
Hon. Robert N. Giaimo, Democrat, of Connecticut.
Hon. Frank Horton, Republican, of New York.
Hon. Eugene J. Keogh, Democrat, of New York.
Hon. Torbert H. Macdonald, Democrat, of Massachusetts.
Hon. Robert McClory, Republican, of Illinois.
Hon. Joseph M. McDade, Republican, of Pennsylvania.
Hon. Clark MacGregor, Republican, of Minnesota.
Hon. Robert T. McLoskey, Republican, of Illinois.
Hon. Ray J. Madden, Democrat, of Indiana.
Hon. John O. Marsh, Jr., Democrat, of Virginia.
Hon. William E. Miller, Republican, of New York.
Hon. John E. Moss, Democrat, of California.
Hon. Abraham J. Multer, Democrat, of New York.
Hon. William T. Murphy, Democrat, of Illinois.
Hon. Lucien N. Nedzi, Democrat, of Michigan.
Hon. Ancher Nelsen, Republican, of Minnesota.
Hon. Barratt O'Hara, Democrat, of Illinois.
Hon. Frank C. Osmers, Jr., Republican, of New Jersey.
Hon. Harold C. Ostertag, Republican, of New York.
Hon. Edward J. Patten, Democrat, of New Jersey.
Hon. Alexander Pirnie, Republican, of New York.
Hon. Melvin Price, Democrat, of Illinois.
Hon. Adam C. Powell, Democrat, of New York.
Hon. Roman C. Pucinski, Democrat, of Illinois.
Hon. George M. Rhodes, Democrat, of Pennsylvania.
Hon. R. Walter Riehlman, Republican, of New York.
Hon. Fred B. Rooney, Democrat, of Pennsylvania.
Hon. John J. Rooney, Democrat, of New York.
Hon. Fernand J. St Germain, Democrat, of Rhode Island.
Hon. Richard S. Schweiker, Republican, of Pennsylvania.
Hon. Don L. Short, Republican, of North Dakota.
Hon. Bill Stinson, Republican, of Washington.
Hon. Robert Taft, Jr., Republican, of Ohio.
Hon. Frank Thompson, Jr., Democrat, of New Jersey.
Hon. Thor C. Tollefson, Republican, of Washington.
Hon. George M. Wallhauser, Republican, of New Jersey.
Hon. Bob Wilson, Republican, of California.
Hon. John W. Wydler, Republican, of New York.
Hon. Clement J. Zablocki, Democrat, of Wisconsin.

Noncongressional members

Hon. Hugh J. Addonizo, mayor, city of Newark, N.J.
Hon. Elmer L. Andersen, former Governor of Minnesota.
Rt. Rev. Msgr. John Balkunas, president, Conference of Americans of Central-Eastern European Descent.
Ralph Bellamy, Hollywood.
Hon. Alvin M. Bentley, former Congressman.
Dr. Anthony T. Bouscaren, professor of Political Science, Le Moyne College.
Hon. Ted W. Brown, secretary of state of Ohio.
Hon. Farris Bryant, Governor of the State of Florida.
Charles Burke, Polish American Congress, Inc.
Dr. Milton Butariu, administrative officer, Assembly of Captive European Nations.
Desiderio Cardenas, co-president, Committee for Abolition of Enslavement.
Hon. Jerome P. Cavanagh, mayor of the city of Detroit.
Luben Christov, president, American Bulgarian League.
Gen. Mark W. Clark, president of The Citadel, Charleston, S.C.
Gilmore D. Clarke, consulting engineer.
Arthur Prudden Coleman, Fordham University.
Marion Moore Coleman, author.
Brutus Coste, secretary general, Assembly of Captive European Nations.
Hon. James W. Day, mayor of the city of Parma, Ohio.
Donald DeLue, sculptor.
Dr. George M. Dimitrov, president, Bulgarian National Committee.
His Excellency John J. Dougherty, Auxiliary Bishop of Newark and president of Seton Hall University.
Christopher Emmet, chairman, American Friends of Captive Nations.
Feliks Gadomski, Assembly of Captive European Nations.
Martin W. Gallagher, Georgetown University.
Harry D. Gideonse, president, Brooklyn College of the City College of New York.
Dr. W. G. Glaskow, chairman, Supreme Cossack Representation.
Chester C. Gorski, council president, city of Buffalo, N.Y.
Mason W. Gross, president, Rutgers University, New Jersey.
Edmund Gulewicz, commander, AMVETS.
Hon. Blair F. Gunther, commissioner, Allegheny County, Pa.
Hon. William L. Guy, Governor of the State of North Dakota.
Robert W. Hansen, Fraternal Order of Eagles.
Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain of the U.S. Senate.
Loy W. Henderson, School of International Service, the American University.
Hon. Robert King High, mayor of the city of Miami, Fla.
Walter D. Hyle, Jr., commander, Catholic War Veterans.
Walter H. Judd, former Congressman.
Hon. Daniel H. Kane, New York University.
Rev. William F. Kelley, S.J., president, Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wis.
Watson Kirkconnell, translator of Shevchenko.
Rev. John A. Klekotka, O.S.A. president, Villanova University, Villanova, Pa.
John Kosiak, president, Byelorussian Congress Committee of America.
David E. Kucharsky, news editor, Christianity Today.
Hon. Richard C. Lee, mayor of the city of New Haven, Conn.
Gerald B. Leighbody, deputy superintendent, board of education, Buffalo, N.Y.
Dr. Peter P. Lejins, president, American Latvian Association.
Jozef Lettrich, Czechoslovak National Committee.
Marx Lewis, chairman, Council Against Communist Aggression.
Prof. Clarence A. Manning, Columbia University.
Henry Mayer, chairman, Cold War Council.
Hon. Theodore R. McKeldin, mayor, city of Baltimore, Md.
Hon. William H. McKeon, chairman, New York Democratic State Committee.
Hon. Stanislaw Mikolajczyk, former Premier of Poland.
Edgar Ansel Mowrer, columnist.
Hon. Eugene H. Nickerson, Nassau County executive, New York.
Hon. Richard M. Nixon, former Vice President of the United States.
His Excellency Patrick A. O'Boyle, Archbishop of Washington.
Charles H. Percy, chairman, Bell & Howell Co.
Dr. Edward M. O'Connor, former U.S. Commissioner, Displaced Persons.
Dr. Daniel A. Poling, editor, Christian Herald.
Dr. Herminio Portell-Vila, former Cuban diplomat and professor, University of Havana.
Francis J. Proch, Polish American Congress.
Prince S. A. Radziwill, London, England.
Ronald Reagan, Hollywood.
Vera Rich, poetess.
Pamfil A. Riposanu, Rumanian National Committee of U.S.A.
Hon. George Romney, Governor of the State of Michigan.
Prof. Joseph S. Roucek, chairman, Department of Sociology, University of Bridgeport, Connecticut.
Maj. Gen. Ralph C. Smith, U.S. Army, retired.
Hon. Frank R. Somers, mayor of the city of Dayton, Ohio.
Hon. James H. J. Tate, mayor of the city of Philadelphia, Pa.
Henry J. Taylor, columnist.
Hon. John A. Volpe, former Governor of Massachusetts.
Hon. Robert F. Wagner, mayor of the city of New York, N.Y.
Francis J. Wazeter, president, Downstate New York Division, Polish-American Congress.
George L. Yaremenko, president, Cossack American National Alliance, Inc.
Walter Zachariasiewicz, All-American Council, Democratic National Committee.

SPIRES OF THE SPIRIT—NEW STATUE OF LIBERTY

(By Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain, U.S. Senate)

For America and all the world, both slave and free, a new Statue of Liberty has been unveiled. The plaudits of thrilled thousands still rend the air. The familiar and "Loved Lady with the Lamp" in New York Harbor salutes New World pilgrims in the form of a heroic figure symbolic of liberty enlightening the world. But the impressive sculptured monument now standing in a dedicated spot in Washington, capital of the free world, speaks of freedom from coercive shackles of the body and mind, in the physical likeness of one who, himself, was tortured by cruel tyranny and who, in Abraham Lincoln's time, yearned for an emancipator for his enslaved land like unto the Washington of the American Revolution. His name—Taras Shevchenko—who, in the depths of Russian serfdom and thraldom, cried out in desperate hope that some day the liberating principles made flesh in the Father of the American Republic would snap the imprisoning chains of his loved Ukraine.

This new and deeply significant Statue of Liberty has been fashioned by authority of Congress in an action signed by the then President Eisenhower, who has declared: "There can be no true peace which involves acceptance of the status quo in which we find injustice to many nations and repression of human beings on a gigantic scale."

The new Statue of Liberty is vocal with righteous indignation that burned like fire in Shevchenko's bones and smoldered in his very soul during the years of his enforced exile by the Russian czar from under his Ukrainian skies. His angry protest flamed against the coercive Moscow sword which dripped with Ukrainian blood as it does today. The same sort of atrocities which Shevchenko denounced by the Russian autocracy were being perpetrated then by czardom as they are today by the ruthless policy of the Soviet regime. Who knows more than do the Ukrainians that in its contemporary colonizing aggression Red Russia is a ferocious leopard which has not changed its czarist spots. In accomplishing its foul objectives, as Secretary of State Rusk declares: "The very language of international intercourse has become distorted. Aggression is whatever stands in the way of their world order." That is what makes every one of their embassies and legations a nest bed of spying and infiltration.

It is no wonder that the Soviets, with their fixed manifest destiny complex of world domination, rant and rave at the achievement of this new statue of liberty. They claim with perverted upside-down logic that if living today this apostle of democracy, who they admit was a child of genius, would be found aiding and abetting the enslavers. To make Taras Shevchenko a partner of the Kremlin conspiracy is akin to saying that if Washington were living today he would follow the perfidious betrayals of Benedict Arnold. To the cruel billingsgate, which has been hurled at those in this free land who insist on telling the historic truth about Russia, and about Shevchenko, there has been a silence quite vocal in our American officialdom. Any refutation by stubborn facts, from history not rewritten, might tend to upset the applecart of brotherly coexistence, which peaceful-looking vehicle stripped of its camouflage is more than likely to turn out to be a totalitarian tank, crushing into dust all obstacles to world rule.

Before he went so tragically, President Kennedy had this to say regarding Shevchenko: "My congratulations on the anniversary of the Shevchenko Scientific Society. Among your numbers have been some of the great names in learning to whom the world owes an incalculable debt."

Our new statue of liberty is a sacred altar where the plight of all captive nations will be lifted by a never-ending procession to the author of liberty whose decree is, "Let my people go." It will be a mecca for representatives of the peoples held in the grip of this new colonialism who, at the feet of this great Ukrainian, will cry out, "Oh Lord, how long, how long?" Here it will be remembered that this poet was not a narrow nationalist. His concern was not only for the liberty of his people but also for the Poles, the Lithuanians, the Georgians, and the other ancient peoples subjected by Russian aggression.

The Ukranians who have fled from "the Utopia" on the other side of the Iron Curtain have plenty of company. From the captive nations the estimated number of refugees from communism since World War II is 13,083,000, plus other millions who have been liquidated. In terms of human misery and suffering this vast uprooted army speaks with deafening and terrifying voice that the hope of the common man is not Lenin but Lincoln.

And so, brave poet-prophet, even your deadening years in serfdom could not put out the fire in your soul but rather turned your eyes to the emancipating principles of the American Revolution. Tens of thousands acclaiming voices welcome you to America to stand near the glistening memorials of patriots whose principles and ideals fired your own heart—Washington and Jefferson. When 50 years has passed since he penned the Declaration, and at the very end of his mortal days, Thomas Jefferson wrote: "Mankind has not been born with saddles on their backs with the favored few booted and spurred to ride them."

Here—Shevchenko—you will watch and wait for the saddle on the back of the Ukraine which has never belonged to Russia (except by conquest) to be torn away and its booted and spurred riders dethroned in that sure "someday" of which you dreamed when, for your captive millions and for all the captive nations inside and outside the Soviet colonial empire will come "another Washington."

The "Controversial" Statue

(By Lev E. Dobriansky)

If one were to place credence in certain newspaper accounts, the statue of Taras Shevchenko in our Nation's Capital would be under some shadow of doubt. Supposedly, it would be controversial. Presumptively, it would stand with certain reservations.

Actually, this supposition involves more humor than anything else. Among numerous circles in Washington, whether in the private clubs, on Capitol Hill, in several interested agencies or at the universities where this writer normally circulates, the supposition has become a standard piece of banter. "How are the two boisterous controversialists on Shevchenko faring nowadays—Wig and Louch?" is the customary introduction to a measure of amusing conversation.

Without exaggeration, it is generally recognized even among those who were scarcely familiar with Shevchenko in mid-1963 that the so-called controversy over the statue engendered in significant terms a ratio of something like a million for and two against. Aside from the unheeded protests of the Soviet Embassy, the great controversy was really precipitated by two persons: Mr. J. R. Wiggins, editor of the Washington Post, and Mr. Walter C. Louchheim, Jr., a member of the National Capital Planning Commission. Doubtless, there were a number of persons who gullibly absorbed their fiction, but by the same token, applying our well-founded and conservative ratio, there were scores of others who didn't. What a measure of controversy—a million to two.

THE NATURE OF CONTROVERSY

This episode in the development of the Shevchenko statue has been a most interesting and instructive one. First, it has shown how the very term controversy or controversial can be uncritically bandied about. On the basis of our effective ratio in this case, nothing in life is beyond controversy. In our society as well as others, you'll always find two or more creatures objecting to mothers, God, children, virtue, and what have you. If out of ignorance or base motivation, a pair objects and criticizes loudly, does then the object of their misguided utterances become controversial? Hardly. Logically, it is one thing to have just an opinion, it is quite another for that opinion to be grounded in fact, evidence, and rational support. Alone, the former is scarcely sufficient to warrant a genuine controversy for it is nothing more than a thoughtless gesture of tongue or pen. When an expression of opinion rests on grounds of fact and reason, then we can seriously entertain it as a contribution to wholesome controversy.

In this light, genuine controversy is a condition to be desired. By its very nature it is nothing more than an accented exchange of mature views, a sharp clash of more or less justified opinions. Controversy crystallizes issues and aspects of subjects in a way that no other process of intellectual encounter does.

With this rational view of controversy we have never had any fear about the outcome of the Shevchenko statue. And in the end we were proven right. The technique of dubbing something or someone as being controversial simply because a few ignorant or ill-motivated voices are raised is clearly an exercise in obscurantism which bears no constructive relationship to the development of a controversy in its true sense. Both Mr. Wiggins and Mr. Louchheim endeavored to exploit this technique in the extreme.

As to controversy being incited by Moscow and its puppets, the above criteria of rational controversy virtually predetermine the only sensible reply on this score. One of the paramount reasons for honoring Shevchenko in this country has been the need to maintain the purity of his stature and meaning. As was anticipated, Moscow and its puppets have disfigured Shevchenko, have painted him as a forerunner, a precursor of the Russian Bolshevik revolution; in short, they have perverted the patriotic and nationalist freedom fighter for their own psychopolitical ends. This, of course, is not new with the professional perverters in the Kremlin, Kiev, and elsewhere. The honored names of Lincoln, Jefferson, Washington, Shakespeare and dozens of others have been blemished in like manner. From the very start, the motivation is a dishonest one, aimed at a calculated disfigurement through manipulation of a quarter or half truth.

THE POINTS OF "CONTROVERSY" ABOUT SHEVCHENKO

The entire and complete story of the so-called Shevchenko statue controversy is systematically laid out in the book "Shevchenko, a Monument to the Liberation, Freedom and Independence of All Captive Nations" (U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, 1964). It is, of course, impossible to treat here every specious argument and accusation that was raised in the period of September 1963 to February 1964, nor is it necessary. Although every conceivable argument was concocted against the statue and its sponsors, some being of the basest and most vicious sort, the two controversialists relied ultimately on two main contentions that have been repeated over and over again. Apparently, by sheer repetition they have hoped to render these contentions plausible and rationally acceptable. The extreme to which Wiggins has gone in abusing the facilities of the Washington Post can be seen from the editorialized announcement of the placement of Shevchenko's statue ("Shevchenko Statue Ready for Pedestal," the Washington Post, May 30, 1964) and a report of its realization a week later ("Controversial Statue Placed on Its Pedestal," the Washington Post, June 4, 1964). The pattern of editorial comments is the same: "controversial," "anti-Semitic," and "the idol of the Communist Party."

Last fall and early winter, this pattern emerged and was used repeatedly, not only in the Post's editorials but also in what was supposed to be objectively reported events. The validity of the first contention, that the statue is "controversial," obviously rests on that of the other two. Merely to repeat that the statue is controversial is no support of its alleged character; and as we've seen above, the conservative ratio of a million for and two against is not an unimpressive fact. Also, if one were to analyze carefully the comedy of journalistic error and bias as portrayed in the work quoted above, he would be even more impressed by the apparition of controversy surrounding the statue. In short, the technique of crying "controversial" is too obvious.

Before considering the allegations of anti-Semitism and Communist adoration, we should first take note of the way Wiggins developed his almost hysterial assault. This is important because his self-contradictory maneuvers patently represent a full confession of ignorance—worse, ignorance mixed with bold arrogance. In his first editorial on "Poetic Injustice" (September 23, 1963) he claimed that he stands second to none in his esteem for Shevchenko and for Ukraine, but since the city of Washington "found precious space for the Ukraine's national poet," he laments why space cannot be found for Shakespeare. Although Britain's great has been honored in multiple, substantial ways, our reaction was simply "why not." Of course if Wiggins were terribly impassioned by his own proposal, he would have been laboring for it since. Obtaining legislation for a national statue entails heavy toil and hard work, and there is no evidence to present date that the sedentary editory of the Post has embarked on it.

It was quite evident from this first editorial that Wiggins didn't know what the Shevchenko statue was all about. He actually admitted as much. The second editorial on October 18 confirmed all this, and the subsequent ones of November 1 and 12 demonstrated not only his fundamental deficiency in knowledge and understanding of the subject but also his base motivations regarding Shevchenko. The editorials contained every trick in the trade of journalistic smearing, even going so far as to degrading Shevchenko and alleging him to be offensive to numerous American groups. It is especially noteworthy that no self-respecting group fell for this smear technique. It backfired and added another self-inflicted blemish on the integrity of the newspaper. The comedy was also featured by the distinct contradiction of these editorials to Stephen S. Rosenfeld's article on "A Ukrainian Poet Gets Statue Billing" in the September 29 issue of the Post, particularly on the matter of Shevchenko's alleged anti-Semitism. As shown in the quoted source, the editorials even contradicted themselves in a most erratic fashion.

Rather amusing, too, was the sight of a Shakespearean devotee accusing Shevchenko of being anti-Semitic because of a passage or two in his poems about hated Jewish tax collectors. As a poet and a perceptive observer of reality, Shevchenko recorded in these few passages the feelings of people who despised those whom they regarded as their exploiters; and in the tyrannical system of serfdom it was not difficult to find a scapegoat, particularly a Jewish collector. Shakespeare bore the same poetic responsibility.

Both Wiggins and Louchheim have committed a grave injustice to the poet laureate by concocting this anti-Semitic slander. Nowhere did they dare quote Shevchenko out of context. The slander was perched merely on vague verbal generality. We were waiting for them to commit this additional error. For the fact is that in the preface to his realistic work the poet himself morally repudiates this irrational attitude and calls for rectitude of judgment. Most important of all, he placed his very life in jeopardy by signing a public protest against the officially sponsored oppression of the Jews. Those who know the history of anti-Semitism in the Russian empire, both czarist and Soviet, can well appreciate the service rendered to it by this ignorant accusation heard on these shores. Moscow couldn't have done better itself.

Another feature of this comedy is the spurious claim that Shevchenko is the idol of the Communist Party. When this writer first appeared before the National Capital Planning Commission in the fall of 1962, Mr. Louchheim, who admitted knowing nothing about Shevchenko, quickly reached the rigid conclusion that a statue here would serve Russian interests. Indeed, after a concise briefing was given on Shevchenko, he still dreaded the thought of having a statue in honor of a "Russian poet." Later, when Wiggins came into the act, the Washington Post amusingly transformed itself into a rabid anti-Communist organ, protesting Shevchenko as an idol of the Communist Party.

Enough had been said earlier on the disfigurement of national heroes by Moscow and its puppets to indicate the pathetic character of this contention. Moreover, if Wiggins were at all familiar with the literature on this battle since 1960, he would learn that our effort has unmasked the hypocrisy and cynicism involved in Moscow's manipulation of this Ukrainian hero. Furthermore, to inform the reader that thousands of collective farms, factories, streets, and what have you bear the Shevchenko name in the U.S.S.R. and that this fact proves he's a Communist idol is one of the worst forms of twisted reasoning. One would perhaps expect too much of this editor to grasp the meaning of this fact. The vast majority of these places are in Ukraine, where naturally they should be, and the Shevchenko nomer has served conspicuously to preserve the national identity of 45 million people, who even today are being subjected to Russification. For this great anti-Communist organ to overlook these essentials is scarcely cause for wonderment.

SOME LESSONS FROM THE CONTROVERSY

With the unveiling of the Shevchenko statue on June 27, 1964, and turning our eyes to the future, we might ever so often remind ourselves of the many lessons to be drawn from this so-called controversy over the statue. Some of them really constitute guidelines for the future.

One lesson is that although the experience was not one of genuine controversy, the "controversial" pair contributed heavily to popular familiarization with Shevchenko. This writer, for one, was quite eleated over the salutary results of this familiarization process. Despite its unsavory aspects, the "controversy" managed to absorb the interest of countless citizens in Washington and beyond. An evil begot much good.

Second, our freedom of the press came into play to offset the irresponsible and unfounded contentions of one man. Happily, Mr. Robert J. Lewis, writer for the Washington Star, sensed early the malicious character of the Post's editorials and articles, and in the November 10 issue of his paper presented an accurate account of "The Status of a Statue." A month later, the editor of the Washington Star came out with a pungent editorial on the tactics of the "controversialists," appropriately titled in the December 15, 1963 issue as "Association Again." In a democracy forces of reason and justice are always present to combat their negators.

The third lesson is the extent to which arrogant ignorance in our midst can serve as ready fodder for Moscow and its puppets. When Wiggins foolishly began to write about askewed nationalism and the like, the perverters saw their chance of horning in on the Shevchenko project. The Ukrainian puppet in the U.N. spoke his piece and a group in Ukraine sought to intervene in the final festivities of the project. The prevalence of arrogant ignorance in positions of public responsibility is always a tool for our cold war enemies.

Supplementing this is the fourth lesson, namely that the erection of Shevchenko's statute is only a phase in the battle of knowledge and understanding in America with regard to Ukraine and the other captive non-Russian nations in the Soviet Union. The controversy lucidly revealed the nature and character of this battle. The statue is a fixed monument calling for victory in this battle, which in every respect would be our victory in behalf of the basic interests of our Nation. One flays the meaning and significance of the statue if he interprets it harrowly as an end in itself. On June 10, 1964, Nikita S. Khrushchev, "the Hangman of Ukraine," did not unveil Shevchenko's statue in Moscow out of any cultural attachment. The timing itself is suggestive.

No, the Shevchenko statue in Washington is the free world's bridge to an understanding and support of the aspirations of the 45 million Ukrainian nation for freedom and independence. The "controversialists" failed to destroy this bridge. But, rest assured, their head will reemerge. Do not be suprised to read more editorialized comments on the unveiling and in the long period ahead. In tune with our treasured institutions, let us hope for genuine controversy.

Unveiling Rites Set Today for Statue of Shevchenko

The controversial statue of Taras Shevchenko, 19th-century Ukrainian poet and national hero, will be unveiled here today. Approximately 100,000 persons from all over the world are expected to attend the ceremonies, and some 32,000 Ukranians and descendants of Ukranians will march in a parade preceding the unveiling.

The parade will leave the Ellipse at 10 a.m., head north on 15th Street NW., to New York Avenue, west on Pennsylvania Avenue to 23d Street and north to the triangle formed by 23d, 22d and P Streets, where the 14-foot bronze statue will be unveiled.

Controversy developed over the statue because of differing views over the Ukranian's philosophy. To Americans, Shevchenko was a champion of freedom; to Soviets, a disciple of what is now communism. He died 103 years ago.

Former President Eisenhower will unveil the statue at ceremonies set for 2 p.m. Former President Truman, who is not expected at attend, is honorary chairman of the program and nominee for one of five special "Schevchenko Freedom Awards."

A dozen bands and groups dressed in Ukranian costumes will participate in the 3-hour parade.

Vehicles authorized to use reserved Government parking facilities in the area and motorists who want to use private parking spaces along the parade route and disbanding area will be permitted to cross police lines if they indicate their intentions by turning on their headlights. Once the parade route is closed to traffic, however, no vehicles will be permitted on or across it.

Shevchenko was born a serf, gained his freedom at the age of 24 and went on to become his country's greatest poet. He died in 1861 at the age of 47. Moscow represents him as a forerunner of modern communism.

while his anti-Communist sponsors here insist he was an original "European freedom fighter."

Parade and Dedication Here To Honor Ukrainian Poet

(By Robert J. Lewis)

Today is Taras Shevchenko Day in Washington, and representatives of the Nation's 2 million liberty-loving Americans of Ukrainian origin have arranged an impressive show of pride in their 19th century poet-hero.

An estimated 50,000 Ukrainian Americans and others from Canada and countries abroad converged on the city last night and today for a parade and dedication of the Shevchenko statue authorized by Congress 4 years ago.

Former President Dwight D. Eisenhower is scheduled to deliver the principal address and unveil the $250,000 monument to the Ukrainian people's foremost prohphet of freedom.

LAW SIGNED IN 1960

The law authorizing construction of the statue was signed by President Eisenhower on Septembr 13, 1960.

It is located on a triangular site at 23d and P Streets, just south of Massachusetts Avenue NW.

The parade started at 10 a.m. from the Ellipse while buses still were unloading persons who expected to participate.

A crowd gathered early this morning at the monument site to be sure of having a place to see the dedication ceremonies.

Many thousands of khaki-clad youngsters who arrived with Ukrainian youth groups were in the parade's line of march. Among musical groups and bands were the Royal Sabers of Washington. Officials said eight bands were to be in the parade.

SEVERAL TREATED

By parade time, a Red Cross first aid station at the south end of the Ellipse reported a few persons had been treated for blisters and fainting.

The influx of participants and spectators for the ceremonies was arranged for by the Shevchenko Memorial Committee of America, the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, the Ukrainian National Association, and other groups.

The 14-foot-high sculptured figure of the poet surmounts a 7-foot polished granite base in the quarter-acre landscaped park adjacent to the Episcopal Church of the Pilgrims.

The site authorized by Congress was selected by the Interior Department and approved by the National Capital Planning Commission. All funds for the monument were raised in voluntary contributions by Ukrainian-American groups.

Opening event of the gala celebration, formally marking official recognition of the Ukrainian poet laureate in the Nation's capital, was a Constitution Hall concert last night. More than 1,800 persons from delegations arriving early, as well as others, were present for the program by Ukrainian instrumentalists conducted by John Zadorozny.

Besides the parade and dedication, today was to be crowded with other events, ending with a banquet for an estimated 3,500 persons at the District National Guard Armory at 8:30 p.m. Among events was to be the placing of wreaths on the grave of the late President John F. Kennedy and at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier in Arlington Cemetery by the Ukrainian-American veterans' organization.

Principal speaker at tonight's armory banquet, at which five Shevchenko Freedom Awards are to be presented, will be Senator Morton, Republican, of Kentucky. Honorary chairman of the sponsoring committee for today's celebration is former President Harry S. Truman, who has been chosen to receive one of the Freedom Awards.

Opening Address, Taras Shevchenko Monument Unveiling Ceremony, June 27, 1964

(By Prof. Roman Smal-Stocki, chairman, Shevchenko Memorial Committee)

The Shevchenko Memorial Committee extends to all of you, our fellow Americans, fellow Ukrainians, and delegates from near and far, our warmest welcome and cordial thanks for honoring us with your presence at this historic event in our Nation's Capital.

To the great soldier, President Dwight Eisenhower, who signed into law the House joint resolution on the Shevchenko Memorial, we offer our special welcome and tribute—a tribute born of our deep gratitude and respect to a man who is a symbol of our country, beloved by the whole free world.

We also extend a cordial welcome to their excellencies, the most reverend metropolitans, bishops, monsignors, clergy, and venerable sisters; to our honorable Senators and Congressmen; to the large delegation from Canada, headed by the Senators of Canada; to the delegations from Latin America, Australia, Europe, and especially to all delegates from the captive nations.

With God's help we are establishing a historical landmark in our Capitol. From the far corners of the globe we have gathered here to dedicate this monument to Taras Shevchenko—to a fighter for the freedom of serfs and enserfed peoples by Russian imperialism. We have come here to dedicate this monument to an apostle of true Christianity in the dark age of tsarist absolutism, to a teacher of the ways of peace, justice, and friendship among all neighbors. We have come here to pay tribute to the memory of a man who gave Eastern Europe and the world a vision of brotherhood among free nations under, as Shevchenko called it, "Washington's just and new law," under the ideas of the American Declaration of Independence—a freedom under God. Thus Shevchenko belongs not only to Ukraine, he belongs to America, to all captive nations, and to the whole free world as a symbol of freedom, human dignity, and good will toward all men. It is in that deep sense that this monument to Shevchenko is more properly a monument to the glory of God—to the God who granted us the inalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

To carry out this noble ceremony of dedication may I now call upon the honorable Lev Dobriansky of Georgetown University, president of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, to act as master of ceremonies for this historic event.

Shevchenko Monument: A Challenge to Moscow

(By Walter Dushnyck)

For almost 4 years, specifically from the observances of the centennial of Shevchenko's death in 1861 and the decision of the Ukrainian community in the United States to the Soviet press both in Russia and Ukraine, has been waging a systematic and scathing campaign against the Shevchenko project, which was undertaken by the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America and the specially established body, the Shevchenko Memorial Committee of America.

As we approach the final stage of this greatest and historic manifestation ever undertaken by the Ukrainian emigration in this country, let us review briefly the underlying reasons for this indiscriminate campaign by the Communists against our honoring and venerating Taras Shevchenko.

The Soviet Russians, unlike their predecessors, the Russian czars, have fully grasped and undertaken the powerful meaning and significance of Taras Shevchenko among the Ukrainian people. They could neither denigrate nor suppress the widespread cult and reverence which Shevchenko enjoyed and still enjoys among the Ukrainian people everywhere. What they tried to do, however, was to espouse him as their own precursor and prophet of their bloody and inhuman regime imposed in Ukraine and elsewhere in the U.S.S.R., which they euphemistically call the "dictatorship of the proletariat."

When the Ukrainian community in the United States undertook the project for the erection of a Shevchenko statue in Washington, the center of the free world, the Russian totalitarians and their puppets in Kiev howled with rage and indignation. No one, they contended, has a right to the heritage of Shevchenko, except his true heirs, the Ukrainian people, which in the Communist lexicon is equated with the Soviet regime.

Ukrainians in the United States were scathingly berated and labeled as "lackeys of American imperialists" and "unworthy" to build a statue to the Ukrainian poet, Shevchenko, and symbol of man's eternal search for freedom, justice, and equality, something entirely alien to the Communist ideology and Soviet totalitarian doctrine.

One of the alleged Soviet experts on Shevchenko, Eugeni Kiriliuk (his name would seem to indicate his Ukrainian origin—W.D.), for instance, wrote in the U.S.S.R. magazine (January 1961):

"The peoples of the Soviet Union, and with them all progressive mankind, are getting ready for a worthy observance of the immortal memory of the genius lover of freedom * * *. But our enemies are not asleep. The American imperialists, relying on those docile servants * * * the Ukrainian nationalists * * * are planning to take advantage of the 100th anniversary for the monstrous, disgusting, and provocative purpose of slandering the homeland of Shevchenko, Soviet Ukraine, and our people, with a flood of anti-Soviet insults, provocations, muck, lies and distortions. * * * The nationalist scribes, of the breed of Zaitsev, Dontsov, and Dobriansky, are displaying an extraordinary adroitness in the matter of falsifying Shevchenko and the blasphemous distortions of his works, attempting to present our great poet as some kind of advocate of the modern 'American way of life * * *.' "

Only a few weeks ago Literaturna Ukraina, which is the official organ of the Union of Writers of Ukraine, had printed a series of articles attacking the Ukrainians in this country for erecting the Shevchenko monument in Washington. For instance: one Dmytro Pavlychko even wrote a verse, in which he derided those "who sold out their Ukraine in the mire of lies, but who at the same time had erected a monument in Washington." In the same vein wrote another Soviet "expert" on Shevchenko, Mykhailo Novikov, who assailed Prof. Clarence A. Manning for his article on "Religion of Shevchenko," which appeared in House Document 445, "Europe's Freedom Fighter: Taras Shevchenko, 1814–61" (cf. Literaturna Ukraina, May 27, 1964, Kiev). The same organ earlier (March 9, 1964) had assailed a number of Americans for sponsoring the Shevchenko monument. The writer Mykola Tarnavsky (incidentially, Mykola Tarnavsky was compelled to leave the United States as an undesirable alien in the late 1940's, and now has become a Soviet "expert" on Ukrainians in the United States) castigated Congressman John Lesinski, Paul Jones, Senator Jacob K. Javits, and former Congressman Alvin M. Bentley, of Michigan, for their contribution to the project of the Shevchenko statute in Washington. Prof. Lev E. Dobriansky and all others who are helping in the realization of the great plan, are called "inhuman scum," while at the same time the "progressive Ukrainians" are being praised by this traitor to America and Ukraine.

Taking all this into consideration, one is puzzled at the new outburst of the Washington Post, which, it is recalled, last fall began a rather mysterious campaign against the Shevchenko monument in Washington and against the Ukrainians as a whole. When the Shevchenko statue was brought to Washington and placed on its pedestal in Washington on June 2, 1964, the Post again demonstrated its unfairness and anti-Ukrainian bias, when under the two photographs of the Shevchenko monument it printed a caption, stating that the "controversial statue" was already set up, and that the project was assailed on the basis that Shevchenko was "an idol of Communists and anti-Semitic."

One is prone to wonder, who are the "experts," who feed the editors of the Washington Post such utter nonsense?

In any event, the overwhelming majority of the American people, and their leaders were not and are not now of the opinion that Shevchenko was not worthy of the honor bestowed on him by the erection of a monument in his memory and honor. Moreover, in connection with the forthcoming unveiling of the monument, a special Shevchenko Monument Honorary Sponsoring Committee was established under the honorary chairmanship of the Honorable Harry S. Truman, 33d President of the United States, with some 180 prominent American political, cultural, and civic leaders as members. Would they really join such a committee, had they a shred of doubt that Shevchenko was not worthy of their moral support?

There was another honorary committee established, of which all Ukrainian Catholic and Ukrainian Orthodox hierarchs in the free world became honorary members, as well as many representatives of Ukrainian scientific, political, cultural, and other organizations in the free world.

The Shevchenko monument in Washington is not only a great undertaking of the Ukrainian American community, but an act of tremendous international significance. Moscow and its puppets in Kiev tried in every way to belittle the project, or if possible, nix it before it is successfully terminated. When all these nefarious efforts of Moscow failed then a new tactic was adopted. Some 34 Ukrainian cultural leaders from Soviet Ukraine issued a public appeal, whereby they invited themselves to come to the unveiling ceremonies, on June 27, 1964 and to bring a "fistful of sacred Ukrainian earth" from the Shevchenko grave in Kaniv. This "appeal" was another ruse of Moscow to hitch itself to a project which they thought was important enough to be associated with, even though it was organized by the "despicable Ukrainian bourgeois nationalists." But this, too, was promptly rejected by the Ukrainian community, specifically, by the Shevchenko Memorial Committee of America, inasmuch as the hand of Moscow was too clearly evident in the gesture, and the Shevchenko monument project is the work of the American citizenry of Ukrainian origin, without any support or assistance of the Soviet masters and enslavers of Ukraine.

Thus, with the successful conclusion of the Shevchenko monument in Washington, the Ukrainians in the United States have completed a gigantic project; they have brought Taras Shevchenko, a symbol of human freedom, and the eloquent spokesman of the persecuted, to the center of the free world—Washington, D.C.

Heretofore Moscow had not been challenged and was left to distort and interpret Shevchenko to suit its own political objectives.

Ukrainians in the United States have ably brought the meaning of Taras Shevchenko to the focus of world opinion, and presented Shevchenko in a true historic light: Shevchenko was neither a Russian poet, nor an apologist for Moscow's imperialist policies in the past; he was a stanch Ukrainian poet, patriot and nationalist, and an intrepid fighter for the freedom of all races, colors and creeds, and he envisioned a free Ukraine with a "new and righteous law" of George Washington, which obviously had no parallel in Russian or any other literature of Central and Eastern Europe.

It is for this that we went a long way forward to establish a lasting monument to Shevchenko in Washington—the center of the free world today.

Shevchenko Statue Here Unveiled by Eisenhower

(By Robert Lewis)

Former President Dwight D. Eisenhower yesterday unveiled Washington's Taras Shevchenko statue as nearly 100,000 anti-Communist Ukrainian Americans and Canadians cheered and applauded.

The ceremony climaxed a colorful 2¾-hour parade that traveled a 16-block-long route. Police estimate about 35,000 persons participated.

The 73-year-old former Chief Executive flew by helicopter from his Gettysburg home to officiate at the dedication.

Despite a cruelly scorching sun, he stayed to the very end of the hour and 40-minute exercise at the base of the $250,000 statue at 23d and P Streets NW.

DEDICATED TO FREEDOM

Standing beneath an umbrella put up to protect him from the sun, the former President said he hoped erection of the monument in the Nation's Capital would help "kindle a new world movement in the hearts, minds, words, and actions of men."

Such a movement, he said, should be a never-ending one whose aim should be dedicated freedom of peoples of all captive nations of the entire world.

Speaking vigorously, Mr. Eisenhower said the "outpouring of lovers of freedom to salute a Ukrainian hero far exceeds my expectations."

In what appeared to be an obvious warning to Soviet Russian and Chinese leaders, the former President said, "We can be sure that this Nation will, with its valued allies, sustain the strength—spiritual, economic, and military—to foil any ill-advised attempt by dictators to seize any area that is independent and where the love of freedom lives and blazes."

The former President was surrounded by Ukrainian-American officials, Democratic and Republican Members of Congress and Ukrainian church dignitaries on a platform in front of the 14-foot bronze statue.

AUTHORIZED IN 1960

The monument and its quarter-acre park were authorized in a 1960 bill enacted by Congress and signed by Mr. Eisenhower while he was President.

All funds for erection of the statue and its surrounding park and fountain were raised voluntarily by Americans and Canadians of Ukrainian origin.

Taras Shevchenko, who died more than 100 years ago, is revered as the Ukrainian nation's foremost hero-poet and symbol of freedom.

Ukrainian spectators and participants in the parade and dedication poured into Washington last night and early today by a special train, hundreds of chartered buses, planes, and private cars.

WORE NATIVE GARB

Many wore the colorful Ukrainian national costume and others, including youngsters, were khaki-clad in uniforms of Ukrainian organizations.

Dozens of cities in the United States and Canada were represented. Many persons said they had traveled all night to arrive in time for the parade. Many were being unloaded along Independence Avenue, at the south edge of the Ellipse, after the parade had started, but succeeded in joining the line of march.

Deputy Chief of Police W. J. Liverman, who was in charge of traffic, estimated about 35,000 were in the parade and 100,000 jammed the 22d, 23d, and P Streets area, just south of Massachusetts Avenue, during the dedication.

DR. DOBRIANSKY PRESIDES

Presiding at the dedication was Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, a Georgetown University professor and president of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America.

The welcoming address and introduction of former President Eisenhower was delivered by Prof. Roman Smal-Stocki of Marquette University, president of the Shevchenko Memorial Committee of America, which sponsored the ceremonies.

Other speakers at the dedication included Representative Derwinski, Republican, of Illinois; Representative Dulski, Democrat, of New York; Representative Feighan, Democrat, of Ohio; and Representative Flood, Democrat of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Dulski, said Shevchenko stands as a "symbol of freedom, and against tyranny, for all mankind."

Ukrainians Make Eisenhower Feel "Like I Were Back in Politics"

(By Phil Casey)

Former President Dwight D. Eisenhower received an ovation when he spoke at ceremonies for the unveiling of the bronze statue of the 19th century Ukrainian poet Taras Grigoriyevich Shevchenko at 22d and P Streets NW. yesterday afternoon.

Thanking the crowd of about 36,000 Ukrainians from this country, Canada, Latin America, and Europe for its warm welcome, Mr. Eisenhower said: "You make me feel almost like I were back in politics."

The parade began at 10 a.m. at the Ellipse and ended shortly after noon at 22d and P Streets NW., after a march up 15th Street, Pennsylvania Avenue, and 23d Street NW.

The former President praised Shevchenko's poetry and his fight for freedom, saying the poet "expressed eloquently man's undying determination to fight for freedom and his unquenchable faith in ultimate victory."

He said the statue, a 14-foot figure on a 10-foot base, speaks to "millions of oppressed persons" in Eastern Europe and "gives them constant encouragement to struggle forever against Communist tyranny, until, one day, final victory is achieved, as it most surely will be."

He warned: "The touchstone of any free society is limited government, which does only those things which the people need and which they cannot do for themselves at all, or cannot do as well."

The parade and ceremonies were a demonstration against communism as well as a tribute to Shevchenko.

Nevertheless, the poet is beloved by Communists as well. The Soviet Union hails him as a fighter for the ideals of communism and the Ukrainians idolize him as a fighter for freedom from tyranny and the oppression of Communist states.

A high point of the celebration, aside from the former President's appearance, was the non-Ukrainian Royal Sabres drum and bugle corps, which swings. There were few spectators for the parade, but those who did turn out applauded that band all along the parade route.

Shevchenko became a Ukrainian hero when he wrote revolutionary verse and worked actively for a free union of Slavonic peoples under a republican form of government. A serf, he won freedom for himself and his family.

A Ukrainian from Canada was found in the hot crowd, wilting in the 90-degree temperature. But he was glad to be there.

Peter Besko, who is well acquainted with the works of Shevchenko, said, "I work in the streets for the city of Toronto. I am a laborer, but I know Shevchenko. Maybe half of these people have never read him, but they know him as a fighter for freedom, and that is enough."

Another man, down from New York, explained the Ukrainians' love for and knowledge of Shevchenko.

"In the Ukraine," he said, "even the poor people know of him. When I was young, even the very poor had two books: the Bible and the poems of Shevchenko."

Ukrainians Have History of Freedom Seeking

The Ukrainian-born Americans and Americans of Ukrainian descent who came to Washington yesterday brought with them freedom-seeking traditions inherited from Cossacks and peasants.

Although the Ukraine has been a Soviet Social Republic since 1920, the Ukrainian-Americans retain a distinctive language, music, and dress—all of which were in abundant evidence yesterday around the statue of Taras Shevchenko at 22d and P Streets.

According to Orest Horodyskyj, a native of the Ukraine and writer for the weekly newspaper Ukrainian Life in Chicago, about a million Ukrainian-Americans now live in the United States, and some 40,000 were in Washington yesterday for the statue-unveiling ceremonies.

Horodyskyj said the main immigration of these people to America was about 90 years ago, and that most initially took jobs as farmers and laborers.

They now are concentrated in the urban centers of New York State, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Illinois, and Michigan. About 80 percent of them speak Ukrainian, a Slavic tongue, and youngsters could be heard talking in Slavic sounds around the statue.

Standing beside his Scout-uniformed, 15-year-old son under a glaring sun, Horodyskyj, 45, gave this account of Taras Shevchenko and his meaning to Ukrainian-Americans:

Shevchenko lived from 1814 to 1861 in a time when landlords owned not only large pieces of land, but also their peasants. Shevchenko, though a peasant, was a very able painter, so friends bought him from his landlord and sent him to St. Petersburg in Russia to an art academy, from which he was graduated with a gold medal.

He began writing poems about the hard life of the Ukrainian peasant and political oppression under the czar. For these poems, and for membership in the inter-Slavic Cyrylo-Methodius Brotherhood, Shevchenko was put in the czarist army for 10 years.

Freed, he wrote anti-czarist poems and became one of the first strong voices in his time against the persecution and oppression of his people.

The poems were translated into other Slavic languages and marked Shevchenko as a champion of liberty whose works are still held up as models of the independent spirit.

Parade Causes Traffic Jam: 36,000 Ukrainian-Americans March in Heat to Unveiling of Poet's Statue

A Ukrainian poet, dead a little more than a century now, precipitated here yesterday a traffic jam of dimensions unsurpassed by those attending the occasional visits to this city of live foreign dignitaries.

Some 36,000 Ukrainian-Americans paraded in tribute to the man whose statue they unveiled at 22d and P Streets NW. Non-Ukrainian motorists found themselves hard put to go about their normal vehicular ways during the festivities.

Coping with the various traffic impasses downtown and in the Georgetown area were 700 policemen, a number of whom were themselves casualties in the searing 91-degree midday heat.

One motorist said he required an hour for his usual 15-minute trip; another said he was detoured around the crush, achieving a normal 4-mile drive over an 11-mile route.

But, police reported, the massed march from the Ellipse past the White House to the Taras Shevchenko statue site was accomplished without untoward incident and by midafternoon the traffic situation had dissolved to normal.

At St. Matthew's Cathedral guests arrived for the 10 o'clock wedding of Geneve Suzanne Murnane and Photographer Fred J. Maroon and waited. And waited. The wedding got off 25 minutes late and another wedding that followed was delayed also.

Inspector Charles L. Wright said 100 cars had to be towed away from temporary no-parking zones.

The Ukrainian-Americans came from as far as Michigan. After their long march from the Ellipse to the statue, they broke ranks to look for refreshment.

A restaurant across 22d Street from the statue did a land-office business and stores along P Street also tried to keep up with the unaccustomed rush on beer, soft drinks, ice cream, and sandwiches. One place was reported to be getting $1 a beer.

Down Connecticut Avenue a few blocks from the ceremony, a record shop quickly adjusted to the opportunity by prominently displaying records of Ukrainian music.

At one point enough persons were feeling faint from the heat for police to start calling taxis to carry away the indisposed.

Police Pvt. Charles J. Rusinak was half-dragged and half ran for 150 feet when his arm was caught in a car which he had tried to stop from entering the parade zone. A bus diver then tried to chase the determined driver but lost him.

The 700 policemen were supplied with box lunches of chicken, which this time did not spoil as some had during the civil rights march on Washington last August.

Once yesterday, the police braced for what looked like trouble. After the statue-unveiling ceremony, about 2,000 men started marching again, this time along P Street toward their buses and hotels. They looked determined.

However, they dispersed agreeably when told their parade permit had expired:

Inspector Wright called all of the marchers "a well-behaved group."

Statement by Hon. John Lesinski at the Shevchenko Memorial Banquet on Saturday, June 27, 1964, at 8:30 p.m., in District of Columbia Armory

Ladies and gentlemen, I deeply and sincerely regret that I will not be able to join you in person for this celebration, honoring the great Ukrainian poet and freedom fighter, Taras Shevchenko; but I am with you in spirit.

I was honored and privileged to have been able to play a significant role as the sponsor of the resolution to publish House Document No. 445, 86th Congress which tells of Shevchenko's contributions to the ideals of freedom and democracy. I was also glad to give a helping hand in having enacted the bill which provided for the erection of the Shevchenko statue in Washington which was dedicated this afternoon.

The enemies of freedom in other countries are trying to embrace Shevchenko as their own; but his words and his works stand in direct contradiction to them.

Shevchenko stands as a monument to freedom not only for the Ukrainians who suffer under Communist Russian rule but also to their descendants in this country, and to the people and descendants of all those other captive nations behind the Iron Curtain. Together, we of the various ethnic groups, who know only too well what loss of liberty and freedom can mean, must work against any force that would deprive us of the freedom which we enjoy in this country. Freedom can be lost step by step, so we must all cooperate both at the national and the local levels to protect our individual rights and privileges.

Let us then join hands and strive for a better and a stronger America with all of its blessings and look forward to the day when the people of all nations will be able to share a life of freedom from oppression.

Message From Senator Hugh Scott, Shevchenko Memorial Banquet, June 27, 1964

I am gratified that so many of you are paying tribute to a man who in action and in verse proved himself inextricably bound up with the cause of freedom. The life of Taras Shevchenko has very properly become symbolic of a basic wish in all men—the desire to be their own masters.

As a recipient of the inspiring Shevchenko Memorial Award, I am particularly happy to greet all of you this evening. I also want to extend a special word of appreciation to the President of the Ukrainian Congress Committee—Dr. Lev Dobriansky—whose excellent advice and wise example I have always found rewarding in my work with the committee.

Exhilarating though this occasion may be, we must continue to pray in our hearts for those millions still saddled with philosophies not in their national tradition and governments not of their free choice. We have succeeded in raising a statue to Taras Shevchenko, and I share with all of you a natural sense of accomplishment. But much remains to be done in freedom's behalf, and I know that we will never rest until the chains of all captives are broken and the last enslaving wall crumbles away.

Commemorative Scroll

Be it known to all future generations that on this 27th day of June in the year of our Lord 1964, of the independence of the United States of America the 188th, and of the reestablishment of the independent, united, and sovereign Ukrainian National Republic the 46th,

When the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson was the 36th President of the United States of America,

When the Most Reverend Ambrose Senyshyn, O.S.B.M., was archbishop-metropolitan of the Ukrainian Catholic Church in the United States,

When the Most Reverend Ioan Theodorovich was archbishop-metropolitan of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church in the United States,

When Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky was president of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America,

When Dr. Roman Smal-Stocki was president of the Shevchenko Scientific Society,

When Dr. Alexander Archimovich was president of the Ukrainian Academy of Art and Sciences in the United States,

When all freedom-loving peoples, led by the United States of America, having defeated the imperialist and genocidal forces of nazism and fascism, were engaged in a bitter cold war, pursued relentlessly in spite of temporary periods of seeming relaxation, against an equally evil and menacing threat of Russo-Communist imperialism,

On this day the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, 34th President of the United States of America, unveiled this monument in honor of Taras Shevchenko, the bard of Ukraine and universal champion of freedom, on the 150th anniversary of his birth, in the presence of a solemn gathering of thousands of people, including representatives of the American political, civic, and cultural life, representatives of Ukrainian central and national organizations from many countries of the free world.

This monument is dedicated to all nations and peoples who, like the Ukrainian people, are engaged in a relentless and uncompromising struggle against Russian communism and all other forms of tyranny and despotism and who are constantly striving toward the attainment of the highest ideals propounded by Taras Shevchenko—liberty and national independence with freedom and justice for all.

This monument was authorized by U.S. Public Law 86–749, passed by the 86th Congress and signed by Dwight D. Eisenhower, 34th President of the United States of America, on the 13th day of September 1960.

This monument, created by Sculptor Molodozhanyn, was erected with funds donated by over 50,000 American citizens, mostly of Ukrainian origin and descent, and the implementation of the law authorizing the erection was carried out by the special Shevchenko Memorial Committee of America, representing 2 million Ukrainian Americans.

Given on this 27th day of June, in the year of our Lord 1964 and the 150th anniversary year of the birth of Taras Shevchenko, in Washington, D.C., the National Capital of the United States of America.

In witness thereof, we, the undersigned members of the executive board of the Shevchenko Memorial Committee of America hereunder affix our signatures to this scroll prior to its encasement in the base of the monument.

Biography of Leo Mol, Sculptor for the Shevchenko Memorial

Mr. Leo Mol, sculptor for the Taras Shevchenko memorial in Washington, D.C., was born in Ukraine in 1915, and studied modeling in Vienna, in Berlin, and at the Academy of Fine Arts at The Hague. He has lived in Winnipeg, Canada, since 1948.

Mr. Mol has exhibited his sculpture with the Royal Canadian Academy, the Montreal Museum of Fine Arts, the Hamilton Gallery, and the Toronto Art Gallery. He is a vice president of the Sculptors Society of Canada and a past president of the Manitoba Society of Artists. In 1960, Mr. Mol received a gold medal from the Canadian Society of Architects for his achievement in sculpture and stained glass.

Mr. Mol works in clay, plastics, stone, concrete, sheet and cut bronze, wrought iron, and welded steel. He also has done work in stained glass and in oils. His works are found in permanent collections of Hamilton, Toronto and Winnipeg Art Galleries and in numerous private collections throughout Canada and the United States.

Physical Details of the Taras Shevchenko Memorial Statue, Washington, D.C.

Total height, 24 feet.

Polished granite base for the figure of Shevchenko, height, 7 feet; width, 4½ feet; thickness, 4½ feet; weight, 12 tons.

Bronze figure of Shevchenko (three times life size), height, 14 feet; weight, 3 tons.

"Prometheus" unit (concave granite wall), height, 10 feet; width, 13 feet; thickness, 2 feet; weight, 30 tons.

The bronze figure of Shevchenko was cast at Bedy & Rassy Art Foundry, 229–31 India Street, Greenpoint, Brooklyn, N.Y.

The granite base and "Prometheus" wall is from Jones Brothers Co., Barre, Vt.

Light gray granite from Barre, Vt., is used for the memorial, including polished park benches and the granite for the fountain.

Inscription on Shevchenko Monument in Washington—Dedicated to the Liberation, Freedom and Independence of All Captive Nations

(Submitted by L. S. Dobriansky)

This monument of Taras Shevchenko, 19th-century Ukrainian poet and fighter for the independence of Ukraine and the freedom of all mankind, who under foreign Russian imperialist tyranny and colonial rule appealed for "the new and righteous law of Washington," was unveiled on June 27, 1964. This historic event commemorated the 150th anniversary of Shevchenko's birth.

The memorial was authorized by the 86th Congress of the United States of America on August 31, 1960, and signed into Public Law 86–749 by Dwight D. Eisenhower, the 34th President of the United States of America, on September 13, 1960. This statue was erected by Americans of Ukrainian ancestry and friends.

APPORTIONMENT OF STATE LEGISLATURES—EDITORIAL COMMENT CONCERNING U.S. SUPREME COURT DECISION

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I spoke in support of House Joint Resolution 1100. I introduced this resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to permit a State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population. With many others, it is my hope that before we adjourn this year, my resolution—or one similar to it—will be approved by this House.

Many thoughtful citizens share my concern that the recent decision of the U.S. Supreme Court requiring that both houses of a State legislature be apportioned on the basis of population was not wise. Many thoughtful and concerned citizens feel that the decision represents an unnecessary and unwarranted invasion of the rights of the several States to conduct their own affairs—within the framework of the U.S. Constitution.

The Keene Evening Sentinel, published in Keene, N.H., in my congressional district, comments on the recent Supreme Court decision in a recent editorial. I commend to my colleagues' attention the measured and perceptive observation of this editorial. The criticism expressed in this editorial is powerful and persuasive. It is especially so because of the fact that this excellent, independent paper has forcefully defended the U.S. Supreme Court in connection with some of its recent controversial rulings. I include at this point in the RECORD the editorial to which I refer:

Unwise Intervention

As we have made clear on a number of occasions, we believe seats in both houses of the New Hampshire Legislature should be apportioned on the basis of population.

But we do not believe it is either healthy or wise for this result to be achieved at the direction of the U.S. Supreme Court—which is now, apparently, about to happen.

A majority of the Court, with vigorous dissents by three Justices, has in effect ruled that in every State seats in both legislative houses must be apportioned strictly on the basis of population.

Since the Court has thus adopted the same principle that we, as a newspaper, have urged, why do we think the Court's decision is so unfortunate?

The reason is very simple: We feel it represents an unnecessary and unwarranted invasion of the rights of the several States and, to a degree, the rights of the Nation's voters.

Basically, the Court's majority argued that unless every citizen's vote for a State representative and State senator is given weight equal to the vote of every other citizen, then some citizens have been denied "equal protection of the laws," contrary to the 14th amendment to the Constitution.

Presumably the same principle would apply to all local selections, and thus the Court's ruling, if it stands, would require that representation in every law-making body in the land be determined strictly according to population.

We shall leave to others arguments about the fine points of the law and turn, instead to what Walter Lippmann in his Monday column on this page said was the "crucial question."

"It is," he said, "whether the United States (courts) should intervene" in cases of apportionment, especially of State legislatures.

Lippman believes the Court should intervene in this situation, or in any others, "where there is a major ill for which there is no other remedy" except Federal Court intervention.

Regardless of whether Lippmann is right in this premise, we think it can be argued that in most States there are other remedies available to correct the injustices of unequal legislative apportionment.

He points out, correctly, that in many States (and New Hampshire is one of them) legislative seats have been apportioned so as to favor a minority of rural voters over a majority of urban voters. This is, we agree, unjust and is a major ill.

But we believe that, in New Hampshire and elsewhere, it can be corrected when and if a majority of voters become sufficiently aroused to insist through constitutional amendment or legislative action that the injustice be remedied. This might take a long time in a given State, but if the partially disenfranchised majority cared enough, we feel sure it could find ways to make its views prevail.

The recent New Hampshire constitutional convention had an opportunity to direct that both houses of the legislature be apportioned on a population basis. But it did so only with respect to the senate. It refused to change the apportionment of the house—and in this action rural delegates were aided and abetted by a number of urban delegates.

Under these circumstances, it seems quite clear that a legal method of reapportioning both houses was available, and that it simply wasn't used.

But beyond all this, there is another cause for grave concern in the Court's decision. Ever since the founding of the Republic, the States and their people have been left free to decide for themselves how to apportion their State and local legislative bodies.

Undeniably, many of them have done so in weird ways; but many of them, too, have changed their ways over the years in response to popular pressure.

We cannot understand why, suddenly, the Supreme Court has decided it—and it alone—must determine precisely how all such bodies must be apportioned.

Though we have been sympathetic with many of the Court's controversial rulings in recent years, especially those dealing with individual rights, we find ourselves in complete disagreement with the wisdom of the apportionment ruling, even though we believe wholeheartedly in the principle it enunciates: one man, one vote.

However, unless and until it is modified, it is the law of the land and should be observed as such. The New Hampshire constitutional convention is being reconvened in this spirit.

DROP IN FARM PARITY PROGRESS IN REVERSE

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. Berry] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, the 1-percent drop in farm parity income reported by the Department of Agriculture yesterday shows more progress in reverse for the farmer and from all indications this progress will be remaining in reverse.

The parity ratio, as all Members of Congress know, shows the relationship between prices received and prices paid by the farmer and they fell to a 25-year low of 74 percent of parity last month.

When Secretary Freeman took office the parity ratio was 81 percent. Since then it has dropped each year and according to the July 1 report of the Department of Agriculture it hit the lowest point since August 1939.

For wheat farmers, Mr. Speaker, the news is even worse. The same Department announced wheat prices at only 56 percent of parity.

It should be pointed out that nothing is being attempted and nothing is being done to improve this situation. The President has threatened to veto a bill even if passed by Congress which would limit beef imports, and the administration forced through Congress a bill which would reduce the support price on wheat from $2 to $1.72 a bushel, and the $1.72 includes diversion payment. It seems the Department of Agriculture and the administration are fighting to reduce farm income.

VOTE AGAINST THE CIVIL RIGHTS BILL

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Bob Wilson] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I am voting against the civil rights bill today. In my 12 years in Congress, I have voted for every civil rights measure brought to the floor, but I cannot support the final version.

Earlier this year, I voted with the majority of our colleagues to send the civil rights bill to the Senate in the belief that the Senate would be able to modify the most troublesome sections, including public accommodations. I had supported proposed amendments in the House that would improve this bill and which would be more apt to solve rather than compound the racial tensions that have built up because of the very real deprivation of the rights of Negroes.

Rather than improve the bill and make it more workable, the Senate added over 80 amendments that further compound and restrict orderly enforcement of the bill. For example, the Senate amendments in substance increase the powers of the Attorney General, who is a political appointee, not necessarily responsive to the people.

The Senate version is being brought out today under a gag rule that prohibits any opportunity to debate or modify the Senate's additional provisions.

Under these circumstances, I must reluctantly vote against the measure.

RESOLUTION BY THE FISH AND CANNERY WORKERS

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Bob Wilson] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert into the Record at this time a resolution adopted by the fish and cannery workers special legislative conference held by the Seafarers International Union of North America.

I introduce this resolution to emphasize to my colleagues the importance of the fisheries industry to this Nation. As more is learned about the sea, harvest of its fish food resources will increase.

The resolution asks that the well-being of the American worker be considered when decisions are made, when treaties are talked, when actions are taken that could affect American fisheries. The fisheries workers want a voice in consideration of fisheries agreements. I introduced legislation which Congress has passed to protect our own fishermen within the 3-mile limit. The pressure of foreign fisheries is increasing. Huge trawlers lurk off our shores. We in Congress, and those in the executive branch, owe it to the fisheries industry and its workers, to see that their rights to harvest seafood resources off our shores are protected and that no nation be allowed to arbitrarily foreclose them from the open seas beyond traditional limits due each sovereign country.

Text of the resolution is as follows:

Resolution of Fish and Cannery Workers Special Legislative Conference, Seafarers International Union of North America, June 23, 1964

Whereas:

1. The world fishery is a vastly expanding industry as to activity, number of nations engaged, and scientific development; and

2. United States consumption of fishery products has more than doubled in recent years and will continue to increase; but

3. United States import of fishery products has increased 900 percent in quantity (over 4½ billion pounds in 1962) and 1,000 percent in value since 1940; but

4. U.S. production has remained static, and U.S. fishing fleet and employment in the industry has drastically declined; and

5. Increasing consumption of fishery products in the United States has benefited only foreign fisheries at the expense of American workmen and their employers; and

6. Executive and administrative action of the various departments of the executive branch of the U.S. Government could do much to alleviate this distressing situation and reverse this disastrous trend; and

7. Workmen in the industry have not been adequately represented in the policymaking processes of the executive department of the United States Government: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this conference adopt as policy, and attempt to prevail upon the President of the United States to adopt as policy the following:

In all actions of the executive department, and all its branches, special attention and care shall be given that no action shall be taken which is detrimental to the American fishing industry, especially to those actions which are detrimental to American fisheries to the benefit of foreign fisheries, and that every effort shall be made wherever possible in administration and executive actions to foster, expand, and improve American fisheries, and that representatives of those employed in the industry should be adequately represented in all decision-making processes wherein consultation with the industry is indulged.

RETIREMENT OF DR. JAMES H. WAKELIN

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Bob Wilson] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the June 30 retirement of a distinguished American, Dr. James H. Wakelin, as Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Research and Development.

Dr. Wakelin was appointed by former President Dwight D. Eisenhower on July 8, 1959. His career has been characterized by dedication to public service and leadership in industrial research. He has participated in many of the scientific breakthroughs which have helped keep our Navy tops in tactical facilities.

Dr. Wakelin attended Cambridge, England University, and Yale. He worked for the B. F. Goodrich Co. in the early 1940's, then became ordnance staff officer to the Coordinator of Research and Development of the Navy Department from 1943 to 1945. As a lieutenant commander, U.S. Navy Reserves, he was head of the chemistry, mathematics, and mechanics and materials sections of the Planning Division, Office of Research and Inventions. Following World War II, Dr. Wakelin joined a group of former Navy research scientists in the establishment of Engineering Research Associates, Inc., of Washington, D.C. After serving as director of research for Princeton University for 3 years from 1951 to 1954, Dr. Wakelin established his own consulting business, where he served several industries and was instrumental in founding Chesapeake Instrument Corp., of Shadyside, Md.

Dr. Wakelin is an example of the restless, creative mind which has helped the United States advance scientifically into world leadership. His was the blending of the discoverer with the producer. He is a coauthor with C. B. Tompkins and W. W. Stifler, Jr., of "High-Speed Computing Devices," published in 1950.

I know that I join my colleagues in wishing Dr. Wakelin many happy, productive years of well-earned retirement.

May I express my appreciation on behalf of our fellow citizens for the extraordinary record of achievement and public service compiled by Dr. Wakelin during the past three decades.

SECRETARY OF COMMERCE'S POWER OF DESIGNATION IN ARA

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Talcott] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, the Area Redevelopment Administration law is so broadly drawn that it makes the Secretary of Commerce—or the ARA Administrator—a veritable satrap or czar when it comes to designating areas for eligibility. Last July Under Secretary of Commerce Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., told the House that the Administrator already had the authority to group contiguous counties which were not hard up with counties which were. This was so that special, particular counties could be tied into a single neat redevelopment area. The ARA calls this "rounding out" an economic area. The truth of the matter is, however, that after the ARA got through with its first frenzy of designation, it turned out that some counties failed to qualify even under the loose criteria ARA was using. This put some Congressmen, who had voted for the legislation and promised their constituents lavish benefits, "on the spot." So, the new "rounding out" technique was concocted. Under this scheme, the ARA claimed the right to "depress" a county, or series of counties, if it touched counties already eligible under the rationale that the group of counties constitute a single economic unit and ARA assistance to a "rounded out" county would benefit the unemployment and underemployment in the contiguous areas. By this scheme, 24 more counties were added to the dole.

But, like the little boy with jam on his face and a guilty conscience, ARA went back to Congress and asked the legislation to give it authority which it claimed it already had. The change in the law, said F.D.R. Jr., "merely makes more explicit the authority and discretion the Administrator already has." For once, thank heaven, Congress had the courage and foresight to say "No." But the ARA still carries those 24 counties on the dole.

Congress should investigate these techniques before it permits the Area Redevelopment Administration to continue.

CALIFORNIA FARMERS ARE TRYING DESPERATELY TO FIND SUBSTITUTE FOR BRACERO PROGRAM

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Talcott] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, ever since Congress served notice upon the fresh fruit and row-crop vegetable growers that they could not supplement the domestic farm labor supply with braceros, the farmers in my district in California have been trying every idea ever proposed. In order to prevent wholesale spoilage of crops, in order to provide jobs for workers in allied industries, in order to save their businesses and land, the farmers are experimenting and testing every conceivable proposal.

I want to share these various experiments with Members, so they can better evaluate the comparative values of the bracero program.

The Garin Co., at great cost and expense, and after much planning and preparation, recruited 46 experienced field workers from Mississippi and transported them all the way to the Salinas Valley of California.

High school students from San Francisco are being employed to pick strawberries by the Merrill Farms Co. near Salinas. Puerto Ricans have been contracted by the Santa Maria Association. Texas Mexicans have been recruited by the Yuma (Ariz.) Association.

The Carl Maggio Co., of King City, Calif., is working directly with and at the direction of the California State Department of Employment to obtain domestics. This company was willing to contract for 350 year-round workers at $1.12 per hour, plus fringe benefits.

The Farmers Cooperative, of Salinas—Ted Gottlieb, president—has attempted to use "green carders"—legally admitted Mexican nationals.

Mexican nationals earn $1.50, and more, per hour during the harvest seasons. Other workers could earn more. Living conditions are as good as any. Working conditions are unsurpassed. In spite of these favorable conditions, the experiments are not progressing well. As the results are documented, I shall make them available to Congress so that Members can know better how to solve the farm laborers' plight.

UNITED STATES REJECTS $4 MILLION GRANT FOR FOURTH STADIUM IN PHILADELPHIA—HOUSE SPECIAL HOUSING SUBCOMMITTEE URGED TO TAKE NOTE OF HISTORIC DEVELOPMENT

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Widnall] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, one of the most unfortunate developments in the Federal urban renewal program has been the stretching of the intent of the Congress past the breaking point. Local officials, encouraged by Federal Urban Renewal Administration decisions in the recent past, have tried to shove every conceivable project under the urban renewal tent. I have been calling attention to this fact for some time now, and I am happy to report that, at least in one case, the intent of the Congress is being observed.

Plans to use $4 million of Federal urban renewal funds to build a fourth sports stadium in Philadelphia over the Pennsylvania Railroad tracks has been rejected by the Federal Urban Renewal Commissioner. The rejection was based on the very logical and reasonable grounds that the air space over a thriving freight yard can hardly be called a blighted slum area. This rejection followed by 1 week my own condemnation on June 22 of the proposed grant of Federal funds—Congressional Record, June 22, 1964, pages 14669–14671.

It is my hope that this decision by the Federal Urban Renewal Commissioner will be read by other regional directors of the Federal Urban Renewal Administration and reread many times in the future by Federal URA Commissioner William L. Slayton. If this is done conscientiously we may hope to return to the original intent of the national housing policy and of the Housing Act of 1949, which was to provide decent, safe, and sanitary housing for people, not to provide it for athletic teams and stock exchanges.

I have in the past called attention to the pioneering work being done by Philadelphia in the housing code enforcement area—daily Congressional Record, June 15, 1964, page A3218—and I hope that Philadelphia will continue its leadership in the housing and urban renewal field not only as it relates to the enforcement of housing codes but in reforming and humanizing the Federal urban renewal program.

One final note: I would like to call the attention of my Democratic colleagues on the House Special Housing Subcommittee to the fact that the rejection of this stadium project in Philadelphia was made after Federal URA Commissioner Slayton made a personal investigation of it in the field. I would suggest that the House Special Housing Subcommittee could become equally well informed on a national basis through the same techniques of personal investigation. This would be the logical, and, in fact, it is the only way of preventing further mistakes in solving the problems present in the housing field when we act on the extension of the housing and urban renewal laws.

I include as part of my remarks several newspaper articles which shed further light on the action by the Federal Government in rejecting the application by the city of Philadelphia for a $4 million Federal urban renewal grant to help finance a local sports stadium:

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Inquirer, June 29, 1964]

U.S. Ruling Bars Aid to Stadium

(By C. Allen Keith)

An informal application for $4 million in Federal and city funds to purchase the air rights for the proposed 60,000-seat stadium over the Pennsylvania Railroad tracks at

30th and Arch Streets was turned down Tuesday by the Urban Renewal Administration.

URA Commissioner William L. Slayton said he was forced to refuse the subsidy on the ground that "it is clear that the rail yard area does not meet the requirements of law."

His announcement was released through Jason R. Nason, regional URA director here. Slayton's decision, which was not unexpected, came just 7 days after he inspected the west Philadelphia site.

TATE STILL HOPEFUL

Mayor James H. J. Tate, while expressing "disappointment in the ruling," said the program would go forward without U.S. aid.

David C. Bevan, PRR's chairman of finance, said "we cannot comment on the Urban Renewal Administration ruling until we have an opportunity to examine the details of the announcement and confer with our urban renewal consultants and city officials."

At the same time, the Philadelphia Real Estate Board voted to go on record as favoring the 30th and Arch Streets site, and said "failure to carry through on this proposal can only do harm to present plans and the actual future redevelopment of center city."

Slayton's rejection of the stadium project was the second setback Mayor Tate has received within a week. Last Thursday Jerry Wolman, owner of the Philadelphia Eagles and Connie Mack Stadium, announced he would not become a tenant at the new stadium.

ASKS PUBLIC OWNERSHIP

Wolman said the stadium should be publicly owned.

Mayor Tate, angered by Wolman's refusal to have the Eagles play at the new stadium, offered to buy the Mack Stadium from Wolman for 50 cents. Wolman had previously offered to sell Mack Stadium to the city for that sum, provided the city would redevelop the 21st Street and Lehigh Avenue property as a modern stadium with adequate parking.

In rejecting the application for URA funds for the stadium project, Slayton said his "decision is certainly no reflection on the urban renewal program being carried out by the city of Philadelphia, which we consider one of the finest in the Nation."

DICTATED BY LAW

"Rather, it is a decision dictated by the terms and the purpose of the Housing Act passed by the Congress," Slayton said. "The only question we have before us is the legal eligibility of the proposal under the Housing Act. No other aspect of the stadium proposal is involved in any way.

"The law states that Federal urban renewal funds shall be used for assisting cities to eliminate 'blighted areas.' It is not possible to interpret these words in any reasonable way as applicable to the rail yards adjacent 30th Street Station.

AREA NOT ELIGIBLE

"This area is one which does not contain 'slum or blighted structures,' " Slayton continued. "On the contrary it is an area which is in active, heavy use by a thriving, well-managed industry, and it will continue to be used.

"To find that this area is 'blighted' would not be in keeping with the law passed by Congress. If we considered this to be a blighted area, then we must inevitably conclude that virtually every sizable railroad area in the Nation is also eligible as an urban renewal project. This is clearly not what Congress intended."

If the URA had approved the project, the Federal Government would have contributed $2.7 million and the city $1.3 million toward the purchase of the air rights from the railroad.

TOTAL COST $25 MILLION

The city would be required to put up an additional $6 million for service streets. The total cost in construction has been estimated at $25 million, $13 million of which would be financed by Stadium Corp., comprised of the railroad, Madison Square Garden Corp., and McCloskey & Co., building contractors.

Mayor Tate, in commenting on Slayton's rejection, which is considered final, said:

"Naturally, I am disappointed in the ruling but it should not discourage us from following through on our parallel proposal for building the stadium without Federal funds. This will evidently satisfy the dissenters who are concerned over the use of Federal money for this purpose.

"The importance of building this modern sports stadium is unquestioned," Mayor Tate added. "However, we will continue our negotiations with the Pennsylvania Railroad and the Madison Square Garden Corp."

The mayor said he thought the new stadium could be supported by the Phillies alone, although he welcomed the Eagles as tenants.

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Evening Bulletin, June 30, 1964]

United States Rejects $4 Million Grant for Stadium—Renewal Unit Decrees Site Is Not Slum—City Sought Aid for Project at 30th and Arch Streets

The Federal Government today rejected the city's application for a $4 million urban renewal grant to help finance the proposed stadium on stilts over the Pennsylvania Railroad tracks at 30th and Arch Streets.

The rejection was announced here by Jason R. Nathan, regional director of the Urban Renewal Administration, on behalf of William L. Slayton, URA Commissioner. Slayton inspected the proposed site last Tuesday.

The URA decision was the second setback in less than a week for the stadium project.

Last Thursday, Jerry Wolman, owner of the football Eagles, said his team wouldn't play in the proposed stadium under arrangements presented to him thus far. At the same time, George Harrison, treasurer of the baseball Phillies, said the terms offered were "very stiff" and must be negotiated further.

NOT QUALIFIED

Nathan said the rail yard area could not qualify either as a blighted or as a slum area under the Federal urban renewal law.

"As far as the Urban Renewal Administration is concerned, this matter is a closed book," Nathan said. "The decision is final."

Mayor Tate said he was disappointed but not discouraged by the ruling and that he will continue to push for the 60,000-seat stadium estimated to cost $25 million.

"This program will go forward," he said.

Nathan, in explanation of the turndown, said that the only question involved was whether "this was a blighted or slum area."

The city, he recalled, has described the area as a "blighting influence" on the surrounding area.

"An application must stand or fall on its own merit, without consideration to the contiguous area," Nathan said.

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Evening Bulletin, June 30, 1964]

Mayor Says He'll Press for Stadium

Mayor Tate said this afternoon the city will continue to press for a sport stadium at 30th and Arch Streets despite loss of a $4 million Federal grant to help finance it.

He said that he had not seen the Urban Renewal Administration's ruling but that he understands it is based on legal grounds, not on the merits of the project.

"Naturally, I am disappointed in the ruling," he said. "But it should not discourage us from following through on our parallel plan for building a stadium without Federal funds.

"Needless to say, this program will go forward on this basis," he said.

SIXTY THOUSAND SEATS

The mayor observed that the rejection evidently will satisfy dissenters who objected to use of Federal money for the proposed $25 million, 60,000-seat stadium-on-stilts over the Pennsylvania Railroad tracks.

"The importance of building this modern sports stadium is unquestioned, however, and we will continue our negotiations with the PRR and the Madison Square Garden Corp.," he continued.

"The prospects are still excellent to develop the 30th Street area in the same manner as the Penn Center was developed through the last decade. The proposed stadium would spark an entire development program of this type.

SPARK RENAISSANCE

"Such forward-looking plans have sparked the city's renaissance—and we must continually look to the future."

Tate expressed his appreciation to the URA and its commissioner, William L. Slayton, for the attention they gave the stadium proposal.

"We can note with pride their recognition of the outstanding urban renewal program that keeps Philadelphia in the forefront of progress," he said.

[From the Evening Bulletin, Philadelphia, Pa., July 1, 1964]

Rejection Likely To Speed Stadium, McCloskey Says

(By John F. Morrison)

Thomas D. McCloskey, president of McCloskey & Co., said today that rejection of the city's request for a $4-million urban renewal grant to help finance the proposed sports stadium might prove to be a blessing in disguise.

"It may actually speed up construction of the stadium," said McCloskey, whose construction company is a partner in the project.

McCloskey said the way is now cleared for Mayor Tate's proposal of earlier last month that the stadium be built through the redevelopment authority—without Federal funds.

MOVE A LOT QUICKER

"The redevelopment authority will move a lot quicker than the Federal Government," McCloskey said.

"But," he said, "the Federal application had to be made and acted on before other steps could be taken."

Awaiting a decision by the Urban Renewal Administration has kept the project largely in abeyance since last fall.

McCloskey & Co. is in partnership with the Pennsylvania Railroad and Madison Square Garden Corp., of New York City, in the plan to build a stadium on stilts over the Pennsy's tracks at 30th and Arch Streets.

Ned Irish, president of Madison Square Garden, refused to comment on the rejection.

DETAILS OF TATE PLAN

Mayor Tate's finance plan called for the redevelopment authority to put $16 million in bonds and for the Pennsy and its partners to put up $13 million.

Of the $16 million, $4 million would be used to buy air rights over the tracks from the Pennsy. This was to have been the purpose of the $4 million Federal grant.

The redevelopment authority would own the stadium, under Tate's plan, and the bonds would be retired by rentals.

The rejection of the urban renewal grant was announced here yesterday by Jason R. Nathan, regional URA director, on behalf of William L. Slayton, URA Commissioner.

DECISION IS FINAL

Nathan said the rail yard area could not qualify either as a blighted or as a slum area under the Federal urban renewal law.

"As far as the Urban Renewal Administration is concerned, this matter is a closed book," Nathan said. "The decision is final."

Nathan said the only question was whether this was a blighted or slum area.

The city, he recalled had described the area as a blighting influence on the surrounding redevelopment areas.

"An application must stand or fall on its own merit without consideration to the contiguous area," Nathan said.

NO BLIGHTED BUILDINGS

"The law states that Federal urban renewal funds shall be used for assisting cities to eliminate 'blighted areas.'

"It is not possible to interpret these words in any reasonable way as applicable to the rail yard adjacent to the 30th Street Station.

"This area is one which does not contain slum or blighted structures which will be eliminated. On the contrary, it is an area which is in active, heavy use by a thriving, well-managed industry, and it will continue to be so used."

Tate said he was disappointed but not discouraged by the ruling and that he will continue to push for the stadium.

"This program will go forward," Tate added.

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Daily News, June 29, 1964]

Pennsylvania Railroad To Revise Stadium Terms, Wolman To Listen

(By Lou Schienfeld)

The Pennsylvania Railroad is willing to meet Jerry Wolman across the bargaining table—and Wolman is willing to listen. So, maybe the $25 million stadium on stilts at 30th Street still has a prop or two to stand on.

Pennsylvania Railroad officials aren't about to forget the whole project just because the young Eagles' owner walked out on their take-it-or-leave-it terms.

The word is that Pennsylvania Railroad Financial Chief David C. Bevan and Ned Irish, the Madison Square Garden Corp. president, will ease their stiff terms and come up with a lease that won't double over Wolman with laughter.

The rejected terms confused Wolman. He couldn't figure whether Irish wanted to be one of his landlords or his partner.

It's no secret that Irish's manner caused the Eagles to make up their minds in a hurry. One high Eagles' aid said that if Irish had handled things less brusquely, the team would have been willing to sit down and seek a compromise.

Terms dictated by the developers, Pennsylvania Railroad, McCloskey & Co., and the Garden, reportedly included a whopping 20 percent of box office admissions, control of parking, and a cut of concessions.

There would be no charge, of course, for air to fill the pigskins.

Anyway, Wolman can just sit back and wait for the phone to jangle.

He may not have to wait long.

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Evening Bulletin, June 23, 1964]

Early Opinion Due on Grant for Stadium—Renewal Head Tours Pennsylvania Railroad Site and Talks With City Officials

William L. Slayton, head of the Urban Renewal Administration, said yesterday that there is legal precedent for Federal grants for air rights in renewal projects.

But Slayton said the precedent is in cases where more than air rights was involved.

He said, however, there is nothing to preclude payments for such air rights, and that the requirement is to prove it a deteriorating or deteriorated area.

OPINION DUE IN 2 WEEKS

Slayton came here from Washington at the city's request to give an informal opinion on whether the proposed stadium site over the Pennsylvania Railroad tracks at 30th and Arch Streets could be called blighted.

The Administrator said he expected to decide within 2 weeks.

Slayton was careful to point out that if the proposed 17-acre stadium area is declared blighted, the entire 85-acre railroad yard would have to be considered blighted. He said the city wants to know if the entire 85 acres is eligible for redevelopment grants.

The city proposes to buy air rights over the tracks from the railroad for $4 million, then built the stadium on stilts over the tracks.

If Slayton rules informally that the area is blighted, the city will follow with a formal application for a renewal grant.

ANOTHER POSSIBILITY

The Administrator also said the city advanced the possibility of making the proposed stadium site part of the University of Pennsylvania redevelopment project.

Slayton began his tour here at Mayor Tate's office where he looked over at Pennsylvania Railroad's model for redevelopment of the entire 85-acre track site.

The model consisted of a number of office buildings and an arena on stilts over the tracks.

Slayton referred to the model as "a rather exciting project" with many good points.

The Administrator then toured the area. Later, he attended a conference at the redevelopment authority's offices at Broad and Walnut Streets with city, authority, and Pennsylvania Railroad officials.

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Evening Bulletin, June 23, 1964]

Jersey Legislator Opposes Stadium Aid

WASHINGTON, June 23.—Representative WILLIAM B. WIDNALL, Republican, of New Jersey, said yesterday that Federal urban renewal funds should not be given to Philadelphia for construction of a sports stadium.

WIDNALL said the stadium should be "a function of private enterprise since the probable users will be highly profitable athletic teams."

The north Jersey Republican, ranking minority member of the House Housing Subcommittee, said that if Federal funds are approved for the stadium, he will demand an investigation.

He said that "millions of Americans have a desperate need of good housing." Philadelphia already has three sports stadiums, WIDNALL pointed out.

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Inquirer, June 23, 1964]

United States Near Decision on Stadium OK—Renewal Chief Promises Action Within 2 Weeks

(By Daniel Langan)

William L. Slayton, Federal Urban Renewal Administrator, said Monday he would decide within the next 2 weeks whether a plan to build a stadium atop the Pennsylvania Railroad tracks at 30th and Arch Streets would qualify for Federal aid.

Slayton made the statement after a 3-hour visit here, during which he conferred with Mayor James H. J. Tate, toured an 84-acre west Philadelphia redevelopment area and heard a 1-hour "pitch" by top railroad officials, concerning the proposed stadium.

UNIVERSITY PROJECTS

Slayton said the entire acreage, which includes the university 4 and 5 projects the city wants redeveloped, will be approved or rejected by his Department "maybe in a week or two."

During his meeting with Tate and other city officials at the mayor's reception room, Slayton declared Federal urban renewal payments for "air rights" in renewal projects are possible.

Viewing a table-top model of the west Philadelphia stadium projects, Slayton said it also would be possible under urban renewal laws for redevelopment authorities to own or lease stadiums.

STADIUM OWNER

Under the Philadelphia proposal for the stadium, the redevelopment authority would own the stadium and lease it to the Pennsylvania Railroad and its associates.

The proposal by the city seeks to have the Federal Government put up the $4 million to pay for the "air rights" over the Pennsylvania Railroad tracks at the site.

The stadium would occupy 17 of the 84 acres for development in the project. Mayor Tate has proposed a $16 million bond issue to help finance the 60,000-seat arena.

Following the conference with Tate, Slayton toured Society Hill, which he called "a quite exciting development," and the proposed stadium site and West Philadelphia projects.

Then he went to the Urban Renewal Authority office, where he met with Pennsylvania Railroad treasurer William R. Gerstnecker; David C. Brown, chairman of the railroad's finance committee; Fred N. Sass, economic analysis department manager, and several legal, architectural, and engineering consultants.

OFFICIAL SEES SLIDES

Slayton was shown filmslides as the Pennsy officials explained their plans for the stadium.

After the conference he said, "I got their pitch, you might say." He and the railroad officials were noncommittal, but the Administrator said his decision would be forthcoming within 2 weeks.

He then said the purpose of his trip here from Washington was "to determine the eligibility" of the proposed project for "air rights" payments.

"The basic question," he said, "is whether this project meets the criteria for redevelopment funds under Federal and State laws."

CITES PRECEDENT

He said also there is a "precedent" for Federal payments for "air rights." But, he added, "air right" payments would not be made solely because railroad tracks might be called a slum or blighted area.

The local plan calls for having the tracks declared a slum area in order to clear eligibility for the Federal money.

At city hall, Tate said the city must show good faith in the railroad because it had done a good job in the development of Penn Center.

Slayton pointed out that no Federal urban renewal funds were involved in the Penn Center project.

Also present at the conference with Slayton were Managing Director Fred T. Corleto, City Finance Director Edward J. Martin, City Representative Fredric R. Mann and City Development Coordinator John Shea.

Meanwhile, in Washington, Representative WILLIAM B. WIDNALL, Republican, of New Jersey, delivered another slashing attack on the stadium as an unjustified diversion of urban renewal funds.

WIDNALL blasted the stadium proposal again, saying Congress never intended the urban renewal program to be used "to provide new homes for profitable ball clubs."

He said Philadelphia already has three stadiums and asked what "possible connection does such a project have with the national housing policy?"

JANE JACOBS' WHITE HOUSE SPEECH ON THE NEEDS OF OUR CITIES

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, on June 16 Mrs. Robert H. Jacobs, Jr., famous author of "The Death and Life of Great American Cities," was guest speaker at Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson's fifth monthly Women Doers luncheon at the White House. President Johnson dropped by to shake hands with each of the guests and to "give a special greeting" to Mrs. Jacobs, according to a report in the Washington (D.C.) Post of June 17, 1964.

Mrs. Jacobs said, according to the Washington Post, that the Federal-aid urban renewal programs which shunt poor people and Negroes out of their accustomed neighborhoods "are cause for worry."

I was much interested in this talk by Jane Jacobs, which she was kind enough to send me. I believe this Congress should carefully consider what she has to say in light of the new substantive programs being proposed by this administration for our cities.

One of the main points of Mrs. Jacobs' significant speech, which has not received the attention and study it deserves, is that "a great unbalance has developed in cities between money for building things and money for running things."

The explanation given by Mrs. Jacobs is that there is money available for capital grants to build new parks and new buildings and new highways, but the cities do not have the financial resources to maintain and improve existing facilities. Federal grants which encourage making capital outlays often result, says Mrs. Jacobs, in "capital expenditures that are unnecessary and even inane."

I wonder if the much heralded open space program, for example, does not help to starve existing parks and recreational areas. When I see city after city competing for ever more urban renewal funds to start new projects when old ones lie incompleted and housing codes lie unenforced I am forced to the conclusion that we in Congress have not been fully aware of the true needs of our urban centers. As Mrs. Jacobs puts it:

> Already, it has become easier for cities to let things disintegrate awaiting a big capital expenditure of some kind, and at that point sweep away the good with the bad, the beautiful with the ugly, and the productive with the unproductive. We see the paradox of cities actually impoverishing themselves by capital improvements. This unbalance is approaching a point of economic and social crisis.

I believe that we in Congress, as well as the administration, must bear the responsibility for much of the unbalance which Mrs. Jacobs complains of. Congress as well as the administration, therefore, has a responsibility to explore the problems created by this unbalance and seek a solution in cooperation with State and local governments.

I am pleased to include a letter from Mrs. Jacobs and the text of her White House speech for the consideration of my colleagues in the Congress:

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
June 29, 1964.

Congressman WILLIAM B. WIDNALL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WIDNALL: Thank you very much indeed for the copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 17, with your very generous remarks about my efforts. I was also most interested to read the United Steelworkers' pamphlet material which you quoted, as I had not known of it.

I noticed from your remarks that you had asked at the White House for a text of my luncheon remarks. As they said, I did not speak from a text; but the fact is that I had previously worked out for myself a text and so knew what I would be saying. I am very pleased to enclose a copy for you, since I know you are interested. It is not long, as I was asked to confine my remarks to 7 minutes. I would be interested to know what you think about this problem of the relatively decreasing running expense money and relatively increasing capital funds. I do not think that aid to cities can much longer ignore the one and so much exaggerate the other.

Your work for the mass transit bill is greatly appreciated by many other citizens besides myself, I am sure. Highways versus transit is of course another field that has gotten wildly out of balance; many many thanks for your work on a start toward redressing it.

Again, may I say how much I appreciate your very kind remarks.

Sincerely,

JANE JACOBS,
Mrs. R. H. Jacobs, Jr.

REMARKS OF MRS. ROBERT H. (JANE) JACOBS, JR. AT THE FIFTH MONTHLY WOMEN DOERS LUNCHEON, SPONSORED BY MRS. LYNDON B. JOHNSON AT THE WHITE HOUSE, JUNE 16, 1964

This is an age when we talk more and more about city amenity and produce it less and less. Many outrages are committed in its name. Poor people, Negroes and businesses on which many livelihoods depend are tossed out of their neighborhoods in the name of somebody's idea of amenity. Here and there our cities are given a slick, artificial mask. But neither that aberration, nor the drabness, dirt, and dispiritedness in other places answers the profound need we have for character, convenience, visual pleasure and vitality—all those things we lump together as amenity and cherish in cities.

The attractiveness of cities is not gotten by subtraction. It builds up from lots and lots of different bits and details, lots of different bits of money, lots of different notions, all coming out of the concern, the affection, and the ideas of lots and lots of different people. The amenity of cities cannot possibly be planned or bought wholesale. It is so much more complicated and quicksilver than a choice between wall-to-wall pavement and wall-to-wall grass.

From my observation, there is deep concern about city amenity on the part of great numbers of ordinary people, and no dearth of ideas and effort too. The serious problem is that all the concern and the efforts are consistently coming to so little.

Numerous obstacles prevent the thousands of improvements and differences that add up to attractiveness and amenity. I am going to speak about only one obstacle, not because others are unimportant but because this one is probably the most serious and far reaching.

Almost unnoticed and unremarked, a great unbalance has developed in cities between money for building things and money for running things. Let me give a current example from my own neighborhood. For years we have been begging for repair and restoration of our park. For years the park has been running down. Last month the city offered to destroy the park and build a new one. Why not use that money, the citizens asked, to restore and maintain the park, and several others besides? The parks commissioner candidly explained that his department is starved for maintenance funds but is relatively well off for capital funds. He has money to build an unwanted new park for $750,000 but is hard put to find money for repairing benches, planting flowers, and picking up papers.

The consequences of such unbalance go far beyond dirt and disrepair. The certainty of not having enough money to run things automatically rules out wide ranges of potential recreation in cities, and many forms of potential beauty—not so much because of what these cost to develop but because they take more than routine care. Even the devastating ugliness of parking lots is insured when the hospital director or housing manager or auditorium chairman knows in advance that his budget cannot possibly support maintenance of more than hot, unrelieved asphalt and chain link fence. And how can we make headway combating private devastation of this kind when everyone can plainly see that the public standards are as low or lower?

Variety and character in parks and in the total city scene will steadily become less and less possible, no matter how lavish our lip service to amenity, unless we get many, many more cleanup people, repair people, painters, gardeners, and so on, working for the public. Many of these jobs, incidentally, require little training.

The wild unbalance between capital funds and running expenses is typical of many municipal services, and of all cities. This unbalance is compounded by the present forms of the subsidies for highways, institutions, public housing, most instances of urban renewal, and by the devices of public authorities with their own borrowing power. Most of these cases of aid to cities, especially nowadays the grants for highways, remove great territories from the local tax rolls, while they simultaneously increase welfare, policing and social work burdens. Yet the subsidies themselves provide only for construction. They do not provide the equivalent of tax funds, nor even funds for the public share of their own subsequent maintenance costs. The cities' matching grants to projects can be in the form of capital improvements; this provision frequently stimulates capital expenditures that are unnecessary and even inane. The local borrowing power can be called on to finance these, but the interest comes out of the same pot as running expenses.

Theoretically, all these forms of aid are supposed either to cut running costs or bolster the local tax base; but they are not working out that way at all. The unbalance automatically feeds on itself and increases, because the harder it is to get maintenance funds, the greater the scramble for capital funds instead. Already, it has become easier for cities to let things disintegrate awaiting a big capital expenditure of some kind, and at that point sweep away the good with the bad, the beautiful with the ugly, and the productive with the unproductive. We see the paradox of cities actually impoverishing themselves by capital improvements.

This unbalance is approaching a point of economic and social crisis. The disappointing appearance of things is only one of many symptoms. Perhaps we can do nothing until this crisis is upon us full force. I am an optimist, and prefer to think we can.

I am sorry if I sound too serious, but you know there is no point in setting a course, toward attractiveness or anything else, without knowing where the boobytraps lie. Of course there are other boobytraps—weird thickets of deadening, obsolete and absurd regulations for instance. But one of the great things about public efforts in this country is that when we do find the traps, and enough people make enough noise about them, we can be wonderfully ingenious at dealing with them.

THE FOLKS AT HOME EXPRESS THEIR OPINIONS

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FOREMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, it has long been my feeling that too many times the opinions of the people have been overlooked or disregarded by their elected representatives. Too often, I fear, we are inclined to let those immediately surrounding us—the professional pollsters, the news writers, interpreters, columnists, and the bureaucrats—have more influence on our decisions than the folks back home. With this thought in mind and with the help of hundreds of volunteer workers, I recently mailed out my second annual legislative questionnaire to the citizens of the 16th Congressional District of Texas, inviting them, individually, to advise me of their views and opinions on some of the major issues facing Congress and the Nation.

The response to this questionnaire was tremendous. It far exceeded the number of replies to my first questionnaire. Over 35,000 answers have already been received, and almost 10,000 of them had additional comments attached. Answers came from every single community and all of the 19 counties in my district—from people in all walks of life—from Democrats, Republicans, and independents alike. Because of this diversified and widespread response, I believe that this poll is a reasonably accurate expression of public opinion. I am pleased to report the results of these replies for the information and review of my colleagues.

	Percent	
	Yes	No
1. Should the U.S. Government guarantee credit for the Soviet Union's purchase of wheat or other commodities?	3.2	96.8
2. Do you favor the creation of a Domestic Peace Corps or a National Youth Corps financed by Federal tax funds?	12.8	87.2
3. Do you favor Federal medicare for the aged financed by an increase in social security taxes?	14.3	85.7
4. Do you favor the administration's proposal of more new Federal welfare programs to end poverty?	15.7	84.3
5. Do you favor the provisions proposed in the civil rights bill now before Congress?	15.4	84.6
6. Do you favor a reduction of Federal controls and regulations of agriculture?	89.1	10.9
7. Do you favor a constitutional amendment permitting voluntary prayer and Bible reading in our public schools?	79.2	20.8
8. Do you think we should make some large reductions in our foreign aid expenditures?	94.0	6.0
9. Do you feel that our prestige abroad is lower now than when Eisenhower was President?	80.1	19.9
10. Who do you believe would make the best President of the United States, 1964-68?		

	Percent
President Lyndon Johnson	30.1
Senator Goldwater	53.5
Governor Rockefeller	1.0
Governor Scranton	2.2
Senator Smith	.4
Ambassador Lodge	3.2
Richard Nixon	7.6
Others or no opinion	2.0

Mr. Speaker, these views and results speak strongly and forcefully for a concerned American people—God-fearing, taxpaying citizens—people who believe in the free enterprise system and in the preservation of our representative form of government. They are the kind of people who believe two and two still make four, and that all that glitters is not necessarily gold.

They are honest Americans who still believe in the good, old-fashioned principles of fiscal and personal responsibility, individual liberty and freedom, integrity, patriotism, loyalty, and hard work—people who are not afraid to tell the truth and look the world straight in the eye—people who are not too lazy to work, not too proud to be poor—people who are willing to live on what they have earned, and wear what they have paid for—people who are not ashamed to say "no" to socialism and communism with emphasis, and who are not ashamed to say, "I can't afford it."

From the results of this questionnaire, it is evident that the people of west Texas fully realize that every dollar that is received from Washington must be paid for by them or borrowed and paid for later by their children or grandchildren, with interest added. They know, too, that Government has no money or income that it does not first take from the people. Most of these folks feel that they are getting more government than they need, and more government than they want. One nice little lady was very expressive in her reply to me by penciling in the margin of the questionnaire, "Thank goodness we don't get all the government we pay for."

Yes, Mr. Speaker, these people are solid, sincere Americans, who are still puritanical enough to believe that a man and government should pay its debts and not continuously spend more than it takes in. They still refuse to find shame in our power or our creed. They still believe that the American story of individual freedom, responsibility, and dignity is worth telling. They are dedicated, devoted people who put their country ahead of petty partisan considerations. They just want to see America win every time. I share their viewpoint, and I am proud to represent them in this great, lawmaking body.

Mr. Speaker, I grew up on a farm. We did not have very much money and my folks were not able to give me much in the way of material things, but they gave me something even more valuable—they taught me about individual responsibility and hard work, and, in a way, about capitalism. They taught me that if I wanted to have more material things in my life, I would have to work for them. They taught me that the world pays for the right answers, efficiently delivered—and that the No. 1 question in life is not, "How many storms did you ride out?" or "Did you have a rough time?" but, "Did you shoot square, did you bring the ship in safely?" They taught me the virtues of honesty and self-respect—and they taught me that when my problems were too great for me, I could always drop down on my knees and ask for, and get, help from our God above.

I hope Americans never forget, or stray away from these fundamental, basic principles that made us what we are today. West Texans have not, and I do not think the American people have, or will, but we could fail if we ever stopped relying on ourselves and started looking to Government to solve all our problems and make all our decisions for us. Yes, America could go down, but if we ever do, it will not be because the world developed a hydrogen bomb—it would be because we have developed a philosophy that says the individual is no longer economically responsible for his own welfare, or morally responsible for his own conduct.

It was American freedom, and that alone, which first made it possible for our country and the world to dream of a day when poverty might be abolished. It is American freedom, and that alone, which is the only really new idea, the only genuine bold new program in all history for the production of wealth for all. Socialism is the latest form of an age-old fraud, that something can be created out of nothing, that we can get wealth by merely wishing for it or claiming it as a right, that government can plan a man's life for him better than he can. Socialism is a fraud because it creates poverty while constantly promising to abolish it, and so by a vicious circle, maintains itself in power.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully urge my colleagues in the Congress and our national leaders, regardless of their political party affiliations, to give heed to these opinions, this feeling, this voice of the American people. Let us rededicate ourselves to the task of preserving our freedom, our heritage, our constitutional rights and principles, and our great Nation "under God." Let us stop our continually increasing Government spending programs, let us initiate some tough, tightfisted management over our wasteful, irresponsible foreign aid giveaway programs; let us get back in balance again, economically and spiritually, and let us place the welfare of this great country ahead of political considerations. All my life I have lived and worked and fought for these truths and ideals. During the past 2 years, as a Member of this Congress, my position has been clearly, plainly, and irrevocably spelled out—on the record. These are the principles I have believed in and worked for—for my Democrat and Republican friends alike. This, gentlemen, is a nonpartisan question, a nonpartisan challenge. It is our country and our freedom that are at stake. This is far more important than the success or failure of a political party. Indeed, it is the success or failure of the preservation of freedom for our children and for all mankind.

EUROPEANS SPEND OVER $1½ BILLION IN LOTTERIES

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. FINO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, while we refuse to recognize the tremendous advantages of a Government-run lottery, 81 foreign countries enjoy the revenues derived from such harmless activities. All of these 81 foreign nations utilize government lotteries not only as a compromise with their gambling problems but as revenue-raising devices as well.

All of these 81 foreign countries have found that restraining rather than prohibitive measures are best not only for their people but for their governments as well.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of the Members of Congress, the tremendous success of the European lotteries. Twenty-eight countries in Europe have found that government-run lotteries not only yield substantial revenues but also help eliminate underworld problems.

I am happy to list 28 countries in Europe which recognize and accept the fact that gambling is a normal fact of life and should be treated as such.

In 1963, 28 countries in Europe, listed below, took in gross receipts of over $1,532,384,000 from its government-run lotteries. The net income to the governments of these countries came to over $631,372,000 which was used for social welfare programs, hospitals, culture, housing, arts, youths, schools, charity, sports, transportation, veterans and other worthwhile projects.

Mr. Speaker, why cannot we be as smart as our European friends? Why cannot our own people's thirst for gambling? What is wrong with us when we ignore and close our eyes to a possible additional revenue of $10 billion a year?

A national lottery in the United States will not only strike a lethal blow at organized crime but it will pump into our Treasury over $10 billion a year in additional income which can be used to cut our taxes and reduce our national debt. Is it not time that we stopped pussyfooting and become realistic on this issue? What is wrong with us?

Country	Gross receipts	Net income	Purposes used
1. Austria	$16,800,000	$7,200,000	General purposes.
2. Belgium	19,713,162	6,200,000	Social welfare programs.
3. Bulgaria	3,517,600	1,005,025	General purposes.
4. Czechoslovakia	11,157,600	5,000,000	Hospitals, sports, and culture.
5. Denmark	7,076,000	638,000	General fund.
6. England [1]	212,000,000	125,000,000	Central government expenses.
7. Finland	5,773,346	1,951,306	Science and fine arts, opera.
8. France	140,000,000	44,000,000	General purposes.
9. Germany	433,000,000	175,000,000	Youth, sports activities, and health.
10. Gibraltar	1,832,600	434,000	Housing, education, and social services.
11. Greece	26,994,000	6,145,000	Welfare agencies.
12. Hungary	84,333,990	33,730,845	Housing and sports facilities.
13. Iceland	960,000	310,000	Housing for elderly and research.
14. Ireland	43,229,849	10,586,334	Hospitals.
15. Italy	97,450,000	52,565,600	Hospital, orphanages, and education.
16. Liechtenstein [2]		$4,350	Sport activities and welfare.
17. Luxembourg	$1,562,300	624,920	Charity, welfare, and medicare.
18. Malta	1,273,314	209,000	General purposes.
19. Netherlands	9,893,000	1,083,000	General revenue.
20. Norway	18,700,000	5,800,000	General funds.
21. Poland [3]	53,378,000	18,138,000	Housing and culture.
22. Portugal	23,118,200	6,290,604	Public assistance.
23. Rumania [4]			50 percent of income used for sports.
24. Russia [5]	113,220,000	56,610,000	Unknown.
25. Spain	134,000,000	37,000,000	General budget and Red Cross.
26. Sweden	58,228,000	32,343,124	Culture and artistic purposes.
27. Switzerland	6,350,000	1,706,480	Public building and transportation.
28. Yugoslavia	8,824,000	1,786,666	Veterans, deaf and blind, Red Cross.
Total	1,532,384,861	631,372,254	

[1] Premium savings bond lottery used.

[2] Principality of Liechtenstein has a population of 17,000 and participates in Swiss lotteries.

[3] 1962 figures are used.

[4] Rumania is a Communist country: information not available.

[5] Information considered confidential. Figures are estimates.

POLITICS AND POVERTY

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert in the RECORD, at this time, two articles which discuss some of the provisions of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

The two articles reveal that there is genuine bipartisan concern over the intents and the powers inherent in this act. The first is an article compiled by J. R. Anderson, an employee of the Republican congressional committee. The second is a newsletter issued by Representative E. C. "TOOK" GATHINGS, Democrat of Arkansas.

Many have the attitude that Congress is remiss in its duties if it does not spew forth a stream of legislation. This attitude of "don't just stand there, do something" may be fine in some instances. However, if one is standing on the edge of a cliff, impulsive action may be more conclusive than desirable. I feel we are standing on the edge of a legislative abyss when we consider legislation with such widesweeping powers centralized in a very few.

I am hopeful that my colleagues will read these articles carefully, and give some constructive thought as to the serious nature of the course of action we are being asked to take in the name of fighting poverty.

Text of the articles is as follows:

PRICE OF "POVERTY" PROGRAM

There are a few in the Congress of the United States who would differ with the concept that it can serve no nobler purpose than to afford the opportunity for education and training, the opportunity to work, and the opportunity to live in decency and dignity to all citizens of this land.

The provision of these related opportunities is the stated aim of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. Achieving this aim is fundamental to the well-being of this Nation and to the labors of those of us who serve in its legislature.

And yet, in striving for opportunities of this kind through legislation, we must always bear in mind the warning of the First Baron Acton, when he declared "Power tends to corrupt and absolute power corrupts absolutely."

We must never permit ourselves, in drafting and acting upon legislation, to rationalize that our ultimate purpose is so noble in its intent that the end justifies the means. If the means of achieving opportunity for all our citizens tends to concentrate unlimited discretionary power in the hands of an individual then the specter of corruption lurks within a moment's journey and the principle of checks and balances must inevitably be haunted by the fear of destruction.

The American people, and those of us delegated the power to serve their interests, have consistently rejected the concept of czarism. Concentration of unlimited power within the grasp of a single individual is anathema to us all, and properly so.

And yet, despite our tradition of separation of powers, despite our characteristic caution in vesting unlimited discretionary power in the hands of one man, other than the President in time of national emergency, the Congress has before it a bill which does violence to these concepts. While acting to relieve the suffering of those of our citizens who experience the hardship of poverty, unemployment, and despair, we must, at the same time, safeguard the basic philosophy of our Nation and protect against the surrender of our Federal Union to the threat of statism or dictatorship.

There may be those who will say that this warning establishes a strawman as a convenient target for launching opposition to a worthy bill. There may be others who will hold that control of funds by the Congress will effectively limit the growth of power in the person of the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity. Some there may be who will view this opposition as a political lever, designed to alarm the people and thus damage the acceptance by them of administration programs.

Believe me when I say that none of these objections is valid. Believe me when I say that my concern with the language and methodology of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 stems from a knowledge of history and a determination that "It can happen here."

The destruction of a nation may be brought about through legal means whenever legislators and the people relax their vigilance. The rise of Hitler, not so long ago that we should have forgotten the warning, demonstrates the precedent * * * the ultimate outcome of that rise dramatizes the insidious nature of a legal approach to dictatorship.

In 1933, the Reichstag passed an "enabling act" which formally was known as the "Law for removing the distress of people and the Reich." Hitler asked for powers which would enable him to overcome a number of serious problems, one of which, according to William L. Shirer in his book, "The Rise and Fall of the Third Reich," was "getting the country out of its economic morass and finding jobs for the 6 million unemployed."

That purpose, I am sure, strikes a familiar chord, since the purpose stated in H.R. 10443, the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, is "to mobilize the human and financial resources of the Nation to combat poverty in the United States."

It is true that the legislation before this body does not contemplate, as did the Reich's "enabling act," removal of the power of legislation, control of the budget, approval of treaties with foreign states, and the initiation of constitutional amendments, from the hands of the legislature. However, by vesting unlimited specific powers in the hands of the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, it does tend to fulfill the shift of control which Hitler later achieved in his "Law for Reconstruction of the Reich," which was passed 1 year after he came to power.

Let us look at this second German takeover law and relate it to the "Economic Opportunity Act of 1964." The 1934 act transferred the sovereign powers of the states to the Reich, all state governments were placed under the Reich government, and the state governors put under the administration of the Reich Minister of the Interior Wilhelm Frick, who explained this latter move, "The state governments from now on are merely administrative bodies of the Reich."

Within 1 year, Hitler had effectively destroyed the age old Federal character of Germany. Does not a similar threat lurk within the provisions of the "Economic Opportunity Act of 1964"?

Look at the powers of the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity with respect to the "Job Corps":

He is authorized to "enter into agreements with any Federal, State, or local agency or private organization for the provision of such facilities and services as in his judgment are needed to carry out the purposes" * * * he is authorized to "prescribe such rules and regulations and make such arrangements as he deems necessary," * * * he may enroll male individuals "who have attained the age 16 but have not attained age 22 at the time of enrollment, and who meet the standards for enrollment prescribed by the Director" * * * he has the right to extend service beyond 2 years "as the Director may determine in special cases."

In fiscal management, the allowances and maintenance of enrollees are determined, not by the law, but "as the Director may deem necessary or appropriate for their needs."

Throughout the bill there is constant reference to determinations, judgments, allocations, and decisions by the Director, with the net result that the will of the Congress, the States, local governments, and cooperating private organizations are neither implied nor specified in a wide range of issues which normally fall within their purview.

Elimination of the Federal character of our country lies within the language of the bill related to "work-training programs," since it is inevitable that the hand which controls the purse strings establishes the tenor and extent of State functions. Section 113, for instance, says: "The Director is authorized to enter into agreements providing for the payment by him of part or all of the cost of a State or local program submitted hereunder if he determines" that it meets criteria subject to his own interpretation.

The enrollment of youth, meritorious as it appears to be to achieve their ultimate economic independence in maturity, gives pause when viewed in the perspective of history. In 1932, the last year of the German Republic, the Hitler Youth enrollment totaled only 107,956. Six years later it numbered 7,728,259. Most significantly, Baldur von Schirach who was named "Youth Leader of the German Reich" in June 1933, served under the Ministry of Education until December 1, 1936, when he was made responsible directly to Hitler. The youth enrollment program under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 eliminates the waiting period and begins with the Director reporting solely to the President.

Shirer, commenting upon the influence of the Hitler Youth movement in Germany, said: "The young in the Third Reich were growing up to have strong and healthy bodies, faith in the future of their country and in themselves and a sense of fellowship and comaraderie that shattered all class and economic and social barriers."

Although we remain confident that "it can't happen here," is there not a grave danger when the National Government is put in a position to control the indoctrination, the feeding, the clothing, the shelter, and the economic philosophy of youth?

Is there not cause for apprehension to be abroad in the land when the provisions of a loosely drawn bill afford the Director of any Federal program the right to acquire and maintain, in direct violation of existing law, a personally controlled, uniformed military force?

You say this bill provides no such thing? Listen—section 106(e) says "Personnel of the uniformed services who are detailed or assigned to duty in the performance of agreements made by the Director for the support of the Corps shall not be counted in computing strengths under any law limiting the strength of such services or in computing the percentage authorized by law for any grade therein."

In effect, that section authorizes the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity to draw upon the Armed Forces of the United States for any number of personnel he requires, to promote them as he sees fit, regardless of limitations imposed on the numbers of military personnel in each grade, and the military leaders of the Nation would then be enabled to fill the holes in their forces, thus created, although ceilings have heretofore been imposed on military strength by Congress. Does this not constitute a private army? Does this not balk the will of Congress in its determination of the number of Americans to serve under arms? Is there not danger in such a move?

There are infinite other examples of the peril inherent in this proposed act. That they exist by design as a means to establish a dictatorship, I seriously doubt. That they could, however, achieve this end in the hands of the wrong men, I do not doubt.

Hitler, at a meeting of state governors in the Chancellery on June 6, 1933, declared: "In the long run our political power will be all the more secure, the more we succeed in underpinning it economically."

The economy of the United States is a matter of paramount concern to every one of us; it is of critical concern to those Americans who suffer the deprivation of poverty. And yet, I venture to say that even those who suffer hunger and cold and discomfort and despair as a result of poverty would not surrender their freedom for a crust of bread, a pair of shoes, or a roof over their heads. I believe that Americans want to remain free and independent and I am convinced that the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, as presently drawn, could effectively deny freedom and independence to every American if it were to become law.

"Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty," and the Congress of the United States must serve as the first watchman against the forces which could destroy us from within. I submit that the dangers inherent in the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 must be clearly recognized and eliminated if we are to provide Americans enduring freedom as well as bread.

THE ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY BILL OF 1964

(By Representative E. C. "TOOK" GATHINGS)

The bill to aid the Nation's impoverished people is a reckless departure from commonsense and prudence. It is wasteful, extravagant, and ill advised. The legislation comes along at a time when belt tightening and retrenchment could very well aid in the absorption of a part of the $11½ billion tax cut recently enacted.

A look at some of the provisions of this so-called economic opportunity bill of 1964 is most revealing. Title III embraces "special programs to combat poverty in rural areas." The statement of purpose says this: "It is the purpose of this title to meet some of the special problems of rural poverty and thereby to raise and maintain the income and living standards of low-income rural families." In order to carry out such policy or purpose the Director of such an agency is authorized to make grants not to exceed $1,500 to low-income rural families where in his judgment such grants have a reasonable possibility of effecting a permanent increase in the income of such families by assisting or permitting them to:

1. Acquire or improve real estate or reduce encumbrances or erect improvements thereon.
2. Operate or improve the operation of farms not larger than family sized.
3. Participate in cooperative associations.
4. Finance nonagricultural enterprises which will enable such families to supplement their income.

Also, loans to such families, having a maximum maturity of 15 years and in amounts not exceeding $2,500 in the aggregate to any family at any one time are provided.

The House Committee on Agriculture heard testimony from Agriculture Department officials. The testimony stated that 1 million families are "boxed in" because of age, education, or physical disability. Of these, 400,000 would be outside the scope of the present authority of the Farmers Home Administration.

The $1,500 in grants would be made to farm families for fundamental improvements, such as to buy livestock, feed, seed, fertilizer, farm equipment, or land. The bill provides for family farm development corporations and authorizes the Director to cooperate with such organization which would have the power to acquire real property or any interest therein in rural areas to divide up large tracts into units not larger than family farms. Necessary fences, farm buildings, land and water development, and related facilities are included. The farms so developed or reconstituted would be sold to low-income farm families. Under the present Farmers Home Act, a borrower could contract for say 80 acres of land for $250 an acre, but he would not be loaned more than the normal value of the land which the Farmers Home Administration may set at about $200 an acre. Such applicant would have to pay the $50 an acre himself. Under the new proposal contained in the antipoverty bill, the $50 an acre downpayment would be paid by the Government, then a loan made to him in the amount of $16,000 for the 80 acres of land. In addition, the Government would build him a house, a barn, and other improvements which would cost in the neighborhood of $10,000, making a total outlay of $26,000 with regard to the land transaction. At this time the Farmers Home Administration loses less than 1 percent on its land insured loan program. The losses would be astronomical if the recommendations carried in the antipoverty bill were to be enacted.

The $1,500 grant to eligible individuals could be made by itself or in connection with a loan of up to $2,500 which could be used for some other line of activity outside of farming, such as the establishment of a machinery repair shop, welding, or some other form of endeavor or trade which the applicant may wish to enter.

Other provisions of the 47-page bill would make loans to companies which will agree to put more men to work. It would lend up to the sum of $10,000 for each new job that is produced. The bill says in this respect, "Persons not already employed by the borrower, a majority of whom will be recruited from among the longtime unemployed." This would mean that should a company desire to build a $50,000 new plant or an addition to an existing one, he could hire three men who need a job and two men who are already employed elsewhere. The bill calls for an authorization of $962,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and such sums as are necessary to carry out this act. This is quite an ambitious program which needs to be studied most carefully across the country as well as by the Members of both branches of the Congress. There is a lot more to this legislation than the catchy phrase of bringing "war on poverty."

THE JOHNSON ADMINISTRATION VERSUS THE SCHOOL BOARDS

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to suggest that the Johnson administration is in the process of carrying out a policy which, if allowed to run its sure course, would effectively undermine the last citadel of local self-government in this country—the school board control of public education. Whether this policy is deliberate, Mr. Speaker, I do not presume to say. I do not know. I prefer always to credit my political opponents with the highest of motives. In this case I am confident that the President and his educational policymakers want to bring about what in their opinion would be the best possible education for American youth. And these Federal educational policymakers give every indication of feeling that they know best how to get the best.

I too want the best education possible for American youth, but I believe—and I believe it strongly—that the local school boards—made up of community leaders, and so forth—know best. They know better than the education policymakers here in Washington what sort of an education they want for their children. I believe that once the school board's education decisionmaking has been sufficiently weakened and the control of curriculums centered in Washington, not only will we have to submit to an authoritarian type of educational system but to an authoritarian type government in other fields as well. What will it avail us if we be the first to reach the moon if we lose our own liberties?

Mr. Speaker, I have documentary evidence to show that this is the direction the Johnson administration is leading us; first, through action being taken by the executive branch, particularly through HEW's Office of Education; and second, through administration bills now before the Congress, including the so-called Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

POVERTY PACKAGE

First let us consider the Economic Opportunity Act now before us. This package of poverty programs include principally, first educational programs; second, job training programs; third, job experience programs; and fourth, aid to individuals and groups which will aid others in these three fields to wage "war on poverty."

On May 27, the ranking minority member of the Education and Labor Committee my esteemed colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] said of this so-called Economic Opportunity Act, H.R. 11377:

> The pending proposal bypasses established State and local governments. It requires no outlay of State and local funds. It accords them no recognition. It places no responsibility on them. And it permits them no meaningful participation in the administration and development of the various activities envisioned in the bill.
>
> This undermining of traditional State-Federal relationships and this resort to direct Federal intervention in local affairs is, in our opinion, unnecessary and unwise. It would constitute a monumental error in judgment and pose a real danger to proven receipts of American governmental practices.

The minority report on the poverty package, signed by all the Republican members of the committee also stresses that:

> This bill is marked by an administrative philosophy completely at war with the proven precepts of American government and society—a philosophy which accords no meaningful recognition, role, or purpose to established State and local governments or to local planning bodies, and looks only to Federal action directly upon citizens and private groups to carry out programs of Federal design.

I would like, Mr. Speaker, to spell out exactly how this bill bypasses the school boards and relieves them of their traditional responsibilities.

THE SCHOOL BOARDS AND THE JOB CORPS

Title I, part A, of H.R. 11377 establishes a Job Corps within the Office of Economic Opportunity, for young men and young women, 16 through 21, who have dropped out of school. The Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity is authorized to "enter into agreements with any Federal, State, or local agency or private organization for the establishment and operation, in rural and urban areas, of conservation camps and training centers and for the provision of such facilities and services as in his judgment are needed."

He is authorized to provide or arrange for the provision of programs of useful work experience; and "arrange for the provision of education and vocational training of enrollers in the corps, provided, that, where practicable, such programs may be provided through local public educational agencies or by private vocational, educational institutions or technical institutes where such institutions or institutes can provide substantially equivalent training with reduced Federal expenditures"—section 103(b).

Please note that the local public educational agencies would not be in control of the education of the boys and girls of the proposed Corps. "Where practicable," in the opinion of the Poverty Director, educational programs for the Corps "may" be provided through local public educational agencies. The word "may" is most significant.

Apparently, however, the local public school agencies in order to qualify at all would have to set up special programs because under section 104(a):

> Only in exceptional cases shall enrollees in the Corps be graduates of an accredited high school, and no person shall be accepted for enrollment in the Corps unless the local school authorities have concluded that further school attendance by such person in any regular academic, vocational, or training program, is not practicable.

Who does this language make eligible for enrollment in the Job Corps? Who else but the mentally retarded though teachable teenager and the incorrigible school dropout whose further attendance "in any regular academic, vocational, or training program", would not be "practicable?" Surely not many bright students whose only reason for dropping out of the regular public school system is to get a job to help support their younger brothers and sisters would choose the Job Corps. A boy who did not want his mother to have to accept aid to dependent children on his account would do better both financially and academically to take a daytime unskilled job—of which there are many going begging—and go to night school than enroll in the Job Corps.

What the administration warriors against poverty have in mind may be deduced from a pamphlet entitled "The War on Poverty—A Congressional Presentation, March 17, 1964" prepared by Mr. Schriver's staff.

Explaining the difference between the Job Corps conservation camps and its training centers, the pamphlet says:

> In conservation camps, young men with problems of attitude and resistance to learning will be given basic skills training, as well as reading, writing, and arithmetic. The training centers will offer more intensive and advanced education and training to young men who are ready for this experience. In the long run, it is anticipated that many youths will be coming to the training centers as conservation camp "graduates."

Speaking of "the education component" of the conservation camps, the pamphlet says:

> The education program in conservation camps will be designed to meet the needs of young men who are so lacking in basic academic skills that they cannot undertake vocational training. (A fifth to sixth grade literacy equivalency is considered necessary to profit from vocational training. An analysis of Selective Service System rejectees indicates that over half of those who fail to meet mental achievement requirements will be below this level.) Reading, writing, arithmetic, and speech will be taught, and minimum levels to be obtained are as follows:
>
> Reading: An ability to read and comprehend at mean seventh-grade level,
>
> Writing: An ability to complete, clearly and legibly, application and other employment, forms, to write simple letters of inquiry, and to make out orders,
>
> Arithmetic: An understanding and mastery of the four basic skills (addition, subtraction, multiplication, and division), common and decimal fractions, reading of scales, units of measurement,
>
> Speaking: An ability to be understood in employment and other conventional situations, and to understand directions.
>
> To reach these goals, new instructional materials designed especially for the purpose will be developed. But the education component of the program cannot wait. The availability of current materials will be reviewed by the Office of Education and those determined to be best suited will be used. Continuing evaluation of the camps' programs will provide guidance for the development of new materials.

Revealing that "for every 100 young men, there will be an educational and counseling staff of 4, responsible to the Deputy Director for the Job Corps through the camp director." The pamphlet informs us:

> The 800 education and counseling staff members required the first year will be recruited from many sources, including college placement offices, retired people, and volunteers throughout the country. These teachers will undergo a special intensive training course, currently planned to take about 4 weeks, which will prepare them for their work in the camps.

As to the training centers, the pamphlet tells us:

> The major emphasis of the training centers will be on vocational training and basic educational improvement in preparation for permanent employment. Vocational training and basic education will consume most of the day in a training center.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, the extensive Job Corps educational programs in basic academic skills and vocational training will be beyond the control of the school boards. The Office of Education will choose the "instructional materials" to be used while "new instructural materials designed especially for the purpose" are being developed. Teachers "will undergo a special intensive training course—which will prepare them for their work in the camps." The Federal Government will be in control.

For this reason, at the proper time, Mr. Speaker, I will introduce an amendment to bring the Job Corps on a grants-in-aid basis under the administration of the States and local governments.

THE SCHOOL BOARDS AND THE WORK TRAINING PROGRAMS

Title I, part B, of H.R. 11377, authorizes the Poverty Director to "assist and cooperate with State and local agencies and private nonprofit organizations in developing programs for the employment of young people in State and community activities which whenever appropriate shall be coordinated with programs of training and education provided by local public educational agencies"—section 112. "The Director is authorized to enter into agreements providing for the payment by him of part or all the cost of a State or local program submitted hereunder if he determines, in accordance with such regulations as he may prescribe, that," among other things:

First. "Enrollees in the program will be employed either (a) on publicly owned and operated facilities or projects, or (b) on local projects sponsored by private nonprofit organizations, other than projects involving the construction, operation, or maintenance of any facility used or to be used solely for sectarian instruction or a place of religious worship"—section 113(a) (1)

Second. "To the maximum extent feasible, the program will be coordinated with vocational training and educational services adapted to the special needs of enrollees in such program and sponsored by State or local public educational agencies: *Provided, however,* That where such services are inadequate or unavailable, the program may make provision for the enlargement, improvement, development, and coordination of such services with the cooperation of or where appropriate pursuant to agreement with, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare."—section 113(a) (6) and

Third. "The program includes standards and procedure for the selection of applicants, including provisions assuring full coordination and cooperation with local and other authorities to encourage students to resume or maintain school attendance"—section 113(a) (7).

Despite the legal lipservice to the effect that these work-training programs shall be coordinated whenever appropriate "with programs of training and education provided by local public educational agencies," Mr. Speaker, this part B of title I undermines school board authority in three ways.

First, it permits, under section 113(a) (B) Federal aid to parochial schools other than those used solely for sectarian instruction.

Second, where, in the opinion of the Poverty Director, the vocational training and educational services sponsored by the State or local educational agencies, are not adapted to the special needs of the enrollees in the work-training program, where such services are inadequate or unavailable, the Poverty Director "may make provision for the enlargement, improvement, development, and coordination of such services with the cooperation of/or where appropriate pursuant to agreement with, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare."

Third. The Poverty Director has discretionary power over the coordination "whenever appropriate" of the poverty work-training programs and the training and educational programs provided by the local public educational agencies.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government in the person of the Poverty Director may, under this part, find a local public school system "inadequate and make provision for its enlargement, improvement, development" and so forth.

There is no language permitting the local school board to decline the Federal dollars thus dangled before their noses to follow the Federal lead—even though the school board might be wholly opposed to the so-called "improvements" proposed. Under the part, the Federal Government would in effect be able eventually to take over all school board functions relating to vocational education and the education of working students and potential school dropouts.

For this reason at the proper time, I will introduce an amendment to bring the work-training programs, on a grant-in-aid basis, under the administration of the States and local governments so that the school boards' decisionmaking prerogatives in this field will not be threatened.

SCHOOL BOARDS AND WORK-STUDY PROGRAMS

Title I, part C, Mr. Speaker, authorizes the Poverty Director to make grants to institutions of higher education to assist in the operation of "work-study programs" to promote the part-time employment of students of low-income families in work either for the institution itself or for a public or private nonprofit organization.

Although institutions of higher education are not under the control of the local school boards, nevertheless under this part, parochial as well as public schools may receive Federal aid in the form of work service—section 124(a) (2) (B).

Since neither the consent nor the advice of the State and local governments is requested under this part, I will, at the proper time introduce an amendment to bring the work-study program, on a grant-in-aid basis, under the administration of State and local governments.

SCHOOL BOARDS AND COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS

Now, Mr. Speaker, we come to a massive, multiple attack—not on poverty because the amounts involved are not enough and the means proposed could never win a "war on poverty." No, this is a massive multiple attack on the prerogatives of local self-government. It is a subtle, devious undermining of public education by reducing it to the status of "welfare."

Title II, part A has as its purpose "to provide stimulation and incentive for urban and rural communities to mobilize their resources to combat poverty through community action programs"—section 201.

> The Director is authorized to make grants to, or to contract with, appropriate public or private nonprofit agencies, or combinations thereof, to pay part or all of the costs of development of community action programs (sec. 204).
>
> The Director is authorized to make grants to, or to contract with, public or private nonprofit agencies, or combinations thereof, to pay part or all of the costs of community action programs which have been approved by him pursuant to this part, including the cost of carrying out programs which are components of a community action program and which are designed to achieve the purposes of this part. Such component programs shall be focused upon the needs of low-income individuals and families and shall provide expanded improved services, assistance, and other activities, and facilities necessary in connection therewith. Such programs shall be conducted in those fields which fall within the purposes of this part including employment, job training and counseling, health, vocational rehabilitation, housing, home management, welfare, and special remedial and other noncurricular educational assistance for the benefit of low-income individuals and families (sec. 205(a)).

The original bill, H.R. 10620, defined "community action program" as meaning a program "which is conducted, administered, or coordinated by a public or private nonprofit agency * * * which is broadly representative of the community"—section 202(a)(4)).

The words "which is broadly representative of the community" were cut in committee, Mr. Speaker, meaning that under the bill as it is before us any "public or nonprofit agency" which fights poverty even by providing extra jobs—any such group the Director sees fit may receive Federal aid. Federal aid conceivably could go to the Democratic Party, the Republican Party, the Communist Party, the John Birch Society, the NAACP, or CORE.

The orginal bill also included the language under section 204(b):

> Any elementary or secondary school education program assisted under this section shall be administered by the public educational agency or agencies principally responsible for providing public elementary and secondary education in the area involved. No child shall be denied the benefit of such a program because he is not regularly enrolled in the public schools.

Without such language, the highly controversial church-state issue would have come to the fore again. Without this language, the administration could not have hoped for the support of the NEA, the Council of Chief State School Officers, and other organizations particularly devoted to the public schools and the separation of church and state. Indeed, Dr. Adron Doran, president, Morehead State Teachers College, Morehead, Ky., representing the NEA, said in his testimony before the committee:

> We note with approval that section 204(b) provides for public control of any elementary and secondary school education programs which may develop under this title and that such programs must be made available to all children whether or not they are regularly enrolled in the public schools.

Nonetheless, Mr. Speaker, this whole section 204(b) was deleted in committee thus permitting not only Federal aid to parochial schools but to any agency the Poverty Director sees fit to conduct "special remedial and other noncurricular educational assistance for the benefit of low-income individuals and families."

The fact that section 205(b) states that "No grant or contract authorized under this part may provide for general aid to elementary or secondary education in any school or school system" is irrelevant. It does not prohibit any categorical aid the Poverty Director thinks would help to fight poverty.

It is not surprising that the opposing sides in the Federal aid to parochial schools controversy hold different views on the language of section 204.

A key to the Roman Catholic position to the reason section 204(b) was deleted and to the formula used in an attempt to make Federal aid to parochial schools constitutional as a welfare measure rather than an educational program may be found in a column by Msgr. George G. Higgins published in the Catholic Standard, May 15, 1964. Reporting on his testimony before the committee Monsignor Higgins said in part:

> The members of the subcommittee neither agreed nor disagreed without line of reasoning, but, in any event, they clearly gave the impression, during a 45-minute colloquy, that they were at least open to suggestions as to how the bill as a whole might be improved, and, more specifically, how the exclusively public-school language of section 204 might be amended.
>
> DELICATE PROBLEM
>
> The members of the subcommittee recognized, and so did we, of course, that this is a rather delicate problem given the lack of consensus in and out of the Congress on the meaning of the first amendment and its applicability in the case of legislative proposals aimed at providing educational or related services to parochial schoolchildren.
>
> Nevertheless, they were willing to discuss the matter on its merits—not in the doctrinaire terms in which it has too often been debated in the past, but realistically in terms of the particular bill in question, which is essentially an antipoverty bill and not a general aid-to-education bill.
>
> It was only after the social action department had testified in support of the antipoverty bill that the Reporter published an article by William Lee Miller of the Yale Divinity School, entitled "Aid to Education: A Better Deal."
>
> In the words of this perceptive article, Mr. Miller says, among other things, that President Johnson's antipoverty program:
>
> May give a new focus that will allow people to rearrange their old positions (on the question of aid to education) or make them do it, and may open new possibilities.
>
> Let us have an all-out war against poverty, he says. If eliminating poverty requires aid to schools, fine. Who can object if aid to schools to eliminate poverty includes some participation by religious organizations and schools?

Dr. Edgar Fuller, executive secretary of the Council of Chief State School Officers, has this to say about H.R. 11377:

> This bill (H.R. 11377) makes an effort in changing "education" to "supplementary educational services" to avoid the constitutional issue by making what is education by any name appear to be welfare in a constitutional sense instead of education.
>
> To authorize the use of Federal tax funds for discretionary allocation to parochial schools by a Federal official, violates the Federal Constitution and constitutes vicious Federal control of/and interference with local education throughout the United States.

At the proper time, Mr. Speaker, in order to prevent the downgrading of American education to the status of welfare, as well as the undermining of the dignity and integrity of the school boards, I shall offer an amendment striking part A of title II from the bill.

THE SCHOOL BOARDS AND ADULT BASIC EDUCATION

Title II, part B, authorizes the Poverty Director to make grants to the States which have approved State plans for adult basic education.

To be sure this part does not totally bypass the State and local governments as do title I parts A and B and title II part A. It provides a Federal grant to the States for one more kind of categorical aid to education. It has Federal strings attached to make sure that the money goes where the Federal Government wishes it to go. It thus would tighten the Federal grip on the local school systems in a way which, since we already have passed adult basic education under the Manpower Training Act, would seem to be an unnecessary duplication.

At the proper time, therefore, I will introduce an amendment striking this part from the bill.

THE SCHOOL BOARDS AND MIGRANT AGRICULTURAL FAMILIES

Title III, part B, authorizes the Poverty Director to:

> Develop and implement as soon as practicable a program to assist the States, political subdivisions of States, public and nonprofit agencies, institutions, organizations, farm associations or individuals in establishing and operating programs of assistance for migrant agricultural employees and their families which programs shall be limited to housing, sanitation, education, and day care of children. Institutions, organizations, farm associations, or individuals shall be limited to direct loans. (Pages 42–43.)

Since this language makes it possible for the Poverty Director to make direct loans to individuals and organizations thus bypassing State and local governments and school boards, I shall at the proper time introduce an amendment to strike part B of title III from the bill.

URBAN EXTENSION SERVICE

Another front upon which the President and his administration are busily at work undermining the rights of the school boards to control American education is what is being called an urban extension service.

On Sunday, June 21, 1964, the Washington Post reported:

> At Irvine (Calif.), Mr. Johnson said he foresaw the day when an urban extension service operated by universities will do for urban America what Agriculture Extension Service has done for rural America.
>
> The President said he had directed the U.S. Commissioner of Education to meet with educators "to see how that can come to pass."

> Just as our colleges and universities changed the future of our farms a century ago, so they can help change the future of our cities, he said.
>
> Mr. Johnson pointed out that a century ago 80 percent of the American people lived on farms while today 70 percent live in urban areas.
>
> Hailing California's educational gains, he made it clear he does not regard education as only a State problem. And he spoke with pride of the three education bills he has signed into law.

Offhand this idea of an "urban extension service" patterned after the Agricultural Extension Service gives the impression of a service to adult city dwellers in their diverse occupations as the Agricultural Extension Service is a service to farmers in their occupation of farming. But this is only partly true. What the administration has in mind—and we have their own words for it—is a complex of federally financed "research and development centers" in the universities where, according to U.S. Commissioner of Education Dr. Francis Keppel:

> Behavioral and social scientists, subject matter scholars, educational specialists, administrators, and teachers will not only conduct research but also translate the results into new materials and methods that can be evaluated in school settings.

The purpose is not only to bring about curricular changes but also changes in the local control-structure of the Nation's elementary and secondary schools.

I quote, first, pertinent parts from the House Appropriations Committee hearings, U.S. Office of Education request for funds for fiscal 1965 under the Cooperative Research Act:

> Mr. KEPPEL. A new element in the 1964 program which will continue in 1965 would be the initiation of research and development centers which will focus on a wide band of research activities in such crucial problem areas as school dropouts, disadvantaged children, talent development, and arts and humanities. (Pages 447–448.)
>
> Dr. IANNI. These centers are very similar to the agricultural research centers that did so much for agricultural research. (Page 460.)
>
> Mr. FLYNT. May I say a word, Mr. Chairman? It took agriculture almost a century to cover the span from basic research in the laboratory to application in the field. The land-grant colleges were begun in 1862 but it was not until 1887 that the Hatch Act was enacted and a cooperative research program was created.
>
> Even that still fell short of translating research from the laboratory to the operating farm, because the farmer felt the Government could always try again if it failed, but that he could not. He would go bankrupt if he tried a new breed of chicken that did not lay the amount of eggs expected. The Smith-Lever Act of 1913 brought another element in it, a middleman between the experimental research man at the agricultural experiment station and the farmer. And this man is backed up by an enormous paraphernalia of research people and specialists in the colleges and experiment stations.
>
> It is the scientific miracle of our age that we can produce more things than we can eat, more food and fiber than we can use, for less and less labor force.
>
> When the land-grant colleges were established in 1862 it required 56 percent of our labor force to provide the requisite food and fiber; today it requires only 8 percent of our labor force. This surpasses atomic energy or anything else. All of these other things are puny compared to this.
>
> It seems to me that we ought not to sit around and wait for this long span of time to pass in education. If we can build centers in which basic research, experimentation in the laboratory situation, field testing and evaluation, and finally tryout, can take place, through the cooperation of a university, a State department and school systems we might create an institution which will shorten the lag to 5 or 10 years. You cannot expect basic research to become immediately operative—people want to see it tested out and proved.
>
> When we are dealing with a farmer, we were dealing with his very livelihood. In education we are dealing with the minds of men, and there is a deep moral question involved.
>
> I think if there is any one great contribution we can make to educational research, it is to get these centers going. (Pages 460–461.)

The Cooperative Research Program Newsletter of November 1963, listing completed projects indicates the sort of project so far undertaken. Here are just a few:

> "A Study of the Structure of Attitudes of Parents of Educable Mentally Retarded Children, and a Study of Change in Attitude Structure." Volumes I, II.
>
> "A Comparative Investigation of the Learning and Adjustment of Trainable Children in Public School Facilities, Segregated Community Centers, and State Residential Centers."
>
> "Motivational and Personality Factors in the Selection of Elementary and Secondary School Teaching as a Career."
>
> "Career Development in the Public School Teaching Profession With Special Reference to Changing Motivations, Pressures, Satisfactions, and Dissatisfactions."
>
> "Effects of Children's Social Power and Intelligence on Their Interpersonal Relations."
>
> "Social Structures and Social Climates in High Schools."
>
> "The Quality Measurement Project."
>
> "Restricted Generalization, Bias, and Loss of Power That May Result from Matching Groups."
>
> "A Sociopsychological Study of School Vandalism."
>
> "Relationship of School Experiences to Delinquency."
>
> "The Identification and Measurement of Secondary School Homemaking Teachers' Attitudes and Other Characteristics Associated With Their Ability To Maintain Desirable Learning Situations."
>
> "Evolution of American Educational Theory."
>
> "Psychological Characteristics Underlying the Educability of the Mentally Retarded Child. I. Concept Formation and Transposition in Young Mentally Retarded and Normal Children."

THE USOE AND "NEW CURRICULA"

A more detailed description of the goals of the "Curriculum Research and Development Program of the U.S. Office of Education: Project English, Project Social Studies and Beyond" is given in a chapter under that title by Francis A. J. Ianni, and Lois S. Josephs of the Carnegie Institute of Technology in a book entitled "New Curricula" edited by Robert W. Heath published by Harper & Row, 1964.

According to a footnote, page 161:

> Dr. Ianni contributed to this chapter in his private capacity and no official support or endorsement by the Office of Education is intended or should be inferred.

However, Dr. Ianni is Director of the Cooperative Research Branch of the Bureau of Educational Research and Development USOE and should know what he is talking about. I quote from the text in part:

> The role of the U.S. Office of Education in the development of the new educational curriculums is one of relatively recent origin. While it is certainly a valid assumption that the major Federal agency charged with responsibility for education should have been actively engaged in curriculum revision programs, until the passage of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, the Office's role was primarily a consultative one. And most often this consultation took the form of the preparation of descriptive studies of curriculum materials prepared by other organizations rather than any direct involvement in curriculum revision programs or research into new curriculum methods.
>
> Actually, however, the interest of the national government in both research and education has a respectable antiquity (p. 161).
>
> The cooperative research program of the Office of Education is a relatively recent addition to the growing number of Federal funding programs. The post-World War II period ushered in some awarenesses of the great need for adequate research in education and related areas as a basis for sound educational practices. The growing recognition of this need led to the passage of Public Law 531 by the 83d Congress. This law, which was signed by the President on July 26, 1954, authorized the Commissioner of Education "to enter into contracts and jointly financed cooperative arrangements with universities and colleges and State educational agencies for the conduct of research, surveys, and demonstrations in the field of education." Although the law was passed in 1954, funds were not appropriated for its implementation until fiscal year 1957. For the first year of operation, approximately $1 million was appropriated; for the second year it was increased to $2.3 million. Since that time, the budgetary appropriations have continued to grow; and in fiscal year 1963, the budget for the program, exclusive of some special foreign currency items, is $7 million. The budget requested for 1964 is $17 million.
>
> In the early years, the program was focused on 10 areas of research interest which the Office of Education considered particularly important, although projects in other areas of education were also supported. In recent years, however, the program has encouraged and received applications from the wide spectrum of research interests relevant to education. As a result, the research areas serviced by the program have expanded rapidly; and today research is being supported in many fields of basic knowledge—fields which hold promise of important contributions to educational knowledge. This diversification has led to the involvement of growing numbers of scholars, behavioral and social scientists, who have joined with education researchers in addressing themselves to the problems of education (pp. 163–164).
>
> It soon became obvious that research alone will not bring about educational innovation (p. 165).
>
> The trend in most fields of research has been to move from the project approach to the next stage of research mobilization—program research—where preplanned, continuous attention, through all steps in the research process is focused on persistent problem areas until solutions are found and translated into practice. Thus, one group of researchers follows a research program from development through demonstration. The intermediate steps of basic research, curriculum development and field testing are also a part of the program. Under ideal conditions, the same team of scholars, research scientists, teachers, and school administra-

> tors work continuously on all phases of the program. This is not a new idea and we do not suggest that it is the only course for curriculum revision programs; we simply insist that joint efforts by each of the interested parties to the program will help implement the results of research as soon as they are available.
>
> The first steps in this movement within the Office of Education took place in 1962, with the introduction of "programed research" activities in the areas of English and talent development as a means of focusing major attention on these particular problem areas of education. In 1963, a similar programatic approach is being taken to the area of the social studies and in 1964 the same approach in the arts, in teacher education, and the learning disorders. In each of these programed areas, funds are or will be available for planning and development programs, basic, and applied research, curriculum development, field testing, and demonstration, and dissemination. Under the present operational plan, each phase of the research program must be applied for separately; but we are encouraging applications for total programmatic support in 1963 (pp. 166–167).
>
> The heart of the new plan, however, would be the establishment of a series of curriculum study centers designed to (1) examine existing curricula in English; (2) design and develop new curricula where needed; (3) test and refine the curricula in actual school situations; and (4) produce and make available on a wide scale new curricula materials. Once the materials are developed they would be demonstrated to teachers through a series of demonstration centers established throughout the country (p. 169).
>
> In our experience with the first 2 years of Project English we feel reasonable assurance that this approach has met with great success in both establishing a programmatic approach to the development of new curriculums in English and in establishing a model for future programmatic approaches to other subject areas as well (p. 169).

After a lengthy analysis of the U.S. Office of Education's Project English and Project Social Studies, Ianni and Josephs tell us:

> The hub of the proposed new Office of Education curriculum research and development program would be the Curriculum Program Center and its associated demonstration schools established by university, groups of universities and colleges, or some parauniversity enterprise in association with a State department of education. Each Center would, with long-term Federal financing, conduct research, develop and test new curriculums, establish demonstration and training programs, and generally perform all of the functions now scattered among various institutions. Centers would be established in each of the major curriculum areas and would be associated with a nationwide network of model demonstration schools where new curriculum materials developed at various centers would be tested, evaluated, and made available to local school systems (p. 209).
>
> Now all that remains is to assure the more suspicious among educators that Federal aid is not synonymous with Federal control and that the time has come for bold, new steps in the improvement of education. Such steps will not come about without some positive articulation between the Federal concern for excellence in education and the reality of new curricular revision programs.
>
> And even this will not create the absolute reality. Perhaps in education there is no absolute, no final being since "the process of education" is a continuous becoming, a constant flux. To be even more specific, no curriculum can ever be in final form because as societies change so do the needs of both the individual and the society. The Aristotelian notion of change and reality and Bergson's observation that "we change without ceasing and * * * the state itself is nothing but change" are peculiarly true of education today. Certainly, the reality of education is a changing process; therefore it is the role of the U.S. Office of Education to foster the demands of that reality as it exists in an ever moving and fluid society" (p. 212).

I would like to ask two questions, Mr. Speaker:

First. What exactly is the degree of difference between Federal-aiding the school boards into rubberstamping a federally financed curriculum-change and "control of education"? Certainly the net result is calculated, probably by computer, to be the same.

Second. In reference to the statement by Ianni and Josephs that "no curriculum can ever be in final form because as societies change so do the needs of both the individual and society." During the last 30 years has any one person or group consciously, deliberately tried to fashion a curriculum to bring about social change?

In 1932, Mr. Speaker, Dr. George Counts, professor of education at Teachers College, Columbia University, a follower of Prof. John Dewey, philosophical "father of progressive education," and research director of a Carnegie Foundation-financed, 17-volume study of American education, published a pamphlet entitled "Dare the Schools Build a New Social Order?" in which he said:

> That the teachers should deliberately reach for power and then make the most of their conquest is my firm conviction. To the extent that they are permitted to fashion the curriculum and procedures of the school they will definitely and positively influence the social attitudes, ideals, and behavior of the coming generation (pp. 28–29).

Today, 32 years later, not only are certain educators deliberately reaching for power but they are being permitted to fashion the curriculum backed by the Federal funds and at the behest of the Johnson administration. Some of them are even playing interchangeable roles in Government and the universities. Their immediate target: the circumvention and "reform" of the school boards. This facet of the problem was cited in my speech of June 25, 1963, entitled "NEA Versus the School Boards."

INNOVATION AND EXPERIMENT IN EDUCATION

Further evidence of the Johnson administration's war on the school boards may be found, Mr. Speaker, in a pamphlet published by the U.S. Government Printing Office in March 1964:

> Innovation and Experiment in Education.—A Progress Report of the Panel on Educational Research and Development to the U.S. Commissioner of Education, the Director of the National Science Foundation, and the Special Assistant to the President for Science and Technology.

Although this panel report was not written exclusively by USOE staff, it is a natural sequel to the "Federal Education Agency of the Future—Report of the Committee on Organization and Mission of the U.S. Office of Education." Indeed, the new report outdoes the earlier report in its frankness in regard to local control of education.

In the table of contents of this remarkable panel report, we find among the panel's "leading ideas":

> "Inductive Teaching": (Education in which children induce generalities for themselves brings about more effective learning but requires new instructional materials and new teaching practices.)
>
> "Education in a Changing Society": (Social and technological change mean that youngsters must be prepared to cope with, and help shape, new developments.)
>
> "Aims of the Panel": (The chief aim is to suggest possible lines of action for Government offices and agencies involved in education.)

Before going on to quote from the panel report itself, I will let the panel identify itself. The panel, we are told on page 59:

> Was established in 1961 to operate under the auspices of the President's Science Advisory Committee. Like other such panels, it reports to the President's Special Assistant for Science and Technology, who is also chairman of the President's Science Advisory Committee; but the panel is unusual in that it also reports to the U.S. Commissioner of Education and to the Director of the National Science Foundation.
>
> The panel conducts business, and works to persuade other groups to conduct business, in several ways. There are, first, the regular meetings of the panel. Guests are frequently invited to these meetings to expand the range of competence in the room and to present special views. Growing out of such panel discussions are a variety of 1- and 2-day meetings to develop points of particular interest to the panel; 5 to 15 people take part in these meetings, a few of them chosen from the panel but most of them expert in appropriate fields. These meetings have been held on such topics as teacher education and nongraded schools. The meetings develop new ideas but serve mainly as ways to explore the feasibility of making larger studies, and in some cases to develop possible plans of approach for such studies. Finally, there are the larger studies, or seminars, lasting approximately 2 weeks and consisting of 30 to 50 people; against including a few people from the panel. The seminars have been held on such topics as learning about learning, music education, and education for the deprived and segregated.
>
> The seminars, and the other meetings too, serve as means of attracting new people to educational reform. The reports of the seminars serve both as guidelines for future action and as mandates for that action (p. 59).
>
> Funds for the meetings of the panel and for some of the special 1- and 2-day meetings come from the Office of Science and Technology, which was established in 1962 in the Executive Office of the President. The Office of Science and Technology supplies staff and other support for the President's Special Assistant for Science and Technology and the President's Science Advisory Committee. Funds for certain of these special meetings and for the seminars come from other agencies of the Government. These other agencies have included the Office of Education, the National Science Foundation, the National Institute of Mental Health, and the Office of Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Development. The seminars are supported by the usual procedures of grants or contracts to sponsoring universities, and such projects, of course, must pass an agency's usual reviewing procedures (p. 60).

In other words, Mr. Speaker, this is a federally financed undertaking which has been passed by the usual reviewing procedures of the agencies concerned.

Panel members and associates, we are told on pages 61 and 62, are as follows:

> Jerrold R. Zacharias, chairman, professor of physics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Mass.
>
> James E. Allen, Jr., commissioner of education, State education department, Albany, N.Y.
>
> B. Frank Brown, principal, Melbourne High School, 1050 Babcock Street, Melbourne, Fla.
>
> Jerome S. Bruner, Center for Cognitive Studies, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
>
> Frederick Burkhardt, president, American Council of Learned Societies, 345 East 46th Street, New York, N.Y.
>
> Bowen C. Dees, associate director (scientific personnel and education), National Science Foundation, Washington, D.C.
>
> Charles A. Ferguson, director, Center for Applied Linguistics, 1755 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
>
> John H. Fischer, president, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, N.Y.
>
> Ralph C. M. Flynt, Associate Commissioner for Educational Research and Development, U.S. Office of Education, Washington, D.C.
>
> Sister M. Jacqueline Grennan, S.L., vice president, Webster College, St. Louis, Mo.
>
> Martin Mayer, 33 East End Avenue, New York, N.Y.
>
> Sterling M. McMurrin, Department of Philosophy, University of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah.
>
> S. M. Nabrit, president, Texas Southern University, Houston, Tex.
>
> Marcus G. Raskin, codirector, Institute for Policy Studies, 1900 Florida Avenue NW, Washington, D.C.
>
> Patrick Suppes, Institute for Mathematical Studies in the Social Sciences, Ventura Hall, Stanford University, Stanford, Calif.
>
> Ralph W. Tyler, director, Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences, 202 Junipero Serra Boulevard, Stanford, Calif.
>
> Benjamin C. Willis, general superintendent of schools, Board of Education, City of Chicago, 228 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
>
> Consultants: Evelyn F. Carlson, associate superintendent, Board of Education, City of Chicago, 228 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.; Robert N. Kreidler, Alfred P. Sloan Foundation, 630 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.; Stephen White, Assistant to the President, Educational Services, Inc., Watertown, Mass.
>
> Principals: Leland Haworth, Director, National Science Foundation, Washington, D.C.; Donald F. Hornig, Special Assistant to the President for Science and Technology, The White House, Washington, D.C.; Francis Keppek, Commissioner of Education, U.S. Office of Education, Washington, D.C.
>
> Staff Assistant: Joseph Turner, Office of Science and Technology, Executive Office of the President, Washington, D.C.

It should be noted, Mr. Speaker, that Jerrold R. Zacharias of the MIT, is chairman of the Panel on Education Research and Development, which wrote the panel report, and which is under the auspices of the President's Science Advisory Committee, Executive Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Ralph C. M. Flynt, Associate Commissioner for Educational Research and Development, USOE, was one of the committee responsible for a Federal Education Agency of the Future.

Sterling M. McMurrin, department of philosophy, University of Utah, was U.S. Commissioner of Education when the Federal Education Agency for the Future was published by the Office of Education.

Francis Keppel, now U.S. Officer of Education, chaired a special panel meeting on Teacher Education in Chicago, November 9, 1962—as dean of the Graduate School of Education of Harvard University—page 68.

Also, Mr. Speaker, Francis A. J. Ianni, Cooperative Research Branch, USOE, from whose chapter in the New Curricula I have quoted, took part in some six special panel meetings.

According to the Chairman's foreword:

> The panel was established, and this report was essentially completed, during the tenure of Jerome B. Wiesner, now of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, as Special Assistant to the President for Science and Technology and as Chairman of the President's Science Advisory Committee. We have benefited greatly from his advice and encouragement, and we look forward to working with his successor Donald F. Hornig, as we have been working, and will continue to work, with Francis Keppel and Leland Haworth—page x.

The Innovation and Experiment in Education Panel has, "taken as its domain all of education inside schools and outside schools, for children and youth and for adults"—page 3—a not inconsiderable ambition. But in this first project report the panel touches only on the problems of "learning about learning," "music," "teacher education," and "the deprived and the segregated." It also covers much the same territory as does Dr. Ianni in regard to the USOE's Project English and Project Social Studies. I quote:

> Reforms as a continuing effort: The effort to improve education—to develop better curricular materials, better programs of teacher education, better schools, and school systems—is not a one-shot affair. This activity should be carried on continuously. At the heart of the current effort lies the assumption that nobody knows the ideal system. Meeting immediate needs can prepare the way for longer range reform, and new results in fundamental research will open up new possibilities. Changes in the schools will make possible changes in colleges, and changes in the colleges will make possible changes in the schools.
>
> If reform is to be a continuing effort, then a substantial research and development activity should be built into the educational system—page 5.
>
> A current effort to develop a built-in research component, which the Panel wishes to commend, is found in the newly enacted National Vocational Education Act of 1963. The act authorizes the use of 10 percent of all appropriated funds for research and development.
>
> Pedagogy is an experimental science, and to prefer one teaching method over another is to risk being dogmatic. But the experimenters must choose the places to begin research and the ways to proceed. In this sense the panel can be said to favor a particular approach to teaching, an approach called inductive teaching or the discovery method—pages 5–6.
>
> Learning about learning: There is much still to be learned about these three factors—reward, pleasure, and identification through learning—but several lines of school experimentation seems advisable. With respect to the anticipated rewards of learning, more is needed in our schools to illustrate realistically the manner in which schooling plays a role in life—to show what learning is for. The success story of young Abe Lincoln has limited relevance to the modern child, and particularly to the culturally deprived modern child from a background in which school is regarded as an interim in life (pp. 11–12).
>
> Music: The music education publishing business was found comparable to the automotive industry. A small number of companies are in intensive competition, with very little variation in product (p. 17).
>
> A number of ideas for improving music education were developed at the seminar. One idea was to produce a really new, and really musical, music series for the school curriculum (p. 18).
>
> Teacher education: One implication is that a teacher (sometimes referred to in this report as "he," sometimes as "she") must be better educated than he now is in the subjects that he teaches (p. 23).
>
> A second implication is that prospective teachers must study a number of things that a person seeking only competence in the subject need not study—pedagogy and related matters (p. 23).
>
> At various times in the series of meetings on teacher education, consideration was given to the development of educational complexes in appropriate geographical areas. A complex would include a graduate school of education, several colleges and universities, institutions devoted principally to teacher training, a large number of public school systems, and institutions devoted to educational research and development.
>
> Besides giving prospective teachers experience teaching in public schools and bringing them into contact with the problems of curriculum development, such a complex would provide an augmented flow of scholarship from the colleges and universities into the graduate school of education, where it might contribute to the formation of educational policies and practices (p. 27).
>
> The deprived and the segregated: The panel decided to urge an appropriate group to organize a special project on education for what it initially called "the difficult 30 percent" and now calls "the deprived and segregated." These are youngsters suffering from one or more handicaps, handicaps predisposing them to other handicaps—youngsters on the hardship end of such scales as family income, home atmosphere, skin color, scores on IQ tests, location of the home in the community, location of the community in the Nation, and motivation. They are mostly the children of the poor, usually the children of Negroes, Puerto Ricans, mountain people who have migrated to midwestern cities, workers in service jobs, people in depressed rural areas (p. 29).
>
> The seminar was conducted by the Bank Street College of Education, under a joint contract with the Office of Education, the National Institute of Mental Health, and the Office of Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Development (p. 29).
>
> The seminar brought together approximately 60 people from a wide range of occupations and with a wide range of interests. The participants included teachers, principals, superintendents, professors of education, physicists, biologists, mathematicians, sociologists, social psychologists, philosophers, psychiatrists, novelists, criminologists, judges, lawyers, curriculum reformers, people from foundations, and people from the Federal Government. The seminar was interdisciplinary; it was also interracial (p. 29–30).
>
> By all known criteria, the majority of urban and rural slum schools are failures. In neighborhood after neighborhood across the country, more than half of each age group fails to complete high school, and 5 percent or fewer go on to some form of higher education (p. 30).
>
> The schools are in competition with another educational system, the streets. Staffed by people proud of their professionalism and supervised by boards of education drawn almost exclusively from the upper-middle and upper classes, school systems are often crippled by social parochialism in dealing

> with deprived and segregated children (p. 31).
>
> The panel believes that assistance to the schools is not a matter simply of providing additional funds for more classrooms and for increasing the ratio of teachers to pupils; it is also a matter of experimentation. Schools must learn to make such services more efficient and more effective. The panel believes that special research programs are necessary for deprived and for segregated children. These efforts will require certain familiar forms of research—curriculum development and teacher education—and certain new forms.
>
> A special program in curriculum development does not mean production of watered-down material or any implication that these children are incapable of possessing the world of imagination, from literature to electronics, or that they do not possess their own world of imagination. But the children come to school with experiences different from those of other children and take what they have learned back to different homes. Their teachers must understand what these children know and value and must teach in a way that builds on that foundation. These special materials might also prove useful in improving the education of the more fortunate members of the school population.
>
> The children of the deprived and segregated do not get much help from a standard reading program. Special programs are needed (p. 31–32).
>
> For example, the slum child might read a story in which a child has his own bed in his own room and then return to a home where the entire family sleeps in one small room. The answer may be to let children themselves fill in the details of a story. A child in a story can sleep, but the pupils can say (and write) how and when he sleeps. To give children freedom to shape the manner of their learning is possible in other areas, too. In some schools the visitor will hear kindergarten children reciting nursery rhymes to a jazz beat.
>
> Some subjects, such as arithmetic and science, can readily be taught in an intuitive, nonbookish way. Learning arithmetic—or, more broadly, mathematics—need not depend on the student's ability to read (p. 32).
>
> Also necessary is innovation in the institutions of education—classroom practices, recruitment and utilization of teachers, use of the school building, relationship of the school to the community (p. 34).
>
> Model systems: To develop fully these lines of innovation, still another form of experimentation must be added: the establishment of model school systems—or, within a big-city system, subsystems comprising about 20,000 pupils and 30 principals (p. 37).
>
> The management of the system itself will also be the subject of experiment. The school "system" is a natural unit for reform. The system is an organic, semiautonomous unit of education, with pension plans and supervisors, principals, promotion and hiring procedures, specification of jobs, adoption committees. It has electoral responsibilities, public-relations problems, budgetary experience. World War II measured armies by divisions because the division was the smallest military unit that included all services—Infantry, Artillery, Tanks, and Air. The school system is the "division" of education.
>
> Within a big-city system, a model subsystem would report directly to the superintendent of schools. The subsystem would have its own lay advisory council or "board," including members of the school staff, members of academic faculties of universities, and artists, musicians, writers, lawyers and other interested people from the community. The subsystem could be developed cooperatively by a university, an association of universities, or a special nonprofit organization and the school staff. Selection of the "board" would be made with a view to its task, the cooperative direction of a comprehensive experiment.
>
> The subsystem should be of such superlative quality that it would draw children from middle-class as well as deprived neighborhoods. Such subsystems could be started in the Nation's 10 largest cities and could be staffed partly by people already working in the schools of these cities, partly by newcomers, partly by outsiders. Support could come from sources not usually available directly to the cities—from the large foundations and the Federal Government—and could build up to around $10 million a year for each system.
>
> Model systems are needed as testing and demonstration grounds for new programs. Novelty in one area may require changes in other areas. If a program is really to be tested, freedom to make those other changes is also necessary. To offer one example, new curricular materials require that children play a more active role in their own education. This has implications for the relationships between pupil and teacher, but it also has implications for the relationship between teacher and school principal. If the pupil is to exercise more initiative, the teacher must also exercise more initiative, and this means he must be given a freer hand by the principal. The lesson plans that teachers now generally prepare for their principals should not work against an approach to education that requires teachers to exercise more initiative.
>
> The lines of innovation sketched in the previous section can be pursued separately, but when they are pursued together, many new possibilities open up. To offer a more extended example, such structures as nongraded schools and team teaching have been combined before, but they might now be combined additionally with new procedures for recruiting teachers (persons can be hired who are not yet certified); with use of the school as a teacher-training institute (in cooperation with local colleges and universities); with introduction of new curricular materials (new teachers can be trained immediately in their use); and with use of other professional people outside the schools (persons who helped develop the new curricular materials can help train teachers in their use).
>
> The idea of an autonomous subsystem within a big city school system is not new, nor are the specific programs discussed above. What is new is the notion that such a subsystem would be an experimental system, with freedom to experiment across the board—curriculum, recruitment of teachers, utilization of teachers, the management of the system itself (p. 38–39).

This was the blueprint for Dr. Hansen's model system the school board here in our Nation's Capital has been persuaded to accept.

The panel, on page 5 of its report claims:

> Thus, models can indicate new paths in education without interfering with traditional local responsibilities [sic]. The development of new educational programs provides the Nation's school system with more and better things to choose from. But the school administrator or school board continues to exercise the same responsibilities (p. 5).

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the rubber stamping of a plan inspired by a central planning group offering dollars for its acceptance falls far short of School Board responsibilities to think and decide what sort of education is best for the children in its care. On June 16, I inserted in the RECORD, at page 13983, a report from the Washington Post on the District of Columbia model system. I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point a followup Post article on the subject by Eve Edstrom.

AGENCIES FORGET THEIR SNIPING, FOCUS ON CARDOZO AREA SCHOOLS

(By Eve Edstrom)

Until last week when School Superintendent Carl F. Hansen pushed a plan to turn 18 schools into model educational laboratories, Washington's effort to lift slum children out of poverty appeared to be in a state of crisis.

This was because community agencies were more concerned over who was going to do what instead of what was going to be done.

But now, with some help from White House advisers, the roles of key agencies have been clarified and they are moving ahead with ambitious plans for the 18 schools in the Cardozo High School area.

The educational innovations, which are crucial to widening the horizons of deprived children, will emanate from Hansen and the School Board.

LOOK TO PRESIDENTIAL PANEL

But school officials will rely heavily on the advice of the Presidential Panel on Educational Research and Development which has recommended that big cities operate a cluster of schools as model laboratories for bringing across-the-board services to slum children.

The Chairman of the Panel, Jerrold Zacharias, who helped to initiate the curriculum reform movement in science, and other top-notch educational innovators, will be available to aid the District in establishing its model system.

Also working closely with the schools will be the United Planning Organization which already has $336,000 in private foundation funds and expects to be the funnel for any money the District receives from President Johnson's antipoverty effort.

The role of the United Planning Organization is that of a catalyst to help all community agencies fight against poverty, unemployment, inadequate educational opportunity, and slum housing. As such, it could grant money to the schools to carry out parts of its model plan.

FINANCE MANY SERVICES

It also will help finance many of the new services which Washington Action for Youth (WAY) has designed to improve health, recreation, and family living in the Cardozo area.

That plan, calling for an expenditure of $7 million to bring a saturation of services to disadvantaged children, is expected to be completed by the end of this month. WAY then will be absorbed by the United Planning Organization, which will move ahead to put the plan in action.

WAY had selected the Cardozo area, known as the inner city target area, for the focal point of its plan and had proposed drastic revisions in the educational programs of the area's 18 schools.

HANSEN COOL TO PLAN

But School Superintendent Hansen and his staff showed little enthusiasm for WAY's proposals. Hansen said they duplicated much of what is being done by the schools and that many of the proposals were too broad.

However, Hansen's opposition also stemmed from the fact that he resented noneducators telling him how to run the schools. And he and the school board feared that WAY might be usurping their powers. Antagonism was especially pronounced between Hansen and WAY's director Jack R. Goldberg, who last month returned to his former post as a camping director in New York because the WAY effort was almost completed.

Eventually, the school board adopted a watered-down version of WAY's proposals. Paul P. Cooke was appointed a temporary director of the program but Hansen stressed that Cooke would not institute programs or issue orders.

Consequently, some persons who worked closely on developing the WAY program felt it would come to naught because the schools would not be a central instrument for effecting changes in the lives of deprived children.

But Hansen, in revealing on Thursday that he fully intended to use the 18 schools for wide-ranging educational experimentation, has put the schools at the hub of the effort to salvage the talents of slum children.

THE USOE V. THE SCHOOL BOARDS

You may recall that at the time of the publication of the "Federal Education Agency for the Future—Report of the Committee on Organization and Mission of the U.S. Office of Education" I analysed it and here on the floor denounced it as "a blueprint for complete domination and direction of our schools from Washington." I revealed the reorganization of the Office of Education according to the plans drawn in the mission report for the admitted purpose of attaining the mission goal of OE "leadership" in education. I showed that OE staff members responsible for the mission report had themselves appointed to positions of power in the new structure. And I brought this information up to date in a speech entitled "U.S. Office of Education Versus the School Boards," October 23, 1964.

I can now reveal that a refinement of the OE reorganization has recently taken place, Mr. Speaker, to bring it into better focus on the problem of sociological change. The new reorganization of the Bureau of Educational Research and Development was announced by Commissioner Keppel, April 27, 1964. According to the USOE press release:

> Reorganization of the Bureau of Education Research and Development within the U.S. Office of Education was announced today by Commissioner Francis Keppel.
>
> As a result, the Bureau will operate with five divisions instead of six, under the supervision of Associate Commissioner Ralph C. M. Flynt.
>
> Enlarged and given significant new responsibility was the Division of Educational Research, a division with a name similar to the Bureau's. It now contains four branches: Basic Research and Media Research and two new branches—Curriculum and Demonstration, and Arts and Humanities. The latter formerly was the Cultural Affairs Branch.
>
> To the Curriculum and Demonstration Branch were added the specialists in English, the social sciences, mathematics and science, and talent development. Formerly the specialists were assigned to the Divisions of Higher Education, and Elementary and Secondary Education. Francis A. J. Ianni, former director of the Cooperative Research Branch, will head the Division.

The emphasis on social change is evident from Dr. Ianni's background, Mr. Speaker, not as an educator, but as a sociologist and anthoropoligst. According to a biographical sketch supplied to me by his office:

> Born: Wilmington, Del., March 29, 1926, Married, 3 children.
>
> Education: B.S. (psychology, the Pennsylvania State University, 1949), M.A. (Sociology and anthropology) ibid, 1950. Additional graduate work in anthoropology at Pennsylvania State and at Yale and University of Pennsylvania, Ph. D. (sociology and anthropology) 1952.
>
> Fellowships: Stipend Fellow, The Pennsylvania State University (1950–52) Ford Foundation Fellow, Behavioral Research Council, University of Pennsylvania (1951–52), Carnegie Corporation Fellow, Yale University (1956–57), resident fellow, Berkeley College, Yale University (1956–57), awarded Fulbright Research grant (Italy) 1955, grantee, Bureau of Specialists and Leaders in Education, U.S. Department of State, Ethiopia, 1958, awarded Fulbright Research grant, University of Rome (1959), Smith-Mundt grantee, U.S. Department of State, University, College of Addis Abba, Ethiopia (1959–61).

His professional experience includes:

> In 1950–52: Graduate assistant, Pennsylvania State University. Taught courses in introductory sociology and social problems.
>
> In 1951–52: Fellow, Behavioral Research Council (Ford Foundation).
>
> In 1952–58: Instructor to associate professor, anthropology and psychology, Russell Sage College.
>
> In 1955: Awarded Fulbright research grant for study of Italian ethnological materials on Ethiopia and Eritrea. Visiting assistant professor of sociology, State University of New York (summer sessions).
>
> In 1956–57: Carnegie Corp. teaching fellowship to develop behavioral science course at Yale.
>
> In 1959–61: Awarded Fulbright research grant (University of Rome) and Smith-Mundt grant (Ethiopia) for additional field work among Danakil. Served as professor of anthropology, University College, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. Established social science research program. Lecture tour in East and Central Africa and in Israel for U.S. Information Service.
>
> In 1961: Research coordinator-acting director, cooperative research program, U.S. Office of Education.
>
> In 1962: Director, Cooperative Research Branch, U.S. Office of Education.

In addition to his contribution to the book "New Curricula" from which I quoted earlier, Dr. Ianni has written:

> "The Norristown Study: Technological Change and Social Adjustment," Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, 1959. Sidney Goldstein, senior editor.
>
> "Adolescent Culture," New York, Dorsey Press, 1964 (with David Gottlieb).
>
> "World Minority Group Relations" manuscripts, in preparation under contract to Harper & Bros.
>
> "The Negro Student," manuscripts, in preparation under contract with Prentice-Hall, "Time and Place as Variables in Acculturation Research," "American Anthropologist," volume No. XIV, February, 1958; "Social Class Position and Child Rearing and Child Bearing," "American Journal of Public Health," June 1958;. "Psychological Determinants of Danakil Social Structure," "Bulletin of the Ethnological Society," Addis Ababa, July, 1939; "The Federal Concern for Educational Research," "Harvard-Ford Foundation Seminar on Education and Public Policy" (forthcoming); "Inhibition and Curiosity," School Life, September 1962; "The Contribution of Behavioral Science to Research in Teacher Education," Research in Teacher Education, Bulletin No. 20.

On page 3 of "Innovation and Experimentation in Education—A Progress Report of the Panel on Educational Research and Development," Mr. Speaker, this pamphlet to which Dr. Ianni made at least an indirect contribution as his superior Dr. Flynt, Associate Commissioner for Educational Research and Development—a panel member—made a direct contribution, we find the statement:

> Education for the deprived and the segregated is an important facet of the attack on poverty.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the so-called attack on poverty is an important facet of the administration's war on the school boards. It is part of a master strategy which also includes the USOE's reorganization for the attainment of its "mission"; the USOE research and development centers for curriculum innovation and the establishment of an urban extension service; the panel report on innovation and experimentation education; and the model school system School Superintendent Dr. Hansen has been persuaded to set up here in Washington.

ROAD TO SERFDOM

In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, of all of these facets to the administration's master strategy for its war on the school boards, the so-called Economic Opportunities Act is by all odds the most serious—and this for three principal reasons:

First. It would create a precedent for the bypassing of State and local governments and particularly the school boards.

Second. It would give to Mr. Shriver and to Federal educational bureaucrats under the guise of "welfare" immediate control of the education of the "deprived and the segregated."

Third. The direct federally controlled Federal aid that it would pour into the communities might well act as a narcotic to local initiative and responsibility so that pulling out of it again would require a second American Revolution.

The so-called Economic Opportunities Act, in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, is not a "war on poverty," it is a power grab. It cruelly plays politics with promises to the poor and unfortunate while maneuvering to wrench control of education and poverty-relief programs from the State and local governments. I do not mean merely to hurl epithets. I am simply saying this: the problems of education and training, of school dropouts, of juvenile delinquency and crime and related matters are local responsibilities and when the Federal Government takes over these responsibilities, however well-meaning its officials, we are on our way to losing our liberties, we are on what Professor von Hayek calls in his brilliant monograph "the road to serfdom."

It is for these reasons, Mr. Speaker, that I will offer my amendments to this power grab bill and make an effort to restore some semblance of local control which will preserve local autonomy.

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT TO PROHIBIT THE PEOPLE OF ANY STATE FROM APPORTIONING THE MEMBERSHIP OF ONE HOUSE OF LEGISLATURE BASED ON POPULATION

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Brock] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a constitutional amendment which states that nothing shall prohibit the people of any State from apportioning the membership of one house of their legislature on factors other than population, if the citizens of the State shall have the opportunity to vote on such an apportionment. That the need for any amendment should arise is a sad testiment of the regrettable usurpation by the Supreme Court of powers reserved to the States and their citizens under the Constitution.

Recent decisions strike hard at our time-honored system of limited government with checks and balances. The latest edict further attempts to interpret the 14th amendment to mean that a State's own legislature, duly elected by the people of that State, is in violation of the U.S. Constitution if both houses do not strictly adhere to a new formula based solely on population. The Court's slogan, "one man—one vote" has a ringing appeal to all who believe in fairplay. However, whether it is politically expedient to challenge such a popular slogan or not, we must in all fairness question where they derive the authority for the assumption of this jurisdiction.

Our historic doctrine of a government of the people, by the people, and for the people was rendered asunder by the decision—specifically in the State of Colorado.

Only weeks before the Supreme Court decision, the people of the State of Colorado voted to apportion their two houses, one on the basis of population and the other on the basis of other factors. The constitutional change was approved by the voters of every county, including the most metropolitan areas, with majorities ranging from 2 to 1, to 3 to 1 and greater. In the most unbelievable abridgement of the rights of the voters of Colorado, the Supreme Court threw out the results and said, in effect, that no longer shall the people of Colorado have the right to govern themselves in such a manner.

The Constitution with its amendments is clear in its intention—each State was meant to be sovereign in matters such as local and State elections. In fact, the U.S. Senate is apportioned on a State line basis rather than in accordance with population.

This constitutional compromise insured that smaller States had the protection of some representation in our National Government. The larger States were to have more voice in the House of Representatives which were apportioned by population. In this way, each has a voice. In this way, even the smallest group was given the constitutional guarantee of at least receiving fair and adequate hearings in the councils of our Nation.

Thus it is with a sincere regret that I felt it incumbent upon me to introduce this constitutional amendment, one which simply spells out again a principle which I believe to be so basic to our American way of life that I find it difficult to understand how any court could violate it; the principle that the people of the United States have the right and must maintain the right to govern themselves.

THE SIXTH OBSERVANCE OF CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, JULY 12–16, 1964

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. Short] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to have this opportunity to join with my colleagues in the House of Representatives in observing the sixth anniversary of our national recognition of the captive nations of Europe.

On the eve of our own celebration of Independence Day, which had its birth on July 4, 1776, it is fitting that we keep in mind the nations of Europe today in physical captivity to the Soviet Union.

That these nations, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Ukraine, Rumania, Czechoslovakia, Poland, East Germany, Hungary, White Ruthenia, Bulgaria, Armenia, mainland China, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, and Cuba—long for freedom from their state of captivity—is self-evident.

That there is a continuing effort on the part of the U.S.S.R. and her sister Communist nation, Red China, to complete the subjugation of Europe, is also self-evident. This desire for subjugation of other nations is not even confined to the European continent—it has clearly extended to our own hemisphere, and we had a sharp reminder of this in recent years when we discovered Russian missiles and troops on an island only 90 miles off our own shores—Cuba. We will not soon forget that lesson, nor will we overlook the attempts to extend the Communist empire to South America. It almost seems that wherever we look in the world today we find no peace. Yet, we hear daily protestations of peaceful intentions from the Soviet Union, just as did the present captive nations in Europe before their takeover was completed.

We know in this country the value of a dynamic democracy. For those foreign countries who view our national campaigns every 4 years with wonder, we quote words from the writings of one of our American sociologists, Saul D. Alinsky, who said:

> There can be no democracy unless it is a dynamic democracy. When our people cease to participate—to have a place in the sun—then all of us will wither in the darkness of decadence. All of us will become mute, demoralized souls.

This cannot happen in our country as long as we are aware of the value of our freedoms, and the need to be active in the affairs of our Government. The time to become worried is when the people can no longer become aroused over presidential candidates, and candidates for the House of Representatives or the Senate, or the State legislatures, on down to the local offices.

The only way to make the mass of any people see the beauty of justice, and of a government founded on principles of justice, is to show them in plain terms the consequences of injustice. For this reason, it would seem important for us to press for creation of a Special Committee on the Captive Nations. In this way we will be able to study the results or consequences of what happened to those people of the captive nations when they were taken under the pseudoprotecting wing of the Soviet Union. These people live in twilight zones of the spirit. They cannot freely speak citicism of their government; they cannot publish critical observations of those in power; they cannot travel freely; they cannot take part in free elections—with a choice of candidates—but instead are handed a sop by supposedly casting their votes for one candidate and told this is freedom. When news is beamed their way, through the Voice of America, or Radio Free Europe, the broadcasts are jammed with a few rare exceptions. When they get news of our country's affairs, it is news of the kind their captors feel they should hear—in other words, the frailties and the weak spots here and there in our Government and daily life. The isolated cases of injustice or wrong are played up as though these are acceptable, daily occurrences which our type of government stands powerless to control. Even our open and public disagreements with one another are used as examples of disorder in a weak people and weak government.

I believe, however, that these people cannot help but realize that if we are able to voice our feelings so freely, we surely have freedom of a unique quality which they obviously are not able to enjoy. The one thing which the Communist dictatorships are not able to do is make captive the minds and hearts of these people, unless they are willing to let them do so.

Our fine and respected former President, Herbert Hoover once said:

> The spark of liberty in the mind and spirit of man cannot be long extinguished; it will break into flames that will destroy every coercion which seems to limit it.

The spark of liberty is indeed flickering in the minds of many of the peoples of these captive nations. We can see the results of this spark from time to time in news from Poland; news from Cuba; news from many other parts of the world. We hear reports of the stirrings in these countries and we know the history of the world proves beyond all doubt that those who desire freedom will not forever be denied.

We cannot forget our own heritage. Our desire for freedom overcame the natural reluctance of many to break away from a mother state.

We must be diligent to remind the people in these nations to nurture carefully the spark of freedom. We know the pretensions of the Communists of a policy of "noninterference in the internal affairs of states" for the falsehood it is. We have free access to information and we have seen clearly the results of the foreign policy of the U.S.S.R. since the beginning of its own revolution when it overthrew the rule of the czars, only to have forced upon them the rule of a Communist dictatorship.

Only half a century ago, the world was largely made up of empires. These have gone their way, with but a few exceptions where the ruler is only a figurehead without power to affect the true government of their people.

In its place, however, we have seen the supposedly "peaceful means" whereby the Communist dictatorship has swept into its protective embrace 23 nations on the European continent, and will sweep even more unless they become aware of the falsity of their surface friendship.

Indeed, our own Nation was in danger during the thirties, when in the midst of a depression we found the false ideology of communism had become attractive to many discouraged American citizens. To a large extent, these same American citizens—once they became aware of the falsity of communism—returned to American principles of government. For those who still remain captive in mind to the Communist ideology we have deep pity, but not the kind of pity that will allow them to freely subvert our Nation without even a word of protest from those of us who truly value our American republican form of government.

We in this country know what it means to earn liberty. Beginning with the first small group of courageous men and women who sought not only civil, but religious, liberty as well, this grew from a small whisper to a shout on July 4, 1776, when the Declaration of Independence came into being. An English clergyman, Caleb C. Colton, once wrote:

> Liberty will not descend to a people; a people must raise themselves to liberty; it is a blessing that must be earned before it can be enjoyed.

To me this truth was voiced in some of the finest words of our history as a nation, and I offer them to each of the captive nations, to ponder and cherish in their hearts until the day they can let the spark become a flame of liberty for their country:

> When in the course of human events, it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bands which have connected them with another, and to assume among the powers of the earth, the separate and equal station to which the laws of nature and of nature's God entitle them, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to this separation.
>
> We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness—that to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed, that whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new government, laying its foundation on such principles, and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness.
>
> Prudence, indeed, will dictate that governments long established should not be changed for light and transient causes; and accordingly all experience hath shewn, that mankind are more disposed to suffer, while evils are sufferable, than to right themselves by abolishing the forms to which they are accustomed. But when a long train of abuses and usurpations, pursuing invariably the same object, evinces a design to reduce them under absolute despotism, it is their right—it is their duty—to throw off such government and to provide new guards for their future security.

These are the words which lighted the torch of liberty for this Nation. These are the principles which, if nurtured, will one day cause the captive nations we honor here today, to throw off their government and provide new guards for their future security.

As long as only a half-dozen people in each captive nation subscribe to these principles, the spark will be kept alive—and one day it will take form and substance and the nations under captivity will throw off their bonds and become free. With this freedom, God grant that they cherish their added knowledge, born of their suffering under captivity, to truly provide themselves with the new guards which will provide protection for their future security.

SUPREME COURT DECISION ON APPORTIONMENT OF STATE LEGISLATIVE BODIES

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maine [Mr. McINTIRE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, there have already been expressions of great concern in this House over the decision on the 15th of June by the Supreme Court that both branches of State legislative bodies must be apportioned on the basis of population. I would like to add my voice to those who have proposed that something must be done to erase this action. I, therefore, introduce a House joint resolution as an amendment to the Constitution to read as follows:

> The Judiciary powers of the United States shall not be construed to extend to any suit in law or equity concerning the apportionment of representation in a State legislature if either or both Houses of that State legislature are apportioned on the basis of approximately equal population, and the citizens of the State have approved by vote in referendum the composition of representation of its legislative body.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that this amendment would not only protect our form of government but assure that the interests of minorities and majorities, too, would be guaranteed their rightful protection.

Mr. Speaker, I most sincerely feel that if we do not act in such a manner as to reverse this momentous decision, minority groups in the United States will be stripped of their most singular voice in Government. May I say, that the legislative bodies of our Government, are unique in the representation they give to the will and desires of the majority, while affording, at the same time, protection for the rights of minorities. I would not like to see this changed. I would not like to think that by a 6 to 3 vote the Supreme Court could usurp the legislative prerogatives of the Congress of the United States. I would not like to think that this House would permit such a thing to happen without protest.

Chief Justice Earl Warren has stated that legislators represent people, and not trees, or acres—that legislators are elected by voters and not farms or cities or economic interests. But it is a fact of our way of life that trees, and acres, and farms, and cities, and economic interests are vital to the welfare of our people. I know what these things mean to the people of Maine and I know what they mean to the peoples of other States. But if the people of the United States had wanted to change their form of government, this could have been done by petition and legislative action through their duly elected representatives. Justice John Harlan has hit the nail on the head in his dissenting opinion. He says:

> What is done today deepens my conviction that judicial entry into this realm is profoundly ill-advised and constitutionally impermissible. I believe that the vitality of our political system, on which in the last analysis all else depends, is weakened by reliance on the judiciary for political reform.

Right at the heart of the matter is Justice Harlan's comment that the Constitution is an instrument of government, fundamental to which is the premise that in a diffusion of governmental authority lies the greatest promise that this Nation will realize liberty for its citizens. He states that the Court exceeds its authority and has added something to the Constitution which was deliberately excluded from it. Justice Potter Stewart stated that he considered the Supreme Court's decision a long step backward and Justice Tom Clark also disagreed with the majority opinion. Yet, unless we do something about it, six men have changed the direction of the Nation and altered the historic strength we have found in the Constitution.

I agree with Chief Justice Earl Warren who once held an entirely different view on the matter of apportionment as reported in the July 6 issue of U.S. News & World Report. In a speech at Merced, Calif., on October 29, 1948, he said:

> Many California counties are far more important in the life of the State than their population bears to the entire population of the State. It is for this reason that I have never been in favor of restricting the representation in the Senate to a strictly population basis.
>
> It is the same reason that the Founding Fathers of our country gave balanced representations to the States of the Union—equal representation in one House and proportionate representation based on population in the other.
>
> Moves have been made to upset the balanced representation in our State, even though it has served us well and is strictly

> in accord with American tradition and the pattern of our National Government.
>
> There was a time when California was completely dominated by boss rule. The liberal election laws and legislative apportionment of the system have liberated us from such domination. Any weakening of the laws would invite a return to boss rule which we are now happily rid of.
>
> Our State has made almost unbelievable progress under our present system of legislative representation. I believe we should keep it.

Mr. Speaker, the present form of our National Legislature has set the pattern for good government throughout the free world. The legislative bodies of our States have confirmed the rightness of the system, in fact, some were well established before the Federal body came into being. The States of the Union and the citizens of the United States must look upon June 15 as the day upon which the delicate balance, which protected all people from the absolute control of the majority, was upset. The Congress of the United States must look upon this day as another day when its exclusive right to make the law of the land was abrogated. And I am sure that history will note this day as that upon which we departed from the wise path which the founders of our country clearly marked with their genius when they prepared the Constitution. I say that this must not happen. It is the duty of this House to act decisively and repair the damage before it is too late.

APPALACHIAN DEVELOPMENT—A POLITICAL GIMMICK

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, about 7 weeks ago the President of the United States, with great fanfare, submitted to the Congress his proposed Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1964. Almost before the ink was dry on the 45-page printed bill, H.R. 11065, an ad hoc subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works was appointed, and public hearings commenced.

MISSING—CAREFUL THOUGHT AND STUDY

Hearings on the bills have continued through 17 separate sessions over a period of 5 weeks, and one fact has been made embarassingly clear: the bill, as prepared by the executive branch and recommended by the President, is a prime example of fuzzy thinking and poor legislative drafting. It is vague and ambiguous, it can be interpreted in almost any way one wishes, and it contains provisions which would have the Congress abdicate many of its most basic responsibilities.

Witness after witness—including spokesmen for the executive branch who necessarily favor the bill and will assist in its administration if it is enacted—proposed or conceded the necessity for amendments, clarifications, and revisions of the bill. Perhaps the nadir was reached during the testimony of Secretary of the Interior Udall, who appeared before the Ad Hoc Subcommittee on which I serve, on May 6. Secretary Udall's testimony did not seem to bear much relationship to the bill recommended by the President. It developed that the Secretary's testimony was based upon the erroneous assumption that a number of specific administration-sponsored amendments to the bill dealing with mining areas had been submitted to the subcommittee. They had not been—and at the end of the hearings on June 11, some 5 weeks later, still had not been—submitted to the subcommittee. In fact, they have not yet been submitted.

When the President of the United States recommends legislation to the Congress, the Members should be able to devote their attention to the merits of the proposal on the assumption that the bill is properly drawn and clearly and precisely reflects the President's views as to the methods and details of accomplishing his objectives. The proposed Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1964 is so in need of major revision that a serious question is presented as to whether the proposal is the product of careful thought and study, as it is publicized to be, or a spur-of-the-moment gimmick mainly with political gain in mind. The administration has spotlighted the plight of some of our allegedly less fortunate neighbors, in one part of the country, often to their great embarrassment, and then raced about madly in all directions ballyhooing a hastily drawn, poorly conceived, ineffective, and inadequately developed Federal plan for their assistance.

A proposal to extend massive Federal aid to assist, what is termed, a poverty stricken area is an attractive objective from a humane as well as a political viewpoint. But, in the interests of the people of Appalachia, as well as the millions of taxpayers throughout the Nation, the details of such a proposal must be closely examined to assure that it will actually be beneficial to the people who need help, rather than merely aiding politicians in Washington, D.C.

UNLIMITED SPENDING FOR THE SAKE OF SPENDING

The mere spending of great sums of money by the Federal Government will not necessarily assure permanent economic improvement of the Appalachian area. It, alone, will not guarantee new jobs and a continuing higher standard of living for the people of Appalachia. Government spending which is unlimited in this bill, merely for the sake of spending, historically has proved to be of little lasting benefit to the economic well-being of people. Even the Public Works Acceleration Act, which was enacted in 1962 as a highly publicized solution to the nationwide unemployment problem, has proved to be a failure. Almost $900 million has been obligated under this program, and the Area Redevelopment Administration has been unable to show any substantial reduction in unemployment actually attributable to the program. They have made glowing reports of the number of jobs to be created by projects, as distinguished from the number of unemployed persons actually put to work, but even these figures have been ballooned out of all reason, apparently in an effort to secure congressional authorization of additional funds. The Comptroller General of the United States, in a report to the Congress in May of this year, advised that the ARA has overstated the on-site man-months actually worked on projects by from 83 to 128 percent. Furthermore, the on-site man-year project cost has been exorbitantly high, frequently exceeding $50,000, and in at least one instance exceeding $1 million. The expenditure of almost $900 million under the PWA program may have helped someone, but it has been of little demonstrated assistance to unemployed persons.

ONE HUNDRED PERCENT FEDERAL FUNDS WAIVE STATE RESPONSIBILITIES

We find this same type of PWA program included in the President's proposed Appalachian legislation, only bigger—and better—insofar as the expenditure of public funds is concerned. Section 216 of the bill would authorize the Secretary of Commerce—who is in charge of the ARA and PWA programs—to allocate unlimited Federal funds for 100 percent of the cost of such existing and future Federal grant-in-aid programs as he may designate, except for construction of highways. This 100 percent Federal financing would be available until the beginning of the third full fiscal year after enactment of the bill, and thereafter the Federal share of the cost would not exceed 80 percent.

The PWA Act provided for a maximum of only 75 percent Federal contribution to the cost of projects, whenever the State or local government cannot pay all of its usual 50-percent share of the cost. It would appear that all existing grant-in-aid programs, including PWA and ARA, and all grant-in-aid programs to be enacted by Congress in the future, which provide assistance for the construction or operation of facilities, would be eligible for this increased Federal financing. Irrespective of what Congress may have prescribed as State and local matching funds requirements, for whatever good and valid reason, under the proposed legislation such requirements can be waived by the Secretary of Commerce for all or parts of those portions of the 10 States within the designated Appalachian region.

There is clearly no justification for an expanded and 100-percent financed PWA program in Appalachia, particularly when its nationwide application has not proved to be effective in securing the desired results. Furthermore, there is neither any time limit nor any dollar limit on this Appalachian WPA portion of the bill.

A BLANK CHECK PROGRAM

In fact, there is no dollar limit on any portions of the legislation proposed by the President, except for the construction of highways at $976 million, health facilities at $26 million, and the purchase of stock in the Appalachian Development Corporation at $550 million. Section 501 is an open-end, blanket authorization for the appropriation of such amounts as may be necessary, without any limitation whatsoever, to carry out all of the remaining programs contained in the bill. No administration witness who appeared before the ad hoc subcommittee would even hazard a guess as to how much the entire Appalachian program would ultimately cost the American taxpayers, although the figure of $4.6 billion has been rumored for a 3-year period. Furthermore, the bill imposes no time limit on the many programs it encompasses, except to place a 5-year limit on grants of Federal funds for the operation of health facilities.

COMPLETE VETO POWER IN FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Title I of the bill establishes the Appalachian Regional Commission, which is composed of a representative of each of the 10 States involved, and one Federal member, who has complete veto power over the decisions and plans of the Commission. This is in addition to the authority of the Secretary of Commerce or other designated Federal officials to approve or disapprove proposals submitted by the Commission.

The Commission apparently is not a Federal agency—although this is as subject to doubt as other parts of the bill—and its officers and employees are not considered Federal employees. Yet, the Federal Government will pay, under section 105, all of the expenses of the Commission for 2 to 3 fiscal years, and half of such expenses thereafter.

Who would submit a budget for such expenses, to whom would the funds be appropriated, and who, if anyone, would audit the books, is not stated. There seems to be no real Federal control over the amount of such expenses, which, considering the functions of the Commission, could be substantial.

Also, sections 106(c) and 107(b) of the bill authorize Federal agencies to make available to the Appalachian Regional Commission information and personnel "on a reimbursable or, where appropriate, nonreimbursable basis." The bill contains no indication as to when or why it would be "appropriate" to decide whether these aids would be on a reimbursable or nonreimbursable basis. Nor do they indicate who would make the decision.

A NEW GOVERNMENT BUREAU?

Of really deep concern is the question of who will administer the various programs provided for in the bill. Will it be the existing agencies—State or Federal—or will it be the Appalachian Regional Commission acting as a superbureaucracy for the Appalachian region? The bill requires that all programs it authorizes—which include supplementations and modifications of existing programs as well as new programs—must be carried out under plans and recommendations of the Commission. If the Commission is to administer these programs instead of existing, fully staffed agencies, it will be a ridiculous and wasteful duplication. And there seems to be nothing in the bill to preclude this.

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT TO PAVE PRIVATE DRIVEWAYS?

Section 201 of the bill, relating to highways, is a morass of uncertainties, ambiguities, and unwarranted abandonment of established principles. The bill authorizes the appropriation of a total of $645 million for the construction of 2,350 miles of development highways and also 500 miles of local access roads to serve "specific recreational, residential, industrial, or other like facilities or will facilitate a school consolidation program."

Under this provision, for the first time in history, Federal participation in the cost of private driveways would be legally possible. Furthermore, an entirely new classification of highways would be grafted upon the Federal aid highway program, and it would only be a matter of time before this new classification would be proposed for financing out of the highway trust fund.

The development highway and local access road program would be undertaken pursuant to recommendations of the Appalachian Regional Commission. There is no requirement in the bill that the State highway departments be consulted. The Commission could deal with counties, municipalities, or local improvement districts, without even advising the highway department of its highway plans and activities.

The highway aspects of the bill are to be conducted "in accordance with those provisions of title 23, United States Code, that are applicable to Federal-aid highways and are not inconsistent with the purposes of this act or the provisions of this section." The "purposes of this Act" are set forth in one short sentence of section 2 of the bill, and are so vague and indefinite as to make it completely impossible to determine which of the provisions of title 23 would or would not be applicable.

Section 201 of the bill authorizes the Secretary of Commerce to increase the Federal share of the cost of constructing developmental highways and access roads from 50 percent to a maximum of 80 percent, and authorizes the appropriation of $185 million for this purpose. The bill contains no real guidelines, limitation, or criteria concerning the increase in the Federal share. Furthermore, under the bill, the Secretary would have authority to increase the Federal share in one State while denying such increase to others—all without control by the Congress.

CABINET MEMBERS EMPOWERED TO DELEGATE POWERS

Section 303 of the bill states:

> The Secretary of Commerce is authorized to delegate his functions under this Act, to the extent he deems appropriate, to the Administrator of the Appalachian Development Corporation appointed pursuant to section 402. The authority hereby granted shall be in addition to, and not in limitation of, any authority now existing or otherwise granted by this Act.

The Appalachian Development Corporation would be basically a financing organization. Its main function would be to provide funds to "local development districts" through loans and purchase of obligations.

The functions of the Secretary of Commerce, under the bill, include administering the development highway and access road program—section 201—the authority to waive or modify fund-matching requirements established by the Congress in all existing or future Federal grant-in-aid programs except those dealing with highways—section 216; providing funds for research and demonstration projects and making grants for administrative expenses to "local development districts"—section 301; and appointing an "independent committee" to review the effectiveness of the programs authorized by the bill.

There is no apparent reason why these functions should be delegated to the Administrator of the Appalachian Development Corporation. There are many obvious reason why they should not, particularly in the case of the highway and road program which can be handled by the existing Bureau of Public Roads.

SUPERMONSTROSITY—APPALACHIAN DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

Title IV of the bill, which would provide for the creation of the "Appalachian Development Corporation" is patently absurd. It creates an unprecedented, hybrid supermonstrosity.

The Corporation, a Federal agency, would be authorized to make project loans to "local development districts" in Appalachia. As defined in the bill, the term "local development district" would include private corporations organized for profit. And the projects for which loans could be made could include the construction of golf courses, swimming pools, and the like, if a finding is made that such projects would contribute to the "economic growth" of the area by promoting tourist trade.

The initial capital of the Corporation would be advanced entirely by the Federal Government, and to this end the bill authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase preferred stock of the Corporation having an aggregate par value of $50 million. The bill authorizes appropriation of $50 million for this purpose. In addition, the Corporation is authorized to borrow from the Treasury or the public, up to 10 times the sum of the Corporation's capital and retained earnings; namely, $550 million.

The Corporation could make loans to "local development districts" to help defray the costs of projects. Such loans, among other things, could be used to meet the requirement of local matching funds on Federal-aid projects, so that even if the Secretary of Commerce does not waive the laws requiring local matching funds (under sec. 216 of the bill) the result could be projects financed 100 percent with Federal funds.

A PRESIDENTIALLY APPOINTED CZAR

The Corporation is to be headed by an Administrator, a presidential appointee. By granting or withholding financial assistance, the Administrator could exercise an effective veto over projects in areas where financing is a problem. And this veto power of the Federal member of the Appalachian Regional Commission, and power of approval or disapproval of the Secretary of Commerce or other official designated by the President under section 223 of the bill.

The Congress would not have an opportunity to review projects to be given financial assistance by the Administrator of the Corporation. The Administrator would have full discretion to grant or withhold financial assistance. In view of this and the authority of the Corporation to borrow money from the U.S. Treasury, it is obvious that the President's proposal is a blatant case of back-door spending: taking funds from the Treasury without specific appropriation control.

Section 222 reads as follows:

> Nothing contained in this Act shall be interpreted as requiring any State or political subdivision of a State to engage in or accept any program without its consent.

Since a substantial part of the programs provided for in the bill can be extended directly to individuals, private organizations, and local development districts, this provision is utterly meaningless.

TESTS TO QUALIFY ARE WITHOUT MERIT

The President's proposal defines the Appalachian region by listing the 340 counties in 10 States. As of April 15, 1964, 59 of those 340 counties—about 17 percent—could not meet the eligibility requirements—high rate of unemployment—for assistance under either the area redevelopment program or the Public Works Acceleration Act. One of the primary reasons for designating the area as in need of special treatment is the comparatively high percentage of families having an income of less than $3,000 annually—the assumed poverty level. But this ignores many factors, such as the price indexes in the area, or the above-national-average incidence of homeownership, car ownership, washing machine ownership, and so forth, in West Virginia, which is presumably fairly typical of the Appalachian region, since it is the only State wholly included therein. It also ignores the widespread Government-financed poverty—if $3,000 annual income is to be the test—under the social security program. As of December 31, 1962, some 193,000 families—including a worker, spouse, and 1 or more children—were receiving social security benefits. The average family benefit ranged from a high of $1,891.20 annually to a low of $1,339.20 annually. It includes areas with no chronic unemployment and no widespread poverty.

EXPANSION OF PUBLIC POWER SEEN

It is particularly significant that the Appalachian region—as defined in the bill—includes one-half or more of the region supposedly developed by the Tennessee Valley Authority. Two Federal agencies would have jurisdiction over the same area. Nearly one-third of the counties listed as being in Appalachia are in the Tennessee Valley or are within the TVA service region. The expenditure of vast sums of money by the TVA since its inception in the 1930's evidently has not solved the problem. It is questionable whether additional expenditures of tax dollars on the proposed programs would do more. And the creation of an additional bureaucracy having duplicatory and overlapping functions and powers would be inexcusable.

The danger of such overlapping was made apparent in the testimony of Mr. Alex Radin, general manager, American Public Power Association. Mr. Radin quoted President Lyndon Johnson as saying that:

> Everything I saw justified our speeding up action on the poverty bill, yesterday. There is need for careful scrutiny of the development of power resources looking toward action. That would mean specifically the possibility of steamplants, TVA, in some of that area.

Mr. Radin also quoted from a letter of Secretary of the Interior Udall to Under Secretary of Commerce Roosevelt, as follows:

> It is my view that an effort should be made to undertake the studies recommended by the Commission immediately. These studies should include preparation of engineering plans and economic analyses for specific installation of large thermal plants of 1,000 to 2,000 megawatts together with suitable peaking hydroelectric capacity.
>
> Concurrently, various organizational and financial arrangements for making such development possible should be studied, including the possible establishment of a public-nonprofit corporation that could borrow capital on the open market. The studies should also give consideration to new industrial development that can be attached to the region by low-cost power and to marketing arrangements that will reduce power costs to industry.

These quoted statements may well reveal the real purpose of this bill. Under the vague sweeping language of the bill, it might well be possible to construct public power facilities throughout the region. The statements of President Johnson and Secretary Udall indicate the extreme danger that an attempt to do this will be made, and all without specific authorization, or even consideration, by the Congress.

OTHER REGIONS COMING

One of the most serious objections to this bill is the regional approach taken. Certainly there are many people throughout the United States making less than the $3,000 a year poverty level set by the administration who might equally be said to be held down by their impoverished environments.

I consider any Federal program that selects certain areas of the Nation for Federal aid while overlooking other areas, to be discriminatory in its conception and susceptible to vote buying in its application.

The best indication of the future prospects for this type of legislation was revealed by Under Secretary of Commerce, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., who in testimony before the committee in behalf of the bill, said that he could see other regional areas that one day might qualify for similar redevelopment programs. He listed two prospective poverty areas as the Ozarks and the upper Great Lakes iron-ore areas.

The ramifications of this program are readily apparent. By selecting certain "pockets of poverty" and by eliminating other parts of the country, the program can be used in a discriminatory manner for political expediency, Executive favoritism, and vote buying on a grand scale.

The regional Federal Government dominated antipoverty gimmick cuts across State borders, subverts State authority, and would give birth to a hybrid TVA-type approach to the national poverty problem—with the Federal control covering every conceivable public endeavor in addition to power development.

WOMEN OF AMERICA, FOR GOD'S SAKE, AWAKE

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BECKER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting herewith the above-entitled article written by a great-grandmother, Mrs. Phil Regan, in Palm Springs, Calif.

I believe this is a wonderful expression by a very good lady, and there is little doubt of the truth and wisdom of her statement.

I commend the reading of this article to all Members:

WOMEN OF AMERICA, FOR GOD'S SAKE, AWAKE

> The torch is passed to the women of America. It is our moral responsibility to restore Bible reading and prayer in our schools.
>
> Many wonderful things have been twisted into instruments of destruction. In amendment 1 of the Constitution, what law has been broken by Bible reading and prayer in schools?
>
> There is no doubt that the U.S. Supreme Court is comprised of fine men who acted upon the letter of the law when they ruled 8 to 1 on cases from Maryland and Pennsylvania that State laws providing for a religious exercise or prayer recital are unconstitutional under the doctrine of separation of church and state.
>
> What Supreme Court Justice Robert H. Jackson said in 1948 still stands:
>
> "One can hardly respect a system of education which would leave the student wholly ignorant of the currents of religious thought that move the world society * * * for a part in which he is being prepared."
>
> One persistent atheistic woman never stopped until she had reached the Supreme Court and through the technicality of the interpretation of the letter of the law succeeded in banning Bible reading and prayers in our schools while we women—mothers, grandmothers, and great-grandmothers (the writer is in the latter category)—looked on, too lethargic to prevent this audacious woman who was speaking for her own child.
>
> What has happened to the women in this country to take this lying down? We are paying taxes for all children to enjoy an American education.

Who is financing her? Who are the unseen insidious forces behind her atheistic move? Are we going to let one godless woman succeed without setting out to reverse this decision? Do you realize what will happen if we take God out of our schools?

A LESSON FROM THE NAZIS

During the postwar trials of Nazis in Germany in 1946, a former high official of the Third Reich confessed that he had taken part in the coldblooded murders of 2½ million persons by Nazis. One American investigator, astounded by the casual manner in which the defendant admitted these atrocities, asked: "Do you believe in God?"

"Most emphatically not," the Fuhrer's disciple replied.

In countries the world over where God has been deliberately rejected by atheistic rulers, the value of human life is soon belittled.

We of this generation have no excuse not to learn from a terrible experiment which has taken place in our own times.

This know-it-all claims, "Religious people are weak." Under the Hitler regime kindness was considered weakness; brutality became a virtue.

Those who would enslave man concentrate first on schools as the most effective place to deform and debase impressionable minds. Thus they quickly eliminate all teaching that reminds the human being that he is made in God's image and that his rights come from his Creator.

The edicts of the Supreme Court shall pass. The laws of God shall never pass.

No child ever became a delinquent or a traitor by applying the inspired words of the Bible and prayer to his daily living.

Milton said: "There are no songs comparable to songs of Zion; no orations equal to those of the prophets; and no politics like those which the Scriptures teach."

Horace Greeley said: "It is impossible to mentally or socially enslave a Bible reading people. The principles of the Bible are the groundwork of human freedom."

Francis Bacon said: "They that deny God destroy man's nobility; for clearly man is kin to the beasts by his body and if he is not kin to God by his spirit; he is a base and ignoble creature."

Young said: "A foe to God was never a true friend of man."

Unless a man's spirit be free, he is imprisoned.

This amendment has interfered and prevented our freedom of spiritual speech. For when we pray we speak to God and when God answers, He speaks to us, His children on earth—black, white, yellow, Jew, Protestant, Catholic—through the Bible.

Nothing in the Constitution prohibits Bible reading and prayer in our schools. Why change and play into the hands of atheistic Communists. The Supreme Court has gone beyond its power in amending the Constitution.

Article I: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press or of the right of the people."

Women, why not take a popular vote?

The atheistic aim is clear. Without God the consciousness of man is lowered. With this accomplished, man will be unable to discern evil if it has a legal dress. Without God in our schools, we shall perish.

The Old Testament teaches wisdom. The New Testament teaches love and peace. Combine these three, they equal power for good.

All of our Presidents from George Washington up to and including Lyndon B. Johnson were consistent in recognizing the dependence of this Nation on God. This is clearly revealed in the inaugural address of each President. Every President invoked God's help and recognized dependence of this Nation on God. These are excerpts from three of their inaugural addresses:

Abraham Lincoln: "With malice toward none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right."

Dwight D. Eisenhower: "This is the work that awaits us all, to be done with bravery, with charity, and with prayer to Almighty God."

John F. Kennedy: "Asking His blessing and His help, but knowing that here on earth God's work must truly be our own."

Our Founding Fathers repeatedly referred to the duty in our Declaration of Independence. We are one nation under God. Would they today try to make us "One nation under Khrushchev"?

The first amendment has been interpreted in the light of man's limited thinking, therefore, the letter has been construed.

The whole of our State constitutions are miniature declarations of independence. Some of them use the very words of the Declaration itself, recognizing God and practically all call attention to the fact that our rights and liberties stem from God.

Do you realize that only 3 out of 100 Americans actually deny the existence of God? The convictions of a small minority should not result in the imposition of a godless philosophy on the other 97 percent.

In conclusion, I would like to draw your attention to an interview given to the Realist by this godless woman:

"If I can't come through this case the same offensive, unlovable, bullheaded, defiant, aggressive slob (she said this, I didn't) that I was when I started it, then I'll give up now. My own identity is more important to me. They can keep their g--damn prayers in the public schools, in public outhouses, in public H-bomb shelters, and in public whorehouses."

Those are the words of the woman who brought the case to the Supreme Court; the woman who doesn't want her child exposed to prayer.

Every night I shall ask Almighty God to spark each and every woman in America to act now. Do something—a popular vote on our National and State ballots, not at some future date, but now and in the meantime write your Congressman as follows:

"In order to insure our freedom of speech and religion, we, the women of America, demand that some legally effective measure be adopted forthwith to allow Bible reading and prayer in every school throughout our Nation, the United States of America."

Sign your name and address clearly.

Do it now and may Almighty God speak through you.

Permission is granted to print this article.

JO B. REGAN,
A Great-grandmother Who Is Very Concerned About the Lethargy of Our Women of Today.

RICE ANSWERS NCWC

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BECKER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting herewith a letter Charles E. Rice, professor of constitutional law at Fordham University, has written to the editor of the Tablet in reply to the statement issued by the National Catholic Welfare Council.

I feel his answer is worthy of the attention of all the Members of the House, for I believe he does his usual superb analysis in this letter.

The letter follows:

FORDHAM UNIVERSITY,
New York, N.Y., July 1, 1964.

THE EDITOR OF THE TABLET,
Brooklyn, N.Y.

DEAR SIR: The legal department of the National Catholic Welfare Conference has urged the American hierarchy to be cautious toward proposals to amend the Constitution to rectify the Supreme Court decisions on school prayer. The department's statement noted that the great variety of the various amendment proposals, together with the haste with which they were formulated, displayed more eagerness than profound constitutional deliberation. Moreover, the statement noted, the House Judiciary Committee hearings have contributed to the uncertainty and confusion.

At the risk of disturbing the olympian detachment of the learned gentlemen of the department, I venture to observe that their talents should have been put to use in aid of the constructive efforts of others who have sought, and are seeking, to draft an appropriate amendment. To the best of my knowledge, the department has not acted to help surmount the drafting problem during the past 2 years. Nevertheless, even at this late hour, the department, instead of carping, could render a public service by making concrete suggestions on the legal problems involved in drafting an amendment.

The department has not been timid in the past about taking a stand when the matter at issue was a Federal subsidy to parochial schools rather than merely the question of whether the Government can constitutionally recognize the existence of God. It should be remembered that no general program of nondiscriminatory aid to education, including parochial schools, can realistically be enacted except in an atmosphere of governmental hospitality toward theistic religion. The logic of the school prayer decisions, however, unless the Court is checked by amendment, will predictably usher in a period of governmental hostility to such religion. Moreover, I hardly expect that those vocal pressure groups which oppose both Federal aid to parochial schools and a prayer amendment will lend their support to the former merely because some Catholics, who ought to know better, oppose the latter.

Very truly yours,

CHARLES E. RICE.

MY VOTE ON THE CIVIL RIGHTS BILL

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. REID] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in the year and a half that I have been in Congress I have never cast a more difficult vote than was demanded of me today.

I abhor discrimination in any form and strongly believe in equal rights for all. However, after spending hours in concentrated study of the changes made by the Senate, delving into my conscience, and, I might add, spending sleepless nights, I came to the conclusion that I would be derelict in my constitutional duties as a Member of Congress if I voted for this bill. This is purely my own decision. It is with regret that I break with the leadership of my party—but I came here to vote my convictions and not to take the easy way out.

When the House first considered this bill in February, I worked for enactment of amendments that would have improved the bill so as to provide for equal rights for all without the erosion of individual liberties. Most of the suggested improvements were rejected. Nevertheless, I voted for passage of the House version of the civil rights bill with the hope and belief that the Senate would be able to improve the worst features of the bill. Instead, it appears to me that many of the amendments adopted by the Senate confuse rather than clarify the real intent of the Congress. Furthermore, many of the Senate changes grant even greater discretionary power and authority to one man—the Attorney General of the United States. No matter how able and highly motivated an individual Attorney General may be, he is—after all—a political appointee. Vesting such great power in the hands of one individual not responsible to the electorate is fraught with dangers to the basic structure of our constitutional system.

The greatest tragedy of all is that there is no legislative history to guide this one man in the implementation of the law. Observance of the traditional procedures of orderly legislation would have provided the guidance which assures a government of laws rather than of men. Without committee reports on the final bill, without a conference, and with a gag rule which gave the House only 1 hour to consider some 80 amendments, I had no alternative but to vote against passage.

IN THE NAME OF CHRISTIANITY

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WAGGONNER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, much has been said and much has been written concerning the racial disturbances which have been stirred up in the South, but which are exploding with equal violence without urging in the North. I believe the most succinct examination of the present-day dilemma I have ever read is contained in an editorial, "In the Name of Christianity," in a recent Shreveport, La., Times.

I commend it to the attention of all my fellow Members and do so without the necessity of further comment:

IN THE NAME OF CHRISTIANITY

Between May 20, 1963, and mid-March of this year, there were 2,229 racial demonstrations in 338 cities and 40 States of the United States. This is an average of more than seven—almost eight—per day, winter and summer, rain or shine.

The period of time covered has no especial significance. It simply happens that the Times asked a Federal Cabinet Department last April for this information and the data given was the latest available at that time—and is the latest quickly available at this moment.

The Department cannot be identified because it does not officially publicize such information. But the statistics are gathered by its own employees, who happen to be stationed in many cities all over the country, and from newspaper and press association reports. The figures indicate the constant prodding that is being carried out all over the Nation in behalf of Negro demands for desegration of something or other, or for more desegration than has been granted under law or voluntarily, and for self-asserted privileges which are described as rights but may have no connection whatever with Federal or State constitutions or with Federal or State laws.

The rate of demonstrations per day probably has increased since the period covered in the above figures—increased with spring and summer weather and the ending of school, which has released tens of thousands of young Negroes of the type belonging to the Congress of Racial Equality (CORE) and the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee (SNCC), the two organizations whose activities most frequently lead to violence.

All of the prodding in the world cannot justify what seems to have happened in Mississippi in the disappearance of persons making up part of a huge vacation period invasion of Mississippi for "rights" purposes. Two were whites from Brooklyn and the third a Negro professional worker for CORE, all men. The fact that their car has been found in a burned condition and that they have not been heard of since they started driving along a highway after paying a fine for speeding several days ago, indicates the worst.

And "the worst" is revolting and repulsive to all decency in a manner that is beyond words to describe.

It could be said that the two from Brooklyn should have stayed there and joined the Maccabees, an organization formed by Jews to carry out unarmed night patrols because of the increasing number of crimes of violence, especially biracial criminality, that obviously has become beyond control of the police; the attempted rape of a Rabbi's wife was an incident merely symbolic of daily and nightly events that caused the Jews to move into action in that part of Brooklyn.

It could be said that the New Yorkers moving into Mississippi might do well to think of their own city where 38 persons recently stood by and watched a man murder a woman without even calling the police; and that another group stood quietly as a naked woman who had been raped tried to escape her attacker by running out into the street but was caught by him and dragged back into a building. In another case, people in the street shouted "Chicken. Yellow Coward. Jump—go on and jump," at a mentally deranged person standing on a building ledge seven stories high.

But one act of horrible repulsiveness does not justify another; much less many others. Some way, some time, people of all areas must courageously face the fact that repulsive crimes and horrible racial incidents of violence are not confined to any one area or any one group of citizenry. Nor are they common to all groups. What has happened in New York and elsewhere does not justify what seems to have happened now in Mississippi. But to assume that such things happen, or can happen, only in Mississippi may merely encourage more incidents of the same type in many places.

The white who murders a Negro for racial reasons in Mississippi is in no way better or worse than the Negro who shoots promiscuously into groups of whites and kills in the Carolinas or elsewhere.

The Negro who hides in the ambush of a building and shoots whites is no better or worse—simply because his bullets did not happen to be fatal—than a white man who shoots a Negro in the back in the dark from ambush, regardless of the geographical location of either incident.

The Negro or the white, whether uneducated and illiterate or a college student or graduate, or a member of the ministry or engaged in any other profession, who deliberately violates the public peace and commits trespass in full knowledge that the end result may be violence and death and even mutilation and murder, cannot plead innocence through professing lack of intent. He is just as guilty of the violence that comes from his action as the person who puts no mask over his intent to cause violence.

The individuals, ministers and churches, and denominations which directly or indirectly make up the National Council of Churches of Christ in America must judge themselves and their organization, as well as be judged by others. The NCC is sponsoring and paying the costs of a training school in Ohio, conducted with a faculty of members of CORE and the SNCC—both organizations of Negro youths often moving in a manner to bring violence.

The first 200 graduates have been sent into Mississippi and 400 more are scheduled to go through the school and then go to Mississippi for their own school vacation periods. Other training schools similarly conducted are expected to bring the total forces—mostly college youths—invading Mississippi to at least 1,000 and perhaps 2,000 this summer. Many of the students are from the Eastern Ivy colleges or big State or tuition colleges and universities elsewhere. About 80 percent are white. A strong portion of the girls and women at the first NCC training school were from fashionable Eastern women's colleges.

The National Observer and other publications give eyewitness accounts of training at the National Council of Churches, Ohio school. One television network has presented action films of the training. The National Observer mentions, without comment, that one of the subjects of discussion in the school among the young college girl students is which choice they would make in Mississippi if arrested: to be horsewhipped, or "yield to the (sexual) desires of a jailer." The inference seems to be assumption that the choice would have to be made.

In a school skit acted by CORE professionals, the college boys and girls witnessed supposed Mississippi people cursing the white northerner with vile and filth that could not possibly be published or put on the air. The impression was given that this is common in Mississippi; one might gain the impression that there is no such thing as a decent human being in that State.

The National Observer reporter said that many of the white training school students, who thought they were merely signing up for a sort of summer domestic Peace Corps lark, have become imbued with fear of going to Mississippi, but are more afraid of the jeers and sneers that would come if they backed down after entering the NCC school. The NCC training school students supposedly go into Mississippi simply to assist Negroes in voter registration. But they are trained also how to act in street violence, how to protect themselves, and they are told that they must live with Negroes of the lowest educational, economic and physical hygiene brackets; that white Mississippians won't even talk to them. Frequently they work in teams of three—two rookie students and a trained CORE or SNCC member in charge; often two men and one girl.

These things are presented herewith dispassionately, simply as facts. They are facts that do not have to exist and certainly should not exist. Surely, the fear created in the NCC Ohio training school and the nature of some of the training is of a type to provide seedbeds for human hatred—hatred by the training school students of the whole people of a State; and hatred from others in return; all of this as supposedly the Christian way to cure the evils of mankind.

There is no excuse, no justification, for what has happened in Mississippi in the case of the missing or in some other racial incidents.

But what justification or excuse can be offered, in the name of Christianity, for using Negro organizations (with some white members) to train young college boys and girls to invade areas of which they have no firsthand knowledge and where their presence and immature conduct brings constant danger of inciting both Negroes and whites to violence and bloodshed?

THE U.S. AIR FORCE: A POCKET OF POVERTY

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, what would be the reaction of the people of this Nation if they knew that 8,012 of the active duty personnel in the U.S. Air Force receive annual military cash pay and benefits at less than the theoretical poverty level for the United States? What would be the reaction of the people if they knew that approximately 60,000 airmen are considered to be eligible for various State and civic relief benefits, including low-cost housing, free food, dollar grants, and clothing? What would be the reaction of the people if they knew that over 5,000 airmen are actually receiving relief benefits, and that this figure does not include various medical benefits nor the loans and grants made by the Air Force Aid Society? What would their reaction be if they knew that far more personnel would qualify for benefits if identical relief programs were made available to all active duty personnel, and if the Air Force did not resolve some of the problems by granting hardship discharges?

In my opinion the initial reaction would be one of surprise, followed by strong urgings to do something about this pocket of poverty in the U.S. Air Force. Yet, the facts I have suggested are true. There are 8,012 of the active duty personnel in the U.S. Air Force receiving annual military pay and benefits at less than the poverty level established in connection with the war on poverty. There are 60,000 airmen considered to be eligible for various State and civic relief benefits. There are more than 5,000 airmen actually receiving relief benefits in addition to those receiving loans and grants and other benefits from the Air Force Aid Society. It is true that more personnel would qualify for these benefits if identical relief programs were available to all active duty personnel, and if the Air Force did not resolve some of the problems by granting hardship discharges.

These sad statistics are facts, not rumors. They may be seen in a study recently completed by the Air Force entitled "Survey of Economic Status of Certain Air Force Personnel." This disturbing document reveals not only the figures that I have cited but the following as well:

Another reason there are not more military personnel on relief is because there are over 71,000 heads of families who work after hours to supplement their military incomes. That is, we pay our Air Force personnel so poorly that a substantial number of them are forced to moonlight. For example, in the Strategic Air Command—SAC—our major deterrent force, 11 percent or one airman in nine is a family man working after hours to support his family. Further, more would work if shift work or alert duty permitted.

In some metropolitan areas more than one-fourth of the married junior officers and airmen have supplemental employment, that is, they moonlight, and up to 70 percent of their wives are working.

The highest percentage of moonlighting occurs not at the lowest grades, but in the middle grades where families are beginning to develop and where career decisions are being made. Over 10 percent of the Air Force staff sergeants and 9 percent of airmen first class are moonlighters.

Mr. Speaker, I am confident that if these facts were fully known by the American people they would rise up and demand that we stop shortchanging our military personnel. For if we paid our men and women in the Air Force adequately they would not have to go on relief, they would not have to obtain public assistance, they would not have to borrow extensively and go heavily into debt, they would not have to moonlight and the men would not have to send their wives to work in order to supplement their military incomes, and they would not have to obtain hardship discharges to extricate them from the mess that one gets into when there is not enough income to support the family.

Last Monday, June 29, I introduced H.R. 11819 to increase the subsistence allowance for members of the uniformed services to $75 per month. Surely this is a modest increase from the $30.90 to $47.88 per month that is presently allowed for subsistence. As you know, the subsistence allowance is intended to be used by military personnel who do not eat in the base messhalls for the purchase of food off the base. But you cannot buy enough food with $30.90 or even $47.88 for an adequate diet. And that partly explains why these people have to go on relief, and moonlight, and send their wives to work, and obtain hardship discharges.

By the unanimous consent of this House, I include in the RECORD the "Survey of Economic Status of Certain Air Force Personnel":

SURVEY OF ECONOMIC STATUS OF CERTAIN AIR FORCE PERSONNEL

This briefing is the result of a survey of all major Air Force commands taken by the Directorate of Personnel Plans. The survey was taken as a result of a discussion of the Federal war on poverty.

One definition of poverty given by the President's Council on Economic Advisors, as a rough rule of thumb, is an annual income of $1,500 for a single person, up to $3,000 for a family of four. This chart shows the number of lower grade airmen by these annual cash income brackets. When the so-called poverty criteria are applied to the Air Force, there are 169,000 airmen receiving an annual military cash pay at less than the theoretical poverty level for the United States. Taken without further clarification, this would be 23 percent of our enlisted force.

"Poverty" formula—Total annual cash income

	Single, $1,500	1 dependent, $2,000	2 dependents, $2,500	3 dependents, $3,000
Airman, 2d class (E-3)	45,759	1,734	660	772
Airman, 3d class (E-2)	87,691	4,422	4,568	1,912
Airman, basic (E-1)	20,068	605	449	360
Total	169,000			

However, this large figure is misleading because most airmen are furnished their room and board which most civilians must procure for themselves. When the equivalent value of military rations and quarters furnished in kind are included, we find that 8,012 of our active duty personnel meet the poverty criteria. We feel this is a more accurate measure. In each case these are lower grade airmen with under 2 years of service and with two or more dependents.

Total effective income

	Single, $1,500	1 dependent, $2,000	2 dependents, $2,500	3 dependents, $3,000
Airman, 2d class (E-3)				772
Airman, 3d class (E-2)			4,568	1,912
Airman, basic(E-1)			449	360
Total	8,012			

In our survey we asked all major air commands for the number of personnel who are eligible for various relief benefits. They report approximately 60,000 airmen who are considered to be eligible for various State and civic relief benefits. The four major benefits are: Housing, food, dollar grants, and clothing. This table shows eligibility as reported Air Force-wide. By far, most of these people are merely technically eligible for low cost public housing regardless of whether or not it is available:

Various relief benefits

Low cost public housing	53,811
Food	4,000
Grants	1,900
Clothing	273
Eligible	60,000

But over 5,000 airmen are actually reported to be receiving relief benefits. These are indicated on this chart. These figures do not include various medical benefits nor the loans and grants made by the Air Force Aid Society. Our 5,000 personnel drawing relief benefits include airmen from all ranks but the commands report that it is in the airman first class to staff sergeant level where the highest incidence takes place—personnel whom we consider to be career airmen. The availability of State and civic relief benefits varies widely by geographical area. For example, many recipients of clothing are clients of a religious organization in San Antonio. The low-cost housing may be available anywhere in the United States. Overseas, relief benefits are almost nonexistent, but many areas have a station allowance to offset cost-of-living expenses. We can assume that far more personnel would qualify for benefits if identical relief programs were made available to all active duty personnel, and if we did not resolve some of these problems by granting hardship discharges:

Various relief benefits

Low-cost public housing	4, 698
Food	280
Grants	45
Clothing	24
Receiving	5, 000

Another reason there are not more people on relief is because there are over 71,000 heads of families who work after hours to supplement their military incomes. This figure includes 952 officers. This practice is called moonlighting and varies widely by geographic and economic factors. The number of moonlighters reported by certain commands are shown on this chart. Note that 11 percent of SAC—or 1 airman in 9 in SAC, our major deterrent force—is a family man working after hours to support his family. More would work if shift work or alert duty permitted. In favorable metropolitan areas more than one-fourth of the married junior officers and airmen may have supplemental employment and up to 70 percent of their wives may be working:

Moonlighting to supplement the head of family's income

SAC, 11 percent	26, 464
ADC, 12 percent	11, 347
ATC, 11 percent	6, 487
MATS, 7 percent	5, 117
TAC, 6 percent	3, 732
Others, 5 percent	17, 888
Total	71, 005

Moonlighters by grades are shown on this chart. Note that the highest incidence of moonlighting occurs not at the very lowest grades, but in the middle grade brackets where families are beginning to develop and where career decisions are being made. Over 10 percent of staff sergeants (and 9 percent of airmen, first class) are moonlighters. The subject of moonlighting will be further explored in the May Sample Survey which will be available at a later date, where we will go into the extra hours worked per week, the total amounts earned, and the number of dependents who work. The results of the survey will be available by July. We hope that this information can be used to promote improvement in personnel programs to provide a better personnel image. Information properly handled should be useful as a factor in pushing for better pay, better housing, and extended collateral entitlements:

Moonlighting by grades

952 officers:	
O6	14
O5	78
O4	136
O3	297
O2	268
O1	115
CWO	44
70,053 airmen:	
E-9	253
E-8	622
E-7	3, 033
E-6	7, 507
E-5	19, 476
E-4	19, 168
E-3	14, 713
E-2	5, 172
E-1	149

COMMENTS ON THE INVESTIGATION OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, the June issue of the magazine Banking reprints a letter to the editor from the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN, chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee. This letter replies to an article that appeared in an earlier issue of that magazine, which was critical of the investigation into the Federal Reserve System being conducted by the House Banking and Currency Committee under the able leadership of Chairman PATMAN. The chairman's letter defends the investigation of the Fed, the first comprehensive study of the hard core of our entire financial structure, and explains some of the reasons behind it. Because of the light this letter sheds on the investigation and its critics, and because it constitutes part of the continuing public dialog on the Federal Reserve System, under unanimous consent, I insert at this point in the RECORD the letter to the editor of Banking by Chairman WRIGHT PATMAN:

MAY 2, 1964.

DEAR EDITOR: Were it not an election year, I might be puzzled, even offended, by the remarks of my erudite and distinguished colleague, BILL WIDNALL, which appeared in the May issue of your magazine. In such a year, some ordinarily responsible Congressmen become at least slightly toxic with the political war virus. Such is the case, I suspect, with Mr. WIDNALL, and the article in question is the result.

Since January 21, our Subcommittee on Domestic Finance has been hearing testimony from leading members of the Federal Reserve Board, the 12 presidents of the Federal Reserve banks, the Secretary of the Treasury, leading academicians from our most advanced economic departments in our foremost universities, law deans, representatives of the banking fraternity, labor, and others properly interested in and concerned with money and credit.

I am pleased to report that the Honorable WILLIAM WIDNALL participated frequently in our many hearings, and he invariably asked responsible and astute questions.

I think that it is unfortunate, but this I allow to politics, that the gentleman from New Jersey would write so disparagingly in Banking magazine against the work being done by the committee, especially since he has not seen fit to do so either in committee or in open hearings, or even to the chairman. It is possible that Mr. WIDNALL, and his minority colleagues on the Banking and Currency Committee, have not approved of many of the facts that have been brought out in much of the testimony thus far presented before our committee.

It is noteworthy that minority members of the committee took an antagonistic position on the five bills mentioned by Mr. WIDNALL in the article and which were authored by the chairman, even before the testimony, pro and con, was in. As the May 4 issue of the U.S. News & World Report states, "the five Republican members have shown Mr. PATMAN and his plan nothing but hostility." Perhaps this is the "hippodrome" atmosphere that Congressman WIDNALL referred to.

It is unhealthy, as has been pointed out time and again, for a few people, responsible to no one, to have so much financial power as now exists in the present Federal Reserve setup. Several witnesses have testified that the chronic tight money bias of the Fed—free of any outside checks or balances—has led to serious recessions in 1953–54, 1957–58, and in 1960–61.

The American people are just now, thanks to our hearings, learning about such matters. This knowledge is not forthcoming because of an "inquisition" by the committee or its chairman. On this point, I will quote Mr. T. H. Milner, Jr., representing the Independent Bankers Association, who stated, "I might say, personally, that I have learned more about the Federal Reserve System than I ever knew before. * * * It has been an interesting and revealing study."

The article Congressman WIDNALL wrote is in the great Republican tradition. The GOP members invariably act as apologists for big banks and big banking institutions such as the Federal Reserve. The Fed, a Government agency, is operated for the profit of big banks, rather than for the benefit of the people of the United States. What BILL WIDNALL is asking for is maintenance of the status quo insofar as the Federal Reserve is concerned. "God's in His Heaven, all's right with the world"—so long as interest rates are high and money is hard to get for the average citizen.

"SHOCKING" ASPERSIONS

I do not wish to "nit pick" Congressman WIDNALL'S opus, but there is a point he raises that surprises, even shocks me. I refer to the aspersions he cast upon the distinguished panel of witnesses which have appeared during the past 3 months before our committee. As he himself says, "23 university professors * * * have given testimony based on their analysis of past events, and their theories as to how the central bank of the United States should be organized and monetary policy formulated." He continues, and here is the shocking part, "Some of these presentations could be characterized as freewheeling, for their exponents had no responsibility for the results their brain children could have produced."

Was he referring to Dr. Milton Friedman, world-renowned economist of the University of Chicago, and part-time adviser to Senator GOLDWATER? Did he have in mind Dr. Harold Barger, chairman of the Department of Economics of Columbia University? Did he really mean Prof. G. L. Bach, of Stanford University and Carnegie Institute of Technology and a member of the board of directors of the Pittsburgh Federal Reserve Branch Bank? Or was he thinking of Dr. Paul A. Samuelson of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology—respected by several Presidents of the United States and business leaders all over the country—and author of the world's most widely read textbook on economics?

GROSSLY UNFAIR

I think it grossly unfair that Mr. WIDNALL impugn the integrity or the ability of a single witness. Neither the committee chairman nor the majority members have done any such thing, even when they have disagreed completely with some of the witnesses.

Then the author finds fault with the cost of printing the voluminous report that the committee I chair has printed, and will continue to print as the record unfolds. Is it not rather picayune to complain about such small matters when one considers that the Federal Reserve System, the hard core of our entire financial structure, is having the first comprehensive study made of it in its first half century of existence? Is it right to quarrel about the price of printing committee reports when we are looking into an institution which, at this very minute, holds more than $30 billion worth of Federal securities in its vaults, and which has within itself the power to increase interest rates and tighten money which affects every man, woman, and child in America?

THE BANKERS' FRIEND

Despite the apparent "stand-patism" of the author, who along with his Republican minority colleagues seems unmoved by the testimony, the great bulk of the evidence rejects the present separate existence of the Federal Reserve as incompatible with the requirements of a modern society. Good, sound, Republican banking policy is what comes naturally for most Republican Members of Congress. They think in those terms; they act in those terms. I honestly believe they think they are right. It does not disturb them that they are the bankers' friend, particularly the big bankers' best friend. That they have blinders over their eyes is the fault of no one but themselves.

The American people—I speak of the grassroots American people—the farmers, the small businessmen, the war veterans, the factory workers, and the youth of America—are slowly perceiving that the world was not set up for the prime benefit of those who own bank stock. I am for the free enterprise system, which certainly requires that banking be a legitimate business like any other. But, when enormous profits are not enough for the banking community, then I say we must not let bankers kill the goose that laid the golden egg by tightening money and increasing interest rates to the detriment of our business community, and 190 million Americans to boot.

We cannot permit a totally independent Federal Reserve System, unreceptive at times to the common good, to retain forever power which the Congress of the United States never intended for it to have—the sole power to govern our money and credit structure. Bankers all know that the control of the money supply is exercised by the Open Market Committee that meets in secret every 3 weeks in Washington, and nobody, not even the President of the United States, nor the committees of Congress, knows what goes on at these meetings. To me this is secret and nonrepresentative government, which runs counter to our American tradition.

BANKING APOLOGISTS

What I have been trying to get across in this letter is that apologists, such as Mr. WIDNALL, never are able to perceive of the human effect money and interest policy contains. The concern of big banking apologists is always with how money and credit affects banking institutions per se. I do not apologize for the consistent position I have taken over a period of 35 years, which shows a bias on the side of human beings.

Mr. WIDNALL makes a particular point that there will not be any remedial legislation coming out of the Banking and Currency Committee this session. He is quite correct insofar as the Fed is concerned. However, a far greater volume of important legislation has been processed by the committee this session than ever before, such as the silver bill, continuation of the Export-Import Bank, important small business amendments, credit union amendments, a comprehensive savings and loan bill, area rehabilitation, mass transit, the increase in deposit insurance, and housing legislation, to name some. Before Congress goes home, most of these bills will have become the law of the land; many have already.

Concerning the Federal Reserve study, we intended the current hearings on all facets of the Federal Reserve to serve as an intensive educational program on money and credit for both the Congress and the people. The problems involved are exceedingly complex.

We would never attempt to railroad through any legislation. It has been my purpose to see that the need for remedial legislation be registered, not alone in the Congress, but in the grassroots itself. Despite a continuous propaganda smokescreen such as the Widnall article exemplifies, which ignores the basic issues involved, the story of the cost of maintaining an independent Fed outside of the American system of checks and balances, is getting across to the Congress and the people. I am confident there will be some changes made within the next year or two or three. These will not merely be good for the American people as a whole—they will prove sound for all legitimate banking interests; that is, bankers who are satisfied to make a reasonable profit rather than those who would gouge the lender and bring banking back to the period of the great depression, when a banker had the lowest prestige in the community.

Sincerely yours,

WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman.

P.S.—For the benefit of the Honorable BILL WIDNALL and some fellow Republicans who agree with him concerning the Federal Reserve System, let me quote from President Hoover's memoirs, page 212: The Federal Reserve "was indeed a weak reed for the Nation to lean on in time of trouble."

W. P.

STATEMENT ON H.R. 1794

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. Montoya] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. Speaker, last week the conferees appointed by the Senate and House of Representatives met again to discuss H.R. 1794, a bill providing for the relief and relocation of the Seneca Indians in New York following the taking by the Federal Government of a major portion of their Allegany Reservation in connection with the Kinzua Dam and Reservoir project.

I shall not here attempt to review the unhappy chapter in our Nation's history which precedes this legislation. As the members of the House well know, construction of the Kinzua Dam is being accomplished only at the expense of violating a solemn treaty by which the United States promised to maintain these very Seneca lands inviolate. The time has long since passed, however, for reversing such action. Within a few months, the Senecas will be forced to abandon the reservation communities which they and their ancestors have inhabited for centuries and to find new homes in a new environment.

Though the Kinzua project is fast becoming a fait accompli, there remains an issue of honor, and it is this issue that is being resolved in conference. The issue is whether the United States, having prevented the Seneca people from continuing their chosen way of life and having unilaterally broken its own pledge, will now, by providing adequate assistance, make it possible for the Senecas to begin anew. H.R. 1794, as unanimously passed by the House of Representatives, went a long way toward achieving this goal, and carried the endorsement of the executive agencies involved, as well as the Seneca Nation. Specifically, section 4 of the bill would authorize the appropriation of $16,931,000 in rehabilitation funds to aid the Seneca Indians in relocating their homes and establishing a new and self-sufficient way of life.

The fund provided in section 4, however, was reduced by the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to $6,116,000, a cut of almost 65 percent. Moreover, though the reduced appropriation is clearly inadequate to enable these depressed people suddenly to enter our culture, the Senate committee added a new section 18 to the bill, calling for the termination of the special relationship between the Seneca Nation and the United States.

The volume of mail and telegrams which I have received from my constituents, and the attention focused upon the Seneca legislation in the press evidence a keen public awareness of the moral question presented to the Congress, as well as a genuine sympathy for the plight of these Indians. In order that justice may be done to the Seneca Nation, and in order that the reputation of the United States for fair dealing may be preserved, I believe that agreement by the conferees upon the full amount of the rehabilitation funds authorized by the House and deletion of the termination amendment added by the Senate are required. On behalf of the Indians and other concerned citizens in New Mexico, I am also submitting these views in letters to the House conferees and to Senator FRANK CHURCH, chairman of the Senate conferees.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RYAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, for the sixth time since 1959, we are observing Captive Nations Week.

President Johnson, in accordance with Public Law 86–90, has proclaimed that the period of July 12–18, 1964, be observed as Captive Nations Week.

The observance of Captive Nations Week points up to the tragedy of the people enslaved by the Communists. It focuses attention on the tragic truth that although the Allies won the war, the defeated enemy countries are recognized as free and sovereign while nations that fought on the side of the victorious allies are subjugated satellites of Soviet Russia, one of the perpetrators of World War II.

To us, living in a free world, the observance of Captive Nations Week should be a time for both prayerful reflection and renewed determination. During this week we as Americans can reflect on the liberties and freedoms which we often take for granted. We can once again voice hope and determination that those captive nations will once again regain their freedom which is their inherent right to enjoy.

More than 90 million people of Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, and Rumania were free and independent. In their homelands they lived and were content with their lot under their national and democratic governments. The war changed all this. These nations were fighting to continue to live in freedom, but the U.S.S.R. had different views on their status after World War II. Now nearly two decades later these nations are still under the yoke of Soviet Russia. Not only the people of these nations are under Communist domination, but nearly 17 million Germans in East Germany suffer a similar fate.

The Communist leaders know that if we keep alive the opposition to the Communist tyranny in the captive nations we can move toward their liberation from Communist rule. Hope of freedom lives in the hearts of these people and this spark can be intensified and become a blaze if we can deter Communist ambitions of world domination and eventually bring about its defeat.

In 1959, the House of Representatives and the Senate adopted a resolution for the designation of Captive Nations Week for appropriate observance throughout the country. The month of July was selected as the most appropriate month for these festivities.

After the designation of the first Captive Nations Week in July 1959, it was apparent that this declaration was a thorn in the side of the Russian leaders. At that time Khrushchev denounced the Presidential proclamation of Captive Nations Week because he knew the Soviet Russian treachery and consistent betrayal made her the undying enemy of the captive nations and a foe of Christianity and democracy forever. He realized that he had to retain enough pawns like the captive nations to perpetuate more heinous crimes in the future.

He has publicly stated that he will bury us for he believes that the Godless communism, which Soviet Russia has foisted upon her Christian, God-fearing neighbors, and that the Iron Curtain will be a deathknell of Christianity, democracy, and civilization.

We in Congress, our public leaders, and all citizens, not for only 1 week but throughout the year, should take positive action to halt, control, and eliminate this international conspiracy. We should be fearless and forthright in determining a policy and future course of action that will lead to the restoration of full sovereignty to all the nations that are now enslaved behind the Iron Curtain and the liberation of the millions of Europeans now held captive by the Communists.

During this Captive Nations Week we can reaffirm our sympathy for those people now living under Communist domination. We can assure them that we have not forgotten them and give them assurance that we will continue our efforts for the return of freedom and liberty to them.

Let us strengthen our vows to keep alive the knowledge of the injustice to those subjugated nations and the oppression of human beings. We should do this in the hope that the ensuing years will see these Communist-dominated countries once again as members of a free world community.

What appears to be hopeless today may become a reality tomorrow if we can continue our efforts toward forcing these unfortunate nations from the yoke of Communist oppression. Given the opportunity, these enslaved people will rise up and fight their captors. The free nations must keep this hope alive so that this freedom may soon be attained.

SALUTE TO THE HONORABLE BOB SIKES OF FLORIDA

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Matthews] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I ask permission to have inserted in the Record an editorial which appeared in the Florida Times-Union on Saturday, June 27, and which praises our able colleague, and the dean of the Florida delegation, the Honorable Robert L. F. Sikes.

I particularly agree with this editorial when they praised the choice of Congressman Sikes as principal speaker for the officer candidate graduation exercises of the Florida National Guard recently held at Camp Blanding, Fla., which is in my congressional district.

As an important member of the House Committee on Appropriations, and as an outstanding authority on the requirements of military defense in this country, Congressman Sikes has rendered a great service to our Nation. All of us in Florida who know him appreciate the fact that despite his high position of importance here in Congress, he is never too busy to advise his colleagues and to help us with the many problems that we have.

I salute this great American, and I am pleased that one of his experience and ability is so prominently connected with the military affairs of this Nation. The editorial from the Florida Times-Union follows:

[From the Florida Times-Union, June 27, 1964]

Guard Exercises Hallow a Great Tradition

The choice of U.S. Representative Robert L. F. Sikes of Florida's First Congressional District as principal speaker for the officer candidate graduation exercises of the Florida National Guard tomorrow at Camp Blanding is entirely fitting and proper.

In addition to serving the people of northwest Florida in the lower House, the Congressman is also a major general in the U.S. Army Reserve, a rank to which he climbed all of the way from the bottom rung on the ladder.

The civilian components of the Army of the United States have a great tradition both in war and in peace. General Sikes was among those Reservists who at the outset of World War II provided a nucleus of young commissioned leaders around whom Uncle Sam could expand the Defense Establishment. It was within the framework of the National Guard and the Reserve officer contingent that the immense emergency wartime growth became possible.

The Federal activation of the Guard units was not without its problems. One of the most difficult of these was facing up to the fact that there was a danger in sending units, made up largely of young men who were all from one locality, into combat together. An untoward fortune of war could wipe out all of the youth in one area at one fell blow. The ultimate solution to that problem was using Guardsmen, after a certain period of training, as cadres for new divisions. Thus an entirely new Army was built on the Reserve and National Guard.

Of the many National Guard major generals who were federally activated at the inception of hostilities, only several finished commanding their units. The Regular Establishment saw to it that the men who wore the ring of the U.S. Military Academy were moved into these positions, after relieving the original commanders. It was held that the Guard commanders, in some instances, were not militarily qualified for their jobs, that they were in their positions by virtue of political pull, a charge that still rankles in the bosoms of the men who received such treatment.

CIVIL RIGHTS BILL

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Fraser] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, for all its intrinsic merit, the historic legislation which Congress has concluded passage of today is less an end than a beginning. It is less the whole than a small part of the total effort and struggle to secure full civil rights and equal justice under law for all Americans.

It can hardly be denied that the grievance of this country's Negro minority is longstanding and eminently legitimate. But it is also clear that other Americans are experiencing discomfort in the face of the unprecedented push by the Negro in this decade for immediate improvement of his civil rights and status.

The expansion of public means for combating private discrimination as contained within the civil rights bill is our Nation's response to the urgency and righteousness of Negro demands. Resistance to Negro pressure for full civil rights probably does not stem from a denial that such demands are legitimate. Most Americans admit that the Negro has and still does suffer from grave discrimination. Rather, resistance arises because Americans are disconcerted by the increasing vehemence with which those demands are being expressed, and by the greatly stepped-up pace of change in general.

We must recognize, furthermore, that Negro leaders are not prepared to relent on their drive or modify their demands.

We must realize, finally, that stubborn refusal to accommodate Negro demands can only serve to drive more and more Negroes to seek relief under the auspices of more and more radical and militant leaders.

If all these things are true—that the Negro grievance is legitimate, that civil rights leaders will not relent on their drive, and that failure to accommodate Negro demands will drive Negroes into the arms of more and more irresponsible groups—then is it not our clear obligation to make every effort to redress the longstanding and admittedly legitimate Negro grievances of which I have spoken?

Passage of a strong civil rights bill is a first step and small part of such an effort. Provision for adequate Federal protection of students and citizens in Mississippi should be another. This week, 29 eminent attorneys and legal scholars expressed their considered opinion that sufficient legal foundation exists for Federal intervention in areas where, according to section 332 of title 10 of the United States Code, the President "considers that unlawful obstructions, combinations or assemblages make it impracticable to enforce the laws of the United States by the ordinary course of judicial proceedings."

The legal scholars stated:

> It is not lack of Presidential power to act, but the absence of a conviction that action is now called for that explains nonaction.

It has taken the disappearance of three students in Mississippi to dramatize the fact that "action is now called for."

I strongly urge upon the Members of this House support for these and other matters pertinent to the field of civil rights. There can be no conflict of interest when to accommodate Negro demands for full civil rights is also to act pursuant to America's finest ethical and moral principles.

BANKS SHOW GENERAL IMPROVEMENT

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Vanik] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, in the Wall Street Journal of today, I note from the midyear reports of some of America's largest banks that most banks show a general improvement in the 6-month net operating income compared with the 1963 first half. Among the banks reporting, I noted that all of them reported a substantial reduction in their holdings of U.S. Government securities as follows:

[In millions]

Bank	U.S. Government securities held June 30—	
	1964	1963
Manufacturers Hanover Trust	878, 136	994, 320
Chemical Bank New York Trust	531, 504	646, 050
Marine Midland Trust of New York	129, 697	154, 862
National City Bank of Cleveland	146, 075	146, 484
Fidelity-Philadelphia Trust	104, 507	127, 718
Irving Trust of New York	372, 374	402, 473
Girard Trust of Philadelphia	157, 580	161, 103
Harris Trust of Chicago	237, 910	284, 049
Provident Tradesmens Bank	70, 398	76, 126
United California Bank	376, 144	405, 160
Philadelphia National Bank	181, 181	187, 064
Bank of New York	77, 345	100, 977
State Street Bank of Boston	80, 520	97, 016

It thus appears that in spite of higher profits and higher commercial activities, the banks are reducing their liquidity which is reflected in the continuation of the trend toward the reduction in holdings of U.S. Government securities. In these times, it might well constitute a danger signal.

REAPPORTIONMENT

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Whitener] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to amend existing law with reference to the jurisdiction of the Federal courts in cases involving apportionment or reapportionment of State legislatures.

In view of the recent decision of the U.S. Supreme Court it is imperative that corrective steps be taken by the Congress. Unless this is done promptly it would appear that there will be utter chaos in the several States of the Union. We must immediately consider some remedy to the ill created by the Court and take firm action to prevent further usurpation by the Court in this area.

The dissent of Justice Harlan in the reapportionment case points out in a very vivid manner the error of the majority of the Court. He has expressed the views of many Americans when he states that the Supreme Court is wandering far afield of its intended jurisdiction when it undertakes to usurp the constitutional authority of the States to determine the composition of their legislative bodies.

My bill would get at the heart of the problem. It simply provides that no U.S. district court shall have jurisdiction to entertain a petition or complaint seeking to apportion or reapportion a State legislative body, nor shall the Supreme Court have the right to review the action of a Federal or State court in such cases. This is a direct and proper legislative manner in which we in the Congress can undo the damage done by the power-hungry U.S. Supreme Court.

I urge all of our colleagues to join with us in this effort to bring order out of the chaos created by the unfortunate action of the Supreme Court.

EQUAL OPPORTUNITY—FOR MEN, TOO—IN THE NURSE CORPS AND MEDICAL SPECIALIST CORPS

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. Sullivan] may extend her remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, many of us who have worked long and hard over the years to secure and maintain equal employment opportunities for women are sensitive to unequal opportunities in employment wherever and however they exist. So it is with regret that I learn that the press of other legislation will prevent the Armed Services Committee this year from considering H.R. 1034, sponsored by Congresswoman Frances P. Bolton of Ohio, to permit the Army and the Air Force to commission men for service in the Nurse Corps and the Medical Specialist Corps. Mrs. Bolton is the author of much of our legislation to upgrade the careers and increase the supply of our country's nurses.

Truly, in the nursing field, perhaps more than in any other profession, women are a "little more equal" than men. Men comprise just about 2 percent of the Nation's professional nurses, and many men among that small percentage are holding administrative rather than nursing assignments. Nursing has been considered a "woman's" profession for so long that it has always been difficult to attract men into the field. Yet many men have made excellent nurses and medical specialists, particularly in the armed forces, and many more could be—both in the services and in the private health field. I have received a strong endorsement of Mrs. Bolton's bill from Sister Wilma Marie of the St. Louis University School of Medicine in her capacity as president of the Eastern Missouri Chapter of the American Physical Therapy Association. This organization believes passage of H.R. 1034 would be most helpful in increasing the number of male physical therapists by opening up important new career opportunities in the commissioned ranks of the armed services for men interested in this field.

In 1954 legislation sponsored by Mrs. Bolton enabled men to receive reserve commissions in the Army Nurse Corps and the Army Medical Specialist Corps. But men still cannot be regular officers in those corps. The Air Force has statutory authority to appoint men as regular officers in those fields, but since the law uses such designations as "she" and "her," the Air Force would like the United States Code to spell out in clear language that men are as "equal" as women for consideration for such appointments. H.R. 1034 would amend this law to refer to "persons" rather than to "women" and to eliminate the word "she" in reference to officers in these categories.

Women have a special stake in supporting Mrs. Bolton's bill. Here we can show by example that we really do believe in equality of opportunity for all who, by training and experience, qualify for the job.

THE GLASS INDUSTRY OF AMERICA

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Dent], is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, the glass industry of America is disturbed over the possibility of a reduction in present tariff levels.

Current hearings being conducted before the Tariff Commission could spell the end of the glass industry in America.

Testimony is being given by persons representing both industry and labor. I would like to read to the House some examples of this testimony for the benefit of all who are interested in this critical situation.

STATEMENT OF ENOCH R. RUST

Mr. Chairman and members of the U.S. Tariff Commission, my name is Enoch R. Rust, international second vice president of the United Glass & Ceramic Workers of North America, AFL-CIO.

I make this appearance on behalf of the membership of this international union and especially so in regard to those engaged in the manufacturing of crown, cylinder, and sheet glass. I also appear here as chairman of the stone, glass, and clay coordinating subcommittee on tariffs and trade, a group consisting of 7 international unions with a membership of 250,000.

For the past several years workers in the glass industry have had the displeasure of working under a cloud of uncertainty and doubt. They could only stand by and watch the flood of imports of window glass grow and grow. Their pleas for relief often fell on deaf ears. Many of the melting furnaces within the window glass industry were filled with finished, boxed, and ready-for-sale window glass instead of being in operation (running hot, molten glass down its lehrs toward the American marketplace).

Workers in this industry were becoming despondent and depressed. There was no chance, nor reason, to plan ahead because all that faced them was a future filled with uncertainty.

After an extensive investigation, under section 7 of the Trade Agreements Expansion Act of 1951, as amended, the Tariff Commission found that serious injury to this industry had been caused by excessive imports and by Presidential proclamation, an increase in duties was levied in order to save the industry.

As a result of this long overdue consideration by the Tariff Commission and the President of these United States the worker in this industry accepted this as a new ray of hope and began to plan accordingly.

Now, when things began to look a bit brighter for these people President Johnson has ordered an investigation of the industry's standing as of now. This, of course, again raises the mantle of fear and has thrown some members of management into a mood of near panic. In fact under present conditions a true picture of the actual health of the industry cannot be evaluated.

While there has been a lot of squawking by crown, cylinder, and sheet importing nations, the record will show that their ability to trade in the U.S. marketplace has not been hampered. Imports of this item have held at or near the 400-million-square-foot mark. Gentlemen, this is a lot of glass.

At Clarksburg and Charleston, W. Va., the center of Appalachia where jobs are still as scarce as hens teeth, is where we find the major part of the window glass producing industry located. We came here to Washington in 1960 and consumed the major part of 3 years showing facts and figures which clearly demonstrate the serious plight of this industry and the workers there involved.

We came to seek relief for the people and an industry which had become seriously depressed. We were even granted this relief. Industry, the workers and small business people in these towns all rejoiced in unison. This proclamation by the late President Kennedy served as a large measure of security for us all.

We came pleading for protection for this industry and jobs for our laid-off members. We were granted this protection through a duty increase. Laid-off workers were called back to work, now, gentlemen, is there a danger that the rug will again be jerked from beneath us? We pray not. We believe that there is every cause to continue the present protection and hope that Tariff Commission will so find. We feel the following information and statistics will support our position.

Libbey-Owens-Ford Glass Co. at Charleston, W. Va., has two furnaces that are down and not producing window glass. At the present time 161 men are still laid off. We have 475,000 boxes of glass in warehouses and 200,000 boxes of uncut glass in stock. If all Charleston facilities were in operation we would increase our work force there by 600 workers.

To demonstrate the ability of the foreign importer to enjoy the American market under present duty levels, we will give you a rundown on import figures for the first quarter of the years 1961, 1962, 1963, and 1964. 1961—1,306,000 50-foot boxes; 1962—2,289,000; 1963—1,218,000; and 1964—1,895,000. Gentlemen, there is no sign of any abatement of the pressure from imports in these figures.

Gentlemen, the weight of advantage in the trade situation weighs heavily in favor of the Belgians. I feel that it is very important to take into account here that when we speak of trade with member nations of the European economic community, we think in terms of creating jobs for the natives of those nations in order to create a healthy economic atmosphere, but now we find that after full employment was achieved industrialists of these nations did not stop there but instead are now, importing glassworkers from many distant parts of the world.

It is high time that we call upon our friends to give us a hand in helping to alleviate the unemployment of over 4 million Americans and to increase the minimal income of the 37 million other Americans who live in abject poverty.

Let us look at the window glass exporting situations as existing in both the United States and Belgium.

While Belgian exports during the 10-year period between 1953 and 1962 increased from 286 million pounds to 648 million for an actual increase of 362 million pounds, the American window glass exporters were not quite so fortunate. Instead of enjoying the healthy export growth as did the Belgians, our exports had dropped by 2 million pounds annually by 1962.

Sheet glass exports by Belgium and the United States, 1953–62

[In millions of pounds]

Year	Belgium	United States
1953	286	5.5
1954	318	3.4
1955	404	5.3
1956	474	3.9
1957	392	2.5
1958	455	3.0
1959	596	3.2
1960	515	4.3
1961	524	3.0
1962	648	3.5

Sources: Belgium—Bulletin Mensual du Commerce Exterieur de l'Union Economique Belgo-Luxembourgeoise. Institut National de Statistique Ministere des Affaires Economique et de Lenergie. United States—Table 3 of Tariff Commission publication.

As you may see, U.S. exports were merely a drop in the bucket compared to those of Belgian and even this drop is drying up. And furthermore, most of these American exports go to Canada and do not leave the North American Continent; in fact, most of those exports to Canada go primarily to an affiliate of one of America's window glass producing companies. Otherwise our export picture would now be practically nil.

Mr. Chairman, we have demonstrated here that: (1) The American window glass industry and workers are still not out of the woods in supplying job opportunity to laid-off workers; (2) the Belgian employment picture is at an alltime high and they are importing glassworkers from many parts of the world; and (3) the 1962 duty increase has not interfered with the foreign producers' ability to grab off the entire market expansion in the United States but merely checked their inclination to expand their market inordinately.

This ability on the part of the importers to supply all the increase in consumption in the American market is very dangerous to the American producers and their employees as it erases any and all chance of industrial expansion in this country.

Gentlemen, we rest our case in your hands and pray that you will carefully consider all elements of this situation. It is our strong belief that the facts presented at this hearing will clearly demonstrate that reduction in duties would lead to distress in the U.S. sheet glass industry and would greatly accentuate the plight of the U.S. glassworker.

I want to thank the Commission for this opportunity to appear here.

STATEMENT OF ROBINSON F. BARKER, VICE PRESIDENT, GLASS AND FIBER GLASS GROUP, PITTSBURGH PLATE GLASS CO., BEFORE THE U.S. TARIFF COMMISSION, JUNE 30, 1964

Mr. Chairman and members of the Tariff Commission, my name is Robinson F. Barker. I am vice president, glass and fiber glass group, Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co. and have been in the glass business for almost 30 years.

I have been privileged to appear before the Tariff Commission on two earlier occasions in connection with the Commission's investigations of sheet glass. My first appearance was on August 17, 1960, at the time of the Commission's peril point investigation. My later appearance was on March 15, 1961, in connection with the Commission's escape clause investigation.

The Tariff Commission is, of course, well versed in sheet glass matters. In addition to obtaining a wealth of information at the hearings referred to above, since the summer of 1960 my company and other members of the industry have completed several detailed questionnaires which the Commission propounded. During the 1960–64 period representatives of Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co. have also had several visits from the Tariff Commission staff and have given them additional information that they have requested from time to time.

I welcome the opportunity to appear here today to discuss the current status of the domestic sheet glass industry and the problems in that industry which confront my company.

As you will recall, Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co. owns and operates four sheet glass plants in the United States. They are located at Clarksburg, W. Va.; Mount Vernon, Ohio; Henryetta, Okla.; and Mount Zion, Ill. With the exception of the latter, the business of these plants is confined solely to the production of sheet glass. In the case of our Mount Zion plant, in addition to producing sheet glass, we also perform some fabricating work on sheet glass there.

Although Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co. is a diversified company, we maintain separate books and records respecting our sheet glass operations. This enables us to look at our sheet glass business independently from the other businesses in which the company is engaged.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

PURPOSE OF THIS INVESTIGATION

I am advised that your task in the current investigation is to advise the President of the probable economic effect on the domestic sheet glass industry were there to be a reduction or a termination of the duties applicable to sheet glass which became effective June 17, 1962. In so advising the President, the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 states that "The Tariff Commission shall take into account all economic factors which it considers relevant, including idling of productive facilities, inability to operate at a level of reasonable profit, and unemployment and underemployment" (sec. 351(d)4).

Because the standard prescribed by the statute requires that all relevant economic factors be considered, this means that the standard is not necessarily met if some conditions in the domestic industry have merely improved since June 17, 1962.

I will state categorically that the facts respecting all relevant economic factors do not warrant the Tariff Commission's advising the President to reduce or terminate the June 17, 1962, increased rates of duty applicable to sheet glass.

I will support that conclusion, first, by reviewing briefly the situation confronting the domestic producers of sheet glass at the time the Commission conducted its escape clause investigation. I will then discuss the situation both today and into the foreseeable future, with particular emphasis on the problems of PPG.

REVIEW OF THE SHEET GLASS SITUATION

You will recall, I am sure, the report the Tariff Commission made to the President on May 17, 1961, at the conclusion of the Commission's escape clause investigation of sheet glass. In its findings the Commission stated in relevant part as follows:

"(a) That as a result, in part, of the duties reflecting the concessions granted thereon in the General Agreements on Tariffs and Trade, cylinder, crown, and sheet glass * * * are being imported into the United States in such increased quantities, both actual, and relative, as to cause serious injury to the domestic industry producing like products; and

"(b) that in order to remedy serious injury to the domestic industry concerned, it is necessary that the specific duties applicable to such glass under paragraph 219 be increased" (TC Publ. 17, pp. 2–3).

In order to analyze the sheet glass situation properly, it is necessary that the Commission take a broad look at the situation confronting the domestic industry. Thus, in arriving at the above findings, it is significant that the Commission looked at a period of over 10 years—the period from 1950 through 1960. We believe that in its present investigation the Commission should look at that period as well as at the post-1960 period.

It is not my purpose today to catalog or tabulate the many facts and figures which sustained the Commission's findings in the escape clause investigation of sheet glass. I do think it important, however, that you recall what happened in the U.S. sheet glass market during the period from 1950 to 1960. History teaches that "the past is prolog" and that teaching seems to be particularly applicable to all who are competing for the U.S. sheet glass market. The reason I say this is readily apparent from our first exhibit. With your permission, I will now hand up a chart entitled "Index of Sheet Glass Trends—U.S. Imports, Domestic Shipments by U.S. Producers, U.S. Exports (1950 equals 100)."

This chart records graphically information concerning the years 1950 to 1962, inclusive, derived from table 3, appended to the Tariff Commission's report to the President of September 27, 1963 (TC Publ. 110, p. 22).

In addition, the chart has been extended to include information for the full year 1963 and the first quarter of 1964 which has been published by the U.S. Department of Commerce. I should note parenthetically that the information for the first quarter 1964 has been annualized.

You will observe that this chart presents the rate of change, respecting the data portrayed, on an index basis with 1950 equals 100. The chart presents more eloquently than words the extent to which imported sheet glass has penetrated the U.S. market.

It also shows the relatively static shipment picture of the domestic producers during the 1950–64 period. You will note that the chart records separately domestic shipments by U.S. producers and U.S. exports.

The information recorded on our first exhibit becomes more significant when we look at the growth picture of the U.S. sheet glass market during the same period and see how the domestic and foreign sheet glass producers have participated in that growth. I now hand up PPG's second exhibit which is a chart entitled "U.S. Apparent Consumption of Sheet Glass as Supplied by U.S. Producers and Foreign Imports—Years 1950–1964." Here again I invite your attention to the fact that the data for the first quarter of 1964 have been annualized.

The data shown on this second chart are in absolute quantities, i.e., in billions of pounds, and in this respect the chart differs from the index portrayal utilized in our first exhibit.

This chart shows at a glance the total apparent U.S. consumption of sheet glass by year during the 1950–1964 period. In so doing, it also shows the growth in U.S. sheet glass consumption that has occurred during that period.

We have drawn on this chart a horizontal line which shows the absolute volume of domestic shipments by U.S. producers in the year 1950. We have labeled that line "1950 level." By continuing the line across the entire span of years portrayed, it is abundantly clear that the foreign producers are the prime beneficiaries of substantially all of the growth that has occurred in the U.S. sheet glass market. And, please observe that this was not only the case in the years immediately preceding the escape clause investigation but also such continues to be the case down to the present.

You will also note that the total domestic shipments of U.S. sheet glass producers have exceeded the total amount they shipped in 1950 in only 5 of the 15 years portrayed. This is a far cry from that which has taken place in this country since 1950 insofar as total U.S. industrial production is concerned. You will recall that table 5, appended to your report to the President of September 27, 1963, shows that in the period from 1950 to 1963 total U.S. industrial production increased 64 percent. Although total apparent U.S. consumption of sheet glass in 1964 is approximately 24 percent higher than it was in 1950, the unfortunate fact remains that the whole amount of that increase continues to be supplied by foreign producers.

It should be emphasized that in a vital, dynamic economy such as we have experienced in the United States during this period, no industry having a static, relatively inelastic market position can make the economic, technological, and even social contributions which naturally flow from a position of continued progress.

The post-war history of the domestic sheet glass industry is not a pretty picture. There are two principal factors which have created this situation. First, there is little doubt in my mind but that the successive reductions in rates of duty applicable to sheet glass that took place over the years were a substantial factor. Those reductions, as this Commission found in its report to the President of May 17, 1961, enabled sheet glass to be imported into the United States in such increased quantities as to cause serious injury to the domestic sheet glass industry.

The second factor attributable to the continued plight of the domestic sheet glass industry lies in the simple fact that the foreign sheet glass producers enjoy substantially lower costs than we do. This statement is not a mere assertion on my part but rather it is based upon personal knowledge derived from my experience in administering our foreign glass investments.

There is great disparity between wage rates paid to sheet glass workers among the producing countries in the world. This is borne out by U.S. Department of Labor figures. For example, the average total hourly wage cost for PPG sheet glass production workers today is $3.80. Resolving all doubts in this area in favor of the foreigners, this is more than 3½ times the comparable cost for Belgian sheet glass production workers. The labor cost advantage held by the Belgians over us is even greater in the case of some of the other European sheet glass producing countries for the reason that the latter enjoy even lower labor costs than the Belgians. But that is not all. The labor cost advantage held by the Japanese is still greater than that enjoyed by the European sheet glass producers—at least six to seven times less than PPG.

This cost advantage is of real substance when it is realized that our labor cost alone accounts for nearly 50 percent of our total cost of producing sheet glass.

In addition to the substantial labor cost advantage held by the foreigners over us, it is important to note that foreign producers also enjoy a cost advantage in raw materials. Our studies show that our raw material batch costs are approximately 15 percent higher than those prevailing in the Common Market.

Another substantial advantage held by foreign producers over the domestic producers of sheet glass is that of income taxes. Although the tax rates vary as among the different foreign sheet glass producing countries, the significant fact is that all or virtually all of those countries have lower income taxes than those of the United States.

In this setting of foreign labor and raw material costs and tax advantages, it is no wonder that the domestic producers' exports of sheet glass are miniscule. During the past 15-year period sheet glass exports by U.S. producers have represented substantially less than 1 percent of their total domestic shipments. It should be emphasized that this pathetic situation is not caused by foreign tariff barriers. Indeed, if all the countries of the world were to abolish their tariffs on sheet glass, the U.S. producers would not be able to export any more sheet glass than they are now exporting. The simple reason for this rests in the substantial cost and tax advantages held by the foreign producers. Of course, it goes without saying that with the U.S. sheet glass producers being virtually foreclosed from all export markets, the foreign producers are supplying all of the sheet glass requirements of the other countries in addition to supplying 24 percent of the total apparent U.S. consumption.

EFFECT OF THE 1962 TARIFF INCREASE ON THE FOREIGNERS

It is appropriate at this point to determine what has been the effect on the foreign producers since the late President Kennedy issued his proclamation increasing the rates of duty on sheet glass.

In this connection, my first observation is that the increased rates of duty made effective June 17, 1962, have had no adverse effect on the foreign sheet glass producers' exports to this country. Not only is this clearly reflected in the two exhibits we have previously handed up, but also some of the foreign producers have themselves admitted the validity of my statement in their published reports. For example, the annual report of the Societe Generale de Belgique (the company which controls the entire Belgian glass industry) for the year 1962 contains a number of interesting statements. Thus, at page 20, the report says:

"For flat glass products and chemicals, the volume of production showed increases of 20 and 16 percent respectively."

At page 74 the Societe Generale Annual Report has this to say:

"The flat glass industry in Belgium developed on very satisfactory lines during 1962.

"In the external markets, the chief event of the year was the raising of the import duties on window glass in the United States. The new duties, which came into effect on June 18, 1962, are almost double the old ones. Despite this unilateral action by a country which is a big user of Belgian glass, total exports continued expanding with sales handsomely supported by continued building activity in Europe and overseas. The exports, indeed, practically reached the 1960 levels, which were exceptionally high."

The Societe Generale Annual Report for the year 1963 also refers to business conditions during that year. In this respect, it stated:

"The year 1963 was marked by a material shrinkage in the demand for flat glass products and, more particularly, for window glass.

"This is explained in part by the severe winter conditions of 1962–63 and by the fact that consumers have been reducing their stocks. Moreover, the raising of the U.S. import duties in June 1962 was reflected only in the second half of that year, so that 1963 has been the first year to show the full effect.

"During the first half-year, production remained in excess of sales. Large quantities of window glass had to be taken into stock, despite the stoppage of several furnaces. In July, however, a recovery set in; and its continuation in the following months made it possible for the furnaces to be restarted. Conditions in the second half-year were thus once more on a satisfactory level, not only for window glass but also for plate glass and cast glass."

This admission on the part of Societe Generale is interesting but to put it in its proper context, some additional observations will be made.

Sheet glass imports declined during the last half of 1962 and the first half of 1963. Of course, the foreigners would have this Commission attribute the decline in imports to the increased rates of duty. That was simply not the case. The fact is that the abnormally heavy advance buying which occurred during the first 6 months of 1962 resulted in the accumulation of vast inventories by the foreigners' U.S. customers. Those swollen inventories needed an extended period of time in which to be consumed. And, that is precisely what took place during the last 6 months of 1962 and well into the year 1963. Therefore, the decline in imports during this period is attributable to this advance buying and not to the increase in the rates of duty.

I would also observe that the portion of the Societe Generale 1963 Annual Report which I quoted implies that business was sluggish for the Belgian sheet glass industry in the first half of 1963 but that in July a "recovery" set in. I cannot refrain from noting in this connection a curious coincidence. The increased rates of duty on sheet glass went into effect on June 17, 1962. Because a statutory provision requires the Tariff Commission to report to the President annually with respect to all escape clause matters, it was generally assumed that the Commission would release such a report on or about June 17, 1963. However, several days before this anticipated June 1963 release date, the Tariff Commission corrected this erroneous assumption by indicating that its report would not be forthcoming until September 1963. The curious coincidence I referred to above stems from the fact that foreign sheet glass imports into the United States jumped 29.1 percent in July 1963 over June of that year. This is to be contrasted with an increase in July 1961 imports over June 1961 of 8 percent and with a decrease in July 1960 imports below June of that year of 6 percent. The question thus emerges—did the foreigners intentionally hold back their shipments to this country during the first 6 months of 1963 for the purpose of artificially influencing the U.S. import figures for that period, with the hope that such action would result in a more favorable report from this Commission? In any event, we all know that imports returned to a very high level throughout the second half of 1963 and this continues to be the case through April of this year, the latest month for which data are available.

There are additional facts which clearly demonstrate that the June 17, 1962, increase in the rates of duty for sheet glass has not injured the foreign sheet glass producers. Many foreign producers are operating at such a high level of production that they cannot obtain enough employees to man their factories. In fact, the Belgians have such a shortage of sheet glass workers that they are importing workers, together with their families, from other foreign countries. The following additional quotation from the 1963 Societe Generale Annual Report states the Belgian labor situation in this fashion:

"Frontiers are now wide open to foreign manpower to bridge the gaps in the local supply. Belgium, after recruiting in Italy and Spain, has had to absorb labor from countries as far afield as Greece, Turkey, and Morocco, despite the high costs and the risks involved in these movements of populations, and the many settlement problems which arise.

"The insufficiency of manpower is the more notable in Belgium since the population of working age is growing less rapidly than in other countries. Various estimates have shown the shortage of workers in Belgium is likely to continue for a long time."

While Belgium was importing workers from various parts of the world in 1963 in order to fill their labor shortage, many U.S. sheet glass workers were jobless. Specifically, the number of U.S. sheet glass production workers has declined in recent years. For example, the most recent industry figures which the Tariff Commission has reported show that there were an average of 8,301 such workers in 1955 but only 7,597 in 1962.

In our own case PPG employed fewer sheet glass production workers in 1963 than it did in 1959 and 1962. I recognize that our practice of introducing more efficient methods of production, including automation, may account in some degree for this decline. Of course, with foreign imports accounting for one-fourth of all the sheet glass consumed in this country, I have no doubt that the domestic industry could employ more production workers in spite of our constantly improving technology, if the domestic industry had a larger participation in the U.S. market.

THE PROBLEM OF APPALACHIA

While on the general subject of employment in the sheet glass industry, I believe it appropriate to make reference to the Appalachian bill President Johnson sent to the Congress on April 28, 1964 (H.R. 11065). In his transmittal letter to Congress, President Johnson stated that this bill is "designed to make possible the economic development of the Appalachian region."

The bill itself declares "that the Appalachian region of the United States, while abundant in natural resources and rich in potential, lags behind the rest of the Nation in its economic growth and that its people have not shared properly in the Nation's prosperity."

According to the New York Times, the bill contemplates Federal expenditures of at least $1 billion and possibly $4 billion in order to help the economy of Appalachia.

The Appalachian region is located in a 10-State area. It encompasses all of West Virginia and substantial portions of Pennsylvania, Ohio, Maryland, Virginia, Kentucky, North Carolina, Tennessee, Alabama, and Georgia.

Historically, the sheet glass industry has been closely associated with the Appalachian region. There are 14 sheet glass plants in the United States. Six of those plants are located in Appalachia, and two others are located in the Appalachian States of Tennessee and Ohio. The six plants situated directly in Appalachia presently employ approximately 4,300 employees. If the two other plants are added to these six, this brings the total number of employees to approximately 6,750.

It is interesting to note that even though only 6 of the Nation's 14 sheet glass plants are located in Appalachia, these 6 plants employ 45 percent of the Nation's sheet glass employees. This figure becomes 72 percent if the 8 plants in the Appalachian States are considered.

Needless to say, the payrolls that are earned by these residents of Appalachia help "to make possible the economic development of the Appalachian region." There is no doubt that more Appalachian people would be on the payrolls of these sheet glass plants if foreign glass was not accounting for one-fourth of the U.S. market. So too, it is highly probable that there will be fewer Appalachian people on these payrolls if the foreign sheet glass producers are permitted to gobble up an even greater percentage of the U.S. market.

Furthermore, it should be noted that the Appalachian sheet glass plants are particularly vulnerable to foreign imports because those plants normally serve large volume markets in the eastern and southern sections of the United States, where import competition has been exceedingly intense. Therefore, if sheet glass duties are lowered, that action would obviously result in increased imports into those markets with a concomitant adverse effect upon the Appalachian plants.

If the Appalachian bill is passed by the Congress, our Government will undoubtedly assist the economy of Appalachia by spending huge sums of money in that area. Although I am not an expert on political affairs, to me it would be highly inconsistent for this Government to do that on the one hand and on the other hand reduce the present duties on sheet glass so that foreign producers, in countries where overemployment already exists, can supply the glass that the Appalachian workers would otherwise have supplied. Certainly such inconsistent action would not help to assure that Appalachia's people share properly in the Nation's prosperity.

FOREIGN CARTEL

I have a few other observations to make concerning the foreign producers who are exporting sheet glass to this country. During the year 1963 sheet glass was imported into the United States from 32 foreign countries. Most of the foreign sheet glass companies who export to the United States are not small, independent or struggling business organizations. Quite to the contrary, a preponderance of those companies are large, well-financed, and well-organized corporations. I refer here particularly to the Japanese, Belgian, French, British, Italian, and German producers. In addition, many of the foreign sheet glass producers who export to the United States hold stock interests in each other, and as a result, it is not uncommon for those companies to adopt and pursue identical business policies and practices. Whether or not any of those companies are members of an international sheet glass cartel would call for a legal conclusion on my part that I am not competent to make. However, the fact that many are interrelated by stock affiliation and interlocking directorates is widely known and this interrelation, in my judgment, is clearly relevant to the current investigation. Accordingly, the Commission may wish to explore this subject thoroughly as a part of its own investigation.

PPG'S SITUATION

Turning now to another subject, you will recall that when we appeared before the Commission on March 15, 1961, we submitted a chart entitled "Index of Sheet Glass Trends—U.S. Imports as a Percent of Domestic Shipments—PPG Gross Fixed Assets—PPG Sales—PPG Net Income (1955 equals 100)." That chart covered the years 1955 through 1960.

In order to analyze PPG's situation both before the June 17, 1962, increase in the rates of duty and after, we have brought that earlier chart up to date through the first quarter of 1964. Our updated chart is PPG exhibit 3 and with your permission I now hand up a copy.

This chart shows a number of things:

First, it shows that the tariff increase of June 17, 1962, has had no appreciable effect on the ratio of imports to domestic shipments. With 1955 equaling 100, U.S. imports as a percentage of domestic shipments stood at an index of nearly 220 during the first quarter of 1964. This is higher than any year prior to 1962, the year of the increased rates of duty, and it is only slightly lower than 1962 itself, which was the highest year on record, and the year in which the foreigners were exporting tremendous quantities of sheet glass into this country in anticipation of the duty increase.

Second, PPG's sheet glass gross fixed assets have been on a constantly ascending curve throughout the 1955–64 period. Those assets have gone up each year and today are at an index of 214. Manifestly this constant increase reflects a real and continuing determination on the part of PPG not only to stay in the sheet glass business but also to improve its competitive position. Later in my statement I will speak again about the improvements we have made that underlie the increase in the PPG gross fixed assets curve on this chart.

Third, you will observe that PPG's sheet glass sales rose slightly in 1956 over what they were in 1955. But, you will also observe that our sales dropped off drastically thereafter and remained below the 1955 level for the next 5 years. Thus, it was not until 1962 that PPG's sales surpassed the 1955 level and in that year they rose to an index of about 107. In 1963 our sales showed further improvement and moved up to an index of 122 and they continued at about that level during the first quarter of 1964. Needless to say, I am pleased with this development, but when it is observed that PPG increased its investment in gross fixed assets 114 percent and obtained an increase in sales of only 22 percent during the span of nearly 10 years, I cannot regard this improvement as completely satisfactory. In saying this, I am cognizant that during the same span of years, U.S. industrial production has gone up 33.6 percent and gross national product has increased 53 percent. It is quite evident to me that the improvement in PPG's sales made since 1962 is attributable largely to the tariff increase. I doubt that I could properly be accused of allowing my imagination to stray too far were I to speculate that if the 1962 tariff increase is terminated, it is likely that our sales will again drop below the 1955 level.

Fourth, you will note that PPG's sheet glass net income declined drastically after 1955, and that it reached its low point in 1958, dipping to an index of 20. Although 1958 was a recession year, from the viewpoint of total U.S. consumption as well as total shipments by U.S. producers, 1959 was a banner year. The fact remains, however, that in 1959 PPG's sheet glass net income reached an index of only 64.6, which still was more than 35 percent below PPG's 1955 net income. The chart also shows that our net income sharply declined again in 1960, 1961, and 1962 from what it was in 1959. It was not until 1963 that PPG's sheet glass net income started to rise again. During the first quarter of 1964 our sheet glass net income stands at approximately the same level as it did 7 years ago, in 1957. Even so, our net income is nearly 20 percent lower today than it was during the year 1955.

I submit that no clearer evidence could be offered to prove the fact that the June 17, 1962, increased rates of duty were vital to the domestic sheet glass industry. As I shall develop, those increased rates of duty were extremely helpful in enabling my company to achieve the modest improvement in the earnings picture I have just outlined.

In urging the Tariff Commission to reduce or terminate the increased rates of duty, the foreign producers point to the improvement in PPG's net income picture that has taken place within the past 15 months. To me, any argument based upon such a short period of time is simply unrealistic.

When this Commission found that the previous rates of duty had contributed in part to the increased quantities of imports into the United States so as to cause serious injury in the domestic industry, the Presidential proclamation made effective June 17, 1962, was obviously designed to remedy that cause of injury. It necessarily follows, therefore, that with all other factors being equal, the position of the domestic producers would thereafter improve. In a large sense, improvement was what the Presidential proclamation was designed to attain. Certainly the mere fact that PPG's sheet glass net earnings over the recent 15-month period have improved somewhat from the miserable position they were in during the previous 3 years does not justify the removal at this time of one of the principal causes of that improvement. I am referring, of course, to the 1962 tariff increase.

In my judgment, the fact that some improvement has been made in recent months is living proof of the wisdom underlying the Commission's findings in the escape clause matter and the relief which was instituted thereafter.

To go further, there is little doubt that the June 17, 1962, tariff relief was helpful in bringing about the recent improvement in our sheet glass earnings because that relief provided an economic setting for much-needed upward price adjustments.

Since 1960, we in PPG have had some extremely difficult decisions to make in the pricing of our sheet glass products. Throughout this period we have been on the horns of a dilemma whether, on the one hand, to try to recapture on the basis of price alone the large part of the U.S. market which we previously lost to the foreigners or, on the other hand, to try to get our economic house in order so that we would be in a position to compete effectively against the foreigners by improving our technology and developing more efficient production methods.

In resolving that dilemma, we first utilized a deep price reduction in the form of freight absorption as a competitive weapon in an attempt to recapture some of the lost domestic market. The results we experienced by that action proved to be nearly disastrous. The foreigners' instant retaliation made it abundantly clear that there was virtually no floor to their price levels, and in the spring and summer of 1960 they undercut the domestic prices by even greater amounts than had previously been the case. The Tariff Commission had this to say about prices in its Report to the President of May 17, 1961:

"The information in this investigation shows * * * that the sale of a large and growing volume of imported glass at prices significantly lower than prices for comparable domestic glass has seriously weakened the price structure in the U.S. market."

That, of course, does not tell the full story. In addition to our lack of success in recapturing the lost domestic business from the foreigners, the domestic industry suffered an aggregate net operating loss in 1960 equal to 1.3 percent of the aggregate net sales for the reporting companies. This fact also was reported by the Tariff Commission to the President on May 17, 1961 (Ibid, p. 36).

Accordingly, since that abortive experience, we realized that our principal hope for a succesful future lay in our ability to continue to introduce technological improvements and create operating efficiencies. And, this is what we have done and what we are continuing to strive to do. For example, since March 1962, when the late President Kennedy announced the tariff increase, my company has made capital expenditures for its domestic sheet glass manufacturing facilities in excess of $6 million. Because I do not wish to divulge confidential information that might aid our competitors, I shall not disclose on the record how we have spent that money. The Commision's staff, however, has been fully advised. Suffice it to say, the improvements which have resulted from those expenditures, as well as those made earlier, have increased the quality of our product and created improved operating efficiencies.

It is an economic fact of life that improvements and efficiencies of the kind I am talking about require the expenditure of large sums of money. In order to justify the expenditure of that kind of money, it is also an economic fact that the operations requiring such investments earn a competitively determined profit. Only by making money are we justified in continuing to reinvest in the sheet glass business.

At the time of the Presidential proclamation announcing a tariff increase in March 1962, PPG's net income position continued at approximately the same low level which it had obtained in 1960 and 1961. This is clearly reflected by PPG exhibit 3. Therefore, it was abundantly clear that PPG should attempt to solve its pricing dilemma by obtaining more money for its product. Only in this manner could the company stand to gain the necessary profits to develop better technology and more efficient production methods. Thereafter, on April 9, 1962, PPG increased its prices 5 percent on single, double, and heavy sheet thicknesses. However, this price action still left the company in a less favorable net income position than it was in prior to the time when it began absorbing freight in the spring of 1960. This is also borne out by PPG exhibit 3 where you will observe that PPG's 1962 net income increased only slightly over what it was in 1961, notwithstanding the fact that PPG's April 9, 1962, prices were in effect for nearly 9 months of 1962.

It was obvious to us in PPG that our net income picture did not reach a satisfactory level in 1962. Indeed, our studies showed that between 1960 and 1962 PPG's net realized price per unit (i.e., 50' SSE. box) increased 7.9 percent but our total costs and expenses per unit increased 9.1 percent. This amounted to a net deficit of 1.2 percent which occurred despite a substantial increase in PPG's 1962 shipments. Although we had this information before us in early 1963, we were loath to attempt another price increase because we realized that such an increase might have the effect of diverting more business to the foreigners. However, in the summer of 1963 the foreign producers increased their prices. This gave us the opportunity to raise our prices and thereby provide a basis for an improved net income picture.

You will note from PPG exhibit 3 that even though our net income did improve in 1963, it was still approximately 30 percent below our 1955 level. Therefore, in March 1964 we increased our prices on single strength and thinner sheet glass and on "B" quality selected for silvering. For years our return on single strength and thinner sheet glass had been lower than the return we had obtained from our double strength and heavy sheet glass products and our price action of March 1964 endeavored to improve that situation. In addition, for some time we had been selecting "B" quality sheet glass for silvering without receiving any additional compensation for the added cost such double inspection entailed. Obviously this also required corrective action. Wtih the price changes I have referred to, PPG's net income in the first quarter of 1964 has shown additional improvement, but it is still 18 percent below the level we attained in 1955. We are hopeful that this 1964 price increase will assist us to come closer to the level that we achieved almost 10 years ago, in 1955.

Our recent price changes, whether viewed separately or collectively, were absolutely necessary in order for PPG to attain a healthy position in the highly competitive U.S. sheet glass market. I could speak at length about the economic justification we had for making these increases but I will merely refer to some of the more obvious ones. For example, in this connection you will recall table 8 which is appended to the Tariff Commission's Report to the President of September 27, 1963. Using the 1957–59 period as a base, this table depicts the domestic delivered prices to customers located in eight selected U.S. cities. We have brought that table up to date, and it shows that PPG's prices for single strength sheet glass delivered to factory buyers in those eight cities now stand at an index ranging from 104.8 (Miami) to 117.1 (Pittsburgh), or an average index of 111 for the eight cities. On the same basis, PPG's prices for double strength and heavy sheet have increased about 8 percent since the 1957–59 period.

It is interesting to contrast the price increases that I have just mentioned with some of our cost increases. For example, the total average hourly wages (including fringe benefits) paid by PPG to its sheet glass production and related workers increased 23 percent from 1957 to 1964. And, in the case of the five basic materials which comprise the batch in making sheet glass, PPG's costs for those materials have increased approximately 15 percent for that same period. With those substantial increases in labor and raw material costs, it is no wonder that we suffered the net deficit of 1.2 percent I referred to previously in comparing our 1962 sheet glass operations with those of 1960.

I could continue to talk about other aspects of cost, but if I were to do so, in a sense, I would be talking about individual trees rather than the forest. Cutting through this whole subject of price, the plain, simple fact of the matter is that our sheet glass operating results were dismal during the years 1960, 1961, and 1962 and it was mandatory that we take affirmative action in order to remedy this situation. Our first attempt at a solution involved a drastic price reduction and this method failed. Our second attempt involved getting our economic house in order by increasing our prices and introducing further improved operating methods.

Needless to say, our recent price increases, which were based upon an economic setting that was created in large part by the tariff increase of 1962, have contributed in a substantial manner to the improved operating results which we have recently attained. This is reflected by PPG exhibit 3.

CONCLUSION

We in PPG know that the cost advantage of the foreigners is still overwhelming. In view of this, we are continuing to make every effort to reduce the existing cost disparity by developing efficiencies and improving our technology.

As I have stated earlier, this means continued heavy investment on our part, but to warrant this kind of investment it is axiomatic that the investment earn a return commensurate with the risk. As PPG exhibit 3 certainly shows, we have not yet achieved that result. Therefore, we sincerely believe that the domestic industry needs to operate under the present tariff relief for an additional, reasonable period of time.

Accordingly, for the reasons stated, we earnestly request the Tariff Commission to advise the President of the United States that a consideration of all relevant economic factors respecting the sheet glass industry conclusively points to a continuation of the present rates of duty.

THE U.S. EXHIBIT AT THE NEW YORK WORLD'S FAIR

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROSENTHAL] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I feel it is most appropriate on this historic day in this Chamber for me, as an American and as the member of the New York congressional delegation in whose district the New York World's Fair is located, to raise my voice in defense of the exhibit of the U.S. Government at the fair.

Since this fair opened its doors to the public on April 22, I have heard and read a number of speeches presented by some of my distinguished colleagues in the House of Representatives. As is so frequently the case, those who are satisfied and pleased with an exhibit or an issue, and proud of an accomplishment, will hold their tongues; but let there be the slightest difference of opinion or vague dissatisfaction, and we see the floodgates of criticism open wide.

As I analyze some of the unfavorable comments that have been made about the U.S. exhibit, I am struck by a certain thread of similarity running through them, in substance as well as in the terminology used. I hear it said that the exhibit is a national disgrace, that we have used the pavilion to downgrade America, that we should have advertised to the world that we are the greatest nation on earth and emphasized our accomplishments instead of identifying our aims.

Yet, is it not true that, great as our national achievements are, we still have a long way to go? Would we not be less than candid if we suggested that there is no unfinished business left to be done, no problems to be answered, and no aspects of our freedom yet to be resolved?

No doubt it was a realization of these facts which led John G. Rogers to write in the New York Herald Tribune that the "American exhibit—'The Challenge to Greatness'—is noteworthy because in an exposition replete with self-congratulation, it indulges in self-criticism and concedes openly that the United States still has hurdles to clear in such fields as civil rights and education."

I applaud the maturity of judgment displayed by a citizens' advisory committee which, early in 1962, was charged by the Secretary of Commerce to develop a theme and general concept for Federal participation in the New York World's Fair. This committee included among its members: Leonard Bernstein, composer-conductor; Dr. James M. Hester, president of New York University; C. D. Jackson, vice president of Time, Inc.; Paul M. Rudolph, head of department of architecture at Yale University; Robert W. Sarnoff, chairman of the board of the National Broadcasting Corp.; and Sylvester L. Weaver, chairman of the board of McCann-Erickson Corp., International.

The committee's recommendations follow:

> Within a World's Fair whose theme is "Man's Achievements in an Expanding Universe," there is a natural temptation, perhaps out of national pride, to offer up before the world a U.S. exhibit that reveals our socioeconomic progress, displays the material rewards of our advanced technology, or hails our scientific and cultural achievements.
>
> Yet it is this committee's belief that the very nature of the times requires a deeper reflection of the United States and a truer image of its free society. And we recommend that a Federal exhibit invite interest not merely in our progress, but in the challenges our progress holds up to us * * * not in our technology, but in the responsibilities our technology imposes upon us * * * not in our achievements but in the spirit which leads to our achievements.
>
> Helping visitors to see and understand our challenges, our responsibilities, our dedication, would provide a more accurate and meaningful excursion into the character of a nation that serves as a model for freedom and bears the burden of proof that a democratic system succeeds.
>
> We would have it known that our democracy does not assure progress and achievement—it merely offers the opportunity.
>
> We would have it known that our democracy has problems—yet that same democracy demands of us that every wrong be righted, every ill combatted, every advantage given, every challenge met.
>
> We would have it known that our democracy does not make us great—but does afford us the freedom to become great.
>
> It is with these thoughts in mind that we suggest the Federal Government's exhibit in the World's Fair be created around the theme: "Challenge to Greatness."
>
> We believe this theme allows the United States to show itself without boast to the world, and at the same time offer inspiration to its individual citizens.

Te recommendations of the Citizens' Advisory Committee were accepted by President Kennedy who, in his message dated March 13, 1962, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, stated as follows:

> The theme "Challenge to Greatness," proposed by a Citizens' Advisory Committee established by Secretary Hodges, will enable us

to present to the world not a boastful picture of our unparalleled progress, but a picture of democracy—its opportunities, its problems, its inspirations, and its freedoms.

During subsequent appropriation hearings both in the House and in the Senate, the Department of Commerce, which was assigned responsibility for Federal participation in the fair, stressed the fact that the basic theme proposed by the Citizens' Advisory Committee would form the basis for the Federal exhibit. Subsequently, in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act of 1962, the Congress granted an appropriation of $17 million for this purpose. Thus, in the final analysis, the Congress itself gave its stamp of approval to the recommendations of the Citizens' Advisory Committee.

These recommendations are reflected in a truly imaginative manner in the exhibits which the Department of Commerce and, through it, the U.S. Commission for the New York World's Fair, created for the Federal Pavilion. I have seen this exhibit and I was proud of the fact that our Nation is humble enough to recognize its weaknesses and realize its responsibilities. At a time when so many of us evaluate greatness in terms of wealth, creature comforts, and destructive power to blow this universe to smithereens, it is refreshing to see our Federal Government emphasize the spirit and the human values which are truly the mark of greatness in a nation.

Mr. Speaker, let me take you, if I may, on an imaginary tour of the Federal Pavilion.

The fair visitor enters a 600-seat theater, where he views an introductory film entitled "Voyage to America." This film was produced and directed by John Houseman, cofounder with Orson Welles of the Mercury Theater; wartime Chief of the Overseas Radio Program Bureau in the Office of War Information; three-time Academy Award winner for "The Seven Lively Arts," in 1957, and "Playhouse 90," in 1958 and 1959; artistic director of the American Shakespeare Festival Theater in Stratford, Conn.; and artistic director of the Theater Group of the Adult Education Division of the University of California.

The musical score of the film was written by Virgil Thompson.

The film presents the great cultural legacy and heritage that 40 million immigrants contributed to America. It shows a story of motion and change and of greatness based on a migration that is unique in recorded history. It points out that aside from the American Indians, the rest of us—and this goes for every American who ever lived—are immigrants or descendants of immigrants. Starting with the Pilgrims who came to New England in search of religious freedom, and others—French, Germans, Swedes, Spanish, and Dutch—who founded settlements of their own, all hoping to find in the New World opportunities which the Old World had denied them, the film depicts the great waves of immigration: first the Irish, ravaged by famine, driven off their land, who came 4¼ million strong, to build our first chain of canals, railroads, the cities of the Middle West. From northern Europe, the English, Scotch and Welsh, the Scandinavians, Germans, Austrians and Swiss—15 million—seeking refuge in the New World, bringing with them their skills, education, and ways of life. From southern Europe, the Italians—6 millions; from impoverished countries of central and eastern Europe, Poles, Rumanians, Hungarians, Bohemians, Slovaks, Ruthenians—8 million; from the Balkans and Asia Minor, Greeks, Macedonians, Croatians, Albanians, Syrians and Armenians, came to work in the new land to which a $12 steerage ticket gave them entry. They helped to open what was left of the continent; they flowed as workers and consumers into the shops and mills and factories of the cities, the mines and logging camps and oilfields of the exploding West.

The film goes on to show that in times of crisis our doors are still open and newcomers continue to move in. The great migration is over; but this does not mean that the American journey is complete. To survive, we must face the challenges which are greater than other generations of Americans have faced in the past.

In pointing out that it is for us to extend the discoveries of the immigrants, whose past is our past, to continue their long and painful struggle for dignity and freedom, the film serves as an introduction to the next section of the exhibition.

As he emerges from the theater, the fairgoer enters an exhibition area entitled: "The Challenges: Today." Here an imaginative attempt is made to define and demonstrate through the use of three-dimensional objects some of the major challenges and issues which face the American people today. Divided into two major headings, "Challenges to Freedom" and "Challenges to Peace," the exhibits deal with such challenges as those of equal rights, democracy, learning, growth, social concern, creativity, discovery; and such international challenges as those of the free world, the population explosion, the developing nations, arms control, our world community, and the discovery of space.

Here are some of the exhibition items which were selected to portray these challenges:

Enlargements of letters to the President, some on permanent graphic display and others changed periodically, to symbolize the range of our system of self-government, from the citizen to the Chief Executive, and the opportunity for all Americans to exercise freedom of expression.

A programed audiovisual teaching and work station where young unskilled workers demonstrate how they may be upgraded through on-the-job vocational training; and three individual audiovisual electronic study booths which display the impact of technology on modern-day education.

A model expressing the sweeping scope of the Central Valley project of California to symbolize the challenge of growth in terms of greater utilization of our natural resources.

A life-sized design of a simulated blighted area, which not only points up the ugly side of some of our present day slum conditions, but includes an actual model of an urban redevelopment area in Philadelphia.

A large model of the human cardiovascular system and a display of new equipment and techniques and treatment of heart and circulatory diseases to illustrate both achievements in medicine, and to suggest the direction of future research.

An operating newsroom with three direct news printers and one photofax machine operated by the New York Times, which brings the world's news in words and pictures directly to the Federal pavilion and symbolizes our interdependence and the responsibilities of freemen throughout the world.

A fully equipped two-man submarine used for deep sea nutrition research, to show the challenge of food research and "aqua-culture"—farming the sea, which may become a source of food supply for the exploding populations of the world, virtually as important as agriculture.

A live presentation combined with audiovisual aids to tell the story of the Peace Corps, the Agency for International Development, the Alliance for Progress, as well as efforts by volunteer organizations and private business in assisting the development of underdeveloped countries.

Operating worldwide weather stations receiving signals directly from Tiros and other space objects, to illustrate the space program's contribution to vital areas of nonmilitary research.

A tracking system to detect, track, identify, and catalog all manmade objects orbiting our planet, be they giant satellites or slivers of metal no longer than a pencil. Employing an extensive network of radio operations, high frequency radio sensors, and cameras that can photograph space objects 20,000 miles away, it is manned by personnel of the North American Air Defense Command.

A symbolization of our challenge to secure equal rights for all and to show the Negro movement for equality. Placed in the context of similar historical U.S. drives of our past—in opportunity and in voting—this exhibit is intended to point out that such movements themselves are part of the rule of law in that they exercise both the right of petition and the right of assembly and that they are part of that democratic procedure by which men define justice, make laws, and agree to respect them.

It must be pointed out that at no time does the Federal Government attempt to propagandize or to recommend specific solutions to the burning issues with which it comes to grips in the exhibit. It merely points out that the problems exist and makes you aware that they represent major challenges which this generation of Americans must face and, in one form or another, attempt to solve.

The entire upper level of the Federal pavilion is devoted to a mechanized ride entitled "The Challenges: Tomorrow." This is a unique experience that no one should miss. Visitors enter specially designed moving grandstands, carrying 55 persons apiece, to take a journey through a series of motion and still picture experiences. Produced by Cinerama, based on a script by Ray Bradbury, and using 130 screens and audio devices, this exhibit is intended to demonstrate that our past, characterized by ingenuity and restlessness and a yearning for self-realization has been merely prolog for the next phase of our journey; that these human qualities, nourished by our system of freedom and individual liberty, are the link between our explorers, patriots, inventors, artists, astronauts, and other heroes, and that the wilderness of the universe challenges Americans of this generation and future generations in the same way that the wilderness of the sea, the land, and the air have challenged American pioneers throughout our history.

My enthusiasm for this Cinerama production is shared by some of our well-known news writers. John G. Rogers, of the New York Herald Tribune, in a feature story entitled "A Hit Is Born at the World's Fair: American History at U.S. Pavilion," called it "the latest wonder to be unveiled at this World's Fair already replete with wonders," and refers to visitors emerging from the pavilion as "buzzing enthusiastically about 'the American journey.' "

And Bosley Crowther, writing for the New York Times, acclaims this ride through the centuries of American history as "the ultimate eye and ear excitement that the U.S. Pavilion provides in its 'Challenge to Greatness' exhibit," and quotes a viewer as saying, "There's nothing else like it at the fair."

Returning to the lower level, the fairgoer enters a special exhibit, sponsored by the American Library Association, entitled "Library USA: The Challenge of Information." Staffed with professional librarians, this area contains a modern computer information center, where visitors receive answers to any query that may be related to a subject matter viewed in the Federal Pavilion. A delightful children's area is also included.

This library exhibit is symbolic of the continuing challenge to increase each person's free access to sources of information and has found great popular appeal.

Mr. Speaker, obviously an exhibit which endeavors to deal forcefully with one of the great, unsettled issues of our time cannot be expected to meet with universal approval. But I would venture a guess that the favorable comments far exceed the critical ones.

In view of the fact that the fair is in my district I feel I have the responsibility to set the record straight, and to dispel any misconceptions about the Federal exhibit. I hope I have done so, and I would like to invite you all to come to the fair and see for yourselves just how wonderful it really is.

I have been particularly impressed with an article which appeared on May 20 in Ralph McGill's syndicated column in the Atlanta Constitution and other newspapers under the title of "A World's Fair Show Worth Seeing." Mr. McGill describes the Federal exhibit in some detail, and with permission I wish to extend my remarks to include his article, printed in its entirety. Perhaps it will shed some light on what this exhibit is all about, and will be instructive to those who have been misled by criticism couched in the vaguest of terms.

May I close by pointing to the last paragraph of Mr. McGill's column, which extols our U.S. pavilion as follows:

> One can go to the Illinois exhibit and see a Disney-created Abraham Lincoln rise from his chair and talk about liberty and justice. Or one may go to the Johnson Co. building and see an enchanting 3-dimensional film on the freedom and spirit of children over all parts of the globe. But for Americans, the show in the Federal building is the one not to miss.

The full column by Ralph McGill follows:

AMERICA'S ITINERANT CAMERAMEN—A WORLD'S FAIR SHOW WORTH SEEING

NEW YORK.—Semidarkness came with the pressing of a button. The first half of the Federal building's show here at the New York World's Fair came on the screen, with the picturing of the people who constitute the world power we call America.

There were the beginnings shown in pen and ink sketches by artists of the time, portraying the small ships that came, the first settlements, the Indians, the men in armor, those in lace and pantaloons, and the slave ships.

The journeys were hard and dangerous. One of every three of those who started died on the way. One half of those who came were in some condition of servitude. Thousands were indentured servants, apprentices, or laborers, all bound to a master for a period of years. And, of course, some were slaves.

THE TIDE

There followed a series of old photographs. The immigrant tide were some 40 million persons—the Irish, Germans, Jews from many lands; Poles, Italians, Lithuanians, Latvians, and Ukrainians; Scandinavians, Bohemians, Rumanians, Croats, Serbs, and Bulgars. They came from many lands to join the first adventurers from England, France, and Spain.

For an absorbing while there flashed on the screen a long series of these old photographs. Here and there one heard an indrawn breath, a whispered comment, but mostly there was a tribute of silence. An audience of affluent Americans, able to attend the World's Fair were stilled by these pictures of their ancestors. These early products of the camera's art are magnificent and moving. The subjects are stiffly posed. They stand before sod-roofed houses in the Dakotas; they sit in groups on the decks of immigrant ships, the women shawled, their skirts gathered about their feet.

AMERICA AT WORK

There are pictures of men, women, and children before lonely cabins. Irish labor crews, digging the canals and tunnels, posed for some of these pictures, as did those immigrants who built the rail lines westward. There are pictures of Italians at labor, of men before coal mine pits, and of small boys, their faces and clothing dark with coal dust grime.

There is an occasional picture of men with heroic mustaches, sitting with beer mugs before them in some saloon. But mostly the pictures are of men and women at work building America, ripping its raw materials from the earth, laying steel westward, cutting down trees, putting the plow to the prairies, killing the buffalo wantonly and without reason.

The pictures are stark, with the austerity and hardship of the time. The faces of women look out, some young and pretty and dressed in the frilled blouses and long skirts; others, wrinkled and old at 35 from hard work and the bearing of children. The men peer at us, wearing mustaches and beards. There are dandies in tight trousers and derbies. There are others in patched and shapeless trousers, workers in mines and steel mills and of laborers digging ditches and canals.

MOBILE THEATER

Many of those who daily and nightly sit through these showings have pictures at home of grandfathers and grandmothers, perhaps daguerreotypes of immigrant grandparents like those shown on the screen.

Once this show is over the crowds move to a mobile seating arrangement. It moves in semidarkness, travelling a slow circular route. On each side and ahead, pictures of America flash on screens. The history of development from the first sea crossing to the time men are orbiting the earth and preparing to go to the moon appear on multiple screens. In the ears of those seated in the traveling theater is the story of it.

There is not much talk among those who come out. They are moved and humbled. America was not always so affluent, with pockets of poverty hidden in mountains and slums of large cities. The shining towers of the fair testify to what man has created, but not too long ago his creations were sod and log huts and implements pounded out on anvils by men called blacksmiths.

One can go to the Illinois exhibit and see a Disney-created Abraham Lincoln rise from his chair and talk about liberty and justice. Or one may go to the Johnson Co. building and see an enchanting three-dimensional film on the freedom and spirit of children over all parts of the globe.

But for Americans, the show in the Federal Building is the one not to miss.

RETIREMENT OF GEN. JOE W. KELLY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. LIBONATI). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, Gen. Joe W. Kelly, commander of the Air Force's Military Air Transport Service, will retire July 18 after nearly 36 years of service. I say this with a feeling of sadness because General Kelly is a friend of many years standing, a dedicated public servant, a fine military officer and leader who will leave a lasting mark of his many achievements in the Air Force. For about 5 years, as you will recall, General Kelly was in charge of the Air Force Legislative Liaison Office. In this capacity he gained a wide acquaintance and many friends on Capitol Hill for his hard work, his unfailing courtesies, his sure touch, and his commonsense.

My regard for General Kelly not only is personal; in a professional capacity he has appeared before our committee from time to time and briefed us on developments in the Military Air Transport Service, usually called MATS, which is his present and last military command. The Military Operations Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations has studied military airlift problems, including procurement of civil airlift for the military, extensively; and I agree with Air Force Secretary Eugene Zuckert that General Kelly is our "top expert on airlift." The loss of his services to the Air Force and to the country will be a heavy one.

General Kelly, now 54, took command of MATS on June 1, 1960, as a lieutenant general. Under his direction, and in accord with the recommendations made by our Subcommittee and Mr. Rivers' Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee, the command has been rapidly replacing obsolescent aircraft with a modern jet and turboprop airlift force.

If I may be pardoned a note of reminiscence—and I could recall many interesting incidents of our long association—General Kelly personally put MATS into the jet age in 1961 when he piloted the first jet transport assigned to MATS from the Boeing factory at Renton, Wash., to Eastern Transport Air Force Headquarters at McGuire Air Force Base, N.J. I was standing on the field when General Kelly put the great jet plane down in a perfect landing, moved her to the assigned place, opened the plane door, and came down the ramp to say hello and shake hands with those of us who were there. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] was there; also the gentleman from New York [Mr. RIEHLMAN], who serves on my subcommittee; and other members and staff who follow closely the MATS operation were in the group which welcomed General Kelly.

I might say that General Kelly's continuing development of the global airlift force won him a fourth star on June 6, 1963.

Airlift, as Air Force Chief of Staff Gen. Curtis E. LeMay has said publicly, is an "essential instrument of national policy"; and MATS, as a major airlift arm of our national defense, must have the ability for quick and ready response by deploying American strike forces, as required, to any trouble spot in the world.

Outstanding examples of the Armed Forces' new dimension of mobility provided by MATS include the 118,000 hours flown by MATS during the buildup of forces in the 1962 Cuban crisis, and the deployment in 63 hours of the troops of an entire armored division—plus nearly a million pounds of equipment—from the United States to Germany in 1963 in Exercise Big Lift.

There is also a great humanitarian function that MATS performs, aiding areas stricken by drought and pestilence and flood and other ravages of nature. One of General Kelly's first tasks as MATS commander was the operation in 1960 of a massive mercy airlift to earthquake victims in Chile, where he had served 20 years earlier as a member of the U.S. military mission.

Under the MATS global command and control system, General Kelly is enabled to give direction to the entire airlift force—including the 70 MATS aircraft that are always en route somewhere at any hour of the day or night—and divert them immediately to meet any sudden and new requirement placed on MATS by defense authorities.

Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara reported to Congress recently that the Nation's military airlift capability had been increased by 75 percent over the past 3 years, and that capability still is being increased. The next addition to MATS' airlift force will come this fall with the assignment of the Lockheed C–141 Starlifter, the first jet transport ever designed specifically for troop and cargo operations. The Starlifter also was designed to meet commercial requirements, and orders for commercial versions of the aircraft already have been placed.

MATS modernization, under General Kelly's supervision, is an outgrowth of a recommendation which our committee made in a report to the Congress which we presented in 1958. And closely related to MATS modernization is the continuing orientation of the MATS airlift force to hard-core military missions. It was our general contention that MATS should not be a miscellany of obsolete aircraft competing with civil carriers. We said that rather than run a civil-type airline, MATS should acquire new, modern equipment and direct its activities to military missions which could not be readily performed by commercial carriers. Aircrew training for these military missions requires every crew to achieve a maximum of aircraft capability, including airdrop and assault landing of combat troops and equipment.

As executive agent for the Air Force single manager of military airlift, MATS handles contracts for about $200 million a year in commercial airlift augmentation. This is an important part of MATS work. Our committee was instrumental in encouraging the Defense Department and the Air Force to stabilize the civil airlift augmentation, so that there would be better working relationships between the military and the airline industry, longer term contracts, fair and economical pricing without cutthroat competition, and the buildup of the Civil Reserve Air Fleet.

The conduct of this commercial procurement, under the policies we recommended, has encouraged modernization of commercial air cargo operations. It also has resulted in new, more efficient procedures for activating the Civil Reserve Air Fleet, the organization of the commercial carriers doing business with MATS that would back up the military airlift force in various levels of emergencies.

There have been, and will continue to be some difficult problems of procurement of civil augmentation airlift. Our committee always has contended for broad participation by qualified carriers, with due regard to the needs of small business carriers and the all-cargo carriers, all of whom are struggling to survive in an environment of extensive Government regulation and competition from the large and more prosperous carriers.

I know that General Kelly always has been fair and square in his methods of doing business with the carriers, and I trust that his successor, who will be Gen. Howell M. Estes, Jr., will carry on in the same vein. It should be understood, of course, that the broad procurement policies are set at higher levels than the MATS command, although the command has the specific responsibility for purchase decisions and for allocating the procurement dollars to the various carriers.

The professionalism demonstrated by MATS under General Kelly's command has been widely recognized. Just this year the command was named outstanding in the Air Force for its flying safety record, its ground vehicle safety record, and its aircraft maintenance record.

Last year General Kelly accepted for MATS the Brig. Gen. Nelson S. Talbott trophy for procurement management efficiency, the first time the trophy had been won by a major air command. His command was cited by the American Public Relations Association in 1960 for having the best military public relations program in the Nation.

General Kelly's duties as MATS commander take him on many military exercise and inspection trips. Since he took command of MATS he has flown more than a half million miles visiting and supervising MATS operations in the United States, the Far East, Europe, Africa, the Middle East, and Antarctica. He has logged more than 10,000 hours—more than a calendar year in the air—since he entered flying school in 1932.

General Kelly was born in Waverly, Ind., on January 19, 1910. He attended DePauw University at Greencastle, Ind., for 1 year before entering the U.S. Military Academy at West Point, N.Y., from which he was graduated in 1932.

He served as a pursuit pilot, an air mail pilot, and a flying instructor. During World War II he led a 9th Air Force B–26 bomber unit to the most outstanding record in the European theater.

He later served as director of aviation at West Point, commanded Strategic Air Command bomber units for more than 5 years, and won an Oak Leaf Cluster to his Distinguished Service Medal for his 5 years as director of legislative liaison for the Office of the Secretary of the Air Force.

His other decorations include the Legion of Merit, the Distinguished Flying Cross, the Air Medal with nine Oak Leaf Clusters, the Belgian and French Croix de Guerre, the British Distinguished Service Order, the Chilean Legion of Merit, and the Army Commendation Ribbon among others.

General Kelly and his wife, the former Virginia Johnson, of Paxton, Ill., have three children.

To my friend, General Kelly, and to his family, I extend my best wishes and express my great regard and affection.

DEVELOPMENT OF THE APPALACHIAN REGION

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, during the first week of May several Members of this body introduced legislation to provide public works and economic development programs and the planning and coordination needed to assist in the development of the Appalachian region. Hearings were held on the bills, H.R. 11065 and H.R. 11066, known as the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1964, by an Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Appalachian Regional Development of the House Committee on Public Works. During these many days of hearings it became evident that the bill had extremely serious defects in legislative drafting and coordination with other existing Federal programs.

I would like to make some remarks today generally on the entire bill with some specific comments on the agricultural programs of the legislation. There are a number of aspects of the pasture improvement section which deserve special attention, but first it would be best to look at the entire bill.

In questioning the many witnesses on the two identical bills concern was evident over some of the questionable provisions such as:

First. Open-end spending authorizations.

Second. Duplication of existing programs and services.

Third. Discrimination against the rest of the Nation by establishing a regional approach.

Fourth. Estimated costs that range from $4 to $24 billion for the entire program.

Fifth. Absolute veto and therefore Federal control of all plans and projects by the Federal member of the Appalachian Regional Commission.

Sixth. Back-door spending provisions which would allow upward of $550 million to be spent by such provisions.

Seventh. Nine-hundred and twenty million dollars for a 5-year development highway program.

Eighth. Lack of annual congressional review of the programs and projects.

Ninth. Two hundred and twenty-seven million dollars in 1965 spending would balloon into billions in later years.

Tenth. The accelerated public works program to meet unemployment with expenditures ranging to $960 million has been a failure.

I see no reason for the Federal Government, acting on behalf of 50 States and 180 million citizens, to give preferential treatment to one section of this Nation when there are other areas such as northern Michigan, Minnesota, and Utah which suffer from equally high levels of economic depression from closing of mines. Some people seem to have forgotten that West Virginia, a State which I am sure everyone would concede is a typical part of the region, has a higher percentage of homeownership, automobile ownership, and washing machine—unnecessary item—ownership than the national average. The proponents of this bill, who cite $3,000 per annum as being the cutoff point between poverty and nonpoverty, seem to forget that the maximum amount one can receive without being penalized for earning other moneys under the social security system is approximately $1,890 per annum. Is not this a form of government-instituted poverty?

Now let us turn to the agricultural aspects of the bill.

Section 203 of the Appalachian Regional Development Act would allow the Secretary of Agriculture to make grants to assist in the improvement and development of pastureland for livestock in the region. Grants to any person under this particular section of the bill shall not exceed 80 percent of the costs of improving and developing 25 acres of pastureland utilized by such person. It is not clear as to whether this 25 acres are limited to a family, farm unit, or individual. If it is limited to an individual, then a farmer with 12 children in the family, could receive assistance for 300 acres. If it is assistance per farm unit, then the landowners could receive unlimited assistance if they owned a number of farms.

The Department of Agriculture reported that the importation of beef into this country was the highest on record in 1963, yet at the same time we are holding some land out of beef production in this country and also at the same time we are spending Federal funds for the stocking of surplus American beef. Now the farmers in the rest of this Nation are being discouraged from making any increases in the production of beef, supposedly because of the decrease in the average price per head for beef on the market, but yet the farmer in Appalachia is being encouraged to do so. This is incredibly inconsistent.

Now, some production—if limited to farm-produced-and-consumed foods—might be justified in terms of welfare and/or relief. But the program appears to be intended to provide cash incomes to potential producers, and it would only provide for the subsidization of livestock production on an uneconomic basis. Surely considering the technological problems now taken into account, the production of beef by the beef producers of the Nation, a 25-acre improvement per farm is unsound, uneconomically feasible, and actually of very little benefit to the farmer. Facts given to us by the Department of Agriculture already indicate that the beef industry now is in an unsatisfactory position as to prices and income. This is a direct consequence of Federal-aid programs intended to improve prices and incomes for grain producers, of a rapid increase in red-meat imports into the United States in the past decade, and of a bulge in beef production. Actually, the grants provided by this section would be a very substantial capital subsidy to competitors of the existing livestock industries.

The Chamber of Commerce of the United States, in a prepared statement filed with the ad hoc subcommittee, stated the best probable solution to the agricultural programs in Appalachia when they stated:

> If any assistance is warranted, especially in Appalachia, it should be by increased programs within the framework of the existing agricultural conservation payments programs, or—at most—by loans where funds are not otherwise obtainable and not by grants * * *. Section 203(a) provisions constitute an inequitable, unduly favored treatment not available to farmers who develop and improve pastures outside Appalachia.

Farmers in the Midwest keep asking me, "Why do farmers get special treatment in Appalachia? We are having it rough out here too." What can an adequate answer be? The only adequate answer can be that there is something involved here other than fighting poverty with the single purpose of eliminating poverty.

The passage of the Appalachian Regional Development Act as presently written would only create an agency which would use in its administrative functions funds which could be going to aid the proverty-stricken of this Nation through other programs. Let's not establish another bureau to conduct programs which are already in existence. Instead let us aid all of the people of this Nation through sound programs to help themselves. The proper role of the Federal Government in this area should be to promote the general welfare, not to provide for it.

THE 1964 REPUBLICAN PLATFORM

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, in the July issue of the New Guard, magazine of the Young Americans for Freedom, is a thought-provoking article by the president of the Young Republican National Federation, by D. E. (Buz) Lukens, on the subject, "The 1964 Republican Platform."

I include the article in the RECORD and commend it to the Members of the House—at least on the Republican side—and to the platform drafting committee for its consideration:

THE 1964 REPUBLICAN PLATFORM—WHAT DO WE REALLY BELIEVE? NO MORE SHOPPING LISTS

(By D. E. (Buz) Lukens)

Besides nominating its standard-bearer in the fall presidential election, the Republican National Convention meeting in San Francisco this month has an equally grave responsibility. For the party must once again determine its policies in broad areas of political controversy, in a manner not only appealing to the American voter, but in a greater sense defining the positions upon which Republican candidates on all levels can stand.

Its importance, then, is in direct proportion to the importance of the continuation of the two-party system in the United States. While the GOP has for many years been a minority party, the principles for which it stands are in no sense held only by a minority of the American people.

The dedicated Republicans who have the primary responsibility for drafting the party's platform are the members of the committee on resolutions, headed by the respected Congressman MELVIN LAIRD, of Wisconsin. The document they present to the convention, when adopted, will theoretically represent official party policy, rightly or wrongly, on all major issues from agriculture to statehood for Puerto Rico for the 1964 election and for the next 4 years.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

PARTY GOSPEL

I believe that the platforms as we have come to know them in the past have had certain weaknesses, not the least of which is an undue lengthiness. Therefore, I don't believe I would be making an unpopular statement if I say that cutting down the platform for 1964 ought to be one of the primary considerations of the committee on resolutions. Such a concise document could, I believe, become a much more effective instrument of Republican policy than those voluminous booklets adopted in 1952, 1956, and 1960.

Delegates to the past few national conventions have been frankly bored by the singsong recital of thousands of words making up the proposed platform, read by the committee chairman. Not only are they impatient with the lengthy reading of the document, but they are naturally looking forward to the exciting balloting for the presidential and vice-presidential nominees. More importantly, a wordy platform tends to be subject to varying degrees of interpretation by GOP leaders, and leads to party schism rather than party unity. The platform is also subject to continuing interpretation and misinterpretation in the years following the election. At times, the party finds itself in the embarrassing position of attempting to live up to a 2-, 3-, or 4-year-old platform encompassing obsolete issues and failing to cover newer, more vital ones.

BACK TO PRINCIPLE

We are in this situation now. Though the 1960 platform was necessarily geared to the administration of President Eisenhower and the record and views of Vice President Nixon, it is now being cited as party gospel by some. Yet, Republicans have been given a far better guide in the 1962 declaration of Republican principle and policy, subscribed to by leading Republicans of almost every political viewpoint within the party.

Try to imagine a statement of policy which would satisfy men with admittedly divergent views such as Senator George D. Aiken, of Vermont; Senator Wallace F. Bennett, of Utah; Senator Kenneth B. Keating, of New York; Senator John Tower, of Texas; Representative Peter Frelinghuysen, Jr., of New Jersey; and Representative James E. Bromwell, of Iowa, to name a few. Yet those very Republicans endorsed the declaration of Republican principle and policy in June 1962.

This statement is more universal and acceptable than an election year platform. For few if any Republican leaders could quarrel with the five basic beliefs as espoused in this document: viz, individual liberty, limited government, diffusion of power, government with a heart, and government with a head.

POCKET-SIZE PLATFORM

The trend toward such concise statements of Republican belief is also seen in the platform adopted by the Young Republican National Federation, June 1963, here in San Francisco. The YRNF statement of principle fits on a 4-page insert the size of a business card. The Young Republicans, impatient with long windedness found too often in their elders, say that the statement is "a responsible guide for progress through individual freedom and liberty."

Senator Barry Goldwater's home State of Arizona has long employed the brief statement of principles as its party platform. Republicans in Arizona, who find they must represent the naturally divergent views of those who have settled in Arizona from all geographical segments of the Nation, say that a consensus can be reached in such a set of principles, rather than a potpourri of policy stands on every issue from agriculture to county sewage systems. Arizona's 1-page declaration of principles has been endorsed by every Republican State convention since it was first introduced in 1956.

What, then, should a national platform have as its first aim? I believe that our party's platform must seek to serve as an inspiration to Republicans, and as an affirmation of unchanging principles so that the voters will understand just why there should be a Republican Party.

I also believe most fervently that such a platform, if drafted by the committee and presented to the convention, will cause a stampede of approval—not a unanimous "ho-hum."

For those who will undoubtedly argue that such a platform would fail to provide the 1964 voter with definitive stands on important national issues, let me say this: It is highly unlikely that the average, busy American will read another long-winded platform such as was adopted in 1960. He will look instead to the presidential candidate, and the Republicans running for State and national offices to spell out the party's positions—and the clear-cut alternatives to the nonpolicies of L.B.J.

GENERAL TO SPECIFIC

The question will also be raised as to the possibility that not every Republican officeholder could stand on such a platform. Yet I find it difficult to understand why any Republican, in or out of office, would refuse to subscribe to such a basic tenet of Republican belief as, for example, the principle of God-given dignity of the individual and the duty of the Government to serve that individual—not vice versa.

The important consideration is this: that once a set of general principles has been established and agreed upon, specific applications of those principles should be easily translatable into public policies. It is my feeling that the 1964 Republican platform should include some basic tenets included in the 1962 declaration of principle:

"We believe in the individual's right and capacity to govern himesif without the retraints of dictatorship or paternalism.

"We believe that Government should do for the people only the things they cannot do for themselves.

"We believe that the Federal Government should act only when the people are not adequately served by State or local governments.

"We believe that Government must act to help establish conditions of equal opportunity for all people and to help assure that no one is denied the requisites for a life of dignity.

"We believe that * * * the future will be built by those who work for it—not by those who only promise it."

From those inspiring principles Republicans can reason to more specific positions on major national issues. Not a discussion of whether to support or oppose a Senate or House bill constructing 80,000 hospital beds in the northeastern United States.

Foreign policy is an area where Republicans have an opportunity and a responsibility to expose Democratic blunders throughout the world. But, not, I suggest, in the form of long lists of charges and counterproposals written into a party platform. In foreign policy, more than any other field, events are susceptible to change daily. By stating broad principles rather than proposing specific solutions to specific problems, the Republican Party will be free to respond to Democratic mishaps as they occur.

Our foreign policy plank should be specific enough, however, so that Americans will understand just how important Republicans do regard the matter of foreign diplomacy. In short, I believe we should take a straightforward, fundamental approach to this subject.

Republicans do not merely dispute the administration's handling of crisis after crisis around the world. We should insist that the United States assume its traditional role as the responsible and mighty leader of the free world, and then outline the obligations of such leadership. For without doubt, the Johnson administration has been steadily denying the free world the real leadership it expects, causing retreat after retreat and loss after loss to place all freedom everywhere in jeopardy.

The Republican platform must point out the disintegration our free world alliance system, especially NATO, and propose immediate steps to restore the confidence of our allies, perhaps by limiting U.S. bilateral negotiation with the Soviet Union and assuring our allies that we will consult with them prior to major foreign policy decisions. It is no secret that the one-sided decision to scrap the Skybolt weapon system irked the British, and that all free world allies were miffed by our abrupt announcement of the establishment of a "hotline" from Washington to Moscow.

The party must point to the objectives for which the United Nations was meant to serve. The platform should cite the many instances wherein U.N. action has strayed from its ideal—as embodied in its own charter. It should propose resolution of unnecessary burdens now falling on the U.N., and demonstrate the real opportunity which exists for the U.N. to be used as an effective instrument of American foreign policy. The platform should make it clear, I believe, with no "ifs, ands or buts" that the term "peace-loving" nations which appears in the U.N. charter does not apply to Red China. In short, the platform is no place for wishy-washy, utopian thinking. In the year of decision—1964—it is appropriate for the Republican platform to state unequivocally: "Red China must not be admitted to the United Nations," and "The administration has allowed NATO to drift into disarray."

BE POSITIVE

Rather than argue over the pros and cons of tariffs and world trade, and in attempting to accommodate all views, wind up by saying nothing, I propose that the platform committee take a more positive stand on the subject of trade:

"The best way to achieve a favorable position in world trade is to increase our own ability to compete and to build better production into the free enterprise system."

From that general premise GOP candidates on all levels can argue the issue as it affects their own States and communities. They should point out the policies of the Democratic administration which militate against jobs for American workers and expansion for American business. The platform plank on this issue should be an "issue umbrella" under which Republicans can meet, consult, and then sally forth to do battle against the Democrats.

CALL TO LEADERSHIP

Again, in the issue of concerted action against past and current Communist drives in Latin America, the platform should contain a strong plank not only charging the administration with the failures of present policies, but declaring for once that America will provide the leadership necessary for other, smaller nations to follow in forestalling Communist aggression in the Caribbean and throughout Latin America.

Republicans have an important issue in the misuse of foreign economic aid. But the platform should affirm the necessity of foreign military aid in the overall mutual security program, and then cite the abuse of American dollars in the foreign aid program by the Johnson administration. It is a fact that economic aid has reached a low point in futility in which it is being used by the Democrats as a bribe to our enemies rather than a boost for our friends. The Republican Party historically has called for more cautious use of such economic aid, and the 1964 platform should take a positive turn by calling upon other free nations who are economically capable to share this burden. True to its roots in free enterprise, the party should encourage expansion of private investment abroad, as a means of helping developing nations, rather than continuing to depend on U.S. handouts. And, most important, the platform must condemn aid to Communist nations.

In 1960, nearly everyone recalls the Democratic war cry about the alleged missile gap, which proved to be a hoax. It was charged that the Eisenhower administration had allowed American prestige abroad to sink to a new low. Today I believe the party platform must stress the steady trend toward unilateral disarmament which now passes for a defense policy. Important planks should include mentions of the administration's abandonment of our balanced defensive deterrent; their cancellation of manned bomber systems without introducing new strategic weapons systems; their concentration on "moon-doggling" while ignoring the military and strategic implications of inner space; and their failure in the vital area of research and development.

The Republican Party has a golden opportunity to put the issue squarely before the voters: A pledge that a Republican administration will do everything possible to provide the American people with a modern and adequate defense organization. "Peace through strength" should be the slogan of Republican defense policies.

CLEAR-CUT CHOICE

Domestically, the key to the party's platform should emphasize the differences between Republican and Democratic approaches to economy. The Johnson administration feels that only the Federal Government's experts know how to spend America's earnings wisely. Much is said about growth rates and gross national product. And what has been the result? Recession, followed by an unusually slow recovery, the highest unemployment rate since the thirties, and the greatest number of business failures in 25 years.

The Republican view has nearly always formed a perfect contrast to this tax and spend, spend and tax, policy. Republicans believe that government should encourage economic growth through creation of a favorable environment for fuller employment, higher production, and steadier prices. Our party feels that free enterprise can and will continue to make America grow while providing more jobs for the ever-increasing labor market. The Federal counterparts to this healthy business growth are a balanced budget, reduction of the national debt, and a stable dollar.

This position is best expressed by standing firm for limited government and for individual responsibility. This means arguing against continued concentration of power and authority in Washington, as former President Eisenhower has so often done, and against regimentation of the population by Federal planners in Washington.

In the vital area of civil rights, the Republican Party's traditional stand can well be drawn into the 1964 platform in the form of a principle, rather than a lengthy piece of legislation. We should favor, for example, ways of redressing grievances which would preclude herding people into the streets. We should call for vigorous enforcement of the right to vote, to equal treatment before the law, to hold property, and to the protection of contracts—rights all guaranteed by existing laws. We should demand more detailed investigations of fraud at the polls, since the right to vote is denied just as easily by fraud as by physical exclusion from the voting booth.

THREE CHEERS

In summing up, let me say that besides avoiding longevity and the tendency to be too specific, the 1964 platform should not be a mere shopping list for the voters, wherein they are invited to compare the promises of both parties and choose the one which gives them more.

A punchy, hard-hitting, and enthusiastically presented platform can provide the Republican Party and its standard bearers with undreamed-of inspiration and drive during the 1964 election. But it must be brief, and it must contain a preamble spelling out just what Republicans really believe.

But allow me to make one suggestion. They could not do better than what was adopted in 1963 by the Young Republican National Convention, here in San Francisco:

"We are the custodians of a deep and abiding political, moral, and economic philosophy, which can best be summed up in the words 'individual freedom,' freedom must be fought for and won by every generation. We pledge to this fight our time, our energy, our resources, and ourselves until victory for freedom at home and abroad is achieved."

THE DECLARATION OF REPUBLICAN PRINCIPLE AND POLICY (JUNE 1962)

We believe in the individual's right and capacity to govern himself—to set his own goals—to make his way to them without the restraints of dictatorship or paternalism.

We believe that government should do for the people only the things they cannot do for themselves.

We believe that the Federal Government should act only when the people are not adequately served by State or local governments.

We believe that government must act to help establish conditions of equal opportunity for all people and to help assure that no one is denied the requisities for a life of dignity.

We believe that government must prudently weigh needs against resources, put first things first, rigorously tailor means to ends, and understand the differences between words and deeds. The future will be built by those who work for it—not by those who only promise it.

Republicans understand the workings of a free competitive economy. The present administration does not. We hold that American labor, business, industry, science, and agriculture get the jobs done, pay the wages, and create the rising standard of living.

Republicans believe that this Nation which has, under God, proclaimed liberty throughout the land, must now dedicate its strength to proclaiming freedom throughout the world.

In foreign policy, the overriding national goal must be victory over communism through the establishment of a world in which men can live in freedom, security, and national independence. There can be no real peace short of it.

An active strategy aimed at victory does not increase the risk of nuclear war. Weakness and irresolution on the part of the United States—which could lead the Communists to underestimate the intensity of the devotion of free men to their freedom—are more likely to bring the world to hot war than are strength and firmness.

Republicans demand high-powered deeds, not high sounding words. We want and expect the cause of freedom to win.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Feighan (at the request of Mr. Hagan of Georgia), for 5 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Holifield, for 20 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. Teague of Texas and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Avery.

Mr. Dorn.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Mosher) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Martin of Nebraska.

Mr. Alger.

Mr. Schwengel.

Mr. Snyder.

Mr. Broyhill of Virginia.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Hagen of Georgia) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Toll.

Mr. Kastenmeier.

Mr. Rivers of Alaska.

Mr. Brademas

Mr. Sickles.

Mr. Herlong.

Mr. Bennett of Florida.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 7152. An act to enforce the constitutional right to vote, to confer jurisdiction upon the district courts of the United States to provide injunctive relief against discrimination in public accommodations, to authorize the Attorney General to institute suits to protect constitutional rights in public facilities and public education, to extend the Commission on Civil Rights, to prevent discrimination in federally assisted programs, to establish a Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 7152. An act to enforce the constitutional right to vote, to confer jurisdiction upon the district courts of the United States to provide injunctive relief against discrimination in public accommodations; to authorize the Attorney General to institute suits to protect constitutional rights in public facilities and public education, to extend the Commission on Civil Rights, to prevent discrimination in federally assisted programs, to establish a Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 10433. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LIBONATI). In accordance with House Concurrent Resolution 321, the Chair declares the House adjourned until 12 o'clock noon on Monday, July 20, 1964.

Thereupon (at 5 o'clock and 9 minutes p.m.), pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 321, the House adjourned until Monday, July 20, 1964, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2257. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, Chairman, National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems, transmitting a special report on U.S. participation in an increase in the resources of the Fund for Special Operations of the Inter-American Development Bank, by the Board of Governors of the Bank at its fifth annual meeting in April 1964 at Panama City, Panama (H. Doc. No. 316); to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed.

2258. A letter from the Secretary of Defense transmitting 25 reports covering 37 violations of section 3679, Revised Statutes, and Department of Defense Directive 7200.1, Administrative Control of Appropriations within the Department of Defense, pursuant to section 3679(i)(2), Revised Statutes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2259. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the Inter-American Development Bank Act to authorize the United States to participate in an increase in the resources of the fund for special operations of the Inter-American Development Bank"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2260. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report relating to overcharges for aircraft products liability insurance under various contracts awarded to Pratt & Whitney Aircraft Division of United Aircraft Corp., East Hartford, Conn., Department of the Army; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2261. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to clarify the responsibility for marking of obstructions in navigable waters"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

2262. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the annual report on the relative cost of shipbuilding in the various coastal districts of the United States, pursuant to the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

2263. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in the cases of certain aliens who have been found admissible to the United States, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2264. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases in which the authority contained therein was exercised in behalf of such aliens, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ASPINALL: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 9070. A bill to establish a national wilderness preservation system for the permanent good of the whole people, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1538). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 795. Resolution authorizing the Speaker of the House of Representatives to appoint a special committee to investigate and report on campaign expenditures of candidates for the House of Representatives; without amendment (Rept. No. 1539). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 799. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 3873, a bill to amend section 322 of the Public Health Service Act to permit certain owners of fishing boats to receive medical care and hospitalization without charge at hospitals of the Public Health Service; without amendment (Rept. No. 1540). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 10777. A bill to amend the act of March 3, 1901, relating to divorce, legal separation, and annulment of marriage in the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 1541). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WILLIAMS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H.R. 8068. A bill to amend section 403(b) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to permit the granting of free transportation to guides or seeing-eye dogs accompanying totally blind persons; with amendment (Rept. No. 1542). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 9995. A bill to amend the Policemen and Firemen's Retirement and Disability Act to allow credit to certain members of the U.S. Secret Service Division for periods of prior police service; without amendment (Rept. No. 1543). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H.R. 9752. A bill to preserve the jurisdiction of the Congress over construction of hydroelectric projects on the Colorado River below Glen Canyon Dam; with amendment (Rept. No. 1544). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 10683. A bill to permit officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia to reside anywhere within 25 miles of the District of Columbia; with amendment (Rept. No. 1545). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BONNER: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 11622. A bill to permit the vessel U.S.S. *Alabama* to pass through the Panama Canal without payment of tolls; without amendment (Rept. No. 1546). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DELANEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 801. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 6793, a bill to amend the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, and the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended, to extend disclosure requirements to the issuers of additional publicly traded securities, to provide for improved qualification and disciplinary procedures for registered brokers and dealers, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1547). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 11893. A bill to authorize the mint to inscribe the figure "1964" on all coins minted until adequate supplies of coins are available; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN:

H.R. 11894. A bill to authorize the mint to inscribe the figure "1964" on all coins minted until adequate supplies of coins are available; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ABBITT:

H.R. 11895. A bill defining the jurisdiction of the U.S. Supreme Court and all Federal courts inferior thereto, in certain instances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama:

H.R. 11896. A bill to provide for a national referendum with respect to the Civil Rights Act of 1964; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROTZMAN:

H.R. 11897. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to abolish the renewal requirement for licenses in the safety and special radio services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CLARK:

H.R. 11898. A bill to authorize the sale, without regard to the 6-month waiting period prescribed, of antimony proposed to be disposed of pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee:

H.R. 11899. A bill relating to the tariff treatment of parts designed for use or chiefly used in agricultural or horticultural implements or in tractors suitable for agricultural use; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOLE:

H.R. 11900. A bill to amend section 1033 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that stock and securities may be treated as replacement property for real property held for use in farming which is condemned by the United States in connection with the construction or enlargement of a reservoir; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H.R. 11901. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to make the robbery of a cooperative bank which is a member of a Federal home loan bank a crime; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EVINS:

H.R. 11902. A bill to provide assistance for students in higher education by increasing the amount authorized for loans under the National Defense Education Act of 1958 and by establishing programs for scholarships, loan insurance, and work study; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FOUNTAIN:

H.R. 11903. A bill to limit jurisdiction of Federal courts in reapportionment cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.R. 11904. A bill to amend and extend the National Defense Education Act of 1958; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 11905. A bill to provide Federal assistance for faculty exchange programs of institutions of higher education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 11906. A bill to mobilize the human and financial resources of the Nation to combat poverty in the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 11907. A bill to establish a National Advisory Commission on Interstate Crime; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11908. A bill to establish the position of U.S. customs inspector (nonsupervisory) in the Bureau of Customs, Department of the Treasury, to place such position in grade 10 of the Classification Act of 1949, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 11909. A bill to authorize the construction of a Federal building in Queens County, Long Island, N.Y.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 11910. A bill to establish in the Bureau of Customs the U.S. Narcotics Division in order to improve the enforcement of the narcotics and other antismuggling laws; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H.R. 11911. A bill to authorize checks to be drawn in favor of certain organizations for the credit of a person's account, under certain conditions; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. KILBURN:

H.R. 11912. A bill to authorize the mint to inscribe the figure "1964" on all coins minted until adequate supplies of coins are available; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KILGORE:

H.R. 11913. A bill to authorize the sale, without regard to the 6-month waiting period prescribed, of antimony proposed to be disposed of pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KYL:

H.R. 11914. A bill to amend section 1202(a) of the Additional House Office Building Act of 1955 and the first section of the act of August 6, 1958, to delete, now that the additional House Office Building is nearly complete, their superfluous authority for the acquisition of real property; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LEGGETT:

H.R. 11915. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to make unlawful certain practices in connection with the placing of minor children for permanent free care or for adoption; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana:

H.R. 11916. A bill to provide for a national referendum on the provisions of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONTOYA:

H.R. 11917. A bill to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil service retirement and disability fund; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. NEDZI:

H.R. 11918. A bill to prohibit profiteering in the initial distribution of U.S. coins, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H.R. 11919. A bill to regulate the labeling and advertising of cigarettes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 11920. A bill to amend the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, to provide judicial review of certain determinations of the Tariff Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 11921. A bill to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil service retirement and disability fund; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SHRIVER:

H.R. 11922. A bill to amend chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, to revise the pension program for World War I, World War II, and Korean conflict veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 11923. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to authorize and facilitate the deduction from gross income by teachers of the expenses of education undertaken by them, and to provide a uniform method of proving entitlement to such deduction; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIBAL:

H.R. 11924. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the manufacturers' excise tax on table tennis balls; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H.R. 11925. A bill to limit jurisdiction of Federal courts in reapportionment cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TUCK:

H.R. 11926. A bill defining the jurisdiction of the U.S. Supreme Court and all Federal courts inferior thereto, in certain instances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITENER:

H.R. 11927. A bill to prevent the Federal courts exercising jurisdiction in cases involving apportionment or reapportionment of the legislature of any State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WRIGHT:

H.R. 11928. A bill to allow the State of Texas to use certain funds for the improvement of National Guard armories; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BROCK:

H.J. Res. 1107. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRUCE:

H.J. Res. 1108. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ICHORD:

H.J. Res. 1109. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution relating to the apportionment of districts from which members of a State legislature are to be elected; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPRINGER:

H.J. Res. 1110. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TAFT:

H.J. Res. 1111. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGEN of California:

H.J. Res. 1112. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McINTIRE:

H.J. Res. 1113. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINNEGAN:

H. Con. Res. 324. Concurrent resolution commending the President for his recent statement with respect to aggression in the Middle East and expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to such aggression; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H. Con. Res. 325. Concurrent resolution commending the President for his recent statement with respect to aggression in the Middle East and expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to such aggression; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. POOL:

H. Con. Res. 326. Concurrent resolution to authorize the President to proclaim October 11 of each year as German-American Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLL:

H. Con. Res. 327. Concurrent resolution commending the President for his recent statement with respect to aggression in the Middle East and expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to such aggression; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee:

H. Res. 800. Resolution authorizing expenditures incurred by the Special Committee To Investigate Campaign Expenditures to be paid from the contingent fund of the House; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 11929. A bill for the relief of Antonio Ng; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN of Ohio:

H.R. 11930. A bill for the relief of Harry C. Engle; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAREY:

H.R. 11931. A bill for the relief of Luigi Renzi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 11932. A bill for the relief of Gregoire Karalis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11933. A bill for the relief of Constantin Papagiannis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIN:

H.R. 11934. A bill for the relief of Nasralla Aziz Barber; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 11935. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Laura Turner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H.R. 11936. A bill for the relief of Claire A. Zarur; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HEALEY:

H.R. 11937. A bill for the relief of Elda Bertolotti Lazzarone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 11938. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Hala Landa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R. 11939. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Jetta Barfod Greer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONTOYA:

H.R. 11940. A bill for the relief of Ioannis Kanelis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 11941. A bill for the relief of Dr. Ibrahim Faruk Sarac, his wife, Fatma Nukhet Sarac, and their two daughters, Ayes Hulya Sarac and Fatma Nil Sarac; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHRIVER:

H.R. 11942. A bill for the relief of Capt. Donald W. Ottaway, U.S. Air Force; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TALCOTT:

H.R. 11943. A bill for the relief of Miss Catherine Cariotaki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas:

H.R. 11944. A bill for the relief of Joao Pereira Morais and Maria da Gloria Morais; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.R. 11945. A bill for the relief of Jose DaSilva Da Luz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

951. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., to initiate legislation calling upon the TV industry to cease all its propaganda relating to warfare; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

952. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., relative to the civil rights bill, H.R. 7152; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

A Pioneer Air Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH J. RIVERS

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 2, 1964

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, citizens of the great State of Alaska have a particular reason to be concerned with any activity or ceremony affecting Pan American World Airways. That is why I take great pleasure and pride in joining with my other colleagues in commemorating the memorable and significant event in the history of Pan American World Airways, consisting of its successful inaugural flight across the Atlantic.

Residents of Alaska, Mr. Speaker, recall all too clearly the horror which struck our State last March. Well do we remember the immediate, enthusiastic, and unselfish response of Pan American in making available its equipment and extensive facilities to alleviate continued suffering in Alaska.

Commercial jet transportation played an important role in helping Alaska back to its feet after the Good Friday earthquake.

When the docks at Seward and Whittier were demolished, Pan American Airways' jet clippers began carrying average cargo loads of 6 to 9 tons every night to Fairbanks.

One passenger jet carried 23,826 pounds of badly needed supplies to Alaska—one of the heaviest cargo loads ever transported on a passenger aircraft.

Part of this record load was 9,000 pounds of fresh milk. Foods and other perishables make up a heavy proportion of each jet flight, augmented by drugs, clothing, and other necessities.

Passenger traffic for the weeks following the earthquake reflected the resurgence of the 49th State with a 41 percent gain for Pan American during April over the same month of 1963.

Destruction of the docks at Seward and Whittier posed a major threat to the entire State, even areas not directly affected by the earthquake. Port facilities at these two cities serve as important gateways to Alaska for surface cargo, shipped in bulk or containers.

From these points, cargo is transshipped aboard the Alaska Railroad for carriage into the interior. Following the earthquake, Alaska had the alternative of bringing in vitally needed goods via the long hard truck haul along the Alcan Highway or by a 3-hour nonstop jet Clipper flight.

Although cargo volume doubled almost overnight the capacity of Pan Am's Boeing 707 jet clippers was so great that no backlog of cargo developed except for the first few days immediately following the earthquake.

While the entire community was dependent on air transportation for fresh produce and dairy products, Pan Am's highly nonstop flights to Fairbanks provided a 1,520-mile aerial supply line.

During the emergency, Seattle and Fairbanks airport personnel referred to Pan Am's nightly jet flight 901 as the "flying milkwagon" because of the large amounts of fresh milk and dairy products that went aboard each evening.

Mr. Speaker, it appears that Pan American, who pioneered service to Alaska in 1931, will be serving our great State for an indefinite period of time. We certainly hope so and we anticipate that its services will be maintained, not solely for emergency purposes, but to bring to the great State of Alaska many thousands of our fellow Americans who have never been exposed to the magnificence and beauty of the northernmost State in this Union.

Let Freedom Ring: July 4, 1964

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVE MARTIN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 2, 1964

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, in anticipation of the 188th Anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence on July 4, 1964, the members of the American National Cowbelles—an auxiliary of the American National Cattlemen's Association—have sponsored the presentation of tiny cow bells to each Member of Congress to observe Independence Day by the ringing of bells across the Nation.

Since the initial effort to revive this American custom of ringing bells in celebration was started, it has grown steadily through the participation of patriotic citizens throughout the Nation. In Nebraska, the American Legion has sponsored a statewide program to enlist communities to ring school and church bells at a specified time. It has been enthusiastically received.

I can think of no better time than the present for each of us to reflect upon the freedoms we hold so dear and to renew our personal dedication to continue our American way-of-life in the face of growing threats from all sides.

We should rekindle in the hearts of all of our citizens a feeling of pride and patriotism such as that felt by our forebears when the first Independence Day was celebrated or when this young Nation withstood trials and emerged stronger and more prosperous than before.

I join with the members of the National Cowbelles and invite you to "ring out the bells on the 4th of July."

> "My country, 'tis of thee,
> Sweet land of liberty,
> Of thee I sing:
> Land where my fathers died,
> Land of the pilgrims' pride,
> From every mountainside
> Let freedom ring."
> —*Samuel Francis Smith, 1808–95.*

National Open

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. HERLONG, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 2, 1964

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago the Nation's Capital and the Congressional County Club were host to one of the world's prime sporting events, the 64th Open Championship of the U.S. Golf Association.

Golf fans who witnessed the National Open this year, either on the scene at the Congressional Country Club or via television, were privileged to see the greatest chapter in the long history of this event. In every respect, from the hospitality given visitors by the community and the club to the thrilling climax of the tournament itself, this 64th National Open was the finest of them all.

For this success we can thank Frank J. Murphy, Jr., general chairman of the tournament. It was Mr. Murphy's initiative, planning, and dedication that brought the 64th Open to Washington and the Congressional Country Club, and assured its flawless operation during tournament week. Appreciation must also be expressed to A. E. (Lon) Martin, club manager, and to all the officials and employees of the Congressional who contributed so much to making the Open a success.

And, of course, no one will ever be able to mention the 64th National Open without remembering the gallant and inspiring championship effort of the tournament winner, Ken Venturi, of the Paradise Country Club, Crystal River, Fla., which is in my congressional district. By his performance and courage in winning this year's Open, Ken Venturi reflected credit not only upon the club he represented, but the entire golfing world. We are proud of Ken Venturi, as all those who are interested in golf and the Nation's Capital might well be proud of the success of the 64th Open Championship of the USGA.

Washington Report by Congressman M. G. Snyder, of Kentucky

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. M. G. (GENE) SNYDER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 2, 1964

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of those interested, I enclose my July 1 newsletter, omitting therefrom excerpts from the RECORD which would be a duplication of material already printed herein:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman M. G. "GENE" SNYDER, Third District, Kentucky, July 1, 1964)

DEAR FRIENDS: Another month has rolled around since my last report to you. I am grateful and humbled by your many kind letters. A few are not so kind but the goodness of the good letters heals all the wounds made by the little cuts along the way. The encouragement of your letters; the inspiration of your comments and the promise of your prayers gives me the courage to face up to the great odds in advocating and laboring for the positions I believe in and in which you have given me such wonderful support. I am confident that in the days, weeks, and years ahead, we will win the fight for fiscal sanity in our Government; for responsible foreign policy which does not insult our friends and cater to our enemies and for a domestic policy which recognizes the importance of each individual citizen who has the God-given ability to think for himself.

BUREAUCRATIC BUNGLING

One can always find examples where tax money hurts taxpayers because of projects authorized and administered from Washington. One recent incident is typical of complaints. The Area Redevelopment Administration (ARA) was set up supposedly to assist in depressed areas. Eighteen years ago, Mr. and Mrs. James Willis built a 10-room motel in Woodville, Tex. They were thrifty, worked hard, and later built on an additional 14 rooms. Twelve years ago, Mr. Willis passed away, but his wife carried on the business and improved the motel which is now her sole income. The ARA looked around Woodville, decided it was "poverty stricken" and channeled some $850,000 into a 72-room motel near Mrs. Willis. The 68-year old Texas widow has had to cut her paid staff thereby creating more unemployment. The new motel has its own problem in that occupancy is only 50 percent compared with the 65 percent necessary for an operating profit. According to the bureaucrats, there is a solution to the problem. Let ARA help Mrs. Willis—which has been proposed. But Mrs. Willis reacted: "I don't want a nickel from anybody, and I'm not interested in anything the Federal Government has to give away."

NEED SOMETHING TO READ?

The U.S. Government Printing Office, using taxpayers' money, prints just about anything. Here are a few examples: (1) "Restoration of Lost or Obliterated Corners and Subdivision of Sections"; (2) "Porosity and Bulk Density of Sedimentary Rocks"; (3) "Your Baby's First Year," Spanish edition; (4) "The Search for Extraterrestrial Life"; (5) "Impact of Office Automation on the U.S. Revenue Service"; and (6) "Screw Thread Standards for Federal Services."

General Accounting Office reports uncovering of $486,900,000 in wasteful spending and mismanagement practices by the Defense Department in a 12-month period ending May 1, 1964.

America fights poverty yet Uncle Sam raises the cost of living. Much is being said in favor of programs which are supposed to eliminate poverty and prevent inflation, but little is said about how the low-income families will pay more.

Item: Housewives will pay more for flour and the price of bread will rise.

Reason: The newly enacted farm bill increases the price of wheat.

Item: Coffee prices will continue to increase.

Reason: The administration backed the International Coffee Agreement Act of 1963 which passed Congress and which set a floor protecting producers but provides no protection for the American consumer.

Item: Milk prices in most metropolitan areas are increasing.

Reason: Dairy economists report that Federal milk orders raise consumer prices of milk about 5 percent above what they would be otherwise.

According to a letter of June 22 from OTTO E. PASSMAN, Democrat, of Louisiana, Member of Congress, chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Appropriations, he is being asked to yield to strong executive demands and pressures to get more foreign aid money appropriated. Mr. PASSMAN, who is an outstanding member of Congress, indicates that the facts are so overwhelmingly against the claims of the foreign aid people that there is positively no honorable way for him to yield to the pressures. He reveals that during fiscal 1965 our Government will be dispensing Federal aid in 99 nations and 9 territories. Further, Mr. PASSMAN writes, "This uncontrolled and apparently uncontrollable program now has 71,416 people on its payroll. It has reached such proportions that even the confusion is confused. There are now 26 Federal agencies dispensing some type of foreign aid and the aggregate for fiscal 1965 may exceed $7 billion. This does not include the interest our Government is paying on the money it has borrowed to give away, which is now in excess of $3 billion annually."

As of June 30, 1964, the foreign aid people have on hand and unexpended from previous years' appropriations, $7,133,461,000. During the past 9 years, total economic and military assistance under the regular foreign aid appropriation bill totaled over $30⅓ billion.

Of the countries of the world receiving foreign aid, there are 57 which from 1958 to 1963 received $12,436,400,000 in military and economic handouts from us. During this same period, these same 57 countries purchased $6,977,800,000 in gold from the United States. This would indicate that to some extent they are buying our gold with our money. Even though the latest Treasury reports indicate that the outflow has been somewhat arrested, our gold stockpile stood at only $15,596 million on December 31, 1963. This compares with the gold stockpile of $22,857 million on December 31, 1957.

A popular slogan in Washington today is that bills before Congress should be voted up or voted down. I agree. However, the administration refuses to go along with this idea. When a measure is voted down, the administration turns up its power, twists a few more arms, makes a few more deals, and the legislative chambers must again act on the same bill. For example, on March 12, by a vote of 184 to 222, we voted down the pay raise bill for Federal employees including Congressmen. With a few minor changes and without further hearings, it came back to the House on June 11 and was approved by a vote of 243 to 157. There were many proposed raises in the bill which I thought could have been deleted. For instance, increases for Cabinet and sub-Cabinet officers, Foreign Service Officers, members of the Supreme Court, judges and other judicial employees whose incomes are over $20,000 a year and cannot be called totally inadequate. A pay raise of approximately $450 a year for letter carriers certainly is reasonable, but we could not afford the luxury of such a bill at this time.

The spectacle of a Member of Congress voting to reduce Government income by $11.5 billion (the tax cut bill), and then voting himself and all other Federal employees a sizable pay increase, which has to be paid from borrowed money, makes a mockery of a decent standard of fiscal morality. The administration made a faithful promise that strict spending restraint would follow the tax cut, and I think they should practice what they preach.

Benjamin E. Smith, treasurer of Southern Conference Education Fund, is registered as representing Castro's Communist Cuba in this country, according to the Internal Security Division of the Justice Department. The SCEF is listed in the Louisville telephone directory with an address of 4403 Virginia Avenue. Carl Braden is listed as residing at the same address.

AMERICA MUST WAKE UP

I am worried and deeply concerned about the course our country is taking. Most Americans, I think, share this concern. The gall and callousness of those who would destroy our traditional way of life is shown in the letters below: Madalyn Murray is the Baltimore atheist who filed the suit which banned prayer and Bible reading in the schools and has another suit pending to delete the words "under God" from the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.

GENTLEMEN: It has been brought to my attention that you are circulating mimeographed half sheets asking for signatures for "protest" against "under God" being deleted from the flag.

Have fun.

But meantime, at least, spell my name correctly if you are going to spread hate. It is Madalyn, not Madeline—the latter spelling is the name of the alleged Jesus Christ's girl friend, a streetwalker with whom he played footsie—or haven't you ever read the Bible?

Sincerely,

FREETHOUGHT SOCIETY OF AMERICA, INC.,
MADALYN MURRAY, *President*.

GENTLEMEN: One of our members sent us a tract that your organization is passing out titled "A National Emergency."

Buddy, you ain't seen nothing yet. This is more than an emergency for you superstitious Neanderthals.

You are absolutely correct, we fully intend to destroy superstition in the United States of America for one and for all.

We threw superstition out of the schools, next we will throw the chaplains off the battleships, and we will teach American children that Tyrannosaurus was not on Noah's ark.

The exploitation of sex by the church is another era that has passed.

Defiantly,

GARRY DEYOUNG,
Vice President.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Results of Questionnaire From Constituents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 2, 1964

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, it is essential that a Congressman be properly informed on the views of the people he represents. In this connection, a public information questionnaire was sent to the constituents of the Second Congressional District of Kansas. Approximately 110,000 questionnaires were distributed. These were mailed to every person with a telephone and copies were distributed through clubs and organizations requesting such. Slightly more than 10,000 questionnaires have been returned to date with over 30 percent including a special letter or additional comments. My office continues to receive a few completed questionnaires daily. I have purposely delayed this tabulation of results in order to allow as many of the returned questionnaires as possible to be included in the final tally.

When analyzing the results, consideration was made for the fact that it is difficult to answer some of the questions with a simple "yes" or "no."

If anyone desires extra copies of the tabulation, I will be happy to furnish them.

I am grateful for the fine response and I hope everyone will continue to write me on matters of interest.

The tabulation follows:

Question	Percent		
	Yes	No	No opinion
1. Do you favor sale of wheat to Russia and other Communist countries?	54	40	6
(a) Would you favor this sale if a Federal subsidy is required?	11	73	16
2. Do you favor a continuation of the foreign aid program at present level ($3,000,000,000)?	20	73	7
3. Do you favor a civil rights bill that extends the police power of the Federal Government over business not in interstate commerce?	16	72	12
4. Do you believe our foreign policy has been sufficiently firm in dealing with Castro and Cuba?	19	75	6
5. Would you favor an amendment to the U.S. Constitution to permit Bible reading and voluntary prayer in public schools?	77	18	5
6. Do you believe the administration tax reduction bill should pass without regard to Federal spending?	17	76	7
7. Do you favor the continuing efforts of the Federal Communications Commission to regulate the programs on radio and television stations?	56	29	15
8. Should Congress—			
(a) Approve a new voluntary wheat program?	46	19	35
(b) Extend the soil bank contracts?	23	34	43
(c) Take no action?	11	24	65
(d) Repeal present programs?	29	14	57
9. Do you believe present U.S. import duties are fair to our farmers and manufacturers in view of the treatment given American products abroad?	11	61	28
10. Do you favor Federal aid for—			
(a) Elementary and high schools?	40	51	9
(b) Colleges, public and private?	37	51	12
(c) Vocational training schools?	52	35	13
11. (a) Do you favor a voluntary medical aid program on a cooperative basis with the Government contributing to premium costs for health insurance with private companies?	30	52	18
(b) Do you favor compulsory medical aid program for the aged attached to social security?	27	62	11
12. (a) Do you favor the U.S. membership in the United Nations?	76	16	8
(b) Do you believe U.S. problems are handled with fairness in the United Nations as presently organized?	34	45	21
13. Do you believe the test ban treaty negotiated with Russia was in the national interest?	52	31	17
14. (a) Do you believe the Peace Corps mission is necessary for the success of our foreign policy at a $100,000,000 annual cost?	35	50	15
(b) Do you favor a National Service Corps if costs are comparable to the Peace Corps?	24	47	29
15. Do you believe the present veterans' pension and hospital programs are adequate?	57	20	23
16. Number the following issues in the order of their importance to you:			
(1) National defense.			
(2) Reduction in Government spending.			
(3) Foreign affairs.			
(4) Balanced budget.			
(5) Tax reduction.			
(6) Farm problem.			
(7) Juvenile delinquency.			
(8) Civil rights.			
(9) Labor problems.			
(10) Federal aid to education.			
(11) Veterans' benefits.			
(12) Bobby Baker investigation.			

ATCHISON COUNTY

	Percent		
	Yes	No	No opinion
Question 1	55	41	4
Question 1(a)	14	71	15
Question 2	14	81	5
Question 3	18	69	13
Question 4	22	72	6
Question 5	77	18	5
Question 6	16	78	6
Question 7	59	26	15
Question 8(a)	43	18	39
Question 8(b)	22	34	44
Question 8(c)	12	27	61
Question 8(d)	30	14	56
Question 9	9	68	23
Question 10(a)	40	50	10
Question 10(b)	36	52	12
Question 10(c)	53	33	14
Question 11(a)	36	44	20
Question 11(b)	30	55	15
Question 12(a)	81	11	8
Question 12(b)	30	45	25
Question 13	49	34	17
Question 14(a)	33	50	17
Question 14(b)	22	56	22
Question 15	54	25	21
Question 16:			
(1) National defense.			
Reduction in Government spending.			
(2) Foreign affairs.			
Balanced budget.			
(4) Tax reduction.			
(5) Civil rights.			
(6) Farm problem.			
(7) Labor problems.			
(8) Juvenile delinquency.			
(10) Federal aid to education.			
(11) Veterans' benefits.			
(12) Bobby Baker investigation.			

BROWN COUNTY

	Percent		
	Yes	No	No opinion
Question 1	50	44	6
Question 1(a)	14	67	19
Question 2	11	81	8
Question 3	20	66	14
Question 4	16	76	8
Question 5	82	16	2
Question 6	13	76	11
Question 7	63	26	11
Question 8(a)	50	20	30
Question 8(b)	35	30	35
Question 8(c)	16	27	57
Question 8(d)	29	15	56
Question 9	6	74	20
Question 10(a)	35	55	10
Question 10(b)	34	53	13
Question 10(c)	47	38	15
Question 11(a)	20	56	24
Question 11(b)	24	66	10
Question 12(a)	70	23	7
Question 12(b)	27	46	27
Question 13	42	35	23
Question 14(a)	30	53	17
Question 14(b)	20	46	34
Question 15	52	27	21
Question 16:			
(1) National defense.			
(2) Reduction in Government spending.			
Foreign affairs.			
(3) Balanced budget.			
Tax reduction.			
(5) Farm problem.			
(7) Civil rights.			
Juvenile delinquency.			
(8) Labor problems.			
(9) Federal aid to education.			
(11) Veterans' benefits.			
(12) Bobby Baker investigation.			

CLAY COUNTY

	Percent		
	Yes	No	No opinion
Question 1	51	41	8
Question 1(a)	3	72	25
Question 2	10	67	23
Question 3	12	64	24
Question 4	10	75	15
Question 5	91	6	3
Question 6	5	87	8
Question 7	57	20	23
Question 8(a)	59	12	29
Question 8(b)	37	21	42
Question 8(c)	9	23	68
Question 8(d)	30	15	55
Question 9	5	75	20
Question 10(a)	25	58	17
Question 10(b)	24	55	21
Question 10(c)	41	37	22
Question 11(a)	25	55	20
Question 11(b)	12	74	14
Question 12(a)	60	19	21
Question 12(b)	20	55	25
Question 13	36	35	29
Question 14(a)	29	42	29
Question 14(b)	16	37	47
Question 15	56	29	15
Question 16			
(1) National defense.			
Farm problem.			
(2) Reduction in Government spending.			
(3) Balanced budget.			
(4) Tax reduction.			
(5) Foreign affairs.			
(8) Civil rights.			
Labor problems.			
(9) Juvenile delinquency.			
(10) Veterans' benefits.			
(11) Federal aid to education.			
(12) Bobby Baker investigation.			

DONIPHAN COUNTY

	Percent		
	Yes	No	No opinion
Question 1	46	45	9
Question 1(a)	13	67	20
Question 2	17	78	5
Question 3	12	73	15
Question 4	19	79	2
Question 5	71	24	5
Question 6	17	79	4
Question 7	55	27	18
Question 8(a)	53	16	31
Question 8(b)	36	27	37
Question 8(c)	10	19	71
Question 8(d)	29	16	55
Question 9	7	75	18
Question 10(a)	35	57	8
Question 10(b)	27	60	13
Question 10(c)	50	37	13
Question 11(a)	23	62	15
Question 11(b)	24	66	10
Question 12(a)	69	23	8
Question 12(b)	28	44	28
Question 13	43	34	23
Question 14(a)	26	58	16
Question 14(b)	25	48	27
Question 15	50	32	18
Question 16:			
(1) National defense.			
(2) Balanced budget. Foreign affairs.			
(3) Reduction in Government spending.			
(4) Tax reduction.			
(6) Juvenile delinquency.			
(7) Farm problem.			
(8) Labor problems.			
(9) Civil rights. Veterans benefits.			
(11) Federal aid to education.			
(12) Bobby Baker investigation.			

JACKSON COUNTY

	Percent		
	Yes	No	No opinion
Question 1	56	39	5
Question 1(a)	10	70	20
Question 2	10	77	13
Question 3	16	70	14
Question 4	14	80	6
Question 5	83	13	4
Question 6	9	84	7
Question 7	58	26	16
Question 8(a)	59	20	21
Question 8(b)	40	30	30
Question 8(c)	5	31	64
Question 8(d)	23	21	56
Question 9	7	67	26
Question 10(a)	34	57	9
Question 10(b)	31	53	16
Question 10(c)	51	31	18
Question 11(a)	26	50	24
Question 11(b)	26	58	16
Question 12(a)	74	18	8
Question 12(b)	33	46	21
Question 13	51	33	16
Question 14(a)	27	57	16
Question 14(b)	20	50	30
Question 15	58	21	21
Question 16:			
(1) National defense.			
(2) Balanced budget.			
(3) Tax reduction.			
(4) Foreign affairs. Reduction in Government spending.			
(5) Civil rights.			
(6) Farm problem. Juvenile delinquency.			
(7) Labor problems.			
(10) Veterans' benefits.			
(11) Federal aid to education.			
(12) Bobby Baker investigation.			

MARSHALL COUNTY

	Percent		
	Yes	No	No opinion
Question 1	55	36	9
Question 1(a)	10	71	19
Question 2	14	75	11
Question 3	13	72	15
Question 4	12	81	7
Question 5	78	17	5
Question 6	15	78	7
Question 7	47	33	20
Question 8(a)	60	14	26
Question 8(b)	45	21	34
Question 8(c)	9	37	54
Question 8(d)	27	18	55
Question 9	8	68	24
Question 10(a)	34	56	10
Question 10(b)	28	56	16
Question 10(c)	47	40	13
Question 11(a)	33	50	17
Question 11(b)	20	70	10
Question 12(a)	65	27	8
Question 12(b)	21	55	24
Question 13	43	37	20
Question 14(a)	27	55	18
Question 14(b)	16	49	35
Question 15	58	23	19
Question 16:			
(1) National defense.			
(2) Reduction in Government spending. Balanced budget. Farm problem.			
(4) Foreign affairs. Tax reduction.			
(7) Juvenile delinquency.			
(8) Labor problems.			
(9) Civil rights.			
(10) Veterans' benefits.			
(11) Federal aid to education.			
(12) Bobby Baker investigation.			

GEARY COUNTY

	Percent		
	Yes	No	No opinion
Question 1	59	35	6
Question 1(a)	16	70	14
Question 2	18	74	8
Question 3	17	73	10
Question 4	19	75	6
Question 5	82	15	3
Question 6	19	74	7
Question 7	58	28	14
Question 8(a)	50	17	33
Question 8(b)	24	30	46
Question 8(c)	7	19	74
Question 8(d)	31	15	54
Question 9	9	65	26
Question 10(a)	49	43	8
Question 10(b)	38	46	16
Question 10(c)	55	32	13
Question 11(a)	38	47	15
Question 11(b)	27	62	11
Question 12(a)	82	14	4
Question 12(b)	38	46	16
Question 13	50	34	16
Question 14(a)	33	55	12
Question 14(b)	24	53	23
Question 15	53	24	23
Question 16:			
(1) National defense. Reduction in Government spending.			
(2) Foreign affairs. Balanced budget.			
(5) Tax reduction.			
(6) Civil rights.			
(7) Federal aid to education.			
(8) Labor problems. Juvenile delinquency.			
(9) Farm problem.			
(11) Veterans' benefits.			
(12) Bobby Baker investigation.			

LEAVENWORTH COUNTY

	Percent		
	Yes	No	No opinion
Question 1	50	44	6
Question 1(a)	11	70	19
Question 2	17	74	9
Question 3	13	75	12
Question 4	19	74	7
Question 5	76	20	4
Question 6	20	71	9
Question 7	54	29	17
Question 8(a)	44	19	37
Question 8(b)	19	35	46
Question 8(c)	12	20	68
Question 8(d)	28	15	57
Question 9	9	64	27
Question 10(a)	48	42	10
Question 10(b)	39	47	14
Question 10(c)	52	36	12
Question 11(a)	32	51	17
Question 11(b)	30	55	15
Question 12(a)	71	20	9
Question 12(b)	31	45	24
Question 13	48	34	18
Question 14(a)	30	57	13
Question 14(b)	25	48	27
Question 15	55	26	19
Question 16:			
(1) National defense.			
(2) Balanced budget. Reduction in Government spending.			
(3) Tax reduction.			
(5) Foreign affairs.			
(6) Juvenile delinquency.			
(7) Farm problem.			
(8) Civil rights. Labor problems.			
(10) Veterans' benefits.			
(11) Federal aid to education.			
(12) Bobby Baker investigation.			

NEMAHA COUNTY

	Percent		
	Yes	No	No opinion
Question 1	55	35	10
Question 1(a)	14	65	21
Question 2	16	74	10
Question 3	14	59	27
Question 4	22	72	6
Question 5	84	13	3
Question 6	14	75	11
Question 7	56	25	19
Question 8(a)	56	16	28
Question 8(b)	42	26	32
Question 8(c)	15	22	63
Question 8(d)	23	20	57
Question 9	5	77	18
Question 10(a)	28	60	12
Question 10(b)	30	53	17
Question 10(c)	40	43	17
Question 11(a)	25	56	19
Question 11(b)	12	75	13
Question 12(a)	79	9	12
Question 12(b)	33	38	29
Question 13	49	25	26
Question 14(a)	34	41	25
Question 14(b)	18	36	46
Question 15	57	16	27
Question 16:			
(1) National defense. Farm problem.			
(2) Reduction in Government spending.			
(3) Tax reduction. Balanced budget.			
(4) Foreign affairs.			
(5) Juvenile delinquency.			
(6) Civil rights.			
(8) Labor problems.			
(9) Federal aid to education.			
(10) Veterans' benefits.			
(12) Bobby Baker investigation.			

POTTAWATOMIE COUNTY

	Percent		
	Yes	No	No opinion
Question 1	57	37	6
Question 1(a)	12	67	21
Question 2	18	71	11
Question 3	18	67	15
Question 4	22	70	8
Question 5	79	15	6
Question 6	18	71	11
Question 7	51	29	20
Question 8(a)	50	23	27
Question 8(b)	33	32	35
Question 8(c)	16	24	60
Question 8(d)	31	15	54
Question 9	11	64	25
Question 10(a)	34	55	11
Question 10(b)	32	54	14
Question 10(c)	45	38	17
Question 11(a)	29	52	19
Question 11(b)	22	66	12
Question 12(a)	69	18	13
Question 12(b)	30	44	26
Question 13	52	26	22
Question 14(a)	37	44	19
Question 14(b)	23	45	32
Question 15	62	16	22
Question 16:			
(1) National defense.			
(2) Balanced budget. Reduction in Government spending.			
(3) Tax reduction.			
(4) Farm problem.			
(5) Foreign affairs.			
(7) Juvenile delinquency.			
(8) Labor problems. Civil rights.			
(10) Federal aid to education.			
(11) Veterans' benefits.			
(12) Bobby Baker investigation.			

SHAWNEE COUNTY

	Percent		
	Yes	No	No opinion
Question 1	52	43	5
Question 1(a)	9	78	13
Question 2	20	74	6
Question 3	17	75	8
Question 4	19	76	5
Question 5	76	19	5
Question 6	17	77	6
Question 7	54	31	15
Question 8(a)	43	18	39
Question 8(b)	19	35	46
Question 8(c)	11	22	67
Question 8(d)	30	11	59
Question 9	11	58	31
Question 10(a)	38	53	9
Question 10(b)	37	52	11
Question 10(c)	53	36	11
Question 11(a)	31	51	18
Question 11(b)	26	63	11
Question 12(a)	77	16	7
Question 12(b)	34	47	19
Question 13	52	34	14
Question 14(a)	36	51	13
Question 14(b)	24	49	27
Question 15	63	16	21
Question 16:			
(1) National defense.			
(2) Foreign affairs.			
(3) Balanced budget. Tax reduction. Reduction in Government spending.			
(6) Farm problem.			
(8) Juvenile delinquency. Labor problems.			
(9) Federal aid to education. Civil rights.			
(11) Veterans' benefits.			
(12) Bobby Baker investigation.			

WASHINGTON COUNTY

	Percent		
	Yes	No	No opinion
Question 1	54	39	7
Question 1(a)	14	65	21
Question 2	15	75	10
Question 3	13	60	27
Question 4	13	76	11
Question 5	71	21	8
Question 6	11	82	7
Question 7	55	25	20
Question 8(a)	53	17	30
Question 8(b)	35	32	33
Question 8(c)	13	24	63
Question 8(d)	30	21	49
Question 9	6	78	16
Question 10(a)	29	57	14
Question 10(b)	23	58	19
Question 10(c)	46	41	13
Question 11(a)	26	57	17
Question 11(b)	16	76	8
Question 12(a)	69	17	14
Question 12(b)	25	50	25
Question 13	42	30	28
Question 14(a)	26	55	19
Question 14(b)	20	42	38
Question 15	59	15	26
Question 16:			
(1) National defense. Reduction in Government spending.			
(2) Foreign affairs. Balanced budget.			
(4) Tax reduction.			
(5) Juvenile delinquency.			
(6) Farm problem.			
(8) Civil rights. Labor problems.			
(10) Federal aid to education.			
(11) Veterans' benefits.			
(12) Bobby Baker investigation.			

RILEY COUNTY

	Percent		
	Yes	No	No opinion
Question 1	63	29	8
Question 1(a)	16	67	17
Question 2	32	60	8
Question 3	23	66	11
Question 4	22	72	6
Question 5	67	28	5
Question 6	18	72	10
Question 7	53	29	18
Question 8(a)	46	21	33
Question 8(b)	24	33	43
Question 8(c)	12	29	59
Question 8(d)	31	18	51
Question 9	15	47	38
Question 10(a)	40	52	8
Question 10(b)	44	46	10
Question 10(c)	57	31	12
Question 11(a)	33	50	17
Question 11(b)	23	65	12
Question 12(a)	79	13	8
Question 12(b)	40	39	21
Question 13	59	23	18
Question 14(a)	51	37	12
Question 14(b)	32	42	26
Question 15	57	13	30
Question 16:			
(1) National defense.			
(2) Foreign affairs. Balanced budget. Reduction in Government spending.			
(3) Tax reduction. Civil rights.			
(4) Farm problem.			
(7) Juvenile delinquency.			
(8) Labor problems.			
(9) Federal aid to education.			
(11) Veterans' benefits.			
(12) Bobby Baker investigation.			

WABAUNSEE COUNTY

	Percent		
	Yes	No	No opinion
Question 1	53	42	5
Question 1(a)	16	74	10
Question 2	25	71	4
Question 3	18	69	13
Question 4	17	81	2
Question 5	77	20	3
Question 6	21	71	8
Question 7	55	30	15
Question 8(a)	55	22	23
Question 8(b)	44	29	27
Question 8(c)	10	21	69
Question 8(d)	13	26	61
Question 9	4	77	19
Question 10(a)	33	53	14
Question 10(b)	31	55	14
Question 10(c)	49	38	13
Question 11(a)	18	64	18
Question 11(b)	23	64	13
Question 12(a)	82	13	5
Question 12(b)	33	62	5
Question 13	51	27	22
Question 14(a)	29	56	15
Question 14(b)	20	46	34
Question 15	53	25	22
Question 16:			
(1) National defense. Farm problem.			
(3) Balanced budget. Reduction in Government spending.			
(4) Civil rights.			
(5) Tax reduction.			
(6) Juvenile delinquency.			
(7) Foreign affairs.			
(10) Labor problems.			
(11) Federal aid to education.			
(12) Bobby Baker investigation. Veterans' benefits.			

WYANDOTTE COUNTY

	Percent		
	Yes	No	No opinion
Question 1	56	41	3
Question 1(a)	11	75	14
Question 2	24	70	6
Question 3	14	78	8
Question 4	22	72	6
Question 5	82	16	2
Question 6	21	75	4
Question 7	62	26	12
Question 8(a)	42	20	38
Question 8(b)	16	42	42
Question 8(c)	12	24	64
Question 8(d)	31	13	56
Question 9	12	61	27
Question 10(a)	54	40	6
Question 10(b)	45	46	9
Question 10(c)	55	35	10
Question 11(a)	31	53	16
Question 11(b)	39	52	9
Question 12(a)	79	15	6
Question 12(b)	41	40	19
Question 13	58	28	14
Question 14(a)	35	52	13
Question 14(b)	25	49	26
Question 15	49	29	22
Question 16:			
(1) National defense.			
(2) Foreign affairs. Reduction in Government spending.			
(3) Balanced budget.			
(4) Tax reduction.			
(6) Farm problem.			
(7) Juvenile delinquency.			
(8) Federal aid to education.			
(9) Labor problems.			
(10) Veterans' benefits.			
(12) Civil rights. Bobby Baker investigation.			

Address by Senator Harry Flood Byrd of Virginia, at the Luncheon Held in Honor of the Millionth Subscriber of Group Hospitalization, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 2, 1964

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to insert the text of an address by the Honorable HARRY F. BYRD of Virginia, at the luncheon held in honor of the millionth subscriber of Group Hospitalization, Inc., Mr. Carl G. Kirk of Alexandria, Va. This luncheon was held at the Mayflower Hotel yesterday. Inasmuch as I would like to afford my distinguished colleagues the opportunity of reading Senator BYRD's address, I herewith insert it in the RECORD.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR HARRY FLOOD BYRD, OF VIRGINIA, AT THE LUNCHEON HELD IN HONOR OF THE MILLIONTH SUBSCRIBER OF GROUP HOSPITALIZATION, INC., MAYFLOWER HOTEL, WEDNESDAY, JULY 1, 1964

It is a pleasure to meet with people engaged in such a worthwhile business as Group Hospitalization, Inc. I am pleased to join those congratulating you on your millionth participant.

I have a special interest in this milestone because more than 100,000 residents of nearby counties in Virginia are among the million who have chosen to associate with GHI.

I have come here today to express my appreciation for the nonprofit Blue Cross and Blue Shield plans which you represent. So many have reason to regard them as godsends.

Personally I can understand the importance of the mission you have chosen for yourselves. And, officially, as a Member of the Senate I can appreciate the tremendous responsibility which is yours.

You cannot fail people who rely on you. They have paid for insurance against a rainy day. They have a responsibility not to exploit your services. But you are dealing with human suffering.

I have had some experience with responsibilities of this kind. I was a Member of the Senate, and the Senate Finance Committee, when the first OASI (Old Age and Survivors) Act was passed.

In the beginning I was not satisfied with the soundness of the program. I think it is evil to make promises to people—particularly involving their old age and health—unless every reasonable safeguard is taken to guarantee their fulfillment.

I think the evil is compounded if it is the Central Government that is remiss in a compulsory program which applies Federal taxing power against the lowest brackets of income.

Senator Pat Harrison—then chairman of the Finance Committee—named me to a three-member special committee to work with some of the best insurance experts in the world to devise additional safeguards for the OASI.

It took us 2 years to come up with the 1939 amendments, and I have spent much of the past 25 years trying to protect the OASI trust fund from raids that would impair its soundness.

From what I have said, you can see some of the reasons I oppose financing old-age medicare through the social security trust fund. The pressure for it is tremendous. I am still opposed to it.

Group Hospitalization, Inc.—chartered by act of Congress—is about the same age as social security. It is reassuring to see the sound maturity you have reached in constructive enterprise.

Acceptance of the contributions you are making to the requirements of our time are exemplified by the fact that 59 million persons have availed themselves of Blue Cross coverage which you represent in this area.

This is a third of the Nation's population, and it includes employees of such great American industry as A.T. & T., General Motors, Ford, United States Steel, Du Pont, and Western Electric.

The 3½ million Federal employees and their families constitute the largest prepayment health insurance group in the world. And they may exercise free choice of coverage offered by 38 carriers.

I can understand your pride in the fact that 56 percent of those participating in the Government group chose your Blue Cross and Blue Shield plans.

And Group Hospitalization, Inc. is an institution which has never sought nor received any Government subsidy. It has paid its way since the beginning—more than a quarter of a century.

Its strength lies in the motivation of constructive initiative, the achievements of sound progress, and the profitable benefits of efficient management and operation.

Your record of operating expenses for Blue Cross in the Washington area, which account for 4.9 percent of subscription income, tells a story of interest. And the national record is not far behind.

This may be one good reason why you can tell me that Blue Cross alone pays nearly half of all the hospitalization benefits which are paid out under our insurance and prepayment programs.

Your record of service in the Nation's Capital area may well be regarded as a monument to the vision of the late Joseph Hendrix Himes who, in the days of depression, called your founding group together.

His objective was to bring hospital care within easier reach of those who needed it—particularly those of limited means. Your founders were pioneers in an uncharted field.

Since then the developments in medicine, surgery, and related facilities, have been remarkable. But the costs have risen too—for all of the reasons involved.

This makes your work—trying to keep hospitalization and medical care within the reach of those who need it, when they need it—more and more important. No one is more aware of this than GHI.

You are a company of high purpose. You have met your earlier challenges. You have earned a fine reputation. You have experience, know-how, and motivation.

You have the gratitude of so many whom you have served so well. You have the confidence of many of us who have been privileged to watch your sound development over the years.

These are the rewards of a good company, rendering good service to the public, as you do. But there is another side to the coin. An institution, such as yours, has responsibilities too.

You have all of the responsibilities of an institution on which the community has come to rely so heavily for the important services of your business.

You have the responsibilities of an institution dedicated to the principles of competitive enterprise which is vital to our economic welfare and our system of government.

You have the responsibilities of an institution which knows the public evils of socialized medicine and understands the importance of protecting medical services against government control.

All of those associated with you—participants and others—share these responsibilities. But as leaders in your field, you have the added responsibilities of leadership.

Men and women in your business have my very best wishes in their endeavor to meet their responsibilities as they see them. It is a privilege to be with you.

A Century of Political Campaigning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 2, 1964

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, in this historic election year, it is most appropriate that the Smithsonian Institution's Museum of History and Technology has set up a display of campaign memorabilia which dates back over the past century and is a significant part of our political heritage.

This exhibit was opened this week with appropriate ceremonies and our own distinguished colleague, the gentlewoman from Ohio, Representative FRANCES BOLTON, added to the importance of the occasion with pertinent remarks which have a message for all of us, young and old, who view this exhibit and reflect on the chain of events which have brought our Nation from that historic date in 1776 to the present.

Representative BOLTON's background and experience on the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives permits her to view history with a perspective which few of us have. She has served on the committee for 22 years and is its ranking minority member. She is close to the work of all of the subcommittees and has traveled extensively so that she knows not only what is meaningful for Americans but also how the American story is an inspiration and a hope to other nations, especially those which are emerging as separate entities in the family of nations.

Her remarks at the opening of the campaign display offer a great deal of food for thought, not only for students of history but for patriotic Americans. I wish that I could have been present to have heard them. It is always a treat to hear this gracious lady speak on subjects which are close to her heart. In order that they have the circulation they merit, I have the honor of placing them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I commend them to the attention of my colleagues:

OPENING OF THE HALL OF HISTORIC AMERICANS OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

Mr. Bradley, if you are here, even though you might be in hiding, and Mr. Taylor, the privilege of taking part in the opening of this Hall of Historic Americans in this wonderful Smithsonian Institution is greatly appreciated. May I take this first moment to thank you and the Board of Regents from my heart.

May I also thank Mr. Washburn and Dr. Melder, who were good enough to let me come over a few days ago so that I could get the feel of this remarkable place that gives us such a sense of the reality of these men and women whose lives are part of the warp and woof of our country.

This great Institution, begun by the gift of an Englishman and built step by step with other gifts from collectors of Americana such as Miss Mary Louise Adams Clement, Mr. Peter Jay, Jr., Mr. Lincoln Isham, Mr. Walter G. Peter, Mr. Ralph Becker, and many others, plays and will play an increasingly useful and important role.

In such a country as ours there is great need for us to remember the roots from which we stem and the influences that have given us our direction. This wing holds much of which we should be aware. It shows us one part at least of our inherited procedures. Studied, it might bring us to a saner, safer way of working out our destiny. We need so urgently a feeling of understanding of all that has gone into the making and the development of this Nation.

I would ask you first of all, What is a nation? "Surely it is not something built of bricks and mortar that will crash to ruins at the first strong blow. Rather, it is an echo from the past and a whisper from the future, the whole bound together by the hopes and fears, the dreams and endeavors, the joys and the anguish in the lives of millions of men and women." It is never static. It is constantly evolving, changing, moving now out, now in, now up, now down—but moving, moving, moving.

We have believed that this Nation of ours came into being with a great destiny. That our Declaration of Independence and especially our Constitution and the Bill of Rights are documents written under the inspiration of overshadowing spiritual forces.

We like to think ourselves worthy of all that was given us to do. We like to believe we have upheld the principles laid down in those documents. What was it Mr. Lincoln said: "It is for us to prove whether that nation, or any nation so conceived and so dedicated, can long endure."

A century has passed since he spoke those words. How much have we proven? How true have we been to those profound principles that were expressed so all embracingly in our great documents? How true are we going to be in the onrushing future?

Let me first remind you of matters to which we seldom give any thought:

We have been told that some 25,000 years ago there was a sheet of ice 1,000 feet thick covering the New England part of the United States. It ground the earth down for a very long time and it had much to do with the people who came over from England in the early days of the 17th century at Plymouth Rock. These people had unusual ideas about freedom that fitted into the terrain of the New England area—and when they were made part of what the glaciers did to the earth, they add up pretty well to what good old Thomas Jefferson said about what we call "our way of life." It was one of the products of what he described as the individual family farm of his time. The story of the terrain, of the centuries of grinding ice, the heavy rain, the trees, the rocks forming as they did these small areas where the soil was good were the natural sources of our ideas about individual initiative, private enterprise, our kind of capitalist economy—and our kind of freedom. The one-family farm with all it means of what we've been—what we are—and what many of our people would like to go on being—has its very roots imbedded in the ice, rain, trees, and rocks which are really the takeoff point for any understanding of the American story.

There in the early New England are the roots of what we've been, what we still are, what we shall become.

What we were and are can never be explained to anyone unless this unique combination of things in our history is understood. Ours is an unusual story—as unusual as the land itself. Because this land spelled freedom and opportunity, these words are at the very heart of what we were and are.

"The past is but the beginning of a beginning" (H. G. Wells). The ice-covered earth, the rain forests, the small areas of fruitful soil, the hardy men whose women came with them into untold hardships because there was love between them. All they had was character. All they did was work. All they wanted was self-respect. The sum of those three traits became America. They built their own churches, their own town halls, their own schools with their own hands.

From earliest days as has been expressed so beautifully by an unknown author in "The Flag Speaks":

"There was a dream * * * that men could one day speak the thoughts of their own choosing.

"There was a hope * * * that men could one day stroll through streets at evening, unafraid.

"There was a prayer * * * that each could speak to his own God—in his own church.

"That dream, that hope, that prayer—became America.

"Great strength, youthful heart, vast enterprise, hard work, make it so."

All down the ages after the spark was kindled in the human breast men dreamed dreams of freedom. Then a man saw a vision—and in spite of confusion, bitterness, hardship, and bloodshed, brought it into being, protected its first and made it a nation. This man was George Washington. Towering above his companions in physical, mental, and spiritual stature, he drank deep of the cup of loneliness that freedom might be given form.

And again a tall figure raised himself up by the sheer force of his inner need to serve that same freedom under law—and the Union was saved. Lonely beyond most men's knowledge of loneliness, Lincoln lived out his destiny and forged a great link in the chain of human freedoms.

Leadership, friends, is a lonely business. How many are today prepared in their hearts for the possible loneliness of such responsibility?

Every 4 years we face a choice of leaders. Do we base our judgments upon profound American principles, or, in the excitement of the moment, in strangely thoughtless eagerness do we look only at the superficialities, forgetting that—

"Leadership is only courage and wisdom and a great carelessness of self" (John Bucham, Lord Tweedsmuir). Do we forget that in Philadelphia when Franklin was asked what form of government had been set up he replied, "A Republic if you can keep it so." And he said in no uncertain terms that the power had been given to the people. Did he know that he was repeating what was said in Rome in the year 452 B.C.? "What the votes of the people have ordained in the last instance is the law." And which Cicero followed in 49 B.C. by saying that "No one has power except from the people * * *. This is the condition of a free people: to be able to give or to take away by their votes whatever they see fit."

We are at a moment in time when two powerful nations are meeting on the great battlefield of life—head on. Oh, yes, we "back and fill," we try dance steps along the way—but each day, each month, each year makes it clearer that we are in a war to the death between those who deny the very existence of God and those who believe that "in the beginning God."

For 40 years Moscow has been training its younger generations in argument—infusing them with a passion that is like a flame. Have we prepared our youth to meet them in such combat?

When are we going to give our oncoming generations a truly feeling understanding of the miracle of freedom under God that is ours so that they may be filled with power to withstand the icy arguments, the cold certainty of the adversary? When are we going to see to it that they know that adversary and can answer him with an equal certainty plus the faith that should be ours?

Here in this hall is much that can help us all to see the visible side of the great urge that created and sustained us—that has been built into the Nation we call the United States of America, one Nation under God.

Appalachia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLTON R. SICKLES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 2, 1964

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit for the RECORD my statement on the proposed Appalachian program now being considered by the House Public Works Committee:

STATEMENT OF THE APPALACHIA BILL

(By Congressman CARLTON R. SICKLES)

I am pleased to support the proposed program to relieve poverty and develop economic resources in the 10-State region of Appalachia. As Representative of a State which has three counties in the Appalachian area, I can only add my own voice to the call for urgency which has been sounded so clearly by President Johnson. We in Maryland realize that the full potential of our counties in the western part of the State cannot be realized except as a part of a program whose aim would be to rebuild and revitalize the economy of the entire Appalachian region. We realize that the full potential of the port of Baltimore cannot be reached without full development of the port's natural economic hinterland. We in Maryland realize that the whole country has a stake in what happens in the western part of our State and a stake in the similar progress throughout the whole mountain range from Pennsylvania to Alabama. It has been said that a chain is no stronger than its weakest link. The same thing applies to a nation's economy; when part of the economy or the economy of a region lags, it affects other parts and other people. The program before this committee aims, as President Johnson has put it, "not merely at the symptoms of the economic malnutrition but at its causes." Let us consider for a moment the problems which have accrued in this region of the country.

The largely rural Appalachian region has fallen behind the rest of the country in economic development. In every category of human welfare our fellow citizens in Appalachia are below, and some of them are well below desirable national standards. Low income and an inadequate standard of living are commonplace. In health, in housing, in employment, in education, in the level of community services, in transportation, in farm technology, and in sanitation the region lags. In community after community and in county after county, the struggle against these inadequacies goes on without being won. While the Appalachian region is classified as predominantly rural by census definition, it has never been a major agricultural region. Its present ills arise in part from the decline in employment in leading nonagricultural industries, principally coal, and its cures lie mainly in the development of nonagricultural pursuits, principally recreation and manufacturing industries, including industries based on the timber resources.

The region's farms, while they should be made as productive as possible, can never become the economic base for more than a small proportion of the population now residing therein. Many of them are too small, and the terrain is too rough, for efficient farming techniques. Almost half of the farms in the region have gross incomes of under $2,000 a year.

Survey after survey has been made in the Appalachian area and plan after plan has been developed, but until now there has been no satisfactory regionwide plan for development—one which measures the level of resources, both public and private, required to provide the framework for rapid economic growth.

The Government program that is proposed would provide an economic framework for future economic growth. Nothing in the bill works against private efforts—certainly the people in the area are doing their best, and they will do better with the help of this proposal. Far too often in the past the fragmented efforts of individual communities have been understandably inadequate to the task.

Also, we can never really arrive at a permanent solution to the problems of this region until we stop thinking of it as a "distressed area" shoving its problems under a rug of gloom and begin to consider it as an underdeveloped region with vast untapped human and natural resources—a region that can only find its rightful economic level through a plan of overall economic development, programed for a period of sufficient years to rectify the situation. This plan has three necessary ingredients; investment in the people of the area to improve their schools, housing, health, and to help them acquire new skills; investment in needed physical facilities such as roads, airports, and dams; and finally a regional organization to coordinate the efforts of Federal, State, and local officials in attacking the problems of the region. TVA has proved that these officials can work together for the general good of the community, and similar cooperation is certainly feasible in the Appalachian region.

In summary, this bill is based on the idea that the economc progress of the region requires the wholehearted cooperation of both local, State, and Federal officials dealing with the problems of Appalachia, and the leaders of business, industry, labor, and the local communities in the region. The special needs of this area justify a special approach. The entire Nation, not only the people of the region, have a stake in what is done there. In addition to the fact that development of this area will provide new markets for industries all over the country, the people here must be given the opportunity to fully enjoy the productive fruits of American society. We have this obligation to all of our people.

District of Columbia DAR Commends Director Holtzclaw on "In God We Trust" Currency Conversion Schedule

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 2, 1964

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Sons of the American Revolution, I am always interested in the activities of our patriotic sister organization, the Daughters of the American Revolution, and in its efforts to encourage wider public awareness of the principles on which our Nation was founded under God. Furthermore, as the Member of Congress who sponsored Public Law 140 of the 84th Congress, which requires the use of the national motto, "In God We Trust," on all coins, and eventually on all currency, I was particularly interested in a resolution adopted earlier this year by the District of Columbia Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, dealing with this subject.

Public Law 140, approved July 11, 1955, required:

> That at such time as new dies for the printing of currency are adopted in connection with the current program of the Treasury Department to increase the capacity of presses utilized by the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, the dies shall bear, at such place or places thereon as the Secretary of the Treasury may determine to be appropriate, the inscription "In God We Trust" and thereafter this inscription shall appear on all U.S. currency and coins.

On January 20, 1964, the Honorable LEONOR K. SULLIVAN, of Missouri, chairman of the Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at page 701, a report from the director of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, Mr. H. J. Holtzclaw, on the schedule which is being followed by the Bureau in converting the various denominations of currency to include the national motto, as called for in Public Law 140 of the 84th Congress. This conversion schedule showed that in addition to the billions of $1 silver certificates delivered since 1957, and more than 150 million $1 Federal Reserve notes delivered in November and December 1963, containing the national motto, the Bureau would soon be printing $2 U.S. notes, $5 U.S. notes, and $10 Federal Reserve notes bearing the inscription "In God We Trust." Other denominations would follow in turn later this year and early next year.

Subsequently, it was a pleasure and an honor for me to accompany Congresswoman SULLIVAN and Chairman WRIGHT PATMAN, of the Committee on Banking and Currency, to the Bureau of Engraving and Printing for a little ceremony marking the printing of the first new series of currency this year to carry the national motto, the $2 U.S. note. I am happy to report that Director Holtzclaw has succeeded in maintaining the conversion schedule as outlined on January 20.

COMMENDATION TO DIRECTOR HOLTZCLAW

The District of Columbia Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, in its 63d State conference, noted that by 1965, under the conversion schedule proposed by Director Holtzclaw, approximately 77 percent of our total currency note production will carry the national motto, as provided under Public Law 140. It commended the Director of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing for the manner in which he has been carrying out his responsibility under this law. I, too, commend the Director, and I also want to take this opportunity to commend the DAR for its thoughtfulness in praising a good job well done. Too often, public servants receive only criticism for their errors or alleged errors while seldom receiving recognition for excellence in the performance of their duties.

Under unanimous consent, I submit the text of the resolution adopted by the District of Columbia Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, as follows:

COMMENDATION TO DIRECTOR OF BUREAU OF ENGRAVING AND PRINTING

Whereas many citizens of the United States have expressed concern over rumors that the time-honored motto "In God We Trust" was to be removed from our coins and currency; and

Whereas a conclusive statement appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for January 20, 1964, by the chairman of the Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs which has the responsibility for bills dealing with coins and currency, that there is no bill pending in Congress to remove the motto from coins and currency; and

Whereas "In God We Trust" appears on all coins in keeping with a law passed in 1955 making it mandatory, which law also made it mandatory that the motto be placed on all currency issues at such time as new dies for printing are adopted; and

Whereas the same CONGRESSIONAL RECORD published a chart furnished by the Director of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing which showed that by 1965 over 77 percent of our total currency will carry the motto:

Resolved, That the District of Columbia Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, commend Mr. H. J. Holtzclaw, Director of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, for placing into effect the conversion schedule for new currency as rapidly as manpower availability will allow.

Immigration and Nationality Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 2, 1964

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, for some time I have been urging favorable action on proposed legislation—including my bill H.R. 7960—seeking to correct discriminatory provisions in our Immigration and Nationality Act. Because of the widespread interest on this vitally important subject, I wish to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my statement on June 26 before Subcommittee No. 1 on Immigration and Nationality, House Committee on the Judiciary, which reads as follows:

STATEMENT BY CONGRESSMAN HERMAN TOLL AT HEARINGS OF SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 1 ON IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY, COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, JUNE 25, 1964

It is a privilege to present this statement on behalf of my bill, H.R. 7960, and I thank the Chairman and members of the subcommittee for the opportunity to do so.

The experience under the Immigration and Nationality Act, since it was enacted in 1952, has corroborated the views of Presidents Truman and Kennedy and the major religious, labor, nationality, and community organizations, that the policy on which the law is based and the law itself are designed to exclude people and not to facilitate their entry. The law constitutes an obstacle race for new Americans and not an avenue for immigration.

The single major defect of our Immigration Code is retention of the discriminatory national origins quota system as the basis for admission. This formula was first adopted in the isolationist period of the 1920's. The present law is not only exclusionary, but its deportation provisions are harsh beyond reasonable requirements, and inequities in the law as between native-born and naturalized citizens make a farce of the principle of naturalization.

It is because of these and other discriminatory features of the present law that the great 1960 Democratic National Convention included a forthright plank on immigration in the party platform.

That plank does the following:

1. Calls for adjustment of present American immigration, nationality, and refugee policies to eliminate discrimination and to enable members of scattered families abroad to be united with relatives already in our midst.

2. Acknowledges that the national origins quota system of limiting immigration contradicts the founding principles of this Nation and is inconsistent with our belief in the rights of man.

3. Reaffirms adherence of the Democratic Party to the principle that enlightened immigration, naturalization and refugee policies, and the humane administration of them, are important aspects of American foreign policy.

4. Recognizes that laws to bring greater skills to our land, reunite families, permit the United States to meet its fair share of world programs of rescue and rehabilitation are important factors in the growth of the American economy.

The deficiencies of the present law are also responsible for the historic call made by President Kennedy in his special immigration message to the Congress on July 23, 1963. The President's demand for correction of the unequal and discriminatory provisions of the present immigration law has met with widespread approval by citizens and citizens' groups. On August 8, 1963, 72 organizations affiliated in the American Immigration and Citizenship Conference commended the President for his message, in particular his recommendation to substitute an equitable and nondiscriminatory formula for the iniquitous national origins quota system. Attached to this testimony is the full text of that brief joint statement with a listing of the 72 signatory organizations. It will be seen that they are representative of the religious, labor, nationality and civic groups that make up these great United States.

Within 60 days after he assumed the Presidency, following the grievous tragedy suffered by our Nation when President Kennedy was assassinated, President Johnson met with a representative group of some 50 congressional leaders and leaders of private national organizations to indicate his complete support for reform of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, our present Immigration Code.

The committee will also be interested to know that immigration reform, along the lines of President Kennedy's message and my bill H.R. 7960, has the approval of practically all leading organizations and citizens in Philadelphia. On May 13, 1963, 45 organizations cooperated in the Second Annual Greater Philadelphia Conference on American Immigration Policy, Citizenship, and Refugee Matters. The representative nature of this conference is reflected in the list of cooperating agencies which are: AFL-CIO Philadelphia Council; American Committee for Italian Migration, Philadelphia chapter; American Jewish Committee, Philadelphia chapter; American Jewish Congress, Greater Philadelphia region; Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith; Association of Immigration and Nationality Lawyers; Association of Philadelphia Settlements; B'nai B'rith of Philadelphia—Men and Women; Board of Rabbis of Greater Philadelphia; Catholic Resettlement Council; Casa Del Carmen; Commission on Human Relations; Division of School Extension, School District of Philadelphia; Episcopal Community Services; Episcopal Diocese of Pennsylvania; Family Service of Philadelphia; Federation of American Hellenic Societies; Federal Bar Association; Fellowship Commission; Greater Philadelphia Council of Churches, Community Services Department; Health and Welfare Council HIAS and Council Migration Service; International House of Philadelphia, Inc.; International Institute of Philadelphia; Jewish Community Relations Council of Greater Philadelphia; Jewish Employment and Vocational Service; Jewish Family Service; Jewish Labor Committee; League of Women Voters of Philadelphia; Legal Aid Society of Philadelphia; Lithuanian American Society; Lutheran Board of Social Ministry; National Association for the Advancement of Colored People; National Association of Social Workers, Philadelphia chapter; Neighborhood Friends Guild; Netherlands American Association; Philadelphia Citizens Committee on Immigration and Citizenship; Philadelphia Council for International Visitors; Philadelphia Housing Authority, Social Services; Travelers Aid Society of Philadelphia; United World Federalists; YMCA of Philadelphia; YWCA.

As at the first conference held in March 1962, Gregory Lagakos, Esq., an eminent member of the Philadelphia Bar and then President of International Institute of Philadelphia, was chairman of the conference. The cochairmen of the conference committee were Jules Cohen, Executive Director of the Jewish Community Relations Council of Greater Philadelphia, and Sharon Hatch, executive director, International Institute of Philadelphia. The other committee members were: Tess Corens, HIAS & Council Migration Service; Florence Davies, Episcopal Diocese of Pennsylvania; Herman Gart, Jewish Employment and Vocational Service; Lary Groth, Commission on Human Relations; Helen E. Heydrick, Greater Philadelphia Council of Churches; Melba Hyde, International Institute; Audrey Maetzold, Health and Welfare Council; Beatrice Muller, Jewish Family Service; Richard F. Smith, American Friends Service Committee; Joseph Vanko, Catholic Resettlement Council; Grace Yocum, Travelers Aid.

This significant meeting was not a legislative conference. It was convened for informational and educational purposes. Nevertheless, it is quite clear from the summary of the proceedings that in Philadelphia, as elsewhere, there is widespread support for substantial improvement of American immigration policy and extensive revision of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, to eliminate unnecessary exclusionary provisions, the unfair national origins quota system and other discriminatory sections.

I introduced H.R. 7960 on August 6, 1963, to help carry out the recommendations made by the late and beloved President Kennedy in his July 23, 1963, message. Those recommendations have my full and unequivocal support. Respectfully, and strongly, I urge this Subcommittee on Immigration and Nationality to report out favorably H.R. 7960. Enactment of my measure by the U.S. Congress would, in large measure, redeem the pledge made by the Democratic Party in its 1960 platform plank on immigration. This becomes especially important on the eve of the 1964 Democratic Party Convention. The Democratic Party pledge on immigration reflects my views on the subject of immigration, nationality, and citizenship. It is also clear that enactment of my bill would be in keeping with the announced wishes of the citizens of Philadelphia, as well as the rest of the country.

My bill, H.R. 7960, is identical with H.R. 7700, introduced by the eminent chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, the Honorable EMANUEL CELLER. Since Congressman CELLER presented an excellent detailed analysis of his bill in his July 11 testimony, at these hearings, I will avoid repetition and save the time of the committee by omitting my own analysis.

AUGUST 7, 1963.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES:

We, the undersigned organizations, wish to endorse strongly the historic step you have taken in your message of July 23 in calling for the elimination of the national origins quota system.

We have long urged the removal of this discriminatory aspect of our American immigration policy.

We are greatly encouraged and wish to express our appreciation for the outstanding leadership you are giving in this major field of human rights.

American Baptist Home Mission Societies.
American Civil Liberties Union.
American Council for Emigres in the Professions.
American Council for Nationalities Service.
American Committee on Italian Migration.
American Federation of Jews from Central Europe, Inc.
American Federation of Musicians.
American Friends Service Committee.
American Fund for Czechoslovak Refugees.
American Jewish Committee.
American Jewish Congress.
Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith.
B'nai B'rith, National Commission on Citizenship, Veterans and Community Affairs.
Brethren Service Commission.
Catholic Committee for Refugees.
Catholic Relief Services, NCWC.
Church World Service, National Council of Churches of Christ.
Council for Christian Social Action of the United Church of Christ.
Division of Immigration and Americanization, Commonwealth of Massachusetts.
General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists.
Governor's Commission on Refugees, Boston, Mass.
Greater Miami Section, National Council of Jewish Women.
HIAS and Council Migration Service of Philadelphia.
Immigrants' Service League.
International Institute of Gary, Ind.
International Institute of Greater Bridgeport, Inc.
International Institute of Jersey City.
International Institute of Los Angeles.
International Institute of Metropolitan Detroit.
International Institute of Providence, Inc.
International Institute of San Francisco.
International Institute of Toledo, Inc.
International Rescue Committee.
International Social Service—American Branch.
International Union of Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers, AFL-CIO.
International Union, United Automobile, Aerospace, & Agricultural Implement Workers of America, UAW.
Iuliu Maniu American Romanian Relief Society.
Italian Welfare League.
Japanese American Citizens League.
Jewish Community Relations Council of Greater Philadelphia.
Jewish Community Relations Council of Greater Pittsburgh.

Jewish Counselling and Service Agency.
Jewish Labor Committee.
Jewish War Veterans in the U.S.A., National Ladies Auxiliary.
Lutheran Immigration Service.
Methodist Committee for Overseas Relief.
Michigan Committee on Immigration.
National Board YWCA.
National Catholic Rural Life Conference.
National Catholic Welfare Conference, Department on Immigration.
National Community Relations Advisory Council.
National Conference of Catholic Charities.
National Council of Jewish Women.
National Council Protestant Episcopal Church, Department of Chrisian Social Relations.
National Travelers Aid Association.
Nationalities Service Center of Philadelphia.
Naturalization Council of Metropolitan Area, Kansas City, Mo.
New York Association of New Americans.
New York Protestant Episcopal City Mission Society.
New York Section—National Council of Jewish Women.
Order of AHEPA.
Philadelphia Citizens Committee on Immigration and Citizenship.
Polish American Immigration and Relief Committee.
Selfhelp of Emigres From Central Europe.
The United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., Committee on Resettlement Service.
Tolstoy Foundaton.
Ukrainian Workingmen's Association.
Union of American Hebrew Congregations, Social Action Commission.
United Friends of Needy and Displaced People of Yugoslavia.
United HIAS Service.
United States Committee for Refugees.
United Steelworkers of America.

Public Support for FTC Cigarette Ruling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 2, 1964

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, recently, the Federal Trade Commission took a historic step toward increased consumer protection when it ruled that, effective January 1, 1965, cigarette companies must label their cigarettes as a health hazard. It has long been held by the courts that "to tell less than the whole truth is a well-known method of deception"—*P. Lorillard Co.* v. *F.T.C.* (186 F. 2d 52, 58, 4th Cir. 1950). For example, for some time the Federal Trade Commission has required that a seller of a product of foreign origin affirmatively disclose the country of origin on the grounds that to do otherwise is to withhold from the consumer a fact material to his decisionmaking process. Similarly, the Commission has required affirmative disclosure concerning the hazardous characteristics of commodities. The rationale underlying the requirement of affirmative disclosure is that in the absence of a warning to the contrary, a product cannot be safely employed for its intended use.

Some persons have argued that sufficient publicity has been accorded the medical findings of the health hazards of smoking to make it unnecessary for the Federal Trade Commission to act in this matter. These persons argue that a cigarette company should be permitted to sell its particular brand of cigarettes without reference to the hazards involved since the public has already been alerted to them. I think the Commission answered this question very ably in its decision, when it said:

> There is no inconsistency in holding that such disclosure is necessary because of lack of sufficient public knowledge of the hazards of smoking and in recognizing, as the Commission has implicitly throughout this report, that there is considerable public concern with and anxiety about the hazards of smoking. In the first place, a deception, to be actionable, need not be universal. If many people are cognizant of the hazards of smoking, many others, and probably more, are not. In the second place, while there is little doubt that the publicity accorded the smoking and health problem has engendered widespread anxiety about smoking—anxiety which some cigarette advertising, at least, has attempted to allay—there is an obvious difference between a generalized anxiety, suspicion or fear, on the one hand, and particularized knowledge of a fact, on the other. The existence of the former kind of awareness without the latter is likely to create public confusion, and therefore increases rather than eliminates the need for clear disclosure in cigarette advertising and labeling that smoking is a substantial health hazard.
>
> An argument based on the present level of public awareness of the Advisory Committee's report or other sources fails, in any event, to reckon with the dynamic factors that are involved here. It is perhaps true that today, but a few months after publication of the Advisory Committee's report, public awareness of the hazards of smoking is at a higher level than previously. But the release of that report was an extraordinary event. No similar event has occurred since or is likely to occur within the near future. The publicity given the report has already diminished greatly and it may be surmised that the report is rapidly receding in the public consciousness. There is no basis on which to project the amount of publicity that will be given to health hazards of cigarette smoking in the future. (Commission decision, pp. 115–116.)

Other persons, though admitting that a real public problem of crisis proportions exists in this matter, argue that it is best left to voluntary industry action for correction. I think the statement. before the Commission, by Dr. Edgar F. Borgatta, chairman of the Department of Sociology of the University of Wisconsin explains admirably why it is imperative that the Federal Government assume the legitimate responsibility of requiring an explicit statement concerning the health hazards of cigarettes. He said, in part:

> Currently, there is no implication that there are any dangers or potential hazards associated with cigarette smoking. Further, from my limited experience, it appears to be a most common assumption that the health hazards associated with cigarette smoking are trivial because no action is taken on the part of the Federal Government. There appears to be an implicit assumption on the part of a substantial number of persons that if there were something really wrong with cigarette smoking, the Government would do something about it. The Government has intervened dramatically in the case of obviously dangerous drugs and of immediate food hazards, and thus there is some obvious reliance on the Government for protection from such hazards. Since the dangers associated with smoking are less immediate, dramatic or coercive action certainly cannot be used. However, implicitly until a caution * * * is instituted, a significant segment of the population will continue to believe that there is no hazard because no caution is required by the Federal Government. (Commission decision, pp. 117–118.)

Let me say also, Mr. Speaker, that the FTC decision need not reflect adversely on the tobacco industry. It certainly does not mean that people have no confidence in the industry's efforts to assist in solving what must be termed a major public health problem.

The results of my annual newsletter questionnaire are, I think, a good indication that the public supports the FTC in this issue and, at the same time, looks to cigarette manufacturers with hope and confidence. This poll of Wisconsin's Second Congressional District was taken in February and March of this year, resulting in over 5,000 returns—70 percent of those replying said they favored regulation of cigarette advertising and labeling; 90 percent wanted to see a campaign to educate people about the risks of smoking; while 87 percent favored joint research by the tobacco industry and the medical profession to reduce the health hazards of smoking.

This shows an impressive degree of support for both the FTC's recent action and the industry's voluntary efforts.

The industry will continue to have this support during a very difficult period in its history if it rededicates its major effort toward reducing rather than repressing the health risks associated with smoking. While it has the right to test the FTC's decision in the courts, we must hope it will exercise that right responsibly and with due regard to what is at stake in terms of the health of the whole Nation.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 2, 1964

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of July 4, 1964:

FREEDOM'S BIRTHDAY

Today America observes the 188th anniversary of the birth of freedom. It is a good time to reflect on what America means to each of us. It is a good time for us to reevaluate the meaning of such words and phrases as: the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, freedom, patriotism, the flag, constitutional government, the Bill of Rights.

Consider what Gladstone, Prime Minister of Great Britain, said of the American Constitution:

"I have always regarded that Constitution as the most remarkable work known to me in modern times to have been produced by the human intellect, at a single stroke, in its application to political affairs."

Contrast this view of the Constitution with the modern liberals and "democratic Socialists." Read some of President Johnson's recent speeches as he attacks those who believe in constitutional limited government as "living in the past," or having "outmoded ideas." How do you feel about maintaining individual freedom, the right of the people to govern themselves, on this 188th birthday of American liberty? This is the question you will be called to answer in the coming months when the essence of constitutional limited government is under attack. It is the issue you will be voting on in November. Independence, not interdependence, is the issue.

WELL, WE PASSED THE FOREIGN AID BILL

The House approved a foreign aid bill to spend $3,739,249,400 of money we don't have and will have to borrow to give away. The key vote on the foreign aid appropriation bill, H.R. 11812, was on the motion to recommit. This lost by only 10 votes, 208 to 198. My objections to the appropriation were detailed in the newsletter of June 13. I voiced additional arguments in debate this week.

1. "We are told that our foreign aid is saving the world from communism. This is not true.

"The United States is supporting and aiding communism by money, by food, by arms, by moral support, by trade, by cultural exchange, by giving them our military and nuclear secrets. We are pretending that communism and Communists mean no harm. We are aiding them as they aid other Communists and eliminate any vestige of freedom in the subjugated countries.

2. "Why? Because there is profit to be made by some businessmen in foreign aid, military expenditures, and big Government spending.

3. "We now jeopardize the very currency of our country. Example: In 5 years, 1958 to 1963, we gave $12½ billion to 57 countries who promptly bought $7 billion of our gold with the dollars we gave them.

4. "Now we propose to give them $3.7 billion more. Already foreign governments hold $26 billion in money which can be redeemed in our gold, except we have only $15½ billion in gold left to give away ($12 billion must be kept on hand to back up our money).

5. "Further, there are $7 billion now in the 'pipeline' of unexpended accumulated funds, whether we appropriate any more now or not. Large amounts can be deobligated and spent for new and other programs."

In view of these facts brought out in a masterful minority report of the subcommittee on appropriations for foreign aid, where is the justification for spending more than $3½ billion of your money at a time when we have just raised the debt limit another $9 billion? In spite of all the contrary propaganda, the truth is President Johnson is spending more of your money. Instead of working toward a balanced budget, an end to deficit spending, less Federal spending, he is demanding more and greater expenditures for Federal programs. Such fiscal irresponsibility is a serious threat to your freedom. This is something to think about on this July 4. Maybe its time for Americans to reassert their independence and demand a return to the constitutional principles which alone guarantee freedom for all our citizens. The burden of Federal debt and taxation is not economic freedom.

WHERE DO YOU STAND?

My mail is filled with thousands of letters protesting much of the legislation we are passing. Businessmen, chambers of commerce, trade associations, and individuals demand that I vote against the civil rights bill, the extension of wartime excise taxes, the mass transit bill, the inclusion of tips in figuring withholding taxes, and dozens of other measures. All of these bills are sponsored by President Johnson. He uses every means including pressure, coercion, reward to get them through Congress. The same people who demand that Congress oppose the legislation, in many cases, go all out in support of the sponsor of the bills, the President. Does this make sense? Where do you stand? Do you have the courage to vote your convictions? Or is your Representative in Congress supposed to go it alone?

Water Resources Research

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 2, 1964

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the Congress has finally taken action on the subject of water research legislation. I introduced one of the original bills in the House of Representatives on this subject and appeared before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in support of it. The bill, S. 2, when signed into law and implemented, will meet two national needs, the acceleration of research in water problems and the acceleration of the training of hydroscientists, who are desperately needed to deal with the regional and national water problems that are growing so swiftly.

The bill is designed to enlist the competence of our university faculties and facilities in needed water research work and at the same time to develop and train new additional scientists and engineers. It proposes to do this patterned after the original Hatch Act which created the system of State agriculture experiment stations. I do not believe there is a person in this Congress who has any knowledge of these facilities who could not attest to the fact of the fine work and contributions they have made to our everyday life.

Many schools throughout the country have done pioneer work in the field of water research and conservation. One of the leaders in this work is my own alma mater, the Texas A. & M. University, located at College Station, Tex. Early in 1952, a water advisory council was organized at Texas A. & M. to study the water problems of Texas and to submit recommendations which would enable them to more effectively discharge the responsibility of education and research in the important area of water resources. Following this action on the part of Texas A. & M., the board of directors of the A. & M. University established the Water Research and Information Center. By this action, the board of directors directed that Texas A. & M. University take leadership in education and research programs in water resources. Also, the responsibility for publication and dispensing of research results to the public was emphasized. Since that time, A. & M. has developed an increasingly effective interdisciplinary program of cooperation between the many parts of the institution concerned with water problems. One specific result of the establishment of the Water Research and Information Center has been the successful conduct of eight water-for-Texas conferences held on the campus with published proceedings available the country over.

Another result of past emphasis on water problems has been the bringing together of many documents on water and hydrology in the form of a collection. This collection, which includes many publications not available anywhere in the country, is housed in the Texas Professional Engineers Library located on the Texas A. & M. University campus.

In the field of research, over 100 Texas Agricultural Experiment Station research projects deal either directly or indirectly with water. In addition, many water projects are included in the research activities of the Texas Engineering Experiment Station and the Texas A. & M. Research Foundation. In the past 4 years, there have been over 100 graduate theses having some bearing on hydrology completed at the Texas A. & M. University. During the past year Texas A. & M. has become a member of the Universities Council on Hydrology, a voluntary organization of leading universities with a demonstrated interest in strong programs of teaching and research in the field of hydrology.

The Texas A. & M. University board of directors has just recently approved the renaming of the Water Research and Information Center to the Water Resources Institute. At the same time the organization is being given added strength so that greater emphasis can be placed on research and education in water resources on a multidisciplinary basis. The Institute will provide a focal point for concentrating the many aspects of A. & M.'s total resources effort toward a unified plan for the better understanding and solution of water problems.

The Texas A. & M. University is ready, willing, and able to assume the leadership for the research activities provided for in this bill, Mr. Speaker, and I am glad that I had a personal part in its passage.

Panama Canal Policy: Dangerous Failings of State Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 2, 1964

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, among the most crucial foreign affairs policy matters to come before the Congress in many years have been those affecting the Panama Canal and interoceanic canals generally. Expounded on the floor of the

House on many occasions by my able and brilliant colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood], the canal problem, especially the role played by the Department of State, has become a subject of national interest and concern.

Featured by indecision, timidity, and downright incompetence, the conduct of our relations with Panama concerning the Panama Canal culminated on January 9–11, 1964, in Red led and directed mob assaults on the Canal Zone, killing a number of our soldiers, endangering the lives of our citizens, and jeopardizing the security of the canal itself.

It was, therefore, with the greatest interest that I read, in the June 1964 issue of the Reader's Digest, a thoughtful and very able article on "The Dangerous Failings of Our State Department," by Hon. Frank J. Lausche, distinguished senior Senator from Ohio and member of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. It is especially gratifying that in this revealing article Senator Lausche emphasizes our failures at Panama.

The major part of the indicated article follows:

The Dangerous Failings of Our State Department

(The Government agency primarily responsible for fighting the cold war is a study in indecision, timidity, and inefficiency. Result: we're in danger of losing that war.)

(By Senator Frank J. Lausche)

In every corner of the world we are losing ground to the Communists. From Panama to Cambodia to Ghana to Bolivia to Indonesia, we are belittled, battered, and backpedaling. Our flag is trampled, our prestige and power are flouted. Our embassies are mobbed, our officials threatened or arrested at gunpoint. Respect for our strength dwindles.

As the agency responsbile for our foreign relations, the State Department must stand chiefly accountable for our defeats in the long struggle against communism. The harsh fact is that State is not equipped to cope with the explosive conflicts our enemies are stirring. Secretary of State Dean Rusk is a sincere, devoted diplomat who works tirelessly to do the best job he can; but, unfortunately, the vast organization over which he presides contains long-entrenched and frequently misguided men whose views too often account for our unsuccessful policies. Thus, while our opponents run circles around us, these officials, from their lofty glass-and-granite heights above the Potomac, persist in underplaying Communist advances.

Consider the Department's actions during last January's revolution in Zanzibar. After a band of rebels, at least 30 of them trained in Cuba, seized power, statements began to ooze out of our foreign-policy superstructure disparaging the importance of the Communists. "U.S. Aids Unconvinced Pro-Reds Run Zanzibar" ran a New York Times headline based on one State briefing.

Yet, State's own files revealed that a Zanzibar political office had been set up in Havana in 1961. Cuban-instructed students had returned to Zanzibar shortly before the rebellion—and State knew about it. The new Foreign and Defense Minister, Abdul Rahman Mohammed, had been a paid agent of the Chinese Communist press agency—and State knew about it. Vice President Kassim Hanga, educated in Moscow and with a fanatical hate-America record, had stalked out of a meeting last fall when it moved to express regret over President Kennedy's assassination—and State knew about this, too.

But what did State do? It soft pedaled the grim facts and clung to the old line that the coup was merely a nationalist revolution that had picked up some Communist overtones. Then Red China announced a half-million-dollar loan to Zanzibar, and our one remaining diplomat was given 24 hours to pack his bags and get out of "The People's Republic of Zanzibar." Four days later, at State's insistence, we responded by recognizing this Communist-riddled regime which was soon to demand removal of our space tracking station and receive Soviet arms and technicians. Yet, in stark contrast, when a new anti-Communist regime took over last fall in the Dominican Republic, we would not recognize it although we knew the overthrown government had refused to crack down on serious Communist infiltration.

Such foolishness can lead only to further failures. Before we suffer additional setbacks, something must be done now. For a campaign is already mounting within our foreign-policy complex to change our attitudes toward Communists. Honest criticism of our State Department, especially by Congress, has been scorned long enough. Real reforms have been shelved too often. My own experience on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, plus a vast amount of material on the public record, convinces me that there are five chronic weaknesses which plague the Department:

Weakness 1. State has a habit of glossing over critical matters until they turn into disasters.

Indonesia is one case. More than 2 years ago the Department's files were crammed with hair-raising evidence revealing how Communist-leaning President Sukarno had mortgaged his Government to the hilt to acquire Soviet military aid, while accepting what has added up to $780 million in U.S. economic aid. Naively hoping for the best, State's policymakers insisted we keep propping up Indonesia.

Because we did not dare tell Sukarno to give up his partnership with the Russians or get along without our help, a dangerous small war is brewing in Asia—as Sukarno threatens to crush the newly formed Federation of Malaysia with his Russian weapons, telling us, "To hell with your aid."

Much the same folly has been evident in our policy toward Ghana. For more than 3 years the government of President Kwame Nkrumah has been degenerating into a Marxist tyranny. Again we ducked a showdown, not having the guts to inform Nkrumah that we would not subsidize his regime as it slid toward communism. All the while State issued rosy "fact sheets," including a recent one claiming that Ghana has "steadily increasing ties of friendship with the United States." Today Ghana has all but plunged into the Soviet orbit; our Embassy has been mobbed and our flag pulled down by Nkrumah's stooges.

To force State to rise above its fears of showdowns, a persistent effort must be made by both the press and Congress to compel the Department to tell the truth. Coverup and deception are too often practiced by misguided, arrogant officials who distrust and fear the judgment of American citizens.

Weakness 2. State too frequently forgets that we must act our role as the free world's leader, and enforce our rights if we expect to survive.

No major nation has ever achieved peace without courageous use of its might at proper times. The calm that descended over Berlin and other crisis points after President Kennedy's dramatic action on the Soviet missiles in Cuba in October 1962 is proof. Yet, a deep-seated feeling is too often evident at State that there's something sinful about exercising strength.

Take Vietnam. In the wake of the State Department-encouraged overthrow of President Diem last November, the war against the Communist Vietcong gravely deteriorated. Nonetheless, elements in our State Department continued to resist the one obvious and long overdue tactic: hit-and-run guerrilla strikes by the Vietnamese against the enemy on his own home ground in North Vietnam. To be sure, this is a power maneuver, but the alternative may be to abandon Vietnam—and ultimately the rest of southeast Asia—to communism.

State's attitude toward exercising leadership was also obvious after the bloody January riots in Panama. Soviet, Chinese, and Cuban propaganda instantly spread lies that our troops had slaughtered innocent Panamanians. Then Panama lodged a charge of "aggression" against us before the Organization of American States.

Instead of responding to these smears in a manner befitting a great power, the State Department timidly consented to an investigation of Panama's complaints. Then and there, vast evidence could have been presented for the public record, including photographs and tape recordings showing how at least 70 trained Communists, some recently schooled in Cuba, staged the riots and fanned them to a bloody pitch. Indeed, State so underplayed Communist influence that Cuba was not even openly mentioned before the OAS at that crucial time.

Obedient to State's orders, our Voice of America made only fleeting mention of Communist involvement in the riots, during broadcasts to Latin America about the OAS meetings. Communist activity was not discussed at all in VOA's newscasts to Western Europe and most other regions. Is it any wonder that after the OAS voted 16 to 1 to seek evidence of U.S. aggression, our allies and most of the rest of the world concluded we were in the wrong?

Until the State Department realizes that we must act like the great nation we are, opportunists, half-pint dictators and even some of our friends will continue to slice away at us. And in doing so they will gladly watch us slide into second-class status. Former Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs Robert Murphy, who directly served three Presidents, recently said, "In appropriate cases our Government should use its power and capacity to deal directly with a provocation whether in Panama, Ghana or Cuba. If we do this from time to time in suitable situations, I am convinced the United States will regain an element which it seems more recently to have lost—international respect both for American leadership and American power."

Weakness 3. State has not devised a consistent plan to defeat communism's political-warfare strategy.

This stems from an ingrained belief that the solution to our conflict with communism lies not in taking the offensive but in seeking areas of understanding. This attitude was typified recently by our Ambassador to West Germany, George C. McGhee, who declared, "We must seek solutions by indirection through promotion of evolutionary change in the context in which the problems appear on the world scene."

This naïveté has filled the corridors and conference rooms at State for years. The entrenched powers at State are still convinced they can reach gentlemanly agreements with the Communists, and talk them out of aggressive aims.

State has gone even further down this road of self-delusion with its policy of making life more palatable behind the Iron Curtain. If, the Department argues, we sell our wheat to Russia, we help Khrushchev avert an agricultural difficulty and give him a breather to put his house in order. Then a better atmosphere will prevail for negotiation. Help poor Nikita, so the line goes, prove to his Communist competitors, particularly Red China, that his peaceful coexistence policy works.

His policy works all right! It stirs terror and mass murder in the Congo, spreads lies about us in Panama. It shoots down our off-course fliers over East Germany, even as State Department encouraged trade deals send tons of U.S. grain to this despised puppet regime. It teaches Castro's elite how to operate missiles, and it poisons the bloodstream of every free society with anti-American hate.

Still, our State Department strategists are so enchanted with the search for minor agreements that they have not even begun to think through the major problem: ways to thwart and destroy communism's worldwide social-demolition apparatus—be it directed from Moscow or Peiping.

Weakness 4. State's decisionmaking machinery is so inefficient that it moves at a caterpillar pace.

Shortly after President Kennedy took office, the White House asked the Department for a swift answer to a Russian maneuver in Berlin; 43 days later it arrived. Bureaucracy has reached such proportions that an estimated one out of every three Foreign Service employees is bogged down in strictly administrative chores, while well over half of State's 24,000-man payroll performs clerical, housekeeping duties such as processing 2 million pieces of paper a week. Vital matters crawl through in-out boxes gathering signatures of approval as crucial hours tick by. Recently, Secretary of State Rusk admitted to Congress that telegrams which come to him can take as many as 10 days to go up and down the line before a decision is reached, when everyone knows what the answer should be.

Such a senseless roundrobin is an outrage. And not just because of the delays involved. All too frequently, in the course of the buckpassing and the ponderous discussion in one committee after another, proposals get so emasculated that the decision is: don't act. Surely the unnecessary echelons can be eliminated.

Weakness 5. State's personnel is not up to the tasks that confront it.

Despite numerous dedicated, able Foreign Service officers, the entire personnel structure needs more disciplined, realistic men coming in at the bottom and moving toward the top. The Department has more than enough bodies, and not nearly enough mental brawn. Particularly is this true at the desk-officer level. For nearly every country we deal with, there is a "desk man" in Washington whose authority and influence on foreign-policy decisions can be enormous. Too often these posts are filled by juniors who either buck decisions up another rung or, worse, make mistakes that are not caught. We need seasoned top diplomats in these jobs, men who can be held accountable for decisions.

Deputy Under Secretary of State for Administration William J. Crockett recently admitted to a congressional committee that a rigorous "weeding-out process" at State was "a matter of highest priority." The real question, however, is who goes out. Too often it is the wrong man. Ambassador Clare Timberlake, among those credited with saving the Congo from a Soviet-run takeover, was called home in 1961 because Rajeshwar Dayal, the Indian U.N. commander in the Congo, considered him too anti-Communist.

• • • • •

The Department's ability to discern between desirables and undesirables is in serious doubt.

Just as alarming, the raw talent coming into the Foreign Service, our future Ambassadors, is below par. Moreover, State's personnel training continues to be grossly inadequate, and all too few of our diplomats have a sophisticated knowledge of communism's social-demolition techniques. Not nearly enough of those in Red target areas know how to deal with a professional agitator or can spot a Communist-led riot in the making.

Individually and collectively, these five weaknesses at State have spelled setbacks, blunders, and catastrophes. Nothing more vividly shows this than the case of Cuba. For months we watched as the slow infiltration of Soviet troops and weapons wiped out the Monroe Doctrine, yet did nothing. Finally the missile crisis of October 1962 was upon us, and we stood at the brink of world war III. Afterward, the State Department announced a bold program to isolate Cuba by discouraging all free world shipping to the island. Promise was further made that Cuba's exportation of communism would not be tolerated. Nearly 2 years ago Secretary Rusk told our committee that "if the Cubans or the Soviets in Cuba attempted to move arms illicitly into other Latin American countries, the Armed Forces of the United States would be used to intercept such traffic."

Both programs have now collapsed. Cuba is today a training center for guerrillas and terrorists. A full-scale African indoctrination program there has already sent more than 100 graduates back to their homelands, which range from Algeria to Southern Rhodesia. The OAS has compiled massive evidence showing Cuban aggression against Venezuela, including financial aid and substantial arms shipments. (Captured plans disclosed a plot to seize Caracas with the help of mortars, bazookas, and recoilless rifles slipped in from Cuba.)

As for the economic embargo, its ballyhooed success was rudely shattered by Britain's $11 million sale of 400 buses to Castro. We knew well in advance that this and other deals by our various allies were in the making. State might have devised a campaign to nip these deals in the bud. Instead, it argued that we should sell wheat to the Soviet Union, the main source of economic support to Cuba.

Nothing could have more thoroughly undermined our embargo, since it was precisely the kind of excuse our allies were looking for to launch full-scale commerce with Castro. Thus, even while a 42-million-dollar contract for the sale of 1 million tons of wheat to Russia was being negotiated in New York last January, a British freighter, the *Sycamore Hill*, was taking on 10,000 tons of Canadian wheat in Nova Scotia. Destination: a Russian Black Sea port. Some 48 hours after the deal was consummated, the ship's captain got new orders from Moscow: Head for Havana.

A few days later the *Tulse Hill*, another British vessel, docked in Baltimore. Longshoremen refused to load it and 25 other ships, some of them scheduled to carry wheat for Iron Curtain countries. Why? These same ships had been delivering goods to Cuba. State Department officials rushed to talk the union out of its anti-Cuban boycott.

Small wonder that our friends fall away from us and our foes make mincemeat of us. Yet, instead of stern measures, we are now hearing calls for reevaluations looking to a still weaker line against communism. From my own party in Congress, one influential foreign-policy voice, conditioned by State Department thinking, decries cold war "myths" and declares that Russia has "ceased to be totally and implacably hostile to the West." Approval reverberates through our diplomatic echelons, where the word is out to educate the public about "good" Communist nations. Our officials pontificate about the Soviet-Chinese dispute over how to bury us, and all the while communism creeps ahead.

If we will but courageously help our friends and not aid our enemies, the protection of our interests can be achieved with the least risk of violence. And if we are to survive, one top piece of business at the White House must be an immediate study, reshaping and strengthening of our State Department. For how long can we afford to fail?

Exchange of Remarks Between President Lyndon B. Johnson and Prime Minister George Papandreou of Greece Upon the Latter's Arrival on the South Lawn of the White House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 2, 1964

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, a distinguished recent visitor to the United States was His Excellency, Prime Minister George Papandreou of Greece.

Under unanimous consent I include in the RECORD the exchange of remarks between President Lyndon B. Johnson and Prime Minister Papandreou upon the latter's arrival on the south lawn of the White House on June 24, 1964:

EXCHANGE OF REMARKS BETWEEN PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON AND PRIME MINISTER GEORGE PAPANDREOU OF GREECE UPON THE LATTER'S ARRIVAL ON THE SOUTH LAWN OF THE WHITE HOUSE

President JOHNSON. Mr. Prime Minister, it is a proud privilege for me to welcome you to the United States this morning, and to express my deep personal appreciation for your coming to our country at this time.

This country and your country are bound together by ties that are both ancient and modern. The founders of these United States drew deeply from the wisdom and the ideals of ancient Greece in formulating the concepts of our own free and democratic society. In this 20th century, your country and mine have stood stalwartly together to defend those enduring ideals against aggressors, and to advance their fulfillment among our people.

We are friends in freedom; we are allies in NATO for peace; we are coworkers in the common labors of progress and prosperity. These are strong and welcome bonds. We are bound together also, Mr. Prime Minister, by close and lasting ties of kinship. Americans harbor a very warm affection for those of your countrymen and their dependents who have honored us through the years by coming to live in our midst as neighbors, as friends, and as leaders in American life.

In recent months, occasions of grief have brought us close together in moments of national sorrow. Last November Queen Fredericka came to our country as a representative of your country at the time of the tragic death of President Kennedy. Only a short time later, Mrs. Johnson made a sad mission of mourning to attend the funeral of your beloved King Paul, whom we had been privileged to meet so happily on our visit to your land only 2 years ago.

Today I am confident that your visit and the talks that we shall have together will again affirm the close and cordial relations between Greece and the United States. With diligence and understanding, we shall seek to chart a course that will preserve the union and harmony of free nations, militantly opposed to Communist aggression.

We in America know that the people of Greece yield to no other people in the world in their devotion to freedom and independence, and in their desire to keep the peace won and maintained by such great sacrifice from freemen in our times.

Mr. Prime Minister, it is to that cause of peace that our efforts are dedicated today.

Prime Minister PAPANDREOU. Mr. President, I thank you for your kind welcome. I regard it as a great privilege that upon your friendly invitation I find myself in the Capital of the mighty American democracy, the great friend and ally of Greece, and before this famous mansion which has housed so many illustrious promoters of human achievement, of liberty and justice.

I am happy that I shall be given the opportunity to become personally acquainted with the present great leader of the United States, the champion of peace, as well as with members of his administration and of the Congress of the United States.

Your concern for the maintenance of peace and freedom is shared by the Greek nation and by myself. Greece has always tried for the promotion of peace. A people that has suffered as much as ours from the violence of war and the reverses of history can only long for peace, but no peace can be durable without justice, and no settlement of problems can be right and just if it is not based on democracy and freedom.

In the past there existed a distinction between the world of ideals and the world of politics, between a policy based on idealism and a policy based upon realism. Nowadays they have merged into one, and the policy is today the more positive the more it is consonance with ideas. This constitutes the glory of our times, the glory of the free world whom you are called upon by history to lead.

My country does not forget that the United States, through the doctrine which bears the name of one of your great predecessors, President Truman, has been instrumental in the defense of Greece against aggression, as well as in the rehabilitation of the country, exhausted and devastated by cruel years of war. Greece also feels proud to be represented in your great democracy by a number of citizens of Greek descent who constitute a living link between the two nations, and of our national cultural ties to the world of American civilization.

Mr. President, I welcome this opportunity to bring to you and to the people of the United States the cordial salute of the people of Greece.

JOINT COMMUNIQUE OF PRIME MINISTER PAPANDREOU OF GREECE AND PRESIDENT JOHNSON

Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the text of the joint communique of June 25, 1964, of Prime Minister Papandreou and President Johnson with respect to the Cyprus situation.

The communique follows:

JOINT COMMUNIQUE OF PRIME MINISTER PAPANDREOU OF GREECE AND PRESIDENT JOHNSON

During the visit to Washington of the Prime Minister of Greece conversations were held between Mr. George A. Papandreou and the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, and other officials of the U.S. Government.

The conversations, which were conducted in an atmosphere of friendship and warm cordiality, have contributed to the strengthening of the close ties between Greece and the United States.

The visit provided the opportunity to the Greek Prime Minister and the President of the United States to review various aspects of the international situation and to discuss subjects of mutual interest.

The President of the United States and the Greek Prime Minister had a sincere and useful exchange of views on the Cyprus situation. Both expressed full support of the efforts undertaken by the Security Council and the Secretary General of the United Nations for the establishment of peace in the island and for rapidly finding a permanent solution. The Greek Prime Minister explained in detail the Greek position on the problem. He emphasized that a permanent solution should be based upon the principles of democracy and justice. The two leaders reiterated their determination to make every effort to increase the understanding among allies.

The Greek Prime Minister expressed the deep appreciation for the generous support of the U.S. Government and people in the hard struggle of the Greek people for their freedom and welfare.

SENATE

MONDAY, JULY 6, 1964

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. METCALF).

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, God: From the jubilation of the Nation's joyous remembrance of heroic bequests from the costly past, we come with bowed heads and grateful hearts, praying that grace may be ours to hallow the deeds of the yesterdays and to remember that not annual observances, but eternal vigilance, is the price of liberty, and that each generation must earn the right to keep it.

In all the national agitation that privileges guaranteed to all shall be open to all, may there be among all elements of our favored people a solemn acknowledgement of the rights which the state, whose very breath is freedom, requires for itself of every loyal citizen.

Give, we pray, to those who are anxiously claiming their birthright the realization that among the rights claimed by the Republic is the obligation of those who enjoy liberty to practice in all human relationships the Golden Rule, to give loyal obedience to the Nation's laws, to strive to increase the store of understanding and good will, and that each citizen worthy of freedom, jealous of the total strength of the commonwealth, shall have as his highest joy, not what he takes, but what he gives.

We ask it in the Name of the One who was the servant of all. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, July 2, 1964, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on July 3, 1964, the President had approved and signed the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 71) to establish a National Commission on Food Marketing to study the food industry from the producer to the consumer.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions, and they were signed by the Acting President pro tempore:

S. 2. An act to establish water resources research centers, to promote a more adequate national program of water research, and for other purposes;

H.R. 2735. An act for the relief of Ligia Paulina Jimenez;

H.R. 2737. An act for the relief of Pedro Aguinaldo;

H.R. 5408. An act for the relief of Jackie Bergancia Smith;

H.R. 5478. An act authorizing a survey of the Frio River in the vicinity of Three Rivers, Tex., in the interest of flood control and allied purposes;

H.R. 5501. An act for the relief of Wieslawa Marianna Borczon;

H.R. 6385. An act for the relief of Wolfgang Seidl;

H.R. 6455. An act to amend subsection (b) of section 512 of the Internal Revenue

Code of 1954 (dealing with unrelated business taxable income);

H.R. 6473. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Loward D. Sparks;

H.R. 6923. An act authorizing a survey of Cedar Bayou, Tex., in the interest of flood control and allied purposes;

H.R. 8590. An act to incorporate the Aviation Hall of Fame;

H.R. 9094. An act to authorize the President to declare July 9, 1964, as Monocacy Battle Centennial in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the Battle of the Monocacy;

H.R. 9234. An act to incorporate the Little League Baseball, Inc.;

H.R. 10407. An act for the relief of Keith Hills;

H.R. 10437. An act to incorporate the National Committee on Radiation Protection and Measurements;

H.R. 10456. An act to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and administration operations, and for other purposes;

H.R. 11004. An act to authorize the sale, without regard to the 6-month waiting period prescribed, of zinc proposed to be disposed of pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act;

H.R. 11235. An act to authorize the disposal, without regard to the prescribed 6-month waiting period, of approximately 11 million pounds of molybdenum from the national stockpile;

H.R. 11257. An act to authorize the sale, without regard to the 6-month waiting period prescribed, of lead proposed to be disposed of pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act;

H.J. Res. 475. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim December 7, 1966, as Pearl Harbor Day in commemoration of the attack on Pearl Harbor; and

H.J. Res. 950. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to an amendment to the compact between the State of Ohio and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania relating to Pymatuning Lake.

ORDER DISPENSING WITH CALL OF THE CALENDAR

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the call of the Legislative Calendar, under rule VIII, was dispensed with.

AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE TO MEET DURING SENATE SESSIONS FOR WEEK BEGINNING JULY 6

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Appropriations was authorized to meet during the sessions of the Senate for the week beginning July 6, 1964.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

Report on Overobligations of Appropriations

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, 25 reports on overobligations of appropriations (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations.

Report on Loan to the Plains Electric Generation & Transmission Cooperative, Inc., Albuquerque, N. Mex.

A letter from the Administrator, Rural Electrification Administration, Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on a loan to the Plains Electric Generation & Transmission Cooperative, Inc., of Albuquerque, N. Mex., in the amount of $10,807,000, for the financing of certain transmission facilities (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations.

Report on Loan to the Lea County Electric Cooperative, Inc., Lovington, N. Mex.

A letter from the Administrator, Rural Electrification Administration, Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on a loan to the Lea County Electric Cooperative, Inc., of Lovington, N. Mex., in the amount of $6,020,000, for the financing of certain generation and transmission facilities (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations.

Report on Relative Cost of Shipbuilding in the Various Coastal Districts of the United States

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the relative cost of shipbuilding in the various coastal districts of the United States, dated June 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

Report on Unnecessary Costs Incurred in Handling Imported Merchandise

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on unnecessary costs incurred in handling imported merchandise, Bureau of Customs, Treasury Department, dated June 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on High Deadline Rate of Air Defense Equipment and Excess Spare Parts at an Oversea Location

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on high deadline rate of air defense equipment and excess spare parts at an oversea location due to supply support deficiencies, Department of the Army, dated June 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Overstatement of Requirements for Aircraft Electronic Systems

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on overstatement of requirements for aircraft electronic systems resulting in improper procurement actions, Department of the Navy, dated June 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Award of Young American Medals for Bravery and Service

A letter from the Attorney General, reporting, pursuant to law, on the award of the Young American Medals for Bravery and Service, for 1962; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Suspension of Deportation of Certain Aliens

Two letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders suspending deportation of certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law pertaining to each alien, and the reasons for ordering such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Minneapolis, Minn., favoring the enactment of legislation to provide for medical and hospital care for senior citizens; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the Michigan Democratic Spring State Convention, favoring the enactment of legislation to designate the recently enacted civil rights bill "The John F. Kennedy Civil Rights Act of 1964"; to the Commiteee on the Judiciary.

The petition of Philip C. Macfadden, of Represa, Calif., relating to his claim for a redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONTINUATION OF CERTAIN EXISTING RULES RELATING TO THE DEDUCTIBILITY OF ACCRUED VACATION PAY—AMENDMENT (AMENDMENT NO. 1096)

Mr. FULBRIGHT submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 10467) to continue for a temporary period certain existing rules relating to the deductibility of accrued vacation pay, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, July 6, 1964, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 2) to establish water resources research centers, to promote a more adequate national program of water research, and for other purposes.

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF TWO VERSIONS OF CIVIL RIGHTS BILL (H.R. 7152)

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, Representative William M. McCulloch, of Ohio, who had much to do with the passage and also the preparation of the civil rights bill, has prepared a comparative analysis of the House version and the Senate version of H.R. 7152. I believe this analysis is highly informative.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent as a special request, that in printing this comparative analysis in the Record, it be set forth in parallel columns, in order to show in every case the differences in the sections and in the titles. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this be done.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The tabulation follows.

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS BILL, H.R. 7152, AS PASSED BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND BY THE SENATE

(Prepared at the request and under the supervision of WILLIAM M. MCCULLOCH, Representative to Congress, Fourth District, Ohio, June 29, 1964)

TITLE I—VOTING RIGHTS

House version	*Senate version*
1. No State or local government official shall in determining whether a person is qualified to vote in an election in which Federal officials are to be elected:	1. Same.
(a) Apply any standard, practice or procedure different from the standards, practices or procedures applied to other individuals within the same county, parish or similar political subdivision who have been found qualified to vote.	(a) Same.
(b) Utilize an immaterial error or omission committed by a person on any application or registration form as a basis for denying the person the right to vote.	(b) Same.
(c) Employ any literacy test (1) unless such test is administered to a person wholly in writing except where a person requests and State law authorizes a test other than in writing; and (2) unless a certified copy of the test and the answers given by the person are furnished to him within 25 days after a request is made for the test and the answers.	(c) Employ any literacy test (1) unless such test is administered to a person wholly in writing; and (2) unless a certified copy of the test and the answers given by the person are furnished to him within 25 days after a request is made for the test and the answers, except that the Attorney General may enter into agreements with State and local authorities that alternative testing procedures may be utilized by State and local authorities in the cases of persons who are blind or otherwise physically handicapped.
2. In a voting rights suit, instituted by the Attorney General where literacy becomes a relevant fact, there is created a rebuttable presumption that a person who has not been judged an incompetent and who has completed the sixth grade of school possesses sufficient literacy to vote in an election in which Federal officials are to be elected.	2. Same.
3. In a voting rights suit, the Attorney General or any defendant in the proceeding is authorized to request that a three-judge district court be convened to hear the suit.	3. In a voting rights suit, where the Attorney General requests a finding of a pattern or practice of discrimination, the Attorney General or any defendant in the proceeding is authorized to request that a three-judge district court be convened to hear the suit.

TITLE II—PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS

House version	*Senate version*
1. All persons shall have access to the following places of public accommodation without regard to race, color, religion or national origin:	1. Same.
(a) hotels, motels, and similar places of lodging serving transient guests, except proprietor-operated dwellings having five rooms or less for rent.	(a) Same.
(b) eating establishments.	(b) Same.
(c) places of entertainment, such as theaters and sports arenas.	(c) Same.
(d) gasoline stations.	(d) Same.
(e) any other establishment which (1) is physically located within or houses one of the above places of public accommodation and (2) holds itself out as serving patrons of one of the above specified places of public accommodations.	(e) Same.
2. Bona fide private clubs or other establishments not open to the public are exempt from coverage, except where their facilities are made available to customers or patrons of one of the places of public accommodation specified above.	2. Private clubs or other establishments not in fact open to the public are exempt from coverage, except where their facilities are made available to customers or patrons of one of the places of public accommodations specified above.
3. In addition, all persons shall have access to any establishment (whether or not specified above) without regard to race, color, religion or national origin if such establishment is required by State or local law to discriminate.	(3) Same.
4. No person shall:	4.—
(a) withhold, deny or deprive, or attempt to withhold, deny or deprive any person of the right to have access to the above specified places of public accommodations.	(a) Same.
(b) Intimidate, threaten or coerce, or attempt to intimidate, threaten or coerce any person with the purpose of interfering with the right to have access to the above specified places of public accommodation.	(b) Same.
(c) Punish or attempt to punish any person for exercising or attempting to exercise the right to have access to the above specified places of public accommodation.	(c) Same.
5. A civil action to enjoin a violation of this title may be instituted by a party aggrieved or by the Attorney General.	5. A civil action to enjoin a violation of this title may be instituted (1) by a party aggrieved or (2) by the Attorney General if he has reasonable cause to believe that any person or group of persons is engaged in a pattern or practice of resistance to any of the rights secured by this title, and that the pattern or practice is of such a nature and is intended to deny the full exercise of the rights secured by the title.
6. No such provision.	6. Where an action is instituted by a party aggrieved, the court may in its discretion permit the Attorney General, upon timely application to intervene in such action if the Attorney General certifies that the case is of general public importance.
7. No such provision.	7. Where an action is instituted by a party aggrieved, the court, upon receipt of an application, may appoint an attorney and waive fees and other court costs for the party aggrieved if the court believes that circumstances so warrant.
8. No such provision.	8. In a State or political subdivision thereof which has a law prohibiting an act or practice prohibited in this title and which establishes or authorizes a State or local authority to grant or seek relief from such act or practice or to institute criminal proceedings with respect thereto, a party aggrieved may not institute a civil action under this title before the expiration of 30 days after written notice of such act or practice has been given to the appropriate State or local authority. The court may stay proceedings of the party aggrieved under this title pending the termination of the State or local proceedings.
9. No such provision.	9. Where an action is instituted by a party aggrieved in a State or political subdivision thereof which has no State or local law prohibiting an act or practice prohibited in this title, the court may refer the matter to the Community Relations Service for up to 120 days in an effort to secure voluntary compliance.

TITLE II—PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS—continued

House version	*Senate version*
10. In a place where State or local laws or regulations forbid an act or practice prohibited by this title, the Attorney General shall, before instituting a civil action, refer the complaint to appropriate State or local officials and afford them a reasonable time to act unless the Attorney General certifies with the court that the delay caused by the referral (1) would adversely affect the interests of the United States or (2) would prove ineffective.	10. Deleted.
11. In a place where State or local law does not forbid an act or practice prohibited by this title, the Attorney General may, before instituting a civil action, utilize the services of any Federal, State, or local agency or instrumentality which may be available in an effort to secure voluntary compliance.	11. Deleted.
12. In an action commenced pursuant to this title, the court, in its discretion, may allow the prevailing party, other than the United States, reasonable attorney's fees as part of the costs.	12. Same.
13. No such provision.	13. In an action instituted by the Attorney General pursuant to this title, the Attorney General may request that a three-judge district court be convened to hear such action. The request must be accompanied with a certificate that, in the opinion of the Attorney General, the case is of general public importance.
14. In cases of criminal contempt arising under this title, a defendant shall be entitled to a trial de novo with the right to a jury trial if the defendant has been fined more than $300 or sentenced to jail for more than 45 days in the initial contempt proceeding.	14. See general criminal contempt provision in title XI, section 1101.

TITLE III—DESEGREGATION OF PUBLIC FACILITIES

1. The Attorney General is authorized, upon receipt of a signed complaint, to institute a civil action to enjoin discrimination or segregation in public facilities (other than public schools) which are owned, operated or managed by or on behalf of a State or local government, provided that the Attorney General certifies that the signer of the complaint is unable to maintain his own suit because of financial inability or fear of economic or physical reprisal.	1. Same.
2. The Attorney General is authorized to intervene in a civil action, instituted by an individual, where such individual claims a denial of equal protection of the laws.	2. Provision transferred to title IX, section 902.
3. In any action or proceeding brought under this title, the United States shall be liable for costs, including reasonable attorney's fees, if it loses the action or proceeding.	3. Same.

TITLE IV—DESEGREGATION OF PUBLIC EDUCATION

1. The Commissioner of Education is authorized to:	1.—
(a) Conduct a survey concerning the lack of equal educational opportunities in public educational institutions because of race, color, religion, or national origin.	(a) Same.
(b) Render technical assistance to a school board or other State and local governmental units, upon request of the applicant, in order to assist in the desegregation of public schools.	
(c) Arrange with institutions of higher learning for the establishment and financing of special training institutes to improve the ability of school personnel to deal effectively with educational problems occasioned by desegregation; and to pay stipends to school personnel to attend such institutes.	(c) Same.
(d) Make grants to school boards, upon request, to provide school personnel with inservice training and to permit the school boards to employ specialists in order to deal with desegregation problems.	
2. The Attorney General is authorized, upon receipt of a signed complaint, to institute a civil action to desegregate a public school, provided that he certifies that the complainant is unable to maintain his own suit because of financial inability or fear of economic or physical reprisal.	2. The same except that the Attorney General must notify the school board of the complaint and give it a reasonable time to correct the conditions alleged in the complaint before he institutes legal action.
3. The Commissioner of Education and the Attorney General are prohibited from taking any action under this title to overcome "racial imbalance."	3. Same.
4 No such provision.	4. Nothing in this title shall empower any official or court of the United States to issue any order seeking to achieve a racial balance in any school by requiring the transportation of students from one school to another or from one school district to another in order to achieve such racial balance, or otherwise enlarge the existing power of a court to insure compliance with constitutional standards.

TITLE V—CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION

1. The Commission's life is extended until January 31, 1968.	1. Same.
2. The Commission is authorized to serve as a national clearinghouse for information in respect to equal protection of the laws.	2. The Commission is authorized to serve as a national clearinghouse for information in respect to denials of equal protection of the laws.
3. The Commission is authorized to investigate cases of vote fraud.	3. Same.
4. The Commission, its advisory committees, or any personnel under its supervision or control are prohibited from investigating membership practices or internal operations of any fraternal organization, any college or university, fraternity or sorority, any private club, or any religious organization.	4. Same.
5. The Commission is granted rulemaking authority.	5. Same.
6. Provisions in House version were not as detailed in this regard.	6. The procedures of the Commission were amended to afford greater protection to the rights of individuals who may be required to appear before the Commission. Among the amendments were those to assure sufficient advance notice of the time and subject matter of a hearing; the right of counsel, accompanying a witness, to examine the witness and to present objections on the record; and to afford a witness, who may be subject to defamation, degradation or incrimination (through the Commission's receipt of other evidence or testimony) the opportunity to refute such evidence or testimony in executive session, including the right to have other witnesses called.

TITLE VI—NONDISCRIMINATION IN FEDERALLY ASSISTED PROGRAMS

House version	*Senate version*
1. No person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance.	1. Same.
2. Federal departments and agencies empowered to extend financial assistance by way of grant, contract, or loan shall terminate, refuse to grant, or refuse to continue financial assistance to a recipient of such assistance if the recipient, on grounds of race, color, or national origin, excludes from participation, denies the benefits, or subjects to discrimination any individual under any such program or activity of financial assistance.	2. Same.
3. No action may be taken under this title with respect to contracts of insurance or guaranty (as, for example, may arise in Federal housing programs).	3. Same.
4. Federal departments and agencies administering financial assistance programs or activities are granted rulemaking authority to carry out their duties under this title, but such rules must be approved by the President.	4. Same.
5. Assistance may be withheld or discontinued under this title only after a hearing has been held and there has been an express finding of a failure to comply with the provisions of the title.	5. Same.
6. Assistance may not be withheld or discontinued under this title until it has been determined that compliance cannot be secured by voluntary means.	6. Same.
7. Assistance may not be withheld or discontinued under this title until 30 days after a written report has been filed with the appropriate legislative committees of the House and Senate which disclose the circumstances and grounds for withholding or discontinuing the assistance.	7. Same.
8. No such provision.	8. Termination or refusal to grant or continue financial assistance shall be limited to the particular political entity, or part thereof, or other recipient, and such action shall be limited in its effect to the particular program, or part thereof, in which such noncompliance has been so found.
9. A person aggrieved (including a State or political subdivision thereof) is authorized to obtain judicial review of the action taken by a Federal department or agency either according to judicial review authority contained in the statute authorizing financial assistance or pursuant to the authority contained in the Administrative Procedure Act.	9. Same.
10. No such provision.	10. Nothing contained in this title shall be construed to authorize action under this title by any department or agency with respect to any employment practice of any employer, employment agency, or labor organization except where a primary objective of the Federal financial assistance is to provide employment.
11. No such provision.	11. Nothing in this title shall add to or detract from any existing authority with respect to any program or activity under which Federal financial assistance is extended by way of a contract of insurance or guaranty.

TITLE VII—EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY

1. Employers having 25 or more employees, labor organizations having 25 or more members, and commercial employment agencies are prohibited from discriminating against any individual in any phase of employment or union membership (including advertisement for employment) on the ground of race, color, religion, sex or national origin. (During the first year after the effective date of the act, only employers and labor organizations having 100 or more employees or members, respectively, shall be covered; during the second year only 75 or more employees, or members, respectively; and during the third year only 50 or more employees or members, respectively.) Excluded from coverage are: (1) The United States, a corporation wholly owned by the Government of the United States, or a State or political subdivision thereof; (2) a bona fide private membership club (other than a labor organization). The U.S. Employment Service is covered, however, as well as the system of State and local employment services receiving Federal assistance.	1. Same except that an employer will only be covered if he has 25 or more employees for each working day in each of 20 or more calendar weeks in a current or preceding calendar year. In addition, a labor organization is covered if it operates a hiring hall, while Indian tribes are excluded from coverage. But, it is provided that it shall be the policy of the United States to insure equal employment opportunities for Federal employees without discrimination because of race, color, religion, sex or national origin and the President shall utilize his existing authority to effectuate this policy.
2. Discrimination is also prohibited in apprenticeship or other training or retraining programs, including on-the-job training, by employers, labor organizations or joint labor-management committees.	2. Same.
3. Exemptions or limitations.	3.—
(a) The title shall not apply to the employment of aliens outside any State or employment by a religious corporation, association or society of individuals of a particular religion to perform work connected with the carrying on of religious activities.	(a) Same. In addition, the title shall not apply to an educational institution with respect to the employment of individuals to perform work connected with the educational activities of such institution.
(b) It shall not be an unlawful employment practice for an employer to advertise or employ employees of a particular religion, sex or national origin where such is a bona fide occupational qualification reasonably necessary to the normal operation of a particular business.	(b) Same. In addition, labor organizations, employment agencies, and joint labor-management committees controlling apprenticeship or other training or retraining programs are granted the same exemption.
(c) It shall not be an unlawful employment practice for an institution of learning to hire or employ employees of a particular religion if such institution is owned, supported, controlled or managed by a particular religion or a particular religious organization, or if the curriculum of such institution is directed toward the "propagation" of a particular religion.	(c) Same.
(d) It shall not be an unlawful employment practice for an employer to refuse to employ any person who holds atheistic practices and beliefs.	(d) Deleted.
(e) The title shall not apply to any employment practice of an employer, labor organization, employment agency or joint labor-management committee with respect to an individual who is a member of the Communist Party or other subversive organization.	(e) Same.

TITLE VII—EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY—continued

House version	*Senate version*
(f) No such provision.	(f) It shall not be an unlawful employment practice for an employer to refuse to hire or to discharge an individual; or for a labor organization or employment agency to fail or refuse to refer an individual for employment if the position to be filled requires a Government security clearance and the individual has not obtained such clearance.
(g) No such provision.	(g) It shall not be an unlawful employment practice for an employer to apply different standards of compensation, or different terms, conditions or privileges of employment, pursuant to a bona fide seniority or merit system, to employees who work in different locations, provided that such differences are not the result of an intention to discriminate because of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin.
3. (h) No such provision.	3. (h) It shall not be an unlawful employment practice for an employer to give and act upon the results of any professionally developed ability test—provided that such test, its administration or action upon the results is not designed, intended, or used to discriminate because of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin.
(i) No such provision.	(i) It shall not be an unlawful employment practice for an employer to differentiate upon the basis of sex in determining the amount of wages or compensation paid to or to be paid to employees of the employer if the differentiation is authorized by the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act.
(j) No such provision.	(j) The title shall not apply to any business or enterprise on or near an Indian reservation with respect to any publicly announced employment practice of such business or enterprise under which preferential treatment is given to an Indian living on or near a reservation.
(k) No such provision.	(k) The title shall not be interpreted to require any employer, employment agency, labor organization, or joint labor-management committee to grant preferential treatment to any individual or to any group because of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin on account of an imbalance which may exist with respect to the total number or percentage of persons of any race, color, religion, sex, or national origin employed by an employer, referred or classified for employment by an employment agency or labor organization, or admitted to or employed in any apprenticeship or other training program, in comparison with the total number or percentage of persons of such race, color, religion, sex, or national origin in any community, State, section, or other area, or in the available work force in any community, State, section or other area.
4. To carry out the objective of the title, there is created an Equal Employment Opportunity Commission composed of five members, not more than three of whom shall be the same political party.	4. Same.
5. The Commission shall have authority to:	5.—
(a) Cooperate with and utilize the services of regional, State, local and other agencies, public and private, and individuals.	(a) Same, except that cooperation may only be extended upon request.
(b) Furnish persons subject to this title technical assistance, upon request, to further their compliance with the title.	(b) Same.
(c) Where employees of an employer refuse or threaten to refuse to cooperate in carrying out the provisions of the title, to assist an employer, upon his request, to effectuate such cooperation through conciliation or other remedial action.	(c) Same, except that assistance may also be extended to labor organizations.
(d) Make technical studies to effectuate the purposes and policies of the title.	(d) Same.
(e) Cooperate with other departments and agencies in carrying out educational and promotional activities.	(e) Same.
(f) No such provision.	(f) Refer matters to the Attorney General with recommendations for intervention in a civil action brought by an aggrieved party, or for the institution of a civil action by the Attorney General, and to advise, consult, and assist the Attorney General on such matters.
6. A charge may be filed with the Commission by or on behalf of an aggrieved person, or by a member of the Commission where he has reasonable cause to believe that a violation of the title has occurred. The Commission shall furnish the accused with a copy of the charge and shall conduct an investigation.	6. Same, except that a charge may not be filed on behalf of an aggrieved person, and that the charge may not be made public by the Commission.
7. If two or more members of the Commission determine, after an investigation, that reasonable cause exists to believe that the charge is true, the Commission shall endeavor to end the unlawful employment practice through conference, conciliation and persuasion, and, if appropriate, to obtain from the respondent a written agreement describing particular practices which the respondent agrees to refrain from committing.	7. If the Commission determines, after an investigation, that reasonable cause exists to believe that the charge is true, the Commission shall endeavor to end the unlawful employment practice through conference, conciliation and persuasion. Nothing said or done during such endeavors shall be made public by the Commission without the written consent of the parties. (The authority to investigate and attempt conciliation is dependent upon requirements set out in paragraph 8 below.)
8. If voluntary methods fail: The Commission may institute a civil action within 90 days in a U.S. district court, unless it has determined that the public interest would not be served by bringing the action. If the Commission fails to institute a civil action within 90 days, the party aggrieved may bring an action in a U.S. district court, if one member of the Commission gives permission in writing. No action may be based on an unlawful employment practice occurring more than 6 months prior to the filing of the charge.	8.— Where an unlawful employment practice occurs in a State, or political subdivision thereof, which has a State or local law prohibiting the unlawful practice and providing for legal redress, a party aggrieved may not file a complaint with the Commission before the expiration of 60 days after proceedings have been commenced under State or local law, unless such proceedings have been earlier terminated. (The period of abeyance shall be 120 days during the first year after enactment of a State or local law.) Where such State or local law exists and where a charge is filed by a member of the Commission, the Commission shall take no action for at least 60 days after referral of the charge to the appropriate agency of a State or political subdivision. (Referral shall be made for at least 120 days during the first year after enactment of a State or local law.) A charge must be filed with the Commission within 90 days after it occurs, except that where a party aggrieved has first filed the charge with a State or political subdivision thereof, the charge must be filed with the Commission within 210 days or within 30

TITLE VII—EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY—continued

House version	*Senate version*
	8 (continued).— days after receiving notice that the State or local agency has terminated the proceedings, whichever is earlier. If within 30 days after the Commission investigates a charge (whether the Commission receives the charge directly because there is no State or local law or whether it receives the charge after initial reference to a State or political subdivision thereof) the Commission has been unable to obtain voluntary compliance, it shall notify the aggrieved party. Within 30 days thereafter the aggrieved party may bring a civil action against the respondent named in the charge in a U.S. district court. Upon application, the court may appoint an attorney to represent the party aggrieved if the court believes it necessary. Upon timely application, the court may, in its discretion, permit the Attorney General to intervene in the civil action if he certifies that the case is of general public importance. Upon request, the court may, in its discretion, stay proceedings for up to 60 days pending the termination of State or local proceedings (when they occur) or the efforts of the Commission to obtain voluntary compliance. Irrespective of the above provisions, whenever the Attorney General has reasonable cause to believe that a person or group of persons is engaged in a pattern or practice of resistance to the full enjoyments of the rights secured by this title, the Attorney General may bring a civil action in a U.S. district court. The Attorney General may request the convening of a three-judge district court to hear the case if he certifies that it is of general public importance. In any case in which an employer, employment agency or labor organization fails to comply with an order of the court issued in a civil action brought by the party aggrieved, the Commission may commence proceedings to compel compliance with such order.
9. An action may be brought either in the judicial district in which the unlawful employment practice occurred or in which the accused has his principal office.	9. An action may be brought in the judicial district in which the unlawful employment practice occurred; in the judicial district in which relevant employment records are maintained and administered; or in the judicial district in which the plaintiff would have worked except for the alleged unlawful practice, but, if the respondent is not found within such district, the action may be brought within the judicial district in which respondent has his principal office.
10. If the court finds that the accused has engaged in or is engaging in an unlawful employment practice, the court may enjoin the accused from continuing such practice and may order the accused to take affirmative action, including the reinstatement of hiring of employees with or without back pay.	10. If the court finds that the accused has intentionally engaged in or is intentionally engaging in an unlawful employment practice, the court may enjoin the accused from continuing such practice and may order such affirmative action as may be appropriate, including the reinstatement or hiring of employees with or without back pay (payable by the employer, employment agency, or labor organization, as the case may be).
11. No order of court shall require the admission or reinstatement of an individual to a labor organization or the hiring, reinstatement, promotion of an individual by an employer if the labor organization or employer took action for any reason other than discrimination on account of race, color, religion, or national origin.	11. Same, except "sex" was included. (This had been unintentionally omitted in House bill.) Also, court action in this regard was prohibited where an individual opposed, made a charge, testified, assisted, or participated in an investigation, hearing or proceeding of an unlawful employment practice of an employer, employment agency, or labor organization.
12. In a case filed in court, where the pleadings present issues of fact, the court may appoint a master to hear the facts, issue a report, and recommend an order.	12. Deleted.
13. In any court action or proceeding under this title, the Commission shall be liable for costs if it loses the case.	13. In any court action or proceeding under this title, the court, in its discretion, may allow the prevailing party, other than the Commission or the United States, reasonable attorney's fees and costs.
14. Where a State or local agency has been established to end discrimination in employment and the Commission determines that such agency is effectively taking action, it shall seek written agreements with such agency under which the Commission and persons aggrieved shall refrain from bringing civil actions in the State.	14. Same.
15. The Commission may, with the consent and cooperation of State and local agencies charged with the administration of State fair employment practices laws, utilize the services of the State and local agencies, and reimburse them for their services, in aiding the Commission in carrying out its duties.	15. Same.
16. Every employer, employment agency, labor organization, and joint labor-management committee, subject to this title, shall make and keep such records and make such reports as the Commission may prescribe by regulation, after a public hearing. If any such requirement might result in undue hardship, the party affected may apply to the Commission or bring an action in a U.S. district court for an exemption or other appropriate relief.	16. Same, except that the provisions shall not apply with respect to matters occurring in any State or political subdivision thereof which has a fair employment law, to which the employer, employment agency, labor organization, or joint labor-management committee is subject, except that the Commission may require such notations on records which these parties are required to keep (under the State or local law) as are necessary because of differences in coverage or methods of enforcement between the State or local law and the provisions of this title. Moreover, where an employer is required to file reports relating to his employment practices with any Federal agency or committee pursuant to Executive Order 10925 or other Executive orders, prescribing fair employment practices for Government contractors and subcontractors, the Commission shall not require the employer to file additional reports.
17. The Commission is extended subpena power.	17. Same, although the manner on enforcing the subpena power is altered in form, but not in substance.
18. The Commission is granted investigatory authority, at reasonable times, to have access to, for the purpose of examination, and the right to copy any evidence of any person being investigated or proceeded against that relates to any matter under investigation or in question.	18. The Commission is granted investigatory authority, at reasonable times, to have access to, for the purpose of examination, and the right to copy any evidence of any person being investigated or proceeded against that relates to an unlawful employment practice covered by this title and is relevant to the charge under investigation.
19. State or local fair employment laws shall not be preempted or superceded by the enactment of this title.	19. Same.
20. The Commission is granted the authority to issue procedural regulations in conformity with the standards and limitations of the Administrative Procedure Act.	20. Same.

TITLE VII—EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY—continued

House version	*Senate version*
21. There is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $2,500,000 for the administration of this title by the Commission during the first year after its enactment, and not to exceed $10 million for such purposes during the second year after such date.	21. Deleted. (See general authorization provision in sec. 1105 or title XI.)
22. The Secretary of Labor is directed to conduct a special study and make recommendations for legislation concerning discrimination in employment because of age.	22. Same.
23. The title shall become effective immediately, but no proceeding may be commenced under the title until 1 year after the date of enactment.	23. Same.
24. The President shall convene one or more conferences for the purpose of enabling interested persons and groups to become familiar with the rights and obligations provided in the title and for the making of plans for the fair and effective administration of the title. Those invited to participate in the conferences shall be (1) members of the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity, (2) members of the Civil Rights Commission, (3) representatives of State and local fair employment agencies, (4) representatives of private agencies engaged in furthering equal employment opportunity, and (5) representatives of employers, labor organizations, and employment agencies subject to the title.	24. Same.

TITLE VIII—REGISTRATION AND VOTING STATISTICS

House version	*Senate version*
1. The Bureau of the Census is directed to compile registration and voting statistics in such geographic areas as may be recommended by the Civil Rights Commission.	1. Same.
2. The compilation shall, to the extent recommended by the Civil Rights Commission, include a count of persons of voting age by race, color, and national origin, and a determination of the extent to which such persons are registered to vote, and have voted in any statewide primary or general election in which Members of the U.S. House of Representatives are nominated and elected since February 1, 1960. Such compilation shall be made in the 19th decennial census (1970), and at such other times as Congress may prescribe.	2. Same.
3. No such provision.	3. In any compilation made by the Bureau of the Census, pursuant to this title, no person shall be compelled to disclose his race, color or national origin, or be questioned about his political party affiliation, how he voted, or the reasons therefore, nor shall any penalty be imposed for his failure or refusal to make such disclosure. Every person interrogated with respect to such information shall be fully advised of his rights to fail or refuse to furnish such information.

TITLE IX—PROCEDURE AFTER REMOVAL IN CIVIL RIGHTS CASES

House version	*Senate version*
1. A defendant, who has sought removal of a State court suit to a Federal district court on the ground that he would be denied his civil rights in the State court, may appeal to the Federal court of appeals an order of the Federal district court sending the case back to the State court.	1. Same.
2. Provision transferred from section 302 of title III.	2. The Attorney General is authorized upon timely application to intervene in a civil action, instituted by an individual, where such individual claims a denial of equal protection of the laws if the Attorney General certifies that the case is of general public importance.

TITLE X—ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMUNITY RELATIONS SERVICE

House version	*Senate version*
1. There is established in the Department of Commerce a Community Relations Service which shall be headed by a Director, appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate for a 4-year term.	1. Same.
2. The Director is authorized to appoint six additional personnel and to procure the services of additional experts and consultants on a per diem basis.	2. Limitation on the number of personnel the Director may appoint is deleted.
3. It shall be the function of the Service to provide assistance to communities and persons therein in resolving disputes, disagreements, or difficulties relating to discriminatory practices based on race, color, or national origin which impair the rights of persons in such communities under the U.S. Constitution or which affect or may affect interstate commerce.	3. Same.
4. The Service may offer its services on its own motion or at the request of State or local officials or other interested persons.	4. Same.
5. The Service shall, whenever possible, seek and utilize the cooperation of appropriate State or local agencies.	5. Same, except that the State or local agencies may be either public or private.
6. The Service shall hold confidential any information acquired in the regular performance of its duties upon the understanding that it would be so held.	6. Same. In addition, the activities of all officers and employees of the Service in providing conciliation assistance shall be conducted in confidence and without publicity. A violation of such confidence shall constitute a misdemeanor.

TITLE XI—MISCELLANEOUS

House version	*Senate version*
1. No such provision.	1. In any proceeding for criminal contempt arising under title 2 through 7 of this act, the accused, upon demand, shall be entitled to a trial by jury. Upon conviction, the accused shall not be fined more than $1,000 or imprisoned for more than 6 months.
2. No such provision.	2. An acquittal or conviction in a prosecution for a specific crime under laws of the United States shall bar a proceeding for criminal contempt, which is based upon the same act or omission and which arises under the provisions of the act. Similarly, acquittal or conviction in a criminal contempt proceeding shall bar a prosecution for a specific crime under the laws of the United States based upon the same act or omission.
3. Nothing contained in this act shall be construed as an intent on the part of Congress to preempt and thereby invalidate a State law on the same subject unless such State law, or part thereof, is inconsistent to and contrary in intent with the purposes and provisions of this act.	3. Same.
4. Existing legal rights of the United States are in no way denied or impaired by the enactment of this act.	4. Same.
5. Such sums of money are appropriated as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.	5. Same.

S. 935, TO PROTECT THE CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS OF THE MENTALLY ILL IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, a few days ago this body fashioned the first link in what I hope will soon be a long and strong chain of constitutional protections for a sorely neglected group in our society. I refer to the unanimous consent of the Senate in passing Senate bill 935, to protect the constitutional rights of the mentally ill of the District of Columbia. Because of the significance of this measure, not only to the fields of law and medicine, but also to the immediate preservation of individual rights which may be jeopardized by delay, I hope the House accords prompt and favorable consideration to S. 935.

This bill is the result of a 3-year study by the Constitutional Rights Subcommittee, during which we had the advice and assistance of those in the fields of law, medicine, and psychiatry who have felt keenly the problems of the mentally ill, and have diligently sought solutions to them. Tribute should be paid especially to Judge Alexander Holtzoff, of the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia; Dr. Winfred Overholser, former Superintendent of St. Elizabeths Hospital, and Dr. Dale Cameron, the present Superintendent; Colman B. Stein, president of the District of Columbia Association for Mental Health; Dr. Zigmond M. Lebensohn; Richard Arens; Dr. V. Terrell Davis, of the National Association of State Mental Health Program Directors; Mrs. Gladys Harrison; Hyman Smollar; Hugh J. McGee; Charles B. Murray; Charles Halleck; Dr. Jack Ewalt, of the American Psychiatric Association; Dr. Francis J. Braceland; Judge John Biggs, Jr., of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit; Dr. Manfred Guttmacher, chief medical officer of the Supreme Bench in Baltimore; Judge Shephen S. Chandler, U.S. District Court for the Western District of Oklahoma; Dr. Thomas S. Szasz; Dr. Morton Birnbaum; and many others.

A highly qualified and capable staff was the driving force behind the study. In addition to the present staff members, we appreciate particularly the dedicated services of Mrs. Elyce Zenoff Ferster, Mrs. Linda Rosenberg Sher, and the late Curtis Johnson, all former members of the subcommittee staff. The able assistance of Robert Louthian, of the Legislative Counsel's Office, was invaluable.

The Senate can be proud of this bill. As a leading psychiatrist told me recently, it is one of the finest bills in this field ever presented to a legislative body. I am proud to have taken part in the efforts which produced it.

Although it applies only to the District of Columbia, I think this bill may well serve as a model for revision of State laws relating to the mentally ill. During the subcommittee hearings in 1961, representatives of the medical, psychiatric and legal professions described for us the difficulties of working under laws and procedures which they called archaic and cumbersome. Our investigation pointed up the fact that while the problems are acute in many States, the District of Columbia has some of the least desirable procedures in the United States for protecting the legal and medical rights of the mentally ill patient.

On the basis of the recommendations then made to the subcommittee, a measure was drafted to meet the most urgent needs of the District. I introduced it in the 87th Congress as S. 3261, and again this year as S. 935. The bill constitutes a much needed revision of the various District laws which have been enacted and amended in piecemeal fashion for over half a century.

Let me summarize the important changes it makes. First, it protects the personal and civil rights of patients, by separating judicial findings of the need for hospitalization from a finding of incompetency. This means that Congress for the first time recognizes that mental illness does not necessarily mean that one lacks the ability to exercise his rights.

Much of the concern over the rights of individuals who are hospitalized stops short at the door of the hospital. What happens to the patient inside is often a closed book, since he may be so shorn of his rights that his story never reaches the outside world. Deprived of communication privileges, of visitation rights, of the power to protest against physical restraints, of the capacity to seek release, and more important, sometimes of his moral right to medical treatment, the mentally ill patient may become nothing more than a statistic.

S. 935 gives a remedy for this in the District, by providing a "bill of rights" for patients after they enter a hospital, as well as before. Furthermore, again for the first time, Congress is according legislative recognition to the moral right to medical treatment for the mentally ill patient whom society sends to a hospital.

The subcommittee has heard witnesses testify to the shocking fact that institutionalized patients often receive only custodial care, and may go for months without seeing a doctor. As yet there is no legal precedent for enforcing the right of a patient to treatment. The argument is valid, however, that to deprive a person of liberty on the ground that he is in need of treatment, and then to deny him that treatment, is tantamount to a denial of due process. Hampered as the medical and psychiatric professions are by inadequate facilities, apathetic legislatures, low appropriations, and a low ratio of doctors to patients, the concept of a right to treatment is still essentially a moral issue. Yet, S. 935 is the first Federal step toward its achievement. It provides that any person hospitalized by court order shall be entitled to an examination of his condition periodically. He is entitled to have a physician of his choice participate; and if the patient is indigent, the Department of Public Health will pay for the doctor. Provision is made for review of these medical reports, and for release of the patient if the patient is no longer mentally ill to the extent that he is likely to injure himself or others if not hospitalized. Dr. Morton Birnbaum, who contributed to the subcommittee study, recently told a session of the American Medical Association that recognition of this right would improve the ratio of patients to doctors in State institutions, and would prevent such institutions from becoming dumping grounds for those who are simply elderly and infirm or otherwise inadequately prepared to cope with life outside.

One of the most significant features of the bill is the emphasis it places on voluntary admission procedures. Over 200 patients are admitted voluntarily to St. Elizabeths Hospital each year, but present District law gives the Superintendent discretion to refuse anyone who applies for admission. By requiring him to admit all voluntary applicants who are shown by examination to need hospitalization, the bill gives voluntary patients the same status as those hospitalized through court order.

Many times, the subcommittee was told, cumbersome, legalistic procedures which might prove embarrassing and distressing to the patient and his relatives, will prevent early treatment of a patient. By easing the way for voluntary admissions, this bill will encourage early treatment. Nonjudicial procedures established by the bill allow admission of a patient who, for one reason or another, lacks the capacity to apply for hospitalization, but who does not object to being hospitalized if someone else applies on his behalf. At the same time, the patient's rights are protected by a requirement of a signed statement by him at the time of admission and a stipulation that he must be immediately released upon written request.

Another important change is made in the law of the District by the provision for emergency hospitalization. Many of the complaints received by the subcommittee often arose from a disregard of the procedural rights of individuals who were hospitalized on an emergency basis by officials who had little or no guidance from a statute, and who often construed broad grants of power to suit their own convenience. S. 935 sets a specific statutory standard for such hospitalization, by requiring a belief that the person is mentally ill and likely to injure himself or others if not detained immediately.

Mr. President, these are some of the major problems the bill will meet. It deserves the support of all who would see justice done, not only for those whose cause is championed by heavily financed organizations with political power, but also for those who have few champions and whose voice is weak. This, to my mind, is the true measure of our democracy.

SMITHFIELD, N.C.: FINALIST IN NATIONAL COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, one of the strengths of our form of government is the capacity of Americans to unite in community action, to work together for common goals. Since it is a tradition which has marked North Carolina society from earliest colonial times to the present, I have always felt that the people of my State are among the world's most skillful in the art of self-government. Therefore, I take pride in sharing with all Senators the latest example in North Carolina's long history of local self-government—an example of such proportions that it has received well-deserved national recognition.

I refer to the cooperation of the citizens of Smithfield, N.C., in creating and carrying through the Smithfield plan for improving and beautifying their town. As a result of their efforts, Smithfield was recently chosen from among 9,976 entries as 1 of the 10 outstanding communities in the United States, for an award in the national community improvement program contest sponsored by the General Federation of Women's Clubs and the Sears Foundation. It already had been accorded first place in a competition with 300 other communities in North Carolina.

Credit for this outstanding honor goes, of course, to all of the citizens of Smithfield who participated so enthusiastically in the improvement program. Principally, however, it is due the Woman's Club and the Junior Woman's Club of Smithfield. In addition to their efforts in making the plan a success, it was their work in compiling a monumental scrapbook describing the history and progress of the renovation projects which focused national attention on Smithfield.

Features of the community plan, which was begun in 1961, included a million-dollar modernization of the downtown area, a residential cleanup campaign, a picnic area, an airstrip, and revision of town ordinances.

In the general federation's report "Won Among Many," Mrs. Virginia Stitzenberger, director of the community improvement program, has described the background of this community effort:

> The word "plan" has a special meaning in Smithfield, N.C. (population 6,117), where citizens developed the Smithfield plan to combat economic inroads made by nearby shopping centers.
>
> In 1957, when the Smithfield Woman's Club and the Smithfield Junior Woman's Club entered the community improvement program, they tried to persuade the chamber of commerce to help organize a community council to study the town's problems. The chamber declined. Practicing the art of gentle persuasion, clubwomen succeeded in recruiting some support which included the local press.
>
> Broader citizen interest awakened when 25 leading businessmen chartered a bus and toured 800 miles inspecting communities that had solved similar problems. Returning with ideas and enthusiasm, they launched the Smithfield plan.
>
> With emphasis on beautification as well as utility, businessmen cooperated in a million dollar effort to modernize the downtown district. A residential cleanup campaign went hand in hand with downtown redevelopment. All major organizations extended cooperation. Among them were the jaycees who developed parks. Kiwanis headed a dollars-for-scholars program which provided funds for students of all races. The senior woman's club, under the title of "Know Your Government," campaigned for court reforms, urged voter registration, and kept the women of the community informed about government action. The junior woman's club organized a community council, a coordinating body which insures continuing community improvement in Smithfield. Through these and other efforts, the town became revitalized. New industry, impressed by town morale, settled in Smithfield.
>
> Further testimony to the success of the plan is the fact that community leaders have been invited to towns and cities as far north as New York and as far south as Florida to tell their inspiring story.

To the story of Smithfield's success, I would only add that I am proud to represent such people.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD several newspaper articles and editorials reporting the story of Smithfield's successful effort to meet the problems of change in a growing economy.

There being no objection, the articles and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Smithfield (N.C.) Herald, Apr. 10, 1964]

COULD BE NO. 1 COMMUNITY IN UNITED STATES: SMITHFIELD ONE OF 10 NATIONAL WINNERS IN IMPROVEMENT CONTEST

Smithfield, riding its widely acclaimed "plan," has moved into the finals of a national community improvement contest. It is in the running for a $10,000 top prize and the distinction of being the No. 1 community in the Nation.

Mrs. Denton F. Lee, president of the Smithfield Woman's Club, and Mrs. Stratton R. Story, president of the Smithfield Junior Woman's Club, have been notified that Smithfield is one of 10 national winners in the 1962–64 community improvement program contest cosponsored by the General Federation of Women's Clubs and the Sears Foundation.

Smithfield was selected as one of 10 national finalists after being declared winner of the North Carolina division of the contest.

The community will receive a $300 cash award as State winner.

It is assured of at least another $1,000 in cash as one of 10 national winners.

Mrs. Story and Mrs. Lee said they were informed that a judging team will visit Smithfield on April 27 to take a firsthand look at Smithfield's community improvements, mainly the accomplishments of the Smithfield plan.

The top community in the contest will receive $10,000; second place will win $5,000; third place, $3,000.

The presidents of the Smithfield clubs affiliated with the general federation were notified of Smithfield's success by Mrs. Virginia Stitzenberger, director of the community improvement program, who maintains headquarters in Washington, D.C. In a telephone conversation, Mrs. Stitzenberger said full information about the winners was being mailed to the successful communities.

Smithfield took top honors in North Carolina in competition with more than 300 communities that submitted reports on their improvements prior to a March 1 deadline.

Smithfield submitted a 4-pound scrapbook compiled by members of the woman's club and junior woman's club.

The scrapbook featured the Smithfield plan, with emphasis on downtown renovation projects. Information concerning all projects in the plan, their history, and their progress was included in the scrapbook. Newspaper clippings were used along with before-and-after pictures illustrating improvements. The report emphasized the wide citizen participation in improvement projects.

The theme of the Smithfield scrapbook was "Smithfield, the Town on the Move."

A scrapbook committee spent some 400 hours preparing the report that brought to Smithfield the coveted national distinction.

Members of the scrapbook committee Mrs. Denton F. Lee, Mrs. William Barnes, Mrs. Murray Bonder, and Mrs. Joe Teague, representing the woman's club; Mrs. Stratton R. Story, Mrs. C. Harold Creech, Mrs. Donald Carson, and Mrs. Von Rhoades, representing the junior woman's club.

The presidents of the Smithfield clubs received congratulations Friday morning from Mrs. James M. Harper, Jr., of Southport, president of the North Carolina Federation of Women's Clubs. She praised Smithfield for the community's achievement in winning first place in the State contest and for its selection as a national finalist.

[From the Smithfield (N.C.) Herald, Apr. 14, 1964]

BASKING IN SUN SHOULD REFRESH US FOR NEW EFFORTS

How does it feel to be a resident of a town selected as one of 10 finalists competing for a $10,000 first prize in a national community improvement contest? Great.

Smithfieldians are proud of the accomplishments of the Smithfield plan. And Smithfieldians are encouraged to work harder for community improvement when outsiders see merit in things we are doing and point to Smithfield as a community which sets an example of citizen cooperation worthy of emulation. Surely we want to measure up to the reputation we have acquired beyond the borders of our town. We desire to be a worthy example.

Contests are means of establishing standards. Contests also engender enthusiasm among competitors—and no worthwhile community improvements are attained without the propulsion that comes from community enthusiasm.

The women of Smithfield—especially the members of the woman's club and the junior woman's club—have an abundance of enthusiasm as well as ability to get things done. They have been prime participants in development of the Smithfield plan from the start. Their enthusiasm has rubbed off on the men—and Smithfield men are doing more for their town than they would be doing if the women weren't around to do some prodding.

The women, led by Mrs. Denton Lee and Mrs. Stratton Story and a hard-working group of associates, spent hundreds of hours assembling information about Smithfield and its community improvement program. The women, entering Smithfield in a national contest sponsored jointly by the General Federation of Women's Clubs and the Sears-Roebuck Foundation, submitted a 4-pound scrapbook to contest judges. The scrapbook tells a story of citizen cooperation which was thrilling even before we received the announcement that Smithfield was State winner in the contest and one of 10 national finalists.

It's nice to be the No. 1 community in North Carolina. It's nice to be one of 10 national winners. It will be a great deal nicer if Smithfield wins that $10,000 prize.

But the truly important thing that matters is that Smithfieldians are doing worthwhile things to make Smithfield a more attractive community in the eyes of those of us who have lived here a long time and also in the eyes of the newcomers who are heartily welcomed to share our community life. The life we live here is more important than the honors we win, and the contest sponsors will say that this is so.

Even the thrill of being a State and national winner in a meaningful contest does not overshadow the thrill of knowing what has happened in Smithfield, not simply in the past 2 years but in the past decade or so.

Some men of vision were disturbed 10 years ago by the great change taking place in agriculture and its effect upon the economy of Smithfield and Johnston County. Mechanized agriculture expanded, and the expansion was accompanied by a steady exodus from the farms. Fewer hands were needed on the farms as the machines came in. Our men of vision were disturbed by the threat of declining population and accompanying community decay, but not discouraged. Local imagination and initiative set in motion a period of industrial development unprecedented in the history of this area. Within a few years, four major industries were established in the Smithfield-Selma area, providing from 1,000 to 1,200 new jobs. Old industries expanded. Some new small industries cropped up here and there. People living on farms found profitable employment in industry.

Industrial development prompted Smithfieldians to take a more careful look at their community. What they saw was not altogether pleasing. More and more our people acknowledged that the old town needed more modern facilities in several areas of community life. There was resolve, especially, to give the downtown area a facelifting. We wanted the community—its shopping area and indeed, all its aspects—to keep pace with industrial development. There was increasing awareness that the old town was inadequate for the new day.

A group of Smithfield business and civic leaders chartered a bus and spent 4 days in parts of four States hunting for improvement ideas. The group came home with more enthusiasm than the tour planners had thought possible. Things began to happen. The Smithfield plan unfolded, under the direction of the Smithfield Chamber of Commerce, with excellent cooperation from many civic groups and individuals—and from town government.

Smithfield has much yet to be accomplished. And this we must remember even as we bask in the sun of favorable publicity and a spreading good reputation that is enhanced by victory in a national contest. This is not to say that we shouldn't enjoy the basking. It is only to suggest that the basking is meant to refresh us—for that second, and third, or fourth effort. The job is not yet finished.

[From the Raleigh (N.C.) Times, Apr. 25, 1964]

WOMEN'S CLUBS COMPETING FOR $10,000 AWARD: SMITHFIELD PLAN RECEIVES NATIONAL RECOGNITION

(By Carol Colvard)

The Smithfield women's clubs have brought the town's community improvement efforts to the attention of the entire Nation and the town is now in competition with nine out-of-State communities for a $10,000 award.

The Smithfield women's club and the Smithfield junior women's club together submitted a 4-pound scrapbook depicting the community cooperation in the Smithfield plan to the community improvement program sponsored by the General Federation of Women's Clubs and the Sears-Roebuck Foundation.

Smithfield was in competition with more than 300 communities on the North Carolina level and more than 9,000 at the national level. As one of the 10 national finalists, the town is in the running for a $10,000 prize. Four other prizes will be awarded in order of place and the five communities not placing will receive honorable mentions of $1,000 each.

All prize money must be spent on the community as a whole.

Mrs. E. L. Rankin, of Raleigh, State chairman of the contest, noted that Smithfield is the second consecutive North Carolina community to place in the national finals.

The Mooresville women's club's and junior women's club's joint entry on their community placed in the 1960–62 contest.

JUDGES

Judges for the national contest will arrive at the Raleigh-Durham airport on Monday and will be met by Mrs. James M. Harper, Jr., president of the North Carolina Federations of Woman's Clubs, by Mrs. Rankin and by members of the Smithfield clubs and officials of the town.

Judges who will decide the final position of the local club after a 3-hour visit Monday are Mrs. Mildred White Wells, Lookout Mountain, Tenn., former editor of the general federation magazine, the Clubwoman, and a former director of the community improvement program; Robert C. Child, Carbondale, Ill., assistant director, community development service, Southern Illinois University; and A. B. Hamilton, College Park, Md., assistant dean of agriculture, University of Maryland.

A feature of the visit will be the presentation of a special community improvement record book to the Smithfield clubwomen in recognition of their outstanding work in behalf of the community. It will be accepted by Mrs. Denton F. Lee, president of the Smithfield Woman's Club.

Results of the judging will be announced June 10 at the General Federation of Women's Clubs national convention in Atlantic City. Awards to the winners will be made at a later date.

THE SMITHFIELD PLAN

The Smithfield plan was touched off in 1961 by Thomas J. Lassiter, editor of the Smithfield Herald. It was picked up by the chamber of commerce and the town board, which drew in other trade, social, and service groups.

The women's part of the plan was explained by Mrs. Lee who described the effort of the junior woman's club in inaugurating a steering committee of representatives from each civic organization. This group evolved into the community council.

The chamber of commerce, town board and the community council literally changed the face of the town. Sidewalk canopies and refurbished store fronts appeared.

Each of 25 organizations took an individual project. The juniors already had the community council, and the woman's club decided on citizenship. The women attended many of the planning meetings and governmental meetings, and took an active part in the decisions about the town's new look.

Mrs. Frank E. Barnes, a member of the woman's club and president of the Smithfield Garden Club, worked with her clubwomen and with the Smithfield council of garden clubs to landscape the areas around the courthouse, the nurses' home, the ballpark, and the entrances to the town.

The men, in addition to their work through their businesses, also worked through their civic organizations on such projects as improvement of the parks.

A TOWN WORKING TOGETHER

"The whole town was working together," Mrs. Lee emphasized.

She and Mrs. Stratton Story, president of the junior woman's club, summarized the Smithfield efforts:

"Smithfield suffered from the same blight as that of many other small towns because local citizens preferred to shop in nearby cities. With the cooperation of the local press, interest was sparked in a bus trip to take leading citizens on an 800-mile tour of communities that had solved problems similar to ours.

"When our people returned to Smithfield and toured their own town for comparison, they knew something had to be done. A community-development program known as the Smithfield plan was born, with the result that businessmen and the chamber of commerce cooperated in a million-dollar effort to modernize the downtown district. Emphasis was on beautification as well as utility.

"When downtown redevelopment was well on the way, citizens focused on other improvements—a residential cleanup campaign, a picnic area, an airstrip, and revision of town ordinances."

After word of the Smithfield plan had spread, local community leaders were invited to tell the Smithfield story in cities and towns as far south as Florida and as far north as New York.

In January Governor Sanford and about 200 town officials and businessmen from eastern North Carolina spent several hours in Smithfield looking over the town improvement, which over 50 delegations have come to study.

Governor Sanford praised the new and moving spirit of cooperation that set the Smithfield plan in motion. He will be there again Monday to attend the tea given at the Woman's club for the judges.

PRESERVATION OF THE PLAN

Representatives from the General Federation of Woman's Clubs, including Mrs. Dexter Otis Arnold, GFWC president, and the Sears-Roebuck Foundation will accompany the judges.

The plan will be presented to the group as soon as they arrive from Raleigh, by Harold Creech, chamber of commerce manager, and Joe Grimes; the men are cochairmen of the Smithfield plan steering committee. Lassiter will review the economic conditions that gave rise to the plan and the needs for further community development.

Other Monday afternoon events include a walking and bus tour of the town and a question and answer period conducted by Mrs. Story to clarify information about the improvements.

Special displays of projects not easily accessible, such as Bentonville restoration and Harper House, are being prepared by club members.

[From the Smithfield (N.C.) Herald, June 12, 1964]

SMITHFIELD AT ATLANTIC CITY: IN LIMELIGHT, BUT NOT AS NO. 1

Smithfield received national recognition at Atlantic City, N.J., this week, even though Smithfield did not win one of the top three prizes awarded in the community improvement program of the General Federation of Women's Clubs and the Sears-Roebuck Foundation.

As 1 of 10 national finalists in the improvement contest, Smithfield was in the limelight at the 73d annual convention of the general federation.

Smithfield's entry in the contest, which featured the Smithfield plan, was sponsored by the Smithfield Woman's Club and the Smithfield Junior Woman's Club.

Mrs. Denton Lee, president of the senior club, appearing in behalf of both Smithfield clubs, received recognition, symbolic of Smithfield's success, from Mrs. Dexter Otis Arnold, president of the general federation, and James T. Griffin, president of the Sears-Roebuck Foundation.

Mrs. Arnold also presented Mrs. Lee with a miniature Statue of Liberty, symbolizing the significant role of community improvement in "Strengthening the Arm of Liberty," theme of Mrs. Arnold's general federation administration in the past 2 years.

A check for $1,000, to be used for further community improvement under rules of the program, will be presented to the Smithfield clubs in a local ceremony on a date yet to be announced.

The top prize in the national contest—$10,000—was awarded to Leavenworth, Wash., for sparking an organization which brought together a divided community to solve grave economic and educational problems.

The second prize—$5,000—went to Grafton, W. Va., for leading a survival program which lured new industry to "the town that refused to die."

Indianapolis, Ind., won a $3,000 third prize for leading an anticrime crusade and a program which brought hundreds of dropouts back to school.

The $1,000 prizewinners, in addition to Smithfield, were Windsor, Calif.; Elmhurst, Ill.; Camden, Maine; East Concord, N.H.; Pawhuska, Okla.; and Balmorhea, Tex.

[From the Smithfield (N.C.) Herald, June 12, 1964]

Smithfield Did Not "Lose" the National Contest

The news from Atlantic City, on the outcome of the community improvement contest sponsored by the General Federation of Women's Clubs and the Sears-Roebuck Foundation, was not what we in Smithfield had hoped it would be. But let no one say Smithfield "lost" the contest.

We didn't become the No. 1 community in the Nation.

But—we finished among the top 10 communities in the Nation. And that is no ordinary achievement, when you consider that almost 10,000 U.S. communities were entered in the competition.

We were judged to be the No. 1 community in North Carolina. And that's a pretty good ranking, when you consider the spirit of North Carolina communities. We live in an improvement-minded State.

The news release which came from Atlantic City to the Smithfield Herald was appropriately worded. The lead sentence did not say "Smithfield lost the national community improvement contest." The lead sentence declared that the Smithfield Woman's Club and the Smithfield Junior Woman's Club "were honored" Wednesday night at the General Federation's 73d annual convention for Smithfield's being among the national finalists.

We in Smithfield should be proud of the community spirit that produced "the Smithfield plan," proud of the women's clubs for the role they have played in development of that community spirit, proud of Smithfield's national ranking in the General Federation's improvement program. But let our pride not become something to rest upon. Let it be something to build upon.

It is time to take a fresh look at "the Smithfield plan." What projects have been completed? What projects yet unfulfilled need pushing? Does the plan have any deadwood that ought to be removed? What new projects should be added?

The honors we have won and the favorable reputation we have received as a result of the Smithfield plan give us delight. But more valuable than national honor or favorable reputation is the actual accomplishment of worthwhile community improvements through the coordinated efforts of civic organizations and community minded individuals.

Let's keep the Smithfield plan alive and kicking—and growing.

ALBERT COATES HONORED BY NORTH CAROLINA BAR

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, in 1935, Roscoe Pound, then dean of the Harvard Law School, wrote:

> I doubt whether anything which has taken place in connection with American government in the present century is as significant as the movement for planned, intelligent, official, and administrative cooperation which began some years ago in North Carolina, and has now taken on enduring form in the Institute of Government.

North Carolina's Institute of Government was established to study government at every level from the township to the State, including the best methods for cooperation with the Federal Government. The knowledge thus gained by its highly trained staff is made available to public officials through schools, publications, legislative journals, guidebooks, reference services, and special reports done for the Governor on any requested problem.

The institute is a product of the unrelenting dedication, tenacity, and plain hard work of one man: Albert Coates. It is impossible for the citizens of North Carolina to thank him enough for the contributions he has made to good government in our State.

Last week, Albert Coates received the North Carolina Bar Association's fourth annual John J. Parker Award given for distinguished service in the field of jurisprudence,

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "Institute of Government Founder Honored by Bar," published in the June 20, 1964, edition of the Raleigh News & Observer, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Institute of Government Founder Honored by Bar

MYRTLE BEACH, S.C.—Albert Coates, founder of the Institute of Government at Chapel Hill, was honored Friday night by the North Carolina Bar Association.

Coates, who retired in 1952, received the association's fourth annual John J. Parker Award given for distinguished service in the field of jurisprudence.

Beverly C. Moore, of Greensboro, chairman of the awards committee, made the presentation at a banquet session of the association convention.

Coates started the Institute of Government about 1929, using his own classroom and offices at the University of North Carolina.

At the time of his retirement, the institute had its own building, 24 assistant directors and other personnel carrying on a program of training, teaching, and research work on public law and government for cities, counties, and the State.

New York Attorney James B. Donovan, who was scheduled to speak Friday night, could not attend due to illness.

Earlier, in a panel discussion, three superior court judges and three attorneys agreed there is a need for reducing the time required for selecting a jury. They also cited a need for improvement in the quality of prospective jurors brought into the courtroom.

The panel also heard a report that many North Carolina judges expect to begin permitting trial attorneys to make opening statements to the jury before beginning trial of a case.

Participating on the panel, discussing trial practices, were Judges Leo Carr, of Burlington, Walter J. Bone, of Nashville, and Henry A. McKinnon, of Lumberton. The attorneys of the panel were David M. Britt, of Lumberton, James L. Newsom, of Durham, and Robert D. Rouse, of Farmville.

At a meeting of the young lawyers division, F. Gordon Battle, of Chapel Hill, was elected chairman.

The convention will end Saturday with the election of officers.

INDEPENDENCE DAY ADDRESS BY SENATOR HOLLAND

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President last Saturday, July 4, 1964, I had the honor to deliver an address at the Independence Day celebration put on by the civic and public bodies at my hometown, Bartow, Fla.

I ask unanimous consent to have the text of my speech printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Address Delivered by Senator Spessard L. Holland July 4, 1964, Peace River Park, Bartow, Fla.

Today we celebrate the 188th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence. We have come a long, long way since that distant day when thirteen small and weak Colonies solemnly declared their independence from Great Britain. Meanwhile, the history of our Nation has become the world's greatest success story.

Our forefathers succeeded in the Revolutionary War in which—with great help from France—they won by armed force and superb courage the freedom which they had declared in 1776.

They succeeded in the long effort to establish a permanent national organization which culminated in the adoption of the Federal Constitution and the beginning of our new National Government in March 1789.

They succeeded in retaining our independence in the War of 1812 with the mother country.

Temporarily divided, they lived painfully but courageously through the terrible Civil War of the 1860's and the tragic era of Reconstruction which followed.

Again united, they succeeded in building an ever more powerful nation. They successfully served the cause of freedom in the Spanish-American War and the two great World Wars, where the sons of the North and of the South served together, shoulder to shoulder.

Through the devoted fighting of millions of men and the dedicated service of millions of men and women, earlier Americans have succeeded in preserving and strengthening our country. What a debt of gratitude we Americans of this day owe to all Americans who have served our country so valiantly during these 188 years—a period of three average lifetimes.

We are enriched today by the fact that we have among us 22 million veterans who have served in the uniforms of our Armed Forces and who now still serve their Nation, working in hundreds of peaceful pursuits. They know something about what it means to fight to preserve freedom for ourselves and for others who also want to be free.

We have become not only the strongest force for freedom in the world, but also the mightiest power from every standpoint that the world has yet seen.

Our population has exploded from a little over 3 million in the beginning to 190 million now.

Our vast territory, extending from Florida to Alaska and from Maine to Hawaii, embraces in the 50 States the richest combination of material resources to be found anywhere in the world.

Our agricultural capacity is the marvel of the world, producing food for our people to enjoy the highest standard of living of all the nations as well as an abundance to go to poorly fed millions elsewhere.

Our industrial capacity is far the greatest that the world has ever seen, built as it is upon the principle of free enterprise and a responsible and highly skilled labor force.

Our financial strength has made us the most powerful force for additional development, both at home and on a worldwide basis.

Our inventive and scientific genius has kept us in the forefront of this modern and fast-moving world.

Surely this vast complex of human and material resources which is now the United States of America must make every American proud of his citizenship, proud that he can call himself an American. And surely we must realize at the same time that more than human genius has been required to make such a success of our great American adventure. I hope that every American tempers his pride with the feeling of humility and thanksgiving that comes with knowledge of the fact that a greater force than our own has played a necessary part in the development of this great Nation.

There are those who think that recent decisions of our Supreme Court can take us away from the close reliance upon the Divine Creator which this Nation has always recognized. I think that they will feel differently if they come to the Senate or the House of Representatives and note that each day the session begins with prayer. They need to go to a presidential inauguration and to see how every new President, and for that matter the whole Nation, becomes a suppliant for divine guidance through the prayerful intercession of devout religious leaders of many diverse faiths. They will be helped by remembering that in all of the Armed Forces the kindly services of chaplains are regarded as vitally necessary. They should recall that in all of the great fundamental documents of our Nation—the Declaration of Independence—the Constitution—the constitutions of our various States—and many official mottos, creeds, songs, and symbols our dependence upon the Great Creator is recognized over and over again.

If they could see at one glance the tens of thousands of church spires which dot the vast expanse of this country throughout its length and breadth and could look at one time into the faces of the millions of worshipers who gather there weekly they would realize that the religious bent of this great Nation has not been lost but that instead it remains a vital and permanent part of the soul of America. You can no more take the religion out of America than you can take the warmth away from the bright light of Florida sunshine.

And so, each of us on this Fourth of July can and should rejoice in the strength of our Nation, and in its high stature among the nations of the earth. Each of us should feel deep personal pride and gratitude to be one of its citizens.

But, along with these pleasurable feelings, we must remember our responsibilities as citizens to participate fully in sustaining the Nation in its efforts to solve the unprecedented problems which confront us, both in the field of foreign affairs and on the homefront. These problems, far too many to mention here, point up the positive need for active participation of every good citizen in the affairs of his government. We should keep ourselves informed to the fullest degree possible and then, on the basis of that information, we should perform the manifold duties of citizenship in such a way as to do our personal part in maintaining our hard-won freedom and preserving our high degree of individual opportunity and prosperity.

The fact which causes greatest concern at this critical moment is that there are too many divisions among us. Whether it be conservatives against liberals, Republicans against Democrats, capital against labor, country people against city dwellers, divisions on racial, religious, or regional lines, we frequently take them so seriously as to undermine our capacity to work together to advance our country's good. Almost every citizen is a patriot in time of war but pure patriotism in time of peace becomes a much more difficult matter because of these many divisions which exist among us and because of our preoccupation in our own selfish interests. What we must be thinking about much more seriously today in these difficult and confusing times, is the welfare of our beloved Nation as a whole.

And so, on this Independence Day I hope that all of us will think seriously on how we can best show by our daily constant interest in the affairs of our Nation, our State, our county, our community, that we recognize our personal responsibility as very great and our own influence as a force which must be continuously exerted if the Nation is to continue to advance and prosper as it should.

I am sure that most of us have thought many times today about the fact that the so-called civil rights bill which deals with the racial division among Americans, which has reached serious proportions, has just been signed by President Johnson, thus becoming the first major law in the field of civil rights to be enacted since the Reconstruction days of almost 100 years ago. The mention of this new law is not a pleasant subject. Everyone here knows that many of the contents of this law are as distasteful to your speaker as to any citizen who is here for this celebration. I vigorously opposed it on the floor of the Senate for 83 days. I deeply feel that coercive and compulsory legislation in such a field as this is wholly inappropriate to carry out the desired results. For we cannot, by coercion, make people like each other better or work and live together more cordially.

But the fact is that the civil rights bill has now passed the Congress in the regular way prescribed by our Constitution. It has passed by a large majority of both Houses, has been signed by the President, and has become a part of our law. In spite of our long and vigorous objections, a large majority of the Congress has passed it and it is clear that, at least as of this time, a large majority of the people of our country have approved it.

Some of this law is good and acceptable. Much of it in my opinion is bad and unconstitutional, unreasonable, unfair to the Southland or difficult, if not, impossible, of enforcement. We have the clear right to attempt by persuasion to repeal those portions which we do not approve. We have both the right and the duty to challenge in the courts those portions which we think are unconstitutional. But as law-abiding citizens we have no right to defy it and no choice but to obey this new and highly distasteful law. Several of its more controversial features have already been ruled upon by the courts such as the question of segregated public schools and the question of segregated use of public property. Other most objectionable features such as the so-called public accommodations title and the FEPC or equal employment practices title will be promptly subjected to vigorous court challenges.

I believe that the pendulum of our national philosophy has swung too far to the left—too far to the side of too great haste—too great coercion—too little persuasion, tolerance, and understanding. I believe that it will swing back, inevitably, and that the final standards which will determine the basis on which the two races will live together peaceably in our Nation must depend upon what both races find to be tolerable.

In the meantime, I hope we shall not resort to bitterness—much less to violence of any kind—and I hope we shall always recall that when good citizens do not obey the law they help to bring about a breakdown of government. This is a time for patience, restraint, self-control and tolerance. Somehow I feel that even in this difficult hour our Florida people, both white and colored, will respond in a very fine way to this challenge and that we shall have a minimum of difficulties in our good and lovely State.

This is a time for confidence in ourselves as well as confidence in our Nation. In my last remarks in the debate on the civil rights bill, shortly before the final vote in the Senate, I included a brief statement expressing my complete confidence in what would happen in the South after passage of the bill. I shall repeat that statement here and I hope that it will express the feelings of most of us. I said there on the Senate floor, and I quote:

"If I may speak for a moment about the area which I represent in part—the great Southland—which for the first three-quarters of a century of our Nation furnished so much of its leadership—I must say that we will not only survive this experience, but we will come through with flying colors, with continued development and prosperity, with continued biracial progress in many fields through conscientious and continuing efforts, and I believe without much of the disorder and lawlessness which has already reared its ugly head in other parts of the Nation and which I fear will vastly increase."

If there has ever been a time when we need to draw the utmost of inspiration from the events of that original Fourth of July when a small group of dedicated and courageous men in Philadelphia, representing that tiny string of Thirteen Colonies along the Atlantic seaboard, dared to sign the document by which they severed the bonds existing between those Colonies and the mother country, that time is right now. Sitting in Independence Hall, after many weeks of consideration of the supremely serious step which they were taking, they signed that document, our Declaration of Independence, which has been the forerunner of the many revolutions by which since that time men have claimed their freedom in countless places all around the world. They took that serious action with no illusions as to the danger which it might bring to themselves if the effort which they launched there should fail. They knew that their act would be regarded as treason by the mother country and that it could involve forfeiture of property and of life, itself.

But, as the concluding sentence of that historic declaration, just before their own signatures, Thomas Jefferson, Benjamin Franklin, John Adams and their heroic associates, appended this famous statement whose words shall never be forgotten by free men everywhere and particularly by all Americans: "And for the support of this Declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of divine providence, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes and our sacred honor."

It is upon their action that day and upon that foundation that our Nation has been built and has written in its history, as I have said earlier, the greatest success story of all times.

As we think of that day and that imperishable act, as we recall the ringing in old Philadelphia of the bells of liberty—whose sound has been heard round the world and will never cease to ring clearly in the ears of free men everywhere—perhaps we may better realize how resolutely we must meet the challenges of the hour which confront us and which must be solved in such a way as to allow our Nation to continue to be the shining star of freedom to which the eyes of free men everywhere are lifted with hope and confidence. We must write new chapters to add to that American story—the greatest success story of all times.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

A TRIBUTE TO A GREAT AMERICAN: HUBERT HUMPHREY

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, a fine appraisal of our able and beloved majority whip, Hubert Humphrey, appears in a series on vice-presidential candidates in the current issue of the New Republic.

It brings out what those who know Hubert Humphrey have long appreciated—that with all his fervor and enthusiasm, dynamism and effective leadership, he is not only a most kindly but also basically a modest person. He is an unselfish individual who leans over backward in the matter of fairness and considerateness, and often prefers to yield the credit for his accomplishments to others and to ascribe successes in no small degree attributable to him most generously to those who have at times had a later, and perhaps a lesser, part in them.

As William V. Shannon's article points out, Hubert Humphrey was the originator of such important legislation, for which he has received little recognition or credit. Shannon properly mentions, as among the great ideas which in large part were inspired by Hubert Humphrey, the Peace Corps, the nuclear test ban treaty, and the drive for disarmament. These are major achievements, any one of which taken alone would cause Hubert Humphrey's service in public life to be rated as outstanding and unforgettable. But there is much, much else besides. Few indeed are the worthwhile legislative measures enacted by the Congress during the last 15 years in the enactment of which he has not played a significant part. Few are the good and enduring causes to which he has not contributed his eloquent and meaningful support.

Those who observed his gallant and good-humored conduct throughout the long, gruelling civil rights battle, which his tenacious and dedicated leadership brought to a successful conclusion, appreciate his unique genius and the nobility of his conduct.

I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled: "Why Humphrey Gets Taken for Granted," written by William V. Shannon and published in the current issue of the New Republic, be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Why Humphrey Gets Taken for Granted

Men now campaign for the Vice-Presidency in much the same manner that candidates ran for President in the 19th century. They disclaim any active interest in the office and they make no canvass. But they write careful letters, make foreign tours, encourage their friends to organize in their behalf, give interviews to sympathetic journalists, receive delegations, and keep themselves in constant readiness.

Hubert Humphrey jokes about this discreet jockeying: "Just look at what's happened. The President sent Bobby Kennedy to the Far East. He sent Sargent Shriver to deliver a message to the Pope. Adlai Stevenson got to escort Mrs. Johnson when she went to the theater in New York. So I asked the President, 'Who's going to enroll Lynda Bird in George Washington University? I'll volunteer'."

Although he tries to joke about it, this oblique and old-fashioned approach to office-seeking presents a serious problem for Humphrey. By nature, he finds coyness and pretense not only alien but almost impossible to practice—no matter what his keen mind tells him he should do. Moreover, this business of seeking the Vice-Presidency while seeming not to do so hits him on his weakest front—the matter of style. In more than 15 years in national politics, he has been an astonishing success in matters of substance but he has as often as not flunked questions of style. Perhaps no other major politician suffers so great a disparity between the high quality and broad range of his legislative and political accomplishments and the general public's misapprehension of him and his record.

The image is of a glib, clever, somewhat superficial, youngish politician who is long on talking but short on doing, facile with quick solutions but deficient in sober judgment and thoughtfulness. Set forth starkly in this way, this stereotype of Humphrey is self-evidently a grotesque misrepresentation. Yet elements of this caricature in one form or another have entered the public thinking about Humphrey and damaged him.

To trace this stereotype to its origins is to learn once again about the power of words in politics. Humphrey, who is interested in this as in most other aspects of the human comedy, used to point out during his long, running battle with former Agriculture Secretary Ezra Benson that the predominantly urban and Republican press put the farmers at an initial disadvantage in the very terms used to describe the controversy. For example, rival price support plans might have made different impressions if, instead of being described as "rigid" (a bad word) and "flexible" (a good word), they had been described as, respectively, "firm" and "soft." In Humphrey's own case, why not "articulate" instead of "garrulous"? Why not versatile and well informed instead of clever and facile? The basic reason is that when Humphrey, an aggressive, convinced, self-confident battler for social reform and a sophisticated foreign policy, entered the Senate in 1949, the tidal drift toward the conservatism of the 1950's was already underway. Despite Harry Truman's fluke victory in 1948, the liberal impulse was momentarily exhausted. Humphrey as a man with convictions that had a cutting edge, found himself out of harmony with the prevailing mood, fighting against the tide of opinion and events. It is no easy task for a public man to build a national career under such adverse circumstances. Humphrey almost inevitably became the victim of subtle disparagement. From earliest times, societies wishing to rest on the status quo have disposed of social critics by reducing them to figures of fun. (Swift wrote "Gulliver's Travels" as a savage indictment of his times and the world turned it into a fairy tale for children.) Humphrey, to his credit, during the difficult years of the 1950's committed none of the political mortal sins: cynicism, quietism, opportunism.

By an ironic turn, most liberals have rewarded Humphrey by taking him for granted. Humphrey, without bitterness but with wry awareness of the realities, takes note of this situation by referring to himself as "Old Available."

"The people and the organizations that believe in the things I do know they can count on my vote and that I'll speak to their banquets and help them raise money and so on. Nobody has to woo me. I'm old reliable, available Hubert," he says.

Here we get to the heart of this matter of style. Familiarity, if it does not breed contempt, is at least fatal to a sense of awe. Voters, when they think of a Presidential-sized figure, want a certain emotional distance between him and themselves. They want a touch of mystery, a hint of unexplored depths and unused potential. A certain snobbishness is at work here. That note or aristocratic reserve that has been present in personalities otherwise so dissimilar as Franklin Roosevelt, Adlai Stevenson and John Kennedy has considerable appeal in our status-conscious democracy.

If there is one thing that Hubert Humphrey is not, it is reserved. He has energy enough for two people. He is a warm, outgoing, optimistic extrovert. His is not the hardened bonhomie of the professional politician; he is genuinely friendly and open. "I've never met a man I did not like" is usually the attitude of a Rotarian conformist, but in Humphrey's case, his authentic good humor in no way diminishes his zeal. He is that rare man, the happy crusader. But this very quality makes many think him folksy and one dimensional. In this respect, he resembles Harry Truman. People think they know all there is to know about him. But do they?

CLIMAX OF A LONG FIGHT

Consider the issue of civil rights. Humphrey has not only been able floor leader these past months, shepherding the bill through the wastelands of southern filibuster and off-the-record negotiations with Everett Dirksen, but he also was responsible for shaping the present bill before it was ever introduced. In conferences with President Kennedy a year ago, he persuaded the late President to strengthen certain important provisions, notably the ban on discrimination in public accommodations. This was partly a matter of conviction, partly one of political tactics. Regarding the latter, he told Kennedy in one of their conferences: "Mr. President, no labor union ever walked into a bargaining session with management by first yielding on half of its demands."

The passage of this year's civil rights law climaxes the long fight Hubert Humphrey began 16 years ago when, as a young senatorial candidate, he made his dramatic plea for a strong plank in the platform at Philadelphia in 1948. His plea persuaded the Democratic convention to substitute his language for a much milder draft backed by the Truman administration.

Medicare is one of the major pending items on the Johnson administration agenda. How many people realize that the very first bill Humphrey introduced in the Senate in January 1949 was one to provide hospital care for the aged under social security?

The struggle for a general Federal aid for schools has been going for a generation. Humphrey has worked tirelessly on numerous bills and tried different approaches, seeking the practical accommodations that would permit breakthroughs on a front where there is so much useless religious and ideological cannonading. Not many persons, even in the press gallery, could name the author of the National Defense Education Act. It was Humphrey who, in the first surge of excitement after the sputnik, conceived the idea of linking aid to education to the defense effort. The legislation was not ideal, as Humphrey is the first to admit, but it was the only education bill to make its way through the doldrums of the Eisenhower era.

HUMPHREY'S IDEA

The Peace Corps is now regarded as one of John F. Kennedy's monuments. Without taking any honor away from the late President or from Sargent Shriver, the almost-unknown fact is that the Corps was HUMPHREY's idea. He introduced the bill to establish it on June 15, 1960, 3 months before Mr. Kennedy first took it up in a campaign speech.

Everyone knows that HUMPHREY actively pushed for the nuclear test ban treaty and got the Senate to ratify it. But few realize the years of patient, dogged, painstakingly detailed work HUMPHREY has invested in problems of disarmament. He began studying them in the fall of 1955. Early the next year, the Senate passed his resolution to establish the Disarmament Subcommittee of which he became chairman. His first memorandum to the subcommittee staff said that he wanted to "stop talking in generalities and get to specifics, to go into the most important aspects of the field of disarmament in a responsible, practical way."

In the last half of 1956, he began writing a series of letters to Secretary of State John Foster Dulles asking just what the Government was doing in the field of disarmament, and urging politely that more be done. In early 1957, HUMPHREY put forward the idea, which was then novel, that if there was ever to be a test ban treaty, the United States would have to develop a way to detect Soviet explosions with pinpoint accuracy. He held the first congressional hearings on the dangers of nuclear fallout the same year.

As he grew in knowledge and mastery of the technical complexities of disarmament, HUMPHREY began bombarding the Senate, the administration, and the public with speeches, hearings, letters, and press releases. HUMPHREY is the Capital's only rival to Lyndon Johnson in the fantastic-energy department. For example, he rallied two-thirds of his Democratic colleagues to hear him make a major speech on disarmament in the Senate on February 4, 1958. He held the floor for more than 4 hours while 22 other Senators made statements supporting the main themes of his speech. (So many important Senate speeches go unnoticed that it is necessary to organize this kind of a demonstration in order to get public attention.) This effort put disarmament on the Nation's front pages and drew the largest favorable mail that HUMPHREY has received in his 16 years in the Senate. He kept it up. During Easter week, 1958, he took the floor every day to talk about a nuclear test ban.

In 1959, he kept the issue alive by getting the Senate to pass a resolution in favor of "an international agreement for the suspension of nuclear weapons tests." In 1960, he introduced a bill to create a National Peace Agency which in slightly revised form passed the following year and established the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. He held hearings, visited Geneva to sit in on the negotiations, and kept urging action until the treaty was finally signed in the summer of 1963. Men have won the Nobel Peace prize for less.

HUMPHREY is popular in the Senate and in his party. Although he has had his share of frustrations and disappointments, recriminations are not his style. After their bruising primary struggles, he and President Kennedy worked harmoniously together. When Lyndon Johnson was in the Senate and trying to build bridges to the northern and western liberals, he instinctively turned to HUMPHREY, a natural politician like himself. HUMPHREY has frequently stepped aside, to let other Senators share the credit or because he realistically concluded they could carry a bill to success better than he could. For example, he deferred to Senator CLINTON ANDERSON, Democrat, of New Mexico, as sponsor of the medicare bill because he decided that ANDERSON, a more conservative figure and a member of the Finance Committee that handles such legislation, would improve the bill's prospects. Similarly, HUMPHREY intended to introduce a resolution this year calling for a commission, similar to the Hoover Commission, to study the effects of automation, but he deferred to Senator HART, Democrat, of Michigan, who is running for reelection this year in a State where automation is a rising issue. HUMPHREY is always willing to help raise money or obtain favorable publicity for colleagues like FRANK MOSS, of Utah, and GALE MCGEE, of Wyoming, who face hard reelection fights.

If political conventions awarded nominations on the basis of gratitude or even recognition of proved ability, I would guess that HUMPHREY would win the nomination for Vice President by acclamation.

OUR WILDERNESS MUST NOT VANISH

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, an excellent article by one of Alaska's greatest nature enthusiasts, Justice William O. Douglas, appears in the current issue of the Ladies Home Journal.

It will particularly appeal to us Alaskans, who are happy to have in Alaska the greatest unspoiled wilderness left on the North American continent—perhaps, indeed, in the entire Western World. We Alaskans treasure that wilderness, which is our most priceless heritage, and will do everything in our power to see that it is not damaged, polluted or impaired, but is preserved in its pristine beauty, abundance and mystery.

At the same time, this determination need in no sense conflict with the purpose of developing our natural resources sanely, to harness our rivers, instead of letting them flow wastefully to the sea, utilizing their potential energy for the benefit of mankind, thereby making Alaska also a suitable habitat for the two-legged species—homo sapiens—whose habitat will not be viable for man unless it has an economy to sustain him.

With those objectives, not only will Alaska's wilderness not vanish in accordance with Justice Douglas's apprehensions, but people will be there to enjoy it.

I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled: "America's Vanishing Wilderness," written by Justice William O. Douglas, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICA'S VANISHING WILDERNESS

(By William O. Douglas, Associate Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court)

I envy those who first ventured into the vast wildness of this wonderful land of ours. I have often thought that man's most exciting journey would have been the first crossing of the Appalachians, or travel with Lewis and Clark, who, at the turn of last century, went up the Missouri from St. Louis and headed west over a trackless continent to the Pacific Ocean at Astoria, Oreg. Those would be more telling experiences than a trip into outer space, for they would be journeys into man's own domain.

The hardwood forests of the East with their flowering shrubs then, as now, were unequaled in the world for their variety of species and for colorations both spring and fall. The prairie grasses of the West stood 6 feet high; green rolling hills had blue-flecked mountains as a backdrop; pure, clear, free-flowing streams were unmarred by dams or sewage-disposal plants; the wilderness bowl was unbroken. The turf had been pounded by animals' hoofs for centuries on end, and still the land was not overgrazed. Dust storms, stirred up by man's contrivances, were yet to come. Forests stood in splendor—ponderosa pine, Douglas fir, Sequoias, Sitka spruce—some so large in girth that 20 men holding hands could not encircle one.

The sacking of the woodlands by predatory man was still decades away. At every height of land wilderness extended to the horizon, beckoning man onward, transforming meadow after meadow into homesites. The abundance of game and fish, the surplus of water, the supply of raw materials, the beauty, and serenity of the scene made America from the Appalachians on westward the land that man would rather possess than any in the world.

There are few places in America where those experiences can be duplicated today. America is so interlaced with highways that it is difficult, even in the Pacific Northwest, to get 10 miles from a road.

There are of course, roadless (wilderness) areas in the national forests. The Bob Marshall Wilderness in Montana is such a place. The national parks, in spite of their "development" as tourist attractions, still have large back country. But they are mostly alcoves—hardly large enough for the present population and woefully inadequate for three times the present number that, according to the Laurance Rockefeller report, will use them in the 21st century.

The one place in America where the immense expanse and solitude of the original wilderness can still be seen and felt is in Alaska. There the Brooks Range stands several hundred miles beyond road's end. The forests thin out into slender fingers of white spruce; the tundra rolls on and on like a prairie, to a distant horizon. One who watches from a height with binoculars will be rewarded before day is done by stirring sights—fast-stepping herds of caribou; a magnificent wolf in a graceful lope; an occasional grizzly bear dozing on a sunny hillside; Dall sheep high on the pinnacles; a wolverine slinking through willow lining a river bottom; golden eagles and many other kinds of birds. There is no habitation of man anywhere to be seen. This is untamed wilderness with no mark of civilization and none of its debris. The solitude is deep and immense. Some who see and feel the vastness of this wilderness get a sense of fulfillment; others have only fears; still others, an urge to "civilize" the wilderness and exploit it.

The question is, how long will Alaska stay untamed and wild?

Getting rid of the wilderness was part of the leveling of the frontier. The bulldozer became the symbol of our power. If our other experiences along the wilderness frontier are followed, Alaska's rivers will soon be harnessed by industry and her resources tapped by civilization.

Trees are important for their cellulose, and we need managed forests for lumber and other products.

Waterways are useful for disposition of sewage effluent, and for generation of electric power.

A mountain fastness may have to be invaded for an ore vital to our economy.

Valleys and grasslands must be developed to accommodate our steadily growing population.

But the planning for wilderness is as essential as planning for parks and shade trees in our urban centers. While we made some plans for wilderness, we did not start acting until this century was well underway; and our plans were woefully inadequate.

Conservationists who wanted to reserve large areas were opposed by special interests in logging, mining, and stockraising who even to this day often see nothing but dollar signs on our resources. The result was a series of compromises, reserving wilderness areas in national forests and in national parks that are inadequate today, let alone for the 21st century. Population has multiplied beyond expectations; automation has increased our leisure time; the workweek promises to get shorter; the machines will be slaves of the new society, with everyone having more time on his hands for development of his interests and talents. Sports stadiums, tennis courts, swimming pools, picnic grounds—the demand for these is increasing. Wilderness demand is also increasing—a longing for roadless sanctuaries where people can enjoy the primeval glories that once were America.

As we pile up in apartments and work in ant hill office buildings and have the roar of subways, autos, and trains in our ears day after day, we need wilderness for release from the tensions of life.

The wilderness is the only area—the ocean apart—where one can escape the noise, din, and smoke of civilization. A boy or girl should have the opportunity to grow up in the Daniel Boone, Thoreau, or Muir tradition—learning about survival in the woods, ridding the mind of fear, filling the heart with affection for all the mysteries of the forests, acquiring reverence, wonder, and awe for all the handiwork of the Creator. Here a person can come to an understanding basis with the earth and all its creatures.

Running fast-water rivers, or exploring chains of lakes by canoe, hiking ridges, scaling cliffs, traversing a glacier with the aid of ice axes, foraging for food in alpine basins—these are ways for building character; and they are vital in the American saga. Some will not want these adventures. But the opportunities should be left for those great-great-grandsons of ours who do turn their faces to the peaks rather than to the playgrounds.

If one looks down on a map of this continent and visualizes existing threats to our wilderness as fires, he will see blazes everywhere.

Our free-flowing rivers have been largely ruined by sewage and industrial waste. A river is a "treasure," Mr. Justice Holmes once said. But we have despoiled them. The pure, clear, free-flowing stream of the 18th century has not entirely disappeared; a few are left, such as the current in Missouri, the middle fork of the Salmon in Idaho and the Allagash in Maine. But sewage and industrial waste have seriously polluted most of them. The Potomac in the environs of Washington, D.C., where John Quincy Adams and his family liked to swim, is now a cesspool, giving off nauseating odors on hot, humid days. Towns up and down the Potomac have sewage-disposal plants, but none is large enough to handle the present volume of use; all were built to serve smaller communities than the years have produced. As a consequence, raw sewage enters the river. The same story is true across the land, many rivers being so polluted they have zero oxygen, which means that not even trash fish can survive.

Even though all raw sewage is kept from a waterway, the sewage effluent may in time kill the river as a recreational utility. The effluent contains some of the original contaminants as well as dissolved nutrients in the form of nitrogen and phosphorous compounds, which in turn tend to promote excessive algae growth and an eventual loss of dissolved oxygen. When the effluent comes in small quantities, life in the river may flourish. But the balance is a delicate one, and the effect of sewage effluent is cumulative. Detergents add to the problem. "Hard" detergents do not break down in sewage-disposal plants but emerge as foam on the water. They even enter percolating waters and artesian wells, and penetrate municipal water supplies. "Soft" detergents have been promised by the industry for 1965. Meanwhile the "hard" ones add to our water problem.

The processes for distillation of salt water and brackish water are adoptable to eliminate all contaminants and nutrients from sewage effluent, returning pure water to the river and pumping the residue to some distant point where it will not pollute drinking water. One or more of these plants would help to clear the Potomac.

Old attitudes are hard to change. But when Castro cut our sweet-water lines to the Guantánamo base, we put up a distillation plant to convert sea water to sweet water. The dollar cost vastly exceeded the cost of resuming relations with Castro. But the added cost was properly deemed irrelevant.

When it comes to the Potomac, the Corps of Engineers takes quite a different stance. They propose a huge dam at Seneca, Md., that will make a muddy, ugly waterhole out of many miles of the river, for the impoundment will fluctuate some 30 feet. And the chief purpose of the dam is to supply a head of water for flushing the river of sewage. The installation of a coal-fired distillation plant for sewage effluent would cost less than the dam, while the operating costs for water purification would probably be greater. Yet what price a pure, free-flowing Potomac? What price a stream with fast canoe waters, hundreds of swimming holes, picnic grounds washed by clean water? What price a river toward which the people turn their faces, not their backs?

Most of our rivers have been drafted into service of the country—if not for sewage effluent, then for power, industrial and municipal water needs, navigation and irrigation. While those uses are essential, there is another use long overlooked—recreation. Rivers offer that opportunity; and, when available, hundreds of thousands make use of the service. Today a joint study team named by Secretary of Agriculture Freeman and Secretary of the Interior Udall, and headed by Edward C. Crafts, of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, is surveying the free-flowing rivers we have left in an effort to establish a system of "wild rivers" to be set aside and protected for all time in their natural state. These include the Allagash in Maine; the upper Hudson in New York; the North Branch of the Susquehanna in New York and Pennsylvania; the Clear Fork and New River, in Kentucky and Tennessee; the Savannah headwaters in North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia; the Suwannee in Florida and Georgia; the Buffalo in Arkansas; the Current and Eleven Point in Missouri; and the St. Croix and Namekagon in Wisconsin and Minnesota.

Farther west are the Niobrara in Nebraska; the upper Missouri in Montana; the upper Rio Grande in New Mexico; the Green in Wyoming; the Klamath and the Middle Fork of the Feather in California; the Rogue in Oregon; the Skagit, and its Sauk and Suiattle tributaries, in Washington; three forks of the Flathead in Montana; the Salmon and the Selway Fork of the Clearwater in Idaho.

These are streams that should be guarded from all intrusions—including the building of dams—so that those who live here in the 21st century can enjoy float, canoe, or boat trips for a day or more without seeing too many other people. Visitors will be able to hike, fish, and camp alongside them and seldom know that civilization exists within a hundred miles, although in truth the nearest town or sawmill or farm may be barely out of sight over the bank.

Some of our lakes need as drastic a cleaning as the Potomac River. Lake Erie is one—a lake whose shores have been despoiled by Cleveland. Our seashores also need protection.

The Cape Cod Seashore National Park, established in 1961, has within its borders many private homes. It preserves the remaining underdeveloped acres in perpetuity, preventing uses which might make the area a slum come the 21st century. We must do the same in other areas.

The incomparable Indiana Dunes have been threatened with appropriation for industrial use. They must somehow be preserved for those whose playgrounds have now been mostly paved.

The Oregon Dunes are another pressing example; they, too, should be set aside as a national seashore before their character is lost in the developments that seem to come almost overnight.

At one time most of the beaches in California were in private ownership. The American people owned by the edge of the ocean, so to speak, but they had no access to it. The State of California several years ago started acquiring it by purchase or condemnation. By the end of 1963 about one-third of the shoreline was back in public ownership, but the price had jumped to $1,600 a foot or $133-plus an inch. (Some Lake Tahoe beach frontage sells for $2,000 a foot or $166 an inch.) Point Reyes in California was acquired as a National Seashore in 1962. As one travels the Pacific beaches north from San Diego to the Juan de Fuca Strait, he finds that most have been invaded by roads, billboards, hotdog stands, and other marks of "civilization."

Individual homes and indeed whole communities cling to highlands above the beaches; shops and filling stations are everywhere. There are in that long stretch only some 30 miles of primitive beaches—primitive in the sense that no roads touch them, no structure is on them or overlooks them. These beaches lie between Cape Alava in Washington south to the Quillayute River near Lapush. The land east of those beaches was logged over some years ago and now is second growth, showing wind-blown Sitka spruce along the escarpment above the beaches. Red alder grows in varied stances closer to the high tide marks; they lean seaward to form an umbrella over corners of these beaches. At dawn, deer and their fawns can be seen on the ocean's edge, looking for seaweeds. Elk keep in the spruce higher up. But their tracks are also found where sweetwater streams pour through alder and bracken to the ocean. The howl of a coyote is common at night; the tracks of cougar are a reminder that one of our most skillful hunters is abroad; fresh tracks in the morning show that raccoons and skunks, who enjoy shellfish, have been abroad. Bright days are idyllic in this bit of heaven on earth; in the shade of alder one is carried far away in reveries as he listens to the soft murmur of the Pacific. On foggy mornings the headlands become distorted and ghostly.

When the storms mount and angry waves pound the shoreline, a sheltered retreat in the spruce makes one a witness to an inspiring primordial force that in a matter of seconds can move tons of earth and rock.

Though this stretch of the beach is in the Olympic National Park and though its value lies in its primitive nature, there are eager commercial interests who want to "improve" these beaches by bringing access roads down to them or along them. This proposal had some backing within the National Park Service in the late fifties. Seventy of us put on a 3-day protest hike down that 35-mile stretch of the beach. Opinion crystallized against the road. But in 1964 another hike will be held, as commercial interests working with the Bureau of Public Roads have again proposed roads along and into these seashore sanctuaries.

The threat to the Everglades—perhaps our most nearly unique national park—is also continuous and immediate. That problem starts and ends with fresh water that keeps the saw grass green, the water holes filled, and so maintains all the life of the Everglades region, from the tiny mosquito-eating Gambusia fish to the alligators. More than that, fresh water pouring south holds back the salt water that always threatens to invade.

A reservoir system that releases water gradually is one secret of the maintenance of the Everglades as a river of grass teeming with life. The rock underlying the Everglades is another. Though called Miami limestone, its technical name is oölitic limestone, because it resembles partially fused fish eggs. Lumpy, permeable and soft, it is filled with holes, some small, some as big as one's fist, some as large as a washtub. These holes hook up into a vast underground waterway.

Its chief characteristic, important to the ecology of the Everglades, is that it lies only a few feet above sea level and has low rims on the east and west, giving it the shape of a spoon. The Everglades is, indeed, like fresh water in a spoon that is pressed down into a sea of salt water. The margin between fresh and salt is narrow. Once that low rim is broken, the salt water comes in. Man has tampered dangerously with this delicate balance.

The Everglades National Park, embracing 1,529,000 acres of land and water, was established in 1947, just in the nick of time. The race was on to restore the balance between fresh and salt water. The result was the creation of conservation areas north of the Everglades Park that fed into the southern part the necessary fresh water.

But the drainage continues today—this time under the aegis of an agency known as the central and southern Florida Flood Control District, 80 percent of whose costs are paid by the Federal Government. This drainage is not only for flood control but also for reclaiming lands, once flooded periodically, for agricultural purposes.

The flow of fresh water from the north has been so reduced that the ocean has taken over most of the coastal streams. It has driven the alligators, who enjoy only fresh water, way upstream. The otter, a freshwater animal, has also been driven far inland.

The growth of population and the expansion of industry to the east carry threats to the very existence of the Everglades. Drainage today is threatening water birds and waders. As sloughs and pools dry up or recede, competition for food increases and some birds disappear. Drainage is slowly changing the face of the Everglades. As the sweetwater level is lowered, exotics come in—willow, holly and wax myrtle. A casual visitor might not notice their invasion, but methodical studies show that the ecology of the Everglades is subtly changing.

As the Interior Department said in 1948 respecting the Everglades, "The question is not one of too much water but a guarantee that there shall not be to little."

The Everglades is a national property that more than a half million people visit a year—and the sanctuary is close to the hearts of people in all the States. We must make plans quickly to preserve the Everglades. Florida will need saline water conversion plants; the Government tells us they are now economically feasible when run by nuclear energy for the dual purpose of distillation and electric power. These conversion plants will be needed irrespective of their costs, for values are at stake that can never be measured in dollars—the preservation of sweetwater sanctuaries which make Florida unique among our 50 sovereign States.

Elsewhere in the Nation, the views of rivers, bays, rolling hills or ridges are being impaired by progress. Those views are often wilderness values in a sense. For though close views show intrusions and developments, distant ones give the effect of an untamed wilderness. These views have esthetic values greater than man can create on an easel or shape with his hands.

Those who know Mount Vernon know how restful to the eye the green hills and purling river are. They are part of the majesty of the historic monument. Mount Vernon would, of course, still have sentimental values even if it were surrounded by smokestacks and factories. But though there is legal power to despoil it in that way, there is a moral precept against it. Our values are not exclusively commercial; they are spiritual and esthetic as well. So the Potomac community was shocked when the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission, an all-powerful Maryland agency, decided to locate a sewage disposal plant opposite Mount Vernon. An aroused public got that decision reversed—by persuasion. But threats of that kind will constantly recur, since our private and public agencies usually have commercial standards, not esthetic ones.

Farther up the Potomac, builders planned to erect high-rise apartments near the riverfront. These structures would have destroyed the serene, peaceful view of a river that makes up a part of the charm of the city. Those intrusions were finally stopped through acquisition by the Federal Government of scenic easements.

On a recent visit to California I was shocked to see the green, rolling hills that make up the coast range being marred by huge towers carrying powerlines. Why should not the power be transmitted by buried cable? It would cost more to do it that way. But what about the esthetic values? Are they not worth enough to be preserved at almost any cost? Ugliness is not an inevitable cost of modernity.

Planners are not always a boon and a blessing. Many of them value trees in terms of cellulose, ridges as powerline sites, valleys as sites for dams or highways. Yet enduring values are often realized only by keeping the trees, the ridges, and the valleys untouched.

As John Muir once wrote of our coast redwoods:

"Any fool can destroy trees. They cannot run away; and if they could, they would still be destroyed—chased and hunted down as long as fun or a dollar could be got out of their bark hides, branching horns or magnificent bole backbones. God has cared for these (Sequoias), saved them from drought, disease, avalanches and a thousand straining, leveling tempests and floods; but he cannot save them from fools—only Uncle Sam can do that."

Commercial interests unrestrained by biologists, botanists, ornithologists, artists and others, who see the spiritual values in the outdoors, can in time convert every acre of America into a money-making scheme.

Once Ohio had the finest stand of hardwoods that was to be found in the world. Today they are all gone, except perhaps for an occasional alcove. All the woods in Maine are filled with roads and crisscrossed by highways. The State has only a 20-mile corridor of wilderness left—Baxter State Park—and it was made out of cutover depleted land.

We have leveled the frontier so fast, we have reduced the wilderness at such a great rate, that we have precious few retreats left—apart from Alaska—and even the existing retreats will soon have to be rationed to hikers because the thin soils of our high country cannot take the pounding of an indefinite number of feet.

We have been going at the whole matter piecemeal, fighting rearguard actions, first at this point and then at another, winning a few battles, only to find that in other critical areas the road has pushed on another few miles until there are very few retreats left.

What we need is an overall plan—not one that lumps Florida and California together, or the Potomac Valley and Maine, but one that takes a whole region, such as the green hills of California or the Potomac Basin or Florida's Everglades, and drives as deeply into law as can be driven guarantees that precise areas will be kept as wilderness exhibits, now and forever. Grasslands where patridge can thrive even on the outskirts of a metropolitan area must be locked up in perpetuity. Zoning must be used to make not only the cities but also the countryside beautiful and inviting.

Plans to preserve these islands of beauty must be made by constitutional guarantee or otherwise.

Our coast redwoods (Sequoia sempervirens) will soon be museum pieces, though they once stretched in great numbers across this country, and from France to Japan. These trees are the tallest in the world, rising nearly 400 feet. They make a veritable cathedral of wilderness where all sounds are muted, where man stands humbly before the Creator. We started with nearly 2 million acres of these giants. For years they enticed but baffled the loggers, for their size presented difficult problems of felling and transportation. But these problems were solved.

A tree that took a thousand years to grow can now be felled in an hour or two. For years their timber was considered mediocre. But when man discovered that this timber was rotproof, termiteproof, easy to work, handsome and nonwarping, the trees were condemned to destruction. On the average, 15,000 acres are cut each year, the wood being in great demand. Some 50,000 acres have been set aside in State or national preserves. Apart from them, the remaining stands total 200,000 acres. At the present rate of cutting, the last of the unreserved coast redwoods will be gone in about 15 years. They may conceivably return in 1,000 years, the time it takes a tree to reach maturity—provided their growing sites are not taken over for highways, industrial plants or homes. If we are as reckless in dealing with them as we have been in cutting the trees, we will have only museum pieces left when the 21st century arrives.

Even the redwoods set aside are in danger. Torrential rains falling on adjacent cutover lands sometimes cause vast landslides. Some redwood preserves have lost substantial numbers of trees from the roaring torrents heading up on land astride the preserve. It is at last realized that as long as substantial parts of the watershed remain in private hands, the protection afforded by a preserve is illusory. The reckless methods of logging—with a loss of 6 pounds of soil for every square yard of land—makes regeneration of some redwood forests most problematical. Highways, destructive of redwoods, have been cut through the area "to open up new vistas to Californians and our millions of visitors from other States and nations."

The redwood groves are already too thin to stand the number of visitors who come to admire the trees.

"This wear and tear is becoming more serious all the time, as the popularity of the redwoods increases," Phillip Hyde and Francois Leydet report in their book, "The Last Redwoods." "Every year the campgrounds become more crowded. The qualities of silence and mystery and solitude of the redwoods' magic become increasingly impaired."

Theodore Roosevelt said more than 60 years ago:

"I feel most emphatically that we should not turn into shingles a tree which was old when the first Egyptian conqueror penetrated to the valley of the Euphrates, which it has taken so many thousands of years to build up, and which can be put to better use. That, you may say, is not looking at the matter from the practical standpoint. There is nothing more practical in the end than the preservation of beauty, than the preservation of anything that appeals to the higher emotions of mankind."

Instead of preserving only museum pieces, why don't we stop cutting now, and leave more ample areas for camping and picnicking by the 300 million people who will shortly occupy the land?

There is hardly a householder who has not seen the devastation wreaked by the modern bulldozer in clearing land for roads, in the needless sacrifice of ancient trees and unique scenic views. Every State has examples of the needless pollution of rivers and lakes, of the spoliation of scenic views by powerlines, of the thoughtless sacrifice of esthetic values for commercial ones.

Some will want to drain the nearby swamp for a factory, when the swamp should be preserved for boys who like to catch frogs, for biology, zoology, and botany classes.

Some will want to open up a 40-acre tract near or in the town for homebuilding, when it should be preserved for leafy trials where young and old can commune with nature.

Some will want to run a road along the crest of the ridge for the scenic view it affords, when the whole mountain should be kept as a relic of the original American wilderness.

It will be proposed that a beach area be zoned for business, when recreational needs cry out for its preservation as a quiet alcove in a noisy, strident world.

All communities seem to be under the hammer of progress and improvement. Yet those terms are technology's excuse for wiping out some of our remaining natural grandeur and beauty.

In Oregon there are few primitive valleys left, roads having penetrated everywhere. The one remaining is the Minam River in eastern Oregon. Lumber companies want its timber. But the penetration by bulldozers and trucks will mark its demise as a primeval place of serenity and beauty. The same fate threatens most of the remaining roadless canyons in the State of Washington. Today the North Fork of the Rattlesnake, remote, distant and unknown, is doomed to the same fate. It has few friends to defend it. But left alone, it could in the 21st century become a hiking and camping ground for thousands who would explore its valleys and canyon walls.

These remote valleys belong not to the lumber companies and the few loggers and roadbuilders who will profit from their destruction, but to all the people. They belong to the apartment dwellers in New York, Illinois, and Pennsylvania as well as to the fishermen and hunters in the nearby cities. But the question of their sacrifice or preservation will be decided by distant bureaucrats.

We need committees of correspondence to coordinate the efforts of diverse groups to keep America beautiful and to preserve the few wilderness alcoves we have left. We used such committees in the days of our Revolution, and through them helped bolster the efforts of people everywhere in the common cause. Our common cause today is to preserve our country's natural beauty and keep our wilderness areas sacrosanct. The threats are everywhere; and the most serious ones are often made in unobstructive beginnings under the banner of progress. Local groups need national assistance; and that means joining hands in an overall effort to keep our land bright and shining.

We inherited the loveliest of all continents. We should bequeath it to our grandchildren as a land where the majority is disciplined to respect the values even of a minority. Those values are esthetic or spiritual, and they reflect the principle that beauty is an end in itself and that man will find relaxation, renewed strength and inspiration in the wildness of the earth.

We should leave behind a land where those yet unborn will have an opportunity to hear the calls of loons and come to know that they are more glorious than any whir of motors.

TARAS SHEVCHENKO

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I have watched with great interest the events surrounding the erection of a statue to the great Ukrainian poet, statesman, and humanitarian, Taras Shevchenko. The ground-breaking ceremony on September 21, 1963, and the unveiling of the finished work on June 28 of this year were most impressive and moving.

Recently, many Americans have discussed the poet's life and accomplishments. He is a national hero to all Ukrainian people wherever they may be. However, as we will begin Captive Nations Week on July 12 it is particularly fitting to speak about the poet and his meaning to all Americans.

The imposing statue which stands today in our Nation's Capital serves as a reminder to us all of the tyranny of the Soviets, for it recalls their efforts to suppress all observations of his birthday behind the Iron Curtain. They have repeatedly attempted to distort his message of freedom for all peoples under governments of their own choosing. They made an implicit recognition of the power of this poet's universal cry when they removed the cross which marked his grave. The Shevchenko statue is a constant reminder of the ruthlessness of the Soviets in their unending attempts to stamp out liberty—even the idea of liberty—in the oppressed nations of Eastern Europe.

The statue serves yet another function. It is a constant reminder to the American people of their obligations to fulfill Shevchenko's hopes for liberty for the Ukrainian people and all the peoples of the world. Shevchenko wrote:

> Terrible to fall into chains
>   To die in captivity
> But worse, far worse, to sleep, to sleep
>   To sleep in liberty.

This great poet knew the danger of taking liberty for granted. The sight of this monument will keep us from ever forgetting our friends, the peoples who are now imprisoned behind the Iron Curtain. As such it is fitting that it is standing in our Capital as we begin the celebration of Captive Nations Week.

Shevchenko is a great Ukrainian—their national hero and poet. But his greatness made him a citizen of the world as well as a fighter for freedom for the Ukraine against czarist Russia. His example of dedication to the unending fight against tyranny, and his immortalization of that fight in great poetry, is a symbol of hope for all men—those who possess that freedom he fought for and, especially, those who do not but who refuse to give up the fight for liberty which he championed by his actions and in his words.

A MESSAGE FOR ALL MEN OF GOOD WILL

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, we hear so much these days about cynicism and lack of spiritual values in America that I should like to call attention to a wonderful article which appeared in yesterday's New York Times. It is a verse, inserted as an advertisement, by Mr. Eliezer Goldfarb, a 77-year-old resident of New York.

Mr. Goldfarb, a deeply religious man, was impressed by the lines from the Torah:

> I shall tell man of Thy wonderful works and the precious kindness unto all Thy creatures.

According to an article in the Times, he pondered these words as he said his morning prayers in his apartment in midtown Manhattan.

Recently, he decided to put his thoughts into action by purchasing space in the New York Times to express publicly thanks for being an American and for being alive. Undaunted by the cost—nearly $1,000—which represented about a quarter of his life's savings, Mr. Goldfarb persevered in his project.

His verse eloquently states the philosophy and religious conviction of a man whose life has had its ups and downs but who retains a refreshingly happy outlook on things.

Mr. President, I am delighted to have this opportunity not only to bring Mr. Goldfarb's fine sentiments to the attention of this body, but to salute him for his significant and meaningful gesture. It should help restore in each of us something of the faith in religion and in this country that has sometimes seemed to be missing.

As long as there are loyal Americans, imbued with the spiritual values which have made this Nation great, we need have no fear about the future. Allegiance to the fatherhood of God is, after all, the cement which binds together all men of good will the world over—and gives meaning to the lives of each of us.

Mr. President, I am grateful to Mr. Goldfarb for reminding us of these eternal truths and I commend his verse to the deep contemplation of each Member of this body. I therefore ask unanimous consent that his poignant verse, which appeared in the New York Times of July 5, 1964, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, July 5, 1964]

THANKS

Every morning when I get out of bed
I arise with a feeling of being glad.
I count my blessings one by one
And they are so many I can count upon.
Take, for instance, this land I live in:
No country on earth compares in worth
To our standard way of livin'.
Our forefathers who prayed unto God to lead them,
Have left us a heritage of priceless freedom.
Opportunities aplenty one can have the best,
All I need is know-how and the means to pass the test.

Of my friends and neighbors I can talk for hours,
Of races and peoples in this land that is ours.
Without hatred or malice we live as one
In this blessed land oppressed by none.
We have our squabbles but they are few.
In peace dwell we here, Moslem, Christian, and Jew.
No shooting, no looting by rebels depraved;
No crying, no dying by a people enslaved.
And so I pray to God I may never forget,
To thank Him each day for blessings like that.

—ELIEZER GOLDFARB.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McGOVERN in the chair). The time of the Senator from New York has expired.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered; and the Senator from New York is recognized for 2 more minutes.

UNITED NATIONS DRAFT CONVENTION ON ELIMINATION OF ALL FORMS OF RACIAL DISCRIMINATION

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the United Nations Commission on Human Rights should express the sense of the world's peaceloving peoples that racial discrimination in all its forms must be terminated. The recent meetings of the Commission to discuss the draft international convention on elimination of all forms of racial discrimination contain well-founded arguments against anti-Semitism. The people of the world must never forget the Nazi culmination of anti-Semitism witnessed in this century, or permit such practices to be repeated.

Dr. Isaac Lewin, of the Agudas Israel World Organization, ably expressed arguments for the inculsion of language condemning anti-Semitism in this convention. I request unanimous consent that a summary of Dr. Lewin's testimony before the Human Rights Commission be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Chairman suggested that the Commission should hear Mr. Lewin, representative of the Agudas Israel World Organization, a nongovernmental organization which had asked to make a brief statement with regard to article III of the draft convention.

It was so decided.

Mr. Lewin (Agudas Israel World Organization) expressed the appreciation of his organization, which represented Orthodox Jews in 23 countries, for the work done by the Commission on Human Rights and other United Nations bodies to eliminate all forms of racial discrimination.

The draft convention which was being prepared by the Commission was a document of great importance, which embodied the principle of nondiscrimination proclaimed thousands of years ago in the Bible. Nevertheless, it was essential that articles III and IV of the draft should contain a clear condemnation of anti-Semitism, which was the oldest and the most brutal and inhuman form of racial discrimination. Anti-Semitism had begun more than 2,000 years previously in the hellenized Orient and had assumed various forms during ancient times and in the Middle Ages among the nations of Europe. In modern times it was the Germans who had been the bitterest foes of the Jews. In 1841, King Frederick William IV, of Prussia, had issued an order declaring the Jews to be a colony of foreigners. Later, a legal system had been created based on the principle that a nation could include only persons speaking the national language and belonging to the same race. Almost 100 years later, on September 15, 1935, the Reichstag had assembled at Nuremberg and had passed unanimously a "law for the protection of the German blood and the German honor." A citizenship law of the same day had also provided that only persons of German or cognate blood could be citizens of the Reich; the concept of a "Herrenvolk" had thus been sanctioned by German law. Those measures were to lead to the massacre of 6 million Jews.

After the Second World War anti-Semitic propaganda had been revived and had reappeared in Germany in December 1959. That was why the Commission on Human Rights had, at its 664th meeting, in March 1960, adopted resolution 6 (XVI), which in particular condemned manifestations of anti-Semitism as violations of principles embodied in the Charter of the United Nations and in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and was a threat to the human rights and fundamental freedoms of all peoples. The Commission should not forget those courageous words when drafting a convention on the elimination of all forms of racial discrimination. Anti-Semitism was certainly not less an enemy of racial equality than apartheid and deserved an outright condemnation.

It could possibly be said that anti-Semitism was included in the general condemnation of all racial discrimination. There were, however, two arguments to justify the inclusion of a special mention of anti-Semitism in the draft convention. First, anti-Semitism was a movement which could easily escape legal formulas. There were many forms of anti-Semitism which led to discrimination although they did not qualify under a general condemnation of racial discrimination. Thus, there was an ethnological anti-Semitism represented by W. Marr, and the metaphysical anti-Semitism professed by Schopenhauer; there was also the ethical anti-Semitism of Nietzsche, who had opposed Jewish and Christian ethics as the ethics of slaves, not of masters. In fact, Nietzsche had probably been the spiritual father of the Nazi conception of the "Herrenvolk," which had led to the extermination of 6 million men, women, and children. Secondly, the Jewish people were entitled to expect that, less than 30 years after the adoption of the Nuremberg laws, and less than 5 years after a new wave of neo-Nazi propaganda, there would be an open and unambiguous condemnation of anti-Semitism in an international convention. Justice demanded that the evils of anti-Semitism should be considered as no less important than those of apartheid.

He therefore hoped that articles III and IV of the convention would expressly condemn anti-Semitism.

OUR OWN JAPANESE IN THE PACIFIC WAR

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, no greater, no finer, and no more courageous contribution was made to the preservation of the United States and to the cause of freedom in the Second World War than that so heroically made by American soldiers of Japanese extraction. Over the weekend, while reading a copy of the American Legion magazine for July 1964, I discovered a highly interesting article, written by Bill Hosokawa, editor of the Denver Post Sunday magazine section. Mr. Hosokawa records in the article, possibly for the first time to the general public, the fact that 6,000 Nisei in the uniform of our country fought in the Pacific. The article is a moving description of how our fellow citizens who are Nisei by their war-time valor will occupy a very unique niche in America's Hall of Fame. I ask unanimous consent that the entire text of the article entitled "Our Own Japanese in the Pacific War" be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the American Legion magazine, July 1964]

OUR OWN JAPANESE IN THE PACIFIC WAR

(NOTE.—Our use of Japanese Americans in the Pacific War was so hush-hush that virtually nothing has been told of them until now. Here's their amazing story.)

(By Bill Hosokawa)

One of the least known stories of World War II is the remarkable tale of the unique record of more than 6,000 Japanese Americans, better known as Nisei, in the war in the Pacific against Japan. These Nisei performed a service in the uniform of the United States that nobody else could perform—and at considerable risk of being shot not only by the enemy, but out of mistaken identity, by their own comrades as well.

To this day it is a common belief that we dared use no Nisei in the Pacific. Had it not been for the insistence of Lt. Col. (now brigadier general) John Weckerling and Capt. (now colonel) Kai E. Rasmussen, who were on duty with 4th Army Intelligence at the Presidio in San Francisco in 1941, perhaps we would not have used them.

But nobody who had the misfortune to be at Maggot Hill in Burma with Merrill's Marauders (the 5,307 Composite Group, Provisional) in the Easter season of 1944 has any doubt that Japanese Americans served with distinction against the Japanese.

Maggot Hill was one of the most critical battles of the war in the struggle for Burma. The hill's real name was Npum Ga, and it was not important before or since. Merrill's 2d Battalion held the hill against the vastly superior Japanese 18th (Kurume Shidan) Division, the crack outfit that had swept through Malaya and Burma in earlier campaigns.

If the battle had been lost, the Marauders would have been destroyed as an effective fighting unit, and their mission in Burma would have failed. The primary objective of the 2d Battalion in the battle was to get out alive.

The GI's hung on for 15 tortured days. Finally, on Easter Sunday, they were rescued by the 3d Battalion which broke through enemy lines while the 1st Battalion, near exhaustion after a 5-day march, kept the foe off balance with diversionary attacks.

There were many heroes on Npum Ga, and not the least of them was a shy, slight, bespectacled Japanese American, Sgt. Roy Matsumoto. Matsumoto had the facial characteristics of the enemy, but he was an American, born in California. Like all the other marauders, he had volunteered for the mission. Unlike most of the others he had two jobs—rifleman and translator.

When darkness fell over the jungle Matsumoto crawled out beyond American lines to within earshot of the enemy, where he lay and listened alone. One night he heard the Japanese planning a dawn attack along a lightly defended sector. A breakthrough would have been disastrous. Risking fire from both sides, as he always did on these missions, Matsumoto slipped back with the information. The 2d Battalion, placing its fate in the hands of Matsumoto's intelligence, concentrated its power at the reported point of attack.

Just as Matsumoto had said, the attack opened at first light. Suddenly the dawn was hideous with the enemy's screams but the GI's, forewarned, were ready. Under their concentrated fire the first wave of attackers crumbled. The second wave hesitated in bewilderment.

Fearing that they might withdraw to fight another day, Matsumoto leaped to his feet and screamed in Japanese: "Charge, you soldiers of Japan, charge, charge, charge."

Reacting with blind discipline, the Japanese rose and advanced straight to their deaths in the withering gunfire. After the attack was beaten off the GI's counted 54 enemy bodies; how many more casualties the foe had been able to drag back was never known. For his part in the victory Matsumoto was awarded the Legion of Merit.

Sergeant Matsumoto was one of 14 Japanese Americans (Nisei) who served with the Marauders. Most of them had equally hair-raising experiences. All were decorated, and half of them won battlefield commissions.

These men were among the more than 6,000 Nisei linguists who were trained to serve with Allied forces in the Pacific during World War II. Of that number, 3,700 served in combat areas before the surrender. They went into action with the marines at Guadalcanal. They took part in every landing in the bitter island-hopping campaign up through New Guinea, the Marianas, Philippines, and Okinawa, and finally participated in the surrender ceremonies in Tokyo Bay.

Our Nisei in the Pacific were assigned to the U.S. Joint Intelligence Center in Hawaii, to every Army division, the Marines, Navy, paratroops, OSS, and OWI units. Some were loaned to British, Australian, New Zealand, and Chinese forces. Attuned to the Japanese tongue, the Nisei were the eyes and ears of Allied fighting forces. Through their skills and courage they saved countless American and Allies' lives and helped shorten the war by many months.

The Nisei served at the headquarters of the 6th, 8th, and 10th Armies, and the I, IX, X, XI, XIV, and XXIV Corps. Also with the 1st Cavalry at Los Negros, Leyte, and Manila; with the 6th Infantry at Sansapor in New Guinea and in northern Luzon; with the 7th Infantry at Attu, Kwajalein, Leyte, and Okinawa; with the 11th Airborne at Leyte, Manila, and Cavite; with the 24th Infantry in New Guinea, Leyte, Corregidor, Verde Island, and Mindanao; with the 25th Infantry at Guadalcanal, New Georgia, and in the Philippines; with the 27th Infantry at Makin Island, Saipan, and Okinawa; with the 31st Infantry in southern Mindanao; with the 32d Infantry at Buna, Aitape, and Leyte; with the 33d Infantry at Baguio; with the 37th Infantry at Munda, Bougainville, Lingayen Gulf, and Manila; with the 38th Infantry during the recapture of Bataan; with the 40th Infantry at Los Negros, Luzon, and Panay Island in the Philippines; with the 41st Infantry at Salamaua, the Marshalls, Mindanoa, and Palawan; with the 43d Infantry on New Georgia, New Guinea, and Luzon; with the 77th Infantry at Guam, Leyte, and Okinawa; with the 81st Infantry at Angaur, Peleliu, and Ulithi; with the 93d Infantry on Morotai, New Guinea, and the Philippines; with the 96th Infantry at Leyte and Okinawa; and with the Americal Division at Guadalcanal, Bougainville, and Cebu.

They were also attached to headquarters of the 5th, 7th, 10th, 11th, 13th, 14th and 20th Air Forces. They were with the marines at Tarawa, Guadalcanal and Iwo Jima; with the Advance Alaskan Department of Aduk; with the British in India and the Australians in Borneo.

Teams of 10 men were usually stationed at division headquarters, with smaller teams on regimental and battalion levels. Nisei interpreters usually landed with the second or third invasion waves—they were too valuable to risk in the first wave—to provide instant translation of the enemy's shouted orders, intercepted messages or captured documents.

The commanders who depended on the Nisei were lavish in their praise. "I couldn't have gotten along without them," said the late Maj. Gen. Frank D. Merrill, whose marauders broke the Japanese hold on Burma and opened the land route into China.

Maj. Gen. Charles A. Willoughby, the late General MacArthur's chief of intelligence, declared in Tokyo: "The information received through their skills proved invaluable to our battle forces." Col. G. F. Blunda, commander of the Southeast Asia Translation and Interrogation Center, in New Delhi, India, said each Nisei linguist "was as valuable as an infantry company."

Because they were so important to the Pacific war effort, the American command kept them out of the publicity spotlight. The Nisei G–2 boys, as they were called, received none of the attention showered on their brothers in the 442d (Go for Broke) Regimental Combat Team which fought with such valor, and paid such a price in blood, in Italy and France. During the fighting the linguists were under security wraps. After the surrender of Japan their story was lost in the flush of victory.

Like Sergeant Matsumoto, many of the linguists operated in the front lines and even behind enemy lines. They accompanied marines and GI's on jungle patrols. They tapped phone lines and manned forward observation posts, providing their officers with instant translations of Japanese commands.

In a battle not far from Myitkyina, Burma, Sgts. Robert Honda and Roy Nakada of Honolulu, and Sgt. Ben Sugeta of Los Angeles tapped a telephone wire and listened to communications between elements of the Japanese 18th Division. They overheard reference to an enemy ammunition dump, then located it on a map. U.S. bombers soon destroyed it. Honda later operated with the OSS Kachin Rangers in the Myitkyina-Fort Hertz area for 8 months from March to November 1944. Another Nisei, T/3 Ship Mazawa, now of Chicago, commanded a unit of Kachin tribesmen in setting ambushes for Japanese troops.

Under heavy enemy fire, Sgt. Henry Gosho, now a State Department official, interpreted the foe's shouts in the midst of a battle in Burma, enabling his platoon to shift its firepower to repel a heavy assault.

Gosho served for a time in the U.S. Embassy in Tokyo after the war and is now in Washington, D.C.

Sgt. Hoichi Kubo of Hawaii earned the Distinguished Service Cross for risking his life to talk a group of dangerous enemy holdouts into surrendering. Sgt. Jack Tanimoto of Gridley, Calif., won the Silver Star for similar action on Okinawa.

Some died in battle. Sgt. Frank T. Hachiya of Hood River, Oreg., was awarded a Silver Star posthumously. Hachiya was attached to the 7th Division HQ and did not have to go into combat. He volunteered to cross a valley on Leyte under enemy fire to scout Japanese positions. He was out ahead of his patrol when a sniper shot him. Hachiya killed the sniper and, although mortally wounded, brought back the needed information.

But most of the Nisei worked in the anonymity of command posts and rear echelon headquarters at the tedious and demanding job of translating captured documents. These documents included battle plans, defense maps, tactical orders, intercepted messages, and diaries. Their efforts turned up a mass of information that enabled American commanders to anticipate enemy action, evaluate their strengths and weaknesses, avoid surprise and strike where they were least expected.

Headquarters duty alternated between utter boredom and a series of frenzied, intense, 20-hour days when captured documents were rushed back following battle. Most teams were commanded by an intelligence officer who helped evaluate the findings. Often, captured maps of enemy defense positions were translated and rushed back to the front in time to turn the tide of battle. On the rare occasions when prisoners were captured, they were hurriedly interrogated by Nisei. Lt. Kan. Tagami of Selma, Calif., with the 124th Cavalry in the CBI Theater, said the big difficulty was in overcoming the prisoners' fear that they would be killed. Once the Nisei won their confidence the POW's talked freely. Since the Japanese Army expected its men to die rather than be captured—and since they didn't expect the United States to have Japanese-speaking personnel—Japanese troops were not security conscious. "They talked their heads off," said Lieutenant Tagami.

The album of the Military Intelligence Service Language School, published in 1946, says the Nisei "translated the entire Japanese battle plans for the naval battle of the Philippines. These plans were captured from the commander in chief of the combined Japanese fleets when the plane in which he was hurrying to join his fleet made a forced landing in the Philippines * * * Likewise, the complete Japanese plans for the defense of the Philippine Islands also were made known through the work of the language specialists from the school long before our forces had landed on Leyte."

I have not been able to identify the lost enemy fleet commander for certain, but a Japanese war history says that Adm. Mineichi Koga, who succeeded Adm. Isoroku Yamamoto as commander in chief, was forced down during a storm while flying from Palau to Davao in the Philippines on March 27, 1944. Koga and several members of his staff were killed in the crash.

The Japanese were lulled into a false sense of security in their belief that Americans could not fathom the complexities of their language. They didn't know until the end of the war that every captured document was being rushed back to translating teams.

The enemy's laxness astounded U.S. officers. Our ability to take advantage of it, plus the fact that Japanese codes had been cracked, led one military historian to remark that never did one nation know so much concerning its foe's intentions as did the United States during most of the Pacific campaign.

Yet the skills of the Nisei were almost lost to the Nation by our inability to see their potential.

During the darkening summer of 1941, a handful of American officers tried to alert superiors to the importance of Japanese language specialists in the seemingly inevitable war ahead. Among them were Brig. Gen. John Weckerling, then a lieutenant colonel, and Col. Kai E. Rasmussen, then a captain. Rasmussen had studied Japanese as a military attaché in Tokyo and he knew what a difficult language it was to learn.

Both Weckerling and Rasmussen were on duty with the 4th Army intelligence staff at the Presidio in San Francisco. Weckerling later became deputy assistant chief of staff, G-2, of the War Department general staff. Rasmussen became commandant of the Military Intelligence Service Language School.

"Men who can read, write, and speak Japanese are as necessary as guns, planes, and ships," protested Rasmussen in urging a linguist program. "We do not have these men. Knowledge of the enemy's tongue, as well as the workings of his mind, is imperative if our intelligence service is to function."

Rasmussen and Weckerling knew that only a very few Americans of European ancestry were familiar with Japanese, mostly businessmen or members of missionary families. Our college Japanese language programs were elementary and had had far too few students to serve a national need. There was no time to teach students in these courses enough Japanese to be militarily useful. Even finding qualified teachers was a problem.

The only alternative was to use Nisei—the American-born offspring of Japanese immigrants—who naturally had a Japanese language background. The trouble was that they were an unknown quantity to most highly placed officials. The Nisei had embraced American ways with characteristic thoroughness. But could these youths of an alien race, only one generation removed from the old country, be trusted in battle and in highly sensitive intelligence work against the people of their own blood?

Weckerling and Rasmussen argued that the Nisei were loyal. Rasmussen himself is of foreign birth—he speaks both English and Japanese with an accent—and he reminded the others that the United States is made up of immigrant groups. As it turned out, there was never any occasion to question the loyalty of a single Nisei GI.

The two officers had trouble convincing the War Department of the feasibility of their project. After costly delays they won reluctant approval for a small-scale language school. Indicative of the Department's dim view, the school was placed under the 4th Army, which at the time had jurisdiction over the west coast, and not under the Army's regular specialized training program. The initial appropriation was for only $2,000.

Weckerling and Rasmussen had no time to be discouraged. There was work to be done. But they ran into difficulty almost immediately when they discovered that the vast majority of Nisei were too thoroughly Americanized. Of the first 3,700 men interviewed, only 3 percent proved to speak Japanese fluently. The next 4 percent could be considered fairly proficient in Japanese. Another 3 percent knew just enough so that they could be used after intensive training. And even the best of them had to be taught military vocabulary and usage.

I was among those Colonel Rasmussen interviewed. I thought I could boast a fair speaking knowledge of the language, but he quickly proved me completely inadequate in other respects. First he asked me to read a high school text. I could make out perhaps 2 or 3 characters in 100. The colonel kept lowering the standard until he got down to a level I could handle—third grade.

"Hosokawa," Colonel Rasmussen rasped with ill-concealed disgust, "you'd make a helluva Jap."

Rasmussen turned me down as hopelessly ignorant. Later, I was evacuated from my home in Seattle, Wash., to the war relocation center at Heart Mountain, Wyo., from where I moved to Des Moines, Iowa, to work on the Des Moines Register. For reasons unknown to me, I was never drafted. During the Korean war I served as a correspondent for the Denver Post, covering the defense of the Taegu perimeter, the Inchon landing and first recapture of Seoul.

A job of monumental proportions lay ahead of Rasmussen and he had no time to waste on me. Selective Service provided military intelligence with the name of every draftee of Japanese parentage. Rasmussen and Weckerling, or their aides, interviewed all of them for Japanese language proficiency. The most able were selected for transfer to the school as soon as it could be started. Two were picked to be instructors. One of them was a brilliant attorney named John F. Aiso who was serving as a private first class. Aiso is a native of Los Angeles, a graduate of Brown University in Providence, R.I., and his law practice had earlier taken him to the Far East. Aiso eventually was named director of academic training. He left the service at the end of the war as a lieutenant colonel and today is a California superior court justice.

The two servicemen and two Nisei civilians were ordered to set up a curriculum and prepare textbooks for a Japanese military language school at crash speed. Because of lack of funds, the first texts were mimeographed.

On November 1, 1941, scarcely 5 weeks before the outbreak of war, the 4th Army Intelligence School was opened in a converted hangar at Crissy Field, The Presidio, San Francisco. Half the hangar was used for classrooms, the other for barracks. Orange crates were pressed into service as chairs until furniture could be wangled from more adequately endowed outfits.

There were 60 handpicked students in that first class—58 Nisei and two Caucasians. All day and late into the night they studied Japanese reading, writing, interrogation, translation and interpretation; analysis of captured documents; Japanese geography and mapreading; Japanese military organization and technical terms. For good measure they were given lectures on the social, political, economic and cultural background of Japan.

Fifteen of the students couldn't keep up and had to be reassigned. After 6 months, 35 of the graduates were divided between the Marines headed for Guadalcanal and the 7th Division in the Aleutians. The remaining 10 were added to the faculty to teach an enlarged second class.

The Army meanwhile was evacuating all persons of Japanese origin from the west coast as a security measure. Some 100,000 men, women, and children, citizens and aliens alike, were packed off to inland camps. With the source of students gone from the west coast, the school was transferred to larger quarters at Camp Savage in Minnesota. By then the top brass could see the value of the program. It was reorganized as a military intelligence service language school under direct War Department supervision, and on June 1, 1942, a second class of 200 men, virtually all Nisei, got underway.

The rough spots discovered in the first class were smoothed out and an even more rigorous routine adopted. Classroom sessions started at 8 a.m. and ended at 4:30 p.m. Additional classes were held from 7 p.m. to 9 p.m. The academic term was 6 months. So rapid was the pace that even the more able students had to study every spare minute to keep up. Lights-out was at 11 p.m., but it was common practice to continue cramming by flashlight under bedcovers. Examinations were held Saturday mornings. The rest of the weekends were spent in road marches and field maneuvers, for these men were expected to be soldiers as well as linguists.

No one was happier than members of the faculty when performance records began to come back from distant fronts. A report from the 6th Infantry at Sansapor, New Guinea, reads in part:

"A captured map of the enemy infantry regiment was brought in by the infantry boys * * *. The Nisei language team worked feverishly to decode the vital message contained on the map * * *. We found the disposition of the troops and its future plans. It stated on the map that the (enemy) regiment would commence attacking at 2000. Preliminary information was sent to all commanders concerned * * *. The corps commanding general was informed of the hot news and he immediately ordered all corps, division and independent artilleries to point their guns at the location of the enemy. At 1945 the barrage started with all guns firing simultaneously * * *. The next morning the recon troops went out into the impact area and they found the enemy was practically wiped out * * *. That ended the campaign." What had promised to be a hand-to-hand battle was won solely with intelligence and artillery.

There was one plea common to all these communications: "Send us more Nisei linguists."

By the fall of 1944, the school had turned out 1,600 enlisted graduates, 142 officer candidates and 53 officers. Reflecting the stepped-up tempo of the war in the Pacific, the Army ordered the school's efforts redoubled.

The school was moved to even more spacious quarters in Fort Snelling, near Minneapolis. Almost without exception the students entering later classes knew less Japanese than had those in the first classes, increasing the burden on the instructors. The faculty was placed on duty every evening as tutors. Classes were scheduled 6 days a week. Many of the linguists were shipped off with a bare minium of basic military training.

Just as the Nisei as a group had to prove themselves to the War Department at the outset, many of the linguists faced individual problems in winning the confidence of fellow GI's. Except for the Westerners, most of our servicemen had never encountered Nisei before and many assumed they were Japanese prisoners pressed into American uniform.

Akiji Yoshimura, who now runs a cleaning plant in Colusa, Calif., recalls he had to "prove" he was an American by repeating "Lala Palooza" for soldiers who had heard Japanese were unable to pronounce the letter "l."

"In 1943 I shipped out on the troopship *Lurline,* a converted Matson liner, headed for Burma via Bombay," Yoshimura says. "We were passing under the Golden Gate Bridge headed out into the Pacific, when a GI came up and asked 'Say, how're things in your country?'

"Obviously he thought I was a prisoner of war who had had a change of heart. I replied: 'They look damned good from here.' He was astonished that I didn't have an accent and he didn't know whether to believe me when I explained I was a native Californian on my first trip out of the States."

During the long voyage Yoshimura and other Nisei lectured the troops on Japanese weapons, tactics, customs, and training. By the time they disembarked at Bombay on the way to Burma, even the skeptics had been convinced the Nisei were thoroughly American. They trained for 2 months at Hsamshingyang with the 5307 Composite Unit.

One day in Burma, Yoshimura remembers, he and a Nisei buddy were bathing in a stream out of sight of the bivouac area when a GI new to the Marauders approached.

"You fellows Chinese?" he asked.

Without thinking, Yoshimura replied: "Nope, we're Japanese."

The soldier blanched, and Yoshimura hurriedly assured him the proper term was

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Japanese Americans. Yoshimura fought through five major campaigns with the Maurauders, then was sent to the Sino Translation and Interrogation Center in Kunming, China, where he was commissioned.

One of the questions most often asked the Nisei was, "What do you think the Japanese will do to you if they capture you?"

They had a standard reply: "Don't know. But they'll have to run like hell to catch us."

Fortunately, none of our Nisei was ever captured by the enemy, although Cpl. Tony Uemoto, a native of Honolulu, had the uncomfortable experience of being seized by our Chinese allies near Tonkwa, Burma, where he was serving with the 475th Infantry (Mars Task Force). They took his shoes away to prevent escape and marched him 4 hours in his bare feet to American lines as a prisoner.

One of the more fabulous characters of the Burma campaign, S. Sgt. Kenny Yasui, had an even closer shave. Yasui stood 5 feet 2 inches, weighing 120 pounds, and loved dice and poker. He volunteered to go with three GI's to bring in a group of Japanese hiding on an island during the Irrawaddy River mopup.

All four stripped and swam to the island with only their hand weapons. Standing stark naked on a sandbar, Yasui announced loudly that he was a Japanese colonel working with the Americans and ordered all soldiers to surrender.

A Japanese noncom appeared and helped Yasui round up 15 fully armed men. Yasui lined them up and was about to order them to give up their arms when a Japanese officer sprang from a thicket and threw a grenade. Yasui ducked into a foxhole out of harm's way. His companions opened fire, and the officer and several of the Japanese enlisted men were killed.

Yasui took possession of the dead officer's sword, put the survivors through close-order drill to establish his authority, then boarded a makeshift raft and had the prisoners push him back across the stream, much to the admiration of his buddies. Yasui's bravery won him the Silver Star.

By the end of the war in August 1945, the language school was a smooth-running organization with 1,800 students. With victory, the school shifted its emphasis from military Japanese to general Japanese and civil affairs, for the work of the newest linguists was just beginning. Their assignment was to take part in the occupation and reconstruction of the defeated country. The last 2,300 who were trained graduated so late that all their duty was in Japan until the Korean war.

In Japan, the Nisei were put to work interpreting for military government teams, locating and repatriating imprisoned Americans, translating seized military documents, in counterintelligence, rounding up war criminal suspects and interpreting at their trials. They were as valuable in the cleanup after victory as they had been in combat. The very presence of Nisei in the occupation army contributed much to the rapid democratization of Japan. They helped to smash black market operations, evaluate Air Force bomb damage, train Japanese military police, and supervise repatriation of Japanese prisoners.

The school was finally deactivated in June 1946, after graduating some 6,000 men. Today, a skeleton operation is still maintained at the Presidio in Monterey, Calif.

Many of the Nisei decided to make the army their career and spent additional tours of duty in Japan. When war broke out in Korea in 1950, they were among the first American troops sent to the front. The United States was as short of Korean linguists at that time as it had been of Japanese specialists a decade earlier. However, since virtually all adult Koreans are familiar with the Japanese language, the Nisei once again served their Nation's needs. Nisei were rushed to places like Taejon, Chonju, and Taegu, with the 1st Cavalry, the 25th Division, 5th Army RCT, and the 27th Infantry.

Many of our Nisei of the Pacific war have long been civilians again, but others are still serving, not only as linguists but in the broader field of military intelligence.

For example, there's Maj. Ken Sawada, of Denver, who is now stationed at Fort Bragg and who spent two tours of duty in Okinawa. Major Sawada served in Australia, New Guinea, and the Philippines in World War II, was among the first to land in Japan after the surrender, was assigned to counterintelligence work and interpreted at war crime trials. On his most recent oversea tour he was detached to Thailand to train troops under combat conditions.

As historians get around to evaluating the contribution Nisei linguists made to the war effort, it is likely that a good many eloquent tributes will be voiced. But none will be so meaningful as the words that some unremembered editor wrote for the Military Intelligence Service Language School album; "Information and knowledge of the enemy obtained by these men cannot be measured in words, but by the weight of victory itself."

In September 1962, Colonel Rasmussen addressed a reunion of the Hawaiian veterans of the Military Intelligence Service, at the Hilton Hawaiian Village in Honolulu. Speaking with a voice that had the familiarity and urgency of an air-raid warning, he urged that the United States establish a National Academy of Languages at once as a security measure. Before the men he trained in World War II, he declared: "We must establish the study of languages as a total career, military as well as civilian. When I realize that people behind the Iron Curtain speak 55 languages and more than 200 dialects, it makes me fearful of our responsibilities in this area. Linguists do not appear automatically. You cannot create language experts overnight."

NOMINATION OF FRANKLIN H. WILLIAMS TO BE U.S. REPRESENTATIVE TO ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, within the next few days, the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations will have approved several nominations that recently have been sent to the Senate by President Johnson. Thereafter the Senate will take action in consenting to the service of the nominees.

I was delighted to read that Mr. Franklin H. Williams was appointed by the President to be U.S. representative to the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations. I have the pleasure of knowing Mr. Williams, mostly by his excellent reputation, but also personally. An excellent citizen, who has been active in government, he will be an excellent representative to the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, whose deliberations are about to commence in Geneva.

On July 1, the Washington Post commented on the appointment of Mr. Williams. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ENVOY TO THE U.N.

In choosing Franklin H. Williams to be the new U.S. representative to the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, President Johnson has told the world a great deal about the evolving pattern of American life. Mr. Williams is abundantly qualified for the post by capacity and experience. As head of the Peace Corps Division of University, Private, and International Cooperation and as its Regional Director for Africa, he has displayed a wealth of imagination and concern about social and economic problems.

There is no doubt that he will prove to be a lively and energetic and informed spokesman in this important U.N. agency. We think his effectiveness will be enhanced by the fact that he happens to be a Negro who has always worked and spoken forcefully for the cause of human equality. And we think that his appointment will contribute to the world's recognition that human equality is finding full realization in the United States. The President deserves congratulations on so felicitous a nomination. We hope the Senate will give it speedy and enthusiastic endorsement.

POVERTY AND POPULATION EXPLOSION—THE NEED FOR ACTION AT HOME AND ABROAD

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the war against poverty will be won when we acknowledge the fact that the population explosion perpetuates and intensifies poverty both at home and abroad.

If one may judge from indicators of awareness such as newspaper stories and advertisements, magazine articles, television programs, and a rash of informative books, residents of the United States are better informed about the world population explosion today than ever before in history. There is, of course, one big stumbling block—too many Americans sincerely believe the problem exists only in impoverished pockets of this Nation or outside our boundaries in the land and people masses of South America, Africa, the Middle East, or Asia. But poverty knows no boundaries. It will come uninvited.

Let us look at a few dramatic illustrations of the problem.

I was impressed recently by the full-page advertisement which appeared in many newspapers which was headlined "War on Poverty," and was addressed to President Lyndon B. Johnson. The accompanying cartoon showed a stork carrying a bundle labeled "World Population Explosion" racing neck and neck with a buzzard which was labeled "World Hunger." Eighty-one prominent Americans—all leaders in the fields of business science, education, theology and other humanities—signed the advertisement. These men and women urged the President to help end poverty by curing one of its major causes which they believe is the present explosive growth of population. They believe that a crash program coupling research and action, such as is proposed in the Clark-Gruening resolution, will help us and the scores of poverty-ridden nations dependent upon the United States for economic aid. The signers believe, as do I, that population growth and poverty are really not political or religious matters. The advertisement is signed by 81 prominent Americans including Frank W. Abrams, former chairman of the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey; Mrs. Clare Boothe Luce, former U.S. Ambassador to Italy; the Right Reverend Arthur C. Lichtenberger, presiding bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church; William E. Moran, Jr., dean of the School of Foreign Service, Georgetown University; Dr. Benedict J. Duffy, director of the Center for Population Research of Georgetown University; Dr. Thomas H. Carroll II, president, George Washington University; Allan Nevins, historian; Fairfield Osborn, conservationist and president of the New York Zoological Society; the Right Reverend James A. Pike, bishop, the Protestant Episcopal Church, California; and Dr. John Rock, professor of gynecology emeritus, Harvard University, and others no less distinguished.

Out at Georgetown University, the Institute of Social Ethics is sponsoring a series of summer lectures concerning "Christian Social Ethics and Population Control." The public course started June 16 and ends July 24. The pamphlet describing it says:

> The problem of population expansion is one of increasing world concern. * * * It is obvious, then, that an increasing world population poses many grave problems, problems for which the lessons from the past are inadequate as guidelines to solution.

I suggest that public lectures related to the population growth, the contraceptive pill, research in fertility control and other aspects of the population dilemma might have been obviated a decade ago. Georgetown University is performing a valuable service.

Increased population, with its implications, is the topic of three major national magazine articles I read this long Fourth of July weekend. Newsweek for July 6 carries an article entitled "Birth Control: "The Pill and the Church."

The New Republic for July 4 contains a piece by Michael J. O'Neill headed "Debate on Birth Control."

Look magazine dated July 14 has a story by senior editor Leonard Gross on "Latin American Catholics and Birth Control."

They are informative, sometimes pessimistic, but extremely necessary to us as we speed the population dialog. I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the three articles be printed in the RECORD, following my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. GRUENING. As we are concerned about overpopulation in the underdeveloped nations of the world, so should we be concerned about the problem here in the United States.

The facts are brilliantly interwoven in the book "Too Many Americans" written earlier this year by Lincoln Day and his wife, Alice, and published by Houghton Mifflin Co., of Boston, Mass. The authors have training in research and sociology, plus the insight and ability to analyze the statistics available and the trends predictable and to use them informatively.

Grim findings about America's future emerge on nearly every page of "Too Many Americans."

Our yearly population increase of 1.5 percent seems trivial. The Days point out that in no country with a similar level of economic development has the birthrate remained so high for such a long period of time. This rate means we shall double our population of 192 million by the turn of the century and every 40 years thereafter.

Americans marry early, have two to four children per family, know their progeny will have a long and fruitful life. These residents of the United States comprise 6 percent of the world's population and consume one-half of the world's nonrenewable resources. The average American consumes in natural resources as much as 25 or 30 residents of India.

The Days therefore suggest that Americans are failing to apply the hazards of excessive population domestically, although they may appreciate its perils abroad.

"Too Many Americans" contains too many valuable facts for one speech. I recommend its reading and hope it will enable more of us to realize what can happen to a nation which uses up its capital rather than its interest.

Bigger does not necessarily mean better.

The Days bluntly state:

> Population stability must be achieved if any measure of the high quality of life we Americans still enjoy is to be maintained for ourselves and bequeathed to our posterity.

In their concluding remarks, the Days say that a reluctance to undertake population limitation for fear other nations will outnumber us is self-defeating. Such reasoning is obviously specious, for were it so we would have already been overrun in numbers by India, China, and Russia.

The Days hope we can have a society in which "no unwanted child is born; the decision to bear or not to bear a child is made solely by the potential parents; and most important of all for the goal of a stable population, this decision is made in a social and cultural context in which a family of three children is considered large."

If our population growth does not stabilize, we may reasonably assume that we will lose the freedoms and privileges we enjoy today. The loss to the individual will be dispersed among many and become increasingly less. Quantity will curb quality.

We will experience undreamed-of crowding on the highways, in parks, on the beaches. Our public services will expand in size but offer less to the individual. Our professional services will be increasingly impersonal and deteriorating. As our standards decline, our urban sprawl will increase and today's wait to try personal injury cases, which requires nearly 23 months in communities exceeding 750,000 will seem short. The family wishing to visit Yellowstone National Park will make a reservation not a season ahead, but many years ahead.

The concluding paragraphs of "Too Many Americans" are worth our attention, and I ask unanimous consent they be printed in the RECORD at this time:

There being no objection, the excerpt from the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TOO MANY AMERICANS

To advocate the early achievement of population stability by widespread voluntary effort is not to predict that this is the way it will actually come about. Studies of the factors that determine family size are of such recent origin and are based on such a limited range of experience—only about two generations—that forecasts of future American birth rates really have very little to go on. We can hardly predict natality levels over the next decade, much less over the next half century. Conditions quite different from those we have recommended above might possibly arise to effect a decline in the birth rate sufficient to halt our population growth: severe economic depression (such as occurred in the 1930's) or a feeling of helplessness and pessimism in response to national and international circumstances (as seems to exist today in some of the East European satellite countries), for example. But there is nothing in our present demographic situation to suggest that low natality in a modern industrialized country like ours need occur only as a symptom of social malaise. It can also be a symptom of social health—of a condition in which people were willing to think beyond their own personal interests, and in which they were willing to modify their behavior to meet altered social needs.

Reluctance to undertake limitation for fear that others will outnumber us is only self-defeating. It misinterprets the factors that make for world power, and overlooks the fact that the limits of any population must be defined in the context of its own resources, land area, and way of life. Even if tomorrow we managed somehow to halve our rate of growth we would still be adding each year nearly 1.5 million Americans—as many as there are in the city of Cleveland and its suburbs. There is no chance of keeping our population at 190 million. What we hope to attain with the proposals we have made is a population that does not exceed 210 or 220 million.

In the past, the size of their population and the level of economic development relative to the abundance of land and natural resources permitted Americans a period of essentially unrestricted growth. But such conditions no longer exist. Today, 110 million more of us than at the turn of the century must share what our country has to offer, and we must do so at a time when our way of life places far heavier demands on resources and land area. If our numbers continue to increase, not even the most farsighted of plans will permit coping with the problems entailed. Since eventual population stability is inevitable, if not by reduced natality, then by increased mortality, we submit that the wisest course is reduction by the limitation of births now while we still have something worth preserving.

If we are to retain for ourselves and our posterity much of what is valuable in the American way of life, we must bring our population growth to a halt, and we must do so soon. If we are to emphasize democratic and not totalitarian values, this cessation must be achieved by individual couples acting without coercion. If we are to emphasize the value of parenthood and the dignity and worth of the individual, there must be no greater restriction on the proportion who become parents than there is now.

In short, what we must have—and what our recommendations have been aimed at—is a society in which (1) no unwanted child is born; (2) the decision to bear or not to bear a child is made solely by the potential parents; and (3) most important of all for the goal of a stable population, this decision is made in a social and cultural context in which a family of three children is considered large.

EXHIBIT 1

[From Newsweek, July 6, 1964]

BIRTH CONTROL: THE PILL AND THE CHURCH

The setting was informal. Twenty-seven cardinals had come to Pope Paul's private library on the second floor of the Vatican palace to greet the pontiff on the eve of the feast of St. John the Baptist, the saint after whom he had been christened 66 years ago as Giovanni Battista. But even on such a gentle, warmly human occasion the Pope never sheds the authority of his office; when Paul spoke out last week on birth control his words bore the imprimatur of the Bishop of Rome and the Vicar of Jesus Christ, the representative of an unbroken succession of leaders reaching back to St. Peter.

Paul spoke of change, but he knew full well that his 2,000-year-old church, though not immutable and unbending, submits reluctantly to change. The church's movements can be likened to those of a majestic ship; charts and currents must be studied, the wheel turned by the hands of powerful steersmen, innumerable lines pulled taut and made secure while the sails fill with the freshening winds. Even after all this has been done and the tiller turned, the vessel only slowly heels, and comes about on its new course.

RULES

When the doctrinal revision involves such a basic tenet as birth control, the difficulties of navigation are magnified infinitely. Not since the Copernicans suggested in the 16th century that the sun was the center of the planetary system has the Roman Catholic Church found itself on such a perilous collision course with a new body of knowledge while all about swirl dangerous currents. The meaning of the Pope's statement is clear: in all the vast structure of the church, scholars are now scrutinizing nothing less than a position that goes back to Scripture itself and the story of Onan (Genesis 38: 8–10), who refused to obey the levirate law which required him to marry and bear children by his brother's widow; though he slept with her often, he always practiced coitus interruptus—he "spilled his seed upon the ground."

The specific issue moving the church away from traditional opposition to all forms of artificial birth control is the new oral contraceptive pills. The church rule on the pills, a combination of synthetic female hormones that prevent ovulation, had been set down by Pius XII a month before his death in 1958. The pills, Pius XII said, could be used on a doctor's prescription to treat reproductive disorders; used as a contraceptive, however, they were a morally unacceptable form of sterilization. He thus grouped the pill with mechanical contraceptives and onanism as contrary to the traditional church view that the primary end of marriage—and therefore of sexual intercourse—is the procreation and rearing of children. Interference with the power to generate life—by withdrawal, douching, condoms, creams, diaphragms, or chemicals—violates natural and divine law.

What has impelled the church to reconsider this firm and fiercely defended position? The reasons are varied—ecumenical, economic, practical, political, humanitarian, scientific, psychological.

DISPUTES

First of all, within the church, realistic Pope John XXIII helped fan the winds of change by assiduously promoting the current ecumenical dialog between Catholics and Protestants. Birth control is one of the central disputes which divide the major Christian faiths. All major Protestant sects sanction birth control for family planning, although the Church of England did not fully accept it until 1958. Second, over a broader sweep of time, the gloomy, discredited Malthusian picture of an overpopulated world unable to feed itself, seemed slowly to come into focus as birth rates climbed while modern medicine cut infant mortality rates and lengthened the lifespan. The neo-Malthusians are mostly scientists, but a Catholic theologian, Father John O'Brien, of Notre Dame, has warned that each year a population the size of France (50 million) is added to the world's total.

Third, the economic facts of life illustrated how birth rates—for both family and nation—are related to well-being. Poverty no longer need be regarded as the inevitable lot of man, and a family overburdened by too many babies is apt to be poor. As the New Republic pointed out last week in commenting on Paul's announcement: "In many Catholic countries, U.S. foreign aid is currently canceled out by the birth rate as fast as it is given." And, of practical concern to the church's integrity, anticlerical forces are most active precisely in those Latin American nations with high birth rates.

CONCERNS

Of equally practical concern, church leaders now realize that moral theories about contraception are not always observed in connubial practice by Catholic couples. In a recent survey of 1,600 households in the United States, public opinion analyst, Louis Harris, found that those who wanted a relaxation in their church's rigid attitude toward birth control outnumbered those who didn't by better than 3 to 2. And other recent studies conducted in the United States suggest perhaps as many as 70 percent of U.S. Catholics use some form of contraception besides the church-approved rhythm method. Fearing for their marriage and family, otherwise devout Catholics have rejected the church's teachings in good, if troubled, conscience. "I don't confess that I take the pill," says a New Jersey mother of four, "because I don't believe it is a sin."

Finally, there is the oral contraceptive pill itself. It is the product of modern science, supposedly the adversary of religion; yet the pill opens up, rather than forecloses, opportunity for change within the church.

According to its advocates, at least four virtues commend oral contraceptives to Catholics particularly: they involve no mechanical contrivances of any sort; they promise virtually 100-percent effectiveness; the codeveloper and principal exponent is the distinguished Roman Catholic gynecologist, Dr. John Rock. And, last and most important, as Rock has argued in his book, "The Time Has Come," the pills can be considered morally acceptable because they imitate the body's own natural endocrine chemistry to prevent the female egg from maturing. "The pill," says Rock, "is the first physiologic method of contraception and it preserves the integrity of the sex act." For these reasons, he holds that the Catholic Church should not place the pill in the same category as any other previous birth-control techniques.

While such compelling secular forces as these seem to bend the church toward a new course, there remain imposingly intractable voices that demand no retreat. If traditional church teaching and current marriage practice are in conflict, the conservatives argue, then the proper remedy is to change the practice. The opposition can be bitter, as when the Right Reverend Monsignor Francis W. Carney, of Cleveland, referred to the 74-year-old Rock, the father of 5 and the grandfather of 13, as a "moral rapist." And in England, recently, when Dr. Anne Biezanek, a Catholic general practitioner and mother of seven, opened a family-planning clinic in the working-class town of Wallasey on the Mersey, near Liverpool, her parish priest refused her the sacraments.

ORIGINAL SIN

The current conservative opposition to birth control reflects the early church fathers' views on marriage. Since the Bible offers no evidence that Adam and Eve had intercourse until after banishment from Eden, the traditionalists concluded that sex in marriage was the shameful byproduct of original sin. In the sixth century, Pope Gregory the Great declared that married couples always sin in having intercourse, not because the act itself is wrong, but because "what is licit is not kept within the bound of moderation." Seven centuries later, St. Bonaventure conceded that marital relations were good if motivated solely by the desire to have children. From this doctrine, the church derived its position that artificial devices were wrong because they frustrated the primary end of marriage.

Today, powerful voices still echo Bonaventure's strictures. The Catholic Marriage Manual, written by the Very Reverend Monsignor George A. Kelly, director of the Family Life Bureau of the New York Archdiocese, states: "The reason why artificial prevention of births is immoral is written into the very nature of the sexual organs and the marital act itself. The sex organs were made by God to reproduce the human race."

An able and personable administrator of an agency that counsels the 5 million Catholics in Metropolitan New York on their family problems, Kelly recognizes that there are sometimes grave reasons for practicing birth control, but holds that continence is the only method condoned by the church. "People can live a life of continence in marriage," he says. "But now they're being told they can use the pill and have more fun."

But physiology, as Rock says, tends to refute the argument that God had only conception in mind. Not only must the sex act take place to effect conception, but the sperm must find its way to the egg and an egg must be available for fertilization. And Rock points out that, even when an egg is available, intercourse results in conception only about 25 percent of the time.

LOVE VERSUS SEX

The church generally recognizes the enhancement of love as one of the secondary ends of marriage. This end justifies sexual intercourse as long as the biological structure of the act is not violated—by, for example, the use of a contraceptive device. In this context, Pius XI, in his 1930 "Encyclical on Christian Marriage," termed birth control "intrinsically vicious."

Advocates of the pill, however, counter that love is not subsidiary but equal to procreation as an end of marriage. Just as there is more to conception than a sex act, liberal theologians argue, there is more to marriage than a series of sex acts. Therefore, they ask, why can't conception be prevented in some cases in order to permit parents to provide better for children already born?

But the only choices morally open to Catholic couples now are partial continence—the rhythm method—or total continence. In the rhythm method, intercourse is avoided during the time of ovulation, which is usually around the 13th to the 17th day of the menstrual cycle. Since a slight rise in body temperature follows ovulation, women practicing rhythm often try to plot their fertile period by keeping a daily temperature record with a special oral thermometer. But because such records are a rule of thumb at best, and the time of ovulation can vary widely from month to month, most couples must avoid intercourse for about a 10-day period. And even if they follow the rhythm method with reasonable care, the risk of pregnancy is still significant. According to one study, women using rhythm run twice the risk of pregnancy that women using diaphragms do.

AGREEMENT

More and more Catholic theologians are beginning to take up Rock's position that the more effective pill may be just as proper as rhythm. The one who has articulated the argument best is Canon Louis Janssens, of the Catholic University of Louvain. Just as with the rhythm method, says Janssens, the pill does not interfere with the nature and structure of intercourse. But the Belgian scholar points out that in the period immediately after childbirth, ovulation is normally suspended. If a woman, since she is not ovulating at this time, begins to take the pill she is simply helping extend a natural physical process. Janssens' conclusion, published in Ephemerides Theologicae Louvanienses, the theological journal of his university: the pills are not inherently evil. The argument is essentially what Rock has been saying all along. But what gives Janssens' words greater impact is the fact that they appeared under the auspices of Leo Josef Cardinal Suenens, of Brussels. "This is not a maverick talking," one U.S. Catholic theologian noted last week, "but a voice from the mainstream."

For his part, Rock was not happy to be labeled a "maverick." "They can't take my church away from me. It's as much mine as it is theirs," he once remarked.

"I have no martyr instinct," the white-haired physician said last week in his brown clapboard summer home in Temple, N.H., where he spends long weekends working on a new book tentatively titled "Sex, Science, and Survival." "I had no idea of having the church make an issue over the pill." But, typically Irish, he says: "I'm in this fight for good."

PIONEER

His present involvement in the birth-control fight could have been predicted a long time ago. In the 1940's he began teaching his students at Harvard Medical School how to prescribe contraceptives, but he scrupulously avoided offering them to women in his own practice. Earlier, in 1931, he was the only Catholic doctor in Massachusetts to sign a petition asking for repeal of the State's law against the sale of contraceptives. "At the time," Rock recalls, "I felt that the church should not press its views on non-Catholics."

Rock and Dr. Gregory Pincus, of the Worcester (Mass.) Foundation for Experimental Biology, began developing the oral contraceptive in the early 1950's. And the tall, always elegantly tailored Rock became a kind of advance man, describing its contraceptive effects at meetings and in medical journals. In 1958, at a meeting of obstetricians and gynecologists in Cleveland, he proposed for the first time in public that the pill should be acceptable for Catholics. "By this time," he notes, "I had become thoroughly worked up over the population problem and realized what a significant part my church's views played."

But Rock's differences with his church begin and end with the birth-control issue. He has been a devoted Catholic since he was confirmed at the Church of the Immaculate Conception in Marlborough, near Boston. Rock was one of five children. His father, who traced his ancestry to County Armagh, owned a successful liquor store, dabbled in real estate, and promoted the town baseball team. After graduating from Boston's High School of Commerce, Rock worked for more than a year and a half as an accountant, first with United Fruit in Guatemala, then for Stone & Webster in Woonsocket, R.I. "I was fired for incompetence from both jobs," he recalls, "so I thought I'd better go to college."

BOSTON DAYS

At Harvard, Rock hurried through the college in 3 years and entered the medical school. While an intern at Massachusetts General Hospital, he met Anna Thorndike, daughter of a professor of urology. They were married in 1925 by Boston's William Cardinal O'Connell, a close friend of the Thorndikes. "I considered it a most signal favor," says Rock, "which the cardinal rarely expressed."

Rock's wife died 3 years ago, but he still maintains their spacious gray frame home in "Pill Hill," the doctors' section of Brookline. He also has working and living quarters two blocks away at the Rock Reproductive Clinic, established after his retirement from Harvard in 1956. Here he is continuing his research on reproductive physiology and seeing women troubled with infertility. On a recent morning at the clinic, Rock was visited by the 11-year-old son of a former infertility patient. "She had asked me," Rock said, "to tell him the facts of life."

Ironically, the studies that led Rock to the birth-control pill began as a search for ways to overcome sterility. Rock was interested in progesterone, a female hormone secreted by the ovary mainly after ovulation. Progesterone thickens the lining of the uterus to prepare it to receive the ovum, if fertilization occurs. Progesterone also travels through the bloodstream to the brain where it prevents the master pituitary gland from signaling the release of another egg—in this way the body avoids overlapping pregnancies. When fertilization does not occur, the supply of progesterone diminishes and menstruation follows in the normal monthly cycle.

In the early fifties, Rock had the insight to give large doses of progesterone, combined with the female hormone estrogen, to women whose sterility, he believed, might be caused by inadequately developed wombs. During the 3 months they took the hormones, the patients underwent "false pregnancy"; they stopped ovulating and menstruating. When treatment was stopped, the "sterile" women went back to their normal cycles and almost one in every five became pregnant soon after.

REBOUND

A short time later, Pincus and Rock got together to see if new synthetic hormones would work with Rock's patients. The drugs, which were effective in much smaller doses than natural progesterone, stopped ovulation and, when withdrawn, increased fertility, a rebound effect that meant the pills not only prevented babies in women who didn't want them but also helped those that did want babies. In 1956, Rock and Pincus began field trials to test the pill's effectiveness as a contraceptive. The trials involved women in Puerto Rico, Haiti, and Brookline. The trials proved beyond doubt that the pill is the best contraceptive yet devised. In nearly every case where an accidental pregnancy has occurred, the woman, it turned out, had simply skipped her pills.

Because of the proved dependability of the contraceptive pills, they are big business in the United States. When Chicago's G. D. Searle introduced Enovid for birth control in 1960, about 225,000 women began to use it. Today, Searle executives claim Enovid has 2.5 million users. The second birth-control pill, Ortho-Novum (Ortho Pharmaceutical Corp.), was introduced in 1962 and is now used by almost a million women. And last spring, Parke, Davis began distribution of Norlestrin, and Syntex Laboratories marketed Norinyl. These contain a smaller dose of hormones than the original pills did, and both Enovid and Ortho-Novum are now available in the less expensive low dose.

CALENDAR

The pills must be taken faithfully for 20 days each month. To help women keep to the schedule, Enovid now comes in a 20-pill calendar packet with a space for the user to write down the day and date as she removes each pill. Even more ingenious is Ortho's "DialPak." (End of article.) But even these innovations can't prevent accidents, some of them due to ignorance rather than forgetfulness. A Philadelphia man complained to Searle that his wife became pregnant even though he took the pills regularly.

Aside from its effectiveness when properly used, the pill seems also to have dramatically reduced the fears, inhibitions, and apprehensions connected in many young women's minds with sex. "Some young girls call it the magic pill," says Dr. Freda Kehm of Chicago's Association for Family Living. Dr. Seymour Sholder, a Chicago gynecologist, agrees that the pill has improved married life. "Frigidity is often caused by fear of pregnancy; with that gone, so too is the frigidity." Monsignor Kelly's fears are justified: sex is more fun with oral contraceptives.

Indeed, the simplicity with which the pill can be used makes some observers worry about its effect on sexual behavior outside marriage. Not only might it foster promiscuity, Dr. Kehm notes, but it is being used on college campuses in a kind of psychological warfare: "The girl tells the boy she is using the pill when she really is not—then she traps him."

Such reports strengthen churchly concern. The birth-control pills and immorality are often linked in the minds of church conservatives. "Once you say there's no clear-cut moral law on the subject," says Kelly, "then you're saying sexuality has an autonomy all its own."

But in groping for a new interpretation of the traditional church attitude on birth control, the liberals stress the need of giving Catholic couples the autonomy—and the responsibility—for deciding how to enrich their family lives. "Each couple," Canon Janssens notes, "have to ask themselves in conscience what, in their particular circumstances, is the generous measure of fecundity to be achieved."

Meanwhile, John Rock interpreted Pope Paul's statement in Rome last week to mean that the church would put new emphasis on individual conscience, permitting Catholics to make their own careful judgment about the pill. "I have no doubt," Rock concluded with satisfaction, "that the final statement will leave the well-formed conscience of the parents as the final determinant."

CONCLUSIONS

In Rome, Vatican watchers prognosticated that the problem of family planning will be part of "the church in the modern world," the monumental draft schema to be considered by the Vatican Council when it reconvenes in September. And mild-mannered Father Bernard Häring, secretary to the 15-member committee working on the schema, seemed certain last week that the council would clarify "at least the basic principles" of church policy on birth control. "Family and population problems will be faced," Häring said when reached in Collegeville, Minn., where he was conducting a retreat at St. John's University. "The whole spirit of the council assures that it will not be a superficial consideration." But even if the council fails to act, the conclusions that Paul spoke of could come in a new papal decree.

The debate over the pill may end there, but the larger issues it represents undoubtedly will continue. The spectacle of the church leadership following its flock and responding to pressures from below cannot soon be forgotten. If the church can be likened to a ship, its members can also be ranked like sailors, officers, commanders, and captains. In every aspect of the church's life—liturgy, unification, education—the winds of renewal and reform blow strong.

But the strongest pressure comes from the millions of rank-and-file married laymen who are pounding on the door of doctrine, anxious to take their long-forgotten seats among popes, bishops, and theologians as rightful participants in the church's magisterium.

A PILL A DAY

Some Roman Catholics couples call the church-approved rhythm method of birth control "Vatican roulette." In the same light manner, the wheel above can be termed "contraceptive roulette." The little white pills along the rim are one type of the new female and oral-contraceptive pills; the inner disk with the calendar days on it can be rotated so that one pill pops up on each of the 20 days during the month that the drug must be taken. Skipping a day, the user is reminded, could mean an unwanted pregnancy.

The pills contain synthetic female hormones and prevent ovulation by acting on the brain centers that trigger the release of the egg from the ovary to the Fallopian tubes—the same way the body's hormones stop ovulation during pregnancy.

Schedule

Pills must be taken from the 5th through the 24th day of the 28-day cycle (ovulation occurs around the 15th). Menstruation occurs a few days after pill taking stops. Then, on the day five, the user begins the next month's schedule. To make sure they stick to the schedule, many women keep their pills next to the toothpaste on the bathroom sink or beside the kitchen range. Some doctors advise taking the drug with a meal.

The pills are marketed by four drug firms in the United States (the "DialPak" shown above is supplied by Ortho Pharmaceutical Corp. for its pill, OrthoNovum). A month's supply of pills—which are sold by prescription only—ranges from about $2 to $2.25 in the United States. Prices abroad are also modest.

[From the New Republic, July 4, 1964]

DEBATE ON BIRTH CONTROL

(By Michael J. O'Neill)

The Vatican's Alfredo Cardinal Ottaviani has called for a moratorium in the public controversy over the morality of oral contraceptives. The conservative secretary of the Congregation of the Holy Office says "It is not pleasing to the Holy See that one or another local authority express doctrinal concepts on debated questions, which rather require central direction, since * * * in these matters it is necessary to preserve unity of thought and expression." His warning was addressed specifically to the recent statement of Belgium's Leo Cardinal Suenens that science is close to perfecting a family planning pill which the church will be able to accept. But his caution was also aimed at widespread speculation that Rome may soon change its basic teachings on birth control.

Many Catholics are already in revolt against these teachings. A national survey has disclosed that 30 percent of Catholic couples in the United States use contraceptive techniques condemned by the Vatican, and many others are submitting only grudgingly to its dicipline. The old natural law arguments are being challenged by such eminent Catholic theologians as Canon Louis Janssens of the University of Louvain who argues that the oral contraceptives are just as justifiable morally as the rhythm method which the Church endorses.

Catholic intellectuals in this country are hostile. Daniel Callahan, associate editor of the Commonweal, for example, has publicly attacked the Jesuit theologians John C. Ford and Gerald Kelly who attempt to steer a middle course between the conservatives and liberals in their "Contemporary Moral Theology: Marriage Questions" (Newman Press, 1963). Although they recognize conjugal love as a legitimate end of marriage, not just a necessary evil to be tolerated only in the act of procreation as St. Augustine claimed, Fathers Ford and Kelly also resolutely reject contraception. "The church is so completely committed to the doctrine that contraception is intrinsically and gravely immoral," they write, "that no substantial change in this teaching is possible. It is irrevocable."

Callahan charges that their treatise fails to deal forthrightly with the pressing needs of modern Christian marriage which recognizes the personal values as well as biological necessity of conjugal love and which emphasizes the adequate education of children rather than just their conception. He suggests that the restraint of the two moralists is prompted by fear that any substantial change in Catholic teaching "would have disastrous consequences for the church's claim to teach with authority." But he counters that "no theologian today can be expected to be understood if he continues to argue that the primacy of the species takes precedence over the personal good of individuals," and "if he says that one must accept a doctrine or a law on the basis of authority alone."

The U.S. hierarchy is sensitive to the hardships which couples must often endure to comply with the church's decree, Msgr. George W. Casey, pastor of a parish in Lexington, Mass., and a columnist for the Boston Pilot, recently wrote that "the inexorability of the law and the implacability of some experts who expound it seem almost heartless." He was especially stricken by the tragedy of women condemned by nature to deliver defective infants if they become pregnant.

The practical though long-delayed response of the American bishops has been to adopt a more positive attitude toward the value of sex and love in marriage, to urge rather than merely permit intelligent family regulation, and to champion the use of the rhythm method as an alternative to artificial contraception. The Family Life Bureau of the National Catholic Welfare Conference sponsors a nationwide educational program covering everything from teenage petting to family planning.

On another front, the church is vigorously pressing studies aimed at perfecting the rhythm method, which is anything but foolproof. Georgetown University's new Center for Population Research, for example, is collecting data from thousands of women in an attempt to develop accurate information on averages, or "normal," fertility-infertility cycles. This would not only improve the rhythm technique but, quite possibly, provide guidelines for the use of cycle-regulating drugs. Catholic theologians generally agree that the temporary use of such drugs would be morally justified since the purpose would be to regularize cycles in cases where the use of rhythm is otherwise difficult or impossible. Contraception, if it occurred, would then be a secondary result rather than a directly intended primary act. The unsettled question, apart from the fact that a clearly acceptable cycle-regulating drug hasn't yet appeared, is how narrowly or broadly the church might define a "normal" cycle and what terms it might set for a compound's use.

Indications are that the third session of the Vatican Council, which convenes in September, will fail to resolve the issue in any definitive way. But a draft declaration on family and parenthood asserts the personal values of conjugal love, rejecting the Augustine tradition, and accepts the proposition that family limitation may be both necessary and good. For the moment, artificial contraception remains formally condemned. The employment of oral contraceptive drugs for the specific purpose of preventing children is forbidden. But the theological debates over other potential uses of drugs in family regulation continue unabated, despite Cardinal Ottaviani.

[From Look magazine, July 14, 1964]

LATIN AMERICAN CATHOLICS AND BIRTH CONTROL

(By Leonard Gross)

An unpublicized campaign for birth control is underway in Latin America with the acquiescence and measured support of key elements of the Roman Catholic Church. The campaign is provoked by a shocking discovery: staggering rates of criminal abortion. It is underscored by a brutal projection: Without birth control, Latin America, which cannot nourish its 220 million people now, will have three times as many mouths to feed within 35 years.

Though the campaign is in its early stages, its importance cannot be overestimated. Birth control, by rigid tradition, has been the unspeakable subject in Latin America, to a point where the secular leaders not only feared to discuss it with the church, but refused to discuss it with one another. That point has been passed, so suddenly and easily that population specialists are now wondering whether the great controversy the issue was expected to provoke will ever occur. So marked, in fact, has been the willingness of some cardinals and bishops to discuss their position that observers now ask whether Latin American governments have used the church as an excuse for not confronting the issue themselves. One U.S. authority has said, "The official groups are giving the Catholic Church the rap for something that was not its fault. The church is dying to get into this."

This story, which involves almost every Latin American republic, is the product of a search that began a year ago. It is based on more than a score of new studies and reports, and dozens of long conversations with social scientists, doctors and priests. They speak with urgency, because they believe that only public awareness will create the climate essential to an all-out attack on Latin America's primary problem. But they speak gingerly, regretfully, cautiously, mindful of the passions they might unleash. At their insistence, part of this story must be told without names or details that identify them. But what they say, taken together with the accumulating data on attitudes, abortions and population problems, concretizes the theoretical arguments over contraception now swirling through Christendom. These arguments were recognized on May 27 by the publication of an article in the official Vatican journal, L'Osservatore della Domenica, which suggested that the church might reexamine its position in the light of new discoveries about birth-control pills.

The reaction takes several forms. At its heart is an attempt by influential Latin American clerics to disabuse Catholics of the widely held notion that the church opposes birth control, per se.

Until quite recently, clerics had rarely if ever discussed the subject openly. Conservative priests had argued effectively that discussion would make Catholics aware of the need for birth control and unwittingly encourage them to adopt means unsanctioned by the church. Now, there is evidence that church progressives seem willing to take the risk.

The evidence is found in citations by priests of Pope Pius XII's statement that strong economic and social reasons can relieve Catholic couples of the obligation to have children; in the publication of criticisms by priests of the idea that Catholics must have all the children that God sends them; and in the willingness of priests to have a dialog with family planning groups.

Publicly, priests carefully point out that birth control should be achieved only by the church-approved natural rhythm method. Privately, however, some of them deplore this method as ineffective, particularly among the uneducated. One well-placed priest says flatly:

"Our people badly need birth limitation. We should have been working years and years ago to find a solution. Up to now, no solution has been found. I deny strongly from the scientific point of view that there has been found a real method to check the world's population problem." He sees the rhythm system as presently unworkable for people who cannot read or count, and other contraceptive systems—the moral issue aside—as too expensive. "The Catholic Church sees the need for control. Why doesn't it talk about it? Because it has no answer. And that's where the church is guilty. The church must say clearly that limitation of birth is a duty."

This widely felt sense of responsibility may explain a second type of clerical reaction to the problem.

Workers in Latin American birth-control programs report that they have not met a single instance of resistance by the church, even though they are introducing forbidden contraceptive techniques. One doctor, the head of a hospital where women who request intrauterine devices are being fitted with them, reports indirect word from the church that it would not object. "There's an unwritten agreement. We don't bother them. They don't bother us. If we advertise in the papers, we've got a fight on our hands, but if we rely on word of mouth, we've got plenty of work to do." Another doctor said to a North American colleague: "We consulted our spiritual authorities, and they told us, 'We aren't going to approve it, but we aren't going to oppose it.' "

An executive of the authoritative New York-based Population Council sums up the present Latin American situation: "You can't say you're doing it. You just go ahead and do it." Both sides, he reports, are seeking to avoid "a dramatic confrontation."

A third form of reaction by clerics shows up on the parish level. One young Chilean priest, whose work is mainly among slum dwellers, admits, "It's really difficult to be too strict with them on matters like that when you see how they live." In various parts of Latin America, some priests are reported, on the highest authority, to be so disturbed by the ravages of amateur abortions that they consider contraceptives the lesser evil. A physician in charge of a family planning center in Mexico reports frequent referrals by priests. "The priest who sends the woman recommends treatment to cure her 'irregularity.' But he knows that what we are going to do is plan her family. There are many of these priests. Usually, they are from the slums."

A similar report comes from another doctor interested in family planning. He says: "To have a child when you want to have a child, when you are in love, that is the most beautiful thing. The young priests understand this. From them, we receive an indirect authorization. The priest says to the lady who's had difficulty: 'Go to the physician. Perhaps he can resolve your problem.' You feel the backing to take a wider attitude."

A professor at a Catholic hospital, he explains:

"I am a physician not only for Catholics. I know as a Catholic I haven't the right to impose my ideas on people who don't think as I think. It would not be correct if I taught only Catholic ideas. I am a scientist.

"We have a department for instruction in the licit method. The physicians who attend this department are Catholics. And we have a department for illicit methods. This is attended by physicians who are not Catholics."

The choice of method, this doctor stresses, is left to the individual. "We wash our hands. It is not our decision. I cannot say, 'You can't do that.' It is a position of you inside. Although we are both Catholics, we have different ideas.

"I know that many in the United States will say that this is hypocrisy. We do the best we can with an open mind and heart. I am not in contact with the church on this problem. You're obliged to make a decision when you have strong responsibility."

Like many of his colleagues, this doctor believes that the church's position on oral contraceptives has not been made clear. He says, "Where the position is not clear, the Catholic has the right to use his own judgment."

This viewpoint is becoming more common within the church itself. One cardinal, asked for his opinion about oral contraceptives, replied, "I leave that to my technicians." His "technicians," young priests, mostly Jesuits, are inclining to the theory that pills can be used licitly to assure the success of the rhythm method.

"But, gentlemen," a puzzled visitor asked the priests, "you realize that if you use the pills, you don't need the rhythm method?"

"That's true, isn't it," was one priest's nonplussed reply.

Doctors report great expectations among priests for change in interpretation of natural law that will make oral contraceptives licit. They are closely following the debate among Catholic theologians on this point.

In Colombia, a study published last year by R. P. Jaime Salazar, S.J., cites numerous instances in which pills might be used to delay menstruation at inconvenient times. An example: A girl who "set the date of her marriage precisely during the days of her period."

One Latin American cardinal confided, "We must go with the church concept today, but we must be ready for a change tomorrow."

The most open declaration of clerical support for pills came 2 months ago in Mensaje, an influential Jesuit magazine published in Santiago. Its editors—priests—argue that progestogene synthetic pills, which inhibit ovulation, but do not destroy any egg, are permissible. Progestogene, say these priests, is simply a duplication by man of the natural substance progesterone, which the female body begins to produce, once an egg is fertilized, in order to prevent further ovulation. This natural "protection" continues through pregnancy and lactation.

The nub of the argument of these priests is that such protection can and should be taken over by man after the child is weaned. By limiting family size, man increases the likelihood of a humane setting for the child. Says the article:

"The child is not only a body, but a human being, which has to be fed, dressed, educated, etc. Nature, in its intrinsic dynamism, tends to insure the future of that child, logically as far as she can. Will it then be illicit that man, making use of his intelligence, supports, insures and prolongs this direction of nature? Of course not.

"Taking off from the base that parents not only have to procreate but make possible the normal human development of their children, the church accepts the regulation of births. It is this that is called, and rightly so, responsible procreation. Why then not accept the use of the progestogenes that do nothing but supplement and carry forward the natural dynamism of nature?"

There are several explanations for these changing attitudes. The first is the church's recognition in recent years of Latin America's economic plight, and its determination to do something about it. The population explosion is an integral part of that problem. So fast is the population growing that the area must triple its real income in the next 35 years just to maintain an inadequate standard of living. The "unproductive" population—children 15 and under—is so large that three out of every four available dollars must be spent on schools and health services. Only the fourth dollar can be used to raise per capita production and income.

A Guatemalan physician, Dr. Enrique Castillo Arenales, grimly describes the resulting problem: "We see daily families of 10 or more children who live in one room with no hygienic conditions whatsoever; here, the income, if any, is not more than $20 to $30 a month; they come to the same hospital for their deliveries where they have two more children suffering from anemia or malnutrition in the pediatrics department."

A second explanation for the acquiescent attitude of some priests relates to a recent discovery: Latin America's unbelievable rate of abortions. The dimensions of this problem were not fully realized until a report, given at a conference last year, estimated that there were 129,000 abortions in Chile in 1961. A participant recalls, "It dropped like a bombshell. They all went home and looked up their own records."

Abortion estimates vary widely. One country, Uruguay, produced a figure of three abortions for every live birth. Other nations with a higher birthrate estimate just the opposite—one abortion for every three live births. A new study completed in Santiago adds to the evidence. Of 1,890 women interviewed at random, 26 percent had had criminal abortions. A majority of these women had had several. Fifteen women alone accounted for 187 criminal abortions—13 percent of the total. On the basis of these findings, there were 25,000 criminal abortions in Santiago in 1962. A survey director, Tegualda Monreal, says, "We think it is quite representative. The results could be related to other cities."

Realism provides a third reason for the clerical attitude. There is ample proof that most Latin American families want to limit the number of their children, and are willing to violate church doctrine to do so.

It has always been assumed that lower class families in Latin America have more children than upper class families because they want them. Research has now riddled this assumption. A survey in Lima by J. Mayone Stycos, director of Cornell's International Population Program, shows that while the upper classes consider four children ideal, the lower classes want three children or less. Says Stycos, "If you ask 'Would you rather not have two of your children?' of course, they answer no. But if you ask, 'If you had it to do all over again, how many children would you have?' they give you a number less than the number they have.

"Studies of Catholics in Puerto Rico, Peru, Santiago, Chile, and Mexico City show the lower classes to be overwhelmingly in favor of having small families, and * * * generally favorable toward birth control when they know what it is."

In a survey in Chile, two-fifths of the women queried said they were in favor either of complete freedom or birth control for families with low income; two-fifths favored birth control for those whose health might be endangered, and only one-fifth were unalterably opposed to birth control. Ninety-two percent of the women questioned were Catholic.

Ninety-one percent of women surveyed in Guatemala "expressed a desire to space their pregnancies and sought contraceptive information, especially regarding sterilization," Roberto Santiso, head of the department of gynecology at Latin American Hospital, reported last year.

Contraception is widely practiced by the upper classes. One physician said that he could name at least one woman in each of 14 prominent families in El Salvador who had been fitted with an intrauterine device.

A new seven-city survey by the U.N.'s Latin-American Demographic Center is now nearing completion. Preliminary findings suggest that the conclusions of earlier studies will be confirmed. Even in Rio de Janeiro, where two-thirds of the women interviewed said they would not take oral contraceptives, most explained that the pills might make them sick. Few mentioned religion.

Carmen Miró, director, and Jorge Somoza, of the U.N.'s center, state: "The persistence of an elevated level of fecundity cannot be attributed to the predominantly Catholic condition of the population, but to the backward economic and social situation. If the obstacles that impede development were removed * * * the religion of the people would not be an impediment to a reduction in the elevated rate of reproduction."

Whatever the reasons for the clerical attitude, the climate for an attack on the population problem has never been better. A few years ago, only El Salvador and Mexico sent delegates to a regional conference of the International Planned Parenthood Federation. This year, all Latin American nations were represented. Standing among them at an animated gathering, a U.S. delegate exclaimed, "Five years ago, a year ago, a meeting like this would have been impossible. These delegates openly representing their country? Never."

Ofelia Mendoza, a field director of the International Planned Parenthood Federation, told the delegates: "The first family planning association was established in Mexico City in 1958. All its activities have been very quiet. The contraceptive services have been given at private clinics.

"In contrast with the caution of this first Mexico City attempt, all the associations which have been established since 1961 have started their activities in the open, and their efforts have been toward the establishment of contraceptive services in public hospitals. Six countries have been successful in their efforts.

"Up to the present time, none of these activities have suffered official government or church opposition and have received enthusiastic support from medical and other professional groups. Of course, there are some priests, nuns, and lay people, including physicians, who made criticisms based on personal, moral, religious, and political beliefs."

In Honduras, the director of the nation's largest hospital has allowed the Honduran Planned Parenthood Association the use of all the hospital's maternal and prenatal clinic facilities for the establishment of a family-planning service. The association intends to provide contraceptive services at the hospital and through medical teams in the slums. It notes that "all contraceptives will be used to meet the medical, social-economic, and religious needs of the clients."

Now the Alliance for Progress has cautiously entered the field. Recent legislation authorizes the Alliance to do population research. But the agency has to move with caution.

"We have to go around and get the groups talking to one another," a high Alliance official explains. "We're down there like innocents, saying, 'Oh, are you interested in this? Why, perhaps we can help you.'"

Early this year, the Alliance ordered field offices to establish information programs "especially designed to alert the more elite groups in Latin America, specifically university professors, Government officials, Army and labor leaders, city and rural planners."

It is not only religious sensibilities that must be respected. The U.S. presence in the population field is certain to raise cries of "imperialism" from Communists and nationalists. Both factions see in the plans for population control a scheme by the powerful nations to keep them dependent.

"The most important thing the United States can do," says Dr. Stycos, "is to see that Latin American leaders are informed about population dynamics and seriously discuss avenues for affecting population growth."

Should the elite groups become sufficiently aware of the problem, then, in the opinion of Dr. Dudley Kirk of the Population Council, "within 5 years, you'll begin to see some effects."

The conservatives in the Catholic Church have yet to react to new developments. Should present trends continue, however, the battle for birth control in Latin America will not be between the church and society, but between enlightenment and ignorance. Says Giorgio Mortara, an eminent Brazilian demographer, "It is important now to show the need for birth control. Whether it is possible to put into effect in Latin America is the second step. Once a need is shown, a way will be found."

THE EARTHQUAKE'S CONSEQUENCES ON ALASKA'S KENAI PENINSULA

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, while the Office of Emergency Planning, under the dynamic leadership of Edward McDermott, and the Federal Reconstruction and Development Planning Commission for Alaska, under the chairmanship of Senator Clinton P. Anderson, are working with might and main to restore Alaska as rapidly as possible, the fact remains that the full extent of the earthquake damage, its latent and indirect effects, have still to be appreciated, and much remains to be done.

Pertinent is a statement from the Chamber of Commerce of Soldotna, a relatively new community, which has sprung up on the Kenai Peninsula. The statement points to the depressing economic effects of the earthquake on that previously promising and progressing region.

I call this matter to the attention of all concerned with the program and problems of Alaska's rehabilitation, and ask unanimous consent that the statement by M. L. Grange, president of the Greater Soldotna Chamber of Commerce, which gives a lot of pertinent facts, be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement of Economic Conditions on the Kenai Peninsula, June 16, 1964

I. Introduction

Although the Kenai Peninsula did not suffer a great deal of physical damage as a result of the earthquake, this area has been vastly affected economically, and adversely so. The economic effect has been the same as if the area had received severe physical damage—people out of work and many businesses readily reaching the point of insolvency.

Unfortunately, the areas of little physical damage will not benefit but indirectly from the many State and Federal recovery programs. The greatest portion of the peninsula will not be aided by reconstruction projects.

Loss of the full use of the road to Anchorage is a major cause of the present economic straits of the peninsula. Severe limitations on travel to and from the peninsula for the remainder of the year will greatly decrease the tourist traffic to a negligible trickle. Supply costs to the peninsula will increase and further depress an already harassed economy.

At a regular meeting of the Soldotna Chamber of Commerce held on June 16, 1964, the following statements were made by business persons representing Homer, Coopers Landing, Ninilchik, Anchor Point, North Kenai, Sterling, and Soldotna.

II. Statements of Local Businessmen

Grocery retailer: "My business is down in gross 38 percent from 1963. Also, I can't get the merchandise when I need it and at favorable prices."

Motel, bar, and cafe: "We've had next to no tourists to date. Business is way off and, where I employed six last year, this year I have two employees."

Hardware and building supply retailer: "From last year April is off 48 percent, May down 14 percent, and June so far is down 54 percent. I had planned for an additional employee, but not now."

Fishing lodge and grocery: "Gross business is down 30 to 40 percent from 1963. Had it not been for some business from the road crews, business would have really been bad."

Cafe: "Last year I had two cooks and one waitress working full time. This year there's only me and I still may not make it."

Electric co-op: "Manager stated that for the first time since 1957 their growth and extension of service has stopped and actually declined."

Cafe, gifts, smokehouse: "Owner says there's no business at all. She says her business is dependent on the tourists and there aren't any."

Building supply: "I normally have a lot of traffic from outside of the peninsula but have none this year. My gross is off 15 percent from last year."

Auto repair: "My gross is a little better than last year but my profit is way down because parts and equipment is more expensive to ship it."

Motel and fish camps: "Normally I'm pretty well full, even during the week, but this year I haven't been full one weekend and have no traffic during the week."

Bar and rest: "Gross sales are off 70 percent from 1963. Normally I hire two people at this time of year but I'm working by myself this year."

Retail gas station: "Business down about 50 percent. We need some long-term low-interest money to refinance."

Laundromat: "My business has nothing much to do with the tourist trade but my gross is down 25 to 30 percent from 1963."

Doctor: "We are doing 30 to 40 percent less work and yet our accounts receivable are forever climbing. People just don't have the money to pay."

Printer: "Business is down 30 percent and I'd had to lay off three employees. Erratic supply of materials which missed deadlines have caused me to lose several customers. I also had to cancel my plans to expand the shop."

Retail dairy: "The earthquake eliminated some competition but I'm selling less milk to fewer people. I've had to extend my routes to sell a bigger volume and in doing so have increased my costs."

Gas station: "I just recently bought this business. We used to employ five people full time and now I have only one full-time employee. I had to cut my service to the public from 24 hours to 16 hours."

Large volume retail grocer: "My volume is only off 8 percent from 1963, but our net profit is nonexistent. We had planned for a big expansion program in 1965 but our plans are undecided now."

Local banker: "There is no question that the earthquake resulted in a serious decline in all business activity on the peninsula. Our problem now is to seek ways of acquiring longer term moneys for business and provide funds to restore depleted working capital."

Fishing lodge: "My business is down 80 percent from 1963 and the rate of decrease gets worse each week."

Clothing retailer: "My business is off about 25 percent from 1963. Normally it picks up by now but hasn't so far this year."

Movie theater: Gross ticket sales are down some 60 percent from 1963.

Appliance retailer and serviceman: "My sales are actually a little better than last year, but my collection on accounts is terrible."

Building supply: "My business is down to where I can't really afford to pay myself. I laid off my last employee yesterday."

Drugstore: "My volume is about the same, but I do the greatest amount of business on a credit basis and my only recent growth is in accounts receivable."

General store: "Sales are down 25 percent and each day more old cash customers are requesting credit."

III. SUMMARY

We all know that the earthquake has severely damaged the peninsula from an economic standpoint. This damage could become permanent if steps are not taken to ease the present strain that threatens to wipe out the many steps forward that the peninsula has achieved to date.

The State can help by giving restoration of the highway to the peninsula the highest priority. Also, all other proposed and approved projects should be given the full go-ahead—the North Kenai Road extension and the addition of new trails and campground facilities.

The Federal Government can help by formally declaring this area an economic disaster area and providing financing under such disaster loan programs as the Small Business Administration. Also additional improvements that are needed in the Moose Range should be authorized at this time with work to commence in 1964.

The incorporated statements of several businessmen of the peninsula are simple statements of fact. They were not rehearsed and I daresay we could have filled many more pages with similar statements. We are not asking for any handout type program and fully expect to pay for the help we receive. However, we recognize a problem and are soliciting the aid and cooperation of both our our own State government and the Federal Government in the solution of this problem.

GREATER SOLDOTNA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
M. L. GRANGE, *President.*

ACTION OF CONFERENCE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, on June 29 remarks were made in this Chamber that suggested that the action of the conference committee on the Interior Department appropriations bill allowed itself to be used as a vehicle for the settling of personal grievances of one Member of the House, the Honorable MIKE KIRWAN, of Ohio.

It was alleged in those remarks that an item of $203,600 added by the Senate for rehabilitation of the Berlin National Fish Hatchery in New Hampshire was deleted in conference because Mr. KIRWAN had objected to the votes of some Members of the New Hampshire delegation on other appropriations matters.

Mr. President, I was a member of that conference committee and I think that in fairness to Mr. KIRWAN it should be noted that this action by the House conferees and its approval by the conference committee is entirely in line with past procedures on similar matters. It should be noted that no hearings were conducted in either the House or the Senate on the factors behind this appropriation, nor was this item included in the President's budget.

Indeed, Mr. President, in an almost similar circumstance, a $300,000 appropriation for the control of predatory animals and injurious rodents was added to the fish and wildlife budget at the request of the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], who was a member of the conference committee. Since this item, as was the case in the New Hampshire item, was not budgeted nor subject to hearings by either Senate or House committees, it, too, was deleted at the insistence of the House conferees.

Mr. President, I have worked on many appropriations matters with the gentleman from Ohio and I am proud to say that on all I have found him to be most agreeable and truly concerned that the committees and the Congress discharge their function in appropriating public moneys in the most efficient and effective way possible.

Mr. President, we, who represent Western States, where the Federal Government is involved in large-scale public works and rehabilitation measures have found MIKE KIRWAN to be a strong and effective proponent of those measures designed to overcome the obstacles of nature that stand in the path of development of our resources. I commend him for his dedication and devotion to the public welfare.

FARM PARITY DROPS TO 74 PERCENT

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, in many respects and perhaps in all, the most important unfinished business of this Congress is to do something effective to stop the continuing decline in farm purchasing power and to correct the second-class status our farmers and ranchers now hold in our national economy as reflected in the fact that according to the Department of Agriculture the cost-price imbalance for agriculture became so serious that the farm parity ratio is now only 74 percent—the lowest point it has reached since the depression years of the late thirties. This glaring disparity between what the farmers receive for their products and what they must pay for their purchases has reached the alarming point of an emergency situation.

Mr. President, this administration rode to victory in 1960 in part because of its pledge to provide "better times for farmers" and its promise to provide more income for farmers and its campaign orators held out the hope of 100 percent parity for agriculture if the Democratic Party came to power. What does the record show? Its own democratically controlled Department of Agriculture in its current monthly release on "Agricultural Prices" demonstrates dramatically the failure of this administration to fulfill those pledges. Instead of "better times for farmers," farm parity has dropped to a new low for the past quarter of a century. During the last month of the Eisenhower administration, December 1960, parity was at 81 percent and it has been steadily dropping under the pressure of Democrat import and farm policies until it has now fallen to 74 percent.

Comparing the Republican farm years with the Democrat farm years, Mr. President, presents an even more melancholy picture from the standpoint of the American farmer and rancher. During the first 7 years of the Eisenhower administration, farm parity ranged from 81 percent to 92 percent of parity and only in the last Eisenhower years because of a national bumper crop did farm parity ever drop below 80 percent. Thus under the Democrat administration, farm parity has been averaging from 8 percent to 10 percent lower than during the Republican years and its present low level of 74 percent is a full 18 percent below the high point obtained during the Republican administration.

Mr. President, to demonstrate how steadily and seriously our farm situation is deteriorating in this country, let me call your attention to the following table of farm parity ratios during the past 4 years, including the month of June of 1964:

Farm parity ratio

[December 1960: 81]

	1961	1962	1963	1964
January	80	80	78	78
February	81	80	78	77
March	80	80	77	77
April	80	79	78	75
May	78	79	77	75
June	78	78	77	74
July	78	79	79	------
August	80	80	78	------
September	80	81	77	------
October	80	80	77	------
November	79	79	77	------
December	79	79	76	------
Annual average	80	79	------	------

Mr. President, turning now to the yearly averages of our farm parity ratios, taking June of each year as the testing point, I call attention in the following table to the fact we started with a farm parity ratio of 92 percent in the Republican year of 1953 and call attention to the steady decline under the present policies of our Department of Agriculture under Secretary Freeman:

Price parity ratio since June 1953 USDA

June 1953	92
June 1954	88
June 1955	85
June 1956	85
June 1957	81
June 1958	85
June 1959	81
June 1960	78
June 1961	78
June 1962	78
June 1963	77
June 1964	74

REAL PARITY AT 1934 LEVELS

Mr. President, to further point up the economic distress in which the farmer finds himself, the Washington Farmletter for July 3, 1964, and I consider this publication to be one of the most reliable farm letters in Washington, states that if Secretary of Agriculture Freeman had not manipulated the parity formula by including Government payments as part of the "adjusted parity ratio" that parity would actually show that it has reached its lowest point since 1934. Thus after 30 years the farmer finds himself paritywise exactly where he was back in the dark days of the depression of the 1930's.

Mr. President, I quote the paragraphs from the Washington Farmletter published by Wayne Darrow for July 3, 1964, which sets forth the parity decline in which the farmer finds himself:

> Parity: The old parity ratio (patched up 14 years ago with a complex "modern parity") dropped in June to 74 percent, the lowest in 25 years. USDA said the 1-point drop in June was due to a 48-cent-a-bushel decline in wheat prices in the transition to lower levels. In weightings in parity index, wheat accounts for 6.9 percent of price received index.
>
> When Government payments are taken into account, as they are now in USDA's new once-a-year "adjusted parity ratio," the parity ratio for 1963—and now—is the lowest since 1934. Government payments as a percent of cash farm receipts are increasing—in 1963 were 4.83 percent of cash receipts—exceeded only six times in the 30 previous years.

NOTICE OF OPPOSITION TO THE PAGE SCHOOL

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I take the floor today briefly for the sole purpose of informing my colleagues that on tomorrow there will come before the Senate a bill which I consider of importance, and upon which there probably will be a rollcall vote. I refer to the bill, which has been reported favorably by the Committee on Public Works of the Senate, to provide for a page school. It will cost the taxpayers more than $1 million to construct the school for pages of the House of Representatives, the Senate, and the Supreme Court. In my judgment, it will be a continuing expense after that.

It happens that I was chairman of the subcommittee that held hearings on and considered this matter. It also happens that I am in the minority on the committee insofar as this bill is concerned. I voted against the construction of the school. The majority of the members of the Committee on Public Works voted to report the bill favorably, with the recommendation that it be passed.

I am simply apprising my colleagues that there is opposition to the bill. I think it is an unnecessary extravagance and is not compatible with the austerity program announced by this administration.

We have very fine pages in the Senate; but the time is coming—I think it is here now—to reappraise the situation. Originally, in 1789, a few runners were employed. Then, over 100 years ago, in 1841, Members of Congress who took an interest in certain orphan boys who were in destitute circumstances had their sympathies aroused. They were successful in having officers of the House engage the boys for service in the House. At that time, $250 was appropriated at the end of the session to pay each of the runners, now called pages.

In my judgment, consideration should be given by Senators as to whether or not it would be advisable today to employ young men and women college students, of the ages of 17 to 22, to serve instead of pages, and have them do what most Capitol elevator operators, policemen, and mail clerks do—attend universities when they are not working at their duties as pages. This would give some college students the valuable opportunity to view the work of Congress firsthand, help them to pay their way through college, and relieve Members of Congress of the responsibility for teenage boys, many of them on their own for the first time far from their parents and homes.

It is time to review the entire situation. The pages are fine boys; but at the present time their salaries amount to approximately $4,700 a year. Under the new pay raise bill, pages in the House and Senate, will receive, as compensation for their services, in excess of $5,000 per annum.

I know that, as a young lawyer with a wife and two children, and struggling to establish a practice, had I been offered a position paying me $4,700 a year, I would have been glad to take that job.

I like the pages. Each one of them is a fine boy. But there is a question as to whether we are justified in spending more than a million dollars to construct a page school. Should not we stop, look, and listen? I say we should. That is why I am apprising my colleagues of my opposition to this proposal.

Change is not necessarily reform. Further hearings should be held on this question. After all, this practice originated with the hiring of orphan boys, who then were made presents of $250 at the end of a session. It should be determined whether we are justified in embarking upon an expenditure of more than $1 million to perpetuate the present system, when a study might determine that it would be a better practice to hire college students who are somewhat older, 17 to 22, instead of those who now act as messengers or pages. Some of the boys who now act as pages would still be eligible in a few years.

In hiring those youngsters, I would not exclude the hiring of girls; I would like girls to receive the same consideration that boys would receive.

This is a serious matter. We should not undertake to spend a million dollars of taxpayers' money until we have gone more thoroughly into the question.

THE COTTON EQUALIZATION PROGRAM

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, earlier this year the administration announced several programs as part of its war on poverty. One was the starting of a new subsidy program for the cotton industry, under which the industry would be paid the difference between the world price and the domestic price of cotton used in American mills.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a list in connection with the payment of the first $24 million under the New Frontier relief program. The report is broken down by States, as well as by recipients. It will be rather interesting to read some of the rather sizable payments being made under the administration's war on poverty.

Personally I fail to see how making these large subsidy payments to the cotton industry helps either the consumer or the farmer.

From the taxpayers' standpoint they are an expensive way of buying an election. I ask unanimous consent that a letter dated June 23, 1964, addressed to me, with the accompanying list be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and list were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, June 23, 1964.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: This is in further reply to your letter of June 12, 1964, regarding payments under the 1963–64 cotton equalization program.

We are enclosing a listing of payments under this program through June 11, 1964. We do not have in the Washington office information showing when these payments were made but they were made during May and the first 11 days of June, 1964.

Sincerely yours,
KENNETH M. BIRKHEAD,
Assistant to the Secretary.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, June 15, 1964.

Individual payments, interim cotton PIK program: Following is a listing of individual payments under the interim cotton equalization payment-in-kind program through June 11, 1964. Payments which began about mid-May cover bale openings by domestic users beginning on April 11 when the provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1964 became effective. The total of payments reported through June 11 is $24,561,018.26, of which $18,977,084.14 were sight drafts and $5,583,934.12 were payment-in-kind certificates:

Name and address	Sight-draft payments	Payment-in-kind certificates
ALABAMA		
Avondale Mills, Sylacauga, Ala	$365,070.01	$471,769.05
Aliceville Cotton Mill, Inc., Aliceville, Ala	20,862.14	25,950.67
Bam Cotton Mills, Inc., Geneva, Ala	22,651.91	27,237.86
Botany Cottons, Inc., Gurney Plant, Prattville, Ala	8,871.98	----------
Danville Yarn Mills, Inc., Bon Air, Ala	74,423.17	----------
Fayette Cotton Mill, Inc., Fayette, Ala	31,341.18	44,627.76
Geneva Cotton Mills, Inc., Geneva, Ala	22,669.40	28,694.64
The Linen Thread Co., Blue Mountain, Ala	19,550.96	----------
Opelika Manufacturing Corp., Opelika, Ala	128,411.71	----------
Riverview Mills, Inc., Geneva, Ala	----------	6,060.79
Russell Mills, Inc., Alexander City, Ala	94,732.56	113,168.44
Union Yarn Mills, Inc., Jacksonville, Ala	47,416.98	57,862.35
Victorian Furniture Corp., Post Office Box 60, Montgomery, Ala	119.99	----------
Siluria Mills, Inc., Siluria, Ala	26,047.06	32,217.51
Winfield Cotton Mill, Inc., Winfield, Ala	15,687.55	18,067.40
Mount Vernon Mills, Inc., Tallassee Division, Tallassee, Ala	105,483.04	----------
Standard-Coosa-Thatcher Co., Coosa Spinning Mill, Piedmont, Ala	48,887.73	----------
West Point Manufacturing Co., Fairfax, Ala	347,948.37	450,145.99
Bemis Bros. Bag Co., Talladega, Ala	78,622.96	----------
Pepperell Manufacture Co., Opelika, Ala	54,198.17	69,784.46
West Boylston Manufacturing Co., Montgomery, Ala	31,517.26	----------
Handley Mills, Roanoke, Ala	57,555.68	----------
Anniston Manufacturing Co., Anniston, Ala	56,101.11	----------
Lowenstein Cotton & Storage Corp., Box 470, Anderson, S.C	108,758.00	133,407.36
Opp Cotton Mills, Opp, Ala	33,361.83	----------
Micolas Cotton Mills, Opp, Ala	98,552.87	----------
Adelaide Mills, Inc., Post Office Box 1320, Anniston, Ala	23,739.95	31,641.48
The Kendall Co., Albertville plant, Albertville, Ala	17,286.42	23,977.91
Cowikee Mills, Post Office Box 422, Eufaula, Ala	72,940.78	95,690.77
Wehadkee Yarn Mills, Box 150, West Point, Ga	9,358.50	14,629.87
Dan River Mills, Inc., Post Office Box 261, Danville, Va	----------	143,640.55
Samson Cordage Works, Anniston, Ala	6,698.64	----------
Wehadkee Yarn Mills, Talladega, Ala	45,859.06	54,352.08
Johnson Cordage & Gin Co., Prattville, Ala	133.64	----------
Total	2,074,861.01	1,842,954.14
ARKANSAS		
Pinecrest Cotton Mills, Inc., Pine Bluff, Ark	8,570.25	----------
Crompton-Arkansas Mills, Inc., Morrilton, Ark	58,721.78	----------
Total	67,292.03	----------
CONNECTICUT		
Acme Cotton Products Co., Inc., East Killingly, Conn	1,000.87	----------
The American Thread Co., Inc., New York City, N.Y	10,223.52	----------
The Gould Products Corp., Middletown, Conn	651.10	----------
The Baltic Mills Co., Baltic, Conn	1,773.20	----------
Total	13,648.69	----------
GEORGIA		
Not completed.		
ILLINOIS		
Johnson & Johnson, Chicago, Ill	14,643.72	----------
Bear Brand Hosiery Co., Chicago, Ill	12,233.85	----------
Total	26,877.57	----------
KENTUCKY		
January & Wood Co., Maysville, Ky	7,839.65	----------
Louisville Textile, Inc	2,115.81	----------
Total	9,955.46	----------
MAINE		
Pepperell Mills, Biddeford, Maine	83,300.30	106,640.10
Bates Manufacturing Co., Lewiston, Maine	300,608.27	----------
Subtotal	383,908.57	106,640.10
Total	490,548.67	
MASSACHUSETTS		
Sagamore Manufacturing Co., Fall River, Mass	18,302.83	----------
United Products Cotton Co., Fall River, Mass	507.71	----------
Berkshire Hathaway, Inc., New Bedford, Mass	45,222.31	----------
The Kendall Co., Griswoldville, Mass	4,107.73	----------
Total	68,140.58	----------
MISSISSIPPI		
Erwin Mills, Inc., Durham, N.C	110,264.50	----------
MISSOURI		
Absorbent Cotton Co., Valley Park, Mo	30.03	----------
American White Cross Laboratory of Missouri, Cape Girardeau, Mo	1,386.26	----------
Total	1,416.29	----------
NEW HAMPSHIRE		
Chicopee Manufacturing Co., New Brunswick, N.J	$63,826.62	----------
NEW YORK		
Greenhaven Prison Industry, Stormville, N.Y	1,915.03	----------
Clinton Prison Industries, Dannemora, N.Y	2,016.50	----------
Total	3,931.53	----------
NORTH CAROLINA		
Not yet completed.		
OKLAHOMA		
Oklahoma City Mattress & Feed Co., Oklahoma City, Okla	21.32	----------
RHODE ISLAND		
Coats & Clark, Inc., Pawtucket, R.I	4,053.79	----------
Berkshire Hathaway, Inc., New Bedford, Mass	18,895.43	----------
Total	22,949.22	----------
SOUTH CAROLINA		
Not yet completed.		
TENNESSEE		
Bemis Bros. Bag Co., Bemis, Tenn	145,584.58	----------
Cherokee Textile Mills, Sevierville, Tenn	50,540.75	----------
Dixie Mercerizing Co., Chattanooga, Tenn	97,940.70	----------
Dyersburg Cotton Products, Inc., Dyersburg, Tenn	55,052.59	----------
Elk Cotton Mills, Fayetteville, Tenn	41,975.89	----------
Rockford Manufacturing Co., Rockford, Tenn	29,451.75	----------
Standard-Coosa Thatcher Co., Chattanooga, Tenn	72,942.03	----------
Standard Knitting Mills, Inc., Knoxville, Tenn	88,302.75	----------
Trenton Mills, Inc., Trenton, Tenn	13,843.30	----------
Werther Bag Corp., Nashville, Tenn	89,235.63	----------
J. P. Stevens Co., Inc., Kingsport ,Tenn	----------	$61,002.69
Subtotal	648,869.97	61,002.69
Total	745,872.66	
TEXAS		
Denison Cotton Mill Co., Denison, Tex	67,453.10	----------
Central Texas Development Co., West, Tex	3,603.79	----------
Lone Star Textiles, Inc., Mexia, Tex	37,222.64	----------
Red River Cotton Mills, Bonham, Tex	18,549.31	----------
Houston Cotton Mills Co., Houston, Tex	6,377.15	----------
Hillsboro Cotton Mills, Hillsboro, Tex	13,495.16	----------
Brenham Cotton Mill, Brenham, Tex	81,326.89	----------
Mission Valley Mills, New Braunfels, Tex	38,693.65	----------
Corsicana Cotton Mills, Corsicana, Tex	10,226.25	----------
Texas Department of Corrections, Huntsville, Tex	10,431.13	----------
Plainview Mattress Factory, Plainview, Tex	135.52	----------
Postex Cotton Mills, Post, Tex	50,100.04	----------
B. I. Cotton Mills, West, Tex	17,374.62	----------
Sherman Manufacturing Co., Sherman, Tex	99,351.85	----------
Texas Textile Mills, McKinney, Tex	110,833.64	----------
Houston Textile Co., Houston, Tex	----------	10,912.52
Subtotal	565,174.74	10,912.52
Total	576,087.26	
SOUTH CAROLINA		
Abney Mills, Greenwood, S.C	235,644.87	----------
Alice Manufacturing Co., Easley, S.C	257,799.67	----------
American Thread Co., Inc., New York	87,091.87	----------
Arkwright Mills, Spartanburg, S.C	77,292.54	95,777.17
Bamberg Textile Mills, Bamberg, S.C	31,232.62	----------
Beacon Manufacturing Co., Swannanoa, N.C	24,138.92	----------
Blair Mills, Inc., Belton, S.C	35,788.86	----------
Blanche Cotton Mills, Inc., Augusta, Ga	4,508.79	----------
Bowling Green Spinning Co. Gastonia, N.C	29,029.38	----------
B & I Cotton Mills, Spartanburg, S.C	99,156.97	----------
Cannon Mills Co., Kannapolis, N.C	89,428.75	----------
Catlin Farish Co., Batesburg, S.C	28,133.30	----------
Cherokee Cotton Mills, Inc., Cheraw, S.C	59,581.14	----------
Chicopee Manufacturing Co., New Brunswick, N.J	80,304.31	----------
Clifton Manufacturing Co., Clifton, S.C	248,676.21	----------
Clinton Cotton Mills, Clinton, S.C	74,308.32	----------
Cone Mills Corp., Greensboro, N.C	48,577.55	----------
Drayton Mills, Spartanburg, S.C	16,540.42	----------
Fireston Textiles, Bennettsville, S.C	9,936.55	0
Franklin Process Co., Greenville, S.C	23,549.17	0
Gaffney Manufacturing Co., Gaffney, S.C	49,018.84	----------
Graniteville Co., Graniteville, S.C	279,395.27	382,417.68
Greenwood Mills, Greenwood, S.C	214,843.90	----------
Greer Manufacturing Co., Easley, S.C	24,864.45	----------
Hamer Spinning Mills, Hamer, S.C	28,485.08	----------
Hamrick Mills, Gaffney, S.C	19,896.56	----------
Hartsville Mill, Hartsville, S.C	13,700.18	----------
Hermitage Cotton Mills, Camden, S.C	19,247.54	----------
Highland Park Manufacturing Co., Rock Hill, S.C	39,262.79	----------
Inman Mills, Inman, S.C	123,634.80	166,253.48
Jackson Mills, Wellford, S.C	188,322.48	----------
Joanna Cotton Mills Co., Joanna, S.C	128,746.08	----------
Joint Research Prototype Mill, Spartanburg, S.C	12,621.83	----------
Judson Mills, Greenville, S.C	16,581.69	----------
The Kendall Co., Charlotte, N.C	195,392.40	260,816.84

Name and address	Sight-draft payments	Payment-in-kind certificates
SOUTH CAROLINA—continued		
Lockhart Mill, Lockhart, S.C	$50,996.33	------------
Lowenstein Cotton & Storage Corp., Anderson, S.C	364,124.91	------------
Lydia Cotton Mills, Clinton, S.C	116,299.82	------------
Mackintosh Spinning Mill, Inc., Clover, S.C	15,744.68	------------
Manette Mills, Inc., Lando, S.C	857.02	------------
Massachusetts Mohair Plush Co., Kingsmountain, N.C	9,700.07	------------
Mayfair Mills, Arcadia, S.C	292,420.68	------------
Monarch Mill, Union, S.C	106,019.35	------------
Mount Vernon Mills, Inc., Baltimore, Md	193,751.43	------------
Musgrove Mills, Gaffney, S.C	14,978.60	------------
Newberry Mills, Inc., Newberry, S.C	66,611.67	------------
Orange Cotton Mills, Orangeburg, S.C	18,707.90	------------
Pacolet Yarns, Greenville, S.C	22,243.45	------------
Pacolet Mill, Pacolet, S.C	73,141.31	------------
Parke, Davis, & Co., Greenwood, S.C	3,953.69	------------
F. W. Poe Manufacturing Co., Greenville, S.C	70,782.46	------------
Raybestos-Manhattan, Inc., North Charleston, S.C	1,582.88	------------
Reeves Bros., Inc., Spartanburg, S.C	158,019.14	------------
Riegal Textile Co., Ware Shoals, S.C	138,850.13	------------
South Carolina Cotton Mills, Orangeburg, S.C	40,161.02	------------
Scotland Mills, Inc., Lancaster, S.C	26,839.34	------------
Spartan Mills, Spartanburg, S.C	279,998.80	------------
Springs Cotton Mills, Lancaster, S.C	782,961.12	------------
J. P. Stevens & Co., Inc., Greenville, S.C	------------	$527,611.98
Townsend Cotton Mills, Anderson, S.C	4,536.93	------------
United Merchants & Manufacturers, Inc., Bath, S.C	97,432.20	------------
West Point Manufacturing Co., West Point, Ga	34,720,07	------------
Woodside Mills, Greenville, S.C	------------	548,530.04
Total	5,840,446.62	1,961,407.19
VIRGINIA		
Halifax Cotton Mills, South Boston, Va	14,860.63	------------
Fieldcrest Mills, Spray, N.C	42,876.08	------------
Washington Mills, Fries, Va	164,708.31	------------
Dan River Mills, Danville, Va	------------	344,622.65
Subtotal	222,445.02	344,622.65
Total	567,067.67	
GEORGIA		
J. P. Stevens Co., Inc., Atlanta, Ga	------------	75,642.71
Avondale Mills, Sylacauga, Ala	25,813.71	32,375.52
Erwin Mills, Durham, N.C	8,333.77	------------
Canton Cotton Mills, Canton, Ga	89,179.09	------------
Calloway Mills Co., La Grange, Ga	46,349.75	------------
Chicopee Manufacturing Co., Athens, Ga	24,216.33	------------
Crompton Highland Mills, Griffin, Ga	18,608.52	------------
Crown Cotton Mills, Dalton, Ga	70,279.29	------------
Crystal Springs Bleachey, Chickamauga, Ga	66,497.79	------------
Eastman Cotton Mills, Eastman, Ga	40,597.37	------------
Echota Cotton Mills, Calhoun, Ga	14,064.89	------------
Federal Prison Industries, Atlanta, Ga	31,004.74	------------
Fitzgerald Mills Corp., Fitzgerald, Ga	9,224.99	------------
Flagg-Utica Corp., Grantville, Ga	13,204.49	------------
Graniteville Co., Graniteville, S.C	111,438.79	157,491.81
Habersham Mills, Habersham, Ga	25,607.79	------------
Harmony Grove Mills, Commerce, Ga	43,976.79	------------
Harriet & Henderson Cotton Mill, Inc., Beryton, Ga	33,764.83	------------
Imperial Cotton Mills, Eatonton, Ga	16,699.02	------------
Juliette Milling Co., Macon, Ga	7,461.48	------------
Klopman Mills, Inc., Greensboro, N.C	30,696.57	------------
Monroe Mills, Monroe, Ga	27,938.10	------------
Opelika Manufacturing Co., Hawkinsville, Ga	15,095.53	------------
Pepperill Manufacturing Co., La Grange, Ga	85,258.74	110,931.99
Piedmont Cotton Mills, East Point, Ga	1,551.22	------------
Social Circle Cotton Mill, Social Circle, Ga	20,849.53	------------
Strichland Cotton Mills, Valdosta, Ga	41,111.46	------------
Summerville Manufacturing Co., Summerville, Ga	19,680.11	------------
The American Thread Co., Dalton, Ga	31,628.61	------------
The Hartwell Mill, Hartwell, Ga	22,749.95	------------
Thomaston Cotton Mills, Thomaston, Ga	144,305.91	------------
Union Manufacturing Co., Union Point, Ga	3,956.09	------------
U.S. Rubber Co., Hogansville, Ga	40,233.30	
Walton Cotton Mill Co., Monroe, Ga	48,345.18	------------
Washington Manufacturing Co., Tenville, Ga	14,045.72	------------
West Point Manufacturing Co., West Point, Ga	105,879.47	------------
Whitfield Spinning Co., Dallas, Ga	11,954.54	------------
Willingham Cotton Mills, Macon, Ga	21,957.39	------------
Buck Creek Cotton Mills, Columbiana, Ala	4,619.74	------------
Chicopee Manufacturing Co., Gainesville, Ga	48,695.27	------------
The Jefferson Mills, Jefferson, Ga	36,240.23	------------
Rushton Cotton Mills, Griffin, Ga	18,166.14	------------
Swift Spinning Mills, Columbus, Ga	64,558.06	------------
The American Thread Co., Tallapcosa, Ga	21,276.90	------------
Lavania Manufacturing Co., Hickory, N.C	1,476.80	------------
B. F. Goodrich Textile Products, Thomaston, Ga	150,963.34	------------
Tifton Cotton Mills, Tifton, Ga	25,899.51	------------
Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., Cedartown, Ga	18,246.07	------------
Fieldcrest Mills, Inc., Spray, N.C	68,735.16	------------
Dundee Mills, Inc., Griffin, Ga	94,968.25	------------
Mary-Lella Cotton Mills, Greensboro, Ga	20,415.65	------------
Reeves Bros., Inc., Columbus, Ga	44,246.28	------------
Moultrie Cotton Mills, Moultrie, Ga	14,828.06	------------
Georgia Duck & Cordage Mills, Scottdale, Ga	11,000.40	------------
Pepperell Manufacturing Co., Tindale, Ga	189,397.26	216,118.04
Riegal Textile Corp., Trion, Ga	251,721.60	------------
Callaway Mills, La Grange, Ga	94,554.19	------------
Swift Manufacturing Co., Columbus, Ga	81,554.33	------------
Coats & Clark, Inc., Clarkdale, Ga	11,987.43	------------
The John P. King Manufacturing Co., Augusta, Ga	82,720.04	------------
Coats & Clark, Inc., Albany, Ga	2,476.88	------------
Fulton Cotton Mills, Atlanta, Ga	41,637.96	------------
GEORGIA—continued		
Whittier Mills Co., Atlanta, Ga	$23,347.02	------------
Puritan-Cordage Mills, Athens, Ga	1,917.30	------------
Atlantic Cotton Mills, Macon, Ga	11,719.82	------------
Trio Manufacturing Co., Forsyth, Ga	4,856.34	------------
Scottdale Mills, Inc., Scottdale, Ga	33,516.66	------------
Gainesville Mills, Gainesville, Ga	45,181.82	$59,801.88
New Holland Mill, New Holland, Ga	96,161.39	130,646.10
Bibb Manufacturing Co., Macon, Ga	316,514.37	------------
Total	3,317,161.10	------------
NORTH CAROLINA		
Acme Spinning Co., Belmont, N.C	40,975.48	------------
Alexander Mills, Forest City, N.C	40,812.59	------------
Amazon Cotton Mills Co., Thomasville, N.C	31,918.25	------------
American & Efird Mills, Inc., Mount Holly, N.C	120,394.55	------------
Arista Mills Co., Winston-Salem, N.C	22,088.30	------------
Balston Yarn Mills, Inc., Lincolnton, N.C	5,760.23	------------
Bartex Spinning Co., Clayton, N.C	8,964.60	------------
Bannit (Rockingham), New York, N.Y	6,270.74	------------
B. I. Cotton Mills, Asheville, N.C	145,563.26	------------
Bladenboro Cotton Mills, Inc., Bladenboro, N.C	51,054.12	------------
Bonnie Cotton Mills, Kings Mountain, N.C	8,130.45	------------
Borden Manufacturing Co., Goldsboro, N.C	36,851.16	45,030.15
Botany Cotton, Inc., Gastonia, N.C	48,121.30	------------
Caldwell Cotton Mills Co., Lenoir, N.C	25,944.87	------------
Cannon Mills Co., Kannapolis, N.C	709,380.01	------------
Carlton Yarn Mills, Inc., Cherryville, N.C	2,995.07	------------
Carolina Mills, Inc., Maiden, N.C	152,080.94	------------
China Grove Cotton Mills Co., Inc., China Grove, N.C	52,257.46	------------
The Chronicle Mills, Belmont, N.C	22,574.69	------------
Clayton Spinning Co., Gastonia, N.C	14,236.30	------------
Cleveland Mills Co., Lawndale, N.C	36,719.47	------------
Climax Spinning Co., Belmont, N.C	27,483.04	------------
Clyde Fabrics, Inc., Newton, N.C	24,792.09	------------
Cane Mills Corp., Greensboro, N.C	646,619.74	------------
Corriher Mills Co., Inc., Landis, N.C	30,716.59	------------
Craftstun Yarns, Inc., Kings Mountain, N.C	32,943.82	------------
Cramerton Mills, Cramerton, N.C	45,541.40	------------
Crescent Spinning Co., Belmont, N.C	13,573.56	------------
Cross Cotton Mills Co., Marion, N.C	30,464.91	------------
Dacotah Cotton Mills, Inc., Lexington, N.C	33,875.27	------------
Dora Yarn Mill Co., Cherryville, N.C	2,428.20	------------
Dover Mill Co., Shelby, N.C	3,523.51	------------
Dover Yarn Mill, Inc., Shelby, N.C	1,219.33	------------
Durham Hosiery Mills, Durham, N.C	1,212.37	------------
Eagle Yarn Mills, Inc., Belmont, N.C	13,955.69	------------
Eastern Manufacturing Co., Selma, N.C	32,047.86	------------
Edenton Cotton Mills, Edenton, N.C	31,867.03	------------
Elizabeth City Cotton Mills, Elizabeth City, N.C	15,571.59	------------
Elk Cotton Mills, Inc., Fayetteville, Tenn	11,895.97	------------
Erlanger Mills, Inc., Lexington, N.C	17,840.87	------------
Erwin Mills, Inc., Durham, N.C	303,767.29	------------
Esther Mills Corp., Shelby, N.C	284.44	------------
Falls Manufacturing Co., Granite Falls, N.C	17,196.14	------------
Fieldcrest Mills, Inc., Spray, N.C	92,262.42	------------
Firestone Textiles, Gastonia, N.C	8,421.07	------------
Flint Plant, Gastonia, N.C	41,574.00	------------
Gambrill Melvin, Inc., Bessemer City, N.C	11,489.27	------------
Gibson & Cushman, Inc., Lincolnton, N.C	7,545.39	------------
Glenn Raven Cotton Mills, Inc., Kinston, N.C	1,577.68	------------
Globe Mill, Mount Holly, N.C	11,517.35	------------
Golden Belt Manufacturing Co., Durham, N.C	9,775.80	------------
Groves Thread Co., Inc., Gastonia, N.C	40,502.99	------------
Hadley Peoples Manufacturing Co., Silver City, N.C	52,024.76	------------
P. H. Hanes Knitting Co., Winston-Salem, N.C	74,815.91	96,648.09
Harriet Cotton Mills, Henderson, N.C	55,854.10	------------
Hart Cotton Mills, Tarboro, N.C	33,791.22	------------
Hayes Cotton Mills Co., Lenois, N.C	13,129.22	------------
Henderson Cotton Mills, Henderson, N.C	65,869.83	------------
Henry River Mill Co., Henry River, N.C	1,224.86	------------
Hickory Spinners, Inc., Hickory, N.C	9,169.94	------------
Highland Cotton Mills, Inc., High Point, N.C	58,075.09	------------
Holt-Williamson Manufacturing Co., Fayetteville, N.C	10,863.58	------------
Howell Manufacturing Co., Cherryville, N.C	7,807.28	------------
Hudson Cotton Manufacturing Co., Inc., Lenoir, N.C	4,897.23	------------
Imperial Yarn Mill, Inc., McAdenville, N.C	14,239.61	------------
Ivy Weaver Plant No. 174, Hickory, N.C	8,873.47	------------
Johnston Manufacturing Co., Charlotte, N.C	34,303.81	------------
Johnston Spinning Co., Monroe, N.C	14,900.66	------------
Jordan Spinning Co., Saxapaw, N.C	10,490.29	------------
Kasas Mills, Inc., Casar, N.C	1,183.32	------------
Kindley Cotton Mill, Inc., Mount Pleasant, N.C	8,186.42	------------
Kings Mountain Manufacturing Co., Kings Mountain, N.C	6,227.71	------------
Klopman Mill, Inc., Greensboro, N.C	40,913.00	------------
Lily Mills, Co., Shelby, N.C	7,438.79	------------
Linford Mills, Inc., Belmont, N.C	14,815.32	------------
Linn Mills Co., Inc., Landis, N.C	28,385.04	------------
Lions Club Industries for the Blind, Durham, N.C	361.98	------------
Little Cotton Manufacturing Co., Wadesboro, N.C	29,345.94	------------
Long Shoals Cotton Mills, Inc., Lincolnton, N.C	8,222.04	------------
R. C. G. Love Plant, Gastonia, N.C	7,396.80	------------
Lowenstein Cotton & Storage Corp., Anderson, S.C	44,187.26	57,632.24
Majestic Manufacturing Co., Belmont, N.C	6,881.93	------------
Macanal Mills, Salisbury, N.C	15,262.45	------------
Marion Manufacturing Co., Marion, N.C	13,242.90	------------
Marshall Mill No. 2, Charlotte, N.C	8,647.34	------------
Mauney Mills, Inc., Kings Mount, N.C	7,167.42	------------
J. D. Mills, Inc., Henderson, N.C	19,996.14	------------
Moore Cotton Mill Co., Lenoir, N.C	2,351.37	------------
Mooresville Mills, Mooresville, N.C	68,949.75	------------
Moorehead Mills, Inc., Spray, N.C	9,960.79	------------
National Yarn Mills, Inc., Belmont, N.C	22,420.12	------------
Oakboro Cotton Mills Co., Mount Pleasant, N.C	8,408.01	------------

Name and address	Sight-draft payments	Payment-in-kind certificates
NORTH CAROLINA—continued		
Oakdale Cotton Mills, Jamestown, N.C	$13,371.21	
J. M. Odell Manufacturing Co., Pittsboro, N.C	10,881.91	
Paola Cotton Mill, Inc., Statesville, N.C	14,937.32	
Parkdale Mills, Inc., Gastonia, N.C	54,331.61	$70,927.61
Park Yarn Mills Co., Kings Mountain, N.C	7,443.67	
Peck Manufacturing Co., Gastonia, N.C	35,047.99	
Peerless Spinning Corp., Lowell, N.C	3,351.27	
Perfection Spinning Co., Belmont, N.C	10,979.80	
Phenix No. 1 Plant, Kings Mountain, N.C	73,963.17	
Pickett Cotton Mills Corp., High Point, N.C	20,181.39	
Piedmont Processing Co., Belmont, N.C	18,220 28	
Pilot Mills Co., Raleigh, N.C	11,660.22	
Quaker Meadows Mills, Inc., Hickory, N.C	4,037.86	
Randolph Mills, Inc., Concord, N.C	42,630.38	
Rhodes-Whitener Mills, Inc., Raylorsville, N.C	17,605.90	
D. E. Rhyne Mills, Inc., Lincolnton, N.C	2,861.94	
Roberta Manufacturing Co., Concord, N.C	16,416.14	
Robinson Mills, Inc., Gastonia, N.C	21,146.32	
Rockfish-Mebane Yarn Mill, Inc., Chattanooga, Tenn	40,344.91	
Rocky Mountain Mills, Rocky Mount, N.C	74,122.81	
Rowan Cotton Mills Co., Salisbury, N.C	26,423.86	
Roxboro Cotton Mills, Roxboro, N.C	55,760.37	
Royal Cotton Mill Co., Saxapahaw, N.C	13,311.48	
Rudisill Spinning Mills, Inc., Hickory, N.C	4,576.97	
Sadill Cotton Mills Co., Inc., Kings Mountain, N.C	14,445.01	
Schneider Mills, Inc., Taylorville, N.C	3,455.27	
Scotland Mills, Inc., Lancaster, S.C	66,555.97	
Sellers Manufacturing Co., Saxapahaw, N.C	10.837.19	
Shelby Mills, Inc., Shelby, N.C	395.65	
Sherrill Yarn Mills, Inc., Taylorsville, N.C	$666.51	
Shuford Mills, Inc., Hickory, N.C	23,279.35	
Smitherman Cotton Mills, Troy, N.C	16,833.63	
Smithfield Spinning Co., Smithfield, N.C	3,319.90	
A. M. Smyre Manufacturing Co., Gastonia, N.C	38,879.55	
South Fork Manufacturing Co., Belmont, N.C	16,518.84	
Spindale Mills, Inc., Spindale, N.C	26,219.83	
Spray Cotton Mills, Spray, N.C	5,504.80	
Sterling Cotton Mills, Inc., Franklinton, N.C	5,413.32	
J. P. Stevens & Co., Greensville, S.C	0	$183,142.29
Stowe Spinning Co., Belmont, N.C	23,709.20	
Stowe Thread Co., Belmont, N.C	5,872.62	
Superior Yarn Mills, Inc., Mount Holly, N.C	19,781.38	
Textiles, Inc., Gastonia, N.C	144,418.68	
Tolar, Hart & Holt Mills, Inc., Gastonia, N.C	21,623.55	
Travara Textiles, Inc., Graham, N.C	21,378.24	
Tuscarora Cotton Mills, Mount Pleasant, N.C	6,213.93	
United Spinners Corp, Lowell, N.C	167.57	
U.S. Rubber Co., Gastonia, N.C	14,925.10	
Valdese Manufacturing Co., Valdese, N.C	18,891.92	
Virginia Mills, Inc., Swepsonville, N.C	5,777.65	
Wade Manufacturing Co., Box 32, Wadesboro, N.C	30,671.94	
Washington Mills, Inc., Laurinburg, N.C	1,783.14	
Wennonah Cotton Mills Co., Lexington, N.C	9,699.10	
Wiscassett Mills Co., Albemarle, N.C	134,957.81	
Worth Spinning Co., Stoney Point, N.C	3,980.92	
Total	5,499,893.50	453,389.98

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK—JULY 12 TO 18

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, last Saturday we celebrated a day which is symbolic of the birth of freedom for America. I daresay that there were many who treated that day as just another holiday away from work, with only a bare thought as to the meaning of the Fourth of July.

Next week, thousands will observe a week underscored by a hope—a hope that some day freedom again will be restored to the peoples in the Communist orbit.

We cannot afford to forget these people, for they are a constant reminder of what could happen to us. And in observing Captive Nations Week, July 12 to 18, we will be telling them that we, who cherish our freedom, have not forgotten those who have lost theirs and need our help to regain it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

TWO-PART RETIREMENT SYSTEM FOR NEVADA UNDER SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 287) to amend title II of the Social Security Act to include Nevada among those States which are permitted to divide their retirement systems into two parts for purposes of obtaining social security coverage under Federal-State agreement.

MAJ. JACK J. SHEA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid aside temporarily, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 981, House bill 8201.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 8201) for the relief of Maj. Jack J. Shea, USAF.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, is the bill open to amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. MILLER. I send an amendment to the desk and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, in line 5, it is proposed to strike out "$1,392.26", and to insert in lieu thereof "$568.20".

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I have a brief explanation of the amendment. It reduces the amount of the allowance to the amount which represented an overpayment at the time when the overpayment procedure was first discovered. On page 2 of the committee report, I read a statement which points this out:

> It is significant to note that at the time the mistake was first discovered the overpayment amounted only to $568.20. Major Shea protested the adjustment in his pay date and appealed the determination that a repayment was in order, as was his right. It is startling to note that during the pendency of Major Shea's appeals the overpayment was compounded by further erroneous payments from early in 1957 until in 1963. It was this negligent handling of Major Shea's pay accounts that allowed his alleged overpayment to accumulate to the sum of $1,392.26.

My amendment reduces the amount of the bill to $568.20 because that was the amount at the time when the major first became aware of the arrears. I cannot understand why an allowance over and above that amount should be made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

E. A. ROLFE, JR.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 990, H.R. 2215.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 2215) for the relief of E. A. Rolfe, Jr.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, in line 6, after "Arkansas," it is proposed to insert "and assessment of deficiency by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue for any of said years against the said E. A. Rolfe, Junior,".

Mr. MILLER. I have a brief explanation of the amendment. It is a technical amendment which would make sure that the statute of limitations, which the bill would waive, would operate in favor of both the taxpayer and the Internal Revenue Service. From what I know of this case, the statute of limitations would operate in favor of the individual and would give relief in this meritorious case. I have no reason to believe that it would not operate also in favor of the Service. However, as a matter of proper procedure, if the statute is waived for the taxpayer, it should be waived for the Internal Revenue Service, also.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 503 OF THE FEDERAL PROPERTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES ACT OF 1949 TO AUTHORIZE GRANTS FOR COLLECTION OF SOURCE MATERIAL DEALING WITH THE HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1001, H.R. 6237.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill is to amend section 503 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, so as to authorize the Administrator of General Services, within the limits of appropriated and donated funds available therefor, to make allocations to Federal agencies, and grants to State and local agencies, to colleges and universities, and to other nonprofit organizations and institutions, for the collecting, describing, preserving and compiling, and publishing of documents which are basic to an understanding and appreciation of the history of the United States. For the accomplishment of these purposes, the bill would authorize an appropriation to the General Services Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and each of the 4 succeeding fiscal years an amount not to exceed $500,000 each year, the bill further provides that prior to the making of allocations to Federal agencies and grants to State and local agencies and nonprofit organizations and institutions, the Administrator of General Services should seek the advice and recommendations of the National Historical Publications Commission.

Further, H.R. 6237 would require the Administrator of General Services to submit an annual report to the Congress concerning the projects undertaken, including detailed information on the receipt and use made of all appropriated and donated funds and would require the recipients of grant assistance to maintain adequate records, open to audit and examination by the Administrator and the Comptroller General of the United States or any of their duly authorized representatives, of moneys received and expended.

Heretofore, the National Historical Publications Commission, established pursuant to section 503 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, has been concerned with planning, encouraging, and assisting publication projects. H.R. 6237 authorizes the funds necessary for the Commission to more adequately maintain a well-balanced program, consistent with national needs and responsibilities, for the preservation and publication of source material significant to our Nation's history.

The two principal results of this proposed legislation would be, first, assurance by multiplication of copies of the preservation of historical source material of national significance which might otherwise be lost and, second, the broader distribution of such historical source materials to colleges and universities, to public and research libraries, and to scholars, students, and our educated citizenry generally, thereby increasing its use and multiplying its values.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I have had the privilege of serving for the past 4 years as a Senate member of the National Historical Publications Commission, and I have followed with a great deal of interest the course of this bill.

As the Senator from Montana has pointed out, the whole purpose of the bill is to preserve documents dealing with our early history and to make them available to historians in the days to come.

It is not an effort to write history; it is an effort merely to preserve the original historical papers.

In less than 200 years our National Government has grown from a handful of States acting together in their mutual self-interest, to a vast executive, legislative, and judicial complex governing the lives of 180 million people. The story of this growth, and its trials and triumphs, is the story of the development of a free democracy. It is most important that we preserve the historical records of this development so that we may have a complete and accurate picture of the events and personalities which contributed to the formation of our Government.

Not only is it important to increase the accessibility of these documents, but it is imperative that they be edited and presented more reliably than has been true in the past. Rather than give a historian's interpretation of historical events, or a simple narration of what took place, the Commission has tried to preserve and publish the actual records of the formative years of our Government. To date, the Commission has initiated, in cooperation with other Federal, State, and local nongovernmental agencies, more than 20 separate documentary publication projects. The first volumes of the Jefferson, Adams, and Franklin papers have already been published and have been received with much acclaim. Little-known details of the lives and ideas of the men involved are at last being brought to light and put forth in a comprehensive and readable form. Through the efforts of the Commission such knowledge will now be available to all interested in their Nation's history. In addition to these high-priority projects which the Commission felt had too long been neglected, 10 more projects are now in the planning stage.

I feel it is most important for the National Historical Publications Commission to continue the work which it has so excellently begun. Though State historical societies, universities, and research institutions can make vast contributions to the preservation of our historical records, the Commission is in the best position to focus and coordinate the efforts in this area. It serves as an informed and discriminating channel to evaluate priorities and prevent duplication of activity.

The bill represents an effort that we should carry forward at this time in order to make original historical documents available in a form in which they can be used. It is a matter of great importance to me. I am happy to see the bill go forward.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement made by the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 4, 1964, at the time when the bill was reported by the committee, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, under the authority granted to the General Services Administration in this legislation, the U.S. Government will, at long last, begin a service which has been badly needed for many years—the collection and publication of documents and other source materials significant to the history of our Nation.

Presidents of the United States, as far back as Thomas Jefferson, have endorsed the idea of careful compiling of our historic documents. Former Presidents Hoover, Truman, Eisenhower, and Kennedy, as well as President Lyndon Johnson, have urged more attention to the problem of collecting source documents which provide better understanding of our national beginnings, tradition, and history.

Under the provisions of this legislation, an amount not to exceed $500,000 will be appropriated to the General Services Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for each of the 4 succeeding years. It is expected that this amount will be matched by private contributions, so that a total amount of $1 million will be utilized in this important work, annually.

The General Services Administration provided our committee with a list of papers significant to the development of our Nation. It is apparent that much of this work will go undone if some assistance is not provided to the colleges, universities, scholars, and private groups who are interested in such undertakings. Informed witnesses told the committee that a number of projects are being held in abeyance for lack of some small support. Many universities can provide personnel and research facilities, but lack the little extra money to fully implement historical research projects. This appropriation is expected to give them the impetus to go ahead.

Thus far, our country has not given the support to this type of project that other nations have provided, but, under this legislation, we can expect to do slightly more than most other countries are doing. It is hoped that we can overcome any lag which may exist.

During the course of our hearings, this legislation was endorsed by many historic societies, historians, and officials of universities and colleges. The members of the Committee on Government Operations in reporting H.R. 6237 expects that enactment of this legislation will give assistance and encouragement to the collection, reproduction, and compilation of documents which bear significantly on our history and heritage.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H.R. 6237) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CATALINA PROPERTIES INC.

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 933, H.R. 2262.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The bill will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 2262) for the relief of Catalina Properties, Inc.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 1, line 3, after the word "That", to insert "in accordance with the findings of fact of the United States Court of Claims in the case of Catalina Properties, Inc. v. The United States, Congressional No. 12–60, decided July 18, 1962,".

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the committee report in justification of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the report (No. 964) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> This bill directs the Secretary of the Treasury to pay to Catalina Properties, Inc., the sum of $29,425.01, representing the amount determined by the Court of Claims, pursuant to congressional reference, to be equitably due Catalina Properties, Inc. The bill provides that the above sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of Catalina Properties, Inc., against the United States arising from rental payments on the Catalina Hotel, Miami Beach, Fla., which were lost during the period from about December 15, 1952, to about March 15, 1953, because of inaction of certain officers and employees of the United States.
>
> The provisions of this bill are identical with those of H.R. 12701 in the 87th Congress, which passed the House and Senate but did not receive Presidential approval.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

RECESS TO 1:30 P.M.

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess until 1:30 o'clock p.m.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Is there objection?

There being no objection, at 12 o'clock and 47 minutes p.m., the Senate took a recess until 1:30 o'clock p.m. of the same day.

On the expiration of the recess, the Senate reassembled, when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. MCGOVERN in the chair).

Mr. **JAVITS**. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. **FULBRIGHT**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

Mr. **JAVITS**. Mr. President, I object.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Objection is heard.

The legislative clerk resumed the call of the roll.

Mr. **FULBRIGHT**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call now be rescinded.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF FOREIGN AGENTS REGISTRATION ACT OF 1938

Mr. **FULBRIGHT**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending business, H.R. 287, be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. 2136.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2136) to amend the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arkansas?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with amendments, on page 2, line 17, after the word "any", to strike out "substantial portion"; on page 3, line 19, after the word "inserting", to insert "before the words, 'matter pertaining to', the words 'public relations' and"; on page 4, line 13, after the word "with", to strike out "respect to any matter pertaining" and insert "reference"; in line 15, after the word "or", where it appears the second time, to strike out "pertaining" and insert "with reference"; in line 16, after the word "the", where it appears the first time, to insert "domestic or"; in the same line, after the word "foreign", to strike out "or domestic"; on page 6, line 22, after the word "contributions", to strike out "made in connection with activities which require his registration hereunder which are required to be reported under the preceding provisions of this clause" and insert "the making of which is prohibited under the terms of section 613 of title 18, United States Code"; on page 7, line 20, after the word "mercantile", to insert a period; in the same line, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "and inserting in lieu thereof the words 'financial, mercantile, or public relations'."; on page 10, line 25, after the word "section", to strike out "3" and insert "4"; in the same line, after "(g)", to insert "or (h)"; on page 11, at the beginning of line 23, to insert "(g) If the Attorney General determines that a registration statement does not comply with the requirements of this Act or the regulations issued thereunder, he shall so notify the registrant in writing, specifying in what respects the statement is deficient."; on page 12, line 2, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "Whoever acts" and insert "It shall be unlawful for any person to act as an agent of a foreign principal at any time ten days or more after receipt of such notification without filing an amended registration statement in full compliance with the requirements of this Act and the regulations issued thereunder."; in line 7, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out the comma and "shall, without regard to any penalties provided in subsection (a) of this section, be punished by a fine of not more than $5,000 or by imprisonment for not more than six months, or both"; at the beginning of line 11, to strike out "(g)" and insert "(h)"; and on page 15, line 2, after "chapter 29", to insert "of title 18,"; so as to make the bill read:

> *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, That section 1 of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended, is amended as follows:
>
> (1) Subsection (b) is amended to read as follows:
>
> "(b) The term 'foreign principal' includes—
>
> "(1) a government of a foreign country and a foreign political party;
>
> "(2) a person outside of the United States, unless it is established that such person is an individual and a citizen of and domiciled within the United States, or that such person is not an individual and is organized under or created by the laws of the United States or of any State or other place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States and has its principal place of business within the United States; and
>
> "(3) a partnership, association, corporation, organization, or other combination of persons organized under the laws of or having its principal place of business in a foreign country."
>
> (2) Subsection (c) is amended to read as follows:
>
> "(c) Except as provided in subsection (d) hereof, the term 'agent of a foreign principal' means—
>
> "(1) any person who acts as an agent, representative, employee, servant or in any other capacity at the order, request, or under the direction or control of a foreign principal or of a person any of whose activities are directly or indirectly supervised, directed, controlled, financed or subsidized in whole or in major part by a foreign principal, and who directly or through any other person—
>
> "(i) engages within the United States in political activities for or in the interests of such foreign principal;
>
> "(ii) acts within the United States as a public relations counsel, publicity agent, information-service employee or political consultant for or in the interests of such foreign principal;
>
> "(iii) within the United States solicits, collects, disburses, or dispenses contributions, loans, money, or other things of value for or in the interest of such foreign principal; or
>
> "(iv) within the United States represents the interests of such foreign principal before any agency or official of the Government of the United States; and
>
> "(2) any person who agrees, consents, assumes or purports to act as, or who is or holds himself out to be, whether or not pursuant to contractual relationship, an agent of a foreign principal as defined in clause (1) of this subsection."

(3) Subsection (d) is amended by striking out "clause (1), (2), or (4) of".

(4) Subsection (g) is amended by inserting before the words, "matter pertaining to", the words "public relations" and before the semicolon at the end thereof the words "of such principal".

(5) Such section is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(o) The term 'political activities' includes the dissemination of political propaganda and any other activity which the person engaging therein believes will, or which he intends to, prevail upon, indoctrinate, convert, induce, persuade, or in any other way influence any other person or any section of the public within the United States with reference to the political or public interests, policies, or relations of a government of a foreign country, or a foreign political party or with reference to the domestic or foreign policies of the United States.

"(p) The term 'political consultant' means any person, including, without limitation, any economic, legal or other consultant, who engages in informing or advising any person with reference to the political or public interests, policies or relations of a foreign country or of a foreign political party or with reference to the domestic or foreign policies of the United States."

Sec. 2. Section 2 of such Act is amended as follows:

(1) Subsection (a) is amended by striking out the second, third, and fourth sentences and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "Except as hereinafter provided, every person who becomes an agent of a foreign principal shall, within ten days thereafter, file with the Attorney General, in duplicate, a registration statement, under oath on a form prescribed by the Attorney General. The obligation of an agent of a foreign principal to file a registration statement shall, after the tenth day of his becoming such agent, continue from day to day, and termination of such status shall not relieve such agent from his obligation to file a registration statement for the period during which he was an agent of a foreign principal."

(2) Subsection (a)(3) is amended by inserting before the semicolon at the end thereof a comma and the following: "or by any other foreign principal".

(3) Subsection (a)(4) is amended by inserting before the semicolon at the end thereof a comma and the following: "including a detailed statement of any such activity which is a political activity".

(4) Subsection (a)(6) is amended by inserting before the semicolon at the end thereof a comma and the following: "including a detailed statement of any such activity which is political activity".

(5) Subsection (a)(7) is amended to read as follows:

"(7) The name, business, and residence addresses, and if an individual, the nationality, of any person other than a foreign principal for whom the registrant is acting, assuming or purporting to act or has agreed to act under such circumstances as require his registration hereunder; the extent to which such person is supervised, directed, owned, controlled, financed, or subsidized, in whole or in part, by any government of a foreign country or foreign political party or by any other foreign principal; and the nature and amount of contributions, income, money, or thing of value, if any, that the registrant has received during the preceding sixty days from each such person in connection with any of the activities referred to in clause (6) of this subsection, either as compensation or for disbursement or otherwise, and the form and time of each such payment and from whom received;".

(6) Subsection (a)(8) is amended to read as follows:

"(8) A detailed statement of the money and other things of value spent or disposed of by the registrant during the preceding sixty days in furtherance of or in connection with activities which require his registration hereunder and which have been undertaken by him either as an agent of a foreign principal or for himself or any other person or in connection with any activities relating to his becoming an agent of such principal, and a detailed statement of any contributions of money or other things of value made by him during the preceding sixty days (other than contributions the making of which is prohibited under the terms of section 613 of title 18, United States Code) in connection with an election to any political office or in conection with any primary election, convention, or caucus held to select candidates for any political office;".

(7) Such section is further amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(f) The Attorney General may, by regulation, provide for the exemption from registration, or from the requirement of furnishing any of the information required by this section, of any person who is listed as a partner, officer, director, or employee in the registration statement filed by an agent of a foreign principal under this Act, where by reason of the nature of the functions or activities of such person the Attorney General having due regard for the national security and the public interest determines that such registration, or the furnishing of such information, is not necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act."

Sec. 3. Section 3(d) of such Act is amended by striking out the words "financial or mercantile".

Sec. 4. Section 4 of such Act is amended as follows:

(1) Subsection (a) is amended by inserting after the words "political propaganda" the words "for or in the interests of such foreign principal"; and by striking out the words "send to the Librarian of Congress two copies thereof and file with the Attorney General one copy thereof" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "file with the Attorney General two copies thereof".

(2) Subsection (b) is amended by inserting after the words "political propaganda" where they first appear the words "for or in the interests of such foreign principal"; by inserting after the words "setting forth" the words "the relationship or connection between the person transmitting the political propaganda or causing it to be transmitted and such propaganda;"; and by striking out the words "each of his foreign principals" and inserting in lieu thereof "such foreign principal".

(3) Subsection (c) is amended by striking out the words "sent to the Librarian of Congress" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "filed with the Attorney General".

(4) Such section is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(e) It shall be unlawful for any person within the United States who is an agent of a foreign principal required to register under the provisions of this Act to transmit, convey, or otherwise furnish to any agency or official of the Government (including a Member or committeee of either House of Congress) for or in the interests of such foreign principal any political propaganda or to request from any such agency or official for or in the interests of such foreign principal any information or advice with respect to any matter pertaining to the political or public interests, policies or relations of a foreign country or of a political party or pertaining to the foreign or domestic policies of the United States unless the propaganda or the request is prefaced or accompanied by a true and accurate statement to the effect that such person is registered as an agent of such foreign principal under this Act.

"(f) Whenever any agent of a foreign principal required to register under this Act appears before any committee of Congress to testify for or in the interests of such foreign principal, he shall, at the time of such appearance, furnish the committee with a copy of his most recent registration statement filed with the Department of Justice as an agent of such foreign principal for inclusion in the records of the committee as part of his testimony."

Sec. 5. Section 5 of such Act is amended by inserting after "the provisions of this Act," where they first appear the words "in accordance with such business and accounting practices,".

Sec. 6. Section 6 of such Act is amended by inserting the letter "(a)" after the section number and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(b) The Attorney General shall, promptly upon receipt, transmit one copy of every registration statement filed hereunder and one copy of every amendment or supplement thereto, and one copy of every item of political propaganda filed hereunder, to the Secretary of State for such comment and use as the Secretary of State may determine to be appropriate from the point of view of the foreign relations of the United States. Failure of the Attorney General so to transmit such copy shall not be a bar to prosecution under this Act.

"(c) The Attorney General is authorized to furnish to departments and agencies in the executive branch and committees of the Congress such information obtained by him in the administration of this Act including the names of registrants under this Act, copies of registration statements, or parts thereof, copies of political propoganda, or other documents or information filed under this Act, as may be appropriate in the light of the purposes of this Act."

Sec. 7. Section 8 of such Act is amended as follows:

(1) Subsection (a) is amended by adding before the period at the end of paragraph (2) a comma and the following: "except that in the case of a violation of subsection (b), (e), or (f) of section 4 or of subsection (g) or (h) of this section the punishment shall be a fine of not more than $5,000 or imprisonment for not more than six months, or both".

(2) Such section is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(f) Whenever in the judgment of the Attorney General any person is engaged in or about to engage in any acts which constitute or will constitute a violation of any provision of this Act, or regulations issued thereunder, or whenever any agent of a foreign principal fails to comply with any of the provisions of this Act or the regulations issued thereunder, or otherwise is in violation of the Act, the Attorney General may make application to the appropriate United States district court for an order enjoining such acts or enjoining such person from continuing to act as an agent of such foreign principal, or for an order requiring compliance with any appropriate provision of the Act or regulation thereunder. The district court shall have jurisdiction and authority to issue a temporary or permanent injunction, restraining order or such other order which it may deem proper. The proceedings shall be made a preferred cause and shall be expedited in every way.

"(g) If the Attorney General determines that a registration statement does not comply with the requirements of this Act or the regulations issued thereunder, he shall so notify the registrant in writing, specifying in what respects the statement is deficient. It shall be unlawful for any person to act as an agent of a foreign principal at any time ten days or more after receipt of such notification without filing an amended registration statement in full compliance with the requirements of this Act and the regulations issued thereunder.

"(h) It shall be unlawful for any agent of a foreign principal required to register under this Act to be a party to any contract, agreement, or understanding, either express or implied, with such foreign principal pursuant to which the amount or payment of the compensation, fee, or other remuneration of such agent is contingent in whole or in part upon the success of any political activities carried on by such agent."

SEC. 8. (a) Chapter 29 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"§ 613. Contributions by agents of foreign principals

"Whoever, being an agent of a foreign principal, directly or through any other person, either for or on behalf of such foreign principal or otherwise in his capacity as agent of such foreign principal, knowingly makes any contribution of money or other thing of value, or promises expressly or impliedly to make any such contribution, in connection with an election to any political office or in connection with any primary election, convention, or caucus held to select candidates for any political office; or

"Whoever knowingly solicits, accepts, or receives any such contribution from any such agent of a foreign principal or from such foreign principal—

"Shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than five years or both.

"As used in this section—

"(1) The term 'foreign principal' has the same meaning as when used in the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended, except that such term does not include any person who is a citizen of the United States.

"(2) The term 'agent of a foreign principal' means any person who acts as an agent, representative, employee, servant, or in any other capacity at the order, request, or under the direction or control of a foreign principal or of a person any substantial portion of whose activities are directly or indirectly supervised, directed, or controlled by a foreign principal."

(b) Chapter 11 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"§ 219. Officers and employees acting as agents of foreign principals

"Whoever, being an officer or employee of the United States in the executive, legislative, or judicial branch of the Government or in any agency of the United States, including the District of Columbia, is or acts as an agent of a foreign principal required to register under the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended, shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned for not more than two years, or both.

"Nothing in this section shall apply to the employment of any agent of a foreign principal as a special Government employee in any case in which the head of the employing agency certifies that such employment is required in the national interest. A copy of any certification under this paragraph shall be forwarded by the head of such agency to the Attorney General who shall cause the same to be filed with the registration statement and other documents filed by such agent, and made available for public inspection in accordance with section 6 of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended."

(c)(1) The sectional analysis at the beginning of chapter 29 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"613. Contributions by agents of foreign principals."

(2) The sectional analysis at the beginning of chapter 11 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"219. Officers and employees acting as agents of foreign principals."

SEC. 9. This Act shall take effect ninety days after the date of its enactment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the bill before the Senate primarily reflects the progressively larger role in world affairs that the United States has had to play in the past 20 or so years. Particularly since World War II, American foreign policy has become a central point of reference to the policies and basic interests of virtually every nation in the world. Thus, the efforts to influence American policy have become correspondingly greater and subtler over this same period.

The Committee on Foreign Relations has for some time been aware of the growing tendency of foreign political and commercial interests to influence American policy by other than the conventional diplomatic representations. Besides the Department of State, the Congress has also been the object of the efforts of the domestic representatives of foreign principals to influence American foreign policy generally and specific areas of policy such as foreign aid legislation.

It should be understood that the committee's concern with this problem began long before certain of my colleagues and I sought to amend the sugar legislation and to curtail the influence of the so-called sugar lobbyists. The bill before the Senate, I repeat, is designed to assure, as far as possible, the public disclosure of all persons acting for or in the interests of foreign principals whenever their activities are entirely or partly political in nature.

I emphasize the fact that the bill does not prohibit the representation of foreign principals, but merely requires, and its objective is to require, the public disclosure of that fact.

As such, the committee believes that the bill will enable the Department of Justice to cope more effectively with a problem that has changed considerably since 1934, when the first Un-American Activities Committee was established to investigate Nazi and other subversive propaganda then being circulated in the United States.

As a result of its findings, this committee, chaired by the distinguished Speaker of the House of Representatives, Congressman JOHN W. MCCORMACK, reported a series of legislative recommendations that resulted in the passage in 1938 of the Foreign Agents Registration Act. The first, and primary, legislative recommendation of Congressman MCCORMACK's committee was:

> That the Congress shall enact a statute requiring all publicity, propaganda, or public relations agents or other agents who represent in this country any foreign government or a foreign political party or a foreign industrial organization to register with the Secretary of State of the United States, and to state name and location of such employer, the character of the service to be rendered, and the amount of compensation paid or to be paid therefor.

Since passage of the act, it has been amended twice, and in 1942 jurisdiction was transferred from the Department of State to the Department of Justice. However, the object of the statute remains as originally set forth by Mr. MCCORMACK's committee.

The Committee on Foreign Relations instructed the staff in the spring of 1961 to undertake a survey of certain nondiplomatic activities that had attracted the committee's attention. As a result of questions raised by this initial survey, a broader study was undertaken by the staff in order to determine if a full committee investigation would be advisable. Following upon this additional survey of the problem the committee decided in July 1962 to report Senate Resolution 362, which authorized "a full and complete study of all nondiplomatic activities of representatives of foreign governments, and their contractors and agents, in promoting the interests of those governments and the extent to which such representatives attempt to influence the policies of the United States and affect the national interest."

At this time, the committee also issued a preliminary study which illustrated the kinds of activities in which nondiplomatic representatives of foreign governments have been engaged. This study included, anonymously, some actual cases, which I will insert in the RECORD at the end of my remarks. But a few of them I will read at this point:

In 1961, a foreign government's U.S. public relations firm whose registration statement indicates it was hired to promote tourism filmed nine newsreels, seven of which dealt with political events within the foreign country. The news films were distributed to major U.S. newsreel companies and shown in theaters across the country with no indication to the audiences that the films were paid for by the foreign government.

In 1955, the Washington editor of a monthly national magazine received money from a foreign government for public relations work on their behalf. During the period he wrote at least one article on that particular country for his own magazine. In addition, he served as a paid consultant to a congressional subcommittee which was making a study of political activities within the country he represented.

In 1961, the U.S. public relations firm for a foreign client gave financial support to an American committee of nationals from the country involved. The chairman of this committee, who received a weekly salary from the public relations firm, led a delegation to Washington to complain about U.S. policy toward his former homeland. He contacted Members of Congress and officials at the White House and Department of State, but failed to disclose during these meetings that he was receiving funds from a foreign principal.

In 1959, a private American organization requested the congressional delegation of a large eastern State to answer a mailed questionnaire dealing with a controversial foreign policy issue that involved a government allied to the United States. The American organization did not disclose to the Senators and Congressmen the fact that the questionnaire they were requested to answer had been drawn up by a lawyer who represented the foreign nation involved. Nor did the organization inform the legislators that their replies were to be passed on to the foreign country's diplomatic representatives in the United States.

In 1959, officers of a major U.S. radio network signed an agreement with officials of a small Caribbean republic calling for the network to carry a "monthly minimum of 425 minutes of news and commentary" about the foreign country. News material was to be supplied by the foreign government and the network officials agreed not to broadcast anything inconsistent with the foreign government's best interests. For 18 months of this service, the foreign government paid the network officials $750,000. The deal collapsed shortly after it was signed when the top network official involved resigned from office.

In 1956, a New York City law firm hired as general counsel for legal matters in the United States for a foreign government helped arrange a special presidential economic mission to its client country.

Following Senate approval of this resolution, the committee undertook a still more comprehensive investigation, with additional staff assisted by accountant-investigators supplied by the General Accounting Office and with the cooperation of the Justice Department and the State Department.

As indicated in the committee report, "some 250 registration statements on file with the Department of Justice were reviewed and 50 were chosen for closer review. From these 50, 15 individuals representing 9 registrants were called to testify before the committee in executive hearings. Their selection was not made because they were necessarily typical of the majority of nondiplomatic agents. Rather, they were chosen because the types and sometimes obscure patterns of their activities represented, in the judgment of the committee, violations of the spirit and purpose of the Foreign Agents Registration Act. It was from a study of such situations that the committee hoped to determine legislative needs as well as suggested changes in executive agency procedures and safeguards."

In January 1963, the committee reported favorably Senate Resolution 26, which expanded the committee's study to include the activities of agents with nongovernmental foreign principals. Throughout the year, the committee held public and executive meetings both with public officials and registered agents.

The chief provisions of this bill would have the effect of:

First. Giving the Attorney General power to enjoin an agent from acting for his foreign principal if the agent's filings with the Department of Justice are found to be inadequate. Under present law the Attorney General could only seek to prosecute agents under a criminal provision if their registration was inadequate.

I believe that perhaps this is one of the most important sections in the bill. Our investigation indicated that because of the severity of the remedy carried in the existing law, the Department of Justice has found it very difficult to enforce the law and, in a sense, have been deterred from enforcing the law, because of the feeling that it cannot obtain a criminal conviction when there is a failure of such a person to file adequate reports. Therefore, I believe, as a matter of administration and of obtaining compliance, that this first provision, giving the Department injunctive power, is probably one of the most important sections in the bill.

Second. Requiring an agent to disclose his foreign principal in all communications with agencies and officials of the U.S. Government, including Members of Congress.

I am sure Members of the Senate remember that one of the most notorious lobbyists appeared before committees of Congress and, I am sure, spoke directly with Members of Congress, without revealing his interest in a particular legislative proposal. I am confident that members of my committee, including myself, did not know—I certainly did not know—of the relationship of one of these men, who was the subject of further study, and of his interest in the legislation.

Further, the agent would be required to file a copy of his last previous registration statement at any time he testifies before congressional committees on behalf of his foreign principal.

If that provision had been in the law at the time I spoke of, when the subject involved the Philippines, I am confident that the result would have been different.

Third. Prohibiting an agent from soliciting campaign contributions from or acting as a conduit for campaign funds from foreign principals. The amendment further requires that all foreign agents file a report of campaign contributions made with funds other than those directly received from their foreign principal.

Fourth. Prohibiting contingent fee contracts between agents and foreign principals.

Fifth. Defining with greater precision the persons whose political activities in this country on behalf of foreign interests require registration.

In general, the bill is intended to enable the Department of Justice to regulate more effectively those activities which the statute is designed to cover. The bill is also intended to exempt those activities with a genuine commercial purpose which is served by other than political activities.

I emphasize this because I think there is some misunderstanding of this aspect of the proposed legislation. The existing law restricts exemptions to financial and mercantile activities. The committee believes that in addition to these activities, legal, public relations, and other activities should be exempted where their objectives are stricly commercial and where these objectives are advanced by nonpolitical means.

Some American businessmen have expressed concern that, while the commercial exemption provision is broadened by the committee bill, it could nevertheless require registration by representatives of domestic subsidiaries of foreign parent corporations or foreign subsidiaries of domestic parents which do no more than carry on normal commercial activities involving contacts with the Government. Let me make unmistakably clear the committee's strong view that all activities of agents or foreign principals that are not political in nature can and should be exempted.

The committee went to some length in its report to dispel any doubt on this point. During the hearings on the bill last November, I asked Mr. Katzenbach for the Justice Department's view of the application of the act, as presently written, to foreign subsidiaries of domestic parent corporation, and more specifically to the question of whether the activities of a particular agent can be determined to be on behalf of a foreign subsidiary or its domestic parent. Mr. Katzenbach replied:

> You have to assume, first, that none of the exemptions apply to this particular activity. Most of these, I suspect, are within the commerical exemption.

He went on to say:

> I think that really in this sort of instance one can go along fairly well on form. If you are acting for and being paid by the foreign subsidiary of a domestic corporation that in itself ought to really be enough, and I would think there is no particular advantage to the Government in that instance in piercing corporate veils or attempting to decide which way it would be done. I think the more difficult cases are those in which you are acting on behalf of and paid by the American entity, whereas the activities really are more closely related to the foreign subsidiary. I think that is the more difficult case, and I suspect one could get by in that instance, in most instances, without a registration.

Mr. Katzenbach, it should be emphasized, was addressing himself to existing law, not to the committee amendment, which, as I have indicated, significantly broadens this commercial exemption. That fact is that all of those who might conceivably have to register under the committee bill are already required to do so under the much broader existing law.

Some of the businessmen who have not yet been reassured on this question submitted to the committee staff a list of examples of the kinds of activities carried on by agents of foreign subsidiaries of domestic parent corporations and the domestic subsidiaries of foreign parent corporations that they fear might fall within the scope of the bill. With respect to domestic parent corporations, it seemed clear that none of the examples, as set forth, would require registration. With respect to domestic subsidiaries of foreign parent corporations, some of the examples seem clearly exempt, while some others would—and should—require registration under both existing law and the committee bill.

What the committee has sought to exempt are routine commercial activities designed to reach commercial objectives. It has not, however, exempted political activities designed to reach commercial objectives.

Mr. President, the bill before us, as indicated, is the product of more than a year of investigation and study. We have heard a great deal in the past about the powers of Congress to investigate and the purposes to which such investigations are put. I strongly believe that we have a responsibility to study areas in which activities undertaken by individuals may harm the public interest. Such investigations should be directed, however, toward those areas where the harmful activities are either untouched by existing law, or inadequately covered. The responsibility of the Congress is to determine in such cases whether new or amended statutes are required.

Where harmful activities are already covered by the law, or where they are beyond legislative remedy, the responsibility for regulating them rests elsewhere. Clearly, a law is only as effective as its enforcement, and the committee, as indicated in the report, "is encouraged by testimony that cooperation between the executive departments has increased with regard to enforcement of the Foreign Agents Registration Act and circulation of information disclosed under the act."

An inherent part of the problem of regulating the activities of nondiplomatic agents of foreign interests is the public's right to know the source of material inspired by foreign agents and conveyed by the mass media. The first amendment guarantees freedom of the press, but only the press itself can make the public aware of the source of material which it may convey to the public, but which originates with representatives of foreign interests.

The committee's hearings disclosed a number of cases of what one prominent editor characterized as "corruptions" of our mass media. Again, only the press, perhaps behind the urging of the public and the Congress, can take whatever steps are necessary to meet its public responsibilities in this sensitive area.

Mr. President, as I have tried to indicate, the scope of our country's oversea commitments and responsibilities are unique. More than that, they are vital to our own and to the security of the free world. The responsibility to see that American foreign policy is adequate to its responsibility is a collective one. The officials responsible for our policies must rely on the informed support of those whom they govern. The bill is basically intended to serve that purpose.

I strongly urge that the Senate act favorably upon the bill.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have listened with the greatest of interest to the development by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas of the amendments to the Foreign Agents Registration Act. The Senator from Arkansas has given the subject much attention, as has the committee of which he is the chairman, in developing the bill.

As he himself noted in his presentation, the bill involves serious fundamental questions. He stated the problem, and I think his language is as good as any on what the problem is. He said—and I believe my recollection is fairly accurate—that the bill seeks to exempt from registration anyone who pursues routine commercial activities designed to reach commercial objectives.

He said the bill seeks to bring about the registration of those who would engage in commercial activities to reach political objectives.

The only trouble with that definition is that it leaves out a large number of people and a great number of situations, because many commercial activities seek to reach objectives which are mixed economic and political objectives; and the test which is prescribed by the bill, as its intent is described in the committee report, would clearly bring about a requirement for registration in many situations in which, in my judgment and in the judgment of many in the commercial world, there is no intention whatever to bring about such registration.

I shall, in the course of these remarks, specify in detail many of those situations, and I also shall submit an amendment which I believe will clarify the limitations of the statute.

To begin with, I point out that I agree with the statute. I favor the registration of foreign agents in an effective way, so as to close the loopholes; but in the process of closing those loopholes, I do not believe we can engage in an unrealistic appraisal of actual practices of business concerns which are genuinely American businesses.

The report is significant on this score; insofar as the subject matter which I am raising is concerned, the report deals with a description of what is intended to be accomplished by section 3 of the bill. I read from the report as follows:

> Section 3 would amend section 3(d) of the act by exempting all activities with a bona fide commercial purpose which are private and are not political activities. The existing provision appears inadvertently to have been narrowed from its original scope by an amendment adopted in 1961, which restricted exemptions to financial and mercantile activities. The committee intends that legal, public relations, and other activities should be exempted when they have a commercial end and meet the other requirements of the section. The extension is not intended, however, to exempt activities having a bona fide commercial end but which employ political means to arrive at that end as, for example, in the case of the representative of a foreign manufacturer who brings pressure on the Department of Defense to reverse a "buy American" policy.

Then the report deals with exactly this point, on page 12; I shall refer to it, because it is very important:

> Both this subsection and the preceding subsection, as well as others in the proposed bill, employ the phrase, "for or in the interest of" the agent's foreign principal. It is, of course, recognized that thorny questions of interpretation will arise under these provisions. In situations involving complex corporate structures, it may prove difficult to make a factual determination as to whether certain material serves the interests of a foreign principal. The registered agent of a foreign corporation may also perform services for the corporation's domestic affiliate.

I digress here for a moment, to point out that there are American companies which have foreign subsidiaries and foreign affiliates, as there are also foreign companies which have American subsidiaries and American affiliates which are very American in their ownership and in their line of business. These are the problems with which we feel the bill deals unrealistically.

I continue reading from the report:

> Conceivably, booklets and news releases disseminated by the agent on behalf of the domestic affiliate may appear to some to fall within the scope of the proposed language; others may reach a different judgment. Clearly, this is not a question for which the law can establish strict criteria. However, the Department of Justice has stated that it is prepared to advise on hypothetical situations in order to help to resolve uncertainties under this and other provisions of the act. It is also clear that the authority for determining the scope of the language "for or in the interest of a foreign principal" lies with the Department of Justice, not the registrant. For example, the mere assertion by a registrant that a letter from him to a newspaper editor is not "for or in the interest of" should not decisively affect the judgment of the Justice Department, assuming, of course, the letter in question bears on matters of interest to the registrant's foreign principal.

To show how thorny this subject is, I continue to read from the committee report on page 12, the second paragraph:

> In the situation where an agent of a U.S. parent corporation acts as agent for a foreign subsidiary or where a foreign corporation establishes an American subsidiary, the committee recognizes that the interests of the parent and subsidiary are not invariably the same. Where in either of these cases the domestic affiliate or agent engages in political or other activities covered by the act, the predominant interests served—

And I beg Senators to take note of those words—

> will in every case decide the question of registration. For example, the question of a U.S. parent's ability to repatriate profits earned by its foreign subsidiary is predominantly in the interests of the parent rather than the oversea subsidiary. Likewise, questions arising under the National Labor Relations Act affecting the domestic subsidiary of a foreign parent would probably be predominantly in the interests of the local subsidiary to resolve.

Therefore, by implication, although the committee does not say so, one would assume that in those situations registration would not be required. The significance of those two examples is that they show cognizance on the part of the committee, as well as on the part of the drafters of the proposed legislation, of the fact that there are situations which do not represent the preponderant interest in a foreign subsidiary by an American company and, likewise, situations which do not represent the preponderant interest of a foreign principal in a subsidiary of that foreign corporation.

Now we come to the point where the shoe pinches:

> Where, on the other hand, the local subsidiary is concerned with U.S. legislation

> enlarging the U.S. market for goods produced in the country where the foreign parent is located (as in the case of sugar quota legislation, for example) the predominant interest is foreign. Likewise, where the foreign subsidiary of a U.S. parent is concerned with U.S. legislation facilitating investment or expansion of production abroad the locus of the interest will, also, as a general rule, be predominantly (even if not ultimately) foreign.

The first question which suggests itself is this: What about the local subsidiary of a foreign corporation concerned with U.S. legislation relating to sugar produced in this country?

This is the point which has caused many of the major corporations of the United States to be cast in deep doubt about this matter, and has caused the Chamber of Commerce of the United States to have grave questions about this matter, which is the reason for the amendment which I shall propose.

I point out that the best one can say for the committee report is it proposes that the Department of Justice shall decide whom it will prosecute and whom it will not prosecute under this particular measure.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, at that point, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I should like to finish, first.

That decision, on the basis of the so-called predominant interest theory—that is, what is the predominant interest in every case—is causing grave questions to arise in the Department of Justice. Anyone who has antitrust-law experience wishes to know when the Department will act and when it will not act, according to its authority under certain laws. It can be appreciated why American business feels that it will be placed in great jeopardy if this matter is allowed to reach the point where there always will be a question as to whether the Department of Justice will or will not act in a particular case, thus involving such businesses in many borderline situations, a whole list of which I propose to read to the Senate.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In order to pinpoint this matter, does the Senator from New York maintain that the bill covers areas that are not covered by existing law?

Mr. JAVITS. I believe that, under existing law, there has been established a pattern which enables many of these activities to continue—and they are continuing—free of registration. It is felt that with the proposal which is now before Congress, and with the interpretation placed upon that statute by the committee itself, many of these activities will be caught within the net of the new law. That is the reason for the desire to amend it in order to deal with these specific factual situations.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I state to the Senator that it is my belief—and I think it is the committee's belief—that the exemption provision is broadened by the committee bill. If the activity the Senator describes or proposes to describe is presently exempt, I think it will be clearly exempt under the bill.

What I think the Senator is suggesting is that, perhaps because of lax enforcement today, many people have been doing something in violation of the law, in that they have not registered; and they think that because this bill provides for more effective methods of enforcement, such as the injunctive process, the law will henceforth be enforced more rigorously. Is that the correct conclusion to be drawn from the Senator's statement?

Mr. JAVITS. That is completely incorrect. I cannot agree with the Senator that the Justice Department can be indicted because it has been lax and has not made people register. In my judgment, it is fair to assume—and it is the only assumption that can be made—that it has not believed that such people should register. The way in which the committee is setting up the ground rules for this particular statute is new; it introduces provisions not heretofore in the law. Under these criteria, which I have read with great care, there is very real concern that activities never intended to be reached by the bill will nonetheless be reached.

For that reason, it is felt that some clarification is required. I think the Senator has had this whole question discussed with him by me and by others. But so far we have seen no light cast on these situations, which, as I have said, I shall describe in some detail, and which perhaps represent the twilight zone. I can understand that situation perfectly—as between what the Senator defined in his opening remarks as the commercial objective, and what seems to be defined in the bill as a political objective.

We are dealing not so much with a political objective alone. It seems to me that the Senator has emphasized the political objective. It is true that we are dealing with a political objective, but we are also dealing with foreign principals. This is the Foreign Agents Registration Act, not merely a lobbyist registration act. I think what needs to be clarified is that both of these concepts—that is, the concept of a political activity and the concept of a political activity pursued for the benefit of a foreign principal are areas in which I think it is very necessary to have the law spelled out in much more specific terms than has thus far been done.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The whole purport of the committee report and the discussion of the committee is not that we shall bring in added registrants and require the registration of those not now registered. The existing law with respect to criminal penalties is, I think, very strong with respect to those required to register. What really concerns the committee is that those who do register do not disclose adequately what they are doing. That is the thrust of the bill and of the report.

One of the most important elements in the bill is the injunctive power given to the Justice Department with respect to the adequacy of the registration. If one chooses not to register at all, that is a willful violation; and he would be subject to criminal penalty, under the existing law, as well as under the bill. It seems to me that the committee broadened the exemption by the slight change in language to which the Senator referred, from the financial and mercantile exemption to a broader concept, the language of which the Senator just referred to. It is a little broader.

Mr. JAVITS. The language is "financial and mercantile."

Mr. FULBRIGHT. We are talking about exemption, not coverage. The exemption in the law is a narrower concept than the language in the bill now, which reads:

> Any person engaging or agreeing to engage only in private and nonpolitical activities.

This is an exemption, I submit in all fairness, that is broader language than what is contained in the existing law. To be exempt under the present law, a person must engage or agree to engage only in activities which are financial or mercantile and which are also both private and nonpolitical. Under the bill, it will suffice if the activities are private and nonpolitical, even though they may not be financial or mercantile. I think the committee was trying, not to broaden the scope of activities which require registration, but really to make the registration more sufficient than now required.

Mr. JAVITS. Often a bill designed to catch a felon will catch an innocent victim. The way the committee has interpreted the particular provision which it is now inserting—which is new language—means, in my judgment, and in the judgment of people who have a great deal at stake in this matter—and I have named who they are; there is no secret about it, as the Senator well knows—that this arrow will miss the target, and will hit a completely different target. I suggest to the Senator that we have tried very hard to agree upon what should be the thrust of the bill.

If the Senator would hear me on some of the examples which have been referred to, then perhaps it might be possible to refine the issues, in order to give assurances which appear to be lacking in the language of the bill and in its interpretation as contained in the report.

I wish to give some of these examples, which have been furnished to me. They are typical situations. It is claimed that registration might be required—although, from what the Senator says, this is not so at all.

All of us are very well aware that hundreds of American companies—businesses engaged in the production of oil, automobiles, aluminum, steel, and other metals; also chemicals, rubber, office equipment, and in the international telephone business—operate abroad in a very widespread field. If my memory serves me, we have approximately $70 billion invested in direct investments throughout the world in many of these operations. Here are some of the instances which are submitted to me as being placed in jeopardy by the way in which the statute is interpreted in the committee report. The U.S. oil companies' international operations would like the Interior Department to increase the import tax on residual fuel oil

Among the major beneficiaries would be its subsidiary in Venezuela, where production would be increased. Nevertheless, a great beneficiary would also be the American company concerned.

Another example is an automobile company which has a German subsidiary which assembles and markets cars in Europe. The Germans propose a tax on horsepower, which would have the effect of discriminating against cars of the type handled by subsidiaries of U.S. companies, but would benefit smaller German cars. The parent company wishes to discuss the subject with the State Department. That is, an American company seeking to discuss the question with the State Department, so that the State Department might intervene to prevent a subsidiary of the American company from being discriminated against.

A Brazilian subsidiary of a U.S. utility is threatened with expropriation or with unfair competition from a government-owned company. The parent wants to familiarize the executive branch and the Congress with this situation.

An American cosmetics company, with a French subsidiary which manufactures perfume, wants to testify in behalf of lower U.S. excise taxes on cosmetics. If the excise tax were lowered, a principal beneficiary would be the French perfume subsidiary, whose production would increase.

An American electrical appliance manufacturer, interested in increasing its capital investments in its subsidiaries in Latin America, wishes to see the U.S. investment guaranty program strengthened and desires to present its case to the executive branch and to members of the appropriate congressional committees. The investment guarantees would apply, of course, to the foreign subsidiaries.

An integrated American aluminum company, obtaining its raw material, bauxite, from a subsidiary incorporated abroad, is alarmed by the threat of a tariff that would decrease its foreign production and wants to express its views to members of the executive branch and the Congress.

An American metal producer markets in various parts of the world through foreign subsidiaries. It finds that the Russians are killing the market in certain countries by dumping the metal, for political reasons, and it wants to speak to officials in the executive branch.

A U.S. computer manufacturer incorporates a manufacturing subsidiary in Belgium in order to better compete in the Common Market. It wishes to bring a number of Belgians to this country to familiarize them with a new line of products, and desires to facilitate visa arrangements with the Justice Department. The beneficiary would be a foreign national.

An American chemical company wishes to expedite an export license at the Commerce Department for some materials urgently needed at the plant of its subsidiary in Central America.

An American rubber company has a European subsidiary which manufactures tires. The subsidiary wants to begin marketing its production in certain African countries, and asks the parent to obtain information from the Commerce and State Departments about U.S. attitudes toward private investments in that area, political conditions, marketing data, and so forth.

There are other examples. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and I have been very instrumental in the establishment of a great private investment company known as ADELA, the Atlantic development group, which is going to be incorporated in Luxembourg. A very large number of the investors in that enterprise will be American. The preponderant investment will be here.

Interestingly, under the proposed bill, none of these activities would require registration if the foreign operations were conducted through a branch. If, however, the foreign operation is conducted through a subsidiary, registration would appear to be required.

Then there are a great many very important foreign companies which have subsidiaries in the United States. The activities of such subsidiaries might be very, very much confined to the benefit of the subsidiary. A number of examples are as follows:

First. Contacts with the executive branch or the Congress on tariff legislation, or appearances before the Tariff Commission concerning trade negotiations.

Second. Discussions with appropriate Government officials concerning disposals from the strategic stockpile which could affect the U.S. market for various materials.

Third. Meetings with Internal Revenue Service on the application of various U.S. taxes to the domestic subsidiary.

Fourth. Discussions with the Food and Drug Administration regarding a spice which a U.S. subsidiary imports from a foreign parent and wishes to use in a food product marketed in this country.

Fifth. Negotiations with the Customs Bureau concerning the proper tariff classification of an imported product.

Sixth. Appearances before executive agencies and the Congress on customs simplification matters.

Seventh. Informing the foreign parent on discussions held with the Council of Economic Advisers concerning possible U.S. Government actions to increase interest rates or to enforce the wage-price guidelines.

Eighth. Discussions with the State and Commerce Departments concerning U.S. attitudes toward trade with the Soviet.

Ninth. Discussions with the State Department concerning interpretation of tax treaties.

Tenth. Representations concerning the effects of Federal excise taxes on markets in the United States for a product whose raw materials are supplied by the foreign parent.

Eleventh. Attempts to combat a drive to impose burdensome labeling requirements on imported products.

Indeed it is claimed that there really was not presented during the committee's investigation any evidence indicating any necessity to require registration by legitimate companies, primarily American in their ownership and base, conducting normal liaison relations with the U.S. Government on subjects of basic commercial importance.

I think that is borne out, as I have said, by the phrase which I found in the presentation of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], which seemed to me so clear. I think if the Justice Department really follows out that intent, and, in view of all the examples which I have stated, requires registration as a foreign agent of persons who engage in commercial activities in order to reach objectives which may be partially political—almost any American business pursues those objectives all the time—we shall indeed have a very much broader registration requirement than we have now, and there will be considerable jeopardy to the individual companies, in that regard.

In order to incorporate in precise language what I have in mind, I send to the desk an amendment to the bill, and ask that it be stated by the clerk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McINTYRE in the chair). The Chair informs the Senator from New York that his amendment will not be in order until the committee amendments are agreed to.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from New York will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, in line 17, it is proposed to insert, after the words "amended by", the words "inserting a dash after the words 'does not include' and adding thereafter '(1)', by"; and on page 3, line 18, to delete the period at the end thereof and add thereafter the following: ", and by adding at the end of subsection (d) the following:

" '(2) any corporation, or any officer, director, employee, servant or attorney of any corporation organized under or created by the laws of the United States or of any State or other place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States having its principal place of business within the United States which is at least 80 per centum owned as of record by citizens of the United States and which is regularly and primarily engaged in bona fide commerce, industry, or finance, solely by virtue of activities of any such person in furtherance of the bona fide trade or commerce of any bona fide business corporation or other similar association or organization or combination of persons

" '(i) directly or indirectly at least 50 per centum beneficially owned, or

" '(ii) owned by not more than 20 persons and directly or indirectly at least 5 per centum beneficially owned

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

by the corporation engaging, or the corporation the officers, directors, employees, servants, or attorneys of which engage in such activities.' "

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I realize we have a problem; yet I believe the bill requires amendment, because certainly the problem is not met by the bill. I say that for this reason. The amendment is, for all practical purposes, an assertion that as for businesses and activities which are substantially owned in the United States, the act shall not apply in terms of foreign agents' registration. That is a generic exemption of a whole class of companies and people.

What the Senator from Arkansas and the committee have been saying is, "Let us seek to exempt a class of activity, that class of activity to be defined within very broad permissive provisions that the act contains."

It can be very easily understood why the people and the corporations concerned are unwilling to submit themselves—and there are a number of them, many of them with great complexities—to this determination by the Department of Justice on a case-by-case basis. One example very opposite to this situation is the antitrust laws. At the same time, it can be easily understood why the committee feels that in some cases even an American principle may be acting for itself, or acting as a subsidiary of a foreign corporation, or acting as the parent of a foreign corporation, and may engage in an activity which comes within the confines of the statute.

The real problem which has been raised is due in the first place, to the effort to regulate, by registration, something which probably is very difficult to regulate; and, second, due to the way in which the committee in its report has set a standard of judgment based upon predominant interest, a criterion which is extremely hard to get to.

I would suggest—and I know the chairman of the committee is wrestling with these questions—this possibility to the chairman: I would say that where there is a very heavily predominant interest in the United States, we deal with it in a specific way. The major part of my amendment deals with 80-percent ownership by Americans. It may very well be that the only way in which this Gordian knot can be cut is to provide that, in the case of an American company which has a very substantial interest in a foreign subsidiary, for the purpose of this statute such a corporation shall be considered as an American company, and not acting for a foreign principal. On the other hand, if a foreign company has an American subsidiary, it would have to be very substantially owned in the United States in order to avoid foreign-agent registration.

Therefore, I suggest to the Senator from Arkansas the possibility of agreeing upon some practical percentage which would make a generic exemption, on the ground that for the purpose of this registration statute it would be necessary to have some rule of thumb other than the uncertain definition of the Department of Justice.

For example, we could provide that an American company would be considered an American company, no matter what it did in this field—even if it were to act in the interest of a foreign subsidiary—provided the foreign subsidiary was two-thirds beneficially owned by the American company.

That is a very high percentage because partnerships and joint ventures abroad often proceed on a 50–50 percent basis. Such a company might well be considered as substantally owned in the United States. Suppose we were to provide, in reverse, that when we are dealing with an American subsidiary of a foreign company, that company would have to be 50 percent beneficially owned in the United States in order to qualify as an American company.

That is a rule of thumb, I agree, and it is an arbitrary standard; but at the same time it is an effort to get away from the predominant-interest subject, which means that the Department of Justice would have to give a railway letter—and I am sure the Senator understands what I mean—any time a doubtful situation existed.

It is important to try to set up some standard by which, for the purpose of this act, we can say that if an American company has subsidiaries abroad, which subsidiaries are owned to the extent of two-thirds, they will be considered to be American companies, whereas if the foreign companies are owned to the extent of one-half, we will consider those subsidiaries to be American companies.

I am not entirely wedded to this percentage; I have merely proposed it in an effort to resolve the issue.

It does seem to me that unless we proceed in this way, we cannot have a sense of assurance or a sense of being at all precise, as one should be in writing a statute.

In order to avoid a number of thorny questions, I believe that some percentage basis as a determinant of what is an American company should be acceptable. I would also not mind if we provided 80 percent of such ownership as to a parent company. In other words, a parent would have to have 80 percent ownership in the United States, and with the subsidiaries, it must own at least x percent of the subsidiaries. I suggested 80 percent. With respect to a foreign subsidiary in the United States, I have suggested that it would have to be 50 percent beneficially owned by Americans. That might be a way in which we could get away from the concept. What I have tried to do is to suggest a solution which will deal with the foreign aspect of this question, rather than with the activity.

I would appreciate having the Senator's comment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, what is involved is the nature of the activity. The Senator from New York is thinking, I suppose, of an ordinary commercial corporation. Suppose it were one of the large unincorporated public relations firms. It might be 100 percent owned by Americans. It could operate just as would an American citizen, who is not incorporated either, and could represent a foreign government. He could represent it in the ordinary course of commercial activities, without having to register. All he would do would be to follow the law, not seek to influence the policy of the Government, particularly as we have seen happen in the notorious cases of lobbyists who come to Congress to lobby before a committee, without ever telling that they are employed. What is involved is the nature of the activity and the end it is intended to reach. If we provide exemptions on the basis of relationships rather than on the basis of the kinds of activities involved, then in a few years, all the lobbyists would be organized in accordance with the particular type of exemption, and they would do whatever they pleased, whenever they liked. I would rather have no bill than to provide such an exemption.

These concepts of political and public policy interests grew up around existing law. There is nothing new in the bill. The bill relates to the power of injunction enforcement beyond the broadened exemption. The words of art have already been developed under existing law.

I do not see how the Senator believes anyone will be grossly misused or injured by the very minor provisions, particularly in this part of the act.

Rather than create an arbitrary standard for exemption on the basis of corporate structures, I would rather have no bill at all; I think we would do better with existing law, by trying to enforce it a little better. The proposals of the committee make it easier to enforce, because it is not necessary to go before a grand jury and get an indictment, put people in jail, or fine them heavily. Under the bill, such representatives can be regulated and the law administered much more easily. All those who would be required to register under the bill also have to register under the existing law.

Mr. JAVITS. In the first place, I think the Senator's point is answered by the amendment, in view of the way the amendment deals with the commercial and business activities of the particular person and of the particular corporation that may be called upon to register. The amendment deals with the activities of the subsidiary of the particular company which is in that particular line of business. It also deals with the domestic subsidiary of a foreign company which is engaged in that particular company's line of business and he engages in its activities in that particular line of business.

As to a company which represents or makes a business of representing other companies, such as a public-relations company, I see no objection whatever to eliminating it completely from this amendment. I have no intention or design to the contrary. We are looking to companies which pursue normal activities throughout the world, and have a real concern that they will be caught in this particular net.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. What is "normal" in that case? The Senator cited a great many examples. I reviewed, with the staff, the first 12, which deal with U.S. parent corporations with foreign subsidiaries. We were unanimous in believing not one of those would be required to register.

As to the second group, foreign parent corporations with U.S. subsidiaries, we could not arrive at a conclusion as to most of them, primarily because there was not enough information.

What is involved is the kind of activity. For example, someone mentioned a Canadian company whose legitimate purpose or legitimate objective is the perfectly normal one of unloading surpluses onto the American stockpile. The Canadian company wants to get rid of its surplus at a price. We have established stockpile policies. The Canadian company comes here openly, with a lawyer, and follows open procedures, without trying to influence policy, but merely to abide by existing policy. It does not seem to me that an activity of that kind would fall within the pattern of the bill.

But suppose the company came before members of a committee that was investigating the matter or had jurisdiction over it, and sought to change the law or change the policy. That would be pursuing the legitimate business objective of selling its metals or whatever its products might be, but by using political means. If the company did that, it would be required to register. We do not say it would be prohibited from doing even that. We do not say it could not approach members of the Government; but if it did, it would be representing a foreign agent or a foreign principal, and it ought to let it be known that it is paid by a Canadian concern and is engaged in that kind of activity. I do not see how that would be a great imposition on such a company.

But if it was doing a normal business, not seeking to influence the policy of the Government through political activities, it would not have to register. It does not have to register under existing law; it would not have to register under the bill.

I cannot approve a big exemption of unknown extent. I would rather have no bill than to have such an exemption.

Mr. JAVITS. In the first place, the Senator from Arkansas picks out stockpiling, which is a relatively small part of the business of foreign companies or foreign subsidiaries.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I was merely citing an example.

Mr. JAVITS. I understand; but it is a most invidious example. The Senator did not pick out an ordinary example of clothing or appliances; he picked out stockpiling.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If one is selling, there is no reason why he should not attempt to sell those articles, unless he was trying to sell them to the Army or the Navy. But if he were, he would have to register.

Mr. JAVITS. He would have a perfect right to sell them to the Army or the Navy. But the Senator does not include in his example an American company, owned by thousands of American stockholders, and having a Canadian subsidiary whose representative is in the United States, trying to explain something to Congress or to the executive department.

Let us assume that the subsidiary is owned 100 percent by the American company, as the American company itself is 100 percent owned by Americans. The Senator from Arkansas would have it rely on whether the Department of Justice thought or did not think it was representing a foreign principal.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is perfectly clear that it would not register. There is no doubt at all. I do not think that is even a marginal case. Under those facts, it would register if it did any lobbying. It would register with Congress under the domestic lobbying act. The registration certainly would not be as a foreign agent.

Every one of the cases the Senator cites would scare us all to death. They would not have to register under those facts. There is no question about it.

Mr. JAVITS. It is the Senator from Arkansas who is trying to scare us to death. The Senator refers to language in the bill that shows that they would not have to register under these facts; but where is the language that says they would not have to register—except for that in the committee report, which provides that the Department of Justice shall determine what is the predominant interest, if they are lobbying in Washington. Where in the bill is there anything to exculpate a company because it is an American company?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I read from page 23 of the report, section 3(d):

> Any person engaging or agreeing to engage only in private and nonpolitical activities in furtherance of the bona fide trade or commerce of such foreign principal or in the soliciting or collecting of funds and contributions within the United States to be used only for medical aid and assistance, or for food and clothing to relieve human suffering * * *.

It is the words:

> Any person engaging or agreeing to engage only in private and nonpolitical activities in furtherance of the bona fide trade or commerce.

As the Senator describes the case, it is as clear as the nose on one's face that it comes under that exemption.

Mr. JAVITS. May I describe this?

It is a mixed political and economic activity, and whether the Attorney General would require the agent to register would be strictly up to the Attorney General.

In response to what the Senator said to me, why does not the Senator consider taking the amendment to conference, in the expectation that in the course of that attritional process we shall be able to agree upon some formula which, apparently, we find it difficult to work out on the floor—a formula which will be fair in the matter of the twilight-zone, thorny questions that we have been debating rather than to ask that the matter now be passed, without any qualifying consideration whatever. At the conference, the Senator will have great control over what proposed legislation will result. But, at least, further recognition will be given to a situation which is apparently deeply troubling a very large part of American business.

It seems to me that in this debate I am only buttressing the feeling that these concerns are not imaginary, that they are real, that the matter will really, in all practicality, be left on the most open-end basis, with the Attorney General deciding on a case-by-case level when he will do what.

In other words, I do not believe that the mere definition of private and nonpolitical activity in furtherance of a bona fide trade or commerce of such foreign principal exempts anything except what the Attorney General wishes to exempt. It seems to me that all of the activities I have described, which the Senator says will not require registration, are mixed economic and political matters. At the very best, one can say they are mixed rather than that they stand alone and of themselves.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I regret that the Senator is pushing this matter. It is not a matter of life or death, to me. I am not going to destroy the bill by making an exemption. I would rather put the bill off. I did not know the Senator would be so positive in his insistence upon this exemption. If the Senator wishes to have this amendment considered, perhaps he should consider having the chairman of the House committee submit it in the House. That is one way that he could approach it.

Mr. President, in order to clarify the RECORD, I believe I should insert at this point in the RECORD a letter from the Department of Justice. It is signed by Nicholas deB. Katzenbach, Deputy Attorney General, and is dated June 29, 1964. He was the representative of the Department who followed these hearings, and he is thoroughly familiar with the activities.

I believe it might be pertinent to read a paragraph or two of the letter; he is commenting on an amendment similar to the Senator's, though slightly changed:

> The proposed amendment would change section 1 of the act so as to exclude from the definition of the term "foreign principal" foreign subsidiaries of American business corporations and foreign parents of American business corporations provided such parent corporations are not controlled or financed by the government of a foreign country or a foreign political party.
>
> Thus, in effect, it would exclude any American parent or subsidiary of a foreign business corporation from occupying the status of an agent of a foreign principal irrespective of the nature of the activity engaged in by the parent or subsidiary if it is on behalf of the foreign business corporation.

That is the part of it which I cannot accept—to set aside this class and say that it does not matter what they do, that they are exempt. The real criteria is: What are they doing? That is the criteria which applies to corporations generally: How do they go about achieving their objective, even though that objective is a normal business objective? Are they going to be corrupting the legislator, or bribing the executive, or influencing them in some unacceptable way? That is what is involved. That is why I cannot go for a specific exemption of a class of people, irrespective of the means they seek to achieve their

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

ends—even though the ends may be commercial, not political.

Personally, I believe, with the members of the committee, that we are not going to take that kind of exemption.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the entire letter to which I just referred printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, D.C., June 29, 1964.

Hon. J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: This is in response to your request for the views of the Department of Justice on a draft amendment to S. 2136, "To amend the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended," submitted to your committee by certain corporations, a law firm and one public relations firm.

The proposed amendment would change section 1 of the act so as to exclude from the definition of the term "foreign principal," foreign subsidiaries of American business corporations and foreign parents of American business corporations provided such parent corporations are not controlled or financed by the government of a foreign country or a foreign political party.

Thus, in effect, it would exclude any American parent or subsidiary of a foreign business corporation from occupying the status of an agent of a foreign principal irrespective of the nature of the activity engaged in by the parent or subsidiary if it is on behalf of the foreign business corporation.

This Department is opposed to legislation which would result in an absolute elimination of an entire class of persons from the purview of the registration requirements of the act, since past experience has illustrated that future unforeseen contingencies make such an absolute exclusion undesirable, particularly in this instance as will be indicated. Such a provision is not necessary in order to eliminate from the registration requirements the subjects of the proposed amendment in connection with their normal business operations.

Section 3(d) of the act as presently constituted and as it would be amended by S. 2136 serves to exempt from registration any corporation engaged only in private and nonpolitical commercial or mercantile activities in furtherance of the bona fide trade or commerce of its foreign principal. Accordingly, any American subsidiary or parent of a foreign corporation whose activities fall within this category may presently avail itself of the exemption. However, the effect of the proposed draft amendment to S. 2136 would be to remove from application of the act such corporations even if they engage in political activities as currently defined by the act or as proposed in S. 2136. Under S. 2136, the obligation to register is imposed only upon those corporations which represent the political or public interests of their foreign principal. With reference to the proposed definitions of political consultant and political activities in S. 2136, you advised Arthur H. Dean, senior partner, Sullivan & Cromwell, during his testimony before your committee on November 20, 1963, that the act as it would be amended was not intended to reach the normal operations of an American corporation or its attorney.

None of the activities of an American parent or subsidiary of a foreign corporation or its attorneys could bring them within the act if the proposed amendment to S. 2136 were adopted. Agents of those corporations who would fall within the proposed exclusion could conceivably engage in political activity of precisely the character that Congress initially intended to be disclosed by its passage of the Foreign Agents Registration Act and the proposed exclusion could, in some instances, defeat the basic purpose of the act.

For the above reasons, this Department is opposed to the suggested change to S. 2136.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this report from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely yours,
NICHOLAS DEB. KATZENBACH,
Deputy Attorney General.

Mr. JAVITS. I appreciate the Senator's purpose and his idea. That is the very thing which is being opposed here. As I interpret it, the Senator's concept is that if an American company—taking the extreme case—100 percent American owned, has a subsidiary abroad which it owns 100 percent, and then comes to Congress or the Executive and seeks to do something which is in the interests of that foreign subsidiary, the Senator says that at the very best the Attorney General will have to decide whether that is representing a foreign principal. At the very worst, it will depend on what they do, what kind of question it is that they raise.

It seems to me that if we have an American lobbying statute, and if American companies can lobby all they wish without the need to register as an agent of a foreign principal—which some American companies may particularly wish to do—then one is imposing a rather onerous burden by asserting that because they operate abroad through a subsidiary they are put in doubt and in jeopardy under this whole statute, on the ground that they are really not an American company owning an American subsidiary.

I do not believe that the Senator can have it all that way, either. I do not believe that is fair, in view of the fact that we have an adequate American lobbying statute which theoretically, as the Senator first argues, under the guise of relaxing the restrictions of the statute, many people will be "caught in the net." The Senator states that they should have been caught before, but the law has not been well administered.

I cannot propose to assume that. We must assume that it has been well administered, and that they will be "caught in the net" now, because of the interpretation placed upon it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I did not say that. The Senator is speaking exactly contrary to the interpretation. I said that the way the Senator originally described it left the impression that there are a number of people who, under existing law, should have registered, but that the law has been very laxly enforced.

I did not say it would not be because of the bill, but only because the Department was more vigorous in its enforcement. That well may happen without a bill. I do not know. The Department has been chastened by its experience in the hearings. But that was not because of the language in the bill at all—or what I said. The bill has not broadened the coverage at all. It has broadened the exemption.

I do not follow the Senator at all in what he is saying—what he is attributing to me, at least. We have not broadened. We are not interested in broadened registration. We are interested in proper enforcement and a thorough checking of those who are registered.

There was only one case of a nonregistered agent, and that was simply a case of a clear violation, and the party pleaded nolo contendere. Our whole trouble was that there were cases of registrants who did not register fully and properly. That was all we are interested in—as to the coverage of certain people who have not been complying under the approach of the Senator to this problem. A domestic corporation could have a foreign subsidiary and the principal of the domestic firm could hire himself out, and he would be completely exempt, no matter what he did.

We had some cases of American citizens with foreign principals—subsidiaries, if one likes—it does not make any difference whether an individual or a corporation. They hire themselves out and come over here and do all sorts of things through the American Government, and we all become involved in aid, sugar, and handouts of various kinds. It is a dangerous area in which to create any exemptions. I cannot be a party to them.

Mr. JAVITS. The extreme case which has just been described is that there is accommodation to the point of view which I have set forth. The Senator asserts that he does not believe they will have to register, that the Attorney General will let them off the hook. In the first place, the difficulty there is that we have to have an ad hoc decision on every particular situation. This becomes an uncomfortable situation for companies engaged in a very wide range of business.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Who decides that? This does not change the committee. The Attorney General stated that he would be perfectly willing to give advisory opinions. Consider the existing law. No one has advanced this, but someone has got to take the responsibility of saying whether one should register.

I do not see that there is any difference compared to the present law. One can ask the Attorney General ahead of time, "Under these circumstances, should I register?"

The Attorney General has placed himself on record as being perfectly willing to render opinions about this matter. What is the difference between that situation and the situation which exists now?

Mr. JAVITS. The difference between that situation and that which exists now is that the committee has now set forth exactly how it intends this matter to be handled on the predominant interest theory. That is left completely to the Attorney General. The Attorney General does not have to give advisory opinions unless he wants to give them. The present Attorney General may want to render opinions. The next Attorney General may not want to do that.

One should not be left in jeopardy every time he goes to see a Senator or Representative as to whether he should register under the act.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Why is one not in jeopardy today?

Mr. JAVITS. One is not in this kind of jeopardy because he is not faced with a new law, such as we have before us now, the enforcement of which has been spelled out very clearly by the committee in charge of the legislation.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INVESTIGATION OF ROBERT G. BAKER BY COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the Senate Rules Committee has announced that it has completed the investigation of the Bobby Baker case. I regret to say that I must disagree with this report. The Rules Committee may have stopped its investigation, but it has not completed it.

The majority membership of the Rules Committee have backed down when confronted with a possibly embarrassing disclosure, and by their failure to pursue this investigation they are vulnerable to the charge of attempted whitewash. The failure of the committee to call certain key witnesses to clear up highly important questions cannot be defended. Likewise their insistence that Members of the Senate are above questioning is indefensible.

As the author of the original resolution which started this investigation I am disappointed with the results of the committee's work.

Today, I shall cite another example of the incomplete work of the committee by showing how Mr. Robert Baker apparently charged an estimated $3,000 in personal telephone calls to the Government.

These allegations that Mr. Baker had charged many of his personal business telephone calls to the Government were presented to the committee. When questioned in the committee about these calls Mr. Baker, upon the advice of his attorney, took the fifth amendment. But the committee should not have stopped here; all of Mr. Baker's expenditures should have been audited.

Significantly, Mr. Baker took the fifth amendment on the excuse that if he answered the question the answer might incriminate him. He was right. The correct answer would have incriminated him. There is no question but that Mr. Robert Baker did charge many of his personal business telephone calls to the U.S. Government as being official calls.

This is a clear violation of the law and collection proceedings should be handled by the Department of Justice.

Between October 1, 1961, and March 31, 1964, Mr. Baker made 1,211 telephone calls at a total cost of $3,473.41. These calls were all listed as official calls and charged to the Government through his office as secretary to the majority.

As a comparison, during this same period the secretary of the minority made only 88 official telephone calls at a total cost of $142.55.

With the majority membership of the Senate about double the minority membership it could be understood why Mr. Baker's official telephone calls would be proportionately higher, but under no circumstances could a justification be made for his telephone calls being 25 times higher.

As evidence of Mr. Baker's arrogance when asked about these calls I shall quote from his testimony before the Rules Committee on February 25, 1964. At that time he was being questioned as to why certain calls had been charged to the Government, and in each instance he took the fifth amendment.

The Rules Committee has in its files an itemized breakdown of all of these telephone calls.

The questions and answers from the committee records of February 25, 1964, are as follows:

Senator CURTIS. Mr. Baker, on or about November 30, 1962, you made a long distance call to Milwaukee, to Mr. Max Karl, head of the MGIC Corp. A similar call on April 2, 1963, a similar one on April 22, 1963, a similar one on May 8, 1963; will you tell the committee whether or not those calls were made at Government expense?

Mr. BAKER. I stand by my previous answer.

The CHAIRMAN. I order and direct that the witness answer the question.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, I stand by my previous answer.

I depart from the reading of this testimony, to state that the MGIC Corp. is a corporation in which Mr. Baker bought a substantial bloc of stock, at a very low price in relation to its market value, and thereby realized a substantial profit. He registered the stock in the name of some of his friends and certain Government employees.

Continuing to read:

Senator CURTIS. Mr. Baker, records indicate that you made a number of calls to San Juan, P.R., to one Paul Aguirre. Will you state whether or not those calls were made at Government expense and, if so, what Government business was discussed?

Mr. BAKER. I stand by my previous answer.

The CHAIRMAN. I order and direct that the witness answer the question.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, I stand by my previous answer.

* * * * *

Senator CURTIS. Mr. Baker, the telephone records indicate a number of calls made by you from Miami, Fla. For instance, February 26, 1963, you called from Miami, Mr. Tucker. Was the purpose of that call your private business or Government business?

Mr. BAKER. I stand by my previous answer.

The CHAIRMAN. I order and direct that the witness answer the question.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, I stand by my previous answer.

I point out that Mr. Tucker was the Washington law partner of Mr. Baker. Mr. Tucker was handling some of the fees that they were receiving on the side.

Continuing to read:

Senator CURTIS. On this same day of February 26, 1963, there was a conversation between Miss Tyler, Mr. Ed Levinson, who was then at the International Airport Hotel. I refer to, Mr. Witness, that the Witness Black stated his business was gambling. Do you know whether or not that call was charged to the Government?

Mr. BAKER. I stand by my previous answer.

The CHAIRMAN. I order and direct that the witness answer the question.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, I stand by my previous answer.

Senator CURTIS. On the 20th of February the records indicate—this is 1963—that you called Ed Levinson at his Fremont Hotel at Las Vegas, Nev. Will you tell us whether or not that call related to your official duties or whether it related to private business?

Mr. BAKER. I stand by my previous answer.

The CHAIRMAN. I order and direct that the witness answer the question.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, I stand by my previous answer.

Senator CURTIS. Will you tell us who paid for the call?

Mr. BAKER. I stand by my previous answer.

The CHAIRMAN. I order and direct the witness to answer the question.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, I stand by my previous answer.

Senator CURTIS. Mr. Baker, the telephone records indicate that on the 20th of November 1962 or—excuse me—on the 5th of December 1962, you called Mr. Clint Murchison, Jr., at Dallas, Tex. Will you state whether or not that call pertained to your official duties as secretary of the majority or whether or not it was your private business?

Mr. BAKER. I stand by my previous answer.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the witness answer the question?

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, I stand by my previous answer.

Senator CURTIS. Did the Government pay for that telephone call?

Mr. BAKER. I stand by my previous answer.

The CHAIRMAN. I order and direct that the witness answer the question.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, I stand by my previous answer.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of these interrogations by committee members of Robert Baker, in connection with specific telephone calls, be printed in the RECORD, along with his answers thereto.

There being no objection, the testimony was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator CURTIS. Mr. Baker, the telephone records indicate many other calls; I am selecting some for the purpose of informing the Senate in the event any further laws or rules or regulations pertaining to Government facilities are necessary. The records indicate a great many calls to and from your office, official Government office, to Ocean City. Will you tell us whether or not any of those calls which related to your private business were paid for by the Government?

Mr. BAKER. I stand by my previous answer.

The CHAIRMAN. I order and direct the witness answer the question.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, I stand by my previous answer.

Senator CURTIS. Mr. Baker, the record indicates a number of calls made by you to one Nick Popich, New Orleans, La. Will you tell us whether or not those calls were made as part of your official duties?

Mr. BAKER. I stand by my previous answer.

Senator CURTIS. I request that he be ordered to answer.

The CHAIRMAN. I order and direct that the witness answer the question.

Mr. Baker. Mr. Chairman, I stand by my previous answer.

* * * * *

Senator Curtis. Did the Government pay for any calls that you made to Nick Popich which did not relate to your official duties?

Mr. Baker. I stand by my previous answer.

The Chairman. I order and direct the witness to answer the question.

Mr. Baker. Mr. Chairman, I stand by my previous answer.

* * * * *

Senator Curtis. Mr. Baker, the records indicate that the 26th day of April 1963—I withdraw that. Mr. Baker, on March 7, 1963, you called Fred Black who was in Beverly Hills, Calif. Will you tell us whether or not that was in connection with your official Government business?

Mr. Baker. I stand by my previous answer.

The Chairman. I order and direct that the witness answer the question.

Mr. Baker. Mr. Chairman, I stand by my previous answer.

Senator Curtis. Will you tell us whether or not that call was made at Government expense?

Mr. Baker. I stand by my previous answer.

The Chairman. I order and direct that the witness answer the question.

Mr. Baker. Mr. Chairman, I stand by my previous answer.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I do not think the fact that Mr. Baker took the fifth amendment in this connection closes the case. Certainly the accounts in his Government office ought to be audited by the Comptroller General. The result of this audit should be forwarded to the Department of Justice.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Sparkman in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE INTERNATIONAL MONETARY SYSTEM

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, Prof. James Tobin, of Yale, former member of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, has written an article, which was published in the May issue of the Harvard Review of Economics and Statistics, in which he criticizes the actions of the managers of the international monetary system, particularly the reactions of the central bankers of Europe toward the U.S. balance-of-payments deficit.

Although I would place more of the responsibility than he has on our own officials who had at their disposal the enormous resources of the United States to resist European pressures, and could have tackled the question of world monetary reform with greater foresight and imagination, I am in sympathy with his criticism. This is not to say that during the past few years those who are responsible for operating the system here and abroad have been devoid of all ideas or initiative. On the contrary, they have introduced innovations which have been effective in postponing a crisis.

My own dissatisfaction is that their approach to adapting the international monetary system to current world conditions has been timid, being more disposed toward taking ad hoc measures than to come face to face with the basic question of whether the adjustment mechanism implicit in the existing system is flexible enough to bring about, within a reasonable time, correction in the imbalances in the international monetary system, and whether this adjustment mechanism places equal burdens on the countries which are in surplus positions and those which suffer payments deficits. Presently major imbalances take years to eliminate, and require, on the part of deficit countries, measures which hamper growth and world trade.

The financial managers must also answer the question whether the stock of international credit—liquidity—will be adequate in the near future to provide countries suffering temporary balance-of-payments deficits sufficient time to take corrective action without halting or inhibiting measures designed to expand their economies. The answers to these questions cannot be delayed indefinitely without great cost to every country concerned.

Professor Tobin sums up the case against the present approach as follows:

> The dollar crisis will no doubt be surmounted * * *. The world monetary systems will stay afloat, and its captains on both sides of the Atlantic will congratulate themselves on their seamanship in weathering the storm.
>
> But the storm is in good part their own making. And if the financial ship has weathered it, it has done so only by jettisoning much of the valuable cargo it was supposed to deliver. Currency parities have been maintained, but full employment has not been. The economic growth of half the advanced non-Communist world has been hobbled, to the detriment of world trade in general and the exports of the developing countries in particular. Currencies have become technically more convertible but important and probably irreversible restrictions and discriminations on trade and capital movements have been introduced. Some Government transactions of the highest priority for the foreign policy of the United States and the West have been curtailed. Others have been "tied" to a degree that impairs their efficiency and gives aid and comfort to the bizarre principle that practices which are disreputably illiberal when applied to private international transactions are acceptable when Government money is involved.

The central bankers' disposition to discuss major international financial problems in private is, in my view, one of the major deterrents to substantial progress in this field. Therefore, on July 10, 1963, I submitted Senate Concurrent Resolution 53, in which I proposed that a well-prepared international monetary and economic conference be convened by the President, to recommend needed changes in existing financial institutions and to consider other pressing economic problems placed before the conference by a preparatory committee.

I renew my proposal with the full realization that both the Paris Club and the IMF are conducting studies regarding the adequacy of international monetary institutions and international liquidity, for what is needed is basic reform, and this requires a framework in which agreements can be made.

I ask unanimous consent that Professor Tobin's thoughtful article; as well as an editorial dealing with this subject, from the June 24 edition of the Washington Post; and an article from the June 22 edition of the New York Times, be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the articles and the editorial were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Review of Economics and Statistics, May 1964]

Europe and the Dollar

(By James Tobin)

The dollar crisis will no doubt be surmounted. "The dollar" will be saved. Its parity will be successfully maintained, and the world will be spared that ultimate and unmentionable calamity whose consequences are the more dreaded for never being described. The world monetary system will stay afloat, and its captains on both sides of the Atlantic will congratulate themselves on their seamanship in weathering the storm.

But the storm is in good part their own making. And if the financial ship has weathered it, it has done so only by jettisoning much of the valuable cargo it was supposed to deliver. Currently parities have been maintained, but full employment has not been. The economic growth of half the advanced non-Communist world has been hobbled, to the detriment of world trade in general and the exports of the developing countries in particular. Currencies have become technically more convertible but important and probably irreversible restrictions and discriminations on trade and capital movements have been introduced. Some Government transactions of the highest priority for the foreign policy of the United States and the West have been curtailed. Others have been "tied" to a degree that impairs their efficiency and gives aid and comfort to the bizarre principle that practices which are disreputably illiberal when applied to private international transactions are acceptable when Government money is involved.

These are the costs. Were, and are, all these hardships necessary? To what end have they been incurred?

They have been incurred in order to slow down and end the accumulations of dollar obligations in the hands of European central banks. It is fair to ask, therefore, whether these accumulations necessarily involved risks and costs serious enough for the countries concerned and for the world at large to justify the heavy costs of stopping them.

Which is easier? Which is less disruptive and less costly, now and in the long run? To stop the private or public transactions that lead one central bank to acquire another's currency? Or to compensate these transactions by official lending in the opposite direction? I do not suggest that the answer is always in favor of compensatory finance. But the issue always needs to be faced, and especially in the present case.

Several courses were open to European countries whose central banks had to purchase dollars in their exchange markets in recent years. (a) They could have built up their dollar holdings quietly and gladly, as they did before 1959. (b) By exercising their right to buy gold at the U.S. Treasury, they could have forced devaluation of the dollar or suspension of gold payments. (c) They could have taken various measures to correct and reverse chronic European payments surpluses. (d) By occasional withdrawals of gold and by constant complaints they could have brought tremendous pressure for

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

discipline upon the United States without forcing a change in the dollar parity.

European central banks and governments chose the fourth course, with token admixtures of the third. They have made world opinion, and American opinion, believe there is no other choice. Almost everyone agrees that the pressure of the balance-of-payments deficit upon the United States is inescapable arithmetic rather than the deliberate policy of foreign governments. Yet for almost 10 years previously, U.S. deficits were no problem. Clearly it is a change in human attitude and public policy, not inexorable circumstance, which has compelled us to take corrective actions.

It is true that the concern of financial officials about the dollar was only an echo—and a subdued echo at that—of the fears, hopes, anxieties, and speculations that arose in private financial circles in the late 1950's. But financial officials do not have to follow the private exchange markets; they can lead instead. By an equivocal attitude toward private suspicions of the dollar, European officials kept pressure on the United States. Never did they firmly say that they would not force devaluation or suspension of gold payments. Instead, they succeeded in making the maintenance of gold-dollar convertibility at $35 per ounce a unilateral commitment of the United States, under three successive administrations. Once a banker has solemnly assured the world and his depositors that he will never fail, he is at the mercy of those depositors capable of making him fail.

Memories are short, and gratitude is not a consideration respected in international relations, especially when money is involved. But the United States had and has considerable moral claim on European governments and central banks.

The present excess supply of dollars is in many respects an unwinding of the dollar shortage of the immediate postwar period. Capital left Europe because the Continent was vulnerable to military attack, its governments were unstable, its industries were prostrate and uncompetitive, and its currencies were inconvertible. Capital has returned to Europe when events have overcome the special advantages which North America seemed to have in these respects. It is therefore relevant to recall the behavior of the United States when the shoe was on the other foot.

During the dollar shortage the United States: gave Western European countries (other than Greece, Turkey, and Spain) $32 billion of military and economic aid; lent them $11 billion additional (in spite of the default of European governments of debts connected with World War I); acquiesced in substantial devaluations of European currencies, without which European exports would still not be competitive; and acquiesced in exchange controls, capital controls, quantitative restrictions on imports, and discriminations against the United States and other non-European countries—by no means all of which are liquidated even now. After enabling Europe to overcome the dollar shortage, the United States has been expected to adjust to its reversal without the tools that Europe used in its turn. Rightly so, because many of these tools were illiberal expedients—the more reason for replacing them now with compensatory intergovernmental finance.

The United States has undertaken, at considerable cost in real resources and foreign exchange, to defend Western Europe against the Soviet Union. This is in theory a joint effort, but European governments do not even yet fulfill their modest commitments to NATO. While European political leaders solicit constant reassurance that U.S. military power will remain visibly in Europe, their finance ministers and central bankers complain about the inflow of dollars.

The United States has not only tolerated but encouraged the development of a European customs union which attracts American capital and discriminates against American exports (especially the products of industries, notably agriculture, where North America has a clear comparative advantage).

The United States has borne a disproportionate share of the burden of assistance to uncommitted and underdeveloped nations, in which European countries have a common political and, one might hope, humanitarian interest.

The United States has provided a reserve currency. In the late forties no other international and intergovernmental money was available except gold; and the supply of gold was not keeping up with the demand. U.S. deficits filled the gap with dollars. It is true that this gave the United States a favored position among countries. Anyone who can print money can choose how new money will be first spent. The United States did not seek this privileged role; it arose by accidental evolution rather than conscious design. As it happens, the United States did not exploit it to live beyond our means, to make the American people more affluent. We used it rather for broad international purposes. No doubt in the long run the creation of new international money should be a privilege and responsibility more widely and symmetrically shared. But once the United States and the world are adjusted to the creation of international money via U.S. deficits, it is scarcely reasonable suddenly to ring a bell announcing that the world's financial experts have now decided that these deficits—past, present, and future—are pernicious.

The United States has not pushed its moral case before world public opinion. This is because many Americans believe, or prefer to believe, that balance-of-payments deficits, like venereal diseases, betray and punish the sins of those whom they afflict. Others regard them as simply matters of arithmetic and circumstance. Still others are afraid that making a moral argument will indicate to our all-powerful European creditors insufficient resolution to overcome the difficulties. On their side, the Europeans have neatly segregated the contexts. Their financial officials wash their hands of tariff and trade policies, agricultural protection, defense and aid appropriations, and their governments' budgets. Any European failings on these counts are facts of life to which the United States must adjust, rather than reasons for more patience or more credit.

By the narrowest of bankers' criteria—all moral claims aside—the United States is a good credit risk. Its balance sheet vis-a-vis the rest of the world, not to mention its internal productive strength, indicates the capacity to service a considerably increased external public debt. The United States has been confined to the types of credit that can be given on the books of central banks. European Parliaments cannot be asked to vote long-term loans to Uncle Sam, although the American people voted through the Congress to tax themselves to finance the Marshall plan when Europe's credit rating was nil.

Meanwhile, European central banks are uneasy holding short-term dollar assets. They prefer gold. Why? Because they might some day force us to give them a capital gain on gold holdings. We compensate them with interest on their dollar holdings when they forgo this speculative possibility. But bygones are bygones; and past interest earnings are irrelevant when future capital gains beckon. On its side, the United States has had nothing to lose and much to gain in guaranteeing to maintain the value of official dollar holdings. After stubbornly resisting this suggestion on obscure grounds of principle, the U.S. Treasury now belatedly and selectively guarantees value in foreign currency.

The only remaining reason to refuse the U.S. credit is that the United States, like any other deficit country, must be "disciplined." Disciplined to do what?

To stop an orgy of inflation? The United States has the best price record of any country, except Canada, since 1958—before there was a balance-of-payments problem. The rates of unemployment and excess capacity during the period scarcely suggest that the Government has been recklessly overheating the economy with fiscal and monetary fuel.

Nevertheless, many Europeans say that when they buy dollars they are importing inflation. It is hard to take this claim seriously. First of all, if acquisitions of dollars are inflationary so are acquisitions of gold, and Europe shows no signs of saturation with gold. Second, the classic mechanism of international transmission of inflation is certainly not operating. We have not inflated ourselves into an import surplus adding to aggregate demand in Europe. To the contrary, we have maintained a large and secularly growing export surplus. Third, although central bank purchases of foreign exchange have the same expansionary monetary effects at home as other open market purchases, it is not beyond the wit or experience of man to neutralize these effects by open market sales or other monetary actions. Fourth, U.S. farmers and coal producers, and Japanese light manufacturers, among others, stand ready to help European governments reduce their living costs and their payment surpluses at the same time. The truth is that Europe does not really want a solution at the expense of its balance of trade.

Perhaps we are to be disciplined to cut foreign aid. European governments do not attach the same importance as we do to aid programs, especially in the Western Hemisphere. Clearly we need a better understanding on development assistance and burden sharing among the advanced countries.

Should the United States be disciplined in order to cut off private exports of capital, by controls or by tight monetary policy or both? This has been a major and successful focus of European pressure. The U.S. authorities have responded by pushing up U.S. interest rates, more than a full point at the short end, and by proposing the interest equalization tax. European pressure is motivated in part by nationalistic and protectionist aims—keep the rich Americans from buying up or competing with local industry. This may or may not be a worthy objective, but its worth is the same whether international payments are in balance or not.

Two other issues are involved. The first concerns capital markets and controls. Should the United States move toward poorer and more autarkic capital markets, or should the Europeans move toward more efficient and freer capital markets? Much of U.S. long-term capital movement to Europe does not represent a transfer of real saving. Instead it is a link in a double transatlantic chain connecting the European saver and the European investor. The saver wants a liquid, safe, short-term asset. The investor needs long-term finance or equity capital and seeks it in the United States. Unfortunately, another link in the same chain is official European holding of short-term dollar obligations. But the Europeans themselves could, through institutional reforms, do a great deal to connect their savers and investors more directly and to reduce the spread between their long and short interest rates.

The second issue is the appropriate international level of interest rates. Evidently national rates must be more closely alined to each other as international money and capital markets improve. But surely the low-rate country should not always do the alining. This would impart a deflationary bias

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

to the system. In principle, easy fiscal policy could overcome this bias, but only at the expense of investment and growth. In the present situation European countries are fighting inflation by tightening their money markets rather than their budgets. They are forcing the United States to fight unemployment with a tight money, easy budget mixture. If interest rates are raised whenever a country faces either inflation or balance-of-payments difficulties, while expansionary fiscal policy is the only measure ever used to combat deflation, a number of swings in business activity and in payments will move the world to a mixture of policies quite unfavorable to longrun growth.

In summary, the adjustments forced on the United States to correct its payments deficit have not served the world economy well. Neither were they essential. European countries have had at their disposal several measures which are desirable in their own right, not just as correctives to the present temporary imbalance in payments. To the extent that they are unprepared to take these measures, they should willingly extend compensatory finance. International financial policy is too important to leave to financiers. There are more important accounts to balance than the records of international transactions, and more important markets to equilibrate than those in foreign exchange.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, June 24, 1964]

EUROPE AND THE DOLLAR

Many high Government officials, particularly those on leave from universities, look to the day when they can discard their masks of anonymity and discuss sensitive policy issues without fear of committing indiscretions. James Tobin, the distinguished Yale economist, was close to the balance-of-payments problem when he served on the Council of Economic Advisers, and now he exploits that experience with telling effect in his candid reflections on "Europe and the Dollar" which appear in the current number of The Review of Economics and Statistics.

The thrust of Professor Tobin's excellent article is that the policies which the United States is following in an effort to correct its payments deficit have not served the world economy well. Nor are they essential.

When the European central bankers in 1959 decided that their dollar holdings were excessive, there were several alternatives. They might have gone on accumulating dollar claims as they had for nearly a decade; or by exercising their right to buy gold from the Treasury they could have forced a suspension of payments or the devaluation of the dollar. A third alternative would have been measures to eliminate the European payments surpluses. But instead they chose a policy of needling coercion: occasional withdrawals of gold, doubts about the integrity of the dollar and loud demands for a balance-of-payments "discipline" that resulted in tighter money, higher interest rates, and unemployment in this country.

What the Europeans forgot in their zeal to place this country in the position of a profligate supplicant was the record of generosity during the postwar period of the dollar shortage. Instead of demanding "discipline" the United States extended $43 billion in gifts and loans to the countries of Western Europe. It acquiesced in substantial devaluations of European currencies and in the establishment of capital and exchange controls, some of which are still in force. It encouraged the formation of the Common Market, a customs union which attracts American capital and discriminates against American exports.

In glimpsing into the future, Mr. Tobin is concerned over the trend of world interest rates. In order to eliminate disequilibrating movements of capital, the levels of interest rates among trading countries must be closely alined. But the United States as the low-interest country should not always do the alining, for doing so imparts a strong deflationary bias to the world system: "In the present situation European countries are fighting inflation by tightening their money markets rather than their budgets. They are forcing the United States to fight unemployment with a tight money-easy budget mixture. If interest rates are raised whenever a country faces either inflation or balance-of-payments difficulties, while expansionary fiscal policy is the only measure ever used to combat deflation, a number of swings in business activity and in payments will move the world to a mixture of policies quite unfavorable to longrun growth."

[From the New York Times, June 22, 1964]

BANK CIRCLE SCORED—FORMER KENNEDY AID TAKES DIM VIEW OF INTERNATIONAL MONETARY OFFICIALS

(By M. J. Rossant)

The tight little central banking fraternity, which is responsible for keeping the international monetary system in operation, recently got a rough going over from a former official of the Kennedy administration.

James Tobin, who served on the President's Council of Economic Advisers, was never in the inner circle of monetary and financial officials. But he was reasonably close. From what he observed, he has come to the conclusion that "international financial policy is too important to leave to financiers."

This may well be true, but Mr. Tobin neglects to mention his candidates to take over the task of running the monetary system. It is doubtful that he would give the job to politicians, for that would mean continuous confrontations with General de Gaulle.

In all likelihood, the international fraternity will keep on doing business at the same old stand. But Mr. Tobin's slings and arrows have some validity.

EUROPE CRITICIZED

Writing in Harvard University's Review of Economics and Statistics, he argues that international cooperation to defend the dollar has been costly, exaggerated and one sided. Washington, he states, has been doing most of the cooperating, with the Europeans either dragging their feet or actively forcing the United States to take steps that hurt its domestic growth.

Most observers have been full of praise for the cooperation achieved by the monetary authorities. But though Mr. Tobin admits that cooperation has worked, he is sparing with his compliments and his respect.

Central bankers are men of mystery. They have their secret "gold pool" in London; they have the committee of 10, which is working out new arrangements to strengthen the international monetary mechanism; there is another closed-door study being undertaken by the International Monetary Fund, and regular meetings of the fraternity take place at the Bank for International Settlements in Basle. It is all very cozy, with no interruptions by television or the press.

The fraternity has no special hand clasp, but all of its members are closemouthed. Most were incensed when Reginald Maudling, Britain's Chancellor of the Exchequer, publicly expressed demand for new measures in 1962. That sort of thing just isn't done. The fraternity may not be as image-conscious as politicians, but it has succeeded in putting on an impeccable and unassailable solid front by settling all differences in private.

DIM VIEW TAKEN

As an outsider, Mr. Tobin cannot be accused of giving away any fraternity secrets. But he has a very dim view of most central bankers and financial officials. He infers that they are ungrateful, ungenerous, and narrowminded; he adds that they are a suspicious lot, given to making constant complaints.

In fact, he blames the fraternity with weathering the dollar storm "only by jettisoning much of the valuable cargo it was supposed to deliver." He charges that international cooperation was at the expense of full employment in the United States, a curbing of world trade and other restrictive developments.

As Mr. Tobin sees it the European branch of the fraternity could have done a great deal more to keep the financial ship in order and the dollar protected from disruptive storms.

He takes them to task for failing to dispel private suspicions about the dollar. Instead of making clear that they not demand gold in exchange for their growing pile of dollars, he says that they added to the pressure on the United States by forcing three successive administrations to make unilateral commitments to maintain the existing price of gold.

Their attitude, Mr. Tobin states, placed the United States in an unenviable position, for "once a banker has solemnly assured the world and his depositors that he will never fail, he is at the mercy of those depositors capable of making him fail."

Mr. Tobin believes that the Europeans in recent years did not match the generosity displayed by Washington earlier. If they had been willing to make use of their surpluses and shared the costs of defense and aid, the United States would have been faced with a much easier problem.

But the Europeans, he points out, "wash their hands of tariff and trade policies, agricultural protection, defense, and aid appropriations, and their governments' budgets."

Mr. Tobin's harsh indictment is not without substance. The fraternity is powerful, but only within carefully circumscribed limits. Central bankers who sought to make their influence felt on trade or defense or other politically sensitive areas would soon be out of a job—and the fraternity.

The cooperation that has been achieved by central bankers has shortcomings, but it has been working more smoothly than in some other areas. Indeed, there has been a notable lack of cooperation on trade agreements and a virtual unraveling of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization alinement.

Despite all of their human failings, their cautiousness and conservatism, and shortsightedness, central bankers have been more constructive than they were in the years between the wars.

The fraternity may not be moving fast enough, but Mr. Tobin is overestimating their importance by blaming them for being uncooperative. Getting admitted into the fraternity is in the hands of politicians.

AMENDMENT OF THE FOREIGN AGENTS REGISTRATION ACT OF 1938

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2136) to amend the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I withdraw the amendment which I previously offered and send another amendment to the desk, which I ask to be read by the clerk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from New York is withdrawn.

The clerk will now read the amendment presently offered by the Senator from New York.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed, on page 7, line 20, to strike out the period and insert: "and inserting after the words 'beneficial' the words 'or other activities not serving substantially a foreign political interest.'"

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I believe the words of the amendment which I have sent to the desk occur in section 3(d) after the words "foreign principal." I do not think the amendment has been read correctly. I would like to read the amendment for the Record, if I may do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the correction will be made.

Mr. JAVITS. I should like to read the text of the amendment for the Record so it will be clear:

On page 7, line 20, strike out the period and insert: "and inserting after the words 'foreign principal' the words 'or other activities not serving substantially a foreign political interest.'"

Those words will be added to the exemption clause of the Foreign Agents Registration Act as it was reported to the Senate and would, in my judgment, tend to qualify, in accordance with our discussion, the activities which are exempt from the statute, and to include yet another category which will fit a great many of the specific examples which I gave, and which have been confirmed by the Senator from Arkansas and which will enable the Attorney General, in the enforcement of the law, to have some provision of the law to which he can refer in his definition of what is exempt and what is not exempt, rather than be confined to the specification of the intent as set forth in the committee's report.

Mr. President, I again suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I withdraw the amendment which I have just offered, and offer the following amendment. I shall read the amendment, to help the clerk:

On page 7, line 20, strike out the period and insert the following words: "and by inserting after the words 'foreign principal' the words 'or other activities not serving predominantly a foreign interest.'"

Now I ask the clerk to state the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from New York will be stated.

The Legislative Clerk. It is proposed, on page 7, line 20, to strike out the period and insert the following words: "and by inserting after the words 'foreign principal' the words 'or other activities not serving predominantly a foreign interest.'"

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am glad we have been able to work out something which will give the Attorney General a standard by which a whole range of activities can be properly dealt with, with the knowledge of those being dealt with and the Attorney General himself. I hope the Senator from Arkansas will accept the amendment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I shall be glad to accept the amendment. I do not think it does violence to the committee report. I accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, before passage of the bill, I would like to say to my colleague, the Senator from Arkansas, to the committee, and to the Attorney General, that I hope very much the fact that we have debated this question and have included another standard in the bill will make clear to the Attorney General, whoever he may be, who is administering the act, what is exactly the thrust of the statute as amended. As the Senator from Arkansas explained so properly, the statute is being amended in order to get what was felt would be a tighter administration.

It is not intended to reach activities of a character which no one ever expected would be reached in this fashion, a good many of which we have described as coming from domestic companies with subsidiaries abroad and coming from domestic subsidiaries of foreign companies. We have chosen to make our distinction based upon activity. That follows the views of the Senator from Arkansas. We have also made it very clear that the mere fact that an activity has some political complexion or some foreign interests does not necessarily make it an activity which brings the person directing it under registration.

I hope very much that all this legislative history will be considered in respect of the administration of the law, which will heavily depend for its administration, in good commonsense and with accommodation to the activities of the American business world, upon the way in which the Attorney General takes to heart what we have said here today.

I am very grateful to the Senator from Arkansas for his cooperative spirit and open mind.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senator. The Senator has been very reasonable about this matter. I was reluctant to open up exemptions which could be far-reaching and which I thought would destroy the effectiveness of the bill. I do not regard this bill as a panacea for all our ills, but it can be useful if it is properly administered. I believe the Department of Justice will administer it properly.

I believe that the hearings and these discussions will clarify the situation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (S. 2136) was passed.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

MRS. MARJORIE CURTIS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanmous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1106 (H.R. 4811).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (H.R. 4811) for the relief of Mrs. Marjorie Curtis.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point a brief explanation of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the report (No. 1168) was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to pay Mrs. Marjorie Curtis, of La Monte, Mo., $1,000 in full settlement of her claims against the United States for the inconvenience and disruption incident to the crash of a B-47 aircraft of the U.S. Air Force on her farm on February 27, 1956, and in further settlement of all her claims for personal injuries, pain, and suffering traceable to that crash.

STATEMENT

The facts in the case are set out in House Report 231 and are as follows:

On February 27, 1956, a U.S. Air Force B-47, while on an Air Force mission, crashed and burned on a farm approximately 4½ miles north of La Monte, Mo. The main part of the fuselage hit about 30 feet from a farmhouse occupied by Mr. and Mrs. Clay Curtis as tenants. Mrs. Curtis and her son Danny escaped from the house which was burned down with a total loss of their personal property therein. The crash also destroyed certain farm implements owned by the Curtises, including a tractor.

The committee has carefully considered the circumstances of this matter which have resulted in an appeal to the Congress for legislative relief. A subcommittee hearing was conducted on the bill on April 4, 1962, and, subsequent to that hearing at the request of the subcommittee, additional information was presented to it. The compensation provided in the amended bill is intended to provide for payment for certain losses which could not be paid under existing administrative or judicial procedures. However, the committee has found that the unusual circumstances of this case justify the payment in an amount of $1,000 on the basis of broad considerations of equity and justice.

As will appear from a reading of the report on the bill from the Department of the Air Force, the total loss of personal property referred to above was the subject of a settlement with the Air Force under the terms of the Military Claims Act (31 U.S.C.

223b). However, that settlement did not take into consideration the unusual hardship which was imposed on that family. Approximately 8 years prior to this crash, Mrs. Curtis lost the sight of one eye. Thereafter she suffered a diminution of about 80 percent of the sight of the other eye due to a prior and hereditary organic affliction. While the Air Force report states that the crash neither caused nor aggravated Mrs. Curtis' condition, this committee has concluded that the crash had a very clear and burdensome effect upon her life which is also related to her blindness.

The Air Force report notes that the settlement was unable to take into consideration the item of inconvenience which resulted from the readjustments Mrs. Curtis had to make as the result of acclimating herself to new housing arrangements. Obviously, prior to the destruction of her home Mrs. Curtis was familiar with the location of the items within that house and its general layout. This enabled her to carry on her household tasks and daily living to the fullest extent of her ability despite the severe diminution of her sight. However, the bare outline of the facts, as reflected in the Air Force report, do not truly reflect the unfortunate effect of this crash upon the Curtis family.

On the day of the crash, Mrs. Curtis and one son, who was ill and therefore at home, escaped from the house with some minor burns. Another son returning home on a schoolbus was intercepted by two soldiers and was barred from his home without fully knowing what had happened to the family. The father, Mr. Clay Curtis, returned home from a farm sale to find complete destruction and to discover that his fences were down and his livestock had strayed away. It is reported to the committee that he became a nervous wreck and found it difficult to begin to provide for his family and rearrange his farming operation. The crash destroyed farm machinery including the tractor and combine. While the depreciated value for the machinery was the subject of the Air Force settlement, the replacement machinery had to be purchased at inflated prices to enable continued farm operation. Mr. Curtis had to borrow money to provide a home for his family and continue farming. The Curtises built a garage on a tract of 80 acres they owned across the road from the site of the crash. Water had to be carried to this temporary house. In a letter to the sponsor of the bill, Mrs. Curtis described the impact on the family in this way: "* * * My garden was located in a field a quarter of a mile from the house as we were told by authorities that all of that ground that had fuel spilled on it from the jet would not produce. Much worry, nervousness, and shock occurred from the crash and many inconveniences were suffered. Clay worked so hard trying to keep things going under difficult situations and he worried so much over the settlement and the fact that we had to go so deeply in debt that his health was impaired. We asked on the claim for $6,000 for inconvenience, nervousness, and shock. This was not allowed to us in the settlement. * * *"

Mrs. Curtis further referred to the attempts they made to secure payment on the claims and finally the delays and disappointments in 1961 incident to the consideration of the private bill introduced in their behalf. Finally she described the events which led up to the tragic death of her husband when he took his own life: "* * * The latter part of October, Clay said to me, "You wonder why I am so despondent, but I counted so strong in May to hear something and in September also." His constant worry and poor health this summer evidently caused his mind to snap with the tragic results you will read about in the clippings. He was a person who always dealt honestly with everyone and felt he should be treated the same way."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is before the Senate, and open to amendment.

If there be no amendment to be offered, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TWO-PART RETIREMENT SYSTEM FOR NEVADA UNDER SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 287) to amend title II of the Social Security Act to include Nevada among those States which are permitted to divide their retirement systems into two parts for purposes of obtaining social security coverage under Federal-State agreement.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have submitted an amendment to the bill, and I had intended to propose another.

The first amendment would amend the Social Security Act to raise from 18 to 21 years the maximum age of children receiving survivor benefits if they are attending schools during those additional years.

The other body, in its wisdom, has included this provision in the social security bill pending before it. I very much hope—and I believe I have reason to believe—that the Senate Committee on Finance will consider with sympathy and will likely adopt this provision when it comes before it, and therefore I see no need for pressing the amendment at this time.

With respect to the other amendment, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] has assured me that he will give every consideration to the situation of children surviving one who was not either a natural or an adoptive parent but who stood in loco parentis to the children. This is a very vexing problem. It is one which the Senator from Virginia has assured me will have sympathetic consideration by the committee.

On the basis, first, that the primary amendment I have, extending survivor benefits from 18 to 21 years to children attending school, is contained in the bill pending in the other body, and, second, with the assurance of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] that the other amendment, dealing with foster parents, or with people who stand in loco parentis, will have every consideration by the committee, I am prepared to withdraw my amendments to the bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Senator from New York has brought up two proposals, both of which he indicated the chairman of the Finance Committee has commented upon. I am privileged to read a statement by the Senator from Virginia. I read it in his behalf, so that the RECORD may be very clear on the points raised by the Senator from New York:

> STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD OF VIRGINIA
>
> Since children's benefits were first authorized by the Congress in 1939, benefits have been terminated at age 18. The one exception was passed in 1956 when benefits were authorized for permanently and totally disabled children at any age if they had become disabled before 18.
>
> Amendments similar to the one proposed by the Senator from New York have been offered in previous Congresses and each time rejected primarily because of the cost, which is now estimated to be $175 million a year.
>
> This amendment is identical to a provision in the social security bill H.R. 6638 which has been approved by the House Ways and Means Committee. No doubt that bill will be passed by the House soon after the recess. I can assure you that the Committee on Finance will give immediate consideration to the bill and especially to the amendment which he advocates.
>
> I think there is a great deal of merit in the amendment but would like to consider it along with the other major amendments proposed in the House bill, all of which increase the cost of the program. I can say that it will have my sympathetic consideration.

In reference to the proposal which would permit children to receive social security benefits on the basis of the wage record of an individual who has supported them, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] has made the following statement:

> This amendment also appears to have merit. I shall be pleased to have the staff of the Senate Committee on Finance to make a thorough study of the proposal so that it may be considered as an amendment when the social security revision bill is received from the House.

Mr. President, those are the statements of the Senator from Virginia.

I should like at this time to associate myself with the proposals of the Senator from New York, so that the Senator from Virginia may know that other Senators are deeply concerned with these problems.

With respect to the pending bill, under a provision of section 218 of the Social Security Act which is designed to facilitate the social security coverage of members of State and local government retirement systems, 17 specified States are permitted to divide a State or local government retirement system into two parts for purposes of old-age, survivors, and disability insurance coverage, one part consisting of the positions of members who desire coverage, and the other consisting of the positions of members who do not desire coverage. Services performed by the members in the part consisting of the positions of members who desire coverage may then be covered under old-age, survivors, and disability insurance, and, once those services are covered, the services of all persons who in the future become members of the retirement system must also be covered. The 17 States which are now permitted to extend coverage under this provision are California, Connecticut, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Massachusetts, Minnesoto, New Mexico, New York, North Dakota, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Texas, Vermont, Washington, and Wisconsin. H.R. 287 would add Nevada to this group of States.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am very grateful to the Senator from Minnesota and to the Senator from Virginia [Mr.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

BYRD]. I wish to point out that the House bill will be a much more felicitious medium for doing what I am trying to do. I am pleased that the chairman of the committee will give sympathetic consideration to it. There is no point in standing in the way of the pending bill. Therefore I withdraw my amendments to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be offered, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H.R. 287) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TEN THOUSAND PEACE CORPS MEN

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in these times of great international problems, our newspapers are filled with the news of how unpleasant people—and nations—can be to their neighbors. Violence holds the headlines; hate and mistrust have motivated that violence.

But in the midst of this, I have great news. It will not appear on any front page tomorrow; yet I think it is significant beyond most news that will.

There are, today, more than 10,000 Americans in the Peace Corps, either serving overseas or training to do so. The fact of 10,000 people in the service of their country, without salary, is a remarkable thing. More than 1,500 volunteers will complete their service and will come home this summer.

This body does not need me to praise these fine Americans. It has too often in the past voted overwhelmingly to support the Peace Corps. But let me add my voice to the chorus of nations where our fellow citizens are serving, and say "Well done. May your numbers increase."

I salute the Peace Corps on having placed in the field so many people to help people help themselves with its great education and training program.

STATEMENT BY AFL–CIO PRESIDENT GEORGE MEANY AT SIGNING OF CIVIL RIGHTS BILL OF 1964

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the AFL–CIO, representing more than 16 million workers, has long been a forceful and effective advocate of the legislation to protect further the civil rights of all Americans.

Mr. George Meany, president of the AFL–CIO, was present at the White House when President Lyndon B. Johnson signed the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Mr. Meany issued a very significant statement expressing the views of organized labor.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Meany's thoughtful and meaningful statement be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEWS FROM THE AFL–CIO

The signing of the civil rights bill is, of course, a great historic occasion, the culmination of a remarkable legislative achievement. But far more than that, this signing represents a challenge to American society—a challenge that calls for the full realization in fact of the rights now established by law.

The trade union movement, like every other segment of American life, must do its part in meeting that challenge.

More than a year ago I called upon all State and local central bodies of the AFL–CIO to set up communitywide programs on civil rights, in keeping with a policy unanimously adopted by the 1961 AFL–CIO Convention. We have established a top-level task force to assist in this job. A considerable number of these programs have been established in concert with civil rights organizations, church and civic groups, and local government officials.

The results have been encouraging, but the effort must be broadened. Therefore, I have today urged all the State and local central bodies to intensify existing programs and to initiate them where they do not yet exist. In particular, I proposed a greater involvement of employers in every community.

The rights set forth in the new law—such as the rights to register and vote—will not be automatically bestowed upon those who have hitherto been denied them. Nor should they lie in abeyance until enforced by Federal prosecution, while the rest of the community sits back. This would flout the national consensus which the civil rights law represents.

The basic rights of all Americans which this law confirms are also the responsibility of all Americans, in their own communities. I expect the trade union movement to do its part in seeing that the responsibility is fulfilled.

In addition, the labor movement has a special responsibility. Title VII of the law, covering fair employment practices, will not take effect until a year from today, but we cannot wait.

The labor movement has fought for fair employment practices legislation for many years. We have worked hard and effectively to bring equal opportunity closer to reality in unionized establishments and within union organizations. We have never claimed total success; that is why we asked the support of law. But it is undeniable that racial discrimination is worst where there are no unions.

Now we must prepare to go further. I will ask the AFL–CIO executive council, at its meeting on August 3, to call a national conference of affiliated unions and State central bodies to work out a program through which the AFL–CIO can best help to implement the terms of the civil rights law.

One important phase of such a program will deal with title VII. It seems obvious to me that the AFL–CIO, which serves as spokesman and champion of all workers in so many other respects, should also take the lead in assuring fair employment practices. We have already established machinery to process and resolve civil rights complaints by union members; it is my hope that means can also be devised through which the affiliated unions of the AFL–CIO can process grievances of workers against employers—organized and unorganized—as well.

By the time title VII takes legal effect, voluntary compliance would be widespread. To this end, we now look for the full cooperation of employers and employer organizations.

We in the AFL–CIO are proud of our part in helping to bring about the measure that today has become law. Just as we did everything in our power to support its enactment, so will we exert every possible effort to clothe it with full reality.

As we have said many times, this requires more than full enforcement, and even more than full community efforts; it requires a full employment economy. But until that end is achieved, we and all other Americans have a deep obligation to make the spirit which this signing represents become an inherent part of the life of our Nation.

TEXT OF MR. MEANY'S LETTER TO ALL OF THE STATE AND CITY CENTRAL BODIES OF THE AFL–CIO

You will recall that in June 1963 I wrote to you, urging the prompt establishment of biracial committees or councils in every community to accelerate the destruction of racial barriers at every level.

My letter was prompted by a request from President Kennedy. However, as I pointed out, what the late President asked was no more than the policy adopted by the 1961 AFL–CIO convention.

Now the civil rights bill is not just an objective; it has been signed into law by President Johnson. The "continental divide" has been crossed. The full achievement of civil rights for all Americans is no longer a matter of good will, it is a matter of law.

It would be tragic for America, and for the labor movement, if law were the only reliance now. Enlightened self-interest, as well as abstract justice, demands that we in the AFL–CIO exert maximum leadership to bring about massive compliance in every phase of community life.

Therefore I call upon those of you who have set up and joined in community civil rights programs to intensify your efforts. And I call upon those of you who have thus far failed to act to delay no longer.

In particular, I urge you bring about the fullest possible involvement of the employers in your community, both organized and unorganized. Employers as a whole have stood aloof from the civil rights struggle; they cannot remain aloof from the law.

In every sense, we in the AFL–CIO have a special obligation to implement the law we supported and the principles it represents. This can best be carried out in the States and communities. I urge you to move promptly and vigorously; and I again remind you that my office stands ready to provide whatever advice, counsel, or technical assistance you may need.

THE MEANING OF THE LATIN AMERICAN REVOLUTION—ADDRESS BY MSGR. JOSEPH GREMILLION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, a few weeks ago, at the meeting of the United States Conference for the World Council of Churches, held in Buck Hill Falls, Pa., an important discussion of current problems in Latin America took place. The conference heard and discussed a remarkable address on the "Meaning of the Latin American Revolution," delivered by Msgr. Joseph Gremillion, director of socioeconomic development for the Catholic Relief Services. Monsignor Gremillion, who is the first Catholic priest to address the United States Conference of the World Council of Churches, pointed out that it is a mistake to label the social revolution now taking place in Latin America as Communist inspired. The current social revolution, he said, is not a Communist plot, but is a response to the oppressed peasantry and slum dwellers in Latin America. Monsignor Gremillion stated that the Catholic church, which is predominant in Latin America, has awakened to the new realities of the hemisphere, and is now supporting the social revolution in many countries.

Monsignor Gremillion, in his perceptive address, carefully documented a theme on which I have spoken a number

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

of times in recent months; namely, that the church has become a progressive force in Latin America; that the aims of the church in many instances coincide with those of the Alliance for Progress.

I am particularly encouraged by the fact that the forum for Monsignor Gremillion's address was the meeting of the World Council of Churches. This is a good indication that the ecumenical spirit, which has developed rapidly since the pontificate of Pope John XXIII, is now making itself felt among American Protestant leaders and Catholic leaders who jointly share a concern about the present problems of Latin America. It is encouraging to see the growing cooperation between American Catholics and American Protestants in the various programs which American groups conduct in Latin American countries.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the address, entitled, "The Meaning of the Latin American Revolution," delivered by Msgr. Joseph Germillion, be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE MEANING OF THE LATIN AMERICAN REVOLUTION

(Address by Msgr. Joseph Gremillion, director, socioeconomic development, Catholic Relief Services, National Catholic Welfare Conference, New York, N.Y.)

My friends in Christ, Mario Lopes works on a banana plantation in northeast Brazil. I met Mario Lopes 5 months ago, in December 1963, while visiting the office of the state federation of peasants' labor unions in Natal. Natal is a city of 100,000 people, located in the hub of Brazil's convulsing sharecropper northeast.

As I entered the narrow office Mario Lopes and two fellow members of his local union where in agitated discussion with officials of their state federation of farmworkers' unions. A fresh crisis for their 3-year-old organization had fallen the night before. Mario Lopes and 150 fellow workers who form the local sindicato on 5 nearby plantations had gone on strike, the first full-fledged work stoppage in the short history of the young Christian inspired peasants' movement.

I asked Mario, "Why did you go on strike?"

"Because we get so little that we have to become thieves to feed our children," he shot back without hesitation.

"What are your wages?"

"Three hundred cruzeiros a day. And we work only 3 days a week on the average." Three hundred cruzeiros equals 25 U.S. cents for a day's work.

"But that is not the whole story," Mario went on. "The owner of the plantation will not allow us to raise a couple of goats to give milk to our little ones. That is why we organized our union, so all of us can stand together for a little justice."

"Well, what does the owner of the plantation think about all this?"

"Oh, he does not like it at all. And especially he does not like me, because I head up the union. That is how the strike actually began yesterday. The landlord told me I was fired, that I must vacate my house and get off his land in 24 hours."

"Then what happened?"

"I took a stick in my hand," Mario gesticulated. "I told him that he and I had better draw a line on the ground to show where his land ended and mine began, because I would only leave my place a dead man. The landlord walked away. The 30 men who work with me held a meeting. They decided to stand behind me and have a show down. Then the 120 workers on neighboring plantations, who are fellow members in our local sindicato, they also voted to back us up. So now we're all on strike."

At this point Jose Martins spoke up. He is vice president of the peasants' federation which covers all that State, Rio Grande del Norte. He explained the overall goals of the State's 60,000 farmworkers who have formed 46 local sindicatos in the past 3 years under his leadership.

"We want an 80-percent increase in wages (from 25 to 45 U.S. cents a day). We want a family subsidy of 35 cruzeiros (3 cents) a day extra for every child in the worker's family. We want the plantation owners to recognize our right to form a union, that they must bargain with us altogether.

"We're really part of a big movement," the State labor official went on, "spreading over all the State and country, even joining with other nations of Latin America and the world."

Mario Lopes and his sharecropping brothers in misery—and in hope—personalize the great fresh reality which is the new Latin America. Mario's new experience and new leadership. his new comradeship in the cause of justice for all, give flesh and sinew, spirit and drive to the fact of a societywide revolution.

The high degree of social justice which now obtains in Western Europe and North America is the product of a slow, maturing process which has come about through two centuries of change and struggle. This profound transformation has been marked by the highlights of the American and the French Revolutions of the late 1700's, by the civil wars of the 1800's both here and in Europe, by the Jeffersonian-Jacksonian popular movements and the Lincolnian emancipation, by the struggles of labor and farm organizations and the antimonopoly legislation of 1900, by the New Deal of the 1930's, and the racial strife of our day.

For a hundred years North America has enjoyed political stability and economic advance to a degree unmatched in any other part of the globe, in any other century of history. The Catholic Church in the United States as a spiritual body has been supported and nourished by the gradually maturing natural life of our affluent, industrial society.

Quite the opposite has taken place in Latin America. The church there has been battered and weakened by ideological and political conflict, by social and economic fossilization. In her human manifestations the church has shared the ills of the civic body, whose outmoded feudal structures have at last collapsed to produce the crisis of the hemisphere.

This revolution is now actually happening. It is no longer a "should" or an "ought." The old feudal structure is being overturned consciously by the oppressed peasants and slum dwellers themselves, with help, true, from others. A new economic and social system is unfolding, but in today's embryo tomorrow's fresh creation cannot yet be well discerned.

Note here my use of present participles. Because Latin America is in the midst of a process, a convulsive change which has neither wholly begun or wholly ended. The ancient regime is not yet dead; the new order is not yet born. In short, the new Latin America is in gestation. In some places travail has begun, with all its pangs and shrieks, anxiety—and hope.

We of the Roman Catholic Church, in and outside Latin America, have, as a whole, awakened to these new realities only in the past 5 or so years. The church is now stirred by this Latin travail. In the statistics of church membership, after all, Latin America accounts for one-third of our 550 million members. We are accustomed to speaking of it as one-third of the visible Body of Christ. Speaking to a group of Latin bishops during the past session of the Council, Pope called Latin America "a continent with a Christian tradition, yet a menaced continent."

Bishop Manuel Larrain of Talca, Chile, for 20 years the most forward-looking prelate in Latin America, and now President of CELAM, the Council of Latin America's 650 bishops, took up this theme in an address 2 months ago. "What we have to face," says Bishop Larrain, "is the hard, painful birth of a new civilization. The danger arises if we do not become aware of this event, and if we cannot give guidance to all the dynamic drives stirring up in our continent."

Bishop Larrain attributes this hard, painful birth of a new civilization to two causes, operative above others. These two he terms "quantitative" and "qualitative." First, he cites the "demographic explosion." "We are at present 200 million inhabitants; in 1980 we will be over 350 million; toward the close of the century, we will be about 600 million. This means that we must get all these rapidly increasing masses of people incorporated into educational and social channels, so that the rapid changes brought about by the demographic explosion can really find the fair and adequate solutions which are necessary."

The qualitative cause, which the presiding bishop of the Latin American hierarchy cites, refers to "modifications in social and cultural structures. Latin America is undergoing a rapid, overall transformation: changes take place in the cultural, social, political and civic fields, giving the continent a new physiognomy upon which we must focus for the future. How do these structural changes become especially apparent? Until a few years ago, the rural population of Latin America, 60 to 70 percent of the people, were excluded from cultural and economic, social and civic life. The rapid spread of communications media, of radio, television and roadways, has suddenly incorporated these huge marginal masses into the life of the nation, thus causing deep structural changes."

Bishop Larrain then points out that along with the facts of population growth and basic structural change, a significant phenomenon comes forth from within the human will: "Active participation of the whole population in the life of the nation, and most of all, the extraordinary desire for human betterment manifest among all strata of society. The troubles presently affecting our continent are those caused by a stream seeking its course, and we must give our continent the course it requires.

"Many a time," the bishop continues, "we have—let us be honest—erronously described these troubles by simply calling them revolt, the agitation of Communists. While at bottom they are but a desire for improvement, for human advance, for finding a just and humane solution, a solution which allows men to fulfill that longing for betterment and perfection which lies at the core of all their spirits." (Opening address to First Latin American Meeting of Caritas, Santiago, Chile, February 1964.)

We see then that Mario Lopes, the dollar-a-week banana worker, and Bishop Larrain, the cultivated head of Latin America's Catholic hierarchy, agree closely on their continent's ills and in the seeking of drastic remedies. This accord, this growing understanding and joint action of the high and the low within the church may well turn out to be the most telling transformation of all Latin America's intertwining revolutions. The church, as a whole, is no longer to be identified with the landed aristocracy, with the political oligarchy and the oppressive status quo. Bishops, priests, and lay leaders provide much of the new ferment for institutional reform.

This hopeful and dramatic change among Catholics manifests itself in many ways.

The authentic social teaching of the church is now reaching the people through pastorals and public statements of national conferences of bishops, through newly written catechisms and preaching campaigns with heavy social content, and through many intermediate and grassroots teaching and training centers, usually directed and manned by lay leaders. These are comparable to the labor schools which sprang forth in North America during the great depression of the 1930's.

I have here the 1962 Pastoral of the Chilean Bishops on "Social Reform and the Common Good," and the 1963 statement of the Brazilian Bishops' Council on "Basic Reforms for a Just Social Order." Both these documents apply the two great Encyclicals of Pope John, "Mater et Magistra" (Christianity and Social Progress) and "Pacem in Terris," to the concrete realities of Chile and Brazil. The chapter headings of the Brazilian statement give a good fell of its content and spirit: "Transformations Can No Longer Be Postponed," "The Rural Question," "Reform of Business," "Tax Reform," "Administrative Reform," "Electoral Reform," "The Presence of the Church Through Laymen."

I quote from the last section:

"The presence of the church in the transformation of the temporal is concretized through free and responsible laymen who, like all men of good will, manifest a spirit of understanding, of distinterestedness and a desire to collaborate loyally in attaining objectives good in their nature, or that, at least, can move toward the good." ("Pacem in Terris.")

A principal author of the Brazilian statement and of the social apostolate over the whole continent is Archbishop Helder Camara, executive secretary of Brazil's Council of Bishops and vice president of Celam, the Council of Latin American Bishops. Archbishop Helder Camara has startled many persons with his fresh ideas and activities. Last year he circulated his personal thoughts in this 24-page mimeographed statement entitled "Exchange of Ideas With Our Brothers in the Episcopate in the Course of the Second Vatican Council."

Archbishop Helder Camara is one of the Latin leaders of the movement known as the Church of the Poor. This voluntary grouping of clergy seeks, in his words, "to study the mystery of the Poor One (Christ) and to discover practical ways to help the church find again the lost paths of poverty." He suggests that the titles of eminence, beatitude, and excellency be abandoned, and that "we [bishops] lose the obsession to be of the nobility and drop our coats of arms and mottoes.

"It seems like nothing, but how this creates distance between our clergy and our faithful. It separates us from our century which has already adopted another style of life. It separates us especially from the workers and from the poor."

I share with you the thoughts of these two leading Latin bishops in order to convey something of the self-criticism, universal concern and doctrinal deepening which underlie and motivate the church's new social apostolate. And it must be stressed that this far-ranging renewal has entered, and increasingly influences, the main stream of church life and policy. I need only cite that Bishop Larrain was elected president of the Council of Latin American Bishops 6 months ago by the delegate bishops from each of the 20 national episcopal conferences. And I point out that Archbishop Helder Camara, until now only an auxiliary, with no diocesan jurisdiction of his own, was elevated by Pope Paul 2 weeks ago to the Archdiocese of Recife, the leading post in Brazil's northeast, the troubled area where Mario Lopes, the banana worker, and 15 million of his brothers in Christ subsist in subhuman misery.

Raul Cardinal Silva, a recognized leader of the social apostolate throughout Latin America, also first gained attention for his work with the poor as national director of Caritas, Chile. I first met Father Silva in the slums of Santiago in 1957. A few days before, this priest had led by night a group of squatters, newly arrived from their rural serfdom, onto the military drill field on the outskirts of the capital city. There they were building their hovels—of odd strips of zinc and thatch and wood—while Father Silva fended off the police and negotiated a long-term payment arrangement so each family could acquire title to their homesite. Out of these experiences, Father Silva and his coworkers developed 120 housing cooperatives and savings and loan associations which now provide 1,500 new homes a year. Another proof of the transformation in the church of Latin America is that within 3 years this simple padre of the slum dwellers became Archbishop of Santiago and Cardinal Silva. A year ago he was elected president of Caritas Internationalis, the world federation of all Catholic social service organizations, my own included.

A year ago, the New York Times reported: "Chile's Roman Catholic Church is trying to help solve critical political and economic problems here to improve the lot of the common man. The move is under the leadership of 55-year-old Raul Cardinal Silva, who calls for drastic and social reforms. Despite some gains, there is general agreement here (Santiago) that there are gross social inequalities. But the meat of the latest message from the church hierarchy is that reforms are going entirely too slowly and that too many so-called faithful Christians in Chile are showing cold indifference to problems of the masses that have now reached the emergency state." (Nov. 5, 1962, New York Times, international edition, p. 7.)

On my arrival recently at the residence of Bishop Silvio Haro of Ibarra, on Ecuador's altiplano, a formal committee of laymen was awaiting me as a director of Catholic Relief Services—NCWC, an official agency of the bishops of the United States. These committee members were not the hacienda owners, not the affluent merchants of the town, nor beplumed Knights of St. Gregory in battle array. No, the bishop had gathered around him those closest to his heart—delegates from the festering slums and scrubby mountain farms. As can happen readily among the unlettered, ceremony was overcome, not to say crushed, and they spoke out spontaneously, giving testimony from the heart.

The change within the church of their own diocese as manifested by their own bishop was the principal theme. I saw there that the church is now being recognized as friend and mother of the poor, champion of the oppressed, promoter of a just social order by the afflicted themselves. One mother, weary with worry, malaria, and a nursing baby at her open breast, broke up the meeting. "This palacio," she said, "the bishop's palace, is no longer reserved for the rich from the big haciendas. Now it has become our house, my house, the home of the poor." This weary mother broke up the meeting because Bishop Haro burst into tears and left the room. And so did I.

It is a truly humbling experience for us of the affluent United States of America, the "colossus of the north," to encounter in our brothers south of the border this new incarnation of the Christ of the Gospels, as the poor Nazarene who had not whereon to lay His head. Down there Our Lord is becoming visible in His church, in ways which we Americans in our suburban parish complacency find it difficult to understand.

Nourished by Pope John's encyclicals, and Pope Paul's further insistence upon this social teaching, strengthening by the spirit of aggiornamento and by the new regional and world solidarity fostered by the Vatican council, the church goes about her newly grasped and complex task of redeeming the temporal. She seeks amid strife and near-chaos to humanize the social order, so that all men might realize and live the dignity which is theirs as children of God and brothers in Christ.

Forty-year-old Bishop Marcos McGrath, former dean of theology at Chile's Catholic University, and newly appointed ordinary of Santiago, Panama, explains the role of the church today. He states that our catechisms are often deceptively simplistic in their description of the church's threefold mission to teach to rule and to sanctify. "Since the time of St. Robert Bellarmine, in reaction against Protestant rejection of external church authority, our manuals of theology have fixed their attention sometimes too exclusively on the visible aspects of the church. Take for example St. Robert Bellarmine's definition of the church: "The society composed of men united among themselves by the communion of the same sacraments, under the jurisdiction of their legitimate pastors and above all of the Roman pontiff."

"The church is a mystery," Bishop McGrath of Panama asserts. "She (the church) is an object of faith, which we can only partially understand and which therefore, in the words of Pope Paul VI, 'permits ever new and more profound inquiries into her nature.' (Address inaugurating the second session of Vatican II, September 29, 1963.)"

Bishop McGrath wrote these words for the keynote address at the first annual meeting of CICOP, the Catholic inter-American cooperation program, this past January in Chicago. CICOP is a newly launched initiative to promote understanding, friendship, and concerted effort among Catholics of the United States and our confreres of Latin America. CICOP operated under the aegis of the NCWC, the National Catholic Welfare Conference, and is presided over by six cardinal presidents, the archbishops of Boston, Chicago, St. Louis, Caracas, Lima, and Santiago. A thousand Catholics attended the 4-day meeting in Chicago last January, including Cardinal Silva, Archbishop Helder Camara, Bishop Larrain, and other Latin leaders, clergy, and lay. We were especially pleased and honored to have as participants Dr. Roswell Barnes, executive secretary of the U.S. office for the World Council of Churches, as well as the Reverend Dana Green, of the National Council of Churches, and representatives of other national Protestant bodies.

CICOP reflects another important fact about the awakening and renewal of the Latin Church: This occurs in growing solidarity with the church of the United States, Canada, and Europe—indeed of the whole world. In the last 5 years we have come more to know and to love one another, and to care about the whole Body of Christ, the universal people of God, the entire household of faith.

In response to the invitation of the bishops of a hundred dioceses, 3,589 priests, brothers, sisters, and lay volunteers from our country have gone to work in Latin America, an increase of over 100 percent in the past 10 years. In 1961 Pope John asked the religious congregations of the United States to send 10 percent of their 203,000 members into the southern vineyard by 1970. Pope John set up in Rome the Pontifical Commission for Latin America to coordinate this great collaborative movement from Europe and North America.

Let us return to Bishop McGrath's doctrinal analysis of the role of the church in time and history: "The church is the divine leaven working in the mass of society. Father Henri de Lubac put it smartly when he wrote that the mystery of the church is more difficult to understand than the mystery of Christ, as the latter is more difficult than

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

the mystery of God. Why? Because the church involves all this mystery.

"The mystery of the church is not simply that Christ, with His redemptive death 2,000 years ago, set the church in motion to let it carry on by itself until the end of time. This would be rather the description of a human empire. 'The church,' says Bossuet, 'is Christ communicated by the Holy Spirit.' And we believe that Christ is more active in His church today than when He walked visibly over the hills of Palestine. Literally, in His own words, it was better for the church that Christ should go away so that He could send forth, infuse the Holy Spirit into the souls of all believers (John 16: 7); thus bringing it about that as Christ is the Son of God, so 'all those who did welcome Him, He empowered to become the children of God, all those who believe in His name.' (John 1: 12)."

My friends in Christ, I quote literally from Bishop McGrath and other Latin leaders, because I do not wish to tell you merely what I, a North American, a gringo, think about the meaning of the Latin American revolution. I prefer letting Latin church leaders speak for themselves. And I now stress these doctrinal roots, because our Latin confreres insist that only deepening faith can adequately nourish a social apostolate of such range and difficulty as that now required, and now appearing, to redeem that fermenting continent. I quote at length from Bishop Marcos McGrath because he was dean of a major faculty of theology, and because he was selected by his fellow Latin Bishops for membership in the Theological Commission of the Second Vatican Council, where he now serves with distinction.

"It is God then who acts through Christ in His church," the Bishop continues. "Toward what end? Toward unity; the unity of all men in the love of God; in the unity of the living God. All born and yet unborn are to be incorporated into Christ; with Him they form the church, they are the church. He acts upon all near and afar through the invisible Spirit of God, and through the visible ministry of His members. A 'truly tremendous mystery,' said Pope Pius XII, that we depend upon one another for our salvation. We are not saved singly but in society, in dependence upon so many around us for all that we have, all that we know, all that we desire."

Bishop Marcos McGrath of Panama continues: "The mission of the church is specifically religious. But she strives to make man and his whole life religious. The community of believers unites about the altar in the community of worship, and creates in the home and far beyond it the community of love. This is the obvious projection of the church.

"Quickly, however, Christianity touches upon the temporal order—the world of work, of art, of science, of education, of business, of politics: of all that is not specifically religious * * * human relations involve basic values * * * both doctrines and moral principles.

"The application of these principles then rests principally with the Christian himself: whether it be in settling a family quarrel or launching a union into a major strike. The Christian active in the temporal order finds himself rubbing shoulders and convictions with men of very diverse creeds. In all honesty of purpose he must strive for a serious cultivation of temporal values in themselves, material well being, culture, science, and the like, and in their proper relation to peace and spiritual progress. In this he will link arms with all men of good will whenever possible, with never a need to impose his religious creed on others.

"The church," the bishop concludes, "as a religious society is distinct from the temporal order. Christian men, however, live deeply imbedded in the temporal order. Christ makes Himself present in each of these two manners: indirectly, through doctrine, directly, through its personal and prudential application."

We see then, in short, the Latin Catholicism, in doctrine as well as in practice, is becoming incarnational. And I purposely stress the doctrinal renewal even more strongly than the concrete application. I could have listed and documented the astonishing proliferation of welfare agencies, cooperative and rural movements, community development, adult education and leader training programs which have burst forth in city slums, mountain villages, and jungle outposts.

But I insist that the deepened and broadened Faith which nourishes this new resurrection deserves consideration prior to mere facts and statistics. The new peasants' movement of Mario Lopes is important, and so is Mario's bishop, Eugenio Sales, who inspired the movement and set up the center to form the leaders who trained Mario. (This Natal training center was partly financed, incidentally, by a $30,000 grant from MISEREOR, the German Bishops' fund for social development.) But more important still is the fresh concept of Christ and His church which led Bishop Sales to pioneer this social movement 5 years ago.

Dr. John A. Mackay, in a paper given here in 1961, before the study conference of the Committee on Cooperation in Latin America, correctly reported that these following questions were being asked in Roman Catholic circles of the Western World:

How can Hispanic Catholicism become incarnational? That is to say, "How can it become related to life in such a way that it shall transform life?" In a word, how can historical Roman Catholicism in Latin America become truly revelant to the human situation and constitute a spiritual redemptive force? (John A. Mackay, "The Latin American Churches and the Ecumenical Movement," booklet published in April 1963, p. 3.)

My brothers in Christ, I thank God that I can report that this is now happening, and has indeed already occurred to a marked degree. And I know that my Latin American confreres join me in thanking God that your own interest in this spiritual awakening is so great that you have graciously asked to hear of it.

Time does not permit an adequate account of how this incarnational apostolate actually works, nor to assess its failures and successes, nor to point out its dangers or excesses. Mario Lopes and thousands upon thousands of other Christian leaders are active at all levels of Latin America's new temporal society, now aborning. According to the natural competence of each, and in keeping with their varying gifts of Christian vision, they struggle with land tenure and sharecropping reforms: with technical training and leader formation; with capital formation, job creation, and wage-profit equity; with legislative, tax, and administrative reforms; with the countervailing forces of worker, peasant, and slum-dweller unions.

Will there be time enough for this social apostolate to take effect? So much must be done; the pressure of totalitarian shortcuts is so great. Perhaps our Christian comrades will fail, in this or that country, maybe in the whole continent. Even if they do not succeed in renewing their temporal society, they are succeeding in renewing the church. The latter is infinitely the more important. Although failure in the temporal may mean going underground or waiting in the upper room another generation, the ferment for another birth is at work, because Christ lives on in them as the people of God.

These struggling men and women are nourished by a new grasp of the faith, imparted by a new emphasis on preaching the word—often by the laity themselves—and by the liturgical reforms already brought about by Pope John's aggiornamento.

I know that they are nourished too by the ecumenical spirit which sustains us all, by this visible expression of care and concern and friendship which we Christians now manifest for one another. I know that our Latin confreres are nourished even more by the invisible sustenance of Christ in their own souls in response to your own understanding, love, and prayers.

AMENDMENT OF ATOMIC ENERGY ACT OF 1954, ATOMIC ENERGY COMMUNITY ACT OF 1955, AND EURATOM COOPERATION ACT OF 1958

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1070, S. 2963.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2963) to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, the Atomic Energy Community Act of 1955, as amended, and the Euratom Cooperation Act of 1958, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, this bill will be the pending business of the Senate.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM — ADJOURNMENT UNTIL NOON ON WEDNESDAY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, tomorrow, the Senate will have a good deal of committee work to complete. It is our sincere hope that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare may be able to complete the markup of the bill known as the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, the so-called antipoverty bill.

Because of the heavy committee schedule tomorrow and the desire of the leadership to move as many bills as possible, there will be no session of the Senate on Tuesday.

I now move that the Senate stand adjourned until 12 o'clock on Wednesday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 54 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Wednesday, July 8, 1964, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 6, 1964:

CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION

LeRoy Collins, of Florida, to be Director, Community Relations Service, for a term of 4 years.

OFFICE OF EMERGENCY PLANNING

Franklin B. Dryden, of Kentucky, to be Deputy Director of the Office of Emergency Planning, vice Justice H. Chambers, resigned.

SENATE

Wednesday, July 8, 1964

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. Metcalf).

Rev. Homer E. Watkins, minister, First Christian Church, Centralia, Ill., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, the source of life and goodness, grant that we may sense Thy presence, as we endeavor to know and do Thy will. We are grateful for the high principles which have inspired us as a nation and have given us direction through dark and stormy days. We thank Thee for the joys and privileges of freedom, and pray that we may understand more fully the responsibilities inherent in a life of free choice.

We are mindful of the struggles and sacrifices out of which our Nation was born, and ask that they will not be valueless, but that we may stand bravely upon the shoulders of those who have given so much.

In a larger vein, we would hold before Thee the struggling people around our earth. May their faith in us and the causes for which we toil be well founded. We would not forget them or their sufferings and sacrifices. Grant that Thine eternal purposes for mankind will not forever be frustrated by selfish, heartless people, and may freedom have a rebirth for all mankind.

In these critical hours for our own great Nation, we lift grateful hearts and voices for the dedicated leadership with which we have been blessed. From this trying vortex, wilt Thou lead us to new personal dedication, where selfishness will be forgotten, and love and understanding will reign supreme.

In Thy name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request by Mr. Humphrey, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, July 6, 1964, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H.R. 10053) to amend section 502 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, relating to construction differential subsidies, and it was signed by the Acting President pro tempore.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. Humphrey, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSIONS

On request of Mr. Humphrey, and by unanimous consent, the following committees and subcommittees were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today:

The Fiscal Affairs Subcommittee of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary.

AUTHORIZATION FOR FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE TO FILE REPORT ON H.R. 11380

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Foreign Relations Committee be authorized to file a report, together with minority views and individual views, on H.R. 11380, at any time during the recess or adjournment of the Senate after tomorrow.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS TO FILE REPORT DURING RECESS OR ADJOURNMENT OF THE SENATE

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Foreign Relations Committee be authorized to file a report on H.R. 11380, the foreign aid bill, notwithstanding adjournment or recess of the Senate either tomorrow or on Friday.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES TO FILE REPORTS TOMORROW

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to file reports during the session of the Senate tomorrow or at any time tomorrow.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

Report on Additional Laboratory Spaces at University of Illinois

A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on additional laboratory spaces at the University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill.; to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

Instruction of Two Citizens of Thailand at the U.S. Naval Academy

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to receive for instruction at the U.S. Naval Academy at Annapolis two citizens and subjects of the Kingdom of Thailand (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Salary Increase for District of Columbia Police and Firemen

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958, as amended, to increase salaries, to adjust pay alinement, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Report on Unnecessary Payments for Temporary Lodging Allowances to Military Personnel in Naples, Italy

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on unnecessary payments for temporary lodging allowances to military personnel in Naples, Italy, Department of Defense, dated June 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Excess Transportation Costs Due to Erroneous Weights on Military Shipments of Household Goods

A letter from the Comptroller General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on excess transportation costs due to erroneous weights on military shipments of household goods, Department of Defense, dated July 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Claim of Adler Construction Co. v. the United States

A letter from the Clerk, United States Court of Claims, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of the court's order relating to the claim of *Adler Construction Company, a Partnership Constituted of Harold C. Adler and Vera L. Adler*, v. *The United States* (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Admission Into the United States of Certain Defector Aliens

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered granting admission into the United States of certain defector aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Temporary Admission Into the United States of Certain Aliens

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered granting temporary admission into the United States of certain

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PROVISION OF STAFF AND NECESSARY SERVICES TO COMPLETE THE AFFAIRS OF A PRESIDENT WHO DIES IN OFFICE

A letter from the Acting Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of August 25, 1958, title 39, United States Code, and the act of March 7, 1964, to provide office staff, and necessary services, to wind up the affairs of a President who dies in office or of a former President after his death (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A petition of the Assembly of the Kitanakagusuku-Son, of the island of Okinawa, praying for the enforcement of the law relating to the public election of the chief executive; to the Committee on Armed Services.

The petition of Servando Salinas Flores, of Piedras Negras, Coahuila, Mexico, praying for a redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter in the nature of a memorial from R. Keen, relating to an increase in congressional salaries; ordered to lie on the table.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. RANDOLPH, from the Committee on Public Works, with an amendment:

S. 1147. A bill to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to construct and maintain an adequate system of roads and trails for the national forests, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1174).

OPERATION OF ARTICLE VII, NATO STATUS OF FORCES TREATY—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 1171)

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, on December 12 the full Committee on Armed Services approved the annual report entitled "Operation of Article VII, NATO Status of Forces Treaty" together with other jurisdictional operations.

I submit to the Senate this report and ask that it be printed with illustrations.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and printed as requested by the Senator from North Carolina.

CRIME AND CRIMINAL PROCEDURE IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—MINORITY VIEWS (S. REPT. NO. 1172)

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, I report favorably, with an amendment, the bill (H.R. 7525) relating to crime and criminal procedure in the District of Columbia, and I submit a report thereon, together with the minority views of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE]. I ask unanimous consent that the committee report, together with the minority views, be printed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and the bill will be placed on the calendar; and, without objection, the report will be printed, as requested by the Senator from Nevada.

AUTHORIZATION FOR SENDING OF OBSERVERS FROM THE U.S. SENATE TO NEXT GENERAL MEETING OF COMMONWEALTH PARLIAMENTARY ASSOCIATION IN JAMAICA—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 1173)

Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 339) authorizing the sending of observers from the U.S. Senate to the next general meeting of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association in Jamaica, and submitted a report thereon; which report was ordered to be printed, and, under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the President pro tempore of the Senate is authorized to appoint four Members of the Senate as a delegation to attend the next general meeting of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, to be held in Kingston, Jamaica, at the invitation of the Jamaica Branch of the Association, and to designate the chairman of said delegation.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the delegation, including staff members designated by the chairman to assist said delegation, shall not exceed $10,000 and shall be paid from the contingent funds of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

FINANCIAL OR BUSINESS INTERESTS OF OFFICERS OR EMPLOYEES OF THE SENATE—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—MINORITY AND SUPPLEMENTAL VIEWS (S. REPT. NO. 1175)

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, Senate Resolution 212, agreed to October 10, 1963, authorized and directed the Committee on Rules and Administration to make a study and investigation with respect to any financial or business interests or activities of any officer or employee or former officer or employee of the U.S. Senate. The resolution charged the committee to ascertain whether such interests or activities involved conflicts of interest or other impropriety and whether additional laws, rules or regulations are necessary or desirable for the purpose of prohibiting or restricting any such interests or activities. Finally, the committee was instructed to report to the Senate the results of its investigation together with recommendations at the earliest practicable date.

It is my considered judgment, Mr. President, that seldom has a committee of the U.S. Senate been given a more difficult, a more important, or a more challenging assignment. As chairman of the Senate Rules Committee, I am proud to report that each and every member of that committee, and of its staff, during long months of intensive investigation has been dedicated to a thorough and objective search for truth, motivated solely by the grave public trust placed in them.

Today, Mr. President, it is my prerogative to fulfill the mandate of Senate Resolution 212 and report to the Senate the committee's findings and recommendations. In doing so, I ask unanimous consent that the report may include the minority views of Senators CURTIS, COOPER, and SCOTT, and the supplemental views of the Senator from Kentucky, who also concurs in the minority views.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and printed, as requested by the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, the report speaks for itself. I will not belabor my colleagues with any recitation of its details at the present time. Instead, I invite them and citizens everywhere to withhold judgment on its worth until they have read and digested its contents.

I realize that the committee's work and report may not find complete universal acceptance. For example, the minority members of the committee feel that certain additional witnesses should have been called. In their minority report, they discuss at some length a number of such witnesses. It should be pointed out that each and every one of these witnesses were interviewed, some of them several times, and the committee had the benefit of all the information they were able to furnish us.

No matter how conscientiously an investigation is conducted and concluded, it is not surprising if a few honestly mistaken individuals or impassioned zealots are disappointed—some that the results are not more sensational, others that the inquiry is over at all. It is not my intention to question their sincerity but it is my purpose to meet the test of their criticism.

Speaking as one Senator who has been privileged to share a patriotic burden with eight others on the Committee on Rules and Administration, I am ennobled by the dedication of my colleagues and the high caliber of their performance. To them and the committee's dedicated staff, I am deeply grateful. In their behalf, I now present the Rules Committee's report on the so-called Bobby Baker case. On this record, Mr. President, we are prepared to stand.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, the minority has filed a report and supplemental views concerning the investigation of Robert G. Baker.

I do not intend at this time to discuss the minority or majority report in detail. I simply state, speaking for the minority, that we did not concur in the report. The chief reason that we did not concur is that we believe that the investigation was not concluded.

Robert Baker availed himself of the fifth amendment, and in refusing to testify, closed the door to information that might have been secured from him.

The minority believed strongly that it was imperative that the committee search out from every available source all information that it could possibly secure.

Several months ago the minority members of the committee presented to the committee a list of witnesses that it believed should be called. One member of the minority, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott], presented to the committee a list of additional witnesses. On a motion that I had made as a substitute for a motion of a member of the majority that hearings be concluded, we presented our list of witnesses and witness by witness explained to the committee the reasons why each witness should be called.

In every case, when a vote was taken, the majority members of the committee refused to call the witnesses whose names had been presented by the three members of the minority. It was said that the witnesses need not be called because some had previously testified, or statements had been taken by investigators for the committee. But the minority insisted that because of conflicting testimony and the right of members of the committee to examine and cross examine witnesses and to search out new information even from witnesses who had given statements to investigators, it was the right and the responsibility of the committee to hear further testimony.

But witnesses were not called. Later, efforts were made by the minority, to call other witnesses, including Senators. The motions were also voted down. So in substance the minority takes the position that the investigation was not completed. I make this statement today for myself and on behalf of Senators on the minority side, Senator Curtis and Senator Scott, who are not present.

TO PRINT ADDITIONAL COPIES OF VOLUMES I AND II OF SELECTED READINGS IN EMPLOYMENT AND MANPOWER OF A COMMITTEE-PRINT SERIES—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I report an original concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 90) for the purpose of authorizing the reprinting of the first two volumes of the committee print series "Selected Readings in Employment and Manpower." These documents were compiled for the use of the Employment and Manpower Subcommittee for the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. They proved to be much more popular than was expected. The initial supplies of roughly 2,000 copies of each volume were exhausted some months ago, and the subcommittee continues to receive requests. The reprinting would provide another 1,000 copies for meeting the request backlog, as well as for making 400 copies of each available to depository libraries around the country. It would also permit several Government agencies to obtain additional copies directly from the Government Printing Office, and for the Government Printing Office to place the volumes on public sale.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The concurrent resolution will be received, and, under the rule, will be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 90) is as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare one thousand additional copies each of volume 1, entitled "Exploring the Dimensions of the Manpower Revolution", and volume 2, entitled "Convertibility of Space and Defense Resources to Civilian Needs; A Search for New Employment Potentials", of its committee-print series of the Eighty-eighth Congress of selected readings in employment and manpower, compiled for the use of its Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower.

TO PRINT ADDITIONAL COPIES OF COMMITTEE PRINT ON EMPLOYMENT AND MANPOWER POLICY—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I report an original resolution (S. Res. 340) to print additional copies of a committee print on Employment and Manpower Policy prepared by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received, printed, and, under the rule, will be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The resolution (S. Res. 340) is as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare four thousand additional copies of its committee print of the Eighty-eighth Congress entitled "Toward Full Employment: Proposals for a Comprehensive Employment and Manpower Policy in the United States", a report, together with minority and individual views, prepared by the Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT OF 1964—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare I report S. 2642, the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, with a committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. I ask unanimous consent that the printing of the report on the bill, with minority or individual views, be delayed until July 22.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 2978. A bill to provide citizenship for certain employees of Free Europe Committee, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Javits when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

S. 2979. A bill to authorize the sale, without regard to the 6-month waiting period prescribed, of antimony proposed to be disposed of pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KEATING:

S. 2980. A bill for the relief of Michele, Maria, and Francesca Catalanatto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIBLE (for himself and Mr. Beall):

S. 2981. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958, as amended, to increase salaries, to adjust pay alinement, and for other purposes; and

S. 2982. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT (by request):

S. 2983. A bill to amend the Foreign Service Act and the Federal Employees International Service Act; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. Fulbright when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JACKSON (for himself and Mr. Magnuson):

S. 2984. A bill to authorize the exchange of public domain lands heretofore withdrawn and reserved for the use of the Hanford project of the Atomic Energy Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BIBLE (for himself and Mr. Cannon):

S. 2985. A bill to amend the act of August 1, 1956 (70 Stat. 775), so as to provide that the excess land provisions of the Federal reclamation laws shall not apply to certain lands that will receive a supplemental water supply from the Washoe reclamation project; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Bible when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McCARTHY:

S. 2986. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to withhold the tax credit provided under section 3302 from maritime employers in States that do not meet the conditions required by section 3305(f); to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. NELSON:

S. 2987. A bill to authorize insurance of loans for education beyond secondary school; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. Nelson when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 2988. A bill for the relief of Leonard Storino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIRKSEN (by request):

S. 2989. A bill for the relief of Athanatios P. Gouvas, Alexandros P. Naimpantis, and Stefanos H. Eliadis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STENNIS:

S.J. Res. 181. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Stennis when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

TO PRINT ADDITIONAL COPIES OF VOLUMES I AND II OF SELECTED READINGS IN EMPLOYMENT AND MANPOWER OF A COMMITTEE-PRINT SERIES

Mr. CLARK, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, reported an original concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 90) to print additional copies of volumes I and II of "Selected Readings in Employment and Manpower," of a committee-print series, which, under the rule, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above concurrent resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. CLARK, which appears under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTIONS

AUTHORIZATION OF SENDING OF OBSERVERS FROM THE U.S. SENATE TO NEXT GENERAL MEETING OF COMMONWEALTH PARLIAMENTARY ASSOCIATION IN JAMAICA

Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 339) authorizing the sending of observers from the U.S. Senate to the next general meeting of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association in Jamaica, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. FULBRIGHT, which appears under a separate heading.)

TO PRINT ADDITIONAL COPIES OF COMMITTEE PRINT ON EMPLOYMENT AND MANPOWER POLICY

Mr. CLARK, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 340) to print additional copies of a committee print on Employment and Manpower Policy prepared by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, which, under the rule, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. CLARK, which appears under a separate heading.)

PROVIDING CITIZENSHIP FOR CERTAIN EMPLOYEES OF RADIO FREE EUROPE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I send to the desk a bill for appropriate reference.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2978) to provide citizenship for certain employees of Free Europe Committee, Inc., introduced by Mr. JAVITS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I invite the attention of my colleagues to this very interesting bill, which will provide U.S. citizenship for certain employees of the Free Europe Committee who because of residence requirements have not been able to be naturalized. My bill provides that any person who has been employed continuously for not less than 5 years by the Free Europe Committee and has had not less than 6 months' residence in the United States may be naturalized upon compliance with all the requirements of title III of the Immigration and Naturalization Act except physical residence.

Radio Free Europe was organized in 1949 by Americans impelled by the idea that the best way to overcome Communist propaganda in the satellite countries behind the Iron Curtain was to get exiles from those countries to broadcast the message of freedom to the people back home.

I have actually seen this operation at Munich and other places.

Today Radio Free Europe is an independent broadcasting network operating 28 transmitters in Europe on medium and shortwaves capable of penetrating behind the Iron Curtain in spite of Communist jamming. Its operations are supported by contributions from Americans, and the headquarters of the Free Europe Committee, which is the parent organization, are in New York City.

It is an absolutely free, private organization.

The hundreds of men and women who make up its staff of broadcasters, writers, pamphleteers, analysts, and researchers are exiles and refugees from the lands to which they broadcast, many of them persons of considerable stature and achievement. I know many of them personally. Among them are former prime ministers and other government officials, diplomats, jurists, scholars and journalists—people of considerable talent and ability who have firsthand knowledge of Communists' aims and how to fight them.

These men and women, though stateless, are true soldiers of freedom, and I believe that we should facilitate the process by which they may become citizens when they want to do so. Thus far this has been impossible for them primarily because they cannot meet the continuous residence requirement by reason of the fact that they must work in Europe.

During World War II, the Lodge Act of 1950 made it possible for aliens serving in the U.S. Army to become citizens of the United States. Because the members of Radio Free Europe are no less soldiers for the reason that they are fighting in the cold war, I am introducing an amendment to the Immigration and Nationality Act which makes it possible for them to become American citizens.

I commend the bill for very early consideration by the Judiciary Committee, and for enactment into law.

TO AMEND THE FOREIGN SERVICE ACT AND THE FEDERAL EMPLOYEES INTERNATIONAL SERVICE ACT

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Foreign Service Act and the Federal Employees International Service Act.

The proposed legislation has been requested by the Secretary of State and I am introducing it in order that there may be a specific bill to which Members of the Senate and the public may direct their attention and comments.

I reserve my right to support or oppose this bill, as well as any suggested amendments to it, when the matter is considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed in the RECORD at this point, together with the letter from the Secretary of State dated June 26, 1964, to the President pro tempore of the Senate in regard to it and an explanation of the bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill, letter, and explanation will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2983) to amend the Foreign Service Act and the Federal Employees International Service Act, introduced by Mr. FULBRIGHT, by request, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 520 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, is further amended as follows:

"(1) Subsections (b) and (c) are renumbered (e) and (f) respectively.

"(2) New subsections (b), (c), and (d) are inserted as follows:

"'(b) The Secretary shall, upon application of the officer concerned, reemploy in the Service any Foreign Service officer who has transferred to an international organization within the meaning of section 4 of the Federal Employees International Organization Service Act, and who has served continuously in this status up to the time of his application for reemployment.

"'(c) The Secretary may, in accordance with such regulations as he may prescribe, consider for promotion any Foreign Service officer who has transferred to an international organization within the meaning of section 4 of the Federal Employees International Organization Service Act, during his service with an international organization. Such promotion shall not be recommended by the Secretary until the officer has been reemployed pursuant to paragraph (b) of this section.

"'(d) Any Foreign Service officer who serves with an international organization by reason of transfer pursuant to section 4 of the Federal Employees International Organization Service Act shall continue to be subject to such obligations and limitations imposed by this Act and regulations issued pursuant thereto, that the Secretary determines to be appropriate.'

"SEC 2. Sections 2(7), 3(a), 4(a)(5), and 4(d) of the Federal Employees International Organization Service Act are amended in each case by omitting the word 'three' and substituting therefor the word 'five.'

"SEC. 3. Section 4(a)(1) of the Federal Employees International Organization Service Act is amended by inserting before the final period the following phrase: 'provided such period of service does not form the basis, in whole or in part, for an annuity or pension under the organization's retirement system'."

The letter and explanation presented by Mr. FULBRIGHT are as follows:

JUNE 26, 1964.

Hon. CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore of the Senate.

DEAR SENATOR HAYDEN: It is U.S. policy to encourage details and transfers of Federal employees for service with international organizations. Implementation of this policy will be facilitated if legislation is enacted (1) to clarify the basis for reemployment of Foreign Service officers under the Federal Employees International Organization Service Act and (2) to extend to 5 years the period during which an employee may serve an international organization while retaining the rights and privileges of Federal service.

The Department is therefore submitting for consideration by the Senate a bill amending the Foreign Service Act and the Federal Employees International Service Act. An explanation of the bill is also enclosed.

The Department recommends enactment of the proposed bill and trusts that it may receive favorable consideration by the Congress.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to this proposed legislation from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely yours,

DEAN RUSK.

EXPLANATION OF PROPOSED BILL: AMENDMENTS TO THE FOREIGN SERVICE ACT OF 1946

REAPPOINTMENT, RECALL OR REEMPLOYMENT OF FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS

"SEC. 520. (a) The President may, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, reappoint to the Service, a former Foreign Service officer who has been separated from the Service. The Secretary shall, taking into consideration the qualifications and experience of each candidate for reappointment and the rank of his contemporaries in the Service, recommend the class to which he shall be reappointed in accordance with the provisions of this section.

"(b) The Secretary shall, upon application of the officer concerned, reemploy in the Service any Foreign Service officer who has transferred to an internatioal organization within the meaning of section 4 of the Federal Employees International Organization Service Act and who has served continuously in this status up to the time of his application for reemployment.

"(c) The Secretary may, in accordance with such regulations as he may prescribe, consider for promotion any Foreign Service officer who has transferred to an international organization within the meaning of section 4 of the Federal Employees International Organization Service Act during his service with an international organization. Such promotion shall not be recommended by the Secretary until the officer has been reemployed pursuant to paragraph (b) of this section.

"(d) Any Foreign Service officer who serves with an international organization by reason of transfer pursuant to section 4 of the Federal Employees International Organization Service Act shall continue to be subject to such obligations and limitations imposed by this Act and regulations issued pursuant thereto, that the Secretary determines to be appropriate.

"[(b)] *(e)* The Secretary may recall any retired Foreign Service officer temporarily to duty in the Service whenever he shall determine such recall is in the public interest.

"[(c)] *(f)* Notwithstanding the provisions of title 5, United States Code, section 62, and title 5, United States Code, section 715a, a Foreign Service officer heretofore or hereafter retired under the provisions of section 631 or 632 or a Foreign Service staff officer or employee hereafter retired under the provisions of section 803 shall not, by reason of his retired status, be barred from employment in Federal Government service in any appointive position for which he is qualified. An annuitant so reemployed shall serve at the will of the appointing officer."

The proposed amendment to section 520 will overcome an existing obstacle to making Foreign Service officers available to international organizations on the basis of "transfer" under the provisions of the Federal Employees International Organization Service Act.

The Federal Employees International Organization Service Act provides a satisfactory means of placing U.S. Government personnel, other than Foreign Service officers, in international organizations.

Such personnel can be either assigned or detailed on a reimbursable or nonreimbursable basis, or they can be "transferred" and placed on the payroll of the international organization with full reemployment rights and with retention of retirement and insurance benefits as well as leave balances.

Foreign Service officers can be assigned or detailed on a reimbursable or nonreimbursable basis under the provisions of section 571 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended. This authority is adequate to the extent that an international organization is willing to accept an officer who remains an employee of the U.S. Government. In many instances, however, international organizations are unwilling to accept this kind of arrangement. The organizations' relationships with other governments and with its employees who are nationals of other countries frequently demands separation of its employees from national government ties. This poses a special problem in the case of Foreign Service officers since, under present law, there is a question as to whether a Foreign Service officer who is "transferred" can be guaranteed reemployment rights as reemployment ordinarily requires reappointment by the President with Senate confirmation.

The Department of State is making a determined effort to place a larger number of highly qualified Americans in positions with international organizations. A very important pool of talent upon which it can draw is the Foreign Service officer category. Career Foreign Service officers frequently possess the language and other skills, understanding of international affairs, and administrative ability required to qualify for such positions. It is therefore especially important to the Department that it be able to assure a Foreign Service officer that following his service with an international organization he will resume his Foreign Service officer status without loss of benefits, as provided for in the Federal Employees International Organization Service Act.

Proposed new section 520(b) provides that upon the application of an officer who has been transferred to an international organization within the meaning of the Federal Employees International Organization Service Act, the Secretary shall reemploy him as a Foreign Service officer of the same class in which he was serving at the time of separation by transfer without the need for a new Presidential appointment or Senate confirmation.

Proposed new section 520(c) provides that such an officer may be considered for promotion while he is serving with an international organization. The Secretary may use various means for this purpose. For example, should an officer be reached for promotion through the normal selection-board process the Secretary could recommend his promotion to the President following his return to duty.

Proposed new section 520(d) provides that an officer transferred to an international organization shall continue to be subject to such obligations and limitations imposed by the Foreign Service Act, as the Secretary determines to be appropriate.

APPLICABILITY OF EXCESS LAND PROVISIONS OF FEDERAL RECLAMATION LAWS IN CERTAIN CASES

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my distinguished colleague, Senator CANNON, I introduce for proper reference the bill to waive the acreage limitation provisions of reclamation law insofar as it applies to the Washoe project located in Nevada and California. Implementation of this project has been held up for the past 7 years because of the inability of the farmers in the area to meet the provision that prohibits the delivery of water to any individual who owns an excess of 160 acres.

Although this proposal was modified to some extent at the time the bill was enacted, the requirements are still of such a nature that the water users are unable to meet them. This proposal would provide for the delivery of water to presently irrigated lands irrespective of the acreage limitation provisions.

Since progress on this very worthwhile project is essential to the economic growth of western Nevada, I urge early action on this bill by the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2985) to amend the act of August 1, 1956 (70 Stat. 775), so as to provide that the excess land provisions of the Federal reclamation laws shall not apply to certain lands that will receive a supplemental water supply from the Washoe reclamation project, introduced by Mr. BIBLE (for himself and Mr. CANNON), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

THE CONTINUING EDUCATION OPPORTUNITIES ACT

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, the crisis in financing higher education remains acute despite the justly praised efforts and innovations of this Congress.

The anxiety of many an American family was reflected in the very wide support gained last fall by Senator RIBICOFF's unsuccessful attempt to give tax relief to those with heavy educational expenses.

According to the U.S. Office of Education statistics, fully 30 percent of the high school seniors in the 80th to 90th aptitude percentiles fail to go to college.

American families demand and deserve action. The Nation itself cannot afford continued neglect of these able young minds.

After studying the problem I have drawn up a bill, the Continuing Education Opportunities Act which I believe could bring advanced education within the financial grasp of every American boy and girl who really desires it. I wish to introduce that bill today.

As the Education Subcommittee of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee goes into executive session on higher education legislation, I hope it will take cognizance of my approach. Senators VANCE HARTKE, HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR., and others have made very valuable suggestions in this area. However, my study indicates that the approach used in my bill has merit. The bill provides for 4½-percent student loans for both college and post-high-school technical training. The Federal Government would provide a 90-percent loan guarantee and pay the banks the difference between the 4½ percent and the going commercial interest rate. To avoid excessively high interest charges the Commissioner of Education would have the authority to determine a maximum commercial interest charge for these loans.

Under the program authorized by this proposal, a student enrolled full time in an eligible institution of post-high-school education would be able to borrow up to $1,000 a year from a private participating bank for each year in attendance at that institution. A student would not be able to borrow more than an aggregate amount of $5,000 during his undergraduate career. A graduate student, studying for a higher professional or academic degree would also borrow up to $1,000 annually during his graduate studies up to an aggregate amount of $5,000. If the graduate student borrows during his undergraduate career he would be able to accumulate up to a $10,000 loan obligation.

Repayment of these loans would begin 1 year after the student ceases or completes his studies and would extend for 10 years in the case of undergraduates or graduates, and 20 years in the case of graduate students who have borrowed further during their undergraduate career.

The idea of a Federal interest differential payment is borrowed from the successful student loan program in New York State administered by the New York State Higher Education Assistance Corp. In New York, the Higher Education Assistance Corp. fixed the maximum chargeable interest rate at 6 percent. The corporation guaranteed the student loan to the participating bank and assumes payment of 3 percent of the interest charge. This program has been a continuing success. At the end of January 1964 there were 66,674 loans outstanding in the State.

While studying the feasibility of this proposal, I asked several banks throughout the country what interest charge they would make on this sort of loan. The majority of the banks who expressed a willingness to participate in this sort of public service loan program, estimated that they would charge 6 percent simple annual interest on these loans.

The Continuing Education Opportunities Act would cost the Federal Government comparatively little. With the borrower paying 4.5 percent interest plus a one-quarter percent insurance premium, and the commercial banks charging a 6-percent interest rate, as most of the banks I canvassed suggested, the interest cost to the Federal Government would be $157,500 over a 15-year period for each $1 million in freshman loans. This is $15.75 for each $100 loaned.

Fully $150 million in commercial credit could be secured under my bill at a cost of less than $2.5 million for interest subsidies and administration.

The use of commercial sources for student loans eliminates the need for large revolving funds which may total more than $1.5 billion in the next decade. Moreover, the use of commercial credit sources will effectively minimize the heavy investment in time and effort which participating institutions must provide under the National Defense Education Act program.

Judging from experience under the National Defense Education Act, students are excellent credit risks. To date, actual losses from death, disability, or borrower bankruptcy under the National Defense Education Act program in the first 5 years have amounted to less than one-tenth of 1 percent of the total capital outstanding.

Credit finance has won the comfortable life for the American of average means. We should encourage the use of this financial tool to win the education that can make that life meaningful in the future.

Wisconsin has had a student loan program since 1934. Students pay 1 percent interest while in school and 5 percent simple interest after graduation. Participation has grown from 585 students in 1959–60 to 3,849 in 1962–63.

Those who fear that Federal participation in the student loan field will drive legitimate, nonprofit, private groups out of business ought to take heart from both the truly astounding predictions for growth in this area—and by the practical experience in Wisconsin.

Prof. Seymour Harris, the respected Harvard economist, estimates a need for $2.5 billion in student credit by 1970. Others have estimated even higher amounts.

In a letter to a member of my staff, Thomas L. Burch, field representative of the United Student Aid Funds, Inc., the largest private nonprofit student loan organization, said:

> The USA Funds programs operates as a supplement roughly parallel with the Wisconsin State-supported program.

Both are prospering.

A SPECIAL FEATURE

In May 1963, the Wisconsin student loan program was broadened to aid students taking post-high-school vocational and technical training. I have included similar provisions in the Continuing Education Opportunities Act.

Full-time students at vocational, business, and technical institutions accredited by the Commissioner of Education would be also eligible for the low-interest, guaranteed loans.

The rapid growth of junior colleges, community colleges, business schools, and vocational and technical schools points to the increasing demand for post-secondary-school, noncollege education. The "Vocational Training Directory of the United States" lists over 7,000 private and public schools offering nearly 700 different semiprofessional, technical, and trade courses.

The "Education Directory" of the U.S. Office of Education lists only accredited 2-year, business, vocational, and technical schools offering nonbachelor degree courses. Considering only these Office of Education listings, there has been a healthy increase in this type of post-high-school training. The number of these institutions grew from 557 in 1958–59 to 593 in 1961–62. By last year this number had climbed to 628.

The importance of these institutions is clearly underlined by the increasing numbers of students seeking enrollment in them. In the fall of 1957, 465,963 students were enrolled in post-high-school institutions of this type. This number rose to 717,000 by the fall of 1962. And by 1963, 771,000 were enrolled in post-secondary junior colleges, business schools, community colleges, and vocational schools.

Many of these students cannot afford to go to a formal, 4-year college. Often the family situations of these students are such that they are overwhelmed with adult financial burdens before they even graduate from high school. Providing an opportunity for post-high-school training would be a great help.

Testifying on March 10, 1964, before the Senate Subcommittee on Education, Mrs. A. G. Gaston, director of the Booker T. Washington Business College of Birmingham, Ala., testified, "One-third of the current 700 applicants to the school were unable to attend because they were unable to pay just the first quarter of tuition." Another third of the students were paying by installments.

A nationwide survey of 216 accredited business colleges conducted in February of 1964 showed that the average tuition and fees for the academic year at these schools was $700.78. The average total cost of attendance for 9 months was $818.05 if the student lived at home, and $1,436.06 if the student boarded.

Students who cannot afford the heavy financial burden of 4 years of college, and students who seek shorter courses of practical training should not be pushed aside and neglected in our society. There is no reason why these young people should forgo the type of practical training necessary to become useful citizens because financial aid is not available for the type of training they want. The training that could lift them out of the hopelessness of the unskilled labor pool is readily available at business schools, technical institutes, and vocational schools.

The late President Kennedy stated our high aim in his education message to the Congress, January 29, 1963:

> That no student of ability will be denied an opportunity for higher education because of financial need.

We are still far from that goal. The Continuing Education Opportunities Act could be a big step in the right direction toward our objective.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2987) to authorize insurance of loans for education beyond secondary school, introduced by Mr. Nelson, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT RELATING TO APPORTIONMENT OF STATE LEGISLATURES

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I propose a constitutional amendment, which would be passed on by the people through their representatives in Congress and their State legislatures. It would authorize the State in each case to apportion the less numerous branch of its State legislature on other than a population basis.

Mr. President, during the past 30 years the U.S. Supreme Court has rendered numerous decisions which have announced abrupt departures from the interpretations of the Constitution theretofore rendered by the Court. I do not propose to here review those cases; nor do I propose to censure the Court. This is not an attack on the Court. What I propose is a constitutional amendment, which is a remedy to be passed on by the people through their representatives in Congress and their State legislatures.

The latest and one of the most far-reaching of these departures from a well defined and established principle occurred in a series of opinions rendered by the Supreme Court on June 15, 1964, dealing with the apportionment of State legislatures. Prior to the decision in *Baker et al.* v. *Carr et al.*, 369 U.S. 186 (1962), the Court had uniformly refused to entertain such apportionment cases on the ground that these cases involved political questions not presenting a justiciable issue to the Court. In Baker, however, the Court summarily reversed its prior decisions and held that it had jurisdiction over the subject matter and that the cause of action was justiciable. This decision was a blow to the delicate balance in Federal-State relations and a further extension of judicial control was advanced by the Court. In an unanswerable dissent, Mr. Justice Frankfurter clearly and forcefully attached the majority opinion in the Baker case when he stated:

> The Court today reverses a uniform cause of decision established by a dozen cases, including one by which the very claim now sustained was unanimously rejected only 5 years ago. The impressive body of rulings thus cast aside reflected the equally uniform cause of our political history regarding the relationship between political and legislative representation—a wholly different matter from denial of the franchise to individuals because of race, color, religion or sex. Such a massive repudiation of the experience of our whole past in asserting destructively novel judicial power demands a detailed analysis of the role of this Court in our constitutional scheme.

The Court has now gone much further, Mr. President, than it did in the above cited case. It has now announced that in a bicameral legislature the State senate as well as the House of Representatives must be strictly apportioned on the basis of population and that such apportionment must reflect as nearly as practicable the "one-man, one-vote" concept. Up to this time, it has never been considered that the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment, or any other provision of the Constitution, requires that both houses of a State legislature be composed of members apportioned on a strict population basis. To the contrary, our system of government presupposes representation of all elements of society. Unlike a pure democracy, a republican form of government such as that of the United States must give due regard to the minority group and interests. There can be no better proof of this fact than the explicit provisions of the U.S. Constitution itself establishing a Congress composed of the House of Representatives, apportioned on the basis of population, and the Senate, in which each State, regardless of size, has two Senators.

It seems clear, Mr. President, that the Court moved far beyond the bounds of its authorized powers in rendering these decisions on June 15 last. Mr. Justice Clark in his dissenting opinion in one of those cases, *Lucas et al.*, v. *Colorado General Assembly et al.*, ——— U.S. ———, expressed this opinion very clearly when he stated:

> In striking down Colorado's plan of apportionment, the Court, I believe, is exceeding its power under the equal protection clause; it is invading the valid functioning of the procedures of the States, and thereby commits a grievous error which will do irreparable damage to our Federal-State relationship.

Until the Court acted, it had been rightfully assumed that a State had the right to apportion one house on a basis other than population. Indeed, it had not been seriously questioned.

Because these decisions are of such great significance and are so destructive of the historical and constitutional responsibilities of the several States, I have prepared and now introduce a proposed amendment to the Constitution to enable a State to apportion the less numerous branch of its legislature on factors other than population.

This is the last chance the Congress will have to assure fair representation in at least one branch of our State legislatures for the small areas, the outlying areas, the less populated areas of our Nation. If they are to be swallowed up with the masses on a mere "head count" basis, these areas will lose their identity as well as their representation in local State government. This amendment is necessary to provide direct representation for rural areas, villages and small towns that would otherwise be virtually left out or swallowed up.

In my opinion, this is one of the most vital and important issues which has been presented to the Congress since the founding of this Nation. We must discharge our responsibility to act wisely and deliberately as one of the three independent branches of the Federal Government. Our duty is clear. In the performance of that duty, I urge all Members of this body to devote their immediate attention to this question.

Mr. President, I send to the desk and ask that it be appropriately referred a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to secure to the States their rightful authority to apportion one body of the respective legislatures on factors other than population.

I ask unanimous consent that this joint resolution be printed at this point in the Record, as well as two excellent articles on the subject which appeared in the Wall Street Journal and the Washington Evening Star on June 22, 1964.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution and articles will be printed in the Record.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 181) to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population, introduced by Mr. Stennis, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"ARTICLE XXV

"Section 1. Nothing in the Constitution of the United States shall prohibit a State, having a bicameral legislature, from apportioning the membership of the less numerous branch of its legislature on factors other than population.

"Sec. 2. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress."

The articles presented by Mr. Stennis are as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal,
June 22, 1964]

THE CASE AGAINST THE COURT

As the Supreme Court winds up its term today, it is the target of renewed and more insistent criticism. While some of the criticism, bitterly expressed in personalities, is beneath serious discussion, there are sound reasons for the reasoned objections.

For the fact is that Court members, or rather the often thin majorities, have exhibited in recent years several related attitudes which seem both harmful and increasingly habitual.

One of these—by no means new—is the predilection for ruling according to members' theories or prejudices instead of on a strict construction of the Constitution. Unfortunately that all too human weakness is compounded by other tendencies of more recent vintage.

Time was, for example, when the Court tried to judge a case on the narrowest available ground, in order to avoid presuming to make sweeping law. These days the aim frequently seems to be to rule in the most sweeping possible terms, expounded in the context of a broadly applicable philosophy or ideology.

Presumably an explanation of that trend is another phenomenon: The apparent belief of some members that the Supreme Court should rush to the rescue where the normal workings of the political process seem to them to have failed or been inadequate or too tardy. In practice this means moving into areas the Court itself long considered beyond its proper reach.

Though all these traits can be found in a number of decisions in the past several years, they are glaringly brought together in last week's rulings on the apportionment of State legislatures. The rulings contend that representation in not just one but both houses must be based almostly solely on population; history, tradition, economic and other interests are to be largely ignored. Because many State legislatures have been weighted in favor of rural regions, the Court now sets out to squelch those interests in favor of urban majorities.

Here is how we think the apportionment decisions illustrate the prevailing tendencies:

First, it is hard to find persuasive constitutional justification for the view that population should be the controlling criterion of representation. Indeed, in what strikes us as a demolishing dissent, Justice Harlan shows that neither the wording nor the intent of the drafters of the 14th amendment, on which the majority decision relies, supports the contention. "In my judgment," he says, "today's decisions are refuted by the language of the amendment which they construe."

Second, the opinions are sweeping. Though the Court ruled on cases involving only 6 States, the accepted meaning is that the legislatures of most of the 50 are illegal as presently constituted and must be drastically overhauled. The chaos and consequences of the upheaval are not pleasant to contemplate.

Third, the main reason for the far-reaching impact of such decisions is the general philosophy of ideology which the majority propounds in justification. It is not just a question of whether New York State or Alabama or whatever is deemed wrongly apportioned in its particular circumstances; the population principle—as nearly as possible the one-man-one-vote concept—becomes the requirement for all.

The principle is itself dubious. Unlike pure democracy, a representative, republican form of government does not proceed from a one-man-one-vote premise. It does attempt to represent, and accommodate, a host of different interests, in addition to reflecting population proportions. That is because in our system majority rules but minority rights are to be protected; hence one of the disturbing things about the present decision is its overriding of one kind of minority, the residents of lightly populated areas.

But whatever anyone thinks of the population principle, the point is that the Court here implants in the Constitution a particular political theory which was not there before. It substitutes arbitrary edict for the amendment process.

Even in the unlikely event that all were agreed that this particular theory was the best imaginable, says Justice Stewart in his separate dissent, "I could not join in the fabrication of a constitutional mandate which imports and forever freezes one theory of political thought into our Constitution, and forever denies to every State any opportunity for enlightened and progressive innovation in the design of its democratic institutions."

Fourth, and perhaps potentially most harmful of all, is the prevalent feeling that the Court should promote reform where other branches or levels of government have been slow to move; in the present instance, the reluctance of the States to do much of any reapportioning on their own. This general notion obviously appeals to those impatient with the sometimes lethargic pace of our political processes, but it perverts the meaning of the Constitution, misunderstands the role of the Court and menaces the delicate balances of government.

As Justice Harlan observes, "the Constitution is not a panacea for every blot upon the public welfare, nor should this Court, ordained as a judicial body, be thought of as a general haven for reform movements." If it is to be that, why bother with our legislative and other cumbersome political procedures? What such an approach can only lead to is an undermining of the dispersion of governmental authority and reliance on private initiative which have so far kept this a nation of free citizens.

Loose construction of the Constitution, sweeping decisions, enshrinement of favored theories, moves into areas of doubtful constitutional legality—these appear to us and other observers, including not a few constitutional experts, as grave deficiencies in many Court decisions.

Still, the real case against the Court, it seems to us, is not that any of its members are ill-intentioned or deliberately trying to subvert the relationships among the branches and levels of government. To some extent they merely mirror a widespread emotionalism in contemporary society which puts speed above order and demands instant solutions without regard to the political and social cost. The case against the Court is simply that some of the members, for whatever reasons, too often stray far beyond their limited and preeminently judicial function.

As always in the past, the mood of the Court can change with maturing views or new appointments. But until this Court is willing to reassess and moderate its role, it can only expect mounting criticism, reasoned and otherwise, deserved and undeserved. For the Nation will not lightly suffer such damage to its institutions.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, June 22, 1964]

High Court and Reapportionment: Warren Decision Viewed as Leaving Doubts as to Wisdom of Intervention

(By Max Freedman)

No parallel exists between what the Supreme Court did in the segregation cases and what it has now done with reapportionment. For many years the Court dealt with problems of segregation, moving finally to an examination of the problem in the public school system. Its opinions at different times in the Court's history showed changes in outlook and in emphasis. Sometimes the decisions upheld segregation, sometimes they rejected it. But no one has ever questioned the right and the power of the Supreme Court to deal with these matters.

Until very recently, however, the situation was very different with respect to questions of reapportionment. The division of seats in a legislature, and the ratio of power between the cities and the rural areas, were deemed to be precisely the political questions from which the Court could shrink. A majority of the present Court rejected this doctrine and invited these political cases to come before it. Now the Court has ruled that membership in both houses of a legislature must be governed by the rough rule that all votes are equal, no matter where they are cast in the State.

No member belonging to the minority side in these cases has ever denied that the present system of representation contains gross abuses. The only point at issue has always been whether the Supreme Court should be used to remove these abuses. That is still the issue.

It has not been settled by Chief Justice Warren's opinion. He proceeds on the assumption that it is beyond dispute that representation in State legislatures should rest on the principle of one man, one vote. That principle sounds like a truism that no one in his senses would challenge. Yet it has in fact been most seriously challenged both by dissenting justices on this Court and by respected scholars outside it. On the most generous terms, it must be said that the case made by the majority is still open to the gravest doubt. There is abundant evidence in American history and in American political thought to prove that equality of representation was not always the master rule.

But the case against the Court's majority goes deeper than a complaint against their imperfect scholarship. It touches their basic concepts of their judicial function, and their concept of the Supreme Court's role today.

Chief Justice Warren has spoken of weighted representation as an evil which paralyzes true democracy, which exerts a stranglehold on the system of freedom, and which dilutes all other rights which depend upon equality in the polling booth for their maintenance.

Now it would seem reasonable to expect that an evil of this magnitude would have provoked repeated and vehement resistence. Yet it is precisely this evidence of public resistance that is absent from Mr. Warren's opinion.

Like other members of the Court's majority, the Chief Justice has assumed that it would be futile to seek a political solution to the problems of representation because the people being asked to make the concessions would be the very persons who are benefiting from the injustices. Precisely the same assumption was made by reformers across the country. That explains why something less than a flame of agitation on these matters has been visible over the years.

Now it was not easy to crusade against slavery, or child labor, or the denial of votes to women. There always were powerful beneficiaries of injustice that had to be challenged and repulsed.

But in this campaign against representation, the popular agitation, measured against the issues involved, was brief and fragmentary. The Supreme Court took jurisdiction and gave us reform by judicial decree. Is it a good thing for the Supreme Court to deal with the most complicated political questions now facing the American people? And is it a good thing for American democracy to turn its gravest political problems over to the Supreme Court instead of trying to solve them by self-exertion and reform? These are questions left totally unanswered by Chief Justice Warren.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I note with interest that resolutions on this subject have been introduced in the House of Representatives, particularly one by Representative McCulloch. I tried to confer with him concerning his resolution and the introduction of my resolution in the Senate—resolutions which are similar—but he was out of the city. There is interest in the Senate on this subject. I hope other resolutions will be prepared and presented. Mine is limited in its application. I hope its introduction will increase the chance of having the subject seriously considered and a resolution passed.

DISCLOSURE OF FINANCIAL INTERESTS AND ENUMERATION OF CERTAIN PROHIBITED ACTIVITIES—AMENDMENTS (AMENDMENTS NOS. 1097 THROUGH 1107)

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I send to the desk and ask to have printed 11 amendments which I intend to propose to Senate Resolution 337, the disclosure resolution recently reported to the Senate by the Committee on Rules and Administration as a result of the Bobby Baker investigation.

The first of these proposed amendments is an amendment in the nature of a substitute. The other 10 are amendments to Resolution No. 337.

I ask that when printed, they may be consecutively numbered.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendments will be received, printed, and appropriately referred.

The amendments were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I commend the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania for offering these amendments. It is my understanding that these amendments will provide a far more rigorous code of ethics and a more specific code of ethics. It will be a code which will enable the public to evaluate the conduct of Senators. It is my understanding that the recommendation of the committee will not do this in any kind of an adequate way.

I commend the Senator on his excellent proposal.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for his very kind remarks. The substitute amendment which I have sent to the desk is in my opinion a far better resolution. It requires disclosure of the business and professional connections of Senators and employees of the Senate.

I do not think it is necessarily proposed to define a code of ethics. It has to do primarily with the disclosing of interests which might, in the belief of some—and, perhaps, of many—constitute a conflict of interest, in order that when a Senator casts his vote, or when an officer or employee conducts a particular piece of business or a financial transaction of the type referred to in the resolution, the general public may know just what the officer's interest might be.

Nevertheless, I thank the Senator very much for his kind remarks.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 341 OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954—AMENDMENT (AMENDMENT NO. 1108)

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to H.R. 7301 and request that it be sent to the appropriate committee.

My amendment is a very simple one. I am in favor of the present provisions of our Interal Revenue Code, which allow an extra exemption of $600 for our blind or the aged 65 years or older. However, there are many of our citizens disabled in other ways who are trying just as hard to make ends meet, and are just as needy and just as deserving; consequently, my amendment would extend to those totally or permanently disabled for any reason whatsoever the extra exemption presently allowed our aged and our blind.

Mr. President, I feel the Congress will agree with me that our disabled citizens deserve this extra little bit of help.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred.

The amendment was referred to the Committee on Finance.

TO AMEND FURTHER THE FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961—AMENDMENTS (AMENDMENTS NO. 1109)

Mr. JAVITS submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H.R. 11380) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

EMPLOYMENT SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1963—AMENDMENT (AMENDMENT NO. 1110)

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment intended to be proposed to the bill S. 1542, the administration bill which I introduced at the last session to provide revision and improvement of the unemployment compensation system, and ask that it be printed.

This amendment would amend the Internal Revenue Code to withhold the tax credit provided under section 3302 from maritime employers in States that do not meet the conditions required by section 3305(f) of the code.

Since it appears unlikely that action will be taken this session on the major revision provided by S. 1542, I also introduce for appropriate reference a bill containing the same provisions as the amendment. Even though it is not possible to achieve an upgrading of the entire unemployment compensation at this session, enactment of the bill would remove a loophole which results in hardship to many Great Lakes seamen.

In 1946 Congress extended coverage under the unemployment compensation system to Great Lakes seamen. Unfortunately, no enforcement provision was included to guarantee that seamen would have the same rights for unemployment benefits as other employees in a maritime firm. The bill and the amendment are designed to correct this situation which results in severe discrimination against Great Lakes seamen. The laws in Minnesota and several other States bordering the Great Lakes are in conformity with the Federal statute but this not true of every State. As a result several thousand Great Lakes seamen are without unemployment compensation coverage during the winter months when their need is greatest. The enforcement provisions provided in the amendment and the bill would have the effect of extending coverage for Great Lakes seamen to a yearly basis.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred.

The amendment was referred to the Committee on Finance.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I should like to read a statement prepared by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]. The statement reads as follows:

> Mr. President, S. 2853, a bill to provide for research into and development of practical means for the utilization of solar energy, and for other purposes, was introduced by Senator HUMPHREY and referred to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences. While the Space Committee is certainly interested in solar energy, the purport of this legislation is to develop practicable low-cost means of utilizing solar energy here on the earth so that the total energy resources of the Nation may be maximized. The bill would establish within the Department of the Interior a means to carry out this purpose. I have discussed with the chairman of the Interior Committee this bill and we are of the opinion that it should be considered by the Interior Committee.
>
> I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that the Senate Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee be discharged from any further responsibility for S. 2853 and that such bill be rereferred to the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. I have been advised that the sponsor of this legislation, Senator HUMPHREY, has no objection to this action.

Mr. President, the Senator from Minnesota not only has no objection, but he concurs in the request of the Senator from New Mexico and urges that this action be taken.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTICE OF RECEIPT OF NOMINATION BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, as chairman of the Commitee on Foreign Relations, I desire to announce that today the Senate received the nomination of Tyler Thompson, of Maine, to be Ambassador to Finland.

In accordance with the committee rule, this pending nomination may not be considered prior to the expiration of 6 days of its receipt in the Senate.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON CERTAIN NOMINATIONS BY COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, I wish to announce that hearings will be held on the nominations of Frankie Muse Freeman, of Missouri, and Eugene C. Patterson, of Georgia, to be Commissioners of the Commission on Civil Rights.

The hearings will begin on Tuesday, July 28, 1964, at 10:30 a.m. in room 2228 of the New Senate Office Building. Any person who wishes to appear and testify or submit statements pertaining to these nominations should send the requests or statements to the subcommittee no later than 1 week prior to the hearing date.

SENATE BILL 2914—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the

Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott] may be added as a cosponsor to Senate bill 2914, to exempt from taxation certain property of the United Supreme Council, 33d degree, Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite of Freemasonry, Southern Jurisdiction—Prince Hall Affiliation, when the bill is reprinted.

This request is being made on behalf of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Allott].

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON S. 2950

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I should like to announce that the Committee on Banking and Currency will hold a hearing on S. 2950, a bill to authorize the mint to inscribe the figure 1964 on all coins minted until adequate supplies of coins are available. The hearing is scheduled to be held on Tuesday, July 21, 1964, in room 5302 New Senate Office Building at 10 a.m.

Persons who wish to appear and testify on the bill or to file statements on it are requested to notify Mr. Matthew Hale, chief of staff, Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, room 5300, New Senate Office Building, telephone 225-3921.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Television editorial entitled "Response To 'Prayer in Public Schools' Editorial," broadcast on July 2, 1964, over television station WBTW, of Florence, S.C.

By Mrs. NEUBERGER:

Statement by Senator Engle before the Senate Appropriations Committee, on west coast electric power interties.

LEGION COMMANDER CITES NEED FOR TEACHING CITIZENSHIP IN YOUTH PROGRAMS

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, the national commander of the American Legion, Daniel F. Foley, expresses very well, in the current issue of the American Legion magazine, the need to emphasize training for good citizenship in the various youth programs operated by the Legion.

His words apply as well to all youth programs now being carried on in this country.

Citizenship training should be an integral part of youth programs. Our Nation's strength depends on developing citizens who understand their role in a democracy, and resolve to live up to it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have Commander Foley's statement printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Things That Never Change

(By National Commander Daniel F. Foley)

"Give me a lever long enough and a place to stand," the mathematician Archimedes said, "and I will move the world."

American Legionnaires have the lever in the form of the Nation's greatest citizenship training programs. We have the place to stand in our respective American Legion posts, organized and dedicated to community service, with a special eye toward the development of our youth into the best possible citizens of the future.

With the lever and the place to stand, it only remains for us to make sure that we actually do the job that we can do with our powerful tools. Are we giving youngsters in the American Legion baseball program, in Boys' States, and in our other Americanism programs the best possible chance to build the character and capacity they will need to "move the world" when its leadership eventually falls upon them?

We never intended that our youth baseball program was just playing ball, or that Boys' States should be just a tour of a college campus. When we adopted youth baseball as a national program in 1926 the resolution said that "the underlying purpose of the program has been to cultivate true sportsmanship, which is closely akin to good citizenship." In the "1937 Junior Baseball Manual," Legion coaches were reminded that "in their contacts with the boys they have an opportunity to plant ideals and principles in the minds of the youngsters which will stay there throughout life" by setting a "constant example of good sportsmanship and good citizenship," and by "always holding the highest ideals * * * before the boys."

If anything, this advice is more important today, in all of our Legion programs for young people, than it was then.

It is a cliche that we live in a changing world. It is changing—perhaps too fast—and the burden of fast change will forever test the insides of new generations of citizens.

We must prepare the young men and women of today for new challenges and pressures within the society that they will have to lead as they grow older. Science will make the tools of tomorrow, but only training and precept will make the men.

We must instill in their hearts and minds a fierce loyalty to ideals and values that do not change, and which alone can give them a sure sense of purpose and identity as American citizens. When the people of Rome decayed, their worldly splendors became but booty—and thus it will be of any civilization whose people depart from timeless values.

We must stress, above all else, the importance of personal responsibility, of individual initiative, of personal dedication to a rising standard of morality and ethics. It is becoming all too easy to drift with the tide. Youngsters who are able to lead must be taught the courage to lead.

Life in the United States in 1990 will be a vastly different experience beset by vastly different pressures than we know today. The population, experts tell us, will exceed 250 million, compared with 185 million now. Interplanetary travel may be a reality. Automation's labor-saving devices will have produced a shorter workweek and increased leisure time. Big government and big business will be bigger. More schools will be teaching more facts to more students as we try to understand and apply the advances of science. All this will happen whether we like it or not. More people, more government, more machines, and more competition for material progress will exert new pressures upon America's historic unity and purpose. Some of the less wholesome consequences already are in view.

People on the move hesitate to sink their roots in community life; they don't want to get involved with the problems of others.

There is a growing emphasis on things and comforts and a deemphasis of values. Young people see more, do more, travel more than ever before. They learn more practical things in a world with more practical things to be learned. As they do, their need increases for better judgment, stronger values, firmer principle. But at the same time they rely less upon example and guidance within the family unit.

The warning signals are clear.

I believe we owe young Americans more than instruction in the mechanics of government and in the skills of competitive sport. I believe the times require that we encourage them to train their intellect and conscience as well as their bodies, to value man's personal virtues as well as his public victories.

We need to teach them that problems are not solved by society, but rather by individuals who have the will and strength to accept responsibility; that lip service to democracy's blessings pales to insignificance beside the duty to make the most, not the least, of our better way of life.

Every generation has faced that challenge, and as our comforts increase it becomes harder for each generation to avoid the temptation to coast. We shall continue to advance provided we continue to produce:

1. Americans who love liberty, detest injustice, and respect other men's rights.

2. Americans who will give of themselves in service to others, in a world where the accent is on getting.

3. Americans to whom honor and duty have meaning, and at a time when the crowd may covet something more measurable.

I would ask every Legion post to take an inventory of how much or how little, in its youth programs, it is teaching youngsters responsibility, honor, duty, courage, leadership, and service, and I would ask each Legion post to hold up to itself an image of what more it might do.

JUDICIAL LEGISLATION

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, ever since the Supreme Court tortured the meaning of the 14th amendment in 1954 to hold that segregation in public schools is unconstitutional, we have been proving the truth of Edmund Burke's observation that "nations do not learn by experience."

More than 100 years ago, President Abraham Lincoln—the patron saint of the Republican Party—said in his inaugural address:

> The candid citizen must confess that if the policy of the Government upon vital questions affecting the whole people is to be irrevocably fixed by decisions of the Supreme Court, the instant they are made in ordinary litigation between parties in personal actions the people will have ceased to be their own rulers, having to that extent practically resigned their Government into the hands of that eminent tribunal.

In decision after decision, during the past 12 years, the Supreme Court has arrogated to itself the privilege of amending the Constitution and the full weight of the executive branch of the Government has been placed behind the enforcement of that usurpation of power.

The distinguished constitutional lawyer from North Carolina, Hon. Sam J. Ervin, Jr., placed in the Congressional Record of Monday, June 22, a thoughtful article written by an outstanding member of the Law School of the University of North Carolina, Prof. Frank W. Hanft, who cogently pointed out how the Supreme Court had misinterpreted the Constitution in a number of decisions relating to prayers in public schools. Mr. Hanft said:

> The Court in a particular decision has made statements going far beyond the case

in hand. Then it has used such statements as authority for later holdings, thus extending the area of the constitutional prohibitions.

Continuing, he said:

> The Court ought not to sit as a continuing constitutional convention. The constitutional function of the Court is not to make the Constitution. The judicial power extends only to cases and controversies.

Then he made this wise observation:

> The writer does not believe that the Court is authorized to make its own views as to policy into constitutional requirements.

Within a matter of months, title II, which is the accommodations section of the civil rights bill, will be before the Supreme Court on the question of whether it will confirm the previously unchallenged decision of the Supreme Court in 1883 that the Congress had no constitutional authority to tell hotels and restaurants whom they had to serve.

If the Republican convention, which shortly will meet in San Francisco, decides to turn itself into a Supreme Court on all constitutional issues, and adopts a plank proclaiming the constitutionality of the unconstitutional civil rights bill, either for the purpose of embarrassing Senator Goldwater or for the purpose of pleasing Dr. Martin Luther King, it will go down in overwhelming defeat next November—a fate merited by any party which resorts to political chicanery.

Since the present Court overruled all previous Supreme Court decisions, to say nothing of a long line of State court decisions that held segregation in public schools was not prohibited by the 14th amendment, it is, of course, entirely possible that the Supreme Court will overrule the decision of 1883 on the subject of compulsory accommodations. If it does, it will deliberately rewrite the Constitution, just as it did in a recent decision that Federal courts had the power to compel all States to apportion their senatorial, as well as their house, districts on a strictly population basis.

Now we have the interesting information that when Chief Justice Earl Warren was a Republican candidate for Vice President, he strongly supported the constitutional right of States to consider factors other than population in formulating State senatorial districts; and on June 15, last, he wrote the majority decision in the State redistricting case, in which he overruled 100 percent the views of Gov. Earl Warren, of California.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks an editorial—published in the Newport News Daily Press—entitled: "The Chief Justice Reverses Himself."

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Virginia? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, respect for constituted authority is at an all-time low, while crimes of a felonious character are at an alltime high. The gross national product has been pushed to an alltime high, through the injection into the commercial stream of billions of dollars of borrowed money; but the same Congress which has made those inflationary appropriations, with the expected help of the Supreme Court, is passing laws that are impinging upon, and may ultimately destroy, our cherished constitutional principle of private enterprise, and may undermine our future growth. So, Mr. President, even if we do not choose to remember the admonition of an English statesman that we should learn by experience, we should not totally forget the admonition of President Lincoln that we should not permit the Supreme Court to fix the policy of our Government in vital questions affecting the whole people. In any event, if a majority of the people are willing to have their manifest destiny determined by the U.S. Supreme Court, let us in the legislative branch either limit its jurisdiction or take more care in the selection of its membership.

EXHIBIT 1

[Editorial from the Newport News (Va.) Daily Press of July 6, 1964]

THE CHIEF JUSTICE REVERSES HIMSELF

Sometimes a man's words come back to haunt him, particularly if he is in public life, and given to making pronouncements on controversial matters of great importance.

Chief Justice Earl Warren, for example, wrote the majority decision in the historic Supreme Court ruling of June 15 to the effect that seats in both houses of State legislatures must be apportioned on a population basis, but 16 years previously he expressed himself in a far different fashion regarding a California reapportionment proposal.

U.S. News & World Report went back to the files and found this statement, given October 29, 1948, by Mr. Warren, who was then Governor of California and Republican candidate for Vice President.

"Many California counties are far more important in the life of the State than their population bears to the entire population of the State. It is for this reason that I have never been in favor of restricting the representation in the senate to a strictly population basis.

"It is for the same reason that the Founding Fathers of our country gave balanced representation to the States of the Union—equal representation in one house and proportionate representation based on population in the other.

"Moves have been made to upset the balanced representation in our State, even though it has served us well and is strictly in accord with American tradition and the pattern of our National Government.

"There was a time when California was completely dominated by boss rule. The liberal election laws and legislative reapportionment of the system have liberated us from such domination. Any weakening of the laws would invite a return to boss rule which we are now happily rid of.

"Our State has made almost unbelievable progress under our present system of legislative representation. I believe we should keep it."

In 1948, Chief Justice Warren thought the Founding Fathers' decision as to the apportionment of seats in the U.S. Senate should apply equally and for the same reason to the various State senates. In 1964, from his lofty perch in Washington, Mr. Warren overruled himself. It would be interesting to hear his explanation of this about-face, if he has one.

BARRY GOLDWATER AND A FREE PRESS

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, with a good share of the Nation's press surrendering its objectivity, to conform to a stop Goldwater effort by the GOP's minority elements, it behooves the gentlemen of the fourth estate to read a trenchant column written by one of their own, Mr. John S. Knight, of the Detroit Free Press.

Mr. Knight is regarded by his peers as a moderate or liberal. He is definitely not a conservative or a Goldwater supporter—a point he makes abundantly clear in his column.

Despite his personal preferences regarding the Republican nomination, this journalist took a hard, objective look at press treatment of Barry Goldwater, and asserted:

> I do think the Arizona Senator is getting shabby treatment from most of the news media. Day after day there are loud lamentations from the newspaper columnists to the effect that a Goldwater nomination will destroy the Republican Party.

This contention Mr. Knight puts in proper perspective with the comment that:

> Their deep concern for the GOP's future would be more persuasive if any considerable number of them had ever voted for a Republican nominee or perhaps ever voted at all.

The closing line of this excellent commentary opines that Senator Goldwater "hasn't had a fair shake"—an opinion in which I wholly concur.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Nashville Banner, June 25, 1964]

EVEN IF THEY DISLIKE GOLDWATER—COMMENTATORS OUGHT TO PLAY FAIR

(The following editorial was written by John S. Knight, editor and publisher of the Detroit Free Press, and is reprinted from that newspaper.)

To avoid any misunderstanding of what I am about to say, let me declare that Barry Goldwater is not my candidate and I have done nothing to promote his presidential aspirations.

But I do think the Arizona Senator is getting shabby treatment from most of the news media.

Day after day, there are loud lamentations from the newspaper columnists to the effect that a Goldwater nomination will destroy the Republican Party.

Their deep concern for the GOP's future would be more persuasive if any considerable number of them had ever voted for a Republican nominee, or perhaps, ever voted at all.

In Life's current issue, Walter Lippmann opines that, "There is only one man who at this 11th hour can save the Republican Party from what may be an irreparable disaster, and that man is General Eisenhower."

Poor old Ike. He has sought to stay above what Lippmann calls "the sordid and sweaty battle of the politicians." But they never let him alone, and try to use the Eisenhower prestige for their own selfish ends.

Last summer, Walter Lippmann said on "CBS Reports" that Barry Goldwater was the logical Republican presidential candidate for 1964 if the Republicans really wanted to test the issues and give the voters a real choice.

It was not long before Lippmann had a change of heart and declared Goldwater to be a "radical reactionary." He said Goldwater's views "are a vast confusion and a recipe for panic * * * the Republican Party would be a shambles after a Goldwater nomination."

Lippmann now declares that the Goldwater "adventurers" want "to seize and use the old historic name and the political assets of the Republican Party * * * to take over and make over the party."

This is an idle charge since Goldwater's Republican colleagues in the Senate selected him as chairman of their campaign committee for 5 years. In 1960, Goldwater made 200 speeches for the Nixon-Lodge ticket.

Raymond Moley reminds us that when Goldwater resigned from this post last year, his fellow Republican Senators gave him a glowing resolution of appreciation.

The record would indicate that Barry Goldwater is less of an "adventurer" than the gutless wonders who were willing to let Nelson Rockefeller take him on singlehanded while they stood by hoping to pick up the marbles.

Of the syndicated columnists, I can think of only a few who are not savagely cutting down Senator Goldwater day after day.

Some of the television commentators discuss Goldwater with evident disdain and contempt. Editorial cartoonists portray him as belonging to the Neanderthal age, or as a relic of the 19th century.

It is the fashion of editorial writers to persuade themselves that Goldwater's followers are either "kooks" or Birchers.

This simply is not so. The Goldwater movement represents a mass protest by conservatively minded people against foreign aid, excessive welfare, high taxes, foreign policy, and the concentration of power in the Federal Government.

These people are, as Don Shoemaker of the Miami (Fla.) Herald has said, those many Americans who are "weary with the present, fearsome of the future, and enamored of the past."

They are also those Americans who yearn for solutions to what are actually insoluble problems. They are those Americans who tend to oversimplify issues and demand an end to our ever-recurring crises.

Senator Goldwater's adherents may fail to understand the nature of world change and the significance of our social revolution at home.

Yet their love of country and patriotism cannot be impugned. If they are mistaken in their concepts of modern times and like not what they see, this is their undeniable right.

And so it is with Goldwater. His vote against the civil rights bill and his public attitudes on TVA, the United Nations, relations with Russia, and the war in South Vietnam may give us pause but he has the right to be heard on these questions.

As Columnist Robert G. Spivack has said: "Whether or not Goldwater should be President, he is entitled, as spokesman for one segment of American political thought, to a fair hearing. Fairplay is an inherent part of the American political tradition, and those who violate that tradition do so at their own peril."

The superior attitude displayed toward Goldwater by so many columnists and commentators is already resulting in a backlash of sympathy toward the man from Arizona.

When these "opinionmakers" refer disdainfully to "the kind of people" who were for Goldwater in California, they insult the intelligence of more than a million voters who said with their ballots that they didn't want Governor Rockefeller as the Republican candidate.

The pundits who are presently proclaiming that a Goldwater nomination will hopelessly divide the Republican Party should be fair enough to concede that precisely the same division will occur if he is not nominated.

And they couldn't care less.

The fact that Senator Goldwater enjoys such a long lead over his rivals in delegate strength would indicate that some people must like him.

He holds this advantage because he fought for it and won. The other candidates, excluding Rockefeller, meekly declined the issue.

Gov. William Scranton's challenge to Goldwater is to be welcomed. His belated bid for the nomination insures discussion of all issues prior to the convention. This can be informative and useful.

But I fail to understand why the hesitant gentleman from Harrisburg is suddenly the hero of the hour in most of the press, and Goldwater the party leper.

There was certainly nothing in Governor Scranton's performance at the recent Governors Conference which would suggest that he is the strong, decisive character now being portrayed in the public prints.

Some editors are disturbed because Barry Goldwater is teeing off on the newspapers and other news media for failing to present the news of his candidacy fairly and objectively.

I can't say that I blame him.

He hasn't had a fair shake.

PETROLEUM INDUSTRY IN KANSAS NEEDS ASSISTANCE

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, the Presidential proclamation of March 10, 1959, stated that this country's oil import program should be administered so that there will be a "stable, healthy—petroleum—industry in the United States capable of exploring for and developing new hemisphere reserves to replace those being depleted." I question whether this is being accomplished nationally. In the State of Kansas the petroleum industry is certainly not stable and healthy. What should be a matter of grave concern to the Secretary of the Interior has apparently received little of his attention.

The Secretary discussed this grave situation with representatives of the Independent Petroleum Association of America on May 25 of this year. On the next day a similar group from the west coast oil industry met with the personnel of the Department of Interior. In his news release on June 25, the Secretary said:

> There has been a gradual erosion in the crude [oil] price structure throughout the United States, and that despite moderate increases in crude production, domestic producers are being confronted with increasing difficulties.

Aware of the total situation, the Secretary has responded in an astounding manner. On June 25, 1964, authorized oil imports were raised in district V by 100,000 barrels per day. This action was justified on the grounds of an "abnormal situation" of supply and demand. I point out that there is an abnormal situation faced by the Kansas independent oil producers which deserves his attention.

Since 1956 there has been a steady and continuous decline in oil production, reserves, drilling of developmental and exploration wells, and prices for crude oil. This is an alarming situation and it is hard to see why the Secretary has not recognized it; why instead he has allowed for the increase in imports. This has tended to further depress prices in district V. He has allowed only a slight reduction in imports in districts I–IV based on the falling production in that area.

I am moved to discuss this matter because oil production is of major importance in my State. Kansas is the sixth largest oil producer in the Nation. Ninety out of our 105 counties have proved productive capacity. Over $317 million of crude oil alone was produced in 1963. Of course, Kansas is the Nation's leading producer of wheat and the fourth largest producer of beef. As such, I am fully aware of the importance of international trade and of the necessity of importing as well as exporting. If the United States is to sell its products abroad we must be willing to import. However, when the health of a major domestic industry, the health of a large group of firms, and the health of a State itself are jeopardized by the inflow of imports then the time has come to seriously challenge the wisdom of our import program. And that time has come.

The petroleum producers comprise one of the most complex economic entities in the country, involving many thousands of companies. To fully appreciate the importance of the Secretary of Interior's decision to increase imports of oil, some clearer picture of the oil producers in this country is certainly in order. Commentators on the health of the Nation's oil producers have continually referred to the industry as a single unit, whether such comments refer to depletion, profits or imports. These generalities and oversimplifications are misleading. I should like to point out some characteristics of the oil producing community which are overlooked by most.

It includes the integrated company, the local distributor, the oil refinery, the transporter of the gaseous and liquid hydrocarbons, the independent oil producer, and the landowner or royalty owners. There are also specialized groups such as drilling contractors and service and supply companies, all keyed to exploration for oil and gas. Superimposed on these are the regulatory and conservation agencies within various States and national regulation of some facets of the industry. So there is no single oil industry as such in any meaningful sense of the word.

This is not to say that there are not problems of mutual concern among the many sectors of the oil producing and marketing community. For example, the major oil producers depend upon the strength of the independent producers to explore for new deposits and to provide vast sources of oil. What I am saying is that national policy cannot be structured and implemented as though there were a single and easily identifiable oil industry, and that all parts of the industry will benefit or be damaged equally by changes in national policy. The question of imports must be viewed as it affects the many sectors.

Certainly there is some benefit to be derived from importing oil. No one suggests that all imports should cease. But imports are almost an exclusive benefit to the integrated company and major oil refineries. In almost any instance, imports are in direct competition and detrimental to the independent domestic producer.

What alarms me is the fact that authorized imports have been increased at a time when our Nation's independent producers are in a deteriorating economic situation. This part of the oil community appears to have been overlooked when the decision to increase imports was made. The independent cannot be disregarded if the country's proven reserves are to be expanded as the President's proclamation encourages.

The independent oil producer is largely responsible for the function of exploration. Many operate on a farmout or subcontract basis from large leaseholders or major companies and arrange financing in such a way that many people share in the risk. His function usually ends when the oil that he has produced is sold to a purchasing company, often a major integrated oil company. Since the independent producers are so many and are usually so small, they have no control over the price they receive. The price they receive has been falling rapidly partly due to the price pressure from cheaper imports. At the same time costs have been rising. The heavy costs of drilling new wells for exploration must be recovered if the independent producer is to continue his function of exploration and development. The important fact is that the independent is the segment of the total oil community which has become responsible for expanding reserves. And yet, he is the one who has suffered severely from import policies.

This all helps explain the situation which I cited originally—that oil reserves in the State of Kansas are decreasing even though reliable estimates suggest that there is much oil remaining to be discovered in my State; that with the serious situation facing the independent oil producer, the man responsible for developing reserves, our hopes of fulfilling the Presidential proclamation of 1959 dwindle. The Secretary of the Interior should be concerned with this "abnormal situation." We cannot tolerate Federal policies which continue to discourage oil exploration and development. The independent producer must not be squeezed out of operation by oil imports which depress domestic prices.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE PLANS COULD SERIOUSLY JEOPARDIZE PRESENT METHOD OF DISTRIBUTION OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, today I wish to sound a word of caution regarding plans under consideration in the Department of Agriculture which could seriously jeopardize our present method of distribution of agricultural products through a competitive marketing system. To review the events leading to this potentially dangerous situation, I would remind the Senate that last summer the Secretary of Agriculture reconstituted the National Advisory Commission on Cooperatives to study the marketing system of all agricultural products with a specific goal of determining if the farmer's position in the marketplace could be strengthened and, consequently, produce for him a greater financial return from his farm production.

Recently, this Commission suggested, among other things, that the Secretary appoint a task force of 15 persons to study further and to develop the suggestions of the Commission. A key recommendation of the Commission urges the forming of producer cooperatives into independent bargaining and operating associations and also to use pool cooperatives which have been used in other countries.

Strengthening the farmers' muscle in the marketplace is a worthwhile objective, but I question if any advantage is to be gained by the farmer if we attempt to replace our entire market system with one large centrally administered pseudogovernment agency.

We must remember, Mr. President, that the present stature of our agricultural economy is the product of our private enterprise system.

As such, the agricultural sector of our economy has provided, and must continue to provide, a major proportion of the support of Government as well as of many local economies.

There is a clear danger that a segment of this present marketing system, private agricultural marketing groups, will suffer if this proposed concept of central purchasing is adopted. Many of the small cooperatives around our Nation will suffer as well.

We can ill afford to weaken these individual organizations simply because some theorist in the Department of Agriculture feels a new method should be tried as an experiment. Once destroyed, they may never be restored.

If the recommendations are followed, all semblance of competition could be taken from the market through the control of bargaining associations which would be charged with the dispensing of Government support payments to producers of certain crops.

If any centrally controlled association, regardless of how it is owned, is permitted to dispense government support money, it will automatically become a branch of government, giving farmers little choice of deciding where to sell their crops. If the farmer finds he can receive immediate support payments by simply selling to the giant organization acting in behalf of the Government, he would have little reason to sell his product to a private concern.

This would reduce marketplace activities of private purchasers and would discourage incentive to improve crops and compete for higher prices in the marketplace.

I call this situation to the Senate's attention today because the proposal is only in the discussion stage at the Department of Agriculture. There are other surveys currently underway which deal with the food marketing structure of the Nation, including the congressionally approved National Committee on Food Marketing. Because these other food studies are proceeding, the Department should not embark on any new marketing plans.

My objective today is simply to emphasize that there are many possibilities available to those who would change the marketing structure of farm production. I know the Department presently has a variety of plans on their drawing boards which hopefully will bring greater financial gain to our Nation's farmers. However, I must point out that until all phases of the problem are completely reviewed, there is little chance of developing a better system while there is a great possibility of destroying a good one.

I know those Senators from States with a large part of their economy dependent upon agriculture will want to be especially careful in reviewing this latest proposal being weighed by the Department of Agriculture. The ramifications of developing another awesome bureaucratic dispenser of loan payments for crops could prove to be a nightmare for farmers and farm-related businesses.

CHARLES R. ROSS SHOULD BE MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the so-called regulatory commissions really constitute four branches of government. They are extremely important.

Beginning with the creation of the Interstate Commerce Commission in 1886, a whole family of regulatory commissions has been created in order to protect the public and to insure competition. Members of these Commissions operate under great pressure from the industries which they are supposed to regulate. Not a great deal of publicity is given to their actions. They make enemies easily. It is hard for them to make friends, because of the diffused interest of the public and the indifference of a great section of the public. But they perform vital jobs.

One of the most important jobs is that performed by the Federal Power Commission. It is well known that the Federal Power Commission is now divided 3 to 2—three members tending to favor the consuming side, and two primarily favoring the producing side. One of the stalwarts in the defense of the consumer—Charles R. Ross, of Vermont—is a Republican whose term expired some days ago.

I well understand the difficulty which the President of the United States faces, with the many world and national problems which confront him and the tremendous pressure to which he is exposed. As a humble American and as a Senator, I want to register my hope that he will see fit to reappoint Mr. Charles R. Ross, and will do this before the election in the fall.

An excellent editorial on this subject appeared in the New York Times of July 2, 1964. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, July 2, 1964]

DELAY ON REGULATION

Charles R. Ross' term on the five-man Federal Power Commission expired June 22, but President Johnson has not yet indicated whether he will reappoint him. The delay underlines the crucial nature of the decision the President must make. In the last few years the FPC has been an effective regulator of private energy producers, with Mr. Ross, a liberal Republican, providing the key vote on several occasions. Now that his appointment has run out, the oil industry wants the President to name a new man in the apparent hope of reversing the FPC's present position.

The delay is unfair to Mr. Ross, an able, independent, and dedicated authority on power regulation. It also is damaging to the FPC, whose staff has become revitalized under its present leadership. The superior qualities Mr. Ross has brought to his post are rare; if he is now passed over, the FPC cannot fail to suspect that the White House has bowed to the pressure of the power interests.

Mr. Johnson, who pledged a "new spirit of action" by his administration, must end the suspense and make clear his intentions on Government regulation. No one is better qualified to fill the post than Mr. Ross himself; his reappointment will assure a continuation of the kind of vigorous and constructive regulation that is needed for public protection.

ROSCOE POUND, A GREAT AMERICAN

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, the death of a great American and a dedicated legal scholar, Dean Roscoe Pound, leaves an immense void in American jurisprudence. Besides being a gifted legal scholar, he played an active role in many facets of American life. By simply glancing over a biographical sketch of Dean Pound's life, one can readily see that his knowledge encompassed many, many diverse fields, ranging from the study of botany and Sanskrit to the law.

I, Mr. President, am indeed fortunate and honored to have been a student at Harvard Law School when Roscoe Pound was dean. I fondly cherish my days at Harvard under him, and on numerous times in my legal and public careers, I have drawn from his wisdom and foresight.

Dean Pound frequently admonished his students and young lawyers to first consider themselves servants of justice and humanity, pushing aside financial gain and praise until the ends of justice had been served. It was such direction as this that he gave to those who would work with the law.

The American legal system has been richly blessed under the influence of Dean Pound, and I know that American jurisprudence will continue to gain from the storehouse of knowledge which he dispensed.

Not only the legal profession, but every man who possesses a sense of fairness and justice has lost a great champion.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article, from the New York Times of July 3, commenting on the death of Dean Pound.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, July 3, 1964]

ROSCOE POUND, 93, LAW DEAN, IS DEAD—SERVED AT HARVARD 20 YEARS—INFLUENCED NEW DEAL

CAMBRIDGE, MASS., July 1.—Roscoe Pound, dean of the Harvard Law School from 1916 to 1936 and an internationally known authority on law, died Wednesday night in the Stillman Infirmary at Harvard. He was 93 years old.

From 1953 until last year Dean Pound had been at his office in Langdell Hall daily, continuing his writing and keeping up with his correspondence.

Observing Dean Pound's 92d birthday on October 27, 1962, Earl Warren, Chief Justice of the United States, paid him this tribute:

"His devotion to the law, his contributions to the education of members of both bench and bar, and his great contributions to the jurisprudence of our country have not been excelled in history."

AN AVID BOTANIST

In certain parts of Nebraska there grows a rare plant—a lichen known as the roscopoundia. It was discovered by Roscoe Pound, the man who directed the botanical survey of the State from 1892 to 1903, and was named after him. At one time the future dean of the Harvard Law School was as enthusiastic a botanist as he was a jurist.

This contrast was typical of Dean Pound's remarkable diversity of interests. One of the world's first scholars in modern jurisprudence, dean of Harvard Law in the 20 years that have been called its golden age, and distinguished lawyer, teacher, and administrator, he never received an LL.B. degree. All his graduate degrees were won in botany, except for honorary degrees awarded to him after he had become famous.

He was sometimes called "the schoolmaster of the American bar." Endowed with an encyclopedic mind and great intellectual vigor, Mr. Pound also taught courses in many other subjects besides the law. He was especially at home in the social sciences, but he also mastered French, German, Italian, Spanish, Sanskrit, Greek, Latin, and Hebrew, and had some knowledge of Russian. At the age of 76 he began the study of Chinese.

He had a prodigious memory. As a boy he could recite a whole chapter of the Bible in Sunday school after one reading. He was an athlete in his younger days, and even when he had passed 50 he could run a mile in under 5 minutes.

Dean Pound was a sports fan. Another great jurist, Oliver Wendell Holmes, wrote of him:

"I am told he was once put in a dining car to equalize a baseball man because he knew all the scores for years. I never saw anyone so well read in the philosophy of the law, and I am told he could hold his own against seasoned heads over the wine cup."

CHUBBY FACED, PINK CHEEKED

He was described as "chubby faced, pink-cheeked, twinkle eyed," with a bristly mustache. In his prime he stood 5 feet 10 and weighed 200 pounds. He usually worked in a green eye-shade, with a cigar between his lips.

He was a hard worker, sometimes putting in 16 hours a day at his tasks. At the same time he was amiable and approachable and always ready to take time out to pass the time of day with his friends, of whom there were many.

As a philosopher of the law, Dean Pound believed that lawyers should consider themselves servants of humanity, putting financial considerations in a secondary place. He wrote many books and articles and delivered numerous lectures, advancing the idea of sociological jurisprudence.

His "theory of social interests" did much to change American concepts of law and exerted a strong influence on New Deal social and economic reforms, especially in the growth of administrative tribunals and agencies. Mr. Pound was the first to systematize the theory that the law should pay attention to actual conditions in the modern world as well as to legal codes and traditions.

However, his philosophy was a flexible one, adapting itself to the changing needs of society. He did not hesitate, as administrative agencies grew powerful under the New Deal, to criticize new abuses that developed. He opposed all tendencies for courts and administrative tribunals to invade legislative functions or to usurp power in any way.

Some of the defects of the administrative agencies that Dean Pound criticized were corrected in the Republican Congress in 1946 and 1947, but others were not. He continued his criticisms, and in the end took a strong stand against the welfare state.

Whereas he had once said the law was paralyzing administration, he now held that administration was undermining the law. His final message was a warning to strengthen the independence of the American judicial system as a bulwark against dictatorship.

FATHER A JUDGE

Born at Lincoln, Nebr., on October 27, 1870, Roscoe Pound was the son of Judge Stephen Bosworth Pound and the former Laura Biddlecombe. He graduated from the University of Nebraska in 1888 with an A.B. degree and received an M.A. the next year. He then attended Harvard Law for 1 year (all he could afford) and was admitted to the bar in 1890.

For some years Mr. Pound practiced law at Lincoln, but from the start of his career, he had taken up the pedagogical side of his profession. He was assistant professor of law at Nebraska from 1890 to 1903 and dean of the law department there for the next 4 years. While at Nebraska he received a Ph. D. in botany in 1897.

In addition to his teaching duties, he also directed the botanical survey of the State. Intensely interested in botany from early boyhood, he took delight in gathering rare specimens of plant life.

From 1904 to 1907, Dean Pound was commissioner on uniform State laws for Nebraska.

JOINED HARVARD IN 1910

After teaching law at Northwestern University for 2 years, Mr. Pound spent a brief period as professor of law at the University of Chicago. In 1910 he went to Harvard as Story Professor of Law, was appointed Carter Professor of Jurisprudence 3 years later and became dean of the law school in 1916.

Mr. Pound was the first nongraduate of the Harvard Law School in that post. He organized a faculty with national rather than eastern professional experience and developed a system of legal education and a sociological approach to the teaching of law.

Student registration almost doubled, but his standards were so strict that only two-thirds of his students won degrees. Among them were Dean Acheson, David E. Lilienthal, Thomas Corcoran and others who were to play prominent roles in the New Deal.

Dean Pound, though a Republican, himself supported many New Deal measures in the first administration of Franklin D. Roosevelt. In 1936, however, he backed Alfred M. Landon, the Republican presidential candidate.

TAUGHT ON MANY FACULTIES

Mr. Pound resigned as dean of the law school that year "to work on the frontiers of knowledge." In 1937 he received one of the first of Harvard's "roving professorships," permitting him to teach in any faculty of the university, thus giving room his wide and varied range of interests. He then spent 11 years teaching everything from law and sociology to the writings of Lucretius, the philosophical poet of ancient Rome.

He was named director of the National Conference of Judicial Councils in 1938 and served for many years. In 1940 he won the American Bar Association medal for "conspicuous service to the cause of American jurisprudence."

Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek invited Dean Pound to China in 1946 to reorganize the judicial system of the Nationalist Government as an adviser to the Ministry of Justice. He returned to this country in 1947, retired with the title of professor emeritus after 36 years on the Harvard faculty, and then went back to China to finish the task of judicial reform.

Dean Pound returned to the United States in 1949, exceedingly critical of this Government's China policy. He charged the United States with aiding the Communists and with putting unreasonable pressure on the Nationalists, and he praised Generalissimo Chiang for what he had accomplished despite great difficulties caused by invasion and war.

TAUGHT AT CALIFORNIA

He then became visiting professor of law at the University of California Law School at Los Angeles and held that post until 1953. Meantime he also taught summer courses at the Hastings College of Law in San Francisco. In 1950 he was elected president of the International Academy of Comparative Law in London.

Also in 1950, the Roscoe Pound Chair of Law was established at Harvard and the Roscoe Pound Lectureship at the University of Nebraska.

Dean Pound delivered a lecture before the New York County Lawyers Association in 1950, criticizing the concept of the welfare state, which he called "the service state." He said its proponents were refusing to "look all the facts of life in the face," and were getting perilously close to Marxist doctrine, "to each according to his needs, from each according to his ability."

In 1951 he published a book, "Justice According to Law," summing up his views on the law and its administration. Whereas 19th century judges had refused to adapt abstract law to experience and social change, he held, modern "realists," perhaps under the influence of hasty reading of Marx and Freud, were challenging the value of any standard except experience.

He criticized the administrative agencies of the "service state" for a tendency to interpret laws in line with a stated policy and to act as if law were power itself rather than a restraint on power.

A dominant administration, unchecked by an independent judiciary, he warned, meant "a mere preachment bill of rights, a hierarchy of supermen administrative officials who ex officio, know what is good for us, and ultimately a super-superman to give directions to the hierarchy."

BACKED AMERICAN JUDICIARY

The remedy, he held, was defense and reinforcement of the independent American judiciary, which would devote itself exclusively to the law and its administration, leaving the legislature the task of giving "to each according to his needs" and of regulating basic inequalities among citizens in society.

In 1953, Dean Pound received the William Volker Distinguished Service Award as teacher and public servant. With the award went $15,000. He used the money to return to Harvard and continue his writings on jurisprudence.

When he was not engaged in teaching, Mr. Pound wrote. His many works include "Readings on Roman Law," "Outlines of Lectures on Jurisprudence," "Lectures on the Philosophy of Freemasonry," "The Spirit of the Common Law," "Introduction to the Philosophy of Law," "Interpretations of Legal History," "Law and Morals," and "Criminal Justice in America."

Other volumes are "The Formative Era of American Law," "History and System of the Common Law," "Organization of Courts," "Contemporary Juristic Theory," "Appellate Procedure in Civil Cases," "Administrative Law, Its Growth, Procedure and Significance," "Social Control Through Law," "The Task of Law," and "New Paths of the Law." He also had been an editor of "Flora of Nebraska."

ON WICKERSHAM COMMISSION

With 12 other prominent jurists, Dean Pound was named in December 1925, to serve on the National Crime Commission's special committee for the improvement of legal procedure, prosecution, and judicial administration. In 1929, he was appointed to President Herbert Hoover's Observance and Enforcement (the Wickersham Commission).

He was a member of the Nebraska Academy of Sciences, the American Microscopical Society, l'Académie Internationale de Géographic Botanique, American Association for the Advancement of Science, American Academy of Arts and Sciences, Academia delle Scienze Morali e Politiche, Sociale Reale de Napoli, Botanical Society of America, Académie Internationale de Droit Comparé and Institut Internationale de Droit Public.

Dean Pound received honorary degrees from Northwestern, Brown, Harvard, Cambridge, George Washington University, Union College and the Universities of Michigan, Nebraska, Missouri, Chicago, Pittsburgh, Colorado, and California.

In 1899 he married Miss Grace Gerrard of Columbus, Nebr. She died in 1928. Three years later Dean Pound married Mrs. Lucy Miller, who died in 1959.

A memorial service will be held at 3 p.m. on Tuesday at the Memorial Church in the Harvard Yard.

LIBERTY OR EQUALITY?

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, the spring issue, 1964, of Modern Age carried an article, by Phyllis Tate Holzer and Henry Mark Holzer, entitled "Liberty or Equality?" In my judgment, this article merits wide dissemination and consideration. For this reason, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From Modern Age]

Liberty or Equality—How the Court Chose Equality

(By Phyllis Tate Holzer and Henry Mark Holzer)

On May 20, 1963, the U.S. Supreme Court decided a group of civil rights cases, causing some newspapers to headline that sit-ins had been legalized. This was merely a euphemistic way of expressing a widely held view: equality under the law now meant that Negroes could plant themselves on someone's private property, and that neither the owner nor the police could remove them. The idea came as a shock to those who were naive enough to believe that Americans still retained the right to discriminate where it concerned their own property. There should have been no surprise over the sit-in decisions. They added nothing new. The right of private discrimination was destroyed over 16 years ago.

The principle of "equality under the law" is expressed in the 14th amendment to the Constitution: "No State shall * * * deny to any person * * * the equal protection of the laws." The equal protection clause was basically designed to prevent the enactment of legislation that discriminated between persons in like circumstances, or the discriminatory application thereof. In other words, each person was to be equal before the law—both as written, and as applied. Held unconstitutional, as violations of the equal protection clause, have been the denial of equal access to the courts, inequality of treatment in the courts, systematic exclusion of Negroes from jury lists, suppression of a prisoner's appeal papers, a law requiring sterilization of persons convicted of larceny but not those convicted of embezzlement, and a law withholding permission from 200 Chinese to operate laundries while granting it to 80 non-Chinese. The most publicized equal protection decision came in 1954—"separate but equal" public school segregation was held unconstitutional.

Most people would agree that these decisions were constitutionally correct; that the State has no right to discriminate between its citizens. Yet the attention paid to the equal protection clause by the U.S. Supreme Court, in its blind devotion to the principle of equality, is not without a tragic paradox. Urged on by militant egalitarians, who seldom seem to be bothered by the prospect of advancing one man's "rights" by trampling on those of another, the Court used the equal protection clause in 1947 to destroy one of the most fundamental rights of man in a free society: the right of private discrimination.

Simply stated, this basic right stems from, and is nothing more nor less than, the right to own and use one's property without outside restraint or interference. This presupposes a corresponding duty to respect this same right in other property owners. Thus, privately owned clubs or businesses may rightfully restrict membership or patronage by virtue of the fact that the premises belong to a private person or group of persons. The use of one's private property also encompasses the owner's right to enter into contracts with others respecting that property—such as who can enter or use it, how it can be disposed of, and at what price. But to limit the use to which a man can put his property (except where the use would injure the person or property of another), to deprive him of the ability to make it available to some and not to others, is to make ownership a privilege, not a right—contrary to natural law and without legal or constitutional justification.

There is more than one way to accomplish this untoward result: either the State, through legislative action with judicial sanction, can directly prohibit the manner in which a man can use his property (in which case the infringement of the right becomes so obvious as to invite public censure), or through the courts, it can completely undermine private property rights by refusing to enforce them. By clothing its decision in amorphous language, and supporting it with impressive sounding legal mumbo-jumbo and a string of cases ostensibly serving as legal precedent, a court is quite capable of lulling even the more astute members of the public and the bar into believing that the decision rests firmly on constitutional grounds. It is this latter approach which was seized upon by the Supreme Court in the 1947 case of *Shelly* v. *Kraemer* to decimate the property right of private discrimination. The vehicle by which the Court achieved its objective was the racially restrictive covenant.

A covenant is a binding and solemn agreement between two or more individuals to do or not to do a given thing. Racially restrictive covenants generally take the form of a clause in a property deed prohibiting all subsequent owners from selling to specified classes of persons, or a contract wherein adjoining property owners agree not to sell to members of an excluded class. The prohibition generally extends to Negroes, Chinese, Indians, Mexicans, or Jews. The purpose of the covenant is obvious—to regulate the racial or religious composition of neighborhoods by excluding those the covenantors regard as undesirable. That they choose to take this action is morally reprehensible, because whenever men deal with one another they should be guided by reason and individual merit, not genetic lineage. But that they have the right to express their prejudices in a contractual, and therefore legally binding, form requires some amplification. These covenants are made by and between free, albeit biased, men for valuable consideration, concerning what they voluntarily choose to do with their own property. Their right to discriminate is traceable to a source common to all owners of property.

Since every man is endowed by nature with the unalienable right to pursue happiness by holding fast to his own life, liberty and whatever property he manages to acquire, to the extent that he exercises this right and respects it in others, no other man or group of men may limit his activities. To do otherwise would be to convert that right to mere permissive action, and permission can always be revoked. The task of protecting a right, any right, has been delegated to the State so that, through use of the police, the military and the courts, it can administer protection on a mass scale. Since this is the proper function of government, the State has a delegated duty to enforce even those property rights which may be exercised in a morally offensive manner. At first, the courts appeared to recognize this obligation.

It was not long after the adoption of the 14th amendment in 1868 that the question was raised for the first time: Did racially restrictive covenants violate the equal protection clause? A plain reading of the clause, with its emphasis on State denial of equality, made such an interpretation patently ludicrous. Furthermore, the civil rights cases in 1884 had judicially determined that the 14th amendment in its entirety (which included the "equal protection" clause) proscribed "State action" only; it had no application to the conduct of private citizens.

The first reported legal test which pertained specifically to restrictive covenants came before a lower Federal court in 1892. The holding was essentially that judicial enforcement of a racially restrictive covenant would constitute denial by the State of equal protection of the laws. However, this decision was neither sanctioned by the Supreme Court (the losing party never appealed), nor followed by any other courts. It was totally ignored as precedent because it was inconsistent with established interpretations by the State courts of the equal protection clause. Moreover, the decision stood for the untenable proposition that the courts must abdicate their duty to enforce valid contracts pertaining to private property.

Therefore, the constitutional validity of enforcing restrictive covenants was unanimously upheld by every court which considered them in the 55 years before *Shelly* v. *Kraemer*. The courts chose to concentrate on the proper application of the equal protection clause, confining it to instances where the State, acting through a legislative, executive, or judicial agent, officially performed a discriminatory act against a private person. An example was the 1917 case of *Buchanan* v. *Warley*. The Supreme Court struck down a city ordinance that determined the character of neighborhoods on the basis of race. This was an entirely consistent application of the equal protection clause, since the "State action" resulting in racial discrimination emanated from the city council in the exercise of its legislative function.

To venture from the simple clarity of this analysis to the tortured and confused thinking that accompanied the Supreme Court's decision in Shelly, one must make a considerable adjustment and take a giant step backward. The precedent of half a century can disappear depending merely upon the makeup of the bench. And so it did.

In 1947, the Supreme Court of the United States agreed to examine the constitutionality of judicial enforcement of racially restrictive covenants. The Court chose to hear two cases on the subject simultaneously, one from Missouri and one from Michigan. They were joined together, for the purpose of the appeal, under the name of the Missouri case, *Shelly* v. *Kraemer*. The facts in the two cases were substantially the same. Property owners had executed a contract to the effect that land would not be sold to non-Caucasians. Negroes took a deed to some of the property. The owners of the remainder of the property covered by the covenant sued to prevent them from taking possession and to divest them of title. The supreme courts of both States enforced the contracts by granting this relief. Neither court found any violation of equal protection because the discrimination had been by private individuals. Shelly and McGhee, the petitioners in the Missouri and Michigan cases respectively, took the position that judicial enforcement of the covenants was unconstitutional.

At the outset, it is of more than passing interest to observe who lined up where for the ensuing battle. Thurgood Marshall of the NAACP appeared for petitioner McGhee. By special leave of the Court, the Solicitor General and the Attorney General of the United States appeared as "friends of the Court" and filed a joint brief in support of petitioners. "Friend of the Court" briefs were also filed in support of petitioners by the following organizations: Grand Lodge of Elks; Protestant Council of New York City; Non-Sectarian Anti-Nazi League to Champion Human Rights, Inc.; General Council of Congregational Christian Churches; National Lawyers Guild; AFL; CIO; American Veterans Committee; American Jewish Congress; American Jewish Committee; American Indians Citizens League of California, Inc.; American Civil Liberties Union; National Bar Association; American Unitarian Association; American Association for the United Nations.

Against this array of organizational and legal talent, respondents' case was buttressed by only three "friend of the court" briefs, representing the National Association of Real Estate Boards, the Arlington Heights Property Owners Association, and the Mount Royal Protective Association, Inc.

Why did all the self-appointed guardians of civil liberties line up behind the men who sought to effectuate their desire for equality on a private level, at the expense of someone else's unalienable right to judicial protection of his contracts and his property? Why did none of them realize that pitted against each other was a right and a desire—the latter deserving of sympathy and respect, but something to be achieved by education or economic boycott rather than erosion of the clear meaning of the 14th amendment? One explanation for the fact that no one paid any attention to the civil liberties of the respondents might be rooted in the principle of underdogism: the idea that the enforcement power of the State be used in support of the weaker party. Thus, it was no coincidence that the briefs and oral argument laid great stress on such things as "destruction of human and economic values" and the housing plight of Negroes in large cities.

Only six Justices (Vinson, Frankfurter, Murphy, Burton, Black, and Douglas) participated in the decision. Chief Justice Vinson delivered the unanimous opinion of the Court. First, he clearly framed the issue. The Supreme Court had never before decided if the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment prohibited judicial enforcement of restrictive covenants based on race or color.

Next, he laid the groundwork for the first part of the Court's holding. He admitted that although the State had no right, under the 14th amendment, to discriminate against one who sought to acquire, enjoy or dispose of property, in Shelly the discriminatory restrictions stemmed "in the first instance" from contracts between private persons. The Court therefore concluded that the restrictive covenants standing alone were not violative of any rights guaranteed to petitioners by the 14th amendment.

"So long as the purposes of those agreements are effectuated by voluntary adherence to their terms, it would appear clear that there has been no action by the State and the provisions of the amendment have not been violated."

The Court had thus ruled that private racially restrictive covenants were valid per se.

Such being the case, there was only one course open if the right of private discrimination was to be rendered a nullity. Without the ability to enforce a restrictive covenant, it would be as ineffectual as if it had never existed. Moving in this direction, Vinson sought to show that as soon as a court gave life to a restrictive covenant by enforcing it, this constituted "State action" as prohibited by the equal protection clause. In support of this thesis, he set forth what was to be the underlying premise upon which the entire decision in Shelly rested:

"That the action of State courts and judicial officers in their official capacities is to be regarded as action of the State within the meaning of the 14th amendment, is a proposition which has long been established by decisions of this Court."

To sustain his premise, Vinson engaged in lengthy citation of precedent. While the precedent supported the premise that judges were indeed agents of the State, it failed to support the conclusion that Vinson sought to reach: that whenever a judge determined and enforced the rights and liabilities of litigants in a courtroom, he was engaging in the kind of "State action" proscribed by the equal protection clause. What Vinson neglected to point out was the distinction between a judge who personally performed, sanctioned or "legislated" a discriminatory act, and a judge who merely enforced a contract where the discrimination originated with private parties.

Additionally, the Court equivocated, misled and distorted by resorting to what every law school freshman is taught to avoid as being dishonest. Knowing that only what a court holds—what it decides based on the facts before it—has legal significance and constitutes "precedent," the Supreme Court relied on language which was nothing more than gratuitous "dicta," completely unnecessary and irrelevant to the holding.[1] With the aid of such equivocating terminology as "the principle was given expression," and "further examples of such declarations," Vinson quoted favorable language from courts that had "observed," "stated" or

---

[1] The importance of distinguishing between precedent and dicta cannot be overemphasized, since precedent means that a court's holding will serve as a rule for future guidance in identical or analogous cases. But if dicta were to be regarded as authoritative, then any personal opinions or beliefs a judge cared to insert in his decision, no matter how irrelevant, unwarranted or absurd, could become law.

"pointed out" that action of courts or judges could be State action. Observe that no case was cited as having actually upheld this proposition as a principle of law.

Besides relying on dicta, Vinson cited at least four cases which were not even remotely applicable to the question. Further liberties were taken by using as "precedent" cases where the State itself, as an instrumentality, had taken affirmative action alleged to be discriminatory; the actors being a city council, a State board of equalization, a State legislature, and a State board in charge of condemnation proceedings.

The remaining cases upon which the Supreme Court based its decision in Shelly pertained directly or indirectly to State action on the part of the courts. They may be grouped into three categories, the first of which deals with judges who, from the bench, personally performed a discriminatory act (i.e., they systematically excluded Negroes from juries and thus denied them equal protection of the laws).

The second category involved, not equal protection, but judicial proceedings which were in some manner procedurally unfair. Here, the lower courts had sanctioned such violations of due process as inadequate notice and no opportunity to be heard, use by the State prosecutor of coerced confessions and testimony known to be perjured, the absence of effective counsel, and allowing trials to be held in a mob-dominated atmosphere.

Up to now, Vinson was not happy with his "precedent," and his final comments on these spurious examples of obviously inapplicable State action implicitly revealed his dissatisfaction. He had not yet bridged the gap between the judge who discriminates (either affirmatively or by sanction) as a matter of State policy, and one who makes private discrimination possible by upholding valid contracts. In the third and last group of cases, Vinson made a final attempt to justify the Court's ultimate position that unconstitutional "State action" encompassed both types of activity. And on the surface it looked good.

In an effort to show that "State action" existed even in the absence of a legislative enactment or an obvious deprivation of due process or equal protection from the bench itself, Vinson brandished seven cases where the Supreme Court had found "State action" violative of freedom of speech, press or religion. Yet, in these cases, the Court did not have before it either a statute or a procedurally defective judicial proceeding. The lower courts had simply interpreted the nonstatutory common law and then, as interpreted, enforced it by issuing injunctions or contempt citations. Vinson therefore reasoned that the "State action" consisted of a judge merely making a decision—any decision—and enforcing it; nothing more was required. Naturally, this would enable him to argue that a judge enforcing a private right—such as the right to discriminate through a restrictive covenant—constituted "State action." If true, the State, not the individual, was effectuating the discrimination in violation of the equal protection clause.

But Vinson's conclusion was based on a false premise. In all seven cases, the courts were not engaged simply in making a decision and enforcing a valid right, but in interpreting the old common law. Their interpretations amounted to nothing less than the creation of nonstatutory law, which is one of their proper functions. In a word, they were "legislating"—but in such a way as to violate first amendment freedoms. Vinson unwittingly admitted this crucial fact when he introduced the seven cases. He said: "It has been recognized that the action of State courts in enforcing a * * * common law rule formulated by those courts, may result in the denial of rights." What evolved from these judicial interpretations was as much a part of our law as a statute passed by a legislature. Both can be struck down for violating the Constitution. Neither amount to mere enforcement of one's rights. It was the particular interpretation of the common law that was objectionable, not the mechanical granting of an injunction or a contempt citation. The only valid conclusion to be drawn is that the "State action" in all seven cases was derived from the formulation of law which the courts had engaged in, exactly as legislatures do.

Notwithstanding the fact that all of Vinson's arguments were so easily discredited, the holding in *Shelly* v. *Kraemer* was as follows: court enforcement of racially restrictive covenants was deemed an act of the State, which denied the Negro petitioners equal protection of the laws.

Left up in the air was an unanswered question: Of what use is an unenforceable contract?

Ignored was the fact that in every prior case of legitimate precedential value, what the legislative, executive or judicial body did, or failed to do, as a matter of State policy, was the essence of the offending conduct. State action is a combination of a deed and a conscious purpose, and if the purpose is only to enforce a private right, that purpose does not intrude into the area of State policy.

Forgotten was the logic of following the discrimination back to its source, a series of private acts whose scope and direction had been determined long ago by the contracting parties, with court enforcement merely putting the lid on the transaction.

Now that Shelly was the law of the land, what exactly did the decision of the six Justices mean? It meant that certain contract rights were henceforth to be bottomed on the rather unsubstantial hope of voluntary adherence. It meant that the courts were closed to anyone who sought to use his property with anything less than the same scrupulous regard for fairness and equality which the 14th amendment demands of the State.[2] It meant that every man has legal rights which can become unconstitutional merely through judicial enforcement. It meant that whenever a court does enforce a contract or property right, the State affirmatively sanctions the particular outcome. It meant that if a private citizen discriminates against Jews, the court that tries to enforce his right to do so is likewise prejudiced against Jews. It meant that if a property owner's right to sell to a Negro is restricted by a covenant, the Negro nevertheless has a "right" to purchase the property, thus giving the latter more of a right in the land than the previous owner had himself. It meant that the State had officially reneged on its duty to protect contract and property rights, and had thus converted these rights into meaningless privileges.

If no public outcry was raised over these logical extensions of Shelly, it was only because attention was focused on the more obvious—and less onerous—aspects of the decision. Too many people, by sympathizing with the aspirations of the underdog, failed to notice the subtle encroachments on their liberty. Few took the trouble to dwell on several compelling questions that remained in the wake of *Shelly* v. *Kraemer*. To what extent would the courts venture into the once-sacred preserve of contract and property rights in order to eradicate private discrimination?

In the area of contracts, the answer was not long in coming. Five years later, the Supreme Court held that one who was a party to a restrictive covenant could breach it with impunity, by selling to a Negro, without being liable for damages. He could ignore the covenant even though there was a deliberate breach of a valid contract, voluntarily entered into. The paradox was that Justice Vinson strenuously dissented. He pointed out that since no Negro was being injured by the assessment of damages against the seller, the Court had gone too far and was seeing judicial "State action" where there was none. Vinson's elaborate creation had become a Frankenstein.

The situation with respect to private property, however, is not so clearly defined. If a Jew sues to gain admittance to a private club which restricts membership to Christians, would mere refusal by the Court to grant relief amount to judicial enforcement of the discrimination? If a Mexican seeks an injunction to force someone to sell him land subject to a restrictive covenant, is the court dutybound to order the sale because to do otherwise would be to sanction the restrictive covenant? If, because he is denied access to property which Caucasians are free to enter, a Negro trespasses on that property, can the owner compel the police to remove him from the premises? The Supreme Court provides some of the answers in the recent sitin decisions.

Of the six racial discrimination cases before the Court, only two are significant. The first grew out of a Greenville, S.C., ordinance requiring segregation in restaurants, and the conduct of a local businessman who, refusing to desegregate his lunch counter, regarded the Negro "sitters" as trespassers. Convicted as such, the Negroes appealed.

With the emphasis on State involvement in private discriminatory conduct (a meaningful and attenuated departure from State action), Chief Jusice Warren found that the mere existence of the ordinance absolved the Court of its responsibility to determine whether the businessman had actually wanted to discriminate, or had been intimidated by the city.[3] Disregarding the fact that the Negroes had trespassed on private property, the Court charged, without substantiation, that the trespass law was being used to enforce the ordinance. In short, once the city had asserted the power to require segregation, it automatically became involved with the discrimination practiced in every private eating place. Whether or not the owners had even heard of the ordinance was irrelevant, since the Court would not deign to separate the mental urges of the discriminators. The convictions were thus set aside as violative of equal protection. Only Justice Harlan objected to this novel judicial approach. He realized that henceforth, in any State with a segregation law on the books, private restaurateurs would be forced to resort to self-help, unaided by law enforcement, to rid themselves of trespassers.

The second case, citing the first one as precedent, arrived at the same result on essentially the same facts, with one significant exception: neither the city of New Orleans nor the State of Louisiana had a restaurant segregation law. This time, the alleged State action was disguised in the public announcements of a mayor and a police superintendent. Basically, they had urged a halt to the sitin demonstrations before they deteriorated into a disruption of peace and order in the community. To equate announcements with a segregation statute was an obvious judicial contrivance. Yet the Court did just that:

---

[2] Whether or not private property owners discriminate on the basis of race or religion is a moral issue. Though such discrimination constitutes an unconscionable refusal to measure men by their own inherent worth, to be moral or immoral in this respect is and should remain a matter of individual choice. The State, on the other hand, has no such choice. As the Declaration of Independence points out, it was precisely to secure the unalienable rights of all men that government was created in the first place. In the face of this universal grant of power, it is incumbent upon the State, itself, to treat all of its citizens equally.

[3] The ordinance in and of itself, being an exercise of the city's legislative power, was repugnant to the 14th amendment.

"As we interpret the New Orleans city officials' statements, they here determined that the city would not permit Negroes to seek desegregated service in restaurants. Consequently, the city must be treated exactly as if it had an ordinance prohibiting such conduct."

This was gross distortion, for nothing could even be implied from what was said to bar Negroes from seeking desegregation in a peaceable manner, and without trespassing on the property of unwilling restaurateurs.

Unlike *Shelly* v. *Kramer*, there was no pretense about these two decisions being rooted in a consistent application of constitutional principles, traceable through the years by means of legal precedent. While Vinson made an attempt, however misleading, to justify his conclusions by inundating them with case authority, Warren found it necessary to cite only three cases (two dealing with city owned or leased premises and the third with a judge who excluded Negroes from a jury). That august body, that super legislature, apparently had no need for precedent. Its members had no compunction about rendering a decision based on whatever version of the facts and application of the law would conveniently fit the desired result.

One result may be to hasten the demise of segregation laws. But once the ordinances have been repealed and the local executives gagged, once State policy—official and unofficial—has been submerged, what then? A property owner, at least in Southern States, will undoubtedly find that police protection from Negro trespassers is still unavailable to him. It is now too easy to attribute the discrimination to local custom, and from there to a veiled threat of some public official. Nor is the private club owner, or anyone else, likely to fare any better in the courts should he attempt to enforce his right to discriminate. By merely shifting from a passive to an active role in litigation, by initiating suit on some pretext such as "discrimination is against public policy" or "the club is across the street from city hall," the party being subjected to the discrimination might obtain a hearing. Once in court, a consistent application of Shelly requires the conclusion that any enforcement or implementation of private discrimination—no matter how indirect—is "State action."

The members of the Supreme Court who participated in the sitin decisions might never have taken the liberties that they did without the comforting knowledge that theirs was only a repeat performance of an old play. Nor does the Court need an ordinance or a "coercive" speech to justify its future attempts to weave the thread of egalitarianism into the fabric of American life. Once judicial enforcement of valid private rights is construed as unconstitutional, the groundwork has been laid for withholding recognition of every type of private discrimination that reaches the attention of the courts. Let there be no mistake about the price paid for his kind of "equality under the law"; property and contract rights have been dealt a crippling blow from which they may never recover. And it was *Shelly* v. *Kraemer* that wrote the script, set the stage, and cast "State action" in the leading role.

VIEWS OF A LAYMAN WHO DISAPPROVES

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, a distinguished North Carolina lawyer, Mr. W. W. Taylor, Jr., recently produced an article, entitled "Views of a Layman Who Disapproves," which makes some profound observations upon the civil rights bill, the political activities of clergymen, and civil disobedience. In my judgment, this article merits wide dissemination and consideration. For this reason, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VIEWS OF A LAYMAN WHO DISAPPROVES

(By W. W. Taylor, Jr.)

I have been requested to express the views of a layman who disapproves strongly of some of the positions and activities of the church today. With the few opportunities for expression afforded by the church leadership to those who disapprove, this opportunity carries with it an obligation.

Although I do not presume to speak for anyone but myself, I believe that there are many laymen and some clergymen who share my views that the church—in which my grandfather was a priest, in which I was reared, and in which I have participated actively—has in recent years departed from its primary function of teaching the Gospel of Jesus Christ and has, instead, concentrated its efforts on promoting social and economic theories about which there are wide differences of opinion among those who consider themselves Christians, and has, to a large extent, made itself an appendage of the liberal political movement in the United States, which at all levels depends for its existence upon the bloc vote of minority groups.

My concern has increased progressively, year by year, as I have observed individuals, claiming to speak for the church, appearing before legislative committees in support of or opposition to controversial legislation, stirring up racial discord, publishing an inflammatory magazine called Church and Race, lobbying for the passage of the pending civil rights bill, leading unlawful mob activities, and supporting and subsidizing, with church funds, criminal conduct on the part of clergymen paid by the National Council of Churches to come into this State and openly defy our laws.

All thinking persons are concerned with the present race problem. Most are aware that such problems have always existed where people of different races have lived side by side. The hatred and contempt of the Jews for the Samaritans had endured for centuries before the birth of Christ.

Racial attitudes will not, however, be changed by laws or decrees, regardless of their source. On the contrary, attempts at enforced solutions will not only magnify existing problems, produce increased ill will, and create unyielding opposition among those normally tolerant.

Serious though the race problem may be, there are other questions arising from the church's attitude and activities that are, in my opinion, more fraught with dangers of harmful and lasting consequences.

What has become of the separation of church and state? What will become of our society if open defiance of law is tolerated? What will be the lot of individuals and minority groups if constitutional guarantees of life, liberty, and property are swept away? The church appears to me to be taking an active part on the wrong side of each of these questions.

The church leadership seems fully committed to seeking the passage of the civil rights bill, the true purpose of which is to attract minority bloc votes having the balance of power in a few States which, in the main, hold the balance of power in national elections. A Congressman from New Hampshire, a former attorney general of that State, recently stated unequivocally on the floor of the House that this legislation is purely political and that it would not get 50 votes from the 435 House Members if they voted by secret ballot.

Similar legislation passed by a vindictive Congress to punish the South during Reconstruction days was declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court in 1883. Outstanding lawyers throughout the country have condemned the pending bill as equally unconstitutional. Their voices have become as the voices of those crying in the wilderness when caught up in the emotional frenzy generated by assertions that Jesus Christ and His church demand the passage of this measure.

I do not know what Jesus Christ, if alive, would have to say about the race problem and the civil rights bill—and I do not think that anyone else does, either.

While His views may be subject to different interpretations, Christ's statements to the Samaritan woman at the well and the Canaanite woman, whose sick child He first refused to heal, and His admonition to His disciples, as He sent them forth to spread the Gospel, "Go not into the way of the Gentiles, and into any city of the Samaritans enter ye not," certainly seem to indicate that He felt no obligation to tear down racial barriers then existing between the Jews and their neighbors. Peter and Paul, after His death, apparently conceived that their mission was to carry the Gospel only to the Jews, until the Jews refused to accept it and they turned to the Gentiles.

I find nothing in the Bible to indicate that Jesus Christ was either a revolutionist or an advocate of civil disobedience. Had He, with His miraculous powers, been the former, the Jews, seeking a military leader to drive out the Romans, would have made Him a king, instead of sending Him to the Cross.

His submission to duly constituted authority was a far cry from illegal trespasses on private property, or from support of a Negro leader in Williamston who recently called for the violation of all laws that did not agree with his interpretation of the 14th amendment. It was not popular for Jesus, in the presence of His nationalistic, captive countrymen, to counsel, "Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's," but by so doing He helped to create a respect for law and order in Christian countries that made possible the development and survival of Western civilization.

Those who advocate the unlawful blocking of streets and the highhanded invasion of private property will look in vain to find support in the teachings of Him who counseled obedience to the unpopular laws of the Roman conquerors and to every jot and tittle of the Mosaic Code.

Mob violence and anarchy are no less mob violence and anarchy because the leaders of the mob wear clerical collars instead of hoods and bedsheets. What would be the attitude of the church if the Ku Klux Klan was leading mobs in the street and urging defiance of the law and contempt for private property rights? Can there be one law for the clergy and another for the Ku Klux Klan?

I, for one, am unwilling to condone such behavior, whether by the Ku Klux Klan or by the wife of a retired bishop. The next step after the breakdown of the civil law is rule by the mob. To aid or abet those who defy the law is, itself, a violation of law. And yet, if I participate in the activities of the church and contribute to its support, I find myself forced into that position.

As a lawyer sworn to uphold the Constitution, if for no other reason, I would strongly oppose the civil rights bill and be completely out of sympathy with those who endorse it. But today, in defending basic constitutional principles learned in law school more than 30 years ago, I find myself accused by church publications of being an un-Christian racist.

How many of those crying for the enactment of this questionable legislation have ever read it? How many realize that it is only 10 percent concerned with so-called solutions of race problems and 90 percent devoted to further centralization of power in the Federal Government? How many are aware of the vast new and discretionary enforcement powers it would place in the hands of the President and of the Attorney General appointed by him? How many supporters of the bill would be in favor of it if they thought that Governor Wallace or former Governor Barnett would be the next President and would appoint the next Attorney General? Pendulums, you know, do have a habit of swinging in two directions.

I have no way of knowing who will be President in years to come. Of this, however, I am sure: There has never been, and there never will be, any man to whom I would entrust the exercise of the vast powers over the lives and fortunes of millions of Americans that are contained in the proposed civil rights bill.

Our great constitutional principle of government by laws and not by men has for two centuries afforded to minorities protection against the tyrannies of majorities, and, to all citizens, protection against the tyrannies of government. To take away this protection and to place in a temporary occupant of the White House vast and arbitrary powers over the citizens of this country, from the highest to the lowest, of every race, creed, and color, may, for the present only take away constitutional rights long enjoyed by citizens of one particular section of the country at whom, for current political purposes, it is aimed. Tomorrow, under a different administration, the minorities may find that, in the process, their constitutional guarantees have also been swept away. Will they look then for protection to those who helped to destroy these guarantees?

One would think that, with a knowledge and understanding of the lessons of history, the leaders of all denominations would take a firm stand on the side of long-established constitutional principles. One would expect them to speak out against open defiance of the law, fighting in the streets and invasion of private property. They have, I believe, in the past condemned such activities when carried on by the Ku Klux Klan. Today, though, inconceivable as it may be, they seem to be in the van of those promoting them.

With what fire are they playing? Who will compose the mobs of the future, and on whom will they wreak their fury? The protest against social injustice that started with the mob at the bastille ended with Napoleon's cannon and barricades in the streets of Paris.

History records that when violent political or social upheavals have taken place the Christian church is frequently one of the first institutions to be banned. The Russian experience is still very close to us.

Is it conceivable that in this country we could ever have a complete breakdown in law enforcement, or that constitutional rights could ever be swept away, or that the church could ever be destroyed by forces from without or schisms from within, or even that the right to say a simple prayer in school could ever be denied? We know the answer to the last question. How would we have answered it 10 years ago? What will be our answers to the others 10 years from now?

My concern over current trends and my interest in the preservation of the orderly society of which I am a part, and of the church of my forefathers, make me increasingly reluctant to participate with and support those who, though well-intentioned Christians, are, in my opinion, blind to the dangers of the course which they are pursuing.

NORTH CAROLINA LIBRARIAN CONTRIBUTES TO COMMUNITY EDUCATION

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, throughout their history, the people of North Carolina have pioneered on every frontier of life. The career of Mrs. Willye Wright as a librarian in Johnston County, N.C., illustrates the fact that pioneering is continuing in many facets of life in my State in the 20th century.

To my mind, Mrs. Wright has been a modern-day Johnny Appleseed, sowing the seeds of learning and stimulating education in Johnston County. It would be, however, impossible to fully assess the salubrious effect Mrs. Wright has had upon the development of our State. She has touched so many lives and they, in turn, so many others, that it is indeed difficult to know the multiplier effect of the outstanding work this great lady has undertaken in rural communities in eastern North Carolina. I am proud of Mrs. Wright and of her eminent contribution to the Nation, and of other pioneers similarly situated, who are continuing to explore and find new ways of making this land of ours a greater and happier place.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article and an editorial, from the Smithfield Herald, describing the honors accorded to Mrs. Wright for her lifelong contributions to the education of her community.

There being no objection, the article and the editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Smithfield Herald, June 5, 1964]

WILLYE WRIGHT: 20TH CENTURY PIONEER

The world owes much to pioneers.

Johnston County owes much to its pioneers.

Not all pioneers did their work in past centuries. One of Johnston County's pioneers, a woman, did her trailblazing work in the middle of the 20th century. Her name is Mrs. Willye Wright.

Mrs. Wright is retiring from service in the Johnston County library system on June 30, having been on the library staff for 23 years. When Johnston County first acquired a bookmobile in 1942, she became the bookmobile librarian. The bookmobile was a novelty in the early forties. Mrs. Wright, lover of books and people, who dedicated much of her life to bringing her two loves together through the medium of the bookmobile, had to "sell" Johnston County people on using the bookmobile's service. She pioneered in an unexplored area of Johnston County life.

Blazing a new trail has never been easy. Mrs. Wright's task was no exception.

At first, Johnston County people greeted the bookmobile with indifference, even opposition.

At one stop in the early years of the bookmobile, some men sat in front of a country store whittling. "Any of you like to read?" the librarian asked turning to the whittlers. "Nope," one of the men replied. "Haven't got time." He didn't even glance up from his whittling.

At another stop, a fellow watched his wife select books from the bookmobile with growing apprehension. Warning his wife, he snapped: "There's bound to be a catch somewhere—it ain't free. You put them books back."

Well, the bookmobile service was free. There was no catch in it. And gradually, a large number of the people of rural Johnston County came to accept the bookmobile as something worthwhile, something vital to their lives. Mrs. Wright's pioneering paid dividends, in rich human terms.

The time came, as Mrs. J. J. Boyette noted in paying tribute to Mrs. Wright at Tuesday night's "Willye Wright Dinner," when the boys and girls greeted the bookmobile by clapping their hands and shouting, "Mrs. Wright's coming, Mrs. Wright's coming." And deep within the heart, many an adult felt as the children did.

Mrs. Wright has been coming a long time bringing stimulation to young and old minds, raising the educational level of Johnston County. Even when others took command of the bookmobile 2 years ago, the influence of Mrs. Wright continued to make the rounds of sprawling Johnston County. The official record may show that Mrs. Wright is retiring June 30, but the reality is that a great part of her will always remain in the Johnston County library system, even as it embarks upon other new trails of development. A successful pioneer never really retires.

MRS. WRIGHT RETIRING FROM LIBRARY SERVICE: BOOKMOBILE LADY IS HONORED

The unique role which Mrs. Willye Wright has played in development of the Johnston County library system received public recognition Tuesday night at a "Willye Wright Dinner" held in the Selma Home Demonstration Club Building.

Mrs. Wright, who became widely known throughout Johnston County as the bookmobile librarian, will retire from service in the county library system on June 30. She has been employed by the county library since it was established 23 years ago.

Many Johnstonians called her the "bookmobile lady."

Mrs. Wright's role in library development has been unique because she not only was the first person to carry books on wheels to the people of rural Johnston County, but also was the person who bore chief responsibility for "selling" the bookmobile service to the people.

At Tuesday night's dinner, Mrs. Wright recalled: "We had to sell the bookmobile to the people. Some people thought we were 'nuts'—we were luring the children from the fields. I don't think any farmers look on the bookmobile that way now."

Approximately 75 persons attended the dinner, which was arranged by the staff and trustees of the Johnston County Library. Mrs. Pete Sellers, successor to Mrs. Wright as bookmobile librarian, and Mrs. Raleigh Griffin were appointed to serve as the arrangements committee. Mrs. Sellers was chairman. Mrs. Griffin presided over the dinner.

Friends and relatives of Mrs. Wright joined library personnel in paying tribute to Mrs. Wright. Among those attending the dinner were Miss Frances Gish and Miss Elaine von Oesen, representatives of the State library staff.

Mrs. Wright was praised for outstanding service to the county in personal "testimonies" given by H. B. Marrow, former superintendent of county schools; Miss Elizabeth Sanders, former member of the county library staff; Miss Gish of the State library staff; Mrs. Lucile Oliver, former member of the county board of education and leader in library affairs; James Earp, chairman of the county board of education; Mrs. Eleanor Hooks, county librarian; Mrs. Wilbur Perkins, leader in the Eastern Star, in which

Mrs. Wright has long been active; Mrs. M. P. Young, a patron of the bookmobile; and Miss Rena King, who is retiring this month as county high school supervisor.

As a token of their esteem for Mrs. Wright, the group attending Tuesday night's dinner gave her a portable AM–FM radio. In presenting the gift, Mrs. J. J. Boyette, a schoolteacher who has given many years to library work as a county library trustee, observed that schoolteachers in the county had firsthand knowledge of the value of Mrs. Wright's work in promoting good reading.

"When the bookmobile would come," Mrs. Boyette said, "the boys and girls would clap their hands and shout, 'Mrs. Wright's coming, Mrs. Wright's coming.' Teachers could tell which children had been reading books from the bookmobile."

In accepting the gift and acknowledging the tributes which had been paid her, Mrs. Wright said, "I don't know whether to faint or talk. It is wonderful. As the girls all know, I don't like to be ignored, but this is too much."

Then Mrs. Wright instinctly turned from thoughts of herself to thoughts of others, who had played important roles in development of the county library system. She called the roll of departed library leaders: Virginia Williamson and Evelyn Bishop, who served as county librarians; Mrs. T. J. Lassiter, Sr., Bettie Lee Sanders, Jack Hooks, L. L. Levinson, R. P. Holding, Sr., Mrs. Dwight Barbour, B. I. Tart. The dinner guests stood in silent tribute to their memory.

Mrs. Wright was in a reminiscing mood, and she recalled many interesting experiences which she had encountered in traveling over the county on the bookmobile.

But her mind did not dwell on the past at the conclusion of her remarks. Directing attention to current plans for construction of a single modern building to accommodate both the Johnston County Library and the Smithfield Library, she said: "The vision of our early library leaders is about to be fulfilled."

Mrs. Wright grew up in Selma. After marriage, she lived elsewhere for a number of years, but she returned to Selma after the death of her husband (F. Elliott Wright) in the 1930's. She took a job with the WPA library project in the 1930's. She became one of the "charter members" of the county library staff in 1941. The bookmobile service was inaugurated in 1942. Mrs. Wright rode the bookmobile regularly until 1962.

Tuesday night not only was a time for celebrating Mrs. Wright's 23 years of service in the county library system; it was also a time for celebrating Mrs. Wright's birthday. A four-tiered birthday cake was set before her—a gift from library personnel, other friends, and relatives who attended the dinner.

Mrs. Wright said she would not say how old she was outright, but would indicate her age by telling a little story.

Mrs. Wright said that on one occasion Miss Rena King, the school supervisor, visited the room of Mrs. J. J. Boyette, the teacher, and Miss King became convinced the children in Mrs. Boyette's room were not observant. She wanted to prove her point, and Mrs. Boyette let her conduct an experiment.

"Give me a number," Miss King said to the class. One pupil called out the number 45. Miss King wrote on the blackboard the number 54.

"Give me another," Miss King appealed. A pupil called out 23. Miss King wrote 32 on the blackboard.

This procedure went on for some time, and Miss King was pleased. She was proving her point. The children simply weren't observant.

Then, Mrs. Wright said, a freckled-face lad in the rear raised his hand and said to Miss King, "How about 77?. See if you can turn that one around."

Neither Miss King nor Mrs. Boyette would vouch for the accuracy of the story, but Mrs. Wright had made the point of her exact age.

Tuesday night's dinner program included special music—songs sung by Mrs. Pete Sellers to the piano accompaniment of Mrs. Bill Sanders of the county library staff; violin solos played by Johnny Creech of Wilmington, Mrs. Wright's brother.

William T. Allen, former chairman of the county library board of trustees, gave the invocation. The group attending the dinner sang "Blest Be The Tie That Binds" at the close of the program.

On the mantel in the clubhouse was an arrangement of summer flowers flanked by books. Centered on the speaker's table, in front of Mrs. Wright, was a replica of a bookmobile, made by Buddy Hooks, son of the county librarian.

As guests arrived at the dinner, they recorded their names in a registration book prepared by Carol Sanders, 11-year-old daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Bill Sanders.

The birthday cake was made by Mrs. Alice Brown of Smithfield. It was her contribution to the "Willye Wright Dinner."

COMPLIANCE IS NOT OPTIONAL

Mr. WALTERS. Mr. President, I call attention to a fine editorial, from the Nashville Banner calling attention to the fact that we do not have, as law-abiding citizens, any option as to our choice of compliance or noncompliance with regard to the Civil Rights Act. It is essential that we recognize that the very foundations of our Government are based on majority rule, and that it is mandatory that we live in conformity with the wishes of the majority. To attempt any civil disobedience could only weaken our constitutional right of due process of law. As the editorial so eloquently states, we do have at our disposal adequate means to test certain provisions of this measure, and undoubtedly test cases will soon be considered by our courts.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record this fine editorial—published in the Nashville Banner on July 3, 1964, entitled "To a Law-Abiding People, Compliance Isn't Optional."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Nashville Banner, July 3, 1964]

To a Law-Abiding People, Compliance Isn't Optional

By congressional enactment and presidential signature the civil rights bill has become law. Its provisions now are statutory—meaning that full enforcement power has been conveyed, and the Nation must live with it.

A law-abiding people accepts the obligation of compliance. Anything less is outlawry, and the rank and file of America are not outlaws or anarchists. They recognize the necessity, when a statute becomes effective, of conforming with its requirements; leaving to experience under that law the process of any change addressed to legal or constitutional doubts they entertain.

That such doubts do exist concerning some details of this statutory package is obvious. These questions on point after point were clearly raised in the long Senate debate, and are not allayed by the fact of enactment. Several provisions of the measure undoubtedly will be tested through all the courts.

That is due process—a constitutional right, which must be preserved at all costs, and which is categorically different from scofflaw treatment resting on the anarchial premise of choosing which laws we will observe and and which we will defy. This is not a land of civil disobedience despite incursions of that. It rests upon a foundation of law, as the protector of rights and the instrument of justice, public order and internal security.

By the very nature of the case, tests will be made of those doubtful provisions; but regardless of that, the citizenry of these United States can, must, and will comply with statute—and at every level of government the responsibility rests to recognize the enforcement prerogatives.

The prerogative is not a choice between obedience and disobedience. The American majority does not choose anarchy as its avenue of redress for grievance.

DISTORTIONS CAUSE UNREST AND MISUNDERSTANDINGS

Mr. WALTERS. Mr. President, I call attention to an editorial, from the Morristown Gazette Mail, reporting on an article, carried in a Presbyterian magazine, which is so absolutely wrong as to be almost ludicrous. Morristown, instead of being, as the article indicated, "a town which has never had a Negro student who went to college," has—to the contrary—been recognized as a place where literally thousands of Negroes have attended college. As the editorial states, this is just one example of poor reporting on the part of one publication. It certainly gives rise to speculation that there are many other stories equally as false with regard to Negro higher education in the South. I join the editor of the Daily Gazette in deploring the distribution of this type of loose misinformation, and I hope a satisfactory apology and explanation as to this unfortunate and untimely incident will be forthcoming.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this fine editorial, entitled "Untruths Don't Help in Race Relations," which was published in the Morristown Gazette Mail of July 5, 1964, printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Untruths Don't Help in Race Relations

Untruths, half-truths, misrepresentations, and inaccuracies are the origins of much of the racial trouble this country has been experiencing.

The printed word is usually accepted as fact, whether it is or isn't. Many national magazines and some Northern newspapers consistently publish stories dealing with the South that are blatantly slanted and inaccurate, but the average Northern reader doesn't spot the distortion and the Southern reader can't always be sure.

It isn't often that a publication publishes an outright falsehood, something that cannot be construed simply as a matter of opinion or a partial error, but a complete untruth. Such an untruth appeared last month in—of all places—a church periodical.

"Monday Morning," a magazine for Presbyterian ministers, is published by the General Council of the United Presbyterian Church in the United States of America by authority of the General Assembly. In the June issue, in an article entitled "How Do We Redeem the Negroes' Educational Deficit" by Wilmina Rowland, director Educational Loans and Scholarships, appears this statement (on page 13):

"Robert ———, from Morristown, Tenn., a town which has never had a Negro student who went to college, needs $500 to supplement ——— college's generous help if Robert is to enter in September."

Get that descriptive clause about Morristown: "a town which has never had a Negro student who went to college."

That statement of fact is not even remotely factual or partly true; it is utterly false.

Literally thousands of Morristown's Negroes have attended college, many of them right at home. Morristown College, one of the country's leading Negro institutions of higher learning since its founding in 1881, has educated at least 1,000 local residents, according to Dr. Elmer P. Gibson, president.

Many of these have gone on to enter colleges to receive higher degrees (Morristown College is a Methodist, junior coeducational institution, fully accredited) and now hold prominent positions in Government, education, religion, law, medicine, and other professional fields.

It is estimated conservatively by Dr. Gibson and other Morristown educators that at least 25 percent of the total present Negro population here has attended Morristown College or other colleges. In round figures, this would mean about 600 persons.

A very good case could be made for the thesis that a higher percentage of Morristown Negroes than Morristown whites have gone to some college.

Probably a higher percentage of Morristown's Negro citizens have received post-high school training than New York or Washington Negroes.

Morristown College is one of the city's chief assets, and the entire community supports it through the United Fund and through private gifts for scholarships. One Morristown industrialist alone provides $4,200 annually for students who graduate from Morristown's West High School.

And, as Dr. Gibson points out, "Any and all qualified graduates of West High have available to them full scholarships at Morristown College made possible by Morristown people."

Although Morristown College is a Methodist Church-related institution, E. B. Fisher, a prominent Morristown businessman (and Presbyterian, we might add), is chairman of the board of trustees.

Other Morristown members among the trustees are John D. Wallace, Earnest R. Taylor, Lynn Sheeley, J. W. Arnold, Jacob Popkin, and Eugene Walker. Seven of the college's 33 active trustees are Morristownians, and 6 of them are white, Mr. Walker being the only Negro member.

Morristown has always had the best interracial climate.

These facts are superfluous in giving the flat lie to the statement that this is a town "which has never had a Negro citizen who went to college," but we recite them in order that the enormity of the untruth may be apparent to the publishers of "Monday Morning" and to all those who read the statement.

This magazine has slurred Morristownians, white and Negro, and Morristown College. An apology should be in order.

How many other such untruths lie undiscovered or unchallenged among the pages of widely distributed publications, we wonder.

UNSOLVED DISAPPEARANCE IN MISSISSIPPI OF THREE CIVIL RIGHTS WORKERS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a copy of an open letter, presented at the White House on July 2, 1964, by a number of Pennsylvanians who have a keen interest in the unsolved disappearance in Mississippi of three civil rights workers who went to Mississippi in an attempt to assist in the registering of Negro voters. Mr. President, I state my commendation of the point of view expressed by these constituents.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A COPY OF AN OPEN LETTER PRESENTED AT THE WHITE HOUSE, JULY 2, 1964

PHILADELPHIA, PA.,
July 1, 1964.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The still unsolved disappearance of three civil rights workers in Mississippi has brought to the attention of all Americans the serious breakdown of law and order in that State. It is clearly evident that this situation existed long before the expanded civil rights project, involving summer workers, started last week.

The workers in the COFO-Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee projects are engaged in lawful activities to further the human rights guaranteed under the Constitution. The record of the past years indicates that local authorities are either unwilling or unable to protect the lives and constitutional liberties of all the people within the State of Mississippi.

As deeply concerned citizens of a nation based upon the principles of liberty and justice for all, which principles you have proven your desire to uphold, we urge you to take up the responsibility, vested in you by our Constitution, to enforce the laws of the Nation. Your inherent and statutory powers to do so are clearly established, as are the circumstances calling for the exercise of these powers, now.

We know that you, Mr. President, have the earnest support of our fellow Americans, who look to their Government to secure the protection of human life and liberty throughout the Nation.

SIGNERS

Sadie T. M. Alexander.

J. Hampton Barnes, president, Eisenhower Exchange Fellowships, Inc.

Rabbi Martin Berkowitz, president, Rabbinical Association of Philadelphia.

Hugh Boyton.

The Reverend Clement Burns, O.P., assistant professor of theology, LaSalle College.

George R. Clark.

John F. Connors, Catholic Intergroup Relations Council of Philadelphia.

The Right Reverend Robert L. DeWitt, bishop of the Episcopal Diocese of Pennsylvania.

Sidney B. Dexter.

Gertrude S. Ely.

Dr. and Mrs. John M. Gibbon.

Dr. Carl N. Grip, dean of men, Temple University.

The Reverend Edward G. Harris, dean of the Divinity School of the Protestant Episcopal Church in Philadelphia.

Dr. George Huganir, dean of the Graduate School, Temple University.

Walter Jenkins, General Division of Publications of the United Presbyterian Church and the Westminister Press.

Sidney L. W. Lea.

Katherine E. McBride.

The Reverend Elizabeth J. Miller, executive director of Christian Social Action Concern, American Baptist Convention.

Dr. Howard E. Mitchell.

Susie Monroe, Pennsylvania State representative.

Dr. Emily Hartshorn Mudd, professor of family study in psychiatry, School of Medicine, University of Pennsylvania.

Dr. Stuart Mudd, vice president of the World Academy of Art and Science.

Robert N. C. Nix, Jr., attorney.

The Reverend Thorold Winthrop Olafson, Germantown Unitarian Church.

Marjorie Penney, director, Fellowship House.

Walter M. Phillips, retiring president, board of trustees, Lincoln University.

Clarence Pickett, secretary-emeritus, American Friends Service Committee.

The Reverend Robert A. Raines, pastor, First Methodist Church, Germantown.

Louis Marshall Ream, Jr., financial vice president, Atlantic Refining Co.

Hampton Riley, Pennsylvania State representative.

Rabbi Arthur A. S. Rosenbaum, president, Rabbinical Association of Philadelphia.

Joseph B. Shane, Swarthmore.

Robert Mitchell Thomas, president, Catholic Community Relations Council of Philadelphia.

Theodore Voorhees.

Rabbi David A. Wice.

POPULATION CONTROL—ADDRESS BY SENATOR GRUENING

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, on August 15 last year, in this Chamber, I discussed the problem of population control, for in my opinion the time had come to speak out. Dr. John Rock's book "The Time Has Come" had been recently published, and his work in perfecting the oral contraceptive pill was the subject of conversation.

In New York State, the first American Assembly symposium on "The Population Dilemma" took place on May 5, 1963, at Arden House, in Harriman. Since then, regional assemblies, sponsored by Columbia University and host institutions, have been held around the land. Indeed, the time has come for public discussion about a subject which has the gravest implications for the future of mankind.

During the course of my August 15 remarks, I submitted, for myself and the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], a concurrent resolution calling on the President to establish a population commission to find out the extent of the problem, and urging the President to speed this Nation's research in the population field, and to make our findings available to countries requesting assistance. Since August 15, public support for this proposed legislation has grown substantially—as has the public discussion of the population problem.

At Georgetown University in Washington, D.C., this summer, the Institute of Social Ethics is sponsoring a course on "Christian Social Ethics and Population Control." The speakers participating in this forum are experts in their field.

They include Dr. Frank Lorimer, of American University; Dr. Vincent Whitney, of the Population Council: Dr. Irene Taeuber, senior research demographer at Princeton University; Dr. Alice Rivlin, of the Brookings Institution; Father Robert Johann, S.J., Loyola Seminary, Shrub Oak, N.Y.; Father Francis X. Quinn, Institute of Social Ethics, Georgetown University; Dr. Joseph Fisher, Resources for the Future; Senator Ernest Gruening, of Alaska; Father James Vizzard, S.J., National Rural Life Conference, National Catholic Welfare Council; Rev. Thomas O'Donnell, S.J., professor of medical ethics, Georgetown University; Dr. Franklin Brayer, Radio Isotope Unit, Georgetown University Hospital; Dr. Herbert Ratner, Department of Public Health, Oak Park, Ill.; Rev. George Wilson, S.J., Woodstock College, Woodstock, Md.; Father Frank Madigan, S.J., Georgetown University; and John L. Thomas, S.J., professor of sociology of St. Louis University.

Senator GRUENING was to speak at the institute's July 1 session; but the business of the Senate made that impossible. However, his prepared remarks on the population problem, and describing particularly the work of the Congress and the Federal Government, were, I am told, ably read by his administrative assistant, George Sundborg.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks of Senator GRUENING at Georgetown University be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF SENATOR ERNEST GRUENING, OF ALASKA

The thinking world has become serious in its discussion of the population explosion. Increasingly it is being understood that it has the gravest implications for mankind's future.

Today, half a century after Margaret Sanger warned of the dangers of burgeoning population, her predictions have become obvious realities. And so, a growing body of public opinion is facing the problem realistically.

The only major difference in the approach to this cosmic task is as to the method to be used. I am optimistic enough to believe that man is sufficiently intelligent to resolve his differences, to do so soon, and thereafter to tackle the problem vigorously.

Acceptable solutions will come because men and women of good will and vision will overcome minor disagreements, take advantage of new scientific knowledge, and unite in the fight for the common good and for the preservation and enlargement of the essential values of modern civilization.

Forums like this—the Institute of Social Ethics' "Christian Social Ethics and Population Control", sponsored by Georgetown University—give us the opportunity to discuss the population expansion, to have an exchange of ideas and free discussion of the essential preliminaries to desirable social change. I can only regret that I could not attend each session, for the topics have been pertinent and the speakers knowledgeable.

Fortunately, these speeches and the discussions which have been suitable will not be lost. I understand that they will be published, and that volume, or volumes, will be valuable contributions to our ever increasing dialog on this fundamental issue.

You may perhaps wonder why a U.S. Senator from the State of Alaska, an underpopulated area one-fifth the size of the contiguous 48 older States should be interested in the population problem. While I have been interested in it long before I ever had any contact with Alaska, I will say that Alaska is a splendid example of the advantages of small population. Its vast unspoiled wilderness, all the values of which we Alaskans wish to preserve, affords a striking contrast with what has happened to once beautiful California. Today, hundreds of little boxes, called houses, have, in valley after valley, replaced nature's charms there, and once magnificent arteries of travel from which natural wonders lifted the hearts and spirits of men have now degenerated into motor slums. The millions of people who have rushed to California have brought about this deterioration.

Life in Alaska, by contrast, differs from life in the older States because there the untrammeled wilderness, with all its primeval abundance, beauty and mystery, is at everyone's door.

However, I should mention that my interest in birth control goes back half a century. After college, I studied medicine and became a physician. Without enlarging on purely personal elements, valuable as this training was and has proved to be afterward, I came to the conclusion that in order to be a successful and happy medico, one ought to exclude much interest in other matters, matters which did interest me. So, without knowing what the future would bring, I ventured into newspaper work. Perhaps, as it turned out, what with journalism and subsequent entry into public life, it might be said, retrospectively, that I preferred to concern myself with the illnesses of the body politic rather than those of the human body. Both are equally in need of therapy and doubtless always will be, despite what we hope are steady improvements.

As editor of a Boston newspaper, I had a personal experience with the highly controversial subject of birth control. The advertising manager of the Boston Journal, of which I was then the editor, was promoting a woman's page, or pages, in which articles presumably of interest to women were to be surrounded and supported by advertising of products that likewise appealed to the distaff side. There was some criticism that the written material—which was really filler to sell the ads—was dull and not sufficiently interesting, so, I varied it one time by having an article on the pros and cons of birth control published. The reaction was immediate. So many advertisers canceled their advertising that the page had to be discontinued. Remember, this was Boston. And the year was 1916. Much has happended in the subsequent near half a century.

Later, in 1922, when I was editor of a magazine in New York, Margaret Sanger asked me to comment on the birth control problem for publication in the "Birth Control Review." If you read the isue of July, 1922, you will find that I complied.

I will not read the full text of her questions nor my replies, but one question and one answer are particularly relevant tonight. Her question was:

"Do you believe that knowledge which enables parents to limit their families will make for human happiness and raise the moral, social and intellectual standards of the population?"

This was my reply then, and the words are true today. I said:

"I believe that no single reform capable of such immediate and widespread application would so greatly add to the happiness of the human race. There are no panaceas, but birth control, properly established, would go further to eliminate poverty, sickness, insanity, and crime, with all that these scourges imply, than any other remedy proposed."

The world owes much to Margaret Sanger and to others who are pioneers in the birth control field. Few people are fortunate enough to see their pioneering work recognized within their own lifetime.

We owe much to our late President, John F. Kennedy, who did not let his personal beliefs interfere with the common good. During his administration our Government took important steps nationally and internationally to learn more about the population problem here and overseas. During President Kennedy's April 24, 1963, press conference he said this Nation could certainly do more to know more about the whole reproductive cycle. And he emphasized that such information should be made available to the world so that everyone could make his own judgment.

What is being done?

Here in the Nation's Capital, Georgetown University has taken an active, positive lead in studying the population problem.

Last July, the Georgetown University population study center opened officially. The center will benefit all mankind as it explores the population problem and as it works toward the perfection of the rhythm system. Its director is Dr. Benedict J. Duffy. The late Donald J. O'Connor, a pioneer in the population field, good friend of Dr. Duffy and of mine, first brought the need of such a center to the attention of the Reverend Edward B. Bunn, president of Georgetown University, several years ago.

Don O'Connor was an economist of established reputation. He did not falter in his quest for a reasonable answer to the population problem, which he had seen illustrated by the overcrowding and poverty in Puerto Rico, an answer which would be acceptable to all, including the members of his own Catholic faith. His death delayed establishment of the center, but today his dream is being realized.

The progressive role of the Catholic Church as it relates to the world's population problem is heartening. Men like Edward Bunn, Donald O'Connor, and Ben Duffy are real pioneers.

Dean William E. Moran, Jr., of the Georgetown University School of Foreign Service has contributed to the population dialog. He discussed the population problem in the Catholic Standard last October 4.

Dean Moran pointed out at that time that there was serious question whether the Alliance for Progress or other development efforts can hope to succeed if population growths in the Latin American countries continue at present levels. Dean Moran is correct.

The Congress of the United States is for the first time giving some consideration to the population problem.

The Senate Committee on Foreign Relations last year voted its approval of an amendment to the foreign aid bill which would have authorized birth control studies and technical and other assistance to countries receiving foreign aid from the United States. On October 10 I praised this action on the floor of the Senate.

This is the language the Senate approved:

"Funds made available to carry out this section may be used to conduct research into the problems of controlling population growth and to provide technical and other assistance to cooperating countries in carrying out programs of population control."

This language in the Senate draft of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1963 was seriously weakened in the House of Representatives but certain parts of it were held in conference. This is the modified version of the Fulbright amendment as approved by both Houses of the Congress, and now in the law.

"Funds made available to carry out this section may be used to conduct research into the problems of population growth."

Carrying on research is desirable but this is not the equivalent of providing "technical and other assistance" to cooperating countries in carrying out programs of population control. That should be done henceforth.

From the foreign aid appropriations of fiscal year 1964 a total of $130,000 could go toward helping to solve population problems. That is a miniscule amount. A 1-year contract of $100,000 with the Centro Latinoamericano de Demografia, a U.N.-sponsored demographic training center headquartered in Chile, will enable this center to expand its facilities to teach demography to an increased number of Latin-American students, and to stimulate demographic research and provide technical advice in this field to Latin American governments.

The remaining $30,000 will probably be a voluntary contribution to the Pan American Health Organization to assist in developing five research training centers in selected institutions in the Latin American area.

Further, the Agency for International Development (AID) is positively exploring the possibility of its supporting a coordinated program of research and training on population problems in the Philippines involving Georgetown University and two institutions in the Philippines—the Ateneo de Manila and Xavier University in Mindanao. The preliminary proposal is being reshaped. Your Ben Duffy and Tom Berch have done much of this work.

Research in the population field is important. Demography gives us the start. We must know how many people live in a land.

Demographers estimated that between 200 and 300 million people lived on earth in the time of Jesus Christ. The number had nearly doubled by 1650. After 1650 it mushroomed.

In the 200 years following 1650, the world's population again doubled. Our population growth of but 200 years had equaled that of the previous 1,650 years. And it required but 163 more years to treble the 1650 figure.

A century and a half ago man learned how to prevent smallpox.

By 1964 man found how to lessen infant mortality, and he learned how to prolong the human lifespan by preventing numerous diseases that had taken a heavy toll on life. The incidence of virtually every disease and its lethal effects have been drastically reduced. Medicine and surgery have gone hand in hand to keep people alive who formerly would have died. In recent years we have almost eliminated malaria. Yet while man has learned how to defer death he has because of this knowledge contributed to our accelerated population growth, and created new problems.

Since the turn of the century we have seen a startling increase in the life expectancy of American citizens. A person born in 1904 could expect to live for 48 years. A person born in 1964 can expect to live for 68 years. This is an increase in the lifespan of 20 years. If our medical knowledge has enabled us to increase a lifespan 2 decades in a short period of 60 years, we can confidently expect to increase that expectancy by another 40 years within the next 6 decades.

Let us look at another example. A man age 20 in 1904 could expect to live for 42 years. Today a man age 20 can expect to live another 50 years. In this instance his lifespan increase is more than 8 years and we can expect it to lengthen.

Man has surpassed the first Biblical definition of his lifespan of threescore and ten years which, according to Genesis vi: 3 comprise "the days of our years." Man is well on his way to surpassing the second definition found in the same book of Genesis which is fourscore years. Man's future lifespan cannot be predicted accurately.

This is the full quotation from Genesis:

"The days of our years are threescore years and ten; and if by reason of strength, they be fourscore years, yet is their strength labor and sorrow; for it is soon cut off and we fly away."

More than 50 million people are added to the world's population each year. That is the rough equivalent of the population of the United Kingdom; of Argentina, Belgium and Burma combined; of France; of West Germany; or of Italy. It is approximately one-half the population of Japan or double the population of Thailand.

Runaway population will not permit our society to prosper.

Family planning in one country or in part of the world does very little to change the entire picture if population is exploding in other areas. And it is.

For these reasons I have cosponsored with Senator JOSEPH CLARK, of Pennsylvania, a Senate concurrent resolution which proposes:

1. That the President create a presidential commission on population to get the real population facts and to report what they mean; and

2. That the President substantially increase our research in the field of human reproduction and make our findings freely available to countries requesting assistance.

Your support of Senate Concurrent Resolution 56 will be welcome.

A recent full page advertisement supporting the Clark-Gruening resolution appeared in major newspapers throughout the Nation. The advertisement carried a simple message. It pointed out that the war on poverty will not be won until its root cause, the present explosive growth of population, is confronted and licked.

I have a copy of this ad with me. It is headlined the "War on Poverty." It is a message addressed to President Lyndon B. Johnson. The accompanying cartoon shows a stork carrying a bundle labeled "World Population Explosion" racing neck and neck with a buzzard which is labeled "World Hunger."

This ad says that its 81 signers, all leaders in the world of business, science, education, theology, and other humanities, urge the President to help end poverty by curing one of its major causes which they believe is the present explosive growth of population.

These signers point out that a crash program supported by our Government could arrest the population explosion. Such a program coupling research with action could also help scores of poverty ridden nations dependent upon the United States for economic aid. The signers of the advertisement point out that our population growth and the poverty which plagues too many Americans are not political or religious matters.

They recommend that President Johnson speed up this Government's research program into the problems of population growth. They recommend that the readers of the advertisement support the Clark-Gruening resolution.

Human misery, according to the signers of this letter, all of whom are probably represented in "Who's Who," is grist for the Communist mill.

This advertisement is signed by 81 prominent Americans including Frank W. Abrams, former chairman of the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, Mrs. Clare Boothe Luce, former U.S. Ambassador to Italy, the Right Reverend Arthur C. Lichtenberger, presiding bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church and men you know better—Dean Moran and Dr. Ben Duffy, and Dr. Thomas H. Carroll II, president, George Washington University, Allan Nevins, historian, Fairfield Osborn, conservationist, and president of the New York Zoological Society, the Right Reverend James A. Pike, bishop, the Protestant Episcopal Church, California, and Dr. John Rock, professor of gynecology, emeritus, Harvard University, and others no less distinguished.

Since I became the cosponsor of the Clark-Gruening resolution August 15 last year, I have been astonished by the unanimous favorable response which has come from throughout this Nation.

The Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, the committee to which the resolution was sent, has asked several Federal Government departments and agencies to report on the resolution. One has been received from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The HEW report says in part:

"We believe that the Government of the United States might profitably devote increased effort to studies of population problems."

The Department feels the studies can be made without the establishment of a presidential commission using agencies of the Government. I have no objection.

Secretary Celebrezze informs me that the agencies of his Department are ready to help our Government share with other governments the knowledge of results of health research.

Before coming here I asked Secretary Celebrezze which of our States have used Federal funds for family planning and programs which are related and, more specifically, how much money at the State and Federal levels has been put into such programs.

On June 29, I was informed that the use of federally matched funds for family planning was entirely a matter of State discretion. Secretary Celebrezze says the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare regards the question of family planning as one for individual decision and would raise no question about the provision of such services by a physician to his patient within the normal scope of the doctor-patient relationship.

Elsewhere in Government the situation is about as follows:

Since passage of the amended Fulbright amendment last year little has happened. So far the Federal Government has done very little. By January 1963 our Government had spent the inadequate sum of $5.2 million in population research, according to figures compiled by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress.

However, as taxpayers we have spent substantial sums on research in other fields. Some examples include: Foot-and-mouth research, $31,177,000; brucellosis, $6,829,000; breeding disease and quality investigations of tobacco, $9,167,000; construction of a national animal disease laboratory, $13,200,000; cancer—Public Health Service and National Cancer Institute, $629,457,564; cancer—Atomic Energy Commission, $38,093,000; atomic energy, $29,729,800; development of M–14 rifle, $6,352,000; space, $9,902,200,000.

We still need a vastly expanded research budget to find inexpensive and safe contraceptive methods available to those requesting them.

Our national budget is $100 billion. That's a lot of money, but it is wasted if we bankrupt ourselves to feed inadequately an ever-increasing world population.

The Ford Foundation and other private groups cannot be expected to carry the world's burden.

Let us recognize that our foreign aid program is doomed to failure unless we realistically confront the population problem. It does little good to say that we in this Nation are not concerned because we can support our birth rate. Furthermore, our concern should be shared by the nations whose citizens at this time have the education and means to support their birth rate and provide a decent standard of living. The depressing fact is that most of the world's inhabitants cannot support their present birth rate.

According to the statistics presented at the World Food Congress last year 10,000 people die of malnutrition or starvation every day, and more than one-half of our 3-plus billion world inhabitants live in constant hunger. In our own United States 30 million Americans go to bed hungry each night.

Where do our people grow?

The world population growth rate in 1963 was about 2 percent. It was confined almost entirely to the poverty-stricken areas of Africa, Asia, and Latin America. A 3-percent-per-year growth means a nation doubles in slightly less than 25 years.

An article in the National Review for June 30, 1964, pointed up the trouble spot in Nigeria where 56 million people live in a land thought to hold 40 million until a census was taken. This means the Nigerian birth rate of 5.5 percent is the highest in the world, the highest known rate, I add quickly.

Small wonder that Historian Arnold J. Toynbee told delegates attending the World Food Congress in Washington, D.C., last June that the campaign against hunger cannot be won unless the hundreds of millions of wives and husbands voluntarily decide to regulate the number of human births. Dr. Toynbee shares my feeling that this is a major challenge confronting man today.

In the United Nations our representatives have called for and supported an intensified program of international cooperation in the population field. At this moment the United Nations is undertaking a monumental study to collect information concerning economic development and population changes of its member nations.

This Nation's public policy as enunciated by Department of State Deputy Assistant Secretary Richard Gardner at the United Nations was made with the approval of President Kennedy. Isn't it remarkable and yet so right that our national public policy should move forward so honestly, so ably, under the aegis of a Catholic President.

Many times I have said that I am happy to see the Catholic Church coming to grips with the population control issue. Dr. John Rock, who developed the pill, has contributed positively to the discussion with his book "The Time Has Come." In that book he calls attention to the 1930 encyclical of Pope Pius XI, the "Casti Connubii" in which sanction is given to the rhythm method of birth control. Dr. Rock also discusses the expressed hope of Pius XII in October 1951 that the licit-rhythm method can be perfected.

And last year the New York Times observed editorially on August 9, 1963:

"A worldwide ferment is going on in all institutions. The church's readiness to keep its own thinking under constant reexamination has been demonstrated in many fields by Popes John XXIII and Paul VI."

The Associated Press from Vatican City, on October 9, 1963, reported:

"A leading Roman Catholic progressive said last night the Vatican Ecumenical Council will redefine the church's position on birth control, but not this year.

"Leo Joseph Cardinal Suenens, archbishop of Brussels, said birth control would be reached eventually, as part of the 17th and last schema—or topic—considered by the council which will recess this session, December 4."

"And the council will give an answer," Cardinal Suenens said.

Many of us heard Cardinal Suenens personally develop his opinion when he appeared on the Georgetown campus earlier this year.

Public policy does not spring full grown from the loins of any one person or group. Public policy is carefully nourished, carefully tended by many until it can go forth to battle.

Poverty is the handmaiden of an exploding population. One comforts the other, nourishes its overweening pride, instills a sense of fulfilment which is only a sense of frustration.

We must realize the full implication of the knowledge that man has licked the scourges of olden days.

I said at the beginning of this evening I was certain man is smart enough to win this overpopulation problem. For one thing I am greatly encouraged by the public pronouncements of men of all faiths and I want to quote from the remarks of June 23, 1964, made by Pope Paul VI in Rome in the Vatican.

Pope Paul said:

"We will talk, in conclusion * * * about the problem * * * of birth control, as it is called, namely, of population increases on one hand, and family morality on the other.

"The question is being subjected to study, as wide and profound as possible, as grave and honest as it must be on a subject of such importance.

"It is under study which, we may say, we hope will soon be concluded with the cooperation of many and outstanding experts.

"We will therefore soon give the conclusions of it in the form which will be considered most adapted to the subject and to the aid to be achieved."

These words bring hope to each of us here for in one way they, too, are a part of world public policy.

Population figures and their percentage of annual increase are the best illustrators of population growth.

Latin America's exploding population is the highest in the world. Here are a few examples:

1. Costa Rica: Costa Rica's population in 1927 was 472,000. The percentage of annual increase then was 1.9. Costa Rica's population in mid-1963 was 1.3 million and the percentage of annual increase was 4.4.

2. Brazil: Brazil's population in 1900 was 17.3 million and its percentage of annual increase was 1.9. Brazil's population in mid-1963 was 78 million and the percentage of annual increase was 3.6. Recall that an increase of 3 percent annually means that a population doubles in less than 25 years.

3. Mexico: Mexico's population in 1910 was 15.1 million and its annual percentage increase was 1. Mexico in mid-1963 has a population of 38.3 million and Mexico has a percentage of annual increase which is 3.1. This means Mexico will have more than 70 million inhabitants before 1990.

Elsewhere in Latin America similar warning signs confront us. The percentage of annual increase exceeds 3 percent in El Salvador, Nicaragua, Dominican Republic, Venezuela, Ecuador, Guatemala, Honduras, and British Guiana and the story can be repeated in other countries.

My topic tonight is "Population Control and Public Policy."

No single problem mankind faces today exceeds the population problem in its gravity.

It is so important that the forces of our Federal Government must be mobilized to solve it. The solution may be a population commission which can act as well as study. The solution may be the establishment of a special agency in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

But the solution should include the engaging of our complete resources and our findings must be made available to our State governments. Possibly State governments can do research of their own, but I believe this research can better be done at the Federal level.

Results of this mobilization for a better world must be available to the nations requesting them, as well as to all the private agencies which are concerned.

We can attack the population problem with vigor and enthusiasm, keeping in mind the sensibilities of religious practices and always remembering that we do not have to ask anyone to do anything which is opposed to his own particular beliefs. Individual choice must prevail.

Victor Hugo in 1877 wrote:

"An invasion of armies can be resisted: an invasion of ideas cannot be resisted."

Modern man has paraphrased it to:

"There is one thing stronger than all the armies in the world and that is an idea whose time has come."

As Dr. John Rock says, "The time has come."

PROF. ROYCE HANSON URGES CONGRESSIONAL REFORM

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I call attention to an informative article entitled, "Let's Get the Congress Moving Again," by Prof. Royce Hanson, of American University, Washington, D.C., which appeared in the May 1964 issue of Nation's Cities.

A national authority on representation, Professor Hanson is president of the Maryland Committee for Fair Representation, which sparked the successful reapportionment campaign in that State in 1962. He holds M.A. and Ph. D. degrees in government from the American University, where he is now a member of the faculty of the School of Government and Public Administration, specializing in problems of regional development and metropolitan affairs. He is the Democratic nominee for Congress from Maryland's Sixth Congressional District.

Professor Hanson is also a student of congressional procedures, and is a vigorous advocate of congressional reform along the lines indicated in his article. It is indeed encouraging, Mr. President, to find outstanding candidates for Congress, such as Professor Hanson, making congressional reform an issue in this election year.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record the text of Professor Hanson's excellent article, which was published in the May 1964 issue of Nation's Cities.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

LET'S GET THE CONGRESS MOVING AGAIN

(By Prof. Royce Hanson)

Many years ago the philosopher John Dewey wrote that America had not yet developed representative institutions worthy of its democratic public. In recent years, Congress and State legislatures seemed dedicated to proving the accuracy of Dewey's judgment. Now there is reason to hope that Congress will assume its proper responsibilities in an urban democracy.

The first cause for hope is the recent decision by the U.S. Supreme Court declaring Georgia's gerrymandered congressional districts unconstitutional. Equal representation in legislatures will soon be a fact of American political life rather than a dream. A residue of malapportionment will remain for a few years in State legislatures, and its beneficiaries will do their utmost to thwart the spirit of the Georgia decision by artful carving of their States to prevent redistributions of power while achieving the appearance of equality. But the important matter is not the delay they might achieve. It is that ultimate success for fair representation is at last attainable, even certain.

This prospect gives rise to the second reason for hope—a growing interest, both inside and outside Congress, in a basic reassessment of the rules, procedures, organization, and proper functions of Congress.

A MODERN ROLE FOR CONGRESS

Our democracy requires a Congress. If one did not exist, we would invent it, but it is doubtful that we would invent the Congress we have, for it has not equipped or disciplined itself to exercise the functions which are uniquely its own and which are essential to the strengthening of democratic government.

The range of needed reforms is great. The rules are archaic, procedures are cumbersome. The power of committee chairmen often tends to be almost absolute. Leadership institutions and party discipline are weak or virtually nonexistent. The seniority system of selecting committee chairmen regardless of their views on the programs which committees control also cries for change to a more responsible method of choosing key congressional leaders. All these reforms are relevant to the transformation of Congress to a modern representative body. All these problems are, however, symptomatic of the deeper need to rethink the role Congress can and should play in an urban, technical and populous society.

The proper function of a modern Congress is that of popular control of the vast bureaucracy and holding the Executive accountable to the people and their elected representatives.

In this "new age of human relationships," Congress cannot be the primary initiator of public policy. This function has been shifted irretrievably to the executive branch of Government with its superior expertise, its close relation to the intimate details of public problems, and its synthesis of national opinion in the office and person of the President. The challenge to Congress is not to recapture lost powers, but to exercise fully those functions most significant to the maintenance of a modern democracy; to temper national policy through its accurate representation of the complexities and conflicts of our society.

THE ANTIBUDGET BUDGET

Central to the operation of a modern Congress is effective supervision of the administration. And the primary instrument of congressional power in discharging this function should be the budgetary process. As the central plan of Government activity and a major influence on the national economy, the budget establishes conscious priorities among governmental programs. It is the major instrument of political and administrative discipline in the executive branch.

Congress, however, is not organized or politically attuned to develop this sort of budget. The budget now produced is misleading to the public and it is incomplete and inadequate either as a plan of action to achieve national goals or as a means of effective congressional control over the administration. It does not contain a full accounting of either the totality of government income or expenditure. Trust fund accounts, such as social security and the interstate highway program, are separated from the budget which the public hears so much about. Operating expenditures, such as salaries, are consolidated with new capital outlays for such programs as library construction, urban renewal grants, and rivers and harbors projects. Government corporations budget almost independently, seeking congressional approval of only their usual administrative expenses.

MAYORS WOULD BE HORRIFIED

The budgetary process in Congress would horrify a modern mayor or manager. There is no overall review of the general policy the budget represents. Instead of enacting a budget, at least 20 separate appropriations bills are enacted. There is no general debate on the budget or the President's budget message. The fiscal year may be half through before appropriations for vital programs are made. These conditions combine to subordinate national policy to a series of budget games revolving around the political semantics of "balancing" and deficits or surpluses.

The partial budget Congress receives is called the administrative budget. Since it must, by law, exclude some sources of revenue, it is harder to balance than the cash budget which shows all receipts and all expenditures. This distinction allows the professional budget cutters to establish a mythical danger in a mythically unbalanced budget, putting increases in Federal programs in automatic jeopardy and placing extremely heavy inhibitions on the starting of new programs. This sort of budgeting leads to measuring programs almost entirely against last year's budget rather than against evidence of national requirements or against a system of priorities within the budget.

In only a few years since World War II has the Government experienced a cash deficit, but the paper deficit in administrative budgets has remained a major impediment to development of the kind of Federal budgetary policies required to meet the goal of full employment which Congress itself established in the Employment Act of 1946.

The result of existing budget practices is that Congress demands and gets, not a budget but an antibudget: an incomplete statement of policy which is then eviscerated by Congress into a variety of little budgets. There is no review of the budget as a whole, no weighing of priorities. The emphasis in budgetary politics tends to be on procedure and gamesmanship rather than national needs and capacity to meet them.

The need for reform in congressional organization is nowhere more apparent than in the budgetary process. If there is no general budget, it may be because there is no Congress, in a real sense, to enact it. Not only are the committees which legislate separate from those which appropriate, but the appropriations committees themselves are divided into a series of balkan kingdoms. Each appropriations subcommittee jealously guards its sovereignty over its slice of the budget. Each "little Congress," with its sphere of influence, tends to accept the decision of the others in return for support of its interests. In the House of Representatives, particularly, the specialization of work forces Members to rely on the judgment of the small groups which constitute the subcommittees and the parent committees.

Moreover, the legislative and appropriations committees operate as if the Constitution required that they check and balance each other. Much of the inner turmoil in recent years on urban measures has resulted from competition of the legislative and appropriations committees for ascendency over their respective areas of interest. This conflict is best illustrated in such programs as urban renewal, airport construction, and urban transportation by the issue of backdoor financing. This devious sounding practice simply means that legislative committees grant agencies the power to borrow from the Treasury directly or to sign contracts up to a specific amount in order to carry out certain programs. This means the agency with such authority does not need an annual appropriation for a program funded in this way. The appropriations committees object to being bypassed, for this reduces their power over programs, and thus over Members of Congress.

The case for a separate appropriations process can be made only if it permits a genuine overall review of policy which the legislative committees cannot provide because of their specialization. The Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 called for an Omnibus Budget Act. Congress once passed one in 1950. Since then it has concluded that the task is just too great—the work is too hard. And the liberties which subcommittees can take with their parts of the budget are too small.

CONGRESS DOES NOT PARTICIPATE

Because it uses review practices unsuited to modern budgeting needs, Congress tends to oppose the budget rather than to participate in its development. In attitude and politics, the Congress tends toward antibudgeting systems which prevent it from presenting an accurate picture of the Nation's fiscal condition and needs to either Congress or the public. The Congress loses its most effective means of keeping the executive accountable to it. The opportunities to distort the meaning, intent, and financing of many programs are so much more available—at the cost of rational public debate. The process lends itself to indiscriminate cuts or increases based on the prejudices of the separate appropriations subcommittees of each House. The leadership of Congress plays no real part in guiding fiscal deliberations until it is called in to save individual administration programs from emasculation.

The problems of Congress are not, then, going to be solved by any quick, easy, scientifically tested method. If Congress is to be made an instrument of democratic government rather than an impediment to it, some hard thinking and rough politicking will have to begin.

Clearly, reform must come to Congress. In the crucial area of budgeting, new approaches will be required of both the executive and the Congress. One needed improvement is on the executive side of budgeting, so Congress will have the information it needs to act intelligently. Congress should require that a full budget be set before it. It should require the budget message to spell out the goals the Nation seeks and to show how the budget reaches toward them. It should require a separation of capital expenditures and operating programs.

These reforms should be met with reorganization of Congress to cope with such a coherent document. Senator JOHN MCCLELLAN has repeatedly urged establishment of a Joint Committee on the Budget to provide a more coherent and capable review of Government activity. Just as repeatedly, the idea has been vetoed by the House Appropriations Committee which tenaciously justifies its position by reliance on the constitutional fairy tale that it alone (not really the House as an institution) must initiate bills for all expenditures annually. What the Constitution requires is that revenue bills, not expenditure bills, must originate in the House.

The budget is of course not the only area of public policy which Congress fails to consider in an orderly fashion. Reorganization in other areas would facilitate the budgetary process. The executive branch has found it necessary to coordinate national security policy through the National Security Council. Congress, which passed the National Security Act, separately reviews many of the military and diplomatic—not to mention scientific and economic—aspects of policy essential to our very national survival. The problems of cities and metropolitan areas also seem to suggest the use of joint and concurrent committees. Urban programs are now the bailiwick of an almost endless number of committees and subcommittees. The result is the absence in Congress of a capacity to develop, much less review, a comprehensive urban affairs program.

The changes suggested are directed toward making the Congress effective in assuming its modern role, in discharging responsibly its function of administrative review and public control. The objective of congressional reforms is to make the Congress an instrument of the people in shaping national policy, rather than playing field for petty chieftains in pursuit of their parochial objectives.

There is no more urgent business before the Nation than the rejuvenation of the National Legislature. None are better qualified to call for such action than the leaders of cities who have given voice in their own governments to the need for responsibility and adjustment of old institutions to new conditions of urban life. And no one is affected more adversely than the cities by the anachronisms of congressional procedure. No theme would be more appropriate for the

1964 election than to paraphrase the compelling exhortation of the late President Kennedy's campaign: "Let's get the Congress moving again."

CAPTAIN OF THE CREW—SENATOR LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "An Old Salt Rows Again," written by Anne Denton Blair, and published in the Washington Post on June 21, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

An Old Salt Rows Again

(By Anne Denton Blair)

Eight young men from Harvard College whipped their scull through England's Thames River on a sunny Fourth of July 50 years ago and for the first time won for the United States the top trophy in amateur rowing, the Grand Challenge Cup of the Royal Regatta at Henley-on-Thames.

Next week, all eight members of that remarkable American crew expect to meet at the market town of Henley, Oxfordshire, 35 miles west of London, for a unique reunion. After all, the youngest member of the 1914 crew, now a distinguished surgeon, was 69 in April and the other seven are all in their seventies.

There will be wives, children, and grandchildren cheering them on as the eight men take their numbered places in a scull and again dip their oars in the Thames. But it will not be a race this time—just a token row saluting the past.

Who are these men whose names were added to the rowing Hall of Fame at Syracuse University 2 years ago? All are prominent in business or the professions; four are in Who's Who; one is a nationally known political figure.

The bow, captain of the crew and a senior, was Leverett Saltonstall, three times Governor of Massachusetts and a U.S. Senator since 1944. The No. 2 was James Talcott, a New York cotton broker who lives at Rye, N.Y. No. 3 was Henry Hixon Meyer, a Boston lawyer. No. 4 was J. William Middendorf, a Baltimore banker, and No. 5 was his twin brother Henry, also a banker, who lives at Chestnut Hill, Mass. No. 6 was David S. Morgan, a New York chemist; No. 7, Louis Curtis, a Boston investment banker.

The stroke was Charles C. Lund, a Boston surgeon and a faculty member of the Harvard Medical School. The cox was Henry L. F. Kreger, a Cleveland lawyer. Also planning to attend the reunion is the crew manager, Robert C. Cobb, a poultry raiser at Concord Junction, Mass., and perhaps the country's leading exporter of baby chicks.

The 1914 crew has held other reunions, but this 50th anniversary will be something special. Besides the token row, there will be luncheons and dinners, and probably too many speeches. A highlight will be the presentation to the winners of a Grand Challenge Cup to replace their original trophy, which will be retired with honors.

The Henley Regatta, to give it its short title, is to rowing what the Ascot is to horse racing and Wimbledon to tennis. Its continuity has been broken only twice since 1839, during World Wars I and II.

For this year's regatta, as always, there will be gay refreshment tents along the grassy banks of the Thames, grandstands and deck chairs at choice locations, rowboats and punts filled with spectators. The caps and blazers of rowing clubs from all over Britain will be on display, including the cerise of Leander, the nation's oldest.

The race is upstream for a mile and 550 yards. In the 1914 regatta, most of the 35 entries in the eight-oar events were British. One by one they were eliminated until finally Leander defeated the German team only to lose to Harvard.

On July 3, Harvard beat a Canadian team "with splendid uniformity and dash," and on July 4 it took the trophy by defeating the Union Boat Club of Boston, a team composed of Harvard graduates.

For the first time, no British team had been in the finals, and it was only the fourth time that the Grand Challenge Cup had left England. But British papers commented that the Harvard undergraduates had "made themselves so popular with the boating fraternity * * * that their final tussle evoked almost as much applause from English spectators as from transatlantic visitors."

A month later, amateur rowing took a back seat for some years. England and Germany declared war.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, to a very large extent, the article is in praise of our colleague, Senator Leverett Saltonstall, of Massachusetts. When he was a member of the Harvard crew of 1914 which won the Grand Challenge Cup, at Henley-on-Thames, perhaps he was a little younger than he is now; nonetheless, at the recent reunion, he took his old place in the Harvard shell.

POPULATION CONTROL

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record an editorial entitled "Controlling Population," which appeared in the New York Times of the 15th of June of this year; and a news article entitled "Draft Vatican Decree Suggests Family Planning May Be Needed," written by Paul L. Montgomery and published in the New York Times, June 13.

There being no objection, the editorial and the article were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York Times, June 15, 1964]

Controlling Population

Many factors, psychological and economic, have contributed to a recent decline in the birth rate; but the need for family planning remains enormous. There has been a great growth in public acceptance of birth control techniques. The Government has been making available information on regulation of pregnancy, offering individuals complete freedom of choice among various methods. Assistance is also being provided to countries requesting guidance in family planning, without which long-range attempts to improve worldwide standards of living become almost meaningless.

The United States cannot relax its efforts simply because the rate of increase in population is now declining. An alarming proportion of all large sized families is living in poverty; the clear-cut relationship between the incidence of poverty and the lack of family planning demands stepping up of governmental assistance.

The critical situation in both Latin America and Asia, where population growth continues to outstrip resources, is a matter of concern to world health and security. It has prompted debate within the Catholic church, which is deeply troubled by the instability and unrest and misery that have been caused by overpopulation. Some of the latest methods of prevention have led some churchmen to suggest a modification in the Catholic church's traditional doctrine on birth control.

Despite such encouraging developments the struggle to control population and ameliorate human misery is far from won. Much greater knowledge and a greater spread of that knowledge will be necessary to gain mastery over the population explosion.

A declaration drafted for consideration at the Vatican's Ecumenical Council recognizes that limiting family size may be a necessity in the modern world. The draft does not relax the church's ban on contraceptive devices, but it would provide more latitude for discussing birth control and exploring practical methods.

[From the New York Times, June 13, 1964]

Draft Vatican Decree Suggests Family Planning May Be Needed

(By Paul L. Montgomery)

Washington, June 12.—The principle that family limitation may be a necessity in the modern world is included in the draft of a declaration, completed this week, for the Vatican's Ecumenical Council.

The declaration, which is still subject to revision, is expected to come before the Roman Catholic bishops for approval when the third session of the council convenes in September.

An outline of the declaration was given today by the Reverend Dr. Bernard Haring, a leading moral theologian and secretary of the commission that prepared the draft. Father Haring arrived from Rome yesterday to preside at a conference at Catholic University.

While recognizing the principle of responsible parenthood and the limitation of family that that implies, Father Haring said, the declaration is silent on the means toward this end. It would thus represent no relaxation of the church's ban on contraceptive devices.

If approved, it could serve to extend discussion on birth control, however, and provide new ground for theological work on it.

Many theologians believe that the responsible parenthood principle, which the council declaration would make explicit, is already implicit in the teaching of the Roman Catholic Church. It has been stated in various forms by Pope Pius XII and his predecessor, Pope John XXIII.

The principle holds that parents have a responsibility in the upbringing as well as the procreation of children. Because of financial considerations and limitations on the time parents can spend with each child, it thus precludes an extravagant number of offspring in most cases.

It has often been taught by traditionalists in the church, on the other hand, that Catholic parents have an obligation to produce as many children as they physically can.

ONLY TWO METHODS APPROVED

The only means of family planning now permitted to Roman Catholics are total abstinence from sexual intercourse or selective abstinence through the so-called rhythm method, which is based on the ovulation cycle.

This year there has been debate in the church over the hormone type of oral contraceptive, which chemically prevents expulsion of ova during fertile periods. The church has forbidden use of this pill, as it does all purely mechanical contraceptive devices.

However, Canon L. Janssens, a Belgian theologian, and others have written articles in recent months stating that use of the hormone pill is not contrary to Catholic principles. If the draft declaration is adopted, it is expected to provide the impetus for the theological work necessary to clear up the controversy.

Father Haring, a reticent German scholar now teaching in Rome, gave an outline of the draft declaration in his opening lecture for a workshop in moral theology at the university.

CHURCH IN MODERN WORLD

The statement on marriage and the family is part of the Vatican Council's 17th schema, or draft decree, entitled "The Church in the Modern World." The document is believed to be potentially the most important the council can adopt because of its far-reaching statements on the renewal of the church.

Father Haring said several bishops on the preparatory commission had already spoken about the schema, so that he was not bound by the rule of secrecy.

In an interview later, he said the purpose of the chapter on the family was to try to establish the dignity of conjugal love rather than to lay down formalistic rules for behavior.

In its birth control pronouncements in the past, the priest said, the church has not always been so aware as it is today of the difficulties of parents and the danger of overpopulation. But, he added, these expressions in the past also show "the deep love of the church for the married family."

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, as Senators know, both the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] and I have, from time to time, taken occasion to call the attention of Senators to the very rapid development of public support for measures of voluntary population control on the part of all races, religions, creeds, and particularly on the part of a very substantial religious group which until recently has been rather opposed to the concept of population control.

METROPOLITAN PLANNING

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a series of resolutions dealing with urban and metropolitan area problems. The resolutions were adopted at the recent convention of the U.S. conference of mayors.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution 15, "Metropolitan planning by local governments," was amended by revising the language in the fourth paragraph to read as follows:

"Now, therefore, be it resolved, That the U.S. conference of mayors encourages and supports the voluntary establishment of cooperative arrangements among the elected officials of local governments in each metropolitan area to:".

And was further amended by revising the language in the last paragraph to read as follows:

"Be it further resolved, That the conference recommends that State and Federal assistance for the planning of metropolitan development be channeled through such organization or body which may be officially designated for such area purposes under voluntary cooperative arrangements established by joint action of the local governments, and that such organization or body be recognized by the State and Federal Governments as an eligible recipient of such assistance in those areas."

Resolution 16, "Area redevelopment," was amended by adding the following new language as the final paragraph:

"Be it further resolved, That the U.S. conference of mayors endorses Federal recognition of the principle of separation of core cities from surrounding suburban communities in determining the rates of unemployment used as a basis for designating such cities as eligible for assistance."

Resolution 21, "Hospital Modernization," was amended by adding the following new language as the final paragraph:

"(3) Grant credit to local governments for local funds expended in construction of hospital facilities where hospitals are constructed under more than one project and facilities are provided in original projects which reduce costs of subsequent projects."

Resolution 22, "Urban renewal program improvements," was amended by adding the following new language as the final paragraphs:

"Be it further resolved, That the U.S. conference of mayors again expresses its full support for legislation to strengthen the urban renewal program presently before Congress, including the provisions to improve the program's ability to deal with problems of downtown areas, and that the funds authorized for urban renewal be increased to $4 billion without limitation upon the rate of their commitment by the Urban Renewal Administration; and

"Be it further resolved, That the U.S. conference of mayors conduct a thorough study of the issue of establishing new communities in urban areas, the report of this study to be completed in time for submission to the Congress in 1965."

In addition, the committee by a two-thirds vote, acting under the rules of the U.S. conference of mayors, considered the several additional resolutions noted below and recommends to the membership that said resolutions do pass:

No. 24. American Landmarks Celebration.
No. 25. Health services for aging.
No. 26. Accident controls.
No. 27. Measles immunization.
No. 28. Federal urban land use.
No. 29. Rights of citizenship.

The above-noted resolutions are attached hereto for consideration by the membership.

The committee, after due deliberation, disapproved Resolution 10 "Junked automobiles." However, the committee did feel that this resolution related to a problem of growing seriousness to the cities and recommended to the executive committee a study of the problem be made.

The committee, after due deliberation, voted to table Resolution 11, "Land value taxation." The committee felt that it was not in a position to fairly evaluate the substance of this resolution and recommended that the executive committee authorize a staff study of this subject.

The committee, after due deliberation, voted to table Resolution 23, "Federal loans for local improvements." Mayor Alfred R. Pierce, of Camden, N.J., was commended by the committee for bringing this important matter to its attention. The committee felt that a further and more detailed analysis of the proposals embodied in the resolution was warranted and recommended to the executive committee that such a study be undertaken.

Respectfully submitted.

JEROME P. CAVANAGH,
Chairman.
SAM MASSELL, Jr.,
Secretary.

(NOTE.—All resolutions approved by the resolutions committee and recommended to the membership for passage, will be considered at the annual conference business meeting to be held on Wednesday, May 27, beginning at 10 a.m. in the Sutton Ballroom. At that time, the chairman of the resolutions committee will read for the approval by the membership a resolution of appreciation to the host city of New York and its chief executive, Mayor Robert F. Wagner.)

PROPOSED RESOLUTION 24—AMERICAN LANDMARKS CELEBRATION

Whereas Congress declared in 1935 "that it is a national policy to preserve for public use historic sites, buildings, and objects of national significance for the inspiration and benefit of the people of the United States"; and

Whereas the congressionally chartered National Trust for Historic Preservation, under the honorary chairmanship of Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson, is sponsoring the American Landmarks Celebration; and

Whereas the purpose of the American Landmarks Celebration in 1964 is to reawaken a sense of esthetic responsibility in the individual citizen and to draw the attention of State and local authorities—as well as the individual—to the urgent need to preserve the richness and diversity of the historical, architectural, and natural heritage of America as living history: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the U.S. conference of mayors urge State and local authorities to support and participate fully in this celebration and that it suggest that mayors of member cities issue proclamations calling on their communities to observe the celebration.

PROPOSED RESOLUTION 25—HEALTH SERVICES FOR AGING

Whereas an increasing proportion of the population of the United States is entering the older age bracket, which is especially subject to serious disabling and crippling diseases such as heart disease, cancer, stroke, diabetes, glaucoma, and mental illness; and

Whereas these conditions if allowed to progress result not only in lack of productivity of the individual but in medical and hospital therapeutic costs which place an increasing social and economic burden on the Nation; and

Whereas it has been demonstrated that there is an effective public health service approach to the amelioration of these conditions and to the prevention of unnecessary premature superannuation and senility: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the U.S. Conference of Mayors, That Congress and State legislatures be called on to provide adequate funds for the development by local health departments of adult health and geriatric centers for the early diagnosis of chronic diseases and the promotion of positive physical and mental health in the elderly toward the goal of prevention of premature superannuation and senility.

PROPOSED RESOLUTION 26—ACCIDENT CONTROLS

Whereas more than 100,000 persons are killed and more than 45 million disabled by accidents in the United States each year, bringing a staggering economic loss to the Nation as well as individuals and draining our limited medical, nursing, hospital, and rehabilitation resources: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the U.S. conference of mayors (1) commends Congress for its recognition of this problem and for the support it has given various agencies for research and control programs in the accident field; (2) calls for additional congressional appropriations and support for research and community demonstration programs in accident prevention; (3) encourages State and municipal governments to initiate and pursue programs to reduce the toll of accidental injuries.

PROPOSED RESOLUTION 27—MEASLES IMMUNIZATION

Whereas immediate and long-range effects of the almost universally experienced disease measles are commonly underestimated; and

Whereas complications from measles include deafness, visual damage, encephalitis, mental retardation, pneumonia and even death; and

Whereas there now is available a long-sought simple preventive measure in the form of a safe and effective vaccine, the true usefulness of which depends on its ready availability to and use by all preschool children regardless of ability to pay: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the U.S. conference of mayors call upon Congress to adopt appropriate legislation to extend financial support, now made available to communities for intensive immunization against other childhood diseases, to include a program for eradication of measles, providing adequate supplies of vaccine and accompanying supplies and materials required for its administration as a national protective measure.

Proposed Resolution 28—Federal Urban Land Use

Whereas large areas of urban land and land in the path of urban development are owned by the Federal Government, under the control of various Federal agencies; and

Whereas the Federal Government does not now have a general urban land use policy which promotes utilization in line with planning objectives of local communities involved: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the U.S. conference of mayors favors enactment of Federal legislation which would provide for a comprehensive national policy covering the Federal use, development and disposition of land in urban areas and promoting coordination and cooperation with local governments, so that purposes to which the land is put are not in conflict with the best social and economic interests of the communities.

Proposed Resolution 29—Rights of Citizenship

Whereas the U.S. conference of mayors has supported the cause of understanding and goodwill among all citizens; and

Whereas the U.S. conference of mayors has instituted affirmative and active programs to implement the equal opportunities resolution adopted at the 30th annual conference; and

Whereas the full implementation of all the rights of citizenship is a direct and primary obligation of officials who serve at the local levels of government: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the U.S. Conference of Mayors (1) reiterates its commitment to advance and extend equal opportunities to all our citizens; (2) calls upon all segments of the Nation to support every constructive effort to protect equal rights of citizenship for all; (3) pledges its full support to all efforts to create a broad climate of compliance with law, cooperation among all groups and mutual confidence between citizens; and (4) urges passage of a civil rights bill by Congress and statutes and ordinances by State and local legislative bodies to implement these principles.

Proposed Resolution 3—Cooperation in Metropolitan Areas

Whereas population expansion, accelerated technological change, and the attractions of urban living produce an increasing concentration of population in urban areas; and

Whereas urban areas are served by an increasing number of cities and other local jurisdictions existing side by side; and

Whereas many public services in urban areas can be more effectively and efficiently planned and administered on a cooperative basis by the local governments involved: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the conference of mayors, That the States should make available to cities appropriate machinery and devices for achieving cooperative and coordinated action in meeting the needs of residents of metropolitan areas, including:

1. Interlocal contracting and joint performance of services.
2. Voluntary transfer of functions between cities and counties.
3. Areawide study commissions on problems of governmental structures and services.
4. Simplified annexation procedures.
5. Voluntary councils of elected officials.
6. Strengthened metropolitan planning.
7. Uniform taxing powers and authority for cooperative tax enforcement for cities and their neighboring jurisdictions.
8. Stricter standards for creating new municipal corporations.
9. Responsible areawide service corporations with authority to perform one or more urban functions with elected local officials included on their governing bodies.
10. Extraterritorial planning, zoning, and subdivision regulation.
11. State levy and administration of taxes to be shared with cities.

Proposed Resolution 4—Impact of Federal Aid on Local Government

Whereas Federal aids for urban development are of vital importance to the cities of this Nation; and

Whereas such programs to be most effective must be coordinated, with local planning and decisionmaking, and administered through responsible local governments; and

Whereas almost all such aids to local governments are available to special districts as well as to cities; and

Whereas overly restrictive population and dollar ceilings on Federal aids to cities often discourage more economical joint projects with neighboring jurisdictions; and

Whereas few States have seen fit to supplement Federal grants to cities for urban development; and

Whereas few Federal aid programs have the stated objective of implementing locally adopted plans for development: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the U.S. conference of mayors, That—

1. Congress should remove from Federal aid programs for urban development all limitations which require or promote special districts to the disadvantage of the cities and other general units of local government.
2. Both Federal and State programs should encourage joint participation in cooperative projects by local governments through removal of population and dollar limitations.
3. States should more fully assume their responsibility for assisting urban development by supplementing Federal matching grants to the cities.
4. Congress and the executive branch should establish the principle and implement the practice of Federal interagency coordination in the full range of programs affecting urban development.

Proposed Resolution 5—Equalization in Federal Grant Programs

Whereas the growing urbanization of the country is concentrating increasingly larger proportions of the less privileged and less prosperous members of the population in central cities; and

Whereas the concentration of disproportionately large numbers of the poor in city centers produces relatively high municipal costs not adequately reflected in the conventional measures of municipal need; and

Whereas these city centers often have relatively low taxpaying capabilities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the U.S. conference of mayors call on Federal departments and agencies charged with the administration of grant programs to review the adequacy of the indexes of need and the appropriateness of the equalization provisions employed in the programs, taking account of the especially high social program costs confronting the larger cities; and be it further

Resolved, That the need is urgent to examine the Federal grant programs which distribute funds directly to local governments or support local projects in order to determine whether the bases of distribution recognize adequately the variations in local needs and fiscal capabilities, and the feasibility of administering equalization provisions in such grants to take adequate account of disparities between needs and resources in the cities.

Proposed Resolution 6—Metropolitan Water and Sewer Systems

Whereas the indiscriminate use of wells and septic tanks in metropolitan areas contributes to urban sprawl and substandard development, often endangers public health, and rarely provides a permanent solution to the problem of obtaining water and disposing of sewage in the areas; and

Whereas use of public water and sewerage systems, designed to high standards with area-wide considerations in mind, generally is preferable to dependence upon individual systems; and

Whereas water pollution control, water allocation, water resource development, and other phases of the overall water problem traditionally have been administered independently by different agencies and independent boards within State governments which give inadequate attention to long-range planning and policy coordination to meet the growing needs of urban areas for clean water: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the U.S. Conference of Mayors, That the State legislatures be urged to enact legislation which would endow State and local agencies with effective regulatory authority over individual wells and septic tanks in urban areas, encourage use of community water supply and sewerage systems wherever feasible in accordance with comprehensive plans for orderly development of the area, and make State agencies responsible for overall State water resources planning and program coordination—giving full consideration to the requirements and problems of urban areas.

Proposed Resolution 7—Industrial Development Bonds

Whereas the unrestricted use of tax-exempt municipal obligations for financing the acquisition of industrial plants for lease to private persons tends to lure business firms from their established locations in our industrial centers; and

Whereas tax-exempt industrial bond financing can become an abuse of the tax exemption privilege which threatens to endanger the tax immunity of all municipal bonds: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the U.S. conference of mayors, That the States be called on to regulate by law local governments' use of industrial development bonds, restrict the authority to issue such bonds to units of general government (i.e., municipalities and counties) and deny it to special districts, and prevent the use of such bonds to pirate industrial plants from their established locations and leave stranded unemployed workers behind.

Proposed Resolution 8—Housing Code Enforcement

Whereas housing code enforcement is a principal means of eliminating blight and slum housing in American communities, and is so recognized by the Federal Government which requires a housing code as a part of the workable program for urban renewal in each city; and

Whereas a comprehensive enforcement program of minimum housing code standards can restore to usefulness many neighborhoods which would otherwise require at some later date condemnation and clearance at great expense to the Federal Government and to local governments; and

Whereas the necessity to expedite housing code inspections and enforcement over large areas of our major cities requires a considerable expansion of trained personnel and administrative supervision if we are to provide decent, safe, and sanitary housing for minority groups and for others who are without access to acceptable housing; and

Whereas the local communities of most States are without the necessary revenue sources to effect increased housing code inspections and enforcement within current revenue limitations and local budget restrictions: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the U.S. conference of mayors, That it is to the interest of the Federal Government, the local government, and the taxpayer generally that housing code implementation be financed in the same manner as urban renewal projects: with Federal participation to the extent of two-thirds of such cost and in depressed areas three-fourths of such cost, recognizing this as the only feasible means of correcting housing deficiency upon a wholesale basis, and recognizing likewise the ultimate economy which is inherent in this approach.

Proposed Resolution 9—Aircraft Noise

Whereas since the advent of jet powered aircraft, many cities in the United States have been increasingly plagued by the problem of noise from aircraft; and

Whereas with the advent of supersonic transports in the next decade, noise will be greatly increased in the communities already affected and other cities throughout the United States will be plagued with this problem; and

Whereas while local agencies have, within the scope of their authority, endeavored to resolve this critical problem, the real solution lies in a determination of tolerable noise levels which is the responsibility of the Federal Government and the Federal Aviation Agency: Now, therefore be it

Resolved, That the U.S. conference of mayors request Congress, the Federal Aviation Agency, and the Surgeon General to undertake immediate steps to determine definitively by studies and research what noise levels are tolerable for various types of uses within the approach patterns of airports; and be it further

Resolved, That Congress be requested to provide sufficient funds for the Federal Aviation Agency, the Surgeon General's Office, or some other agency of the Federal Government to pursue the studies until acceptable and/or enforcible standards are found.

Proposed Resolution 10—Junked Automobiles

Whereas existing prices for scrap metal have, for several years, made it economically impractical for many scrapyard operators to process and sell junk automobile bodies and unusable automobile parts; and

Whereas the accumulation of such automobiles in licensed scrapyards and in many unlicensed areas has become extremely offensive and a considerable detriment to cities and environs in their efforts to make them attractive; and

Whereas there is no way presently known to properly dispose of such dead automobiles other than to allow continued accumulation in and about cities, and the increasing numbers of such automobiles make it apparent that they will ultimately cover the entire surrounding countryside; and

Whereas the automobile industry, having produced these vehicles, bears a responsibility for their ultimate removal when they are no longer useful for transportation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the U.S. Conference of Mayors, That automobile manufacturers be requested to include in their future production programs a plan for gathering up derelict automobiles from all the cities and towns in the United States where their products are sold and to return the same to their respective places of manufacture at the expense of said automobile manufacturers, to be then and there processed for scrap at the further expense of said automobile manufacturers; and be it further

Resolved, That such automobile manufacturers assume this obligation forthwith and program the expense thereof as one of their overall costs of production.

Proposed Resolution 11—Land Value Taxation

Whereas property taxation is always of importance to cities; and

Whereas property taxation has, in some areas, fallen into ill repute because of improper application; and

Whereas the House & Home magazine (a Time and Life publication) of August 1960 was awarded the annual Jesse H. Neal Award by the Associated Business Publications, for this issue concerning land value taxation; and

Whereas this is the most coveted award in the business magazine publishing field and, hence, their equivalent to the Pulitzer Prize for newspapers; and the article which has stirred the hearts and minds of innumerable officials, throughout the breadth of this country; and

Whereas the Reader's Digest, in its article dated July 1962, entitled "Land Speculation and How To Stop It," has again pointed out the need for further study in enchancing the value of land value taxation; and

Whereas the most recent article in Fortune magazine, dated October of 1963, entitled "The Strange Leveling Off in Land," has spelled out as a prerequisite to land value taxation, the encouragement of greater taxes thereon, to accomplish this result; and

Whereas this legislation is being studied in the States of Michigan, California, New York, and Alaska, as a step toward more modern application of property taxation; and

Whereas the State of Hawaii has recently adopted its land value taxation bill, following in the footsteps of the State of Pennsylvania; and

Whereas the application of urban renewal and the eradication of slums in the cities of the United States is in need of modern methods to carry out this result and (the application of) land value taxation to the exclusion of taxes on improvements being such a valuable tool: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the U.S. Conference of Mayors go on record as supporting the advocacy of the principles of land value taxation in the various States of our Union; and be it further

Resolved, That the U.S. conference of mayors take an aggressive position in the support thereof, by informing the member organizations of the progress being made in many cities, where this is being applied as a program; and be it further

Resolved, That the U.S. conference of mayors extend its thanks and appreciation to the publishers of House & Home, (Time and Life, Inc.) and the publishers of Fortune magazine and Reader's Digest, for their award-winning contributions to the field of property taxation.

Proposed Resolution 12—National Highway Program

Whereas the U.S. conference of mayors joined with other national organizations in promoting the national highway program approved by Congress in 1956; and

Whereas the legislation provides that the program will be completed by 1972, and Congress is now considering legislation which would authorize the Bureau of Public Roads to make a new highway needs study as the basis of a continuing Federal-aid highway program after 1972; and

Whereas the present Federal-aid program is doing an outstanding job in providing the finest highway system ever conceived to promote travel between and through the cities of the United States; and

Whereas this highway program nevertheless does not meet the needs of the metropolitan areas, where feeder systems—both inside and outside of the core cities—are greatly in need of improvements if they are to keep up with the standards of the fine Interstate System: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the U.S. Conference of Mayors urge Congress to enact pending legislation which would authorize the Secretary of Commerce (Bureau of Public Roads) to make a comprehensive study of the needs of the Federal-aid highway system; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of Commerce through the Bureau of Public Roads be asked to join with State highway and city officials in giving full consideration to the needs of the local urban primary and secondary systems; and be it further

Resolved, That Congress be requested to increase the A-B-C allocation of Federal highway funds as provided for in the original 1956 Highway Act and that a larger allocation of these A-B-C funds be made available for the immediate problems of the feeder and connecting roads in the metropolitan areas.

Proposed Resolution 13—Traffic Safety

Whereas in spite of our efforts to build safer and more modern highways, deaths on our highways continue to increase alarmingly despite the relatively good safety record of our limited-access highways systems; and

Whereas a large percentage of these deaths are on old primary and secondary roads of obsolete design, with narrow shoulders and obstacles too close to the roadway itself; and

Whereas President Johnson has emphasized the need to start an action immediately to reduce this great loss of life: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the U.S. conference of mayors urges Congress to authorize the Bureau of Public Roads to proceed immediately with a comprehensive study of the major cause of traffic accidents on our primary and secondary highway systems; and be it further

Resolved, That Congress be urged to revise the Federal Aid Highway Act so as to apportion a larger percentage of the highway funds toward eliminating hazards and modernizing our primary and secondary highway systems; and be it further

Resolved, That local units of government be urged to cooperate in every way possible in modernizing street systems and in promoting educational, driver training, and enforcement programs so as to reduce accidents.

Proposed Resolution 14—Poverty

Whereas the paradox of poverty in the midst of plenty constitutes an economic, social and moral challenge to our society and to our national way of life; and

Whereas local governments in the United States have for long struggled with the problems of poverty, striving for solutions which help every American have an opportunity for education and training, an opportunity to work and an opportunity to live in comfort and decency; and

Whereas no nationwide effort to eliminate poverty can succeed unless national resources are mobilized in support of campaigns against it in local communities, planned by local citizens and conducted by local citizens: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the U.S. Conference of Mayors welcomes the delaration of war on poverty by President Johnson and pledges its alliance with him in waging that war; and be it further

Resolved, That the conference endorses the strategy for winning that war as outlined in the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964—particularly its plan to conduct all-out attacks on poverty by building on locally initiated community action programs.

Proposed Resolution 15—Metropolitan Planning by Local Governments

Whereas many problems facing our Nation's metropolitan areas—such as those in transportation, air and water pollution, sewage and water supply, and in many social and economic areas—can only be solved through cooperative planning and action by local governments composing the areas; and

Whereas planning for the solution of such areawide problems depends for its effectiveness upon policy guidance and direction by the elected local officials of the area, and implementation depends upon their concurrence; and

Whereas Federal and State programs assisting or affecting metropolitan growth and development can be administered most efficiently and economically where coordinated with comprehensive metropolitan plans cooperatively developed by local governments of the area: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the U.S. Conference of Mayors encourages and supports the establishment of cooperative arrangements among the elected officials of local governments in each metropolitan area to—

1. Consider problems affecting the growth and development of the area;
2. Carry on a continuing cooperative and comprehensive process for the orderly development of the area as a whole;
3. Represent the interests of the area in connection with State and Federal programs, requirements, and activities affecting the area as a whole; and be it further

Resolved, That the conference recommends that State and Federal assistance for the planning of metropolitan development be channeled through such organization or body which shall be officially designated for such area purposes under cooperative arrangements established by joint action of the local governments, and that such organization or body be recognized by the State and Federal Governments as the sole recipient of such assistance in those areas.

Proposed Resolution 17—Clean Water

Whereas the Nation's continuing population and urban growth and rapid technological change impose new and increased demands for water supplies of essential quality for all legitimate uses, and pollution reduces the capability of our water supplies to meet such increased demands, making pollution the Nation's No. 1 water resources problem; and

Whereas Congress has provided a Federal role in the prevention, control, and abatement of pollution through enactment of the Water Pollution Control Act, as amended; and

Whereas the effective implementation and administration of Federal water pollution control programs imperatively require amendment and expansion of the Water Pollution Control Act, and legislation to achieve these purposes is presently before Congress: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the U.S. Conference of Mayors endorses and urges the early enactment of legislation to amend the Water Pollution Control Act in order to—

1. Establish a separate water pollution control administration in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, but removed from the Public Health Service, to administer all of the provisions and unified programs under the Water Pollution Control Act.
2. Increase the amount of grant assistance provided for individual municipal waste treatment works construction projects from $600,000 to $1 million and for joint multimunicipal projects from $2,400,000 to $4 million.
3. Provide a financial incentive of an additional 10 percent in the amount of grants for sewage treatment projects that conform with urban development plans for the area.
4. Provide grants to assist municipalities in developing new and improved methods for controlling pollutional waste discharges from storm sewers and combined storm and sanitary sewers.

Proposed Resolution No. 18—Mass Transportation

Whereas the necessity for balanced and coordinated transportation facilities in large and small urban areas throughout the United States is increasingly imperative, in view of the accelerating expansion of population in these areas; and

Whereas balanced transportation in urban areas cannot be achieved without reversal of the continuing deterioration of mass transit facilities in urban areas; and

Whereas reversal of this trend is not possible without a program of Federal financial assistance which will provide a sound and effective basis for cooperative action by local, State, and Federal governments in meeting and overcoming the problems; and

Whereas Federal funds that have been provided, under the pilot program of mass transit demonstrations authorized by the Housing Act of 1961, will not be available after the end of fiscal year 1964, and the loan program authorized by that act expired on June 30, 1963; and

Whereas the late President Kennedy, in 1962 and again in 1963, recommended a program of low-interest loans, matching Federal capital grants and research and demonstration grants to meet the requirements of improved and extended mass transit facilities in urban areas; and

Whereas legislation to carry out the late President's recommendations was approved by the Senate and recommended by the House Banking and Currency Committee more than a year ago; and

Whereas President Johnson has endorsed the pending legislation and urged prompt completion of congressional action on it: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the U.S. conference of mayors urgently requests the House of Representatives to promptly approve this pending legislation whose enactment is vitally needed to assure the orderly growth and development of urban areas throughout the United States.

Proposed Resolution 19—Open Space

Whereas the open-space land program authorized by the Housing Act of 1961 has been in operation nearly 3 years, and in that time has assisted in the acquisition of more than 67,000 acres of open-space lands in cities and other urban areas of 30 States; and

Whereas the value of open-space lands for park, recreation, and conservation purposes in combating urban blight and suburban sprawl, favorably influencing timing and location of urban development, and providing much-needed outdoor recreation opportunities for urban people has been clearly demonstrated; and

Whereas present provisions of the Federal open-space law limit the amount and kind of assistance that can be made available, and prevent the program from becoming a more effective partnership aid to the cities in preserving rapidly disappearing urban open space: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the U.S. conference of mayors, That—

1. Grant assistance available under the Federal open-space land program should be increased to a level more nearly comparable to Federal-local ratios in other grants-in-aid, since this increased assistance is essential to mounting the kind of effective national open-space program needed to get the job done, where there is still time—and lands are still available.
2. The program should be broadened to permit Federal cost-sharing for open-space developments, such as the installations of recreation facilities, as well as for land acquisition to which it is limited now.
3. Assistance should be available for acquiring and clearing developed lands in built-up areas where existing undeveloped areas are inadequate or inappropriate for open-space uses, and for making relocation payments under the same conditions authorized in urban renewal project areas.
4. The urban renewal statute should be amended to permit the dedication of project lands for public open-space use without regard to benefit to the project.

Proposed Resolution 21—Hospital Modernization

Whereas the Hill-Burton Act has proved to be an effective influence in stimulating the construction of hospitals and other health care facilities, and has substantially contributed to the provision of needed facilities throughout the Nation; and

Whereas the need for this program and the demand for health care facilities continue; and

Whereas the need to modernize and rebuild older, obsolescent facilities in the more densely populated areas has become urgent; and

Whereas the need for good nursing homes increases as our aged population increases; and

Whereas the great need for health care facilities and the limited financial resources available in the cities require most careful coordination and planning to assume efficient use of services and facilities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the U.S. conference of mayors urge extension and improvement of the Hill-Burton Hospital Construction Act, especially including—

1. Recognition of the need of urban areas for modernization of facilities.
2. Planning grants for the purpose of developing comprehensive plans for the construction, utilization, and coordination of all types of health facilities.

Proposed Resolution 22—Urban Renewal Program Improvements

Whereas the urban renewal program, established by Congress in title I of the Housing Act of 1949 and subsequently expanded on and improved by further acts of Congress, is of vital importance to the cities of the Nation in their efforts to eliminate slums and blight and to create a healthy, viable, and prosperous urban environment for their inhabitants; and

Whereas the residential areas of the city cannot properly be considered in isolation from other aspects of the community, of which they form an integral part; and

Whereas blight and decline seriously threaten important nonresidential aspects of the city, especially the commercial and industrial districts which constitute a major part of its tax base and which provides essential employment for its residents, and the great institutions such as hospitals and universities which provide the city's residents with needed services; and

Whereas without Federal financial assistance in the form of grants under the urban renewal program it would be impossible for most cities to attack and overcome the blight and decay which threaten both their residential and nonresidential areas and functions: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the U.S. conference of mayors strongly supports the principle that urban renewal grant assistance should be provided for both residential and nonresidential renewal and that present arbitrary restrictions in the statute on the use of the aid by the cities of the Nation should be removed and recognition given to the special functions, needs and problems of the cultural business districts of our cities.

PROPOSED RESOLUTION 23—FEDERAL LOANS FOR LOCAL IMPROVEMENTS

Whereas it is apparent that many of our municipalities throughout the United States are faced with a multitude of problems resulting from age, deterioration, blight, and/or decay; and

Whereas the financing capabilities of many of said municipalities are in many cases insufficient to adequately develop the resources and economic opportunities existent within said municipalities; and

Whereas the industrial and economic strength in these municipalities is an important and vital part of America's continued strength and stability; and

Whereas it is apparent that assistance from the U.S. Government has become a necessity in order to achieve proper economic growth for these municipalities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this body does hereby recommend to the Congress of the United States the passage of legislation which would provide for the loan of funds to municipalities upon approval of the State government officer, agency, or body charged with the overseeing of municipal finance.

The said act to also provide that no municipality be required to make any payment on account of principal of such loan until 10 years from the time of the date of receipt of funds pursuant to such loan. Said act to further provide that funds be available to those States that contractually agree to participate in said loans to the municipalities to the extent of $1 for every $2 loaned by the Federal Government.

Said act to further provide that Congress appropriate such funds initially to equal the sum of $2 billion, which sum shall also include the interest payments prior to the time that said municipality begins to repay principal of the loan, at which time said municipality also to assume further interest costs.

CONGRESSIONAL REFORM

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a copy of an article entitled "The Case for Congressional Reform; Changing the Rules," published in the Advance, the official publication of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, AFL–CIO. The article was written by the splendid Representative from Wisconsin, HENRY S. REUSS.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CASE FOR CONGRESSIONAL REFORM—CHANGING THE RULES

(By Representative HENRY S. REUSS, of Wisconsin)

The rules of the Congress, obscure, complicated, and unexciting as they are, go to the very heart of the U.S. ability to survive as a democracy in the trying years ahead.

Democratic government cannot endure if the National Legislature does not represent the will of the majority and translate that will into law in an orderly way.

Unfortunately, Congress now falls far short of this ideal. The present rules allow a minority or even a few willful men to block measures desired by a majority at numerous points in the legislative process.

These roadblocks to majority rule have been described clearly and extensively in the excellent articles by Ed Murray in the Advance. The point was made sharply that achievement of congressional reform is the key to the enactment of much of the legislation that is needed to assure progress, prosperity, and full employment in this country. But how is reform to be achieved? The reformers cause looks dark indeed when one considers that, in the House, reform proposals are referred to the Committee on Rules—one of the wellsprings of the obstructionism. In the Rules Committee, the reform proposals and even bills to merely study reform die the same quiet death as many liberal measures before them.

The obstructive minority will use all its power and craft to preserve the rules that are the source of its power.

In the long run, reform no doubt will be achieved. Reapportionment and the realization of free and equal access to the franchise for all Americans will increase the number of Representatives in favor of reform. As congressional failures and shortcomings continue, the public demand for reform will grow. If need be, the cause of reform will ultimately enlist a massive, determined, majority that can overcome the barriers that are placed before it.

But there is a way to bypass the strongholds of the obstructionists in the House if reform-minded citizens will focus their efforts on January 1965.

When the 89th Congress meets then for the first time, the House of Representatives will be without rules. It can adopt whatever rules the Members then choose. Usually, the chairman of the Rules Committee is recognized and he moves the adoption of the rules of the previous Congress.

But if reformers lay the groundwork, another Member can be recognized to propose the adoption of the previous rules with amendments which will at least:

1. Reinstate the 21-day and 7-day rules. The 21-day rule would overcome the roadblocking power of the Rules Committee by allowing the chairman of a subject-matter committee to call up for action on the floor any measure which had been before the Rules Committee for 21 days without action. The 7-day rule applies to attempts to send bills to a conference to resolve differences between House and Senate versions. Under that rule, the chairman of a legislative committee would be able to call up a resolution to send a bill to conference if the Rules Committee hadn't acted for 7 days.

2. Reinstate the 150-signature discharge petition. Lowering from the present 218 the number of signatures needed to bring a bill out of a committee which opposes it will reduce the power of committees that are out of step with the majority of the House. As it is now, committees are virtually independent sublegislatures. Two hundred and eighteen signatures on a discharge petition are so difficult to obtain that it is next to impossible to overturn a negative vote by a committee. Thus a dozen or so committee members may block legislation, like medicare, and never give the representatives of all the people a chance to vote it up or down.

3. Establish committee rules that will assure democratic government of the standing committees and thus take the sting out of the seniority system of selecting committee chairmen.

4. Allow any member of the District Committee to call up for consideration a bill to establish home rule in the District of Columbia. Legislation to give the 750,000 residents of the Nation's Capital the right to govern themselves has been advocated in Democratic and Republican Party platforms, urged by Presidents Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson and passed by the Senate.

This procedure of moving the adoption of rules changes at the opening of Congress would allow a clear-cut, rollcall vote on the issue of reform of the House. The people would learn where every Member stands on this vital issue.

It is up to the citizens of the United States to determine whether the issue of the reform of the House comes to a vote at the opening of the 89th Congress. They can see that it does by pressing for the inclusion of planks pledging adoption of the reform package in both the Democratic and Republican Party platforms. They can urge candidates for Congress to support the cause of congressional reform and back and work for those who do.

In working for congressional reform, citizens will be working for democracy and the American system of government.

EXCERPTS FROM COMMENTS ABOUT THE CASE FOR CONGRESSIONAL REFORM

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS,
March 23, 1964.

Mr. JACOB S. POTOFSKY,
General President, Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. POTOFSKY: I appreciate very much receiving the special edition of Advance dedicated to the subject of congressional reform. As many of your members know, I have frequently spoken out on this urgent subject. In any democratic system it is always necessary to re-examine and re-evaluate our governmental procedures in the light of shifting events and changing times. We must not become wedded to old notions and concepts simply for their own sake but we must be willing to ask the difficult, searching questions which disclose whether or not our institutions are geared to demands of the contemporary scene.

This is particularly true in relationship to the activities of Congress. The press of daily events on our elected representatives in both the House and Senate grow more burdensome with every passing year. The time cannot be postponed for long when Congress will have to take a searching look at its own modes of operation. Your excellent summary of these problems will help stimulate this study and most certainly contribute to the long overdue modernization of our congressional machinery.

Congratulations on this outstanding special edition of Advance.

Best wishes.

Sincerely yours,

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
April 21, 1964.

JACOB S. POTOFSKY,
General President, Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. POTOFSKY: Thank you for forwarding to me your special issue of the Advance on the reform of Congress. I found it most perceptive and interesting.

I have long urged an overhaul of the archaic rules of the Senate. I have coauthored several resolutions to this end, and I have consistently supported attempts at congressional reform.

The civil rights filibuster which is presently going on in the Senate is a striking example of how a handful of Senators can thwart prompt action on legislation that is vital to the entire country. I do hope that action will soon be taken to improve our outmoded congressional procedures.

It was a pleasure to meet you at Mr. Justice Goldberg's recent dinner. I will look forward to seeing you again.

With kindest regards.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
U.S. Senator.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 18, 1964.

Mr. JACOB S. POTOFSKY,
General President, Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. POTOFSKY: I read with great interest the special issue of the Advance on the subject of the need for reform of congressional machinery. It places the spotlight on an urgent problem of national concern, and the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America are to be congratulated on a public service.

The archaic and autocratic rules of the Congress of the United States impede the business of the Nation, and infuse undemocratic procedures in violation of the democratic principles upon which our country is founded.

The filibuster in the Senate holds us up to ridicule, and the vast and arbitrary power of the House Rules Committee also is most damaging.

As one who has long supported meaningful revision and reform of our Congressional rules of organization and procedure, I am heartened by the interest and concern of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America.

Best personal regards.

Sincerely,

CHARLES S. JOELSON,
Member of Congress.

I am in receipt of a reprint of a series of articles which appeared in the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America's official newspaper, the Advance, relative to the Congress of the United States.

I certainly agree with you on the three issues mentioned in your special edition and would support reform of congressional rules which would prevent the House Rules Committee from pigeonholing legislation; which would prevent bills from being talked to death (filibustered) in the Senate; and which would prevent committee chairmen in both Houses from delaying or preventing legislation from the full House or Senate.

Sincerely,

JOHN J. ROONEY,
Representative From New York.

The special issue of the Advance covering the need for congressional reform was greatly appreciated. Mr. Murray has made a painstaking study of our creaking machinery, and I hope some of the recommendations he makes can be realized.

Cordially,

OTIS G. PIKE,
Representative From New York.

Thank you for your letter of March 20 and the copy of the Advance. I read the issue from front to back and was impressed. Mr. Murray did a very fine job.

I am honored that you would ask me to contribute something concerning this issue. I am enclosing a statement which I made last year on congressional reform, and you may quote at will from it. As you know, I strongly feel that a comprehensive reform is needed. Chances for anything being done this session are dim—but if organizations like yours keep plugging for it, we are going to succeed eventually. The situation in the Senate right now is a prime example of why we need to rework the rules.

Sincerely,

JOHN V. LINDSAY,
Representative From New York.

Thank you for sending me a copy of the special reprint on congressional reform and I am very pleased to have this matter as it has always been of primary concern to me throughout my years in Congress.

I have already read the various articles with great interest and am especially in agreement with you on the matter of reforming the Rules Committee. As you well know, I have led the fight during the past two Congresses to reform the Rules Committee and make it possible for the House to free itself from this unfair, autocratic, one-man rule, which is so disruptive to our democratic system.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN A. BLATNIK,
Representative From Minnesota.

Thanks so much for having a copy of the special edition of Advance in regard to congressional reform sent to me. I think it is very well done and I, for one, appreciate deeply the support which you and the Amalgamated are giving in our efforts to get somewhere in this most important fight.

Sincerely,

CLIFFORD P. CASE,
Senator From New Jersey.

I am most grateful to you for sending me a copy of the excellent special section on congressional reform in the Advance.

You have my congratulations and my keen appreciation for a first-rate job. Mr. Ed Murray, of your staff, has skillfully laid bare the rusty and archaic rules, precedents and procedures by which the will of the majority has repeatedly been frustrated in both the House and the Senate.

I am convinced that congressional reform is on a rising tide. But unless an informed and indignant public opinion can be brought to bear on the issues, there will be no victory for those who seek to modernize and democratize our national legislature.

As one who is determined to see that victory attained, I want to extend my personal thanks for your help in this fight.

Sincerely,

JOSEPH S. CLARK,
Senator From Pennsylvania.

NEEDED: FACTS ON JOB OPPORTUNITIES

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, recently there appeared in the New York Times an excellent article, by Will Lissner, entitled "Economist Doubts Retraining Plans." This article presents a number of questions raised by Prof. Joseph Froomkin, of Columbia University's Bureau of Applied Social Research, about the effectiveness of the manpower retraining programs. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD at the close of my comments.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. PROXMIRE. Professor Froomkin complains that only a minority of present manpower training programs are of any value in cutting unemployment. Froomkin says the reason is that there is now no solid, uniform information about what kinds of jobs are available. So we train thousands for jobs and there is, in some cases, no demand for the trained man and woman. In other words, we need to know more. We need more facts; we need more statistics.

As chairman of the Statistics Subcommittee of the Joint Economic Committee, I have been concerned for a long time about the nature of the available statistics indicating where employment opportunities and employment needs exist. These statistics must be fairly detailed in nature. It is not enough to know that unemployment exists, for instance, in the automobile industry. We also need data indicating the particular types of skills which unemployed persons in the automotive industry have, and the related types of skills which are needed in the economy, either by the automobile industry or by related industries.

In the past, the Statistics Subcommittee has done some significant work in improving the data in this area. In particular, the subcommittee had hearings on employment in 1961–62, and again in 1963, in studying the ways in which both Government and private efforts could improve our knowledge of where jobs are opening up, as to location and occupation, and the skills and other assets the unemployed possess. I believe the hearings give the most definitive statement yet presented of the needs and policies in this area. As a result of the subcommittee's efforts and also as a result of a year-long study by a Presidential Committee, under the chairmanship of Prof. Aaron Gordon, of the University of California, significant steps have been taken by the Department of Labor to initiate programs of research to produce a well balanced and reasonable solution to the problem of developing statistics on job vacancies and on developing occupational opportunities. We are hopeful that before this year is up, this study will provide more information on job opportunities. It is also expected that we shall have a net set of data on future developments in different occupations, to guide future training programs. In addition, it is my understanding that the National Industrial Conference Board has received a grant to make an experimental study in one large industrial city, to ascertain what can be done to get usable information about detailed job opportunities.

Basically, what types of information do we need for a meaningful program of job guidance and job retraining?

We need statistics on unfilled jobs, classified according to occupation and location. For measurement usefulness, we need to have comparable information on the conditions and trends in employment in the same occupations and areas. Such statistics should shed light on the precise skills and basic education that are most likely to lead to jobs, so that training programs can be concentrated on areas that are expanding, rather than, as has often happened in the past, I am afraid, be aimed at jobs which do not exist or are disappearing. This information will be useful, not merely to public agencies in placing training programs for adults, as well as for students in the public schools, but also to employers in recruitment, placement, job counseling, and on-the-job training.

Interestingly enough, up to the last year or so, the only comprehensive source of such detailed occupational statistics was the decennial census which produced data that were 12 years old by the time the next set of figures became available.

Mr. President, such an analysis of job opportunities is long overdue. In 1958, our unemployment level was 6.8 percent; and since then it has not dropped to as low as 5 percent. In 1961, it was 6.7 percent; and in 1963, it was 5.7 percent. The latest monthly figure, seasonally adjusted—for June of 1964—is 5.3 percent. Yet economists used consistently to tell us that unemployment should not drop below 3 percent; and even now the interim goal is 4 percent. One reason for these high unemployment figures is that we do not adequately relate jobs to people. We should get on the job, so that people can get on the job.

EXHIBIT 1

ECONOMIST DOUBTS RETRAINING PLANS—SAYS MOST APPEAR UNLIKELY TO CUT JOBLESS ROLLS; CALLS SOME PROMISING—LACK OF DATA DEPLORED—COLUMBIA RESEARCHER HOLDS IT LEADS TO PREPARATION FOR NONEXISTENT OPENINGS

(By Will Lissner)

An economist engaged in a large-scale study of the effects of automation says that only a minority of current retraining programs appear likely to get the trainees off the unemployment rolls.

The economist, Joseph Froomkin, of Columbia University's Bureau of Applied Social Research, reports on his survey in the Columbia University Forum.

He points out that $30 million will be spent this year to retrain 275,000 workers under acts of 1958, 1960, and 1962 aimed at meeting labor shortages, revitalizing depressed areas or retraining unemployed workers.

The programs that appear promising, Mr. Froomkin says, are those that prepare workers as aids in the medical field, those that teach skills for various repair services such as television receiver technician, and those in the metal trades.

SKEPTICAL OF OTHERS

He regards skeptically other programs. One provides data-processing training for which employers have traditionally paid the costs, he finds, and others are in this category. There is a course in farm work, he says, although farming has had a contracting labor force for many years.

Mr. Froomkin joins Arthur F. Burns, former Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, and many Federal and State labor economists in deploring the lack of analytical information about current job opportunities.

The economists say that because there is no solid, verified information about the requirements for job openings, the vocational educators organize training programs for jobs that no longer exist.

THE UNFILLED JOBS

Mr. Froomkin says there is only intelligent guesswork now about what kinds of jobs are available. This guesswork indicates that the great majority of unfilled jobs in this country fall into two categories: jobs for college graduates, especially those with engineering or science degrees, and short-term jobs in certain businesses with seasonal requirements.

The retraining programs do not offer work at the college or graduate level to fit applicants for professional vacancies.

And in hiring temporary workers, Mr. Froomkin says, employers continue to favor experience over training. Hence, he reports, the retraining programs are limited to preparing displaced workers for new long-term openings.

In this they have met with varied success, he says. Retrained employees in the Los Angeles area, where unemployment is less acute, found new jobs and managed to keep them. In Harlan County, Ky., a depressed area, however, when retrained workers could find jobs they were able to hold them only for a short time.

WASTE CLIMBS WHILE SUPERSONIC AIRLINER STAYS GROUNDED

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, an increasing amount of evidence shows that the Government's commitment to the supersonic aircraft represents a wasteful and foolhardy loss of taxpayer funds, roughly comparable to throwing the money to the four winds.

On Wednesday, Mr. William Littlewood—a distinguished expert on the aviation industry, who was, until last year, vice president in charge of aircraft procurement for American Airlines—criticized the SST, in statements before the annual meeting of the American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics. His criticisms represent just a few of the arguments that have been made against this expenditure.

While Mr. Littlewood's comments have not been made available in printed form, a summary of his views recently appeared in the New York Times, in an article written by John W. Finney, and entitled "Economic and Noise Problems May Delay Supersonic Airliner Until 1980." I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ECONOMIC AND NOISE PROBLEMS MAY DELAY SUPERSONIC AIRLINER UNTIL 1980

(By John W. Finney)

WASHINGTON, July 1.—A former airline executive predicted today that economic and technical problems would delay the introduction of a supersonic airliner until 1975–80 and perhaps kill the project.

The Government was criticized for plunging too quickly into the supersonic transport project and for not adequately considering the sonic boom problem.

The outspoken criticism came from William Littlewood at the annual meeting of the American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics.

Until his retirement late last year, Mr. Littlewood was vice president in charge of aircraft procurement for American Airlines, and he is still a consultant to the company.

REFLECTS SECOND THOUGHTS

To a large extent, his criticism reflected the second thoughts now being raised in some Government circles about the feasibility of building a supersonic transport at this time.

Thus far, these doubts have centered on the question of whether the plane would be economical to build and operate.

As a result of the economic problems, a special advisory committee, headed by Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara, has been created to review the program and the Commerce Department has been directed to make a survey of the economic feasibility of supersonic airliners.

The blunt conclusion of Mr. Littlewood was that there was "no economic need" for the supersonic transport and that it probably would not be able to compete with more efficient subsonic transports that he foresaw being developed in the coming decade.

To illustrate his point, he said one unidentified airline president recently had commented to him that he would be "happy if we didn't have a supersonic transport for 50 years."

Another, more technical problem that is beginning to bother some scientific policymakers within the Government is the sonic boom that would be created by the plane as it traveled at supersonic speeds.

As it strikes the ground with a thunderlike clap, this pressure wave could become a public nuisance and in sufficient strength could cause property damage.

Within some Government circles, there is a belief that the Federal Aviation Agency, which is in charge of the supersonic jet project, has tended to overlook the seriousness of sonic boom problem.

Significantly, the responsibility for assessing the problem was recently taken away from the Agency and given to the National Academy of Sciences.

WARNS OF PROBLEM

At a news conference discussion of the project, Mr. Littlewood placed considerable emphasis upon the sonic boom problem as a potential barrier to immediate development and use of the plane.

The problem has "not been solved by a long shot," he declared, and a lack of a solution "could cause abandonment of the project entirely."

The administration's original plan was to introduce the supersonic transport into commercial service around 1970.

With recent economic and technical problems, Mr. Littlewood said, the schedule has now "slipped" until 1974–75, and his own appraisal was that it would be 1975–80 before the plane is placed into commercial service "if we solve the basic problems of economics and noise."

INTEREST EQUALIZATION TAX INEFFECTIVE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of my colleagues to an editorial which appeared in Tuesday's Washington Post regarding the interest equalization tax bill presently pending before the Senate Finance Committee.

As other newspapers have done on several previous occasions, the Post calls into question the consistency of this bill with stated national principles and with the facts of life of international finance. It questions the effectiveness of the pending bill in light of the numerous exemptions built into it, including one for bank loans. It also points out that should long-term interest rates widen between those prevailing in the United States and in Western Europe, the bill would be rendered ineffectual. According to an article in the New York Times last Sunday, money rates are, in fact, rising in Europe, reflecting the gradual upward creep of both short-term and long-term interest rates. Unless the Federal Reserve Board raises the discount rate in turn, the outflow of U.S. capital will once again resume.

The editorial concludes with the statement that if our balance-of-payments deficit should reach menacing proportions, we should require a far more effective measure than a tax affecting one type of capital outflow, and calls for the creation of a capital issues committee should such a situation arise.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the Washington Post, entitled "Interest Tax Alternatives"; and the article from the New York Times, entitled "Rates on Money Rising in Europe," be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial and the article were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, July 7, 1964]

Interest Tax Alternatives

If the members of the Senate Finance Committee who are now hearing testimony on the administration's interest equalization tax will take the time to weigh the issues, they may devise a solution to the problem of private capital outflows that is consistent with this country's professed principles and more congruent to the facts of life in international finance.

Proposed by President Kennedy on July 19, 1963, the retroactive equalization tax was designed to stanch one of the outflowing streams of capital by placing a tax on new and outstanding foreign securities purchased by Americans. Since the American selling prices of foreign capital issues decline by the amount of the tax levied, the cost to foreigners of raising capital in this country increases. The term "interest equalization" is widely used on the assumption that the tax would eliminate or reduce the disparity between the cost of borrowing in this country and the money markets of Western Europe, thus discouraging the sale of foreign issues.

As pending legislation the tax is a partial deterrent. Purchases of new and outstanding foreign issues declined sharply. But the very great increase in bank loans to foreigners indicates that eager borrowers and willing lenders are surmounting the potential tax barrier. When one capital tap is turned off, another is opened wider. The circumvention of the long-term capital markets by recourse to bank loans increases the volume of short-term credit, thus making the international debt structure more vulnerable to shocks that could touch off a chain reaction of defaults.

A second technical objection to the interest equalization tax is that it would be rendered ineffectual if the gap between the cost of raising capital funds here and in Europe should widen appreciably. The countries of Western Europe have been advancing their interest rates in an effort to stem inflationary pressures, and if the trend continues, the proposed tax will do precious little in the way of equalizing the costs of capital.

In addition to these technical objections, there are issues of principle. It ill behooves a country that extolls the virtues of free trade to levy a tax which can well destroy the world's only unfettered market for capital funds. It is hardly in keeping with our oftrepeated strictures against discrimination to exempt one of our allies, Canada, from the tax while subjecting another, Japan, to its full force. Nor is there great equity in a tax levied on portfolio investment while direct investment and bank credit remain unscathed.

The balance-of-payments position may change in the second quarter but the situation is not so serious as to require restrictions on portfolio investments. If the deficit should increase to menacing proportions, we shall require a far more effective measure than a tax affecting one type of capital outflow. Rather than rush to embrace a measure that would violate our principles without any guarantee that it would solve the capital outflow problem, the Senate Finance Committee should defer action on the equalization tax. If a very serious payments problem ensues, Congress can then authorize the creation of a capital issues committee.

[From the New York Times, July 5, 1964]

Rates on Money Rising in Europe—But Uptrend Has Not Yet Attracted U.S. Funds

(By Albert L. Kraus)

A little over a month ago in the ornate, high-ceiling Schwartzenberg Palace in Vienna, Secretary of the Treasury Douglas Dillon delivered a message to European governments and central banks.

The time had come, he suggested, to find new ways to cope with the difficult problem of inflation. Higher interest rates were no longer the answer.

If Europeans heard the message, they did not necessarily heed it. Within 2 weeks, the Netherlands central bank raised its official lending rate to 4½ percent from 4 percent. Then last week, the Belgian and Swiss central banks followed suit. For Belgium, the rise to 4¾ from 4¼ percent was the third in a year. But for Switzerland, the advance from 2 to 2½ percent was extraordinary. It was the first change in the bank rate since 1959.

The increases in official rates are the latest public confirmation of tighter money policies in effect in much of Europe for 6 months or more. They reflect the gradual upward creep of both short-term and long-term market rates since last fall.

Before the recent increases, short-term rates had advanced from 2½ to almost 4 percent in Belgium, from 1¾ to more than 3 percent in the Netherlands, and from 2 to 2¼ percent in Switzerland. Long-term rates had risen from 5 to 5½ percent in Belgium, from 4½ to 4¾ percent in the Netherlands, and from 3¼ to almost 4 percent in Switzerland.

Secretary Dillon argued that continuation of long-term interest rates in Europe at "unusually high levels" historically would lead to a renewed outflow of portfolio capital from the United States, an outflow held in check for the last 12 months by the proposed interest-equalization tax on American purchases of foreign securities.

Surprisingly, however, the rather marked rise in European rates has not led to a short-term outflow. In countries like Belgium and Switzerland, this is not hard to understand. Neither has a highly developed market for short-term funds. In addition, Switzerland has sought to insulate her domestic economy from such influences by prohibiting the payment of interest to foreigners.

The advantage to Americans of investing in British treasury bills, when hedged against fluctuations in currency exchange rates, however, has risen markedly in recent weeks without triggering any outflow of funds from the United States. This is noted in the new issue of the First National City Bank's monthly letter.

A rule of thumb in years past was that some money would leave the country when this covered differential grew as large as ¼ point, and that the outflow would become serious at ½ point. In recent weeks, the advantage has been as large as 4/10 point without any noticeable increase in the flow of funds from the United States to Britain.

What has changed to make the old rule of thumb less applicable? Students of the problem warn that the situation could change quickly. But they suggest several changes in the situation today from that of a year or two ago.

For one thing, they note, some $12 billion or so of liquid funds that once may have sought investment in the American or British Treasury bill market, largely the excess cash of industrial corporations, today are invested in negotiable commercial bank time certificates of deposit, a money-market instrument that did not exist several years ago. The marketability of these certificates, plus their influence on a corporation's bank relationships, have made them an extremely attractive alternative to older short-term investments.

For another thing, the likelihood of demands on corporate treasurers for cash—for plant and equipment purchases, for inventory buying, for trade credit—has put some premium on keeping cash more readily available than when invested in foreign money markets.

Perhaps more important than anything else, however, has been the great rise in foreign confidence in the dollar. One informed observer describes this optimism as almost as illogical as the pessimism of several years ago. He said:

"People wouldn't believe me in 1961 when I said the dollar would'nt be devalued, won't believe me today when I say it will not have to be revalued—that the United States balance-of-payments problem is far from solved."

One reason students of the problem will not rule out a renewed outflow of short-term funds is that domestic credit-tightening efforts are only one part of the tighter money situation in Europe. Another is the contraction of the Euro-dollar market.

In its annual report, the Bank for International Settlements noted that these dollar deposits in foreign banks served as an alternative source of credit that might enable European countries to circumvent a domestic credit squeeze.

It noted also, however, that a few bad debts late last year had caused the volume of this credit to contract.

Euro-dollar rates recently have remained fairly steady. Any strong new demand on this market could push up rates, however, and pull funds from the United States.

AWARD TO DR. SALMON

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on Monday, June 30, the American Optometric Association gave its 1964 Apollo Award to Dr. Peter J. Salmon, executive director of the Industrial Home for the Blind, in Brooklyn. The presentation was made at a luncheon held at the New York Hilton Hotel at Rockefeller Center. The Apollo Award is the AOA highest honor conferred on an individual for his outstanding contribution to the recognition and service of optometry. This is the first time that the award has been made to a person connected with an agency for the blind.

Dr. Peter J. Salmon, executive director of the IHB, located at 57 Willoughby Street, in Brooklyn, a philanthropic organization for the blind, has long been aware of the problems faced by visually handicapped persons—especially children. His own visual problems made him realize the lack of essential services to this particular group. Upon being appointed director of the IHB in 1947, he inaugurated a pilot project to determine the precise services needed by blind persons who have some remaining sight.

In March of 1953, Dr. Salmon began the first formal low vision rehabilitation center for blind persons, employing Dr. George O. Hellinger, an optometrist, who is still with the agency. The pilot project and the study of the first 500 cases served by the center from 1953–57, definitely established that, in many cases, special optical aids and devices were of benefit to blind persons after all possible medical and surgical help was exhausted. The IHB Low Vision Center serves only legally blind persons, that is to say, only those persons who are blind but who have some remaining useful vision. Today, there are some 40 low vision centers throughout the country modeled after the program available at the IHB Low Vision Rehabilitation Center for Blind Persons, now located in Jamaica, N.Y.

The need of a vision rehabilitation program is revealed by the overwhelming response IHB has received from not only persons living in this country, but from all over the world.

HEALTH CARE FOR THE AGING

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, in spite of volumes of testimony on the urgent need to provide a Federal program of health care insurance for the aging, Congress has thus far failed to take positive action on this issue. This problem will not go away by itself, and in the face of rising hospital and medical costs as well as sharp increases in nonprofit and commercial health plans, the plight of the retired citizen who seeks health care services is becoming increasingly grave. I deeply believe that we cannot put off action any longer on this essential program for persons 65 years of age and older, who are becoming an increasingly numerous sector of our population, and I am determined to take such action when the social security bill reported out of committee in the other House reaches the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Sop for Medicare," which appeared in Newsday of June 26; and a letter by James W. Fogarty, executive director of the Community Council of Greater New York, which appeared in the New York Times of July 7.

There being no objection, the editorial and the letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Newsday, June 26, 1964]

A SOP FOR MEDICARE

Most people, very probably, believe in the principle of medical care for the aged, but there is a wide area of disagreement as to how it can be most equitably financed. One thing is certain: The House Ways and Means Committee has not come up with a solution. That committee, opposed by a majority to medicare in any form, has provided a sop to the elderly—an increase of 5 percent in the old age, disability, and survivors insurance program, to be financed by a social security tax increase. The aged will, through this plan, receive $12 per month more, or $144 per year—hardly adequate to pay for the crippling diseases and the protracted periods of convalescence to which those of advanced years are prone.

The administration has proposed the total financing of medicare through social security, which would be a staggering sum. A good deal more practical proposal has been made by Senator JACOB K. JAVITS, Republican, of New York, and five Republican colleagues. This would provide a combination of Federal subsidy to the aged, financed by a very modest increase in the social security payroll tax, plus a federally chartered association of private insurance and group service companies. This association would offer a standard, low-cost, medical-surgical policy for those over 65.

The decisions, for this year at least, are academic. From all evidence, a meaningful medicare bill will not pass the present session of Congress.

[From the New York Times, July 7, 1964]

MEDICAL CARE BILL URGED: LEGISLATION TO FINANCE NEEDS OF AGED VIA SOCIAL SECURITY BACKED

To the EDITOR:

Your June 26 editorial on medicare made two extremely important points. You referred to the inadequacies of the Kerr-Mills program, which we regard as a total failure in terms of what Congress intended—namely, to serve the marginal income group above the public assistance level.

In New York City the effect has been bookkeeping transfers from old age assistance to the medical assistance to the aged category in order to collect the new Federal reimbursement for services previously rendered out of city funds. It is conservatively estimated that 235,000 New York City residents would have been eligible for preventive health services even under stringent income levels promulgated by New York State. But only a few hundred have been willing to submit themselves and their adult children to humiliating financial investigation.

You correctly pointed out that a 5 percent increase in social security benefits would not even meet the rise in cost of living since the 1959 adjustment in benefits, much less enable older people to purchase hospital insurance. The 1960 census gave us a sobering picture of income levels of older people in New York City.

About 70 percent of those 65 years and older have incomes of less than $2,000—well over half a million older people. That same year the average monthly social security benefit for retired workers was under $80; for the surviving spouse it was $60 to $67 a month. It is ironic that the small percentage of older people supported by public assistance also get a range of medical and related services while the much larger group living on inadequate social security benefits do not have access to services.

VULNERABLE GROUPS

The drain of medical costs on limited incomes of older people is well known, but we would like to call attention to two particularly vulnerable groups. The 1960 census indicated that nearly 156,000 older New Yorkers were living alone, and 69 percent of them had less than $2,000 income in 1959. Those 75 years and older totaled almost 230,000 people in 1960, a group larger than the total population of Staten Island. Median income for males was $1,473 and $807 for females.

It is the fundamental conviction of Community Council, the planning and coordinating agency for health and welfare in New York City, that the socially desirable and fiscally sound approach to financing health care for the aging is through the social security system. We hope most urgently that a bill embodying this principle can be enacted before the close of this congressional session.

JAMES W. FOGARTY,
Executive Director, Community Council of Greater New York.

NEW YORK, *June 30, 1964.*

LT. STEPHEN MICHAEL CASE, U.S. NAVY

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief statement to pay tribute to the memory of Lt. Stephen Michael Case, U.S. Navy, a young man of considerable promise and ability, who recently lost his life in the service of his country.

Lieutenant Case made his home in Flushing, N.Y. He first came to my attention in 1959, when I sent him a congratulatory telegram for winning a Navy scholarship at the University of Michigan. Upon his graduation in 1961, he entered the Navy, with the rank of ensign.

Lieutenant Case was assigned to the U.S.S. *Bennington*, an aircraft carrier with the 7th Fleet, on antisubmarine duty in the China Sea. There rests on the 7th Fleet the tremendous responsibility of reassuring our friends in southeast Asia, by its presence, that the United States stands ready to maintain peace and freedom, and to act as a warning to the enemies of freedom that their aggression will be turned back with all the power of our Armed Forces.

On May 16, Lieutenant Case was on routine patrol duty. Fifteen times during the course of the day, he had taken off, made his run, and returned safely. On the 16th takeoff, his plane swerved, and crashed into the sea. His untimely death exemplifies the self-sacrifice and devotion to duty of the men in our Armed Forces, and their recognition of the need always to be on guard to protect freedom against encroachments by hostile Communist forces. To his family, we send our heartfelt sympathy on their loss.

The finest tribute to Lieutenant Case was paid by his father Dr. Maurice Case, who wrote me of his son:

> He was such a fine, attractive, intelligent, trained, patriotic, and religious boy. He gave his life in line of duty, and we are too shocked to do anything but mourn.

Mr. President, is the Senate, in the face of this kind of sacrifice, less shocked to do its very utmost, in terms of the struggle for justice in our country and in the world, with every measure of resource and power which we have, to bring about decent and just and humane conditions for mankind and for our own citizens, when a young American such as Lieutenant Case sacrifices his life?

INVASION OF THE SOUTH

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the current invasion of the South by outside agitators who are bent on stirring up emotions to the end of seeking to have Southern States occupied by Federal troops has been well exposed by a perceptive and capable Washington correspondent, Mr. Frank van der Linden. In articles written for the Nashville Banner, of Nashville, Tenn., on March 24, 1964; the Jackson Daily News of Jackson, Miss., on June 22, 1964; and the Greenville News of Greenville, S.C., on July 5, 1964, Mr. van der Linden has shown that plans for the current agitational efforts in Mississippi were well laid months ago by National Council of Churches officials in conjunction with

Negro extremist groups. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks these three articles by Mr. van der Linden.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on yesterday, I pointed out, in a Commerce Committee hearing, that outside agitators have likewise moved into South Carolina, without publicity. Some are currently camped in Orangeburg, S.C., which is a low-country county, with a population of 60-odd percent Negroes. Racial tensions have been high in Orangeburg for some time, because of agitational efforts.

On last Sunday evening, a group of 20-odd outside agitators attempted to test the new so-called civil rights law, by purchasing tickets to a previously segregated movie theater in Orangeburg. These young people were sold tickets in accordance with the law. After getting the tickets, however, they deliberately formed into integrated couples, and then proceeded to march into the theater, through the lobby. They were stopped, and were not permitted entry into the theater, because of their highly provocative attempt to cause racial disorder and disturbance of the peace.

Such is the type of agitation, Mr. President, to which the people of the South are being subjected at the present time, as the crown of thorns, in the form of a so-called civil rights law, is being pressed down upon their brow. These incidents are clearly designed to provoke disorders, as both Mr. van der Linden and the "liberal" columnist Mr. Joseph Alsop have pointed out.

It would seem appropriate, Mr. President, that the first act of any conciliation service by the Federal Government under the new so-called civil rights law would be immediately to get these agitators out of the Southland, and to let the law be tested at the local level by local people, if this be their desire, but not by outsiders who only seek publicity, martyrdom, and the introduction of Federal forces to speed the current reconstruction program for the South.

Exhibit 1

[From the Nashville (Tenn.) Banner, Mar. 24, 1964]

NCC Predicts Clashes in Mississippi Projects

Washington.—An official of the National Council of Churches predicts there will be clashes between Negroes and whites when it starts an integrated antipoverty program in the hostile delta area of Mississippi, probably this summer.

James A. Hamilton, associate director of the council's Washington office, said "We can't avoid some civil rights controversy" in distributing food and clothing and holding classes for Negroes and poor whites.

Hamilton said one of the big problems is combating the white Mississippians' "tremendous reaction against any outside aid."

INTEGRATION EXPECTED

Since the national council is urging Senate passage of the civil rights bill, its Mississippi functions are expected to be integrated.

"However, we're not trying to amalgamate the races in this program, or push voter registration or conduct sit-ins," Hamilton said. "In the long run, I'm sure there will be clashes and we're going to get involved in civil rights situations," he added.

"We'll be forced into taking a stand in Mississippi," Hamilton said, "and our field leaders will have to decide what to do."

DATE NOT YET SET

The delta project is being organized by the council's division of home missions in New York City. No date for its start has been set. If successful, it will spread to other areas in the South where there is "abject poverty," Hamilton said.

The first step will be straight relief, providing food and clothing to the poor. It largely will be financed and manned by the council, with help from the World Council of Churches.

"This won't solve the racial problem in the South," Hamilton admitted. "But we believe it will help relieve other conditions which aggravate the racial problem."

The council apparently isn't worried about demands by Senator Strom Thurmond, of South Carolina, that its exemption from Federal taxes be cut off for "illegal lobbying" for the civil rights bill.

TOUGH ROW TO HOE

"That's a mighty tough row for him (Thurmond) to hoe," Hamilton said. The council spokesman pointed out that the Internal Revenue Service has refused to define "substantial" lobbying that would cause a church or nonprofit group to lose the exemption.

In demanding the action last week, Thurmond placed in the Congressional Record a February 5 council letter calling for a barrage of telegrams, telephone calls, and letters to Congressmen, State delegations, to visit Washington in behalf of the bill and clergymen to take part in the round-the-clock church services in Washington during the expected Senate filibuster.

[From the Jackson Daily News, June 22, 1964]

Army Invasion of State Seen: Senators Say Youth Influx Paving Way

(By Frank Van Der Linden)

Washington.—Some southern Senators see pressure being deliberately built up to make President Johnson send Federal troops into Mississippi this summer to protect the racially mixed student groups which are moving into the State for the announced purpose of feeding, teaching, and registering Negro voters.

Senator Richard B. Russell of Georgia charges that the "burgeoning bureaucracy" in Washington "is already planning an organizing invasion after invasion of the South, preceded by thousands of young people who have been recruited in the greatest crusade since the children's crusade of the Middle Ages."

Senator John Stennis of Mississippi is appalled because ministers of the Gospel are joining with racial "agitators" to promote the "invasion" and demand Federal "protection" of the youngsters who are entering his State on their dangerous mission.

"By 'protection' I assume they want troops," Stennis said. He charged "the real aim of extreme Negro organizations is to secure the military occupation of Mississippi by Federal troops, and perhaps parts of Louisiana and Alabama, too.

Stennis cited Newspaper Columnist Joseph Alsop who wrote in the Washington Post that "the real aim of extreme Negro organizations is to secure the military occupation of Mississippi by Federal troops."

Stennis said he had appealed to President Johnson and Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy "for a word of discouragement and warning" to these agitators to stay out of Mississippi, "but as far as I know, no such word has been given out."

Stennis said a minister who conducted a television program in Washington, promoting the Mississippi movement, "did not even try to conceal his glee and enthusiasm that a State of this Union was to be invaded this summer like it was some foreign country and we were in the midst of all-out war."

The National Council of Churches is raising $260,000 for the "ministry of social redevelopment" among the Negroes in the delta area of Mississippi.

NCC agents are to develop indigenous centers in each county, to help the natives learn to read, train for better jobs outside the cotton fields, and improve their status in employment, welfare, housing, education, and legal matters.

"The staff will be inter-racial and multidisciplined," the NCC instructions state. "Preliminary planning includes a project director and staff of persons for each of 15 counties." The NCC intends to pay 60 percent of the $260,000 expense and the other 40 percent is coming from the World Council of Churches.

MORALS WARNING

About 700 student volunteers, including many white youngsters from northern colleges, have been indoctrinated at Western College for Women at Oxford, Ohio. Negro instructors have warned them to prepare for arrests and possible physical violence and jail terms in Mississippi.

The students have also been warned to keep their private lives "really private," because the Mississippi authorities would dearly love to catch the inter-racial "invaders" on morals charges of one kind or another.

The Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee (SNICK) is leading the drive, with the aid of the NC, NAACP, CORE, Dr. Martin Luther King's Southern Christian Leadership Conference, and the National Lawyers Guild.

"These groups of agitators and zealots are openly proclaiming their intention of going into Mississippi, and some parts of Alabama and Louisiana, and creating civil rights disturbances," Stennis said.

"These civil rights groups and other pressure groups have had the limelight for more than a year now. They will not voluntarily give it up. With their marches and demonstrations, many of which were unlawful, and with their threats and political blackmail, they have frightened the people of the Nation and have pushed the Congress and the President to the extreme." The net result is the civil rights bill, passed by both Houses of Congress. Now, said Stennis, "they will want more fields to conquer."

The Mississippian recalled that last year, the late President Kennedy ordered 3,000 Federal troops to Birmingham despite Alabama officials' assurances that they could handle the disturbances. Stennis said the "agitators" are moving into his State to repeat the pattern. When the law officers put down the riots, there will be appeals to Washington for "Federal intervention," and eventually more troops.

[From the Greenville (S.C.) News, July 5, 1964]

Roles for Actors in "The Mississippi Tragedy" Were Written Months Ago

(By Frank Van Der Linden)

Washington.—The actors in the tragedy in Mississippi are playing parts actually written for them months ago, by Negro leaders and their white allies who want Federal Armed Forces to occupy the South.

One of the chief instigators of the project to send racially-mixed groups of college students into Mississippi, in an open challenge to its segregated society, is a Negro in his twenties named John Lewis.

Lewis is national chairman of the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee, a 1963 graduate of Fisk University at Nashville, Tenn., and one of the top-ranking leaders of the "March on Washington" last August.

The Catholic Archbishop of Washington threatened to withdraw from the "march" program at the Lincoln Memorial until the strongest passages were cut out of Lewis' prepared speech. These sentences finally were deleted from the Lewis diatribe:

"We will march through the South, through the heart of Dixie, the way Sherman did. We shall pursue our own 'scorched earth' policy and burn Jim Crow to the ground—nonviolently."

(Lewis always hastens to add "nonviolently" to his most violent gasconades.)

Lewis went even further in a speech February 20 of this year at a "freedom rally" in Nashville. He called for action ("nonviolent," of course) that "would turn this Southland upside down" to rid it of "the evil of segregation."

He predicted that this summer would bring "an aggressive, nonviolent march through the South—through the heart of Dixie—to make it clear that we want to be free now."

He urged "those of us involved in the freedom fight to bring about confrontations between the Federal Government and the State governments of the South."

A "confrontation" is exactly what is taking place now as President Johnson is being high pressured to send Federal marshals or troops or both into Mississippi.

Last March 24—3 months ago—the Nashville Banner quoted an official of the National Council of Churches as predicting "there will be clashes" between Negroes and whites during the NCC's integrated antipoverty program in Mississippi this summer.

James A. Hamilton, associate director of the NCC's Washington office, said "we can't avoid some civil rights controversy" in combating the white Mississippians' "tremendous reaction against any outside aid."

Hamilton has proved as perceptive a prophet as Lewis. They predicted violence when the students moved into Mississippi, and presto—violence resulted.

The National Council of Churches budgeted $260,000 for its "ministry of social redevelopment" for the announced purpose of feeding, teaching, and registering Negro voters in Mississippi. The NCC offered to pay 60 percent and the World Council of Churches is supplying the other 40 percent.

Cosponsors of the students' Mississippi invasion include John Lewis' SNICK, the NAACP, CORE, the National Lawyers Guild, and Dr. Martin Luther King's Southern Christian Leadership Conference.

Now SNICK is running big display ads in New York newspapers soliciting more money and urging the public: "Don't let the summer workers struggle alone on the front lines of freedom."

SNICK calls for these three actions immediately:

"1. Wire your Congressman and your Senator, asking them to urge that the administration act under existing statutes to provide Federal protection for civil rights workers.

"2. Wire President Johnson asking that he assert his moral authority with a public declaration that further abuse of human rights and due process will not be tolerated. (There is a special low rate for telegram 'opinion messages.')

"3. Support the Mississippi summer project. It needs funds for books, medicines, and other supplies; for maintenance and legal aid. Send as much as you can and send it as fast as you can."

This sounds like a switch on the old gag: "Keep Mississippi Green. Send Money."

At long last, some of the self-styled liberal columnists who have so long championed racial integration are beginning to see the real aims of the agitators.

Joseph Alsop has discovered that "Provoking the military occupation of Mississippi and other recalcitrant regions of the South is, in fact, the avowed aim of John Lewis," the SNICK chief. That is what Mississippi Senator John Stennis has been but Stennis has been getting no response from his pleas to the President to call off the students' invasion for the sake of their own safety.

"It is a dreadful thing to say," Alsop adds, but "the organizers who sent these young people into Mississippi must have wanted, even hoped for, martyrs."

Marquis Childs discovers that those involved in the Mississippi project include not only the "religious-idealistic" students, and the "tough-minded civil rights leaders" who want a showdown that will "bring Federal intervention," but also "a few extreme leftists, close or once close to the Communist orbit, for whom a bloody conflict would be proof of the failure of American society."

The columnist stops short of naming these "leftists," but he might look at the list of speakers at the Western College for Women at Oxford, Ohio, where the students were trained for the "invasion."

One speaker was Bayard Rustin, organizer of the March on Washington, admitted former member of the Young Communist League, who served a 3-year prison term for defying the draft in World War II, later led ban-the-bomb marches in London and for 5 years was the secretary of Dr. Martin Luther King.

Senator Strom Thurmond, Democrat, of South Carolina, exposed Rustin's unsavory record in a Senate speech last summer, fully documented in the Congressional Record.

VIOLATION OF CIVIL RIGHTS ACT BY AN INSPECTOR OF NAVAL MATERIAL

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on last Friday, July 3, I stated to the press that it had come to my attention that an inspector of naval material, of the Department of Navy, was directing a Navy contractor to discriminate in employment against white people. At the same time, I released to the press a copy of a letter written by the industrial employment policy specialist of the Office of the Inspector of Naval Material. The names of the individuals and companies involved were omitted from the letter, for their protection.

Mr. President, according to the newspapers, the naval officer in Pittsburgh has denied that such orders were given. In order that there may be no mistake about this matter, I request unanimous consent that my statement to the press of July 3, a copy of the letter from the Office of the Inspector of Naval Material to the company in question, with the names omitted, and an Associated Press news article from the July 7 issue of the Greenville News, of Greenville, S.C., reporting that the naval officer in Pittsburgh denied knowledge of this matter, be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks. Mr. President, the direction from the Department of the Navy to the contractor speaks for itself.

There being no objection, the statement, letter, and article were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement by Senator Strom Thurmond on Violation of the Civil Rights Act of 1964

On the day following passage of the so-called Civil Rights Act of 1964, I have discovered a major violation of this act being committed at the instance and by the direction of the U.S. Government itself.

It has come to my attention that the inspector of naval material of the Department of Navy in Pittsburgh, Pa., has directed a company doing business with the Navy to discriminate against white persons by hiring only Negroes. In a recent letter of instructions to the company, the inspector of naval material directed the company to contact various NAACP representatives and a representative of the Urban League to fill vacancies and also to fill vacancies, and I quote from the letter of instructions to the company, "by contacting other companies who have employees on layoff and requesting Negro applicants for all vacancies."

This letter of instructions directing the company to request Negro applicants for all vacancies is in direct conflict with section 703(a) of title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, signed by the President yesterday.

The President, on signing this bill, stated that this law did not give preference to any race. That statement is also in direct conflict with the action of the inspector of naval material.

The direction by the Navy to one of its contractors to contact the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and the Urban League to fill employment vacancies is an abominable practice which indicates beyond any doubt that it is the intention of the Government to give preference to Negroes in employment and that the Government is not interested in equal employment opportunities, but rather in giving preferential treatment to Negroes in order to obtain the political benefits of the Negro bloc vote.

It is equally abominable for the administration to use the Armed Forces of the United States as an instrument for carrying out this un-American activity which has nothing whatever to do with the principal mission of the Armed Forces—to defend the United States of America.

I am releasing a copy of the directions from the Navy to the company, after having removed the names of individuals and corporations involved in order to protect those who would suffer retaliation as a result of the release of this information.

Department of the Navy,
Inspector of Naval Material,
Pittsburgh, Pa.

This letter will confirm the proceedings of the summary conference held with you and Mr. ——— on the completion of the recent special compliance review of your facility.

On that occasion you were advised that, in the course of the review, certain deficiencies in your equal employment opportunity program were found. As a result of the discussion of those deficiencies, it was agreed that you would take the following actions:

1. The contractor will distribute a copy of the company's policy on equal employment opportunity to all employees within 30 days.

2. The contractor will establish a more formal procedure internally to inform supervisors periodically on the equal employment opportunity policy.

3. The contractor will expand and intensify recruitment efforts in minority group areas in the following manner. Contact these sources even though the contractor uses past applications on file. Use all of these sources.

(a) By making greater use of the Pennsylvania State Employment Service for all vacancies.

(1) For ——— contact Mrs. ——— Bureau of Employment Security, Pennsylvania State Employment Service, ———, Pa. Telephone: ———.

(2) For ——— plant and any recruiting for the ——— plant done in the Pittsburgh area, contact Mr. ———, manager, professional and clerical office, Bureau of Employment Security, Pennsylvania State Employment Service, ———, Pa., telephone: ———. Manager, trades and industrial office, Bureau

of Employment Security, Pennsylvania State Employment Service, ——— Pittsburgh, Pa. 15222. Telephone: ———.

(b) By contacting Mr. ———, Pa. ——— Telephone ——— NAACP representative for all vacancies for the ——— plant if any recruiting is done for the ——— plant from the ——— area.

(c) By contacting Mr. ——— Urban League of all vacancies for the ——— plant and the ——— plant if any recruiting is done for the ——— plant in the ——— area.

(d) By contacting Mr. ———, Pa., telephone ———, local NAACP representative, for all vacancies at the ——— plant.

(e) By contacting Mr. ———, Pa., telephone ———, local NAACP representative, for all vacancies at the ——— plant.

(f) By contacting other companies who have employees on layoff and requesting Negro applicants for all vacancies.

4. The contractor will establish a feedback system reporting monthly listing the number of job openings during the period covered in the report, the number of applicants for each position, by race, the name and race of the person selected in each case, together with the reasons for selection, the list of promotions by race.

5. Notify all recruitment sources in writing of the company policy on equal employment opportunity within 30 days.

6. Post additional equal employment opportunity posters (some needed at the ——— plant), a copy of the company policy on equal employment opportunity and a copy of the standard form 38 on bulletin boards, and in the employment office if not already posted in each of these places.

7. Send a letter to the local unions requesting acknowledgment of the standard form 38 that was sent to them earlier in both the ——— and ——— plants.

8. The contractor will notify the inspector of naval material (Attn: Mr. ———, industrial employment policy specialist), 401 Old Post Office Building, Pittsburgh, Pa., 15219, of any staffing up of employees outside of the union recall list.

9. Give each applicant an opportunity to fill out an application form and keep those forms on file for 1 year. Consider all applicants. This time limit is subject to a corporate level conference to establish uniformity of practices.

10. In the future, submit standard form 40 separately for the plant and the ——— plant.

11. The contractor will forward, within 30 days, 2 copies of the following to the inspector of naval material (Attn: Mr. ———, industrial employment policy specialist) address as above:

(a) The contractor's policy state on equal employment opportunity.

(b) Information as to the degree of dissemination.

(c) Copies of the letters to recruitment sources.

(d) Information as to the compliance with the other recommendations.

12. The contractor will send a monthly report notifying the inspector of naval material (Attn: Mr. ———, industrial employment policy specialist), address as above, of the results of the tabulations made as related to paragraph 4.

If I can be of any assistance to you in the performance of these actions, please do not hesitate to call upon me. I shall look forward to hearing from you with regard to the success of your efforts.

Sincerely yours,

——— ———,
Industrial Employment Policy Specialist
(By direction of Inspector of Naval Material).

[From the Greenville (S.C.) News, July 7, 1964]

Prefer To Hire Negroes: Naval Officer "Amazed" at Thurmond's Claims

Pittsburgh.—A Navy captain said Monday he knows of no Government orders that would require defense contractors in the Pittsburgh area to hire Negroes in preference to white persons.

Capt. T. G. Doyle, administrator of the Defense Contract Administration service region in Pittsburgh, made the statement in reply to Senator Strom Thurmond, Democrat, of South Carolina.

Thurmond said last Friday he had been advised that an inspector of naval material at Pittsburgh issued instructions to a naval contractor "to discriminate against white persons by hiring only Negroes" and to contact Negro organizations in filling job vacancies.

"I have no idea where he [Thurmond] got his information," said Doyle. "It surprises me. It amazes me."

"We have no such instructions," he said. "No such instructions, to my knowledge, have ever been given."

"The Navy," Doyle said, "is interested in seeing that the Negro is given equal opportunity for work if he is qualified, but I know of no directive that he must be hired in preference to a white person."

THE REAPPORTIONMENT OF STATE SENATES

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, just as any woman reserves her right to change her mind, the same may evidently be said for the Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court. In 1948, Mr. Warren, as Governor of California, had one view on reapportionment of State senates on a population basis and in 1964 quite another as Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court.

The July 2 issue of the Washington Daily News makes a point of this inconsistency in Mr. Warren's stand on reapportionment of State senates and expresses a conclusion that I believe to be the correct constitutional view of this matter as well as reflecting the overwhelming consensus of American opinion.

I also call attention, Mr. President, to another outstanding editorial in the Chicago Tribune in its July 1 issue which makes this same point. The New York Daily News in its July 1 issue has also taken a very strong stand against the Warren ruling in the recent reapportionment decision.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that these three editorials be printed in the Record following these remarks.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, July 1, 1964]

Now the Trouble Starts

And the good Lord alone knows how or when it will end.

We're speaking of the trouble stirred up by the Earl Warren Supreme Court's decree that both houses of State legislatures henceforth must be apportioned according to population.

Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller, moving with very deliberate speed to obey this command, announces that he will shortly appoint a special committee to find out how best to redistrict the State.

At least 10 complicated questions will have to be hashed over by this group before a special session of the legislature can produce an informed and intelligent reapportionment.

Then, too, Suffolk County (eastern Long Island), fearing a court ruling a la Earl Warren that would tip the balance of political power to the county's five big western towns, is thinking of splitting into two counties, like an ameba.

Where all this comes out, no one can foresee.

You can foresee something else, though, with the naked eye; namely, that if Congress or the State legislatures, or both, don't clamp some hobbles on the U.S. Supreme Court, a judicial dictatorship in this country is only a matter of time.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, July 2, 1964]

What Warren Said in 1948

The U.S. News & World Report has dug up a speech Earl Warren gave in 1948, when he was Governor of California, directly opposing the views he and a majority of the Supreme Court has just written into law in the highly controversial State legislature reapportionment cases.

At the time, when Mr. Warren also was the Republican nominee for Vice President, California was considering a proposal to apportion the State senate by population, the procedure which the Warren Court majority ruled on June 15 of this year must be followed throughout the country.

Said Governor Warren on October 29, 1948, at Merced, Calif., according to U.S. News & World Report:

"Many California counties are far more important in the life of the State than their population bears to the entire population of the State. It is for this reason that I have never been in favor of restricting the representation in the senate to a strictly population basis.

"It is the same reason that the Founding Fathers of our country gave balanced representation to the States of the Union—equal representation in one House and proportionate representation based on population in the other.

"Moves have been made to upset the balanced representation in our State, even though it served us well and is strictly in accord with American tradition and the pattern of our National Government.

"There was a time when California was completely dominated by boss rule. The liberal election laws and legislative reapportionment of the system have liberated us from such domination. Any weakening of the laws would invite a return to boss rule, which we are now happily rid of.

"Our State has made almost unbelievable progress under our present system of legislative representation. I believe we should keep it."

Governor Warren's views of 1948 made good sense, in our opinion, and still do, the 1964 U.S. Supreme Court decision to the contrary notwithstanding.

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Tribune, June 10, 1964]

Warren Versus Warren

Chief Justice Earl Warren reversed himself in the recent decision of the U.S. Supreme Court that both houses of State legislatures must be apportioned according to population.

Sixteen years ago, when he was Governor of California, a proposal was made to reapportion State senate seats, reducing representation of the 50 agricultural counties. Mr. Warren attacked the proposal in the following statement:

"Many California counties are far more important in the life of the State than their population bears to the entire population of the State. It is for this reason that I have never been in favor of restricting their representation in the senate to a strictly population basis.

"It is for the same reason that the Founding Fathers of our country gave balanced representation to the States of the Union, equal representation in one House and proportionate representation in the other. Moves have been made to upset the balanced representation of our State, even though it has served us well and is strictly in accord with American tradition and the pattern of our National Government.

"There was a time when California was completely dominated by boss rule. The liberal election laws and legislative reapportionment of the system have liberated us from such domination. Any weakening of the laws would invite a return to boss rule which we are now happily rid of. Our State has made almost unbelievable progress under our present system of legislative representation. I believe we should keep it."

Chief Justice Warren has now overruled the opinion of former Governor Warren. In the recent majority opinion of the Supreme Court, which he wrote, he specifically rejected the concept that States ought to be able to follow the Federal pattern of having one house based on population and the other on geographical considerations.

"We * * * find the Federal analogy inapposite and irrelevant to State legislative districting schemes," said the Chief Justice. "* * * The Founding Fathers clearly had no intention of establishing a pattern or model for the apportionment of seats in State legislatures when the system of representation in the Federal Congress was adopted."

Wonder what the Founding Fathers would think about the conflicting opinions attributed to them by the same man? Wonder if they had in mind the creation of a court which could overturn the legislative system of most of the States?

It is interesting to note that in his 1948 opinion, Mr. Warren saw the danger of a return to boss rule in California if a reapportionment gave control of both houses of the legislature to the metropolitan counties of the State. Now he evidently sees no such danger, or he does not fear it.

A good many people in California and other populous States may think his 1948 opinion came closer to commonsense and to the realities of political life.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, in accordance with a resolution which I introduced in the Senate in 1959, the President of the United States recently designated the third week in July as Captive Nations Week. Thus, next week, Americans across the country and overseas will be especially mindful of the people in bondage behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains. As we all know, these captive people in Eastern Europe, southeast Asia, Cuba, and other countries do not enjoy the material and intangible blessings which our Government provides and safeguards for us. In the captive nations, the rightful fruit of the laborer does not accrue to him—it goes to his captors; the laws and rights which are rightfully all mankind's are not his—Communist satellite constitutions are no living reality and are therefore a cruel joke; even the right to rejoice in his unique national heritage is denied—instead he must parrot and praise the cultural dogma of his captors. Although these people have not lost their inner dedication to the ideals cherished by their forefathers and by free men everywhere, they are, in every sense of the word, captive people. Next week we will reaffirm our fundamental belief that no man should be, in any sense of the word, captive.

Since World War II we have witnessed startling changes in the world of nations. From one corner of the globe to the other, leaving no nation untouched, the Communists have struck and are striking at free nations who are too weak to defend themselves or who allow their guard to lower. Using well-refined and practiced techniques of military action, political subversion, and personal intimidation, the Communist world extended its control over the once-free nations of Eastern Europe. In 1940 the Soviets swept into the Baltic states of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, instigating a vicious reign of terror during which thousands of freedom-loving people were forcibly deported to Siberia. The incorporation of these Baltic nations has never been recognized by the U.S. Government, and we will never abandon our hope that the people of these brave little states will one day again be free.

In the last stages of the war in Europe, the Russian troops closed the people of Czechoslovakia, Poland, Yugoslavia, Hungary, Bulgaria, Rumania and others behind the Iron Curtain of communism. In 1964 the people of these once-free nations are still deprived of their basic right to a government of their own free choice. They are still denied freedom of speech and press, freedom of religion, freedom to travel, free choice of employment. They are still taught party doctrine, and in 20 years it has not extinguished their love of liberty.

Right now the even more belligerent Chinese communism threatens to engulf southeast Asia and place the free countries of South Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos under direct Communist control. This threatened engulfment, in addition to the loss of Cuba to the other world, has occurred since we first observed Captive Nations Week 5 short years ago. In the new worlds of Asia and Africa the very survival of freedom is threatened. Shall these young countries, having thrown off the shackles of their colonial masters and having breathed the heady air of freedom now unwittingly put on the chains of communism and also become captive nations? The United States will continue, I am sure, her policy of helping and welcoming these young nations into their rightful world, the world of responsibility in freedom.

CONCLUSION

The greatness of the United States is founded upon the talents of people of the most diverse racial, religious, and national backgrounds. American citizens who have come from the now captive nations have contributed their labor and their skills, and have made an inestimable cultural contribution to our country throughout our growth. The combined heritages of the captive nations are part of our heritage. Each year Captive Nations Week renews our spiritual ties to the peoples of Eastern and Central Europe. Each year renews our concern for the well-being of all captive peoples.

Our goal of freedom for the captive nations has at times seemed remote. Yet if other free countries join with the United States in pressing for action to aid the captive people, freedom for them may not be so distant a goal. We must continue to work, in any way we can, toward the end of gaining freedom, government under just laws, and national self-fulfillment for the peoples of the world. We can have no finer goal.

URBAN RENEWAL

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I apologize for again addressing the chair, but I overlooked one item which I wish to have printed in the RECORD.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article—which appeared in the Wall Street Journal on June 16, 1964—entitled "Urban Renewal Aids Set To Refurbish Many Historic U.S. Spots."

This article, coming as it does, from the Wall Street Journal, I believe goes at least part way in refuting the quite unjustified criticisms which have been made in recent days, both in Congress and out of Congress, with respect to the conduct of the administration of the urban renewal program, an administration which I strongly support.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

URBAN RENEWAL AIDS SET TO REFURBISH MANY HISTORIC U.S. SPOTS: PRESERVATION PLAN TO RESTORE A GOLD-RUSH TOWN, UNCLUTTER PLYMOUTH'S VIEW OF ITS ROCK

(By Richard F. Janssen)

WASHINGTON.—The Government's Urban Renewal Administration is turning its attention to such historic spots as Plymouth Rock on the Massachusetts shore, a tavern patronized by George Washington in York, Pa., and the gold-rush town of Jacksonville, Oreg.

Despite its basic approach of bulldozing down blighted neighborhoods to make way for new construction, however, the Federal agency isn't aiming to flatten everything on the hallowed ground. To the contrary, amid certain demolition projects, it's promoting "historic preservation."

Partly in response to mounting criticism, the agency is increasingly encouraging local authorities to spare historic buildings that often dot aging areas tagged for clearance, and is providing funds that are used to acquire them. Usually, local agencies buy the property and clear most of it, then resell to private or public bodies for redevelopment.

That's what's happening in Plymouth, Mass., the place where the Pilgrims landed. With help from a $1.5 million Federal grant, Plymouth is clearing many blighted buildings from a 31-acre area and will redevelop some of the land to provide a park overlooking the Plymouth Rock National Monument. The plan calls for saving about 15 residences "unique in the town's colonial heritage" and for freeing the view of the rock from the clutter now encroaching on it, officials say, as well as for private construction of apartment houses, stores, and a motel nearby.

GOLDEN PLOUGH TAVERN

The URA can focus funds just on a historic building or two even if they're not part of a more sweeping renewal program. That is what it did in York, Pa., where one of the Nation's smallest urban renewal projects was dedicated early this month. Covering only four-tenths of an acre, the project was designed to remove all 12 shabby buildings from the site, except 2 which dated from before the American Revolution. Those two, the former headquarters of Gen. Horatio Gates and the Golden Plough Tavern, where George Washington and General Lafayette were entertained, were restored by a local nonprofit group and the cleared land was turned into a tourist parking lot.

An effort to restore a whole business district to its appearance of about 100 years ago will be undertaken with the help of a $37,872 grant recently approved for Jacksonville, Oreg. A few buildings will be demolished to preserve "the historical value of the area," the URA says, but most will eventually be rehabilitated to look as they did when Jacksonville, a town of 1,172, was "one of first gold-rush towns in the old Oregon Territory."

Starting with strong encouragement from the late President Kennedy, the agency has aided about 30 preservation projects across the Nation in the last few years. About half of these, which eventually will involve about $16 million of Federal funds, have been helped just in the last year or so.

Putting fresh emphasis on the activity, Urban Renewal Commissioner William L. Slayton has dispatched a letter to some 1,500 local agencies declaring that "historic preservation is a genuine concern of the present administration and of the URA," and pledging "all possible support" to preservation.

To help prevent local agencies from inadvertently demolishing a building worth saving, he sent them all a National Park Service roster of some 450 officially designated historic landmarks, ranging from such an obvious one as the White House to Elfreth's Alley, a narrow street of old residences on the Philadelphia waterfront. He also referred them to a list of some 10,000 historic buildings that the Library of Congress keeps. The Park Service's local offices have been alerted to advise renewal authorities in their communities, too.

SOME PRODDING NEEDED

The URA hasn't always been so sensitive to cultural considerations, officials readily admit, and allow that prodding from such groups as the National Trust for Historic Preservation has led to their new awareness of these values. "I'm sure urban renewal has been responsible for destruction of some historic buildings," Mr. Slayton says, but adds many people wrongly assume that the wrecking of any cherished landmark is under the URA's auspices. Many of the episodes arousing the hottest public debate, such as the junking of New York City's Pennsylvania Station, don't involve the URA, officials say.

Among the buildings leveled by urban renewal, it's difficult to cite any that are clearly historic, says Robert Garvey, the National Trust's executive director. But he contends that in Chicago and Pittsburgh the program has destroyed neighborhoods with at least some "distinguished and useful" buildings that should have been retained. The new preservation effort is "excellent," Mr. Garvey adds.

The money the URA channels into preservation isn't large by Government standards, or even in terms of its spending of around $700 million a year. At present, the URA can't provide funds for the actual restoration of rundown historic buildings, which is up to local governments and civic groups, but several bills have been introduced in Congress to allow this. The agency hasn't taken a stand on them; officials aren't sure they want to get entangled in local disputes over whether a particular structure is worth saving or is only an old eyesore.

Greater numbers of valuable old buildings will be rescued from the wreckers as local groups find more "economic" uses for them, Mr. Slayton predicts, and an aid adds, "After all, there must be a limit to how many museums you can have."

A prime example of usefully integrating old buildings into new projects, officials say, is provided in the Southwest redevelopment area in Washington. Within sight of the Potomac River and the Capitol dome, a complex of modern luxury apartments is rising on land cleared from long-decaying slums. The local planning agency required that the developers retain four old structures, which they say they're glad to have.

"It's a conversation piece," says Ralph Edwards, resident manager of the Tiber Island apartment project, referring to the elegant four-level "Law" house occupied by Martha Washington's granddaughter, Elizabeth Parke Custis, in 1796. Refurbished at a cost approaching $100,000, it will serve as a party center for residents of the new buildings. Renewal officials are particularly pleased that the old structures don't appear to be "overpowered" by taller new ones, since they're carefully separated from them by courtyards and new townhouses of similar height.

This gentler approach is starting to give urban renewal "a new dimension," Mr. Slayton asserts, involving preservation of entire neighborhoods that have distinctive period architecture even if they weren't the site of recognized historic events. The agency is willing to take a broad enough view of historical value to aid in preserving streets of "wonderful Victorian" character, he says. In San Francisco, for instance, it endorses an expressed aim of local planners to "escape the drab results of sweeping the slate clean" by keeping many ornately detailed old dwellings mixed in among more clean-lined new ones.

Aside from its ventures associated with city slums, the URA also operates an "open space land program" which lets it chip in on acquiring "lands and buildings of historical value for public purposes." Thus, it is providing $450,000 of the $1.5 million New Jersey is using to acquire 1,350 acres of the Monmouth Battlefield of Revolutionary War renown. Most of this scene of Molly Pitcher's water-carrying, gunswabbing activities will be held intact in its present farm and orchard usage, with a small historical park to be developed around an existing monument. Other grants are going to rebuild a fort near Minneapolis started by the Lewis and Clark Expedition and to help Fremont, Calif., build a park around the State's first flour mill.

BEEF AND VEAL IMPORTS

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, on several occasions during recent months I have called to the attention of the Senate the critical condition of our domestic livestock market, with particular reference to beef and veal prices. The Secretary of Agriculture, in his testimony to the House Committee on Ways and Means on June 4, 1964, very vividly illustrated the seriousness of this situation when he stated:

> Changes in the cattle industry during the last 18 months are having serious adverse effects on a broad sector of American agriculture and on the entire economy. Prices of Choice fed steers at Chicago dropped from an average of $27.67 per hundredweight in 1962, to just under $24 in 1963, and to less than $21 in the spring of this year.

Mr. President, no industry or segment of an industry can experience such a tremendous drop in the market price of its product without being very seriously affected.

The President is to be commended for the attention he has devoted to this matter and for his instruction to the Department of Agriculture to establish as a matter of high priority such actions and programs as may be necessary to bring relief to our domestic producers. The increased purchases of beef for schools and needy persons, the increased purchases by the Department of Defense, and promotional efforts to increase domestic consumption and increase exports, will have some beneficial effect on our domestic prices. I hope the administration will continue these efforts.

Contrary to the position of the Secretary, however, I am confident that the substantial increase of beef and veal imports has been a significant factor in the reduction of prices on our market. While there are other factors involved, certainly more than a negligible effect can be attributed to an increase in imports of 3.9 percent of domestic consumption in 1957 to a 10.7 percent increase in 1963. This increase of almost 300 percent has had a cumulative effect on the other factors involved, and I believe this Nation must take action to protect its markets against the unfair competitive position of foreign producers.

The recent agreements which we have entered into with Australia, New Zealand, Mexico, and Ireland, limiting 1964 imports to the average level of imports in 1962 and 1963, clearly will not be effective in reducing these imports to the level necessary to alleviate the problem. The level of imports reached an alltime high during 1962–63, so it is quite clear that these agreements do not grant any real relief whatsoever; all they do is to freeze imports at their highest peak plus providing an automatic annual increase based on the growth of our domestic market.

I believe it is incumbent on the Congress, Mr. President, to take immediate action to establish a realistic quota on the importation of these beef and veal products. The Senate Committee on Finance last week reported H.R. 1839 with an amendment to provide a specific limitation on the quantity of such items which may be imported into this country. I understand that the limitations contained in this bill are based on the average annual level of imports during the past 5 years. In my opinion this is a much more realistic approach than that taken by the administration in entering agreements limiting imports to the level of 1962–63. This measure should be considered by the Senate promptly and I urge all Members of the Senate to give it their closest attention and support. Only by the passage of such legislation will the cattlemen and the economy of the Nation be given the protection which is necessary.

The bill reported by the committee is known as the Mansfield bill, and contains modifications made by the committee. I hope it will soon be taken up for consideration by the Senate.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, for the consideration of nominations reported today.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

REQUEST BY PRESIDENT FOR WITHDRAWAL OF TREATIES FROM THE SENATE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in his message to the Senate on June 8, the President of the United States asked for the withdrawal of three treaties from consideration of the Senate. These treaties are the agreement between the United States of America and India for the avoidance of double taxation with respect to taxes on income, signed at Washington on November 10, 1959—Executive H, 86th Congress, 2d session—the convention between the United States of America and Israel for the avoidance of double taxation of income and for the encouragement of international trade and investment, signed at Washington on September 30, 1960—Executive B, 87th Congress, 1st session—and the Convention between the United States of America and the United Arab Republic for the avoidance of double taxation of income, the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on income, and the elimination of obstacles to international trade and investment, signed at Washington on December 21, 1960—Executive A, 87th Congress, 1st session.

It is understood these treaties will be renegotiated by the United States with the three nations.

I find that a resolution of the Senate is necessary to instruct the Secretary of the Senate to make a return of these treaties to the President. Accordingly, I submit a resolution, and ask unanimous consent that it be immediately considered.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be, and is hereby, directed to return to the President of the United States, in accordance with his request, the following treaties:

1. Agreement between the United States of America and India for the avoidance of double taxation with respect to taxes on income, signed at Washington on November 10, 1959 (Executive H, Eighty-sixth Congress, second session).
2. Convention between the United States of America and Israel for the avoidance of double taxation of income and for the encouragement of international trade and investment, signed at Washington on September 30, 1960 (Executive B, Eighty-seventh Congress, first session).
3. Convention between the United States of America and the United Arab Republic for the avoidance of double taxation of income, the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on income, and the elimination of obstacles to international trade and investment, signed at Washington on December 21, 1960 (Executive A, Eighty-seventh Congress, first session).

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Commerce:

Frederick W. Ford, of West Virginia, to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission;

George Henry Hearn, of New York, to be a Federal Maritime Commissioner;

Capt. Charles P. Murphy, and Capt. Joseph R. Scullion, for promotion to the grade of rear admiral in the Coast Guard;

Rear Adm. William D. Shields, U.S. Coast Guard, to be Assistant Commandant of the U.S. Coast Guard, with the rank of vice admiral;

Jimmie D. Woods, of the permanent commissioned teaching staff of the Coast Guard Academy, for promotion to the grade of lieutenant commander; and

Don A. Jones, and sundry other persons, for permanent appointment in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

By Mr. HUMPHREY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Mercer Cook, of Illinois, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Republic of Senegal;

Randolph A. Kidder, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Kingdom of Cambodia;

Robert J. Ryan of Massachusetts, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Republic of Niger;

Clinton E. Knox, of New York, a Foreign Service officer of class 2, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Republic of Dahomey;

Franklin H. Williams, of California, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations;

Dorothy B. Chandler, of California, to be a member of the U.S. Advisory Commission on Information; and

Frank Stanton, of New York, to be a member of the U.S. Advisory Commission on Information.

U.S. ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INFORMATION

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the nominations to the U.S. Advisory Commission on Information.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Dorothy B. Chandler, of California, to be a member of the U.S. Advisory Commission on Information.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Dr. Frank Stanton to be Chairman of the U.S. Advisory Commission on Information.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, as the Senate considers the nomination of Dr. Frank Stanton to be Chairman of the U.S. Advisory Commission on Information, there are a few comments I would like to make for the RECORD.

I have known Dr. Frank Stanton for more than 25 years; and during that period he has proved to be an outstanding leader with foresight and determination and courage. His statesmanship has been demonstrated on many occasions. His willingness to meet problems head on and his ability to analyze and articulate on the most complex issues has won him the respect of all those in and out of Government.

I know that he brings to this challenging assignment in the U.S. Advisory Commission on Information, a skill and experience which will enhance the efficiency and efficacy of the organization that he will advise.

To recite the total accomplishments and honors of Dr. Frank Stanton would take many pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It is sufficient to say that Frank Stanton joined CBS in 1935 and was elected president in 1946. Born in Muskegon, Mich., in 1908, he received a B.A. from Ohio Wesleyan University and a Ph. D. from Ohio State University.

Dr. Stanton is chairman of the Rand Corp., a trustee and former chairman of the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences, a member of the Business Council, trustee of the Rockefeller Foundation and the Carnegie Institution of Washington, and a director of the Lincoln Center for the Performing Arts. He is a fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, the American Psychological Association, American Association for the Advancement of Science, and Sigma Delta Chi.

In 1961, for his sustained effort to bring about the "Great Debates," he received the George Foster Peabody Award—and the congratulation of President Kennedy who commended "his role in making it possible for last year's TV debates to take place" and noted this "significant advance in American politics."

Last fall Dr. Stanton served as U.S. delegate to the Second United States-Japan Conference on Cultural and Educational Interchange, at which he delivered the keynote address.

This spring Dr. Stanton was awarded a fourth Peabody Award—in recognition of "his contribution to international understanding—farsighted vision, and understanding of the possibilities of electronic communications in a troubled world" for "Town Meeting of the World," a series of international television broadcasts which brought together by Telstar relay prominent statesmen in face-to-face discussions which were seen and heard on two continents simultaneously. He also received the Michael Friedsam Medal for his "significant contribution to a vastly wider appreciation of the place of the arts in the life of the Nation."

Dr. Stanton is the editor, with Dr. Paul F. Lazarsfeld, of "Radio Research, 1941"; "Radio Research, 1942–43"; and "Communications Research, 1948–49."

In my judgment, we are extremely fortunate to have a person of the stature, statesmanship, experience, and courage of Dr. Frank Stanton to take on this most important assignment. I urge the Senate to confirm his nomination.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Mercer Cook, of Illinois, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Republic of Senegal.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Randolph A. Kidder, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Kingdom of Cambodia.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Robert J. Ryan, of Massachusetts, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Republic of Niger.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Clinton E. Knox, of New York, a Foreign Service officer of class 2, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Republic of Dahomey.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Franklin H. Williams, of California, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Frederick W. Ford, of West Virginia, to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission for a term of 7 years from July 1, 1964.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of George Henry Hearn, of New York, to be a Federal Maritime Commissioner for the term expiring June 30, 1968.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

COAST GUARD

The legislative clerk read the nominations of Capt. Charles P. Murphy and Capt. Joseph R. Scullion for promotion to the grade of rear admiral in the Coast Guard.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Rear Adm. William D. Shields, U.S. Coast Guard, to be Assistant Commandant of the U.S. Coast Guard with the rank of vice admiral.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Jimmie D. Woods, of the permanent commissioned teaching staff of the Coast Guard Academy, for promotion to the grade of lieutenant commander.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read the nominations of Don A. Jones and sundry other persons for permanent appointment in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations in the Coast and Geodetic Survey will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith of the confirmation of all these nominations.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS BY MAYOR ARTHUR NAFTALIN, OF MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, we are living in an age when talk is cheap, when public figures are called upon constantly for speeches, and the very frequency and range of topics makes originality, insight, and memorable words rare virtues.

The speech that I am calling to the Senate's attention is one which, I believe, exemplifies these rare virtues. It is original; it is reflective; and, to me at least, it is memorable.

This is a speech by a dear friend and former associate of mine, Mayor Arthur Naftalin, of Minneapolis. The occasion for his remarks was the graduation ceremonies at Talladega College, in Alabama.

The theme of this speech is discovery—discovery of one's self, of the infinite richness of human experience, and of the opportunities and obligations of society—through recognition that no man is an island; and that a full life means movement, change, and growth.

There are some moments in history when the pace of discovery is especially dynamic and touches the life of every man, woman, and child. Such an age is an exciting time in which to live. There are inexhaustible physical and spatial vistas which excite the imagination and stimulate the intelligence of men. There are equally vast spiritual terrains to be explored. Our age is such an age, and among the revolutions we are witnessing is the renaissance of the American conscience.

The European Renaissance of the 14th through the 16th centuries ushered in new ways of seeing things. It was in essence a breakthrough in stereotyped thinking, because only too often our vision is circumscribed by our ideas. The Renaissance stripped away many of the preconceptions which had defined reality. In America, we are witnessing a similar burst of light; the indifference and complacency which obscured our vision of social injustice is being lifted. Statistics are being looked upon not as ciphers but as symbols of fellow human beings whose suffering and whose aspirations immediately concern us.

I have read and studied the speech carefully. It is one of the most moving, provocative speeches I have had the privilege of reading in many a year. It was written as a challenge for a graduating class; but it is a challenge equally valid for the coming "graduates" of the 88th Congress. We might do well to assess our own performance in light of its standards and ask ourselves whether we are still receptive to discoveries. While I intend to improve my score in this regard, there is one discovery for which I am prepared to claim partial credit, and that is the early recognition of the talent and ability of my fellow Minnesotan, Arthur Naftalin, mayor of Minneapolis, whom I was privileged to have as my secretary when I was mayor of that great city.

I ask unanimous consent that Mayor Naftalin's address be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The New Discovery of America

(Commencement address by Mayor Arthur Naftalin, city of Minneapolis)

President Long, members of the faculty, parents, friends, and members of the 1964 Talladega graduating class, it is a great honor for me to be with you this morning to participate in these impressive graduation ceremonies.

It is a special pleasure for Mrs. Naftalin and me to see your beautiful campus, to meet so many students and faculty members, and to share in the excitement of the commencement occasion.

It is especially pleasant to renew our old friendship with Dr. Herman Long, whom we first met almost 20 years ago when he came to my city of Minneapolis to help us undertake a self-survey of our practices and attitudes in the field of human relations.

Dr. Long came to Minneapolis at the invitation of our then mayor, Hubert Humphrey, and he helped us not only to launch the self-survey but also to advise us on the adoption of a municipal FEPC ordinance and on the establishment of a mayor's council on human relations.

Dr. Long was then a member of the faculty at Fisk University and I was secretary to Mayor Humphrey. We enjoyed a most productive relationship. As a result of those early efforts the city of Minneapolis was one of the first communities in the Nation to establish a municipal FEPC, and we have had continuously since that time an active mayor's commission on human relations, which just recently has been given status as an official city agency.

These efforts have helped the people of Minneapolis to discover—one might say rediscover—their community. We have by no means achieved a total solution to our problems of human relations, but we have moved steadily toward an enlarged understanding among all our citizens and toward the kind of mutual acceptance that is the essence of the democratic community.

Because of this long association with Herman Long, my appearance here today is touched with a bit of nostalgia and with a deep sense of appreciation. Today—this very morning—Mayor HUMPHREY, now Senator HUMPHREY—is delivering the commencement address at Fisk University and here I am with Herman Long to renew our friendship and to express to him my city's thanks for the help he gave us in that early period of concern and to thank him, in a broader sense, for what he has continued to do over the years in helping so many other communities of this Nation to discover themselves.

I speak today, on the occasion of your commencement, of the efforts my community and other communities are making toward the discovery and rediscovery of their communities. This, it seems to me, is the heart of the great struggle in which this Nation is now engaged. It is a struggle that is so appropriately linked to the commencement ceremony, for truly this Nation must act upon that stirring exhortation of the late President Kennedy, "Let us begin." For your commencement marks a special beginning in your individual lives and at a time when our Nation undertakes a vast new beginning in a movement that must and will achieve a great new era of equality, decency, and justice in our national life.

It is a struggle that is marked by turmoil and tension, and, as I speak, I am aware that on this campus and in Birmingham and in places, both near and far, people of dedication and of commitment have bravely thrown themselves into the struggle, determined that we shall overcome the forces of fear, ignorance, and intolerance, determined that we will build a society that is firmly based upon the best in our tradition and heritage.

So I speak to you today of the new discovery of America. I speak to you about a new discovery that asks of each of us the best we have to give and that demands understanding, knowledge, and the training and education of every person who shares our common life.

We must discover each other. We must discover our community. We must discover ourselves.

Each of these discoveries is nurtured by the process of education. Discovery is learning; it is seeing, knowing, understanding.

It comes in reading, talking, studying, experimenting. Above all it comes through human association and human association demands freedom for all members of the society to come and to go and to know each other.

I speak of discovering each other, because implicit in the discovery of each other is the doctrine of human equality. When we discover each other we find the essence of our own individuality. When we have genuinely come to understand and see others as individuals, sharing the same concerns, the same needs and the same expectations, it is then that we ourselves have become individuals properly attuned to the democratic society. When one is prepared to say, "I want all men to be free; I want all men to be treated as human personalities; I want all men to be accepted as equals by each other," then we are prepared to proclaim our own individuality and our own humanity.

In this sense discovery means the dawning of awareness that our lives have meaning, that they find their expression in the variety and depth of personal relationships—the more varied, the more intense, the more human, the greater the measure of our own fulfillment.

It is at this level of discovery that the effort to adopt civil rights legislation is so crucial. By insuring the rights of all men to enjoy the privileges and responsibilities of citizenship and the opportunities and obligations of society, we give to all men the opportunity of confronting each other so that they can discover each other as individuals and as personalities with human dignity.

But the discovery process is a larger one. At another level it involves the awareness of the patterns of community life, how our political, social, and economic institutions are shaped and how they shape us. It is imperative that our great Nation discover its strength, its wealth, its beauty, and its own heritage. It is imperative that we come—and soon—to an understanding that the forces of contemporary life, with its urbanization, its mechanization, its industrialization, and its specialization, impose upon us the inescapable need to shape patterns of community life that draw from each of us the best we have to give.

No community is strong and free if it does not provide freedom and equality of opportunity for everyone. No community is free if it does not conquer the forces of poverty, ignorance, and disease. We must discover in America the richness and vitality that exist in our people. This is why the war against poverty is so important, and the war against poverty is not only the struggle to achieve employment and minimum income levels. It is also a struggle to educate and train the people of America so that they can achieve for their communities and for themselves a level of culture that endows their lives with richness, that gives them the knowledge that they need to cope with the problems in our contemporary life.

We are all aware today that our world is in crisis and our Nation is in transition. We know that modern technology and science are making men more interdependent. We know that the exploding population combined with the growth of mechanization is producing new and often disturbing patterns of community life. The problems we face will not be solved except through enlarged understanding of social, economic, and political process. This is an age in which education is indispensable for human progress.

But the process of discovery is still not complete until we have discovered ourselves. This is the most important discovery of all. We must liberate ourselves from the shackles of fear and intolerance, we must see our lives as part of a large human process in which we are free to confront the world and to confront each other with genuine compassion and without fear or selfishness.

My work as mayor brings me into contact with individuals and groups reflecting all segments of my community, and it affords me an opportunity to meet with many people in other parts of the country. I find two great forces at work in our Nation. One force pushes us in the direction of largeness and strength. This is the force that recognizes and acts upon a spirit of openness and freedom. It faces the world with optimism and confidence. It appreciates the reality of our strong resources and sees in our wealth and in our technology the promise of better tomorrows for everyone. It retains the spirit of adventure that is the essence of democracy. It welcomes new opportunities and new experiences. It is large, open, free, and strong.

The other force is the force of pettiness and insecurity. It is the spirit that says, "I want mine and I don't care what happens to others." It is a spirit of non-involvement, of defensiveness and of self-protectiveness. It is the business firm, the trade union or the profession that blindly refuses to see itself as part of the larger community. It is the voice of discrimination and bigotry. It is a force that opposes the use of our Democratic Government to meet constructively the great problems of our time. It is a force that is set against admitting into the mainstream of community life all segments of the population. It is a force that clings to narrow prejudices. It is a force that regrettably has gained momentum despite the magnificent struggle that goes on nationally for the ensuring of rights for all.

This war between the forces of hope, confidence, and optimism on the one hand and narrowness and selfishness on the other is reflected in the lives of each of us. We are all tempted to escape from larger responsibilities to seek comfort and the false security of a private life rather than to grapple with large and difficult social forces. But to escape into a private, noninvolved world is to turn our backs on the very freedom that we seek and cherish. To have freedom one must have a capacity for freedom and this capacity can be developed only by experience that exposes and involves one in the full process of life.

In the end freedom is a quality of mind and spirit. Freedom is to be alive, vibrant, concerned about life and its problems and its promises. It means the discovery of oneself and the shaping of attitudes that enable one to live fully and openly and with a sense of involvement.

As we face the struggle of this period we must, in our individual lives, have the sense of freedom that endows us with compassion and understanding. We must have the strength to be indignant about oppression and the denial of human fulfillment. We must have strength of commitment and conviction that enables us to protest indignities to our fellowmen. We must have the personal strength and courage to grapple with the realities around us.

At the same time we are not free if our passion and commitment give way to blind hostility, uncontrolled rage, or to the venting of destructive impulses. It is only through the use of reason, the use of education in the shaping of our attitudes and our strategies that we become and remain free. We will serve the cause of decency and justice only by putting our reason as well as our passion to work in behalf of ourselves and society.

This is what I mean by the discovery of oneself. It is the enlargement of one's capacity for human experience. This is the real meaning of an education and it is for America today our greatest need.

Last August I participated in that enormously moving freedom march in Washington. I shall always remember this experience, in particular the inspiring and enlightening words of Martin Luther King when he told that huge multitude of the dream that he has for America, an America that truly fulfills its destiny as a Nation of free people.

We can say today that we have a dream, a dream of a new discovery of America in which each of us discovers the essential humanity of each other person, in which we discover the richness and magnificent opportunities that abound in this Nation and in which each of us shall emerge as an individual of integrity and commitment and with passion for justice and decency for everyone.

TRIBUTE TO MURRAY D. LINCOLN, CHAIRMAN, BOARD OF CARE AND PRESIDENT OF COOPERATIVE LEAGUE OF THE U.S.A.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in connection with a unique event that happened yesterday, I pay tribute to a man and a movement and the role that both of these are playing in our fight to preserve the private-enterprise system and to meet the challenge of communism in the marketplace. The man I am referring to is Murray D. Lincoln, chairman of the board of CARE, president of the Cooperative League of the U.S.A., and a world renowned leader. The movement I am referring to is the American cooperative movement which in this century has grown from practically nothing to a point in which cooperatives now do over $17 billion worth of business in our country. Cooperatives have played a major role not only in the economic development of our country but in the political and social life of our citizens. On this occasion I am happy to note the role of a leading Minnesota cooperative.

My friend, Murray Lincoln, has stated that "cooperatives belong wherever their presence can play a positive role in accomplishing equitable and lower costs to the consumer; in the lesser developed countries of the world their presence is particularly needed because these countries need low-cost energy if they are to be able to lift themselves out by their bootstraps into the industrialized age." Mr. Lincoln has been convinced that in meeting the Soviet oil challenge the American cooperatives can make an important contribution. Early this week the Government of the Dominican Republic awarded an oil refinery concession to Midland Cooperatives, Inc., of Minneapolis, Minn., an outstanding Minnesota cooperative.

Last year the possibility of a refinery in the Dominican Republic was drawn to the attention of Mr. Lincoln. After a feasibility study, Mr. Lincoln chose Midland Cooperatives, Inc., a member of the Cooperative League, as the prospective principal in the development of the Dominican project. Mr. Lincoln presented this idea to Mr. Art Smaby, executive vice president of Midland Cooperatives, Inc., of Minneapolis. Art Smaby, a leader in the cooperative movement, received unanimous approval from his board of directors to go ahead with the drafting of a proposal to the Dominican Government. The Midland Cooperative has a long history of sound cooperative practice and business management in the State of Minnesota. It employs roughly a thousand people and does an annual gross volume of business of $80 million. In addition, let me say to those who are frequent critics of cooperatives that it pays all Federal taxes. It enjoys no tax exemptions.

The Dominican Government, having received many requests from oil companies and individuals for a refinery concession, decided that the best way to solve the problem was to ask for bids based upon specifications developed by the Dominicans. Specifications on the bid invitation were published and proposals received from seven companies. Yesterday, the award was made to Midland Cooperatives, Inc., by the Dominican Government. This represents the first time in the history of our Nation that an American cooperative has gone into an oversea venture. This is a true cooperative people-to-people project since Midland Cooperatives, Inc., is putting up the entire equity capital of which 50 percent represents a loan to the Dominican Institute of Cooperatives and Credits. The latter is an organization somewhat similar to the Cooperative League of the U.S.A. except that its operations extend into all phases of the cooperative movement in the Dominican Republic. Within the last year, the institute has formed over 200 consumer co-ops and their operations extend into every corner of the Dominican Republic. This refinery venture will make funds available to the institute to train and inform Dominican nationals so that they can take over most of the jobs involved in the refinery operation. There is also provided in the plans of the refinery, which is called the Lincoln Cooperative Refinery, a provision for setting aside roughly a half million dollars a year, which will be used to train, develop, and forward the cooperative movement in the Dominican Republic.

It is being recognized more and more that if political and economic freedom is to flourish, the private economy must be fortified by the development of cooperatives that are efficiently managed and truly cooperative in character.

This is particularly important in the Latin American countries where there is a shortage of capital. The shortage of private capital in some of these countries, particularly Asian, African, and Latin American areas, has led some nations into socialism. The free cooperative movement, which represents a pooling of private capital, can help create a social and political environment in which private property, the free enterprise system, and democratic institutions can live and flourish.

I believe that this pioneering and unique cooperative venture will have repercussions far beyond the boundaries of our two countries. I am particularly proud of the fact that Midland Cooperatives, Inc., with its headquarters in my own State, has been awarded this responsibility.

Finally, I wish to doff my hat to Murray D. Lincoln, a most unusual man, a gifted man, and a man highly respected in our Nation, who has done so much for so many people in our own country, and who now has been responsible for creating an opportunity for cooperative leaders in America to make similar contributions to our friends overseas.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am glad to yield.

Mr PROXMIRE. It is a fine thing that the acting majority leader has spoken on this matter today. He is an outstanding expert on cooperatives, thoroughly understands them, and has championed them many times. He is also one of the real experts in the Senate on foreign policy, particularly with regard to Latin America.

Mr. President, I wish to add my comments and commendations to those which have been given by the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota on the agreement which has just been reached between the Dominican Republic and Midland Cooperatives. This is a significant day in the history of the cooperative movement in this country and throughout the world.

Basically, as has been indicated, this contract involves a 12-year contract between the Dominican Republic and Midland for a 15,000-barrel-a-day refinery that Midland and co-ops on the island will jointly own. But the significance of the contract goes far deeper. This is the first such contract ever negotiated between a foreign country and a U.S. cooperative. It represents, therefore, another step toward the development of a true cooperative movement in Latin America, a movement that has been so successfully promoted to date by actions of cooperatives in the United States.

We in Wisconsin are especially proud of this development because of the active role our State has played in the advancement of cooperatives in Latin America. Both the Credit Union National Association, with its headquarters in Madison, Wis., and the National Cooperative Rural Electric Association have contracts with AID to work in the development of cooperatives in Latin America. This new contract with Midland represents a similar type of endeavor—as the Senator from Minnesota has stated so well—except that it is being done entirely with private funds and individual initiative. Midland Cooperatives, incidentally, while based in Minneapolis, has almost half of its membership in Wisconsin. In fact, I believe they have more members in Wisconsin than they have in Minnesota.

Under the terms of this new contract with the Dominican Republic, a half million dollars a year of refinery earnings will be used to develop co-ops of all types in the Dominican Republic. Some of these funds will be used for organizational and educational assistance such as CUNA and NCREA are now providing.

Mr. President, I do not believe it is sufficiently well known that the cooperatives of the upper Midwest through the Cooperative League have a contract with the University of Wisconsin to provide training for cooperative leaders of Latin America in cooperative management, cooperative credit, and cooperative organization. We now are in the second year of operation of the International Cooperative Training Center at Madison, which is under the able direction of Adlowe Larson.

Part of the funds from the new refinery will be used to send students from the Dominican Republic to the University of Wisconsin Center.

Mr. President, this venture will be a major expansion in the range of influence of American cooperatives to assist our neighbors to the south to apply techniques of self-help that have been so successful in this country. It is appropriate that we take advantage of this new opportunity to wish them well.

I thank the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, and congratulate him once again on the achievement of Midland Cooperatives, Inc., which has its headquarters in Minneapolis and so many of its members in Wisconsin.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin for his statement in reference to what I hope to be, and what I believe to be, a beneficial development, not only for the Dominican Republic and the people of that harassed island, but also for the Alliance for Progress and the foreign policy of the United States of America, in cooperation with our neighbors in Latin America.

I have repeatedly stated—and I shall continue to believe it, because I am of the opinion that the facts support and bolster my statement—that cooperatives often offer the opportunity for the preservation, in a free enterprise economy, of private capital in countries which are short of large amounts of capital. It also permits the citizen to have the experience, in a private economy, of owning some capital, investing some capital, and managing some capital.

The property movement today is the answer to collectivism, which often is resorted to by countries and peoples who have become desperate. I believe that we in this country would do well, as we forward the whole concept of democracy and free enterprise, to remember that a vital part of the free enterprise economy is the cooperative movement.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, if the Senator from Minnesota will yield at that point, he is so right. The only way that the vast majority of people in these countries can take part in an independent, private, individual enterprise is through the cooperative movement. The alternative is either for the Government to act and move in on some kind of socialistic basis, or capital investment through plutocratic monopoly. This cooperative movement is the only way these people can take part in an economic enterprise that is independent of government operation. Few cooperatives have been more successful and active as those in the American farm economy. Why? Because the farmer's capital is limited and the only way he can get into an economic enterprise on a big scale is to work with his fellow farmers on a cooperative basis. This is the only way, it seems to me, that we can develop the kind of genuine economic independence, the kind of free, economic activity in Latin America which we need to develop.

I commend the Senator.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I am pleased to join with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] in expressing my keen appreciation for the leadership of Midland Cooperatives, Inc., in making possible the first cooperative refinery to be sponsored by an American cooperative group outside of our own country.

Midland Cooperatives, which serves farm supply and consumer cooperatives in my State as well as North Dakota, Minnesota, Iowa, Wisconsin, and Michigan, will participate with a group of Dominican Republic cooperatives in an oil refinery project in Dominican Republic.

Mr. Murray D. Lincoln, of Columbus, Ohio, president of the Cooperative League, played a key role in negotiating this new cooperative arrangement. Mr. Lincoln has long been a giant in the cooperative field. I came to know him well during my service as Food for Peace Director under the last President Kennedy. Mr. Lincoln had been designated earlier by President Kennedy to head a citizens task force on the subject of food for peace. A longtime chairman of CARE, an organization participating significantly in the food-for-peace program, Mr. Lincoln contributed valuable leadership to our accelerated food-for-peace effort. He deserves our praise and our appreciation for his role in this historic new development in the Dominican Republic.

Mr. President, the American cooperative movement has contributed mightily to our rural society. It has strengthened the grassroots foundations of our democracy. It has strengthened our free enterprise economy. I believe that it can make similar contributions to the people of Latin America. It is thus most encouraging to learn of the new cooperative arrangement with our Alliance for Progress neighbor, the Dominican Republic.

OUTSTANDING QUALITIES OF GOVERNOR LeROY COLLINS, DIRECTOR OF COMMUNITY RELATIONS SERVICE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Committee on Commerce will be taking up action on the nomination of the distinguished former Governor of Florida, LeRoy Collins, as the first Director of the Community Relations Service.

Today, I wish to state for the RECORD, which I have stated privately to the Governor, that the Nation is indeed fortunate to have obtained the services of Governor LeRoy Collins as the first Director of the Community Relations Service.

President Johnson is to be commended for this appointment. It shows his understanding of the many difficulties that we face in the days ahead in the field of human relations and civil rights.

President Johnson has indicated that the Service will bear substantial responsibility for securing the peaceful and voluntary compliance with all aspects of the new Civil Rights Act, with particular emphasis on title II, the public accommodations section. Governor Collins has demonstrated the qualities which are essential in this demanding and important position.

He is a man of the South and understands thoroughly the difficult problems facing the South in the area of race relations. But he is also a man of the United States and his courage, intelligence, and sense of justice will be of great importance in resolving racial disputes in all sections of the country.

The independent qualities of this man's character were clearly evident during his tenure as president of the National Association of Broadcasters. He not only served as the industry spokesman but also as a source of constructive criticism directed at problems existing within the broadcasting industry. He filled this difficult post with great integrity and unquestionably restored the sagging prestige of this important communications industry.

It is well known that Governor Collins has made a great economic sacrifice in accepting the President's nomination as Director of the Community Relations Service in the Department of Commerce. And, I think, it is a sacrifice of physical well-being. The responsibilities of being Director of this Community Relations Services are going to be very demanding, and very heavy.

Once again, I salute a fine citizen who has been willing to make a great personal sacrifice in order to serve his country. All too often the people of America do not appreciate the sacrifices which are made by some of those persons in office—an appointive office in this instance—where the demands are very heavy, and the responsibilities are indeed serious and demanding.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article by Lawrence Laurent, the radio and television critic, published in the Washington Post on July 1, 1964, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post,
July 1, 1964]

NAB WILL MISS COLLINS' LEADERSHIP

(By Lawrence Laurent)

The resignation of LeRoy Collins as president of the National Association of Broadcasters (NAB) will create some huge problems for the broadcasting business. A LeRoy Collins is hard to find.

Collins, former Governor of Florida and chairman of the 1960 Democratic National Convention, is resigning to become Director of Community Relations Services for the new civil rights legislation.

In the current prosperity, station owners tend to forget that Collins took over the NAB right after the industry had suffered from scandals over rigged quiz programs and from the stench of payola. Collins provided leadership of integrity, became an effective spokesman in Congress, and restored some of the industry's lost prestige.

The effective leadership, however, did not win universal popularity for Collins. Many broadcasters resented his criticism of the audience ratings services, his suggestions that cigarette commercials might be made less attractive to children, and his statements that broadcasting has yet to reach ultimate perfection.

Collins had inherited a tradition that the NAB president should be confined to screaming about "Government interference with broadcasting" and to bombarding the Federal Communications Commission with cries of "censorship." After all, the broadcasters do pay their leader a salary of $75,000 and give him allowances that total about $25,000.

Some station operators resigned from the NAB after a speech by Collins in Columbia, S.C., last winter. What Collins told his fellow southerners is that the men of moderation and wisdom should speak out on the issue of racial injustice. He said it is "time the decent people in the South, with all their might and strength, told the bloody-shirt wavers to climb down off the buckboards of bigotry."

(In addition to the resignations, some station operators joined the NAB, for the first time, as a result of the talk.)

Broadcasters are in need of effective leadership. Subscription television (pay-as-you-see TV) is threatening the entire structure of an advertiser-supported broadcasting system. Community Antenna systems (CATV) create a problem of survival for some, smaller television stations. Senator THOMAS DODD, Democrat, of Connecticut, is ready for another round of hearings on sex and violence in television.

There are still unsolved problems concerning the television rating services. And any election year brings a flood of complaints about the "unfairness" and "bias" of television in covering politicians.

If there is one single description that best suits the lean, suntanned, silver-haired LeRoy Collins best, it is one written about 400 years ago by Robert Whittington to describe Sir Thomas More. The description: "a man of angel's wit and singular learning; I know not his fellow. For where is the man of that gentleness * * * and affability? And as time requireth, a man of marvelous mirth and pasttimes; and sometimes of as sad a gravity; a man for all seasons."

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. I share the view of the Senator from Minnesota. In addition, I hope that Governor Collins will be able to induce the students that are scattered all over Mississippi—and who may soon be moving into other parts of the South—to return home. I would like to see the Commission that has been established under the so-called Civil Rights Act put in motion without any interference from some of these dogooders from the North.

In my estimation, groups such as these can only act to further cloud the issues, and muddy the waters of reason and mediation by stirring up more racial strife. Many matters will arise which can only be settled through litigation. Emotional appeals on either side will not help matters at all. These intruders should be asked to leave the South before they retard any progress Governor Collins may be able to make.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I say to the Senator from Louisiana that I was one of those who cheered his forthright and courageous statement of some days ago which was so well reported in the American press and in the editorial columns of our country, relating to the law of the land and the necessity for order and respect for law and order.

Senator ELLENDER has justly received a number of high commendatory comments in editorials. The job Governor Collins will have will be one of talking and reasoning in an effort to resolve many of these difficult problems through commonsense and understanding.

This is a very important assignment. It is one that will be very demanding. But I believe that the men who will be assigned to this task in this Division of Community Relations Service will be very helpful.

THE LAS VEGAS RHYTHMETTES

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, the most charming group any State could hope to have as its representative at the New York World's Fair was here in Washington recently, and I would like to take a few brief moments to call the Senate's attention to the group's activities.

I am speaking about the Las Vegas Rhythmettes, a precision marching and dance group made up of girls from Las Vegas High School. This is the first group of its kind, Mr. President, and a highly successful group at that. Organized in 1949, the Rhythmettes' purpose is to provide wholesome activity and companionship for the student members and to set high standards of character and behavior for each participant. Each Rhythmette must have top moral and scholastic standards.

The Rhythmettes' precision marching and dancing techniques are unusual and completely original, and carried out without a leader and without the use of commands. Obviously, each Rhythmette must be an adept choreographer on her own as well as a person who can work well with others.

As I mentioned, the Rhythmettes represented my State during Nevada Day at the New York Fair. They have also appeared at all types of national events and on a variety of nationwide television shows.

This busy group, under Director Evelyn Stuckey, graced the Washington area with performances in the Senate Office Building Rotunda, Bolling Air Force Base, Andrews Air Force Base, and Junior Village.

Mr. President, the Rhythmettes are a living, active example of what can be accomplished with initiative and imagination at the high school educational level. I am proud of the Rhythmettes, and I know that Nevada is proud of them.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD the names of the young ladies who participate in this group. They are: Darlene Beggerly, Kathy Chang, Susan Cleaves, Joan Dredge, Janice Fallman, Charlene Friedkin, Trudy Griffin, Teri Hayes, Marilyn Johnson, Linda Jones, Julie Larsen, Judy McColl, Colleen Holtberg, Ann Sutherland, Jaynie Wright, Sharon Young, Kathryn Naylor, Beth Sromalla, Susan Pocias, Sharon Ziemniak, and Kathy McNally.

YEAR OF A PARTY REVOLUTION: 1964

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, highly perceptive and greatly renowned, Raymond Moley, whose intimate observations of political trends go back over more than three decades, has just had published in the July 13 issue of Newsweek a most interesting and informative essay on recent political developments in the United States. It is one which every student of government and all who purport to comment accurately on current trends in our political life should carefully study.

Too many of our Capitol Hill reporters and commentators along with editorial writers in the eastern press display so much provincialism in their interpretative efforts in large part because they have a paucity of personal information about what is taking place in America outside of the metropolitan areas of the country and among the people not living on the sea coasts or domiciled in one of the crowded bedroom surburban areas surounding our major cities. Thus while they may be honest in their analysis they are grossly inaccurate because they are too ill informed about conditions and attitudes beyond their own habitual haunts. Perhaps that is one reason why 1964 has been uniformly such a disastrous year for political pollsters, great and small.

In all events, Raymond Moley knows America because he has surveyed it many times as a reporter and traveler who sticks to the ground, visits with people living in communities ranging from 50 to 500,000 and with those living on our farms.

He is what is known as a shoe-leather reporter who learns things about American behaviorism which are denied to those who fly over the country in jet planes and put down only in the busy airports of our major municipalities. Thus historically he has had to "eat less crow" and has made fewer bad conjectures than a great many of his associates.

In his little essay entitled, "A Party Revolution," Ray Moley writes his observations of changing conditions he has witnessed in the course of 11 round trips by automobile from coast to coast added to 6 additional trips made through the South since World War II. He reports the basic reasons why the so-called eastern establishment which once ruled supreme in dictating the choice of candidates in both major political parties has lost out to the big labor chiefs and city machine bosses in one party, and to the people of America living between the Appalachians and the Rockies—including the revived political influence of Dixie—in the other party. In other words, America has changed and is continuing to change since the "vested interests" in the international banking institutions were in control. Truly, at last, the Republican Party has become "a peoples' party" and the symbol GOP has come to mean for one and all, "government of the people."

It is this salient fact which has made the Goldwater miracle possible whereby a Senator from a State with only four electoral votes could reach a national Republican convention with more electoral votes than the combined total of respected Republican leaders from the big city States and the control centers of the past. Truly, a new Republican Party is evolving into full bloom in our times and it may well go on to become the most respected and most popular party of the South as well as of the progressive minded, independent-thinking, high-spirited free men and women living between Pittsburgh and the Pacific Ocean.

Whether better highways, fast air transportation, the marvel of television, the decrease in the influence of metropolitan newspapers and magazines, the continuing slow process of realining the issues and personalities of our two major political parties, the lower average relative ages of citizens living in less congested areas, the time to think and the opportunities for reflection available to people residing in communities where life proceeds at a less frenzied pace, or some, or all, of these factors combined have produced the change is immaterial. The change has come and there are indications that more is yet to come. Parties are going to stand for something definite once again. Voters at long last are to be given a choice between differing political programs. Perhaps GOLDWATER is more a symbol than a cause of the change but the progressive spirit of individual independence is beginning to have more popular appeal and to exert more influence than the synthetic pulling power of a false liberalism which glorifies the central state and downgrades the individual citizen.

Mr. President, I commend to my colleagues, to the country, and to historians puzzling over how to report the story of 1964 a thoughtful, dispassionate, introspective reading of Raymond Moley's piece entitled "A Party Revolution" and ask that it be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Newsweek magazine, July 13, 1964]

A PARTY REVOLUTION

(By Raymond Moley)

LOS ANGELES.—Eastern and northeastern politicians and erstwhile leaders, as well as those who interpret them for us, fail to realize that in attacking GOLDWATER they are tilting at a symbol rather than a reality. The reality is a protest, deep and wide and powerful, among Republicans, homeless Democrats, and the politically unattached against past Republican Party control and also the sort of government we have had during the last 25 years. This protest has grown in the past decade from a mere difference of opinion to a veritable revolution. It arose from natural developments—a great shift of population and of economic power and social change.

It was so when the Jeffersonians overthrew the Federalists in 1800 and when in the age of Jackson the frontier revolted against the built-in Washington bureaucracy, King Caucus, and the Bank of the United States. It was so when the Republican Party was born out of the ashes of the Whigs. And also when western "progressives" started a movement which ended in the Republican schism in 1912. It was so when Franklin D. Roosevelt tore the Democratic Party away from its traditional moorings in the 1930's.

FORCE AND OPTIMISM

Since the beginning of World War II there has been a tremendous shift of population, of wealth, and cultural and educational leadership from the East and Northeast to the West and South. Between 1950 and 1960 the most rapidly growing regions have been the Pacific coast, with a gain of 40 percent (this is larger now), the mountain area with 35 percent, and the Southeastern States with 22 percent. Also, Texas has had a gain of 24 percent.

I have seen this change from year to year in the course of 11 round trips by automobile between the coasts and during 6 trips through the South during that period.

There has also been a great movement of people into urban areas from the rural counties and from the North and East. The latter have moved there because of the location of so many industrial plants in areas with a favorable business climate and which are closer to their raw materials and also to their markets. The vivid impression one gets in those cities and sprawling suburbs is force, energy, optimism, and progress. With a few exceptions, they are not waiting for help from Washington. They want to grow, exploit their natural advantages. People want to own their homes, educate their children, and realize other benefits of a new life.

THE BOURBONS

In politics there is always a lag of years before natural changes such as these are reflected in the thinking of observers. There is an old German saying that things are faster than thoughts. Before a philosophical system is thought out and written, the world on which it was based has passed away. The minds of those who promoted the Willkie nomination in 1940 and the three which followed fail to comprehend what has been happening in the Nation during those years. Until the threat of a Goldwater nomination loomed a year ago, those people were happy in "anticipation of yesterday afternoon." When a glimpse of the reality of GOLDWATER's strength appeared, there was at first doubt, then consternation, and later, hysterical frustration.

Their immoderate language belies their claims to be moderate. They prate about looking forward when they are still scanning the past. The names of the illustrious dead are invoked to drive away GOLDWATER's demand for a change. They talk about a mainstream, although the main channel has long left their provinces. These are not the progressives of our time. They are the Bourbons who never learn and never forget. When the Duc de La Rochefoucauld-Liancourt rushed to Versailles with the news of the fall of the Bastille on July 14, 1789, the King said: "But, it is a revolt." The answer was: "Sire, it is not a revolt—it is a revolution."

It is not coincidence that GOLDWATER's support is greatest and most firm in areas where there has been the most marked growth. GOLDWATER may win or lose, but this revolution is a durable fact. The Republican Party will never be the same after the nomination this year.

PROFESSIONAL FOOTBALL TELECASTING

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, the telecasting of professional football games on Friday evenings constitutes a serious threat to the traditional high school football program throughout the country. Eighty-six percent of the Nation's high schools with an interscholastic football program play their games on Friday night. The decline in attendance that would result from having professional games shown on the same evening would deprive our high schools of this valuable athletic program. It not only financially supports other necessary high school activities but it is a healthy, competitive, and integral part of the high school experience our young people deserve.

The pending legislation which, among other things, is designed to protect the local high school football program deserves the wholehearted support of Congress.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the National Federation of State High School Athletic Associations opposing the telecasting of professional football games on Friday nights which was sent to me by Brice B. Durbin, executive secretary of the Kansas State High School Activities Association.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TELEVISION RESOLUTION

Whereas interscholastic athletic contests have become an integral part of the educational program of our high schools, providing a culmination for broad student participation in physical education and physical fitness programs; and

Whereas interscholastic athletic contests provide a wholesome recreational outlet and stimulant to school and community morale, through participation of teams, bands, cheer sections, and fans, thus becoming an important part of the American way of life; and

Whereas interscholastic athletic contests have through experience and tradition been scheduled on Friday evenings in order to reduce interference with the academic program of students and to fit into the school and community activity schedule (86 percent of these high schools participating in football play Friday evenings); and

Whereas interscholastic athletic contests are depended upon to provide income through gate receipts to finance not only athletics but also other school activities (it has been estimated that the high schools of the Nation could lose $16 million in football revenue annually because of the possible televising of professional football games on Friday nights): Therefore be it

Resolved, That the National Federation of State High School Athletic Associations, representing 50 States, 19,500 member high schools, and 8,830,000 students, go on record as strongly opposing the telecasting of any athletic events on Friday evenings that could interfere with attendance at high school athletic contests; and be it further

Resolved, That the National Federation of State High School Athletic Associations strongly favor legislation that would prevent the telecasting of professional football contests on Friday evenings.

THE VACANCY ON THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, on March 1, 1964, Sigurd Anderson resigned from his position as one of the five members of the Federal Trade Commission and created a vacancy on the Commission. His place is still empty. No successor has been nominated to replace him.

For more than 4 months, this important agency has been shorthanded, forced to proceed with only four members instead of the five called for by the law.

I regard this as a serious matter. The Federal Trade Commission is an important agency, with far-reaching responsibilities. Its fundamental aim is to protect business and the public against unfair methods of competition and to prevent practices which would lessen competition or tend to create monopolies. In short, it is charged with a duty to protect our competitive, private enterprise economy.

The existence of a vacancy for so long a period inevitably takes its toll on the work of the Commission. It not only tends to reduce the output of the Commission and increase its backlog, but also throws an unfair burden on the remaining members.

And the vacancy has had all the more impact because the past 4 months have been a particularly significant period for the Federal Trade Commission. Its decision in the cigarette labeling case is a vivid example of the type of proceeding which should not have to be decided by an artificially truncated Commission.

But even more important is the principle. Congress established the Federal Trade Commission as a five-man body, and required the President to nominate five Commissioners. Had the Congress felt that the public interest would be adequately served by four Commissioners, it would have said so in the statute. Instead, it specified five Commissioners, without ever dreaming that the President would convert this into a four-man agency simply by refusing to nominate someone to fill a vacancy.

My concern is the more acute in this instance because the vacancy has left the Federal Trade Commission without a single Republican member. Three members of the Commission, quite properly, are Democrats, while the fourth is an independent. The statute provides that no more than three of the Commissioners may be members of one party, but the spirit of the law clearly contemplates a bipartisan agency, whose members include Republicans as well as Democrats. The President's inaction is a clear evasion of the intent of the law. I think the President has not, in this case, fulfilled his duty in failing to submit a nomination to fill this time-worn vacancy. No one would quarrel with a reasonable delay, occasioned by the need to search out a qualified and capable nominee, but a 4-month delay is beyond reason. Unquestionably, the President could find a qualified, willing Republican in much less time.

Unfortunately, the situation at the FTC is not unique. A somewhat parallel situation appears to be devolping at the Federal Power Commission, where the term of Commissioner Charles R. Ross expired on June 22. His reappointment has not been announced. No new nomination has been submitted. Under the terms of the Federal Power Act, Commissioner Ross may serve until his successor is duly qualified. However, no Commissioner can be at his best during a long period when he does not know whether he is to be reappointed or replaced. It makes an unsettling situation impairing the efficiency of government.

We can only speculate on the reasons the President might have for the delay in filling these positions. Clearly, more and more people will engage in this kind of speculation if the White House persists in its failure to act.

THE CIVIL RIGHTS BILL

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, on Monday, July 6, the people of Hawaii said "thank you" for the civil rights bill. A cross section of my constituents financed a half-page advertisement in Monday's Washington Post to thank the Congress for passing the bill into law.

Needless to say, I cannot help but feel a touch of pride because of this thoughtful gesture.

If there are no objections, I would like to read the text of the advertisement which appeared in Monday's Washington Post:

> The Hawaiians have a word for it—in congressional language, the term is "civil rights." In Hawaii we say "Aloha"—which stands for friendship.
>
> The words mean the same—fairplay for all.
>
> The hula dancer acts out the word "aloha" by forming her hands before her, a gesture "from the heart."
>
> The word exists everywhere in Hawaii: In the houses of the humble and the cathedrals of worship, in a neighbor's greeting, in the edicts of high office.
>
> Hawaii has another word that comes from the heart. "Mahalo." "Thank you."

When Governor of Hawaii John A. Burns proclaimed Civil Rights Sunday, he urged all of us to pray and work for the day "When the aloha spirit will stretch as a rainbow across our entire Nation and our entire world."

The people of the State of Hawaii now say mahalo to the 88th Congress for passing the civil rights bill. Now we have rules to help us achieve our ideal—an era of universal tolerance, understanding, peace, and aloha.

Thank you, Mr. President and Members of the Congress, for the promise of our rainbow.

WILDLIFE THREATENED WITH EXTINCTION WOULD BE HELPED BY MORE NATIONAL PARKS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, as one who has been privileged to take part in many conservation efforts of the Congress, including preservation of both land, water, and wildlife, I want to commend the Department of the Interior for its action in setting up a team to study ways to preserve some of our rarest animals and birds.

This is an important program. It requires our combined efforts to succeed.

It requires concentrated work to combat pollution of the air, water, and earth. For whatever pollutants endanger the various species of wildlife are also a threat to the habitat and health of man.

The Congress has been most effective in preserving land for public use. The 87th Congress enacted my bill creating the Padre Island National Seashore Recreational Area, preserving more than 80 miles of island beach off the gulf coast of Texas for the people of the Nation. In addition, the 87th Congress enacted bills preserving Point Reyes, Calif., and Cape Cod, Mass., National Seashore Recreational Areas, a major conservation achievement in the Nation's history.

I am continuing to work for park-site preservation in Texas, including the bill to authorize the establishment of the Alibates Flint Quarries and Texas Panhandle Pueblo Culture National Monument (S. 1348), the De Zavala park bill (S. 261), and the Guadalupe Mountains National Park bill (S. 2296). There is strong local support for each of the measures, showing the growing awareness of the American people of the importance of land and wildlife preservation. The preservation of park areas is primarily to preserve great objects of natural beauty, but also for recreation. In preserving the areas in their natural form, we also help preserve habitats that may save some threatened species of wildlife from extinction.

I ask unanimous consent that the Interior Department press release of July 6, which in my opinion is a tribute to the exceptional capability of Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall, together with the list of extinct and threatened species be placed in the RECORD, and also an article from the Washington Post of July 7, 1964, by Martha Cole captioned "60 Wildlife Species Face Extinction Peril."

There being no objection, the press release and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT STEPS UP FIGHT TO SAVE NEAR-EXTINCT WILDLIFE

The Department of the Interior announced today it has named a special scientific team in its Fish and Wildlife Service to make an intensive study aimed at preserving dozens of rare or endangered forms of American wildlife, ranging from the Nene goose of Hawaii to the polar bear of the Arctic.

In making its announcement, the Department released a long list of fast-vanishing American birds, mammals, fish, and reptiles and gave specific information regarding the nearly twoscore birds and mammals that have disappeared from the American scene in less than 150 years. Of the extinct species, about half have vanished since 1900.

"The study to be undertaken by the Department is a firm step directed at halting the further disappearance of endangered wildlife," Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall said. "We hope that with man's aid and understanding, the long list of threatened species can be narrowed. The scientific study, we believe, is essential if we are to reverse the trend that has witnessed such a heavy toll of some of our most valuable species since the turn of the century."

Specialists in the biology of birds, mammals, reptiles, amphibians, and fish—all from the ranks of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife—comprise the study team. Commissioner Clarence F. Pautzke, of the Fish and Wildlife Service, said they will advise Director Daniel H. Janzen, of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, which is responsible for Federal programs to protect and preserve rare and endangered American wildlife.

In its studies, the Federal team will work with private and non-Federal groups and will seek the counsel of prominent authorities concerned with wildlife management and preservation.

The serious situation facing so many American wildlife species is not peculiar to this hemisphere, Commissioner Pautzke said. Many species of the African veldt—its great cats, elephants, and numerous other wildlife—are in danger. In the world's oceans, the blue whale and the great marine turtles also face extinction. These forms of wildlife can be saved only through the highest type of forward-looking conservation actions, according to Pautzke.

An important function of the study team will be the development of cooperative programs with non-Federal groups to propagate rare and endangered species. Another is the designating of exotic species that should be denied entrance into the United States under provisions of Federal laws that bar importation of undesirable species.

A species is considered "rare" when its numbers are small but its survival is not in jeopardy in the foreseeable future. When survival is seriously threatened, it is "endangered."

Bureau Director Janzen said many of the world's wildlife species are in trouble because complex forces of civilization are upsetting delicate life patterns—habitat is being destroyed; some species are being harvested beyond their reproductive capacity; and pollutants resulting from man's activities introduced into nature are silently attacking others.

"In some instances, the reason for the decrease of a species is more complex and obscure," Janzen added. "Many people are surprised to learn that as many as 35 or 40 kinds of animals native to the North American Continent have become extinct within the span of U.S. history."

Members of the special study team include Charles H. Lawrence, assistant chief, management and enforcement, chairman; Drs. John W. Aldrich, Ray C. Erickson, and Richard H. Manville, wildlife research; Dr. Willis King, chief, fishery management services; Lynn H. Hutchens, fish hatcheries; Gale W. Monson, wildlife refuges; Samuel E. Jorgensen, chief, office of foreign activities; and Clifford Presnall, chief, predator and rodent control, all of Washington, D.C.

In developing its recommendations, the study team will seek assistance from experts outside Government. In problems that arise in connection with the propagation of rare and endangered migratory game birds, such authorities as Carl Buchheister, president of the National Audubon Society, New York City; Dr. John A. Griswold, ornithologist and curator of birds, Philadelphia Zoological Garden; Jack Kiracofe, president of the Whooping Crane Conservation Association, Sierra Vista, Ariz.; and Dr. S. Dillon Ripley, zoologist and former curator of Yale University's Peabody Museum (now Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution), have agreed to assist the team.

The team also will consult with the Canadian Wildlife Service to insure full coordination of propagation and other management efforts undertaken to prevent the extinction of any American wildlife species. It also will ask other highly qualified representatives of private organizations prominent in the field of wildlife conservation and aviculture for advice on problems concerned with the preservation of rare and endangered wildlife.

A partial list of extinct and endangered species of the United States and Puerto Rico is attached.

Partial List of Extinct and Endangered Animals of the United States and Puerto Rico

EXTINCT BIRDS OF THE UNITED STATES AND PUERTO RICO (WITH TIME OF EXTINCTION)

Labrador duck, *Camptorhynchus labradorium* (1875), northeastern North America.

Heath hen, *Tympanuchus c. cupido* (1932), eastern United States.

Laysan Island rail, *Porzanula palmeri* (1944), Laysan Island, Hawaii.

Spotted Hawaiian rail, *Pennula sandwichenses* (about 1883), Hawaii Island, Hawaii.

Great auk, *Pinguinus impennis* (about 1844), North Atlantic Ocean.

Passenger pigeon, *Ectopistes canadensis* (1914), North America.

Mauge's paroquet, *Aratinga chloroptera maugei* (about 1892), Puerto Rico.

Carolina paroquet, *Conuropsis c. carolinensis* (about 1904), southeastern United States.

Louisiana paroquet, *Conuropsis c. ludoviciana* (about 1912), south-central United States.

Oahu thrush, *Phaeornis obscurus oahensis* (after 1825), Oahu Island, Hawaii.

Laysan miller bird, *Acrocephalus f. familiaris* (between 1904 and 1923), Laysan Island, Hawaii.

Kioea, *Chaetoptila angustipluma* (after 1859), Hawaii Island, Hawaii.

Oahu oo, *Moho apicalis* (about 1837), Oahu Island, Hawaii.

Laysan honeyeater, *Himatione sanguinea freethii* (soon after 1923), Laysan Island, Hawaii.

Hawaii mamo, *Drepanis pacifica* (about 1898), Hawaii Island, Hawaii.

Perkins' mamo, *Drepanis funeria* (about 1907), Molakai Island, Hawaii.

Oahu akialoa, *Hemignathus obscurus wolstenholmei* (after 1837), Oahu Island, Hawaii.

Lanai akioloa, *Hemignathus obscurus lanaiensis* (about 1894), Lanai Island, Hawaii.

Oahu nukupuu, *Hemignathus l. lucidus* (about 1860), Oahu Island, Hawaii.

Oahu akepa, *Luxops coccinea* (about 1900), Oahu Island, Hawaii.

Ula-ai-hawane, *Ciridops anna* (about 1892), Hawaii Island, Hawaii.

Palmer's hopue, *Psittirostra palmeri* (about 1896), Hawaii Island, Hawaii.

Yellow-headed hopue, *Psittirostra flaviceps* (about 1891), Hawaii Island, Hawaii.

EXTINCT MAMMALS OF THE UNITED STATES (WITH APPROXIMATE DATE OF DISAPPEARANCE)

Gull Island vole, *Microtus nesophilus* (1898), eastern Long Island Sound.

Amargosa meadow vole, *Microtus californicus scirpensis* (1917), California.

Plains wolf, *Canis lupus nubilus* (1926), Great Plains.

Arizona grizzly, *Ursus arizonae* (1937), Arizona, New Mexico.

California grizzly, *Ursus californicus* (1922), California coast.

Southern California grizzly, *Ursus magister* (1908), southern California.

Plains grizzly, *Ursus horribilis* (1895), Great Plains.

Tejon grizzly, *Ursus tularensis* (1898), southern California.

Texas grizzly, *Ursus texensis* (1890), Texas, New Mexico, Colorado.

Sea mink, *Mustela macrodon* (1890), New England coast.

Eastern puma, *Felis concolor cougar* (1899), eastern United States.

Steller's sea cow, *Hydrodamalis stelleri* (1854), North Pacific, Bering Sea.

Merriam elk, *Cervus merriami* (1900), Arizona.

Eastern elk, *Cervus c. canadensis* (1880), east of Great Plains.

Badlands bighorn, *Ovis canadensis auduboni* (1910), North and South Dakota.

Rimrock bighorn, *Ovis canadensis californiana* (1914), California, Oregon, Washington.

SPECIES AND SUBSPECIES OF BIRDS POSSIBLY IN DANGER OF EXTINCTION IN THE UNITED STATES AND PUERTO RICO

Nene, *Branta sandvicensis*, islands of Hawaii and Maui, Hawaii.

Aleutian Canada goose, *Branta canadensis leucopareia*, Aleutian Islands, Alaska.

Tule white-fronted goose, *Anser albifrons gambelli*, winters in California; breeding range unknown.

Northern Mexican duck, *Anas diazi novimexicans*, southeastern Arizona, southwestern New Mexico, and western Texas.

Laysan duck, *Anas wyvilliana lasanensis*, Laysan Island, Hawaii.

Hawaiian duck, *Anas w. wyvilliana*, larger Hawaiian Islands.

Greater prairie chicken, *Tympanuchus cupido pinnatus*, central United States to central southern Canada.

Attwater's prairie chicken, *Tympanuchus cupido attwateri*, coast of Texas.

California condor, *Gymnogyps californianus*, southern mountains of California.

Florida Everglade kite, *Rostrhamus sociabilis plumbeus*, southern Florida.

Southern bald eagle, *Haliaeetus l. leucocephalus*, southeastern United States.

Whooping crane, *Grus americana*, breeds in central southern Mackenzie; winters on Texas coast.

Florida sandhill crane, *Grus canadensis pratensis*, Florida, central southern Georgia, and southern Mississippi.

Hawaiian gallinule, *Gallinula chloropus sandvicensis*, large islands of Hawaii.

Hawaiian stilt, *Himantopus himantopus knudseni*, large islands of Hawaii.

Eskimo curlew, *Numenius borealis*, migrates through Texas coast; breeding and winter range unknown.

Puerto Rican parrot, *Amazona v. vittata*, eastern Puerto Rico.

American ivory-billed woodpecker, *Campephilus principalis*, South Carolina, Florida, eastern Texas.

Hawaiian crow, *Corvus tropicus*, island of Hawaii, Hawaii.

Puaiohi, *Phaeornis palmeri*, Kauai Island, Hawaii.

Nihoa miller-bird, *Acrocephalus kingi*, Nihoa Island, Hawaii.

Kauai oo, *Moho braccatus*, Kauai Island, Hawaii.

Kauai nukupuu, *Hemignathus lucidus hanapepe*, Kauai Island, Hawaii.

Maui parrotbill, *Pseudonestor xanthophrys*, Maui Island, Hawaii.

Ou, *Psittirostra psittacea*, larger Hawaiian Islands except Oahu.

Palila, *Psittirostra bailleui*, island of Hawaii, Hawaii.

Nihoa finch, *Psittirostra ultima*, Nihoa Island, Hawaii.

Crested honey-creeper, *Palmeria dolei*, Maui and Molokai Islands, Hawaii.

Bachman's warbler, *Vermivora bachmanii*, southeastern United States.

Kirtland's warbler, *Dendoica kirtlandii*, Lower Peninsula, Mich.

Golden-cheeked warbler, *Dendroica chrysoparia*, Edwards Pleateau, Tex.

Dusky seaside sparrow, *Ammospiza nigrescens*, Meritt Island, Fla.

Cape Sable sparrow, *Ammospiza mirabilis*, Everglades National Park, south Florida.

Ipswich sparrow, *Passerculus princeps*, breeds on Sable Island, Nova Scotia; winters on Atlantic coast of United States.

ENDANGERED MAMMALS OF THE UNITED STATES AND PUERTO RICO

Tule or dwarf elk, *Cervus nannodes*, two small herds in San Joaquin Valley and Owens Valley, Calif.

Bighorn sheep, *Ovis canadensis*, Pacific Northwest, United States.

Black-footed ferret, *Mustela nigripes*, South Dakota, Montana, Nebraska, Colorado.

Utah prairie dog, *Cynomys parvidens*, southwestern Utah.

Kaibab squirrel, *Sciurus kaibabensis*, Kaibab Plateau, north side Grand Canyon, Arizona.

Beach meadow vole, *Microtus breweri*, Muskeget Island off Nantucket, Mass.

Block Island meadow vole, *Microtus provectus*, Block Island, R.I.

Key deer, *Odocoileus virginianus clavium*, Florida Keys.

Grizzly bear, *Ursus horribilis*, Yellowstone and Glacier National Parks; Mount McKinley National Park, Katmai and Glacier National Monuments, Alaska.

Glacier bear, *Ursus americanus emmonsi*, Alaskan glacier between Lynn Canal and Cape St. Elias.

Southern sea otter, *Enhydra lutris nereis*, Pacific coast from Washington to Baja, California.

Peninsula fox squirrel, *Sciurus niger cinereus*, Delmarva Peninsula.

Eastern fox squirrel, *Sciurus niger vulpinus*, Central Atlantic States excluding Delmarva Peninsula.

Polar bear, *Thalarctos maritimus*, Arctic coast and ice floes.

Manatee, *Trichechus manatus*, southern Florida.

Walrus, *Odobenus rosmarus*, northern oceans.

ENDANGERED FISH OF THE UNITED STATES

Atlantic salmon, *Salmo salar*, mostly in Maine; landlocked fish in some New Hampshire lakes and Lake George, N.Y.

Arctic grayling, *Thymallus arcticus*, west-central Montana, Alaska.

Lahontan cutthroat trout, *Salmo clarki henshawi*, a few Nevada lakes.

Ohio muskellunge, *Esox masquinongy ohioensins*, Ohio River drainage, Ohio, West Virginia, Kentucky, Indiana.

Maryland darter, *Etheostoma sellare*, Swan Creek, Aberdeen, and Harford Counties, Md.

Olympic mud minnow, *Novumbra hubbsi*, Olympic Peninsula, western Washington.

ENDANGERED REPTILES OF THE UNITED STATES

American crocodile, *crocodylus acutus,* Cape Sable and Florida Keys.

American alligator, *Alligator mississippiensis,* Gulf States to Carolinas.

Green turtle, *Chelonia mydas,* Gulf of Mexico and Caribbean.

(NOTE.—Scientists are not in complete agreement on whether some of the animals listed here are technically endangered. There is no official designation of the species listed. Certain animals in these lists have been suggested by specialists of the U.S. National Museum and of the American Society of Ichthyologists and Herpetologists.)

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, July 7, 1964]

SIXTY U.S. WILDLIFE SPECIES FACE EXTINCTION PERIL

(By Martha Cole)

The Interior Department yesterday listed some 60 birds, mammals, fish and reptiles of the United States possibly in danger of extinction.

The list includes the well-known whooping crane, whose migrations and population are watched carefully, the nene goose of Hawaii, the Arctic polar bear, the southern bald eagle, the bighorn sheep, and the little deer of the Florida Keys.

The Department announced that it had named a special scientific team in its Fish and Wildlife Service to make an intensive study aimed at preserving the rare or endangered forms of American wildlife.

Director Daniel H. Janzen of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife said that many of the species are in trouble because complex forces of civilization are upsetting delicate life patterns.

On the endangered list were 35 birds, 16 mammals, 6 fish, and 3 reptiles—the American crocodile, the American alligator, and the green turtle of the Gulf of Mexico and Caribbean.

Others on the lists included the greater prairie chicken of central United States, the Florida Everglade kite, the American ivory-billed woodpecker, the sparrow of south Florida, Ipswich sparrow, which winters on the Atlantic coast, and the Laysan duck of Hawaii, others endangered are: the Utah prairie dog, the walrus of northern oceans, the eastern fox squirrel, the Atlantic salmon and the Lahontan cutthroat trout in a few Nevada lakes.

The Department named 23 birds and 16 mammals of the United States that have become extinct. Most of the birds were in Hawaii at one time, but the list also includes the passenger pigeon, which disappeared from North America about 1914, the heath hen of eastern United States and the Labrador duck of northeastern North America.

Among extinct mammals were the plains wolf, the California grizzly, the Badlands bighorn and the Rimrock bighorn of California, Oregon, and Washington.

The others on the endangered list were:

Birds: Aleutian Canada goose, Tule white-fronted goose, which winters in California, northern Mexican duck, Attwater's prairie chicken on the Texas coast, California condor, Florida sandhill crane, Eskimo curlew, Puerto Rican parrot, Bachman's warbler of southeastern United States, Kirtland's warbler of Michigan, golden-cheeked warbler of Texas, dusky seaside sparrow of Florida, Cape Sable duck, Hawaiian gallinule, Hawaiian stilt, Hawaiian crow, puaiolhi, nihoa millerbird, kauai oo, kauia akialoa, kauai nukupuu, maui parrotbill, ou, palila, nihoa finch, and crested honeycreeper.

Mammals: Tule or dwarf elk of California; blackfooted ferret of South Dakota, Montana, Nebraska and Colorado; Kaibab squirrel of Arizona; beach meadow vole of Muskegee Island, Mass.; Block Island meadow vole of Rhode Island; grizzly bear of Yellowstone and Glacier National Parks; glacier bear of Alaska; southern sea otter of Pacific coast; peninsula fox squirrel of Maryland and the manatee of Florida.

Fish: Arctic grayling of Alaska, Ohio muskellunge in the Ohio River drainage, Maryland darter and Olympic mud minnow of western Washington.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If there is no further morning business, the morning business is closed.

The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

AMENDMENT OF ATOMIC ENERGY ACT OF 1954, ATOMIC ENERGY COMMUNITY ACT OF 1955, AND EURATOM COOPERATION ACT OF 1958.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2963) to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, the Atomic Energy Community Act of 1955, as amended, and the EURATOM Cooperation Act of 1958, as amended.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BREWSTER in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, what is the parliamentary situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill (S. 2963) to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended; the Atomic Energy Community Act of 1955, as amended; and the EURATOM Cooperation Act of 1958, as amended, is before the Senate.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the bill now before the Senate, S. 2963, is the AEC omnibus bill for 1964.

It contains a number of noncontroversial amendments to several basic laws in the atomic energy field. The amendments are intended to clarify and modify this legislation in order to keep our atomic energy laws current with new developments in the nuclear field.

Section 1 of the bill is a simple 5-year extension of the AEC's authority to compel the licensing of certain patents in the atomic energy field. This authority first appeared in the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 with a 5-year limitation. It was extended for another 5-year period in 1959 and expires on September 1 of this year. The amendment will allow this authority to continue until 1969.

The authority to compel the licensing of atomic energy patents is a reserve power. It has never been utilized by the Commission in the past 10 years. But, it is a useful reserve power because it prevents the creation of patent monopolies in the formative period of this new industry.

Sections 2 and 3 of the bill clarify the Price-Anderson indemnity provisions of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954.

The amendments would make it clear that a nuclear reactor, for which the Commission issues a construction permit prior to August 1, 1967, will be afforded Price-Anderson indemnity coverage extending through the period of its operation, even if the operating license for the facility is not issued until after that date. The AEC's authority under the Indemnity Act expires on August 1, 1967. If it were held that an operating license had to be in effect on this cutoff date then, because of the leadtime involved in the construction of new reactors, no facility built between now and 1967 would be eligible for indemnity coverage—the Indemnity Act would be prematurely terminated.

It was clearly the intent of Congress, when the Price-Anderson Act was enacted in 1957 that the Commission's authority under this act would be effective for a full 10-year period to 1967. Every witness who testified before our committee stated that this was the proper and preferred interpretation of the Price-Anderson Act. There is no doubt on this point in the mind of any member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. The General Counsel of the AEC has rendered an opinion to this effect.

Nevertheless, doubt on this point has been raised by at least one utility company. In our view this matter should be clarified and accordingly the committee recommends the approval of sections 2 and 3 of S. 2963.

These amendments will not modify, alter or extend any aspect of the indemnity authority. It is only a clarifying amendment and is so regarded by the committee.

Section 4 of the bill adds a new section 120 to the Atomic Energy Community Act of 1955. Under this authority the Commission could make real and personal property available in its Hanford project, located near Richland, Wash., for the conduct of activities in that area which do not relate to atomic energy. The Commission could lease land, and could sell or lease personal property, related to the land, in the Commission's project area near Richland.

This amendment is intended to confer upon AEC the authority to dispose of property for purposes not related to the development and utilization of atomic energy. The Commission, in requesting this amendment, asserted that it now has the authority, under the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, to dispose of Government property for use by the transferees for purposes related to the development and utilization of atomic energy. This amendment neither adds to, nor detracts from, whatever authority the Commission may now have to dispose of property for nuclear-related purposes. The matter of the Commission's existing authority is thus not germane to the consideration of this amendment.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. This particular paragraph was of great interest to the New

York State Atomic and Research Development Authority. Based upon its inclusion as a part of the legislative history, I have withdrawn an objection to consideration of the bill.

May I point out that in the statement which the Senator made, perhaps inadvertently, he used the words "atomic power" instead of "atomic energy" at the end of the sentence reading:

> The Commission, in requesting this amendment, asserted that it now has the authority, under the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, to dispose of Government property for use by the transferees for purposes related to the development and utilization of atomic energy.

Mr. ANDERSON. "Atomic energy" are the correct words. Those are the words I had intended to use. "If I used the word "power," it was inadvertent. As the Senator knows, I spent a little time considering the question of atomic power. I thank the Senator.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator. His courtesy and cooperation in this matter is typical of my colleague, with whom I have cooperated so closely in other matters.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator's request was a reasonable one, and one that was fair; it should have been included.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator.

Disposals of property under this amendment would depend upon a determination by the Commission that the action would help to reduce the adverse economic impact of reductions in the Commission's activities in the Richland area.

The reduction in the production of plutonium announced by the President in his state of the Union message in January 1964, will have its greatest impact at the Commission's Hanford works near Richland, Wash. Beginning with the 6-month period starting January 1, 1965, about 2,000 positions, or about 24 percent of the present employment level of some 8,300, will be affected. A vigorous effort by Richland community leaders over the past few years has been directed at attracting new, diversified industry to the Richland community. This effort has had the sympathetic support of the AEC. The additional authority in section 4 would permit the Commission to further assist the Richland community leadership in its economic and industrial development efforts.

It is important to keep in mind that the production cutbacks do not imply an end to Richland's usefulness in the atomic energy program. To the contrary, the community remains of continuing importance to the national atomic energy program. Many activities involving both the military and peaceful aspects of atomic energy are conducted at the Hanford works. It is vital that, as the Government's program for the production of special nuclear materials is lessened, the community remain viable to serve the Commission's continuing requirements.

In our view, this legislation will serve the objective of broadening the economic base of the Richland community by creating new opportunities for private initiative and private enterprise.

All dispositions of property under this legislation would be at the estimated fair market value or fair rental value. Furthermore, all proposed dispositions would have to be submitted to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy in order to assure that the terms and conditions of the dispositions are in the national interest.

Finally, section 5 of the bill would amend section 5 of the EURATOM Cooperation Act of 1958 by adding 40,000 kilograms of uranium 235 and 491 kilograms of plutonium to the amounts of these materials presently authorized for transfer to Euratom.

The bulk of the 40,000 kilograms of uranium 235 added by this amendment would be used for civilian power applications in the European Atomic Energy Community. These amounts would be sold to Euratom on a straight-sale basis, at the same charges made for similar material distributed domestically. Euratom will pay all shipping charges from the AEC plant site. Although firm supply contracts have not yet been executed, if the entire 40,000 kilograms were sold to Euratom the return to the United States would be on the order of $300 million.

Return of this magnitude would, of course, help in alleviating our balance-of-payments problem.

Moreover, the assurance of a long-term supply of enriched uranium should be of assistance in encouraging the sale of U.S.-developed enriched uranium reactors abroad.

With respect to the 491 additional kilograms of plutonium authorized by this amendment, this material will similarly be sold to Euratom on a straight sale basis at a base sales price of approximately $43 per gram.

Euratom has already agreed to purchase 350 kilograms of plutonium which will be used in its fast breeder reactor research and development program. The return to the United States from the sale of this amount of plutonium is estimated at approximately $15 million, of which $11 million is expected to be received during fiscal year 1965. Payment for the plutonium will be made in U.S. dollars.

All material transferred to Euratom is subject to the multination Euratom safeguards system, in order to insure against diversion to military purposes.

I should like to note, Mr. President, that there are several minor printing errors in connection with the punctuation at the end of lines 23, 24, and 25 on page 3. I ask unanimous consent for the clerk to correct these errors, prior to engrossment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Brewster in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, there is nothing controversial in this bill. It it a sound bill, and I urge its prompt enactment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (S. 2963) was passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection 153(h) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, is amended, by striking out the date "September 1, 1964," and inserting in lieu thereof the date "September 1, 1969."

Sec. 2. Subsection 170c. of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "With respect to any production or utilization facility for which a construction permit is issued between August 30, 1954, and August 1, 1967, the requirements of this subsection shall apply to any license issued for such facility subsequent to August 1, 1967."

Sec. 3. Subsection 170k. of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "With respect to any production or utilization facility for which a construction permit is issued between August 30, 1954, and August 1, 1967, the requirements of this subsection shall apply to any license issued for such facility subsequent to August 1, 1967."

Sec. 4. The Atomic Energy Community Act of 1955, as amended, is amended by adding the following new section:

"Sec. 120. Disposal of Property.—In addition to any other authority the Commission may have, the Commission is authorized, without regard to the provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, to lease land, and to sell, lease, including leases with options to purchase, and otherwise dispose of improvements thereon, and such equipment and other personal property as is determined to be directly related thereto, in the Commission's Hanford project in and near Richland, Washington, upon a determination by the Commission that such disposition will serve to prevent or reduce the adverse economic impact of actual or anticipated reductions in Commission programs in that area: *Provided, however,* That the compensation to the Government for any such disposition shall be the estimated fair market value or estimated fair rental value of the property as determined by the Commission: *Provided further,* That before the Commission makes any disposition of property under the authority of this section, the basis for the proposed disposition (with necessary background and explanatory data) shall be submitted to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and a period of forty-five days shall elapse while Congress is in session (in computing such forty-five days, there shall be excluded the days on which either House is not in session because of adjournment of more than three days): *Provided, however,* That the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, after having received the basis for the proposed disposition, may by resolution in writing waive the conditions of, or all or any portion of, such forty-five-day period."

Sec. 5. Section 5 of the EURATOM Cooperation Act of 1958, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 5. Pursuant to the provisions of section 54 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, there is hereby authorized for sale or lease to the Community:

"Seventy thousand kilograms of contained uranium 235

"Five hundred kilograms of plutonium

"Thirty kilograms of uranium 233

in accordance with the provisions of an agreement or agreements for cooperation between the Government of the United States and the Community entered into pursuant to the provisions of section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended: *Provided*, That the Government of the United States obtains the equivalent of a first lien on any such material sold to the Community for which payment is not made in full at the time of transfer."

AMENDMENT OF TARIFF ACT OF 1930—CATTLEMAN'S AMENDMENT

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, on the Senate Calendar is order No. 1105, House bill 1839, an act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of wild animals and wild birds which are intended for exhibition in the United States.

Most people will recognize that this bill is not on the calendar for the purpose of providing free importation for wild animals and wild birds intended for exhibition in the United States. It is on the calendar because it carries a cattleman's amendment, and I believe the Senate ought to be familiar with what is involved in this.

Members of the Senate will recall that there was a rather close vote on the Hruska amendment to another bill. At that time the cattle people were told that efforts had been made to improve the beef situation and cut down imports. I voted against the Hruska amendment because I did not think it a proper way to legislate; and I also was willing to accept the statement of the President of the United States that he intended to do something about the import situation.

Subsequently, the able majority leader, the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], introduced an amendment to H.R. 1839, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the amendment be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMENDMENT No. 465

(Amendments intended to be proposed by Mr. MANSFIELD (for himself, Mr. METCALF, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. CANNON, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. DOMINICK, Mr. EDMONDSON, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. JORDAN of Idaho, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MECHEM, Mr. MILLER, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. YARBOROUGH, and Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota) to H.R. 1839, an Act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of wild animals and wild birds which are intended for exhibition in the United States)

At the end of the bill insert the following:

"SEC. 3. The total quantities of beef, veal, and mutton (in all forms except canned, cured, and cooked meat, and live animals) and lamb originating in any country which may be entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption during any period of twelve months shall not exceed the average annual quantities of such products imported from such country during the five-year period ending on December 31, 1963: *Provided*, That beginning January 1, 1965, there may be an annual increase in the total quantities of such products which may be entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for such purpose, corresponding to the annual rate of increase in the total United States market for such products, as estimated by the Secretary of Agriculture."

Amend the title so as to read: "An Act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of wild animals and wild birds which are intended for exhibition in the United States, and for other purposes."

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I would call your attention to the sponsors of this amendment. They were Senators MANSFIELD, METCALF, BIBLE, BURDICK, CANNON, CARLSON, CURTIS, DOMINICK, EDMONDSON, GOLDWATER, HARTKE, HAYDEN, HICKENLOOPER, JORDAN of Idaho, LONG of Missouri, MAGNUSON, MCGEE, MCGOVERN, MECHEM, MILLER, MONRONEY, RANDOLPH, SIMPSON, YARBOROUGH, and YOUNG of North Dakota.

Members of the Senate who have been long interested in agricultural matters will recognize that this is a very representative group of Senators, most of them either from cattle-range States or cattle-feeding States. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], one of the sponsors, represents a State that was, at one time at least, and I think probably still is, the greatest feeder of cattle of any State in the Union, although the average number owned by the average farmer is small—8 to 10. The amendment also had as sponsors the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], in whose State there is a great deal of cattle feeding; it had Mr. YARBOROUGH, from Texas, where the cattle industry is a very important part of the economy; also, the Senators from North Dakota, Nevada, Oklahoma, Idaho—in fact, the Senators from nearly all of the cattle areas in our country.

The Senate Finance Committee was called in session to pass upon this amendment. I received from the New Mexico Cattle Growers' Association of my State, a telegram by Les Davis, requesting my active support for a favorable Senate committee report on the Mansfield amendment.

That was not all. I received from the National Livestock Feeders Association of Omaha a letter stating that it was of the utmost importance for the Finance Committee to move as quickly as possible, and outlining some needed amendments to the Mansfield amendment.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter from Don F. Magdanz appear at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL LIVESTOCK FEEDERS
ASSOCIATION,
Omaha, Nebr., June 29, 1964.

Re meat import legislation now pending before the Committee on Finance.

Hon. CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Member of Committee on Finance, U.S. Senate, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR ANDERSON: The officials and members of the National Livestock Feeders Association are sincerely grateful for the attention the Senate Committee on Finance has given the urgent need for legislation to restrict imports of meat into the United States to a reasonable level.

Since time is short during the remainder of this congressional session, the association feels it is of the utmost importance for the committee to move as quickly as possible to mark up satisfactory legislation and report it out of committee.

To give the domestic industry adequate protection to assure an equitable position, the following amendments to the Mansfield amendment are needed:

1. All forms of beef, veal, lamb, and mutton should be covered, including cooked, canned, and cured. Excluding cooked, canned, and cured, in effect, nullifies any restriction since the specified amounts may be exceeded by merely changing the form of the product being imported. The case of dairy products gives ample evidence of this danger.

2. No provision should be made for a specified growth factor, as such, because this would guarantee exporters to the United States an ever-increasing portion of this market without regard to domestic conditions; and in so doing, would tend to nullify the intentions and purposes of the legislation.

3. To prevent adverse effect on the domestic industry, the allowable import level for any given calendar year should not exceed the tonnage imported in 1960, or about 5 percent of domestic production for beef and veal and 11 percent for lamb and mutton.

Legislation is the only positive avenue to assure that meat imports into the United States will not continue to trend upward in future years, even from the very disastrously high levels of 1962 and 1963. Although imports of beef and veal for the first 4 months of 1964 are below those for the same months of 1963, according to Customs Office figures, the 1964 tonnage is approximately equal to that of 1962, which was an all-time record. Furthermore, there is no assurance that the 1964 volume will continue below 1963 for the remainder of the year, and certainly no chance of it being reduced to the 1960 level.

Respectfully yours,
DON F. MAGDANZ,
Executive Secretary-Treasurer.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I was a little disturbed by that letter, because I recognized that it just could be that there would be an effort made to supplant the Mansfield amendment with something which would not be as promising to the cattlemen and the farmers of this country as was the Mansfield amendment. Many people will know that the Secretary of Agriculture appeared before the Finance Committee on June 17 and testified, at which time he pointed out that imports of beef and veal this year are expected to be at about the 1959–63 level, and that imports for the first 4 months of the year were 11 percent below the previous year, and for the year, are expected to be down 25 percent. He urged the Congress not to pass the Mansfield bill, S. 2525, or similar bills at this time.

Therefore we had a right to understand that the Secretary of Agriculture felt that the present voluntary program with Australia and New Zealand was working; and I assumed, as I imagine others assumed, that if we tried to pass a very drastic amendment, it would not get by without a recommendation for a veto from the Department of Agriculture, which was something that no one would want if he sincerely wanted to help the cattlemen.

The Secretary of Agriculture presented some tables which are very interesting, showing that the dairy cattle were down in numbers the last 25 years, but that beef cattle were up from 68,309,000 to 106,488,000. This is a growth way beyond the population growth of the country and way beyond the effective demand. I have my own theory as to what is helping cause this, but I do not believe that imports are the only cause.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that tables 1, 3, and 4 of the Secretary's report be included in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 1.—*Cattle and calves on farms Jan. 1: Number by classes, United States, 1940 to date* [1]

[In thousand head]

Year	Kept for milk				Other						
	Cows and heifers 2 years and older	Heifers 1 to 2 years old	Heifer calves	Total	Cows and heifers 2 years and older	Heifers 1 to 2 years old	Calves	Steers 1 year and older	Bulls 1 year and older	Total	Total cattle and calves
1940	24,940	5,525	5,967	36,432	10,676	3,357	10,936	5,283	1,625	31,877	68,309
1941	25,453	5,676	6,254	37,383	11,366	3,789	11,413	6,119	1,685	34,372	71,755
1942	26,313	5,889	6,635	38,837	12,578	4,055	12.219	6,596	1,740	37,188	76,025
1943	27,138	6,067	7,035	40,240	13,980	4,547	13,239	7,361	1,837	40,964	81,204
1944	27,704	6,352	7,201	41,257	15,521	4,971	13,768	7,849	1,968	44,077	85.334
1945	27,770	6,307	6,772	40,849	16,456	5,069	12,871	8,329	1,999	44,724	85,573
1946	26,521	5,758	6,270	38,549	16,408	4,859	12,810	7,727	1,882	43,686	82,235
1947	25,842	5,524	6,317	37,683	16,488	4,636	12,804	7,109	1,834	42,871	80,554
1948	24,615	5,550	6,004	36,169	16,010	4,518	12,046	6,672	1,756	41,002	77,171
1949	23,862	5,327	6,081	35,270	15,919	4,657	12,033	7,270	1,681	41,560	76,830
1950	23,853	5,394	6,208	35,455	16,743	4,754	12,516	6,805	1,690	42,508	77,963
1951	23,568	5,493	6,337	35,398	18,526	5,122	14,319	7,029	1,689	46,685	82,083
1952	23,060	5,694	6,481	35,235	20,863	5,971	15,829	8,400	1,774	52,837	88,072
1953	23,549	5,893	6,479	35,921	23,291	6,535	17,440	9,147	1,907	58,320	94,241
1954	23,896	5,873	6,392	36,161	25,050	6,365	17,978	8,229	1,896	59.518	95,679
1955	23,462	5,786	6,094	35,342	25,659	6,514	18,804	8,444	1,829	61,250	96,592
1956	22,912	5,407	5,890	34,209	25,371	6,206	18,869	9,483	1,762	61,691	95,900
1957	22,325	5,267	5,699	33,291	24,534	5,926	18,405	8,991	1,713	59,569	92,860
1958	21,265	5,126	5,571	31,962	24,165	5,903	18,275	9,252	1,619	59,214	91,176
1959	20,132	5,050	5,526	30,708	25,112	6,557	19,407	9,931	1,607	62,614	93,322
1960	19,527	5,079	5,575	30,181	26,344	7,036	20,425	10,574	1,676	66,055	96,236
1961	19,361	5,063	5,550	29,974	27,102	7,069	20,705	10,977	1,707	67,560	97,534
1962	19,167	4,965	5,418	29,550	28,305	7,333	22,050	11,060	1,704	70,452	100,002
1963	18,679	4,823	5,149	28,651	29,970	7,909	23,330	12,129	1,747	75,085	103,736
1964	18,073	4,560	5,021	27,654	31,779	8,313	24,417	12,513	1,812	78,834	106,488

[1] Includes Alaska and Hawaii beginning 1961.

TABLE 3.—*Cattle and calves on feed, 26 States, Jan. 1, 1940–59, and by quarters, October 1959 to date* [1]

[In thousand head]

Year	Jan. 1	Apr. 1 [2]	July 1 [2]	Oct. 1 [2]
1940	3,633			
1941	4,065			
1942	4,185			
1943	4,445			
1944	4,015			
1945	4,411			
1946	4,211			
1947	4,322			
1948	3,821			
1949	4,540			
1950	4,390			
1951	4,534			
1952	4,961			
1953	5,762			
1954	5,370			
1955	5,795			
1956	5,929			
1957	6,122			
1958	5,898			
1959	6,601			5,012
1960	7,173	6,671	5,652	5,127
1961	7,645	7,100	5,822	5,597
1962	7,865	7,230	6,072	6,069
1963	8,887	8,079	6,829	6,704
1964	8,781	8,175		

[1] Cattle and calves on feed are animals being fattened for the slaughter market on grain or other concentrates and are expected to produce a carcass that will grade good or better.

[2] Totals for the 26 States for Apr. 1, July 1, and Oct. 1 quarters not available prior to Oct. 1, 1959.

TABLE 4.—*Meat animal imports: Number of cattle imported, United States, 1954 to date* [1]

[Number of head]

Year	700 pounds and over			Under 700 pounds			Total
	Cows for dairy purposes	Other	Total	Under 200 pounds	200 to 699 pounds	Total	
1954	17,633	46,798	64,431	2,872	3,377	6,249	70,680
1955	26,676	73,696	100,372	3,795	191,849	195,644	296,016
1956	24,364	14,038	38,402	4,419	97,984	102,403	140,805
1957	19,342	230,272	249,614	18,400	434,901	453,301	702,915
1958	20,841	311,724	332,565	16,811	776,837	793,648	1,126,213
1959	16,600	135,956	152,556	31,775	503,725	535,500	688,056
1960	20,618	80,496	101,114	33,852	509,584	543,436	644,550
1961	25,018	125,070	150,088	37,260	835,451	872,711	1,022,799
1962	15,515	108,937	124,452	66,240	1,041,564	1,107,804	1,232,256
1963 [2]	11,876	69,163	81,039	63,739	688,938	752,677	833,716

[1] Imports for consumption. Imports from Virgin Islands not included.

[2] Data are preliminary.

Meat animal imports: Number of cattle imported, United States, by months, 1962 and 1963

[Number of head]

Year	January	February	March	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December
1962	86,694	97.354	96,694	115,821	88,244	43,928	22,115	31.831	47,583	146,936	254,679	200,377
1963 [1]	141,898	99,278	66.832	102,246	72,247	30,610	24,870	16,705	23,883	55,772	98,062	101,313
1964 [1]	56.753	54,178	50,604									

[1] Data are preliminary.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, when the Finance Committee met, the Curtis amendment was introduced and voted upon as a substitute for the Mansfield amendment. In order that its text may be before the Members, I ask unanimous consent that the text of that amendment be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the amendment was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Amendment No. 1085

(Amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. Curtis to the amendments numbered 465 intended to be proposed by Mr. Mansfield (for himself and other Senators) to H.R. 1839, an act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of wild animals and wild birds which are intended for exhibition in the United States)

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted, insert the following:

"Sec. 3. Subpart B of part 2 of schedule 1 of title I of the Tariff Act of 1930 (Tariff Schedules of the United States; 28 F.R., part II, page 19, Aug. 17, 1963) is amended by striking out 'headnote' and inserting in lieu thereof 'headnotes', and by adding after headnote 1 the following new headnote:

" '2. (a) Basic Quotas on Meat and Meat Products.—Except as otherwise provided in this headnote, the quantity of articles in each category listed in this paragraph which may be entered in any calendar quarter beginning after December 31, 1964, shall not exceed:

" '(i) In the case of articles specified in item 106.10 (relating to fresh, chilled, or frozen cattle meat), 168,500,000 pounds.

" '(ii) In the case of articles specified in item 106.20 (relating to fresh, chilled, or frozen meat of goats and sheep (other than lambs)), 12,850,000 pounds.

" '(iii) In the case of articles specified in item 106.30 (relating to fresh, chilled, or frozen lamb meat), 3,200,000 pounds.

" '(iv) In the case of sausages (other than sausages in chief value of pork), specified in items 107.20 and 107.25, 550,000 pounds.

" '(v) In the case of articles specified in items 107.40, 107.45, 107.50, 107.55, and 107.60 (relating to certain prepared or preserved beef and veal), 28,700,000 pounds.

" '(b) Adjustment of Quotas.—

" '(i) Beef and veal.—If, for any 6-month period ending on September 30 or March 31, the average price received in the United States for cattle (not including calves) equals or exceeds the average parity price for such cattle, then for the second and third calendar quarters beginning after the close of such period the quotas specified in paragraph (a) with respect to the categories set forth in subparagraphs (i), (iv), and (v) of such paragraph are hereby increased. The amount of the increased quota for any such category shall be the amount which bears the same ratio to the amount specified in the applicable subparagraph as the number of pounds of the total commercial slaughter of cattle (not including calves) in the United States during such 6-month period bears to 7,352,000,000 pounds.

" '(ii) Mutton.—If, for any 6-month period ending on September 30 or March 31, the average price received in the United States for sheep (not including lambs and yearlings) equals or exceeds the average parity price for such sheep, then for the second and third calendar quarters beginning after the close of such period the quota specified in subparagraph (ii) of paragraph (a) is hereby increased. The amount of the increased quota shall be the amount which bears the same ratio to the amount specified in such subparagraph (ii) as the number of pounds of the total commercial slaughter of sheep (not including lambs and yearlings) in the United States during such 6-month period bears to 35,000,000 pounds.

" '(iii) Lamb.—If, for any 6-month period ending on September 30 or March 31, the average price received in the United States for lambs (including yearlings) equals or exceeds the average parity price for such lambs, then for the second and third calendar quarters beginning after the close of such period the quota specified in subparagraph (iii) of paragraph (a) is hereby increased. The amount of the increased quota shall be the amount which bears the same ratio to the amount specified in such subparagraph (iii) as the number of pounds of the total commercial slaughter of lambs (including yearlings) in the United States during such 6-month period bears to 350,000,000 pounds.

" '(iv) Determinations.—

" '(A) For purposes of this paragraph, the average price received for any article for any 6-month period, and the average parity price for such article for such period, shall be determined by averaging the appropriate figures (as published by the Secretary of Agriculture) for each of the 6 months in such period.

" '(B) For purposes of this paragraph, the determination of the commercial slaughter of any article for any period shall be made on the basis of dressed weight and shall be made on the basis of data for the continental United States (excluding Alaska).

" '(C) All determinations required by this paragraph shall be made by the Secretary of Agriculture and shall be final. All determinations required by this paragraph with respect to any six-month period shall be made not later than the thirty-fifth day after the close of such period. If such determinations result in an increased quota, the Secretary of Agriculture shall immediately certify to the Secretary of the Treasury the amount of such increased quota

" '(c) Exceptions.—

" '(i) National emergencies.—The operation of this headnote shall be suspended with respect to any period which the President declares to be a period of national emergency.

" '(ii) Natural disasters to livestock.—The operation of this headnote shall be suspended (or the quota increased) with respect to a category specified in paragraph (a) if the President determines that because of a natural disaster to the livestock in the United States from which articles like the articles specified in such category are produced, the United States supplies thereof are inadequate to meet demand at reasonable prices to domestic consumers therefor. Such suspension or increase shall be for such period, and any such increase shall be in such amount, as may be necessary to meet such demand, as determined and proclaimed by the President. Any determination by the President under this subsection shall be final.

" '(iii) Small entries.—For purposes of this headnote, any individual entry having an entry weight of twenty-five pounds or less shall not be taken into account.

" '(d) Proration of Quota Over Calendar Quarter.—If the Secretary of Agriculture determines with respect to any category specified in paragraph (a) that the articles in such category are being imported and placed in the market at such times as to disrupt the orderly operation of such market, he shall so certify to the Secretary of the Treasury. Thereafter, the calendar quarter quota for such category shall be prorated over each such quarter on such monthly (or more frequent basis) as the Secretary of Agriculture determines and certifies to the Secretary of the Treasury as being necessary to prevent the disruption of the orderly operation of such market.

" '(e) Entry Weight.—For purposes of this headnote, the number of pounds taken into account with respect to the entry of any article shall be the number of pounds at which such article is entered for customs purposes.

" '(f) Ports of Entry.—Whenever the President deems it necessary in order to prevent the entry, at any port of entry in the United States, of excessive quantities of any of the articles in any of the categories specified in paragraph (a), he is authorized to prescribe, within the total quantities of such articles which may be entered during any period under this headnote, the maximum quantities of such articles which may be entered at such port of entry during such period.'

"Sec. 4. No trade agreement or other international agreement heretofore or hereafter entered into by the United States shall be applied in a manner inconsistent with the requirements of section 3 of this Act."

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, Members of the Senate should notice that the Curtis amendment goes much further than the Mansfield amendment and is far more offensive to Australia and New Zealand than the Mansfield amendment. I do not attempt to guarantee that the President would have signed the Mansfield amendment had it been passed. I would think the President was pretty well satisfied with what he has thus far done in reaching a peaceful solution with our friends in Australia and New Zealand and in the negotiation of a voluntary reduction of meat imports. But there were some features in the Curtis amendment which need to be kept in mind.

The Curtis amendment will create administrative problems because it puts the imports on a quarterly basis instead of on the present annual basis. Meat imports are in transit about 4 to 6 weeks. Changes in sailing schedules and dock strikes create present problems in administration.

Although the Curtis amendment puts the quotas on a specific poundage and is somewhat more restrictive, the meat imports, however, would be about the same as in the Mansfield amendment.

Total imports of beef and veal are expected to be about 820 million pounds in 1964. This is not far up from the 803-million-pound average for the years 1959–63. The Curtis amendment is more acceptable than the Hruska amendment because it provides about 100 million pounds more imports.

The problem with the Curtis amendment is not as great a problem this year because meat consumption is relatively high and the market is good in Europe. The problem will come up in the future, perhaps next year with GATT.

The adoption of the Curtis amendment caused a little unfavorable comment in newspapers and among writers who were carefully watching the scene. The Washington Post for July 6, 1964, had a story entitled "Senate Unit Bows to Beef Bogey," written by Harvey H. Segal. This contains some very interesting material on imports, and I ask unanimous consent that that article may appear in full at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, July 6, 1964]

Senate Unit Bows to Beef Bogey

(By Harvey H. Segal)

Fear beclouded judgment, prejudice triumphed over reason, and longer run perspectives were forgotten when the Senate Finance Committee voted in executive session to clamp tight quotas on meat imports.

The protectionist campaign was touched off by declining beef prices. In 1962 the average hundredweight price for choice fed steer in Chicago was $27.67. It dropped to $23.96 in 1963 and in May of this year touched bottom at $20.52. Since then the price trend has been reversed by large Government purchases and increasing consumption. But the turnabout made litle impression on a lobby which is convinced that imports are the root of the difficulty.

Is the import thesis valid? An analysis of the forces that are depressing beef prices indicates that it is not.

Let's examine the demand-and-supply sides of the beef price equation for the period 1959–62. The figures shown below are from the Department of Agriculture. The computed price indexes are for hundredweights of choice fed steer in the Chicago market.

Year	Demand (per capita beef consumption, in pounds)	Price (index based on 1959)	Supply (domestic production plus imports and inventory change, in billions of pounds)
1959	81.4	100.0	14.26
1960	85.2	94.3	15.01
1961	88.0	88 6	15.93
1962	89.1	99.4	16.29
1963	94.6	86.1	17.74

The figures indicate that demand, as measured by per capita consumption, has been growing steadily, but that prices decline when there are sharp increases in supply. Note that the price dropped when the supply increased by 0.9 billion pounds between 1960 and 1961, and that it fell again in 1962–63 when drought conditions and early slaughtering boosted output by 1.4 billion pounds.

Beef competes against lower priced substitutes—pork, lamb, mutton, and poultry—and the combined production of those meats rose sharply to a record high in 1962–63, thus exerting downward pressure on beef prices.

But what of the role of imports? The relevant figures are as follows:

Year	Beef imports (in millions of pounds)	Net beef imports as a percentage of total supply
1959	996	7.0
1960	705	4.7
1961	965	6.1
1962	1,368	8.4
1963	1,600	9.0

Note that when imports increased by more than 400 million pounds in the 1961–62 period, prices went up. And when imports increased by 232 million pounds in 1962–63, prices fell. If imports had a systematic effect on domestic beef prices, we would expect prices to fall when imports rise and vice versa. But in the period since 1951 no such relationship has obtained. In 8 of the 13 years, the volume of imports and prices moved in the same direction, not in the opposite direction. Rising imports and falling prices occurred in only 4 of the 13 years.

It is not difficult to account for the lack of an inverse relationship between domestic beef prices and the volume of imports. The beef price that matters in this country is the price of grain-feed steers, of high quality beef. But virtually all of the beef that is imported is of the grass fed, manufacturing grade. This is the beef that goes into sausages, luncheon meats, and canned products.

If the imports consisted of high quality beef, competing directly with the domestic product, one might argue that they have a significant effect upon domestic prices. But that is hardly the case. And since the imports are of lower quality, the 9 percent of the total beef supply for which they accounted for in 1963 is quite misleading. To say that imports depress the price of choice domestic beef is tantamount to arguing that imports of Japanese motorcycles have an adverse impact on auto prices.

In subjecting imports of all meat products to global quotas that are virtually fixed, the beef lobby will accomplish nothing by way of an improvement in prices. All that they will succeed in doing is infuriating the Australians, the New Zealanders, the Mexicans, and the Irish who earlier this year agreed to limit their beef exports to this country. And the Common Market negotiators in the Kennedy round will be given an excuse to resist any change in their highly protectionist agricultural policies.

Given the upward trend in beef consumption—and it may become much steeper as family incomes continue to rise—and the possibilities of breaking into the high quality segments of the European markets, the longer term outlook for American beef prices is quite favorable. But these bright prospects are hardly likely to improve if Congress travels down the protectionist path.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, my great concern is that the Curtis amendment adopted by the Finance Committee is being referred to as the Mansfield amendment. It is not and should not be so called. The Mansfield amendment sponsored by these 25 Senators is in the ashcan, completely tossed away in favor of an amendment which in my opinion cannot possibly be passed by the Congress and signed by the President. It is, in my opinion, a futile and unwise gesture, and I so voted inside the committee.

Let me make it completely clear that even though I have some doubts that the President would sign the Mansfield amendment, I would vote for it because I believe that the situation is such that the people of Australia and New Zealand would recognize that this is a reasonable approach and hence would not be disturbing to our international relations. I say again, I will vote for the Mansfield amendment, but I must vote against the Curtis amendment because it is a gesture which cannot possibly succeed, and will only hold out false hope to the cattlemen who will thereafter suffer the usual disappointment.

I recognize, Mr. President, that many of my agricultural recommendations and positions have been unpopular with the Democratic side and perhaps with the Republican side of the Senate. I have opposed, along with the able Senator from Florida [Mr. Holland], and generally with the able Senator from Vermont [Mr. Aiken], and the very experienced Senator from Iowa [Mr. Hickenlooper], many of these agricultural programs. They have been jammed through by zealous people; but what has been the result? The result was a story in the Wall Street Journal of July 1, headed, "Farm Parity Ratio Slipped to 25-Year Low in June; Lower Wheat Prices a Big Factor." I ask unanimous consent that the news story by the Wall Street Journal news staff reporters appear at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, July 1, 1964]

Farm Parity Ratio Slipped to 25-Year Low in June; Lower Wheat Prices a Big Factor

Washington.—The unadjusted farm parity ratio fell in June to its lowest level in 25 years, the Agriculture Department said.

At 74, the June 15 ratio was down from 75 a month earlier and 77 a year earlier. On August 15, 1939, the ratio was 74.

This unadjustable ratio, however, doesn't take into account burgeoning Government payments to farmers, which since 1961 have been offsetting much of the downtrend in farm market prices. At the end of the year the ratio will be adjusted to include these payments.

The parity ratio, the Government's yardstick for measuring farm purchasing power, compares prices received by farmers to prices they pay for goods and services. If the ratio were 100, farmers theoretically would be receiving "fair" prices.

Mainly responsible for the decline in prices received are lower quotes for wheat, reflecting lower price supports in the Johnson administration's new acreage-cutting wheat program.

To maintain income, farmers who agree to reduce wheat plantings at least 11 percent from 1963's are offered Federal payments averaging to 70 cents a bushel on wheat produced on 45 percent of the remaining acres and 25 cents a bushel on wheat harvested from an additional 45 percent of the planted wheat acres. Those who agree to idle wheatland are eligible for additional U.S. payments averaging $6.38 an acre if they put the land in soil-building crops.

The department reports June 15 parity prices of principal farm crops compare as follows:

	June 15, 1964	May 15, 1964	June 15, 1963
Wheat, per bushel	$2.52	$2.52	$2.51
Cotton, per pound	.4075	.4075	.4027
Rice, per cut	6.35	6.35	6.44
Corn, per bushel	1.56	1.56	1.59
Peanuts, per pound	.141	.141	.140
Tobacco, per pound	.742	.742	.728
Potatoes, per hundredweight	2.34	2.34	2.29
Butterfat, per pound	.776	.776	.778
Milk, per hundredweight	5.38	5.38	5.35
Wool, per pound	.795	.795	.778
Barley, per bushel	1.23	1.23	1.25
Cottonseed, per ton	62.90	62.90	62.50
Flaxseed, per bushel	3.82	3.82	3.89
Oats, per bushel	.842	.842	.849
Rye, per bushel	1.38	1.38	1.42
Soybeans, per bushel	3.03	3.03	3.01
Cattle, per hundredweight	24.70	24.70	24.00
Calves, per hundredweight	28.00	28.00	27.00
Chickens, live, per pound	.226	.226	.238
Eggs, per dozen	.470	.470	.482
Hogs, per hundredweight	21.70	21.70	22.40
Lambs, per hundredweight	24.70	24.70	24.50
Sheep, per hundredweight	7.79	7.79	7.84
Turkeys, per pound	.326	.326	.336

Prices farmers received for their principal crops compare as follows:

	June 15, 1964	May 15, 1964	June 15, 1963
Wheat, per bushel	$1.40	$1.88	$1.86
Rye, per bushel	1.19	.915	1.05
Rice, rough, per hundredweight	5.10	5.23	5.08
Corn, per bushel	1.16	1.16	1.16
Oats, per bushel	.633	.628	.668
Barley, per bushel	.957	.923	.974
Sorghum grain, per hundredweight	1.78	1.76	1.75
Hay, baled, per ton	20.90	22.30	20.90
Cotton, per pound	.3239	.3209	.3251
Cottonseed, per ton	(1)	(1)	(1)
Soybeans, per bushel	2.35	2.36	2.48
Peanuts, per pound	(1)	(1)	(1)
Flaxseed, per bushel	2.75	2.77	2.75
Potatoes, per hundredweight	3.98	2.97	1.55
Tobacco, per pound	.430	(1)	.526
Hogs, per hundredweight	14.90	14.30	16.10
Beef cattle, per hundredweight	17.40	17.50	19.70
Calves, per hundredweight	19.90	21.20	24.20
Sheep, per hundredweight	5.63	5.80	5.89
Lambs, per hundredweight	20.80	20.60	19.90
Butterfat, per pound	.584	.584	.583
Milk, wholesale, per hundredweight	3.77	3.82	3.72
Chickens, live, per pound	.133	.131	.140
Turkeys, live, per pound	.209	.213	.217
Eggs, per dozen	.305	.299	.299
Wool, per pound	.533	.536	.499

[1] Not available.

Mr. ANDERSON. I again call the attention of the Senate to the fact that parity has touched the lowest level it has reached since August 15, 1939. In other words, in all the war years and all the postwar years, we have never had farm parity as low as we have it right now, and that in face of a constantly repeated series of attempts to tinker with the law of supply and demand and refuse to face up to the fact that good agricultural programs have been rejected in favor of easy solutions. I think this proves that some of the things I have said to this Senate have been correct, although it has taken a long time to establish that fact; and I therefore have some reason to say to the Senate that I believe the correct thing to do now to this bill upon calendar is to strike out the Curtis amendment and restore the Mansfield amendment sponsored by the able majority leader and jointly sponsored by many fine Members of this Senate from many cattle producing and cattle feeding areas.

I therefore hope that when this bill comes to the floor, there may be an effort made to substitute the milder but more promising language of the Mansfield amendment in the hope that it then may pass the Congress and may then be signed by the President of the United States. I see absolutely no point in going through the meaningless gesture of passing an amendment on this floor which I cannot imagine the Department of Agriculture approving and recommending and which I cannot imagine that the President of the United States, who has a good, sound understanding of the cattle business, would want to sign, particularly when he knows the steps he has already taken and is constantly taking to improve the cattle situation by exports to European countries and by voluntary reduction in the exports from Australia and New Zealand.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

VEHICULAR TUNNEL UNDER PARTS OF THE U.S. CAPITOL GROUNDS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1103, H.R. 10392.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 10392) authorizing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to locate a portion of a vehicular tunnel under parts of the U.S. Capitol Grounds and the U.S. Botanic Garden grounds, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I send a motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion will be read.

The legislative clerk read the motion as follows:

> Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I move to recommit H.R. 10392 to the Committee on Public Works, with instructions to report the bill back to the Senate not earlier than the beginning of the next session of Congress (or Apr. 1, 1965).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, from the Committee on Public Works there has been reported H.R. 10392, a bill which would grant authority of Congress to the District of Columbia to construct a tunnel under a portion of the land which lies within the Capitol Grounds and the grounds of the Botanic Gardens.

The Subcommittee on Public Roads, of which I am the chairman, conducted a hearing on the measure on May 20, 1964, and then referred the bill to the Committee on Public Works for another hearing, which was conducted on June 19, 1964.

The tunnel, for which the bill would grant construction authority, is a part of the center leg of the inner-loop freeway system, which would provide connections from the southwest freeway and the southeast freeway and then to points to the north.

The center leg facility is also a key segment of Interstate Route 95, which extends from Florida to Maine. In fiscal years 1962, 1963, and 1964 Congress granted appropriations to the District of Columbia for the construction of the center leg, but construction has been delayed pending a satisfactory solution of the crossing of the Capitol Grounds without adverse effect on the Capitol itself.

In the opinion of the Architect of the Capitol, the House Building Commission, the House of Representatives—which has passed the bill—and the Senate Committee on Public Works, a satisfactory solution has been proposed concerning the pending bill.

I invite the attention of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] to the fact that the tunnel would not only not have an adverse impact upon the Capitol Grounds; on the contrary, it would enhance the Capitol, so far as it would siphon underground much of the transient traffic that now crosses the Mall in areas immediately adjacent to the Capitol.

Mr. President, I emphasize that the bill is permissive; it is not prescriptive. It would merely allow the authorities of the District of Columbia to construct a tunnel at the designated location. It would not designate the alinement of the center leg, nor would it authorize the construction of any other segments of the inner loop freeway system.

The aspects I now mention fall within the jurisdiction of agencies other than Congress, all of which presented, through their spokesmen, testimony during the committee hearings on this measure. Among the agencies heard by the committee was the Bureau of Public Roads of the Department of Commerce, which earnestly recommended the enactment of the pending bill. Federal Highway Administrator Rex N. Whitton noted that the District of Columbia, because of the exclusively urban character of the Interstate System, is far behind in its development of the Interstate System in comparison with the States. The chairman of the Committee on Public Works, the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], who is in the Chamber, realizes the responsibility of Congress and of the Senate, as do other Members of this body, to move not merely one State forward in the interstate program, but to move all States in a coordinated effort, and that certainly includes the District of Columbia.

The enactment of the bill would remove what I believe to be the most important barrier to the construction of a vital segment in the District of Columbia's part of the Interstate System.

I invite attention to the testimony of Mrs. James Rowe, who heads the National Capital Planning Commission. It will be recalled that she testified that the general concept of the center leg has "been on the books for some time," and that all the members of the Commission, except the Chairman, supported the inner loop when it first appeared on the Commission's agenda as a part of the

District of Columbia budget. In approving funds for the center leg, according to Mrs. Rowe, "the Commission did so on the provision that before bids for construction are advertised, the Commission shall approve a model of the project indicating the architectural treatment of the center leg."

The committee received the testimony of Mr. William Walton, Chairman of the Fine Arts Commission. Mr. Walton testified for that agency and, in speaking of the general principle of a tunnel, stated:

> There are already two tunnels under the Mall, both of which we think are a great addition to the beauty, because they divert traffic from the surface to underground. In general we feel this about the center leg: That in principle it would be a step toward preserving the surface beauty. There are already long lines of trucks thundering across the Mall at Sixth Street and Fifth Street.

However, Mr. Walton expressed reservations about the ramps leading into the tunnel and about the north approach, and indicated the desirability of District highway officials conferring with the Fine Arts Commission before a plan is advanced so far that the Commission can modify only "superficial details."

The subject of ramps was discussed in the Subcommittee on Public Roads and in the Committee on Public Works itself. The committee has been concerned about the approaches to the ramps leading into the tunnel and also about the north approach. However, as shown by the model of the proposed project, which is located in the rear of the Chamber, both north and south approaches to the tunnel will be screened from view of the Mall and the Capitol Grounds.

Furthermore, we have what I think is valid testimony by the Engineer Commissioner of the District of Columbia, Brig. Gen. Charles M. Duke, who addressed the committee twice during the hearings in reference to this proposal, and assured the committee that all responsible agencies would be consulted in the final design.

General Duke addressed these questions of both witnesses and some committee members when he stated before the committee—I emphasize his words, because I believe that here lies an important factor in our consideration today:

> Our plan * * * is to hire a consultant, if the Congress * * * decides to pass this particular bill. * * * The very first thing that he will be asked to do is to decide answers to some of these questions—

That is, questions which have been raised, and properly so—

> with respect to the length of the tunnel—

And I continue to quote General Duke:

> the type of the tunnel and this sort of thing, after consultation with the other planning agencies of the District. He will also be asked—

That is, the consulting firm—

> to prepare a model reflecting his judgment, the model to which the Planning Commission and the Fine Arts Commission have so frequently referred.

Mr. President (Mr. WALTERS in the chair), in my opinion as chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Roads, of the Public Works Committee, General Duke has given every assurance of his intention to cooperate fully with other responsible agencies on this matter, and his desire to consult with these agencies regarding the final design and architectural treatment of the tunnel and its approaches. He can do no more until the Congress—the House has already acted in the affirmative, and now the Senate is asked to act in the affirmative—grants the authority to construct the tunnel under the Capitol Grounds.

After much consultation with committees of the Congress, and approval of the House of Representatives, final permission for the construction of the tunnel now awaits only action in the Senate. I strongly urge this body to act favorably on the pending measure and thus remove one of the major obstacles to progress of the Interstate System in the District of Columbia.

We have had some difficulty with this measure in the Public Works Committee. We have had differences of opinion with the able and considerate advocate of the opposing viewpoint to the one which I have presented, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER]. I know that he will wish to discuss this measure on his own time, and I hope the Senate can give attention to him, as it has to me, with reference to the pending bill.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield for a few questions?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I am glad to yield.

Mr. McNAMARA. I subscribe wholeheartedly to the remarks of the Senator from West Virginia in his explanation of the activity of the Public Works Committee. I wish to compliment him for the study and the diligence which he has applied to bring the bill before the Senate, together with the report.

It seems to me that the report is quite explanatory and raises few questions. However, I have one or two which occur to me at this point.

The report indicates that money is available and will cost the Federal Government nothing; is that correct?

Mr. RANDOLPH. The Senator from Michigan is correct. There is no money involved in the authority for this program.

Mr. McNAMARA. The authority has already been granted for the construction of this section of the highway?

Mr. RANDOLPH. The Senator is correct in his statement.

Mr. McNAMARA. In addition to that, the bill merely authorizes a tunnel under a portion of the Mall?

Mr. RANDOLPH. The Senator is correct in his statement.

Mr. McNAMARA. The detailed drawings cannot be provided until the location has been worked out. Some of the opponents of the bill say that we should have detailed drawings before we can act, but unless we act on this we cannot get the detailed drawings; is that not correct?

Mr. RANDOLPH. The observation of the Senator from Michigan is correct. As the able chairman of the Public Works Committee knows, detailed designs and engineering specifications follow authorizations; they do not precede them. Authorization is a necessary step toward this project being brought to fruition. Congressional authorization does not block out the work of any of the other responsible agencies. It does not block out the consultation which should occur.

Mr. McNAMARA. Is it not a fact that this has been held up by the District Commissioners?

Mr. RANDOLPH. The Senator is correct.

Mr. McNAMARA. Also by the President of the United States, for some months. The fact is, it has now been cleared by all interested parties. Is it not a fact that lengthy hearings were also held in the House?

Mr. RANDOLPH. The Senator is correct. It received very complete consideration of the measure within the agencies mentioned and the Congress.

Mr. McNAMARA. This apparently is the last——

Mr. RANDOLPH. Hurdle.

Mr. McNAMARA. Hurdle to get over.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The Senator is correct.

Mr. McNAMARA. The Senator did not address himself to the motion pending before the Senate at this time—namely, to recommit the bill. I believe that his explanation, together with this colloquy, indicates there would be no purpose served by referring it back to committee. A complete record has been made.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The Senator is correct. I believe that the Senator from Kentucky would say we attempted to bring competent witnesses before the subcommittee and the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. McNAMARA. So that there is a complete record.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I believe that the record is complete.

We had some discussion on this north approach, as the Senator from Michigan knows——

Mr. McNAMARA. This is really not a part of the pending legislation, though.

Mr. RANDOLPH. That is correct; however, I believe that we should bring out the fact it will be completely screened from the Capitol and the Mall. This is an item which has been discussed at some length and, frankly, under the proposal, it would not be a problem.

Mr. McNAMARA. But this is not a part of the pending legislation, anyway.

Mr. RANDOLPH. No.

Mr. McNAMARA. This is for future consideration.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The Senator is exactly right. Though the projection for future consideration is in keeping with the esthetic desires of those who would preserve the Capitol Grounds.

Mr. McNAMARA. As for the esthetics, I understand that the requirements would be to restore the Mall to its original shape. The Architect of the Capitol indicates that he has every intention of insisting on that.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The Senator is correct. I thank the chairman of the committee.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I am glad to yield.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Being a member of this committee—which has done a wonderful job—I wish to commend the Senator for his presentation, and for the many hours of hearings which have been put in along with members of the subcommittee; and the full committee, also, which spent the time it did on this measure.

This is an important project, which has been reviewed and reviewed and reviewed. I believe that it has done a fine job. I commend the Senator and the members of the committee for the diligent work it has performed, and for the recommendations which they have made today.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The remarks of the Senator from North Carolina are appreciated. He is a valued member of the committee. He gives his attention, as do other members, to such projects. I am most appreciative, on behalf of the committee and the subcommittee, for his references.

Mr. COOPER. I made a motion to recommit H.R. 10392. The bill affects not only the District of Columbia and the city of Washington, but also the Capitol Grounds.

It is rather difficult to arouse much interest in a bill of this type. But there are important questions connected with the bill. After I have yielded to the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], I shall make a short statement explaining the reasons why I believe the bill should be recommitted.

So the Senators in the Chamber may know basically what my reasons for moving recommittal are, I point out that by the passage of the bill, we shall influence the commitment of the Federal Government and the District of Columbia to spend about $70 million. Further, if we pass the bill before obtaining detailed plans of the tunnel, we will enact a bill without knowing how it will affect the use and beauty of the Capitol Grounds.

The Senate and the House of Representatives ought to show more concern about these bills which affect the Capitol Grounds, and the Federal city and seem quite innocent. At times they are innocent, but sometimes we wake up to find out that something has happened to the Capitol Grounds, or to the city, and we have made it possible.

Later I intend to discuss this measure for, I hope, not over 10 minutes. I do not think that I shall be able to have this many Senators listen later today. I hope that the Senators who are here will remain.

I am concerned about the bill.

I yield to the distinguished Senator from Alabama.

VISIT TO SENATE OF BRITISH PARLIAMENTARY DELEGATION

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I appreciate greatly the courtesy of the Senator from Kentucky in yielding at this time, so that I may have the privilege of presenting some distinguished visitors to the Senate.

Today we have four parliamentarians from the British House of Commons—two Conservatives and two Laborites. It has been explained to me that the Parliament is in session at the present time, and the only way our visitors were able to come over was to pair off and in that way have two of each party here.

These gentlemen are visiting the United States through the foreign leader exchange program. They have just arrived in our country. We hope they have a very pleasant visit.

I am glad to present them at this time.

First, the Honorable Albert Edward Oram, a member of the Labor Party.

Next, the Honorable Merlyn Rees, also a member of the Labor Party.

Next, the Honorable Robert Chichester-Clark, a member of the Conservative Party.

Next, the Honorable Henry Paul Guiness Channon, a member of the Conservative Party.

We are delighted to have these visitors here today.

(The distinguished visitors rose, and were greeted with applause, Senators rising.)

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that biographical sketches of each of these gentlemen be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the biographical sketches were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCHES

(Biographical information concerning the visit of Mr. Albert Edward Oram, a participant in the foreign leader exchange program of the U.S. Department of State; program arranged by Mr. Dean B. Mahin.)

Name, Albert Edward Oram.

Address, 77 Mackie Avenue, Patcham, Brighton 6.

Born, August 13, 1913, Lewes, Sussex.

Academic training, Brighton Grammar School, London School of Economics.

Present position, Labor and Cooperative Party MP for East Ham (since 1955).

(Biographical information concerning the visit of Mr. Merlyn Rees, a participant in the foreign leader exchange program of the U.S. Department of State; program arranged by Mr. Dean B. Mahin.)

Name, Merlyn Rees.

Address, 50 Cedar Drive, Hatch End, Pinner, Middlesex.

Born, December 18, 1920, Cilfynydd, South Wales.

Academic training, Goldsmiths' College, University of London, teacher's certificate; London School of Economics, B. Sc. (economics) and M. Sc. (economics).

Present position, Labor Member of Parliament for South Leeds (since June 1962).

Previous positions, teacher of economics and history at Harrow Weald Grammar School, 1949–60; staff member of Labor Party, 1960–62; lecturer in economics (including management studies), Luton College of Technology, 1962–63.

(Biographical information concerning the visit of Mr. Robert Chichester-Clark, a participant in the foreign-leader exchange program of the U.S. Department of State; program arranged by Mr. Dean B. Mahin).

Name, Robert Chichester-Clark.

Address, Ross House, County Antrim, Northern Ireland.

Born, January 10, 1928.

Academic training, Royal Naval College, Dartmouth; Magdalene College, Cambridge (B.A. honors in history and law).

Present position, Conservative (Ulster Unionist) Member of Parliament for Londonderry.

Previous positions, journalist, 1950; public relations officer, Glyndebourn, Opera, 1952; assistant to sales manager, Oxford University Press, 1953–55; Secretary to Financial Secretary of the Treasury, 1958; assistant government whip, 1958–60; Lord Commander of the Treasury, 1960–61.

(Biographical information concerning the visit of Mr. Henry Paul Guinness Channon, a participant in the foreign-leader exchange program of the U.S. Department of State; program arranged by Mr. Albert Keogh).

Name, Henry Paul Guinness Channon.

Positions, Conservative Member of Parliament for Southend West (since January 1959); Parliamentary Private Secretary to the Foreign Secretary.

Personal data: Address, 55 Chester Square, London, S.W. 1. Born, October 9, 1935, London. Marital status, married, one child.

Academic training, Eton College; Christ Church, Oxford University.

Other positions, director, Arthur Guinness Son & Co., Ltd. (largest brewery in Europe), chairman, CSE Aviation (imports light aircraft into Britain).

Memberships, member, Bucks Club; member, Turf Club.

Other languages, French and German.

Travel, widely traveled in Western Europe, visits to Eastern Europe and Canada, a brief visit to New York City.

Past positions, Parliamentary Private Secretary to the Home Secretary (November 1960–October 1963); Parliamentary Private Secretary to the Minister of Power (1959–60).

VEHICULAR TUNNEL UNDER PARTS OF THE U.S. CAPITOL GROUNDS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10392) authorizing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to locate a portion of a vehicular tunnel under parts of the U.S. Capitol Grounds and the U.S. Botanic Garden grounds, and for other purposes.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I should like to state my reasons for asking that the bill before the Senate be recommitted. It is difficult to arouse great emotion over a bill affecting the District of Columbia. But I believe some important principles are involved in the consideration of the bill.

At the outset I should like to say that when I voiced objections to the bill when the bill was before the committee, the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], and the chairman of the full committee, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA] with their usual fairness gave an opportunity for hearings. Witnesses were called. Among the witnesses were one of the District Commissioners, Brig. Gen. Charles M. Duke, and the Federal Highway Administrator, Mr. Rex M. Whitton, who supported the bill.

Other witnesses were called at my instance. They included the chairman of the National Capital Planning Commission, Mr. James H. Rowe, Jr., and the chairman of the Fine Arts Commission, Mr. William Walton.

I should like to state why I believe the bill should be recommitted until next April. The Senator from West Virginia

[Mr. RANDOLPH] has stated some essential facts which lead him to support it. The bill would authorize the District of Columbia Department of Highways and Traffic to construct under the Capitol Grounds a vehicular tunnel as a part of what is known as the center leg, which would be a part of the proposed inner loop freeway, which may be described as a highway encircling the city. The proposed center leg would cut the loop in half. It would run from the northern segment of the inner loop, in the neighborhood of Gallaudet College, southerly under the Capitol Grounds and tie into the southern segment of the inner loop. All of the roadway—the inner loop and the center leg would be constructed as a part of the Interstate Highway System.

It is correct that the District of Columbia Commissioners have approved the concept of the inner loop and the center leg which would connect segments of the inner loop.

It is correct also that the Federal Highway Administrator, Mr. Whitton, testified that the Bureau of Public Roads had approved the concept of the inner-loop freeway and the center leg section of that freeway. But as yet no detailed plans have been made either by the Bureau of Public Roads or by the District Highway Commissioners.

Mr. Whitton testified to that fact.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. McNAMARA. Detailed plans which would involve a tunnel under the Mall could not be made unless some assurance were received that a tunnel would be permissible. The proposed legislation would permit the crossing of the tunnel under the Mall; and until such time as such permission is granted, no agency whose officials were in their right mind would spend money to make detailed plans. Actually, the proposed action must precede the making of detailed plans. The agencies, such as the National Capital Planning Commission and the Fine Arts Commission, about which the Senator has expressed great concern, would have an opportunity to examine in great detail. But we cannot prepare such plans unless we have authority to proceed with the construction under the Mall.

Mr. COOPER. I thank the chairman. I shall respond to his statement in a moment.

I again point out that no detailed plans have been made for the complete inner-loop or the center-leg segment. Some portions of the inner loop have been constructed.

Mr. Whitton, Federal Highway Administrator, testified that his Department had not given any consideration to any alternate proposal concerning this center leg, a segment which would include a vehicular tunnel passing under the Capitol Grounds. The total length of the center leg would be 1.8 miles. The remaining segments of the center leg, with the exception of the tunnel itself, would be located in an open cut or trench. It would be an eight-lane highway approximately 250 to 300 feet wide. The Bureau of Public Roads representative further testified that the Bureau has not yet been able to determine the cost-benefit formula which it must apply before the center leg can be constructed. No detailed plans have been prepared, and, of course, no model has been constructed which would illustrate the effect of the construction of the vehicular tunnel and the proposed depressed highway, including access and exit routes, on the beauty of the Capitol Grounds.

I look at the model exhibited in the rear of the Chamber. It is a very fascinating model, but it is not the model of the District of Columbia Commissioners. It is not the model prepared by the Bureau of Public Roads. It is a model which was prepared and constructed by a business group in downtown Washington. It presents the conception of that group as to how the center leg will look. I talked with members of that group, and they told me the model has not been approved either by the Bureau of Public Roads or by the District Commissioners.

The center leg of the inner loop, 1.8 miles in length, is estimated to cost $71 million. It would displace several thousand people and many businesses. It would cut Washington almost in half.

If constructed as presently outlined, bridges would necessarily be required over such streets as Massachusetts Avenue, K Street, and E Street. All other streets running east and west would be blocked.

I want to be correct in my statement. The Senator from West Virginia and I agree on this point. The Committee on Public Works does not have anything to do with the location of the road, fundamentally, or even with its approval. But this is what I object to about the bill. It is my answer to the question just asked by the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee when he stated that those concerned cannot possibly proceed with detailed plans and cannot build a model until authority is secured to build the tunnel. I believe they are putting the cart before the horse. The proposal is offered before there are detailed plans, a model submitted, and final approval is given by the Bureau of Public Roads. In addition these is no evidence as to how the construction is to be financed by the city for its 10-percent share. I point out that before it was made a part of the Interstate System, under which 90 percent would be provided by the Federal Government, the inner loop had been rejected by the District Commissioners as too expensive. Before anything that I have outlined is done, however, this proposal is brought to Congress and Congress is asked simply to say, "We will authorize a tunnel under the Capitol Grounds."

Once that is done, practically every agency will be told, "Look, we have secured the authorization from Congress. Now you must approve this center leg" for the estimated cost of $71 million.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, may I interrupt for a question at this time, which I hope will not interrupt the continuity of the Senator's statement?

Mr. COOPER. I am glad to yield. I shall complete my statement shortly.

Mr. RANDOLPH. At this point I think we should make clear that, insofar as I know—the Senator from Kentucky may have information to the contrary—there has never been a hearing at which there were detailed plans and engineering before an authorization was given for a project. That is what we are asking here.

Does the Senator know of any program for engineering for which the plans had been laid down prior to authorization of the project?

Mr. COOPER. Yes. I have had experience concerning the interstate system in my State. Questions have arisen about the route, or cloverleafs, or access routes. I know there have been many meetings between State highway officials and the Bureau of Public Roads on these subjects before final approval of the entire route was given.

If the District of Columbia Commissioners and the Bureau of Public Roads should agree upon detailed plans and should present them to Congress, and, if these plans were reasonable, and preserved the use and beauty of the Capitol Grounds, I believe that the Congress would approve them. My objection is that before any approval of final plans by concerned agencies has been secured, this proposal is brought to Congress. The House has approved the bill. Now the Senate is asked to prejudge, and in effect determine that the center leg is to be built, and with the result that the route will be determined by the location of the tunnel. For the District Commission will say to all agencies which have not given their approval, "Look, we have the approval of the Congress."

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. COOPER. I will.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I understood the Senator to say that no alternative had been considered. Is that correct?

Mr. COOPER. That is correct.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Why has not some alternative been considered? Plans are not needed, for that to be done. There certainly must be some alternative possibilities.

Mr. COOPER. There are alternatives. It has been proposed that the entire center leg should be underground, a plan that has been followed in many cities. The New York Times of June 22 reported that, after opposition had developed to an expressway through the lower part of Manhattan. Now the feasibility of placing the entire route underground is being considered. Such a proposal has been made by groups in this city.

Let me say that I think the question finally comes down to this—

The Congress has responsibility to determine whether this project costing $71 million should be prejudged by approving this bill. It has also, responsibility to determine whether it affects the use of the Capitol Grounds. It is correct that the exit roads would be at the edge of the Capitol Grounds. On the north, the tunnel would pass under the Capitol Grounds in the vicinity of the Esso Building at Third Street and Pennsylvania Avenue. At the other extremity the exit route would leave the tunnel at the rear of the Rayburn Building. The first plan proposed an exit clearly in view of the Rayburn Building, but it was modified, apparently upon pressure from the House. But even with the exits at the edges of the Capitol Grounds, we have received testimony that it would be necessary to build ramps, and perhaps cloverleafs——

Mr. RANDOLPH. No cloverleafs.

Mr. COOPER. I agree. It was stated in the testimony that there would be ramps, which would further widen construction, beyond the roadway right at the edge of the Capitol Grounds.

The question of beauty of the Capitol Grounds is important. Washington is a Federal city. George Washington and Thomas Jefferson rode over the area, laid out plans, and meant for Washington to be a city of great beauty.

My concern about this bill relates to a process which has developed in Congress, and in the committees. We pass construction bills before we know—through plans and models—what their effect will be on this city of Washington. Later we learn that at times they result in waste, large expenditures, and take away something of beauty of the Capitol Grounds and of the city itself.

We have had criticisms before. I call attention to the fact that we have had troubles with the Senate Office Building and with our proposed subway system. We are also having trouble with the Rayburn Building, which is still being constructed. I know that at times in our committee we approve the construction of Government buildings when we do not know how they will appear. In practice an agency appears before the committee and asks that a new building be constructed. In such cases mistakes have been made. We could look at what happened at Lafayette Square, for example. That is a beautiful square, which seems to have some relation to the whole Capital. The Court of Claims officials and judges appeared before the committee and said they needed a new building. So they started to tear down some of those beautiful old structures in the square. A Court of Claims building could have been constructed anywhere in the city.

I make one last point. The National Capital Planning Commission appeared before the committee through Mrs. Rowe, its Chairman. The National Capital Planning Commission must approve the construction of the inner loop and the vehicular tunnel before money can be appropriated for it, or the actual construction of it can be undertaken. Mrs. Rowe testified before the committee that the Commission has given tentative approval to the concept, but that it did not intend to give approval to the project until there had been made available to it plans and a model.

If the National Capital Planning Commission can demand a model, it seems to me that the Congress can demand a model also before it approves this construction.

Of course, I know that very little importance is being given to the Fine Arts Commission. However, Mr. Walton, its Chairman, testified before our committee. He said that he had never been consulted. The Commission was quite concerned about this project, he said, and did not know anything about its design. They could not approve it until they had more information on it.

It is true that after this project was challenged, at the second hearing, General Duke said that he would consult with the Fine Arts Commission and with the National Capital Planning Commission, and that they would provide a model. In his first appearance he said that he had never consulted with the Fine Arts Commission. I may be wrong, but I do not think he said then that he would consult with the National Capital Planning Commission.

This is a matter which may not seem to be of great importance to some people, but I believe it is. At some time Congress must assume its responsibility and see to it that the Capitol and the Capitol Grounds are protected and, indeed, that the Federal City is protected. We must make a start. That is the reason why I have raised this issue. The distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] has raised it many times. As a Member of Congress I expected to ask for a yea and nay vote on it, and I hope that the Senate will go on record today that we must have more information with respect to these projects in the future before we give our approval to them.

I make one more point. In the bill it is provided:

> SEC. 6. The Architect of the Capitol is authorized to convey to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, for purposes of constructing the Innerloop Freeway System, all, or so much as he determines necessary, of the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to reservations 6B, 6C, 6D, 6E, 6F, and 286 in the District of Columbia. Any real property conveyed under this section shall thereafter be under the sole jurisdiction and control of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

Mr. President, the reservations are named, but we have no engineer's plot and we do not know where they are. Yet we would give to the Architect of the Capitol the power to convey some land in this vicinity, land which is owned by the Government and which is evidently considered to be of some importance to the Capitol Grounds.

I do not say this in personal criticism of the Architect of the Capitol, but I do not think the Architect of the Capitol ought to have any more authority than the Senate has or than the House has. Yet he has it, and he has been exercising it, and, I must say, not always to the advantage of Congress.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from Kentucky in the concern he has expressed about this particular authorization and about the whole large matter of major construction in the nature of highways and buildings, but in particular highways, in the Federal City. We in Congress must assume greater responsibility than we have assumed up to now, not only with respect to structures affecting the Capitol area, the area in which the Capitol Building and surrounding buildings are located, including the park, and so forth, but also with respect to the whole city.

The Senator, in the course of his remarks, mentioned the danger to Lafayette Square. He barely adverted to it. The preservation of its beauty and the saving of its landmarks should not depend upon the fact that we have a President and a President's wife who are concerned about the beauty of the city. These are the things that make Washington a gracious place in which to live and a gracious place to visit and a place of distinction as our National Capital.

The responsibility for this matter should be centered in Congress, unless the responsibility is placed elsewhere; and specific authority should be vested in an authority, with responsibility to see to it that not a stone is turned, not a building is destroyed, or a building erected, without its being in conformance with a well-designed plan for all public works in the city. That is particularly true with respect to highways.

When we drive out to the airport, for example, and cross onto the southeastern loop—I believe that is what it is called; it is the only part that has been constructed—we are appalled to see what the construction of that small segment of the particular highway project involved has meant to a great area of this city.

When we consider the fact that this particular leg has no meaning unless it is connected with the northern loop, we should not put another penny into the planning and certainly not into the execution of the highway system of this city until we know what the completed job will be like; and we should not go along, authorizing it little by little, bit by bit, each bit of which will be used as an argument for the creation of the next segment, with the result that the whole city will be destroyed.

Unless we in Congress take this responsibility seriously upon ourselves, no one else will take it. We cannot rely on the fact that once every 25 or 50 years we shall have a President who has some esthetic sense and feeling for the history of this great city of ours.

Mr. COOPER. The Senator has reached the core of the argument, and that is, to protect the Federal City, the Capital of the country.

I hope that President Johnson will, as did President Kennedy, establish some kind of commission which will make plans for the city itself, and that at least in those areas of the city which have some historic value—buildings which portray the history of this city, which have esthetic value—some legislation will be devised to prevent the tearing down of historic buildings, with the eventual result, as the Senator has said, of the destruction of great monuments in this country.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. FONG. Do I understand that $71 million has been appropriated?

Mr. COOPER. No; that is the estimated cost.

Mr. FONG. It has not yet been authorized?

Mr. COOPER. Ninety percent of it would come out of the Interstate Highway Trust Fund, and 10 percent from the District of Columbia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Money was appropriated to the District of Columbia for the fiscal years 1962, 1963, and 1964. The construction funds would come out of that money.

Mr. FONG. If the project were not completed by 1972, it would lapse?

Mr. RANDOLPH. That is correct; just as in the case of any State project of the Interstate System.

Mr. FONG. Is it not true that 7 or 8 years still remain before the money would lapse?

Mr. COOPER. Yes; there would be 8 years.

Mr. FONG. Do I correctly understand that the Senator from Kentucky is now asking for a delay of approximately 4 or 5 months?

Mr COOPER. Until next April. That would be 10 months.

Mr. FONG. I believe that the request made by the distinguished Senator from Kentucky is reasonable. It would entail a delay of approximately 10 months. Seven or eight more years are still available under the Defense Highway System before the money would lapse.

I believe the Senator's request for a more detailed plan for the proposed vehicular tunnel is a worthy one. We are concerned with the use and preservation of the beauty of the Capitol Grounds. I believe the Senator should be accorded the 10 months' delay. I intend to vote for the motion to recommit the bill.

Mr. COOPER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HILL in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR RECESS UNTIL TOMORROW

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon, tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALTERS in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

VEHICULAR TUNNEL UNDER PARTS OF THE U.S. CAPITOL GROUNDS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10392) authorizing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to locate a portion of a vehicular tunnel under parts of the U.S. Capitol Grounds and the U.S. Botanic Garden grounds, and for other purposes.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, on my motion to recommit the bill (H.R. 10392) with instructions, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky to recommit the bill, with instructions. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] are absent because of illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] would each vote "nay."

I further announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] are necessarily absent.

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MECHEM], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MECHEM], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 26, nays 39, as follows:

[No. 469 Leg.]

YEAS—26

Aiken
Allott
Bennett
Boggs
Case
Cooper
Cotton
Dirksen
Fong
Fulbright
Hruska
Javits
Keating
Kuchel
Metcalf
Miller
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Robertson
Saltonstall
Simpson
Smith
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—39

Anderson
Beall
Bible
Brewster
Byrd, W. Va.
Clark
Douglas
Edmondson
Ellender
Ervin
Hart
Hill
Holland
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Johnston
Jordan, N.C.
Long, La.
Magnuson
McCarthy
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Monroney
Mundt
Nelson
Neuberger
Proxmire
Randolph
Russell
Smathers
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Walters
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough

NOT VOTING—35

Bartlett
Bayh
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Church
Curtis
Dodd
Dominick
Eastland
Engle
Goldwater
Gore
Gruening
Hartke
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Mansfield
McClellan
McGee
Mechem
Morse
Morton
Moss
Muskie
Pastore
Ribicoff
Scott
Thurmond
Tower

So Mr. COOPER's motion to recommit the bill, with instructions, was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, a few Senators have been engaged in an all-day hearing. We have had the benefit of very little of the debate.

I voted for the amendment of the distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky. But, so that I may understand what I am doing on the question of passage of the bill, I ask the Senator from Kentucky whether the bill provides that a hole be dug under the Capitol, and a freeway run through. Is that what the bill provides?

Mr. COOPER. Yes. The bill would authorize the District of Columbia Highway Commission to construct a vehicular tunnel under the Capitol Grounds. One exit would be near the Esso station on Pennsylvania Avenue. The south exit would be just behind the Rayburn Building. It would be an eight-lane highway tunnel.

The reason that I have urged that the bill be recommitted until next April is that the plans and specifications have not been completed by the District of Columbia Highway Commission, nor by the Bureau of Public Roads. They have given their consent only to the concept of a center leg.

The National Capital Planning Commission must give its approval before any funds can be allocated to construct it. Mrs. James H. Rowe, Jr., the Chairman, told the committee that the Commission would not give its approval until detailed plans and models were presented.

The center leg would cost $71 million. I have objected because Congress would be giving its approval for the small segment which would pass under the Capitol Grounds, before final approval had been given by other authorities for a $71 million project which would displace several thousand people and many businesses. We do not know how it would affect the use or beauty of the Capitol Grounds until the plans and the models have been completed.

I believe that, as the guardians and custodians of the Capitol Grounds, and of the Federal City, we have the right to have this information before we give approval to this section of a $71 million project.

If I may have the attention of Senators, I should like to point out that the model which is in the rear of the Chamber is very beautiful but it is not a model which has the approval of either the District of Columbia Commission or the Bureau of Public Roads. It is a model which was prepared by a business group downtown to give their conception of what the project would look like. I talked to the gentlemen who brought this model to the Capitol. They told me that this model did not have the approval of the District of Columbia Highway Commission nor the Bureau of Public Roads. So while the model does give some indication of the project, I point out to my dear friends who are examining it, it has no validity as an official model of the proposed project.

The project might be said to be one which would affect primarily the District of Columbia, but in addition it bears also on our responsibility to take care of the Capitol Grounds in this Federal City. I do not believe that we should pass this bill until we have more information of how the project will appear and its true effect upon the Capitol Grounds, we do have a responsibility to preserve the beauty and use of the Capitol Grounds, and, indeed, the Federal City itself.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the Senator from Kentucky as to the language of the motion which he made.

Mr. COOPER. I moved to recommit the bill until April 1, 1965. The motion was rejected. The pending question is upon passage of the bill.

Mr. KUCHEL. Why is the month of April so important? Why did the Senator select that month as the time at which the committee should report?

Mr. COOPER. It is to give a reasonable time for the city officials to prepare more detailed plans. When General Duke, one of the District of Columbia Commissioners, made his first appearance before the committee, he knew very little about the details of the project. On his second appearance he was better prepared. He then said, that "we will prepare models and detailed plans. We will consult with the Fine Arts Commission and with the National Capital Planning Commission."

I believe that we should wait until we have received these plans and models which General Duke has promised and which are not yet ready.

Mr. AIKEN. As I understand, the purpose of the bill is to authorize the construction of an eight-lane vehicular tunnel through the Capitol Grounds. I understand that a vehicular tunnel is something like a drain, only considerably larger. It appears that the drain must already be in existence, because otherwise where else would some of our esthetic values have gone this afternoon?

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, two or three of us have come into the Chamber from all day hearings, and we plan to go back to them. I do not like the idea of having the Congress blindly consent to the digging up of half the ground around the Capitol Building, and around some of the other public buildings also, when, as the Senator from Kentucky has said on the floor of the Senate, no plans with respect to the proposed project have yet been completed. I should like to give the Senate another opportunity to pass judgment on the question of referral back to the committee.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. In the Committee on Public Works, I voted against the proposed project. I have listened to the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], and I am in agreement with him.

I should like to read an excerpt from the statement by J. George Stewart, Architect of the Capitol. I read the concluding paragraph of his letter:

> It might, however, be appropriate for me to point out to your committee the fact that the entrance and exit to the freeway tunnel on the Senate side, under the bill, is to be located close to the Capitol Grounds at Third Street and Constitution Avenue NW., adjacent to Capitol Grounds reservation 12, whereas on the House side the entrance and exit to the tunnel are to be located a block away from the Rayburn House Office Building, and the Capitol Grounds, at Second and C Streets SW., at the insistence of the House Office Building Commission who objected to any closer location on their side.

Then, in the individual views of Senator JOHN SHERMAN COOPER, the following statement appears:

> Mr. William Walton, Chairman of the Commission on Fine Arts, testified that his Commission had not been consulted regarding the design of the freeway and, particularly, that segment which would enter the tunnel adjacent to the Capitol Grounds, and that the Commission is concerned about its design and esthetic effect.

The junior Senator from Ohio is also concerned. I believe further study of this matter is warranted. If the proposal is brought to a vote now, I intend to vote against it. However, I do hope the question will be deferred until the next Congress, or at least until we return after the recess.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank my able friend. What the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] has said makes sense, and is on all fours with what the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] has said.

There is in this city a Commission on Fine Arts that presumably does have responsibility with respect to the future beauty of this community.

Why is it that Congress is now asked willy-nilly to give its complete permission for the construction of a tunnel to go where someone else wishes to dig it? I do not understand it. I believe Congress ought to give the Committee on Public Works another opportunity. If it is in order, I shall move to recommit the bill to the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Apropos of what the Senator from Ohio has said, is not the proposed entrance of the eight-lane vehicular tunnel at Third Street and Constitution Avenue within a half a stone's throw of the Shakespearean Library and the Annex to the Library of Congress?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Those structures are in the Northeast section; the proposed project is in the Northwest.

Mr. AIKEN. I was thinking in terms of the Northeast section. If the project is proposed to be in the Northwest, I point out that it would be at the foot of Capitol Hill, and would be even closer to many of the other beautiful and honored institutions of the District of Columbia.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I sincerely believe that the Committee on Public Works ought to take another look at the proposal. I think it ought to hear again from the Commission on Fine Arts, whose representative apparently testified briefly that he had not had an opportunity to pass judgment on the recommendation. I see no reason why, in advance of such reports, Congress should say, "Go ahead and do what you want to do with this."

The Senator from Kentucky has stated, on the floor of the Senate, and no Senator has denied it—that the model in the Chamber does not represent the proposed project, and is far from the truth.

Under these circumstances, and so that the committee will be advised, I move that the bill be recommitted to the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota will state it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Did not the Senate already vote on the subject of recommittal?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion voted on was to recommit with specific instructions. The Senator from California has now made a motion that the bill be recommitted.

Mr. DIRKSEN. To a day certain?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No; he merely made a motion to recommit.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The previous motion was to recommit to a time certain.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The present motion is an entirely different motion.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota will state it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is the motion of the Senator from California proper and in order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is the motion to recommit the bill to the committee in order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is in order.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is that not the question we voted on about 10 minutes ago?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion upon which the Senate last voted was a motion to recommit, with instructions.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Nevertheless, the vote was on recommittal of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Regardless of whether the motion contained instructions, the vote was on sending the bill back to the committee.

Mr. President, I wish to speak on the motion. I am not a member of the Committee on Public Works. I make no claim to expert knowledge. But I do wish to say that if the argument on which this motion is based is that otherwise the bill would be passed by the Senate at a time when many Senators are busy elsewhere, then our action on most of the proposed legislation we have passed ought to be rescinded, because many Senators generally are busy elsewhere. Not a day goes by but that we have requests for unanimous consent for committees of the Senate to be authorized to meet while the Senate is in session. Such requests are as common as are the days on the calendar.

Furthermore, there is a report on the bill; and the bill was passed by the House of Representatives. So this proposed legislation is not new. Furthermore, the agencies of the District of Columbia that are responsible for transportation in the District are not in disagreement on the bill.

The Fine Arts Commission may not have been consulted; but truly a tunnel underneath the ground may not always fall within the concept of fine arts, unless it relates to what is going to be put on walls in the way of murals or to statuary or to art of a similar nature.

Without having any particular engineering knowledge, I state that one of the main problems in the District of Columbia is the flow of traffic. And traffic is growing. Every time there has been a proposal to construct a road or building, there has been opposition. Every building proposed in the District of Columbia has been objected to by someone. There was opposition to the construction of the Jefferson Memorial. There was opposition to the construction of the Lincoln Memorial. There was opposition to the construction of the Washington Monument. There was opposition to the construction of the new balcony at the White House. There was opposition to the construction of the Senate Office Building. Now there is criticism of the New House Office Building. But, thank goodness, the "aginers" did not have their way. If they had had their way, all meetings in Washington would be held in Indian huts, with mosquitoes as guides.

Much time has been spent on this proposal, both in and out of committee. We can easily dispose of it. There is a motion to re-refer it to committee. If that is the desire of the Senate, it can so express itself. But I want the record clear that this is not a proposal which no one has looked at. Yes, there was disagreement in committee. I would be less than candid if I did not say that some of my close, personal friends in the District of Columbia testified against the bill, because they did not like the type of construction that was going to result from passage of the bill. However, funds for what the bill provides have already been appropriated. So the bill does not involve new money. It involves a question of whether there is going to be a tunnel or surface transportation. I believe that is a question that it is not always easy for laymen to decide. It must be decided primarily by people with engineering skill.

As is pointed out on page 2 of the report, the freeway described in the bill has been fully coordinated with the House Office Building Commission, the Architect of the Capitol, the National Park Service, and the Board of Trustees of the National Gallery of Art, all of whom have concurred in the project. It seems to me that is a pretty good array of talent—all the way from the house painter to the portrait painter, all the way from the bricklayer to those who are engaged in such interesting service as the Park Service.

I suggest that the Senate pass the bill, and reject the motion to commit.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I do not desire to delay, but I would like to take 30 or 40 seconds to say that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], my cherished friend, would be the last Senator in this body to tell his colleagues that this measure had not been adequately considered in the Public Works Committee. The Senator from Kentucky knows that when the request was made by him that there be a second hearing on this subject, those persons who had not been heard were given an opportunity to testify, and came before the committee and testified.

If we want insufferable congestion to continue within the District of Columbia, this is the way to do it—to stop the progressive steps which are authorized. The District of Columbia already is far behind in its construction of the Interstate System. Let the Senate not needlessly add to that delay. The money has been appropriated. General Duke, Engineer Commissioner for the District of Columbit, will consult with all responsible agencies on this project as he does on all projects on the Interstate Highway System in the District of Columbia.

I would advise the Senate to be very careful not to continue the delay which is being attempted this afternoon in the orderly programing of highway construction in the District of Columbia.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. I have talked too much, but I should like to comment on the Senator from Minnesota's statement. I understood him to say that it was a question of whether there should be a tunnel or surface transportation. I am sure he did not mean to say it was a question of whether there should be a tunnel or surface transportation across the Capitol Grounds.

Mr. HUMPHREY. No.

Mr. COOPER. As to the question of availability of funds, I note that funds are made available to the District of Columbia for the Interstate System. Suppose they are. That does not mean the money should be spent unless it is necessary to construct the center leg.

The District of Columbia will have to provide 10 percent of the cost. It is not in the record, but I have talked to the chairman of the District of Columbia Committee in the House, and he told me the District of Columbia was seeking money in order to pay its 10 percent of the cost of this project.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, no one shall say that I have been indifferent to the affairs and needs of the District of Columbia. For 16 years I was on the Committee on the District of Columbia in the House of Representatives; and for 2 years I was the chairman, and then was succeeded by my distinguished friend from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], who, incidentally, was probably the most able and diligent chairman that committee ever had.

But this matter is not so world shaking that nations are going to rise and fall by having the project delayed for a little while. After all, $71 million is not hay, even in Washington; and that evidently is the amount here involved.

We had better make up our minds that if we ever start on this project, there will be scaffolding and construction tools and mountains of earth and excavations all over the place, and that will probably be our "dish" for a matter of 4 or 5 years. I would rather not venture into this matter so lightly.

This town is pretty well torn up now. If anyone has any doubt about it, I invite him to ask my good friend from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON], who comes down Virginia Avenue every morning. So do I. It has been so torn up that one must zigzag in and out. If one wants to know what adds to traffic congestion, I point out that bridges which are built add to it materially.

I am content to wait a little while until there is complete and well rounded advice on the question. I defy anyone in this Chamber to walk up to my desk and hand me a copy of the last hearings on this bill. There were hearings previously, and they were printed; but where are they? The last hearings were not printed at all. I think the hearings should be printed. We should have something more than the report. If $71 million is to be committed for a construction job that will continue for 4 or 5 years, we should know a little more about it.

After all, this city is a working place. I wish to be sure that whatever is to be done will be conducive to the work atmosphere that should prevail here, because this is our workshop. For that reason, I believe the bill merits more consideration than it has had.

I hope, therefore, that the motion of my distinguished friend from California will prevail. The Berlin wall will not tumble if we fail to pass this bill. The ghastly show in Vietnam will not come to an end if we defer consideration of the bill. Postponement of our action on the bill will not register in the chancelleries of the world; it will not reduce the public debt. It will have none of those effects. But then we shall not be chastised or scolded for having ventured in haste into a matter in connection with which the National Capital Planning Commission has not given its approval. If we do not want that Commission to give thought to the Capital and to the preservation of its beauty and utility, we should not have to set it up in the first place.

I believe there is every argument to commend the motion to recommit the bill. That action will not kill the bill. It can be brought back at any time. At least let us have the hearings on our desks so we can take a look for ourselves. But today we cannot find the hearings. Therefore I propose to vote for the motion of my distinguished friend.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I believe the Senator from Illinois would wish the record to be clear. I have spoken to the chairman of the subcommittee with reference to the hearings. Hearings were held, and hearings were printed.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I said they were printed. But the last hearings, to which our friend from Kentucky referred, were not printed. If they were printed, where are they?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The chairman of the subcommittee tells me that the last hearings were held at the request of the Senator from Kentucky, so that his case might be further heard, despite the fact that full hearings had already been held. The Senator from West Virginia tells me that the reason why the hearings have not been printed is that the corrections of the copy have been delayed in getting to the committee.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Not even the May hearings are here.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The May hearings have been printed with the Highway Act hearings.

Mr. DIRKSEN. They are not here.

Mr. HUMPHREY. They are available.

Mr. DIRKSEN. They should be on the desks of the Senators, together with the bill and the report.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I say respectfully to the Senator from Illinois that the reason why they are not on the desks is that the bill was called up after it had been cleared with both the minority and the majority sides, and we simply did not have time to go to the committee room, to bring the copies of the hearings to the Chamber. This is not new legislation. It has been before the House. It has been before the Senate for months.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I believe that is a frank confession that the hearings are not available to us. Every time a bill is brought up for consideration, copies of the hearings, and of the report, and of the bill are supposed to be on our desks. I do not believe we are under an obligation to go over to the committee every time and ask for a copy of the hearings. It is the accepted practice to have them here; and they should be here.

It serves a useful purpose, therefore, to vote for the motion of the Senator from California [Mr. Kuchel].

Mr. President, on this question, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from California. The yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Bartlett], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Burdick], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Ervin], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Gore], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Edmondson], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Long], the Senator from Montana [Mr. Mansfield], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Ribicoff] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from California [Mr. Engle], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Bayh], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy] are necessarily absent because of illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Edmondson], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Thurmond] would each vote "nay."

I further announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. Cannon], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Church], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Eastland], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Hartke], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Lausche], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee], the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss], the Senator from Maine [Mr. Muskie], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Thurmond] are necessarily absent.

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Carlson], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Curtis], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Dominick], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Goldwater], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Hickenlooper], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Jordan], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Mechem], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Morton], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Curtis], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Jordan], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Mechem], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Morton], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 25, nays 39, as follows:

[No. 470 Leg.]

YEAS—25

Aiken
Allott
Bennett
Boggs
Case
Cooper
Cotton
Dirksen
Fong
Fulbright
Hruska
Javits
Keating
Kuchel
Metcalf
Miller
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Robertson
Saltonstall
Simpson
Smith
Williams, Del.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—39

Anderson
Beall
Bible
Brewster
Byrd, W. Va.
Clark
Douglas
Ellender
Hart
Hayden
Hill
Holland
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Johnston
Jordan, N.C.
Long, La.
Magnuson
McCarthy
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Monroney
Mundt
Nelson
Neuberger
Proxmire
Randolph
Russell
Smathers
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Walters
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.

NOT VOTING—36

Bartlett
Bayh
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Church
Curtis
Dodd
Dominick
Eastland
Edmondson
Engle
Ervin
Goldwater
Gore
Gruening
Hartke
Hickenlooper
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Mansfield
McClellan
McGee
Mechem
Morse
Morton
Moss
Muskie
Pastore
Ribicoff
Scott
Thurmond
Tower

So Mr. Kuchel's motion was rejected.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the motion to recommit was rejected.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, there was some anticipation that perhaps the proposed legislation to implement the so-called International Coffee Agreement might be considered today. I should like to ask the distinguished acting majority leader about that situation.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The last rollcall indicates that 64 Senators are present. The coffee agreement legislation is both important and controversial. Several Senators who are much concerned about it—a number of them are on the negative side, and a few are on the other side—are necessarily absent. We understand the circumstances.

In speaking with the minority leader, it appeared to me that it might be only fairplay and gentlemanly accommodation to withhold any action on this particular measure until the Senate returns in the week of July 20. It is my hope that we shall then be able to take up the coffee agreement promptly. I am sure the majority leader will wish to do that. The President is anxious to have the bill enacted. The majority leader has been in touch with me today, and has been somewhat in hopes that the Senate might act on it now.

I am of the opinion that because of the lateness of the hour, the degree of controversy involved, and also the fact that several Senators have asked to be heard extensively on the subject, it might be better if action were withheld.

However, I should like to place all Senators on notice that the proposed agreement will be called up in the early part of the week after next, the week beginning July 20. It will likely come up after that Monday, and early in the week. It is my hope that there will then be no further requests that action on the measure be delayed.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is entirely fair. The Senate will now be on notice that in the week beginning Monday, July 20, the coffee agreement will come before the Senate.

Mr. HUMPHREY. So far as any foreign policy requirements of the Government are concerned, whether the Senate acted today or on July 21 or 22 would really be immaterial. The effective date of the agreement would be in the month of August. I do not believe we shall in any way be crippling the foreign policy needs of the Government by deferring our action to this extent.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Can the acting majority leader advise the Senate of the plans for the rest of today and also for tomorrow?

Mr. HUMPHREY. On that point, I seek the attention of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. Williams]. The Senator from Delaware, the Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. Metcalf] are concerned with Calendar No. 904, H.R. 7381, to simplify, modernize, and consolidate the laws relating to the employment of civilians in more than one position and the laws concerning the civilian employment of retired members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes. I wonder whether the Senator from Delaware would be willing to have the vote on the bill taken tomorrow.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I have submitted some questions to the Department, but I have not yet received the answers. There is a possibility that I shall have no objection whatever to the bill. I think I might have the answers to my questions by tomorrow.

Mr. HUMPHREY. So that Senators may, therefore, be on notice, I state that when action on the innerloop bill has been completed, there will be some speeches. I understand that several Senators have indicated they desire to make statements for the Record. There will be no further legislative action today.

Earlier, an order was entered for the Senate to stand in recess until 12 noon, tomorrow. So we shall come in at 12 noon, tomorrow, for a very brief session—let me add, to act on Calendar No. 904, House bill 7381. Is that agreeable with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. Williams] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough]? I see that the Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough] is not in the Chamber.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, the Senator from Texas is not in the Chamber; but I talked with him a few minutes ago about this matter, and he informed me that he will be ready.

Mr. HUMPHREY. There will also be a resolution to provide for the Senate to be in recess from Monday next until July 20—from this Friday until July 20. I gather that we shall have a perfunctory session, at least, on Friday, so that we can fulfill the legal requirements; but no business will be transacted on Friday. So I suggest that Senators make their plans accordingly. If they wish to make statements for the Record during the morning hour on Friday, that can be done, but there will be no legislative business on Friday. There will be legislative business tomorrow on Calendar No. 904, House bill 7381.

I do not know whether there will be any committee reports or nominations. There may be something on the executive calendar. That seems to be the program for the balance of this week.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank the acting majority leader.

VEHICULAR TUNNEL UNDER PARTS OF THE U.S. CAPITOL GROUNDS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10392) authorizing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to locate a portion of a vehicular tunnel under parts of the U.S. Capitol Grounds and the U.S. Botanic Garden grounds, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Brewster in the chair). The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (H.R. 10392) was passed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

NEW PRESIDENT OF PAN AMERICAN AIRWAYS, HAROLD E. GRAY, A NATIVE OF IOWA

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the great State of Iowa is not usually identified with international air carriers. It is less expected to be the place of origin of the president of an airline which is one of the largest of its kind in the world.

This morning's newspapers, Mr. President, publish the news that the new president of Pan American World Airways is Mr. Harold E. Gray who, I am most proud to say, is a native of Iowa. He was born on April 15, 1906, in Guttenberg, Iowa, where he spent his boyhood. While he went on from the University of Iowa to become a pilot and outstanding officer of Pan American, and now its president, he has lost none of the modesty or humility so readily identified with his modest background.

President Harold E. Gray joined Pan American World Airways 35 years ago, only 2 years after the company was organized. He has been with the company since that time, and he has been an officer of the company since he was selected a vice president in charge of the Pacific-Alaska division in 1949. In 1952, he became executive vice president in charge of the Atlantic division. In 1959, he became a director and later that year became executive vice president of the expanded overseas division with the merger of the Atlantic and the Pacific-Alaska divisions.

During his 35 years of service, he has contributed importantly to technical and operating standards, including the development of exact and continuous pilot training programs for all Pan American pilots, plus the continuing development of stringent safety requirements and techniques, both in the air and in equipment maintenance; to development of rapid and accurate navigational methods; and to significant improvements in aircraft and engine design.

President Gray has had wide experience in air transportation throughout the world, and is widely recognized in the industry for his administrative abilities.

Now 58 years old, Mr. Gray is famed as a pilot among pilots. He took flight training at Brooks and Kelly Fields in Texas, and joined Pan American in 1929 after serving in the Army Air Corps. He was the tenth pilot hired by the company. He flew the first international airways between the United States and Mexico, Central and South America.

In 1934, he qualified as the first manager of ocean flying boats, the highest pilot rating. After carrying out pioneering flight duties in the Pacific, he was assigned in 1937 to the Atlantic. He conducted the first flights to Bermuda, Ireland, Southampton, the Azores, Lisbon, and Marseilles to prepare for Pan American's inaugural commercial air services to Europe. He commanded the flying boat *Yankee Clipper*, which carried passengers and mail on the first scheduled transatlantic flight.

Mr. President, we of Iowa are proud that Pan American's board of directors has seen fit to elect one of our own as its new president.

EUROPE'S POSITION ON SENATOR GOLDWATER

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the Washington Evening Star for today has published a timely and knowledgeable article, written by the distinguished columnist, Max Freedman, entitled "Europe's Position on Goldwater." I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, July 8, 1964]

Europe's Position on Goldwater: Editors Abroad Err on His Position, Ignore Party Compromise Efforts

(By Max Freedman)

As the Republicans are working on their platform in San Francisco, the European press is continuing its campaign against Senator Barry Goldwater. That criticism suffers always from a lack of good manners and almost always from a lack of good sense.

The only possible justification for this campaign is that Europe will inevitably have to look to the next President of the United States for leadership of NATO. Yet even this argument by no means justifies the sudden rash of irritated criticisms. For Senator GOLDWATER believes in a strong NATO community and wants to make it even stronger. The European editors are ignorant of this fact or else they believe he will choose the wrong methods to strengthen allied unity or will plunge the alliance into reckless danger. How can they be sure?

In Britain as in the rest of Europe there was very little serious attention paid to Senator GOLDWATER until he won the California primary. Then the gushing springs of prejudice poured forth abundantly. Most of the editors consulted their fears, not their files, and made a talent for invective a wretched substitute for accurate analysis. As a result Senator GOLDWATER is being portrayed as a reckless primitive, shooting always from the hip, having a stockpile of prejudices and threats, and incapable of the restraint that sanctifies the exercise of great power.

This is a pleasant caricature but it bears no visible resemblance to the truth. Besides, this entire campaign savors bitterly of something perilously akin to political insolence.

There would be a justified cry of outrage in England or Italy or Germany if the American press by a concerted campaign tried to influence the choice of a party leader in those countries. Yet that is precisely what the European press is now doing. It has not waited for the presidential campaign to start or for the national issues to be defined. It is interfering instead with the right of Republicans to make their own choice for the presidential nomination.

On the lowest grounds of self-interest the European editors are making an exceedingly stupid mistake. For they are stirring up sympathy for Senator GOLDWATER by their surly criticism and lending a color of reality to Senator GOLDWATER's claim that he is the all-American candidate.

If Western Europe really wants to follow the election campaign, it should try to understand the process of compromise now at work in the Republican Party. Unless the Republicans insist on dividing and demoralizing their party beyond hope of cure, they must begin at once to work for a common cause in this election.

This means that both the Goldwater supporters and the Goldwater critics must begin to blunt their differences. The one fair test will be not whether there are compromises, for compromises are now unavoidable, but whether these compromises are within the traditional principles of a national election.

Senator GOLDWATER, in particular, has the right as a presidential candidate to modify his earlier views. That same right was exercised by earlier candidates. It was exercised by President Kennedy and will be exercised by President Johnson. As the campaign develops, Senator GOLDWATER, if he becomes the Republican candidate, will be speaking in a context of responsibility and with sources of information and advice never before open to him on this large scale.

If this new experience does not alter his views on some questions, he thereby shows himself to be inflexible in his thinking and unworthy of national leadership. The sensible assumption therefore is that Senator GOLDWATER will make some concessions in good conscience for the sake of party unity and will accept still other compromises because his large staff of advisers will persuade him to agree with these changes.

Once this process begins, it will be easy to draw a pitiless contrast between what Senator GOLDWATER said in the past and what he is saying in the campaign. But this sort of analysis can be fair only if it takes into account the frankness with which Senator GOLDWATER admits his new policies and gives candid reasons for them.

CONSTITUTIONALITY OF CIVIL RIGHTS BILL

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the Washington Evening Star for today has published an interesting article, written by the distinguished columnist, David Lawrence, entitled "Constitutionality of Rights Bill." I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONSTITUTIONALITY OF RIGHTS BILL: NEGROES ARE EXPECTED TO CHALLENGE PERMISSIVE DISCRIMINATION'S CLAUSES

(By David Lawrence)

If the platform committee of either national party convention undertakes to state flatly that the new civil rights law is completely constitutional, this is one way to invite a lot of criticism—not only from opponents of the measure but also from some Negro leaders. For the new statute contains clauses which amount to permissive discrimination, and these sections are certainly going to be challenged on constitutional grounds by Negro organizations.

As a matter of fact, the basic principle that there should be no discrimination and that every citizen is entitled to "equal protection of the laws" is not really fulfilled by the new Civil Rights Act. There are many exceptions and exemptions which plainly ignore the fundamental concepts of equality.

Thus, for example, discrimination on the basis of race, color, religion, or national origin is prohibited in motels, hotels, or roominghouses with more than five rooms to rent, but discrimination is permissible in buildings with five rooms or less to rent if the proprietor himself happens to live in the roominghouse.

Discrimination is likewise permitted in any restaurant or lunchroom if a substantial portion of the food which it serves does not move in interstate commerce but is actually grown in the same State and if all the customers are local residents.

The new law also permits what is termed "racial imbalance" and specifically says that "desegregation" does not mean "the assignment of students to public schools in order to overcome racial imbalance."

Yet in New York City this very week a petition signed by 42,000 persons—parents and taxpayers—has been presented to the city clerk in an effort to prevent the operation of the board of education's school pairing and student busing plans which are scheduled to take effect in September. The plans, of course, were devised to help eliminate what is called de facto segregation.

In the case of "equal employment opportunities," the new law states that during the first year there must be no discrimination in hiring in any business which has 100 or more employees. But, it will be asked, what happens to the principle of "equal protection of the laws" for those individuals who are discriminated against in companies with less than 100 employees? In another section of the law there is permissive discrimination in the hiring of employees in any business or enterprise "on or near an Indian reservation." And here again the challenge may be made on the ground that the doctrine of "equal protection of the laws" does not permit of any such exception.

There has been a good deal of confusion over the question whether the new civil rights law is based on the 14th amendment or on the commerce clause of the Constitution. Some people who have not read the new statute very carefully seem to think that reliance on the 14th amendment has been abandoned and that the commerce clause of the Constitution alone is being invoked. Actually, the new civil rights law says:

"Discrimination or segregation by an establishment is supported by State action within the meaning of this title if such discrimination or segregation is carried on under color of any law, statute, ordinance or regulation."

This provision is, of course, based on the 14th amendment, which forbids State action of a discriminatory nature. In its 1883 decision, the Supreme Court said the 14th amendment applies only to discrimination by the State itself and not to private individuals. Only last month, three Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States specifically stated that the 14th amendment could not be constitutionally invoked to forbid discrimination in hotels or motels, even though they were licensed by the State to operate. The Justices said: "Businesses owned by private persons do not become agencies of the State because they are licensed: to hold that they do would be completely to negate all our private ownership concepts and practices."

But the new civil rights law—relying nevertheless on the 14th amendment—specifically says that "State action" is involved and Federal authority can be used to intervene when any hotel, restaurant or rooming house discriminates on the basis of "any regulation" required by the State. For these same businesses are licensed by the State irrespective of whether they engage in interstate commerce.

The question of constitutionality is thus open to further arguments by both the proponents and opponents of the new law, and it isn't going to be settled by any national political party convention.

SCRANTON'S CIVIL RIGHTS DEMAND

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the Washington Evening Star for today has published an interesting article, written by William S. White, entitled "Scranton's Civil Rights Demand."

This is a most perceptive article, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SCRANTON'S CIVIL RIGHTS DEMAND

(By William S. White)

Gov. William Scranton's demand that the Republican National Convention take up a position automatically prejudging the new civil rights law as inadequate is a deplorable departure from his usual high standards of public responsibility.

Nothing yet to occur in the battle for the Republican presidential nomination has so illustrated the tragic and dangerous bitterness of this great intraparty contest.

Governor Scranton is fighting for what he no doubt believes to be the very soul of the Republican Party, as well as for his own nomination. And men caught up in such convulsions can be and are forgiven much. Thus, his effort to have the Republican platform denounce such extremists as the John Birch Society—and by implication to associate Senator BARRY GOLDWATER with that organization—lies within the elastic rules of the political game.

So does his proposal that the convention go on record in support of the constitutionality of the Civil Rights Act—against which Senator GOLDWATER voted in the stated belief that those sections dealing with public accommodations and employment are unconstitutional.

NOT ENOUGH TIME

But when Governor Scranton says the Republicans should "go farther at the State and local levels in improving civil rights legislation" he is saying that an historic act on which the ink is yet damp is already doubtful for its purposes even though there has not been a single month's time to test it in the conscience of the country.

This he is saying while most national leaders are desperately trying to give the law a fair test—and to reconcile millions of Americans, not all of them "bigots," to this unexampled extension of the Federal power into the life of this Nation.

Other men are appealing to both sides in the great debate to put aside rancor and intemperate speech and action and to move forward together now in implementing this new law with firmness but also with charity and good sense. Louis E. Lomax, one of the most authentic of the Negro intellectuals, calls upon his race to show tolerance toward the South, now that it has been beaten, and to press its demands upon a defeated region rather slowly, just now in this time of passion and trial.

What he asks, in substance, is for magnanimity, for a spell at least, in the Negro victory. What he asks is for a moment of generosity toward those who opposed the bill; for he knows that in the end public consent must follow legislation, if legislation is to be at all effective and the country is to find a new union.

Senator Allen Ellender, of Louisiana, who fought the civil rights bill with all he had to offer so long as the decision was still open, calls from his side for obedience now to law. "Any other course," he adds, "is foolhardy and indefensible."

If such men as these—men who bore the heat and anguish of a memorable legislative fight from which the Governor of Pennsylvania was far removed—can speak in terms of conciliation, of national responsibility, why cannot William Scranton?

ATTACK CRITICIZED

For a man in high place to attack this act by inescapable inference as not enough, as Governor Scranton has just done, is to encourage the very forces of extremism and disorder which it is surely Governor Scranton's deeper purpose to put down.

To ask a national party to go on record at this somber and crisis-ridden hour with ill-thought demands for yet more civil rights legislation, before there has been the slightest true test of the capacity of legislation just this moment put upon the books, is needlessly provocative. It is, moreover, entirely outside the mainstream of responsible national action. It is waving the bloody shirt—and in a calmer time William Scranton will not be the last to realize as much.

For there is something even more important than the struggle for control of the Republican Party. There is an inescapable obligation not to go beyond the last limits of tolerance in this harsh and terrible and achingly delicate national issue.

NATIONAL ECONOMIC CONVERSION COMMISSION

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, on June 28, the editor of the St. Louis Post Dispatch contributed a significant editorial supporting the efforts of the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGovern] to create a National Economic Conversion Commission, as outlined in S. 2274.

This editorial sharply challenges the testimony of Gardner Ackley that the provisions of the McGovern bill would result in duplications of existing Federal agencies.

As a cosponsor of the National Economic Conversion Commission bill, permit me to invite the Senate's attention to this important statement.

I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Perspective on Arms Cuts

Senator McGovern, of South Dakota, is justifiably concerned over the administration's shortsighted lack of support for a National Economic Conversion Commission. A bill sponsored by the Senator would require such a commission to submit within a year recommendations for easing the impact of cutbacks in military spending, already hurting some cities. It would give a congressional mandate to planning for a shift of production away from military hardware.

Testimony before the Senate Commerce Committee, which is considering the bill, raises the possibility that the administration considers its own Committee on the Economic Impact of Defense and Disarmament to have a corner on insight into a problem so crucial to the Nation's economic health. Gardner Ackley, chairman of the latter group, testified that exaggerating the impact of change could hamper U.S. efforts to reduce world tension.

Mr. Ackley's point is valid. But the present dearth of information concerning exactly what the impact will be, and how communities can soften it, has caused a general uneasiness over arms cutbacks. There is evidence that exaggerated fears already hamper this country's efforts to reduce world tensions. Facts from many sources are needed to put the matter in perspective.

Several university studies already are underway. And the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency has announced plans to study the present and probable future ratio of swords to plowshares in Baltimore, Norfolk-Newport News, and Seattle. But Mr. Ackley's contention that the provisions of the McGovern bill are not needed will not stand up. The measure would require defense contractors to investigate alternate products to manufacture when military contracts are reduced or canceled. How many are planning for conversion with anything like the care they exhibited in 1944?

PROBLEMS OF A CYBERNATED ERA

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, recently, there has been much discussion of the problem of automation. Some have suggested that there is no such thing. They believe that there is nothing unusual about the pace at which machines are replacing men today, and that the only real problem is to find new jobs for displaced men as we have done in the past. Others disagree, arguing that men are being displaced so rapidly that we must find new ways to make sure that if jobs cannot be found, these men will have some way to provide themselves and their families with a reasonable income.

Two interesting contributions to the debate over automation—or, as it is sometimes called, cybernation—appeared recently. While one may agree or disagree with the conclusions of the following views, I believe that it is clear they are thought provoking and interesting.

I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "Automation Worry," published in the July 1, 1964, Wall Street Journal, be printed in the Record, together with an address by Robert Theobald to the International Association of Personnel in Employment Security, on June 30, 1964.

There being no objection, the article and the address were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Automation Worry: Some Economists Fear Impact of Technological Progress

(By Alfred L. Malabre, Jr.)

To call automation just another step in the advance of technology is the same thing as calling the H-bomb just another step in the advance of weaponry."

This is the view of a senior economist at the National Industrial Conference Board, a nonprofit organization devoted to economic research. His remark typifies the view of a growing number of business analysts who are expressing grave concern over automation's potential impact on employment. These authorities fear automation will cause not just temporary, moderate unemployment, as displaced workers are retrained and put in new jobs, but permanent, massive unemployment, as automated devices wipe out jobs wholesale.

Such gloomy prophets, to be sure, represent a minority of the country's economists. But their concern points up a mounting controversy that could have dramatic impact on national policies in coming years.

The core of the argument is this: Can joblessness in the long run be reduced, or even held to present levels, simply by speeding economic growth, through such current measures as the recent tax cut and training programs for persons lacking skills? Or will the advance of automation be so swift and sweeping that the sort of steps now being taken will prove pitifully inadequate a few years hence?

TRADITIONAL THEORY

Traditional economic theory, of course, holds that technological improvements, including automation, ultimately create jobs. In a sense, society has been automating since the wheel was invented, and there certainly has been an ever-increasing number of jobs.

The traditional view maintains that automation creates whole new industries, such as the computer business, and permits many existing industries eventually to employ many more workers at much higher pay. The reasoning is that by cutting costs automation enables companies to sell products more cheaply, and this in turn triggers so great a sales increase that more workers have to be hired, despite laborsaving devices.

The sales surge not only swells employment in the companies directly benefitting, the theory goes, but also in seemingly unrelated industries. A recent Philadelphia Federal Reserve Bank study provides an extreme example. Workers in companies prospering from automation, the study states, "are likely to eat more meals in restaurants, creating new jobs for waiters and waitresses."

Understandably, advocates of this optimistic view of automation are found mostly among conservative economists and members of top corporate management. But the list is far broader than that, as a recent statement by David J. McDonald, president of the United Steelworkers of America, indicates. "To oppose automation," according to the union leader, "is to oppose progress, and this I shall never do."

Those analysts, such as the economist at the National Industrial Conference Board, who liken automation to the H-bomb believe the traditional view of technological change simply cannot be applied to automation.

PESSIMISTIC PREDICTION

Automation is not merely another step in the advance of technology, they say, as the steam engine was a step forward from the windmill. They define automation distinctly—as the mechanization of decisionmaking and control functions, or machines operating machines. And they predict it will displace jobs at such a swiftly accelerating rate that in the end many millions of workers will be without jobs and without hope of ever obtaining jobs.

This will happen, warns the National Industrial Conference Board economists, within this generation. And some of the gloomier analysts predict the day is even more imminent.

What makes the pessimists' argument difficult, of course, is the obvious fact that the massive joblessness they foresee simply hasn't taken place. Only 5.1 percent of the Nation's labor force was unemployed at last report in May, after adjustment for seasonal factors. The jobless rate, in fact, has been declining. Last November, it amounted to 5.9 percent of the work force and as recently as April, 5.4 percent.

The pessimists nonetheless maintain these unemployment statistics are not nearly so cheerful as they might appear. These authorities note that the economy is in the midst of what is probably the strongest business expansion in history, with industrial production running nearly 30 percent higher than at the upturn's start in early 1961. Yet, it is argued, the unemployment rate remains stubbornly above 5 percent, without prospect of moving appreciably lower as millions of unskilled teenagers enter, or prepare to enter, the labor market.

Even Martin R. Gainsbrugh, the National Industrial Conference Board's chief economist who is not nearly as alarmed by automation as the above-mentioned members of his staff, expresses concern. "The unemployment rate," Mr. Gainsbrugh says, "is probably as low as it's going to get, even if the economy continues to expand at the current healthy pace." Many economists feel further quickening of business activity will bring on inflation long before it brings down the jobless rate.

The pessimists also cite what appears to be a marked slowdown in the rate at which so called white-collar jobs are increasing. It is these jobs that will provide enough new employment in coming years to more than offset factory or farm losses from automation, many authorities have hoped. Yet, according to a recent report by this newspaper, last year's gain in white-collar jobs amounted to only 0.9 percent, far less than the 2.8 percent average yearly rise during the 1950–60 decade.

"We may be witnessing the start of automation's invasion of the office," says an analyst at New York City's Irving Trust Co. "It has already invaded the farm and the factory. Where do you go from the office?"

The whole debate over automation's possible consequences is complicated by the ease with which the two sides are able to bring forth statistics, often bearing on the same situation, to support their respective theories.

Take, for example, the matter of automation's impact on automobile industry employment in Detroit. Expounding the traditional view, a recent Government pamphlet notes that "the unemployment rate in Detroit—a city that has experienced about as much automation as any—dropped from 15 percent to under 4 percent in 3 years, largely the result of increased demand for automobiles."

But, discussing the same topic before a, Senate subcommittee on employment and manpower last year, United Auto Workers President Walter P. Reuther cited some very different statistics and drew some very different conclusions. Between 1947 and 1962, he noted, employment of production workers in the auto industry dropped 10.8 percent, even though vehicle output soared 70.8 percent.

Armed with these and similar statistics, Mr. Reuther told the Senators: "Only a moron could believe that in this kind of a revolution we can rely exclusively upon the blind forces of the marketplace" to prevent widespread unemployment.

OVERHAUL OF SOCIAL SYSTEM

Particularly distressing to those who anticipate dire effects from automation is the fear that the Nation's social system will require a drastic overhaul in the years just ahead, to cope with the anticipated unemployment.

"We are entering a period when it will be necessary to revise the deep-rooted belief that work and income should be tied together," claims the worried economist at the National Industrial Conference Board. "People will have to be permitted to live well, even if they can't find work. And that means drastic social changes."

Expressing similar concern, a Massachusetts Institute of Technology analyst warns that unless radical action is taken, automation "will produce an unemployment situation in comparison with which the depression of the 1930's will seem a joke."

The sort of action these economists envisage is typified by a recent recommendation of a 32-member group of economists and liberal publicists, called the ad hoc committee. The suggestion: Guarantee all Americans an adequate annual income, regardless of whether they work. This, the committee stated, would help break the economy's "income-through-jobs link" which provides "the only major mechanism for distributing effective demand (and therefore) acts as the main brake on the almost unlimited capacity" of a highly automated economy to expand.

The great majority of economists, to be sure, doubt that any such radical measures will be necessary, as automation comes into wider and wider use. However, most agree that the accelerating pace of technology requires very close scrutiny, by private business as well as by the Government. And, almost to a man, they urge that efforts to gather pertinent information be stepped up, so that if very difficult unemployment problems do arise from automation they can be tackled in the most effective manner possible.

The current lack of vital facts about employment and unemployment is indicated by an example. The United States, unlike several other highly industrial nations, has no reliable information on job vacancies. Nor, despite some fledgling efforts in this direction, is there any prospect of obtaining such information any time soon. Such data, for one thing, would help officials to know more precisely what sort of training jobless workers should be given.

It seems certain that, whatever else automation may hold for the future, it will be one of the major influences in this Nation's economic planning.

Income Provision in a Cybernated Era

(By Robert Theobald)

In the last 12 months understanding of the realities of the present technological revolution has increased rapidly. An ever larger number of people are recognizing the fact that machines will at some foreseeable point in the future be able to replace men in a wide range of production and decisionmaking tasks. Disagreement today centers around the speed at which this process of replacement will take place and whether we can treat the present changes as a continuation of past trends or must regard them as fundamentally new.

I wish to leave you in no doubt about my position. I believe that we are entering a new era whose requirements are as different from those of the recent industrial age as those of the industrial age were different from the agricultural. In the agricultural era, human skill combined with human and animal power in a system which provided a minimal standard of living for the vast majority of the people and a leisured existence for a small elite. In the industrial age, which we are now leaving, human skills were combined with machine power to provide great wealth for a few, a reasonable standard of living for most and abject poverty for those unable to find a place within the productive system. Today the cybernated productive system is emerging—a new innovation in productive techniques and organization based on machine power and machine skill; i.e., on the combination of automated machinery and the computer.

Cybernation is already manifesting the fundamental characteristics of a production revolution: the development of new productive techniques and the subsequent appearance of new principles of organization, a localized beginning and the appearance elsewhere of the same revolutionary productive complex, a complete reordering of man's relationship to his environment and a dramatic total energy increase.

The beginning of the cybernation revolution is localized here in the United States and now in the 1960's. We must recognize, however, that the problems posed by the cybernation revolution are part of a new era in the history of all mankind but they are first being faced by the people of the United States and their early successes, or failures, will have a continuing effect on the course of the revolution.

The two major aspects of the cybernation revolution are manifestly evident. First, it will force man's mind out of the productive system just as surely as the industrial revolution forced out man's muscle. Gerard Piel, publisher of the Scientific American, has put it this way: "The new development in our technology is the replacement of the human nervous system by automatic controls and by the computer that ultimately integrates the functions of the automatic control units at each point in the production process. The human muscle began to be disengaged from the productive process at least a hundred years ago. Now the human nervous system is being disengaged."

Second, the coming of cybernation means that there will be no effective limit to our productive abilities. U Thant, Secretary-General of the United Nations, has expressed it in the following terms: "The truth, the central stupendous truth, about developed countries today is that they can have—in anything but the shortest run—the kind and scale of resources they decide to have. * * * It is no longer resources that limit decisions. It is the decision that makes the resources. This is the fundamental revolutionary change—perhaps the most revolutionary mankind has ever known."

The immediacy of the consequent challenge can be seen in the following two quotations. The first is by Richard Bellman, of the Rand Corp., and sets out the magnitude of change which can be expected; the second is by the Research Institute of America, a management advisory firm, which spells out the total lack of solutions adequate to deal with the coming problems.

"Industrial automation has reached the point of no return: the pace will increase astronomically in the next decade.

"The scientific know-how to automate American industry almost completely is already available and is certain to be used.

"Banks could cut their staffs in half easily by further automation; the steel and automotive industries could increase their use of automation a hundred-fold.

"Lower and middle management as well as production workers will be displaced for there will not longer be a need for decisionmaking at that level.

"Unemployment resulting from automation would be greater right now except that industries are holding back—at a sacrifice to their profits—to avoid increasing the severity of the problem. Self-restraint on the part of industries cannot continue indefinitely.

"Automation itself will produce few jobs.

"Two percent of the population—by implication the 2 percent at the upper administrative levels—will in the discernible future be able to produce all the goods and services needed to feed, clothe, and run our society with the aid of machines."

The Research Institute of America stated:

"The moment of truth on automation is coming—a lot sooner than most people realize. The shattering fact is that the United States is still almost totally unprepared for the approaching crisis.

"It's already clear that no one has any real solutions to the problems of automation. There are no master plans that work, either in Government offices or in union or industrial headquarters. As a result, there'll be a great deal of anguish and dislocation as emergency adjustments are made, crash programs improvised.

"This report cuts through the confusion and wishful thinking on automation to define the problems and most likely answers. It makes unpleasant reading, for this much is already certain: The actions taken to cope with the coming crisis of automation will be more radical than business and Government leaders publicly admit.

"First fact to grasp: Automation has just begun to bite in. Up to now, techniques have been in the process of development; today, the major systems are complete. From this point on, they'll be spreading rapidly. The effect will be revolutionary on everything from office and plant to society itself."

The era of production, whose organizing principle was economic scarcity, is passing rapidly and institutions based on this principle are both increasingly ineffective and increasingly destructive.

As some of you may know, I made a proposal to deal with the problems being raised by cybernation in my recent book "Free Men and Free Markets," published last fall. The argument of the volume was that technological change was proceeding so rapidly that it might shortly be impossible to provide conventional market-supported jobs for everybody and that a substantial part of the population would therefore be deprived of any possibility of obtaining a sufficient income. My proposal stated that if this should occur, we would need to develop new concepts to justify new patterns of income distribution—in particular I proposed that every individual in the United States should be guaranteed an income which would be adequate to allow him to live with dignity.

I needed a book to develop the reasons for this proposal. I shall make no attempt to justify it here. Suffice it to say that I consider it to be an absolute essential if our basic ideals are not to be casualties of the onrush of technology. I argued that the only step which would be adequate to safeguard the values supporting our concepts of individual dignity and worth would be to transform the present right to a job into right to an income, and to make this latter right absolute. My remarks today are not concerned with the justification for the guaranteed income proposal but with the way in which it would become law.

At the time the book was finally completed in late 1962, I still believed that major changes in our methods of distributing income would not become essential for several years. The aim of my book, therefore, was to stimulate debate around the concept of a guaranteed income. I hoped that as machine systems took over more and more jobs and as the concept that we could provide everybody with an income through holding a conventional job became more and more obviously inapplicable, the alternative of a guaranteed income would gradually come to be seen as desirable.

I have since recognized that I was wrong in my estimate of the pace of change. My error was not in underestimating the rapidity of cybernation but in failing to perceive the speed at which events would move in two other areas—international relations and civil rights.

First, I failed to anticipate any rapid detente between Russia and America, a detente which would necessarily lead to a reduction in arms expenditures. At the time my book was completed, all government sources indicated that defense expenditures would continue to rise or remain at the same level. Today, for the first time since the Korean war, it is official U.S. policy to look toward a reduction in the arms budget. Even the threat of such a reduction has brought about a definite reversal in personnel policies in defense-oriented establishments—companies which have in the past held onto excess personnel in the hope that they would be a valuable attraction for future defense contracts are now releasing people they do not foreseeably need. The result has been relatively severe unemployment in certain defense-oriented areas of the country and in certain professions numerically committed to defense, such as engineering. The State of California, in particular, is only too well aware of the problems which can emerge from any continuing decrease in defense expenditures.

Second, the pace and direction of evolution of the civil rights movement has surprised everybody, including the leaders of the movement. The primary demand of the movement today is for jobs and for the incomes and societal roles these jobs will bring. Such a demand cannot be satisfied so long as the excessive unemployment rates of the past 8 years continue. Daily events demonstrate that the unskilled Negro and white worker are engaged in an increasingly bitter struggle for the few new job opportunities. The potential for severe conflict is increased by the fact that neither side is yet acting upon the recognition that the present lack of job opportunities is due to the advance of cybernation. Continued high unemployment coupled with a demand of the civil rights movement for more jobs now is creating a highly volatile situation.

It was this combination of development in the three fields of cybernation, weaponry, and civil rights which led a group of 32 economists, labor leaders, publishers, and others—myself included—to form an ad hoc committee on the triple revolution. This committee sent a memorandum and letter to President Johnson some 3 months ago. One of the statements made in the letter deserves quotation here: "The men and women whose names are signed (to this memorandum) think that neither Americans nor their leaders are aware of the magnitude and acceleration of the changes going on around them. These changes, economic, military and social comprise the triple revolution. We believe that these changes will compel, in the very near future and whether we like it or not, public measures that move radically beyond any steps now proposed or contemplated."

Why does the increasingly sophisticated recognition and description of the problems not result in constructive debate? I am personally convinced through my work as a writer, consultant, and speaker, that the lack of constructive debate results from the fact that although we are now willing to recognize the problems, practically no important business or administration leaders are yet willing to face the magnitude of the changes which are so urgently required. But there are other, more subtle reasons. First, the United States is historically accustomed to severe crises devolping out of economic problems: It follows that so long as economic indicators do not signal an economic crisis, contrary information from all other indicators—moral, psychological, social, political—is ignored. We have so far been unable to understand that the drive for civil rights and the necessity for a peaceful world order could be the cause, rather than the result, of an economic crisis. Second, we have so far failed fully to understand the implications of the fact that the three revolutions—cybernation, civil rights, and weaponry—necessarily interact and that the fact that all three of them are occurring simultaneously makes the development of adequate policies several times more difficult than if each revolution could be treated in isolation.

We are faced with the need to develop a new socioeconomic order suitable for this new era. Our basic problem is that we have not yet carried out enough imaginative thinking about the potentials and requirements of the new order. However, in common with other members of the ad hoc committee, I have reached one firm conclusion: That the guaranteed income is the first necessary step if we are to achieve this new order.

How can we be so certain? We believe that the guaranteed income must be introduced in the immediate future because it is an absolute essential if we are to preserve our fundamental goal of individual freedom. The guaranteed income is not merely one of many possible solutions to the problems of cybernation: On the contrary, it is a prerequisite for the solution of the real problems of the second half of the 20th century—conservation, effective movement of information, full education, etc.

But the mere statement that it is a prerequisite does not solve the problem of how support can be secured for its introduction. If we are to develop public support for this measure we must understand exactly how Americans think about income distribution and why the scheme is basically an extension of existing American values.

What are the attitudes of Americans, and indeed all Westerners, toward patterns of income distribution? There seem to be two principle elements: First and fundamentally, that man should earn his subsistence through toil. Western man feels that he gains virtue from toil, that toil is not a duty but an opportunity, allowing the individual to develop a sense of value and uniqueness. Any proposal that income should be paid regardless of the toil carried out therefore threatens to destroy not only the present apparent ordering of the economic system but also the ordering of the social and psychological universe.

The other and newer principle states that in the event that the individual is unable to perform this work, he should receive enough income for support of himself and his family. Although application of this newer principle has so far been grudging and qualified, its validity is now accepted by almost all Americans.

The existence of these two principles in Western culture will result in a major clash in values when cybernation makes it impossible to provide market-supported jobs for all. The individual will feel guilty and the society will resist any set of measures which provide income without conventional toil. On the other hand, it will be recognized that it is unjust to deprive people of an adequate income if their toil is not needed in the productive system.

It would appear at first sight as though an impasse had been reached. However, there does seem to be a measure which could be passed to provide an economic floor for all when unemployment is excessive. My proposal would be to amend the Employment Act of 1946 to read: "It is the policy of the U.S. Government either to provide job opportunities for all those seeking work, or, if jobs are not available in adequate number, to guarantee an income of sufficient size to allow the individual or family to live with dignity."

Let us look for a moment at the implications of such a statement, which recognizes the responsibility of the U.S. Government either to provide a job or to provide an income. It should be noticed that this wording immediately eliminates all arguments about welfare chiseling because a right to an adequate income from the Government exists under this law if and only if unemployment is excessive; in other words the individual only receives income under this law when there continue to be insufficient market-supported jobs to go round.

Second, this wording does nothing to prevent or even discourage the drive for full employment; in fact it will probably increase the magnitude of the efforts which are made to continue full employment. Those who disapprove of the right to an income would strive even harder to create jobs. It might even turn out, paradoxically, that this is the one practical measure which would result in a temporary return to full employment because, rather than permit the continuance of present levels of unemployment—which would result in implementation of the right-to-income law—some legislators would prefer to unblock funds presently unavailable for urgently needed social tasks—building of educational and health facilities, city and town replanning, water and land conservation, aid to the underdeveloped countries. I wish to emphasize here that there can be no genuine disagreement as to the urgent need for the carrying out of these social tasks. Nor can there be disagreement about the need, given present conditions, to employ the employable and to train, or retrain, those presently unemployable. The only relevant grounds for disagreement are the political means to release resources to carry out these tasks.

Finally, let us recognize that the traditional financial objections of fiscal conservatives are not valid in an economy of abundance. It is still not understood that in conditions of abundance, when unused productive capacity is available, the creation of new uses for abundant resources increases the national income, creates jobs and generally improves economic conditions in the country. Because this scheme would, by definition, only be operative when unemployment was excessive, the additional payments to the unemployed would call forth additional goods and services rather than reduce the incomes of those still earning reasonable amounts by adding to their tax burdens.

I am not suggesting that it would be possible to secure passage for such a measure immediately: only that its good sense is so overwhelming that it may gather the necessary support from many sections of the public within a brief period of time. I believe that it can be demonstrated that full employment is an absolute requirement for the continued operation of our present system, that it is at least possible that cybernation will make full employment infeasible in the near future, and that we must therefore develop an alternative policy in the form of a practical political measure, which would be effective if the conventional wisdom proves incorrect when applied to the new conditions created by the impact of cybernation.

Let us now examine how this practical proposal should be put into effect. It should be based on one of the fundamental principles of the present U.S. tax system: the exemption of part of an individual's income from taxation. The original aim of this exemption was to insure that each person would only pay taxes when his income exceeded the level required to maintain a decent standard of living. During World War II, however, the implied contract between the Government and the people, which stated that sufficient income to cover reasonable expenses would be tax free, was broken and the amount of income exempted from tax was reduced to $500.

The original aim of the Federal tax exemption should be restored and exemptions should be raised to a level which would guarantee an untaxed income adequate for minimum subsistence. So long as unemployment exceeded a set percentage, those whose incomes did not reach this level would be entitled to receive Federal Government payments to make up the gap between their income and the proposed level. (The specifics of this technique are explored in more detail in the appendix to my book "Free Men and Free Markets.")

In order to put this scheme into effect it would be necessary to define the percentage of unemployment which would activate the scheme and also, the appropriate level of tax-free income. There is still considerable disagreement about the percentage which represents the minimum practicable level of unemployment in America—my estimate is 3 percent. This is, of course, far higher than the levels which have been achieved in Europe, but I believe that there are major differences in the United States and European conditions. As unemployment in the United States in recent years has considerably exceeded 3 percent, it would be necessary to provide for a transition period if this percentage were to be reestablished. The following annual percentages might therefore be applied: 4.5 percent for 1965, 4 percent for 1966, 3.5 percent for 1967 with the 3-percent level applying in 1968 and subsequent years.

Turning to income, at what level should the tax-free income be set? I believe that the starting level should be fixed at $1,000 for each adult and $600 for each child: if one takes the median size of family as four this corresponds fairly closely with the Council of Economic Advisers figure of $3,000 which they accepted as the poverty line.

These income levels are clearly too low: Why should a higher level not be set from the outset of the scheme? The difficulty is not in terms of the financial burden; this would not be of any great magnitude in terms of the productive capacity of the United States. However, any immediate higher level for the exemption would probably not be wise, for it is essential that the operation of the scheme be efficient, and this aim might not be achieved if the initial number of beneficiaries exceeded administrative capacities. It is in these terms that the proposed limits were set for it seems probable that 20 million Americans, or about 1 person in 10, would be covered even at these totally inadequate levels.

A rapid rise in tax-free incomes and hence entitlements should, of course, be achieved, for the $2,000 suggested for a couple is about $1,000 below the Bureau of Labor Statistics estimate of a modest but adequate budget in cities for a retired—i.e., nonworking couple—and the $3,200 allowed for a man, his wife and two children is little more than half the sum required for a similar modest but adequate budget. A provision should therefore be incorporated into the law which would raise the proposed tax-free levels by $100 a year until they approximated the levels calculated by the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

The operation of the scheme would be simple. If unemployment was above the percentage provided by the law (3 percent starting in 1968 and higher levels in earlier years) every individual and family whose incomes were below the level provided by the law ($1,000 per adult and $600 per child in 1965 and higher levels in later years) would receive Federal payments to make up the gap between their existing incomes if any, and their entitlement under the law. In calculating payments, however, we should recognize that those with private incomes from work or even capital should benefit from a larger exemption than those obtaining all their income from the State—a technique for this is also suggested in "Free Men and Free Markets." Many complexities will, of course, be necessary and others desirable. I have only need to set out here the main lines of functioning of the law.

What would be the situation after the passage of the proposed law? Two different evolutions are possible. First it may turn out, as I personally believe, that the effects of cybernation will in fact be so far-reaching and rapid that it will be impossible to achieve full employment: in other words that the growing efficiency of machine systems will continue to increase so fast that employers—both governmental and private—will find it cheaper to own or hire machines rather than men. In this case we would, in effect, have adopted the concept of an absolute constitutional right to an income as proposed in "Free Men and Free Markets." This would guarantee to every citizen of the United States and to every person who has resided within the United States for a period of 5 consecutive years, the right to an income from the Federal Government sufficient to allow him to live with dignity. No Government agency, judicial body, or other organization whatsoever would then have the power to suspend or limit any payments assured by these guarantees. At that time, when it would be perfectly clear that we could not provide conventional toil for everybody, it would also become obvious that society would have to recognize the value of many types of work now denigrated and would also have fundamentally to change the type of education in order to prepare the individual for a life of meaningful activity rather than toil. The goal of full worker employment would be replaced by the goal of full human development.

The alternative evolution, however, is that unemployment would be reduced below the levels specified by the law. I believe this to be improbable and am quite sure that this could only continue for a brief period of years. Nevertheless, this possibility must be dealt with. If effectively full employment were achieved, the proposed new principles of income distribution would not go into effect, for as has been clearly stated, they would apply if and only if excessive unemployment should continue.

In the event that full employment were to be achieved, there would still be substantial numbers of people who were unable to earn any income or whose incomes fell below the poverty level and who were unable through no fault of their own to earn enough to allow them to live with dignity. We will deal separately with two groups: the first group contains those who are presently classified as too old to hold a job, those who are too physically or mentally ill, and those with responsibilities which require that they should not be under the obligation to hold a job, for example women with young children but no husband; the second group contains those being educated.

Analysis of the problems of the first of these groups requires that we recognize that Western societies have never been willing to examine the implications of the fact that certain people cannot be expected to earn a living. This is quite simply a hangover from the past when all nations were so poor that they were in no position to provide funds to those in need and when the responsibility for the helpless had therefore to be left with family and neighbors. Today, society can afford to provide funds to those unable to toil; all that is lacking is the desire to do so.

The provision of incomes to those unable to toil or who should not toil because of their other responsibilities could be encompassed within the same amendment to the Employment Act. It would only be necessary to add that people in these categories should be provided with an income using the same technique described above and that this income should be provided regardless of the level of unemployment.

Let me briefly examine the reason for this step. There should be no need to justify payments to the physically and mentally ill: they cannot work and society should provide for them. A justification is apparently required for income payments to those presently classified as old, for one of the most sanctified of our work myths is that older people both could and should have saved enough to provide for their old age. This is merely a cynical fiction.

Those who are presently classified as old worked in an era when their income was necessarily far lower than is paid for jobs demanding a comparable level of skill and application today. They needed to spend a large proportion of their income just to cover their expenses, including the education of their children; they were therefore able to save very little, if anything, whether directly or through insurance schemes. Today's labor force, however, would not be enjoying its present level of income without their hard work and that of earlier generations who had even less to show for their toil. Any fair distribution of the Nation's resources should insure that old people be allowed to share in the wealth they created. Their labor was, in fact, wealth and it was invested in the national economy at a time when its value was at a premium. Today they should be collecting their earned interest.

I am, of course, aware that we already have many laws designed to meet the special needs of these groups. But this is precisely the problem, for the present mosaic of measures is an enormously cumbersome method of insuring that everybody can survive, or at least that their nonsurvival cannot be attributed directly to the failure of society. The time has come to set up a simple, clear-cut principle which will be philosophically central to the cybernated era in the same way as the pursuit of profit principle was central to the industrial age. The pursuit of profit did not, in effect, solve all problems in the industrial age but it provided an effective basic operating principle—in the same way the guaranteed income will not solve all problems in the cybernated age but it will provide a basic operating principle.

Let us finally turn to the problem of financing the student. Just as we have failed to face the fact that there are people who cannot be expected to earn their living, we have failed to recognize that we have extended the principle of parental support of children far beyond the breaking point. To put it brutally, in an agricultural or even an early industrial society, a child was wealth. After a few years of care, the child added to the family income rather than subtracted from it. In addition, the younger generation was expected to support their parents as they grew old. There was, thus, a rough balance, or even an imbalance, between the economic responsibility of the parents and that of the children.

Let us contrast this with the situation today. Because of the new demands of the world in which we live, a child should be educated at least until he is 21 and sometimes till he is 25 or 30. Despite the much vaunted existence of loans, grants and scholarships, it is still a fundamental assumption of our society that the primary economic responsibility for the education and support of the child lies with the parent. In effect, parents are assuming a double financial burden, for by the time the child leaves the educational process he is generally married and feels no obligation for the economic support of his parents. Parents can no longer be expected to underwrite the lengthy educational process which the future society requires of today's and tomorrow's young people.

We must recognize that the student is already "working" at least as relevantly as the man in the factory. The time has come when we must introduce the concept of a student salary, starting possibly at 14, and increasing with age, payable to all students attending school or university. This salary would be tangible proof of the recognition by society of the value of this young individual and its acceptance by the child would be a recognition by him of his obligation to the society which has accorded him this right.

In closing, let me restate the reason why I have modified the form of my guaranteed income proposal. Let me make it clear that I do not consider this modification an improvement. I am personally convinced that we should come to grips with the clear-cut implications of the cybernation revolution and with the fact that it makes our present socioeconomic system irrelevant. I believe that we will need all our energies to deal with the problems that we face and that it would be best to confront and discuss them directly.

I personally believe that it would be highly desirable that we accept the guaranteed income proposal now in its original clear-cut form. It appears increasingly to me that the gravest problem facing the United States today is the disaffection of large parts of the population from the society. The economically poor and the culturally alienated, who are the young and the minorities, have little interest in the goals our society presently espouses. I believe that the guaranteed income proposal, with its full acceptance of the right of everybody to a decent standard of living, whatever their personal interests, may be the only policy adequate to stop the headlong rush into passive anomie or active crime.

Nevertheless, I recognize that it is highly unlikely that the guaranteed income proposal will be accepted in its original clear-cut form. I recognize that adaption to cybernation will only take place if people can understand the reasons for proposals and come to support them. The guaranteed income proposal appears to be a radical departure from our thought traditions and seems to represent yet one more break with our past at a time when those breaks that have already occurred collectively threaten to cast us adrift from all that we have considered sure and certain. A proposal that the Federal Government should either provide the possibility of a job or provide an income is far more familiar in aspect.

We must all understand that the situation is too grave and too urgent to allow the luxury of fighting in noble postures for unattainable goals. We must come to grips with the fact that the continuation of present social disorder will speed the development of an economic crisis. We must propose policies to correct this disorder and avert this crisis—policies which can be made acceptable both to the public and to the legislators. The task is unprecedented: we have to achieve a pace of change in social and economic institutions and ideals which has never occurred in human history. Indeed, Spengler and Toynbee have already argued that it is impossible.

I believe that cybernation and abundance provide all the potential for evolution into a new and better society, but that they can also destroy us unless we employ them intelligently. I believe that many forces threaten to break loose during the sixties and that they could sweep us irresistably toward a type of computer-controlled society completely alien to our basic beliefs. We will need all the time we now have if we are to make the necessary changes in our socioeconomic system so that we can benefit from abundance rather than be destroyed by it.

FRANCE ENDS UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I should like to invite the attention of the Senate to two newspaper reports in the morning press. A Reuters story published in the New York Times reports that the French Government has decided to introduce a selective military service system to replace the general draft. The French Minister of Information, M. Alain Peyrefitte, states:

> We need about 200,000 men a year and we have available some 400,000.

A similar report published in the Washington Post notes that the French decision to abandon universal military service breaks a tradition leading back to Napoleon, which made no exceptions on the principle that both justice and equality demand universal service.

This new move by France points up the trend of events in all Western countries. Our need for men in service is now relatively stable, but the supply of men available for service is growing by leaps and bounds. Britain and Canada have already drawn the obvious conclusion: they have eliminated the draft and are now relying upon voluntary methods to fill their manpower needs. France has not yet reached this point, but has just decided to move from a universal military system to a selective service system because of the excess of manpower.

On Monday, June 29, 1964, I introduced legislation aimed at eliminating the military draft by 1967, the date the present U.S. law expires. My legislation would direct the Secretary of Defense to submit to the Congress for its consideration by next year a detailed alternative to the draft. It may be that my judgment is wrong and that we are not yet quite at the point where volunteers can fill our needs, but I do not believe so. However, the only way we can find out is if we are able to examine in full detail at least two alternatives, one compulsory and one voluntary.

I believe that the French decision is particularly interesting in this regard. Note that Mr. Peyrefitte states that the French need about 200,000 men a year but have available some 400,000—that is, they have twice as many as they need. Today, we are already at this point in the United States. The fact that 42 percent of eligible draftees are never drafted makes a mockery of the idea of universal military training. But this is only the begininng. Our manpower pool is growing by leaps and bounds. By 1967, the potential pool of manpower available will be at least three times the number required. At that time, if we continue the present system, we shall be drafting about 90,000 men per year out of an eligible pool of more than 12 million. Another 500,000 will be expected to volunteer.

It is clear that as the manpower pool grows and our needs remain fairly constant, we shall one day reach the point where the draft must be eliminated. I believe that point can be reached by 1967. I believe that we can take our cue from the French decision, and begin to consider a serious alternative to the draft which would raise pay and other incentives to volunteer, which would reduce the number of volunteers needed by replacing military personnel with civilians where possible—only 14 percent of men in service are in combat units; the rest are in administrative, clerical, and other support roles—and which would revise presently rigid entrance standards which keep back many thousands of volunteers who actually wish to be in service but are not permitted to enter.

I ask unanimous consent to have these two articles printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, July 8, 1964]

FRENCH PLAN CHANGE IN MILITARY DRAFT

PARIS, July 7.—The French Government has decided to introduce a selective military service system in France to replace the current general draft, Alain Peyrefitte, Minister of Information, announced after a cabinet meeting today.

Mr. Peyrefitte said that every male citizen would still be liable for military service but that France would have available each year twice as many young men of military age as the armed forces required.

"We need about 200,000 men a year, and we have available some 400,000," Mr. Peyrefitte said.

He said the selection would be made by various methods. The standard of physical fitness would be raised, and some men would be exempted on professional or economic grounds according to the current requirements or interests of the country.

Mr. Peyrefitte said the Government had decided on the change because of the progressive adaptation by the French army of nuclear weapons, and the longer training periods required for handling of modern weapons.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, July 8, 1964]

PARIS TO END DRAFT

The French Government has decided to abandon universal military service for selective service because more young men are available now than are needed due to population growth and the lessening demands of nuclear forces.

The move broke a tradition, dating back to Napoleon, which made no exceptions on the principle that both justice and equality demanded universal draft.

DRAFT NOT NEEDED AS A THREAT TO FORCE MEN TO VOLUNTEER FOR MILITARY SERVICE

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, on Monday, June 29, 1964, I proposed that the Secretary of Defense be directed to submit to the Congress for debate and review an alternative to the military draft so that we could evaluate voluntary methods of securing adequate armed forces.

I believe that by 1967, when the present draft laws expire, we shall be in position to maintain our forces by voluntary methods. By that time only 90,000 men will be drafted each year—out of a vast pool of over 12 million.

Another 500,000 volunteers are expected each year. One question those who support the draft often ask is whether these men would actually volunteer for military service if the threat of the draft disappeared. This is a fair question, but I believe that we now have substantial evidence that great numbers of men wish to join the service and would continue to do so even without the draft.

Note that the following evidence that men wish to volunteer with or without the draft is based upon the present pay scales under which volunteers receive a mere $78 per month when they enlist. The plan I proposed Monday would involve a substantial increase in pay and other inducements to enlist. It would also involve reductions in military manpower needs which would reduce the number of volunteers required. These proposed changes would obviously make the task of filling our manpower requirements without the draft much easier.

The evidence that men wish to volunteer even without the draft comes from at least three different sources. In my presentation to the Senate on Monday, I introduced into the RECORD an Army survey which showed that 63 percent of men in service actually join with little thought of the draft. Basically, they wish training and service career opportunities.

I ask unanimous consent that the table which I introduced into the RECORD be reintroduced at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Influence of draft upon enlistment decision of 1st-term Army enlistees, by mental group

[In percent]

	Total	Group I	Group II	Group III	Group IV
No influence	46.8	21.7	35.2	55.9	66.9
Very little influence	16.5	14.0	18.0	16.3	14.6
Some influence	17.4	24.5	23.2	13.9	8.1
Very much influence	19.3	39.8	23.6	13.9	10.4
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Source: 5-percent Army-wide sample survey, as of Nov. 3, 1962.

Based on responses to following question: When you were a civilian without prior military service, how much influence did the selective service draft have upon your decision to enlist in the Regular Army?

No influence; I wanted to be in the Army.

Very little influence; I most likely would have enlisted if there had been no draft.

Some influence; I might not have enlisted if there had been no draft.

Very much influence; I would not have enlisted if there had been no draft.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, this Army survey is supplemented by two Air Force surveys which I should like to bring to the attention of the Senate today. The first, done in October 1962, shows that less than 3 percent of the Air Force recruits enlist fearing the draft. Another 41.9 percent volunteer primarily because of training opportunities, but partly out of fear of the draft. Most important, more than half, 55.4 percent, stated "the possibility of being drafted had no bearing on my enlistment in the Air Force."

I ask unanimous consent to have a summary of this survey printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SURVEY OF THE INFLUENCE OF THE DRAFT ON DECISION OF NONPRIOR SERVICE ENLISTEES TO VOLUNTARILY ENLIST IN THE AIR FORCE (OCTOBER 1962)

All nonprior service enlistees reporting to the basic military training center during the period October 1 through 30, 1962, were surveyed. A total of 9,016 airmen were surveyed.

Survey was accomplished by use of an unsigned form containing the following instructions and questions:

"Which of the following best describes the reason that you decided to enlist in the USAF? (Check one only.)

"1. Primarily because I thought that I would probably be drafted into the service and I preferred to enlist in the branch of my choice: 241, 2.7 percent.

"2. Primarily for the training and/or career opportunities offered by the Air Force, but also partly because I thought that I would probably be drafted if I did not enlist: 3,779, 41.9 percent.

"3. The possibility of being drafted had no bearing on my enlistment in the Air Force: 4,996, 55.4 percent."

(Number and percentage responding to each possible answer is shown following the statement.)

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, the third survey I should like to present was done in May 1962. This confirms the general conclusions of the October survey. It shows that only 13.5 percent of Air Force recruits joined the service "in preference to being drafted." Most volunteered because of training or career opportunities, including 20.3 percent who "wanted Air Force educational and technical training," 11.2 percent who felt that the "Air Force career opportunities looked better to me than civilian life," and 11 percent who joined seeking "travel, adventure, and new experiences."

I ask unanimous consent to have the results of this May 1962, Air Force survey printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

What were the most important reasons for your original enlistment into the Air Force (or Army Air Corps, or Army Air Force)?

	Percent
1. Can't remember my original reason	3.4
2. Was originally drafted	4.8
3. Wanted to get away from an unpleasant civilian situation (other than unemployment)	3.4
4. Travel, adventure, and new experiences	11.0
5. Joined the Air Force in preference to being drafted into military service	13.5
6. Air Force career opportunities looked better to me than civil life	11.2
7. Air Force pay and fringe benefits	.5
8. Wanted AF educational and technical training	20.3
9. Needed a job at the time	3.9
A. Wanted to take advantage of the GI bill in later civilian life	.9
B. Patriotic feelings and national defense	5.0
C. Friends, or relative, recommended the Air Force	1.5
D. Interested in aviation and flying	5.8
E. Security of AF life (steady job and retirement)	3.4
F. Felt it would help me become more mature and self-reliant	7.2
G. Came from a service family	.7
H. None of the above reasons	3.6

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, my proposed legislation, directing the Secretary of Defense to present to Congress, for review and debate, a fully developed voluntary alternative to the draft, is based partly upon the belief that the draft is no longer necessary, as a threat to produce volunteers. The most important elements of this plan are:

Increase military pay and other incentives to enlist. U.S. inductees earn only $78 per month while Canada pays new volunteers almost twice as much. Five thousand U.S. airmen now in service must also receive relief payments to support their families.

Eliminate arbitrary standards which bar men from service who want to enlist. There are many cases of men who were drafted who had previously been rejected by unnecessarily rigid standards when they tried to volunteer.

Reduce military manpower needs by using civilians wherever possible. Of the 2.7 million men in arms, only 14 percent actually are in combat units. Many roles could be filled by civilians.

Induct thousands of technically unqualified men who wish to enlist. I think we should upgrade less qualified men once they are in service. A letter from Lewis B. Hershey, Director of the National Selective Service System, to me shows that large numbers of young men not technically qualified for military service really want to serve.

I am confident that once Congress compares two fully developed alternatives, one compulsory, one voluntary, it will decide that a more economical and efficient armed forces can be maintained without the draft.

Although the Armed Services Committees have held hearings on the extension of the draft, the last time Congress considered the subject the Senate devoted only 10 minutes of discussion to it—and then extended present law for 4 full years.

That is not adequate consideration for a program which is supposed to be a cornerstone of our Nation's defense, and a program which has serious impact on the lives of millions.

This is a matter which affects the lives of every American boy. It overshadows the most important formative years of his life—the years between 18 and 26.

We cannot claim to have fulfilled our responsibilities unless we give serious study to this problem. Yet it has been 14 years since Congress carefully weighed voluntary alternatives to the draft.

The last time we undertook a comprehensive review of voluntary versus compulsory methods to fill our military manpower needs was before the Korean war, in 1948 and in 1950.

I believe that by the time we next vote on the draft—in 1967 when present law expires—we should have before us for consideration at least two fully developed alternatives, one voluntary, one compulsory.

A PROPOSED BASIC CHANGE IN NATIONAL POLICY ON NARCOTICS ADDICTION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have long sought a complete reevaluation of our Nation's approach to the grave national problem of narcotics and drug addiction. Along with my colleague [Mr. Keating] and other Senators, I have repeatedly introduced legislation which would begin the treatment of this grave problem of our increasingly urban society as an illness rather than a crime. I had very much hoped that the report issued last January by the President's Advisory Commission on Narcotics and Drug Addiction would mark a historic break with the past in Federal attitudes toward this problem. Unfortunately, very little attention has been given to the report or to the recommendations for a change in policy which it contained.

Once again the spotlight has been turned upon the need for such a change by the issuance on June 21 by the Advisory Council of Judges of the National Council on Crime and Delinquency of its report entitled "Narcotics Law Violations: A Policy Statement." The judges emphatically recommended a number of changes in law and executive policy which would basically carry out the curative, rather than penal, approach earlier recommended by the President's Commission.

I believe the report fully justifies, as did the earlier President's Commission report, the steps which I have continually urged as the basic minimums of an enlightened view of this social disease:

First. Legislation to provide Federal assistance to State and local governments and nonprofit organizations for broad treatment and rehabilitation programs in the metropolitan environment of those afflicted. A start toward such a program was made at my urging in the Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act, Public Law 88–164, enacted last year, which, based on the work that I did myself on it, and according to the report of the House-Senate conference committee on the measure, would make aid available to narcotics treatment facilities which are part of community health centers. There is still a need for specialized narcotics facilities in those communities which may not be able to take advantage of the Community Health Centers Act. My bill, S. 861, should be enacted to take care of these remaining areas.

Second. Legislation authorizing Federal civil commitment for treatment of narcotics users as an alternative to criminal conviction and imprisonment. This approach, which has been pioneered at the State level by New York and California, should be extended to the Federal level. S. 864, the bill which my colleague, Senator Keating, and I have introduced, would provide such a flexible alternative to the existing inflexible criminal prosecution technique, which is appropriate in cases involving sellers or pushers of narcotics, but is certainly inappropriate in the case of those who are simply sick.

Third. Development of a comprehensive Federal research program within the National Institute of Mental Health. My bill, S. 862, would make it clear that very much needed basic research on approaches to this problem can be assisted by NIMH.

Fourth. A legislative effort to achieve effective international control of the distribution of dangerous drugs.

These basic minimums of an enlightened view should be given prompt attention now that both the President's Commission and the Judges' Advisory Council as well as such medical groups as the New York Academy of Medicine, have called for a new approach to narcotics addiction. There are, of course, differences in specifics among the experts in this field and even between the President's Commission and the Advisory Council, but I believe it is now clear that a consensus has been arrived at that a thorough reevaluation of the existing law and practices is urgently needed.

I am most pleased that the Permanent Investigations Subcommittee of the Senate Government Operations Committee—on both of which I am a member—has hearings scheduled for later this month, in connection with the organized crime hearings which it has conducted during this Congress, devoted specifically to problems of narcotics enforcement and treatment. I very much hope that the critically needed reappraisal will finally be undertaken in these hearings and that the administration will at last give its support to these bills, which would mark a historic break in policy by treating narcotic addiction as an illness rather than as a crime.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the Record the report of the Advisory Council of Judges of the National Council on Crime and Delinquency. The report is entitled "Narcotics Law Violations."

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

NARCOTICS LAW VIOLATIONS—A POLICY STATEMENT OF THE ADVISORY COUNCIL OF JUDGES OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON CRIME AND DELINQUENCY

FOREWORD

Like other social welfare groups, the National Council on Crime and Delinquency is concerned about the problem of organized crime, probably the most damaging form of crime in this country. Its damage exceeds that of all "ordinary" crime, for, aside from the monetary loss it inflicts on the population, aside from the violence and killings committed by the members of the criminal syndicates, organized crime has a uniquely insidious effect on our total culture through its contamination of law enforcement and Government officials. This corruption, together with the status and power of syndicate racketeers and their inroads into legitimate enterprises, encourages criminal careers and disrespect for law and authority.

In part, the problem must be dealt with in the courts. "The Model Sentencing Act," written by NCCD's Advisory Council of Judges and published by NCCD in 1963, provides for sentencing racketeers as dangerous offenders. But the larger part of the problem lies outside the court, in law enforcement and in the legal definitions of criminal acts.

The policy statement in the following pages is another step, along with the Model

Sentencing Act, toward formulating a broad approach to dealing with and solving the organized crime situation. The narcotics problem is a serious one in this country, and it appears to be growing. The damage to persons addicted to narcotics is bad in itself, but existing laws and administration make the addicts' plight even worse. Often they must turn to crime to satisfy their craving, and in some cities a substantial portion of the crimes against property and person is committed by addicts. Worst of all, selling drugs to them is a profitable business and thus one of the major fields of organized crime.

In the concluding paragraph of the policy statement, the ACJ states that it "will cooperate with judicial, bar, and medical groups whose programs are substantially in accord with its policy." There is much to be done by all. The National Council on Crime and Delinquency will continue to have an active interest in this problem and in the future shall publish similar policy statements on other phases of organized crime.

MILTON G. RECTOR,
Director, National Council on Crime and Delinquency.

MAY 1964.

PREFACE

Judges of all courts are painfully aware of the narcotics problem. In trial courts they see addicts and pushers and in appellate courts they encounter special aspects of law enforcement—search and seizure, arrest, entrapment, and sentencing—which illuminate phases of the traffic in narcotics and other activities of organized crime.

Clearly, the problem of narcotics is not of concern to doctors only, or to legislative draftsmen only, or to law enforcement officers only, for its ramifications are as broad as organized crime itself. As judges, it is our responsibility to relate the narcotics problem to other aspects of organized crime; and, as an affiliate of the National Council on Crime and Delinquency, it is most appropriate that we do so. Accordingly, our continuing Committee on Organized Crime is studying other aspects of the problem and plans to issue further reports on them.

It is also clear that much has been left unsaid in this report. Treatment methods for drug addicts have been notoriously deficient. We hope that the policies recommended below will be adopted so that doctors will be released from the restraints that now prevent them from applying their knowledge of treatment of addicts. We hope, too, that, far more than in the past we will be confronted with the task of sentencing not the drug addicts—an ineffectual process, at best—but rather the influential racketeers managing the drug traffic, and that adequate sentencing tools, such as the dangerous offenders provisions of the Model Sentencing Act, will be at our disposal.

ALFRED P. MURRAH,
Chairman, Advisory Council of Judges.

ADVISORY COUNCIL OF JUDGES

Chairman, Alfred P. Murrah, chief judge, U.S. court of appeals, Oklahoma City, Okla.

Chairman, juvenile and family courts section, Leo B. Blessing, judge, juvenile court, Parish of Orleans, New Orleans, La.

Chairman, criminal courts section, Irving Ben Cooper, judge, U.S. district court, New York, N.Y.

Paul W. Alexander, judge, division of domestic relations and juvenile court, court of common pleas, Toledo, Ohio.

Charles O. Betts, judge, district court, Austin, Tex.

Amos N. Blandin, Jr., associate justice, Supreme Court of New Hampshire, Hanover, N.H.

Leo B. Blessing, judge, juvenile court, Parish of Orleans, New Orleans, La.

William J. Brennan, Jr., Justice, Supreme Court of the United States, Washington, D.C.

Alfred J. Chretien, justice, municipal court, Manchester, N.H.

John J. Connelly, justice, Boston juvenile court, Boston, Mass.

Irving Ben Cooper, judge, U.S. district court, New York, N.Y.

George Edwards, judge, U.S. court of appeals, Cincinnati, Ohio.

Harold N. Fields, judge, Marion County juvenile court, Indianapolis, Ind.

Gerald F. Flood, judge, superior court of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.

Philip Forman, judge, U.S. court of appeals, Trenton, N.J.

William S. Fort, judge, circuit court, Eugene, Oreg.

W. Turney Fox, judge, district court of appeals, Los Angeles, Calif.

Thomas D. Gill, judge, juvenile court for the State of Connecticut, Hartford, Conn.

Edward S. Heefner, Jr., judge, Forsythe County domestic relations court, Winston-Salem, N.C.

Thomas Herlihy, Jr., judge, municipal court, Wilmington, Del.

Robert M. Hill, judge, circuit court, Florence, Ala.

Ivan Lee Holt, Jr., judge, circuit court, St. Louis, Mo.

Laurance M. Hyde, chief justice, Supreme Court of Missouri, Jefferson City, Mo.

Bertil E. Johnson, judge of the juvenile court, the superior court, Tacoma, Wash.

Florence M. Kelley, administrative judge, New York State family court, New York, N.Y.

Orman W. Ketcham, judge, juvenile court, Washington, D.C.

Theodore B. Knudson, judge, family court division, district court, Minneapolis, Minn.

Donald E. Long, judge, circuit court, Portland, Oreg.

John W. McIlvaine, judge, U.S. district court, Pittsburgh, Pa. (deceased, July 1, 1963).

William B. McKesson, district attorney, Los Angeles County, Calif.

John E. Mullen, associate justice, superior court, Providence, R.I.

Alfred P. Murrah, chief judge, U.S. court of appeals, Oklahoma City, Okla.

Frank W. Nicholas, judge, court of common pleas, Dayton, Ohio.

Emory H. Niles, chief judge, supreme bench of Baltimore City, Baltimore, Md.

Donald A. Odell, presiding judge, superior court, Los Angeles, Calif.

James C. Otis, judge, supreme court, St. Paul, Minn.

Monroe J. Paxman, judge, juvenile district court, Provo, Utah.

Paul C. Reardon, justice, supreme judicial court, Boston, Mass.

George H. Revelle, judge, superior court, Seattle, Wash.

Henry A. Riederer, judge, circuit court, Kansas City, Mo.

Clayton W. Rose, judge, division of domestic relations, court of common pleas of Franklin County, Columbus, Ohio.

Joe W. Sanders, associate justice, Supreme Court of Louisiana, New Orleans, La.

William F. Smith, judge, U.S. court of appeals, Newark, N.J.

Simon E. Sobeloff, chief judge, U.S. court of appeals, Baltimore, Md.

Herbert J. Steffes, judge, Milwaukee County municipal court, Milwaukee, Wis.

Thomas Tallakson, judge, juvenile division, district court, Minneapolis, Minn.

William J. Thompson, judge, intermediate court of Kanawha County, Charleston, W. Va.

Dorothy Young, judge, juvenile court of Tulsa County, Tulsa, Okla.

Luther W. Youngdahl, judge, U.S. district court, Washington, D.C.

Staff: Sol Rubin, counsel, NCCD.

NARCOTICS LAW VIOLATIONS—POLICY STATEMENT BY THE ADVISORY COUNCIL OF JUDGES, NATIONAL COUNCIL ON CRIME AND DELINQUENCY

Repressing the narcotic drug traffic by criminal sanctions is a comparatively recent innovation in the United States. Until the early 1900's, drugs, including morphine, were available at moderate prices not only from the local pharmacist but from the grocer as well. Doctors were only beginning to warn about opium addiction.

The Harrison Act

In 1912 the United States adhered to the Hague opium convention, by which it undertook to control the domestic production, sale, use, and transfer of opium and coca products, and it has adhered to later international control treaties. A significant aftermath of our participation in the 1912 convention was the Harrison Act, not a criminal statute but rather a regulatory measure.[1] The heart of the act is an excise tax, imposed on opium, inonipecaine, coca leaves, and other opiates and their derivatives at the rate of 1 cent per ounce, to be evidenced by stamps affixed to the package or container. The act makes it unlawful for anyone to purchase, sell, dispense, or distribute any narcotic drugs unless he does so in or from the original stamped package. It is also unlawful for anyone to sell or give such drugs except pursuant to a written order for the recipient on forms supplied by the Treasury Department. Persons in any vocation involving the handling of narcotic drugs (such as importers, doctors, druggists) are required to register with the Treasury Department, pay an occupational tax of $1, to $24, and keep records available for inspection. In 1937 marihuana was subjected to a similar pattern of control, except that the tax rate was prohibitory—$1 an ounce on any transfer to a person registered under the act, and $100 an ounce on transfer to an unregistered person.

Counterfeiting of stamps, failure to file returns, and other evasions are punished by the general tax law provisions; in addition, the possession of drugs in unstamped containers is prima facie evidence of a violation, and drugs in unstamped containers are subject to seizure and forfeiture. Transporting drugs is a crime for any person not registered or protected by certain specific exemptions—e.g., common carriers, employees of registrants, etc.

However, under the act, physicians, dentists, and veterinary surgeons lawfully entitled to dispense drugs may prescribe or administer them to patients in the course of professional practice without making use of the Treasury Department order form and without conforming to the stamped-package requirement (although they must register and keep records), if the prescription is issued for "legitimate medical uses." Persons possessing drugs obtained pursuant to a prescription, or received directly from a registered practitioner, are excepted from the general prohibitions against transportation and possession.

For the first 10 years of the Harrison Act's operation physicians were unhampered in their prescription of narcotics to patients, and a number of clinics for addicts were operating. Indeed, "the Treasury Department's 1919 report encouraged local health departments to set up clinics where addicts could receive carefully regulated amounts of drugs and be encouraged at the same time to overcome their habits. Such clinics were established in 40-odd cities. Some of them appeared to be fairly successful, although many took insufficient precautions to assure that addicts would not obtain drugs from more than one source or failed to ascertain that they were treating actual addicts, so that sometimes peddlers came and sold the drugs they received from the clinics."[2]

---

[1] Act of December 17, 1914, ch. 1, 38 Stat. 785, as amended, 26 U.S.C. 4701–4736 (Int. Rev. Code).

In 1920 the Narcotics Division of the Treasury Department was merged into the new prohibition unit, then launching its crusade against liquor drinkers and bootleggers. It also launched a campaign against doctors who administered narcotics to addicts. The drive, destined to achieve the practical outlawing of medical administration of drugs to addicts, is reflected in a series of cases that reached the U.S. Supreme Court.

The cases

In 1919 Dr. John Webb was prosecuted for a flagrant abuse—selling thousands of prescriptions, at 50 cents apiece, to any person indiscriminately. He was found guilty and appealed to the Supreme Court, which affirmed in a 5-to-4 decision. The Court said that "to call such an order for the use of morphine a physician's prescription would be so plain a perversion of meaning that no discussion is required."[3] Subsequently, a second case of outrageous abuse was appealed to the Court and again the conviction was upheld.[4]

In the next case, *United States* v. *Behrman*, decided March 27, 1922, the abuse was also flagrant.[5] Dr. Behrman had given a known addict, at one time and for use as the addict saw fit, prescriptions for 150 grains of heroin, 360 grams of morphine, and 210 grams of cocaine. The indictment, drawn so as to omit any accusation of bad faith, charged, in effect, that the purpose of Dr. Behrman's treatment was cure of the addict. Thus its validity depended on a holding that prescribing drugs for an addict was a crime, regardless of the physician's intent in the matter. The district court sustained a demurrer, and the Government invoked its right to appeal directly to the Supreme Court. A majority of the Justices, no doubt moved by the flagrant facts, which they set forth fully in the opinion, ruled that the indictment was good. Three Justices dissented. "It seems to me wrong," said Justice Holmes, who wrote the dissent, "to construe the statute as creating a crime in this way without a word of warning. Of course, the facts alleged suggest an indictment in a different form, but the Government preferred to trust to a strained interpretation of the law rather than to the finding of a jury upon the facts."

Armed with what came to be known as the Behrman indictment, the Narcotics Division launched its campaign. As described by Dr. Marie Nyswander, a former staff member of the Federal Narcotics Hospital at Lexington, Ky.: "Prosecution of a number of physicians had made others doubly wary. Of the 8,100 physicians practicing in New York City, less than 40 continued to prescribe narcotics for addicts. And the Bureau seized upon this fact further to discredit the physician's role. These physicians, besieged by addicts, were of necessity giving out a large number of prescriptions. Accused of trafficking in drugs, they were all indicted. The term 'trafficking physician' carried such opprobrium that practitioners who valued their reputation could not afford to administer drugs no matter how ill the addict. The Bureau had won the day in New York, and the private physician's right to treat the ill had been abrogated."[6]

The New York Academy of Medicine reports: "From the year of the Harrison Act to 1938 it is estimated that 25,000 physicians were arraigned and 3,000 served penitentiary sentences on narcotics charges. About 20,000 were said to have made a financial settlement."[7]

Any doctor prescribing for an addict who did not have some other ailment that called for narcotization was likely to be in trouble with the Treasury agents. Addict patients became addict criminals dealing with illegal peddlers and committing crimes to sustain their habit, even though many of those who were caught had once been respected members of their communities. Instead of policing a small domain of petty stamp tax violators, the Narcotics Division expanded its activities until it was swelling the prison population with thousands of felony convictions each year.

The Behrman ruling was sooon challenged. Dr. Charles O. Linder, after a lifetime of honorable practice in Spokane, Wash., was induced by one of the Division's female informers to give her a prescription for three tablets of cocaine and one of morphine. He was indicted in the Behrman form, convicted, and sentenced. He lost on his appeal to the circuit court of appeals. But he carried the fight on to the Supreme Court, where he was completely vindicated.[8]

The unanimous opinion, written by Justice McReynolds, set forth what is still the Supreme Court's interpretation of the Harrison Act:

"The enactment under consideration levies a tax, upheld by this Court, upon every person who imports, manufactures, produces, compounds, sells, deals in, dispenses or gives away opium or coca leaves or derivatives therefrom, and may regulate medical practice in the States only so far as reasonably appropriate for or merely incidental to its enforcement. It says nothing of 'addicts' and does not undertake to prescribe methods for their medical treatment. They are diseased and proper subjects for such treatment, and we cannot possibly conclude that a physician acted improperly or unwisely or for other than medical purpose solely because he has dispensed to one of them, in the ordinary course and in good faith, four small tablets of morphine or cocaine for relief of conditions incident to addiction."[9]

As the Court said, the doctor "knew she was addicted to habitual use of these drugs and did not require administration of [the drugs] because of any disease other than such addiction; and he did not dispense them for any other disease or condition; they were not administered by him or by any nurse or other person acting under his direction, nor were they consumed or intended for consumption in his presence; the amount was more than sufficient to satisfy the recipient's cravings if wholly consumed at one time; petitioner put the drugs into her possession expecting that she would administer them to herself in divided doses over a period of time; they were in the form in which addicts usually consume them to satisfy their craving; the recipient was in no way prevented or restrained from disposing of them." But the doctor's act here was, in all the circumstances, bona fide and within the course of proper medical practice, and was upheld:

"The unfortunate condition of the recipient certainly created no reasonable probability that she would sell or otherwise dispose of the few tablets entrusted to her; and we cannot say that by so dispensing them the doctor necessarily transcended the limits of that professional conduct with which Congress never intended to interfere."[10]

The Court warned that its opinions in the Webb and Jin Fuey Moy cases should be narrowly limited to the facts there involved, and it condemned the indictment in the Behrman case in this strong disclaimer:

"This opinion related to definitely alleged facts and must be so understood. * * * The opinion cannot be accepted as authority for holding that a physician who acts bona fide and according to fair medical standards may never give an addict moderate amounts of drugs for self-administration in order to relieve conditions incident to addiction. Enforcement of the tax demands no such drastic rule, and if the act had such scope it would certainly encounter grave constitutional difficulties."[11]

But it was too late to change the pattern. The doctors had withdrawn. The addict could not reapproach them. The peddler had taken over, and his profits soared as enforcement efforts reduced his competition and drove his customers deeper into the underworld.[12]

This situation has continued, sustained by Narcotics Bureau regulations advising doctors of their rights in dealing with addicts and ignoring what the Supreme Court said in the Linder case—regulations which paraphrase the discredited language of *Webb* v. *United States*.

In direct conflict with the Supreme Court ruling, the Narcotics Bureau regulations still provide as follows:

"An order purporting to be a prescription issued to an addict or habitual user of narcotics, not in the course of professional treatment but for the purpose of providing the user of narcotics sufficient to keep him comfortable by maintaining his customary use, is not a prescription within the meaning or intent of section 4705(c)(2), and the person filling such an order, as well as the person issuing it, shall be subject to the penalities provided for violations of the provisions of law relating to narcotic drugs.[13]

This regulation, as well as the administration of the Bureau of Narcotics enforcing it, clearly violates the rulings of the courts. As the U.S. Court of Appeals said in interpreting the Linder case:

"There is no doubt that the [Linder] case ruled that a physician may lawfully prescribe narcotics for an addict purely because of his addiction, provided the amount is not so large as to put it within the power of the addict to sell part of the drug in violation of the Harrison Act.[14]

In England a doctor is free to prescribe for an addict (a) under gradual withdrawal treatment, (b) when it has been demonstrated that the drugs cannot be safely discontinued, and (c) when it has been demonstrated that the patient is capable of leading a relatively normal life under a minimum dose of morphine or heroin but not when the drug is entirely discontinued.[15] Although some believe that the British experience is not applicable here, the weight of medical opinion supports the view that the British program has been successful in avoiding a rise in addiction, in keeping the addict from turning to crime, and in preventing racketeering in narcotics.[16]

---

[2] Murtagh & Harris, "Who Live in Shadow," 181 (1959). Committee on Public Health, New York Academy of Medicine, 39 Report on Drug Addiction—II, 417 (1963).

[3] *Webb* v. *United States*, 249 U.S. 96, 99 (1919).

[4] *Jin Fuey Moy* v. *United States*, 254 U.S. 189 (1920).

[5] *United States* v. *Behrman*, 258 U.S. 280 (1922).

[6] Nyswander, "The Drug Addict as a Patient," 1–14 (1956).

[7] Committee on Public Health, New York Academy of Medicine, op. cit. supra note 2, at 432.

[8] *Linder* v. *United States*, 268 U.S. 5 (1925).

[9] Id. at 18.

[10] Id. at 16, 22–23.

[11] Id. at 22.

[12] King, "Narcotic Drug Laws and Enforcement Policies," 22 Law & Contemp. Prob. 113 (1957).

[13] Code of Federal Regulations, title 26 sec. 151.392, 1961 Supp. 1963.

[14] *Hawkins* v. *United States*, 90 F. 2d 551 (1937). To the same effect, *Bush* v. *United States*, 16 F. 2d 709 (1927).

[15] Bishop, "The British Approach, in Nyswander," op. cit. supra note 6. See also Lindesmith, "The British System of Narcotics Control," 22 Law & Contemp. Prob. 138 (1957); Schur, "Narcotic Addiction in Britain and America" (1962).

ACJ policy

The Advisory Council of Judges adopts the following policy positions:

Medical Care

(1) The narcotic drug addict is a sick person, physically and psychologically, and as such is entitled to qualified medical attention just as are other sick people.[17]

As a sick person, the addict should receive whatever medical care he may need, as an outpatient of a clinic or private physician or, when necessary, in a hospital. Sick persons do not need criminal or civil process for medical care to be available to them, although some are subject to civil commitment. The mentally ill, for example, are committable under the principle of parens patriae (when they are unable to care for themselves), or the police power (when they are a danger to others, as in quarantine cases), but the vast majority of them, like other persons who are ill, go to doctors and hospitals without any court process.

Judge Sanders' position on commitment is as follows: "In most instances narcotic addicts may be induced to secure medical treatment without the coercive intervention of a court, or resort to judicial process. However, some form of commitment would seem to be essential to take care of addicts who are unable or unwilling to secure treatment on a voluntary basis."

A drug addict should, therefore, have access to medical care, in or out of a hospital, without so-called civil commitment, unless he is, in fact, unable to take care of himself despite medication. Whenever necessary, treatment facilities should be provided by communities.[18]

The cure of addiction seems to be extremely difficult and doubtful. More research and experimentation are needed.

As the Supreme Court pointed out in *Linder* v. *United States*, the present law is interpreted—and should be so interpreted and enforced by the Narcotics Bureau or any other Government agency—as allowing prescription of medicine, including narcotic drugs, "for relief of conditions incident to addiction." Despite this interpretation, the nature of administrative enforcement of the Harrison Act deters physicians from performing their ethical duties. Accordingly, the Advisory Council of Judges recommends that necessary action be taken, either by statute or by the appropriate bureaus and departments, to have the interpretation of the Harrison Act, as set forth in *Linder* v. *United States*, carried out administratively and the regulations of the Bureau of Narcotics amended to conform thereto.

Law Enforcement

(2) The traffic in narcotic drugs is properly controlled by legislation and effective penal sanctions. Since the illegal handling of narcotic drugs today is a big business of organized crime, State and Federal law enforcement efforts should concentrate on reaching the criminals at the upper administrative level.

The addict should be directed to medical help and should not be criminally prosecuted. While the Advisory Council of Judges recommends freedom of medical treatment for addicts, it recognizes the evil of the existing narcotics traffic and the need to prohibit it by penal laws. The problem is primarily one of law enforcement. Our experience coincides with that of other State and Federal judges: the higher-ups in the rackets are rarely brought before us for sentence. Rather, the great majority of narcotics law violators before us are addicts. Although a number of narcotics pushers are also convicted, the majority of them are primarily users also, whose addiction leads them to sell drugs in order to continue their own supply. These persons are more victims than criminals.

To cope with the real traffickers in narcotics, State and Federal law enforcement efforts should be concentrated against all aspects of organized crime. Meanwhile, extending medical care to addicts and administering drugs as necessary would deprive organized crime of a constantly increasing percentage of its customers and would weaken the foundation of narcotics syndicates, which came into existence only after the drug addict was "criminalized."[19]

We commend to the attention of legislatures the Model Sentencing Act, which categorizes narcotics racketeers as dangerous offenders subject to prison terms of 30 years.

Sentencing

(3) In recent years the penalties for narcotics crimes have become more and more severe, the theory of the legislation evidently being that the greater the penalty, the greater the deterrence. The result in practice is to glut the penal institutions with small-fry pushers and addicts serving long terms, without any deterrent effect on the racket but with deteriorating effect on the prisoners and the correctional institutions. We oppose mandatory terms in narcotics cases and the exclusion of narcotics offenders from eligibility for probation or parole.

As already described, the policy adopted by the narcotics division during the 1920's led at an early date to a packing of the prisons. A 1928 census of prisoners in Federal institutions revealed that during the heyday of prohibition there were two prisoners serving sentences for narcotic drug law offenses for every one incarcerated for a liquor law violation. Prisoners committed for violation of the drug laws constituted one-third of the total prison population, 2,529 out of 7,138.[20]

In 1951 the Senate Committee on Organized Crime turned its attention to narcotics and marihuana, receiving testimony that drug addiction was on the increase and had captured schoolchildren and teenagers.[21] The Narcotics Bureau urged harsher penal measures. Congress enacted a bill, submitted by HALE BOGGS, of Louisiana, providing for mandatory minimum penalties and prohibiting suspended sentence and probation for second offenders. A number of State legislatures have enacted comparable legislation and some jurisdictions enacted new legislation providing for compulsory treatment of addicts in confinement. Addiction was made a crime in acts passed in several States, acts subsequently condemned by the Supreme Court.[22] In 1955 a Senate subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee was authorized to make a study of the Harrison Act. This committee, under the chairmanship of Senator Price Daniel, rendered a report calling for even more severe legislation. This resulted in the enactment of new legislation which included the death penalty and raised mandatory minimum penalties.[23]

The State laws follow the style of the Federal acts as interpreted by the U.S. Bureau of Narcotics. The Uniform Narcotic Drug Act is law in 46 States, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia; the remaining 4 States are more or less similar in their punitive approach.[24]

The Uniform Act, like the Federal narcotics laws, makes possession generally unlawful. A physician is allowed to administer drugs "within the scope of his employment or official duty, and then only for scientific or medicinal purposes" and may prescribe drugs "in good faith and in the course of his professional practice only." One study reports that "though very few cases have arisen which interpret these phrases, it seems clear that the Uniform State Narcotic Acts will be so interpreted as to make unlawful prescriptions to an addict for the purpose of treating his addiction."[25] In the Uniform Act the penalty section is left blank, but typically the States provide for stated mandatory minimum terms, increasing in severity for repeated offenses, and some include life imprisonment or death in offenses involving minors. Some of the acts are similar to the Federal law in barring probation or parole; a number of State laws make addiction a crime.

In 1960 15 percent of the Federal prison population was made up of narcotics violators, compared with 4.3 percent in 1946. James V. Bennett, Director of the U.S. Bureau of Prisons, pointed out that longer sentences and mandatory minimum sentences, with no parole, accounted for the increase. The Federal laws designed to be "tough" on narcotics offenders are proving tough on the Federal prison system, producing an increasingly difficult administrative problem. "Prisoners become problems when they have no hope of relief from confinement, regardless of how well they respond to treatment programs. * * * You can well imagine the effect on prison treatment programs for more than 3,000 prisoners who have been sentenced for a purely punitive purpose when parole cannot be extended to those who have rehabilitated themselves."[26]

---

[16] Brill & Larimore, "The British Narcotic System," 60 N.Y.S.J. of Medicine 107 (1960). But see N.Y. Academy of Medicine, op. cit. supra note 2, at 458-459.

[17] *Robinson* v. *California*, 370 U.S. 660 (1962).

[18] "A startling number of those States which have legislated against drug addiction and prescribed mandatory treatment have failed to provide even the minimum facilities required for treating addicts." Senate Committee on the Judiciary, Laws Controlling Illicit Narcotics Traffic, S. Doc. No. 120, 84th Cong., 2d sess., 45 (1956).

[19] Anslinger & Oursler, "The Murderers," 6–7 (1961). See also New York Academy of Medicine, op. cit. supra note 2.

[20] King, op. cit. supra note 11, in which he cites Schmeckebier, the Bureau of Prohibition, Service Monograph No. 57, 143 (1929).

[21] Senate Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce, final report, S. Rept. No. 275, 82d Cong., 1st sess., 27 (1951).

[22] *Robinson* v. *California*, 370 U.S. 660 (1962).

[23] Public Law 728, 84th Cong., 2d sess., 70 Stat. 567 (1956). The mandatory minimum sentences were raised to 2, 5, and 10 years for successive offenses in the possession, prescription, and registration categories. First sale, transfer, and smuggling offenses carry a minimum sentence of 5 years—10 for succeeding offenses—without possibility of suspended sentence, probation, or parole. For sale or transfer to a person under 18, the minimum sentence is 10 years; if the drug is heroin, the court may impose life imprisonment or the jury may direct the imposition of a death sentence. Drug addiction and drug-law violation are made grounds for deportation. The act also made special provisions for Narcotics Bureau police work. Customs and Narcotics Bureau agents may carry arms and may make arrests without a warrant on belief that a drug-law offense has been committed; search warrants issued in connection with alleged narcotics offenses may be served at night under certain circumstances. In narcotics cases, unlike other Federal prosecutions, the Government may appeal from pretrial orders suppressing evidence and compel testimony from witnesses, despite their plea of self-incrimination, by a special grant of immunity.

[24] Cantor, "The Criminal Law and the Narcotics Problem," 51 J. Crim. L., C. & P.S., 512 (1961).

[25] Ibid.

The Advisory Council of Judges will cooperate with judicial, bar, and medical groups whose programs are substantially in accord with its policy. It supports studies of the methods used here and abroad in the treatment of drug addicts in correctional institutions, in hospitals, and in the community.

The National Council on Crime and Delinquency, with a membership of approximately 30,000 citizens and officials, organized in 1907 and incorporated as a national service agency in 1921, provides services to promote rehabilitation of juvenile and adult offenders. On a community, statewide, and national level, the council works to develop effective juvenile, family, and criminal courts, to improve probation, parole, and institutional services and facilities, and to stimulate community programs for the prevention, treatment, and control of delinquency and crime. The council works with citizen and professional groups and with judges, probation and parole officers, correctional administrators, and other public officials.

Through its specialized staff, the council offers direct on-the-spot consultations and makes statewide and local studies of correctional services which are practical guides to action; develops professional standards and guide materials for use by judges, correctional workers, and laymen; drafts model legislation and gives legal advisory service to legislative committees, courts, bar associations, correctional agencies, and citizen groups; conducts an annual conference, organizes training institutes, stimulates professional training for career service in probation and parole, and assists in conducting merit examinations for the selection of professional personnel; serves as a clearinghouse for information about correctional work, maintains an extensive library, stimulates research, and provides material and technical data to public information media; and publishes literature for both professional and lay interests.

NCCD is a nonprofit citizen organization supported by contributions from united funds, foundations, business corporations, and individuals interested in expanding its work and services.

Officers and board of trustees

Honorary president, Roscoe Pound.

President, Sigurd S. Larmon.

Vice president, Jewett T. Flag.

Chairman of the board, Judge Caroline K. Simon.

Chairman, executive committee, Franklin F. Bruder.

Treasurer, Edgerton G. North.

Director, Milton G. Rector.

Mrs. Julius Ochs Adler, Judge Paul W. Alexander, J. David Baker, W. Jack Billings, Ward M. Canaday, Mrs. Bennett Cerf, Joseph Y. Cheney, Justice Irving Ben Cooper, Rt. Rev. John P. Craine, Guy J. D'Antonio, Alfred E. Driscoll, James E. Fain, Dean Fedele F. Fauri, Coverly Fisher, Curtiss E. Frank, Msgr. Raymond Gallagher, Hugh B. Garnett, Paul Gernert, Irving W. Halpern, Charles E. Hamilton.

Garrett Heyns, Karl Holton, Peter Howard, Rudolph Janata, Albert Sidney Johnson, Herbert W. Kochs, Walter Laidlaw, Carl M. Loeb, Jr., Austin H. MacCormick, Justice Miles F. McDonald, J. Kirby McDonough, Judge Harry G. Miller, Jr., William J. Moshofsky, Nicholas C. Mueller, Joseph P. Murphy, Russell G. Oswald, Mrs. Anna C. Petteys, Lawrence D. Pritchard, Elizabeth Glenn Ravdin, M.D., Justice Paul C. Reardon, George J. Reed.

Elmer W. Reeves, Judge Scovel Richardson, Maurice Rosenfeld, Stanley R. Schrotel, Forrest Seymour, G. Howland Shaw, George W. Smyth, Arthur H. Spiegel, Herman G. Stark, Bert Struby, Randall Swanberg, Dr. Alvin Thalheimer, Judge William J. Thompson, Will C. Turnbladh, Mrs. Edward L. Voke, Mrs. Arthur G. Whyte, Jr., Roy Wilkinson, Jr., Ethel H. Wise, Randolph E. Wise,

INVESTIGATION OF ROBERT G. BAKER BY COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, almost 9 months ago to the day, the U.S. Senate, its good name and reputation repeatedly assaulted by news stories of reported misconduct by one of its principal officers, agreed to Senate Resolution 212. The author, Senator John J. Williams, of Delaware, believed its language was broad enough to authorize the Rules Committee to investigate any such misconduct on the part of Members or former Members of the U.S. Senate as well as of its employees.

Four months later a question was raised on the Senate floor as to whether Members were included in the purview of the investigation. Numerous Senators, including the majority leader, assured the Senate that the resolution was so intended.

The issue was an important one because of news accounts by reputable reporters of instances in which Bobby Baker was charged with abusing his office in his relationships with several Members of the Senate. When Bobby Baker was subpenaed, he declined to testify on constitutional grounds. Thereafter, I suggested, in an appearance before the Senate Rules Committee, that, despite Baker's refusal to testify, there was another way to get the facts. I suggested that the committee ask each Senator:

First. Did you ever have any business or financial dealings with Bobby Baker, directly or indirectly? If so, what were they?

Second. Did Bobby Baker ever give you, get for you, offer you, or offer to get for you any campaign contributions; any help in making up campaign deficits by gifts, purchase of tickets, or otherwise; any retainer or employment; any preferment in committee assignment or otherwise; anything of value?

At least three Members of the Senate present at the committee hearings immediately volunteered that their answers to these questions were in the negative. But the committee chairman told the press that the suggestions were "the height of demagoguery" and "would be an insult to a Senator." He raised doubts about whether Senators could be queried, news stories of their dealings with Bobby Baker notwithstanding.

The committee cannot plead ignorance of these news stories, for I presented them at the committee hearing, and they are in the record. Nor can the committee argue that there is no precedent for an inquiry to all Senators, for I called to their attention a specific instance in which precisely this was done in 1894—incidentally, in the wake of press stories suggesting corruption in office.

It seemed to me then, and it seems to me now, that as Senators we have direct and primary responsibility to assist a committee of the Senate in carrying out its assignment to make a full and complete study of Bobby Baker's activities.

Subsequently, Senator Williams of Delaware and I attempted to amend the original resolution to include Members of the Senate explicitly, but the issue was not permitted to come to a vote. Instead, the majority leader, in an extraordinary show of power, succeeded in tabling our amendment. So the die was cast. Senators were not to be questioned in the Bobby Baker inquiry although several had complained publicly of mistreatment at the hands of Mr. Baker, and he had bragged that on any given issue he had 10 Senators in the palm of his hand.

Last week the Committee on Rules and Administration released its recommendations in the Baker case. Not unexpectedly, they are narrow and very weak.

The entire effort thus far has the ring of an investigation, handcuffed before it started, kept that way no matter what, and now, hopefully, destined for the category of "file and forget."

But, inadequate and timid as the committee's inquiry was, it could not avoid the conclusion that the evidence it gathered "proves beyond any doubt that the performance and activities of Robert G. Baker, while serving as a high official of the Senate, form a pattern of conduct and activity inimical to the public welfare."

The committee counsel's own findings, reported earlier in the press, concluded that Baker used "the prestige of his official position for his own private gain."

The committee recommended that the Department of Justice review the evidence to determine whether criminal action is warranted. Of course, this should be done. But apparently the committee feels there is no way to call Baker to account unless violation of specific criminal statutes can be proved.

There is another way. Actions can be unlawful without being violations of a criminal statute. I suggest that if Bobby Baker did use his public position and influence for personal gain or that of his family, his friends or his associates, his conduct was unlawful, and a legal remedy exists, apart from criminal action.

Bobby Baker can be compelled in a civil action to pay over to the United States every penny he has made through the use of his influence and the prestige of his office.

Public office is a public trust. Is there anyone who would not agree that membership in the Congress of the United States is not only a high honor but a position of high trust? Surely there is no one in this body who does not regard himself as a fiduciary to the people of the Nation and to the Nation itself. And I am sure that each member of our individual staffs and of the staff of the Senate holds a like position of trust.

The committee in its recommendations joins me in this conviction:

> There is always a need for any public official—from the highest to the lowest—to conduct himself in a manner beyond question. As Government grows more complicated and more sensitive to the needs of the public, this becomes more and more important and in the case of this investigation,

---

[26] Fed. Prob., December 1960, p. 81.

> it has been made abundantly clear that those who serve the public must recognize that their office is a public trust and should not be compromised by private interests.

Where does this principle of public trust lead us? For one thing, it means, of course, that a person who sells his vote violates a trust. It has long been the law that a government can recover a bribe paid to an officeholder to influence his official decision.

But public trust means more than that. It means that each of us, in the Congress or of its staff, holds the influence and prestige which goes with his position as a fiduciary. Such influence and prestige is not his personal property. They are not his to sell or barter or otherwise compromise. They are held in trust for the Nation and for all the people. And if he breaches that trust and misuses his office, he must account for—that is pay over—all profits to the Government.

The accountability of a government official for breach of his fiduciary duty is well recognized by the courts.

In a recently decided case, *U.S.* v. *Drumm*, 329 F. 2d 109 (1st Cir. 1964), the court of appeals in the first circuit held that the Federal Government could recover from a poultry inspector of the Department of Agriculture payments made to him, as a consultant, by a processor whose operations it was his governmental duty to inspect. Whether preference was actually shown or loss to the Government in fact occurred was immaterial. The potentiality of preferment existed and was alone sufficient to enable the Government to recover. No statute was involved.

Dougherty v. *Aleutian Homes, Inc.*, 210 F. Supp. 658 (U.S.D.C. D. Ore. 1962), a case in which the United States intervened, involved contracts under which the mayor and another citizen of Kodiak were to receive moneys from Aleutian Homes in return for the use of their official positions and influence in securing Federal funds for a housing project. In holding the contracts against public policy and void, the court pointed to a line of cases holding "void and illegal contracts for services that involve personal influence on legislators." The court noted that the question was not whether improper influence was actually used but the corrupting nature of the agreement itself.

A classic case for recovery by a government of profit made through the use of public office or position is *Reading* v. *Attorney-General* (1951), A.C. 507. That case involved a British Army sergeant who during the last war had received money from smugglers for escorting their trucks through Cairo, Egypt, while in uniform, thus enabling them to pass the civilian police without inspection. The British military authorities got wind of this and took possession of the money. The sergeant brought a suit to recover it. The House of Lords held that the Crown was entitled to the money since the sergeant had gotten it by the use of the uniform of the Crown. It was held immaterial that the sergeant was not acting in the course of his employment and that the Crown had suffered no loss and could not lawfully have made the profit itself.

As the principal opinion in this case put it:

> Any official position, whether marked by a uniform or not, which enables the holder to earn money by its use gives his master a right to receive the money so earned even though it was earned by a criminal act. "You have earned," the master can say, "money by the use of your position as my servant. It is not for you, who have gained this advantage, to set up your own wrong as a defence to my claim."

The Harvard Law Review, in commenting on this case in 1952—volume 65 at page 502—states that the principle of the case "might well be applied to the currently notorious 'sales of influence' by public officeholders."

The Harvard Law Review is right.

In the second quarter of this century, the courts of this country, both State and Federal, took the lead in establishing and enforcing the fiduciary obligations of individuals holding positions of private trust, notably corporate officers, directors, and even majority stockholders.

The standards set are strict. Because a review of some of the leading cases involving private trust is relevant to consideration of the fiduciary obligations of those occupying positions of public trust, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks a brief memorandum summarizing several of them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. CASE. The whole thrust of these decisions is summed up in a statement in 1961 by the Securities Exchange Commission in Cady Roberts & Co. In this case, the Commission asserted, with great cogency, that it was the purpose of the Exchange Act "to eliminate the idea that the use of inside information for personal advantage was a normal emolument of corporate office."

I suggest that the principle asserted by the Commission is at least equally applicable to public office. The use of inside information obtained through public office, and the use of the prestige and influence pertaining to public office, for personal advantage is not a "normal emolument" of such public office.

Did Bobby Baker, whose highest salary was no more than $20,000 a year, make $2 million on his own or was the money gained because of his office and the influence it carried? The question has been answered for us by the Rules Committee counsel in his finding that Baker used "the prestige of his official position for his own private gain."

The slightest examination of the committee's hearings, inadequate as they are, can leave no doubt of the justification for the conclusion in the Rules Committee's recommendations:

> The vast amount of information and data discovered and assembled by the committee proves beyond doubt that the performance and activities of Robert G. Baker, while serving as a high official of the Senate, form a pattern of conduct and activity inimical to the public welfare.

Or for the statements in the committee counsel's report, and now the committee report, including:

> Baker used his public office in the Capitol as if it were a private business office. He entertained numerous visitors who were there for private business purposes. From this same office, he communicated with various business associates throughout the United States and even in Puerto Rico. The available records indicate that some of his personal calls were at Government expense.

Yesterday the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] pointed out a specific number of those telephone calls and the charges therefor.

Continuing to read from the report:

> The volume of business and financial activities of Baker was so great and had such ramifications that its magnitude is completely inconsistent with his official duties and responsibilities.

Again:

> Baker used his acquaintance with numerous individuals and the prestige of his official position to obtain participation in many business ventures.

Or for the counsel's overall conclusion, already mentioned, that Baker used "the prestige of his official position for his own private gain."

The next step here is, of course, for the Attorney General of the United States. Surely we can assume he will follow the matter wherever it may lead and whomever it may involve. Given the opportunity, I am sure the courts will hold that the influence and power which come to men through the holding of public position is held by them in trust, that it may not be sold or bartered, that it may not be used in any way for personal gain, and that anyone breaching that trust can be held to account and compelled to disgorge every penny of profit.

The time has come in the field of public affairs, as it came in the past few decades in the field of private corporate affairs, to put an end to all short cuts to big loot, to easy money, to the fast buck. Can there be any surer way of ending wheeling and dealing and influence peddling than by taking the profit out of it?

The doctrine that a public officer or employee is liable to pay over to his employing government any profit derived from the use of his official position is, of course, applicable not only to Members of Congress and its employees. It is equally applicable to all officeholders and employees of all governments—Federal, State, and local.

The vigorous enforcement of this doctrine could open the way to a great cleaning of public life in America at every level.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks a number of editorials on the subject of Bobby Baker, which are in addition to the scores of similar editorials that I have previously inserted in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article which appeared in a recent issue of the Columbia Journalism Review. The article points up the initiative and ingenuity of the press in bringing to light many details which unfortunately have yet to be followed up by the Senate committee's investigation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 3.)

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

EXHIBIT 1

MEMORANDUM OF CASES INVOLVING THE FIDUCIARY OBLIGATIONS OF INDIVIDUALS HOLDING POSITIONS OF PRIVATE TRUST

In *Irving Trust Co.* v. *Deutsch* 73 F. 2d 121 (1934) revising 2 F. Supp. 971, directors and their associates were held liable for profits realized through the acquisition of another company which had patent licenses needed by their corporation, even though there was no intention to defraud and their corporation could not get the necessary funds on account of its impending bankruptcy. A similar holding was made by the Delaware courts in *Loft Inc.* v. *Guth* 23 Del. Ch. 138, affirmed 23 Del. Ch. 255 (1939).

In *Brophy* v. *Cities Service Co.* 70 A 2d 5, (Del. Sup. Ct. 1949) the court held that a corporation could recover profits made by the confidential secretary to a director. The secretary was told by the director that the corporation was about to enter a program of buying its own stock. The secretary bought the stock before the corporate purchases began and sold after they ceased. The secretary's purchases and sales were on the New York Stock Exchange and not to or from the corporation. Despite the fact that the director's secretary was not himself an employee of the corporation and had not dealt with the corporation, and though the corporation itself had suffered no loss or damage, nevertheless, the corporation's recovery of the secretary's profit was ordered.

In *Mosser* v. *Darrow* 341 U.S. 267 (1951), the court surcharged a trustee in reorganization for all profits realized by employees of the trustee on their trading in securities of the corporation; some of these profits had been made on resale to the trustee and others on purchases and sales on the open market. The trustee himself had made no profits. The court held it was irrelevant whether the trust estate had been injured or even benefited. It is interesting here that the trustee was held liable for permitting his employees to do what was forbidden to him; that is, trade on the company's securities on the basis of their inside information. Query: might the Members of the Senate be responsible for profits made by their employee, Bobby Baker—might we individually be liable for profits made by our individual staffs?

In *Berner* v. *Equitable Office Building Corp.* 175 F. 2d 218 (1949), the court penalized (by reducing his fee) a lawyer involved in reorganization proceedings who suggested the purchase of securities to his brother-in-law. (Obviously one in a position of trust cannot escape liability by having the fruits of his breach of trust placed in the hands of a member of his family rather than taking them himself.)

The Securities Exchange Commission held, in Cady Roberts & Co., Securities Exchange Act Release No. 6668 (Nov. 8, 1961), that the antifraud provisions of the Securities Exchange Act were violated when a registered broker-dealer had gotten from his partner, a director of a corporation, inside information not yet made public of an impending dividend reduction and thereupon caused shares of stock of the corporation owned by his customers in discretionary accounts to be sold on the stock exchange without waiting for public announcement of the dividend reduction. The Commission held that the broker-dealer's fiduciary duty to his customers was overridden by the impropriety of his use of inside information obtained from his partner, a director of the corporation. In this case the Commission asserted that it was the purpose of the Exchange Act to "eliminate the idea that the use of inside information for personal advantage was a normal emolument of corporate office."

EXHIBIT 2

[From the New York (N.Y.) Herald Tribune]

BOBBY BAKER—PALLID REFORM

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—The Senate Rules Committee, after a pallid, tiptoe investigation of the Bobby Baker scandals, is now proposing a pallid, tiptoe reform unequal to the need.

Committee Chairman Senator B. EVERETT JORDAN, Democrat, of North Carolina, described the proposed disclosure rule designed to put the financial affairs of Senators and high-bracket Senate employees sufficiently into the open to prevent repetition of the Bobby Baker manipulations, as the best compromise the committee could get.

It seems to me that Senator JORDAN is absolutely right, if that is the kind of compromise it wanted.

And what kind of compromise is it? I would put it this way: It is sufficiently weak so that it can't do much good and has an appearance of sufficient strength to have a good chance of fooling people into think it is stronger than it is and thus might do some good.

If you are after good compromises, a compromise hardly comes any neater than that. This disclosure requirement is so full of loopholes that a Bobby Baker who did too well for himself and too poorly for the Senate when he served as secretary of the Democratic majority, could drive a tank through it, and and back again.

The specific Rules Committee proposal is that all Senators and employees whose salaries exceed $10,000 must report annually the names of companies in which they hold an interest worth at least half of their salary. In the case of Senators that will shortly be $15,000. They must also disclose the names of companies in which they are officers and law firms in which they have an interest if these firms practice before Federal agencies.

Even a layman can see the gaping doors in such a regulation and a lawyer could see them with his eyes closed. (Most Senators are lawyers.)

Take a peek at some of them:

Why should there be any lower limit in applying disclosure to Senate staff? If Bobby Baker had been earning $10,000, instead of more, would that have deterred him from misusing his office?

Why shouldn't there be total disclosure of a Senator's outside financial interest—instead of only limited disclosure. Under the proposed rule Senators would have to report financial holdings of more than half their salary from a single company but would not have to report separate financial holdings of less than half their salary in several companies.

Under the proposed rule Senators are free to have significant associations with business interests as long as they are not "officers" of the company and there are plenty of conflicts-of-interest between lawmaking and law firms even if they do not practice before Federal agencies.

Is this really a shield against impropriety, against private misuse of public office? Bobby Baker would go through this kind of thing the way a buzz saw would go through a pound of butter. Senator CLIFFORD CASE points out that Baker would not have been required to report his unsecured loans, the finder's fee in connection with the sale of Haitian beef, other fees paid to him for placing of vending machines, or various valuable gifts.

For many years there have been egregious conflict-of-interest improprieties. A Senator would draw his principal income from oil and devote his principal time in the Senate to maintaining the oil depletion allowance. A Senator would represent railroads in his law practice and supervise the enactment—or nonenactment of laws relating to railroads.

There is no security against these improprieties in the proposed new "disclosure" rule.

Under the "reform" proposed by the Rules Committee, the whole Senate loses, good government loses, and the public loses.

[From the Miami Herald]

ETHICS AND THE SENATORS

Nothing, or next to it, seems to be the word for the new "ethics code" proposed by the Senate Rules Committee.

This is the committee which investigated the Bobby Baker thing, taking 1,899 pages of testimony. It has come up with an income disclosure law which is shallow in its scope and weak in its methods of enforcement.

Under the code, Senators and Senate employees with salaries of more than $10,000 a year would be required to list the firms in which they had financial interests of more than half their annual salary or from which they had income amounting to more than half that salary.

As an aside, they would list also the directorships and offices they hold in businesses which seek Government contracts.

This is all, and it falls far short of the sort of disclosure law which would better serve the public interest. Not incidentally, 20 Senators already have thought enough of that interest to make voluntary disclosures of outside income.

The minority report by Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, goes all the way, but it strikes us as preferable to a namby-pamby codification of a Senator's responsibility.

Senator CLARK would require full financial accounting by the Senators, including gifts of $100 or more and fees paid for speeches.

"What we have heard today (in the code) is a compromise that we think everybody can live with," deposes Senator B. EVERETT JORDAN, Democrat, of North Carolina, who is chairman of the committee.

Perhaps the Senate can live with it. But can the public?

In the executive branch of the Federal Government, custom has come to demand scrupulous accounting of outside income as a prerequisite to appointment (with confirmation by the Senate). Cabinet members have had to put their holdings in hock while serving the public.

At the State and local levels of government, there is increasing concern with conflict of interest. Dade County and Miami, for instance, go, if anything, to the opposite extreme in separating the public from the possible private interest.

The Senate, we fear, did not get the message from the Bobby Baker scandal. It has not sensed there is public concern for the full integrity of the most powerful House of Congress in the freest of nations.

Under legislation passed by the House and pending in the Senate, the Members of both would have their salaries increased from $22,500 a year to $30,000. That's a boost of one-third, and however deserved it may be, it is a considerable increment.

Public office being a public trust, hasn't the public the right to know what outside interests concern the office seeker who is a supplicant for its favors?

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star]

DISCLOSURE

Having successfully buried what it lightly called an "investigation" of the extra-secretarial activities of the recent majority secretary, Bobby Baker, the Senate Rules Committee is now attempting to hide the body and thus make sure it stays buried. To do this it is erecting an elaborate, tasteless and absolutely meaningless mausoleum in the form of what it apparently imagines is a rule for financial disclosure by Senators and some Senate employees.

It is anticipated that when the rule comes to the discussion of the Senate as a whole it will be violently opposed by Senators who have fought off disclosure in the past. If it is, it will only be because such Senators are opposed, to vary an old principle of public trust, even to the appearance of honesty.

For the new rule addresses itself only to the appearance, not to the substance.

Under it, Senators and Senate employees paid more than $10,000 a year would be required to name those firms which they serve as officers or in which their interest is equal to one half their Senate pay. They would be required to disclose the names of law firms they are associated with if those firms practice before Government agencies. And, as a presumed concession to liberal Democrats who felt fleeced by Mr. Baker's handling of party funds in the interests of the Old Confederacy and old conservatism, Senate employees would no longer be given the disposal of campaign money among Senators.

The curious relationship between the amount of interest and disclosure under the proposed rule is the key to its real purpose, which is simply to make a gesture in the direction of disclosure and leave things as they are. The heart of conflict-of-interest lies in the amount of gain a public official derives from private interests dealing with public interests which are in his charge or under his influence. Of this the proposed rule says nothing.

Moreover, the rule will allow Senators or their employes to continue the time-honored practice of putting questionable sources of income in their wives' names, at which point all bets are off and no disclosure need be made at all. For the benefit of unmarried Senators and those who do not trust their wives, the same privilege extends to proxy ownership at large.

All in all, those Senators who oppose disclosure as a matter of principle—the principle that the financial dealings of its servants are none of its business—may safely vote for the proposed rule in perfect confidence that it will result in no unseemly actual disclosures of senatorial interests.

If the Rules Committee ever does get around to a serious consideration of keeping the Senate honest, it will adopt real disclosure proposals similar to those made by Senators CLARK and KEATING.

[From the Westfield (N.J.) Leader]

DANGEROUS SPECIAL PRIVILEGE

The issue raised by Senator CASE of New Jersey in demanding that Senators be questioned as to their business activities with persons under a congressional committee investigation has caused public wonderment.

It is difficult for the people to understand why a public official should be exempted from the same kind of questioning to which a private citizen is subjected in congressional committee hearings.

Senator CASE is to be commended for his endeavor to put our public officials on the same footing as private citizens. Immunity from questioning for a public servant destroys confidence in our chosen representatives.

[From the Chico (Calif.) Enterprise-Record]

THE LIBERAL AND THE BOBBY BAKER CASE

Able and energetic Senator CLIFFORD P. CASE is considered one of the most liberal Republicans in the present Congress.

Representing the heavily industrialized State of New Jersey, Senator CASE ordinarily can be found in the forefront of GOP legislators who line up with the Democratic majority in pushing administration programs through the Halls of Congress.

But when the matter of ethics is concerned, Senator CASE is not one to shut his eyes and "go along" in order to "get along" with the Democratic majority in Congress or the Democratic administration in the White House.

And right now Senator CASE is working overtime on the matter of ethics as it applies to the sordid case of Bobby Baker, one of the smelliest incidents of recent years.

It will be recalled, of course, that Baker—former majority secretary of the Senate and generally considered the right-hand man of President Lyndon B. Johnson when the latter was Senate majority leader—was the subject of an "investigation" by a Senate committee earlier this year.

As far as it went, the investigation scraped the top off scandals revealing that Baker, a poor man when he became a Senate employee, amassed himself a fortune in excess of $2 million by mysterious manipulation of "influences" attaching to his post.

Before getting completely to the bottom of things, however, and without coming to any real or final conclusions, the Senate investigation suddenly ended and, for all practical purposes, closed the book on the Baker incident.

Newsmen who have sought to learn the reasons for the shutdown of the investigation have run into the stone wall of silence. White House staffers and the President himself decline to answer questions concerning past and present relationships between Lyndon Johnson and his ex-protege, Bobby Baker.

And Senator CASE is very upset with the way things now stand. He feels that the integrity of both Congress and the legislative process as a whole is placed in jeopardy when such a coverup is permitted to happen.

As a result, Senator CASE is stumping vigorously for passage of a "public disclosure" bill by which Congress would be required to police itself and, as a consequence, maintain and enhance the public respect which is essential to public confidence in the lawmaking body.

Broadly speaking, the bill would establish requirements for "regular public disclosure" of financial interests and of transactions by Members of Congress and top legislative staffers (such as the post held by Bobby Baker).

The bill also would require, in the words of Senator CASE, "that all communications, oral or written, to regulatory agencies from a Member of Congress or any other person outside the particular agency, with regard to a particular case, be made part of the public record of that case."

Such a requirement would, of course, prevent a great deal of the sort of "influence peddling" which reportedly enriched Bobby Baker during his service under the then Senate Majority Leader Lyndon Johnson.

Along with his efforts on behalf of the proposed legislation, Senator CASE has testified repeatedly for a reopening of the Bobby Baker case.

It is to be hoped that Senator CASE's eloquent pleading will be heard and acted upon by his congressional colleagues.

The public certainly is entitled to a full investigation and report on the Baker incident, and the public is entitled to the sort of information Senator CASE's bill would provide to guard against "behind the scenes" and "undercover" hanky-panky by both lawmakers and staffers.

[From the Washington (D.C.) News]

LET THE PUBLIC KNOW

The Senate Rules Committee has moved in the right direction in recommending that Senators and their top aids be required to disclose major sources of outside income.

It didn't move far enough though. The proposal approved by the committee leaves some big loopholes which should be plugged when the measure reaches the Senate floor. But, as Senator JOHN SHERMAN COOPER remarked, it is better than nothing at all.

The disclosure principle is a sound one. For Congress is an agent of the American people. Its Members and staff should not object to letting their employers—the public—know about any outside interests they might have. Then voters could judge for themselves whether a Congressman was acting in the interest of his own pocketbook or theirs.

The Rules Committee proposal would achieve this only to a degree. It would require disclosure of holdings only if they exceed half of the official's annual salary. Under that plan, a Senator could hide a large investment in a given industry—oil stocks, for instance—simply by scattering it among a number of firms.

Senator CLIFFORD CASE, who wants a tougher rule, said the proposed plan would have failed to uncover many aspects of the Bobby Baker case, from which the recommendations stems. If so, it obviously is not strong enough.

It also leaves unclear whether holdings by wives would be covered. That should be spelled out clearly so that the requirement cannot be evaded simply by transferring property to a spouse's name. And the House should enact its own disclosure rule.

[From the Hammond (Ind.) Times]

LIFTING THE LID

The U.S. Senate has closed the lid on the Bobby Baker case and intends to keep it closed. There is some reason to doubt that the lid will stay on, in view of the continued efforts of some Senators to raise it.

Baker was a former secretary of the Democratic majority in the Senate who resigned suddenly when it was disclosed that he had used his power of influence over the Senators to extort favor seekers into helping him become a wealthy man.

A Senate committee controlled by the very majority Democrats who were Bobby's former employees and, some say, stooges, "investigated" the Baker case. Bobby took the fifth amendment, and that was that. By a party-line vote, the Senate decided to end the hearings.

Republicans, it being election year, would like to have the hearings continue, notably such voices of probity as Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS of Delaware and Senator CLIFFORD CASE, of New Jersey. Now CASE proposes a special Senate committee to question individual Senators about their financial relationships with Baker, since Baker clammed up on the witness stand.

A 90-year-old retired Washington newspaper reporter by the name of Webster Ballinger read of CASE's suggestion and recalled covering a similar hearing back in 1894. At that time, Senators answered questions under oath—including questions about members of their families and even their employees—concerning newspaper charges that Senators had been paid off in "campaign funds" for voting against a pending sugar tariff bill. No evidence of such indirect bribery was uncovered, but the hearing did establish a precedent.

There is no reason, therefore, why a special Senate committee can't be appointed for a real look into the Bobby Baker case and question Senators under oath. There's no reason Senators should refuse to answer questions about their money any more than Cabinet appointees.

[From the Paterson (N.J.) News]

Case Despairs of Congress Policing Itself Properly

(By George J. Marder)

Washington.—The Constitution says, in article 1, section 5:

"Each House shall be the judge of the qualifications of its own Members."

But Senator Clifford P. Case, New Jersey Republican, despairs that Congress will ever effectively police itself.

He and Senator John J. Williams, Republican, of Delaware, are fighting to keep alive the Bobby Baker case. This is an affair in which resigned Senate Democratic Secretary Robert G. Baker amassed a fortune—at least on paper—on a comparatively modest Senate salary.

Democrats in control of the Baker inquiry have closed the probe over Case's bitter protests. But they are proposing a code of ethics which would require all Senators and Senate employees to expose to public view all their outside financial holdings and connections. They also would be forbidden to have contact with persons doing or wanting to do business with the Government.

History supports Senator Case's pessimism.

SELDOM CLEANSES ITSELF

Seldom does Congress invoke its constitutional powers to cleanse itself. In the past quarter of a century it has conducted only two investigations of its Members, both in the Senate. One involved Senator Theodore G. Bilbo, Mississippi Democrat. The other, Senator Joseph R. McCarthy, Wisconsin Republican. McCarthy was disciplined by the Senate, not for what he did to others through his Red hunting investigations, but what he did to the prestige of the Senate itself. Bilbo's case involving alleged conflict of interest in war contract cases was never carried to final judgment before his death.

But during this time there sat in Congress accused criminals and even convicted criminals. There were, for example, men suspected of having abused their offices to the point of accepting kickbacks and bribes, and finally convicted of such.

But Congress would not move and never did move, even after the men went to jail. The constitutional power remained in limbo. Congress continued to permit itself and its Members a form of conduct—or misconduct—which it would not tolerate for a moment in officials of the executive branch.

DOUBLE STANDARD

This double standard also extends into other matters.

For instance, Congress permits its Members outside sources of income of a type which it would never allow Government officials operating in the comparable field.

It allows itself privileges of influence which it bans from the executive department. A simple inquiry from the White House on how a certain case or defense contract is going will create hows of protest in Congress. That same query from a lawmaker is merely classed as protecting the interests of a constituent.

The legislators go on lecture tours and accept fees, some of them plush, to report to trade associations on proposed laws. Executive officials would find themselves under quick fire if they accepted lecture fees from organizations they were about to regulate.

How do the Congressmen justify this double standard?

EXCLUSIVE CLUB

First, it must be kept in mind that membership in Congress is like being a member of an exclusive club. The lawmakers might not like what a fellow Member is doing but he is a Member. So long as he is a Member, he can enjoy all the privileges of sanctuary.

Second, they feel that the voters, and not Congress, regulate the morals and character of the legislators sent here. The late Speaker Sam Rayburn, of Texas, despised some of the men who served with him. But so long as the voters elected them, he would accept them as full-fledged Members. He felt that it was not for Congress, but for the people, to say who should represent them. And if the people made a bad choice, Congress must suffer until the people wised up.

Congress, Senator Case feels, while forfeiting the power to police itself, can make it easier for the people to wise up. In the wake of the Bobby Baker case, he is urging that all Senators be compelled to observe a code of ethics.

[From the Dayton (Ohio) News]

No Rule, No Raise

The Bobby Baker case may have vanished over the horizon, at least for a time, but the wake still rocks the congressional boat.

New Jersey's Senator Clifford Case, aside from demanding a more thorough investigation of the incident, has made repeated proposals for a rule requiring public disclosure of the financial interests of all legislators.

Oregon's Senator Wayne Morse says without such a rule the American public must doubt the integrity of the men it sends to Washington.

Now Senator Kenneth Keating, of New York, suggests tying such a rule to the present demand for a pay raise. No rule, no raise.

Some argue that such a rule amounts to an invasion of privacy. But there is some doubt as to whether men in such responsible positions are entitled to privacy. And Congress mutes this point, anyway, by demanding financial disclosure by high-ranking officers in other branches of the Government.

Financial disclosure may not be the answer. Corporations and individuals alike have been finding loopholes in our income tax laws for years, and they are a form of record-baring.

But a disclosure rule merits more serious consideration than either Congress or the people have given it to date.

[From the Dyersburg (Tenn.) State Gazette]

On Same Footing

The issue raised by Senator Case of New Jersey, in demanding that Senators be questioned as to their business activities with persons under a congressional committee investigation has caused public wonderment.

It is difficult for the people to understand why a public official should be exempted from the same kind of questioning to which a private citizen is subjected in congressional committee hearings.

Senator Case is to be commended for his endeavor to put our public officials on the same footing as private citizens. Immunity from questioning for a public servant destroys confidence in our chosen representatives.

[From the Indianapolis (Ind.) Star]

Shameful Performance in the Senate

One thing was perfectly obvious after the dust of battle had settled: The Senate will not tolerate an investigation of itself in connection with the Bobby Baker case.

The inquiry into the affairs of the former secretary to the Senate's Democratic majority stopped at a plainly drawn line. It was quite proper, and even desirable, to investigate the Senate's employees. It was not proper, and in fact highly undesirable, to investigate Senators.

Senator B. Everett Jordan, Democrat, of North Carolina, chairman of the Rules Committee, put it in this classic way at one point in the inquiry: "We are not investigating Senators."

Now the Senate has reaffirmed that edict by rejecting a Republican resolution which would have expanded the Rules Committee probe to its own Members. The vote was 42 to 33 against the resolution, and every one of the opponents was a Democrat.

The partisan nature of the issue was further revealed in the parliamentary shenanigans by which the Democratic majority refused Senator Clifford Case his right to speak. It seems to us that this was a shameful performance, whatever technical justification for it might be found in the Senate rules.

The Senate will permit a civil rights filibuster to run its timewasting course for weeks and weeks. But it will not permit one of its Republican Members to speak on behalf of an investigation of the Senators themselves.

The probe into Baker's tangled financial affairs was so circumscribed that it gave the timid appearance of a whitewash. Thursday's action only served to reinforce that impression. It was a sad day indeed for the Senate's reputation and prestige.

[From the Springfield (Ill.) State Journal]

Bobby Baker—Mystery Still

The Bobby Baker scandal apparently is to be pigeonholed and forgotten, thanks to the Democratic Party.

Republican Senators attempted to continue and broaden the probe into the influence-peddling activities of the former secretary to the Senate's Democratic majority. Forty-two administration-oriented Democratic Senators voted against the move.

Strangely, Senate Democratic leader Mike Mansfield, of Montana, who spearheaded the drive to block continuance of the probe, declared the GOP resolution would "impugn the integrity" of all Senators.

Had the investigation been reopened, its results certainly would not have justified Senator Mansfield's assertion. Obviously, the majority of Senators would have nothing to fear from a further probe.

Senator Edward M. Kennedy, Democrat, of Massachusetts, presiding at the session, upheld Senator Mansfield in the latter's refusal to yield the floor to Senator Clifford P. Case, Republican, of New Jersey, cosponsor of the resolution to extend the probe.

The door thus was closed, possibly forever, by administration leaders on the extracurricular activities of Bobby Baker that apparently breached moral if not legal ethics.

As a result, there always will remain an aura of doubt about the relationship between Mr. Baker and some of those who fought determinedly, and successfully, to kill the probe.

The Baker affair has been buried in mystery—a mystery that has created public uneasiness about the sincerity of the administration.

[From the Rochester (N.Y.) Democrat & Chronicle]

What Price Codes?

After a Democratic-dominated U.S. Senate committee ducked out on its responsibility of investigating thoroughly the Bobby Baker case, it piously discussed a proposed code of ethics as if no such code existed to guide and sustain Congress.

Until Senator Clifford P. Case set the record straight, much of the public would not have known that Congress in 1958 passed such a code. Its 10 platitudes, beautifully printed on a large placard in the national colors, are available to any person in Government service who feels ethics-minded. It should stir every patroit.

We cannot say whether Bobby Baker, as a Senate official, ever read the code. Nor do we know if Mr. Baker reconciled making fortunes with point No. VII, which states: "Engage in no business with the Government, either directly or indirectly, which is inconsistent with the conscientious performance of your Government duties." Nobody else knows, either, because the Senate committee did not seem interested in finding out.

If printed platitudes were all that those in Government service needed to remind them that public office is a public trust, our worries would be over. But, as Senator CASE emphasized to his colleagues, the present code of ethics did not deter Bobby Baker. Nor is it likely to deter others like Baker. Until codes of ethics are backed by fearless investigation of wrongdoing, they won't be worth the pretty paper they are printed on.

[From the Lyndhurst (N.J.) Commercial Leader & South Bergen Review]

CASE'S FIGHT

There are some who have been startled at the vigor with which Senator CLIFFORD CASE has pursued the Bobby Baker case. Those who have thought of CASE as the gentle soul unwilling to be unkind at the expense of somebody else feel he is out of character in the zealous followup on the Baker case.

That is just because they may not have been too familiar with CLIFFORD CASE as a public official.

In every day of his public life CLIFFORD CASE lives the job which he is sworn to do. He does it efficiently. He does it without fanfare. He has a reputation in Washington for being one of the most conscientious men in the Capitol. When he accepts a responsibility he does not let it go until it has been discharged.

The headlines that flow around his head today are not needed to add to his stature: they merely spotlight a man who is doing a good job the best way he knows how.

[From the Riverton (N.J.) New Era]

DANGEROUS SPECIAL PRIVILEGE

The issue raised by Senator CASE, of New Jersey, in demanding that Senators be questioned as to their business activities with persons under a congressional committee investigation has caused public wonderment.

It is difficult for the people to understand why a public official should be exempted from the same kind of questioning to which a private citizen is subjected in congressional committee hearings.

Senator CASE is to be commended for his endeavor to put our public officials on the same footing as private citizens. Immunity from questioning for a public servant destroys confidence in our chosen representatives.

[From the Appleton (Wis.) Post Crescent]

A STRANGE SILENCE

Democrats in the U.S. Senate have once more tried to sweep the whole sorry story of Bobby Baker and his remarkable dealings under a convenient rug, this one made available by the Democratic majority in the Senate.

When Republican CLIFFORD CASE tried to get the hemming and hawing Rules Committee, which heard the evidence about Bobby, to call Senators themselves for questioning, Democrats became righteously noble. Inexperienced freshman Senator TEDDY KENNEDY happened to be presiding but he knew enough about party problems—and who was in the White House—to order CASE to sit down and stop his wrangling.

The Rules Committee is reluctantly studying recommendations that Senators and Senate employees be required to disclose their financial holdings and that Senators be required to testify if so requested by a Senate committee. But behind the committee's reluctance, the almost straight party line fracas on the floor of the Senate, lies the questions the Bobby Baker investigation has raised—more questions so far than it has answered.

Why are the Democratic Senators afraid of more investigation? How involved was President Johnson with his protege and when did he find out how Bobby was using that friendship and his myriad of other connections? How many other Democratic Senators were part of this power establishment? How many had interests in the Puerto Rican meat deals, the motels, the Las Vegas gambling halls and all the other wondrous affairs which Baker engineered or had his hands in?

Conscience-clean Senators should have no trouble making known their financial holdings or testifying before a Senate committee. American voters ought to be watching how they vote—if the matters ever come up for a vote at all in the strangely publicity-shy U.S. Senate.

[From the Boston (Mass.) Herald]

SENATORIAL ETHICS

The Senate has done its reputation great harm by cutting short the Bobby Baker investigation and refusing to inquire whether any of its own Members were involved in the former majority secretary's "improprieties."

But it could recoup something by adopting the stiff code of ethics recommended in the draft report of its staff investigators.

This would require: (1) That Senators make public disclosure of all their financial interests; (2) that Senators and employees of the Senate avoid "all associations" outside the Senate with persons and organizations doing business with the Government; and (3) that Senators testify upon request before any Senate committee.

Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN, the Republican leader, says that the adoption of such a code would make "class B citizens" out of Senators. We agree with New Jersey's Senator CLIFFORD CASE that without such a code the Senators are in fact "a privileged class."

When Cabinet officers and other high executive officials come before the Senate for confirmation, they are often asked to disclose their financial interests and in cases of conflict to divest themselves of them. Why should Senators, who may also be involved in conflict situations, be immune from this check? The same may be said about testimony before committees. If other Government officials are made to submit to the investigatory process why not the investigators, too?

The most controversial of the code requirements is No. 2. This, it is argued, would prevent Senators from interceding with Government agencies on behalf of individuals or companies doing business with the Government, a time-honored legitimate service.

But there is no doubt that this "legitimate" service is often abused. And even where it is truly legitimate, it is often unnecessary and a timewaster. If Senators were forbidden to perform such services, both they and the Government might be better off.

We favor giving rule 2 a trial run, too.

Rules won't solve all problems, of course. If Senators are irresponsible or corrupt, they will get around any rule. But well-established and well-enforced standards can help. If the Senate lawmakers adopt this code and gives it teeth, they will have done much to make up for the Bobby Baker whitewash.

[From the Plainfield (N.J.) Courier-News]

PUBLIC DISCLOSURE

It is hardly time to call the Bobby Baker case a closed deal. We are sure to hear more about it during the election campaign this summer. We think it should be discussed further and that the Members of the Senate should not be beyond censure where it is deserved.

One of the most outspoken advocates for a stronger code of ethics in the Senate has been Senator CLIFFORD P. CASE, Republican, of New Jersey. Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR., Democrat, of New Jersey, recently joined with him in a public disclosure of financial interests and transactions.

Senator CASE said last week before the Senate Rules Committee: "Public disclosure is, I have long been convinced, the most effective way to protect the integrity of the Congress and the legislative process. The need for such a requirement rests on a simple fact, which is, I think, universally recognized—outside of Congress. That is the fact that Congress is not going to police itself. One need look no further than to the current inquiry."

We agree. And we note with interest the insertion in Senator CASE's remarks—"outside of Congress." The Congress should not hesitate to police its own Members and to heighten the concern that Members of that legislative body should not only be right but also seem right in the public view.

[From the Salt Lake (Utah) Tribune]

KEEP HAMMERING AWAY

The Democratic majority in the Senate managed to terminate the investigation of Bobby Baker, its onetime secretary. But Senators like CLIFFORD P. CASE, Republican, of New Jersey, do not intend to let the matter rest. Too much is at stake, including the reputation of the Senate and its Members, no matter what their party.

CASE is critical of the failure of the Rules Committee, the investigating body, to dig into complaints made by Senators themselves.

Baker is accused, among other things, of deceiving the Democratic steering committee on the allocation of various committee assignments. If that is correct, then Baker betrayed some of his own employers. Yet the Rules Committee seemed no more interested in this phase of the Baker case than it was in his ability to amass a small fortune by allegedly peddling influence.

CASE is confident that the public pressure will bring a revival of the Baker investigation. Meanwhile, the Rules Committee is studying his bill requiring Senators, Representatives, and top Federal officials to make regular public reports on their private financial interests. An attempt was recently defeated in the House to tack a similar provision on to the congressional pay raise bill. In the Senate, however, the plan seems to be picking up support.

We regard this as desirable legislation. If it becomes law, it can well be regarded as a byproduct of the Baker case. But one good byproduct will not be enough. We hope public, press, and a handful of dedicated Senators keep hammering away at the main objective.

[From the Paterson (N.J.) News]

THE BIG POTATOES

The American people know that Bobby Baker is "small potatoes," Senator WAYNE MORSE, Oregon Democrat, told his colleagues clearly intimating that the American people want to know how the "big potatoes" were involved, if at all.

If the Senate inquiry ends with Baker, it will be because the Senate was anxious to protect its own Members at the expense of one of its favorite hirelings, MORSE added, echoing the repeated charge of New Jersey's Clifford P. Case.

"Secrecy and resistance to reform always create the impression of wrongdoing—in this case profitable wrongdoing," he said. "In my opinion this is a general impression of the American people about their Congress. It will continue until the Congress itself does something about it."

It is one thing for a Republican Senator, in this instance, Senator Case to call on the Senate to disclose if Baker had helped any of them in getting campaign funds or in other ways. It is another for Morse, a Democrat, to point the finger of scorn at his own majority and call for a soul searching that might scorch some of the most elevated Members, present and recent.

Morse deserves the thanks of the people for his forthright statement as of course does Senator Case. The shameful whitewash will haunt Senator Morse's party if it does not do something about it soon.

[From the Oklahoma City (Okla.) Daily Oklahoman]

Where Reform Is Needed

Suggestions for a code of ethics for U.S. Senators as a result of the Bobby Baker scandal should be followed by action.

This is a long-needed reform that can help restore public esteem for the Senate as a body. It will be resisted by some "Members of the club" who have questionable dealings.

A public disclosure of financial interests of all Senators and of Senate employees would not preclude them from holding legitimate investments. Such a disclosure would be measured against their votes on pending legislation and in the actions of various Federal regulatory bodies. There is a difference between legitimate intercessions in behalf of constituents and the use of committee power to get financially favorable rulings.

The filing of financial statements would not invade the privacy of Senators, their personal staffs or professional committee staffs. They are in public positions, are paid with public funds, and know what the pay is when they seek the jobs. They should not attempt to hide behind a double standard which demands of Federal appointees a diverstiture of personal financial interests unmatched by any similar action of the Senators themselves.

Under the "advise and consent" prerogative for approval of top level appointments in Government service, the Senate insists on public disclosure of financial holdings, including investments in stocks of firms which hold Federal contracts or even may be in the position of seeking them.

Charles E. Wilson gave up a $500,000 annual salary and lost large potential profits from stock and stock options when he quit as president of General Motors to become Secretary of Defense in 1953. Robert S. McNamara of Ford sacrificed an equivalent salary, and perhaps $3 million in stock dividends, to take the $25,000 Defense job in 1961.

Senators are among the first to speak out for the need of high level, successful businessmen to operate the world's largest business, which is the U.S. Government. But while Senators demand that these individuals make full disclosures of their financial standing, and divest themselves of stocks where there might be a conflict of interest, Senators seldom make a similar sacrifice themselves.

Neither do they always give up their share in legal fees earned by firms with which they maintain connections, even when those firms have Federal contractors for clients.

This double standard is not confined to the Senate. Some House Members use advance information gained in closed committee hearings to make speculative investments in real estate and in stocks.

Unless the few lawmakers who seek a single standard are supported by the public the dirty linen never will get washed. Those who demand honesty in others should not be afraid to offer proof of their own integrity.

[From the Toledo (Ohio) Blade, July 6, 1964]

Much Ado, Little Done

If the Senate committee investigating the Bobby Baker case had done a job that left anyone convinced it got to the bottom of a Senate employee's scandal-tainted rise to reputed millionairedom, this would speak more effectively than any new rules or resolutions relating to official good conduct.

As it is, the committee's proposed new rule calling for certain financial disclosures by Senators and their hired help won't even shut the barn door, much less lock it against the kind of politicofinancial manipulations called to public attention in the Baker case.

About all it does is to require the identification of companies with which Senators and Senate personnel are associated, not the extent of their holdings nor the returns from them. And if before the report date of January 31, the individual had disposed of a hunk of stock on which he had made a killing, such a holding wouldn't have to be disclosed.

The proposed rule, in short, seems mostly loophole. About the best that can be said for it is that it represents a beginning of an official Senate policy on financial disclosure by Members and Senate employees. But even this toothless smile on efforts to bring about senatorial self-discipline may not get an approving response from the Senate assembled. It is not enough for some who want effective action; it is too much for others.

We favor the sort of financial disclosures that a few legislators—with Ohio's Senator Young in the van—have already made voluntarily. But we suspect that such efforts as are made to put senatorial finances above the suspicion of corrupting self-interest will continue to depend mostly on the integrity shown by individual Senators.

Exhibit 3

Washington: Outsiders' Exposé

(By Laurence Stern and Erwin Knoll)

Muckraking, still an honorable form of journalistic enterprise at the city hall and State capital levels, has long gone out of fashion among the elite corps of reporters assigned to the Congress of the United States. The national legislature makes so much news that most of the reporters assigned to it cover only the surface flow of events—such formal happenings as committee hearings, floor debates, parliamentary maneuvers, and the genial press conferences staged regularly by the leadership. A state of symbiosis has grown up between press and lawmakers, enabling both to go about their business in an atmosphere of mutual tolerance. The viability of this relationship is rooted in an unwritten code that the press, and especially the journalistic "regulars" who cover the daily operations of Congress, will behold only the official face of the legislative branch and avert their eyes from the tattletale gray patches of private impropriety.

When the Bobby Baker scandal broke into print last fall it came, therefore, as something of a journalistic anomaly. Stories of personal wrongdoing emanating from Congress about its own Members are a rarity in Washington bureau dispatches. When such scandal flares, it usually centers on a hapless member of the executive branch.

At the outset the Baker affair had a divisive effect on the Capitol Hill reportorial community. "It has the smell of dead fish," grumbled one veteran Senate correspondent about the early allegations. The regular Senate hands, to whom Baker had long been an invaluable news source, responded to the early flow of revelations with skepticism and even a touch of annoyance at those colleagues who persisted along the Baker trail.

This is a point that deserves emphasis. The initiative and enterprise that went into development of the story did not come from the Senate Press Gallery, but rather from a group of journalistic outsiders and irregulars. For example, the story was brought to the surface by Jack Landau, an alert Federal district court reporter for the Washington Post, who recognized immediately the explosive implications of a civil suit to which he had been tipped.

Once the Baker affair surfaced, Senator Joseph S. Clark could not resist twitting the newsmen who regularly covered the world's greatest deliberative body. "Where have you guys been all these years?" Clark needled. Clark's question still haunts some of the newsmen and editors who pride themselves on their grasp of political realities in the Senate. Where, indeed, had they been while Baker—between trips to the Senate floor—was amassing and directing a paper empire that he valued at more than $2 million?

There had been clues, to be sure. Some newsmen had been guests at the gala opening of Baker's sumptuous motel, the Carousel, in the seaside resort town of Ocean City, Md. Newspapers in the Capital celebrated the event as a major social event of the 1962 summer season—and it was. That a $19,600-a-year Senate employee with no known private resources could plunge suddenly into a million-dollar business venture apparently was accepted unquestioningly by all. The Carousel opening was dutifully recorded on Washington society pages.

A little earlier the same year, John J. Lindsay, of the Washington Post (now with Newsweek), had disclosed Baker's affiliation with a Silver Spring, Md., insurance agent, Don B. Reynolds, who had written $200,000 in insurance on the life of Lyndon B. Johnson (and who was later to become Baker's principal public accuser). Painstaking research among Maryland corporate records had confirmed the story for Lindsay, but Baker had denied taking any active part in the firm's affairs. Reynolds subsequently testified that he had paid Baker some $15,000 for helping to bring in business from his many Capitol Hill acquaintances. After a one-shot story, there were no follow-throughs.

By the time of the Carousel opening, a diligent examination of public records could have provided a catalog of Baker financial affiliations that included: a motel partnership with a fellow Senate employee, Small Business Committee Clerk Gertrude G. Novak; a $54,000 Small Business Administration loan for repair of hurricane damage at the motel; a thriving Washington law practice; and an active insurance business. Further investigation into the law firm might have revealed to such additional affiliations as the Serv-U Corp., a fast-growing west coast vending machine firm; the celebrated Quorum Club on Capitol Hill, and a travel agency, Go Travel, Inc.—all listed in District of Columbia records as enterprises incorporated by Baker's law firm.

If Baker's name emerged in the news during this period, it was only in occasional profiles of a bright young man on the way up the Washington social and political ladders. In these appreciative pieces tribute was invariably paid to Baker's acumen as a Senate head counter, to his personality, and to his devotion to duty. One exception was an article by Chicago Daily News Correspondent Jim McCartney, who related Baker's boast that he controlled ten Senators.

Nonetheless, the genesis of the Baker case, insofar as the press is concerned, must be dated September 12, 1963. That was the day when the Washington Post published on page 3-C, deep in the local section, a story by District Court Reporter Landau that was headlined: "Senate Official Is Named in Influence Suit." Baker's name was not mentioned until the third paragraph, but Landau's article gave the details on the civil suit filed against the Senate official and two associates by a vending machine operator, Ralph L. Hill. Hill claimed, in effect, that he had bought Baker's influence to get a lucrative vending concession in a defense plant and that Baker's influence was subsequently used to break the contract.

There had been considerable initial soul-searching by the Post's editors on whether news of the suit should be reported, since it was a complaint in a private dispute. Finally, the executive editor, J. R. Wiggins, and the city editor, Ben W. Gilbert, decided to clear Landau's story without so much as a call to the newspaper's counsel.

Following publication of the initial story, additional manpower was assigned to the Baker story by the Post. The result was a page 1 story published on September 22, 1963, that identified for the first time Baker's heavy financial interest in the Serv-U vending concern, which did most of its business in defense plants. At this point the Post's only direct competition on the story was a little-known trade publication, Vend magazine, organ of the vending machine industry. Both published the story of Baker's affiliations with Serv-U on the same day. It was one of those rare instances when a highly specialized trade journal became a newsstand sellout in Washington.

After September 22, reportorial curiosity was further whetted by a sudden freshet of leads from disenchanted former associates of Baker, from casual acquaintances who could speak of specific episodes, and from anonymous telephone tipsters. Those who professed to know hinted darkly to newsmen of call-girl operations on Capitol Hill, of abortion rings, and of clandestine business deals in which prominent congressional figures were alleged to have participated. One of Baker's former associates passed out the telephone number of a prostitute who boasted to several newsmen of a list of patrons almost large enough to constitute a quorum of either House. Her confessions were tape-recorded by a Washington private detective who subsequently granted paid audiences to newsmen who wanted to hear the recordings. (Stories based on the tapes were eventually published in the Hearst newspapers, the New York Daily News, and the New York Post. Only the News named the woman—and printed her picture.)

Some of the initial reports that came to the press from the gossip mines of Capitol Hill later proved to be substantially accurate; others turned out to be distortions of utter fabrication. Nevertheless, to the small corps of newsmen who were pursuing the story and trying to sift fact from fantasy, the Bobby Baker affair was assuming a new importance. This stemmed in part, to be sure, from Baker's close relationship with Lyndon B. Johnson. But there was also the additional suspicion that a far bigger story lay beneath the surface of the Baker case. One news magazine correspondent made this memorable observation at the time: "What we have here is the story of the invisible government of the Senate—of how things are really done in Washington." The way things were really done in the world of Bobby Baker, reported Julian Morrison in the Washington Daily News, included the use of Senate limousines on private business and the juggling of Senate pageboy salaries.

Only a handful of newsmen was engaged in the lonely, investigative stage of the inquiry preceding Baker's resignation on October 7. Without the early stories, it is doubtful that Baker would have resigned or that the Senate would have directed the Rules Committee on October 9 to embark on a full-scale investigation.

While the Rules Committee made leisurely preparations for an investigation—an activity that was foreign to its normal housekeeping role—disclosure was heaped upon disclosure by a growing phalanx of reporters devoting all or most of their time to the story. In a massive display of gang journalism, Life magazine deployed platoons of reporters and photographers throughout Washington to bivouac in major hotels, roam the city, and extract whatever intelligence could be beguiled or bought on Baker's operations.

It was at this point that press coverage of the Baker case entered its lavendar period. On October 21, the Advance News Service—Washington Bureau for the Newhouse newspapers—disclosed that Baker owned the lavendar-carpeted townhouse near the Capitol that was occupied by his comely secretary and another Senate girl Friday. This story titillated the imagination of some editors who had been unmoved by the disclosures of possible financial conflict of interest and political skullduggery. Five days later Clark Mollenhoff, Washington correspondent of the Cowles publications, filed an even more sensational report that a mysterious German beauty had been whisked out of the United States because of her intimacies with high-level Washington personages.

This development made the Baker case an international cause celèbre from Times Square to Red Square. Photographs of the alluring West German brunette side by side with Baker's Capitol Hill secretary were blazoned across front pages. "Senators, Model Held Parties at Baker House," blared the New York Post on the same day that the New York Daily News proclaimed: "German Pip Charmed On-the-Town VIPs." In London the sedate and intellectual New Statesman and Nation crisply headlined an article on the Baker case: "America's Profumo Scandal." Australian newspaper readers were cautioned: "U.S. on brink of sex scandal."

Ultimately the press reached the limits of its investigatory powers. In the Baker case, Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS, of Delaware, was able to complement the work of newsmen by relating their findings, both published and unprinted, to the leadership. He called in witnesses whose testimony had been of interest only to the press and he invited newsmen to bring in material that they were unable to develop themselves.

Although WILLIAMS had no investigative staff of his own, nor even the power of subpena to carry out his private inquiries, he had built up a reputation in the Senate for spotlighting official wrongdoing in both Republican and Democratic administrations. He was the catalyst by which the Baker case was transformed from a newspaper investigation into an official inquest by a Senate committee.

On December 17, 1963, when the Rules Committee convened its first public hearing in the Senate caucus room, the theater for the Senate's most publicized investigations, the Baker case was formally inaugurated on Capitol Hill as a news event. There were television cameras and May Craig sitting in customary prominence at the press corps' head table. There was a full turnout of wire service correspondents and Washington bureau regulars. The Baker affair was no longer "dead fish." It was an investigation that could be chronicled in the calendar of congressional events posted by the Senate press gallery.

Ironically, when the klieg lights were turned on, the spotlight of press initiative was turned off. Newsmen became increasingly dependent on official disclosures, and coverage of the Baker case gradually slipped back into the traditional pattern of reporting testimony. There were a few exceptions—notably revelations of some of Baker's Caribbean financial interests and his intercession for Nevada gamblers. These were reported respectively in the New York Times and the Washington Evening Star—both of which came to the story late but caught up quickly.

The concentration of reportorial energy and attention on the pursuit of Baker's myriad financial dealings produced important ancillary dividends. They included these revelations: Representative JOHN W. BYRNES, a Wisconsin Republican, had interceded with the Treasury Department in behalf of the Mortgage Guaranty Insurance Corp. of Milwaukee (MGIC), which later favored him with the opportunity to buy valuable stock at below-market prices (Washington Evening Star); Senator OLIN D. JOHNSTON of South Carolina had interceded with Dominican authorities for a gambler-constituent whose investments were endangered after the downfall of Trujillo (New York Times); Senator JOHN J. SPARKMAN, second-ranking Democrat on the Banking and Currency Committee, had bought stock in a newly chartered Washington national bank with a one-third downpayment (Los Angeles Times); a cargo airline had provided free transportation for Capitol Hill staffers and lobbyists to a Las Vegas fundraising dinner in honor of Senator HOWARD W. CANNON, Democrat, of Nevada (Scripps-Howard).

Lyndon B. Johnson's accession to the Presidency imposed heavy inhibitions on newsmen who had been exploring the nature of the relationship that existed between Johnson and Baker. The press reflected the national desire to maintain unity in the wake of catastrophe. On the morning of November 22, insurance man Don Reynolds gave Rules Committee investigators the first evidence injecting Johnson's name into the Baker inquiry. Although the details of Reynolds' session with the committee staff were known to several reporters, the story did not appear in print until January.

Of all the private sources of information, Reynolds knew the most about Baker's business dealings and had the most documentation to back up his assertions. As a witness, he provided some of the most damaging testimony—although only in the form of published transcripts, since the Rules Committee never called him in open session. He became the center of the Johnson administration's first news management controversy.

"Persons within and close to the Johnson administration have attempted to use secret Government documents to impugn the testimony of a witness in the Robert G. Baker case," Cabell Phillips reported on page 1 of the New York Times on February 8. In the background of the controversy were Reynolds' allegations that he had been pressured into buying advertising time on the Johnson family's Austin, Tex., television station, and that he had paid for an expensive gift stereo set for the Johnsons. After Reynolds had given his testimony at two executive sessions of the Rules Committee, publishers and other key newspaper executives began receiving telephone calls from high figures in the Johnson administration who pictured the insurance agent as an unreliable witness and cautioned against publication of his charges.

Phillips reported, and others confirmed, that "in several instances, individual newsmen and news executives have been read excerpts from what purported to be reports by either Air Force intelligence or the Federal Bureau of Investigation. These reports purported to contain derogatory information on Mr. Reynolds' background and his reputation for veracity."

The effect of these calls was varied. The Washington Evening Star revised a story about the stereo gift after a White House call, only to acknowledge later that its reporter had been right in the first place. The Hearst Headline Service, first to publish the story, made its decision to go ahead after a frantic round of telephone calls between Washington and New York. The Washington Post decided to await the expected release by the Rules Committee of Reynolds' testimony about the stereo set and advertising kickbacks to the Johnson station.

In any event, the Reynolds' charges were widely publicized in all media when uncensored transcripts were released by the committee—although they had to compete for news play with the concurrent release of President Johnson's budget message.

At this point, columnist Drew Pearson and his associate, Jack Anderson, began to publish a series of sharp attacks on Reynolds, quoting extensively from what they described as official records. In one instance, Pearson appended to his column the text of an Air Force memorandum on Reynolds' war record that bore a January 1964, Pentagon stamp. In a "confidential note to editors," according to one published account, Pearson wrote: "For your information and because of possible concern over libel in columns on Don B. Reynolds, I am giving for your private information a copy of an Air Force report on Reynolds' background. Information contained in columns is from various sources, though the following is a fairly good summary."

The White House denied that it had any part in compiling or releasing the dossier on Reynolds. The Justice Department also denied any complicity in the leak. The Defense Department refused to make any comment on the episode, even in response to senatorial inquiries.

The source of the leaks remains a mystery to this day. And the problem of how to handle unattributable, derogatory information from official files—a problem posed in its most acute form during the McCarthy era a decade ago—remains unresolved. In dealing with the Pearson revelations, the Washington Post twinned the first critical column with an answering statement by Reynolds. Other Pearson subscribers carried only the column. In a few instances the Pearson column was killed.

A chronic problem underscored by the Bobby Baker affair is the strong pressure on congressional beat men to confine their reportage to the visible legislative surfaces. Admittedly, covering the Senate is a complex and exacting assignment—one that is competently performed by most of the mature professionals in the press gallery. It is argued that Senate reporters are too burdened with daily coverage responsibilities to ferret out corruption in the legislative branch. However, the disclosures of the Baker case drive home the harsh truth that self-interested actions concealed behind the parliamentary facade are an intrinsic part of the story.

One Senate aid paid tribute to the role of the news media in the Baker case with the observation that "without the newspapers this would have been over long ago." He alluded to the fact that press disclosure provided the frame of reference for the Rules Committee investigation. Unarguably, the press did itself credit in the Baker affair, displaying the investigative initiative it can bring to bear once its interest has been whetted.

Still, the question propounded by Senator CLARK—"Where have you guys been all these years?"—remains a perplexing one. Had it not been for a seamy business squabble that spilled over into the courts, how long would it have been before the press recognized that the private financial interests of the Senate's No. 1 news source were also news?

BEET SUGAR QUOTA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to make a few observations about the sugar situation as it confronts us today, because I believe there is a great deal of confusion in the minds of some people as to why sugar legislation once more will be before the Congress.

Two years ago I played an important role in bringing about amendments of the national Sugar Act, which opened the way for a limited expansion of the domestic beet sugar industry. This is an important segment of our agriculture and of our total economy in Minnesota and neighboring States. Those amendments created an acreage reserve on which to base plans for building several new sugarbeet processing plants and thereby increasing our own production of sugar in the United States to assure consumers adequate supplies of this essential commodity at all times and at reasonable prices.

I always have supported the best interests of the American beet sugar industry because I recognize the importance of increasing our national self-sufficiency in sugar and reducing our reliance upon foreign supply lines.

In 1962, the Sugar Act was revised to meet a new set of circumstances. Cuba, formerly our great nearby sugar warehouse upon which we had relied for many years to keep our sugar supplies in balance with demand, no longer served our needs. The lesson of Cuba taught us we must move forward in increasing our own production, and this is what the 1962 amendments to the Sugar Act were designed to accomplish, to a limited degree.

Not only was I acutely aware at that time of the overall national need for better assured supplies of sugar, but I also was extremely sensitive to the desires of many groups of farmers in our country to be permitted to produce sugar crops. Sugar is a nonsurplus farm commodity bearing cash returns much needed by our farm operators. It certainly was, in my mind, simple justice that our own American producers should be permitted to participate more fully in the U.S. sugar market.

So the law was changed and, as I mentioned, I was pleased to be in a position to help bring about the accomplishments of 1962 in behalf of our sugarbeet farmers and American consumers.

This was done without in any way seriously or adversely affecting foreign suppliers of sugar, particularly cane sugar suppliers.

Now a new set of facts confronts us. We have been through a particularly stormy year in the sugar world, a year which showed a sharp and largely unanticipated swing in the world sugar situation from a condition of chronic surplus to one of deepening shortage of supplies. Against a worldwide condition of rising per capita demand for sugar there came a period of substandard total world production. Available stocks were eroded away. Supply tightness dominated the marketplace, resulting in heavy buying—scare buying in many instances and for an extended period. As buying mounted, so did the price of sugar. These were some of the factors affecting our U.S. sugar market just about a year ago when the price finally, on May 23, 1963, climbed to a 40-year high.

As fear over the availability of needed sugar rose along with prices, the Government called upon our domestic beet sugar producers to step up production. Several actions were taken by the Government to provide the incentive for production increases. The sugarbeet growers and the processing companies responded with a magnificent performance, turning out an added half-million tons of sugar on short notice during 1963, and building their production by another expected quarter-million tons this year. At the same time, the beet sugar people resisted taking advantage of a bad situation. Rather than seeking to charge all that the traffic would bear, they held back on prices, and by so doing helped to bring the marketplace back to normal much sooner than might overwise have been possible.

I think this point needs to be emphasized. The producers and processors of sugar held the price line and refused to advance prices, which resulted in reduced prices, at a saving to the consumers of this country of hundreds of millions of dollars. So the actual cost of the sugar programs for the past year, if not fully, was at least in large measure paid for by savings to consumers, as a result of reduction in the price of sugar commodities.

As a result of their magnificent response to the critical situation through which we have just lived, these same beet sugar people now face a crippling dilemma: Their production has been pushed to levels substantially greater than their marketing quota.

That production was increased because of the national need for sugar supplies.

In simplest terms, this means that unless the domestic beet sugar industry is awarded a substantial quota increase this year, the very people who were instrumental in overcoming last year's sugar crisis will be penalized by a 40-percent cutback of their production by 1966—a 40-percent cut in sugarbeet acreage which our Nation's sugarbeet growers cannot afford to sustain; and sugar needed by our consumers necessarily will be withheld from the market. And we shall again be at the mercy, so to speak, of the uncertainties of the world market for sugar. As I pointed out 2 years ago, that market today is controlled in large measure by the Soviet Union, which has in its possession or control well over 30 percent of all supplies of sugar.

Mr. President, I am a cosponsor of a Senate bill to adjust the beet sugar industry's quota upward by 750,000 tons annually and thus avert the injustice of a crippling cutback. I have every intention of again doing all that is in my power to see this measure through to successful completion.

I not only feel it is good for the domestic economy and for the sound and good economy of beet producers, but that it is also good, sound national security policy to have an adequate supply of sugar, and at the same time, because of the growth of the population and the growth of the per capita consumption of sugar, not to adversely affect imports of sugar.

In the proposal to increase our quota by some 750,000 tons lies the hope, I believe, of the established beet-sugar industry and the only hope of those who are now standing on the sidelines awaiting the opportunity to get into the business.

There is an adequate amount of sugar still set aside from the former Cuban quota to accommodate the necessary beet quota increase. The industry has demonstrated its ability to deliver in times of stress. Foreign supplies to some extent are shaky and uncertain. In short, it is to the best interest of consumers, producers, and our Nation as a whole that the beet-sugar quota be enlarged at once.

Therefore, I have joined the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Young] and other Senators in this body in the proposing of legislation to expand sugar-beet production. I intend to lend every effort toward achieving that end.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. McNAMARA. In connection with the Senator's remarks on sugar and the beet-sugar industry, I agree with his comments and his activities in behalf of the beet-sugar producers of the United States and the need for an increase in quotas, which I think is so eloquently justified in the speech he has just made. However, I question whether the price of sugar to the consumer has been stabilized. It seems to me the housewife is now paying about twice as much for sugar at the local outlet as she did 2 years ago. I have always gone along with the sugar programs, because this has not been the case. Sugar was being produced and sold at the retail level at 8 or 9 cents a pound; but now the price has perhaps doubled. The last time I checked, the chainstores were charging 35 cents for a 2-pound package of sugar. Perhaps the price has come down since then; but I think the fluctuation has been at the wholesale level, and has not been reflected at the retail level.

While generally I concur in what the Senator from Minnesota has stated, I think further consideration should be given to the consumer. I know the Senator is as much interested in the consumer as I am.

Mr. HUMPHREY. First, I thank the Senator for his comments on the proposed legislation. Michigan is one of the large beet-sugar producing States. In that State, as in mine, and others, producers did a good job a year ago in meeting the heavy demand for sugar. I referred to the fact that the price of sugar rose rapidly, until it reached a 40-year high a year ago. I am talking about both retail prices and wholesale prices. At that point, when the sugar industry increased production, it was able to level off the price; and since then there has been a slight drop.

The actual amounts of sugar in surplus are limited. The sugar market is tight. That is why we feel we ought to have a good look at this proposed legislation, to see whether what we propose is adequate.

I thoroughly agree with the Senator from Michigan that we ought to look into the pricing structure. The National Food Commission legislation to study the whole structure of food prices in the United States will make it possible to go very quickly into this subject.

The President has been appointing the members of the Commission. I am hopeful that the Commission will be able to make an interim report some time in the early part of next year, if not later this year.

Mr. McNAMARA. I thank the Senator for his remarks. I am sure that his concern, as he has expressed it, is the same as my concern.

However, there is another alarming aspect to this subject. We are in the process of entering into a worldwide coffee agreement. In the light of the experience the consumers have had in the sugar fields, many of us feel we should take another look at the Coffee Agreement, which has substantial support, as I understand, in the State Department and generally in the administration.

I would be very reluctant to take a position in opposition to the administration in this field; but unless some guarantees for the protection of the consumer are written into the agreement, I shall have to be in opposition to the Coffee Agreement, because of the many problems from the standpoint of the consumers that we have had in connection with the sugar agreement.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am aware, of course, of the views of the Senator from Michigan. He is always a very articulate and frank and straightforward man. While he does not speak long, he always speaks to the point. A man would have to be rather ill informed, or perhaps even stupid, not to understand what the Senator from Michigan means.

It is my view that the sugar agreements which we have made in the past have, in the main, served the consumer's interest.

Mr. McNAMARA. I agree.

Mr. HUMPHREY. We did achieve price stability. Then came the situation when the Cuban sugar went into Soviet orbit, so to speak. It is a fact that the Soviet Union has been receiving sugar in payment for arms it has sent to Cuba. As a result, the normal economic laws have not applied, because the market has been somewhat manipulated. I hope we can restore the balance we had for many years in connection with sugar prices.

Mr. McNAMARA. I agree with the Senator. I join in the hope he has expressed. However, I wish to point out to him that it was long after the Cuban incident that the tremendous rise in the price of sugar occurred, so far as the consumer was concerned; it was many years after the reduction in the quotas and the cutting off of quotas to the Cuban sugar-producing areas. I do not believe we shall find that situation to be the total answer. Many other manipulations must be considered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The National Food Commission, which the President asked for, and which Congress has set up, will, I am sure, give thorough consideration to many such commodities. It will concern itself with the retail price of beef, for example. It will look into the retail price situation at a time when the wholesale prices are going down. We hope to have some very interesting revelations made as a result of these studies.

Mr. McNAMARA. I do not wish to go too far afield, by considering either beef or bread; but in the Detroit area there has been some difficulty in connection with bread. Those concerned have come to me and have protested the importation of bread from Canada. I looked into the matter in Detroit, and found that the largest importers of bread are the bakeries, the very people who have been complaining to me about the importations of bread. The big bakeries have been importing bread, while at the same time complaining to me about it.

Some very peculiar things are going on; and I believe they must be corrected.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Michigan.

DUAL EMPLOYMENT AND DUAL COMPENSATION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 904, H.R. 7381, so that it may be made the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (H.R. 7381) to simplify, modernize, and consolidate the laws relating to the employment of civilians in more than one position and the laws concerning the civilian employment of retired members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service with amendments on page 12, after line 5, to strike out:

> Sec. 205. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a retired member of any of the uniformed services shall not be appointed to any civilian office in the competitive civil service unless (1) the United States Civil Service Commission shall have given prior public notice of the fact that a vacancy exists in such office and of the fact that an assembled examination (includng written tests, oral interviews, and security investigation), where practicable, or a combination of an assembled or nonassembled examination, where practicable, open to all persons, is to be given at a specific time and place, but not before the thirtieth day after the date such notice is first given, and (2) such office is filled only from among those qualified

persons who successfully complete such examination. This section shall not affect the authority of the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration contained in section 201(e) of this title.

At the beginning of line 22, to change the section number from "206" to "205"; on page 13, after line 17, to strike out:

(c) The President of the Senate with respect to the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives with respect to the United States House of Representatives, and the Architect of the Capitol with respect to the Office of the Architect of the Capitol each is authorized to provide for a means by which exceptions may be made to the restrictions in subsection (a) of this section whenever he determines that such exceptions are warranted on the ground that personal services otherwise cannot be readily obtained.

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

(c) Unless otherwise authorized by law, no money appropriated by any Act shall be available for payment to any person of salary from more than one civilian office if the aggregate amount of the basic compensation from such offices exceeds the sum of $2,000 per annum, and if (1) one of such salaries is disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate or the Clerk of the House of Representatives or (2) one of such offices is under the Office of the Architect of the Capitol.

On page 15, after line 2, to insert:

(5) compensation received by any person holding an office or position the compensation for which is disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate or the Clerk of the House of Representatives or any office or position under the Architect of the Capitol;

At the beginning of line 8, to strike out "(5)" and insert "(6)"; at the beginning of line 11, to strike out "(6)" and insert "(7)"; on page 17, after line 10, to insert:

(f) This title shall not be applicable to persons employed under the joint resolution approved July 6, 1961 (75 Stat. 199; Public Law 87-82), or under section 208 of the First Supplemental Civil Functions Appropriation Act, 1941 (54 Stat. 1056; Public Law 812, 76th Congress).

And on page 34, after line 10, to insert:

(c) Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to repeal or modify the provisions of the last paragraph under the heading "Administrative Provisions" in the appropriations for the Senate contained in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1957 (70 Stat. 360; 2 U.S.C. 66a).

QUALIFICATIONS FOR THE OFFICE OF SENATOR

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, once in a long time something which comes along in a publication is as refreshing as a bright spring morning.

A short time ago, the editor and publisher of the Burlington Record wrote an article entitled "Yep, Quite a Change". In the article he discusses some of the foibles and some of the absurd things that are going on in America today.

The article is so reminiscent of the very best of William Allen White, that I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Yep, Quite a Change

Something is happening in the political picture of America today on which I am a little vague or else the thrill of it all has so far managed to escape me. Apparently, the newest lark or thing to be in with is to run for the Senate in a State in which one does not reside. According to the California primary, it's the only sure way to win an election. And it does make sense, doesn't it? After all, if nothing (good or bad) is really known about such a candidate, why should a voter post a negative ballot?

It's been rumored that one has to maintain residence in a State for a required amount of time in order to vote, but—wonder of wonders—not to run for the Senate.

Now, I ask, if we are going to attempt inner-State campaigns for our own representatives, let's abandon the traditional 50-State concept and consolidate into one mammoth glob * * * the United States of America? And why not? When one considers the unbelievable percentage of governmental workers in the Nation today, it just might be feasible to consider such a setup when one also realizes that that same employment could be sliced almost in half under a single U.S. deal. Actually, if we still kept our current local and State governments and combined them into one * * * who needs the present Federal Government?

Think of the panic such a situation could cause throughout our United States. Unemployment would be at an even greater alltime high and the ensuing years might even make the WPA days seem mild as we envision breadlines stretching into the miles.

But why daydream? This all doesn't really seem practical since the Washington heads would never let such a movement get off the ground. However, the whole thing could have another application with regard to our roving candidates.

If, for instance, a young Senator tried a radical, way out move in his own State and realized too late, that in the next election he wouldn't even make it out of the starting gate; he could pack his little bag and present himself and his views in a State where his beliefs might appear more practical.

Now, we have established another trend * * * vote for Joe Schmoo, the unbeatable Senator from Colorado, Kansas, Utah, California, and New York. Take your pick, he'll be equally happy to represent one State as the other * * * just so he gets elected somewhere. But here our young gentleman could possibly find himself in deep water. Suppose he appeals to more than one State at the same time? Well, the answer to that is merely adjusting one's campaign strategy so the pulse of the people, is tapped so well that he will never please but one of the States at any given time.

In conclusion (and this thing must be concluded sometime else it mushrooms out of control), when Colorado politicians ask themselves what office they should attempt to snare, a chubby, short, crewcut, dark, cigar-smoking and victory-fresh man might say—

"Colorado? Bah. Forget home ties and native pride * * * look for greener pastures before you announce candidacy. But stay out of California—that's mine now."

THE WAR ON POVERTY

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I have received a very interesting letter from Mrs. Don Wright, of Olney Springs, Colo. She addressed her letter to the human-interest editor of the New York Times; and in the letter she discussed many aspects of poverty and the absurdity of our programs and attempts to solve such problems in this country.

I ask unanimous consent that her letter be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Olney Springs, Colo.,
June 16, 1964.

New York Times,
New York, N.Y.
(Attention: Human Interest Editor).

Dear Sir: Hail. Please don't lay this aside until you have read it. I'm determined to see what I can find out about the principles of this Nation and would appreciate if you would help me.

I want to know how a citizen informs the uninterested taxpayer of information vital to each and every taxpayer and vital to our Nation. You will hear them say, "What do I care about the beef industry? I couldn't help the stockman because I know nothing of his situation."

There is nothing more American than a T-bone steak, a hamburger, or a hot dog. Without the beef industry these American foods will not exist. While the livestock producer is in the minority according to his voting potential, he is the backbone of the Nation when it comes to producing its food. If you break him you will break the Nation. I want to know how to let the public know the seriousness of a current problem, what they can do to help; and also why a minority voice is ceasing to be heard in this land where there is supposed to be opportunity for all with each person supposing to have a voice in the Government. The beef quota, which is the quantity of pounds of beef which may be imported into the States, is so high that it is going to break the cowman and force him to become dependent upon the Government; the Government being you, the taxpayer. His dependency will not only increase your taxes, it will lead to a very socialized way of government. The cattleman has always been very independent, and would like to remain that way if this administration will do something to stop the beef import.

I am a housewife; not an average housewife, however, for I'm married to a young man who would like to make a successful career out of farming and ranching. Do you have any idea of the impossibility of this desire? Both of us have been reared in the country. We love the land and the stock and are willing to work to get on our own, but how can we when this administration seems insistent that the agriculture people become just another puppet on their strings?

We are employed by a rancher-farmer, draw a small monthly wage, get a share of the crop, a house to live in, pasture for 10 head of cows. By living very modestly we have tried to increase our livestock herd yearly. On paper it would seem that you could live on the salary and crop profits, leaving the livestock as a means for securing capital necessary to become independent.

A rancher's life is not such an open and shut case. A dry year last year took all of the livestock profit to live on and acquire enough feed to maintain the livestock herd. This administration's grain programs are producing an abundance of grain which leads to an excess of beef. As if this wasn't enough, they refuse to limit the imported beef; hence our market prices are going lower and lower. Under normal circumstances when there became an oversupply of beef there would be a drop in prices, but then when the demand rose again the gain would replace the cowman's loss over the low-market years. With the import this cannot happen, the cowman's loss will be final.

Another very vital factor which the wage earner could stop by placing a no vote on farm subsidy programs is the "government farmer." This is the man who obtains all the land that he possible can, puts it into the grain programs, and lets the taxpayers pay for his land that he has purchased. People like this do not cut down the grain supply as the bill was intended to do. The taxpayer merely pays him for doing nothing to abate the supply. This man also has increased the price of land, its taxes, and its unavailablity. All of these facts contribute to the fact that someone like us cannot possible acquire enough capital to start our own enterprise as it will take a fortune.

This is supposed to be the land of opportunity, home of the free, yet at the very much publicized family-invited news conference that President Johnson had on the White House lawn, there was not one question regarding the beef import situation. Why? I'm under the assumption that these conferences are to inform the Nation about the status of the Nation, its Government, and affairs. How can the citizens become informed if the facts are not presented to them?

Johnson's "war on poverty" headlines everything. I fear his concern is not for the poor, it is for how many votes he can secure—for how can he eradicate poverty when he is creating more of it all the time by ignoring the cattlemen's import protests?

How does this situation affect you and every New Yorker on the street? You are paying taxes for nothing. The feed-grain program costs you $2.5 billion, the purpose of which was to cut down the oversupply of feed grains. After 3 years the corn crop of 1963 was the highest ever produced. (Enclosed please find some very good literature which will support my statements).

Yes, I am a Republican, prejudiced, but I'm also concerned over our three daughters. If things progress as they are now the taxes that they will inherit from our stupidity, from our thriftless generation will be astounding. Can't something be done to stop this waste of money?

If every wage earner's taxes were not withheld from his weekly paycheck, he would probably have trouble paying his taxes in April. However, if his taxes had to be paid as one lump sum he would soon realize how high they are and perhaps would take the trouble to vote down these atrocious bills or at least take the time to study about how the tax dollar is being wasted and misused. A little study would soon show him that every cowman that is put out of business becomes competition for him as the cowman must become a wage earner too.

My father has been a Colorado rancher all of his life so I feel as if I'm fairly well versed on the subject. I just want to know why the minority, the independent enterprises, are being forced to succumb to governmental control in a land which boasts of free enterprise? How can a concerned American citizen belonging to this minority make his argument heard and listened to by the majority?

After all, it is the fear of poverty which induces every man to work and improve his standard of living. Let us not take away our free enterprises; for a socialistic nation only exists on governmental desires, while a free nation will thrive to become "one nation, under God, with liberty and justice for all."

Yours truly,

MRS. DON WRIGHT.

THE SUDETEN GERMANS

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, for many years, I have been interested in Sudeten German Day, held on Whitsuntide, and what it means to people living all over the world. I have from Dr. Walter Becher, secretary general of the Sudeten German organization, a letter expressing to me his thanks for my interest in this subject.

Because I believe Americans should never forget what is happening in Germany, and what has happened since World War II, I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUDETENDEUTSCHER RAT E. V.,
München, den, June 26, 1964.

HON. GORDON ALLOTT,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR ALLOTT: On the occasion of July 4, the American National Independence Day, I would like to express to you the best congratulations on behalf of the Sudeten German people.

The fate of the whole world depends on whether the great American ideals of the past will prevail also in the future. The hopes of all freedom-loving people and also of my people rest on your great country and above all on the statesmen in the Congress of the United States. We pray that your work may succeed and feel, today more than ever, closely attached to your great people and its great traditions and ideals.

On your national day, I send you the best wishes for your country, for you and your human and political work.

With kindest personal regards.

Yours very sincerely,

DR. WALTER BECHER,
Secretary General.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, if no other Senator wishes to address the Senate, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HEALTHY SKEPTICISM NEEDED FOR DEFENSE DEPARTMENT ECONOMY CLAIMS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the Defense Department is making new and sweeping claims of economy in its operations. Fortunately, these claims, which originally were taken at face value, are now being greeted with a more sophisticated skepticism on the part of those familiar with Pentagon estimates and calculations. Although I have no information one way or another as to the validity of Secretary McNamara's claims as made yesterday, I do have some interesting and fairly detailed information relating to savings which the Defense Department announced in December, savings estimated at $336 million a year in the closing of certain defense installations.

Mr. President, one of those installations is the Rome Air Materiel Area in New York. Since I knew very well that this was not an obsolete facility—because the procurement of ground based communications electronics equipment would be increasing over the next decade—I questioned what economies could arise from transferring these jobs around the country. Representative PIRNIE, of New York, Senator JAVITS, and I asked the General Accounting Office to audit the cursory figures produced by the Air Force to determine whether they were valid. After a 6-month investigation the GAO issued what can only be described as a startling report. In three different areas of claimed savings, the Comptroller General said that the figures of estimated savings were overstated by at least 25 percent of the total and the figures of estimated replacement costs were understated by a similar amount. What is more, in trying to ascertain the validity of the remaining 75 percent of savings claimed by the Air Force, the GAO ran into a blank wall. Let me quote from the conclusion of this report.

> The soundness of the Air Force decision depends almost entirely on the validity of the estimated savings attributed to the move. However, we were unable to determine the reasonableness of the greatest portion of this savings estimate because the Air Force has not provided sufficient detailed support for the single most important factor affecting it; that is, the extent to which AFLC's total authorized personnel strength can be reduced. We were informed that the detailed work to arrive at this estimate was performed by one officer in order to avoid premature widespread concern over the proposed closing during the early planning stages and that the officer was instructed to and did destroy the detailed papers supporting the estimate.

In short, Mr. President, incredible as it may seem, when it comes right down to proving to knowledgeable and experienced accountants that havings actually exist as claimed by the Defense Department, the evidence has mysteriously disappeared. One unidentified official made the calculations and destroyed the evidence. This is a concept of government that is more reminiscent of Franz Kafka's novels of nightmarish beaucracy than it is of a government responsive and responsible to an informed electorate.

Mr. President, what we really have had presented amounts to a new kind of news management—a top-level briefing with numerous pictures and charts and a great many figures which are meaningless until they have been analyzed by experts. The GAO report on ROAMA, which is the only instance I am aware of in which the inflated economy claims of the Defense Department have been thoroughly examined, deflates these claims to a considerable extent and suggests that a healthy skepticism is necessary in evaluating these latest economy claims.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, next week is the sixth annual celebration by the United States of Captive Nations Week.

This most important observance has a meaning for both the imprisoned peoples of the world and our own citizens. It is a truism that the deprivation of liberty does not remove the desire for it. Events such as the Hungarian uprising in 1956 or the recurring attempts to escape over the Berlin wall remind us of the enduring hope and courage which burns in the hearts of all these captive peoples. We must show the citizens of the Soviet and Red Chinese satellites that we care; we will act; that their appeals for help are heard and understood.

Recently, we have read much about the "thaw in the cold war." This is encouraging and a sign for hope in the future. But we must not let ourselves be deceived: the Soviets have not yet given up their desire for complete world domination. The plight of the captive nations is a reminder of the tyranny of communism and the possible results of a lack of caution. Until the Communists give up their domination of so many people we cannot believe that their peaceful overtures are anything but new ways to achieve old desires. In the meantime we must use any Soviet policy changes for our own advantage and for the assistance of the unfortunate people who today are suffering from Communist tyranny all over the world—now even in our own hemisphere.

Lest we forget the love of freedom which lives today behind the iron curtain we celebrate Captive Nations Week and rededicate ourselves to achieving liberty for all peoples in the world. Until universal liberty is a fact, a lasting peace will only be an illusion held by those who believe what they wish to at the expense of the facts which they choose to ignore.

Freedom and peace are long range goals. In the meantime, however, there are things we can and should do.

Our food programs, administered under Public Law 480, have been very successful in the past and should be continued. We must make use of the openings in the Iron Curtain to expand trade with those peoples who hope to escape from Russian domination by building strong and growing economies of their own. We must continue to make the most important distinction between the desires of the peoples themselves and the goals of their oppressive governments. We must make sure that the peoples of these countries know that this generous aid comes from the people of the United States. Such a distinction will assure us that our foreign policy is aimed at those who must ultimately benefit from it if we are to have a world that is all free, not half slave.

Finally, it is well this week to remember those now living in this country who have claims on these governments. Our State Department must use every device to assure these citizens the fairest and best possible settlement of their just demands.

We must not seek a settlement with Communist nations at the expense of our own citizens.

It is imperative that in the turmoil of campaigning for the highest office in the land we do not forget that over 100 million people are denied the rights which we are exercising under our free government. All Americans must rededicate themselves to the fight which is more important today than ever before—the fight for liberty and freedom. Captive Nations Week will be celebrated by us to assure the captive peoples of the world that we have not forgotten them, for on their freedom rests the ultimate hope of the free world.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the text of an analysis of the situation in Eastern Europe by Brutus Coste, Secretary General of the Assembly of Captive European Nations.

There being no objection, the analysis was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

ARE THE CAPTIVE NATIONS RECOVERING THEIR INDEPENDENCE?

(By Brutus Coste, Secretary General of the Assembly of Captive European Nations)

There is a quite widespread belief that the individual east-central European Communist regimes are much less subservient than they were under Stalin, or in the 2 years immediately preceding the events of October 1956, and are increasingly, though in varying degree, asserting their own policies vis-a-vis the Soviet Union.

The one delevelopment common to all the captive countries on which this view rests is the elimination or curtailment of certain conspicuous reminders of Soviet Russian domination. Among them were the joint economic enterprises (which in Rumania, for instance, controlled 16 of the most important branches of the economy up to 1954) and the too ostentatious tokens of Soviet political overlordship (monuments of Stalin; towns, streets, institutions, and plants bearing the name of Stalin or other Soviet or Russian figures) and cultural penetration (compulsory teaching of Russian, preponderance of translations from Russian writings, sycophantic pro-Soviet cultural and educational organizations and institutions).

It is, of course, tempting to construe such developments as assertions of independence by the Communist regimes. There is, however, even more justification to regard them as concessions made by Moscow to the national sensibilities of the anti-Communist majorities, as reasonable moves to do away with unnecessary irritants, the better to conceal the less obvious but much more important controls the Soviets are intent upon preserving. As such, they reflect the change from Stalin's paranoia to Khrushchev's shrewd commonsense; from a position of military weakness (in modern weapons) to one of relative strength; from the pre-1956 doubts concerning Western behavior in the event of uprisings in Eastern, to the self-assurance generated by Western passivity at the time of the Hungarian revolution. The grand design is not to weaken the organic dependence of these regimes but to consolidate it by trimming it down to essentials.

Thus party and government structure, army and security organizations and methods, economic organization and the high priority given heavy industry at the expense of living standards, the educational and cultural policy keep on following closely the Soviet pattern. The foreign policy statements and actions of the satellite regimes reflect as slavishly as ever the policy line set forth by the Soviet Union. From coexistence, to disarmament; from the advocacy of nuclear free zones meant to weaken the West to the call for a Warsaw Pact-NATO nonaggression treaty; from the shrill denunciation of "Western imperialism" to the effort to use the nationalism of the underdeveloped countries for the purposes of Communist expansion—the voice of the East European satellites is the voice of the Soviet Union.

The one apparent exception would seem to be Rumania which is, paradoxically enough, from the domestic point of view the least de-Stalinized of the captive countries. In fact, however, it is precisely for this reason that the appearances of independence are being created. Too weak to risk internal relaxation, the Rumanian regime has concentrated on a series of gestures calculated to improve its international image. The new image is expected to secure a measure of popular acceptance inside Rumania, to help Communist political penetration in the underdeveloped countries by demonstrating that a Communist-ruled country is not necessarily a satellite and to generate Western credits that would gradually spread to the whole Communist-ruled area.

Three such gestures have received the greatest attention in the West and are usually adduced as evidence for the optimistic theory that there are no longer any satellites.

First, the Rumanian regime gave wide publicity to its longstanding differences with East Germany and Czechoslovakia concerning the further development of Rumanian heavy industry. This was interpreted, as it was meant to be, as a defiance of a Soviet-dictated economic integration within the COMECON. The truth of the matter is that the Soviet Union never took a clear stand in this conflict between satellites and is still delivering machinery for the Galati steel complex project.

Another Rumanian gesture was to vote last November in favor of a Latin American denuclearization resolution, when the Soviet Union abstained. This widely acclaimed gesture was not taken in defiance of the Soviet Union. Its immediate purpose was to improve the chances of Rumania to carry out its assigned task of Communist spearhead in Latin America. For this purpose the Rumanians, who, ever since the Communist takeover were depicted as Slavs, are once again permitted to stress their Latin origin and character.

Lastly, the Soviet-instigated Rumanian move to act as mediator between Moscow and Peiping was skillfully presented as an independent action. Not even Pravda's admission that the Soviet Union approved the Rumanian move could dispel the myth that this was another evidence of independence. This myth rests on a basic contradiction. On the one hand, it is said, the Soviet-Chinese rift has given more freedom of action to the satellites; on the other, that the regime which allegedly took the greatest advantage of this rift is trying to heal it at the risk of antagonizing its only source of power.

That the Rumanian gestures are really only an "independence ploy" designed to serve Communist penetration in Latin America and to prepare the ground for massive Western, particularly American, credits, is indicated by several essential facts:

(1) The Rumanian Communist Party is qualitatively the weakest in Eastern Europe. It has not dared to relax police terror. Yet this regime is credited with actions defying Soviet power. The Yugoslav and Polish precedents cast a serious doubt on this theory. Both Tito in 1948 and Gomulka in 1956 had the full support of the party leadership and, therefore, could only be removed by Soviet military power. They were, in other words, practically purgeproof. Yet they felt the need of placating the people by permitting the peasants to disband collective farms and by giving to the workers, at least temporarily, through the workers' councils, a voice in the running of the enterprises in which

they worked. Not even the most optimistic would claim that Gheorghiu-Dej and his closest associates enjoy the 100 percent support of the party organs against Moscow, or that they have taken any internal measures that would give them a measure of popular support.

(2) Rumanian industrial development, according to well-informed technicians who recently escaped to the West, has reached a dead end. The Soviet Union is in no position to supply the required installations and Rumania lacks adequate technical know-how to carry out existing development plans. Rumania has therefore been prodded to purchase, on credit, entire factories, complete with technical help to set them up and make them operative. They have been quite successful in getting such installations, on credit, in Western Europe and appear to have been almost as successful in Washington.

(3) Were the Rumanian assertion of independence genuine, it would comprise a serious attempt to end Soviet exploitation, through discriminatory prices in Soviet-Rumanian trade. The fact is, however, that since 1955, the year when Moscow started publishing foreign trade data, and up to 1962, the captive nations lost over $8 billion as a result of over-charged Soviet exports and underpriced imports. The loss of Rumania alone aggregated almost $1 billion. In 1962—the last for which Soviet figures are available—the Rumanian loss amounted to $161.8 million.

To conclude, a cool assessment of developments in Eastern Europe does not bear out the overoptimistic theory about an increasing assertion of independence on the part of the satellites and a gradual weakening of their dependence on Moscow. Only time will separate facts from gestures calculated to produce certain definite effects in the West. Until this will happen, the better part of wisdom would be not to take the widely reported changes in Eastern Europe at their face value but rather view them as attempts to correct certain unworkable features of the system and to make it more effective, hence stronger.

THE POST OFFICE IS PUBLIC BUSINESS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, it is most important that the Post Office Department be continually aware of its obligations to the public and its own employees. Without the good will of its employees, it is unable to perform its vital function; and without the confidence and support of the public, it fails in its assigned tasks.

In my judgment, the curtailment order of May 4 evidenced a disregard of the Department's responsibilities both to the public and to the postal employees.

Through the years, postage rates have continually been on the upswing, while the public has received less and less service. The May curtailment order was no exception to this trend in service. It marked an undue imposition on the public, one which Congress should not expect to be endured. The total effect has been a deprivation of postal services to many numbers of the public who are unable to use the post office facilities during the week and find themselves restricted to 4 hours of limited service on Saturday morning. The burden falls most heavily on the workingmen and women who can go to the post office only on Saturday morning. The elimination of night service windows; the operation of consolidated windows on Saturday to handle both stamps and packages; and the Saturday elimination of money order sales, information windows, and postal savings transactions are not changes which benefit the public or take their interest into account. The order did not provide simply for an adjustment of services, it amounted to a blatant disregard of duty to the public.

The reduction of parcel post deliveries from 6 days a week to 5 in urban areas served by truck has had its effect not only upon service to the public but also upon the morale of our dedicated postal employees. The use of career substitutes, so I have been advised, heretofore permitted regular career employees involved in parcel post deliveries to have an occasional weekend off with their families. But the curtailment order has eliminated the use of career substitutes on parcel post routes and any opportunity for the weekend off.

It is in our national interest to have competent and satisfied employees in the postal service system. These men and women have labored year in and year out in handling an ever-increasing workload. We are not going to be able to maintain the same high standards for postal employees, even with the much merited pay increase, if we do not give full consideration to their working conditions.

Because of my deep concern that the curtailment order did not serve the public's interest and was harmful to the morale of our postal employees, I wrote to Postmaster General Gronouski requesting his reconsideration of the order with a view to its revocation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my letters of May 5 and May 6 and Assistant Postmaster W. M. McMillan's responses of May 19, 1964, be printed in the RECORD, following my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the Post Office Department apparently justified the curtailment order solely on the grounds of economy. I congratulate Postmaster Gronouski and all other Federal officials on their efforts to initiate economies in their departments. But curtailment was not true economy. It involved only a savings of money, first estimated at $12.7 million and more recently at $8.8 million, without considering other aspects of the economy equation: services performed to the public and value of employees' morale. Moreover, the Post Office Department's recent policy to schedule employees at night and on the weekend to handle circulars and other nonpreferential mail is certainly not an economical practice. Third-class mail is beneficial to the economy as a whole as it generates increased spending. It is not, however, a profit-making venture for the Post Office. With overtime rates for career employees and the night differential paid to all employees, third-class mail becomes increasingly uneconomical to handle. In addition, the use of regular employees on the weekend to process nonpreferential mail causes concern that first-class mail will be delayed when these men are given compensatory time off during the week. In my judgment this policy change is also uneconomical in that it reduces employees' efficiency by disregarding their former work schedules.

Although the Post Office Department was satisfied with the curtailment order on May 19, 6 days later, Postmaster General Gronouski announced the initiation of the local improvement program. The announcement in and by itself raises as many questions as it answers. It does, however, hold out the hope that the local post offices will be enabled to respond to the needs of the local community and give effect to the interests of the employees. This is the only way we will achieve the quality postal service to which this country is entitled.

The business of the Post Office Department is the public's business. We must insist that the local improvement program is properly implemented to insure a fair shake for the public and our postal employees.

EXHIBIT 1

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
May 5, 1964.

Hon. JOHN A. GRONOUSKI,
Postmaster General,
Post Office Department,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. POSTMASTER GENERAL: Many of my constituents have advised me of their strong opposition to the postal curtailment order which went into effect yesterday.

The objections have been directed to the elimination of essential services to the public, the lack of any economic justification for the changes in operational procedures, and the demoralizing effect upon the dedicated postal employees.

The order appears to place a particular burden on urban citizens and those whose employment necessitates the use of postal facilities on Saturday and on the financial and commercial community because of the cessation of all night-service windows.

It also appears to impose a hardship upon postal employees who have worked so diligently in processing a steadily increasing volume of mail. I have been advised that under this order many career men will be required to work on Saturday with compensatory time off during the week rather than the present Monday through Friday schedule and that others will face a reduced workweek with less income.

The impact of the order on the morale of these employees could undermine current efforts to insure the maintenance of the high caliber of postal employees through legislation to increase their salaries.

All of us are interested in providing the best possible postal service at the lowest cost, but the considerations outlined above strongly suggest that no real economy will result from the new order and that it will impose an unreasonable burden both on the public and the Department's employees. Under these circumstances, I would most respectfully urge that the order be reconsidered with a view to its revocation at the earliest possible date.

With personal regards.

Very sincerely yours,
KENNETH B. KEATING.

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
May 6, 1964.

Hon. JOHN A. GRONOUSKI,
Postmaster General,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. POSTMASTER GENERAL: During the past week I have received a great number of letters protesting the Post Office Department's policy to schedule employees at night and on the weekends, as well as during the weekday, to distribute circulars and other nonpreferential mail.

On the basis of the information I have received from various individuals, I am somewhat mystified by this new policy. It seems to be a departure from the Department's endeavors to economize and its previous program of concentrating work during the weekday, which allowed most postal employees the privilege of spending their evenings and weekends with their families.

If it is necessary to have employees work third-class mail at night and on the weekend I question whether the added expense of the night differential and overtime is not more expensive than the hiring of additional substitute employees. Further, if regular postal clerks work on the weekend and are given compensatory time off during the week, does this endanger the prompt handling of first-class mail?

I urge you to review the merits of this policy in connection with its effect upon employees and the efficiency of the Department. I would be grateful if you could advise me whether there is merit to the assertions that one of the causes of the third-class mail backlog in New York is the Department's refusal to hire any replacements until a target of 1,700 jobs have been eliminated.

Your cooperation, as always, is very much appreciated.

Very sincerely yours,
KENNETH B. KEATING.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL,
BUREAU OF OPERATIONS,
Washington, D.C., May 19, 1964.

Hon. KENNETH B. KEATING,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: The Postmaster General has asked me to reply to your letter of May 5 and comment on the items you mention in connection with the postal service adjustments recently announced.

First, I wish to assure you that the discontinuance of night and Sunday window service in the few post offices formerly providing this service should not seriously affect the financial or commercial community. Only a relatively few citizens and commercial businesses used this exceptional service in the few cities where it was provided, and the costs of providing it far outweighed the advantages. Therefore, we do not feel that it is unreasonable to ask that these patrons arrange to transact their postal business during normal business hours.

The adjustment of Saturday window service to reduce the number of hours during which service is provided, and to discontinue some marginal and less essential services for that one day should not seriously inconvenience the general public. So far the public response and cooperation concerning this change has been very gratifying and we cannot foresee any injustices being created by this action.

Your comments about career postal employees being required to work on Saturday with compensatory time off during the week rather than the present Monday through Friday schedule is not understood. Apparently you are referring to our recent order to schedule additional assignments on Sunday to distribute third-class mail. We have always scheduled regular employees for Saturday duty and there has been no change in this policy.

The scheduling of additional Sunday work assignments to distribute third-class mail was necessary to eliminate unwarranted delays, to provide a balanced work load for delivery employees, and to prevent congestion due to lack of space.

This type of mail, which includes circulars, advertisements, notices of meetings, notices of sales, samples of merchandise, etc., has been piling up in post offices over weekends, requiring delayed delivery in large quantity on Tuesdays and Wednesdays. Our new policy provides for the handling of this mail within 24 hours at all post offices.

You will be interested to know that trade sources report that third-class mailers spend $2 billion annually on third-class mail, generating several billion dollars in sales. In addition, this type of mail provides employment for a substantial number of career postal employees as well as almost 5 million other Americans who are employed in industries and businesses which depend primarily, or largely, on third-class mail.

Therefore, there has been no operational change in the distribution of mail which would result in any economic hardship on career employees.

I appreciate the opportunity of furnishing you this information, and if I can be of further help, please let me know.

Sincerely yours,
W. M. MCMILLAN.

MAY 19, 1964.

Hon. KENNETH B. KEATING,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: The Postmaster General has asked me to reply to your letter of May 6 concerning the Department's policy to schedule employees to distribute circulars and other nonpreferential mail on weekends.

The policy to schedule additional Sunday work assignments to distribute third-class mail is necessary to prevent congestion due to lack of space, to provide a balanced workload for delivery employees, to eliminate unwarranted delays, and to insure more efficient use of manpower.

This type of mail, which includes circulars, advertisements, notices of meetings, notices of sales, samples, etc., has been piling up in post offices over weekends, requiring delivery in large batches on Tuesdays and Wednesdays. Such conditions have resulted in delays of from 24 to 72 hours in getting this mail delivered. It is necessary that these delays be eliminated because a large amount of this mail has time value—such as sales announcements by local stores, notices of meetings, etc. Our new policy provides for the handling of this mail within 24 hours at all post offices.

You will be interested to know that trade sources report that third-class mailers spend $2 billion annually on third-class mail, generating $28 billion in sales. In addition, almost 5 million Americans are employed in industries and businesses which depend primarily, or largely, on third-class mail. And, I might add, this type of mail provides employment for a very substantial number of our career employees.

I can assure you that our employment control program, which involves an employment reduction of 1,570 throughout the New York region, did not bring about the backlogs of third-class mail referred to. The backlogs were being experienced on weekends long before the employment control program was initiated.

This policy should not result in any serious inconveniences or hardships to postal employees; it will result in better service to the public by eliminating unnecessary delays.

Sincerely yours,
(Signed) W. M. McMillan
W. M. MCMILLAN.

MIDDLE EAST ASSURANCES

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, so often in history, disputes have arisen because of misunderstandings which are the result of lack of clarification of policy by the parties involved in the disagreement. Today, the Middle East is in just such a situation where vagueness on the part of the United States may mean disaster for that area and the world.

Israel is in the process of diverting water from the Jordan River, in an attempt to improve her agricultural situation. Such action is in accordance with the 1955 unified plan for the Jordan River Valley, a plan which was worked out with the help of Ambassador Eric Johnston, and was agreed to by Syria, Lebanon, Jordan, and Israel. Recently, the Arab nations have resumed their verbal attacks on this important project, in the hope that they might rally world opinion against it.

The United States has finally made specifically clear, in a letter to me, that it favors Israel's efforts. Assistant Secretary of State, Frederick G. Dutton has stated that because Israel's activities are within the allocations of the 1955 unified plan we—the United States—therefore support Israel's current efforts. I am happy to notice in the same letter that the Assistant Secretary has stated that the United States would take steps to repulse any illegal Arab action relating to the diversion of the Jordan River. He writes:

> In the event that other Middle Eastern States attempt to frustrate the Israel plan by other counterdiversion projects, the United States would oppose such projects if it appeared that the Arab riparian States combined were offtaking waters in excess of the combined allocations to the Arab States specified in the 1955 plan.

This clarification of U.S. policy will be welcomed by all who support Israel's efforts and fear illegal and dangerous attacks on Israel by the Arabs.

I ask unanimous consent to have Assistant Secretary Dutton's letter and my letter of June 1 printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, June 17, 1964.

Hon. KENNETH KEATING,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR KEATING: Thank you for your letter of June 1 in which you request clarification of certain points made in the Department's letter of May 25.

You asked specifically whether we regard Israel's present water diversion program as consistent with the 1955 unified plan. At a news briefing on May 6, a Department of State spokesman who was asked this question replied publicly, "We have been informed by the Government of Israel that its use of the waters from the Jordan Valley will be within the allocations of the 1955 unified plan." We have every reason to believe that this statement is true as regards the present Israel project, and we therefore support Israel's current efforts. In addition, as the President stated in the joint communique of June 2 on the occasion of Israel Prime Minister Eshkol's visit, the United States and Israel will undertake joint studies on problems of desalting water, as part of the effort being undertaken to solve the problem of scarcity of water, and hope for rapid progress toward large-scale desalting in Israel.

With regard to your question as to whether the United States would take action to prevent other Middle Eastern States from frustrating this plan militarily, a longstanding principle of U.S. policy in the Near East is our opposition to aggression. This policy was expressed in the late President Kennedy's statement of May 8, 1963, in which he made it unmistakably clear that we oppose the use or threat of force. He also said that, "In the event of direct or indirect aggression we would support appropriate courses of action in the United Nations or on our own to put a stop to such aggression." As stated in the joint communique during Prime Minister Eshkol's visit, President Johnson specificaly reiterated this statement of U.S. policy. In the event that other Middle Eastern states attempt to frustrate the Israeli plan by other counter-diversion projects, the United States would oppose such projects if it appeared that the Arab riparian States combined were offtaking waters in excess of the combined allocations to the Arab States specified in the 1955 plan. The form of any such U.S. opposition would of course depend upon the circumstances prevailing at that time.

If I can be of further assistance, please do not hesitate to let me know.

Sincerely yours,

Frederick G. Dutton,
Assistant Secretary.

June 1, 1964.

Hon. **Frederick G. Dutton,**
Assistant Secretary of State,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Fred: In further reference to your letter of May 25 concerning U.S. policies in the Middle East, I would appreciate a clarification of paragraph 5, which states: "The U.S. position on Jordan waters is one of support for projects for utilization of water consistent with the 1955 unified plan for the Jordan River Valley. As you know, the allocations contemplated in this plan were worked out with the technicians of the states using water from the Jordan. The unified plan serves as a standard providing for a reasonable and equitable distribution of the water, in the view of the U.S. Government."

Specifically, I would appreciate knowing whether the Government of the United States regards Israel's present water diversion program as consistent with the 1955 unified plan for the Jordan River Valley; whether the Government of the United States approves and supports Israel's current efforts for utilization of the Jordan waters; and whether the Government of the United States would take action to prevent other Middle Eastern States from frustrating this plan either militarily or by other diversion efforts.

Very sincerely yours,

Kenneth B. Keating.

ECONOMIES ARE PRACTICAL AT BROOKLYN NAVY YARD

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, an employee of the Brooklyn Navy Yard has just been credited with saving the U.S. Government $30,000. Sidney Drucker, of Brooklyn, received an $800 award for his initiative. Such moneysaving ideas from employees are common in this installation, where the employees are proud of their yard and proud of the work that is done there. This is typical of the spirit of the men who work there—a spirit which I have felt in my several visits to the yard.

The Brooklyn Navy Yard has for years been doing work which cannot be done better anywhere else in the world, and they are proud of their record. Their past efforts are continuing today. It would be a wasteful and foolish action by the United States to close this yard, for although some of the facilities may be duplicated, the esprit de corps which has enabled this organization to coin its reputation as the "can do" yard, can never be replaced.

I ask unanimous consent that an article describing this achievement be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Navy Yarder's Suggestion Trims $30,000 From Costs

A planner and estimator employed at the Brooklyn Navy Yard has been credited with saving $30,000 with a suggestion to redesign a commercial electrical switch for Navy use.

Sydney Drucker, 67, of 225 Adams Street, Brooklyn, received an $800 award for his cost-saving idea. The yard has put Mr. Drucker's suggestion into use on several destroyers being overhauled there. Later it is expected that it will be applied to other ships assigned to Brooklyn for overhaul, thus increasing the aggregate savings and putting Mr. Drucker in line for an additional cash award.

Mr. Drucker began his Navy yard career in September 1941 as an electrician. After 9 years in the trade, during which time he worked on many of the major vessels built at the yard, he was promoted to a planner and estimator. As such, he has received many commendations, most notable of which was for his work on the construction of the aircraft carrier *Saratoga*.

The award just received by Mr. Drucker is not his first. A prolific contributor to the employee suggestion program, he collected a $205 bonus in 1958 for proposing a modification to light fixtures going into several ships being modernized by the Navy yard. He has also received several smaller awards ranging from $30 down to $10, all credited with being moneysavers to the Navy.

Mr. Drucker and his wife, Adele, have in mind using the latest award money for a long-awaited cruise. "I don't know where to," Mr. Drucker said. "We won't be going until later in the year. In the meantime we'll try to decide. Believe me, it will be a big thrill for both of us since we've dreamed for years of something like this."

Mr. Drucker's chief concern is that the yard gets more work to halt the continuing layoffs. "I'm nearing the mandatory retirement age," he observed, "but it's these younger fellows I feel for. Maybe if we keep cutting costs with usable ideas the yard will be assigned more ship work."

Mr. Drucker expressed this assurance: "I'll keep trying, you can be sure of that."

POLAND RESISTS COMMUNISM

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the Attorney General has done a great service to the cause of freedom throughout the Soviet empire. His recent visit to Poland, during which thousands cheered him in several cities, calls to our attention again the spirit and drive of the Polish people. Like Richard Nixon's tumultuous welcome at Warsaw in 1959, that welcome is testimony to the living desire for freedom which burns in all Polish hearts. Weekly we learn of heroic attempts by the valiant peoples behind the Iron Curtain to resist Communist domination and to secure for themselves and their families the basic freedoms they seek.

As the Attorney General's trip reveals, a tragic paradox lies at the heart of Polish life today. On the one hand Polish citizens, especially writers and artists, spoke freely to me, when I visited Poland in late 1962, of their dissatisfaction with the often brutal tactics of their regime and the hardships that it was imposing on each and every citizen. Almost every person I spoke with expressed his desire to make clear to me that the actions of the Communist government did not reflect the feelings of the Polish people.

Every day the churches are filled for mass as the Poles reaffirm the faith which is so much a part of their heritage. The church is permitted more freedom than any other non-Communist institution. I was also struck by the traditional Polish hostility toward Russia, collectivist farms, and intellectual restrictions. All things considered, this country of 30 million people has the most liberal government of any of the satellite countries now under Russian domination.

On the other hand, all Poles know that even this limited freedom is in danger. The Communist government is employing economic, intellectual, and physical means to bring Poland completely under the domination of the party. Most Polish citizens have a great deal more freedom than their counterparts in Eastern Europe. Yet the very possession of this freedom makes the restrictions upon it, and the Communist attempt to eliminate it, all the more onerous.

Nowhere else in the Communist world is there so wide a gulf between the official party line followed by the press and the opinions expressed in private. The Polish people themselves are well aware of the paradox of their existence and use this awareness as a fertile ground for political jokes. When I was in Poland in 1962 a Russian sputnik had recently been put into orbit. That, said one friend to me, is the only satellite that ever got away from Russia.

Poland's history since the war is divided into four distinct periods, each of which has done its share to mold the situation which exists today. The first of these lasted from the end of the war until 1948. The present Communist regime was established by the Soviet army when it marched into Poland as the Germans were retreating. Wladyslaw Gomulka, who became first Secretary of the Polish Communist Party in 1943, advocated a rather independent line in domestic affairs which was at variance with the many dogmatic pronouncements of Joseph Stalin. For example, in 1947 Gomulka stated:

> We have totally rejected the collectivization of farms * * * We stand firmly on the basis of individual peasant cultivation.

Gomulka is the key figure in Polish history since the war and his personality has influenced the course of events to a great extent. The son of an oilfield worker, who at one time was employed in Pennsylvania, Gomulka was trained as a locksmith. He was arrested in 1926 and again several times in the thirties for illegal Communist activities. He spent the years 1934–36 in the U.S.S.R. and was a student at the International Lenin School in Moscow. When he returned to Poland in 1939, he worked himself rapidly to the top of the Communist heirarchy and was elected to Secretary General of the Central Committee in 1943. It was at this time that he first began to propose his new ideas on a nationalistic approach to the development of the concepts of Stalin and Lenin.

Gomulka's desire to lead Poland on an individualistic road to communism did not mean that his attempts to secure Communist control would be any more lenient than the oppressive Russian techniques. In the election of 1947, he used every known type of terrorist tactics to intimidate the voters. Over 100,000 members of the Polish Peasant Party were arrested and 130 were murdered. In those districts where the peasants were not to be frightened, the Communists tampered with the actual mechanics of election. Our Government protested that such tactics were flagrant violations of the Yalta agreement which called for "free and unfettered elections." Other elections, held in 1952, 1957, and 1961, were merely formalities in which only one slate of candidates was presented to the electorate. Surely, nothing is a better example of what a sham the title of "People's Democracy" is as a name for the current government in Poland than these elections.

The second phase of postwar Polish history began when Gomulka was put in jail by the Russians in 1948. This second period was the most oppressive, for the government was directed straight from Moscow. Soviet economic policies were so unsuccessful that they brought the country to virtual poverty and economic chaos by 1956. In February of this year Premier Khrushchev made his famous denunciations of Stalin. This radical change in Kremlin policy plus the obvious failure of the Stalinist policies sparked the remarkable Poznan uprising in June. This spontaneous demonstration against the Moscow-directed Communist overlords certainly helped to restore Gomulka to power in 1956.

Gomulka's restoration was the beginning of the third period in recent Polish history. Gomulka attempted to reduce political and economic hardship in an effort to establish a broad base for his government. Polish intellectuals hailed his return as the beginning of a new freedom for Poland's citizens and independence from Russia.

Unfortunately, Polish hopes were never fulfilled. About 1958 Gomulka's regime began to harass the church and all other individuals who resisted the government's attempt to gain complete control over every facet of Polish life. This new attempt at restricting the economic, political and intellectual life of the country is the fourth period in Polish postwar history. It is continuing today. Because of the quiet, yet valiant resistance of the Polish people to the Communist attacks on the church and its writers, as well as to the Communist economic programs, both have been unsuccessful. Quite recently, however, freedom of speech has been challenged and several Polish intellectual publications have been shut down. As far as I can see, there is little hope in the near future that the Gomulka regime will end this present period of harassment and terrorism except under the strongest internal and free world pressures.

The recent history of Poland is a study of a brave people's resistance to an oppressive government. The Polish people's resistance to communism is particularly noteworthy in the areas of agricultural, industrial, and fiscal policy. Here the citizens have quietly frustrated every Communist attempt to turn the government toward a planned Communist economy. Such brave, yet unspectacular actions are a living demonstration of the hatred which the Poles feel toward their overlords and their desire to control the Polish way of life.

The Polish peasants have consistently resisted the collectivization of the farms. Moscow made collectivization a major issue in the struggle against Tito and Yugoslavia in 1948 and hoped to have all Polish agriculture under state control by 1970. Because of peasant resistance, this policy was very hard to implement and led to serious food shortages by the middle of 1955. In 1956, Gomulka declared that most of the families on collective farms could decide for themselves whether they wished to return to a free system of owning their own farms. Most of the farmers withdrew from the state agricultural enterprises, and in 1962 only 1.2 percent of the land under cultivation and 0.4 percent of the individual farms were involved in collective enterprises. This astonishing figure reflects the repugnance which the Polish peasants feel toward their Communist government.

Recently, however, the Communist regime has introduced new gimmicks to control the lives of the peasant farmers. Pressure is being exerted on them to join state organizations which control the sale and availability of supplies as well as the delivery of livestock. This "voluntary" trend—a communistic euphemism for indirect force—is being helped along by heavier taxes on individual farms and exemption from taxation for those who joint the state-supported agricultural circles. Apparently Gomulka hopes to push for more collectivization in Polish agriculture.

The avowed policy of the Communists is to change the Polish economy from one based on agriculture to one with a predominantly industrial base. The 6-year plan adopted in 1946 nationalized 3,300 factories, mills, plants, and mines. Oppressive taxation was introduced to eliminate private enterprise. Two other 5-year plans were introduced in the fifties, though they achieved only moderate success. The emphasis today is on modernizing, reconstructing, and expanding old establishments as well as constructing new installations in mining and power areas. Never have these programs even come near to the hopes of the Communist planners; moreover, industrial advances have been made at the expense of private comfort. For example, during the period 1956–60 some 1,340,000 marriages were performed but only 620,000 apartments were built, many of which are now useless due to dilapidation, fires, and poor construction.

Hardships imposed through ill-advised industrial programs were greatly enlarged because of the fiscal policies which were implemented by the Communist regime prior to 1956. All banks were nationalized after the war, and in 1945 a new form of money was introduced. The effect of these actions was to wipe out virtually all savings, theoretically forcing all persons to engage in productive labor. In 1951, the Communist regime began the so-called voluntary loan for the development of Poland's strength. A minimum amount was prescribed for each worker in an attempt to reduce the amount of money in the hands of individuals. Other similar programs were introduced until the workers rioted in Poznan in 1956. This led to Gomulka's return to power. His fiscal policies were more lenient, though those Poles who hoped that he might introduce policies which would remove the heavy burdens which had fallen upon the working class were doomed to disappointment.

Most certainly the most spectacular manifestation of the Polish people's hostility to the Communist regime is the support they have given to the church and its fight against the Government. The intent of the Communists today is to turn the church into just another organization, one which can be completely controlled by the party. The individual most responsible for the church's success in circumventing this attempt is Cardinal Stefan Wyszynski. He became Primate of Poland in January 1949 upon the death of Cardinal Hlond. The first thing he did was to negotiate with the Communist government. In less than a year he signed an agreement with the state in which the church was promised freedom of religion, freedom of the church press, and uninterrupted religious instruction in the schools and Government institutions. In return, the church agreed to nothing that would hinder "the building of socialism."

The agreement of 1950 was particularly notable for the speed with which the Government violated it. The years between 1950 and 1956 were ones of growing persecution of the church in Poland. Cardinal Wyszynski compromised in every reasonable way but resisted strongly any attack on the essentials of religious freedom. Until 1953, the tempo of persecution increased rapidly. Schools and religious houses were systematically closed down, priests were arrested on charges of spying and black market activity, and Catholic presses were closed down in order to prevent any more religious literature from reaching the people. In 1953 the Government issued a decree which made it illegal for the church to "create, transform, or eliminate any ecclesiastical church positions, as well as any other change in their sphere of competence" without prior approval of the state. At the same time the Government made it mandatory for each priest to take an oath of loyalty to the state.

This era of persecution reached its peak when Cardinal Wyszynski was relieved of his position as head of the Polish church and imprisoned. He was released about the same time Gomulka was and a new agreement was signed with the more liberal Communist government in December 1956.

Gomulka's persecution of the church is quite different from that employed by the Moscow-directed government of 1948–56, though it is just as real. Until recently, when open persecution, arrests, and terrorism have become common again, Gomulka's activities were often indirect. The Patriot Priests, a Communist organized group of priests, attempts to weaken the church from within. Their assignment is to create the nucleus of a schism in the church, though their movement is very unpopular with both the priests and layman alike. Their number has never exceeded 300 and no more than 1,700 of the 12,000 priests in Poland have ever been reported to have been even mildly interested. At times the peasants have thrown them out of their parishes and often their services and meetings are boycotted.

Probably the most insidious organization is the so-called Pax movement which is headed by Boleslaw Piasecki. It is believed to be partially supported by Russia, and it enthusiastically supported the Moscow-directed Stalinists against Gomulka in 1956. Piasecki's organization works at an attempt to reconcile Catholicism and communism and is used by the Communist government to represent the Catholics abroad. Needless to say, the church is united in its opposition to this front organization.

Gomulka also employs the usual Communist youth movements in an attempt to mold young people's minds and lead them toward atheism. In the main, these have been rather unsuccessful, for the church's youth activities are favored by parents. None of the Communist groups have been able to appeal widely to university students. The purpose of these groups is to indoctrinate young people with the party philosophy and ideology. The Communists themselves admitted in 1960 that only 10 percent of all youth within the appropriate age groups belong to any organization controlled by the Communist Party. A survey conducted the same year found out that 69 percent of Warsaw University students proclaim themselves religious believers. The survey went on to state that 78.3 percent of all youth, including the high school age group, attend church regularly. This is quite a contrast to the Communist claim of only 10 percent of all students in their organizations and is one more example of the quiet Polish resistance to communism.

Recently, the Gomulka regime has intensified its attacks upon the church. Censorship of church publications, requirements for construction of church buildings, and controls on the teaching of the catechism in the public schools have all been used by the Communist regime to harass the Catholic Church. In 1960, increased taxes were imposed upon the church; priests were no longer exempted from military service; and riots were staged over the Communist dismantling of crosses and church building under construction. In all these cases the Communists demonstrated their desire to achieve their aims through intimidation and pressure rather than the use of force. Communist threats continued through 1961 when the cardinal called upon all his priests to be ready for "punishment, exile, and loss of freedom" in the defense of their faith in the "new atmosphere of a fighting, fanatic spirit of atheism that has arrived."

These Communist tactics are continuing at the present moment and probably will in the future. Nonetheless, the church has exhibited great strength in opposing the Government. The riots which have often broken out over Communist aggression against the church are a constant reminder to the regime of the power of this organization and the spirit of the Polish people. The church position is part of the Polish paradox. It has never been stronger—yet it is fighting for its life. Each day it publishes a paper, however; each day it baptizes a baby; each day a mass is said; each day a religious teacher comes to school; the spirit and strength of the Polish people is renewed. The church is a beacon of light, a voice for morality in a demoralized society. Cardinal Wyszynski emphasized the active, mobilizing force of the church when he said:

> You have proved that you can die for your country. What you must do now is something that may be harder—to live for your country.

In these brave words, the cardinal has captured the basic problem in Poland today. The Poles must endure—they must hold on to the vestiges of freedom which they now have in hopes that their possession may lead to a gradual improvement of their lot. The American Government has recognized the spirit of the Polish people and the fact that their overlords do not represent the people when it extended loans totaling almost $487 million between 1957 and 1962. In addition, we have delivered 1 million tons of wheat, some 250,000 tons of barley, about 500,000 tons of corn, 100,000 tons of sorghum, 40,000 tons of cotton, 30,000 tons of vegetable oils, and many other goods to the Polish shores. Today we are continuing to send surplus food to the Polish people.

When I was in Poland, I talked to many citizens, lawyers, businessmen, factory workers, and farmers about their problems. They spoke freely of their problems and the fears that each of them has living under an oppressive Communist regime. They know all too well that at any moment their churches may be closed, their publications forcibly shut down, or their relatives arrested. They are aware that their life is less subject to Communist pressure than the lives of others trapped in Iron Curtain countries. Nonetheless, they are concerned that the Gomulka regime may intensify its oppressive activities against the church, against Poland's writers, and against the leaders of those informal groups which work daily to reduce Communist influence. Most of those I talked to expressed a desire to end the Communist regime, yet felt that alone they are powerless to do so.

It is indeed a moving experience to live with these brave peoples and sense their undying desire for freedom and democracy. I felt deeply the tragic sense of frustration in Polish life when I saw the pain that is felt when a people experience the joys of just a little freedom while being denied the most basic freedom of all—the freedom from fear.

Everyone I talked to expressed their fondness for the American people and support for our desire to bring peace to all the nations of the world. The Polish people today are looking to us to supply the leadership that is denied them in a society dominated by the Soviet Union.

Our Government must recognize the desires and strength of the Polish people when it formulates its policy toward this unique satellite. Gomulka's regime has already begun an era of stepped-up oppression toward the people of Poland. The United States must recognize the valiant fight that the Polish people have been waging in recent years. It has not always been one that made the headlines, but as I have tried to point out, it has resulted in a constant frustrating of Communist policies in many areas. The Polish people want to be free. They make their desires known every day in their current history which is living proof of the power of the idea of freedom.

My purpose today, Mr. President, is to emphasize my conviction that the U.S. Government must do everything in its power to assist the Polish people in order that their hopes for a new life will not be in vain. We must not let these valiant people down. In this regard I propose a seven-point program by which the United States can intensify and improve its present policies toward Poland.

First. Our citizens and Government officials should be encouraged to visit Poland whenever possible, as the Attorney General did. Such visits will have two major effects. First, they will give our Government officials firsthand knowledge of the problems and hopes of the Polish citizenry; second, they will be a further demonstration of the support of the American people for this Nation's fight against their oppressive Government. My own visit provided me with experiences which I shall never forget, and with a vivid impression of the undying spirit of Poland. Such experiences, hopefully, can be repeated over and over again in the near future if Americans seek to visit and travel in Poland and other captive nations.

Second. Our food program has been successful and should be expanded. I found, however, that the Polish people did not always know about this country's assistance to them. The State Department must work with VOA and USIA to make certain that the Polish citizens are aware of our attempts to help them in their long struggle for freedom. In addition, it must redouble its efforts to make sure the food and supplies reach the people—not the Communist government.

Third. The United States should support and expand the present programs of the Voice of America and the U.S. Information Agency. It is crucial that the Polish people know that the United States shares their hopes for a new life in the near future. Such support will boost the spirits of these brave people and give them the strength to carry on their three-decade fight against communism.

Fourth. There is a lack of competent scholarship about Poland today and about Poland's history and culture. The U.S. Government, with the help of Polish-American groups, must take the lead in creating an interest in this great country so that this intellectual void may be filled as soon as possible. New awareness on the part of our scholars and citizens will greatly assist us in fighting the Communist menace in this great land.

Fifth. The United States must make known in no uncertain terms that it completely and unequivocally supports the attempt of the Roman Catholic Church to reduce the Communist influence in Poland, especially influence over the minds of Polish youth. Whenever possible, U.S. citizens should support the church's program which, though still quite strong, is always in danger of being undermined by the ruthless policies of the Communists and their drive to replace the love and veneration of God with loyalty to an atheistic state.

Sixth. We must capitalize on the enduring spirit of the Polish people to fight communism as we formulate our policy in the years ahead. In dealing with this unique Communist satellite, we must always remember that the wishes of the people and the desires of the Government are completely opposed. The Polish people are very sympathetic toward the West and, despite Communist propaganda, very fond of the United States and its citizens.

Seventh. In the same area, we must use to our advantage the conflicting desires of the central personality in the Polish Government. Wladyslaw Gomulka. On the one hand, he is as ruthless as any of the other Communist overlords in Eastern Europe today. Nonetheless, he desires to make Poland as independent of Russia as possible. The United States can make use of these nationalistic desires of Gomulka's to aid our policy of freeing the Polish people.

Mr. President, the Polish people have waged a long and valiant fight. They will not be able to complete their fight for liberty without the support of the United States and its citizens. I have tried to emphasize the power of the quiet resistance of the Polish people and to demonstrate that its results are being manifested today: the Polish people are using their token freedom in an attempt to destroy their overlords. The time has come to pledge our Government to full support of their valiant struggle.

The Polish people have demonstrated once again one of the truths on which our Government was founded: The love of liberty never dies, it generates strength and through history has made men do courageous deeds. With our help, through the implementation of the ideas I have presented today, the Polish dream can become a reality. I fear, however, that if we fail to meet the challenge which the courageous Polish people have given us, the united actions of these great people may have been in vain. We owe it to the Polish people, we owe it to free people everywhere, we owe it especially to the captive nations of the world who are inspired by the resistance of the Polish people, and we owe it to ourselves not to let the quiet heroism of the past three decades be in vain. With our support, the Poland of tomorrow can be a free one. Let us work with the Polish people to make this dream a reality in the very near future.

ADDITIONAL EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following additional executive reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Arlon E. Lyon, of California, to be a member of the Railroad Retirement Board; and

Herbert E. Carter, of Illinois; Julian R. Goldsmith, of Illinois; William W. Hagerty, of Pennsylvania; Mina S. Rees, of New York; John I. Snyder, Jr., of New York; Julius A. Stratton, of Massachusetts; and Frederick P. Thieme, of Washington; to be members of the National Science Board, National Science Foundation.

RECESS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 34 minutes p.m.) the Senate, under the previous order, recessed until tomorrow, Thursday, July 9, 1964, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 8, 1964:

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Air Force, under the appropriate provisions of chapter 835, title 10, United States Code, as amended. All officers are subject to physical examination required by law.

LIEUTENANT COLONEL TO COLONEL

Line of the Air Force

Aberson, Albert D., 33348A.
Abrams, Stuart M., 12442A.
Adair, Philip R., 11927A.
Adams, George W., Jr., 9076A.
Adams, Peter P., 9538A.
Allen, Merle F., Jr., 11508A.
Anderson, Clarence E., Jr., 9725A.
Anderson, George S., 11726A.
Anderson, James E., 12562A.
Anderson, John F., 9498A.
Anderson, Joseph W., Jr., 9734A.
Anderson, Reid J., 33292A.
Anderson, William A., 8569A.
Andrews, John W., 8808A.
Annis, Ross E., Jr., 12669A.
Arnold, Edison F., 33054A.
Artwohl, Arpod J., 12153A.
Ayersman, Richard L., 12314A.
Bahler, George P., 9458A.
Bailey, Lawrence O., 12640A.
Ballinger, Edward P., 10390A.
Baron, Oakley W., 7822A.
Barricklow, Fred M., 51717A.
Barry, John G., Jr., 33131A.
Barton, Terry R., 8472A.
Baska, John W., 33311A.
Bayne, Harry C., 12289A.
Beahan, Willard J., 33172A.
Beall, J. Mac, 8276A.
Bearden, Joe, 10930A.
Beasley, Carl L., 12265A.
Bell, Roscoe L., 11389A.
Bellan, Rudolf A., 11579A.
Bennett, John W., 8984A.
Benson, Morrie, 11318A.
Bertie, Gilbert H., 12471A.
Best, William M., 9636A.
Bethea, William E., 51703A.
Bice, John D., 33151A.
Biggs, Ernest E., 11417A.
Biggs, George J., 12375A.
Binnell, Francis E., 11248A.
Birnbaum, Myron L., 20018A.
Black, Lee C., 9866A.
Black, Walter E., Jr., 9202A.
Blacksten, Harry B., 33363A.
Blair, Ben R., 12232A.
Blair, Guy N., 33433A.
Blum, Edward F., 8056A.
Bobbitt, Aubrey M., 20644A.
Bogert, James H., 33106A.
Boland, Jeremiah M., 12210A.
Bone, Marshall B., 11293A.
Booth Clifford R., 11209A.
Booth, Raymond W. W., 12104A.
Bowers, William R., 11462A.
Bowry, Donald W., 12620A.
Boyd, Hugh F., Jr., 33159A.
Boyd, Willis G., 51715A.
Braddock, Edward I., 33313A.
Bradley, Leonidas C., Jr., 10987A.
Brady, Roland H., Jr., 11736A.
Brassfield, William H., 11501A.
Bray, Leslie W., Jr., 18136A.
Bregar, Adolph J., 12611A.
Brenner, Felix G., 12000A.
Bressan, Christopher, 11476A.
Bridge, John E., 33372A.
Brimberry, Will O., 11199A.
Brinson, William L., 18117A.
Brodie, George F., Jr., 8236A.
Broussard, Eddie J., Jr., 33098A.
Brown, James W., 33341A.
Brown, Marshal C., Jr., 32911A.
Broyles, Enoch E., 9598A.
Bull, Leonard P., 12198A.
Bullock, Ralph E., 12339A.
Bundgaard, Robert C., 9617A.
Burget, Carl E., 13393A.
Burnett, Ernest T., 33091A.
Burnett, John J., Jr., 12071A.
Burrows, Adrian M., 12251A.
Burt, George W., III, 11492A.
Bussing, Henry G., 9012A.
Byington, Telford S., 11928A.
Cabas, Victor N., 12162A.
Cables, Warren M. F., 33027A.
Caldcleugh, Clarence M., 10319A.
Caldwell, John S., Jr., 33360A.
Callander, Thomas J., 12063A.
Campbell, Claude W., 11232A.
Campbell, Joseph L., 19667A.
Cannell, James L., 33237A.
Canny, Robert W., 12700A.
Capio, Fred Jr., 12343A.
Carey, John A., 8091A.
Carter, David L., 12035A.
Carter, Walter T., 11288A.
Carwile, Ernest D., 12392A.
Caseria, Armando, 33117A.
Cavin, Edgar R., 12240A.
Chadwick, Roscoe L., 7339A.
Chalifoux, Alphonse, Jr., 12293A.
Chamberlain, David S., 19927A.
Chenchar, Paul, Jr., 33416A.
Choate, Henry L., 33463A.
Cipolla, Roland H., 33271A.
Clark, James F., Jr., 11866A.
Clark, Leon R., 33156A.
Clark, Ovie D., 33079A.
Clark, Robert H., 10154A.
Clary, Ralph L., 8399A.
Clements, Ross L., 12460A.
Clendenin, Robert A., 9192A.
Coe, Grover K., 10630A.
Cole, Louis B., 9282A.
Coleman, Francis J., 51708A.
Collins, Edward M., 11629A.
Collins, Rupert P., 33402A.
Collinsworth, J. D., 8489A.

Conklin, Joseph E., 9681A.
Connell, James S., 9922A.
Connell, Milton M., Jr., 33085A.
Connell, Royal W., 12302A.
Coogan, Francis R., 48713A.
Cook, Marshall A., 18074A.
Cool, Paul E., 7413A.
Coonan, Daniel J., Jr., 8247A.
Cooper, Theodore L., 9687A.
Cordell, Richard N., 33228A.
Covell, Paul M., 10477A.
Cox, Omer L., 10389A.
Crampton, William M., 33148A.
Craven, Charles W., 10789A.
Creighton, Vernon F., 11671A.
Crow, Roy H., 11777A.
Cummings, Louis H., 9749A.
Curran, James R., 4857A.
Cutler, Edward W., 10189A.
Czapski, Edmund, 11110A.
Dale, Theodore R., 10604A.
Davison, Walter C., 10378A.
Davitt, William J., 4727A.
Dawson, Robert E., 33008A.
Dean, Robert M., 12533A.
Dearmond, Velfort J., Jr., 33279A.
Deegan, Leo F., 8009A.
Degiacomo, Gene M., 10950A.
Dennis, Harry S., Jr., 9321A.
Desaussure, Hamilton, 15486A.
Diantonio, Andrew, 33255A.
Dill, Alvin W., 11974A.
Donahue, Donald A., 10966A.
Doran, Brendan J., 12083A.
Douglas, James D., Jr., 11688A.
Drake, Leo A., Jr., 12489A.
Duff, David D., 8794A.
Duffy, Robert A., 11984A.
Dunken, Allen G., 7561A.
Dupont, Rene G., 11836A.
Duval, Joseph E., 11989A.
Dyke, Eugene H., 33471A.
Dyser, Francis E., 9967A.
Eagle, Comly J., 18115A.
Easley, Sidney P., 33167A.
Edwards, Joseph E., 11530A.
Eisenbrown, Walter T., 8573A.
Eldredge, Clayton, R., 11985A.
Ellington, Edward H., 8095A.
Elliott, McLean W., 12307A.
Emerson, Jack G., 12697A.
Emmert, Benjamin H., Jr., 9578A.
Emmons, Perry C., 11526A.
Everett, Phillip E., 11571A.
Everhart, John W., 33150A.
Fahey, James M., 8131A.
Fahringer, Frederick H., 12645A.
Fancher, Jack N., 33093A.
Farrell, Everett N., 12003A.
Farrell, Robert H., 4597A.
Fava, James A., 7981A.
Fendall, Bill G., 32932A.
Fife, William P., 10520A.
Fisher, Charles D., 4730A.
Fisk, Harry E., 9427A.
Fleming, David T., 10989A.
Fleming, George T., 7314A.
Fleming, Joseph F., 33258A.
Flesner, Eugene E., 11507A.
Fletcher, Edward C., 11762A.
Flicek, Jerry F., 12113A.
Fly, Hugh G., Jr., 9470A.
Ford, Perry C., 33142A.
Forrest, Birdene E., 33240A.
Fortney, Alvin R., 33141A.
Foster, James W., 9385A.
Fowler, Oscar F., 20583A.
Foxx, James M., 11139A.
Fredrickson, Marshall V., 12069A.
Frenk, Ardelle W., 33418A.
Freund, Darral J., 33180A.
Friedman, Leon J., 11101A.
Frizzie, Bernard E., 21442A.
Froehlich, Vernon W., 11666A.
Frost, Foy B., 11050A.
Fulmer, Harold G., 9462A.
Gahl, Ralph D., 11300A.
Gallogly, William F., 10918A.
Garuti, Mario A., 33265A.
Garvin, Louis A., 12676A.
Gaston, Arthur D., 10774A.
Geck, John J., 11226A.
Gianatsis, James A., 10419A.
Gibson, Marion B., 12695A.
Giddings, Richard E., 10949A.
Gilpin, Harry D., 18124A.
Glover, Jerry C., 20659A.
Godwin, Jasper L., Jr., 8592A.
Gonye, Leonard F., 9676A.
Goodman, Raymond E., 12306A.
Gordon, Vincent P., 10464A.
Goss, Quentin J., 9776A.
Gradwell, Burgess, 10203A.
Graham, John K., 7661A.
Gregg, Charles R., 11416A.
Griffin, John A., 12049A.
Griffin, Ralph H., 11153A.
Gunter, Lester E., 12040A.
Gunter, William A., 32970A.
Hagreen, Robert J., 8058A.
Halber, Alexander D., 10424A.
Hale, Charles E., 12229A.
Hale, Richard E., 7477A.
Hall, Conway S., 4399A.
Hall, William L., 9446A.
Hamilton, George G., 10328A.
Hammett, Charles E., 11466A.
Hand, Ned F., 19789A.
Haney, Charles W., 12002A.
Hanley, Thomas J., III, 8912A.
Hansen, Carleton V., 33323A.
Hansen, William R., 12355A.
Hanson, Kermit T., 11674A.
Harb, Wallace S., 10785A.
Hardy, John K., 4652A.
Harrell, Thomas, 33219A.
Harrington, Ralph H., 8599A.
Harris, Floyd D., 33094A.
Harris, James W., III, 12370A.
Harris, Jesse L., 7178A.
Harrison, William C., Jr., 11652A.
Hart, Ernest J., 33440A.
Hatch, Lewis M., 8251A.
Hause, Milton M., 7148A.
Hawkins, Harry L., 7883A.
Hawkins, Steedly P., 9674A.
Heaberg, James H., 9063A.
Healy, Warren F 12487A.
Hearn, James A., 9979A.
Hein, Gordon E., 11942A.
Henderson, Vernon J., 11899A.
Henry, Harry C., 33099A.
Henry, Jesse G., 12204A.
Herbold, Robert V., 10718A.
Herrington, William C., 12468A.
Heydon, Thomas A., 7154A.
Hickey, James E., 33217A.
Hicky, Dan M., 11385A.
Hill, Clayton C., 8755A.
Hiney, John W., 12105A.
Hinkle, Wayne K., 9071A.
Hirshberg, Sidney S., 11838A.
Hobaugh, John H., 9070A.
Hogan, Walton L., Sr., 12143A.
Holliday, John H., 49132A.
Holmes, Capers A., 7527A.
House, Walter G., 33482A.
Houston, Harold W., 32927A.
Howell, Henry R., Jr., 8221A.
Hubbs, Edgar H., 11023A.
Huffman, Roy E., 7732A.
Hugunin, Guy J., Jr., 11662A.
Huke, Theodore C., 20027A.
Hull, Robert R., 8003A.
Hunt, Jerry J., 33374A.
Hurlburt, Dana F., 18119A.
Husband, Toy B., 33263A.
Jackson, Arthur C., Jr., 9323A.
Jarratt, Jerry D., 9634A.
Jenstrom, Eino E., 11401A.
Jewell, Malcolm E., 20588A.
Johansen, Martin C., 11774A.
Johnson, Arthur H., 22684A.
Johnson, Clyde J., 33451A.
Johnson, Douglas D., 12362A.
Johnson, Thomas B., 12119A.
Johnston, Robert D., 33427A.
Johnston, Wallace W., 12106A.
Jones, Donald P., 11699A.
Jones, Edward M., 5197A.
Jones, Elmer D., Jr., 10811A.
Jones, Percy L., 12377A.
Jones, Robert L., 11961A.
Jones, William O., 7676A.
Junker, Jules X., III, 11174A.
Jurkens, Edward A., 4724A.
Kanable, Gerald E., 51730A.
Karas, Philip, 12459A.
Karhuse, Carl A., 11071A.
Kaufman, Frank L., 12300A.
Kaufmann, Milton M., 33175A.
Keefer, Irvin J., 12393A.
Keeffe, Donald J., 12632A.
Keller, John C., Jr., 9232A.
Keller, Robert W., 9116A.
Kelley, Charles A., 13989A.
Kelly, Francis A., 12509A.
Kenney, Richard F., 11425A.
Kibler, Bertram A., Jr., 33322A.
Kilgore, Bishop M., 9695A.
Kilroy, Walter D., 33331A.
King, Max J., 10892A.
Kingery, William W., 11390A.
Kirk, Norbert W., 33044A.
Kirkland, Jack M., 11392A.
Kirklin, John M., 12419A.
Kiser, Ralph W., 9680A.
Klotz, Robert C., 10470A.
Knutson, Bruce B., 11363A.
Koeck, Adolph K., 33063A.
Koerschner, William F., Jr., 10600A.
Kohrman, Elwood N., 20602A.
Kolb, Lewis J., 3474A.
Koller, Rudolph C., Jr., 11324A.
Korger, Harold F., 11856A.
Krout, Harold E., 33143A.
Kuhn, Francis L., 11943A.
Kyzer, David A., 8328A.
Lake, James, 12145A.
Lakin, John W., 12470A.
Lambert, Joseph R., 12039A.
Lambert, Lee R., 11426A.
Lancaster, Rayburn D., 12022A.
Langdon, George E., 33221A.
Larsen, William A., 9466A.
Latella, John J., 20032A.
Latta, Farley A., 12395A.
Lee, John J., 12411A.
Lefebre, Frederick H., 9088A.
Lefrancis, Richard G., 11937A.
Legwin, John H., 10742A.
Leonhardt, Herbert B., 11767A.
Levine, Arnold, 12653A.
Lewin, Walter W., 10981A.
Lewis, Warren R., 11469A.
Lheureux, Harry D., 11520A.
Light, Herbert M., Jr., 18128A.
Liles, Cecil N., 33224A.
Lilley, Earl A., 10228A.
Linck, John J., 12484A.
Lindahl, Thomas B., 10863A.
Lindberg, Frank R., 33339A.
Lindsay, Louis P., 32972A.
Little, Edward L., 7225A.
Lockhart, George M., 11386A.
Loftus, Joseph F., 7005A.
Long, John D., 33123A.
Long, Robert F., 18142A.
Long, Walter W., 11454A.
Looney, William A., 11654A.
Lovell, Stanley R., 33464A.
Lucich, Stanley, 9619A.
Ludwig, George H., 7579A.
Lunsford, George M., 22646A.
MacDonald, Earle F., 11376A.
Maddalena, Joe, Jr., 33087A.
Mahoney, Hugh, 5110A.
Manatt, James C., 33377A.
Markham, Theon E., 9180A.
Marsh, Robert A., 9507A.
Mauck, Ernest B., 33278A.
Maxwell, George S., 11896A.
Mayes, Archie S., 33267A.
Mayland, Lawrence P., 33078A.
McAllister, Walter L., 8493A.
McBrayer, Madison M., 33355A.
McCall, David D., 32886A.
McCaslin, Kenneth R., 12603A.
McClughan, George W., 8387A.
McClung, James D., 12269A.
McClung, Thomas S. L., 12250A.
McCorkle, Howell P., 8390A.
McCurnin, John C., 32923A.

McDaniell, Sam R., Jr., 4572A.
McFalls, John O., Jr., 33101A.
McIntosh, Laurence P., 33066A.
McIntosh, Richard K., 11442A.
McKinney, Claude G., Jr., 33179A.
McKinney, Clell H., Jr., 12639A.
McKinnon, Duncan J., 9430A.
McLachlan, Joseph J., 9475A.
McLean, Lawrence S., 10304A.
McMillin, Wallace D., 11570A.
Meeker, Roy L., 12388A.
Mickelsen, Earl H., 12335A.
Milburn, Walter B., Jr., 9128A.
Miles, James H., Jr., 12050A.
Miller, Charles L., 9591A.
Miller, Earl C., 9647A.
Miller, Samuel F., 11265A.
Miller, Vernon H., 33274A.
Milling, John B., 4849A.
Millis, Billy J., 12245A.
Millson, Edwin H., 10211A.
Minietta, Eugene D., 12421A.
Minihan, Charles E., 12652A.
Minnehan, Bernard A., 9043A.
Minton, Silas J., 33157A.
Mitchell, J. C., 33168A.
Modesitt, Walter E., 11285A.
Money, Thomas J., 33303A.
Montagne, Robert D., 33115A.
Montour, Gilbert E., 19790A.
Moore, Donald F., 12568A.
Moore, Ernest F., 12693A.
Morales, Carl H., 8373A.
Morgan, Charles W., 33088A.
Morgan, Spencer G., 12255A.
Morrison, Harry B., Jr., 11548A.
Murchison, Weldon O., 33210A.
Murphy, Charles L., 11328A.
Murphy, Thomas L., 11008A.
Nance, Ernest T., 11904A.
Nash, John F., Jr., 11543A.
Neff, Leo M., 33324A.
Nelson, Charles L., 11455A.
Nelson, William H., 33458A.
Nichols, Philip C., 8740A.
Nichols, Steward H., 9046A.
Nickols, Jess R., 11284A.
Niemczyk, Julian M., 20671A.
Nole, Jack D., 20598A.
Norton, Howard B., 33119A.
O'Brien, James E., 33382A.
O'Connor, Denis P., 8831A.
O'Connor, Joseph J., 33247A.
Ohlmeyer, Harold Z., 12656A.
Oneil, Donald E., 11074A.
Orem, Robert E., 33455A.
O'Rourke, Gorden J., 33467A.
Osborn, Robert R., 33334A.
Otis, James D., Jr., 11821A.
Owen, Clyde W., 12348A.
Pallo, John G., 11891A.
Papik, Corwin J., 7287A.
Pappas, Gus J., 33272A.
Parris, Harry N., 9487A.
Partridge, Lewis J., 7328A.
Patterson, Neill T., 33129A.
Patton, Gene M., 12034A.
Pearson, William H., 33077A.
Pelaez, Emanuel A., 10398A.
Pellegrini, Joseph J., 33176A.
Pellegrini, Joseph, 33390A.
Perkins, Dale J., 33356A.
Perry, Donald J., 33432A.
Peters, Francis D., Jr., 18137A.
Peterson, Conrad R., 10460A.
Peterson, Harry G., 8033A.
Petkus, Walter A., 22613A.
Pezda, Edwin F., 8888A.
Phoenix, Homer J., 33407A.
Pierce, Russell K., Jr., 18118A.
Platz, Alfred W., 33456A.
Plecha, Stanley L., 11458A.
Plott, William C., 8929A.
Poehler, Garland W., 33304A.
Porter, Howard J., 4663A.
Porter, James B., 33222A.
Potebnya, Orr Y., 9610A.
Pottebaum, Cletus J., 33391A.
Potter, Henry A., 4940A.
Potter, Nolan L., 33404A.
Pouliot, Albert S., 33067A.
Pournaras, Stephen W., 9620A.
Powell, Clarence L., 11162A.
Powers, Kenneth H., 7783A.
Pratt, Charles J., 33269A.
Price, Robert F., 8111A.
Price, Teller S., 33332A.
Quirk, Michael J., 9115A.
Radomski, Meko M., 33305A.
Randazzo, James J., 33223A.
Rapisardi, August J., 33062A.
Ray, Robert J., 11823A.
Reed, Jack L., 7268A.
Reed, Lawrence B., 32910A.
Reynolds, William M., Jr., 11568A.
Rice, William L., Jr., 12699A.
Ripko, Joseph U., 9044A.
Roche, Jean R., 9252A.
Roessell, Jack, 5021A.
Rowe, Everett C., 7407A.
Runyan, Samuel H., 7281A.
Salmon, Delbert J., 11834A.
Sampson, Victor J., 7623A.
Sansing, Max, 32956A.
Sanxter, Donald L., 11732A.
Schenkein, George, 9643A.
Schlitzkus, Samuel C., 33229A.
Schmitz, Frederic H., 12448A.
Seay, James S., 12319A.
Semanek, Joseph J., 33061A.
Shaeffer, William F., 12515A.
Shearer, Richard E., 12161A.
Shepard, Ernest B., 8961A.
Sherman, John E., 10921A.
Sherwood, Joseph H., Jr., 8040A.
Shimer, Byron D., 9291A.
Shwiller, Seymour, 33422A.
Sifford, Lynn D., Jr., 11488A.
Silliman, James G., 22644A.
Simpson, Robert H., 11470A.
Slaughter, Charles W., 33049A.
Slaughter, Clarence B., Jr., 12673A.
Sledge, Thomas E., Jr., 12698A.
Sloan, William A., Jr., 9682A.
Smith, Alwyn V., 51704A.
Smith, Charlie M., 11500A.
Smith, Clifford E., 11474A.
Smith, Douglas T., 33111A.
Smith, Francis H., 11333A.
Smith, Gayle L., 20683A.
Smith, James W., 12600A.
Smith, Raymond E., 10445A.
Smith, Robert E., 8313A.
Smith, Robert G., 11669A.
Smith, Stanley, 8379A.
Snyder, Harold T., 12341A.
Soderberg, Robert W., 33375A.
Solomon, Joseph L., 11388A.
Sonntag, Willie H., 33138A.
Stalzer, Eugene A., 11347A.
Steinmann, F. Cable, 4803A.
Stevenson, Dudley W., 10820A.
Stewart, R. C., 9079A.
Stow, Kenneth R., 10936A.
Stribling, Robert A., 10851A.
Stroud, Conley B., Jr., 7093A.
Stumpf, Oscar J., 11826A.
Sullivan, Leo W., 12184A.
Swan, Frederic F., 10271A.
Swanger, Joe N., 12450A.
Swann, Franklin W., 7520A.
Sweetland, Earle E., 8551A.
Swindal, James B., 33465A.
Szapiel, Stanley V., 10346A.
Taylor, Jay J., 20580A.
Taylor, Powell H., 4528A.
Templin, Jack D., 11715A.
Tenold, Leslie A., 11835A.
Thomas, David B., 10942A.
Thomas, William W., 33291A.
Thompson, Robert C., 12073A.
Thorvaldson, Joel D., 11763A.
Todt, Donald C., 11782A.
Towne, Raymond L., 7332A.
Turk, Herbert A., 48716A.
Turner, Lewis M., 7969A.
Urquhart, Charles T., Jr., 20584A.
Vandiver, Robert S., 12586A.
Vanetten, Chester L., 33248A.
Veneziano, Salvatore J., 33214A.
Vickrey, Charles R., 11967A.
Vintson, Stonewall P., 11278A.
Vlcek, Donald H., 9783A.
Vogler, Alfred F., 20670A.
Vogler, James B., Jr., 12079A.
Voight, Dean A., 33244A.
Voorhees, Roy D., 12167A.
Waldher, Eugene N., 11122A.
Waldman, Herbert, 33333A.
Walker, Demelt E., 11509A.
Walmer, Harry E., 12633A.
Walsh, David I., 9638A.
Warren, Joseph B., 22586A.
Washburn, Walter R., Jr., 7358A.
Webb, James H., 12543A.
Weil, August E., 9736A.
Weiland, Francis H., 33373A.
Weiner, James H., 33425A.
Weir, Gordon T., 11105A.
Welch, George C., 7918A.
Wells, Ernest J., 12268A.
Wells, Robert L., 33256A.
Whipple, Ray W., 33273A.
White, Boyd B., 20626A.
White, Floyd, 11594A.
White, Thomas D., 7581A.
Whitehead, Robert S., III, 33282A.
Wight, Carroll H., 7555A.
Wilcox, Lawrence R., 11768A.
Wildt, Jesse H., 33320A.
Wiley, James R., 4733A.
Williams, Eugene S., 51714A.
Williams, Howard W., 4508A.
Williams, John L., 10586A.
Williams, Robert G., 12020A.
Wilson, Ernest B., 11930A.
Wilson, Houser C., 32960A.
Wilson, Richard S., 18121A.
Winningham, Porter L., 11753A.
Witry, Frank, Jr., 11980A.
Wittbrodt, Edwin S., 33201A.
Woodward, Charles H., 12435A.
Working, William H., 11305A.
Worley, Ernest L., Jr., 9391A.
Wynne, Lawson P., 12591A.
Yandala, Gust J., 19775A.
Young, John N., 10904A.
Young, Joseph J., 33162A.
Younkin, Richard C., 9033A.
Zais, Richard A., 11710A.
Zeine, Merle M., 9478A.
Zipper, Harry, 11460A.
Zwicke, Norbert A., 12378A.

Medical Corps

Ayars, Laurence S., 21840A.
Borah, William N., 19274A.
Campbell, Daniel C., Jr., 19290A.
Chambers, George H., 19362A.
Condit, Norman I., 19956A.
Connor, Joseph A., Jr., 19279A.
Eggeling, Ian N. J., 19311A.
Foley, Francis E., 19543A.
Giffen, Martin B., 19319A.
Graham, Wistar L., 24185A.
Greider, Lester S., 25459A.
Hansen, Carl L., Jr., 19353A.
Henderson, John A., 19297A.
Henry, James P., 54937A.
Hood, Oliver C., 19325A.
Jernigan, George C., Jr., 22546A.
Karmany, William H., 21724A.
Kenoyer, Wilbur L., 19604A.
Leiter, Eugene R. K., 26691A.
Levine, Robert, 22559A.
Nareff, Max J., 29805A.
O'Brian, Spencer A., 19197A.
Park, Oakley K., 20823A.
Randel, Hugh W., 19357A.
Reynolds, George E., 22955A.
Rowen, Burt, 19291A.
Sanders, Hallman E., 19144A.
Schear, Evan W., 19352A.
Seaman, Oliver R., 19242A.
Stonehill, Robert B., 21684A.
Stuart, Lawrence D., 26692A.
Veit, John P. A., 27973A.
Vivian, Donald N., 19988A.
Westbrook, William H., 19327A.

Dental Corps

Butler, James M., 18935A.
Jones, Thomas K., 19744A.
Ketcham, Frank H., 21685A.

Krause, Lyndon S., 20522A.
Manners, Philip, 21729A.
Morris, Charles C., 20834A.
Rudd, Kenneth D., 27487A.

Veterinary Corps

Hempy, Jack H., 19003A.

Medical service corps

Foley, Frank, R., 21870A.
Gaines, Robert L., 19496A.
Holihan, Francis L., 21607A.
Holmes, Warren H., 19488A.
Nielsen, George L., 19438A.
Peterson, Carmen A., 19419A.

Nurse Corps

Kovach, Ethel R., 21110W.

Medical Specialists Corps

Creech, Kathleen R., 21201W.

Chaplains

Ferguson, Warren E., 18751A.
Ressel, Delvin E., 18803A.
Tomasovic, Paul, 48564A.

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Air Force, under the appropriate provisions of chapter 835, title 10, United States Code, as amended. All officers are subject to physical examination required by law.

SECOND LIEUTENANT TO FIRST LIEUTENANT

Line of the Air Force

Abeln, Paul J., 63573A.
Adams, Jerry C., 74328A.
Albro, William A., 63622A.
Allen, Calvard S., 63574A.
Allen, Daryl D., 69614A.
Allen, Roland J., 63591A.
Anderson, William F., 69794A.
Andes, William S., 63572A.
Armstrong, Don R., Sr., 74340A.
Armstrong, Michael P., 64185A.
Babione, William P., 74348A.
Bacher, Stephen E., 63673A.
Backer, Donald E., 69559A.
Badgett, Lee D., 63637A.
Baggiano, Anthony L., 63607A.
Bailey, Roy C., Jr., 64191A.
Ballou, James R., 74358A.
Baran, Michael F., 63594A.
Barker, Sumpter H., 76335A.
Baustad, Harry E., 64194A.
Beavin, Rudy C., 63645A.
Berta, Michael A., 63632A.
Bertero, James B., 63642A.
Bethel, Howard E., 63575A.
Birch, Joel R., 69557A.
Blevins, Bedford D., 69567A.
Bolton, Malcolm F., Jr., 69788A.
Bond, Robert L., 63592A.
Boyer, Robert E., 63577A.
Branch, Christopher I., 69650A.
Brandt, Alan B., 63689A.
Brewer, Roderick D., 63597A.
Brooks, Elton O., 69628A.
Bullmer, Joseph J., 69679A.
Burnett, Thomas E., 63649A.
Butcher, Doyle A., 63699A.
Cabana, John B., Jr., 63710A.
Campbell, Joseph M., Jr., 64189A.
Campbell, Roger R., 69543A.
Canning, Gordon J., Jr., 63639A.
Carpenter, Will H., Jr., 63617A.
Carter, Robert L., 63693A.
Casey, Kendall F., Jr., 69629A.
Casey, William J., 69633A.
Cheatham, Walter H., Jr., 69673A.
Christian, Robert E., III, 74468A.
Clingenpeel, Jerry D., 63706A.
Clinkenbeard, Robert L. R., II, 69534A.
Cockburn, Timothy M., 63694A.
Cole, William J., 63690A.
Combest, William D., 69648A.
Corson, Howard A., Jr., 69669A.
Cotter, Edward J., 63643A.
Cox, Gary E., 69589A.
Crotwell, George P., Jr., 63595A.
Daniels, John F., 63697A.
Day, Mark N., Jr., 74519A.
Dedoes, Dirk H., 63692A.
Dekock, Karel R., 69799A.
Detjen, Derek H., 69558A.
Dicks, Gary R., 63701A.
Dozier, Arthur L., III, 69547A.
Elliott, Thomas A., 69630A.
Ellis, Larry G., 64175A.
Engleby, Thomas L., 64173A.
Feldman, John L., 64174A.
Fisk, James W., 69651A.
Flexsenhar, Michael A., 63628A.
Fossgreen, Andrew E., Jr., 69538A.
Fournier, Paul E., 63705A.
Fox, William H., Jr., 69672A.
Friday, Elbert W., Jr., 75498A.
Fukumoto, Malcolm T., 69668A.
Fulmer, Richard L., 64180A.
Gale, Kenneth A., 63598A.
Galey, Fred D., 63654A.
Ganger, Marvin O., 74614A.
Gargasz, Louis J., 63584A.
Garrett, Harley F., Jr., 71176A.
George, Getty J., Jr., 63600A.
Gill, Duane D., 69652A.
Goldslager, Philip A., 63608A.
Gordon, Gerald E., 63644A.
Graves, John K., 69646A.
Green, Richard I., 69579A.
Grimm, Joseph M., 63696A.
Groth, George W., Jr., 69545A.
Guise, Ralph F., 63615A.
Guizerix, Robert J., 63620A.
Hale, Robert H., 63704A.
Hamasaki, Chalmers K., 69795A.
Hanks, George F., 69653A.
Hatcher, Ronald N., 63629A.
Havel, Thomas E., 76137A.
Hendrix, Jerry B., 63636A.
Herndon, Floyd D., Jr., 76336A.
Hickman, David B., 69585A.
Hintze, Carl, III, 69696A.
Hodge, Clifford A., 74712A.
Holets, James J., 69654A.
Horn, George E., 69580A.
Hrastar, Gerald J., 69537A.
Ingalls, Robert B., 63621A.
Ingram, Reuben R., 73324A.
Ingvoldstad, Carl P., 74747A.
Jack, Tharon L., 63703A.
Jewell, Fredric S., 63668A.
Johnson, Harvey L., 74760A.
Johnson, Myron, 69570A.
Johnson, Samuel K., 63619A.
Jones, Daryl F., 64177A.
Jones, Howard H., II, 69657A.
Jones, Iredell, IV, 69786A.
Jones, Thomas A., 63627A.
Jordan, Elton M., Jr., 64186A.
Kanemori, Charles S., 69581A.
Keasey, Kenneth W., 69571A.
Kelly, John L., Jr., 69647A.
Kemp, James F., 63708A.
Kiley, Robert A., 63590A.
Kimball, David G., 63670A.
King, Michael, 63613A.
Kitchenka, Francis L., 75313A.
Knebel, George W., 63596A.
Kujawski, Bruce T., 63623A.
Labovitz, George H., 63580A.
Langreich, Donald A., 64201A.
Lawyer, John E., Jr., 69595A.
Laycock, Guyron B., 69785A.
Lee, James A., 63602A.
LeMay, James D., 63713A.
Livingston, William S., 69789A.
Loken, Thomas A., 64184A.
Lowry, Michael H., 63593A.
Lucas, Edward R., 69847A.
Luczak, Casey R., 63570A.
Lunte, James W., 69540A.
Lynch, Urban H., 69535A.
MacGreggor, Charles H., 76337A.
Maddox, Russell R., 69594A.
Magee, Richard H., Jr., 63578A.
Marino, John M., Jr., 63650A,
Martel, John H., Jr., 63585A.
Martens, Hans G., 69796A.
Martin, Samuel D., 69634A.
Marzolf, Julian B., 64183A.
Mather, Henry S., 63638A.
May, Frank J., Jr., 64165A.
McClain, Howard R., 64167A.
McCredie, Donald F., 63588A.
McCulloh, Donald N., 63667A.
McDonald, Terry L., 69632A.
McDougle, James T., 64197A.
McKemey, Dale R., 69541A.
McLain, John B., 64182A.
McLeod, Robert D., 63587A.
McNair, Kenneth R., 63630A.
Medland, Thomas M., 64169A.
Miller, John M., Jr., 69667A.
Milner, David B., 64179A.
Miner, Robert W., 63566A.
Monger, Joel P., 69828A.
Moon, Edward E., 63652A.
Moore, Edward S., II, 69655A.
Morea, Michael J., 63698A.
Morgan, Stanley H., 69649A.
Murphy, Charles C., 69593A.
Myatt, Paul B., 63625A.
Myers, David K., 63599A.
Myers, Jerry M., 64168A.
Nakamura, George I., 64195A.
Nash, Donald S., 63659A.
Newcomer, Edwin V., 74947A.
Newell, David B., 64178A.
Newland, Samuel R., Jr., 63711A.
Newton, Harvey J., Jr., 64196A.
Nolen, James H., 63624A.
Norton, Jay L., 63672A.
O'Connor, Donald J., 69697A.
Odom, Robert E., 63656A.
Oliver, William D., 69565A.
Ordonio, Franklin C., 69698A.
Orme, David L., 63669A.
Ormrod, Rodney B., 69546A.
Owensby, Garvie H., 74967A.
Paquette, Gerald R., 63655A.
Paster, Jacob H., 64172A.
Pearson, Wayne E., 64188A.
Peoples, Ronnie C., 64171A.
Perry, Colin K., 63709A.
Pinsky, David H., 63658A.
Pisel, Gary H., 64192A.
Plants, Louis S., 63671A.
Plaskon, William G., 63589A.
Poteet, William T., Jr., 63717A.
Pounders, William R., 63565A.
Poynter, Gary M., 63576A.
Proud, John G., 69645A.
Pruner, James R., 63571A.
Pucci, Joseph A., 63567A.
Purvis, Gary E., 70545A.
Quick, Dennis L., 63586A.
Quigley, Hale A., 63666A.
Rauschenbach, Charles C., 69797A.
Reed, Max W., 63712A.
Regan, Michael J., 69566A.
Roberts, Arthur, III, 69583A.
Roberts, Floyd N., 63653A.
Roberts, Kenneth A., 69627A.
Rochez, Fred, 63631A.
Rogers, Lewis R., II, 69548A.
Royer, Erlind G., 63707A.
Rucker, Roger, 69676A.
Russell, Kenneth E., 64199A.
Rutz, Ernest F., Jr., 69670A.
Samelson, Louis J., 69656A.
Sanderson, Rex F., 70411A.
Sato, Roy E., 69592A.
Saunders, David W., 63604A.
Sawyer, Richard R., 63579A.
Scherer, Waldemar P., 63719A.
Schreiber, William A., 75079A.
Schroeder, Henry W., 63583A.
Schwitters, Michael T., 69798A.
Scooler, Donald, 63605A.
Scruggs, Leonard M., 69587A.
Shankland, Charles G., 63641A.
Shepherd, Hill W., Jr., 63614A.
Shinn, Darrel D., 63695A.
Shouse, Joseph P., 63647A.
Simms, James W., 71091A.
Sipple, Garryl C., 63714A.
Small, Albert W., 69677A.
Smith, Charles W., Jr., 69787A.
Smith, Irvin B., 63616A.
Speros, Richard L., 69572A.
Sprigg, Gordon H., Jr., 64187A.
Stanley, Norman W., 63633A.
Stephenson, Stanley D., 69573A.
Stewart, Joseph T., Jr., 70693A.

Stover, Thomas A., 63606A.
Stovin, Scott B., 63716A.
Strasser, Allen E., Jr., 69582A.
Stretch, Grover W., 64190A.
Swarts, Robert F., 69695A.
Syslo, Joseph M., 69591A.
Tait, Eric V., 69542A.
Taylor, Daniel A., Jr., 63581A.
Taylor, Robert L., 63626A.
Taylor, Val W., 63691A.
Thomas, Lowell V., 64170A.
Thon, Martin L., 69671A.
Tittenhofer, Robert N., 63715A.
Tropy, Charles R., 63634A.
Troffo, John, Jr., 75192A.
Turczynski, Raymond, Jr., 69544A.
Underwood, Ellie B., Jr., 63635A.
Uyehara, Robert K., 75204A.
Vaughan, Michael L., 63718A.
Ventling, Jack L., 69569A.
Waite, Richard W., 69560A.
Walker, Richard L., 69675A.
Watson, Thomas D., 63603A.
Wells, William V., Jr., 69574A.
Wergin, Lawrence M., 69536A.
Weston, Timothy J., 63582A.
Whisner, Richard L., 64166A.
White, Donald J., 69539A.
White, Lewis R., 64198A.
Wiebold, Arnold A., 63648A.
Wills, Dennis L., 69829A.
Wintzer, Louis A., 63640A.
Yates, Robert A., 64181A.
Zakrzeski, Alexander, Jr., 69868A.
Zinselmeier, Jack M., 63646A.

Medical Service Corps

Burke, David U., 63660A.
Bush, Conrad L., 70937A.
Christian, Raymond D., 71114A.
Dunton, Donald D., 76454A.
Fitch, Roger C., 76377A.
Flynn, Bernard L., Jr., 69584A.
Grisolano, James E., 76455A.
Hartman, Richard A., 76378A.
Kilpatrick, Karl L., 70936A.
Perry, Alan H., 76533A.
Pickett, William E., Jr., 76379A.
Rohrbough, Frank G., 76277A.
Trimberger, David J., 76280A.
Wrenn, Hubert E., 76380A.

Nurse Corps

Lillis, Ann P., 76542W.

Medical Specialist Corps

Baldwin, Elizabeth M., 76411W.
Huebsch, Mary A., 76412W.
Swanson, Christian M., 76333W.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Tyler Thompson, of Maine, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Finland.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 8, 1964:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

AMBASSADORS

Randolph A. Kidder, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Cambodia.

Robert J. Ryan, of Massachusetts, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Niger.

Mercer Cook, of Illinois, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Senegal.

Clinton E. Knox, of New York, a Foreign Service officer of class 2, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Dahomey.

UNITED NATIONS

Franklin H. Williams, of California, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

U.S. ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INFORMATION

Dorothy B. Chandler, of California, to be a member of the U.S. Advisory Commission on Information for a term of 3 years expiring January 27, 1967, and until her successor has been appointed and qualified.

Frank Stanton, of New York, to be a member of the U.S. Advisory Commission on Information for a term of 3 years expiring January 27, 1967, and until his successor has been appointed and qualified.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Frederick W. Ford, of West Virginia, to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission for a term of 7 years from July 1, 1964.

FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION

George Henry Hearn, of New York, to be a Federal Maritime Commissioner for the term expiring June 30, 1968.

U.S. COAST GUARD

Rear Adm. William D. Shields, U.S. Coast Guard, to be Assistant Commandant of the U.S. Coast Guard with the rank of vice admiral.

The following-named officers of the Coast Guard for promotion to the grade of rear admiral:

Capt. Charles P. Murphy
Capt. Joseph R. Scullion

The following officer of the permanent commissioned teaching staff of the Coast Guard Academy for promotion to the grade of lieutenant commander:

Jimmie D. Woods

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

Subject to qualifications provided by law, the following for permanent appointment to the grades indicated in the Coast and Geodetic Survey:

To be captains

Don A. Jones
David M. Whipp
Francis X. Popper
Howard S. Cole
Raymond M. Stone

To be commanders

Arthur R. Benton, Jr.
Eugene A. Taylor
William D. Barbee
Herbert R. Lippold, Jr.
Roger F. Lanier
John B. Watkins, Jr.
Jack E. Guth
Robert E. Williams

To be lieutenants (junior grade)

Charles G. Bufe
John W. Carpenter

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

West Coast Electric Power Interties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MAURINE B. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 8, 1964

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, we all know that the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] is recuperating at home from a difficult operation. But he has not lost contact with a subject that has always been close to his heart—water and power development.

On the controversial issue of the west coast electric power intertie, the Senator from California, in a statement presented last week to the Senate Appropriations Committee, let his position be known with certainty and clarity. He is for public power—for at least one all-Federal intertie line that will go through Oregon and through the Central Valley of California to Los Angeles, without any intermediary private toll gates.

I ask unanimous consent that the good statement by the Senator from California be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"WEST COAST ELECTRIC POWER INTERTIES"—STATEMENT BY SENATOR CLAIR ENGLE, DEMOCRAT, OF CALIFORNIA, BEFORE THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, JULY 2, 1964

Mr. Chairman, this intertie package is offered to us as a great westernwide partnership power plan of mutual benefit to Federal, public, and private electrical systems in 11 Western States.

It is not that, in my judgment.

More realistically, I think, it is a surrender of control of the most lucrative power market in the West to a combine of six private utility companies.

The reason I say this is that no one of the four lines proposed in this package is truly an all-Federal line. This in spite of the fact that the principal power producing plants involved in the proposal are three of the greatest Federal power developments in the country—the Bonneville system in the Northwest, the Central Valley project in northern California, and the Colorado River system in the Southwest. These three systems are Federal systems, built by taxpayers' money. And the Secretary now proposes to interconnect them with six private companies in charge of the transmission tollgates.

As I have said before, this is analogous to having the Federal Government build and own the store and, permitting the private companies to operate the cash register. I object to such business.

I recognize that one of the lines—the one that is proposed for deferred construction by 1971—is called a Federal line in the Secretary's announcement. But its only connection to California, via Hoover Dam, would be non-Federal. And even for the Federal portion of this line, which would go through Nevada, the Secretary mentions in his report that he sees no objection to non-Federal construction. Perhaps he has a point here. Because I am sure that if the Congress were faced with a "fait accompli" of the other three lines, which are scheduled to be completed in 1967 and 1968, it would be a poor political bet to expect the Congress to put up money to build a fourth line at that late date. Realistically then, we would have no Federal line at all, through Nevada or California. That would be the end of Federal competition, the end of the Federal yardstick, principle, and the doom of most electric ratepayers and taxpayers in California, if not in other States as well.

I recognize also that another of the package lines is in fact proposed as a public line, to be built and operated by Bonneville in the north, then by the city of Los Angeles through the State of Nevada and over to Los Angeles. This is fine for Los Angeles. The city has been successful in getting a special deal from the Department that I would be glad to support by itself. But as an integral part of the private package, no—the price tag for the rest of California is too great. I agree with Assemblyman Charles B. Garrigus of California who has called it a "weekend loss leader special" to try to sell the whole package.

Getting back to the Secretary's announcement about the 11-State deal, I can see quite well what it does for the Northwest States. It gets Bonneville out of the red and protects the Northwest's present low power rates. That is fine. I have some difficulty seeing what it does for some of the other States on the list. However, I will leave that question to be judged by the Senators from Montana, for example, and the Senators from Utah and New Mexico and other States.

I have no difficulty at all seeing what the package does to my own State of California. It would rescue Bonneville at the expense of California. It would be ruinous to our public power agencies, our Government water projects, and our power consumers both public and private—for all except possibly those in the city of Los Angeles.

I might add, Mr. Chairman, that I can see what the package deal might do for your State of Arizona. Tied in with the proposed Federal line to Hoover Dam (if that line is ever built) are two lines from Hoover Dam to Phoenix. One would be built and operated by the Arizona Public Service Co., a private utility. The other would be built and operated by the Bureau of Reclamation—and therein you would have your protection. The public power users of your great Salt River project would have the benefit of Federal competition and the Federal yardstick on rates.

No such protection is offered to California. No Federal line is proposed down through California to serve the Central Valley project or the new California State water plan. No Federal line is proposed to serve, through the CVP, our municipal systems at Sacramento, Palo Alto, Redding, Roseville, and other cities; or the many public irrigation districts in California which need summer power for water pumping; or the U.S. military bases and other Government institutions which also are public agencies and are supposed to have the benefit of public power preference under reclamation law—and, I might add, Bonneville law. The time-honored public preference law would be neatly circumvented by the Department's package intertie plan.

The Secretary's report claims that the package "would provide great benefits to the small public agencies and cooperatives in the Central Valley of California." This I challenge, because all service in northern California would be at the will and whim of the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. which would own and operate both intertie lines proposed for that territory. The P.G. & E. would have control of its own large private system, of course, and the Government's public system as well. This kind of partnership between private business and Government has been described as good business. It obviously is, for the P.G. & E.; but it is not good government.

In conclusion I want to refer to a series of conferences that were held on this subject with officials of the Department in May and June prior to last Thursday's announcement. My office was represented. Secretary Udall was present at two of them.

On the matter of control—which is the vital issue—the Secretary maintained that control would rest with the Federal Government because of Bonneville's commanding position in the north. My answer is that in electric power distribution, control does not come from the act of power generation or at the upper end of any intertie. Control comes down at the load centers—in the last transmission mile, so to speak—where, under this package deal, the P.G. & E., the Southern California Edison Co., the city of Los Angeles, and the San Diego Gas & Electric Co. would be in charge. They would have transmission control—cash register control. In no case would the Federal Government have control where it counts, so far as California power users are concerned.

My final point has to do with those who have told us that, after 3 years of discussion since 1961, they are tired of fighting for a Federal intertie * * * that the fight for a Federal line has been lost. To them I ask, when has the fight been made by the present administration of the Department of the Interior? The Congress in 1962 voted funds to start an all-Federal intertie, with a corollary injunction to the Secretary to explore other possibilities. He has done so, with the package proposal we now have before us. What kind of fight is this?

As for myself, I first introduced an exploratory Federal intertie bill in 1948. That was 16 years ago. Now the issue finally is coming to a head. I am not ready to surrender. I am not that tired.

Accordingly, Mr. Chairman, I repeat my strong conviction that the public interest can be served only if one—at least one—all-Federal line is built through California prior to or simultaneously with any combination of private lines. I testified on this point before this committee a year ago, on June 21, 1963. I did not then ask and I do not now ask for a 100-percent Federal intertie package. I ask only that at least one Federal line be routed through California with top or equal priority in time of construction.

Since this cannot be achieved under the present proposal of the Department of the Interior, I suggest we take a little more time for reanalysis and reflection. Let us think a little more about the interests of power consumers, water users, and taxpayers everywhere. Let us not base this crucial decision at this time only in terms of Bonneville's red ink. I respectfully request, Mr. Chairman, that you deny any funds whatsoever to the Department of the Interior for any west coast intertie construction at this time.

H.R. 6367

(Mr. ENGLE, of California, introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands)

A bill to conserve water and power for irrigation and related purposes and to conserve petroleum used in power generation and to direct the construction, operation, and maintenance of transmission lines interconnecting Federal power systems of the Bonneville Power Administration and the Bureau of Reclamation in the Pacific Northwest and northern and central California

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That for the purpose of conserving water and power for irrigation and related purposes and to conserve petroleum used in power generation, the Secretary of the Interior, through such agency or agencies in the Department of the Interior as he may select, is hereby directed to construct, operate, and maintain such transmission lines as may be required in his judgment, for the adequate interconnection of the power generating, marketing and transmission facilities heretofore or hereafter constructed and/or administered by the Bonneville Power Administration and/or the Bureau of Reclamation in the States of California, Idaho, Oregon, and Washington.

SEC. 2. The construction costs of such interconnecting transmission lines shall be apportioned by the Secretary among the projects or systems interconnected and shall be amortized in accordance with the laws governing the amortization of such investments in connection with the projects or systems to which they are apportioned. Operation and maintenance costs of such lines shall be apportioned annually among the projects or systems interconnected and shall be returned in accordance with the laws governing the return of operation and maintenance costs of the projects or systems to which they are apportioned.

SEC. 3. The system of origin shall have first right to any and all power of that system without regard to the requirements of any other system or systems. Exportation of power from any system shall be limited to dump or waste power except that exportation of firm and/or secondary power or power of other classifications may occur only on certification of the Administrator of the system of origin that there is a surplus of that classification to the needs of that system.

SEC. 4. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be required for the purposes of this Act.

Prayer in Public Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 8, 1964

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I have been impressed with an editorial commentary by the distinguished and able Congressman from the Second District of South Carolina, the Honorable ALBERT W. WATSON, on the subject of prayers and Bible reading in our schools. This editorial was broadcast by television station WBTW, in Florence, S.C., on July 2, 1964, in accordance with that station's policy of permitting responses to editorial comments by the station.

I point out, Mr. President, that the people of the Second Congressional District of South Carolina, in which district I have the honor to reside, have demonstrated in a recent poll that they staunchly back Mr. WATSON in his strong stand against the recent Supreme Court decision against prayers and Bible reading. Congressman WATSON has recently released a poll of constituents which shows that 90 percent of people in his district are against these court decisions.

I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial response printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Response to Prayer in Public Schools Editorial

The following response to WBTW's editorial on "Prayer in Public Schools," is from South Carolina Representative Albert W. Watson, of the Second District.

Congressman Watson said, "While there is much honest disagreement on the Supreme Court's decision prohibiting prayer and Bible reading in the public schools of America, I believe the Court's interpretation of the first amendment is exactly the opposite to what the framers of our Constitution had in mind. Seeking to protect the people from a state religion, they designed the amendment to guarantee to all Americans freedom of religion, not freedom from religion."

Congressman Watson continued, "Certainly a law or decision of a court should not discourage—much less forbid—the offering of a voluntary prayer or the reading of a few verses of Scripture. For the Supreme Court to forbid such is in actuality protecting the atheists and agnostics to the point of virtually establishing atheism as a state religion, the thing our forefathers sought to prohibit."

Congressman Watson said further, "The argument of the Supreme Court that a stigma would be placed upon the child of the nonbeliever who voluntarily leaves the classroom during a brief period of devotion is a dubious one at best. The atheist, by deciding against the beliefs of the majority, has, in fact, chosen to separate himself, and it is ridiculous for him to ask society to subordinate its wishes in order to protect him against something of his own choosing.

"While everyone will agree that it is the primary responsibility of the church and home to provide a child with religious instruction," said Congressman Watson, "it is illogical for the Court to conclude that the Government and school officials should tell the child that the Bible reading and prayer he learned through the church and the home are illegal and unconstitutional in a classroom. This places the Government in a position of opposition to religion rather than a proper position of neutrality."

Congressman Watson also wrote, "Many in South Carolina are under the false impression that, because schools are still conducting brief devotionals in spite of the Court's decision, this condition will continue. However, you can rest assured that the Federal Government will enforce the decision to the point of doing away with all such devotional periods. Unless the Supreme Court is checked," Congressman Watson concluded, "the freedom of Americans to express trust in God in any place other than the church, synagogue, or home, is in serious jeopardy."

This has been a response to a WBTW editorial from South Carolina Representative Albert W. Watson of the Second District.

SENATE

Thursday, July 9, 1964

(Legislative day of Wednesday, July 8, 1964)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. Metcalf).

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou God of love and hope, through all the length of changing years Thy goodness faileth never.

In a day so full of fear and threat, save us from any panic of spirit, because our inner strength is drawn from deep wells.

With the light of Thy wisdom and the strength of Thy grace, enable those who in these baffling times have been entrusted with the stewardship of the national welfare to be true servants of Thine in the advancement of Thy kingdom's cause.

Grant us to feel the passion of high resolve as we cherish above all else the compelling mission to which Thou hast called us as a nation—to help lead a groping world from the darkness into the light.

We ask it in the name of the dear Redeemer, who is the Light of the World. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, July 8, 1964, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, it was ordered that there be a morning hour for the transaction of routine business, with statements therein limited to 3 minutes.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEES TO FILE REPORTS DURING ADJOURNMENT TO JULY 20

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournament of the Senate until July 20, 1964, committees be permitted to file reports during that period.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD subsequently said: Mr. President, in connection with the request I made earlier to permit committees to file reports during the recess or adjournment of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that committees may be granted permission to submit supplemental reports and supplemental views during the recess or adjournment of the Senate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Commerce:

LeRoy Collins, of Florida, to be Director, Community Relations Service.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, from the Committee on Armed Services, I report favorably the nominations of 4,031 officers in the Army for appointment and promotion to the grade of colonel and below. Since these names have already appeared in the Congressional Record, in order to save the expense of printing on the Executive Calendar, I ask unanimous consent that they be ordered to lie on the Secretary's desk for the information of any Senator.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations are as follows:

James H. Aarestad, and sundry other officers, for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Arlon E. Lyon, of California, to be a member of the Railroad Retirement Board for the term of 5 years, from August 29, 1964.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the National Science Foundation.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, it is a distinct pleasure for me to join in support of these nominations for membership on the National Science Board of the National Science Foundation.

As one of the original sponsors of the legislation creating the National Science Foundation, I have been vitally interested in its work through the years. The contributions that have been made to both practical and theoretical science through the work of NSF are too comprehensive and too voluminous to sketch, even in the broadest of outlines.

As chairman of the Independent Offices Subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee, I have joined other Members of the Senate in keeping a watchful eye on the NSF budget requests and on the success of its programs. By and large, these dollars have been among the most fruitful and beneficial to mankind of any expenditures made by our Federal Government.

It is a distinct personal pleasure for me to join in support of these nominations, because Dr. Frederick Patton Thieme, of Seattle, Wash., is one of the nominees. Dr. Thieme is a native son of Seattle; and since he returned to the University of Washington, in 1958, as vice president of that great institution, I have come to know him well as a person, and to respect his ability as an educator and a scientist of broad vision.

A member of the National Research Resources Committee, of the National Institutes of Health; and of the Executive Committee of the Behavioral Sciences Division of the National Research Council, National Academy of Sciences, Dr. Thieme has long been active in the deliberations of our Nation's most learned men and women.

Dr. Thieme will be the first member of the NSF Board from the Pacific Northwest; and I commend the President, not only for the selection of this outstanding nominee to serve our Nation in this important position, but also for the high caliber of all the nominees on whose nominations the Senate acts today.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

On motion of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communication and letters, which were referred as indicated:

Proposed Amendments to the Budget, 1965, for Departments of Agriculture, and Health, Education, and Welfare (S. Doc. No. 85)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed amendments to the budget, 1965, and a proposed supplemental appropriation for the Department of Agriculture, amounting to a net decrease of $17,547,000, and an amendment for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, in the amount of $800,000 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

Amendment of Communications Act of 1934, To Remove Inequities Imposed on Commissioners and Employees of Federal Communications Commission

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to remove inequities imposed on commissioners and employees of the Federal Communications Commission (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

Authorization of Exchange of Certain Public Domain Lands

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the exchange of public domain lands heretofore withdrawn and reserved for the use of the Hanford project of the Atomic Energy Commission, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Report on Claim of Lewis H. Nelson III *v.* the United States

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report and recommendation relating to the claim of Lewis H. Nelson III, against the United States (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Disposition of Executive Papers

A letter from the Acting Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. Johnston and Mr. Carlson members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution adopted by the Sixth Annual Convention of the United Filipino Council of Hawaii, Honolulu, Hawaii, favoring the repeal of the quota system provided for in the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A petition of the Southern Conference Educational Fund, Inc., of New Orleans, La., signed by the Reverend Fred L. Shuttlesworth, president, and several other officers, relating to alleged action against that organization by the Internal Security Committee of the Committee on the Judiciary; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. McINTYRE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, without amendment:

H.R. 8313. An act to repeal the District of Columbia Credit Unions Act, to convert credit unions incorporated under the provisions of the act to Federal credit unions, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1176); and

H.J. Res. 888. Joint resolution to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to promulgate special regulations for the period of the 91st annual session of the Imperial Council, Ancient Arabic Order of the Nobles of the Mystic Shrine for North America, to be held in Washington, D.C., in July 1965, to authorize the granting of certain permits to Imperial Shrine Convention, 1965, Inc., on the occasions of such sessions, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1178).

By Mr. McINTYRE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with an amendment:

H.R. 6413. An act to amend the act approved March 3, 1921, as amended, establishing standard weights and measures for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1177).

By Mr. MANSFIELD (for Mr. Fulbright), from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with amendments:

S. 1917. A bill to provide authority to protect heads of foreign states and other designated officials (Rept. No. 1179).

FOURTEENTH ANNUAL REPORT OF SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS (S. REPT. NO. 1180)

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I submit the 14th Annual Report of the Select Committee on Small Business. I ask that the report be printed, together with the minority views of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Prouty].

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and printed, as requested by the Senator from Alabama.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 2990. A bill to establish a National Oceanographic Council; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. Magnuson when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 2991. A bill to clarify the responsibility for marking of obstructions in navigable waters; and

S. 2992. A bill to broaden the vessel exchange provisions of section 510(i) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to extend such provisions for an additional 5 years, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. MUNDT:

S. 2993. A bill for the relief of Raymond Ku; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNETT:

S. 2994. A bill for the relief of F. F. Hintze; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARTLETT (by request):

S. 2995. A bill to amend section 511(h) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, in order to extend the time for commitment of construction reserve funds; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. BARTLETT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MONRONEY:

S. 2996. A bill for the relief of Laura Hui-Wei Wong and her children, Janet Wong and Simon Wong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2997. A bill to amend title 18, chapter 39, of the United States Code, entitled "Explosives and Combustibles"; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MONRONEY when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota:

S. 2998. A bill to amend the act of July 1, 1948 (62 Stat. 1215), providing for the furnishing of Government headstones and markers; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

S. 2999. A bill to provide for the expansion of the Beverly National Cemetery, Beverly, N.J.; and

S. 3000. A bill to provide for the administration and care and maintenance of the National Cemetery system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separating headings.)

By Mr. MILLER:

S.J. Res. 182. Joint resolution providing for the establishment of a joint committee of the two Houses of the Congress to study matters relating to the implementation of the award of the board established under Public Law 88-108 to arbitrate a labor dispute between certain carriers by railroad and their employees; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. MILLER when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

NATIONAL OCEANOGRAPHIC COUNCIL

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate referral, a bill to establish a National Oceanographic Council. I request unanimous consent that this measure lie on the table through July 20 to afford an opportunity for those of my distinguished colleagues who may wish to do so to be cosponsors.

Oceanography is composed of complementary and competing disciplines; it is pursued by a multiplicity of agencies and organizations.

Each of these agencies and organizations has a distinctive and specialized mission. These missions range from—

Antisubmarine warfare to fisheries development.

Long-range weather forecasting to near-shore pollution and sewage disposal.

Navigation improvements to recovery of critical and strategic minerals from or beneath the ocean floor.

Marine and seashore recreation to protection against contamination of the seas by atomic wastes.

Beach erosion controls to antifouling research expected to save the Nation $50 million annually.

Port security to sea-produced medicinal and industrial products.

A recent proposal is to place deep-sea seismographs where earth faults extend far out into the oceans to give early warning of quakes such as recently devastated Alaska cities and communities.

These oceanographic missions are widely dispersed through the administrative branch of our Government.

Agencies, offices, and bureaus in five Government departments are actively engaged or involved in the oceanographic effort. Eight are in the Department of Defense, four in the Department of Commerce, four in the Department of the Interior, two in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and one in the Treasury Department. In addition, two independent operating agencies and an important advisory agency participate extensively in oceanography.

The purpose of the bill I am introducing today is to have a comprehensive, unified national program of marine research, surveys, and education developed for submission to the Congress within 1 year of enactment.

It is contemplated that in this program all Government oceanographic activities of a scientific nature will be coordinated, effective cooperation will be achieved among all departments and agencies participating in the program, and the program will be conducted with efficiency and economy.

The bill provides that reports be made to the Congress annually describing the programed activities and accomplishments of all departments and agencies in the fields of marine science and education, including an evaluation of the activities in terms of attainment, or failure to attain, objectives.

These reports would be accompanied by recommendations of such legislative enactments as the Council considers advisable to implement the national program, and by an estimate of funding requirements of each department or agency for its projected program activities during the succeeding fiscal year.

In brief, the bill would place at the top where it belongs, full responsibility for development, coordination, and execution of an expanded oceanographic program national in concept and unexcelled by that of any other nation in the world.

The National Oceanographic Council would have, in the broad area of marine science, the same duties and functions that the National Security Council has with relation to defense planning and our preparedness activities and that the National Aeronautics and Space Council has with relation to the national space effort.

The National Oceanographic Council would be established and its duties and responsibilities fixed by statute as were those of the National Security Council and the National Aeronautics and Space Council.

President Johnson, as a Senator and as chairman of the committee which drafted the National Aeronautics and Space Act, led the effort to create the Space Council. Later, as Vice President, he served as Chairman of the Council. His foresight and performance as Chairman has made an invaluable contribution to our progress in outer space.

The National Security Council and the National Aeronautics and Space Council each has a small, competent, objective staff of experts in administration and the pertinent scientific disciplines, experts who exercise independent judgments in matters involving departments and bureaus with related but separate missions.

The National Oceanographic Council would similarly have a small, competent, objective staff who would exercise independent judgment in matters affecting the 22 separate Government agencies actively pursuing some oceanographic objective.

This staff would, of course, keep a sharp and watchful eye over oceanographic operations of all agencies from the standpoint of efficiency and economy and would be responsive to the many needs of Congress for detailed information.

Mr. President, as a member of the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences and as chairman of the Independent Offices Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, I am constantly impressed by the value and usefulness of the Space Council to the Senate of the United States, its committees, and to the individual Members.

As Dr. Edward C. Welsh, Executive Secretary of the Council, testified recently at the subcommittee's hearing on the proposed fiscal 1965 budget for the Council, and I quote:

> During the past year, we have been called upon increasingly by the members and staffs of the congressional committees concerned with space matters, in order to furnish competent and objective information and advice about the national space program.
>
> While our job is to advise and assist the President, I believe that such contributions as we can make to keep the Congress informed are also assists to the President indirectly and hence within the scope of our area of responsibility.

Mr. President, the Congress and its committees have a very great need for similar information about the work and progress being made by the 5 departments, 3 independent agencies, and 22 offices and bureaus participating in the Nation's oceanographic programs.

Mr. Welsh gave the Independent Offices Subcommittee further information about the work of the Space Council.

> Among other things, he said, we participate in the overall space budget analyses prior to their formal presentation to the President and transmission to the Congress.
>
> In so doing we are able to advise as to duplications, speed of performance on projects, advance planning, and areas of needed coordination.

Free from departmental rivalries or pressures, and divorced completely from any empire-building concepts that operating agencies may have, a National Oceanographic Council would survey, review, and evaluate the numerous operational programs with objectivity and, as Dr. Welsh states, advise as to duplications, project efficiency, planning of future undertakings and needed coordination.

Mr. President, I have long felt a need for such centralized, independent, high-level authority and such clear-cut responsibility in the vast and complex field of oceanography.

The monetary benefits that would accrue from the establishment of a National Oceanographic Council would, I am sure, far outweigh the amount required to maintain the council and its efficient staff.

The National Aeronautics and Space Council operates on a budget of $525,000 a year. Almost alone among the agencies which appear before the Appropriations Subcommittee on Independent Offices, the budget request of the Space Council has been less each year than when it was created. This year the request is for the same amount as last year, but prior to this year it diminished annually despite statutory salary increases.

The National Security Council requires only slightly more funds than the Space Council. The National Oceanographic Council would require less than either.

Mr. President, 5 years ago interest in our oceanographic endeavors was largely centered in our scientific community.

In recent months to my knowledge, leading newspapers in many States, including Maine, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, Pennsylvania, Florida, Washington, California, and Texas, have featured articles on oceanography. Doubtless the press of many other States have expressed equal concern.

Our television networks have featured special programs on oceanography.

The scientific, technological, and trade publications which have encouraged expanded oceanographic research are too numerous for an attempt to list them.

National magazines of wide circulation—Time, Life, Fortune, Newsweek, the National Geographic, to name only a few that have come to my desk—have stressed the need to know much more about the oceans.

Public concern and congressional concern over our progress in oceanographic research also has intensified in the past 5 years.

One reason for this growing concern is the activities and achievements of other nations—and particularly those of Soviet Russia—in this scientific field.

Today there is nationwide awareness that knowledge of the oceans and the dynamic forces and life within the oceans is vital to the security and welfare of the Nation.

As President Kennedy stated in a letter to the President of the Senate on March 29, 1961, in which he stressed the need for an expanded oceanographic program: "Our very survival may hinge on it."

This year, on March 19, President Johnson, likewise in a letter to the President of the Senate, enunciated national objectives to our oceanographic program, and again I quote:

> To enhance our military defense; to develop marine mineral and fisheries resources; to control pollution; to predict more accurately storms and tides that endanger life and property; to assist State, National, and international bodies in wise legislation and regulation of commerce on the sea; and to extend scientific knowledge generally.

Mr. President, many scientists I have talked to believe that scientific knowledge of the oceans—which occupy three-fourths of earth's surface—is as important to our national destiny as scientific knowledge of outer space.

Defense of our country from attack by sea—or from under the sea—is as vital today as defense from air attacks.

Nuclear-headed missiles can strike from ocean depths as they can from space.

Extraordinary efforts have been made, are being made, and should continue to be made, to counter missiles launched from land bases.

Extraordinary efforts should be made also to counter any possible missile attack from inner space—the oceans.

Today we must be prepared against attack from far below the surface of the seas; against attack from the black depths in which no ray of sunlight ever penetrates; and where the only means of locating an enemy—if he can be located—is by sound, and by singling out certain particular vibrations from a myriad of other sounds of which the origin of many is still unknown.

Our Navy must know more about the ocean depths, about the mysterious sounds and what produces them, about densities of the various water layers, about internal waves and turbulence and counter currents far below the surface of the seas, about gravitational and magnetic forces and anomalies, about bottom topography in some parts of the ocean more rugged than on terra firma.

Our Navy must know more about these depths so that in time of war it can locate, track, and kill enemy submarines lurking far below the surface. And it must know more about inner space for our own attack submarines to operate with maximum efficiency.

Soviet Russia has approximately 500 submarines, including nuclear and missile-firing submersibles. She has more submarines than those of all the nations of the free world combined and three times as many as the United States.

Soviet Russia also wants to know more about inner space. During the past 5 years she has conducted the most extensive oceanographic research program of any nation. Her large, modern, oceanographic research ships are operating in all oceans, but an area in which she has shown particular interest is the Gulf Stream, flowing northward close to our eastern shores.

I quote in part from an article entitled "The Gulf Stream" which appeared recently in a Moscow publication:

> For 5 years Soviet ships have studied the physical nature and dynamics of the Gulf Stream. The following ships took part in the oceanographic investigations: the scientific research ship *Mikhail Lomonosov*, the expeditionary oceanographic ships, *Sedov, Ekvator, Kruzenshtern, Polyus, Stvor*, and four fishing trawlers of the Kaliningrad and Murmansk Councils of National Economy.

The *Mikhail Lomonosov*, I may interpose, is the 6,000-ton "queen" of the Soviet oceanographic research fleet and the world's largest modern research vessel. I continue the quotation:

> The investigators have set out buoys with automatic apparatus which records the speed and direction of currents at great depths. The buoys are also equipped with radar. The buoys are usually set out for a period of from a few days to 1 month. Probing into the depths of the Gulf Stream has revealed strong, deep undercurrents. New discoveries about basic principles of physical processes in the Gulf Stream and atmosphere make possible solutions to many problems of navigation and commercial fishing connected with the ocean and weather forecasting.

Mr. President, I doubt that Soviet interest in the Gulf Stream is limited to commercial fishing and weather forecasting.

Studies of the Gulf Stream with a view to weather forecasting, short-range or long-range, would be far more beneficial to the United States than to Soviet Russia, 5,000 to 10,000 miles away.

The United States has lagged in studies of air-sea interaction which scientists say are necessary if we are to make long-term predictions of changes in persistent weather patterns. Such patterns, they contend, depend on patterns in the sea.

Only recently has it been determined to set up a sea-air interaction laboratory in which two agencies of the Commerce Department—the Weather Bureau and Coast and Geodetic Survey—will cooperate in these studies which the Russians apparently have been conducting in the Gulf Stream area for years.

Only recently has a large scale U.S. study of the Gulf Stream been proposed—to commence in 1966.

One eminent American oceanographer commented sardonically:

> Too many have been more interested in the Indian Ocean Expedition than the Gulf Stream.

A National Oceanographic Council, Mr. President, could recommend priorities.

The rains that fall on our crops and fields and that feed our streams and rivers and reservoirs have their origin in the oceans. So do hurricanes and violent storms that ravish our coastal areas.

Scientists and economists in a recent cooperative study have estimated that only a 50-percent improvement in the accuracy of long-range weather forecasting—which can only be achieved through greater knowledge of the interactions between the oceans and the atmosphere—could save farmers, utilities, builders, and fuel producers and consumers over $2 billion annually.

Four billion dollars more in potential economic benefits have been projected within 15 years as the fruits of a sound, comprehensive, balanced oceanographic program, and at a cost at no time more than double what we are spending now, including the costs of Navy and military oceanographic research, which those defense arms are incurring for our national security.

The $6 billion-plus total applies to projected economic benefits alone.

Quite properly, I think, no attempt was made to put a monetary value on the benefits that would assure to our national defense. Freedom is priceless. Our national independence is priceless. The lives of our citizens are treasured beyond price.

Oceans and their estuaries virtually surround us. Our 12,255-mile coastline and tidal shoreline of 28,909 miles fronting on three oceans, the Atlantic with its giant arm, the Gulf of Mexico, the Pacific, and the Arctic, are the third longest of any nation in the world.

Our inland ocean, the Great Lakes which we share with Canada, has a shoreline of 4,000 miles, and there is no other comparable body of water anywhere.

Fifty-two million of our citizens live within 50 miles of the ocean shores in our 48 contiguous States, a very short distance in these days of intercontinental missiles and of missiles launched from submarines.

Much of our manufacturing dependent on waterborne materials or requiring nearby shipping facilities for our export trade is concentrated in this narrow belt.

Even with the continued maintenance of peace, science sees dangers ahead for our coastal populations.

Our coastal population is expected to double in the next 30 years. So will the wastes, industrial and otherwise, draining into coastal embayments, estuaries, and seas. Pollution of these waters will be an increasing menace to health, to marine life, to recreation.

Oceanographic research will be needed in the nearshore environment to determine the types and degree of treatment needed to dilute or dissipate these wastes, the diversion of these wastes to less hazardous accessible locations.

Considerable work has been done in connection with disposal of atomic wastes in the marine environment, but very little on other kinds of pollution.

A national oceanographic council undoubtedly would have to consider many other problems of a scientific and technological nature. It would determine priorities on the basis of our security, welfare, health, and economic needs.

It would enunciate with authority our national objectives with relation to the seas which surround us.

It would develop and direct in the national interest a national program on which, as President Kennedy said, our survival may hinge.

And it would report, with clarity and objectivity, on the activities, concepts, and projections of the operating agencies under its surveillance.

Mr. President, it is my hope that each and every one of my distinguished colleagues will have an early opportunity to study and consider this bill I am introducing today, and to favor the committee with comments and suggestions.

The bill follows very closely the language of those provisions of the National Aeronautics and Space Act, as amended, which relate to the establishment of the National Aeronautics and Space Council.

In drafting this bill I also took into consideration the report of the Special Committee on Space and Aeronautics, of which Senator Johnson was chairman, and which reported the original space bill.

In its report the committee noted that in addition to the Department of Defense and the proposed Aeronautics and Space Agency—and I quote:

> At least some 10 additional agencies of the Government will have an active interest in these and related agencies.

And the report added:

> Any differences arising among the agencies must be settled at a governmental level higher than that occupied by any of these operating agencies.

I submit, Mr. President, that any differences arising from the 5 departments, 3 independent agencies, and 22 operating bureaus and offices in the oceanographic field must also be settled at a governmental level higher than that occupied by any of these operating agencies.

The higher Government level will be, when this bill is enacted, the National Oceanographic Council.

Five years ago, many of my distinguished colleagues will recall, I and many of my colleagues from both parties introduced a bill to establish a comprehensive, long-range program of oceanographic research and surveys as recommended by the National Academy of Sciences National Research Council.

The Committee on Commerce voted unanimously to report favorably the bill to the Senate. The bill passed the Senate by unanimous consent. No action was taken on this proposed legislation in the House of Representatives.

In the 87th Congress the national oceanographic bill again was introduced, again was unanimously approved by the Committee on Commerce, and again passed the Senate. The House, late in the second session, substituted an abbreviated measure which was vetoed by the President.

The bill introduced today represents a new concept, that of placing at the highest Government level—a National Oceanographic Council—responsibility for developing and for carrying out a broad, balanced oceanographic program that will assure our Nation leadership in this vital field of science.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Washington.

The bill (S. 2990) to establish a National Oceanographic Council, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

CLARIFICATION OF RESPONSIBILITY FOR MARKING OF OBSTRUCTIONS IN NAVIGABLE WATERS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to clarify the responsibility for marking of obstructions in navigable waters. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury requesting the proposed legislation, together with a comparison showing changes in existing law made by the proposed bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter and comparison will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2991) to clarify the responsibility for marking of obstructions in navigable waters, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter and comparison presented by Mr. MAGNUSON are as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, D.C., July 1, 1964.

Hon. CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is submitted herewith a draft of a proposed bill. "To clarify the responsibility for marking of obstruction in navigable waters."

Present law requires the owner of any vessel which is wrecked and sunk in a navigable channel to mark the wreck and to maintain that marking until it is removed or abandoned. If the owner fails to mark a wreck, the Coast Guard is authorized to mark it for him at the owner's expense. Once the abandonment of a wreck has been established, the Department of the Army has the responsibility of marking it pending its removal. The law provides that the Coast Guard may mark the wreck during this period at the request of the Army.

The Department of the Army has interpreted existing law as meaning that it has no responsibility or authority to mark a wreck once it has been decided not to remove it. Nor is there any specific authority for the Coast Guard to do so. Thus under present law there is no provision for the marking of a wreck once it has been decided not to remove it. This creates a potential hazard, since in many cases these wrecks are a danger to navigation. In such cases, even though it may not be feasible to remove them, they should continue to be marked for the protection of mariners.

The purposes of the proposed bill are to eliminate the dual responsibility for wreck marking and to provide for marking of a wreck following a decision not to remove it. The bill would vest sole responsibility for wreck marking in the Coast Guard. It would give the Secretary of the Treasury discretionary authority to mark wrecks or other similar obstructions for so long as in his judgment the needs of maritime navigation may require. Thus under this authority the Coast Guard could, as at present, mark a wreck before its abandonment if the owner failed to do so. It could also mark the wreck after abandonment and, additionally, would have the authority to continue to mark it even though the Army had decided not to remove it.

The bill would give the Secretary authority to terminate an owner's liability to pay for the cost of marking a wreck. If this authority were not exercised in a particular case, the owner's liability would terminate when the wreck was removed or abandoned as is the case under the present statute. This authority would add flexibility to the administration of this law.

The bill would make no changes in an owner's statutory duty to mark and to remove a wreck or other similar obstruction.

It would not change an owner's responsibility to pay for the marking of a wreck when he fails to mark it and the Coast Guard does so for him. Nor would it make any changes in the authority or responsibility of the Army regarding removal of wrecks. Finally, the bill would make no changes in the substantive law of abandonment.

Enactment of this bill would clarify the law in this area and result in greater efficiency in its administration. It would end the division of authority and responsibility between the Coast Guard and the Army and enable each service to handle its responsibilities in this area more efficiently. It would increase protection for the mariner by providing clear authority for the marking of wrecks at any time the needs of navigation may require.

The bill would have only a minimal impact on costs. Some costs which are now paid from Army appropriations would be assumed by the Coast Guard. Increased costs would only result in those cases where the authority is exercised to mark wrecks which the Army has determined are not required to be removed.

A comparative type showing changes in existing law made by the proposed bill is attached.

It would be appreciated if you would lay the proposed bill before the Senate. A similar bill has been transmitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection from the standpoint of the administration's program to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

Douglas Dillon.

Comparative Type Showing Changes in Existing Law Made by the Proposed Bill

(Matter proposed to be omitted is enclosed in brackets; new matter in italic.)

SECTION 86 OF TITLE 14, UNITED STATES CODE

§ 86. Marking of obstructions

The [Coast Guard] *Secretary* may mark for the protection of navigation any sunken vessel or other similar obstruction existing on any navigable waters of the United States [, whenever the owner thereof has, in the judgment of the Coast Guard, failed suitably to mark the same in accordance with the provisions of section 409 of title 33. Until the abandonment of any such obstruction has been established in accordance with the provisions of section 414 of title 33, the owner thereof shall pay to the Coast Guard the cost of such marking. As soon as the abandonment of any such obstruction has been so established, the Secretary of the Army shall keep the same so marked pending removal thereof in accordance with the provisions of section 414 of title 33, but the Coast Guard may at the request of the Department of the Army continue the suitable marking of any such obstruction for and on behalf of that Department; and] *in such manner and for so long as, in his judgment, the needs of maritime navigation require. The owner of such an obstruction shall be liable to the United States for* the cost of [any] such marking [shall be borne by the Department of the Army.] *until such time as the obstruction is removed or its abandonment legally established or until such earlier time as the Secretary may determine.* All monies received by the [Coast Guard] *United States* from the owners of obstructions, in accordance with [the provisions of] this section, shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts. [No provision of this] *This* section shall *not* be construed so as to relieve the owner of any such obstruction from the duty and responsibility suitably to mark the same [in accordance with the provisions of section 409 of title 33.] *and remove it as required by law.*

BROADENING AND EXTENSION OF VESSEL EXCHANGE PROVISIONS OF MERCHANT MARINE ACT

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to broaden the vessel exchange provisions of section 510(i) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to extend such provisions for an aditional 5 years, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Secretary of Commerce requesting the proposed legislation, together with a statement of the purposes of the bill, and a comparative text, be printed in the Record.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter, statement, and comparative text will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 2992) to broaden the vessel exchange provisions of section 510(i) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to extend such provisions for an additional 5 years, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Magnuson, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter, statement of purpose, and comparative text presented by Mr. Magnuson are as follows:

The Secretary of Commerce,
Washington, D.C., June 30, 1964.

Hon. Carl Hayden,
President pro tempore of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President: There are submitted herewith four copies of a proposed bill, together with a statement of its purposes and provisions, to broaden the vessel exchange provisions of section 510(i) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to extend such provisions for an additional 5 years, and for other purposes. A comparative text showing the changes the draft bill would make in existing law is also included.

The need for and purpose of the proposed bill are set forth in the accompanying statement.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that from the standpoint of the administration's program there is no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

Luther H. Hodges.

Statement of the Purposes and Provisions of the Draft To Broaden the Vessel Exchange Provisions of Section 510(i) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, To Extend Such Provisions for an Additional 5 Years, and for Other Purposes

Section 510(i) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, provides that until July 5, 1965, the Secretary of Commerce may, subject to certain conditions, acquire war-built vessels from private owners in exchange for more modern war-built vessels (except tankers) in the national defense reserve fleet. The term "war-built vessels" is defined for this purpose as vessels which were constructed, or whose construction was contracted for, by shipyards in the United States between September 3, 1939, and September 2, 1945. This definition is taken from the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, under which merchant vessels built, or otherwise acquired by the Government, for World War II purposes were sold to private owners after the war. The conditions to which the section 510(i) exchange are subject are as follows:

1. The traded-in vessels shall have been owned by a citizen of the United States and been operated without subsidy under title VI of the Act, and have been documented under the laws of the United States, for at least 3 years before the exchange.

2. The Secretary shall determine the fair and reasonable values of the traded-in and traded-out vessels as of the date of the exchange.

3. In determining said values, the Secretary shall consider the cost of placing the vessels in class with respect to hull and machinery; and if the traded-out vessel is a military type, the Secretary shall consider the cost of converting the vessel for normal commercial operation in determining its value.

4. If the value of the traded-out vessel exceeds that of the traded-in vessel, the applicant shall pay the difference in cash at the time of the exchange. The Secretary shall make no payment to the owner of a traded-in vessel with respect to any exchange.

5. The applicant shall agree that if the United States reacquires the vessel at any time within 20 years from its construction, the owner shall be paid the value thereof but not exceeding the exchange value plus the cost of capital improvements depreciated to the date of acquisition or scrap value, whichever is greater.

6. Any repairs or reconversion necessary at the time of the exchange to place the traded-out vessel in class and to prepare the vessel for commercial operation to be performed in a shipyard in the continental United States.

The draft bill would amend section 510(i) by eliminating the requirement that the traded-in vessels shall be "war-built vessels" as defined in the section and by substituting for that a requirement that such vessels be of 1,500 gross tons or over which were constructed or contracted for by the U.S. shipyards before September 3, 1945. These are the same requirements as those for war-built vessels as defined in the section except that war-built vessels so defined are "oceangoing" and were built after September 2, 1939. The draft bill would also extend the expiration date of the section to July 5, 1970.

The purpose of the amendments to change the requirements for trade-in vessels is to make vessels now in use on the Great Lakes eligible for exchange under the section. As of December 31, 1962, there were 271 vessels in operation in domestic trade on the Great Lakes. One hundred and sixty-four of these were built before 1920. Forty-seven were built between 1920 and 1940. The other 60 were built after 1940. Most of these vessels could not qualify for exchange under the existing provisions because they were not built after September 3, 1939. In addition, vessels designed for Great Lakes operation are not oceangoing vessels, and for that reason would not be eligible for exchange under existing law. Because of different wave conditions existing on the Great Lakes and the oceans, vessels specifically designed for the Great Lakes do not meet the Coast Guard and American Bureau of Shipping requirements for operation on the oceans.

Section 510(i) of the act was enacted in 1960 to aid in upgrading the unsubsidized fleet. As of January 16, 1964, 114 applications had been received under the section; 38 of these had been withdrawn; 51 were still pending; and 25 had been completely processed. The completely processed applications resulted in the trade-out of 28 ships, the trade-in of 32 ships, payment to the Government of an estimated $2,700,000 as the excess of value of traded-out ships over traded-in ships, with an estimated $9,200,000 of reactivation and conversion costs to be incurred by the private owners. To permit the continuation of this program and to give Great Lakes and other domestic operators adequate time to participate in the program, the draft bill would extend the expiration date of the section to July 5, 1970.

Comparative Text Showing the Changes in the Draft Bill "To Broaden the Vessel Exchange Provisions of Section 510(1) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, To Extend Such Provisions for an Additional Five Years, and for Other Purposes" Would Make in the First Sentence of That Section

(Deletions are shown by brackets; new matter is shown in italic.)

"Sec. 510.—

* * * * *

"(1) In order to improve the type and suitability of vessels operating in the domestic and foreign commerce of the United States, and to further the policies of this Act, the Secretary of Commerce is authorized (subject to the provisions of this subsection) to acquire at any time [within five years from the date of enactment of this Act war-built vessels (which are defined for purposes of this subsection as oceangoing] *before July 5, 1970,* vessels of one thousand five hundred gross tons or over which were constructed or contracted for by the United States shipyards [during the period beginning September 3, 1939, and ending September 2, 1945)] *before September 3, 1945,* in exchange for more modern or efficient war-built vessels *(which are defined for purposes of this subsection as oceangoing vessels of one thousand five hundred gross tons or over which were constructed or contracted for by the United States shipyards during the period beginning September 3, 1939, and ending September 2, 1945)* owned by the United States."

AMENDMENT OF MERCHANT MARINE ACT, RELATING TO EXTENSION OF TIME FOR COMMITMENT OF CONSTRUCTION RESERVE FUNDS

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill that would extend for 1 additional year from December 31, 1964, the time for commitment of the American-Hawaiian Steamship Co.'s construction reserve fund established under section 511 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended. Similar legislation was passed last year which extended the time to December 31, 1964, but due to certain actions taken by the Department of Commerce and the Maritime Administration, additional delays have been encountered.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a statement made available to me by the American-Hawaiian Steamship Co. explaining the need for this legislation.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 2995) to amend section 511(h) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, in order to extend the time for commitment of construction reserve funds, introduced by Mr. Bartlett, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The statement presented by Mr. Bartlett is as follows:

Purpose of Legislation Regarding American-Hawaiian Steamship Co.'s Construction Reserve Fund

The purpose of the legislation is to extend until December 31, 1965, the period during which construction reserve funds established under section 511 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended, must be expended or committed for new vessel construction.

By an application dated November 17, 1961, American-Hawaiian Steamship Co., requested that the Secretary of Commerce, Maritime Administration, grant ship mortgage insurance under the provisions of title XI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, in connection with the construction of three containers ships for operation in the intercoastal trade between U.S. east and west coast ports.

The Maritime Administrator acting under statutory authority directed that for administrative convenience there be a public hearing in connection with the American-Hawaiian application. Hearings on this matter commenced August 26, 1962, in San Francisco, Calif., and ended October 25, 1962, in Washington, D.C. Notwithstanding a favorable decision on April 8, 1963, by the chief examiner, Department of Commerce, Maritime Administration, the Maritime Administrator informed the company that on October 23, 1963, the Secretary of Commerce concurred with the Administrator's decision to deny our application for 87½ percent mortgage insurance on the proposed trailerships for operation in intercoastal trade. The Administrator also advised that the Secretary of Commerce concluded that Government backing for 87½ percent of the total estimated cost of the vessels puts too little burden of risk on the applicant and if, therefore, American-Hawaiian is willing, the Department of Commerce will consider a revised application based on Government insurance of not more than 50 percent of the estimated cost of the vessels. The company, on Ocober 24, 1963, informed the Maritime Administrator that it accepted the invitation to revise its application for mortgage insurance based on Government insurance of not more than 50 percent of the estimated cost of the vessels. The revised application was filed on March 23, 1964.

Sealed bids are returnable from the various shipyards on or about August 19, 1964, and will be opened by Maritime Administration. Thereafter Maritime Administration will proceed to consider the pending application in the light of the bids on the vessels. We anticipate that normal procedures in the processing of the pending application will take several months. If there is favorable action on the application, we expect that additional time will be required to work out the mortgage insurance indentures and make final arrangements for financing and awarding of contracts for construction of the vessels and contracts for the container equipment. It appears therefore, that the foregoing program will run well into the year 1965.

The company has approximately $11 million in its construction reserve fund which must be committed by December 31, 1964, under present law. The proposed legislation would extend for 1 year the period within which the construction reserve funds could be made available in the building of the new vessels. The Federal income tax that would have to be paid if these funds are not invested in new ships, amounts to approximately $2,400,000. Such tax, if paid, would be lost forever for new construction.

American-Hawaiian was organized in 1899. Its first four vessels, built in 1900–1901 were coal burners and provided service between the east and west coasts via the Strait of Magellan and to and from Hawaii. In 1902, American-Hawaiian pioneered in the use of oil-fired equipment in two new ships and in the same year caused construction of the largest freighter built in the United States up to that time.

By 1907, American-Hawaiian served the intercoastal trade with steamers to and from railroad terminals on each coast of the Isthmus of Tehuantepec, in Mexico and in August 1914, commenced use of the Panama Canal.

In approximately early 1916, American-Hawaiian's intercoastal service was suspended and its ships were diverted to war charters. In the following year, American-Hawaiian's 20 vessels were requisitioned by the Government for national defense.

Following World War I, American-Hawaiian resumed its intercoastal service. By the end of 1939, it owned 39 vessels, 30 of which were engaged in intercoastal trade and 9 in foreign trade. But war once again disrupted its service. In December 1941, the company owned 32 steamers, all in active service and maintained in the highest classification for vessels of their type with American Bureau of Shipping. The American-Hawaiian fleet once again was made available to the Government for national defense.

Following World War II, which had totally destroyed the trade of the intercoastal lines, the Government reestablished the intercoastal service using Government-owned, war-built ships and employing the former intercoastal lines as Government agents. American-Hawaiian participated in this agency operation from 1945 until its discontinuance because of heavy losses in the fall of 1947. American-Hawaiian then chartered Government-owned vessels and continued its intercoastal service without interruption until early 1951 when the Government discontinued the chartering of vessels for use in the intercoastal trade. At that time American-Hawaiian purchased vessels from the Government and, again without interruption, continued its intercoastal service.

However, the conventional-type freighter no longer provided a profitable operation for American-Hawaiian. On February 27, 1953, American-Hawaiian sent a letter to stockholders, announcing the temporary suspension of its intercoastal service upon completion of current voyages.

The present application of American-Hawaiian for vessel mortgage insurance is the result of investigations of new shipping concepts during the past several years, and involves the building of three large 24-knot, approximately 60,000 horsepower containerships for the intercoastal trade.

The ships proposed by American-Hawaiian would be the largest, fastest dry-cargo ships ever built and would be the first new ships developed for the intercoastal trade since World War II.

LAURA HUI-WEI WONG AND HER CHILDREN JANET WONG AND SIMON WONG

Mr. MONRONEY. I am introducing the bill at the request of the University of Oklahoma Research Institute and the Department of Physics. The bill is a special bill to grant permanent resident status to the widow and two minor children of Dr. Wen Nong Wong, a very able nuclear physicist who joined the physics staff of the university in September 1963, and died on January 24, 1964.

Dr. Wong graduated from the Graduate School of Indiana University. He received a Ph. D. degree in physics in 1959 and was employed for 4 years by Midwestern Universities Research Association at Madison, Wis., until he joined the University of Oklahoma faculty in September 1963.

When Dr. Wong resigned from his position at Midwestern Universities Research Association his first preference classification lapsed. However, upon petition by the University of Oklahoma, it was reestablished on December 26, 1963, and the paroles of his wife and children were extended.

Because of the preference status that the deceased husband enjoyed, I believe it would be fitting and proper to grant this relief to the children who, had the father not died, would have been permanent residents of the United States.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2996) for the relief of Laura Hui-Wei Wong and her children, Janet Wong and Simon Wong, introduced by Mr. MONRONEY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF TITLE 18, CHAPTER 39, UNITED STATES CODE, ENTITLED "EXPLOSIVES AND COMBUSTIBLES"

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to place pipelines under the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission for the purpose of establishing safety regulations for interstate pipelines.

Safety in transportation, either of passengers or property, is uppermost in the mind of the public. The transportation industries subject to safety regulation realize that the public interest demands that such regulation be applied consistently, rather than applied to some forms of transportation and not to others.

The bill I am introducing will bring about more consistency in the regulation of safety of interstate carriers subject to the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission. The proposed legislation would make oil pipelines subject to safety regulation by the Commission.

Prior to 1960 the ICC, under authority of the Transportation of Explosives Act of March 4, 1921, presumably had authority to establish safety regulations for oil pipelines. Several surveys were made by the ICC but no comprehensive code of safety regulations was deemed necessary.

This situation continued until the law pertaining to the transportation of explosives was amended in 1960 to modernize the act to encompass the movement of new commodities such as radioactive materials and etiologic agents. In the course of the enactment of this legislation oil pipelines were, inadvertently, I believe, from the research I have done on the subject, removed from the jurisdiction of the ICC with respect to safety regulations. This bill would restore the Commission's authority.

I should point out that the need for such legislation has been recommended by an interagency committee on dangerous cargoes that recently completed a comprehensive study of the subject. The Interstate Commerce Commission favors restoration of the safety authority repealed in 1960, pointing out that "if the Commission is again vested with authority over all pipelines in the field of safety, the carriers will be protected against the threat of conflicting safety legislation by the States, and the Commission will be able to cope with any safety hazards which may arise by virtue of changes in the operations or traffic consist of oil pipelines."

Finally, I should add that the oil pipeline industry has asked that the Congress restore the Commission's safety jurisdiction in the field of oil pipeline safety. The bill I am presenting will accomplish that purpose.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2997) to amend title 18, chapter 39, of the United States Code, entitled "Explosives and Combustibles," introduced by Mr. MONRONEY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

FURNISHING OF GOVERNMENT HEADSTONES AND MARKERS

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the act of July 1, 1948 (62 Stat. 1215), providing for the furnishing of Government headstones and markers. I ask unanimous consent that a statement in explanation of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the explanatory statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2998) to amend the act of July 1, 1948 (62 Stat. 1215), providing for the furnishing of Government headstones and markers, introduced by Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

The statement presented by Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota is as follows:

STATEMENT OF EXPLANATION FOR BILL TO AMEND THE ACT OF JULY 1, 1948

Under the act of July 1, 1948, 62 Stat. 1215, as amended—24 U.S.C. 279 a–d—the Secretary of the Army is authorized and directed to mark all graves in national and post cemeteries; to furnish appropriate headstones and markers for the unmarked graves of members of the Union and Confederate forces of the Civil War and of all members and former members of the Armed Forces of the United States whose last active service terminated honorably; and to furnish memorial markers honoring any member of the Armed Forces dying in the service whose remains were not recovered or identified or were buried at sea.

A situation has been brought to my attention which is not covered by the present provisions of this act as amended. In this particular case, a World War I veteran whose active service terminated under honorable conditions passed away and at the request of his family, his body was sent to the State medical center for use in medical research. Later the widow requested information from the Office of the Chief of Support Services in the Department of Army concerning her husband's eligibility for a Government marker under these specific conditions. They advised her that he was not eligible since his remains were not actually buried in a cemetery. In checking further with the Army, I was informed that if his remains were ever buried when the medical research is over, he would be entitled to a headstone or marker for his grave provided that his final active service in the Armed Forces terminated honorably.

There would be no problem in cases of this type if the veterans' bodies were returned for interment at the completion of the medical research. However, frequently, under the laws of the various States, the remains are otherwise disposed of and are not considered to be interred under the current interpretation of the law.

This bill would amend this act as amended to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Army to furnish when requested an appropriate headstone or marker to commemorate any former member of the Armed Forces of the United States whose last service was terminated honorably if the remains of such member or former member, as may be the case, have been donated to an educational or research institution for medical study or research purposes and are not interred under conditions which would permit the furnishing of a gravestone or marker under the present provisions in this act as amended.

The family of a veteran who has served his country should not be denied the right to receive a memorial headstone or marker for placement in a cemetery because the veteran's body was given to aid medical research and was not later available for interment. I believe the family under these conditions would be equally, if not more, entitled to this consideration than the average case since such a veteran not only served his country and risked his life, but was so concerned for his fellow man and the advancement of science that he desired that his body be used for medical research. This is a situation which I am sure will repeat itself many times in the future. Therefore, I hope that this act will be amended so that the Secretary of the Army will be able to provide this recognition for the veteran who is legally entitled to it under the present law but who is disqualified because his body is given to medical research.

EXPANSION OF BEVERLY NATIONAL CEMETERY, BEVERLY, N.J.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the expansion of the Beverly National Cemetery, Beverly, N.J. In introducing this bill, my primary interest is that those who served their country so willingly and courageously, when their country called upon them, shall be honored with a final resting place which befits the dignity with which they served.

There are 98 national cemeteries on U.S. soil, most of which came into being in the course of, or as a result of, the Civil War. Eighty-one of these cemeteries were established between 1862 and 1899, two of which were in New Jersey. According to the latest statistics, 17 of these cemeteries are now closed and 27 more will be closed within the next 15 years.

The cemetery in Beverly is the only national cemetery now open in New Jersey, and it will be closed within the next

3 years due to lack of burial space. It was placed in commission in 1864 and over 30,000 grave sites are already taken within its 65 acres. The rate of burials per day, of course, fluctuates, but a recent survey indicates funerals are entering this cemetery at the rate of one every 15 minutes of each working day. Approximately seven out of every eight funerals accommodated by this facility were from outside the State of New Jersey, coming from Maryland, Delaware, Pennsylvania, New York, and some even as far as Georgia. As a result of such intensive use of these facilities, we are faced with the closing of the cemetery in the near future because no more room will be available. Action must be taken to alleviate this situation.

We should not let our national cemeteries fade from existence. Either we must adopt a responsible attitude toward the obligation of a great Nation to its veterans, to which we have already committed ourselves, and provide this necessary additional space, or we must accept the alternative and tell our veterans that the privilege of burial in a national cemetery has been abrogated. I do not want the latter situation to be the case for the veterans of New Jersey. I therefore urge that the proposal I am introducing today be afforded serious consideration.

Mr. President, Gov. Richard J. Hughes, of New Jersey, has taken a leading role in our State in the effort to solve this problem, and I ask unanimous consent that there be included in the RECORD following my statement a letter he has sent me endorsing this proposal. I also ask unanimous consent to have the text of the bill printed in the RECORD following this statement.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2999) to provide for the expansion of the Beverly National Cemetery, Beverly, N.J., introduced by Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Army shall expand the Beverly National Cemetery, Beverly, New Jersey, to provide adequate burial space to accommodate probable needs through the year 1985, and shall provide for the future care and maintenance thereof. Land necessary to provide for the expansion required by this Act shall be acquired by donation, purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, and shall be contiguous to or in the vicinity of such cemetery.

The letter presented by Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey is as follows:

STATE OF NEW JERSEY,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Trenton, June 26, 1964.

Hon. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, Jr.,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: It is my understanding that you plan to introduce legislation on the floor of the Senate providing for an expansion of the Beverly National Cemetery in New Jersey.

The expansion of this cemetery has long been of great concern to me and so many other New Jerseyites. I know that burial space is limited and will shortly be exhausted. This is a situation which will work a severe hardship on families, not only in New Jersey, but in other States as well. Your bill would avoid this hardship on those who sacrificed so much and it has, therefore, my full support.

I hope that the Congress will give it both early and favorable consideration.

Sincerely yours,
RICHARD J. HUGHES,
Governor.

ADMINISTRATION AND CARE OF THE NATIONAL CEMETERY SYSTEM

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, earlier today I introduced a bill to provide for the expansion of the Beverly National Cemetery, Beverly, N.J. In introducing that bill, I explained that my primary interest was that those who served their country so willingly and courageously, when their country called upon them, shall be honored with a final resting place befitting the dignity with which they served. I pointed out that the national cemetery in Beverly would have to be closed in the near future, because of lack of space, unless action is taken to resolve the situation. My studies into the specific problems at Beverly, and upon the general subject of national cemeteries, have made me realize that the problem of national cemeteries and their administration is one of considerable historical background, complexity, and far-reaching implications. Furthermore, my studies on this subject have brought to my attention a situation, which, in my opinion, needs corrective action.

There are now in existence not one but five different cemeterial systems. There are 85 national cemeteries administered by the Department of the Army. The Department of the Navy maintains 12 cemeterial plots. The National Park Service, Department of Interior, operates and maintains 13 national cemeteries. The American Battlefield Monuments Commission, an independent agency of the Federal Government, administers and maintains, in addition to World War I monuments, 14 World War II national cemeteries located outside the United States, its territories, and possessions. And, the Veterans' Administration has 15 active cemeteries located in 15 different States.

In my opinion, this situation, wherein five different but functionally related systems exist, although each results from different historical backgrounds and authority, is bound to result in administrative duplications and in economic inefficiency. Two important questions must therefore be considered. First, is an integrated administration of active national cemeteries needed, and, if the answer to this question is "Yes," where should the responsibility for such administration be located?

In answering the first question, concerning the integration of cemeterial systems, three of the five governmental cemeterial systems may, for all practical purposes, be eliminated in considering the question of consolidation. The oversea cemeteries administered by the American Battlefield Monuments Commission, and comparable cemeteries maintained by the Army, probably should be continued as a separate system, at least for the present. The 12 cemeteries administered by the national parks system are all inactive and are maintained more as parks or historic sites than as cemeteries. The 12 naval cemeteries which are still classed as active contain less than 1,000 potential grave sites and a majority are really naval plots in private cemeteries.

There still remain for consideration, however, the Army and Veterans' Administration systems, which actually contain the majority of cemeteries involved. I personally believe there is a sound basis for their consolidation. The integrated operation of these cemetery systems would avoid much of the confusion that now exists in the matter of eligibility, administration, and other problems created by the present divided authority. At present, a veteran may be ineligible for burial in a Veterans' Administration cemetery near his home but eligible for burial in a national cemetery far distant from his home. The converse is also true. Moreover, the operation of an integrated system should reduce expenditures and produce significant economies, not only in administrative and overhead cost but also in a better utilization of existing cemetery services, that is, economizing the need for acquisition of additional space at existing cemeteries. The establishment of a single cemetery system for veterans would eliminate overlapping and duplication of effort and will permit the resolution of many of the present problems on an orderly basis. Furthermore, I believe that the responsibility for such a consolidated system should be in the Veterans' Administration.

The Army's present cemeterial responsibility stems from the fact that after the Civil War it was given the task of caring for, and memorializing the Civil War dead. At that time it was the only appropriate agency available for the task. With the establishment of the Veterans' Administration in 1930, there came into being an agency responsible for the administration of veterans benefits. The desirability of centralizing veterans affairs in one place was recognized. Transfer of functions and services were effected, and today practically all activities relating to veterans rights and benefits are the responsibility of the Veterans' Administration.

The administration of a national cemetery system for veterans would seem to be a logical extension of Veterans' Administration functions. The burial of former servicemen is more closely related to veterans benefit programs than to military functions of the Department of the Army. Moreover, I believe a serious question exists as to whether the administration of national cemeteries by the Army is compatible with its general purpose. I do not believe this civil function is sufficiently related to the Army's primary mission to justify its continued performance by the Army. It appears to be unrelated to the other civil functions of the Army and is even less related to the military functions.

I believe the Army should be freed of responsibilities unrelated to, and intruding upon, its central military mission. I am, therefore, introducing, for appropriate reference, a bill to consolidate the administration of the national cemeteries within the 50 States now operated by the Department of the Army, and the cemeteries now operated by the Veterans' Administration. This bill will place control of the consolidated system in the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs and will transfer all functions, personnel, property, records, unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations, and other funds—available or to be made available—related to the operation of such cemeteries, to the Veterans' Administration.

I have asked appropriate executive agencies and congressional committees to continue their study of this problem and to direct such study toward any legislative action necessary to codify and perfect the laws relating to the consolidated cemetery operation and eligibility. I will then sponsor any further legislation necessary to complete and perfect this transfer. Meanwhile, the bill I am introducing today will serve to bring the entire question before the appropriate committee here in the Senate. I hope that there will be early hearings on this measure and that it will be passed before the end of the current Congress.

After consolidation has been effected, it will then be possible to determine what additional steps may be necessary to establish and maintain an up-to-date, equitable policy concerning present and future cemetery needs. We can then determine the need for adjustments to the system, as it now stands, in order that we may follow through on the obligation of a grateful Nation to its veterans.

This is an area of vital concern to the major service organizations. Time after time these veterans organizations have adopted recommendations and resolutions in support of a national cemetery system and recommended adjustments in such system as the need arises. I am sure we will have their support in our efforts, both now and in the future, to carry out this commitment to our veterans. In this connection, I ask unanimous consent to include at this point in my remarks a letter I have received from Mr. Francis W. Stover, director of the national legislative service of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, commenting on the problem and the approach to its solution proposed in this bill.

Mr. President, I firmly believe the proposal set forth in this bill is in accord with this administration's goal of sound and economically efficient government, and I, therefore, urge its early consideration. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD following my statement.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3000) to provide for the administration and care and maintenance of the national cemetery system, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the National Cemeteries Act of 1964.

SEC. 2. (a) Part II of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new chapter 24 to read as follows:

"CHAPTER 24—NATIONAL CEMETERIES

"Subchapter I—Establishment and eligibility

"Sec.
"950. National cemetery system.
"951. Persons eligible for burial in national cemeteries; removal of remains.
"952. Markers to honor memory of certain Armed Forces personnel.

"Subchapter II—Administration

"960. Manner of acquisition of lands.
"961. Appraisement of real estate.
"962. Payment of appraised value.
"963. State donations of land.
"964. Conveyance to State or municipality of approach road to national cemetery.
"965. Encroachment by railroad on rights-of-way.
"966. Superintendents of cemeteries.
"967. Inclosure, headstones, and registers.
"968. Penalty for defacing cemeteries.
"969. Arlington Memorial Amphitheater—Recommendations for memorials and entombments.

"Subchapter III—Headstones and markers

"985. Headstones for unmarked graves; eligibility thereto.

"Subchapter I—Establishment and eligibility

"§ 950. National cemetery system.

"There shall be in the Veterans' Administration a national cemetery system. The responsibility for the administration and the care and maintenance of such system shall be in the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. Such system shall consist of the cemeteries transferred to the Veterans' Administration by section 3 of the National Cemeteries Act of 1964, veterans cemeteries under the jurisdiction of the Veterans' Administration on the date of the enactment of such Act, and such other cemeteries which may be established or otherwise acquired pursuant to the provisions of this chapter.

"§ 951. Persons eligible for burial in national cemeteries; removal of remains.

"(a) Under such regulations as the Administrator may prescribe, the remains of the following persons may be buried in national cemeteries:

"(1) Any person who served in the Armed Forces—

"(A) on active duty and whose last such service terminated honorably; or

"(B) who died while he was on active duty for training or inactive duty training, or while hospitalized or undergoing treatment, at Government expense, for injury or disease contracted or incurred under honorable conditions while on such duty, or while undergoing such hospitalization or treatment.

"(2) Any member of the Reserve Officers Training Corps of the Army, Navy, or Air Force whose death occurs under honorable conditions while he is—

"(A) attending, or performing authorized travel to or from, an authorized training camp or practice cruise; or

"(B) hospitalized or undergoing treatment, at Government expense, for injury or disease contracted or incurred under honorable conditions while engaged in the activities listed in subparagraph (A) above, or while undergoing the aforementioned hospitalization or treatment.

"(3) Any citizen of the United States who, during any war in which the United States is or has been engaged, served in the armed forces of any government allied with the United States during that war, and whose last such service terminated honorably.

"(4) The wife, husband, surviving spouse, minor child, and, in the discretion of the Administrator, unmarried adult child of any of the persons listed in paragraphs (1)–(3) above, except that the remains of any person listed herein may, in the discretion of the Administrator, be removed from a national cemetery proper and interred in a special section of a national cemetery or, with the approval of the Secretary of the Army, in a post cemetery if, upon death, the related person named in paragraphs (1)–(3) of this section is not buried in the same or an adjoining gravesite. However, such remains may not be so removed if the related person is—

"(A) lost or buried at sea;

"(B) officially determined to be permanently absent in a status of missing or missing in action;

"(C) officially determined to be dead for the purpose of terminating his status of missing or missing in action; or

"(D) one whose remains have not been recovered.

"(5) Any person eligible for interment in a VA cemetery, under regulations of the Administrator, on the date of enactment of the National Cemeteries Act of 1964.

"§ 952. Markers to honor memory of certain Armed Forces personnel.

"The Administrator shall set aside, when available, suitable plots in the national cemeteries to honor the memory of members of the Armed Forces missing in action, or who died while serving in such forces, and whose remains have not been identified, have been buried at sea, or have been determined to be nonrecoverable, and shall, under such regulations as he may prescribe, permit the erection of appropriate markers thereon in honor of any such member or group of members.

"Subchapter II—Administration

"§ 960. Manner of acquisition of lands.

"The Administrator may purchase from the owners thereof, at such price as may be mutually agreed upon, such real estate as in his judgment is suitable and necessary for the purpose of carrying into effect the provisions for national cemeteries, and obtain from such owners the title in fee simple for the same. Where the Administrator is not able to agree with any owner upon the price to be paid for any real estate needed for such purpose, or to obtain from such owner title in fee simple for the same, he is authorized to enter upon and appropriate any real estate which, in his judgment, is suitable and necessary for such purposes.

"§ 961. Appraisement of real estate.

"The Administrator, or the owners of any real estate thus entered upon and appropriated, are authorized to make application for an appraisement of real estate thus entered upon and appropriated, to any district court within any State or district where such real estate is situated; and such court shall, upon such application and in such mode and under such rules and regulations as it may adopt, make a just and equitable appraisement of the cash value of the several interests of each and every owner of such real estate and improvements thereon.

"§ 962. Payment of appraised value.

"When appraisement of the real estate thus entered upon and appropriated has been made under the order and direction of the court, the fee simple thereof shall, upon payment to the owner of the appraised value, or in case such owner refuses or neglects for thirty days after the appraisement of the cash value of the real estate or improvements as aforesaid, to demand the same from the Administrator, upon depositing the appraised value in the court making such appraisement, to the credit of such owner, be vested in the United States, and its jurisdiction over such real estate shall be exclusive. The Administrator is authorized and required to pay to the several owners or owners, respectively, the appraised value of the several pieces or parcels of real estate, as specified in the appraisement of any of such courts, or to pay into any of such courts by deposit, as provided in this section, the appraised value; and the sum necessary for such purpose may be taken from any moneys appropriated for the purposes of national cemeteries.

"§ 963. State donations of land.

"The Administrator is authorized to accept (on behalf of, and without cost to, the United States) from any State title to such land as he deems suitable for national cemetery purposes. Upon the acquisition of such land by the United States, the Administrator is authorized to establish thereon a national cemetery and to provide for the care and maintenance of such national cemetery.

"§ 964. Conveyance to State or municipality of approach road to national cemetery.

"The Administrator may convey to any State, county, municipality, or proper agency thereof, in which the same is located, all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to any Government owned or controlled approach road to any national cemetery: *Provided,* That prior to the delivery of any instrument of conveyance hereunder, the State, county, municipality, or agency to which the conveyance herein authorized is to be made, shall notify the Administrator in writing of its willingness to accept and maintain the road included in such conveyance: *Provided further,* That upon the execution and delivery of any conveyance herein authorized the jurisdiction of the United States of America over the road conveyed shall cease and determine and shall thereafter vest the State in which said road is located.

"§ 965. Encroachment by railroad on rights of way.

"No railroad shall be permitted upon any right-of-way acquired by the United States leading to a national cemetery, or to encroach on any roads or walks thereon maintained by the United States.

"§ 966. Superintendents of cemeteries.

"The Administrator shall appoint a Superintendent for the purpose of guarding and protecting each national cemetery and to give information to parties visiting the same. Such superintendent shall be a veteran who was retired from the Armed Forces for a physical disability, or who is entitled to receive compensation for disability under chapter 11 of this title. He shall be furnished with quarters and fuel at the several cemeteries and for this purpose the Administrator shall cause to be erected a suitable building at the principal entrance of each national cemetery.

"§ 967. Enclosure, headstones, and registers

"The Administrator shall have all national cemeteries, established pursuant to this chapter, enclosed with a stone or iron fence; and cause each grave to be marked with a small headstone of appropriate design and weight. Each such headstone shall bear the name of the soldier and the name of his State inscribed thereon, when the same are known, and also with the number of the grave inscribed thereon, corresponding with the number opposite to the name of the party in a register of burials to be kept at each cemetery and at the Veterans' Administration Central Office, which shall set forth the name, rank, company, regiment, and date of death of the officer or soldier; or if these are unknown, it shall be so recorded.

"§ 968. Penalty for defacing cemeteries

"Every person who willfully destroys, mutilates, defaces, injures, or removes any monument, gravestone, or other structure, or who willfully destroys, cuts, breaks, injures, or removes any tree, shrub, or plant within the limits of any national cemetery, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, punishable by a fine of not less than $25, and not more than $100, or by imprisonment for not less than fifteen days, and not more than sixty. The superintendent in charge of any national cemetery is authorized to arrest forthwith any person engaged in committing any misdemeanor prohibited in this section, and to bring such person before any United States commissioner or judge of any district court of the United States within any State or district where any of the cemeteries are situated, for the purpose of holding such person to answer for such misdemeanor, and then and there shall make complaint in due form.

"§ 969. Arlington Memorial Amphitheater—Recommendations for memorials and entombments

"(a) The Administrator may send to Congress in January of each year, his recommendations with respect to the memorials to be erected, and the remains of deceased veterans to be entombed, in the Arlington Memorial Amphitheater, Arlington National Cemetery, Virginia.

"(b) No memorial may be erected and no remains may be entombed in such amphitheater unless specifically authorized by Congress.

"Subchapter III—Headstones and Markers

"§ 985. Headstones for unmarked graves; eligibility thereto.

"(a) The Administrator is authorized and directed to furnish, when requested, appropriate headstones or markers at the expense of the United States for the unmarked graves of the following:

"(1) Soldiers of the Union and Confederate Armies of the Civil War;

"(2) Persons buried in Post or National cemeteries; or

"(3) Persons eligible under section 951 (a) (1) and (2) of this title for interment in a national cemetery.

"(b) The Administrator is also authorized and directed to furnish, when requested, an appropriate memorial headstone or marker to commemorate any member of the armed forces of the United States dying in the service, whose remains have not been recovered or identified or were buried at sea, for placement by the applicant in a national cemetery or in any private or local cemetery.

"(c) The Administrator is authorized to prescribe such rules and regulations with respect to the submission of applications for all Government headstones and markers and other pertinent matters as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section. He shall also cause to be preserved, from the date of the enactment of the National Cemeteries Act of 1964, the name, rank, organization, date of death, place of burial, and such other information as he shall prescribe, of all persons for whom headstones or markers are authorized by this section, when such information is known. Any such information transferred to the Administrator from the Secretary of the Army by the National Cemeteries Act of 1964, shall also be preserved."

(b) The table of chapters at the head of such title 38, and at the head of part II thereof, are each amended to add immediately following:

"23. Burial benefits."

the following:

"24. National cemeteries."

SEC. 3. (a) There are hereby transferred to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs all personnel, property, records, obligations, and commitments relating to or associated with the national cemeteries in the United States under the control of the Secretary of the Army, or relating to or associated with the furnishing of headstones or markers at the expense of the United States, and all unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations, and other funds available (or to be made available) for such purposes.

(b) Any authority given to the Secretary of the Army by the Acts of August 4, 1947 (61 Stat. 742), March 10, 1950 (64 Stat. 12), or August 10, 1950 (64 Stat. 434), to expand the existing cemetery facilities at Fort Rosecrans, California, Jefferson Barracks, Missouri, Fort Logan, Colorado, Rock Island, Illinois, Fort Leavenworth, Kansas, or Barrancas (Pensacola), Florida, shall be transferred to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, who may make such expansions, if not already accomplished, subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Army or Secretary of the Navy where surplus military property is utilized.

SEC. 4. The following provisions of law are repealed, except with respect to rights and duties that matured or penalties or liabilities that were incurred before January 1, 1965:

(1) In the Revised Statutes of the United States, sections 2870 (24 U.S.C. 271); 4871 (24 U.S.C. 272); 4872 (24 U.S.C. 273); 4873 (24 U.S.C. 274); 4874 (24 U.S.C. 275); 4875 (24 U.S.C. 276); and 4877 (24 U.S.C. 279).

(2) The Act of July 24, 1876 (19 Stat. 99; 24 U.S.C. 278).

(3) The third paragraph under the heading "National Cemeteries" in the appropriations for the Quartermaster Corps in the Act of April 15, 1926 (44 Stat. 287; 24 U.S.C. 290).

(4) The Act of June 11, 1938 (52 Stat. 668; 24 U.S.C. 289).

(5) The Act of June 29, 1938 (52 Stat. 1233; 24 U.S.C. 271a).

(6) The Act of August 4, 1947 (61 Stat. 742; 24; U.S.C. 281a–281c).

(7) The Act of March 24, 1948 (62 Stat. 84; 24 U.S.C. 275).

(8) The Act of May 14, 1948 (62 Stat. 234; 24 U.S.C. 281).

(9) The Act of July 1, 1948 (62 Stat. 1215; 24 U.S.C. 279a).

(10) The Act of March 10, 1950 (64 Stat. 12; 24 U.S.C. 281d–281f).

(11) The Act of August 10, 1950 (64 Stat. 434; 24 U.S.C. 281g).

(12) The Act of August 27, 1954 (68 Stat. 880; 24 U.S.C. 279d).

(13) The Act of September 2, 1960 (74 Stat. 739; 24 U.S.C. 295a).

SEC. 5. All rules, regulations, orders, permits, and other privileges issued or granted under the laws repealed by Sec. 4 of this Act and in effect on the date of enactment of this Act shall remain in full force and effect until modified, suspended, overruled, or otherwise changed by the Administrator.

SEC. 6. This Act shall take effect January 1, 1965.

The letter presented by Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey is as follows:

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS,
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C., May 11, 1964.

Hon. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, Jr.,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILIAMS: One of the priority legislative objectives of the Veterans of Foreign Wars for many years has been the continuation of the National Cemetery System.

Successive national conventions have adopted a multitude of resolutions calling for the establishment of new or the expansion of existing cemeteries. At the same time a resolution has been adopted for the last several years urging the Congress to set up a cemetery site selection board with authority and power to lay down standards for the establishment of new cemeteries and the enlargement of existing cemeteries for the purpose of providing and continuing national cemeteries for the burial of war veterans.

It is my understanding that you plan to introduce legislation which will authorize the consolidation of the Veterans' Administration Cemetery System with the National Cemetery System in the United States under the control of the Secretary of the Army and to place control of such consolidated system in the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. While the Veterans of Foreign Wars has no resolution or mandate dealing specifically on this point, I can assure you that our organization will be sympathetic to any and all proposals which have any chance of success in the Congress and approval of the administration concerning this program.

The average age of veterans today is 56. The average age of World War II veterans is 45. The national cemetery system is presently 100 years old and during the last 90 years the question of the capacity of these national cemeteries as opposed to the eligible veteran population has been in the main ignored. Nevertheless, during this same period conditions of eligibility have been regularly expanded.

For example, beginning with 1890, eligibility for burial in national cemeteries has steadily expanded to include spouses, widows, widowers, and minor children, not only of wartime veterans but also veterans of the peacetime establishment and their dependents. During this same period, from 1890 to date, only 17 new national cemeteries have opened. The eligible veterans, however, have increased from 1.3 million to 22.5 million and these figures do not include those on active duty. This gives some idea of the magnitude of the problem.

Traditionally the National Cemetery System has been administered by the Department of the Army. As all veterans know, most veterans' rights and benefits are administered by the Veterans' Administration. Even though the Department of the Army has handled this program, the Veterans' Administration nevertheless has under its jurisdiction 17 cemeteries located adjacent to Veterans' Administration facilities. Thus, experience in this field has already been gained over a long period of time since in effect these are national cemeteries in the broad sense.

It is interesting to note that the 87th Congress, in its appropriation act for the operation of the Veterans' Administration, authorized the development of a national cemetery for veterans in the Houston, Tex., area. Thus, the Veterans' Administration stands to gain further experience in the development and operation of a new cemetery which would be extremely helpful in the event your proposed bill is approved.

Since our organization does not have a specific mandate to accomplish the purpose of your bill, rest assured this proposal will be brought to the attention of the delegates to our next national convention which is scheduled to be held in Cleveland, Ohio, August 21–28. Previous efforts both in the Congress and administratively have failed of any affirmative action in this area. It is hoped that your bill will be the answer and provide the solution to the question of adequate space for the burial of our war veterans.

Sincerely,

FRANCIS W. STOVER,
Director, National Legislative Service.

JOINT COMMITTEE TO STUDY MATTERS RELATING TO IMPLEMENTATION OF AWARDS UNDER PUBLIC LAW 88–108

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution which would provide for the establishment of a joint committee of the two Houses of Congress to study matters relating to the implementation of the award by the board established under Public Law 88–108, to arbitrate a labor dispute between certain carriers by railroad and their employees.

The joint resolution is designed to arrange for a full and complete study and investigation relating to the implementation and application of the arbitration award, and particularly to ascertain whether the policy considerations set forth in Public Law 88–108 have been fulfilled.

Section 7(a) of that public law states:

> In making any award under this joint resolution the arbitration board established under section 2 shall give due consideration to the effect of the proposed award upon adequate and safe transportation service to the public and upon the interests of the carrier and employees affected, giving due consideration to the narrowing of the areas of disagreement which has been accomplished in bargaining and mediation.

The policy considerations as set forth by Congress in the law are very important to the national well-being. It seems to me that the establishment of a joint committee to investigate, make recommendations, and report to Congress regarding the implementation of these considerations, and to make recommendations for necessary legislation is timely and important.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 182) providing for the establishment of a joint committee of the two Houses of the Congress to study matters relating to the implementation of the award of the board established under Public Law 88–108 to arbitrate a labor dispute between certain carriers by railroad and their employees, introduced by Mr. MILLER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 248, a bill to amend section 801 of title 38, United States Code, to provide assistance in acquiring specially adapted housing for certain blind veterans who have suffered the loss or loss of use of a lower extremity, and that the bill be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency for consideration.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONTINUANCE FOR A TEMPORARY PERIOD CERTAIN EXISTING RULES RELATING TO DEDUCTIBILITY OF ACCRUED VACATION PAY—AMENDMENT (AMENDMENT NO. 1111)

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to the bill H.R. 10467. If the amendment is adopted, it will authorize the Secretary of Commerce to investigate and study the feasibility of imposing taxes on those transient and commuter systems which are to be the beneficiaries of the Federal financial assistance program under the Urban Transportation Act of 1964.

The Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] has made the statement that the reclamation projects in the West have been self-liquidating and that the cost of the projects have been substantially repaid to the Federal Government, not to the taxpayers.

The amendment, which is sponsored by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and myself, contemplates a study out of which might come a recommendation that taxes be imposed upon those transportation systems that are to become the beneficiaries of the Subsidy Act of 1964.

In principle, what we have in mind is related to the method under which we have financed the Interstate Highway System of the Federal Government. The excise taxes were proposed, earmarked, and placed into a trust fund. Out of that trust fund 90 percent of the cost of building the Interstate Highway System has been paid.

It is the opinion of the Senator from Viriginia [Mr. BYRD] and myself that a study of this character is justified, for it may disclose that there are ways and means of financing this undertaking separate and apart from the general burden that is imposed upon the general taxpayer.

Mr. President, I ask that the amendment be printed and that it be referred to the committee.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be printed and appropriately referred.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] be added as a sponsor of the amendment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 1111) was referred to the Committee on Finance.

FURTHER AMENDMENT OF FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961—AMENDMENT (AMENDMENT NO. 1112)

Mr. JAVITS submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 11380) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON S. 108, A BILL MAKING COLUMBUS DAY A LEGAL HOLIDAY

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on behalf of the standing Subcommittee on Federal Charters, Holidays, and Celebrations, of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Wednesday, August 12, 1964, at 10 a.m., in room 2228, New Senate Office Building, on S. 108, a bill making Columbus Day a legal holiday.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearing may make such representations as may be pertinent.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan], the Senator from New York [Mr. Keating], and myself, as chairman.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

By Mr. BEALL:

Address delivered by Congresswoman Catherine May, before the annual convention of the Maryland-Washington, D.C.-Delaware Broadcasters' Association, at Rehoboth Beach, Del.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

Address by Dr. Glenn T. Seaborg at luncheon honoring delegates to the National Youth Science Camp; introduction of Dr. Seaborg by Senator Randolph; list of delegates to National Youth Science Camp.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

Excerpts from address delivered by Hon. Steward Udall, Secretary of the Department of the Interior, at the dedication celebration of the New Jersey Great Swamp National Wildlife Refuge, on May 29, 1964.

MRS. JACQUELINE KENNEDY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the news that Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy is moving to New York is understandable, but saddening. Washington's loss will be New York's gain, for wherever she goes, Mrs. Kennedy brings the grace, nobility of spirit, and an awareness and concern for the beauty and humanity of the conditions around her which have won the hearts of millions.

She brought to this city a youthful warmth, a unique personal manner, and an exceptional artistic and cultural sensitivity which has left the Capital with a permanent enrichment. And what was gained here by her presence and leadership was felt throughout the Nation and the world.

Mrs. Kennedy leaves Washington as a permanent resident for personal reasons which are as poignant as they are well-founded. However much we may regret the decision, we can only bow to it. No one has a greater right than Mrs. Kennedy to reorder her life and that of her wonderful children as she sees fit. We can only ask that she continue, in ways of her own choosing, to contribute her graciousness, her courage, and her great abilities to the Nation.

Two editorials, from the Washington Evening Star and the Washington Daily News, express the regret, understanding, and good wishes of all of us, I know, at Mrs. Kennedy's decision to move to New York. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these editorials, dated July 8, be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, July 8, 1964]

Goodby, Lady

Jacqueline Kennedy will move to New York in the fall, and Washington will be the poorer for her move. Citizens who hate to see her go will nevertheless understand the decision. Not only are there the persistent sad memories of Washington and Georgetown, but the turning of her home into a prime tourist attraction added to the problem.

The hold was mutual. She came among us like some wildly unexpected fairy queen, a total surprise in the homely landscape of our national politics. She walked in beauty like Byron's verses and what she touched was touched with grace.

When she, and we, were touched by fate too horrible to speak, she more than any American rose to fate and showed that since it must be borne it can be borne with dignity. In a time grown soft with self-pity, she revealed again what the Greeks first learned: That tragedy can be beautiful, can be uplifting, can enhance the life of the wounded spirit.

She goes and with her goes the heart of everyone who has lived in this place while she did. May God lighten the days of her future as she has lightened the days of our past.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, July 8, 1964]

Godspeed

We are saddened by Jacqueline Kennedy's decision to leave Washington. We were graced by her presence here—in the days when her family was all together and in the time of the great loss which they and this whole Nation shared.

And yet we understand her wish to go where her children, who have yet to experience a fully "normal" life—and perhaps never shall—at least can have a somewhat better chance for it.

We are sorry for the many intrusions on their privacy here—simple-minded some of it, but all occasioned by love and respect—and we trust that these trespasses will be forgiven.

Wherever they go, we will keep a place for this young family here—in our hearts. Godspeed. We hope that before too many years have passed they will come home to us.

INCREASED PAY AND ALLOWANCES FOR THE MILITARY NEEDED

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, Congress has seen fit to respond to the urging of successive Presidents to provide an ample salary scale for the civilian officials and employees of the Government. It would be my hope that we would now approach the problem of military pay scales in the armed services with something of the same understanding and zeal.

We ask a great deal of the men and women in the services. We charge them with enormous responsibilities. We expect of them an unquestioning dedication and a high sense of discipline in carrying out these responsibilities. But we provide pay and allowances which are generally inadequate, and all too often work an actual hardship on the families of servicemen. Some of our servicemen even have to moonlight. It is my understanding that in the Air Force alone there are at least 5,000 members of that service who have to hold 2 jobs, in order to make ends meet for their families.

We need to attract and to hold able people in careers in the military service. This vital need has grown in proportion to the growth in military science and technology. We can no longer afford the luxury of low pay and poor living conditions for our military. Developing skills and training technicians to operate and service jet planes, missile sites, and nuclear submarines is expensive and time consuming. Skills such as these command high salaries in private industry, and too frequently men with training vital to the national defense are lured away by higher salaries and more attractive emoluments. The effort to compensate by the draft system for this situation is growing as unfair as it already is inadequate.

Mr. President, the defense of the Nation and of freedom depends in great part on the Armed Forces. We must maintain a first-rate Military Establishment; and the men and women who staff it deserve first-rate treatment insofar as pay and allowances and fringe benefits are concerned.

Mr. President, under the chairmanship of its distinguished chairman [Mr. Russell], I am confident that the able members of the Armed Services Committee will give this matter the prompt and careful consideration which it deserves.

I would point out that, in my opinion, a pay raise is an economy measure, because of the great amounts of money the Government must spend in training the members of our armed services. If they leave the armed services—which many of them do not wish to do—because of the low pay and lack of allowances, that means that the Government has to start once again from scratch, and thereby the costs are increased.

I repeat that a sizable increase in pay, something in accordance with that recently granted the civil service and the Members of Congress, and perhaps more, should be given consideration, and should be acted on before Congress adjourns this year.

I ask unanimous consent to have an article on this subject, written by John G. Norris, which is published in the Washington Post of July 9, printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Congress Takes Service Pay Boost Off Shelf

(By John G. Norris)

Congressional leaders have revived the administration's long-dormant military pay increase proposal and will seek passage of a cost-of-living raise for the armed services before adjournment.

Chairman Richard B. Russell, Democrat, of Georgia, said yesterday that his Senate Armed Services Committee will hold hearings on such legislation and that he "hopes" a "simplified" bill can be got through Congress.

Representative L. Mendel Rivers, Democrat, of South Carolina, ranking Democrat on the House Armed Services Committee and chairman of its pay subcommittee, was even more optimistic. He said a military pay bill will be introduced when the House reconvenes after the Republican convention and that "I am sure we can pass it before adjournment."

Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara sent a draft of legislation to Congress in February to carry out a pledge last year by President Kennedy who promised to push for pay boosts when necessary to keep servicemen abreast of pay in civilian life.

It has been pigeonholed in the Senate and House Armed Services Committees ever since.

McNamara asked for a flat 3-percent increase in base pay for officers and 2.4 percent for enlisted men with more than 2 years service. It would cost about $200 million a year.

Congressional indifference toward the Pentagon proposal stemmed from the facts that it had passed an average 15 percent military pay boost last October. But last week's Senate action in voting an average 4.3-percent raise for Federal civil service employees, 5.6 percent for postal employees, and $7,500 for Congressmen changed the situation.

Russell now has his committee staff at work revamping the Pentagon bill. He thinks its approach is "too complex." He said he probably will push a simpler bill costing about $50 million more than McNamara's proposal.

This could mean about a 3-percent boost for all military, except men serving their obligated 2 years.

FAIR EMPLOYMENT MILESTONE—STATEMENT BY SENATOR GOLDWATER

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a statement by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Goldwater] and an attached newspaper editorial.

There being no objection, the statement and the article were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement by Senator Goldwater

On Monday, July 6, the Washington Daily News very properly hailed the decision of the NLRB that a union practicing racial discrimination is guilty of an unfair labor practice. When I first came to this body, 12 years ago, and was placed on the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, Senator Taft told me that if we could make certain that every bill pertaining to labor that passed the committee contained a provision against discrimination, where appropriate, within a relatively short time these discriminatory practices could be cleared. Time after time after time in the intervening years, I and others on the committee have tried to amend various pieces of legislation before us so that this type of provision would be included. We always lost, because the so-called liberal members of the committee on both sides of the aisle consistently voted against these amendments. Because the Labor and Public Welfare Committee keeps no official record of its committee meetings, other than scribbled notes of its chief clerk, I have had to depend upon those notes, plus notes of my own and my staff, to compile partial lists of the efforts that have been made to end discrimination and the actions taken upon them. The compilation is as follows:

NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT AMENDMENTS, JUNE 1961

Segregation—Grandfather clause amendment

Senator Javits proposed the following amendment: "The Commissioner shall not make any loan under the provision of this section to any private nonprofit elementary or secondary school unless such school or the school system of which it is a part was in full-term operation during each of the 4 calendar years immediately preceding the date of enactment of the National Defense Education Act amendments of 1961."

A question was raised, asking if the National Defense Education Act is an appropriate means for obtaining civil rights legislation.

Senator Javits said this was a specific limit on Federal loans to certain types of private schools.

The amendment was rejected—9 of 10 Democratic Senators voting against it, while 5 Republican Senators, including Senator Goldwater, and 1 Democratic Senator voted for it.

S. 1—Youth Employment Act, March 1963

Senator Goldwater offered four amendments to deal with discrimination on account of race, color, creed, and national origin. The amendments were as follows:

On page 7, line 24, after the word "title" insert a colon and the following:

"*Provided*, That the Director may exclude from enrollment such classes of persons as he may consider detrimental to the well-being or welfare of the corps except that no person shall be excluded on account of race, color, or creed."

On page 21, line 7, after the word "title" insert a colon and the following:

"*Provided*, That the Secretary may exclude from enrollment such classes of persons as he may consider detrimental to the well-being or welfare of the corps except that no person shall be excluded on account of race, color, or creed."

On page 3, line 25, after the word "responsibility" insert the following: "which agreements with Federal agencies shall (A) prescribe that there shall be no discrimination on account of race, creed, color, or national origin in the employment of the resources, areas, and facilities to be protected, conserved, developed, or managed, and (B) shall give the Attorney General of the United States the right to enforce such prescription."

On page 19, line 4, after the word "authorities" insert a colon and the following:

"*Provided*, That the Secretary of Labor shall provide no assistance or cooperation to any private agency or any agency of any State, county, or local government, unless such agency (A) shall prescribe that there shall be no discrimination on account of race, creed, color, or national origin in the employment of the resources, areas, and facilities to be protected, conserved, developed or managed, and, (B) shall give the Attorney General of the United States the right to enforce such prescription."

Senator Goldwater's amendments were defeated 4 to 9.

Senator Goldwater's antidiscrimination amendments to S. 1, the youth employment bill, were offered on the Senate floor by Senator Tower.

The first amendment, which included antidiscrimination language in the original CCC bill, was adopted by a 71-to-15 vote. Senator Goldwater voted "yea."

The second amendment prohibited discrimination in areas in which the Youth Corps was to be utilized. Senator Mansfield's motion to table this amendment carried 50 to 41. Senator Goldwater voted "nay."

The third amendment prohibited the Secretary of Labor from providing assistance under the bill to areas or localities which discriminated. Senator Mansfield again moved to table. His motion passed 58 to 33. Senator Goldwater voted "nay."

Immediately prior to the final vote on the bill itself Senator Goldwater made a strong statement in regard to these antidiscrimination amendments:

"Mr. Goldwater. When we characterize Senators as heroes of particular campaigns, we should include not only the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Prouty] but also the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower]. He finally brought the issue out: Who are the phonies on civil rights? His question has been answered without a doubt."

S. 1321, to create a National Service Corps, July 1963

Senator Goldwater offered three amendments in behalf of Senator Tower, all related to antidiscrimination. The three amendments are as follows:

Page 24, line 3, add following the period:

"Such terms and conditions of enrollment, training, and service shall in no manner discriminate against nor give preference to any individual or class of persons on account of race, color, creed, or ethnic origin."

Page 28, line 4, add following the period:

"No such contracts, leases, and agreements shall be entered into with any agency, organization, or political subdivision that exercises discrimination on account of race, color, creed, or ethnic origin."

Page 28, line 16, after the word "Act" insert a colon and the following:

"*Provided*, That the Director may exclude from enrollment such persons as he may consider detrimental to the well-being or welfare of the Corps except that no person shall be excluded on account of race, color, creed, or ethnic origin."

Senator Goldwater said he felt all legislation should contain provisions against discrimination, that there would not be the national crisis in civil rights today if this had been done as he had been urging.

Senator Goldwater said that a Davis-Bacon provision is written into every bill. He said the southerners would oppose his amendments, but they could be voted down. He said labor unions talk a lot about desegregation but they don't act.

On a rollcall vote, all three Tower amendments were rejected, four to eight. Senator Goldwater voting in favor of them.

Senator Tower offered one of his antidiscrimination amendments to the National Service Corps bill on the floor of the Senate. This amendment prohibited the Corps from entering into contracts with organizations and local governments which discriminated. Senator Mansfield moved to table and his motion was agreed to by a vote of 49 to 41. Senator Goldwater voted "nay."

I also call attention to the following editorial from the Washington Daily News of July 6:

"FAIR EMPLOYMENT MILESTONE

"Almost a year to the day before it becomes effective, the controversial fair-employment section of the civil rights law has been overshadowed in a decision by the National Labor Relations Board.

"In a history-making decision, the NLRB has held that a union practicing racial discrimination is guilty of an unfair labor practice. The case involved a Negro excluded from an apprenticeship program because of his race. The independent Metal Workers Union of Houston, Tex., lost its certification as bargaining agent in a Hughes Tool Co. plant as a result of his complaint.

"This leaves this union open to raids by other unions. It cancels the union's right to file cases with the NLRB. The board now can compel the Negro worker to be accepted as an apprentice, by court action if necessary.

"The decision results from a 2-year legal campaign by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and should strengthen the position of leadership occupied by the NAACP, as opposed to more radical elements in the civil rights cause.

"The AFL–CIO officially opposes racial discrimination but has been unable to get some of its member unions to comply. In the Houston case the AFL–CIO had no authority because the accused union is not a member of the national organization.

"While the fair employment section of the civil rights law stresses conciliation and will not actually be fully effective until 1968, this NLRB decision provides direct recourse against practices denying Negroes work and advancement in industry.

"In many fields a man without a union card cannot get a job, regardless of his training and ability. And he cannot get the card if he is colored. This obviously violates the spirit of national labor legislation designed to protect the rights of all workers. Under this NLRB decision—long delayed, in our opinion—it also violates the letter of the law.

"The decision should help substantially to break down the color bars which deny the Negro his equal chance to make a living—without which the other rights endorsed in the bill just passed by Congress are not worth much."

ALASKA DIGS OUT

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, one of the first Federal officials from Washington to visit the scene of the Alaska disaster was Robert E. Wolf, Assistant to the Director of the Bureau of Land Management. He has now written a report of his visit, an article published in the May issue of American Forests.

I ask unanimous consent to have this interesting report printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALTERS in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALASKA DIGS OUT

(By Robert E. Wolf)

(The author, Robert E. Wolf, is assistant to the Director of the Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior. He was the first Interior Department official from the Washington office on the scene of the earthquake, arriving at Anchorage 24 hours after the quake struck. He has been designated by Secretary of the Interior Udall as a special assistant to Under Secretary James Carr to assist in bringing the best efforts of the Department to the rebuilding of Alaska.)

For Alaskans, when the sun rose on Good Friday, it looked like a wonderful day was dawning. Up until almost sunset it was. The day was warm—about 35 degrees along coastal Alaska—the wind was light and the snow was melting rapidly. The ice seemed to start out of many small harbors. Easter was aproaching and, as it always has for much of the world, it signified spring.

Enjoying the spring grazing were the cattle of Louis Beaty. He's one of the 29,000 ranchers who depend upon Bureau of Land Management land for grazing, but his grazing permit is unique because it is located on Kodiak Island in the Gulf of Alaska.

His cattle usually graze right along the water's edge until late afternoon when they work their way up to higher ground. Early in the afternon he curiously noticed his stock up on the higher elevation. He merely noted the fact but before the sun set on this Good Friday he would know that his livestock sensed some danger lurking beneath the pasture near the calm Alaska Sea.

Before the sun would set on March 27, this would be a far different day for the people of Alaska living along 600 miles of her vast coastline, and even for people as far away as Crescent City, Calif.

At 5:37 p.m. Alaska Standard Time an earthquake struck south-central Alaska; Anchorage, Seward, Kodiak, Valdez, Cordova, Whittier, Chenange, and a host of other towns and hamlets in the 49th State were struck by a great earthquake which jumped the seismographs to 8.7 on the Richter Scale, and recorded the most violent tremors ever on this continent. With it came a gigantic seismic wave which cracked a mountain of water over the coastal towns like a bullwhip; then fire gutted Seward, Whittier, and Valdez.

PRESIDENT ADVISED IN SECONDS

President Johnson, who was in Texas, received immediate notice of the earthquake through the defense network just a few seconds after it occurred. He ordered Ed McDermott his Director of the Office of Emergency Planning, into action. Among the earliest to learn of the disaster were Senators E. L. "BOB" BARTLETT and ERNEST GRUENING who, like President Johnson, spent most of the night getting direct reports from General Reeves, of the Alaska Command.

I first learned of the disaster in the Saturday morning paper. My last experience with an earthquake was in 1959 in Montana. Remembering well the violence, I sensed that the Alaska quake, considering the city of Anchorage with its population of 50,000 could be catastrophic. I also feared that many of our personnel and their families might have been killed or injured.

I called Charles H. Stoddard, the Director of the Bureau of Land Management, to discuss what we had to do; we agreed an effort should be made to get a BLM official to Alaska as fast as possible. Another call to Capitol Hill revealed that Senators Bartlett and Gruening of Alaska, and Ed. McDermott, the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning, were leaving for Alaska in an hour in a special Presidential plane; in 30 minutes I was at Andrews Air Force Base and we were on our way.

IN TOUCH WITH PRESIDENT

As the jet flew at over 600 miles per hour at 30,000 feet, facts were coming in on the quake. Early reports were that over 600 were dead, and that Anchorage and other cities, Seward, Valdez, and Whittier were aflame and the victims of a seismic wave. Later the death toll was estimated to be at least 100.

At about 6 p.m. Anchorage time, we approached the city as low as the pilot could permit. From the air, at first glance, the damage did not seem extensive. Most of the major buildings were standing. This gave a deceptive appearance because we all expected that such landmarks as the Mt. McKinley Hotel would have tumbled in the shattering earthquake.

As soon as we landed at Elmendorf Air Force Base, we met with General Reeves, Governor Egan, and key State and Federal officials to get their on-the-spot reports; it was a major catastrophe. We immediately went into Anchorage, not fully prepared for the impact of what we would see. A newly opened six-story J. C. Penney store looked like a giant hand had squeezed it.

Roger Robinson, the State director of the Bureau of Land Management, told me that when the earthquake struck he was at a small farewell party for a group of BLM employees who were being transferred to other States. He had just lifted a glass of mild refreshment to his lips when the building started to quiver and shake. With a quick gulp on the run, he and the rest ran out. The earth was shaking under them and buildings were waving madly.

The whole side of the street in one city block had dropped 20 feet into a crevasse created by the earthquake. Most of the major buildings in town, the apartment houses, schools, stores, and hospitals over three stories high were shattered by huge cracks running up and down their faces. The odd thing was that on the other side of this street the buildings stood there as though nothing had happened—the very huge plate glass windows still intact.

The downtown area was without lights and patrolled by soldiers and civil defense workers. Others were busy searching the buildings to see if there were still people in them.

WOOD BUILDINGS RODE IT OUT

The huge concrete-and-steel buildings seemed to have suffered the greatest damage in the quake. Many of the small wooden buildings and homes had ridden the earthquake out reasonably intact, except those that were immediately astride crevasses or in Turnagain Arms, a heavily hit residential area.

Before leaving Andrews Field, Secretary of the Interior Udall had designated me to act temporarily as departmental officer in Alaska to assess earthquake damage and take necessary action. When we returned to Elmendorf Air Force Base from our tour of the city at about 8 p.m., I met with key Interior Department officials to assess damages and, as much as possible, assess the damage and injuries which Department personnel and their families had suffered. It later turned out that only one railroad employees had been killed. But many employees and their families had been near casualties.

It was apparent that the Department faced several major problems. First and foremost was the Alaska Railroad which the earthquake rendered inoperative all the way from Healey Fork north of Mt. McKinley down to the all-weather ports of Seward and Whittier. Manager John Manley described the damage and the total loss of port rail facilities. Prompt repair of the railroad was the highest priority item because the harbor at Anchorage is not ice free year round and is not adequate to handle all of the traffic required for defense, interior Alaska, and the normal rebuilding needs in the Anchorage area.

The second major problem was the almost total destruction of the fisheries resource in the area the earthquake hit. Whole islands had been lifted up and dropped down by the earthquake. Razor clam beds that had been lifted above normal tide levels suffered catastrophic damage. The king and Dungeness crab industries had their fishing fleets, canneries, and refrigerator plants swept away. Even worse, in some areas fire had burned out canneries.

The BLM's newly rented six-story building in Anchorage was a jumble of office equipment, files, and survey and forestry tools. Since the State's land records and much of the natural resource servicing the Bureau provides Alaska is dependent upon this office, it was important to reestablish operations there.

CIRCUIT BREAKERS KNOCKED OUT

At that early period the extent of the damage to the Bureau of Reclamation's 30,000-kilowatt powerplant and dam at Eklutna had not been determined. It provides essential power both to Anchorage and Palmer. When the quake struck, the powerplant and its two huge generators, which are in a tremendous concrete building footed on a bedrock base, had been lifted and vibrated to such an extent that the employees inside could not get out of the building. A huge overhead crane used to service the turbines had been swinging madly back and forth making it impossible to exit through the turbine room. The quake had knocked out the circuit breakers, but by Saturday evening the Bureau of Reclamation crew had been able to bridge these and were able to get the generators back in operation. Despite the tremendous upheaval that the quake caused, the turbines were operative, although they could be run at only half speed because stones as big as a man's head were coming through the 9-mile tunnel from Eklutna Lake and hitting the turbine wheels.

The powerplant had been designed to withstand a 5.0 Richter Scale earthquake. It withstood an 8.7 quake, or measured in physical intensity, a quake over 5,000 times greater.

The Bureau of Indian Affairs provides health, hospital, education, and other services to the native population, many of whom live in outlying villages in the Kodiak area.

All day Saturday the BLM pilots were busy helping those in outlying towns—Cordova, Valdez, Whittier, Seward, and others—flying out people needing medical attention. The Bureau also manned fire control stations so that equipment would be available wherever needed.

Saturday night we decided that John Manley, Manager of the Alaska Railroad, Roger Robinson, State director of the BLM, Senator Bartlett, and myself would fly over the route of the Alaska Railroad Sunday morning from Anchorage to Whittier to Seward to determine what it would take to get the railroad into operation.

We took off in a BLM Grumman Goose and headed for Seward following the route of the Alaska Railroad.

PLOWED BY PAUL BUNYAN

As we started over the city we flew above Turnagain Arms, Anchorage's finest residential district. The area looked as if Paul Bunyan had gone over it with a 60-foot plow. In the furrows were crevasses so deep whole houses were dropped into them and invisible from the ground. Automobiles were strewn about in and around and under houses. Some of the houses appeared to be virtually intact while others were completely destroyed. Those houses nearest the water's edge were in a mire of muck.

The damage that the earthquake did here was compounded by the unstable nature of the soil. The Geological Survey some 5 years ago had made a special report on the Alaskan soil characteristics which showed that there was a bed of slippery clay underlying the alluvial soil. When the earthquake hit, the effect on the homes of this fine residential area was like that of stepping on a banana peel at the edge of a swimming pool. A major cause of the extensive damage in the Turnagain Arms area occurred because the ground actually slithered on this slippery clay base into Cook Inlet.

All told in Alaska, over 1,000 houses were so badly damaged that they may never again be usable. Earthquake insurance is extremely expensive, so virtually no one carries it The losses that homeowners and businessmen suffered will have to be borne personally unless some special legislation is enacted by local, State or Federal Governments for economic relief.

As our plane flew over Anchorage we saw a weaving path of destruction beneath us. Along the railroad line heading for Potters Hill on the edge of town, a huge slide had taken the railroad tracks and plunged them into Cook Inlet.

Every mile of the roadbed had some sort of damage. The bridges that cross the many little streams into Turnagain Inlet were bowed up. In other places the tidal wave action had stripped out the fill on each side of the railroad bridges. The railroad track was either twisted vertically or horizontally—and sometimes both. Huge snowslides, sometimes 25 feet in depth, had come down the mountains to cover the track in at least 20 places between Anchorage and Portage.

PALL OF SMOKE OVER BAY

As we went over the pass and down into Seward the sight that greeted us from the air was terrifying. A huge pall of smoke hung over the whole bay. Fire still burned brightly along the waterfront. The mountain in back of Seward was covered to an elevation of 3,000 feet with a gray soot from the heavy fire. It looked as though not a building along the waterfront had survived.

Seward, one of the two all-weather termini of the Alaska Railroad, was one of the hardest hit coastal cities. After the quake, the huge seismic wave ripped across the bay followed by exploding waterfront gas and oil storage tanks. Twenty-five feet high at its crest, the wave swept burning water over the lower part of the town and up the bay toward the airport. The water hit with such force that three huge railroad gantry cranes on the railroad dock disappeared into the water; a 100-foot ocean ship was gone; dock and railroad tracks were ripped out as though they had never existed.

When we landed at the airport we met a young man and his wife who were trying to reach Anchorage to get a portable generator for their chicken farm. They had no electricity, no water, and 14,000 chickens. Already townspeople had come out to the farm to help kill, pluck, and preserve the chickens for food. Seward was dependent entirely upon air traffic since the road, the bridge, and the railroad were out.

Fox, the chicken farmer, told us how he had been driving toward his farm when the earthquake hit. At first he thought he had blown a tire on his car. He stopped. The car kept trembling. Then he thought he had thrown a rod in the engine. He turned off his engine and the car still trembled. It was only then he realized he was in an earthquake. His first thought was to try to get home. He started up again and approached a bridge which dropped out of sight as he slammed on his brakes at the very brink.

A passing dump truck picked us up and as we rode into town in the back the driver told Senator BARTLETT his brother's boat was the only one that appeared to have survived the earthquake and seismic wave. Shortly we came upon it—the *Celtic*—perched on the edge of the woods about one-half mile from the water's edge as if it had always been there. We drove on into Seward through a sea of homes, cars, boats, trucks, beds, and other debris. The driver pointed out various personal effects belonging to his family: his mother's house, a relative's trailer, his new red automobile overturned in a pool of water 500 yards from where it had been when the earthquake hit. The scene was one of complete ruin and desolation.

As we drove up to the school a huge crowd was gathered at the provisional headquarters that the mayor of Seward had set up. Seward was to hold its All American City celebration the following week and the kind of response that people of the city of Seward made to their plight proved indeed they were an All American City. The large gathering was there not to greet us but because it was rumored another seismic wave was coming and the school was on high ground. The first seismic wave had hit immediately after the earthquake. At 3 a.m. Sunday, everyone in the town had been awakened and sent to higher ground because of a report a second giant wave was on its way.

The one seismic wave that hit Seward was enough. One man told us about a marine railway just outside the city which he and his brother had been working over 6 years to complete. They had over $100,000 invested in the project, he said. At 5:30 p.m. on the day the earthquake hit, they had just decided that their work was done. They were about to head back to their house when the earthquake struck. One of them jumped into a car and the other into a pickup. They saw a huge crest of water, over 25 feet high, coming across the bay toward them at a speed of 500 miles an hour. The wave threw their vehicles over one-half mile, overturned them, and tossed the men into its swirling water. Both of them swam desperately and miraculously escaped alive but wet and cold when the water receded.

THREE KNOCKOUT PUNCHES

As they shivered in the cold they could see their Seward in the distance, a victim of three knockout punches—the earthquake, a seismic wave, and fire from some 20 oil and gasoline storage tanks that had exploded—all in the space of 30 minutes.

At 10 o'clock that night, the two finally made their way back to town only to find virtually everything they owned had been destroyed.

The Seward waterfront, a jumble of burned and twisted oil and boxcars, was in shambles. A huge 60-ton diesel engine had been overturned and carried over 100 yards by the seismic wave. Battered boats were everywhere. Near the head of the bay wrecks were impaled on trees, pushed into the brush and timber. At one place a boat was resting on dry land as though it had been there forever.

The people of Seward were not idle. The mayor and town officials had established a community kitchen to take care of the people remaining in the town. All of the food and bedding that could be obtained had been commandeered and placed in a central location. Citizens and soldiers who had been flown in by the Alaska Command were patrolling the destroyed area. Crews were working everywhere to begin the repair of the roads and clean up the debris so that Seward could start rebuilding. Everyone we saw looked haggard. Over 36 hours had elapsed since the earthquake and most of the people had not had a pause for a wink of sleep.

Gov. Bill Egan was there talking with the mayor and other officials about what could be done to help Seward get back on its feet. Everyone was determined that Seward would rebuild.

From Seward, we flew on up to Whittier while Governor Egan went down to Valdez, his hometown. The sight at Whittier was one of equal desolation, mitigated only by the fact that Whittier is a smaller city. As we came over the town, we could see it was deserted except for a few Alaska Railroad engineers seeking to determine what could be done to get the railroad back in operation.

We continued our flight over the Columbia Glazier toward Valdez. The Columbia Glacier, its ice going back for many miles, seemed undisturbed by the earthquake but as we came over the mountain that brings you into Valdez we saw a pall of smoke lying over the beautiful little town called the Switzerland of America.

It was apparent that Valdez, too, had been badly hit. Gasoline and oil tanks were still burning furiously. In all, some 15 bulk fuel tanks, bunched near the docks, were still sending smoke 3 to 4,000 feet into the skies. When the quake hit Valdez, the *Chena* steamer had been within 10 minutes of completing its unloading at the dock. About 30 people were there. Suddenly, a huge chasm opened and swallowed the dock and it simply dropped out of sight.

The *Chena* hit the bottom of the bay, was lifted again, and again bounced down. When it came up the second time, there was no sign of the dock. The people who had been gathered there were gone. Planks and timbers were rocketed into the town by the impact of the earthquake as it ran along the waterfront. The small boat harbor and all the boats were completely obliterated. About 10 p.m. Valdez had its fire. The tanks exploded covering the whole town with flames. About 75 percent of Valdez had been burned or destroyed by the fire and quake.

Valdez is the home of Governor Egan. His sister Alice Horton was standing in front of the bank when the quake struck. She said the ground rose nearly as high as the building and a wall of water began rolling up the street. She began to run but was caught by the water. Two children dashed back and pulled her free. She said there had been 7 feet of water in the buildings. Along the main street, we could see the high-water marks.

DETERMINED TO REBUILD

The Governor stood with us, knowing that almost everything had been wiped out. He had been on his feet without pause for over 40 hours, redeyed, face drawn, and shoulders slumped. As he and Senator BARTLETT surveyed the wreckage, he turned and said: "Somehow or other we're going to rebuild, but I don't know how we'll do it."

PEOPLE DID NOT PANIC

Surveying the damage, it was difficult to see how so many had survived. When all the facts are in, the reasons for the relatively low death toll may be clearer than they are now. The quake, followed by the tidal wave and fire, hit one of the most heavily populated parts of Alaska. The quake's line through the city of Anchorage alone was in an area of extremely heavy population.

As far as I could determine, the major reason for the low death toll was that people didn't panic. Alaskans have had experience with tremors before. After the quake's full force and effect were felt they kept their heads. People in the waterfront communities also realized that the quake would probably bring a seismic wave. Normal communication facilities were disrupted, and a great deal of credit is due the ham radio operators who spread the word far and wide in hamlet and village as to what was happening and what further precautions should be taken.

We flew to Anchorage from Valdez that evening, arriving about 5 p.m. As we came back, we wondered how the job of rehabilitation could be done. The State was in shambles and all means of livelihood had come to a standstill. Alaskans were challenged by a superhuman test of rebuilding and saddled with debts with no collateral to back any loans they might seek. The State government is potentially faced with a drop in revenue from the State income tax.

But the Alaskans we talked to showed a firm determination to rebuild Alaska's economy and get on with the job. No one sounded discouraged even though he may have lost all his material possessions.

RAILROAD GETS PRIORITY

On our return to Anchorage, we met with key officials. It was decided high priority should be given to reconstruction of the Alaska Railroad. Without it, all of Alaska would be in serious economic difficulty, because it is the main artery from Seward and Whittier through Anchorage and on to Fairbanks.

Second, the reconstruction of the railroad would show private industry that the Federal Government, which operates the Alaska Railroad, had faith in Alaska's ability to bounce back, and encourage private rebuilding in the ports of Seward and Whittier, as well as in Anchorage. Rapid restoration of the railroad would also serve as a public works stimulus providing jobs and payrolls.

The second priority was to restore the fishing industry's economic force in the State. Alaska is heavily dependent upon its fishing industry and it was decided every effort would be made by the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries of the Department of the Interior and by the Small Business Administration and other organizations to get Alaska's fishing industry back on its feet. With boats and with canneries in operation, payrolls would be restored and Alaska would be back on the road to progress.

Another essential need was to get the Bureau of Land Management back in operation. Without basic land records, much of Alaska's development would be stifled. Surveys must be continued to permit the orderly growth of the State, and to assure intensified fire control to protect Alaska's valuable resources during the coming summer.

Fortunately, the Nation's defense capability in Alaska was not reduced by the earthquake. Elmendorf Air Base, while sustaining substantial damage, was always completely operational, and, in fact, was able to release personnel to render yeoman assistance to the civilian population.

WHERE AND HOW TO REBUILD?

A major problem facing the hard-hit cities in Alaska, is where to rebuild and how to rebuild. A decision was reached that the Geological Survey in Interior and the Housing and Home Finance Agency would cooperate in making key personnel available to the Governor and the mayors and other municipal officers to assist in aiding the rebuilding of private businesses and homes on areas where soil was most stable at the earliest practicable date.

We had spent the Easter weekend hard at work. The group which had flown up from Washington had had only a few hours sleep in 48 and, as we started back for Washington, we knew that a huge job lay ahead of us. We left Anchorage at 7:30 p.m. Sunday and arrived at about 7:30 a.m. Washington time. At 9 a.m. I met with Secretary of the Interior Udall, Under Secretary Carr, Assistant Secretaries Carver and Holum, and other Department officials to give a report.

Secretary Udall acted swiftly. He designated Under Secretary Carr as his special delegate to handle all earthquake matters and he dedicated all Department of the Interior resources toward making a maximum contribution to help Alaskans.

The role of the Department in Alaska is to serve the needs of the people through its management of the natural resources. The Alaska Railroad, the assistance to commercial and sports fishing, the services to the native population by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the land records and land management operations of the Bureau of Land Management, the geologic and water assistance and mineral development which comes from the Geological Survey and the Bureau of Mines, all are geared to Alaska's development.

The activities of the Department of the Interior in restoring Alaska are but a part of the larger effort by the people of Alaska, by its local governments, by its State government under Governor Egan, and by the various other Federal agencies working through the special Commission appointed by President Lyndon B. Johnson and chaired by Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, of New Mexico. As you read this report the work of the special Anderson Commission will be well underway. Alaska will rebuild so that it will be better tomorrow—better than it was when the Good Friday earthquake hit.

THEY HAVE OWN WAY TO FIGHT REDS

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, in the Los Angeles Times for April 27, there was an article entitled "They Have Own Way To Fight Reds," written by the distinguished columnist, Victor Riesel.

This timely and excellent article relates to Self-Help, Inc., an Iowa nonprofit organization which has exerted a considerable amount of influence among some of the underdeveloped nations, in helping people to help themselves.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Los Angeles (Calif.) Times, Apr. 27, 1964]

THEY HAVE OWN WAY TO FIGHT REDS

(By Victor Riesel)

WAVERLY, IOWA.—There are dedicated men in this small Midwest city who have developed a counterinsurgency strategy which may yet frustrate Peiping and Havana guerrillas in the jungles of the world.

For this is the hometown of Self-Help, Inc., into which pour the energies of a few who wearied of asking futilely, "What can we do about it?" and decided simply to "do it."

Actually this story begins back in 1935 when the Chinese Communists were on their retreat into the isolated northwest area of the mainland. They stopped long enough to choose Mao Tse-tung as their leader at the Tsun-yi conference. This choice signified a victory over the Stalinist faction which believed that Communist revolutions could only succeed in the big cities.

Mao became party leader, with an independent strategic concept—the concept of rural guerrilla warfare which is now shaking the world. It is based on winning the support of the impoverished populace in the open fields and tangled jungles. Today it has become Fidel Castro's master plan as well.

Here in Waverly some men are working hard and in undeserved obscurity to frustrate that master strategy. Self-Help picks out areas in the jungles of the world, especially in Latin and Central America, and locates masses of hungry people. It supplies them with farm equipment like harvesting machinery, tiny power stations and simple tools which enable indigent peoples to build for themselves, to develop a stake in the soil and to preserve their dignity.

Self-Help's program is elementary: Take small, outdated machinery which is lying around and rusting in disuse on a thousand American farms. Then rebuild the equipment and send it to the underdeveloped communities of the world—not as a gift but for a price, no matter how small. Thus, the impoverished become true owners and proud of their own accomplishments—a pride off which Communist propaganda is sure to bounce.

There is, for example, the "thresher that flew" to the remote jungle area of Macuma in Ecuador. Americans attempting to help the Jivaro Indians saw immediately that to maintain their strength the jungle people needed protein, which could be supplied by soybeans. Since this crop had to be harvested quickly in order to get the beans in before the rainy season, the Indians needed a big threshing machine. They could as well pay for a new one as for a moon capsule.

But the two Americans among them learned of Self-Help. They flashed a request for a combine (thresher). Self-Help people found an old one, refurbished it, replaced old, worn parts with new ones, painted it, crated it, and dispatched it to New Orleans. Then it went by boat to Guayaquil, Ecuador. From this port it was hauled by borrowed truck over the Andes to the end of the jungle road, where it was dismantled and recrated so it could fit into a Cessna–180 plane and be flown to an emergency airstrip in the midst of the forest. There the two Americans reassembled it.

The Indians learned to use it, cleared fields for plowing and now they have the largest known single field—18 acres—for the entire jungle area. From its produce comes the few dollars to pay Self-Help. It is not likely the Jivaro Indians will aid any Communist guerrilla bands trying to live off their land.

This is just one of hundreds of such shipments.

Thousands of farm items have been dispatched across the world—enough to fill 33 freight cars.

Perhaps this is not much in an era of massive logistics. But the concept is massive—and the hearts behind it. Who can say these will not win eventually?

THE REPUBLICAN PARTY MUST LOOK FORWARD—IT MUST REPRESENT THE PEOPLE

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the Republican Party has produced great national leaders during its more than a century-long history. It has consistently stood for human freedom. It survived the storm and strife of the Civil War. It produced the martyr, Abraham Lincoln, the greatest Chief Executive of all. Down through the decades, it has stood for progress.

Today, and during the balance of this week, in the city of San Francisco, the Republican platform committee, under the chairmanship of Representative MELVIN R. LAIRD, is sitting in judgment as to the commitments the Republican Party should make, as a constructive alternative, to the American people in 1964.

Congressman LAIRD earlier invited all of us in the House and Senate, who are members of the Republican Party to make suggestions with respect to the platform. I have made some suggestions by letter to him.

In my letter, I have recalled the positions which our party forthrightly and vigorously took in the last several national elections, with respect to the grave and overriding problems which confront the people of the United States and, indeed, all mankind.

I suggest, Mr. President, that the direction the Republican Party must take is not a matter of turning left or right, but of going forward. We need to rededicate ourselves to the national interest, to the best interests of the many, and not of the few, nor of the very few.

I have alluded to our unyielding Republican endorsement of the United Nations, as one mechanism which brings some hope to troubled mankind, in the cause of freedom versus slavery in the world.

I have recalled, briefly, other crucially important issues which have been spelled out in past Republican platforms. I included, for example, the nuclear test ban treaty approved in the Senate, and overwhelmingly approved, I may say, in great part under the leadership of the minority leader in the Senate. The painstaking exertions for such a dependable compact started in the early days of the administration of General Eisenhower. They were specifically reflected in our platform as we wrote it 4 years ago. While we must remain preeminently strong, militarily, we need, at the same time, to work for a just peace.

As a Westerner, I think I have some duty to speak for the special problems of Western America and for the cause of sound conservation in this country. What we do to conserve natural resources in the West redounds to the strength of the entire Nation.

The other day, we passed legislation which would authorize additional research, in cooperation with Western States, in regard to water. There is a growing water problem in this country, as there is in every clime around the world. The problems of an adequate water supply, an adequate supply of electricity, and of expanded recreational opportunities for our people, particularly as automation continues to surge forward, should be carefully considered by the two great American political parties; and, after having done so, they should reflect their views to the American people.

I recall with great pride that it was under the leadership of the great Republican President, the late Theodore Roosevelt, that the reclamation laws of the Government of the United States were first reflected upon our statute books. I want those laws to continue. I want them to be invigorated.

The West shall be ever grateful to the cause of reclamation legislation which has helped people in the Western United States to conserve their national resources for the benefit of the people, all the people.

Reclamation projects, built by the might of the Federal Government are repayable projects. The money expended by the Federal Government goes back into the Federal Treasury, by the people who reap these benefits.

I outlined my views with respect to conservation legislation and what I believe my party ought to stand for in the coming campaign in some detail in my letter.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire text of the letter which I wrote on June 29, 1964, to Congressman LAIRD be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUNE 29, 1964.

Hon. MELVIN R. LAIRD,
Chairman, Committee on Resolutions, 1964 Republican National Convention, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MEL: I appreciate your invitation to express my views on the topics which I believe of importance in the 1964 Republican national platform.

I believe that the 1960 platform which was unanimously adopted at Chicago and designed "to build a better America" was a sound document which Republicans could not only run on, but also stand on, and govern on. I would hope that our platform this year would not retreat from that sound and grand design, but rather expand upon it.

In 1960, we pledged ourselves to support the United Nations and that under it we agreed to "work for the peaceful settlement of international disputes and the extension of the rule of law in the world." Certainly we should do no less today. Republican Senators by a 2-to-1 margin indicated their support of the United Nations when they approved a U.N. loan.

Most Republican Senators—and all four Senate Republican leaders—again acted with the interest of their Nation and their party at heart when, by overwhelming majorities, they supported the establishment of the Arms Control Agency, the ratification of the nuclear test ban treaty, the extension and expansion of educational and cultural exchanges, and the annual renewal of the mutual security program to aid our allies and free, friendly nations.

So too in domestic policy, it was Republican Senators who submitted the most comprehensive package of civil rights legislation now before Congress 3 months before the present administration acted. The good judgment of 78 percent of the House Republicans in supporting the present civil rights bill—which is largely due to the work of Congressman McCULLOCH and his Republican colleagues on the House Committee on the Judiciary—has been repeatedly reaffirmed by Republican Members of the U.S. Senate by equally overwhelming margins. We prevented the referral of the House-passed bill to the Democratic-controlled Judiciary Committee where it would have languished; we succeeded in bringing debate to a close under the capable leadership of Senate Republican leader DIRKSEN, and, in the last few days, an equally impressive percentage of Senate Republicans, 27 out of 33, voted for the bill on final passage.

Various Republicans in the Senate, myself included, have also sought to grapple with the very real problems of catastrophic illness which are confronted by many of our senior citizens. We have worked to integrate a fiscally responsible approach whereby the citizen puts away his own money during his working years for possible use during his retirement years with a complementary public-private program which would realistically get the job done. It makes no sense to those of us who are attempting to solve legitimate social problems on a sound basis to drift along with the "soak the rich and give to the poor" approach advocated by some of those who would use only general funds to meet the high cost of institutional care. It makes no sense for the property and income taxpayers of this Nation to support an individual whose lack of personal responsibility or seeming financial pressures have prevented him from providing for his own needs only to become a burden on everyone in society, but himself, at age 65. Contributory social insurance eliminates that type of irresponsibility. It also acts as a built-in regulator in striking an appropriate balance between benefits and costs. One is not so likely to demand unnecessary services if the costs of those services are directly related to his own wages.

These are but a few of the many concerns that Republicans—and all Americans—share especially in an urbanized State such as California. But as a western Republican with a long and vital interest in the development of our natural resources, I am particularly concerned that Republican platforms of the future keep faith with the proud heritage that our party has had in the development of the West, first with the Homestead Act and Land Grant College Act under President Lincoln and later with the Reclamation Act and the abiding interest in the conservation and development of all of our natural resources which was keenly possessed by President Theodore Roosevelt.

Water has long been the lifeblood of Western America. But the West is no longer alone. As burgeoning urban concentrations of people and factories require ever greater quantities of water to produce the electric power which lights our homes and turns over our machinery as well as to nourish human and plant life, it is of increasing importance to all parts of the United States. The full utilization of our water resources is essential if our country is to meet rapidly increasing demands for not only municipal, industrial, and irrigation water but also for recreation, electric energy, and wildlife conservation as well.

To do this job, as every reclamation State in the West knows, requires the active assistance of the Federal Government. This does not mean the dominance of the Federal Government. In California, it would be impossible to develop fully our water resources without the closest cooperation between Federal, State, and local government as well as the private sector of our economy. Despite great Federal reclamation and public works projects which have harnessed raging rivers to produce needed water and power and recreational opportunities, the people of California have initially bonded themselves in the amount of $1.75 billion for what will eventually be a $12 to $15 billion State water program. Local districts and municipalities have acted similarly.

An essential element in the development of water resources projects is the development of hydroelectric power. This is not merely because of its value, but also because the power produced at Federal projects is a "paying partner" for irrigation, municipal and industrial water supplies, flood control, navigation, and irrigation. Without it, the financing of many of these other purposes would be impossible. Furthermore, power facilities are a self-liquidating investment: all costs are returned to the Treasury and with interest.

In California, the Central Valley project combines water and power to develop the fertile farmland of my State, to reduce the cost of water to the farmer, and to provide low-cost power for industrial development, homeowners, and small businesses.

The Colorado River storage project—urged and authorized during the last Republican administration—is one of the biggest reclamation projects in our history. This project, strongly supported by President Eisenhower, will permit the reclamation of vast expanses of now arid acres: power will pay 90 percent of the total cost. The Missouri Basin and the Tennessee Basin have enjoyed for many years the advantages which accrue from blending power production with irrigation, navigation, and flood control.

From the beginning, Republicans in the executive and legislative branches have played a major role in establishing principles of true conservation in water and power development for the benefit of all the people. Theodore Roosevelt wisely declared that "conservation means development as much as it does protection." He advocated that it was "our duty to see that hereafter power sites are kept under control of the general government for the use of the people as a whole in a way which shall encourage development of the water power, but which shall not create a monopoly."

These are the kinds of ideas, which our party, to merit and receive the support of the people, should continue to advocate. As Republicans, in our 1960 platform, we took pride in the fact that "the past 7 years of Republican leadership have seen the development of more power capacity, flood control, irrigation, fish and wildlife projects, recreational facilities, and associated multipurpose benefits than during any previous administration in history."

We went on and pledged specifically "to observe the 'preference clause' in marketing Federal power." The history of the "preference clause" in Federal power marketing law goes back to the Town Site Act of April 16, 1906, in which the Secretary of the Interior, was authorized to lease surplus hydroelectric power from Federal Reclamation projects for periods not exceeding 10 years, "giving preference to municipal purposes." This was a great accomplishment of the Republican administration of Theodore Roosevelt. Roosevelt and his successor, William Howard Taft, advocated a general Federal Power Act. Such an act was considered by several Congresses and finally became law during the Republican 66th Congress. This act provided for the licensing of power sites on navigable waters by the Federal Power Commission with provision that the Commission was to give preference to applications by States and municipalities for permits and licenses to build and operate projects on navigable waters.

I believe that the Republican Party should advance the following principles in its 1964 platform to permit the maximum resource development during the rest of this decade:

1. Comprehensive development of our water resources for all beneficial purposes.
2. Inclusion of power in Federal water projects wherever economically feasible in order to prevent waste of a great national asset and in order to provide additional revenue and the earlier payout of self-supporting projects.
3. Adherence to the preference clause—originally and continuously endorsed by Republicans—by giving first call in the marketing of Federal power to States and their political subdivisions and rural electric cooperatives, thus encouraging "competition by comparison" and discouraging monopoly.
4. Support of interregional power pooling to promote use of technical advances for increased electrical integration and greater efficiencies in generation, transmission, and distribution of power thus permitting lower costs to industrial and residential consumers and assuring further economic growth for underdeveloped areas within our economy.
5. Leadership in advancing atomic power as a supplement to other existing fossil fuels which are limited in future supply.
6. Expansion of outdoor recreation at Federal reservoirs to meet the growing demand for water-based, leisure-time activities, and recognition of recreation as a prime object purpose at Federal dams.
7. Improved budgeting for resource development with realization that Federal reclamation projects are capital improvements which cannot properly be treated as operating expenses.
8. Increased research on water and power—such as expanded saline water research—to insure that we can meet our needs in the future at the lowest possible cost.
9. Appropriate legislation to relate water needs and water law so that Federal-State water resource relationships can mutually develop without either the Federal or the State Government having exclusive control in all aspects of water resource development within a given area.

I hope that you and the members of the Committee on Resolutions of the 1964 Republican National Convention might agree that we, as Republicans, in the area of the fullest development and utilization of our priceless natural resources, must seek always to serve the interest of all our people—the interest of the many, not the few. I hope you will agree that these positions which I have only briefly outlined combine the ideals of the past, brought to fruition under Republican leadership, with the realities of the present and the urgent needs of the future and, consequently, are very much worth fighting for by our party this year.

With kindest regards.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
U.S. Senator.

THORNS AND ROSES IN THE LIFE OF JEFFERSON DAVIS

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, Mr. Rex McGee, noted historian, author, and newspaper writer, recently delivered the principal address at a special ceremony commemorating the 156th birthday anniversary of Jefferson Davis, sponsored by the United Daughters of the Confederacy, District of Columbia Division, with Mrs. Frank A. Hornaday as president. The event was held in Statuary Hall of the U.S. Capitol, on June 6, 1964.

Mr. McGee has prepared a most interesting speech, filled with history and drama of another trying time in American history. I wish to share this address with Members of the Senate who may not have had an opportunity to hear it.

I ask unanimous consent that the speech be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THERE ARE ALWAYS THORNS WHERE ROSES GROW

(Address given by Mr. Rex McGee, Statuary Hall, Washington, D.C., June 6, 1964)

Jefferson and Varina Davis, with loving care grew roses with all the thorns which figuratively pricked them grievously in the years to come.

But before speaking of the painful thorns, the delicate petals, and the attar of roses distilled by public opinion over the Nation a century after the fratricidal war between the States, a brief sketch of the only President of the Confederacy is warranted.

Jefferson Davis was a West Pointer. As a lieutenant he resigned from the U.S. Regular Army to marry Knox Taylor, the daughter of his colonel who afterward became a general and President of the United States—Zachary Taylor. Davis was 28. His honeymoon ended when his young wife singing "Fairy Bells" died of malaria in his arms.

The grieving husband became a recluse on his plantation Brierfield, appropriately named after the wild roses plowed under to make way for a plantation home and cottonfields of snowy white. Then on a Christmas, at the invitation of Jefferson's older brother, Joseph, Miss Varina Howell, a 17-year-old belle of the Briers in Natchez, Miss., came by boat and carriage with her New England tutor, a judge, to visit at Hurricane, an adjoining plantation to that of Jefferson Davis. She boldly wore a Whig brooch when all the Davises were plebian Democrats.

Miss Howell, educated in a fashionable school for girls in Philadelphia, Pa., could talk politics and history. As was the custom, the Davis brothers read aloud from their extensive libraries and soon Miss Howell was reading to them in a well modulated voice. Wise old Joseph, from time to time, excused himself from his library and Jefferson and Varina plumbed the depths of politics of the times, she Whig, he Democrat.

On the last day of Varina's Christmas visit on Davis Bend, a peninsula in the winding Mississippi River, she and Jefferson Davis met in the music room. By the light of the blazing hickory logs on brass andirons, Jefferson saw that Miss Howell was no longer wearing the Whig brooch. They were married in little more than a year—she 18 and he 37. No roses were growing when they met in December; none bloomed when they married a year later in February.

Mrs. Varina Howell Davis brought the widower out of his 10-year seclusion. Democrats sent him to Congress, a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives. Mrs. Davis, less than 20 years of age, the mistress of a plantation, was whisked away to the National Capitol on the Potomac as the wife of a freshman Congressman. Their plantation life was broken by politics.

Within a year, war loomed with Mexico. Mississippi blades, quick with dueling pistol, organized a regiment to join the Texans to repel the threatened Mexican invasion. The 1st Mississippi elected Congressman Jefferson Davis as colonel. He, to his wife's misgivings, accepted when the personal messenger arrived in Washington, D.C., the Capitol of the Confederation of States known as the United States of America.

Congressman Jefferson Davis resigned from Congress, the first Member to do so, for combat duty on foreign soil. En route to Mississippi to take command of his regiment, Colonel Davis and his wife traveled by stagecoach the route over the National Road when roses were in full bloom, June 1845. Once—only once—did feminine petulance flare up. This was over his preoccupation in a small book of military tactics. Then, after he heard the rumbling of artillery—Duncan's Battery going down to Mexico—his nostrils flared as he scented afar the smoke of battle.

He left the coach and talked to the youthful cannoneers. When he returned to the stage, alert and elated in his martial ardor, his young wife submerged heroically all her objections to his leaving her for war. That was her role through life, a dutiful wife who stifled her feminine objections for her husband's advancement. A distant war in Mexico uprooted her life as a Congressman's wife in society-sheltered Washington City. The call to martial duty took him from the legislative halls of the Nation.

Jefferson Davis returned on crutches from the war in which he had distinguished himself. He had suffered a nasty foot wound while fighting under his former father-in-law, Gen. Zachary Taylor.

In New Orleans the 1st Mississippi and Colonel Davis were showered with roses from the grilled balconies as they paraded from Lafayette Square to Jackson Square for dinner. In Natchez belles of the city strewed roses in their path as they came from the river steamboat. Standing in the crowd were Mrs. Varina Howell Davis and her brother-in-law, Joseph Davis. Said Joseph in undertone, "You and I become first even if we must be last just now. Let them have him. Our time will come." and their time came—years of few roses and many thorns.

Grateful Mississippians sent Col. Jefferson Davis to the U.S. Senate as a Democrat before he could discard his crutches from the Mexican War. He took the oath of office while his first father-in-law, a Whig, was President of the United States. In the next Congress, Davis became chairman of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs by vote. Under President Franklin Pierce, a Mexican War general, Davis later became an able Secretary of War. After his term in the Cabinet, Mississippians returned him to the U.S. Senate. Then, when his State seceded, Senator Davis while his wife was in the gallery delivered his farewell address in the Senate to join his State, his musical voice and choice of words moving some to tears. That famous speech, my dear ladies, was made in the same building in which you are honoring him today, the U.S. Capitol.

Back at Brierfield went ex-Senator and Mrs. Davis. If war came, he hoped that he would be called to lead an army even though he had previously declined an offer of a generalship in the Regular U.S. Army. His State made him a major general before the Civil War broke. And his new nation, the Confederacy, soon called him not as a field general but as President and Commander in Chief of the armies.

Jefferson Davis and his wife were cutting rose slips at Brierfield when a man on a foaming horse dashed up and delivered a telegram after a long ride. The message read that Davis had been elected President of the Confederate States of America, much to his frustration. For Davis wanted to be a field general in the fighting, not a President.

Allow me to bypass the details of the war, with which you ladies are so familiar. But out of all this came those grievous thorns in the lives of two illustrious Mississippians who were cutting rose slips in a secluded plantation on Davis Bend of the Mississippi River when the telegram came.

As you know the war came—4 years of it. And as you are aware President Davis of the Confederacy later became the scapegoat of the unreasoning radicals. And out of this have come some historical fallacies never fully corrected. The corrections are:

1. Jefferson Davis was not a firebrand. He had the respect of moderate northerners, including the Blair family after whom the famous Blair House on Pennsylvania Avenue is named.

2. He was captured not in woman's clothes as the radicals would have it. In the passions of war the least rumor was printed on both sides in newspapers. For instance, President-elect Abraham Lincoln, fearing the plot—suspected of the railroad Detective Allen Pinkerton—disguised himself in tam and kilts as a knobby-kneed Scotsman. Historians have exposed the imagination of unfriendly reporters of northern not southern daily newspapers, and cleared President Lincoln of kilties and tam-o-shanter. But unless Hudson Strode in his popular definitive biography of Jefferson Davis can convince the northern public, Davis will continue to be a fugitive in hoop skirts. For facts in the case which would defy the many published reports, I cheerfully refer you to Dr. Chester D. Bradley, curator of the Casemate Museum in Fort Monroe, Va., and Dr. Dallas Irvine, Chief Archivist of the National Archives here, who arranged for the return to the heirs a shawl and a raincoat purported to have been worn by Davis a century ago when captured. He did wear such when captured.

Excitement in the Nation was high—war hysteria after the assassination of President Abraham Lincoln of the U.S. radicals accused Davis of plotting the assassination. President Andrew Johnson by proclamation offered $100,000 for the capture of Davis. Union cavalry caught him. And as late as 1949, a popular writer who fashioned facts, wrote unabashedly that Davis was captured in "poke bonnet" and "crinoline," a far cry from the woman's raglan picked up in the darkness of a tent and a shawl thrown over his head by his wife to protect him from the predawn mists. For the best documented account of the distorted episode, I refer you to the late David Rankin Barbee's pamphlet, "The Capture of Jefferson Davis," reprinted from Tyler's Quarterly Historical and Genealogical magazine, July 1947. It contains the fabricated picture ordered by the Secretary of War of the United States 3 days after the capture of President Davis. The President is shown as a faceless mannequin in dress with unspurred boots, all taken from a department store. The War Department released the faked photograph to the press. Harpers Weekly of June 7, 1865, carried this caption: "The Clothes in Which Jefferson Disguised Himself" (from a photograph taken at the War Department by Alexander Gardner).

Mr. Barbee's tract on the capture of President Davis is in the Library of Congress. As all of you know, the capture was near Irwinville, Ga. The cavalry escorted Mr. and Mrs. Davis to Macon, Ga., where they, as prisoners, were quartered at the best hotel. A man waiter brought the dinner tray to Mrs. Davis and on it was a large napkin covering something. Mrs. Davis raised the napkin and sighted a bouquet of roses with the food. The Negro waiter bowed and said respectfully, "I thought you would like some flowers to brighten your meal." They did. But shortly thereafter thorns appeared when the military authorities shackled President Davis at Fortress Monroe.

The act aroused some northern leaders. The Davis trial lagged but the fetters were removed. Legal opinion prevailed and Davis was kept a prisoner in Virginia to be tried by civil not military court. That ruling prevented doubtlessly a Nuremburg trial. In the course of time he was released from custody under $100,000, signed principally by northerners who had been loyal to the United States during and after the war. Among them was Editor Horace Greeley, of New York.

3. Another misstatement of fact which comes down through the years is that he was succeeded by a Negro in the U.S. Senate. He well could have been, for Mississippi is the only State which sent Negroes to the Senate—two of them, Hiram R. Revels and Blanche K. Bruce, both men of ability and with college training. Revels was the first for a short time. He took the seat vacated by Senator Albert G. Brown, of Mississippi, who like Davis, withdrew from the august body when his State seceded. Bruce eventually went to the Senate in the class of Davis, but after two white, Union veterans had filled the vacancy left by Davis.

Radicals boasted that they would seat the first Negro Senator in Jefferson Davis' desk. But they reckoned not with Republican Senator Edmond Gibson Ross, of Kansas. He was in Davis' desk and proud of it, even though the desk bore a bayonet scar from a battle-scarred veteran on duty guarding the empty Senate in the Capitol one night. The soldier jabbed his bayonet in the Jefferson Davis seat. Ross kept the scarred desk despite political pressure, for this and his later opposition to the radicals during Reconstruction, won a full chapter in the late President John F. Kennedy's prize-winning book, "Profiles in Courage."

And that desk today, bayonet hole plugged and expertly veneered, is occupied by none other than U.S. Senator JOHN CORNELIUS STENNIS, of Mississippi.

Notwithstanding the fact that Union Gen. Adelbert Ames, son-in-law of Union Gen. Benjamin F. Butler, actually filled the vacancy left by Jefferson Davis, some historians—among them two Mississippians who should have checked—lapse into the error that the Negro preacher, Hiram Revels, replaced Davis. One of the Mississippians was a reputable historian some years ago at Chicago University. The other is a living liberal, editor of a newspaper and a Pulitzer Prize winner. Yet the political canard on Jefferson Davis is by chance carried on by them.

It is easy to understand. As the radicals planned the cartoonist drew. Harpers Weekly carried a cartoon of Revels the Negro Senator taking Davis' seat while Davis was scowling in an anteroom. The cartoon represented the wishes of the radicals not the courage of Senator Ross.

Limned lines of a political wish distorted history by blotting out the strong heart of a conscientious man, a sad commentary but a fact in our times. The canard of a Negro succeeding Jefferson Davis in the U.S. Senate lingers on through the years.

Despite all the abuse heaped upon the losing President of the War Between the States, the remainder of his life, after his release from prison and dropping of the charges against him, was not all unpleasant. He died in 1889. Benjamin Harrison, once a Union general, was President of the United States, John J. Ingalls, a Union lieutenant colonel, was President pro tempore of the U.S. Senate; Union Gen. Anson G. McCook, of New York, was Secretary of the Senate; a Union assistant paymaster, Thomas B. Reed, of Maine, was Speaker of the House; and Confederate Gen. John B. Clark, Jr., of Missouri, had retired only a few days before as Clerk of the House since the political complexion had changed.

After Jefferson Davis' death came the attar of roses distilled by public opinion in the case of his widow. Mrs. Varina Howell Davis was now a writer on the staff of the New York World. She was related to the wife of the owner, Joseph Pulitzer. Upon one occasion Mrs. Davis went to watch a parade of cadets at the U.S. Military Academy, West Point, where her late husband had once paraded. She was a guest of Cranstons-on-the-Hudson. Mrs. U. S. Grant was staying there. And Mrs. Grant knocked at the door of Mrs. Davis.

"I am Mrs. Grant," the Union general's wife said simply, "and I welcome you."

"I am very glad to meet you," replied Mrs. Davis. "Come in and be seated."

After dinner they sat together and talked a long time on the porch of the hotel, for they had much in common. Both were widows. And their husbands had been maligned, in the military and in the presidency. Other guests watched with almost rude interest. The widow of a former U.S. President who as a general had captured Vicksburg, Miss., and who had accepted the surrender of the Army of the Confederate Gen. Robert E. Lee at Appomattox, was talking most amiably with the widow of the Confederate President who had for 4 years tried to capture Washington and had been thrown into irons in Fortress Monroe for some of his pains.

Together the two visited the monumental tomb of President Grant in New York City. Upon one occasion Mrs. Grant said, "I will soon be laid beside my husband." And she was. When Mrs. Davis learned of Mrs. Grant's death she dropped to her knees and uttered a fervent prayer.

In closing I wish to quote the words of General Grant and Mrs. Jefferson Davis. In 1907, the World assigned Mrs. Davis to write an article on General Grant for the memorial edition of the newspaper. And what Varina Howell Davis, once the mistress of the Confederate White House in Richmond, wrote of General Grant is so applicable today.

"Let us have peace," said the gentle-hearted soldier, "and I believe every portion of our reunited country heartily joins in the aspiration."

Peace in a reunited nation—that is why without molestation you can bring the Confederate battle flag into the Capitol today and honor the commander in chief who tried to capture this selfsame Capitol some hundred years ago in which he had served in both Houses of Congress. This couldn't happen in Cuba or Russia; it does happen in the good old United States of America.

CRITICAL ISSUES—THAT'S RIGHT

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, on July 1 Republican Members of both Senate and House inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD "Critical Issues Paper No. 11," entitled "Resources and the Future: Energy," a publication of the Republican Citizens Committee of the United States.

This publication deals indeed with issues critical to all American families—size of their light bills.

This publication, bearing the imprint of a Republican organization and the names of former President Eisenhower and Dr. Milton Eisenhower, is a handy summary of misguided advice with which the Nation's largest industry—the electric light and power companies—have attempted to bamboozle the American public for years.

I know that all members of the Republican Party—which does include some stanch supporters of rural electric cooperatives and municipal-owned power systems—do not accept ideas expressed in this publication, that "REA has realized its purpose," and so forth. But this publication illustrates how that wing of the party which seeks unbridled, monopoly control of the power industry—and consequently higher consumer costs because of lack of competition—is in ascendance in the Republican Party.

Mr. President, the July 3 issue of the Rural Electric Minuteman, published by the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, carries an excellent analysis of the Republican Citizens Committee's "Critical Issues Paper No. 11," along with a little rundown of the interesting records of some of the power industry executives and other persons who served on the committee. The Minuteman article was written by Joe Jenness, NRECA research and information consultant.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD Mr. Jenness' article, "Fancy Versus Facts—'Critical Issues' Document Refuted."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"CRITICAL ISSUES" DOCUMENT REFUTED

(By Joe Jenness)

The so-called Critical Issues Council, sponsored by the Republican Citizens Committee of the United States, recently published a "Critical Issues Paper No. 11," which deals with "Resources and the Future: Energy."

Its contents are such that it could have been issued by the Edison Electric Institute, the trade association for the Nation's commercial power companies, because the Rural Electrification Administration and the rural electric co-ops are made the prime whipping boys.

The 15-page document contains allegations that support positions taken by the power companies on every conceivable issue in the electric energy field. By the same token, it completely rejects the interests of American consumers and their publicly owned and cooperatively owned electric systems. Specifically challenged and attacked is the historic role of the Government in providing natural resource development projects, particularly in the production of power.

Identified as honorary chairman of the Republican Citizens Committee is Dwight D. Eisenhower, the former President. The organization's headquarters is listed as 1625 K Street, Washington, D.C.

The council membership comprises 24 Republicans with corporation ties, headed by Milton Eisenhower, brother of Ike. Two of the members of the board of trustees of the Citizens Committee are J. E. Corette, president of the Montana Power Co., a longtime major foe of the rural electrics; and Maurice Stans, Director of the Bureau of the Budget under Eisenhower and syndicated author of vicious and untrue economic attacks on REA.

Organized under the chairmanship of Milton Eisenhower is a "Task Force on Energy," specifically responsible for "Critical Issue No. 11." It is chairmaned by Adm. Lewis L. Strauss, former AEC Chairman and architect of the infamous Dixon-Yates deal to torpedo TVA during the Eisenhower administration days.

Helping Strauss is Robert L. L. McCormick, Washington, D.C., onetime assistant to Herbert Hoover on Hoover Commission No. 1; Director of Research for Citizens Committee for the Hoover report, and member of the second Hoover Commission To Reorganize the Government. It will be recalled that the Hoover Commissions were loaded with alleged "objective" supporters of the power monopoly.

A third member of the four-man task force is Los Angeles Nuclear Physicist W. F. Libby.

The fourth member is Louis Roddis, president of the Pennsylvania Electric Co., who launched an unprovoked attack on REA early this year in the Johnstown, Pa., Tribune-Democrat. His company is sole power supplier for 12 of Pennsylvania's 13 REA electric borrowers. In fiscal 1962, they paid him $3,478,523 for wholesale power at an average rate of 8.6 mills per kilowatt-hour as compared to the national average for REA borrowers of 5.5 mills.

Here are a number of the claims made by the Republican Citizens Committee with the actual facts following each quote.

Claim: "In 1938, 89 percent of all farms were without central service electricity. In 1964, the situation has completely reversed itself; 98 percent of all American farms are electrified through central station service and most of the remaining 2 percent could be so serviced readily. In this respect, we believe the REA has realized its purpose."

Fact: Congress made REA a permanent agency of Government in 1944. The job of serving consumers is never done. Private power companies invest new capital every year. Their job is never finished. Rural and farm people double their power requirements every 7 to 10 years also. Why demand a double standard for urban and for rural? REA's job is not done but must keep abreast of a growing America. REA borrowers increase their wholesale purchases of power from utility companies 9 percent a year. They need additional capital to provide facilities to utilize the increased power purchases.

Claim: "The REA has placed major emphasis on the building of transmission and generation facilities, and on supplying electrical energy to suburbia and 'outer suburbia'."

Fact: Where cities expand into rural areas already served by REA financed borrowers, the established supplier seeks to continue the fine service being rendered. The Rural Electrification Administration Act does not authorize use of Federal funds for purposes alleged by the pamphlet writers. Loss of territory already served and backing the security of an REA loan is a serious threat to the ability of the borrower to fulfill his financial obligations, and is not in the public interest.

Claim: "In the few years since the Eisenhower administration left office, borrowings from the REA to set up facilities for generation and transmission of electrical energy have greatly increased and the trend is sharply upward."

Fact: Ten million population was added to the United States from the time President Kennedy took office until his assassination. Power companies order more and more generating and transmission facilities too. With power company overcharging soaring toward $6 billion, income tax benefits reaching over half a billion, and rural consumers burdened with higher rates than urban, the basic right to generate in the Rural Electrification Administration Act, is being exercised to provide borrower security as well as economic gain for REA-financed borrowers where justified.

Claim: "We believe it unwise to finance such facilities with Federal funds where adequate and existing private facilities already exist."

Fact: It was in task force member Roddis' utility territory that REA back in 1936 first exercised the legal threat to generate. The power company had adequate and existing facilities but demanded a rate which made the project unfeasible. Threat to generate broke the monopoly demands. The right to generate is basic in the act. However, it must be completely justified before a loan is made. It is not in the public interest to curtail this right in any way.

Claim: "These recent policies of the REA (on generation and transmission) are not the purposes of the law as expressed by its original congressional sponsors."

Fact: Section 4 of the Rural Electrification Administration Act states that the Administrator is authorized and empowered to make loans for the purpose of financing the construction and operation of generating plants, electric transmission, and distribution lines. Such authority was also defined in the Executive order of President Roosevelt which set up REA previous to the 1936 act.

Claim: "We do not believe that long-term money borrowed by the United States at about 4 percent and then reloaned through the REA at 2 percent should be used to promote competition with private citizens."

Fact: REA loans do not compete with private citizens. Neither does the United States borrow money and then reloan it through the REA. Under the Eisenhower administration billions were loaned to Great Britain at 2 percent. Foreign aid loans have been made at three-fourths of 1 percent. Use of Federal funds at an equalizing rate has long been established Federal policy. Statements in "Critical Issues" overlook completely the fact that rural electric borrowers are serving areas power companies would not serve or could not serve. Actually the policies advocated are the old Eisenhower tight money policies calling for higher interest rates, higher electric rates, all at the expense of the consumer.

Western European countries electrified their rural areas while America stayed in the dark, waiting for private citizens to do the job. Actually it was the private citizens making up rural electric borrowers who electrified rural America in spite of the opposition of power companies. Use of private citizens to mean power companies is misapplied semantics. They are regulated monopolies.

Claim: "Efficient private producers have proven that they can provide electricity at low cost to the consumer even against competition taking advantage of the artificially low interest rates of REA loans."

Fact: If this claim is true, why fuss about REA interest rates which do not affect power company operations until the power company invades the rural electric borrower's service area? A study of power rates show the further a private company is from Federal power developments the higher the rates. Maine has rates three times as high as the TVA area. In most instances it takes a bold regulatory authority to get rate reductions.

Claim: "The REA appears to have changed its emphasis from servicing farmers to the generation and transmission of electrical energy for consumers not engaged in agriculture."

Fact: The original Executive order of President Roosevelt in 1935 which first established REA states: "To initiate, formulate, administer, and supervise a program of approved projects with respect to the generation, transmission, and distribution of electric energy, in rural areas." Emphasis supplied in the critical issues pamphlet is the echo of Edison Electric Institute propaganda line, "The Deviation of REA," made up out of imaginations of the mythmakers of Madison Avenue. It has made possible electric service to 1 out of 10 Americans in an area no private citizen served and is purring along and adding a billion dollar market every year for electric appliances and equipment. REA loans also are creating millions of dollars in additional power sales for the utility suppliers.

Claim: "The Congress should, by suitable legislation, restrain the REA from financing the construction of steam-power-generating facilities as supplements to hydroelectric projects in cases where the Congress itself has refused to appropriate funds specifically for such facilities."

Fact: This statement is not descriptive of any existing situation. The steamplants, fought against by power companies, were Government projects. REA loans are to private borrowers whose electric system is a State corporation—not a Federal agency—and is incorporated and operates as a private venture under State laws and controls. Being nonprofit the borrower has rights under Federal law not possessed by profit-seeking power companies. If power companies can make contracts to interconnect with Government hydro powerplants, there is no moral or legal reason why other electric systems should not gain the same privileges—except monopoly wants to hog it all. REA borrowers are organized people, citizens of the United States and are entitled to the economies of large-scale generating engineering as power companies exercise. Under the law they have more rights.

Claim: "The questionable point is that REA loans have been made apparently to build steamplants for which the Congress has refused to grant funds." Here are examples: (citing Colorado-Ute, Basin Electric, and Upshur, Tex.).

Fact: With the exception of Upshur, still in the courts, Colorado-Ute and Basin have met all tests of legality, such as the criteria set forth in the REA Act and its administration. Congress would have investigated if the REA Administrator attempted to circumvent the purposes of the REA program. The basic functions of REA-financed plants is to furnish low cost power to rural consumers, gain peaking power efficiencies, the same as power companies do. If it is good for power companies, why isn't it also good for rural electric systems?

Claim: "Consumers located where they may buy power from Federal projects usually obtain it at a price well below its true cost of production."

Fact: It is the power component of a multipurpose dam which is the cash register producing revenue for Uncle Sam, and to cut the cost of flood control and other purposes of multipurpose development of natural resources to the taxpayers.

If what they call true cost is anywhere the same as power company costing, Uncle Sam could fill his coffers with overcharges, tax collections he does not get now, and all the fat margins which make utility stocks the growth stocks of Wall Street. The true inequity in the power business today are the scandalous tax subsidies and the billions in overcharging arising out of the failure to regulate these monopolies in the public interest.

Claim: "The rates charged to users of Federal power should be adjusted so that the users of such power do not receive an unfair advantage as opposed to those who do not receive their power from federally subsidized projects."

Fact: Such a policy is claiming to hike electric rates for millions of Americans—higher prices, tight money, and try and get all American electric consumers under monopoly control to their disadvantage.

Claim: "Since the Eisenhower administration left office, the Interior Department has sought to establish control over the terms, conditions and uses of electrical power transmitted by lines across land owned by the Federal Government."

Fact: This is not true. The Department has sought to reestablish the policy which was in effect before the Eisenhower administration kicked it out.

Claim: "Congress has never authorized an electrical transmission grid across the Nation. Yet, segment by segment, Federal agencies appear to be working to accomplish this."

Fact: According to the Electrical World, it is the power industry which announces from issue to issue how many segments of an interconnected grid the utilities are creating. The Federal Power Commission is completing a study for a national grid. There is no evidence the Federal agencies are creating a national grid.

Claim: "The Congress should express a national policy on high-voltage, cross-country transmission grids for electric energy to be adhered to by all Federal agencies."

Fact: Why just the Federal agencies? Why not include the power companies, too? As General Manager Clyde T. Ellis said at the 1964 annual meeting of NRECA in Dallas, Tex.: "National power pooling exists in every major nation but our own. Tremendous savings can be effected by connecting all generation. This can be done without disturbing any present ownership and control patterns. Indeed it is being done right now by and among the power companies, TVA, and other Federal wholesale power marketing agencies, but not much as yet by the electric co-ops and power districts. We're either going to be in or out of the pools, and we can't afford to be out. We are mostly out now."

Claim: "Small plants are relatively inefficient producers. Studies made 8 years ago clearly demonstrate that the cost of producing electricity by steam varies significantly with the size of the generating plant employed."

Fact: By limiting this claim to steam studies 8 years old, the task force team has overlooked development of the automatic jet engine peaking plants now solving many power supply problems on existing systems. To say that a 1-million-kilowatt plant can produce power for a little more than half the cost involved in a 25,000-kilowatt plant can be true engineeringwise but overlooks the fact there are few electric systems in the country with firm power loads to efficiently use a 1-million-kilowatt unit. Even Consolidated Edison of New York is reaching to Labrador to seek additional energy sources to integrate in its system.

Claim: "Consumers of electricity supplied by investor-owned electric companies must bear through their electric bills a significant tax burden."

Fact: This could be eased significantly if power companies would refund the excess taxes they collect and also reduce rates to provide a reasonable return on investment instead of the billions of overcharging resulting from the policies they follow. Such policies would zoom electric consumption, increase their dollars of profit, and add to the economic activity of the Nation. This has been true whenever rates have been reduced.

IOU NO. 26

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, over the past several months I have made a series of statements calling attention to what I believe are serious shortcomings in the performance and operations of the electric light and power industry. I have called attention to the fact that in many instances these investor-owned utilities—or IOU's as I prefer to call them—are gouging the public by charging exorbitant rates for electricity. I have called attention to the fact that in their greed for profits they keep rates unjustifiably high; that despite the fact that they are only tax collectors, not taxpayers, many of them fail to pass tax reductions on to the consumer; that they are conducting a multimillion-dollar campaign—paid for partly by the public—in an attempt to destroy their yardstick competitors—the rural electric cooperatives, public-owned municipal power systems and the Federal power program—that they regularly contribute vast sums to extremist organizations dedicated to the destruction of the United Nations, civil rights, the progressive income tax, and nonprofit power; that as part of this same propaganda campaign they attempt to mislead the public and Congress with phony letter campaigns, planted editorials, and scurrilous but subtle advertising, and that there has been a general erosion in the public's right to know about these Government-sanctioned monopolies.

I do not know how much good has been accomplished by these presentations, but I do know that I have incurred the wrath and bitter animosity of the Nation's largest industry as a result of them. Rather than attempting to answer my detailed and documented criticisms with evidence to the contrary, the leaders of the power industry have chosen to reply with accusations that I am deliberately distorting the truth, and with their unsubstantiated statements that my criticisms are unfounded. The industry is also attempting to discredit my statements by charging that I am conducting a vendetta against the private power industry for personal reasons.

Mr. President, I mention these things because the Federal Power Commission on June 30 handed down an opinion and order which, I think, establish that my criticisms are not without foundation.

The opinon and order to which I refer rejected the application of Black Hills Power & Light Co. to set up a restricted stock option plan which would have permitted the company's top executive to purchase stock at prices below market value. The FPC held that the stock option plan "is not in the public interest."

As my colleagues may recall, two of the statements to which I referred earlier dealt with the use of restricted stock options in the electric light and power industry. On May 13 I detailed the operation—and abuses—of this device by a Montana IOU. On June 2, I made a similar presentation about private power utilities in Texas.

On both of these occasions I cited several reasons why public service industries such as these should not be allowed use of the stock option. I hope I will not be judged immodest, but I think it important that my objections to public utility use of stock options be measured alongside the reasons the FPC gave for rejecting the Black Hills application to start an option plan.

I said stock options reduce the company's capital and dilute the equity of ordinary stockholders.

The FPC said stock options "dilute the equity of the company."

I said the costs of stock options—the benefits which company insiders receive from them and the extent to which they water down the company's stock—are hidden from those who foot the bill for option plans.

The FPC said:

> The actual costs [of stock options] are hidden from the shareholders and consumers * * *. There is no practical method of accounting for stock options which will give a clear indication of their cost to the company. Over the years the accounting for costs has been made the foundation of knowledgeable regulatory control. Since there is no disclosure of service costs under these plans in the accounts of the utility, the use of the stock option form of executive compensation distorts the real cost of electric utility service.

I said the consumer is forced to foot the bill for the lush option benefits received by company insiders because option plans not only tend to prevent reductions in electrical rates, but often cause rate increases.

The FPC said:

> Stock options are a form of deferred compensation which impose a share of the burdens of compensating present management upon the stockholders and consumers at a later date when the options are exercised.

In short, stock options granted in the past are causing higher rates today and options granted today will cause higher rates tomorrow.

> Each generation of consumers—

The FPC said—

> should pay its own way as the costs are incurred and * * * the consumer of today should not be asked to pay for the services provided in earlier years nor should later generations of consumers [be required to] pay for services performed currently.

I said option plans tend to encourage company officials to forgo rate reductions and keep profits high so that the market value of the stock will increase and enable them to make even greater windfall profits when they exercise their options.

The FPC said:

> Stock options tend to make management focus more on common stock prices than on the [public] service obligations of the company. An overriding personal stake in the stock market is doubtfully compatible with the public service responsibilities of the management of a public utility. A conflict of interest may be created in the duty of those optionees who establish the rate policy of the company.

I said option plans enable company insiders to grant each other unnoticed and unwarranted riches in addition to their already lucrative salaries.

The FPC said:

> Option plans permit executive compensation which is often irrational, erratic, and unrelated to the performance of the executive * * *. Such plans disguise the extent of managerial compensation and thus make it easy for top managers to receive excessive compensation.

In addition to these specific objections, Mr. President, I questioned the justifications the IOU's advance in defense of stock option plans. They claim that stock option plans are needed to attract and hold competent executives and that the option is an incentive device that benefits both stockholders and the consumer by stimulating better management.

Here is what the FPC had to say about these justifications:

> Black Hills argument that the stock option plan is needed in order to retain top management staff can hardly be accepted since the record shows that without stock options the company has lost no employees with a salary in excess of $7,000 per year except by death or retirement.
>
> Stock options usually [go to] the top executives and ignore the important role of the lower and middle management group.
>
> The reward (of stock options) may have little, if any, relationship to the value of executive performance.
>
> The record made in this proceeding affords no basis for concluding that there is any positive relationship between the companies in the vanguard of the electric power industry * * * and those which have adopted stock option plans.
>
> There is * * * no basis for concluding that such plans either lead to or have evolved from distinguished performance in the public interest.

And insofar as the stock option is an incentive device, the FPC had this to say:

> The incentives under stock option plans * * * tend naturally to divert management from their responsibilities to the public and to focus their attention on maximizing prices and earnings in order to push stock quotations even higher.

I have also, in several of my previous presentations stressed the point that although they spend vast sums to advertise themselves as such, the IOU's are not "just another competitive American business."

Listen to the FPC on that point:

> Electric utilities are public service companies serving under franchises and certificates granted by agencies of government and possessing the power of eminent domain and other special privileges not available to ordinary companies. While there is an increasing amount of competition between the various forms of energy, electric service maintains a monopoly position for many uses and, even where subject to competition from other energy sources, the rivalry is not of the kind that normally assures reasonable prices for goods and services in a free enterprise situation. For this reason electric utilities are subject to regulation; otherwise they could take advantage of their monopoly position to charge excessive rates and make exorbitant profits.
>
> In those areas where price is controlled by the free interplay of competitive forces, perhaps the outstanding measure of management's competence is to be found in its ability to produce the highest earnings and greatest return on the shareholder's investment. In regulated (public service) industry this purpose cannot be accepted. The goal here must rather be effectiveness in the performance of a public service and the measure of executive endeavor is and must remain not the judgment of the stock market on present and future profits but success in providing a service upon which our entire economy is dependent, not at the highest prices which can be obtained but at the lowest rates consistent with the health of the industry and its ability to care for the future needs of its customers.

Mr. President, this is the point I have been attempting to put across in the past 6 months. The American people are fortunate that the present commission is dedicated to this public service concept of regulation.

I hope this dedication will continue, however, I must note that the balance is extremely delicate for only three members of this five-man Commission concurred in the Black Hills decision—and there is a cloud of doubt hanging over the continuance on the commission of one of the majority members.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the

RECORD the June 30, 1964, press release, opinion, and order of the Federal Power Commission in the Black Hills case.

There being no objection, the press release, opinion, and order were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FPC REJECTS RESTRICTED STOCK OPTION PLAN FOR BLACK HILLS POWER & LIGHT CO.

WASHINGTON, D.C., June 30, 1964.—The Federal Power Commission today, in a 3-to-2 ruling, rejected a proposed restricted stock option plan for Black Hills Power & Light Co. of Rapid City, S. Dak., in an opinion which suggested that such plans were inappropriate for public service companies.

Black Hills proposed to issue and sell up to 10,000 shares of common stock to executives and other key employees at not less than 95 percent of the market value.

Today's opinion was signed by Chairman Joseph C. Swidler, joined by Commissioners Charles R. Ross and David S. Black, Commissioner Lawrence J. O'Connor, Jr., filed a dissenting statement in which he was joined by Commissioner Harold C. Woodward.

The Commission observed that electric utilities are public service companies serving under franchise and certificates granted by agencies of government and possessing the power of eminent domain and other special privileges not available to ordinary companies, and for this reason electric utilities are subject to regulation; otherwise they could take advantage of their monopoly position to charge excessive rates and make exorbitant profits.

"The function of regulatory agencies" the FPC observed, "is to exercise a positive influence on the welfare and growth of this industry which is fundamental to the progress of our entire economy by controlling rates and profits and by focusing the attention of management on their public service responsibilities. The incentives under stock option plans, however, tend naturally to divert management from their responsibilities to the public and to focus their attention on maximizing prices and earnings in order to push stock quotations ever higher."

The FPC did not hold that the Federal Power Act prohibits executive stock options. "A public utility is free to apply for approval of such a stock issue if it believes that its proposal can be justified," the Commission said.

However, the FPC said it found nothing in Black Hills' presentation "which indicates that theirs is an exceptional case or in any way immune" from its general objections to stock option plans.

The Commission found that Black Hills' actual experience in recruiting and retraining management without stock options, the comparison of its salary scale with that of comparable companies, and the evidence as to the expected future life with the company of those who have received the bulk of the options, "all fail to establish applicant's case for a restricted stock option plan."

The record in this case, the Commission said, reveals a number of specific objections to a stock option plan for a public service company. The objections are:

Such plans disguise the extent of managerial compensation and thus make it easy for the top managers to receive excessive compensation. There is no practical method of accounting for stock options which will give a clear indication of their cost to the company.

Stock options usually prefer top executives and ignore the important role of the lower and middle management group. On a companywide basis they may create a morale problem for the many which offsets their claimed incentive value for the few.

Such plans lead to executive compensation which is often irrational, erratic, and unrelated to the performance of the executive.

Such options tend to make management focus more on common stock prices than on the service obligations of the company.

The impact of such options is to dilute the equity of the company.

The Commission said its objections to Black Hills' proposal go to the merits of the Federal Power Act's requirements that security issues must be compatible with the public interest.

The plain purpose of the act, the FPC explained, is to prevent the issuance of securities which might impair the company's financial integrity or its ability to perform its public utility responsibilities. "It is by this standard that the present application is to be judged and it is by this standard that applicant's plan fails," the Commission declared.

The record made in this proceeding, the FPC continued, affords no basis for concluding that there is any positive relationship between the companies in the vanguard of the electric power industry on the technology and policy levels and those which have adopted stock option plans.

There is also no basis for concluding that such plans either lead to or have evolved from distinguished performance in the public interest, the Commission said.

While noting that stock option plans have been accorded favorable tax treatment under the Internal Revenue Code and have been approved by two other Federal regulatory agencies (Interstate Commerce Commission and Securities and Exchange Commission), the FPC pointed out that at least three State regulatory agencies (Maryland, Georgia, and New York) have refused to approve stock option plans for public utilities.

Commissioner O'Connor said the majority's conclusion that all stock options are not prohibited by one section of the Federal Power Act does little to conceal their conclusion that all such options are prohibited by another section. "When the generalities relied upon to reject this application are weighed against the applicant's impressive presentation, it becomes clear that no stock option will ever be approved for an electric utility under the jurisdiction of this Commission," Commissioner O'Connor declared. "No applicant will ever be able to rebut the hazy rationale of this decision," he added.

This "regrettable outcome" is compelled by neither law nor reason, Commissioner O'Connor said, but rather because of a vague apprehension that all optionees will inevitably cease functioning in the public interest.

The majority's opinion, he said, minimizes the fact that smaller utilities need extra blandishments to attract and retain qualified personnel; that the cost of salaries are unquestionably borne by consumers whereas reasonable stock options seldom are; and that, at any rate, there is evidence that salary increases are seldom as attractive as stock options.

Commissioner O'Connor called an unfounded infirmity the majority's contention that, although the present plan did not result in any dilution of equity, it would be difficult, if not impossible, to find that any future increment was in itself not compatible with the public interest. "The majority envisions no consideration of degrees; no leeway to accept what is reasonable and to reject what is not," Commissioner O'Connor said. "It thus becomes better to proscribe all options—even the unquestionably reasonable Black Hills option—than to attempt to identify and reject only the unreasonable or inappropriate applications," he continued.

Commissioner O'Connor said he would approve the plan conditioned to require the issuance of shares at 100 percent of their market value on the granting date rather than the 95-percent price proposed.

[United States of America, Federal Power Commission, docket No. E-7046]

BLACK HILLS POWER & LIGHT CO.—OPINION No. 433

Appearances: For Black Hills Power & Light Co.: H. R. Hanley, Esq., Rapid City, S. Dak.; for the staff of the Federal Power Commission: Wallace E. Brand, Esq., Washington, D.C., Leonard Eesley, Esq., Washington, D.C.

Before Commissioners: Joseph C. Swidler, Chairman; L. J. O'Connor, Jr.; Charles R. Ross; Harold C. Woodward; and Davis S. Black.

OPINION AND ORDER DENYING AUTHORITY FOR ISSUANCE OF COMMON STOCK (ISSUED JUNE 30, 1964)

Chairman SWIDLER: This case involves an application by Black Hills Power & Light Co. (Black Hills or applicant) for authorization under section 204 of the Federal Power Act to issue and sell up to 10,000 shares of common stock to executives and key employees under a restricted stock option plan approved by the Black Hills stockholders in April 1962.[1] In June 1962, options to purchase 7,400 shares were granted to 16 key officers and employees at a price of $37.25. Options on 2,600 shares were reserved for future use.

Briefly, the plan provides for the issuance and sale of up to 10,000 shares of optioned stock prior to February 1, 1982. Options for terms of up to 10 years may be granted at any time before February 1, 1972. The price for the optioned shares, which is fixed at the time of issue of the option, is to be not less than 95 percent of the market price of the stock on the date of the grant, the limit provided in the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 for realization of the full tax benefit under section 421. The options are exercisable only by the grantees during their respective lifetimes (or in the event of death by their heirs within 1 year); are not exercisable for 1 year from the date of grant; and are exercisable to the extent of 25 percent of the optioned shares for each year after the first year, provided the grantee remains in the employ of the applicant or a subsidiary. The plan is to be administered by a committee comprised of members of the board of directors.[2] This committee will determine when and to which employees options shall be granted.

The application was filed July 23, 1962, in accordance with our rules but without detailed information as to the justification for the plan. The Commission initially disposed of the application without hearing, denying approval of the applicant's plan by a vote of 3 to 2.[3] The Commission found that: "* * * where a company proposes to sell stock for purposes other than the raising of needed funds, and particularly where the beneficiaries are top management officials of the company, we should authorize the proposal, if at all, only after a comprehensive showing that the proposal, in its mode of operation as well as basic intent, is reasonably necessary or appropriate to achieve some lawful object of the company and otherwise compatible with the public interest."[4]

On January 24, 1963, Black Hills applied for rehearing, indicating that it was prepared to show that the criteria of section 204 had been met. Rehearing was granted February 21, 1963, and a hearing was ordered so that both the applicant and the Commission staff might have an opportunity to introduce comprehensive evidence. The hearing was held in June 1963, and on November 26, 1963, the presiding examiner issued his initial decision (1) authorizing the issuance and sale of 7,400 shares upon condition that the option price be changed from $37.25 per share to not less than $43.60 per share, and (2) denying authorization for the remaining 2,600 shares without prejudice to the filing of further applications at such times as options for such stock are granted. Exceptions to the examiner's decision were filed by staff, and the applicant filed a reply to staff's exceptions.

---

[1] The recent amendments to the Internal Revenue Code, sec. 421–425, 78 Stat. 19, 63–71, placing further limitations on the terms of stock option plans for income tax purposes would necessitate some changes in the instant application.

[2] Article III of the plan provides that neither the members of the committee nor any member of the board of directors who is not an officer or employee of the company shall be eligible for options under the plan.

[3] 28 FPC 1121 (1962).

[4] Id. at 1125.

The issues in this case are framed by the provisions of section 204 of the act, under which the Commission is empowered to authorize the issuance of securities by a public utility. Section 204(a) provides: "No public utility shall issue any security * * * unless and until, and then only to the extent that, upon application by the public utility, the Commission by order authorizes such issue or assumption of liability. The Commission shall make such order only if it finds that such issue * * * (a) is for some lawful object, within the corporate purposes of the applicant and compatible with the public interest, which is necessary or appropriate for or consistent with the proper performance by the applicant of service as a public utility and which will not impair its ability to perform that service, and (b) is reasonably necessary or appropriate for such purposes."

Under the criteria set forth in the quoted paragraph, the Commission must give consideration first to the object or purpose of the stock issue, and second to its use as a means of accomplishing that object or purpose. With respect to the object or purpose, the Commission must determine the following: (1) that it is lawful; (2) that it is within the corporate purposes of the applicant; (3) that it is compatible with the public interest; and (4) that it is necessary or appropriate for or consistent with the proper performance by the applicant of service as a public utility and will not impair its ability to perform that service. With respect to using a stock issue as a means of accomplishing that object or purpose, the Commission must determine that it is reasonably necessary or appropriate to that end. Unless the Commission can make these statutory findings, the application must be denied.

Although applicant indicates that it will utilize the net proceeds from the stock sales for additions and improvements to its properties, the stock option plan is not designed to secure additional capital. The fundamental and admitted purpose of the issue is to provide for additional compensation for key executives beyond present salaries by allowing optionees to purchase stock, at a discount and under favorable tax conditions, and to share in company profits through dividends and capital gains. The plan purports to provide an incentive for such personnel to remain with the company and for qualified new people to seek employment. The issue in this case is whether this plan is compatible with the public interest within the meaning of section 204.

The Commission staff raises serious questions with respect to (a) the compatibility of stock options with the public interest, (b) their consistency with the performance of the applicant's services as a public utility, and (c) the reasonable necessity or appropriateness of using stock options to accomplish the stated purpose of the plan. Staff's objections are directed both to Black Hills' specific proposal and to all restricted stock option plans for regulated public utilities.

The applicant presented three witnesses who urged the approval of stock options as a means of executive compensation. They stated that the option plan was adopted only after prolonged study of the need to retain and attract key personnel and of the possible alternative methods of providing the necessary incentive; and that it was approved at the annual meeting of stockholders held on April 10, 1962. Further, they noted that the plan has since been favorably received by the optionees. They testified that the option plan offers benefits to both the optionees and the company which are absent in increased salary compensation, and that the company is already paying salaries as high as its economics will permit. The witnesses emphasized that Black Hills is a small company, operating in a rugged terrain and in competition with the service furnished by rural cooperatives, as well as with natural gas service; that the company needs an aggressive management to insure its growth and prosperity; that, being a small company, key personnel have broad responsibilities, thus making the company dependent upon their services at the same time that their broad experience made them highly attractive to other companies looking for executive talent; and that Black Hills must compete for managerial and executive talent with companies paying higher salaries and offering employee stock options. They also presented testimony to show that consideration was given to the impact of the stock options on the company's financial situation; that, since the option price exceeds the book value of the outstanding shares, in their view there would be no impairment of the capital structure; and that the number of shares subject to options is small in relation to the number of outstanding shares, thus precluding the possibility of any serious dilution of the per-share earnings or of any substantial adverse impact on the cost of equity capital and the rates charged to the company's utility customers, pointing out that the proposed issue of 10,000 shares represents 2.22 percent of the approximately 450,000 shares currently outstanding.

Staff's presentation, while directed to the specific proposal by Black Hills was designed also to show that public utilities generally should not be permitted to use restricted stock option plans. The staff witness took the position that the inevitable inability to determine the cost of such plans violates public utility accounting principles and frustrates regulatory supervision and control; and that because of the difficulty of evaluating the dollar impact of such plans, executives may be inclined to a philosophy in which they would be preoccupied with obtaining excessive compensation to the detriment of both consumers and shareholders. He stated that there is no direct relationship between executive efficiency and stock market prices for regulated utilities, so that it cannot be assumed that the stock option type of compensation will encourage such efficiency.

The staff witness emphasized the hidden nature of option costs, the dominance of factors other than managerial efficiency in determining earning power and profits, and the possibilities of dilution as the primary reasons for denial of stock options to regulated utilities. He further testified that these public interest considerations warrant a denial of Black Hills' application even though in this case dilution is not a "particularly significant problem," because of the possibility that approval of one such plan was likely to encourage the filing of more ambitious plans with hidden and cumulative costs equally difficult to appraise.

For these reasons staff argues that such plans are not appropriate to compensate management and would impair the company's ability to perform the services of a public utility and are, therefore, not compatible with the public interest within the meaning of section 204(a).

The examiner, reviewing the testimony of the applicant's witnesses with respect to the need for the stock option plan and the advantages which prompted the company to adopt the plan, found the plan to be reasonably necessary or appropriate for its intended purpose. He accepted the testimony of the applicant's witnesses that the company is paying salaries as high as its financial situation warrants, making further increases impracticable. He further noted the impossibility of making a meaningful comparison of benefits between stock options and salary increases, since many benefits, other than the additional dollars received, must be considered in connection with the stock options. He concluded that even if it were possible reasonably to calculate the profit possibilities to the optionees and compare them with salary increases, it would be futile if the optionees in fact preferred the options; and in his judgment the evidence revealed that dollar for dollar the stock option plan is more attractive than a pay raise. Also, in terms of benefits to the company, he found that as a device for retaining key people the stock option plan has advantages not matched by a salary increase program of like dimensions.

On the question of dilution, the examiner found that that there would be no adverse effect on the average net asset value of the company's stock, which at the end of 1962 was about $25 per share, by the granting of options to purchase new stock at $37.25. However, the possibility of some dilution of the earning power of the company's stock led the examiner to modify the option price to $43.60 as a condition of his approval of the plan. This is the price which he computed would, as new investment, return the same earnings as were realized on the company's rate base for the year 1962, the last year for which figures were available at the hearing. Finding that the company earned 6.33 percent on its rate base in 1962, and that its earnings per share for 1962 were $2.76, he concluded that the option price should be the amount of new investment which at 6.33 percent would produce earnings of $2.76; i.e., $43.60. It was his judgment that at this price the company's stock would continue to hold its value, other things being equal, and the sale of the optioned shares at a discount would not detract from the company's ability to render service. With respect to the 2,600 shares not yet included in option grants, the examiner said that authority to issue and sell such shares should be withheld until such time as the company desires to grant the options, when the proper option price can be determined on the basis indicated above.

Staff's exceptions charge that the examiner misconstrued the issues and that he did not consider the important questions raised by it. Staff is especially concerned with his failure to consider the question of the inability to determine the cost of and the proper accounting for option costs in a regulated industry. Staff also cites his failure to consider the question of the relationship or, rather, lack of relationship between executive service and the stock prices which measure the reward under the option plan.

In our view the record in this case raises serious questions of the compatibility of stock option plans of public utilities with the responsibilities of a regulated enterprise under the Federal Power Act. We are not of the opinion that executive stock options are prohibited by section 305(a) of the act which makes it unlawful for officers and directors to benefit from the sale of securities. A public utility is free to apply for approval of such a stock issue if it believes that its proposal can be justified under section 204(a). Our objections go rather to the merits of the requirements of the act that security issues must be compatible with the public interest. As we view the evidence, the applicant has not made out a case for approval under section 204(a). As the Commission recently held, "The plain purpose of section 204 is to prevent the issuance of securities which might impair the company's financial integrity or its ability to perform its public utility responsibilities."[5] It is by this standard that the present application is to be judged and it is by this standard that applicant's plan fails.

Electric utilities are public service companies serving under franchises and certificates granted by agencies of government and possessing the power of eminent domain and other special privileges not available to ordinary companies. While there is an increasing amount of competition between the various forms of energy, electric service maintains a monopoly position for many uses and, even where subject to competition from other energy sources, the rivalry is not of the kind that normally assures reasonable prices for goods and services in a free enterprise situation. For this reason electric utilities are subject to regulation; otherwise they could take advantage of their monopoly position to charge excessive rates and make exorbitant profits. The function of regulatory agencies is to exercise a positive influence on the welfare and growth of this industry which is fundamental to the progress of our entire economy by controlling rates and profits and by focusing the attention of management on their public service responsibilities. The incentives under stock option plans, however, tend naturally to divert management from their responsibilities to the public and to focus their attention on maximizing prices and earnings in order to push stock quotations ever higher.

In nonregulated industry the ostensible reason for stock option plans is simple.[6] It is to maximize profits. Whether they fulfill this purpose is another question, but the purpose is unchallenged. The maximization of profits over the long term is an important management responsibility. Indeed, in those areas where price is controlled by the free interplay of competitive forces, perhaps the outstanding measure of management's competence is to be found in its ability to produce the highest earnings and greatest return on the shareholder's investment. In regulated industry this purpose cannot be accepted. The goal here must rather be effectiveness in the performance of a public service and the measure of executive endeavor is and must remain not the judgment of the stock market on present and future profits but success in providing a service upon which our entire economy is dependent, not at the highest prices which can be obtained but at the lowest rates consistent with the health of the industry and its ability to care for the future needs of its customers. An overriding personal stake in the stock market is doubtfully compatible with the public service responsibilities of the management of a public utility. The electric power industry of today recognizes that it must perform its work with a broad regard for the interests of consumers and the general public, as well as the interests of stockholders and management. Stock option plans do not lend themselves to this balanced management attitude.

The record made in this proceeding affords no basis for concluding that there is any positive relationship between the companies in the vanguard of the electric power industry on the technology and policy levels and those which have adopted stock option plans. There is also no basis for concluding that such plans either lead to or have evolved from distinguished performance in the public interest. Presumably the lack of or any such relationship is at least one of the reasons that although 57 percent of the companies listed on the New York and American Stock Exchanges have adopted stock option schemes, only 11 percent of the class A and B electric companies have employed this device.[7] This evidence of the consensus of judgment within the industry that stock options are not necessary or appropriate for public utilities is to be respected and weighed against the views of the management of the applicant in this case.

The record in this case reveals a number of specific objections to a stock option plan for a public service company. First, such plans disguise the extent of managerial compensation and thus make it easy for the top managers to receive excessive compensation. As the staff showed in this case, there is no practical method of accounting for stock options which will give a clear indication of their cost to the company. Over the years the accounting for costs has been made the foundation of knowledgeable regulatory control. Since there is no disclosure of service costs under these plans in the accounts of the utility, the use of the stock option form of executive compensation distorts the real cost of electric utility service. On the other hand, increases in cash salary payments are immediately evident. Entered into the books of account, they are disclosed and understood by investors, consumers and regulatory officials alike.

Second, stock options usually prefer the top executives and ignore the important role of the lower and middle management group. On a companywide basis they may create a morale problem for the many which offset their claimed incentive value to the few.

Third, such plans lead to executive compensation which is often irrational, erratic, and unrelated to the performance of the executive. General market trends and the growth of the economy in the company's market area may play a larger role in determining the value of the options than the efforts of the optionholders themselves.

Fourth, as discussed above, such options tend to make management focus more on common stock prices than on the service obligations of the company.

Finally, the impact of such options is to dilute the equity of the company.

It is argued that applicant proposes only a small issue in relation to total capitalization. While initial plans, such as that of Black Hills, may be sufficiently modest to avoid serious dilution, stock options tend to be habit forming and the first plans are usually followed by more and bigger ones which cannot be rejected by management or the regulatory agency if future company officials are to be treated like their predecessors. Adpotion of this course of supplementary executive compensation is almost irreversible and thus the initial decision is the crucial one, irrespective of the size or impact of the initial plan.

Black Hills' argument that the stock option plan is needed in order to retain top management staff can hardly be accepted since the record shows that without stock options the company has lost no employees with a salary in excess of $7,000 per year except by death or retirement.[8] Of the three options which have been granted for 1,000 shares or more, one of the recipients is 72 years old and one is 66. Of the remaining 13 recipients, 5 are between the ages of 55 and 65. It could hardly be contended that the options are needed to retain the services of these veterans. Options on only 1,850 shares of stock have been received by employees under the age of 50.[9]

What is clear from this evidence is that since most of the present options are to be granted to older employees additional stock options will soon have to be proposed, and authorizations requested, to attract and retain the services of younger men. Thus, the fact that the initial dilution would be relatively small in this case is not determinative particularly where the cumulative effect may be substantial. Having once permitted the plan to go into operation, it would be doubly difficult, if not impossible, to find that any future increment was in itself not compatible with the public interest.[10]

The growth and results of the only stock option previously approved by this Commission are instructive. The Montana Power Co.'s plan which had a limit of 100,000 shares when approved by the Commission in 1956[11] had increased to 750,000 shares by January 1, 1962, equal to 10 percent of Montana's common stock. The record shows that if all these options are exercised Montana Power will forgo over $9 million in additional capital which the company would have received from the sale of the same stock at the market price rather than the option price.[12]

To illustrate the possible impact of the dilution problem further, the evidence in this proceeding also shows that on the average electric utilities stocks have increased in market value by 150 percent in the last 10 years. If the same trend is assumed for the future, an option granted today will be exercised 10 years from now at 40 percent of the then market price.

A further problem is presented by the timing factor of the option form of compensation. The general rule for regulated companies is that each generation of consumers should pay its own way as the costs are incurred and that the consumer of today should not be asked to pay for the services provided in earlier years nor should later generations of consumers pay for services performed currently. Stock options are a form of deferred compensation which impose a share of the burdens of compensating present management upon the stockholders and consumers at a later date when the options are exercised.

We find nothing in the presentation of Black Hills which indicates that theirs is an exceptional case or in any way immune from the foregoing objections.

We of course are aware that stock option plans have been accorded favorable treatment under the Internal Revenue Code and have been approved by 2 other Federal regulatory agencies[13] and by the regulatory commissions of 16 States. We note that at least three State regulatory agencies have refused to approve stock option plans for public utilities.[14] Our concern in this case is limited to a determination whether such plans meet the standard set by section 204(a) of the Federal Power Act. We find that applicant's actual experience in recruiting and retaining management without stock options, the comparison on the record of its salary scale with that of comparable companies, and the evidence as to the expected future life with the company of those who have received the bulk of the options, all fail to establish applicant's case for a restricted stock option plan. We further find that the fact that stock options involve a "no-cost" method of accounting; that actual costs are hidden from the shareholders and consumers; that the reward may have little, if any, relationship to the value of executive performance; that a conflict of interest may be created in the duty of those optionees who establish the rate policy of the company; and that the normal growth of such options tends to dilute the equity of the company, establish that the use of the stock option as a device for executive compensation is not consistent with the proper performance by a utility of its public service obligation.

---

[5] *Pacific Power & Light Co.*, opinion No. 354, 27 FPC 623, 626.

[6] A rich literature is accumulating on this intriguing subject. See J. A. Livingston, "The American Stockholder" (J. P. Lippincott Co., 1958); "The Mysterious Stock Option," Erwin N. Griswold, dean, Harvard Law School, in "Tax Revision Compendium," Nov. 16, 1959, vol. 2, pp. 1327–1335, House Committee on Ways and Means; "Executive Compensation: Taxation of Stock Options," Vanderbilt Law Review 475 (1960); Leslie Gould, "Directors Responsibility—Two Schools of Thought on One Board", New York Journal-American, Apr. 6, 1960; Dean Erwin N. Griswold, "Are Stock Options Getting Out of Hand?", Harvard Business Review, November-December, 1960.

[7] Exhibit No. 12, schedules 1 and 2.

[8] Exhibit No. 12, schedule 10. The reply brief of Black Hills indicates that the witness Walrafen resigned from his position as of September 1, 1963. The fact that the applicant has been forced to go outside the record to find one lone employee who, for one reason or another, has left the company only serves to point up the weakness of the company's case.

[9] Exhibit No. 3.

[10] Although the present plan is limited to 10,000 shares, applicant conceded in the hearing that there is nothing in the plan to prohibit their coming in with a supplemental application at any time.

[11] The Montana Power Co., 16 FPC 863 (1956).

[12] Exhibit No. 12, schedule 7, sheet 5.

[13] *Chicago & Northwestern Railway Co.*, 296 ICC 277, 454 (1956); *Middle South Utilities Co.*, SEC release No. 14367, 37 PUR 3d 461 (1961).

On the record in this case we conclude that the restricted stock option plan of applicant Black Hills is not compatible with the public interest. Accordingly, the application for authority for the issuance of stock will be denied.

The Commission finds:

1. Black Hills Power & Light Co., a corporation organized under the laws of the State of South Dakota and the applicant herein, is a public utility within the meaning of section 204 of the Federal Power Act, subject to the jurisdiction of the Commission, as heretofore described and set forth in the Commission's order issued November 2, 1962, in this docket, 28 FPC 785.

2. The proposed issuance and sale of up to a maximum of 10,000 shares of common stock, par value $1 per share, pursuant to the provisions of the above-described restricted stock option plan will constitute an issuance of securities within the purview of section 204 of the act.

3. The applicant is not organized and operating in a State under the laws of which the security issue here involved is regulated by a State commission within the meaning of section 204(f) of the act; and the proposed issuance of common stock, as described above, is, therefore, not exempt by virtue of that subsection from the requirements of section 204 of the act.

4. The proposed issuance of 10,000 shares of common stock pursuant to applicant's restricted stock option plan (a) is not compatible with the public interest, is not necessary or appropriate for or consistent with the proper performance by the applicant of service as a public utility, and will impair its ability to perform such service; and (b) is not reasonably necessary or appropriate for the accomplishment of the corporate purposes of the applicant.

The Commission orders:

The application by Black Hills Power & Light Co. for authorization to issue 10,000 shares of common stock pursuant to the restricted stock option plan is denied.

By the Commission:

JOSEPH H. GUTRIDE,
Secretary.

Commissioner O'Connor dissenting filed a separate statement appended hereto. Commissioner Woodward dissenting joins in Commissioner O'Connor's statement.

BLACK HILLS POWER & LIGHT CO., DOCKET NO. E-7046

(Issued June 30, 1964)

O'Connor, Commissioner, dissenting. In the first of this two-stage proceeding I carefully explained what the legislative history and judicial interpretation dictate as the proper criteria for section 204(a).[1] I strongly urged that the very plan, here again rejected, met those criteria and that the Commission had exceeded its statutory authority in holding to the contrary. I have not altered my views. However, lest the absence of their repetition be misconstrued, I hereby reindorse them.

The thrust of my comments will be toward the highly speculative nature of the majority's statement, and at a significant, and unfortunate, consequence to which it may well lead.

The majority holds that stock options are incompatible with the responsibilities of electric utilities. As a result, they are hereinafter proscribed for those utilities.

The majority fears that options will result in higher power prices. Higher prices, they reason, by producing higher earnings, will ultimately produce higher market demand for common equity. Thus managers can, and would, effect market escalations. Notwithstanding this conclusion's variance with their statement that general market trends and area growth—and not individual efforts—produce market fluctuations, it is emphatically repudiated by the record upon which this opinion ostensibly rests. Testimony reveals that subsequent to the option's adoption by 77 percent of the Black Hills shareholders, i.e., at a time when the majority anticipates higher rates, company managers voluntarily reduced rates in one service area, and, at the time of the hearing, had announced a further reduction in its general service rate.[2] The evidence simply will not support any inference that Commission authorization of the Black Hills option would inevitably have, or tend to have, effects detrimental to the public interest.

Moreover, one legitimately wonders how optionees of well-regulated utilities could violate their public trust to the extent sufficient to create market repercussions. Fallacious surplus accounts, alluring to the unsophisticated investor, are proscribed by our uniform system of accounts. Excessive rates of return, productive of larger dividends, are proscribed by the general provisions of section 205(a). Inflated rate bases, by which reasonable rates of return could produce excessive dollars of return, and reasonable rate bases containing fees paid to controlling interests, are proscribed by section 3(13). Any violation of the uniform system of accounts would be noticed upon the filing of the company's first annual report, and any violation of section 205(a) would be exposed the first time a company initiated a section 205(e) proceeding, or the Commission initiated a periodic actual rate of return spot check. Violations of section 3(13) would be revealed in either section 205(e) or 206(a) proceedings. Slight violations of section 3(13) could escape unnoticed, but slight violations would have absolutely no effect on the market.

The majority also fears that stock option plans disguise their costs, the implication being that disguised costs lead to excessive costs. The majority defines "costs" several ways, one of which is as "capital forgone." "Capital forgone" represents the difference between the option price and the market price on the date of exercise, and is synonymous with "dilution." Referring to this dilution as a cost is more fanciful than accurate because the dilution resulting from the regulated issuance of stock options would cost consumers nothing and shareholders very little.

True costs, in the sense that more capital need be raised to generate the same income, are envisioned by the majority's indication that the exercise of an option will burden future consumers. Deciphered, this is an endorsement of staff's Montana Power Co. exhibit whereby they calculated the annual earnings requirement of the "excess shares" issued under the option.[3] Staff's exhibit reasoned that as n shares earned x dollars per share, the issuance of $n+$ shares, where the $+$ constituted excess shares, would continue to earn x dollars per share. The conclusion is fallacious. As staff witness Beidatsch recognized, the initial impact of minor dilution is on shareholders, not consumers.[4] Unlike the issuance of paid-for shares which create an investment and thus a return, a reasonable amount of excess shares would result in a corresponding, but minute, decrease in earnings per share. Before earnings could remain constant, i.e., the dollar-impact be shifted to consumers, rates must be increased. Thus, the unfortunate consequence of staff's exhibit is that return on equity becomes directly translated into return on investment for ratemaking purposes. This is a position to which the Commission has not committed itself but one which, if they believe that option-exercise will inevitably burden consumers, is indicated by the majority's statement. Aside from its undesirable consequences, the Montana Power Co., exhibit was premised upon assumptions too speculative for even witness Beidatsch to accept.[5] One of its assumptions, viz, that this agency would have authorized the additional 450,000 shares to be optioned, is by itself sufficient to dismiss its dollar-conclusions as meaningless.[6]

Thus, before stock options could create costs borne by consumers, two conditions must exist: First, the equity dilution must be so extensive that the market price of the company's equity is substantially depressed; and second, the applicable regulatory agency must determine that an increased rate of return is needed as compensation. Apparently conceding the desirability of the second condition, the majority indicates its helplessness to prevent the first. The rationale is that stock options are uncontrollable; once an initial application is approved, subsequent applications become impossible to reject. The majority envisions no consideration of degrees; no leeway to accept what is reasonable and to reject what is not. It thus becomes better to proscribe all options—even the unquestionably reasonable Black Hills option—than to attempt to identify and reject only the unreasonable or inappropriate applications.

Their position is totally meritless. There is no legal or practical restriction upon the denial of stock option applications. Whether a particular application be initial or secondary, it may be denied. Clearly, whenever its approval would result in the extent of dilution necessary to impair substantially the cost of capital, it must be denied.

The majority seeks to shore up their position with the suggestion that, due to the age of the Black Hills optionees, other Black Hills applications are soon forthcoming. Again they ignore the evidence. Six of the fifteen optionees are under 44 years of age, which, assuming retirement at age 65, gives them an estimated future employment of from 21 to 29 years. These are not veterans soon to retire. Moreover, the present plan is without restriction as to the age, department, or length of service requirement for its optionees. The present optionees include line superintendents, the general sales manager, the sales production manager, the production superintendent, the distribution engineer, and the chief revenue accountant. Consequently, any intimation that the scope of the present plan is insufficiently narrow is inaccurate. Further still, there are 3,200 unoptioned shares under the present plan. Inasmuch as the average share per optionee below the level of senior vice president is 275, this indicates that 12 more options could be granted before another application need be filed. The majority's clairvoyance in the face of this evidence regrettably escapes me.

---

[14] *Re Baltimore Transit Co.*, 4 PUR 3d 151 (Maryland PSC, 1954), affirmed 9 PUR 3d 1, 114 A. 2d 834 (1955); *Re South Atlantic Gas Co.*, 13 PUR 3d 230 (Georgia PSC, 1956); *Re The Brooklyn Union Gas Co.*, 24 PUR 3d 445 (New York PSC, 1958), affirmed 29 PUR 3d 388, 187 N.Y.S. 2d 207 (1959).

[1] *Black Hills Power & Light Co.*, 28 FPC 1121, 1134–40 (1962).

[2] Record, vol. 1, p. 129.

[3] "Excess shares" are defined as being "* * * the number of shares * * * exercised by optionees in excess of the number required to raise on the market on the * * * dates of * * * exercise the equivalent amount of capital contributed by the optionees." Staff schedule 7, sheet 1.

[4] Record, vol. 2, p. 330.

[5] Record, vol. 2, at 41–42.

[6] Unmentioned in the majority's statement is that Montana Power Co. common stock underwent a 3-for-1 split in 1959.

Commission approval of proposals which involve potential, de minimis dilution is neither unusual nor improper when, as here, there are counterbalancing considerations. Examples can be found in financing plans whereby bonds are issued with warrants to convert to common shares. Thus, in January of 1960, this Commission approved a financing plan for Midwestern Gas Transmission Co. (Midwestern) whereby $1,000 first mortgage bonds were issued with warrants to purchase 4 shares of Midwestern's common stock at $15. The warrants could be exercised between 1964 and 1973, and were admittedly "sweeteners" added solely to attract potential investors away from more secure investments.[7] Midwestern common is now selling around $19 per share.

Other straws to which the majority clings can be disposed of briefly. First, their apprehension that stock options ignore lower and middle management groups is curious in the context of Black Hills which doesn't have such groups. Moreover, it ignores the employee welfare and savings plan which, although less attractive than the restricted stock option plan, is open to all employees.[8] More curious, a unanimous Commission approved the employee welfare plan even though the shares were to be issued at 90 percent of their market value on the granting date. Thus, as of the date of issuance, 10 percent of the market value of the shares is likely to be forgone. Moreover, the majority's concern for the morale of this nonexistent group is touching, unconvincing and hardly dispositive, and smacks of their position of rubber-stamping subsequent applications. If a serious morale problem could be shown in any application, either initial or secondary, likely to impair the ability of the company to perform its public utility operations, obviously the application should be denied.

Their contention of "compensation unrelated to performance" is unacceptable for two reasons. First, stock values, they say, appreciate because of general market trends and area growth. True. Area growth, however, often appreciates because of readily available sources of cheap power which, in turn, is often the result of efficient management. The majority has yet to contend that better management won't produce cheaper power. To do so would be astonishing, not only because of its patent invalidity, but also because it would hard press this Commission to justify its current project to measure the performance of public utility managers. Second, however, and with more ominous implications, cash salaries are no more related to performance than are stock option tax benefits. Thus, although the instant decision purportedly deals only with a method of compensation and not the amount, the "unrelated compensation" test will inevitably be read as a mandate to prescribe salary levels, and, in fact, the number of personnel a utility may employ. Such far-reaching regulation is ideologically impalatable to most individuals, but it is the inevitable conclusion—in fact, the next short step—from the majority's statement.

Equally weighty is their argument that if industry vanguards have no option plans, no industry component, regardless of how small, can justify one. The rebuttal is obvious: stock options are enticements to attract and keep qualified personnel, and industry vanguards do not need these enticements. Their standing offer of security, prestige, large salaries, and opportunities to work with other capable personnel are, in themselves, sufficient attractions. Any speculative elaboration on Black Hills' need is unnecessary, inasmuch as the record itself establishes it. At the time of the examiner's hearing Mr. L. Duane Walrafen was vice president and secretary-treasurer of Black Hills. He was also the chief accounting officer, and was described as having "primary responsibility for accounting, rates, financing, budgeting, forecasting, corporate records, stockholder relations, taxes, and Commission regulation."[9] He was then 39 years of age, and, although his salary had more than doubled in his 7 years at Black Hills, he admitted that he would be compelled to consider other offers. Our public files, of which I take official notice, now reveal that Mr. L. Duane Walrafen is a vice president of the Kansas Power & Light Co. Kansas Power & Light has a stock option in effect for its key employees.[10]

The majority's conclusion that all stock options are not prohibited by section 305(a) of the Federal Power Act does little to conceal their conclusion that all such options are prohibited by section 204. When the generalities relied upon to reject this application are weighed against the applicant's impressive presentation, it becomes clear that no stock option will ever be approved for an electric utility under the jurisdiction of this Commission. No applicant will ever be able to rebut the hazy rationale of this decision. This is a regrettable outcome; one that is compelled by neither law nor reason. It is reached because of a vague apprehension, confirmed by neither the record nor the fabricated supports, that all optionees will inevitably cease functioning in the public interest. It is made with inadequate consideration of the fact that potential optionees can always acquire a personal interest in their company on the open market, and that the compulsory first-offer requirement precludes any get-rich-quick scheme.[11] It is directed at the conflict-of-interest of stock owning utility managers, and never pinpoints the evils inherent in stock options. It minimizes the fact that smaller utilities need extra blandishments to attract and retain qualified personnel; that the cost of salaries are unquestionably borne by consumers whereas reasonable stock options seldom are; and that, at any rate, there is evidence that salary increases are seldom as attractive as stock options. In short, it has accentuated the problem faced by public utilities in employing and retaining qualified personnel. It admits the absence of equity dilution in this case, but relies upon an unfounded infirmity to prevent it in subsequent applications. Lastly, by giving section 204 the most stringent of interpretations, it unquestionably has obstructed the passage of pending legislation S. 1700 and H.R. 6790. These bills would amend section 12 of the Natural Gas Act to give us the identical security-issuance jurisdiction we now possess under section 204 of the Federal Power Act. If this legislation is passed, and the instant decision stands, the fate of the pipeline company stock option becomes fixed.

To a decision by which every one loses, I must respectfully dissent. It is my firm belief that the Black Hills plan should be approved. I would, however, condition it to require the issuance of shares at 100 percent of their market value on the granting date, in lieu of the 95 percent price now proposed. This condition would preclude dilution as of this date, and would comply with the Revenue Act of 1964 whereby Congress reiterated its impetus to the adoption of these plans.

Commissioner Woodward joins me in this dissent.

L. J. O'Connor, Jr.,
Commissioner.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE PATRICK JUDGE

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, one of the most important private representatives of the United States abroad is the Asia Foundation. This group conducts educational activities in the Far East in an effort to improve Asian-American relations. One of its outstanding programs brings young Asian political leaders to Washington for a year's training in the offices of U.S. Senators and Representatives.

Today I pay tribute to the memory of Paul Patrick Judge, the former Manila representative of the Asia Foundation, whose remains were recently flown to his home city of San Francisco for burial.

For more than a decade, Patrick Judge implemented some of the most outstanding programs of the Asia Foundation in the Far East. Where U.S. aid programs often appear impersonal and remote from the felt needs of our friends overseas, Patrick Judge brought to his work two rare gifts—a quality of sincere compassion and the ability to inspire aid recipients with the will to achieve their own set goals.

A tribute to Patrick Judge's life work has been written by one of the last young Asians he guided—a youthful Philippine politician currently interning in the U.S. Senate.

I ask unanimous consent that this tribute be printed in the Congressional Record.

There being no objection, the tribute was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Tribute to Paul Patrick Judge, Asia Foundation Pioneer

(By Bartolome De Castro)

A deep sense of personal commitment to his host country's interests characterized Paul Patrick Judge's tenure as Asia Foundation representative in the Philippines. This commitment was evident in his day-to-day work and in his qualities of mind and heart which came to be the hallmark of the foundation's program in the Philippines.

---

[7] Record, vol. 10, p. 1473, *Midwestern Gas Transmission Co.*, docket No. RP61–19.

[8] Approved 28 FPC 785 (1962).

[9] Record, vol. 2, p. 216.

[10] The Montana Power Co., which operates in the neighboring States of Montana, Wyoming, and Idaho, and the Washington Water Power Co., which operates in Washington and Idaho also have stock option plans in effect.

[11] "Shares purchased upon exercise of an option may not be sold or transferred within 6 months of the date of issue of the certificate therefor, unless they are first offered to the Corporation at the option price of such shares, and the certificate or certificates for such shares shall be endorsed to reflect such restriction." Article V of the stock option plan. This restriction is also contained in condition 1 of each individual option.

He lent strong support to the fellowship program which brings young Asian leaders to Washington for a year's apprenticeship at the U.S. Capital. When he first mentioned the program to me, he had one important question: What can you do for your country when you get back from the training? In this and other foundation-sponsored programs, he had to be convinced that American aid would ultimately serve the best interest of the Philippines.

Patrick Judge saw foreign aid as more than just a dollars-and-cents proposition. He knew that before the foundation's program could ever be meaningful, he had to give the full measure of his talents and ideals to his job. More important, he demonstrated by his dedication the qualities of self-sacrifice and the will to achieve that he expected and inspired from aid recipients. Youthful Asian leaders often surpassed themselves because "Patrick Judge expects the best from us."

Following the Asia Foundation's policy, Patrick Judge channeled assistance toward private institutions or community groups. He disliked programs of handouts, doles, and mass charity. Instead, he sparked interest in credit unions, cooperatives, consumer groups, and women's leagues, all of which mobilized local resources and gave the people an opportunity to achieve their own desires. Confronted with the inroads of communism and political opportunism among student groups, he responded with a positive program of leadership training which the students themselves managed.

Patrick Judge's work is a shining testimonial to what Americans can achieve through private aid programs. As one Filipino intellectual put it, "the Asia Foundation here has become identified with self-sacrifice, excellence, and respect in its humanitarian goals." In every way, Paul Patrick Judge was the human embodiment of this description.

ELBERT COVELL COLLEGE—SPLENDID PROGRESS BY UNIVERSITY OF THE PACIFIC

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, until September 4, 1963, no Latin American student from the Spanish-speaking countries could enroll as a full-time participating student in a North American college or university unless he was proficient in the English language. The doors to North American educational opportunities and technological advancement were closed to all eager Latin American students unless they were as proficient in the English language as our own high school graduates.

In the same way, until September 4, 1963, a North American student, no matter how intense his interest in Spanish America, could not study any subject matter in the Spanish language except its literature. Those North American students who specialized in the critical needs of all the Americas—the sciences, economics, teaching, and so forth—were seldom, if ever, permitted to offer Spanish as the required foreign language in the areas of their specialization.

This unhappy situation was brought to an end by the establishment of Elbert Covell College, the Spanish-speaking college of the University of the Pacific in Stockton, Calif. The educational program of this excellent and unique new college is specifically designed to produce inter-American specialists: young men and women who are trained to offer their skill for the continuing social and economic development of all the American Republics.

These people will be specialists in the skills Latin America needs most—engineering, business administration, and educational supervision. But the most important thing is that they will be bilingual, equally able to share their advanced training in two languages, Spanish and English, to people of various cultures. They will have studied the values, traditions, and reactions of the young men and women of another culture who are their classmates. And no less important, while studying another culture, they will become aware of and appreciative of their own culture, which they are also required to study in this program of inter-American studies.

Mr. President, we in the United States have recently become aware of our drastic shortcomings where the teaching of foreign languages is concerned. This country has a history of producing scholars who are not proficient in any language but English, but these American scholars must go out and deal with persons from foreign nations who are skillfully multilingual. I believe the Elbert Covell College is making a significant and growing contribution toward overcoming this tragic foreign language deficiency among American scholars and, generally, among our people. This college's program is one that should be emulated by other institutions of higher learning throughout this Nation. For this reason, I would like a brief description of this program to be placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the description was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ELBERT COVELL COLLEGE: THE SPANISH-SPEAKING COLLEGE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF THE PACIFIC

Until September 4, 1963, no Latin American student from the Spanish-speaking American republics could take advantage of the professional opportunities of higher education in the United States unless he were qualified to meet academic competition in the English language. This Nation of ours, which rightfully boasts of superior teaching techniques, materials equipment, and facilities has been willing and eager to share its educational achievements in this country only with those Latin Americans who were qualified to receive new information through the medium of one language alone—the English language. We have made the serious mistake of sharing North American knowledge in this country only with those men and women who can experience it in the North American language.

We have insisted that the Latin American student begin his advanced education in the United States as equally articulate in the English language as his North American classmate. We have demanded the impossible, for we have demanded that the Latin American be North American in order to partake of North American eduational experiences. We expect him to understand, speak, read, and write the English language at a level of correction deemed satisfactory to college entrance examination boards and monolingual professors.

We have failed to meet the Latin American as he is—Spanish speaking. We have related intelligence or academic accomplishment to his revelation of it in the English language.

We disregard his potential for receiving in his own language and disseminating in it new kinds of knowledge to his countrymen. We fail him early in his university career for poor spelling in a language of little use to him or his compatriots upon his return to his native country. Too many Latin American students have come to the United States to study and have failed because of the language barrier. Eager to learn, enthusiastic and ambitious, they have returned home, bitter and resentful.

Other Latin American students have successfully struggled through the language barrier, so successfully, in fact, that they have "North Americanized" themselves and located permanently here rather than return to share their training with their countrymen. If we continue to insist in our institutions of higher learning that Latin Americans be taught in the English language and that they become like us as quickly and thoroughly as possible, we shall continue to do much more harm than good for our Latin American neighbors. We shall make it much easier for the eager, the enthusiastic, the ambitious to remain in this country. We shall be draining national human power from the nations we wish to help rather than send it to them.

In our position of educational leadership we have been wrong in failing to share the resources of this leadership with Latin American students in their own language. We have failed to make adjustments in the techniques and materials so that the shared leadership with Latin Americans could be put to effective use in meeting the special needs and requirements in Latin America. The young and the idealistic men and women who leave families and homes for the purpose of acquiring knowledge and skills which they intend to put at the service of their families, friends, and native land must be given a chance to succeed in their original intention: They must go back home with knowledge immediately applicable to their national needs.

Until September 4, 1963, a North American student, however sincere may have been his desire to live and work in Latin America, could not study any subject matter in Spanish except the language itself and its literature. With this kind of training, he could, of course, teach the Spanish language. Latin America does not need North Americans who have been trained to be Spanish teachers. It does, however, need inter-American specialists who are skilled in the sciences and mathematics, business administration and economics, and teaching and administration in grade schools and high schools.

Latin America does need North American teachers of home economics who are able to share their training in the Spanish language to Spanish-speaking people whose values and reactions they understand and respect. It does need North American biology teachers who can create laboratories out of glass jars and household insects. It does need elementary school teachers who can make a visual aid out of any magazine cover. It does need the bilingual economist who has lived in a nation of consumers, where small profit on many sales satisfies both the man who buys and the man who produces the article. Latin America does need the North American who has something to offer in the Spanish language to a people he understands.

One-third of the students in the Elbert Covell College are North Americans; one-third of the students are Latin Americans whose parents can afford to send them to the United States to study; one-third are Latin Americans who without financial help could not study in this country, or even, possibly, in their own counrtries. The majority of these students are young, ranging in age from 18 to 22. With belief and effort, like the young in all ages, all countries, the Elbert Covell College students are dedicated to development in Latin America and to improvement in inter-American relations.

Their language for communication in the classrooms, the dining hall, the dormitories, and in social events is Spanish. The Latin American students study programed courses in English as a second language and they are urged to take some of their college work in that language when they are sufficiently well prepared to do so. Although the Elbert Covell College is not primarily a center for learning foreign languages, within the period of 4 years all students will be completely bilingual. The Elbert Covell College believes that students should learn their information in the languages in which they are going to use this information. Inter-American specialists who plan to work in Spanish-speaking Latin America must master the vocabulary and concepts of their skills equally well in the Spanish and English languages.

Elbert Covell College provides a unique intercultural living and learning experience. Latin Americans of all economic classes, from all the Spanish-speaking countries study with North American students in an atmosphere where the Spanish language and culture dominate. The flags from each of the American Republics hang from the beams in the Elbert Covell College dining hall. Each Latin American is at home with North American students and other Latin Americans in a valuable and pleasant, educational atmosphere which has reduced to a minimum the "culture-shock" which plagues all students in their first foreign residence and study.

It has also become evident in this first year of operation that both North American and Latin American students are becoming very aware of and appreciative of their own heritage, thus unafraid or envious of the heritage of the other Americans.

Latin American students from the Spanish-speaking countries can now enroll in an institution of higher education in the United States to take advantage of North American educational opportunities and technological advancement in their own language. North American students can now become fluent in the Spanish language while specializing in the educational needs of all the Americas.

The Elbert Covell College has innovated a practical, 20th-century innovation in inter-American education. It deserves to be admired and supported for its pioneering effort.

AMERICAN VETERANS COMMITTEE ENDORSES COLD WAR GI BILL IN NATIONAL CONVENTION

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, among the ardent supporters of the cold war GI bill (S. 5) are the various veterans organizations representing veterans throughout our country. Although this bill has been stagnated on the Senate Calendar for over a year as of July 2, the pressing need for this bill gives rise to hope that this legislative body will soon recognize the necessity for its enactment.

On the foundation of the belief that justice must soon prevail, the veterans groups of this country have maintained their active support of the cold war GI bill. As an illustration of this continued support, I ask unanimous consent that a letter recently received from the American Veterans Committee be printed in the RECORD, along with their endorsement of the cold war GI bill in both their 1964–65 platform, and by a general resolution adopted by their whole national convention in May of this year.

There being no objection, the letter and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN VETERANS COMMITTEE,
Washington, D.C., July 1, 1964.

Hon. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH,
Chairman, Senate Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR YARBOROUGH: As chairman of the Veterans and Armed Forces Affairs Commission of the American Veterans Committee, I am pleased to transmit to you a copy of the platform and resolutions passed by the 17th national convention of the American Veterans Committee, held in New York City, May 15–17, 1964.

Your attention is invited to the items which appear to be of particular interest to you, and which have been marked on the enclosure.

Yours very truly,
MURRAY M. CORAN,
Chairman, Veterans and Armed Forces Affairs Commission.

[From the American Veterans Committee Bulletin, June 1964]

PLATFORM, 1964–65: ADOPTED, NATIONAL CONVENTION, MAY 15–17, 1964

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE CONVENTION—VETERANS AND ARMED FORCES AFFAIRS

Cold war GI bill

The military action in Vietnam lends increased emphasis to the justice of enacting the cold war GI bill, S. 5. The failure of the Congress to provide veterans' benefits to those actually engaged in combat is inexcusable. Since every member of the armed services is subject to being assigned to combat or other hazardous duty at any time, extension of veterans' benefits to those serving in the Armed Forces since the expiration of the Korean GI bill is not only just, but clearly in the national interest.

Peacetime GI bill of rights

Experience with the World War GI bill of rights has given ample evidence of the value in increased productivity to the Nation and in the increased taxes to the Government of that law's education and training provisions.

AVC endorses a modified GI bill of rights for peacetime draftees and volunteers who have been on extended active duty. It is our belief that such men who enable our country to maintain peace and meet its commitments and responsibilities to our allies are entitled to basic readjustment benefits to enable them to return without distress to civilian life at the end of their service and become useful and productive members of their communities.

Therefore, in principle, AVC endorses any peacetime bill of rights which will carry out the principles hereinabove set forth and which will allow for equitable readjustment benefits to peacetime veterans.

CHICAGO CITY COUNCIL ENDORSES PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION OF A U.S. MINT IN ILLINOIS

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, on April 23 I introduced S. 2762, to provide for the estbalishment of a mint of the United States in the State of Illinois. Several similar bills have been introduced in the House.

I pointed out at that time that there is a severe shortage of coins in the Midwest and that the two existing coinage mints, though now operated virtually 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, to produce about 4 billion coins annually, are unable to meet the demand. Recent studies show that we will need an annual production of at least 5.1 billion coins by 1970 and 17.8 billion by 1990. The announcement by the Treasury Department a few days ago that steps are being taken to increase present production at the existing mints may offer hope that the present demand will be partially satisfied, but it offers little hope for a satisfactory long-term solution. A mint in Illinois would be an economical and proper long-term solution.

Support for this proposal is strong. Many individual banks, banking associations, chambers of commerce, and retail trade associations have pleaded for action on this legislation. Impressive additional evidence of the support for this proposal is the resolution recently adopted by the City Council of the City of Chicago. I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF CHICAGO AT MEETING HELD ON JUNE 10, 1964

Whereas the Association of Commerce and Industry has called the city's attention to the need for a U.S. mint in the Chicago area; and

Whereas the Chicago area, being centrally located geographically, transportationally and otherwise, is an ideal location for the placement of a U.S. mint: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States and the President of the United States are memorialized and urged to take whatever steps might be possible toward the establishment of a U.S. mint in the city of Chicago; and be it further

Resolved, That the city clerk is hereby authorized and directed to mail a copy of this resolution to each member of the Illinois congressional delegation.

HEALTH CARE FOR THE AGED

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the responsibility for meeting the problems of health care faced by our aged citizens is now in the hands of the Senate. It has become increasingly apparent that the Kerr-Mills program is inadequate, and that a new plan, financed under the social security system, is necessary. The House Ways and Means Committee has proposed a 5-percent increase in social security benefits, but this is not a solution to the health care problems of the aged. The New York Times, in a June 26 editorial, indicates that it is fallacious to believe that this 5-percent increase can meet the health needs of our aged citizens. On Monday, a letter to the editor of the New York Times by the director of the Community Council of Greater New York, Mr. James Fogarty, further shows why an increase in benefits does not remedy the problem and why a new plan must be passed. It is my hope that the Senate will take such action.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial and the letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, June 26, 1964]

ONE-MAN VETO ON MEDICARE

The great power exercised by Representative WILBUR D. MILLS as chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee is displayed in its starkest form by the committee's decision to shelve medical care for the aged based on social security. Mr. MILLS prefers the restrictive approach to health care embodied in his own Kerr-Mills Act—a preference to which he clings despite the inadequacies demonstrated in the 4 years since that law's passage. The result is that the committee has once again refused to give the full House membership a chance to vote on medicare, even though this has been a must item through all of the Kennedy and Johnson administrations.

Instead of improved health protection for the elderly, the Ways and Means Committee is reporting out a general increase of 5 percent in all cash benefits under the old-age, disability, and survivors insurance program. As we have noted before, such an increase is eminently desirable to offset part of the erosion in the purchasing power of benefits that has occurred since the last across-the-board rise in 1959. But it represents no answer to the medicare problem. Indeed, it will not even wholly erase the impact of higher living costs on the benefit standards Congress set 5 years ago, much less enable the aged to make more adequate provision for paying hospital bills.

The administration's opportunity to revive its medicare program will presumably come when the social security measure gets into the Senate. The program is urgently needed; it would be a defeat for the democratic process to kill it without giving both Houses of Congress a direct voice in the decision.

[From the New York Times, July 7, 1964]

MEDICAL CARE BILL URGED—LEGISLATION TO FINANCE NEEDS OF AGED VIA SOCIAL SECURITY BACKED

To the EDITOR:

Your June 26 editorial on medicare made two extremely important points. You referred to the inadequacies of the Kerr-Mills program, which we regard as a total failure in terms of what Congress intended—namely, to serve the marginal income group above the public assistance level.

In New York City the effect has been bookkeeping transfers from old age assistance to the medical assistance to the aged category in order to collect the new Federal reimbursement for services previously rendered out of city funds. It is conservatively estimated that 235,000 New York City residents would have been eligible for preventive health services even under stringent income levels promulgated by New York State. But only a few hundred have been willing to submit themselves and their adult children to humiliating financial investigation.

You correctly pointed out that a 5-percent increase in social security benefits would not even meet the rise in cost of living since the 1959 adjustment in benefits, much less enable older people to purchase hospital insurance. The 1960 census gave us a sobering picture of income levels of older people in New York City.

About 70 percent of those 65 years and older had incomes of less than $2,000—well over half a million older people. That same year the average monthly social security benefit for retired workers was under $80: for the surviving spouse it was $60 to $67 a month. It is ironic that the small percentage of older people supported by public assistance also get a range of medical and related services while the much larger group living on inadequate social security benefits do not have access to services.

VULNERABLE GROUPS

The drain of medical costs on limited incomes of older people is well known, but we would like to call attention to two particularly vulnerable groups. The 1960 census indicated that nearly 156,000 older New Yorkers were living alone, and 69 percent of them had less than $2,000 income in 1959. Those 75 years and older totaled almost 230,000 people in 1960, a group larger than the total population of Staten Island. Median income for males was $1,473 and $807 for females.

It is the fundamental conviction of community council, the planning and coordinating agency for health and welfare in New York City, that the socially desirable and fiscally sound approach to financing health care for the aging is through the social security system. We hope most urgently that a bill embodying this principle can be enacted before the close of this congressional session.

JAMES W. FOGARTY,
Executive Director, Community Council of Greater New York.

NEW YORK, *June 30, 1964.*

THE 88TH CONGRESS GREAT CONSERVATION RECORD

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, the record this Congress is making on resources legislation is an outstanding one, and we are regularly adding to it in these last weeks of the second session.

A number of us have been aware of the record that is building up. Now that awareness is spreading.

I ask unanimous consent to have included in the RECORD an editorial from the Huron (S. Dak.) Daily Plainsman of Wednesday, July 8, captioned "Congress Shows Awareness of Resource Development." It is a splendid editorial calling attention to the many resource development measures which have been passed, or are likely to be passed before we adjourn.

The Plainsman is an independent newspaper. It is also a great conservationist newspaper which does not hesitate to give credit where credit is due for achievements in the conservation field.

The editorial points to impending authorization of the great Garrison diversion project in North Dakota, which has passed the Senate and has been favorably reported to the House.

It applauds the water resources research bill which has been passed and will soon be signed by the President. It mentions the river basin planning bill, S. 1111, which we have passed and the House Interior Committee now has in markup, the recent wetlands bill the wilderness bill, seashore and inland recreation area measures, and the proposed land policy review.

I was pleased that the Plainsman mentioned our colleague, Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, of New Mexico—a native of South Dakota—by name in the editorial. His leadership on resources legislation has been outstanding, and it has been a privilege to coauthor with him the Senate bills which compose the portfolio of measures on which the Plainsman editorial comments.

If I could make one addition to the editorial, I would add the name of Chairman WAYNE ASPINALL, of the House Interior Committee, under whom I served for two terms in the House. Chairman ASPINALL is the author of the land policy review bill and the land and water conservation fund bill now on the House calendar, and has expedited the Senate conservation measures as they came to the House.

This Congress can be proud of the conservation record it is making. I insert the Plainsman's fine editorial to indicate that it is widely appreciated.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS SHOWS AWARENESS OF RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT

A growing awareness of the Nation's responsibility in preserving its natural resources is evidenced in a sheaf of bills reported nearing enactment by Congress.

Of major interest to South Dakota is the Garrison diversion unit bill which has been favorably reported from the House Insular Affairs Committee and which will be considered on the House floor later this month.

This bill is the authorization for the Garrison irrigation unit and its favorable consideration will be a help to South Dakota which will in a few years be seeking approval of the Oahe project.

Another bill of interest to the State is a water resources research bill which is in conference committee to reconcile differences between the House and the Senate versions of this bill.

This act would appropriate $100,000 annually for the operation of a water research center at State university (or any other school designated by the Legislature). The center would conduct studies into the utilization and preservation of South Dakota's water supplies.

A companion bill also allows matching grants up to $100,000 for specific water research projects. These bills have carried the full support of the South Dakota congressional delegation, with an assist from Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, of New Mexico, who is a native South Dakotan.

Another water bill deals with river basin planning and allows $5 million aid to States for State programs in the next 10 years. This bill has cleared the Senate and is in House committee. This measure is intended to get comprehensive development plans ready for every major river basin in the Nation in a joint Federal-State program.

Payments to State counties in lieu of taxes on wetlands will be increased by $13,000 a year under another bill which the Senate has passed. The aim of this bill is to reduce resistance to the program of setting aside migratory wildfowl areas.

While this wetlands program is in effect, a comprehensive wilderness bill which provides for starting a wilderness system with 8 million acres of wild and wilderness areas in national forests and review of another 55 million acres in the national parks and other areas, has passed the Senate and reported favorably to the House.

Other bills are concerned with national seashore and inland recreation and a land law review which would update Federal public land policies to the times.

As the population grows and demands on the land and water resources increase, it is necessary for the States and the Federal Government to take constructive action to retain and develop resources and scenic lands still available.

The conservation of national resources demands enactment of wise legislation which serves the public's needs. Favorable consideration of such legislation as the water resource bill shows that the conservation problems can be met.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, by the terms of the Captive Nations Week resolution passed by Congress 5 years ago, 1 week in each year is set aside for the purpose of reflecting upon the tragic histories of some 22 nations victimized by the ravages of international communism and of planning for their return to freedom. The spirit of this resolution was intended to make the people now suffering under these illegal and immoral regimes aware that the United States had not forgotten their plight nor abandoned the cause of their freedom. In extending this recurring encouragement, Congress endeavored to rekindle the light of hope in the hearts of millions now enslaved in their own countries. I fear, however, the actions of this administration have given those millions little cause for either cheer or hope.

Last year at this time, I stated that this important psychological weapon, Captive Nations Week, had been blunted by the failure of the executive branch to use it boldly and effectively. That reluctance continues to be the policy in Washington despite the increased need for a more forceful attitude toward the captive nations problem. In fact, it would seem that this administration is following a course of action virtually opposite in spirit to that intended by the Congress.

In the authorizing resolution we specifically named the nations under Communist control and marked the Soviet Union as the imperialist aggressor. That the people behind the Iron Curtain heard these words and were encouraged by them is unquestioned. Bracing that encouragement were the direct and forceful Presidential proclamations of 1959 and 1960. President Eisenhower left no doubt in any mind that his support of the captive nations cause was wholehearted.

Unlike that statement, President Johnson's proclamation was little more than an announcement of the date for that observance. He referred to neither communism nor the Soviet Union and failed to name a single captive nation. The encouragement given to captive peoples by such a lacklustre statement is of negligible value.

Unfortunately, the administration's attitude in this matter is not restricted to negligence. Under the guidance of President Johnson, this Nation is engaged in increasing trade with Communist puppet governments in eastern Europe and the Balkans for the first time since their usurpation of power after the Second World War. By increasing trade with Russia and her satellite governments without asking or demanding any concessions toward increased freedom for their enslaved peoples, the administration is giving tacit approval to the policies of these unlawful governments. Such an attitude can only be described as cynicism. To accept the status quo of Soviet domination in these countries would be the crime of the 20th century.

This reappraisal of our trade relations with the Communist bloc is definitely one of the most important and far-reaching decisions made in the past two decades, and as such deserves more serious deliberation than this administration seems to have given it. What are the reasons that could be compelling enough to convince us that we can trade profitably with an avowed enemy—when we spend a billion dollars a week defending ourselves against a government which denies even the most basic human rights to hundreds of millions of people, and which renders any attempt at easing world tensions impossible by arming and supporting revolutions throughout the world? The only possible justifiable answer for extending this trade lies in securing the freedom of those peoples held captive by Communist puppet regimes. But is this the case? It would seem not.

Our trading power must be regarded as a highly effective instrument for extracting meaningful concessions from the Communists. Aside from this, there is little reason why this Nation should be engaged in a trade that serves to do nothing but bolster the economic and political position of the Communist governments and further extend their effective control over captive peoples. This administration cannot see, or does not wish to see, the logic of this position. We have demanded no meaningful concessions in return for breaking our boycott with the Communists, and, in fact, we have bent over backwards to extend favorable credit terms to them. Is there logic in such a move? Do we need trade with the Communist bloc so badly as to justify the abandonment of the captive peoples we have aimed to free?

Or does the administration seriously entertain the notion that because of our increased trade the Communist regimes have mellowed, and as a result the people living under their systems are any closer to the freedom for which they pray? If this is the intention, our only choice is to regard it as idealistic naivete, or a cynical rationalization. Recent refugees from Eastern Europe, the best available authorities on problems there, have repeatedly cautioned us that increasing trade with the East European dictatorships merely strengthens the dictators and tightens their grip on the people. They constantly urge us to uncover the weaknesses of the Communist system by ceasing to support their economies with our trade.

The Soviet Union, for example, explained to its people that its purchases of wheat from this country were merely due to bad weather conditions. The wheat purchase was widely proclaimed as a show of strength in the Soviet economy rather than an example of the inherent inefficiency of collective farming that it was. In fact, according to the version sold to the Russian people by the Communists, the sale was a sure sign of decadence in the capitalist United States. The belief, understandably, gained wide credence. We may assume that for many of those captive peoples, the wheat sale was the last indication needed to convince them that their cause for freedom had been abandoned, and to break their will to resist Soviet domination.

By trading with the Communist bloc, we not only break the spirit of the captive peoples but we abdicate our moral leadership of the Western nations. How can we logically protest the British sale of buses to Cuba after we have sold tons of wheat to Russia herself? By abandoning the attempt to unify the West in economic pressures against the Soviet bloc, we drastically reduce the possibility of independence for the captive nations and seriously endanger the future of the rest of the free world.

Historically, Congress has favored strict controls on trade with the Communists and has supported efforts to persuade our allies to adopt similar controls. There was a time when administration leaders shared this view. When the Trade Expansion Act was before the Congress in 1962, they claimed that one of its principal aims was to wage economic war against the Communists. One of the three purposes specifically stated in the bill is "to prevent Communist economic penetration." The examples of congressional attempts to choke communism economically are many, but it appears that the administration wishes to ignore these desires.

As we observe another Captive Nations Week, we must think carefully on these things and decide whether this policy of increased trade with the Communist bloc is really the answer we are seeking when we think of the paths of freedom open to our friends and relatives in nations held captive by communism.

Let us go forth this year united in a reaffirmed hope, with a replenished spirit, and with a recommitment to the proposition that this Nation is politically, legally, and morally bound to exert its constant efforts and resources to the reestablishment of freedom and independence in those areas held captive by Soviet communism.

CHANGE IN IMMIGRATION LAW NEEDED TO FACILITATE ENTRY OF SKILLED AND PROFESSIONAL PEOPLE

Mr. HART. Mr. President, one of the many reasons for the broadly based support for immigration reform, is the growing recognition that new legislation is needed to facilitate and encourage the entry of selected skilled and professional persons who can help meet urgent manpower needs and contribute directly to the development of our society.

A case in point is the continuing need for highly skilled health research specialists. Several days ago the President's Commission on Heart Disease, Cancer, and Stroke, issued a significant resolution. It recommended in part, "that the immigration laws should be so revised as to facilitate the immigration and naturalization of scientists and physicians who can make special contributions to the intellectual resources of the Nation."

S. 1932, now pending in the Judiciary Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization, would accomplish the recommendation of the President's Commission. It is the bill I introduced nearly a year ago, on behalf of myself and 26 other Senators, to carry out the legislative recommendations of Presidents Kennedy and Johnson.

In an article for the New York Times of July 5, 1964, Dr. Howard A. Rusk comments on the Commission's resolution, and makes these sensible observations:

> Medical science should have no international boundaries. Highly skilled research workers should have the opportunity of conducting their studies in the best available environment. Our present immigration policies by denying many this opportunity hinder the possibilities of research advances that might be of great value not only to our own Nation but also to the entire world.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Rusk's article be made a part of my remarks at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Change in Immigration—President Urges Easing of Strictures on Letting Skilled Scientists Stay in United States

(By Howard A. Rusk, M.D.)

After hearing preliminary reports by a subcommittee on manpower, the President's Commission on Heart Disease, Cancer, and Stroke took its first official action last Tuesday.

It issued a resolution urging a change in immigration laws to facilitate immigration of highly skilled health research specialists.

Each year several thousand research scientists from abroad come to the United States on visitors' exchange visas. Such persons can stay in the United States only 5 years.

Should they wish to immigrate to the United States and take up permanent residence, they must leave the country and not reenter for 2 years.

The action of the President's Commission was taken the day before hearings were to begin in the House Judiciary Committee to amend the immigration laws.

One of the proposed changes would permit increased numbers of highly skilled persons to immigrate into the United States.

The committee is head by Representative Michael A. Feighan, Democrat, of Ohio.

A KENNEDY MEASURE

The bill being considered is an administration proposal introduced by Representative Emanuel Celler, Democrat, of Brooklyn, at President Kennedy's request a year ago. It was reintroduced in January at the request of President Johnson.

The bill would establish an immigration board that would make continuous studies of such conditions within and without the United States that might have any bearing on our Nation's immigration policies.

After consultation with the appropriate Government agencies, the board could recommend changes in admission policies to the Attorney General.

The bill specifically mentions consultations with the Secretary of Labor, State, and Defense, but for some strange reason does not include the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Inclusion of the latter is particularly important if the objectives recommended by the President's Commission on Heart Disease, Cancer, and Stroke are to be realized.

THE CURRENT POLICY

Under current policies and procedures, foreigners in the United States on visitors' exchange visas may petition to be granted permanent visas.

The Department of Justice then asks the appropriate Government agency for its recommendations.

From 1957 to 1963, 985 such requests were acted upon by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Of these, 234 were persons holding positions in research and teaching in colleges and universities.

Six hundred and eighty-five were physicians, most of whom were engaged in research or teaching.

Under the current policies and criteria, only 207 of these 985 applications could be approved.

This meant that many highly skilled research workers were forced to return to their own countries, where they lacked the facilities and equipment to continue their important research efforts.

ONE PROJECT HALTED

One distinguished professor of biochemistry told the President's Commission that his first assistant, who is engaged in a most promising highly sophisticated research project, will be forced to leave the country within the next few months.

Since he cannot be replaced by an American, the research project will come to a halt.

The scientist will either return home where he has no facilities, equipment, or funds and will waste his time, or will emigrate to another country. Many such persons who are forced to leave the United States go to Canada.

This same story has been repeated many times since.

Under the new legislative proposals, such persons could be admitted to the United States on permanent visas.

It is because of this that the President's Commission unanimously adopted and forwarded to the President its resolution, pointing out that "scientific research is of universal and international benefit."

THE RESOLUTION

The resolution continues:

"Contemporary research requires facilities and equipment of great cost as well as organization of great complexity.

"Such facilities and research environments are often more readily available in the United States than in other countries.

"Gifted scientists who are foreign nationals but who have received extensive training in the United States are normally compelled to return to their own countries to the considerable detriment of their careers, the loss of their potential scientific contributions, and to the permanent injury of the research on which they are engaged."

In view of this, the Commission recommended that foreign scientists and physicians of demonstrated accomplishment or recognized potential should be given indefinite extension of their visas.

It also recommended "that the immigration laws should be so revised as to facilitate the immigration and naturalization of scientists and physicians who can make special contributions to the intellectual resources of the Nation."

A MORE MODERN VIEW

The bill would also regard epilepsy, mental illness and mental retardation in a more modern light.

At present, it is impossible for a person with a history of any of these conditions to be admitted to the United States. This connotes an official Government attitude that such conditions are hopeless, which simply is not true in terms of modern medical knowledge.

The United Epilepsy Association, for example, reports that 50 percent of the estimated total of 1,854,000 persons in the United States with epilepsy are so amenable to modern medical treatment that all manifestations of their problem can be completely eliminated.

Medical science should have no international boundaries.

Highly skilled research workers should have the opportunity of conducting their studies in the best available environment.

Our present immigration policies, by denying many this opportunity, hinder the possibilities of research advances that might be of great value not only to our own Nation but also to the entire world.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK—A FREEDOM OFFENSIVE IS NEEDED NOW

Mr. HART. Mr. President, President Johnson has proclaimed the week of July 12, 1964, as Captive Nations Week. It is a good time to refresh our minds of the havoc wrought by international communism, and to renew our energies on behalf of the millions of citizens in the captive nations of Eastern Europe. Years have passed but their hope for freedom and national independence remains alive, as indeed it must; for it is a natural yearning of all mankind.

America's responsibility in this situation is clear. As the chief guardian of liberty, with strong family ties to the people of Eastern Europe, we must mount an offensive to support the hope of the captive peoples and encourage their faith that the future holds out the substance of freedom and national independence.

In my book, Mr. President, this offensive goes beyond an annual celebration of Captive Nations Week. It goes beyond the passing of freedom resolutions and the giving of stirring speeches. It must also include a prudent use of diplomacy, trade, and cultural exchange—in the interests of a peaceful evolution of freedom and national independence within the captive nations of the Soviet bloc.

New opportunities are opening up daily in this area. Eastern Europe is no longer a monolithic structure under the exclusive tutelage of the Soviet Union. The captive peoples are beginning to stir in a courageous and valiant way. They are thinking once again in terms of their individual national destinies. They are expressing a desire for a measure of freedom and a better way of life, for a more open society and comfort. And the Communist leaders are coming to terms with their people by preaching national independence and offering modest political and economic concessions. The Polish way is rubbing off on neighboring countries. Nationalism is replacing satellitism in Eastern Europe, opening new doors for the West.

It is the wise judgment of the present administration, just as it was the judgment of Presidents Kennedy and Eisenhower, that the best thing we can do for the peoples of Eastern Europe—short of a liberation war no thoughtful person desires—is to encourage them to maintain their national identities and to develop their economic independence from the Soviet Union.

Certainly, Mr. President, there are risks involved in this course of action—I would be the first to admit it. And, to be sure, the devices by which the Communist hierarchy continues to rule are still intact. As a system of exerting power, communism is very efficient, indeed—even if its economic system has many defects. But changes are afoot; the potential for bending these changes to the cause of freedom exists, a potential which challenges the creativity and ingenuity of the free world.

The Attorney General's recent trip to Poland reminds us of the undying spirit of the Polish people and their fellowmen behind the Iron Curtain. My own visit to Poland gave similar experiences, which I shall never forget.

Let us not, Mr. President, permit this spirit to languish in a wasteland of inactivity by the United States. Hopefully, we have the good sense to exert the responsible leadership we claim is ours, and work with the captive peoples to make their hope for freedom an ever-increasing reality. Captive Nations Week reminds us of our task.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

DUAL EMPLOYMENT AND DUAL COMPENSATION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate and be made the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7381) to simplify, modernize, and consolidate the laws relating to the employment of civilians in more than one position and the laws concerning the civilian employment of retired members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I am chairman of the committee to which the bill was referred; but the bill was handled by the subcommittee of which the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] is chairman. That subcommittee held the hearings, and the Senator from Texas is very familiar with the subject. For that reason, I have asked him to handle the bill on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, this bill is the product of approximately 9 years' careful study by various agencies of Government, the Civil Service Commission, and the Committees on Post Office and Civil Service of the House and Senate. It is a major reform in the laws affecting the employment of all retired military persons. Heretofore, some 50 statutes and more than 200 decisions by the Comptroller General have regulated personnel actions in regard to these people. This proposed law completely replaces all of those statutes and decisions, some of which are nearly a century old. It is of vital importance to the U.S. Government that this bill be favorably considered by the Senate.

In 1894, Congress declared that the general policy of the Government regarding the employment of retired military persons would be that no retired officer receiving an annuity amounting to $2,500 a year could be employed. At that time, $2,500 was a lot of money. Today a retired master sergeant receives about that much money. The law is clearly antiquated. It is also riddled with exceptions, both statutory and administrative. Today, only regular commissioned officers and warrant officers who have retired for length of service rather than any kind of disability are excluded from employment. Enlisted men are completely exempted from the statutes. Reserve officers may work for the Government and receive both a civilian salary and their military retirement. While another civilian at the next desk performing the same duties and having the same qualifications is limited to $10,000 total compensation merely because he was retired from the service for a noncombat physical disability. The laws presently existing are highly discriminatory and deprive the Government of the services of highly trained persons who could render valuable service in this atomic age. It is vital that this legislative be enacted.

H.R. 7381 was the subject of hearings before the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee on December 12, 1963. After careful consideration the bill was amended and reported to the Senate March 4, 1964.

The committee's amendments are designed to improve the House bill by eliminating section 205, which would, in essence, prohibit the employment of retired military personnel. Almost all witnesses appearing before the committee favored the elimination of this section. Mr. John W. Macy, Jr., Chairman of the U.S. Civil Service Commission, strongly endorsed the committee's action. The only other amendments are in regard to the employment of retired military persons in the legislative branch of the Government. These amendments are designed to continue our present employment policy in the House and Senate.

Mr. President, I urge the Senate to favorably consider and pass this bill. Our national defense, our continued research in science, our exploration of outer space, and all our other governmental activities require the talents of the most skilled people we can find. H.R. 7381 will assist us in our efforts to attain these goals.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be agreed to en bloc, and that the bill, as amended, be considered as original text, for the purpose of amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered; and the committee amendments are agreed to en bloc.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Do I correctly understand that under the bill a retired officer or anyone retired from the military service, who had 20 or 30 years' military service, could continue to draw retirement pay if he obtained a job under civil service, at, let us say, $15,000 a year? Is it correct that under this bill a person could draw retired pay of $10,000 to $12,000 and receive a salary of $15,000 under civil service; that is, would he be able to draw both the salary and retirement pay at the same time?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I refer the Senator to page 10 of the bill. If the person was a regular officer who retired on length of service, he would get the first $2,000 plus half of the remainder of his retired pay. At the present time, without the proposed law, any retired enlisted man, regardless of the reason for his retirement, or any retired Reserve officer, regardless of the reason for his retirement, or any retired Regular officer who retired as a result of combat disability, can draw full retirement pay plus full pay under civil service. The bill applies to Regular officers who retired because of length of service. It does not affect retired enlisted personnel or retired Reserve officers. The Reserve officers exceed the number of Regular officers. Nor does it affect any Regular officer who retired because of a combat-connected disability.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Am I to understand from the Senator's answer that a retired officer who would be eligible for $10,000 a year retirement pay, let us say, and who got a job under civil service at a salary of $15,000, would not be able to draw both the retirement pay and the salary under the bill?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Not all of it. He would be able to draw just $2,000 of his retired pay plus half the remainder. He would get that part of his retired pay plus the full amount of the civilian pay.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Under this bill, if he worked 5 years under civil service and then retired how would his retirement benefits be computed?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. He would get the choice of the two. With certain statutory exceptions, that is the present system.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I was advised by an official in the Retirement Division this morning that, as he read the bill, he thought a retired person could get the benefit of both. He would not have to make a choice but could draw both. What I want to find out is, is that correct?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. The retired person would have a choice of the two. He would not get both. Certain retired military personnel can get both under present law. The majority may have one or the other, but not both.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I understand that. I am talking about the period during which he would be working for the Government in a civilian capacity. Would he be able to create retirement benefits in the civilian service?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. He could build that up while serving. Suppose he had served in the Regular Army for 20 years and then retired. Then he worked under civil service another 20 years and retired. He could build up retirement while working in civil service. But at the time he finally retired, he would have to make a choice.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Then he could take the highest of the two, not both?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. He could have his option and take the highest, but not both.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Where is the section in the bill that so provides?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. The committee did not amend the retirement law. That is not in the bill. We left the law as it was. What I have stated is the law.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Then I think the Senator is wrong in his interpretation of the law, because I was told this morning by one of the officials in the Retirement Division that as the bill was written and amended a retired person could draw both civilian and military benefits. I could be in error, but I think we should have a clear answer to that question. I was advised that some in the Department interpret this to mean what the retired person could get both benefits.

I am told that under the bill he would receive credit for his civilian service and in addition again get credit for the military service, which would give him dual benefits. This could be in error, but it should be made clear, because the official I talked to said that as he read the bill that was the way he would interpret it. We should get a written memorandum which would clear this question up with a ruling by the Commission. There should be such a ruling before the Senate acts.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. The Committee on Post Office and Civil Service worked on this matter for a long time with the Civil Service Commission, and other agencies of the Government. I am not infallible with respect to these matters, but our staff assures me that ours is the correct interpretation. We took this matter up in our executive hearings on the bill. The testimony was not made available, but the entire subject was fully discussed in executive session. It was discussed in more than one executive committee session.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I recognize the work that has been done on the bill, and I have tremendous respect for both the Senator from Texas and the staff of the committee. I am confident, therefore, that someone can point out where in the law such a provision exists.

Perhaps someone can point out the specific section of the bill that makes such a provision or the section of the law that exists now that provides what the Senator has said.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. This point was checked specifically with Mr. Andrew E. Ruddock, Director of the Bureau of Retirement in the Civil Service Commission. Our staff was given specific answers on this point.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Such assurances would have to be based on some language in the law or in the bill. What I would like to have the Senator do is quote us the exact language.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. The bill does not amend the present law.

The bill does not affect the present law at all. It leaves the law as it is. The Civil Service Commission assured us that a person could not draw both his military retirement and his civil service retirement benefits unless he is authorized under present law to do so.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I do not question the Senator's sincerity. The gentleman I talked with told me that as the bill is drawn a retiree could draw both benefits. All I am asking is to have quoted for the benefit of the RECORD the section of the law or the section of the bill which would prohibit such a thing happening. I am sure the Senator would expect to have his statement based on written law and not on the figment of someone's imagination. The information I received differs from what the Senator from Texas has said. I recognize that in conversations we can get a wrong understanding of a statement. There must be some provision in law which covers this point. I have such tremendous respect for both the Senator and for the staff of the committee that I am sure that they can give the section of the law that refers to this point.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Our information was confirmed by Mr. Ruddock, the Director of the Bureau of Retirement and Insurance of the Civil Service Commission. He has been with the Commission for many years. He is an outstanding authority on this subject.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I recognize Mr. Ruddock as an outstanding authority, too. It so happens that he is the same man with whom I talked this morning. Either I or the staff misunderstood what Mr. Ruddock said. Since there is this misunderstanding I believe we should wait until we can get a written memorandum from Mr. Ruddock as to exactly what the bill would do.

I do not say that I am infallible, but my understanding of the information that I received from Mr. Ruddock is that as the bill is now drawn and as it would mesh in with existing law a retiree could draw both civilian and military retirements benefits. A person who retired could claim benefits under civil service for the same military service upon which he was already receiving retirement payments. Thus he could collect double compensation.

If that is true I am sure the Senator would agree that that is unjustified.

I would be willing to support the bill with the understanding that a retiree could accept the highest of the two retirement benefits. He might earn some civilian credit, of course, but we would not want him to have duplicate credit or double credit for military service.

If the staff claims that Mr. Ruddock or someone in the Commission has pointed out a different interpretation I am sure that it would be easy for them to cite the section which prohibits such a procedure. All I am asking is that there be no misunderstanding. We should have quoted for us the section of the law or the section in the bill which would prohibit such a thing taking place.

The staff member is sitting beside the Senator. I suggest that he merely cite the law upon which his claim is based.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I agree with the Senator when he objects to dual retirement benefits.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Where does the Senator find such a prohibition in the law or in the bill?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I am asking a staff member to get in touch with Mr. Ruddock. We did not know that this question would arise, or we would have had Mr. Ruddock here.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Did Mr. Ruddock testify when the hearings were held?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Yes; hearings were held, but Mr. Ruddock did not testify. He was consulted after the hearings.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator from Texas may be right, but I want to have it checked. I suggest that we not act on the bill until we get a written memorandum from Mr. Ruddock as to how the law would work. This point should be spelled out. I am perfectly willing to accept Mr. Ruddock's written interpretation. I doubt that we would want to leave the impression that he has told the staff of the committee one thing and me another. It is a point of misunderstanding, I am sure.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I might suggest that we lay the bill aside, except for this matter. For several years some warrant officers were not considered subject to the law of 1894. Since 1962, the law has been applied to them. Many retired warrant officers and some retired Reserve officers who had been working for the Government in a civilian capacity have had claims filed against them for many thousands of dollars on the basis of the Comptroller General's interpretation of the law. There are many hardship cases, as a result. Many retired warrant officers and Reserve officers are caught between the upper and nether millstones. These people badly need relief.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I recognize the problem, and I am willing to try to straighten it out. However, we should wait until we have a memorandum on this point and not take up the bill until we have it. The answer should be available today if the staff ever had the answer.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. If we had known that this issue would be raised, we would have had an official statement from the Civil Service Commission. I agree with the Senator that this point should be clarified. We are trying to get the officials to come to the Senate at this time.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I am somewhat confused by this last statement of the Senator. Earlier he said that the committee had considered this question and that the question was answered satisfactorily. Now I understand him to say that the question had not been raised.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Yes; the point was checked, and we got the answer. We did not know that the answer we received was different from the answer that the Senator from Delaware had received. The matter was checked out after our hearings. We did not think there was any dispute about it. This specific point was checked with Mr. Ruddock. We thought it was entirely clear. No effort was made to pull up something in a hurry and dash it through.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Oh, I know that.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. We thought that that matter had been resolved; otherwise we would have had Mr. Ruddock appear and would have written records before us.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I do not suggest that the committee is trying to put anything over. Do not misunderstand me. I am perfectly willing to wait until Mr. Ruddock has been contacted and we can receive a memorandum on the subject. I had hoped that this question would be clarified here today. If it has been, where is it? If it has not, it should be clarified before the bill is passed. I am willing to withhold any further questions until the Senator can obtain such a memorandum from Mr. Ruddock.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I think it will be found that this is what happened in this particular case. During the war, Congress passed a law providing credit for anyone who entered the civil service after he left the military service. He was given the right to count his military service toward his retirement. But it will be found that persons who have received dual compensation must make a choice as to their retirement compensation. In other words, if they choose military retirement, they will receive military retirement pay. But if they choose civilian retirement, they will not receive any military retirement pay. It must be one or the other. That is the law. Congress has made some exceptions. The bill before the Senate does not change that situation at all.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. As I have said, if that is a correct interpretation, we could proceed, but I wish to make certain that that is the correct answer because based on the information I have received, there is some question as to whether that is true. The gentleman with whom I spoke thought that a person could collect under both retirement systems and get credit for this same military service under both. If, as claimed, the bill only provides terms by which one can elect to choose whichever retirement pay is higher, I would approve of that privilege; I would go along with that.

Mr. JOHNSTON. The Senator will find nothing whatsoever in the bill in regard to that. In other words, the laws now on the statute books are the laws that prevail in this particular instance.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I should prefer that we wait until we have received a written memorandum.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, while that information is being obtained, will either the Senator from South Carolina or the Senator from Texas yield to me for some questions?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I should be glad to yield. However, the Senator from Texas held the hearings and has handled the bill, and I do not wish to intrude upon his handling of the bill.

Mr. METCALF. According to the report, the bill merely simplifies the laws and regulations concerning dual compensation by placing them in one manageable statute. Yet 50 separate statutes and 200 decisions of the Comptroller General are involved. When we turn to the back of the report, we note the changes in existing law that are made by the bill. These begin on page 24 and continue to the end of the report on page 47.

This is a far-reaching bill. Not only would it change the laws that are cited on numerous pages of the report, but it would also change longstanding procedure, including the Dual Office Act of 1894, the Dual Compensation Act of 1916, and the Economy Act of 1932.

The Senator from Delaware has stated that the bill would also have an effect on the Retirement Act. We do not know what other acts might be affected. The bill certainly would affect the Veterans' Preference Act.

Based on a memorandum, I wish to address a question to the Senator from Texas or the Senator from South Carolina. I have before me a memorandum which states that the bill is completely inconsistent with other Federal retirement systems. If a combat veteran of World War II, having 19 years of service, entered the civil service, he would pay 6½ percent of his salary into the civil service retirement fund, but he could not collect dual compensation under the bill.

A citizen reservist could complete 20 years of military reserve duty, but he must wait until he was 60 years of age, in order to collect dual compensation.

Finally, social security retirees are limited to the poverty level of $1,200 a year. Civil service retirees, who returned to the Government would lose their entire pension, and this includes veterans having less than 20 years of service.

I have studied the bill, and I am unable to ascertain whether that charge is correct. I should like to have the Senator from Texas answer that question.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. So far as retired enlisted men are concerned, the bill makes no change in existing law. It does not increase their rights or decrease them in regard to compensation.

Mr. METCALF. Should there not be a change, if we are doing what we say we are doing, namely, simplifying dual compensation?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. We have worked on this problem for 9 years and have finally achieved a bill that all departments of the Government approve. We do not claim that the bill is perfect.

Concerning the matters about which the Senator from Montana asked, if there are any injustices, we have not created them in the bill. The bill seeks to eliminate some of the injustices.

If a Reserve officer retires, he is treated the same as an enlisted man, if he retires based on length of service, 20 or 30 years. If a Regular officer retires after 20 or 30 years, he is treated in a radically different manner. There were disadvantages as compared with a Reserve officer.

So many different organizations were interested in the measure, both for and against it, that the committee effected a compromise. The bill relates to dual compensation and dual office holding. The bill does not rewrite the retirement laws. The Senator from Delaware raised the question about retirement benefits. The bill does not affect or change the retirement laws. Congress has written laws relating to payment for work done. The bill relates to the limited field of dual employment and dual compensation.

The retirement field is one which requires some work. We are approaching the close of the 2d session of the 88th Congress and are trying to make progress here today in one limited field, the field of dual employment.

We think the committee has reported a good bill relating to this limited field. If the field were to be broadened to enter the field of retirement, there would be delay.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I might answer the question a little further. The committee is at present studying all the different systems of retirement. We shall have to do something with respect to the safeguarding of the retirement funds. We realize that unless something is done in that field, sooner or later there will not be funds from which to pay the people when they call for their annuities.

The Senate might be interested to know that almost 50 percent of the approximately 2 million civil service workers are ex-service personnel. They entered the Federal service and received credit for all the years of their military service, without having brought any funds over whatsoever.

Mr. METCALF. That is a fine thing, so far as I am concerned.

Mr. JOHNSTON. The committee is studying that situation and also the inequities in the various systems that have been established for retirement. We are trying to find ways to bring the many systems into one system. At this particular point, the bill before the Senate touches only one phase, and that is the phase of dual compensation. It does not relate to retirement. It does not go into that field. It leaves the law as it was in the past in that field, but the bill that we hope to bring in later will do something in the field that the Senator is bringing to our attention at the present time.

Mr. METCALF. The Senator from South Carolina has said a good many things with which I agree and concur. I know of the hard work that he and his committee have done, and are continuing to do, to protect and make more powerful our retirement system. However, here is a bill which amends 50 separate statutes. It applies to people from Boxing Commissioner of the District of Columbia to meteorological investigations in the Arctic region. It has application to thousands and thousands of different jobs. Here is a bill which amends or changes or repeals several basic traditional compensation statutes.

Mr. JOHNSTON. The only thing this bill does is to deal with dual compensation and dual office holding alone, and only that.

Mr. METCALF. Dual compensation for only officers and Reserve officers. This is not an enlisted man's bill. I concede and grant the need for constant revision and clarification of such statutes as we have on the books. I feel that we should not go back to the Dual Office Act of 1894, or to the Economy Act of 1932, and say that we must adhere to them because they were passed a long time ago and have tradition. We have changing times and changing conditions today. This is a bill which is directed only at retirement Reserve officers who are changing jobs. This is not an enlisted man's bill.

Mr. JOHNSTON. For the information of the Senate, let me say that at the present time, the Regular officers retired for length of service are the only people deprived of the opportunity to enter Federal service. We are putting them in the same category with the others at this time. That is what this bill does.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I have examined the hearings, and I find that several people testified. Did the Senator have any representatives of any of the agencies of the Government testify as to the merits of the bill?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I beg the Senator's pardon. I did not hear his question. Was there an interrogatory directed to me?

Mr. METCALF. The Senator from Delaware directed an interrogatory. Both the Senator from Delaware and I have some concern about the bill, and we wish to understand the procedures.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I have examined the hearings, and I notice that a whole series of witnesses appeared before the committee who would be benefited by this bill; and they testified in favor if it. I do not see listed here the representatives of many of the agencies of the Government. Did they testify? Did the Senator have anyone from the retirement system of the Civil Service Commission or from any of the other agencies testify before the committee?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. If the Senator from Delaware will kindly withhold his question for a moment, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] wishes to offer an amendment. I should like to say to him that, yes, we shall take his amendment to conference.

The Senator from Iowa must catch a plane in a few moments, and I wonder whether the Senator would mind if he offered his amendment at this time.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I have no objection.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The Senator from Iowa proposes to amend the bill, on page——

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment submitted by Mr. MILLER is as follows:

On page 12, after line 25, insert the following new section:

"SEC. 206. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no retired member of any regular component of the uniformed services who holds any civilian office the compensation for which is determined in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, shall receive salary for the performance of the duties of such civilian office at a rate which combined with the rate of retired or retirement pay received by him is in excess of the maximum rate authorized by such Classification Act of 1949, as amended; and no retired member of any of the uniformed services who holds any civilian office the compensation for which is not determined in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, shall receive salary for the performance of the duties of such civilian office at a rate which combined with the rate of retired or retirement pay received by him is in excess of the rate of salary received by the head of the department or agency by which he is employed."

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment is to avoid a possible inequity which some of us believe we have detected. The Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] has very graciously consented to take the amendment to conference, where the conference committee will have an opportunity to check the amendment with the appropriate Civil Service officials. I understand that under those circumstances, the amendment is acceptable.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Yes, I agree to take the amendment of the Senator from Iowa to conference. As the Senator from Iowa has said, both Houses can check it.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I move the adoption of my amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. If the Senator from Delaware will kindly let me have his question again, I shall try to answer it promptly.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. My question was that in looking over the hearings I noticed that representatives of the organizations affected did testify in favor of the bill, but I do not see that many representatives of the agencies of the Government testified. Did representatives of the Civil Service Commission's Retirement Division or the Defense Department testify?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. John Macy, Jr., Chairman of the U.S. Civil Service Commission testified. He was accompanied by Mr. Robert Hampton, Commissioner; Mr. Harold Leich, Chief, Program Planning Division, Bureau of Programs and Standards; and also by Frank M. Witham, program planner of the same Bureau.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes, I have read Mr. John Macy's testimony.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. That is on page 23 of the hearings.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Did anyone testify in connection with the retirement provision?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. No, he did not testify on the retirement provision, because this bill has nothing to do with civil service retirement.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Let me repeat: The reason we did not have anything on retirement in this bill is that it deals with dual compensation, not with retirement.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator has been chairman of the committee long enough to know that one cannot deal with the compensation of a civil service employee without affecting his retirement; therefore, retirement is affected, or at least both the chairman of the subcommittee and the officials in the retirement division think so. The Senator from South Carolina is alone in his opinion that we can deal with a bill like this and not affect retirement benefits.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I agree with the Senator that that is true. But this bill deals only with retired military people being able to work for the Government. We are putting the Regular officers in the same category as Reserve and enlisted.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I yield.

Mr. METCALF. Again, it has been pointed out that no matter whether the objective here is to deal with only that of dual compensation, we are amending a broad spectrum of laws and we are affecting, directly or indirectly, the retirement system and the veterans' preference system. We are also affecting the retirement of enlisted men, Reserve officers, citizens reserve officers, Regular officers, whether we intended to do so or not. We are indirectly affecting those retirement programs. These are problems which we must think about and consider in the enactment of this proposed legislation.

As I have already pointed out, more than 50 specific statutes are applied to a broad group of civil service employees, and a broad group of retirement officers are specifically mentioned and amended by this proposed legislation. This is a complicated and complex piece of legislation. Each one of those statutes, directly or indirectly, affects the retirement of those involved in the agencies mentioned.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. These are matters which have been considered. This situation was thoughly discussed. Now the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF] and the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] are attempting to place an impossible burden upon us, by asking us to prove to them that this does not affect something else. They say pull it out, show us the statutes which will be affected, and prove to us that this amendment does not affect some other statute. It would take in the whole realm of retirement statutes to do that.

I ask the Senators from Montana and Delaware to point out some of the statutes which it does affect, other than dual compensation. We have retirement laws on the books already. The Senator from South Carolina has pointed out the effect of them. We have not affected them at all in this proposed legislation. We did not repeal any of those retirement laws; we did not amend any of them. Examine the bill we have set out. The Senate rules requires a statement of changes in existing law. This begins on page 24 of the report. We have not changed the retirement laws. We have not repealed the retirement laws. This is a limited law, applying to retired regular officers. It is limited in scope. It is a matter which has been in controversy for a number of years. The need for this change has become more acute as Regular officers are retiring who have been working in the space sciences, and their services are needed now in space exploration, and many other fields of science and engineering.

Mr. METCALF. The Space Act exempts retired Army officers from the provisions of these laws at the present time. Is that correct?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. They can work for NASA but they do not draw their retirement pay.

Mr. METCALF. But they would be included under the bill?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Yes. They are included; and NASA is given special authority for certain positions in their agency.

Mr. METCALF. I have some additional questions that I would like to get in the Record, no matter what disposition is made of the measure.

I know, because of the hearings and the long study and knowledgeability that the Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Johnston] have of the whole program, that they can be placed in the Record as a part of this debate.

The Senator mentions in the hearing that there are approximately 475 Reserve officers—this is on page 38—who have been affected by this decision of the Comptroller General. And 225 have a combined retired pay and civilian income in excess of $10,000.

How much is the bill going to cost the Government?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. The money involved is $15,971,000.

Mr. METCALF. Approximately $16 million?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. That is correct. It would be approximately $16 million. But it is not a cost. It is the money the Government paid these people for services rendered, and now the Government is requiring them to pay it back.

Mr. METCALF. It states on page 39 that at the present time the military departments have identified 1,188 temporary warrant officers who are subject to the Comptroller General's decision. Of that number, 872 are currently employed by the Federal Government. Their employment would have to be terminated as a result of the decision unless relief is granted. A review of these cases identified indicates that some of these temporary warrant officers have been employed since 1956 and 1957, with overpayments totaling as much as $56,000.

Where are these people employed? What agency of the Government has employed almost 1,200 people in violation of a law that dates back to the last century?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. No one thought there was any violation of the law until the ruling of the Comptroller General. No one knowingly hired them in violation of the law. It is not a statute. It is an interpretation by the Comptroller General which says that the warrant officers come under the same prohibition as regular officers. It was an interpretation of a statute, many years after enactment, that it was a violation. No one knowingly was hired in violation. No one knew that it was a violation until the Comptroller General rendered his decision.

It would be better to clarify the law then to leave it in this state. I personally think, whether or not the law passes, that these officers ought to be relieved of the interpretation placed upon them by the Comptroller General. The people are employed in various departments. They are employed primarily in the Department of Defense.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in view of the fact that there are many questions still to be asked on this matter, I would like, with the consent of all concerned, to propose a unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that 2 hours be allocated for the further consideration of this bill, including amendments—1 hour to each side, and with the time to be equally divided between and controlled by the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough] and the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. Williams]—and that the bill be called up after the Senate reconvenes on July 20.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, reserving the right to object although I shall not object; I shall agree—I wish to say that I have some additional questions. I should like to have them placed in the Record.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. If the distinguished Senator from Montana would give us the benefit of these questions, we would work these up with the Civil Service Commission and the other branches of the Government. We would have the different branches of the Government get the data together and get it ready for us.

Mr. METCALF. I was going to suggest that I have the statement printed in the Record, and be permitted to file the questions for the Record, so that they will appear there. Then the colloquy on these questions will be developed in the full debate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I change the unanimous-consent request, to provide that the time be divided between the minority leader and the majority leader. We shall, of course, farm it out to those who have charge of the bill.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, we have no objection to the request of the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if the distinguished Senator from Delaware wants to raise any additional questions, the answers could be forthcoming.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement by the American Federation of Government Employees be printed at this point in the Record, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

> Over the past 3 years, we have consistently opposed dual compensation as a costly, discriminatory and unethical fringe benefit or subsidy extended solely to professional (20-year) military retirees—at the expense of the already overburdened American taxpayer, career civil service employees and military veterans in Government.
>
> We feel that dual compensation should be abolished or at least drastically reduced, if only in the interests of economic solvency. It is ridiculous for the Federal Government to be paying some people two incomes and giving them two careers, through early or premature retirement, while millions of unemployed Americans today do not have one job or even one Federal income. Taxpayer funds should be applied to more pressing needs or other more critical areas.
>
> We seriously question the "level of competence" of the Civil Service Commission and others in submitting proposals so heavily laden with loopholes as to "militarize" the American civil service system. Dual compensation legislation as proposed by the CSC makes railroad featherbedding (37,000 firemen on diesel engines) look like an efficiency engineers' utopia. The Pentagon already admits that 24,278 military retirees (20 years) or dual compers now occupy lifetime civil service jobs at double expense to the taxpayer. We feel that this figure was misleading and misrepresented in recent Congressional testimony as it only relates to the Department of Defense. If a Government-wide figure were available (and it should be before this legislation receives any more consideration) it is possible that there are as many as 75,000 military retirees (20 years) now receiving dual compensation from the Federal Government. This is particularly significant as the railroad firemen featherbedding issue only invloves 37,000 jobs.
>
> By 1970, we estimate that if existing dual compensation limitations are relaxed that at least 250,000 military retirees (20 years) will be occupying lifetime Federal civil service jobs and collecting dual compensation. No other Americans are allowed to do this, and this includes railroad firemen, social security retirees, civil service retirees (including veterans) and most if not all of American industry or business. In fact, we do not know of one American corporation or business today that extends dual compensation to its employees such as proposed in the proposed legislation. If they did this, plus the noncontributory retirement system granted military personnel (while civil service pays 6½ percent) they would no doubt soon go bankrupt. We estimate that in the next 6 years or less that proposed dual compensation legislation would increase Federal manpower and payroll cost by $500 million per year. And this is not including the cost of

the pending military pay raise. In fact, dual compensation is in effect a hidden or secondary pay raise for professional military retirees (20 years). It will be the death knell of a career and merit-oriented American civil service system. If proposed legislation is adopted by the Congress, it will lay the foundation for the most expensive bureaucracy in American history.

We agree that existing dual compensation laws are unfair and need changing. But the change that is needed is to tighten or restrict this privilege, rather than open up the floodgate for a potential spoils system in civil service jobs. Rather than a 6-month waiting period for retired military being rehired in Federal civil service jobs, we feel that the waiting period should be 3 years in order to discourage collusion and the buddy system which now exists in the hiring of many retired officers in high salary civil service jobs. We feel that 3 years is an appropriate period as it coincides with existing limitations on retired officers selling procurement contracts to the Pentagon. We feel that a lifetime civil service job often involves as much money as an average defense subcontractor procurement contract.

We also feel that the proposal to raise the dual compensation ceiling to $20,000 per year is ridiculous. You might as well raise it to $50,000 per year, then all retired military could enjoy this new form of Federal featherbedding at taxpayer expense. In fact, we wonder if dual compensation limitations should not be extended also to the defense industry. In many cases, military officers retire in the Pentagon one day and are working the next day for the XYZ defense contractor at $20,000 per year and up. They collect their full pension and the new salary (which ironically still comes from Federal funds via chargeoffs to defense contracts) and in effect are still on the Federal payroll but not subject to dual compensation limitations.

We feel that many labor, employee, citizen, and veteran organizations have literally fallen asleep at the switch as to the cost and impact of proposed dual compensation legislation. To achieve a clearer perspective as to the illogical nature of dual compensation, imagine the Federal Government as a long railroad train. We find professional military officers and enlisted men getting off this train via retirement in 20 years—and then getting back on this same train in such agencies as the Department of Defense, NASA, CIA, FAA, State, Commerce, Interior, Labor, Immigration Service, the Civil Service Commission, and even in Congress or the judicial branch itself—and collecting their full pensions and a new fresh start salary at one time. Nobody else is allowed to do this; and this is what we mean by Federal featherbedding.

We have no objection to military personnel retiring in 20 years even at 40 years of age. But, we feel strongly that dual compensation should not be allowed until they are at least 60 years of age. This age criteria is already applicable to most Reservist retirements with the exception of enlisted personnel who for some mystic reason are not subject to dual compensation restrictions. The 60 years of age criteria also applies to most civil service retirees whether they are military veterans or not. We fail to see any argument for the present "double standard" in Federal Government retirement policies. The present situation is costly, unfair, and needs prompt congressional correction.

Civil service employees (veterans included) now pay 6½ percent of their salaries into the retirement fund, and are not allowed dual compensation. If they are rehired in a Federal job they forfeit their entire pension—even if they have paid retirement for 30 years at 6½ percent. However, in contrast, professional military retirees (20 years) who pay nothing into the retirement fund are allowed to retire—take a lifetime civil service job and collect their full pension for in some cases as long as 30 or more years. There is little wonder in this type of spending why the national debt is at an all time record high.

Arguments put forth by vested military interests that dual compensation is a necessary expense to acquire rare and hard-to-get occupational skills lost when military personnel retire are not valid. If the retiring officer or enlisted man was so skilled and needed then why did the service allow him to retire prematurely in the first place? In fact, existing dual compensation loopholes are creating or compounding the reenlistment problem in all services as the Federal Government is financing or encouraging enlisted men to retire prematurely through existing dual compensation incentives which may be given to a 38-year-old airmen or soldier who has 20 years' service. Most of the dual compers in the Government today are enlisted men and it is easy to see why they leave the service.

We also question how can a military man acquire more skill and experience in a civil service type job or duties (even in Department of Defense) than the career civilians who in many cases spend 10 to 15 years in the same specialized area? The skill argument for dual compensation is weak, unsound, and laden with legislative obfuscation.

* * * * *

In fact, and until the constitutionality of the reservists in Congress is decided by the Supreme Court, a cloud of illegality hangs over much of the military legislation and expensive fringe benefits (including the $1.2 billion military pay raise) now being ramrodded into law. One taxpayer suit could cause the dual compensation laws to be voided (via the Supreme Court) even if enacted, due to the conflict of interest within Congress itself. These are serious and somewhat stunning charges. However, they must be promptly faced if we are to present ourselves as an example of good government and informed democracy to the rest of the world.

Other reasons why we oppose existing dual compensation legislation are:

1. Veterans preference: It will dilute or downgrade veterans preference by establishing a new form of "superveterans" preference through job and pay advantages extended exclusively to 20-year military retirees (via dual compensation) at the expense of other veterans now in career civil service jobs. For example, a veteran with as much as 19 years' military service (who is not eligible for dual compensation) might be getting paid $8,000 per year in his civil service job—while sitting at the same desk and doing the same job a "superveteran" (20-year retiree) will get his $8,000 pay plus possibly as much as $4,000 retirement pay at the same time. This will cost the Government a total of $12,000 for an $8,000 job—and violates the long standing labor principle of equal pay for equal work.

2. An aged civil service: It will tend to "age" the American civil service system by loading it down with so-called fresh start 40- to 50-year-old military retirees. This will destroy job opportunities for thousands of jobless and unemployed Americans; reduce employment opportunities for young people coming out of school; and also reduce employment opportunity for young veterans (less than 20 years' service) coming out of the military service or having completed the draft. In one action, the Federal Government will be paying taxpayer money to aggravate the unemployment situation; the juvenile delinquency problem; destroy the integrity of the career civil service system and at the same time lower military reenlistment rates.

3. Dual compensation overpayments: This legislation will legalize or cover up the illegal overpayment of millions of dollars of taxpayers' money already paid out in violation of existing dual compensation laws to military retirees. One reported case involving an officer is estimated to involve $30,000 in overpayment. There are apparently thousands of cases brought out by General Accounting Office investigation. Collection of overpayment is apparently being held up in the hope that this legislation will make it all legal. Worse still is the loophole that if dual compensation laws are approved that they will not apply to the present job incumbents who collect 20-year military pensions. This means that thousands of retirees will continue to ride the Federal gravy train for the rest of their lives—regardless of what new laws are on the books. The laws will not apply to them. This is a ridiculous situation, that suggests unconstitutionality.

In summary, we feel that the existing laws on the books and legislation proposed in this session of Congress are inadequate, too complicated, unfair and ineffective solutions to the dual compensation problem. Our recommendations are:

(a) Dual compensation as a Federal retirement policy should be abolished or drastically curtailed.

(b) Failing this, then dual compensation should be limited only to military retirees of 60 years of age and this criteria should be applied to all military retirees—Regular and Reserve officers and enlisted men. This would eliminate the present inequities within the services themselves.

(c) To discourage the present tendency toward a "spoils system" in retirees getting Federal jobs (particularly in Department of Defense) a 3-year waiting period should be enforced to prevent military retirees being collusively rehired back into the Government at double expense to the taxpayer. Only in rare skill cases should waivers be granted or exceptions made.

These viewpoints have not been hastily arrived at. They represent a position developed by the lodge membership, its officers, two presidents and our executive council over the past several years.

Respectfully,

JOSEPH W. WESTHORN,
President,
AFGE Lodge No. 1092.

ARLINGTON, VA.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, in summary, as I read the hearings and my mail in opposition to this proposed legislation, here are the specific charges that are made:

First. It is antilabor and antiveteran—those with less than 20 years' service.

Second. It will cost the American taxpayer hundreds of millions of dollars in increased Federal manpower costs.

Third. It will expand the civil service job spoils system now existing in many Federal agencies where 20-year military retirees are collusively hired by their own buddies.

Fourth. Perverts and distorts the original intent of Congress in granting dual compensation as a very limited and restrictive privilege to retired Reserve officers over 60 years of age.

Fifth. It is economically unsound. It is not practiced in any American industry or corporation that we know of. It is unethical and unfair in the sense that it is a new form of "economic featherbedding" on the American taxpayer.

Sixth. It will destroy ordinary veterans preference in Federal jobs by establishing a new category of "super veterans preference" for 20-year military retirees at the expense of other veterans in civil service jobs.

Seventh. Nobody knows—and this includes the Civil Service Commission, the Defense Department, and the General Accounting Office—as to how many retired military now occupy civil service jobs throughout the entire Federal Government and are receiving double pay or dual compensation. One estimate is that there are 26,000 military retirees—20 year—now receiving dual compensation in the Defense Department. We estimate in the next year or so, there will be 75,000 or more dual compers in Federal jobs if this legislation is enacted.

Eighth. This legislation will merely legalize or cover up overpayments to 20-year retirees running into the millions of dollars. Worse still it will legalize those already hired to continue to be overpaid. One overpayment case to a 20-year military retiree amounts to $36,000.

Ninth. H.R. 7381 makes the railroad featherbedding issue look like an economy drive. It most surely contradicts present White House efforts toward frugality and economy in Government.

Tenth. It is completely inconsistent with other Federal retirement policies. A combat veteran of World War II with 19 years' service who enters civil service pays 6½ percent of his salary into the civil service retirement fund, yet he cannot collect dual compensation. A citizen-reservist can complete 20 years of military reserve duty yet he must wait until he is 60 years of age to collect dual compensation. Finally, social security retirees are limited to the poverty level of $1,200. Civil service retirees who return to Government lose their entire pension and this includes veterans—with less than 20 years' service.

Eleventh. It will increase unemployment. There will be less opportunity for young people in Government because dual compensation will load down the American civil service system with overage, second career, 20-year military retirees. Through dual compensation, the Government will actually be paying to increase unemployment, juvenile delinquency, and welfare/relief problems. In fact, many career civil service employees—veterans, too—have already been forced out of their jobs, or into early or premature retirement, or onto unemployment roles by the influx of 20-year military retirees—dual compensation motivated—taking over Federal jobs in all agencies via the "buddy system."

Merit promotion or experience have little to do with it. The civil service system itself needs a major overhaul to eliminate the growing collusion, favoritism, and recruitment riggings in agencies now dominated by active duty or retired military officials in key or top management positions.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I appreciate the cooperation of the Senators in carrying this measure over. Meanwhile, we can get answers to the questions that have been raised.

There are many features of the bill which are meritorious, but questions have been raised which need to be answered before the bill is passed. If we carry it over at this time we can work out the answers.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, if the distinguished Senator from Delaware will furnish us those questions before the Senate reconvenes on July 20, we shall have the various agencies of the Government seek to obtain the answers. Many of the questions are technical. They come before the Civil Service Commission. We shall have written answers prepared in advance. The questions have been worked on by the committee for months. The answers were not in writing, but we shall have them in writing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request?

The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The unanimous-consent agreement, as subsequently reduced to writing, is as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

> *Ordered,* That on Monday, July 20, 1964, the Senate proceed to the further consideration of H.R. 7381, the Dual Compensation Act, and that debate thereon and on all amendments, if any, proposed thereto, shall be limited to 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by Mr. MANSFIELD and Mr. DIRKSEN.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO 9 A.M. TOMORROW, SENATE THEN TO ADJOURN UNDER AUTHORITY OF HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 321, AS AMENDED

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I send to the desk a proposed order, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The proposed order will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The proposed order reads as follows:

> *Ordered,* That when the Senate concludes its business today it adjourn to meet at 9 o'clock a.m. on tomorrow (Friday); and that immediately after convening on that day, the Presiding Officer shall, without the transaction of any business or debate, declare the Senate adjourned, under authority of H. Con. Res. 321, as amended, until 12 o'clock noon on Monday, July 20, 1964.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, I wish to announce that there will be no further business today or tomorrow. At the conclusion of the brief session tomorrow, the Senate will stand in recess until noon on Monday, July 20.

The order of business which I am about to state is subject to change; but it is anticipated that on July 20, the Senate will turn to the consideration of Calendar No. 910, the bill (H.R. 8864) to carry out the obligations of the United States under the International Coffee Agreement, 1962, signed at New York on September 28, 1962, and for other purposes.

That bill would be followed by Calendar No. 970, the bill (S. 2272) to insure the availability of certain critical materials during a war or national emergency by providing for a reserve of such materials, and for other purposes, which is the so-called stockpile disposal bill; and Calendar No. 911, the bill (S. 332) to prohibit trading in Irish potato futures on commodity exchanges.

It is our understanding that the antipoverty bill, which was to be reported on Tuesday by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare under an agreement of sorts which has been reached, will not be reported to the Senate until July 21, and will be taken up some time shortly thereafter.

After we return on the 20th, we would like to have the Senate consider the bill (H.R. 11380), the foreign aid bill.

Other measures which will be ready or which should be ready for early consideration are: First, the bill which would extend the Hill-Burton Act, and whicl I understand, will be reported during the week of the 20th; the housing bill, on which the subcommittee is to meet during the week of the 20th; the tax equalization bill, which I understand is ready for markup in the Finance Committee; and, of course, appropriation bills as they are ready. It would appear that the District of Columbia appropriation bill, the independent offices appropriation bill, and the legislative appropriation bill are approaching that stage at this time. During sessions of the Senate, conference reports will always be in order, and will have priority.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF BROADCASTERS CONTRACT SETTLEMENT WITH LEROY COLLINS, FEDERAL CONCILIATOR OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, a few days ago it was announced that President Johnson will appoint Mr. LeRoy Collins, former Governor of Florida, as Federal conciliator of the new Civil Rights Commission.

As one who respects Governor Collins I was well pleased with this appointment and shall support his confirmation; however, in reading an announcement of this new assignment as appearing in the June 29 issue of Broadcasting there is a question raised in connection with this new assignment which gives me great concern.

In an article appearing in the June 29 issue of Broadcasting entitled, "Collins To Move to New Civil Rights Post," there appears the following statement:

> He'll be released from NAB contract, which was effective through December 1965, and will be paid substantial settlement—reportedly some $60,000. His salary has been $75,000 a year, and his allowances have run to another $25,000.
>
> Because he resigned, NAB was under no obligation to pay him severance, but settlement was negotiated after personal intervention of President Johnson who called members of executive committee of NAB

board to his office to request Mr. Collins' release. Committee members met with President for about 20 minutes Friday afternoon (June 26).

It was in response to President Johnson's assurance that Mr. Collins' services were needed that NAB executive committeemen voted to release their president and give him severance to offset salary sacrifice he will make in taking a Government job.

I question the propriety of the President of the United States calling together representatives of an industry whose future is so dependent upon decisions of regulatory bodies and confronting them with a demand that they underwrite or compensate this official of their organization for his loss in income as a result of taking a Government job.

Under this formula, what would stop the Ford Motor Co. from underwriting Mr. McNamara's Government service to offset the difference in his salary as president of the Ford Motor Co. and as the Secretary of Defense, or General Motors from having underwritten Mr. Wilson's differential in salary?

I am sure that President Johnson would have been the first to criticize either of these procedures, and I cannot but feel that he has overlooked the significance of this new precedent wherein he personally is encouraging private industry to supplement the salary of a public official.

We cannot have a dual standard for Government service, and the fact that such payments may have been negotiated and approved by the President does not minimize the danger; in fact, quite the contrary, the danger is increased.

Certainly no company or group of companies would dare reject the recommendation of the President.

A couple of years ago we had a somewhat comparable experience when the Attorney General of the United States used the prestige of his office to collect contributions from the drug companies to be used as payment toward the ransoms being demanded by Castro. In that case drug companies who had cases pending before the Department of Justice privately admitted that they urged their boards of directors to be overly generous in their contributions and further admitted that they recognized the danger of creating ill will by rejecting the solicitation of the Department of Justice.

These are bad practices which have been established by the "frontier administration," and they should be stopped. It is unfair to the men and the companies involved.

I ask unanimous consent that the article appearing in Broadcasting on June 29, 1964, in which is confirmed the intervention of the President toward obtaining severance pay for Mr. Collins, be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Collins To Move to New Civil Rights Post—He'll Leave NAB To Become Racial Troubleshooter

LeRoy Collins will leave presidency of National Association of Broadcasters to take new, high-level job as Federal conciliator in civil rights disputes.

He'll be released from NAB contract, which was effective through December 1965, and will be paid substantial settlement—reportedly some $60,000. His salary has been $75,000 a year, and his allowances have run to another $25,000.

Because he resigned, NAB was under no obligation to pay him severance, but settlement was negotiated after personal intervention of President Johnson who called members of executive committee of NAB board to his office to request Mr. Collins' release. Committee members met with President for about 20 minutes Friday afternoon (June 26).

Pay cut: Job for which Mr. Collins has been tapped will be created by Civil Rights Act which is expected to be passed by House and signed by President soon, perhaps on July 4. Though salary has not been firmly established, it is expected to be between $24,500 and $28,500 a year.

New position is Director of Community Relations Services. Mr. Collins' mission will be to attempt to settle racial disputes before Federal court action, as prescribed in new Civil Rights Act, becomes necessary.

In his meeting with NAB executive committee, President Johnson reportedly said he deemed new job to rank in importance with Cabinet offices. President said Mr. Collins was especially qualified for job.

Mr. Collins, former Governor of Florida, is southern Democrat of prominence who has embraced liberal view on civil rights. Last December in speech to chamber of commerce in Columbia, S.C., he told his southern audience that racial injustices must end, and he said it "is time the decent people in the South, with all their might and strength, to the bloody-shirt wavers to climb down off the buckboards of bigotry."

His Columbia speech was widely reported in news accounts.

Presidential word: It was in response to President Johnson's assurance that Mr. Collins' services were needed that NAB executive committeemen voted to release their president and give him severance to offset salary sacrifice he will make in taking Government job.

Action of executive committee must be ratified by NAB board. Wires recommending approval were dispatched to all board members late Friday.

First word that NAB executive committee members had of Mr. Collins' offer from White House came not from Mr. Collins but from White House aid who last Thursday telephoned Willard Schroeder, of WOOD-AM-TV, Grand Rapids, Mich., chairman of combined NAB boards. Mr. Schroeder summoned other members. Mike Shapiro (WFAA-AM-TV Dallas), John F. Dille, Jr. (communicana group of Indiana), Rex G. Howell (KREX, Grand Junction, Colo.) and Jack W. Lee (WPRO, Providence, R.I.), to meet in Washington next morning with Mr. Collins. After seeing him, they met with Secretary of Commerce Luther Hodges, to whom Mr. Collins will report in new job, and then went to see President. Mr. Collins was not present.

Date on which Mr. Collins will quit NAB reportedly was set at August 1. After his new job is established by law, his appointment must be confirmed by Senate.

Attitude change: Mr. Collins has not always been among liberals on civil rights matters. He was Governor of Florida when U.S. Supreme Court ruled in 1954 that school segregation was unconstitutional, and at next session of Florida Legislature he said he would use all lawful powers to preserve segregation in public schools. Mr. Collins, native of Tallahassee, Fla., had roots deep in southern customs and attitudes.

As racial tensions worsened in Florida, Governor Collins began to disassociate himself from white supremacists who wanted to defy Supreme Court. When legislators passed an interposition resolution declaring Supreme Court's decisions null and void, Governor Collins, though he had no power to veto it, declared action amounted to anarchy, though he said he still thought Supreme Court had usurped States' powers.

He was still pleading for moderation in March 1960 when sit-in riots erupted in Tallahassee. He was given much credit for quieting matters when he went on statewide TV and radio broadcast to urge peaceable settlement of racial differences and to announce appointment of biracial committee to arbitrate disputes.

Governor Collins came into national prominence in summer of 1960 when he was chairman of Democratic National Convention. In preparation for convention he was instrumental in programing speeches by four Governors, one of them Luther Hodges, then Governor of North Carolina, whom Mr. Collins had known when both were active in National Governors' Conference. Mr. Hodges, it is believed, was instrumental in selection of Mr. Collins for his new job on civil rights.

Mr. Collins became president of NAB on January 4, 1961, at expiration of his term as Florida Governor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Z'EV JABOTINSKY

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, this week I was privileged to attend a moving and dramatic event—the ceremonies for return of the remains of Z'ev Jabotinsky to the land of Israel, which was his spiritual home from the earliest days of his career. Born in Russia, Jabotinsky was a brilliant writer, who deliberately chose to dedicate his life to the ideals of Zionism. He struggled against seemingly insurmountable odds for the creation not merely of a Jewish homeland, but also of a Jewish state in which the principles of self-determination and representative government would be fully respected.

On Monday the remains of this pioneer for Israel—who had been commander in chief of the underground during the early efforts to establish the Jewish homeland—were transferred from their resting place on Long Island, in a moving ceremony, to be returned to his true and spiritual home of Israel.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Record following my remarks the editorial "Home at Last," which appeared in the Jewish Press on Friday, July 3.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Home at Last

Z'ev Jabotinsky is going home and an injustice of decades is finally righted.

In a generation of tragedy, Jabotinsky was the most tragic of all figures. At a time when most Jewish leaders had to struggle merely against the non-Jewish enemy, Jabotinsky had to contend with Jewish opponents whose attacks and smears bordered on the shamefully indecent.

It seems absurd to those of us who lived through the years beginning with early Zionism to have to explain who Z'ev Jabotinsky was. And yet, the name of the man has been buried so deeply that all too many Jews today may have forgotten just how great this man was and how much of a debt we owe to him.

Jabotinsky was a man who did not have to choose Jewishness. He was a brilliant Russian writer and linguist who could have assimilated himself into the general Russian milieu of Odessa and won universal fame for himself. But this was not his way. Though not an observant Jew, within his soul there burned that eternal flame that never dies and which enveloped his very being. To him the ideal of a unified Jewish people in a Jewish homeland became a holy thing which transcended all personal glory or material wealth. In his struggle for his people Jabotinsky was the visionary, the prophet who went against official Zionist policy by demanding unlimited Jewish immigration as opposed to the selective kind of Chaim Weizmann; a Jewish state at a time when the leadership spoke only of a "national home"; armed resistance against the British and Arabs when others timidly worried about the "Jewish image."

In the end, each of these points was accepted by Zionism. In the end Jabotinsky was proven right on each of his major points. But the man who did so much to bring about a State of Israel has lain all these years in a Long Island cemetery the victim of petty politics which prevented his bones from being carried over to the land that he loved.

Finally, all this has ended. The Israeli Government has officially decided to bring over the remains of Z'ev Jabotinsky to be buried with honors and tenderness in the Holy Land. Justice has been tardy, but, in the end, triumphant. Welcome home, Z'ev Jabotinsky, and rest in peace.

PLIGHT OF BALTIC STATES

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, on July 6 a letter appeared in the New York Times by Alfred Berzins, a former Minister in the last free Latvian Government, discussing the tragic situation of the peoples of the Baltic lands. Overrun by the Soviet Union, persecuted under the iron yoke of communism, and then brutally deported to Siberia and other parts of the Soviet Union, the Baltic peoples have suffered deeply under communism.

Yet, Soviet exploitation has not succeeded in killing the vivid spark of national consciousness and love of freedom among the Baltic peoples. Moscow's harsh colonialist policy toward Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia should be dramatic proof to all the peoples of the world that Soviet imperialism remains a tremendous threat to the rights and dignities of individuals.

Mr. President, this letter concludes with a plea for free elections under U.N. supervision to determine whether these lands really desire freedom or whether they prefer, as Khrushchev has said, to remain in the Soviet "brotherhood of nations." There can be little doubt what the decision would be.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include following my remarks in the RECORD, this letter, a bitter reminder that other peoples are still enslaved under Moscow's domination.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PLIGHT OF BALTIC STATES—KHRUSHCHEV'S CLAIMS OF IMPROVED STANDARDS CHALLENGED

To the EDITOR:

The June 24 issue of the Times reports that Nikita Khrushchev, Premier of the Soviet Union, visiting Stockholm as a guest of the Government of Sweden, has striven to persuade the political exiles from the Baltic nations of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania that life in their homelands is better than it ever was during the period of their independence.

Mr. Khrushchev's claims of the improved standard of living are so typical and his aims so evident that they are not dissimilar, for example, from speeches of President Salazar of Portugal in his references to Portugal's colonies. The only difference is that the Soviet Union has seized freedom from independent states with a higher cultural and economic level and has suppressed them under the average standard of Russia's Soviet Republic.

GOAL OF INDUSTRY

It is true that under Soviet occupation new factories have been built and old ones expanded. But with what goal in mind? During the independence of the three Baltic States, industry was geared to the demands of each republic's consumers and appropriate export. The industry built by the Soviet Union no longer serves the inhabitants of these areas but as a tool for the military and economic ends of the U.S.S.R. exploiting the technical expertise of the Baltic labor force and the raw materials of the occupied countries.

The decisions as to what must be produced in each Baltic republic as well as the quantity of such production are made by the planning authorities in Moscow, who also determine how much is to be turned over to Moscow for prices which, again, are established by Moscow.

Nevertheless, the gravest charge against the Moscow colonialists is one of genocide. which continues systematically to be practiced in the Baltic nations.. The step-by-step plan of continuing deportations of Baltic inhabitants to other parts of the Soviet Union and the resettling of Russians and other minority groups in the Baltic is to destroy the ethnic unity and identity of the Baltic peoples—the Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians.

PLANNED EXTERMINATION

No one other than Khrushchev himself asserted this planned physical extermination of all minorities under the rule of the Kremlin. In his speech to the 22d Congress of the Community Party he said: "The population in the various republics is becoming more and more mixed in national composition. There is a lively exchange of qualified personnel between them. All this promotes stronger international bonds between the peoples of our country."

Khrushchev's efforts are futile to persuade the Baltic refugees who have fled from the Communist terror of the improvements in the standard of life after their loss of basic human rights. If only a minuscule portion of the statements with which Khrushchev embarrassed his hosts at the dinner in Stockholm given in his honor rang with truth, nothing could be simpler than to allow the people of the Baltic nations to choose, in a free election under United Nations supervision, to restore liberty in an independent state or to remain in the "brotherhood of nations" of the Soviet Union.

ALFRED BERZINS.

NEW YORK, *July 2, 1964*.

(NOTE.—The writer was a minister in the last Latvian Government.)

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. In addition to the legislative program for the week of the 20th of July, which has been cleared with the distinguished minority leader, I wish also to serve notice that it is hoped the Senate will be able to turn to the consideration of Calendar No. 1110 (S. 1147), to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to construct and maintain an adequate system of roads and trails for the national forests, and for other purposes.

Also Calendar No. 1105 (H.R. 1839), to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of wild animals and wild birds which are intended for exhibition in the United States. I may say the bill includes more than wild animals and wild birds.

SOVIET OIL EXPORTS

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD an alarming article by J. H. Carmical, which appeared in the June 21, 1964, issue of the New York Times. The article is a factual account of the progress the Soviet Union is making in the production and export of oil products. It states that by 1970 the Soviet Union may surpass the United States and become the world's leading petroleum producer. The article also portrays the strategy and tactics being used by Russia such as using oil as a medium of foreign exchange for obtaining oil refineries and large diameter pipeline needed to permit further increases in Russian exports.

Reports such as these have startled the managements of many private U.S. oil companies and have caused deep concern in those agencies of our Government responsible for the conservation and development of our natural resources. It is difficult for free world oil companies to compete now with low-priced Soviet oil—dumped at below-cost prices many times for political reasons. Those persons who advocate cutting depletion, abolishing intangible drilling expenses, and other measures designed to give our companies the competitive tools needed to meet the real threat of Soviet oil should read Mr. Carmical's article with great care.

This Soviet economic challenge must be met and defeated. To do this, our companies must have equal competitive advantages with the Russians. And they must have the support of our Government.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOVIET IS PUSHING OIL EXPORTS TO THE FREE WORLD—SHIPMENTS IN FIRST QUARTER 15 PERCENT ABOVE 1963 LEVEL—PIPE IS SOUGHT TO BUILD LINES TO INCREASE FLOW

(By J. H. Carmical)

Soviet oil exports to the free world are increasing rapidly and expectations are for more of the same. For the next few years the Soviet Union is expected to push intensely such exports to carry out its program of increasing agricultural production, including the building of huge chemical and fertilizer plants.

The main reason behind the push is to obtain the equipment and technical knowledge from the West to build these and related facilities. Since these must be paid for with long-term credits or gold, Soviet stocks of which are believed to have been depleted greatly by payments for wheat, Russia is turning to oil exports to provide a great share of the foreign exchange.

Although there have been some delays in finishing Russia's ambitious pipeline projects, exports of petroleum to the free-world area, including Cuba, in the first quarter averaged 800,000 barrels a day. This was more than 15 percent above the 1963 level for the period and compared with 740,000 barrels a day for all 1963.

Since 1955, Soviet oil exports to the free world have been increased sevenfold, or from 116,000 barrels a day. This is considerably greater than the rate of growth in consumption of free foreign oil, which has been at a compound rate of 10 percent annually. Last year, about 54 percent of Russian petroleum exports was crude oil.

The bulk of Soviet oil exports to the free world has gone to Europe, which last year took about 500,000 barrels a day, or about 8 percent of its total needs. Italy, with imports of 150,000 barrels a day, and West Germany, with 100,000, accounted for half of the Soviet oil sales in Europe.

Although emphasis has been focused on the European market, where Russia is able to obtain all sorts of needed industrial equipment, the Soviet Union is not neglecting the less-developed nations, where sales are more for political than economic reasons.

Recently a deal was completed by Russia for the sale of 3.5 million barrels of crude oil to Ghana. The oil is to be delivered over the last half of this year at an average rate of 20,000 barrels a day to be processed in a new refinery at Tema, Ghana.

The plant was built by Ente Nazionale Idrocarburi, an Italian state agency, with the Government of Ghana holding an important interest. When the refinery was in the process of construction, the companies marketing oil products in Ghana were given to understand that for a fee they could have their crude oil processed in the plant and then distribute the products within the country through their own facilities.

DEAL WITH RUSSIA

Now it appears that Ghana has built up a credit with Russia, partly through the sale of cocoa, and that as a result she must buy the crude oil for the refinery from the Soviet Union.

The oil companies in Ghana were asked to distribute the products from the Russian oil, including any in excess of what would be needed in Ghana. Reluctantly, the oil companies agreed to market only those products that would be consumed within the country, leaving the problem of selling any excess production to the operators of the refinery.

What the next step will be remains to be seen. However, about 18 months ago the Government of Ceylon took over oil marketing facilities in that country when the oil companies refused to cut prices. Ceylon then turned to Soviet sources for supplies.

The Ghana and Ceylon developments are considered forerunners of many others in the less-developed countries and are believed by many to be a part of a plan to disrupt the established free-world oil industry.

The drive on the part of the Russians to acquire foreign exchange and equipment through the sale of oil actually is causing the oil companies more concern just now than Soviet activities in the less-developed countries. The sale of oil to the less-developed countries does not enable the Russians to obtain materials and supplies needed to expand petroleum production and deliveries and to push increased quantities of oil on free-world markets.

Discussions were held recently between Japanese interests and Russia involving the purchase of 200,000 barrels of oil a day, largely in exchange for pipe to be used in the construction of a 2,730-mile extension of the crude oil line from Irkutsk in Siberia to the Pacific Ocean port of Nakhodka.

SALES BAN URGED

Construction of this line probably is not economic, but in the oil industry it is believed that discussions about its construction will serve a lot of purposes.

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization Council has urged its members not to sell large-diameter pipe to the Soviet Union. Although the Russians have said that they could make such pipe, indications are that they have not been entirely successful, for they are now bargaining with Sweden for large-diameter pipe.

One purpose of the proposed Japanese oil deal is to tell Sweden if she will not sell the pipe the Soviet Union will obtain it from Japan. Also, there is the possibility that Russia will take the Japanese pipe in payment for the oil and use the pipe in its systems to bring oil from the Urals-Volga area westward to markets in Europe. In that event, oil would be delivered to Japan in tankers from Black Sea ports.

Most of the lag in construction of the oil pipelines in Russia has resulted from the restriction on the sale of large-diameter pipe by the NATO countries and the Soviet emphasis on construction of natural gas pipelines. However, the Russians are said to have obtained or have firm commitments for the delivery by the end of this year of 40 percent of the 2.5 million tons of such pipe needed to complete the oil pipeline projects now underway.

New oil pipelines definitely planned or under construction in the Soviet Union will be capable of delivering to terminals on the Baltic Sea, Black Sea or in central Europe about 1.1 million barrels of crude oil a day.

These lines include the Comecon, or so-called "Pipeline of Friendship," which will be in full operation in 1965. Extending from the Urals-Volga area to Poland, East Germany, Czechoslovakia and Hungary as well as the Baltic export terminal of Ventspils, this system of 3,824 miles will have a capacity of 750,000 barrels a day over the 40-inch sector at its beginning. The smaller-diameter sectors in the satellite countries already are in operation, being supplied at their Russian terminals by rail.

Another important system partly completed extends from the Urals-Volga area to Leningrad. This will be constructed of 32- and 28-inch pipe and will have a capacity of 320,000 to 340,000 barrels a day. Completion is said to be unlikely before 1965.

A new line from Volgograd, formerly Stalingrad, to Tikhoretsk, where two branch lines lead to the Black Sea ports of Tuapse and Novorossiysk, is partly completed. This will have a total capacity at Black Sea ports of 170,000 barrels a day.

Still another planned line would branch off from the Comecon line at Michurinsk and run to Odessa on the Black Sea, where it could deliver 125,000 barrels of crude oil a day.

These pipelines, which will be in addition to lines now in use, not only will increase Soviet export capabilities, but will greatly lower transportation costs. In instances where railroads now are used, the cost will be reduced by as much as two-thirds.

Indications are that more than adequate crude oil production will have been developed by the time the pipelines are finished. In fact, production has been in excess of the annual goals for the first 5 years of the 7-year plan started in 1958. From 1950 production has grown at the rate of 14 percent a year. Last year's output averaged 4.12 million barrels a day, compared with only 760,000 daily in 1950.

The Russian tanker fleet is being expanded at a faster rate than provided for under the 7-year plan. In 1958 the fleet amounted to 819,000 deadweight tons. Although the plan contemplated increasing the tanker fleet by 80 percent by the end of 1965, it had been almost tripled by the end of 1963 to 2,376,000 deadweight tons.

In addition, on January 1, 1964, there were 10 tankers being built in Soviet yards and Soviet orders for construction in free-world yards amounted to 43 ships with a total of nearly 1 million deadweight tons. By 1965, it is estimated the Soviet fleet will total about 3.1 million deadweight tons, or about four times the size at the end of 1958.

Some in the oil industry are concerned over developments in Russian oil. Only because of the rapid rise in demand for oil products have the private companies been able to meet the competition without a general drastic cut in prices. In fact, to hold some of their markets, some companies have had to cut prices rather sharply.

Last year, Russia produced a bit more than one-half as much oil as the United States. By 1970, it is maintained that Russian output may surpass that of this country, with the Soviet Union becoming the world's leading petroleum producer.

That would be considerably above the Russian bloc's needs, since emphasis is being placed on natural gas and coal for fuel within Russia.

The Russians have the ability to do a great deal of expanding in the petroleum industry, but they can do much more if they are able to get technology and other items from the free world.

Recent reports are that Russia is seeking to buy a complete refinery here and much equipment for making petrochemicals. Some maintain that what the Russians really want is the advanced technology and that any such equipment would be used as a prototype for additional facilities in Russia.

SUPPLEMENTAL AND ALL-CARGO CARRIERS

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, for several months I have been greatly disturbed by the increasing financial difficulties that are being faced by the small-business element in our air transport industry.

Members of the Senate will remember the urgings by committees of Congress for the establishment of supplemental airlines to carry out charter functions and to do other types of commercial flying pursuant to certificates of public convenience and necessity, issued by the CAB.

Members of the Senate will also remember that Congress authorized the CAB to issue permanent certificates to the supplemental carriers, as another class of air carriers. The CAB has issued permanent certificates to two all-cargo carriers to carry out the specialized functions of moving airfreight.

Due to reasons which are explained in the statement I shall have printed in the Record, these classes of carriers are faced with extinction, and the threat that the door will be closed to the entry of small business into the great field of commercial aviation. The CAB has recognized this danger, but finds that it may be without sufficient jurisdiction to make it possible for both the passenger and cargo carriers to meet expenses and to pay for their turbine-powered aircraft. The CAB has recognized the necessity of the needs of these carriers to amend the rules under which they are operating both here and on international routes.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record the statement I made before the Civil Aeronautics Board yesterday, outlining the predicament in which the small airlines find themselves, and the need for a greater opportunity for them to work their way, without subsidy, to a position of prosperity in the great commercial airline industry.

I am proud of the work that has been done by the great commercial carriers. They have done exceptionally well, and the next score of years promises to be a golden age for their successful and profitable operation. At the same time that they are enjoying this record-breaking period of prosperity, I feel we should most concern ourselves with the eventual continuance and existence of the small carriers, which also make an important contribution to our aviation picture.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement by Senator Monroney Before the Civil Aeronautics Board, July 8, 1964

Mr. Chairman and members of the Board, the consideration of proposed amendments to part 207 relating to the limitations on the amount of charter trips which may be performed by combination carriers and all-cargo carriers and to part 399 regarding the Board's policy on block space at wholesale rates marks the first significant effort by the Board to explore measures to carve out a role for the supplemental and all-cargo carriers in aviation. These carriers are the small business segment of aviation. In many respects they have been treated as the stepchildren of oftentimes neglectful parents.

The consideration of these amendments is significant, not only because of the substantive changes involved, but also because it represents an awareness by the Board of the ill health of these carriers and a determination at least to investigate cures. I commend the Board for taking this step. It is in line with the intent of the Senate Committee on Commerce which in 1961 in its report on the supplemental air carrier legislation said:

"In deciding what authority should be given each carrier the Board should certainly start with what the carrier wants to do; what its experience has been; what its capability is in terms of financing, personnel, and equipment. A supplemental industry constructed on this basis requires courage and imagination on the part of the carriers in developing and proposing how they can best serve the public interest. It requires on the part of the Board a sense of liberality and experimentation and a willingness to undertake a trial, even at the cost of occasional error."

This view is unchanged today. Only by experimentation and innovation can the problems be solved and progress continued. A failure to act can produce only stagnation.

The Board's responsibility is to promote, encourage, and develop the airline industry in this country. This responsibility runs to all classes of carriers and to all individual lines which have been certificated. It is the responsibility of the Congress as well. For we cannot create by legislation that which is in the public interest and then stand aside to watch our infants destroyed.

Neither the Board nor Congress should hesitate to put to the acid test of implementation measures which would help weak segments of the industry. The history of all classes of carriers begins with an initial period of protection and sustenance by the Government. This was certainly true in the case of combination carriers, who are now the mature and prosperous adults of the industry. It was not always so.

Today, our trunk carriers can look forward to a decade of golden years. They have reached maturity and are reaping the rewards. But it is significant to remember the chaotic condition of the industry in general in 1938 when the Civil Aeronautics Act was passed and to note that it has taken over 25 years for the combination carriers to attain the stability and profitability that they enjoy today. Determined and competent management gave strong leadership to this upward progress.

I do not believe that the management of any of these carriers would presume to say that its company alone could have achieved this maturity if, in those early years, there had been no regulation, no subsidy, no mail contracts, no exclusive routes, no wartime military contracts, and no encouragement. In subsidy alone the Federal Government paid out over $580 million during the period from 1939 through 1953. Approximately half of this sum went to four airlines which today are our leading carriers. This has proven to be a good investment for the Nation as well as for the airlines. It has taken beneficient regulation of competition and routes; it has taken generous infusions of subsidy; it has taken virtually guaranteed Government contracts. And, perhaps as important as any, it has taken promotion, encouragement, and development by the Board and by the Congress to enable these carriers to give to the public the benefits which they now provide.

The combination carriers have a definite role to play. Their purpose and function are clearly identified. They are authorized to fly anything that can be loaded on an airplane to anyplace on their assigned routes and, almost without exception, to anyplace off their routes if they can fill up the plane. Yet, with all this, they passed through difficult years. It is little wonder that the supplementals and the all-cargo carriers are experiencing difficulties in their trying development stage.

These difficulties are matters which the Board and Congress must face head on. We have both concluded that these classes of carriers serve the public interest. In 1961, the Congress enacted legislation authorizing the issuance of certificates to supplementals. This action was based on the conviction that these carriers had a place in aviation and a role to perform which would benefit the public. In this regard the Senate Committee on Commerce said:

"These carriers have been instrumental in expanding the horizon of air commerce. To a large extent they are responsible for the tremendous expansion in the charter field which has taken place in the last few years. They pioneered the military contract business and the airfreight or all-cargo field. They were the first to develop aircoach travel and as a result opened a vast new field of air transportation by encouraging people to travel by air who had never done so previously.

"Since its origin, the supplemental air carrier industry has existed in an atmosphere of uncertainty from one month to the next as to whether operating authority would continue. It has been an era of continued court challenges, protracted, costly, and tedious Government deliberations, anxiety and frustration. Your committee is unanimous in its conviction that the supplemental air carriers have a vital role to play in meeting the air transportation needs of this country."

As early as 1949, the Board recognized the need for air specialists in cargo movement when it initiated what was then called the all-cargo experiment. As late as 1962, the Board again affirmed the wisdom of creating this new class of specialists by issuing permanent certificates to two all-cargo carriers. The Board said in the Domestic Cargo—Mail Service case (docket No. 10067 et al.):

"The Board is satisfied that * * * the all-cargo experiment has been of real benefit to the Nation as a whole as well as to the shippers and recipients of cargo. It is convinced that the specialized and stimulating effects of the all-cargo carrier are needed for the intensive development of freight potential which is still required. * * * The proportion of * * * cargo carried by the all-cargo carriers, the service which they have provided to civilian and military users, the new aircraft which they introduced, and the stimulation which * * * they have afforded the all-purpose carriers, all indicate that renewal of all-cargo carriers will serve the public convenience and necessity.

"We think it is clear that both the all-purpose and the all-cargo carriers have peculiar advantages and can make special contributions to the industry. In our judgment, the development of a system of cargo transportation adapted to the Nation's needs will best be accomplished through their combined efforts."

I am in wholehearted agreement with these statements by the Board. There is a vital necessity for the continuation and preservation of the all-cargo carriers. They have stimulated the development of air cargo. They have pioneered new aircraft and new techniques.

The Aviation Subcommittee of the Senate Commerce Committee and the Board have worked closely in the past to achieve a well-balanced air transportation system through the issuance of certificates to both large and small airlines and to encourage the development of new areas of air transportation. One of the results of this joint effort and interest has been the creation of different classes of carriers such as the all-cargo carriers and the supplemental carriers.

I am greatly disturbed by the impending crisis which threatens the balance achieved in our system and which could bankrupt the all-cargo carriers and the supplementals. Unless steps are taken soon to open greater business opportunities for these two groups of carriers, I am afraid the progress of many years will be lost. That is why some action by the Board is so imperative.

The Defense Department recently reviewed its policy in connection with the MATS procurement program and has now awarded its fiscal 1965 MATS contracts. I understand that the Board was consulted in connection with the review of policy. Although the Defense Department affirmed the wisdom of the Presidentially approved courses of action which were implemented by the Air Force in 1960 and has indicated its intention to continue that policy, it appears that certain other factors have changed significantly the allocation of the total MATS business among the competing carriers. And this is the business upon which supplementals and all-cargo carriers must now rely primarily, until commercial carriage can be secured in greater amounts.

Among these factors are (1) the reduction in rates recently approved by the Board, (2) the addition of many new jet aircraft to the program, and (3) the awarding of contracts to airlines which previously did not participate in the MATS program. For fiscal 1965 alone the above three factors will result in a reduction of about 50 percent in the per jet aircraft allocation and about 30 percent in the per CL–44 allocation. The total amount of MATS business for fiscal 1965 is reduced from $145 to $129.2 million. Thus, the share which will go to those carriers which did not add new aircraft in 1964 has been cut drastically.

The Defense Department has also put into effect specific rules to implement its previously announced policy with respect to using air carriers which have an appropriate balance between civil and military business. For fiscal 1966 the MATS contracts will be awarded in such a way that the carriers who receive contracts will derive at least 30 percent of their revenue from commercial sources. The Defense Department goal is for the carriers in the near future to derive 60 percent of their revenue from commercial sources. While this is a laudable policy and one with which I am in general agreement, I am concerned about the 30- and 60-percent rules, particularly the timing of their implementation. The carriers which will be affected most severely by this policy are the all-cargo carriers and the supplementals. The combination trunk carriers with their big passenger income have no worries in meeting even more than the 60-percent commercial income test.

The supplementals will also lose this year another source of revenue—their individually ticketed business. One of the all-cargo carriers has lost almost all of its mail revenues as a result of another change in Defense Department and Post Office Department policy regarding the allocation of oversea military and civilian mail transported by air. Of course, domestic all-cargo carriers have never participated to any great degree in the movement of mail. Postal rules effectively preclude their participation.

I know that the Board is familiar with these developments, as well as others, but I state them to apprise you of the specific problems which trouble me. Among other things, the Congress has vested in the Board the authority and imposed upon it the duty to encourage and develop our air transportation system according to the needs of our commerce, the postal service and the national defense, to foster sound economic conditions and to maintain competition. As one Member of Congress I feel that I should make known my views in this public forum for consideration by the Board.

The malady of the supplementals and the all-cargo carriers cannot and should not be approached as a subsidy matter. These carriers are ineligible for subsidy and should so remain. The solution lies in opening up new avenues of commercial revenue for them so they may compete on a fair and effective basis with combination carriers for a slice of the aviation dollar. The Board must study and consider new approaches which can be taken to remove the operating restrictions presently imposed on these carriers. These carriers must be granted an exclusive niche in the airline industry and a part of the overall traffic must be reserved for them alone. The Board's consideration of the amendments to parts 207 and 399 is a start in this direction.

Without additional promotion by the Board it is unlikely that these classes of certificated and congressionally authorized carriers will have sufficient revenues to survive as sound, safe, and profitable carriers. They have acquired modern turbine powered equipment for the military which they will have difficulty in paying for on drastically reduced military contracts. It is unlikely that any repossessed aircraft would remain in this country as part of the CRAF program. It is also improbable that these carriers will be able to meet the military 30 percent and 60 percent requirements, assuming a normal market growth and no change in existing operating authority.

Ways and means must be found to enable these carriers to increase their commercial business and to obtain profitable business. I do not know whether the proposed amendments are the answer. But it is an encouraging sign that the Board is giving consideration to some change which will give relief. The Board should also investigate through actual proceedings the feasibility of granting supplementals the right to sell all-expense tours along the lines being used so successfully in Europe. The Board should work closely with the Department of Defense in matters relating to the award of MATS contracts. Without stable and sound supplemental and all-cargo carriers the strong Civil Reserve Air Fleet built in recent years will vanish. Further, the Board and the Post Office Department should reexamine all existing rules and regulations affecting the movement of mail. These rules preclude all-cargo carriers from obtaining anything but a miniscule amount of mail. In particular, a joint Board-Post Office study should be made to determine whether it would be advantageous to sell all-cargo services at low bulk rates for the carriage of types of mail now moving on time-consuming service routes.

The Board must do now whatever it can within the power vested in it by Congress. If that power is insufficient, recommendations should be made to the Congress requesting authority to take whatever steps are needed.

The Board and Congress have declared a need for these carriers. They perform a function vital to the maintenance of a balanced transportation system. Every appropriate effort must be made to provide a sound base for the growth of these classes of carriers by assigning them separate and select functions in the airline industry. It would be tragic in the extreme that having qualified for certificates of public convenience and necessity, these carriers should have the Board turn its back on them and fail to show any concern over whether they survive or die.

SECRETARY RUSK URGES NEW IMMIGRATION LAW

Mr. HART. Mr. President, yesterday the Secretary of State the Honorable Dean Rusk, testified before a House subcommittee on the urgent need to reform and modernize the outmoded Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952.

The Secretary's appearance is an event of importance. It is the first time in several years that a Secretary of State has appeared before Congress to support long needed reform in America's method of selecting immigrants.

The Secretary's statement is forthright and articulate, a lucid statement on the need for reform. It puts on the line, especially, the adverse effect the national origins quota system, basic in our immigration law, has on the operation of our foreign policy.

At one point the Secretary reminds us, that "what other peoples think about us plays an important role in the achievement of our foreign policies."

He continues:

> We in the United States have learned to judge our fellow Americans on the basis of their ability, industry, intelligence, integrity, and all the other factors which truly determine a man's value to society. We do not reflect this judgment of our fellow citizens when we hold to immigration laws which classify men according to national and geographical origin. It is not difficult, therefore, to understand the reaction to this policy of a man from a geopraphical area or of a national origin, which is not favored by our present quota laws. Irrespective of whether the man desires to come to the United States or not, he gets the impression that our standards of judgment are not based on the merits of the individual—as we proclaim—but rather on an assumption which can be interpreted as bias and prejudice. Inasmuch as our immigration laws are regarded as the basis of how we evaluate others around the world their effect on people abroad and consequently on our influence, can readily be seen.

Later the Secretary states:

> What is needed, basically is to bring our immigration laws into line with the real character and disposition of the American people, who are at heart and in fact hospitable, kindly disposed and interested in all races and cultures. This is so because we know from actual experience that immigrants previously admitted, regardless of race and place of birth, have made their distinctive contribution to what is America today.

Mr. President, Secretary Rusk is to be commended for his excellent statement. It is my understanding that others in the executive branch will testify shortly, including the Attorney General. Here we see the administration giving firm leadership in a significant area of public policy.

I would hope that we in Congress will proceed expeditiously to consider the pending legislation, S. 1932 and H.R. 7700. The companion bills have broad support on both sides of the aisle and throughout the country. Their passage would put on the books an immigration law which befits our tradition and ideals. It would mark a great achievement for the American people.

Mr. President, I hope Secretary Rusk's statement will be widely read. I ask unanimous consent that it and an article entitled "Change in Immigration," written by Howard A. Rusk, M.D., and published in the New York Times of July 5, 1964, be made a part of my remarks at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the statement and article were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement by the Honorable Dean Rusk, Secretary of State, on the Administration's Proposals for Amendment of the Immigration Laws (H.R. 7700 and S. 1932), Before the Immigration and Nationality Subcommittee, the Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I appreciate this opportunity to appear before you to discuss a very important problem. I refer to the effect on the operation of our foreign policies of the national origins system which is the basis of our immigration laws.

The administration has proposed in H.R. 7700 and S. 1932 the progressive elimination of the national origins system from our immigration laws. I should like to discuss with you the foreign policy aspects of our immigration laws and of the administration's proposals from the point of view of the Department of State. Others will discuss internal or national aspects of the administration's proposals.

Under the national origins system, the primary objective was to maintain the ethnic balance among the American population as it existed in 1920. This system preserves preferences based on race and place of birth in the admission of quota immigrants to the United States. This results in discrimination in our hospitality to different nationalities in a world situation which is quite different from that which existed at the time the national origins system was originally adopted.

Since the end of World War II, the United States has been placed in the role of critical leadership in a troubled and constantly changing world. We are concerned to see that our immigration laws reflect our real character and objectives.

What other peoples think about us plays an important role in the achievement of our foreign policies. We in the United States have learned to judge our fellow Americans on the basis of their ability, industry, intelligence, integrity, and all the other factors which truly determine a man's value to society. We do not reflect this judgment of our fellow citizens when we hold to immigration laws which classify men according to national and geographical origin. It is not difficult, therefore, to understand the reaction to this policy of a man from a geographical area or of a national origin, which is not favored by our present quota laws. Irrespective of whether the man desires to come to the United States or not, he gets the impression that our standards of judgment are not based on the merits of the individual—as we proclaim—but rather on an assumption which can be interpreted as bias and prejudice. Inasmuch as our immigration laws are regarded as the basis of how we evaluate others around the world, their effect on people abroad, and consequently on our influence, can readily be seen.

There have been times in the past when we have been accused of preoccupation with the peoples of the West to the neglect of Asian peoples in the Far East. Unfortunately, the national origins system gives a measure of support and credence to these observations.

Actually, Mr. Chairman, we are not quite as prejudiced as we sometimes appear. Congress has progressively liberalized our immigration laws to permit the reunion of families. We admit the native born from our sister Republics in the Western Hemisphere on a nonquota basis without discrimination as to origin or place of birth. Congress has also found it desirable over the years to pass special laws providing for the admission, generally on a nonquota basis, of immigrants of different races and circumstances who have been uprooted and displaced by political upheavals.

In these special laws we have exhibited a generosity of spirit and a complete absence of concern about the origin, race and place of birth of the refugees whom we have admitted to our shores under circumstances of need.

I don't have to remind you, Mr. Chairman, and the members of the committee, of the fine record Congress established in passing the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, the Refugee Relief Act in 1953, and the "Fair Share" Refugee-Escapee Act in 1960. These acts, for all practical purposes, exempted refugees from the quota restrictions which would have delayed their entry into this country for many years.

More recent legislation has clearly reflected the intent of the Congress to relieve pressures created by quota restrictions. On five separate occasions since 1957 the Congress granted nonquota status to quota immigrants who had been waiting for visas for an extensive period of time. While I shall not indulge in a statistical presentation, I should like to remind this committee that, as a result of this liberalizing policy of the Congress, only 34 percent of the 2,599,349 immigrants who came to the United States from 1953 through 1962 were quota immigrants.

What is needed, basically, is to bring our immigration laws into line with the real character and disposition of the American people, who are at heart and in fact hospitable, kindly disposed and interested in all races and cultures. This is so because we know from actual experience that immigrants previously admitted, regardless of race and place of birth, have made their distinctive contribution to what is America today.

President Kennedy, in a special message to the Congress on July 23, 1963, said:

"The most urgent and fundamental reform I am recommending relates to the national origins system of selecting immigrants. Since 1924 it has been used to determine the number of quota immigrants permitted to enter the United States each year. Accordingly, although the legislation I am transmitting deals with many problems which require remedial action, it concentrates attention primarily upon revision of our quota immigration system. The enactment of this legislation will not resolve all of our important problems in the field of immigration law. It will, however, provide a sound basis upon which we can build in developing an immigration law that serves the national interest and reflects in every detail the principles of equality and human dignity to which our Nation subscribes."

President Johnson in January 1964 said:

"This bill applies new tests and new standards which we believe are reasonable and fair and right. I refer specifically to: What is the training and qualification of the immigrant who seeks admission? What kind of a citizen would he make, if he were admitted? What is his relationship to persons in the United States? And what is the time of his application? These are rules that are full of commonsense, common decency, which operate for the common good.

"That is why in my state of the Union message last Wednesday, January 8, 1964, I said that I hoped that in establishing preferences a nation that was really built by immigrants—immigrants from all lands—could ask those who seek to immigrate now: What can you do for our country? But we ought to never ask: In what country were you born?"

The administration's proposal would eliminate the national origins system on a gradual basis by reducing all established quotas by 20 percent each year for 5 years. The present total of quota authorizations would be maintained, except initially all minimum quotas and subquotas would be increased from 100 to 200. These minimum quotas would have the 20 percent reduction each year applied to them.

A quota reserve pool is established by section 2 of the bill before the committee under which all numbers would be allocated by the fifth year. In each of the 5 years constituting the period of transition, the pool would consist of (1) the numbers released from national origin quotas each year, under the 20 percent progressive reduction plan and (2) numbers assigned to the old quotas but unused the previous year because insufficient demand for them existed in the assigned quota area.

Experience has shown that we have approximately 50,000 visa numbers annually which are unused and are not available for reallocation to other quota areas. These unused numbers are chiefly from the United Kingdom and Irish quotas.

In the fifth year all quota allocations would be made from the quota reserve pool which would then become a worldwide quota. So that no one country could enjoy a disproportionate amount of numbers from the pool based on registrations of relatively longstanding, the bill provides that no one country could receive more than 10 percent of the total authorized quota numbers.

A strict first-come, first-served basis of allocating visa quotas would create some problems in certain countries of Northern and Western Europe, which under the national origins system enjoyed a situation where quota numbers were readily available to visa applicants.

To apply the new principle rigidly would result, after a few years, in eliminating immigration from these countries almost entirely. Such a result would be undesirable, not only because it frustrates the aim of the bill that immigration from all countries should continue, but also because many of the countries so affected are our closest allies.

At a time when our national security rests in large part on a continual strengthening of our ties with these countries, it would be anomalous indeed to restrict opportunities for their nationals here. Therefore, the bill allows the President to reserve up to 50 percent of the pool reserve for allocation to qualified immigrants, who could obtain visas under the present system, but not under the terms of the bill before the committee, and whose admission would further the national security interests in maintaining close ties with their countries.

Also involved in this is the issue of our immigration policy toward Asian persons, to which I now wish to address myself. Perhaps the most discriminatory aspect of the present law is the so-called Asia-Pacific triangle which requires persons of Asian stock to be attributed to quota areas not of their place of birth but according to their racial ancestry. This feature of the present law is indefensible from a foreign policy point of view. It represents an overt statutory discrimination against more than one-half of the world's population. Here again our request is not that the Congress drastically depart from existing policy, but rather that it pursue to a conclusion a development which began more than 20 years ago. As your Committee is well aware, the Congress, at the request of President Roosevelt, eliminated in 1943 the Chinese exclusion laws and established for the first time a quota for the immigration of Chinese persons. This well-considered and cautious beginning of a revision of our policy of excluding Asian persons has been followed by progressively liberal amendments to our laws. In 1952, the drafters of the Immigration and Nationality Act eliminated race as a bar to naturalization and thereby to immigration. Asian spouses and children of American citizens were given the same nonquota status as enjoyed by any person of non-Asian ancestry.

The only discriminatory features affecting Asian persons which then remained were the establishment of an upper limit of 2,000 for the so-called minimum quotas in the Asian area, and the rule that the quota of an Asian person born outside the Asian sphere be governed by ancestry, rather than by place of birth. The Congress in 1961 removed the 2,000 limit on the number of Asian immigrants from minimum quota areas. The only remaining discriminatory provision of the law now, therefore, is the one requiring that an Asian person be charged to an Asian quota even if he were born outside the Asian area in a quota or nonquota country.

The restrictive effect of this rule has been significantly tempered during the last decade as a result of the special legislation to which I referred earlier. The very liberal policy which found expression in these special measures, as distinct from the letter of the general law, is best illustrated by the volume and composition of immigration from some of the major countries of the Far East. During the 10-year period from 1953 to 1963 a total of 119,677 immigrants came to the United States from China, Japan, and the Philippines; 109,654 of these were nonquota immigrants and less than 10 percent were quota immigrants. These facts may startle those who read in our immigration laws that Japan has an annual quota of 185, the Philippines a quota of 100, and that China has a total of 205 quota numbers a year. Any increase in the volume of immigration resulting from the proposed amendments would be rather limited against the actual volume of Asian immigration into the United States between 1953 and 1963. We deprive ourselves of a powerful weapon in our fight against misinformation if we do not reconcile here too the letter of the law with the facts of immigration and thus erase the unfavorable impression made by our old quota limitation for Asian persons.

I urge you most earnestly to eliminate this last vestige of discrimination against Asian persons from our immigration laws. This action would bring to a logical conclusion the progressive policy the Congress has followed since 1943.

Consistent with the foregoing, I should like to urge you to accord equal status to all immigrants born in our American sister republics. It has always been the policy of the Congress to recognize the common bond uniting the Americas by exempting from any quota restrictions those immigrants who were born in independent countries of the Western Hemisphere. When the Congress in 1952 formulated the pertinent provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act it included in the list of nonquota countries all those which were independent at that time. Meanwhile, our neighbors in the Caribbean, Jamaica, Trinidad, and Tobago, have become independent. The wording of the law required that we proclaim for each of these areas quotas of 100. We have had serious representations from these countries concerning these quota restrictions which are interpreted as discriminatory measures. Jamaica and Trinidad are among our best friends in this hemisphere and their friendship is of considerable significance to us.

Assistant Secretary Mann will expand upon this in later testimony. Mr. Abba P. Schwartz, Administrator, Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs, will also present a statement on the refugee aspects of the administration's proposal.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, without going into the economic aspects of the administration's proposals, on which others will testify, I wish to conclude with a few general considerations.

Present-day immigration is very different in volume and makeup from the older migration on which most of our thinking is still based; and its significance for this country is considerably different. Immigration now comes in limited volume and includes a relatively high proportion of older people, females, and persons of high skill and training.

The significance of immigration for the United States now depends less on the number than on the quality of the immigrants.

The explanation for the high professional and technical quality of present immigration lies in part in the nonquota and preference provisions of our immigration laws that favor the admission of highly qualified migrants. But still more it depends on world conditions of postwar economic and social dislocations, discriminations, and insecurities in various parts of the world that have disturbed social and occupational strata not normally disposed to emigrate and has attracted them to the greater political freedom and economic opportunity offered in the United States. Under present circumstances the United States has a rare opportunity to draw migrants of high intelligence and ability from abroad; and immigration, if well administered, can be one of our greatest national resources, a source of manpower and brainpower in a divided world.

It should be emphasized that there has been no relaxing of the qualitative criteria for admissibility to the United States, and that no relaxation of these mental, moral, economic, and ideological criteria is proposed in S. 1932 or H.R. 7700.

I urge you, Mr. Chairman and members of this committee, that you give most careful consideration to the President's proposals embodied in H.R. 7700 and S. 1932.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

[From the New York Times, July 5, 1964]

Change in Immigration—President Urges Easing of Strictures on Letting Skilled Scientists Stay in United States

(By Howard A. Rusk, M.D.)

After hearing preliminary reports by a Subcommittee on Manpower, the President's Commission on Heart Disease, Cancer, and Stroke took its first official action last Tuesday.

It issued a resolution urging a change in immigration laws to facilitate immigration of highly skilled health research specialists.

Each year several thousand research scientists from abroad come to the United States on visitors' exchange visas. Such persons can stay in the United States only 5 years.

Should they wish to emigrate to the United States and take up permanent residence, they must leave the country and not reenter for 2 years.

The action of the President's Commission was taken the day before hearings were to begin in the House Judiciary Committee to amend the immigration laws.

One of the proposed changes would permit increased numbers of highly skilled persons to immigrate into the United States.

The committee is headed by Representative Michael A. Feighan, Democrat, of Ohio.

A KENNEDY MEASURE

The bill being considered is an administration proposal introduced by Representative Emanuel Celler, Democrat, of Brooklyn, at President Kennedy's request a year ago. It was reintroduced in January at the request of President Johnson.

The bill would establish an immigration board that would make continuous studies of such conditions within and without the United States that might have any bearing on our Nation's immigration policies.

After consultation with the appropriate Government agencies, the board could recommend changes in admission policies to the Attorney General.

The bill specifically mentions consultations with the Secretaries of Labor, State, and Defense, but for some strange reason does not include the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Inclusion of the latter is particularly important if the objectives recommended by the President's Commission on Heart Disease, Cancer, and Stroke are to be realized.

THE CURRENT POLICY

Under current policies and procedures, foreigners in the United States on visitors' exchange visas may petition to be granted permanent visas.

The Department of Justice then asks the appropriate Government agency for its recommendations.

From 1957 to 1963, 985 such requests were acted upon by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Of these, 234 were persons holding positions in research and teaching in colleges and universities.

Six hundred eighty-five were physicians, most of whom were engaged in research or teaching.

Under the current policies and criteria, only 207 of these 985 applications could be approved.

This meant that many highly skilled research workers were forced to return to their own countries, where they lacked the facilities and equipment to continue their important research efforts.

ONE PROJECT HALTED

One distinguished professor of biochemistry told the President's Commission that his first assistant, who is engaged in a most promising highly sophisticated research project, will be forced to leave the country within the next few months.

Since he cannot be replaced by an American, the research project will come to a halt.

The scientist will either return home where he has no facilities, equipment or funds and waste his time or will emigrate to another country. Many such persons who are forced to leave the United States go to Canada.

This same story has been repeated many times since.

Under the new legislative proposals, such persons could be admitted to the United States on permanent visas.

It is because of this that the President's Commission unanimously adopted and forwarded to the President its resolution pointing out that "scientific research is of universal and international benefit."

THE RESOLUTION

The resolution continues:

"Contemporary research requires facilities and equipment of great cost as well as organization of great complexity.

"Such facilities and research environments are often more readily available in the United States than in other countries.

"Gifted scientists who are foreign nationals but who have received extensive training in the United States are normally compelled to return to their own countries to the considerable detriment of their careers, the loss of their potential scientific contribution, and to the permanent injury of the research on which they are engaged."

In view of this, the Commission recommended that foreign scientists and physicians of demonstrated accomplishment or recognized potential should be given indefinite extension of their visas.

It also recommended "that the immigration laws should be so revised as to facilitate the immigration and naturalization of scientists and physicians who can make special contributions to the intellectual resources of the Nation."

A MORE MODERN VIEW

The bill would also regard epilepsy, mental illness and mental retardation in a more modern light.

At present, it is impossible for a person with a history of any of these conditions to be admitted to the United States. This connotes an official Government attitude that such conditions are hopeless, which simply is not true in terms of modern medical knowledge.

The United Epilepsy Association, for example, reports that 50 percent of the estimated total of 1,854,000 persons in the United States with epilepsy are so amenable to modern medical treatment that all manifestations of their problem can be completely eliminated.

Medical science should have no international boundaries.

Highly skilled research workers should have the opportunity of conducting their studies in the best available environment.

Our present immigration policies by denying many this opportunity hinder the possibilities of research advances that might be of great value not only to our own Nation but also to the entire world.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I heartily subscribe to the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Michigan. I, too, hope that individuals may be admitted to the United States upon the basis of worth, rather than upon the accident of birth, and that this may become our national policy.

REDISCOVERY OF RAILROAD TRAVEL

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I am always happy to note when people of authority—and in particular, men of the press—rediscover the railroad train. A few months ago I was able to call attention to an excellent and interesting article about a recent transcontinental train ride, written by Brooks Atkinson of the New York Times.

Today I am pleased to report that another distinguished columnist of the New York Times has stumbled upon the almost-forgotten mysteries of the Iron Horse. I refer to Russell Baker's column in the New York Times of Sunday, July 5, entitled "Westward With Pride of Pioneer."

Mr. Baker apparently has been participating in the current westward political migration of the news media, but he chose to make his trip, at least as far as Denver, by train. In the process he discovered some of the pleasures and satisfactions of traveling in comfort and relaxation close to the countryside, and he also discovered some of the drawbacks to rail travel which have kept passengers off the trains.

In a subsequent column on July 7, entitled "Encounter on the Oregon Trail," Mr. Baker reports some ironic observations on the second leg of his journey, from Colorado to Oregon, which was accomplished by a more common means of transportation, the automobile.

As an advocate of the rehabilitation of our railroads, I wish to commend Mr. Baker for his thoughtful, entertaining articles. We need more of the kind of rediscovery which Mr. Baker experienced if we are to bring commonsense and balance to the planning of our national transportation program.

In particular, I hope that we can start to achieve that commonsense and balance along the main arteries of travel of our crowded northeastern States. My pending bill, Senate Joint Resolution 13, authorizing an interstate authority to run high-speed rail transportation between Washington and Boston, would offer many people the opportunity, I believe, to rediscover the pleasures Mr. Baker describes. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record Mr. Baker's articles of July 5 and 7, 1964.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York Times, July 5, 1964]

Westward With Pride of Pioneer

(By Russell Baker)

Denver, July 4.—Here is a fascinating new idea in travel. It is called the train. It is marvelous. It hugs the earth and bears you along at one-tenth the speed of sound, with frequent stops to allow close scrutiny of the American landscape.

It is especially recommended for the ruling classes, who suffer from the delusion that being shot across the continent in a metal cylinder is the ultimate in fancy living.

A substantial train trip—as from Washington to Denver—takes two nights. Trains provide ingenious private rooms complete with plumbing and beds. Seasoned air travelers will be delighted to find that, once seated or reclining in these rooms, privacy is absolute.

Young women with glass smiles do not barge in to ask if a seatbelt is fastened, or to offer chewing gum, or to push coffee, tea, and milk.

AIR TRAVEL NERVES

The fast trains west out of Washington depart at teatime. There is no luggage weigh-in at the terminal and no psychic compulsion to buy $65,000 worth of life insurance before boarding, though the first few hours may put heavy strain on the person unaccustomed to train travel.

After half an hour—a period in which he would normally expect to be approaching Pittsburgh—he may start wandering the train nervously, asking how far it has gone. It will be just outside Silver Spring, Md., perhaps 20 miles beyond Washington.

As the evening wears on and the great diesels start their labored curve over the darkening Appalachians, he will discover the diner and the lounge and begin to notice features of America that are invisible from 30,000 feet. That the eastern countryside is carpeted with black-eyed susans. That country children still stand by railroad tracks to wave at people bound for Chicago.

ORDEAL IN CHICAGO

And then, with nightfall, the train is a cocoon of soft light rushing through the starred tunnel of night, its whistle baying at mountain towns. Over the rough Appalachian roadbed, the thing creaks and groans like a ship at sea, and in the black hours with a screech and jolt of brakes it wakes the sleeper to witness the fires of Pittsburgh.

With morning, it is racing across the Indiana flatlands and by breakfast it is gliding into the steel labyrinth of Chicago, already shimmering under a hot brass sky. It is still necessary to change trains to cross the Mississippi. The explanation is a mystery to all but railroad men. Hogs can cross the continent without changing trains, as someone used to say, but people can't.

The result is a day of toil. Baggage must be unloaded, shipped to another station, stored. Hours must be killed in Chicago. Nobody can say for certain how many hours, for the trains have their own time, and only mathematicians understand it.

In Chicago it is 98° in the shade. The streets are melting. One begins to curse the train. And, also to feel heroic about making such a hardship journey West.

TWO WHOLE DAYS

Back to the station through layers of heat for the night train to Denver. Get the baggage out of storage. Fight for a baggage cart. Then agony. The train leaves at 5 p.m., central standard time, and not 5 p.m., central daylight time. Another steaming hour to kill with the baggage. Do not ask why the trains refuse to operate on local time. It is a mystery, like why they force people to change in Chicago. The trains have their dignity. They do not put themselves out for people.

And then, at last, it is moving again through the dusk. Across the Mississippi and into Iowa and hurtling down across Nebraska, restoring serenity. By morning it is a new world of vast crystal sky and sagebrush, pounding toward the Rocky Mountains.

Fifty miles across the prairie, the peaks are still creased with snow. At Denver the air is hot, dry, and sparkling, and the westering man who could have made the whole trip in 5 hours by jet arrives with a sense of having made an expedition.

He has not merely been on an elevator ride. He has traveled, and he feels it. Two whole days from Washington to Denver. The pioneers couldn't have arrived with a greater sense of pride.

[From the New York Times, July 7, 1964]

Encounter on the Oregon Trail

(By Russell Baker)

Pendelton, Oreg., July 6.—Back down the road a piece, along the Snake River, there was a grizzled mirage standing in the sage brush. There was nothing to do but photograph him, but he was obviously uneasy and it was necessary to jolly him along with small talk.

"Hello, there, oldtimer. You're a mirage, aren't you?"

"Yup," he said.

"Lost?"

"I'm looking for the Oregon Trail," he said. "You haven't seen the wagons along this way by any chance?"

"Well, you see, oldtimer, we don't travel by wagon train any more. Nowadays we have cars." He looked nonplused. "See that box sitting over there on wheels? That's a car. It goes 600 miles a day. When you people wanted to get to Oregon it took you 5 months from Missouri. We make it now in 3 days."

FOOD AND SNAPSHOTS

He whistled in disbelief. "What's it like?" he asked. "Traveling in one of those cars, I mean."

"Why man, it's the only way to see the country. I get in this car in Denver and I go roaring over the Rocky Mountains at 60 miles an hour, and then I come out onto the desert and zoom along at 80, running down prairie dogs, birds, snakes, heifers—anything that gets between me and Oregon."

"That's right clever," the oldtimer said. "Kills your food for you as it goes along." He was hopelessly out of touch.

"No, it just kills these animals because they get in the way. When we want to eat we stop at a burgerama and have some dehydrated, frozen, sanitized beef patties with plenty of catsup and mustard to give them taste."

"It's a miracle," the oldtimer said. "If we'd had some of those cars and burgeramas in 1818 and 1843, we couldn't have starved for 2 months coming across the desert."

The old fellow clawed some dust out of his beard and eyed the camera. "What's that iron box?"

"This makes pictures. Just like little paintings. We come roaring across the desert at 80 miles an hour and see a fine big mountain or a vast dust bowl, and we take its picture. See?"

NOT FOR BEAVER

"I can't see what you want with a picture. Seeing things with your own eyes is better than having little pictures of them." He was pure 19th century.

"Look when you're going toward Oregon at 600 miles a day, you don't have time to look at anything but the road so you take pictures all along the way. Then when you get to Oregon you have a record of what you didn't see."

The old man changed the subject. "What are you going to do in Oregon?" he asked. "Farm or trap beaver? I hear the beaver up there is really something."

"I'm afraid the world has gotten away from you. Nobody traps beaver any more, and not many people farm. Nowadays people go to Oregon to sell cars or go into the burgerama business, and a lot of people go just so they can come back home and say they've been there. That's what we call tourism."

A CASE OF WEAK VISION

"A strange business," the oldtimer grumbled. "You mean that people are hurrying out there at 80 miles an hour, taking those silly new fangled pictures, killing the wildlife, killing their gizzards with that dehydrated, frozen, sanitized beef, and not seeing anything along the way—and going to all that misery just so they can go back home and say they've been there?"

"That's what we call tourism, oldtimer. It's one of the things that make this country dynamic, powerful, prosperous. And we owe it all to you for opening up this territory. You ought to be mighty proud."

"Not me," the old fellow protested. "All I wanted was beaver. I never thought I was leading the country into any such idle silliness as this. If you take my advice, young man, you will get out of that car, put that camera away, quit eating those burgers, and go back to living." With that he vanished irascibly.

That was the trouble with those oldtimers. The beaver blotted out their vision of the American future.

FORTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ROGERS ACT

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, a very significant event occurred on July 1, and that was the 40th anniversary of the Rogers Act, the cornerstone of our modern Foreign Service. I am particularly interested in this anniversary because I am informed I am the first former Foreign Service officer to serve in the U.S. Senate since the passage of this act.

Named for the John Jacob Rogers, Representative from Massachusetts, the act was the culmination of a long struggle to remove the Foreign Service from politics. It established the merit principle as the basis of recruitment, and it consolidated and amalgamated the diplomatic and consular services. Thus it laid the foundation for our present day Foreign Service, which I believe compares favorably with any other in the world.

At a period in our history when the freedoms which we celebrated on July 4 are threatened by dangerous and insidious enemies throughout the world and when we need the very best diplomats our country can provide, it is fitting that we commemorate the 40th anniversary of the Rogers Act, which occurred on July 1. For if the Rogers Act is not the most recent legislation which significantly affects our Foreign Service, it is the rock upon which all other acts—such as the Foreign Service Act of 1946, or the "Wristonization" program of a decade later—have been built.

The Rogers Act gave shape and form to a previously amorphous structure. As far as the administration of U.S. foreign policy is concerned, probably no legislation has been more meaningful. Forty years later it remains a landmark.

As a former Foreign Service officer, I am most pleased to bring this anniversary to the attention of my colleagues.

AMENDMENT OF TARIFF ACT OF 1930—REGULATION OF IMPORTATION OF BEEF

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the distinguished majority leader announced that in the week of July 20, the Senate would take up Calendar No. 1105, H.R. 1839, to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of wild animals and wild birds which are intended for exhibition in the United States. I understand that the bill contains other items; and I thought that perhaps the majority leader would like to make a brief explanation of the rest of the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes, there is much more to H.R. 1839 than to provide for the free importation of wild animals and wild birds.

The bill considers the question of the importation of beef into the United States, imports which reached an exorbitant level last year, so that they comprised 11 percent of the total.

This year, imports are down to approximately the amount I endeavored to bring them to under the Mansfield amendment; namely, the average of the past 5 years, 1959 to 1963, inclusive. This would reduce the amount of imports from 11 percent to around 6 percent. It is my understanding that the imports of beef will be below the 6-percent level for the rest of this year and that this situation will very likely continue into next year, as well. This is because Australia and New Zealand, principally have found that there is a demand in Western European markets, primarily, for their cutter stock, and also because, despite overproduction and overfeeding in this country, there happens to be a world shortage of meat, and we are finding new markets in France and Italy and, I believe, most recently, in Israel.

Furthermore, the Department of Agriculture is spending close to $100 million in the buying of domestic beef. The Department of Defense has purchased on the order of 100 million pounds of domestically produced beef. All Defense Department purchases of beef for Western Europe, which used to be in the large part from the Western European countries, are now made in this country.

I believe the amendment I have submitted is better than the substitute adopted by the Committee on Finance and offered by the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

It had been my intention, as the minority leader is well aware, to call up the bill this week, because it has been cleared by the Committee on Finance. On last Monday, the Democratic policy committee cleared it, as well. However, because a good many Republicans were interested, for some reason or other, in what is transpiring and will transpire in San Francisco, it was deemed not advisable to bring up the bill this week, and at their request its consideration was postponed. However, as I announced earlier, some time after the Senate reconvenes on July 20 the bill will be laid before the Senate for consideration and debate.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am very glad to hear the explanation of the bill. I want the Senator from Montana to know that I am wholeheartedly behind him in his endeavor to have the bill passed. It is a bill which seeks to bring at least some assistance and relief to one of the most depressed industries in this country—the livestock industry.

I wonder whether the bill goes far enough. We might as well do the job completely when we have an opportunity to do so. However, I believe that we are going to find that all the alibis given to the beef industry by the Secretary of Agriculture to date are most unacceptable, because in my opinion they are highly fallacious and will not give the beef industry the protection to which it is entitled under the existing circumstances.

LIMITED FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE BY SENATORS AND SENATE OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, yesterday, I sent to the desk, for printing, a number of amendments which I presently intend to call up when the two resolutions, Senate Resolution 337 and Senate Resolution 338, are called up from the calendar.

These two resolutions constitute the recommendations of the Committee on Rules and Administration for a limited financial disclosure by Senate officers, employees, and Members of the Senate. These recommendations result from the investigation by the committee into the activities of Mr. Bobby Baker. The report of the Rules Committee, including dissenting views, was filed yesterday.

The two resolutions to which I refer appeared on the calendar on June 29 and July 1, respectively.

The second of the two resolutions was drafted by me, as a member of the committee; and I am happy that it met with the approval of my colleagues on the committee.

However, in my opinion, the provisions for disclosure recommended by a majority of the committee are inadequate to effectuate the results they are intended to bring about. For that reason, I am prepared to offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute. If, unhappily, the substitute should not be adopted, then I shall offer a total of 10 amendments which would considerably strengthen and stiffen the recommendations of the full committee.

In order that Senators may have an opportunity to consider and study this controversial matter before the amendments to the resolutions are called up on the floor of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that each of my amendments, in the order in which yesterday I asked to have them printed and

marked, be printed in the Record, accompanied by a brief explanation of each amendment as it appears, with identical numbering on pages 5, 6, and 7 of the individual views which I filed in connection with the report of the Committee on Rules and Administration to accompany Senate Resolution 337, which is Calendar No. 1067.

There being no objection, the amendments and the explanations were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Amendment No. 1097

Beginning with line 4, page 1, strike out all to and including line 14, page 5, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Rule XLI

"Disclosure of financial interests

"1. Each individual who at any time during any calendar year serves as a Member of the Senate, or as an officer or employee of the Senate compensated at a gross rate in excess of $10,000 per annum, shall file with the Secretary of the Senate for that calendar year a written report containing the following information:

"(a) The fair market value of each asset having a fair market value of $5,000 or more held by him or by his spouse, or by him and his spouse jointly, exclusive of any dwelling occupied as a residence by him or by members of his immediate family, at the end of that calendar year;

"(b) The amount of each liability in excess of $5,000 owed by him or by his spouse, or by him and his spouse jointly at the end of that calendar year;

"(c) The total amount of all capital gains realized in excess of $5,000, and the source and amount of each capital gain realized in any amount exceeding $5,000, during that calendar year by him, by his spouse, by him and his spouse jointly, or by any person acting on behalf or pursuant to the direction of him or his spouse, or him and his spouse jointly, as a result of any transaction or series of related transactions in securities or commodities, or any purchase or sale of real property or any interest therein other than a dwelling occupied as a residence by him or by members of his immediate family;

"(d) The source and amount of each item of income, each item of reimbursement for any expenditure, and each gift or aggregate of gifts from one source (other than gifts received from any relative or his spouse) received by or accruing to him, his spouse, or to him and his spouse jointly from any source other than the United States during that calendar year, which exceeds $100 in amount or value; including any fee or other honorarium received by him for or in connection with the preparation or delivery of any speech or address, attendance at any convention or other assembly of individuals, or the preparation of any article or other composition for publication, and the monetary value of subsistence, entertainment, travel, or other facilities received by him in kind;

"(e) The name and address of any professional firm which engages in practice before any department, agency or instrumentality of the United States in which he has a financial interest; and the name, address, and a brief description of the principal business of any client of such firm for whom any services involving representation before any department, agency or instrumentality of the United States which were performed during that calendar year, together with a brief description of the services performed, and the total fees received or receivable by the firm as compensation for such services;

"(f) The name, address, and nature of the principal business or activity of each business or financial entity or enterprise with which he was associated at any time during that calendar year as an officer, director, or partner, or in any other managerial capacity.

"2. Each asset consisting of an interest in a business or financial entity or enterprise which is subject to disclosure under paragraph 1 shall be identified in each report made pursuant to that paragraph by a statement of the name of such entity or enterprise, the location of its principal office, and the nature of the business or activity in which it is principally engaged or with which it is principally concerned, except that an asset which is a security traded on any securities exchange subject to supervision by the Securities and Exchange Commission of the United States may be identified by a full and complete description of the security and the name of the issuer thereof. Each liability which is subject to disclosure under paragraph 1 shall be identified in each report made pursuant to that paragraph by a statement of the name and the address of the creditor to whom the obligation of such liability is owed.

"3. Except as otherwise hereinafter provided, each individual who is required by paragraph 1 to file a report for any calendar year shall file such report with the Secretary of the Senate not later than January 31 of the next following calendar year. No such report shall be required to be made for any calendar year beginning before January 1, 1964. The requirements of this rule shall apply only with respect to individuals who are Members of the Senate or officers or employees of the Senate on or after the date of adoption of this rule. Any individual who ceases to serve as a Member of the Senate or as an officer or employee of the Senate, before the close of any calendar year shall file such report on the last day of such service, or on such date not more than three months thereafter as the Secretary of the Senate may prescribe, and the report so made shall be made for that portion of that calendar year during which such individual so served. Whenever there is on file with the Secretary of the Senate a report made by any individual in compliance with paragraph 1 for any calendar year, the Secretary may accept from that individual for any succeeding calendar year, in lieu of the report required by paragraph 1, a certificate containing an accurate recitation of the changes in such report which are required for compliance with the provisions of paragraph 1 for that succeeding calendar year, or a statement to the effect that no change in such report is required for compliance with the provisions of paragraph 1 for that succeeding calendar year.

"4. Reports and certificates filed under this rule shall be made upon forms which shall be prepared and provided by the Secretary of the Senate, and shall be made in such manner and detail as he shall prescribe. The Secretary may provide for the grouping within such reports and certificates of items which are required by paragraph 1 to be disclosed whenever he determines that separate itemization thereof is not feasible or is not required for accurate disclosure with respect to such items. Reports and certificates filed under this rule shall be retained by the Secretary as public records for not less than six years after the close of the calendar year for which they are made, and while so retained shall be available for inspection by members of the public under such reasonable regulations as the Secretary shall prescribe.

"5. As used in this rule—

"(a) The term 'asset' includes any beneficial interest held or possessed directly or indirectly in any business or financial entity or enterprise, or in any security or evidence of indebtedness, but does not include any interest in any organization described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 which is exempt from taxation under section 501(a) of such Code;

"(b) The term 'liability' includes any liability of any trust in which a beneficial interest is held or possessed directly or indirectly;

"(c) The term 'income' means gross income as defined by section 61 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

"(d) The term 'security' means any security as defined by section 2 of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended (15 U.S.C. 77b).

"(e) The term 'commodity' means any commodity as defined by section 2 of the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended (7 U.S.C. 2).

"(f) The term 'dealing in securities or commodities' means any acquisition, transfer, disposition, or other transaction involving any security or commodity.

"(g) The term 'officer or employee of the Senate' means (1) an elected officer of the Senate who is not a Member of the Senate, (2) an employee of the Senate of any committee or subcommittee of the Senate, (3) the Legislative Counsel of the Senate and employees of his office, (4) an Official Reporter of Debates of the Senate and any person employed by the Official Reporters of Debates of the Senate in connection with the performance of their official duties, (5) a member of the Capitol Police force whose compensation is disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate, (6) an employee of the Vice President if such empolyee's compensation is disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate, (7) an employee of a Member of the Senate if such employee's compensation is disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate, and (8) an employee of a joint committee of the Congress whose compensation is disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate.

"Rule XLII

"Prohibited activities

"1. No Member of the Senate and no officer or employee of the Senate may engage or participate in any business or financial venture, enterprise, combination or transaction with any person, firm, or corporation which is—

"(a) engaged in any lobbying activity;

"(b) engaged for compensation in the practice of rendering advisory or public relations services relating to the securing of contracts with the United States or any department, agency, or instrumentality thereof; or

"(c) engaged in, or seeking to become engaged in, the performance of any construction, manufacturing, research, development, or service contract with the United States or any department, agency, or instrumentality thereof.

"2. No Member of the Senate and no officer or employee of the Senate may accept—

"(a) at any time from any individual, entity, or enterprise which is engaged in lobbying activity any gift of money, property, entertainment, travel, or any other valuable consideration in an amount or having a value in excess of $100; or

"(b) within any calendar year from any such individual, entity, or enterprise such gifts in an aggregate amount or having an aggregate value in excess of $100.

"3. No officer or employee of the Senate may be vested with or exercise any authority or responsibility for, or participate in any way in any consideration of or determination with respect to, the allocation between or among two or more Members of the Senate of any funds available for use to defray expenses incurred or to be incurred by any individual for or in connection with any campaign for the nomination or election of any individual to be a Member of the Senate.

"4. As used in this rule—

"(a) The term 'officer or employee of the Senate' has the meaning given thereto by rule XLI; and "(b) The term 'lobbying activity' means any activity undertaken by any person other than a Member of the Congress to influence directly or indirectly the introduction, passage, defeat, amendment, or modification of any legislative measure in either House of the Congress.

"RULE XLIII

"Testimony of Members of the Senate before committees

"Whenever any standing, special, or select committee of the Senate or any joint committee of the Congress, which is engaged in any investigation within its jurisdiction has reason to believe that the testimony of any Member of the Senate may be pertinent to such investigation, such committee, with the approval of a majority of its members (including at least one member of the minority party), by written communication may request such Member of the Senate to appear before the committee to give testimony concerning the subject matter under investigation. Such Member of the Senate shall appear before such committee in obedience to such request unless within ten days after receipt thereof he delivers to the chairman of such committee a written statement, duly signed by such Member of the Senate, stating that he is without knowledge of the subject matter under investigation.

"RULE XLIV

"Outside employment

"1. No officer or employee of the Senate shall engage in any business, financial or professional activity or employment for compensation or gain unless—

"(a) such activity or employment is not inconsistent with the conscientious performance of his official duties; and

"(b) express permission has been granted by the Member of the Senate charged with supervision of such officer or employee by this rule;

Provided, however, That in no event shall any officer or fulltime employee of the Senate, without special leave of the Senate—

"(a) serve in any managerial capacity in any business or financial enterprise; or

"(b) engage in any regular professional or consulting practice, or maintain an association with any professional or consulting firm.

"2. For the purposes of this rule—

"(a) each Member of the Senate shall be charged with the supervision of each of his employees;

"(b) each Member of the Senate who is the chairman of a Senate or joint committee or subcommittee shall be charged with the supervision of each employee of such committee or subcommittee;

"(c) the majority leader shall be charged with the supervision of each officer and employee of the majority, and the minority leader shall be charged with the supervision of each officer and employee of the minority;

"(d) the Vice President shall be charged with the supervision of each of his employees; and

"(e) the President pro tempore shall be charged with the supervision of all other officers and employees of the Senate.

"3. As used in this rule, the term 'officer or employee of the Senate' has the meaning given thereto by rule XLI."

EXPLANATION

My proposal would strengthen and broaden the committee's resolution in these regards:

AMENDMENT No. 1098

On page 1, line 12, strike out the word "and".

On page 2, line 1, immediately after the words "activity of", insert a comma and the words "and the fair market value of any interest held by him, his spouse, or him and his spouse jointly in".

On page 2, line 4, immediately after the word "individual,", insert the words "his spouse, or such individual and his spouse jointly,".

Beginning with the word "value" in line 6, page 2, strike out all to and including the word "Senate" in line 9, page 2, and insert in lieu thereof the words "fair market value of $5,000 or more".

EXPLANATION

1. Asset disclosure: The committee's proposal would require disclosure of the identity of business entities in which an interest is held, but not the value. My amendment would also require disclosure of the fair market value of the asset. The committee's proposal applies only to assets having a value equal to one-half of the annual salary rate of the person required to disclose. My amendment applies to each asset having a fair market value of $5,000 or more.

AMENDMENT No. 1099

On page 2, line 17, strike out the period, and insert in lieu thereof a semicolon and the word "and".

On page 2, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following new subparagraph:

"(c) the amount of each liability in excess of $5,000 owed by him or by his spouse, or by him and his spouse jointly, at the end of the preceding calendar year, and the name and address of the creditor to whom such liability is owed.

Strike out all in lines 4–5, page 4, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"6. As used in this rule—

"(a) the term 'officer or employee of the Senate' means—

On page 4, after line 25, insert the following:

"(b) the term 'liability' includes any liability of any trust in which a beneficial interest is held or possessed directly or indirectly.

EXPLANATION

2. Liability disclosure: In my view the holding of an obligation of a person in high public office is as much a lever for evil influence as the sharing of a business undertaking. Consequently, my amendment would require the disclosure of each liability in excess of $5,000 together with the name of the holder thereof, owed by a Member, officer, or employee of the Senate, or by his spouse, or by him and his spouse jointly. There is no equivalent provision in the committee's resolution.

AMENDMENT No. 1100

On page 2, line 17, strike out the period, and insert in lieu thereof a semicolon and the word "and".

On page 2, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

"(c) the total amount of all capital gains realized if in excess of $5,000, and the source and amount of each capital gain realized in any amount exceeding $5,000, during the preceding calendar year by him, by his spouse, by him and his spouse jointly, or by any person acting on behalf or pursuant to the direction of him or his spouse, or him and his spouse jointly, as a result of any transaction or series of related transactions in securities or commodities, or any purchase or sale of real property or any interest therein other than a dwelling occupied as a residence by him or by members of his immediate family.

Strike out all in lines 4–5, page 4, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"6. As used in this rule—

"(a) The term 'officer or employee of the Senate' means—

On page 4, after line 25, insert the following:

"(b) The term 'security' means any security as defined by section 2 of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended (15 U.S.C. 77b).

"(c) The term 'commodity' means any commodity as defined by section 2 of the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended (7 U.S.C. 2).

"(d) The term 'dealing in securities or commodities' means any acquisition, transfer, disposition, or other transaction involving any security or commodity.

EXPLANATION

3. Capital gain disclosure: A familiar means of passing a reward to one to whom a gift cannot be given is the "hot issue." By means of this device one in possession of information concerning a future dramatic rise in the value of a particular security can pass that information on to others, thus permitting them to take advantage of the surge in value and realize the profit through the low tax, capital gains route. In earlier days this was known as the preferred list. There is nothing in the committee's recommendation which would force disclosure of transactions of this sort if the securities had been sold prior to "reporting day": January 1 of the preceding year. My amendment, on the other hand, requires disclosure of both the source and amount of all capital gains realized during the year in any amount exceeding $5,000, by (1) the person required to report; (2) by his spouse, or by him and his spouse jointly; or (3) any strawman; that is, any person acting on behalf or pursuant to the direction of him or his spouse. But as with asset disclosure, matters relating to real property which is used as a dwelling occupied by him or his immediate family are exempted.

AMENDMENT No. 1101

On page 2, line 17, strike out the period, and insert in lieu thereof a semicolon and the word "and".

On page 2, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

"(c) the source and amount of each item of income, each item of reimbursement for any expenditure, and each gift or aggregate of gifts from one source (other than gifts received from any relative or his spouse) received by or accruing to him, to his spouse, or to him and his spouse jointly from any source other than the United States during the preceding calendar year, which exceeds $100 in amount or value, including any fee or other honorarium received by him for or in connection with the preparation or delivery of any speech or address, attendance at any convention or other assembly of individuals, or the preparation of any article or other composition for publication, and the monetary value of subsistence, entertainment, travel, or other facilities received in kind.

Strike out all in lines 4–5, page 4, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"6. As used in this rule—

"(a) The term 'officer or employee of the Senate' means—

On page 4, after line 25, insert the following:

"(b) The term 'income' means gross income as defined by section 61 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

EXPLANATION

4. Income disclosure: There is no provision whatsoever for the disclosure of items of income in the committee's resolution. This strikes me as a most grave, if not a fatal, defect, particularly if it is coupled with an asset disclosure provision which would, under the proposed new pay scale, exempt from the disclosure requirement for Senators assets worth $15,000.

My amendment would require the disclosure of the source and amount of every item of income in excess of $100 received during the preceding calendar year by the person required to disclose, his spouse, or by him and his spouse jointly. It expressly includes gifts, other than gifts received from a spouse or other relative, as well as fees or honoraria received for preparing any speech or article, whether in cash or in kind, as in free travel, subsistence, or entertainment. Income is given the broad meaning which it has under section 61 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

AMENDMENT No 1102

On page 2, line 17, strike out the period, and insert in lieu thereof a semicolon and the word "and".

On page 2, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

"(c) the name and address of any professional firm which engages in practice before any department, agency or instrumentality of the United States in which he has a financial interest; and the name, address, and a brief description of the principal business of any client of such firm for whom any services involving representation before any department, agency or instrumentality of the United States which were performed during the preceding calendar year, together with a brief description of the services performed, and the total fees received or receivable by the firm as compensation for such services.

EXPLANATION

5. Disclosure of association with professional firm: The committee resolution goes part way toward meeting the problem of the Senator or Senate aid who maintains an association with a professional firm which engages in practice before an agency of the Federal Government, by requiring disclosure of the name and address of the firm. My amendment carries the rule to the logical next step by requiring disclosure also of the name, address, and principal business of any client of the firm for whom any services involving representation before a Government agency are performed, and a brief description of the services performed, together with a statement of the total fees which were charged for such services.

AMENDMENT No. 1103

On page 2, line 4, immediately after "individual,", insert the words "his spouse, or such individual and his spouse jointly".

EXPLANATION

6. Disclosure of financial condition and activity of spouse: The splendid cartoonist Lichty, in his "Grin and Bear It" which appeared in the Washington Post of May 26, 1964, depicted an address at a typical Lichty version of a woman's club meeting, being delivered by "Mrs. The Honorable Senator Snort—On the Power Behind the Throne." The words in the caption were Mrs. Snort's: "The pressures of public office are indeed terrific and a wife must do all she can to help * * * such as letting the Senator put all his investments in my name."

By failing to make any provision at all for the possibility of evasion by this time-honored technique—which incidentally has inheritance tax benefits as well—the committee left a gaping loophole which renders all but worthless the other provisions of its resolution. My amendment is an effort to sew this loophole shut.

AMENDMENT No. 1104

On page 5, between lines 11 and 12, insert the following new paragraph:

"2. No Member of the Senate and no officer or employee of the Senate may engage or participate in any business or financial venture, enterprise, combination or transaction with any person, firm, or corporation which is—

"(a) engaged in any lobbying activity;

"(b) engaged for compensation in the practice of rendering advisory or public relations services relating to the securing of contracts with the United States or any department, agency, or instrumentality thereof; or

"(c) engaged in, or seeking to become engaged in, the performance of any construction, manufacturing, research, development, or service contract with the United States or any department, agency, or instrumentality thereof.

Beginning with line 12, page 5, strike out all to and including line 14, page 5, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"3. As used in this rule—

"(a) The term 'officer or employee of the Senate' has the meaning given thereto by paragraph 6 of rule XLI.

"(b) The term 'lobbying activity' means any activity undertaken by any person other than a Member of the Congress to influence directly or indirectly the introduction, passage, defeat, amendment, or modification of any legislative measure in either House of the Congress."

EXPLANATION

7. Prohibition of joint ventures with lobbyists: In my view there are some business relationships which are so likely to be corrupting, or at least to raise reasonable if unfounded fears of corruption, that they should be prohibited outright. Chief among these, I would say, is the engaging in business ventures for profit with persons actively engaged in lobbying, or in counseling or advisory activities relating to the procurement of Government contracts. These activities would be prohibited by my amendment. There is no comparable provision in the committee's resolution.

AMENDMENT No. 1105

On page 5, between lines 11 and 12, insert the following new paragraph:

"2. No Member of the Senate and no officer or employee of the Senate may accept—

"(a) at any time from any individual, entity, or enterprise which is engaged in lobbying activity any gift of money, property, entertainment, travel, or any other valuable consideration in an amount or having a value in excess of $100; or

"(b) within any calendar year from any such individual, entity, or enterprise such gifts in an aggregate amount or having an aggregate value in excess of $100.

Beginning with line 12, page 5, strike out all to and including line 14, page 5, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"3. As used in this rule—

"(a) The term 'officer or employee of the Senate' has the meaning given thereto by paragraph 6 of rule XLI.

"(b) The term 'lobbying activity' means any activity undertaken by any person other than a Member of the Congress to influence directly or indirectly the introduction, passage, defeat, amendment, or modification of any legislative measure in either House of the Congress."

EXPLANATION

8. Accepting gifts from lobbyists: As I have noted, the committee's recommendation does not even contain a provision requiring the disclosure of gifts. My amendment does require the disclosure of gifts in excess of $100 from persons not in one's family. But in addition, it would seem to me to be wholly salutary to set a limit on the value of a gift which a Senator or a Senate aid might properly receive from a lobbyist. My amendment sets this limit at a most generous $100, which should surely be sufficiently high to permit the expression of a bountiful, if not scandalous, generosity on the part of persons in the business of influencing the passage of legislation.

AMENDMENT No. 1106

On page 5, line 14, strike out the closing quotation marks.

On page 5, after line 14, insert the following:

"RULE XLIII

"Testimony of Members of the Senate before committees

"Whenever any standing, special, or select committee of the Senate or any joint committee of the Congress, which is engaged in any investigation within its jurisdiction has reason to believe that the testimony of any Member of the Senate may be pertinent to such investigation, such committee, with the approval of a majority of its members (including at least one member of the minority party), by written communication may request such Member of the Senate to appear before the committee to give testimony concerning the subject matter under investigation. Such Member of the Senate shall appear before such committee in obedience to such request unless within ten days after receipt thereof he delivers to the chairman of such committee a written statement, duly signed by such Member of the Senate, stating that he is without knowledge of the subject matter under investigation."

EXPLANATION

9. Testimony of Members of the Senate before committees: There is at present an unwholesome cloudiness in the Senate rules about the duty of Senators to appear and testify before Senate committees acting within proper jurisdictional bounds about matters regarding which they have personal knowledge. While the balance of opinion seems to be that no such enforcible obligation now exists, it seems to me most clear that it should exist, and that the procedures by which it can be made effective should be spelled out quite plainly in the Senate rules.

For this reason my amendment contains a new Senate rule XLIII, which would authorize any duly authorized committee of the Senate to request any Senator to come before it and give any pertinent testimony which it has reason to believe he can give on the subject matter under investigation. A Senator receiving such a request would be required to appear and give testimony, unless within 10 days he delivers to the chairman of the committee a signed statement to the effect that he is without knowledge of the subject matter under investigation.

There is no analogous provision in the committee's resolution.

AMENDMENT No. 1107

On page 5, line 14, strike out the closing quotation marks.

On page 5, after line 14, insert the following:

"RULE XLIII

"Outside employment

"1. No officer or employee of the Senate shall engage in any business, financial or professional activity or employment for compensation or gain unless—

"(a) such activity or employment is not inconsistent with the conscientious performance of his official duties; and

"(b) express permission has been granted by the Member of the Senate charged with supervision of such officer or employee by this rule;

Provided, however, That in no event shall any officer or full-time employee of the Senate, without special leave of the Senate—

"(a) serve in any managerial capacity in any business or financial enterprise; or

"(b) engage in any regular professional or consulting practice, or maintain an association with any professional or consulting firm.

"2. For the purposes of this rule—

"(a) each Member of the Senate shall be charged with the supervision of each of his employees;

"(b) each Member of the Senate who is the chairman of a Senate or joint committee or subcommittee shall be charged with the supervision of each employee of such committee or subcommittee;

"(c) the majority leader shall be charged with the supervision of each officer and employee of the majority, and the minority leader shall be charged with the supervision of each officer and employee of the minority;

"(d) the Vice President shall be charged with the supervision of each of his employees; and

"(e) the President pro tempore shall be charged with the supervision of all other officers and employees of the Senate.

"3. As used in this rule, the term 'officer or employee of the Senate' has the meaning given thereto by rule XLI."

EXPLANATION

10. Moonlighting by Senate officers and full-time employees: The facts of the Baker case, as disclosed in the record compiled by the committee, are such as to cast grave doubt on the practice of permitting officers and full-time employees of the Senate to serve as managers or proprietors of business enterprises, to engage in a regular professional or consulting practice, or to maintain an association with a professional or consulting firm. My amendment would create a new Senate rule to prohibit moonlighting of this sort, in the absence of permission obtained by special leave of the Senate.

In addition, the substitute amendment which I propose would permit moonlighting of other sorts only on two conditions: (1) that the activity or employment is not inconsistent with the conscientious performance of the officer's or employee's official duties; and (2) that express permission has been given by the Member of the Senate charged with the supervision of the officer or employee. For the purposes of the rule, each Senator would be responsible for supervising his own staff; chairmen of committees would supervise committee staffs; the majority leader, the minority leader, and the Vice President would supervise their own employees; and the President pro tempore of the Senate would be charged with the supervision of outside employment engaged in by all other officers and employees of the Senate.

I point out that this new Senate rule would not prohibit various types of moonlighting by Senate officers and employees which seem to me wholly inoffensive, such as giving lectures, or writing books or articles. It would, however, require the disclosure of these activities to the responsible Member of the Senate.

Even if there had been no Baker case, this rule would stand well recommended by the Biblical dictum that no man shall serve two masters. But in view of what the committee has brought to light about Bobby Baker's extensive financial operations, I believe the case in favor of the adoption of this rule is conclusive. Nevertheless there is no comparable provision in the committee's recommended resolution.

The amendment I propose would meet the minimum requirements of an effective disclosure procedure.

In my opinion the committee resolution does not.

GRENVILLE CLARK: PUBLIC CITIZEN

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, one of the most distinguished of our American citizens is Mr. Grenville Clark, public citizen, who has rendered extraordinary service to his country during a long career.

Mr. Clark was in large part responsible for the Plattsburg military training camps, during World War I. He has been a most successful New York lawyer; nevertheless, he has interested himself for many years in connection with assuring that all citizens be afforded the civil liberties guaranteed to them by the Constitution of the United States.

More recently, in collaboration with Prof. Louis B. Sohn, of the Harvard University Law School, Mr. Clark has published a monumental work entitled "World Peace Through World Law," which has been translated into many different languages. It was presented by Ambassador Adlai Stevenson to Mr. Khrushchev. It has been generally circulated across the world, among all national groups seriously interested in the No. 1 problem of the world: How to achieve general and complete disarmament under enforceable world law, before all are destroyed by a nuclear holocaust.

Mr. Irving Dilliard, of the Research Foundation of Princeton, N.J., and formerly editorial page editor of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, has prepared a portrait entitled "Grenville Clark: Public Citizen," which I commend to the attention of all readers of the RECORD.

I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McINTYRE in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GRENVILLE CLARK: PUBLIC CITIZEN

(By Irving Dilliard)

(Irving Dilliard, formerly editorial page editor of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, is teaching at Princeton University this year. His special interest is in constitutional law and civil rights. He has edited "The Spirit of Liberty," a collection of Judge Learned Hand's papers, and, more recently, "One Man's Stand for Freedom: Mr. Justice Black and the Bill of Rights," a collection of Justice Black's Supreme Court opinions.)

If you are driving up from Boston you come first to Peterborough where the MacDowells started their colony for musicians, artists, and writers deep in the New Hampshire hills nearly 60 years ago. Since you phoned ahead and are almost due at Outlet Farm, you will follow right along west through Dublin, one of the highest towns in New England, where a library was begun in 1793, where gold was discovered in 1875, and where Theodore Parker, Lord Bryce, Albert Bushnell Hart, and American Winston Churchill, and Amy Lowell enjoyed many a summer holiday. Going out of Dublin toward Marlboro, you will want to watch for the turnoff because it drops down suddenly to the left into the trees. This narrow road winds a bit through the timber and then you are on the shore of Dublin Lake with the worn crown of old Monadnock 3 miles due south.

A tall, rugged man bearing a long walking stick stands at the edge of the road to make certain that you are alert to the next and last turn. It is a scented summer evening that he waits in, but you can dress him warmly in your mind's eye and see him in 2 feet of subzero snow. Or you can set him in the first green of spring in the forests, frost still coming from the ground and the early bluebirds overhead. Or in October when the emerald lake reflects a border of autumnal yellow and scarlet and burgundy.

The wayside receptionist points his stick in the direction of a lane, again to the left, that rises away from the lakeshore. For good measure, his squarish, jutting chin also indicates the way. Seconds later you are at the dooryard of Outlet Farm. Grenville Clark, 80-plus, who greeted you at the gate, follows up afoot. His good wife, Fanny Dwight Clark, steps out from her flowers before the rambling frame and red brick house. There is a garden trowel in her hand; she had been improving the July twilight.

Any of a score of missions may have brought you to Outlet Farm—close by is the opening in the lake that starts a rocky stream from which the farm long ago took its name. But you are quickly made at home whether the purpose at hand is world peace through world law or an adequate defense machinery in time of national emergency or legal representation for Negro defendants arrested in demonstrations for equal rights, or the precarious state of our historic liberties in the hands of heedless legislators and administrators and far too many judges or the effects of the population explosion on international affairs or a grievous trespass on academic freedom that needs immediate attention. People with ideas are welcome at Outlet Farm, and people who work to make constructive ideas effective are most welcome of all.

Almost in less time than it takes to tell it you are comfortably settled in the low-ceilinged house, amid its books old and new, its current magazines, its pictures and signed photographs and art treasures from around the globe. For Fanny Dwight's family included sailors from Salem whose square-riggers plied the seven seas and brought back vases and china and lacquers from the Orient. Her grandmother gave Outlet Farm to her mother for a summer place some 80 years ago and it has been the year-round home of the Grenville Clarks for the past 20 years. In fact, they have lived there ever since he retired from his lucrative partnership in one of the most celebrated of New York law firms to devote himself to the things he considered important and urgent in his time. Not the whole world fortunately, but a large part of the world that counts has beat a path to their New Hampshire door.

Is there any private citizen in the United States who has never held public office of any kind who has been more beneficially influential in significant ways in American government and life than the broad-shouldered man who looks at you from under bushy gray brows with friendly eyes that light up a sunbrowned face? If so, his name does not come to mind. Grenville Clark is Public Citizen Clark. The descriptive words become as honored a title as Senator or Governor or Justice or President might but not necessarily would be. It all depends on the man and Grenville Clark is so rare a man among our 190 million people.

An episode in his college days—in June 1901—foretold how "Grenny" Clark would operate through the long and crowded years ahead. As a Harvard undergraduate, he had an invitation to visit at the home of Vice President Theodore Roosevelt on Long Island. Even then pushed for time to get everything done, he elected the midnight train from Boston to New York and took a late trolley car from Harvard Square to Boston with a small margin of time to catch the train. As the car neared the Boston end of the Harvard Bridge across the Charles, its progress was stopped by a traffic jam caused by a woman's leap from the bridge in a suicide attempt. When the motorman stopped his vehicle, the Harvard student en route to see the man who soon would be President of the United States, ran to the scene and jumped into the dark waters. He reached the woman, hauled her to safety, and raced back to the trolley car. When the midnight trained pulled out of the station, Grenville Clark was narrowly aboard.

Nearly 60 years later he paused in his crusade to engage the lawyers of the world in an international program for peace in order to assist white-haired Dr. Willard Uphaus in the religious leader's final effort for release from jail where he had been imprisoned on a contempt citation. Grenville Clark was enough of an individualist himself to be deeply concerned about the plight of a 70-year-old peace advocate whose chief sin seemed to be that he would "not bear false witness against his neighbor." Through life Clark has had his long-range projects but he has always been able to interrupt them briefly to cope with the emergency of the hour.

But the story of Grenville Clark begins a lot further back than that nocturnal rescue on the way to Sagamore Hill. It begins before his birth to banker Louis Crawford Clark and Marian de Forest (Cannon) Clark, on November 5, 1882, at 311 Fifth Avenue, Manhattan. On his mother's side he had a remarkable grandfather, LeGrand Bouton Cannon, a colonel in the Union Army, an early backer of the Republican Party, and a sky-high protectionist. Grandfather Cannon knew Lincoln. His memoirs, "Personal Reminiscences of the Rebellion: 1861–1866," written and privately printed for the family in his 80th year—he lived to be 91—tell of his meetings with the Civil War President at Fort Monroe.

When "Grenny" Clark was about 12, his stocky, possessive, strongly opinionated grandsire took him to look up the neglected grave of John Brown at North Elba, N.Y. A self-made railroad builder of large means and spacious living, LeGrand Cannon arranged for the transfer of the famous abolitionist's burial place to the State of New York for preservation as hallowed ground. He knew Daniel Webster well enough to call him a friend. And he preached self-reliance with fervor to his grandson who remembered the lessons. When grandfather Cannon died, it developed that he had thought enough of his grandson, then barely of age, to make him an executor of his will.

Colonel Cannon's Harvard-educated son-in-law, Louis Crawford Clark, was a New Englander whose father had gone West to St. Louis from Northampton, Mass., about 1835 and returned to found the firm of Clark, Dodge & Co. in New York in 1845. His life of business and pleasure included frequent excursions to the summer home at Burlington, Vt. His son, Grenville, made the most of such a scheme of things and in a sense overcame the wealth and the advantages that it made possible. As a boy he had to begin to make his own way. From Pomfret School, where he ran the gamut of the sports, he entered Harvard at 16. That made him a year or so younger than most of his associates. The elm-shaded yard was the center of intellectual ferment in those days of Charles William Eliot, William James, Barrett Wendell, George Herbert Palmer, Abbott Lawrence Lowell, and LeBaron Russell Briggs.

The Harvard ferment touched undergraduate Clark who began to see that the political orthodoxy of post-Reconstruction Republicanism did not encompass the whole of defensible thought and action. This realization broadened when, after graduating from the college with Phi Beta Kappa honors in 1903, he went on to the Harvard Law School. Felix Frankfurter undoubtedly became most widely known among the 196 graduates in the law class of 1906. But Monte M. Lemann, of New Orleans, also stood out and so of course does Grenville Clark. A list of others in the class who distinguished themselves in the law or public service or education would include Elihu Root, Jr., Richard Washburn Child, Stanley King, Robert J. Bulkley, and Francis William Bird.

For a little more than 2 years young Clark practiced with an established New York City firm. Then on January 1, 1909, he and classmates Root and Bird opened a partnership that grew to be one of the most outstanding of New York law offices. It received notable additions in personnel over the decades but its course and reputation were set in the early years. From the outset Grenville Clark did his own research on cases and the pertinent law and precedents. When he went into the courtroom it was seldom that anyone else knew anywhere near as much that was applicable to the case at hand. If preparation was a forte so was cross-examination. There was much to the grim remark of an opposing counsel: "He prepares like a scientist and hangs on like a leech."

The year 1909 was notable in another way. With the law partnership well begun, Grenville Clark's next step was to take the hand of Fanny Dwight in marriage. A Beacon Street Bostonian who danced as well as she skated, she came of the intensely New England Dwight and Silsbee families whose antecedents all were English. Her first Dwight ancestor, John, came from the Barbados about 1630 to Dedham, Mass. The town records list him among 25 original proprietors of the new town who were present at the January 1, 1645, meeting to vote for what the town records described as "our first free public school * * * to be supported by general taxation." The Dwight family grew so distinguished that the Encyclopaedia Britannica, under the heading "Dwight," presents it as "a group of U.S. educators, clergymen, lawyers, and authors." In her girlhood, Fanny Dwight played charades with Mark Twain, learned to flycast, and began a lifelong delight in plant and flower growing and exhibition. Her husband has shared the gardening interest and she has counseled and helped with his many public undertakings. Their two daughters and son grew up in a home where mutuality of concerns characterized daily living.

At Harvard, Grenville Clark was impressed by old Dr. Eliot's prompting of university-trained men to engage in public service whether or not they held public office. The young lawyer's first major public service came early. The new law firm was not a half dozen years old when Archduke Franz Ferdinand of the Austro-Hungarian Empire was assassinated in Sarajevo. In a few weeks Europe was red with war. Attorney Clark was not long in seeing something that escaped a good many eyes in Washington, namely, that the United States would in all probability be drawn into the conflict. Even more evident to him was the inadequate state of American defenses. Many sincere people felt that preparedness would only lead to war and so opposed Maj. Gen. Leonard Wood's efforts to provide military training for college students as potential officers.

What Citizen Clark did was to take the lead in organizing the long since historic "Plattsburg movement." With a few associates he agreed to recruit a hundred volunteers from business and professional ranks for military training at their own expense if the War Department would cooperate by furnishing proper instruction. Strenuous effort and a public rally in New York City produced a first training class of twelve hundred which went to an old Army camp at Plattsburg, N.Y., in August 1915. Washington was so impressed at what took place at Plattsburg that in 1916 the War Department set up 12 more "Plattsburg camps." Before the U-boat violations of American lives and shipping forced the United States into the war, close to 20,000 trainees were graduated and potential officer personnel provided for the raw draftees who in 1917 were soon flooding into the Army camps.

But this was only the start of Grenville Clark's World War I service. When President Wilson found it necessary to ask Congress for a declaration of war against the Kaiser's German Empire in April 1917, the principal founder of Plattsburg suggested to Washington that his group be authorized temporarily to examine and screen officer-training candidates. The offer was immediately accepted, to run until the War Department could set up its own officer procurement machinery. The results were phenomenal. In less than a month Plattsburg supporters, including businessmen, lawyers and physicians over the country working under Clark's direction, reviewed 150,000 applicants. Of these 40,000 were accepted for training. By September 1917, a total of 27,341 were commissioned. Had it not been for this crash officer-training program with candidates produced by Grenville Clark and his volunteer associates, it is hard to see how Gen. John J. Pershing's army could have been supplied with indispensable junior officers.

Clark himself went into the Army and was assigned as a major in Washington to follow up on these trailblazing ventures. The manpower needs included not only combat officers but specialists in many areas. Rising to lieutenant colonel in the Adjutant General's Department, he played a leading role in obtaining and training more than 130,000 technicians for war service. Here again he astonished the military professionals whose ideas about mobilization were fitted to slower turning gears.

Between the wars, he became more interested in the workings of peacetime government in the National Capital. He had been friends with Franklin D. Roosevelt since the days when both were fledgling attorneys in the same Manhattan law office. F.D.R., after his election in 1932, accepted a proposal by Clark for a comprehensive reduction in Federal spending, after which citizen Clark fell to and produced the plan that was embodied in the National Economy Act of 1933. By declining appointment to Federal office, he was in the clear to organize a national committee of 250 lawyers who joined in successful opposition to Roosevelt's bill to enlarge the Supreme Court, then disrespectfully dubbed "the nine old men" after the Court's invalidation of a series of major items in the New Deal legislative program.

Clark had already joined in launching the National Economy League in 1931. In that year he was appointed a fellow of Harvard College. These and other public and semipublic activities took more and more time from the law practice. At the age of 47, he put down on paper the pros and cons of leaving the partnership and going to Dublin to live, with his family, a life devoted to the jobs that he knew needed urgently to be done. The pros may not have won out all at once, but in later years they did indeed carry the day.

The rash of so-called loyalty statutes of the 1930's, calling for, among other things, special oaths for schoolteachers, awakened Grenville Clark to a new internal danger—the subversion of our historic freedoms under the Bill of Rights by often sincere but misguided superpatriots in legislative bodies, local, State, and National. Convinced that lawyers generally and the American Bar Association in particular should be vigilant in the protection of individual liberties, he proposed the creation of a bar committee at the national level to guard the Bill of Rights from trespasses of all kinds. He did this in an address to the Nassau County (N.Y.) Bar Association on June 11, 1938.

Arthur T. Vanderbilt, then president of the American Bar Association, read the account of the address in the New York Times. At once he telephoned the speaker and told him that this idea of a bar committee charged with continuous concern about American freedoms and rights had occurred to both of them independently. Vanderbilt, who was soon to leave the American Bar Association presidency, arranged a meeting for himself and Clark with the incoming president, Frank J. Hogan, who agreed to such a committee of 14 with Clark as its chairman. Clark accepted on the condition that he be allowed to select members who believed with him in the mission of the committee. Clark chose all the members except one, who was recommended by Hogan. That single exception was out of tune with the committee's purposes and opposed its most important early decisions. But, on the whole, it was a remarkably unified committee of outstanding lawyers from over the Nation, including, in addition to Clark's classmate, Lemann, such stanch supporters of civil liberty under the Constitution as Douglas Arant, Zechariah Chafee, Jr., George I. Haight, Ross L. Malone, Jr., and Charles P. Taft.

As chairman, Grenville Clark moved promptly to make the new and in many ways surprising committee an effective force in American life as well as within the bar. Careful plans were laid for the publication of a journal through which the work of the committee and the issues before it could be communicated to the bar and to the public. Named the Bill of Rights Review, this excellent publication first appeared in the summer of 1940. Sustained at the outset by a grant from the Carnegie Corp., it was published by the committee with the chairman as one pro tem editor and Joseph Harrison as the other. As its reason for being, the Bill of Rights Review said both frankly and perceptively:

"A growing volume of cases in recent years has made it increasingly apparent that a distinct field of law—that of civil rights—is emerging and taking its place along with the older established fields and such newer fields as administrative law, labor law, and tax law. The subject often involves heated controversy and is intrinsically of such importance that it requires a wise and balanced treatment on the part of the ablest members of the bar. These can best help maintain the American system of free institutions by being guided by the letter and spirit of the law of civil liberties rather than by their political or economic predilections. Such an approach to this all-important subject would be timely and might well become the organized bar's greatest contribution to the preservation of the American way."

The Bill of Rights Review came out every quarter for several years. In that time it did much to resist the war hysteria against those who held unpopular opinions. If the times made the mission of the committee the harder, so was its opportunity the greater in awakening, at the very least, some members of the legal profession, educators and editors of newspapers and magazines to the increasing assaults on the liberties of the individual citizen. It can only be regretted that this noble undertaking did not continue straight through the years. Nearly a quarter century later the Review's files are a collection of many of the finest editorials and articles ever written and published on American freedoms.

Even before it could issue volume 1, No. 1 of the Bill of Rights Review, the committee went into action as friends of the court—in two eminent civil liberties cases. First it strongly opposed Mayor Frank Hague in his arbitrary and unconstitutional deportation of Norman Thomas, from Jersey City, where the Socialist leader was prevented from addressing a public meeting. In the Hague case the committee was resoundingly on the winning side. Then, after a year of study of the compulsory flag salute issue, the committee filed a brief, prepared by Clark and Chafee, in opposition to the claims of the Minersville (Pa.) School District that it could, first, compel children to salute the flag as a condition to staying in school, and, second, that if pupils did not join in the compulsory flag salute the school board had the authority to suspend them.

Two children in the school, Lillian Gobitis, aged 12, and her brother, William, aged 10, refused to take part in the daily salute. Their parents taught them that according to their religion (Jehovah's Witnesses) to salute the flag was to "bow down before a graven image." The committee's brief argued that to insist on the flag salute in these circumstances amounted to an unconstitutional infringement of religious liberty. Here the committee, in June 1940, lost 8 to 1—temporarily. The majority opinion written by classmate Frankfurter, then a new Justice, was soon seriously weakened in the 5-to-4 Handbills case also arising from the activities of the Jehovah's Witnesses. In less than 3 years, the 8-to-1 decision in *Minersville School District* v. *Gobitis* was reversed by the Supreme Court in the 6-to-3 decision in *West Virginia State Board of Education* v. *Barnette*. The brief of Clark and Chafee and the Bill of Rights Committee of the American Bar Association had become the law of the land.

Oddly enough it remained for citizen Clark to perform in World War II a function very much like that which brought him the Distinguished Service Medal in World War I. The conquest of Norway by the Nazis, in April 1940, told him that the United States would in all probability be drawn into the hostilities however much we might wish to avoid involvement. And so, when the Plattsburg alumni met on May 8, 1940, he proposed that the United States begin to organize and train its manpower through a national Selective Service Act.

But the Secretary of War, Harry H. Woodring, was opposed to conscription when the United States itself was not at war. Clark's solution to this first aspect of the problem was to work for a change at the Cabinet level. He laid his plans carefully and dealt quietly with men influential in Washington. When his movements were completed, President Roosevelt had, on June 20, 1940, replaced Woodring with the eminent Republican, Henry L. Stimson, who had served as Secretary of War under President Taft and as Secretary of State under President Hoover. One of the conditions that Stimson had set as a basis for acceptance of the secretaryship (at the same time Republican Frank Knox became Secretary of the Navy) was that he have a free hand to work for Selective Service. As in World War I, Clark took the cause to the public. He set up a program to inform the country as to the need for a draft of manpower by Congress. Then he largely wrote the Selective Service Act which, after amendment, passed the Senate, 2 to 1, and became law in September 1940. In 1941 he answered Stimson's call for help, went to Washington and was in the War Secretary's office to write the declaration of war against Japan after the dastardly attack on Pearl Harbor. Citizen Clark had done it again.

Yet he would probably say that vital though survival is, nothing he did in the two World Wars is as important as his efforts for world peace. He began to turn over thoughts about limited world government as long ago as the 1920's. In 1939, spurred by the precarious state of global affairs, he wrote out his developing ideas in "A Federation of Free Peoples." With the Second World War substantially won by July 1944, Clark quit Washington and went back to Dublin to work on winning the peace. Secretary Stimson encouraged him to raise his sights so as to devise a world constitution for the postwar era.

The result was that he produced an outline for a world government to maintain peace which the Indiana Law Review published that same year with the significant title, "A New World Order—The American Lawyer's Role." In October 1945, he assembled the meeting known as the Dublin conference. At Clark's inspiration and with Supreme Court Justice Owen J. Roberts as chairman, a group of 40 distinguished citizens met in sight of old Monadnock to think together about the means for preventing the holocaust that could destroy civilization. Out of their deliberations came the Dublin declaration looking to the formation of a world federal government.

The essence of the Clark position on world peace is that as long as the nuclear arms race continues, the world lives with a loaded gun at its head. This, he submits, is not only dangerous to the point of foolhardiness but intolerable. And so he is for world law, legislated by a world body and enforced by a world administration, with a world police force to keep international order. Any disputes would be adjudicated or mediated by world courts and related tribunals. This comprehensive peacekeeping machinery would be supported by an adequate world revenue system.

The United Nations is good so far as it goes, but as is evident from the Clark plan, it does not go far enough. And so Citizen Clark undertook to work out a detailed revision of the United Nations Charter with a view to provoking "the worldwide discussions which must precede the adoption of universal and complete disarmament and the establishment of truly effective institutions for the prevention of war."

In the formulation of his plan's many details, he enlisted the help of Prof. Louis B. Sohn of the Harvard University Law School, whose field is international law. Their book, "World Peace Through World Law," was published by the Harvard University Press in March 1958. The first edition was soon exhausted and a revised edition came out in 1960. It has been translated in whole or in part into at least a dozen languages, among them Chinese and Russian, and serves as a basis for genuine world peace and disarmament talks wherever they are held. Then in order to propose an alternative method he and Professor Sohn published in 1962 a draft treaty establishing a World Disarmament and World Development Organization within the framework of the United Nations. The purpose was to create a compact but inclusive treaty text on which statesmen might start to work in any sincere effort at drawing the teeth of war.

In recent months Grenville Clark has been studying the probable effect of disarmament on the world's population problem. One of the fruits in this area was a provocative article which he contributed in February 1963, to a series in the Saturday Review. His encouraging expectations can be told from these hopeful words: "The release, through complete disarmament, of vast resources to raise living standards in the 'have-not' areas of the world could bring about effective population control within a few decades." Those who strive for peace and those who strive for population control should, he wrote, "strike hands in a united effort for the preservation and welfare of mankind."

How do fellow lawyers appraise the career of Grenville Clark? Judging by the widely circulated exchange of letters in 1949 on the issue of "Freedom at Harvard" between him, as a Harvard fellow, and Harvard law graduate Frank B. Ober, of Baltimore, there are those who find fault with parts of it—to say the least. But then there are countless others who regard the patient, far-seeing man with the square, strong jaw as among the glories not only of their profession but of all America.

On presenting Grenville Clark with the American Bar Association's highest award, its gold medal for "conspicuous service to the cause of American jurisprudence," President Ross Malone spoke for many lawyers, on August 27, 1959, at Miami Beach, when he said, quoting the citation:

"Through his dedication to the discharge of the public responsibility of the bar during a long and distinguished professional career, he has rallied many others to that noble concept. He has helped keep freedom's flag flying, and by his example has ever reminded his fellow lawyers of their duty to uphold liberty and to expand support for the rule of law."

Yet more than gold medals and citations he must cherish the words of Secretary Stimson from a handwritten letter sent after World War II:

"You certainly should record your work. At almost every critical period in our history which I can remember, it was your sagacity which diagnosed and pushed forward the best remedy, and you have not had a quarter of the recognition for it which you should have had."

Among those in high place who have commended Grenville Clark's work is President Kennedy. Praising him as a man alert, in both war and peace, to vital needs, the President has well said that "his example is one for which we can all be grateful."

But let Grenville Clark speak for himself. His words come to us from the spotlighted rostrum of the bar convention where he has received the gold medal, from the study in the Harvard law library where he is hard at work, from the old farmhouse on the mountain slope in New Hampshire where he takes comfort from the serenity of the lake that greeted the pioneers two centuries ago. He says to us:

"I hope that we may constantly recall the words of Lincoln: 'As our case is new, so must we think anew and act anew.' For I wish that our thinking shall not be crippled by timidity or undue regard for tradition, but shall be as imaginative and creative as the problem is vast and new. I further wish that we may resist any temptation to avoid the hardest problems.

"I earnestly hope that we may have the insight to perceive the uselessness of talking about any effective rule of law in world affairs unless in addition to world tribunals we are prepared to accept world legislative and executive agencies equipped with adequate authority to make the judgments of those tribunals surely enforcible.

"In particular I hope that we will realize that nothing less will suffice than universal and complete, rather than partial, national disarmament, together with an adequate world police force. On no easier terms than these, I believe, can a world rule of law, however strictly limited to the prevention of war, become a reality.

"This problem of world peace under law is indeed hard. But it is not insoluble and the goal is worth the effort. There is a tide in the affairs of men. It brings us now a supreme opportunity and also imposes an urgent duty. If we can rise to that duty we shall fairly earn the gratitude of all mankind."

And so going west out of Dublin watch for that turnoff to the left into the woods. It is a third of a mile beyond the village post office which puts the cancellation, "Dublin, N.H.," on so many important letters and statements and pamphlets that go out around the world—just a third of a mile and no more. Citizen Clark, U.S.A., walking stick in hand, is waiting in the cool of the summer evening at the lane that leads up to Outlet Farm where Fanny Dwight Clark has been cultivating her prize roses. It would be too bad to miss even a minute that you might have had there.

THE WAR IN VIETNAM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, last week, on Saturday, July 4, the convention of the Oregon Democratic Party, meeting at Coos Bay, Oreg., adopted a resolution calling for submission of the jurisdiction of the war in South Vietnam to the United Nations. At this large convention, there was only one vote in opposition. The comments made at the convention also left no room for doubt that the participants in that Democratic convention in Oregon are very concerned about the course of action that the United States is following in the foreign policy in southeast Asia.

In my judgment this is the most sensible action that has been taken by any party convention yet on this critical international conflict.

The resolution states in full:

> We urge that the United States ask the United Nations to take responsibility for the settlement of the conflict in Vietnam and that the United States declare its readiness to contribute troops and military support under United Nations command upon the assumption of this responsibility by the United Nations.

There is no doubt as to the position of these Democrats in support of having other nations who are members of the United Nations proceed to carry out their responsibilities, along with the United States, in applying the rule of law, rather than American unilateral military action in southeast Asia in an attempt to settle this dispute.

The American people everywhere, not just in Oregon, are beginning to awaken to the fact that what is happening in southeast Asia is not the exclusive business of the U.S. Department of Defense or of the U.S. Government as a whole. They are beginning to appreciate that it is a threat to international peace of exactly the kind the United Nations was created to handle.

Even the Secretary General of the U.N., U Thant, is coming to appreciate the same thing. At long last, he has called for a new 14-nation conference on southeast Asia, with the possibility that the United Nations could play a role in enforcing its decision. I would that the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, Mr. Adlai Stevenson, would give to Mr. U Thant the help and cooperation that is needed, rather than follow the course of action that Mr. Stevenson has been following in recent months in regard to the war in southeast Asia. The United States opposes any new agreement on southeast Asia until the existing agreements are lived up to. But since we are not living up to them any more than North Vietnam or China, this is only a semantic objection and not a real one. It stands to our historic discredit.

The official position of the United States only raises the question of why the United Nations should not be brought in to enforce the existing agreement. If we really want it enforced, why do we try to keep the U.N. out? The American concern about living up to existing agreements will not be believable even to our own people until we seek an international, not a unilateral, enforcement of them. Until we demonstrate in good faith—and the United States in southeast Asia is not demonstrating good faith, but bad faith—the United States in southeast Asia is not living up to its obligations under even the Geneva accord of 1962, and we did not even sign the Geneva accord of 1954. The United States is not demonstrating good faith in southeast Asia until it demonstrates a willingness to sit down at a 14-nation conference table, as Mr. U Thant now, at long last—but better than never—has finally proposed in the press today.

I am proud that the Oregon Democratic convention has raised its voice in behalf of the rule of law in world affairs. As the war continues, as it becomes more widely discussed in this country, and as more information about it trickles down to the American people, there will be more voices raised along the same line.

More people in the country are speaking out through the various media of public information than there were 90 days ago. I ask unanimous consent to have certain communications that I have received in support of the position I have taken on this issue and certain newspaper articles printed in the RECORD at the close of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, great concern is being demonstrated among our allies over our military course of action in southeast Asia. We are beginning to hear rumblings of fear and doubt in respect to the U.S. policy in southeast Asia among the people of many lands.

In today's press, our potential enemy, Russia, is making disquieting statements about her concern over what she alleges to be U.S. aggression in southeast Asia. She is beginning to make noises to the effect that she does not propose to ignore her commitments made with other countries to see to it that aggression is not carried out in southeast Asia or elsewhere.

Certainly, I agree that she ought to be the last to be discussing it. When one looks at the blood of aggression on the hands of Soviet Russia, it becomes a bit paradoxical to read her pratings today. But, nevertheless, we have placed ourselves, I respectfully submit, in a position so that Russia can carry on that kind of propaganda against the United States. In this instance, the United States is wrong. Russia is going to take advantage of every mistake we make. She is beginning to indicate that she is not going to walk out on Red China. There are stirrings, rumblings, and propaganda announcements coming out of Peiping itself.

Red China is showing an intention not to be bluffed by the United States, not to submit to the United States as we continue our policy of making war, and not peace, in southeast Asia.

In my judgment, the war clouds are becoming more black and ugly over Asia. They are becoming so black they have caused even Pakistan to endorse a 14-nation conference according to today's press reports. Pakistan is one of the SEATO members that has refused to join American forces in Vietnam, despite the vast aid we furnish to Pakistan. I am more concerned than ever before that if we continue our unilateral military course of action in Asia, the probabilities are that there will be a full-scale war in Asia, and the United States will live to regret that we took the course of action that brought about the beginning of that war, rather than resorting, as we should, under treaty commitments, to existing procedures of the rule of law or at least an attempt to settle the dispute by peaceful procedures, rather than by American military might.

EXHIBIT 1

TAKAPUNA, AUCKLAND.
NEW ZEALAND,
June 25, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senator for the State of Oregon, Senate of the United States of America, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I have read in our newspapers recently your sane and balanced views on world affairs particularly with regard to events in southeast Asia, a part of the world that is of great concern to those of us that live in the South Pacific region.

Your comments as reported today (June 25, 1964) on the question of the course indicated by the United States in this vital area are listened to and understood by people from many walks of life here. To those of us that look with great concern at the march toward a conflagration in southeast Asia, your voice is an indication of wiser councils that rise above the constant barrage of talk of war that flows in an endless stream from so many U.S. spokesmen and various journals.

Please accept my thanks for your courage and humanity in speaking out on these issues which keep alive the faith that so many people like myself still endeavor to retain in the American democratic tradition of the past, despite so many blows against a retention of that faith during recent years. Whilst persons like yourself in positions of responsibility in your country still speak out on matters that they consider against the interests of peace, independence, and common humanity, we know that the best traditions of American democracy still retain some hold in these dangerous times.

Please accept my assurance based on my own experience that your words are not lost on millions of ordinary people outside the United States, we can well see what would be the inevitable result of the policies you speak out against as a true American.

Thank you.

Yours faithfully,
Mr. F. S. BALDWIN.

[From the New Zealand Herald, June 25, 1964]

SENATOR FEARS BIG WAR

WASHINGTON.—Senator WAYNE MORSE, Democrat, of Oregon, said in the U.S. Senate yesterday that the United States was heading for a major war in Asia.

He said he had just come from a briefing on the military situation in South Vietnam held by the Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara, and the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

"If the United States continues following the course indicated by this briefing," he said, "we are headed for a major war in Asia, in which thousands of American boys will die.

"We will be hated for 500 years and we will be known as the Nation that was chiefly responsible for scuttling the United Nations.

"The greatest threat to the peace of the world is the United States."

Senator MORSE said the situation in South Vietnam should be put before the United Nations.

LINCOLN PARK, MICH.,
June 28, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Bless you for expressing your views on Vietnam. We have urged our Senators to back you up in this. We, too, are alarmed by the appointment of M. Taylor.

Yours sincerely,
D. SPEIR.

JUNE 28, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish other Senators would be as forthright as you have been in speaking on Vietnam. Try to get them to read Helen S. Lamb's basic pamphlet on "The Tragedy of Vietnam—Where Do We Go From Here?" Surely after reading it all your Senators and Congressmen would want a peaceful settlement after reading Helen S. Lamb's pamphlet.

Yours respectfully,
Mrs. BETSY DAVENPORT.

JULY 3, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Keep up the good work on your southeastern Asia position. We're all for you. Have written to KENNEDY and SALTONSTALL expressing my views. Maybe we can start them moving in the right direction, too. Best of luck.

Yours,
SIDNEY DORFMAN.

ITHACA, N.Y.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Congratulations on your speech of June 22 on the war in South Vietnam. I agree completely with what you said. Keep up the fight.

WILLIAM DUELL.

SHEFFIELD, MASS.,
July 4, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: On this July 4, we want to thank you for speaking out on behalf of commonsense and humanity, and against our policy of spreading or continuing the war in Vietnam. Yours is a courageous voice, and there are plenty of people who appreciate.

Sincerely,
JOAN and LES LASKOFF.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.,
July 6, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have been so thankful for what you have been saying about Vietnam and southeast Asia. I think you have made three speeches on the topic recently. I should be very grateful for a copy of each of them. If I should pay for these, please let me know.

With greater faith in America because you are in our Senate.

HENRY S. HUNTINGTON.

BERKELEY, CALIF.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for your effort to fight the bad American policy in southeast Asia. There is no reason for unilateral action by the United States.

Yours truly,
GEORGE GOLDMAN.

Senator MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: You are so right, all the trouble in Vietnam is our fault, why did we not go to the U.N.? Why were we not kinder to Castro when he came here in 1958? That is Eisenhower? Who is setting our foreign policy under the Republicans and the Democrats? The governments of the world must be by the individuals for the individual and of the individual, give the principles of the declaration both at home and abroad even when we do not wish too, such as to every child.

BRIDGEVILLE, PA.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
The Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I want to express my great appreciation and admiration for your discussion on the program "Issues and Answers." I have written to ABC in New York to inquire if copies can be obtained.

It seems so important that such a sane, intelligent presentation of our international conduct (especially with reference to the U.N.) should be given the widest possible distribution.

Thank you again for your inimitable performance,

Very truly yours,
Mrs. ALICE G. HARRIS.

JUNE 30, 1964.

Hon. Senator WAYNE L. MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

HON. SENATOR WAYNE MORSE: I commend you on your courageous stand on the situation in South Vietnam and its terrible possibilities of war. We appreciate your services to the cause of peace.

Yours truly,
SYLVIA HILL.
LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

JUNE 30, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Your interview with the press Sunday was outstanding. How I wish your advice would be acted upon immediately.

FLORENCE S. REED.
GLENDALE, CALIF.

NORTHAMPTON, MASS.,
July 2, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This is to commend you on your stand concerning present U.S. policies in Vietnam. I think our relations with China and southeast Asia have reached a dangerous point and that every effort should be bent, not to extending the war there, but to negotiating its end.

Sincerely yours,
ALICE A. LAGEROWITZ.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I should like to add my approval of your stand on our involvement in South Vietnam. Keep up the fight.

There are countless U.S. citizens who agree. I hope you hear from them.

Mrs. Robert Schon.

Berkeley, Calif.

July 3, 1964.

Honorable Senator Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: Thank you for speaking out on the Vietnam situation. What are we ordinary citizens to do when our leaders tell us this situation can only be resolved through "brinkmanship." I would very much appreciate it if you could send me a transcript of your speeches on Vietnam.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Edith Alterman.

Claremont, Calif.

The Honorable Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I strongly support your efforts to change our unilateral military policy in Vietnam. I heard your forceful TV speech when you urged that the United States get the free world to organize behind the U.N. Charter. I have sent the President a night letter which several others signed and am writing my Senators.

With gratitude for your courage and forthrightness in presenting the situation to the country and stressing our obligation to international law.

Mrs. Elizabeth P. Steiner.

July 4, 1964.

July 5, 1964.

Senator Morse,
Washington, D.C.

My Dear Senator Morse: This is to declare my strong support of your courageous stand against the U.S. policy in southeast Asia which I agree is politically disastrous and morally wrong.

I am writing to President Johnson to this effect.

Sincerely yours,

Jane M. Chase.

Albany, N.Y.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Sir: Bravo Senator Morse, it takes a real A-1 American citizen and statesman to tell off the warmongering racketeers that have for too long a time brainwashed the average American citizen. The United Nations is our only salvation for survival for the entire conflict areas of dispute.

Let's go, U.N.O.

J.J.C.

Salem, Oreg.,
June 13, 1964.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: I want to add my name to the rapidly growing number of concerned citizens who feel as you do—that it is time some sanity be brought into the American policy in Asia. The stand you have taken on what we have done and are doing in Vietnam (and now in Laos) shows that you believe we have the moral obligation to practice what we "preach." Are we so drunk with power that we believe we are justified in working with the United Nations only when doing so furthers our own selfish interests?

Your protest makes me feel that the America I was taught about in school is not altogether dead. I still believe too strongly in the greatness of our ideals to look upon most of our actions in Asia with anything but a feeling of hopeless horror. The future of our Nation, and therefore of the world, depends upon you—and the others of your persuasion—whose eyes are not in the backs of their heads, and whose moral values compel them to weigh America in the same scales with which America weighs the actions of other nations.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Martha Fullenwider.

Cheektowaga, N.Y.,
June 27, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: Would you please send me a copy of your interview on "Issues and Answers," Sunday, June 27, 1964.

Sincerely yours,

Harold R. Rolan.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Sir: Please send me copies of your speeches on Vietnam, Laos, and southeast Asia.

M. Riskin.

Los Angeles, Calif.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Could I please have a copy of your speech on Vietnam—by the 28th if possible.

Thank you very much.

Joan Rawles.

Claremont, Calif.

Los Angeles, Calif.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: Please keep on talking against our foreign policy in Asia. If you speak often and loud enough the newspapers, radio, and TV have to report it once in a while.

According to State Secretary Rusk, we are the only ones who belong to Vietnam and Laos, the natives should leave it or like what we order for them.

Thank you,

J. Hirschfeld.

Whittier, Calif.,
June 27, 1964.

Senator Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: Thanks for being a modern Paul Revere on the "Today" show this week. I believe your alarm is greatly needed just now.

We published some of your statements recently in the daily press. What more can we do?

Sincerely yours,

Ed H. Runcorn.

Racine, Wis.,
June 28, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: Heard you on the "Issues and Answers" program. You are right; the U.N. should have all these jobs.

W. A. Nordstrom, Sr.

June 29, 1964.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: Good for you. My husband and I heard you on the "Today" program, the other day.

Indeed, it is high time we withdrew our troops from Vietnam and let the U.N. decide its fate. The poor Vietnamese people must be plenty tired of the war, and a civil war at that.

Sincerely yours,

Georgine C. Molnar.

Eastchester, N.Y.,
June 29, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: "Wars can be prevented just as surely as they are provoked and we who fail to prevent them must share in the guilt for the dead."—Gen. Omar Bradley.

I agree with your position on southeast Asia, and South Vietnam in particular, as expressed on TV yesterday. But how can you support President Johnson?

I believe we need a third party more than ever before. It seems the Democrats and Republicans are competing in saber rattling (occasionally atomic and hydrogen bomb rattling). I don't feel I can trust either one of them.

I hope you will continue to tell the truth.

Yours very truly,

L. Pach.

Arcadia, Calif.,
July 2, 1964.

Dear Senator Morse: I can no longer resist my urge to thank you for the magnificent insight and courage you have so long displayed—and particularly for your forthright position on Vietnam. Every sane citizen of our country must be indebted to you, whether he knows it or not.

I am taking the liberty of enclosing copies of our two latest issues of the Churchman, with a few things marked which might be of special interest to you. I am also asking our Florida office to place you on our subscription list, thinking that you may be interested in seeing a liberal religious journal 160 years old but not entirely dead on its feet—I hope. We shall keep on cheering for you. If at any time we can be of service through our pages, please let me know.

Cordially and gratefully yours,

Guy Emery Shipler,
Editor.

[From the Churchman, June 1964]

WHO IS FIGHTING THE VIETNAM WAR?

In spite of propaganda to the contrary, it is obvious that the United States is fighting in the Vietnam war, and using some modern techniques in doing so. Several times General Hester had pointed this out in his articles in the Churchman, in which he has quoted many authorities. Life magazine deserves credit for printing the letters of Capt. Edwin Shank, 27, to his wife, in its issue of May 8. The captain was killed in Vietnam 2 days after his last letter, dated March 22.

In a letter of December 4, 1963, written following one of their night attacks, we read: "After the first two bombs, we spotted the bad guys shooting at us. So Frank directed me in and I burned them with napalm." Please note the "I." In a letter of January 4, of this year, Shank wrote: "Napalm is gasoline which is jellied into a mass about the consistency of honey. When you drop it, it ignites and spreads fire about 200 to 300 feet. With charcoal in it, the charcoal is thrown another 200 feet, like a burning baseball, and does further damage to Vietcong houses." On January 7 he wrote: "I don't know what the United States is doing. They tell you people that we are just in training situations. But we're at war. We are doing the flying and fighting. We are losing." And on January 15: "We can no longer save face over here, for we have no face to save. We are more than ever fighting this war." On January 20: "What gets me most is that they won't tell you people what we do over here. I'll bet that anyone you talk to does not know that American pilots fight this war. We—me and my buddies—do everything. The Vietnamese 'students' we have on board are airman basics. They don't even know their own serial numbers. The only reason they are on board is: in case we crash there is one American 'adviser' and one Vietnamese 'student.' They are sacrificial lambs."

So—we send our boys to Vietnam under orders to burn innocent people, including mothers and children, with napalm—and to be killed. Senator Morse, member of the Foreign Relations Committee, who has persistently denounced our Vietnam policy, declares that "millions of Americans are beginning to realize that it is time for us to get out of South Vietnam." And he told the Senate "all of South Vietnam isn't worth the life of a single American boy." At this writing the count of Americans soldiers killed is 225.

[From the Churchman, June 1964]

What Kind of Freedom?

(By Hugh B. Hester)

The American people have been shown two pictures in their daily newspapers recently which depict the situation in the world better than many thousands of words. One shows the bloody, cruel, and utterly insane war the U.S. Government is waging against defenseless, innocent, and poor men, women and children—in this instance, halfway around the world. It is of a Cambodian father holding in his arms his badly burned napalm-bombed child. The other picture shows the abysmal poverty of the "have-nots" in Latin America.

To state, as did the late John Foster Dulles and many others, that the presence of Communists among the people of Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia pose a threat to the interests of the mighty United States is fantastic; to claim that the U.S. Government is not responsible for the war in this area is false; and to call this a defense of freedom is literally obscene. This is coldblooded, senseless murder, worthy only of the heirs of Hitler's Nazi Germany, her concentration camps and crematories.

The picture of a village in northern Brazil illustrates more clearly than anything else possible the reasons for discontent and turmoil in this continent south of us. The recent coup d'etat in Brazil which deposed President Joao Goulart will not solve this problem of poverty. The continued use of U.S. funds for the arming of the feudal forces in Latin America will not solve this problem either. The causes of instability in this vital area can only be achieved through the eradication of the worst features of poverty. Unless the leaders of the United States are willing to attack the causes instead of the symptoms of this deadly malady, they would be wise to completely disengage the United States from this area.

A real solution, of course, would consist of a vast program for agricultural reform and for industrialization for education and medical care. Only when these people have adequate food, clothing, shelter, medical care, and education, can democracy, as we think of it in the Anglo Saxon world, be cultivated.

It is vitally important, it seems to this writer, that the leaders of the capitalist West recognize that the conditions in most of the undeveloped world are fundamentally different from those in the developed world. Democracy and freedom as prated about in the capitalist West, have no meaning to hungry, naked, and homeless people. Their order of freedom consists of the freedom to eat, to have shelter, clothing, medical care, and education. Unless our leaders can understand this, no amount of military aid, no amount of "economic" aid a la Western style can solve the problem. You can't shoot an idea with bullets or bombs and you can't fill the empty stomachs of hundreds of millions of hungry people with the crumbs from the capitalist table.

Staten Island, N.Y.,
July 6, 1964.

Dear Senator Morse: I have just written to President Johnson, congratulating him on passage of civil liberties legislation, and protesting foreign policy in Vietnam and expressing thorough agreement with positions taken by you and Senator Gruening.

It is alarming to me that so few people in key positions seem aware of the dangers of escalating war in southeast Asia and the importance for the country that we extricate ourselves, before we bog down deeper and precipitate major catastrophe.

We seem to be trying to control the life and politics of these people against their will. We just can't indefinitely play God to the whole world—and get away with it.

I wish I knew how to use my small voice more effectively. At least I can also write to New York Senators—and will.

Sincerely,

Flora M. Davidson.

P.S.—I congratulate you and Senator Gruening for commonsense and courage to speak up.

Worcester, Mass.,
July 2, 1964.

Senator Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator: In a letter from the organization PAX I read an excerpt from your letter to Norman Thomas concerning the growing willingness in the Pentagon and the State Department to go to war with Red China.

I am writing to tell you that I am in agreement with you about the immorality of this attitude. Please do your utmost to make your views heard.

Respectfully yours,

Mrs. Annabel Wolfson.

Philadelphia, Pa.,
July 6, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator: I am enclosing a copy of a letter which I sent to President Johnson. This will serve to convey my views on the war in southeast Asia. I wish to add to that an expression of gratitude for your many forthright statements in opposition to that war. It is reassuring to know that there are a few men in Congress who dare to ask, "Where are the emperor's clothes?"

Very truly yours,

Mrs. Ida G. Klingsberg.

"Dear Mr. President: For several months I read with a growing feeling of ease and reassurance your many statements in favor of finding peaceful solutions for the world's problems. Recent developments in southeast Asia, however, point in the direction not of peace but of war. American lives continue to be lost; Laos is bombed; a military man serves as our ambassador to South Vietnam; talk increases of expanding the war. These things are most alarming.

"Can we not learn from history? After 9 years of warfare in Indochina, the French suffered a quarter-million casulties. Despite billions of dollars in U.S. aid, they surrendered at Dien Bien-phu with a half-million troops still under their command. Do we aim to emulate that record? Or are we headed for the point of no return?—a nuclear conflagration? There is a third choice, Mr. President. In a nuclear age it is the only choice: the conference table. Two frameworks for such a conference already exist: The United Nations and the Geneva Conference.

"As a lifelong Democrat I have not enjoyed hearing the repeated charge that the Democratic Party is the party of war inasmuch as the three wars of this century have occurred in Democratic administrations. In the past I have regarded this charge as fraudulent and politically motivated. But I pray, Mr. President, that it will never be possible to make such an accusation again."

Carlisle, Mass.,
July 4, 1964.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
The U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

My Dear Senator: Since I feel that your position concerning the war in southeast Asia and its inevitable consequences is correct and commendable, I would like to pledge my support to you in your efforts to encourage a more sane policy there. Until the U.S. Government recognizes the necessity of working within the U.N. and adhering to international law, it will continually jeopardize the peace of the world, as it has during the past few years. It is surprising that this Nation which began with a struggle for its own independence from a colonialist power should now be falling into the same errors as its earlier opponents.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. Katherine Haramundanis.

Millers Falls, Mass.,
July 4, 1964.

Dear Senator Morse: I would like to quote part of a book review from the New York Times which was partially reproduced in an article by A. J. Muste in Liberation. It was written by Prof. George Kateb of Amherst College:

"There is already evidence of a new statism which makes of international relations a Renaissance game; which spends inconceivably large sums of money on redundant or artificial projects; which so encloses our leaders in their struggle with the enemy that one day they could have more in common with their counterparts in the enemy country than with their own people; which can speculate on thermonuclear casualties in the scores of millions and still speak about the survival or victory of the Nation."

Brief as it is this statement clearly indicates the present trend of U.S. policy in southeast Asia. Vietnam and Laos have now become the focal points in a struggle against Communist aggressors while they should really be treated as signs and alarms of the increasingly complex political, economic, and social situation which exists in southeast Asia.

I applaud and wholeheartedly support your opposition to our Government's warhawk attitude. To be certain, peacekeeping, and not warmongering, is the central task for the United States in southeast Asia.

For the first time in our Nation's short history, when and if the administration calls for more overt action, there will be opposition from representative officials like you and some of your colleagues.

I have already written a letter to President Johnson voicing my opposition to the present trend of military and political affairs in southwest Asia, but I urge you to keep the voices of opposition strong and creative enough to offer an alternative of peaceful conciliation in Vietnam and Laos.

The President made an unfortunate choice in appointing General Taylor to the ambassadorial post in Vietnam. I sincerely hope that this trend of action can be countered by creative proposals for a turn toward peace.

Yours truly,

Phillip Szenher,
Clark University.

New York, N.Y.,
July 6, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Our great admiration and strong support for your June 29th speech about peace in Asia.

H. Koningsberger.

Sausalito, Calif.,
July 6, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We owe undying gratitude for your opposition to U.S. policy in Vietnam.

Roby Frick.

Dedham, Mass.,
July 4, 1964.

Dear Senator Morse: Congratulations on your stand in regard to the war in southeast Asia. It is heartening to know that a few of our leaders want to keep us from suffering the fate of France in that area.

Please don't let us be drawn further into that quicksand.

Sincerely,

Anne B. Stedman.

Newton, Mass.,
July 6, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: I am writing to express support of your criticism of our present southeast Asia policy. I am in favor of beginning immediate negotiations for a neutralization of the area rather than extending a war that doesn't have the support of even the South Vietnamese. I hope more Senators will be as truthful and outspoken as you.

Yours truly,

Evelyn Grinspoon.

July 4, 1964.

Dear Senator: Thanks so much for your uniquely courageous stand on the South Vietnam war. It is so rare and rewarding to hear the blunt truth spoken out. I am sure many Americans support both your views and your crusading spirit. It is merely a sad commentary on our times that to speak out should be so extraordinary. I am glad that on this historic date I can write to a real patriot, and pay honor to at least one man's dedication to truth.

Yours,

Mrs. Jeanne S. Bagby.

New York, N.Y.,
July 3, 1964.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Wayne: Enclosed is a copy of my column on Vietnam. It goes to the Denver Post which may or not print it and also to the Socialist paper, New America.

Thanks for your draft.

Sincerely yours,

Norman Thomas.

[From the New York Times, July 1, 1964]

ASIAN POLICY ASSAILED—NORMAN THOMAS SAYS HOPE LIES ONLY IN NEGOTIATION

To the Editor:

On June 21 you carried an editorial on the situation in southeast Asia which ended: "Military victory is not possible for either side in this struggle, but the danger of a global conflict seems to be advancing with fearful speed."

On the next day in the Senate Wayne Morse made a bitter and documented attack on the administration's policy. I didn't see it reported in the Times and he tells me that it seems to be the policy of newspapers, television stations and so forth throughout the country to let the administration lead us to war without reporting important dissent even in the Senate by him and Senator Gruening. Administration supporters have not yet bothered to answer them.

Like him, I am one of those who believe that "in the State Department and Pentagon are men who think Red China will never be weaker than she is at the present time, and therefore now is the time to finish her off if she resists a U.S. takeover in southeast Asia."

Even in the name of the most righteous anticommunism, it is madness for us to embark on a course that may lead to world war. The world in general would not think us champions of righteousness but of a neoimperialism, and even if we could and should crush China in a military sense, we would lose.

We cannot thus organize Asia, much less the world, for democracy. We should be accused of white imperialism pretty much around the world. One shudders at the cost we might have to pay in money and in lives. Even if our present threats delay or hinder action by Communist forces, it is nonsense to think that we can get a settlement in Communist Asia, halfway around the world, and hold it simply by military power. Any hope there is lies in negotiation for neutrality. When will the public begin to speak out?

Norman Thomas.

New York, *June 23, 1964.*

New York, N.Y.—In Minneapolis on Sunday, June 28, President Johnson warned the world that the United States, "when necessary," would not hestitate "to risk war" in southeast Asia. Of course, in order to preserve peace. On Wednesday, July 1, Secretary Rusk asserted his belief that peace can be achieved without further extension of fighting. This sort of talk is characteristic, probably of doubt in the administration itself of what it will do and certainly of the great desire to juggle the issue of peace or war until after the election.

Senator Goldwater will have none of that. He, who does not believe it is the business of Federal Government to guarantee ordinary rights of human beings in Mississippi, wants a tougher policy in southeast Asia. That is, a government, which can't protect its own citizens, should play policeman around the world, using the most diabolical forms of war in that role. The House Republican Policy Committee went along with Goldwater, not Lodge, when it argued that we must repeal today's complacent commitment "to prevent a Communist victory" and substitute a commitment "to insure victory for freedom."

Under no circumstances shall we insure a victory for freedom by the indefinite continuance of our present confused policy in southeast Asia, much less by any expansion of war. In purely military terms this is not a war that we can win any more than did the French. It is the irony of our present military power that we can't use our weapons of total destruction to preserve people or freedom anywhere. Neither can we win in a civil war such as that which we face in South Vietnam. There is extraordinarily little evidence of direct Chinese or North Vietnamese military help of consequence. Most of the Vietcong's guns are American, captured in guerrilla war. Vietcong's leader is a Vietnamese who is said not to be a Communist. In the new nations, communism can do nothing but gain by a long, dragged out war in which we will be represented as the neo-imperialists and the white racists.

The situation will become infinitely worse as soon as the war is expanded as it doubtless will be if it should long be continued. Sooner or later, China would be drawn in. There is reason to believe that Senator Morse is right in charging that important figures in the State Department and the Pentagon want to fight China now while she is relatively weak. This, among the other disastrous consequences, would take Russia off the hook. We could weaken China for her while she could still profess loyalty to the Communist cause and even render some service to it. To the nonwhite world we should be made to appear as racial imperialists. There is no better way to a third world war as the eventual end of our policy. In any case its costs would be catastrophic.

We must negotiate. Any solution of the problem must be political, involving the 14 nations which made the Geneva agreement on independence and neutrality. It should also involve the United Nations and most certainly Communist China. It is not to deny that it will be difficult to deal with China to say that we have made it impossible to deal constructively with her so long as we insist that Chiang represents the country out of which he was ingloriously driven.

One of the more rational spokesmen for the State Department in a recent debate with me in Detroit argued, first, that we could not deal with the Chinese Communists because of the nature of their communism, and, second, that we did not need to recognize Chinese Communist government and were in fact dealing with it without giving it recognition. It may be that Peiping will prove so intransigent that the end will be war no matter what Washington does. I don't believe this, partly because of China's present relative moderation in southeast Asia. But the United States has no right to fulfill its own prophecies of Chinese intransigence by its absurd policy of nonrecognition and the exclusion of the real China from the U.N. Peace, all too probably the world's peace, depends upon political solution of southeast Asian problems in terms of negotiation and neutralization.

Norman Thomas.

Brookline, Mass.,
July 5, 1964.

Dear Senator: This letter is to let you know that I stand with you in any further extension of the war in Vietnam.

I am particularly disturbed by the replacement of Lodge as Ambassador by General Taylor. I fail to see how a man with a military mind like Taylor can fit into what is essentially a delicate political situation.

What can be done by you and your other four constituents in breaking what seems like an almost conspiratorial silence on the part of the press and television in reporting your remarks? Could the National Committee for an Effective Congress (of which you may be a member) come up with some answer on this?

I have written to Senators Kennedy and Saltonstall, and they both say the same thing; i.e., if we lose in South Vietnam, then the famous domino theory will prevail; one by one the nations of southeast Asia will fall to the Communists.

I am not subscribing to wholesale American evacuation of South Vietnam. As the orientals, we would not or could not lose face. There must be other political ways that have not been pushed or explored to ease the explosive situation.

Thank you for your efforts in behalf of us all, and I hope your views will receive greater publicity.

Very truly yours,

Robert Soboff.

Chicago, Ill.,
July 6, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: I salute you and say "Bravo" to you for your forthright stand on Vietnam and Mississippi.

How ironic that we can send troops thousands of miles away where we are not wanted by the people and can find only 400 sailors to search for three courageous young people. You must know that many, many Americans applaud you even if they haven't written.

Please "hit the road" and stump for your position. Americans need to hear your voice and position.

Once again—I salute you.

Respectfully yours,
TOBEY S. SCHEIN.

OAKLAND, CALIF.

Mr. MORSE: I am terrified at the proportions the war in southeast Asia is taking. Your position deserves my support. I am aware that you have San Francisco's Representative PHILIP BURTON and New York's Representative WILLIAM FITTS RYAN, calling for negotiations in economic trade and peaceful elections.

But, sir, the ambiguity arises out of press coverage as to whether there is Communist infiltration of South Vietnam and Communist supplying of the national liberation front. From one source I understand the army itself has stated that the infiltration and alleged supplying of rebel forces is negligible, yet from the mass (or is it mess?) of others the cry goes up of Communist infiltration, conspiracy, armament, atrocities. I ask you sir, which is it, what was reported by Mr. Rusk and Mr. McNamara and the Army intelligence. Sir, I with a multitude of others thirst unquenchably for information, good honest information, of the situation and receive none. I have written to Senator KUCHEL but I have received no answer. I suppose the letter was discarded as pressurized by the activities of groups here in the bay area. I ask you to inform me as to what the Army's report was, if possible.

Also I volunteer you my support in any way possible.

Thank you sir.
GEORGE EWART.

JUNE 23, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SENATOR: It is wonderful to hear you talk from time to time protesting the things that makes one wonder if most of the people in the Government who tolerates CIA who refuses to see what is happening to many countries, especially our attitude in South and North Vietnam, also Laos and Cambodia, besides Cuba, Germany, etc., we must realize that our attitude must eventually lead to atomic war.

Also peace seems to be a dirty word. How can one possibly get the people to realize our only hope for survival is peace—and a strong movement that can force the Government to recognize their wishes. Or will peace topple the capitalist system?

Thanks again for being a dissenter. We need more of them in Washington.

PEGGY KLEMPUER.

STATEN ISLAND, N.Y.,
July 4, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I want you to know that I support wholeheartedly your position on U.S. involvement in South Vietnam. Please continue your efforts to get the United States out of this cruel war as well as prevent further involvement and the risk of war with China.

Sincerely yours,
ELAINE OBRINSKY.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
July 1, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I enclose a carbon copy of a letter I am sending President Johnson today on Vietnam.

As you see, a copy goes also to Senator GRUENING, with whom I have been in converse.

Please keep up your good stand.

Respectfully yours,
ROBERT MELTON.

JULY 1, 1964.

DEAR PRESIDENT JOHNSON: I have just heard the halting and not very credible or creditable speech of your recent Ambassador to Saigon before the National Press Club.

It was evasive, when not actually mendacious, on Vietnam.

It was a rather disgraceful performance.

But, in its being so, it unfortunately echoes the position of our Government on the civil war in South Vietnam—for it is a civil war, and not an international conflict (except insofar as we are making it so), which our Government represents it as and is apparently trying to escalate it to.

I see the role of the NLF as indistinguishable from the forces that fought to get rid of the French—to get rid of all foreign power and make Vietnam self-governing.

This, by the same logic, means getting rid of all puppet dictators like Diem and Kanh, who continue under different forms the oppressive aims of a colonial power.

We have seen to it that we succeeded France as the colonial power in southeast Asia, and have acted rather more rapaciously than the French, more murderously.

Our aim there is immoral because it is to prevent the self-determination of a people.

And, as could be expected with an immoral aim, our methods are equally immoral, what with defoliation, napalm, and torture and terrorism directed toward the ordinary citizenry, to say nothing of death.

As a reflection of this immoral aim of ours, the NFL has the allegiance of 70 percent of the area, 50 percent of the population, has its own government, issues its own postage stamps, collects taxes from U.S. Government contractors in Saigon itself, can have its military forces operate within 5 miles of Saigon, can have its agents operate freely within Saigon, and has the secret sympathy of a large number of foreigners.

In addition to the immorality of our aims and methods in South Vietnam—or as a consequence of it—we are threatening to run the risk of a world war in the course of which we as a nation, as well as many others, would most likely be wiped out.

Sir, are you really unaware of these things?

Respectfully yours,
ROBERT MELTON.

Copies to Senators GRUENING and MORSE.

VALRICO, FLA.,
July 1, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I heard your remarks on "Issues and Answers" last Sunday and I heartily agree with what you said.

I did not think we had any straight-and-honest-thinking Senators left any more, but I find we have a few, such as you, Senator FULBRIGHT, and a few others who think as Senators should.

I certainly wish the southern Senators thought like you. I am sure there would be less trouble throughout the world.

I hope you are fortunate enough in convincing more of our Senators and others of your views.

I think like F.D.R. did, and I am sure Mr. Roosevelt was more right than those who opposed.

I think F.D.R. one of the best, if not the best, President. He was the only President I ever voted for. I sure hope Mr. Johnson turns out to be his equal.

Wishing you every success in your efforts to make America a better place to live.

Respectfully,
ARTHUR C. EVERHART.

WARWICK, R.I.,
June 25, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
State House,
Oregon, U.S.A.

SIR: Moments ago I watched, with intense interest, an interview you had with a news reporter, and shown on the "Today" show this date.

I hold with you that our President either declare war or, as you suggested, turn future action and decisions over to the U.N.

The purpose of my letter is to ask what we the people can do in an effective way to so move the powers that be?

I personally feel that the present situation is a travesty to "right" and atrocious to our GI's.

Your suggestions shall be carefully considered. Best to you in your continued fight for right.

Sincerely,
CHAN.

FOREST HILLS, N.Y.,
July 2, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR: Deeply alarmed about the turn of events regarding southeast Asia. I am sending you this message in support of your valiant stand against any extension of the war—or wars in these parts, and begging you to continue your efforts. It is a great consolation that there are people like you in our governing bodies.

May your struggle be blessed.

Yours sincerely,
MIMI ZOFF.

JUNE 29, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

SENATOR MORSE: I heard your views on Vietnam as expressed in an interview with newsmen that appeared on one of our local stations. I am very happy to see there are indeed thinking and informed Senators representing us.

My thanks to you for taking a strong stand. You have earned my respect. And I think you will find more support for your views than either the administration or the Republicans think exists.

RAYMOND J. LAFLEUR,
HAYWARD, CALIF.

BOSTON, MASS.,
July 2, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am writing to let you know of my support in your stand on the U.S. policy in southeast Asia.

I have written to President Johnson urging him to begin immediately negotiations to end this war. I have also written my Senators, EDWARD KENNEDY and LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, urging them to support you on this critical issue.

Sincerely yours,
PATRICIA MCKENNEY.

SCAPPOOSE, OREG.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I saw the television program "Issues and Answers" yesterday and almost died of pure joy listening to you. They had the issues and boy did you give them the answers. And I couldn't agree with you more. At the last meeting of the executive board of the YD's of Oregon, we passed a resolution which encompassed much of what you said.

I sometimes disagree with you on matters of foreign policy, but as far as I'm concerned you are one of the most honest men in Government today. I always like Mr. Stevenson, that is up until the Cuba Bay of

Pigs issue came up. I felt sorry for him because of the position he was put in but I still didn't like the way he handled himself. The more I get into politics the more people tell me I am naive to believe in honesty in politics and in Government. Perhaps I am, so you seem all the more like a breath of fresh air on a very muggy day.

As a member of the team setting up the dinner for you on the 10th, I am looking forward very much to meeting you.

Thank you again for a half hour of refreshing truth.

Yours very truly,
Mrs. GRETCHEN FULLER,
Executive Secretary, YDCO.

SEAL BEACH, CALIF.,
July 1, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I keep wondering what there can be about the soil, climate, or water in Oregon that makes voters up there intelligent enough to elect a Senator like you.

Your courageous recent words about the wicked, bloodthirsty interference by U.S. State Department in Vietnam were like clean air coming into the poisonous, hypocritical statements usually coming out of Washington.

Yours very truly,
PAYSON MARSH.

BACON BASKETWARE, LTD.,
Toronto, Canada, July 2, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
The Senate
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I was very interested to read of your opinions on the war in Vietnam as stated in the enclosed article taken from the Toronto Globe and Mail.

I think you are entirely correct in your views and would like to take this opportunity of expressing my full support of them.

Yours very truly,
SYDNEY BACON.

[From the Globe and Mail, June 26, 1964]

U.S. OPPONENT OF VIETNAM WAR

(By George Bain)

WASHINGTON.—In the U.S. Senate it has become almost a daily occurrence that Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon, rises in his place to denounce what he calls McNamara's war in Vietnam.

He says that the United States cannot legally justify its presence there, that it is following a policy which is likely to lead to a long drawn out and costly war with China, and that if the fighting in Vietnam endangers the peace of the world—as he thinks it does—the place to take the issue is to the United Nations.

He says that the United States has acted not only unwisely but improperly, and points out that South Vietnam as well as North Vietnam has been accused by the International Control Commission of violating the 1954 Geneva accords—South Vietnam by receiving U.S. military assistance.

He has made public answers given him by experts appearing before the Senate foreign relations committee, of which he is a member, to the effect that very few North Vietnamese, or Chinese, or other foreigners have been found among the Vietcong taken prisoner in the fighting in South Vietnam.

The foreigners in South Vietnam today, he has said, are Americans.

He looks upon the war in South Vietnam as a civil war, in which each side has its backers outside, rather than as an aggressive war waged from North Vietnam. He believes, however, that North Vietnam, with China beyond it, has been the greater offender against the Geneva accords, and that the case could be proved in the United Nations, although to do so might be to expose the mistakes of the United States.

In a recent speech he said: "Peace is more important than U.S. face. Peace is more important than a temporary loss of U.S. prestige, if we lose prestige by seeking to right a mistaken course of action, I believe the opposite would be true."

In his long campaign, Senator MORSE has had several associates—most notably Senator ERNEST GRUENING, of Alaska. They are both Democrats. Both from time to time have criticized the U.S. press for the scant attention it has paid their other-side-of-the-case argument at a time when Vietnam and Laos rarely have been off the front pages. Not all the attention that has been paid them has been favorable.

The Washington Star in an editorial this week said:

"It must be that Senator WAYNE MORSE stands on his head when he looks at the international situation. * * * The latest of (his) attacks accuses President Johnson of carrying out an illegal and immoral Asian policy "making the United States the world's leading threat to world peace." This is an outrageously irresponsible statement. It does violence to the realities, and it certainly lends more than a little aid and comfort to the Communist enemy in southeast Asia."

Whether or not the conclusion complained of by the Star editorialist was warranted, the Senator's attack on the legality and morality of the U.S. policy can hardly be called irresponsible. Both are open to question.

The losing war which France waged to maintain its Indochina colonies—a war substantially assisted by the United States at the end—was brought to an end with the signing of the Geneva accords in July 1954. What had been Indochina was divided in four—Cambodia, Laos, and North and South Vietnam.

The United States did not sign. Senator MORSE says: "It is my view that we did not sign the Geneva agreements because we did not intend to go along. We have not gone along. Therefore we stand here today in this ugly, shocking posture of the United States before the eyes of the world, engaging in McNamara's war in South Vietnam."

It is part of his thesis that, after encouraging France not to give up the fight, then sounding out Britain particularly to see if a joint venture could not be launched to keep up the war against the Communist Viet Minh, that John Foster Dulles, the then Secretary of State, reluctantly accepted the work of the Geneva conference and with reservations.

"Why did not our representatives sign that treaty?" Senator MORSE asks. "Why did not South Vietnam sign it? I think the answer is that their refusal to sign it was based on the fact that the United States had already decided to step into South Vietnam at least, and carry on where France had left off—to keep South Vietnam as a Western protectorate and toehold in Asia."

Whether or not that was the intention, the fact is that while withholding its signature from the accords the United States issued an independent statement to the effect that it would observe them.

But as early as January 1955, Mr. Dulles was referring to the Geneva agreements as a major setback. And even before that, in September 1954, he had pasted together the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization as a response to the new situation in southeast Asia.

Its members were Australia, France, New Zealand, Pakistan, the Philippines, Thailand, Britain, and the United States. A protocol to the treaty extended to Cambodia, Laos, and South Vietnam the protection of clause 4, which says, among other things, that an attack upon one will be regarded as an attack upon all.

It is upon this shaky foundation that U.S. involvement in the fighting in South Vietnam rests. Ostensibly, the United States is there—and has been since 1955—at the request of South Vietnam to assist it in its defense against aggression from North Vietnam.

What Senator MORSE says is this: "Today South Vietnam does not run the war against the guerrillas. She does not make her own foreign policy or military policy. The United States does. The U.S. Air Force is fighting in South Vietnam. Its planes and men are providing the air support and air transportation for the Government ground forces. Americans numbering at least 15,000 are fighting with the ground forces. When they are shot at, they shoot back."

U.S. participation on this order is not in keeping with the Geneva accords, article 16 of which says: "With effect from the date of entry into force of the present agreement, the introduction into Vietnam of any troop reinforcements and additional military personnel is prohibited."

It was in 1957 that the International Control Commission, composed of Indian, Polish, and Canadian members, complained of violations by South Vietnam involving U.S. troops. The most serious incident involved the introduction of 290 U.S. military personnel into the country even after the Commission had said that their entry should be held up by pending further study by the Commission.

There were complaints of North Vietnamese violations then and have been since. Senator MORSE accepts that assistance has been given the Vietcong in the training of men and the equipping of them—although much of the Vietcong equipment is American-made, having been captured—but that what North Vietnam may have done does not warrant the United States matching it.

LEBANON, OREG.,
June 21, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

SENATOR MORSE: We are deeply concerned over the recent decision of the Government in risking total all-out, hopeless, war in southeast Asia. Another stalemate like Korea is all that can be hoped for, in Vietnam, land of political indecision and Communist bounded. Various reports over newscasts, from time to time, have made known your fight against this contemplated action. Keep it up, by all means. The peace of our Nation and the lives of the young men are at stake. And if you who represent us do not cry out against this foolhardy thing, who can?

We are writing each of our Congressmen from Oregon, to begin at once, in earnest to decry this thing that is sweeping our Nation toward another hopeless conflict (which the Communist world gleefully anticipate, etc.)

Also we have written the editor of the Oregonian, to urge the readers, to beseech the President and Congressmen by telegram and letter to protest against the proposed, further intervention in such a hopeless, far-off war. Also, did ask the editor to contact other editors of the Nation for such an effort, that the voice of the people might be heard in protest against such foolhardiness. Only the united voice of the people can hope to stem the tide, from all indications of the rash action being taken by those in authority. And concern is all but smothered out by the complacency and harangue over the political issues (and candidates) of the day, etc.

Therefore, continue to stand strong and sure for those things which are right and true regardless of men's words and actions. You have stood, time after time, for the right, in the face of great opposition, and many of us have cheered behind the scenes, and now we want you to know we are behind your efforts by word and by prayer, and when our life's work is finished the only thing that will really count for time and eternity, is "Have we obeyed and striven to do those things, that God hath put into our hand to do, for His glory and men's good." As we obey His voice to our hearts day by day, "The steps of a good man are ordered of the Lord," Psalms 37: 23 (if that man will hear and heed). How can they be, if he won't? We can move by word and deed in the will and way of the Almighty, and what better way is there to move? None, I daresay. God says, Psalm 119: 105: "His word is a lamp unto our feet and a light unto our path." But what if we ignore God's lamp and light unto men? We do walk in darkness without His help, His guidance, His presence along the way. How well I know, I have walked both paths. And again, "As many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God," Roman 8: 14. But if those who bear His name (regardless of church affiliation) neither listen nor pay heed when that Spirit of the Almighty ("God is a spirit" John 4: 24) strives to urge and prompt the spirit (or heart of men) to lead and direct their steps, their words, their actions, in the best way, for their good and God's glory, they do not walk in all the privileges of "sons."

May God bless and direct you day by day, is my prayer.

We plan to send the following telegram to the President, concerning the Vietnam issue:

"Mr. President: Do the leaders of this Nation seek another Korea? How foolhardy.

Mr. and Mrs. Otis Beard."

These words of encouragement to stand firm and strong, in and with God's help and guidance, are from the heart of some friends of the home State.

God bless you,

Mr. and Mrs. Otis Beard.

Green, Richardson, Green & Griswold,
Portland, Oreg., June 21, 1964.

Senator Wayne L. Morse,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Wayne: Permit me to congratulate you, on your stand on Vietnam, and also your stand on the civil rights bill. Keep up the fight.

We enjoy your Washington letter, and since you have admirers in New Hampshire, we send copies on to them.

Best regards to you and your family.

B.A.

June 26, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: We are business and professional people living in the San Francisco Bay area who are deeply concerned about the critical situation in southeast Asia. We believe that the increasing involvement of American men and arms is immoral and is disastrous to world peace and American prestige.

You are performing the most valuable kind of service by presenting the unembellished facts about this situation to the American public. However, there has been a virtual blackout of your speeches and statements in all communications media in this area.

There are many people in San Francisco who wish to be acquainted with your position. We believe that a speech delivered by you personally in San Francisco would be attended by a significantly large audience and would break the news blackout.

Could you possibly make room in your busy schedule to speak on a public platform in San Francisco, at a time most convenient to you? Specific arrangements can be made well in advance for your convenience and approval.

The deepening crisis in southeast Asia and its dangerous consequences has prompted this letter from us. Sponsorship of the proposed meeting would be by the undersigned and other interested people. We are not members of any organized group but rather individuals of differing political views who agree that your position on southeast Asia demands the widest possible exposure.

Very truly yours,

(For your information, a list of those whose signatures appear on the preceding letter:)

Merton Dushkes, northern California manager, Berney Insurance Agency, San Francisco, Calif.

Hal Dunleavy, prominent California political pollster and housing consultant, San Francisco, Calif.

Mel Krantzler, importer, San Francisco, Calif.

Mara Alexander, director, Actor's Lab Drama School, San Francisco, Calif.

Victor Honig, certified public accountant, San Francisco, Calif.

Allen Brotsky, attorney, San Francisco, Calif.

Morton M. Garfield, physician, San Francisco, Calif.

Alfred Barauch, electrical engineer, San Francisco, Calif.

Hans Feibusch, consulting engineer, San Francisco, Calif.

Henry Mozesson, insurance broker, San Francisco, Calif.

Richard Liebes, research director, building service, international union (AFL-CIO), San Francisco, Calif.

L. B. Delaney, vice president, San Francisco Carmens Union, Transport Workers Union (AFL-CIO), San Francisco, Calif.

Sam Pichey, real estate builder and developer, San Francisco, Calif.

Ralph Aron, toy wholesaler, San Francisco, Calif.

Beachmont, Mass.,
July 2, 1964.

Dear Senator Morse: I hope with all my heart you succeed in your heroic efforts to prevent escalation of the war in southeast Asia.

Sincerely,

May Braude.

Northampton, Mass.,
July 2, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

My Dear Senator Morse: I want you to know that we thoroughly support your policy of opposing further involvement in southeast Asia.

I trust you will do all in your power to bring this most unhappy situation to a close.

Most cordially,

Edward J. Manwell, M.D.

Brooklyn, N.Y.,
July 4, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Chambers,
Washington, D.C.

Honored Sir: I write on our national holiday to wish you well on your course. I believe the policies you espouse in connection with southeast Asia will keep the peace, whereas those of the administration will bring on war, whether by inadvertence or by design. It seems to me the appointment of General Taylor will all the more convert the American troops into the Hessians of Asia. I admire the force of your statements.

Appreciatively yours,

Murray Lewis.

Kendall Park, N.J.,
July 5, 1964.

Dear Senator Morse: As an old China hand, formerly on the faculty of West China Union University, please allow me to congratulate you on your courageous stand concerning Vietnam.

There is no need to go into details. Independently I have reached the same conclusions.

It is imperative that the Fourteen Power Conference be reconvened to deal with this matter.

The refusal thus far to agree to the calling of that conference is in itself an admission of guilt.

Sincerely yours,

Rev. J. Spencer Kennard, Jr.

Hastings, N.Y.,
July 3, 1964.

Dear Senator Morse: First let me express my deep gratitude for your outspoken attack against our role in Vietnam and the recent appointment of General Taylor.

This is a most frightening situation. I have urged our friends to write and try to talk about the truth in this dangerous position we hold. However, what more can we do to stop this threat to the peace.

My young son who has just graduated from college has gotten many of his schoolmates to write. I hope the American public will be aroused and will bring the President to act in behalf of stopping forever involvement and getting out of Vietnam.

Sincerely yours,

Anne Weeropol.

Ann Arbor, Mich.,
July 1, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: We are proud of you. Thank you for enunciating our views on Vietnam to the American television public. We hope that the war hysteria that is focusing on southeast Asia won't prevent you from continuing your vociferous and courageous stand.

Sincerely,

Dr. and Mrs. Stanley Moss.

Orwell, Vt.,
July 2, 1964.

Dear Senator Morse: We are very much opposed also, to extending the war in southeast Asia. We support you in your stand, along with Senators Aiken, Pell, Gruening, and Bartlett. I hope others soon join you and that you gain the ear of the State Department and the President in urging them to begin negotiations to end the war.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. Nathan Senft.

Cambridge, Mass.

Dear Senator Morse: I know that you oppose any spread of the war in southeast Asia and I heartily endorse your stand. The war there is impractical as well as immoral, victory is impossible, negotiations are the only solution. Please keep on trying to bring Secretary Rusk back to a saner point of view.

Yours truly,

Priscell B. Grace.

July 1, 1964.

North Hollywood, Calif.,
June 30, 1964.

The President,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Johnson: Speaking for those who seek honor for their country rather than vain glory—who assume vigilance of mind over tyranny—who feel to implant integrity for temerity into the body of the lawmakers is rightful.

We are indeed grateful for the voice of Mr. Wayne Morse, Senator, and are cognizant of his precarious position in speaking alone for fairplay, with honesty and justice his modicum.

We are mindful of his moral courage, his veracity, and his attitude in assuming we have not all forgotten the qualifying factors that distinguish men from beasts.

I personally am hopeful Senator Morse speaks long and passionately for the qualities we, as a nation, had put behind us for the sake of expediency and self-aggrandizement.

May the blessings of the Spirit who is the essence of all our highest aspirations open the mind of our Nation's governing body to beneficence, good will, and a tolerance for political and economic parties not their own—for people throughout all history have chosen (when allowed to choose) that which is beneficial rather than deleterious to mankind; and even on an individual level—through personal selection, we come out more on the credit side of the ledger than the debit.

My regards to yourself in allowing the people to influence your dictums in what is needful to their general and particular well being—and let us fervently hope that "a government of the people, by the people, and for the people, shall not perish from the earth"—neither of mold from without or decay from within.

Yours most respectfully,

Sol Vec.

(Copy to Mr. Wayne Morse, Senator.)

Norman, Okla.,
June 27, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: This is to commend you for suggesting that there should be an exploration of peaceful alternatives to the conflict in Vietnam. The risks incurred by escalating this war far outweigh the risks of attempting a negotiated settlement.

Truly yours,

Margaret E. Salmon.

Brooklyn, N.Y.,
June 27, 1964.

Dear Senator Morse: It has been a revelation to all of us to hear you voice your opinion against the wasteful and useless money and lives we are sacrificing in South Vietnam.

Keep up the good work.

Truly yours,

B. H. Young and Family.

Geneva, N.Y.,
June 28, 1964.

Dear Senator Morse: I have been watching the TV program on which you are appearing "Issues and Answers." As a wife and mother, may I say I agree with you, and am thankful you speak out. May you continue to press for peaceful solutions to our foreign problems, and to criticize the administration's talk of war in southeast Asia.

As a New Yorker, I am unable to vote for you, but want to let you know you are representing us, and all thinking, responsible people.

Sincerely,

Margery Brown
Mrs. Roger Brown.

Fayetteville, N.C.,
June 28, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Democrat, of Oregon,
U.S. Congress,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: Let the people speak. Please print this in Congressional Record as soon as possible. My son, Jim, went into service June 17, intending to get it over with so he could devote himself to a career.

Fate is a hunter, you know. Or, life is a chessboard, on which fate moves us, the pawns, at nebulous whim.

Meaning: Hardly in service (861st Airborne Unit) a week, my son in now chosen for OCS. Proud as I am of this, you can appreciate its possibilities for placing my son in imminent danger, so far as Vietnam is concerned.

Senator Morse, the potential for slaughter of our fine young men is not only very real, but appears more imminent every day. I cannot sleep lately. Being astute and strongly intuitive, I can only see wanton waste and irreparable loss ahead for parents (if the present administration continues on the course it's chosen). I concur with you, sir.

No young man is going to be called "chicken," so, if he's ordered to Vietnam, he'll go, quietly. It is time we parents let the proper authorities know that we did not raise our young men to die for the likes of such a God-forsaken country. Why do we always jump in, ready to bristle our armor, and "show our strength" for, any country that yells (and now, for one who didn't)? It's sickening.

A mother who lost her only son in Vietnam the other day was interviewed on TV yesterday. Until the day I die, I shall see her pitiful face with the large, haunted eyes. I shall hear her ask, over and over again: "Why? You tell me, why did my son have to leave the United States, and go to Vietnam to die? What good did it do?" From her appearance, I do not believe she'd slept nor eaten since. But she'd wept. For what? The truth was proven in Korea. No one ever wins a war. The crosses are mute testimony.

In God's name, tell me what we parents can do to stem this tide? Had Johnson two fine young sons (same age as his girls), I wonder if he would not listen less to McNamara and more to his heart? Yes.

I love my son. He has had a tough life and only lately, after graduation, has Jim even been able to have a suit, shoes when he needs them, a little happiness at last.

We parents are not ready to sacrifice our sons for Vietnam. Please tell me to whom I can write to get this across? Soon. I'm a former Oregon constituent of beautiful Oregon.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Williams.

Vero Beach, Fla.,
June 26, 1964.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: Mrs. Deming and I heard what you had to say on the Vietnam situation the other morning and were greatly impressed by what you had to say on the subject. Your vigorous and forthright approach to this highly dangerous situation is encouraging. We hope your views prevail with the administration. We have written to President Johnson to this effect.

You have plenty of fire and the courage of your convictions. Power to you.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. Leon J. Deming.

Geneva, Ohio,
June 28, 1964.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: I enjoyed hearing you on TV "Issues" very much. I am a former resident of Oregon.

The following article of mine appeared in the Plain Dealer of Cleveland on June 1, 1964:

"The rightwing coup in Laos was probably promoted by the Central Intelligence Agency, in line with their past policies. When the Communists retaliated and won victories, we fell back upon neutralism. So why not neutralism for all southeast Asia, rather than insisting they be our satellites? Cambodia, in order to get rid of our CIA, and plots for another rightwing military coup, refused to accept any more U.S. aid. So instead of aggression against Cambodia and threatened aggression against North Vietnam, why not have a Geneva conference to establish neutralism to be safeguarded by U.N. troops, so our CIA and our American boys can come home? We are not winning friends in the Orient by firebombing villages suspected of harboring a few Vietcong."

J. Paul Cotton.

June 29, 1964.

Dear Senator Morse: I have taken the liberty of quoting you in the attached letter-article to Judd Arnett of the Free Press.

May I also congratulate you on your fearlessness and strength of your convictions.

Sincerely,

Tom Kizer.

June 26, 1964.

Mr. Judd Arnett.
The Detroit Free Press,
Detroit, Mich.

Dear Judd: Edwin A. Lahey, in his June 25 headline story in the Free Press said, "At first it seemed like a political story. Henry Cabot Lodge was coming home from Saigon * * * but this is a war story."

And war story it apparently is—may God help and forgive us.

Further in his news article, Lahey said, "Administration leaders for many weeks have been getting the public ready for the news that the only way he can avert disaster in southeast Asia is with a show of force that the Communist Chinese will respect.

"This theory, if taken to its next logical step would escalate the southeast Asia war to a point where the Chinese themselves will have to decide whether they want to take on the United States in another Korean-type action."

Now, what is unsaid but follows as inevitably as death follows war, is that the escalated war to avert what they call disaster in Vietnam will bring heartbreaking disaster to thousands and thousands of American homes through lost, killed, and maimed American sons. What about that disaster? It's great to talk about saving Vietnamese but someone neglects to tell us that in the saving we sacrifice thousands of our own sons, fighting a war for a people who don't seem willing to fight their own and in a country so far away the average American doesn't know where to look for it on the map.

The people of the country never wanted any one of the last three wars we have had and they don't want this one. Then who does?

It seems Mr. Johnson, Mr. McNamara, and Mr. Rusk are credited officially with the decision and behind it all is the soporific reason "to save face," and "give freedom to the Vietnamese". Poppycock.

If it costs the life of your son or mine it is not worth it. If the Vietnamese want communism, let 'em have it. If they don't want it, let them fight against it. It looks like in all these situations a majority want what they get and we are siding with a minority. I'm sure that if a majority of any nation didn't want communism, they will eventually rebel and overthrow it just as did our small rebellious colonies with England. The principles are the same today, only the tools of war have changed. If we could and did do it with England, Vietnam can do it with communism if the majority want to desperately enough. If they don't, to hell with it—don't send my son to do it for them. I'm positive 99 percent of all American parents and perhaps an equal percentage of eligible draftees feel we have too many soldier graves in foreign lands and too many Veterans Hospitals here filled with broken minds and bodies from foreign conflicts. We want no more. Only Wayne Morse seems to have the courage to speak out and in doing so he speaks for millions. He said of the Vietnam affair, as reported in Mr. Lahey's column, "The United States is headed for war in Asia and will be hated for the next 500 years by the majority of mankind."

Morse told the Senate that this country "will go down in history as the nation chiefly responsible for scuttling the United Nations." He said he told McNamara and Taylor at the committee briefing that they had convinced him that "the greatest threat to peace in the world is the United States."

If the officials of this Nation need their "face saved" in Vietnam or anywhere else, let them save it by some other means than war and the waste of young American lives. One way might be as suggested by Eric Remarque in "All Quiet on the Western Front," put the officials who want war in a ring with the Communist officials and let them scrap it out. I doubt it.

Yours very truly,

T. J. Kizer.

Ann Arbor, Mich.,
June 28, 1964.

Dear Senator Morse: I wish to commend you for your forthright statements on Vietnam and Laos. Having viewed "Issues and Answers" this afternoon, I found your comments refreshing and helpful. You have obviously studied the problem thoroughly and are standing by your conclusions. To find a man of your courage and convictions is rare in these days of wishy-washy thinking and talking. I salute you, Senator.

I am also writing Senator Hart, my Senator, this evening to ask if he will not join you in your efforts to prod the administration into recognizing their United Nation's commitments—to stop this waste of human life. We, a nation of peace, should not be setting a bad example all over the globe, billions for arms and other instruments of war; we should be leading a peace race and the place to start is the U.N.

As a concerned citizen, mother of two young boys, and eager to be of help, please let me know if I can be of assistance to you in your quest for peace. I remain,

Your admirer,

Nancy K. Webster.

Los Angeles, Calif.,
June 29, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: Again I must thank you for your splendid wisdom and courage in speaking out against our insane policy in southeast Asia. You give strength to the American people who are, as you say, deliberately kept in ignorance as to the terribly dangerous action, which involves the peril of nuclear war, that the United States is carrying on. I urge you to continue to oppose the madness of our Government. I would much appreciate a copy of your last speech.

Yours truly,

Juliet Green.

Claremont Men's College,
Claremont, Calif., June 30, 1964.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senator From Oregon,
Washington, D.C.

My Dear Senator Morse: I write to tell you how much I admire you for your wise and statesmanlike remarks about the pending war in Vietnam which I heard you make over the radio a few days ago. You seem to be one of the few people who talks sense about this matter; or are there many people in Washington who talk sense privately but keep quiet in public because of the chauvinistic trend of sentiment in the country. I assure you that I know many people even here in California who view the trend of developments in Vietnam with dismay.

Am I not correct in thinking that General MacArthur viewed our entry into a war on the mainland of Asia with grave misgivings? Should not his name be invoked in the present circumstances? Surely he knew more about that situation than (say) Senator Goldwater.

An English observer of the United States once observed that we have the illusion of omnipotence. He was quite right about this. Anyone who knows anything about history knows that such an illusion gets a country into very serious trouble.

Thank you for speaking out courageously and intelligently.

Sincerely,

Walter B. Smith.

Encinitas, Calif.,
June 30, 1964.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senator, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: We saw and heard you on television "Issues and Answers," and I believe you presented the most sane and intelligent ideas we have heard. Please try to influence others in Government in the direction of peaceful attempts at resolving disputes. I hope you receive a letter from every citizen in America.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. Oakes.

Minneapolis, Minn.,
June 30, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator: I agree with you that we should get out of Vietnam. We had no business there in the first place.

Yours truly,

C. E. Hoigaard.

Gates Mills, Ohio,
June 29, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: We write in somber appreciation of the position you have taken against the unwise and dangerously immoral belligerence of our Government in southeast Asia. We trust this will help to convince you that commonsense and common morality are not so unpopular in the country at large as they are among high officials and the news media. In spite of the formidable apparatus of opposition and informal censorship we entreat you to continue speaking your mind and ours on an issue of life and death to so many Vietnamese and Americans and possibly most of the world.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. Robert Zevin.

(Copy to Senator Stephen Young.)

Dear Senator Morse: As you can see, this is a fan letter. May God Bless your honest efforts on our behalf:

"June 24, 1964.

"K. P. O. J.
"*Editorial Department,*
"*Portland, Oreg.*

"Sirs: In answer to your request for listener reaction to your "editorial" against Senator Wayne Morse, may I say that I disagree completely. You abuse him because he speaks out clearly on our foreign policies even when his views have to be critical. You suggest that he ought to tend to strictly Oregon State affairs—such as the Dunes bill, etc. Surely you cannot believe that Oregonians would have elected him as often as they have if they were not convinced that he serves them well. I love those dunes and all the rest of the scenic wonders of Oregon and want them preserved for all to enjoy. But I also care very much that America is, by pursuing this cruel, illogical and illegal war in Vietnam, losing the respect and trust of the world's people, as well as recklessly inviting destruction of the whole world, as we know it now. Admitting that there is no easy pat solution to the problems, it seems inexcusable that we have not brought the whole matter into the United Nations long ago. It would have been embarrassing to disclose just how wrong and blind we had been in supporting Diem's every action. We desperately need to hold up a full length mirror to our policy in Vietnam, accept the ugly truths it would disclose, and set about remedying them as would befit an enlightened government.

"Sincerely,

"Caroline Schnoor
"Mrs. Caroline A. Schnoor.

"Portland, Oreg."

P.S.—I watched the "Today" show where you spoke; was, of course, in agreement and amazed that Senator Church, of Idaho, who was to have taken the so-called opposite view did not do so. However, Ray Shearer told Senator Church that you had called President Johnson a warmonger. I did not hear you say that and if you did not perhaps you should advise Ray Shearer to rerun the tape and find out what you did say. Senator Church actually brought out very clearly that Asians would unite against us if this Government did try all-out war in Vietnam.

Rutland, Vt.,
June 30, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator: I have just read in a Canadian newspaper that you said in a recent speech that the greatest threat to peace with the resulting possibility of bringing about a third world war in the world is the United States.

I agree with you 100 percent. I note that none of the U.S. newspapers I read are reporting truthfully this fact to the people. They aren't telling the people how this could be prevented.

Yours truly,

Irving H. Reynolds.

State College, Pa.,
June 29, 1964.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senator from Oregon,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: This continues my expression of appreciation and thanks for your efforts to have the Vietnam situation handled by a United Nations deliberation and possible presence of some kind. I wrote you longhand on the 26th, on hearing part of the interview by NBC with Senator Church to follow up your presentation the day before.

After reading the various insertions and speeches in Congressional Record for the 23d, the 25th, and 26th, I decided that a letter to NBC to include suggestion that more views be given how to get the United Nations into the scene might be in order. I enclose copy of my letter to let your office know that at least one person is asking for more TV appearances to get this U.N. idea out in the open.

I do think that it is alarming to read, as you pointed out in your remarks, page 14801 in Record of the 23d, that after Senator Church's convincing speech on the United Nations, his views that it should be used in Vietnam situation, then that a series of Senators gave general tones of favor for the United Nations, but then went on to hold fast to a decision being made by the administration by other advice, it seems.

The tone of the NBC interview in asking about possible use of U.N. was perhaps sincere, but it had the air of skepticism which I would prefer left out of an objective search for views from the guest. You are up to meeting this mood; I wish you continued effort and more appearances.

Sincerely yours,

Merwin W. Humphrey.

State College, Pa.,
June 29, 1964.

Mr. Al Morgan,
Producer of "Today" Show,
National Broadcasting Co.,
New York.

Dear Mr. Morgan: The "Today" show on TV is to be congratulated on seeking out last week the views of two Senators on what most of us agree is a topic of highest concern to the peace of the world—our policy in Asia. Senator Morse on Thursday, the 25th of June and Senator Church on the next day, Friday, the 26th combined to bring before your vast audience some of the issues and the concern they each hold for efforts before the United Nations to bring about peaceful solutions.

This kind of attention to issues of the day which has been heightened, it seems to me, in recent weeks, is good for the viewer's advantage in watching the "Today" show.

I trust that the seemingly critical note in some remarks in the course of interview with Senator Church, charged to Senator Morse (per his entry in the Congressional Record, page 15226, of June 26) will be corrected in some subsequent statement. I had taped most of Senator Morse's interview and on playing it back I could not detect any basis for criticism of President Johnson as a "warmonger". Yet in listening to the interview with Senator Church I have the impression that some such implication was unhappily given. We are all aware that Senator Morse in his entries in the Congressional Record has confined himself to views and opinions; similarly Senator Church in his address on the United Nations on June 23, 1964, gave such a detailed analysis of his views in reasoning for more use of U.N. peace-keeping machinery of the U.N. (especially column 2 of page 14790, June 23) that many viewers might wish more extended time on TV by these two Senators who to the reader might seem good choices for more explanations to American audience of the possible advantages of use of the United Nations.

We hope that "Today" show will continue to try to give its close attention to the efforts toward use of United Nations for peacekeeping authority and influence.

Sincerely,

Merwin W. Humphrey.

Cincinnati, Ohio, *June 29, 1964.*

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: Congratulations on your magnificent TV talk of June 28. Would that other respected and influential Government officials would have the courage to bring the true state of affairs to the people. Neither do most of our newspapers live up to their obligation to inform the public by printing any background news such as the why and how of happenings. For several years such magazines as the New Republic, Christian Century, Progressive, and even Newsweek have said that we have no business to be in Vietnam and that we were in violation of the 1954 Geneva agreement. But since a very small segment of the people read these magazines they were voices crying in the wilderness, I'm afraid. But I am hopeful that your TV interview was seen by a great part of thoughtful Americans and that it will inspire and encourage other like minded persons to protest our present foreign policy. I am writing about this to the President and the State Department. As a registered Republican (who finds it more difficult each election to find a worthwhile Republican to vote for) I want to say that I am thankful that you and others such as Senators Humphrey, Fulbright, and Mansfield have the mental honesty and the courage to criticize our Government's actions when necessary and the wisdom to present alternative actions.

Sincerely yours,

Helen S. Monce
Mrs. H. J. Monce.

Falls Church, Va.,
June 29, 1964.

Dear Sir: I agree with you and Senator Fulbright's foreign policy views 100 percent. I admire you so because you're more outspoken and not afraid to put your political future on the line and speak out regardless of vote (not many Senators dare do this). I'm not from Oregon but you would make a great President of the United States. You are too sophisticated for the average American. Oregonians know and vote for a great man like you.

Lou Dorian.

P.S.—Our baby wrote on card, too.

Shreveport, La.,
June 28, 1964.

Dear Senator Morse: Listened to your interview tonight on "Issues and Answers" and was extremely pleased and enlightened by your analysis of the problem and with your solution. As you may well imagine such a philosophy as yours is very unpopular in the Shreveport area, and, for that matter throughout most of the South, but that's just the object of my card. For the first time tonight I've heard an intelligent discussion of the situation and a well-thought-out and far-reaching plan for the eventual easing of tension and a return of the Government to the hands of the South Vietnamese. I know you'll continue to speak your mind on this vital issue and I just couldn't let this opportunity pass without adding what small encouragement I can.

Very truly yours,

B. Shaw.

Wyoming, Mich.,
June 30, 1964.

Dear Senator Morse: This one American who agrees with you, and wholly. As you said Sunday, we usually assume a superior position that allows us the use of the principle of any vile, dishonest, corrupt, or atrocious means are permitted us so long as we can attain our ends. Few know that the opponents of Vietnam, and others, are natives, not aliens, fighting for what they think best. Few have any foresight at all and so cannot see the ill feelings, hopes for vengeance, retaliation, etc., in store for us. We would fight like mad, hate, if anyone put his foot into our business. No one knows or sees that the Communist nations change their policies faster through experience than war.

Sincerely,

Dorothy Rebentisch.

Penfield, N.Y.,
June 25, 1964.

Dear Sir: I heard you today on "Today" show. Keep fighting to get our boys out of Vietnam, Laos, Korea. Let's work to keep this land of ours as it is, I'm for helping them with supplies to do their fighting with, but not our boys. Our boys belong here at home with their families and parents.

I believe Johnson will not remain President long if he makes this war a general war. He should be made to lay it before the United Nations. I hope by your time spent on the "Today" show will rouse up millions and millions of Americans. When Judgment Day come how will our President justify his sending our boys to their deaths and Harry Truman for the war in Korea. How can he justify for the many he sent to die in Korea. But at least he as you said turned it over to the U.N. Today our President told of sending 500 more guerrilla fighters. But he should know as you and I know a guerrilla war they are experts at that type of fighting over there. This type of warfare is extremely difficult to win and even if it was won where would it leave us if Johnson pushes us into full scale war. If he is prepared to face our people, the parents of our men and explain to them why he made us face the loss of perhaps 50,000 to 100,000 of our young men plus the enormous cost to our Nation not only in lives but money. It would also mean a loss of face for us before the rest of the world, then how do we know Red China may not feel there is nothing to lose in even a more direct challenge to America? We Americans may soon find we are faced or must make a drastic decision on Vietnam, and we better get used to it or toughen our thinking. Our efforts to train and aid them has brought no decisive results.

Mrs. John Hermenet,
An Invalid Mother and Grandmother.

Pontiac, Mich.,
June 29, 1964.

Dear Sir: Please let me congratulate you on your Vietnam stand as I watched on "Issues and Answers," Sunday on TV.

Sincerely, all the best wishes in the world.

Mrs. Marie Evans.

Dallas, Tex.,
June 29, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator: We heard your TV interview Sunday, and agree with you wholeheartedly. In fact, President Johnson has just lost my vote, because I certainly would not vote for Goldwater, and because President Johnson is talking war. Because both President Johnson and ex-President Kennedy are not stopping this Government interference into the States. Governor Scranton will get my vote.

The colored race should be given an education. You can only force education, religion, etc., just so far. They can be given the opportunities to learn, and should have them—but let them go from there. I am not with the Council of Churches, and many of our ministers are not, either. You cannot force me to like my neighbor. I must want to. You cannot make a student do anything but obey the laws of the school, but cannot force them to go to a library to learn more. There must be a line drawn.

Our Government, our schools, and our churches must have laws. But they must only go so far. The people revolt—a natural thing.

One the other hand, the Negroes must be made to understand, and should be made to understand (instead of giving in to them) that the white race came up to where we are by hard work—by education—nothing has been given to us except our heritage from our ancestors. Now, they want it handed to them. Let them make it—instead of all this hullaballoo that is going on, dangerous as it may become—start working. Our working Negroes are not in this line of march.

I blame the white people for what they are doing too. All of this force is no good—it will explode some place. I think what may happen down here is the fact that some businesses will be forced to close. We have some eating establishments that have hostesses—they will seat the colored, to be sure when it is law, if it is law—but where they want them to be seated. Education—both church and school—should be given them, but nothing else. And this is the opinion of the majority.

No American wants to hear anything about war. President Johnson should be patient and work for peace—war out of the question. He should be winning friends and influencing people all over the world. America doesn't need to be divided amongst its whites—it is—thanks to the Kennedys. He will find that no one is behind him even taking a risk of war. Win the people over, all over the world, and if that cannot be done, let them lose their freedom. Of course, attention at home should come first.

Americans are so busy living, I feel certain they do not stop to write but we are not behind President Johnson in many things. Therefore, my vote is going to Governor Scranton, if he can get elected. I think Texans will show how much they are against GOLDWATER, if at the coming convention Governor Scranton can make it, this late date.

America must have a man in the White House who respects States rights. My great-great-great-grandfather left Virginia for Tennessee, for the unknown lands, to have freedom of religion and be free of England's rule. That is what has been handed to us—we have worked for the rest. We must keep it.

Sincerely,

MRS. W. H. COOK.

P.S.—Mrs. Binkman, Hinsdale, Ill., is working hard for this constitutional freedom.

NEW YORK CITY,
June 28, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This looked like something you should have and should share with Senator GRUENING. Should even insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

McNamara's war is Johnson's war now and the idiocy is incurable.

Sincerely,

HORACE CASSELBERRY.

P.S.—The "power of the idea whose time has come" is "light years" beyond the comprehension of these idiots.

SINCE WHEN WAS DYING FINE?

(By Henry J. Taylor)

"I think the military situation is coming along fine now," U.S. Gen. Paul D. Harkins stated June 22 on his return to Washington from command in South Vietnam. This was apostasy, tragic to observe.

Fine. That's Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara's line. And it's utterly heartbreaking to see a distinguished officer peddling that kind of pap under McNamara's censoring eye. God help us. This is what happened to the prewar armed forces in France.

Any of about 16,000 Americans in South Vietnam could tell you how fine the situation is. Our entire position is just a long, drawn out Bay of Pigs all over again.

In another sense—an even more basic sense—the truth about a war is known only to a soldier under the gun, there or anywhere, ever.

It's easy to confuse morale with a desire to fight. I've never known one soldier in a thousand who wants to fight. Most fight for a dozen other reasons combined; but, oh, no, not that one.

Along with hunger, fear is a universal emotion. It has nothing to do with bravery. Anybody with any sense is afraid.

Fine? Nothing's fine when you're getting shot at.

Nothing's fine when you start to count the missing and the dead, and you do not know how it could happen that one of them is not you.

Nothing's fine when the road blows up and your eyes go blind because something smashed them closed. You're afraid to open them, because you may not be able to see. Or it's pitch dark anyway and your face—do you still have a face?—is flat down in the mud.

Nothing's fine when you hear a sharp, hard "ping"—a single shot—and you feel the man next to you in a jeep or helicopter suddenly strain his body against yours. A moment ago he was your friend. Now he is dead.

He is lost, to everyone who loved him, and to the world. He will never see morning again, write a letter or sing a song. He has no hope and any hope of this world in him is gone forever.

It's easy to discuss the problem of war—in South Vietnam, Laos, anywhere. But this is different and it is the essence of war. One man. Men in their prime, dying one by one.

General Eisenhower once said in a letter to Ernie Pyle: "I get so eternally tired of the general lack of understanding of what the frontline soldier endures—the acceptance of unendurable conditions—that I become completely inarticulate."

Or listen to Ernie Pyle himself.

We were in Italy. An infantry column was coming out of battle. All ranks were 50 feet apart, for dispersal. So were Ernie and I. The wounded were lying with the dead because the Germans had shot our litter bearers when they stood up and walked over to get them. That night this is what Ernie wrote:

"The line moves on but it never ends. All afternoon men kept coming around the hill and vanishing eventually over the horizon. There is agony in your heart. The sag of their bodies speaks their inhuman exhaustion. They're just guys from Brooklyn and Main Street, but you wouldn't remember them if you saw them. Their world can never be known to you."

Each day in South Vietnam armed Americans die quietly, tragically, unknowingly, obediently.

Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, who personally takes over in South Vietnam now, recently admitted to the Armed Forces subcommittee that we control nothing there.

Fine? As at the Bay of Pigs and the giveaway of Laos, the United States is defeated again. But not a noisy debacle, mind you, nothing noisily noticeable. General Taylor's task is to see that the collapse stops short of that.

On June 24 able Washington insider James Reston wrote in the New York Times: "This administration is not prepared to accept any spectacular defeat in South Vietnam, particularly in an election year."

In short, Americans are just to die quietly, tragically, unknowingly, obediently—while nobody rocks the political boat until November.

Isn't there anything—anything, anything, anything—that can bring conscience into politics?

GOLETA, CALIF.,
June 24, 1964.

Senator THOMAS KUCHEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR KUCHEL: Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon, is reported in today's newspapers as saying that there is no justification for the U.S. course in Vietnam, and that the only way a major war can be averted is for the American people to stop it.

I agree with Senator MORSE. I agree also when he says that the greatest threat to the peace of the world is the United States.

U.S. military action in any part of Asia is inexcusable. We have here on our own continent problems of greater magnitude when it comes to matters of social justice and malignant behavior.

I am requesting that you support Senator MORSE and oppose escalation of U.S. military action in Asia. The situation in South Vietnam—and other areas of southeast Asia—should indeed be put before the United Nations.

Very truly yours,

L. A. LAUER.

SEATTLE, WASH.,
June 30, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have followed your speeches in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with great interest and heartily agree with you and your colleagues who are opposed to the dangerous American adventure in South Vietnam and now in Laos.

It is appalling that the administration is supporting a government that does not have the backing of its people and steadily moving toward a potential world war.

Even worse is the virtual blackout in our press of views such as yours. If more Americans have access to the facts as raised by you there would be more opposition.

I would appreciate receiving copies of your speeches so that I could inform others.

Your courage is commendable.

Sincerely,

LYLE MERCER.

ANAHEIM, CALIF.,
June 27, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Amen, and amen to what you said a couple of mornings ago over the TV program, "Today," relative to Vietnam, and relative to the United States functioning through the United Nations.

Thank you for speaking for many fellow citizens, among whom I am one.

God sustain you, in your forthright words, and your forthright deeds.

Sincerely and respectfully,

ARTHUR M. STEVENSON.

BROOKVILLE, OHIO,
June 30, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Someone should tell you, I think, that your views as expressed on the "Issues and Answers" program on TV Sunday, June 28, were very much appreciated.

As you suggested—if we keep on moving down the blind alley that we are in now there may not be much to boast about after the smoke clears away.

While to be sure I don't want Russia arming Cuba against us as they were doing at the time of the "missile crisis" it sure still beats the ham out of me to figure out how we could justify the bellowing we did at that time when we just stop to consider that we had men and military supplies in many areas of the Far East for years before Russia slipped into our hemisphere.

As you said Sunday, war and especially nuclear war is unthinkable as a sensible means of settling disputes. Let pride be damned if it must but there is just no sense in saving face at the reckless expense of a ruined future for millions of people including ourselves quite likely. My mother had four sons and one daughter and ended up with five of us in the armed services at one time or another and I'm telling you that if I feel any more secure today than I did before the first one of us went, it is simply because I've learned not to let the state of international affairs worry me so much as it once did. All our armed might, mighty as it is, has merely, so far as I'm concerned, made our problems greater instead of our world safer.

Incidentally, wouldn't that BARRY GOLDWATER be a reckless reuben in case he should get charge of things in an emergency? I really believe he stands out as a freedom smasher.

Mr. MORSE, I hope I haven't been too distasteful for your digestion and may God make this country a real shining light in the world as I once thought we were meant to be.

Sincerely yours,

RUSS MONTGOMERY.

LA MIRADA, CALIF.,
June 28, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Thank you for your thoughtful and courageous talk on "Issues and Answers." We wholeheartedly agree.

The United Nations must be the peacekeeping force in the world and the United States must live up to its charter.

Respectfully yours,

D. D. Kellogg.
G. Pearl Kellogg.

Seattle, Wash.,
June 28, 1964.

The Honorable Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: I heartily agree with you in regard to our present policy in Vietnam.

I have asked the Honorable Adlai E. Stevenson why the United States is going it alone in South Vietnam, why a U.N. force isn't there, but have not had a satisfactory reply. Also, what has happened to SEATO?

I am extremely worried that the war in Vietnam may lead to World War III. God forbid.

How can the United States glibly talk peace while spending enormous amounts of money for arms and interfering in civil wars?

I object having my tax dollars (I'm 63 and would like to semiretire) handed out to South Vietnam or any other country where we have no right to be. My heart aches for the poor Vietnamese who have endured untold suffering for so many years. How heartless can we get?

I am proud of you, Senator Morse, and agree with your statement to the Senate "that this country will go down in history as the nation chiefly responsible for scuttling the United Nations." It appears our faith in the U.N. is badly shaken.

Do you suppose that one of these days before it's too late that others in Washington will come to their senses? Or, are they enjoying the cold war and interfering in the self-determination of other peoples?

Thank you for your courage. My hope and prayer is that soon others will join you in protesting the continuation of the war in Vietnam. It's our men who are losing their lives needlessly.

Respectfully,

Mrs. Mary O'Neill Hayes.

P.S.—I saw you on "Issues and Answers" Sunday and you were great.

San Francisco, Calif.,
June 28, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate.

Dear Senator Morse: As an American, and a concerned supporter of the United Nations, I wish to state my agreement with your views on Vietnam as stated on ABC's Sunday program "Issues and Answers." This agreement also stands for your views on Laos.

I am not an Oregonian, but were I a constituent of yours, I would proudly wear a Wayne Morse campaign button. Good luck to you and the Democratic Party from another reconstructed Republican. My wife, apparently somewhat brighter than both you and I, has been an intelligent, loyal Democrat since her first vote, and sends her greetings.

Sincerely,

Michael E. Grodeky.

Palm Springs, Calif.,
June 30, 1964.

Senator Morse,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator: I am inclined to support you in your attitude of the policy toward southeast Asia.

I am inclined to fear any nation that is all powerful, and that includes our own.

I fear a "prevention" war toward Red China on a national policy under the guise of a forced peace.

"Peace" yes—but "peace on our terms" could lead to war with a nation such as Red China. We felt we were entering on her internal affairs.

You have a tough job in combating the Pentagon-industrial complex.

Sincerely,

La McGellinary.

St. Louis, Mo.,
June 29, 1964.

Dear Senator Morse: Your appearance on TV was very enlightening to me, as I had not understood what was going on in Laos, and I only wish that the administration would take as sensible an attitude. The American people actually are not given much information as to what choices are possible in such situations. Our leaders make the decisions without consulting the people, although this is supposed to be a democracy.

We do not have any more genuine leader in public life today than you have proved yourself to be over a considerable period of years.

Spencer Williams.

Washington, D.C.,
June 30, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: I had the good fortune of being present in the Senate gallery on June 29 when you made your speech criticizing the U.S. foreign policy of military intervention in southeast Asia. I applaud both your stand against the United States policy in Vietnam and your suggestion for the establishment in troubled areas of a peace force under the direction of the United Nations.

A specific issue which I as a professional botanist am concerned about is the use by the United States of chemical defoliants on the Vietnam flora. Use of chemical defoliants is a form of CBR warfare which we (the United States) categorically deny using. I suppose it is argued that economic crops are not sprayed and therefore the people are not affected. Nevertheless severe damage to the local flora will quickly lead to an imbalance in both plant and animal communities and eventually will have a direct effect on the inhabitants. The ultimate magnitude of the destruction of such a defoliation program cannot be imagined.

The responsibility that you show by making public the important issue of the military situation in southeast Asia is greatly needed. I can only hope that other ears were tuned to your speech.

Sincerely,

Peter K. Hepler, Ph. D.

Los Angeles, Calif.,
June 29, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: May I commend your courage in speaking out against our involvement in South Vietnam.

If, indeed, intervention is necessary, I believe it should be handled through the United Nations.

It frightens me to know that Mr. Lodge is being replaced by a general; this seems to indicate to me that we are heading toward a full-scale war.

It is my hope that enough thinking people will seek a more peaceful solution in these troubled areas.

Please keep your voice heard, Mr. Morse; many of us are listening.

With every good wish from myself and our many friends,

Sincerely,

Edith Willins.

Mesa, Ariz.,
June 28, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Morse: I just listened to "Issues and Answers" and was so pleased with your answers. Surely we do not want war in Asia, and for a long time I have wondered why this had not been taken to the United Nations. Have not liked the way Mr. McNamara has taken over. He is apparently so sure of himself. Is there any way to change the President's attitude, so that a peacemaking force could take over?

Have long admired your stand.

Helena Sanderson.

Los Angeles, Calif.,
June 30, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senator, Oregon,
The U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: I can't tell you how pleased my wife and I were regarding your stand on the problems confronting this country in southeast Asia and its existing war. We were glad that through the "Today" TV show, you were able to reach many concerned, though confused Americans: confused by the press, concerned with the peace of the world.

Please continue your peaceful fight to keep America informed, uphold the U.N., and maintain the peace. War is very unpopular to sensible people.

My best wishes.

Sincerely,

Steve Weiss.

Providence, R.I.,
June 29, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: I listened to the interview with you on "Issues and Answers" program yesterday, and I want to commend you on the stand you took of the United States-Vietnam situation.

It is heartening to find someone with the courage to speak out in opposition to the stand being taken by some of his own countrymen in places of power—especially since this in the United States at present might be construed as being on the side of the Communists.

I feel your views make sense and are in line with principle. I thank you for expressing them so well and I pray our fellow countrymen will pay heed to them.

Yours respectfully,

Mrs. Grace Lamb.

Honolulu, Hawaii,
June 27, 1964.

Dear Senator Morse: Congratulations on your forthright stand against aggressive U.S. policies in southeast Asia. Urge you and colleagues of similar mind to continue to press for peaceful rather than military solution. We have no right to be there.

Sincerely,

John M. Kelly.

Lexington, Ky.,
June 30, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: I am as disillusioned as you are regarding the situation in Vietnam.

When is the United States going to get out of there?

Sincerely,

Robert L. Zimmerman.

P.S.—Also when is the United States going to have a decent medical care program?

NORTHRIDGE, CALIF.,
July 1, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have asked the President and Senator HUMPHREY to consider your proposed policy for Vietnam. Also I have asked Republicans to discuss it constructively. Thank you for getting on television and giving the public the facts. I took notes.

Very truly yours,

MRS. T. M. STOUT.

PHOENIX, ARIZ.,
June 28, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Have just been listening to the program "Issues and Answers." I agree heartily with every word you said. I have long wondered why the United States does not lay the whole question before the United Nations. I am so glad that someone has the nerve to speak out, as you have done.

Incidentally, I am so glad you joined the Democrats. We can certainly use a little commonsense.

Sincerely yours,

FRANCES L. DIX.

NEW ROCHELLE, N.Y.,
June 30, 1964.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: All mankind is in your debt for the intelligent, reasonable, and humane stand you are taking on southeast Asia. We are involved in an ugly and brutal war and no slogans or platitudes can alter this fact. We hope you will continue your courageous efforts in behalf of peace. I want you to know that you have our wholehearted support.

Very truly yours,

Mr. and Mrs. ELIAS TANENBAUM.

AVON PARK, FLA.,
June 30, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: You are 100 percent right on southeast Asia. A war there on the scale proposed by the President would only escalate into a nuclear war—and no sane man or woman wants that.

Americanly,

HENRY STONER.

P.S.—Please try to defend the great June 15, 1964, U.S. Supreme Court reapportionment decision as any good Jeffersonian would do.

WESTERN SPRINGS, ILL.,
June 29, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: This is to thank you for speaking out and calling a spade a spade in the southeast Asia situation.

Will our leaders never learn? Again we are getting ourselves completely involved in a local struggle on the other side of the world, as in Korea, where we wasted thousands of young lives and have poured billions of dollars into a country, only to end up supporting an unpopular dictatorship.

Keep up the good work—maybe in due time our people will wake up to the fact that we are indeed the greatest threat to peace in the world today, not because we want to help oppressed peoples, but because we can't stand competition.

Sincerely,

FRED L. CRAWFORD.

MORSE HITS OUR ASIA PUPPET SHOW

WASHINGTON.—Senator WAYNE MORSE, Democrat, of Oregon, charged again yesterday that the United States is an outlaw nation fighting a unilateral war in southeast Asia.

The Senator called South Vietnam this puppet of ours.

MORSE said it may be true that Red China and North Vietnam are violating the Geneva accords on Laos, but that two wrongs do not make a right.

He charged the United States is pursuing a course of action outside the charter of the United Nations.

Speaking on a television program, MORSE said that a peacekeeping operation supported by U.S. SEATO allies ought to take the place of unilateral U.S. action until such time as the United Nations can move in with its own force.

He rejected the notion that in the time it takes to set up such operations the Communists can move in. He said it would not take as much time as most people claim.

MORSE said he had faith in President Johnson, "But I think he's being ill advised."

MORSE, a Senate Foreign Relations Committee member, said Mr. Johnson doesn't want war, but American policies in South Vietnam and Laos are escalating the fighting against Communist forces while Red China has 200,000 troops poised on its borders nearby.

P.S.—I agree with you completely, Mr. MORSE.

CARLSBAD, CALIF.,
June 28, 1964.

DEAR MR. MORSE: We approve of the stand you have taken concerning the United States in southeast Asia.

We sincerely hope that your voice and voices of others who have the same feelings about the terrible danger that present U.S. action is creating will be heard and heeded. This country must use organizations established for the purpose of keeping peace.

Yours truly,

FLETCHER A. CARR.

CARLSBAD, CALIF.,
June 28, 1964.

Senator MORSE: We have listened to your interview on "Issues and Answers."

Your stand is just and wise. Certainly the United Nations should be used and every possible ways and means used to mediate in Vietnam.

Sincerely,

MRS. F. D. CARR.

SANTA MONICA, CALIF.,
June 27, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. SENATOR: I want to express my deepest gratitude to you for being the strongest voice among the very few sane voices in our Legislature, our Government, who is speaking out against our crime in Vietnam. It is indeed a sad truth that we are today "the greatest threat to the peace of the world."

Continue working for an end of our role in the Vietnam war. You have the support of millions in our country and all over the world.

Gratefuly yours,

MRS. T. L. TOMASH.

LA JOLLA, CALIF.,
June 30, 1964.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am appalled by the threats of unlimited war if China continues to help the Communists in Laos and South Vietnam. I know that you will do all that you can to reach the President and to alert the country to the dangerous turn in our foreign policy. There is no one else in the Congress who has shown so much courage in speaking out against the war in Vietnam, and on whom we can so hopefully rely to mobilize others for sanity and responsibility.

The following is a copy of the telegram which I sent to the President and to Senator KUCHEL last evening:

"I do not believe that either honor or commonsense are served by U.S. military involvement in southeast Asia. Threats against China may deter temporarily but they will increase enmity. This is the road to war, now or in our children's time. It may put the human race in jeopardy. Real responsibility to mankind requires that we act through the U.N. and set our own house in order."

Is it not strange that we are willing to risk a nuclear war to defend the freedom of Asian peasants who want nothing so much as to be let alone, yet we cannot defend the right of many of our own citizens to vote, or the lives of our idealistic young people who are willing to sacrifice so much for freedom here?

Yours respectfully and gratefully,

HELEN M. BEARDSLEY.

LA JOLLA, CALIF.,
June 30, 1964.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I also want to thank you for your sponsorship of S. 1500 and S. 1501 which will eliminate some of the injustices suffered by foreign born under the Walter McCarran Act. It was courageous of you to introduce these bills.

Yours sincerely,

HELEN M. BEARDSLEY.

NORMAN, OKLA.,
June 29, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senator from Oregon,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MORSE: Your comments on our Far East policy made on TV this past Sunday were indeed refreshing and swelled me with pride. Thank goodness for an alternative position—regardless of right or wrong. The important thing is that your views, in contrast to a general policy of escalated war or one of "let's get it over with now," provides a real choice between peace and war. I salute you for speaking out as you did. Also it was indeed a pleasure to listen to a politico who said substantially what he believed rather than the usual hedging, high-sounding and patronizing speech one has become so accustomed to hearing.

My best wishes,

MICHAEL KULLA.

FORT WORTH, TEX.,
June 28, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: All I could say after listening to you today on "Issues and Answers" was, "Love that man." That is my way of expressing appreciation for your courageous facing up to reality in the area of foreign policy.

Through bits of information in the newspapers and more details in periodicals such as New Republic and Progressive, I have followed your career. But you were much less a stranger after a full half hour on this program.

I do hope that soon a few other Senators will rally to the cause of peacekeeping, as you have. Senator CHURCH was effective, I thought, on the "Today" program last week. Senator FULBRIGHT's two speeches have not been given proper publicity in this conservative stronghold. What Senator McGOVERN has to say on the floor of the Senate never makes the newspapers here. But I must admit that you emerge as a forceful, colorful personality in my mind. So I dare say the press has quoted you more than I realized.

Thank you very much. Everything you said I have been writing in letters to the editor, a lone voice in a wilderness of superpatriotism. That makes me a "Comsymp." I can imagine what kind of mail you receive, so decided to offset the negative with a fan letter.

Yours truly,

Stella Mae Hunter.

June 30, 1964.

My Dear Sir: We sincerely trust that you will pursue your stand re Cabot Lodge's opinion of Vietnam situation. It is our opinion that he does not and has not given a ——.

Also President Johnson appointed Maxwell Taylor. American military or Vietnamese have little use for him there.

You know this most vitally important situation far better than we, and we ask that you please use your influence to do what you can to terminate the falseness and coverup that has been going on for so long.

Respectfully yours,

L. Heddes.

Duluth, Minn.,
June 29, 1964.

Dear Senator Morse: I wonder if you are aware of the CBS brainwashing broadcasts that are being put out this week to sell the radio audience on the idea that all we seek in the Vietnam and Laotian area is peace and liberty * * * that if war should come in spite of our peaceful bombings and strafings and general forceful interference in the affairs of these unfortunate people, it will be because the Chinese people want to pick a fight with us.

Not only this but deliberate intent exists to pin the label of communism on anyone who feels that we should get out of that area and turn the problem over to the U.N.

I am satisfied that this is not just CBS but is a Government (State Department) broadcast worked out with CBS in the best style of Adolph Hitler who proclaimed his peaceful intentions as he moved into Czechoslovakia, and Austria in the days when he was telling the world that he didn't seek war * * * didn't want war, was hellbent on peace, even if he had to put people into stockades and shoot their official leadership to achieve it. It seems to me that it is news when a Senator from the great State of Oregon, a member of the governing party, breaks with the President and the military on a major question of foreign policy. If so, it is a reflection on our so-called free press that there is little or no publicity given to your effort to save not just our good name, but the lives of many, many fine young Americans. Why are not the newspapers and the radio and TV facilities that claim to give us the whole truth and nothing but the truth burying your efforts and doing everything in their power to paralyze the intelligence and commonsense and Christian feelings of the Nation?

I have written Humphrey and McCarthy and Blatnik on this score. McCarthy promises his efforts. Humphrey is full of weasel words that don't mean a thing except that when the chips are down, he will find good and sufficient reason to support the State Department. Who is running this Government anyhow, when we go to war without congressional approval or debate?

I am proud to be represented by the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Alaska. We are bypassing the U.N., and going it alone, into a boobytrap that will make Korea look like a Sunday school picnic.

With warm regards,

Herman J. Griffith.

Drexel Hill, Pa.,
June 30, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: I am writing to tell you that I thoroughly agree with your comments about southeast Asia. Please keep saying over and over that we must refer this situation to the United Nations and try to ease tensions by conference and discussions, not by a buildup of U.S. military forces.

Sincerely,

Jean F. Lester.

Hemet, Calif.,
June 28, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,

Dear Senator: Again I waited anxiously to hear your talk about the Vietnam situation. Your calling it McNamara's war does not mean it's not Mr. Johnson's war—he is President—not McNamara.

I know he wants to prove to the Republicans he is not weak in foreign affairs—but all he proves is that he must take responsibility if he is the President—and get us out of the Vietnam war.

Sincerely,

Peggy Klempner.

San Diego, Calif.,
June 29, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse.

Dear Mr. Morse: Just heard you on TV and we were with you on the Vietnam situation and the U.N., etc. You were fine.

Now for some questions and answers, please.

Politics in both parties are going full blast now, viz the "war on poverty" and unemployment, and more economy. Seems of much concern to our Government and the President at this time. While at the same time the House passed an outrageous pay raise to Cabinet officers, Supreme Court Justices, district justices, House Doorkeeper, postmasters, Federal civil service. Federal civil service employees also enjoy fringe benefits, vacation pay (generous), sick leave, retirement benefits, and provided maximum job security; also a great percentage of District of Columbia Federal workers are colored. Last but not least the House voted themselves and the Senate a nice raise also again, since last year. Where is our dollar? "An indefensible raid upon the Treasury," so states the Human Events—a weekly Washington report. "Our Government debt is sky high."

Where do the retired and "over" age (limit) come in these days? Some living on very small pension or social security. Going back to 1958, what have the House and Senate given our retired personnel and officers, especially the military?

Too many of World Wars I and II had hard and brilliant careers in Army, Navy, and other services, with disabilities, unable to work out a full life, small pensions only. Why shouldn't these retired, capable men and women deserve some raises also? Last year they were the forgotten ones and again this year. So far the one or two raises since 1958 have been pitifully small. This year again, nothing for the retired military man. One of our living heroes, Sergeant York, has existed on $60 (and less at first) for many years, and not even a plaque in memory of his heroism.

My husband was in both wars—in its worst places—and when he retired with a pension—not enough in return for his service—he was not allowed dual occupation. Where Senators, for instance, reach ripe old age and still in service with a good salary even in retirement.

How about the Senators and the lawmaking honorable bodies making the laws instead of allowing the honorable Supreme Court to reign supreme—and get back to the Constitution of our country.

Thank you for listening.

Very truly and respectfully yours,

Susan P. Jones.

Otego, N.Y.,
June 29, 1964.

Dear Senator Morse: It was very gratifying to see and hear you on TV the other day. It's about time that someone got on the floor and told the truth about South Vietnam and the whole Asian question. Are we the police department for the whole world, I thought we had the U.N. for these trouble spots.

I agree with you, this administration is bent on escalating the war or wars in Asia and it looks to me and to others, that a behind-the-door deal has been made. The Russians are pulling out of Cuba; for what reason? Is it a deal in which we are to clip Red China's wings, to save the Russians the job, I wonder?

Any way, it certainly would be the height of folly for this country to start to tangle with Red China. Our boys would just be put down the drain, sacrificed for nothing, as no matter what manpower we put in Asia it would be swallowed up and nothing accomplished.

Was no lesson learned from France's dismal record in Indochina? The same man that beat the French is now doing it to us. I say Asia for the Asiatics, keep our boys and our tax money to home. I hope you get up in the Senate and howl good and loud; maybe it will penetrate up to high what we want. It took Senator Keating to expose the Cuban fiasco; you can do the same with the Asian one.

Another thing, these Negroes should be gotten off the streets with their fake passive demonstrations. It's all bunk. They are not too interested in civil rights; when they finally get them by law, they will not use them to advantage. Their big interest and major aim is intermarriage; they want to be white, that's their major aim. I ought to know how they think. I've lived with them for a time. If demonstrations are not stopped, there will be much bloodshed, I am sure.

Good luck to you on Vietnam.

A. G. Barwood.

St. Paul, Minn.,
June 30, 1964.

Dear Senator Morse: I support your point of view on the situation in Vietnam.

I think that talk of expanding that war is insanity.

I share the opinion of the French Foreign Minister that this war is primarily an internal political war.

It appears to me that we are again backing a strong man against the will of the local people.

Information seems to be coming out now that the CIA is behind much of our foreign problems. Even going so far as to override Presidential decisions.

I think the CIA should be curtailed at once.

Sincerely,

Frank B. Schwartz.

McHenry, Ill.,
June 28, 1964.

Dear Senator Morse: I believe your stand on the South Vietnam question is absolutely correct. The United States is guilty of breaking international law just as the Communists are. It appears that we are just as desperate to gain control of this piece of property for the sake of prestige as they are to set up another Communist country. Being 17 years old it scares me to think that I might have to serve my country in an undeclared and illegal war.

The answer, of course, is the United Nations. It was created to handle this type of situation. If the United States has no faith in its power to settle this dispute, the U.N. is doomed. You must continue to fight. We can't continue to turn our backs to the truth much longer. I know you have been criticized on your stand. Well, keep in mind that there must always be men like you around to blast some sense into Uncle Sam—keep it up. I am now going to write Senator Douglas on this matter. I think he can be one of your helpers.

Sincerely yours,

Paul Liebman.

Ormond Beach, Fla.,
June 30, 1964.

Dear Senator Morse: I listened to your opinions on Vietnam over "Today" and got great satisfaction out of what you said. I was in China 1915-37—taught at the University of Shanghai and deprecate our isolating ourselves from that nation. I inclose an article from Eastern Horizon published in Hong Kong which confirms some of your ideas about "aid." We often help the wrong people. I met you at Paul Raymond's when you spoke at the Daytona Beach forum.

Yours sincerely,

George Poteat.

Buffalo, N.Y.,
June 25, 1964.

Hon. Senator Wayne Morse,
The Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: This morning I heard you talk on the "Today" show. You were wonderful and expressed my sentiments exactly. I agree 100 percent with what you said regarding sending U.S. troops to Laos.

Would it be possible to have a copy of your speech? I should like to read it to all my friends. What can we poor citizens do about this? I hope I hear from you. Thank you.

Most sincerely,

Ruth Fruchtbaum.

Berkeley, Calif.,
June 28, 1964.

Dear Senator Morse: I have just heard you on television on "Issues and Answers" and want to tell you that my husband and I agree with your views wholeheartedly. It is a dreadful mistake for us to be escalating the war in Vietnam as we surely are doing and seem to be about to continue doing. It can only lead to a real major war. NATO and SEATO are our only hope and we must call upon these in as forceful a way as can be managed and now. I have just written to President Johnson to express these same views. I hope a lot of other people do the same, so he can realize the people are not supporting this dangerous new policy. Thank you for speaking out.

Sincerely,

Edith Weaver.

Hollywood, Calif.,
June 28, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Foreign Affairs Committee,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: After hearing your interview on television, I am hastening to write you and applaud you from the bottom of my heart. What you had to say was so true, so logical and to the point. You seem to be one of the very few brave souls left. Our treatment of South Vietnam and Cuba has been a disgrace and has lost us respect and friends.

I do hope that President Johnson, whom I believe, as you do, really wants peace and the welfare of mankind in general, will take your advice rather than that of the military and others who have selfish interests in keeping animosities alive.

I lost all respect and confidence in Adlai Stevenson when he lied about our part in the Cuban affair. I have never been so disillusioned in a man as I have in him. He has no stamina or principle left.

How I wish that there were more men like you among our politicians. We could then look forward to a brighter and safer future for these United States.

God bless you.

Yours sincerely,

Elenita Lindi.

P.S.—Would there be any possibility of getting reprints of the above interview? I should certainly like to pass them out so that people might be better informed.

Greenville, S.C.,
June 29, 1964.

Dear Senator Morse: It seems you are in the right on Vietnam, as usual. Charles Wells in Between the Lines has good material. Can you have a copy of your remarks from the Congressional Record sent me at once? We may get out a small paper on it locally, taking off from the recent war speech of the President.

I hope to get back to Eugene for a time this summer. I trust all is well with you and the family and interests.

Cordially,

Ross Anderson.

Westminster College,
Fulton, Mo., June 25, 1964.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: I happened to catch your appearance on NBC's "Today" show this morning and feel compelled to write of my agreement with your stand on the Vietnamese question. This is the first time I have ever responded in this way to such an interview, but you said quite well those things which I have felt strongly for some time. In the days ahead as escalation seems an eminent danger in southeast Asia, I trust that you and others in positions of prominence will continue to speak out.

I teach American history here including a course in recent U.S. history. The latter is a discussion-type seminar course, and I am constantly looking for materials to give my students a variety of viewpoints on current topics as well as those others over the past 50 years which still exert their influence on us today. If your views on southeast Asia are available from a Senate speech or other presentation, I would appreciate receiving 20 copies for use with these students.

Sincerely,

William E. Parrish,
Professor of History.

Dallas, Tex.,
June 25, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
The Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: I heard you on the "Today" show this morning and am writing you to ask you what I can do to get the administration to take the Vietnam war to the United Nations. I have selfish reasons as well as moral reasons for not wanting a war. My son finishes 6 years of service in the Navy this October and I want him to be able to go to college and live a normal life. Besides, war is no solution as well we know. My older son served the Army 2 years and is married and living happily in Kellogg, Idaho. I have a 20-year-old daughter. I should know what to do to help to make this a better world at my age, but one feels so helpless in the face of politicians. You certainly seemed well informed and you were a forceful speaker. You seemed so sincere and I liked you very much.

Enclosed is a self-addressed envelope to save the Government's money. Thank you for your stand and any help you can give me.

Sincerely yours,

Ann Hearst.

College of Guam,
Agana, Guam, June 28, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: We warmly approve your efforts to bring about a more sensible and more hopeful policy in Vietnam. We have just written to Senators Aiken and Gruening to applaud their efforts in a like direction.

A friend of mine has a relative who has been a career officer in the lower ranks of the officer class. This officer served in Vietnam for a good many months. Finally he was transferred to the United States of America. He immediately gave up his career in the military forces because he was so ashamed of what the United States was doing out there.

Keep up your struggle. I would appreciate having copies of your speeches on Vietnam.

Respectfully yours,

Prof. E. Lewis B. Curtis.
Catherine S. Curtis.

College of Guam,
Agana, Guam, June 28, 1694.

President Lyndon B. Johnson,
White House,
Washington, D.C.

Dear President Johnson: We so heartily approve of many things which you do and hope to do. We are, however, deeply perturbed at the direction our policy seems to be taking in Vietnam. We believe that our national interests will be better served by going to the conference table as soon as possible. To extend military action will not make us friends. Napalm bombs and defoliation procedures, quite understandably, seem to increase our opponents.

May a concerned couple recommend to our President some bedside reading? We urge you to reread our Tokyo Ambassador's (E. O. Reischauer) "Wanted—An Asian Policy."

We enclose copies of letters to Senators Aiken, Morse, and Gruening.

Respectfully yours,

Prof. E. Lewis B. Curtis.
Catherine S. Curtis.

Clearwater, Fla.,
June 25, 1964.

Hon. Senator Morse,
State Chambers,
Salem, Oreg.

Dear Senator Morse: This morning I heard your interview on the "Today" program originating in New York City. I was very much impressed with your knowledge and ability to size up the situation we find ourselves in, in Vietnam.

I would appreciate it, if you could send me a copy of your interview or would tell me where I could secure a copy.

With the wish that all patriotic citizens might have a chance to hear your views, I am

Sincerely yours,

Laura Phillips.

San Antonio, Tex.,
June 25, 1964.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: I just heard your interview on the "Today" program this morning and I am deeply impressed with your stand on the position of the United States in South Vietnam.

I have been looking for the exposition of the "other side" and you provided it.

In order that I may study your position more thoroughly and be informed on the facts you presented, will you please send me printed material giving me the facts on your position, including such items as the Geneva Accords, SEATO and the approach to the U.N. Your cooperation in sending this material will be deeply appreciated.

Many thanks.

Sincerely yours,

Paul Kulick.

Boynton Beach, Fla.,
June 25, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator: Since hearing your views on the war (to be) in Laos, Thailand. etc., let me strongly urge you to see to it that it does get into the U.N.'s hands, and out of the U.S. military's hands. I talk from firsthand information, because I have a son in Hawaii, who has already been to Thailand twice, and because I know he would perhaps be among those slaughtered for what? The problem there should be left to Vietnamese. We would resent Russia coming here to take charge of our colored problems, wouldn't we?

A war there would last such a long time and what would we gain? Many hungry people here would appreciate getting $10 more a month social security, but instead our loose money is to go to Vietnam. Why?

I have read item after item on the situation, and know it must be the Pentagon, or McNamara, that wants our sons killed, in some far away country that has no bearing in the fight for our freedom.

Will appreciate hearing from you very soon.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. R. Kinne.

New York, N.Y.,
June 28, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: Let me take this first opportunity to congratulate you on the stand you have taken on U.S. policy on South Vietnam. I agree completely with your belief that American troops should be withdrawn from Vietnam—on legal grounds, their presence violates the 1954 Geneva accord; on moral ground, the United States has no right to force the regime of our serpentine satrap Khanh down the throats of the Vietnamese people; and on military grounds, as a U.S. Army veteran, I feel pretty sure that our military program is hopeless.

Your courage—and foresight—on this issue are commendable, and your speeches and statements are in the finest tradition of American politics. Just as we (rightly) criticize the police state that the Russians have imposed on the East Germans, we must also have the candor and courage to criticize a program that has led America to become what you have correctly called "a threat to world peace."

If your office has copies of the major speeches you have made on Vietnam, I would be most grateful if I could be sent 10 copies, which I shall send to my friends. I will be glad to bear any expense that this entails.

With best wishes.

Sincerely yours,

George W. Phillips.

Project City, Calif.,
June 22, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: I had to read in an obscure periodical your position against war in Asia. For although I take four of them, the daily press, and controlled wire services suppress anything but the mildest criticism of war. Can't even get a "letter to the editor published." Thus I write you to help stop this insanity.

The warmongers and industrial-military complex General Eisenhower warned against have gained control of this country. I understand every nation but this wishes to arbitrate or negotiate neutralism in southeast Asia. But they prefer countless thousands of our youth be slaughtered and mutilated defending another corrupt military dictatorship in Asia. How many thousands were killed and maimed to produce the dictatorship in Korea with recent riots against its corruption? Were hundreds of thousands of the flower of French youth slaughtered before they were driven out? I would appreciate as an American citizen your answering me the above and the following questions:

1. Has Congress given up its sole power to declare war, thus making this country a military dictatorship?

2. What is the authority of this country for establishing protectorates in Asia backed with military occupation and the power of one man to send the country to war?

3. Is the enclosed statement, that appeared in a San Francisco newspaper true?

4. In the "aid to South Vietnam bill" will you include free passage to the frontlines for these warmongers so anxious to defend corrupt military dictatorships to relieve them of sitting comfortably in front of their TV sets listening to the news of hundreds of thousands of our youth and sons being butchered, to keep their prestige and interests?

5. Is the foreign policy of this country to encourage, aid and abet, and protect military dictatorships throughout the world even at the cost of thousands of our youth killed? Are they afraid to use nuclear weapons as they might get hurt themselves? No wonder we have to go it alone.

The world will love this country when it invades Asia, and you can count on me to expose the butchers from the top down. Hundreds I've talked with feel the same.

William Coyle,
Member, Shasta County Democrat Central Committee, Five Counties Central Labor Council, etc.

[From the San Francisco Examiner, June 9, 1964]

Is it moral to slaughter peasants for a corrupt dictatorship engaged in a brutal and hopeless civil war?

Do U.S. security interests, as defined by the cold warriors, have a priority over the rights of self-determination of the southeast Asian peoples? Do the former, in fact conflict with the latter?

Perhaps a partial answer to these questions lies in the conduct of U.S. foreign policy in Laos in 1958. From 1955 to 1957 in accordance with the Geneva agreement, the neutralist government under Souvanna Phouma had stabilized itself and demobilized most of the Pathet Lao armies. In 1958 elections were held and resulted in a substantial popular victory for the Pathet Lao and other leftist forces. The United States thereupon suppressed the democratic elections by supporting, politically and militarily, a rightwing coup.

Arthur Di Quattro.

Baltimore, Md.,
January 29, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: I would like to commend you for your realistic position concerning our involvement in South Vietnam's civil war. I have discussed this issue with many religious, educational, business, and civic leaders in my community and they, in the great majority, completely support your position.

I realize that President Johnson must be careful how he handles this controversial issue, this being an election year. I am sure that our President would like to wash his hands of this mess, as much as any of us, providing it wouldn't hurt him politically.

However, I sincerely believe that if you could persuade President Johnson to be honest with our citizens and to make known to the public the true facts that you have been courageously revealing about our involvement in this war, the great majority of our citizens will support your position.

The failure of President Johnson to reveal these realities will encourage our cold war politicians to utilize this issue for their political advantage. I hope that you can persuade President Johnson to see this danger.

I would appreciate any material you have on this issue so that I can help support your stand.

Very sincerely,

Leon Shapiro.

North Miami, Fla.,
June 25, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse.

Dear Senator: I scan the newspapers and I am extremely dissatisfied with information about the U.S. policy in the Indochina area of east Asia.

Today I read Edwin Lahey's article on your speeches on this subject. I am deeply alarmed about our policy in this area. I feel our policy violates the United Nations Charter. Also as a practical matter I believe President Johnson is trying to prove he is tougher than Mao Tse-tung with the fate of mankind in balance. Mao is probably the toughest, shrewdest opponent he has faced.

Will you please send me all your speeches you have made on this subject this year and any other material you can send. Please reply. This is my third letter I have written to you without response.

Yours sincerely

Louis Flum.

P.S.—I heartily endorse your position on Indochina, Viet, etc.

Greenbank, Wash.,
June 25, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator: We strongly support your stand on South Vietnam and would like to have a copy of your speech if it is available. We have not been able to read it in our papers.

It is regrettable that we do not have more Members of the Senate with your courage.

Yours very truly,

M. M. Andersen.

Delray Beach, Fla.,
June 25, 1964.

Dear Senator Morse: I want to congratulate you on your very frank and very apropos discussion of the Vietnamese situation, or should I say disaster.

It is very heartening and encouraging to hear a Democrat dare to criticize the President's policies in Asia. I thought you were magnificent and couldn't help but laugh at the way you said everything you wanted to say, instead of being interviewed and led into answering the questions Ray Scherer and Nancy had evidently prepared to ask you. It does my heart good every time a real redblooded American patriot stands up and speaks the truth fearlessly. You are right about the people not being behind "McNamara's War." I have felt ever since he was appointed that he was a ruthless, opinionated pipsqueak and that we have consistently lost face and ground since he was put in charge of our defense. I also agree that General Taylor should never have been put in Henry Cabot Lodge's place. It is rattling sabers in the faces of those Red devils.

As long as we have men of your caliber and principles, Senator, I feel our chances of survival as a democracy have a fighting chance.

Senator, may I have a copy of this telecast of the "Today" show, June 25?

Bless you.

LILLIAN WOOD.

UNITED PROTESTANT CHURCH,
Duluth, Minn., June 25, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MORSE: Congratulations upon your analysis and expressed convictions on the Vietnam situation. I saw you on the "Today" show June 25 and I thoroughly concur with your views that the United States should make a desperate effort to have the United Nations handle the situation rather than try to deal with it militarily on a unilateral basis.

I am president of the Head of the Lakes Chapter of the Association for the United Nations and am greatly concerned for peace and feel the U.N. is our best hope for keeping the peace. For years I have talked and preached more solid support of the U.N. on the part of the United States.

How do your fellow Senators stack up on this issue? Do you have much support there?

Would it be possible to have a copy of your presentation of June 25, or another address in which you have dealt with this subject?

May your tribe increase and rapidly.

Cordially yours,

G. TRUETT HIGH.

CHARLESTON, S.C.,
June 25, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have been watching your interviews on television several times. I am very much impressed with your realistic views on the different political issues pertaining to the foreign policy of our great country.

During World War II I was in Greece. We suffered under the German-Italian-Bulgarian occupation and finally we had the civil war against the Communists. I have a bitter personal experience of war.

I could not help to write to you and express my admiration for your healthy and realistic stand on American foreign policy.

I will appreciate it very much if you send me your periodical newsletters.

Respectfully yours,

C. ANTONATOS, M.D.

SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH,
June 28, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Is it possible to obtain several copies of your debate that was given today by ABC news on TV? I should like very much to have these copies—you were excellent. If obtainable, and if any cost, please enclose bill.

Vietnam and our war there is the topic under discussion.

Sincerely,

MRS. W. P. DUNN.

GREAT NECK, N.Y.,
June 25, 1964.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I was very much touched by the report of the New York Times covering your recent speech on the situation in Vietnam. But there was nothing in the paper the next day.

I would much appreciate it if you will be good enough to mail me copies of some of your latest foreign policy speeches for distribution to my colleagues at Fairleigh Dickinson University.

Thank you and with kind regards.

Yours cordially,

CHANG HSIN-HAI.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
June 22, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have been doing my best to follow American policy and action in southeast Asia. From what little I have been able to find in the newspapers (New York Times and Washington Post) about your position, I support it fully. Please keep up your good work. We appear to be at the brink with no room within the present policy to turn to new means to resolve our conflicts. It is very disappointing to read today's Post and see them all but declare war on China and North Vietnam.

Since I have found it so difficult to find your Senate speeches reported with any detail in the press, I would like to know if you could send me copies of your major speeches on Laos and South Vietnam for the last few months? If it is available, I would appreciate earlier speeches too.

Please continue your efforts and please keep reporting your views to the American people.

Sincerely yours,

PETER HUNT.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
June 25, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Your interview this morning on the "Today" program was so honest and straightforward. It gave facts which needed to be brought to the attention of the American people long before this. I hope it is not too late.

I am sure that my friends and neighbors who did not hear and see you this a.m. would very much appreciate having a copy of this interview. Might it be possible to have some copies of it?

Thank you so much for your most worthy contribution to the American way at this very crucial moment.

Respectfully yours,

REBECCA S. LEVINE.

CLEVELAND, OHIO,
June 24, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: For months, I and many of my acquaintances and friends have followed the lonely battle that you and others, though much too few, in the Senate have been waging against the brutal and dangerous policy of the United States in Vietnam. Your courage and your honesty are among the brightest spots in the morass that our Congress seems to be sinking in.

As I write, I almost feel that I am writing to someone I am close to personally, and a typewriter is a most inadequate instrument to convey my admiration for you through. I hope it is important to you to know that there are individuals like myself, and many others, who share with you an intense revulsion against our policies in Vietnam. This is an issue that I believe must be carried to the American people, one which, I believe, might be able to prick their collective conscience if the facts were known. With this in mind, I would like to ask you to send me as much of your materials on the Vietnamese situation as you can: speeches, inserts into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, articles, fact sheets, etc. To the extent that I can, I will use these materials to publicize the issues and your own activities. I am chairman of a campus organization called Voice on the University of Michigan campus, which is a chapter of Students for a Democratic Society, a growing national student organization which is very concerned about American policy throughout the underdeveloped world. We believe that Vietnam may be all too typical of a pattern which may be developing.

You may be interested to know that this letter was immediately prompted by the appointment of General Taylor to replace Mr. Lodge as Ambassador to Vietnam, a move which I feel bodes further ill to that beleaguered country and to the Americans who, I fear, in increasing numbers, may be sent there to fight and perhaps to die. It was also prompted by an article I read in the Cleveland Press yesterday in which you were quoted as saying that the United States "is heading for a war in Asia and will be hated by a majority of mankind for the next 500 years." I am ashamed to have to say that I fear you are right. Any help I may be to help you in your battle against this senseless war is at your disposal.

Looking forward to hear from you and receive your materials, I am,

Sincerely yours,

RICHARD F. MAGIDOFF.

P.S.—If you might be interested in more information about Students for a Democratic Society, and particularly our activities regarding Vietnam, please let me know.

AKRON, OHIO,
June 24, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SENATOR: I heard you this morning on the "Today" program. I do not know how widespread that program reaches. Relatively few men hear that program, because it comes at a time when hundreds of men are on their way to work. I wish you would put the substance of your remarks on paper, so that your views could be given wide currency.

The people must be aroused to the danger we are now facing.

Yours very truly,

G. A. WIEDEMER.

SAN PEDRO, CALIF.,
June 24, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE.

MY DEAR SIR: I read a small portion of your magnificent speech in the Senate in our local newspaper, and I find it difficult to conceive of words which will adequately describe your brilliance of mind and magnanimity.

Sir, I would very much appreciate knowing how I can obtain copies of your recent speeches deploring and admonishing the evil forces in our society.

Sir, I hope you will never tire in your efforts to make the blind open their eyes and their minds to truths. Thank you.

Your friend and admirer,

MAX MAZSICK.

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
POST NO. 33,
St. James, Minn., June 25, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Please accept our sincere thanks and congratulations upon your sage observations, which are born out by conservative and liberal German and Swiss newspapers and magazines still available for reading to the writer (NBC "Today"). We are fast "losing face" as well as the best of our young manhood in uniform due to our lack of proper diplomacy and statesmanship. I would appreciate your sending me the substance of your courageous remarks with documentation as to the parts of treaty, U.N. regulations, etc., so I may factually inform the members of our post and other friends.

Most gratefully and respectfully,

HANS KRUGER,

Past Second District Commander.

HOUSTON, TEX.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I had the privilege of being present in the visitor's gallery of the Senate Chamber on the morning of June 25 and listened to your speech on the situation in Vietnam and our involvement. I wish to say that I agree heartily with you in this situation.

I would appreciate very much if you would send me a copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD containing your speech.

Thanking you for your kindness and assuring you of my high regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

JACOB RUDNICK.

PEACE PUBLICATIONS COMMITTEE,
San Francisco, Calif., June 30, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Our thanks and congratulations to you on your remarkable contribution in warning the people of the United States against the great danger of continued military operations in southeast Asia.

If you will send me copies of your addresses (especially the latest) or any articles you have written on this important topic, we will make full use of them.

Please place my name on your mailing list.

All good wishes,

HOLLAND ROBERTS.

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN,
Ann Arbor, Mich., July 3, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: You deserve the gratitude of every one of us for your leadership on both issues of NATO and Asian policy. You must realize how important it is to those of us trying to organize grassroots opinion, that there be eminent outspoken dissenters. I hope that in this election year, when the center and the right will be busy conversing, we can muster support for your position enough to bring Fulbright-minded people to your position.

I am preparing position papers on Vietnam for several Democratic primaries in Michigan. I would be grateful to get four or five copies of your major policy remarks during 1964 on the Senate floor and elsewhere. Please keep me on your list for any of your new statements during the summer.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM PAUL LIVANT, Ph. D.,
Associate Research Psychologist,
Mental Health Research Institute.

BROOKLYN, N.Y.,
July 4, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MORSE: Yours is like a voice in the wilderness of the war being promoted by the present U.S. policy in south Asia. I am glad to know that some of my fellow citizens, men and women, are protesting. The methods used by our leaders are more cruel than murder because there is no way they can be put on trial. The pretenses expressed in the cause of freedom are either a figment of imagination or the perpetration of evil for the purpose of gain. I cannot believe that they can succeed against forces for the preservation of mankind.

I am deeply grateful to you for your bravery and enlightenment in the face of blindness and mistaken ideas promoted by both major political parties in their foreign policy pronouncements. I want to add my voice to strengthen those of men of good will which you epitomize. If you will send me copies of some of your recent speeches I shall be glad to circulate them. Thank you for your continuing efforts for the benefit of all peoples.

Very sincerely,

RUTH B. CAMBLON.

SAN DIEGO, CALIF.,
June 21, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I would appreciate receiving your speeches concerning the Vietnam war as well as on other vital topics. Your recent remarks on our participation in the southeast Asia hostilities are most welcome. Please continue your courageous struggle.

Yours sincerely,

VICTOR H. MARTELL.

CHAGRIN FALLS, OHIO,
July 2, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senator from Oregon,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I heartily applaud your opposition to our Government's aggressive policy in Asia as reported by Norman Thomas in yesterday's New York Times. However, like him I did not have the pleasure of seeing your documented comments reported in it or any other newspaper; and wonder, accordingly, if you would favor me with a copy or summary of your remarks.

I have the honor to remain,

Yours very truly,

JOHN SAYRE MARTIN.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
June 30, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

SENATOR MORSE: We read an article in the Los Angeles Times which quoted you as saying that the present course in Asia is leading toward a major war. I am greatly concerned about a war of any kind.

I am very interested in your opinion on this matter and the course you suggest in order that we may exert what little pressure we have on the Senate.

ALLYN E. MORRIS.

WHITTIER, CALIF.,
July 1, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I want to express my complete support for your position on Vietnam and to further tell you of my admiration for the brave stand you have taken. It takes much courage to speak out and it is people like yourself throughout our American history who have in the long run been the true heroes, who have molded the ideals that many Americans still believe in. I am enclosing a copy of a letter expressing my protest against our role in Vietnam which I have sent to two newspapers.

Sincerely,

MRS. JUNE S. RIAVE.

P.S.—I do hope that you will come to Los Angeles to speak on Vietnam—the American people must learn the truth. Would appreciate your sending me copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—containing your speeches on Vietnam. Thank you.

LOS ANGELES TIMES,
LETTERS TO THE EDITOR,
Los Angeles, Calif.:

The U.S. Government would have the American people believe we are fighting for "freedom" in South Vietnam, when actually we are intervening in a civil war. I agree with Senator WAYNE MORSE that the United States has violated the U.N. Charter, making us an outlaw Nation. Are we fighting for American freedom 10,000 miles from home? Are we protecting the people of South Vietnam by consistently supporting a succession of corrupt, repressive, dictator regimes that have never had the support of the people? Reliable sources tell us that the Saigon government has the allegiance of no more than 30 percent of the people. We are not being told the truth about Vietnam. By labeling the Vietcong Communists we overlook the fact that the Vietcong, or properly called the National Liberation Front, is a coalition of many groups, peasants, certain Buddhist sects, the Cambodian minority and ethnic tribes, students, intellectuals, several political parties including the Communists. The NLF has the support of 70 percent of the Vietnamese people. The $10 million that General Khanh boasts about came out of our pockets. We continue this immorality by giving Khanh $1.5 million additional daily to fight a war that even military experts say can't be won. If the United States is a moral Nation, we should be negotiating a peaceful settlement, instead of sending more Americans to be killed, instead of rattling our sabers at China and the whole of southeast Asia, instead of threatening to carry the war into North Vietnam and risking the possibility of a full-fledged nuclear war.

MRS. JUNE RIAVE.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
June 29, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,

DEAR SIR: I want to commend you for the stand you have taken upon the action of our Government in southeast Asia.

It is high time that more of us get behind you and some others who are trying to save the people of the world from atomic war.

I understand you had read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD some disclosures by the magazine "Aviation Week" in regards to a policy attributed to President Johnson.

Would you be able to send me a copy of that number of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—or better, several if you can.

With many thanks.

Very truly yours,

JOHN C. BLAIR.

ITHACA, N.Y.
July 1, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: In a letter to the New York Times today Norman Thomas refers to a critical statement which you made on the floor of the Senate concerning the administration's policy in southeast Asia. I would be grateful if you would send me a copy of this statement.

Mr. Thomas also indicated that your remarks had received little or no publicity. If this is true, do you have any reason to believe that it reflects a deliberate suppression of criticism by our news media?

Sincerely yours,

CHANDLER MORSE.

NEWBURGH, N.Y.,
July 2, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I want to congratulate you for your continuing opposition to the administration's folly in southeast Asia. I agree with you that our present course is heading toward disaster.

However, I find it difficult to follow your statements since the newspapers and radio do not carry your remarks.

Therefore, please send me a copy of your "Bitter and Documented Attack on the Administration's Policy" made in the Senate on June 22, or the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for June 22 if it includes that speech. Thank you.

Yours very truly,

SAVI CLOUGH.

ORINDA, CALIF.,
July 1, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am belatedly writing to thank you for your marvelous and courageous statement on a recent television interview.

It is disheartening to witness our country arming and financially supporting corrupt dictatorships all over the earth in the name of combating communism. It is logically safe to assume from what has gone before, that our bloody and expensive struggle against communism will ultimately triumph in a world without a trace of democracy or even of a breathing, living man. What we are doing makes no sense whatsoever.

I especially fully share your indignation over our illegal war in southeast Asia, where, reportedly, 250,000 Vietnamese have already died since 1954 as a result of our highly efficient techniques of mass murder in a country without modern means of defense or offense except as they capture these from our forces. Here too, it is evident, in the unlikely event that we win the war for "democracy" there will be few natives left alive, outside the well-protected members of the puppet government, to practice it.

To me you represent the best traditions of American statesmanship and character. I wish you health and long life.

I would very much like to have any copies of your recent speeches or copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in which your statements appear. Inasmuch as the press and radio do not give the same coverage to a viewpoint such as yours as is devoted to the congressional rubberstamps, copies of your statements would be useful for circulation among my acquaintances.

Very sincerely,

BENEDICT R. SOBLER.

BOSTON UNIVERSITY,
Boston, Mass., July 3, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I was pleased to hear from a colleague that you have expressed concern over the growing crisis in South Vietnam and Laos.

Unfortunately, I have not heard your statements reported on radio or television, nor read them in the newspapers. I hope you will continue to speak out, and that you will find a larger audience for your comments.

Should our present policies result in war, the moral responsibility would be ours. Please continue to encourage the President to negotiate for a just peace.

Very best wishes,

ROBERT R. SMITH, Ph. D.,
Assistant Professor, Communications.

NEW YORK, N.Y.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I would appreciate your sending me a copy of the speech described in this letter from Norman Thomas. Thank you.

ARTHUR H. KAHN.

ASIAN POLICY ASSAILED—NORMAN THOMAS SAYS HOPE LIES ONLY IN NEGOTIATION

To the EDITOR:

On June 21 you carried an editorial on the situation in southeast Asia which ended: "Military victory is not possible for either side in this struggle, but the danger of a global conflict seems to be advancing with fearful speed."

On the next day in the Senate WAYNE MORSE made a bitter and documented attack on the administration's policy. I didn't see it reported in the Times and he tells me that it seems to be the policy of newspapers, television stations and so forth throughout the country to let the administration lead us to war without reporting important dissent even in the Senate by him and Senator GRUENING. Administration supporters have not yet bothered to answer them.

Like him, I am one of those who believe that "in the State Department and Pentagon are men who think Red China will never be weaker than she is at the present time, and therefore now is the time to finish her off if she resists a U.S. takeover in southeast Asia."

Even in the name of the most righteous anti-communism, it is madness for us to embark on a course that may lead to world war. The world in general would not think us champions of righteousness but of a neo-imperialism, and even if we could and should crush China in a military sense, we would lose.

We cannot thus organize Asia, much less the world, for democracy. We should be accused of white imperialism pretty much around the world. One shudders at the cost we might have to pay in money and in lives. Even if our present threats delay or hinder action by Communist forces, it is nonsense to think that we can get a settlement in Communist Asia, halfway around the world, and hold it simply by military power. Any hope there is lies in negotiation for neutrality. When will the public begin to speak out?

NORMAN THOMAS.

NEW YORK, *June 23, 1964.*

CAMP HILL, PA.,
July 1, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have read in the papers lately that you are in disagreement with our policy concerning South Vietnam. Would you please send me detailed information on how you believe this operation should be conducted? Thank you.

Respectfully,

J. RICHARD GRAY.

MOUNT KISCO, N.Y.,
July 2, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to join those who have applauded you for the series of forceful speeches you have delivered on Vietnam and the entire southeast Asia problem.

Your position is a rather lonely one, but I think that sometime hence when the balanced history of this period is written, and American policy in Vietnam coolly appraised, you will have an honorable place in it, even as those who went against the tide on such occasions as the Mexican war now are deemed to have been closer to the truth than their detractors.

Since the New York Times and most other newspapers do not find much space for your addresses, I have not been able to read your argument as fully as I would like and have been dependent on excerpts and summaries.

If you have available any of your major speeches on Vietnam, I would indeed be grateful to receive them.

Very truly yours,

HUGH DEANE.

UNION, N.J.,
July 2, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Regarding your contention that the southeast Asia problem be turned over to the United Nations, I am in complete agreement.

Would you be kind enough to send me a reprint of your speech regarding this matter.

Thank you.

Respectfully yours,

BERNICE FISCHER.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
July 3, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I read in the New York Times of last Wednesday, July 1, on page 34, "Letters to the Times," in Norman Thomas' letter, "Asian Policy Assailed," that you made "a bitter and documented attack on the administration's policy" (namely in southeast Asia).

In view of the fact that I have been to southeast Asia most of last year and spent considerable time traversing the length and breadth of South Vietnam and as I fully concur with the statements you, Sir, made in the past, I would be keenly interested in reading your utterances of June 22, I believe. Would you therefore be so kind as to let me have two transcripts of your remarks in the Senate as I wish to forward one to a friend of mine while keeping the second one.

Thank you in advance for your kindness.

With all good wishes.

Yours sincerely,

GEORGE H. CORD,
Former Foreign Correspondent.

BROOKLYN, N.Y.,
July 2, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Congratulations on your remarks regarding the Vietnam situation. However, the TV item was brief. I understand you made an address in the Senate on this subject. Could you send me a copy of it? Thanks.

Sincerely,

HENRY SHEMIN.

OAKLAND, CALIF.,
July 1, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I have heard nothing but the most favorable comments about your televised address of last Sunday.

Since I unfortunately missed hearing it, would it be possible to have a copy sent to me—or two. I'm sure that one will be on loan continuously.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES FRANKLIN.

CONGERS, N.Y.,
July 1, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: In a letter published in this morning's New York Times, Norman Thomas states that on June 22 you made a bitter and documented attack on the administration's policy in Vietnam, and that this speech was not covered by the newspapers.

I, too, am growing more and more doubtful of the wisdom of our current policies in Asia. I would appreciate it greatly if I could read a copy of your speech. I am also most interested in knowing if administration supporters have bothered to answer the questions posed by you and Senator GRUENING.

You may be sure that, whatever the best policies are of dealing with communism in southeast Asia or elsewhere, I and most of the people I know recognize that there is nothing sacred about the actions of the United States. When our actions seem to cause the deaths of many Americans and Asians, the rise of governments like the Diem regime, and all the other horrible aspects of the Vietnamese situation, they should be even more open to constant reappraisal by all citizens.

Sincerely,

Larry M. Lawrence.

University of Illinois,
Champaign, Ill., July 1, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: If available for public distribution, I would very much appreciate a copy of your speech on U.S. policy in southeast Asia, made in the Senate on June 22. I have seen no reports of it in the press and would like to read it for myself.

I have always admired your independent thinking.

Sincerely,

Herbert I. Schiller,
Research Associate Professor.

New York Life Insurance Co.,
Houston, Tex., June 29, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator: You appeared on the "Today" show on June 25, 1964. If possible, I would appreciate your sending me a copy of the comments you made on this program.

Best personal regards.

James D. Davidson.

Bar Harbor, Maine,
June 28, 1964.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: I saw you, I think it was last Friday morning, on the "Today" show, and want to congratulate you on your stand on Vietnam. That we should be there, if at all, only to keep the peace, not to make war, and that we should better be acting through the United Nations, seems to me sensible and just. I was glad to see that Senator Church also favored U.N. action.

I am currently chairman of a local Mount Desert Island Committee for Peace which sees as its role the study and propagation of intelligent means of cooperating peaceably with all peoples. Last winter we decided that we did not know enough about the southeast Asia situation and that we should call in someone who could tell us the facts. We tried to set up a public discussion on Vietnam. I wrote to Senator Mansfield, who is a "classmate" and old friend and whom I knew to be something of an expert on that region, for suggestions on speakers. He gave me no specific names, but referred me to the universities of this region. I tried Harvard, Bowdein, Bates, and the University of Maine without finding anyone. I wrote to Ellsworth Bunker, who is also an old friend and whose experience in India as our Ambassador should have given him insight, but I got no answer—he probably never received my letter. We contacted the Quakers, the Turn Toward Peace groups, and others. We turned up no one whom we thought could give us facts. We finally abandoned Vietnam as a subject and settled for South America where I at least have intelligent colleagues. We remain in profound ignorance of what is really going on, and particularly of why we are there. I respect the abilities of Mr. Lodge and Mr. McNamara, but no decent American is going to support wholeheartedly a war entered into by the back door and under the cloak of secrecy.

I shall write to Margaret Chase Smith, from whom I have yet to get a straightforward answer, and to Senator Muskie, who is much more forthright, to heed your voice. And I will write to Mike Mansfield and George Aiken. I wish that you were 30 years younger, and that I could be working beside you.

Cordially and respectfully yours,

Philip R. White.

Hollywood, Calif.,
June 29, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: I read in the newspapers with extreme interest excerpts from your courageous speech concerning our warlike policy in southeast Asia. I have written the President urging him to pursue the course outlined by you. I would very much appreciate receiving a copy of the speech if one is available.

Very truly yours,

Stanley Fleishman.

San Francisco, Calif.,
June 28, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: I wish to add my voice to those who have already expressed serious concern over the deteriorating situation in southeast Asia, where our Government has committed itself to a disastrous policy of unilateral military action and nuclear brinkmanship reminiscent of the era of John Foster Dulles diplomacy. Our commitment to prosecution of the war in South Vietnam, with the imminent possibility of escalation into a nuclear confrontation between East and West, is an unjustifiable violation of the U.N. Charter and the Geneva Agreements of 1954. As you made unmistakeably clear this afternoon on television's "Issues and Answers," we cannot enforce peace in southeast Asia, or anywhere else in the world, if we place ourselves above and outside the jurisdiction of international law. To judge from recent developments in South Vietnam, as well as the statements from Washington and our military command in southeast Asia, it appears that we are prepared to risk an all-out nuclear conflict with China in order to have our way in that part of the world. It is preposterous to speak of freedom and independence for the people of South Vietnam and the rest of southeast Asia, when we are conducting a brutal war of annihilation in which the native population are the victims of napalm, crops contaminated by poisonous chemicals, and villages which are strafed and burned to the ground.

At this time, when American public opinion is bewildered due to misinformation and conflicting reports out of Washington and Saigon, it is vitally important that you (and the courageous minority in Congress, such as Senators Gruening and Mansfield) continue to voice loud and clear your criticisms of present U.S. policy in southeast Asia, until such time as the American Government is shamed into taking a course of action which is honorable and realistic. In your speeches to the Senate, and on such occasions as your appearance on "Issues and Answers" today, you have made an important contribution to political realism, and what I hope to be the beginning of intelligent and open political dialog on our policy in southeast Asia. As in the case of Senator Fulbright's remarkable speech to the Senate on the divergence between myth and reality in foreign policy, I predict your unceasing efforts to arouse the American conscience to the truth about Vietnam, will incur the wrath and indignation of those who have reason to be embarrassed and ashamed for something which is indefensible. In closing, I wish to convey my thanks and admiration for your courage and principles.

Respectfully yours,

Bart Smith.

P.S.—If it is possible, could I trouble you with a request for several copies of the transcript to your views expressed on "Issues and Answers." I would like to send one copy to my father, Richard D. Smith, a great admirer of yours who now lives in Europe. He remembers you from our Oregon days in mid and late forties, when it was his privilege on one occasion to meet and speak to you at the fair. Since then he has followed your career in the Senate with keen interest and pride, and on several occasions (so he has told me) he has communicated with you by letter from Europe. (He has lived in Europe with my mother for the past 11 years, where he works as a safety director. Currently he is the safety director of SETAF, whose headquarters is in Verona, Italy.)

Clearwater, Fla.,
June 30, 1964.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: I was appalled the other day to learn over NBC–TV (Ray Sherer) that you had labeled the President as a "warmonger."

Perhaps this is just another Sherer inaccuracy or worse still, an outright distortion. I would hope so as such a statement can only do irreparable harm to our cause in Florida where we are seriously being challenged by the Republicans come next November. I do hope that you can disavow this opprobrium and will appreciate learning your more temperate views in due course. Perhaps the most incredible part of all this is Senator Church's failure to defend or dilute the assertion by Sherer.

Cordially,

H. B. Qualy.

Omaha, Nebr.,
June 29, 1964.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

My Dear Senator Morse: I am enclosing a copy of the letter I am sending to NBC. It explains itself. I just thought you might be interested to know how some of the public reacted.

Very truly yours,

C. F. Bantin.

Omaha, Nebr.,
June 29, 1964.

Re interview of Mr. Ray Sherer with Senator Morse of Oregon.

National Broadcasting Co.,
New York, N.Y.

Gentlemen: We heard the interview Mr. Sherer had with Senator Morse on the "Today" show June 25. On the "Today" show of the following morning we were dumbfounded to hear Mr. Sherer say that Senator Morse had called the President of the United States a warmonger. This is a very serious accusation to make against a Senator and it could do irreparable damage to a public career if accepted as true by an unsuspecting public. We knew it was entirely untrue.

We have long been aware that Mr. Sherer is one of the reporters or commentators who slants his interviews by using questions that are loaded or slanted, or by sneering inflections of the voice which change the question into a disparaging comment. We concluded, rightly I think, that this was a tactic to put Senator Morse in a very bad light and discredit his views with which, no doubt, Mr. Sherer disagreed.

This morning Mr. Sherer read a letter from Senator Morse and stated that the Senator had not called President Johnson a warmonger. I could detect no sincere feeling of regret or apology on Mr. Sherer's part.

I can see but two possible explanations of this incident. The first is that Mr. Sherer was completely unaware that he had distorted and misquoted what the Senator had said. If this is true he is incompetent and should not have the responsibility of reporting to a nationwide audience.

The second possibility is that Mr. Sherer deliberately and knowingly altered the news, in which case complete dishonesty would be involved.

Neither explanation combined with the weak correction given today—I cannot call it an apology—can excuse such reprehensible tactics to chop down someone Mr. Sherer disagrees with. The incident has the appearance of inexcusable arrogance.

I can assure you that from now on a number of us will question the veracity of Mr. Sherer's statements except for news items which we can corroborate from other reporters on other networks.

I have no connection with Senator MORSE. I do not particularly agree with him, and I know he does not need me to defend him. However, this flagrant violation of honesty in reporting could involve and reflect unfavorably on any Senator, Representative, or private citizen.

I hope this incident will anger enough people in the country that future episodes of the nature here demonstrated will be detected by the public for what they are and be properly resented as foul play.

Very sincerely,
C. F. BANTIN.

HADDAM, CONN.,
July 1, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: It was my good luck to hear most of your discussion Sunday on TV program "Court of Reason" on channel 2 from Boston.

I want to congratulate you on your sensable and realistic position on the Vietnam situation. I cannot understand that "we" as a peace-loving nation have any business in southeast Asia or are some of our military men and others not so peace loving? If there is a problem there it should be handled through the United Nations.

As I did not get to hear the entire discussion on "Court of Reason" is it possible to get a few copies of the discussion? I have some friends that I would like to have read it.

Also, Senator MORSE, your recent remarks in the Senate on this same subject which were printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I would like to have some copies if they are available.

Keep up the fight.

Respectfully yours,
ERNEST F. MCNUTT.

PROVIDENCE, R.I.,
July 1, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: As one who is deeply concerned with our increasing involvement in South Vietnam I would like to thank you for your wise and courageous counsel and in particular for voting against the confirmation of General Taylor as Ambassador to that troubled part of the world. I have two requests to make of you. I would very much appreciate receiving copies of your recent statements on South Vietnam. In addition I would appreciate any suggestions you may have for increasing the visibility of anti-interventionist sentiment. Both Norman Thomas and I. F. Stone have pointed out the distressing fact that our "free press" seems determined to ignore your statements on Vietnam, reporting them seldom if ever. If the counsel of U.S. Senators is systematically suppressed how can the views of those, like myself, who support your position, be made visible?

Sincerely,
ROBERT SEKULER.

HAWTHORNE, CALIF.,
June 28, 1964.

Senator MORSE.

DEAR SENATOR: Heard your interview on the radio today and I certainly agree with your point of view 100 percent. Wish I could get a copy of your interview, also is there anything I can do as an individual to help your cause and viewpoint as far as the public is concerned.

I had a foster son caught in the Chinese trap in North Korea and to say the least am real unhappy with that type of a situation.

Sincerely,
HARRY B. FAY.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
June 24, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Last night, on TV, I saw and heard both you and Senator AIKEN express displeasure at the appointment of General Taylor as Ambassador to South Vietnam.

Though I am not one of your constitutents, I take the liberty of writing to you because you represent my point of view in this matter—and to you rather than Senator AIKEN because I met you once when you were visiting here in my community of Highland Park a few years ago.

It seems to me that the appointment of General Taylor infers a hardening of our pursuit of a military solution for the problems of southeast Asia—and further limits our freedom to choose some other method which could more nearly serve our true national interests in this area.

I understand that you have made some comments on this general subject on the Senate floor and would appreciate a copy of your remarks.

Thanks again for representing my point of view.

Sincerely,
ANNE BINCH.

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR
THE UNITED NATIONS,
June 16, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: The Milwaukee chapter of the American Association for the United Nations is much concerned about U.S. involvement in Vietnam. It is our opinion that the United Nations organization should assume responsibility for peacekeeping activities in Indo-China.

We respectfully request that you use your good office to that end.

Very sincerely yours,
JOHN O. RIEDL,
Chairman, Milwaukee Chapter.

PACIFIC PALISADES, CALIF.,
June 15, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: In view of the actions we have taken in Vietnam and Laos, it is most important that the American people get your point of view on the situation. Most of our TV and radio programs are showing only one side of the story—the present policy.

Your interview on "Face the Nation" was most informative and I feel that you should use your office to obtain time on other major broadcasts to tell the American people the true story of the Vietnam war.

Respectfully yours,
LEAH ROSENBERG.

HARBOR CITY, CALIF.,
June 16, 1964.

Senator MORSE.

DEAR SENATOR: I wish to commend you for your stand about this stupid war that we are engaged in in Vietnam. I can never figure out why after the French were driven out of there why our Defense Department went there to get a lot of Americans killed in a futile war over a country that don't belong to us. Johnson, Stevenson, Rusk and McNamara keep uttering words about the new regime and its merits, and it is not getting anywhere. The State Department encouraged murder there, one of the ignoblest acts ever staged by statesmen. Tell them again to get our boys out of there.

Sincerely yours,
J. E. MCKENZIE.

SANTA MONICA, CALIF.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We feel that the program presented on "Face the Nation" (CBS) be repeated again and again. All stations should show it, because of its timely importance.

Yours truly,
MRS. L. GOODMEN.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
June 15, 1964.

Hon. W. MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: In view of the many TV programs urging our total commitment in Vietnam, I urge you to make your voice heard on other stations, such as the program on "Face the Nation" as of several weeks ago.

Sincerely yours,
NORA SCHACK.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
June 16, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Thanks for your fight to get this country out of southeast Asia where it had no business being in violation of the final declaration of the Geneva Conference to which the United States was supposed to be in accord.

The United States insists it is a Christian, law-abiding nation but after reading of our atrocities in Laos and South Vietnam I would like to know upon what we base that claim.

Insist upon that war being taken to the United Nations, where it belongs, and where this Government is preventing it from being settled.

Thanks again for your efforts, however futile, since I fear you are up against great odds.

Very sincerely,
MRS. ANNE E. O'CONNOR.

SANTA MONICA, CALIF.,
June 15, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Your interview on "Face the Nation," May 31, 1964, on CBS television was so important that we urge you to speak on all the networks. Yours is the only important voice counteracting the many programs which call for extending the war in Vietnam.

Sincerely yours,

LEAHN and DARALEE HALPRIN.

SANTA MONICA, CALIF.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: In regards to your recent CBS "Face the Nation" interview, what can we the agreeable public do to get repeats of your talk. Being so vital a public service it should be repeated on as many other stations as possible. Having written to other major stations, what else can I as one do. Of course I'll advise others of my like hundred friends to request your repeat program. (Many already have.)

Keep up speaking out when and where you can. More agree with you than you know—only not many are writers.

Sincerely,

MRS. IRENE TAX.

FAIRFIELD, CONN.,
July 3, 1964.

Hon. THOMAS J. DODD,
Senate-House Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR DODD: You and your confreres should do something right soon about getting this situation under control and our people pulled out of that rat trap.

Once the general public wakes up to the fact this Vietnam-Laos fiasco is another Korea in the making—which is exactly what it is—one LBJ and some few Members of the present Congress might well find themselves looking for other work come November 3.

The great altruists, who never get into combat, say we can't back out of Vietnam because we will lose "face."

Well, the French pulled out after commiting some 400,000 men over a period of years, and is Mr. DeGaulle's face red? Hardly. He is laughing at us.

After all, what is this word "face"? Is it not a gentle metaphor for "raw power"—or the lack of same?

President Johnson tells us there is no country on this globe we could not completely annihilate 6 or 60 times over in a matter of hours—and they all know it.

So I do not think we need be too much concerned about our "face."

But the Congress had better get desperately concerned about commiting the lives of our children and our grandchildren—and at once.

If this situation has not been cleared before November there is likely to be such a flood of protest votes against all now in office—excepting those who stand with Senator MORSE—as could quite possibly swing the election.

Don't forget, Senator, the women now vote and every mother in this benighted country is violently opposed to any more Koreas.

With them this matter carries an infinitely greater priority than all the sound, fury, and blather the integrationists can stir up. My wife has told me.

You have built up some little prestige in Washington, Senator, and deservedly so.

There will never come a better time for you to exert it.

Most sincerely,

HORACE D. STRONG.

ADA, OKLA.,
July 1, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SENATOR: We heard you answer the issues on "Issues and Answers," June 28, 1964. I'm sure more Oklahomans than our family would like for our allies to join us in our problems in Vietnam. And help keep our plans of the United Nations agreement we made after World War II. Full support would sure be ideal; also, more help in Washington.

Thanks for trying.

JIMMIE JO TAYLOR.

BERKELEY, CALIF.,
July 2, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This letter is to express my deep appreciation of your criticism of our present policy in South Vietnam. I was shocked when I saw the headlines in the paper saying that the President was considering the risk of all-out war in South Vietnam "in the interests of peace." I considered the statement wholly irresponsible and extremely dangerous. But I felt completely frustrated because I could not see anything that I could do to stem this drift toward war with China, except to write a letter to the President, which I have done.

Your statement gave me a ray of hope that sanity would prevail. I live in a university town and I can say that none of my friends favor the policies we are now following. I feel certain that the majority of the people of the United States are with you.

I also want to express my appreciation of your support of the public ownership of the Pacific Northwest-Pacific Southwest extra high-voltage intertie and of your support of the acreage limitation provision of the Reclamation Act.

Sincerely yours,

WALTER E. PACKARD.

MILL VALLEY, CALIF.,
June 29, 1964.

DEAR MR. MORSE: Last night I heard you being interviewed on radio by two ABC newsmen.

I can't tell you how heartened and inspired I was by your stand concerning our policy in Vietnam. I know that you are very busy with your work in the Senate, but I feel that if you could perhaps make your views more available to more people; to talk on television, to somehow reach the people, and let everyone know that there is another road to settle the Vietnam situation, namely through the U.N. and not by the way Mr. McNamara and, unfortunately, President Johnson are doing by involving us deeper and deeper in this war.

Bravo to you. I wish there were more like you in Washington.

Sincerely,

PHILIP FATH.

MONTEREY PARK, CALIF.,
June 30, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to add my voice to yours in support of your sober and enlightening judgment of our policies in southeast Asia.

I wish it were possible for me to assist you in the herculean task of awakening the American people to the dangers inherent in our position. Even on page 6 of the Los Angeles Times your words convey the basic truth—might creates blight.

I wish you good health and a long life, sir.

Sincerely yours,

ISAAC B. SALTERS.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.,
July 2, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE: May I add my little mite?

I appreciate very much your peace efforts. A statement such as L.B.J.'s to the people at Minnesota (I believe) a few days ago hardly fits in with this age of potential mass destruction.

I believe the booby hatch (insane asylum) is the proper place for people who are war brainstorming.

May your and the Alaskan Senator's efforts increase in ratio to the rolling snowball's proportions.

The booby hatch should also include the reactionary Senator GOLDWATER.

Best,

FRANK CHOHA.

LEXINGTON, KY.,
June 25, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: You are so wonderful this morning on the Today show—you are so right and our country is like a mother or father who neglects their children to take off to the more ego rewarding business to let their own family go hungry—uncared for while they do a lot of work for the poor—very rewarding in publicity, etc. I would so love to have a copy of what you said this morning on the Today show. I have no children so that angle is not a worry but if we don't work under the law as a government—why and how can they expect their citizens to do so. If we belong and support the U.N. why don't we use it?

DOROTHY SCHIMPFERING.

NORTH NEWTON, KANS.,
July 1, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I heard you on TV last week, also read about your work in "The Progressive." I agree with you and hope you will continue in your effort.

I have not read anything about your efforts in the Senate in our daily papers but headlines like the one above are not hard to find. These are the kind I do not like.

More power to you.

Sincerely,

SAM REGIER.

WALLA WALLA, WASH.,
June 28, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I have just listened to your questions and answers on the ABC television about the United Nations Charter as it applies to this country.

I am in complete accord with your views and the sooner our Nation gets back to law and order the better it will be for us.

I only wish there was some way we individuals could aid you in your wonderful defense of our great national heritage.

Sincerely yours,

RALPH TAGGART.

OAKLAND, CALIF.,
June 29, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Although I am not a constituent of yours, I wish to thank you for expressing your views on South Vietnam. I agree with you wholeheartedly, word for word. If I were a citizen of Oregon I'd work day and night to keep you in office. We need men like you.

You are one of the real statesmen we have in Congress today. Most of them are political hacks.

Good luck to you.

MRS. FREDA L. HANSEN.

GREAT BEND, KANS.,
July 2, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We heard your interview on the "Today" show, last week, and want to commend you for your stand on Vietnam. As Korea and every place else on the globe, we are sending our boys to be slaughtered.

We have no business in Vietnam, Laos, etc. Our CIA goes in and stirs up a civil war and we follow up with our boys and more money.

If you want to do our country a big favor, why don't you go on TV some evening and tell what you told that morning and all the rest you know, when you have more air time and you can enlighten more people as to what really is going on there. I also think a lot of it is to help the Catholics—Kennedy was the one who sent in the first Americans, who divided Vietnam into North and South. Why isn't Johnson impeached? Where does the Constitution give him the power to involve us in war, thousands of miles from here and on people who have done nothing to us? Let these people take their quarrels to the U.N.

We never suggest countries take their troubles to the U.N. Our smart—they think—men in Washington send our boys all over the world where we have no business. Any two-bit ruler can ask for our troops and money and we send them. Why? They say, "We will keep our commitments." Just what darn fool gave all those promises? Isn't it about time for whoever did it to lose face, instead of us, our boys?

It's time we had a President and Congress who are for America. England stopped her draft in 1957. They use us like we still were her slaves.

Get our boys and money home. More power to you. Tell us more.

Yours respectfully,

MRS. N. CAMPBELL.

SAN ANTONIO, TEX.,
June 30, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senator from Oregon,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am enclosing a clipping from yesterday's newspaper—and I beg of you to give this article some notice and publicity in the Congress.

I have a son engaged in the fighting in Vietnam and a husband who will surely be going soon if this war continues. There are many, many more wives and mothers like myself who are vitally concerned over the lack of any apparent concern in Washington over this situation.

Unless Congress becomes concerned enough to force the present administration into doing something about Vietnam there may not only not be a Democratic administration after November, but a great many Members of Congress may find themselves without jobs before too much longer. The American public is finally becoming aroused over Vietnam and will demand that some steps be taken to end this war—one way or another.

We are fully aware that Congress does not make foreign policy, but on the other hand our representatives should be the conscience of this country—and many of them seem to have forgotten that they even have a conscience in this election year.

Again, I respectfully request you take some action to bring this to the attention of your fellow Members of Congress.

Sincerely,

MR. ROBERT L. GOLTZ.

HENRY J. TAYLOR WRITES

"I think the military situation is coming along fine now," Gen. Paul D. Harkins stated June 22 on his return to Washington from command in South Vietnam. This was apostasy, tragic to observe.

Fine. That's Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara's line. And it's utterly heartbreaking to see a distinguished officer peddling that kind of pap under McNamara's censoring eye. God help us. This is what happened to the prewar armed forces in France.

Any of about 16,000 Americans in South Vietnam could tell you how fine the situation is. Our entire position is just a long, drawn-out Bay of Pigs all over again.

In another sense—an even more basic sense—the truth about a war is known only to a soldier under the gun, there or anywhere, ever.

It's easy to confuse morale with a desire to fight. I've never known one soldier in a thousand who wants to fight. Most fight for a dozen other reasons combined; but oh, no, not that one. Along with hunger, fear is a universal emotion. It has nothing to do with bravery. Anybody with any sense is afraid. Fine? Nothing's fine when you're getting shot at.

NOTHING'S FINE IN COMBAT

Nothing's fine when you start to count the missing and the dead, and you do not know how it could happen that one of them is not you.

Nothing's fine when the road blows up and your eyes go blind because something smashed them closed. You're afraid to open them, because you may not be able to see. Or it's pitch dark anyway and your face—do you still have a face?—is flat down in the mud.

Nothing's fine when you hear a sharp, hard ping—a single shot—and you feel the man next to you in a jeep or helicopter suddenly strain his body against yours. A moment ago he was your friend. Now he is dead.

He is lost, to everyone who loved him, and to the world. He will never see morning again, write a letter, or sing a song. He has no hope and any hope of this world in him is gone forever.

It's easy to discuss the problem of war—in South Vietnam, Laos, anywhere. But this is different and it is the essence of war. One man. Men in their prime, dying one by one.

WHAT IKE TOLD ERNIE PYLE

General Eisenhower once said in a letter to Ernie Pyle: "I get so eternally tired of the general lack of understanding of what the frontline soldier endures—the acceptance of unendurable conditions—that I become completely inarticulate." Or listen to Ernie Pyle himself.

We were in Italy. An infantry column was coming out of battle. All ranks were 50 feet apart, for dispersal. So were Ernie and I. The wounded were lying with the dead because the Germans had shot our litter bearers when they stood up and walked over to get them. That night this is what Ernie wrote:

"The line moves on but it never ends. All afternoon men kept coming around the hill and vanishing eventually over the horizon. There is agony in your heart * * *. The sag of their bodies speaks their in human exhaustion * * *. They're just guys from Brooklyn and Main Street, but you wouldn't remember them if you saw them * * *. Their world can never be known to you."

Each day in South Vietnam armed Americans die quietly, tragically, unknowingly, obediently.

THE U.S. DEFEATED AGAIN

Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, who personally takes over in South Vietnam now, recently admitted to the Armed Forces Subcommittee that we control nothing there. "We command nothing," he agreed. Fine? As at the Bay of Pigs and the giveaway at Laos, the United States is defeated again. But not a noisy debacle, mind you, nothing noisily noticeable. General Taylor's task is to see that the collapse stops short of that.

On June 24 able Washington insider James Reston wrote in the New York Times: "This administration is not prepared to accept any spectacular defeat in South Vietnam, particularly in an election year."

In short, Americans are just to die quietly, tragically, unknowingly, obediently—while nobody rocks the political boat until November.

Isn't there anything—anything, anything, anything—that can bring conscience into politics?

WALNUT CREEK, CALIF.,
June 29, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am writing this letter in response to the comments you made about our unilateral actions in South Vietnam which I heard on a recent ABC radio program. No doubt you will receive very few letters applauding your stand. This is one of them.

I am very encouraged about the fate of mankind when I hear a Senator make the appeals to reasons that you did. A world of law is our announced goal, and we should live up to our professed beliefs.

You have my complete support in your efforts to return the United States to the community of civilized nations, and make the world truly safe for humanity.

Thank you,

DALIEL LEITE.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
July 2, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I would like to strongly commend and congratulate you on the responsible attitude you took with regard to the South Vietnam problem. I fully sympathize with your position and urge you not to give up your efforts for a reasonable solution ending the war in that unfortunate area, and consequently, U.S. participation in it, as fast as possible.

Considering the desperate situation in South Vietnam and the danger of the United States getting involved in a major war as a result of previous irresponsible policies, I wish that more of your colleagues would start following your example.

Sincerely,

INGERORG D. KILKER.

FONTHILL, ONT.,
June 28, 1964.

Senator W. MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Having just listened to your broadcast on "Questions and Answers," I felt that I would like to express my thanks for renewing the faith we have had in the officials of the U.S. Government. I'm sure this personal feeling of mine appiles personally to many of my fellow Canadians. In recent years sometimes there has been a small doubt creeping in as to whether anyone in power could ever possibly admit any mistakes in their policies but having heard you speaking so outwardly and sincerely on the television show I have mentioned, once again we have every faith in your powerful Nation.

Yours sincerely,

MRS. M. COLEMAN.

THE THACHER SCHOOL,
Ojai, Calif., July 1, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: I admire your courage in speaking so eloquently in support of your convictions. I heard you on the "Today" show, and have since read your speeches in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. As a teacher I support your determination to call to the attention of the American people the grave dangers we face in southeast Asia today.

But if this is the Democratic administration's policy, how can one voice his opposition at the polls come November?

Sincerely,

M. H. SHAGAM.

SAN ANSELMO, CALIF.,
June 25, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Our thanks to you for such a fine statement on American policy in Vietnam that we heard on the NBC "Today" show.

Your arguments were given with the same kind of political fervor that ordinarily can only be heard on the far right. We were glad to hear a Member of the Senate apply this same spirit in the cause of the integrity of the United States and in the cause of peace.

Very truly yours,

MRS. JULIE MATHEW.

VAN NUYS, CALIF.,
July 2, 1964.

The Honorable Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have been following your remarks on the southeast Asia question during the past 10 days. You have the leadership on the stateman's approach to the whole question.

As I just wrote to Senator GRUENING, Red China is a problem but it will be better solved in debate, face to face—not only with mainland China but face to face with the whole world. We must "solve" the problem with clean hands. The days of 1898 must not be repeated in another area of the world.

I see some (like the Luce people in Fortune) are thinking of dividing China between Russia and the United States—Russia to have hegemony over northern and the United States to have hegemony over the southern area under, I presume, Chiang Ching-kuo. This is the same old cul-de-sac thinking and action.

I wish you were heading a third party to light a fire under both the old ones.

Respectfully,

DONALD R. PRISMON,
Associate Professor, American History.

ANAHEIM, CALIF.,
July 1, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

SENATOR: Regarding your stand on South Vietnam and Laos, a man who can keep his head while all those around him are losing theirs, is a man.

It may be you are ahead of the times; evolution hasn't caught up with you; sometimes you seem like a man among apes.

I've known for many years that you would be a good man for President, however if you can somehow straighten Johnson out on his foreign policy, etc., it would be the next best thing to being President yourself, and possibly then Johnson might become a great President.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT AUCHARD.

CHICAGO, ILL.,
July 3, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have always had a great deal of admiration for your independence of thought and action which fortunately was constructive and liberal, and after seeing and hearing you on the TV program, "Issues and Answers," on June 28, my admiration multiplied, for you faced many issues fairly and squarely and gave answers to questions which many of our political leaders avoid and evade.

May you continue to be given strength and health to continue representing the people of the United States in so fair a manner for many years to come.

Sincerely yours,

HYMAN REZNICK.

[Reprinted from the Plain Dealer, June 18, 1964]

AN OPEN LETTER TO THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE—NEEDED: AN APPROACH TO END THE WAR IN VIETNAM

The United States is a foreign party to a civil war in Vietnam. Fifteen thousand U.S. uniformed personnel have been committed to the battle. Casualties include American soldiers.

Acceleration of the American war effort in South Vietnam invites increased aid by China to the Communist Vietnamese. Stepping up the war effort risks the use by either side of nuclear arms. Nuclear war offers no victory. What is the alternative?

Negotiation is urged by Senator Wayne Morse, Senator Ernest Gruening, Columnist Walter Lippmann, and others. Recognizing it takes both sides to make peace, we urge our Government to initiate a conference of nations to guarantee a neutral Vietnam. We support U.S. efforts to insure enforcement of agreements. The United Nations can assist direct negotiation. Inspection teams must be free to operate wherever needed. They can be backed by frontier patrols.

The best guarantee of enforcement is the mutual advantage of the agreement. The goal is a Vietnam whose independence is guaranteed and respected.

Robert R. Archer, Professor; Raymond S. Beard, Business Counselor; Marguerite S. Bellamy, Housewife; Keith C. Billman, Social Worker; Evelyn A. Blackburn, Insurance Agent; Isabel N. Bliss, Homemaker; William M. Bliss, Engineer; Edith O. Brashares, College Instructor; Edwin A. Brown, Minister; Rilma Buckman, Sociologist; Bronson P. Clark, Businessman; Sheldon D. Clark, Lawyer; Lila Cornell, Homemaker; Marie F. Cotton, Homemaker; Wendell P. Cotton, Salesman; Natalie C. Crouter, Housewife; Elfrieda S. Dalber, Secretary; Alan J. Davis, Minister; Hortense M. Davis, Teacher; Jack G. Day, Lawyer; Steven Deutsch, University Faculty; Mort Epstein, Designer; Gail R. Gann, Homemaker; Donald S. Gann, Surgeon; Joel M. Garver, Lawyer; Paul Gitlin, Social Worker; Henry Gluck, Psychologist; William F. Hellmuth, Jr., Professor; Arnold A. Herzog, Lawyer; Fred Husa, Office Worker; Sidney D. Josephs, Businessman; Mrs. Harry Kirtz, Homemaker; Waldo H. Kliever, Consultant; Dennis G. Kuby, Minister; Jerome Landfield, College Professor; Ada N. Leffingwell, Homemaker; George Levinger, Educator; John P. Marhevka, Male Hair Stylist; Mrs. Edward A. Marshall, Homemaker; Charles R. Miller, Lawyer; Paul I. Miller, Professor; Hans F. Mueller, Retired; Laura Mueller, Homemaker; Sarah B. Nenner, Housewife; James M. Newman, Advertising; Paul Olynyk, Professor; Clyde Onyett, Public Relations; William W. Outland, Order Analyst; Samuel Prellwitz, Industrial Research; Harold J. Quigley, Minister; Willard C. Richan, Educator; Eldon P. Roe, Merchant; Marian Rosenberg, Social Worker; Ralph Rudd, Lawyer; Audrey Sabadosh, Librarian; Nicholas Sabadosh, Teacher; Wilmer L. Satterthwait, Painter; Vera A. Schwartz, Legal Secretary; A. L. Sherwin, Lawyer; Frank Spigel, Lawyer; Benjamin Spock, Physician; Sam Sponseller, Retired; Vera Smisek, Teacher; Oscar H. Steiner, Businessman; Helen Stewart, High School Counselor; Edward A. Taubert, Photographer; Warren E. Thompson, Educator; Hugh Tyson, Graduate Student; Harry O. Way, Bacteriologist.

BEDFORD, OHIO,
June 2, 1964.

The HONORABLE WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senator from Oregon,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Enclosed is reprint of three-quarter page advertisement-statement which appeared in the Cleveland Plain Dealer the day the U.S. State Department had a foreign policy briefing session here.

It made a stir, as you will note from the report to the ad sponsors, also enclosed.

From Mr. Sullivan and Secretary Dean Rusk I gather it is U.S. policy to continue fighting until South Vietnam is established by defeating the guerilla forces, then offer to negotiate on the premise there is to be a separate South Vietnam.

Since Ho Chi-Minh has been fighting for 18 years or more for a united Vietnam there is an obvious deadlock. I see no justification for continuing a war, with resulting loss of American and Vietnamese life, which would have ended years ago but for American intervention.

The support of the ad sponsors of yourself is self-evident. We hope in some small measure to show Americans that our policy should be negotiation now on the ground rules for determination of the political future of Vietnam—not what it must be.

Sincerely,

SHELDON D. CLARK.

REPUBLIC OF INDONESIA,
June 29, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I have just listened to an interview with you by the press over Voice of America—Philippines United States Armed Forces Radio.

I wanted to write and express my complete agreement with you and to urge you to extend every influence possible to influence the American foreign policy in Vietnam along the peace-oriented lines drawn out in this interview.

I say this as a registered Democrat and normally supporter of Johnson.

Respectfully,

REV. PAUL PEDERSEN.

CHICAGO, ILL.,
July 2, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: It was my good fortune to have heard your speech on TV on the "Today" show. It was a magnificent speech. I wish that every adult American could have heard it.

This is being dictated immediately after I heard your speech. It will not get typed for several days, owing to circumstances that I am unable to change, but the sentiments will not change in the meantime.

With very best wishes, I am

Sincerely and very respectfuly yours,

JAMES H. HUTTON, M.D.

BOSTON, MASS.,
June 27, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MORSE: Each day people are being killed in Vietnam, and when people are killed there should be a very compelling justification for it. I can see none in this case. It is obvious where the sympathies of the Vietnamese people lie. They are not interested in dying for an oligarchy possibly created and certianly maintained by an alien power. The right of a people to self-determination is meaningless if we feel free to abrogate it whenever they disagree with our idea of what is best for them.

The United States places a high value on liberty and life at home. It is ironic that we should be so callous abroad. We should admit our mistakes instead of compounding them, and attempt to negotiate toward a neutral Vietnamese Government that enjoys the support and reflects the will of its people. A powerful nation saving face is not worth the life of a single human being. The spectacle would be ridiculous if it were not also cruel.

If, as I suspect, the President is indeed postponing a decision on this until after the election—thus allowing the slaughter to continue at its present pace—I would find it difficult to vote for one so calculatingly cold-blooded.

Sincerely yours,

MARCIA ANGELL ROTT.

DETROIT, MICH.,
June 29, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am sending this letter to you to offer my sincere thanks for your courageous and forthright television presentation of the Vietnam issue yesterday afternoon. Our war in Vietnam is an example of how tragically blind and inept American statesmanship, which in recent years has brought us to this pass, has been. The French were bold enough to pull out of this deadly quagmire, only for us with more remote interests to step in.

You have done a public service to spotlight our disregard of SEATO commitments and our bypassing of U.N. in this dread emergency. Your appeal for honesty and legality in dealing with this problem, and your castigation of hypocritical and misleading doubletalk with reference thereto, offer us the best that has yet happened.

Again I thank you for your leadership in coming to grips with this situation.

Sincerely yours,

SAMUEL M. LEVIN,
Professor Emeritus of Economics,
Wayne State University.

TUCSON, ARIZ.,
June 29, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: It is gratifying to learn of your recent pronouncements regarding the U.S. involvement in southeast Asia. All of the controversy on this issue that is allowed to appear in the press centers over whether we should step up the war or simply continue it at its present pace, and it is indeed rare to hear expressed the view that we have no business there altogether—a view which, we believe, has considerable support among a large segment of the American people, but which up till recently has lacked a spokesman.

There are all too few public figures today willing to speak out on unpopular issues, and we are always thrilled to see you often fighting off the entire Senate—your one-man filibuster against the communications satellite bill, on which your colleagues were for once quite ready to vote for cloture, is a worthy argument in favor of unlimited debate, despite the fact that the procedure is generally used for far less worthy causes.

Keep up the good work. Only with envy and embarrassment can we compare Oregon's delegation in the U.S. Senate with our own.

Dr. RONALD JACOBOWITZ.
Mrs. ADA R. JACOBOWITZ.

BOSTON, MASS.,
June 29, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MORSE: I believe we all see things you do and admire you so much for all you have the courage to say. Especially in these days when so much needs to be said and so few have the courage to say them.

Mrs. ALICE HORNBY.

P.S.—I once attended summer school at University of Oregon and taught history of art in California college. I was a friend of Bob La Follette for years and visit Mary in Washington, and I know you were a friend of theirs. I admired Bob so much.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
May 18, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Am so thankful for your fight to withhold troops from Vietnam.

Have written to President Johnson and Senator KUCHEL, of California, urging them to do same.

Yours with gratitude,

PATRICIA WERTHIMER.

WATERVLIET, N.Y.,
June 29, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: For some time I have been concerned about our foreign policy in the world and especially in southeast Asia. It was a pleasure to hear and see you on television on Sunday, June 29, at 1:30 to 2 on ABC news on the "Issues and Answers" program.

I agree with you in your belief that two wrongs do not make a right and that war solves no problems but creates them, also that the United States ought to pursue a policy of peace and not a brink of war policy. As a professor of philosophy I found your arguments to be both consistent and cogent.

Yours truly,

ALEX HETKO.

MILWAUKEE, WIS.,
June 28, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: You are our only great hope today as we are surely inching along toward world war III. Your pronouncement of emphasizing principle as the basis of conduct in the Far East is something that the uninformed and ill-informed alike may understand. How can President Johnson be made to see the light and the danger of his policy? With the recent revelations of the CIA and Pentagon more enlightenment may come. How far are these men going because of their idea prosperity depends upon the vast heavy industry deals? To have such courage as yours expressed comes only by once in a decade, but with your spiritual development, you know that you will be the beneficiary through all eternity, with deep appreciation.

ANNETTE ROBERTS.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
June 29, 1964.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: My husband and I heard you on a KABC program called "Issues and Answers" yesterday afternoon and we don't know when we've heard such a marvelous broadcast. It was thrilling to hear someone tell the truth about our activities in Vietnam. I just want you to know we agree with everything you said and hope there are more people with us.

What can we as citizens do about this? This morning the Times carried President Johnson's speech about being willing to go to war over this situation. Nobody asks the people any more. We're not willing to fight but we seem to have no voice any more.

Perhaps, if you'll keep speaking for us, we may see some sanity.

Sincerely,

JOE and CLARE GLOVER.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
June 29, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: This is to express in strongest terms a protest against continuing and escalating military action on our part in Vietnam and related area; also the replacement of diplomatic representation with military representation.

Instead it is to urge in strongest possible terms that we lead out in seeking solution through multilateral diplomatic action and work toward U.N. collaboration.

Our present napalm orgy is hardly favorable to our place in the coming decade of trade. You note that this is written from the Pacific Coast where, in spite of the dust kicked up by the ultraminded, there are those who view with concern the fact the European and Latin American countries are not interested in our fracas, but in building up practical trade relations.

In my own instance, this concern keen though it is, is secondary to my very great revulsion at the spectacle of torture which we inflict on thousands of homes and families in order to support for political reasons decadent potentates who obviously are repudiated by their people. I find it very difficult to reconcile this with the humanity which you proclaim.

Sincerely,

C. V. STURGES.

HOLLYWOOD, CALIF.,
June 27, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

Senator MORSE: Thank you for answering the issues with the strong voice of reason, this Sunday on ABC.

Let us hope that after election year emotionalism and hysteria, more hearts and minds will become open and convinced.

Do carry on with the same clarity of presentation, honesty, and courage. May your voice of dissent soon become the rule rather than an exception.

We are with you,

YORAM KAHANA.

VANCEBURG, KY.,
June 27, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: You are right on our foreign policy. No use to fight communism 5,000 miles away, when we are losing good men for nothing. If the administration must fight communism, which I am in favor of, we could do it 90 miles from home. I am sending you a clipping out of Louisville paper. Please read it, and please cut foreign aid more.

Respectfully yours,

ALLEN G. RAE.

P.S.—If you ever have the chance, ask Mr. Lodge why he really quit his post in Saigon. If you do, be sure and watch his reaction close. Of course, he may be a very good poker player. Do not take your time to answer this.

Thank you.

A.G.R.

[From the Louisville Courier-Journal
June 28, 1964]

EXPERTS ARE WORRIED: WESTERN EUROPE SUFFERING ACUTE ATTACK OF PROSPERITY

(By Carl Hartman)

BONN, GERMANY.—Western Europe is suffering from an acute attack of prosperity.

People are earning a lot more money than they used to, and they're not having to work so hard to get it. So they're spending it with an abandon that has the experts worried.

Unemployment has just about disappeared except in Italy. Even in Italy there are many places where labor is short, in part because high pay in other countries has drained away skilled hands.

MILLION GO TO GERMANY

Almost a million foreign workers have come to West Germany, and many thousands to Switzerland and France. They come not only from Italy and Spain, but from Turkey and Greece and even a few from Yugoslavia.

In Wolfsburg, home of the Volkswagen, 5,000 young Italian workmen are living three to a room in rows of neat wooden barracks. A good deal of the money they get is sent home—and helps bid up the prices of Italian goods.

In West Germany and France, thousands of good jobs go begging for want of applicants.

The experts call this overemployment and say it results in excess demand. The ordinary European finds such terms hard to understand. To him things look pretty good: Wages high, jobs easy to get, plenty of goods in the shops.

The businessman never has had so many customers, with so much money in their pockets.

FARMERS DO LESS WELL

Farmers are doing less well than the rest of the population despite hefty Government subsidies. Wages are so good and farm prospects so relatively bleak that large numbers of farmers have found industrial jobs.

But they are not moving to town fast enough to satisfy the need of factories for labor. That's one reason industrial wages keep going up.

High wages mean high prices—especially in Italy where the law says price increases must bring wage increases as well. The result is that the Italian economy is getting as hot and breathless as a puppy chasing its tail on a summer afternoon in Capri.

It's Italy, the experts say, where inflation is at its worst, although there has also been a wage explosion recently in Holland.

EASY TO UNDERSTAND

From the human viewpoint it's easy to understand. Italy has long been a poor country, with the average workman earning only half as much as his counterpart in France or Britain, and only a fifth what the average American makes. Unemployment is traditionally high and families are large.

Between 1958 and 1963, national income in the European Common Market countries rose by half, and in Italy it increased by nearly two-thirds. A lot of the money went into food, but more and more into TV sets and refrigerators.

In 1960, only 1 Italian in 25 had a car. In 1963 it was 1 in 13.

The result, say economists, is that not enough is being saved for investment in new plant to increase production in years to come. This they find highly dangerous.

ITALY RUNS TRADE DEFICIT

They are worried that the Italians are buying so much goods abroad that they are not able to export enough to pay for them. Recently the United States had to come to the rescue and advanced a billion dollars to help the Italians out of this particular hole.

France and, to a lesser extent, Holland and Belgium have also been hit by this kind of inflation. Up to now, West Germany has been able to avoid it. Wages here have gone up but production has kept in step and prices have held steady.

They have held so steady, in fact, that West German firms are filling their books with French and Italian orders. Such trading is favored by the gradual disappearance of the tariff wall between Common Market countries. The big and growing demand for German goods tends to raise prices at home. Inflation can be catching.

GERMAN RAISES SOUGHT

West German labor unions are coming up this fall with some wage demands to meet the price rises. If they get them, stable prices will be seriously threatend in West Germany, too.

The experts say they have a remedy, hard and unspectacular but effective. It's called holding the line, and the West Germans have shown its effectiveness up to now on a national scale. The calculation is that every year roughly 5 percent more goods are produced, so a 5-percent increase in wages and Government spending is also permissible. But no more.

In principle there is agreement on this by the governments of the Common Market countries: France, Italy, West Germany, Holland, Belgium, and Luxembourg. It's often a long way between principle and practice. Practice in this case might mean strikes and unemployment. It would certainly mean the postponement of badly wanted schools, houses, and roads.

The agreement was made in April. The governments are due to report in July how well they are keeping their promise.

OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLA.,
June 28, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have just listened to your interview on "Issues and Answers." Congratulations.

I wish we had more leaders like you in this United States. Keep up the good work.

Sincerely,
MRS. M. L. ADAMS.

STEINER, ROUSE & CO.,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR SENATOR: Please accept my most sincere congratulations on your outspoken views on our foreign policy.

I applaud your courage and your insight. Thanks in behalf of all straight-thinking Americans.

Very sincerely,
SIDNEY ROSNER.

LITTLE COMPTON, R.I.,
June 28, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Oregon Democrat,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Today I had the pleasure to hear you verify my very thoughts on the Far Eastern situation in which, until I heard you speak, I had felt so much alone. For some time past, I have felt the big brass in the Pentagon has been gradually preparing the public to not feel surprised when we again go to war. I do not mean to imply that this is done with that intention, but because of their way of thinking. And there are many "Goldwaters," and so few have read the "Passion of the Hawks," by Tristram Coffin, Congressional Catalog Card No. 63–1528. I feel you will understand my feelings, when I tell you, in the 74 years I have had time to ponder, brought up seven children, five sons at sea, all during the last war. It will be men of reason like yourself that can guide us through the troubled days ahead.

With best wishes and great respect.

ROBERT W. GRICE,
Member, Democratic Town Council.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have read quite a bit about what you have to say about Vietnam, in I. F. Stone's Weekly. I admire your outspoken and farseeing views on this grave situation. I have written the President that I am against his policy and do not intend voting for him, although I am a Democrat, unless he changes. I am very much afraid of the outcome. So, sir, keep on fighting against war; there will only be losses. I also read "Overkill."

Sincerely,
LETTY SPOCK.
PONTIAC, MICH.

SAN FRANCISCO WOMEN FOR PEACE,
San Francisco, Calif., June 20, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We were shocked to read in our newspapers that U.S. jet fighters armed with rockets and bombs have been attacking positions on the Plain des Jars in Laos. This is especially distressing in the face of repeated denials—the most recent last week—that the United States is using jet aircraft for military action in Laos or Vietnam. We fervently hope that this report of U.S. armed military participation in southeast Asia does not indicate that a repetition of the Bay of Pigs incident is imminent. As at that time, we fear another belated public admission that U.S. policy is being made by the CIA and the secret government, not by the State Department.

We were even more deeply shocked and dismayed to learn that a general has been appointed to the delegate post of Ambassador in this most troubled spot. Again we urge that you take every possible step to end U.S. armed intervention in southeast Asia, beginning with the dismantling of the Danang Air Force Base, and that you use your good offices to bring peace to this area.

Sincerely,
MRS. GLORIA FELDMAN,
Chairman.

(Copies of this letter are being sent also to Senators William Fulbright, Thomas Kuchel, Clair Engle, Congressman Philip Burton, and Secretary of State Dean Rusk, as well as President Lyndon B. Johnson.)

CHICAGO, ILL.,
June 29, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I think your views on the war in Vietnam are a valuable contribution, and I hope they will have some effect.

Yours truly,
SAMUEL D. LIPTON, M.D.

DETROIT, MICH.,
June 28, 1964.

OUR BELOVED SENATOR MORSE: Thank you kindly for your wonderful answers on TV "Today." If only we had more men like you in Washington how different the opinion of the world would be toward our United States of America.

Thank you again. Please keep up the good work.

Very gratefully,
VALERIA KLEK.

THE UNIVERSAL EXCHANGE,
Orlando, Fla., June 28, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senator, Oregon,
Washington, D.C.

God bless you, sir. Thank you for the straightforward statements you made to us via television today.

You said that these issues must be taken to the people, and the people must be heard.

Will you speak at meetings throughout the Nation to accomplish these purposes?

As you know I have been trying for years to arouse the people to work for universal prosperity and peace.

I cannot attract an audience to public meetings, nor even get space in the newspapers and time on radio and television to announce my meetings.

I am sure your name and your message will draw tremendous audiences.

The friendship room of the First Federal Savings & Loan Association, Orlando, is available to me for Saturday afternoon, July 25, if you will speak.

Thank you,

JAY CRESWELL, Sr.,
Cotrustee.

[From the New Statesman, June 26, 1964]

A CRUEL AND NASTY WAR

How seriously should we take last weekend's threats of American military action to "restore" the situation in southeast Asia? Gen. Maxwell Taylor's appointment to replace Ambassador Lodge will strengthen the military setup in South Vietnam, but gives nothing to the hotheads; and President Johnson went out of his way in announcing the appointment to emphasize that he was not contemplating an extension of the war. On the other hand, the deep, background briefing on which most of the Washington correspondents based their reports of renewed American toughness seems to have originated with Secretary Rusk in person. It is thus clear that the administration means this further final warning to impress outsiders with the threat of interdiction by American bombers. It may still be bluff—directed, perhaps, as much to Messrs. Goldwater and Nixon as to Mao Tse-tung and Ho Chi Minh. Even so, the domestic device of trying to outbid GOLDWATER's lunacy is self-defeating.

The truth is that American policy in Laos and South Vietnam is now in a disastrous situation. In Laos Communist control extends over four-fifths of the country; in South Vietnam the military situation is on paper a shade less disastrous, but all the evidence suggests that, outside one or two anti-Communist fortresses, most of the suffering population would prefer to settle for the hardships of a regimented peace under the Vietcong than prolong the misery of war and corruption under General Khanh. If this is true, what would be the end of aggressive American air intervention? The bombing of Hanoi and the Vietcong supply lines would greatly increase the prospect of a direct United States-China confrontation—and it would be imprudent to suppose that the Russians could remain indifferent to that. It would also harden non-Communist opinion in the whole of Asia against the United States. Moreover it would almost certainly be ineffectual. The Pathet Lao and the Vietcong are guerrilla fighters and they will go on fighting, hampered but not suppressed by interrupted supply lines, until either the Chinese call them off or the populations of Laos and South Vietnam find an alternative which inspires their resistance. The intervention of American bombers in this situation could do nothing to change it fundamentally, and any effect it had would be at a heavy—even unacceptable—political price.

There are in fact only two serious options open to President Johnson. He can, if this is what he wishes, claim the Indochinese Peninsula as vital to American security and send in troops to conquer it. Such an operation might be successful in the end and at a cost. But it would be a lengthy, difficult campaign and it would have to finish with a long-term American occupation. To almost the whole of world opinion outside the United States, it would seem both senseless and immoral and it would command little or no support from any of America's major allies, including Britain.

Moreover, when the full cost in men and material was understood by the American public, the war weariness which led to the end even of the Korean war would be aggravated by a sense of shame and exasperation at the futility of an operation which failed to distinguish between vital interests—India, for instance, or Berlin—and mere political prestige. If the President is not prepared to recommend this, the alternative remains a settlement by negotiation—a settlement which must include the Chinese and which must in the long run involve the abandonment of 10 years of disastrous American policy. Unpalatable? Certainly. But, as President Kennedy bravely told his people a year ago, not even they can expect an American solution to every world problem—and the alternative (as the French found to their cost) would be worse.

The Johnson administration now faces a test of statesmanship. Clearly negotiation with the Chinese and the North Vietnamese is impracticable before the election. But, short of an all-out war, it must come soon. The President's best course now would be to follow the advice which Secretary McNamara is believed to be offering—to concentrate on defending what is left of Saigon-controlled Vietnam and the line of the Mekong River, meeting Communist attacks with no more than equivalent force. That situation would be militarily and politically uncomfortable, but, in the short term, not impossible. It is the only course which leaves the door open for serious negotiation later, to end what Walter Lippmann has bluntly called a cruel and nasty war that has no visible end. The alternatives are escalation or humiliation.

MILWAUKEE, WIS.,
June 29, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Until I heard you on "Issues and Answers" yesterday I was in complete despair and I cried out to myself, Isn't there one voice to be heard?

Re Taylor as Ambassador to Vietnam: I came to Washington in May to lobby with W.I.L. on Vietnam. We got to important people in State Department. I'll come again if you think it will help.

MRS. J. MARTIN KLOTSCHE.

[From the Washington Post]

NEUTRAL INDOCHINA STILL A BUFFER—ASIA SCHOLAR ARGUES THAT PEIPING ONLY WANTS A QUIET BORDER

(NOTE.—Two weeks ago in this section, Prof. Wesley R. Fishel, of Michigan State University, wrote that the United States could neither withdraw from former Indochina nor allow it to be neutralized. Our only choice, he argued, was to "stay and fight." Here is a differing opinion on what our policy should be, written by an associate professor of sociology and a staff member of the Institute of War and Peace Studies at Columbia University. Amitai Etzioni is also the author of "Winning Without War," recently published by Doubleday.)

(By Amitai Etzioni)

In the last few weeks, the United States has again escalated the war in southeast Asia by strafing pro-Communist positions in Laos with rockets which hit, among other targets, a Chinese mission.

Like previous escalations, this one did not bring us an inch closer to winning the war; guerrilla wars are never won from the air. Like previous escalations, it involved us more deeply in a war that continually costs more lives and resources. This involvement, in effect, has given Communist China the option to decide if and when to turn this war into a Korean-type confrontation.

If tomorrow, China were to match our thousands of "advisers," our mass supply of modern weapons and our aerial bombardments, we would either have to retreat openly under fire (which is quite inconceivable), engage in a large-scale conventional war (which the Democrats swore never to get entangled in again after Korea) or use nuclear weapons, which would at least push China back into the arms of the Soviet Union and probably instigate a world war.

A DULLES LEGACY

The alternative is not preventive surrender but genuine neutralization. In examining neutralization, we have not yet freed ourselves from the Dulles tradition that sees in neutrality the immoral position of noncommitment in the struggle between the forces of light and darkness as well as an invitation to the Communists to try to fill the resulting vacuum. That neutralization is supported by De Gaulle (and the U.S.S.R.) is viewed by many in the Capital as sufficient evidence in itself that this idea does not warrant careful consideration.

The critical question is not whether the area can be neutralized but whether neutralization can be made to stick and not be a thin cover for an American retreat and a Communist takeover. In principle, neutralization can be made to work only if it is in the interest of all the big powers concerned. It is my central contention that this is the case in southeast Asia now.

The key to our mistrust of a neutralist solution for southeast Asia is our expectation that it will result in Chinese domination of the region. China is depicted by our propaganda as a major aggressive, expansionist power ready to engulf first the Indochinese peninsula, then Malaysia and Indonesia, and soon all of Asia.

PEIPING OVERRATED

A busy team of learned State Department staff members and consultants provides an endless flood of quotations from Chinese writings and speeches to this effect. But we should learn to distinguish between pronouncements and policy.

In reality, China is neither a major nor an aggressive power, and neutralization of the area would be in line with its present foreign policy. China's bellicose threats seek to cover up a quite cautious foreign policy in order to gain favor in the international Communist movement without incurring the risk of a major war.

China has talked about liberating Taiwan for half a generation but has done nothing about it. China has criticized Khrushchev for retreating from Cuba but itself did not try to move into next door Hong Kong, full of pro-Chinese Communists. It has not launched an attack on Quemoy and Matsu, 3 miles from its mainland shore.

Far from being the aggressive nation we tend to describe, it has improved its relations with Japan, Pakistan, and Ceylon, increased its trade with Britain and Canada and won the recognition of more than 50 countries.

In general, Communist China's policy at this stage seems to be to support weak neutral governments on its borders. Cambodia has been such a weak neutral country for a decade and a half; Burma readily qualifies for the same characterization; Nepal is not exactly a formidable opponent or a Western ally. Yet these countries are as free as Pakistan or Thailand.

Even when India's defenses collapsed, China did not take the risks involved in marching deeper into the country but limited itself to holding a border zone that has been in dispute for years, and over which even Nationalist China recognizes mainland China's claim. Once India was shown to be weak, it was left alone.

None of these neutral countries has been annexed because China itself is weak. Her agriculture is in a mess; her industrialization is floundering; a succession of administrative crises and food shortages have left the country with a low morale; the Chinese Army is poorly equipped; China has found it difficult to obtain gasoline to fly its airplanes since the Soviet Union cut off the supply; it has no nuclear weapons or modern systems of delivery.

For at least the next decade, China will have to focus on building up its industrial base. Whether that goal can be reached in less than 20 years and whether China will be as Stalinist and bellicose after that period as it is now are open questions. For the next 10 years, however, China is to be expected to prefer weak neutral countries on its borders over the risks of a fuller confrontation with the United States as a result of a violation of a neutrality pact.

To be successful, neutralization must be backed by power. We must make clear from the onset that neutralization will win our support only if China and Russia will commit themselves to refrain from armed intervention in the neutralized area, and that any violation of these commitments will bring our return with a vengeance, with whatever force required.

We are now committed to protect the people of the area from external aggression and to assure their right of self-determination; we can fulfill this commitment under neutralization by setting up remote deterrence forces; i.e., by holding forces in a state of readiness outside a given territory to deter the intrusion of the other side and if necessary to counter it.

The zone to be neutralized has yet to be determined. Ideally, all of southeast Asia should be included. North Vietnam was a Chinese vassal for hundreds of years, and its leaders still fear and resent Chinese overlordship. Given an opportunity, Ho Chi Minh might well prefer to act like Yugoslavia, at least like Rumania.

But it might be too late for the inclusion of North Vietnam; the younger generation of pro-Chinese leaders might be too deeply entrenched for this plan. Nor is China likely to let go of North Vietnam.

It would be more realistic to neutralize an area where China would be unwilling to accept the risks involved in continued or renewed conflict with the United States: South Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos south and west of the 1962 neutralization line (which the pro-Communist forces have not yet crossed).

Such a zone would obviously meet with the approval of France and have the active support of Russia; the U.S.S.R. seeks to contain Chinese influence in Asia.

A neutral zone established in line with the interests of all concerned might still be eroded and a major war triggered if either side, while seeking to adhere to its commitment, felt that the other side had violated the pact. That is what happened with the 1954 and 1961–62 neutralization accords.

Not only were they not backed by power, but an utterly ineffectual international machinery was set up to supervise their implementation. A fair-sized United Nations observer force patroling the borders of the area would go a long way toward doing that job.

By making violations more visible to world public opinion, they would become less tempting. (No U.N. force could deter a major power intending openly to violate the neutrality pact; that would be the task of the "remote deterrence" forces.) Such a U.N. force would be much more likely to gain Soviet financial support than the peacekeeping activities in the Congo or Gaza Strip.

After a short period of pacification, free elections should be held in the neutralized territories under U.N. supervision. There seems to be no reason why Cambodia would not retain its current government nor why south Laos, shorn of the Communists in the north, would not continue to be governed by the present Vientiane coalition of rightists and neutralists.

The fate of the South Vietnamese Government is less easy to predict. The present Government has practically no popular basis and suffers the onus of being the puppet of a foreign power. At worst, free elections would lead to a nationalist pro-Communist government.

As long as South Vietnam was prevented by the neutrality pact from joining any military bloc or being annexed by North Vietnam, however, it would still be a buffer state in the way of future Chinese expansion. And there is the possibility that with the return of a saner life in South Vietnam, viable political alternatives to the National Liberation Front would emerge.

This is not a sanguine picture. Surely we would prefer to leave South Vietnam with a democratic government committed to economic development and social progress. But there is no way of establishing such a government; surely our massive economic aid to a government by generals and our escalation of the war have not brought such a government closer.

The alternative in southeast Asia is not between flourishing democracy and communism but between trying neutralization and escalating a war in which no military victory seems possible; which devastates the countryside, makes American support of repugnant regimes seem necessary and leaves China with the option to involve us in another Korean-type war.

CARLSBAD, N. MEX.,
June 28, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SENATOR: Please accept my thanks for the many things you do for all U.S. citizens. I think you are correct about foreign aid, the war in Southeast Asia, preserving our wilderness areas.

A. O. OGDEN.

WESTON, MASS.,
July 2, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you so much for continuing to speak out boldly, wisely, and courageously against our present Government policy of prolonging our participation in the civil war in South Vietnam. Please keep up your end of the struggle and try to get influential Senators, Representatives, and business leaders to support your views and those of many other decent Americans, who like myself are parents and voters, and who deplore the cruel tactics of torture, napalm bombings, pesticides used against much-needed crops, which equate our actions with those of the Nazis during World War II.

I wish you, and Senators GRUENING, BARTLETT, PELL, and AIKEN could help our administration bow out peacefully from this hopeless war—with the help of our allies and the U.N. and turn the southeast Asia problems over to the U.N. and obviously prepare our people to see that China must be admitted to the U.N. too.

Thank you all for helping pass the civil rights bill too. I hope you have a fine Fourth of July weekend.

Very sincerely,
RITA PAINE
Mrs. John B. Paine, Jr.

NEW YORK CITY,
July 4, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: It is so heartening to hear a sane voice in Government circles as regards our treacherous, suicidal and unmoral position in southeast Asia—but also how sad and frustrating that you have so few allies for your patriotic, just position.

We are beginning to wonder why our Government is so committed to protect freedoms so many thousands of miles from home when they can't seem to manage to protect a few hundred civil rights workers who are down in Mississippi to uphold the Constitution of our land.

Mr. MORSE, your voice must be heard outside the Senate Chamber and committeeroom. This country needs you to speak out loud and clear if we are to emerge from these nightmarish times into a real blossoming of our democracy.

Sincerely,
MRS. H. BEATRICE G. SCHUTZ.

BOSTON, MASS.,
July 1, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have just watched you on the television program "Issues and Answers," and I would like to thank you for your sane and courageous position on Laos and Vietnam. As a young person who would like to live long enough to marry and have children (I am presently a student at Harvard College), I have been most concerned by the provocative foreign policy presently advocated by both political parties in this area. I feel as you do that it is extremely unfortunate that nowadays politicians must prove their opposition to communism by exhibiting a willingness to engage in an all-out war which would be disastrous for all humanity, and I agree that the matter of southeast Asia would best be handled by the United Nations.

I wonder if you are in accord with Senator FULBRIGHT's suggestion that our Cuba policy also be reassessed. It has always seemed ironic to me that our Government tolerate the many rightwing dictatorships in Latin America and the rest of the world, and yet be so maniacally militant in its policy toward Castro. Granted, the man is a dictator; but isn't he preferable to men like Batista or Somoza or Duvalier or that stanch ally of ours, Franco? Perhaps here again our wisest course of action might be to further freedom through economic aid, unilateral reconciliation, and arbitration through the U.N.

Thanking you again (I wish you, and not my cousin LEVERETT, were the senior Senator from Massachusetts), and looking forward to hearing from you, I am,

Sincerely yours,
STEPHEN SALTONSTALL.

SHEFFIELD, MASS.,
July 4, 1964.

Hon. EDWARD M. KENNEDY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR KENNEDY: Concerning the involvement in Vietnam, I hope you will support the position taken by Senators AIKEN, MORSE, PELL, GRUENING, and BARTLETT on the matter.

We seem to be in Vietnam for emotional reasons, not for the defense of the United States. Defense of the country seems to me to be the only constitutional reason for ordering our forces into action, unless the action is called for by our United Nations treaties. In the Vietnam matter there has been no U.N. action, and there has been no declaration of war by our Congress. This is another Korea-like trap.

Indeed our security is endangered by our presence in Vietnam. There is no visible military advantage there which we do not have anyway from our naval position.

What we seem to be getting is a progressive military socialization of the American economy in the guise of battling communism in the far reaches of the world. Does this make sense?

Let's settle the Vietnam adventure before war and ruin overtakes us.

Sincerely yours,
WILLARD C. FRENCH.

Circuit Court of Oregon,
Fourth Judicial District,
Portland, Oreg., July 1, 1964.

Hon. Wayne L. Morse,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Wayne: Just a note to let you know that I was watching the "Today" show on June 24 and was proud of your courage and statesmanship.

We are going to have to do more than give lipservice to establishing the rule of law in our relations with other nations.

I agree with you that this is the greatest contribution which our Nation can make to a world that will find it difficult to survive unless it substitutes the rule of law for the rule of force.

With every good wish, I am,

Cordially yours,

Alfred T. Sulmonetti.

Washington, D.C.,
July 1, 1964.

The Editor,
The Evening Star,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: I suspect that Columnist Max Freedman's attack tonight on Senator Morse was caused by his having been attacked for associating with the Senator.

Last week (I think it was Tuesday) one of your editorial writers was flaying Senator Morse for being "gravely obnoxious" for having said the United States was the leading threat to world peace. Across the page that night Columnist Freedman was exercised about the Johnson administration's having stumbled into, in southeast Asia, a piece of brinksmanship unsurpassed by John Foster Dulles at his wildest.

This similarity of view must have been brought to Mr. Freedman's attention. He shouldn't turn tail, though. He was quite right in his "brinksmanship" analysis last week.

Senator Morse is also quite right in advancing "the grave charge," according to Mr. Freedman tonight, "that the American program in Vietnam 'violates one international commitment after another.'" It is not true that "he commands no support for this view," as is also claimed, because he has mine—at minimum least.

I thought last week Mr. Freedman was with the Senator and me.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. Dorothy Maund.

Glendale, N.Y.

Hon. U.S. Senator Wayne Morse.

Dear Senator: The more I read about your statements in Washington, and before various committees and articles in newspapers, on the U.S. foreign policy, you are becoming by far, my favorite U.S. Senator.

The courage and wisdom you have to say the things you do against great odds.

I, being a veteran of the First World War, only hope that the Almighty will bless you with good health and long life, to keep up your good work. The people of your State should be very proud to have such a U.S. Senator.

Here's hoping, in closing, that the overwhelming majority of the American people will agree with you. And I may live long enough to see it.

Lots of good wishes.

Ben Smith.

Stanford, Calif.,
July 2, 1964.

Senator Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: I agree completely with your attitude toward the Vietnam situation. I think it is the only morally and politically correct thing to do. Withdraw from Vietnam is what the United States should do. We, as you stated, should turn it over to the United Nations, too. Your stand on the entire situation is very encouraging.

Sincerely yours,

Nancy Smith.

Elgin, Ill.,
July 1, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: We have seen and heard you on TV and we think you are great. It takes a man of courage to say the things you did.

But we disagree with you on the U.N. It is a trojan horse and the United States should get out of it.

Respectfully,

Dorothy and Ray Niedert.

Senator Morse: We commend you on your efforts to stop the war in southeast Asia. We agree with you thoroughly.

We would appreciate copies of your speeches on the subject—and the price for multiple copies.

Please inform us of anything we can do to aid you.

Yours truly,

Sybil Murray.

San Diego, Calif.

Van Nuys, Calif.,
July 1, 1964.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: We pray for your continued health and clear thinking so that your voice will continue to be heard, so importantly, in our Senate.

Good wishes. We wish we could vote for you.

Most sincerely,

Evelyn T. Moyer.

Lexington, Mass.,
July 4, 1964.

Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: I would like to express support and gratitude for your recent warnings on Southeast Asia and hope everyone will pay attention to what you have said about the problem.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Arthur J. Pennell.

Tucson, Ariz.,
July 3, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: It is encouraging to note that you and a few others in Washington are talking sense on the situation in southeast Asia. I and several of my friends hope you will continue your efforts to extricate the United States from a very dirty and frustrating war.

Sincerely yours,

J. C. Spitzer.

Brooklyn, N.Y.,
July 4, 1964.

Dear Senator Morse: Your remarks in the Senate about Vietnam and objection to a military man, Gen. Maxwell Taylor, as Ambassador made or rather gave me hope. Our President speaks about the risk of war. Does he forget we live in an atomic age.

I saw the President's remarks all over the front pages and no rebuttal. I felt hopeless. What can I do? But with voices like yours (someone showed it to me in an obscure newspaper) I begin to have hopes again. Thank you, Sir, for your courage.

Respectfully,

Syma Kaufman.

Concord, Mass.,
July 2, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: Thank you for your strong stand about the war in Vietnam. Your voice should be heard loud and clear above all the threats of bombings and extension of the war against Red China. This is as you say "immoral and inexcusable." More power to you.

Sincerely,

Alice Lee.

Laguna Beach, Calif.,
June 29, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Sir: I agree with you heartily in your summation as to the involvement abroad into which our country's foreign policy is leading us, vis-a-vis southeast Asia. The foolhardiness of our unilateral intervention there could but bring about a contest of wills between China and ourselves, a test which jeopardizes the whole world. It shapes up almost as though we are engaged in "Red-baiting," hoping to lure Red China to move as it did finally in Korea (we disbelieved clearly stated warnings then), to the end that Nationalist forces on Formosa may be unleashed to assault the mainland, and all that hardware the military have had around unused for so long, may be thrown at the Chinese—which as you have said, will only beget us the hatred of the Asiatic peoples, if not the world. Would we allow Chinese intervention in Mexico or Central America?

It was bad enough noting in a recent copy of Life magazine, torture shots of Vietcong by their captors, the Vietnamese, wherein we Americans are indirectly implicated. Though the Vietnamese officer administering the "treatment" is quoted as only "doing his duty," I believe that was the defense repeated by German war criminals and for which the German people as a whole were indicted. The hate reflected in the captive's eyes perhaps is indicative of what we can expect when they have license to do the same (not that they are not using methods of terror, but that's their guilt, not ours).

Could it be possible that there are "vested interests" there in South Vietnam of which we have no knowledge, for which our otherwise uncalled for unilateral action was devised to protect? Could it be possible that the loss of King Ranch properties in Cuba is what has whipped up such agitation in relation to that island undergoing social change—while almost complete disregard exists in another dictatorship every bit as ruthless in Haiti where the Murchison brothers apparently have considerable property?

Again and again, the issue of property seems to be what we are called upon to defend as against human rights, i.e., the desperate search of peoples throughout the world to change the existing status quo, and in great many cases to the end that they may have opportunity for a more abundant life, long denied. Just which side are we really on? Life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness—for whom?

Our pretentions to the "defense of freedom" has a hollow ring in light of the fruitless struggle by some peoples in the world who have had to resort to whatever methods are available—confronted by our "shows of force," what can they think?

The British seem to have learned their lesson, and the French theirs, but we, brash adolescents that we are, seemingly may have to learn ours the hard way, if we persist in our present course of unilateral action. That we could not have been more aware of historical imperatives, indicates our sad state of immaturity. God have mercy on our souls.

Most sincerely yours,

C. W. Chase.

Lowell, Mass., *July 4, 1964.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: You are doing a terrific bang-up job of speaking up against the involvement of American troops in the civil war of South Vietnam.

As of the present I am thinking of casting a write-in vote for you as President in the November election.

Keep up the excellent work.

Peace on earth, good will toward men.

Respectfully yours,

Charles Gibadlo.

Hon. Senator Wayne Morse.

Dear Sir: I wholeheartedly commend and thank you, for letting the American people know the true facts about the situation in South Vietnam. The course the United States is pursuing is indeed a threat to the peace of the world. I hope your colleagues in the Senate, will be influenced by your wise words and act accordingly, so this matter will be put before the United Nations, thereby averting a major war in Asia, saving the precious lives of thousands of our boys, and millions of dollars.

Thanking you again, I am,

Respectfully yours,

Edith Hershey.

Los Angeles, Calif.

Snyder, Tex.,
June 30, 1964.

Re request for additional list of liberals.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: Last Sunday, June 28, I heard your discussion over the radio on "Issues and Answers," and I appreciate so deeply your courageous stand against the U.S. involvement in Vietnam, where as you have often said, "We have no business to be."

It takes real courage and lots of it to speak out against a Government policy or procedure that has been made popular by such powerful groups as the political organization that is backing Goldwater including the John Birchers, American Legion, the Pentagon, and others.

All of we liberals throughout our Nation should stand squarely behind you, Senator Morse, and let you know that we are with you and the others, Senators Church, Gruening, Olin Johnston, James Eastland, and Mike Mansfield. The action our Government has embarked on is a form of imperialism that in some ways is almost as bad politically, economically, and humanitarianly as was procedure used by England, France, Spain, Portugal, the Dutch, and others during the period that they were building their empires. It is our duty as liberals to band together, and try in every way possible to stop this aggressive action before the United States gets so deeply involved that it can't stop short of bringing on another major war.

Senator Morse, there surely must be other liberal Senators and Representatives that believe as you do and if they receive the right kind of encouragement might join in with you, and won't you please appoint someone in your office to make a list of all who believe as you do whose names I do not have, so that I may also write them, and if any are up for reelection I will try to send a contribution to help on their campaign expenses.

Most sincerely yours,

G. W. Zenith, Sr.

Seattle, Wash.,
July 2, 1964.

Editor,
The Seattle Times,
Seattle, Wash.

Dear Sir: It would be enlightening to know what factual basis the Times has for stating that Senator Morse's "dangerous distortions go far beyond competent criticism" when he opposes administration policies in South Vietnam (July 1).

There seems to be considerable evidence to justify Senator Morse's description of Major General Khanh, head of the Government, as a "tinhorn tyrant."

General Khanh recently arrested nine top political opponents who asked for the release of two prisoners. He banned a newspaper, "Tien" (Progress) because it spoke of the general's regime as the so-called democratic government. Another newspaper was banned for criticizing the failure of the Government adequately to protect the American aircraft ferry that had been bombed by the Vietcong. The general has already closed down more than 20 journals.

I salute Senator Morse's integrity and courage in joining the unpopular minority who are trying to let the American people know how dangerous and self-defeating our policies are in southeast Asia.

Sincerely yours,

Mary Farquharson.

Dear Senator Morse: More power to you. I wish to heaven the two Senators from this State were in your class.

Mary Farquharson.

La Jolla, Calif.,
June 28, 1964.

Dear Senator Morse: I have just been listening to your TV interview today and I want you to know that I am saying here, here, I am with you. The ominous war cloud again growing over southeast Asia needs to be spotted and dispersed, and I hope there will be a growing sentiment to back your warnings. More power to you.

Sincerely,

Mary Mason.

Alhambra, Calif.,
July 1, 1964.

Re the shocking and brutal war in Vietnam.

Editor,
Life Magazine,
New York, N.Y.

Sir: The shocking photographs shown in the June 12, 1964, issue of Life, are "ipso facto" proof of guilt as well as positive identification of the guilty.

These shocking offenses against the body of prostrate and shackled prisoners are against all canon laws pertaining to treatment of human beings.

Crimes against humanity must not go unpunished. The guilty should be held for international war crimes trials, regardless of national origin, color, or race.

To date of beginning of World War II, beating a prisoner with a cane, "the torturing went on intermittently for nearly 3 hours." "A captive turns to avoid choking on water poured into his nose," by these minions of the devil, would have called for a court-martial and a prison sentence or, possible summary execution of the guilty.

Senator Wayne Morse (Oregon) has stated, "that the American program in Vietnam, violates one international commitment after another." Why are American soldiers there?

Let the preacher from the pulpit preach and let all the Christian people in Christendom rise up as one nation and put a stop to this shocking and brutal war.

As a veteran of World War I, I recall with sorrow the mockery of the slogan on 1917-18, "To make the world safe for democracy" and "this is the war that is to end all wars."

Yours for world peace and not for World War III.

Paul M. Smith.

Copy to Senator Wayne Morse, Oregon, Washington, D.C.

Fresno, Calif.,
June 28, 1964.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: My wife and I would like to thank you for your sanity and courage in opposing the administration's Asian policy.

It's become fairly obvious to us that our Government hasn't always been practicing what it preaches. We had practically given up hope that there was a man of reason in government who would speak out.

We have been appreciative of your liberal, common sense stands in the past.

I feel sure that there are large numbers of Americans who feel the same way we do about our aggression in Asia.

We wish you the best of luck. Generations to come will remember and be grateful to you and those few like you.

Sincerely,

Claude Hasty.

Brooklyn, N.Y.,
July 1, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: I am writing to offer whatever encouragement I can in your effort to deflect the insane warmongers of U.S. policy in southeast Asia. From the material made available by most of our daily newspapers (even here in New York) it is extremely difficult to form a rational estimate of current happenings; the few accurate reports on your speeches in such journals as the National Guardian have been a most welcome note of sanity in our present circumstances. If our country ever gets out of its present position of being the leader of all the most reactionary forces in the world, much of the thanks will be owed to you. Please accept the gratitude of one citizen. I hope that we are not too alone in this struggle.

I am a graduate of the University of Rochester (1961), have been attending the New School for Social Research this past year, and will be attending the City College of New York this coming fall (working on a master's degree in philosophy). I am writing as a private citizen, and do not represent any political party (what political party could anyone not in favor of preventive war join under present circumstances?).

Sincerely,

James Johnson.

Santa Barbara, Calif.,
July 2, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator: I just read your speech of June 2 as reprinted in the Liberal Democrat with which I thoroughly agree. I hope you will keep up the strong opposition to this Vietnam project of the Pentagon.

I can best express my opinion by enclosing a copy of a letter I wrote to William Winter the other day.

Best wishes,

Irving F. Laucks.

JUNE 30, 1964.

Mr. WILLIAM WINTER,
Editor, "William Winter Comments",
Sausalito, Calif.

DEAR MR. WINTER: Your May 4 issue which I just read (forwarded from Honolulu) says "we have been deceived"—about Vietnam, etc.

I have a theory of deception even worse than yours, viz: No military strategist in his right mind would undertake to maintain a landing by conventional tactics on a coast 8,000 miles away from his base, with 700 million potential enemies in the hinterland and the coastal inhabitants indifferent or even hostile.

Therefore, since Pentagon strategists have done this, and have gradually increased our forces in Vietnam from a few advisers to now 18,000, and are now pressing for more; and since I don't believe they are entirely crazy, I deduce that they have had in mind from the beginning the possibility of using nuclear weapons either on Hanoi or Peiping or both whenever the necessity arose. They would figure this might be a good chance for some practice. By the use of nuclear weapons they might maintain an otherwise untenable position.

Furthermore, I suspect that the buildup for peace which has been going on ever since last Christmas, has been to prepare the American public for the bad news that we now must undertake another oriental war, this time even worse than Korea.

The administration can now point to its peaceful record—"you see, we have used every means to cultivate world peace and diminish friction—now regretfully we are forced into war."

And, of course, the public will fall for it, the poor fish.

Best wishes,

IRVING F. LAUCKS.

P.S.—I note your good plug for the center in same issue. I hope to see you in Santa Barabara some day.

NEWTON LOWER FALLS, MASS.,
July 3, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: My heartfelt support to you in your courageous speaking out against the administration's move toward escalation in southeast Asia. Please keep up this opposition.

Sincerely,

LESTER GRINSPOON, M.D.

TACOMA, WASH.,
June 29, 1964.

THE LETTER BOX,
Editor, Tacoma News Tribune.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This is a copy of a letter to the Tacoma News Tribune—our only newspaper. Hurrah for your courage and understanding.

HAROLD BASS.

"BACKS SENATOR MORSE

"DEAR EDITOR: Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon, deserves the praise and support of the American people for his courageous condemnation of 'McNamara's war' in southeast Asia. It is tragic that only a handful of our Congressmen realize what complications would grow out of expanding that war. Not only would there be the certainty of Chinese participation but the very nature of the terrain would impel us to use tactics that would arouse the condemnation of most Afro-Asians and perhaps the world.

"It would not be expedient for us to meet the enemy man to man in the jungle; we would make extended use of air power, napalm, poison sprays and atomic weapons. These indiscriminately directed as they are not only against people but to the destruction of vegetation and the soil itself, would incite the flaming hatred of most Asian peoples. They feel what we seem sometimes to forget—that life itself is sustained by the 'Good Earth.' They know that, to date, such weapons have been used only against Asiatics. We, without our great wealth and atomic might would be regarded as the great bully endeavoring by superior size and weight to subdue the brave but poorly equipped underdog.

"Moreover, what could we do with those parts of east Asia we might subdue? We have not been able to produce commendable results in South Korea where, in 12 years, though our country has expended billions of dollars, the government is honeycombed with corruption, millions are unemployed and hungry, and tens of thousands of students are demonstrating in opposition the trend to put Japan back into control of South Korean business and affairs. True, it would ease our load if Japan could manage South Korea; but to Asiatic peoples it looks like we are for turning the clocks back. Could we do any better in southeast Asia? Let's support Senator MORSE's effort to get us out of there.

"Yours very sincerely,

"Rev. HAROLD J. BASS,
"Hillside Community Church."

SEATTLE, WASH.,
June 27, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Thank you for your stand on war.

R. D. FREER.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.,
July 1, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This morning, I read in the New York Times a letter from Norman Thomas, and I received a letter from Pax which quotes N. Thomas.

I am happy to say that I support you in your stand on South Vietnam. In the French newspaper Monde, I read a report on your comments, and approve of them.

May I say that I am, with best regards.

Yours very sincerely,

MARCEL FRANÇON.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.,
July 2, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: In the National Guardian I have read your statement regarding the South Asian war. I admire you for trying to raise the issue involved for the opposition to this war. This war as I see it is a Pentagon war used solely for the purpose of testing weapons and war gadgets. That is all, except for a church group.

A recent letter from a soldier in this area wrote a letter and published in the Philadelphia Bulletin—in long, long—that testing of war gadgets is essential true—the main purpose. This next door neighbor to a fellow who defends the other side is on the spot of getting his scholarship revoked by the flag wavers.

The German military in 1914 was the strongest and best. Look where it led Germany. During the World War II the German military was the strongest in the world. Look at the result. Now the U.S. military is the strongest. If this military sustains its Asian policy it too can bring this country to a brink of disaster.

You deserve much credit for speaking out as you do against a fatal policy than can only lead to discredit.

Cordially,

——— ———.

P.S.—DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I would like to sign this letter. If I did it really could get me in trouble—so please excuse me for not doing so.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
June 28, 1964.

Hon. Senator WAYNE MORSE: I want to thank you for your truthful appraisal of our policy in Vietnam.

We, the people, are very confused about our interference there, and hope that it will be brought out to all of us, that we must stay out of involvement that will bring about a war in which our sons will have to take part.

Thank you.

ETTA ISAACMAN.

MARKHAM, ILL.,
July 2, 1964.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
The U.S. Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: It was with deep gratification that my wife and I read of your sane approach toward a solution to the undeclared war we are waging in South Vietnam.

It was particularly refreshing when so many elected officials are actually leading mass hysteria for war with any government with whom the United States differs politically.

Your lone voice must take the same kind of personal integrity and courage as must have faced Abraham Lincoln when as a U.S. Senator, he alone opposed the then "popular" war against our neighbor, Mexico.

I urge you to continue your fine effort toward awakening America toward the danger implicit in these days of nuclear power, and I am sure, many millions of other Americans who have no voice also wish for a true peace.

Respectfully yours,

BENJAMIN T. SCOTT.

OREGON DEMOCRATIC CONVENTION UNANIMOUSLY REJECTS SECRETARY UDALL'S PROPOSED ELECTRIC POWER INTERTIE ARRANGEMENT WITH PRIVATE UTILITIES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, while the Democratic convention in Oregon last week almost unanimously, with only one dissenting vote in support of the administration policy, called for a submission of the jurisdiction of the war in South Vietnam to the United Nations, they unanimously rejected Secretary Udall's present proposal for an intertie arrangement in connection with the so-called electric power intertie arrangement with private utilities on the Pacific coast.

Let me make very clear, Mr. President, that the Oregon Democratic convention does not object to the sale of power into California and other Western States from the Bonneville system; nor does it, of course, object to the sale of Canadian power, after the Canadian treaty is implemented. Other States are entitled to their share of the power, too.

The senior Senator from Oregon has never taken the position that the Pacific Northwest has a monopoly on, or monopoly ownership of the power that is developed from dams that have been built with the money of all the taxpayers of the country.

But we do have a Federal power policy. That Federal power policy is a sound policy. Our Federal power policy gives certain rights, benefits, and protections to so-called public power preference users.

The Democratic Party convention last Saturday wanted to know the specific details of the protection that Secretary Udall proposes as a guarantee in carrying out the long existing Federal power policy. They wanted to be certain of protections such as those enacted into law, for example, when the Bonneville Act was adopted in the first place.

I am in accord with the critics at that convention who hold that the agreement as tentatively proposed by the Secretary of the Interior does not contain those guarantees and protections. That is why the Oregon convention went on record rejecting the agreement in its present form as submitted by the Department of the Interior to the appropriate committees of the Congress.

Last Thursday I spoke on this subject on the floor of the Senate after testifying before the Senate committee. I stand on every word that I said last Thursday. I made my plea then that the proposed intertie agreement be made more specific.

The convention also went on record as opposing any agreement on the west coast intertie arrangement unless there is written into the agreement the construction of a Federal line from Hoover Dam into Nevada, Arizona, and the other areas to be served by that line. As the convention pointed out, and as some of us in our testimony last week also pointed out, that line is essential if we are to have a public power yardstick check against the private utilities. Such a check is needed if we are to protect the consumers who will buy the power.

We will find an insistence upon the maintenance of such a check from the industrial power consumers. There is no group more insistent that such a yardstick check be maintained than industry itself, because industry knows what happens to its power rates if a private utility is given control of dams built by the taxpayers' money. If we give them control of the transmission lines, we might as well give the power at bus bar.

I stress again that I am highly desirous of working out a satisfactory arrangement or agreement that will protect the legitimate—and I underline the word "legitimate"—interests of the public utilities, the legitimate interests of the public power group, the legitimate interests of the public power preference users, and, most of all, the legitimate interests of the taxpayer.

I am satisfied that the interests of the taxpayer will not be protected under the Udall agreement as offered in its present form. That is why the two Senators from Oregon have already served notice that we shall oppose the intertie agreement in its present form. I am hoping that in the weeks and months ahead we can work out with the Secretary of the Interior and with all parties concerned a satisfactory adjustment of the differences.

One provision, for instance, that must be deleted is that which would permit an escape from the assurance that an all-Federal transmission line will be built from The Dalles to Hoover Dam. I refer to the sentence on page 25 of the Secretary's report which indicates that it might in the future be possible to build that line through contracts with private utilities.

Under no circumstances, if we look at the agreement in its entirety, would any such proposal be acceptable or satisfactory to the Senators from Oregon.

In light of the discussion, the debate, and the resolution adopted by the Democratic Party convention in Oregon last July 4, the present administration would be well advised to note now that it is headed for the type of an all-out fight on the power issue in my State, such as past administrations, both Democratic and Republican, have experienced in the last 25 years. It will come if there is any attempt to underwrite an agreement, such as the one proposed, which would not give preference, in effect, to the public preference users under existing law, but would, rather, in effect give preference to the private utilities.

Now is the time to avoid such a controversy. Now is the time to insist that the Secretary of the Interior offer an agreement that cannot possibly be used, or have language in it that can possibly be used, as a device to circumvent or evade a great power policy that has served the best interests of the people of this country for a long time.

I would have the administration carefully reflect before it puts a stamp of approval on the present proposal of the Secretary of the Interior. I would recall to the memory of the Johnson administration, for that period of meditation and reflection, the names of some of our great conservationists and great bipartisan developers of our natural resources. I would have the Johnson administration recall the contribution of Pinchot, of Hiram Johnson, of Charles McNary, of Norris, of La Follette, of Brookhart, of Wheeler, of Clarence Dill, and many others.

Those Republican and Democratic conservationists are cataloged by some as progressive liberals, and they truly were. They were the great progressive liberals of a bygone day who wrote into the statute books of our country a set of laws that give to the consumers of our country the protection that they need against the hijacking and exploiting policies of the private utilities of this country. These practices would no doubt appear if we should permit the private utilities ever to go unchecked.

Many of us are concerned about the proposed Udall agreement on the intertie because, although we have the same objective in mind, we do not believe that the machinery or the principles set up in the proposed agreement will accomplish that fine objective.

I plead with the administration that they not rush this project, but that we take our time on it. They are not going to persuade me with the argument that if we do not get something done very quickly, Bonneville rates may have to be raised. I do not intend to sell out the interests of the people of my State for any mess of pottage. I want a sound program. I do not intend to be rushed into this. The proposed agreement, in my judgment, needs much reconsideration and redrafting.

This is not the first time that I have found myself in this position. Not so many years ago there were those in my State and throughout the Pacific Northwest who wanted me to swallow another partnership program. Under that program the Eisenhower administration sought to have the taxpayers pay for the nonreimbursable costs of a great multiple-purpose dam and then turn the power generation facilities over to the power utilities at the damsite. They called it a partnership. It was a fine partnership. My colleague at the time, Dick Neuberger—I paraphrase him, but I think the paraphrase is close to the original—said on the floor of the Senate one afternoon—

> What is proposed is that the Federal taxpayers supply a cow, from which the private utilities can take the milk.

That is just about what the partnership program amounted to. Instead of surrendering to it under all the pressure that was being exercised by Democrats and Republicans alike, those of us who said we were not going to agree appeared before and appealed to the Appropriations Committees of the Senate and the House over a period of several years, asking for appropriations to proceed to build public dams, not partnership dams. We succeeded in getting the money.

One of the greatest thrills I have had in my service in the Senate was to give the dedication speech not so many weeks ago at the great Cougar Dam in my State. It is a multipurpose dam, a dam belonging to the taxpayers of the United States.

But the Eisenhower administration, in the beginning of that fight, would not recommend a dime in its annual budget estimates for Cougar Dam—or, for that matter, the Green Peter Dam—which will be dedicated within a couple of years.

The message was given to me time and time again that if I would just go along, we would get the money, so that the dam could be built. Many Democrats in my State were persuaded to "put the heat on." The mail was voluminous. Many of the Democrats who wrote to me asked me to surrender to the Eisenhower administration's demand for a partnership program.

I told them:

> You say that now, but the time will come when you will applaud if we win this fight. If we lose this fight, you will pay through the nose with higher power rates for years to come.

We won both fights. Now we have one dam completed and another on its way.

The same thing was attempted in connection with one of the greatest of all our western dams, now under construction, the John Day Dam on the Columbia. We fought that battle, and we won.

I want my President to know now that we are going to scrutinize with the greatest of care the Udall intertie agreement. I want to say to some of my colleagues from the Pacific Northwest who are on the other side, "You had better scrutinize it, too. You had better go over the proposal with a fine tooth comb."

We would like to sit down with the administration to work out a settlement that will protect the consumers and protect this country's power policy. If we cannot arrive at such a negotiated settlement of this matter, we are ready to fight. The people in our part of the country are ready to fight.

Members of the Democratic Party assembled at Coos Bay, Oreg., served clear notice on this administration that we are ready to fight to protect the legitimate power rights of the people of the West. When we protect those people, we protect the power rights of the people of the country and the taxpayers as well.

I thought I should make these comments today because I have been advised that an attempt will be made to rush this matter through. I sincerely hope that, on reflection, the administration will decide to consider further before it acts.

Mr. President, with reference to the Tongue Point issue that was debated in connection with the Interior appropriation bill, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter on this matter which a former Congressman from Oregon has written to the Portland Oregonian.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EUGENE, OREG., *June 26, 1964.*

The EDITOR,
Oregonian,
Portland, Oreg.

DEAR SIR: I doubt that any Oregonian with an ounce of sense will be influenced by your criticisms of Senator MORSE and his efforts on behalf of proper use of the facilities at Tongue Point (your editorial, June 24).

It was my privilege to serve for 4 years in the Congress with my fellow Eugenean, WAYNE MORSE. We didn't always agree, to be sure, but there was never any doubt in my mind about his intelligence, his courage, and his doggedness in looking after interests of Oregon.

Rather than castigate Senator MORSE for working too ardently for Oregon's vital interests, the Oregonian should be encouraging him and other members of the Oregon delegation to represent our interests vigorously and persistently.

Very truly yours,

CHARLES O. PORTER.

WATER—ITS ROLE IN OUR FUTURE—ADDRESS BY JAMES H. JENSEN

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, an address given last month in Portland, Oreg., before the Portland Downtown Lions Club by Dr. James H. Jensen, president of Oregon State University, has just recently been brought to my attention.

President Jensen describes vividly the urgent need for protecting and developing our water resources, and outlines some of the State and Federal programs for this purpose now in progress, or soon to begin, in the State of Oregon.

Mr. President, the interesting and enlightening information which President Jensen conveys in his speech, in my judgment, will be of value and benefit to Senators. I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that President Jensen's address be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WATER—ITS ROLE IN OUR FUTURE

(A talk by President James H. Jensen, of Oregon State University, to the Portland Downtown Lions Club, June 26, 1964)

I want to talk about water today * * * about some of the efforts in Oregon toward assembling facts and seeking additional information that will help in maintaining water quality and in avoiding serious shortages * * * about its relationship to the economic and social life of the State * * * about the highly promising water research possibilities in Oregon.

A well respected national magazine (Saturday Review) earlier this month reported dolefully on a phase of what it described as "the problem of environmental poisoning now so characteristic of contemporary living."

The article pointed to contamination of streams by widespread use of detergents, to rivers becoming infected by poisons from insecticides and to the death of millions of fish. It decried the fearsome despoiling of the Nation by superhighways and the triumph of asphalt, cement and black hydrocarbons as the main features of human environment.

Numerous points are made that our Nation is demanding more and more water while at the same time it is producing more and more waterborne wastes.

A $100 billion proposal for carrying water from the rivers of Alaska, British Columbia, and the Yukon Territory through a system of reservoirs, canals, tunnels, and rivers to 33 of our States and Mexico was unveiled in the U.S. Senate only a few weeks ago. The chairman of the Senate Public Works subcommittee on western water development said his committee was excited over the proposal.

For some years the people of the Pacific Northwest have heard of various proposals to divert waters of the Columbia and Snake rivers to California. This hot interstate controversy was officially short-circuited in May by the western Governors' conference which called for a comprehensive study of regional water resources development.

Water within only the past few years has become a likely competitor of weather as a subject of conversation. Little can be done about the weather—up until now—at least. But many individuals and many agencies throughout the United States, and in Oregon, have begun doing something about the many, many complex problems related to water and the expanding water needs.

I fully realize that in talking briefly today about this great natural resource, perhaps the greatest nonhuman resource we possess, I fully realize I can no more than merely scratch the surface.

We live in a water world. Yet less than 1 percent of this water is available for use by man as fresh water.

Most of us are conscious nearly all the time * * * in our own small way * * * of the importance of water in our lives. We drink it, wash in it, swim in it, skate on it and ski in it, irrigate our lawns and fields with it, we see the rain and snow and dew and fog, we fish in it and boat on it, we see it generate power, we acknowledge its contributions to sanitation, we admire its beauty in river and lake and ocean, we recognize it as a haven for fish and animal life, we know it as a highway of commerce, we delight in its recreational enjoyments and benefits.

In the past 5 years, however, water has had to be rationed in well over 1,000 communities in the United States.

Much of the current discussion and study about water concerns supply, or lack of supply * * * in other words, local water shortages. Over on the Oregon coast are localities that get an average annual rainfall of 80 to 90 inches, but are faced with water shortages for several weeks in the summer. In the Columbia Basin, localities that get only a few inches of rainfall annually also may have drought problems although their lands may be adjacent, or nearly so, to one of the great rivers of the world—the mighty Columbia.

Some of the things mentioned earlier—contamination of streams, waterborne wastes, diversion of supply, loss of fish life, etc.—are systems of an impending water shortage. But this, in its most serious aspects, is a shortage of clean water—or will be if we don't stop it. And it will be caused most likely not by drought but by pollution, and by rapidly increasing populations.

In discussing this matter, the U.S. Public Health Service points out that we're still getting as much rain as we always did. Our lakes and streams are as large as they ever were. We have more and larger dams to impound water. Yet, we are finding it more and more difficult to get the quality of water we need, where we want it, and at the right time.

Hydrologists tell us that essentially the source of all water found on the land is the water of the oceans—the oceans which cover about three-fourths of the earth's surface. The unending circulation of the earth's moisture and water is called the water cycle, or the hydrologic cycle. Water from the surface of the oceans is evaporated into the atmosphere. That moisture, in turn, is lifted and eventually is condensed and falls back to the earth's surface as precipitation. Some of the precipitation runs off over the surface to the streams. Some of that which soaks into the ground is available for growing plants and evaporation. Some reaches deeper zones and slowly percolates through springs and seepage to maintain streams during dry periods. The streams, in turn, eventually lead back to the oceans where the water originated.

We are told that ever since water has covered most of the earth's surface, this cycle of evaporation, transpiration, precipitation, percolation, infiltration, runoff, evaporation, has gone on endlessly. Today's rain showers deliver drops of water that are literally billions of years old. And except for the small amounts of "new" water brought to the surface by volcanic eruptions or added by certain meteorological disturbances, every drop of water on the planet has been actively moving between sky and earth since the dawn of the earth's history.

So it would appear we have as much as we ever had. It also appears that we're not going to have much more very soon, barring some unforeseen catastrophic upheaval of both heaven and earth.

But the distribution of this water—and its use and reuse by a lot more people is another matter—a very important matter.

Increases and shifts in population, shifts in agriculture and industry, drought, and pollution in streams and lakes are among the developments of the past two or three decades that have emphasized the urgency to take immediate steps to increase the conservation, improve the utilization, and expand the administration of our water resources.

Oregon holds a unique position in its relationships with its water resources. We have our problems and disagreements on policies, of course. We have occasional misunderstandings. There have been battles between the power and the fishing interests, between the agricultural and the forestry interests, and among the commercial and sports fishermen. We've had our ups and downs on river pollution. But by and large, we have escaped many of the major unexpected problems of shortage or of pollution faced by many other States. Partly because of our physical and geographical attributes and for population and sociological and perhaps other reasons, we have not experienced the water supply difficulties of southern California, for example.

This has made it possible for the State to take a much more positive position in connection with water—to look ahead and plan rather than spend valuable time and effort in repairing past errors, settling unpleasant arguments and engaging in endless controversy.

As a land-grant institution, Orgeon State University even before the turn of the century was engaged in research and instruction in water-related matters. This interest and concern continued and expanded through the years until the cooperative phases of the programs called for coordination of the skills of the scientists and the engineers and the agriculturalists and the pharmacists as well as the social scientists. The result in 1960 was the organization of the OSU Water Resources Research Institute. The function of the institute is to encourage, facilitate and coordinate research at OSU on the factors that affect the quantity and quality of water. That covers a wide range—and the work of the components of the institute covers an equally wide range.

A recent summary of the institute lists 81 different studies being carried on currently in nearly a score of different areas. Among them are biology of water, fish and game management, engineering, chemistry of water, meteorology, oceanography, plant ecology, radioecology, soil physics, water economics, watershed management, and food science and technology.

An official State agency, the State water resources board, was created by the 1955 legislature to establish Oregon water policies, license power development and settle water disputes. The board speaks officially for the State in water matters—which pleases Federal officials. It turns to Oregon State University for most of the technical and scientific information it needs, through a very satisfactory cooperative arrangement with our staff.

About a year and a half ago the Willamette Basin task force was organized. This is another example—a unique example—of the coordinated water resources program in the State of Oregon. The task force is composed of representatives of seven Federal departments together with the Water Resources Board. All told, nearly 40 Federal and State agencies are involved. The task force is now engaged in formulating a comprehensive plan for development of the water resources of the Willamette Valley. This is the first comprehensive study undertaken anywhere that gives consideration to all presently recognized factors of water and related land resources.

There are other evidences of Oregon's leadership in water resources management and research, but I won't take time now to recount them.

Oregon State University is vitally interested in all of the many ramifications connected with water. We are mindful of our special responsibilities as Oregon's land-grant university of keeping OSU geared toward programs in instruction, research, and off-campus education and service of particularly high caliber.

We have vigorous training programs in various water-related areas through 15 departments at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. Our cooperative extension service conducts its educational programs in agricultural-oriented phases of water use throughout the State. But for this particular occasion, we are more concerned about water research.

When we read about water shortages in New York or Los Angeles, we could conclude that the demand for water must be increasing at an unprecedented rate. Some Oregonians may have a tendency to say in regard to these shortages: "It can't happen here." If we assume greater population in Oregon, greater industrialization, more agricultural irrigation, more boating, water skiing, and recreational use of water, maybe it could happen in Oregon—and, if it does, how will we increase our supply?

Will it be through increased storage facilities, through salt water conversion, through reuse, or multiuse, through weather manipulation, or how?

Even without any major shortages of water, Oregon has pollution problems, although the Pacific Northwest has not yet experienced the extremes of the East and Midwest. Bids are expected to be let very shortly now for the new $2 million U.S. Public Health Service Pacific Northwest Water Laboratory on the Oregon State University campus. This is the first of nine new laboratories to be built at strategic points throughout the United States as part of the Federal Government's water pollution control program.

Congress in authorizing these laboratories recognized both the importance of water pollution control and the need for a greatly expanded research effort in this field. The Public Health Service explains that there is not presently enough scientific knowledge to cope with the critical problems which will be encountered in the future as our population, industry and agriculture grow.

Many of the waterborne wastes are new and baffling wastes of synthetic origin, encountered nowhere in nature. All this will require development of more effective ways of keeping water clean so it may be used over and over again. This is necessary, the Public Health Service adds, not only for economic reasons but for the protection of public health and the preservation of a great recreation and aquatic life resource.

The U.S. Public Health Service in cooperation with our Agricultural Research Experiment Station has sponsored an aquatic biology research program at Oregon State since 1953. Research subjects at the new Public Health Service laboratory at Oregon State will involve more exhaustive studies on pulp and paper, timber, municipal, food processing and industrial wastes, changes in water quality and temperatures, preservation of fishing and shell fishing and ground water pollution. The lab will cooperate closely with OSU and other universities, research institutions, private industries and governmental agencies in the region. It will serve Oregon, Washington, Idaho, Montana, Wyoming, Utah and to some degree Nevada and California. It will employ about 150 persons, two-thirds of whom will be scientists and other professionals.

The OSU Water Resources Research Institute will be vitally concerned in studies of chemical residues in water supply and pollution control in connection with the 5-year universitywide study of pesticides in the environment of man, animals and plant announced only a month ago by the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. A first-year award of $207,000 was made to Oregon State. At least $1,600,000 is expected to be involved in the full 5-year study.

The U.S. Senate Committee on Public Works recently added its weight to the national campaign for water quality. This Senate committee said tersely: "Pollution is the No. 1 water resources problem in the United States."

It may be some time before Oregonians are drinking desalted sea water. But there seems to be some progress in taking fresh water from the sea, cheaply and abundantly. Reports from the Federal Office of Saline Water indicate that engineering development has refined known processes and reduced costs to an extent where large-scale desalting plants may become practical possibilities within 10 to 20 years.

Agricultural irrigation a few years ago was by far the greatest single consumptive water user. There is evidence now on a national basis that irrigation may have been surpassed by industry, although water used for irrigation continues to increase. But tremendous quantities must remain in streams for fishlife, navigation, and recreation.

The possibilities of increasing water supplies through more efficient agricultural use is illustrated by a recent Bureau of Reclamation study. This showed that on the average only 58 percent of the water diverted from the natural watercourse was finally delivered on the farm. The remainder was lost to seepage from canals, evaporation, and overflow back into the watercourse—and less than half of that finally delivered to the farm is actually used by the crop. Sprinkler irrigation does much better and it is said that an efficiency of some 65 percent would be possible.

The OSU School of Forestry along with engineering, science, and agriculture is doing valuable research related to water resources. The water use rate of forest vegetation is inadequately identified and little work in this of any significance has been done previously in the Pacific Northwest. The use of water by trees is important in its relationship to the establishment and growth of trees, to floods, and to water supply. Forests occupy about half of the land area of Oregon. Some of the major conflicts in water use are related to logging operations on forest lands. Streams can be modified drastically and fishing habitat reduced in the vicinity of logging roads and clear-cut areas for marked distances downstream.

I have hardly touched on scores of research projects on the campus or operated nearby in connection with campus labs. There's the Alsea watershed study, one of the many OSU Agricultural Experiment Station projects.

This study utilizes the extensive 280,000-acre field laboratory of the Alsea basin within 25 miles of the campus. It is an almost all-inclusive resource productivity survey of an entire river basin including soils, vegetation, water, logging, and fisheries resources.

There's the Berry Creek experimental streams, only about 15 miles north of the campus, where a quarter mile of typical woodland stream has been brought under complete flow control for the study under natural conditions of plants, insects, larger invertebrates and fish.

There's the Oak Creek laboratory, only a few minutes from the main campus, for the study of the influence of water-quality changes on fish and other fresh water organisms. I wish we had time to mention others.

Many of us on the Oregon State campus are really excited about the instructional and research possibilities of the new million-dollar Oregon State University Marine Science Laboratory on the Yaquina Bay at Newport. This laboratory, constructed with funds provided by the Federal Area Redevelopment Administration, will contribute greatly to knowledge about Oregon's water resources. We hope to be able to move into it this fall.

One wing of the new laboratory will be cooperatively shared by the OSU Departments of Fish and Game Management, Botany, Veterinary Medicine, and Agricultural Economics, and the engineering experiment station. It is expected that other agencies such as the State fish commission, State game commission, State sanitary authority, the U.S. Public Health Service, and others will also become engaged in mutual fishery and water quality investigations at Newport.

The laboratory will make possible the expansion of existing research and new research in areas of importance to Oregon's economy and development. Much of this work will be on problems associated with development and preservation of our water, land, and timber resources.

Oregon now possesses a magnificent coastal area that provides sports fishing, hunting, boating, and other recreational pursuits for a great many people and contributes generously to the support of the State's third largest industry—the tourist business. The coastal region is a base for commercial fishing, which is also a significant industry. In addition to these assets, we also have a great timber resource in the coastal area that can support expanded pulp and paper and other wood products industries.

Development of our forest resources without irreparable damage to watersheds, and without polluting our rivers and bays with the wastes from pulpmills and other wood products industries is of utmost importance to Oregon's economic development. These can be provided only through careful management of our land, timber, and water resources. Much of the effort in this laboratory will be directed to problems associated with such resource development.

Scientists from our fish and game management department have for a number of years been working on the effects of pulpmill waste discharges on oysters and other forms of marine life. They have been joined in this effort by our engineers to consider methods by which the waste from pulpmills may be treated and disposed of economically in estuarial or intershore water without damaging the fisheries or recreational assets of these waters. Other studies are underway to determine the feasibility of using such wastes for irrigation.

Activities of the fish and game management department at Yaquina Bay have included and will continue to include field training for students interested in fishery resources and biological aspects of water pollution. An active research program has been underway for a number of years. It includes studies on oysters, clams, trout, salmon and other marine organisms, fishes of Oregon bays, salmon poisoning in dogs, and others.

Many other problems have been tackled and are in planning stages now involving engineering combined with other sciences and technologies.

A second wing of the laboratory will be devoted to oceanography and its related fields. I'm always amazed at how many different sciences are related to the ocean. These are only a few of the things we're talking about when we talk about oceanography: water masses, currents, temperature and salinity distribution, upwelling, air-sea interchanges, fish and shellfish, invertebrates, whales, waste disposal, chemistry and physics, sand transport along beach areas, biology, topography and distribution of sediments from the shoreline out, geology of the continental shelf, marine organisms, weather, earthquakes, and so on.

A third section of the laboratory will contain an aquarium, a public auditorium and other facilities for visitors.

We believe we have a good opportunity to develop the Oregon State University Marine Science Laboratory into one of the leading centers of marine research in the country. All the ingredients are there. The laboratory site is only an hour and a quarter from the university, and just a mile from the open ocean. Few other laboratories in the country can match this situation. We hope that through the marine science coordinating committee of Oregon State and the University of Oregon, cooperative work in these two institutions may be enhanced. Scientists and research groups from the University of Oregon and other institutions have been invited to share these most convenient facilities.

The laboratory's location on the Oregon coast is ideally situated. The University of Washington, with its departments of oceanography and fisheries, is 360 miles north of us by sea. (This is the distance from Cape Cod to Chesapeake Bay on the east coast, where half a dozen marine laboratories are located.) The University of Washington has the disadvantage of being located 16 hours from the ocean by ship, while it will take us only a few minutes to get to sea from our laboratory. Scripps Institution of Oceanography, the largest oceanographic institution in the world, is almost 1,000 miles south of here.

We are hopefully looking toward a complex of marine science activities at the laboratory site. Most of the other marine science laboratories in the country have drawn to them branch governmental research labs and private manufacturing firms. The same possibilities exist at Newport. The U.S. Public Health Service has already indicated its plans to build a small branch pollution research laboratory. One of the State conservation agencies has shown interest in locating a branch laboratory there. In the future, we hope that the Fish and Wildlife Service, as well as other Federal agencies, will be influenced by the advantages of the laboratory location and will add their own branch laboratories to the site. The laboratory will furnish basic research results which will lead to fuller utilization of the coastal rivers and estuaries, the coastal waters, and the deep waters off Oregon.

There is hardly a phase of the potential research program that would not result in findings that will have direct application to the important problems of economy of the State of Oregon and the Nation. Oregon has the fourth longest exposed outer coastline of the States of the continental United States. California, Florida, and Texas, with longer coastlines, have large marine science organizations and make tremendous use of their oceanic and coastal resources.

Recently, Dr. Bernard Smith, chief engineer for the Navy's Bureau of Weapons—and a Reed College graduate—declared: "America has not yet grasped the idea that the water-covered areas of our own globe may hold greater potential than anything to be discovered on distant planets."

Dr. Smith appealed for at least as much attention to "inner space"—the ocean—as to outer space. He painted an intriguing picture of harvests of mineral treasures and vast food resources from the sea. He, among others, has even suggested the possibilities of giant floating cities completely equipped to draw from ocean and air everything needed to support human life.

The Statesman at Salem commented that "Dr. Smith makes one suddenly aware that Oregon's juxtaposition to 350 miles of Pacific Ocean could turn out to be its greatest natural resource." Maybe we should begin planning an oceanic counterpart of Cape Kennedy for the Oregon coast. In all seriousness, if we are looking ahead—as we should be doing—don't the possibilities of the unknown vastness of the Pacific Ocean stir your imaginations? New species or new distribution records of animal and plant life swept from the depths of the sea are brought into our oceanography labs with nearly every voyage of the department's research vessel.

Research in water resources indeed faces frontiers of tremendous and dramatic scope. Its possibilities are real and immense.

I have been told the State of Oregon in the past few years—for some of the reasons previously mentioned—has assumed a position of national leadership in water resource research and water management. Our State agency and our OSU engineers and scientists are recognized throughout the country for their knowledge and their competence. They have headed numerous national and international professional organizations in this field. Federal agencies are turning to Oregon for suggestions and guidance.

There is no question about research being the key to the solution of many of the most perplexing water problems. Oregon State University occupies a unique position in water research—a position few if any other universities in the Nation are privileged to occupy.

I have said before that Oregon State University, Corvallis, and much of western Oregon could very well become the leading water research center in the United States. I have no doubt that it will be one of the leaders in this field.

The concentration of an outstanding research staff, unmatched facilities, and a most varied setup of resources in their natural stages gives Oregon State a substantial advantage in both depth and breadth of its water research studies.

A history of years and years of solid cross-campus research encompassing many different departments and many different courses and studies forms a strong backdrop for present and future water research.

Dr. Roger Revelle, dean of research for all nine campuses of the University of California, recently said "development of the best use of water to meet the needs of the American people in the years ahead holds a master key to the future of the United States."

Commenting on the bill supporting nationwide water research approved by Congress earlier this month, Dr. Revelle said: "It is a program to grow people. It means we shall be developing economists, hydrologists, biologists, public health specialists, agriculturalists, sociologists, and so on. Water is universal—it brings together all these fields of human inquiry and knowledge. Primarily, the water problem is sociological. Its solution is up to the people. Its solution rests on a human sense of values. It tests what people think."

Even though our present knowledge and understanding of water is limited in many areas, it is not difficult to perceive that the waters of the earth are the common property of all people. Instead of engaging in endless and sometimes pointless controversy over conflicts of interest we need to bend every effort in learning how to utilize water effectively—in finding means of cleaning water so that it can be used and reused again and again—and in developing in the minds of all men the realization that in the uses of water we share a common heritage and have common responsibilities—and in Oregon, tremendous opportunities.

ADJOURNMENT TO 9 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, unless some Senator desires to speak at this time, I am under instructions to move that the Senate stand in adjournment, under the previous order, until 9 o'clock tomorrow morning. I so move.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 35 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the previous order, to tomorrow, Friday, July 10, 1964, at 9 o'clock a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 9 (legislative day of July 8), 1964:

In the Army

The following-named officer under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in grade as follows:

Maj. Gen. Bruce Palmer, Jr., O20117, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army), in the grade of lieutenant general.

In the Air Force

The officers named herein for appointment as Reserve commissioned officers in the U.S. Air Force under the provisions of sections 8218, 8351, 8363, and 8392, title 10, of the United States Code:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. George R. Boster, Jr., AO815665, Alabama Air National Guard.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Staryl C. Austin, Jr., AO812003, Oregon Air National Guard.

Col. Duane L. Corning, AO946636, South Dakota Air National Guard.

Col. George W. Edmonds, AO755898, California Air National Guard.

Col. Harry G. Staulcup, AO660211, Delaware Air National Guard.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 9 (legislative day of July 8), 1964:

Railroad Retirement Board

Arlon E. Lyon, of California, to be a member of the Railroad Retirement Board for the term of 5 years, from August 29, 1964.

National Science Foundation

The following-named persons to be members of the National Science Board, National Science Foundation, for term expiring May 10, 1970:

Julian R. Goldsmith, of Illinois.
William W. Hagerty, of Pennsylvania.
Mina S. Rees, of New York.
John I. Snyder, Jr., of New York.
Julius A. Stratton, of Massachusetts.
Frederick P. Thieme, of Washington.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Conservation Triumph in New Jersey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 9, 1964

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, among the Nation's most precious natural resources are its thousands of acres of unused land, of open spaces. The preservation of that land and its beauty is a goal to which thousands of Americans in 29 States have devoted themselves.

The celebration of their long and arduous efforts took place on May 29, when New Jersey dedicated the Great Swamp National Wildlife Refuge in Morris County. Present for that occasion were the Honorable Stewart Udall, Secretary of the Interior, the Honorable Richard J. Hughes, Governor of New Jersey, and many other individuals who gave much time and energy to this project, including Senator Clifford P. Case; Congressman Peter H. B. Frelinghuysen; Mr. Robert A. Roe, the commissioner of the Department of Conservation and Economic Developments of the State of New Jersey; Hon. Thomas J. Hillery, State senator from Morris County; Mr. William Louis Arthur, president of the Morris County Park Commission; Mr. Daniel Johnson, Director of the U.S. Department of Interior's Bureau of Fisheries and Wildlife; Mr. John S. Goodschalk, Regional Director of the Fisheries and Wildlife Service; Sister Hildegard Marie, president of the College of St. Elizabeth's; Dean Samuel Pratt, Farleigh Dickinson University; Mr. Carl Bucheister, president of the National Audubon Society; Mr. Herbert P. Onick, president of the New Jersey Audubon Society; the honorary chairman of the Great Swamp Committee, Warren Ted Kenny; and its executive Secretary, Mrs. Helen Fenske.

The conclusion of this task represents a victory for both the State and the Nation. It demonstrates the strides that can be achieved by the concerted efforts of many individuals joining in a meaningful, cooperative venture guided by able leadership.

The constant expansion of urban centers threatens to destroy much of our Nation's beautiful wildlands. The initiative which New Jersey and other States have just taken may help to retard this process of deterioration. Secretary Udall and Governor Hughes are acting to meet this challenge, and their words merit citation.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that excerpts from the remarks made at the May 29 ceremonies be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement of the Honorable Stewart Udall, Secretary of the Interior

This is not simply a matter of significance in this particular region of New Jersey, but I think this is an occasion that has significance for all the people of this country. I'm encouraged to think that the conservation movement is getting somewhere by what has been accomplished here by so many people. And I am here to express to you my feeling of optimism regarding what has been done. President Kennedy, every time I talked with him about conservation problems, used to say to me, "Let's do the things now near the great centers of population, for the opportunity will be lost unless we act in the next few years." And this is precisely what you people have done. Last Saturday in Michigan, President Johnson gave what I think was one of the finest speeches of his Presidency. In the course of it, he challenged the American people to join the battles that build a great society, to prove that our material progress is always the foundation on which we build a richer life of mind and spirit. * * * He spoke of three areas where he suggested that we can begin to build this great society—in our cities, in our countryside, and in our classrooms. And we are gathered here today to celebrate what in my opinion is one of the most successful and meaningful battles to save the American countryside in recent memory. It is the distinctive nature of this battle that makes the Great Swamp so important. For we applaud not action by the Federal Government, or by a single public-spirited philanthropist or foundation, but by discipline, toughminded action, by many voluntary citizens groups, who were determined that a unique outdoor place did not have to be sacrificed to the demands of development. I am hopeful that this will serve as a memorable example for the whole country. This is an extraordinary thing and I want all those who participated to realize that this does set a pattern for the country. I think this is the significance of this occasion and I certainly hope that from here on in the Federal Government shall provide part of the help.

Statement of the Honorable Peter Frelinghuysen

To explain this project in one way, it raised a million dollars. That is no small job, and I think that we can take pride in that achievement. But, of more significance—who gave that million dollars? There were over 6,000 people, and not only was New Jersey represented in that list of donors, but contributions came from some 29 States. * * * The many individual firms in the area realized that a wildlife refuge within reach of some 30 million people is a sound investment, because it makes New Jersey a better place in which to live. What we are establishing today is a permanent resource not only for ourselves, but for future generations. This resource will increase in value in the years to come. This ceremony will have meaning therefore not only for those who are here, it will also give encouragement to groups all over the United States who hope to save a river, or a forest, or a marsh. For what we have done, they can do as well.

Statement of the Honorable Richard J. Hughes, Governor of New Jersey

It is a grand triumph, a triumph of determined effort, which in Secretary Udall's words deserves to be trumpeted throughout the land as an abiding example of effective citizen action. The forces of conservation throughout this region and the country have preserved this wonderful wilderness in the heart of urban America. The effective action of many citizens whose work we honor this afternoon in this dedication, reflects the very best in America. It is the America of the voluntary association. Citizens banded together on their own initiative for a common cause.

To meet similar demands for the preservation of open space and recreational lands, the State of New Jersey has embarked on its new nationally famous Green Acres program. As of April 1964, we have bought a total of 103,000 acres either purchased or approved for purchase under the State government through its Green Acres program to enhance the esthetic and practical values of the Great Swamp region. Many other acquisitions are under consideration within the Federal open space program.

STATEMENT OF MR. WARREN TED KENNY, HONORARY CHAIRMAN

The job has been anything but an easy one. Five long years have actually gone by since we first organized, and most of our members and workers have been with us from the beginning. We are indeed grateful, Mr. Secretary, that our country has had the very good fortune to have you and your capable staff. We have never had a more steadfast and dedicated leader than yourself.

West Virginia Sponsors Second Annual National Youth Science Camp; Delegates Visit Washington, Attend Senate Luncheon, Hear Worthwhile Message by Dr. Glenn T. Seaborg, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 9, 1964

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, from June 28 to July 18, 1964, 100 young men are participating in a unique program of recreation and education in the scenic mountains of West Virginia. Delegates to the Second Annual National Youth Science Camp, these high school youths have been chosen on the basis of demonstrated leadership capability and achievement in scientific study. They come from every section of our country, two from each State, to join in this positive activity sponsored by the State of West Virginia, and the Claude Worthington Benedum Foundation, and administered by West Virginia University.

In addition to the pleasant pursuits associated with a camp the delegates have access to the facilities of the National Radio Astronomy Observatory, at Green Bank. Scientists, university professors and research experts visit the camp, conducting panel discussions and lectures in an informal atmosphere where questions and answers are encouraged. There is a definite emphasis on stimulating young minds so that they will return to their homes and schools with new insights and higher goals.

Mr. President, again, as last year, it was my privilege to cooperate with camp officials in planning a brief 2-day visit to Washington for the delegates. Yesterday afternoon they toured the installations of the Goddard Space Flight Center, Greenbelt, Md., and last night were at the beautiful Water Gate Theater.

This morning the group was escorted through the White House, after which they went to the Department of Justice and were personally received by the Attorney General, Robert F. Kennedy. Representative KEN HECHLER, of West Virginia, arranged this memorable meeting and guided the campers as they inspected the U.S. Capitol Building.

A luncheon was scheduled in the New Senate Office Building to which all members of the Senate were invited. As host, it was my pleasure to introduce to the delegates many Senators to greet the young men from their respective States. Also introduced were: Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain of the Senate; Prof. Charles N. Cochran of West Virginia University, director of the National Youth Science Camp; Dr. Glenn T. Seaborg, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission; Hon. James E. Webb, Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration; Representative HECHLER, a member of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics; Dr. Leland J. Haworth, Director of the National Science Foundation; and myself.

In the principal address, Atomic Energy Commission Chairman Seaborg called attention to the expanding role of the scientists, not only in building a stronger nation, but in helping to govern it as well. Dr. Seaborg said: "Over the years as the United States matured in its industrial development many other trades and professions have furnished legislators. Now that we are strongly entering into a revolution of science we may expect to see scientists taking part in making the laws of the Nation as duly elected representatives of the people."

Mr. President, I request that Dr. Seaborg's inspiring message be printed in the RECORD, together with my remarks in introducing him, and a list of the delegates to the second annual national youth science camp.

There being no objection, the address, introductory remarks, and list were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF SENATOR JENNINGS RANDOLPH, DEMOCRAT, OF WEST VIRGINIA, INTRODUCING DR. GLENN T. SEABORG AT LUNCHEON HONORING DELEGATES TO THE NATIONAL YOUTH SCIENCE CAMP, NEW SENATE OFFICE BUILDING, THURSDAY, JULY 9, 1964

We honor the 100 delegates to the National Youth Science Camp—young men of scholastic and leadership ability from the 50 States of the Union. This luncheon is designed to provide an opportunity for "mutual inspection" between the delegates and the U.S. Senators who represent them. We seek an air of informality in which these youthful scientists can gain a new appreciation of the responsibilities and challenges which confront the legislator in the discharge of his duties. In turn, each Senator will leave this room with renewed confidence in young Americans and clearer insights into the goals and ambitions they embrace.

The world-renowned Albert Einstein was asked how he explained that outstanding progress could be achieved in the intricate and unfathomed world of physics, and yet there appeared to be little progress in politics. He replied simply: "Physics is easier."

Without commenting pro or con, I express the hope that the scientists and politicians gathered here will depart with a better understanding of each others' role in building a better America.

Albert Einstein may have achieved an intellectual feat which will never be repeated. He may have been the last man ever to reestablish the foundations of physics singlehandedly. I do not infer that this complex discipline will never need revision, for it probably will. But, few physicists believe that a single mind will ever again be capable of so enormous a task.

Still, who can tell? Perhaps in some small laboratory, or isolated schoolhouse, or perhaps even in this very room there is a budding genius who will write a short paper which will establish his name alongside those of Newton, Archimedes and Einstein.

You delegates are doubtless inspired by the presence here today of internationally respected men of science and authority such as Dr. Haworth, Dr. Hornig and Mr. Webb. Theirs in considerable degree is the task of shaping the patterns of scientific inquiry and effort in the most powerful Nation on earth.

It is fitting then, that we have as our principal speaker a gentleman who is no stranger to public service, and who has also won acclaim for his achievements in the world of the test tube, beaker and bunsen burner—or more properly—the world of reactors, isotopes and transuranium elements.

Dr. Glenn T. Seaborg is Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, and a member of the highly sensitive National Aeronautics and Space Council, a top-level policymaking group headed personally by President Johnson.

As a young instructor in chemistry at the University of California, he became the codiscoverer in 1940, of element 94, plutonium. Since then he has established himself as a foremost authority on the transuranium elements and has personally contributed to the discovery and identification of a number of these vital properties.

His work in this field led to his appointment in 1942 to take part in the famed Manhattan project at the University of Chicago, where he remained until after the close of World War II.

Dr. Seaborg is author of approximately 200 scientific papers, and several books. He served for a time as chancellor of the University of California and in various teaching posts. He was chosen in 1947 by the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce as one of the Nation's 10 outstanding young men. He has earned innumerable recognitions and honors including the Nobel Prize in Chemistry in 1951, and the AEC's Enrico Fermi Award in 1959.

The late President Kennedy appointed our guest as Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission in January of 1961, and he was reappointed for a succeeding 5-year term in 1963.

It is a privilege to introduce a learned man of science who has become an effective force in the molding of public policy. I present the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, Dr. Glenn T. Seaborg.

PIONEERING IN THE NEW WORLD OF SCIENCE

(By Glenn T. Seaborg, Chairman, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission)

I am particularly gratified to be able to speak before this large group of young men who are taking time out from a pleasant and stimulating 3 weeks' encampment in the mountains of West Virginia, a period devoted to outdoor sport and science studies, to visit us here in Washington. I only wish the shoe were on the other foot and I were able to listen to what some of you have to say about the future of science, for it is really in the imaginative enthusiasm of the young scientists that we of previous generation will be able to visualize what is in store for us in these beginnings of the third revolution, the revolution of science.

Last year another group of delegates such as this heard Mr. Webb on the subject of man's adventure into space, and I believe that earlier during the encampment they had an opportunity of talking with Astronaut Scott Carpenter about his experiences beyond the earth's atmosphere. This is no doubt that today the pioneers are those who are engaged in pushing back the frontiers of science. The terra incognita—the unexplored territories of our time—are the territories beyond the bounds of present scientific knowledge and they are yielding rapidly to man's insatiable quest for further knowledge of the universe in which he finds himself.

I want to stress today that these frontiers should not be considered only in terms of the dimensions and extent of physical space. There are many dimensions involved in the pioneering explorations of modern science. Time has become an exceedingly important dimension. Some 30 years ago a French philosopher and poet, Paul Valery, found it remarkable that at that time man had begun to measure the duration of many events in units as small as a twentieth of a second instead of by hours or days or years as he once did. What would Mr. Valery think if he should return to the present-day world and learn that we have by now found ways of measuring time not in twentieths, hundredths, or even thousandths of a second but in microseconds or millionths of a second? And we are not doing this out of idle curiosity alone. The precise control of the giant rockets that launch our astronauts on their voyages into space depends on this kind of accuracy in timing and coordinating the sequence of operations. Here we have an example of man creating an extension of himself in the computer for doing a task that he is incapable of doing unaided. The first approaches to such superhuman timing were the gunsighting control systems developed during World War II.

I want to emphasize further that the great physical exploits of our time are all of them based on a multitude of even greater intellectual exploits that formed the foundation of their accomplishment.

Many of these intellectual exploits involve an exploration of the structure and particles that compose the atom, once thought to be the smallest possible division of matter. As a matter of fact the clocks on which we now depend for the fabulous degrees of accuracy we have achieved in measuring time are atomic clocks. Before this we were using the vibrations of very precisely dimensioned crystals of quartz. And still earlier we used such comparatively crude devices as pendulums.

You may have suspected by this time that I am leading you into the realm of nuclear science and engineering and I must confess that this is indeed the case. Nuclear science—the field of particular interest to those of us who are concerned with the national nuclear energy program—opens out in many fascinating directions. Not the least of these is its connection with the space program (and I will give you a little more detail on that in a moment). The Atomic Energy Commission has for many years been deeply involved in fundamental scientific research programs—high- and low-energy physics, radiochemistry and radiobiology, metallurgy, solid state physics, and plasma physics, to mention some major areas. In our applied research and development activities a major objective, as many of you know, has been the use of nuclear energy for electrical power and propulsion. In this field of endeavor we have already to our credit the unparalleled achievements of the *Nautilus* type submarine and the NS *Savannah* and we have developed, years sooner than we expected to do so, reactors which promise to make electrical power from nuclear fuel widely available at a reasonable price.

The frontiers of today include research on means of desalting seawater to provide ample supplies of fresh water for the arid regions of the world, including some sections of the United States. We see nuclear energy as one of the most promising implements for conquering this frontier. Our imaginations are stirred also by the objectives of Plowshare, the use of nuclear detonations to accomplish civil engineering projects on a scale previously inconceivable—cutting gaps through mountain ranges and digging canals to connect ocean with ocean and waterway with waterway.

Less spectacular in their dimensions but of no less importance to the national health and economy are the widespread applications of radioisotopes. These products of the nuclear reactor and cyclotron have revolutionized many industrial control processes, have served as tracers enabling us to better observe some of the key biological processes such a photosynthesis and genetic transformation, have been useful in locating and tracing the flow of water underground, and have made important contributions to medical diagnosis and therapy.

What I have to say about nuclear energy and the space program isn't based on firsthand participation because Mr. Webb hasn't yet come up with a capsule built to my dimensions.

But I can assure you we are hard at work with his people developing nuclear power sources to furnish both electrical energy and propulsion for the space program. We have two programs in this area. The Rover program is the development of a nuclear rocket which utilizes a nuclear reactor to heat liquid hydrogen, the most efficient rocket propellant, to high temperatures. In May of this year, a possible reactor for this rocket was successfully tested at our Nuclear Rocket Development Station near Las Vegas. Our other program is the SNAP program (which stands for Systems for Nuclear Auxiliary Power). This program is aimed at the development of both radioisotope sources and compact, reliable nuclear reactors which would generate electrical power in space. It was in the SNAP program that we achieved our first space success in June 1961 when a small 3-watt generator was successfully orbited in space. It still operates today. Since then, several of these radioisotopic electric generators, which have no moving parts since they utilize thermoelectric elements to convert the heat into electricity, have been placed in orbit. Next year we expect to place in orbit our first compact nuclear reactor.

Further in the future, but—according to many AEC scientists enthusiastically working in this field—not beyond our ultimate grasp is the possibility of controlled thermonuclear power. The international peaceful competition in this field to harness the potentially limitless energy of the fusion reaction (the reaction by means of which the sun's energy is released) is gaining in momentum year by year. I need not emphasize the significance a real breakthrough in this field would have for the future of mankind.

Here then are a few of the varied opportunities awaiting young scientists in the field of nuclear energy alone.

As I have said on other occasions there is room for a broad spectrum of abilities in the democracy of science. I want to push that point even further than before. Most of you young men here today are capable of becoming leaders in science and engineering. You are here because you have demonstrated not only your intellectual capability in science but have also shown promise of leadership. You therefore have a wide range of choice opening before you into the future. At the same time you have obligations that cannot be disregarded without serious consequences both to yourself and to the society, the country, which has done much to shape you into the excellent young men you are today. You have the obligation to accept the responsibilities that go with outstanding capability.

The scientists of the generation which made its great contribution during the period of World War II were the first, I think, to have strongly impressed on them that no scientist of the future—even the most theoretical—can expect to live insulated from the social consequences of his work as a scientist. At one time this was possible.

The scientist was a remote figure in a quiet laboratory whose ideas may have been of tremendous consequence to others in his field, but whose prime achievements were not so well reported in the newspapers as the fact that Man-of-War had won the Derby. There may be a few of the more senior Senators in the audience who will remember Man-of-War.

Today the scientist finds himself called upon to advise and assist in the process of government—legislative, executive, and judicial. He may even find himself lured away from the laboratory and the university, which he has always considered his natural habitat, to become the administrator of an agency when the agency's programs deal largely with his field of competence. He will almost certainly—if he makes any considerable mark in his specialization—be asked to serve on one of the numerous scientific advisory committees that are now essential to almost every agency—the Department of Defense, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the National Institutes of Health, the Atomic Energy Commission to name only a few of the most demanding customers. I don't believe many scientists today can complain of leading sheltered lives. They may not visit places quite as interesting as those reached by the jet set, but scientists of the present day accumulate about as many miles of airline travel. The other day starting on a trip I told my third son (there are four altogether), "I'm off to Nebraska." He just waved me a backhanded goodbye without interrupting his surveillance of a game between the Senators and the Chicago White Sox. This story also illustrates another point I suppose—that as important as science has become it still has to compete with baseball.

Frankly, I don't foresee the demands on the scientist stopping with things as they are now. I believe the time is approaching when the scientist will be moved—and should be moved—to seek responsibility of the highest order in the legislative process itself. There was a time in our country when the Congress was composed almost entirely in its membership of those trained in the legal profession and this profession no doubt will continue to be predominant. But over the years as the United States matured in its industrial development many other trades and professions have furnished legislators. Now that we are strongly entering into a revolution of science we may expect to see scientists taking part in making the laws of the Nation as duly elected representatives of the people. It would not surprise me some day to hear that one of the young men present at this luncheon had—after making a name for himself as a scientist—gone ahead to achieve equal eminence in the Congress of the United States.

I would hope that this may happen because I believe the scientists has obligations of this kind to his fellow citizens. Having had this brief opportunity to size up another promising group of future scientists and citizens such as this one further strengthens my belief that America's future lies in good hands.

DELEGATES TO NATIONAL YOUTH SCIENCE CAMP

ALABAMA

Billy Collier, Titus.
Charles Michael Simpson, Hartselle.

ALASKA

Robert Edward Sands, Juneau.
William Dale Allen, Anchorage.

ARIZONA

Carl T. Swanson, Jr., Phoenix.
Gerard R. Bogue, Tucson.

ARKANSAS

Gibson Preston Stroupe, Helena.
Victor Manuel Lovell, Fort Smith.

CALIFORNIA

Patrick G. Hogan, San Francisco.
David B. MacQueen, Saratoga.

COLORADO

Jeffrey H. Loesch, Montrose.
Daniel James Wilson, Durango.

CONNECTICUT

Michael Zeilik, Stratford.
Robert Michael Wilson, Woodbridge.

DELAWARE

Norman A. Nielsen, Wilmington.
Richard Platt, Wilmington.

FLORIDA

Terry Alan Grossman, West Miami.
Neil Erling Olsen, Cape Kennedy.

GEORGIA

Robert W. Willingham, Washington.
David F. Foster, Athens.

HAWAII

Patrick T. Murata, Hawaii.
Michael Takemori, Honolulu.

IDAHO

Terrence Roy White, New Plymouth.
Jack Haxton, Genesee.

ILLINOIS

Stephen Butler, Leland.
Michael James Berry, Chicago.

INDIANA

Michael Wayne Dybel, Highland.
Stephen D. Ahlbrand, Columbus.

IOWA

Richard C. Randell, Keosauqua.
Donald B. Irwin, Bagley.

KANSAS

Richard A. Berg, Wichita.
Robert E. Jacoby II, Topeka.

KENTUCKY

John Howard Duff, Jr., Bowling Green.
Crawford Harris Blakeman, Jr., Middlesboro.

LOUISIANA

John Walter Harris, Baton Rouge.
Joseph Peter Frederick, New Orleans.

MAINE

Richard E. Pollard, Falmouth.
Roger Pinkos, Falmouth.

MARYLAND

Arnold L. Polinger, Chevy Chase.
Edward T. Strassberger, Aberdeen Proving Ground.

MASSACHUSETTS

C. Whiting Rice, Wrentham.
William H. Ryder, Hamilton.

MICHIGAN

Timothy Murphy, East Lansing.
Thomas Riddering, Detroit.

MINNESOTA

Richard J. Borken, Duluth.
Randall R. Gawtry, International Falls.

MISSISSIPPI

D. Conrad Smith, Jackson.
Robert Douglas Gillette, Biloxi.

MISSOURI

John Charles Lamy, Sedalia.
Mel Piehl, St. Louis.

MONTANA

Charles Campana, Anaconda.
Franklin Lamb, Helena.

NEBRASKA

Stephen L. Coy, Lincoln.
Kenneth R. Middleton, Bellevue.

NEVADA

Mark Duane Wallace, Elko.
Robert D. Spitzer, Reno.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Robert Chasse, Sommersworth.
Ronald Labbe, Berlin.

NEW JERSEY

John J. Clair, Trenton.
William Ehrhardt, Paterson.

NEW MEXICO

Richard H. St. John, Albuquerque.
Robert L. Mercer, Albuquerque.

NEW YORK

Robert T. Baumel, Elmhurst.
William C. Mead, Lancaster.

NORTH CAROLINA

William O. Wallace, Washington.
Richard T. Williams, Mount Holly.

NORTH DAKOTA

Brady Vick, Minot.
Jerry L. Sander, Bismarck.

OHIO

Joseph Pottebaum, Middletown.
Frederick W. Walker, Toledo.

OKLAHOMA

Barry A. Blackman, Duncan.
Raymond Simons, Ponca City.

OREGON

Douglas DeHart, Portland.
Conrad Fong, Corvallis.

PENNSYLVANIA

William Shaheen, Pittsburgh.
Robert B. Litman, Philadelphia.

RHODE ISLAND

Theodore E. Kubaska, Chepachet.
Paul Edward McNamee, Woonsocket.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Tommy Littlejohn, Spartanburg.
William John Hilton, Jr., Rock Hill.

SOUTH DAKOTA

James Conrad Giebink, Sioux Falls.
Brian E. Tucholke, Hot Springs.

TENNESSEE

Joe Alexander Sigman, Dyersburg.
Donald Eric Peterson, Oak Ridge.

TEXAS

Arthur E. Cavazos, Houston.
Tom L. Neal, Austin.

UTAH

Lynn B. Higgs, Bountiful.
Thomas D. Rogerson, Salt Lake City.

VERMONT

William Joseph Kolasky, Jr., Springfield.
Edward Henry Beaudette, Northfield.

VIRGINIA

Stephen Ira Gallant, Fredericksburg.
David Brownell Coomber, Arlington.

WASHINGTON

Julian Tarnowski, Vancouver.
Dennis McGuire, Seattle.

WEST VIRGINIA

Daniel Kurtz, Charleston.
Edgar Norris Jaynes, Jr., Fairmont.

WISCONSIN

Max S. Elbaum, Milwaukee.
William H. Carlson, Superior.

WYOMING

James Albert Helzer, Cheyenne.
David Kimport, Newcastle.

Address of Congresswoman Catherine May, of Washington, Before Maryland-Washington, D.C.-Delaware Broadcasters' Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 9, 1964

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, on June 26, 1964, Congresswoman CATHERINE MAY addressed the annual convention of the Maryland - Washington, D.C. - Delaware Broadcasters' Association at Rehoboth Beach, Del.

In a forthright statement, Mrs. MAY reviewed the role and responsibility of private industry in today's free enterprise economy. I was privileged to be present on this occasion and was delighted to hear a Member of Congress set forth, with such insight and understanding, the problems facing our Nation's businesses.

Mr. President, in order that my colleagues may have the benefit of Mrs. MAY'S thoughts, I ask unanimous consent that the speech delivered before the Maryland - Washington, D.C. - Delaware Broadcasters' Association be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I feel a special kinship to members of the broadcasting industry. I started my business career—as a bachelor girl—telling housewives how to handle their homes, their husbands, and their children.

Not having any of these at the time, I was extremely generous with my advice.

Needless to say, I escaped with my life and limbs intact, although both have grown older since then.

As a result of my radio experience and subsequent election to the Congress, I have been privileged to view your industry from two vantage points—as it actually performs and as it reacts to Congress and Congress reacts to it.

I am reminded of a line from Shakespeare, which you will note I altered a bit, that reads: "Ten thousand men that 'Minows' (fishes) gnawed upon."

"Me thought I saw a thousand fearful wrecks," he added, an appellation which I will not apply on this occasion, despite your problems with the Federal agency that watches over you with such benevolence.

In any event, just as you now are dealing with a new voice and personality in the segment of the Government that concerns you the most, so are you facing new problems within your own industry.

Satellites, Telstar, and Lord know what, confront your visions daily as you look into the future and what it will bring.

I am confident that with your wisdom and know-how, you will meet the challenge of the sixties just as you have met the challenge of each decade of change in the past.

But, I think the main reason that I am very proud and happy to be with your group today is that it has always been my sincere belief that there isn't very much that can go wrong with this country if we keep the communication lines open between the people and those who serve them in public office and make governmental decisions on their behalf. You are a vitally important segment of that two-way communication line.

I went to Congress 5 years ago with the announced intention that I would try to be, at the congressional level, a true and faithful partner to American business. And that intention was based on my sincere belief that the great American dream of better living will be realized only if we keep our private enterprise system healthy and unhampered in its growth.

When I entered the Halls of the Nation's Capitol back in 1959, our Nation was well along in the most complex period of its history. And a flashback of those intervening 5 years presents to me an almost unbelievable panorama of events that have quite literally occurred one on top of the other. The international crises keeping us always on the brink of peril: in Cuba, Vietnam, Indonesia, the Congo—Latin America, today—Zanzibar, Tanganyika, Panama, Cyprus. Our own Nation torn by racial riot, one change of Presidency by hard-fought election, and another change of Presidency by tragic, horrifying assassination. And always, Congress grinding along, turning out those laws that inevitably will set into action a change of pattern for the American people. A Congress that is alternately charged with doing too much and then lambasted for doing nothing. You and I together have lived through a lot in the past 5 years. And it looks like we're probably going to have to live through a lot more. But I never lose my faith that we'll come through all right if we can just stay free to roll with the punches.

And, thank God, that's what our Founding Fathers had in mind. Those wise, foresighted gentlemen couldn't promise us we wouldn't have our terrible troubles and our tragic problems. Maybe they couldn't label them: Fascism, communism, racism, population explosion, automation—they just knew we'd have them. So, in the absence of a guarantee against problems, they set up a strong system to guarantee us the freedom to use our individual strength and know-how to meet those problems, figure out the best way to lick them, and all of us have something to say about the choices we made. And that system has been working just fine for 177 years—developing us into the richest, strongest nation in the world, free from completely centralized power and dictatorship. And so you would just naturally think that at this climax in our Nation's history we Americans would be busier than ever strengthening this system, releasing more of our creative energies to build bigger and better mousetraps to lick our at-home problems, to meet the challenge, every place it rose around the world, of fending off the attempted takeover of freemen by slave societies.

Instead, strange paradox, the challenge to America today is to remain free ourselves while we combat the concepts of dictator nations. We have two battlefronts—abroad and at home. And what worries me is that while everyone is aware of the existence of the cold war on the far-flung fronts of the world * * * a lot of Americans, too many, remain completely oblivious of the battle on the homefront. Now this isn't too surprising because the shape of that battle is very hazy in outline sometimes. And we have a lot of well-meaning people who muddy up the picture running around in little circles crying "charge" and "attack" when the dragon just isn't there. (And in this respect may I assure you that I am not one of those who wants to turn back the hands on the clock of history. Even if I wanted to it would be politically impossible, and even if it were politically feasible, it would be economically disastrous.)

But it seems to me that the main reason so many citizens are unaware of this battle is that it is so subtle. The line which separates legitimate government regulation from encroachment by government on our personal liberty and free choice is extremely fine. I am frank to admit to you that this is the question that, above all else, causes me the most soul searching as I evaluate the various legislative proposals we process in the U.S. Congress. So, if it is difficult for those of us who are sitting in the front row on the 50-yard line to determine what is sound regulation by government and what is unbridled regimentation, it is not surprising that many of our citizens today fail to be aware that the game is even being played.

There recently came across my desk a book, just published, titled "The Attack on Our Free Choice." It was written by Meryle Rukeyser, an outstanding economist and journalist. In his book, Mr. Rukeyser gives an excellent appraisal of the state of our Nation in regards regimentation versus free choice. He gives a detailed analysis of the many ways we have, over the past few years, wrested decisionmaking from the individual citizen and given it to the bureaucrats. And he really puts the finger on those so-called liberals who promote the idea that our Constitution is an old-fashioned, outmoded document, a relic of the dark ages. Because they are stymied by the Constitution itself in removing its safeguards by legal means, they seek to circumvent the Constitution with promises of a millenium. On this Mr. Rukeyser says, "Nowadays words are weapons in the battle for men's hearts and minds and in the search for power through boob appeal, a school of thought in universities and high posts of government has seductively, through blue-sky word usage, sought to make varying degrees of slavery (or regimentation) seem more glamorous than freedom." In other words, the devastating and diabolical technique of offering sugar-coated alternative to free choice.

Now I want to make it very clear that I don't think my fellow Americans are stupid, I don't think they are gullible, and I don't think they are indifferent to the welfare of their country. I believe 100 percent with the man who said, "Americans will never give away their freedom, except under a delusion." But there is the rub—the delusion.

As I said in the beginning we have a host of problems to settle in this country. It shames and irritates us all that in a nation as rich and strong as ours we should be plagued with the social festers of the too-many jobless, deprived and under-nourished children, the helpless elderly who need more adequate medical care, hovel housing, and those other sore spots that mar the great image of a great country. And so it is not to be wondered at that in our deep concern over these things we find ourselves succumbing to the appeal of socially desirable programs associated with government action. And then, too, because it gives comfort to our enemies, we're especially humiliated when one of the members of our great American business sector gets caught with his hand in the cookie jar. In these cases the American public, embarrassed and indignant, is too often ready to be persuaded that government intervention is the sole approach for dealing with abuses and evils and malpractices.

And there lies the fertile, fallow ground in which the dedicated liberals plant their seeds, with high hopes of harvesting another good crop of programs by Government and more Federal rules and regulations. And there lies another million jobs for Federal employees to do the weeding and the watering.

Five years ago I went to Congress determined to try and be an effective partner to the best interest of American business. May I be the first to publicly confess that we partners haven't been anywhere near as effective as we should be.

The voice of business has been a splintered voice and there have been many times that I felt great concern for industry when it either did not deserve criticism, or because of its own political ineptitude, created a situation that aroused comments from its harshest critics.

There has been a steady, constant, centralized control of power within the Federal Government that has not been completely arrested under either Republican or Democratic administration.

There is the antibusiness attitude prevalent today. It has become popular to criticize business, to use it as a whipping boy, to criticize bigness or profits as being something bad or extremely distasteful, if not indecent.

Punitive legislation is still finding its way into law at the Federal, State, and local levels. Our opposition is increasing its vocal strength and in a much more articulate way than we are. There are those who fear encroachment on Federal powers and would fight to preserve the Government bureaucracy. The presence of labor is evident to anyone who has traveled between Capitol Hill and the White House and noticed the marble palaces that house their headquarters and legislative liaison machinery. These people—many of them dedicated and sincere—work daily, hammer and tong, on the development of policies which over the years will be detrimental to business. I often ask myself if we, who believe in the free enterprise system, are half as zealous.

To make matters difficult, the business record is not completely clean. We have to admit that there are chinks in the armor and that a few in the ranks of business have marred the good record of many by false advertising, unfair prices, nonperformance on Government contracts, and antitrust involvements which have been of great concern to us all. In addition, there is the fragmentation of industry itself and the diversions of viewpoint. Add to this a fear of political involvement on one hand and complete lack of interest on the other from some segments of business and one finds a dilution of the private enterprise story.

So the chips are down for America and we, who believe in the private enterprise system, are faced with the greatest challenge we have ever had. We also have tremendous resources with which to do the job. The American business sector possesses intelligence, loyalty, and a tremendous devotion to an ideal which made our Nation what it is today. We are unified in our belief that the purpose of the Constitution is to set the ground rules, and limit even the right of democratically chosen legislatures, National and State, to invade the inalienable rights of citizens. We are experienced in recognizing areas for Government action and private decisionmaking. And we know that if we show the lines of demarcation clearly to our fellow citizens they'll support us in seeing that they are respected. We can meet this challenge. But it will take a modern approach in these modern times, so that our way of life will not merely survive but will gain ground at the same time. A standoff will not do.

I mentioned earlier that as a young upstart how I advised housewives to run their homes and so, today, I am sure you in your brodacasting industry, feel that everybody is advising you how to conduct your business.

I shall, of course, hasten to add my own two cents worth, not only for the obvious benefit of those before me, but to business in general.

Yours is a unique industry, an important industry, but you as individuals are no different from the run of the mill businessman when it comes to community responsibility, and national interest. In fact, if anything, you are more so.

By your own volition you have become the eyes and the ears of the world. I leave it to your own aches and pains to determine whether or not this is a blessing, but it is an inescapable fact and one you cannot avoid facing, even if you wanted to do so.

Because there is glamor, immediately, and close personal contact in what you are doing and selling, you often are the victims of catalystic reaction from the people—and you often return the compliment—in spades.

Now, business is my business, as a woman, housewife, mother, and as a Member of Congress. So I'm no patsy about the claims some segments of your community may try to sell as alleged wounded dragons of the free enterprise system.

Nor do I think you and your profit system brethren in other areas of our economy are all bad—or I wouldn't be here and neither would you.

We are coming down to the wire, faster than you think, in the constant struggle between business and government over who is going to control our national economy—and thence the welfare and freedom of all of us.

At this point in our history I would wish that every American citizen would have hanging in his home or his office the words of Alexander Fraser Tytler:

"A democracy cannot exist as a permanent form of government. It can only exist until the voters discover they can vote themselves largess out of the public treasury. From that moment on the majority always votes for the candidate promising the most benefits from the public treasury with the result that democracy always collapses over a loose fiscal policy, always to be followed by a dictatorship and then a monarchy."

It is essential then that you give renewed consideration to the important role your industry plays in this drama of titans.

Look about you, here in Washington today—at the White House, the regulatory agencies, the Congress itself—at the steps being taken or contemplated—to control by Federal fiat (sanction; decree) the payrolls of industry's employees; the packaging, the labeling, the customers you can or cannot service, the teaching, the transportation and maybe even dialogue between our people and its elected representatives.

Some of you are worried about where the yellow went—more of you had better be concerned about where the freedom went—because what I am talking about is not a speck on the horizon, a dark cloud in our future or a bad apple in the barrel, or any other bit of wisdom we might glean from Benjamin Franklin. It's here today, now, on Capitol Hill, the White House, and up and down Pennsylvania Avenue.

Whether we get what they are planning for us, or avoid it, largely depends on what and how well the facts are communicated to the American people.

And this is your job. And the job of all business interests.

(1) Business must police itself—every abuse of the business trust creates a clamor for government action. You have a code of ethics—some of you live up to it—some of you hang a sign in your window. It must assume, in word and fact, the true sense of corporate responsibility, and with this a sense of humility and sincerity. It is important that everyone work at this to build a convincing image of integrity through action rather than words.

(2) From business should come creative leadership in meeting the social problems of our day with positive programs. Attempts of the private sector to sweep the mess under the rug, or just pretend it isn't there, raises the hue and cry for government action.

(3) Business must do a better job of telling its story. If too many Americans today have the feeling that business is a class apart or a special interest group instead of the most important operating arm of our entire national structure, then business must share part of the blame. The public must be given the economic facts of life in an understandable, forthright way.

My fourth and final point is that business should encourage employees to develop and maintain contact with elected representatives and take an active interest in political issues and party work. There is only one way to influence national policy and that is within the framework of this country's two-party system. Unless you participate at some level of political life in your country today, then you are letting someone else make your final decisions for you. Unlike Soviet Russia and other Communist countries, in a republic there is no law compelling you to be politically active. You can shirk your responsibilities, you can stand on the sidelines and there is no legal penalty. But the penalty in a free nation when a large percentage of the population refuses to give their country a helping hand comes to everyone when a nation goes down to defeat, not only does the present generation go down with it but their children and their children's children.

In many areas of current distress your industry has done a superb job. The victims of racial unfairness, of poverty and poor education are advertised better than bars of soap today, and this is honest journalism or communicating, or whatever you want to call it.

You present it, you analyze it, you editorialize on it.

And you serve your Nation when you do.

But the coin has another side—how do we cure our economic and personal ailments?

Just reporting what government wants is not enough.

Business has a viewpoint. Let's hear what it is, more often, more loudly, and more consistently.

If you aren't embarrassed about selling underarm deodorants, I can't see why there should be any bashfulness about selling the business viewpoint with the same freedom and glibness. You get paid for advertising the deodorant—but I doubt if you have seen a check from government for your public service time.

Nor should there be any bashfulness about clouting business, including your own, when it gets off base.

Business is trying—with public affairs programs—business-industry political action committees—in hundred of different ways it is trying to make its voice heard—and all it needs is a little encouragement.

The voice of labor, the voice of government comes across loud and clear on your wave lengths—largely, I believe, because it does not have the responsibility of paying for all the bright new ideas and ideals it propounds.

But the voice of business is truly the voice of the turtle, unless my creeping deafness is getting worse.

Somebody has got to pay the piper, for all of these grand schemes if they are sold to the American people—and they are being sold because the voice of caution is awfully quiet.

You are the technicians and the experts on how to bring balance to our economic arguments and benefit all of the people.

In Congress we can only respond to the wishes of our people and provide our own poor efforts in trying to lead them down the pathways of decency, happiness, and security.

You are the petitioners, in a way that no other industry can be.

You are the communicators of ideas as well as being partial owners of our free enterprise system as individuals, employers, and stockholders.

Your opportunity is unique, as you have recognized. Your job now, as I see it, is to concentrate the same genius, energy, and facilities—in utmost fairness—in selling the other half of the story about where America is headed behind the mounting pressure of Government supervision and regulation.

Some of it we must have. But we had better be intelligent about how much of it we can stand. There are limits, Germany learned that, and the Russian people are beginning to behave like international Beatles under the same yoke.

My office door is open to help. I have no fear about the results, only the consequences if we default our obligations to inform.

We did not build this great Nation overnight—but we did build it enwrapped in an ideal of freedom that glows with the same brightness today as it did almost 200 years ago.

You did not build your industry in a day. It took sweat, tears, intelligence, and hard cash.

It does today.

It also takes courage. It involves risks and it demands leaders.

Your industry is blessed with men and women of talent and imagination that is the envy of all others.

You have met change, consternation, and confusion before—and conquered them all.

The American people look to you for leadership. They have not been disappointed in the past nor will they be in the days ahead. The need to know is greater than ever before. The facilities to inform are more sophisticated than ever before.

Your energy and courage will provide the mix. Get on with the job. I'll be listening.

SENATE

Friday, July 10, 1964

The Senate met at 9 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. Metcalf).

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 321, as amended, and the order of the Senate of yesterday, the Chair declares the Senate adjourned until 12 o'clock noon on Monday, July 20, 1964.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, JULY 20, 1964

Thereupon (at 9 o'clock and 12 seconds a.m.) the Senate adjourned, pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 321, adopted July 2, 1964, until Monday, July 20, 1964, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 20, 1964

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

II Timothy 2: 19: *Nevertheless the foundation of God standeth sure.*

Almighty God, our Father, we are invoking Thy needed blessing as we search and strive for the right solution to our many difficult problems.

Grant that we may not be merely content to stand idly by and deplore these days when the old foundations and securities of our turbulent and troubled world are being severely shaken.

May the mind and heart of our President, our Speaker, and all the Members of Congress be tempered and inspired by that calm and steadfast spirit which has found its refuge and strength in Thee.

Show us how the ideals and lofty principles, which Thou hast ordained and called us to proclaim and practice, may become a more vital force in our beloved country and in the life of humanity as it struggles for freedom and peace.

In the name of our blessed Lord we offer our prayer of supplication and intercession. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, July 2, 1964, was read and approved.

COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communications from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

Office of the Clerk,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C., July 3, 1964.

The Honorable the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Sir: Pursuant to authority granted on July 2, 1964, the Clerk received from the Secretary of the Senate today the following message:

That the Senate passed H. Con. Res. 323 entitled "Concurrent resolution requesting the President to return to the House the enrolled bill (H.R. 10053) entitled 'An act to amend section 502 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, relating to construction differential subsidies', and for other purposes."

Respectfully yours,
Ralph R. Roberts,
Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives.
By John A. Roberts.

Office of the Clerk,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C., July 3, 1964.

The Honorable the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Sir: Pursuant to authority granted on July 2, 1964, the Clerk received from the Secretary of the Senate today the following message:

That the Senate passed H.R. 5478, entitled "An act authorizing a survey of the Frio River in the vicinity of Three Rivers, Tex., in the interest of flood control and allied purposes.";

That the Senate passed H.R. 6385, entitled "An act for the relief of Wolfgang Seidl.";

That the Senate passed H.R. 6923, entitled "An act authorizing a survey of Cedar Bayou, Tex., in the interest of flood control and allied purposes.";

That the Senate passed H.R. 10407, entitled "An act for the relief of Keith Hills.";

That the Senate agreed to the conference report on H.R. 10456, entitled "An act to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and administrative operations, and for other purposes.";

That the Senate agreed to the conference report on S. 2, entitled "An act to establish water resources research centers at land-grant colleges and State universities, to stimulate water research at other colleges, universities, and centers of competence, and to promote a more adequate national program of water research.".

Respectfully yours,
Ralph R. Roberts,
Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives.
By John A. Roberts.

Office of the Clerk,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C., July 6, 1964.

The Honorable the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Sir: Pursuant to authority granted on July 2, 1964, the Clerk received from the Secretary of the Senate today the following messages:

That the Senate passed S. 1282, entitled "An act to permit a State to increase the mileage of its Federal-aid primary system when provision is made for the completion and maintenance of 75 per centum thereof.";

That the Senate passed S. 1593, entitled "An act to amend section 14 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1954 concerning the interstate planning and coordination of the Great River Road.";

That the Senate passed S. 2164, entitled "An act for the relief of Polly Ann Mutz Kampouris.";

That the Senate passed S. 2205, entitled "An act for the relief of Giuseppe DiCenso.";

That the Senate passed S. 2452, entitled "An act for the relief of Angelina Martino.";

That the Senate passed S. 2548, entitled "An act for the relief of Nora Chin-Bing.";

That the Senate passed S. 2599, entitled "An act for the relief of Denise Hojebane Barrood.";

That the Senate passed S. 2673, entitled "An act for the relief of Debra Lynne Sanders.";

That the Senate passed S. 2698, entitled "An act for the relief of Linus Han."; and

That the Senate passed S. 2730, entitled "An act for the relief of Dr. Jorge A. Picaza.";

That the Senate passed Senate Joint Resolution 23, entitled "Joint resolution to designate the second Monday in April of each year as National Teachers' Day.";

That the Senate passed with amendment the bill (H.R. 4732) entitled "An act to change the name of the United States Olympic Association to the United States Olympic Committee.";

That the Senate passed with amendments the bill (H.R. 10503) entitled "An act to authorize appropriations for the fiscal years 1966 and 1967 for the construction of certain highways in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code, and for other purposes." and

That the Senate passed with amendment the bill (H.R. 11049) entitled "An act to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, and for other purposes."; and request a conference with the House of Representatives on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

That Mr. Johnston, Mr. Monroney, and Mr. Carlson be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

Respectfully yours,
Ralph R. Roberts,
Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives.
By John A. Roberts.

July 7, 1964.

The Honorable the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Sir: Pursuant to authority granted on July 2, 1964, the Clerk received from the Secretary of the Senate today the following messages:

That the Senate passed S. 2136, entitled "An act to amend the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended.":

That the Senate passed H.R. 287, entitled "An act to amend title II of the Social Security Act to include Nevada among those States which are permitted to divide their retirement systems into two parts for purposes of obtaining social security coverage under Federal-State agreement.";

That the Senate passed H.R. 4811, entitled "An act for the relief of Mrs. Marjorie Curtis.";

That the Senate passed H.R. 6237, entitled "An act to amend section 503 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to authorize grants for the collection, reproduction, and publication of documentary source material significant to the history of the United States, and for other purposes.";

That the Senate passed with amendment the bill (H.R. 2215) entitled "An act for the relief of E. A. Rolfe, Jr.";

That the Senate passed with amendment the bill (H.R. 2262) entitled "An act for the relief of Catalina Properties, Inc.";

That the Senate passed with amendment the bill (H.R. 8201) entitled "An act for the relief of Maj. Jack J. Shea, U.S. Air Force.";

That the Senate passed with amendments House Joint Resolution 658, entitled "Joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President to proclaim 1964 as "See America Year," and for other purposes."; and

That the President pro tempore, pursuant to Senate Joint Resolution No. 71, appointed Mr. Magnuson, Mr. McGee, Mr. Hart, Mr. Morton, and Mr. Hruska as members on the part of the Senate of the National Commission on Food Marketing.

Respectfully yours,
Ralph R. Roberts,
Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives.
By John A. Roberts.

Office of the Clerk,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C., July 8, 1964.

The Honorable the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Sir: I have the honor to transmit herewith a sealed envelope addressed to the Speaker of the House of Representatives from the President of the United States, received in the Clerk's office at 12:15 p.m. on July 8, 1964, and said to contain "H.R. 10053, an act to amend section 502 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, relating to construction differential subsidies" the return of which has been requested by House Concurrent Resolution 323 of July 2, 1964.

Respectfully yours,
Ralph R. Roberts,
Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives.
By John A. Roberts.

CONSTRUCTION DIFFERENTIAL SUBSIDIES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the message of the President of the United States.

The Clerk read as follows:

To the House of Representatives:

In compliance with the request contained in the resolution of the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring therein), I return herewith H.R. 10053, an act to amend section 502 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, relating to construction differential subsidies.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 8, 1964.*

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., July 9, 1964.

The Honorable the SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SIR: Pursuant to authority granted on July 2, 1964, the Clerk received from the Secretary of the Senate today the following messages:

That the Senate passed S. 2963, entitled "An act to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, the Atomic Energy Community Act of 1955, as amended, and the EURATOM Cooperation Act of 1958, as amended."; and

That the Senate passed without amendment the bill (H.R. 10392) entitled "An act authorizing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to locate a portion of a vehicular tunnel under parts of the U.S. Capitol Grounds and the U.S. Botanic Garden grounds, and for other purposes."

Respectfully yours,
RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives.
By JOHN A. ROBERTS.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS ENROLLED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 2735. An act for the relief of Ligia Paulina Jimenez;

H.R. 2737. An act for the relief of of Pedro Aguinaldo;

H.R. 5408. An act for the relief of Jackie Bergancia Smith;

H.R. 5478. An act authorizing a survey of the Frio River in the vicinity of Three Rivers, Tex., in the interest of flood control and allied purposes;

H.R. 5501. An act for the relief of Wieslawa Marianna Borczon;

H.R. 6385. An act for the relief of Wolfgang Seidl;

H.R. 6455. An act to amend subsection (b) of section 512 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (dealing with unrelated business taxable income);

H.R. 6473. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Loward D. Sparks;

H.R. 6923. An act authorizing a survey of Cedar Bayou, Tex, in the interest of flood control and allied purposes;

H.R. 8590. An act to incorporate the Aviation Hall of Fame;

H.R. 9094. An act to authorize the President to declare July 9, 1964, as Monocacy Battle Centennial in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the Battle of the Monocacy;

H.R. 9234. An act to incorporate the Little League Baseball, Inc.;

H.R. 10407. An act for the relief of Keith Hills;

H.R. 10437. An act to incorporate the National Committee on Radiation Protection and Measurements;

H.R. 10456. An act to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and administration operations, and for other purposes;

H.R. 11004. An act to authorize the sale, without regard to the 6-month waiting period prescribed, of zinc proposed to be disposed of pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act;

H.R. 11235. An act to authorize the disposal, without regard to the prescribed 6-month waiting period, of approximately 11 million pounds of molybdenum from the national stockpile;

H.R. 11257. An act to authorize the sale, without regard to the 6-month waiting period prescribed, of lead proposed to be disposed of pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act;

H.J. Res. 475. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim December 7, 1966, as Pearl Harbor Day in commemoration of the attack on Pearl Harbor; and

H.J. Res. 950. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to an amendment to the compact between the State of Ohio and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania relating to Pymatuning Lake.

SUNDRY ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to the authority granted him by House Concurrent Resolution 322, 88th Congress, he did on July 3, 1964, sign the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions of the House:

H.R. 2735. An act for the relief of Ligia Paulina Jimenez;

H.R. 2737. An act for the relief of Pedro Aguinaldo;

H.R. 5408. An act for the relief of Jackie Bergancia Smith;

H.R. 5478. An act authorizing a survey of the Frio River in the vicinity of Three Rivers, Tex., in the interest of flood control and allied purposes;

H.R. 5501. An act for the relief of Wieslawa Marianna Borczon;

H.R. 6385. An act for the relief of Wolfgang Seidl;

H.R. 6455. An act to amend subsection (b) of section 512 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (dealing with unrelated business taxable income);

H.R. 6473. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Loward D. Sparks;

H.R. 6923. An act authorizing a survey of Cedar Bayou, Tex., in the interest of flood control and allied purposes;

H.R. 8590. An act to incorporate the Aviation Hall of Fame;

H.R. 9094. An act to authorize the President to declare July 9, 1964, as Monocacy Battle Centennial in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the Battle of the Monocacy;

H.R. 9234. An act to incorporate the Little League Baseball, Inc.;

H.R. 10407. An act for the relief of Keith Hills;

H.R. 10437. An act to incorporate the National Committee on Radiation Protection and Measurements;

H.R. 10456. An act to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and administration operations, and for other purposes;

H.R. 11004. An act to authorize the sale, without regard to the 6-month waiting period prescribed, of zinc proposed to be disposed of pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act;

H.R. 11235. An act to authorize the disposal, without regard to the prescribed 6-month waiting period, of approximately 11 million pounds of molybdenum from the national stockpile;

H.R. 11257. An act to authorize the sale, without regard to the 6-month waiting period prescribed, of lead proposed to be disposed of pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act;

H.J. Res. 475. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim December 7, 1966, as Pearl Harbor Day in comemmoration of the 25th anniversary of the attack on Pearl Harbor; and

H. J. Res. 950. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to an amendment to the compact between the State of Ohio and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania relating to Pymatuning Lake.

And an enrolled bill of the Senate as follows:

S. 2. An act to establish water resources research centers, to promote a more adequate national program of water resource, and for other purposes.

H.R. 10053

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that after the President returned the bill, H.R. 10053, the Clerk of the House, pursuant to the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 323, 88th Congress, caused the bill to be reenrolled with a correction. The Speaker, pursuant to the authority granted him by House Concurrent Resolutions 322 and 323, 88th Congress, did on July 8, 1964, sign the same.

MEMBERS OF NATIONAL COMMISSION ON FOOD MARKETING

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to authority granted by the House on July 2, 1964, and provisions contained in section 2, Public Law 88-354, the Chair did, on July 7, 1964, appoint as members of the National Commission on Food Marketing, the following members on the part of the House: Mrs. SULLIVAN, of Missouri; Mr. PURCELL, of Texas; Mr. ROSENTHAL, of New York; Mr. CUNNINGHAM, of Nebraska; and Mrs. MAY, of Washington.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special orders I have for today, tomorrow, and the next day be postponed for 2 weeks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 1 OF HOUSE SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Subcommittee No. 1 of the House Small Business Committee be privileged to sit while the House is in session during 3 days this week, commencing tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

"FISHBAIT" MILLER IS AGAIN 39

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, fortunately we are able to resume our work in the Congress this morning on a happy note, on an occasion when we can felicitate a valued employee upon his birthday. On this day, one of the most loyal, one of the most capable, and one of the best loved employees of the House is "again 39."

I refer to our friend, and he is a good friend of every Member of the House, the Honorable William M. Miller, Doorkeeper of the U.S. House of Representatives. Congratulations, "Fishbait," the House loves, appreciates, and respects you.

OAS CAN END CASTRO IN CUBA

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, Castro has been waging war with peacemaking attempts to undermine the Organization of American States' meeting tomorrow in Washington. Because the OAS will consider strong sanctions against Cuba, Castro has generated publicity recently which makes him appear anxious for reconciliation with the free world.

But consider the source. Aside from Castro's reputation as a master of deceit, it should be recalled that the New York Times, which first carried stories of Castro's recent peace offensive, was the same newspaper which published accounts of Castro and his revolutionaries before they took over in Cuba, painting them up as freedom fighters, and overlooking their Communist backgrounds. It was New York Times Writer Herbert Mathews who traveled closely with Castro then, and who was later criticized for not revealing Castro's Communist leanings by former Ambassador to Cuba under President Eisenhower, Earl E. T. Smith.

However, Castro's efforts cannot succeed as it appears that the OAS will adopt sanctions against Cuba. One chief step which can have great effect is that of boycotting trade between Latin America and Cuba, and calling on the rest of the free world nations to do likewise.

The Cuba economy is ravaged. U.S. efforts to embargo trade have been successful, and Castro has suffered, his despair being lightened only by the trade he enjoys with our allies in Europe and elsewhere.

Yet America's efforts have been directed primarily at ending allied sales to Cuba, not allied purchases from Cuba. And ironically, most U.S. allies buy more goods from Castro than they sell to him, giving him ready markets from which to foster his regime. For example, Italy bought some $37 million in goods from Castro during 1963, while selling approximately $600,000 in return. Britain bought some $34.7 million last year, sold $5.8 million. Japan bought $21.5 million, sold $2.3 million. The total amount of goods bought last year from Castro by our allies comes to over $182 million.

The Organization of American States should not be deceived by Castro's attempts to placate the hemisphere. The United States must not soften its efforts to see these sanctions adopted by the nations of the hemisphere. It is clear that strong action by the OAS will lay the groundwork for subsequent trade boycotts of Cuba by the other nations of the free world, thereby forcing the entire supply burden for Cuba back on the already strained economies of the Communist world.

THE SITUATION IN PHILADELPHIA, MISS., AS COMPARED TO THAT WHICH EXISTS IN NEW YORK

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I have just returned from my hometown of Philadelphia, Miss., and I am glad to report that the people are getting along peacefully.

We recently had a visit to our State by J. Edgar Hoover and I hope everyone saw the favorable comment which he made wherein he stated that there had been an "overemphasis" on the situation in the South and that the situation in Mississippi is no worse than in other sections of the country.

I view with horror and concern, as do all Americans, the recent events of rioting and mob violence that has occurred in our Nation's largest city over the past weekend. I hold in my hand a copy of the New York Daily news and the pictures which appear in its center cover are indeed shocking and disgraceful. We are witnessing a complete breakdown of law and order and it comes as no surprise to those of us who have followed over the past few years the activities of such men as James Farmer, Dick Gregory, Martin Luther King, and others who have openly defied the law and have advocated a complete disregard for the laws of our communities, our States, and our Nation. It is a culmination—a product—of the leadership of men who teach and train citizens to break the law, and who themselves openly brag about how many times they have been jailed, a result of the very lawlessness which they advocate.

Mr. Speaker, for weeks now the liberal press, television, and radio have been referring to the so-called reign of terror that exists in Mississippi. I sincerely ask my colleagues and the American people: Where is this reign of terror? I shudder to think what would be the fate of the innocent law-abiding people of Mississippi if the rioting in New York City this past weekend had occurred in the South. Where are the Federal marshals that have in the past been sent into Mississippi and Alabama? Where are the 30,000 troops that were sent against the 4,000 innocent students at the University of Mississippi? Why has not the National Guard been federalized in the State of New York? What has the Attorney General, Bobby Kennedy, done to free the 30 people who were arrested in New York last night? CORE Director James Farmer even made a statement to the press that "I have not seen anything like this before, even in Alabama and Mississippi."

It is a sad commentary, Mr. Speaker, that while mobs stalk the street of New York, while innocent women and children are subjected to rape, beatings, and even murder, that some 1,500 so-called civil rights workers and troublemakers are in Mississippi, a State with the second lowest crime rate in the Nation, subjecting innocent law-abiding people to insults, national scorn, and are creating trouble wherever they can best serve their own selfish interest. I suggest that the cause of law and order would be better served if these students returned to their own State, to their own section of the country, and tried to clean up this disgraceful state of affairs which exists in the very "show place" of integration.

OLD-FASHIONED AMERICANISM

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, always have I believed in old-fashioned American patriotism and old-fashioned American Fourth of July celebrations. I think it does us all good now and then to shout out our love of country and to let everyone know that we are bursting with pride over the greatness and the goodness, the strength, and the achievements of this, our country, our own beloved United States.

Much of the spirit of the old-fashioned American Fourth of July celebration is captured in the district on the south side of Chicago that I have the honor to represent. The South Deering Improvement Association, for one, makes an all-year job of planning for the annual Fourth of July celebration with the result that the entire community—men, women, and children—actively and wholeheartedly participates in the patriotic activities that continue from morning until the close of the fireworks and the program of brief speeches and lively competitive games in Trumbull Park at night. It is estimated that the night crowd this Fourth of July in Trumbull Park numbered 80,000, certainly one of the largest gatherings in all America on the Fourth. The fireworks display usually is the most elaborate in the Chicago area.

But what impresses me perhaps more deeply than anything is that practically every home displays the American flag. The parade this year, as in previous years, covered many blocks and I saw few, if any, homes that were not brilliantly and gloriously alive with the flying colors of Old Glory.

Mr. Speaker, all of this represents hard year-round work on the part of patriotic and public-spirited Americans, I think, Mr. Speaker, it is work that pays a rich dividend in a stronger and happier America. It is in the best traditions of old-fashioned Americanism, old-fashioned love of, and pride in this, our own beloved land.

Joseph A. Grande, as in past years, was general chairman of the South Deering Improvement Association celebration, and General Horace F. Wulf the grand marshal of the parade, and deputy marshals were Andrew Diorio, Joseph Gornick, Tony Lowery, Alex Savastano, Sylvio Blascovich, Jack George, and Robert Lestinsky.

Here is the order for one of the Nation's great and inspiring Fourth of July parades:

Under Chairman Grande: Police escort, massed colors, convertibles for VIP's: Martino Motors and Roseland Buick.

Under Deputy Dioro:

Roseland Community Union Marching Band.

U.S. Marines Communications Color Guard.

Englefield Post, Veterans of Foreign Wars.

South Deering Post, American Legion.

Burke-O'Malley Post, American Legion.

Under Deputy Gornick:

William Franko Post, Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Jackson Park Post Drum and Bugle Corps, American Legion.

Russell Square Post, American Legion.

South Deering Fire Department.

Under Deputy Savastano:

Seven city floats.

Woodrow Wilson Post Drum and Bugle Corps.

Under Deputy Blascovich:

South Chicago Eagles.

Park Manor Post Drum and Bugle Corps.

Knights of Columbus.

Loyal Order of Moose.

Southeast Lions Club.

Under Deputy Lestinsky:

Illiana Post Drum and Bugle Corps.

Tenth Ward Young Democrats.

East Side Lions Club.

Lulich and Ogrizovich Post.

Under Deputies Lowery and George:

Twenty-nine floats, decorated cars and trucks, intersperse the following musical organizations: Stelmaszek Post Drum and Bugle Corps, Stelmaszek Drum and Bugle Corps Jets, and South Chicago Memorial Post Drum and Bugle Corps.

LEAGUE OF UNITED LATIN AMERICAN CITIZENS

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in 1956 David Cerda was president of the first council in the Midwest of the League of United Latin American Citizens. Now there are 10 councils in Illinois alone, and the league is one of the country's fastest growing ethnic organizations in membership and influence. This year it took over the Fourth of July celebration in Calumet Park on Chicago's south side, not only managing but financing a day-long observance of our national Independence Day that was an outstanding success and attracted tens of thousands of celebrants.

The league graciously had invited me to address the gathering, and David Cerda met me at O'Hare Airport and drove me to Calumet Park. David is of Mexican blood, his charming wife Puerto Rican. He studied for 2 years at the University of Mexico before completing his law course at DePaul University, and now has a large practice, mainly among Latin Americans. His heart is in the League of United Latin American Citizens, and this was true of all the men and women I had the good fortune to meet and talk with this Fourth of July at Calumet Park.

Mr. Speaker, I am placing in my remarks at this point the LULAC code, which defines the noble and high purpose of this dedicated organization of our fellow Americans of Latin American blood. The code follows:

Respect your citizenship and preserve it; honor your country, maintain its tradition in the spirit of its citizens and embody yourself into its culture and civilization.

Be proud of your origin and maintain it immaculate, respect your glorious past and help to defend the rights of all the people. Learn how to discharge your duties before you learn how to assert your rights; educate and make yourself worthy, and stand high in the light of your own deeds; you must always be loyal and courageous.

Filled with optimism, make yourself sociable, upright, judicious, and above all things be sober and collected in your habits, cautious in your actions and sparing in your speech.

Believe in God, love humanity, and rely upon the framework of human progress, slow and sound, unequivocal and firm.

Always be honorable and highminded, learn how to be self-reliant upon your own qualifications and resources.

In war, serve your country, in peace, your convictions; discern, investigate, meditate and think, study, at all times be honest and generous. Let your firmest purpose be that of helping to see that each new generation shall be of a youth more efficient and capable, and in this let your own children be included.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud and happy of the contribution made by men and women of Latin American blood or ancestry to the district that I have the honor to represent in the Congress of the United States. Some are employed in the steel mills, and all are hard and faithful workers for their employers and loyal to their union. Some are on the police force, some in the professions, some in executive positions and in the religious, artistic and cultural activities. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, in all the hard work and in all the good work of a community of many ethnic groups, all working together to make our America ever greater and finer, the Latin Americans have played their full part with dignity and dedication. None stands higher in the esteem of their neighbors and fellow toilers in the vineyards of this, our own United States.

Leaders of the LULAC in Illinois have a keen realization of the need for education and this is responsible for the intensive educational drive now under way, stimulated with scholarship awards. I know that my colleagues will find interesting and inspiring the following account from the program of the benefit dinner dance given to raise money for the scholarship fund:

> Up to about 1950 it had been easy for immigrants to obtain jobs in the Chicagoland area despite the fact that immigrants had very little education and only a poor knowledge of English. The children of the immigrants often quit school before finishing high school and less than half finished high school because it was then easy to obtain a job with only a little education. Today a high school diploma is only the beginning of a person's education and is essential to obtain a job. Educational training beyond high school is necessary to obtain a good job and, or, to obtain positions of responsibility and better pay. The Illinois LULAC scholarship fund has been doing its part to help the Mexican community to progress by awarding college tuition scholarships to deserving students of Mexican descent since the winter of 1957–58. The Mexican community needs college educated men and women to be our leaders and to work in our community after they have a college education. LULAC is well recognized as the leading national Mexican-American organization in the United States for the past 35 years. LULAC invites other organizations, businesses, and persons to help further the education of our Mexican youth by making donations to the Illinois LULAC scholarship fund, 2023 South Ashland Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

The present members of the board of directors of the Illinois scholarship fund are: Thomas Munoz, president, council No. 288; Markel Martinez, secretary-treasurer, council No. 288; Gilbert Munoz and Mary Ann Torres, Roseland Council No. 332; and David Cerda, South Chicago Council No. 313. The members served as the preliminary judges and selected the five finalists who were then presented to the final judges who were: Arthur Velasquez, of the Commission on Spanish-Speaking Residents of Illinois and the present president of the Mexican Chamber of Commerce; Carlos Romero, M.D., the representative of the Association of Mexican Physicians; and the Reverend William Goedert, a high official of the Catholic Board of Education.

Former scholarship award winners are: 1958, Adele Martinez; 1959, Albert Vazquez; 1960, Thomas Martinez and Sara Hernandez; 1961, Joseph J. Lazaro; 1962, Alfonso Perez, Jr.; and 1963, Robert Michael Rodriguez and James Ayala.

Miss Elvia Yolanda Armendariz is the first-place winner of the 1964 LULAC scholarship fund award.

Elvia graduated from Cardinal Stritch High School on May 31, 1964. She maintained a 90-percent grade average for the 4 years she attended this school. Her major courses of study are English and journalism.

Elvia has chosen the College of St. Francis, in Joliet, as the place in which to further her education and she has been accepted. She plans to study journalism, English, and languages. Elvia hopes to become a feature writer or a schoolteacher.

Our 1964 winner has been quite active in school. Her extracurricular activities include being a member of the school paper staff, member of the Future Teachers of America, library aid, member of the Math, Latin, and Camera Clubs. She is a member of Sodality and, also, a member of the National Honor Society. She still found time to participate in the Chicago Inter-Student Sodality, Chicago Archdiocese—CISCA. In addition, Elva has worked part time during all this time.

Elvia has won the following honors: Quill and Scroll pin, certificate in feature writing of St. Bonaventure University, and the NSPA pin in journalism.

There are six children in her family. The oldest four members of her family are married and the youngest one is still single. Her mother is a homemaker and her father is deceased. We know that Elvia will do well in her school work and go far in her chosen career.

The Illinois LULAC Scholarship Fund Board of Directors has elected to award two $500 scholarships this year. One of these scholarships will go to the 1963 first-place winner, Robert Michael Rodriguez.

Robert Michael was born in Detroit, Mich., on June 7, 1946. He attended the Andrew Jackson School before attending St. Ignatius, from which he graduated last June. He is presently attending Rockhurst College in Kansas City, Mo., where he has just completed his first year in a premedical course. He has maintained a B+ average for this year.

We feel that Robert Michael will be an even greater asset to our community once he has completed his medical studies and has started to take an active part in community affairs. Also taking second place, Miss Mary Mejia. The third place winner for 1964 is Mario Cruz.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot conclude without mention of Miss Maria Rodriguez, the queen of beauty, and her court who reigned over the celebration in Calumet Park. Latin beauty, always the toast of artists and poets, never has had more glorious reflection than in these charming young women.

After Miss Rodriquez had been crowned queen by John Delgado, the local LULAC president, she rode in the parade with her attendants, Miss Linda Tellos and Miss Delphine Estrada, who had finished second and third in the contest for the queenship. State Senator Dan Dougherty rode with them, and among the local VIP's who joined in making this an outstanding Fourth of July celebration were State Representatives Nick Svalina and Henry Lenard, Committeeman Stanley Zima and Alderman John Buchanan.

RUSSIA CONTINUES TO SHORE UP CASTRO'S DICTATORSHIP—AMERICAN GRAIN TRANSSHIPPED TO CUBA

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, the press this morning carries an article that the captain and first mate of the U.S. ship the *Sister Katingo* have seen American wheat being loaded on a Russian ship for delivery to Communist Cuba. It will be recalled that the two witnesses, Capt. Arthur H. Fertig and First Mate Daniel Jamieson, were involved in a dispute last week with the Russians over unloading charges which led to a shooting incident at sea and a Russian party boarding and searching their ship. Indeed, the two men are quoted as saying that it was the identical cargo of wheat which they had delivered to a Soviet Black Sea port that was immediately placed aboard the Soviet freighter headed for Cuba. They cite as authority for their statements both Soviet sailors and officials. The same reports indicate the State Department, when queried about this charge, contented itself with replying that it "had no information on the truth or falsity of Fertig and Jamieson's charge."

Mr. Speaker, perhaps by this time we should be completely immune from the type of shock and amazement which I felt upon reading about the reported illegal transshipment of American wheat from the U.S.S.R. to Communist Cuba. Perhaps we should also be completely inured to the apparent lack of concern on the part of individuals in the State Department and of other administration officials at this violation of the terms of the export licenses under which this grain was originally shipped. Of course, Mr. Speaker, those of us who last December repeatedly voted against the proposition of authorizing the subsidy and sale of American grain to the Soviet Union raised this very question at that time; namely, that we might expect to see the U.S.S.R. divert this wheat to its Communist ally here in the Western Hemisphere. Nevertheless, I am completely amazed that the administration is not at this very hour demanding an official explanation of this act of bad faith on the part of the Soviet Union in permitting these supplies of grain to be transshipped to shore up the Castro dictatorship.

Mr. Speaker, it is not wholly without significance that this event has occurred on the eve of the meeting of the Foreign Ministers of the Organization of American States to consider the question of sanctions against Cuba. We have only recently begun to be advised that our original hopes of mustering a strong two-thirds vote in favor of such sanctions may go glimmering. I am sure that when Latin American countries on whose votes we are counting, learn that it is American wheat that is supplying the needs of the Cuban people that our arguments for economic sanctions and a strong economic blockade against Cuba will meet raised eyebrows. This episode once again clearly illustrates that the Soviet Union cannot be looked upon in the same light that we would regard any other legitimate trading partner.

Mr. Speaker, I have today directed a telegram to Secretary of Commerce Luther Hodges demanding an immediate investigation of the charges that American wheat is being transshipped to Communist Cuba in violation of the terms of the export licenses under which it was originally shipped from American ports. Mr. Speaker, I desire also at this time to serve notice on the administration that the failure of the Secretary of Commerce or other appropriate administration officials to conduct an exhaustive investigation of this matter should result in an immediate congressional investigation of just where our decision to trade with the Soviet Union is leading us.

SHOCKING WASTE IN DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, a letter received today from the Comptroller General provides one explanation why the U.S. Department of Agriculture budget has swollen to such astronomical proportions.

The Comptroller General, Mr. Joseph Campbell, states that 2,400,000 unnecessary mailings were made in fiscal year 1963 at a cost of about $180,000.

If the same loose administration exists in other activities of the Department—and may we safely assume anything else?—then a major portion of the $7.7 billion spent by Agriculture Secretary Freeman in fiscal 1963 was money utterly wasted.

U.S. farms now number 3.6 million, so the "unnecessary mailings" amounted to nearly one per farm in 1963. To the average farmer whose mail box seems clogged daily with unsolicited mailings from USDA, the Comptroller General's estimate will seem conservative indeed.

Text of Mr. Campbell's letter:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C., July 16, 1964.

To the SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

To the PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE OF THE SENATE:

Our review of selected aspects of the activities of the Department of Agriculture relating to the mailing of informational material to the public disclosed that, because the Department had not maintained most of its mailing lists in Washington, D.C., in a current status, substantial costs were incurred in mailing informational material to addressees who no longer had any interest in such information. We have estimated that 2,400,000 unnecessary mailings were made in fiscal year 1963 at a cost of about $180,000. Our review disclosed also that mailing costs could be reduced by about $35,000 annually in Washington, D.C., and by additional amounts in field offices by maximum use of a mailing technique that eliminates the use of envelopes.

The Government printing and binding regulations require all departments to revise their mailing lists annually to eliminate waste in Government funds caused by improperly addressing or mailing publications to persons no longer desiring them. Also, these regulations require imprinting the postage indicia and mailing address directly on printed materials—the self-mailer technique—rather than using separate envelopes for mailing whenever such technique will prove feasible and economical.

We found that 372,000 addressees included in 820 of the Department's mailing lists in Washington, D.C., were not circularized during fiscal year 1963 to enable the required annual revision of such lists. If they had been, we estimate, on the basis of the Department's experience in fiscal years 1963 and 1964 after circularizing the addressees included in 128 lists, that about 2,400,000 mailings could have been avoided and unnecessary mailing costs of about $180,000 would not have been incurred.

Only 36 percent of mailings made by the Department from Washington, D.C., in fiscal year 1963 had the indicia and mailing address printed thereon. Of the other 64 percent, about 3 million mailings could have been sent by this technique. We estimate, based on the Department's cost records, that the unnecessary insertion and envelope costs for these mailings were $35,000.

We proposed that the Secretary of Agriculture establish adequate controls to provide for the required annual revision of the Department's mailing lists and that he require imprinting, to the maximum extent practicable, of the penalty or postage indicia and mailing address directly upon printed materials.

In a letter dated May 15, 1964, the Director of Information, Department of Agriculture, expressed the Department's agreement with the objectives of our proposals. He informed us that annual revision of mailing lists would be an integral part of an automatic data processing system which was being established for departmental mailing lists and which was scheduled for operation in September 1964 and that steps were being taken to bring about maximum use of the self-mailer technique.

We are recommending that, if the scheduled operation of the new automatic data processing system is delayed, the Secretary provide in the interim for the necessary circularization of all addressees who have not been circularized within the past 12 months so that unnecessary costs will not continue to be incurred as a result of mailing informational material to addressees no longer desiring the information.

Copies of this report are being sent to the President of the United States and to the Secretary of Agriculture.

Joseph Campbell,
Comptroller General
of the United States.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California [Mr. Holifield], has announced, and the Speaker has agreed, that in lieu of H.R. 11832, amendments to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, he will call up S. 2963, which is a similar bill.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to Mr. Monagan, for 30 minutes, tomorrow.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. Younger) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Jensen.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Albert) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Dingell.
Mr. Willis.
Mr. Gallagher.
Mr. Rivers of South Carolina.
Mr. Celler.

SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1282. An act to permit a State to increase the mileage of its Federal-aid primary system when provision is made for the completion and maintenance of 75 percent thereof; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 1593. An act to amend section 14 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1954 concerning the interstate planning and coordination of the Great River Road; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 2136. An act to amend the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2164. An act for the relief of Polly Ann Mutz Kampouris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2205. An act for the relief of Giuseppe DiCenso; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2452. An act for the relief of Angelina Martino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2548. An act for the relief of Nora Chin-Bing; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2599. An act for the relief of Denise Hojebane Barrood; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2673. An act for the relief of Debra Lynne Sanders; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2698. An act for the relief of Linus Han; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2730. An act for the relief of Dr. Jorge A. Picaza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S.J. Res. 23. Joint resolution to designate the second Monday in April of each year as National Teachers' Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 287. An act to amend title II of the Social Security Act to include Nevada among those States which are permitted to divide their retirement systems into two parts for purposes of obtaining social security coverage under Federal-State agreement;

H.R. 4811. An act for the relief of Mrs. Marjorie Curtis;

H.R. 6237. An act to amend section 503 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to authorize grants for the collection, reproduction, and publication of documentary source material significant to the history of the United States, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 10392. An act authorizing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to locate a portion of a vehicular tunnel under parts of the U.S. Capitol Grounds and the U.S. Botanic Garden Grounds, and for other purposes.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, From the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on the following dates present to the President, for his approval, bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On July 6, 1964:

H.R. 2735. An act for the relief of Ligia Paulina Jimenez;

H.R. 2737. An act for the relief of Pedro Aguinaldo;

H.R. 5408. An act for the relief of Jackie Bergancia Smith;

H.R. 5478. An act authorizing a survey of the Frio River in the vicinity of Three Rivers, Tex., in the interest of flood control and allied purposes;

H.R. 5501. An act for the relief of Wieslawa Marianna Borezon;

H.R. 6385. An act for the relief of Wolfgang Seidl;

H.R. 6455. An act to amend subsection (b) of section 512 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (dealing with unrelated business taxable income);

H.R. 6473. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Lowardo D. Sparks;

H.R. 6923. An act authorizing a survey of Cedar Bayou, Tex., in the interest of flood control and allied purposes;

H.R. 8590. An act to incorporate the Aviation Hall of Fame;

H.R. 9094. An act to authorize the President to declare July 9, 1964, as Monocacy Battle Centennial in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the Battle of the Monocacy;

H.R. 9234. An act to incorporate the Little League Baseball, Inc.;

H.R. 10407. An act for the relief of Keith Hills;

H.R. 10437. An act to incorporate the National Committee on Radiation Protection and Measurements;

H.R. 10456. An act to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and administration operations, and for other purposes;

H.R. 11004. An act to authorize the sale, without regard to the 6-month waiting period prescribed, of zinc proposed to be disposed of pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act;

H.R. 11235. An act to authorize the disposal, without regard to the prescribed 6-month waiting period, of approximately 11 million pounds of molybdenum from the national stockpile;

H.R. 11257. An act to authorize the sale, without regard to the 6-month waiting period prescribed, of lead proposed to be disposed of pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act;

H.J. Res. 475. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim December 7, 1964, as Pearl Harbor Day in commemoration of the attack on Pearl Harbor; and

H.J. Res. 950. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to an amendment to the compact between the State of Ohio and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania relating to Pymatuning Lake.

On July 9, 1964:

H.R. 10053. An act to amend section 502 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, relating to construction differential subsidies. (Reenrollment pursuant to H. Con. Res. 323.)

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, July 21, 1964, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2265. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year 1965 in the amount of $13,088,000 to support programs authorized by the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (H. Doc. No. 318); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2266. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, transmitting report on title I, Public Law 480 agreements signed during June 1964, pursuant to Public Law 85–128; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2267. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to receive for instruction at the U.S. Naval Academy at Annapolis two citizens and subjects of the Kingdom of Thailand"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2268. A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a report for the fourth quarter of fiscal year 1964 showing the number of officers on permanent duty, pursuant to section 8031(c), title 10 United States Code; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2269. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize payment of incentive pay for the performance of hazardous duty on the flight deck of an aircraft carrier"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2270. A letter from the Administrator, Small Business Administration, transmitting the Annual Report of the Small Business Administration for the year 1963; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2271. A letter from the Administrator, Small Business Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, entitled "A bill to amend the Small Business Act and the Small Business Investment Act of 1958"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2272. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958, as amended, to increase salaries, to adjust pay alinement, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2273. A letter from the Secretary, Export-Import Bank of Washington, transmitting a report relative to shipments to Yugoslavia for the month of June 1964, pursuant to title III of the Foreign Aid and Related Agencies Appropriation Act of 1964, and the presidential determination of February 4, 1964; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2274. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on a review of supply support furnished to an air defense system at an oversea location disclosed that deficiencies in the supply management of repair parts had caused a high deadline rate of essential equipment representing an investment of about $30 million and had resulted in large stocks of repair parts for which there was little or no demand; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2275. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on a review relating to unnecessary costs incurred in mailing informational material to the public by the Washington, D.C., headquarters office, Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2276. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, relative to the Navy issuing overstatement of requirements for aircraft electronic systems resulted in improper procurement actions, Department of the Navy; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2277. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, relative to a review relating to overprocurement of containers for 5-inch, .54-caliber ammunition cartridges, Department of the Navy; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2278. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on a review relating to undercollections of interest and principal in foreign currencies on certain loans to foreign governments, Agency for International Development, Department of State; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2279. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report relating to the uneconomical acquisition and use of teletypewriter circuits and equipment by the Army and the Air Force, Department of Defense; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2280. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report relating to payments to Coast Guard reserve officers on annual active duty training for unnecessary days of travel, U.S. Coast Guard, Treasury Department; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2281. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States; transmitting a report on a review relating to excess quantities of heavy trucks and buses at selected military installations, Department of Defense; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2282. A letter from the Comptroller of the United States, transmitting a report relating to unnecessary payment for temporary lodging allowances to military personnel in Naples, Italy, Department of Defense; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2283. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on a review relating to excess transportation costs due to erroneous weights on military shipments of household goods, Department of State; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2284. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report relating to the lack of appropriate consideration of cost savings obtainable by cancelling the procurement of ineffective rocket packs for F–8U aircraft, Department of the Navy; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2285. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on a review relating to unnecessary annual expenditures by the Departments of the Army and the Navy for leasing commercial facilities to store petroleum products in the Los Angeles, Calif., area, Department of Defense; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2286. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on a review relating to unnecessary costs incurred in handling imported merchandise, Bureau of Customs, Treasury Department; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2287. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting a copy of a staff report prepared by the Commission's Bureau of Power, covering the electric utility operations and system performance of the New England Power Co.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2288. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to remove inequities imposed on commissioners and employees of the Federal Communications Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2289. A letter from the Chairman, Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States, transmitting the First Annual Report of the Jewish Restitution Successor Organization, pursuant to Public Law 87–846; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2290. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a copy of the report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in the Federal Communications Commission as of May 31, 1964, pursuant to Public Law 554, 82d Congress; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2291. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to provide for the disposition of judgment funds on deposit to the credit of the Quinaielt Tribe of Indians"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2292. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize the exchange of public domain lands heretofore withdrawn and reserved for the use of the Hanford project of the Atomic Energy Commission, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2293. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report and recommendation to the Congress concerning the claim of Lewis H. Nelson III, against the United States, pursuant to the act of April 10, 1928, 45 Stat. 413, 31 U.S.C. 236; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2294. A letter from the clerk, U.S. Court of Claims, transmitting certified copies of the court's opinion and finding relative to the case of *Chicago School of Automotive Trades, Inc.* v. *The United States* (Congressional No. 16–58); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2295. A letter from the Librarian of Congress, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, entitled "A bill for the general revision of the Copyright Law, title 17, of the United States Code, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2296. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report relative to the awarding of the Young American Medal for Bravery and Young American Medal for Service for the year 1962, pursuant to 64 Stat. 397–398; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2297. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, entitled "A bill to amend section 510(a)(1) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

2298. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, entitled "A bill to amend the act of August 25, 1958, title 39, United States Code, and the act of March 7, 1964, to provide office staff, and necessary services, to wind up the affairs of a President who dies in office or of a former President after his death"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

2299. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report on the use of funds to provide additional laboratory spaces at the University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill., pursuant to 77 Stat. 141, 142, 425 and 439; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

2300. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report on the administration of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 for the year ending May 31, 1964; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

2301. A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, entitled "A bill to amend the tariff schedules of the United States to suspend the duty on certain tropical hardwoods"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2302. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to section 244(a)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, as amended by 8 U.S.C. 1254(a)(2); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2303. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to section 244(a)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, as amended by 8 U.S.C. 1254(a)(1); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2304. A letter from the Acting Archivist of the United States, General Services Administration, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal under the law; to the Committee on House Administration.

2305. A letter from the Director of Civil Works, Office of the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, relative to transmitting additional material relating to a review of the Mississippi River and tributaries project (H. Doc. No. 319); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed.

2306. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Acting Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated December 16, 1963, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on Maniece Bayou, Ark., in partial response to an item in the Flood Control Act approved October 23, 1962 (H. Doc. No. 320); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed.

2307. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated April 28, 1964, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on an Interim Hurricane Survey of Washington, D.C., metropolitan area, authorized by Public Law 71, 84th Congress, approved June 15, 1955 (H. Doc. No. 321); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with one illustration.

2308. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated January 15, 1964, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers on Merced River development, Merced River, Calif., in partial response to an item in the Flood Control Act approved July 14, 1960 (H. Doc. No. 322); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed.

2309. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated February 25, 1964, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a cooperative beach erosion control study of Hunting Island Beach, S.C., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved July 3, 1930, as amended and supplemented (H. Doc. No. 323); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with four illustrations.

2310. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated April 28, 1964, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of the reports on the Housatonic River, Conn., Mass., and N.Y., requested by resolution of the Committee on Public Works, U.S. Senate, adopted February 4, 1949, and September 14, 1955, and the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted June 13, 1956, and July 23, 1956 (H. Doc. No. 324); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with three illustrations.

2311. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated April 1, 1964, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a cooperative beach erosion control study of Atlantic City, N.J., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved July 3, 1930, as amended and supplemented (H. Doc. No. 325); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with one illustration.

2312. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated March 18, 1964, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a cooperative beach erosion control study of Falmouth, Mass., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved July 3, 1930, as amended and supplemented (H. Doc. No. 326); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with three illustrations.

2313. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated May 4, 1964, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of the reports on Bayou La Batre, Ala., requested by resolutions of the Committees on Public Works, U.S. Senate and House of Representatives, adopted May 24, 1960, and June 30, 1960 (H. Doc. No. 327); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with one illustration.

2314. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated October 31, 1963, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of the report on the Ouachita River, Monroe, La., requested by resolutions of the Committees on Public Works, U.S. Senate and House of Representatives, adopted July 24, 1958, and June 3, 1959 (H. Doc. No. 328); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with six illustrations.

2315. A letter from the Secretary of the Army transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated November 4, 1963, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on an interim report on East St. Louis and vicinity (East Side Levee and Sanitary District), St. Clair and Madison Counties, Ill., requested by resolutions of the Committees on Public Works, U.S. Senate and House of Representatives, adopted July 18, 1957, June 17, 1948, and August 20, 1957 (H. Doc. No. 329); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to an order of the House on July 1, 1964, the following bill was reported on July 7, 1964:

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 11865. A bill to increase benefits under the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system, to provide child's insurance benefits beyond age 18 while in school, to provide widow's benefits at age 60 on a reduced basis, to provide benefits for certain individuals not otherwise eligible at age 72, to improve the actuarial status of the trust funds, to extend coverage, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1548). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to an order of the House on July 2, 1964, the following bill was reported on July 7, 1964:

Mr. HARRIS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H.R. 11241. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to increase the opportunities for training professional nursing personnel, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1549). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to an order of the House on July 2, 1964, the following bills were reported on July 9, 1964:

Mr. MACDONALD: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H.R. 4731. A bill to amend section 402(d) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act; without amendment (Rept. No. 1550). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HARRIS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 1451. An act to amend section 41(a) of the Trading With the Enemy Act; without amendment (Rept. No. 1551). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HARRIS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H.R. 5673. A bill to prohibit the introduction into interstate commerce of any shipping container manufactured in the United States from imported steel unless the container is marked so as to indicate the country of origin of the steel; with amendment (Rept. No. 1552). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HARRIS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H.R. 11083. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to extend the authorization for assistance in the provision of graduate or specialized public health training, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1553). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. POWELL: Committee on Education and Labor. H.R. 11611. A bill to establish a National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress; with amendment (Rept. No. 1554). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee:

H.R. 11946. A bill to provide public works and economic development programs and the planning and coordination needed to assist in the development of the Appalachian region; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 11947. A bill for the general revision of the copyright law, title 17, of the United States Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FEIGHAN:

H.R. 11948. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHORT:

H.R. 11949. A bill to provide for the entry free of duty of articles donated by Canadian residents to the International Peace Garden, Dunseith, N. Dak.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHALLEY:

H.R. 11950. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to establish laboratories and provide testing programs relating to agricultural chemicals; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KILGORE:

H.J. Res. 1114. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, relative to legislation providing that 90 percent of all moneys received from the sale of, or as bonuses, royalties, or rentals on, federally controlled minerals within the State of Colorado be paid by the U.S. Treasurer of the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, urging and requesting enactment of legislation to curb the encroachment of the U.S. Supreme Court upon the inherent right of the several States to apportion their own legislative bodies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, relative to requesting the Soviet Union to grant Jewish citizens the right of freedom of worship; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON:

H.R. 11951. A bill for the relief of Hassan Sayeed; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BELL (by request):

H.R. 11952. A bill for the relief of Alistair McEachen Ross; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHELF:

H.R. 11953. A bill for the relief of Jesse B. Dean; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 11954. A bill for the relief of Maria and Francesca Catalanotto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11955. A bill for the relief of Anastasia Tropeano Olivo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FEIGHAN:

H.R. 11956. A bill for the relief of Woo Soon Kook; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GROSS:

H.R. 11957. A bill for the relief of Foster Masahiko Gushard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 11958. A bill for the relief of Radonjica Dragovic and Vera Dragovic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNGER:

H.R. 11959. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth Alice Swanson, nee Elizabeth Alice Leighton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

953. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the secretary, Lithuanian-American Council of Southern California, Canoga Park, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to passing Senate and House concurrent resolutions dealing with the Baltic States' liberation question before the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

954. Also, petition of the secretary, the Appalachian Trail Conference, Washington, D.C., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of H.R. 3846, the land and water conservation bill, and urging its early passage; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

955. Also, petition of William J. Lederer, commander, United Veterans Council of Philadelphia, Philadelphia, Pa., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to requesting action on certain bills which would provide for the establishment of national cemeteries in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

956. Also, petition of the president, the Civil Rights Committee, Tucson, Ariz., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to demanding that the State of Mississippi be denied congressional representation in Washington, D.C.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

957. Also, petition of the manager, Oklahoma Association of Electric Cooperatives, Oklahoma City, Okla., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to passage of legislation which would specifically exclude the question of reapportionment of State legislatures from the Federal courts and return this question for determination by the States themselves; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

958. Also, petition of the secretary, Lutheran Church of America, New York, N.Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to their position relative to the Civil Rights Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

959. Also, petition of the president, United Filipino Council of Hawaii, Honolulu, Hawaii, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to requesting Congress to repeal the quota system provided for in the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

960. Also, petition of the president, Brookland Junior Civic Association, Washington, D.C., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to commending Congress on the enactment of the civil rights law of 1964; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

961. Also, petition of Maurice R. Franks, Searcy, Ark., relative to requesting that Congress rectify the Postmaster General's refusal to issue a commemorative 5-cent postage stamp in honor of the late General of the Army Douglas MacArthur, and further requesting Congress to authorize and direct the Postmaster General to issue a commemorative 5-cent postage stamp in honor of the memory of the late General of the Army Douglas MacArthur; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

962. Also, petition of the legislative secretary, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, Washington, D.C., petitioning consideration of their resolutions with reference to congressional reform and full employment; to the Committee on Rules.

963. Also, petition of the secretary, the Kentucky Peace Officers' Association, Louisville, Ky., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to congratulating and supporting officials and agents of the Bureau of Narcotics for success in suppression of the illicit narcotic traffic, and approving the mandatory penalty provisions for violations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

964. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., to require to be published in the Congressional Record a study by the Legislative Reference Service showing all provisions of acts of Congress for the admission into the Union of new States relating to congressionally called-for structure of New State legislatures; to the Committee on House Administration.

965. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., to demand swift compliance with the June 15, 1964, reapportionment decision of the U.S. Supreme Court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

966. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., seeking passage of a private bill for the relief of Henry Stoner, which would restore his civil rights, allegedly taken from him mainly because he is an epileptic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

967. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., directing the attention of the Committee on the Judiciary to "The Law of the Federal and State Constitutions of the United States," by Frederic Jesup Stimson, the Boston Book Co., 1908, which proposed that both branches of State legislatures be apportioned by population alone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

968. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., asking Congress to defeat H.R. 11879, a bill to provide that courts of the United States shall not have jurisdiction to enjoin or modify the operation of laws respecting State legislative districts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

969. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., to require the Committee on the Judiciary to do a study of the most important element now, domestically, in this Nation, one involving the very crux of real and effective representative democracy; to the Committee on Rules.

970. Also, petition of the speaker of Koza City Council, Ryukyu Islands, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the realization of the Chief Executive by public election; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

971. Also, petition of the speaker of Gushikawa-son Assembly, Gushikawa-son, Okinawa, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to demanding the realization of public election of the Chief Executive; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

972. Also, petition of the chairman, Tomigusuku Village Assembly, Tomigusuku, Okinawa, petitioning consideration of their reso-

lution with reference to giving the Ryukyus back to Japan and granting the expanded right of self-government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

973. Also, petition of the chairman, Ginowan City Assembly, Ginowan, Okinawa, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to consideration of the request for early permission to select the Chief Executive by popular vote; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

MONDAY, JULY 20, 1964

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

Rev. George R. Davis, minister, National City Christian Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

"Bless the Lord, O my soul, and all that is within me bless His holy name." To Thee we turn, Father of us all, whose patient love is more inspiring to us than Thy power which has created and is creating all things. How gratefully indeed we turn to Thee. To whom else shall we go? Thou hast the words, and the way of life eternal. Standing upon the threshold of every endeavor, every new experience, we must pray, "Thy will be done in us, and in the affairs of all the earth." So we stand upon the threshold of this session of our Nation's Senate, with prayer on our lips and in our hearts. Continue to give guidance to the men and women who have been chosen by us to reason here, to debate here, to represent us here. Inspire, as Thou often hast in the past, their earnestness, their sincerity, their dedication. Bless Thou them, their families, their associations. They know as well as we—indeed, our Father, they know far better—how grave are the times, how serious at home and abroad the devastating issues. Grant health and strength to them, or, at least, patient endurance for their tasks. And may they, O Father, find sufficient time for the refreshing of their spirits, and relief from the pressures. Grant them to be unwearied in well-doing, so that our children and our children's children and all mankind may rejoice, at last, when the Nation and the world will be secure, united in brotherhood and righteousness. In the name of Him who taught us to pray, "For Thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, forever." Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, July 9, 1964, and Friday, July 10, 1964, was dispensed with.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Pursuant to the order of the Senate of July 9, 1964, the following reports of committees were submitted:

On July 9, 1964:

By Mrs. SMITH, from the Committee on Armed Services, with an amendment:

S. 2369. A bill to retrocede to the State of Kansas exclusive jurisdiction over certain State highways bordering Fort Leavenworth Military Reservation and the U.S. Penitentiary at Leavenworth (Rept. No. 1181).

By Mrs. SMITH, from the Committee on Armed Services, with amendments:

H.R. 9021. An act to authorize the conveyance of two tracts of land situated in Salt Lake City, Utah, to the Board of Education of Salt Lake City (Rept. No. 1186).

By Mr. SALTONSTALL, from the Committee on Armed Services, without amendment:

H.R. 393. An act to make retrocession to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts of jurisdiction over certain land in the vicinity of Fort Devens, Mass. (Rept. No. 1182).

By Mr. YOUNG of Ohio, from the Committee on Armed Services, without amendment:

H.R. 4177. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey to the city of St. Paul, Minn., all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain lands heretofore conveyed to such city (Rept. No. 1183).

By Mr. STENNIS, from the Committee on Armed Services, without amendment:

H.R. 7248. An act to change the designated use of certain real property conveyed by the Department of the Air Force to the city of Fort Walton Beach, Fla., under the terms of Public Law 86–194 (Rept. No. 1184).

By Mr. INOUYE, from the Committee on Armed Services, without amendment:

H.R. 7499. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force or his designee to convey 0.25 acre of land to the city of Oroville, Calif. (Rept. No. 1185); and

H.R. 10736. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to adjust the legislative jurisdiction exercised by the United States over lands comprising the U.S. naval hospital, Portsmouth, Va. (Rept. No. 1187).

On July 10, 1964:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with amendments:

H.R. 11380. An act to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes; with minority views (pt. 2 of Rept. No. 1188).

By Mr. SYMINGTON, from the Committee on Armed Services, with amendment:

H.R. 8954. An act to amend section 409 of title 37, United States Code, to authorize the transportation of house trailers and mobile dwellings of members of the uniformed services within the continental United States, within Alaska, or between the continental United States and Alaska, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1189).

By Mr. SALTONSTALL, from the Committee on Armed Services, without amendment:

H.R. 10322. An act to extend the provisions of the act of August 11, 1959, Public Law 86–155, as amended (74 Stat. 396) to provide improved opportunity for promotion for certain officers in the naval service (Rept. No. 1190).

On July 15, 1964:

By Mr. RUSSELL, from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 3001. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to increase the rates of basic pay for members of the uniformed services (Rept. No. 1191).

On July 16, 1964:

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Commerce, with an amendment:

S. 1063. A bill to amend section 1(14)(a) of the Interstate Commerce Act to insure the adequacy of the national railroad freight car supply, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1192).

On July 17, 1964:

By Mr. SYMINGTON, from the Committee on Armed Services, without amendment:

H.R. 6299. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to produce and sell crude oil from the Umiat Field, Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 4, for the purpose of making local fuel available for use in connection with the drilling, mechanical, and heating operations of those involved in oil and gas exploration and development work in the nearby areas outside Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 4, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1193).

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On July 9, 1964:

S. 6. An act to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems, both public and private, in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes.

On July 17, 1964:

S. 2. An act to establish water resources research centers, to promote a more adequate national program of water research, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, informed the Senate that, pursuant to authority granted by the House on July 2, 1964, and the provisions contained in section 2, Public Law 88–354, the Speaker had, on July 7, 1964, appointed Mrs. SULLIVAN, of Missouri; Mr. PURCELL, of Texas; Mr. ROSENTHAL, of New York; Mr. CUNNINGHAM, of Nebraska; and Mrs. MAY, of Washington as members of the National Commission of Food Marketing, on the part of the House.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H.R. 287. An act to amend title II of the Social Security Act to include Nevada among those States which are permitted to divide their retirement systems into two parts for purposes of obtaining social security coverage under Federal-State agreement;

H.R. 4811. An act for the relief of Mrs. Marjorie Curtis;

H.R. 6237. An act to amend section 503 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to authorize grants for the collection, reproduction, and publication of documentary source material significant to the history of the United States, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 10392. An act authorizing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to locate a portion of a vehicular tunnel under parts of the U.S. Capitol Grounds and the U.S. Botanic Garden Grounds, and for other purposes.

ORDER DISPENSING WITH CALL OF CALENDAR

On request by Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the call of the legislative calendar, under rule VIII, was dispensed with.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

On request by Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request by Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Appropriations was authorized to meet during sessions of the Senate for the week beginning July 20, 1964.

APPOINTMENTS BY THE PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The **PRESIDENT** pro tempore. The Chair announces the appointment of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] as advisory members to the U.S. delegation of the ninth meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs of American States, to be convened in Washington on July 21, 1964.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The **PRESIDENT** pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

Report of Title I Agreement Under Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954

A letter from the Associate Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, Department of Agriculture, reporting pursuant to law, on title I agreements under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, for the month of June 1964 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Report of Export-Import Bank of Washington on Guarantees of Certain Transactions

A letter from the Secretary, Export-Import Bank of Washington, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on the issuance by that Bank during the month of June 1964, of guarantees with respect to certain transactions; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Incentive Pay for the Performance of Certain Hazardous Duties

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize payment of incentive pay for the performance of hazardous duty on the flight deck of an aircraft carrier (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Report on Number of Officers Assigned or Detailed Permanent Duty in the Executive Part of the Department of the Air Force at the Seat of Government

A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, reporting, pursuant to law, that, as of June 30, 1964, there was an aggregate of 2,161 officers assigned or detailed to permanent duty in the executive part of the Department of the Air Force at the seat of Government; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Amendment of Small Business Act and Small Business Investment Act of 1958

A letter from the Administrator, Small Business Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Small Business Act and the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Amendment of Section 510(a)(1) of Merchant Marine Act, 1936

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 510(a)(1) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

Amendment of Tariff Schedules To Suspend the Duty on Certain Tropical Hardwoods

A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States to suspend the duty on certain tropical hardwoods (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

Report on Fiscal Operations of the United Nations

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the fiscal operations of the United Nations, as of December 31, 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Report of Jewish Restitution Successor Organization

A letter from the Chairman, Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Jewish Restitution Successor Organization, dated June 26, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Report on Undercollections of Interest and Principal in Foreign Currencies on Certain Loans

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on undercollections of interest and principal in foreign currencies on certain loans to foreign governments, Agency for International Development, Department of State, dated July 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Lack of Appropriate Consideration of Certain Cost Savings, Department of the Navy

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on lack of appropriate consideration of cost savings obtainable by canceling the procurement of ineffective rocket packs for F8U aircraft, Department of the Navy, dated July 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Unnecessary Costs Incurred in Mailing Informational Material to the Public by Department of Agriculture

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on unnecessary costs incurred in mailing informational material to the public by the Washington, D.C., Headquarters Office, Department of Agriculture, dated July 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Excessive Quantities of Heavy Trucks and Buses at Selected Military Installations

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on excessive quantities of heavy trucks and buses at selected military installations, Department of Defense, dated July 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Unnecessary Annual Expenditures by the Departments of the Army and the Navy for Leasing Certain Commercial Facilities To Store Petroleum Products

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on unnecessary annual expenditures by the Departments of the Army and the Navy for leasing commercial facilities to store petroleum products in the Los Angeles, Calif., area, Department of Defense, dated July 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Uneconomical Acquisition and Use of Teletypewriter Circuits and Equipment by the Army and Air Force

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the uneconomical acquisition and use of teletypewriter circuits and equipment by the Army and the Air Force, Department of Defense, dated July 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Payments to Coast Guard Reserve Officers on Annual Active Duty Training for Unnecessary Days of Travel

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on payments to Coast Guard Reserve Officers on annual active duty training for unnecessary days of travel, U.S. Coast Guard, Treasury Department, dated July 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Overprocurement of Containers for 5-Inch, 54-Caliber Ammunition Cartridges

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on overprocurement of containers for 5-inch, 54-caliber ammunition cartridges, Department of the Navy, dated July 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Disposition of Judgment Funds on Deposit to the Credit of Quinaielt Tribe of Indians

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the disposition of judgment funds on deposit to the credit of the Quinaielt Tribe of Indians (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Report on Case of Simpson Construction Company *v.* The United States

A letter from the clerk, U.S. Court of Claims, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of that court's order in the case of *Simpson Construction Company* v. *The United States* (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Report on Case of R. M. Clark *v.* The United States

A letter from the clerk, U.S. Court of Claims, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of that court's opinion and findings in the case of *R.M. Clark, an individual, doing business as Lenoir City-Alcoa Bus Lines,* v. *The United States* (with the accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Report on Case of MacArthur Mining Company, Inc. *v.* The United States

A letter from the clerk, U.S. Court of Claims, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, certified copies of that court's opinion and findings in the case of *MacArthur Mining Company, Inc., in receivership,* v. *The United States* (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Report on Administration of Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the administration of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950, for the year ended May 31, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REVISION OF COPYRIGHT LAW, TITLE 17, UNITED STATES CODE

A letter from the Librarian of Congress, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the general revision of the copyright law, title 17 of the United States Code, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 1004

"Joint memorial to the Congress of the United States with reference to enacting legislation granting 90 percent of all moneys from the sale of, or as bonuses, royalties, or rentals on, federally controlled minerals within the State of Colorado to the State of Colorado

"Whereas the surface and minerals constitute an important part of the economy of the State of Colorado; and

"Whereas the Federal Government holds 36.3 percent of the land surface area of the State of Colorado and controls 48.5 percent or 32 million acres of the total mineral acreage in the State of Colorado; and

"Whereas the development of minerals and the recreational uses of Federal lands impose increased economic burdens on services and facilities of county and State government; and

"Whereas the impending development of an oil shale industry will create additional financial burdens for schools and roads in western Colorado counties; and

"Whereas only 37½ percent of all royalties that the Federal Government collects on Federal lands in Colorado is returned to the State; and

"Whereas Alaska in its Act of Admission was given 90 percent of the mineral royalties on Federal lands and on private lands in which the Federal Government has reserved the minerals; and

"Whereas the Tideland States have been granted the mineral rights on offshore submerged lands; and

"Whereas historically, Eastern States were given all of the land within their confines; and

"Whereas the State of Colorado and the Western States have been denied equality of treatment as given Alaska, Tideland States, and the Eastern States: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 44th General Assembly of the State of Colorado, in second extraordinary session convened (the Senate concurring herein), That the President and Congress of the United States of America are hereby memorialized to fairly and diligently consider the welfare and interest of the people of the State of Colorado who favor legislation providing that 90 percent of all moneys received from the sale of, or as bonuses, royalties, or rentals on, federally controlled minerals within the State of Colorado be paid by the Treasurer of the United States to the State of Colorado to be used as the Legislature of the State of Colorado may direct; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be transmitted to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate of the Congress of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of said Congress, the Members of Congress from the State of Colorado, the Secretary of the Interior, the Director of the Bureau of Land Management, and the State legislatures of all the States of the United States.

"JOHN D. VANDERHOOF,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.
"DONALD H. HENDERSON,
"Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives
"ROBERT L. KNOUS,
"President of the Senate.
"MILDRED H. CRESSWELL,
"Secretary of the Senate."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Colorado; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"HOUSE MEMORIAL 1001

"Memorializing the Congress of the United States to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States concerning the apportionment of State legislatures

"Whereas historically and traditionally, the people of the sovereign States have provided for the establishment of legislative bodies, the members of which have been elected under provisions of the individual State constitutions to best meet the needs and desires of each particular State, with due regard for population only in one house, and for population, geographic areas, and economic factors in the other house; and

"Whereas the people of the State of Colorado have by a 'one-man one-vote' election, determined for themselves that means of representative government by which they do give consent to be governed, and under that system the people themselves do have the right to initiate changes from time to time as such changes may become necessary; and

"Whereas the constitution of the State of Colorado reserves to the people of the State the right of both initiative and referendum; and

"Whereas the people have interests unifying themselves and differentiating among the various regions of the State, and those interests cannot always be served by application of mere arithmetic in the apportioning of both the senate and the house of representatives; and

"Whereas the people of the State of Colorado, in 1962, voted overwhelmingly in each and every county in support of a State constitutional amendment providing that the State house of representatives be apportioned on a basis of population only, and the State senate be apportioned on a basis giving consideration to population, geographic area, and economic factors; and on the same ballot the people of every county rejected overwhelmingly an amendment which would have apportioned both houses of the legislature on a basis of population only; and

"Whereas the function of a bicameral legislature, in many States, is that of providing a balance of representation when clusters of population are the result of topography, or wherein geographic considerations require the equation of area along with population in one of the two houses to effect a reasonable and proper representation of such districts, wherein other factors are present to such a degree as to be of primary concern to the State; and

"Whereas this bicameral function has been clearly recognized and its need fulfilled by an initiated amendment to the constitution of the State of Colorado in 1962; and

"Whereas the Supreme Court decision of June 15, 1964, has had the effect of nullifying said function of Colorado's bicameral legislature, and overturning the vote of the people which endorsed this function, and substituting therefor a plan which was essentially that rejected by the people of Colorado: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 44th General Assembly of the State of Colorado, in second extraordinary session convened, That the house of representatives of the General Assembly of the State of Colorado respectfully petitions the Congress of the United States to initiate an amendment to the Constitution of the United States which will require each State of the United States to apportion one house of its legislature on the basis of population and permit each State to apportion the second house of a bicameral legislature on a basis which includes other factors in addition to population, such as geography, economic interests, and historical association; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be sent to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and the Members of Congress from the State of Colorado.

"JOHN D. VANDERHOOF,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.
"DONALD H. HENDERSON,
Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives."

A resolution adopted by the Midwestern Regional Conference of the Council of State Governments, at Minneapolis, Minn., favoring the request for research funds to eradicate cereal leaf beetles; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Petitions signed by Seitoku Nagamine, chairman, Tomigusuku Village Assembly, Seitoku Tomigawa, speaker, Gushikawa-son Assembly, and the Village Assembly of Kawasoe-son, all of the island of Okinawa, praying for permission to select their chief executive by popular vote; to the Committee on Armed Services.

A resolution adopted by the Midwestern Regional Conference of the Council of State Governments, at Minneapolis, Minn., favoring an amendment to the Constitution relating to apportionment of State legislatures; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the Kentucky Peace Officers' Association, of Lexington, Ky., signed by Lt. Charles L. Young, secretary, relating to the Bureau of Narcotics; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The petition of Richard H. Davis, of Louisville, Ky., praying for a redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the board of trustees of Kiamichi Electric Cooperative, Inc., of Wilburton, Okla., relating to the apportionment of State legislatures; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A paper in the nature of a petition from Sotir A. GJorgonoski, of Los Angeles, Calif., relating to his claim for a redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the North Dakota Knights of Columbus, Bismarck, N. Dak., relating to prayer in the public schools; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter in the nature of a petition from Arthur Johnson, farm representative, First State Bank of Springdale, Ark., praying for the enactment of House bill 1839, relating to meat imports; ordered to lie on the table.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the Farmers State Bank, of Aurora, Nebr., signed by W. Ed Coblentz, president, favoring the enactment of House bill 1839, in regard to meat imports; ordered to lie on the table.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the National Livestock Feeders Association, of Omaha, Nebr., signed by Don F. Magdanz, executive secretary-treasurer, relating to pending meat import legislation; ordered to lie on the table.

A resolution adopted by the Midwestern Regional Conference of the Council of State Governments, at Minneapolis, Minn., favoring action by the Congress in respect to the importation of beef and other meat products; ordered to lie on the table.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the First National Bank, Tucumcari, N. Mex., signed by G. Wilbur Jones, president, favoring the enactment of House bill 1839, relating to meat imports; ordered to lie on the table.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the department of industrial relations, Fair Employment Practice Commission, San Francisco, Calif., expressing appreciation for the enactment of the civil rights bill; ordered to lie on the table.

A resolution adopted at the biennial convention of the Lutheran Church in America, at Pittsburgh, Pa., expressing appreciation for the enactment of the civil rights bill; ordered to lie on the table.

ROCHESTER-RENNES CULTURAL CENTER—RESOLUTION

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, for several years the cities of Rochester, N.Y., and Rennes, France, have maintained close contacts with the assistance of the U.S. Information Agency. This friendship of cities culminated in the first Bi-National Cultural Center which was established in Rennes and staffed and equipped by USIA.

This experiment is a noteworthy example of how much goodwill can be created for a small amount of money. It would be most unfortunate if the U.S. Information Agency decided to discontinue the funds which support this Center which has meant so much to the citizens of Rochester and Rennes. It is especially unfortunate at a time when France and the United States are regrettably growing apart in their international policies.

On June 23 the Council of the City of Rochester unanimously adopted a resolution protesting this proposed action of the U.S. Information Agency.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the resolution of the Rochester City Council printed in the Record, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was refered to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Resolution 64–60

Whereas the city of Rochester has maintained close ties with the city of Rennes, France; and

Whereas the program of international cooperation and amity between the cities has flourished under the auspices and guidance of the U.S. Department of State and the U.S. Information Agency; and

Whereas one of the significant aspects of this cooperation has been the establishment in Rennes of the first Binational Cultural Center in France, staffed and equipped by the U.S. Information Agency; and

Whereas the Binational Cultural Center has helped establish the most cordial relations between the United States and France and, more particularly, between the cities of Rochester and Rennes; and

Whereas it has been reported that funds for staffing the Binational Cultural Center in Rennes will not be made available by the American Foreign Service, to the detriment of international understanding and the expansion of amicable relations between the United States and France and between the cities of Rennes and Rochester: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this council urge the Congress of the United States, the U.S. Department of State and the U.S. Information Agency to provide the necessary funds for the continuation of this important program; and be it further

Resolved, That the city clerk be and hereby is directed to send copies of this resolution to U.S. Senators Jacob K. Javits and Kenneth B. Keating, together with letters urging that the Binational Cultural Center in Rennes be continued.

Adopted by the following vote:

Ayes—Mayor Lamb, Councilmen Barry, Legg, Gillette, Lill, Malley, Malloy, Pierrello—8.

Nays—None.

Attest:

W. Patlow,
City Clerk.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. RUSSELL:

S. 3001. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to increase the rates of basic pay for members of the uniformed services; placed on the calendar.

(The above bill was reported by Mr. Russell, from the Committee on Armed Services, on July 15, 1964.)

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota:

S. 3002. A bill for the relief of Dr. Ilhan Baki Taskin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 3003. A bill for the relief of Alfonso Ruiz Coranado (also known as Francisco Ojeba); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARLSON (for himself and Mr. Pearson):

S. 3004. A bill for the relief of Riddle Quarries, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TALMADGE:

S. 3005. A bill for the relief of Philip R. Codd; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLENDER:

S. 3006. A bill for the relief of Ottilia Bruegmann James; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCLELLAN (by request):

S. 3007. A bill to establish a procedure for the publication of patent applications;

S. 3008. A bill for the general revision of the copyright law, title 17 of the United States Code, and for other purposes; and

S. 3009. A bill to provide for the compulsion of testimony in racketeering cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. McClellan when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S.J. Res. 183. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the fourth week in April of each year as "Youth Temperance Education Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PROCEDURE FOR PUBLICATION OF PATENT APPLICATIONS

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I introduce, by request, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the publication of certain patent applications. A major purpose of this bill is to relieve the Patent Office of some of the burden involved in the examination of patent applications. The enactment of this legislation would result in more efficient use of Government personnel and contribute to a modest reduction in the sizeable backlog of pending patent applications. This bill would also facilitate the more rapid dissemination of scientific information and provide a less-expensive and quicker alternative form of protection for those who currently secure patents mainly for defense purposes.

The bill which I am introducing today was drafted by a committee of the American Patent Law Association and represents the result of intensive study of this subject. In view of the serious burdens which confront the Patent Office it is essential that the Congress, in cooperation with the executive branch, the patent bar, inventors, and industry, seriously consider measures to improve the functioning of our patent system. While I believe that there is merit in the approach reflected in this bill. I am not committed to any particular procedure concerning the publication of patent applications. I introduce this bill to provide a basis for further discussion and I, accordingly, invite interested individuals and groups to communicate their views to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Walters in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3007) to establish a procedure for the publication of patent applications, introduced by Mr. McClellan, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REVISION OF COPYRIGHT LAW, TITLE 17 OF UNITED STATES CODE

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights of the Committee on the Judiciary, and at the request of the Librarian of Congress, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for a general revision of the copyright law, title 17 of the United States Code.

Starting in 1955, the Copyright Office of the Library of Congress, pursuant to appropriations by Congress, has been continuously engaged in preparatory work leading to a general revision of the copyright law. Thirty-four studies and a subject index, prepared by the Copyright Office, have been published by this subcommittee. On the basis of these studies, the Register of Copyrights in July 1961 submitted to the Congress a report containing his tentative recommendations for general revision of existing law. These recommendations have been exhaustively studied by a Panel of Consultants, established by the Register, and composed of representatives of those groups most directly affected by this legislation.

Although I presently have no opinion concerning particular provisions of the bill which I am introducing today, it does represent an effort by the Copyright Office to achieve a general consensus among the conflicting interests involved in this complex subject. The Copyright Office and all others who have assisted in this undertaking should be congratulated upon the diligence and ability with which they have performed this task.

Significant differences do exist as to certain aspects of copyright revision, but there is general recognition of the necessity for action by the Congress. The present copyright law is essentially that enacted in 1909 and is clearly inadequate to meet contemporary conditions.

I would remind the Senate that the 2d session of the 87th Congress established a target date of December 31, 1965, for the enactment of a revision bill. On that date the provisions of Public Law 87-668, providing for a temporary extention of the renewal term of copyrights pending action on the general revision bill, will expire. Although it will not be possible for the subcommittee to consider this bill during the current Congress, I am introducing it now so that it may be carefully studied and to permit all interested parties to set forth their views.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3008) for the general revision of the copyright law, title 17 of the United States Code, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. McCLELLAN, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

COMPULSION OF TESTIMONY IN RACKETEERING CASES

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I introduce, by request, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the compulsion of testimony in racketeering cases. I should like at this time to quote from the letter which I received from the Attorney General with a draft of this bill was forwarded to me:

> It is evident to all of us that combating the forces of organized crime is an undertaking of major proportions. It is also readily apparent that one of the few ways to get incriminating evidence against the principal figures in organized crime is to compel minor participants, who have valuable information, to testify in return for an immunity grant. It is imperative that the Department of Justice should be given this effective weapon in its fight against organized crime. The authority to make immunity grants has been given to nearly all administrative agencies and it seems incongruous to withhold it, in large part, from the prosecutive arm of the Federal Government, where it is most needed.
>
> As was mentioned earlier in my testimony before the committee the problem of obtaining testimony is nowhere more acute than in establishing violations of the Racketeering Travel Act (18 U.S.C. 1952, interstate and foreign travel or transportation in aid of racketeering enterprises) which the Congress enacted in August 1961.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3009) to provide for the compulsion of testimony in racketeering cases, introduced by Mr. McCLELLAN, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954, TO IMPOSE A TAX ON ACQUISITIONS OF CERTAIN FOREIGN SECURITIES—AMENDMENT (AMENDMENT NO. 1113)

Mr. McCARTHY submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 8000) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to impose a tax on acquisitions of certain foreign securities in order to equalize costs of longer term financing in the United States and in markets abroad, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

TEMPORARY CONTINUANCE OF CERTAIN EXISTING RULES RELATING TO THE DEDUCTIBILITY OF ACCRUED VACATION PAY—AMENDMENT (AMENDMENT NO. 1114)

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], I submit an amendment to the bill, H.R. 10467, to continue for a temporary period certain existing rules relating to the deductibility of accrued vacation pay. I ask unanimous consent that this amendment be referred to the Committee on Finance and that it be printed.

The substantive provisions of this amendment are identical to those of the bill, S. 2846, which the two Senators from New Hampshire introduced on May 14 of this year. That bill would have amended the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to clarify the original congressional intent and specify that sweepstakes conducted by a State would be exempted from the tax on wagering.

My amendment is in the nature of a technical amendment which would put State governments on at least the same basis as charitable and educational corporations, fraternal and benevolent societies, business associations, and chambers of commerce, so far as the Federal tax on wagering is concerned. The present provisions of the Internal Revenue Code clearly specify that no tax will be imposed on a parimutuel wagering enterprise licensed by a State. But the code does not contain any specific exemption for a sweepstakes enterprise which is conducted by the State itself.

The state of the tax law with respect to the New Hampshire Sweepstakes is ambiguous, contradictory, and somewhat irrational. Congress did not consider the specific situation of a State conducted sweepstakes at the time of passage of the Internal Revenue Code for the simple reason that no such sweepstakes were in existence at that time. Now that the citizens of the State of New Hampshire have voted overwhelmingly to endorse a sweepstakes, it is time for the Congress to clarify the Internal Revenue Code and provide for a specific exemption.

Mr. President, the New Hampshire sweepstakes was conceived as a well thought out plan to increase the fund available for the use of our State's educational system. Such fiscal experiments on the part of States interested in obtaining more money for educational purposes should be encouraged, and not discouraged, by our Federal tax laws.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred.

The amendment was referred to the Committee on Finance.

SHORTAGE OF COINS—ANNOUNCEMENT OF COMMITTEE HEARING AT 10 A.M. TOMORROW, JULY 21

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, we have a shortage of coins that is both critical and unnecessary.

On June 25, 1964, I introduced S. 2950, a bill to authorize the mint to inscribe the figure 1964 on all coins minted until adequate supplies of coins are available.

This bill has been endorsed by the Treasury Department, the Director of the Mint, and the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

In each of the past 3 fiscal years, 1961, 1962, and 1963, the mint has established a new production record for domestic coins, and yet the normal flow of coins from the mint to the Federal Reserve System to the marketplace and back to the banks has not been maintained.

In normal times, the return flow of coins for redistribution was nine times as great as the number of new coins received from the mint by the Federal Reserve banks. Now, however, the return flow is sharply reduced and the number of coins coming from the mint exceeds the number returning from circulation.

This disruption of our normal circulation pattern has forced banks to ration coins to assure a fair distribution of the available supply Merchants who depend on coins for change in their daily operations complain that they have been cut to as much as 25 percent of their normal coin requirements. Some say they have been forced to buy coins from other businesses at premiums of up to 10 percent.

There is every indication that the shortage will grow worse before action that has been initiated by the Government to correct it can become effective.

This action includes:

First. An increase in mint facilities. An addition to the Denver Mint is scheduled for completion this fall and both the Senate and the House have approved a budget request of $16 million for a new mint at Philadelphia.

Second. New coin presses are being acquired from surplus Government supplies and private industry.

Third. There is continuous 7-day, 24-hour production at our mints in Denver and Philadelphia.

Fourth. The mint is now purchasing rolled nickel and bronze strips, ready for blanking, from private industry. This permits the mint to use all of its melting and rolling capacity for silver coins only, greatly increasing the output of all denominations.

S. 2950 is an additional measure to help solve this coin shortage problem.

The Treasury Department, the Bureau of the Mint, and the Federal Reserve Board believe that the retention of the date "1964" on all coins will discourage the hoarding of vast numbers of coins by coin dealers and collectors. The sheer number of the coins will make them less valuable to collectors and dealers. This bill is being opposed by many of them.

The hoarding of coins by dealers and collectors is, of course, not the only cause of this coin shortage, but it is a factor which must be considered in any attempt to solve the problem. I have been informed that individual collectors who in the past have been content with one coin of a special kind are now buying rolls and even bags of coins.

Dealers are advertising bags and rolls of 1964 uncirculated coins for sale at premium prices and the advertisements do not specify any limit on the amounts which may be purchased.

The economic effect of a severe coin shortage to our banks, stores, turnpike authorities, vending machine companies and other businesses is very grave. The impact that this bill will have on coin collectors and dealers in this country must be weighed against this economic fact.

It is clear that this bill is needed by the Government to help solve this very critical coin shortage.

There will be hearings commencing at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning on Senate bill 2950.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. THURMOND:

Article entitled "FBI Chief Sees No Change in Reds," published in the Times & Democrat of Orangeburg, S.C., on July 12, 1964.

THE INFLATIONARY DANGER OF PLANNED DEFICIT SPENDING

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, in the July 20, 1964, issue of Newsweek there was published a most thought-provoking article, written by Mr. Henry Hazlitt, entitled "Dread of a Surplus."

In this article, Mr. Hazlitt calls attention to the policy of the present administration of deliberately planning deficit spending and points out the inflationary dangers of such a fiscally irresponsible program.

I ask unanimous consent to have this article, entitled "Dread of a Surplus," written by Mr. Hazlitt, printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DREAD OF A SURPLUS

(By Henry Hazlitt)

The last fiscal year ended on June 30 with a deficit of about $8.8 billion. This was more than the entire amount spent by Franklin D. Roosevelt in any fiscal year till 1939. It will be followed by a deficit in the current fiscal year officially estimated at $5.8 billion (and it will probably be much larger). The two deficits taken together will be the biggest for any 2-year period in peacetime.

Yet no one showed any particular concern about this. The New York Times report hailed it as a great achievement. "The deficits in the last 3 years, while believed to have spurred the economy, have clearly not been inflationary."

Most of the comment, indeed, has been to the effect that the deficit has not merely been harmless, but beneficial. And this reflects the present administration's own underlying fiscal philosophy, which is that a budget balance should be attempted only when the economy is at the level of full employment. This it defines as unemployment of 4 percent or less of the labor force. The President's economic advisers have often expressed their conviction that previous efforts to balance the budget when the economy was operating with idle plant and idle labor only prolonged and increased unemployment.

Because of this fiscal philosophy the present administration does not expect to see the budget balanced until the fiscal year 1967, which ends 3 years from now.

WHY BALANCE EVER?

But if the administration's economic assumptions are correct, why balance the budget even then—or at any time? If the country is enjoying full employment, as a result of deficit spending, why needlessly endanger that prosperity by returning to a budget balance?

We can be sure that, if ever the blessed full-employment goal were achieved, this argument would be put forward. And it is hard to see how it could be politically resisted. In fact, there are already commentators who contend that the Government cannot afford ever again to run a surplus, and that balanced budgets are economic suicide.

It is instructive to recall the series of rationalizations that have brought us to this point. At first it was argued that a balanced budget was harmful only in "bad" years. The necessity of balancing the budget was accepted, but it should be only a cyclical balance over a series of years. But the cyclical theorists never revealed how long their cycle was, or how they or anyone else could know at any time just where we were in a cycle. If an average cycle is 6 years, say, then to offset the expected cumulative 3-year budget deficit of $21 billion at the end of this fiscal year there would have to be an average $7 billion surplus in each of the next 3 years. The professed cyclical balancers would be appalled at such a prospect.

THIRTY-FOUR YEARS, 28 DEFICITS

So their theory is now that we should always run a budget deficit as long as there is any unemployment. And though we have already run 28 deficits in the last 34 years, they deplore only the six surpluses.

What will be the result if their theories continue to be followed? It was crushingly demonstrated in the thirties that even heavy uninterrupted deficits cannot cure mass unemployment. But more deficits can and must lead to further increase in the National debt, further increase in the money supply, a further rise of prices, and a further depreciation of the dollar. The purchasing power of the dollar has already been reduced 63 percent since 1933 and 43 percent since 1945.

It is true that in the last 10 years the dollar has depreciated only 12 percent. But this result looks good only in comparison with the dreadful international record. The New York First National City Bank's annual review of comparative rates of depreciation shows that in the last 10 years the German mark has lost 18 percent of its purchasing power, the British pound 23 percent, the Italian lira 25 percent, the French franc 34 percent, and the Argentine, Brazilian, Chilean, and Bolivian currencies respectively, 91, 94, 95, and 97 percent.

Whether the deficits are planned or unplanned, the result is always the same.

INVESTIGATION OF ROBERT G. BAKER BY COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, in the July 10, 1964, issues of the Washington Evening Star and the Evening Journal of Wilmington, Del., there were published two editorials, both criticizing the Senate Rules Committee and its apparent effort to whitewash the Baker investigation.

Both these editorials agree that the investigation is far from a full disclosure, and point out that the majority membership of the committee must accept the responsibility for having made these scandals a political issue.

As one who recognizes that the overwhelming percentage of the membership of the Democratic Party are honest, loyal Americans, I am sure that they will agree that the Rules Committee's decision to stop this investigation short of a full disclosure is most unfortunate.

I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial published in the Washington Evening Star on Friday, July 10, entitled "Still a Whitewash," and the editorial published in the Wilmington, Del., Evening Journal on that same date, entitled "Baker Report Is Incomplete," be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, July 10, 1964]

STILL A WHITEWASH

Chairman JORDAN, commenting on his committee's investigation of the Bobby Baker case, says he feels "ennobled by the dedication of my colleagues and the high caliber of their performance." We can't imagine why the head of the Senate Rules Committee would say such a thing. For the committee's investigation from the opening day to the final report has been a whitewash. It reflects discredit on the committee and leaves grave doubt respecting the integrity of the Senate.

True, the report comes down hard on Bobby Baker—as it should. We hope that further action can be taken against him, either through criminal procedures or through some such civil action as that proposed by New Jersey's Senator CASE. Even if something of this sort materializes, however, the strong impression will remain that Bobby Baker is the scapegoat of this investigation—that he is being made to take the rap while other and more important figures go untouched.

We agree thoroughly with the minority report that the whole story of the Bobby Baker case has not been told because the Democrats on the committee voted against a full and determined investigation, in which all appropriate witnesses could be heard. We further agree that any investigation of alleged misconduct "which has brought shame and reproach on the U.S. Senate" should be "thorough, complete and exhaustive."

This has not been true in this instance. Let's take just one example.

A principal witness was Don Reynolds, Silver Spring insurance man, who claims he paid for a stereo set given by Baker to the then majority leader, Lyndon Johnson, and also that he was pressured into buying some $1,200 worth of (to him) useless advertising time on the L.B.J. network in Texas. Mr. Reynolds added that Walter Jenkins, longtime aid to Mr. Johnson, was involved in the advertising deal. Mr. Jenkins told committee staff members that he had nothing to do with the arrangements for the advertising. But somebody did.

The committee heard the insurance salesman in closed session. But Mr. Reynolds' request to testify, under oath, in public session was rejected. Why?

The report implies that the committee was skeptical of his testimony, although it was supported by documentary evidence. But if the committee majority turned down the request from Mr. Reynolds because it thought he was given to flights of fancy, what about Mr. Jenkins? Why was he not called to testify publicly and under oath? Surely the committee would not want anyone to draw the inference that Mr. Jenkins might be an unreliable witness.

The conclusion, we think, is plain enough. The committee did not want to put the facts of these transactions on the open record and therefore they were covered up.

Ennobling?

[From the Wilmington (Del.) Evening Journal, July 10, 1964]

BAKER REPORT IS INCOMPLETE

The majority report on the Bobby Baker investigation makes it clear not only that the investigation was never completed, but the majority on the Senate Rules Committee never had any intention of completing it properly and responsibly.

How could the report be complete in view of that fact that the Democratic majority (six) refused to call a single witness requested by the minority (three) of the committee?

The majority did see fit to declare Baker guilty of "gross improprieties," and to detail a number of them. But the majority members expose themselves to warranted criticism by Republicans and others. The report in forthright fashion makes Baker out to be a self-seeking opportunist who didn't hesitate to use "his Senate office as if it were a private business office," and who used "the prestige of his official position to obtain participation in many business ventures."

The report presents an affidavit from Walter Jenkins, President Johnson's longtime assistant, denying the charge that he (Jenkins) put pressure on a Washington insurance man to take advertising time on the Johnson family's TV station in Texas in return for insurance sold to the then Senator Lyndon Johnson. But somebody was lying, or badly confused to say the least. It may be observed that cross-questioning of Jenkins along with the insurance agent under oath might have produced information pertinent to the work of drafting a code of ethics for senatorial behavior in future. The same Senate Rules Committee is presently faced with this unpalatable but necessary task.

The Republicans—including especially U.S. Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS (not on the Rules Committee) are entitled to take careful aim at the Bobby Baker report and make whatever political hay from it they can. That goes without saying. Any and all Americans truly devoted to good government, whatever their party, can help to make sure that the U.S. Senate does not offer a roosting place in future for any such a fancy bird as Robert G. Baker.

Nor, we may add, does his present status as the most noted motel operator of Ocean City, Md., necessarily make him the pride of the Delmarva Peninsula.

TAX-EXEMPT STATUS OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF CHURCHES

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I have pointed out on the Senate floor on several occasions that the National Council of Churches has been consistently violating the law with regard to its tax-exempt status by engaging in lobbying and political activity throughout the country. In vain I have called on the Internal Revenue Service to make a thorough investigation of this matter so that the law can properly be enforced in accordance with the will of the Congress in writing into our tax laws specific prohibitions against such activities by organizations which are granted this special privilege of a tax-exempt status. I have been supported in my contentions by the distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee and the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], and I have also had printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on March 12, 1964, a letter from the then chief of staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, Mr. Colin F. Stam, pointing out that his study of the questions relating to specific lobbying activities by the National Council of Churches indicates that the National Council of Churches tax-exempt status may be "in jeopardy."

Evidently, my efforts have not been completely in vain, as the National Observer has taken enough interest in this question to publish a detailed article on church lobbying in the July 13, 1964, issue. This article was written by Mr. Lee E. Dirks, and examines in some detail lobbying pressures, techniques, and activities of the National Council of Churches and other similar groups not only on the recently passed so-called civil rights legislation, but in other areas and specifically in the upcoming antipoverty legislation.

I was amazed to read in this article that the National Council of Churches plans to spend considerable time and effort in lobbying in support of the so-called antipoverty legislation, even though it violates in several particulars the principle of separation of church and state which has been used by the National Council of Churches and other church groups to try to stop passage of a proposed amendment to the Constitution to permit voluntary nonsectarian prayer and Bible reading in the public schools as existed prior to recent decisions by the U.S. Supreme Court.

Mr. President, this article on lobbying by the church groups should be read by every Member of the Congress, and specifically by the leadership in the Internal Revenue Service. I therefore ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of these remarks this article from the National Observer, together with an article from the State, of Columbia, S.C., dated July 5, 1964, on this same subject by Mr. William D. Workman, and an editorial from the Columbia Record of July 18, 1964, entitled "Churches Are Political Lobbies."

There being no objection, the articles and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the State, July 5, 1964]

COUNCIL OF CHURCHES

(By W. D. Workman)

A grave threat to church membership in the South is a sociopolitical action agency with the high-sounding but misleading name of the National Council of Churches.

The hierarchy of that organization includes a host of compulsive meddlers who are undertaking to reorder both the thinking and the conduct of American citizens. The assertion that they are backed by some 39 million church men and women of the United States is a gross distortion of fact and abuse of position.

Unfortunately, a considerable number of Protestant and Eastern Orthodox demoninations of America are affiliated with the national council. Even more unhappily, many leaders within those separate denominations do subscribe to the principles and policies of the council, sometimes using it as a forum to expound views they might not advocate within their own more democratic bodies.

But the rank and file of church membership, especially among southern Protestant churches, disagree violently with the national council's ultraliberal views and resent the constant and calculated inferences that they are represented by the council. At long last, the time seems at hand for these southerners to make a clean and clear break with the national council if they are to preserve their individual self-respect, their congregational identity, and their churchly effectiveness.

PROMOTING STRIFE

The straw that may have broken the back of long-suffering southerners was the national council's sponsorship of the Ohio training school which is dispatching hundreds of young men and women, black and white, upon troublemaking missions into the South. The disappearance of three such workers in Mississippi seems not to have any sobering effect upon the national council, and the expeditionary force continues to move south.

The National Council of Churches in effect has declared war upon the State of Mississippi and presumably upon the rest of the South where racial separation is either practiced or preferred.

The council is deliberately fomenting discord and civil disobedience, and doing so in the name of Christianity. The action is consistent with earlier positions taken by the council and its constituent agencies.

Earlier this year, the Council's Emergency Commission on Religion and Race sponsored a youth ministry consultation on race at Nashville. Meeting at the headquarters of the Methodist General Board of Education, the delegates were told that young people should become involved (one said "blooded") in demonstrations for racial equality.

DABBLING IN POLITICS

But the National Council's adamant stand for racial mixing is not the only position it has taken in an effort to influence politicial decisions and governmental action. In a brazen repudiation of the traditional American concept of church-state separation, the council has maintained lobbyists, sponsored demonstrations, stimulated letter-writing campaigns and in general rallied the full force of its organization in support of the civil rights legislation adopted by the 1964 Congress.

As far back as 1957, one of the council's agencies described segregation as "a tragic evil that is utterly un-Christian."

But despite this presumed concern over Christian conduct, another council agency (the Fifth World Order Study Conference) favored our diplomatic recognition of Red China and the admission of that godless, anti-Christian, Communist country to the United Nations.

HUNTING FOR HEADLINES

But the bill of particulars against the National Council neither starts nor stops with the citations above. The council, its officers, or its agencies have offended the sensibilities or the convictions of countless churchmen with such pronouncements or positions as the following:

A request (by Dr. Eugene Carson Blake, when president of the National Council) asking general financial support for the legal defense and educational fund of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

The selection of the Reverend Martin L. King as the author of the council's 1957 Race Relations Sunday message.

A condemnation of right-to-work laws.

Opposition to the movie "Operation Abolition," which portrays Communist-directed efforts to abolish the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

Promulgation of a "reading list" containing authors identified with pornography, atheism, or communism.

There may be areas of activities in which the National Council of Churches renders a genuine service to Christianity. But when it indulges in pressure politics, sociological meddling, international appeasement, and domestic troublemaking, the council forfeits whatever right it might claim to speak for American Protestants, especially those of the South.

[From the National Observer, July 13, 1964]

CHURCH LOBBYISTS STEP UP PRESSURE, SCOUT NEW FIELDS—HOW THE MEN OF THE CLOTH OPERATE ON CAPITOL HILL—DOUBTS IN THE PEWS

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Call religious lobbying on Capitol Hill improper, or call it courageous. It goes on—and it's growing.

Church groups applied the weight that tipped the balance for passage of the civil rights bill, and religious pressure killed the proposed school prayer amendment. Now the church lobby is getting ready for the legislative fight over poverty.

Priests, ministers, and rabbis whose faces are familiar in the Halls of Congress have joined Walter Reuther's citizens committee on poverty. Washington-based churchmen are beginning to mobilize letterwriting campaigns urging Congress to pass strong antipoverty legislation.

The church, in coming months, will beam its voice onto a stronger frequency on such issues as foreign aid, immigration, and disarmament; interfaith support for a huge New York convocation next February to study the late Pope John XXIII's encyclical on peace may herald a stronger peace campaign in Congress by the churches. All the while the drumfire will persist on civil rights.

WILL PLEAD FOR FUNDS

In San Francisco last week Arthur S. Flemming, former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and first vice president of the National Council of Churches, went before the Republican platform committee to urge vigorous enforcement of the civil rights law. When Congressmen return to Washington after the GOP convention, they'll hear churchmen plead for President Johnson's request for funds to help enforce the bill. Clergymen already are serving on the advisory committee of the new Community Relations Service, which is working behind the scenes to encourage compliance.

The churches, by every account, played a decisive role in the civil rights struggle in Congress. Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, Democratic floor manager for the bill, termed them "the most important force at work" on behalf of the measure. The leader of the Southern forces, Georgia's Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL, blamed the bill's passage on pressure from President Johnson and many of the Nation's clergy.

"This is the second time in my lifetime an effort has been made by the clergy to make a moral question of a political issue," recalled Senator RUSSELL minutes before the Senate voted to shut off debate. "The other was prohibition. We know something of the results of that."

A moral issue the clergy unquestionably sought to make it. And the emphasis on the "moral," as opposed to the "political," is one of the elements that distinguishes the "new look" of church lobbying in Washington.

HIS FIRST BATTLE STARS

"You can always fight 'politics'," asserts a young lobbyist of the cloth who, like many of his associates, earned his first battle stars in the civil rights campaign. "But it's difficult as hell to fight 'morality'."

The theme will be repeated on the poverty fight. "Modern technology is increasingly bringing within man's possibilities the elimination of poverty," declares the National Council of Churches, whose member churches comprise two-thirds of American Protestantism. "Poverty is therefore ethically intolerable. The persistence of poverty has become a matter for which men are morally responsible."

Catholics and Jews confide that they too will stress the "moral" aspect of the poverty problem. In their common approach, the three faiths demonstrate another element of the new look in church lobbying.

The oldtime superficial "brotherhood" has vanished—victim of a new era of candid discussion among the faiths. Confesses one Protestant: "Before, when we faced an issue, we used to ask, 'Where are the Catholics?' Then we'd take the opposite position."

UNPRECEDENTED TESTIMONY

Now Washington spokesmen for the three faiths wrestle with the issues and disagree when they must. But hard reasoning on the civil rights bill resulted in the unprecedented joint testimony before Congress by national leaders of all three faiths a year ago. And frank conversations now undergird the churches' growing interest in speaking out on such broad issues as poverty and peace.

No longer, in fact, do churches lobby largely to protect their own interests—as on social security for the clergy, for example. No longer do they speak incessantly on issues dear to their own theology—alcohol, say, or gambling—and remain silent on larger concerns.

But the new look applies not merely to church offices in the shadow of the Capitol. It applies to church conventions in Denver and Des Moines. It applies to pastors and their congregations in Hackensack and Sacramento. "We don't get the question, 'What are you doing lobbying?' any more," declares James Hamilton, 32-year-old civil rights strategist for the National Council of Churches in Washington. "Instead they're asking, 'What more can we do?' "

HOW THE LOBBYING WORKS

Church lobbying has many shades, many forms. It can be as direct as a straight pitch to a Congressman in the privacy of his office or as subtle as a bishop's impromptu comment to the press hundreds of miles away. Its practitioners may openly acknowledge they're trying to influence votes, or they may speak in euphemisms about "keeping our people back home informed."

Drop into the second-floor offices of the Friends Committee on National Legislation (FCNL) at 2d and C Streets NE., in the Capitol Hill section. There's no effort there to disguise activities with euphemisms, no uneasiness over the job they're doing. Declares the Friends' E. Raymond Wilson, dean of Washington's church lobbyists: "Lobbying is as American as hamburgers or the Fourth of July."

Mr. Wilson deplores what he believes is the prevalent public view "of a partially eclipsed God who can shed His light on missionary activities in Cambodia and the Congo, but not on Congress. Not that church bodies speak with the full wisdom of God, but Members of Congress do need the warmth of religious fellowship."

SIX HUNDRED "INTERVIEWS" IN 1963

Congress, it's evident from a huge wall chart in FCNL offices, feels the warmth of Quaker fellowship. The chart shows every Member of Congress, the dates Quakers visited them or their assistants in 1963 and 1964, and the subjects discussed. FCNL staff members or volunteers held more than 600 "interviews" with Congress in 1963.

Mr. Wilson helped form the FCNL in November 1943, when the Pacifist Friends were especially concerned about protecting the interests of conscientious objectors in the draft. The FCNL, Mr. Wilson proudly recalls, was "the first full-time legislative staff of a religious denomination to work on the three jobs of lobbying: Sending out information to its members and bringing them to Washington; getting out in the field to discuss the issues; lobbying in the narrow sense—interviewing Members of Congress intensively and testifying before legislative committees."

Of the more than 1,000 lobbyists registered under the Lobbying Act of 1946, only 5 are religious lobbyists—and 3 of these are staff members of the FCNL. The Unitarian Fellowship for Social Justice, soon to be absorbed by the new department of social responsibility of the Unitarian Universalist Association, is the only other registered religious lobbyist associated with a denomination. The fifth religious lobbyist: The Christian Amendment Movement, sponsors of a proposed constitutional amendment that would commit America to "the authority and law of Jesus Christ." The amendment is introduced and pigeonholed in Congress perennially.

FEW REGISTER AS LOBBYISTS

Most churchmen on Capitol Hill don't register as lobbyists because, they contend, they're not lobbyists in the usual sense. They distinguish between lobbying for one's own interests—the type pursued by labor unions, companies, and trade associations—and lobbying for what they construe as the interests of society.

"We're not concerned about partisan benefits that may come to the church as an institution," explains the Rev. A. Dudley Ward, general secretary of the Methodist Board of Christian Social Concerns. "Furthermore, the Members of Congress have a right to expect the persons who are supposed to represent the moral consensus of the Nation—or the lack of moral consensus—to speak out."

On balance, Washington churchmen speak very little to Congressmen themselves and far more to their members back home. "I'm ashamed to admit this," confided one Protestant "lobbyist" last week, "but I didn't see a single Senator or Congressman during the whole civil rights thing."

The Reverend H. B. Sissel, Washington spokesman for the United Presbyterians, made a "deliberate and calculated" decision not to visit Congressmen himself. Mr. Sissel doubts the church lobbyist can be effective: "He has no votes, no money, no technical information to offer." What's more, Mr. Sissel believes he can spend his time more productively enlisting support among people who do have influence on Congressmen—their constituents.

GROWTH IN PUBLICATIONS

Church offices have mushroomed in Washington in postwar years; more than a dozen groups maintain full-time representatives, and others, such as the Episcopalians, have men who visit the Capitol regularly from other cities. But the greatest growth has occurred not in personnel, but in publications.

From the Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs streams "position papers" on almost every nuance of the continuing church-state debate. From the imposing 10-story headquarters of the National Catholic Welfare Conference (NCWC), the nerve center of Catholicism in the United States, pour influential statements on social welfare, education, peace, and family life.

Inevitably, these "education" efforts have an impact on Congress. An NCWC priest once told of a Congressman who was disturbed because he had learned too late the NCWC position on the Taft-Hartley Act; due to the poor timing, the Congressman said, he had voted the "wrong" way. This year many Catholic legislators suffered similar distress when they supported the proposed school-prayer amendment, only to have the NCWC come out against it.

To see how one Washington church "lobby" mobilizes its resources in the context of the new look, trace the activities of the Washington office of the National Council of Churches on behalf of the civil rights bill. The action began in June 1963, when the general board of the national council created a Commission on Religion and Race.

The commission received a three-part mandate from the general board: Urge denominations to desegregate their own institutions, help churches aid in the desegregation of communities, and work for meaningful civil rights legislation. Jim Hamilton, a husky graduate of George Washington Law School and a 5½-year veteran of the Washington staff, was drafted to work full time on civil rights.

The National Council strategists quickly reached four crucial decisions:

Cooperate with the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights, a loose confederation of about 80 organizations ranging from fraternal societies to labor unions.

Work informally with Washington lobbies of individual denominations, issuing statements on a trifaith basis where possible.

Formulate trifaith testimony for early delivery before Congress, and follow up with visits to key legislators by the religious leaders testifying.

Concentrate field work on the Midwest and Rocky Mountain regions, where labor unions and other traditional supporters of strong civil rights legislation were weak.

The Midwestern and Mountain States, the national council knew, had sent a number of Congressmen to the House who were uncommitted on civil rights; they possessed a huge bloc of uncommitted votes in the Senate. And so, less than a month after the march on Washington in late August, the suspenseful campaign for support—support where it counted—began.

PRODDING CHURCH LEADERS

To Lincoln, Nebr., for a 2-day meeting, the national council brought 150 top church leaders from 13 States. The purpose: To help them understand, in Mr. Hamilton's words, "the dimensions of their involvement in the civil rights legislative fight," and to prod them into planning how to enlist support in their home States. Similar 1-day meetings were held in succeeding weeks in Denver, Indianapolis, and several smaller cities.

In October, four-man teams roved Ohio, Illinois, Iowa, Nebraska, South Dakota—five States that held critical votes in the House. On each team were a minister (to speak of the religious motivation for concern over civil rights legislation), a Negro youth (to say, Mr. Hamilton explains, "I've been through it—and it's hell"), a legislative expert (to describe the bill), and a contact man from the State council of churches.

The teams toured the breakfast and luncheon circuit, encouraging clergymen and laymen to return to their churches and enlist others in telephone and telegram appeals to their Congressmen, or even to organize delegations to visit their Congressmen in Washington. Where they could, the teams called on other faiths for help; a rabbi participated in Sioux City, Iowa, a priest in Dubuque.

All the while, the national council was pumping out fact sheets on the bill as it progressed through the House. The periodic reports went to about 5,200 church leaders.

SENT JOINT TELEGRAMS

In Washington, Mr. Hamilton was joining leadership conference delegations visiting key Congressmen on the House Judiciary Subcommittee—GEORGE MEADER, of Michigan, CLARK MACGREGOR, of Minnesota, CHARLES MATHIAS, of Maryland. Twice while the bill was in the House, the three faiths sent joint telegrams (on public accommodations and on fair employment) signed by prominent national spokesmen.

The House passed the bill in February; every Illinois Congressman voted for it, and so did two of Nebraska's three Congressmen. Within days Iowa-bred Jim Hamilton was back in the hustings, this time in the Great Plains. The Reverend Jay Moore, from the Commission on Religion and Race, visited the Mountain States.

This time they met with smaller groups—groups of 20 or so. They recorded tapes to circulate among the churches. And they began to spot signs that their earlier work was paying off.

In Sioux Falls, S. Dak., a power executive told Mr. Hamilton he had spoken with Senator KARL E. MUNDT in South Dakota the previous weekend and would see him again in Washington that week. When Mr. Hamilton visited Nebraska "to tell them to tighten up" on Senator ROMAN L. HRUSKA and Senator CARL T. CURTIS, a State Council of Churches leader told him they had already been buttonholed. Newspaper ads signed by churchmen began to appear in influential newspapers—in Senator BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER's hometown of Cedar Rapids, Iowa, for example.

OPENING A 24-HOUR VIGIL

The stretch drive opened on April 28, when 6,300 churchmen from around the Nation jammed Georgetown University's McDonough Auditorium in Washington for the National Inter-Religious Convocation on Civil Rights. The next day, daily services sponsored by the Commission on Religion and Race (a counterpoint to the Senate filibuster) began at a Lutheran church on Capitol Hill; the services continued, with attendance as high as 270 and as low as 2, until the bill passed. At the Lincoln Memorial, theological students representing more than 100 seminaries—Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish—opened a 24-hour vigil for civil rights legislation.

"Yes, I know, I know * * * the seminaries," interrupted a Senator when one seminary student started to explain the purpose of his visit.

On May 18, the day after the 10th anniversary of the Supreme Court decision on school desegregation, 260 churchmen from 43 States assembled at the Lutheran church, marched to the Supreme Court for a brief prayer, and then visited their Congressmen. Soon afterward, three national council men, including Mr. Hamilton, struck out for the Great Plains to urge churchmen to make a last-minute pitch.

The harvest was plentiful. Voting for cloture were both Senators from Iowa, both from Nebraska, both from Kansas, both from South Dakota. Many factors influenced votes in both Houses of Congress, but for some Congressmen, religious pressure was the decisive one. Grumbled a Kansas conservative in the House just before the vote: "I'd like to vote against it, but I can't. The church groups are on my tail."

THE CHURCH REACHED OUT

"Who knows who had what influence we had, or why?" muses a contemplative Mr. Hamilton as he gazes at a wall map of congressional districts. "We only know this: It wasn't just the church operating as a church. It was the church operating in lay fields, involving the business community, reaching into the power structure."

It was, in short, the classic political pattern. In one city, it was a huddle with the Red Feather man who knows the community power structure; a pitch to a Methodist minister followed, and the minister in turn contacted the president of the largest bank in the State, who promised to contact a Senator. In other cities, other persons were involved, but the pattern was the same.

"We kept churning," says Mr. Hamilton. "We kept saying, 'We gotta do something this week, next week. We gotta keep the boiler going.' " The Catholics he says, were more conservative in their approach, "perhaps more wise."

The Catholics relied on a network of more than 55 Catholic interracial councils to build grassroots support for the bill. Only in May did they organize a major Midwest conference sweeping across state lines and pulling in delegates from 50 dioceses. In Washington NCWC priests refrained from extensive visits to legislators. "We had the feeling you could overdo the Roman collar around Capitol Hill," says one NCWC priest.

USED THE BLANKET APPROACH

Some Protestant denominations felt no such restraint. More than once the Episcopalians brought several score churchmen to the Capitol; they used the "blanket" approach, reporting one time they saw 400 of the 435 House Members. A United Church of Christ "Witness in Washington" in March attracted more than 100 people, who fanned out to see Senators from 22 key States. More than one denomination paid the travel expenses of some of their volunteer churchmen.

If the church lobbies harvested votes, they harvested criticism, too. Charging that the national council was "engaging in political activity of a lobbying nature" in violation of its tax-exempt status, Senator STROM THURMOND, of South Carolina, last March demanded an Internal Revenue Service inquiry.

The controversy hinges on one word in the Internal Revenue Code: Religious organizations qualify for tax exemption if no "substantial" part of its activities involve propaganda or efforts to influence legislation. What is "substantial?"

The only guideline is a 1955 case in which the court indicated that, if "less than 5 percent of the time and effort" of the organization were devoted to "political" activities, these activities would not be considered "substantial." The national council points out that less than 1 percent of its budget goes to its Commission on Religion and Race, and only a part of this sum went to support of the civil rights bill.

WITHHOLDING PAYMENTS

Scores of southern churches associated with the national council have been withholding their payments in protest over national council activities on civil rights. A Thurmond aid echoes their sentiments: "We stand against everything the national council stands for, except preaching the Gospel—and they don't do much of that."

The revolt probably won't spread much beyond the South and Southwest, but it expresses the extreme of a second criticism against church lobbying: What right do churches have to spend money from the collection plates for purposes individual members oppose?

The Friends Committee on National Legislation (FCNL), the most aggressive lobby on the Hill, avoids this criticism as neatly as it avoids the first. As a registered lobbyist, it claims no tax exemption. And as a group independent from the Religious Society of Friends, receiving financial support from separate sources, it spends no loose bills dropped into collection plates.

"The FCNL speaks for itself and for like-minded Friends," it declares in its testimony and in its newsletter. "No organization can speak officially for the Religious Society of Friends." Many church lobbies make similar disclaimers and some—the Committee for Racial Justice Now of the United Church of Christ, for example—collect their funds from special offerings.

SENATOR THURMOND'S WARNING

A fear of the churches will muddy still further the murkey waters of church-state relationships disturbs some critics of church lobbying. "Keep your church out of politics," Senator THURMOND warned a group of Methodist lawyers in North Carolina recently. "But you—you as individual Christians—should work to use your influence politically."

Counters America magazine, a voice of liberal Catholicism: "Separation of church and state has never been interpreted to mean the insulation of lawmaking from the moral demands of religious faith."

Finally, critics wonder where the churches will draw the line between proper and improper concerns. The church-inspired Anti-Saloon League, during its heyday in the first two decades of the 20th century, unashamedly delivered and withheld votes on the basis of a single criterion: How the candidate voted on temperance. Complained one writer in 1919: "The average Member of Congress is more afraid of the Anti-Saloon League than he is even of the President of the United States."

MR. WILSON'S ARGUMENT

The Friends' Mr. Wilson and his more timid associates in other denominations seek no return to the days of the Anti-Saloon League. Mr. Wilson argues that it's improper for churches to endorse political parties or candidates, or to permit political meetings to be held on their grounds.

But Mr. Wilson rebukes his colleagues for a lobbying stance he believes is still too meek. "The churches haven't been doing 10 percent of what they should be doing on social action," he complains. Seven representative Protestant denominations, he calculates, spend from 4 to 19 cents per member each year—"the cost of an ice cream cone or a Coca-Cola"—on social action.

Rumblings on Capitol Hill indicate Mr. Wilson may be swimming against the tide, at least in terms of congressional sentiment. "We hear a lot of talk on the Hill that it was okay to push hard on the civil rights bill—the moral bit, and all that—but we'd better not try it on poverty," reports one church lobbyist.

IT WAS AN UNAMBIGUOUS ISSUE

Some churchmen, like some legislators, are uncomfortable about any consistent church alliance with labor. They warn, too, that any antipoverty program must be a complex package of legislation, with any number of church-state traps that could divide opinion sharply among the faiths. "Civil rights had the virtue of being a completely unambiguous issue in terms of Christian implications," says Dr. Lewis I. Maddocks, of the United Church of Christ.

But the central question remains. What is the proper role of the church on Capitol Hill? "The answer has been rewritten this past year," says the national council's Mr. Hamilton. "I hope it has been rewritten unalterably."

If it has, the National Council of Churches has another rewriting job to do. For in the simple statement of purposes of its Washington office remain these words written several years ago: "The Washington office as such is not to engage in efforts to influence legislation."

[From the Columbia Record, July 18, 1964]

CHURCHES ARE POLITICAL LOBBIES

Church organizations have become one of the most powerful pressure groups on Capitol Hill.

This was admitted when Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY credited and Senator RICHARD RUSSELL blamed the churches as "the most important force at work" in the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

Religious lobbies of the three major faiths, encouraged by their success with that measure and against the proposed school prayer amendment, plan to conduct other political crusades, beginning with an effort to pass the administration's poverty bill.

They will cloak political schemes with the mantle of "moral issues," including such projects as foreign aid, immigration, and disarmament as well as strong "civil rights" implementation.

"You can always fight 'politics'," one of the lobbying clergymen explained, "but it's as difficult as hell to fight 'morality.' "

Some U.S. Senators found that out recently. A comprehensive report on church lobbying in the National Observer details the classic political pattern used by the National Council of Churches to win over Legislators for the "civil rights" cause.

Senators MUNDT, of South Dakota; HRUSKA and CURTIS, of Nebraska; and HICKENLOOPER, of Iowa, were specific targets.

A Kansas Representative admitted, "I'd like to vote against the 'civil rights' bill, but I can't. The church groups are on my tail."

Church lobbyists, with small exception, are not among the thousand lobbyists registered under the Lobbying Act of 1946. They escape on the technicality of the budget percentage spent on political activities.

The forthright Quakers have registered their Friends Committee on National Legislation. The committee claims no religious tax exemption. It is financed by separate funds, in contrast with unregistered church lobbies which receive their money from church collection plates.

Political participation is enjoying a wave of popularity among clergymen who are themselves subjected to a constant stream of political propaganda from religious headquarters.

But many persons are inclined to agree with Senator STROM THURMOND, of South Carolina, who told a group of religious lobbyists from another State, "Keep your church out of politics. But you—you as individual Christians—should work to use your influence politically."

THE NEED TO END MILITARY WASTE OF MANPOWER

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the New York Times recently printed an editorial emphasizing the disgraceful situation which now exists for those who are serving in our Armed Forces. The legislation which this body passed recently which provides increased pay for civil service employees and other Government workers makes the contrast with the very low pay of our Armed Forces all the more conspicuous.

As the editorial points out "pay alone is never enough." In other words pay should not be the only incentive for serving one's country. Yet just this week I received a letter from an enlisted man who declared that after being drafted and trained as a radio operator he was assigned to a golf driving range. For 13 hours a day he drives around on a small tractor picking up about 3,000 golf balls a week. A whole squad is employed in keeping this officer's golf course and driving range in condition. When our Army uses drafted men to maintain golf courses, the time for reforming our entire military manpower system has come.

Mr. President, I have already proposed that a bipartisan commission be set up by the President to investigate the manpower needs of our armed services and the best way to fulfill these needs, whether by continuing the draft or by voluntary recruitment. A committee working in the Pentagon could hardly be unbiased. An independent Presidential commission would be far more appropriate.

It is a serious waste to draft young men to do nothing but menial or unnecessary tasks. Our young people can do many valuable things for our country—picking up golf balls is not one of them.

I hope the Congress of the United States will take this matter very seriously and work quickly to assure that inequalities and abuses in the present system are eliminated as soon as possible.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this New York Times editorial printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MILITARY "PAY GAP"

The latest Federal pay increase for civilian employees widens the "pay gap" between civilian and military pay.

The military pay increase approved last year was originally predicated on the basis of "comparability" with government civilian and private industrial pay scales, but this principle was ignored in the final legislation. Last year's pay raise did a great deal to make up for years of neglect—but by no means enough. When the bill was passed Secretary McNamara committed himself and his department to further annual adjustment of service pay scales. But such adjustment has not been pressed this year and, except for endorsement of a 2½ percent increase by the Senate Armed Services Committee, Congress has taken no action in this session.

Yet the dimensions of the problem are increasing year by year. As Senator GAYLORD NELSON has pointed out, last year's military pay raise did not affect beginning pay. An entering private still receives $78 per month as compared to $112 a month in Canada; obviously the inducement to volunteer is low. Some 71,000 enlisted men and officers in the Air Force alone are forced to "moonlight," according to the Air Force Times, to supplement their service pay. At least 5,000 Air Force enlisted men, who earn less than $3,000 annually, are depending upon welfare programs of various sorts to help provide for their families.

These and other statistics which will undoubtedly astonish the American public constitute, as Senator KEATING says, "a disgraceful reward for those who have sworn to defend our country."

Pay alone is never enough—nor should it be the primary incentive for the uniformed services. Yet service rewards and emoluments—tangible and intangible—are not adequate to promote professionalism, or to foster what Capt. William A. Golden, USN, calls "a credible incentive." In a bitter article in the July issue of the Naval Institute Proceedings, Captain Golden predicts that, unless present conditions change, "by 1973 we will have an officer corps generated from a quarter of a century of poor procurement and retention—poorly educated, dissatisfied, and ill-equipped to man" the new and technologically complicated Navy. He concludes on behalf of the professional officers and enlisted men of all the services:

"It is now necessary to recognize objectively that officers (and enlisted men) cannot be paid like busboys, worked like field hands, and released like old, slow halfbacks—not because it is not legal, but because it simply is not good business."

THE U.S. MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, too little attention is given to one of our permanent national academies, the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy located at Kings Point, Long Island. For 21 years it has been training officers to serve in the merchant marine of the United States and in the course of that time it has graduated 12,000 men.

Certainly, much of the success of this institution must be attributed to its superintendent, Rear Adm. Gordon McLintock.

For 17 years he has directed the school's teaching staff of 92 and its nonteaching staff of 172.

A recent article in the New York Times discusses the history of the school and the dedicated service of Rear Admiral McLintock. This national Academy is proud to join those of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Coast Guard in serving its country. I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KINGS POINT DISCIPLINE OF SEA IN HALLS OF IVY—MCLINTOCK IS PROUD OF PROGRESS IN BRIEF HISTORY—ACADEMY ON LONG ISLAND HAS 38 BUILDINGS ON 65 ACRES

(By George Horne)

KINGS POINT, LONG ISLAND.—Campus life in the pastoral acres of the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy here is a rare mixture of halls of ivy and military spit and polish.

The academy—now a beautiful 65 acres with 38 buildings—is in its 21st year. It looks out over the waters where Long Island Sound meets the East River. It is one of the five permanent national academies, along with those of the Army, Air Force, Navy, and Coast Guard. And, in the opinion of Rear Adm. Gordon McLintock, now in his 17th year as Superintendent, not a regiment of cadets has marched over the parade ground turf of Captain Tomb Field (or up Fifth Avenue, as they often do) that could not match in discipline and bearing the best turned out by the older academies.

PRIDE AND ACHIEVEMENTS

The 61-year-old admiral is proud of the fact that the school, in a relatively few years, has achieved a collegiate tradition and a military standing.

Two hundred and ten Kings Point cadets lost their lives in action in World War II. Their names are listed on a plaque and are being written in fine calligraphy in a big memorial book that is in preparation for the new Interfaith Chapel, overlooking the Sound.

The admiral is a Scot—a native of Dysart, Fifeshire—and full of his race's pawky humor. He likes to tell how an error was made in the counting and the plaque had 211 names until one day a graduate stormed in like a marlinspike skipper and demanded that his name be erased.

More than 12,000 engineer and deck officers for the merchant marine have gone out through Vickery Gate with their diplomas and licenses as seagoing officers.

Two hundred more will go out this year with these testaments and also with bachelor's degrees.

One of the McLintock goals in his early years at the institution was accreditation, which came in 1949. Another was to obtain permanent status as a national Academy, and this was granted by an act of Congress in 1959.

The admiral has been a naval reservist since 1928, but he is essentially a merchant mariner, with an affection for the sea that comes naturally to a son of a Scots family whose men were seafarers or engineers. His admiral's rank is in the U.S. maritime service.

It is a long time since seamen used a long glass, but he has a fine one. There are two round holes in the front screen door overlooking the Sound—one high enough for him, and a lower one for Mrs. McLintock—and he often stands with an eye to the glass inspecting traffic headed for the East River, or watching one of the Academy sailboats off Execution Light.

"The only trouble," he says, "is that most of the time all I can see is that what's-its-name academy over in the Bronx.

This is a jibe at his friend Vice Adm. Harold C. Moore, retired Coast Guard officer, who commands the State University of New York Maritime College at Fort Schuyler.

Kings Point is one of the few colleges—and perhaps the only major one—that runs its college year through 11 months. Its plebes in their first year get the beginnings of seafaring sciences and much physical training.

In their second year they go to sea. Kings Point, unlike the State academies, does not have a schoolship for world training cruises.

"Nine hundred ships of the merchant marine are our schoolships," the admiral says.

Steamship companies are glad to get the young cadets. They are paid $110 a month while at sea, and stand watches regularly as junior officers, either as engineers or navigators. Then they return to King's Point for 2 more years of study.

Kings Point has a teaching staff of 92 and a nonteaching staff of 172.

HALLS HAVE HISTORIES

Many of its halls were former private homes. The great classical-revival edifice that serves as the main administrative center—Wiley Hall—was once the country mansion of Walter P. Chrysler, and Melville Hall, housing the officers' club and conference rooms was the residence of Thomas Meighan, a movie great of the silent film days. Land Hall was the estate of Nicholas Schenk.

The new Interfaith Chapel, great pillared and almost startling in the inner decor of brilliant Wedgwood blue, cost $760,000, and was financed for the most part by public subscription. The school's next goal is a new library, and an appropriation bill has passed the committee in the House of Representatives.

Admiral McLintock cherishes the last report of the Congressional Board of Visitors, which inspects and reports on the academy each year. It gave warm approbation to the Superintendent and his staff for the quality of its curriculum and the high standing of its graduates, many of whom are now moving from sea into posts of responsibility with shipping lines and related shore industries.

Admiral McLintock served his own cadetship in the British merchant navy without benefit of a college education. He got his master's papers at the age of 22, served on the bridge of American-flag vessels, and came ashore here in 1930 to join the Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation. He was chief inspection officer of the Maritime Commission bureau of training for 5 years before taking over at the Academy in 1948—its fourth Superintendent.

PURPOSE: LEADERSHIP

He is no martinet, but he believes in the Academy's main purpose, turning out "leadership." He bombards the cadets with truisms and axioms from the sea.

He explains why the visibility of sea lights is usually given in miles, as seen from a height of 15 feet. In the old days, he says, this was the height of the average poop deck.

He intones an old navigating mnemonic:

"When all three lights I see ahead,
I port my helm and go to bed."

At dinner with a visitor the other day the Superintendent commented: "We may be 61 years old, but we do not look it." "Yes, you do," retorted his aide, Comdr. Robert O'Leary.

"Do you remember," Admiral McLintock asked him, what happened to the lieutenant who said 'No' to the admiral?"

"No, I do not," replied O'Leary.

"Nothing," said the admiral, "ever. He stayed a lieutenant."

LIBRARY SERVICES ACT ADDRESS BY COMMISSIONER KEPPEL

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on June 28, 1964, the U.S. Commissioner of Education spoke to the Annual Conference of the American Library Association, in St. Louis, Mo.

His speech, which touched upon a number of matters, sets forth so clearly and lucidly the problems of this segment of American education that I feel that it can be read with profit by all who share his concern. I particularly noted his comments:

> Legislation to provide books, not merely bricks and mortar, is still before the Congress. It is not likely to be enacted during the remainder of this congressional session. But I believe that this legislation will again be brought before the attention of the next Congress. It is important unfinished business and it concerns us all.

This is a statement with which I am sure many Senators will agree. To vary a metaphor used by the Commissioner, a library without books is like mortar without bricks. It is my hope that these further steps will be taken, to make our libraries fully effective. I would agree that this program, like that for the training of library personnel, ought to be kept high on our agenda of needed educational legislation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of Commissioner Keppel's address be printed in the Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

LIBRARIES: FUTURE UNLIMITED

(An address by Francis Keppel, U.S. Commissioner of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, before the opening session of the annual conference of the American Library Association, St. Louis, Mo., Sunday evening, June 28, 1964.)

I am delighted to be with you for your opening general session of this conference. I have been invited—indeed, I have been urged—to speak before you this evening for 45 minutes to an hour. This I could do.

But I have no intention tonight of taking advantage of librarians, who are already overwhelmed by the greatest floodtide of communications in history, a tidal wave of written and spoken words that exceeds everything written or said from the day of the Rosetta Stone to the day of movable type to the day of the portable tape recorder.

In speaking before librarians, I am aware that some of the most valued items in your stacks are not necessarily those that fill volumes or take hours of saying—that Ecclesiastes can be read in a single setting, that the Gettysburg Address can be inscribed on an envelope back, that E–MC^2, in overturning an era, can be said in the flicker of an eyelash.

So I plan to be reasonably brief before you who are already challenged enough by fantastic quantities of material to be selected and cataloged, retrieved, and interpreted to thousands of library users every day. Like the mosquito at the nudist colony, today's librarian may justly complain: "I see what they expect me to do. My only problem is where to begin."

In my regard for librarians, I am my father's son. He liked books. He liked libraries. He liked librarians. In his administration of the endowments of Andrew Carnegie, he saw as a principal problem of education the staffing of Carnegie's gift of libraries to America with gifted librarians, skilled in the science and art of their profession.

I consider it a happy privilege to be on hand as Commissioner when the Public Library Services and Construction Act was passed to take up where the private Carnegie benefactions left off more than 40 years ago. After years of educational famine, we have now reached a festival year of educational legislation—historic acts by the 88th Congress which include the recognition that libraries, like other aspects of American education, are becoming in larger measure our Nation's responsibility. As my father's son, I cheerfully remember his wise injunction that "Nothing succeeds like a successor."

This evening, therefore, I would like to review briefly with you some of the highlights of present and future legislation specifically applying to libraries. And then I will talk about two other developments in which libraries must, it seems to me, play a central and pivotal role.

At the outset, before we consider the problems we have, I think we might allow ourselves a few moments of satisfaction over some of the problems we no longer have. Education and our libraries as a principal instrument of education have now moved strongly into the public's awareness.

We have repeated evidence that the rural Library Services Act has been one of the most successful and widely appreciated grant programs ever passed by the Congress. The program has clearly demonstrated how effectively Federal grants can stimulate State and local efforts for education.

This demonstration has led, in turn, to the new Library Services and Construction Act—a giant step in expanding urban public libraries and public library construction. In signing the act on February 11, President Johnson said: "There are few acts of Congress which I sign with more pleasure, and certainly none with more hope."

An act without the appropriation of funds, of course, is something of a hunting license. Last week we went on a hunting trip. I had the pleasure of testifying before the Senate Appropriations Committee in support of the President's request of $55 million for the Library Services and Construction Act in fiscal 1965.

The new library legislation could be—and I think will be—the beginning of a renaissance in public library development. It remains for us, all of us here tonight, to help in developing State plans and programs to use these funds constructively and creatively, to assure our ultimate goal of high level public library service for all our people.

Federal seed money, to be matched by States and local communities, presents a great opportunity to remove present deficiencies in public library services. Based on past performance, I have every confidence that with local, State, and Federal colloboration, the job can be well done.

Sound statewide planning and strong, purposeful action are both important—and both are now underway. The six regional meetings last winter and spring between the staffs of our library services branch and the staffs of State library agencies led to draft regulations and procedures. The new legislation has also led to the elevation of library services in our office to divisional status.

Last week, on June 23, Secretary Celebrezze signed the final regulations under which the new act will go into effect. This week, these regulations will be officially released to the States. Meanwhile proposed plans from 34 States have already been received, indicating that the principle of building strong statewide library systems will be followed. We are presently hopeful that the 1965 appropriations will be available by August 1. With the money in the till, the real work can begin.

In addition to this specific library act, the 88th Congress also took a second major step for libraries with the passage of the Higher Education Facilities Act. This measure authorizes Federal matching funds for the construction of academic libraries along with classrooms and laboratories.

The inclusion of libraries was particularly gratifying to me. I have been shocked at what our statistics show us on the inadequacies of so many academic libraries, particularly at a time of rapidly growing enrollments and rapidly increasing independent study and research programs.

The library is the heart of higher education. It is just as important to the arts and the humanities as the laboratory is to the sciences. Without high quality libraries to support high quality faculties, American higher education may expand in form, but it will diminish in substance. It will be higher education in name. But it will be mediocre education in fact.

The Higher Education Facilities Act, with its help to academic library construction, comes none too soon. Funds are provided as part of this act's authorization of $1.2 billion over the next 3 years. But the unfinished job—the hardest job—still remains. It is to build adequate collections of books and other materials needed by college students and faculty for their study and research. This is both an immediate and a long term, continuing task. A library without books, of course, is about as useful to learning as an empty warehouse.

Legislation to provide books, not merely bricks and mortar, is still before the Congress. It is not likely to be enacted during the remainder of this congressional session. But I believe that this legislation will again be brought before the attention of the next Congress. It is important unfinished business and it concerns us all.

Basic to all library development programs, whether they be public, college, or school libraries, is the availability of well-trained personnel. The last report of our advisory committee on the library services program bore down heavily on this point. Again there is still legislation before this Congress that would authorize appropriations for training programs for librarians in addition to other educational personnel. However, if this legislation does not pass or does not provide sufficient stimulation or assistance to library training, this is another program we must keep high on the agenda for action at the earliest possible date.

So much for legislative highlights. Now let me turn to two developments in which libraries can perform a signal service to America.

The first is the national attack on poverty, a high priority program on President Johnson's list of "must" legislation. It calls on us for a range of accomplishments at home as challenging as those the Peace Corps is so nobly accomplishing abroad. It presents to us an exciting opportunity and high adventure—to conduct for the first time a successful assault on an age-old enemy, the enemy of poverty and deprivation and despair. And in this assault, the library can be an arsenal.

At every turn, the statisticians show us that poverty and ignorance are almost always linked, just as affluence and education are linked. The evidence is now incontrovertible that the ability to learn and to read goes hand in hand with the ability to earn and to succeed in our modern society. This presents a challenge not merely to public officials, or to educators generally, but to librarians specifically.

Dynamic, well-stocked, well-staffed libraries—both school and public can help develop reading interests and reading skills. They can provide not merely the books but through gifted librarians, the vital incentives that encourage and stimulate the move from illiteracy to literacy, from the wastelands of apathy to the high horizons that reading can reveal.

Today, 60 percent of America's elementary schools with 10 million of America's children have no school libraries whatsoever. This is a national disgrace. It must be eliminated. I call upon all of you, who know that a school without a library is a crippled school, to dramatize this shame of America—to carry your concern beyond your own councils to the American people.

When there are no libraries, they must be created. And where they exist, they must be dynamic if they are to serve in the coming war against poverty.

There are such libraries today. They set a goal for others to follow and amplify. They deserve our attention and the Nation's gratitude.

The Brooklyn Public Library, for example, is now conducting Operation Second Chance. Through this program, it is helping to improve the reading ability of native-born and Puerto Rican functional illiterates.

The Boston Public Library has set up a tutorial service for junior and senior high school students in one area for underprivileged. The Minneapolis Public Library has provided space in a branch library in a slum area where a social worker and a librarian working together offer a broad range of service to people needing help.

In New Haven, Conn., the public library is developing a neighborhood center in a slum area, providing an educational program to attract nonreaders.

These are a few examples of libraries on the move. There are others and there will be, I predict, many more in the months and years ahead as libraries take on the responsibility—and the opportunity—that lies before them.

Our libraries, at their best, have always been creative centers of their communities. They have devised the bookmobile, one of the most dramatic and interesting extensions of what a library is all about—to bring books to the people. Today, the bookmobile offers new potentialities. It can bring books not only to rural areas, but to urban slums as well. It can attract not only readers but also small groups for remedial teaching programs.

This new momentum of creative libraries is expressed in several State plans submitted to us under the Library Services and Construction Act. They include the development of a variety of special services in culturally and economically depressed areas.

This is important and proper business for our libraries today, both under the new Library Act and also under the community action program envisioned in the President's Economic Opportunity Act—the antipoverty program. I think it is quite likely that funds for such library programs will become available. I think it is most unlikely that they will be withheld if the libraries themselves demonstrate their own creative potential for service. Indeed, the report of the House Committee on Education and Labor specifically indicates that "special library services" are contemplated under the legislation.

The second challenge to library service is equally important and moves to the other end of the scale. Just as libraries can be of indispensable service in lifting the dead weight of poverty and ignorance, so are they indispensable in meeting what is commonly and graphically called the "information explosion."

An explosion it is. From 1953 to 1963, the annual production of books has doubled. From 1961 to 1963 alone, there was a 43 percent increase. At present, the number of scientific and technical periodicals around the world is estimated as exceeding 50,000—and the number is increasing annually by 10 to 15 percent. At the present growth rate, library holdings in the year 2000 will be five times what they are today.

Meanwhile, the costs of library materials are rising in an equally alarming manner. The cost of the average library book rose 82 percent from 1948 to 1963. During the same period, the average periodical subscription rose 56 percent in cost. When we add to this the costs required for more staff to process and service the new materials, for more space to house them and the larger numbers of people who will use these facilities, it is clear that we will need to look further for funds and be infinitely resourceful in their use.

The Federal legislation passed by the 88th Congress for academic and public library construction may only provide a partial solution to this long-range problem. The encouragement of regional and cooperative resource libraries which this legislation will also foster may also ease the problem for a time.

But for big answers to the big question, more research and development will clearly be needed. I was pleased that our cooperative research program was recently able to contract with the Rutgers University Library School for the study and identification of the problems of library service in large metropolitan areas, those areas where 70 percent of our population are now living and where 85 percent will shortly be living.

One answer to the information explosion is automation—the use of the electronic computers to store and retrieve information. This of course is a promising approach. But librarians, as well as library machines, must learn to control the explosion, and they will not do so by retreating to bombproof shelters or to the archives of the past. Unless librarians maintain their position as organizers and retrievers of information, they may well wind up as a vanishing breed while another species ascends the library ladder. I have already heard this new and ominous breed called on by name. They are, I am told, "information scientists."

Library automation is now underway. At the Federal level, both the Library of Congress and the Executive Office of the President have been studying its possibilities and potentials and the National Library of Medicine of the Public Health Service has already established one of the most advanced systems in the field of medical literature.

Dr. Stafford L. Warren, a special assistant in the President's Office, recently issued a report proposing the establishment of a National Library of Science Systems and Network. What particularly interested me in Dr. Warren's report is his proposal to utilize the strengths and capabilities of existing major research libraries to prepare abstracts and citations of scientific journals in specific disciplines. These abstracts would be fed on computer tape or microfilm into a central pool in Washington from which any information in any field could be requested.

I was also impressed with Dr. Warren's specific recognition of our need in the developmental stages of the program for funds to train librarians to staff the new service. He is aware, as we are aware, that a library, above all, is a human enterprise and that it depends ultimately upon the skilled minds and talents of librarians if it is to perform its proper role in our changing society.

For libraries and librarians, this is an exciting time, a time of challenge and of opportunity. And it will remain exciting for all who are creative in this profession whose future is unlimited.

LEGISLATIVE VIEWS OF OREGON STATE GRANGE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Oregon State Grange at its annual convention adopted a number of resolutions which have been brought to my attention. Since the resolutions cover many aspects of Federal legislation currently under consideration by the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks, in order that the views of these responsible representatives of Oregon agricultural interests may be brought to the attention of my colleagues.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STREAM POLLUTION—COMMITTEE CONSERVATION

Whereas pollution in the Columbia River is killing large quantities of fish; and

Whereas this pollution contributes to very unsanitary conditions; and

Whereas this pollution will in a few short years destroy fish in our streams to the extent that it will be necessary to discontinue sport and commercial fishing; and

Whereas this condition by destroying spawners will eventually contribute to the eradication of ocean salmon; and

Whereas if spawners are fortunate enough to reach the spawning grounds, the pollution takes an untold toll of the fingerlings on their return to the ocean; and

Whereas the industries and municipalities that are causing these conditions should be held responsible and made to clean up their operations; and

Whereas according to recent reports this pollution is so bad that most of the commercial fishermen in the lower river are unable to use their fish nets since they collect so much slime that they cannot be handled: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Warren Grange go on record demanding that the proper State agencies take immediate action to remedy this situation and that if we do not have adequate laws to govern this, that the Oregon State Grange take steps to initiate them and a copy of this resolution be sent to the State Game Commission, Governor Hatfield, and our Senators and Representatives in Congress.

Submitted by Warren Grange.

Adopted by the Oregon State Grange.

COLUMBIA DRAINAGE BASIN WATER—COMMITTEE RECLAMATION AND IRRIGATION

Whereas officials of Los Angeles have proposed a plan to divert Columbia Drainage Basin water to their area by pumping out of the Snake River below Thousand Springs, Idaho, and through Nevada to Lake Meade for their use in the Southwest; and

Whereas the diversion of this water would constitute a serious economic loss to the States in the Columbia River Basin where it is needed to firm up the power in the many powerplants on the Snake and Columbia Rivers below the proposed diversion; and

Whereas there are thousands of acres of desert land in Southwest Idaho that need this water for irrigation; and

Whereas the loss of this water would jeopardize navigation of the Snake and Columbia Rivers from Lewiston to the sea; and

Whereas it could seriously affect the salmon and steelhead runs in these streams which have been increasing the past several years: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Grange go on record opposing any action by anyone attempting to transport water outside the confines of the Columbia Drainage Basin; and be it further

Resolved, That we urge action by Congress to prevent the diversion of these waters by outside interests; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to Senator WAYNE MORSE and Representative AL ULLMAN.

Submitted by Jefferson Pomona Grange.

Adopted by the Oregon State Grange.

PAY RAISE FOR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS—COMMITTEE LEGISLATION

Whereas the country is going farther and farther into debt, and the budget is getting farther and farther out of balance; and

Whereas the good President has signed into law a tax reduction with an implied promise to cut down on spending: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Central Grange, Clackamas County, hereby go on record as strenuously opposed to a pay raise of Members of Congress and other Government officials as recently reported out by the rules committee, a pay raise of from 28 to 44 percent when any raise above 3 percent is supposed to be inflationary; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the National Grange Legislative Committee, Maurine Neuberger and Wayne Morse.

Submitted by Central Grange.

Adopted by the Oregon State Grange.

Dunes Seashore Park—Committee Conservation

Whereas the United States and Congress are being asked to establish a dunes national seashore park of some 30,000 acres on the Oregon coast which will include rights of condemnation of private property; and

Whereas the State government and Federal agencies have numerous parks, wayside areas, campsites and recreational areas on the Oregon coast: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Jasper Grange meeting in regular session this 10th day of December 1963, go on record commending Senator Morse for his attempt to amend this seashore park bill to forbid condemnation of private property; and be it further

Resolved, That Jasper Grange go on record opposing the creation of any national park in the dunes area of the Oregon coast. This resolution to be sent to Senator Morse of Oregon with copies to Mark O. Hatfield, Governor of Oregon, and to Mike Mansfield, Senate democratic leader.

Submitted by Lane Pomona Grange.

Adopted by Oregon State Grange.

Aid to Injured Persons—Committee Legislation

Whereas on many occasions a person desires to help those who are in positions of peril, or have been injured or are in pain and need immediate aid; and

Whereas those wishing to come to their aid are reluctant to do so because of the possibility, and in many cases probability, that they may be subject to civil or criminal liability or harassment or nuisance, or be compelled to defend a court action because they have helped those in need of immediate aid or treatment; and

Whereas many physicians and/or surgeons, some licensed to practice in the State of Oregon and some unlicensed but otherwise qualified, registered nurses, ambulance drivers, and some ambulance attendants, and those having duly recognized first-aid certificates with to help others; and

Whereas it is in the best interest of all the people that those answering in good faith they cry, or need for help in emergency situations, are entitled to the protection of law: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Legislature of the United States be encouraged to enact "good Samaritan" legislation which will release from civil or criminal liability those persons to wit: Duly qualified physicians and surgeons, registered nurses, ambulance drivers, ambulance attendants, those having a duly recognized first-aid certificate of competency, and other persons acting in good faith and for the best interests of those in positions of danger, or being injured, and using that standard of conduct that a prudent man in a like position and competency, would do in a similar situation; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be forwarded to the National Grange and to the Congress of the United States for their action.

Submitted by Pacific Grange.

Adopted by Clatsop Pomona Grange.

Adopted by Oregon State Grange.

Oppose H.R. 3669 and S. 774—Committee Legislation

Whereas the present existing law is sufficient to protect both the manufacturer and the consumer;

Whereas under our free enterprise system competition is the life blood of our economy; and

Whereas there needs to be flexibility under varying conditions; and

Whereas this bill would work hardship on the average consumer: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Parkdale Grange go on record as being opposed to H.R. 3669 and S. 774, to amend the antitrust laws to authorize manufacturers to fix resale prices; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to Senator Wayne Morse, Senator Maurine Neuberger, Representative Al Ullman, Representative Walter Norblad, and to the National Grange.

Submitted by Parkdale Grange.

Adopted by the Oregon State Grange.

THIS BOOMING ECONOMY

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the first page of the Monthly Economic Letter of July from the First National City Bank of New York entitled "General Business Conditions" be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

General Business Conditions

At midyear, business activity continues to push ahead on a broad front. Consumer demand is strong and businessmen have further confirmed plans to increase spending for plants and equipment. Against this background of high-level business activity, there are some uncertainties, but nothing that should halt the uptrend during 1964. Defense cutbacks are causing business letdowns in certain localities and construction seems to be leveling off at record highs. Questions are being raised about the outcome of labor negotiations this summer in the auto industry and the pattern it might set for labor contracts in other areas. And abroad there is the nagging problem of inflation, which is being fought not only with fiscal and "incomes policies" but also with monetary restraint, including higher interest rates.

In the months immediately ahead we will experience the usual letdown that accompanies vacations and hot weather. But the strength of demand indicates that the seasonal dip in steel production and other manufacturing activities may be shallower than usual this year. Thus, after seasonal adjustment, business activity will continue rising.

The gross national product is unofficially estimated to have reached an annual rate of approximately $620 billion in the second quarter, compared with a $608 billion rate in the first quarter and $600 billion in the final 3 months of 1963. The increase would be comparable in size to the fourth quarter rise last year. The influence of the tax cut is not only evident in increasing consumer demand, but also—as was hoped for—in accelerating capital investment.

The industrial production index advanced in May to a new record of 130.3 (seasonally adjusted, 1957–59=100). The index has risen about 5 percent in the past year, with half of the rise concentrated in the last 4 months.

SPENDING THE TAX-CUT DOLLARS

There is little doubt any more that consumers are spending more freely. Retail sales in the first quarter averaged 4.4 percent more than a year earlier, but in April the year-to-year gain widened to 5.5 percent and in May it reached 7.4 percent.

The market for new cars has been exceptionally good. In the month ended June 20, dealers reported the daily rate of new car sales was up 7 percent from the previous peak performance in 1963 and 8 percent from the 1955 period. In the first half of 1964, over 4 million domestic cars are estimated to have been sold—up 7 percent from 1963. To achieve the goal of an 8-million car year (including around 400,000 imported cars) domestic car sales would need only to match the 1963 pace in the second half of the year.

SPACE PROGRAM IS HERE TO STAY

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, recently there appeared in the Kansas City Star an editorial entitled "Space Program Is Here To Stay." It points out that President Johnson has reaffirmed the national space goals set by President Kennedy when he said:

> I do not believe that this generation of Americans is willing to resign itself to going to bed every night by the light of a Communist moon.

Expressing surprise that some would disagree with this, the editorial sets out five reasons, given by the Administrator of NASA, James E. Webb, for the space program. These are:

> (1) National security.
>
> (2) International leadership in science and technology.
>
> (3) Acquisition of scientific knowledge and technical skills.
>
> (4) Practical uses of space for the benefit of mankind.
>
> (5) The challenge of space exploration.

Speaking of the need for our space program, the Kansas City Star says:

> A more effective argument than defense—for the present at least—deals with this Nation's world leadership. A successful landing on the moon—and a return—would provide a demonstration of scientific competence. It would, we believe, impress on the rest of the world the fact of this Nation's position as the leader in science.

With that most of us will agree. If our Nation is to remain strong and a leader of men, then it is necessary that we maintain a position of leadership in the greatest adventure of our time.

Not only would a slowdown in this program have an adverse effect on U.S. leadership, but it would cost the taxpayer more money. NASA estimates that for every year the program is stretched out a billion dollars would have to be added to the program. That is not surprising. Any major R. & D. program requires a tight timetable if it is to be an efficient program and provide the necessary incentive. Without a tight timetable the work drags on through repeated changes and indecision. As in most human endeavors the establishment of a tight schedule in fact provides assurance that the program will in fact be accomplished.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial published in the Kansas City Star of June 14, 1964, entitled "Space Program Is Here To Stay," be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Kansas City Star, June 14, 1964]

Space Program Is Here To Stay

"If the whole objective were to bring back a handful of lunar sand, or hang a sign, 'Kilroy was here,' none in NASA would pursue it. Space is a proper subject for man. I do not believe any other material program has so captured the imagination of the whole world."—Dr. WERNHER VON BRAUN.

Von Braun, as an eminent spaceman, is not exactly an unbiased observer. Nevertheless, we suspect that his sentiment on behalf of the $20 billion effort to place Americans on the moon in this decade reflects the views of most scientists and of a sizable segment of the public.

The lunar landing venture, in 3 years, has become a vital part of the Nation's political, social, and economic fabric. Every time you pay $1 to the Federal Government in income taxes, about 5 cents is marked for space. Naturally, so expensive a program is a source of political controversy. Continuous debate is in order. On the other hand, we regard a stated national goal as a fact of history. There was wide acceptance in 1961 when President Kennedy declared a moon landing in this decade to be a national goal.

In part, it was an attempt to buoy the Nation's spirits in the face of Soviet successes. But without similar prodding, President Johnson has reaffirmed the policy:

"I do not believe that this generation of Americans is willing to resign itself to going to bed each night by the light of a Communist moon."

We are not surprised that some citizens disagree. For example, the Republican Critical Issues Council recently questioned the program. But it was critical not of the space endeavor itself, but significantly, of the timing. It urged the administration to drop the 1970 deadline.

Such criticism is understandable and it has a purpose. On the other hand, we note also that a Republican task force has expressed doubt about the two-man Gemini capsule for its lack of a tower rescue system. That strikes us as a matter of scientists, not for politicians. Really, now, we doubt that there is a Republican or a Democratic way to build a spaceship.

Nearly 7 years after Sputnik I, it is significant that few voices have been raised of late to demand the abandonment of the space venture. So far, the proposed $5.2 billion appropriation for the next fiscal year has met little opposition on Capitol Hill. Of course it has barely left the launching pad of one House committee and we would expect some reduction. At any rate, it is timely to review the progress of the space program and to examine its justification today.

In the vast industrial plants across the Nation, where the boosters and spacecraft are being assembled, the United States clearly is nearing the halfway point in the great moon adventure. The tools and dies have been made. The hardware is being built. Ground facilities for assembly and testing are being completed.

The investment already has reached $7 billion. By June 30, 1965, $10 billion will have been committed. These are funds for the round trip to the moon. Civilian space expenditures of all types may reach $35 billion by 1970.

Despite frustrating delays on subordinate parts of the mission, the major components are on schedule. Saturn IB, designed to put the Apollo spacecraft in earth orbit, is scheduled to soar in 1966. Saturn V, the moon rocket, will be tested in space in 1967.

The pessimism that prevailed 6 months ago has been replaced by a buoyant optimism on the part of space agency and industrial officials. In these circles no one can be found who doubts that this country now has the means to achieve a lunar landing and possibly on schedule.

But then why go to the moon at all? Is the trip worth $20 billion? The most articulate defender, James E. Webb, space agency Administrator, suggests five reasons:

National security.

International leadership in science and technology.

Acquisition of scientific knowledge and technical skills.

Practical uses of space for the benefit of mankind.

The challenge of space exploration.

Some of these arguments are stronger than others and it is doubtful whether the moon flight could be justified by any one of them. Taken collectively, however, the case seems to be strong indeed.

The defense argument becomes less tenable as more is learned about space. Orbiting nuclear weapons have been pretty well ruled out by the agreement between the United States and the Soviet Union to keep them out of space. The practical reason is that earthbound missiles would be infinitely more accurate.

Presumably the chief military use of space vehicles will be for surveillance. The U.S. Samos project—designed to put picturetaking satellites in orbit—is hush-hush. Nikita Khrushchev seems to be the only one will discuss this type of space effort. He says he has pictures taken from space. At any rate, space spying has not yet become an open and important part of the defense scheme. Possibly it will. But this type of activity hardly compares with the usual fanciful pictures of space warfare we used to get a few years ago.

A more effective argument than defense—for the present at least—deals with this Nation's world leadership. A successful landing on the moon—and a return—would provide a demonstration of scientific competence. It would, we believe, impress on the rest of the world the fact of this Nation's position as the leader in science.

The practical benefits from space will come first from projects incidental to the moon landing. These include weather and navigation satellites and communications. The spinoff commercial benefits make an imposing list. But let's not get too hasty in counting their value. We have seen pans made from heat-shield materials and the astronaut program has introduced some new medical concepts. Nevertheless, it will be some time before space has significantly changed the lot of man on earth. The day will come, however.

There is another strong argument in the challenge of space exploration to the spirit of man. Once Yuri Gagarin demonstrated that man could fly freely through space, the exploration of the moon, Mars, and other planets became inevitable. Human nature cannot resist the challenge, and frankly, we would have it no other way.

In connection with the moon program, a very practical reason for its continuance is that we are halfway there. A few more appropriation bills in the next 3 or 4 years will complete the major financing.

Current attacks have been centered more on the "crash" nature of the program. There is an impression that a slower pace could save money. We fail to understand the reasoning. Visit the space plants and you see no evidence of a speedup. George E. Mueller, Deputy Administrator, contends that to delay the moon landing 3 years would add $2.6 billion to the cost. It is a point that congressional committees ought to check out.

Some critics suggest that we may, by now, be merely racing ourselves to the moon. There has been some confusion over Kremlin pronouncements but confusion has always been a fine Communist weapon. The Soviet program is secret but the open evidence suggests that the Reds would be very happy to land a man on the moon first—if they can. It would be risky to assume that the Soviet Union has abandoned its once-stated purpose in space.

The economic effects of the space program are causing increasing discussion and concern. Present employment of 250,000 for all civilian contractors and subcontractors is expected to level off at 300,000 next year. A letup may follow. For all practical purposes the industrial phase of the moon project is now simply an assembly operation. Some manufacturers are beginning to cast anxious eyes to the future. They may have developed more rocket and spacecraft capabilities than NASA knows how to use.

This has led to many conferences between Government and participating companies on what will come after the lunar landing. Huge orbiting space stations, more moon landings, and probes to Mars have been proposed. We would assume that even before that first landing on the moon, some additional decisions will have to be made.

For the present, however, there is the fact that the huge space industry complex—and the space psychology itself—has found a place in the Nation's consciousness. The United States is more than 6 years away from its first puny satellite, and in that time the acceleration of progress has been on the edge of the fantastic. The space age has barely been born but we cannot see how anyone can misread the promise of adventure and discovery in the years to come.

WHAT NEXT FROM PUGWASH?

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the American Security Council has published in the July 6, 1964, Washington Report one of the best and most revealing articles which the American Security Council has ever produced. This article is entitled, "What Next From Pugwash?" and was written by a Korean war hero who has established himself as an authority on U.S. disarmament efforts. In this article, Mr. Duane Thorin has written an excellent analysis of the Pugwash Conferences originally established by Mr. Khrushchev's close friend and confidant, Mr. Cyrus Eaton, who favors laying down U.S. arms in the face of the threats posed to the world by the forces of world communism.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, Mr. Thorin's report on the Pugwash Conferences.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT NEXT FROM PUGWASH?

The full portent of the Pugwash Conferences has never been grasped by the American public. Yet these friendly meetings between Communist and free world scientists and other "thought leaders," the first of which was held 7 years ago today, have become the incubator for U.S. foreign policy in its headlong plunge toward world government under the banner of "disarmament."

To date, there have been 12 of these "Conferences on Science and World Affairs," with the 13th scheduled for September in Carlsbad, Czechoslovakia. From their very beginning they have had the enthusiastic support of Soviet Dictator Khrushchev and have been attended by Soviet representatives. Starting with the seventh and eighth meetings, they have also enjoyed the blessing of the U.S. Chief of State. Despite the fact that the Soviets had only recently shattered the test ban moratorium, President Kennedy sent a message to the September 1961 conclave at Stowe, Vt., stating that he looked to the Pugwash movement for "initiative and guidance."

Even before this, however, the late President had given his tacit approval to Pugwash. Soon after his election in 1960 Walt

W. Rostow and Jerome Wiesner, whom he later selected for top-level policy posts in his administration, were active participants in the Sixth Pugwash Conference in Moscow. More recently, President Johnson has picked up the torch. In January he sent the following message to the 12th meeting convened in India:

"I have followed the proceedings of your earlier conferences. They are a serious attempt to achieve new solutions to old problems. I look forward to new ideas in this field. In your last meeting, a suggestion was made to exchange officers between the military establishments in certain areas of Europe. Let me assure you that this suggestion, as well as any other new ideas, will be studied thoroughly by me and by this Government in our continued effort to achieve workable disarmament."

Exactly what are these conferences upon which the President relies so heavily for "new ideas"? They take their name from Pugwash, Nova Scotia, where Nikita Khrushchev's close friend, Cleveland industrialist, Cyrus Eaton, played host to the first meeting at his summer home from July 6–11, 1957. The invitations were issued by Lord Bertrand Russell, patriarch of the peace movement and the philosophical father of the Pugwash movement. Among the most ardent backers have been Dr. Linus Pauling, America's leading "peace" pusher, and the late Frederic Joliot-Curie, the French Communist who was dismissed as his country's atomic energy commissioner for proclaiming that "progressive" scientists could not in conscience work on weapons that could be used against the Soviet Union.

The purpose of the Pugwash powwows, as described by Prof. Eugene Rabinowitch, founder and editor of the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, has been to "breach the walls of isolation" and wash away the "atmosphere of suspicion in which scientists and science have become enveloped since the days of (Alan Nunn) May and (Klaus) Fuchs."

As Senator Thomas J. Dodd has said, the free world scientist comes to Pugwash "with an open mind, full of trust, and a desire to communicate and cooperate. The Communist scientist comes * * * with carefully defined political directives. It is his duty to attempt to shape and exploit the conferences in a manner which will best serve the ends of Soviet imperialism." The leading Soviet Pugwash delegate, until his death in 1962, was A. V. Topchiev, a power in the Communist-controlled Soviet Academy of Sciences, and chief hatchetman in the purges of nonconformist Russian scientists under both Stalin and Khrushchev.

In short, the American and other Western conferees are playing policy poker at Pugwash with a loaded deck. And the stakes are nothing less than the security and freedom of the United States and its allies. How then has the game been going? The seventh anniversary of Pugwash seems an appropriate time to tote up the score:

(1) The U.S. "program for general and complete disarmament" conforms in its basic design and significant details to a plan previously outlined in the first six Pugwash Conferences.

(2) Unilateral disarmament before United States-Soviet ratification of the formal program has always been near and dear to the heart of many leading Pugwashers. They argue that America must make the first concrete moves toward disarmament if we wish the Soviet to take our official proposals seriously. (How far the United States has gone down this unilateral road was outlined last week in the June 20 issue of Washington Report.)

(3) The "hot line" between the White House and the Kremlin was pushed by Pugwash ostensibly as a means of avoiding an "accidental" nuclear war but also to set up direct communications between the U.S. Chief Executive and the Soviet "head of state."

(4) The nuclear test ban treaty of July 1963 was actively sought by Pugwashers as far back as 1960. They billed it as a "confidence building" measure and a "first step which would open the way to the steps beyond." Their words were echoed almost verbatim by the administration in winning Senate ratification of the Treaty of Moscow 3 years later.

(5) Several Pugwash-prescribed "steps beyond" the test ban have already been taken. Perhaps the most important is the United States-Soviet agreement to ban the orbiting of nuclear weapons—with no provision to inspect or enforce Soviet compliance. Moreover, this agreement was effected through the United Nations and approved by the U.S. executive branch, thus bypassing the U.S. Senate and the treatymaking procedures set forth in the Constitution.

It is revealing to follow the sequence of events leading up to this last agreement. In late September of last year the 11th Pugwash Conference convened in Yugoslavia. The conferees hailed the Treaty of Moscow and urged a "ban on orbiting nuclear weapons" as "another recommended step which would have the effect of increasing international confidence." The Pugwashers specifically recommended that this step be taken as a "declaration by the heads of state of the United States, the Soviet Union, and other nations."

Three weeks later, on October 16 and 17, the pertinent U.N. resolution was drafted and approved by acclamation. Ambassadors Stevenson of the United States and Federenko of the U.S.S.R. had already given prior endorsement to the draft. Stevenson declared that "the United States has no intention" of placing nuclear weapons in orbit or on space platforms—but no similar explicit declaration was made by the Soviet's Federenko.

From these and other recent events the relationship between Pugwash proposals and U.S. policies is demonstrably clear. The question is to what ultimate end will this relationship lead? Surprisingly, even some Pugwashers seem a bit uncertain about what kind of offspring the marriage may produce. At the eighth conference in 1961 two American Pugwashers—Harrison Brown and Aaron Katz—posed the following questions:

"How will a world without armaments function? How will international disputes be resolved? Will a World Court resolve disputes? If so, how will the laws governing the Court be made. Will the laws apply to nations alone, or will they also apply to individuals? What will be the nature of the international security forces? How will they operate? Who will direct them?"

Other Pugwashers have endeavored to supply the answers. Walt W. Rostow, speaking from his lofty perch as the U.S. State Department's top planning officer, confidently proclaims that the disarmed world will function under "strict international controls." As for the jurisdiction of the World Court, several other American Pugwashers have urged that the Court be empowered to try any individual for "crimes against the peace." Such "crimes" might include even vocal opposition to a disarmament treaty or the international control organization. One conferee even proposes the death sentence in absentia for any individual who fails to appear before the Court when summoned. Such a sentence would make this individual an international outlaw and any peace-loving citizen might kill him with impunity—and possibly for reward.

These are but a few samplings of the "new solutions to old problems." One hopes that the President will take a closer and more careful look at Pugwash before he decides to implement any further ideas generated by these conferences. A few more steps beyond and he may well find himself presiding over the affairs of a nation that has lost its sovereignty and been trapped into de facto surrender.

Duane Thorin,
Guest Editor.

PROJECT HOPE

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, all of us are generally familiar with and proud of the fine humanitarian work that has been accomplished by Project Hope.

So far the hospital ship *Hope* has logged 22,000 miles, which is the equivalent of a trip around the globe.

Thousands of patients have been treated and many doctors and nurses have been trained in modern medical techniques by the American doctor and nurse volunteers.

A recent issue of the New Haven Register carried an article about some Connecticut doctors and nurses who have participated in Project Hope, treating the less fortunate and teaching their foreign counterparts in Vietnam, Indonesia, Peru, and Ecuador.

I think it is admirable of Dr. Donald P. Shedd, Registered Nurse Nancy Campion and the other doctors and nurses to take time out from their careers to help fulfill the moral obligation we Americans have to try to improve the everyday lives of people in the less prosperous countries.

By way of tribute to the Connecticut and other volunteers who have helped to make such a success of Project Hope, I ask unanimous consent to have the New Haven Register article, "Project Hope Nurse," printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Leaves of Laurel—Project Hope Nurse

(By Marc Drogin)

"To a doctor it is a shocking experience to find oneself plunked down abruptly among so much human suffering. Finding oneself providing medical care to people who otherwise might not receive it, has a strong emotional impact.

"This is an impact," Dr. Donald P. Shedd explained, "which is difficult to describe but probably is related to the sense of obligation one man has for another—an obligation which has been clearly spelled out in my religion and in others."

One way in which Americans are paying this moral obligation is through a most basic level— health—in the form of a project taking place today on the world's first peacetime hospital ship in the Guayas River at the harbor of Guayaquil, Ecuador.

Dr. Shedd, acting chairman of the local committee for Project Hope and member of the Yale School of Medicine faculty, Grace-New Haven Hospital, has had firsthand experience at the work and wonder of such a project, and an opportunity to work with and know a Waterbury nurse who stands out as someone particularly special among the more than 500 American physicians, dentists, nurses, and auxiliary personnel who have volunteered their efforts in Project Hope over the past 4 years.

"Hope is essentially a teaching program," Dr. Shedd explained, "although necessarily there is treatment involved. American staff members work with their counterparts in foreign countries, can pass along modern techniques and the latest medical knowledge under working conditions. Ann Theresa Campion is an outstanding example of the type of dedicated individual who is willing to give several years of service to this project in international medicine."

One of six nurses who has served on the ship for all three of its medical education missions, Miss Campion is a graduate of St. Mary's Hospital School of Nursing, Waterbury, and of Hunter College in New York, with 9 years' experience in Veterans' Administration hospital work.

She wrote to Hope in 1959 when she learned that the Government had agreed to take a hospital ship out of mothballs and loan it to the nonprofit foundation for a floating medical university that would visit countries less privileged than ours.

She spent 10 months with the *Hope* in South Vietnam and Indonesia, training local nurses and administering gentle, competent care to those who, without the *Hope*, would never have had an opportunity for better health, or a belief that strangers, Americans, cared enough to help them.

After a homeward trip for supplies, the *Hope* sailed in May 1962 for Peru, with Miss Campion again aboard, as Dr. Shedd recalls, "spreading cheer and happiness in her own inimitable way. When not on active duty, she was frequently surrounded by admiring young patients who, even though they could not speak her language, found communication easy with her warm and loving personality."

Again in 1963 she volunteered to remain aboard the *Hope* and it sailed in November—now training hundreds of doctors, nurses, auxiliary medical personnel in Guayaquil, Quito, and Cuenca, and Duran. Supported by contributions always welcome at Project Hope (1261 Avenue of the Americas, room 2858, New York, N.Y.) the *Hope* has so far logged 22,000 miles, the equivalent of once around the globe.

Dr. Shedd indicated other local people who have helped with this project: Miss Barbara Rousseau at West Haven Veterans' Administration Hospital; Miss Elizabeth Berry, of New Britain; Miss Catherine Murphy, of Bridgeport; Miss Dorothy Grimes, of Wolcott; Dr. Paul W. Tischer, of New Britain; Dr. Allen Margold, of Norwalk; Dr. Chester Weed, of Hartford; Miss Priscilla Strong, who came from Grace-New Haven Hospital; and Dr. Archie Golden, of New Milford.

People like these, and like Miss Campion help to pay a moral obligation of which we perhaps should be aware in realizing that this world is filled with many less fortunate. And the work that people like these can do, makes its impact felt.

"There is another strong impact," Dr. Shedd concluded, "and it is an important one. One feels an intense pride in the dedicated group with which he is working.

"This is a group of fellow countrymen who make you feel that perhaps North Americans are not all ugly Americans."

THE RACIAL SITUATION IN ST. AUGUSTINE, FLA.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, several weeks ago the Danbury News-Times carried a series of three exceptional articles on the difficult and tense racial situation in St. Augustine, Fla.

The articles were prepared by Jonathan Brown, the 19-year-old son of Eugene J. Brown, the publisher of the News-Times, who spent 3 weeks participating in the integrationist movement in St. Augustine.

Because each of the three is so well written and such a graphic description of the efforts to integrate this historic city I ask unanimous consent to have them printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Danbury News-Times, June 29, 1964]

THE ST. AUGUSTINE STORY: A CITY RULED BY FEAR

(By Jonathan Brown)

(This is the first of a series of articles by Jonathan Brown, 19, of 80 Clapboard Ridge Road, on the current situation in St. Augustine, Fla. Brown has returned from that city after 3 weeks participation in the integrationist movement there. His assignment was to set up a tutorial school for Negro students and to lay the groundwork for a daily newssheet covering the movements of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference. Brown is a graduate of Kent School and is entering his junior year at Yale.)

For a "white," working in civil rights in the South is a strange mixture of love and fear.

As soon as the white integrationist demonstrates his involvement in the freedom movement, he is adopted by the Negro community.

Because I was beaten up by Klansmen and local police twice during the first 2 days of my stay in St. Augustine, all doors in the Negro community were immediately open for "the boy who had come down from the North to help."

At the same time, the segregationists put the white integrationist in a special category of hatred for in their eyes he is a "traitor to the white race."

OUTSIDE AGITATOR

To the segregationists I was "an outside agitator," a "white nigger," and quite obviously a sexual pervert.

To the average northern white who seems naturally to stay within the environment of his own race and to whom the Negro community remains much of an enigma, his stay in the South is a juxtaposition.

Suddenly, in the South, the Negro community becomes his physical and spiritual home not only because he is involved in the freedom struggle, but because the white community becomes alien and dangerous.

ONE HOME OPEN

During my entire 3-week stay in St. Augustine, I visited only one white home, that of a divorcee with six children ranging in age from 3 to 24—Mrs. Margaret Ann Muhl.

The only local white resident who dared to demonstrate with us, because of her basic belief in equality, Mrs. Muhl had been almost totally ostracized by white St. Augustine.

She received as many as 35 threatening phone calls a day, found a wiretap on her phone. After she and one of her sons marched with Negroes in a nonviolent demonstration a gang of kids outside her home just waited for any of her children to appear.

Mrs. Muhl believes that virtually all the white people of St. Augustine are for segregation (the mayor proudly admits he is one) and attributes this to "generations of hatred, misunderstanding, and a basic belief in their own supremacy."

They have, she says, "an abysmal disregard for equality under our Constitution."

WHITE NIGGERS

Mrs. Muhl and the other whites from outside St. Augustine are called "white niggers," and in effect when a white person joins the integration fight, he gives up all the rights and privileges that a white person has in the South.

A walk through the white sections of St. Augustine will very likely result if you are recognized in a beating or at the least, verbal harassment.

In contrast, a walk through the Negro community is one of the friendly hellos or chats with people you know and don't know.

Home and safety is black, alienation and injury is white.

Northern whites comes to the South to fight for civil rights for many reasons.

The older ones come mainly for religious reasons or because they have been in the movement so long that freedom has become something for which they continually fight.

The religious integrationist has a firm commitment to fight for equal rights based on religious principles.

From Genesis to modern theology, they see religion demanding them to make all men free.

UNCOMMON BRAVERY

Mostly ministers, these people of faith have shown uncommon bravery in the face of constant physical assaults.

Sarah Patton Boyle, of Virginia, author of "The Desegregated Heart" and other books on civil rights, entered the movement in her native State and seems to turn up whenever the movement needs help.

The younger white integrationists come to the South for generally different reasons.

Most of them do not seem to have the firm religious commitment, rather basing their involvement on natural not supernatural principles.

STARTED ACTING

As one college student remarked, "I have been in school for years and have been learning over and over again what is right and what is wrong. It's time I started acting."

For others, the civil rights movement does not involve just the Negro, but in fact all men of good faith.

One rabbi remarked that "anytime one man's liberty is infringed upon, then the liberty of all men is infringed upon.

"As long as I cannot take a friend into a restaurant or motel or any other public place simply because his skin is not white, then his freedom as well as mine has been violated."

In my own case, I came to St. Augustine to set up a tutorial program for Negro children to be run by northern college students and to start a newspaper for the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, Martin Luther King's organization, which is leading the integration fight in St. Augustine.

I was needed, I thought I could be useful, and I went.

However, after a few days, I began to feel that I was not in St. Augustine just to help the Negroes in education or gaining admittance to public facilities or to convince the local whites that all men were created equal by God and the Constitution.

NADIR OF MANKIND

It became clear to me (as it does to others) that I was fighting for my country, black and white, just as surely as if I had enlisted in the armed services.

Segregation based on violence and ignorance is making this country as totalitarian and backward as Nazi Germany or any other example of the nadir of mankind.

While the segregationists validly point to the existence of discrimination in the North, the white integrationist should not necessarily feel he has to stay home and help there.

The white integrationist is vitally important in the South not because of his knowhow or education but because his very presence shows that the civil rights struggle is not drawn along strictly racial boundaries.

He says to the Nation and to the world (rightfully horrified that a nation which is so proud of its democratic way of life should tolerate segregation) that this is more than a problem of skin pigmentation.

In reality it arises out of the self-interest and ignorance which one group of people has decided should be the determination of their way of life.

Segregation is only one of the techniques of the man who says, "I am the best and I should be treated as such because everything I do and think is right and good."

The white integrationist in the South places the "Negro problem" where it should be, in the realm of the struggle between the man who sees himself as the world against he who sees himself in the world.

Segregation is a moral problem for all of us.

[From the Danbury News-Times, June 30, 1964]

ECONOMIC CHAOS: THE TWO ST. AUGUSTINES—TOURISM AND BRUTALITY

(By Jonathan Brown)

(This is the second in a series of articles on St. Augustine by Jonathan Brown, of Danbury.)

DANBURY.—St. Augustine, the oldest city in North America, has long prided itself as the birthplace of American civilization.

But after 399 years, this northeast Florida city of 15,500 is the Birmingham of Florida—a symbol for racial strife.

I have been to St. Augustine half a dozen times, first as a tourist, just recently as an integrationist.

I have found that there are two St. Augustines.

The first is a tourist attraction with a beautifully preserved Spanish fortress, the oldest house on the continent turned into a museum, and the usual lesser historical attractions trying to get their share of tourist dollars.

LIKE ANY OTHER

The other St. Augustine is like any town one would find in north Florida, Alabama, or Mississippi. Segregation is a social basis of the city and the vast majority of whites who control the power structure will commit any excess to protect the supremacy of the white race.

Like most of the other segregation towns, St. Augustine is controlled by the Ku Klux Klan.

When I went to St. Augustine, I expected violence from Klansmen and it happened. What surprised me, however, was the conspiracy between local, county, and State police and the Klan elements.

There are some 250 State police in St. Augustine today. Last Friday, sitting on the porch of the Negro home in which I was staying, a dozen police cars passed within 15 minutes.

On the eve of its 400th anniversary celebration in 1965, St. Augustine is a town of violence and fear.

Each day new demonstrations are held by Negroes seeking their rights by sitting in at restaurants, marching downtown, and attempting to use a white beach which by law is integrated, and by the violence of the Klan segregated.

And each day one sees nonviolent demonstrators being beaten by white hoodlums and Klansmen regardless of the fact that these integrationists may be ministers of God, a 70-year-old woman, or just young children.

SKIN NOT WHITE

Except for two dime stores' lunch counters and a Howard Johnson's restaurant, St. Augustine is segregated for 3,500 of its citizens simply because their skin is not white.

Each side is determined that it shall win the current fight and has brought in help from outside St. Augustine.

The groups of integrationists from Savannah, Ga., Albany, Ga., Boston, Mass., Williamston, N.C., and other places, are for the most part gone now, but 1,000 Klansmen from other parts of the South remain.

The Klan is the backbone of the segregation movement and as one of its speakers, Rev. Connie Lee, of Alabama, has said, "I believe in violence, all the violence it takes to either scare the Niggers out of the country or to have them all 6 feet under."

In contrast, the Southern Christian Leadership Conference under its leader, Martin Luther King (the Klan refers to him as Martin Looney Coon), which is heading the St. Augustine civil rights movement, preaches nonviolence.

Like every other "freedom fighter," I was given training in nonviolence, how to fall to the ground and "cover up the vital parts of your body because one must not fight back."

I was told that when I saw another integrationist being beaten up I could not attack his assailant under any case. The only thing I could do would be to throw my own body over my friend's to protect him.

DESTROYING ITSELF

Almost unrecognized amidst the violence and hatred in St. Augustine is the fact that a city is destroying itself, physically and spiritually and economically.

Because the civil rights movement had adopted nonviolence as its method and Christianity as its creed, the integrationists constantly suffer physical injury.

Their homes and cars are shot into, they are fired from their jobs simply because they dare to demonstrate for their rights, and they are hurt during demonstrations because police will not protect them.

While the majority of the Negroes believe in this nonviolence, some do not, and during the early morning hours, whites and Negroes attack each other.

Because city and county officials and police are openly sympathetic with the segregationists, the responsible white citizens of St. Augustine have lost their will to change their town, abrogating their responsibility to what they themselves call "the town's scum."

As one white youth put it, the responsible whites in St. Augustine are afraid of the violence of the Klan and apathetic because they do not think they can do anything to stop the Klan. They just sit home and watch TV.

Thus far, the few local white businessmen who have integrated their establishments have been forced to segregate them again after Klan elements broke their windows and made personal threats against the men and their families.

BODY DESTROYED

As the soul of the city is being destroyed, so is its body. The economy of St. Augustine is 85 percent dependent on tourism and the city had hoped to attract 2.5 million visitors and $25 million during the year-long 400th anniversary of the founding of St. Augustine next year.

But the racial strife has had a disastrous effect on tourism. Tourists are frightened by the newspaper articles and television films of the war in St. Augustine.

If a man's conscience will not keep him away, the threat to his physical safety will.

Tourist figures are down from 30 to 50 percent over the same months of last year according to reports of 2 weeks ago. The extreme violence of last week and the presence of 1,000 Klansmen should decrease these figures even more.

Prospects appear dim that St. Augustine can have a successful and profitable quadricentennial celebration if the present conflict is not quickly resolved.

[From the Danbury News-Times, July 1, 1964]

HOW A POLICEMAN WATCHES AS A BOY IS KICKED, BEATEN

(By Jonathan Brown)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This is the last of a series of three articles written by Jonathan Brown, 19, of Danbury, covering his experiences in the city of St. Augustine, Fla., during the recent demonstrations and riots in the confrontation between civil rights groups and opposing groups.)

A Yale classmate and I arrived in St. Augustine on the morning of June 9. That night we marched through the white section of the town to protest the continuing violence against the civil rights marchers and the injustice of segregation.

By marching in the usual nonviolent manner and taking the blows without returning the violence we hoped to stir the conscience of the town and Nation—but especially we hoped, by our example, to arouse the conscience of the attackers.

BEGIN TO FORM

Early in the evening the nonviolent marchers begin to form—two by two. I am scared because I am white and will be a special target of the Klan's violence who look upon us as "white niggers" deserving the worst. I feel guilty for my skin—I know that many of us are going to be hurt by fellow whites.

I realize that the only quality I have in common with white segregationists and klansmen is the color of our skins.

The procession moves out from the church where it started and quickly reaches the old slave market, a block park with various enclosures where slaves once were sold.

Led by two Southern Christian Leadership Conference men, Rev. Andrew Young and Rev. Lavert Taylor, we attempt to cross the street into the slave market.

A score of white youths ranging in age from 20 to 25 block our way and when we refuse to stop, the two integration leaders are attacked and hit time and again by the whites.

Further back in the line we see this. Young punks beating up ministers while local and county police stand not 10 yards away refusing to interfere.

PULLS BACK

The line pulls back and Young and Taylor try to cross at another intersection. Again they are beaten, fall to the ground and are kicked. Young is hit by a blackjack.

This time, however, the area is brightened by the floodlights of newsmen and the young hoodlums get scared and retreat into the enclosure of the slave market.

The line moves around the slave market from which the whites yell taunts and obscenities.

Suddenly, 10 yards in front of me, five white segregationists attack the first white in our line, Rev. Bill England of Boston University.

KICK HIM

They pin him between the curb of the street and a car and hit and kick him before his fellow marchers fall on his body, protecting him with their own.

The line moves on, the white hoodlums now stand calmly 2 yards from the line waiting for the next white, me.

I see them and I know I'm going to get it. The Negro girl with whom I'm walking knows it too and grabs my glasses.

The whites let me pass and then attack from my rear, the first punch hits the back of my neck, then two or three hit me all at once and I am down on the ground trying to cover up my vital areas.

STOP KICKING

For 20 or 30 seconds, they kick me, but suddenly stop. They're getting scared themselves by this time for what if the Negroes become violent, and anyway this "white nigger" (me) won't be back again.

I pick myself off the ground and find my trousers and shirt ripped. A local cop is within 10 yards of me. He has been there throughout my beating.

We make our way back to the church and hear the speakers tell us that "you have to work and suffer for freedom," and you should have pity for those who have to resort to violence to stop us.

BACK MARCHING

The next night we are back marching—for us a nonviolent march—for the Klan another chance to beat the "niggers," black and white.

The purpose of these marches and the wade-ins at St. Augustine Beach is to contain the violence of the Klan.

By offering our own bodies as witnesses for Christ Martin Luther King preaches we are actually halting violence.

ACID, KNIVES

The sight of nonviolent demonstrators being brutally attacked with iron pipes, acid, knives, and other weapons should so horrify this Nation that eventually so much public pressure should be built up that St. Augustine will have to protect all of its citizens.

In addition, by these demonstrations, the Klan shows itself for what it is. As Rev. C. F. Vivian, director of affiliates for SCLC puts it, "Our marches have made the Klan show their faces. Now, they can be counted and pointed out. The merchants can see them for the kind of little people they are."

The presence of the moderating and organizing influence of SCLC in St. Augustine is the only factor that saves this city from all-out race war.

(SCLC is the Southern Christian Leadership Conference.)

This organization with Martin Luther King as its leader came into St. Augustine when a race war was a distinct possibility and convinced the people of the Negro community that nonviolence was the only moral and practical way to attain equal rights.

Using the Bible, the example of Christ, and the hatred by which the segregationist lives, the leaders, mostly ministers, have convinced the local Negroes that "you should love these segregationists and forgive them even as they are beating you."

The SCLC picked St. Augustine as the starting point in their plans for direct action this summer. It seemed a fairly easy town to crack because of its dependence on tourism.

SCLC thought that if it could show the "real St. Augustine" a segregated town of hatred and violence, economic survival would necessitate giving in to Negroes demands for equality.

BECOMES APPARENT

But it has become apparent that segregation is so deeply imbedded in the minds of the whites that an easy solution is impossible.

In addition, the Ku Klux Klan has decided to make its stand in St. Augustine, and today over a thousand of them practically rule the town.

To show the extend of Klan control over even the State police sent in by the Governor, last Thursday night four klansmen under arrest were taken by force from the State patrol cars in which they were riding by fellow klansmen.

James Hauser, a Negro working at Fairchild Aircraft in St. Augustine, was beaten up 2 months ago by white workers.

He identified three of his attackers immediately but to this time the case is still under investigation and no arrests have been made.

But surrounded by this violence and hatred the Negroes of St. Augustine continue to fight.

They have suffered too long to give up. For centuries they have been in physical, economic and physiological slavery and nothing can be worse than what they have gone through.

As the Negro spiritual goes, "Before I'll be a slave, I'll be buried in my grave, and go home to my Lord and be free."

Speaking at the Washington march last summer, Dr. King said, "We cannot turn back. There are those who are asking the devotees of civil rights 'when will you be satisfied?'

"We can never be satisfied as long as the Negro is the victim of the unspeakable horrors of police brutality.

HEAVY WITH FATIGUE

"We can never be satisfied as long as our bodies, heavy with the fatigue of travel, cannot gain lodging in the motels of the highways and the hotels of the cities.

"We cannot be satisfied as long as the Negro's basic mobility is from a smaller ghetto to a larger one.

"We cannot be satisfied as long as a Negro in Mississippi cannot vote and a Negro in New York believes he has nothing for which to vote.

"No, no, we are not satisfied and we will not be satisfied until justice rolls down like waters and righteousness like a mighty stream."

The Negro of St. Augustine believes in the aged-old "American dream" and this is why he does not rebel against his country.

But he has also run out of patience, he wants his share now. In St. Augustine he is fighting for it.

WICHITA, KANS., THE AIR CAPITAL OF THE WORLD

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, Wichita, Kans., is truly the air capital of the world—or, as it has been called, the Detroit of the air.

The complex of companies producing and modifying both civilian and military aircraft in Wichita has assigned it a continuing role of importance in America's air transportation, space, and defense future.

The Boeing Co. Wichita plant has been the production center for hundreds of B–47 and B–52 aircraft, which have guaranteed air superiority for the Strategic Air Command. Today, the plant's function has shifted, as the B–47's and B–52's are no longer in production; but the B–52's continue as a major segment of our retaliatory force, and are, in addition, being modified for other uses. The company's experience and the talents of its personnel are being called upon to satisfy our demands to dominate outer space. Upwards of 18,000 aviation workers are involved in this company's activities in Wichita.

Cessna and Beech are internationally known producers of smaller military and civilian aircraft. Together, they produce 61 percent of the 7,569 private planes produced in this country last year. Their work for the military continues to be imaginative and essential. Together with the newest arrival on the Wichita aviation scene, Lear-Jet Corp., the 3 companies now employ 10,000 employees, with a payrool of over $70 million a year.

Lear-Jet Corp., while new in Wichita, is well known in aviation circles. Later this week, Lear expects to receive the Federal Aviation Administration's certification of its new Executive Jet—a plane which will make its mark in private aviation, along with those of its companions in Wichita—Cessna and Beechcraft.

Kansas and the country are proud of the active and imaginative aviation industries centered in Wichita. I ask unanimous consent that a feature article entitled "Why Wichita Is Abuzz With Private Planes," from the National Observer of July 20, 1964, be printed in the Record, in connection with my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the National Observer, July 20, 1964]

The Detroit of the Air: Why Wichita Is Abuzz With Private Planes

Wichita, Kans.—Huge aircraft factories spread like weeds through the wheatfields outside this city. But despite this seeming incongruity, a brief flight over the countryside shows that Wichita's role as the Detroit of the private plane industry is no accident.

The Arkansas River is the only break in a runway-flat terrain. The air is so clear that once you are airborne, you quickly spot the large grain elevator at Hutchinson, 45 miles to the northwest. Wichita averages 26 days of unlimited visibility a month, year around. From Wichita's central location, light planes can fly nonstop to most cities. These are reasons why Wichita has attracted factories that built 61 percent of the 7,569 private planes produced in the United States last year.

This year that percentage may rise. Both of Wichita's two big private plane builders, Cessna Aircraft Co. and Beech Aircraft Corp., last week announced that their sales in the 9 months ended June 30 exceeded sales for the entire previous fiscal year. On July 24, Wichita's other private plane builder, Lear Jet Corp., expects to receive Federal Aviation Agency certification on its executive jet, and make its first delivery in early August to Rexall Drug & Chemical Co.

Planes dominate Wichita's economy. Cessna, Beech, and Lear-Jet pay their 10,000 employees more than $70 million a year. That is well over 10 percent of the manufacturing payroll for the entire State of Kansas. Further, Boeing Co. has a huge military aircraft installation here, employing another 18,000 aviation workers.

Even now, privately owned planes carry 85 million passengers a year, about 25 million more than the airlines carry annually. And with new lines of planes and continued growth of light plane travel, Wichita's plane builders should have many brisk years ahead.

GROWTH RATE OF 10 PERCENT

Dwane Wallace, Cessna president, figures the demand for private planes is growing at 10 percent a year. Equally confident is William P. Lear, who moved Lear-Jet to Wichita 2 years ago. "It's vital, with a capital 'V,' for the Nation's survival that industry decentralize to overcome urban congestion," he explains. "And as you decentralize industry, the need for executive planes goes up."

He sees a change in the role of the executive plane. Until now, he contends, most corporate planes have served as taxicabs, hauling executive from small airports to larger ones, where businessmen hop aboard commercial jets. This has been because of the limited range of many light planes, which flew at low altitudes, often in choppy air, because they lacked pressurization.

"Now we can beat the big jets," Mr. Lear says enthusiastically, and a bit inaccurately.

(His Lear Jet crosses the country in just over 5 hours, counting a necessary fuel stop. A big jet can do it in under 5 hours.) New more expensive models of propeller planes that Cessna and Beech are building also should help upgrade the role of business airplanes.

Already that role is an important one. American business now flies 34,500 executive planes, more than the total aircraft operated by the Armed Forces and commercial airlines combined Yet there is plenty of potential. Only 360 of the Nation's 3,000 largest corporations own their own planes. By 1970 industry figures to have 80,000 business planes flying.

TRAVELING FOR PLEASURE

And there are many other uses for light planes They serve other business purposes—crop dusting, ranching, and patrolling oil pipelines. Government experts figure that private planes are flown an additional 3,500,000 hours a year solely for pleasure travel, about as many flying hours as are accumulated annually by the Nation's airliners.

Further, there's a brisk export trade. Cessna exports a quarter of its production. Beech, which sells 30 to 35 percent of its planes abroad, recently flew 15 twin-engine planes south for use as trainers and transports by Brazil's air force.

Yet the planemakers still have a selling job ahead of them. One problem is getting potential customers to overcome the fear of flying in light planes. "It's quite a problem getting people to realize a light plane is safe as a car, and a lot more convenient," says one executive. To demonstrate his thesis, he delights in taking a visitor aloft in a single engine plane, purposely stalling it, then resuming power.

A more tangible problem: The continuing effort to induce owners of small airports to keep them open, rather than sell the strips off for housing developments. But no such problem exists here. Landing fields abound. Cessna and Beech operate busy company fields, hard by the huge Boeing-Air Force facility. Planes are constantly taking off.

IT PACKS A WHINE

The nine-seat Lear Jet comes in just one model, which looks small but packs a whine as loud as any commercial jet. By contrast the propeller planes built by Cessna come in 13 models, selling from $7,825 for a two-seater to a $76,950 twin-engine plane, seating up to six. Single-engine planes dominated last year's Cessna production of 3,456 planes.

Beech, however, powers 80 percent of its production with two engines, selling eight propeller models from $13,300 to $140,000. About half the 1,061 planes Beech sold last year cost more than Cessna's most expensive model.

Both companies are building new models. Cessna plans delivery early next year of its twin-engine model 411 to compete with the more expensive Beech models. Carrying up to 7 passengers, it will sell for $120,000, cruise at 230 miles per hour at 16,000 feet, and have a 1,000-mile range.

Beech is upgrading its line with the King Air, a pressurized, turbo-prop plane that cruises at 270 miles per hour, and has a 1,400-mile range, carries 6 to 8 passengers. Its price: $300,000 to $400,000, depending upon electronic equipment. Beech anticipates delivering 14 King Airs this year, with production reaching the rate of one a week by year's end.

EIGHTY-FOUR MINUTES TO CHICAGO

Across town, at the north end of Wichita Municipal Airport, Mr. Lear is building the most expensive executive plane produced in Wichita. The first production model of the Lear Jet—N801L—flew its maiden flight last fall, but was destroyed by fire in a crash landing 2 miles south of the airport runway a month ago during single engine takeoff tests. The pilot, who escaped uninjured, forgot to position certain wing flaps, enabling the plane to get only 70 feet into the air, Lear Jet says. The second production model, N802L, has since completed the qualification tests.

And the Lear Jet turned out to be quite a plane, able to climb to 40,000 feet in 13 minutes, cruise at 570 miles per hour, and whisk an executive from New York to Chicago in 84 minutes.

Selling at $575,000, the sleek white jet with twin pods astride the rear of the fuselage is cheaper than any competing executive jet. Since it weighs 2 tons less than any other executive jet—there are a half dozen competing executive jets on the market—it's also more economical and speedy, Lear officials say.

But to build it fast and light, Mr. Lear sacrificed interior space, resulting in a somewhat cramped cabin. Explains Mr. Lear: "People don't ride in airplanes to get comfortable. They ride to get someplace." He figures to deliver 14 of his jets by year's end, with production reaching a rate of 8 to 10 a month by January.

Cessna, Beech, and Wichita's airplane business began long before Mr. Lear's spirited little jet. In 1917 Clyde V. Cessna, who died a decade ago, flew the first plane built here. He and other plane builders were lured to Wichita by air races sponsored by local oilmen. At one time about 30 airplane companies were headquartered in Wichita.

BOTTLE SHAPED FUSELAGE

The industry here has produced an interesting trio of executives. Mr. Lear, 62, might have coined the cliche about the American dream. He parlayed a sixth-grade education, a knack for business, an interest in flying, and what he calls the "ability to see a market before it develops" into an electronics-aviation empire. After selling out, he decided to invest $12 million of that fortune into his compact jet, with its Coke bottle shaped fuselage.

Cessna's Mr. Wallace, 52, has spent his entire adult life at Cessna. He joined the company after college under the guidance of his uncle, Mr. Cessna. And though he soon became company president, he spent many of his early years in that job flying in air races to give Cessna planes publicity. Occasionally he had to rush back to Wichita with a purse to meet the company payroll.

Mr. Wallace still does a lot of his own flying on business trips. After work he occasionally drives the few hundred yards from his office to the Cessna hangar to take a brief pleasure spin.

Mrs. Olive A. Beech, 60, has headed Beech since the 1950 death of her husband, Walter Beech. Highly respected by the rest of the executive plane builders, she nevertheless is quite touchy about being one of the few presidents of a manufacturing company who happens to be a woman.

Like Mr. Wallace and Mr. Lear, she is a persuasive advocate of executive planes. But unlike her male competitors, she never learned to pilot a plane. "I never had to; there was always someone else to do it," she explains. Wichita's plane industry is banking on the expectation that other executives won't follow Mrs. Beech's lead on that subject.

FOREIGN AID—OPERATIONS OF AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, the time is at hand when the Senate will be considering foreign aid legislation and foreign aid appropriations. In this connection, I think it is appropriate to bring to the attention of the Members of the Senate the results, to date, of the special hearings which the Senate Appropriations Committee conducted last year with respect to "Personnel Administration and Operations of the Agency for International Development." More particularly, I wish to make available AID's response to the conclusions and recommendations of my report which was based upon these hearings—Senate Document No. 57.

The special hearings went into the administration and operations of the AID agency in great detail, and attempted to equate personnel administration and qualifications with the vast responsibilities with which the Agency was charged, on the premise that proper management and implementation of our infinitely complex and far-reaching foreign assistance programs is quite as important as the amount of money which goes into such programs.

In brief, my report pointed out the nearly devastating effects which successive reorganizations and frequent changes of leadership over a period of the past 15 years have had on the stability and morale of this Agency, which must carry out responsibilities of such tremendous proportions. It called for a stabilizing period and longer tenure for key personnel with the proper qualifications. From the information at hand, I believe the Agency is on the way to making marked accomplishments in this regard.

The report was also highly critical of overstaffing in both American and local employees in certain countries and programs, while inadequate attention and personnel were given to the multi-billion-dollar loan and Public Law 480 programs. It criticized the lack of adequate coordination between the economic and military assistance programs; the use of outright grants in situations where loans would have sufficed; and the making of excessively soft-term loans with low interest rates, long grace periods, and long-term maturity, where more normal terms appeared appropriate. It stressed the necessity for a more realistic and frugal approach in these areas. It pointed out the critical need for an independent group within the Agency to make objective evaluations of Agency programs, and the failure of the Agency to give adequate support to the organization which it had doing this work.

My report also went into considerable detail with respect to the need for improvements in personnel administration. It was severely critical of the totally inadequate procedures employed in its contract operations, and cited the necessity for the Agency to include in its budget presentations estimates as to the approximate amount it intended spending in each major program area, so that Congress might make a judgment as to whether particular programs were receiving too little or too much attention.

The report also made recommendations with respect to corrective action to be taken in each of the above areas.

The response which AID has made to these conclusions and recommendations is quite heartening, as it reflects a concerted action to make improvements in many areas. I would also like to feel that the reduction of nearly $1.5 billion from last year in the current year's budget request bears more than a distant relationship to the work which went into the Senate committee's study.

This detailed response for AID should serve to permit Senate Appropriations Committee members to follow up specific issues where additional improvement is indicated and give a better understanding of the problems involved.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the comments and report of action taken on the conclusions and recommendations in my report on "Personnel Administration and Operations of Agency for International Development," including a list of dollar development loans made at three-fourths of 1 percent, as approved by AID through December 1963, be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE, AGENCY FOR
INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT,
Washington, D.C., May 19, 1964.

The Honorable CARL HAYDEN,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations, U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Agency has completed its review of the "Report on Personnel Administration and Operations of the Agency for International Development" which Senator GALE W. MCGEE submitted to your committee in November 1963.

We are always appreciative of the constructive comments, suggestions and recommendations received from you and the members of your committee. We have found this report most helpful in evaluating and improving the operations of the Agency for International Development.

A copy of our comments on the report recommendations is attached for your information and the information of the members of the committee. Copies of the Agency's comments are being sent also to Senator MCGEE.

Sincerely yours,

DAVID E. BELL.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE, AGENCY FOR
INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT,
Washington, D.C., May 19, 1964.

The Honorable GALE W. MCGEE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MCGEE: We have completed a review of your report to the Senate Committee on Appropriations on Personnel Administration and Operations of the Agency for International Development. Our detailed comments on each of the specific recommendations are attached. A copy of the Agency's comments is being sent to the committee also, as indicated in the attached letter to Senator HAYDEN.

I am most appreciative of your personal efforts in connection with these hearings and of the comprehensive and constructive approach taken in your report on problems being encountered in the administration of the foreign assistance program. Our senior management officials have given your comments and recommendations very serious consideration.

You will note in our attached comments that we have taken many constructive steps along the lines recommended in the report. In other instances we consider the steps taken to be consonant with the objectives of your report.

As you know from our personal discussions, I have placed considerable emphasis on improving the administration and management of our program. The special hearings held by the committee presented an excellent opportunity to discuss the complexities of our personnel and related problems and to get the benefit of the ideas and suggestions from the members of the committee for improving our operations.

We feel sure that you will agree that the attached comments which indicate the improvements already made and being actively pursued will do much toward improving the Agency's operations. We appreciate the stimulation your report has provided to our management improvement program and shall be pleased to furnish any additional information which you may consider necessary.

Sincerely yours,

DAVID E. BELL.

COMMENTS AND REPORTS OF ACTION TAKEN ON THE CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS IN THE REPORT OF SENATOR GALE W. MCGEE ON PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION AND OPERATIONS OF AID

RECOMMENDATION 1

Summary of conclusions: "One of the most critical needs of the Agency is for more objective and effective evaluation of its programs and projects."

Recommendation 1a: "It is recommended that the Agency take the necessary steps to equip itself with a field evaluation and survey group equal to the task of conducting adequate, objective evaluations—as a constructive aid to management and the elimination of waste and ill-conceived projects. It is recommended that the committee follow the action taken in this regard."

Agency comment: AID is taking a number of actions to strengthen and expand its mechanisms for evaluating the effectiveness of programs and to insure that projects and activities are achieving the development goals set for them, are ably administered and are furthering U.S. foreign policy objectives. These actions include:

(a) An operations evaluation staff has been established in the Office of the Administrator. Under the supervision of the Deputy Administrator, this staff is the focal point for planning, arranging, and conducting periodic evaluations of Agency operations. These evaluations will place primary emphasis on the performance of mission and headquarters staffs in carrying out approved policies and programs in the aid-receiving countries.

The AID operations evaluation program is designed to meet the Administrator's need for an internal mechanism to provide objective assessment of the operational performance and effectiveness of the USAID's and headquarters in carrying out approved programs projects. This executive review program, implemented by carefully selected evaluation teams, will encompass all aspects of AID's operational performance, in addition to an appraisal of program objectives, suitability of projects, loan/grant ratios, and overall responsiveness of programs to current U.S. goals and objectives.

These objectives are to be met by establishment of a planned program of comprehensive, onsite operations evaluations conducted in the USAID's by teams of senior officers assigned by AID/W. These evaluations will focus on AID's progress in achieving previously approved goals and targets in respect to the aid-receiving countries. Each operations evaluation will result in reports and recommendations as guides for immediate management action by the responsible officials.

Operations evaluations will not substitute for or lessen the responsibilities of USAID's, regional bureaus, and AID/W offices for self-evaluation measures and management improvement actions in the activities for which they are responsible. Corrective action to comply with recommendations resulting from an operations evaluation will be the responsibility of the affected USAID Director and regional Assistant Administrator.

(b) The President has indicated his intention of providing for an external evaluation of the effectiveness of assistance programs through the creation of a bipartisan General Advisory Committee on the foreign aid program. The Committee members will be men and women of outstanding reputation drawn from the ranks of the U.S. private community. This Committee will be called upon to provide objectives and informed evaluations of AID programs in key countries.

The above actions are in addition to an expansion of the Agency's present comprehensive internal audit system which reviews program implementation and administrative operations in addition to the usual financial examinations.

RECOMMENDATION 2

Summary of conclusions: "* * * where the United States * * * contributes * * * the greatest portion of a country's budget in its fight against communism, it appears to do so * * * without the coordination and safeguards necessary to prevent * * * corruption and the diversion * * * of our assistance into the wrong hands. While the responsibility for perfecting and insisting upon such safeguards is certainly not entirely within the responsibilities of AID personnel, the Administrator of AID, by law, is cloaked with coordinating authority for military and economic programs. If, in practice, as well may be, the AID Administrator is not in a position to enforce adequate control to assure effective use of our aid, the administration should devise whatever steps are necessary."

Recommendation 2: "It is recommended that a general review be made of this whole problem area and that the necessary steps be taken to correct it. Further, it is suggested that the committee request the Administrator of the Agency to report back to the committee, within 3 months of the date of this report, furnishing the action and steps that are being taken in this regard."

Agency comment: This recommendation relates to military force maintenance support and to economic program assistance.

Force maintenance support provided under the military assistance program is directly administered by the Department of Defense. Supplies financed by the military assistance program are procured by the U.S. armed services and are supplied to the recipient defense ministries through logistical, directly administered channels. MAP does not make use of commercial markets, bank financing or host country budget controls, although final use of supplied material is the responsibility of the recipient Ministry of Defense. The Department of Defense procures directly, ships, and delivers by its own order, and supervises the introduction and use of MAP-supplied material.

This system is very effective for supplementing and improving the defense capabilities of recipient countries and is a natural outgrowth of the procurement and supply system of the U.S. Armed Forces. Only in those situations such as Korea, Vietnam, and Laos, where a radical expansion of the activity of the Defense Ministry has been involved, under combat conditions and with military assistance financing a very large share of operating costs, does this system run into substantial difficulties. In these situations where an initially weak administrative structure has had an impossible expansion forced upon it, the danger of diversion and corruption would have been far greater were it not for the extensive involvement of U.S. military advisers, trainers, and administrators in the supply and administration of MAP-financed material. The monitoring and counsel provided not only assures proper use of U.S.-supplied material, but greatly strengthens the military administration of the recipient country.

Economic program assistance, in contrast to MAP and to economic project assistance, is the provision of financing in connection with the general situation, including filling a balance-of-payments gap, sustaining and stabilizing an economy strained by common defense efforts, or providing assistance necessary to achieve a general policy purpose. During the past year AID has conducted a general review of the provision of program assistance and has published new manual orders establishing policy criteria and review and approval procedures for such assistance.

The basic principle followed by AID in the administration of assistance of this character in order to avoid corruption and diversion, is to use the existing systems for the control of resources in the recipient country and, most particularly, to make full use of the automatic controls provided by commercial transactions in the open market. AID implements the congressional mandate to utilize commercial channels of trade in program assistance by financing private imports into aid recipient countries. While such transactions have the protection of competitive market forces and cooperating country controls, they are also surrounded by a safeguard of AID regulations, which impose maximum price rules, standards for contracting, and require effective utilization of commodities. In addition AID limits its programs to essential commodities and requires the borrower/grantee to permit audit to ascertain full utilization and to insure that aid goods are not reexported. Compliance with these rules is obtained by requiring the aided countries and suppliers to agree to make appropriate refund to AID for violation of its regulations. Moreover, the financing of private transactions is arranged through the facilities of U.S. banks, which examine documentation prior to payment. Further examination is made by the AID controller's office in post audit. No system, in practice, offers perfect defense against error and fraud. The system employed by AID is no exception to this principle but it has enabled the Agency to generally insure the satisfaction of U.S. procurement standards since Marshall plan days and has resulted in refunds of more than $430 million in program and project assistance. The AID controllership organization is responsible for followup on program assistance as it is for other AID assistance, to assure that assistance was provided within the terms approved and in accordance with law and that commodities financed were not diverted, were eligible for AID financing and were constructively used within the recipient economy.

Sparing use is made of grant program assistance by AID. It is required in half a dozen countries, particularly including Korea, Vietnam, Laos, and Jordan, which are bearing common defense burdens larger than their economies will support. This form of assistance is also provided on a loan basis to countries which have prepared comprehensive development programs and investment plans with which AID concurs and which we have agreed to support. In India, Pakistan, Turkey, Colombia, and Chile a substantial part of AID assistance is provided through commodity financing under program loans in support of the country's development program.

RECOMMENDATION 3

Summary of conclusions: "There is another too common situation to which AID personnel are a party but over which they do not have full control. This involves U.S. overindulgence of certain countries in our aid giving. It has taken the form of outright grants where loans would have sufficed; furnishing the full costs of technical assistance projects, when the recipient country could well have afforded to pay the local, or even total, costs; making little or no effort to obtain any interest on many huge deposits in foreign banks, and making grants and exceedingly soft-term loans to countries well on their way to prosperity."

Recommendation 3: "It is recommended, first, that the top policymaking officials and bodies in the executive branch take precautions against creating conditions or an atmosphere which permits a prodigal attitude in the disbursing of U.S. resources in the name of foreign aid; secondly, that the AID organization perfect procedures of review, staffed with men of experience and commonsense, which will reduce to a minimum grants, soft-term loans, and other assistance where the circumstances do not warrant it; and, finally, that the Appropriations Committees of the Congress consider placing restrictions and conditions on appropriations which will impress on AID that the funds appropriated are not to be committed indiscriminately, but with a sense of frugality."

Agency comment: The President has repeatedly emphasized his policy that foreign assistance should be used as economically as possible to achieve U.S. policy objectives, and the Administrator has taken precautions to insure this result.

In this connection we would like to point out:

1. AID grants have declined as a share of economic assistance from 98.7 percent in 1953 and 76.4 percent in 1958 to 47 percent in 1962, and 41.6 percent in 1963 and 31 percent projected for 1965. This trend will continue.

2. Fourteen countries received $420 million in grant support in 1960 for which no supporting assistance is proposed for 1965. Total grants other than for technical cooperation were $1,121 million in 1960 compared to $654 million in fiscal year 1963 and about $370 to $400 million anticipated for fiscal year 1964 for total supporting assistance and contingency fund grants.

3. The Agency has scrupulously followed the requirements of section 611 of the Foreign Assistance Act, as amended, which pertain to the "Completion of plans and cost estimates" before agreements are executed in excess of $100,000.

4. AID withheld $240 million of development funds from obligation in 1963, mainly because potential recipients failed to qualify under AID criteria for self-help and project evaluation.

5. The proposed foreign assistance program for fiscal 1965 is based on conservative estimates of the minimum amounts needed to meet priority requirements both for economic assistance and for military assistance. The amounts proposed are substantially less than the Administrator feels would best serve U.S. interests if optimum policies and conditions were to be found in recipient countries, but is based on a realistic estimate that in fact a number of recipient countries will find it impossible to take self-help measures which we, and frequently their own leaders, agree are desirable and essential if best use is to be made of U.S. assistance.

We do not believe additional restrictions and conditions on our appropriations are necessary or desirable. The authorizing legislation now provides strict and sound policy guidance and criteria.

With respect to the question of interest on deposits the U.S. Treasury Department as a matter of policy treats all U.S.-owned foreign currencies in all countries, where there are no restrictions on premature withdrawal, as fungible assets for the purpose of determining how much can be placed in interest-bearing accounts. Treasury follows the policy of attempting to place on time deposit local currencies in excess of a 30-day supply. AID has instituted action to require USAID's to report to AID/W monthly any funds available for deposit in interest-bearing accounts for referral to Treasury for appropriate action.

RECOMMENDATION 4

Summary of conclusions: "The facts indicate that numerous field missions are overstaffed—and that corrective action was being taken."

Recommendation 4: "It is recommended not only that the operating personnel of AID continue their efforts of review and the elimination of unnecessary positions in the Agency and field missions, but that independent surveys and objective evaluations be conducted for this purpose. It is suggested that AID be requested to report back to the committee within 6 months as to the progress made in this regard."

Agency comment: The Agency has taken a series of positive actions, beginning in July 1963, to assure that only essential personnel are assigned to the oversea missions.

One of the key features of the program is to require each year an advance plan of specific actions to be taken at each level of the organization to improve Agency operations. These plans provide concrete management goals for the Agency against which improvements and economies can be measured. In addition, through a system of periodic reports, the various efforts being made throughout the Agency to increase productivity and operational efficiency are coordinated; duplication of effort is eliminated; and maximum application of the benefits derived from improved operations is insured. Thus, the Agency now has a continuing action program for economizing, simplifying, and accelerating its operations.

1. A major cutback in employment is underway: The Agency is determined to reverse the historical upward trend in staff levels and to find ways of doing its job with substantially fewer personnel. To achieve this objective, AID is taking the following actions:

(a) Critically reviewing each country mission and each Washington unit to eliminate every job of marginal value.

(b) Eliminating projects and activities which are not of high priority.

(c) Steadily expanding the use of facilities of other Government agencies and the private U.S. community in lieu of direct AID development and execution of technical assistance projects.

As a result of this new and firmly enforced Agency policy, total employment is being reduced this fiscal year and further significant cuts will be made in fiscal year 1965. Staffing will be decreased from 16,782 as of June 30, 1963, to 16,500 as of June 30, 1964. Between June 30, 1964, and June 30, 1965, AID staff will be further reduced by an additional 900 United States and foreign national employees. Thus in a period of 2 years, total AID employment will be reduced by about 1,200 employees. Anticipated employment as of June 30, 1965, is 15,600—6,480 U.S. nationals and 9,120 local employees.

2. A comprehensive survey of the Agency's manpower management processes has been undertaken by AID with the assistance and cooperation of the Bureau of the Budget: This survey has now been completed, and

we are now putting into effect new methods and approaches to increase the effectiveness of manpower programing, to tighten internal controls on employment and to redesign the employment statistics system in order to make it a more effective management control device.

RECOMMENDATION 5

Summary of conclusions: "One of the principal factors which has contributed to our ill-advised or overly ambitious projects is the fact that the United States too frequently pays practically all the costs of such projects. Accordingly it would seem that there should be a requirement as a condition to the initiation of technical assistance projects in most instances, that the recipient country contribute a significant part of or all local costs in some form, and in many countries, the full or major costs of the entire project."

Recommendation 5a: "It is recommended that the Agency, as a condition to approval of technical assistance projects, set up procedures requiring that recipient countries make substantial contributions to the local costs of such projects in some form, and that a higher percentage of countries pay the complete costs, or a major percentage thereof, and that AID, in its budget presentation to Congress, present estimates of recipient country contributions in each case to the local costs, and what portion of the total cost of each project such contribution represents."

Recommendation 5b: "It is further recommended that the Agency report back to the committee on the feasibility of carrying out this recommendation and any problems involved. It is also recommended that the Appropriations Committees consider making this a requirement in a high percentage of all new projects."

Agency comment: We agree strongly with the sense of the report that technical assistance like any other assistance must be a joint effort if it is to be effective; that there must be evidence of keen recipient country interest in any major technical assistance project, and that there should be willingness and ability to contribute substantially to the activity and ultimately to carry it on. This is one aspect of self-help which is increasingly a crucial criterion in determining what assistance should be provided. This criterion is firmly established in foreign assistance legislation in that section 211 of the Foreign Assistance Act requires the President to take into account the willingness of the country "to pay a fair share of the cost of programs under this title."

RECOMMENDATION 6

Summary of conclusion: "The Agency was still very much in the process of completing the staffing and organization necessary to carry out the loan functions for which the Agency is responsible—the [loan] program was understaffed in both numbers and experience, and that there was an insufficient appreciation of what was required to make a program of this magnitude work. It is inconceivable that a development loan operation of this size can be operated effectively with personnel who have little or no investment banking experience."

Recommendation 6: "It is recommended that continued high priority be given to the building of a better balanced loan staff, at both the Washington and field levels, and that every attempt be made to employ the services of an investment banker with outstanding reputation and abilities to head up the Agency's loan operation, with authority to take whatever steps are necessary to make it work with a high degree of professional proficiency."

Agency comment: Action is already underway to strengthen our loan staff and to augment it where necessary in both Washington and field operations. The recently completed AID implementation project—a hard internal look at program operations—came up with the basic findings that more and better people were needed on the capital development side of our personnel ledger and that additional efforts must be directed at the implementation and monitoring of loan programs. Major studies of the loan operations of three regional bureaus have now been completed and recommendations designed to overcome operating deficiencies are now being implemented. We now have positions for 61 professionals to work on loan matters in the four Regional Bureaus in Washington and for 42 professionals in our oversea missions. To assist them there are 42 engineering positions assigned to the regional bureaus and 153 positions overseas. There are also lawyers, controllers and auditors assigned both in Washington and overseas who are available to assist our loan officers.

As a part of the Agency's recently inaugurated management improvement program, we will initiate before the end of the fiscal year a comprehensive study to assess loan operation personnel needs for the next 2 fiscal years as the loan program expands and more loans enter the implementation stage.

The central staff office with primary responsibility for the development of Agency policy in the lending field is the Office of Development Finance and Private Enterprise. We have just appointed an Associate Assistant Administrator for Capital Development who has international banking experience and who will fill the role outlined by the committee.

RECOMMENDATION 7

Summary of conclusions: "There are indications that the Agency has carried to excess the making of long-term loans at three-quarters of 1 percent interest, with long grace periods, and that certain countries have received such loans when more normal terms would have sufficed as well."

Recommendation 7: "It is recommended that the Agency submit, at the time of the appropriations hearings, a list of all loans made at three-quarters of 1 percent, including the name of the country and the terms of the loans, together with a summary reflecting the percentage of such loans in relation to the total development loans made since the three-quarters of 1 percent interest loans were authorized; also, that the Agency be prepared to justify its action in reference to all loans made at the lower interest rate."

Agency comment: In accordance with this recommendation, the Agency is submitting separately a list of loans made at three-quarters of 1 percent interest and the summary, as requested.

AID policy has taken into account the ability to repay external debt to those countries that have shown progress toward self-sustaining growth or that have relatively good foreign exchange earning capacity. For example, recent dollar development loans to the Government of Israel, to the Republic of China, to the Government of Thailand, to the Government of Venezuela, to the Government of Mexico, to the Government of Greece, and to the Government of Iran have all been made at rates higher than the legal minimum and maturities shorter than the legal maximum.

AID has pressed other free world countries to follow similar rules in their programs of lending for development and in April 1963, the 12 countries in the Development Assistance Committee agreed that loan terms should be consistent with the debt-servicing capacity of the recipient countries, that terms should be more nearly comparable among donors, and that these aims should be met by liberalizing the terms of the harder lenders.

RECOMMENDATION 8

Summary of conclusions: "The Public Law 480 programs have been badly understaffed and given inadequate attention. While AID has done much to improve the oversea administration of these programs, a great deal more must be done."

Recommendation 8a: "It is recommended, first, that the Agency make a concerted effort to correct the misconceptions held by many of the AID employees regarding the Public Law 480, title I, program."

Agency comment: AID recognizes the need for better understanding within the Agency and generally of the purposes and objectives of the title I program. To increase employee understanding three training films are in preparation. These 15-minute films are designed to present graphically a general explanation of the Public Law 480 program, and give specific understandings of the titles I and IV programs, the barter program and the essentials with respect to the titles II and III grant and donation food programs. The Food for Peace Newsletter is issued monthly containing current highlights of the programs in the various countries and made available to all personnel and prominent space is given to the various Public Law 480 programs in Front Lines, the Agency's internal semimonthly newspaper for employees.

Official instructions on the title I program are contained in M.O. 1142.1 which was issued September 30, 1963. A handbook is also in preparation covering Public Law 480 generally with detailed sections on each of the titles.

Recommendation 8b: "It is further recommended that the Agency give the same consideration to Public Law 480, title I, 104(g) loans as is given to development loans made from funds directly appropriated, and that a country-by-country survey be made to assure that the Public Law 480 programs are getting adequate and consistent attention."

Agency comment: Recent evolution and changes in the administration of the Public Law 480 program will help to assure that all aspects of it including section 104(g) loans get adequate and consistent attention. The planning, negotiation and implementation of "country use" sales proceeds for development or the common defense is explicitly an AID responsibility. This includes loans to American private enterprise in the country and loans and any grants to the cooperating government.

Because they derive from the sales agreement process and are a partial reflection of commodities already supplied, the section 104(g) loans differ in a fundamental fashion from AID dollar development loans. The approval of a dollar development loan is the approval of a transfer of resources from the United States to the recipient country. The corresponding approval in the Public Law 480 title I picture is the approval of the sales agreement. The section 104(g) loan is provided for in that agreement and is a reflection of it.

Recommendation 8c: "It is also recommended that AID be required to justify before Congress any grants made for economic assistance under section 104(e) of title I, and any outright grants made with Public Law 480 currencies originally designated for U.S. uses, regardless of whether or not the benefiting countries happen to be so-called excess currency countries."

Agency comment: The authority to use a share of title I currencies on a grant basis is extremely important to the usefulness of this program for foreign policy purposes. Occasionally a non-revenue-producing activity is a critical element in a country program and the ability to provide some grant financing for it gives the United States an extremely valuable negotiating leverage. For example, a recent sale agreement with Brazil included assistance for the anti-Communist northeast program and one in the Sudan included a grant for expansion of the university. In both cases, inclusion of the grant was an important element in making the title I sale a positive element in U.S. relations with the country.

In recent years, very sparing use has been made of the grant authority. Less than 5 percent of sales proceeds of fiscal year 1963 agreements are to be used for grants compared to a 30-percent level in previous years. This drastic drop is due in part to following a tighter policy and part of the fact that during 1963 it was not necessary to renew the large long-term sale agreements with India and Pakistan. In both of these countries local currencies freely available for U.S. use within the country greatly exceed U.S. expenditure requirements both in terms of cash on hand and for the more distant future, as large outstanding loans are repaid in rupees.

With one exception grants have not been made with Public Law 480 currencies designated for U.S. uses. The single exception in recent years has been the unique situation in Nepal where Indian rupees are acceptable in payment for local costs. Here AID has been able to substantially expand its development program without dollar cost to the United States by drawing Indian rupees under an allocation from the Bureau of the Budget for the payment of program local costs in Nepal. This arrangement has been made with the consent of the Indian Government.

All Public Law 480 grants are reported to the Congress semiannually in the reports on Public Law 480 operations, and the terms of all new sales agreements are reported currently to the Agricultural Committees of both the House and the Senate. It is our intention to continue the current policy of making sparing use of the grant authority, using it only in those cases where a unique contribution to U.S. policy objectives can be obtained.

Recommendation 8d: No AID comment is warranted.

Recommendation 8e: "It is recommended that much greater emphasis be placed upon the use of title II and III food donation programs by using these operations as the basis for building toward community responsibility and self-help projects, and that, insofar as possible, they be made more than mere humanitarian projects through conversion into programs having a schedule looking to the overall improvement of the lot of the recipients to the point where they will be self-sustaining; and that the local governments be urged to assume greater responsibility in such projects and in the welfare of their people."

Agency comment: AID concurs in and strongly supports this recommendation and, in fact, has been directing its efforts towards making the "highest and best use" of the food resources both to serve the best interest of the recipients and of the United States. Some examples of these efforts are:

1. Increasing and continuing emphasis on title II food for work economic development programs or projects both on a government-to-government basis and through the voluntary agencies.

2. Strong AID support of the administration's request for an increase in the annual authorization for title II programs from $300 million to $450 million.

3. The USDA title III regulations issued November 6, 1963, provide that donated foods shall not be distributed as compensation or award for, or as a condition of the performances of services; however, this limitation permits the acceptance of voluntary services upon any public or any other nonreligious activity which has been approved by AID. AID's implementing instructions to these regulations encourage the voluntary agencies to promote self-help activities.

During the hearings before the Foreign Agricultural Operations Subcommittee of the House Committee on Agriculture on the extension of Public Law 480, administration witnesses indicated the intention to revise these regulations to provide that voluntary agencies are urged to promote self-help and community development activities on the part of the recipients.

Recommendation 8f: "It is further recommended that AID conduct a country-by-country review to determine whether there is adequate personnel, both in numbers and in qualifications, to assure proper administration of these food programs as they are presently operating, and that adequate personnel be added to insure against serious diversion and confusion in these programs."

Agency comment: In August 1962, AID conducted a country-by-country review of its personnel resources in relation to the food for peace program. Following this review, 12 food for peace officers (that is technicians who have principal responsibility for the conduct of the food for peace program) have been assigned to as many countries. Further continuing reviews of the food for peace program indicated a need for additional personnel. There are currently 38 food for peace officers or assistant food for peace officers serving in 23 countries and two are under consideration for assignment to 2 additional countries. In addition, in each of the other 79 countries or territories in which title II or title III programs are conducted, an employee of the USAID mission, or in those countries or territories where we do not have a USAID mission, an employee of the embassy, legation or consulate has been designated as acting food for peace officer. These food for peace officers receive training in AID/Washington either prior to departure to their post of assignment or in connection with home leave. Consideration is being given, within existing budgetary limitations, to the assignment of food for peace officers to additional countries.

Increased attention both as to staff time and audit coverage has been devoted to Public Law 480 title II and III programs during the past fiscal year. This trend is expected to continue and has been planned for fiscal year 1964.

RECOMMENDATION 9

Summary of conclusions: "The facts indicate that there are a number of other program areas where additional employees are needed; namely, qualified engineers, capital development officers, investment guarantee personnel, economists, controllers, and auditors and other specialists. The Agency indicated it was recruiting for these jobs and, to a great extent, the additional personnel would be offset by a cutback in personnel in the technical assistance and administrative areas, where there are indications of overstaffing. The facts did indicate a special need for additional controllers and auditors. In a number of countries, the lack of sufficient auditors has resulted in serious delinquencies in conducting audits of a number of important projects."

Recommendation 9: "It is recommended that the Agency carefully analyze the need for controllers and auditors on a country-by-country basis, and hire a sufficient number to do a practical and effective job."

Agency comment: The Agency concurs with the recommendation and has already taken the following implementing steps:

1. Each mission controller is required to take an inventory of all unaudited workload. The controllers are then required to make positive judgments and screen out of cumulative workload that portion which reasonably could be determined to have little or no audit potential in accordance with instructions supplied by AID/W.

2. Each mission controller is then required to weigh the remaining audit workload in terms of priorities and availability of staffing to permit better judgments on the use of available audit manpower. Mission controllers are required to prepare annual reports on their audit plans for the ensuing fiscal year and to report semiannually on their audit accomplishments during each prior 6-month period. These revised planning, reporting, and review instructions are permitting us to better identify those countries in need of greater backstopping assistance as well as additional manpower resources.

Based on a detailed study and review of the above information coupled with visits to individual missions and additional special information when required, the Agency will make a realinement of controller and auditor positions and personnel to assure compliance with the following policies:

(a) Audit staff should be available to provide adequate audit coverage of all loans, technical assistance projects, capital projects, program assistance, local currency projects and Public Law 480 title II and III food programs. (Adequate audit coverage does not imply a 100 percent detailed audit which would not be economically justifiable but requires the employment of a professional audit approach with reviews and selective audit tests made to determine the extent of audits necessary.)

(b) Medium and large missions with ongoing programs should be staffed with adequate and well-balanced controlled personnel to be self-sufficient for performing auditing, budgeting, accounting and related financial management functions.

(c) Smaller missions, liquidating or phased-down missions will either be staffed to perform the necessary financial management functions or will be provided full or supplemental accounting and audit coverage from a neighboring mission, an area controller office, or from AID/W.

If after realinement of controller positions it is determined that additional controller and auditor staff are considered necessary to provide adequate audit coverage, additional staff will be recruited as part of the same intensive program being developed for the other essential specialists—engineers, loan officers, food for peace officers, etc.

With respect to headquarters controller functions, continual effort is being made to make more effective use of available manpower and other resources. In increasing headquarters audit coverage, the Agency has worked out negotiations to utilize other government agency audit facilities and to use to the extent possible private accounting firms.

RECOMMENDATION 10

Summary of conclusions: "As repeatedly indicated, one of the greatest handicaps under which the Agency is working is the lack of stability due to the great many reorganizations in the Agency and particularly the many changes in the leadership and top personnel. If substantially improved operations are to be expected, the Administrator of the Agency must have longer tenure, and the key personnel must not only have proper qualifications initially, but must remain in their respective positions for longer periods than has previously been the case. The converse is equally true. Inept or unsatisfactory personnel cannot be left in their jobs for unnecessary periods of time because of weak administrative practices. Bringing greater stability through a topnotch personnel staff and advancement on merit, is one of the most important things that can be done to improve the operation of the Agency."

Recommendation 10: "It is recommended that the administration take cognizance of certain deplorable personnel conditions which have prevailed in this Agency and support it in working toward greater stability in personnel administration."

Agency comment: The conditions described in this part of the committee's conclusions were a not unexpected concomitant of the total transition into AID from its two predecessor agencies—ICA and DLF. The calendar year 1962, during which this changeover was initially accomplished, was a period of drastic structural reorganization and replacement of leadership.

Beginning almost simultaneously with the preliminary inquiries of the committee's staff, relatively early in 1963, significant gains began to be achieved in accomplishing the objectives cited in the committee report. These positive actions have included the following:

A new Assistant Administrator for Administration and a new director of personnel were appointed, whose backgrounds in both the foreign assistance area and in oversea service assure understanding and competence in achieving the goals stated in the committee's recommendation.

Further details of achievements and projections are contained in the response provided hereafter to recommendation 12 of the committee's report.

RECOMMENDATION 11

Summary of conclusions: "There exists a great lack of coordination—between the respective bureaus themselves, between the bureau operations and the administrative functions, and—between bureau operations and the Washington staff offices. Although many—functions have been decentralized into the four regional bureaus, there still is an urgent need for a strong central personnel office to maintain consistency in policies and planning—and to insist on coordination between the bureaus. There is—a need for the office of engineering (to coordinate) policy and standards in the engineering field—a central contract office—to correlate and regulate—contract operations and to provide centralized information respecting contract operations."

Recommendation 11: "It is recommended that these serious deficiencies, of which the Administrator is well aware, be corrected as expeditiously as possible and that the Agency report back to the committee within 3 months after the date of this report as to the progress being made."

Agency comment: The problem of coordination among operating bureaus and between line and staff offices is probably endemic to all new or reorganized agencies of Government. The weakness was recognized by AID, and, in the past year, has been subjected to a frontal attack.

The "implementation project"—an organizational self-analysis performed by seven working groups composed of senior staff from all the major offices of AID—thoroughly reviewed the Agency's method of designing programs, selecting projects, doing business, and coordinating its activities. The immediate result of the project has been the issuance of rationally designed and clearly stated procedures governing the major fields of AID endeavor, among them capital, technical and program assistance, procurement, and private enterprise activities. In each area, there now exist uniform criteria to be considered, uniform clearance rules, uniform means of documenting, expressing, and implementing decisions that have been reached. Responsibilities and powers of the various line and staff offices in each phase of AID activity have been more clearly established.

We now have for the first time in AID a single office, the Office of Procurement Policy in the Office of Material Resources, which is responsible for continuous examination and improvement of AID's procurement policies, procedures and practices.

The Office of Material Resources is also in the final stages of developing a centralized contract reporting and information system.

The office of engineering also has a new director. A new functional statement for that office has been developed which clarifies that staff's present relationship with other major elements of the agency. We are improving communications with that segment of the U.S. business community comprised of the construction industry and the engineering professions by direct relations with the established national professional groups such as the National Society of Professional Engineers, Consulting Engineers Council, the Coordinating Committee on Relations of Engineers in Private Practice with Government, the Associated General Contractors, and the National Constructors Association.

The participant training operation has been raised from division to office status and placed under a newly appointed director.

The office of management planning, which played a central role in the implementation project and is responsible for agency follow-through regarding it, is likewise headed by a new director.

Lastly, AID's Assistant Administrator for Administration is the principal officer charged with improving the workings, procedures, and coordination of the Agency. The present incumbent assumed his duties just as the implementation project was coming to fruition and its new mechanisms policies, and procedures were going into effect. On his shoulders, assisted by the other members of the management team, will fall the principal burden of completing the job of transforming AID into a better managed, better coordinated, and more effective Agency. Important informal coordinating mechanisms have been adopted which provide policy guidance and a basis for discussing mutual problems through weekly meetings between the Assistant Administrator for Administration and the principal management officers and by a personnel council composed of representatives of the central office of personnel and the regional bureaus.

RECOMMENDATION 12

Summary of conclusions: "There are able, dedicated, career employees in this Agency who, due to a lack of adequate personnel policies, have been shuffled to positions inconsistent with their abilities and experience, to the detriment of the work of the Agency. Reportedly, there are also a number of unsatisfactory or marginal employees who, because of this same lack of personnel policies, have been retained on the rolls of the Agency for too long a period of time. There has never been an adequate career system in the Agency, nor has there ever been a workable, systematic, and equitable 'selection-out' process until the initiation early this year of such a program, which, of necessity, was limited to the Foreign Service Reserve employee category of approximately 3,200 Because of the delays in the initiation of the selection-out process, it should be carried out at the earliest possible time that it can be equitably done. Also, consideration should be given to providing means of conducting the same type of operation with respect to the civil service employees. The inservice training program in the Agency has been very inadequate—an exceedingly high number of supervising personnel in the Agency were observed to be in an 'acting' status for unduly long periods with the consequent bad effect on morale. A particularly bad record has been made in the past by slowness in transferring or terminating employees after their assignments were completed.

Recommendation 12: "It is recommended that the Agency report back to the committee within 6 months after the date of this report on the action which has been taken to correct the specific conditions cited above."

Agency comment: The deficiencies cited in the committee's statements of conclusions under this heading are recognized by AID officials and have been given serious attention. Much has already been accomplished toward their correction, and much yet remains to be done. The following details are presented both in the areas of achievement and intent.

The lack of adequate personnel policies inherited from predecessor agencies ICA and DLF had been the subject of a special effort mounted in 1962. Over 150 specific issuances were identified for revision or complete replacement. During 1963, a major part of the job was completed by the office of personnel administration. As of the end of January 1964, 76 revised or new directives had been issued or approved for issuance. Twelve others were in the clearance process or awaiting final approval, and 20 were in the drafting stage. Priority has been given to the most important Foreign Service personnel areas. This major task should be completed by the end of 1964.

Upgrading the quality and competence of AID employees is a major objective of both the organizational and procedural aspects of the Agency's overall personnel management improvement program. With a few exceptions, the placement problems resulting from the transitional period of 1961–62 have by now been resolved. Normal attrition, the retrenchment program initiated in late 1963 and projected throughout fiscal years 1964 and 1965 and new separation authorities currently being requested from the Congress will enable the Agency to complete the proper reassignment of competent and experienced employees, and to eliminate in an orderly manner those employees identified as marginal or unnecessary.

As a matter of equity, it must be recognized that previous attempts to dispose of less than adequate staff members were associated with crash programs subject to short-time limitations and resultantly intensive political pressures. In its fiscal year 1965 legislative proposals, the administration is requesting flexible and continuing authority.

The selection-out program for AID oversea employees was carefully initiated in 1963. Early in 1964 the first group of employees identified for separation under the authority were notified. Plans are already underway to extend the refined and equitable procedures to additional foreign service employees before the end of fiscal year 1964.

One of the new legislative authorities previously referred to consists of the extension of the selection-out concept to the domestic service employees in the Agency's headquarters. In anticipation of approval by the Congress, plans are already being developed to revise the performance evaluation system, applicable to these employees so that marginal performance can be clearly and equitably identified and eliminated.

Considerable attention was given in 1963 to improvement of the Agency's employee training activities. Both the in-service and the orientation programs have been redesigned to stress better administration and management of the assistance programs. Closer coordination has been achieved with the staff of the Foreign Service Institute as a part of the overall review. Additional funds are being requested for fiscal year 1965 to accomplish the essential improvements.

A recent review of positions occupied on an acting basis indicated improvement in the past 12 months. Sixteen of the 20 acting incumbencies reported on page 78 of the committee's hearings have since been removed from the acting category. A relatively few positions continue to be filled by employees in an acting capacity for short periods of time due to temporary assignments made pending new recruitments or oversea rotatees entrance on duty in AID/W.

The Agency's accomplishments in reducing oversea employee "turnaround" time in the first half of 1963 were continued throughout the year. Considering the human and cost factors involved in the oversea employment situation, it is believed maximum economy and effective manpower utilization is being achieved. The new concepts, streamlined procedures, and concentrated attention to the problem resulted in an effective operation when the U.S. AID Cambodia activity was terminated recently.

RECOMMENDATION 13

Summary of conclusions: "In the technical assistance program, practically as much money is spent for contracting services, including commodities, as is used for direct hire employment in the Agency in this area. The Agency is unable to furnish the exact number of its contract employees or to give a breakdown between the salaries and expenses costs of such contracting services and the cost of commodities which are furnished incident to such projects. This is unsatisfactory and should be corrected."

Recommendation 13: "It is recommended that the Agency maintain and furnish sufficient records to the committee to reflect complete and accurate cost data respecting contractor employees, including a breakdown, by contract, between costs of 'salaries and expenses' and the costs of materials furnished by the contractor; also, that it furnish more accurate figures on the number of contractor employėes and provide data which will enable the committee to make comparison between the relative costs of direct hire and contractor services."

Agency comment: To comply with the essence of this recommendation, the Agency has adopted a form entitled "Contract Cost Data" for use by its contracting officers to provide the type of information stated in the recommendation. A breakdown will be obtained by contract between costs of "salaries and expenses," the cost of materials furnished by a contractor, the number of employees contemplated, as well as other information which may prove helpful to AID in future contract administration.

The provision of this information was adopted effective March 1, 1964, since it was considered unfeasible, because of the heavy manpower cost involved, to attempt to retroactively obtain similar information on previous contract actions.

RECOMMENDATION 14

Summary of conclusions: "The Agency employs a host of foreign nationals in various capacities—to support its U.S. employees overseas—there were indications that there was an excess of these employees worldwide."

Recommendation 14: "It is recommended that a review be made of this situation; that the numbers of these local employees be curtailed to the bone; and that the committee be advised within 6 months of the date of this report as to what progress is being made."

Agency comment: The Agency has reviewed its foreign national staffing worldwide and has taken steps to make significant reductions where these can be accomplished without detrimental effect on program operations. By June 30, 1965, AID plans to make substantial reductions in local employment to a level of approximately 9,100 worldwide, a net reduction of almost 700.

RECOMMENDATION 15

Summary of conclusions: "In presenting appropriation requests, the foreign assistance agencies have submitted an administrative budget, covering administrative personnel expenses on which Congress has placed a dollar limitation, while all other employees are classified as program personnel on whom there is no numerical or fiscal limitation and whose salaries and expenses are paid from development grants for technical assistance. This would appear to be unbusinesslike. It permits an unlimited ceiling on program personnel."

Recommendation 15: "It is recommended that this practice be eliminated; that in the budget presentation for fiscal year 1965, the Agency prepare the regular 'salaries and expenses' budget request required of other agencies; and that the personnel and expenses incident to each major program operated by the Agency be broken down separately."

Agency comment: Examination of this recommendation and the related discussion leads us to the conclusion that adoption of this recommendation in its entirety is impractical and undesirable for the Agency at this time. There are several aspects of the proposal which are involved in this conclusion.

Previous administrations and the Congress have recognized the necessity for administrative flexibility in the execution of the economic assistance program and for this reason have accepted the concept that our congressional presentation is largely illustrative and not firm in its details in the normal budget sense. Manpower, whether direct hire or by contractual arrangement, is only one of the several elements required to execute the programs and projects proposed in the budget, and if flexibility is essential for the total operation, then a similar degree of flexibility would be essential for each of the components. The rigidities inherent in the proposed "salaries and expenses" request argue against adoption of this proposal.

However, in recognition of the need for firm administration of manpower utilization, internal controls, overall personnel, program and administrative, have recently been adopted through the establishment of numerical limitations on direct-hire personnel. These controls are designed to insure the appropriate level and mix of staffing commensurate with the volume and nature of the current program. The fiscal year 1965 congressional presentation includes an exhibit titled "Summary of Total Direct-Hire Personnel Strength." This exhibit shows personnel strength actually onboard at yearend for fiscal year 1963 and established for fiscal year 1964 and 1965. It is designed to provide the user with relevant data regarding administrative and program personnel based on Agency planning.

It would be possible to adopt part of the recommendation by charging the salaries and expenses of program-funded personnel to the appropriation which finances the activities. Under current practices the Agency charges the salaries and expenses of all program-funded personnel to the development grant appropriations regardless of whether the employees' services are required in conjunction with other activities, i.e., development loans or supporting assistance. This practice has been followed because (a) the majority of program-funded personnel has been engaged in technical assistance activities; (b) it was believed that an adequate cost accounting system for the distribution of salaries and expenses to related appropriations would cost more than the results would be worth.

If a cost formula would be acceptable to the General Accounting Office, there would be no objection to the distribution of these charges. In view of the current fiscal year 1965 budget deadlines, however, it seems probable that the fiscal year 1966 budget would offer the first opportunity for proposing this change.

The Agency is continuing its efforts to improve manpower management in compliance with the intent of Congress as expressed in the subject report and on frequent occasions in the past. Moreover, we believe that the strict manpower controls recently adopted by the Agency provide an alternative means of reaching the objective implicit in the recommendation.

AGENCY COMMENTS IN RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATION 7 IN THE REPORT OF SENATOR GALE W. MCGEE ON PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION AND OPERATIONS OF AID

The report of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on the proposed Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 said regarding loan terms:

"These subsections effect a major change in the terms and conditions of development loans and the method of financing them. Whereas most of the loans negotiated by the Development Loan Fund have been repayable in local currency, all loans extended under the new authority must be repaid in dollars. Interest rates as low as 1 percent are contemplated, and some loans will probably be interest free. Terms of repayment up to 50 years will be permitted, in some cases with no repayment of principal for initial periods of up to 10 years. The aid agency will have flexibility in establishing terms and conditions that will reflect the capacity of the recipient country to service its debts."

AID policy recognizes that the balance-of-payments prospects of most underdeveloped countries receiving major assistance from AID are such that loan financing on hard terms would severely limit their future abilities to maintain reasonable levels of development imports and therefore prolong and expand future aid requirements. AID established and the National Advisory Council affirmed minimum loan terms involving interest rates of three-fourths percent with up to 40 years to repay and including as much as a 10-year grace period for Foreign Relations Committee as well as in the executive branch presentation, none have actually been made. Likewise, the maximum maturity has been 40 years, rather than the 50 years mentioned in the committee report. Since the ability of a country to repay does not normally change from loan project to loan project, terms are generally the same for all loans to any one country.

AID policy takes into account the differences among countries in ability to repay. For nations that have shown progress in moving toward self-sustaining growth such as Greece, Thailand, Taiwan, and Israel, or those that have relatively good foreign exchange earning capacity such as Mexico, Libya, or Venezuela, terms are harder. The harder terms may be reflected in the interest rate, the length of a grace period, or the duration of the loan.

Even in countries that are eligible for softest terms some AID credits are repaid by borrowers at harder terms. For dealing with projects of a directly revenue-producing nature such as private enterprise and public utilities, procedures are utilized to maintain a normal debt burden on borrowers without unduly aggravating the host country's balance-of-payments difficulties. Thus, in the usual case, a two-step arrangement is concluded between the borrower, the host government, and AID, which provides for repayment by the borrower on normal terms (approximating Export-Import Bank terms) in local currency to the host government, which then will assume the obligation to repay AID in dollars but on terms similar to those which otherwise would be established by AID for direct loans to the Government.

Attached (see attachment) is a list of AID development loans approved through December 1963, at three-fourths percent interest. There were 171 of them. They constituted about nine-tenths of all loans approved during the period. The list includes six loans which, though they carried three-fourths percent interest, had maturities or grace periods shorter than the maximum permitted by the governing policy.

In terms of lending volume, total approvals in the period amounted to about $2.4 billion. Over $200 million of this went at interest rates higher than three-fourths percent. In addition, there were about $88 million in three-fourths percent loans with maturities or grace periods shorter than the permitted maximum (see 2 per list). Forty loans, included in the 171 at three-fourths percent interest, were two-step loans involving harder terms to the ultimate borrower (see 1 per list). The total amount of these two-step loans was over $345 million.

Dollar development loans authorized after December 16, 1963, reflect the amendment to section 201(d) of the Foreign Assistance Act adopted by the 1st session of the 88th Congress. Interest during the first 10 years of the loan will be no less than three-fourths percent and no less than 2 percent after the first 10 years. AID will limit maximum loan durations and grace periods on the repayment of principal, as before, to 40 years and 10 years respectively. Harder terms will be applied to loans to countries with higher debt-servicing capacities. As before, loan terms will also be adjusted for loans for revenue-producing projects with the "two-step" procedure used when needed to impose normal debt burdens on borrowers while protecting the foreign exchange position of the host countries. The congressional presentation for fiscal year 1965 will discuss loan terms for each country for which harder terms are now planned.

Dollar development loans at ¾-of-1-percent interest approved by AID, November 1961 through December 1963, by region and country

[In thousands of dollars]

Country	Loan	Amount	Country total
Argentina	Feasibility studies	3,000	
	Road program	30,500	
	Road project	6,700	
	Grain storage	[1] 21,700	
	Housing bank	[1] 12,500	
	Animal disease laboratory	[1] 1,400	75,800
Bolivia	Customs and warehouse center	2,200	
	Highway	3,900	
	Access roads	7,200	
	Feasibility studies	6,000	
	El Alto Airport	1,200	
	Highway maintenance	400	
	Agricultural bank	3,700	
	Industrial bank	[1] 2,400	27,000
Brazil	Highway project	11,000	
	Feasibility studies	1,500	
	Emergency electric power	2,400	
	Carbon black plant	[1] 2,000	
	Development bank	[1] 4,000	
	Rubber plant	[1] 3,400	
	Nonproject	74,500	
	Electric power	[1] 5,300	104,100
Chile	Nonproject	35,000	
	Development bank	40,000	
	Feasibility studies	3,000	
	San Vicente port	[1] 7,000	85,000
Colombia	Mineral survey	2,000	
	Agricultural credit	10,000	
	Feasibility studies	4,000	
	Nonproject	60,000	
	Self-help housing	[1] 7,500	83,500
Costa Rica	Highway program	2,100	
	Cachi hydropower	1,500	
	Slum housing	2,000	
	Agriculture bank	[1] 5,000	
	Water supply	1,400	
	Industrial bank	[1] 5,000	17,000
Dominican Republic	Housing bank	[1] 2,100	2,100
Ecuador	Feasibility studies	2,000	
	Industrial expansion	[1] 5,000	
	Highways	2,700	
	Administration reform	1,600	11,300
El Salvador	Industrial institute	4,500	
	Agricultural loans	8,900	
	School construction	2,400	15,800
Guatemala	American school	[1] 700	700
Honduras	Rural schools	600	
	Water supply	1,050	1,650
Jamaica	do	1,500	
	do	2,200	3,700
Mexico	Agricultural credit	20,000	20,000
Nicaragua	Las Mercedes Airport	1,000	
	Highway construction	900	
	Schools	[2] 540	2,440
Panama	Water supply and sewage	[1] 6,000	
	Development bank	5,100	11,100
Peru	Feasibility studies	3,000	
	Lima water and sewage	8,600	
	Hydroelectric project	[1] 2,200	
	do	[1] 2,000	15,800
Uruguay	Home mortgage bank	[1] 6,000	6,000
Venezuela	Slum clearance	[2] 30,000	
	Agricultural credit	[2] 10,000	40,000
CABEI	Feasibility studies	2,500	
	Home loans	10,000	12,500
Latin American regional total			535,490
Cameroon	TransCameroon Railroad	9,200	9,200
Ethiopia	3d highway loan	4,000	4,000
Guinea	Electrification	[1] 2,400	2,400
Ivory Coast	Highway equipment	1,700	1,700
Kenya	Nairobi water supply	[1] 2,200	2,200
Liberia	High school	1,700	
	Medical center	5,300	
	Hydropower	[1] 24,300	31,300
Mali	Teachers college	2,100	
	Veterinary laboratory	1,100	3,200
Niger	Development Bank	500	500
Nigeria	Ibadan water supply	12,100	
	Calabar-Ikom Road	8,600	20,700
Somalia	Port facilities	3,600	3,600
Sudan	Sewage system	3,800	
	Development bank	[1] 2,000	5,800
Tanganyika	Electrical equipment	300	
	Agriculture college	1,250	
	Community development center	250	
	Teachers college	800	
	University	800	
	Water supply	1,300	
	do	2,200	
	Program	1,000	7,900
Tunisia	Agricultural equipment	6,500	
	University of Tunis	1,800	
	Nonproject	15,000	
	do	10,000	
	Irrigation	1,000	
	Sfax water supply	600	
	Tunis water supply	800	35,700
Uganda	Schools	2,400	
	Development bank	[1] 2,000	4,400
African regional total			132,600
Afghanistan	Airlines	2,625	
	Transport equipment	2,000	4,625
United Arab Republic	Cairo powerplant	30,600	
	Grain storage	17,000	
	Cardboard plant	[1] 5,700	
	Viscose plant	[1] 3,000	56,300
India	Tarapur power	[1] 80,000	
	Coal washery	5,100	
	Gear production	[1] 2,300	
	5th railway loan	15,850	
	Truck plant	[1] 13,700	
	Hindustan motors	[1] 15,800	
	Trombay power	[1] 17,900	
	Rayon plant	[1] 9,800	
	Development bank	[1] 20,000	
	Auto plant expansion	[1] 3,000	
	Chandrapura power	16,000	
	Nonproject	240,000	
	Central ropeway	7,700	
	Satpura power	25,100	
	Delhi "C" power	16,000	
	Ramagundam power	8,400	
	Hydropower	20,200	
	4th railroad loan	43,000	
	Nonproject	200,000	
	Bandel power	38,000	
	Patherdihn washery	4,200	
	Cambay power	33,600	835,650
Iran	Electrification plans	[2] 2,400	2,400
Israel	Nonproject	[2] 35,000	
	do	[2] 10,000	45,000
Nepal	Industrial Bank	[1] 1,000	1,000
Pakistan	5th railroad loan	14,500	
	Water and sewage	3,100	
	Consulting services	5,600	
	Sawmill	[1] 2,200	

See footnotes at end of table.

Dollar development loans at ¾-of-1-percent interest approved by AID, November 1961 through December 1963, by region and country—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Country	Loan	Amount	Country total
Pakistan	Power generation	[1] 26,000	
	Public health	1,500	
	Nonproject	70,500	
	Salinity control	750	
	Consulting	4,400	
	Dacca Airport	4,300	
	Coastal embankment	6,500	
	Feasibility studies	2,000	
	Salinity control	10,800	
	Airport	2,100	
	Chalna anchorage	3,600	
	Nonproject	30,000	
	Malaria	3,800	
	Nonproject	42,000	
	4th railroad loan	31,000	
	Dacca-Chittagong power	8,600	
	Nonproject	45,000	
	do	45,000	
	Mechanical equipment	1,500	
	Machinery pool	5,000	
	Telecommunications	4,700	
			374,450
Syria	Grain storage	14,700	14,700
Turkey	Nonproject	35,000	
	Nylon plant	[1] 1,800	
	Feasibility studies	3,000	
	do	350	
	Power generation	31,300	
	Locomotives	10,000	
	Highway equipment	18,100	
			90,550
Near East and south Asia regional total.			1,433,675
China	Nonproject	20,000	
	Telecommunications	5,200	
			25,200
Korea	Kunsan power	12,800	
	Changsong coal mine	9,500	
	Locomotives	8,300	
	Pusan power	20,900	
	Cement plant	[1] 4,250	
			55,700
Far East regional total.			80,900
Grand total			2,182,715

[1] 2-step loan. Terms to borrower were at higher interest rate.

[2] Interest at ¾ of 1 percent. Grace and duration shorter than softest terms.

INCREASED SALARY FOR SENATORS

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, while the recently enacted salary increase bill was pending before the Congress, there appeared in the Columbus, Ohio, Citizen Journal newspaper an editorial entitled, "Prestige? Dignity? Status?"

The views expressed by the writer of this editorial and called to my attention by Mr. Donald L. Patin, research associate of the Ohio State University, concur with my thinking.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESTIGE? DIGNITY? STATUS?

Senator OLIN JOHNSTON, Democrat, of South Carolina and his colleagues of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee have formally recommended that all Senators and Representatives be paid an additional $7,500 a year.

Their bill, scheduled for Senate action, also provides pay increases for all other Federal employees, judges, congressional help and postmasters. It follows the pattern of the one passed by the House and ups the lawmakers' pay from $22,500 to $30,000 a year. (Only 9 years ago Congressmen were paid—and some overpaid—$15,000 a year.)

The Johnston report argues that the "increasing cost of serving in Washington" is one reason for the pay increase. But no Congressman ever was hogtied and made to take the job.

But when the report says that "also involved (in the proposed pay increase) is the prestige, dignity, and status of the Congress and its Members," it is indulging in as ridiculous a bit of sophistry as we've ever seen in a congressional report.

Senators should know money won't buy "prestige." If it's "prestige" they want, let them write a law (and obey it) to end congressional conflicts of interest and set up a rigid and honest congressional code of ethics.

If it's "dignity" they want, more pay won't assure it, but an end of nepotism might. Let them seek "dignity" by forcing the end of employment at fat Federal salaries of wives, sons, daughters, brothers, and in-laws.

And if it's "status" they desire, let them seek it by putting an end to sponging on the Federal Treasury with lush Government-paid junkets disguised as "factfinding" or "investigative" trips, and let them pass an honest "clean elections" law to assure complete and instant disclosure of all campaign contributions and expenditures.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALTERS in the chair). Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALTERS in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

COMMUNITY RELATIONS SERVICE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of LeRoy Collins, of Florida, to be Director of the Community Relations Service.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on the question of confirmation of the nomination of LeRoy Collins to be Director of the Community Relations Service, I request the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I am opposed to the confirmation of Gov. LeRoy Collins to head the Community Relations Service, which was established under the recently enacted so-called civil rights bill. I opposed the creation of this new Federal agency when it was before the Senate, and I want to reiterate my opposition at this time. Further, I believe that the past actions and statements of Governor Collins prove beyond a shadow of a doubt that he is not qualified for this position.

On December 3, 1963, Governor Collins made a speech to the annual banquet of the Columbia, S.C., Chamber of Commerce. I ask unanimous consent that this speech in its entirety be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, in this speech, which was carried on a statewide radio and television network, Governor Collins castigated the South, and its elected representatives in particular, in a highly inflammatory and completely unnecessary fashion.

I have asked that this speech be placed in the RECORD in its entirety so that everyone who reads it may draw his own conclusions concerning what was said by Governor Collins on that occasion. However, I feel there is no room for doubt but that Governor Collins' remarks were so ill-chosen and indicative of a lack of discretion as to make him unfit to head an agency whose ostensible purpose is to cool passions and act as a conciliatory body.

Also, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a series of editorials and statements from South Carolina newspapers, following the address by Governor Collins, be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. **THURMOND**. Mr. President, these editorials show how the people of South Carolina interpreted this speech and how they felt about it. It is generally considered that Governor Collins insulted the people of South Carolina and of the South without cause or justification. As could be expected, newspapers from other sections of the country and even from neighboring States differed in their interpretation of these remarks, but I know of no favorable comments concerning this address from any South Carolina newspaper or individual.

In addition, Mr. President, the events which have occurred since Mr. Collins undertook the tasks of this position show that the Community Relations Service will have little, if any, beneficial effect in attempting to solve any racial problems which may exist in the country. The response of the Governors who have been contacted by Secretary Hodges and Mr. Collins has not been at all favorable. Most of the southern Governors, and most of the communities in the South, would rather be left alone to work out any difficulties with the local people, free from outside interference or intervention of any kind. It seems from all the evidence at hand that the Community Relations Service will serve no useful purpose.

Mr. President, the enforcement of the recently enacted so-called Civil Rights Act will mean the upheaval of social patterns and customs more than a century old in many communities, both in the South and in other areas of the Nation as well. To force people to change their pattern of living overnight, to require them to forget how they have acted and reacted over the entire span of their lifetime, creates a potentially dangerous situation. In many instances the best advice which could be given would be for the integration groups to discontinue their demands and their agitation. And yet, Mr. President, it is clear that the conciliatory advice which will be offered by the nominee as head of the Community Relations Service will be all one sided. The advice will be limited as to how integration can best be achieved, not whether it should be pushed or not. This one-sided advice can in no way be considered conciliatory, and will do little to ease tensions.

Mr. President, the nominee now before the Senate for confirmation has stated within recent months that he is opposed to racial segregation. He has also stated that he feels that segregation at lunch counters is morally wrong. This attitude seems to be of rather recent origin because when the nominee was the Governor of Florida, he entertained a different point of view. Governor Collins ran for and served as Governor of Florida as a segregationist. I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point a copy of a letter dated August 1, 1956, signed by LeRoy Collins, Governor of Florida. I have removed the name of the addressee to avoid embarrassing him. In this letter, Governor Collins wrote:

> I have stated repeatedly, of course, that I favor segregation.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF FLORIDA,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
Tallahassee, August 1, 1956.

DEAR MR. ———: I acknowledge your letter of July 28.

Under a fundamental arrangement of our form of government, the executive has no control over the legislative branch in the way that your letter seems to indicate and I am confident you would not want me to do anything that would violate this principle.

I have stated repeatedly, of course, that I favor segregation and it is my sincere judgment that the program enacted by the Florida Legislature in this special session will be effective.

With best regards, I am,
Sincerely,
LEROY COLLINS,
Governor.

Mr. **THURMOND**. Mr. President, the nominee has now changed his viewpoint completely. Governor Collins told the Senate Commerce Committee during its hearings on this nomination that:

> I have had an opportunity here in Washington to expand my horizons.

There seems to be a tendency for an individual to do a turnabout when he is no longer responsive to the electorate and he is instead filling an appointed office. I have little respect for turncoats who are willing to sacrifice their previous principles for political expediency. Governor Collins' views are now substantially at variance with those which he publicly held while he was running for and holding an elective office in his native State of Florida.

Being fully knowledgeable of the trend today toward centralization of all powers here in Washington and the erosion of States rights, and being further cognizant of today's practice of catering to the bloc votes, I am under no delusion as to the outcome of the vote which is soon to be taken. Nevertheless, I am opposed to the confirmation of this nominee and want the RECORD to clearly show my opposition.

EXHIBIT 1

ROUT FORCES OF HATE

(Address of LeRoy Collins, president, National Association of Broadcasters, before the annual meeting of the Greater Columbia Chamber of Commerce, Columbia, S.C., December 3, 1963)

It is a high privilege for me to be here in Columbia, and to participate in this Greater Columbia Chamber of Commerce annual meeting of 1963.

I like South Carolina, and I always have. Yours is a State rich in history and exciting in opportunity.

Your distinguished Governor, Donald Russell, who honors us all by his presence here tonight, is a public leader of conspicuous competence and of uncommon dedication.

I would like to add my warm congratulations to all of your chamber of commerce officers and committees. You have had a remarkably successful year; and, while the rank-and-file support of your membership doubtless has been excellent, special praise is due all who have supplied the leadership.

My message this evening is being carried by many broadcasters here and across this State. I am grateful to them. I also salute them, along with all other broadcasters, for their enormous efforts in reporting to the American people and to the world the story of our Nation in the agony of its trial after the assassination of President Kennedy. As soon as the first dastardly shot was fired in Dallas, response of news broadcasters was immediate. It became complete, and reflected the highest skill and dedication.

This was the free broadcaster at his finest. No one from the Government had to make the slightest move to get him going, or to keep him at his task, or to hold out any hope that his commercial losses would be offset in any way or shared by anyone else. It was his job. And in performing it, he asked not what the country could do for him, but only what he could do for his country.

I do not believe anyone is more genuinely proud of his southern birth and "raising" than I am. I love this land. But some thoughts have been brooding in my mind lately, especially in the few mad days since the murder of our young President, and I thing South Carolina and Columbia are good places for me to talk these out.

Not all of you will agree with what I have to say. This does not trouble me, and it should not trouble you.

I have tried to be a southerner who speaks plainly on sensitive issues, and you are sons and daughters of a State which, from the time of Sumter and Pickens and Calhoun, has been characterized by forthright debate.

Doubtless as you have detected down the years, a number of people in other neighborhoods of America have not always agreed with the forthright talk emerging from South Carolina. But debate, if it is honest and thoughtful, refines the decisions in our Republic and makes them more intelligent.

I have not come to address old grievances. It is the future of the South and of our Nation I wish to take up with you here tonight. And the one is inseparable from the other.

I would hope first that we might consider as our own the creed of our new President, Lyndon Johnson, who, once exasperated by his critics in the Senate when he was the leader of that forum, sought to explain himself in these terms: "I am a freeman, an American, a U.S. Senator and a Democrat, in that order."

Most of us, when we talk about the South, find the easy things to say. We like to recall the handicaps our region has suffered in the exploitation of its natural resources; the impoverishment which followed the Civil War, and the later unjust and repressive efforts made to thwart our growth and development. Then we like to speak of the happier days of our recent dynamic economic growth and prosperity—of the "new South," a land of vast new opportunities. And these things are all true. We can prove them by the bank deposits, by the new factories, by the lines on the charts, by the clothes we see children wear to school.

We also like to speak of the "new, new South," which glitters with projections of future prosperity almost beyond comprehension. And I firmly believe that you and I will see all this come to pass in our lifetimes.

But let us think together this evening about things more personal than material progress.

I do not like it when people speak of southerners as if they are not human parts of the United States. But the prime reason they do this is that for too long we have permitted the South's own worst enemies to speak for it.

We have allowed the extremists to speak for the South—the very ones against whom we in the South have had to struggle in our towns and in our State capitals for much of the progress we have made.

They have done it in speeches on the floor of Congress which have sounded like anti-American diatribes from some hostile foreign country.

They have done it in the national press and on the national radio and television to such an extent that citizens outside the South would be entitled to wonder if they might not need visas to pass through our region.

And all the while, too many of the rest of us have remained cravenly silent or lamely defensive while Dixie battle cries have been employed to incite sick souls to violence—egged on by the rabble rousers' call to "stand up and fight."

It is little wonder that other Americans fail to regard us on occasions as being in the mainstream of American life and citizenship.

And I ask you tonight, how long are the majority of southerners going to allow themselves to be caricatured before the Nation by these claghorns? How many Sunday school children have to be dynamited to death? How many Negro leaders have to be shot in the back? How many Governors have to be shot in the chest? How many Presidents have to be assassinated?

All those evil happenings have been the products of environments where hatred has been preached and lawlessness extolled—environments which you and I know are foreign to the South for which we care deeply and are repugnant to most southerners. Violence and disorder will occur anywhere, regardless of the issue, when reason and discussion are allowed to give way to hate and acrimony.

It is time the decent people in the South, with all their might and strength, told the bloody shirtwavers to climb down off the buckboards of bigotry. It is time we started speaking and acting together more like loyal Americans and self-respecting southerners.

You here in South Carolina have shown in many ways that you understand—that you are moving forward.

The cities of Oxford, Birmingham, Little Rock, New Orleans, Dallas—and Philadelphia and Chicago, for that matter—are not to be found in the State of South Carolina.

And that fact, as all of you well know, is no accident of geography.

It is because the leadership of this community and this State reached a rational decision that South Carolina was not going to allow bigotry and lawlessness to pervade your society and pollute your bloodstream.

There has been no need for Federal marshals patrolling your university campuses, thanks to the good sense and respect for law among the people of this State.

You have demonstrated to the rest of the Nation, which includes the rest of the South, and to yourselves, that a Deep South community does not have to throw itself onto a funeral pyre of hate.

Yes, there are forces at work in the South—men and women who do not have their faces turned backward, stalwart men and women who have not received the headlines and public notices which have been accorded the more sensational examples of lack of progress, but who have been in the vanguard of progress nonetheless.

There is a story which came out of World War I. I do not vouch for its literal accuracy. In fact, there are many reasons for doubting its truth in detail. But its message rings true.

Three American soldiers—one a Protestant, one a Catholic, and one a Jew—became fast friends as they marched and fought together in France. They entered into a pact committing the survivors to do everything possible for the family of any one of them who might be killed in action.

In a battle soon afterward, on the outskirts of a small French village, the Protestant boy was killed. The only place of worship was a little Catholic church. The Catholic boy and the Jewish boy asked the priest of this little church for permission to have their friend buried in the church cemetery adjoining. But when the priest learned that the dead boy was not Catholic, he regretfully declined, pointing out that under the regulations of the church the cemetery had been established and blessed for the burial of Catholics only.

After considerable discussion of the point, the priest suggested as an alternative that the burial be made just outside the fence of the cemetery and said, "Here we will be sure to see that the grave is cared for and not desecrated, just as faithfully as we care for the graves on the inside."

The arrangement was worked out, and the two boys who survived went on through the war. When peace came, they returned to their homes in the United States.

They had the understanding, however, that 3 years from the date their friend was killed they would meet in the French village and together visit the grave.

When this day came, they met as agreed and soon came to the little church. But when they arrived just outside the fence where they had buried their friend, they were shocked to see no sign of the grave. Angrily, they found the old priest and scolded him for his neglect.

Then the old father took the two young men out into the cemetery and led them down the inside of the fence. There was the grave just as the soldiers had left it. Then he said, "You know, some time after you left, I went back and studied our regulations further. I found it to be very clear that while I was not permitted to allow the burial inside the fence, there was nothing which prevented me from later moving the fence over."

Fellow southerners, we can talk about our mores, our local laws and customs, the low standards of many Negroes, but the time has come where we must move some fences.

The soul of man is beyond the reach of a court order or a legislative act. But while courts and laws cannot change the innermost dictates of the human conscience, courts and laws most certainly can control the acts of men.

This task of assuring racial justice is no easy one for us in the South—nor is it for those in the North. But Americans everywhere must recognize that this is a national commitment and a national necessity. It is not going away.

The advancement of all rights of national citizenship, as we well know, will occur with the overt aid of the National Government if local citizens and local and State governments do not move effectively to accomplish this on their own.

Yet, too many politicians down our way have been hoodwinking the people on the civil rights issue. They have been trying to pretend, for their own personal political advantage, that the changes which are coming over the hill really are not there. They talk defensively of States rights when they and we well know that there can be no such thing as a State's right to default on a national duty.

Any rational man who looks at the horizon and sees the South of the future segregated is simply seeing a mirage.

"That all men are created equal" is not an empty cliché. It was not put in our Declaration of Independence by Jefferson merely to stir our revolutionary forces to greater sacrifice.

It is a mighty idea that is the keystone of our Nation's whole meaning and perpetual commitment. It is the basic idea which supports the dignity of man as an individual.

It is an idea that can never be stopped—not by custom, not by prejudice, not by hate, not by murder, not by armies, not by any mortal force.

It may be thwarted—it may be delayed—its triumph may be at great cost and sacrifice—but it will keep coming on and on, for it has the invincibility of simple truth, justice, and right.

Aside from human attitudes the most basic changes which must occur to aid us in resolving our racial difficulties is the improvement of the standards of living of all underprivileged Americans. The taproot of future progress is greatly expanded and improved public education for all American youngsters.

While in the Florida Legislature many years ago, I undertook the leadership for the passage of legislation known as the minimum foundation program. Under it, the State government guaranteed to every child in Florida, regardless of where he lived or how poor his county, a public education of no less quality than certain prescribed standards. This has worked quite well, and other States have developed similar plans.

There was talk at the time that a program like this would rob local communities of local interest and influence, but this did not turn out to be the case.

Now, I feel that we should mount in this country a massive national minimum foundation plan under which the Nation would assure to every child an education adequate to the full development of his talents.

This would call for the supplementing of local resources in proportion to need. It could enable us to close our educational gap and bring to an end our vicious cycle of ignorance breeding more ignorance with resulting impoverishment of body, intellect, and spirit.

This is not only a national need; I say it is a necessity. We must do this to enable the Nation better to meet it adversaries in a hostile and competitive world. But, more importantly, we must do it to provide for American children a seedbed of simple justice which is now their rightful heritage, although for millions it has not been their inheritance.

Our country has a right to expect the best from all of us, regardless of where we live.

And just as it is wrong for anyone, including some southerners, to sell the South short, by the same token we in the South have no right to go off in a corner and sulk.

Southerners, like Americans from every section of this land, have a solemn obligation to make whatever general and unique contributions they can to the national good.

It is high time the South rid itself of any political inferiority complex.

Leadership in the South—business, professional, educational, and political—instead of being rejected out of hand nationally must be regarded as a valuable resource in the role which America must play in meeting the challenge of history.

Some politicians in other regions of the Nation contend that the South now bears such a stigma before the Nation that it is incapable of producing national leadership. And there are even some southerners who parrot the same fallacy.

After all, where was this Republic founded? By whom were our Nation's principles of freedom and individual dignity hammered out?

So much of this came from the minds of Washington and Jefferson and Henry. The young Republic was nourished by the philosophies of Madison and Monroe and Jackson. Southerners all.

The South should be bright and optimistic, indeed, as we face the future.

To become a more vital part of the Nation's efforts for the fulfillment of national goals will not demean our posture as States, but enhance it. It will not be a retreat, but an advance. It will not be a defeat, but a victory.

My fellow countrymen, a few long days ago our young President was struck down on the street of an American city. Good men have differences, and many Americans had differences with John Kennedy. But I do not know of any fellow countryman who, after rendezvousing with his soul, would not share the sweet dream of John Kennedy for a better America or his dedication to move his dreams toward reality. He was the unusual, heroic person in politics who thought not in terms of years, but in terms of generations and of what America must be for our children and the children of our children.

Just a few days before his death, President Kennedy was talking to one of our leading southern editors—a very close friend—William Baggs of the Miami News, about the year A.D. 2000 and of what we, in our generation, must plant and plow up to make this country right for its sons and daughters in A.D. 2000.

I say to you tonight that above all else it is the moral duty of our generation to plow under racial injustice everywhere in the United States and to plant new opportunities for the generations which will come along after us and reside in this green part of our old planet.

This has not been anything like the speech that I first expected to make here.

But the other day, as I followed the caisson drawn by the six white horses to Arlington's green hillside and listened to the bugler's mournful cry and saw the flame lighted on the grave as if to hold back at least a tiny part of the approaching darkness, my conscience grew heavy with the long promise of history:

> "Beyond the sundown is tomorrow's wisdom;
> Today is going to be a long, long ago."

Oh, God of all mankind, help us to find that wisdom. Help us to make today count for more than its sorrows.

Exhibit 2

[From the Edgefield Advertiser, Dec. 4, 1963]

The Collins Speech in Columbia

There is the account of the speech of former Governer Collins in Columbia yesterday with bold heading on the front page of this morning's paper. Too much of the speech is untruth, and on the whole it is a misrepresentation spoken in the face of southern people.

Mr. Collins is now president of the National Association of Broadcasters whose monopoly for propaganda is today the most powerful single voice in the country. Whether it is used with the best taste, in the best national interest, is questionable, but it and its president are adept at propaganda.

The building of a new world through the airways engages much of the time of Mr. Collins, one may be sure. Not content with visiting the homes of the South through remote broadcast of entertainment, he comes into the Deep South to the capital of the Secession State, to preach against the South's evil, which he says is segregation.

It is typical and unfortunate that as men move into positions of power they lose something of the values that made them what they were, but are no longer.

The greatest power is not always at the top, and that is why centralization, seeking perfection in the whole, is bereft of the means of achieving it.

Dictatorship may have many good reasons for acceptance, but it has been historically true that dictatorship and the ultimate ideals of good have been two separate and distinct things.

People naturally and historically resent intrusion; for there is no absolute power except in the conscience of the individual, and there is no power to be respected above one's own convictions.

Mr. Collins has been drawn into the central establishment of power in the United States, which assumes that it can engineer a new social order from the top.

The baptism of power is often fatal; and, in a country of liberty, it is only power that can destroy it. Mr. Collins, who blames the South for the assassination of President Kennedy, would deny criticism, opposition, the spoken and written word, it seems. He would deny the very freedoms that are conscienceful forces in our country dedicated to maintaining our freedoms.

Destroy them, and the well of liberty has gone dry.

Years ago in the days of steam pumps, an engineer was being examined for graduation, when his examiner proposed the following question: "Suppose you have a steam pump constructed for a ship, under your own supervision, and know that everything is in perfect working order yet, when you throw out the hose, it will not draw. What would you think?"

"I should think, sir, there should be a defect somewhere."

"But such a conclusion is not admissible, for the supposition is, that everything is perfect, and yet it will not work."

"Then, sir, I should look over the side to see if the river had run dry."

Those who stand in positions of power inevitably want to create a perfect machine, which now in contemplation is a new world order without freedom.

When, along the way, will they learn that no matter how perfect the machine is designed, the river of liberty, which is life itself, is to be reckoned with, too?

One must agree with Mr. Collins that politicians have misled the people into believing that the public law in time will uphold segregation. Segregation will never be a public ideal. It is a private, personal matter, embraced by freedom, but not by the law.

The idea that men are created equal, he said, "is an idea that can never be stopped, not by custom, not by prejudice, not by hate, not by murder, not by armies, not by any mortal force * * * has the invincibility of simple truth, justice and right."

With all that most southerners agree, and anyone of heart and reason must ever wish that it will be so. It is a great ideal.

But there is no known order, in all history, no system of government, no man-made laws, no army bayonet, no appropriation of funds, or anything else that can be done to bring about equality without first the complete destruction of freedom; for ultimate equality is an ideal of freedom, not of power.

And, while so many leaders talk of advancing the cause of humanity, of moving forward in social and economic fields—all of which sounds so promising and so winning—they seldom say that a dictatorship could get it all done quickly and easily; but that is what they would say, if they wanted to be truthful all the way, which Mr. Collins has not been. But he did say this—thanks to his frankness—"The advancement of all rights * * * as we know, will occur with the overt aid of the National Government."

And, all the while, the power establishment softens its approach to the dictators of the world who are committed to bury us all, and to whom freedom is the sinister evil.

In the power establishment—closely supported by the National Association of Broadcasters—the leaders, the public casually observes, are nearly all millionaires or very rich; and this is so on nearly all leadership levels, the wealth of government having its courtiers now as it did in the early days of royalty.

It becomes importunate that they gather before humanity a set of ideals attractive to the masses, and that they crusade to justify their power and good fortune, to soothe their conscience, to seem to supply a high service and thus to further their own interest—to accomplish what they would like to be given credit for but are not competent either to conceive or to administer.

And like the infallible kings of old, while what they say is a form of power itself, they themselves contribute almost nothing. Like the royalty of ancient times, their work consists of spending money taken from the pockets of the people.

[From the Charleston (S.C.) News and Courier, Dec. 6, 1963]

The Collins Insult

Besides insulting millions of southerners with public blame for President Kennedy's murder, former Gov. LeRoy Collins, of Florida, managed in his speech at Columbia to work in a specific insult to a southern family by the name of Claghorn.

The late Fred Allen, one of the greatest American comics of our time, invented a character with a southern accent and called him Senator Claghorn. Members of the Claghorn clan may not have liked this use of the name but at least they could enjoy Mr. Allen's harmless humor.

The venon in Mr. Collins' barb about "these Claghorns"—whom he linked with several murders, including Mr. Kennedy's—is something altogether different. At least one descendant of a Claghorn—a name with an honorable record in American history—has already expressed the resentment that we are confident is spreading throughout this region. Mrs. B. Ellis deTreville, of Beaufort, whose mother was a Claghorn, has said she intends to sue Mr. Collins unless he makes a public apology.

We wish it were possible for every affronted southerner whatever his name and ancestry, to extract an apology from the man, through we are not prepared to say what it would be worth.

[From the Greenville News, Dec. 6, 1963]

LeRoy Collins' Grievous Errors

We feel for the hosts at the annual meeting of the Columbia Chamber of Commerce and, especially for Gov. Donald S. Russell, who was called upon to introduce former Gov. LeRoy Collins of Florida prior to his speech in which he denounced in terms at least as vicious as its most extreme critics have used his native South.

When he declared that "Dixie battlecries which incite sick souls to violence" fostered or contributed to the assassination of President John F. Kennedy, the once politically ambitious Floridian not only libeled the South but the whole Nation.

For the things he said of his own region could be said with just as much truth—or the lack of it—of any other region or of the country as a whole.

We shall not waste time taking Governor Collins' remarks apart and dignifying and further broadcasting them by refuting them. But when he spoke in the most extreme terms of the behavior of what he referred to as a few southern extremists, he committed the selfsame sin of which he was accusing them.

Nothing can be said by us or anyone else to excuse or mitigate some of the bombings, shootings, and other crimes to which Mr. Collins referred in the course of his remarks. But he spoke as if this occurred only in the South, and he certainly knows better than that.

The South has its sick souls, of course. But they are about equally divided between the two extremes on the race issue, which

Collins attempted to say was the main cause if not the whole cause of the assassination. The available evidence does not support that thesis.

And, as for the incitement of the sick souls, the kind of man who killed the late John Kennedy is capable of killing anyone for the same paranoid reasons. In fact they don't need any reasons.

The flames of incitement are already burning within their troubled hearts and twisted minds.

Mr. Collins should know that every region and every community in the country has its potential paranoid assassins. They strike often, except that their victims are lesser folk than Presidents and we call it murder instead of an assassination.

Mr. Collins has committed two grievous errors in addition to embarrassing his hosts.

One is that, like certain others, he had attempted to indict unfairly a whole people for the crime of one man or one small group of men.

The other has to do with the old adage that it's a pretty sorry bird who will foul his own nest.

[From the Columbia (S.C.) State,
Dec. 5, 1963]

THE MAN WHO CAME TO DINNER

Agree or disagree with LeRoy Collins, you must give him credit for consistency if not for propriety.

The former Governor of Florida long has wanted to remake the image of the South into something more nearly resembling that of the rest of the Nation. His efforts in that direction were apparent when he was the chairman of the southern Governors' Conference—and when he was the presiding chairman over the Democratic National Convention in 1960.

Now that he is president of the National Association of Broadcasters, he carries the same uncharitable view of many things and many people of the South. That is his privilege, and we would be the last to stand in his way of sounding off.

But it seemed singularly inappropriate for him to use the annual banquet of the Columbia Chamber of Commerce as an occasion to castigate the South and its spokesmen. We accept, with somewhat qualified gratitude, his differentiation of South Carolina from our sister Southern States. We cannot accept his more general indictment of the South.

Least of all can we accept from him or anyone else the accusation that southerners are "un-American" in their adherence to values and traditions which have their very origins in the birth of this Nation of ours.

And for him to impute some sort of collective guilt to the South for the assassination of President Kennedy is both inexcusable and insulting.

If he is genuinely concerned with madmen and meanness, he need only look about in the northern region where he now resides.

The greatest service LeRoy Collins could render the South, and indeed the Nation, would be to use his considerable influence in the world of network broadcasting to throttle those false messiahs of the microphone who glory in misrepresenting all that is decent in Dixie.

[From the Columbia (S.C.) Record,
Dec. 5, 1963]

GOVERNOR COLLINS' SPEECH

"A Deep South community does not have to throw itself onto a funeral pyre of hate," the former Governor of Florida, LeRoy Collins, declared in a Columbia speech Tuesday night.

Nor do southerners have to soak themselves in the oil of guilt and set themselves aflame for distant hordes of Saracens to applaud.

Donning the sackcloth of the apologist, he addressed the Greater Columbia Chamber of Commerce on "some thoughts that have been brooding in my mind lately. I do not like it when people speak of southerners as if they are not human parts of the United States," he declared. Then, with his customary urbane eloquence, he proceeded to sharpen the lines of misunderstanding and condemnation.

"For too long we have permitted the South's own worst enemies to speak for it," he said. He might have added, "And too often do the South's own best friends speak against it."

"We have allowed the extremists to speak for the South," the former Governor, now president of the National Association of Broadcasters, continued. "They have done it in the national press and on the national radio and television to such an extent that citizens outside the South would be entitled to wonder if they might not need visas to pass through our region * * *. And I ask you tonight, how long are the majority of southerners going to allow themselves to be caricatured before the Nation by these Claghorns?"

The distortion will continue as long as these extremists, these Claghorns, are the only prosouthern voices to which the national press and Governor Collins' own national broadcasters will listen.

The speaker deplored, "Dixie battle cries [that] have been employed to incite sick souls to violence," but he ignored the sources of much of the incitement and preachment of hate which are neither Claghorn nor southern.

"How many Sunday school children have to be dynamited to death? How many Negro leaders have to be shot in the back? How many Governors have to be shot in the chest? How many Presidents have to be assassinated?" Governor Collins asked, compounding the reckless libel that crime and lawlessness are a hallmark of southern society.

"It is time the decent people of the South, with all their might and strength," he added, "told the bloody-shirt wavers to climb down off the buckboards of bigotry." And they should speak loudly enough to be heard afar in the unholy sanctums of intolerance and prejudiced ignorance.

"Too many politicians down our way," the top broadcaster said, "talk defensively of 'States rights' when they and we well know that there can be no such thing as a States right to default on a national duty." One of the indictments against the South by those who confuse "national duty" with personal ideology is that the South is too American, too patriotic. Where true national duty has been concerned, the people of Dixie have always stood in the forefront and provided a shield against those who would destroy our national character and heritage. They have observed no conflict between loyalty to State and loyalty to Nation.

"Some politicians in other regions of the Nation contend that the South now bears such a stigma before the Nation that it is incapable of producing national leadership," the speaker declared in his conclusion, "And there are even some southerners who parrot the same fallacy."

Yes, Governor, there certainly are.

[From the Charleston (S.C.) News and Courier, Dec. 8, 1963]

BYRNES TAKES ISSUE WITH COLLINS SPEECH

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The following article is reprinted from the Columbia State:)

James F. Byrnes, in a statement Friday, charged that "if any group has contributed to building a climate of hate it has been the broadcasters."

Mr. Byrnes, former Governor of South Carolina, and Secretary of State, was taking issue with LeRoy Collins, ex-Governor of Florida, who in a Columbia address attributed hate to the South and racial prejudices. Collins is president of the National Association of Broadcasters.

The firing last summer on a Citadel cadet by a young Negro, and the subsequent shot at that institution's president, Gen. Mark Clark, was cited by Mr. Byrnes. "No broadcaster referred to it or denounced it as encouraging a climate of hate," he declared.

Mr. Byrnes refuted the idea that Lee Harvey Oswald was motivated by racial feeling in the killing of President Kennedy. "On the contrary, all the evidence has shown his feelings in favor of the Soviet Government," Mr. Byrnes said.

Following is the text of the statement of Mr. Byrnes:

"Everybody will agree that there should not be developed in any community, or in the country at large, a climate of hatred for an individual or group because of differences in views about political issues. However, Mr. LeRoy Collins spent his time emphasizing that the climate of hate was built up in Birmingham and other southern spots because of race hatred and race prejudices.

"The fact is, in all the thousands of words written about the assassination of President Kennedy, not one witness has offered a statement indicating even that Oswald was motivated by any feeling on the race question. On the contrary, all the evidence has shown his feelings in favor of the Soviet Government which caused him to try to become a citizen of that country and caused him to go to the trouble and expense of advocating Fair Play for Cuba.

"In addition, it is noteworthy that when asked about counsel to represent him, he stated he did not want any Texas lawyer but that he would like to have Mr. Abt, of New York, who first came into public view as a close friend of Alger Hiss and who has been the subject of investigation by some Government agencies.

"Oswald was young. He could not have personally known Abt. His immediately expressed desire to have this lawyer represent him would indicate that he has knowledge of and probably has sympathy with the man who, like Hiss and Lee Pressman, have been active in the causes sympathetic with the Communists.

"The truth is, if any group has contributed to building a climate of hate, it has been the broadcasters, because they have consistently misrepresented the South and a people who are misrepresented necessarily resent such treatment.

"The press carried a statement last summer that a Citadel cadet while driving a young lady home from a dance at the Citadel, was fired upon by a young Negro. The bullet entered his jaw and was removed from his chin. No broadcaster talked about that being due to the climate of hate that was built up.

"Within 48 hours after that incident, Gen. Mark Clark, a distinguished general in the U.S. Army and a hero of the attempted assassination driving to the Citadel was fired upon. The bullet struck his car but fortunately he was not hurt. The press carried a statement of the attempted assassination but so far as we can recall, no broadcaster referred to it or denounced it as encouraging a climate of hate.

"When Oswald, who admittedly is a Communist sympathizer, and who gave the hammer and sickle salute (clenched fist) in the Dallas jail, killed the President of the United States, his act is attributed by Mr. Collins, to a climate of hate growing out of race prejudice."

[From the Charleston (S.C.) News and Courier, Dec. 8, 1963]

Orangeburg Station Raps Collins Speech

Orangeburg.—Radio station WDIX here yesterday took issue with a speech made by former Florida Gov. LeRoy Collins to the Columbia Chamber of Commerce.

The editorial stated that Mr. Collins said many extreme and radical things but used the time to comment on only one point made by the president of the National Association of Broadcasters. Mr. Collins said: "The assassination of President Kennedy was fostered by 'Dixie battle cries which incite sick souls to violence.' "

The full text of the editorial follows:

"Speaker at the annual meeting of the Greater Columbia (S.C.) Chamber of Commerce was the Honorable Mr. LeRoy Collins, former Governor of Florida and now the president of the National Association of Broadcasters. The Associated Press reports the broadcasters' president as saying that the assassination of President Kennedy was fostered by 'Dixie battle cries which incite sick souls to violence.' The broadcasters' president said many other extreme and radical things—intolerant and violent things. We will observe only the one thing—that Dixie battle cries fostered the assassination of President Kennedy.

"What Mr. Collins said was equally well said by the three top officers of the Communist Party, U.S.A.—Gus Hall, Elizabeth Gurley Flynn and Benjamin J. Davis—also reported by the Associated Press that they 'called the President's assassination "the ultimate end * * * by the racists and forces of the ultraright," ' the Communist Party, U.S.A. What the Honorable Mr. Collins said and what the top Reds in the United States said, has also been said by the Communist news agency, Tass, since their first release on President Kennedy's death. The Honorable Mr. Collins, it must be noted, is joined by Chief Justice Earl Warren and the Communists, in a similar view. That is the privilege of Chief Justice Warren and the Communists and the Honorable Mr. Collins—to smear the South, the segregationists, and 'unnamed southern politicians' who advocate States rights.

"Thank goodness, not all responsible people—like the Honorable Mr. Collins—aline themselves in the manner he has. For instance, in referring to Supreme Court Justice Warren's statement about the 'forces of hatred and malevolence,' the Chicago Tribune said: 'This perverted thesis may be reduced to an attempt, naked and without apology, to liquidate dissent in the United States.' "

Statement of Walter J. Brown, President of Spartan Radiocasting Co. and Former President of South Carolina Broadcasters Association

It was "inappropriate," to use the words of the Columbia State, for Governor Collins to use the annual banquet of the Columbia Chamber of Commerce as an occasion to "castigate the South and its spokesmen."

As a broadcaster, I go further and say Governor Collins broke faith with those of us who broadcast his speech when, without warning, he chose the occasion to impugn the motives of most southern leaders over a statewide broadcast which had been set with the written commitment that "Governor Collins will deal with the Government threat to the broadcasting industry."

In fairness to Governor Collins, it should be said that late in the afternoon he released his speech to news media, and Senator Russell, having seen an advance copy, had the opportunity in his introduction to issue a disclaimer, but the broadcasting stations carrying the broadcast had no such opportunity.

What I resented most about the Governor's speech was his attempt to link opposition to the so-called civil rights program to the tragic assassination of President Kennedy. Everyone knows he was killed by a known Communist and Castro sympathizer. It is so unfair for anyone, whether he be the Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court or president of the National Association of Broadcasters, to contend that opposition by the people of the South or any other section to far-reaching proposals of the civil rights program pending in the Congress was in any way responsible for the trigger that was pulled in Dallas which took the President's life.

No one certainly would want to take from Governor Collins the right to say what he pleases about any subject at any time. However, he is the paid and recognized spokesman for broadcasters. When he makes a blanket indictment against the people of the South and a vast majority of their duly elected Members of Congress, we feel he oversteps his authority and does a disservice to broadcasting.

If Governor Collins wants to come South and talk about "Claghorns," "bloody-shirt wavers," and riders of "buckboards of bigotry," he should name names. At least this would enable those of us who broadcast his speech to offer equal time.

I know personally most of the southern leaders in Congress, as well as many of our southern Governors. We may not agree with them on all subjects, but none of them falls under the Governor's indictment.

I realize there is a hysteria sweeping the country about civil rights. Perhaps Governor Collins was swept away by this emotional virus when he came to Columbia. But as one broadcaster, I agree with Senator Russell that this civil rights program takes away more liberty than it gives. It deserves calm and deliberate legislative consideration. Governor Collins made no contribution to that end, and he made it difficult for those of us who agreed to serve with him in promoting better relations in the Congress for the worthwhile legislative objectives of our association.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, speaking for the two Senators from the State of Florida, I wish to express our very strong endorsement of the nominee, former Gov. LeRoy Collins of Florida, for this important post.

I hardly think it necessary for me to state for the Record that my own position with reference to the Civil Rights Act was to oppose it in every way that I could. That statement goes also for my distinguished colleague [Mr. Smathers].

However, the fact is that now we have a law. Included in the various provisions of that law is the community relations title, which, to my way of thinking, offers perhaps the greatest opportunity for any possible advancement under the civil rights effort.

The community relations title deals with the subject of conciliation, the matter of adjustments, the effort to establish friendly relations, the bringing of critical racial situations to an end in communities where they may exist, and the warding off of difficult community racial disturbances where they are threatened. For such a post, I feel that Governor Collins is uniquely qualified. He has made an outstanding record as a public servant.

He was a member of the House of Representatives of the Florida Legislature when I first became a member of the Florida Senate. I found him to be an able, intelligent, aggressive, distinguished public servant. Later he served in the State senate. A part of that time I had the honor to serve as Governor, and I had the opportunity to observe him closely. He served in the State senate with distinction.

From there he went into the Second World War as a Navy officer, where he also served ably and with distinction.

He then became Governor of our State, being the first Governor to serve 6 years in that office, 2 years to round out the elective term of the late lamented Dan McCarty and 4 years upon reelection for a term of his own. That his term was both successful and widely recognized is best shown by the fact that he served as chairman of the southern Governors conference and also as chairman of the national Governors conference.

Later he served as chairman of the Democratic Convention at Los Angeles, in 1960. I am sure that most Senators will recall that he served there with ability, fairness, and distinction.

For a number of years he has been the head of the National Association of Broadcasters. All of us know that he has not hesitated to take positions there which he thought were for the advancement of that great industry, even though sometimes those positions were not uniformly popular with the industry which he served. He has resigned his post as president of the National Association of Broadcasters in order to accept this post as head of what I prefer to call the conciliation service, or as it is called in the act, the Community Relations Service. To me, that sacrifice indicated strong dedication. Governor Collins felt that he had a duty and a challenge which he could not fail to meet. I honor him for meeting that challenge. I feel certain that he will perform that duty with signal honor and satisfaction to himself, to the President who appointed him, and to the whole Nation.

I am sure Governor Collins knows better than any of us that his new post will not be an easy one in which to serve; that it will be a post from which will arise frequent difficulties and controversies. Yet he has accepted the challenge to attempt to solve the extremely difficult matters which must arise during the administration of the recently passed Civil Rights Act.

I have received some letters asking me why it is that the Florida Senators who opposed the Civil Rights Act now find it possible to support strongly the nomination of Governor Collins. I have answered them all by saying that I did not expect the President, the appointing authority, to name one who, like myself, had opposed the act in every way that he could, but rather to find someone who, in general support of the act, nevertheless is a southerner, born and bred, knowing the great difficulties which have already beset us and which will arise as the act is being administered. I am sure that Governor Collins, bringing to the task, as he does, a ripe experience in the administration of law, and bringing also his knowledge of race relations in the South in a superlative way, because, as a southern boy, he has served in all the administrative positions I have mentioned, as well as legislative positions, has certainly found out how difficult is the problem of race relations in the southland, which I am sure he loves as do the two Senators from Florida.

I strongly endorse the nomination of Governor Collins and hope that it will be overwhelmingly approved. I wish Governor Collins well in the very difficult task which he is undertaking at such great sacrifice to himself. I am sure that all the people of the Nation, regardless of what may be their position on this particular vote, will join in hoping that Governor Collins may make a great contribution to the solution of the problems which will arise between the members of the two races during the administration of the Civil Rights Act.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to join in the remarks made by the distinguished senior Senator from Florida apropos the nomination of Gov. LeRoy Collins to the post to which he has been nominated by the President and approved by the Committee on Commerce.

I wish especially to commend the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. Holland] and other of his colleagues, including the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell], the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Ellender], the distinguished junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Thurmond], the distinguished junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. Robertson], the distinguished Senators from Tennessee [Mr. Gore and Mr. Walters], the distinguished Senators from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan and Mr. Fulbright], the distinguished junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. Talmadge], and the other members of the so-called southern bloc, for the statesmanship they have shown since the passage of the Civil Rights Act and for the advice which they have given publicly, indicating that we operate under a government of laws, not a government of men.

These Senators fought hard and vigorously against the passage of the bill; but as true Americans and great statesmen, they faced the reality. They are doing the same when they consider the nomination of a man of the caliber of LeRoy Collins for the appointment to which the President has designated him.

I add my words of praise for the nomination, and I compliment all Senators who opposed the civil rights bill but who have conducted themselves so admirably since its passage.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I deeply appreciate those warm, gracious words, coming from our great majority leader. I assure him, as I have already stated in the Record, that I feel he will be proud in the future of the contributions toward racial peace and understanding that will be made by this appointee.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Alaska.

Mr. BARTLETT. I commend President Johnson for his selection of Governor Collins. I commend Governor Collins for accepting the appointment. No better man could have been chosen. We all know that he accepts the post at great personal sacrifice. It is indeed a public service. I know of no one who is more capable of performing this service in the manner we all desire.

The choice of Governor Collins is an excellent one. I know that I shall be as glad to cast my vote in confirmation of his nomination on the floor of the Senate today as I was in committee earlier.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator from Alaska.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. No greater tribute could be paid to LeRoy Collins than the tribute we have just heard so eloquently expressed by the Senator who knows him best, our distinguished colleague from Florida [Mr. Holland].

I am a member of the Commerce Committee, which had the responsibility of passing upon the confirmation of this nomination.

I did not know LeRoy Collins until 1960, when he officiated as chairman at the Democratic National Convention at Los Angeles. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Communications I came to know him very, very well. Since then LeRoy Collins was president of the National Association of Broadcasters, and I therefore came in almost daily contact with this distinguished public servant.

I have always found LeRoy Collins to be fair under all circumstances—judicious—with a deep sense of public service and official responsibility. It is reassuring to all of us that the President of the United States, having to make this appointment under the law, has been able to command the services of LeRoy Collins. I know of no man who is better qualified to perform this demanding service, in the interests of this country, and in the interest of all mankind.

I hope that the Senate will confirm the nomination overwhelmingly, not only because this man deserves the accolade from the Senate, but also because we are fortunate to have a man of his quality and caliber to perform such a sensitive task, which needs to be done in connection with an issue which is fraught with great emotion, and potential misunderstanding.

No man in the United States understands this problem better than does Governor Collins.

No man can perform the task better than Governor Collins.

I applaud the President of the United States for choosing this man; and I urge his confirmation by the Senate in an overwhelming vote as the cause and Governor Collins deserve.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. KEATING. As one who differed with the distinguished Senator from Florida for some 83 days with reference to the issue of civil rights, I am happy to agree with him in the characterization which he has made of the very fine selection by our President of LeRoy Collins to head the Community Relations Service. The Community Relations Service established under the act has an opportunity to render an outstanding service in easing racial tensions and making the act operative without untoward incident.

In that effort, I do know of Governor Collins' courage, his intelligence, and his dedication to public service will be invaluable. I know him to be a fine man in every sense of the word. I believe that he is deserving of our support on this vote for confirmation, and I shall be happy to support him. I compliment the President on this selection.

Mr. HOLLAND. I appreciate those kindly words from the Senator from New York, as I do those from the Senator from Rhode Island, both of whom have had unusual opportunities, because of their committee assignments, to see the type of fair, just, and courageous service which Governor Collins has performed in a highly difficult post of public relations.

Mr. President, unless other Senators wish me to yield, I yield the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana (after having voted in the negative). Mr. President, on this vote I have a pair with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Williams]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I withdraw my vote.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. Humphrey], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Nelson], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Williams], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Anderson], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. Bible], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Brewster], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. Cannon], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Inouye], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Long], the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson], the Senator from Montana [Mr. Metcalf], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell], the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers], and the Senator from Maine [Mr. Muskie] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from California [Mr. Engle], the Senator from

Indiana [Mr. BAYH], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] are absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON], the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MECHEM], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] is detained on official business.

If present and voting the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], and the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 8, as follows:

[No. 471 Leg.]

YEAS—53

Aiken
Allott
Bartlett
Beall
Boggs
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Carlson
Case
Church
Dirksen
Dodd
Douglas
Ellender
Fong
Fulbright
Gore
Hartke
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Holland
Hruska
Jackson
Keating
Kuchel
Lausche
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Monroney
Morse
Morton
Moss
Neuberger
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Ribicoff
Simpson
Smith
Symington
Talmadge
Tower
Walters
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—8

Eastland
Hill
Johnston
McClellan
Robertson
Sparkman
Stennis
Thurmond

NOT VOTING—39

Anderson
Bayh
Bennett
Bible
Brewster
Byrd, Va.
Cannon
Clark
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dominick
Edmondson
Engle
Ervin
Goldwater
Gruening
Hart
Humphrey
Inouye
Javits
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mechem
Metcalf
Miller
Mundt
Muskie
Nelson
Randolph
Russell
Saltonstall
Scott
Smathers
Williams, N.J.

So the nomination was confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the nomination was confirmed.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

ROUTINE NOMINATIONS IN THE ARMY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the routine nominations at the desk, reported from the Committee on Armed Services, be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations reported from the Committee on Armed Services and lying on the Secretary's desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nominations.

CERTAIN DIPLOMATIC NOMINATIONS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I desire to announce that today the Senate received the nominations of Lucius D. Battle, of Florida, to be Ambassador to the United Arab Republic; Miss Margaret Joy Tibbetts, of Maine, to be Ambassador to Norway; Winthrop G. Brown, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Korea.

In accordance with the committee rule, these pending nominations may not be considered prior to the expiration of 6 days after their receipt in the Senate.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

On motion of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate turn to the consideration of Calendar No. 1108, and following measures on the calendar, and that at the appropriate places in the discussion of the bills, which have been cleared by the leadership on both sides, proper insertions and explanations may be made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

On motion by Mr. MANSFIELD, the following measures were considered and acted upon as indicated:

U.S. COURT OF CLAIMS JURISDICTION FOR CLAIM OF SARPY COUNTY, NEBR.

The bill (S. 2339) conferring jurisdiction upon the U.S. Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Sarpy County, Nebr., was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding any statute of limitations pertaining to suits against the United States, or any lapse of time, or bars of laches, jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon any claim of Sarpy County, Nebraska, arising out of the closing of the north-south county road connecting Bellevue and La Platte to make way for the principal east-west runway at Offutt Air Force Base, in said county.

SEC. 2. Suit upon any such claim may be instituted at any time within one year after the date of the enactment of this Act. Nothing in this Act shall be construed as an inference of liability on the part of the United States. Except as otherwise provided herein, proceedings for the determination of such claim, and review and payment of any judgment or judgments thereon shall be had in the same manner as in the case of claims over which such Court has jurisdiction under section 1491 of title 28 of the United States Code.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1170), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the bill is to confer jurisdiction upon the U.S. Court of Claims to enable Sarpy County, Nebr., to file a lawsuit against the United States based upon the closing of portions of two roads to make way for a runway at Offutt Air Force Base. Jurisdiction would be conferred notwithstanding any laches, or statutes of limitations, or other bar to filing suit against the United States, provided such suit is instituted within 1 year after enactment of the measure.

STATEMENT

The Department of the Air Force, on behalf of the Department of Defense, considers the merits of S. 2339 to be a matter primarily for the equitable consideration of the Congress.

The facts of the case are set out in the report of the Department of the Air Force as follows:

"In 1954 it became necessary to close portions of two secondary public roads lying within the area required for the Air Force runway extension project. The underlying fee title to the roads is vested in the United States, subject to the usual road easements. A detailed study of the effect of this road closing was made by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, which disclosed: (1) there remained only approximately 15 dwellings served by the roads which were closed, (2) a representative traffic count showed an average of only 12 vehicles in a 24-hour period, and (3) there were adequate alternate routes available to serve the same areas. As a result, it was the conclusion of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers that there was no necessity to provide substitute facilities. Subsequently, the Bureau of Public Roads conducted an independent survey of this road situation which further confirmed the opinion of the Department of the Army.

"A considerable time after the roads were barricaded, the Sarpy County commissioners requested the United States to construct a road where none existed to connect with an existing road which extends into the town of Bellevue. This proposal would entail construction of approximately 2 miles of road and a bridge across Papillion Creek. This proposed road would serve an area located a considerable distance from the area served by the closed roads. Thus, the new road would serve different people in a different area for a different purpose than that previously served by the closed roads.

"Justification for any replacement road is based on the need of the traveling public at the time. U.S. Highway 73–75 and Nebraska State Highway 31 provided, and still provide, adequate travel facilities to Bellevue for the people who were previously served by the closed roads. In 1955 the Air Force contributed $17,000 for the construction of an interchange access connection in support of Highway 73–75. In addition, the Air Force contributed $278,000, under fiscal year 1962 access roads program, for the improvement of East road, located east of the base, which extends in a north-south direction connecting with the southern boundary of Bellevue.

"It is a well-established principle of law that a State or other public entity is entitled to compensation for the permanent closure of a public highway only to the extent that as a result of such closure it is compelled to construct a substitute highway. Where it has been determined that a substitute road is not required, the courts have held that no compensation is required for the extinguishment of the public's right in the road easements. While Sarpy County did not seek a judicial determination at the time the roads were closed, it is reasonable to assume that had such action been taken, this same principle would have applied. While construction of the new road in the location proposed by the county would be of assistance to the undeveloped area south of Papillion Creek, it cannot properly be considered as a substitute for the roads that were closed.

"It is the normal policy of the Corps of Engineers to recommend the initiation of condemnation proceedings where no agreement can be reached between the Government and a State or local governmental agency as to the necessity for replacement roads. This procedure affords the Federal Government and the State or local governmental agency the opportunity to have the question of the need for replacement road facilities judicially determined. In this instance, the Federal Government did not initiate condemnation proceedings because extended negotiations between the county and the Government and studies conducted by the Bureau of Public Roads led all concerned to believe that agreement could be reached without court action.

"Since the opinions of the respective parties could not be reconciled and the Federal Government did not file a condemnation proceeding, the only remedy of the county commissioners was to have instituted a suit against the United States in the U.S. Court of Claims pursuant to the so-called Tucker Act (28 U.S.C. 1491); such suit, however, must be brought within 6 years of the accrual of the claim (28 U.S.C. 2501). In the instant case, by reason of the lapse of time, the right of the county to bring such suit is barred. The bill, S. 2339, would in effect waive this limitation and permit the county 1 year from enactment of this act to sue the United States."

The report of the Department of the Air Force to the chairman of the committee appears to contain certain conclusions of fact and interpretations of law which are disputed by the beneficiary of the bill (S. 2339) Sarpy County, Nebr. The committee notes that the sole purpose of this legislation is to confer on the U.S. Court of Claims jurisdiction to hear and determine the facts and render judgment thereon. Attempts to prejudge either the facts or law in this case clearly are inconsistent with the spirit and intent of the bill and the committee wishes to completely disassociate itself from any such effort.

It is normal procedure for the Government to file condemnation proceedings and thus giving a county such as Sarpy County, Nebr., its opportunity to be reimbursed for the fair market value for the "taking." If the Government does not condemn, the only remedy for the county is to institute a suit against the United States in the U.S. Court of Claims pursuant to the so-called Tucker Act (28 U.S.C. 1491).

The facts in this case were unusual. The Government did not take the county roads by condemnation but in effect took them by seizing possession. The Government then instituted negotiations with the county, which negotiations collapsed. During the period of negotiations, the time for filing suit by the county expired. The committee believes under these circumstances that the county should be afforded its day in court and therefore recommends favorable enactment of the bill S. 2339.

KANSAS JURISDICTION OVER CERTAIN STATE HIGHWAYS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2369) to retrocede to the State of Kansas exclusive jurisdiction over certain State highways bordering Fort Leavenworth Military Reservation and the U.S. penitentiary at Leavenworth which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with an amendment on page 2, line 4, after "1868", to strike out "which now remains within the boundaries of said Fort Leavenworth Military Reservation and Leavenworth Penitentiary lands and" and insert "(15 Stat. 238), which remains United States Government property,"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there is hereby retroceded to the State of Kansas by the United States exclusive jurisdiction over all of the following described areas bordering Fort Leavenworth Military Reservation and the United States Penitentiary at Leavenworth:

A strip of land one hundred feet in width along the southern boundary of the Fort Leavenworth Military Reservation, and along the southern boundary of the Leavenworth Penitentiary lands being that portion of the Fort Leavenworth Military Reservation donated for exclusive use as a public road by Act of Congress approved July 27, 1868 (15 Stat. 238), which remains United States Government property, being a part of State Highways Numbered 92 and 7, the highway numbered United States 73, and the public road known as Mount Zion Road;

Also, a strip of land one hundred feet in width being fifty feet on each side of the centerline of the highway numbered United States 73 and State Highway Numbered 7 extending from the north boundary of the above described one hundred-foot strip northwesterly to the point of intersection of the centerline of said highway with the westerly boundary of said Fort Leavenworth Military Reservation;

Also, that portion of the right-of-way of the public road known as Mount Zion Road which extends in a northwesterly direction along the southwesterly boundary of the Leavenworth Penitentiary lands.

SEC. 2. The retrocession of exclusive jurisdiction provided by this Act shall take effect upon acceptance by the State of Kansas.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1181), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The enactment of this measure into law will retrocede to the State of Kansas by the United States exclusive jurisdiction over certain State highways bordering the Fort Leavenworth Military Reservation and the U.S. penitentiary at Leavenworth.

EXPLANATION OF THE BILL

Fort Leavenworth Military Reservation is located on the Missouri River in Leavenworth County, Kans. It was originally established in 1827 on public domain lands, was subsequently expanded by the acquisition of small areas of privately owned lands, and currently comprises 5,971 acres. The area of the U.S. penitentiary at Leavenworth affected by this legislation abuts Fort Leavenworth on the south. By virtue of various legislative acts of the State of Kansas, the United States is vested with exclusive jurisdiction over the lands of both installations. The above areas are traversed or bordered by segments of State Highways 92 and 7, U.S. Highway 73, and Mount Zion Road. These highways are heavily traveled, were constructed by the State, are maintained by the State, and until recently were policed by State and municipal authorities. In September 1961, however, a local court ruled that neither the State nor its municipalities had jurisdiction over those portions of State highways within the boundaries of Federal installations. This, of course, has resulted in a serious disruption of law enforcement and the Federal authorities are unequipped to properly police these roads. The purpose of this bill, therefore, is to remedy the problem through a formal retrocession of jurisdiction by the Federal Government to State authorities. The retrocession of exclusive jurisdiction will take effect upon acceptance by the State of Kansas.

JURISDICTION OVER CERTAIN LAND IN MASSACHUSETTS

The bill (H.R. 393) to make retrocession to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts of jurisdiction over certain land in the vicinity of Fort Devens, Mass., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report

(No. 1182), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of H.R. 393 is to authorize the Secretary of the Army to adjust legislative jurisdiction exercised by the United States over lands located within the vicinity of Fort Devens, Mass.

EXPLANATION OF THE BILL

This measure if enacted into law will grant general authority to the Secretary of the Army to retrocede such legislative jurisdiction as he deems necessary within the vicinity of Fort Devens, Mass. The language of the bill as passed by the House of Representatives is in accordance with the suggestion of the Department of the Army, and is identical with previous enactments on the subject with respect to other military reservations such as Fort Sheridan, Ill., Fort Hancock, N.J., Eglin Air Force Base, Fla., and the Naval Supply Depot, Ogden, Utah. It is likewise in keeping with the position of the Interdepartmental Committee for the Study of Jurisdiction Over Federal Areas Within the States.

At issue at the moment is the question of jurisdiction over 3.6 acres of land comprising a portion of a public road. The Fort Devens Military Reservation was established in 1917 in Middlesex and Worcester Counties, near the town of Ayer, Mass., and currently embraces approximately 10,163 acres of Government-owned land. The United States is vested with exclusive jurisdiction over these lands by virtue of several acts of cession of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

The road referred to is a portion of public highway known as Shirley-Ayer Road, which traverses the northly section of Fort Devens; it is a 50-foot-wide strip about 0.6 mile in length; it is also considered a portion of West Main Street of the town of Ayer. For many years there has been a difference of opinion as to the legislative jurisdiction over this road. The justice of the First District Court of Northern Middlesex County has steadfastly contended that the United States acquired the underlying fee title and exclusive jurisdiction; the military authorities have been equally firm in their opinion that the Federal Government is not the fee owner, and irrespective of ownership, legislative jurisdiction still remains in the Commonwealth. By reason that both the Commonwealth and the United States contend, respectively, that jurisdiction is in the other party, there is very little law enforcement on subject roadway. The retrocession of jurisdiction to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts herein proposed would rectify this situation.

FISCAL DATA

The enactment of this legislation will not result in any cost to the Federal Government.

CONVEYANCE TO CITY OF ST. PAUL OF CERTAIN LAND IN ST. PAUL, MINN.

The bill (H.R. 4177) to authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey to the city of St. Paul, Minn., all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain lands heretofore conveyed to such city was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1183), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of H.R. 4177 is to direct the Secretary of the Army to grant to the city of St. Paul, Minn., a release of certain reservations and conditions contained in a deed from the United States to the city of St. Paul dated July 5, 1928, covering a small parcel of land within the city of St. Paul, entered into pursuant to the act of May 29, 1928 (45 Stat. 956); the release is to be conditioned upon the payment of the fair market value of the interest to be conveyed, as determined by the Secretary of the Army after appraisal. Senator MCCARTHY introduced an identical bill in the Senate (S. 799).

BACKGROUND OF THE BILL

The property involved comprises 15,500 square feet of land described as lot 3 and part of lot 4 in block 31 of the plat of St. Paul proper. It was part of the military reservation originally known as the St. Paul Quartermaster and Commissary Depot situated within the city of St. Paul, Minn., and was acquired without cost by the United States from the city of St. Paul by deed dated August 19, 1882. The act of May 29, 1928 (45 Stat. 956), authorized and directed the Secretary of War to convey to the city of St. Paul this property upon payment of $34,750. This amount was considered to be the fair market value. In compliance with this act the Secretary of War on July 5, 1928, executed a deed conveying said property to the city subject to the following reverter clause:

"*Provided always,* That this conveyance is made upon the express condition and limitation that the above described premises shall be limited to the retention and use for public purposes, and upon cessation of such retention and use shall revert to the United States without notice, demand, or action brought."

The city of St. Paul has to date allocated the use of subject property for public streets, parkway, and park purposes. However, the city has advised that it has under consideration use of a portion of the property for erection of a replica of the original Winter Carnival Ice Palace; that while the city believes such to be a public use, it wishes to avoid any possible question of title; and, therefore, is desirous of obtaining a release of the aforementioned deed restrictions. By reason that these restrictions were imposed pursuant to an act of Congress (45 Stat. 956) the parties are without authority to remove the same. This bill would, in effect authorize the Secretary of the Army to grant the necessary release.

FISCAL DATA

The enactment of this bill will have no effect on the budgetary requirements of the Department of Defense.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, shortly I shall have to go to the State Department. The majority leader has asked me to examine Calendar Order No. 1118, H.R. 4177, which would convey to St. Paul, Minn., all rights, title and interest of the United States in and to certain lands heretofore conveyed to that city. The bill provides for fair market value payment, and therefore the bill in no way contravenes the Morse formula.

CHANGE IN DESIGNATED USE OF CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY AT FORT WALTON BEACH, FLA.

The bill (H.R. 7248) to change the designated use of certain real property conveyed by the Department of the Air Force to the city of Fort Walton Beach, Fla., under the terms of Public Law 86-194 was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1184), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of H.R. 7248 is to amend Public Law 86-194 to permit the use of property previously conveyed by that law to include "educational purposes."

EXPLANATION OF THE BILL

Public Law 86-194, enacted August 25, 1959, authorized the conveyance of 338.75 acres of land on the Eglin Air Force Base, Fla., to the city of Fort Walton Beach, Fla., to be used as a municipal golf course and for other recreational purposes. The city paid the fair market value for the property. Public Law 86-194 contains a reverter clause which provides that "if such city shall ever cease to use such real property for a municipal golf course and other recreational purposes, the title thereto shall revert to the United States, which shall have the right of immediate entry thereon."

Local authorities in Fort Walton Beach, Fla., now desire to use approximately 100 acres of the land originally conveyed, for the construction of a junior college and secondary school facilities. In light of the above referred to reverter clause, limiting the use of the property for "recreational purposes" the city authorities are unable to proceed with their plans without violating a stated condition of the original conveyance. It is therefore desired to amend Public Law 86-194 to expand the condition to include "educational purposes."

COMMITTEE ACTION

The committee approves this measure since it is apparent that the property, for which the city paid the fair market value, will continue to be used for the benefit of the public and is in keeping with the intent of Public Law 86-194.

FISCAL DATA

The enactment of this measure into law will not involve expenditure of any Federal funds.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LAND TO CITY OF OROVILLE, CALIF.

The bill (H.R. 7499) to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force or his designee to convey 0.25 acre of land to the city of Oroville, Calif., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1185), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of H.R. 7499 is to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to convey approximately one-quarter acre of land to the city of Oroville, Calif., without consideration. This small tract of land had previously been donated by the city to the Air Force.

EXPLANATION OF THE BILL

The city of Oroville, Calif., formerly owned the land which is the subject of this legislation. By quitclaim deed executed October 14, 1955, the city conveyed this land to the Government without charge as the site for the construction of an Air Force gap filler station.

Subsequently, operational requirements changed, and plans by the Department of the Air Force to install the gap filler at this location were canceled.

Inasmuch as the property is excess to Department of the Air Force requirements, the Department has, in accordance with routine disposal procedures, screened the property with the Departments of the Army and Navy to determine if there is a requirement for this property within the Department of Defense. The screening process within the Department has been completed with negative results.

The Department of the Air Force has advised the Committee on Armed Services that the estimated fair market value of the property is less than $1,000.

The city of Oroville has now notified the Department of the Air Force that, in view of the absence of any defense requirement for this property, it desires return of the property for city use. Notwithstanding the city's desire for return of the property and the official position of the Department of the Air Force that the property should properly be transferred back to the city without consideration, the provisions of the Federal Property Act will prevent such a transfer. Consequently, this legislation is required to authorize the return of this property to the city of Oroville.

FISCAL DATA

The enactment of this legislation will not result in the expenditure of any Federal funds.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the majority leader, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] asked me to look at Calendar Order No. 1120, H.R. 7499, which seeks to convey to Oroville, Calif., land of less than $1,000 fair market value which was originally quitclaimed by the city to the United States without compensation.

Standing alone, the bill could be thought to violate the Morse formula technically. I wish to make a statement in regard to the bill for the RECORD, because I believe that in principle, it does not violate the Morse formula.

The bill involves a small piece of property which the city of Oroville, Calif., donated to the Federal Government through the Air Force for what is known as a filler gap location for a radar screen. The Federal Government, through the Air Force, was perfectly willing to pay full fair market value for that little piece of property at the time, but the City Council or Oroville, Calif.—and quite properly, I believe, through a patriotic impulse—adopted a resolution which Senators will find in the committee report. I ask unanimous consent, without taking the time to read the resolution, that an excerpt from the report, including a portion of the resolution, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The following excerpt from the city's resolution, approved at the regular meeting of the city council on October 3, 1955, and signed by the mayor, is indicative of the city's lofty motives: "* * * for the construction of a permanent low altitude gap filler radar screen; and

"Whereas said radar screen is necessary and appropriate for the defense of the United States of America by the U.S. Air Force and will be used by the U.S. Air Force for such purpose and particularly for defense of the people of the city of Oroville and the surrounding area; and

"Whereas, therefore it appears to be to the best interest of the people of the city of Oroville that said land be quitclaimed to the United States of America for such purposes without consideration: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved* * * *."

Mr. MORSE. The resolution pointed out that, after all, the Federal Government was making the installation for the protection of the citizens of Oroville, and therefore it offered to give the piece of property to the Federal Government. That was done.

I say most respectfully to the Defense Department, as well as to the donors, it is too bad that, at that point, a reversionary clause was not inserted, which would have made it perfectly clear that if the property were not used for the purpose for which it was donated, it would revert to the municipal government. Yet one cannot read the resolution and the dealings between the city of Oroville and the Federal Government without coming to the conclusion that this intent was taken for granted. In my judgment, one could question the legal draftsmanship of the original conveyance on this point. The Federal Government has however, now found the property to be surplus. This type of filler gap program has been disbanded, and the Federal Government now wishes to clear any question as to the title of the property and to have it revest in the city of Oroville. I believe it is quite appropriate that it should.

But I make this statement now so that no one in the future will cite the Oroville, Calif., case to show that the Morse formula applies to property transfers when the property is donated by the city, county, or State, and there is no intention that there should be any reversionary clause attached. The Morse formula does apply when there is no intention that the property should come back to a city in case the property is no longer to be used for the Federal purpose for which the donation was made.

In my State there arose the famous Roseberg case, in which, as the senior Senator from Oregon, I took the position that the property fell under the Morse formula. I applied it to my State. I pointed out that if the city intended that the property should revert, a reversionary clause should have been included in the grant. In the Roseberg, Oreg., case there was not the background history that exists in the Oroville, Calif., case.

One cannot read the record without coming to the conclusion that Oroville could have had the full market value for the property at the time of the transfer if it had so desired. The Federal Government was willing to pay it, but the City Council of Oroville, Calif., said, "We donate it, because it is for defense purposes, for the benefit of the people of Oroville. We donate it. Do not pay a cent." Now the Federal Government has given up the Federal use, the so-called filler gap program for the radar screen in that part of California. The city council resolution speaks for itself.

I want the RECORD to show that, in my opinion, the Morse formula, under the surrounding facts and circumstances of this case, does not apply. But it does not follow that it cannot apply in any other case in which a donation was made without any reversionary clause and in which the city or council or State then tried to get the property back for nothing. That would not be permissible under the Morse formula. I shall continue to object to all such cases. However, when there is a background such as this, I think it would be a misuse of the Morse formula to apply it. Therefore, I raise no objection.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LAND IN SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH, TO BOARD OF EDUCATION

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 9021) to authorize the conveyance of two tracts of land situated in Salt Lake City, Utah, to the Board of Education of Salt Lake City which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services, with amendments, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That (a) the reversionary clause effective with respect to the following described tract of land which was conveyed by the United States to the Mount Olivet Cemetery Association of Salt Lake City, Utah, pursuant to the Act of January 23, 1909 (35 Stat. 589), shall not operate with respect to such tract of land so long as such tract is used for the public purpose specified in such Act or for public school purposes:

Beginning at the southwest corner of the Mount Olivet Cemetery Association property (said point being 100 feet north from the original southwest corner of the Fort Douglas Military Reservation and in the north line of Sunnyside Avenue, Salt Lake City, Utah); running thence north 0 degrees 00 minutes 28 seconds east along the west line of the cemetery property 237.76 feet; thence southeasterly along the arc of a 573-foot radius curve to the right (tangent to which bears south 57 degrees 37 minutes 13 seconds east) a distance of 157.06 feet; thence south 41 degrees 49 minutes 59 seconds east 21.23 feet; thence southeasterly along the arc of a 730.146-foot radius curve to the left, a distance of 183.86 feet, to a point in the south line of the cemetery property, which is the north line of Sunnyside Avenue; thence south 89 degrees 59 minutes 50 seconds west along said north line of Sunnyside Avenue 272.77 feet to the point of beginning. Containing 0.75 acre.

(b) The reversionary clause effective with respect to the following described tract of land conveyed by the United States to the Mount Olivet Cemetery Association of Salt Lake City, Utah, pursuant to the Act of January 23, 1909 (35 Stat. 589), and subsequently conveyed by such association to Salt Lake City, Utah, pursuant to the Act of April 3, 1952 (66 Stat. 36), shall not be operable with respect to such tract so long as such tract is used for the public purposes specified in such Acts or for public school purposes:

Beginning at the original southwest corner of the Fort Douglas Military Reservation, which is located in Salt Lake City, Utah, and running thence north 0 degrees 00 minutes 28 seconds east along the west line of said military reservation, a distance of 100.00 feet, to the north line of Sunnyside Avenue;

thence north 89 degrees 59 minutes 50 seconds east along said line 272.77 feet to a point in a curve, tangent to which bears south 56 degrees 15 minutes 38 seconds east; thence southeasterly along said curve to the left having a radius of 730.146 feet, a distance of 94.71 feet to a point of intersection with the west line of 14th East Street produced north; thence south 0 degrees 02 minutes 40 seconds west 52.64 feet to the south line of Sunnyside Avenue; thence south 89 degrees 59 minutes 50 seconds west along said south line of Sunnyside Avenue which is also the south line of the said military reservation, a distance of 354.77 feet to the point of beginning, containing 0.77 acre, more or less.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An Act to authorize the use of two tracts of land situated in Salt Lake City, Utah, for public school purposes."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1186), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXPLANATION OF AMENDMENT

The amendment made by the committee is in the form of a substitute of new language in lieu of that proposed in the House-passed bill. The basic purpose of the draft bill is to broaden the reversionary clause with respect to a tract of land conveyed by the United States to the Mount Olivet Cemetery Association of Salt Lake City, Utah, pursuant to the act of January 23, 1909 (35 Stat. 589), to permit two small contiguous portions of the tract of land in question to be used for public school purposes. The draft bill as passed by the House of Representatives approaches the problem in a rather circuitous manner. The committee, therefore, determined it advisable to clarify the meaning by rewriting the bill in its entirety, thus approaching the problem directly. The objective and the intent of the bill remains the same.

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The effect of the bill would be to permit the city of Salt Lake, Utah, and the Mount Olivet Cemetery Association to convey to the Board of Education of Salt Lake City, Utah, two small parcels of land totaling about 1½ acres for public school purposes. Both parcels were a part of the original conveyance to the Mount Olivet Cemetery Association provided for under the act of January 23, 1909, and the underlying interest of one tract still remains with the cemetery association. Both tracts are subject to present public use for State and highway purposes. Senator BENNETT (for himself and Mr. Moss) introduced an identical bill in the Senate (S. 1478).

BACKGROUND OF THE BILL

The property described in the bill was formerly part of the Fort Douglas Military Reservation, Utah. Camp Douglas was established in 1862 as a Regular Army post on approximately 4 square miles of public domain lands set aside for military use. The reservation boundary lines were readjusted from time to time by reduction in public land areas, acquisition by purchase of additional land, and transfers and disposals of other areas. Of the original reservation, many areas have been transferred or conveyed to various Federal, State, and local agencies. Fort Douglas, as the reservation was designated in 1878, currently comprises 3,692.28 acres of public domain land and 3,343.89 acres of land acquired by the United States in fee at a cost of $99,600.

Pursuant to the act of January 23, 1909 (35 Stat. 589), the Secretary of War executed a deed on February 10, 1909, conveying to the Mount Olivet Cemetery Association of Salt Lake City, Utah, a 50-acre tract of land, located at the extreme southwest corner of Fort Douglas, which was part of the public domain lands originally set aside for the establishment of the reservation. The deed of conveyance, as required by the enabling act, provides that the land shall be used forever as a cemetery for the burial of the dead and that when it ceases to be used for such purposes shall revert to the United States. The act of January 23, 1909, also provided that the deed would be delivered when the grantee conveyed or caused to be conveyed to the United States in fee simple a certain tract of land containing 150.92 acres. This condition was satisfied by L. H. Young and wife and J. A. Young and wife in January 16, 1909, with the Mount Olivet Cemetery Association paying the consideration of $12,500 to the Government's grantors.

The granting clause in the deed of the cemetery association also contained the following words: "subject to the right-of-way, 100 feet wire, along the south boundary of said premises which was granted to Le Grand Young by deed of the Secretary of War, dated October 8, 1906, under the act of Congress of June 29, 1906; and subject also to the grant to the city of Salt Lake, Utah, of a right-of-way for a boulevard by act of Congress of February 25, 1907."

The Government's grant of the hundred-foot right-of-way to Le Grand Young for a railroad and wagon road was in turn, subject to public use for highway purposes.

The described right-of-way is not a part of Sunnyside Avenue and is the land described in paragraph (b) of the proposed bill, consisting of 0.77 acre, more or less.

The small tract of land described in paragraph (a) of the bill contains 0.75 acre and is contiguous to that described in paragraph (b). It is likewise a part of the original land conveyed to the Mount Olivet Cemetery Association under the act of January 23, 1909. However, under the act of April 3, 1952 (66 Stat. 36), the Mount Olivet Cemetery Association conveyed to the city of Salt Lake, Utah, approximately 2 acres of their holdings to enable the city to construct a continuation of Eighth South Street into Sunnyside Avenue. The 0.75 acre of land described in paragraph (a) is a part of this 2-acre parcel not actually used for the street extension. The deed of conveyance contained a provision that such tract shall be used for State or highway purposes and so long as used for such purposes the reversionary clause set forth in the act of January 23, 1909 (35 Stat. 589), would not be operable with respect to the tract.

Both parcels of land described in the bill are adjacent to the other property now being acquired by the school board for the expansion of East Side High School in Salt Lake City. The enactment of this measure will enable the city of Salt Lake and the Mount Olivet Cemetery Association to convey their interest in these two tracts of land to the school board and permit the use of the land for public school purposes. If it should cease to be used for such purposes, however, title would revert to the U.S. Government.

The two parcels of land in question have, over the years, become widely separated from the present boundary of Fort Douglas through various disposals of reservation lands.

COMMITTEE ACTION

The U.S. Government appears to have been properly compensated for the land conveyed to the Mount Olivet Cemetery Association by the act of January 23, 1909, of which these two small parcels are a part. There is no current or foreseeable military requirement for the property and, since the provisions of the bill would assure continued use of the property for worthy public purposes, and provide a reverter to the United States if such uses should cease, the committee believes the public interest will best be served by the enactment of this measure and so recommends.

FISCAL DATA

The enactment of this measure will not entail the expenditure of any Government funds.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, H.R. 9021 seeks to amend the reversionary clause of a 1909 act to permit the use of two small parcels of property for public school purposes. These two small parcels were originally included in a larger tract for which the Federal Government was compensated. The larger tract was conveyed subject to two highway easements. The bill, if enacted, would permit the two small parcels to be conveyed to the school district without a cloud on the title.

Since the Federal Government in 1909 received a fair market consideration for the property as a whole, it is my view that the transaction now contemplated would not fall under the Morse formula requirement. The title to the property ought to be cleared.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I think there is another bill to which I should refer, Calendar No. 1122, H.R. 10736, which permits police protection by the State of Virginia to be afforded to a military hospital. There is no application of the Morse formula involved in that bill.

Therefore, to repeat, since Calendar No. 1118, H.R. 4177, contains a fair market value clause, Calendar No. 1119, H.R. 7248, but broadens a reversionary clause regarding land for which a fair market price was paid, and I have just discussed Calendar No. 1120, H.R. 7499, Calendar No. 1121, H.R. 9021, and Calendar No. 1122, H.R 10736, I would hold that the Morse formula does not apply, for the reasons I have set forth, to any of them.

I thought I should make this statement for the benefit of the majority leader. I must leave to go to the State Department. I understood that the majority leader wanted to call the bills up this afternoon. I have no objection to them.

ADJUSTMENT OF LEGISLATIVE JURISDICTION EXERCISED BY THE UNITED STATES OVER LANDS COMPRISING THE U.S. NAVAL HOSPITAL, PORTSMOUTH, VA.

The bill (H.R. 10736) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to adjust the legislative jurisdiction exercised by the United States over lands comprising the U.S. naval hospital, Portsmouth, Va., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1187), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of H.R. 10736 is to transfer legislative jurisdiction now exclusively vested in the Federal Government to the State of Virginia in order that adequate police protection may be provided by local authorities on the military reservation. This proposal is a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for the 88th Congress and has the approval of the Bureau of the Budget.

EXPLANATION OF THE BILL

The bill will, if enacted, provide authority to the Secretary of the Navy to retrocede to the State of Virginia all, or such portion as he may deem desirable for relinquishment, of the legislative jurisdiction the United States may possess over any lands comprising the U.S. Naval Hospital, Portsmouth, Va.; the retrocession to take effect upon acceptance by the State of Virginia. As a matter of policy, concurrent jurisdiction is always retained by the United States.

The U.S. naval hospital embraces approximately 108 acres of Government-owned land and the major portion of the hospital facility consists of the initial 79 acres acquired by conveyances in 1799 and 1840. The United States is vested with exclusive jurisdiction over these lands by virtue of several acts of cession of the State of Virginia.

Because the major portion of the hospital facility, comprising a parcel of 79 acres, is held by the Government under exclusive jurisdiction, local police authorities are unable to provide regular police protection. It is understood that, as an emergency measure pending such authority to effect ordinary police patrol as may follow upon retrocession of concurrent jurisdiction, the city of Portsmouth has agreed to respond to specific calls for police assistance within the hospital enclave notwithstanding the lack of legislative jurisdiction. The requirement is for police adequate to protect hospital patients and staff, including nurses quartered at the installation, as well as personal property, buildings, and grounds in an urban environment in which the hospital is physically isolated from other Government activities. Prior to 1957 there had been a civilian guard force. From that time until July 1963, security had been afforded by utilizing limited-duty personnel assigned by the Navy's Enlisted Personnel Distribution Office. Since July 1, 1963, that Office has been unable to provide such personnel.

The Interdepartmental Committee for the Study of Jurisdiction Over Federal Areas Within the States, in its report approved by the President April 27, 1956, stated, in pertinent part, that "the most immediate need, in the view of the Committee is to make provision for the retrocession of unnecessary jurisdiction to the States." The Committee accordingly recommended that section 355 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended, be further amended "so as to give to the heads of Federal agencies and their designees the necessary authority to retrocede legislative jurisdiction to the States." There are presently pending for consideration S. 815 and H.R. 4068 and H.R. 443, 88th Congress, bills designed to implement generally the recommendations of that Committee.

The Department of Defense has heretofore endorsed the enactment of such general legislation which would authorize heads of executive agencies to adjust legislative jurisdiction over installations under their control to meet the needs of individual installations as determined by the agency heads. Most recently, the Department of Defense appeared in favor of passage of S. 815 at hearings on that bill.

H.R. 10736 illustrates, and is consistent with, the general principle and with Department of Defense endorsement of specific legislation authorizing retrocessions which have been enacted within the last few years pending enactment of the general effort.

Accordingly, because it has been decided that effective law enforcement can best be obtained for this installation by local police effort, and in light of the fact that the State has specifically shown its willingness to accept such jurisdiction by passage at the 1964 session of its general assembly of an act, chapter 196, authorizing the Governor to accept such retrocession over the Portsmouth Naval Hospital as many be granted by the United States, the Department of the Navy on behalf of the Department of Defense recommends enactment of H.R. 10736 without awaiting action by the Congress on the abovementioned general bills. Passage of this bill will permit local police enforcement desired by the Navy over an area which the city is willing to police and in which it is logical for it to do so. Enactment of this measure will not involve the expenditure of any Department of Defense funds.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H.R. 11380) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

TRANSPORTATION OF HOUSE TRAILERS AND MOBILE DWELLINGS OF MEMBERS OF UNIFORMED SERVICES WITHIN THE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 8954) to amend section 409 of title 37, United States Code, to authorize the transportation of house trailers and mobile dwellings of members of uniformed services within the continental United States, within Alaska or between the continental United States and Alaska, and for other purposes which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services, with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That section 409 of title 37, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 409. Travel and transportation allowances: trailers

"Under regulations prescribed by the Secretaries concerned and in place of the transportation of baggage and household effects or payment of a dislocation allowance, a member, or in the case of his death his dependent, who would otherwise be entitled to transportation of baggage and household goods under section 406 of this title, may transport a house trailer or mobile dwelling within the continental United States, within Alaska, or between the continental United States and Alaska, for use as a residence by one of the following means—

"(1) transport the trailer or dwelling and receive a monetary allowance in place of transportation at a rate to be prescribed by the Secretaries concerned, but not more than 20 cents a mile;

"(2) deliver the trailer or dwelling to an agent of the United States for transportation by the United States or by commercial means; or

"(3) transport the trailer or dwelling by commercial means and be reimbursed by the United States subject to such rates as may be prescribed by the Secretaries concerned. However, the cost of transportation under clause (2) or the reimbursement under clause (3) may not be more than the lesser of (A) the current average cost for the commercial transportation of a house trailer or mobile dwelling; (B) 51 cents a mile; or (C) the cost of transporting the baggage and household effects of the member or his dependent plus the dislocation allowance authorized in section 407 of this title. Any payment authorized by this section may be made in advance of the transportation concerned. For the purposes of this section, 'continental United States' means the forty-eight contiguous States and the District of Columbia."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1189), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill as amended by the committee is as follows:

(a) The bill deletes the limitation of 36 cents per mile and inserts in lieu thereof 51 cents as the maximum ceiling which may be paid for the reimbursement of commercial transportation for mobile homes.

This increase is based upon a survey by the Department of Defense which has determined that 51 cents per mile is the current average cost of the movement of mobile homes. This includes 47 cents as the haul rate, plus 4 cents per mile for accessorial charges. The latter includes such items as permit fees, toll charges, etc. The 36 cents per mile is, therefore, unrealistic under existing conditions, in view of the current average cost as determined by the survey.

(b) The bill would extend the geographical coverage for reimbursement, presently limited to points within the continental United States, to the State of Alaska. Under the new language, reimbursement would be authorized for transportation of a mobile dwelling within Alaska or between the continental United States and Alaska.

(c) The bill adds new language which would permit the trailer to be transported by the United States. Under existing law, reimbursement is limited to transportation completed by commercial means. The principal purpose of this additional language is to permit the movement of trailers to points within Alaska where no commercial means for movement are available.

The housing shortage in Alaska is sufficiently critical to justify the extension of the trailer authority to this State.

COST

The Department of Defense has indicated that the additional annual cost of the bill, as amended by the committee, is as follows:

Army	$375,100
Navy	215,800
Marine Corps	Negligible
Air Force	484,100
Total	1,075,000

IMPROVED OPPORTUNITY FOR PROMOTION FOR CERTAIN OFFICERS IN THE NAVAL SERVICE

The bill (H.R. 10322) to extend the provisions of the act of August 11, 1959, Public Law 86-155, as amended (74 Stat. 396) to provide improved opportunity for promotion for certain officers in the naval service was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1190), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

This bill extends the so-called Navy and Marine Corps hump authority enacted in 1959 from June 30, 1965, until June 30, 1970. The basic law enacted in 1959 provided authority whereby the Navy and Marine Corps, under prescribed procedures, could mandatorily retire Regular officers in the grades of commander and captain, and Marine Corps equivalents, prior to the normal point of retirement. Normally, a commander twice failed of selection to the next higher grade would be retired after 26 years of service, and a captain at 30 years of service. Under this legislation, all officers affected must complete at least 20 years of service, but their retirement points will have been reduced from 1 to a maximum of 7 years.

This legislation has been necessary in order to provide an equitable promotion opportunity to the grades of commander and captain, and Marine Corps equivalents, for those officers who were commissioned during World War II.

During the period of extension—from 1965 to 1970—this authority will be used by the Navy and Marine Corps for the purpose of creating vacancies only for the grade of captain or colonel. The problem of the hump no longer exists in either the Navy or Marine Corps with respect to the grades of commander and lieutenant colonel. It should be pointed out that as a technical matter this authority would be in existence for the grade of commander or lieutenant colonel and could possibly be utilized by the boards for the elimination of officers whose performance did not justify their being continued on active duty for any purpose.

BACKGROUND

The premise of the hump extension authority contained in this bill is the same that necessitated the enactment of the original legislation in 1959. It is the fact that it is essential for the management of the Navy and Marine Corps that its career officers at any point in time be properly distributed in terms of years and experience throughout the grade structure. If this legislation had not been enacted in 1959, about three-fourths of all the Regular officers in the Navy and Marine Corps who were commissioned during World War II would have been forced into premature retirement. This result would have occurred because the anticipated vacancies would have been insufficient to provide a reasonable promotion opportunity for this group of officers, all of whom were commissioned within a 2- to 3-year period. This group in both the Navy and Marine Corps constitutes what is known as the World War II hump. The basic legislation, therefore, has been utilized to provide vacancies in addition to those caused by normal attrition in order to permit these younger officers to be selected into the grades of commander or lieutenant colonel, or captain or colonel. Without the vacancies, the younger officers would have been mandatorily retired due to nonselection after the completion of 20 years of active service.

REVIEW OF THE OPERATION OF THE AUTHORITY (PUBLIC LAW 86–155) TO DATE

The basic authority provides for two methods of mandatorily retiring Regular Navy and Marine Corps officers prior to the normal point of retirement. The first method, that was used by the Navy, provides that officers in the grade of captain who have served in grade for a period of 5 years will be subject to board consideration for the purpose of being either continued on active duty or being mandatorily retired. The second method, which has been utilized by the Marine Corps, is to provide for similar type boards for officers in the grade of colonel who have been twice failed of selection to the grade of brigadier general. For the grade of commander in the Navy and lieutenant colonel in the Marine Corps the basic authority provides that officers who have been twice failed of selection to the next higher grade will be subject to board action for the purpose of either being continued on active duty or being mandatorily retired.

The number of officers who either have been or will be mandatorily retired prior to their normal retirement point in the Navy and Marine Corps during the effective period of this law, between June 30, 1960, and June 30, 1965, is as follows: In the Navy, approximately 1,047 (or 35 percent) of the captains who have completed 5 years in grade were mandatorily retired under this authority; in the grade of commander, approximately 910 officers will have been mandatorily retired; in the Marine Corps, 240 colonels will have been mandatorily retired, with 30 continued on active duty for a normal career; in the grade of lieutenant colonel, 369 were mandatorily retired, and 3 continued.

The vacancies created under this legislation during the initial 5 year period have enabled the Navy to provide a 45-percent promotion opportunity to the grade of captain and a 65- to 75-percent rate to the grade of commander. Without these vacancies, there would have been only an approximate promotion opportunity of 30 percent to the grade of commander and about 25 percent to the grade of captain. In the Marine Corps, with respect to the grade of lieutenant colonel, without the enactment of this legislation, there would have been about a 25-percent opportunity for selection to this grade. With the vacancies created under this authority, a promotion opportunity of about 70 percent has been possible. With respect to the grade of colonel, the authority contemplated that the vacancies created would permit about a 60-percent promotion opportunity for this grade. Without this authority, Regular officers in the grade of lieutenant colonel would have been confronted with even less promotion opportunity than their counterparts in the Navy.

NEED FOR THE BILL

The need for extending the authority contained in this bill from June 30, 1965, to June 30, 1970, is the same as that underlying the original legislation, which is to provide a reasonable promotion opportunity to the grade of captain in the Navy and colonel in the Marine Corps.

Without the authority to create vacancies by mandatory retirement over the 5-year period in question, promotion opportunity to the grade of captain in the Navy and colonel in the Marine Corps would be only 30 percent. With this legislation, the opportunity will be 45 percent in the Navy and 60 percent in the Marine Corps.

In terms of the operation of the authority for the next 5 years, in the Navy there will be mandatorily retired approximately 448 officers in the grade of captain (347 unrestricted line and 101 other groups). In the Marine Corps 326 Regular colonels will be mandatorily retired over the 5-year period prior to the normal retirement point.

As indicated previously, there are no plans for the continued use of the authority for the purpose of mandatorily retiring twice-failed commanders and lieutenant colonels prior to the normal retirement point.

Neither the Navy nor the Marine Corps foresee the need of any use of this authority beyond June 30, 1970, at this time.

With the authority contained in the extension, both the Navy and Marine Corps will be able to retire officers in the grade of captain and colonel progressively over a 5-year period in order to assist in creating the vacancies for the officers in and behind the World War II hump for the purpose of moving these officers into the grades of captain and colonel.

It might be observed that if the extension is not granted, in addition to the lack of promotion opportunity, about one-half of the officers in the grade of colonel in the Marine Corps would be mandatorily retired in fiscal year 1972 and in the Navy, during this approximate time period, about 40 percent of the captains would be mandatorily retired.

SAVINGS PROVISION

Section 3 is a savings provision inserted for the purpose of conforming the changes in the retired serviceman's family protection plan to the provisions enacted in 1959 in the hump authority for this purpose. Basically, this provision operates to prevent the mandatory retirement of an officer under the hump authority from having his rights altered because of his early retirement.

Section 3 of Public Law 86–155 is a savings provision to protect the validity of changes or revocations of elections made by noncontinued officers under the Contingency Option Act. Under that act, a member of the Armed Forces may elect to receive reduced retired pay in order that his wife and children may have an annuity after his death. At the time of enactment of Public Law 86–155, elections under the Contingency Option Act had to be made before the member completed 18 years of service. Having made an election, the member could change or revoke it, but such a change or revocation would be void if the member retired within 5 years after making it. It was obviously probable that some of the officers who would be retired early under the hump law would have registered changes or revocations of elections which would be invalidated by their unexpectedly early retirement. In fairness to such officers a savings provision was inserted in the law to provide that such an officer's change or revocation is effective if made at such a time that it would have been effective if he had been permitted to complete his normal 26- or 30-year career.

The Contingency Option Act was amended by the act of October 4, 1961, Public Law 87–381, and was renamed the retired serviceman's family protection plan (codified in 10 U.S.C. 1431–1446). The 5-year waiting period was reduced to 3 years. Further, a serviceman, subject to the 3-year rule, may make an original election after his 18th year and may make a new election after having revoked an earlier one. Because of these changes, it is necessary, in section 2 of the proposed legislation, to amend section 3 of the hump law so as to afford protection to these newly authorized actions. It should be noted, however, that, in order to protect the actuarial soundness of the plan, an officer will not be able to enter or reenter the program after the date on which the board which considers him for continuation is convened. In other words, he is not permitted to wait until he knows that he is about to be retired before deciding to participate in the plan.

COST AND BUDGET DATA

The Department's letter concerning the proposed legislation indicates that its enactment would result in increased annual costs ranging from $497,000 in fiscal year 1966 to $4,774,000 in fiscal year 1970. For budgetary reasons it was necessary for the Department to state these increases as attributable to these years, but most of the additional cost represents expenditures that, in the absence of the proposed legislation, would have to be made in future years. The retirement of officers prior to their normal retirement points will, of course, cause increased expenditures through the retired pay appropriation until the time when the officers would have reached their normal retirement points. After that, until the officers' deaths, the expenditures in retired pay will be less, because the earlier an officer retires, the lower his retired pay.

Payments for unused leave, for travel from last duty station to home, and for the replacements' travel are all payments that would be made in later years, therefore, do not represent true costs.

There will be a reduction in active duty pay as the retiring officers are replaced by officers in lower pay brackets.

The only direct cost clearly attributable to the proposed legislation is the $234,000 that may be paid in readjustment pay to 117 colonels who will be eligible for the payment if they are retired under the legislation.

The costs which would result from not passing the legislation are probably greater. They are difficult to state in dollars and cents, since it is impossible to put a price tag on the loss in combat effectiveness that would result from the assessment of 70 percent attrition on the commanders and lieutenant colonels who are the war-tested hard core of our future leadership.

In the long run and in the overall view, the Committee on Armed Services believes that the monetary costs of the proposed legislation will be negligible.

AUTHORITY TO SELL CRUDE OIL FROM UMIAT FIELD, NAVAL PETROLEUM RESERVE NO. 4

The bill (H.R. 6299) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to produce and sell crude oil from the Umiat field, Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 4, for the purpose of making local fuel available for use in connection with the drilling, mechanical, and heating operations of those involved in oil and gas exploration and development work in the nearby areas outside Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 4, and for other purposes was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1193), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

This bill would provide temporary authorization, until January 1, 1969, for the Secretary of the Navy to produce and sell petroleum from the Umiat Field of Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 4 in Alaska. The purpose of this sale is to aid petroleum exploration and development in the nearby areas outside the naval petroleum reserve.

EXPLANATION

The Navy owns oil reserves at Umiat, Alaska, an area deep within the Arctic Circle, hundreds of miles from a town or city. The Umiat Field was discovered in 1945 during Navy exploration of Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 4. Exploration was suspended in 1954. Estimates of the recoverable oil in this field have varied from 30 to 122 million barrels. There is now no economical method for transporting oil out of the area.

Within recent years private oil companies have engaged in oil exploration and development in this area. Fuel requirements for commercial drilling on nearby lands outside the reserve must be airlifted from Fairbanks, a distance of 350 miles, or barged in from wells in Canada, 1,000 miles away. Consequently, the current cost of fuel oil at Umiat is very expensive—more than $35 a barrel compared with approximately $3 a barrel in Anchorage, Alaska. This oil is necessary as fuel for diesel-powered drilling equipment and to provide heating for the machines and men who operate the equipment.

The combined production capacity of the two wells that are almost immediately capable of providing the production contemplated by this bill is about 500,000 barrels over a period of less than 5 years. This production would be less than 1 percent of the oil in this one 6,000-acre field within the 23-million-acre reserve.

WHY CONGRESSIONAL ACTION REQUIRED

Under section 7422 of title 10, United States Code, oil is ordinarily produced from the naval petroleum reserve only to protect or conserve these reserves or whenever the oil is needed for national defense, and the production is authorized by joint resolution of the Congress.

If commercial oilfields are successfully developed outside the reserve, the private oil companies presumably will devise and develop means of transporting the oil out of that area. If this were done, the Navy would then have access to the oil it owns within the reserve so that this oil might be produced and used in times of national emergency. For this reason the Department of the Navy favors enactment of the bill.

FISCAL DATA

Enactment of this bill would not involve the expenditure of any Federal funds since the Navy plans that the sales contract will provide that the purchaser is responsible for all production costs. On the contrary, Government revenues will be increased by the amount of the purchase price.

The basic law, section 7430(b) of title 10, United States Code, requires public sale of production from the reserves to the highest qualified bidder. The committee was informed that the Navy plans to use the Seattle, Wash., posted price of marine diesel bunker fuel as the base price for the oil to be sold in the Umiat Field. This price would be increased by a differential factor that gives weight to the remoteness of the area. This weighted price would become the maximum at which the oil could be sold by the successful bidder to other explorers and developers in the area. The successful bidder will be the one that offers the largest return to the Department of the Navy from the weighted maximum price.

INCREASE IN BASIC RATES OF PAY FOR MEMBERS OF THE UNIFORMED SERVICES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business continue to be laid aside temporarily and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1126, the bill S. 3001, and that the bill be made the pending business.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The bill will be stated by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 3001) to amend title 37, United States Code, to increase the rates of basic pay for members of the uniformed services.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** (Mr. PROXMIRE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, S. 3001, the pending bill, was unanimously approved by the Senate Committee on Armed Forces on July 9. The purpose of the bill is to provide a simple and timely increase in basic pay for career members and the junior officers of our Armed Forces.

TIMELY INCREASE FOR MILITARY PERSONNEL

Ordinarly the committee would not recommend a military pay increase at this time, for it is well known that Congress passed military pay legislation in the previous session of Congress, which became effective October 1, 1963. However, since legislation increasing the pay of the civilian workers of the Federal Government, in even greater percentage, has now passed both Houses, it is only fair that a military pay increase be passed at this time in order to maintain a reasonable comparison in compensation trends for military personnel.

The budget of the President for this year included a pay increase not only for civil servants of the Government, but also for military personnel.

Following the enactment of the Military Pay Act of 1958, which provided for significant increases, there was no further military pay legislation until the Military Pay Act enacted last October, except for an adjustment in the allowances for quarters, effective January 1, 1963.

As Senators know, the civilian workers of the Federal Government, following a pay increase in 1958, also received increases in 1960, 1962, and except for the supergrades, January 1, 1964. The latter was an automatic increase provided for in the legislation of 1962.

As Senators are all aware, the Senate and the House of Representatives both approved legislation providing for a substantial civilian pay increase. That measure is now pending in conference.

It is now a regular part of the congressional procedure—almost ritualistic—to grant a civilian pay increase in every election year. The military have not been that fortunate. They have been compelled to wait, and I must assume some responsibility for delay, because I had delayed a military pay increase on one or two previous occasions, to see whether or not legislation providing for a civilian pay increase would finally be enacted. That carried the military pay increase over for another year. So the military has consistently been behind the civilian workers of the Federal Government with respect to timing in receiving a pay increase.

We all know that the legislation now in conference will be enacted into law, and under the circumstances an increase in military compensation is not only warranted at this time, but is imperative if we are to deal justly with those in the military services. Those who wear the uniform are entitled to the same consideration as those who carry on civilian work. Those who wear the uniform have no 40-hour week. They do not receive any overtime pay. They must work 90 hours a week. There are a number of other benefits that civilian workers have granted to them in their work that are not available to those in our armed services.

SUMMARY OF INCREASES

Mr. President, I turn now to the specific provisions of the bill. In summary, the bill provides for a 2.5-percent increase in basic pay for all personnel, enlisted and commissioned, with more than 2 years of service. In addition, for commissioned and warrant officers with less than 2 years of service, the bill provides for a 8.5-percent increase in basic pay.

AN 8.5 PERCENT INCREASE IN BASIC PAY FOR OFFICERS WITH LESS THAN 2 YEARS OF SERVICE

For the junior officers with less than 2 years of service the 8.5 percent increase would provide an average monthly increase of approximately $19 for the O–1 second lieutenant, and $22 for the O–2 first lieutenant. In terms of total annual compensation, the O–1 second lieutenant with dependents would receive $4,790, as compared with $4,563 at present. A first lieutenant would receive $5,388, as compared with $5,214 at present.

The reason that the commissioned personnel with less than 2 years of service will receive an 8.5-percent increase as compared with a 2.5-percent increase given to other members of the armed services lies in the fact that the commissioned personnel with less than 2 years of service have had no increase whatever since 1952 in their basic pay.

It may be remembered that when the Senate passed the last pay bill for the Armed Forces it allowed an increase for our commissioned personnel with less than 2 years of service, but after long discussion in conference that provision was lost. It went down the drain. This modest increase of $19 a month for a second lieutenant and $22 a month for a first lieutenant is thoroughly justified, in my opinion.

A 2.5-PERCENT INCREASE IN BASIC PAY FOR ALL PERSONNEL WITH OVER 2 YEARS OF SERVICE

Mr. President, for officers with over 2 years of service the bill provides a 2.5-percent increase in basic pay which would authorize average monthly increases as follows: For the O–2 first lieutenant, $11; for the O–3 captain, $15; for the O–4 major, $18; for the O–5 lieutenant colonel, $22; for the O–6 colonel, $26; and for general officers, O–7 brigadier general through O–10 chief of staff, a range from $31 to $49 per month.

Therefore, all Members of the Senate can see that these increases are extremely modest.

As an example of the effect on total annual compensation for officers with typical years of service, the O–1 first lieutenant with dependents would receive $7,735 as compared to $7,595.

For enlisted personnel the effect of the 2.5-percent increase on those with typical years of service with dependents is as follows: The E–4 would receive $4,158, as compared to $4,098 at present. The E–6 would receive $5,575, as compared to $5,480 at present, and the E–9 would receive $7,783 as compared to $7,638 at present. Table 2, beginning on page 6 of the report, sets forth the amounts for each pay grade. Those figures show that these increases are very small indeed.

I ask unanimous consent that table No. 2 be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE NO. 2.—*Examples of present pay and allowances with those proposed for fiscal year 1965 (S. 3001)*

OFFICERS

Pay grade	Title	Number in grade, fiscal year 1965	Typical years of service	Present		Proposed			Alternative or additional (no change)	Monthly amount
				Type	Monthly amount	Monthly amount	Increase	Percent increase		
0-10	Chief of Staff; Chief of Naval Operations; Commandant, USMC; Chairman JCS.	5	30	Basic pay	$1,970.00	$2,019.30	$49.30	2.5		
				Personal allowance	[1] 333.33	[1] 333.33	0	0		
				Quarters allowance with dependents.	[1] 201.00	[1] 201.00	0	0	Quarters allowance without dependents.	[1] $160.20
				Subsistence allowance	[1] 47.88	[1] 47.88	0	0	Flight pay (if eligible)	165.00
				Total, monthly	2,552.21	2,601.51	49.30	1.9		
				Total, annual	30,626.52	31,218.12	591.60	1.9		
0-10	General, admiral	32	30	Basic pay	1,785.00	1,829.70	44.70	2.5		
				Personal allowance	[1] 183.33	[1] 183.33	0	0		
				Quarters allowance with dependents.	[1] 201.00	[1] 201.00	0	0	Quarters allowance without dependents.	[1] 160.20
				Subsistence allowance	[1] 47.88	[1] 47.88	0	0	Flight pay (if eligible)	165.00
				Total, monthly	2,217.21	2,261.91	44.70	2.0		
				Total, annual	26,606.52	27,142.92	536.40	2.0		
0-9	Lieutenant general, vice admiral.	110	30	Basic pay	1,575.00	1,614.30	39.30	2.5		
				Personal allowance	[1] 41.67	[1] 41.67	0	0		
				Quarters allowance with dependents.	[1] 201.00	[1] 201.00	0	0	Quarters allowance without dependents.	[1] 160.20
				Subsistence allowance	[1] 47.88	[1] 47.88	0	0	Flight pay (if eligible)	165.00
				Total, monthly	1,865.55	1,904.85	39.30	2.1		
				Total, annual	22,386.60	22,858.20	471.60	2.1		
0-8	Major general, rear admiral (upper half).	495	30	Basic pay	1,420.00	1,455.60	35.60	2.5		
				Quarters allowance with dependents.	[1] 201.00	[1] 201.00	0	0	Quarters allowance without dependents.	[1] 160.20
				Subsistence allowance	[1] 47.88	[1] 47.88	0	0	Flight pay (if eligible)	165.00
				Total, monthly	1,668.88	1,704.48	35.60	2.1		
				Total, annual	20,026.56	20,453.76	427.20	2.1		
0-7	Brigadier general, rear admiral (lower half).	643	28	Basic pay	1,235.00	1,266.00	31.00	2.5		
				Quarters allowance with dependents.	[1] 201.00	[1] 201.00	0	0	Quarters allowance without dependents.	[1] 160.20
				Subsistence allowance	[1] 47.88	[1] 47.88	0	0	Flight pay (if eligible)	165.00
				Total, monthly	1,483.88	1,514.88	31.00	2.0		
				Total, annual	17,806.56	18,178.56	372.00	2.0		
0-6	Colonel, captain	15,371	24	Basic pay	1,000.00	1,025.10	25.10	2.5		
				Quarters allowance with dependents.	[1] 170.10	[1] 170.10	0	0	Quarters allowance without dependents.	[1] 140.10
				Subsistence allowance	[1] 47.88	[1] 47.88	0	0	Flight pay (if eligible)	245.00
				Total, monthly	1,217.98	1,243.08	25.10	2.1		
				Total, annual	14,615.76	14,916.96	301.20	2.1		

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE No. 2.—*Examples of present pay and allowances with those proposed for fiscal year 1965 (S. 3001)*—Continued

OFFICERS

Pay grade	Title	Number in grade, fiscal year 1965	Typical years of service	Present		Proposed			Alternative or additional (no change)	Monthly amount
				Type	Monthly amount	Monthly amount	Increase	Percent increase		
O-5	Lieutenant colonel, commander.	37,461	21	Basic pay	$855.00	$876.30	$21.30	2.5		
				Quarters allowance with dependents.	[1] 157.50	[1] 157.50	0	0	Quarters allowance without dependents.	$[1]130.20
				Subsistence allowance	[1] 47.88	[1] 47.88	0	0	Flight pay (if eligible)	245.00
				Total, monthly	1,060.38	1,081.68	21.30	2.0		
				Total, annual	12,724.56	12,980.16	255.60	2.0		
O-4	Major, lieutenant commander.	56,284	19	Basic pay	740.00	758.40	18.40	2.5		
				Quarters allowance with dependents.	[1] 145.05	[1] 145.05	0	0	Quarters allowance without dependents.	[1] 120.00
				Subsistence allowance	[1] 47.88	[1] 47.88	0	0	Flight pay (if eligible)	240.00
				Total, monthly	932.93	951.33	18.40	1.9		
				Total, annual	11,195.16	11,415.96	220.80	1.9		
O-3	Captain, lieutenant	106,243	8	Basic pay	565.00	579.00	14.00	2.5		
				Quarters allowance with dependents.	[1] 130.05	[1] 130.05	0	0	Quarters allowance without dependents.	[1] 105.00
				Subsistence allowance	[1] 47.88	[1] 47.88	0	0	Flight pay (if eligible)	185.00
				Total, monthly	742.93	756.93	14.00	1.8		
				Total, annual	8,915.16	9,083.16	168.00	1.8		
O-2	1st lieutenant, lieutenant (j.g.).	55.751	4	Basic pay	465.00	476.70	11.70	2.5		
				Quarters allowance with dependents.	[1] 120.00	[1] 120.00	0	0	Quarters allowance without dependents.	[1] 95.10
				Subsistence allowance	[1] 47.88	[1] 47.88	0	0	Flight pay (if eligible)	150.00
				Total, monthly	632.88	644.58	11.70	1.8		
				Total, annual	7,594.56	7,734.96	140.40	1.8		
O-1	2d lieutenant, ensign	50,894	0	Basic pay	222.30	241.20	18.90	8.5		
				Quarters allowance with dependents.	[1] 110.10	[1] 110.10	0	0	Quarters allowance without dependents.	[1] 85.20
				Subsistence allowance	[1] 47.88	[1] 47.88	0	0	Flight pay (if eligible)	100.00
				Total, monthly	380.28	399.18	18.90	5.0		
				Total, annual	4,563.36	4,790.16	226.80	5.0		
W-4	Chief warrant, commissioned warrant.	3,366	24	Basic pay	635.00	651.00	16.00	2.5		
				Quarters allowance with dependents.	[1] 145.05	[1] 145.05	0	0	Quarters allowance without dependents.	[1] 120.00
				Subsistence allowance	[1] 47.88	[1] 47.88	0	0	Flight pay (if eligible)	165.00
				Total, monthly	827.93	843.93	16.00	1.9		
				Total, annual	9,935.16	10,127.16	192.00	1.9		
W-3	do	4,627	21	Basic pay	540.00	553.50	13.50	2.5		
				Quarters allowance with dependents.	[1] 130.05	[1] 130.05	0	0	Quarters allowance without dependents.	[1] 105.00
				Subsistence allowance	[1] 47.88	[1] 47.88	0	0	Flight pay (if eligible)	140.00
				Total, monthly	717.93	731.43	13.50	1.8		
				Total, annual	8,615.16	8,777.16	162.00	1.8		
W-2	do	4,999	18	Basic pay	470.00	481.80	11.80	2.5		
				Quarters allowance with dependents.	[1] 120.00	[1] 120.00	0	0	Quarters allowance without dependents.	[1] 95.10
				Subsistence allowance	[1] 47.88	[1] 47.88	0	0	Flight pay (if eligible)	135.00
				Total, monthly	637.88	649.68	11.80	1.8		
				Total, annual	7,654.56	7,796.16	141.60	1.8		
W-1	Warrant officer	2,772	14	Basic pay	405.00	415.20	10.20	2.5		
				Quarters allowance with dependents.	[1] 110.10	[1] 110.10	0	0	Quarters allowance without dependents.	[1] 85.20
				Subsistence allowance	[1] 47.88	[1] 47.88	0	0	Flight pay (if eligible)	130.00
				Total, monthly	562.98	573.18	10.20	1.8		
				Total, annual	6,755.76	6,878.16	122.40	1.8		

ENLISTED

Pay grade	Title	Number in grade, fiscal year 1965	Typical years of service	Type	Present monthly amount	Proposed monthly amount	Increase	Percent increase	Alternative or additional (no change)	Monthly amount
E-9	Sergeant major or master chief petty officer.	13,546	20	Basic pay	$485.00	$497.10	$12.10	2.5	Sea and foreign duty pay	$22.50
				Quarters allowance with dependents.	[1] 120.00	[1] 120.00	0	0	Quarters allowance without dependents.	[1] 85.20
				Subsistence allowance	[1] 31.50	[1] 31.50	0	0	Flight pay (if eligible)	105.00
				Total, monthly	636.50	648.60	12.10	1.9	Proficiency pay, minimum	30.00
				Total, annual	7,638.00	7,783.20	145.20	1.9	Proficiency pay, maximum	100.00
E-8	Master sergeant or senior chief petty officer.	33,795	19	Basic pay	415.00	425.40	10.40	2.5	Sea and foreign duty pay	22.50
				Quarters allowance with dependents.	[1] 120.00	[1] 120.00	0	0	Quarters allowance without dependents.	[1] 85.20
				Subsistence allowance	[1] 31.50	[1] 31.50	0	0	Flight pay (if eligible)	105.00
				Total, monthly	566.50	576.90	10.40	1.8	Proficiency pay, minimum	30.00
				Total, annual	6,798.00	6,922.80	124.80	1.8	Proficiency pay, maximum	100.00
E-7	Sergeant 1st class or chief petty officer.	110,621	18	Basic pay	370.00	379.20	9.20	2.5	Sea and foreign duty pay	22.50
				Quarters allowance with dependents.	[1] 114.90	[1] 114.90	0	0	Quarters allowance without dependents.	[1] 75.00
				Subsistence allowance	[1] 31.50	[1] 31.50	0	0	Flight pay (if eligible)	105.00
				Total, monthly	516.40	525.60	9.20	1.8	Proficiency pay, minimum	30.00
				Total, annual	6,196.80	6,307.20	110.40	1.8	Proficiency pay, maximum	100.00
E-6	Staff sergeant or petty officer 1st class.	231,284	14	Basic pay	315.00	322.80	7.80	2.5	Sea and foreign duty pay	20.00
				Quarters allowance with dependents.	[1] 110.10	[1] 110.10	0	0	Quarters allowance without dependents.	[1] 70.20
				Subsistence allowance	[1] 31.50	[1] 31.50	0	0	Flight pay (if eligible)	100.00
				Total, monthly	456.60	464.40	7.80	1.7	Proficiency pay, minimum	30.00
				Total, annual	5,479.20	5,572.80	93.60	1.7	Proficiency pay, maximum	100.00
E-5	Sergeant or petty officer 2d class.	405,392	10	Basic pay	265.00	271.50	6.50	2.5	Sea and foreign duty pay	16.00
				Quarters allowance with dependents.	[1] 105.00	[1] 105.00	0	0	Quarters allowance without dependents.	[1] 70.20
				Subsistence allowance	[1] 31.50	[1] 31.50	0	0	Flight pay (if eligible)	90.00
				Total, monthly	401.50	408.00	6.50	1.6	Proficiency pay, minimum	30.00
				Total, annual	4,818.00	4,896.00	78.00	1.6	Proficiency pay, maximum	100.00
E-4	Corporal or petty officer, 3d class.	450,917	5	Basic pay	205.00	210.00	5.00	2.5	Sea and foreign duty pay	13.00
				Quarters allowance with dependents.	[1] 105.00	[1] 105.00	0	0	Quarters allowance without dependents.	[1] 70.20
				Subsistence allowance	[1] 31.50	[1] 31.50	0	0	Flight pay (if eligible)	70.00
				Total, monthly	341.50	346.50	5.00	1.5	Proficiency pay, minimum	30.00
				Total annual	4,098.00	4,158.00	60.00	1.5	Proficiency pay, maximum	100.00

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE NO. 2.—*Examples of present pay and allowances with those proposed for fiscal year 1965 (S. 3001)*—Continued

ENLISTED

Pay grade	Title	Number in grade, fiscal year 1965	Typical years of service	Present		Proposed			Alternative or additional (no change)	Monthly amount
				Type	Monthly amount	Monthly amount	Increase	Percent increase		
E-3	Private 1st class or seaman.	585, 754	1	Basic pay	$99. 37	$99. 37	0	0	Sea and foreign duty pay	$9. 00
				Quarters allowance without or 1 dependent.	[1] 55. 20	[1] 55. 20	0	0	Quarters allowance with 2 dependents.	[1] 83. 10
				Subsistence allowance	[1] 31. 50	[1] 31. 50	0	0	Quarters allowance with 3 or more dependents.	[1] 105. 00
				Total, monthly	186. 07	186. 07	0	0	Flight pay (if eligible)	55. 00
				Total, annual	2, 070. 00	2, 232. 84	0	0	Proficiency pay, minimum	30. 00
									Proficiency pay, maximum	100. 00
E-2	Private or seaman apprentice.	345, 891	1	Basic pay	85. 80	85. 80	0	0	Sea and foreign duty pay	8. 00
				Quarters allowance without or 1 dependent.	[1] 55. 20	[1] 55. 20	0	0	Quarters allowance with 2 dependents.	[1] 83. 10
				Subsistence allowance	[1] 31. 50	[1] 31. 50	0	0	Quarters allowance with 3 or more dependents.	[1] 105. 00
				Total, monthly	172. 50	172. 50	0	0	Flight pay (if eligible)	50. 00
				Total, annual	2, 070. 00	2, 070. 00				
E-1	Private or seaman recruit	160, 271	[2] 0	Basic pay	78. 00	78. 00	0	0	Sea and foreign duty pay	8. 00
				Quarters allowance without or 1 dependent.	[1] 55. 20	[1] 55. 20	0	0	Quarters allowance with 2 dependents.	[1] 83. 10
				Subsistence allowance	[1] 31. 50	[1] 31. 50	0	0	Quarters allowance with 3 or more dependents.	[1] 105. 00
				Total, monthly	164. 70	164. 70	0	0	Flight pay (if eligible)	50. 00
				Total, annual	1, 976. 40	1, 976, 40	0	0		

[1] Tax free.

[2] Under 4 months.

NOTE.—Minimum amount of retired pay: For length of service or age, 50 percent of basic pay at 20 years. For permanent disability, 30 percent of basic pay but not less than 2½ percent times years of service. For temporary disability, 50 percent of basic pay but not less than 2½ percent times years of service. Maximum amount of retired pay, 75 percent of basic pay. This maximum is payable if the member has 30 years of service or at least an 80-percent disability rating.

COMMITTEE APPROACH

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, some comment is now in order with respect to the committee approach to this legislation. First, the committee felt that a bill should be reported at the present time, in view of the civilian increases, which, as I have stated, have been much more numerous and substantial than those given to the members of the armed services; second, that the bill should be simple in its approach and in its application.

As the Senate may know, the Department of Defense, in February 1964, submitted a military pay proposal which would have provided for a 2.4-percent increase in basic pay for all enlisted personnel with over 2 years of service and a flat 3 percent in basic pay for all officers both under and over 2 years of service. These percentages were computed through rather complex formulas involving comparisons with a number of civilian type indexes, together with certain retirement discount formulas.

The committee, after consideration, decided on a more simplified approach. First, it was felt that the career enlisted and officer grades should receive the same percentage increases. Let it be remembered that in the last two pay acts enlisted men have received less overall increases than commissioned personnel. Second, it was the committee's opinion that junior officers with under 2 years of service should receive more than the 3-percent increase proposed by Defense in view of the fact that this pay bracket has not been increased since 1952. Third, the committee did not adopt the Department of Defense proposal which would have excluded from any increase the reservists and National Guardsmen who are entitled to drill pay. Historically, reservists entitled to drill pay have been authorized the current basic pay of the grade concerned. Our reservists in a drill pay status are a vital part of our national defense and the committee saw no reason for changing the current law in this regard.

I should observe, Mr. President, that the pending bill does not involve additional costs over what the Defense proposal would have involved when the inclusion of drill pay in the increase is taken into account. The defense proposal would have cost $191 million annually. With the inclusion of drill pay an additional $11 million is involved. The pending bill involves for the Department of Defense an additional annual cost of $202,441,000, which is the total increase for 1,833,000 men on duty in our Armed Forces.

NUMBER OF PEOPLE AFFECTED

Mr. President, the increases contained in this bill would affect 2,762,000 persons, including 1,833,000 on active duty, and 879,000 in the Reserves.

This is a very simple proposal. In my opinion the proposed increase is fully deserved by our men and women in the uniform, and I urge that the Senate pass the bill promptly.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, since the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee introduced this bill and has brought it to the Senate for consideration, I have received letters from wives of enlisted men who have served less than 2 years, complaining that they had received no increase in pay and that their living costs have substantially increased. How can I answer such letters?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, there may be some cases of men who voluntarily enlisted and who may have a complaint. Otherwise, I do not believe there is any merit in this suggestion. For the most part the enlisted personnel, during their first 2 years, are in a purely training status.

In addition, most men with less than 2 years' service live in barracks and eat at Government mess halls. The E-1 recruit, upon his entry into military service is assured, through normal promotion, during his first 2 years of service, of three automatic pay raises during that period, with a good chance of receiving four.

Under existing law, at the end of 4 months, a man with less than 2 years' service receives an increase of $5.20 a month.

That is more than the bill gives to those who serve more than 2 years.

Moreover, although the requirements vary among the military departments, it is possible for a recruit to be promoted during that period to the grade of E-4, which is corporal, although he may have served less than a year.

There may be a few instances of married men who have voluntarily enlisted; but we know now that none who are married are drafted. They cannot be taken involuntarily. But the vast majority of the less-than-2-year men live in barracks. They are housed in Government barracks, are fed in the Government mess, and receive their automatic increases in pay during that period.

Mr. CARLSON. I appreciate the Senator's comments.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Kansas is the ranking member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and has handled pay increases.

Mr. CARLSON. I am familiar with the pay schedules of the civil employees.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is familiar with the pay increase for civilian employees. He understands the absolute impossibility of dealing exactly equally with every employee, because some who are in the same caetgory will have jobs that are twice as hard and involve more responsibility than others in the same grade or whatever the classification is.

Mr. CARLSON. The Senator from Georgia has been most helpful. I appreciate his comments. The pay increase is justified. The Senator from Georgia, who is chairman of the committee, and the other members of the committee are entitled to much credit for the fine way in which they considered and reported the bill.

I hope it will be unanimously approved by the Senate.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is there anything in the act passed last year which would give the Department of Defense the opportunity to come before Congress every year or so to obtain increases such as are provided in the instant bill?

Mr. RUSSELL. No; nothing was written into the law. We do not treat the military personnel as we do the civilian personnel by providing automatic increases for them. We did not provide anything in the bill that would authorize such action.

In the committee report it was stated that if the increases we had allowed, which were the first that had been granted since 1958, were not adequate, the Department of Defense could come back and submit an additional program this year. I do not know whether this proposal was submitted in pursuance of that statement or not; but that statement was in the committee report.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I recall, the cost to the Government for the increases made available last year was in excess of $1 billion a year.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; it was in excess of $1 billion.

Mr. ELLENDER. I feel that the increase we provided last year, a sum of more than $1 billion a year, was rather generous. This year, 1 year later, we are again increasing the salaries of generals and admirals and members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and so forth, by an additional $207 million a year. Is that a correct statement?

Mr. RUSSELL. No; this amount is $201 million. It is $207 million if we include the Coast Guard and the Public Health Service.

Mr. ELLENDER. They are all supposed to be a part of the armed services.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. The amount is $207,510,000.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct. That is for the Public Health Service, the Coast Guard, and the Armed Forces.

Mr. ELLENDER. I did not hear what the Senator from Georgia stated was the justification for the increase; but, as I understand, the committee did not spend much time in holding hearings, did it?

Mr. RUSSELL. No; it did not.

Mr. ELLENDER. What is the justification for such an increase so soon after the previous pay raise?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Louisiana knows that we could have held hearings over the weeks and could have built up a record that would have been very long to sustain this proposal. But I did not hold hearings because I thought the hearings that had been held on the civilian pay increase bill, which showed the difficulty of retaining personnel in the civil service and showed the increase in the cost of living, applied in every respect to the Armed Forces.

The Senator well knows that in 1955 Congress increased the pay of civil service employees by 7.7 percent on the average; in 1958 it increased their pay 10.1 percent; in 1960 it was increased by 7.7 percent; in 1962 we increased the pay of civil service employees by 5.5 percent on the average; and in January 1964, we increased the pay of civil service employees by 4.1 percent. Under that bill, there was an automatic increase, in January of this year, of 4.1 percent.

Only the other day the Senate passed another bill to increase the pay of civil service employees by 4.2 percent, but that percentage ran from 3 to 22.5 percent for classified employees.

Mr. ELLENDER. To 33 percent in one case.

Mr. RUSSELL. Thirty-three percent in one case.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is what caused me to vote against the bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. I, too, voted against that bill. But this bill provides an increase of only 2½ percent. That is the highest increase, except for the group of less-than-2-year officers, who would get 8 percent. In general, a 2½-percent increase is the highest that anyone in the military service would receive.

I do not see how anyone can justify leaving the military personnel so far behind when we have increased the pay of civilian employees again and again. Of course, that was not done with my vote; I voted against that increase.

The Government has contributed to inflation. It is said that the pay increase is not inflationary; but it would be difficult to find anyone who would not say that his costs of living have not been affected by inflation. The Government has contributed to the wage spiral by its constant increases in civil service pay. But I do not believe the man in uniform should be discriminated against because he does not have a Government employees' union that is permitted to come to Washington and lobby with Senators and Representatives to obtain pay increases. That is one reason why I encouraged the committee to report the bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. I hope the Senator from Georgia will not try to promote a footrace between those who serve in the Armed Forces and those who are employed in the civil service. If one branch receives a pay raise, I do not believe in providing the other branch with a raise whether it is justified or not. I do not believe that is the way Congress should act.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not propose to have a footrace; but, in my judgment, those who serve in the Armed Forces are more entitled to a pay increase every year than are the civil employees of the Government. If we increase the pay of civil employees even more than they are entitled to, I do not propose to see those who wear our country's uniform discriminated against and denied an increase.

So long as I have anything to do with it, I shall continue to urge the Senate to deal equally as between those who are in the civil employment of the Government and those who are risking their lives in Vietnam and elsewhere today and who tomorrow may be called upon to risk and give their lives in large numbers. I believe they are as much entitled to an increase as are the employees of the Senate and, for that matter, Members of the Senate themselves. We voted ourselves a large increase.

Mr. ELLENDER. It was $7,500.

Mr. RUSSELL. We voted ourselves an increase of $7,500 at one fell swoop.

I may be entirely wrong in my philosophy, but if Congress, whatever may be its reason—perhaps because it does not understand the situation, perhaps for political reasons, to build a Frankenstein of so many Federal employees—is unwilling to say, "No," I do not propose to see those who have no other voice in Washington discriminated against when we distribute tax funds to those in civilian Government employment.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thought the armed services were very well treated last year. My reason for asking the questions was to be at least consistent. I think it has been clearly indicated here one pay increase leads to another; and that the whole process is threatening to get out of hand.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is exactly what I am trying to do. I am trying to be consistent. We are not being very consistent if we give to those in uniform only a 2.5-percent increase, while we give a 4.2-percent increase to civilian employees.

Mr. ELLENDER. I note that table I, proposed increases in one bracket in basic rates for officers under 2 years, shows that the increase will be $49.30.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. Let us take the admirals and generals.

Mr. RUSSELL. None of them has served as little as 2 years.

Mr. ELLENDER. Under 2 years, there is an increase of $102 in comparison to $34.20 for one over 10 years. Why is it that the longer they serve the less increase they seem to get?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is correct. The reason is that those figures were computed, yet they do not apply to a single living human being. Those figures should have been marked with asterisks and explained. We seem to give a greater percent of increase to those who serve less than to those who serve more.

Mr. ELLENDER. Why is that?

Mr. RUSSELL. Those figures were based on a mathematical formula. They do not apply to a single living human being. They are available in case the President should reach down and make some second lieutenant with less than 2 years' service, say, a Chief of Staff in the Army or an admiral in the Navy. Those figures would then apply. Unless the President did that, they would not apply to anyone. They do not apply today.

Mr. ELLENDER. What this table shows is a little confusing, to say the least. It shows that for under 2 years' service the increase will be greater than for those who have served over 30 years.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is correct. That is because none of them is in that category. There is not a man in these high grades who would be affected by this pay increase.

Mr. ELLENDER. So I am to understand that generals and admirals who have served less than 2 years will not receive the increase of $102?

Mr. RUSSELL. I beg the Senator's pardon?

Mr. ELLENDER. Am I to understand that generals and admirals who have served under 2 years will not receive the increase of $102?

Mr. RUSSELL. They would, if there were any such. The Senator knows that there are no generals or admirals who have served less than 2 years.

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not know it. I am asking.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Senator will look at the last figures on the right, he will see the total number involved. He will see that many, if not most of our generals and admirals have served more than 20 years—most of them more than 30 years.

Mr. ELLENDER. I see that. In each category of generals and admirals, there are 32 who would be affected.

Mr. RUSSELL. No—there are 32 people affected who would receive $44.70 a month. I do not believe that is a great increase to give a general or an admiral.

Mr. ELLENDER. Let me say to my good friend the Senator from Georgia that I am not complaining about it. I am only wondering why this table should show——

Mr. RUSSELL. It was really an oversight, because in making a mathematical computation we take it out; not a living soul would be affected by it, because we raised it by 8½ percent since they have not had a pay increase since 1952. Therefore, we increased them a bit more.

Mr. ELLENDER. Looking at the same figure, in the first column, under 2 years, the increase in pay seems to be almost as much, as, if not more than in the case of those who have served longer.

Mr. RUSSELL. It is several times as much because it is 8½ percent instead of 2½ percent, but no one gets it.

Mr. ELLENDER. It strikes me, then, that the table is misleading.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is correct. It is, to any one who does not understand the Army's procedure. But the Senator from Louisiana knows as well as I do that there is no general or admiral, nor even a colonel, in the Armed Forces today, who has had less than 2 years' experience.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALTERS in the chair). Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. McNAMARA. I am happy to vote for the support of the committee. I arrive at the conclusion that I am in support of this recommendation not on the basis stated by the distinguished Senator from Georgia, but because I believe that the Services require this increase, and that they are properly entitled to it. Strictly on that basis, I am for the report of the committee.

I believe that we put this problem out of focus when we start comparing the military with civilians.

Mr. RUSSELL. I was not altogether comparing it with civilians. I believe a most substantial reason for these pay increases is to keep in our Armed Forces the very finest young talent that we have, who cannot afford, in their self-interest, to stay with the services when they can get three or four times as much money working for some large industrial concern or some big business organization.

Mr. McNAMARA. I thoroughly agree. I am glad to hear the chairman of the committee make that statement. Moreover, as the chairman of the committee so ably points out, many of our fine young men in the services are not there by their own choice. Certainly, we should treat them as well as the report of the committee indicates they should be treated. I wholeheartedly agree with the report of the committee

Mr. RUSSELL. Let me say to the Senator that it has become common in this country to "slough off" the officers of our Army and to talk about the "brass," but there are no more dedicated men in the service of our country than those in uniform. I know of more men personally who are serving at great financial sacrifice in the Army of the United States than I do in any other walk of life in this Nation or in any other enterprise.

Mr. McNAMARA. I am sure that many of us share that view.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator.

(At this point Mr. McGOVERN took the chair as Presiding Officer.)

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield for one observation?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield.

Mr. STENNIS. I commend the distinguished Senator from Georgia, chairman of the Armed Services Committee, for the work he did with reference to the officers in the services with less than 2 years of service. The adjustments in pay in that category were long overdue.

We talk about morale. This is where a relatively few dollars will certainly boost morale. The Senator has been very fair and much concerned about this matter, and took it upon himself to lead in making the adjustment, and I commend him highly.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator will recall that when we passed the last pay bill we undertook to do something about young officers with less than 2 years service, but we ran up against a stone wall.

In order to get a bill, we had to give up that increase. The Senator is exactly correct. We cannot expect too much from the morale of these men, discharging the same responsibilties as their colleagues who have served, perhaps, for 2 years and 2 days, and are drawing substantially more money than they are.

Mr. STENNIS. I believe that the Senator from Georgia has devised a plan which will prevail and become the law.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator for his comments.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I commend the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee for the work which he has done on this bill. I believe that these pay raises are justified. The distinguished Senator from Georgia has rendered a very fine service. I shall support the measure.

I wish to inquire as to one or two categories. One is that of the man with less than 2 years' service, which I shall come to later. But first I wish to ask the distinguished Senator, the chairman of the committee, if he would accept an amendment to the substance of S. 2021, which was drafted last year, as an amendment to another pay bill. This is the amendment which would give a Reserve officer's widow the same protection that a Regular Army officer's widow would receive, if the officer died during a 30-day period after his retirement and before the first check came in. I should like to send the amendment to the desk——

Mr. RUSSELL. Let me say to the distinguished Senator from Texas that I am thoroughly familiar with the provision. It has considerable merit, but I have been hopeful to get this bill approved. The bill which will follow the one now before the Senate, the dual compensation bill, to equalize the opportunities of Reserve officers and Regular officers serving in the Federal Government, is a much more proper vehicle for this amendment than the pay bill. I hope that the Senator will defer offering his amendment for an hour or so and offer it to the dual compensation bill.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the bill deals with military retirement pay.

Mr. RUSSELL. I understand. So does the other bill. It deals with compensation.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. The other bill deals solely with civilian compensation after the personnel have left the military service and entered civilian employment.

I have worked on the bill long and hard in order to get action for these people.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am in favor of that bill. But I regret that the Senator sees fit to offer it as an amendment to this bill. He has worked hard on the dual compensation bill. There is no doubt in my mind that the dual compensation bill is a more appropriate place for the amendment than a bill which provides for a straight pay increase and does not deal with retirement or pension.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. The dual compensation bill is under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. This amendment, S. 2021, comes under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Armed Services, not under our committee. We could not appropriately put it in our bill, or we would have written it into the bill. It is a matter that has come before the Armed Services Committee. As the distinguished Senator from Georgia knows, the bill had been offered as an amendment long before the bill was introduced. While the Defense Department has not seen fit to write a report, the Social Security Administration has. In its report, it comments on the relatively insignificant financial effect of the plan. It applies only in the very limited case of a Reserve officer who has served his time and then dies before the first of the following month, on which day his first check would be received by the widow. The widow gets nothing, although the officer has selected his annuity plan.

The proposed amendment would provide that the annuity eligibility would go into effect when he retired. If he had been a Regular officer and retired, this annuity gap would not arise.

The amendment would apply to only a very limited class. It would apply only in the case of an officer who died in that 30-day period. If he were to live 30 days, past the first of the month, the widow would receive the annuity. It is a great hardship. The husbands have served out their time. They have earned the pension.

The Board of Actuaries advising the Defense Department says it would not cost more. The reason that the Board of Actuaries says it will not cost more is that the men have already earned it. They have designated their widows as the survivors. Then they die before the annuity can be collected. There is a hiatus in the law that has existed for years.

We have taken this measure up with the committee. We have offered a bill. To this day, the Defense Department—which says it wants to see fairness done in this case—has never answered the request of the committee chairman. It has never given a report on the bill. It ought to be as fair to the widows of officers who die as they are to those who are still in the service.

The chairman has rendered a distinguished service. The only way that we can get fairness for the widows is to bring this measure out on the floor of the Senate. The Defense Department has not prepared an answer to the committee with regard to this measure, and 11 months have gone by.

Mr. President, I ask the distinguished chairman to please accept the amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I freely confess that the Senator has a case. I do not believe there are many people involved. But that is no reason for doing an injustice, if only one person is involved. If there is any disparity, I want to correct it. But I wish that the Senator would not insist that I accept his amendment to the bill. If I do it now, it will go to conference. That would mean that the Senate amendment would undoubtedly be lost in the conference. It would mean a delay in the enactment of the bill, whereas I have every reason to believe that in the form the bill is in today, it will pass without any conference.

I shall be glad to again urge the Department to make a report on the bill. I am in favor of the bill proposed by the Senator. If we receive a report from the Department, I shall be glad to bring it to the attention of the committee and bring the bill on the floor.

I hope the Senator will not insist on his amendment to the bill. The bill affects many people of relatively small income. If the amendment were agreed to, it would cause a delay of a month or two in the pay that these people would receive.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I appreciate the remarks of the distinguished chairman. Were this January, of course, I would not attempt to offer the amendment. But considering the lateness of the session, this is the only way that we can obtain justice in this session for this very limited class of people.

The bill has not yet passed the House. The bill would go to the House. It has not yet reached the state of conference.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is true. I had hoped that it would not reach the state of conference. I had reason to believe that if it were passed in the form in which it was reported by the committee, it would not go to conference.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. If the House were to strip this amendment from the bill, there would be no occasion for a conference unless the Senate then voted for the amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the entire House voted for the amendment, it would go to conference. The bill has not been introduced in the House. The military pay increase bill has not been introduced in the House.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. If the amendment were agreed to, the question of whether the bill would then go to conference would be a matter for the entire Senate. Suppose the amendment were agreed to. If the House removed the amendment from the bill, then the question of whether or not there would be a conference would depend on whether the Senate insisted on its amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. I had assumed that if we were to send the bill over with the amendment included in it, the House would probably ask for a conference, if it were to pass the bill. If it did not ask for a conference, the Senator is correct from a parliamentary standpoint. The Senate could recede. But if a conference were requested, the Senate would have no option. We could not dispose of the bill then in any other way.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. The Board of Actuaries certified that there would be no additional cost. It seems to me highly improbable that there would be a conference in the closing days, when it is so difficult to get a bill passed on this small amendment that might affect a dozen widows who have already earned the annuity, and, merely because their husbands died before the 1st of the month, they cannot receive it. We worked on this problem for more than a year.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I have great compassion for the small number of people involved in the bill. But I cannot accept a retroactive amendment that goes back to 1951.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I would like to read a sentence from the report of the chief actuary, Robert J. Meyer, of the Social Security Administration, advising the Defense Department on this bill. It is dated April 7, 1964. It reads:

> Accordingly, from our point of view, we would have no objection to S. 2021 as drafted in its present form, insofar as its bearing on the cost of the plan is concerned.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator's report is based on a bill on which the Department of Defense has not yet submitted a report. I assure the Senator that I will obtain a report on the bill from the Department of Defense within the next 3 weeks so that the matter can be considered. But I cannot accept a retroactive amendment to the bill.

I regret it very much. I am for the Senator's proposal. When we get a report from the Defense Department, I intend to move to report his bill. But I cannot accept a provision on the pending bill which is intended to have retroactive application.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, has my amendment been stated?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Texas has not yet been stated. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 4, line 15, it is proposed to add a new section 5, as follows:

> That (a) section 1437 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking out at the beginning of the first sentence thereof "Each annuity" and inserting in lieu thereof "(a) Except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, each annuity".
>
> (b) Such section is further amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:
>
> "(b) In any case in which a person—
>
> "(1) has met all the requirements for the receipt of retired or retainer pay under chapter 67 of this title,
>
> "(2) has made an election in favor of a beneficiary or beneficiaries under section 1434 of this title, and
>
> "(3) dies prior to the date on which he would have first become eligible for the receipt of retired or retainer pay under such chapter 67,
>
> an annuity shall be paid under this chapter to such beneficiary or beneficiaries, as the case may be, upon application filed by such beneficiary or beneficiaries as provided in regulations prescribed by the Secretary concerned, beginning as of the first day of the month in which such person would have been eligible to receive retired or retainer pay under chapter 67 of this title had he not died."
>
> (c) The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) of this section shall become effective as of October 1, 1963, but no benefits shall accrue to any person as a result of the enactment of such amendments prior to the date of enactment of this Act.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter dated April 7, 1964, from Mr. Robert J. Myers, Chief Actuary, Social Security Administration, referring to the bill S. 2021, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., April 7, 1964.

Mr. R. L. WALTER,
Chairman, DOD Joint Board, RSFPP, Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel, Department of the Army, Washington, D.C.

DEAR RUDY: This is in response to your request to the Board of Actuaries in regard to its views on S. 2021.

The following recommendation on this bill is based on our understanding that it is of extremely limited scope in that it would only apply to reservists who are not in active-duty status for the fractional-month period between the time that they attain age 60 and the first day of the following calendar month. As the law now stands, such individuals who have elected to participate under the plan do not have any protection thereunder in the rare event that they die in this fractional-month period. The bill would change the situation so that they would have this protection.

As we understand the bill, there would be no deduction from the subsequent retired pay for the fractional-month protection afforded. From a strictly actuarial-equivalent approach, there should be such a proportionate deduction for the fractional-month period involved with respect to all the reservists affected—not only the few dying in this fractional month but also the vast majority who live through it.

The Board of Actuaries has considered this problem from a broad viewpoint. After taking into account both the administrative problems that would be created by requiring proportionate deductions for the fractional-month period and the relatively insignificant effect on the financing operations of the plan resulting from such proportionate deductions, the Board does not consider it necessary that such proportionate deductions be required. We would, of course, have no objection if they were required.

Accordingly, from our point of view, we would have no objection to S. 2021 as drafted in its present form insofar as its bearing on the cost of the plan is concerned. We are somewhat concerned, however, about the policy involved in this bill, since such a procedure might well serve as a precedent to cover similar cases of deaths in active service under the plan, and the cost of doing this is not covered in the financing provided.

Sincerely yours,

Robert J. Myers,
Chief Actuary.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, my amendment is identical in terms with the bill S. 2021. I believe that the distinguished Senator from Georgia, as he stated, is fully conversant with the amendment.

I ask unanimous consent that a brief explanation of the amendment be printed at this point.

There being no objection, the explanation was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Explanation of Yarborough Amendment to Military Pay Bill

This amendment concerns payment of annuities for survivors of retired members of the Armed Forces. Under present law a member of the Armed Forces may elect to accept a reduced amount of retired pay in order to provide an annuity for his widow, or children under 18 years of age and who also meet other limiting conditions. This annuity may be 50, 25, or 12½ percent of the reduced amount of the man's retired or retainer pay.

In order for the intended beneficiary to qualify for the annuity, the serviceman must have been in receipt of retired pay at the time of his death. For the convenience of Government bookkeeping, an individual does not start receiving retired pay until the beginning of the month following the month in which he actually qualifies for retired pay.

Thus if he dies between the date on which he qualifies for retired pay and the first of the following month, his intended beneficiary will receive no annuity.

This amendment would correct the unintended inequity by amending section 1437 of title 10, United States Code so that in cases in which a serviceman has completed all the age and service requirements for the receipt of retired pay but dies between the date on which he qualifies and the first of the following month, his properly designated beneficiaries will receive the annuity to which they are entitled.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I appeal once more to the distinguished Senator from Georgia to accept the amendment. I have worked for more than a year on this proposal for the limited class of people who have been so disadvantaged. A Reserve officer who has been in military service has earned his retirement. He might have designated his wife as an annuitant. He has earned that annuity by his service to our Government in the uniform of his country. If a Regular Army officer retires on the first of a month and dies before the first of the next month, this problem does not arise, but if a Reserve officer should die in a similar situation, his wife would not receive a red cent. He might have served for a period of more than 20 years. He has earned the annuity. Yet his wife might be left penniless.

This is a question which is under the jurisdiction of the Armed Services Committee; it is not under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. We have worked on S. 2021 for more than a year. We have brought the proposal in the form of a bill to the committee of which the distinguished Senator from Georgia is chairman. We were told to offer the proposal as a separate bill. Last August we introduced the bill. For 11 months, the Defense Department has declined to give the committee a report on the bill. The Department would kill it by its refusal to report. But the board of actuaries advising the Defense Department has rendered a report and has shown that it would have no substantial cost.

The deceased Reserve officers have earned the annuity. It is money that the officers earned while in the uniform of their country.

The injustice is so great that, I believe, with the great prestige of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services behind the proposal, the House of Representatives would accept it, if the chairman would accept it. I commend the Senator from Georgia for his work on the pending bill. I shall support the pay bill. But I point out that here is a group of people who have suffered and waited for a long time, and we have been unable to obtain a report from the Defense Department on the subject. I think it is time that someone acted in behalf of those affected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough].

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I regret that I cannot accept the amendment. If the Senator will offer the amendment to the dual compensation bill, which deals with equalizing the discrepancies between Reserve officers and Regular officers, and which is to follow the pending bill, I shall be happy to support the proposal. But I do not think it has any place in the pending bill. It would be much more in order in connection with the bill H.R. 7381.

The Senator from Texas is a member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. I think he should offer his proposal as an amendment to the bill H.R. 7381, rather than the pending bill. The proposal could only result in delaying a modest increase in compensation to those in the service of our country. The bill providing for dual employment and dual compensation deals with a condition which has existed for a great number of years.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I point out that the dual compensation bill deals only with compensation and not with retirement.

Mr. RUSSELL. No retirement benefits are provided in the pending bill. The bill H.R. 7381 deals with equalizing inequities between Reserve officers and Regular officers. The pending bill applies to both, Reserve and Regular, in reference to the proposed pay increase. I insist that the bill is much more in order on the bill H.R. 7381, which is to follow consideration of the pending bill. I shall be glad to support the proposal in connection with that other bill.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. The bill was referred to the Committee on Armed Services. The Committee on Post Office and Civil Service has no jurisdiction over the subject matter of the bill S. 2021. It is a military question.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have not been too sure that the Committee on Armed Services has jurisdiction of that bill, because many questions relating to Reserve officers are handled in the Finance Committee. I was for the bill, and I was hoping that we could obtain a report on the subject and bring the bill before the Senate. Therefore, I have not raised any question of jurisdiction. But I cannot accept the bill as an amendment to the pending bill.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I understand that the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell], is willing to appoint a special subcommittee of members of the Committee on Armed Services who will not be too busy in the closing weeks, and who would be willing to serve on such a subcommittee to consider the bill S. 2021. Am I correct in my statement?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is correct. The amendment possesses great merit. Standing on its own bottom, I would be happy to support it. There is no doubt in my mind as to the action that would be taken. However, I do not wish to speak for a subcommittee that has not yet been appointed. I shall be happy to appoint a subcommittee of three members of the Committee on Armed Services to consider the bill immediately. I shall appoint such a subcommittee today.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President I appreciate that action of the distinguished chairman, particularly his offer to appoint the subcommittee today. We had not asked the chairman for such prompt action. I am grateful for it.

Mr. President, in view of that statement, I withdraw the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I wish to ask the distinguished chairman of the committee a question with reference to the paragraph of the report beginning on the second line from the bottom of page 1, which reads:

> The basic pay for those with under 2 years of service has not increased since 1952, as compared to the other pay brackets which have been increased in varying amounts in 1955, 1958, and 1963. The committee was of the opinion, therefore, that an increase for the under-2-year officer pay brackets in excess of that provided for the over-2-year pay brackets was justified in view of the lack of past increases for these brackets.

My question to the distinguished Senator from Georgia is, Has this situation existed with reference to servicemen in grades E–1 to E–5 since 1952? Have they had no increases in pay since 1952?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is correct. All of those with under 2 years of service, whether enlisted men or commissioned personnel, have not received any basic pay increase since 1952. There is a considerable difference, however, in the status of commissioned and enlisted personnel in the under-2-year bracket. Most of the first 2 years service of the enlisted men is spent in training of one kind or another, whereas the commissioned personnel have had their training and are supposed to embark upon their duties when they reach the organization to which they are assigned.

In addition, married men are no longer drafted. Most of these men are single and live in Government barracks and eat at the Government mess; whereas the officers in many cases have to find housing and have to eat outside and do not have the benefits of the Government mess. That is the reason why the distinction is made.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Those in grades E–1 to E–5 who have been in service for over 2 years also live in barracks and eat at Government mess.

Mr. RUSSELL. If they have over 2 years' service, they receive the increase.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Those who served for 2 years also received an increase in 1955, 1958, and 1963.

Mr. RUSSELL. I believe that is correct.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. But during that same period of time, as was so ably pointed out by the chairman of the committee in his statement in support of the entire bill—and I am in support of it—civilian employees of the Government have received numerous increases.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct. Of course, civilian employees of our Government do not live in Government barracks or eat at the Government mess.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. And they do not receive hospitalization.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. During that period of time, with the exception of E–1 through E–5, the privates, the corporals, and all the rest of the lower grades, have received three other raises in addition to those here proposed.

Mr. RUSSELL. This is not as unfair as it seems because the less-than-2-years servicemen are automatically assured of three pay raises during that 2-year period—three promotions. At the end of 4 months they receive an increase of $5.20 under existing law. At the end of 1 year they may receive increases because of promotion that amount to about 18 or 20 percent of their initial pay. That is due to the pay increases established by existing law.

I do not believe the same rule applies to enlisted men that applies to officers, who in many cases are married and who are from 4 to 7 years older, on the average, than enlisted men with less than 2 years' service, who are very well provided for in the barracks and at the mess.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. The letters I have been receiving over the years from those in these grades and their families are not in accordance with the opinion expressed here that they do not need the increase.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Senator will pardon me for interrupting, if the selective service regulations had not been changed so that married men are no longer subject to the draft, I would have supported a pay increase for this category, but under the present selective service regulations, a married man is not subject to induction or compulsory service. Therefore, these are usually single men, between the ages of 18 to 21. There are individual cases in which married men, even though they may have had a child or two, have enlisted for one reason or another. In that latter case, this pay is not adequate, but I do not believe we should overpay 98 percent of those for whom this pay bracket is adequate in order to equalize the pay for the 1 or 2 percent for whom the compensation may not be adequate.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I cannot agree that $78 a month or $83.20 a month or $85.80 a month, for example, in grades E–1 and E–2 is overpayment.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have not said they are overpaid. I said if we were to give them a substantial increase, they would be overpaid. I think this pay is about right. At one time we increased the compensation of the recruit in the U.S. Army, as I recall, from $30 to $65 or $70 a month, which was the largest increase ever given. It was in 1942. Since that time it has been increased to $78.

The 2-year service members are, in a sense, discharging their obligation to their country. If they remain in the service longer and desire to make a career of it or serve for longer than 2 years, they will receive the benefit of these pay increases.

Very frankly, I do not think the situation justifies an increase of pay which would bring about a great increase in the total cost of the bill.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Could the distinguished chairman of the committee inform me, or does the staff have the figures, as to what the increase in cost would be if the pay of the enlisted men were increased, not by the 8½ percent the officers and warrant officers would receive, but by only 2½ percent?

Mr. RUSSELL. It would be only $28 million, but such an increase in those pay brackets would mean an additional pay of only what would be spent in a night over the weekend or perhaps on a case of beer. It would not be a substantial increase. If their pay is to be increased, it should be an 8- or 10-percent increase, on the ground that they have been passed over. Personally, I do not think they are entitled to one, because they live in Government quarters, in barracks. Ninety-nine percent of them eat at the Government mess. I refer to those with less than 2 years' service. All of them are engaged in training for at least 4 months, and the majority of them are in training for 1 year.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. They could not very well eat anywhere but in a Government messhall, at $78 a month.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course not. If they did not eat there, we would increase their pay also.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I have had legislative counsel draft a proposed amendment to increase the pay of these enlisted men by 2.5 percent. I agree with the distinguished chairman that it ought to be 8.5 percent.

Mr. RUSSELL. I did not say it ought to be. If they should receive an increase, that is what they should receive. I do not believe they should receive an increase.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I made a rapid calculation that it would cost $26 million. The staff claims it would be $28 million.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. We are increasing the pay of all the civil servants. We are increasing the pay of every military person except those who have served less than 2 years, below grade 5. The tables show that some majors have served under 2 years but are also receiving an increase. Table 1 shows majors and lieutenant commanders with less than 2 years of service who are getting an increase.

Mr. RUSSELL. I challenge the Senator to name one in that category.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. The figures show that.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the President were to reach down to one of these recruits and appoint him Chief of Staff, he would get an increase of $49.30 a month, but the possibility of the President doing that is remote, and therefore the figures do not mean anything.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. The distinguished chairman has challenged me to name one major.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have challenged the Senator to name a lieutenant commander or major who has less than 2 years of service. There may be a few medical officers, of course.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Table 1 shows 10 majors with less than 2 years' service.

Mr. RUSSELL. There undoubtedly may be a few officers that I overlooked.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. And also captains and lieutenants. The table shows 2,527 captains and lieutenants with less than 2 years' service. It shows 4,861 first lieutenants, or lieutenants junior grade.

Mr. RUSSELL. All of them would receive an 8½ percent increase.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I ask unanimous consent that table 1 be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

TABLE NO. 1.—*Proposed increases in basic pay rates for officers (1965) (S. 3001)*

[Cost figures in thousands of dollars for 12 months]

Pay grade	Title	Years of service															
		Under 2	Over 2	Over 3	Over 4	Over 6	Over 8	Over 10	Over 12	Over 14	Over 16	Over 18	Over 20	Over 22	Over 26	Over 30	Total
C/S	Chief of staff:																
	Proposed	$2,019.30	$2,019.30	$2,019.30	$2,019.30	$2,019.30	$2,019.30	$2,019.30	$2,019.30	$2,019.30	$2,019.30	$2,019.30	$2,019.30	$2,019.30	$2,019.30	$2,019.30	--------
	Present	$1,970.00	$1,970.00	$1,970.00	$1,970.00	$1,970.00	$1,970.00	$1,970.00	$1,970.00	$1,970.00	$1,970.00	$1,970.00	$1,970.00	$1,970.00	$1,970.00	$1,970.00	--------
	Increase	$49.30	$49.30	$49.30	$49.30	$49.30	$49.30	$49.30	$49.30	$49.30	$49.30	$49.30	$49.30	$49.30	$49.30	$49.30	--------
	Number	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	5	5
	Cost	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	$3	$3
O-10	General; admiral:																
	Proposed	$1,302.00	$1,347.90	$1,347.90	$1,347.90	$1,347.90	$1,399.20	$1,399.20	$1,506.90	$1,506.90	$1,614.30	$1,614.30	$1,722.00	$1,722.00	$1,829.70	$1,829.70	--------
	Present	$1,200.00	$1,315.00	$1,315.00	$1,315.00	$1,315.00	$1,365.00	$1,365.00	$1,470.00	$1,470.00	$1,575.00	$1,575.00	$1,680.00	$1,680.00	$1,785.00	$1,785.00	--------
	Increase	$102.00	$32.90	$32.90	$32.90	$32.90	$34.20	$34.20	$36.90	$36.90	$39.30	$39.30	$42.00	$42.00	$44.70	$44.70	--------
	Number	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	32	32
	Cost	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	$17	$17
O-9	Lieutenant general; vice admiral:																
	Proposed	$1,153.80	$1,183.80	$1,209.60	$1,209.60	$1,209.60	$1,240.20	$1,240.20	$1,291.50	$1,291.50	$1,399.20	$1,399.20	$1,506.90	$1,506.90	$1,614.30	$1,614.30	--------
	Present	$1,063.30	$1,155.00	$1,180.00	$1,180.00	$1,180.00	$1,210.00	$1,210.00	$1,260.00	$1,260.00	$1,365.00	$1,365.00	$1,470.00	$1,470.00	$1,575.00	$1,575.00	--------
	Increase	$90.50	$28.80	$29.60	$29.60	$29.60	$30.20	$30.20	$31.50	$31.50	$34.20	$34.20	$36.90	$36.90	$39.30	$39.30	--------
	Number	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	14	96	110
	Cost	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	$7	$45	$52
O-8	Major general; rear admiral (upper half):																
	Proposed	$1,045.20	$1,076.20	$1,101.90	$1,101.90	$1,101.90	$1,183.80	$1,183.80	$1,240.20	$1,240.20	$1,291.50	$1,347.90	$1,399.20	$1,455.60	$1,455.60	$1,455.60	--------
	Present	$963.30	$1,050.00	$1,075.00	$1,075.00	$1,075.00	$1,155.00	$1,155.00	$1,210.00	$1,210.00	$1,260.00	$1,315.00	$1,365.00	$1,420.00	$1,420.00	$1,420.00	--------
	Increase	$81.90	$26.40	$26.90	$26.90	$26.90	$28.80	$28.80	$30.20	$30.20	$31.50	$32.90	$34.20	$35.60	$35.60	$35.60	--------
	Number	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	25	138	334	495
	Cost	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	$11	$58	$143	$212
O-7	Brigadier general; rear admiral (lower half):																
	Proposed	$868.20	$927.60	$927.60	$927.60	$968.70	$968.70	$1,025.10	$1,025.10	$1,076.40	$1,183.80	$1,266.00	$1,266.00	$1,266.00	$1,266.00	$1,266.00	--------
	Present	$800.28	$905.00	$905.00	$905.00	$945.00	$945.00	$1,000.00	$1,000.00	$1,050.00	$1,155.00	$1,235.00	$1,235.00	$1,235.00	$1,235.00	$1,235.00	--------
	Increase	$67.92	$22.60	$22.60	$22.60	$23.70	$23.70	$25.10	$25.10	$26.40	$28.80	$31.00	$31.00	$31.00	$31.00	$31.00	--------
	Number	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	2	5	136	296	204	643
	Cost	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	$1	$2	$51	$110	$76	$240
O-6	Colonel; captain:																
	Proposed	$643.20	$707.40	$753.30	$753.30	$753.30	$753.30	$753.30	$753.30	$779.10	$902.10	$948.00	$968.70	$1,025.10	$1,112.10	$1,112.10	--------
	Present	$592.80	$690.00	$735.00	$735.00	$735.00	$735.00	$735.00	$735.00	$760.00	$880.00	$925.00	$945.00	$1,000.00	$1,085.00	$1,085.00	--------
	Increase	$50.40	$17.40	$18.30	$18.30	$18.30	$18.30	$18.30	$18.30	$19.10	$22.10	$23,00	$23.70	$25,10	$25.10	$27.10	$27.10
	Number	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	6	4	13	68	1,613	8,766	3,440	1,461	15,371
	Cost	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	$1	$1	$3	$19	$445	$2,640	$1,119	$475	$4,703
O-5	Lieutenant colonel; commander:																
	Proposed	$514.50	$604.80	$645.90	$645.90	$645.90	$645.90	$666.30	$702.00	$748.20	$804.60	$850.80	$876.30	$907.20	$907.20	$907.20	--------
	Present	$474.24	$590.00	$630.00	$630.00	$630.00	$630.00	$650.00	$685.00	$730.00	$785.00	$830.00	$855.00	$855.00	$885.00	$885.00	--------
	Increase	$40.26	$14.80	$15.90	$15.90	$15.90	$15.90	$16.30	$17.00	$18.20	$19.60	$20.80	$21.30	$22.20	$22.20	$22.20	--------
	Number	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	10	21	62	805	2,654	9,420	20,249	3,279	961	37,461
	Cost	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	$2	$4	$14	$189	$662	$2,408	$5,394	$874	$256	$9,803
O-4	Major; lieutenant commander:																
	Proposed	$434.10	$528.00	$563.70	$563.70	$573.90	$599.70	$640.50	$676.50	$707.40	$738.00	$758.40	$758.40	$758.40	$758.40	$758.40	--------
	Present	$400.14	$515.00	$550.00	$550.00	$560.00	$585.00	$625.00	$660.00	$690.00	$720.00	$740.00	$740.00	$740.00	$740.00	$740.00	--------
	Increase	$33.96	$13.00	$13.70	$13.70	$13.90	$14.70	$15.50	$16.50	$17.40	$18.00	$18.40	$18.40	$18.40	$18.40	$18.40	--------
	Number	10	11	6	21	74	347	2,712	4,963	7,657	7,421	7,536	9,535	14,420	1,360	211	56,284
	Cost	$4	$2	$1	$3	$12	$61	$504	$938	$1,599	$1,603	$1,664	$2,105	$3,184	$300	$47	$12,072
		Commissioned officers with less than 4 years of active service as an enlisted member															
O-3	Captain; lieutenant:																
	Proposed	$353.70	$450.90	$481.80	$533.10	$558.60	$579.00	$609.90	$640.50	$656.10	$656.10	$656.10	$656.10	$656.10	$656.10	$656.10	--------
	Present	$326.04	$440.00	$470.00	$520.00	$545.00	$565.00	$595.00	$625.00	$640.00	$640.00	$640.00	$640.00	$640.00	$640.00	$640.00	--------
	Increase	$27.66	$10.90	$11.80	$13.10	$13.60	$14.00	$14.90	$15.50	$16.10	$16.10	$16.10	$16.10	$16.10	$16.10	$16.10	--------
	Number	2,527	742	579	14,595	16,763	16,740	17,559	11,389	3,620	1,148	1,330	922	3,517	138	191	91,760
	Cost	$839	$97	$82	$2,294	$2,736	$2,812	$3,140	$2,118	$699	$222	$257	$178	$679	$27	$37	$16,217
O-2	1st lieutenant; lieutenant (junior grade):																
	Proposed	$281.40	$384.30	$461.40	$476.70	$486.90	$486.90	$486.90	$486.90	$486.90	$486.90	$486.90	$486.90	$486.90	$486.90	$486.90	--------
	Present	$259.36	$375.00	$450.00	$465.00	$475.00	$475.00	$475.00	$475.00	$475.00	$475.00	$475.00	$475.00	$475.00	$475.00	$475.00	--------
	Increase	$22.04	$9.30	$11.40	$11.70	$11.90	$11.90	$11.90	$11.90	$11.90	$11.90	$11.90	$11.90	$11.90	$11.90	$11.90	--------
	Number	4,861	18,914	15,135	6,662	2,725	1,162	737	254	112	44	8	1	--------	1	1	50,617
	Cost	$1,286	$2,111	$2,070	$935	$389	$166	$105	$36	$16	$6	$1	--------	--------	--------	--------	$7,121

TABLE NO. 1.—*Proposed increases in basic pay rates for officers (1965) (S. 3001)*—Continued

[Cost figures in thousands of dollars for 12 months]

Pay grade	Title	Years of service															
		Under 2	Over 2	Over 3	Over 4	Over 6	Over 8	Over 10	Over 12	Over 14	Over 16	Over 18	Over 20	Over 22	Over 26	Over 30	Total
O-1	2d lieutenant; ensign:																
	Proposed	$241.20	$307.50	$384.30	$384.30	$384.30	$384.30	$384.30	$384.30	$384.30	$384.30	$384.30	$384.30	$384.30	$384.30	$384.30	
	Present	$222.30	$300.00	$375.00	$375.00	$375.00	$375.00	$375.00	$375.00	$375.00	$375.00	$375.00	$375.00	$375.00	$375.00	$375.00	
	Increase	$18.90	$7.50	$9.30	$9.30	$9.30	$9.30	$9.30	$9.30	$9.30	$9.30	$9.30	$9.30	$9.30	$9.30	$9.30	
	Number	37,113	6,720	1,676	1,377	530	279	78	9	2						1	47,785
	Cost	$8,417	$605	$187	$154	$59	$31	$9	$1								$9,463
		Commissioned officers with over 4 years of active service as an enlisted member															
O-3	Captain; lieutenant:																
	Proposed				$533.10	$558.60	$579.00	$609 90	$640.50	$666.30	$666.30	$666.30	$666.30	$666.30	$666.30	$666.30	
	Present				$520.00	$545.00	$565.00	$595.00	$625.00	$650.00	$650.00	$650.00	$650.00	$650.00	$650.00	$650.00	
	Increase				$13.10	$13.60	$14.00	$14.90	$15.50	$16.30	$16.30	$16.30	$16.30	$16.30	$16.30	$16.30	
	Number				227	64	269	499	464	3,148	2,235	2,337	2,173	2,887	188	92	14,483
	Cost				$36	$10	$45	$89	$86	$616	$437	$438	$425	$565	$37	$18	$2,802
O-2	1st lieutenant; lieutenant (junior grade):																
	Proposed				$476.70	$486.90	$502.20	$528.00	$548.40	$563.70	$563.70	$563.70	$563.70	$563.70	$563.70	$563.70	
	Present				$465.00	$475.00	$490.00	$515.00	$535.00	$550.00	$550.00	$550.00	$550.00	$550.00	$550.00	$550.00	
	Increase				$11.70	$11.90	$12.20	$13.00	$13.40	$13.70	$13.70	$13.70	$13.70	$13.70	$13.70	$13.70	
	Number				11	76	662	750	492	1,013	719	526	523	322	38	2	5,134
	Cost				$2	$11	$97	$117	$79	$167	$118	$86	$86	$53	$6		$822
O-1	2d lieutenant; ensign:																
	Proposed				$384.30	$410.10	$425.40	$440.70	$456.00	$476.70	$476.70	$476.70	$476.70	$476.70	$476.70	$476.70	
	Present				$375.00	$400.00	$415.00	$430.00	$445.00	$465.00	$465.00	$465.00	$465.00	$465.00	$465.00	$465.00	
	Increase				$9.30	$10.10	$10.40	$10.70	$11.00	$11.70	$11.70	$11.70	$11.70	$11.70	$11.70	$11.70	
	Number				68	645	642	557	309	544	256	81	3			4	3,109
	Cost				$8	$78	$80	$72	$41	$76	$36	$11				$1	$403
		Warrant officers															
W-4	Chief warrant officer:																
	Proposed	$361.20	$440.70	$440.70	$450.90	$471.60	$492.00	$512.40	$548.40	$573.90	$594.60	$609.90	$630.30	$651.00	$702.00	$702.00	
	Present	$332.90	$430.00	$430.00	$440.00	$460.00	$480.00	$500.00	$535.00	$560.00	$580.00	$595.00	$615.00	$635.00	$685.00	$685.00	
	Increase	$28.30	$10.70	$10.70	$10.90	$11.60	$12.00	$12.40	$13.40	$13.90	$14.60	$14.90	$15.30	$16.00	$17.00	$17.00	
	Number		2		1		1	1		7	41	145	417	1,040	1,481	230	3,366
	Cost									$1	$7	$26	$77	$200	$302	$47	$660
W-3	Chief warrant officer:																
	Proposed	$328.50	$405.00	$405.00	$410.10	$415.20	$445.80	$471.60	$486.90	$502.20	$517.50	$533.10	$553.50	$573.90	$594.60	$594.60	
	Present	$302.64	$395.00	$395.00	$400.00	$405.00	$435.00	$460.00	$475.00	$490.00	$505.00	$520.00	$540.00	$560.00	$580.00	$580.00	
	Increase	$25.86	$10.00	$10.00	$10.10	$10.20	$10.80	$11.60	$11.90	$12.20	$12.50	$13.10	$13.50	$13.90	$14.60	$14.60	
	Number	2				2		3	24	79	226	870	1,596	1,386	414	25	4,627
	Cost	$1							$3	$12	$34	$137	$259	$231	$73	$4	$754
W-2	Chief warrant officer:																
	Proposed	$287.40	$353.70	$353.70	$363.90	$384.30	$405.00	$420.30	$435.60	$450.90	$466.50	$481.80	$497.10	$517.50	$517.50	$517.50	
	Present	$264.82	$345.00	$345.00	$355.00	$375.00	$395.00	$410.00	$425.00	$440.00	$455.00	$470.00	$485.00	$505.00	$505.00	$505.00	
	Increase	$22.58	$8.70	$8.70	$8.90	$9.30	$10.00	$10.30	$10.60	$10.90	$11.50	$11.80	$12.10	$12.50	$12.50	$12.50	
	Number	7	10	2	9	21	157	401	473	845	1,032	936	708	329	54	15	4,999
	Cost	$2	$1		$1	$2	$19	$50	$60	$111	$142	$133	$103	$49	$8	$2	$683
W-1	Warrant officer:																
	Proposed	$238.20	$312.60	$312.60	$338.40	$353.70	$369.00	$384.30	$399.90	$415.20	$430.50	$445.80	$461.40	$461.40	$461.40	$461.40	
	Present	$219.42	$305.00	$305.00	$330.00	$345.00	$360.00	$375.00	$390.00	$405.00	$420.00	$435.00	$450.00	$450.00	$450.00	$450.00	
	Increase	$18.78	$7.60	$7.60	$8.40	$8.70	$9.00	$9.30	$9.90	$10.20	$10.50	$10.80	$11.40	$11.40	$11.40	$11.40	
	Number	81	21	36	75	147	443	453	334	595	369	125	80	13			2,772
	Cost	$18	$2	$3	$8	$15	$48	$51	$40	$73	$46	$16	$11	$2			$333
E-9	Sergeant major; master chief petty officer:																
	Proposed							$445.80	$456.00	$466.50	$476.70	$486.90	$497.10	$522.90	$573.90	$573.90	
	Present							$435.00	$445.00	$455.00	$465.00	$475.00	$485.00	$510.00	$560.00	$560.00	
	Increase							$10.80	$11.00	$11.50	$11.70	$11.90	$12.10	$12.90	$13.90	$13.90	
	Number							1	6	344	1,418	2,951	3,394	4,559	752	121	13,546
	Cost								$1	$47	$199	$421	$493	$706	$125	$20	$2,012
E-8	Master sergeant; senior chief petty officer:																
	Proposed						$374.10	$384.30	$394.50	$405.00	$415.20	$425.40	$435.60	$461.40	$512.40	$512.40	
	Present						$365.00	$375.00	$385.00	$395.00	$405.00	$415.00	$425.00	$450.00	$500.00	$500.00	
	Increase						$9.10	$9.30	$9.50	$10.00	$10.20	$10.40	$10.60	$11.40	$12.40	$12.40	
	Number						7	166	669	2,711	5,483	8,334	7,511	7,714	1,033	167	33,795
	Cost						$1	$19	$76	$325	$671	$1,040	$955	$1,055	$154	$25	$4,321
E-7	Sergeant, 1st class; chief petty officer:																
	Proposed	$206.39	$282.00	$292.20	$302.40	$312.60	$322.80	$333.00	$343.50	$358.80	$369.00	$379.20	$384.30	$410.10	$461.40	$461.40	
	Present	$206.39	$275.00	$285.00	$295.00	$305.00	$315.00	$325.00	$335.00	$350.00	$360.00	$370.00	$375.00	$400.00	$450.00	$450.00	
	Increase	0	$7.00	$7.20	$7.40	$7.60	$7.80	$8.00	$8.50	$8.80	$9.00	$9.20	$9.30	$10.10	$11.40	$11.40	
	Number			4	28	177	1,606	4,412	7,826	18,083	25,268	24,853	15,477	10,836	1,791	260	110,621
	Cost				$2	$16	$150	$424	$798	$1,910	$2,729	$2,744	$1,727	$1,313	$245	$36	$12,094

E-6	Staff sergeant; petty officer, 1st class:																
	Proposed	$175.81	$246.00	$256.20	$266.40	$276.90	$287.10	$297.30	$312.60	$322.80	$333.00	$338.40	$338.40	$338.40	$338.40	$338.40	-------
	Present	$175.81	$240.00	$250.00	$260.00	$270.00	$280.00	$290.00	$305.00	$315.00	$325.00	$330.00	$330.00	$330.00	$330.00	$330.00	-------
	Increase	0	$6.00	$6.20	$6.40	$6.90	$7.10	$7.30	$7.60	$7.80	$8.00	$8.40	$8.40	$8.40	$8.40	$8.40	-------
	Number	----------	36	65	3,294	12,231	17,513	27,493	33,889	39,165	40,601	33,426	15,628	6,899	847	197	231,284
	Cost	----------	$3	$5	$253	$1,013	$1,492	$2,408	$3,091	$3,666	$3,898	$3,369	$1,575	$695	$85	$20	$21,573
E-5	Sergeant; petty officer, 2d class:																
	Proposed	$145.24	$215.40	$225.60	$235.80	$251.10	$26.130	$271.50	$282.00	$287.10	$287.10	$287.10	$287.10	$287.10	$287.10	$287.10	-------
	Present	$145.24	$210.00	$220.00	$230.00	$245.00	$255.00	$265.00	$275.00	$280.00	$280.00	$280.00	$280.00	$280.00	$280.00	$280.00	-------
	Increase	0	$5.40	$5.60	$5.80	$6.10	$6.30	$6.50	$7.00	$7.10	$7.10	$7.10	$7.10	$7.10	$7.10	$7.10	-------
	Number	4,125	17,141	22,692	38,842	49,343	49,197	56,574	54,773	42,729	31,018	23,470	10,515	4,652	264	57	405,392
	Cost	0	$1,111	$1,525	$2,703	$3,612	$3,719	$4,413	$4,601	$3,641	$2,643	$2,000	$896	$396	$22	$5	$31,287
E-4	Corporal; petty officer, 3d class:																
	Proposed	$122.30	$184.50	$194.70	$210.00	$220.50	$220.50	$220.50	$220.50	$220.50	$220.50	$220.50	$220.50	$220.50	$220.50	$220.50	-------
	Present	$122.30	$180.00	$190.00	$205.00	$215.00	$215.00	$215.00	$215.00	$215.00	$215.00	$215.00	$215.00	$215.00	$215.00	$215.00	-------
	Increase	0	$4.50	$4.70	$5.00	$5.50	$5.50	$5.50	$5.50	$5.50	$5.50	$5.50	$5.50	$5.50	$5.50	$5.50	-------
	Number	40,658	86,792	87,050	84,339	50,338	37,999	27,330	15,950	7,362	6,476	4,824	1,261	515	20	3	450,917
	Cost	0	$4,687	$4,910	$5,060	$3,322	$2,508	$1,804	$1,053	$486	$427	$318	$83	$34	$1	----------	$24,693
E-3	Private, 1st class; seaman:																
	Proposed	$99.37	$148.50	$159.00	$169.20	$169.20	$169.20	$169.20	$169.20	$169.20	$169.20	$169.20	$169.20	$169.20	$169.20	$169.20	-------
	Present	$99.37	$145.00	$155.00	$165.00	$165.00	$165.00	$165.00	$165.00	$165.00	$165.00	$165.00	$165.00	$165.00	$165.00	$165.00	-------
	Increase	0	$3.50	$4.00	$4.20	$4.20	$4.20	$4.20	$4.20	$4.20	$4.20	$4.20	$4.20	$4.20	$4.20	$4 20	-------
	Number	347,156	148,916	53,490	19,442	7,952	5,358	1,562	795	470	290	248	63	11	----------	1	585,754
	Cost	0	$6,254	$2,568	$980	$401	$270	$79	$40	$24	$15	$12	$3	$1	----------	----------	$10,647
E-2	Private; seaman apprentice:																
	Proposed	$85.80	$123.00	$123.00	$123.00	$123.00	$123.00	$123.00	$123.00	$123.00	$123.00	$123.00	$123.00	$123.00	$123.00	$123.00	-------
	Present	$85.80	$120.00	$120.00	$120.00	$120.00	$120.00	$120.00	$120.00	$120.00	$120.00	$120.00	$120.00	$120.00	$120.00	$120.00	-------
	Increase	0	$3.00	$3.00	$3.00	$3.00	$3.00	$3.00	$3.00	$3.00	$3.00	$3.00	$3.00	$3.00	$3.00	$3.00	-------
	Number	300,830	30,389	8,391	3,371	1,507	863	228	98	84	44	54	25	7	----------	----------	345,891
	Cost	0	$1,094	$302	$121	$54	$31	$8	$4	$3	$2	$2	$1	----------	----------	----------	$1,622
E-1	Recruit (over 4 months); seaman recruit:																
	Proposed	$83.20	$112.80	$112.80	$112.80	$112.80	$112.80	$112.80	$112.80	$112.80	$112.80	$112.80	$112.80	$112.80	$112.80	$112.80	-------
	Present	$83.20	$110.00	$110.00	$110.00	$110.00	$110.00	$110.00	$110.00	$110.00	$110.00	$110.00	$110.00	$110.00	$110.00	$110.00	-------
	Increase	0	$2.80	$2.80	$2.80	$2.80	$2.80	$2.80	$2.80	$2.80	$2.80	$2.80	$2.80	$2.80	$2.80	$2.80	-------
	Number	47,072	6,184	1,725	705	324	178	100	49	49	22	38	16	5	----------	----------	56,467
	Cost	0	$208	$58	$24	$11	$6	$3	$2	$2	$1	$1	$1	----------	----------	----------	$317
E-1	Recruit (under 4 months); seaman recruit:																
	Proposed	$78.00	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	-------
	Present	$78.00	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	-------
	Increase	0	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	-------
	Number	103,804	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	-------
	Cost	0	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	-------

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The bill is before the Senate and open to amendment.

Mr. **YARBOROUGH**. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to provide for a 2½-percent increase in pay for all enlisted men in grades 1 through 5, with less than 2 years of service.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, under the column "2 or less" in the table after line 1, strike out:

145.24
122.30
99.37
85.80
83.20
78.00

And insert in lieu thereof, respectively, the following:

148.87
125.36
101.85
87.95
85.28
79.95

Mr. **YARBOROUGH**. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. **YARBOROUGH**. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. **YARBOROUGH**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. **RUSSELL**. Mr. President, I should like to inquire how many Senators need be present in order to provide for a yea-and-nay vote.

Mr. **YARBOROUGH**. I withdraw my request for a yea-and-nay vote.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas.

The amendment was rejected.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. **THURMOND**. Mr. President, I commend the able Senator from Georgia for the excellent work he has done on the pending bill. The proposed increase in pay for the military is justified. Civilian employees of the Government have received numerous pay raises. The military have not received, in proportion, what the civilian employees have received. Frequently we overlook the important service that is being rendered by our military. They are sent from one country to another. Frequently they are separated from their families. They endure many hardships and make many sacrifices. I am very much pleased that the bill is now before the Senate, and I hope the Senate will take prompt and favorable action on it.

Mr. **YARBOROUGH**. Mr. President, I also desire to commend the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia for bringing the bill to the Senate. I regret that he does not agree with me that some recognition should be given to the enlisted personnel in grades E-1 through E-5, who have less than 2 years of service. They are the ones who are the footsloggers, who do the dirty work in the military service. They get the harsh details to perform; they get the cleanup details to perform. They are the ones who do the hard work.

These people have not had an increase in 12 years. The other members of the military services have had three increases in that time. They are the ones who are discriminated against. They are pulled out of their civilian employment and denied the GI bill benefits to go to school after they have completed their military service. No pay increases have been given to them in 12 years. Everyone else in the military service has received increases in pay. This is one group of people who are discriminated against by act of this Government.

I offered my amendment to point up how unjustly these men are being treated. They are sent to the tropics and to Arctic outposts, where they suffer many hardships. Yet they are denied the increase that is given to those who are higher up in the military services.

I do not decry the increases to the other personnel in the military service. They are justified. I see no justification in not increasing the pay of these other people. They are the ones who dig the foxholes, clean out the latrines, work around the messhalls, and go out on security patrols. They do the hardest work in the military service. Yet we are telling them, "No; you are not going to get an increase, because you really do not need the money."

It has been said that they would only spend their money on beer and cigarettes. I do not assume that men who earn $78 a month will spend that money on cigarettes and beer.

I regret that provisions have not been made for those men.

The remainder of the bill is justified. It is a fine bill otherwise. I commend the distinguished Senator from Georgia for getting as much as he has been able to get into the bill. However, I feel it leaves out one vital part. I am in favor of the bill, and I commend him and his committee for bringing it to the Senate, even though there are provisions that should be included but which have not been included.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. **LAUSCHE**. Mr. President, I voted against the pay raise bill which was passed a few weeks ago. I did not think it was justified. For that reason it met with my disapproval. The bill pending before us today contemplates giving the military some semblance of an equal increase in pay.

Mr. **RUSSELL**. Only 2½ percent.

Mr. **LAUSCHE**. It is much less than we have given to the civil servants of the Government.

I am very much struck by this accidental or deliberate deed. In each election year we have given a pay increase to the civilian employees. In 1958, an election year, the pay increase was 10.1 percent. In 1960, another election year, it was 7.7 percent by way of an increase. In 1962, an election year, the increase was 5.5 percent, with an automatic pay increase included in the 1962 measure, to take effect on January 1, 1964.

Again, in 1964, an election year, an increase of 4.2 percent was given.

It may be that such increases are made by accident in an election year.

There are some who will argue that that was by chance, not by deliberation. To accept that argument would require an absolute dismissal of reasoning on my part. It could not have happened that five pay increases were granted in election years without being the product of design and, in my judgment, of abject weakness.

Why in election years do we give pay increases to 2,700,000 employees? Is it because it brings votes? Or is it because in election years the demonstration has been made that the increases are justified?

Finally, if the civilian employees are entitled to pay increases, no one can argue to me that the military personnel are not. Although I voted against the civilian pay raise bill, I shall vote for this bill because, in my judgment, it contemplates nothing more than, in a measure, trying to deal with some semblance of equality with the various employees of the Government, although this measure grants a pay raise of only 2.5 percent to the military personnel.

I wonder when we are going to stop, in election years, indulging in conduct which, in my opinion, is wholly unbecoming the high and dignified office that we occupy in the Senate. The time will have to come. The sooner, the better.

Mr. **FONG**. Mr. President, I shall give my wholehearted support to the pending bill granting pay raises to nearly 2 million men and women in military service.

I supported the military pay raise bill last year as a "must"—to bring military pay more in line with that of Federal civilian and private industrial workers doing similar tasks.

Until last year, pay scales for military personnel had not been increased since 1958, although the cost of living had gone up 5½ percent.

Last year's pay bill was a major overhaul of military pay designed to bring greater equity in pay for America's men and women in uniform.

The pending bill is a relatively simple, but very important, across-the-board increase intended to keep military pay reasonably in pace with the increases recently voted by the House and Senate for Federal civilian employees.

I am very pleased that the Senate Armed Services Committee provided an 8.5-percent increase in basic pay for officers and warrant officers with less than 2 years service. Basic pay for this group has not been increased since 1952, while other pay brackets were increased in 1955, 1958, and 1963.

I would say an increase for commissioned personnel with less than 2 years' service is long overdue. Last year I cited the failure to give a pay boost to these service personnel as a defect of the pay bill of 1963. I am glad that the defect is being remedied.

I commend the members of the Armed Services Committee for recommending an 8.5-percent increase, compared with the 3-percent increase requested by the Department of Defense. About 44,600 persons will benefit from this provision.

The pending bill also provides an increase of 2.5 percent in basic pay for all personnel—officers and enlisted men alike—with more than 2 years of service. About 1,788,000 military personnel will benefit from this increase.

I am happy that the bill also provides pay increases for those entitled to drill pay—the reservists of the various services and National Guardsmen. The Department of Defense proposal would have excluded these persons.

I agree with the Armed Services Committee report that: "Today, the Active Reserves, especially those in a drill pay status, constitute a vital part of our national defense." Therefore, they should be included in this pay raise bill.

What I have said before in support of adequate pay for military persons deserves repetition. There are more than 2½ million military personnel on active duty in our Armed Forces. We depend on them to defend us.

The least we can do is give them fair and decent pay on a par with civilian Government workers and employees in private industry.

I support the pending bill as another step toward fair and decent pay for America's service men and women.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, as ranking minority member of the Senate Committee on Armed Services, I fully support S. 3001, which the chairman of the committee has urged the Senate to adopt. This military pay bill, which will provide a 2.5-percent increase in basic pay for all personnel with over 2 years of service and an 8.5-percent increase for officers with less than 2 years of service, is fully justified.

As the senior Senator from Georgia has noted, since 1958 civilian workers of the Government will have received four pay increases, including the one that is now in conference. Except for an adjustment in the quarters allowances in 1963, there was no intervening military pay raise following the one received in 1958 until the legislation which was enacted and effective last October 1.

COMMITTEE APPROACH

Mr. President, the committee approach to this problem was to provide the same percentage increase of 2.5 percent for both officers and enlisted men. In terms of dollars, for enlisted men this will provide average monthly increases ranging from about $7 for the E-4 to about $13 for the E-9; for officers, this will provide average monthly increases ranging from about $11 for the first lieutenant, $18 for the major, and $26 for the colonel, with general officers receiving increases ranging from $31 to $49 per month depending on their rank.

The 8.5 percent increase for officers with under 2 years is fully justified, in view of the lack of increase in this pay bracket since 1952. This will mean about $19 for the second lieutenant and about $22 for the first lieutenant. As the chairman has indicated, the Department of Defense recommended only a 3-percent increase for the under-2-year brackets.

Mr. President, the committee rightfully included all of our Reserves who are presently in a drill pay status, now numbering about 879,000, within the increases of this bill. As a vital part of our national defense, we should continue the historic practice that those in a drill pay status will be entitled to the current pay of the grade.

SUMMARY

Mr. President, this bill, affecting 2,762,000 persons and involving a cost of $207,519,000, is completely justified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (S. 3001) was passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. RUSSELL. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

STANDARD WEIGHTS AND MEASURES FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1113, H.R. 6413.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 6413) to amend the act approved March 3, 1921, establishing standard weights and measures for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with an amendment on page 2, line 6, after the word "if", to insert "the net contents of each such package are clearly and permanently marked thereon and if the labeling of the package conforms with the requirements of this Act or".

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1177), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> The purpose of this bill is to amend existing law (the act approved March 3, 1921, as amended, establishing standard weights and measures for the District of Columbia) so as to permit packaging of cream, milk, ice cream, and other fluid and frozen dairy products in smaller containers than those presently authorized.
>
> Section 14 of the above cited act reads in part as follows:
>
> "That bottles or jars used for the sale of milk or cream shall be of the capacity of one gallon, half gallon, three pints, one quart, one pint, half pint, or one gill."
>
> Thus, present law forbids the sale of milk in containers smaller than 1 gill in capacity. Because of this restriction, it is necessary for restaurants and other food service establishments to fill individual 1-ounce containers from bulk packages in order to provide individual servings of cream or half-and-half with coffee servings. The committee is advised that the District of Columbia Department of Public Health is of the opinion that unsanitary conditions often result from the exposure of open servings, and the Department does not approve such practice.
>
> Upon enactment of this legislation, the local dairies propose to utilize small, individual containers that would allow the packaging of 1 ounce or less of cream or half-and-half to be used for serving with coffee.
>
> Under the provisions of the bill as amended by the committee, the dairies will have the option of labeling each container filled with cream or half-and-half with the actual net contents, or, alternatively, of packaging two or more of such identical containers in a larger package and labeling such container with the total contents. When the latter packaging technique is used, the actual labeling of each individual unit with the net contents will not be required.
>
> These two alternative methods of packaging appear to be compatible with the existing packaging processes of the dairies and will not require the industry to make any extensive modification of their packaging techniques and equipment. Equally important, it is the view of the committee that these packaging provisions of the bill will benefit and protect the public as the actual packaging of the container with the dairy fluid product will be supervised and accomplished in an environment that maintains high standards of sanitation.
>
> Present law also prescribes a minimum of one-half pint for the quantity of ice cream, sherbet, and similar frozen food products which may be packaged for sale. This obsolete packaging provision does not, of course, take cognizance of modern packaging processes which have been developed by industry in connection with the sale of ice cream and other frozen dairy products. This is apparent from the fact that existing law renders illegal the sale of ice cream in cups smaller than one-half pint, Eskimo Pies, and similar frozen dairy products and desserts.
>
> H.R. 6413 would correct the inadequacy of existing law as it relates to the packaging of ice cream and other frozen products and desserts by providing for all frozen dairy products and desserts to be packaged in units of gallons, 1½ gallons, 2½ gallons, integral multiples of the gallon, or binary submultiples of the gallon of not less than 1 fluid ounce.
>
> In addition to packaging in these quantities, the bill also makes provision for ice cream and other frozen dairy products to be sold in individually packaged portions in integral multiples of 1 ounce, between the limits of 4 and 16 ounces, and in integral multiples of one-half ounce if the portion is smaller than 4 ounces. Also, when 2 or more of these small individual portions are sold in a single outside container (as a package of 24 Eskimo Pies of 3 ounces each), the outside package must be labeled to show properly the number of individual portions contained therein and the total net contents of the package.
>
> On January 23, 1964, the Subcommittee on Business and Commerce held public hearings on H.R. 6413, at which time representatives of the Commissioners for the District of

Columbia, and the Milk and Veterinary Division, Department of Public Health for the District of Columbia, appeared and testified in support of the bill. Also appearing at the hearing and supporting the bill, as amended by the committee, were representatives from the East Coast Ice Cream Novelties and the American Can Co. No one appeared in opposition to the legislation.

Enactment of this measure will not involve any additional expenditure for the District of Columbia.

GRANTING OF CERTAIN PERMITS TO IMPERIAL SHRINE CONVENTION, 1965, INC.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1114, House Joint Resolution 888.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 888) to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to promulgate special regulations for the period of the 91st annual session of the Imperial Council, Ancient Arabic Order of the Nobles of the Mystic Shrine for North America, to be held in Washington, D.C., in July 1965, to authorize the granting of certain permits to Imperial Shrine Convention, 1965, Inc., on the occasions of such sessions, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 888) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 1178), explaining the purposes of the joint resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

> The Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom was referred the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 888) to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to promulgate special regulations for the period of the 91st annual session of the Imperil Council, Ancient Arabic Order of the Nobles of the Mystic Shrine for North America, to be held in Washington, District of Columbia, in July 1965, to authorize the granting of certain permits to Imperial Shrine Convention, 1965, Inc., on the occasion of such sessions and for other purposes, after full consideration, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the joint resolution do pass.
>
> The purpose of this joint resolution is to authorize the District of Columbia Commissioners and certain Federal officers to provide for the comfort and protection of all persons within the District of Columbia during the 91st annual session of the Imperial Council, Ancient Arabic Order of the Nobles of the Mystic Shrine for North America, which will convene in the District of Columbia on July 13, 1965, and conclude 2 days later on July 15, 1965.
>
> The committee has been advised that the magnitude of the forthcoming Shrine convention will present special problems, as well as exert a heavy burden on the municipal services of the city. These problems relate to the handling of traffic and large crowds, and the erection of reviewing stands for the Shrine parade. In addition, there is a need for the services of the Police Department and the Department of Public Health to be adequately supplemented in order to protect the personal safety and health of the citizenry of the District and the many visitors who will be here.
>
> The enactment of House Joint Resolution 888 will in some large measure take care of these related problems and provide the District Commissioners and certain Federal officials with the authority needed to cooperate fully with Shrine officials in implementing a safe and successful Shrine convention in the District of Columbia.
>
> The principal provisions of House Joint Resolution 888 are as follows:
>
> 1. The Commissioners are authorized and directed to make regulations to preserve peace and order, specially regulate traffic, and issue special licenses to peddlers and vendors, such regulations to be effective during the period of the meeting, defined by the resolution as a 10-day period beginning July 8, 1965, and ending July 17, 1965, both dates inclusive.
> 2. Appropriations are authorized to pay the cost of providing additional municipal services and to pay for other municipal expenses connected with the meeting, estimated at $216,000.
> 3. The Secretary of the Interior and the Commissioners are authorized to grant permits for the use of public space under their respective jurisdictions, subject to certain limitations imposed by the resolution.
> 4. The Commissioners are authorized to permit the installation of temporary electrical facilities of all kinds, also subject to certain limitations imposed by the resolution.
> 5. The Secretary of Defense is authorized to lend certain equipment belonging to the Department of Defense to be used in connection with providing for the well-being of the expected crowds, also subject to limitations imposed by the resolution.
> 6. The temporary placing of wires along and across the line of any parade for use by electric lighting and communications concerns is authorized.
> 7. The effective period of the regulations authorized to be adopted and a penalty for their violation are prescribed.
> 8. The resolution requires the corporation to indemnify and save harmless the District of Columbia and Federal Government against loss, damage, or liability, and provides that such requirement shall be satisfied by the corporation's submitting to the District of Columbia Commissioners and the Secretary of the Interior an insurance policy or a bond, or both, in such amounts and subject to such terms as these officials may deem adequate to protect the interests of the respective governments.
> 9. Finally, the resolution specifically exempts from its provisions the U.S. Capitol Buildings and Grounds, and other property under the jurisdiction of the Congress.
>
> Legislation similar in scope to House Joint Resolution 888 has been enacted by the Congress in past years when conventions and other public gatherings have brought great numbers of people into the District of Columbia. On July 25, 1958, Congress adopted a resolution (72 Stat. 412) similar to House Joint Resolution 888 when the Middle Atlantic Shrine Association meeting of APONMS was held in the District of Columbia in September of that year. Similarly, another resolution was adopted in connection with the American Legion Convention of 1954 (68 Stat. 743). This joint resolution is patterned substantially after the Presidential Inaugural Ceremonies Act of 1956 (70 Stat. 1049).
>
> On January 22, 1964, the Subcommittee on Business and Commerce held a public hearing on Senate Joint Resolution 107, the companion joint resolution to House Joint Resolution 888. During such hearing, the committee was informed that the Imperial Shrine Convention is held annually in one of the major cities of the United States, Canada, or Mexico, and further, that when the forthcoming 91st annual session is scheduled to convene in the District of Columbia, it is estimated that 150,000 Shrine delegates will be in attendance. As is generally the custom, the Shrine during the course of its convention will present two parades, one at night and the other during the day. It is anticipated that these colorful events will attract more than a million viewers into the downtown area of the city. The committee was also advised that the many Shrine delegates with their families, and the hundreds of thousands of spectators to the Shrine parades and activities may be expected to result in the spending of $15 to $20 million in the District of Columbia during the convening of the convention.
>
> A representative of the Commissioners for the District of Columbia appeared at the public hearing on this joint resolution and supported enactment of Senate Joint Resolution 107, but with amendments that makes the Senate resolution identical to House Joint Resolution 888. The committee also received letters from the Assistant Secretary of the Department of the Interior, and the Secretary of the Army, wherein it was indicated that they had no objection to the enactment of the joint resolution. However, the latter imposed an objection to paragraph 6 of the joint resolution which authorizes the Secretary of Defense under certain conditions to lend the Shrine Corp. certain field hospital equipment. The committee carefully considered the objection and concluded that such paragraph should not be deleted. This position was taken for the reason that the provisions of paragraph 6 are intended as standby authority in instances of emergency, and further, the loaning of any such equipment is permissive with the Secretary of Defense and is not mandatory.

PROTECTION OF HEADS OF FOREIGN STATES AND OTHER DESIGNATED OFFICIALS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1115, S. 1917.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (S. 1917) to provide authority to protect heads of foreign states and other designated officials.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with amendments, on page 1, line 3, after the word "That", to strike out "the first paragraph of"; in line 9, after the word "minister", to strike out "Ambassador" and insert "ambassador"; on page 2, line 6, after "chapter 7", to insert "title 18, United States Code"; in the line following line 7, after the word "public", to strike out "minister.", and insert "minister"; in line 8, after the word "and", to strike out "adding" and insert "inserting"; at the beginning of line 12, to insert "or any"; in the same line, after the word "security", to strike out "officers" and insert "officer"; at the beginning of line 13, to strike out "and", and insert "or"; in line 14, after "1955", to strike out the comma and "69 Stat. 188," and insert "(ch. 199, 69 Stat. 188; 5 U.S.C. 170e)"; and on page 3, after line 2, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 5. Nothing contained in this act shall create immunity from criminal prosecution under any laws in any State, Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, territory, possession, or the District of Columbia.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 112 of title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 112. Assaulting certain foreign diplomatic and other official personnel

"Whoever assaults, strikes, wounds, imprisons, or offers violence to the person of any head of foreign state or foreign government, foreign minister, ambassador or other public minister, in violation of the law of nations, shall be fined not more than $5,000, or imprisoned not more than three years, or both.

"Whoever, in the commission of any such acts uses a deadly or dangerous weapon, shall be fined not more than $10,000, or imprisoned not more than ten years, or both."

SEC. 2. The analysis in chapter 7, title 18, United States Code, is amended by deleting

"112. Assaulting public minister"

and inserting in lieu thereof

"112. Assaulting certain foreign diplomatic and other official personnel".

SEC. 3. Section 1114 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting immediately before "while engaged in the performance of his official duties," the following: "or any security officer of the Department of State or the Foreign Service.".

SEC. 4. The Act of June 28, 1955 (ch. 199, 69 Stat. 188; 5 U.S.C. 170e) is amended by adding a new section at the end thereof, to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. Security officers of the Department of State and the Foreign Service engaged in the performance of the duties prescribed in section 1 of this Act are empowered to arrest without warrant and deliver into custody any person violating the provisions of section 111 or 112 of title 18, United States Code, in their presence or if they have reasonable grounds to believe that the person to be arrested has committed or is committing such felony."

SEC. 5. Nothing contained in this Act shall create immunity from criminal prosecution under any laws in any State, Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, territory, possession, or the District of Columbia.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1179), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAIN PURPOSE

The purpose of S. 1917 is to enable the Department of State better to discharge its responsibility to safeguard certain specified foreign officials while visiting the United States on official business by (1) making it a Federal offense to assault the head of a foreign state or of a foreign government or a foreign minister; (2) making it a Federal offense to kill security officers of the Department of State and the Foreign Service while engaged in the performance of official duties or on account of such duties; and (3) empowering such security officers to arrest without warrant persons violating section 111 or 112 of title 18, United States Code, in their presence or if they have reasonable grounds to believe that the person to be arrested has committed or is committing such a violation.

BACKGROUND

Presently 18 U.S.C. 112 makes it a Federal crime to assault, strike, wound, imprison, or offer violence to the person of an ambassador or other public minister. The language and terminology of this section dates from a 1791 statute. At that time, and for practically a century and a half afterward, the conduct of foreign relations was almost entirely carried on by an "ambassador or other public minister." Beginning with World War II, however, diplomacy began to be conducted more frequently by the heads of state or governments and by foreign ministers. The average number of foreign ministers visiting Washington each year is approximately 25.

Visits of such nature are undertaken with the advance agreement of the U.S. Government which then assumes an obligation under international law to offer complete protection to the visitor. The first change proposed in S. 1917, therefore, is to make it a Federal offense to assault foreign heads of state or of governments and foreign ministers, as well as the ambassadors and other public ministers now covered by the law.

The second change proposed in S. 1917 is to make the murder or manslaughter of State Department and Foreign Service security agents a Federal offense by adding this group to the provisions of 18 U.S.C. 1114, which now covers post office inspectors, Coast Guard personnel, internal revenue personnel, immigration officers, as well as Park Service employees, employees of the Bureau of Animal Industry and of the Bureau of Land Management in the Department of Agriculture, and employees of the Indian Field Service.

The third provision of S. 1917 authorizes those State Department and Foreign Service security agents, who are entitled under Public Law 104 of the 84th Congress to carry firearms, to "arrest without warrant and deliver into custody any person violating the provisions of section 111 or 112 of title 18, United States Code, in their presence or if they have reasonable grounds to believe that the person to be arrested has committed or is committing such felony."

These latter two provisions are deemed to be equally desirable by the Department of State.

The Department of State has been carrying out the function of protecting distinguished foreign officials during visits to the United States since 1917. The only authority which State Department and Foreign Service security agents have had, and then only since 1955, is that contained in Public Law 104 of the 84th Congress, authorizing certain security officers, who have qualified for the use of firearms, to carry firearms for the purpose of protecting heads of foreign states, high officials of foreign governments and other distinguished visitors to the United States.

Frequently, State Department or Foreign Service security officers are the only protective agents present as high foreign officials move from State to State or city to city in the United States. It is, therefore, deemed important that an offense against the person of the agent be considered a Federal offense. Similarly, the power to make arrests without warrant is considered "a reasonable grant of authority to men who are given a very heavy responsibility and who are scarcely in a position to discharge that responsibility without having such authority." The nature of the arrest power is exactly the same as that given to agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, U.S. marshals and their deputies, and employees of the Bureau of Prisons of the Department of Justice. In the case of State Department and Foreign Service security agents it will be limited strictly to the area of protection of foreign dignitaries.

COMMITTEE ACTION AND RECOMMENDATION

S. 1917 was proposed by the Department of State in a letter to the Senate received on July 15, 1963, and referred that day to the Committee on Foreign Relations. It was introduced by Senator FULBRIGHT (by request) on July 18. 1963. On July 7, 1964, the Committee on Foreign Relations held a public hearing on the bill at which Richard D. Kearney, Deputy Legal Adviser of the Department of State, appeared on behalf of the measure. Mr. Kearney's prepared statement is appended to the report, together with a letter submitted for the record by the Department of Justice. No adverse comments of any kind were brought to the committee's attention. Following the public hearing, the committee ordered S. 1917 reported favorably to the Senate with amendments, which are largely of a perfecting nature. With the proposed amendments, S. 1917 is identical to H.R. 7651, which passed the House on May 4, 1964, and is now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate. The one noteworthy amendment is a new section 5 added by the House which states:

"Nothing contained in this Act shall create immunity from criminal prosecution under any laws in any State, Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, territory, possession, or the District of Columbia."

This language is acceptable to the Department of State which considers it to reflect current practice.

In voting to report S. 1917, the committee noted the limited scope of the measure. Assuming that each of the 110 nations with which the United States maintains diplomatic relations, has a head of state, a head of government, and a foreign minister—which they do not—the maximum number of persons entitled to the increased protection contained in the first section will be no more than 330. Likewise, the number of State Department and Foreign Service security agents, who are now authorized to carry firearms, having been qualified for this under the standards of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and who would be affected by the other two provisions of S. 1917, is at present 110. The provisions of S. 1917, therefore, are strictly circumscribed both by the nature of the authorities contained therein and by the number of persons affected. The committee concurs with the executive branch that S. 1917 constitutes a reasonable effort to increase the protection offered to visiting high officials and urges the Senate to take prompt and favorable action on it.

MEETINGS OF SUBCOMMITTEE ON ADMINISTRATIVE PRACTICE DURING SENATE SESSIONS THIS WEEK

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure of the Committee on the Judiciary be permitted to hold hearings during the sessions of the Senate this week.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DUAL EMPLOYMENT AND DUAL COMPENSATION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of the unfinished business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7381) to simplify, modernize, and consolidate the laws relating to the employment of civilians in more than one position and the laws concerning the civilian employment of retired members of the armed services, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the majority leader has 60 minutes on the bill, and the minority leader has 60 minutes on the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the distinguished majority leader.

I had intended to offer an amendment to H.R. 7381, the so-called Dual Compensation Act. The amendment would eliminate Senate confirmation of nominations of U.S. postmasters in the top three classes. The amendment would enhance the efficiency of the postal service by extending to postmasters all the merit service principles which now apply to classified Government personnel.

In my judgment, Senate confirmation of the nominations of postmasters is a carryover from horse-and-buggy days, when the country was far smaller, our Government was far less busy, and much more time was available to Senators.

For Senators to spend their time scrutinizing the qualifications of a postmaster in "East Overshoes" does not make any sense. We know we do not do it. We rely on those who are partisans in our States to make recommendations to us. To be frank about it, our partisans do the best they can to assess the qualifications of postmasters; but the only qualification on which they will insist, whether they be Republicans or Democrats, is that the nominee be a good party worker or be active in the party and have participated in political activities.

How can any postal employee aspire to be postmaster when his employment by the Government prohibits political activity, and Senate confirmation makes political activity a virtual necessity for Senate approval of postmasters?

This single ridiculous legal requirement that the U.S. Senate act on the confirmation of the nominations of postmasters compels Senators to devote many hours of valuable time and requires excessive staff time whenever the Senator belongs to the same party as the President.

I tried to keep a record of the amount of time we had to spend in our office, which is fairly typical, on postal appointments. It is shocking. It is a ridiculous waste of time for the staff and for the Senator.

The only argument for immersing postmasters in politics this way is that the nominations of postmasters give Senators a chance to build some patronage, to enhance their position in the political party, to give them some influence, so that they can build a little organization in the State. We who have had experience for even a little while realize how empty such patronage is.

From a political standpoint, the patronage leads to nothing but grief. If we recommend a man for appointment, and he becomes postmaster, then he cannot take part locally in political activity. The county chairman may have served faithfully in that post, but if he is made postmaster in a little town, he has to remove himself from political activity. That does not make sense. Also, for every successful appointee there are from 2 to 10 or more unhappy or even infuriated "rejectees" who will long resent their Senator's action.

I have had pending for years in the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service a bill to stop this nonsense. I know at least one other Senator, the distinguished senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], has had a similar bill pending for many years. I introduced my first bill for this purpose several years ago and have reintroduced it at each session, to end this ridiculous situation, but I cannot obtain hearings.

Under the circumstances, my only alternative is to call up my bill as an amendment, which I hesitate to do on this occasion, because it is not directly related to the dual compensation bill. But apparently there is no other bill to be reported by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service this year which could be amended and would have a chance of passage except this particular one.

Mr. President, I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I join in support of the argument of the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin. The Senate should not continue the farce of requiring the Senate confirmation of the nominations of postmasters. Certainly I am not qualified to pass on the merits of postmasters in Wisconsin. I do not have the time to study the background of all these individuals.

Sooner or later we should pass a bill similar to that which both the Senator from Wisconsin and I have introduced. Several years ago I introduced a companion bill to achieve the same objective. The sooner we pass such a bill and take postmasters out of the political arena the better it will be for the postal service, the Senate, and the country.

If the Senator from Wisconsin does not press his amendment now I will join him in continuing to urge the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to afford us the opportunity to have hearings on one bill and to get some action on it. The time is long overdue when the Senate should stop this procedure.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield to the Sena-from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Do I correctly understand the Senator from Wisconsin to have said that he has a bill pending upon which he cannot obtain hearings in the committee?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I have written to the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service who, in my estimation, is one of the finest Members of this body, a most considerate and thoughtful man, but I have not been able to get any hearings. I have asked for hearings, but hearings have not been forthcoming.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator would not seek to amend the pending bill——

Mr. PROXMIRE. I had intended to amend the pending bill, but I hope that the distinguished Senator from South Carolina, who has been most considerate and is such an able man, will consider the possibility of scheduling hearings, if not this year, which I know is very late, then perhaps next year, if I return to the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, in reply to the Senator from Wisconsin, let me say that I believe he realizes the situation in——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I yield 4 minutes to the Senator from South Carolina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I am sure the Senator realizes that there have been many bills in the committee. They should be acted upon and will require hearings, but I assure the Senator from Wisconsin that there will be hearings on his bill as soon as possible.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Will the Senator indicate that in the event hearings are not possible this year, hearings will be held as early as possible in 1965?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I agree to that. Of course, I am not holding up the measure. It was taken up in committee and discussed. We went over the bills before the committee. The committee thought it best not to try to press for action immediately; but we should certainly have hearings on the pay bill and other matters which are believed to be important.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield for a question?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Under the Senator's bill, how would the appointments be made?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The appointments would be made strictly on the basis of a civil service examination, on the merit principle, on the basis of the person being qualified through a civil service examination.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Thus liberating Senators from the responsibility of making approvals solely upon the word of political leaders back home and nothing more, because a Senator does not have the time to delve into the matter as deeply as he would like to in making his approval.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is correct. It would have three effects. First, it would mean that a person would be appointed on the basis of merit. Second, it would mean a far greater incentive in the postal service for people to aspire to the top jobs, which in most local communities would be that of postmaster. Third, Senators would be relieved of a burden which is excessive and irrelevant.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the distinguished Senator from Ohio very much.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I thank the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin for not pressing his amendment at this time, since the bill before us is the dual compensation bill relating solely to one limited field of compensation and not to the matter of qualification and appointment, and particularly since the matter of post office patronage is basically one for the House of Representatives. This is a problem for the House, and if we start in the Senate to——

Mr. PROXMIRE. The House does not confirm nominations of postmasters. The Senate does. It is true that some Senators have delegated a great deal of that patronage to the House. But we in the Senate have the basic responsibility. Conversations with House colleagues and the experience I have gained over a number of years convince me that they, too, recognize that this is a burden, and that it is far more of a political liability than a political asset to them.

I know of very few people who really want this system and who think it is essential politically, or in any other way. Almost everyone agrees that it is not good government.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I thank the Senator for withdrawing his amendment at this time.

Mr. President, I yield myself 15 minutes on the bill.

In answer to the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], who stated that H.R. 7381 had no effect on civilian military retirement, and that it applied to the dual compensation bill rather than the retirement bill, I ask unanimous consent at this time to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Mr. Andrew E. Ruddock, Director of the Bureau of Retirement and Insurance of the Civil Service Commission, dated July 14, 1964, explaining how the retirement law works.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
BUREAU OF RETIREMENT AND INSURANCE,
Washington, D.C., July 14, 1964.

Hon. RALPH YARBOROUGH,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Civil Service, Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, U.S. Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in response to your oral request for a review of the existing provisions of the Civil Service Retirement Act governing the creditability of military service and for comment as to whether enactment of H.R. 7381 in present form would alter these provisions.

Under existing law, once an employee covered by the Civil Service Retirement Act completes 5 years of civilian service, the act authorizes credit for all of his past periods of honorable active military service, subject to the following exceptions:

1. Credit for military service is barred if the employee receives military retired pay, unless the retired pay is awarded—

(a) On account of service-connected disability which was incurred in combat with an enemy of the United States or was caused by an instrumentality of war in line of duty during a period of war, or

(b) Under chapter 67 of title 10, United States Code (providing retired pay at age 60 after 20 or more years' non-Regular service by members of Reserve components of the Armed Forces). (5 U.S.C. 2253(b).)

2. Credit is also barred for periods of military service performed after December 1956 (other than periods covered by military leave with pay from a civilian position) if the employee or his survivor is, or upon proper application would be, entitled to monthly old-age or survivor benefits under the Social Security Act based upon any wages or self-employment income of the employee. This credit bar operates from the commencing date of annuity if the social security eligibility exists at that time. If social security eligibility arises after annuity has commenced, the annuity is recomputed to exclude credit for the post-1956 military service from the point of social security entitlement. (5 U.S.C. Supp. IV, 2253(j).)

These Retirement Act provisions relate to service credit only and do not affect an individual's right to retired pay or other benefit deriving from military service. Neither the Retirement Act nor the retired pay statutes contain any provision prohibiting the concurrent receipt of military retired pay and civil service annuity if entitled to both.

For convenient reference, I am enclosing several copies of our informational leaflet BRI 46-226b which explains, in question and answer form, the existing rules on the crediting of military service under the Retirement Act.

H.R. 7381, as passed by the House and reported by the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, proposes no change in the present method (above outlined) of crediting military service for annuity purposes under the Civil Service Retirement Act.

Sincerely yours,
ANDREW E. RUDDOCK,
Director.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. For further clarification, Mr. Ruddock's letter explains the provisions of the present law on retirement. It states that title 5, United States Code Annotated, section 2253(b), provides retired pay only in the event of service-connected disability which was incurred in combat with an enemy of the United States or was caused by an instrumentality of war in line of duty during a period of war, or in the case of one who is eligible for military retirement benefits upon the completion of 20 or more years of non-Regular service at the age of 60.

I emphasize that this is a provision of the existing law, and that H.R. 7381 would not in any way change the retirement provision of existing law. We are dealing solely with employment and compensation under dual compensation.

In our discussion of July 10, the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF] summarized his reasons for opposing certain provisions of this bill. He propounded 11 interrogatories which are printed on pages 16189 and 16190 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for July 9, 1964.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand the answers to those 11 interrogatories, and since the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF] who propounded them is not present in the Chamber at this time, I ask unanimous consent to have these answers printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the interrogatories were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

First. H.R. 7381 is not antilabor and antiveteran. Veterans' preference is modified by counting for purposes of reduction in force only those periods of service during a national emergency, armed conflict, or war. Peacetime service will no longer be counted in computing preference over nonveterans or veterans not entitled to preference. Any veteran having less than 20 years' service, who therefore does not receive the military retirement unless he is retired on disability, will continue to enjoy all veterans preference. No veteran presently employed by the Government will lose any preference.

Second. There is no evidence that H.R. 7381 will cost any money. In fact, there will be modest savings caused by the reduction in retirement pay for retired Regular officers who obtain civilian positions.

Third. The "buddy system," as it is popularly known, is effectively proscribed by section 204 of the bill. A 6-month waiting period will be necessary before any retired military person can be employed anywhere in the Department of Defense unless unusual conditions exist and requirements specified in the bill are met in each case.

Fourth. H.R. 7381 does not pervert or distort congressional policy in regard to retired military personnel. H.R. 7381 embodies new policy reflecting the needs of the Government in the atomic age for securing the services of highly skilled personnel.

Fifth. There is no evidence demonstrating this bill is economically unsound. Positions in the Federal service need to be filled with the best people we can find. It does not cost a cent more to hire a retired military person to fill a civilian position. In the event he is a retired Regular officer heretofore barred from the Federal service, slight savings will be incurred.

Sixth. Veterans' preference is modified only for purposes of reduction in force and the accumulation of annual leave. These modifications apply only to persons retired from the military with at least 20 years' service who receive retirement benefits.

Seventh. The 1962 employment figures show that approximately 3 percent of our civilian employees are retired military people. Under present law, the only retired military man who cannot be employed by the Government is a Regular officer retired for length of service. Since 85 percent of the military are enlisted personnel and about one-half of the commissioned officers are Reserve, and because some officers retired on disability, the number presently barred from Federal employment who would become eligible for employment is not more than a few hundred a year.

Eighth. Relief provisions for warrant officers and Reserve officers are designed to correct an inequity caused by incorrect administrative interpretation of the present law. These employees were paid for services performed. It would be unconscionable to require them to reimburse the Government.

Ninth. In pursuance of White House efforts for economy in government, H.R. 7381 modernizes employment laws so that the Government can obtain the best qualified personnel available.

Tenth. There are five different retirement systems operated by the Government: Civil service, Foreign Service, railroad retirement, social security, and military retirement. Different rules apply in different cases. A retired career civilian employee may enter the military service, receive the full pay of his military rank and his full annuity. There are many examples of this exact situation.

Eleventh. It is difficult to see how modernized dual compensation laws to allow people to go to work will result in unemployment. On the contrary, it will create opportunities for employment which does not presently exist.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I hope that other Senators will find these answers responsive to the questions raised during the recess for the Republican Convention. The staff had had time to diligently work on this problem. The answers were prepared by the aid of the staff, and they have boiled them down to less than two letter-size pages. I commend the staff for the fine work they have done. They have had some time and have done their work well.

With these clarifications and the explanation that was made when the bill was taken up July 9, and which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD from pages 16184 through 16191, I feel that it would be merely repetitious for me to explain the bill further at this time.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I thank the Senator from Texas for putting Mr. Ruddock's letter in the RECORD. Many points were raised in the discussion on July 9 at which time the bill was before us, and while I recognize that the committee's questions are answered in the letter, for clarification I should like to ask the Senator if I am correct in my understanding that the bill as it is now before the Senate does not in any way affect or change existing law as regards retirement benefits?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. The Senator is correct. We have had this matter before the Bureau of Retirement Insurance since our discussion here this afternoon, and they assure me that it would not in any way affect or change the retirement benefits.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. One other question in connection with existing law on retirement, I should like to raise this question because I believe it is one which should be given consideration either on this bill or in connection with the next retirement bill. I am referring particularly to the Ruddock letter as it outlined a situation in paragraph 1(b), which reads as follows:

> Under chapter 67 of title 10, United States Code (providing retired pay at age 60 after 20 or more years' nonregular service by members of Reserve components of the Armed Forces).

In this situation does this individual get credit for the same 20 years' military service in computing both his military retirement and his civil service retirement assuming he works 5 years minimum under civil service? Am I correct that in retiring he can pick up, No. 1, his military retirement benefits for his 20 years or more in military service? That would be No. 1 retirement. Second, as a result of his 5 years of civilian service under the civil service could he retire and draw compensation for this 5 years' civilian service plus the 20 years of military service?

In other words, would he get credit for 25 years under civil service retirement even though he had only worked 5 years? This is what I had in mind when I referred to this as giving a man double credit for his military service.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. That is correct. The distinguished Senator from Delaware has correctly interpreted the law. That is the existing law. That is not affected by the bill. Ours is a compensation law, not a retirement law.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I think the question of dual retirement benefits for military service should be pointed out. How would that work if a man in the same category were elected to Congress and were to serve 5 years in Congress? Would he be eligible for the dual retirement in the same manner?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. As I understand it, the congressional retirement is different from the service retirement.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Will the Senator from Texas, the Senator in charge of the bill, obtain the answer and have it placed in the RECORD?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. We shall obtain the answer and have it printed in the RECORD. That proposal applies to a very limited group.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It may be a limited group, but it would be an unusual benefit if it were to apply to Members of Congress. Assuming that the $30,000 a year salary is in effect 5 years from now, it would mean an additional $15,000 a year in extra retirement benefits for a man with 20 years' military service as described in the letter from Mr. Ruddock. At a time when we are debating whether we can afford to pay $1,200 to those who had military service in World War I, it certainly looks strange now to give another group an additional $15,000 a year. I would agree that the individual involved should have the right to select the higher of the two, but not to receive both retirements.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I know of no Senator who would qualify for this.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. But it would be possible if a man were working in any department of the executive branch for him to pick up this dual credit for military service in computing his retirement?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Yes. That is the existing law. But that is a limited group. That concerns those in the Reserve. A Regular Army officer could not do that, under the existing law, or under dual compensation.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I realize that it is a very limited group. But that does not mean it is right. Does the Senator not feel that the committee, when it brings out a bill that deals with retirement, should take into consideration whether the formula does constitute an unwarranted pension benefit in regard to a particular group?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Undoubtedly the question of whether they have favored positions will be studied. The present law deals only with the compensation of a limited group of retired officers who are retired on length of service and not disability.

We have worked on this problem for 9 years. The work started before I came to the Senate. It took that long to make this much progress. I promise speedier progress on this question.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. May we have the assurance of the Senator that it will be studied?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Yes. Our committee will comply with the request of the distinguished Senator from Delaware. We shall instruct the staff to include that in the subsequent study when the retirement laws are amended.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I think we should get that assurance. Since the bill before us does not deal with the retirement benefits, I shall not press the point at this time. However, I think these are questions which should have been given a little more careful consideration by the committee before it reported the bill.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], who had raised some of these questions, is unable to be present. He has a prepared statement in which he points out his reasons for being disturbed over some of the provisions in the bill and why he felt the bill should have been given a little more careful consideration before being reported by the committee.

Mr. President, upon his request I ask unanimous consent that the statement prepared by the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF] on H.R. 7381 be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY LEE METCALF

As I indicated in our debate on this bill recently, I am disturbed by some of its provisions and omissions. I am prepared to suggest that it be sent back to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service with instructions that it be restricted to two points. The balance of the proposals should be resubmitted next year after appropriate, and I would hope, more detailed and critical study. The committee should report back a bill which would cancel all obligations of officers found to have been illegally overpaid down to the date of the Comptroller General's ruling of July 9, 1962, and permit the employment of Federal civilian personnel in more than one position up to the length of the Federal workweek, plus a ceiling on total pay.

I assume that these provisions of the bill are relatively noncontroversial. Certainly the ban on two civilian positions hampers several agencies and if guarded by an hours-per-week limit, as in this bill, plus a ceiling on compensation, which is not in this bill, it should be acceptable. As regards the former officers who have illegally received dual compensation, we should avoid working a hardship on innocent citizens even though the total involved is estimated to be $16 million, most of that sum having been paid out by the Defense Department. In reporting this bill back, I would hope that the committee would include in its report a statement of the total amount involved, by Federal agency, and include the name, military rank, and civilian position of every individual involved who has been illegally paid more than $500. I think the Congress has a right to know which agencies were delinquent in enforcing the law and the extent of their delinquency. I do not think that innocent persons should be penalized for agency delinquency, but since the agency which is apparently the chief offender is the one department which should be best informed on laws affecting military personnel I see no reason why all the facts should not be made available.

In reporting this bill the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service asserted that it had four basic goals in mind.

First, it intended to codify and simplify Federal law on dual compensation, a commendable aim, a job long overdue, but not one to be achieved at the expense of more important principles. A part of this first purpose, actually a second purpose was to afford what it terms "relief" for the two groups of officers found to be overpaid by some $16 million. I am agreeable specifically to the second part of this first aim, and generally to the first part.

The second purpose as stated in the committee's report was to remove the present ban on dual compensation for retired Regular officers of the U.S. Armed Forces. The committee reports that under present law such an officer is prohibited from accepting Federal employment because of the maximum salary limitation established under the Dual Office Act of 1894. Perhaps I do not grasp the complexities of these matters as quickly as I should, but are we being advised that the Dual Office Act of 1894 absolutely prohibits civilian employment of a retired Regular officer? That such an officer cannot give up his military pension, temporarily or permanently, and qualify for any job he wants and can get? If the ban is absolute, then I do not believe this to be just or right.

The third purpose stated by the committee report is to modernize dual compensation to remove the $2,000 per annum ceiling on the amount of compensation any person may receive from the Federal Government for more than one civilian job. I do not think this is a controversial purpose or provision, except, as I have indicated—I think there should be a ceiling on the amount of compensation any individual holding more than one position can receive as long as we have millions of unemployed. This bill provides for no ceiling in salary—only in hours. This is unjust and unfair.

To modernize a law we do not need virtually to erase it from the books, and I urge that this section be modified to place a ceiling on such dual compensation. The ceiling should not be higher than 1½ times the Federal minimum wage. Indeed the provision could be so written as to make it self-adjusting over the years, automatic modernization.

The fourth stated purpose of this bill is to "establish * * * a more equitable employment system" by allowing Regular officers, retired for length of service, or voluntarily, I presume, to take full-time civilian jobs with the Federal Goverment and still draw part of their military retirement pay. The parts of the bill pertaining to the achievement of this purpose are those which have excited the most firm and articulate opposition.

The urgency of this bill, as I understand the matter, is primarily that of giving relief to the officers who were overpaid some $16 million. I understand this urgency and am sympathetic to giving them relief. Frankly, I do not consider the other sections as being urgent at all, but since the one modernizing restrictions on dual compensation for civilian jobs is apparently not highly controversial I see no reason why we should not deal with it this session.

I am firmly opposed, however, to the other revisions proposed in this bill until there has been a great deal more fact gathering and an adequate set of hearings and a more comprehensive report is available for study.

My first interest in this bill as it came from the committee was aroused by the alleged urgency of the measure, because of the pending necessity for securing reimbursement of the overpayments—but no figures were forthcoming on the amount of overpayments. The committee report on page 10 flatly stated that the committee was unable to obtain any specific cost information on the amount of the overpayments. Subsequently, in the recent debate, the figure of slightly less than $16 million was offered by the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. YARBOROUGH.

This is certainly a bare-bones figure. We are offered no explanation as to what departments made such overpayments and to whom, nor are we even offered an explanation as to why the Comptroller should order repayment and so advise the agencies and 2 years later the committee is compelled to advise this body that the cost figure was not available. This reticence is peculiar, at least, and I would like the committee in its reconsideration of this bill not only to elicit additional information but also to indicate to the Senate why this information was so difficult to come by.

Before we make any changes in the law on dual compensation, beyond that minor change referred to earlier, I think the appropriate committees should conduct hearings on the whole Federal retirement system. I see no more reason for being concerned about dual compensation and the alleged discrimination against Regular military officers than I do about the glaring differences in the various Federal retirement and social security programs.

On a simple bookkeeping basis, what justification is there for requiring a citizen to pay social security taxes; requiring a Federal civilian employee to pay 6.5 percent of his salary into a retirement fund; and levying no tax on the military? I think this is obvious and unjustifiable discrimination and should be brought to an end. It is my understanding that the civil service retirement fund is inadequate for the requirements which will be made on it in future years. Why? How inadequate? To what extent do the claims of retired military people on the civil service funds, deriving from their special privileges in counting military time toward retirement, constitute a drain on the civil service fund? How big is this drain?

What valid arguments are there against establishment of a military retirement fund equivalent to the civil service retirement fund so that retired military men shifting to the civilian payroll can get credit for their military service—but so that the retirement fund can be the beneficiary of the sums accumulated in the military fund for the individual involved?

It has been alleged that the military retirement obligations will mount rapidly in the years ahead and will soon reach $1 billion a year. To what extent could this rise be offset by adjusting the relationships between a military pension fund and a civilian pension fund? Will the provisions in this bill, pending here today, allowing $2,000 plus half of the remaining pension benefit for Regular military officers, encourage early retirement and step up the cost of military retirement?

It seems to be that we cannot separate the laws on dual compensation and retirement, despite the honest effort made to do so here in our recent discussion of this measure. If pensioned retirement poses questions for civilian civil service employees, then it is quite unrealistic to say that this bill does not affect the retirement laws. There is no doubt that this bill does affect civil service employees; it does affect their retirement fund; it affects the total cost of Federal retirement programs—and it should be restudied with this in mind.

I firmly believe that some of the inconsistencies in Federal law as regards the right to retire with compensation can be eliminated or reduced. What set of circumstances in real life calls for a cut in the social security payments when wage income rises above $1,200, and knocks out social security payments entirely at about $1,700? Yet a retired enlisted man or Reserve officer can draw his retirement benefits regardless of his wage earnings.

I am not prepared to say at the moment in which direction the change should be made. But I do not believe there is any justice in telling a hard rock miner in Montana that if he earns a few dollars in his old age his social security will be reduced or eliminated entirely, while his son, retired from the military, can draw his full retirement benefits regardless of his other earnings. Surely we can achieve more equity in the law than this.

The original justification for imposing a penalty on social security recipents was a make-work concept. We were going to provide some old-age aid, but require that the aged yield jobs to young people.

As nearly as I can gather, the original justification for an inflexible and very generous retirement policy for the military was to offset low wages and facilitate maintaining a youthful military force. Possibly these are also the justification for not withholding retirement taxes from military salaries. I submit that this is poor logic and poor administration on withholding taxes—and places a burden on the civil service retirement fund. I submit that a generous retirement program is a poor substitute for adequate military pay. And I would like to see a study made of the connection between a generous retirement program and recruitment of military personnel. It is facts I would like to hear, not rationalizations.

I doubt very much that the marked differences between military and civilian retirement rights can be justified in the clear light of a committee hearing. Some differences, very well, but not the present sharp contrast. One requires contributory payments; the other does not. One is very generous in terms of the length of service required, the other is not. One is, with minor exceptions, irrevocable; the other is a fragile thing—the civilian retirement—a fragile thing which can be reduced or eliminated on small provocation.

I submit we need a study of all of these things before we undertake to enact legislation this comprehensive.

I think the dual compensation laws should be modernized. I think they should be equitable. I think they should cover the waterfront. In general, I think dual compensation should be eliminated—that this should be the guiding principle of those drafting the new legislation. If we cannot make the dual compensation laws, as revised, yield immediate equity because of standing commitments to classes of the military already in retirement, then I submit that the laws should be so written as to achieve equity among all military retirees after the date of enactment.

I do not believe that the present bill achieves equity. I do not believe that its accomplishments outweigh its shortcomings. I don't think it is the best bill by any means that can be drawn on this subject, and I urge that another attempt be made.

I have studied many hearings on many bills, and I submit to you in all charity that these hearings leave more questions unasked and unanswered than any other set of hearings I can recall.

I trust no member will take these remarks personally. They are not intended as criticism of any person or committee. The burden of our work is heavy. Time is always at a premium—but I must insist that I do not believe that this measure should pass this year. I believe that it should be recommitted with instructions.

Special privilege if we must have it must serve a vital public function. It should not be suffered as a result of hurried compromise.

Our responsibilities are broad. We have time and the will to write better law. It is our responsibility to do so and to remember that special privilege and discrimination breed riots in hell.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], who is necessarily absent, may be printed in the RECORD, at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JAVITS

I fully support H.R. 7381, which would simplify, modernize, and consolidate the laws relating to the employment of retired members of the Armed Forces in civilian positions of the U.S. Government. I have long recognized the need to permit such officers to be employed by the Government since their technical skills are extremely valuable for our national security.

As it stands now, existing law consists of an 1894 act and a maze of ad hoc amendments to that act. The purpose of these amendments was to extend rather than restrict the eligibility of retired officers to accept civilian positions with the Government, but with the great changes in wages and prices since 1894, the monetary limitations in the basic act have become so restrictive that many conflicting exemption provisions have made enforcement arbitrary, cumbersome, and inadequate.

I first introduced in the 86th Congress a bill, S. 2703, calling for a study by the Civil Service Commission of the entire field of laws affecting the employment of retired officers and the submission to the Congress of a draft bill codifying and revising the laws. The bill also provided for temporary permission to employ retired officers in civilian positions with partial retirement pay. Again in the 87th Congress, I introduced substantially the same bill as S. 1103.

However, in the interim the Civil Service Commission conducted the comprehensive study on this situation which my bill called for, and the study resulted in a draft proposal which I introduced on October 3, 1962, as S. 3780. The pending bill, H.R. 7381, follows the basic pattern of S. 3780 by permitting a combination of retired pay in the amount of $2,000 per year plus one-half of the balance.

Now more than ever we need experienced, highly trained men and women working in all phases of the Government. The training and expertise which officers of the Armed Forces have gained during their military service are a great asset to the Government and should be utilized rather than wasted, and I am very much gratified that action is now being taken on this bill which presents a reasonable solution to the problem.

I very much regret, however, that the committee has not dealt with two other related aspects of the problem. Another group of skilled former Federal employees is also not being fully utilized under existing law. I refer to civilian retirees of the Federal Government who would, if they could, often be very useful to the Government by serving after retirement on a part-time basis. In the 87th Congress I introduced a measure, S. 1340, which would permit civil service retirees to work up to half time for the Federal Government without losing their annuity benefits. At present a civilian retiree's salary must be reduced by the amount of his annuity allocable to the period of his actual employment. My proposal would eliminate this disincentive to the utilization, at least on a part-time basis, of the skills developed during long years of civilian Government service.

Another provision related to the pending bill would establish controls over the employment of retired military officers by defense contractors, along the lines which now limit the employment of lawyers after they terminate Government service. I first introduced such a bill in 1959 in the 86th Congress as S. 2228 and reintroduced it in the 87th Congress as S. 1104. While this is basically a conflict-of-interest provision, it is nonetheless relevant to the pending measure, which deals with Government employment of military retirees.

When the Congress last recodified the conflict-of-interest laws, in Public Law 87-849, the then-existing conflict-of-interest laws, sections 281 and 283 of title 18, United States Code, were left standing as applied to retired military officers. My proposal would strengthen section 281 and would add additional safeguards.

Since I believe that the basic principle embodied in H.R. 7381 is of overriding importance, I am not at this time pressing these additional proposals. However, I shall soon reintroduce them as separate bills and urge that the committees to which they will be referred give them prompt and favorable attention.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, if there is no further request for time, we yield back all time, if all time is yielded back by the other side.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is yielded back.

The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading and passage of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I congratulate the Senator from Texas for the admirable way in which he has handled the bill. The Senator was allowed 2 hours. He took only a few minutes.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. It was his patience year after year that resulted in the passage of the bill. It is a just law that has long been needed. A group of our citizens have been discriminated against in their employment. The bill is particularly needed now in the science category and in the space category. We shall obtain the benefit of the technical skill and know-how of a group of retired military personnel in the field of military science. That is where it is needed. That is where the urgent request came from for this law.

We have had the full cooperation of the committee so that this bill might be brought out of the committee.

FRAUD IN AID PROGRAM FOR IRAN

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, today I wish to discuss a situation wherein under our foreign aid program our Government paid $1,550,995 for what was supposed to be a shipment of 1,341,250 yards of textiles; but instead of obtaining delivery of good textiles they actually received about $40,000 worth of old rags.

These old rags were shipped under our AID program to Iran and paid for either directly or indirectly with money appropriated under our foreign aid program.

This fraudulent transaction took place in 1958 and 1959, and some of the individuals and companies responsible were indicted by a Federal grand jury in the southern district of New York on November 27, 1961; but this case has as yet not been brought to trial, and during this interval, our foreign aid officials have continued to carry the individual responsible for this fraud and his companies on the eligible list to handle foreign aid transactions. They were not suspended until May 23, 1964, or about 2 months after I began an inquiry into the case.

The names of the companies and individuals mentioned in the indictment of November 27, 1961, were:

Manoutchehr Aadal, Western National Fabrics Co.; Nasrollah Darab, Amerimpex Trading Co.; Faizollah Namdar, All American Fabrics Co.; Hassan Rafati, Worldwide Export Co.; Harfa Commercial Co.

As evidence of the seriousness of this fraudulent transaction which Mr. Aadal and his associates perpetrated on the American taxpayers, I quote from the text of the indictment as appearing on record in the District Court of the Southern District of New York:

> 1. From on or about the 1st day of January 1958, and continuously thereafter, up to and including the date of the filing of this indictment, in the southern district of New York, Manoutchehr Aadal, Nasrollah Darab, Faizollah Namdar, Hassan Rafati, Western National Fabrics Co., Amerimpex Trading Co., All American Fabrics Co., Worldwide Export Co. and Harfa Commercial Co., the defendants herein, and other persons to the grand jury unknown, unlawfully, willfully and knowingly did combine, conspire, confederate and agree together and with each other to commit offenses against the United States to wit, to violate section 1001, title 18, United States Code, and section 121, title 49, United States Code, and to defraud an agency of the United States to wit, the International Cooperation Administration of the U.S. Department of State, in the exercise of governmental functions relating to the administration of the foreign economic assistance program.
>
> 5. It was further a part of said conspiracy that Manoutchehr Aadal and Hassan Rafati, the defendants, would cause to be shipped worthless rags, scraps and pound goods to Iran from the United States instead of the fine fabrics and textiles indicated in the said letters of credit.
>
> 6. It was further a part of said conspiracy that Manoutchehr Aadal and Hassan Rafati, the defendants, would make and cause to be made false statements in both shipper's export declarations and bills of lading, to the effect that fine fabrics and textiles were to be shipped to Iran, whereas, as alleged in paragraph 5 hereof, said defendants would ship and cause to be shipped worthless rags, scraps and pound goods.

Mr. Aadal, the key individual and the prime factor in this fraudulent transaction, is not even an American citizen. He entered this country in 1958 from Iran and promptly proceeded to establish a series of exporting companies. He then contacted the gullible administrators of our foreign aid program and about the same time applied for his American citizenship.

The State Department at first tried to belittle the taxpayers' loss under this fraudulent transaction by claiming that only $58,685 of the approximately $1½ million paid for these old rags represented foreign assistance funds. However, when pressed they admitted that while only $58,685 was financed directly with foreign assistance funds the balance of the approximately $1½ million fraudulent payment indirectly came from cash grants which we had made to Iran under our AID program.

In fiscal 1959 under our AID program we made grants to the Government of Iran of approximately $3 million which in turn were deposited in the Bank Melli in Iran. Direct cash grants of another $39 million were made to Iran during fiscal years 1961 and 1962.

The Bank Melli then paid the individuals named above the $1½ million for the bunch of old rags which had been labeled as good textiles. There can be no question but that it was the American taxpayers' dollars which paid for this transaction even though it was done in this roundabout method.

At this point I ask unanimous consent that certain correspondence be incorporated in the RECORD:

First, I insert a letter received from the Agency for International Development, Department of State, dated March 2, 1964, in which they confirmed the payment of $1,550,995 for a shipment of about $40,000 worth of old rags which had been described as good textiles, along with a list of the names of the companies and individuals indicted on November 27, 1961. In this letter it will be noted that the State Department tried to claim that only $58,685 of this amount was financed with American taxpayers' money.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE, AGENCY FOR
INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT,
Washington, D.C., March 2, 1964.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: This is in further reference to your letter of February 17 in which you asked for information about the extent of participation in the foreign aid program of certain enumerated companies and individuals. You expressed particular interest in a situation in which some of these companies and individuals allegedly defrauded the Government of approximately $1.5 million by shipping $40,000 worth of rags in place of good textiles.

Before passing to more detailed information, it may be noted that the situation to which your inquiry refers is now pending prosecutive action by the office of the U.S. attorney, southern district of New York, following indictments handed down by a Federal grand jury in 1961. It should also be noted that only a relatively small portion of the funds involved in the procurement were foreign assistance funds.

Files of this Agency disclose that the following firms were beneficiaries of letters of credit calling for the shipment of 1,341,250 yards of textiles in the amount of $1,550,995:

All American Fabrics Co., 277 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

Amerimpex Trading Co., 277 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

Harfa Commercial Co., 170 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

Western National Fabrics Co., 277 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

Worldwide Export Co., 79 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

These firms were trade styles set up and registered in New York City by Hassan Rafati, a citizen of Iran. Actual shipments were traced to the supplier and found to contain rags and pound goods, such goods having been purchased by Rafati and his associate, Manoutchehr Aadal.

Of the amount mentioned, only $58,685 was financed with foreign assistance funds and the balance of the funds involved belonged to the Bank Melli, Iran. Three vouchers covering the foreign aid portion were forwarded to the FBI about August 1959 for review and use in court. These vouchers were paid on the following dates: September 30, 1958; October 13, 1958; and January 22, 1959.

A Federal grand jury, southern district of New York, returned a true bill on November 27, 1961, against the following:

Manoutchehr Aadal, Nasrollah Darab, Faizollah Namdar, Hassan Rafati, Western National Fabrics Co., Amerimpex Trading Co., All American Fabrics Co., Worldwide Export Co., and Harfa Commercial Co.

Our files do not show that the remaining companies and individuals on your list were involved in the transactions on which prosecutive action is pending in New York, nor do our files disclose AID-financed shipments, other than those which are included in the pending case, for any of the named individuals and companies except Monarch Trading Co., Inc.

Monarch Trading Co. has appeared as supplier of a variety of products in hundreds of sales financed by AID and its predecessor agencies. Since, with one exception, these transactions are not known to have presented any problem, we assume that you may not be interested in having the transactions enumerated although, of course, the task could be undertaken if you wished to have such a compilation.

The one known problem involving Monarch Trading Co., 150 Broadway, New York, N.Y., results from a complaint by Shenh Yuh & Co., Ltd., Taiwan, that he ordered 200,000 pounds of coke tinplate waste waste from Monarch but received electrolytic tinplate waste waste (a less valuable product) instead. Shenh Yuh & Co., Ltd., agreed to a settlement of $3,975.40 offered by Monarch on October 19, 1963. Our investigation of this matter is pending.

We trust that the foregoing supplies the information you wish, insofar as it is in the possession of this Agency. We shall, of course, be pleased to be of all possible further assistance.

Sincerely yours,

CRAIG RAUPE,
Director, Congressional Liaison.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Second, I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD a letter received from the Agency for International Development, Department of State, dated April 28, 1964, signed by Mr. David E. Bell, in which after further questioning they confirmed that all of the $1,550,995 involved in the textile transaction was obviously paid for with American taxpayers' money. In this letter Mr. Bell confirms the $42 million cash grants which were made to the Government of Iran and from which there can be but little question that payment was made for these old rags.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE, AGENCY FOR
INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT,
OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR,
Washington, D.C., April 28, 1964.

The Honorable JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: This is in answer to the inquiries regarding certain textile sales to Iran which you raised in your letters of February 17 and April 1, 1964, and in the hearings before the Committee on Foreign Relations on April 21, 1964.

In your letter of April 1 you correctly noted that a Federal grand jury returned an indictment against Mr. Manoutchehr Aadel and others in 1961. This matter has been in the hands of the Department of Justice since March 1959 when the ICA referred it to the Federal Bureau of Investigation. The case is now in the hands of the U.S. attorney for the southern district of New York. We have been informed that all pretrial motions have been completed and that the case will be tried sometime later this year. We have referred your requests for a copy of the indictment and for verification of the charges on which the indictment is based to the Department of Justice. A copy of our letter to the Department of Justice is enclosed.

You also inquired whether—even though only $58,686 out of the total of $1,550,995 involved in the textile transactions is known to have been financed with foreign assistance funds—there is a possibility that the balance of the expenditures may have come from checks furnished Iran for general purposes by the U.S. Government. The only U.S. foreign assistance transactions which could have furnished funds for general purposes to Bank Melli are cash grants. During fiscal years 1958 and 1959, the period in which the allegedly fraudulent act took place, there was one transaction of this nature.

In fiscal year 1959, this Agency purchased Iranian currency equivalent in value to $3 million from Bank Melli. The Iranian rials so purchased were used to help finance the local costs of joint Iranian-American development projects. The dollars received by Bank Melli in exchange for the local currency became a part of its foreign exchange holdings, indistinguishable from earnings from Iranian exports, which were available for sale to Iranian importers.

The dollars received through this Agency's purchase of rials in fiscal year 1959 constitute a very minor portion of the Government of Iran's foreign exchange, most of which was held by Bank Melli as Iran's largest bank. At that time Iran's export earnings, mostly in hard currencies, were at the equivalent of over $700 million annually. There is therefore no way to answer your question because the dollars provided by the grant were indistinguishable from Iran's hard currency export earnings.

There were no similar cash grants in either fiscal year 1958 or fiscal year 1960. In August 1960, the Bank Markazi was founded as Iran's Central Bank and $39 million of direct cash grants took place through that bank during fiscal year 1961 and fiscal year 1962. This type of assistance was terminated in fiscal year 1962.

If further information is desired, please do not hesitate to let me know.

Sincerely yours,

DAVID E. BELL.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Next I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD a letter from the Agency for International Development, Department of State, dated May 25, 1964, signed by Mr. William O. Hall, assistant administrator, in which he states that the Agency had finally gotten around to suspending the firms and individuals involved in the indictment of November 27, 1961, from further participation in the handling of our AID goods.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Department of State, Agency for
International Development,
Washington, D.C., May 25, 1964.

Re Manoutchehr Aadal.

Hon. John J. Williams,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Williams: As I stated in my letter to you of May 5, 1964, the Agency undertook a review to determine the feasibility of disqualifying the firms with which Mr. Aadal is connected from participating in AID-financed transactions.

Our review of this matter has not yet been completed, but it has progressed to the point where we deemed it appropriate to suspend temporarily the firms and individuals indicted on November 30, 1961, and the firms apparently owned or controlled by Mr. Aadal. A copy of our letter notifying the affected firms and individuals is enclosed.

We are continuing our investigation of this matter and will continue to keep you apprised of developments as they occur.

We sincerely appreciate your calling this matter to our attention.

Yours truly,

William O. Hall,
Assistant Administrator for Administration.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the May 23, 1964, notice of suspension which the Department of State sent to the individuals and companies involved be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the notice was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Department of State, Agency for
International Development,
Office of the Administrator,
Washington, D.C., May 23, 1964.

(Sent to all parties listed in (1) and (2) below).

You are hereby notified that effective immediately the persons described below are not eligible to be suppliers of commodities or services under any AID-financed contract and AID will not finance, directly or indirectly, any transaction to which any of such persons are parties:

(1) Manoutchehr Aadal; Nasrollah Darab; Faizollah Namdar; Hassan Rafati; All American Fabrics Co., 277 Broadway, New York, N.Y.; Amerimpex Trading Co., 277 Broadway, New York, N.Y., Harfa Commercial Co., 170 Broadway, New York, N.Y., Western National Fabrics Co., 277 Broadway, New York, N.Y., and Worldwide Export Co., 79 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

(2) Monarch Trading Co., Inc., Monarch Processing Corp., American Asian Lines, Transasia Carrier Corp., Transasia Marine Corp., Transasia Steamship Co., Inc., Transasia Transportation Corp., all located at 150 Broadway, New York, N.Y., and all under the direction or control, directly or indirectly, of Manoutchehr Aadal.

This action is being taken to protect the interests of the U.S. Government and to assure the prudent use of AID funds and the integrity of AID operations. It is based on the facts set forth in the indictment filed November 30, 1961 against the persons named in paragraph (1) pursuant to which criminal prosecution of such persons is pending in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York. The facts set forth in the indictment, including the making of false statements to the U.S. Government, raise serious doubts concerning the present responsibility and reliability of the persons named in (1) and (2) above as participants in programs and transactions financed by AID. The suspension of all the above-named persons from eligibility to participate in AID-financed transactions will continue for a temporary period during which AID will further investigate the facts and determine what further action should be taken with respect to this suspension.

Very truly yours,

William O. Hall,
Acting Administrator.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. As a prospective applicant for American citizenship Mr. Aadal further displayed his contempt for our laws. The administration was extremely lax in taking appropriate steps to protect the American taxpayers in its business relationship with Mr. Aadal and his companies; as evidence of this laxity it should be noted that during the same period in which Mr. Aadal was selling these old rags to the Government as good textiles he was likewise negligent in paying his Federal income taxes. The records of the Treasury Department show that for the years 1958, 1959, and 1960 his total tax delinquency amounts to $464,234.03. This delinquency is broken down as follows:

Additional income taxes owed, 1958, $251,242.28.

Additional income taxes owed, 1959, $146,166.98.

Additional income taxes owed, 1960, $66,824.77.

As of May 6, 1964, these taxes were still outstanding, and there appeared no evidence to indicate that the State Department was aware of the tax delinquencies of Mr. Aadal and his companies, nor is there any indication that the Treasury Department was aware of the fraudulent sale of old rags to the State Department. To make the situation more reprehensible neither agency seemed to be too much concerned until after I began making inquiries.

At this point I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the Record the May 6, 1964, letter of the Internal Revenue Service as signed by Commissioner Mortimer M. Caplin.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

U.S. Treasury Department,
Internal Revenue Service,
Washington, D.C., May 6, 1964.

Hon. John J. Williams,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Williams: This is in further reply to your letter of February 17, 1964, requesting certain information in connection with the income tax matters of Mr. Manoutchehr Aadal, New York City, and other persons listed in the letter.

Mr. Aadal arrived in this country in 1958. Therefore, income tax returns were not due to be filed by him prior to that date.

Mrs. Violet Aadal married Manoutchehr Aadal in 1959. Prior to that time she filed income tax returns under her maiden name of Violet Bach.

Notices of Federal tax liens were filed against Mr. Aadal for additional 1958 income taxes and against Mr. and Mrs. Aadal for additional 1959 and 1960 income taxes as follows:

Additional 1958 income taxes, $251,242.28.
Additional 1959 income taxes, $146,166.98.
Additional 1960 income taxes, $66,824.77.

The taxpayers have filed an appeal which is pending before the Service.

We do not find a record of income tax returns for Hassan Rafati, Narsollah Darab, or Feizollah Namder, having been filed in our Brooklyn or Manhattan district offices. Our information indicates that these persons have left this country.

With regard to the Western National Fabrics Co., Amerimpex Trading Co., All American Fabrics Co., World Wide Export Co., and Harfa Commercial Co., we have no record of returns having been filed. Our information indicates that these businesses were operated by Hassan Rafati, and ceased operations when he left the country.

Our information indicates that American Asia Lines, Inc., was incorporated in New York City in 1963; Transasia Carriers Corp., Transasia Transport Corp., and Transasia Steamship Co., were incorporated in Delaware in 1963. We are investigating to see whether income tax returns are due to be filed yet and, if so, whether they were filed and the address indicated on the returns.

The Monarch Trading Co. is an individual proprietorship of Manoutchehr Aadal and, as we previously reported to you, the business income or loss is reported in a schedule in the Aadals' individual returns.

The Monarch Trading Co., Inc., was incorporated in New York City in 1963. The Monarch Processing Co. was incorporated in New York County in 1962 and has been dormant.

We will write you further as soon as additional information is received from our district offices.

With kind regards.

Sincerely,

Mortimer M. Caplin,
Commissioner.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Notwithstanding this miserable record of Mr. Aadal and his companies in their dealings with the U.S. Government I regret to report that his farflung operations were just beginning to get started. For example, in recent months Mr. Aadal has branched out into the shipping business and with the consent of the Maritime Commission has purchased several secondhand ships and promptly thereafter has proceeded to arrange with the officials of our AID program to transport some of our AID supplies going to foreign countries. He was well on the road to success until the present inquiry started. It appears that no Government financing was involved in his purchase of these ships; however, on January 27, 1964, after having established a series of holding companies and after having purchased these ships he applied to the Maritime Commission, requesting operating differential subsidies in the name of the American Asia Lines, Inc., for a service which he was planning from the U.S. gulf and east coast to India and Pakistan.

On January 30, 1964, the Maritime Commission sent Mr. Aadal a copy of the form of application to be filed for such operating differential subsidies together with a request for more specific and detailed information. His attorney replied and indicated that since his client would not be eligible for U.S. citizenship until October 1964 the application would not be submitted until after his citizenship was granted.

In a second letter on January 27, 1964, Mr. Aadal requested consideration that his company, the American Asia Lines, Inc., be appointed as general agent for the operation of Government-owned ships.

Our Government did use the services of some of these ships of Mr. Aadal's to transport foreign aid goods, and as evidence of this point I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter dated May 5, 1964, signed by Mr. Hall, assistant administrator of AID.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE, AGENCY FOR
INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT,
Washington, D.C., May 5, 1964.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: This is a further report on the inquiries which we have undertaken as a result of the questions you have raised with David Bell and with me regarding Manoutchehr Aadal's relationships with AID.

We have determined that Mr. Aadal is president of a corporation called American Asia Lines, Inc., which operates ships owned by four affiliated companies. Each affiliated company owns one ship on which AID-financed cargoes have been carried in the last year. We have information indicating that Manoutchehr Aadal is vice president of the following affiliated companies:

Transasia Steamship Co., Inc.
Transasia Transport Corp.
Transasia Carriers Corp.

Violet Aadal, Manoutchehr Aadal's wife, is an officer of each of the three corporations listed above. We do not yet have information about the officers of the fourth company, Transasia Marine Corp., but we assume that the same pattern has been followed.

Our General Counsel is attempting to determine whether corporations which list among their shareholders and officers persons who have been indicted for alleged fraud against the Government should be disqualified from doing business with AID. Among other questions, he will have to determine whether a corporation must be penalized for acts of one or more of its principals taken independently of the corporation. He will also have to examine whether an indictment alone is sufficient to justify disqualification of the corporation or whether a more substantial indication of wrongdoing is required.

We have asked the Maritime Administration whether, in view of the foreign citizenship of some of the principals, the American registry of the ships owned by these corporations is appropriate.

We have also asked the Department of Commerce whether its records indicate that the Export Control Act was violated in the transaction which resulted in the indictment of Mr. Aadal and the effect of such violation, if it did occur, on Mr. Aadal's present involvement in foreign trade from the United States.

Mr. Bell and I appreciate your calling this matter to our attention. We shall, of course, continue to keep you informed as further developments occur.

Sincerely yours,
WILLIAM HALL,
Assistant Administrator for Administration.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. There is no question but that Mr. Aadal was on the verge of an expansive program for the handling of our foreign aid goods when the brakes were suddenly applied after the State Department found that an inquiry was underway.

At this point I ask unanimous consent that a letter dated March 17, 1964, and signed by Mr. J. W. Gulick, Deputy Maritime Administrator, be printed in the RECORD. In this letter Mr. Gulick gives a list of the various ships acquired by Mr. Aadal and his newly established companies.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
MARITIME ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., March 17, 1964.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: This letter has been prepared in reply to your letter of February 17, 1964, which was acknowledged by the Chief, Office of Government Aid on February 20, 1964. The information outlined below has been developed by a search of the records of this agency, and reflects the only transactions the Maritime Administration and its predecessors have had with the companies mentioned in your letter. For easy reference your inquiries are repeated before each reply.

1. The date of construction of the ship, the date the ship was purchased, the original construction cost, and the net amount paid by the company.

Present name, *Ponderosa.*

Previous names, *Tobias E. Stansbury, Taxiarch, Wanda, Kyra, Pondora.*

Year built, 1943.

Builder, Delta Shipbuilding Co., Inc., New Orleans, La.

Type, built for Government as a Liberty-type tanker but converted to a dry-cargo ship with private funds in 1957.

Original construction cost, $2,247,157, which included $60,000 for national defense features.

Original owner, former Maritime Commission sold this ship under the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946 to Tanker & Transport Corp. on June 1, 1948, for the statutory sales price of $495,500. Since that time, it apparently has changed hands several times. Recent information shows that in April 1963 it was sold by its then owner, Epiphany Tankers Corp., to its present owner, Transasia Steamship Co., Inc., for $282,500.

Present name, *Yukon.*

Previous names, *Natalie, Celestial.*

Year built, 1944.

Builder, Moore Drydock Co., Oakland, Calif.

Type, built for Government as a C–2 dry-cargo ship.

Original construction cost, $3,579,103, which included $127,000 for national defense features.

Original owner, former Maritime Commission sold this ship under the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946 to Sprague Steamship Co. on November 8, 1946, for the statutory sales price of $957,818. Since that time this ship has apparently changed hands two or three times. Recent information shows that in January 1964 this ship was sold by its then owner, Intercontinental Transportation Co., Inc., to its present owner, Transasia Carriers Corp., for $600,000.

Present name, *Bonanza.*

Previous names, *Carrier Dove, Agwicomet, Ines, Jackson.*

Year built, 1946.

Builder, Consolidated Steel Corp., Ltd., Wilmington, Calif.

Type, built for Government as a C–2 dry-cargo ship.

Original construction cost, $3,368,070 (no national defense features were included).

Original owner, former Maritime Commission sold this ship under the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946 to Agwilines, Inc., on November 3, 1947, for the statutory sales price of $980,670. Since that time this ship has apparently changed hands several times. Recent information shows that in May 1963, while registered in the name of Jackson Shipping Corp., it was sold at auction in the port of Aden to Walter E. Heller, mortgagee, for $224,000. Although the records show that this ship is now named the *Bonanza* and is registered in the name of Transasia Carriers Corp., we have no information as to how it was purchased or the amount paid.

Present name, *Eldorado.*

Previous name, *Santa Teresa.*

Year built, 1940.

Builder, Newport News Shipbuilding & Drydock Co.

Type, built for Government as a C–2 dry-cargo ship.

Original construction cost, $2,578,000 (no national defense features were included.)

Original owner, former Maritime Commission sold this ship with construction-differential subsidy under the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to Grace Line Inc., upon its delivery by the shipbuilder, for $1,358,000. Until recently this ship was operated by Grace Line under its operating-differential subsidy agreement. In October 1963 it was sold to Transasia Transport Corp. for $415,000.

2. A complete report on any Government financing, in the form of either loans or loan guarantees, which has been made to assist Mr. Manoutchehr Aadal individually or any of his companies in the procurement of the above-named ships.

No Government financing in the form of either loans or loan guarantees has been made to assist either Mr. Manoutchehr Aadal individually or any of his companies in the procurement of these ships. Although these ships were sold with Government mortgages to the original owners, the mortgages were paid off prior to the sale of the ships to the "Transasia" companies.

You may be interested in knowing, however, that Mr. Aadal, in a letter dated January 27, 1964, requested operating-differential subsidy in the name of American Asia Lines, Inc., for a service from the U.S. gulf and east coasts to India and Pakistan. In our reply of January 30, 1964, we enclosed a copy of the form of application for operating-differential subsidy, together with a request for more specific and detailed information. Up until this time, we have not received a reply from Mr. Aadal although his local attorney indicated that since his client will not be eligible for U.S. citizenship until October of 1964, this application will not be submitted until after citizenship is granted.

In another letter dated January 27, 1964, Mr. Aadal requested consideration for appointment of American Asia Lines, Inc., as general agent for the operation of Government-owned ships. Actually, the general agency program does not call for any more agents than we now have so that Mr. Aadal's request in this matter cannot be granted.

3. If there are any other ships which are not included in the above list please furnish similar information to that requested in 1 and 2, above.

Our records do not show that there are any ships, other than those mentioned above, owned individually by Mr. Aadal or any of his companies, including the Monarch Trading Co. With reference to the agencies mentioned in your letter, we have found that while shipping publications show American Asia Lines, Inc., of 150 Broadway, New York City, as agents for the four ships mentioned above, the American Bureau of Shipping record shows the operating agent to be the Penn Shipping Co., Inc., of 405 Park Avenue, New York City. The local attorney for the corporate group of companies of which Penn Shipping Co., Inc., is a member has stated however that Penn Shipping Co., Inc., no longer acts as agents for any of these ships.

For your further information there is enclosed a copy of a report we have just received from Dun & Bradstreet on Transasia Steamship Co., Inc.

4. A record of any arrangements which have been made with the Maritime Commission whereby these companies or any of their affiliates have been selected to transport American commodities under our AID programs.

The Maritime Administration is not authorized either to select or approve bookings or charters made by shipping agencies of the U.S. Government or any foreign governments. It has been reported, however, that the SS *Ponderosa* was chartered by an agency of the Government of India for the carriage of approximately 10,000 metric tons of ferromanganese for shipment in February 1964 from Vizagapatam to Baltimore. It is our understanding that this shipment was made pursuant to a Public Law 480 title III barter agreement between the Government of India and the Government of the United States.

The American Asia Lines, Inc., advertises sailings from the U.S. Atlantic ports to ports in India and Pakistan on the SS *Eldorado*, SS *Yukon*, SS *Ponderosa*, and SS *Bonanza*. It is therefore, possible that these vessels have handled parcels of U.S. Government financed commodities sponsored by the Agency of International Development of the State Department and by the Department of Agriculture under titles I, II, and IV of Public Law 480.

I regret that the Maritime Administration does not have more detailed information on the carryings of AID cargoes by Mr. Aadal's companies. If additional information is required, however, you may wish to contact the Agency for International Development and the Department of Agriculture, which administer the shipments of AID commodities.

Sincerely yours,

J. W. Gulick,
Deputy Maritime Administrator.

Mr. **WILLIAMS** of Delaware. Immediately following this insertion I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an article appearing in the July 1, 1964, issue of the New York Times entitled "Four-Ship Fleet Being Liquidated."

In this article the writer, Mr. Callahan, calls attention to the fact that these various shipping companies, apparently after being denied further government assistance and cargo, are on the verge of being either liquidated or sold in bankruptcy.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York Times, July 1, 1964]

FOUR-SHIP FLEET BEING LIQUIDATED—IRANIAN ORGANIZER OF LINE IS UNDER INDICTMENT HERE

(By John P. Callahan)

A 38-year-old Iranian who organized an American-flag steamship line last year while under a 2-year-old indictment for fraudulent exports said yesterday that he was liquidating the four-ship fleet of American Asia Lines, Inc.

While the ship executive, Manoutchehr Aadal, now vice president of the company, disclosed plans for meeting obligations in excess of $1,990,000 to major oil companies, stevedores, ship chandlers and ship crews, the Federal District Court here was processing another charge of fraud. Mr. Aadal was arrested on Friday for having allegedly falsified bills of lading on a shipment of steel for Pakistan. He is on bail of $50,000 on that charge.

Two of the four cargo ships—the *Yukon* and the *Eldorado*—are in port. The *Bonanza* is due here July 7 with cargo from Far East ports, and the *Ponderosa* was "arrested" under lien yesterday in Bombay, where one of 28 seamen members of the Seafarers International Union has filed suit for wages from May 4 to June 26.

LOADED SHIP AT ANCHOR

The *Eldorado* is at anchor here with about 7,000 tons of general cargo that was loaded early this month for Karachi, Pakistan. Other officials of the company ordered the vessel back after it was halfway to its destination, Mr. Aadal said. The *Yukon* is tied up at pier 17, Hudson River, because of an action for crew's wages filed by the Seafarers Union.

Mr. Aadal said the largest creditor seeking satisfaction was the Monarch Trading Co., of which he has been the chief officer since he arrived here from Iran in 1958 and organized the company to specialize in exporting agricultural products, chemicals, and steel to India and Pakistan.

The others, including oil, stevedoring, chandler and ship repair companies, are owed $500,000, Mr. Aadal said, and about $700,000 is due on ship mortgages.

American Asia now is operating agent for the four ships. Each of the vessels is a separate corporation owned by U.S. citizens, including Mr. Aadal's three children, whose interests are in trusteeship.

Mr. Aadal said the "demise" of the enterprise was precipitated last month when the U.S. Departments of Agriculture and Commerce declared it ineligible to carry foreign-aid cargo, "because of the indictment against me pending since 1961."

Mr. Aadal said that if the creditors did not "go along" with his efforts to sell the four ships, "we will go into bankruptcy proceedings." He added: "We must make arrangements with the creditors through liquidation, and we hope they will go along with us."

Mr. **WILLIAMS** of Delaware. When we consider how harsh Uncle Sam can be in collecting a small obligation from the average John Doe who may be a few dollars delinquent in his income taxes or in a payment on his FHA or VA mortgage it is hard to understand how such a glaringly fraudulent transaction as outlined above could be allowed to continue and even to be supported by agencies of the U.S. Government.

When we stop to think about the scandals we have had, in connection with salad oil, the Billie Sol Estes case, and others, I most respectfully suggest that the Department of Justice should forget some of its political activities and begin to call to justice those who are responsible for violating our laws.

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. **DIRKSEN**. Mr. President, earlier in the day the majority leader indicated what the schedule would be like for this week. I thought perhaps he would like to amplify his remarks so that we might have a pretty firm idea of the bills that will come up in due course within the next few days.

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Mr. President, if the distinguished minority leader will yield, I had anticipated, after discussing the matter with him, that we would take up the bill on potato futures and stockpiling on Tuesday, but I find, because of negotiations now in process, that it will not be possible to take up the stockpiling bill tomorrow. Therefore, it is anticipated that the bill to prohibit trading in Irish potato futures on commodity exchanges will be considered.

In that respect, I ask unanimous consent that Calendar No. 911, S. 332, be laid before the Senate and made the pending business.

PROHIBITION OF TRADING IN IRISH POTATO FUTURES ON COMMODITY EXCHANGES

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The bill will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (S. 332) to prohibit trading in Irish potato futures on commodity exchanges.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, no action will be taken on the pending bill this evening, but it will be the pending business and the first order of business tomorrow.

In place of the stockpiling bill, after consulting with the distinguished minority leader, it has been decided to call up Calendar No. 1067, Senate Resolution 337, to provide disclosure of financial interest and to enumerate certain prohibited activities; also, Calendar No. 1089, Senate Resolution 338, amending rule 25 of the standing rules of the Senate relative to the jurisdiction of the Committee on Rules and Administration.

After those matters are disposed of, it is anticipated that the next order of business will be Calendar No. 1111, S. 2642, a bill to mobilize the human and financial resources of the Nation to combat poverty in the United States.

Action on that bill will be followed by Calendar No. 1123, H.R. 11380, the so-called foreign aid bill.

It is anticipated and hoped that there will be reported to the floor of the Senate during this week appropriation bills covering the District of Columbia, the legislative branch of the Government, and perhaps the independent offices appropriation bill.

Mr. **DIRKSEN**. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield?

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. I yield.

Mr. **DIRKSEN**. Does the Senator anticipate that on Tuesday there will be before the Senate for consideration the bill relating to trading in Irish potato futures, both of the rules resolutions, and the antipoverty bill?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But not the foreign aid bill on Tuesday?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I do not believe the Senate could get through with all those matters tomorrow. The best we could do would be to lay down the so-called antipoverty bill tomorrow night because, under an agreement reached some 2 weeks ago, the minority has until midnight of the 21st to file its report. Therefore, the first time we could get the foreign aid bill before us would be when the Senate convened on Wednesday. My guess would be that very likely the foreign aid bill would not come up until Friday or perhaps Saturday.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But it will follow?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes; unless an appropriation bill came in between, that might not take too long.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. The probabilities are that the foreign aid bill will not be reached until Friday.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is the way it looks now, if the Senator will allow for flexibility. It might be Thursday, but I do not think so.

Mr. MORSE. The probabilities are that it might not be reached until Monday, but Friday or Saturday would be my guess.

Mr. MANSFIELD. We shall see.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Perhaps the majority leader would like to give us his present plan with respect to the bill to implement the coffee agreement, and whether or not he sees that in the picture for this week, or is it further along?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I wish I could give a definitive answer to the distinguished minority leader, but, to put it mildly, the situation is in a state of flux.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I know the Senator will do everything he can, but I think it is important to consider the coffee agreement as soon as possible. As Senators know, we are in conference this week with our friends from Latin America in connection with the OAS matter. I am sure that the coffee agreement is going to be on the lips of many of them. Speaking only for myself, and no one else, it would greatly strengthen the persuasiveness of the American delegation at that conference if we could at least give some assurance that it will come up, and be voted either up or down, because to them this is a matter of economic life.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It is, however, beset with difficulties that are real and practical.

Mr. MORSE. That is true, but we may as well face them and have them behind us, rather than leave our friends from Latin America suspended in the air.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, one of the reasons for the delay is that the leadership wishes to discuss this matter with the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], who will be in charge of the bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Prior to the time the Senate recessed for the convention in California, it runs in my mind that we discussed the possibility of taking up the beef import measure.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes; that will be brought up at the appropriate moment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Some time later?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

THE RIOTS IN HARLEM

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I feel, as a Senator from New York, that while it is not a Federal problem, I should have a word to say about violence in the streets of New York. Such violence is no way in which to solve whatever grievances exist either in Harlem or any other community.

I am certain that every responsible official and civic leader is deeply shocked by these events. Such extremist actions do not promote freedom or justice; rather, they serve to inflame passions and incite racial hatred. Only hatemongers, racists, and demagogs can benefit from such demonstrations of lawlessness and anarchy.

Legal remedies exist against any alleged police brutality, both under Federal and State laws. If such legal remedies are inadequate, they should be strengthened. Nothing will be solved by extremist appeals to lawlessness and violence. Every possible step must be taken to restore order and to bring reason and moderation to this situation.

I have been asked whether I felt there should be Federal intervention. My answer to that query is "Not at this time." The police force of the city of New York should be able to handle the situation. I am sure that the officials of the city of New York feel as deeply concerned about this situation as do I. But I cannot condemn in strong enough terms the use of violence or lawlessness to bring about any ends in this free country.

U.S. CONSUMER PAYS THE PRICE OF COFFEE AGREEMENT

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, H.R. 8864 is entitled "An act to carry out the obligations of the United States under the International Coffee Agreement, 1962, signed at New York on September 28, 1962, and for other purposes." That is a long title.

Its real purpose can be stated more briefly, and in shorter words. Its real purpose is to push the price of coffee up, and to hold it up. That is the sum and substance of this legislation.

The basic principle of the International Coffee Agreement can be described in simple terms. Essentially, it is an arrangement to control the price of coffee throughout the world, by limiting the quantities that will be permitted to be sold. Under this arrangement the countries that produce the coffee and ship it abroad accept quotas on their exports; that is, limits on the quantity of coffee that each may ship and sell to other countries—but of course by doing so, these exporting countries receive higher prices and thus, more money for less coffee.

It is the well-known old principle of pushing up the price by restricting the supply on the market.

If such a thing were done domestically, we would call it a monopoly or trust or restraint of trade and vigorously prosecute those involved under the antitrust law. In this case, governments have lent the sanction of law and thus the color of respectability to it.

Now, what is involved? Who will pay the cost of this scheme? The consuming countries, of course. And although there are other countries which import coffee, the United States is the most seriously affected by far. Actually, this country each year consumes more than half of all the coffee exported throughout the world. We import over 3 billion pounds of coffee a year. We drink 450 million cups a day. That is equal to 2½ cups per day for every man, woman, and child in the United States.

How much will this agreement cost us? Mr. President, each penny-a-pound increase in the price of green coffee costs this country about $30 to $35 million a year.

Defenders of the treaty argue, of course, that it is designed to protect consumers as well as producers. Unfortunately, the terms of the agreement with coffee producing nations and the testimony at the hearing do not support that argument. Article 27, paragraph (1), of the agreement states, in part:

> The members * * * agree on the desirability of operating the agreement in a manner such that the real income derived from the export of coffee could be progressively increased so as to make it consonant with their needs for foreign exchange to support their programs for social and economic progress.

Then, in paragraph (2) of article 27, the agreement states:

> The members agree on the necessity of assuring that the general level of coffee prices does not decline below the general level of such prices in 1962.

In other words, the agreement sets a floor, but not a ceiling on coffee prices. There is a bland statement of platitudes in article 1 of the agreement, which refers to "equitable prices," but nowhere in the treaty is there any definition of that term, and there are no provisions to carry out that objective.

In May of last year, Secretary of State Rusk wrote:

> The objective of the new International Coffee Agreement is to stop the long-term decline in revenues from coffee exports by stabilizing prices at a level no lower than the general level of coffee prices in 1962.

The Presidential message urging House enactment of this implementing legislation, H.R. 8864, stated:

> The purpose of the agreement, which I fully endorse, is to check the disastrous decline in coffee prices that began in 1955, by holding a floor under these prices at the general level prevailing in 1962, and to bring stability to coffee markets by preventing major fluctuations in price.

The report on the agreement itself by the Committee on Foreign Relations said:

> The main purpose of the agreement is to prevent a further decline in the world price of coffee which has dropped more than 50 percent since 1954, the year of the all-time highest price.

In the phrasing of all these platitudinous assurances, it will be noted that the emphasis is on stopping the decline, preventing the price from going any lower, and in stabilizing the price. Little or nothing is openly admitted about the desire to boost the price.

Yet the fact is that we have already learned from experience how this mechanism can be used as a new kind of rocket propulsion fuel, to send the price of coffee into orbit.

On May 21, 1963, the Senate gave its advice and consent to the treaty. Our instrument of ratification of the treaty was deposited in December of 1963. Immediately, the price of coffee started to climb. Making comparison on the basis of the wholesale price of Santos 4's, the most commonly quoted type of Brazilian coffee, for the full year 1963, the average price was 34.11 cents per pound. The price of coffee had advanced just slightly during the last months of 1963 and averaged 37.45 cents per pound in December.

But after the U.S. ratification of the treaty was made formal, in January the price averaged 44.83 cents, a gain of a full 20 percent in a single month. Then in February and March it went up some more, reaching a high of about 51 cents at one time in March. It has now receded slightly, but not very much.

Altogether, the increase has amounted to about 50 percent—17 cents a pound above the 1963 level to the peak reached so far. And we have no proof that we have seen the maximum yet.

Supposedly, there were built-in safeguards to protect the consuming countries from this kind of price gouging. Supposedly our representation in the International Coffee Council, which has its headquarters in London, would permit us to stop prices from skyrocketing. The majority report of the Finance Committee states:

> The interests of the United States are protected by the fact that it will hold a minimum of 400 votes out of the total of 1,000 consumer votes in the International Coffee Council, the governing body of the agreement, and will also be a member of the executive board. Since practically all important decisions, such as adoption of the budget, establishment of the quotas, or the production control program, require a two-thirds vote of the consumers and producers voting separately, the United States holds sufficient votes to prevent actions which might be considered adverse to our policy interests, to our business community, or to the American consumer.

Despite these assurances, we have found that our voting strength will not protect us. Last fall, there began to be received the first firm indications of serious damage to the Brazilian coffee crop. It became clear that the price would increase unless prompt action was taken to increase available supplies of coffee on the market by increasing the quotas.

The International Coffee Council considered the matter. The other consuming countries voted unanimously with the United States for at least a moderate increase in quotas, to relieve the upward speculative pressure on the coffee market.

But the agreement provides that no changes in quotas can be made unless the consuming countries, and the producing countries, voting separately, each approve the change by a two-thirds vote. Of course, the producing countries were not displeased at the price rise. A vote for increased quotas would have checked the price increase; for the producing countries, that would have been a vote against self-interest. At the time there was great pressure on them to approve increased quotas, because the United States had not yet formally adhered to the Organization, and there was doubt that this country would go along. Coffee-producing interests were afraid that the United States might, after all, reject this legislation, or withdraw from the Organization. In that case the whole proposal would collapse, since the United States accounts for more than half of all coffee imports.

On that ground, a number of the coffee-producing countries were persuaded to vote against self-interest, and go along with the proposed increase in quotas. Even so, the increase was defeated, since it received less than a two-thirds vote of the producing countries.

Surely nothing could reveal more clearly our lack of power in such an international conclave. We had been delivered into the hands of our antagonists—insofar as fixing the price of coffee is concerned, that is. They had the votes, they had the control, and we had to accept their decision. That first test of the agreement showed clearly that the coffee-producing countries of Africa, Latin America, and Asia can and will dominate the market.

It is true that about 3 months later, in February of this year, after the price had already climbed about 10 or 15 cents, the Council was willing to vote an increase in quotas. Even then, we must remember, that action was taken in part to ward off the danger that the United States might after all not adopt this implementing legislation. This bill was then still before the Senate and had not yet been acted upon, and prices were increasing at an unparalleled rate. There was nervousness among coffee-producing countries that the American housewife would see through the whole scheme, rise in revolt, and induce this body to block our participation and thus bring the whole project to a grinding halt. On that basis the producing countries, perhaps reluctantly, voted quota increases.

It may be that that will be the last quota increase they will vote voluntarily. Once we have approved this legislation, our last major defense will have been given away.

What does this particular bill do? It does two major things. It provides that we may require certificates as to country of origin for all coffee imported here. Second, it provides that we may limit, reduce, or stop altogether any imports of coffee from countries which have not adhered to the International Coffee Agreement.

The purpose of these two powers is to enable us to help to enforce its control over the world coffee market by the International Coffee Organization. They have no other purpose. When quotas had been set, we would help to enforce the quotas—whether we agreed with them or not—by rejecting coffee imports from any country that might secede from the International Coffee Organization, or from any individual producer in a member country who might try to ship us coffee without securing an export license or certificate from his own government. In effect, the United States would become an enforcing arm of a world coffee cartel, devoted to raising the price of coffee and keeping it high. And since we are by far the largest importing country, we would be the chief enforcing arm of the cartel. That is what this bill provides.

We are told that our attitude toward this bill is a reflection of our sympathies for the poor people of Latin America. Possibly, the American housewife would not mind paying a little more for her coffee if the additional money would really go to help relieve starvation and suffering. But there is persuasive evidence that this money would not go to the poor in Latin America. As the minority views on the bill well state:

> The chief beneficiaries of the International Coffee Agreement are government treasuries which levy heavy taxes on exports, coffee speculators, and a few large landowners, and the American housewife will pay the bill.

It is not even a program to help the poor peasant, but rather a form of foreign aid, disguised to deceive the unsuspecting public.

When the agreement itself was before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee for consideration, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] said very candidly:

> It seems to me that to make an argument that this agreement is in the interest of the consumers is something less than frank. It is really in the interests of our national foreign policy, isn't it? * * * It is in the interest of our foreign policy like our foreign aid bill.

If each penny increase in the price of coffee costs the American consumer $30 to $35 million, then the increase of 15 to 17 cents a pound that we have experienced since last fall is costing American consumers well over $500 million annually. It is as if we had levied a sales tax on the American housewife, and had then taken that revenue and handed it over to the coffee-producing countries. The difference is that this kind of foreign aid does not have to be approved in detail by the Foreign Relations and Appropriations Committees of the Senate.

Neither does it necessarily go where it is most needed. It does not go to the poor who need it, nor for capital investment which at least would build up the economies of those countries. Instead it goes to the large landholders, who may use it for conspicuous consumption at home, or who may secrete it in numbered and anonymous accounts in Swiss banks; or it goes to the government of the exporting country which levies its tax on coffee thus exported.

Mr. President, we are told that we are under a moral obligation to pass this implementing legislation, since we have already approved the International Coffee Agreement. It is true that the Senate was persuaded to give a form of advice and consent to that treaty. I refer to it as "a form of advice and consent" because it was clearly stated and we were clearly told at the time that our ratification would not be deposited and that the treaty would not be binding upon us until Congress had had an opportunity to pass upon this implementing legislation. Now we are told that since the Senate approved the treaty, we are committed, we are obligated, and that it would be unthinkable for us to reject this legislation at this late date.

In this matter as in so many others, Congress has been led down the primrose path by promises from the other end of the avenue. I think the story can best be told in the words of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Douglas] in his individual views on the bill:

> We were told by the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee last year when we were considering the formal coffee treaty that even if we did approve it, it would not go into effect or be binding upon us until the Congress passed the legislation now before us. I am sure the able and honorable Senator from Arkansas, who made that pledge, did so in complete and utter good faith. Secretary Rusk, also a highly honorable man, made a similar pledge to the minority leader. (See Congressional Record, vol. 109, pt. 7, p. 9126.) We assumed, therefore, that the ratification of the treaty would not be deposited unless and until the implementing legislation was passed.
>
> The Finance Committee was delayed in considering the implementing legislation in the fall because of hearings on the long delayed tax bill. But in December our committee squared away to consider the measure. I shall never forget the hectic morning when the State Department started off by urging speedy hearings on the coffee agreement and then within an hour urged just as strenuously that action be withheld until after the tax bill was passed. I do not blame anyone for this. Assistant Secretary Dutton manfully took the blame for this, but it was obviously not his fault as he was merely the messenger. Then, at the suggestion of members, the chairman asked a high authority whether if we withheld action as requested, there would be any danger that the treaty would be deposited and hence go into effect even though no implementing legislation had been passed. He reported to us that he had been assured that this would not be done. The committee, therefore, felt it safe to postpone the hearings on coffee and get on with the tax bill. No sooner was this done, however, than individuals on the committee, of whom I was one, were informed that, due to the pressure of time, the State Department would deposit the treaties after all. I was asked if I had an individual objection and replied that I did not regard myself, as one Member of the U.S. Senate, as being sufficiently important to alter the policy of the U.S. Government, but that I thought the Finance Committee had been treated cavalierly to say the least and that promises had been made which had not been fulfilled.

Mr. President, it is not too late for us to stop and think. This may be our last chance, but we still do have this chance to pull back from this dangerous and harmful agreement before it is too late. It has well been said:

> If H.R. 8864 is adopted there can be but one result. Prices will remain high and continue to penalize the domestic consumer. A solid floor has been built, but nothing has been done to set an upward limit.
>
> The time has arrived when we had best begin to look after our American interests, instead of trying to assume the burdens of surplus coffee producers in many nations.
>
> This bill should be defeated.

To this viewpoint, this Senator wholeheartedly subscribes.

This outcome as provided in the bill is not unexpected. It was forecast by those who voted against ratification of the treaty last year. This Senator is among those who did so. At that time, we felt it ill-advised and against the best interests of America, with her adverse gold flow, and against the interests of our citizens and the consuming public. The provisions of the pending bill bear us out in our fears.

The administration advocated and forced a tax cut earlier this year. But the pending bill is the equivalent of an increase in taxes levied by coffee producing countries upon the large and widely spread coffee drinking population of our 50 States. It is a bill which vests in the foreign nation cartel members the power to retain and even increase that tax and to pocket the proceeds for themselves.

This is not a good bill. It is a bad bill. It should be defeated.

THE CHALLENGE AHEAD IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, each year the University of Nebraska welcomes back its graduates to the campus in Lincoln for an alumni roundup.

Two of the speakers at this year's reunion on June 13 concerned themselves with the problem of providing higher education for the years immediately ahead when campuses across the Nation are becoming increasingly crowded.

Dr. Clifford Hardin, chancellor of the university, and Mr. Charles Thone, president of its alumni association, discussed this subject in thoughtful terms, expressing concern about the challenge we face, yet confidence that the challenge will be met.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have printed in the Record the remarks by Chancellor Hardin and President Thone.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

REMARKS BY CLIFFORD M. HARDIN, CHANCELLOR, UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA, LINCOLN

As I visit with you today, I want to do so as a Nebraskan who is proud of his State, proud of his neighbors, and grateful for the privilege of speaking to the alumni of this great university on behalf of a large group of colleagues at the university who are "Cornhuskers" by deliberate choice, and who intend to continue to be "Cornhuskers" in the long and interesting years ahead.

We are thrilled to be associated with great Nebraska builders like Sterling McCaw, George Cook, and Peter Kiewit—and we are proud of all of our great and distinguished alumni wherever they may live and work.

If I were to use a text today, I would use a statement sometimes quoted by engineers: "You can move forward and still be bumped or trampled because you did not move fast enough."

The April issue of a little publication called News Front, which bills itself as management's news magazine, contains an article entitled "Knowledge—New U.S. Industry." Here are a few quotations from this article:

"It is not generally realized how far the United States has gone in the transition from a production-oriented system to a science-based, or idea-oriented economy.

"Education now generates at least one-fifth of the U.S. growth rate.

"The 'knowledge industry' accounts for nearly one-third of the entire economy, and is growing twice as fast.

"U.S. business spends $17 billion yearly to educate its personnel, or one-third as much as is spent on the Nation's public and private school system.

"More than one-fourth of the Nation is engaged in education (51 million students and 2 million teachers).

"Investment in education has increased the output of the economy and the income of those educated equal to a return on investment of about 10 percent, according to the Chase Manhattan Bank."

And then they refer to a paragraph in Clark Kerr's Godkin lectures when he says: "We are just now perceiving that knowledge may be the most powerful single element in our culture. What the railroads did for the second half of the last century and the automobile for the first half of this century may be done for the second half of this century by the knowledge industry."

News Front also quotes from Prof. Theodore Schultz: "The contribution of education to economic growth between 1929 and 1959 exceeded that of physical capital."

Following this series of citations, the article then editorializes on their meaning as follows: "The knowledge revolution is also changing the economic geography of the Nation. The dominant 'growth' institutions of the future will be, not the factories, but the Nation's intellectual organizations—the research corporations, industrial laboratories, experimental stations, and universities.

"These, in turn, attract industry. This is clearly shown by one of the Nation's most research-oriented industries—defense. Three States—California, New York, and Massachusetts—have been able to claim nearly 60 percent of all military research contracts, because, according to Deputy Secretary of Defense Roswell Gilpatric, they are also centers of learning.

But it is not only research that follows this pattern, for these same three States are now receiving nearly 40 percent of all military prime contracts for production.

This brief review provides part of the background against which I wish to discuss the future of this university. There are a few other items that need to be added.

It has become almost trite to talk about the population increase. Even so, few realize the magnitude of it or the probable results within a society such as our own or on the relations among nations. It is now estimated that one-fourth of the people who have ever lived on the face of the earth are still alive. Within the United States it is now suggested that if, by some miracle, size of family could be reduced immediately to two children per family, our own population would still double by the year 2000.

There is also the explosion in new knowledge. If we were to attempt to select a date for which we could say that since then more scientific knowledge has been discovered and recorded than in all previous time, it is probable that that date would fall in the decade of the 1940's. I would be so reckless as to forecast that by 1985 we shall have added more scientific knowledge than exists in 1964.

Thanks to the efforts of many able and interested people, both within the university and outside, the institution has been able to make substantial progress during the past 10 years. Yet we know that whatever has happened in the past decade must be completely dwarfed by events of the next if Nebraska is to grow and prosper, and if she is to hold her own among the States.

All schools and colleges will be caught up in this onrush of events, but the impact in the next 10 years will be greatest at the college and university level. In Nebraska this institution, because of its size, because it is the only institution with doctorate programs, because of the professional colleges and the commitment to research and service, and because it is the single State university, must play the key role.

Let us turn first to the undergraduates.

All of you can think of an excellent liberal arts college that has an enrollment somewhere between 700 and 1,300 students. You can visualize also the campus, its buildings, the faculty, and the other things that go with that kind of college. If you will do this, perhaps you will then be able to appreciate more clearly the magnitude of the task here. We've added the equivalent of one of these colleges in each of the past 3 years, and we shall be expected to add another on the average in each of the next 10 years. Remember, the increase in birth rate which occurred following World War II will affect the colleges for the first time this fall.

Think, if you will, of 60 additional faculty members for each 1,000 students, office space for them, new classrooms and laboratories, land for additional intramural athletics and recreational facilities, dormitory space and dining facilities for 1,000 more students each year, a new location for fraternities and sororities—all of this while we continue to upgrade, remodel, or replace space for such existing programs as music, mechanical engineering, architecture, the biological sciences, physical education for women, physics, and English.

Now let us add to this undergraduate program comparable changes in our graduate and professional schools and colleges. More than a fifth of our students are now working for an advanced degree.

The National Science Foundation has announced a new policy of attempting to facilitate the development of 10 to 12 additional scientific research centers throughout the country—centers with faculty and facilities to do some of the things now being done at the existing top dozen such centers. We hope and believe that the University of Nebraska can be one of these new centers. Such a goal is within reach if the citizens of the State wish to make sufficient effort. And while the dollar costs will seem high, the possible returns in terms of the economic and cultural development of the State are enormous, if not fantastic.

We have a strong faculty, and it is improving each year—thanks to a group of able people who stuck it out when things were tougher than they are now, to a much improved salary scale, and to the relatively new regents professorship program which was born in the alumni association and which is going a long way in insuring our future academic excellence.

Our administrative group will rank with the very best to be found in any university anywhere—in terms of competence and imagination.

We are fortunate that the State chose to concentrate on the development of a single State university in contrast to nearly all of our neighbors.

The reputation of our graduates is excellent. For example, we are still among the top 25 universities in numbers of graduates listed in "Who's Who in America."

We have this excellent structure which provides a central facility and focus for our rapidly developing program of continuing education and which, in turn, is helping to relate the university's total resource more directly to the needs of the State.

We have these things and many others—a solid foundation for further building—for the further building of a university to be of greater service to the people who support it. This is an important point. A university must never be considered as an end in itself, but rather as an institution that enables a people to do things that they want or need that could not be so well provided otherwise.

Most of you know this, but it is important that you know that we also realize it. What we are proposing here, therefore, should be considered part of a total program for making Nebraska an even more satisfying place to live. And somehow I feel that we in Nebraska have the ability to accomplish almost anything that we want—if we want it enough.

Profs. Robert Manley and James Olson are preparing a history of the University of Nebraska to be published in connection with the university's centennial in 1969. Yesterday they visited with our centennial committee about some of the material that has been collected. Dr. Manley reported that news stories and articles throughout the Nation in the 1890's and the early 1900's invariably included Nebraska in any list of the six or eight most distinguished institutions. They would mention two or three Ivy League schools—Michigan, Nebraska, and Wisconsin. There was frequent local reference to Nebraska as "the best in the West." And, indeed, we were one of the early members of the Association of American Universities—the university that provided the advanced graduate program (first graduate college in public university in United States; first in any university west of the Mississippi).

I asked Dr. Manley whether this was the result of the efforts of a few able people; or was there evidence that this prestige was understood and strongly desired by the citizenry. He states that the evidence is unmistakable—the people wanted that kind of university and insisted on having it; they were inordinately proud of Bessey, Barbour, Brace, Fling, Edgren, Avery, and many others.

I then asked him if he could pinpoint the time when the institution began to lose momentum. He said definitely that the pace slowed in the 3 or 4 years following 1910. There was great debate on whether the downtown campus should be moved. During the years of this debate, many important decisions were postponed until the location issue was settled. Momentum appeared to have been lost and gradually a fervent desire to excel in every way gave way to a willingness to settle for something less—even, in some instances so the record shows, to apology.

I hope future historians will record that somewhere in the fifties the psychology began to change and by 1964 once again Nebraskans were on the move, that they were determined to excel—and excel they did.

I hope that Nebraskans will insist that they want in their State university a significant share of the Nation's most distinguished scholars and scientists. That we will insist also that our other colleges and universities prosper and be permitted to make their maximum contribution. I hope that we will insist that all Nebraskans be provided opportunity to develop their talents to the full extent of their respective abilities.

If we do these things, I believe the results will be most rewarding. I believe that we shall find ourselves greatly increasing our average productivity. I believe that we shall be supplying quality service to the other States, to other parts of the world, and to ourselves in greater amounts than we have ever dreamed. We already have some excellent examples of this type of activity. We have Nebraska contracting companies and architectural firms operating throughout this country and abroad which are successfully competing with the very best anywhere. We have insurance companies which are among the best. They are selling insurance, to be sure, but they are also selling excellent financial management. These are examples of services provided from Nebraska which help to enrich our own economy.

We can do more of these things if we want to—if we can rekindle that spirit of pride and burning zeal that we seemed to have possessed a half century ago.

It is the persons in this room more than any other group who must take the lead. In so doing we must realize that just moving forward is not enough—that it is possible to make progress but so slowly that we can get trampled from behind.

Tomorrow is going to be vastly different from yesterday. There is great urgency and even greater opportunity. Let us move forward rapidly enough to be leaders in whatever we attempt.

Remarks of Charles Thone, President of the University of Nebraska Alumni Association

The University of Nebraska Alumni Association does me a great honor by allowing me to serve as its president. I am deeply appreciative and accept the office in the effort to make some contribution in repayment of the great debt I personally owe to higher education and to the university particularly.

This annual alumni roundup is an appropriate occasion for all of us to consider our obligations to education. It has been an important friend to me, as I know it has to you.

This is a case of a friend indeed is a friend in need.

Higher education today is in need. The gale winds surrounding the postwar population explosion threaten to extinguish the lamp of opportunity which for so long beckoned our young people—at the very moment in time when they most need the light of learning.

Only a few facts are needed to pinpoint the problem.

In the past 2 years, elementary and secondary school enrollment in Nebraska has increased by more than 20,000.

Next fall, nearly 24,000 students are expected in the State's 12th-grade classes alone, representing an increase of some 20 percent over this year.

Nearly half of our current crop of high school seniors will attend college within the State's borders. The going-to-college rate in Nebraska not only stands at 45 percent, but increases by nearly 2 percent with each passing year. And by adding technical and vocational schools—and a most generous and sympathetic understanding in this area is essential—the post-high-school education ratio for Nebraska's graduating young people rises to 54 percent.

The university's growth pattern, showing an increase for the sixth consecutive year, and a record high of 11,450 students last fall, is being duplicated in higher learning institutions throughout the State. At its current rate of growth, 20,000 students roaming the NU campus by the early 1970's looms as a distinct probability.

At Wayne State College, enrollment demands have already forced a limitation on out-of-State students for the first time.

To those of us with firsthand appreciation of its value—and I speak as a young man who went from a one-room country schoolhouse to a high school staffed with a couple of exceptional teachers—through our law school here at the university, higher education is not only an old friend, but one of our very best. And right now, here in Nebraska, it's a friend that urgently needs our top-priority interest and active support, our effective support.

The responsibility extends to all the people, not merely their leaders. We need additional facilities. We need more teachers, perhaps teachers most of all. We need space. We need money.

To ignore these needs is to ignore our children and to ignore our children is to ignore the future of our State. The future is our promise to our children and to our children's children.

The young people of Nebraska want, deserve, and must have the chance to meet and get acquainted with our old friend, education.

The challenge is there. The question is, shall we meet it? When we consider our obligations to this longtime friend, I am confident we will.

It is a mistake to consider that education is an end to be achieved. Education is not a destination; it is an endless road we travel all the days of our lives.

NEBRASKA PLANNING OBSERVANCE OF CENTENNIAL

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, it was 160 years ago that President Jefferson authorized the Lewis and Clark Expedition to explore and report the assets of the newly acquired Louisiana Territory. Since this time, the area which was to become Nebraska has played a significant role in the history of the Louisiana Purchase and the West. From the 1820's until the 1840's the future Nebraska was considered to be a part of the Great American Desert where little would grow and where the opportunities for human life were bleak.

In the 1840's, John C. Fremont and his band of explorers crossed Nebraska and sent a report to the Secretary of War regarding his explorations. Subsequently, the Secretary suggested that the area be called Nebraska, based on the Indian word meaning "shallow river." Thus, just 120 years ago, Congress first considered a bill to create a new political unit west of the Missouri River. This new area was to be known as the Territory of Nebraska, but due to the political issues of the time this movement came to naught.

This period of the 1830's and 1840's had great importance for the history of Nebraska and the West, because it was during this time that the basis was laid for future settlement and development. The early pathfinders established the routes which would permit the extensive movement of people and enable the East to tap the rich trade possibilities of the Northwest and the West to make known to settlers its vast mineral and agricultural resources. As we all know, Mr. President, the result was the development of the famous overland routes of the Oregon and Mormon Trails. Both of these routes converged in the present State of Nebraska and followed the Platte Valley until they reached its western border where they separated. Undoubtedly, these trails greatly facilitated the settlement of Nebraska and hastened its territorial organization.

After Congress abandoned the Nebraska territorial bill in 1844, it was 10 years before the matter of organizing the Territory again presented itself to the Congress—this time in the form of the Kansas-Nebraska bill of 1854. After 5 months of debate, the measure was passed and the Territory of Nebraska was created which extended between 40° and 49° North up to the Canadian border. The area on the east from the Missouri River extended to the Rocky Mountain Divide on the west. This new Territory embraced all or substantial parts of the area now occupied by the States of North Dakota, Wyoming, South Dakota, Montana, and, of course, Nebraska.

Finally, the last step on the road to statehood was begun 100 years ago this year. By an act of Congress in 1864 and signed by President Lincoln, the citizens of the Territory were authorized to draw up a constitution for presentation to Congress. Thus, Mr. President, 1964, is a memorable year in that it was this year 100 years ago that the preparatory step was taken with the view toward statehood for Nebraska. Also, in the year of 1864, Nebraska was reduced almost to its present size. The long process culminating in statehood was completed on March 1, 1867, when President Johnson by proclamation recognized the free State of Nebraska as the 37th State in the Union.

Nebraskans in the years since statehood have experienced both prosperity and depression, fought against grasshoppers and the elements of nature, and lived always with faith in the future and belief in the strength of the individual. Today Nebraskans in all sections of the United States are making contributions in their own ways to the fulfillment of the American dream of a century ago.

One writer put it this way:

> Nebraska has staggered and suffered through three depressions, born of speculation and grasshoppers in the 1870's, agricultural failure and drought in the 1890's, and the total economic collapse of the 1930's.
>
> But Nebraska survived.
>
> When the soil dried up and blew away, the people held fast. When the dollar withered into near worthlessness, it was the value of the people which saved the State.
>
> And so it has always been.
>
> Those first white men who settled in Nebraska lived with hardship as an unwelcome, but constant companion. They forged a living on sheer force of daring and guts.
>
> For Nebraska had long been branded as a forgotten desert wasteland where the savage lived, a land unsuitable for agriculture, even for life. It was a place where nature dared man, where the farmer had to gamble to survive.
>
> Pioneer life was a drudgery. Man stood alone out here against the ravages of nature and storm, against the haunting specter of starvation and disease.
>
> The Nebraska of the 20th century which bounced back from the devastating depression of three decades past had no patent on will or courage. Their ancestors had long since showed the way.
>
> Strength of the individual is a heritage in this State, an attribute which was actually the result of necessity. For in the vast, unsettled soil of Nebraska, those who worked the land lived a lonely life, an isolated existence in an environment where self-help was often the only help.

Mr. President, the Nebraska State Centennial Commission is now making plans and arrangements to celebrate the centennial year of Nebraska statehood. A period from March 1, 1967, through Thanksgiving Day has been set aside for events at the municipal, county, and State levels to commemorate a century of pioneer heritage. This will truly be a grassroots movement by the citizens of Nebraska to show their pride in being Nebraskans and their love for their State.

I take this opportunity to invite my colleagues and the citizens of their States to visit Nebraska in the years ahead and to make special note of the dates set aside for the Nebraska Centennial celebrations, March 1 through Thanksgiving Day, 1967.

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call may be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 9 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, July 21, 1964, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 20, 1964:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Lucius D. Battle, of Florida, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the United Arab Republic.

Miss Margaret Joy Tibbetts, of Maine, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Norway.

Winthrop G. Brown, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Korea.

U.S. ATTORNEY

William N. Goodwin, of Washington, to be U.S. attorney for the western district of Washington for the term of 4 years, vice Brockman Adams, resigned.

U.S. MARSHAL

George J. Ward, of New York, to be U.S. marshal for the eastern district of New York for the term of 4 years, vice Thomas M. Dugan, resigned.

COAST GUARD ACADEMY

The following officers of the permanent commissioned teaching staff of the Coast Guard Academy for promotion to the grade of captain:

Paul F. Foye
Raymond J. Perry
Ephraim P. Rivard

FEDERAL COAL MINE SAFETY BOARD OF REVIEW

Edward Steidle, of Pennsylvania, to be a member of the Federal Coal Mine Safety

Board of Review for the term expiring July 15, 1967. (Reappointment.)

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officer under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in grade as follows:

Maj. Gen. John Lathrop Throckmorton, O19732, U.S. Army, in the grade of lieutenant general.

The following-named officer under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in grade as follows:

Maj. Gen. James Hilliard Polk, O19028, U.S. Army, in the grade of lieutenant general.

IN THE NAVY

Vice Adm. Horacio Rivero, Jr., U.S. Navy, to be Vice Chief of Naval Operations in the Department of the Navy under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5085.

Having designated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, Vice Adm. Horacio Rivero, Jr., U.S. Navy, for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, I nominate him for appointment to the grade of admiral while so serving.

Vice Adm. John Sylvester, U.S. Navy, for appointment to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 5233.

Having designated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, Rear Adm. Andrew McB. Jackson, Jr., U.S. Navy, for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, I nominate him for appointment to the grade of vice admiral while so serving.

IN THE ARMY

The officers named herein for promotion as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 593(a) and 3384:

To be brigadier generals

Col. Arthur Frank Brandstatter, O351996, Military Police Corps.

Col. Robert Frank Cocklin, O1165715, Artillery.

Col. Harry Jack Mier, Jr., O537865, Infantry.

The Army National Guard of the United States officers named herein for promotion as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 593(a) and 3385:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Robert Aye Ballard, O342774.

Brig. Gen. Harold Raymond Bauer, O298149.

Brig. Gen. William Reuther Douglas, O373402.

Brig. Gen. Donald Charles Grant, O360644.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Robert Glen Elder, O1014892, Armor.

Col. Hugh Barbee Mott, O1056820, Armor.

Col. Donald Paul Radde, O348479, Infantry.

The Army National Guard of the United States officers named herein for appointment as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 593(a) and 3392:

To be brigadier generals

Col. William Charles Doyle, O1307380, Infantry.

Col. Heber Lowe Minton, O1010514, Infantry.

Col. Robert Outsen, O258366, Adjutant General's Corps.

Col. Norman James Walton, O391347, Artillery.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of first lieutenant subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

James L. Shaw
Daniel J. Massey

The following-named officer of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of colonel:

Franklin C. Bacon

The following-named officer of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of major:

Raymond R. Hall, Jr.

IN THE NAVY

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers Training Corps candidates) to be permanent ensigns in the Supply Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Ernest J. Notar
Robert F. Walker

Ronnie G. Carter (Naval Reserve Officers Training Corps candidate) to be a permanent ensign in the line of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

The following-named graduates from (Navy enlisted scientific education program) to be permanent ensigns in the line of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

David F. Bolka
Carl L. Ludwig
James R. Proctor
Robert D. Rantschler
William F. Schwarz
Kenneth F. Scigulinsky
Stephen J. Seyl

Douglas H. Trager (Navy enlisted scientific education program) to be a permanent ensign in the Supply Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

The following-named (officer candidate) to be permanent lieutenant (junior grade) in the line of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Robert M. Simpson

The following-named (Naval Reserve officers) to be permanent lieutenants (junior grade) and temporary lieutenants in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

William J. Deely
Thomas V. DiSilvio
Stanley E. Donahoo
Norman A. Goldstein
Joseph A. Hunter
Richard Shapiro
William A. Stone
Charles J. Vacanti, Jr.

William A. Kornblum (Naval Reserve officer) to be a permanent lieutenant commander and a temporary commander in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

The following-named (Naval Reserve officers) to be permanent lieutenants in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Norman Cardoso
Joseph F. Nataro

Walter E. Beasley III (Naval Reserve officer) to be a permanent lieutenant and a temporary lieutenant commander in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be permanent lieutenants (junior grade) and temporary lieutenants in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

David A. Andrzejewski
Leonard P. Chandler, Jr.
Richard D. Gowin
Joseph F. Koenigs
Daniel R. Riley
David A. Sampe
Carl J. Smith

The following-named (Naval Reserve officers) to be permanent lieutenants (junior grade) and temporary lieutenants in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Jimmy E. Albright
John M. Box
Michael D. Callihan
Joel O. Diven

Elpides S. Rallis (Naval Reserve officer) to be a permanent lieutenant and a temporary lieutenant commander in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officer Training Corps) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Lance J. Bibin
Timothy V. Moore
Lynden R. Steele
Richard W. Vaughn

The following-named (meritorious noncommissioned officer) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Leonard L. Ingram.

IN THE NAVY

Lieutenant (junior grade) Joseph F. Jaggard, U.S. Navy, for permanent promotion to the grade of chief warrant officer, W-2, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

The following-named lieutenants in the U.S. Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of chief warrant officer, W-3, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Adams, George C.
Austin, Ellis E.
Carter, Charles S.
Glover, Fred "B"
Guthrie, William C.
Moore, James A.
Riley, Joseph F.

The following-named officers of the U.S. Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of chief warrant officer, W-4, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Baker, Encell T.
Barbarick, Lewis V. Jr.
Bateman, William L.
Blanchard, Ernest J., III
Buchanan, Oscar M.
Collins, Paul N.
Cook, William E., Jr.
Creed, Euly C., Jr.
Hardison, Jeffrey J.
Hirte, Richard E.
Huddleston, Louis H.
Hudson, Gerald W.
Jermier, Jack R.
Johnson, Charles G.
McKinney, Byron C.
Parker, Robert L.
Prestwood, Robert M., Jr.
Reeder, James L.
Roy, Clyde R.
Tibbs, Robert W.
Watson, Roy D.

The following-named officers of the U.S. Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of chief warrant officer, W-3, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Adkins, Wilbur L.
Childers, Virgil R.
Conway, Lonnie E.
Coslett, Audrey G.
Cox, Harold E., Jr.
Davis, George R.
Dederling, Kenneth C.
Doherty, Richard A.
Droddy, Donald F.
Foust, Frank R.
Holland, Muscoe C., Jr.
Jablonske, Donald K.
Jacobs, Donald F.
Jeffra, Arthur J.
Jones, John C.
Konopa, Frank J.
Lang, Earl W.
Legrande, Frederick O.
Leone, Theresa
Lyon, Jennings L.
Meeler, William F., Jr.
Rutkofske, John A.
Scalise, Raymond A.
Schroeder, Philip W.
Sharpe, Virgil G.
Shipman, Dan B., Jr.
Slaughter, Arthur R.
Sloan, Wallace V.
Spain, John H.
Tancredi, Domenic N.
Tarver, Carroll L.
Uhlhorn, Elmer C.
Waller, George E.
Werts, Glenn E.
White, James A.
White, Theodore L.
Whyte, George L.
Wooten, Robert W.

The following-named officers of the U.S. Navy for temporary promotion to the grade of lieutenant in the line, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Auch, James, M., Jr.
Barnes, Edward T.
Barr, John G.
Beck, William R.
Borders, Jack B.
Bowman, Jack B., Jr.

Burns, William F., Jr.
Castano, John B.
Chapman, John B.
Collins, William J.
Croll, Stuart L.
Davenport, Cedric M.
Drylie, James T., II
Durkin, James J.
Farkas, Louis J., Jr.
Fowler, Eugene C.
Fuscaldo, Robert P.
Giersch, George J.
Hansen, Emery D.
Healy, Kevin M.
Hudspeth, John R.
Kavanaugh, James A.
King, Wesley A.
Ligon, Elvin S., III
Ouzts, "H" "C"
Peacock, Billy F.
Poe, William H.
Rickgauer, Donald R.
Seely, Peter R.
Staton, Billy E.
Steele, Richard H.
Tollefsen, Thomas S.
Whalen, John M.

The following-named officers of the U.S. Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of lieutenant (junior grade) in the line and staff corps, as indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LINE

Bremner, Bruce B.
Castellano, William J.
Catchings, Thomas J.
Chappel, James R.
Chappell, George C.
Doll, Robert J.
Driscoll, Joseph A.
Dryden, Victor D.
Fisher, George G.
Fox, William E.
Gerhardt, Robert T.
Giersch, Albert E.
Gudmunson, Charles E.
Hawk, Richard S.
Holmes, Ephraim P., Jr.
Kunz, James C.
Lair, James A.
Lash, Franklin B.
Lee, John H.
Lewis, Richard T.
Martin, Harold V.
Miles, John H. T.
Mulin, Charles F.
Murphy, Edward M.
Nash, James D., Jr.
Payne, Joseph C.
Pullinger, William A.
Reilly, George V., Jr.
Rogers, Paul D.
Ruff, Paul G., III
Sammons, Charles E.
Sanders, Leslie A.
Scott, Gerald D.
Sellgren, Charles A.
Sirmans, James S.
Soles, Thomas E.
Wilson, James K., Jr.

SUPPLY CORPS

Chalupsky, Raymond J.
Chism, David M.
MacGregor, Bruce
Payne, Billy I.
Priest, William G., Jr.
Redman, William E., Jr.
Shahan, Robert R.
Sherman, Bruce L.
Snyder, James R.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Brown, Gerald L.
Russell, William H.

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Dasler, Adolph R.
MacConnell, Thomas W.

The following-named officers of the Navy for permanent promotion to the grades indicated:

To be commanders, line

Lowell D. Chansler
William M. Harrison
Robert Wrzeninski

To be commanders, Medical Corps

Jaime M. Benavides, Jr.
Elgin C. Cowart
Kenneth P. Jones III
Roger F. Reinhardt

To be commanders, Chaplain Corps

Ralph W. Below
Benjamin J. Davis
Robert L. Deal

To be commanders, Dental Corps

Robert W. Bruce
Theodore E. Carlson
Joseph R. Evans

To be lieutenant commanders, line

Abbott, William B., III
Ackerman, Richard F.
Adair, Frederick S.
Adams, George J., Jr.
Adams, Robert L., Jr.
Ajemian, Andre V.
Akagi, Joe L.
Aldern, Donald D.
Alexander, Adam G., Jr.
Alexander, Marvin G.
Alexander, William H.
Alexich, Milton P.
Allen, Douglas A.
Allen, John B.
Allen, Richard C.
Allen, Robert J.
Allen, Winfred P.
Altwegg, David M.
Alvis, John G.
Amick, Benjamin C., Jr.
Amor, Raymond C.
Anaston, Tommy K., Jr.
Anderle, Charles K.
Anderson, Alden B.
Anderson, Charles A.
Anderson, Charles L. R.
Anderson, Duane E.
Anderson, Paul L.
Anderson, Robert J.
Andes, Paul G.
Andrews, Leon L.
Angier, Donald L.
Anthony, David J.
Applegarth, Samuel H., Jr.
Archer, Burton E., Jr.
Argiro, Vincent J.
Armel, Lyle O., II
Armstrong, Edward M.
Arn, Robert W.
Arnheiter, Marcus A.
Arnold, John E.
Ashley, William H.
Ashman, Lee E.
Ashworth, Edgar M., Jr.
Asmus, Paul A.
Aston, William J.
Atherton, Robert F.
Avallone, Eugene M.
Averyt, Howell D.
Axthelm, Charles E.
Aylward, William J., Jr.
Ayres, James H.
Baciocco, Albert J., Jr.
Backes, Ronald J.
Backman, Fred M.
Bacon, James A.
Bacon, John L.
Bademan, Harold W.
Badgett, John J.
Bahm, John J.
Bailey, George T.
Bailey, Kenneth R., Jr.
Baillie, Richard H.
Baker, James E., Jr.
Baker, James G.
Balchunas, Robert C.
Baldridge, Louis D., Jr.
Baldwin, Robert A.
Ball, Millard C.
Ballew, Richard F., Jr.
Bandurraga, Thomas, Jr.
Banghart, Leslie L.
Banks, Bruce R.
Banks, William E., IV
Bariteau, Frederick J.
Barker, Merle M.
Barnes, Clifford P.
Barnes, James P.
Barnes, John B.
Barnes, William M.
Barnett, Gerald P.
Barney, Glenn P.
Barrett, Gardner S.
Barrett, Roy F.
Barringer, Malcolm L.
Barron, William T.
Barrow, Robert W.
Bartholomew, John L.
Bassett, Jerry S.
Bates, John A., Jr.
Bath, Alan H.
Bathurst, Robert B.
Batten, Charles G.
Beard, Donald W.
Beates, James K.
Beattie, Thomas T., Jr.
Beatty, Lloyd D.
Beaulieu, Reo A.
Beavers, Roy L., Jr.
Beck, Donald M.
Beck, Stuart M.
Beech, Wayne "L"
Beecher, John D.
Beem, Jack M.
Belcher, Sylvester A.
Bell, Clyde R.
Bell, Gerald R.
Bender, Leslie C., Jr.
Benero, Manuel A., Jr.
Bennett, James L.
Benton, Hugh A.
Berg, Richard C.
Berglund, Lester W., Jr.
Berkley, Lawrence N.
Berndt, Donald J.
Berry, George H., Jr.
Berry, Joel H., Jr.
Bethke, Earl E., Jr.
Bibby, Lowe H., III
Bills, Robert G.
Bingham, Thomas, Jr.
Bird, Charles S.
Biron, Joseph E.
Bixby, Harry L., Jr.
Blackadar, Paul F.
Blackington, Richard N.
Blackwood, Jack D.
Blades, Lawrence T.
Blair, Closkey L., Jr.
Blake, Harry R., Jr.
Blanding, Robert L.
Blass, Richard H.
Bohannan, William L.
Boles, Lee R.
Boles, Richard L.
Bolst, Albert L.
Boone, Robert R.
Booth, Roger G.
Bos, Roger C.
Boschen, Henry C., Jr.
Bosse, Joseph H., Jr.
Botsko, Ronald T.
Bouknight, Foy H.
Bouvette, Albert J.
Bowen, Albert S., III
Bowen, William S.
Bowers, Henry H.
Bowman, Lawrence F.
Bozeman, Henry G.
Brackett, Gerald F.
Bradford, Gerald R.
Bradshaw, Brice L.
Brady, Allen C.
Brady, John H., Jr.
Brandel, William J., Jr.
Breen, Matthew J.
Bress, Allyn V.
Brewer, Glenn M.
Bridge, Daniel T.
Bridge, James A., Jr.
Bridges, Kenneth K.
Bridgham, Russell B.
Bristol, Robert B.
Broadwell, Edward A.
Brogan, Robert C.
Brooks, Walter A.
Brown, Bobby J.
Brown, Charles H.
Brown, Donald N.
Brown, George W. M.
Brown, George A.
Brown, Gideon L., Jr.
Brown, Jacob C.
Brown, James R.
Brown, Robert L.
Brown, Robert M.
Brownley, John H.
Bruner, James R.
Bruning, Richard A.
Bryant, William R.
Bryla, Dominic A.
Buchanan, Alvin J., Jr.
Buck, Donald D.
Buck, John A.
Buckholts, Walter H., Jr.
Bucklin, Jerald W.
Bunyan, Lawrence P.
Burdon, Eugene R.
Burgess, Wallace A.
Burkemper, Raymond G.
Burkhart, Paul C.
Burley, John R.
Burnett, James A.
Burnett, John H.
Burriss, John R.
Burrows, Herbert J.
Bush, James T.
Bush, Robert H.
Butler, Archie P., Jr.
Butler, Charles A.
Buzzell, Carlisle W., Jr.
Byrd, Paul R.
Cagney, Thomas P.
Cahill, William A., Jr.
Caldwell, Earl L., Jr.
Califf, Toxey H.
Calkins, Donald L.
Callahan, Earle R.
Callan, John F.
Cameron, Kenneth R.
Cameron, Norman A.
Campbell, Edward L.
Campbell, John A.
Campbell, Neil V.
Campbell, Ronald A.
Campion, Robert F., Jr.
Cann, Tedford J.
Cantacuzene, Rodion
Carden, Marshall B., Jr.
Carey, William R.
Carl, William T.
Carlin, Robert J.
Carlisle, David R.
Carlson, Howard L.
Carlson, Ronald F.
Carroll, William E.
Carson, Ernest H.
Carson, Ralph
Carter, Tandy W.
Case, George P., Jr.
Case, Richard W.
Caskey, Donald L.
Cassani, Henry L.
Cassidy, Joseph B., Jr.
Caswell, Frederic C., Jr.
Caudill, William E.
Cauffman, Charles E.
Caulk, Robert F.
Cave, John G.
Cave, Thomas H.
Cecil, Durward C.
Chadwick, John R.
Chambers, Lawrence C.
Chandler, Albert N., Jr.
Charbonneau, George L.
Chasse, Robert L.
Cheatham, Augustus B.
Chereskin, Howard
Cherrier, Herbert A.
Chertavian, Armen
Chesebrough, Richard
Chesky, James A.
Chesser, Samuel L.
Chewning, Robert W.
Childers, Donald J.
Chinn, Clarence E.
Chisum, Oscar C.
Christensen, Eugene J.
Christie, Francis J.
Christon, Paul W.
Clare, James S.
Clark, Donald E.
Clark, Robert T.
Clark, Stanley D.
Clarke, Robert R.
Clausner, Edward, Jr.
Clermont, William J., Jr.
Clew, William M.
Cloughley, William D.
Coale, William A.
Cochrane, James H.
Cockell, William A., Jr.
Coffman, Charles L.
Coiner, John A.
Collier, John H.
Colligan, Thomas R.
Collins, Frank C., Jr.
Collins, Harold E.
Combs, Martin F.
Combs, Robert E.
Condon, Edward J., Jr.
Conn, Lannie, Jr.
Connally, Robert F., III
Connell, Lewis E.
Connelly, Robert B.
Connors, Eugene T.
Conrad, Peter C.
Cooke, Robert A.
Cooney, David M.
Cooper, Donald H.
Corbett, William J., III
Cornelius, Winston W.
Cornwell, James W.
Corsepius, Everett D.
Coski, Bernard J.
Costigan, Robert A.
Cotten, Thomas R., Jr.
Cotugno, Paul J.
Councell, Thomas S.
Crain, James D.
Craven, Robert C. E.
Cretsinger, Wilbur B.
Cromwell, John P., Jr.
Cronin, Francis W.
Cross, Douglas E.
Cross, William F.
Crowder, James P., Jr.
Cruden, David S.
Cullins, Peter K.
Cunningham, Melville D.
Cunningham, Richard B.
Cunningham, Alan R.
Curran, Robert W.
Currie, Edgar I.
Cush, Casimo J.
Cywin, Lawrence
Dallaire, Richard P.
Dalla Mura, Richard A.
Dal Pian, Joseph H.
Dalton, Charles W.
Daniels, Verlyne W.
Danis, Anthony L., Jr.
Dapogny, Robert J.
DaRodda, Aldo J.
Darrell, Charles G.
Darwin, William C.
Davey, Richard B.
Davidson, Charles H.
Davidson, Christie H.
Davis, Frank E.
Davis, Henry J., Jr.
Davis, Jay K.
Davis, Michael C.
Davis, Noble J., Jr.
Davis, Paul H., Jr.
Davis, William B.
Davison, David D.
Day, Arthur R.
Deaton, Paul
Degnan, Francis J.
De Mun, Taylor K.
Denbigh, Robert S., Jr.
Denton, David N.
Derby, George K.
Derr, John P.
Desjardin, John W.
Desrosiers, Roland J.
DeView, Joseph R.
De Wispelaere, Earl L.
Dietrich, Henry T., Jr.
Dietz, Richard C.
Dimmick, David K.
Dion, Laurent N.
Dobyns, John E.
Dodd, Charles A.
Doelling, Robert D.
Doggett, William K.
Dorn, Gerald W.

Dorney, William J.
D'Orso, James N.
Dowse, Herbert B., Jr.
Doyle, William J.
Drews, Sheldon
Driskell, Omer L.
Duckett, Philip VanH. L.
Dudley, Paul L., Jr.
DuMont, Sidney P., Jr.
Duncan, Dale W.
Dunn, Robert F.
Dwyer, Laurence A.
Dyer, George T., Jr.
Dykers, Thomas M., Jr.
Eakle, Burke E.
Earl, William C.
Eastman, Alfred C., III
Ebbert, Edwin L.
Echols, Kenneth W.
Ecklund, Hugo L., Jr.
Eddy, William P., III
Edmonds, Hobart J., Jr.
Edmunds, Philip H.
Edris, Richard J.
Edwards, Chester C.
Edwards, Forrest L.
Eggert, Lowell F.
Ekman, Roger E.
Elder, James C.
Eller, Richard L.
Elliott, Charles L.
Elliott, Jack "B"
Ellis, George D., Jr.
Ellison, John C.
Emerson, Jesse R., III
Engel, Richard E.
Englehart, Harry J.
Engquist, Gordon W.
Enos, Ralph L.
Erkelens, Clarence
Eshman, John R.
Etchison, Frank L., Jr.
Evans, Daniel H., Jr.
Evans, David W.
Evans, Laverne E.
Ewy, Howard W.
Faessel, Matthew W.
Fakoury, Ernest P.
Farley, James W.
Farrell, Joseph A., III
Farren, Merritt C.
Farris, George K.
Fay, Edward S.
Federico, Charles D.
Feely, Robert J.
Fellingham, Robert W.
Fellowes, Frederick G., Jr.
Ferguson, Andrew C.
Fernandes, James E.
Fink, Edward R.
Finn, Gerard P., Jr.
Finneran, William J.
Finney, Jack L.
Fisher, Paul J.
Fisher, William G., Jr.
Fitts, Jean M.
Fitzpatrick, Joseph A.
Fleeman, Frederick M.
Fleeson, Richard J.
Fletcher, Charles D.
Fletcher, Richard M.
Foley, James E.
Fontaine, Richard K.
Fonville, Henry P.
Ford, James M., Jr.
Ford, Leon E., Jr.
Forrester, James E.
Foster, John F.
Foster, William F.
Fowler, John W.
Fox, Raymond G., Jr.
Foy, Edward W.
Frame, Edward L.
Francis, John P.
Francis, Thomas A.
Franke, Richard D.
Franklin, Billy D.
Fremd, Harry L.
French, William L.
Friend, Joseph F.
Friese, George A.
Frost, John F., III
Fruchterman, Richard L., Jr.
Gahafer, Joseph G.
Gair, Bruce O.
Galing, Searcy G.
Gallagher, Paul A.
Gamber, Harold W.
Garcia, Jaime
Gardner, Howard W.
Gardner, John E., Jr.
Garland, Daniel H.
Garner, Charles H.
Garrett, Charles I., Jr.
Gaskin, Richard G.
Gatewood, Tommy L.
Gatje, George C.
Gauthier, John O.
Gearhart, Norman R.
Gehres, Francis C.
Gibbins, Gareth W.
Gibbons, Paul C., Jr.
Gillan, Martin J., III
Gillcrist, Paul T.
Glancy, Thomas J., Jr.
Gleason, Richard E.
Gnadt, Fredric
Goetschius, Forrest D.
Golde, Morton
Goldstein, Jonas L.
Goodfellow, John
Goodwin, Bruce G.
Gordon, David E.
Graffam, Earl H.
Grandfield, Francis J., Jr.
Grant, Richard T.
Grant, Thaddeus R.
Granum, Bradford S.
Grappi, Robert L.
Gray, Harvey, Jr.
Gray, James H.
Gray, Walter S., III
Green, William C.
Greenleaf, Wilbur E.
Greff, Clarence H., Jr.
Griffin, Jack E.
Groder, Robert E.
Groehn, Gerhard C.
Grosshuesch, David K.
Guisinger, Lawrence B., Jr.
Gumser, Dale L.
Gunn, William J.
Gurney, Charles E., III
Haack, Donald E.
Hackett, Robert A.
Hagensik, William H.
Hahnert, William F., Jr.
Haigh, Alfred D., Jr.
Haight, Gardiner M.
Hale, William T.
Hall, Harrell W.
Hall, Thomas D.
Hallen, Byron W.
Halton, Joseph H.
Hamilton, John W.
Hamilton, Leroy A.
Hamrick, Thomas D.
Handford, Richard C.
Hannegan, Frank N.
Hansell, Emerson L., Jr.
Hansen, Merle C.
Hansen, Norman T.
Hansen, Ronald R.
Hantz, Francis A.
Harbick, Donald L.
Hardesty, John F.
Hardisty, Huntington
Harnden, Charles G.
Harp, Robert M.
Harper, Roger W.
Harris, Jack R.
Harris, James W.
Harrison, James H., Jr.
Harsh, Loinel R.
Hart, Donald F.
Hart, Richard L.
Hartley, John D.
Hartnett, Bernard E., Jr.
Hatcher, George M.
Havel, Edward F.
Hawkins, Phil "R"
Hawkins, Richard M.
Hayes, Morris L.
Head, John L.
Head, William N.
Headley, Allen B.
Healy, Richard H.
Heasley, Waldo L.
Heath, Frederick T.
Hedberg, Arthur J., Jr.
Hedges, Ralph R.
Heenan, Richard D.
Heffernan, George A.
Helgerson, Warren A.
Helland, Gerald H.
Helme, Charles R.
Helms, Harlie B., Jr.
Hennessy, William J.
Henrikson, Theodore P.
Heon, Robert H.
Herring, Edwin L.
Hess, Adolph W., Jr.
Hession, James M.
Hetu, Herbert E.
Hickman, William J.
Hicks, Harold F., Jr.
Hicks, John W.
Hiehle, Frank G., Jr.
Higgins, Clinton K., Jr.
Higgins, Raymond F.
Highleyman, Searle F.
Hilder, Frederick A.
Hill, Lucio W.
Hinkley, Harold L.
Hipp, Ronald N., Jr.
Hipple, William J.
Hoffman, Merle L.
Hoffman, Robert B.
Holbrook, Hilliard B., II
Holine, Leif A.
Hollandsworth, Roy M.
Hollick, Frederick B.
Holloway, Floyd, Jr.
Holmberg, Lennart G.
Holt, Neil G.
Holway, Nathan C.
Hopper, Richard S.
Horne, Charles F., III
Hossfeld, James F.
Hovater, James D.
Howe, Richard B.
Howey, Robert E.
Hughes, Peter F. H.
Hughes, Wayne P., Jr.
Hull, George T.
Hume, Robert J.
Hunt, Albert M.
Hunter, Herbert P.
Hurlbut, Francis D., Jr.
Hyde, Robert A.
Ilsemann, Frederick J., Jr.
Ingley, Edmund W.
Ingram, John W.
Inman, Bobby R.
Inman, Wayne D.
Irby, Charles R.
Irlandi, Santo A.
Irrgang, Carl H.
Jaburg, Conrad, J.
Jackson, Demster M.
Jackson, Thomas L.
Jacob, Robert E.
James, Charlie N., Jr.
Jameson, Henry C., Jr.
Janulis, George
Jarvies, John E.
Jarvis, Donald H.
Jaycox, Randall E., Jr.
Jayne, Gordon H.
Jeter, Norman L.
Jewell, Thomas A.
Johansen, Wayne A.
Johns, Forrest R.
Johnson, Clifford D.
Johnson, Dale W.
Johnson, Donald L.
Johnson, Emil L.
Johnson, Frederick C.
Johnson, George M.
Johnson, Guy D.
Johnson, Oren D.
Johnson, Philip E.
Johnson, Robert G.
Johnston, George T.
Johnston, Maurice M., Jr.
Jones, Carol W.
Jones, David L., Jr.
Jones, John E.
Jones, Richard H.
Jones, Robert C.
Jones, Samuel O., Jr.
Josephson, Henning C.
Jubb, Donald E.
Kaczmarek, Carl C.
Kalakowski, Joseph E.
Kalmus, William B.
Karvala, Curtis A.
Kaulback, Russell D.
Keach, Donald L.
Keane, James P.
Kearns, James T.
Keathley, Charles C.
Kebschull, Herbert W.
Keefe, Thomas J., Jr.
Keeney, David J.
Kehoe, James W., Jr.
Kehoe, Thomas R.
Kelley, Byron C.
Kelley, Frank A., III
Kelley, Frederick W.
Kelln, Albert L.
Kelsey, Robert L.
Kelt, William N.
Kemble, John R.
Kemble, Richard E.
Kennedy, Ronald W.
Kennedy, Robert C.
Kennedy, Walter J.
Kennedy, William B.
Kershaw, Daniel J.
Kidd, William S.
Kilduff, Paul E.
Kilmer, Donald A.
Kim, Alfred H. S., Jr.
Kimzey, Walter F.
King, Everett D.
Kinnebrew, Thomas R.
Kirby, Albert D.
Kirk, Robert L.
Kirschke, Ernest J.
Kling, William T.
Kniely, Joseph L.
Knight, Charles H.
Knopp, William A.
Knutson, Donald W.
Knutson, Wilbert D.
Koehler, Walter C., Jr.
Koehne, Richard J.
Kollmann, Glenn E.
Kosmela, Walter T.
Kovarick, Frank L.
Kraft, Frederick W.
Kraft, Leroy M.
Kuder, Dalton L.
Kuehner, Karl E.
Kugler, Kenneth D.
Kuhn, Edwin A.
Kully, Sheldon D.
Kuncas, John W.
Kunze, Martin W.
Kvello, Alan
Lacy, Joe R.
Lafferty, Jerry D.
Laighton, Robert H.
Lake, Charles M., Jr.
Lamb, David C.
Lamb, Derwin T.
Lamb, Marion G.
Lamm, William A.
Lancaster, Robert W.
Lane, Archie G.
Langford, John M.
Langton, Charles E., Jr.
Larkins, Burton J.
Larocque, George N.
Larsen, Richard L.
Larson, Charles D.
Lasowski, Donald T.
Laux, William J., Jr.
Lavin, Charles V.
Layman, Lawrence
Leahy, John P.
LeBlanc, Georges E., Jr.
Leftwich, James M.
Lenox, Glenn W.
Leonard, Robert W.
Leslie, Maxwell F., Jr.
Lester, Louis R., Jr.
Leverone, Robert M.
Lewis, Charles G.
Lewis, Harold M. J., Jr.
Lewis, James T.
Lidel, Carl J.
Lighter, Elbert D.
Liston, John M.
Loberger, James C.
Locke, Walter M.
Lockhart, Glenn S.
Lockwood, Forrest P.
Lodge, Billups E.
Lofton, Freeman L.
Loggan, Wilfred J.
Logner, Robert L.
Loposer, Avery K., Jr.
Lorden, Lawrence R.
Louchheim, William S. Jr.
Lounsberry, Jack A.
Lovell, James A., Jr.
Lovvorn, John D.
Lowe, Beverley J.
Luckett, Thomas W.
Ludwick, Louis L.
Lukas, Thomas E.
Lumsden, Richard E.
Lunt, Vernon S.
Lykes, William F. G.
Lyons, James A., Jr.
Lyons, Thomas W., Jr.
Macaulay, Angus
MacDonald, William P.
Macfie, Richard B.
MacKercher, John C.
MacPherson, John J.
Madden, Raymond A.
Madigan, James A.
Maggay, Isidoro, Jr.
Mains, Homer O., Jr.
Malaney, Robert E.
Malone, Roy W.
Malone, Thomas L., Jr.
Maloney, Peter M.
Manara, Vincent J., Jr.
Mandel, Cornelius E., Jr.
Mandeville, Theodore S., Jr.
Manduca, Theodore W.
Manfredi, John P.
Mann, Robert E.
Manring, Charles D.
Marbott, Henry W.
Marin, William T.
Marsh, Lee S.
Marshall, Robert M.
Marshall, Samuel R.
Martin, Donald E.
Martin, Tyrone G.
Martin, William R.
Masse, Donald M.
Massimi, Robert F.
Matherson, Richard
Mathis, Thomas R.
Mattioni, Blasco
Mattson, Donald J.
Mau, George W., Jr.
Maveety, Patrick J.
May, Porter E.
Maynard, Donald J.
McAuliffe, John H.
McBain, Robert F.
McBurney, William J.
McCafferty, William E.
McCardell, James E., Jr.
McCarthy, Francis X.
McCarty, Richard W.
McCollum, Arthur H., Jr.
McCormick, Daniel G., III
McCoy, Robert B.
McCoy, Roy E.
McCune, Joe D.
McCutcheon, Edwin L.
McDaniel, Clarence L.
McDonald, Clyde D.
McDonald, Robert P.
McDowell, Russell N.
McFadden, Albert J., Jr.
McFadden, Grafton R.
McGaughy, Richard W.
McGeachy, Francis L.
McGrath, Harold A.
McGuire, Orville W.
McHugh, James J.
McIntyre, John J.
McKee, Robert X.
McLaird, Preston, Jr.
McLaughlin, Dean N.
McLeod, Kenneth M.
McMillan, Donald G.
McMillan, Louis K., Jr.
McNeely, James S.
McNett, William T.
McPadden, Donald F. X.
McWey, Russell B.
McWilliam, John R.
Meacham, James A.
Mead, Theodore E.
Meader, Bruce I.
Meadows, Okey I.
Meek, Kenneth L.
Meeks, Thomas L.
Mehl, James P.
Meltzer, Melvin
Merrill, Forest "J"
Meserve, Charles L.
Messer, Jarvis N.
Messina, Sylvester C.
Metcalf, Louis E., Jr.
Miale, Robert E.
Michaels, Robert J.
Milius, Paul L.
Miller, Donald A.
Miller, Floyd H., Jr.
Miller, James L.
Miller, John R.
Miller, Kenneth R.
Miller, Richard J.
Miller, Robert L.
Miner, Duane A.
Miner, Jack B.
Mircheff, Robert A.
Mischke, Gayland J.
Mitchell, Edgar D.
Mitchell, Grant L.
Mitchell, John R. C.
Mitchell, Leland G.
Moffitt, Russell L.
Monroe, Charles H., Jr.
Montgomery, Stephen C.
Moody, Thomas J.
Moore, Charles E.
Moore, Charles J.
Moore, Ernest M., Jr.
Moore, Loren I.
Moore, Robert S.
Moore, Rufus J.
Moore, Tommy C.
Moore, Virgil W., Jr.

Moriarty, Peter M.
Morris, Henry C., Jr.
Morris, Howard L.
Morris, Robert E.
Morris, Robert E.
Morrison, Daniel N.
Morrison, Royden U.
Morrow, Charles D.
Morse, Harold C.
Morse, Jack L.
Mounce, Claude E.
Mountford, Edward J.
Mueller, George E.
Mullane, Thomas F.
Mullin, James
Mulloy, Paul J.
Muncy, William E.
Murphy, Douglas C.
Murphy, Gilbert F., Jr.
Murphy, Ray D.
Murray, Joseph E., Jr.
Myers, Carroll E.
Myers, William S.
Mylander, Stig J.
Nation, William C.
Naugle, James O.
Naylor, Charles K.
Neff, Richmond B., Jr.
Nelson, Eric A., Jr.
Nelson, Frank C., Jr.
Nelson, Jack H.
Nelson, James M.
Nelson, Leroy C.
Nesky, Anthony, Jr.
Nevius, William B.
Newsome, James W.
Newton, Robert B.
Nichols, John F.
Niedbala, Thomas F.
Nielsen, George L.
Nolan, Joseph D.
Nordtvedt, Ernest R.
Norman, Thomas V., Jr.
North, Dean B.
Norton, Earl W.
Norton, Richard J.
Noyes, Bradford W.
Numbers, Earl W.
Nunneley, James K.
O'Brien, Austin C., Jr.
O'Brien, Jerome L.
O'Bryan, Michael E.
O'Connell, James M.
O'Connell, John F.
O'Connor, John E.
Oder, Howard W.
Odman, William A.
O'Donnell, John H., Jr.
O'Donnell, John W.
O'Gara, Patrick E.
Ogden, Howard "A", Jr.
Ogle, William J.
Ohan, Harry
Oldham, Albert W.
O'Leary, William E.
Olson, James W.
Olson, Richard S.
Olson, Thane N.
Olson, Willard R.
O'Neil, Louis C., Jr.
Organ, James W.
Orrik, Frederick J., Jr.
Ortega, Joseph J.
Orvis, Peter H.
Orzalli, John B.
Oster, John S.
Outlaw, Thurber A., Jr.
Overdorf, Thomas R.
Pacl, Lawrence J.
Palatini, Glenn L.
Palmer, Wallace C.
Panarese, Adam F.
Pankratz, Carl J.
Pappas, George T.
Parkhurst, David C.
Parks, William W.
Parrish, Donald E.
Patch, Irwin, Jr.
Pattee, Arthur W.
Pattee, Richard S.
Patten, Michael A.
Paul, John E.
Paul, Raymond E.
Paul, Robert F.
Pauly, Donald E.
Payne, Douglas W.
Pearce, Earl H.
Pearson, John F., Jr.
Peelle, Morris A.
Pendell, Carl R.
Penney, William R.
Pennypacker, William S.
Pentony, John F.
Perrault, Mark E.
Perry, Billy
Perry, Franklin H.
Perry, Timothy J.
Peters, Paul F.
Peters, Robert E.
Petherick, George L.
Phillips, Robert A.
Phillips, William R.
Pierce, Ray E.
Pierce, William H., Jr.
Pilon, Jerome R.
Ping, Vernon "S," Jr.
Pinkerton, Roy "T"
Piper, Harold L.
Pirrone, Anthony P.
Placchi, Howard S.
Platt, Grafton S.
Plow, Arthur E.
Pogue, David W.
Pohli, Richard R.
Polatty, Donald B.
Poling, William E.
Pollak, Charles D.
Pollak, Morris
Pope, Daniel K., IV
Post, Robert E., Jr.
Pototsky, William J.
Pouls, Michael C., Jr.
Powell, George "W"
Powell, John J.
Powell, William V.
Powers, Trent R.
Preble, Russell A., Jr.
Preston, Edgar H.
Prezioso, Ronald
Prisby, Donald E.
Prosser, Walter R.
Pugh, Jack M.
Quartararo, Michael A.
Quick, Jay E.
Quin, Clayton W.
Quinn, Robert T.
Quitmeyer, Herman C.
Rabun, Floyd K.
Rafalowski, Joseph W., Jr.
Rainville, Duane D.
Ramsey, David G.
Ramsey, William E.
Randall, Thomas R.
Randolph, Joseph L.
Rankin, George M., Jr.
Rapkin, Jerome
Rasmussen, Robert L.
Ray, Glen P.
Raynes, Robert R.
Rea, Maurice W.
Reaves, Joseph C.
Redfield, John M.
Redifer, Andrew P., III
Reed, Richard W.
Reed, Robert G.
Reed, William H.
Reeder, Ralph J.
Reeks, Richard W.
Reep, Harlan E.
Renicky, Donald D.
Renz, Donald J.
Reynolds, Roy S.
Reynolds, Robert F., Jr.
Rhodes, Francis E., Jr.
Rhodes, John P.
Ricardo, Benny J.
Rice, James O.
Rice, Stanley G.
Rich, Richard
Richard, Jackson B.
Richards, William C.
Richards, William D.
Richardson, Richard H.
Ricks, Robert R.
Ries, Allen L.
Rigsbee, Clifford M.
Riley, Tad T.
Rilling, Alexander W.
Riordan, Edward J.
Ritchey, Donald D.
Rivers, Wendell B.
Roane, Donald P.
Robbins, Allan W.
Roberton, James L.
Roberts, Charles T.
Roberts, John A.
Roberts, William E.
Robertson, Douglas B.
Robinson, Donald W.
Robinson, Kirby L.
Roby, Grady H.
Rochford, John M.
Rockett, John S.
Rockwell, Nevin L.
Rodda, John D.
Rodgers, Frederick A.
Rodgers, Harvey P.
Rogers, Richard J.
Rollins, James "J"
Ross, William A., III
Rossoe, John W. F.
Rowden, William H.
Rowland, James C.
Ruecker, Kenneth H.
Rueff, Eugene C.
Rumplik, Rudolph H.
Rush, Thornwell F.
Rushing, Charles F.
Sacks, Harold H.
Sagerholm, James A.
Salomon, Ferdinand L.
Sanford, Stephen J.
Sapp, John, Jr.
Sassone, Charles H., Jr.
Saul, Elmer L.
Saunders, Thomas J.
Saunders, William H., III
Sayer, William D.
Sayers, Robert M., Jr.
Scalese, Anthony C., Jr.
Scarafone, Ronald
Schack, Edwin R., Jr.
Schaer, Oscar
Scheidler, Willard E.
Schimansky, John A.
Schluter, Hugo E.
Schonenberg, Hans P.
Schroder, Austin R.
Schroeder, Robert E.
Schuller, Gordon J.
Schultz, Ford J. E.
Schultz, John L., Jr.
Schulze, Robert H.
Schurr, Thomas P.
Schutz, Albert C., Jr.
Scott, Edward T.
Scott, Frank P.
Scott, John H., Jr.
Scull, John D.
Searfus, William H.
Sears, Glen R.
Sease, Hugh S., Jr.
Seeger, Charles E.
Self, David L.
Seljos, Lloyd T.
Service, James E.
Seymour, Ernest R.
Shafer, Lawrence
Shaffer, George W.
Shaid, Robert A.
Shanahan, Thomas L.
Shanahan, William F.
Shearer, Peter S.
Sheehan, William F., Jr.
Sheely, Donald M.
Sheets, Roger E.
Sheldon, Robert E.
Shellman, Curtis B., Jr.
Shepherd, David C.
Sherar, Robert C.
Sherman, John W.
Sherman, Lee H.
Shurtleff, Bruce K.
Sibert, George C.
Sierer, Payson D., Jr.
Sigmon, Harold F.
Sigsworth, David E.
Simms, James T.
Simon, Philip C.
Simons, Donald W.
Simpson, Philip M.
Sims, Clifford M., Jr.
Sims, Gelzer L., Jr.
Sinclair, Alexander M.
Siska, Edward
Sisson, Donald E.
Skube, Edward A.
Skyrud, Jerome P.
Small, Joseph F.
Smallidge, Robert L.
Smedberg, William R., IV
Smeltzer, John L., Jr.
Smith, Carol C., Jr.
Smith, Clifford R.
Smith, Gilbert E.
Smith, Hugh T.
Smith, James R.
Smith, John V.
Smith, John P.
Smith, Kenneth G.
Smith, Ordell
Smith, Paul D.
Smith, Paul J., Jr.
Smith, Richard C.
Smith, Scott L.
Smith St. Clair
Smith, William M., Jr.
Snyder, Fred D.
Synder, Herbert J. V.
Snyder, James M.
Snyder, Ned "C."
Solterer, Carl F.
Sothan, Norman L.
Sowinski, Stanislaus J.
Span, William F.
Speer, Richard T.
Spencer, Harry A., Jr.
Sperling, David J.
Springer, Howard C.
Sprunk, William, Jr.
Squier, Lucius R., Jr.
Squires, Walter G., Jr.
Stadelhofer, Robert R.
Stader, John F.
Stafford, Richard M.
Stalder, Roy F., Jr.
Stamey, Claude R., Jr.
Stangl, Richard J.
Stanley, Edward E.
Stanley, Joseph K.
Staple, David F.
Stark, Peter A., Jr.
Starkey, Nelson R., Jr.
Starn, Harrison F., Jr.
Steckbeck, Francis J.
Stein, George D., Jr.
Stein, Norman F.
Stevens, Ralph H.
Stewart, Gene R.
Stewart, Rodney L.
Still, Donald A.
Stiller, Bertram H.
Stine, Leon L., Jr.
Stinner, Robert J.
Stocking, William B.
Stocklmeir, Dean
Stoehr, Leonard A.
Stolle, Edward S., Jr.
Stone, James M.
Story, Warren L.
Stout, Edward N.
Stovall, Walter W.
Straney, Charles N.
Streightiff, Charles W.
Strockbine, Richard E.
Strohm, James J.
Strunk, Arthur A.
Stump, John M.
Sudduth, Roger M.
Sugg, Ross E.
Sullivan, Alfred B.
Sullivan, Edward T.
Sullivan, Francis L.
Sullivan, James J.
Sullivan, Robert H.
Sullivan, Walter F.
Summerfield, Edward R.
Summers, Howard P.
Sutherlin, Benjamin T. W.
Sutton, John F.
Swank, Donald E.
Swarztrauber, Sayre A.
Sweet, William J.
Sylvester, Gerald D.
Talkin, Philip S.
Tallet, Arthur J.
Tallman, Elmer C.
Tate, Charles G.
Taylor, Clinton W.
Taylor, Edmund B., Jr.
Taylor, James D., Jr.
Taylor, Jesse, Jr.
Tetreault, Paul J.
Thamm, Tom B.
Thiel, Louis H. C., Jr.
Thomas, David H.
Thomas, Douglas N.
Thomas, Kenneth G.
Thomas, Richard T.
Thomas, Robert J.
Thomas, Robert F.
Thompson, Archibald S.
Thompson, Arthur R., Jr.
Thompson, Clifford E.
Thompson, William S.
Till, Ernest A.
Tillerson, Leonard E.
Tobias, Ralph W.
Tompkins, George E.
Tonseth, Thomas H., III
Treadwell, Lawrence P., Jr.
Treiber, Arthur E.
Trens, Mike J.
Trimble, Richard W.
Troffer, George J., Jr.
Trost, Carlisle A. H.
Troutman, Burl A., Jr.
Tucker, Alvin E.
Turk, Herman L.
Turnage, Robert L.
Tuszynski, Raymond S.
Tuzo, Lamar W.
Tuzo, Paul B., III
Tyson, Billie C.
Uehlinger, John C.
Uhrig, William R.
Upton, Don L.
Usilton, William B.
Vahsen, George M.
Valade, Larry G.
Van Arsdol, Robert A.
VanBuskirk, George F.
Van Hook, Gordan
Van Houten, Laurence P.
Varley, James F.
Varney, Jack E.
Verser, John K.
Victor, Francis W.
Vine, Victor J.
Voegelein, Gordon R.
VonChristierson, Willian W.
VonWantoch, Harvey
Voorhees, John E.
Vrieze, Edwin H., III
Wadsworth, Francis L.
Waggoner, Kenneth K.
Waite, Charles E.
Wakeland, Max W.
Wakeman, Curtiss O.
Walczak, Norbert F.
Walden, John W.
Walker, Samuel B.
Walker William B.
Wall, Joseph E.
Wallace, Cedric S.
Wallace, Robert J.
Walling, Eugene K.
Wanamaker, John F.
Wandres, Victor C.
Ward, Arthur T.
Ward, Carl B.
Ward, Conley R.
Ward, Gene P.
Ward, John E.
Ware, Owen H.
Warren, Tommy H., Jr.
Wasilewski, Alex, Jr.
Wassell, James W.
Watson, Thomas W.
Watts, Charles R., Jr.
Webber, Gene D.
Webster, Edward W. V.
Weedon, Robert E.
Weeks, George H.
Weimerskirch, John R
Weintraub, Allan P.
Welch, Bernard W.
Welch, Clyde R.
Weller, Thomas G., Jr.
Wellman, Harold N.
Wells, Eugene R., Jr.
Wells, Lawrence H.
Wenker, William A.
Wenzel, Robert F.
Wessman, Robert L.
West, Gordon R.
Wettroth, John R.
Wetz, James E.
Wev, Bosquet N., Jr.
Wheeler, Robert A.
Wheeler, Robert L.
Whelan, Edward C., Jr.
Whelchel, Henry C., Jr.
Whistler, Ralph N., Jr.
Whitaker, Robert McK.
White, John E.
White, Maurice G.
White, Paul G., Jr.
White, Steven A.
Whitley, Clyde T.
Whittaker, Don J.
Whorton, William R.
Whyte, Kent E.
Widder, John A., Jr.
Wilbert, John F.
Wilde, Stanford R.
Wilder, William E.
Wiley, Kenneth R.
Wilhelmi, Quentin E.
Wilkins, Howard W.
Wilkinson, Joseph B., Jr.
Williams, Charles D.
Williams, Charles K.
Williams, Douglas A.
Williams, John T.
Williams, James E.
Williams, James G., III
Williams, Kenneth A.
Williams, Ross N.
Williamson, Paul W.
Williard, Bobbie D.
Willis, Francis R.
Wills, Doyne R., Jr.
Wilson, Charles E.

Wilson, Donald K.
Wilson, Edward W.
Wilson, Herbert E., Jr.
Wilson, Jack L.
Wilson, James E., Jr.
Wilson, Robert R.
Wilson, Samuel B.
Wimberly, Tommy C.
Winfrey, John A., Jr.
Winkel, Raymond N.
Winkler, Richard C.
Winkler, Thomas Q., Jr.
Winter, Harold I.
Winters, Charles A.
Wisdom, Jessie R.
Wiseman, Charles H.
Wiseman, Hobart J.
Withers, Christopher
Wolff, Kenneth E.
Wolff, Kenneth L.
Wolff, William M., Jr.
Wood, Ralph E.
Wood, Stephen C.
Wood, Thomas H.
Woodbury, Robert E.
Woody, William R.
Woodyard, Jon C.
Woolway, James E.
Wright, Richard L.
Wright, Ross W.
Wright, Sidney V., Jr.
Wyatt, William C., III
Wynkoop, Thomas E.
Yamnicky, John D.
Yeager, George E.
Yearous, Glenn W.
Yetman, William R.
Yocom, Earnest
Yoran, Geroge F., Jr.
Young, John W.
Youngquist, John A.
Yount, Tim B.
Zacharias, Jerrold M.
Zastrow, Robert R.
Zong, Donald E.
Zvanovec, Ladimir J.

To be lieutenant commanders, line (LDO)

Donald E. Wallace
Elmer C. Everett
Martin D. Archer
Donald A. Cruse
Frank W. Hughes, Jr.
George T. Chapman, Jr.
Andrew G. Szymanski
Ellis G. Kelly
Gordon F. Averitt
Cecil King
Sylvester F. North
John K. Pegues, Jr.
George Stenke
Everett R. Peugh
James E. Criner
William R. Leibold
John J. Bramblett, Jr.
Arthur A. Bish
William O. Thomson
Robert Pescott
Everett N. Leach
Walter A. Ramsey
Joseph St. Marie
Williard F. Waterfield
Ted K. Tillotson
Bernard H. Garrett
James P. Padgett
Ernest L. Cobern
William G. Sandberg
Jackson M. Tomsky
Joseph E. Pinning
Albert R. Reid
Herman E. Goebel, Jr.
Richard E. Mikkelsen
John D. Lewallen
Loyd G. Peterson, Jr.
George J. Evans
Robert G. Jacks
Wilbur P. Powers
Frank Dievendorff
Joe J. Lilienfeld
John H. Church
Garlin R. Read
George W. Macualey
Eugene J. McGuire
Lloyd E. Murdock
Robert G. Jackson
Donald A. Christensen
Robert M. Johnson
Searle W. Woods
Randall C. Roush
Alonzo C. Jarrett
Lander H. Turpin
Clement Dersin
Howard A. Gire
Mervin Rowland
Andrew Clark
Chesley E. Willis, Jr.
Gerald E. Murphy
Howard K. Selby
James H. Forrester
Edward C. Raymer
Douglas H. Roberts
Barent P. Winant, III
Arthur L. Babine, Jr.
Curtis J. Rozell
Beckom U. Sneed
Frank Saxton
William D. Russell
Rowland E. Burnham
Francis C. Waterloo
Joseph D. Hirz
Robert Riba
Karl D. Kaiser
Phillip S. Arp
Edward H. Weaver
Richard E. Gerlach
Joseph F. Madeo, Jr.
Delbert F. Barbee
Theodore Y. Dunn, Jr.
Charles H. Pogson
Edwin H. DeFriez
"J" Wallace Mitchell
Arthur T. Kasehagen
Gerald P. Pulley
Robert D. Allen
Forrest E. Metz
Dean E. Roberts
Wilmer R. Northup, Jr.
Glen A. Snell
Francis L. Looney
John Wilkens, Jr.
Cecil E. Wood
William L. Strong
Robert W. Addis
Otis A. Henson
Mallie B. Moore
Vito J. V. Gustaff
Robert W. Fisher
William N. Perry
Leo L. Hamilton
Charles H. Webster
Everett B. Sorensen
John D. O'Kane
William J. Bowen
Frederick F. McWilliams
William E. Wise
Wallace A. Dahlen
Fred M. Mhoon
Lee J. Maus
Charles W. Benson
William C. Moss, Jr.

To be lieutenant commanders, Medical Corps

Ahtye, Perry
Aiken, Robert J.
Alexander, Charles E., Jr.
Andersen, Martin G.
Arana, Thomas
Atkins, Claude C.
Austin, James A.
Bachus, Nelson E.
Baer, Henry A.
Baker, John H.
Baker, Richard A.
Balas, George I.
Balyeat, George E.
Barcay, Stephen J., Jr.
Barchet, Stephen
Bargatze, Fred O.
Barnes, Sheldon H.
Barreca, Joseph P., Jr.
Bauer, Paul R.
Beaudry, Arthur A.
Bellamy, James C.
Belser, Robert D.
Best, William C.
Bingham, Elmer L.
Blackburn, Laurence H., Jr.
Boop, Warren C., Jr.
Bornmann, Robert C.
Borowsky, Melvin
Botimer, Allen R.
Bowman, Ercil R., Jr.
Boyden, Douglas G.
Bramlett, Charner W.
Brisbin, Robert L.
Bristow, William M.
Brothers, William "S"
Brown, Leo R.
Brown, Robert A.
Brunner, William F.
Burningham, Richard A.
Cahill, Lewis N.
Carver, Michael C.
Cassidy, Walter J., Jr.
Clarke, Eugene J., Jr.
Cloyd, David H.
Coates, John R.
Colburn, James E.
Colgrove, Robert C.
Colter, Donald C.
Cooke, James K., Jr.
Cooper, Paul D., Jr.
Cooper, William C., Jr.
Cordier, Robert D.
Cowan, David E.
Crawford, Edward P.
Crews, Quintous E., Jr.
Cross, Gregory H.
Cusack, William E., Jr.
Daane, Thomas A.
Davis, Milton D.
Davis, Richard L.
Dean, Philip J.
deArrigoitia-Rodriguez, Enrique M.
Debevoise, Neilson T.
Deluca, Hugo S.
Dempsey, William C.
Dewaal, Jan G.
Deyton, John W., Jr.
Dicus, Donald R.
Doneker, Thomas G.
Donnell, Garrett E.
Donoghue, John J.
Doyle, Fred W.
Easterling, James F.
Edson, Mitchell
Ekvall, Leslie D., Jr.
Ellingson, Abel R.
Elliot, William A.
Emich, Charles H.
Escajeda, Richard M.
Fairfax, George T.
Faulkner, Gerald D.
Fisher, Pierre J., Jr.
Forney, William R.
Fosburg, Richard G.
Fraser, Donald J.
Fraser, Hugh E., Jr.
Gaeckle, Dudley J.
Garcia, Robert C.
George, Frederick
German, Roy E.
Giard, Henry L.
Gibbons, William P.
Gilchrist, Don K.
Glass, James L., Jr.
Glick, Herbert E.
Glover, Clarence K., Jr.
Grunawalt, Robert E.
Hamlin, Charles R.
Harrison, Lucius A., Jr.
Hart, George B.
Hartman, John R.
Hauzenblass, John W.
Henderson, Clyde D., Jr.
Highly, Francis M., Jr.
Holm, Victor M.
Hoofer, Wilford D.
Hopping, Donald W.
Houston, Harry R.
Hughes, James L.
Hughes, Luman H., Jr.
Huseby, Helmer W. S.
Jacobs, Edmund P.
Johnsen, Richard P.
Johnson, Walter M.
Joly, Eugene M.
Jones, Warren J., Jr.
Kawaguchi, Toshiyu P.
Kibbey, Ianthus I.
King, Glendall L.
Kinneman, Robert E., Jr.
Knab, Douglas R.
Kostohryz, Francis T.
Labudovich, Marco
Lambdin, Charles S.
Largent, Gerald P.
Larson, Dale L.
Lawrence, David L.
Lee, Dixon A.
Linaweaver, Paul G., Jr.
Lintner, Donald R.
Lobpreis, Ervin L.
Logan, Jerome A.
Lowery, Clinton H.
Lukash, William M.
Lukens, Robert W., Jr.
Mack, Walter J.
Maher, Francis L.
Martin, Philip R., Jr.
Mazzarella, Italo C.
McGrew, Clinton J., Jr.
McNitzky, Adam A.
McRoberts, Jay W.
Meekins, John A.
Mella, Gordon W.
Miale, August, Jr.
Miller, Alan G.
Miller, Thomas F., Jr.
Millerick, Joseph D.
Millington, Richard A.
Mills, Mitchell
Moga, Gregg M., Jr.
Moore, John L.
Mortensen, Norval
Mucha, Stephen J.
Mullen, Joseph T.
Mulligan, William P.
Mullin, Robert L.
Murgalo, Joseph A.
Narva, William M.
Neugebauer, Marion K.
Nickel, Alvin L.
Nickerson, Charles W.
Nieves, Miguel, Jr.
Ninow, Earl H.
Novotny, Charles A.
Nyborg, Lester P.
Palmer, Hayden D., Jr.
Plaut, Martin R.
Pohl, Charles E.
Potter, Jack W.
Powell, Malcolm R.
Pratt, Hugh S., Jr.
Proulx, Ronald A.
Raasch, Frank O., Jr.
Real, Jack D.
Rehme, Arthur L.
Reid, Donald
Reynolds, John R.
Rice, Bruce H.
Richardson, Fred C.
Rinaldi, "J" Jerome
Rivas, Hector M.
Rizza, Robert G.
Robinson, Donald W.
Rogers, Carl W.
Rosa-Garcia, Mario E.
Royal, Orren L.
Rudinger, Edwin A.
Ryskamp, James J., Jr.
Sargent, Robert T.
Schanberger, John E.
Schorn, Victor G.
Seaton, Lewis H.
Seeley, Richard J.
Segaul, Arthur I.
Seig, Duane L.
Sell, Kenneth W.
Senn, Francis E., Jr.
Sierchio, Gerald P.
Simpson, Richard B.
Sisler, Maynard L.
Sleadd, Franklin B.
Small, Robert B.
Sorenson, Robert I.
Stahl, Charles J., III
Stebbins, George G., Jr.
Stenger, John R.
Stevens, John J.
Stitcher, Joseph E.
Stormo, Alan C.
Stotka, Victor L.
Sweeny, John P.
TenEyck, David R.
Thomas, Robert C.
Toussaint, Harold E., Jr.
Townsend, Guy B.
Trone, James N.
Trumble, Theodore J.
Upton, Richard T.
Van Orden, Richard T.
Varon, Myron I.
Villafana-Justicia, Carlos
Voshell, Thomas H., Jr.
Waldstreicher, Howard E.
Walker, Robert E.
Walker, William W. A.
Wallace, Ralph E., Jr.
Walton, Fred R.
Ware, James G.
Welch, Cecil C.
Wells, Robert M.
Wenger, Norman E.
Wentworth, Alan F.
Wetzel, Richard A.
Whetsell, Joe E.
Whitmore, John T.
Wilhelm, Harry W.
Willett, Leo V., Jr.
Wilson, John S.
Wolfe, Franklin M.
Wood, Joseph H., Jr.
Woodstein, Ira J.
Yarley, Dewey H.
Young, James M.

To be lieutenant commanders, Supply Corps

Adair, Joseph P.
Ayling, Charles W.
Barrett, Charles W.
Barton, Mortimer F., Jr.
Benedict, Joseph W.
Bolander, Jack "C"
Boyce, Thomas A.
Boyle, John J.
Brady, James A.
Brett, Justin D.
Bruch, Herbert W.
Brunson, Robert L.
Buckman, Robert S.
Burns, Richard C.
Calais, Clifford A.
Caliman, Wayman G., Jr.
Carr, Joseph D.
Carson, Donald E.
Catanach, Anthony H.
Causey, Bruce M., Jr.
Cavanaugh, Alfred G.
Chandler, Hugh H.
Chapman, Darrell S.
Connelly, Charles T.
Crane, Barrett
Curtin, Pat
Cuson, Charles E.
Davis, Harold R.
Davison, David D., Jr.
Derby, Francis A.
Desroches, Sylvio J., Jr.
Devine, Paul L.
Devine, Wilfrid
DeWinter, Richard E.
Dickey, William H.
Donnelly, Goodwin, III
Dorsey, Elton E.
Drabek, Stephen J.
Drake, William D.
Dreese, Richard N.
Dukesherer, Raymond V.
Dunlevy, John H.
Durham, Graydon M., Jr.
Eckert, George H., Jr.
Edsall, Van T.
Epstein, Edwin S., III
Fanelty, William C.
Felthousen, Charles E
Fischer, Robert R.
Fleisher, Oscar T., Jr.
Foster, Robert W.
French, Robert T.
French, Robert C.
French, Walter H., Jr.
Frost, Shirley D.
Galvez, Richard M.
Ghostley, Gary D.
Gillespie, James A., Jr.
Giordano, Andrew A.
Goeres, Gerald F.
Gordon, Donald B.
Gordon, John J.
Goslin, Thomas C., Jr.
Griffiths, Donald J.
Grimes, Fred M.
Gudbranson, Larry G.
Guffy, Wellard R.
Gustavson, Arthur R.
Hamilton, Oliver W., Jr.
Hamilton, Thomas, Jr.
Hamilton, Walter S.
Harris, Emerson M.
Hassenplug, John F.
Hendershot, Theodore R.
Henderson, John S.
Hill, Jesse R., Jr.
Hill, Kenneth E.
Hill, Robert E.
Huising, Don L.
Hurt, Richard O.
Jackson, Arthur D.
Jackson, George A.
Jerich, Frank J.
Jones, Rial C.
Kauder, Robert
Keefer, Frederick H.
Kelly, Robert C.
Kenealy, William E., Jr.
Kerwath, Richard C. F.
Kibby, Darrell M.
Kick, David L.
King, Gerald H.
Kirch, Frederick J.
Kitko, John A.
Klatt, Ivan, Jr.
Kohl, Jacob D.
Koller, Bertil R.
Landfair, Robert W.
Lane, Henry L.
LaRose, Eugene M., Jr.
Lashley, Ralph E., Jr.
Leavitt, Jack B.
Leighty, Gary C.
Lewis, John C.
Lukens, Robert F.
Luoto, Hugo M., Jr.
Lynch, Robert E.
Madeira, Charles C.

Maier, Raymond G.
Maldonado, Teodosio
Margason, Bernard L.
Mason, Albert G.
Maxwell, Kenneth R.
Maxwell, Thomas A.
Mayer, William H.
McCoy, Thomas E., Jr.
McDonald, Francis E.
McKitrick, Robert L.
McMahan, Paul T.
Meyers, Walter T.
Miller, Eric H., Jr.
Moore, William J.
Morrison, Quinn B.
Mullen, James V.
Nast, William E.
Needham, Thomas P.
Neelley, Charles G.
Nehez, James R., Jr.
Nelson, George W.
Newman, William H.
Oelkers, Harvey S.
Paul, John W.
Pearson, Lloyd I.
Peldquinn, Ferdinand C.
Phleger, Charles P.
Picht, George C.
Pokorny, Frank J., Jr.
Pomponio, Bruno A.
Postak, John N.
Postich, George
Potter, David W.
Reade, Lowell A.
Rech, Henry J.
Reynolds, Richard F.
Rhodes, Daniel M.
Rowley, Allyn E.
Ryan, William J.
Sabec, Edwin J.
Sammons, Joseph E.
Samuelson, Charles H.
Sandrock, John E.
Saukas, Augustine G.
Schriner, James A.
Searles, Donald W.
Sebes, Edward A.
Shipley, Robert W.
Short, Carl W.
Slemons, Earl G., Jr.
Smith, Charles E.
Spears, Laurence
Stansbury, George L., III
Steeg, Elvin H.
Strange, Hubert E., Jr.
Sumner, William M.
Teaford, Sidney J.
Tesch, Donald A.
Thomas, Magnus R.
Thompson, Gerald J.
Thorup, Carlyle V.
Todd, Alexander W., Jr.
Trueblood, Howard G.
Umstead, Walter W., Jr.
Van Scoyoc, James S.
Vishneski, John S., Jr.
Wadsworth, Ben A., Jr.
Waller, Edmund M., Jr.
Walsh, John E.
Wampler, Richard B.
Warren, Richard D.
Watt, Robert C.
Webb, George H.
Weisskopf, William M.
Wells, John L., Jr.
Wiener, Lawrence "S"
Wolfe, William D.
York, William B., Jr.

To be lieutenant commanders, Chaplain Corps

Auel, Carl A.
Baker, Marvin D.
Beck, John T.
Bevan, Leroy A.
Bigler, Robert L.
Bontrager, John K.
Boreczky, John V.
Carr, John F.
Clayton, Walter "B," Jr.
Clifford, William J.
Earnest, Ralph E.
Goad, John T.
Haroldsen, George E.
Holland, Harry, W., Jr.
Ingebretson, Ervin D.
Jensen, Andrew F., Jr.
Johns, Harry D.
Keenon, John C.
Kopp, George P., Jr.
Letten, Lloyd W., Jr.
Linzey, Stanford E., Jr.
Miller, Harry R.
Morrill, Giles D.
Moser, Robert W.
Murphy, Milton G.
Reagan, Ernest McD., Jr.
Ruud, Carl E.
Schmid, Calvin F.
Scott, Knox O.
Seim, James E.
Simmons, David E.
Struthers, Basil H.
Wartes, Arthur J.
Wicker, Richard F., Jr.

To be lieutenant commanders, Civil Engineer Corps

Armatrout, Merritt F.
Bannister, William H.
Belton, Edward H.
Biederman, Jack C.
Bodtke, David H.
Borberg, James R.
Clark, Ray C.
Coughlin, Richard D.
Dixon, Olin L., III
Doyle, Thomas J.
Fail, Raymond P., Jr.
Field, Robert T.
Gates, Paul R.
Geoly, Charles
Green, Lawrence J.
Hay, Erik K. F.
Houghton, Robert J.
Huffman, James I.
Huszar, Louis, Jr.
Keegan, Robert D.
La Rue, Van B.
Mooney, Malcolm T.
Myers, Clayman C., Jr.
Rickels, Jack C.
Saravia, Benjamin L.
Seites, John H.
Surko, Alexander, Jr.
Sutherland, Andrew G.
Sutley, Robert M.
Taylor, James T.
Tombari, Henry A.
Whitehurst, Marshall N., Jr.
Williams, Curtis R., Jr.
Williams, Edward J., Jr.
Wilson, William L.
Wright, John A.
Zobel, William M.

To be lieutenant commanders, Dental Corps

Albers, Delmar D.
Allensworth, Thomas M., Jr.
Baker, Ronald D.
Barbor, Gerald L.
Billotte, Alfred C.
Bodine, Theodore A., Jr.
Brault, Alfred O.
Brown, Kenneth E.
Cagle, John D.
Clark, Charles N., III
Collevecchio, Emidio J.
Collier, Richard D.
Coombs, Paul S.
Corderman, Roy C., Jr.
Cotton, William R.
Davidson, Richard S.
Duncan, Donald E.
Eichel, Frederick P.
Fulcher, Clyde L.
Gaston, Robert A.
Gonder, Donald C.
Hall, Ollie V., Jr.
Hayes, Daniel E.
Haymore, Robert D.
Herr, Albert
Iandolo, Albert G.
Jackson, Clyde R.
Kaneshiro, Kenneth K.
Kawashima, Zitsuo
Keene, Harris J.
Kelly, James F.
Kieny, Richard J.
King, Gordon E.
Klima, James E.
Koutrakos, John
Lawrence, Joseph J., Jr.
Little, Richard W.
Lommel, Tennyson J.
Longton, Robert W.
Loo, Wallace D.
Mainous, Elgene G.
McDonald, Edwin E., Jr.
McLaughlin, Edward J.
McLeod, Carlton J.
Meister, Donald E.
Moffitt, William C.
Muller, Henry III
Nester, Calvin D.
Parsons, Richard L.
Pepek, Stanley E.
Pines, Barry E.
Prince, Richard D.
Rice, George W., Jr.
Romaniello, Ronald M.
Russell, John R.
Sand, Ralph E.
Sanderson, Alexander D.
Scharpf, Herbert O.
Schultz, Chester J., Jr.
Scott, James F.
Scott, William J.
Shiller, William R.
Stewart, William B., Jr.
Strauss, Philip W.
Timby, Robert E.
Tugwell, Howard S.
Ulrey, Richard D.
Vessey, Robert A.
Watkins, Eugene A., Sr.
Williams, John E., Jr.
Wirthlin, Milton R., Jr.
Witte, Ernest T.
Workman, James L.

To be lieutenant commanders, Medical Service Corps

Ambrose, Edward A.
Asche, Clifton A.
Bean, Willis E.
Bennett, Paul P., Jr.
Blackmon, Edward H.
Brown, Staley W.
Browne, Weldon G., Jr.
Buckley, Emanuel N.
Campbell, Howard B.
Chansky, Ralph D.
Connery, Horace J.
Costa, John F.
Daniel, Harold E.
Dean, Jerdon J.
Doucet, Louis E.
Dowling, James H.
Drake, Wilbur R.
Elliott, Gordon E.
Elmore, Milford D.
Ferris, Ezra F.
Flournoy, Rollin H.
Garver, Richard M.
Gill, Robert L.
Goding, Hubert M.
Green, Gale R.
Green, William J., Jr.
Guinn, John W.
Gutekunst, Richard R.
Haggin, Douglas E.
Harris, Albert C.
Hine, Charles M.
Holcombe, John T.
Honish, Joseph E.
Howard, Wallace R.
Huff, Samuel L.
Hughes, Robert G.
Hypes, Kenton, Jr.
Irvin, Ernest J.
Jones, Earmon R., Jr.
Jordan, Charles J.
Jula, Paul N.
Karrer, John L.
Kirsch, Jean P.
Knight, Jerry B.
Kolb, William H.
Koon, Robert L.
Larson, Alfhild L.
Leonard, Russell D.
Lewis, Thomas "W"
Liedtke, Fred E.
L'Italien, Robert V.
Longest, Clifford "B"
MacCracken, Raymond J.
Mangham, Alonzo L., Jr.
Mateik, Edward D.
May, Carl R.
McClendon, Frank O., Jr.
McConville, William E.
McDuffie, Wilbur B.
McIntosh, Francis W.
McKay, Charles E.
Meyer, Robert E.
Murphy, John S.
Newman, Buther L., Jr.
Nichols, Lavern E.
O'Neill, Joseph M.
Owen, Orville K.
Peake, Stanley C.
Peppler, Leonard A.
Ragle, Philip R.
Reynolds, Donald C.
Robinson, Donald J.
Schindele, Rodger F.
Shaffer, Weller J., Jr.
Smith, Denson L.
Steward, Edgar T.
Tapscott, Donald E.
Tedford, Charles F.
Verme, Dominic A.
Vise, Lee P.
Watts, Lloyd A.
Wells, John E.
White, Leland E.
Williams, Daniel N.
Wilson, James R.
Wolf, John W.
Wylie, David M.
Young, Johnny W.

To be lieutenant commanders, Nurse Corps

Barr, Bette A.
Barry, Dorothy M.
Berkman, Virginia O.
Beveridge, Robina W.
Bonczar, Jean C.
Bove, Mary L.
Bowen, Edith M.
Chart, Helen L.
Clark, Charlotte E.
Courtright, Barbara R.
Cowden, Elnora J.
DeMarco, Evelyn M.
Dinneen, Florence R.
Durkin, Veronica A.
Ellis, Jean E.
Fine, Rachel A.
Finn, Celine A.
Florence, Mary E.
Fogarty, Anna L.
Graves, Ellen G.
Green, Dorothy J.
Guccione, Geraldine M.
Gudsky, Patricia J.
Haile, Evelyn
Halverson, Ruth E.
Hennessey, Jane C.
Hessel, Jane C.
Higgins, Helen B.
Higgins, Mary E.
Job, Lucy A.
Kratz, Hedwig L.
Lanaghan, Harriett M.
Lawrence, Opal M.
Martin, Zuleime L.
Maun, Shirley J.
McCree, Dorothy N.
McHenry, Catherine M.
McKay, Bernadette A.
Mooney, Geraldine T.
Murasheff, Lina D.
Nielubowicz, Mary J.
O'Connor, Margaret B.
Osborne, Leah V.
Osborne, Loah G.
Otis, Clara A.
Pampush, Ruth G.
Parker, Viola J.
Prencipe, Edith A.
Racek, Marguerite J.
Rigsby, Helen M.
Sampson, Natalie T.
Shelton, Mildred L.
Shepherd, Luana
Sherman, Miriam C.
Shirk, Mary L.
Simmons, Harriet A.
Soles, Hazel E.
Spence, Ruth G.
Sterling, Elinor B.
Stowell, Ellen J.
Warren, Ellen G.
Wilson, Katherine
Zanetti, Jean M.

To be lieutenants, line

Abbott, William A.
Abriola, Ralph R.
Adams, James J.
Adams, Jessie W.
Adams, Ralph J.
Adams, Samuel W., Jr.
Aderholt, William L., Jr.
Adgent, Robert B.
Ahrenstein, Monroe J.
Ailes, Robert H.
Ake, Charles F.
Albero, Carl M.
Albritton, Hugh H., Jr.
Aldana, Louis P.
Alden, Robert F.
Alderson, Jack B.
Alexander, William T.
Allen, Archie E.
Allen, David L.
Allen, George S.
Allison, Kenneth L.
Almstedt, Theodore A., Jr.
Altergott, Harvey K.
Alvarez, Franklin F.
Alves, Arcenio, Jr.
Ambos, Brooks L., Jr.
Anderson, Anders T.
Anderson, Archie A.
Anderson, Edwin K.
Anderson, Edward E., Jr.
Anderson, George W., III
Anderson, Peter N.
Anderson, Ronald M.
Anderson, Thomas J.
Anderton, John H.
Andrews, Charle H., Jr.
Appelhof, Gilbert A.
Araki, Makoto
Arcuni, Philip
Armbruster, James H.
Armstrong, Clarence E. Jr.
Arthur, Stanley R.
Arvin, Vernon E.
Atkins, Brandon T.
Atkins, Thomas M.
Atwell, Robert F., III
Aubert, Donald F.
Aucoin, James B.
Avis, Dwight E., Jr.
Aydt, Roger D.
Ayres, David R.
Bailes, Ralph T.
Bailey, James E.
Bailey, Samuel M., Jr.
Baker, Donald A.
Baker, John K.
Baker, Peter A.
Baker, Ronald E.
Baldwin, Oa F.
Baldwin, Roger L.
Ball, Marvin L., Jr.
Ballantine, James C., Jr.
Ballou, Joseph F.
Balsley, Joseph W.
Bambo, Gregory B., Jr.
Bangert, James E.
Bank, Milton H., II
Bankowski, Walter F.
Barbee, Walter E.
Barenti, Jerome C.
Barker, Ernest W.
Barker, Harold D.
Barker, Nathaniel C.
Barker, Richard H.
Barnes, Joel F.
Barnes, Paul D.
Barnhardt, David F.
Barnum, Craig L.
Barrett, Malcolm W.
Barry, Gerald E.
Barstow, Kenneth W.
Bartlett, Larry D.
Bartocci, John E.
Barton, Bryan W.
Barton, Robert L.
Bassett, Charles H., Jr.
Bassin, Paul H.
Bates, Homer R.
Bator, Stanley E., Jr.
Bauer, Herbert
Bauer, Paul F., Jr.
Baugh, Bernard R.
Baumstark, Richard B.
Bauschka, Patrick F.
Beagle, Clyde A.
Beamon, Joseph E., II
Beasley, Charles J.
Beatty, Don G.
Beatty, James R., III
Beck, Donald E.
Beene, Jerry T.
Behrends, Paul O.
Bell, Robert T.
Belto, Meryl A.
Bender, James E.
Bendit, Billy L.
Bennington, Bruce A.
Benson, Burton O.
Bentley, Robert E.

Benz, Philip H.
Benz, Valentine G.
Bergfeld, Rudolph P., III
Bernard, Eugene C.
Best, David E.
Bethea, Carl L.
Betterton, Thomas C.
Betts, William M.
Bevan, John A., Jr.
Bewley, Jack D.
Bickmore, Edward C., Jr.
Biele, Charles E., Jr.
Billings, Charles H.
Binger, James D.
Binsfeld, Arthur J.
Bird, Richard E.
Bisek, Dennis G.
Bishop, Doyse R.
Bishop, Larry D.
Black, Arnold E., Jr.
Black, Richard O.
Black, Robert J.
Blackner, Ronald K.
Blair, Frank
Blake, Raymond G.
Blanchard, Lewis T.
Blasko, John E.
Blessing, George R.
Bletch, James W.
Bloedorn, James J.
Blouin, Robert E.
Bode, Michael G.
Boerner, Delbert D.
Boggs, Harold A., Jr.
Boguslawski, William T.
Boice, Frank B.
Boling, James R.
Bolton, John M.
Bond, Charles S.
Bonhag, Walter D., Jr.
Bornstein, Paul A.
Bostick, James H.
Bouder, Raymond S.
Bower, Bruce B.
Bower, Richard D.
Bowers, John P.
Bowers, Richard F.
Bowers, Robert L.
Boyle, Ronald R.
Boyles, Harlan H.
Boyne, Peter B.
Bradford, "J" "W"
Bradley, Frederick L. Jr.
Brandenburg, Robert L.
Branscomb, Max "G"
Braunschweiger, Andrew E.
Brazzon, Robert
Breckon, Richard L.
Breed, William L.
Bremser, William J., Jr.
Brenner, Leroy E.
Brennock, Robert F.
Brewton, Edward A.
Briggs, Richard W., Jr.
Brightman, James M.
Britton, Jack B.
Bronson, Edward F.
Brookes, Allan G., Jr.
Brooks, Dennis M.
Brooks, James D., Jr.
Brooks, Otis McK.
Brothers, John W., Jr.
Brown, Charles E., II
Brown, Donald G.
Brown, Howard A.
Brown, Kenneth C.
Brown, Parke L., Jr.
Brown, Peter J.
Brown, Ralph E., Jr.
Brown, Randall, R.
Brown, Roger W., Jr.
Brown, Thomas S.
Brown, William S., Jr.
Brown, William T.
Browne, Thomas M.
Brownell, Paul E.
Browning, Wayne B.
Broyles, Bill R.
Bruni, Richard L.
Bruns, Wallace R.
Bryans, Brian K.
Bryant, Don M.
Bryant, George W.
Buchwald, Robert D.
Buck, David E.
Buck, Wilbur P.
Buckland, Rann K.
Buckley, Jimmy L.
Buckner, James A.
Bueche, Arthur H., Jr.
Bull, John S.
Bullene, Richard E.
Bullock, Harold O., Jr.
Buono, Robert T.
Burcher, Philip E.
Burchett, Chester W.
Burgess, Eric C.
Burgess, John E.
Burke, Thomas J.
Burleigh, David P.
Burleson, Frank M.
Burns, James W.
Burns, James M.
Burns, John D.
Burnside, Cecil A.
Burpo, James H.
Burrows, Jack
Burrows, James B.
Burson, Donald L.
Burton, James L., Jr.
Burton, Robert A., Jr.
Butler, Clarence B.
Butler, Robert P.
Butterfield, David L.
Buxton, Donald G.
Byers, Carl A.
Byers, John M.
Bynon, Robert W.
Byrom, James T.
Caciola, James J.
Cahill, Lionel A., Jr.
Cain, William L.
Caine, Paul E.
Caldwell, Leland C.
Caldwell, Theodore E.
Calhan, James R.
Callnin, William J.
Camp, Joe D.
Campbell, John R.
Campbell, Norman D.
Campbell, Robyn M., Jr.
Campbell, William, Jr.
Capley, Joe H.
Carder, Denny M.
Carlson, Richard A.. Jr.
Carpenter, Rex N.
Carr, Samuel L.
Carroll, John L.
Carroll, Peter A.
Carson, William G.
Carter, Herbert E.
Carter, Richard A.
Cashman, James M.
Castle, Ronald G.
Catron, Jerry M.
Chaffee, Roger B.
Chalmers, William C.
Chancy, Thomas M.
Chanslor, Richard M.
Chapman, Rodney M.
Charles, Richard N.
Chauncey, Arvin R.
Check, Leonard L.
Chestnut, Lawrence, Jr.
Christensen, John E., Jr.
Christensen, Ejnar S., Jr.
Christenson, Robert W. S.
Clancy, Wilbert C.
Clark, Allen H.
Clark, Charles F.
Clark, Loren L.
Clarke, Douglas L.
Cleary, Patrick R.
Clevenger, Redmond L.
Clock, Harry S.
Cochran, William F.
Cocotis, Bruce T.
Coen, Francis M.
Coffey, Robert C.
Coffman, William R., Jr.
Cole, William M., II
Coleman, James J.
Coleman, Joseph S., Jr.
Collard, Keith P.
Collins, David M.
Comer, Robert F.
Comstock, George W.
Condon, Robert E.
Conklin, Andrew J.
Conner, Eugene D.
Connery, John D.
Converse, Henry B.
Cook, Herman K.
Cook, John H., III
Cook, Thomas L. P.
Coolbaugh, Jesse D.
Cooley, Donald E.
Cooper, Daniel L.
Cooper, David S.
Cooper, John D., Jr.
Corbeil, Rodolphe N.
Cordek, David
Cordle, "J" "T"
Cornell, John P.
Cornett, Charles S., Jr.
Corrigan, Richard W.
Coulbourn, Samuel W.
Cowan, Terrance E.
Cowling, Cecil G.
Cox, Edward F.
Cox, James P.
Cox, Larry G.
Cox, Robert L.
Cox, William W.
Coyne, Thomas
Coyne, William L.
Cracknell, William H., Jr.
Crahan, Patrick J.
Craig, Harry E.
Cramer, Erich H. E.
Creswell, Lawrence K.
Crew, Perry L.
Crichton, Ian R.
Croghan, Clayton D.
Cromer, Charles C.
Cross, Claude C.
Crouse, David R.
Crow, Claron D.
Crowe, William M., Jr.
Crowell, Alton I., Jr.
Crozier, Ronald L.
Cueroni, Lee A.
Culberson, George W., Jr.
Cullen, Joseph P.
Cumblidge, Kenneth E.
Cummins, Clarence M.
Cundari, Francis L.
Cunningham, Shaun
Curlee, John L.
Curry, Newell L.
Curry, William H., Jr.
Daly, Frederick T., III
Daly, John S.
Dammann, Frederick O.
Dangelo, Anthony V., Jr.
Daniels, Louis D.
Daniels, Richard O.
Darby, Thomas E., Jr.
Daughenbaugh, Robert L.
Daum, Richard A.
Davenport, Charles A.
David, Ralph H.
Davidson, John M.
Davis, Charles L.
Davis, Donald V.
Davis, Jimmy W.
Davis, John W., Jr.
Davis, Philip C.
Davis, Ralph N.
Davis, Robert B.
Davis, Robert E.
Davis, Robert D.
Davis, Thomas A.
Davison, Gregory L.
Dawkins, Heibert C., Jr.
Day, James O.
Day, Raymond D.
Dean, Bill C.
Debode, Donald G.
Deboxtel, Lawrence L., Jr.
Decarlo, John A.
Deegan, Robert F.
Deesch, Earl H.
Defibaugh, Carl F., Jr.
DeGress, Francis B., III
DeGroot, Henry, Jr.
De Lashmitt, Robert E.
Demarest, Joseph G., III
DeMars, Bruce
Dennis, Jefferson R., Jr.
Dewey, Richard F.
Dewitt, Michael T.
Dickens, Russell J.
Dickens, Russell D.
Dickey, James P.
Dickey, John E.
Dickey, Kenneth R.
Didier, Jacob P., Jr.
Disher, John S.
Dixon, John C.
Dixon, Ned E.
Dodd, Jimmy J.
Doeschot, Kenneth G.
Dollenmeyer, James K.
Dolliver, Richard H.
Donahue, John R.
Donnan, Earl L.
Donnegan, Richard
Donnelly, Thomas F.
Doragh, Robert A.
Doran, Daniel F.
Doubroff, Jerome S.
Doughdrill, Charles W.
Dove, Ray W., Jr.
Drew, Kenneth W.
Duffield, Leslie H.
Duffy, Leonard C.
Dugan, Ferdinand C., III
Dulik, Andrew F.
Dumas, Paul J.
Dunham, William C.
Dunlap, James H.
Dunlap, Stanton P.
Durr, James E.
Dvorak, Robert
Dwyer, William L.
Dyer, Thomas E.
Dyer, William E.
Eades, Thomas A.
Earhart, Kay E.
Earnest, William E.
Eason, Ward R.
Edney, Leon A.
Edwards, Walter J.
Egan, Robert W.
Eiken, Donald N.
Eisele, Roderick L.
Eldredge, Floyd W.
Eley, Clifford H., III
Elich, Robert L.
Eller, James B.
Ellingson, Norman D.
Elliot, Arthur J., II
Elliott, Robert J.
Ellsworth, Warren R., Jr.
Elwood, Robert W.
Emmett, Richard F.
Endo, Norio B.
Engelhardt, James H.
English, Glenn A.
Enkeboll, Richard E.
Eoff, Albert W., II
Epstein, Julian D.
Erikson, Theodore W.
Ermis, Leroy C.
Essig, John R.
Estes, William B., Jr.
Eulenstein, Karl H.
Evans, DeWitt C., III
Evans, James R.
Evans, Philip R.
Everding, Edward J.
Everly, Vernon R.
Fahey, William F.
Fahrney, David L.
Fairley, Carl R.
Fannin, Grover F.
Farley, Edward B., Jr.
Farrell, Lawrence M.
Feingersch, Allen
Felt, Bruce C.
Fernald, Lloyd W., Jr.
Ferro, James L.
Fickenscher, David B.
Fidelibus, William T., Jr.
Fidlar, Richard A.
Field, Benjamin H.
Fields, Chester J., Jr.
Fields, David E.
Figg, Charles E.
Filbert, Arthur S.
Finley, John L.
Finn, William A.
Firey, Roger S.
Fischer, Warren H.
Fishburn, John H.
Fishburn, Lewis R.
Fisher, Harvey E.
Fisher, Norman E.
Fisher, Richard L.
Fitch, Dee N.
Fitzgerald, John F.
Fitzgibbons, George P.
Flage, Donald W.
Fleak, Walter H., Jr.
Fleming, Bruce S.
Fleming, Duncan A.
Florko, Donald J.
Floyd, Rodney R.
Flynn, John J.
Flynn, Samuel C., Jr.
Foley, Jerold W.
Follmer, Lloyd D., Jr.
Foote, Ernest D.
Ford, Frank R., Jr.
Ford, Lyndall C.
Ford, Randolph W.
Fordice, James E.
Foreman, Merlin L. R.
Foresman, James H., III
Forhan, William P.
Fosko, Paul D.
Foss, Robert N.
Foster, Naylor C., Jr.
Fournier, Joseph O.
Fowler, Jim B.
Fowler, Norwood V., Jr.
Fox, George R., Jr.
Fox, John F. J.
Fox, Robert F.
Fox, Thomas R.
France, Morgan M.
Frankenberger, Paul F.
Franklin, William P.
Frankoski, John P.
Frazier, Donald L.
Freliche, Harold J.
French, Douglas "E"
French, Frederick A.
Frey, Robert D.
Friederich, Bruce
Fritz, David L.
Fritz, Wayne R.
Frommer, Paul S.
Frye, William J.
Fuller, Dale G.
Funderburk, Jeryl D.
Furey, Edwin M.
Furrow, Donald E.
Furtado, Francis J.
Fyles, Roderick A.
Gaduette, Dudley A.
Gallagher, Joseph G.
Gallion, Lawrence B.
Gambill, Richard K.
Gant, James R.
Garcia, Rodolfo C.
Gardella, John K.
Gardner, James R.
Garrett, Roger D.
Garvey, James J.
Gash, John A.
Gatto, Paul J.
Gault, Harry R.
Gautier, Walter J.
Gearin, Billy D.
Gehrig, Jerome C.
Gentz, Richard C.
George, Troy H., Jr.
Geraldson, Elmer L.
Gerry, Donald D.
Giambattista, Michele D.
Gibson, Alfred P.
Gibson, Douglas B.
Gilbert, Bertrand M.
Gilchrist, James L.
Gilchrist, William F.
Gilkison, Edward R., Jr.
Gillespie, John P.
Gilliland, Lawrence A., Jr.
Gimber, Harry M. S., III
Ginn, James T.
Ginther, Larry L.
Gladis, John T.
Glancy, Robert J.
Glickman, Thomas W.
Godbey, Thomas N.
Godefroy, Pierre L.
Goggin, Richard E.
Golder, Thomas V.
Goldstein, Lawrence B.
Goldstone, Ronald G.
Goodwin, James B.
Googe, James P., Jr.
Gookin, Robert B.
Gordon, Victor
Gott, William B.
Gowans, George K.
Grady, Roger D.
Graf, David L.
Graff, Howard B.
Graff, Paul E.
Graham, George D.
Grant, Edward J.
Grant, Howard W., Jr.
Gray, Olin A.
Green, Richard F.
Greene, George C.
Greene, William H., Jr.
Greeneisen, Kermit W.
Greenhoe, Duane F.
Greer, Joe C.
Greer, Robert E.
Greiling, David S.
Griffin, David H.
Griffith, Dwaine O.
Griffiths, Jerry R.
Grimes, John E.
Grimes, Thomas W.
Groscup, William D.
Gruendl, Paul L.
Grunawalt, Richard J.
Gubitosi, Michael J.
Gudmundson, Marvin L.
Guernsey, Charles H.
Gulliver, Victor S.
Gunderson, Donald H.
Gustafson, Charles B.
Guttery, Thomas H.
Gwin, John O.
Haack, Norman E.

Haas, William R.
Hagen, Dale N.
Hale, Bill J.
Haliday, George W.
Hall, Charles R., III
Hall, Gordon B., Jr.
Hall, John O.
Hamilton, John E.
Hamlett, John W.
Hammack, John E.
Hammock, Donald P.
Hamrick, Raymond J.
Hancock, Gus H., Jr.
Handley, Paul L.
Hanna, Ronald F.
Hannah, Elmore K., Jr.
Hannify, Michael F.
Hanson, Ralph E.
Harjehausen, Lawrence O.
Harkins, Vyron V., Jr.
Harner, Charles F., Jr.
Harney, Patrick F.
Harre, James L.
Harrington, John R.
Harris, Buford A., Jr.
Harris, Roger W.
Hart, Raymond J.
Hart, Vernon D.
Hartfelder, Richard F.
Hartley, Donald A.
Hartman, Anthony G.
Hartman, Phillip G.
Hartman, Richard D.
Hartshorn, David R.
Harvey, Walter D.
Hastie, Robert K.
Hatcher, Jerry M.
Haven, Robert R., Jr.
Havens, Harry S.
Haviland, Carlton E.
Hawk, Allan H.
Hawkins, Charles D., Jr.
Hawkins, Leroy T.
Hawkins, Sam H.
Haworth, Alvin G., Jr.
Hayford, James E.
Haynes, Harald J.
Healy, Jerry F., Jr.
Heekin, John P.
Hegeman, Joey W.
Heisner, Robert I., Jr.
Hellewell, John S.
Hellman, John S.
Hemphill, Allen P., Jr.
Henken, Raymond N.
Henry, Michael C.
Henry, Patrick, Jr.
Herbert, Frank R.
Herbert, Leo E.
Herbert, Roger G.
Herd, Robert V.
Hering, Frederick L.
Herring, George G., III
Hessler, John L.
Hester, James H.
Hewitt, Paul E.
Hewitt, Wesley C.
Heyde, John S., Jr.
Heyduck, William R.
Heyward, Shannon D.
Hibbard, Grant W.
Hickman, Thomas W.
Hiebner, Robert J., Jr.
Higgins, John J.
Higgins, William H.
Higginson, John J.
Hildenbrand, Daniel C.
Hine, Paul M., Jr.
Hines, Dean H.
Hipps, Carl E.
Hite, Philip R.
Hix, Jack M.
Hobler, William J., Jr.
Hodapp, David H.
Hodges, Virgil C.
Hoffmann, John M.
Hogan, Lawrence M.
Holland, Joe L.
Holland, Tommy L.
Holland, Wylen R.
Holmes, Henry D., Jr.
Holmes, Wayne M.
Holt, Arvil A.
Holt, John A., III
Holt, Shirley W.
Holtzclaw, John W.
Holzschuh, Jacob R.
Hooper, John R., Jr.
Hoppe, Herbert L.
Horne, Ronald G.
Horsefield, John E.
Horsley, George W., Jr.
Horton, Jerry D.
Hosey, "H" "P"
Hough, Richard A.
Hough, Van Q.
Houglum, Leon P.
Howard, Harland C.
Howard, John A.
Howard, Richard A.
Howay, John W.
Howe, Frederic N., Jr.
Howe, John E.
Howe, Jonathan T.
Howell, Thomas A., Jr.
Hower, James J.
Howland, John H.
Huebel, Melvin R.
Hughey, Ira A.
Humphrey, Harlow B.
Hungerford, Emerson A.
Hunsicker, Edmund K.
Hutchinson, Charles K.
Hyatt, Charles E.
Hyatt, Leo G.
Hyde, Ronald P.
Ike, William F.
Irlacher, Leonard T.
Irrgang, Ferdinand C., Jr.
Isenhour, William J.
Isquith, David A.
Jackets, Michael E.
Jackson, Jack M.
Jackson, James P., Jr.
Jackson, Lester T., Jr.
Jacobson, Lennart R.
James, James E. M.
James, Thomas P., Jr.
Jarrell, Jerry D.
Jarrett, Edwin B.
Jasperson, Michael
Jaynes, David W.
Jennings, Robert L.
Jensen, George W.
Jerome, John D.
Jines, Milton L.
Johnson, Joseph W.
Johnson, Kenneth W.
Johnson, Leonard W., II
Johnson, Paul S., Jr.
Johnson, Phillip S.
Johnson, Robert B.
Johnson, Ronald J.
Johnson, Robert A.
Johnson, Ronald L.
Johnson, Theodore R., Jr.
Johnson, Verlyn D.
Johnson, Wendell N.
Johnston, Harold B., Jr.
Jones, Colin M.
Jones, Daniel P., Jr.
Jones, Harold L.
Jones, Jack E.
Jones, Robert "F"
Jordan, David C.
Jordan, Dennis R.
Jordan, William T.
Junghans, Peter A.
Jurgens, Robert A.
Kail, Norman H.
Kaiser, Edward R., Jr.
Kalinowski, Raymond S.
Kampen, Kenneth B.
Kantor, Clifford S.
Kapustka, Herman L.
Karr, Harold L.
Kaseote, George
Kassebaum, David L.
Katz, Bennett D.
Katzen, Murry
Kaufer, Richard A.
Kauffman, William C.
Kay, William G.
Keathley, James W.
Keiler, Joseph A.
Keith, John F.
Kemper, Ralph C.
Kennedy, Peter P.
Kennedy, Thomas C.
Kennedy, Thomas L.
Kennelly, Bernard J.
Kenney, Daniel J.
Kenney, Theodore C., Jr.
Kensinger, Roy A.
Kentopp, Donald E.
Kerman, William O., Jr.
Kerr, William A., Jr.
Kershner, Robert L.
Kesteloot, Robert W.
Keyes, James L.
Kiefer, Martin D.
Kiel, Richard H.
Killingsworth, Monte L.
Kilpatrick, Thomas E.
Kimball, Paul E.
King, Carleton J., Jr.
King, James W.
King, John D.
Kiper, William "D"
Kirkland, Thomas J., III
Kirkpatrick, Wayne A.
Kittleman, Donald L.
Klein, Argyle G.
Klinger, Gerald F.
Klish, Theodore, Jr.
Knapp, Daniel L.
Knapp, Montelle N.
Knapp, Ralph E.
Knight, Dennis K.
Kniveton, Robert
Knodle, William C.
Knott, Richard C.
Knowles, Russell, Jr.
Knutson, Jerry G.
Koch, Joseph W., Jr.
Koehler, Norman E., III
Kohn, Arthur F.
Kolstad, Thomas C.
Komp, Richard L.
Korthe, James D.
Koster, Alfred M., IV
Kraft, Robert M.
Kral, Anthony J.
Kramer, Theodore R., Jr.
Kratch, David A.
Krehmeyer, James A.
Krekel, Lyman E.
Kremin, Richard A.
Kriewall, Royce L.
Krilowicz, Thomas J.
Krueger, Milton E.
Kruse, Donald C.
Kuck, Donald L.
Kuehler, Donald E.
Kuehmeier, Joseph K.
Kunkel, Larry D.
Kuntz, David S.
Kurihara, Thomas M.
Kushner, David A.
Laird, Travis H.
Laitsch, Lowell C.
Lamay, Urban R., Jr.
Lamb, Larry R.
Lambert, Raymond A.
Lampert, George E., Jr.
Lancaster, William L., Jr.
Lang, William R.
Lange, Christian A., Jr.
Lange, William R.
Langholz, Marcus J.
Langston, Nicholas D.
Lanman, George M.
Larabee, Kent W.
Larson, Charles W., II
LaSalle, Rene R.
Lasko, Harvey D.
Lassey, Karl I.
Lavoie, Louis A.
Law, James E.
Lawler, Casimir E.
Leahy, Richard N.
Leahy, Vincent J.
Leban, Carl
LeBlanc, Thomas D.
Leech, Robert J.
Leeds, Rene W.
Legare, Maurice T.
Lerner, Albert M.
Leslie, William N.
Lester, William E.
Leuschner, Robert L., Jr.
Levin, Richard R.
Lewis, Eddie C.
Lewis, Marwood D.
Lindstrom, Harry E.
Lineback, Harry W.
Lino, Norman J.
Lipscomb, Jack C.
Littlewood, Lyle E.
Livingston, John G., Jr.
Livingston, Gill F.
Lockwood, Robert K., Jr.
Loewenthal, Robert G.
Loman, Cleve E., Jr.
Lomheim, Louis G.
Longton, Andrew P.
Lonnegren, Robert C.
Love, John J.
Lowe, Gary B.
Lowery, Needham H.
Lowrance, Douglas L.
Lowry, Abner P.
Lubberstedt, Richard L.
Luehring, Davidson
Lueker, Wendell H.
Luetschwager, Edward E.
Luke, Charles T., Jr.
Luke, Robert A.
Lynch, Clayton W.
MacArthur, James D.
MacCubbin, George E., Jr.
MacDonald, Richard W.
MacGregor, John L.
Mack, Robert J.
Mackay, Richard W.
MacKenzie, Bruce E.
MacNichol, Malcolm S.
Madara, Richard J.
Maddox, Ralph R.
Madouse, Richard L.
Magner, Lawrence R.
Magnus, Ralph S.
Maguire, Thomas J.
Mahon, Edward J., Jr.
Mahony, Terrence M.
Malley, Kenneth C.
Malvin, Frederick B.
Mandel, Philip N.
Mann, John P.
Mansfield, James L.
Marcantonio, Anthony W.
Marcom, James C.
Marcus, Robert U.
Margedant, John W.
Marin, Richard
Markley, Wade E.
Marks, Arthur J.
Marnane, Thomas A.
Marovich, Michael
Marriott, Michael J.
Marryott, Ronald F.
Marsh, David R.
Marshall, Harris A., Jr.
Marshall, Harold C., Jr.
Marshall, Raymond E.
Marthinson, Detlow M., Jr.
Martin, James J., Jr.
Martin, John S., Jr.
Martin, Marshall W.
Martin, William G.
Martinson, George P.
Marxer, Hugo E.
Massimino, Andrew S.
Masten, Lawrence E.
Masterson, James E.
Mathis, John P.
Matteson, Kelvin L.
Matthews, Gary D.
Maurer, Earl T.
Maxwell, Matthew T., III
May, James L.
May, Robert J.
May, Robert C.
McAuliffe, Jack M.
McAvenia, Harold G., Jr.
McCabe, Ebe C., Jr.
McCampbell, Richard L.
McCandless, John E.
McCart, Benjamin H.
McCarthy, James F.
McCartney, William A.
McCauley, George K.
McCauley, Hugh W.
McCaull, John W.
McClary, Richard C.
McClure, Gilson K., Jr.
McClure, William F.
McConnel, Richard A., Jr.
McConville, James E.
McCormick, Bruce A.
McCracken, Richard L.
McCulloch, James M.
McCullough, Lawrence E.
McCullough, Robert F.
McCutchan, Milton L.
McDaniel, Rodney B.
McDermott, Joseph T.
McDonald, Gerald W.
McDonald, Richard P.
McDonough, Vincent P.
McEachern, William H., Jr.
McEnaney, Thomas J., Jr.
McFarland, James S.
McGahey, Jack M.
McGee, Donald J.
McGill, James A.
McGinty, Thomas J.
McGlasson, Daniel E.
McGlynn, James R.
McGrail, Charles R., Jr.
McGuigan, David B.
McHenry, William G.
McHugh, Charles E.
McHugh, John T.
McHugh, William M.
McIndoe, James E.
McKamey, John B.
McKee, Junious A., Jr.
McKenna, Michael F.
McKinnon, Patrick C.
McKitrick, Edward R., Jr.
McKnight, James D.
McManes, Albert S.
McManes, Kenmore R.
McMichael, William L.
McMichael, George L.
McMillen, Kenneth A.
McMorris, John A., II
McMurry, William T.
McMurtry, Thomas C.
McNally, James A.
McNeese, Carter V.
McNerney, James L.
McNichols, John P., Jr.
McPherson, Roger B.
McTighe, Roger P., Jr.
McVay, Wesley J., Jr.
Mead, Gerald R.
Meaux, Richard P.
Meehan, James F.
Meeker, Quentin S.
Megehee, Louis D., Jr.
Melnick, Norbert W.
Mendenhall, Ivan F.
Meneke, Kenneth N.
Mericle, David L.
Metz, Frederick J.
Meukow, Walter T.
Meyer, Allan G.
Meyer, Richard E.
Miceli, Joseph D.
Mickle, William McE.
Middleton, John E.
Miefert, Milton D., Jr.
Miklos, Thomas J.
Miles, John I.
Millard, David R.
Miller, Charles H., Jr.
Miller, David G.
Miller, Donald L.
Miller, Edmund B.
Miller, George
Miller, Peter R.
Miller, Robert C.
Mills, Albert
Mills, Leon R.
Mills, Neal O.
Mills, Thad W.
Milner, Harry M.
Miniter, Howard E., Jr.
Missaillidis, Stephen
Misura, Paul
Mitchell, Clyde L.
Mitchell, David L.
Mitchell, Donald L.
Mitchell, Henry H.
Mitchell, Ralph M.
Mitchell, Raymond F., Jr.
Mitchell, William T.
Modeen, Victor D.
Modrak, George P.
Moeser, Milton P., Jr.
Moke, Paul D.
Molenda, Paul H.
Monroe, Vincent D.
Montgomery, Donald J.
Mooney, Andrew R.
Mooney, Harold L., Jr.
Moore, Aubrey A., Jr.
Moore, David W.
Moore, Harry R., Jr.
Moore, Jimmie R.
Moore, John W.
Moore, Rowland W.
Moore, Thomas R., Jr.
Moran, Charles K., Jr.
Moran, Richard A.
Morcerf, Lester A., Jr.
Moreau, Ronald F.
Morgan, Garner E., Jr.
Morgan, Rawls B.
Morgan, William O.
Moriarty, Jack O.
Morris, David R.
Morsches, Robert W.
Morton, Stewart M.
Moss, Robert L.
Mott, Louis D.
Mozley, Edwin A.
Mueller, John A.
Mullen, Cornelius W.
Mumford, Robert E., Jr.
Munson, John H.

Murdoch, Thomas McC.
Murphy, David R.
Murphy, Edward J., Jr.
Murphy, James H.
Murphy, John A.
Murphy, Michael A.
Murray, Gerald W.
Murray, Thomas R.
Myatt, Kenneth E.
Myers, Dale P.
Myers, Stephen G.
Nace, Larry D.
Nagel, Richard C.
Natz, Daryl C.
Neary, Joseph F.
Neeley, Wallace W.
Nelson, Bobby C.
Nelson, John "I"
Nelson, Robert E.
Nesbit, Arthur M.
Nesbit, Gerald E.
Nevin, Robert F.
Nevins, Peter G.
Nevitt, James E.
Newcomb, Zeanious L.
Newell, John W.
Newell, Richard E.
Newton, Clifford A.
Newton, Robert L. L., Jr.
Ney, Kenneth L.
Nicholas, Joseph
Nichols, Richard D.
Nickell, Herbert E., Jr.
Nider, Kenneth E.
Nielsen, Niel P.
Noggle, George A., Jr.
Nolan, Bruce F.
Noll, Charles F.
Normand, Eugene J.
North, David M.
Nucci, Eugene M.
O'Brien, George E.
O'Connell, Daniel J.
O'Connell, James J.
O'Connor, Paul
O'Dea, Thomas V.
O'Donohoe, Joseph P.
O'Donovan, James P.
Ogle, Peter W.
O'Hara, James P., Jr.
O'Keefe, Timothy R.
Olmer, Lionel H.
Ondak, Gerald S.
O'Neill, James P., Jr.
Ong, Richard E.
Oppedahl, Phillip E.
Ore, William E.
O'Rourke, Bernard F.
Osborne, Dale H.
Ostrom, Joseph E., Jr.
O'Sullivan, Joseph F.
Otto, Max W.
Overholser, Merlin K.
Owen, William L., Jr.
Owens, Darrel D.
Owens, Robert S.
Owens, Sherman H.
Paal, William T.
Padgett, Ervin E., Jr.
Page, Arthur "M"
Page, Henry H., Jr.
Pakradooni, Haig H., III
Palmer, Edward J.
Palmer, Gerald A.
Palmer, Stanley B.
Palmer, William N., II
Pape, Frank F.
Pappas, Jimmy
Parcell, Kenneth H.
Parent, Theodore R.
Parker, Ronald H.
Parker, Thomas W.
Parkhurst, Sherwood L.
Parnell, Ural C.
Parsons, Marland W., Jr.
Partlow, James G.
Patrick, Andrew K.
Patterson, Donald R.
Patterson, Ralph A., Jr.
Patterson, Dale W.
Patterson, Dale K.
Paul, John S.
Peace, John D., III
Peacher, Robert W.
Peake, Stephen R.
Pearigen, Jare M.
Pearson, James W.
Pearson, Merton A.
Pedersen, Dan A.
Peerenboom, William H.
Pelphrey, Gary R.
Pember, Norman L.
Penley, Paul E.
Peresluha, Edmund J., II
Perrella, Albert J., Jr.
Perro, Michael A., Jr.
Perry, Leonard G.
Perry, Richard C.
Perry, Timothy J.
Persons, George R.
Pestolis, Thomas C.
Peters, Frank J., Jr.
Peterson, Kenneth D.
Peterson, Laurel C.
Peterson, Paul A.
Pharis, Wade J.
Phelps, Freddie J.
Philipps, George
Phillips, John M.
Phillips, James M.
Philo, Arthur R.
Piche, Paul D.
Picher, Francis X., Jr.
Piersall, Charles H., Jr.
Pingel, Leon J.
Piotti, Walter T., Jr.
Pirotte, James H.
Pistotnik, James J.
Plassmeyer, Joseph D.
Pocklington, William D.
Pollard, Ronald T.
Poole, James R.
Porcaro, Anthony P.
Porter, Donald H.
Porter, Richard G.
Potter, Robert H., Jr.
Pounds, Philip C., Jr.
Powell, Daniel G.
Prien, Richard K.
Pritchard, Joseph R.
Promersberger, Edward S.
Propst, William F.
Prosser, Norman E.
Pruett, Ronald L.
Przekurat, Eugene E.
Puerling, Peter N.
Pundt, Cameron A.
Purvis, Samuel M.
Pyle, Loyd E.
Quantock, Charles W.
Quast, Harry S.
Queen, Ronald J.
Quigley, Francis J.
Quinn, James H.
Rae, Paul O.
Ragan, Charles P.
Raines, Frederick L.
Rankin, Andrew M., II
Rau, Ronald E.
Ray, William J.
Raymond, Calvin D.
Reader, James M.
Reagan, Louis L.
Ream, Ronald L.
Rebber, Roger B.
Reed, Benjamin W., Jr.
Reed, Robert B., Jr.
Reese, Paul J.
Reeve, William F.
Reeves, Roy B.
Reich, Merrill D.
Reichart, Harold L., Jr.
Reid, James R., III
Reiley, Ralph H., Jr.
Rempt, Henry F., Jr.
Renner, Richard B.
Rentle, Norman L.
Repass, Donald E.
Reynolds, Robert L.
Reynolds, Ted "W"
Rhoads, John D.
Rice, Lloyd A.
Rice, Loren M.
Rich, Roger L., Jr.
Richards, Warren D.
Richardson, John D., Jr.
Richter, Ralph, Jr.
Riedemann, Walter J., Jr.
Rigg, Richard G.
Rigney, Robert J., Jr.
Rij, Michael A., Jr.
Riley, Charles E.
Rimson, Ira J.
Ring, Stewart A.
Ripple, James E., Jr.
Ritchie, Sherwood L.
Robbins, Philip D.
Roberson, Harold J.
Roberts, Gordon W.
Roberts, James J.
Robertson, Lester S.
Robinson, John W.
Robinson, Kenneth F.
Robinson, Robert G.
Roche, Denis P.
Roe, James E.
Roeser, Walter V., Jr.
Rogers, David T.
Rollman, Gordon L.
Romano, Gennaro J., Jr.
Romoser, William K., Jr.
Ronni, James A.
Rook, Wilson C.
Rose, Rufus R.
Rositzke, Robert H.
Ross, Norman A.
Ross, Thomas E.
Rothrauff, Thomas B.
Roubik, Arthur F.
Roudebush, Daniel L.
Roundtree, Jack L.
Rowland, Richard P.
Ruchala, Joseph F.
Rucks, Ronald A.
Russell, Earl H.
Russell, Richard E.
Russell, Richard W.
Rutemiller, Oren G., Jr.
Ryan, Patrick F.
Rydzewski, James C.
Ryll, Ronald R.
Sachtjen, Jerry W.
Sakey, Leyon D.
Salisbury, Jack S.
Salley, Alexander McQ.
Salovitch, Edward M.
Sanders, Franklin H.
Sanders, Kit C.
Santoro, Paul J.
Saracco, Robert L.
Sawyer, Tommy D.
Scahill, Lawrence J.
Scales, Richard H.
Schafer, Dennis N.
Schaffer, David G.
Schaper, Delmar O.
Scheible, Jack W.
Schell, John J.
Schenk, Parley G.
Schildhauer, Edward W.
Schilling, Noel K.
Schimming, John G.
Schiwitz, Preston G., Jr.
Schleicher, Richard J.
Schmidt, Arnold C.
Schneider, Henry J.
Schneidewind, Gilbert P.
Schoeff, Kendall "E"
Schroder, Donald C.
Schultz, Alwin L.
Schulz, Paul H.
Schumacher, Duane O.
Schussler, Gerald A.
Schwaab, Denis T.
Schwartz, Hugh L.
Scoffield, Gary A.
Scott, Douglas L.
Scott, Thomas W.
Seaman, Roy E.
Searcy, William P.
Sears, Gilbert H., Jr.
Sears, Johnny M.
Secor, Richard A.
Sedor, Gerald
Segelhorst, Herbert E.
Seidel, Melvin L.
Seng, William R.
Severance, Laverne S., Jr.
Shaffer, Clyde H.
Shay, James E.
Sherman, David D.
Sherrill, John T., Jr.
Sheubrooks, William L.
Shewmaker, John B.
Shields, Ronald M.
Shimmons, George R.
Shirley, Fred E., Jr.
Shirley, Gerald B., Jr.
Shirley, Vernon D.
Sholl, Theodore G.
Shores, Howard V.
Sick, Gary G.
Siegel, Kent R.
Siegrist, Edward A., Jr.
Sierra, Edward P.
Sigg, Earl C.
Sillery, Charles D.
Silvia, Charles P.
Simerly, Glen E.
Simmons, Robert R.
Simone, Thomas J.
Simonton, Bennet S.
Simpson, Benjamin M., III
Simpson, James H.
Simpson, John E., II
Simsarian, James R.
Sitek, Thomas W.
Skelly, Harold J.
Skelly, John F.
Slater, Larue D.
Sloan, Dennis Y.
Sloane, Stephen B.
Slusar, Donald A.
Smith, Albert R.
Smith, Bertram D., Jr.
Smith, Clarence L.
Smith, Clyde A.
Smith, Don L.
Smith, Donald D.
Smith, George C.
Smith, Jimmy F.
Smith, Lee O.
Smith, Leon L., Jr.
Smith, Leroy B.
Smith, Neil D.
Smith, Paul J.
Smith, Richard L.
Smith, Thomas C.
Smith, William E., Jr.
Smith, William J.
Smith, William S., Jr.
Smithey, William J. H.
Snell, William F.
Snow, Kennedy B.
Snyder, William R.
Solomon, Selig
Somers, David W., Jr.
Somerville, Jack E.
Sommer, Leroy G.
Songster, John H.
Southern, Wilson E.
Spero, Joseph R.
Spillars, Harold S.
Spinks, Billy J.
Spivey, Walter H.
Splitt, Robert F.
Spousta, Allen F.
Spring, Arthur T.
Springer, Emerson T.
Spung, John R.
Stacey, John L.
Stampfli, Donald M.
Stanford, Robert L.
Stark, William R.
Stebbins, John
Steckel, John H.
Steelnack, Robert A.
Stegall, Woodie C., Jr.
Steinbrink, Earl E.
Steiner, Frederick N.
Stennett, William A.
Stephens, John A.
Sterling, Paul G.
Stevenson, Leon McC., Jr.
Stevenson, Frederick R.
Stewart, Edward L., Jr.
Stewart, George W.
Stewart, Keith A.
Stewart, Raymond E.
Stiers, Lawrence K.
Stiller, David J.
Stoeckel, Anthony W.
Stoetzer, Raymond N.
Stogis, Peter D.
Stokes, Bobby J.
Stone, George P.
Stong, Russell J.
Stoodley, Francis H.
Stoodt, William A.
Stouffer, John W., II
Stowell, Marshall A.
Strahm, Kenneth A.
Strange, Robert O., Jr.
Strickland, Stanley P.
Strommen, Gene A.
Strong, Daniel L.
Sturtevant, William J.
Sullivan, Eugene T.
Sullivan, Jeremiah F.
Sutphen, Harold J.
Swanson, Matthew C.
Swartz, Theodore R.
Sweat, Wesley A., Jr.
Swift, Charles J., Jr.
Sykes, Floyd E.
Sylvester, Vincent
Taft, Franklin L.
Taggart, Donald J.
Tambini, Anthony L., II
Tannahill, Wayne J.
Tarrico, George J.
Tasker, William G.
Tate, Johnnie D.
Tate, Robert H., Jr.
Tatro, Peter R.
Taunt, Melvin E.
Taylor, Gaylen D.
Taylor, James E.
Taylor, Jeremy D.
Teague, Foster S.
Tema, Robert P.
Templeton, Wilbur D., Jr.
Teter, Eugene V.
Thall, Raymond L.
Thaubald, Edward J.
Theriault, Willard
Thomas, Bruce A.
Thomas, David M.
Thomas, David D.
Thomas, James W.
Thomas, Jerold J.
Thomas, John H., IV
Thompson, Glynn M.
Thompson, James K.
Thompson, Theodore R.
Thornsley, John T.
Thorpe, Gordon L.
Thorpe, Jack C.
Thorpe, Paul J.
Timlin, Joseph W., Jr.
Timm, Dwight D.
Tish, Samuel A.
Titus, Edward D., Jr.
Tollinger, John N., Jr.
Tomion, Jack W.
Tonnessen, Herbert G.
Toole, Morton E.
Touchton, John H., Jr.
Trammell, Arthur B.
Treiber, Maurice L.
Trent, James A.
Triemer, William L.
Trost, Henry J., Jr.
Troxel, Ralph E.
Truxall, Charles W., Jr.
Tulley, Cecil R.
Turner, John J., Jr.
Turner, Robert R.
Tuttle, Clinton L.
Tyszkiewicz, Arthur K.
Uebel, Paul F.
Ulrich, John L.
Underhill, Samuel G.
Unger, Phillip E.
Vaiana, James G.
Van Landingham, Clyde H., Jr.
Van Orden, Douglass L.
Varnadore, James
Varshock, George A.
Vaughan, Edward B., Jr.
Vaughn, Alton L.
Vaughn, Charles G.
Veek, Eugene B.
Venezia, Howard
Vermillion, John E.
Vescelius, Milton J., Jr.
Vezina, George R.
Viessmann, Alex J.
Vohr, James C., Jr.
Vollmer, Thomas H.
Vollmer, William E., Jr.
Vosseller, Richard T.
Waddell, Watson W.
Wages, Clarence J., Jr.
Wakatake, Clifford K.
Walden, Warren L.
Waldman, Jay R.
Walker, Clarence L., Jr.
Walker, Jimmy W.
Walker, Richard A.
Walker Thaddeus O., Jr.
Wall, Arthur D., Jr.
Wallace, Laird E.
Walling, Samuel E.
Walsh, John B.
Walston, Jerry D.
Walter, Clyde M.
Ward, Richard R.
Warden, Kenneth J.
Waring, James D.
Warters, Robert L.
Watson, John A.
Wattay, Alexander E.
Watts, Robert B.
Webb, Kenneth H.
Weber, Gerald M.
Webert, Warren F.
Weeks, James W.
Weichman, Denis R.
Weiland, Robert F.
Weiler, Antone M.
Wellborn, Robert M., Jr.
Wells, Charles T.
Werenskjold, Gary W.
Weseleskey, Allen E.
Wesley, William J.

Wesolowski, Walter
West, William W.
Westfall, Van F.
Westlake, William R.
Weston, Jack L.
Whaley, Thomas P.
Whelan, Mathew J., Jr.
Whitaker, Walter H.
White, Ervin E.
White, George W., Jr.
White, John R.
White, Robert S.
Whiting, Donald W.
Whitlinger, Gregory L
Whitmire, Wilson R.
Wible, William K.
Wichmann, Robert H.
Wicks, Lester H., Jr.
Wiebelhaus, Clarence J.
Wieschhoff, Kenneth H.
Wilbur, Charles H.
Wild, Ronald A.
Wiley, Byron A.
Wilkey, Perry A.
Willey, Bruce T.
Williams, Carl E.
Willis, Clyde P.
Wilson, Bruce D.
Wilson, Garry L.
Wilson, Leonard O.
Wilson, Robert M.
Wilson, Russell W.
Wiltsie, Ronald J.
Wincek, Walter J.
Winchester, Morton S.
Wing, Rodney C.
Wingerter, Edward W., Jr.
Winn, Perry R., Jr.
Wirth, Charles G.
Witt, Robert T., Jr.
Wolfe, Roderic L.
Womack, Leonard R.
Wood, Douglas R.
Wood, Melvin C.
Wood, Richard G.
Wood, Sidney E., Jr.
Woodrow, Warren A.
Woods, Brian D.
Woods, Francis G.
Woods, Theodore, K., Jr.
Woods, Walter, E.
Woodworth, Benjamin B.
Woolman, Jospeh C.
Worrell, Dwight I.
Worst, Dale R.
Wright, Arthur S.
Wright, Joseph R.
Wuorenmaa, John P.
Wurth, John G.
Wyatt, Raymond E.
Wylie, Clayton R.
Wylie, Ronald P.
Wynn, Earl B., Jr.
Yelle, "A" Courtney
Yessak, Lawrence G.
Yetter, William S.
Yockey, Harry M.
Youmans, Virgil D., Jr.
Young, Edward B.
Zachman, John A.
Zackowski, Terrence L.
Zaludek, George M.
Zelna, Denis P.
Zimmer, Emory P.
Zollars, Allen M., Jr.
Zwick, John E.

To be lieutenants, line (LDO)

Clarence G. Bonham
Walter C. Kurz
Henry E. Loudermilk
Richard J. Halloran
Milton W. Schreck
Bernard F. Clausen
Thomas P. David
Herman L. Kinsel
Stephen B. Barnett
Jack D. Durham
Lee E. Barret, Jr.
Elmer E. Salo
John E. Campbell
Eugene A. Mount
John C. McIlwaine
Arthur L. Bentley
Homer R. Spann
LeRoy Bryant
William D. Hughes
George E. Davis
James E. Ballou
Howard E. Bylund
Geroge H. Clayton, Jr.
Ralph W. Welch
Edward J. Kasnicki
Edward R. Mateer, Jr.
James O. Forgy
Robert G. O'Donnell
William J. Stephens
Paul F. Mademann
Allyn C. Christopher
Simon A. Roscoe, Jr.
Bruce F. Brown
James W. Brooks
James J. Murphy, Jr.
Theodore R. Weatherby
Jack L. Reifschneider
Llewellyn L. Naddy
Thomas W. Hefferon
Peter P. Vispo
James E. Brown
James L. Haning
Duane J. Counsell
John H. Richter
Raymond W. Ashbacher
James W. Warren
Roy A. Berry
Robert E. Peetz
Frederick G. Ingalls
Walter A. Cahill
Paul L. Dennis
Robert R. Dunn
Norman P. West
Robert N. Elfsten
John C. Roach
Benjamin W. Gerrald
Robert F. Vincent
Lynn B. Bean
James R. Vannice
Bryce K. Worrock
Donald J. Kreutzberger
Jack R. Carpenter
Dorance L. Ochs
William P. Yarbrough, Jr.
Ashley A. Myers
William N. Morgan
Glynn A. Waldrop
James E. Crickey, Jr.
Robert S. Repta
Jack W. Waddell
Joseph A. Hierholzer
Howard C. Davis
Delbert A. Sexton
Walter H. Fehrs
Francis S. Paine, Jr.
Richard C. Husted
John J. Errickson
Claude C. Brown
James W. Watts
Edward M. Nowak
Edward C. Keeley
Hobart E. Seaward
Edgar L. James
Michael J. Judge
Herbert "H" Scranton
Milton N. Cohen
William P. Koll
Stanley W. Stanwick
Frank B. Scarlett
Rodney R. Reynolds
John H. Dolan
Henry W. Whittle
Frederick W. Glaeser
Michael C. Staats
William J. O'Halloran
Clayton L. Sheppy
Elmer S. Clark
Howard L. Palmer
Robert D. Jebb
Oliver E. Harmon
Donald H. Millon
Norman C. Johnson
William J. Landroche, Jr.
Albert P. Festag
John R. Griffin
Thomas E. Condron
Lawrence C. Gore
Robert L. Miller, Jr.
Robert B. Goodman
Donald D. Shelton
Harold B. O'Connor
Robert J. Robertson
Robert P. Schmidt
Robert G. Patterson
Charles J. Whitbeck
Jay R. Collins
Richard S. Benoit
Gilbert A. O'Rear
Henry B. Perry
William Maliczowski
Ira B. Dement
Robert N. England
George R. Fromm
Ronald W. Richardson
John D. McKinnon
Myron S. Johnson
James J. Brown
Bernard C. Elliott
Charles L. Benjamin
Charles E. Farrar
Martin F. Zoolsek
Milfred C. Berg
James M. Donley
George O. Smith
Homer L. Ford, Jr.
Louis A. Kilpatrick
George E. Campbell
Charles Nuanes
Alden M. Hutchinson
Alfred J. Billings
Jesse V. Boyer, Jr.
Howard W. Hughes
James I. Pardue, Jr.
Eugene J. Schuster
Harry M. Rutherford
Charles R. Witherspoon
Robert C. Borden, Jr.
Edward C. McConkey
Edgbert F. Howard
Charles E. Johnson
James L. McGlamery
Gustav F. Builder
James T. Boyle
Odd B. Pedersen
William J. Hipp
Leo H. Sweeney
Odis A. Nicholson
Calvin H. Lyle
William J. Keith
Mario J. Cicchetto
Edward J. Farrell
Carmano J. Gulli
Clyde W. Holland
Bryce D. Slawson
George W. Crowe
Bruce L. Slawson
Gerald D. McCarthy
Norman L. De Noon
George R. Stradley
Daniel P. Roper
Albert Barre
Walton E. Yates
Donald R. Larkin
Lloyd B. Camp.

To be lieutenants, Medical Corps

Alfandre, Howard J.
Alford, Donald O.
Allshouse, Herbert E.
Altman, Robert L.
Ambur, Richard F.
Anderson, John R.
Anderson, Robert L.
Atkins, Claude C.
Atkinson, Schales L.
Atlas, Ernest
Atwell, Marshall E.
Bardana, Emil J., Jr.
Barr, Harry J.
Birdwell, Tom R.
Bolter, Delano W.
Boop, Warren C., Jr.
Borden, Robert S.
Brandt, Eugene M.
Brannon, William L., Jr.
Bredenberg, Willard A.
Brettschneider, Lawrence
Brown, John W.
Bush, Stephen T.
Byers, George E., Jr.
Byrd, Thomas R.
Caldwell, Marvin G.
Cannon, Richard E.
Cantow, Edward F.
Casimir, Anthony S.
Caspar, George H.
Castrow, Frederick F., II
Chapman, David W.
Chapman, Robert E.
Christ, Ronald L.
Cilento, Bartley G.
Colburn, James E.
Compton, Harold L.
Cordray, Douglas R.
Cotten, Charles L.
Council, John C., Jr.
Crow, Judson L.
Cummins, Larry E.
Dangelo, Ernest P., Jr.
Davies, Raymond O., Jr.
Davis, David R., II
Davis, Gerald N.
Deignan, William E.
Dew, Benjamin G. W.
Donlan, Michael A.
Donovan, James F.
Drinkard, James P.
Dubner, Neil P.
Duff, Donald F.
Duhamel, Robert R.
Dunn, Julius E., Jr.
Erbs, Ronald C.
Farrell, Thomas A.
Farrell, William J.
Feeney, Robert A.
Finnerty, Edward J.
Fisher, Darrell E.
Fitzgerald, Robert B.
Fleming, Peter A.
Fogg, Charles D.
Fornes, Michael F.
Frensilli, Frederick J.
Gallagher, Hugh S.
Gard, Howard E.
Garden, John W.
Garvin, Edward J.
Gay, Michael L.
Gee, William
Geiger, Gerald F.
Gibbs, Benjamin F., Jr.
Gibson, John C.
Gilbert, Edward C.
Giovannini, Andrew M.
Gregonis, Joseph G.
Guiles, Paul A.
Hale, Charles H., III
Hall, John C.
Hand, David J.
Hanna, Charles A.
Hansen, Sigvard T., Jr.
Harlin, Robert S.
Harrington, Randall L.
Hibner, Dan W.
Hoertz, John H., Jr.
Hofmann, Richard M.
Holley, Hilmon D., Jr.
Hoye, John E.
Hudson, Royal C., Jr.
Jackson, Rudolph E.
Janicki, Robert S.
Jeffrey, Clyde G., Jr.
Jewusiak, Edward M.
Johnson, Ernest J.
Johnson, Walter T.
Johnson, William W.
Jones, Edward M.
Jones, George R.
Joyce, Robert W., Jr.
Katz, Harry I.
Keifer, Frederic R.
Kellett, Cyril F., Jr.
Kelly, John C.
Kelly, Robert J.
Kennedy, Harry G., Jr.
Kessler, Carl P.
Knight, Jimmie H.
Kripps, Marvin M.
Langston, Randall A.
Latimer, Ronald G.
Leadbeater, John C.
Lee, Frederick M.
Leissring, John C.
Lentz, Ronald J.
MacAtee, Lawrence J.
Majors, Robert P., Jr.
Mangelson, Ned L.
Martin, William A.
Mauk, Sid "F," III
McDaniels, "L" "B"
McGeoy, Thomas J., Jr.
McGrail, John F.
McQueen, Samuel
McTammany, John R.
Meador, James C., Jr.
Melton, Russell W.
Meyer, Russell
Monihan, Richard M.
Moorefield, James M., Jr.
Moreland, Andrew
Morgan, James D.
Murnane, Thomas J.
Nedelman, Philip B.
Newburger, Alan C.
Nicholas, Carmine F.
Nichols, Robert D.
Nielsen, Surl L.
O'Donnell, Joseph E.
O'Hara, Patrick E.
Ohslund, Ronald K.
Olsen, James A.
Pasquale, Dominick N., Jr.
Patlovich, Joseph
Perlin, Elliott
Phelps, Jerry A.
Philip, Gordon W.
Pickering, Michael J.
Piscatelli, Robert L.
Playford, George A.
Pollard, Emil E.
Porter, Harry, Jr.
Portu, Raymond D.
Power, Curtis G., Jr.
Prietto, Pablo P., III
Pulskamp, John R.
Rashid, Kenneth D.
Reed, Ralph E.
Robison, James S.
Roeder, Donald K.
Rogers, Albert K.
Rooney, Thomas P.
Russo, John F.
Sandok, Burton A.
Schillaci, Richard F.
Schwartz, Bradford B.
Secrist, Wilbur L.
Shade, Allen R.
Silberman, William C.
Skinner, Wendell L.
Smalkin, Michael D.
Smith, Thomas K.
Snodgrass, Garry L.
Snyder, James L.
Spencer, Frederick A.
Sphar, Raymond L., Jr.
Sponaugle, Harlan D.
Spore, William W.
Stanell, Robert E.
Stanton, Kevin C.
Stier, Stanley "D"
Stoop, David R.
Stormo, Alan C.
Stucker, Fred J.
Swan, Robert J.
Swanger, Ronald F.
Swierzewski, Stanley J., Jr.
Tate, Harry R.
Taylor, Fredric S.
Taylor, James Z.
Tenney, Richard L.
Thacker, William C.
Thompson, Robert L.
Thompson, William F.
Tipton, George B.
Tolley, Gary M.
Travis, Kenneth W.
VanBuren, William E.
Vaughan, John A.
Vines, Frederick S.
Vondoepp, Christian E.
Vorosmarti, James, Jr.
Walters, Phil V.
Wanger, William H.
Watson, John T.
West, Robert S.
Westfall, Florent F., Jr.
Wilson, Cecil B.
Wilson, Joseph T., Jr.
Winston, Joseph H.
Wishart, David L.
Woodstein, Ira J.
Yon, Joseph L., Jr.
Zelles, Gary W.

To be lieutenants, Supply Corps

Abele, Robert B.
Adams, Richard G.
Aldenderfer, William D.
Allen, Johnny L.
Allnutt, Alvin H.
Andersen, Thomas C.
Anglim, David L.
Avis, Bruce W.
Balding, David W.
Banas, John M.
Barstad, Clarence H.
Basse, Warner P.
Baxter, John W.
Beck, Kermit "E"
Berg, Robert K.
Bilodeau, James H.
Bittner, Burton F., Jr.
Borchardt, Heinz R.
Bradley, Donald A.
Briggs, John M.
Brown, Alan S.
Brown, Edward J., Jr.
Brown, Lee
Buffoni, Thomas J.
Buscher, Bernard A., Jr.
Carenza, John L.
Carter, Eugene T.
Chafey, William D.
Champion, Andrew A.
Chipley, Charles L., Jr.
Connolly, Robert I.
Coon, Paul D.
Corbitt, James R.
Crawford, James L.
Croeber, Hans R.
Cronin, George W., Jr.
Crouch, Robert L.
Culpepper, Glenn C.
Cunningham, John H.
Dawson, Gerald L.
Dennis, Ward J.
Deshaney, Donald J.

Dewey, Edward P.
Dickinson, Thomas D.
Divelbiss, Carl D.
Dunn, Bernard D.
Easley, Richard P.
Eizenhoefer, David J.
Farley, Charles V.
Felton, Thomas O.
Fields, Simeon
Finbraaten, Laurence K.
Foley, Donald P.
Furiga, Richard D.
Gilvary, Daniel J.
Girman, Robert J.
Girod, Albert P., Jr.
Gleason, Bernard L.
Godsey, Shirley T.
Gore, Bobby J.
Greene, Walter C., Jr.
Gumpert, Leroy C.
Haase, Robert L.
Hahn, Gary E.
Hale, Joe M.
Hardin, Edward L.
Harlow, Charles E.
Heiberg, James E.
Hinds, Douglas J.
Hinkle, Otis R.
Hollingsworth, Charles E.
Horner, Norman K.
Horner, Raymond N., Jr.
Houghton, Donald W.
Irons, John H.
Iverson, Ronald I.
Jackson, Ronald L.
Jahn, Donald R.
Johnson, Rodwell C.
Jones, Jack L.
Jones, Kenneth W.
Jones, Leland B.
Juncker, Carl F.
Kachigian, George N.
Kalafut, George W.
Kriner, Lloyd B. W.
Kulikowski, Jack A.
Lane, Dean S.
Lantsberger, Robert E.
Lee, Gerald L.
Linehan, Daniel J., Jr.
Loftus, Raymond P.
Macafee, Douglas C.
Magee, Gilbert L.
Malzahn, Walter G.
Marino, Leonard J.
Martin, Michael J.
Martineau, Paul J.
McHugh, Thomas H.
Meiners, Arthur C., Jr.
Milburn, Raymond F.
Miller, Harold E.
Miller, James E.
Milliken, Gail L.
Moore, Donald L.
Moore, Richard C.
Morse, William McF., Jr.
Mouton, Earl F.

Mummert, Dale R.
Murphy, Ronald D.
Murray, Harlan E., Jr.
Nace, Richard H.
Naughton, Thomas J.
Nichols, Gerald M.
Nolan, John E.
Novak, Karl J.
Nuss, Gary B.
Nygaard, Richard B.
O'Connell, Arthur B.
Otto, Ronald E.
Palumbo, Frederick C.
Patterson, Jerry G.
Petras, George A.
Phillips, Robert A.
Pierce, Leon L.
Pinnell, Joseph K.
Plante, Rene E.
Platt, Stuart F.
Pliska, Robert F.
Pope, Jere P.
Popik, Charles T.
Quartana, Joseph P.
Rankin, Ronald W.
Reed, John D.
Reilly, Joseph V., Jr.
Rich, Philip J., Jr.
Ridley, David E.
Robinson, Robert L.
Rook, Eugene C., Jr.
Rubenstein, Ralph S.
Schulte, Conrad P.
Sechler, John L.
Seidel, James L.
Sellars, James B.
Sheehan, John E., Jr.
Shirley, Kenneth R.
Shoemaker, Leroy E.
Shroeder, John, Jr.
Sims, Thomas M., Jr.
Skelly, James F., Jr.
Smith, Thomas J.
Snow, Richard C.
Sodrel, Donald L.
Sofley, Billy R.
Sommer, Melvin R.
St. Martin, Robert W.
Stoeffler, John A.
Sutherland, Peter J.
Taylor, William E.
Templeton, James R.
Terry, Victor W.
Thompson, Robert L.
Van Patten, Edward R.
Visniski, Walte W., Jr.
Wallace, Edwin R.
Weinberg, Harry H.
Weissinger, Thomas R.
Weller, Thomas C., Jr.
Whittaker, James B.
Wilber, James R.
Williams, Thomas C., Jr.
Woodward, Corbin, Jr.
Wright, Robert E.
Youmans, Raymond W.
Young, Jack L.

To be lieutenants, Supply Corps (LDO)

Jamie R. Murphy
Diedrich K. Krietemeyer
Billy N. Jones
Harold S. Hatcher
Horald McR. Hughes
George J. Cooney
Charles A. Vedra
Harold S. Parr
James J. Hart, Jr.
Robert H. O'Malley

Frank J. Wolfe
Joseph R. Riser
Joseph M. Zepczyk
Russell S. Dohmeyer
Blaxton V. Todd
Wallace J. Hanna
James F. Erskine
Jettie C. Shuler
Walter E. Buck, Jr.
James Thompson

To be lieutenants, Chaplain Corps

Berg, Vernon E., Jr.
Bertulio, Caesar J.
Black, Gerald W.
Brown, Robert G.
Cook, Gordon S.
Craven, Allen B.

Donan, William E., Jr.
Driscoll, Walter L.
Earnest, Ralph E.
Franklin, Robert C.
Goad, John T.
Johns, Harry D.

Kennard, William E.
Linzey, Stanford E., Jr.
Magor, Warren F.
Miller, Harry R.
Murray, George P.
O'Brien, Eugene C.

Panko, Stephen M.
Simmons, David E.
Spencer, Carroll R.
Struthers, Basil H.
Thacker, Donald L.
Vantassel, Lowell W.
Young, Christopher B.

To be lieutenants, Civil Engineer Corps

Allgaier, Donald D.
Barczak, Jerome J.
Barnes, John A.
Bauer, John G.
Bligh, James E.
Boyce, Heyward E., III
Carle, Barry
Chabay, John L.
Chin, William
Christenson, Carl E.
Clearwater, John L.
Cook, Carlisle F., Jr.
Cope, Ronald P.
Corley, Wentworth H., Jr.
Crisp, Hugh A.
Delage, Paul M.
Derr, Frederick M.
Dugan, Robert W.
Dunn, Jerome R.
Earnst, Rossell A.
Endebrock, Frank L., III
Fegley, Charles E., III
Fraser, John C., Jr.
Frevert, Edward C., Jr.
Gawarkiewicz, Joseph J., III
Gibowicz, Charles J., Jr.
Godsey, Jack L.
Grady, Noel "A", Jr.
Hartman, Paul K.

Jacob, Richard E.
Johnson, Don P.
Kelch, John A., Jr.
Kenny, Robert E.
Kimmons, Victor H.
Kirkpatrick, James D.
Klein, Dale M.
Knauf, Richard H., Jr.
Landes, William G.
Ledder, William R.
Lewis, Edmund F.
Mansfield, Douglas J.
McMenamin, Lester E., Jr.
McNeill, James E.
Merritt, Frederick D.
Miller, Robert K.
Mueller, Karl L.
Murphy, Frank J.
Perry, Edward S.
Resnick, Rudolf
Sandlin, Steven M.
Saum, James H.
Schattner, Bernard L.
Seeber, Earl R., Jr.
Shafer, Richard V.
Siegle, Richard L.
Somerset, Harold R.
Tobin, James M.
Totten, John C.
Westcott, John A.
Yoho, Hugh L.
Young, Joseph F.

To be lieutenants, Dental Corps

Badger, Daniel G.
Bloch, George A.
Bourgeois, Aubrey J., Jr.
Brazil, Robert W.
Brown, Max W.
Bumgardner, Willie A.
Carlson, Roy F.
Cassidy, Robert E.
Ciardello, Carmen A., Jr.
Cottle, Kenneth L.
Dresen, William F.
Dupcak, Joseph, Jr.
Eckerson, Peter L.
Giers, Paul E.
Glazer, Sanford A.
Hearon, Donald L.
Hesby, Richard A.
Hodes, Leonard F.
Holcomb, John B.
Holroyd, Samuel V.
Jann, Robert C.
Jansson, Albert W., Jr.
Johnson, Bruce E.
Kelly, James C., Jr.
Kelly, William J., Jr.
Klanderud, Douglas C.
Krysinski, Theodore T., Jr.

Lehman, Paul C.
Lowman, Jack V.
Mather, John G.
McCreery, Robert J.
McMahon, Joseph P.
Miller, Frank R.
Murray, Robert E.
Niccoli, Dominic J.
Pavlick, Charles T., Jr.
Poidmore, Sam J.
Rackley, Otis D., Jr.
Robbins, George B.
Roper, William Z.
Sawyer, Hershel G., Jr.
Scott, Ronald W.
Shaw, David S.
Stalb, Douglas B.
Thibodeau, Richard A.
Triftshauser, Roger W.
Vaught, James E.
Walker, Oscar B.
Watkins, Owen T.
Wheetley, Woodrow D.
Yeager, James E.
Zotter, Frank E.

To be lieutenants, Medical Service Corps

Aaron, Alvin "J"
Baldauf, George W.
Bertka, Robert E.
Blankenship, William L.
Bolton, Richard B.
Bowden, Ronald R.
Bowdren, Laurence P.
Brideau, Donald J.
Bryan, James O.
Bryant, Eugene M., Jr.
Casler, Wilfred I.
Chastain, Howard T.
Collier, Patrick J.
Condon, Earl N.

Correll, Joseph M.
Crebs, Rollin L.
Dietz, Bruce J.
Dunham, Chester J., Jr.
Eckerman, Weldon R.
Ellis, Glenn M.
Erwin, Richard E.
Fernandez, Manuel S. P.
Flower, Norman L.
Ford, Gerald R.
Formeller, Frank J. Jr.
Francis, Raymond D.
Freeman, Benjamin C.

French, James A., Jr.
Gobbel, Henry D.
Gonsalves, John H.
Goodson, James E.
Gouldman, John R.
Halverson, Charles W.
Hatch, Emery J.
Hatten, Ann C.
Heaton, Harley L.
Hoover, Donald E.
Jenkins, Benny J.
Joseph, Sammy W.
Kane, George P.
Kemp, James E.
Kessler, Raymond B.
Lanier, Bobby McD.
Lawson, Donald R.
Leadford, William M.
Lecas, Kenneth E.
Littner, Henry D.
Lowe, Samuel C.
Lowi, Bertram H.
Martin, Douglas M.
Mayo, Myron F.
McAuliffe, Terrence J.
McClung, Denzel H.
McDermott, Roland W.
McFee, Charles A.
Millard, George W.
Moore, Charles J.
Mullinix, Chloe A.
Nelson, Paul D.

Nourigat, Earl R.
Novak, Paul J.
Nowak, Frederick F.
Pearce, Charles J.
Peckenpaugh, Normand L.
Pelletier, Louis E.
Ramsey, George W.
Roberts, Billie C.
Robinson, Jack V.
Rucker, Thomas J.
Sanderson, Roy D.
Seminara, James
Simmons, Carl B.
Sowers, Hubert H., Jr.
Stephens, Bobby L.
Stephens, Charles T.
Stitzel, Forrest D.
Surface, Robert L.
Swindall, Victor A.
Tandy, Roy W., Jr.
Thompson, Russell J.
Webb, Laurence H.
Wherry, Robert J., Jr.
White, Robert L.
Woodward, Charlene J.
Woomer, Edward F., Jr.
Young, Arthur L.
Zimmeht, John A., Jr.

To be lieutenants, Nurse Corps

Adams, Louise "J"
Agnew, Lynnelle A.
Allen, Patricia M.
Bell, Lou E.
Burrell, Margaret M.
Butler, Lois J.
Carroll, Shirley F.
Chisholm, Marie A.
Chute, Judith R.
Durian, Emma T.
Emond, Lucille G.
Fields, Mary A.
Frazier, Frances M.
Gedrys, Patricia C.
Gillespie, Jacquelin C.
Gomes, Alma M.
Herrington, Daisy J.
Higgins, Margaret J.
Hines, Alyce M.
Huggins, Mabel L.
Jacobson, Dorothy M.
Johnson, Mildred E.

Kearns, Joyce C.
Macenery, Joan M.
Marcotte, Natalie M. G.
Matich, Marie F.
Matuszewski, Barbara R.
Miller, Eleanor J.
Moris, Patricia J.
Pechulis, Verna M.
Rohde, Esther J.
Rosenquist, Hildegarde
Sabold, Sarah R.
Schreiber, Marilyn T.
Thomas, Betty A.
Traubel, Annette M.
Vander Voort, Emily S.
Warner, Elizabeth A.
Watson, Beverly A.
Whitesell, Margaret L.
Williams, Erlene I.
Wilson, Lela B.
Yelle, Dorothy A.

IN THE NAVY

The following-named (Naval Reserve officers) to be permanent lieutenants (junior grade) and temporary lieutenants in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Robert W. Edwards
Stephen H. Libien
Eugene F. Luckstead

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be permanent lieutenants (junior grade) and temporary lieutenants in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Donald R. Gardner
Kenneth J. Nordberg

The following-named (Naval Reserve officers) to be permanent lieutenants (junior grade) and temporary lieutenants in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

John K. Geppert
David P. Longenecker
Raymond Reid
Clyde L. Sabala

The following-named (Naval Reserve officers) to be permanent lieutenants in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Charles S. Borden, Jr.
Charles A. Brown

Egil T. Steen, U.S. Navy retired officer, to be a permanent commander in the line of the Navy, pursuant to title 10, United States Code 1211.

The following-named candidates to be permanent ensigns in the line of the Navy subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Harold L. Galloway
Rodney A. Bankson
James R. Kennish
Thomas A. Davis
Melvin A. Wilson
Johnny F. Smith
James R. Reckner
William H. Clark
David B. Dunlap
James J. Ostertag
Donald A. Wilt
Kenneth J. Culverson
Russell F. Anderson
Arthur D. Sharplin
Harold E. Tittle
Sherril W. Beam
Henry K. Wong
Terry J. Tassin
Phillip R. Babb
David W. Vail
Royal S. Magnus
James W. Hargus
Fred R. Copeland
Donald J. Degreef
John J. Schneider
Robert S. Stolz
Thomas J. Lopez
Charles L. Volk, Jr.
Larry G. Flesher
Thomas P. Rankin
James E. Fausz
George C. Rains, Jr.
James E. Payton
Henry T. Morris III
John P. Wilkinson III
William S. McGhee
Frank Thelen III
Constance G. Bowman
Francis J. Harla, Jr.
Rudolph J. Klampfer

The following-named candidates to be permanent ensigns in the Supply Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Norman L. Schewe
Robert J. Briggs
Kenneth H. Rasmussen
Stanley A. Smith
George Dolores, Jr.
Preben E. Ebbesen
Kenneth R. Hall
Newell J. Paire, Jr.

Thomas R. Pine AT1, U.S. Navy to be a permanent ensign in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

The following-named warrant officers to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Navy, limited duty only, for temporary service, in the classifications indicated, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

SUPPLY

John B. Duran
Anthony Bruno

DECK

Dean S. Higgins
Joseph F. Heeney

ORDNANCE, UNDERWATER

Philip R. Stagg

ADMINISTRATION

Edward B. Brockman
James F. Hornick
Harry J. Nicholas

ENGINEERING

Robert H. Munger

HULL

Bernard H. Wilkens

ELECTRONICS

George L. Whyte
Bruce T. Mundy
George B. Faircloth, Jr.

AVIATION OPERATIONS

Richard W. Phillips

PHOTOGRAPHY

Vernon D. Emmerson

AVIONICS

Robert J. Thompson

AVIATION MAINTENANCE

Hance R. Bruce

The following-named candidates to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Navy, limited duty only, for temporary service, in the classifications indicated, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

SUPPLY

Robert O. Meitzner
Jack E. Edwards
James W. Sprouse

CIVIL ENGINEER

Paul G. Carder
Arnold T. German
Gerald S. Bernardo

DECK

Austin E. Smith
John H. Kircheval, Jr.
Charles A. Lewis
James J. Scroggins
Donn E. Thomas
Paul A. Street
Thomas P. Hershey
Regis H. Dunlap
Houston Childers
George G. Cornett
Edmond B. Bennett
George H. Schuff
Richard D. Yentes

OPERATIONS

Nicholas D. Kuhn
John H. Boyd
Charles E. Evans, Jr.
John S. Rogers, Jr.

ORDNANCE, SURFACE

John D. Friedman
Glenn C. Wagner
Ernest W. Berry

ORDNANCE, CONTROL

Walter C. Wise, Jr.
Ralph G. Johnson
Robert C. Stewart
Russell B. Merrick
Ronald M. Wilder

ORDNANCE, UNDERWATER

Cecil Battiste, Jr.
Robert R. Mastrich

ADMINISTRATION

George C. Warren
Dewey L. Alexander
Thomas J. Farrell
Loy Herbert Wright
John J. Hull
Joel L. Hudson
Albert V. Schnoebelen
George S. Young
Willie M. Martinell

BANDMASTER

Donald H. Worthylake

ENGINEERING

Hal H. Hardwick, Jr.
Frank W. Snyder
George H. Dyer
Latnay H. Miller
Douglas E. Bogue
John G. Ries
Harry L. Kitterman
Rex E. Newman
James C. Pace
Ivan Belakjon
Thomas DeLong

HULL

Bruce W. Taylor
Melvin F. Stone
Leon E. Byrd

ELECTRICIAN

Ralph H. Allen
Ted L. Palmer
Alfred C. Jemlich
Chester Flanagan

ELECTRONICS

James K. Sellers
Raymond G. Hulquist, Jr.
Ralph N. Lies
Frederic Vollbrecht
Edward P. Tolbert

CRYPTOLOGY

Jack E. Fuller
Jim R. Watkins

AVIATION OPERATIONS

Richard F. Driscoll
Joseph E. Miller
Tobias B. Latham, Jr.
Benjamin V. Bernardy
James G. Kearse

PHOTOGRAPHY

Joseph L. Marks

METEOROLOGY

Caloway H. West

AVIATION ORDNANCE

William Wagner, Jr.
Charles B. Hanlon
Jack E. Blacksmith
Elmer J. Hoskins
John T. Delaney
Charles E. Martin
Robert W. Lingo
Gene F. Monroe
Robert E. Geller

AVIONICS

James V. Orlando, Jr.
James D. Jordan
George C. Wilson
Walter S. Dill
Curtis W. Turner, Jr.
John H. Meier
Richard C. Miller
John F. Uhr
Robert W. Searles

AVIATION MAINTENANCE

Ernest E. Weeks
Leroy Grice
Alonzo R. Hamilton
Dominick E. Tineo
Robert W. Krueger
Mathew G. Boyeson
William J. Chambers
James A. Downs
James H. Mauney
Leslie F. Allen
Ernest D. White
Robert A. Ford, Jr.
Frank H. Richardson
Billy J. Manly
Elmer G. Hieldbrant
Diggs O. Walton
Herbert M. Stanfield
William D. Hardy
Leonard R. Bailey
James L. Maddox
William T. Hanson
William B. Nelson
John E. Jackson
Earle W. Hankey
Albert F. Whaley, Jr.
Jefferson D. Stinson
Jack N. Blalock
James A. Jelley
Richard J. Phillips
James E. Taylor, Jr.
James E. Livingston
Raymond A. Eckert
Donald B. Stevens
Robert B. Clark
Robert D. Kemple
Hines D. McNair
Orville A. Hemphill
Jack R. Perry
William G. Morgan
Francis R. Schirra
Charles E. Woodward
Leonard Martin
Demetreos G. Gianakos
Charles J. Cook
Walter D. Pass
William H. Wilson
James P. Doyle
Carl G. Patterson
Oscar H. Hazlip
William L. Maris, Jr.
Joseph H. Gray, Jr.
Orland L. Kreitlow
Patrick E. O'Halloran, Jr.
Roy A. Gonzales
James E. Burns

The following-named candidates to be ensigns in the Navy, limited duty only, for temporary service, in the classification indicated, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

SUPPLY

William F. Norton
Donald J. LaTorra
Daniel S. Frank
Richard W. Newson
Jesse Collins, Jr.
Robert L. Hall
Arthur B. Emde
Edward T. Rucka
Robert L. Archibald
Jack A. Brigden
John F. Black, Jr.
Philip W. Gutman
Allen W. Harris
Donald J. Wilmes
Edward H. Lilley
Joseph N. Pica
Terry M. Bartlett
Jerry W. Smith
James B. Craig
Severiano L. Romero
Daniel Pettigrew
Daley D. Dougherty
Clifford C. Lord
Kenneth V. McMillen
Virgilio G. Gonzales
Joseph F. Birmingham
Creighton E. Johnson
John P. Swing, Jr.
Mitchell Elich
Herbert D. Bennett
Frederick W. Schumann
Charles G. Waldrop
James W. Fee
William R. Andrea
Carl L. Humphrey
Richard C. Fisher
Henry A. Vroman
Eugene J. Driscoll

CIVIL ENGINEER

Eugene H. Steffens
Huey W. Miller
Harold D. Swinford
Eugene G. Jobe
Joseph J. Malla
Franklyn J. Hartman
Jimmie E. Jarvis
William B. Grover
Terry C. Schrader
Purcell C. Payne, Jr.
Alexander C. Gunn
Jerry W. King

DECK

Frederick D. Sears
Charles A. Mallett
John L. Obrien
James D. McCreary
Harold E. Huntsinger
Loenard D. James
William H. Hewitt
Jerry L. Scott
Edmund J. Hunt
Carl L. Seeler
Howard E. Sandusky
Earl A. Walters
John O. Wylie
Jerry L. Smith
Charles K. Hill
Stanley K. Busteed
Jose M. Martinez, Jr.
William L. Yeager

OPERATIONS

Robert W. Baker
Shirley A. Robbins
Kenneth W. Parker
Bernard J. Domanski
William H. Watkinson, Jr.
William F. Bell
Eugene C. Franklin, Jr.
James M. Friesen
Clarence J. Eckhoff, Jr.
Glenn E. Murdock
Alfred M. Durazo
Jose E. Garza
William F. Smith
Ben L. Kegley
Kenneth E. Bailey
Paul E. VanDerveen
William P. Miller
William W. Miller
Edwin W. Creekmore, Jr.
James L. Barrett
Benny M. Morgan
Jerry Beckham
Thomas M. Perkins
Stephen H. Howell
Clyde M. Perry
Clarence E. Smith
Keith D. Stoner
Robert J. Conniff
Robin L. Brunson
Steve Adams

Norman E. Drew
Willie E. Barton
Charles E. Hunnicutt
Ranald J. Arntz
Ralph T. Mott

ORDNANCE, SURFACE

James E. Allen
James T. Harrelson
Wayne H. Mellendorf
Gilbert M. Morse
Hulet G. Walls, Jr.
Joseph W. Saul
Paul V. Huebner
William W. Chambers

ORDNANCE, CONTROL

James D. Tow
Ambrose T. Donnelly
James R. Davis
Donald L. LaVelle
Robert E. Michael
Charlie M. Guthrie
William G. Fell
Ronald C. Kimmel
Frank A. Butler
Morris E. Brooks
Carl S. Everett
Wallace R. Clearman
Ernesto Lassich
James R. Carroll
Howard A. Albright
Robert C. Robbins
Eugene A. Stewart
Robert F. Peckham

ORDNANCE, UNDERWATER

Roger T. Hyneman
John W. Polinsky
Thomas L. Atchison
William A. Roberts
James R. Bruce
Ronald G. Trahan
Ralph F. Ruhland
Richard M. Jackman
Joseph N. Roman
Wendell R. Valentine
Gerland E. Hilleman
Donald A. Tamburello
Bobby W. Lowe
Gerald C. Evans

ADMINISTRATION

James V. Connor
Walter A. Bell
Richard B. Gilbert
Richard F. Clapper
Earley C. Gillie
Robert M. Cobb
Raymond Pfister
Glenn A. Thieme
James R. Becker
Carl A. Patin
Ronald B. Graham
Marlin A. Courtney
Edgar C. Kinard, Jr.
Hubert V. Harris
Ralph V. Powers
William T. Dotson
George G. Madsen
George Seebeck
Ralph E. Chappell
John R. Peak
Roland G. Trance
Edward J. Cody
Carl R. Brown
Richard L. Randolph
Donald S. Flanagan
Joseph E. Baier
James R. Good
Richard L. McMeekin
Michael L. Martin
James L. Russell, Jr.
Clinton D. Older
Larry J. Scott
Paul W. Craker
Jerry Lane Fuller
Thomas N. Newbern
Keith D. Robinson
Wiley G. Dobbs
Donald R. Dean
Richard Perez
Proctor J. Gilbert, Jr.
Ronald B. Henderson
Robert T. Cyr
Jerome P. Burns, Jr.
Henry M. Thompson
Samuel M. Simmons
Bobby G. Windom
Robert L. Glass
Harvey E. Ludwig
Robert L. Greathouse
Jack E. Dameron
Robert E. Yates
Earl D. Junkins
Robert W. Mullican
Wayne K. Wilson
Tremaine K. Gearhart
Don L. Purtzer
Arthur L. Kirk
William R. Topping, Jr.
Charles E. Bousquet
Robert E. Ellis
Ralph W. Faxon
Robert D. Hicks
Robert F. Bruchman
William D. Farnham
John O. Ragsdale
George B. Thomas
Robert R. Hall
Bruce A. Lantz
David H. Smallman
Thomas E. Hedge II
Billy G. Coons
Joseph S. Memolo
Ray L. Widener
Clifford Brogan
John W. Hoggard, Jr.
Arthur B. Davis
Jerry L. Titus
Wood D. Waits
Richard C. Layman
Elmer W. Bailer

BANDMASTER

Compton C. Owens, Jr.
George F. Vipavetz
Ned E. Muffley

ENGINEERING

Paul V. Williams, Jr.
Robert I. McCullough
Chapin C. Brooks
Leon E. Strangeway
Harold R. Banks
Fernley R. Wagner, Jr.
John L. Barry
John F. Cameron
Eugene G. Fiske
George H. Smith
Thomas S. Snead
Charles E. Walt III
James S. Frederick
Robert J. Hotalen
Gerald E. Long
Lawrence F. Keidel
Kenneth M. Nilsson
Marvin L. Mohler
Gayland C. Ivie
Jack R. Sadler
Harry L. Appel
Nick H. Grantham
Dwayne J. Heitzman
Clarence W. Burck
Walter L. Alley
Robert C. Whitehead
James G. Bennett
James W. Draper

Marion E. Carver
John E. Coyle
Dean W. Densmore
James F. Turner
Dix Richardson
Duane S. Warney
Steve A. Minnick, Jr.
Clifford V. Cook
Don M. Horne
Derrell Maroney
Robert J. Spooner
Ernest B. Migliorini
Carl T. Duncan
William E. Lloyd
Leonard S. Lyons
Clifford E. Pollock
Franky G. Watford
Robert L. Looney
George E. Eastberg
John R. Roberts
Daniel G. Whealton
Thomas F. Parker
Charles M. McCrea
Richard L. Bean
William E. Walker
Ellison J. Hearn
Charles D. Aubin
George H. Roberts
William Williams
William E. Breidert
Joseph T. Rucker
Robert W. Carlson
Robert S. Landis
Benjamin J. Gomes
James R. Lindley
Millard A. Cox, Jr.
Henry B. Cook
James E. Summers, Jr.
Eugene P. Krause
Robert A. Melody
Raymond L. Neesley
Jay E. Anthony
Fred L. Languell
Robert J. Jones
Robert A. Lewis
Harry R. Andress
James M. McGrath
James P. Franks
Jose G. Escajeda, Jr.
Edward T. Lyon
John P. Heathscott
James P. Underwood
Alvin G. Cook, Jr.
Victor D. Segal
Martin L. Salter
James A. Vogt
Leroy J. Doran
John E. Hethcox
Kenneth D. Bryant
George E. Gifford
Earl C. Pike
Thomas J. Cooney
Peter C. Dirkx
Paul E. Tuttle
David F. Long
James C. Greene
Robert H. Obrien
Vander Clark, Jr.
Merton W. Arnold
Johnie R. Ashley, Jr.
Howard D. Harger

HULL

Earl D. Shaw
Gary T. Hahn
George Laurick
Frederick S. Moore
Robert F. Foley
Roy E. Isaksen
John B. Lakin, Jr.
John D. McNab
Charles H. Johnson
Ralph J. Sage
Louie A. Schwartz
Walter W. Hess
Walter O. Nelson
Harold D. Smith
Jack L. Stevens
Lloyd J. McNabb
Joseph Dixon Millis
Kenneth F. Payton
Robert R. Williamson, Jr.
Forest D. Williamson

ELECTRICIAN

James N. Benson
Joe B. Goodson, Jr.
Eugene J. Bakkala
Paul E. Thorn
Jack H. Sweet
John L. McDonald, Jr.
Paul D. Tyson
Golden H. Johnson
Arthur A. Fried
Sheldon L. Loveless
James B. Cumbie
George A. Stevenson
Frank W. Outcault
John F. Butterfield
William E. Watson
Walter L. Baird
Gerald G. Boyd
James L. Soderberg
Billie G. Kear
James E. Brashear, Jr.
Jay S. Webb
Edward E. West
Robert F. Smith
William A. Turner
Arthur R. Lassley
Charles R. Haire
Wilbert E. Dawson, Jr.
Calvin E. Keich
Roger W. Tucker
Gerald W. Kunz
James L. Rhodes
Jeremiah J. Murphy
Phillip D. Meek
James J. DeGange
Samuel W. Helm
Paul E. Pritchard
Lyle D. Vandenberg
Harry A. Brown
Paciano F. Bartolo
Joseph S. Stemmer, Jr.
John C. Malone
Charles K. Micele
Joseph Fox
Forest J. Cobb
John J. Joyce
Allan D. Campfield
Daniel E. Lambson
James M. Hollett
Norman S. Reaume
George M. Collins
Forney N. Richardson, Jr.
Edward S. Golie
Robert W. Holzapfel
Sidney T. Jones
James W. Dudgeon

ELECTRONICS

James R. Simmons
Douglas J. Johnson
Virgil E. Morrison
Arthur B. Cox
Pickens W. Irvine
Charles R. Trippel
Paul F. Kiser
Raymond F. Polk, Jr.
Harold S. Bush
Ronald G. Schwendinger
Donald A. McNett
John Butrovich III
Robert H. Yates
Donald L. Jackson
Darrell L. Valentine
William D. Ridley
Bobby P. Staton
Howard W. Dole
Gerald B. Swearingen
Marvin L. Duffy
William J. Edmison

Theodore W. Huckabone
Clayton N. Hilsabeck
Glenn W. Hinds
Franklyn E. Winterberg
William J. Byrd
Richard N. Hansen
Robert D. Poole
John J. McCool
Herman L. Skambraks
Leslie M. Collins
Robert F. Boehme
Paul P. Villandre
Gerald P. Hansen
Milford E. Andersen
William J. Sharp
Donald H. Laudenbach
Fred Krejci
Joseph L. Byrns

CRYPTOLOGY

Robert A. Maze
Hilbert R. Hubble
George E. Suthowski
Richard H. Schrader
Loyle B. Dozier
William H. Deemie
Richard E. Bornman
Kellogg P. Humphreys
Aaron J. Claassen
Bobby D. Kochenower
Robert J. Jensen
Robert J. Wagner
Vander D. Hakes
Jac S. Weller
John W. McLaughlin
William H. Vernon
Sylvester Sneidar
Jack L. Eargle
Charles R. McIntyre
David R. Phaneuf
William D. Kahl
Robert W. Donald
Dale E. Fuller

AVIATION OPERATIONS

Bobby R. Lanier
Robert L. Allison
James T. Ferguson
Thomas W. McMahon
Robert E. Morgan
Mark S. Short
David A. Radford
Richard W. Ritz
Maurice C. Tosspon
Eldon L. Armstrong
Leroy O. Storaasli
Bert J. Anzini
Delbert P. Hoglund
Ambler B. M. Lopez
Arthur D. Billingsley
Norman E. Russ
Sumner C. Brown
Charles W. Baggett
George B. Hale, Jr.
Earl Armstrong, Jr.
Norman T. McCrimmon

PHOTOGRAPHY

Larry E. Kramer
Ray L. Clark
Donald F. Williams
Edward E. Bonjorni
Stanley C. Baker
Gary B. Gross
Harold Abbott
Larry N. Wilson

METEOROLOGY

Albert G. Dentremont
Richard D. Pritchard
Jack C. Hansen
Theodore J. Bourdon
James W. Stanfield
Roger W. Mason
Vernon R. Thompson
Robert J. Gray
Karl M. Haacke
Daniel J. Lepore
Dale E. Grages
Harold E. Collins, Jr.
Raymond F. Martinson
Paul O. Grisham

AVIATION ORDINANCE

Guy Almond Smith, Jr.
Alva D. Watson, Jr.
Robert W. Bryant
William A. Hefty
Ronald J. Thurman
John F. Kautz
George G. Wright
Allen L. McFearin, Jr.
Albert E. Robinson
Judson J. Hendricks
Jere F. Galloway
Robert K. Middlebrook
Kenneth L. Kelley
James W. Kincheloe

AVIONICS

Robert C. Bucholz
Willis T. Wright
Richard A. Christianson
Edwin H. Gless
John M. Jeffords
Lawrence S. Gray
Floyd M. Oakes
George W. Green
Norman L. Hansen II
Robert C. Roffey
Sherman M. Hunnell
Gilbert E. McGauley
Arthur Cornett
Geroge R. Jones
John P. Hall, Jr.
Robert W. Ballinger
Glenn J. Boston
Oval D. Brown
William V. Collins, Jr.
Francis L. King
James P. Dillon
Leonard Gordon
Roy B. Jackson
Ronald W. Morell
Jack T. Swann
Edmund C. Cegler
Reginald C. Webb
Richard L. Taylor
Jimmie D. McKnight
William M. Greenwell
Stephen M. Bahr
Richard S. Brown
Glen T. Paulson
Francis L. Miller
Richard L. Jacobson
Franklin Drake
Richard L. Chambers
George U. Creamer
Leroy E. Buffin
George W. Bunch
Marion L. Beaudrot, Jr
Rufus R. Sikes
Franklin O. Fox
Eugene Jordan
David L. Grossglass
Robert W. Cummings
Richard O. Erickson
Richard J. VanPelt
James E. Thorley
Henry B. Quinn, Jr.

AVIATION MAINTENANCE

Lavern D. Listol
Phil Z. Stratton
James B. Janes
William J. Newton
James E. Graham
Robert H. Herrmann
Jack J. Kaufman
Frederick Dassler, Jr.
John E. Matthews
David F. Elliott
Robert W. McKean
Claude L. Overson
Delmar E. Patridge
Freddie J. Patten
Gene D. Ralston
Donald E. VanBelle
Roland H. Pritchett
Dale M. Burns
Laroyce Shaw
Melvin A. Koch
Eugene M. Savage
Charles E. Hudson
Edmund J. Shustack
William A. Longstreth
Glen L. Goddard
James A. Singleterry
Mitchell O. Scobee
Clifford L. Cornell
Robert A. Gammons
Walter E. Carlyon III
Eugene E. Ernst
Donald L. Disharoon
Jeff G. Winthrope
Earl W. Gipp
Gaylon S. Hall
Bobby D. Crosson
Martin P. Young
Fred B. Irwin, Jr.
John L. Yeager
Claude D. Reynolds
Charles L. Templin
James R. Jones
Carl E. Snodgrass
Earl D. Shuford
S. J. Stone
Colin C. Pemberton
John T. Hall
Theadore R. Land
Robert W. Compton
Edwin R. Pryor III
George A. Felgar
Douglas F. Nicholson
Neil L. Wheeler
Baxter E. Biggs
Hartwell E. Nolan, Jr.
Anthony S. Adams
Gayle W. Bass
Frederick D. Cotton
Jack H. Gillespie
Barthol E. Talaasen
Robert V. Hull
Marvin A. Jensen
Dudley P. Keller
Henry C. Cole
Bobby J. Dickson
Roland F. Namtvedt
Lawrence L. Bedell
Charles E. Sisk
William C. Donahue
Idus L. Stockton

David H. Dalton, CTCA, U.S. Navy, to be an ensign in the line of the Navy, limited duty only, for temporary service, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

The following-named candidates selected as alternates to be ensigns in the Navy, for temporary service, limited duty only, in the classification indicated, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Ronald E. Ortenstone
James E. Mickelson
Jerry D. Crowe

OPERATIONS

Ronnie M. Campbell
Julian A. Galloway
Jack Bailey
Maxie H. Carter
Jerry D. Ward
John S. Townsend, Jr.
Gustavus A. Myers
Theodore McJunkin
James W. Lapp
Richard J. Fairhurst

ORDNANCE, CONTROL

Robert D. Dial
James L. Waters
Richard H. Pickering

ADMINISTRATION

Alan A. Smith
Erwin A. Sharp
Richard J. Adams
Roger D. Hughey
Tommy Shaw
Joseph C. Seckel
William D. Jones
Willis R. Kiker
Grover E. Wood

ENGINEERING

Antone Texeira, Jr.
Edward H. Remmers
Everett E. Sears
Grady L. Belt, Jr.
Floyd E. Rogers
Gene C. Harrison
Floyd A. Walker
James R. Howell
William D. D. McKenzie
Elwood Anders
Richard L. W. Smith
Eugene I. Trego
Gaylord W. Smelker
George P. Morrow
Bobby K. Redwine
Ralph H. Shaw

HULL

Robert Massey
Francis J. Lemieux

ELECTRICIAN

Norman C. Martin
Richard L. Bean
Charles Emmett Bowman
Joseph H. Schmidt
Wilson R. Estes, Jr.
George L. Williams
Robert J. Estep
James D. Zumwalt

ELECTRONICS

Leroy E. Jones
John E. Shaw
James A. Cullins

CRYPTOLOGY

Carl L. Moffett
Michael C. Osband
William N, Granville
Harry A. Brooks, Jr.

PHOTOGRAPHY

Eugene A. Havens

METEOROLOGY

Frederick K. Martin
Nathan L. Greenfeldt

AVIONICS

Frank J. Bowers
Richard D. Hartman
Clinton O. Roderick
Homer B. Graham, Jr.
Paul T. Chapman
Donald G. Robertshaw
James R. Trickett
Martin M. Boone
Eugene E. Lemay
Anton C. Magera, Jr.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 20, 1964:

COMMUNITY RELATIONS SERVICE

LeRoy Collins, of Florida, to be Director, Community Relations Service, for a term of 4 years.

IN THE ARMY

The nominations beginning James H. Aarestad, to be major, and ending Richard M. Wrona, to be second lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on June 29, 1964.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate, July 20, 1964:

POSTMASTER

The nomination sent to the Senate on June 16, 1964, of Mr. Raymond S. Manning to be postmaster at North Franklin, in the State of Connecticut.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Proposed Revision of the Copyright Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 20, 1964

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I have today, at the request of the Librarian of Congress, introduced a bill for revision of the copyright law.

The last general revision of the copyright laws occurred in 1909. Tremendous changes in technology have taken place in the intervening half century. These have fostered entire new industries and new methods for the reproduction and dissemination of literary and artistic works. The 1909 statute is no longer adequate for present-day conditions.

Past efforts to bring the copyright laws up to date have failed. In 1955 Congress provided funds for a comprehensive study by the Copyright Office as the groundwork for a general revision and in 1961, after much study, the Register issued a tentative report containing detailed recommendations. Widespread discussions of the Register's report were undertaken.

A little over a year ago, the Copyright Office began presentation of sections of a draft bill to a panel of experts. The transcript of earlier meetings of the panel on the Register's report have been printed by our committee and we will also print the further discussions on the draft sections.

In the 87th Congress, the Judiciary Committee considered and approved House Joint Resolution 627, which provided for the temporary extension to December 31, 1964, of the renewal terms of all copyrights subsisting at the time the President signed the measure on September 19, 1962. The approval of this bill by the Congress indicated its interest in considering overall copyright legislation. I am therefore glad to find that the Register of Copyrights has submitted a bill at this time.

I wish to emphasize, however, that the purpose of introducing this legislation at this time is to provide an opportunity for examination by interested groups so that any suggestions or recommendations which they may wish to submit may be studied before the measure is taken up for consideration in the next session of Congress.

The auguries for substantial progress in copyright law reform are favorable. I cannot emphasize too strongly the necessity for flexibility and compromise in this area. We have had a long period of preparation and it is time to proceed.

Award of Distinguished Service Medal to Hon. Carl Vinson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 20, 1964

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the citation which accompanied the Distinguished Service Medal that was awarded to the Honorable CARL VINSON, together with the speech delivered by Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara in connection with the award of the medal, during the ceremonies honoring the gentleman from

Georgia [Mr. VINSON] at Fort Lesley J. McNair on June 26, 1964.

Secretary McNamara's remarks were most appropriate for this memorable occasion, and the citation accompanying the award of the Distinguished Service Medal to CARL VINSON speaks for itself.

The President of the United States and the Secretary of Defense have bestowed a highly deserved honor upon our most distinguished colleague. No one who has had the privilege of knowing CARL VINSON could find any public servant in the history of the Nation more deserving of the honors that have been bestowed upon him.

SPEECH DELIVERED BY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE ROBERT S. MCNAMARA AWARDING DISTINGUISHED SERVICE MEDAL TO CHAIRMAN CARL VINSON, JUNE 26, 1964

We meet on occasions such as this primarily to honor our great men—and CARL VINSON is a great man. But we have also another motive, which is selfish: We hope that some of their virtues will be reflected back on us and that we will ourselves be better for having known them.

For myself, certainly, I can say that I have profited from each day of the more than 3 years that I have been privileged to associate with CARL VINSON in the work of preserving the Nation's defense. Wisdom, after all, is a function of age, and Mr. VINSON first took his seat in the Congress of our country 2 years before I was born. He was 15 years old when Theodore Roosevelt charged up San Juan Hill. By the time I came along, he had dealt with whole generations of brash young men. But he greeted them all, as he did me, with unfailing courtesy, infinite patience, and a constant readiness to impart to us whatever portion of his great store of wisdom we were able to absorb.

CARL VINSON has achieved more than most men ever attempt. None has more fully earned the gentle pleasures of retirement or has more laurels on which to rest while doing it.

Since we cannot in good conscience begrudge him the right now to hand on to others a burden he has carried so well and so far, we can only express our gratitude—and our belief that he does indeed leave us wiser than he found us.

It is both my pleasure and honor to award to Mr. VINSON the Distinguished Service Medal, the citation for which will be read by Mr. Vance.

To CARL VINSON for exceptionally meritorious and distinguished service to the Nation in a position of great responsibility.

Since his election to the Congress of the United States in November 1914, as chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee, and as chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, Mr. VINSON has brought to the service of his country a knowledge of military affairs without parallel. With deep concern for the security of America, and with a profound understanding of the relationship of military strength to that security, he has championed legislation which has progressively strengthened the Armed Forces of the Nation. With vigor, fearless integrity, and selfless devotion, he has guided his committee to the resolution of many of the most complex and fundamental problems confronting the Defense Establishment. The Nation is indebted to him and his committee for the fact that it has never been so strong and so secure; the members of the Armed Forces are indebted to him for his unending concern for their welfare.

Patriot, legislator, statesman, military expert, and a man of great humanity—he has earned the deep appreciation of his country, and gained the affection and respect of all.

At the direction of the President, the Distinguished Service Medal is hereby presented to CARL VINSON for his outstanding contributions to the Armed Forces and to the Nation.

——— ———,
Secretary of Defense.

JUNE 26, 1964.

H.R. 3846 Is Needed Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 20, 1964

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, passage of H.R. 3846, the land and water conservation fund bill which this House is considering, would be of substantial benefit to my State of Iowa and to my district in southwest Iowa.

In Iowa we hear a lot of talk about the recreation pressures of the East and about need for more areas around the metropolitan complexes. You can take it from me that my State is just as concerned about outdoor recreation as anyone else, East or West. A few years ago we passed legislation enabling counties to establish county conservation boards for the express purpose of acquiring and developing park and other outdoor recreation areas. Seventy-two of our ninety-nine counties have established such boards. They levy a tax averaging 0.6 mill. This provides about $2 million annually and all of it is going into needed recreation areas. In my own district, 14 of the 19 counties have such boards.

In my estimation, passage of the land and water conservation fund with its grants-in-aid to States for recreation purposes would stimulate increased activity on the part of both the State and of the counties. For example, the Federal funds, available on a matching basis, could help us develop the three new State parks which we have acquired in my district. They would help also in acquisition and development of other Iowa State parks, both in my district and elsewhere. The counties could benefit from passage of the land and water conservation fund because of the provision which allows States to allocate to political subdivisions moneys received as grants-in-aid. This is possible providing the county projects involved are incorporated in a comprehensive statewide outdoor recreation plan. Iowa is working on such a plan.

All of this can mean more picnic and camping grounds, better protection of the spring feeding grounds for all wildlife along the Missouri River, and development of recreation areas in the Ox-Bow Lake areas being created as channel straightening on the Missouri progresses, among many other benefits. Significantly the Iowa State Legislature in 1963 passed a law which enables us to accept Federal funds for use in planning, acquiring and developing outdoor recreation areas.

The provisions of the land and water conservation fund bill constitute a responsible approach to resolving some of our outdoor recreation needs. It makes good sense to charge modest admission and user fees at developed Federal recreation areas, for the recreationist who goes to such places is getting special service. It makes good sense to transfer proceeds from the present tax on motorboat fuels from the highway trust fund to the land and water conservation fund. There is sound logic in allocating proceeds from sale of surplus Federal real property to the land and water conservation fund. Proposed advance appropriations to the fund meet with my approval, since they are to be repaid to the Treasury out of proceeds from recreation revenues.

We are particularly anxious to see the Federal Government devote part of its share of the land and water conservation fund to such projects as those which enhance recreation and fish and wildlife at Federal water facilities projects. We think Iowa and other States would benefit if they were to channel some of the available funds into developing recreation areas along the route of the Lewis and Clark Trail.

Our recreation needs in Iowa, as elsewhere, are great and growing. The land and water conservation fund bill, H.R. 3846, will help provide for future requirements. It has our wholehearted support.

Captive Nations Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 20, 1964

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, Captive Nations Week is a time for the pondering of values. Following as it does our own Independence Day, our celebration of our own birth of freedom and nationhood, it cannot but make us contrast our own good fortune, our pride, and joyful appreciation of liberty and freedom.

Nor are we smug in any notion that it is peculiar to our people and Nation, this love of freedom. Infrequent though its manifestations may be, sometimes latent, but more often inhibited among the captive nations, there is unquestionably a sense of independence increasingly apparent among all men.

The enormous enthusiasm with which Robert Kennedy was greeted in Poland this month—July 1964—bears witness to the love of freedom which permeates the soul of that captive nation. So great was the display that, according to report, the Polish Government asked that he alter his course and not visit centers where popular acclaim would be likely to occur. Nevertheless, no matter where he went on this family vacation tour, the crowds were there, on the sidewalks, in the streets, filling the doorways and windows stories high. These were smiling and cheering crowds. How they had known of his coming no one was able to say. Something like an intuitive radar had spread the word ahead. It was the more remarkable because he not only was not invited, he was not welcomed by the Government, by the officials of the cities and towns. But the people were not to be stilled in their expressions of fervor.

What better evidence could there be of the undying spirit of liberty, the indomitability of the human heart that bows to no master, the yearning for independence that transcends all barriers? For to these people Robert Kennedy was the symbol of what America stands for; what, despite its foibles, it has stood for since the American Revolution—the spirit of liberty, fraternity, equality in individual worth. To them he carried the torch which his brother, our beloved late President, had so recently relit, and with it kindled a glow seen round the world.

Can we fail to see the implications of these demonstrations on the part of the people of a captive nation? Can we be oblivious to the fact that they have never succumbed in spirit to the yoke which binds them? A whole new generation has been born and reared in this state of semicaptivity. Yet the young people share the deep-rooted sentiments of their forefathers, the ideals of their parents, maintained despite the superimposing of a regime which seeks to shatter their values. They shared in this courageous and happy expression of self in the face of undue authority. They share the will and determination to surmount their shackles, as generation before generation had done. Their ancestors for centuries had withstood waves of invading hordes from east, west, and south, whose physical presence and attempts to submerge this proud nation were unable to obliterate the culture, the customs, and the ideals of the Polish people.

And the Polish people are typical of the peoples of the nations which share the captive yoke. As far back as European history can be traced we find among them records of captivity endured but not subduing, of superimposed authority resisted, of the retaining of the right of self-expression despite attempted suppression, and finally of oppression overcome.

These traits the captive nations have in common. Alas, too, how much else do they share in the history of "man's inhumanity to man"? Many of these peoples, many of these ethnic groups share a place in the annals of civilization which would be overwhelmingly distressing were it not for the fact that the very history of their vicissitudes is also a record of their fortitude, their faith, and the triumph of true values through their undying spirit of independence. For many, their history is a series of dark tales of overrunning hordes from neighboring states, plundering, destroying, attempting complete domination. But, however dark that history, it is studded with the bright and enduring stars of ethnic personality maintained and shining through the clouds that would cover but cannot obliterate them.

Those stars that mark the permanence of enduring values also bespeak the eventual clearing of the skies. And for all of the captive nations there have been long stretches of clear weather, of existence as independent nations, when, as in nature, their growth and strength has been fortified. Perhaps the dark days not only make the days of light more valued; perhaps—as also in nature—the very darkness of the clouds and the precipitation of the deluge lends stimulus to that growth, and the roots of freedom, the strands of individuality and liberty of soul are stronger when the days of light return.

The fortitude with which the peoples of the captive nations cling to their hope for the future, to their independence of spirit, to their love of freedom—to their enduring values is an inspiration for generation to generation, which we in America share.

Captive Nations Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 20, 1964

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, once again, during the third week of July, it is my privilege to pause with my colleagues in observance of Captive Nations Week. Again we solemnly renew our pledge to keep alive the ideals of freedom and independence which still exist among those people cut off from freedom by the Iron Curtain.

Almost 20 years have passed since the people of Eastern Europe fell vicitm to the iron grip of communism. The Soviet Union devoured Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. She then went on to dominate Poland, Hungary, East Germany, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Bulgaria, and Albania. Mr. Speaker, this is indeed a tragic list, but it would be an even greater tragedy if we, as Americans, were to forget the plight of these once-free people. Although time has passed since the subjection was fresh in our minds, and spots of rust are appearing on the Iron Curtain with the easing of tension in Poland and Hungary, and the recent independent economic policies of Rumania, we would, nevertheless, be untrue to our American heritage and remiss in our duties as free men, if we did not do everything in our power to keep alive the torch of freedom which burns in the hearts of all captive peoples.

More than 100 million citizens live in these captive nations. Thousands of them have given their lives in protest against their captivity. In East Germany in 1953, patriots fought tanks with bricks torn up from the street in a valiant but futile attempt at rebellion. In Poland in 1956, workers dared the wrath of the Soviet oriented government with their protests against oppression. How many brave men still languish in the prisons of Budapest, because of their desire to be free from the yoke of tyranny? How many more died under Russian bayonets as their shortlived revolution in 1956 was crushed by the Soviet Army? Today resistance to Communist domination continues. The Berlin wall gives mute testimony to this fact. Less than 100 miles from our own shores, Cubans are, at this very moment, risking the perils of the sea in tiny boats because their belief in liberty is greater than their fear of such a hazardous journey.

Our task, as the leader of the free world, is to keep alive the hope of liberty in the hearts of the freedom-loving people behind the Iron Curtain. We must continue to show these people that we have not forgotten them, and we must give them hope that someday they may again enjoy the inalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. We must encourage the nations of Eastern Europe to identify themselves with their Western neighbors and turn their eyes from East to West. Finally, we must continue our efforts through our broadcasts over the Voice of America and Radio Free Europe to be a constant source of truth and inspiration to the people of these nations, for the fight for freedom in our world today is the responsibility of all people, not just those who are struggling to escape the oppression of Communist domination.

One hundred and eighty-eight years ago we fought as a nation to free ourselves from foreign domination and we were not denied this aspiration. We cannot be forgetful of, nor faithless to the brave men who preceded us and endowed us with the blessings of a free country. It is our responsibility as the leaders of a country which has historically supported the cause of freedom and has traditionally abhorred the conditions of slavery and servitude which have been forced upon the nations behind the Iron Curtain, to once again reaffirm our position that we will never close our eyes to the tyranny perpetrated by the Soviet Union upon the nations it dominates.

Statement by Congressman Thompson Stresses Importance of Keeping Public Advised on Work of Their Representatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN E. WILLIS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 20, 1964

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I am sure we all would agree that this Nation could not remain the free country we know it to be today were it not possible for our people to be kept well informed and provided with factual information by which to judge the work of their Representatives.

In this connection I would like to call attention to the following statement by our colleague, Congressman T. A. THOMPSON, reporting on his activities in behalf of his constituents:

To My Good Friends and Constituents:

The past 12 years have been important ones in preparing for the future of our people, and I feel I should give you a progress report at this time. Many things have occurred which have proved most beneficial to our areas, while, of course, some things have transpired which have not, in my opinion, been necessary for securing the welfare of our people. Nevertheless, over the years I have worked with those who share my belief that for America to advance and be strong we must work as a team.

In the spirit of teamwork during this period of tense domestic and international unrest, I have been vigilant to every problem arising in Congress to the extent that my voting record has been documented at 93 percent attendance. The 7 percent of the time for which I am not recorded was spent, for the most part, in meetings in and away from my office on problems affecting the Seventh District involving such matters as persuading Secretary Udall to visit our district (in connection with my efforts to better accommodate our sportsmen and hunters), and in securing approval of a $300,000 four-river-basin Corps of Engineers survey in our areas (consistent with my fight for development and conservation of our water resources, streams and rivers). Of course, in attending meetings in lieu of answering certain quorum calls I have always exercised my best judgment in weighing the relative importance of the considerations on the floor against the matter on which I am working, and whether it has been established by the leadership that the result of the vote will be an overwhelming majority either for or against—such as was the case on the bill extending the Federal Airport Act which passed by a vote of 298 to 11 and which I missed because I was involved in a meeting concerning some industrial problems in Lake Charles.

Recently I gave a press résumé of what has occurred over the years involving problems facing the Seventh Congressional District and my efforts and attitudes in resolving them. In the event you did not note this statement in the local newspapers, I should like to quote principal sections of the report:

"During the past 12 years, I have gained positions of seniority on the Committee on Public Works and on the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries—both of which are vital to the economy of our district. Currently, I serve as chairman of the Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife, and my position as head of this subcommittee has served us well in matters of great interest to 350,000 sportsmen in Louisiana. I am happy to report we can now look forward to a better and more reasonable set of hunting regulations, including an early teal season in Louisiana.

"Briefly, I want to reiterate my platform and outline my accomplishments and aims for the people of the Seventh District. You have no doubt seen in the news recently that I have been able to obtain an important survey on flood control, navigation and drainage which is so essential to the farming interests of our whole district. Over the years, there have been projects for Bayou Courtableau, dredging of the Atchafalaya River, development of the Mermentau Channel, and many important improvements on the Calcasieu River—all of which have helped to create active interest among developers of industry in our district. The evidence of projects completed and those currently under construction show conclusively, in my opinion, that my past performance as Congressman from the Seventh District has not been idle talk. When it is considered that there are 434 other congressional districts over the Nation in competition with us, I am sure we can all agree that the Seventh District of Louisiana has received a lion's share in the return of our tax dollars for various community and public works projects in our areas. This, of course, is where taxpayers' funds rightly belong. Some years ago, as many of you will recall, I began to work on legislation making possible the Toledo Bend Dam. Today if you travel to the Sabine River area you will see it is quickly becoming a reality. Not only will this dam be a boom to the sportsmen, but it will also greatly enhance the economy of our entire area. As I am sure you have been aware, in recent years there has been a definite and ominous sign of Federal interference in matters affecting the everyday lives of our people. I have consistently worked to maintain our position and have fought with others who feel as we do—i.e., that we are well equipped to manage our own business without outside intervention and simply want the Government to give us back that which is rightfully ours through the distribution of taxpayers' funds.

"In the field of agriculture, our rice farmers have prospered during the past several years. In Washington we work as a specialized team and I am sure that you know I have been accepted as a member of that team in good standing. Other than my work on merchant marine and fisheries and matters involving flood control and drainage, I have been designated as the 'rice man' and my efforts with the Department of Agriculture and other Members of Congress have resulted in opening up world markets for additional rice sales. Also, with the enlightened leadership of the rice industry we have managed to publicize the value of rice as a food to the extent that domestic consumption is increasing each year. Consequently, I look forward to many years of sound agricultural economy in our areas.

"We in Washington have been successful in commanding the Nation's attention in the protection of our beef cattle industry, and I can assure you that no foreign imposition will disrupt its status.

"I have been instrumental in developing the food stamp program. I am certain it will soon be accepted nationwide and our great surpluses of farm products will be made available to people who need and deserve them without the loss of dignity.

"I have fought for a continuation of the American heritage of neighborliness where other countries are concerned, and it is my belief that after taking care of our own people, if we have an excess of food and fiber we should give assistance to other nations by shipments of these products to them instead of through the wasteful processes of the foreign aid program which is paid for by the taxpayers' dollars. We simple do not have a surplus of money.

"Over the years, we of the Louisiana team have layed the ground work for an equitable solution to the tidelands problem. Meetings are currently being held by ourselves and the State administration in order that we may present a united front in demanding a just settlement. I am confident that within a year we will have proven our case and will have established agreements which will be to our advantage.

"I am sure that State, parish and city officials throughout the district know that in my service as a full-time Congressman I have helped to develop many things which have added to the economy of our areas and to the comfort of many of our people. The seventh district is first in the development of interstate and other highways in which I have been able to assist because of my membership on the Public Roads Subcommittee.

"In the matter of national security, I have consistently followed the premise that if America is to remain strong we must defeat communism by showing our economic well-being in order to inspire peoples of other nations to demand a government which would allow them to enjoy life and liberty as we do. Of course, we must also continue our military strength in order to protect our 'government by laws' from being threatened by a communistic 'government by man.'

"With these two strengths evident in our Nation, Russia will always be afraid to chance annihilation by overt action. You may rest assured that our Nation is stronger today than it has ever been. I am in a position to know, and those who would cast doubts on the dedication and sincerity of our country's leaders simply weaken our efforts by creating doubts and suspicions in the minds of some of our people.

"I have stated the same platform every 2 years since I first asked for your support as your Representative in Congress. This platform has not changed and even though much of it has been accomplished, I accept these accomplishments not as a diploma of graduation, but rather as a challenge to move on to greater things.

"While not going into the details of my aims for the people of the seventh district, I would simply like to state that my representation of you is my life's ambition and, if given the opportunity, it is a challenge which I shall continue to meet. I want to help to truly balance agriculture with industry. I want to represent all of the people of our district in order that education and an opportunity of choice in careers might be made available to our youth in the pursuit of their happiness. Further, I pledge never to forget our responsibilities in caring for those who cannot care for themselves."

I truly feel that it is my responsibility and duty to make these views and developments known to you in order that you may be aware that my representation of you in Congress has been based on and in accordance with what you have asked of me during my tenure in office the past 12 years. I want you to know that I appreciate and invite your suggestions and constructive criticism in order that my efforts in your behalf can continue to be compatible with your wishes. Rest assured that I shall remain alert to the problems in our areas and our Nation as a whole.

FBI Chief Sees No Change in Reds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 20, 1964

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I am pleased to call to the attention of my colleagues a most important article by FBI Director, J. Edgar Hoover, as written for the distinguished news columnist, Victor Riesel. This column, entitled "FBI Chiefs Sees No Change in Reds," was printed in the Times and Democrat, of Orangeburg, S.C., on July 12, 1964.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD together with a news story reporting on a speech I made in South Carolina on this same subject on July 11, 1964.

There being no objection, the article and speech were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEWS RELEASE FROM THE OFFICE OF U.S. SENATOR STROM THURMOND, DEMOCRAT, OF SOUTH CAROLINA

MONCKS CORNER, S.C., July 11.—U.S. Senator STROM THURMOND tonight outlined "seven false notions about communism" which he described as being comparable to the "seven deadly sins."

The Senator discussed these points in a speech before the American Legion post in Moncks Corner. He charged that they are in large part responsible for U.S. setbacks in the war with communism.

Tabbed as "false notions about communism" were ideas (1) that the Communist leaders are changing into peaceful Socialists; (2) that the Communists can be trusted; (3) that communism is not an international conspiracy; (4) that there are good Communists, like Tito; (5) that communism feeds on poverty; (6) that the first Christians were Communists; and (7) that there is no need to fear communism in a prosperous country.

Thurmond lashed out strongly at the "false notions" that the Communists are changing and can be trusted. He said these fallacious ideas are primarily responsible for the U.S. "no win" foreign policy. "The idea our policy planners have," the Senator said, "is that we in this country can move swiftly to the left to become a Socialist state while the Soviets will move to the right and we can all get together in an international utopian Socialist order."

The Senator then cited quotations, facts, and statistics to support his position that the Communist aim of world domination has not changed. "All they change," he declared, "is their strategy and tactics—their goal of enslaving the world remains the same."

FBI Chief Sees No Change in Reds

(By J. Edgar Hoover, Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice)

Washington, D.C.—Knowledge without commonsense is very unwise. If we do not understand what we learn, then our knowledge has absolutely no power. Today we know a great deal about international communism, but do we fully understand the issue in this struggle between communism and democracy for leadership of the world? Or is it that we fully understand but have become tired of hearing the truth?

Some of our commentators and writers have recently been telling us that Russian communism is becoming more democratic; that it is moving nearer and nearer to our Western way of life; and that even the current rift between the Soviet Union and the Red Chinese is proof that we can trust the Russians—that we can deal with them on terms of mutual respect.

I wonder if we may be permitting our sincere and deep-seated longing for a peaceful world to dull our judgment? Certainly, there are many changes taking place today in the Communist world; however, these changes are primarily a rearrangement of the Communist structure to make tyranny more adaptable to the changing conditions of our era. Make no mistake, this attitude of hailing every change inside the Soviet as a sure sign that democracy is flowering behind the Iron Curtain can be dangerous. While I have no argument with efforts to achieve a peaceful world, I do think it would be folly to ignore the fact that we are dealing with individuals whose goal is the destruction of legitimate governments. In our hungry desire for peace, we must guard against being deluded into sacrificing interests that are not ours to give away. Peace cannot be bought by a compromise with evil.

The real issue is freedom—a principle handed down to us by those serious-minded and dedicated men who made a reality of a dream of national sovereignty. It is our solemn obligation to transmit that freedom to posterity—not to barter it away because we may lack the stamina to sustain loyalty to principle.

I have often called attention to the intensive program of the Communist Party, U.S.A. I have cited pertinent facts which should be known to every citizen who considers himself well informed about international communism. These included the fact that 40 million Communists now rule approximately one-third of the earth's 3 billion inhabitants and a fourth of her land surface. That, like it or not, communism exists legally or illegally in more than 70 free world countries, including our own. In the United States, international communism is represented by an aggressively defiant party whose members have an unswerving allegiance to the Soviet Union. This domestic party follows the dictates of Moscow, reflecting every significant change of direction or emphasis of policy, regardless of the consequences to our country.

And I pointed out that the Communist Party, U.S.A., is currently attempting to exploit every problem of American society by stressing issues such as the racial situation, the reduction of military spending and the abolition of all internal security programs including those congressional committees investigating communism.

The Communist Party, U.S.A., is also waging a relentless campaign to woo the youth of America into its ranks. The intensity of this effort is revealed by a statement made recently by Gus Hall, top-ranking national Communist Party official. He spoke of the success the party had in placing Communist speakers on various college campuses all over the country and he said this youth program was so important that he or any other national leader would go anywhere to meet with young students even if but one student is met.

The action already taken by the party emphasizes Hall meant what he said. Top party spokesmen, skilled in imparting the Communist line with espousals paralleling Soviet views, appeared before 45 college student groups during 1963. This drive is achieving success. Not too long ago Daniel Rubin, national youth director of the party, boasted that 65 percent of the young people attracted in the party's latest recruiting drive were students.

Our knowledge of communism must culminate in an implicit understanding that we are continually dealing with a false ideology—one that can assume many faces and one that can juggle words so that they have one sense in their premise but an entirely different sense in their conclusion. Commonsense must tell us that tyranny can take other forms than slave labor camps, firing squads, and purge trials.

And we must realize that peace cannot be purchased by a toleration of some of the excesses of communism. We must understand there can be no hope for the relaxation of the sufferings of mankind under communism except through logical thinking and action, and through a resolute facing of the world as it is, when the mask of make-believe is stripped off.

This deadly struggle will not be won by "halfway" Americans to whom life in this country is only the enjoyment of rights and privileges devoid of responsibilities. Its success may well depend on whether we are still capable of matching John Hancock's devotion to the cause of freedom. When told that lifting the siege of Boston would probably mean the complete destruction of the houses and other real estate on which his wealth was based, Hancock said: "If the liberties of our country require their being burnt to ashes—issue the order for that purpose immediately."

SENATE

Tuesday, July 21, 1964

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. Metcalf).

Rev. Charles Ray Peters, associate minister, White Rock Methodist Church, Dallas, Tex., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, foundation of all truth and good, Father of all peoples—yea, Father of all those who claim to be Thy sons, although at times we conduct ourselves as less than Thy sons: We pray that Thy blessing of courage be in the lives of those who shoulder so much responsibility for our great Nation's destiny.

Confirm them in the wisdom of Thy ways, as indeed we do know Thy ways. Encourage them to abide in that wisdom, beyond the pressure and prejudice of selfish fragmentation of our citizenry. Inspire them to a plane of leadership surpassing any our country has yet known. Comfort them when we, their people and Thy people, follow with indifference and abuse their sound leadership. May all Thy sons grasp hands, hearts, and lives, that we may make not just our United States "one nation under God," but our world one of godliness.

For all this, in the spirit of Christ, our example and our Redeemer, we pray, for He is Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, July 20, 1964, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9653) to extend the authority of the Postmaster General to enter into leases of real property for periods not exceeding 30 years, and for other purposes; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. Murray, Mr. Morrison, Mr. Dulski, Mr. Corbett, and Mr. Cunningham were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

On request by Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

MEETING OF COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE DURING SENATE SESSION TOMORROW

On motion by Mr. Muskie, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Commerce was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate tomorrow.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

Report on Unnecessary Costs Incurred When Privately Owned Vehicles Are Used for the Convenience of Personnel on Temporary Duty Assignments

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on unnecessary costs incurred when privately owned vehicles are used for the convenience of personnel on temporary duty assignments, Department of Defense, dated July 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Disposition of Executive Papers

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. Johnston and Mr. Carlson members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

RESOLUTION OF NEW YORK CONFERENCE OF THE UNITED CHURCH OF CHRIST

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I present a resolution adopted by the New York conference of the United Church of Christ, held in Albany, N.Y., relating to the foreign aid program, including the Peace Corps. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the Record and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Whereas in the words of our General Synod, "Mankind is, under God, one family"; and

Whereas the preservation and improvement of the welfare of all people, everywhere, affords the only secure foundation for the preservation of freedom and peace throughout the world; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States, in December 1963, failed to provide adequately for American needs in extending economic support to friendly and developing nations; and, in February 1964, failed to provide any appropriation for the contribution of the United States to the International Development Association, an agency of the World Bank that makes long-term loans to underdeveloped areas, using for that purpose contributions of our Government and of many other governments: Be it therefore

Resolved, That—

1. We strongly reaffirm our long-established position in support of a thoroughly adequate and diversified foreign aid program, including the Peace Corps, with increasing emphasis upon technical and consumers' assistance programs and upon programs conducted through multilateral international agencies;

2. We declare that the continuation of such programs on an adequately financed basis is mandatory, both as an act of Christian conscience in meeting our responsibility in the worldwide fight against poverty, as well as a means for insuring the safety and welfare of our own Nation;

3. We declare that the implementation of this resolution shall be the first concern of this conference in the field of world affairs during the year 1964; we instruct our committee on Christian social action so to act; and we call upon our associations and churches to participate fully in this task; and

4. We direct that copies of this resolution, together with the strongest possible supporting communications, be sent to all Senators and Representatives from the area served by this conference, and to the President of the United States, the appropriate officers of Congress, and other public officials, and to the press.

Nellie W. Baker,
Secretary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 724. A bill for the relief of Rollo Oskey (Rept. No. 1196);

S. 1626. A bill for the relief of Jack C. Winn, Jr. (Rept. No. 1197);

S. 2063. A bill for the relief of Honorata A. Vda de Narra (Rept. No. 1198);

H.R. 1742. An act for the relief of the Wetzel County Hospital, New Martinsville, W. Va. (Rept. No. 1199);

H.R. 3220. An act for the relief of Hugh M. Brady (Rept. No. 1200);

H.R. 3757. An act for the relief of Witold A. Lanowski (Rept. No. 1201);

H.R. 4501. An act for the relief of Anthony F. Bernardo and Ambrose A. Cerrito (Rept. No. 1202);

H.R. 5814. An act for the relief of Norman R. Tharp (Rept. No. 1203);

H.R. 6442. An act for the relief of Jasper E. Tate (Rept. No. 1204);

H.R. 6882. An act for the relief of the Maloney Bros. Nursery Co., Inc. (Rept. No. 1205);

H.R. 7346. An act for the relief of certain officers and employees of the U.S. Public Health Service (Rept. No. 1206);

H.R. 8184. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Blanton Darbro (Rept. No. 1207);

H.R. 8415. An act for the relief of Maj. Keith K. Lund (Rept. No. 1208);

H.R. 8479. An act for the relief of Georgette D. Caskie (Rept. No. 1209);

H.R. 8709. An act for the relief of Eugene R. Wooster, Jr. (Rept. No. 1210);

H.R. 8746. An act for the relief of Roger A. Ross (Rept. No. 1211);

H.R. 9199. An act for the relief of CWO Stanley L. Harney (Rept. No. 1212);

H.R. 9280. An act for the relief of Donald J. Kent (Rept. No. 1213);

H.R. 9615. An act for the relief of John A. Peralta (Rept. No. 1214);

H.R. 9764. An act for the relief of Anne S. Henkel (Rept. No. 1215); and

H.R. 10066. An act for the relief of Joe C. Oden (Rept. No. 1216);

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 1640. A bill for the relief of certain employees of the Alaska Railroad (Rept. No. 1217).

By Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

H.R. 9833. An act granting a renewal of patent No. D–162,975, relating to a medal of the American Legion (Rept. No. 1194); and

H.R. 9834. An act granting a renewal of patent No. D–161,955, relating to a plaque of the American Legion (Rept. No. 1195).

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT OF 1964—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—MINORITY VIEWS (S. REPT. NO. 1218)

Under authority of the order of the Senate of July 8, 1964, Mr. McNamara, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, submitted a report to accompany the bill (S. 2642) to mobilize the human and financial resources of the Nation to combat poverty in the United States, together with the minority views of Mr. Goldwater and Mr. Tower, the individual views of Mr. Javits, Mr. Prouty, Mr. Jordan of Idaho, and the individual views of Mr. Jordan of Idaho, which were ordered to be printed.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. KEATING:

S. 3010. A bill for the relief of Kim Sa Suk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 3011. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Yee Au-Yeung Chan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KUCHEL:

S. 3012. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the State of California certain lands in the county of Monterey, State of California, in exchange for certain other lands; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. Kuchel when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 3013. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to provide for nonrecognition of gain or loss on certain reacquisitions of real property; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. NELSON:

S. 3014. A bill for the relief of Speros L. Saites; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

LAND EXCHANGE FOR THE MONTEREY, CALIF., FREEWAY

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to exchange certain U.S. real property in the Monterey, Calif., area for certain property owned by the State of California.

The lands to be so acquired by the State of California would permit the division of highways to complete State Sign Route 1, for which new plans have been approved by local authorities and $5,800,000 have been provided for construction.

The bill would not only clear the way for final planning and completion of this important highway in my State, but would also benefit the Navy because the lands going to the United States from the State of California are of greater use to the Navy than the lands the Navy would give up in exchange. The bill contemplates three parcels going to the State in exchange for two to the Navy. The State property and the Navy property are both appraised at around $163,000. The Navy property is generally unadaptable for Navy use, one parcel being unimprovable, the second being very small and already encumbered by an easement, with the third including a steep hill. The State property, on the other hand, is predominantly level and adaptable for expansion of Navy facilities.

Legislation is needed promptly to authorize this exchange, as it represents a resolution, which I am informed is satisfactory to all interested parties, of a conflict it has taken almost a decade to solve.

I may say for the benefit of our brother from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] that the lands have been appraised at the same price, so I doubt the wisdom of urging any additional amendment to my bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3012) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the State of California certain lands in the county of Monterey, State of California, in exchange for certain other lands, introduced by Mr. KUCHEL, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT OF TITLE II OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT (AMENDMENT NO. 1115)

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I submit, and ask to have printed, an amendment which I intend to offer to H.R. 9393, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide full retroactivity for disability determinations, to extend the period within which ministers may elect coverage, and to validate wages erroneously reported for certain engineering aids employed by soil and water conservation districts in Oklahoma, now before the Finance Committee which would make several miscellaneous amendments to the Social Security Act.

In 1962, the Senate adopted my old-age assistance "Pin Money" amendment which would have permitted those receiving old-age assistance to earn up to $50 a month without such earnings being subtracted from their assistance grant. In conference, the amendment was changed to permit the first $10 and one-half of the next $40 to be disregarded.

The amendment I submit today would restore the Senate version of the amendment; namely, that any amount earned in a month up to $50 may be disregarded by the State agency in determining the amount of the old-age assistance grant. The major objections which agency officials raised to this in 1962 have not been substantiated and the cost has been much lower than was estimated. I think this amendment will cut down on administrative costs and will cause more States than the 22 jurisdictions now taking advantage of this amendment to permit their aged citizens the measure of dignity which comes from contributing to one's self-support.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received, printed, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

LOWER COLORADO RIVER BASIN PROJECT ACT—AMENDMENT (AMENDMENT NO. 1116)

Mr. MOSS submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 1658) to authorize, construct, operate, and maintain the Central Arizona project, Arizona-New Mexico, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and ordered to be printed.

IMPOSITION OF TAX ON ACQUISITIONS OF CERTAIN FOREIGN SECURITIES—AMENDMENTS (AMENDMENTS NOS. 1117, 1118, AND 1119)

Mr. SMATHERS submitted three amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 8000) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to impose a tax on acquisitions of certain foreign securities in order to equalize costs of longer term financing in the United States and in markets abroad, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

MOBILIZATION OF HUMAN AND FINANCIAL RESOURCES TO COMBAT POVERTY—AMENDMENT (AMENDMENT NO. 1120)

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota submitted an amendment to the committee amendment to the bill (S. 2642) to mobilize the human and financial resources of the Nation to combat poverty in the United States, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

DISCLOSURE OF FINANCIAL INTERESTS AND ENUMERATION OF CERTAIN PROHIBITED ACTIVITIES—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENT NO. 1121

Mr. MILLER submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the resolution (S. Res. 337) to provide disclosure of financial interests and to enumerate certain prohibited activities, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT NO. 1122

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I submit an amendment to the resolution (S. Res. 337) to provide disclosure of financial interests and to enumerate certain prohibited activities, which would extend the disclosure provisions of the pending resolution to a Senator's spouse. I had some question as to whether the plural of spouse is "spice" or "spouses." Personally, I prefer "spice."

Mr. President, Senate Resolution 337, although well drafted and the subject of long and serious consideration by the Committee on Rules and Administration, is not applicable to wives. Yet, 7 States and the District of Columbia have community property laws, and over 37 million couples file joint income tax returns. It is common practice in this country, in order to avoid personal liability, to assign title to property and assets to one's wife. I am not suggesting that any person who would be subject to this resolution would purposely attempt to avoid it, but our function here is to provide against such contingencies.

Moreover, I believe if we are to be consistent, we should include a Senator's spouse in the disclosure provisions of this resolution.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

NOTICE CONCERNING NOMINATION BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the following nomination has been referred to and is now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

Santos Buxo, Jr., of Puerto Rico, to be U.S. marshal, district of Puerto Rico, for the term of 4 years. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired March 9, 1964.

On behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in this nomination to file with the committee, in writing, on or before Tuesday, July 28, 1964, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning the above nomination, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearing which may be scheduled.

THE RACIAL CRISIS—A PLEA FOR LOVE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on May 14, 1964, William Stringfellow delivered an address to the Lutheran Church of Reformation in Washington, D.C., on the racial crisis.

It is an inspiring address, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A PLEA FOR LOVE

(Address by William Stringfellow)

"Take your share of suffering as a good soldier of Christ Jesus."—II Timothy 2: 3.

I am sick and tired of the racial crisis in America.

God knows how Negroes must feel, but I am now almost overwhelmed with the feeling that I do not want to hear anything more about it, or see anything more of it, or do anything more in it. I wish it could be somehow escaped or evaded or avoided.

There was another great crisis which this Nation endured, within my own recollection, about which I felt somewhat the same. During the Korean war, I was in the military service, though, mercifully, I was not stationed in Korea or called into combat, but nevertheless I remember—as many others also must—an acute fatigue in which I did not want to hear or see or do anything more about that war. I wanted it to somehow evaporate and make no more demands upon me. Yet I am pretty sure that this sentiment which I suffered during that war did not alleviate or abbreviate it in any way, but, on the contrary, contributed to the aggravation and prolongation of that crisis.

A similar thing is true of the racial crisis. I wish it would end without my being any longer or any more deeply involved. I would rather escape from what now happens to this Nation. Yet I am certain both in my mind and in my guts that this exhaustion will not hasten the resolution—much less reconciliation—of the racial crisis: It can only frustrate and compound it.

A MATTER OF SURVIVAL

There is no one in the land who is not now involved in the racial crisis. If there ever was an option about that, which I doubt, it has expired. The only issue that remains is how one is involved: obstinately, stupidly, irrationally, or with concern, intelligence and compassion. On that matter, let the white people in America at last face some simple truths:

1. The racial crisis is not a good cause in the sense of the conventional charities—cancer research or alms for the indigent or aid for victims of disaster. Let white folks renounce and forget the romantics of good works and the preposterous condescension of liberalism and confess that no white man is doing any favor for any Negro citizen by now advocating the ordinary rights of citizenship for the American Negro. The favor which is done by such involvement is as much for their own self-interest as for any Negro citizen.

2. The dimensions of the Negro revolution are such that the very survival of the Nation is at issue, and, therefore, the life and livelihood of every citizen is also at stake. I suppose this Nation can survive and continue to exclude from the mainstream of its political and economic life, for one example, the American Indian. Such exclusion will not disrupt politics or threaten the economy in a way quickly noticed by most citizens, however damaging such an exclusion may be for the country morally and psychologically. The exile from American society of the Indian is hardly noticed, but the segregation of 22 million Negro citizens from decent housing, educational opportunity, gainful employment, political responsibility, and free access to public accommodations is bound to threaten the survival of the Nation for everybody. The exclusion of that many citizens from society jeopardizes the political freedom, economic solvency, psychological stability and moral integrity of those who are not excluded just as much as those who are. In other words, let white people be involved now in this crisis because they finally wake to the fact that their own welfare is quite as much at issue as that of the Negro. Let the profound self-interest of white people in the Nation's survival finally end the paternalism of white men for black men in America.

3. The Negro revolution must be considered within the context of the traditions of American social revolution. The Nation came into being through the Boston Tea Party and other protests which matured into the American Revolution. Thereafter was the crisis over the Articles of Confederation and, then, the abolitionist movement and, eventually, the Civil War. Soon the Nation suffered the occupation of the South and the Reconstruction crisis. Later, with some time out for foreign conquest and war, was the movement for women's suffrage, the labor revolution, and the veterans rebellion during the depression, and, now, the Negro revolution. There is no great novelty to social revolution in America, and if the present revolt is seen as part of this history, an astonishing fact emerges: These revolts have been characterized by the ethics and tactics of violence until the Negro revolution, with the possible exception of the women's suffrage movement (the women were apparently nonviolent in their demonstrations in the streets, but who knows what happened when they returned home to their husbands?). Considering the vast numbers of citizens involved in the present revolution and the depth of their provocation, it is incredible that, so far, the Negro revolution has been dominated by the ethics and tactics of nonviolence. The forbearance of Negroes during these years of open protest has surely saved the blood of many whites—indeed the best friend, not excepting George Washington, the American white man has ever had turns out to be Martin Luther King.

A DILEMMA IN ETHICS

It is now about 7 years since the Negro revolution has been notorious and has had organization and direction. There have been all these years of peaceful protest: sit-ins and freedom rides and picketing and prayer vigils and marches. In that time, thousands of citizens have been arrested, hundreds have lost their jobs, scores have suffered abuse and humiliation in the churches, in schools, in the courts, in hotels and parks and other public places, even in their own homes, in the pursuit of their rights as citizens.

The question now seriously and urgently arises as to whether the tactics and ethics of nonviolence are vindicated in results. What does the American Negro citizen have to show for these long years of unparalleled dignity and humanity and restraint?

They have to show the body of Medgar Evers—rotting in its grave at Arlington National Cemetery. That's what they have to show.

They have to show the bodies of children in their graves in Birmingham. That's what they have to show.

Hundreds of citizens can show you the scars on their bodies where they have been branded by cattle prods or bruised by police clubs or bitten by dogs. That's what they have to show.

And there are still the children of Harlem—and the other Negro ghettos—who every night risk being devoured by rats that infest the tenements in which their families are consigned to live. That's what they have to show.

There is token integration now in many universities of the South. There is the same at most colleges and universities of the North. But that is all there is.

There is voluntarism in the churches, as well as tokenism in many businesses and public places, but virtually the only unsegregated premises in the Nation are those in communities with no Negro residents at all. That's what they have to show.

The civil rights bill has not even been enacted and the congressional handling of the matter—on both sides—seems both cynical and indifferent to the gathering peril of bloodshed and anarchy. That's what they have to show.

In other words, the ethics and tactics of nonviolence have not yet yielded significant changes in the practical day-to-day lives and livelihoods of the ordinary Negro citizens, while only that sort of change can possibly sustain the incumbent nonviolent Negro leadership in the revolution.

A CRISIS IN TACTICS

The kind of social change which has impact upon the practical lives of the multitudes of Negro citizens has not been launched by these years of peaceful protest, nor is there much evidence that that kind of change has either bothered the conscience or entered the contemplation of white citizens. And, thus, the spirit of revenge is loose to prey upon the frustration and despair which American Negroes have inherited from three centuries of slavery and segregation. The mood becomes more militant and aggressive and explosive as each moment passes. The passion is that it is better not to live than to be a Negro in American society—either in the South or the North—so what is there to be lost by turning to violent assault upon white society and white property and white people?

The watershed of the tactics of peaceful protest was reached in the march on Washington last summer. In the winter and spring that have followed, brushfires of violence have erupted in dozens of cities: in Cleveland 3,500 people rioted for 2 days; in Manhattan a "blood brotherhood" of Negro youths roams the city seeking white stores to loot and white men to rob or maim or murder; white merchants in the ghettos live in fear of their own customers; hate and the alleged futility of nonviolence is preached every night from the streetcorners of the slums; the police become a virtual occupation army in Negro neighborhoods.

There probably was a time—8 or 9 months ago—when enactment of the civil rights bill would have insured that the revolution remain nonviolent. Prompt passage of the bill, following the march on Washington, would have demonstrated that the ethics and tactics of nonviolence can secure tangible results. But that advantage of the bill has been and is still being daily dissipated by filibuster, compromise, and the acute myopia from which the Senate manifestly suffers.

About the only recognition of the now pathetic urgency of this crisis that I have observed in present debate on the bill is the complaint of Senators that they will not legislate under pressure. Do Senators think all citizens are fools? When, in modern times, has the Congress acted on any legislation of significance except under pressure of one sort or another?

I for one do not expect the Senate to act out of compassion for those who have been exiled from the mainstream of American life for three centuries just because they are Negroes. I had hoped the Senate would act out of concern for the vindication of the ordinary rights of American citizenship. But if the Senate will not, as it has not, act even for that cause, will the Senate not even act to forestall the anarchy and bloodletting that looms ahead? This cynical performance which takes place now in the Senate Chamber invites a day of wrath for all of us—black men and white men—in the Nation.

A DAY OF WRATH

As the day of wrath dawns, let it come as no surprise, especially to white men, either Senators or common citizens. After all, what is involved is not merely the frustration of these past several years of peaceful protest, nor just the insensibility of the Senate, but the inheritance of the past three centuries of slavery and segregation.

No Negro child is born in this land who has a responsible parent who is not taken aside at a tender age—at 4 or 5—when the child first goes to school, and told by his parent what it means to be a Negro in America and hears recited the whole saga of the Negro's exile from American society. And then and thereafter, for that child, it is not just his own experience and endurance of discrimination or rejection which are his cause, but now he is an heir to the suffering and travail of his whole people * * * just as each Jewish child who is born becomes an heir to the exile of the Jews from the Biblical times right up to the present time in Nazi Germany, in the Soviet Union, and, alas, also in many parts of the United States.

The exile of the Jews is as much an inheritance of the Egyptians and, now, the Germans. Both captive and captor have the same inheritance. The exile of the American Negro is as much an inheritance of white men in America. But white parents have not been wise enough to tell their children so. Why should it be surprising, then, that white men—confronted with the present crisis—respond ineptly, fearfully, vainly, stupidly, hysterically?

As the day of wrath comes, let white men in America at last confess that captors are always just as much prisoners as capitives and that the emancipation of those in bondage will also set free those who have kept them in bondage.

As the day of wrath begins, let it be realized that the real recalcitrant in the American racial crisis is not the so-called diehard segregationist of the South—least of all is it the pathological segregationist whose rationality has been destroyed by racism. Let neither the diehard nor the pathological segregationists have any comfort: they are not either so many or so important. The real recalcitrants—who are very many and very important—are the nice, white liberals in the North and in the South. They include multitudes of church members. They are respectable, sane, sincere, benevolent, earnest folk. They do not despise or hate Negroes, but they also do not know that paternalism and condescension are forms of alienation as much as enmity. They are the white people who, right now, are asking the question "What does the Negro want?" and think that by asking such a question progress has been made in race relations. They are the white people who are asking the question "What does the Negro want?" and fail to understand that this very question assumes that it is their prerogative to dispense to the Negro what the Negro will get. And, my friends, that assumption is the very essence of white supremacy. And it is that mentality—which most white Americans suffer—which must be exorcised if there is to be reconciliation between black men and white men in America.

On the day of wrath, however, as things stand now, the prospect is not reconciliation: the prospect is that Negro violence will be met by overwhelming counterviolence by the police—perhaps the Army—which the white establishment of America has at its command. If that day comes, the frightful peril for all Americans is that this Nation will take an irrevocable step into a police state—and the possibility of freedom for all citizens (which is the true aspiration of this revolution) will be aborted. That is the most ominous danger that the Nation confronts.

In the day of wrath, what could save the Nation from such a calamity is the recognition by white people that any hostility or assault by Negroes against whites and against white society originated in the long, terrible decades of exclusion and rejection of Negroes by white men. Negro violence now is the offspring of white supremacy. The sins of the fathers are indeed visited upon their sons.

A HOPE FOR ABSOLUTION

Now if it comes to pass that nonviolence is foresaken in the Negro revolution, then there is, I believe, a most specific witness to which white Christians in America are summoned. And I gladly commend that witness to my fellow white men who are Christians.

The witness of the white Christian, on that day, must surely be the same as the witness already, during these long years of protest and agony, exampled by so many Negro Christians: the witness of the Cross.

The Cross is not at all a religious symbol—it is profaned when it becomes that in the minds of men. Nor is the Cross just some reference to an event which took place once upon a time but which has no reality and correspondence in the present day. Rather the Cross means the invincible power of God's love for the world even though all the world betrays, denies, fears, or opposes the gift of His love for the world. The Cross means voluntary love which is unphased by any hostility or hatred or violence or assault. The Cross means voluntary love which is not threatened by death. The Cross means voluntary love which perseveres no matter what. The Cross means the gift of love even to one's own enemy—even to the one who would take one's life.

If it comes to pass that white men who are Christians are attacked by Negroes or endure ridicule or humiliation or interference or taunting or torture, if it comes to pass that white Christians are exposed to the loss of their possessions, or status, or jobs, or property, or homes, or even families, if one's own life itself is at issue, then, let the witness of the white Christian, for himself, for all white men, and, in fact, for all men everywhere, be the witness of the Cross.

When the knife is at the belly, let the white Christian not protest. Let him receive the assault without prudence, without resistance, without rationalization, without extenuation, without a murmur. Let him love in the face of his own death.

I suppose that is calling for and expecting a lot from white American Christians. I suppose my white American church members have long since forgotten and forsaken the Cross.

But God has neither forgotten nor forsaken the Cross.

And so there is no other way that this enormous, desperate, grotesque accumulation of guilt, enmity, estrangement, and terror can be absolved. There has never been—for any man anywhere at anytime—any other way.

In the work of God in our midst in reconciling black men and white men there is no escape from the Cross.

SENATOR DIRKSEN'S GENERALSHIP

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, before today many Senators and many people across the country saluted the distinguished minority leader on the superb role he played in fashioning the civil rights legislation which was recently enacted into law.

The richly deserved tributes to our great minority leader, Senator Everett McKinley Dirksen, for the superb and inspired leadership he gave to the passage of the Civil Rights Act from men and women in all walks of life—Democrats and Republicans—and from all sections of our national life and from all the news media are well known to all his colleagues in the Senate. One tribute to Senator Dirksen which pleases me very, very much—and I am sure it does the Senator, also—is an excellent editorial published in the Chicago Defender on June 22. This is one of the largest and most influential of the many great Negro newspapers in the country. It vigorously opposed the Senator in his reelection campaign in 1962.

As a Congressman he introduced the first Federal legislation to remove discrimination in the Armed Forces of our country, and thus we were not surprised by the minority leader's astute and patient generalship in the passage of this needed legislation. No one will dispute my assertion when I say the act would not have passed except for his constant participation in the legislative exertions attendant upon its passage.

The editor of the Chicago Defender, C. Sumner Stone, is a militant, able, and articulate spokesman for equal treatment under law for all Americans. I salute him for his tribute to Senator Dirksen. Mr. Stone is a graduate of Williams College and of Northwestern University. He traveled extensively abroad for the CARE program. He was a reporter for the Amsterdam News, in New York City. Prior to his becoming editor in chief of the Chicago Defender, he was editor of the Washington, D.C., Afro-American. He speaks with knowledge of the political and legislative scene, gained firsthand through his newspaper assignments and duties.

Among the tributes to our Republican leader's sterling, valiant, and successful fight which he waged in that field is an editorial comment published in the Chicago Defender for June 22, 1964, entitled "Dirksen's Generalship."

Mr. President, because this editorial published in the Chicago Defender is about a vital man and a subject vital to all of our people, I ask unanimous consent to have it printed at this point in the Record, as a part of my remarks; and I ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to take a few moments and read this tribute to our dear friend and fellow Senator.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Dirksen's Generalship

Men with a deep sense of their legislative and moral responsibilities usually rise to the occasion. The U.S. Senate's consideration of the mechanism by which to blunt the Southern bloc's favorite weapon—filibuster—provided the opportunity for the display, not of political sagacity, but of a conscious, purposeful design to be on the side of right and justice.

Despite a nebulous posture at the outset, Senator Everett McKinley Dirksen, of Illinois, the GOP minority leader, came through with flying colors when cloture on a 3-month-old southern filibuster on the civil rights bill became a crucial issue of far-reaching consequences not only to the Negro citizen but to the whole democratic process.

The antediluvian parliamentary marathon could not have been halted without substantial support from the Republicans. Senator Dirksen enlisted all but six Republicans in the drive against further delaying tactics of the Dixiecrats. And he did it, not with flamboyant rhetoric, but with unimpeacheable historical allusion, with cold unanswerable logic.

He pointed to the fatal blunders of the Whigs who, after two decades of compromising with principles, of misinterpreting and misreading the course of history—from 1834 to 1855—finally disappeared. Does the Republican Party, Dirksen inquired, deserve a better fate if it compromises on the issue of freedom?

"Since the civil rights votes of 1957 and 1960," Dirksen commented in an interview, "it has dawned in the national consciousness we are dealing with a profoundly moral issue.

"The comment of Victor Hugo, which I have quoted more than once, applies especially now: 'Stronger than an army is an idea whose time has come.' "

It is abundantly clear that the Senator has a sense of history and is much concerned with the sweep of events that might change the course of America's social history. His is the kind of perspective leadership that transcends partisan alinement.

Even in the high noon of our sharpest criticism of Senator Dirksen, we recognized his intellectual honesty, his rare talents, and the skills he can summon in defending his position on the ultrasensitive race issue. We must confess that in the past we have misunderstood his motives. Today, however, we doff our hats to him for the grand manner of his generalship behind the passage of the best civil rights measures that have ever been enacted into law since Reconstruction.

NEW YORK POST CALLS FOR GI BILL BEFORE CONGRESS ADJOURNS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the New York Post was founded by Alexander Hamilton in 1801. In an editorial published in this newspaper on Monday, June 22, 1964, it calls on the Congress to pass S. 5, the GI bill, before Congress adjourns. It asks whether measures aimed at structural unemployment will be passed before the Congress adjourns. It points out that June 20 is the anniversary of the enactment of the GI Bill of Rights 20 years ago.

The New York Post states that it shares with the New York Daily News enthusiasm for the results of the GI bill.

However—

I am reading from the editorial—

there is a new generation that needs to be given a helping hand.

Mr. President, it is noteworthy that two daily newspapers in New York City have called for the passage of the GI bill.

In my own State, I find more support for this bill, S. 5, than any other proposed legislation pending on the calendar of the Congress.

It is utterly inexplicable to me that the policy committee could let this bill languish since July of 1963, when it was reported by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and shut its eyes to the crying need of unemployed veterans, unable or unqualified to get work because of lack of training.

This is a most urgently needed piece of domestic legislation. Anyone who travels over the country will soon come to know that. A study of statistics on these veterans will prove it conclusively.

We talk about freedom, liberty, and the preservation of our rights. Those men defended liberty around the perimeter of the free world. The Government pulled them out of their places of business, their occupations, their schools, and their homes, and sent them overseas. Now it turns its back on them when they come back, their duty done, their country defended—liberty preserved.

Mr. President, as a young nation with a proud heritage, we of the United States are justly fond of our traditions, folkways and customs. Similarly, our country has realized that one of the main values of history is as a guide to avoid the same mistakes that may have been committed in the past.

Today, I should like to remind all Senators that the corresponding historical lesson of avoiding repetition of errors is to value the successes of the past as patterns for action in the future. Since 1647, when the Massachusetts Bay Colony wrote the first veterans' law of this country in order to care for its defenders, one of the most successful veterans laws we have enacted has been the GI bill.

On the basis of one of the most impressive legislative successes of the past, it is my belief that we should not ignore the original GI bill as a pattern for future laws, and that we should repeat our legislative wisdom by enactment of S. 5, the cold war GI bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this editorial from the New York Post of June 22, 1964, entitled "Needed: A New GI Bill," be printed in the RECORD, in order to remind us of the prominent accomplishments of this legislation.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Post, June 22, 1964]

NEEDED: A NEW GI BILL

Expansion of the economy, says Welfare Commissioner Dumpson, will not bring jobs to most of those who are out of work locally. The jobless have neither the training nor the education for the jobs that are becoming available.

But will Congress before it adjourns pass the antipoverty program and other measures aimed at "structural unemployment"? Not if the GOP and the budget balancers have their way.

This is the 20th anniversary of the enactment of the GI bill of rights. Our neighbor the Daily News salutes it as "the bill that built new lives for millions," the "billion dollar boondoggle" that has turned into a "billion dollar boon."

We share the Daily News' enthusiasm for the results of the GI bill. Today, however, there is a new generation that needs to be given a helping hand.

HOUSTON CHRONICLE COMMENDS GOOD WORK OF AREA REDEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION; CALLS FOR ITS CONTINUANCE

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, one of the Nation's leading newspapers, the Houston Chronicle, has—after extensive reportorial investigation, and actual sifting of the facts—published a series of highly favorable findings on the aims and achievements of the Area Redevelopment Administration.

The series spells out actual achievements in improvement of the economy in areas that have moved to take advantage of opportunities under the Area Redevelopment Act.

Mr. President, I believe that this is a very important series of articles because of the attacks we hear on the ARA which, in most instances, are uninformed.

The Area Redevelopment Act, S. 1 of the 87th Congress, was the first recovery measure of the Kennedy administration. Senator PAUL DOUGLAS was the father of the bill; I had the honor to be a coauthor.

I have supported the Area Redevelopment Act actively from the beginning, and have on numerous occasions assisted communities seeking information on how best to take part in this fine program.

The Area Redevelopment Act is the Magna Carta of rural-economy areas trying to revitalize their economies by attracting new job-creating industries and businesses, trying to stem the exodus of young people from the small towns and cities to the megalopolis, by providing them hope for a better future at home.

I commend the series of the Houston Chronicle and the thoughtful editorial which followed the last of the series to all Senators, and ask unanimous consent that all be printed in the RECORD. Stan Redding did an outstanding job of research and analysis. The articles, listed in the order published, are:

First of six, entitled "Agency That Has Helped Texas May Be Cut Down by Critics," Area Redevelopment Administration, June 21, 1964.

Second of six, entitled "Lawyer Sees East Texas as Industrial Empire," Texas and the ARA, June 22, 1964;

Third of six, entitled, "Opposite Views in the Lufkin Area," Texas and the ARA, June 23, 1964;

Fourth of six, entitled "Cherokee County Rich in Ore, but Could Anyone Make It Pay?" Texas and the ARA, June 24, 1964;

Fifth of six, entitled "Death of Woodville 'Greatly Exaggerated,' " ARA in east Texas, June 25, 1964;

Last of six, entitled "ARA Is Facing Fight for Life in Halls of Congress This Year, Project Has Strong Backers, Foes," June 26, 1964.

After the six articles written by top staff reporters, the summation of the findings in the editorial published in the Houston Chronicle on June 28, 1964, is entitled "Let the ARA Stand—It Performs Well."

There being no objection, the articles and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Houston Chronicle, June 21, 1964]

AREA REDEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION: AGENCY THAT HAS HELPED TEXAS MAY BE CUT DOWN BY CRITICS

(By Stan Redding)

The Area Redevelopment Administration, a Federal agency created to generate jobs by helping finance new businesses, is facing a congressional crisis.

The question before Congress: Should the ARA be allowed to expire on June 30, 1965—as originally decreed—or should it be extended?

Its critics clamor for its end. They brand the program a "government giveaway," a "vote-buying device," and an unsound spending "scheme" at best.

SEEN AS BOON

ARA's proponents argue for its extension. They see it as a boon to underdeveloped urban and rural areas of the Nation, and as a potent weapon in the fight against poverty.

The controversial agency was placed in the national spotlight last month when Reader's Digest published a critical article entitled "Is This the Way To Fight the War Against Poverty?"

Charles Stevenson, the author, charged—among other indictments—that the ARA flouts the law under which it was created by providing financial help to areas "far from depressed," creates new industries to compete with businesses already "beset by overcapacity, thus jeopardizing existing jobs," and is used to "drum up support of even higher congressional appropriations."

ARA UNDER FIRE

But even before Stevenson's article appeared, ARA was under scattered fire.

Representative WILLIAM B. WIDNALL, Republican, of New Jersey, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, blasted ARA for "its sorry record * * * over the first 3 years of its existence."

Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, Democrat, of Virginia, criticized ARA as "an unsound spending scheme through which bureaucrats may make or break cities and towns all over the country by granting or withholding Federal money."

Senator **Frank J. Lausche**, Democrat, of Ohio, labeled the ARA as "not economically sound * * * not fair to the taxpayers. It is a vote-buying device."

FOUR MILLION DOLLARS INVESTED

ARA has invested $4,251,000 in Federal funds in 50 projects in 21 Texas counties, most of them in east Texas.

The $4,251,00 invested in Texas is less than 1.5 percent of the $375 million authorized under the ARA act, the first piece of major legislation signed into law by John F. Kennedy after he assumed the presidency.

Kennedy envisioned the act as a means to stimulate, through loans and grants, industrial activity in underdeveloped areas, provide vital aid to "depressed areas," and to construct public facilities in regions of high chronic unemployment.

ONE THIRD ELIGIBLE

More than 1,000 (one third) of the Nation's counties, including 56 of Texas' 254 counties, have been declared eligible for ARA projects.

Only 21 Texas counties, however, have gone through the complicated procedures necessary to qualify for ARA funds, whether loan, grant or technical assistance.

These counties are Angelina, Bowie, Camp, Cass, Cherokee, Harrison, Henderson, Jasper, Marion, McCulloch, Morris, Nacogdoches, Newton, Red River, Rusk, Sabine, San Augustine, San Jacinto, Tyler, Webb, and Zapata.

TRAVIS NOT QUALIFIED

Travis County is not qualified as a "depressed area," but an ARA program there—a $42,000 grant to finance a mineral survey of 42 Texas counties—was approved for the University of Texas on a statewide basis.

"Depressed" counties are designated by ARA's Washington office. Texas' "depressed areas" designations were—at first—based on an antiquated study by the Agricultural Extension Service of Texas A. & M. University and some embarrassment ensued. For several Texas counties earmarked "depressed areas" are counties that experienced booms in the past 10 to 20 years, and they rejected ARA.

EFFECTS OF SPENDING

But in the counties where ARA was welcomed, the outlay of Federal money has had these effects, among others:

Provided the city of Laredo with an expanded industrial water system.

Created a mild economic boom in Woodville, seat of Tyler County.

Breathed new economic life into Malakoff in Henderson County.

Sparked, with a $7,000 grant, the creation of two new plywood plants (at an estimated cost of $8 million) in Angelina County.

Placed Cherokee County on the way toward possible production of iron and steel.

[From the Houston Chronicle, June 22, 1964]

Texas and the ARA: Lawyer Sees East Texas as Industrial Empire

(By Stan Redding)

Lufkin.—Benton Musslewhite is a young man with restless vitality, a tremendous interest in his city and county and a dream of seeing east Texas become one of the State's great industrial centers.

The Lufkin lawyer saw the Area Redevelopment Administration Act as a stepping stone for the economic progress of east Texas.

Musslewhite was a prime mover in bringing the ARA to Texas. He served on the ARA National Advisory Committee, and was instrumental in forming the Angelina County Development Organization.

ARA maintains a field coordinator in each State. Ray Morrison, with offices in Fort Worth, is the Texas coordinator.

How did Angelina County—and 20 others in the State—become involved in ARA?

"It's not simple," Musslewhite says. "Even though a county is declared eligible for ARA projects, the people must want to take part before it will work."

Morrison—as he does in each instance where an area is eligible—came to Angelina County. Acting with the county agricultural agent, Chester Davis, he called a meeting of business, civic, and financial leaders and city-county officials.

STIMULATE ECONOMY

Morrison explained the purpose of ARA—to stimulate, through loans and grants, industrial activity in underdeveloped areas, thus creating more jobs and a healthier economy.

To qualify, a county must form an official development group.

Musslewhite said:

"The group must be a complete cross section of the entire county, government officials, bankers, labor members, chamber of commerce, agriculture, etc., with every community represented.

H. J. Shands, Jr., president of the First State Bank & Trust Co. of Lufkin, is head of the Angelina County group's executive committee.

OVERALL PLAN

Once a county is organized, an "overall economic development plan" is required, in which the county's economic structure is analyzed, its natural resources and existing industries pinpointed, and its needs and potentials cited.

If the overall plan is approved by ARA the county is free to submit various projects.

ARA is formulated on the assumption that there is inadequate venture capital in areas it classifies as "depressed." The act specifically restricts loans to enterprises or people that cannot secure credit in the open market from banks, insurance companies, mortgage houses, or other financial institutions.

GIVES UP TO 65 PERCENT

ARA makes outright grants or second-lien loans, up to 65 percent of any proposed project. Loans are usually for 10 to 20 years—although they may be for longer periods—and at interest rates never exceeding 4 percent.

The applicant for ARA aid, whether individual, company or group, must put up 5 percent of the estimated cost of a venture, and raise 20 percent of the funds by private means. The remaining 10 percent of the cost of any project is put up by the county development organization.

"The program is a good one," Musslewhite said. "It's not perfect, and it has its faults. For one thing, the various ARA field offices are understaffed.

REDTAPE

"There is too much responsibility for the program imposed on the Washington office. And there is too much redtape.

"For instance, a project must be approved by not only the local development group, the Texas Employment Commission, the ARA field coordinator, and the Washington office, but it must also be approved by the Small Business Administration, which disburses ARA funds. ARA should handle its own funds.

"But despite its drawbacks, ARA, I feel, is effective in stimulating the economic progress of stagnant communities and counties. And despite the criticism of the program, no one can say ARA has lost a dime in Texas."

[From the Houston Chronicle, June 23, 1964]

Texas and the ARA: Opposite Views in the Lufkin Area

(By Stan Redding)

Diboll-Lufkin.—The anchors of Angelina County's economy are the Southland Paper Mills and Temple Industries (southern pine).

Between them—in plants and in the woods—the two giants of the east Texas forest industry employ 20 percent of Angelina County's total work force. Their annual multimillion-dollar payroll is the lifeblood of Diboll, Lufkin, and other surrounding communities.

Both are solid private enterprises, which would oppose any Government encroachment on their rights.

OPINION DIVIDED

But top officials of the two industries hold differing positions on the Area Redevelopment Administration, a Federal agency that acts as a bank to boom new businesses and generate jobs in underdeveloped areas.

Temple Industries is tolerant of ARA, and in fact is involved in both ARA projects in Angelina County, a study conducted to determine the feasibility of building a plywood plant in the county, and the construction of a luxury motel in Diboll.

On the other side of the Angelina County coin, Southland Paper Mills strongly opposes ARA, as an agency which unfairly subsidizes competition for existing industries.

Horace Stubblefield, assistant to the president of Temple Industries, disagrees.

TREMENDOUS TOOL

"We feel a community should grow any way it can," said Stubblefield. "ARA can be a tremendous tool for this area, and we are impressed by the program, which definitely has aided the area."

Temple Industries and Southland Paper Mills are both building new plywood processing plants, each at a cost of $4 million.

Temple Industries' decision to build was based partly on a feasibility survey toward which ARA contributed $7,000. Temple Industries contributed $5,000 and the Angelina County Development Organization put up $2,000.

HAD PLANNED PLANT

"We had originally planned to build a plant—if the study warranted—under an ARA program," said Stubblefield. "However, U.S. Plywood, we learned, was conducting a study of its own, and when the California firm's survey, and the ARA study, both showed the feasibility of such a plant, we joined U.S. Plywood in a privately financed venture."

The plant will go into operation next month. It will create 135 new jobs in the plant, and 85 jobs in the woods, as log-handling requirements for Temple Industries will increase 50 percent, said Stubblefield.

HELPS FINANCE LODGE

Temple Industries is underwriter for $510,000 of the cost of Diboll's Pine Bough Guest Lodge, a luxury motel going up as an ARA project. ARA has $227,500—30.8 percent of the $738,400 cost—in Federal money in the project, which Stubblefield says will provide 30 new jobs.

"We had a restauraht, which we financed ourselves because we felt Diboll needed a fine restaurant," said Stubblefield. "It has been a moneymaking thing—grossing $12,000 a month—but we will close it when the lodge opens.

"The employees of our restaurant will go to the new lodge restaurant, of course. Our study of the motel venture, incidentally, shows we need only gross $18,000 a month to break even. We feel we can do that on the restaurant alone."

DIM VIEW OF VENTURE

Richard Wortham, president of Southland Paper Mills, takes a dim view of the motel venture, and is solidly opposed to ARA.

"Generating new industry in east Texas should be the business of private industry," said Wortham.

"The industrial development of the area should be left to progress naturally and normally. We welcome industries built through private enterprise, for there is ample room for competition, but why should the Government subsidize industries to compete?"

WILL CREATE 120 JOBS

He pointed out that Southland's new plywood plant, a joint venture with a local lumber company, will create 120 jobs. Southland made its own survey, but the company itself was helped in its founding by a loan from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, a larger forerunner of the ARA.

"That is true, but that was a sound business loan, and RFC does not fall in the same category as ARA, in my opinion," said Wortham.

"We had to take a first-lien loan, at going bank interest rates, and for only a 10-year period. We had to put up everything we owned around here."

[From the Houston Chronicle, June 24, 1964]

Texas and the ARA: Cherokee County Rich in Ore, but Could Anyone Make It Pay?

(By Stan Redding)

Rusk.—The hilly soil of Cherokee County, the "hub of east Texas," is a deep red ochre. The land is rich in low-grade iron ore.

Cherokee Countians have known this for 50 years, but there wasn't much they could do about it: A steel mill to take advantage of the county's potential wealth would cost $20 million or more.

It's hard to find that kind of venture capital in east Texas. It's harder to find outside venture capital in that amount when east Texas is involved.

But they're talking iron ore and steel mills in Cherokee County today. Folks feel they are on the threshold of possible production of iron and steel.

BIG IF AND ARA

If so, the Area Redevelopment Administration—a Federal agency designed as a weapon against poverty—will have played a major role.

ARA, through a $75,000 study grant, has established the iron ore is of producible and marketable quantity. County leaders have since been working to attract a steel mill to the county.

The embattled ARA has its enemies, but if there are any in Cherokee County, they are keeping quiet.

E. H. Whitehead, the young and freckled mayor of Rusk—and editor of the Rusk Cherokeean—feels ARA provides an economic transfusion to small communities in danger of "withering away."

"A community with no industries to speak of can't attract the big insurance companies with their venture capital," said Whitehead. "ARA puts us on a competitive basis with larger communities.

"Admittedly, ARA has its faults, and too much redtape is one of them, but small towns will take the redtape if it's a way to attract industry, create new business and create more payrolls."

TWO CREDITS FOR ARA

ARA is responsible for two new industries in Cherokee County: the agency loaned Southwest Design Co. $56,000 for machinery and equipment to establish a furniture plant.

And a new synthetic marble plant is going up here, financed in part by $10,000 from the ARA.

Two of Cherokee County's leading bankers defend ARA against charges of "unsound spending" and "Government giveaway."

Leo Tosh, president of a Rusk savings and loan association, and Tom Aker, a Jacksonville banker, are cochairmen of the Cherokee County Development Organization. They have different views on ARA's disbursal of funds, but both support the agency wholeheartedly.

NOT THINKING BIG?

Tosh feels ARA is too conservative.

"ARA has not been utilized to its full potential," he said.

"Congress tied ARA's hands when it allocated funds for the agency, but put the funds under the Small Business Administration.

"They're not taking enough chances with the loan funds, I feel. After all, it's risk capital. But ARA plays it too safe. After all, if a loan is absolutely good, as ARA requires, private banks will make the loan. ARA should be divorced from SBA, and operate at more than the usual risk, as I believe was intended.

"I don't say it should finance any project proposed, but I think it will have to lose a little money to do the job.

"So far, it hasn't lost a dime."

Aker doesn't necessarily agree that ARA should make some risky loans.

"The Government is in too many loan agencies as it is, and I'm not for all of them by any means," he said.

"But there is a place for ARA. We have this natural resource in the county, millions and millions of tons of iron ore. We think it's a field where Government—through ARA—can help us where private industry won't.

"ARA has already accelerated the industrial progress of the county, and could do more. I don't know where else we'd turn for comparable capital to generate new industries."

[From the Houston Chronicle, June 25, 1964]

ARA in East Texas: Death of Woodville Greatly Exaggerated

(By Stan Redding)

Woodville.—The report of Woodville's death is premature, its citizens indignantly contend. And with ample justification.

Woodville is small—2,000 population—but not sleepy.

And most of the townfolk still are simmering over last month's Reader's Digest article—blasting the Area Redevelopment Administration—which, touching on an ARA project here, stated: "There is not much reason for Woodville except the old courthouse and some lumber mills."

The article condemned an ARA loan of $455,000 to partially finance the $800,000 Woodville Community Inn, now in operation. The article stated the new inn had severely damaged the business of a widow, Mrs. James R. Willis, who operates Woodville's only other motel.

Critics of ARA—the Federal agency designed to stimulate the creation of new businesses and industry in underdeveloped and depressed areas—say the Community Inn wasn't needed.

Woodville's leading citizens say it was and is needed, and that it's already boosting the community's economy.

Frank J. Robinson, president of the Woodville Chamber of Commerce, said: "Because we live at the junction of three highways and can anticipate a large volume of tourists visiting the Sam Rayburn Reservoir now being completed (as the largest fresh water lake in Texas), Woodville seemed to us a most logical place for a first-class motor hotel.

"Civic leaders in Woodville conceived, planned, and built the Community Inn with the broadest local support any such project has received. More than 100 citizens bought stock in the motor inn."

BUSY LITTLE CITY

Woodville is a busy little city. Even before ARA was born in 1961, the community was hustling to lure industry. A booming aluminum plant—now undergoing a $500,000 expansion program—and a private airport attest to this.

"Other industries might have located here, but for lack of adequate lodging facilities for businessmen," said Morris Clemmons, an insurance man.

"We were trying to get a new motel even before we found we were eligible for ARA aid."

When ARA approved the motel project, Woodville citizens raised $163,000 through stock subscriptions ranging from $25 to $25,000. The latter block of stock was bought by E. W. Tubb, a rancher, who said he "has faith in this area."

DENIES STOCK OFFER

Clemmons and Billy Mitchell, chairman of the Tyler County Development Organization, say Mrs. Willis was offered stock.

"I was not," said Mrs. Willis.

Robert Mann, president of the Woodville State Bank, arranged the financing of the remainder of the cost, through his bank and banks in Jasper, Beaumont, Port Arthur, and Colmesneil.

"Such a motel for us would have been years in the future, except for ARA," said Mann. "There is no financing at all for any such project as this, in small communities such as this, except through ARA."

Leo Nelson, manager of the attractive inn, said the motel has enjoyed a "40-percent occupancy rate" since its opening last November.

"We're not happy about the rate, but we're not unhappy, either," he said. "Even though we're losing $4,000 a month right now, we feel we're doing good. Few large motels, especially those in small communities, have a similar occupancy rate during the first year.

Mrs. Willis is bitter. She said her motel, which she took over and improved after her husband's death 12 years ago, lost over $1,000 the first month the Community Inn was in operation. Receipts for the first 5 months of this year are also down, compared to 1963, she said.

"If the new inn doesn't make money, I and the rest of the taxpayers, including you, will have to pay for it," she said. "If it does succeed, I'll be run out of business."

SEES NO INJURY

Nelson feels sure she won't be hurt in the long run.

"We're sorry Mrs. Willis' business is hurt, but we are not competing with just her," he said.

"We are competing with motels in Houston, Beaumont, Port Arthur, and others in this area, which is a burgeoning recreation area.

"Our payroll is $5,000 a month, and every dime is spent in Woodville."

Business has increased, say Woodville merchants, as a result of the inn.

BUSINESS BETTER

"My business is 20 percent better, over last year," said J. D. Vinson, a service station operator. "And it's still increasing, because of the inn, and I'm not even on their list of suggested service stations."

Woodville Mayor E. W. Gassiott, a drygoods merchant, said: "There is no doubt in my mind that the inn has already affected our economy for the better, and is drawing more and more visitors to Woodville."

[From the Houston Chronicle, June 26, 1964]

Project Has Strong Backers, Foes: ARA Is Facing Fight for Life in Halls of Congress This Year

(By Stan Redding)

The Area Redevelopment Administration's fate will undoubtedly be decided in Congress this year.

Proponents of the Area Redevelopment Administration Act—designed to stimulate, through loans and grants, the creation of new job-generating industries in underdeveloped and depressed areas—will ask that the measure be extended.

Critics will seek to block extension, and thus let the measure die a natural death June 30, 1965.

FAVORABLE VOTE SEEN

Texas Congressmen in whose districts ARA is involved in projects will probably vote to extend the measure.

The bulk of Texas' 21 counties participating in ARA projects are in U.S. Representative Wright Patman's District 1 (six counties), U.S. Representative John Dowdy's District 7 (six counties), and U.S. Representative Jack Brooks' District 2 (five counties).

The largest approved project under the Federal aid act is in Patman's district, a tile company to be built in Harrison County. ARA is lending the Marshall Tile Co. $896,000 toward the total $1,378,321 cost of the plant and equipment.

The plant will employ 150 persons.

Patman defends the ARA.

"Like its predecessor, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, ARA has done a lot of good in Texas and many other parts of the country," he said. "It is doing fine work, helping communities to develop industries they might never have gotten any other way."

Brooks, too, is a solid backer of ARA.

"The ARA program has proved to be of exceptional help to people living in east Texas communities," he said. "The program has created hundreds of jobs throughout the area."

Dowdy said: "Some of the people ARA has loaned money to seem to be making a go of it. I would say it has done something to stimulate economic progress of the areas involved, but I'm not familiar enough with the projects to say whether I would vote to extend the bill."

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE AGAINST PROGRAM

The most potent enemy of ARA in the Piney Woods is the east Texas Chamber of Commerce, which opposes the program on principle.

Fred Pool, of Longview, executive vice president and general manager of the ETCC, said: "We don't say there's anything wrong in ARA (as far as fund handling is concerned).

"We just feel it's another case of let the Government do it. Too many of the counties declared eligible for ARA aid were designated so on the basis that the county had lost agricultural income.

"ARA, in our opinion, is not justified until an effort has been made on a local level to attract industry and create jobs."

PROGRAM SUPPORTED

The east Texas Tourist Association supports the ARA program.

Sam Reid, Jr., a director of the group, said: "In almost every case where a community is involved in ARA projects, attempts have been made to attract industry and new business through private enterprise methods. It couldn't be done.

"Most of those who criticize ARA have not taken the trouble to study the program or the problems of communities involved."

A Reader's Digest article last month, blasting ARA's operations, charged that 75 Texas county agents had "quit in disgust" over ARA programs during the past 2 years.

"That is completely untrue," said John E. Hutchinson of College Station, director of the Texas Agricultural Extension Service.

"Less than half that amount have quit, and all quit to take better jobs, or for other personal reasons, plainly stated in resignations. All those records have been submitted to the magazine's editor in the hopes a correction will be made.

VALUABLE TOOL

"ARA, as we see it, is just another resource to combat unemployment and stimulate business. Used properly, it can be a valuable tool, and we feel it has been used properly in Texas."

Whether or not ARA survives its congressional crisis, expiration of the act will not affect these Texas projects (in addition to those already cited), with the possible exception of the proposed steel mill in Cherokee County. Funds for these projects have already been assured or disbursed. Amounts are ARA's participation only:

Bowie County—$52,000, hand power tool company, to employ 30 persons.

Cass County—$12,000 training grant to train 15 chemical operators.

Cherokee County—$2,000 technical assistance grant for U.S. Department of Interior market and resource study.

Harrison County—$62,000 technical assistance grant to Texas A. & M. and Aquatic Controls, Inc., harvesting and processing of Caddo Lake aquatic plants.

Henderson County—$414,000 loan, Texas Clay Tile Co., new firm to employ 69 persons; $23,000 loan to Norman Pottery, expansion, to create six new jobs; $59,000 loan to General Sensors, Inc., to employ 76 persons.

Jasper County—One of 42 counties in statewide mineral study.

Marion County—$19,000 technical assistance grant to Gene Schrickel & Associates, development of tourism.

McCulloch County—$206,000 loan to Spencer-Stafford Loadcraft, trailer manufacturing firm, to employ 430 persons.

Morris County—$343,000 loan to Naples Community Inn, employs 50 people.

Nacogdoches County—Included in statewide project.

Newton County—Included in statewide project.

Red River County—$210,000 public facility loan to cities of Clarkesville and Detroit, water and sewer systems; $264,000 grant to Detroit and Clarkesville, water and sewer system; $26,000 loan to Pats-Co Athletic Manufacturing Co., to employ 40 persons; $42,000 loan to Red River County Industrial Foundation, to construct building for lease to firm, to create 50 jobs; $72,000 for training 30 sewing machine operators, 15 sheet metal operators, 30 athletic (Pats-Co) equipment workers, 10 nurses aids, and 20 all-round farm machinery operators.

Rusk County—$229,000 loan to Red Dot Plastic Industries, new firm to employ 63 persons; $150,000 loan to Henderson Industrial Trust, wood products, to employ 65 persons.

San Augustine County—$17,000 grant to Hare & Hare, recreational planning, Sam Rayburn Lake (McGee Bend Lake).

San Jacinto County—$15,000 grant-R. W. Booker & Associates, planning proposal for Livingston Lake.

Webb County—$95,000 public facility grant, $95,000 public facility loan, Laredo, to expand water system; $204,000 training grants to train 90 farm machinery operators, 30 metal machine operators, 45 irrigator technicians, 35 auto mechanics, 35 stenographers, and 20 service station attendants; $10,000 technical assistance grant to Caudill, Rowlett & Scott, study of international civic and cultural center; $2,000 technical assistance grant to follow-up analysis of Webb County Overall Economic Development Plan.

Zapata County—$7,000 technical assistance grant, Caudill, Rowlett & Scott, study recreational resources, Falcon Lake.

[From the Houston Chronicle, June 28, 1964]

Let the ARA Stand—It Performs Well

Following up a critical article in a national magazine, the Chronicle's Stan Redding wrote a six-part series on the controversial Area Redevelopment Administration.

This Federal agency was created to help generate jobs. It was directed exclusively toward underdeveloped and depressed areas that suffer chronic unemployment. Loans and grants were made by it to small- and medium-size industries, where private capital declined to venture.

ARA has invested $4,251,000 in Federal funds in 50 projects in 21 Texas counties, mainly in east Texas; less than 1.5 percent of the $375 million authorized under the congressional act.

Congress will decide this year whether to extend ARA's future or to let it expire, as originally decreed, on June 30, 1965. Critics clamor for its demise. Proponents argue strongly for its survival.

If a hatchet job is contemplated, critics can always pick at faults. The ARA has its share. But more important, it has earned its valedictory. In bolstering a regional economy, risk is involved. Where private money cannot afford to venture, public funds can be invested—for the sake of people. And in Texas, the ARA has not lost anybody's shirt.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I believe that with the attacks being made on the ARA from the big cities, it is noteworthy to comment that one of the four largest newspapers in the Southwest, and the largest afternoon newspaper in the Southwest, in the sixth largest city in America, has gone out and made an impartial investigation of ARA. Their editorial states that ARA's work is good, that it performs well, and to let it stand.

Mr. President, I commend these articles and this factual research to the attention of all Senators in the debate which goes on weekly on the subject of the ARA.

TRIBUTE TO CURTIS SAULSBURY

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, on July 26, New Haven, Conn., under the able chairmanship of Charles McSweeney, will honor one of its outstanding sons. He is Curtis Saulsbury—musician, singer, and teacher of the spiritual—or religious folk songs. For over half a century he has given of himself to the children and the whole community of New Haven. The tribute to him is well deserved—Connecticut is proud of Mr. Saulsbury.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article describing his work, from the New Haven Register of July 6, 1964, be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New Haven Register, July 6, 1964]

To Be Honored for Church Work—Curtis Saulsbury: He Sings With His Soul

(By Stanley J. Venoit)

"He sings them with his soul as well as his voice," it was said not too long ago of a man who has devoted more than a half century to perpetuating for New Haven culture the spiritual, described as the religious folk song.

Curtis Saulsbury, who in the early days of his now 72 years found his love for music at the Scranton Street School, will be honored next month at the church where he formed his first choir in 1916. In subsequent hours and days many, many people were to share with him a love for the deep beauty of the voice in song.

"Ministry of Music" is the title of the program in which tribute will be paid to Saulsbury at 5 p.m. on July 26 at the Bethel A.M.E. Church.

Children who were to learn the beauty of the spiritual under his coaching will come with their children and their children's children to honor a man who recently summed up his effort by stating: "I'm trying to get people to use this beautiful music that God has given us. It's realistic. It carries a message."

EMPHASIS ON TEACHING

His message has been delivered personally to the joy of many over the years. Passage of time has brought the emphasis now on teaching, rather than his own unique delivery of the song. "It would be singing," he said when asked his preference, "but I'm getting too old for that. It has to be teaching."

Fortunately for people, however, Saulsbury has given a happy combination of both as a singer himself, and as a dedicated, beloved teacher. He has studied sacred, popular, semiclassical, classical music, and opera, but the spirituals, if not his first love, are certainly his last.

NOTHING BUT SPIRITUALS

"If I could sing 50 or more years of my life," he told a New Haven school class, "I would sing nothing but Negro spirituals. But you children don't like them anymore. People do whatever they like to this music now."

It was back in an early Scranton School classroom that he contributed a tenor voice to a mixed quartette. Later he was to be a member of the Immanuel Baptist Church choir, and with his father's pleas to the minister, young Saulsbury was given permission to join the adult choir.

Thus began development in all aspects of vocal work. He was to serve under such teachers as the late Adam Clayton Powell, father of the Congressman, and Dr. David Simpson Klogh, both prominent clergymen. Among those who "rubbed off" their love of music on the young man was Mrs. Edyth Powers who instilled the deep-seated respect for the spiritual in Saulsbury.

FURTHER DEVELOPMENT

Of her singing, he once said: "I just couldn't get that rhythm out of my mind." He was to develop it himself, and instill its feeling in so many others.

At one point in his life he thought that his career in music was to end. Illness struck, at first thought to be tuberculosis, but diagnosed as lead poisoning.

"The seriousness of thought conjured up by that frightful experience caused me to seek divine inspiration while a patient and to promise myself to follow that inspiration wherever it might lead."

It led to a period of 14 years when he traveled throughout the United States and Canada singing in churches of all denominations, and his return to New Haven to form the Saulsbury Choir he has served so faithfully as director. Since the formation of the group three decades ago it has appeared at benefit performances throughout the State and has won wide acclaim.

ALL FIELDS OF MUSIC

On the recent occasion of his 50th year of music participation in New Haven, it was said "over the years he became qualified to function in all fields of music, not only the sacred and the spiritual, the popular and semiclassical, but also in the definitely classical and operatic."

Fitting then and now, was observation Curtis Saulsbury is a man "who really has made history for himself and done much for his fellow citizens."

That's why so many folks will gather soon to "sing along" once again for and with the master singer and teacher.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR INOUYE

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, all Senators know that Senator DANIEL K. INOUYE, of Hawaii, is one of the truly great Members of the Senate. I take the floor today to advert to an incident regarding our very distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Hawaii that may have been unnoticed by some of our colleagues because we were then on vacation.

Senator INOUYE and his lovely wife, Margaret, who is affectionately called Maggie, have been married for 15 years. During the 15 years, this lovely couple has been childless. However, last Tuesday, while the Senate was in recess, there was born to Senator and Mrs. Inouye, a boy, Daniel Ken Inouye, Jr.

I salute our distinguished colleague, Senator INOUYE, and wish Godspeed and happy landings to Daniel Ken Inouye, Jr., who is likely to be a U.S. Senator in 1994.

There is every reason to pay tribute and deference to Senator INOUYE. He served his country during World War II in that almost forgotten front, the Italian campaign. He was a member of the 442d Infantry Regimental Combat Team. We who served in Italy, and all other Americans, know that was the "go for broke" outfit of the 5th Army. Senator DAN INOUYE was a private in that regimental combat team, a team that was hailed by all of us who served with the 5th Army as the greatest fighting outfit in the European theater of operations.

Senator INOUYE demonstrated in battle his courage, his indomitable will, his unconquerable soul, and his bravery. He received a battlefield commission as a second lieutenant.

Mr. President, in the service of his country on the Italian front, our colleague, Senator INOUYE, lost his right arm. That did not disable him. He is an unconquerable individual. He is held in high esteem by people the world over. I recall one incident which occurred when I was in Brazil and spent some 21 days in South America with a group of my colleagues in 1961. In the Brazilian home of immigrants from Japan, there was a picture of Senator INOUYE who was then a Member of the House of Representatives. It was a shrine in that little home. There were freshly cut flowers around it.

This fine young man, our great colleague, and his lovely wife, who after 15 years of married life became the parents of a little boy, are to be congratulated by us. It is another manifestation of the persistence and determination of our colleague, Senator DAN INOUYE, of Hawaii.

I think it fitting to call attention to this great event, to congratulate this happy couple on the birth of their first child, and to wish them the best of everything in the world.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I wish to join in the felicitations extended to our colleague, Senator INOUYE, on the happy event of the birth of a son. If anyone has seen the Senator from Hawaii lately, he has doubtlessly observed that the Senator is obviously the happiest Member of the Senate.

Senator INOUYE is a man of many accomplishments, but I believe the one he will prize most highly is his newest accomplishment—that of fatherhood.

BREAKDOWN IN LAW AND ORDER HURTS AMERICA AND HER PEOPLE

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, all America has good reason to be greatly alarmed by the wave of lawlessness which now seems to be rolling across our land.

Criminal violence has increased to the point that in many of our large cities it is no longer safe for decent, law-abiding people to walk the streets, even in broad daylight. Almost daily we read of another brutal assault on our public streets, and as often as not, other citizens stand by almost as casual observers. The situation with which we are now confronted, particularly in our large eastern cities, is one which calls for immediate and positive attention by law enforcement agencies. Also, in my opinion, our people must rise from their apathy if ever peace and tranquillity are to be restored.

There appeared on July 8 an excellent editorial in the Atlanta Times, a new daily newspaper in Atlanta, condemning the breakdown in law and order and urging strict enforcement of the law whenever and wherever it is necessary. The Atlanta Times correctly points out that laxity and appeasement in law enforcement only invites more criminal activity.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Atlanta Times, July 8, 1964]

BREAKDOWN IN LAW AND ORDER HURTS AMERICA AND HER PEOPLE

Where in the world could you feel most free and safe to go about on the streets of a great city? If your guess is the United States of America, you are in for a rude jolt.

In Western Europe, Russia, or even in Africa, you would be safer than in the United States—particularly in the cities of the North. This is the shameful conclusion made by the U.S. News & World Report after a recent world survey.

Mugging, beating, armed robbery and physical assault on peaceful citizens is uncommon in other world areas. Contrast this with the alarming fact of their open existence in America's northern metropolitan areas. In all the United States there is a sharp rise in criminal violence of every kind. In New York City, citizens are organizing bands of vigilantes to help discourage young criminals and protect themselves and their fellow citizens.

The imperative to find an answer to such outrages is obvious. And to find an answer the underlying cause of violence must be made clear.

You will discover, says the U.S. News & World Report, that police abroad command more authority, and justice is more firm. The rights of society supersede the rights of the criminal. Judges in other lands give criminals short shrift. Those who menace the public are considered violators of the law, not sick people who need treatment.

Police officials of high rank in Britain, for instance, have voiced criticism against the tendency in America to hold the rights of criminals to be more precious than those of the law-abiding public.

This comment is particularly interesting at a time when America is so self-consciously aware of her international image. The newspapers, television networks and radio, especially during this period of civil rights altercation, have bombarded the citizenry with the threat of discrimination defacing America's image in the eyes of the world.

It seems that the U.S. image abroad may have some clay feet in other respects than civil rights alone. One of these areas is the decline of respect for authority, since that authority is noticeably neither firmly nor quickly enforced.

In France the attack on the individual citizen is very rare; in Italy the courts are not inclined to turn criminals loose on technicalities. In West Germany assaults and murders are few.

By and large, street crimes, which keep many Americans indoors at night, are rare in most foreign countries.

According to the survey, it is because the police and the courts crack down hard. These are facts that Americans should face squarely. When authority breaks down, society and individual citizens are in jeopardy.

The present push for reform appears to focus incessantly on the South in the racial question. It is possible that the spotlight of attention might well be trained on the problem of violence in the large cities—New York Boston, St. Louis, Washington, Cleveland, and Detroit. The actuality and the image of American hoodlumism exists worldwide.

If our Nation desires peace and safety for its citizens we need to hold to a policy of strict law enforcement. Violation of the peace by individuals or groups should be stopped. Laxity will bring only the fruit of violence and terror and even an undesirable "world image."

OUR VANISHING CONSTITUTION

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, it is lamentable indeed that bad days have fallen upon our Constitution. It is misinterpreted, twisted, distorted, ignored and even scorned to the point that there no longer is any assurance that this great document still stands as it was meant to stand—as the protector and preserver of individual liberty and the rights of our free and sovereign States.

David Lawrence, the distinguished editor of U.S. News & World Report, has over the years observed the decline of the Constitution, but not without ardent pleas that the American people reverse this trend before it is too late. Many of us here in the Senate, fearful of the ultimate results, have likewise warned against the continual erosion of the Constitution.

In the July 20 issue of U.S. News & World Report, Mr. Lawrence wrote a splendid editorial entitled "Our Vanishing Constitution," in which he again calls attention to what is happening and urges remedial action. I commend this editorial to Members of the Senate and to the people of the United States.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From U.S. News & World Report, July 20, 1964]

OUR VANISHING CONSTITUTION

(By David Lawrence)

Only 175 years after our forefathers ordained the Constitution of the United States, the document has largely fallen into disuse. Some of the clauses that still remain in operation are being given an interpretation stretched far beyond their original meaning. We see an increasing power being exercised by the judiciary over the other branches of the Federal Government as the rights of the sovereign States are gradually being extinguished.

One hundred and seventy-five years is a relatively brief span in world history, and few republics have been able to maintain for even as long as two centuries their original pattern of a democratic system.

The United States has the largest population that has ever lived under a republican form of government. But the safeguards of democracy are being rapidly demolished, and our system of government is being invaded today by the same deceptive Trojan horses that the governments of yesteryears encountered in those fateful periods when the doctrine that the end justifies the means became the political gospel of the day.

Our written Constitution, established in 1789 and amended in the intervening years to meet changing conditions, is being deliberately disregarded, and the doctrine of conformity by coercion is being espoused not only by our so-called intellectual groups but by vote-seeking politicians in our great society.

The words of the Constitution, of course, explicitly specify that rights granted to the people cannot be taken away and that they can be surrendered only by the votes of the people themselves—through the action of two-thirds of both Houses of Congress, and the ratification of three-fourths of the State legislatures.

This method of effecting a change in the Constitution is sometimes called a cumbersome process, but the procedure for amending was purposely made slow moving so as better to protect the minority and save it from the intolerance of the majority. If we are to be governed by an unwritten constitution, the parliamentary formula of Canada or Great Britain has in it much to be commended. But as long as we pay homage to a written Constitution, we are in duty bound to abide by it until such time as it is amended or a substitute is adopted by the process prescribed in the original compact between the States.

We can hardly believe our eyes, however, as we reread the provisions of the Constitution that have been torn to shreds by the autocratic action of a judicial obligarchy. Here, for instance, are the exact words of two amendments included in the Bill of Rights, adopted in 1791:

"Article IX: The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.

"Article X: The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

The words "United States" mean the Federal Government. Since it is stipulated that only the powers specifically delegated to the Federal Government by the Constitution can be exercised by the executive, legislative or judicial branches of the U.S. Government, an attempt to usurp any other rights not so granted is a plain violation of both the letter and the spirit of the Constitution.

Yet today we see the Supreme Court telling the States how they shall constitute the upper and lower houses of their legislatures, how the public schools in States, counties, and cities shall be operated, what taxes shall be levied, and how powers of local police to deal with violence and trespass must be curtailed whenever a disorderly demonstration or a sit-in is ruled to be mere freedom of expression.

Certainly Congress has the power to regulate interstate commerce, but nowhere in the Constitution is the right given to construe that phrase as covering the age-old uses of private property—in fact, the Constitution says that no citizen shall be deprived of his property unless it is confiscated for public purposes and compensation is made. If, however, the phrase "interstate commerce" is to be applied arbitrarily to regulate the entire economic and social life of the Nation, the Constitution vanishes.

We are witnessing, moreover, the impairment of the rights of the States to maintain order. For instance, to prevent or quell local disturbances, Federal troops have recently been sent into two States—without the request or the consent of the Governors or the legislatures, as is required by the Constitution.

The Constitution, as the protector of the rights of the States and of the people, is thus being eroded. Usurpation has been passively accepted. The only question now is whether public opinion can be aroused and will act in time. For our written Constitution—as the bulwark of human rights under a republican form of government—is rapidly vanishing.

IMPROVED SITUATION IN TRANSPORTATION OF WHEAT AT HARVESTTIME

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, each year at wheat harvesttime the Great Plains region has suffered from an acute shortage of boxcars. Wheat piles up at country elevators and pleas for all available empty cars fill the communications systems from coast to coast, pour into the offices of the congressional delegations, and build up pressure in the offices of the Interstate Commerce Commission and the American Association of Railroads.

In anticipation of another period of frustration, I addressed a letter on June 1, 1964, to the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, Abe McGregor Goff, requesting a full statement of ICC preparations to deal with the situation in June of 1964. Commissioner Kenneth Tuggle responded to my letter. I was extremely pleased with the reply and was reassured that the Commission staff was on top of the situation. I hoped my confidence would be justified when the harvest was completed. I am pleased to be able to report to the Senate that there was scarcely a delay in wheat movement this year. I am sure those of my colleagues who normally are deluged with complaints of boxcar shortages were aware of the lack of expressions of concern during the last 6 weeks.

Of course, a number of factors were involved in the efficient handling of this year's wheat harvest, but these should not detract from the fine performance of the ICC and its staff. I extend to the Commission and the personnel of the Bureau of Safety and Service my congratulations.

Mr. J. H. Dean, general manager of the Farmers Cooperative Commission Co. of Hutchinson, Kans., operators of one of the largest elevators in the Nation, recently wrote Mr. Charles W. Taylor, Director of the Bureau of Safety and Service, expressing his satisfaction with the performance of that agency in connection with the movement of this year's harvest.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Dean's letter accompany my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FARMERS COOPERATIVE
COMMISSION CO.,
Hutchinson, Kans., July 16, 1964.

Mr. CHARLES W. TAYLOR,
Director, Bureau of Safety and Service,
Interstate Commerce Commission,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. TAYLOR: I am writing this letter to inform you of the extremely fine service your Mr. Jesse F. Davis rendered this area in the movement of wheat during this year's harvest.

I do not believe I have ever seen a wheat movement handled in a finer manner than we experienced this year. Our records will of course, disclose the fact our volume was less than it has been in many years, however, from some areas we had a very substantial flow of wheat.

Mr. Davis informed himself fully of the situation throughout the area and was on the job every day seeing that cars were adequately distributed and handled so that all shippers received extremely good service. I cannot tell you how much this has meant to, not only us, but our various shippers involved and I know I speak for all of them when I say we appreciate the attention that has been given to the proper distribution of cars.

I felt you should know of the splendid job done by your Mr. Davis. Certainly, we commend him for all of his efforts.

Sincerely,

J. H. DEAN,
General Manager.

EAST-WEST TRADE AND THE VALUE OF THE RECENT WHEAT SALE TO THE SOVIET UNION

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, there has been much discussion in our country on East-West trade and of the value of the recent wheat sale to the Soviet Union. Among the parties most qualified to comment on the success of this transaction is the Continental Grain Co. of New York which recently sold 1 million metric tons of American surplus wheat to the Soviet Union. On June 15 the Continental Grain Co. submitted an interesting memorandum to the members of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations which elucidates this particular sale and also the more general subject of East-West trade. In this statement, the Continental Grain Co. comments:

> The final shipment of surplus American wheat was delivered * * * on April 20, 1964. The final cash payment for this wheat was made by the Soviet Government on April 24. The negotiations were handled by the Soviet Purchasing Agency in a businesslike fashion. During its execution they conformed strictly with their contractual obligations.

After listing some of the advantages of American trade with the Soviet Union, the company concludes:

> The Continental Grain Co. believes that sales of agricultural products to Soviet bloc countries will strengthen the economy of the United States.

In a period when the United States has a continuing balance-of-payments deficit and consequently must seek out all feasible foreign markets, and in an era when we are constantly trying to reduce the tensions between East and West which threaten world peace, I think it is important for all of us to give careful study to informed statements like that made by the Continental Grain Co.

I ask unanimous consent to have this memorandum inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONTINENTAL GRAIN CO.,
New York, N.Y., June 15, 1964.

To: Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate.

Subject: East-West trade.

GENTLEMEN: This is in response to your invitation to comment on East-West trade.

Continental Grain Co. has recently completed a historic transaction involving the cash sale of 1 million metric tons of wheat to the Soviet Union.

The final shipment of surplus American wheat was delivered by our company aboard the SS *Extavia* on April 20, 1964. The final cash payment for this wheat was made by the Soviet Government on April 24. The negotiations were handled by the Soviet Purchasing Agency in a businesslike fashion. During its execution they conformed strictly with their contractual obligations.

The decision to authorize the sale of wheat was arrived at by the U.S. Government. The primary function of our company was to negotiate this sale in competition with other U.S. companies and with wheat of other origins.

As a result of this transaction, we believe we have gained a body of experience in the field of East-West trade, and more specifically in trading with the Russians. Besides, in a broader context, we feel that:

1. The sale was of considerable benefit to U.S. farmers. Due to an accumulation of surplus wheat they have been forced to restrict wheat production, while other nations are increasing their wheat production. Our country has a large unused capacity to produce wheat and farmers are in a position to contribute to the expansion of our Nation's exports. Under recent legislation, U.S. domestic prices of wheat have been brought into line with world prices. Subsidies are no longer being paid to farmers to effect exports. Therefore, any export sales for hard currency benefits U.S. farmers, without creating any budgetary burden on the U.S. Treasury and the taxpayer.

2. The sale was of benefit to the U.S. economy. It made a definite contribution toward the improvement of our balance of payment. The production and movement of the wheat created jobs for many people. Labor built the machines to plant, harvest, and transport the grain. Dollars received from the sale filtered into countless other segments of our economy. The exportation of agricultural products represents the culmination of the efforts of a free industrial society.

3. The Russian Government is currently able to buy wheat from Canada, Argentina, France, and other Western countries. Therefore, there is no question as to whether or not they will be able to obtain the wheat. It is simply a question of whether or not they buy from the United States or elsewhere.

4. The late President Kennedy, in his letter of October 10, 1963, to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives setting forth reasons for the decision, stated that "wheat will be sold at the world price, which is the only way it can be sold." We strongly concur that the only sound basis for foreign trade is to treat all cash buyers on an equal basis, and once having made the decision to sell wheat, we should offer the same competitive conditions as other nations. Unless this is done, any decision to promote trade becomes academic and inoperative.

5. The policy of requiring the use of U.S.-flag ships in trade with cash buyers requires reexamination, because in effect it requires the imposition of a premium price, and hence places the United States out of the market. This is shown by the fact that out of approximately 400 million bushels of wheat purchased by the U.S.S.R. in 1963 and early 1964 the United States sold only 65½ million bushels, or one-sixth—i.e., $134 million out of more than $1 billion. Our Government has directed strong efforts in recent years to expand exports. It is ironic that our tramp shipping industry is the least competitive of any export industry. In order to sell on world markets, our farmers and manufacturers are exhorted to produce goods at competitive prices. The U.S.-flag tramp shipping industry is unable to compete. Foreign buyers cannot be expected nor will they pay premiums for our ships.

The application of the cargo preference act to cash sales cannot lead to genuine trade with such buyers. If the decision to trade with the Soviets is firm, this requirement should be removed. If U.S. shipping needs to be subsidized to equate their freight rates with world rates, this should be done directly. It need be realized that the subsidy is going to U.S. owners, to help maintain a shipping industry as a national policy, not to foreign buyers. As long as any foreign buyer has an alternative source, we cannot exact an administered price over the other competing sources.

Whether it is advantageous to the political, security, and economic interests of the United States to trade with the Soviet bloc in wheat and other consumer products is a matter for the highest authorities of the U.S. Government to decide. We submit the foregoing points for consideration in arriving at a judgment on this issue.

Our information is such as to lead us to assume that the short fall in Soviet food production is likely to be of considerable duration assuming present or increasing per capita rates of consumption. To satisfy these needs, U.S. exporters of agricultural products should be placed in a position to meet this demand if it should materialize and be enabled to compete successfully with the other exporting countries.

To summarize, the Continental Grain Co. believes that sales of agricultural products to Soviet bloc countries will strengthen the economy of the United States.

CONTINENTAL GRAIN CO.

JUNE 15, 1964.

THE PERSONAL DIARY OF LEE HARVEY OSWALD

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, recently the Dallas Morning News revealed the existence of the personal diary of Lee Harvey Oswald. In revealing the contents of that diary, the News gave to the American people an insight into the life led by Oswald while he was in Russia.

important facts concerning Oswald's thinking, his actions, and the actions of the Soviet government's secret police, were revealed for the first time.

I regard the document as of vast importance, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD certain news stories concerning it.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Dallas (Tex.) Morning News, June 27, 1964]

OCTOBER 16, 1959: "I WANT RUSSIAN CITIZENSHIP"

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—From October 16, 1959, until March 27, 1962, Lee Harvey Oswald kept a secret diary covering his stay in Russia. The diary, discovered among his effects since his death, gives some insight to the thoughts and personality of the Presidential assassin. In this story and a subsequent one, details of the diary are disclosed to the public for the first time.)

(By Hugh Aynesworth)

When Intourist Guide Rimma Sherikova met Lee Harvey Oswald's train in Moscow, the first thing he told her was, "I want to apply for Russian citizenship."

Oswald, recently a U.S. Marine, had been led to Russia by the glittering promises of communism. He had made his way to Helsinki, Finland, and there boarded the train for Moscow.

His enthusiasm stunned even Rimma. Later in his diary—which he kept for more than 2 years—he scribbled, "She is flabbergasted, but agrees to help." Rimma telephoned her boss at intourist headquarters, then helped Oswald address a written request to the Supreme Soviet.

"Meanwhile her boss telephones the Passport and Visa Office and notifies them about me," Oswald wrote in his until-now secret diary.

Oswald kept the diary—"Historic Diary" he labeled it—from October 16, 1959, the day he met Moscow and Rimma, until March 27, 1962. A reading of it gives much insight into this man who was to become a Presidential assassin.

But on that October day in 1959 everything was rosy. The day after he arrived Rimma came by the Hotel Berlin to accompany the young American—as was her job—on a sight-seeing tour of Moscow.

"She says we must continue with this although I am too nervous. She is 'sure' I will have an answer soon."

He thought Rimma skeptical. She wanted to know why he wanted to do this.

"I explain I am a Communist," he wrote. "She is politely sympathetic, but uneasy now.

"She tries to be a friend to me. She feels sorry for me. I am something new."

(NOTE.—Oswald's spelling was poor. For this story, it has been corrected.)

Sunday, October 18, 1959, Oswald's 20th birthday:

"We visit exhibitions in the morning and in the afternoon the Lenin-Stalin tomb."

For his birthday, Rimma gave Oswald a book, "Idiot," by Fëdor Dostoveski—a story written in the 1860's about a man's desperate struggle for personal human dignity in a world that often denies it.

More tourism on the next day. Oswald wrote he is "anxious." "Still no word from authorities about my request."

October 20: Oswald was told by Rimma that Intourist has been notified that the Passport and Visa Department wants to see him.

"I am excited greatly by this news," Oswald wrote.

October 21, 1959, thus began with hope for the slender American who felt he was temporarily a "man without a country."

That morning he met with a Russian official and later described him as "balding, stout, black suit, fairly good English." He asked Oswald (as if he didn't already know), "What do you want?"

"Soviet citizenship," snapped Oswald.

"Why?" the Russian grunted.

"I give vague answers about 'great Soviet Union,'" Oswald said. He was shocked when the Russki told him, "U.S.S.R. only great in literature."

"I am stunned. I reiterate. He says he will check and let me know whether my visa will be extended (it expires today)."

At 6 p.m., the Russian police telephoned Oswald in his room and told him he had 2 hours to get moving out of the country. His 5-day student's visa would run out at 8 p.m.

"I am shocked. My dreams. I retire to my room. I have $100 left. I have waited for 2 years to be accepted. My fondest dreams are shattered because of a petty official, because of bad planning. I planned so much."

Oswald was in a dilemma. He had forsaken the United States long ago (not officially, but in his mind and heart) and now he cannot stay in the utopia of his dreams, Russia. And he doesn't have enough money to get very far, which doubtless added to his mental anguish.

Suicide.

The diary says:

"Seven p.m. I decide to end it. Soak wrist in cold water to numb the pain. Then slash my left wrist. Then place into bathtub of hot water.

"I think 'When Rimma comes at 8 to find me dead, it will be a great shock.'

"Somewhere a violin plays, as I watch my life whirl away.

"I think to myself 'How easy to die' and 'a sweet death' (to violins)."

Rimma came about 8 p.m. and found Oswald unconscious by the bathtub—the floor and tub deeply stained by Oswald's blood.

Rimma summoned an ambulance, which took Oswald to a hospital where five stitches were taken in the wrist wound.

The Russian girl—described by Oswald in other notes as in her mid-20s—must have pitied the American. She stayed by his side at the hospital for many hours, in case he needed an interpreter, she said.

"My Russian is still very bad," he wrote. "Far into the night I tell her 'go home' (my mood is bad) but she stays. She is my friend."

Oswald saw a certain amount of strength in the Soviet girl and he envied it. While in the hospital he noted, "She has a strong will. Only at this moment I notice she is pretty."

The next day (Oct. 22, 1959) he noted his surroundings: "I am in a small room with about 12 others (sick persons), 2 orderlies and a nurse. The room is very drab, as well as the breakfast."

He then watched the others and made a startling discovery: "Only after prolonged (2 hours) observation of the other patients do I realize I am in the insanity ward. This realization disquiets me."

"She encourages me, then scolds me. She says she will help me get transferred to another section of the hospital (not for insane) where the food is good," Oswald scribbled.

The next day Oswald was taken to a regular ward, but he distrusted the nurses. "The nurses are suspicious of me," he wrote, then in parentheses "They know."

For the next 4 days Oswald didn't jot much in his diary. Rimma visited every day and on the 23d, he wrote that Rosa Agafonova, another Intourist worker at the Berlin, dropped by to cheer him.

"Very beautiful, excellent English, very merry and kind," he wrote of Rosa. "She makes me very glad to be alive."

October 27: "Stitches are taken out by doctor with 'dull' scissors."

Oswald was released on the 28th and Rimma, in an Intourist car, returned him to the Berlin. He checked out for some reason and moved the short distance to the Hotel Metropole.

As soon as Oswald was checked into the Metropole, Rimma (who must be a Russian diplomat by now) told him the Passport and Registration Office wanted to talk with him. "About my future," he wrote.

They exchanged formalities, asked how his arm was and then got to the point: "Do you want to go back to your homeland?"

"No, I want Soviet citizenship," Oswald replied quickly, adding that he had long planned for the day when he would live in Russia.

"We will see," one Russian said.

They then asked him about the other official to whom he had made his request. Oswald told them, then found out that the first Russian had not even passed along the request; had made no application for extension of his visa.

"I describe him. They take notes," Oswald wrote.

When asked for credentials, Oswald whipped out his U.S. Marine Corps discharge certificate—later to be amended from honorary to undesirable when his defection was announced.

"How long will it take?" Oswald asked.

"Not soon," one of the Russians replied curtly.

Then back to his hotel. Faithful Rimma came by to see how he was feeling. "I feel insulted and I insult her," the diary says.

The following day Oswald wrote that he paced the floor in room 214 awaiting an answer to his fate.

"I eat once, stay next to the phone, kept fully dressed," he wrote.

Writing from his hotel room October 30, he added: "I have been in hotel 3 days. It seems like 3 years. I must have some sort of a showdown."

October 31, 1959: "I make my decision." He hailed a taxi and told the driver, "To the American Embassy."

After some time Oswald was taken to see one of the Embassy officials, John A. McVickers.

"I took out my American passport and lay it on the desk and said, 'I have come to dissolve my American citizenship.'"

Oswald said McVicker warned him not to do such a drastic thing without first making sure the Russians would accept him.

"He says I'm a fool," Oswald penned in the diary. "I state 'My mind is made up' and from this day forward I consider myself no citizen of the United States of America."

Oswald talked for 40 minutes with Richard Snyder, a consul at the Embassy, then said Snyder told him, "Unless you wish to expound on your Marxist beliefs you can go."

"In effect I leave the Embassy elated at this showdown," Oswald wrote. He said he left sure that the Russians would now see the light and welcome him * * * "after this sign of faith in them."

At 2 p.m.—less than an hour after he returned from his showdown with the American Embassy folks—reporters began to converge on room 214 at the Metropole. Oswald turned them away for the time being.

"I feel nonplussed because of the attention," he wrote.

On November 1 Oswald wrote: "My mother and my brother have called three times. Now I feel slightly exhilarated, not so lonely."

From November 2 to November 15 the diary claims that he refused all incoming telephone calls. He called this period "days of utter loneliness."

During this time he mentioned pacing the floor, waiting, waiting, waiting. Most of his meals he ate close by the telephone.

He was ill for some days. He did not eat enough.

"I am racked with dysentery," he scribbled at one spot.

On November 15 Oswald felt better and wanted to talk with somebody, perhaps anybody who would listen. He telephoned Miss Aline Mosby of United Press International, who had left her card when he refused her an interview.

He posed for pictures and told Miss Mosby of his intentions, his hopes.

Later he wrote in his diary that she "distorted" the story and he complained that she had failed in her promise to let him read her story before she filed it.

Following the interview, Oswald felt relieved. He had gained more attention. Best of all, perhaps, he had had somebody to talk with who wouldn't argue with him, who would be very, very interested in what he had to say.

That night he wrote, "I feel slightly better because of the attention."

The very next day—November 16, 1959—exactly 1 month after he arrived in Russia—a Soviet official came to him and told him he could stay until they decided what must be done in his unusual case.

"It is comforting news for me," he wrote.

Though he felt more secure, because he knew the wheels were turning, Oswald still had qualms through November and December when no word came.

He bought a couple of self-teaching Russian books and locked himself in his room and studied.

New Year's Eve of 1960, Oswald didn't feel much like celebrating.

He was worried about his finances. He owed for the entire month of December at the hotel; hadn't paid one kopek. He owed 2,200 rubles and had only $28 left.

"I see no one from November 17 to December 30 except now and then Rimma who calls the Ministry about me * * * 'Have they forgotten?' "

Rimma, Oswald said, had told the hotel that though Oswald was rather slow in paying his bill, not to worry because he was to receive a big sum of money from America any day now.

So, on New Year's Eve he sat and talked at length with Rosa Agafonova. She gave him a small boratin (clown) as a present.

"She is very nice," Oswald wrote. "I found out only recently she is married and has a small son who was born crippled. That is why she is so strangely tender and compelling."

On January 4 he was told by the Russians that he could have a residence document, but not citizenship.

He was instructed to go to the Red Cross to get money to help him settle his bills and pay his train fare to Minsk, where he had been told he would be given a job in a factory.

(Minsk is 468 miles southwest of Moscow, closer to Warsaw. A city about the size of Dallas. It is the capital of Byelorussia.)

Oswald was elated. At last he was moving again on his road, which was to end not in Moscow, but in the Dallas city jail less than 4 turbulent years later.

The money Red Cross gave him especially pleases Oswald. He wrote: "I receive 5,000 rubles, a huge sum."

(This was more than he would receive for 7 months' work in Minsk, despite the fact he made more than the average Russian at his job.

(The American Red Cross said in Washington it had never given any money to Oswald and has no record of correspondence between the American Red Cross and the U.S.S.R. Red Cross regarding the defector.)

January 7, 1960: Oswald boarded a train for Minsk. Train fare: 150 rubles.

"I have a lot of money and hope," his diary says.

Two Red Cross workers met him at the Minsk station and took him to the Hotel Minsk, where two Intourist guides, Rosa and Stellina, came by within the hour.

Stellina, wrote Oswald, was in her forties, "nice, married, young child." Rosa: about 23, blonde, attractive, unmarried, excellent English. We attract each other at once."

January 8, 1960: "I meet the city mayor, Comrade Shrapof, who welcomes me to Minsk, promises a rent-free apartment 'soon' and warns me about 'uncultured persons' who sometimes insult foreigners."

January 10: "The day to myself. I walk through city, very nice."

The following day Oswald visited the Minsk Radio Factory, where he soon was to be given a good job—very good by Russian standards.

He found a man there he immediately liked and respected—one who was to play a big part in his decision to leave Russia and get back to his native land.

Even that day this man might have tried to warn Oswald of what he would encounter. Oswald wrote in his diary:

"There I meet Andrei Tovli, late forties, mild mannered, likeable. He seems to want to tell me something."

Oswald began his job January 13 as a "checker" metalworker at 700 rubles a month. He didn't write much in his diary the next couple of months, except:

"Work very easy. I am learning Russian quickly now. Everyone is very friendly and kind. I meet many young Russian workers my own age, and they have varied personalities.

"All wish to know about me, even offer to hold a mass meeting so I can say.

"I refuse politely.

"At night I take Rosa to the theater, movie, or opera almost every day.

"I'm living big and am very satisfied.

"I receive a check from the Red Cross every 5th of the month 'to help.' The check is 700 rubles. Therefore, every month I make 1,400 rubles, about the same as the director of the factory."

Oswald, known as a complainer in the Marine Corps, hadn't changed. He wrote: "I don't like: Picture of Lenin which watches from its place of honor and physical training at 11 to 11:10 each morning (compulsory) for all."

On March 16 Oswald wrote of his new apartment. He observed that many coworkers have been on the list for an apartment for 5 or 6 years. He called his flat "a Russian dream."

The one-room, kitchen-bath apartment was near his work.

"Only 8 minutes walk," he wrote, and added, "It has a splendid view from two balconies of the river. Almost rent-free (60 rubles a month)."

Soon Oswald told of meeting Pavil Golovacha, a friendly young Russian, about his age. "Very intelligent, an excellent radio technician." He noted that Pavil's father was the famed General Golovacha, commander of northwestern Siberia and a World War II hero.

Next entry was May Day (May 1, 1960). "I follow the American custom of marking a holiday by sleeping in the morning." He then described the "spectacular military parade" and the parade of all the workers—except him—waving flags and pictures of Khrushchev.

That night Oswald went to Tovli's home for a party with 40 people. "We dance, play around, and drink until 2 a.m., when party breaks up."

Tovli finally came out with it, after trying in more subtle terms: "Go back to the United States," he told Oswald.

Oswald was stunned. He wrote later:

"It's the first opposition I have heard. I respect Tovli. He has seen the world. He says many things and relates many things I don't know about the U.S.S.R.

"I begin to feel uneasy inside * * * it's true."

The next 2 months Oswald spent considerable time with another coworker, an Argentine immigrant named Alexander Zeger. Zeger had two daughters Oswald enjoyed.

He wrote of Leonora, 26, and Anita, 20, Zeger's daughters. Anita is "very gay, not so attractive." Oswald said he and Anita "hit it off."

Of Leonora, a divorcee, Oswald wrote: "She has a beautiful Spanish figure, long black hair, like Anita. I never pay much attention to her. She's too old for me (he is 20 now). She seems to dislike my lack of attention for some reason. She is high strung."

Oswald then told of a dingy cafe where he usually ate his evening meal.

"The food is generally poor and always the same menus in any cafe at any point in the city. The food is cheap and I don't really care about quality after 3 years in the USMC."

In August and September of 1960—less than a year in Russia—Oswald decided he wanted out.

"As my Russian improves," he wrote, "I become increasingly conscious of just what sort of a society I live in. Mass gymnastics, compulsory afterwork meetings, usually political information meeting, compulsory attendance at lectures and the sending of the entire shop collective (except me) to pick potatoes on a Sunday at a State Collective farm: a 'patriotic duty' to bring in the harvest."

He added: "The opinions of the workers (unvoiced) are that it's a great pain in the neck. They don't seem to be especially enthusiastic about any of the 'collective duties,' a natural feeling.

"I am increasingly aware of the presence, in all things, of Lebizen, shop party secretary, fat, fortyish and jovial on the outside. He is a no-nonsense party regular."

In October 1960, Oswald wrote of the coming of the bitter Russian winter. His dread of the cold was "mellowed in spendid golds and reds of fall in Byelorussia."

His 21st birthday, October 18, 1960, was his happiest in several years. Still living in splendid fashion, he invited Pavil, Rosa and a beautiful Jewish lass named Ella Germain to a party at his apartment.

He described Ella as "a very attractive Russian Jew I have been going walking with lately, works at the radio factory."

Ella was destined soon to play a big part in the twisted pathways traveled by Lee Harvey Oswald.

Oswald wrote in his diary in much the same manner he often expressed his other views; he felt he was the big cheese—the center of attraction. The same went for the birthday party.

"Rosa and Ella are jealous of each other," he wrote. "It brings a warm feeling to me. Both are at my place for the first time.

"Ella and Pavil both give me ash trays (I don't smoke). We have a laugh."

November brought the winter. Oswald felt it more than some.

"A growing loneliness overtakes me in spite of my conquest of Ennatachina, a girl from Riga studying at the music conservatory in Minsk," he wrote, adding, "And short (this then scratched out) after an affair which lasts a few weeks we part."

He looked elsewhere for attention.

November 15, 1960: "I make the acquaintance of four girls rooming at the Foreign

Language Dormitory in room 212. Nell is very interesting, so is Tomka, Tomis and Alla.

"I usually go to the institute dormitory with a friend of mine who speaks English very well, Erich Titov, 22, who is in the fourth year at the Medical Institute."

Oswald thought Titov "a very bright fellow." Later when he would plan his return to the United States, Oswald could not tell Erich for fear he would somehow block his move.

Oswald's only December jotting was, "I am having a light affair with Nell Korobka."

January 1, 1961, the love bug got hold of Oswald.

"New Year's Day I spend at the home of Ella Germain, I think I'm in love with her. She has refused my more dishonorable advances. We drink and eat in the presence of her family in a very hospitable atmosphere.

"Later I go home drunk and happy. Passing the river homeward, I decide to propose to Ella."

January 2: "After a pleasant hand-in-hand walk to the local cinema we came home. Standing on the doorstep I propose. She hesitates, then refuses.

"My love is real but she has none for me.

"Her reason besides lack of love: I am an American and some day might be arrested simply because of that. Example, Polish intervention in the twenties led to the arrest of all people in the Soviet Union of Polish origin."

"You understand the world situation," he quoted Ella, "There is too much against you and you don't even know it."

Oswald was shocked. He tripped over his own feet as he turned to leave.

"She snickers at my awkwardness in turning to go (I am too stunned to think).

"I realize," he wrote, "she was never serious with me but only exploited my being an American to get the envy of the other girls who consider me different from the Russian boys."

He closed that day's entry:

"I am miserable."

The next day was another low one. "I am miserable about Ella. I love her but what can I do?"

January 4, 1961, 1 year after Oswald was granted his residence document: "I am called in by the Passport Office and asked if I want citizenship (Russian). I say 'No, simply extend my residential passport.'" This was granted.

The rest of January Oswald penned only four lines in his diary, but they tell a story:

"I am starting to reconsider my desire about staying. The work is drab. The money I get has nowhere to be spent. No nightclubs or bowling alleys, no places of recreation except the trade union dances.

"I have had enough."

February 1, 1961: Oswald wrote the U.S. Embassy in Moscow. "I state I would like to go back to United States."

February 28: "I receive letter from Embassy. Richard E. Snyder stated I could come in for an interview any time I wanted."

For 2 weeks Oswald wondered how he was going to get the 468 miles to Moscow to handle the next step of his amended "plan."

"I now live in a state of expectation about going back to the United States. I confided in Tovli. He supports my judgment, but warns not to tell any Russians about my desire to return.

"I understand now why."

March 17, 1961: Another detour appeared in Oswald's mazelike life. That night he and Erich went to a dance at the Trade Union.

"Boring," he wrote later, "but at the last hour I am introduced to a girl with a French hairdo and red dress with white slippers.

"I dance with her, then ask to show her home.

"I do, along with five other admirers. Her name is Marina. We like each other right away. She gives me her phone number and departs home with a not-so-new friend in a taxi. I walk home."

March 18–31: "We walk. I talk a little about myself, she talks a lot about herself. Her name is Marina N."

April 1–30: The diary got skimpy as Oswald was busy courting. "We are going steady and I decide I must have her. She puts me off, so on April 15, I propose. She accepts."

April 31 [sic]: "After a 7-day delay at the Marriage Bureau because of my unusual passport, they allow us to register as man and wife. Two of Marina's girl friends act as bridesmaids, we are married.

"At her aunt's home we have a dinner reception for about 20 friends and neighbors who wish us happiness (in spite of my origin and accent)."

He described an evening of merriment, drinking, and eating, and added, "Uncle Vasily started a fight and the fuse blew on an overload circuit." After all that, they walked the 15 minutes to their home.

"At midnight we were home," he recalled.

May of 1961 and Oswald wrote: "In spite of fact I married Marina to hurt Ella I found myself in love with Marina."

In late May, he added: "The transition of changing the full love from Ella to Marina was very painful, especially as I saw Ella almost every day at the factory, but as the days and weeks went by I adjusted more and more.

"I still haven't told my wife of my desire to return to the United States.

"She is madly in love with me from the very start. Boat rides on Lake Minsk, walks through the parks, evening at home or at Aunt Valia's place mark May."

In June 1961, he wrote: "A continuance of May, except that we draw closer and closer and I think very little now of Ella."

In late June, Lee told Marina he wanted to go home.

"My wife is slightly startled," he wrote, "but then she encourages me to do what I wish to do."

In July, Oswald decided to take his 2-week vacation from the radio factory and fly to Moscow to see if the American Embassy could help him get back to his homeland.

July 8, 1961: Oswald boarded an Ilushin-20 jet, got to Moscow 2 hours and 20 minutes later. He took a bus from the airport to mid-Moscow.

As he arrived at the U.S. Embassy it was closed. It was 3 p.m. on Saturday. He telephoned Snyder ("since all Embassy personnel live in the same building").

Oswald talked with Snyder, who told him to come back Monday morning and they would help him. Oswald telephoned Marina in Minsk and had her fly up the following day.

They both returned to Minsk July 15, and Marina returned to work to find that all her bosses and coworkers knew where she had been.

"They were called at her place of work from some official in Moscow," Oswald wrote. "The bosses held a meeting and give her a strong browbeating, the first of many such indoctrinations."

The next 6 weeks were spent in getting the necessary blanks and applications filled out. "They number about 20," Oswald scribbled.

August 20, 1961: "We give the papers out. They say it will be 3½ months before we know whether they will let us go or not.

"In the meantime, Marina has had to stand four different meetings at the place of work held by her bosses at the direction of 'someone' by phone.

"The Young Communist League headquarters also called about her and she had to go see them for 1½ hours.

"The purpose (expressed) is to dissuade her from going to the United States. Net effect: Make her more stubborn about wanting to go."

He wrote for the first time in mid-August about Marina being pregnant. He added, "We only hope the visas come through soon."

August 21–September 1: "I make repeated trips to the passport and visa office, also to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Minsk, also the Ministry of Internal Affairs, all of which have a say in the granting of a visa. I expected promises of quick attention to us."

September 1–October 18: "No word from Ministry. ('They'll call us.') Marina left Minsk by train on vacation to the city of Kharkov in the Urals to visit an aunt for 4 weeks.

"During this time I am lonely, but I and Erich go to the dances and public places for entertainment. I haven't done this in quite a few months now.

"I spend my birthday alone at the opera, watching my favorite, 'Queen of Spades.' I am 22 years old."

November 12, 1961: "Marina arrives back radiant, with several jars of preserves for me from her aunt in Kharkov."

November–December: "Now we are becoming annoyed by the delay. Marina is beginning to waver about going to the United States, probably from the strain and her being pregnant.

"Still we quarrel and so things are not so bright, especially with the approach of the hard Russian winter."

The Oswalds had a nice surprise for Christmas. That afternoon Marina was called to the passport and visa office and told they had been granted Soviet exit visas.

"She fills out the completing blank and then comes home with the news," he wrote in his diary. "It's great (I think)."

New Year's Day of 1962 the Oswalds attended a dinner party with six others at Alexander Zeger's house.

January 4: Oswald traded in his resident document and was given a special pass, good until July 5, 1962.

"Since they have given us permission to leave, they know we shall," he scribbled later.

Oswald wrote but two lines in the January 4 to February 15 period: "Days of cold Russian winter but we feel fine. Marina is supposed to have baby on March 1."

At dawn on February 15 Marina awakened Lee (Alek, she called him) and told him she felt the time was close.

"It's her time," he penned. "At 9 a.m. we arrive at the hospital. I leave her in care of the nurses and leave to go to work."

At 10 a.m. Marina gave birth to a baby girl.

"When I visit the hospital at 5 p.m. after work, I am given news.

"We both wanted a boy. Marina feels well, baby girl, OK."

February 23: "Marina leaves hospital. I see June for first time."

February 28: "I go to register (as prescribed by law) the baby. I want her name to be June Marina Oswald. But these bureaucrats say her middle name must be the same as my first, a Russian custom supported by law.

"I refuse to have her name written as June Lee. They promise to call the city ministry (city hall) and find out in this case—since I do have a U.S. passport."

The next day Oswald learned he must follow the Russian law. He wrote simply: "Name: June Lee."

March 1962: "The last communiques are exchanged between myself and the Embassy. Letters are always arriving from my mother and brother in the United States.

"I still have not told Erich, who is my oldest existing acquaintance, that we are going to the States. He's OK, but I am afraid he is too good a Young Communist League member, so I'll wait until last minute."

March 24: "Marina quits her job in the formal fashion."

March 25: "I receive a letter from Immigration and Naturalization Service at San Antonio, Tex., that Marina has had her visa petition (approved). The last document. Now we only have to wait for the U.S. Embassy to receive their copy of the approval so they can officially give the go-ahead."

March 27, 1962: "I receive a letter from a Mr. Philles, an employer of my mother, pledging to support my wife in case of need."

That was the last diary entry.

Within a few days the Oswalds were on a Dutch steamer heading for New York and a destiny few, if any, would have believed possible.

[From the Dallas (Tex.) Morning News, June 28, 1964]

Red Secret Police Paid Half of His Income

(By Hugh Aynesworth)

Nearly a year after Lee Oswald defected to Russia, this undesirable discharge replaced his honorable one. The last is dated September 13, 1960, when Oswald already was trying to return to the United States:

"UNDESIRABLE DISCHARGE FROM THE ARMED FORCES OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

"This is to certify that Pfc. Lee Harvey Oswald, 1653230, was discharged from the U.S. Marine Corps on the 13th day of September 1960 as undesirable.

"M. G. Letscher,
"First Lieutenant, U.S. Marine Corps."

The Russian Secret Police paid half of Lee Harvey Oswald's income during 1961 while he was in the Soviet Union, Oswald said in notes he wrote shortly after leaving the U.S.S.R. early the next year.

Oswald wrote that he felt the monthly 700 rubles (he made a like amount at his job in Minsk, he said) was payment for "my denunciation of the United States in Moscow."

In his diary Oswald mentioned that the additional 700 rubles was given him by the "Red Cross," but after he left Russia, he wrote:

"When I went to Russia in the winter of 1959 my funds were very limited, so after a certain time, after the Russians had assured themselves that I was really the naive American who believed in communism, they arranged for me to receive a certain amount of money every month.

"Oh, it came technically through the Red Cross as financial help to a poor political immigrant but it was arranged by the MVD (secret police).

"I told myself it was simply because I was broke and everybody knew it. I accepted the money because I was hungry and there was several inches of snow on the ground in Moscow at that time, but what it really was was payment for my denunciation of the United States in Moscow."

Oswald said this money was "a clear promise that for as long as I lived in the U.S.S.R. life would be very good.

"I didn't realize all this, of course, for almost 2 years."

When Oswald began planning his return to the United States, the Red Cross money stopped, he said.

"As soon as I became completely disgruntled with the Soviet Union and started negotiations with the American embassy in Moscow for my return to the United States, my Red Cross allotment was cut off.

"This was not difficult to understand since all correspondence in and out of the Embassy is censored and is common knowledge in the Embassy itself.

"I have never mentioned the fact of these monthly payments to anyone.

"I do so in order to state that I shall never sell myself intentionally, or unintentionally, to anyone again."

The American Red Cross reports that it had not given Oswald any money and had no record of correspondence between that agency and the U.S.S.R. Red Cross regarding Oswald.

However, the American Red Cross said it was entirely possible that the U.S.S.R. Red Cross gave Oswald money "since each country determines what is humanitarian need.

The exact date of Oswald's writing is not known, but the paper is stationery of the Holland-American Line, so it probably was during the Oswald family's return from Russia in early 1962.

Oswald goes into great detail in picturing the radio factory in Minsk where he was employed for 23 months.

He said the Russians pulled a big trick when they shipped several combination radio-phonograph-television consoles to the 1958 Soviet trade exhibition in New York.

The Russians proudly beamed that such console sets were being mass-produced at that time throughout the Soviet Union.

"After the exhibition," Oswald wrote in his lengthy notes, "the sets were duly shipped back to Minsk and are now stored in a special storage room on the first floor of the administration building at the factory, ready for the next international exhibit."

He said 6,000 persons worked at the Minsk plant, known through the Soviet Union for its electronics production. Only 1,000 of these, he wrote, were Communists.

He appeared to like his working conditions at the plant, but compulsory attendance at the many meetings upset him.

He cited one month as an example, claiming he had to attend 12 of 16 scheduled meetings, which included several hours of listening to Communist and trade union drivel.

Though Oswald was fortunate in getting a nice apartment after only a few weeks in Minsk, he said most of the natives didn't fare so well.

"In order to receive an apartment," he wrote, "people often must wait for 5 or 6 years."

He described the people of Minsk as "warmhearted and simple, but often stubborn and untrustworthy."

"Most workers in Minsk come from peasant stock which repopulated the city at the end of the Second World War," he explained.

Another place, he referred to the strictness of the political lectures.

During the Communist Party directive readings, Oswald wrote, the attention paid by the workers was "phenomenal."

The people sit at rapt attention, "impervious to outside interference or sounds," he said.

"After long years of hardfisted discipline, no worker allows himself to be trapped and called out for inattentiveness by the ever-present and watchful party secretary," he added.

"At these times it is best to curb one's natural boisterous and lively nature," he wrote.

"Under the 6-foot by 6-foot picture of Lenin, founder of the Soviet state, the party section secretary stands, at our place a middle-aged, pouched man by the name of Eockapo, an average-looking man wearing glasses, his wrinkled face and twinkling eyes give one the impression that at any moment he's going to tell a racy story or funny joke.

"But he never does.

"Behind this man stands 15 years of party life. His high post, relatively speaking for him, is witness to his efficiency.

"He stands expounding from notes in front of him, the week's 'information' with all the lack of enthusiasm one gets if someone knows he has no worries about an audience or about someone getting up and going away."

Oswald said this rigid discipline was similar to that used in gathering huge May Day celebrations and other crowds for show purposes.

"I remember when I was in Moscow in 1959 I was just passing in front of the Metropole restaurant when out of the side streets rushed a 10-man police unit which stopped all people on the street from passing in front of the entrance."

Oswald said the police unit surrounded the crowd and kept them hemmed in ("not detouring the flow of traffic as would be expected") for 3 minutes.

"Right on schedule," Oswald went on in his scribble-like hand, "an obviously distinguished foreign lady was driven up to the restaurant, where a meeting in her honor had been arranged."

The woman, said Oswald "was taken through the 'spontaneous welcoming crowd,' after which the police were withdrawn, allowing the passers-by to continue."

Oswald wrote of why relatively few Russians defect.

He said travel was not overly restricted, but that a Russian had to pass certain restrictions to get permission, which, Oswald wrote, included:

"1. That he must be OK'd by the Communist Bureau;

"2. That he must account for the presence of excess money, since speculation is not allowed in the U.S.S.R.;

"3. He must leave behind close relatives, preferably a wife and children or mother and father."

Oswald considered the last point the real clincher.

"The Russians know that a person will not ordinarily leave a delegation or group of tourists to seek asylum if he knows he'll never see his family again, not alive anyway."

(This was the same man who cabled his mother and brother in Fort Worth after his acceptance by the Russians, "I do not want to see or hear from you ever again. I am beginning a new life and I want none of the old.")

There are collective farms, and then there are collective farms, Oswald wrote:

"Twelve miles out of Moscow is a show collective farm for foreign tourists who ask to see a genuine, average collective farm.

"On it is almost every imaginable help to man possible, including automatic milkers, feeders, even automatic floor cleaners.

"The collective farmers at this place along with their counterparts at the same sort of place just south of Leningrad live in well-built apartment houses with food and clothing stores built right into the first floors.

"For the benefit of someone who doesn't want to be duped, I suggest you take the Moscow to Brest highway for 24 miles until you come to Uecteesh."

Oswald said by asking directions in this small town, "you can in 5 minutes find a real collective farm, a village of the small black mud and scrap wood houses seen throughout the Soviet Union.

"And although it's 50 minutes from the Kremlin, it doesn't have electricity or gas. Inside plumbing is unknown and the only automation is that done with a broom."

He went on, "True, the collective farmers may own chickens, a pig or even a cow, as well as his own piece of land, usually one-fourth of an acre, but the isolation and agonizingly hard work in summer and fall offsets these 'advantages.'

"Though still without electricity, 'collective farms' have wire-fed radio programs and a speaker in every home. This is part of the propaganda system instigated by Khrushchev to 'bring the cultural level of outlying collective farms up to the level of the city dweller.'"

Oswald must have been bugged by the "ageepoongs" that dot the Russian landscape, for he mentions them in terms of disgust.

"Ageepoongs" are "agitation points," located at desks or small offices. Oswald said somebody manned these places 15 hours a day to distribute propaganda and watch the populace.

He wrote: "They are manned by 'volunteers,' Communist and Young Communist Party members. They are for the distribution of pamphlets, bulletins and other party literature, for the more or less informal meetings of groups of Communist party members.

"Formed in the 1920's, they were then points of armed workers, located near to each other, who could put down 'white' uprisings or conveniently arrest anyone in the neighborhood.

"Now their function has partly changed but it's still known that any party member can come in and report disloyal comments or an unguarded moment on the part of any citizen. There is always a telephone handy here.

"In Minsk there are only 12 movie houses, but 58 ageepoongs are in the telephone book. They can be recognized at a distance by red flags and banners draped over the doors and windows of the respective buildings."

Oswald was fed up with listening to Radio Moscow, it seemed.

They "assure peoples in 81 countries that the Iron Curtain no longer exists, never did exist and is in general a fictitious slander against the Soviet Union thought up by reactionaries."

"Sick," Oswald closed.

There are no all-day TV buffs in Russia, Oswald claimed. He explained:

"Television is organized and shown in order not to interfere with work in industries.

"Monday to Fridays programs start at 6 in the evening, quite enough to allow any worker to get home in time for the start, but not enough to allow him to take time off to watch television or become a television addict as we have in the United States.

"Programs finish at 11 in the evening so that all the workers can get enough sleep. On Saturdays they start at 3 to compensate for the shop workday and end at 12 or 12:30. Sunday programs start as early as 10:30 in the morning and end at 11 o'clock."

Oswald commented that the television shown was of high caliber—that part other than the usual political propaganda. He said ballet, symphonic music, cartoons for the kids and good movies "break the monotonous run of politics and dry facts and figures."

Oswald wrote of elections in the Soviet Union. Of course, only one name is on the ballot and people mark it and drop it in a box at the polling place, usually a school.

About those who would vote against a Communist candidate:

"In each polling place there is a booth for secret balloting (crossing out the candidate and writing in your own). Under Soviet law, anyone can do this.

"Nobody does for the obvious reason that anyone who enters the booth may be identified.

"There is a Soviet joke about the floor dropping out from anyone stepping into the booth.

"But it's fact that if the entire population used the polling booth they could beat the system. However, years of mass discipline and fears have made the people afraid to attempt any such demonstration."

Writing in a small notebook under the subhead, "The New Era," Oswald predicted that Stalinism might well be revived in the republics of Byelorussia (Minsk is the capital) and Georgia, where Stalin was born.

He tells of the tearing down of a 35-foot Stalin monument in Minsk in November of 1960, just preceding the November 7 revolutionary celebrations. Bulldozers and piledriver were brought in to tear down the bronze and marble structure, wrote Oswald.

"The most remarkable thing about the destruction of this giant monument," he wrote, "was that work was ceased on the 6th of November, but started again on the 7th, the very day the big parade of workers came by. The monument was right across from the reviewing stand, as it was built to be.

"In full view of all the dignitaries and workers going by, the destruction of Stalin and the symbolic ending of Stalinism (Khrushchev hopes) was concluded.

"But Byelorussia, as in Stalin's native Georgia, is still a stronghold of Stalinism.

"And a revival of Stalinism is a very, very possible thing in those two republics."

Oswald apparently was writing these notes for a paid speech because after he explained about the MVD giving him monthly money, he wrote at the bottom of one page:

"As for the fee of $ * * * (it was blank) I was supposed to receive for this * * * (another blank). I refuse it, I made pretense to accept it only because otherwise I would have been considered a crackpot and not allowed to appear and express my views. After all, who would refuse money?"

Oswald wrote of many acquaintances he made while in the Soviet Union, goodhearted, kind people and rough and tough (and untrustworthy) Communists who had sold their soul long before to the party and whom Oswald apparently feared.

When he told of his complaints and troubles in U.S. Marine Corps, he said Russians who had served with the military there "laughed and said we have no discipline.

"But I'm quite sure," he added, "that the 'oohs' and 'ahs' were signs of admiration when I spoke of our 'undisciplined' Army—especially the complete absence of political lectures, under our system of separation of Army and state, and also the fact that at the end of each workday we could don civvies and pile into a car and go to town to movie or a dance, our own disciplinarians."

Oswald told of widespread embezzling in Russia.

"Corruption in the U.S.S.R. takes a major form in embezzling and greasing of palms as in any purely bureaucratic society. In 1961 the death penalty for embezzlement of state funds in large sums was reenacted as an answer to widespread pilfering of goods, crops and embezzling of money and state bonds.

"On any collective or state farm there is a certain percent of state goods illegally appropriated by the collective farmers for their own private use to make up for low wages and therefore low living conditions or for sale to private individuals, stores or at the open market type of bazaar.

"These goods may consist of only a pilfered lamb or piglet or may run in scores of sheep and cows hidden in backwater swamps or thick pine forests and sold by the appropriator piecemeal or in wholesale lots to crooked store supervisors who are supposed to buy state meats and crops at government prices."

Oswald said these crooked store supervisors "pocket the differences of prices from the black market while making entries in their books that such merchandise was bought for state prices."

Oswald wrote that this was common practice. Without such doubledealing, he said, "many stores would be almost empty if they had to rely on the sporadic, poor quality of goods brought in from the state slaughterhouses at high prices."

He wrote further that even a small fruit or milk store can be turned into a "lucrative enterprise" since sufficient proof is hard to come by.

Oswald comments on Russian higher education, which he considered better than its counterpart in America.

"We could definitely learn from the rigorous and highly specialized educational system of the Soviet Union," he wrote.

Oswald later comments about what he considered the fallacies of the American way of life.

"I have often wondered," he wrote, "why the Communist, capitalist, Fascist, and anarchist elements in America always profess patriotism toward the land and the people, if not the Government, although their movements must surely lead to the bitter destruction of all and everything.

"I am quite sure these people must hate not only the Government but the culture, heritage and very people itself, and yet they stand up and piously pronounce themselves patriots, displaying their war medals that they gained in conflicts between themselves.

"I wonder what would happen if somebody was to stand up and say he was utterly opposed not only to the Government, but to the people, to the entire land and complete foundations of his [sic] socially."

Oswald, it seemed, did just that. When nobody paid him heed, perhaps it was then that his twisted mind turned toward violence of the worst possible kind.

While a still upset world has passed judgment on Oswald, one must occasionally wonder what this man thought of himself.

A clue lies near the end of a bunch of notes he must have considered his book. He wrote:

"Lee Harvey Oswald was born in October 1939, in New Orleans, La., the son of an insurance salesman whose early death left a (the words 'desire for' were here but later scratched out) mean streak of independence brought on by neglect.

"Entering the U.S. Marine Corps at 17, this streak of independence was strengthened by exotic journeys to Japan, the Philippines, and the scores of odd islands in the Pacific.

"Immediately after serving out his 3 years in the USMC he abandoned his (he wrote the word 'family' but later scratched this out too) American life to seek a new life in the U.S.S.R.

"Full of optimism and hope, he stood in Red Square in the fall of 1959 vowing to see his chosen course through. After, however, 2 years and a lot of growing up, he decided to return to the United States of America.

"This book is not a study about himself. He is only the narrator. He does think, however, that not too many people, at least Americans, have had the opportunity to look into an often incredible and sometimes terrifying world, but a world whose outward appearance is very like our own, if not quite so gray."

A letter from an official of U.S. Communist Party to Lee Oswald:

COMMUNIST PARTY, U.S.A.,
New York, N.Y., July 31, 1963.

L. H. OSWALD,
Post Office Box 30861,
New Orleans, La.

DEAR MR. OSWALD: Your letter to the Worker has been referred to me for reply.

It is good to know that movements in support of fair play for Cuba have developed in New Orleans as well as in other cities. We do not have any organizational ties with the committee, and yet there is much material that we issue from time to time that is important for anybody who is concerned about developments in Cuba.

Under separate cover we are sending you some literature.

Sincerely yours,
ARNOLD JOHNSON,
Director, Information and Lecture Bureau.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, annually and appropriately in the Congress Captive Nations Week is observed. We are not alone in commemorating the liberty loving people who have lost their liberty behind the Iron Curtain.

Annually since 1959 when a joint resolution of the Congress called upon the President of the United States to proclaim the third week of each July as Captive Nations Week, a Mass has been sung for those hapless people in St. Patrick's Cathedral in New York City.

On Sunday July 12, such a Mass was proceeded by a colorful procession of hundreds of immigrants and descendants of immigrants from Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, and Rumania.

In his sermon Msgr. John Balkunas sounded a warning to all God-fearing people.

> Khrushchev—

He said—

> has evidently now decided that the task of exterminating religious faith is to be rushed to completion. The so-called winds of change are really icy blasts of repression.
>
> The Communist regimes today, aware of the weight of world opinion, prefer to use subtler means for repression rather than the open terror of the Stalin days. Religion is to be slowly choked to death by an artificially fostered scarcity of faithful and clergy.

In Washington the spirit of the week and of our times is evidenced in an editorial of the Catholic Standard of July 17. It is over the initials of Father Joseph M. O'Connell of St. Patrick's Church, and bears the title "Why Captive Nations Week?"

I ask that it be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK?

Each year, during the second week of July, Americans observe Captive Nations Week, an observance that has received a good deal of congressional backing. The President, as did President Johnson this year, issued a statement which highlights the purpose of Captive Nations Week.

This year, however, witnessed the growth of a trend of opposition toward Captive Nations Week. While outright opposition was rare, some publications expressed dissatisfaction with the idea of highlighting the term captive nations. They felt that it might hurt the possibility of friendship between the United States and the Soviet bloc. Other publications seemed to feel that the idea of a week for captive nations was playing into the hands of extreme rightwing groups.

But an objective examination of the situation brings out the sound reasoning behind the idea of Captive Nations Week. The week is not meant as a scare tactic, but it is a time to think. Americans enjoy a great deal of freedom—so much freedom that we tend to take it for granted. People in many parts of the world, especially behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains, do not enjoy this same freedom.

It is true that there are certain rumblings within the Communist bloc. Newspapers constantly carry stories about the differences between the Soviets and the Red Chinese. Rumania has shown in the past few weeks that it wants recognition too.

Yet despite the rumblings among nations, the people within each country do not exercise freedom as we know and live the word. That they desire freedom cannot be doubted. The recent trip of Attorney General Robert Kennedy to Poland did much to demonstrate the freedom-loving spirit of the Polish people. In many of the captive nations, the Communist governments have had to relax their controls on the exercise of human rights. Yet this brings out all the more that in the captive nations the state possesses human rights—not the individual, as we believe in the free world.

Captive Nations Week should be a time when all Americans should think. It is a time for us to realize how important our freedom is and how much we should work to protect and further that freedom. It is a time to pray for our brothers in captive nations and to strengthen our determination to do all that we can to insure their freedom.

J. M. O'C.

THE WAURIKA WATER PROJECT IN OKLAHOMA SHOULD BE ADVANCED

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, Oklahoma is a State of contrasts. We have been alternately plagued by floods and drouth. While generally the surface and ground water supplies for our cities and towns are adequate, extremely hot and in certain sections extremely dry weather has again made it necessary to curtail and ration water in a number of communities.

One area that presently is hit hardest is in Jefferson and Carter Counties. The towns of Waurika, Hastings, Walters, Temple, Duncan, Comanche, and nearby Lawton are all under restrictive use at the present.

Ironically, these are the same towns that have sought to contract with the Federal Government for a municipal water supply from the authorized Waurika project on Beaver River.

The Corps of Engineers has advised that they have a capability for advanced engineering and design of this project if provided with the funds.

I hope, Mr. President, that Congress will, on the basis of the ever-increasing emergency of these towns and the capability of the corps, provide a small appropriation to advance the Waurika project. This is a good project. It has a benefit-cost ratio of 1.9, and the participating cities have agreed to assume $12,900,000 of a total project cost of $25,853,000.

I ask that an article from the Sunday Oklahoman of July 12, 1964, entitled "Summertime Parches State, Leaves Trail of Drought," may be printed following my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUMMERTIME PARCHES STATE, LEAVES TRAIL OF DROUGHT

(By Ivy Coffey)

The blistering heat of summertime moves across Oklahoma, leaving in its parched path the specter of drought—critical water shortages, widespread rationing and a frantic search by cities for an adequate water supply.

Reservoir levels are low in many sections of the State, farm ponds are low and lake levels are dropping. Many cities—notably across the southern section—face an immediate crisis.

Some cities, such as Hastings in Jefferson County, are only a few weeks away from water taps running absolutely dry. Pasture grass is burning up, and in the cities, lawns, trees, and shrubs are browning and dying because of water bans imposed.

Lack of rainfall is the main cause of the worsening problem. In some parts, it's a matter of no water runoff. In most cities, it's also summertime demand. In extreme cases, such as at Ardmore and Waurika, it's dwindling supply.

Federal climatologist Stanley Holbrook said many counties are suffering because of last year's dryness. Rainfall in 1963 in the south central and northeastern sections was 46 percent of normal. Rainfall in these areas this year for the first 6 months is 83 percent and 98 percent of normal, respectively.

Jefferson County, one of the dryest counties this summer, received only .11 of an inch of rain in June, usually the wettest month. Carter County received less than one inch.

The eastern half of Jefferson County and most of Carter County are sharply affected by continued lack of rain.

At least seven cities over the State have water rationing, voluntary or imposed. The list lengthens daily.

Hastings is down to its last farm pond. There is about a month's supply in the 18-foot-deep pond of Glen Brandon. The pond has gone down about 2½ feet since Don Houchins, Hastings water superintendent, began pumping it twice daily. Brandon donates the water from his pond.

Houchins said he might have to cut the pumping next week if Brandon needs to supply his hogs and stock. He now pumps 2 hours in the morning and 2 hours in the evening.

"The water is gone in about 30 minutes," Houchins said.

Hastings has been haunted by water shortage for a whole year, since the city lake went dry last July.

"We've just had showers, no real runoff," said Houchins. He has been superintendent for 7 years. He has been kept busy the past year laying pipe to the farm ponds donated by Brandon, G. E. Adkins, and Bert Davenport. As the ponds dry up, he moves to another.

The Brandon pond is the last one. After that, Houchins doesn't know where the area will get water. He said Vic Clark had offered water rights 2½ miles east of Hastings. Two wells are needed and he figures each well would cost about $500, not including pumps or lines.

Lack of money is the main problem. Many of Hastings' 200 residents are pensioners who pay a flat rate of $3.50 for water. The 65 water customers could not afford to pay more for water, Houchins said, and the town has no money.

Houchins pumps about 3,600 gallons of water a day from the farm pond, which is shared with Brandon's cattle. Normal use in the town is 10,000 gallons per day.

Hastings started depending on farm ponds, donated by their owners, in February after 3 months of hauling water (4,000 gallons daily) from Waurika in a tank truck. Waurika had to cut off the supply because of its own water problems.

A number of Hastings residents have wells but these have dried up. Most of the people buy drinking water, some of them using jugs of spring water. Few people have air conditioning and no one has a garden or a green lawn.

Water from nearby Beaver Creek has tested out as usable, if treated, but even the creek "isn't running off enough for a supply," Houchins said.

Ardmore in Carter County has an estimated 3½-month water supply even with strict rationing, city officials say. Usable reservoir supply until mid-October is 500 million gallons in Mountain Lake, prime water source, and 200 million gallons in City Lake, mainly a reservoir. Usage plus evaporation in that period is expected to equal the reservoir water.

Mountain Lake, built in 1942 about 25 miles northwest of Ardmore, is about one-third full, down about 10 feet, 10 inches or about 1 billion gallons.

Ardmore also pumps 42 million gallons a month from seven wells in the Newport community, built during the 1956 drought for emergency use.

The city is now surveying its critical water situation with a look to the future as well as to the immediate crisis. There is the possibility of tapping the five-lake Caddo Creek watershed project, the Lake of the Arbuckles project (voted down twice by Ardmore residents), the Cook Creek Reservoir and a combination of Cook and Caddo Creek projects.

"It's feast or famine in Waurika," says publisher Don Morrison. Waurika, often plagued by flooding Beaver Creek, now faces a severe water shortage.

Waurika places its hopes and long-range plans on the Waurika (Beaver Creek) Reservoir, but even with fast congressional action on appropriations, construction is at least 4 years away. The project will eventually provide water for the cities of Waurika, Temple, Duncan, Lawton, Walters, and Comanche.

Waurika will vote on a $35,260 bond issue July 28 for drilling two new wells and the reconditioning of five old wells. In the meantime to ease the present shortage, Waurika will begin an $8,000 temporary program Monday to bring water from the Jap Beaver Lake. Finances have been provided through a loan to the town's chamber of commerce.

Mayor George Brown said cost of the temporary program will be kept down by assistance of junior chamber of commerce members who have offered to denote time helping to construct waterlines.

The bond issue calls for pipe and equipment as well as pipe and a pump for a 150-day emergency supply of water from Waurika Lake. The Oklahoma Department of Wildlife Conservation has approved the piping of water from the fishing lake 1.4 miles to the city's water collection line.

The two new shallow wells will be located on Beaver Creek, once the city's water source.

Water restrictions went into effect June 30 on recommendation of Walter Kauerauf, water superintendent.

Peak water consumption in hot weather runs as high as 600,000 gallons daily, Kauerauf said. Consumption should be cut by at least 75,000 gallons, he said, to get daily use down to 200,000 gallons.

Water rationing was requested in Woodward on July 8 for the first time in 10 years. Woodward city officials are considering a $700,000 bond issue for a water system.

Stillwater residents have been asked to skip watering lawns until the city's storage tanks can be refilled to boost water pressure. Oklahoma State University, which shares the city's water system, has been asked to conserve as much water as possible.

Mayor Larry Hansen said voluntary rationing is requested to help prevent a water shortage and to boost pressure in outlying areas, where residents at times have had no water at all.

Hobart residents have been asked to voluntarily conserve the city's dwindling supply. Low pressure has been reported during the hot afternoons and officials fear dangerous fire conditions.

City Manager J. B. Marshall asked Edmond residents to voluntarily stop watering lawns until city water wells catch up with demands after consumption records were broken 4 straight days. A new well tied into the Edmond supply system Thursday has added 460,000 gallons daily.

Walters faces rationing before the summer is over, city officials predict. City Manager Ferrell Phillips said most people are cooperating in the request for water conservation. Wells are pulling water from Walters Lake but the level is dropping. Water restrictions are expected if there is no heavy rainfall soon.

Comanche Lake is reported at a record low point, 11 feet, 10 inches below the dam. The Comanche city council is attempting to locate sites for new wells in case demands continue.

Altus is taking major steps toward insuring an adequate supply of good water for at least a generation. The city is investigating a possible water supply just across the Red River in Texas. The city of Altus has an option on 5,751 acres of land, and it has approved exploratory works on the land for drilling 25 test holes.

The Lawton city council has reduced the time allowed for watering lawns and shrubbery. Some residents have been without water for several hours during peak use periods each day. The problem essentially is one of distribution and not supply.

Lawton residents approved last December a $7 million bond issue to boost the water distribution from 28 million gallons to 48 million gallons a day.

PROTECTION OF HEADS OF FOREIGN STATES AND OTHER DESIGNATED OFFICIALS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the Senate yesterday passed the bill (S. 1917) to provide authority to protect heads of foreign states and other designated officials.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RIBICOFF in the chair). The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1917) to provide authority to protect heads of foreign states and other designated officials.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] to reconsider the votes by which Senate bill S. 1917 was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to reconsider the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the Committee on Foreign Relations ordered S. 1917 reported with amendments to make the text conform exactly to that of H.R. 7651, which passed the House on May 4, 1964. Inadvertently, a few minor changes in the House bill were not noted by the staff.

Mr. President, I propose the following additional perfecting amendments to S. 1917:

On page 1, line 8, strike out "any" and insert "a".

On page 2, line 3, after "acts" insert a comma.

On page 2, line 21, strike out "the provisions of".

On page 3, line 2, strike out "felony" and insert "a violation".

The action has been cleared with the minority leadership.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing, en bloc, to the amendments offered by the Senator from Montana.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I ask unanimous consent that the title be amended so as to read "To provide authority to protect heads of foreign states and other officials."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the title is amended as requested.

TRIBUTE TO THE FISCAL POLICIES OF PRESIDENT JOHNSON

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the New York Times, July 19, 1964, carries an editorial which pays a well-deserved tribute to the fiscal policies of President Lyndon B. Johnson. It should be noted that the budget deficit in fiscal 1964 was smaller than the original estimates despite the institution of a sizable tax cut. Further, the President, with great discernment, has made good his promise to economize in Government expenditures. Most important, his fiscal policies have given a great impetus to the economy without inducing inflation. In short, Mr. President, the economic lights have been turned up throughout the Nation.

These fiscal achievements in less than a year of the Johnson administration are, in every sense, exceptional, as the editorial previously cited, makes clear.

I ask unanimous consent that the text be included at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, July 19, 1964]

BUDGET EXPERIMENT

President Johnson is understandably pleased that the actual deficit in the fiscal 1964 budget turned out to be below administration estimates. His opponents may argue that the forecasts were faulty and that the deficit is still too big, but these criticisms are largely irrelevant. The President has made good on his pledge to economize. He has accomplished the reduction in red ink, moreover, without curbing the economy's balanced advance.

The 1964 budget represented an experiment in flexible fiscal policy. The administration deliberately planned a deficit. But with tax reduction stimulating the private sector, there was a real danger that the Government's deficit financing might generate inflationary pressure. This was averted by the spending cutbacks. At the same time, the administration refrained from excessively large reductions in expenditures that might have led to a falling off in business activity. Instead, it took a moderate course that has so far proved successful.

By demonstrating that a deliberate deficit can work, the administration has dealt a formidable blow to the orthodox idea that the Federal budget must always be in balance. It is demonstrating that the budget can be used either as an accelerator or as a brake, depending on the overall state of the economy. Mr. Johnson can take pride in his record as an economizer, but the real significance of the budget is that it has been successfully used to promote noninflationary growth.

ECONOMY IN GOVERNMENT

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, let us exercise vigilance and discrimination in appropriating taxpayers' money.

We all agree that economy in government, like economy with an individual, means going without some of the things we would like to have but do not absolutely need.

All should agree that we must reduce Government spending. I very definitely am a conservative on fiscal matters. Our defense budget of more than $50 billion a year offers the best target for reducing Government spending by several billion dollars each year. Certainly we spend so little, comparatively, on welfare programs that we should not begin cutting there.

Next to the defense budget, I shall continue my efforts to eliminate military and economic aid to dictators overseas, and to reduce further our grants of money to nations such as Duvalier's Haiti and Franco's Spain.

It may be convenient sometimes to deal with dictators, but in the end it is the people who count, and the people will drive the dictators out.

In the effort to halt extravagance and eliminate duplication and waste, surely in this missile and space age, with all our superiority over the Soviet Union, we should reduce the tremendous number of Armed Forces personnel of 2,700,000. In addition, there are more than 1 million civilian employees in our Defense Department. Let us first bring home from overseas some thousands of the 2,700,000; let us bring home those who are not definitely needed for the defense of our country. That would also mean bringing home many thousands of dependents, and reuniting other families. Of the million civilian employees of the Defense Department, surely 50,000 of such personnel should be dropped almost immediately. We in the Congress have already cut down the budget request of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

We are likely to proceed to cut at least $2 billion from the appropriations for our armed services, and that can be done without in any manner diminishing the power of our defenses. Our Nation will be just as secure and just as powerful. We can cut down appropriations for foreign assistance. They have already been cut. They may be reduced further.

Economy in Government, I am glad to report, is being enforced by our President. There are some thousands fewer Federal employees as of July 1, 1964, than there were in the same period last year. We must continue to practice economy wherever possible as we consider the many appropriation bills that will soon be before the Senate for debate and vote.

PRIVATE VIOLENCE AND PUBLIC FORCE

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, one of the ablest observers and commentators upon the public scene is Mr. Walter Lippmann, who for many years has turned his penetrating intelligence upon the problems of the Nation and of the world.

I call attention to the distinction which Mr. Lippmann draws, in an article which appeared in today's Washington Post, between private violence and public force. The community and the Nation should be very careful about using public force unless it is justified, but I believe we would all profit from reading Mr. Lippmann's article and considering the significant points which he brings out.

I ask unanimous consent that the article by Mr. Lippmann which appeared in this morning's Washington Post be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, July 21, 1964]

THE WISECRACKS ABOUT EXTREMISM

(By Walter Lippmann)

There is a furor, which is not mere wordslinging since Senator GOLDWATER justified extremism, saying that in "the defense of liberty" it "is no vice" and attacked moderation saying that "in the pursuit of justice" it "is no virtue." Coming from a candidate for President these wisecracks can interfere dangerously with the maintenance of law and order in this time of mounting lawlessness.

Since he uttered the words in his acceptance speech on Thursday, the Senator has been defending himself. What he had to say to General Eisenhower, who felt "confused," makes it quite clear that Senator GOLDWATER does not understand the meaning of extremism and that he has never realized the fundamental principle which is at stake in the argument about it. According to his campaign manager, Mr. Denison Kitchel, the Senator said to General Eisenhower: "The most extreme action that you can take in the defense of freedom is to go to war. When you led those troops across the channel into Normandy, you were being an extremist."

The crucial truth is that when General Eisenhower went to war, he was not a private individual. He was not a member of a private and secret society. He was the commander appointed by the legitimate Governments of Great Britain and the United States. He was commanding troops recruited by due process of law. He was engaged in a war which had been authorized by the two Governments.

The essence of the matter is that to be an extremist is to encourage and condone the taking of the law into unauthorized private hands. It is in truth shocking that the Republican candidate for President is unconscious of this sovereign truth. For the distinction between private violence and public force is the central principle of a civilized society.

It has been a long, and as yet uncompleted, struggle to extend the reign of law. In the course of it civilized men have sought, and in a certain measure they have succeeded, in establishing a paramount rule: That no individual or society of individuals may decide for themselves that the defense of liberty and the pursuit of justice require them to go to war or to commit violence. The private defense of liberty and the private administration of justice are lynch law. Private killing is murder. Private war is insurrection.

It is not only in the deadly business of private violence that extremism is intolerable. A civilized society does not condone any breach of the peace, such as spitting in an Ambassador's face, no matter how ardently it is done in that self-induced conviction that it is in the defense of liberty and the pursuit of justice. It is extremism to say that communism is the enemy of the United States and then to declare that General Eisenhower or the New York Times or the anti-Goldwater columnists are working for the public enemy. No private individual has a private right to brand American citizens as traitors. That can be done only by due process of law, and to do it privately is libelous. The laws of libel do not permit the private assassination of private character.

If ever there was time, it is now, when it is against the public interest to tell men that they may take extreme measures in what they believe the defense of liberty and the pursuit of justice. There is a racial conflict in this country and there is a strong tendency to private violence on both sides, among the white and among the black.

With the private shootings, the private burnings, the private bomb throwings, the private mobs, is it not the duty of every American to rally to the defense of law and order? But how can there be such a rally if we must endure an election in which the challenging contender is telling the inflammable crowd that extremism may be no sin and that moderation may be no virtue?

INDIANA DUNES NATIONAL LAKESHORE

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the National Parks magazine, in its July 1964 issue, has just published a splendid article about the Indiana dunes and the national lakeshore proposed to be created there.

The excellent photographs by Mr. Arthur E. Anderson which accompany the article display the rich variety of natural and recreational values which we hope to preserve in the lakeshore for the enjoyment of all the people. It is unfortunate in this case that the photographs cannot be carried in the RECORD, for they show the beautiful shoreline which will provide recreation for the 7 or 8 million people who live within 2 hours' travel of the dunes, and for millions more from across the Nation who will visit the lakeshore each year. They show examples of the natural areas of migrating dunes which are the home of the science of ecology and the laboratory for thousand of students each year. They show also the quiet inland forest areas, lowlands, and streams which will be used by scientists, students, hikers, picnickers, canoeists, campers, and others.

The article, written by a resident of the dunes, Mr. Frederic Sicher, is a thought-provoking account of how the opportunity was nearly lost to save this unique and beautiful gift of nature.

But, Mr. President, we now have an opportunity to preserve about 10,000 additional acres of this irreplaceable natural resource in the heart of a great urban area. S. 2249, the administration bill to establish the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore, introduced last fall by Senator JACKSON and 25 cosponsors, is now pending in the Senate Public Lands Subcommittee. Three days of Senate hearings were completed on March 7, showing strong local support for the lakeshore. The principal cosponsors of the bill, Senators HARTKE and BAYH and myself, have recommended several amendments to the subcommittee which bring us to complete agreement on this legislation. I believe agreement has been reached on the details of the bill. The subcommittee chairman, Senator BIBLE, has advised us that he expects the subcommittee to be able to hold an executive session on S. 2249 very soon.

I have every hope that this bill will be reported to the Senate soon so that we can at last save a significant portion of this treasure of the Midwest.

I ask unanimous consent that the article to which I have referred be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

An Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore

(By Frederic Sicher)

During the 1st session of the 88th Congress, Senator Henry Jackson, of Washington State, introduced Senate bill 2249, for himself and Senators Paul Douglas, Clinton Anderson, Vance Hartke, and Birch Bayh, "to provide for the establishment of the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore, and for other purposes."

If passed by Congress, this bill would establish the first national lakeshore in America, climaxing nearly a half century of bargaining and compromising about what should happen to the scenic beauties of the Indiana shoreline. Because of this seemingly endless altercation, the case of Indiana Dunes presents perhaps more strikingly than that of any other potential national preserve the problems inherent in the painful and difficult path that today leads to creation of a national park system unit.

The fact that this area has been a focus of industrial, residential, and conservation concern for so many years testifies to its value. No other shoreline has dunes exactly like these. At one time, after the great finger of glacial ice that created Lake Michigan had melted, a 75-mile crescent of sand—from what is now Winnetka, Ill., to Michigan City, Ind.—swept around the southwestern tip of the lake. The dunes shifted under the direction of the prevailing westerlies, migrating as much as 30 feet in a year. Forests of jackpine and oak were buried and then exhumed as the wind blew great slashes in the sand. As they moved from the lake, the dunes tended to stabilize through accumulation of soil produced by plants; as they blocked the normal flow of streams, they created bogs and marshy sinks, and ponds and lakes, which supported a rich variety of vegetation and wildlife. Within a width of a mile and a half, the character of the dunes area ranged from the swampy delights of cattails and blackbirds at the outer perimeter to sandhills richly carpeted with trees and plants, then to the stark sandscapes and barren "blowouts" of the active dunes, and finally to the storm beach on the lake itself.

By the early 1900's the area was already prized by botanists, ecologists, ornithologists, biologists, geologists, and zoologists. Naturalist E. Stileman Bailey wrote in 1917 that "there is a greater concentration and variety of species located here than any other place in this country. It is a meeting place for plants more usual in northerly, southerly, easterly, and westerly areas." Today there are still more than a thousand species of plants and trees. Groundpine and jackpine, sand cherry and poplar, barberry and cedar, all look out on the water from above the silver-green dune grass and thick masses of grapevine. Farther inland there is the violet, sunflower, hepatica, phlox, buttercup, Jack-in-the-pulpit, and blue flag; crab apple and dogwood; the wild rose, an unusual kind of dune cactus, and many species of ferns and orchids. Wildlife is equally diverse and abundant.

Arrowheads and other Indian artifacts are found from time to time along the lip of debris left around the end of the lake by the glacier. The Pottawatomies lived for many years along this shore, believing its beauty was the result of a touch from the hand of God. Their village was in the shadow of Mount Tom, the largest dune (192 feet high) which they named Wud-junagow, or the "Sand Mountain."

Because of its historic, scientific, scenic, and recreational values, Stephen Mather, first Director of the National Park Service, proposed in 1916 that the area be preserved as a national park.

The momentous events of 1917 eclipsed this plan temporarily, but determined conservationists kept the idea alive. In 1921 the Governor of Indiana sent a committee to visit the potential park site. The committee was favorably impressed, and a bill to purchase lands for a State park was introduced into the State legislature. It failed to pass. In 1923 it was reintroduced; the committee chairman of the Indiana Federation of Women's Clubs spoke for the bill before the house of representatives for 2 hours, presenting facts and pictures to the legislators and their wives. Her arguments took effect; a law was passed providing for the purchase of lands to be known as the Indiana Dunes State Park. Much of the total cost of approximately $1 million was acquired through private gifts rather than appropriation, including—ironically enough in the light of subsequent events—a $250,000 contribution from the United States Steel Corp. Three and a half miles of shoreline were finally brought under State protection.

In the meantime, however, the northwest portion of Indiana was becoming the economic backbone of the State; from the east, suburbs of Michigan City spread down to the boundary of the new park, and from the west, over the course of just a few years, commercial interests leaped the Illinois State line and swarmed down the Indiana shoreline to develop the Calumet region and the city of Gary.

Since it is a central factor in the tangled skein of events and the ultimate form to be taken by the dunes preserve, it is worth noting that the area is particularly advantageous for the manufacture of steel. In 1929 Midwest Steel purchased a large tract in the heart of the dunes flanking Burns Ditch, which drains the Little Calumet River into Lake Michigan. Since then there has been pressure to turn this portion of the dunes into a deepwater port for oceangoing vessels; this would obliterate a considerable stretch of the shore area west of the State park.

In 1931 the Army Corps of Engineers made an initial study and reported what seemed obvious: that public funds used for such harbor construction would benefit Midwest Steel alone. Midwest tried again in 1935 without success: but in 1937 Congress authorized a preliminary study of the entire Indiana shoreline to select the most likely site for a harbor. The Army Engineers did not report on this study until 1944, when they concluded the matter was not worth further examination because of existing port facilities at Chicago, Calumet, and Michigan City. Despite this recommendation, in 1949 the corps district office in Chicago came up with a preliminary report favorable to the Burns Ditch harbor, and cleared the way for a more serious study.

The engineers' methodical pace had the effect of frustrating the two driving forces behind the harbor idea: the State of Indiana and the steel companies. A private study of the port was financed by the New York Central Railroad, whose lines border the area; National Steel, Midwest's parent company; and a real estate firm. At the same time, the Governor tried to persuade the Indiana Legislature to appropriate funds for land in the Burns Ditch area. State officials were primarily concerned about economic development that would follow the construction of a deepwater port and the new revenues it would produce.

The privately financed feasibility study was favorable, and was used in an attempt to get private backing for the Burns Ditch project. Both this and the Governor's attempts to legislate the money were unsuccessful. In June 1956, the real estate firm sold most of its acreage to Bethlehem Steel, who then stepped into the picture as the second steel company with interests in the area.

ECONOMIC BOOM FORESEEN

In 1959 the tempo quickened. The St. Lawrence Seaway opened, causing government and industrial officials to point out the possible economic boom that increased shipping might bring to the shores of Indiana; the Governor now appointed a new Northern Indiana Lakefront Study Committee to assess harbor sites along the shore. With steel and State urging each other on, Midwest began building a $103 million plant on their Burns Ditch property.

In 1960 the Indiana Port Commission was established to help secure the harbor at Burns Ditch.

All of these events received newspaper coverage, and gradually public dissent arose. Nearly 7½ million people within a radius of 50 miles had traditionally enjoyed the excellent beaches and scenic trails (including Chicago residents, whose Prairie Club of Chicago first promoted preservation of the dunes in 1912 and which donated its 67 acres of dunelands to the State in 1923), and many deplored the seeming misuse of this priceless natural area. Sparked by a nucleus of residents from Ogden Dunes and Dune Acres—small communities just to the west and east of the Burns Ditch steel holdings—a Save-the-Dunes Council was formed in 1952. It accepted the stated need for a deepwater port and economic development, but asked why the port should be constructed with a maximum despoiling effect in the middle of the dunes when there had been no real study of alternative locations.

In 1958, unable to sway official views concerning location of the harbor, the council turned to Senator Paul Douglas, of Illinois, who was familiar with the area and who represented many interested persons in Illinois. Senator Douglas promptly proposed legislation for a national park which would include the State park, the proposed port site, the steel holdings in the area, and other privately owned land. Secretary of the Interior Udall and Park Service representatives once again recommended the area as a preserve and tramped the sandy reaches of the dunes along with Senator Douglas and the mayors of Chicago, Whiting, Hammond, and Gary, and Congressman Ray Madden.

The Army Engineers reentered the picture in 1960 with their long-awaited final report. On the surface the report upset the delicate stalemate with a conclusion favorable to the Burns Ditch site.

There was still, however, the old question of the expenditure of Federal funds for the benefit of one or two steel companies; the Government wanted assurances that if the harbor were to be used principally by Bethlehem and Midwest, the volume of business would produce enough jobs, products, and revenue to substantially benefit the economy of the entire area. This would necessarily be a large commitment, and there was no real guarantee that Congress would furnish the money. In addition, Senate hearings again pointed up the fact that there had been no thorough study of alternative harbor sites.

Suddenly the deadlock seemed to shift against the Burns Ditch promoters. Hearings resulted in a request for $25,000 to study other possible sites. At this point Bethlehem announced a contract to sell sand to Northwestern University as fill for its campus expansion program. Bulldozers and steam shovels began to level dunes just 3 miles west of the State park, while conservationists denounced the destruction of such irretrievable beauty. In December

1962, Bethlehem Steel announced the construction of a $250 million fully integrated plant on its Burns Ditch holdings "to be started as soon as possible."

There had still been no serious study of alternative locations in already industrialized areas. However, Bethlehem's decision spurred developers, who took the attitude that, if a steel mill was to be built at Burns Ditch, why should the new port be located elsewhere? Less than a year later—in September 1963—the Bureau of the Budget sent the Secretary of the Army a letter stating: "It is the President's wish to see a deep-draft harbor for Indiana made a reality, while at the same time preserving as much as possible of the priceless heritage of the Indiana Dunes for future generations."

This, in effect, represented the compromise that had been reached following Bethlehem's announcement. The Bureau of the Budget now felt an Indiana Dunes preservation could not include Burns Ditch, since with proper assurances concerning air and water pollution it would probably be the chosen harbor site. On the other hand, there could be a national preserve, too. A month after this decision was reached, S. 2249, the lakeshore plan which represented the compromise, was introduced into the Senate.

The idea of a national lakeshore had been originally conceived as a means for preserving the unspoiled and largely unpopulated shoreline that stretched unbroken for about 8 miles west of the existing State park. However, the compromise plan exempted the steel holdings and the two communities of Ogden Dunes and Dune Acres; Indiana Dunes State Park would be included with the concurrence of the State. If the preserve could not include most of the shoreline to the west of the State park, it would include most of it to the east. Secondary inland areas slated for trails and nature study would remain largely as originally planned.

Looking at the plan on a map, it appears that the National Park Service would inherit some highly desirable, if fragmented, shoreline areas. There are eight units proposed for the lakeshore, encompassing about 12,000 acres and spread over an area of about a hundred square miles. All except a small portion of Beverly Shores, a community of 475 homes just to the east of the State park, has been annexed to the proposed park by virtue of its excellent 4½ mile beach; there is now local controversy over whether all or part of Beverly Shores will be included in the preserve.

After initial public hearings on the bill on March 6, 1964, the proposed lakeshore remains in a state of flux. But public opinion is probably already strong enough to counter adverse proposals for invasion of the remaining natural country along the lake, and conservationists all over the country look forward hopefully to the time when the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore will become a reality.

POPULARITY OF DOLLAR IN WORLD MARKETS REFLECTS ECONOMIC PROGRESS UNDER DEMOCRATS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the remarkable record of sustained economic growth in the United States achieved under the administration of President Kennedy and President Johnson is demonstrated by the new popularity of the dollar in money markets of the world. We can recall distinctly the balance-of-payments gap which appeared during the 8 years of the Eisenhower administration. We began piling up one multi-billion-dollar deficit after another, and the situation was deteriorating rapidly when the Democrats took command in 1961.

The extent of the recovery which has now been achieved can be seen by reading Sylvia Porter's column of July 8, 1964, entitled "Dollar Regains Old Popularity." Miss Porter writes:

> The drain on the gold reserve has been slowed and exports have been rising. The deficit in the balance of payments has been cut to the lowest level in years. While Congress is expected to approve the penalty tax, the very threat of the tax already has reduced U.S. buying of foreign securities. There is no talk of dollar devaluation and confidence in the dollar's value is firm.

Miss Porter attributes this reversal in the dollar gap to three principal factors: First, we have held the price-wage spiral under control while other countries have experienced substantial inflation and increases in the wage costs per unit of output. Second, we have kept the economy of the United States in an unprecedented advance for 41 consecutive months. Compare this record to the biannual recessions of the Eisenhower administration. Finally, we have created an extraordinary network of defenses against currency speculation and exhibited a determination to narrow the balance-of-payments gap.

This is the record of economic progress which Democratic policies have brought to this country. This is the record which President Johnson can proudly take to the American people this November.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Sylvia Porter's column of July 8, 1964, entitled "Dollar Regains Old Popularity," be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DOLLAR REGAINS OLD POPULARITY

(By Sylvia Porter)

In the money markets of the world, the U.S. dollar is now winning new popularity—a feat which few believed possible only a short while ago, when it was losing financial weight at a dangerous rate and was being bruised by a series of economic blows.

The comeback of the dollar is an enormous tribute to our economy's inherent power and to the policies of recent years.

To grasp the magnificence of the dollar's resurgence, you must recall how it was earlier in this decade.

Gold was pouring out of the country and "hot money" was fleeing in search of higher earnings elsewhere. The cry was widespread that we were pricing ourselves out of the world's market, that we could not successfully compete with our high-cost exports and that we would be overwhelmed by a flood of low-cost imports.

We were spending far more abroad than we were earning abroad—piling one multi-billion-dollar deficit in the balance of payments on top of another—and the foreign creditors were building up claims against our reserves to peak after peak. As recently as last July, President Kennedy felt it necessary to urge Congress to put a penalty tax on buying of foreign securities by Americans to curb the amount of money going into these securities. Confidence in the dollar was so delicate that repeatedly the President had to pledge that we would maintain its gold value.

Now this is the way it is.

The drain on the gold reserve has been slowed and exports have been rising. The deficit in the balance of payments has been cut to the lowest level in years. While the Congress is expected to approve the penalty tax, the very threat of the tax already has reduced U.S. buying of foreign securities. There is no talk of dollar devaluation and confidence in the dollar's value is firm.

Why?

First, we have held prices and wage increases under control, while Europe and Japan have been caught in a price-wage upsurge. We have become increasingly competitive in world trade markets and the boom in exports proves it.

International Monetary Fund experts estimate that U.S. wage costs per unit of output are actually 2 percent lower today than in 1958. In contrast, unit labor costs in France and Germany have jumped 20 percent in this period; Italian costs, 17 percent; British costs, 14 percent—and Japanese costs, a whopping 30 percent. The price-wage trend is still in our favor, while the inflation problem in Europe is urgent.

Second, we have managed to keep the economy in a sustained growth for an almost unprecedented period of time—and without excesses.

This is the 41st month of rise. Tax cuts are feeding new strength into the economy, but so far there has been no feverish spurt of buying by consumers or businessmen. The lid is on Federal Government spending, budget deficits are being reduced and the consumer price level is holding remarkably stable. We're living the equivalent of an economic ideal.

Third, we have, in cooperation with other central bankers, created an extraordinary network of defenses against currency speculation and we are demonstrating our determination to reduce the gap in the balance of payments and making major progress in narrowing the gap to a manageable figure.

REPORT OF THE COMMISSION ON PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGN DEBATES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, last week the American Political Science Association released the final report of the Commission on Presidential Campaign Debates. This exhaustive study was carried on under a grant to the association by the National Broadcasting Co. Under the terms of the grant the commission had complete freedom in defining its approach, carrying out its deliberations, and deciding on its recommendations.

Prof. Carl J. Friedrich, of Harvard University, served as chairman of the commission. Other members included Evron M. Kirkpatrick, executive director of the American Political Science Association; Prof. Harold D. Lasswell, of Yale University; Prof. Richard E. Neustadt, of Columbia University; Prof. Peter H. Odegard, of the University of California at Berkeley; Elmo Roper, marketing consultant and public opinion analyst; Telford Taylor, lawyer and author; and Charles A. H. Thomson, of the Rand Corp. This is an unusually able and distinguished panel of experts to consider this important topic.

The commission and the association are to be highly commended for this contribution to the literature regarding presidential campaigns and our thinking on this question. It is surely a matter which deserves the thoughtful consideration of members of both political parties. Moreover, I believe the recommendations of the commission and the appendixes to the report will be of lasting interest to the Congress and the American public. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the full report be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT OF THE COMMISSION ON PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGN DEBATES, 1964

(By the American Political Science Association, Washington, D.C.)

PREFACE

In the spring of 1963, the American Political Science Association appointed a commission on presidential campaign debates. The commission was asked to review past experience, consider the implications of future television and radio debates between presidential candidates, and make recommendations regarding format and procedures for such debates if they are held. Members of the commission, the work of which was made possible by a grant from the National Broadcasting Co., were the following: Carl J. Friedrich, chairman; Evron M. Kirkpatrick, Harold D. Lasswell, Richard E. Neustadt, Peter H. Odegard, Elmo Roper, Telford Taylor, Charles A. H. Thomson, and Gerhart D. Wiebe.

The association accepted the grant and appointed the commission in the belief that a responsible report would stimulate discussion—and perhaps action as well—on an important aspect of the politics of American democracy. The National Broadcasting Co. made the grant unconditionally; the association assured the commission that it had complete freedom in defining its approach, carrying out its deliberations, and deciding on its recommendations.

The commission met a number of times in 1963 and 1964 in New York City and Washington, D.C. This report is the result of its deliberations and is hereby presented to the public. Neither the officers nor the members of the association's council have reviewed or endorsed the report. The findings and recommendations it contains are those of the commission; it is the report of the commission, not of the association, or of the National Broadcasting Co.

In presenting the report, the association wishes to thank NBC for making the project possible and the members of the commission for their uncompensated time and effort. Both the association and the commission wish to express their appreciation to Prof. Bernard Rubin, who prepared a preliminary research memorandum and bibliography for commission use; and to the many Members of Congress, Governors, and national and State party chairmen who responded to an inquiry directed to them by the commission. For the staff assistance of the former, and for the thoughtful comments of the latter, we are most grateful.

C. HERMAN PRITCHETT,
President, the American Political Science Association.
EVRON M. KIRKPATRICK,
Executive Director, the American Political Science Association.
CARL J. FRIEDRICH,
Chairman, Commission on Presidential Debates.

THE QUESTION OF DEBATES

The 1960 Kennedy-Nixon debates attracted the largest audience ever to view the contenders for the Presidency. While precise figures are lacking, it is estimated that 8 out of 10 families tuned in at some point in the series and that probably more than half watched 3 encounters. Such debates carry with them all the drama of face-to-face conflict. They also provide an excellent opportunity for the citizen to evaluate the personality, knowledge, and point of view of the candidates. Of particular importance in this context is the fact that they tend to promote among partisans an awareness of the candidates and positions of the other party.

Yet, in spite of their drawing power and educational potential, the value of broadcast debates is not universally accepted. Many see in presidential campaign debates a major innovation in the Nation's political life and believe that they should somehow be institutionalized by requiring candidates to debate. Others are not so sure of their value and feel that encounters of this kind should be broadcast only under certain circumstances and under carefully controlled conditions. Still others are convinced that, because of the undue importance attached to personal appearance and "on camera" personality, televised debates are misleading, if not harmful, no matter how they are conducted.

Accordingly, this commission considered two questions related to debates between presidential candidates. The first is more basic: Are there circumstances in which debates should not be held at all? The second relates to the character of procedures and format that are likely to increase the contributions of broadcast debates to political education and to effective political participation.

In considering the first question, it is important to distinguish between debates by candidates who do not hold office and debates in which one candidate also is President. When neither major party candidate is President, as was the case in 1960, the commission is convinced that television debates, properly conducted, are a desirable extension of traditional campaigning now that television is a settled feature of our national communications. However, the matter is less certain when one of the major party candidates is President. Extraordinary situations may be created by the exigencies of the world situation and the international position of the United States. In some of these situations it may be contrary to our national interest for the President to engage in debates. The Cuban invasion and the missile crisis are recent examples. It is possible to imagine even more perilous situations.

The commission, in carrying out its task, wrote all Members of Congress, the national chairmen of the Republican and Democratic Parties, the chairmen of both parties in all 50 States, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico, and all Governors. A substantial number of those replying questioned the advisability of participation in broadcast debates by the President of the United States. As one experienced and distinguished Member of Congress put it:

"While I believe that the Nixon-Kennedy debates of 1960 played a vital role in the 1960 election campaign, nevertheless, I am firmly of the opinion that no President of the United States, while serving as the President, should ever engage in a television or radio debate with an opposing candidate.

"When both candidates are first seeking the office, then the debates are helpful, and, I am sure, of great value to the electorate in making a decision. However, I do not believe that the President of the United States, even though he is a candidate for reelection, should participate in these debates because of the Office he holds. It is one thing for a presidential aspirant to participate in a debate; it is something else for the occupant of the most important office in the world to participate in a debate which may be televised to all parts of the world."

Another wrote: "In the first place, there is some doubt in my mind as to whether an incumbent President should engage in such debates. In order to defend his position, it may be necessary to say things which might rise to haunt him later or which might cause embarrassment internationally. Certainly, a President can find ways of acquainting our citizens with his views which do not possess such inherent danger of being misunderstood."

Although many respondents expressed no such concern, the commission believes that the argument for caution is compelling. The President is the chief representative of the American people in their relations with peoples and officials of other nations. His constitutional position, the international situation, and advancing technology have made him, whether he chooses it or not, the chief guardian of our most vital national interests as well as those of the free world. The presidential candidate, who also is President, must consider fully the duties and responsibilities of his office before engaging in campaign debates. Only he can decide whether he will debate his opponents during the campaign; the commission simply wishes to stress that the decision is properly his.

The commission's view of this matter agrees with the traditional rules and practices of American Government; it does not place any limitation on the President's accountability to the American people. As a matter of fact, advances in technology—while giving rise to the need for extreme caution in some kinds of political communication—have made it possible to intensify the interaction of the President with his national constituency. Further, it is clear that debates are not the only form joint appearances may take. American ingenuity is certainly capable of developing many ways of utilizing the resources at hand in educating and informing the electorate. Among these, the press conference offers a wide range of possibilities for political education. The President meets the press in all its forms (print, radio, television). Opposing leaders can and do use the press conference to present their viewpoints. And the press conference format it should be noted enables the President to maintain the degree of control essential to his role as Chief of State and spokesman for the American people.

Television debates, even if they may play a critical role in some campaigns, are not likely to become the sole—or even the most important—method of campaigning for the Presidency. Nor should they, in the commission's view. The development of new methods and new techniques for informing the electorate should be a matter of concern to all who are actively interested in political life and in the maintenance of a vital democratic system. In perfecting various campaign devices, we must remain keenly aware of what it is we are attempting to accomplish: The promotion of the most reasonable basis for choice among candidates best qualified on all counts for public office. The choice of presidential candidates must not be limited to those who are masters of appearance on television. If the trend seems to be toward such a limitation on our choices, then emphasis must be placed on strengthening methods of campaigning that enable citizens to make judgments on other bases.

What we are saying is that a continuing evaluation is necessary if the potential of radio and television for informing the electorate is to be fully realized. The broadcasting industry has an obligation in the public interest to make its resources available and has expressed its willingness to do so. It is the responsibility of the parties and the candidates, along with others interested in improving the art of self-government, to assist by defining the public interest and by suggesting methods to serve it. To aid the broadcast industry, the parties and the candidates in discharging their responsibilities, the commission makes the following recommendations.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The commission believes that encounters such as occurred in the course of the presidential election of 1960 can under appropriate circumstances add a useful dimension to American public life. When none of

the opposing candidates holds the Presidential Office, the case for debates is especially strong. When one of the candidates occupies the Presidency, we recognize that countervailing considerations may outweigh the advantages. In such situations, the President will have to determine whether his participation in debates will best serve the public interest.

2. When held, debates should be carefully structured. They should take place weekly between Labor Day and election day, on a suitable evening of the week, at prime television hours. They should last for at least 1 hour, preferably more. Participation in the debates should be expanded; the vice presidential candidates and various Senators and Representatives chosen by the presidential candidates might be included.

3. These encounters should consist not only of debates, but also of discussions and other presentations. The first of seven encounters should provide the candidates—including the vice presidential candidates—with an opportunity to present their overall view of the issues. Four of the succeeding encounters should be devoted to the exploration in depth of key issues agreed upon by the candidates. Two of these might concentrate on foreign policy issues, two on domestic policy issues (one of these might be in the style of a conference with Mr. Common Man, in which the emphasis would be on issues and problems most salient in the thinking of the citizen at large who must perforce deal with matters both within and outside his own field of competence). The sixth encounter should be reserved for the candidates of the minor parties. The seventh and final encounter should be a summing up of the campaign by the presidential candidates of the two major parties, assisted by their vice presidential colleagues.

Procedures and participation may be appropriately varied. While the first and seventh encounters call for interaction chiefly among the major candidates, and the sixth involves representatives of the minor parties, two of the others might include as participants one Senator and one Representative chosen by each candidate and two might bring in specialists or experts. Those encounters calling for direct interaction between the presidential candidates should be moderated by outstanding public figures. The others should provide for the participation of interviewers broadly representative of the American people, and should not be restricted to news reporters of press and broadcasting alone.

4. The commission believes that specific rules of debate and distribution of time should not be determined without reference to the subject matter and other conditions existing at the time the encounters are scheduled. These procedures should be established by a board or committee, representing the learned and professional societies in such fields as law, political science, and economics, in consultation with the candidates.

5. The board or committee also should be made responsible for the choice of any experts or representatives of the common man participating under provisions of paragraph 3, but the candidates should have a right to veto any particular choice. This board or committee also should be made responsible for the selection of the chairmen or moderators of these joint appearances, but the nomination of such chairmen ought to be made by the national committees of the two parties for the first and the last encounters. The moderators should be drawn from nonpolitical authorities, such as churchmen, university presidents, or judges.

6. The minor party representatives should be limited to candidates who are on the ballot in at least 10 States. The time of one program should be divided equally among such candidates together with their vice presidential candidates, if they so desire. There should be an opportunity for questions from a panel of representatives of the public, as would be the case in one of the joint appearances of the major party candidates. The program for minor party candidates might well be allowed 2 hours, if the number of candidates warrants it.

7. The commission favors, in addition to simultaneous broadcast by radio, repeat broadcasts by radio, either later the same evening or the next day. It believes that rebroadcasting provides a valuable opportunity for the listeners to check crucial points after having an opportunity to discuss them. Rebroadcasts the next day also make it possible for political and educational groups to organize supplementary meetings for the wider and deeper discussion of the issues raised and debated.

8. The commission suggests that the use of visual aids—maps, charts, graphs—be given careful consideration. In case such aids are employed by one candidate, the opposing candidate should be given an opportunity to review them in advance in order to prepare similar materials illustrating his own viewpoint. Detailed procedures for such an exchange of information need to be worked out between the networks and the candidates, with the assistance of the board or committee mentioned above in paragraph 4.

9. The commission favors Saturday evening, at a prime hour, for the television encounters. This would provide an opportunity for rebroadcasting on Sunday afternoon or evening. As a second choice, the commission believes that Friday evening might be selected, if it is held essential that Sunday be left entirely free.

10. The encounters should be held in a studio and not before an audience. They should require the actual presence of the candidates and others participating in the program. Standardized makeup and other precamera preparation techniques should be developed by the networks in consultation with the candidates and the board or committee mentioned above in paragraph 4.

11. Research should be organized to test the effects and the effectiveness of these meetings and their arrangements. Such research should be organized well in advance of the encounters and might be sponsored by the American Political Science Association.

12. The commission recommends that the Congress take appropriate action, particularly with respect to section 315 of the Federal Communications Act, to remove obstacles to broadcast debates between presidential candidates. Suitable legislation should provide opportunities for the full service of broadcasting to the electoral process, along lines suggested in this report.

13. The commission hopes that its proposals will be discussed as widely as possible in Congress, among the public and in the press. Decisions should be made on holding debates sufficiently in advance of the campaign so that the broadcasters, the political parties, and the candidates have adequate opportunity for developing their approach to them.

14. The commission believes that the American broadcasting industry, in devoting skill and resources to the presentation of encounters of the type suggested here, will render the kind of public service upon which their licenses are based under American law. Such encounters can provide an effective means of presenting candidates and issues to an ever larger electorate; they also can serve the candidates for our country's highest office, assisting them in acquainting the electorate with their views on important public policy issues. Thus, they can inform, invigorate, and strengthen a vital aspect of the Nation's political life.

SUMMARY OF LETTERS FROM MEMBERS OF CONGRESS, GOVERNORS AND PARTY CHAIRMEN ON TELEVISION DEBATES

The executive director of the American Political Science Association, writing on behalf of the commission, invited all Members of Congress, all Governors, all State and the national party chairmen of the two major parties to submit their views on television debates and on the format and procedures for such debates by presidential candidates. The response to this letter, dated September 18, 1963, was excellent, indicating a high degree of interest and an informed concern over the problems involved in arranging such debates. Replies were received from about one-fifth of the Members of the House of Representatives, one-third of the State party chairmen, over one-third of the Senators, and over one-half of the Governors. All of these replies were made available to members of the commission on presidential campaign debates.

Replies from Members of the House

Replies were received from approximately one-fifth (85) of the Members of the House of Representatives. Of these replies 27 were strongly in favor and 6 were strongly opposed to debates. The rest were either noncommittal or accepted debates as a fait accompli and went on to give their views. Several thought incumbents, especially the President, lost more than they gained by participating in debates. Wrote a Georgia Democrat, "It is one thing for a presidential aspirant to participate in a debate; it is something else for the occupant of the most important office in the world to participate in a debate which may be televised to all parts of the world." Another Congressman, a Virginia Democrat, pointed out that "a man with a public record goes into such a situation at a disadvantage against a candidate who may not have had to stand up and be counted or to answer for a particular program."

Most Representatives who were opposed to debates gave as their reason the undue importance in a televised encounter of personality, the quick answer or the ability to crack a joke, and personal appearance. An Illinois Republican, discussing the 1960 debates between Kennedy and Nixon, wrote "As a viewer, I was constantly reminded of 'The $64,000 Question.' Will Dick—or Jack—organize his thoughts and present them effectively before the sweep-second hand stops." Reacting similarly to televised debates, a Pennsylvania Republican said "And as one who became bereft of his cranial adornment early in life, I have always felt that a baldheaded man should avoid TV as he would the plague."

In matters of format, five thought this depended on who the candidates were, that it should be they who decide how the debates should be conducted. Speaking for this point of view, an Ohio Republican stated "my opinion is that the circumstances, personalities, and abilities of candidates will vary so widely that I doubt the value of drawing up any rules." He went on to say that it should be the job of the candidates to work out rules and format.

Nine Congressmen spoke well of the 1960 debates and recommended the same general presentation for 1964. A number of others, while approving the format, thought changes should be made in the panels. Three were adamantly against using reporters. A Michigan Democrat wrote, "My frank feeling is that witnessing a bunch of reporters acting as prosecutors is not always the most appealing form of television programing, and this at all costs should be avoided." He added that the format should be selected with the audience in mind; he blamed the formality of the last debates for the fall off in public attention. Other Congressmen, not so adverse to reporters, thought the panel might nevertheless be improved by including political scientists and economists. One suggested that the reporters should certainly be highly respected commentators like Walter Lippmann.

Approximately 21 of the Congressmen favored face-to-face encounters to provide more direct communication between the candidates. Slightly over half of these were inclined toward some form of the traditional debate where opposing statements are made by each candidate and followed by rebuttal comments and summations, with strictly imposed time limits. Others favored a more flexible approach involving some kind of moderator. Recognizing the problem of selecting such a moderator, three Congressmen made specific suggestions. A Democrat from South Carolina preferred a Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court or the chief justice of the court of appeals. A Wisconsin Republican recommended a different moderator for each debate with no moderator appearing more than once. He suggested Congress as a possible source: one candidate would present a list of three names of Members of Congress to the other candidate who would choose one, the procedure to be reversed in alternate debates. An Iowa Republican suggested the moderator be a nonstudio personality, but an American, preferably unknown to TV, who is universally respected—perhaps a great educator, a Nobel prize winner in some field related to politics, maybe a former President, a historian, possibly even a poet of the stature say of Carl Sandburg.

Three Congressmen thought the format might be varied from program to program to include, perhaps, both questioning by a panel and a direct confrontation between the candidates. A Florida Democrat distinguished between the debate technique and the statement technique, the latter being the opportunity for candidates to state their feelings about their candidacy in a more detached, nonbelligerent manner. These two techniques, he emphasized, should definitely not be combined in the same program.

A rather novel suggestion was made by a Republican Member from the Southwest who recommended that the candidates not meet face to face but have the same question asked of them by the same people. Taped in advance, such a show would allow the presidential candidate "to give true and complete answers to his philosophy, without the temptation to vary his presentation a bit to 'sock the other guy.' "

A number of Representatives were concerned that the debates be long enough for candidates to explore issues in depth. One Congressman warned that allowing too much time was conducive to lengthy speeches. The most commonly suggested lengths ranged from 1 to 2 hours with the suggested number of debates varying from three to six.

The concern for full and meaningful debate, evident in the many recommendations for adequate time, was also behind suggestions for screening and restricting the topics to be discussed. At least 12 Congressmen recommended some sort of measures directed toward securing discussion of meaningful issues. A Maryland Republican expressed this concern well when he said, "I think that debates should be limited to topics which establish the maturity, humanity, judgment, and wisdom of candidates rather than their encyclopedic memory, their histrionic ability, or their sex appeal."

Only two Congressmen asserted that candidates should not have the questions in advance. On this point a Democrat from West Virginia, speaking out for spontaneity, described a formal debate in which he took part during his 1962 congressional campaign: "I found there were so many other interested elements in terms of the sponsors, the committee who screened the questions, and the moderator and his helpers, that actually very little of the real feeling of the two debaters filtered through and reached the audience."

Several Congressman warned that the subjects for the debates should be such that the audience would be interested. To insure this, a New York Republican advocated polling a cross section of U.S. voters to determine what the public considers the basic issues. Another Congressman recommended announcing the subject of each debate beforehand to build up public interest.

Still on the subject of choosing topics, a third Congressman, a Democrat from West Virginia, thought the candidates themselves should decide, while a New Jersey Republican suggested using the platforms of the two parties. In categorizing issues, a Republican from Illinois outlined a plan with the first debate restricted to domestic policies such as unemployment, agriculture, and economic issues; the second to foreign policy and foreign aid; the third to national defense and military posture. In connection with this last, more than one Congressman mentioned the difficulty of discussing security issues when one of the candidates is in possession of classified information.

Only two Congressmen raised the question of whether there should be an audience; both were in favor, one commenting that the debates needed "humanizing," and the other, an Iowa Republican, proposing an audience "evenly divided with half the seats going to the backers of one candidate and half to the backers of the other."

Impartiality and objectiveness, it was generally agreed, should be the keynote of the debates. Several Congressmen stressed the need for equality among the candidates in such matters as makeup, lighting, and the questions directed at them, while another, a New York Democrat, thought that holding debates, even televised ones, in different geographic areas each time was advisable because "we have had evidence of differences in answers given to major and crucial issues according to the geographic location of the person speaking." It was also important, thought a Democrat from Michigan, that "the confrontation of the candidates on TV be entirely and completely divorced from network techniques, their personnel, and their commentators." In the same vein another Representative emphasized that there be no commercials.

In the category of miscellaneous suggestions, two Congressmen urged that the debates be held during prime time, and a third, a New Jersey Republican, added that debaters should be allowed to use notes, books, and any other supporting data they chose. "Extemporaneous speaking is no measure of a presidential candidate's potential." This view was opposed by a California Democrat who thought candidates should speak without written notes. One Congressman asserted that presidential candidates of minor parties should have equal time with those of the two major ones, and another recommended that the candidate be able to see himself on a monitor as he appears on camera.

Replies from Senators

There were 36 senatorial responses to the request for views on the best way to conduct debates between presidential candidates. Of these, 12 were in favor and 3 against such debates; the others did not express strong opinions. Three Senators thought the candidates themselves should decide whether to debate. The following comment of a Republican Senator from a Mountain State expresses as well as any the stand of those opposed to the debates: "Such debates, in my opinion, place too much emphasis on personality and physical posture, and too little on basic philosophy, actual ability, and the inherent qualities that count so heavily in the man who will serve in such a post."

A number of Senators favored continuing the 1960 format. Said a Democratic Senator from the Southwest, "I like the format of the Kennedy-Nixon debates. I particularly like for one candidate to have a chance to contribute his comment which may agree with his opponent or may sharply differ from what his opponent has just said. I am not nearly as interested in the words as I am in the manner of the speaker." Those Senators who disagreed with the Senator recommended either a more traditional debate, an informal conversation between the candidates supervised by an impartial moderator (a Republican Member from the Midwest suggested one moderator might be chosen from APSA) or a number of shows combining different formats.

A Democratic Senator from the Northwest recommended varying the format, " * * * one or two using a press conference format, which also has value in demonstrating certain qualities of intellect and character important to the Presidency. Also at least three debates, quite formal in structure, on propositions selected for the opportunity they will afford each candidate to expound and defend his ideas on a single major issue of the campaign." A Democratic Senator observed that there were two formats which might prove interesting if combined in the same program: the discussion in depth and the question and answer session. He suggested a three-fourth and one-fourth proportion respectively. A Democrat from the Mountain States recommended questioning both by a panel and between the candidates. Four Senators thought that if a panel were used, it should not consist entirely of reporters. To avoid the problem of newsmen "whose views might be similar to one of the candidates," a Republican Senator from the Northeast suggested having the Democratic candidate questioned by Republicans and vice versa.

Senators frequently mentioned the need to explore issues in depth, either by allowing more time for the consideration of each issue or having a schedule sufficiently flexible to permit further discussion when areas of disagreement or controversy arose. Topics, it was suggested, could either be agreed on by the candidates in advance or chosen in some other way, perhaps, as one Democratic Senator from the West suggested, by a poll of newspaper correspondents. Several Senators specified that candidates should have an adequate chance to prepare their arguments.

A midwestern Democrat urged the consideration of minor parties, while one other, a southern Democrat, thought the debates "should be limited to the nominees of the two great national parties."

Among miscellaneous remarks and suggestions were the following: The debates could be used by the President to issue new policy statements and completely leave the opposition without a prepared defense; commitments should be solicited from the Democratic and Republican National Committees that whoever is nominated will take part; regarding physical environment, both men should debate standing behind a low rostrum; debates should be spaced at 2- or 3-week intervals; as a supplement to the debates, there should be single appearances by the candidates for questioning in depth by reporters; and closings should be alternated from debate to debate.

Replies from Governors

Of the 26 replies from the State Governors, only three were against debates, with the others divided almost equally between those in favor and those expressing neither approval nor disapproval. Few respondents went into detail as to format, but among those that did, there were four who favored a traditional debate with presentations and rebuttals, two who stated that there should be a moderator introducing topics and exercising some kind of control over the discussion, two who favored the format used in

1960, and one, a Democrat from the South, who thought the appearance of the candidates could be varied. He suggested, for example, that there be one formal debate with rebuttal, one question-and-answer session between the candidates, and a third program with questioning by newsmen. Such variety, he thought, would attract a larger audience.

Two of the replies observed that debates were unfair to candidates who might be exceptionally able, yet not possess a good television personality.

Only one Governor favored fewer debates than were held in 1960. Another, a midwestern Republican, stated that the number of debates should not, however, exceed three lest the interest of the electorate be dulled.

Two Governors contended that a live studio audience was advisable while two others maintained there should be no audience at all. An audience destroys reasoned discussion said one Governor.

Several Governors thought candidates should be given more time to prepare and answer questions while several others suggested that questions and subjects be screened somehow beforehand to exclude those that were irrelevant or trivial.

Replies from State and national party chairmen

Although only two State chairmen thought debates served no useful purpose, none were so satisfied with the 1960 debates that they recommended the same format for 1964. In fact, only one, a Republican chairman from the Midwest, specifically approved the panel approach, and he recommended that instead of reporters there be a six-member panel representing both political parties which would prepare the questions and put them to the two candidates. There were a number of chairmen who thought there should be no panel at all, but only an announcer or, at the most, an impartial moderator.

Several chairmen thought the encounters between candidates should approach the traditional model of a debate while two others advised mixing the types of format in different programs. Wrote a southern Republican State chairman, "Possibly an initial telecast might take the form of statements of political philosophies of the two protagonists with an ensuing discussion of points of disagreement." A western Democratic State chairman thought that part of each program could be devoted to questions by newsmen, then followed by a face-to-face debate.

A midwestern Democratic State chairman recommended a format which would permit the following: each participant should be allowed adequate time for a definitive opening statement on the subject, and each participant should be given an opportunity to comment on the opening statement of his opponent; a panel of experts, preferably those with news or political backgrounds, should direct questions at the participants, each of whom would be allowed to comment on the question regardless of to whom it was addressed; the participants should have the opportunity to question each other; the panelists ought to be permitted a series of followup questions on particular points so that neither candidate can gloss over a point with a generality or catch phrase; if an area of intense disagreement arises, there ought to be sufficient flexibility in the debate to permit remaining on the subject and thoroughly exploring the area of disagreement.

The need for more time was mentioned frequently One chairman, a Southwest Republican, suggested that debates be longer—1½ hours—but that there be only two or three. This, he felt, would do away with much of the repetition evident in the 1960 debates.

There were recommendations for prior preparation from several chairmen. A New England State Republican chairman suggested that opponents exchange texts of their opening remarks in advance of the debate and added that less rigidity on the matter of time would enable candidates to develop their arguments more effectively. A second chairman, a border State Republican, suggested that editors and directors of television news departments select a number of issues, perhaps eight, from which a group of working newsmen would develop questions to be put to both candidates by a moderator.

Writing at length, a Puerto Rican party official thought questions should be exchanged between the candidates before the debate to permit each candidate to prepare an answer, and the public should be informed of any question refused by a debater. He also thought the public should be allowed to participate; this might be done through five questions picked by lot from those submitted by the public. No candidate, however, should be permitted written notes except for the purpose of quotation. Only one chairman recommended that candidates not be informed of the subjects for discussion. A Southern State Democratic chairman commented, "* * * a part of the purpose in these debates is to judge the ability of the candidate to express himself without prior preparation."

One chairman saw a need for a live audience to give dramatic impact.

The State chairmen had some interesting miscellaneous suggestions. A New England Republican suggested that the debate could be followed by some sort of critical analysis. One chairman specified that what is said in each debate should be printed in a very cheap pamphlet and sold to the public either at cost or for the benefit of some worthy cause. Another raised what he called only a technical objection: the television discussions of President Kennedy and Mr. Nixon were not debates per se, therefore, if the format used in 1960 is continued, the name of the program should be changed to "Presidential Forum" or a similar name. A midwestern Republican suggested that the participants be separated and give their respective presentations in adjoining, but separate facilities. "When one is talking the other could be following him on a monitor and vice versa * * * (this would) allow the participant when not speaking the opportunity to make notes, look up references, walk around, and smoke if he desires."

National committee statement

Following is the statement of a spokesman for one of the national committees. Because of its thoughtful approach to the problem and its general interest, the full text is included in this report:

"A great deal has been written about the 1960 debates. In preparing our answer to your request for the views of the national committee, we have consulted these writings and have discussed the matter with journalists, political scientists, and politicians who were in a position to give us expert advice. A number of suggestions have been made which we believe should be transmitted to your study committee for their consideration.

"One of the most striking things we discovered was the extent of agreement about changes from the 1960 procedures which were thought to be desirable. This also turned out to be one of the cases in which the feelings of the average 'viewers' were very much the same as those of the experts. Of the many studies of the 1960 debates, apparently the only one which specifically asked respondents for suggestions for improvement was conducted by Richard F. Carter, of the Institute for Communication Research at Stanford University. Three comments were made much more frequently than any others. The debates should be longer. The interviewing newsmen should be eliminated. And there should be only one topic per debate. Each of these suggestions can be documented with arguments we have heard from experts.

"Somewhat longer debates would be desirable. It might not be possible to hold an audience for 2 hours but a debate ought to hold their attention for an hour-and-a-half. And this additional time could be usefully employed. The candidates could begin with a statement of their own positions. They could follow this with cross-questioning and still have time for summary statements.

"The role of the press ought to be restricted because they fequently ask a particular type question, one which will produce a newsworthy answer. As is said on 'Meet the Press': 'The questions which the reporters ask do not necessarily reflect their own opinions, but are their way of developing a story for you.' Good stories often result when a reporter asks a provocative question, but the campaign ought to be run for the benefit of the candidates and the electorate, not the reporters.

"Reporters are also concerned with the partisan implications of the questions they ask. They do not want to appear as pro-Republican or pro-Democratic, and therefore avoid asking questions which might give that impression to their viewers. Often it is the frankly partisan questions which stimulate good debate. I believe that it would be better to have frankly political questions asked by acknowledged political opponents.

"Of course, there is no reason why two formats cannot be used in the same series. One or two appearances could be presented as joint press conferences. The others could be debates in which the candidates cross-examine each other. Both of these formats can be used to develop information for the viewers, and perhaps both should be used.

"If it is decided to use a panel of interviewers, the interrogators should be allowed at least one follow-up question. An experienced politician can evade any question in his first answer. If a reporter is allowed a follow-up question, he at least has a chance to probe.

"The selection of the topics to be debated is clearly going to have to be a matter of agreement between the candidates. The topics which are being discussed are just as much a part of the debate as the words which the candidates speak. Some topics give an advantage to one candidate; other topics give an advantage to his opponent. Defining the issues is the business of the candidates. That's what they are supposed to be doing during a campaign.

"In 1960, the debate seemed to lack a focus. There was too much randomness, too much generality, and too much back-and-forth between the candidates. There was not enough serious discussion of the issues. The candidates ought to be encouraged to reach agreement on the topics they will discuss on each debate. The goal here ought to be narrow enough to provide a focus for discussion, but broad enough that it does not constrict the discussion. Something narrower, say, than 'foreign policy,' but not as restricted as the Alliance for Progress.

"There is some danger that trying to achieve agreement on the exact topics to be discussed could bog down the whole negotiations. A committee of experts, such as your study committee, could facilitate agreement. Each candidate could submit a list of topics he would be willing to discuss. The committee could then prepare a proposed schedule for the debates which could be referred back to the candidates as an agenda for their final negotiations. Agreement between the candidates on the specific subjects to be discussed might be easier to reach if the first debate, or the final debate, were retained as a general debate when topics not covered in the other debates could be discussed.

"The timing of the debates is another important question. In 1960 it was not possible to schedule any debates during the final 2 or 3 weeks of the campaign, the traditional period in which the real heat is put on. The impact of the debates would be greater if they were spread out during the campaign period so that there were one or two during the climax of the campaign.

"Many of the studies of the 1960 debates point out that the viewers found themselves unable to follow detailed discussion of the issues, and concentrated instead on the clash of personalities. It is probably true, as Samuel Lubell puts it, that 'the contest between personality and issues is bound to remain an uneven one—as uneven perhaps as matching the crowd appeal of a chorus girl against a she intellectual with horn-rimmed glasses.' But this does not imply that we should give up the opportunity for substantial debate to gain mere showmanship. The judgment which the personality oriented viewer makes is based upon the performance of the candidate in a stress situation. And the procedures which will give us a better debate of the issues also will place the candidate in just such a situation. Nor do we need to lower the quality of the discussion simply to build a giant audience. We know from the 1960 experience that the drama of two men contending for the greatest prize in American political life is itself sufficient to attract the attention of our interested citizens.

"Malcolm Moos spoke for all of us when he wrote: 'With all the frailties that befog the objective projection of our presidential candidates, the (1960) debates did offer new hope of a more rational politics—to which we can all say, speed the day.'

"So I wish your committee good luck in its work, and urge that it bear in mind the injunction of Herbert Seltz and Richard Yoakam: 'Certainly our sympathies are with the networks in their endeavors to have the debates on the air, and with the candidates for their courage in participating, but many of the pressures inherent in such a new venture must be removed so that the content is shaped only by concern for the best interests of the public.' "

Debating the question of debates

Many of the letters contained comments on the general desirability of debates and specific suggestions for arranging them. Some of these are grouped together at this point for ease of comparison:

Florida Democratic Representative: "Frankly I have serious reservations about the worth of this program. I personally prefer time being made available for each candidate to speak at length to the American people about the issues. Debates tend to hairsplitting and I think that little good comes from them, whereas I feel much more could be accomplished in allowing the two candidates national prime time to make major speeches to the American people."

Florida Republican Representative: "First of all, I think whether there be any debate at all in the 1964 presidential campaign is a matter of decision on the part of the two candidates. If they were equally good debaters, then I think a debate would serve some useful purpose. On the other hand, if one candidate were far better than the other in the matter of debating, then I think there may be some danger in a debate. I would think it dangerous if the American people selected their President purely on the glibness of his tongue in the matter of debate, regardless of other qualifications."

Idaho Democratic Representative: "First, let me say very frankly that I heartily favor public debates of this nature between candidates on every level of the political spectrum—and especially when the office involved is of such magnitude as the Presidency of the United States. To insure that the Nation is adequately exposed to the views of presidential candidates, I believe that it is important not only to have at the very minimum a half dozen such encounters during the campaign, but that these encounters be of such a nature to permit questioning by a panel of newsmen following any preliminary statement or debate by the candidates. I would suggest that the debate be no less than 1 hour's duration."

Connecticut Democratic Representative: "I believe that no practical arrangement can be made for adequate and complete presentation of presidential candidates on television or radio. This is not to say that real television or radio debates would not be highly desirable. Unfortunately, however, the practical requirements of the media rule out the amount of time that would be necessary to have a meaningful exchange of views. The result is that the accepted format has grown to be something very different from a debate. It puts a premium upon rapid-fire production of predigested points and a concentrated attempt to create an image in the minds of the viewers or listeners."

Pennsylvania Democratic Representative: "Television debates should benefit the democratic process because they will be some help to the party out of power. The incumbent does have a tremendous advantage now in controlling the headlines. Such a move would tend to counterbalance this and at the same time force the party in power to defend its actions and policies in the same room as its opposition."

Massachusetts Democratic Representative: "Personally, I do not believe that these debates contribute very much to proper, adequate understanding of the issues and the candidates. It may well be that in these debates the real issues are obscured or confused and too much emphasis placed by the viewing public on personality and behavioral factors, rather than upon the substance of the issues themselves."

Southwestern Republican Representative: "In the first place, there is some doubt in my mind as to whether an incumbent President should engage in such debates. In order to defend his position it may be necessary to say things which might rise to haunt him later or which might cause embarrassment internationally. Certainly, a President can find ways of acquainting our citizens with his views which do not possess such inherent danger of being misunderstood."

Illinois Republican Representative: "It is my belief that the first question to be answered is not one of format but one of advisability. To my mind a television debate in a political campaign must be viewed as but one of many campaign techniques. The advisability of even having such a debate depends entirely on who the candidates are and the specific circumstances of an individual campaign."

Ohio Republican Representative: "Certainly no candidate should be compelled to either enter into a debate with any particular format or to enter into a debate at all. It is my feeling that such debates generally tend to obfuscate the issues and put undue emphasis upon personality, mannerisms, and professional training. I believe also that where there is an incumbent President involved, there are serious questions of national security that have to be considered."

Southwestern Democratic Representative: "I have felt since 1960 that the debates between the presidential candidates were one of the great strides forward in our generation. I hope that this will become a tradition so strong that no candidate will be able to avoid participation."

Oregon Democratic Representative: "It is very important that an incumbent President be given every courtesy under the rules which must carefully safeguard against the dangers of degrading the office of the Presidency. Personally, I am not in favor of such debates except when neither candidate is an incumbent. However, if any President should choose to participate in such debates, the importance of maintaining a high level exchange cannot be overemphasized."

Georgia Democratic Representative: "While I believe that the Nixon-Kennedy debates of 1960 played a vital role in the 1960 election campaign, nevertheless, I am firmly of the opinion that no President of the United States, while serving as the President, should ever engage in a television or radio debate with an opposing candidate. When both candidates are first seeking the office, then the debates are helpful, and, I am sure, of great value to the electorate in making a decision. However, I do not believe that the President of the United States, even though he is a candidate for reelection, should participate in these debates because of the office he holds. It is one thing for a presidential aspirant to participate in a debate, it is something else for the occupant of the most important office in the world to participate in a debate which may be televised to all parts of the world."

Northeastern Republican Senator: "I do have some feeling about this matter of debates between presidential candidates and I hope, the Gallup poll notwithstanding, that Republicans don't have to choose between John Glenn and Elizabeth Taylor for their candidates. I would like to see campaigns get away from glamor and be based more on the ability, the courage, and integrity of the candidates. These qualities are not necessarily well displayed on the television screen. However, frequent appearances—even in debates—help the discerning public in making up their minds."

Mountain State Republican Senator: "I am unalterably opposed to the entire idea of television and radio debates between national candidates. Such debates, in my opinion, place too much emphasis on personality and physical posture, and too little on basic philosophy, actual ability, and the inherent qualities that count so heavily in the man who will serve in such a post. The turn of a phrase, or a slip caused by the pressures of the moment can too often create a subliminal image that cannot be erased by any amount of logic. In our complex and trying times, the selection of the man for whom we shall vote as President of the United States, requires much reflective thought and study; not a spur of the moment decision based on his TV image or a voice inflection."

Southwestern Democratic Senator: "About all I would like to do is say that I strongly favor these televised debates. In fact, I prefer them to the radio discussions. You cannot separate the words from the speaker and when you hear a man make a declaration on Cuba or Vietnam or taxation and you can watch his face while he is doing it, you have a far better chance to decide whether you desire or do not desire to entrust your future and the future of your children to his custody."

Midwestern Democratic Senator: "I believe that the debates are a valuable contemporary rejuvenation of a long cherished, but until recently forgotten, American political tradition. While there have been many skeptical analyses concerning the true value of the debates, I believe that there were more informed ballots cast in the 1960 election than ever before. I also believe that there was much more serious reading done by the voters on the campaign issues last year. I think some of these results were due to an increased interest stimulated by the debates. For these reasons I strongly hope that both candidates will agree to debate next year * * * the incumbent President could be hard pressed by the opposition candidate in areas where highly classified materials constitute the main determinant of national policy. Guarding these secrets will take a very determined effort on the part of the President. Format and procedure should be arranged so as to aid the President in his efforts to guard the national interest while he is defending his policies. However, in making any such arrangements, the President must not be given an advantage or unfair shield."

Southwestern Republican Senator: "While I believe it advantageous for the public to have an opportunity to see the candidates together, I seriously question whether the public interest is served by anything approaching a debate. The ability of a chief executive to make sound, considered decisions on many and varied matters is far more vital to the welfare of the American people than is his forensic adeptness. An outstanding trial lawyer does not inevitably make the best judge, nor an orator the greatest public official."

Southern Democratic Senator: "Personally I feel that the debates between the presidential candidates in the 1960 election were most helpful to the electorate of this country. I strongly favor its use in all of our presidential elections. Of course, rules for conducting the debate to insure its objectivity and the fairness of its conduct should be carefully prepared in advance and agreed to by both presidential candidates. My feeling is that it should be limited to nominees of the two great national parties."

Western Democratic State chairman: "I believe the television debates during the 1960 presidential campaign were the best thing that has happened in politics in decades because they provided an outstanding forum for the discussion of basic issues and enabled the public to make a decision on the candidates on the basis of their position on matters of vital national concern."

Border Republican Party chairman: "I am of the opinion that the TV debates between candidates for public office, including President and Vice President are of very dubious value in terms of discussion of the issues or public enlightment. I think they actually do great harm to the two-party system and degrade the electoral process to the level of a personality cult contest. If such debates continue, we may live to have a President more like Clark Gable than George Washington or Abraham Lincoln, and that would be the end of representative government as we know it. I believe your association should discuss this aspect of the matter and discourage such debates rather than encourage them."

Suggestions on format

Florida Democratic Representative: "I do feel that the presentations the last time were too exclusively in the nature of a debate, and I would recommend that while retaining an opportunity for debate in a program or two, there should also be available the opportunity for the candidates for President to state their feelings about their candidacy in a more detached, nonbelligerent manner. In other words, I would urge that in different programs there be the debate technique and there be a statement technique and that these two methods of presentation not be combined in the same specific program."

California Democratic Representative: "With regard to the format, I will confess that I am not an expert but would like to suggest that the debate be sufficiently lengthy to provide adequate exposure of both candidates. I would feel that 1 hour should be a reasonable minimum for this purpose. I feel also that there should be a reasonable number of such debates, preferably not less than four, so as to reserve the possibility that one or the other of the candidates might have a particularly good or particularly bad night on a specific occasion. I saw no particular objection to the procedure used in the Nixon-Kennedy debates in 1960. If anything, I would make them somewhat more flexible so as to include both an opportunity for questions to be presented by a panel of distinguished political writers and also some opportunity for the candidates themselves to raise questions with each other which they feel need to be publicly discussed. I certainly would think that the debate should be conducted without written notes and the answers limited in time so as to avoid lengthy speeches by either of the candidates."

Michigan Democratic Representative: "I imagine the debate form should be used, but I do not feel that this will hold enough viewer attention because I know of very few fans of debates. I would surmise that a measure of interview and discussion would be useful. With regard to the interview panel set up during the last debates, I would say that it appeared useful to me, but I heard a number of adverse comments from viewers. My frank feeling is that witnessing a bunch of reporters acting as prosecutors is not always the most appealing form of television programing and this at all cost should be avoided."

Kansas Republican Representative: "My own thought is that the debates would be far more effective in getting issues before the people in an interesting and worthwhile way if the format and procedures of the debates were more nearly like the format and procedure of a classical debate—rather than having so-called reporters fire questions at the candidates."

Florida Democratic Representative: "I start out by discarding the formal debate type procedure. The program must be more, however, than an opportunity for the candidates to label each other and to label issues. It seems to me, also, to be insufficient to relegate TV appearances to simply an announcement as to where each candidate stands on the issues. Some format must be devised which provides for some depth of discussion on issues so as to minimize the use of psychological semantic gimmicks which were so obvious in the last debate."

Rhode Island Democratic Representative: "I feel that the programs involving the candidates should vary from confrontation to confrontation so as to give each candidate an opportunity to prove his effectiveness under different conditions. There are occasions when the format * * * would produce the best results if it required the candidates to debate in the classical sense; in another instance, an interview type program with prominent reporters or citizens asking questions of the two candidates may prove to be effective, or there may be a combination of the debate-interview type program."

California Republican Representative: "My blunt feelings are that there are simply too many cooks at this fire. If your organization can be of any assistance in clearing away the clutter of egomaniacs of the news media on these occasions it will perform, in my opinion, a helpful public service. I believe that the two candidates should, like two boxers in a ring, have the unimpeded opportunity to spar away at each other—in front of the viewing public—which is perfectly competent to make up its mind as to which is the best man."

Texas Democratic Representative: "I feel that each nominee should have 15 minutes to present his platform and pose any questions that he may wish in any manner that he sees fit. In this connection, if he wishes to use diagrams, photographs, drawings or objects, this he should be allowed to do. I definitely do not think that anyone should ask questions from a panel as there is too much chance for favoritism in such a procedure. On the succeeding programs, the nominees could spend their 15 minutes answering questions that had been posed by the opposing nominee; and in fact, the nominees should be encouraged to ask each other questions to be answered at succeeding programs. In this manner, no one but the nominees, themselves, would have control of the program."

Southwestern Republican Representative: "If debates are to be held, in my opinion the contestants should not be face to face, but should have the same question asked to them by the same people. Obviously, such a show would have to be taped in advance. I think it is important that this be done so that a presidential candidate can give true and complete answers of his philosophy, without the temptation to vary his presentation a bit to 'sock the other guy.' It might be fun for the populace to see presidential candidates slug it out verbally, but I am not sure that it adds much to their total understanding of the subjects involved. After all, the ability to debate is not exactly the prime requisite for a successful President."

Midwestern Republican Senator: "I would like to see one debate between the President and his opponent in which the two candidates would confront each other for an hour and some impartial moderator, perhaps selected from your good association, serve simply to keep the time even and the debate running on a schedule. One candidate would present his viewpoint in perhaps a 15- or 20-minute talk to be followed by his opponent with each given the normal rights of repudiation and rebuttal. This debate would cover whatever subject the representative candidates felt most important to the advancement of his cause and his candidacy."

Western Democratic Governor: "Admittedly, there are dangers in having the two candidates for President debate openly before a nationwide audience. There is always the chance that the more gifted debater might not necessarily be the most knowledgeable candidate. But I believe that if the candidates are to meet at all, there should be a direct exchange between them, so that weaknesses and arguments can be probed and strengths demonstrated as such. Two one-sided arguments, in my opinion, are not nearly as revealing as to the qualities of the candidates as a direct duel of ideas."

Western Republican Governor: "It is my personal belief that so-called television debates in essence are joint appearances and are not constructive for the electorate. Joint appearances before a live audience, with unrehearsed questions from the audience, that would be televised, would appear to have much more merit. In a format such as this, it would require a moderator who would recognize the participants in the audience."

Midwestern Democratic Governor: "I can remember watching the 1960 debates and wondering whether the panel of four reporters served any useful purpose. It seemed that the questions asked by the reporters generated less light than heat and had a tendency to deal with the side issues of the campaign. It would seem to me that the study committee * * * might consider the possibility of a new format for the debates. This format could involve opening and closing statements by both candidates in the manner of the first and fourth debates between President Kennedy and Mr. Nixon. The time between could be used for questions directed by the candidates themselves to each other, for the answers to these questions, and for the rebuttals to each answer."

Northeastern Republican State chairman: "Too many times in the past we have heard half truths or theoretical guesses stated as a matter of fact without any regard to a cross-examination of the statements. Perhaps the use of a moderator or a team of moderators with more leeway for questioning of statements would be the answer, or maybe even a critical analysis immediately following the actual debate itself, or both."

Suggestions on procedure and rules

Illinois Republican Representative: "If debates are held again, I strongly recommend they follow classical debating more closely. The hour should be devoted to a single topic, with the first speaker returning for a 5-minute closing summary. This would leave ample time for introductions, statement of topic, and station breaks."

Wisconsin Republican Representative: "As to the procedural format for the debate, I am inclined to favor something similar to the rules used in ordinary high school debate. For example, allow one candidate 5 minutes in which to present his argument for a particular proposal. Then, give the other candidate 2 to 5 minutes to rebut. Finally, 2 or 3 minutes would be allowed for a counter-rebuttal. In each debate session, perhaps three mutually agreed upon topics that fall within a general subject area such as foreign policy could be treated. This would consume approximately 35 minutes. These three, more or less separate, debates could then be followed by a series of questions put to each candidate by his opponent. There would probably be time for three 1-minute questions with 2½- or 3-minute answers. These questions and answers would have to be germane to the general subject matter but not necessarily to the three specific topics debated earlier."

Michigan Democratic Representative: Format: "Alternating appearances of the two candidates in varying blocks of time ranging from 10 minutes for openers to 2 minutes for rebuttals. Perhaps some such arrangement as: each opener, 10 minutes; each questioner, 4 minutes; each rebuttal, 2 minutes; close, 5 minutes."

Virginia Democratic Representative: "Insofar as presidential debates are concerned, I feel the challenger, if he chooses to criticize a domestic or international policy or program of the incumbent, should be required to state what he would have recommended as a solution to the particular problem."

New Jersey Republican Representative: "A format then could be followed where the first three or four debates could be an hour and a half in length, divided into two segments. An opening statement of 10 minutes on the subject matter would be followed by 10 minutes of rebuttal. Then questioning on these specific areas from reporters and political scientists could follow."

California Republican Representative: "The only suggestion that I would have in regard to the television broadcast of presidential candidates is to limit them to true debates, taking one subject and giving 10 minutes to each candidate with 5 minutes for rebuttal."

Western Democratic Senator: "Allow more time per topic for each individual in the debate. This would allow—indeed force—each individual to develop his thoughts and probe deeply into a given subject. I would recommend 10 minutes in which to give a prepared statement on a subject to each candidate. They should also have one 5-minute rebuttal period. This would give fairly adequate coverage to two subjects in an hour's program."

Border State Democratic Senator: "The first three-fifths of the program could be devoted to a discussion in depth with the last one-quarter a question-and-answer period on subject of national concern."

Western Democratic Senator: "I would suggest that one format be similar to that used in the television debates of 1960. That is, a 5-minute opening statement from each candidate and then a question from a reporter or other source with a 4-minute answer, and then a 2-minute rebuttal from the second candidate, the questions to be asked alternately of each man. At the close of the debate each candidate would have a brief period for summation. A second format might allow for the candidates to question each other. The question would be asked with perhaps 4 minutes for an answer and then 2 minutes for the questioner's comment on the answer. Again each candidate would have a brief period for summation at the end of the debate."

Midwestern Republican Senator: "One candidate would present his viewpoint in perhaps a 15- or 20-minute talk to be followed by his opponent with each given the normal debater's right to repudiation and rebuttal."

Northeastern Democratic Senator: "I'd suggest, therefore, that such debates begin with a 5-minute introduction by each participant, followed by a 20-minute question and answer period during which 5 minutes could be spent on two points raised by one participant and two points raised by the other. I'd then have a short rebuttal period by each candidate. For the final debate I would invite a panel of newspaper men for a "Meet the Press" format lasting a full hour. Each candidate could be given 25 minutes to answer questions individually. Then each could be given 5 minutes for a final summation or rebuttal."

Western Democratic Senator: "I think the 1960 debates did demonstrate a need to devise procedures which will permit, and require, each candidate to express his views, and to develop his arguments, in some depth, on a particular subject or area of concern. This can be done, of course, by making several of the programs debates in fact, rather than devoting them to random comments on a series of topics. A debate requires that each candidate be limited to the discussion of a single, precisely defined proposition, and that each be given an opportunity for both exposition and rebuttal."

Number and subject matter

Illinois Republican Representative: "It would be my hope that future debates would be restricted to major issues so that they might be explored more thoroughly by both candidates. By restricting the scope of the subject matter, a series of debates could be scheduled to deal with various issues on different evenings of the telecast. For example, the first of the series of debates would be restricted to domestic policies such as employment, agriculture, and economic issues. The second of the series might be restricted to foreign policy and foreign aid. The third perhaps to national defense and military posture, etc. This would tend to eliminate the garbling of many issues and give the TV audience a better perspective of just what is involved in dealing with the vast problems of Government from an administrative level."

Idaho Democratic Representative: "The debates should also cover a broad range of topics so that the public does become fully aware of the candidate's political philosophy rather than focusing on perhaps one or two major issues which may have developed during the campaign."

Wisconsin Democratic Representative: "My most serious criticism of the nationwide confrontation is that the questions posed were too broadly based to permit anything but the most superficial treatment. True, the great debates were an excellent test of the candidate's facility with words and factual recall ability, but it was almost impossible to treat a serious subject in the depth it required. One way this might be overcome would be to limit the number of questions to one or two at the most per broadcast and to allow each of the candidates at least a full minute of reflection before launching into a discussion of the issue."

Iowa Republican Representative: "I have always felt that televised debates should be concerned with one issue per program, and that there should be a free 'give and take' process, permitting frequent interchange."

Border State Republican Representative: "I think that debates should be limited to topics which establish the maturity, humanity, judgment, and wisdom of candidates rather than their encyclopedic memory, their histrionic ability, or their sex appeal."

Midwestern Republican State chairman: "I have felt, however, that a definite subject if so advertised, such as foreign aid, farm program, and other vital issues to this Nation should be specifically utilized in individual debates so that the participants do not get wandering into each issue and sketchily or hastily cover too broad a field in each performance. For instance, I personally would like to see the question of civil rights debated as an individual issue rather than part of a general debate covering other issues."

New Jersey Republican Representative: "The problem, as I see it, is to force the discussion, by whatever procedure is followed, into specific channels where thoughts and ideas can be developed. I see no reason why this problem could not be solved by simply using the platforms of the two parties. The general subject areas usually correspond, and can be grouped into categories involving agriculture, urban areas, relations with our allies, the domestic economy, etc. For too long the party platforms have tended to be rather meaningless and neglected, even though candidates for President have sworn their undying acceptance. By announcing before convention time that the programs would make use of the platforms as the basis for discussion and debate, greater party cohesion and responsibility could also be fostered. The voters would certainly benefit and their choices would be made clearer. Knowing the subject matter and the general position of both candidates by way of the platform should make the presentations better prepared and in more depth. Questioning would not wander all over the lot either. The last debate could then be open to whatever subject matter the participants individually chose to mention and the reporters chose to ask about."

Southwestern Republican State chairman: "I * * * feel that perhaps points could be more fully developed and there would be more listener interest if the programs were a little longer—perhaps an hour and a half rather than an hour—and if their number were held down to two or three rather than four. It seems to me that this would do away with a lot of the repetition which was evident during the 1960 debates."

Structuring of questions

Southwestern Democratic Representative: "Since your group represents broad experience, you might undertake to list issues which are vital to effective exercise of presidential responsibility. All might not agree upon the order of importance of these, but I think that consensus could be reached on the entire list, and in specifics rather than generalities. Each candidate would have an opportunity to respond to each of these in advance of broadcast exposure; if and when it can be determined that there is basic agreement upon a particular thesis, this should be scheduled for airing during the course of the debates, allowing each candidate a limited time to state his view and his reasons for it. Thus no impact of personality or superior forensic ability can mar a growth of public awareness that candidates for office are indeed men of good will and that they stand together on issues vital to the national welfare. The electorate must then inform itself and ponder the implications of this fact of political life—that men of both parties often tread the same ground and follow the demand of Constitution and conscience in taking necessary action, even though that action might be unpopular because of misinformation or misconception on the part of a majority of electors."

Southern Republican State chairman: "In general, I would say that issues might be specified in advance, yet the question arises as to who would decide the topics to be discussed. Those that might seem important to your advisory panel would not necessarily seem the vital ones to both candidates."

Northeastern Republican State chairman: "It does seem to me, however, that the debates would be most informative if each of the candidates was required to provide to his opponent the text of his opening remarks a reasonable time in advance of the debate. This should permit each candidate a better opportunity to fully develop the differences in position and viewpoint. My view is that the format for televised debates between presidential candidates should be in the nature of having someone ask questions of the candidates on the key issues, then requiring each candidate to give an extemporaneous response, with the opportunity for rebuttal. Certainly the program should be planned, although there should be very limited rehearsal, as a part of the purpose in these debates is to judge the ability of the candidate to express himself without prior preparation."

Southern Democratic State chairman: "Despite suggestions to the contrary, the wide range of questioning by reporters on a broad range of topics, would present a most effective procedural format. I would, however, hope that future debates would be divided into questions, first on domestic issues, and secondly on foreign policy matters. This would provide more discussion in depth. It is also my feeling that a concentrated effort should be made to screen questions, thus eliminating the inconsequential topics, and also to restrict the order of questioning to consecutive topics."

Puerto Rico party chairman: "I believe that presidential debates should be preceded by: (1) Exchange between the debaters of the questions to be discussed, in an itemized form; the moderator committee would give final form to them in case the same question is asked in different forms by both debaters; (2) Definition of the terms involved in the questions to avoid generalities; (3) If the questions posed by the debaters are too vague and insufficient to clarify their mutual positions, then the moderator committee would submit down-to-earth questions of its own, and any question refused by a debater should be informed to the public."

Border State Republican State chairman: "The editors and publishers and television news department executives could select the eight most important issues involved in the election campaign and designate that only one of these issues be discussed by the candidates during any one debate program. And I would think it would be desirable for a group of working newsmen to select a group of representative questions to be asked of each candidate by a moderator, with newsmen not present in the stuidos."

New York Republican Representative: "Means should be sought to determine what the public considers to be the key campaign issues, and questions relating to these issues presented to the candidates for their discussion. In assessing public sentiment for this purpose, care should be taken so that the polling organization's bias as to the central issues does not influence the respondents. Too frequently, opinion polls produce information applicable only to what the surveyor's employer judges as important. I would like to see a survey conducted among a broad cross section of the American voting public in which those sampled were asked to cite the three items they considered to be the most crucial in their voting decision. From these responses could be drawn a list of those issues which the American voters were planning to take into account before deciding which presidential candidate would receive their vote, and the candidates questioned accordingly."

New York Democratic Representative: "I likewise contend the informal, unrehearsed kind of interview program is more effective as compared with a prepared speech formal presentation. This not only adds spontaneity and dynamics as another dimension, but also exposes the candidate to a realistic experience, the like of which would often be a part of his regular duties as President of the United States."

Iowa Republican Representative: "In any appearance before a panel the presidential candidate, without knowing what the questions may be precisely, should nevertheless have set out for himself the area of questioning to be covered. Thus, for example, should it be his wish not to have any member of the panel to ask questions of a personal nature, this kind of request would be honored. Also, it should be the right of the candidate to exclude from discussion subject matters on which he may not feel himself adequately informed. The idea is to avoid traps and tricks and to give the American people an opportunity to make their appraisals not upon the candidate's genius for evasion or upon his cleverness in dealing with hecklers, but upon his substantive qualities as a man and a leader. It is not the quick reply and the clever retort that make for leadership or sound thinking and they are not evidences of greatness, only evidences of a capacity to perform. What the TV should, as far as possible, be required to present to the American people, is an honest picture of a true leader; or substantive, not superficial proof, of the real qualities of the man on the screen."

Border State Democratic Representative: "I would be of the opinion that the average individual citizen will obtain the greatest interest if he believes the participants are speaking spontaneously. Most of the debates of recent years, including the Kennedy-Nixon confrontation, were entirely too stylized and formal. Apparently, the structure was developed out of the methods and procedures used in formal debating societies at the college level and elsewhere. I believe the fewest possible number of intermediaries should be involved in the debate and that the subjects to be discussed should be agreed upon by the participants and not by some outside element or group of sponsors who assume the responsibility of setting the ground rules and enumerating the issues."

New Jersey Republican Representative: "I would also add that the proponents should be allowed to use notes, books, and any other supporting data they chose. Extemporaneous speaking is no measure of a presidential candidate's potential."

Participation of noncandidates

Wisconsin Republican Representative: "Generally, I would be in favor of four separate confrontations of one hour each. The program should consist of a moderator and the two candidates. In my view there should be no other participants. To make the choice of the moderator as fair as possible, I would recommend the following: first, there should be a different moderator for each debate, with no moderator appearing more than once. One possible, and I think attractive, area from which to draw the moderator would be from the ranks of Congress."

Wisconsin Democratic Representative: "The panel should be revamped so that only half its members are journalists. The others should be political scientists, economists and others who might tend to ask more fundamental, searching questions."

Iowa Republican Representative: "That the Presidential campaign, in the matter of the confrontation of the candidates on TV, be entirely and completely divorced from the network techniques, their personnel, their commentators, wherever the two candidates appear together in a debate, or a discussion. That such a debate be moderated by a nonstudio personality, but an American, preferably unknown to TV, who is universally respected: perhaps a great educator, a Nobel prizewinner in some field related to politics; maybe a former President, a historian, possibly even a poet of the stature, say, of Carl Sandburg. That extemporaneous panel questioning during, before, and after the debate by studio commenators or personnel, be ruled out strictly and absolutely."

Northeastern Republican Senator: "Instead of using newsmen whose philosophy might be similar to that of one of the candidates, it might be well to have the Democratic candidates interrogated by Republican members of the panel and vice versa."

Western Republican State chairman: "I do not feel that questions from newspapermen add materially to the debate. I believe the people are more interested in hearing what seems important enough to a candidate to put into his opening statement."

Midwestern Republican State chairman: "It would be my thought that a panel of six people, composed of members of both political parties, should prepare the questions and ask the questions to the two candidates, dividing the questioning so that part of the questions are from the Republican section of the panel and part from the Democratic section, and in this manner a party's philosophy could be presented without bias and the other party's philosophy could be challenged. I think it would be a much more fair TV debate."

Scheduling of debates

Western Democratic Senator: "I have no specific suggestions for future television and radio debates between presidential candidates, except possibly to say that it might be a good idea to space them over a longer period of time. That is to say, one right after the nominating convention, with the others coming at 2 or 3 week intervals. Possibly, it might be a good idea to have the last debate about 3 days before the general elections with extended time provided."

Northeastern Republican Senator: "I would suggest that commitments be solicited from the Democratic and Republican National Committees well in advance of the national convention that whoever is nominated will take part in a series of debates in the course of the campaign."

Border State Democratic chairman: "It occurs to me that the most important single factor would be establishment of ground rules by a nonpartisan commission. Very frankly, this is the most difficult hurdle to overcome. Moreover, a limitation as to the number of debates and the time of them should be considered. In other words, they should be confined to the closing days of the campaign and curtailed in number of appearances."

Midwestern Democratic State chairman: "Perhaps we should have not only a series of three or four person-to-person debates but a series of equal time discussions over the course of the campaign. For example, one of the candidates for President could present his views on Monday night and the other candidate on Tuesday night and then a taped rebuttal presented during the same program on a Thursday or Friday night of the same week."

Border State Republican chairman: "I think it would be desirable to establish debates on an 8-week setup during the few months preceding the general election."

Physical arrangements and environment

Mountain State Democratic Senator: "For the physical environment for the debate I would suggest that both men should stand behind a low rostrum and be so arranged that the television cameras could, at various times, record both the candidate answering a question and the other candidate's attitude as he listens to the answer. I would have no audience beyond those involved in the debates."

Eastern Republican Governor: "As general guides in the arrangement of such debates, I believe * * * * that all such debates be held in front of a large studio audience so that participants can talk to people rather than principally to cameras or microphones."

Western Democratic Governor: "In my view, I feel the participants should debate without an audience—for obvious reasons—even though an audience would do much to add color to the event. I think the candidates should debate face-to-face, not from a continent apart and through use of television monitors. Perhaps the result is not technically impaired but I am sure the candidates would be inspired to a better performance."

Western Republican Governor: "Under no circumstances should the joint TV-radio appearances be conducted before an acknowledged audience. To do so would destroy the possibility of reasoned discussion that must be the central goal of such occasions."

Midwestern Republican State chairman: "The only suggestion I might have concerning these debates is that the participants be separated and give their respective presentations in adjoining, but separate facilities. When one is talking, the other could be following him on a monitor, and vice versa. The reason I make this suggestion is to allow the participant, when not speaking, the opportunity to make notes, look up references, walk around, smoke if he desires, etc. It would not detract from the debates from the viewers' standpoint, but it would afford those involved a chance to relax a bit when not actually on camera."

Connecticut Democratic Representative: "Perhaps the debate could take the form of a discussion between two candidates, at a small round table with the moderator between them. Should one of the candidates be the incumbent I feel that the candidates should then be seated at separate desks, with the moderator to one side. Both candidates should have the benefit of the best technical assistance, i.e., makeup, that is possible. All nonessential objects should be removed from the camera's view. It would be helpful to the candidates if each could see himself on the TV screen during the entire program (or could see the entire program) so that he will be aware of exactly what the public is viewing."

Texas Democratic Representative: "I also feel that each candidate should have the services of his own makeup artist if he so desires and should have his own advice on lighting during the time that he is on the program."

Iowa Republican Representative: "It appears to me there would be considerable merit in permitting the presidential candidates to appear at least once in an actual debate before an audience in whatever arena was deemed appropriate. The audience would be evenly divided with half the seats going to the backers of one candidate and half to the backers of the other. The event would be televised as it actually took place. There would be no studio-prescribed format. It would be covered by television as any special event of this kind is covered. The network pool would simply move in its cameras and televise it. The networks would not direct it; they would not stage it. They would communicate it to the people as it actually took place."

Wisconsin Democratic Representative: "I believe, however, that there should be more direct confrontation of candidates. Perhaps a format might be worked out which would approximate more closely the traditional platform debate. It might be possible, as well, to have some form of audience participation in the proceedings. To my mind the debates need the kind of humanizing touch which a live audience could contribute."

Equal time and minority parties

Midwestern Democratic Senator: "I feel I must express some concern about the tendency to ignore completely the candidates of minor parties. I am fully aware of the problems which radio and television networks face in giving equal time to minor as well as major candidates. However, I do not think we can let our concern for their economic problems overshadow the basic American principle that all sides have a right to be heard."

Western Democratic Senator: "I am mindful it is claimed by minority parties that suspension of equal time would deprive them of their campaign opportunities and rights. This is unwarranted. The broadcasters proved to us in 1960 they could operate under the suspension with appropriate responsibility."

Illinois Republican Representative: "If networks provide free time for debates between the Republican and Democratic candidates, they should be required to do the same for each national candidate for the Presidency. Lifting the equal time requirement to benefit the two major parties gives them an advantage which they neither need nor deserve. This action tends to give the two parties a favored, quasi-official position. Although I believe firmly in the two-party system, I am equally firm in believing the two parties must themselves provide the system with virility. Today's Republican Party began a third party in 1856, built on a splinter from the Whig Party. Other third party movements have contributed significant ideas to our national life, and frequently have influenced mightily the principles of the two major parties."

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Angle, Paul M., "Created Equal? The Complete Lincoln-Douglas Debates of 1858," Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1958.

Arons, Leon and May, Mark A., "Television and Human Behavior," New York, Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1963.

Aver, Jeffrey and Ewbanks, Henry Lee, "Discussion and Debate, Tools of a Democracy," New York, Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1941.

Coons, John E., "Freedom and Responsibility in Broadcasting," Northeastern University Press, 1961.

Kelley, Stanley, Jr., "Political Campaigning: Problems in Creating an Informed Electorate," Washington, D.C., the Brookings Institution, 1960.

Klapper, Joseph, "The Effects of Mass Communications," New York, Free Press of Glencoe, 1960.

Kraus, Sidney, "The Great Debates, Background-Perspective-Effects," University of Indiana Press, 1962.

Roe, Yale, "The Television Dilemma," New York, Hastings House, 1962.

Steiner, Gary, "The People Look at Television," New York, Knopf, 1963.

Thomson, Charles A. H., "Television and Presidential Politics," Washington, D.C., the Brookings Institution, 1956.

Trenaman, J., and McQuail, D., "Television and the Political Image," New York, Hillary House Publishers, Ltd., 1963 (1959 British election).

White, Theodore H., "The Making of the President, 1960," New York, Pockbooks, Inc., 1962.

Articles

Anonymous, "A Great TV Debate?" the Commonweal, vol. LXXI, No. 26 (Mar. 25, 1960) 687–688.

Anonymous, "At CBS, Blank Check for 1964 Debates," Broadcasting, November 25, 1963, 66.

Anonymous, "At Last, Action on Section 315," Broadcasting, February 24, 1964, 78.

Anonymous, "British Parties Rule Out Great Debates," Broadcasting, March 9, 1964, 91.

Anonymous, "Debate No. 2," Time, vol. LXXVI, No. 16 (Oct. 17, 1960), 17–23.

Anonymous, "Facing the Televoter," Economist, April 20, 1964, 222.

Anonymous, "Goodbye, Great Debate," the New Republic (Sept. 26, 1960), 5.

Anonymous, "Money Is Not the Object," Broadcasting, April 20, 1964, 52.

Anonymous, "Political Television," the New Republic, August 15, 1960, 6–7.

Anonymous, "Should a President Be Required To Debate His Election Opponent on TV?" Senior Scholastic, May 8, 1964, 16–17.

Anonymous, "Small Screen, Super Weapon," Newsweek, August 19, 1963, 76.

Anonymous, "Talk About Debates Tones Down, but Keeps On," Broadcasting, December 2, 1963, 82–83.

Anonymous, "Television Politics: All Star Cast?" Economist, February 8, 1964, 486–487.

Anonymous, "The Campaign," Time, volume LXXVI, No. 18 (October 31, 1960), 9.

Anonymous, "TV Debates in '64, the New Republic," November 7, 1960, 6.

Anonymous, "TV Zooms in on GOP," Business Week, February 22, 1964, 32.

Alsop, S., "Coming Attack on Lyndon Johnson" (debate issue), Saturday Evening Post, March 28, 1964, 15.

Apple, R. W., Jr., "The Little Debates," the Reporter, December 6, 1962, 36–38.

Ascoli, Max, "Intermezzo," the Reporter, November 10, 1960, 18.

Braden, Waldo W., "The Big Shows Versus the Solemn Referendum," Vital Speeches, volume XXVII, No. 17, June 15, 1962, 542–544.

Cater, Douglas, "Notes From Backstage," the Reporter, November 10, 1960, 19–20.

Commager, Henry Steele, "Washington Would Have Lost a TV Debate," the New York Times magazine, October 30, 1960, 13, 79–80.

Cortney, Phillip, "Responsibility of Television to the People," Vital Speeches, vol. LXXVI, No. 8, February 1, 1960, 252–254.

Cousins, Norman, "Presidents Don't Have To Be Quiz Masters," Saturday Review, November 5, 1960, 34.

Crawford, K., "TV or Not TV?" (cameras barred at Baker investigation), Newsweek, March 9, 1964, 32.

Dennis, Lloyd B., "Lincoln Debates Easily Arranged," New York Times, September 26, 1960, 25.

Freeley, Austin J., "The Presidential Debates and the Speech Profession," Quarterly Journal of Speech, vol. XLVII, No. 1, February 1961, 60–64.

Gould, Jack, "Candidates on TV—The Ideal and Others," the New York Times magazine, October 28, 1962, 27. 95–96.

Hamilton, William, "The Victory Was Video's," the Christian Century, volume LXXVII, No. 48, November 30, 1960, 1409–1410.

Harrington, Alan; Kleine, Don W.; McLaughlin, W. G.; Roxroth, Kenneth; and Wheeler, Harvey, "Debating the Great Debate," the Nation, November 5, 1960, 344–347.

Hughs, Emmet John, "52,000,000 TV Sets—How Many Votes?" the New York Times Magazine, September 25, 1960, 23, 78–80.

Kelley, Stanley, Jr., "Campaign Debates: Some Facts and Issues," Public Opinion Quarterly, volume XXVI, No. 3, fall 1962, 351–366.

Krock, Arthur, "The Polite Debate," New York Times, October 9, 1960, E–11.

McGrory, Mary, "Ladies and Gentlemen: In This Corner * * *!" America, volume 107, No. 25, September 22, 1962, 767.

Petersmeyer, C. Wrede, "A Broadcaster Looks at His Industry," Vital Speeches, volume XXVII, No. 16, June 1, 1962, 497–500.

Reston, James, "The Second Debate," New York Times, October 8, 1960, 10.

Reston, James, "The Fourth Debate," New York Times, October 22, 1960, 10.

Roper, Elmo, "Who Really Won the Elections of '62?" Saturday Review, December 15, 1962, 13.

Rovere, Richard, "Letter From Chicago," the New Yorker, October 8, 1960, 167–174.

Salant, Richard S., "The Television Debates: A Revolution That Deserves a Future," Public Opinion Quarterly, volume XXVI, No. 3, fall 1962, 335–350.

Sarnoff, Robert W., "The Time To Plan for the 1964 Presidential Campaign Is Now," McCalls, September 1961, 16, 174.

Shayon, Robert Lewis, "A 'Political Clinic' Program," Saturday Review, November 17, 1962, 38.

Shayon, Robert Lewis, "Elections by Electronics," Saturday Review, March 14, 1964, 22.

Shayon, Robert Lewis, "Pavlov and Politics," Saturday Review, January 23, 1960, 28.

Stanton, Frank, "Case for Political Debates on TV," New York Times Magazine, January 19, 1964, 16.

Stern, Philip M., "The Debates in Retrospect," the New Republic, November 21, 1960, 18–19.

Stevenson, Adlai, "Plan for a 'Great Debate,'" This Week magazine, March 6, 1960, 14–15.

Willis, Edgar E., "Little TV Debates in Michigan," Quarterly Journal of Speech, volume XLVIII, No. 1, February 1962, 15–23.

Reports and pamphlets

CBS Television Network, "Equal Time," Point of View, December 1960.

Federal Communications Commission, report to the Congress of the United States, March 1, 1961. Submitted pursuant to Senate Joint Resolution 207, 86th Congress, in hearings on review of section 315 of the Communications Act, Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, 87th Congress, 1st session, 1961.

Federal Communications Commission, "Survey of Political Broadcasting," Washington, D.C., May 1963.

Federal Communications Commission, "The Communications Act of 1934 with Amendments and Index Thereto," Washington, D.C.

File of editorial comment on the equal time debate distributed by the Columbia Broadcasting System.

House of Representatives, committee on conference, conference report, "Suspension of Equal Time Provisions of the Communications Act for 1964 Presidential Campaign," report No. 1415, second session, 1964.

Kellogg, V. S., "The Kennedy-Nixon Debates," unpublished report, Boston University, 1962.

Sarnoff, Robert W., "Television's Role in American Democracy," NBC pamphlet, March 1963.

Sarnoff, Robert W., "What's Right with Television," NBC, December 1962.

U.S. Senate, Committee on Commerce, final report, "Freedom of Communications," report No. 994, part 3, 87th Congress, 1st session, 1961.

U.S. Senate, Committee on Commerce, report, "Suspension of Equal Time Provisions of the Communications Act for 1964 Presidential Campaign," report No. 501, first session, 1963.

MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION

Carl J. Friedrich: Harvard University since 1926, Eaton professor of science of government at Harvard Graduate School of Public Administration since 1955; director, radio broadcasting research project at Harvard University, 1937–42; served as Government affairs adviser in U.S. military government, 1946–48; member, American Political Science Association (president, 1962), International Political Science Association (vice president, 1961–); the American Historical Association; the American Philosophical Association; and the American Academy of Arts and Sciences; author of "Man and His Government" and numerous other books and articles.

Evron M. Kirkpatrick: Executive director, American Political Science Association, 1954–; professor of political science, University of Minnesota, 1935–48; chairman, social science division, University of Minnesota, 1944–48; wartime service OSS; Chief, external research staff, U.S. State Department, 1947–52; Deputy Director, Office of Intelligence Research and chief, psychological intelligence and research staff, Department of State, 1952–54; member, President's Commission on Registration and Voting Participation, 1963–64; trustee of several research and educational organizations; author of a number of books and articles on politics and international affairs.

Harold D. Lasswell: Professor of law and political science, Yale University, 1952–; fellow of the Center for Advanced Study in Behavioral Science, Stanford, Calif., 1952; director of war communication research, Library of Congress, 1939–45; member: American Political Science Association (president, 1955–56), the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, and the American Sociological Society. Member of the committee of freedom of the press and research advisory board, Committee for Economic Development; author of many books and articles.

Richard E. Neustadt: Professor of government, Columbia University, 1954–; visiting lecturer, Nuffield College, Oxford, England, 1961–62; economist, OPA, 1942; staff member, Bureau of the Budget, 1946–50; White House staff, 1950–53; special consultant to numerous congressional committees and Government agencies, 1959–; consultant to President Kennedy, 1961–1963; member American Political Science Association, the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, the Institute of Strategic Studies (London); author of "Presidential Power" (1960) and numerous articles.

Peter H. Odegard: Professor of political science, University of California, 1948– (department chairman 1948–56); assistant to the Secretary of the Treasury, 1942–45; member of and consultant to numerous governmental commissions including the Atomic Energy Commission, 1947–54; the President's Commission on Migratory Labor, 1950–51; member: American Political Science Association (president 1951); the Academy of Political Science; American Academy of Political and Social Science; author of numerous books and articles in the field of political science and associate editor of the Public Opinion Quarterly, 1940–.

Elmo Roper: Marketing consultant since 1933; former radio commentator, newspaper columnist, and professor of journalism; consultant, director, and member of several wartime governmental offices including Deputy Director of OSS; research director for Fortune Survey of Public Opinion, 1935–50; editor at large of Saturday Review; active participant in numerous Connecticut study commissions and former chairman of the Connecticut Civil Rights Commission; deputy chairman of the NATO citizens delegation to Paris, 1962; and a member of the National Planning Association, American Marketing Association, Market Research Council (president 1942–43) and the American Statistical Society.

Telford Taylor: Lawyer and writer; visiting lecturer, Yale Law School since 1957, Columbia Law School since 1958; professor, Columbia Law School, 1963–; attorney and counsel for numerous governmental offices and agencies, 1933–42, including general counsel, Federal Communications Commission, 1940–42; counsel for the Joint Council for Educational Television, 1951–61; brigadier general of the U.S. Army serving in military intelligence; author of "Sword and Swastika" and numerous articles on political, legal, and military subjects.

Charles A. H. Thomson: Member of the senior staff and administrative officer, department of social science, Rand Corp. since 1959; staff member, Brookings Institution, 1946–59; consultant, Department of State, 1948–49; President's Communications Policy Board, 1950–51; member of task force staff, oversea operations of Second Hoover Commission, 1953–54; visiting lecturer, School of Advanced International Studies, Johns Hopkins University, 1953, 1955–57; author of "Television and Presidential Politics," 1956, and many articles related to political communications and politics.

Gerhart D. Wiebe: Dean of the School of Public Communication, Boston University, 1962–; research associate for Bureau of Educational Research, Ohio State University, 1940–41; research psychologist CBS, 1942–43, 1946–55; assistant to the president, 1955–56; partner, Elmo Roper & Associates, 1956–62; communications research consultant: USAF, USIA; National Recreation Association; National Council of Churches; member of American Psychological Association, American Association of Public Opinion Research (president 1956–57); coauthor of "Casebook in Social Processes" (1960) as well as numerous articles on various aspects of communication.

CUBA

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, recently a series of articles appeared in the Montreal Star on the recent history of Cuba and life under the Castro regime today. They were written by Bruce Taylor and accompanied by pictures taken by Adrian Lunny.

They are an excellent analysis of recent developments in Cuba. Mr. Taylor lived in the country prior to the Castro takeover, so he is well qualified to compare the life there today with the conditions under the oppressive Batista regime.

Taylor maintains a high standard of reporting on economic conditions, the U.S. trade blockade, the agricultural situation, the educational system, Castro's personal history, and a concluding article on what we may expect from this island in the next few years. I call particular attention to Mr. Taylor's observations on Cuban activities which are directed toward the subversion of Cuba's neighbors.

Castro is dedicated to the concept of "the liberation of all Latin America." By liberation he means bringing communism with its onerous state control to every country south of our borders. Castro's attempts to indoctrinate Cuban children are particularly disturbing. Taylor's articles describe in detail the "rewriting of history" which is part of the educational program of filling young people's minds with the doctrines of Stalin and Lenin. If Castro is successful in his educational practices, in 15 years all Cuba's younger generation will have closed minds.

These articles point out to all Americans the oppression of the Castro regime in Cuba today. Castro will stop at nothing to destroy freedom in our hemisphere and bring communism to all the peoples of Latin America. Mr. Taylor has performed a great service in describing so vividly the situation in Cuba today. I am sure that many people will read these fascinating articles with great interest. It is a lesson and warning for Americans and Canadians alike.

I ask unanimous consent to have this series printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Montreal Star, June 15, 1964]

Castro Wields Iron Fist—Cuba Exiles Face Failure

(By Bruce Taylor)

The Cuban exiles who have begun to infiltrate their homeland to organize a revolt against the dictatorship of Fidel Castro face almost certain failure.

Cuba is coming apart at the seams. Its economy is shattered. Conditions overall are far worse now than at the time of Castro's ascendancy 5 years ago, and are deteriorating relentlessly. But there will be no widespread civilian uprising on the island now.

Cuba is totally a police state. Castro is its supreme ruler, and his incredibly efficient internal security network has the nation's 7 million people—who are overwhelmingly dissatisfied with his system of government—tightly in control.

If Castro can keep his island alive for another 15 years—and his only hope of doing so is continuing commerce with Canada and other NATO partners of the United States which have elected to ignore the U.S. trade embargo—Cuba will be irrevocably Communist.

He needs that length of time to imbue Cuba's schoolchildren with a thorough hatred of "Yankee imperialism," and to prepare them to carry his political philosophy through all of Latin America. His program of indoctrination is similar to that used by prewar Germany to rear its fire-eating Hitler Youth.

The adult population, meanwhile, is being restrained by terror, helpless to prevent the brainwashing of its children.

Castro is not endangered by the returning exiles. It would take major military action to destroy what he has built. He stands ready today to resist even the full-scale invasion he believes is imminent.

His army of 200,000 fit, well trained, and dedicated soldiers is equipped with the best weapons in the Russian arsenal. There is no reason to believe it would not fight, or that it could be beaten by anything less than a force of comparable size.

Anti-Castro leaders in Cuba, who hope rather than fear that an invasion is inevitable, are concerned that the United States underestimates Castro's real strength. And they have little but prayer and pity to offer the exiles who are landing in Cuba.

The exiles are scattering into the Sierra Mestra and Escambray mountain ranges of the 700-mile-long island, where they hope to set up guerrilla bases from which to rally open resistance to Castro.

WELL ISOLATED

They are finding themselves almost entirely without help.

Castro is isolating them. He does not intend to give them the kind of toehold he grasped—and held—in his own revolution against Fulgencio Batista, the dictator he deposed in 1959.

Batista didn't understand guerrilla warfare; he merely tried to keep Castro's rebels bottled up in the hills. He lost Cuba in 3 years.

Castro, on the other hand, probably knows more about guerrilla fighting—and certainly more about the mountains—than the exiles who have come back to overthrow him.

He is going into the hills after them. He is using 20,000 and 30,000 soldiers at a time to encircle individual mountains and root out pockets of as few as four or five of them.

The civilians are too frightened to move. They are waiting for "the invasion." Their first question to me often was a despairing "When are the Americans coming?". But even if a major invasion is launched, few civilians will attempt to support it until they are convinced it is succeeding.

They feel there is good reason for their reticence. They say they were taught a bitter and bloody lesson by the fiasco at the Bay of Pigs 3 years ago.

They learned then that Castro's omniscient secret police had far greater knowledge of the then substantial underground than was suspected, and knew where to find its leaders before they could organize an uprising to coincide with the attack. They were rounded up within hours of the landings at the Bay of Pigs, and were butchered or imprisoned.

The underground has never regained even a semblance of its former strength.

And the Cubans dread a repetition of the military blunders that caused the attack to abort when it showed every indication of success, and left them wide open to repercussion.

It can be stated for the first time now that the assault on the island was within inches of victory. It failed only because early advantages were not pressed, and because there was no real air support for the invaders.

Castro's immediate subordinates admit now they were almost powerless to stop the invaders, and that if the latter had been given even minimal support the island would have fallen.

"We had no air strength then," a ranking Cuban army officer concedes. "A few American F–104 (supersonic) jet fighters would have knocked down anything we sent up.

SUPPORT LACKING

"We were using obsolete jet trainers and just about anything else that would fly.

"The B–26 bombers which attacked us came from so far away they had fuel for only a few minutes over Cuba. We were able to send troops and armor unhindered over open roads to the Bay of Pigs.

"Even so, we ran into trouble immediately and probably would have been destroyed if there had been support for the invasion. The mercenaries (the Cuban Government's epithet for the anti-Castro forces it claims were in the pay of the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency) shot up the first three tanks we sent in against them."

(These were Russian tanks. However, Cuba later released photographs of them lying useless on the beach and claimed they were American tanks which had come ashore with the invaders, and which had been stopped by Castro's army.)

"We were so weak that only stupidity prevented us from being beaten," the officer says. "But the situation has changed considerably since then."

Castro, realizing how close he'd come to being toppled by an invasion he hadn't expected, set out at once to build the army he now boasts is second only to that of the United States in the Americas.

He has modern Mig fighters and the men to fly them (both Cuban and Russian), a fleet of fast Russian motor torpedo boats, the best arms and ammunition the Soviet has to offer, and a thoroughly communistic-indoctrinated army that is Russian-trained.

And all over the island there are Russian surface-to-air missiles capable of bringing down even the high-flying U–2 reconnaissance planes which make daily sorties over Cuba from Florida, just 90 miles away.

(The Russians say they have removed their intercontinental atomic missiles from Cuba, but underground leaders there insist that some remain, that they have seen them, and that they are well hidden from the prying cameras of the U–2's.)

Cuba is expanding its armed forces. It has begun compulsory military training for all men between the ages of 17 and 45. Those it deems too solidly entrenched in their opposition to Castro to be converted are being used, literally, as slave labor where manpower is short, such as in sugarcane cutting; the others are being given full political indoctrination and are being trained as fighters.

TASK FORCE

Augmenting the armed forces are 100,000 militiamen and women, all volunteers. They are used to guard nonstrategic civilian sites which could be targets for sabotage: department stores, hotels, banks, theaters, government buildings.

Half the milicianos have been given military training—many are ex-servicemen—and can be counted on to fight.

Not so the other half. It is compromised of clerks, secretaries, stenographers, bookkeepers, ushers. They take turns guarding the buildings in which they work. Each puts in 6 to 8 hours of duty a week. The women are used mainly in daylight hours.

Most have volunteered only to show that, on the surface at least, they are with the Government.

They have had little or no military training—many have never even fired the rifles issued to them—and might reasonably be counted on to run for their lives at the sight of an aircraft carrier off Havana.

So Cuba has at least a quarter of a million people under arms it can depend on in an emergency. It is clearly alert.

"We are not too worried about the exiles who are coming ashore," says a Castro aid. "We are well able to cope with internal trouble.

"Even the chaos that might be created by assassination of Castro would be short-lived. We are prepared for that eventuality.

"Our main concern is a military invasion.

"We have every reasons to expect one. The United States already has supported one invasion. It has blockaded us. It is flying U–2's over us. It had stated publicly it considers the present situation intolerable. Many of its leaders have called for a new attack.

"But we are going to give the United States one hell of a surprise if it thinks it can take us with its famous 'handful of marines'."

Cuban underground leaders agree.

"Any new exterior action against Cuba must not be another Bay of Pigs," one told me. "It must be a full-scale invasion, or it will fail horribly.

"The invaders must not count on an internal uprising to help them. There would not be one.

"Most of Cuba wants desperately to be rid of Castro's communism. But all it can do is wait and hope.

"And if it has to wait too long, there will be nothing that can be done for it.

"It will be too late."

[From the Montreal Star, June 16, 1964]

Economy Running Down—Cuba Being Choked by U.S. Trade Curb

(By Bruce Taylor)

Cuba is being strangled by the U.S. trade embargo.

It cannot survive at its current rate of import and technical assistance from the Soviet bloc nations. It would perish, slowly but certainly, but for its expanding commerce with Canada and other NATO partners of the United States.

Even that may not be sufficient to keep it alive.

Its sugar production—the core of its economy—will be the lowest in history this year. Its agriculture and livestock programs are failing. Its internal transportation system is about to collapse. Its factories—when they operate at all—are turning out products that cost two and three times more to manufacture than to import. Its major construction schedules have been jettisoned.

Soviet industrial and farm replacements for the U.S. machinery that is breaking down through misuse and old age are proving woefully inadequate, both in quantity and in caliber.

Most serious of all, Cuba's 7 million people are fed up with the Government that has been promising them pie in the sky since 1959, and are growing increasingly loath to cooperate with it.

Resentment toward Castro is rising. Deliberate work slowdowns are reaching critical proportions.

Castro, nonetheless, continues to make grandiose claims of progress. Rigid press censorship in Cuba prevents the escape of editorial comment to the contrary. And most visiting correspondents—confined to Havana or taken on carefully guided tours of the 700-mile-long island—have little way of investigating the truth of his assertions.

But Staff Photographer Adrian Lunny and I have just ended 2,200 miles of travel within Cuba—the freest movement ever accorded North American newspapermen behind Castro's Palm Tree Curtain—and have seen at first hand the tragedy that has been wreaked by communism.

Many correspondents who are permitted to go there now have little with which to compare conditions than the standards of their own countries, and that isn't fair. I lived there in 1957, however, and am able to make comparison with Cuba then and today.

CANADA A SAVIOR

Foreign correspondents must acquire official authorization to travel outside Havana. Lunny and I were approved for our extensive movement because Castro is going a long way these days to curry favor with Canadians. He sees Canada as a savior.

It is one of the few countries able to supply him with essential material no longer available to him from the United States, and he claims he will do about $60 million worth of business with it this year. (Official figures are far less than that amount, but it is acknowledged that many Cuban purchases, made for cash, are not recorded as such.)

Even so, there were numerous restrictions on our travel and there was a not entirely subtle warning that an unfavorable report by us would mean detention and deportation from Cuba if we later attempted to return.

Cubans, generally, were delighted to see us, and would go to great pains to talk to us privately. Sometimes, it wasn't easy.

The state of terror in which Cuba is held is not readily apparent in Havana, where movement is reasonably unhindered. Havana still is one of the world's most beautiful cities, although Castro has done his best to blight its esthetic attraction by draping it with building-sized propaganda signs, and this is the Cuba that most visitors to the island see.

It is only when you go into the interior that you are made very much aware of the real nature of Castro's reign.

VIRTUAL SLAVERY

The people there are in virtual slavery. Everything they do, down to the simplest action, is known to the secret police. They speak to strangers only where they cannot be overheard, and then only after looking over their shoulders.

Some of our travel among them was closely escorted by secret police or members of the Cuban Communist party (Partido Unido de la Revolucion Socialistica) who were charged with preventing us from speaking to anyone other than government officials, or seeing anything other than that which previously had been designated acceptable.

Escort was particularly close in Oriente Province, biggest of Cuba's six, at the eastern end of the island. There were three men—one of them armed—to meet us when we stepped from the Russian Ilyushin-18 airliner that brought us to Santiago from Havana. They were with us until we left that province 4 days and several hundred miles later.

It wasn't too difficult to elude them late at night—usually through a back door somewhere—and getting away from them to talk to people became somewhat of a game. One night, however, when Lunny remained in our room to give the impression we both still were there I got into animated political conversation with what I thought was an ordinary Cuban—who turned out to be chief of the area's secret police.

We were not surprised by the close escort in Oriente. There was a report of impending trouble in the province the day we arrived. The day after we left, the big sugar mill at Pilon was blown up.

Some of our travel in other provinces was in the company of a driver selected for us by the government. He spent a great deal of time at the outset attempting to convince us he was a "gusano"—a worm—Castro's word for Cubans who are opposed to him. But he gave up in disgust eventually and lapsed into long, daily propaganda orations.

When necessary, however, as in Oriente, we generally were able to slip away from the various agents entrusted with keeping an eye on us. We met and talked to a wide cross section of the population. And it soon became evident that Cuba today is in far more terrible condition, materially, than when I lived there during the dictatorship of Fulgencia Batista.

Batista was a venal man. His government, devoid of ideology, was unbelievably corrupt. As opposition to him mounted, he took increasingly severe measures to repress it. At length he gave his secret police, comprised in the main of sadists, a free hand. They tortured and killed. It became commonplace to find the children of his opponents dead in the streets. There was no sense of predictability then; a man could be arrested for anything.

Probably more than 80 percent of the population was opposed to him, and would have supported any man who could topple him. Castro was given overwhelming support because he promised reform and a high standard of living. He even promised free elections.

He appeared to be blessed relief from the long line of dictators who successively had bled the Cuban treasury. Batista, for example, is said to have banked $600 million in other countries before he fled.

And if you understand Cubans, you know that politics are of secondary if even of any, importance to most of them. They wouldn't have cared whether Castro was Communist, Fascist, or Democratic, so long as he gave them enough to eat, enough to wear, and enough to spend on simple luxuries.

But he didn't. He imposed a dictatorship that Batista's could not even begin to match for the manner in which it holds its people in subservience. Castro has held no elections, and doesn't intend to. He has failed in every promise to make Cuba a better place to live, and the Cubans say they are worse off than ever, that hardship is more widespread now than in the days of Batista.

There is no question but that poverty existed in some sections of Cuba, particularly among the sugar workers, before 1959.

IDLE BOAST

But even then the country as a whole was far better off. Castro has slightly improved the welfare of the sugar workers, but greatly decreased that of almost everyone else.

He boasts that no one in Cuba goes hungry today, despite the gigantic failure of his nationalized farm system. That is true, but only because of the vast black market in food that exists. All legal food purchases are rationed. The meat quota, for example, is three-quarters of a pound per person per week in Havana, less in the interior. A Cuban may legally buy six eggs a month.

Eggs are 6 cents each in the grocery stores. They are $2 each on the black market.

The government makes no real attempt to stamp it out. It knows if it did the many small farmers who keep it going would cut down production altogether, rather than sell at government prices. Then, there would be no food at all.

There is a black market for everything. Automobile parts are particularly precious. Only government-approved people can purchase new East European cars which come to Cuba in extremely limited quantity. All other cars are American, and all are of 1959 vintage or older. Most are barely hanging together. A 1957 Chrysler in bare running order, for instance, can be sold for the equivalent of $7,000.

Clothing—what little there is of it—is rationed, and new consumer goods are nonexistent. Cubans take you aside to ask in whispers if you can smuggle something-or-other to them from Canada.

You expect them to ask for luxuries, and are startled to hear that what they want, as in the case of one tearful young mother, are items such as baby pacifiers.

The cost of living in Cuba is particularly hard on foreigners because the Government there insists the peso is at par with the American dollar. It relieves you of your dollars immediately on arrival at Havana airport, and replaces them with pesos—one for one.

OMELET COSTS $6

That makes the price of eating, for instance, enormous. Soup is 2 pesos; $2. Tomato juice is 1½ pesos. An omelet is 6 pesos.

Hotel rates, are unexpectedly low, about $6 to $8 per person per room, and service in the major hotels is good. But if you plan to do business around the city you must hire a taxi by the day because you seldom can find one away from the midtown area.

In Cuba, there is a huge black market in American dollars. You are offered 7 and 8 pesos for 1. All of Cuba, it seems, is hoarding U.S. money for "the great escape."

The story of what communism has done to Cuba is written in the frantic desire of its people to get away.

Four hundred thousand already have left. Tens of thousands more have applied for the permission to leave that takes up to 2 years, if at all, to acquire. Most will not get it. Many will. Spain's Iberia Airline, which maintains service between Havana and Madrid, is completely booked for the next 3 years.

Hardly a night passes but that a small boat does not set out from some obscure cove for Key West or Jamaica or the Bahamas. Most are discovered before they get far. Their occupants are shot.

Castro, like his counterparts in East Germany who built the Berlin wall, knows he has lost his bid to convert the adult population to his system of government. He is missing no bets to insure he does not lose it entirely.

A young soldier with a machinegun is the last person to board any domestic Cuban airline flight—to prevent it from becoming an unscheduled international flight.

He comes through the doorway after all passengers are seated and the crew is in the cockpit. He backs all the way up the aisle to the cockpit door, his gun at the ready. Then, he lets himself into the cockpit and bolts the door behind him.

He remains in there until the flight is completed.

[From the Montreal Star, June 17, 1964]

CASTRO HAS TALENT—FOR RUINING THE ECONOMY

(By Bruce Taylor)

It is not despite Fidel Castro's best efforts that Cuba is grievously ill. It is because of them. There is no realism in his programs to make the country self-sufficient.

He establishes himself as the ultimate authority in a project, becomes entirely engrossed in it, sets unattainable goals for it, makes mistakes, loses interest, leaves all of it to be puzzled out by subordinates who know less about it than he does, and moves on to something else.

The results are disastrous.

Cuba's economic welfare is determined almost wholly by its ability to produce sugar. It is Cuba's only real currency. Last year's production was 3.8 million tons, the lowest in the nation's recent history. Premier Castro is talking about 10 million tons by 1970, but this year's production will be even lower than last year's.

FORCED TO BUY SUGAR

He is committed for 3.84 million tons, and has admitted in speeches he has been forced to buy sugar on the open market to meet that commitment.

Mr. Castro is unable to plan ahead.

Last year's low production was caused by the shortage of experienced canecutters he created by bringing them into the cities after the previous season to work in industry. He was unable to free them to return to the fields at harvest time.

Wielding a machete is backbreaking work, and it is definitely an art. Amateurs not only can ruin the current crop, but the succeeding one.

IMPORTS CANECUTTERS

This year, Mr. Castro thought he had the problem beaten by importing new, specially designed Russian mechanical canecutters. They did not prove effective. So he ordered practically all of his army into the fields. This improved the situation to some extent—although we saw thousands upon thousands of acres of cane that could never be cut in time—but this year there was a new problem: transportation.

Where it was relatively good last year, it broke down this year. The old American trucks he has been using were another year older. There are not nearly enough Soviet vehicles in Cuba to replace them. He used oxen.

Next year, he doubtlessly will be plagued by the increasing malfunction of the machinery in the American-built sugar mills. All of it is at least 5 years old, and no replacement parts for it are available to him.

PSYCHOLOGICAL EFFECT

This second successive sugar crop failure has had a tremendous psychological effect on the Cubans. It has heightened anti-Castro emotion everywhere on the island, but most particularly in the agricultural areas where his main strength originally lay.

It is not generally known that Mr. Castro last year carried out a second agrarian reform. It nationalized the farms of the very people who had given him his most solid support.

His first agrarian reform law was enacted in 1960, a year after he became dictator, and was the one which he had promised. It took over for the state all farms of more than 30 "cavallerias." There are 33 acres to a cavalleria.

Most of these farms and plantations belonged to absentee United States and Cuban landlords, and there was little general sympathy for them. The land was not turned over to individuals, however; the individuals were turned onto it, to work it for the state.

REPORTS START TO FLY

Last year, reports began to fly that Mr. Castro was contemplating further agrarian measures.

ANAP, an association of owners of small private farms, was worried. It called a convention last summer to ask Mr. Castro what, if any, plans he had. Mr. Castro assured the association he was satisfied to take no more than 70 percent of all land under cultivation and to leave the balance to the ANAP.

Less than 2 months later he quietly enacted his second agrarian reform law. It nationalized all farms of more than five cavallerias.

ANAP was destroyed, but if that wasn't bad enough, Mr. Castro had more bad news.

TOOK ALL OF LAND

The state took every last acre of every farm of more than five cavallerias. It also took all buildings on the farms, and turned out their owners with nothing more than the clothes on their backs.

Compensation varied, from a minimum of 100 pesos a month to a maximum of 250 pesos a month for 10 years, according to the size of the farm.

A farmer with even one or two children could not survive. To maintain a stable diet he would have to buy food on the black market, and he would now have to pay rent—if he was lucky enough to find a place to live.

Premier Castro's typical lack of foresight compounded their troubles even further. He had neglected the mechanics of a system by which the compensation payments could be made. A great number of the evicted farmers received no money at all for several months.

CONSCRIPTION RESENTED

The reasons for their mounting antagonism toward Mr. Castro do not end even there. He has begun compulsory military service for all able-bodied men between 17 and 45. His method of conscription is to go into small towns, seemingly at random, and strip them of all men who fit the bill.

Mr. Castro began his reign with a great rash of construction. He had reasonable success putting up homes for laborers and farmers in the interior, but his project in East Havana—across the bay from the city proper—was a flop.

MEANT AS SHOWPLACE

It was to have been a showplace. He put up beautiful seven- and eight-story apartment buildings. They are impressive, and government officials delight in pointing them out to you.

But when you get away from the officials and talk to the people who live there, you find the buildings are anything but practical.

You learn that Mr. Castro couldn't get elevators for them, so no one on the upper floors is happy. All transportation to the city is so unpredictable the people can't comfortably get to and from their jobs. Most of them would move—if there was somewhere else to go.

BUILDS POWERPLANTS

Cuba is in the process of constructing two thermoelectric powerplants, one at each end of the island. These, however, are being built by Russians, and are progressing well.

To the very bare credit side of Mr. Castro's construction ledger must be inscribed his fishermen's cooperative at Manzanillo, on the Caribbean coast of Oriente Province. Almost 600 fishermen and their families live in small but very attractive prefabricated concrete homes. They pay no rent.

The development has a barbershop, a hospital a pharmacy and other such services. All are free.

RUSH GIVES OUT

The fishermen earn up to 400 pesos a month, three to four times the national average.

Mr. Castro's early gush of construction has petered out now. There is a sign in Havana that tells people who can't get past the city to see for themselves that 70 percent of the population lived in "bohios"—huts made of palm leaves thatched over wood frames—when Castro came to power, and implies this condition no longer exists.

It is an outrageous lie. The bohios still are there. So are the mud-floor hovels that line every roadway through the interior.

Castro is attempting to inject some reality into his planning now, but without notable achievement.

LECTURES ON LIVESTOCK

Currently, he is an expert on livestock, and lectures at great length on the subject in speeches and in private conversation. He wants to export beef, and says he is experimenting with natural feeds that will enable him to raise cattle without having to import the fertilizers of which he is so desperately short.

At the moment there is not enough good beef in Cuba for his own people.

Cuba's climate is such that it should be a prolific producer of food. Properly tended, its soil can be induced to give three crops of corn a year, for instance. But the island's agriculture is in a mess. The Russian and Red Chinese technicians brought there to straighten it out do not appear to be making much headway.

CANADIANS' FARM SUCCESS

They are being shown to great disadvantage by several Ontario tobacco farmers working on contract in Cuba. Their success has been spectacular. They have introduced Canadian seed and methods to Cuban tobacco farming in Pinar del Rio Province, and have increased production there in the past year by 300 percent.

Mr. Castro's own inadequacies are largely responsible for the failure of his programs and, accordingly, the condition in which Cuba finds itself today.

But he also is handicapped by the fact that the only people he can trust are the people who fought with him in his revolution, and they are the ones he has had to install in positions of wide authority. Most are totally unfit to hold them.

AVOID DECISIONS

It is seldom that the head of one department or ministry knows what his counterpart in another is doing; it is even more seldom that one of them will make a decision.

Cubans have always been famous for getting things done "mañana"—tomorrow.

With the addition of inept Communist bureaucracy, you're extremely fortunate in Cuba today if you can get things done bv "la semana proxima"—next week.

[From the Montreal Star, June 18, 1964]

CASTRO ATTACKS ILLITERACY—VICTORY IN EDUCATION

(By Bruce Taylor)

Of all the programs Fidel Castro has initiated in his 5-year dictatorship in Cuba, only one has been entirely successful. It is in the field of education.

No other program will do more to solidify his brand of communism in Cuba, or to spread it through Latin America.

He has swept the island of illiteracy—almost 1 million adults in a total population of 7 million could not read or write when he came to power—and he has made all education, up to and including university, free.

Schooling is compulsory now through grade six, for children and adults alike. Only a shortage of teachers prevents him from making it compulsory through high school. He has begun an intensive teacher-training program, but the process admittedly is slow.

Meanwhile, university undergraduates are tutoring high school students; high school students are teaching grade school students; grade school students are helping in kindergartens.

ALL STATE SCHOOLS

Education is totally a state affair. But Castro is compensating for shutting down all private schools and colleges—such as those operated by the Jesuits—by spending millions of dollars for new school construction, even in the remotest areas of the interior.

There was only one state university in Cuba 5 years ago, at Havana. Others since have been built at Santa Clara, in mid-island Las Villas Province, and at Santiago de Cuba in Oriente Province, at the eastern end of the island.

Cuba boasts that it is the first country in Latin America to rid itself of illiteracy, and the first to launch a widespread program of training in technical fields.

"In the area of education," says a Castro aid, "even our enemies must acknowledge what we have accomplished."

The huge fortresses former Dictator Batista maintained as barracks for his troops within the limits of Cuba's biggest cities have been converted to schools.

Largest of these at the moment is Ciudad Libertad (Liberty City) on the site of the old Camp Columbia. It is on the outskirts of Havana, and used to house 30,000 of Batista's soldiers.

The buildings have been renovated "to rid them of the barracks look" and 7,000 children go to school there. More than 2,000 of them are boarders; the others live in Havana. Construction is being carried out to increase high school and technical school facilities.

It eventually will handle 10,000 children. It serves as the model for other such centers.

Biggest of them all will be the still uncompleted Ciudad Escolar Camilo Cienfuegos, high in the Sierra Maestra Mountains near Manzanillo, in Oriente Province, birthplace of Castro's revolution.

Officials at the school say Castro conceived it one day while he was still in the mountains, brooding down over the squalor he hoped to eradicate.

The squalor still is there. But right in the middle of it is the incongruous, architecturally attractive concrete-and-glass complex that has been named for one of Castro's closest aids in the revolution. Camilo Cienfuegos disappeared on a flight over the interior not long after he helped Castro take Cuba. His body has never been found. Castro is enshrining him; a tremendous number of state projects have been named for him, and his image adorns the 50-peso note.

There are 2,700 students at the school now. It is being built to accommodate 20,000 by 1974. All of them will be "becados"—special scholarship students in science and technical courses—and all will board there from the time they enter first grade until they are ready to enter university.

The "becados"—there and in other scholarship schools—are Cuba's elite. They are the children upon whom Castro is building communism for his nation, and all treatment of them is directed to that end. The method of indoctrination for them is the same as that utilized to instill nazism in the Hitler youth of prewar Germany.

There are 125,000 of them at present. Plans are being formulated to triple and quadruple their number.

All Cuban schoolchildren are given political indoctrination. The "becados" are saturated with it.

They are taken from their parents, and are permitted to visit them only for short periods. Their school year is 11 months long, but even during vacation periods most of them are kept busy in enterprises of value to the state.

They attend class from 8 o'clock in the morning until 4 in the afternoon. About one-quarter of their time in the classroom is taken up by Marxism, Leninism, Castroism, and anti-Americanism. They are given 6 hours of homework 6 nights a week.

The "becados," unlike regular schoolchildren who live with their families, are housed in large dormitories or in groups of 40 to 45 in slogan-adorned homes which once belonged to the wealthy. They are subjected to further political indoctrination every evening.

They are completely regimented, but they are pampered like no other children in Cuba.

When food is scarce, as it often is, and the mothers of other children hunt frantically for sustenance, the "becados" have the best of everything. They are dressed well, they receive the finest medical and dental services available, and are kept in excellent physical trim by wide-ranging sports activities. Even entertainment—most of it politically slanted—is arranged for them.

And it doesn't take them long to learn that their first duty is not to their parents, but to the fatherland. Good students are "rewarded," for example, by being allowed to "volunteer" to go out into the mountains under the broiling sun to pick coffee beans on their summer vacation, instead of spending the time with their families.

Most of the "becados" are selected from among farming and laboring classes. The scholarships, a Ministry of Education official told me, are awarded for "merit, aptitude, and discipline."

"What kind of discipline?" I asked. "Party discipline?"

He shrugged. "Of course."

HISTORIES REWRITTEN

The emphasis in all Cuban schools today, scholarship and otherwise, is on political economy. And Cuba's history books have been rewritten to conform.

For instance:

"Our history books used to teach that Cuba was a free and independent republic," says the principal of the Karl Marx scholarship school at Habana's Ciudad Libertad. "But that wasn't true. It was only half a republic before Fidel destroyed the capitalists. The other half was under the control of the United States.

"All we had was a flag and an anthem. The riches of Cuba were owned by reactionaries and American imperialists. Our history books now teach the truth."

They also teach that history previously had been falsified to create the impression that the United States helped Cuba gain independence from Spain. And that it is a lie to credit Briton Sir Donald Ross with the discovery that malaria is transmitted by mosquitoes; Cuban textbooks now assert that the real discoverer was Carlos J. Finlay, a Cuban.

English is the official second language of the Cuban school system. It is taught from the fourth grade onward, mainly because English is the international language in the technical fields, and most textbooks and manuals are published in English.

There are about 800 English teachers in Cuba now. Other languages are taught at advanced school levels.

Cuba is in desperate need of physicians. Most fled the country when Castro came to power. There are 2,000 medical students in the universities now, but even some government officials fear they are being rushed through too quickly.

TRAIN TECHNICIANS

Of even more pressing importance to Cuba's chances of survival as a Communist country is its need to develop skilled technicians. Thousands of boys and girls are being sent to school to learn how to operate the toolmaking and other industrial machines imported from the Soviet bloc nations.

But Cubans are by no means inherently inclined toward things mechanical—the country previously had imported almost all of its manufactured goods—and the youngsters are driving their Russian and Czechoslovakian instructors to distraction.

What they learn one day they are apt to forget the next. And if they aren't disappearing half a dozen times a lesson for coffee, they are wandering off for a siesta.

But, on the whole, Fidel Castro's education factories are turning out the kind of product he needs. He knows, and makes no bones about the fact, that if he can retain control of the country for another 15 years, Cuba will be solidly Communist; he is twisting the children's minds to assure it.

It is interesting to note, therefore, that in every classroom of every school in Cuba today there are emblazoned the words of José Martí, the Cuban who led his country's fight for independence from Spain:

"Ninos nacen para ser felices."

They mean: "Children are born to be happy."

[From the Montreal Star, June 19, 1964]

CASTRO NOW TACKLING FRANCO—A LIFE OF STRUGGLE

(By Bruce Taylor)

Fidel Castro is preparing to extend his sphere of subversion to Spain.

He has agreed to train Spanish Communists in guerrilla warfare, and will supply them with arms for a revolt against the regime of Generalissimo Francisco Franco.

The plan, until now, has been top-secret. Cuba enjoys good relations with Spain and is, in fact, negotiating to increase its trade with the European nation.

But Communist members of the Spanish underground now in Cuba have been assured by Castro he will support them in an attempted overthrow of Franco.

Subversion has become Cuba's No. 1 export. The chaos it has created in Latin America already has ruptured diplomatic relations with all but four members of the Organization of American States.

Latest to cut ties was Brazil. Diplomats in Cuba believe Uruguay may be next. Mexico, Chile, and Bolivia would be the only OAS members with ambassadors in Cuba.

Opinion is fairly unanimous in Havana that the continuing deterioration of relations between Cuba and the OAS indicates an invasion of the island may be in the works.

Brazil, prior to the coup which deposed the Goulart government, had—like Mexico, Chile, Bolivia, and Uruguay—resisted all efforts to be pressured into adopting a hard line against Cuba.

But now that Brazil has severed relations, and with Uruguay expected to follow suit, tremendous pressure is being applied to the three other OAS members still in Cuba to reappraise their policies. Eventual armed action against Castro is considered a distinct possibility.

It is generally believed that such action would come under the guise of the combined OAS. The excuse would be Castro's continuing export of subversion.

Castro is aware of the risk he is running. But he has dedicated himself, he says, "to the liberation of all of Latin America," and he can't stop now.

Who is this man who can create such turmoil?

He is, first and foremost, the absolute ruler of his nation. Recurring, and widely accepted, reports that he is merely the puppet of the other men about him are just so much hokum. Castro's word is law.

TOP AIDS

The task of keeping his police state in order falls to two highly trusted subordinates. Their names are little known outside Cuba, but they are becoming tremendously powerful there. They are responsible only to Castro, and are acknowledged to be second only to him in succession of strength, even ahead of the brilliant, ubiquitous Ernesto "Che" Guevara.

They are Ramiro Valdes, Minister of the Interior, and José Matar, chief of the dreaded Committee for the Defense of the Revolution (CDR).

The Ministry of the Interior includes G-2, the counterintelligence department. Not even Castro can free a prisoner held by G–2 until the prisoner's guilt or innocence has been determined. G–2 is concerned mainly with espionage and armed insurrection.

The CDR is the organization charged with keeping the civilian population in line, and the one which most affects the lives of everyday Cubans. It is a pyramid which descends from Havana into each province, each city, each town, each village, each hamlet, each block, each street, each house. No one makes a move, no matter how inconsequential, that is not known to the CDR.

CDR members cannot make an arrest, but they can order one by the simple expedient of denouncing the person they want picked up. People are denounced for all manner of things.

Raul Castro, Fidel's younger brother and his Minister of Defense, is fairly strong in his own right, but has nowhere near the power of Valdes and Matar. Raul is known in Cuba as something of a sadist.

He also is a fanatical believer in the Communist philosophy of fatherland above all else. He demanded in a recent Havana speech that Cubans inform on members of their own families who are opposed to the government. He said mothers must turn in sons, daughters, their fathers, sisters, their brothers, "for the good of the country."

NOT AFRAID

Guevara, Castro's Minister of Industry, remains at the top of the hierarchy and is generally considered to possess one of its keenest minds. He is one of the very few men in key posts who really knows what he is doing. His speeches, unlike the propaganda drivel spouted by the others, including Castro, are intelligent and always interesting to listen to.

Guevara is the one government leader who is not afraid to lay the facts of life squarely on the line. Castro and the others tell the Cubans Utopia is on the way. Guevara tells them they will get nothing without hard work.

He is intensely loyal to Castro.

Castro has botched the job of giving Cuba the Utopia he talks about. And instead of contenting himself with attempting to rectify the situation, he has embarked on his dangerous scheme to spread Communism through Latin America. He is a fanatic, but he is also a sincere and courageous man, and his desire to improve the lot of his people was not always touched with madness. It began before he was 12 years old.

(Much of the following information about Castro's youth and the early days of his revolution was hitherto unknown. It was obtained in Havana from his sister Angelita, 49, who did not realize she was being interviewed. The accompanying photograph of her and Fidel and Raul—previously unpublished—was indirectly obtained from her.)

Castro was born August 13, 1927, although the world believes he is a year older. His father, a Spaniard from Galizia, had been married previously and had sired two children, Lydia and Pedro Emile. He was 30 years older than Castro's mother, Lina Ruz, a Cuban. They had seven children, in this order: Angelita, Ramon, Fidel, Raul, Quena, Emma, and Auguistina.

Emma married a Mexican engineer and has three children. They live in Mexico City. Auguistina, now 22, became a Protestant while studying in Zurich. She married a Cuban pianist and they live in Moscow. They have a daughter.

Castro was married and divorced. He claimed he discovered his wife was a relative of Fulgencia Batista, the dictator he deposed in 1959. Castro's son, nicknamed Fidelito (Little Fidel), is 14 and lives in Havana. Castro doesn't often see the boy, but has lunch with him on occasion.

Castro grew up near Santiago, in Oriente Province, at the eastern end of the island. It was there he would launch his revolution.

His father, a wealthy plantation owner, was a conservative. His mother was a fiery revolutionist, and from her he inherited much of his zeal.

Before he was 12, his sister recalls, he announced to his family one day after returning from a trip through the slum section of Santiago: "When I am a man, I will buy shoes and clothes for all the world."

From that moment on, she says, he became interested in the problems of the poor, and in his teens plunged into campus politics. His father warned him: "You must be calm in a country like this. Don't get mixed up in public affairs."

MOTHER'S SUPPORT

His mother, however, urged him on.

Castro went to Havana to win his degree in law at the Catholic university there. He since has nationalized the school and exiled its rector, Monsignor Masvidal, auxiliary bishop of Havana.

The church plays no important role in the general affairs of Cuba now.

Castro could have begun practice in the wealthy section of the city. Instead, he and two other young men opened an office in the Compostela slum area. They often handled cases without charge.

Outraged beyond endurance by the mounting atrocities of the Batista regime, he returned to Santiago in 1953 to rally support for a revolution.

On July 26, 1953—the day for which he named his revolt—he and 149 other young men, divided, into two bands of 75 each, left a farmhouse 7 miles outside Santiago, where they had stored arms, and attacked the Batista fortress of Moncado in the heart of the city. It was the second largest stronghold in Cuba, and Castro's men were routed, but only after they had made their way over its walls and very nearly captured the machinegun that stopped their assault.

Castro and his brother Raul, who had accompanied him on the raid, were found in the mountains not long after and brought to Santiago for trial. There was no death penalty in Cuba then. They were each sentenced to 15 years. But Batista wanted them killed. He organized a plot to do so.

Several men, pretending to be Castro followers, would smuggle him out of prison, then shoot him for attempting to escape. But a priest, Msgr. Perez Serantes, bishop of Santiago, learned of the plot from a prison guard. He convinced Batista not to go through with it.

AMNESTY DECLARED

Two years later, in 1955, Batista declared amnesty for all political prisoners as the prelude to a rigged election, and exiled them. Fidel and Raul went to Mexico, where they met Guevara, an Argentine Communist and professional bombthrower. They rounded up all the other Cuban exiles they could find, and began to learn about guerrilla warfare.

On October 21, 1956, Castro's father died on his Cuban plantation at the age of 82.

Two months later, Fidel, Raul, Che Guevara and 79 others, all armed to the teeth, set sail for Cuba aboard a pleasure cruiser called the *Granma*.

Their plan was to land at Colorado Beach on Oriente Province's south coast, where the Sierra Maestra mountains are closest (about 15 miles) to the water. The *Granma* was spotted by a Cuban patrol boat just 2 miles from its target, and was turned at once into shore. The spot where Castro landed was an incredible tangle of tropical growth and waist-deep marsh, alive with crabs.

Batista's commanders, alerted to the landing by the patrol boat, sent troops and aircraft into the area. The planes bombed and strafed the rebels. Of the 82 who came ashore, only 12—including Fidel, Raul, and Guevara—reached the mountains.

The 12 set out to take on Batista's 50,000 soldiers.

Batista was ignorant of guerrilla fighting, and never could launch an effective assault on the rebels. Castro's will-o'-the-wisp band, often near starvation, was constantly on the move, never more than a few hours in any one place.

The revolution would have ended one night in 1957, but for one of those miracles which always seem to save the Hitlers and the Mussolinis—and the Castros—for bigger things.

A small patrol led by a Batista captain found Castro and several others, exhausted after a long day's march, asleep in a shelter made of branches.

The captain, completely unaware he had discovered the rebel leader, woke the men. Castro stood and faced him, and put his hand on the captain's shoulder. "I am the man you are looking for," he said. "I am Fidel."

The captain marveled at Castro's candor. He stared silently at the unkempt, fiery-eyed rebel for several moments. Then he asked, "Don't you know that it is my duty to kill you?"

"Yes."

"And you are not afraid?"

"No."

"Nor the others who are scattered throughout the mountains?"

"No."

LET THEM GO

The captain shook his head. He turned to his soldiers and told them, "Let these men go. It will do no good to kill them. It is impossible to kill an ideal."

A month later the captain defected from Batista's army and joined Castro in the mountains. Today he is aide-de-camp to Cuban President Osvaldo Dorticos.

Castro's band grew. If one member of a family joined him, the others went too for fear of being tortured or shot. Children of 14 and 15, both boys and girls, became guerrillas.

Whenever an unarmed person—and most were unarmed—showed up to offer his services, Castro would take him to the edge of a clearing near a Batista patrol post and point to it.

"Those soldiers have guns," he would say. "Go and get one. Then you can join us."

Men and women who fought with Castro say his revolution was dedicated entirely to social reform and the reversion of large, private land-holding to the state, but they insist he was in no way a Communist then, or that he gave communism even serious consideration.

They blame his embrace of communism on the hatred he developed for the United States when that Nation refused point-blank to help him when he went there to seek financial assistance shortly after he came to power.

In 1958, Fidel and Raul came down out of the mountains to spend part of Christmas with their family. They made their way past the soldiers guarding the plantation, spent several hours with their mother, their grandmother and sister Angelita.

Exactly 1 year and 1 week later, on New Year's Day, 1959, Batista, still in command of 30,000 soldiers in Havana who had never been sent into battle, fled Cuba.

Castro's mother, who had inspired him to revolution, lived to see his victory. She died last September at the age of 57.

Castro held a family reunion shortly after he came to power. An uncle who traveled to it from Buenos Aires made a speech. He said: "I am happy my family produced a man who will liberate his people from discrimination, corruption and bad government."

Castro nodded.

"Ours was a revolution not to change a man," he said, "but a system. I will begin to make that change now. My system will be one such as no Latin American nation has ever had."

[From the Montreal Star, June 20, 1964]

INCREDIBLE HEARTBREAK—NO CHA-CHA-CHA IN CUBAN LIFE

(By Bruce Taylor)

The people who run Cuba tell you that what is happening there today is "socialism with a cha-cha-cha." The inference, of course, is that life on the island is a gay affair.

It is difficult to conceive of anything more removed from the truth. Cuba is a nation of despair.

You see it in the incredible scenes of heartbreak when one or more members of a family who finally have been given authorization to leave the island are being seen off at Havana Airport by those who must stay behind. They know they may never see each other again.

A Santa Clara man and his 4-year-old son, the only members of a family of seven who have been allowed to leave, have been waiting more than 2 years to get the exit visas for which the entire family applied. They must go now because it will be their only chance. They can only hope the others will be permitted to follow in time.

They are stripped of everything but the clothes on their backs. A pin of no value that belonged to the man's grandmother is taken from him, as is his tie bar. His watch is demanded. So is every last centavo in his pocket.

The little boy is afraid of the guard who is searching him. His only possession is a pocket comb and he cries when the guard takes it from him. He tries to retrieve it. The guard shoves him away.

The man says nothing. He has heard of people getting all the way to the plane, only to be dragged from their seats at the last moment. Nor does he say anything to anyone other than the boy while the plane is in flight.

He walks stiffly from the aircraft at Mexico City, holding his son close to him. The man is crying when he comes into the immigration area.

Two people near him are talking. One is a self-described freelance writer from Canada's west coast. The other is a Belgian woman. They have come over from Cuba on the same flight, and are discussing Castro in glowing terms.

The man looks at them in disbelief. "You are Communists?" he asks in heavy accents.

The woman smiles condescendingly. "Socialists."

"You are fools," the Cuban says. "Crazy fools." He takes his son to the other side of the room.

CASTRO HATER

And you see despair in the eyes of the beautiful young mother of 22 who has become a prostitute in Havana in order to feed and clothe her 2-year-old daughter.

She knows she will go to jail if she is caught. Prostitution once was a flourishing industry in Cuba, but is outlawed now.

She comes from a family which was wealthy before the revolution, and is well educated. She was married in her teens to a prosperous businessman from another Latin American country and went there to live with him. He died while she was pregnant. She wasn't really aware of what had happened to Cuba in her absence, and returned to Havana to be with her family when she gave birth. Now, she can't leave.

She has been able to buy only two pairs of shoes for her baby. She cut the toes out of them as the child grew. She says she has difficulty buying enough milk for her daughter, even on the black market. Twice the baby was sick, and she couldn't get a doctor.

Is prostitution the only answer?

She shrugs. "They know I am a gusano (a worm, someone opposed to the government) and will give me a menial job at the minimum pay of 85 pesos a month. It cost me more than that for food."

She, like most other Cubans, cherishes a dream of escape. She says she belongs to a group which is planning to steal an airplane. She knows the penalty for even plotting such a scheme, but says she is not afraid.

"My daughter and I would be better off dead than have to live here," she says. "I will kill her before they can take her from me for one of their schools."

QUIET SINCERITY

She speaks with such quiet sincerity you believe her.

Cuba is controlled by a minority which has created the means of maintaining control. It performed a very necessary task 5 years ago, and set off on a path of noble intentions. Along the way it went awry.

It wallows now in the eminence of its position. It takes for itself the best of whatever is available: the good cars, the good food, the good clothes, the good homes.

Photographer Adrian Lunny and I spent 2 days and a night in Manzanillo at the home maintained for visiting party leaders. It was the very epitome of opulence. It had a swimming pool and huge, immaculately kept gardens. Its table setting would have done justice to a maharajah.

At our final dinner, one of our party leader hosts pushed away the remains of one of the finest meals I had ever shared, and leaned forward to wipe his mouth on the hem of the exquisite damask table cloth.

"Well now," he asked, interrupting himself with a belch, "do you still believe the lies of the Yankee imperialists that there is a food shortage in Cuba?"

Across the street, other Cubans were coming home to their palm-thatched huts with their meager quota of rationed foodstuffs.

The "Yankee imperialists" are the convenient scapegoat for everything that goes wrong on the island. Castro runs his country like a crooked labor leader runs a union; he talks about all the wonderful things that are going to happen, uses force to beat down opposition, and tries to take his people's minds off what he is doing by keeping them angry at someone else.

In Castro's case, the target is the United States. It has been blamed for everything imaginable, including last year's failure of the tomatoes to grow.

Oddly enough, the Stars and Stripes are carried in all Cuban parades, and Cuban soldiers on the far side of the 3-mile-wide no man's land salute the flag when it is lowered every evening at the U.S. Guantanamo Naval Base.

Why?

"Because we aren't mad at the American people," explains an official in the Cuban Foreign Ministry. "We hate only their government."

But it is the American people who elect the government, he is told.

"That's a lie," he retorts. "The government is elected by the capitalists and the monopolists. The people have no voice."

He believes it. Everyone who is close to Castro believes it. The entire population of Cuba is coming to believe it. Their propaganda tells them so.

It blares night and day from radios and sound trucks. Television is one continuous political harangue. Every available space on homes and buildings and streets is taken up by signs and banners. The country's newspapers are no more than propaganda sheets. They are subscribers to Tass news service and to Prensa Latina, a service which does little more than rewrite United Press International and Associated Press to conform with Cuba's political line.

We ran into two outstanding examples of this.

One was a story carried on the front pages of all newspapers in Cuba to the effect that Prime Minister Pearson virtually had told President Johnson to go fly a kite in the matter of Canada's continuing trade with Cuba. The stories indicated there had been a great deal of vituperation in Pearson's remarks, and quoted him at great length.

We were in Pinar del Rio at the time. A copy of a newspaper containing the story was shown to us by a government official who was very pleased. "Good for Canada," he said.

We learned from the Canadian Embassy when we returned to Havana, however, that all Pearson had done was answer "no" to a question by Opposition Leader Diefenbaker whether Canada was planning changes in its trade with Socialist countries. There had been no mention of Cuba. The whole thing had been made up by an imaginative Prensa Latina hack on orders of the Cuban Government.

The second example concerned me directly. Lunny and I were photographed when we arrived by air in Santiago. I told the reporter who interviewed me that we were on a tour of the country to see what changes had come about since I lived there in 1957, prior to the revolution. That was all.

The next day we were on the front page of the newspaper Sierra Maestra. Among other things, I was "quoted" about how impressed I had been by the May Day celebrations in Havana. And to top it off, the newspaper called me "El Companero Taylor"—Comrade Taylor.

Castro's May Day parade does more to impress foreigners than the Cubans. Propaganda ordering Habaneros to the parade begins to build up about 6 weeks before the event. It is intense in the week just prior to it.

Few dare shun it. As the marchers pass Castro's reviewing stand at the base of the towering monument to José Marti, the man who led Cuba's fight for independence from Spain, they shout: "Fidel! Fidel!"

If you don't listen too closely, it sounds like: "Sieg Heil! Sieg Heil!"

The Cuban propaganda machine is aimed now at Havana's next big parade, July 26, to mark the 11th anniversary of the start of Castro's revolution.

The third big parade of the year is January 2. It commemorates the fall of the Batista government on New Year's Day, 1959. It is held a day late to give the Cubans time to recover from their New Year's celebrations. This is the one in which Castro shows off his miltiary strength.

Castro spends untold fortunes on internal propaganda. Cubans have learned to live with most of it, but some of it causes great bitterness.

WOMEN BITTER

Cuban women are unable to buy linen and other white wear. There is little available in the stores. Yet, every time there is a parade or special event, tens of thousands of banners and streamers made of white wear flutter out all over the country.

Women, in fact, are among Castro's most dissatisfied subjects. They cannot buy things to make themselves pretty, as in the days of Batista.

The only stockings available to them are from East Europe, and are heavy and unattractive. Lipstick is hard to come by, and a $2 cake of mascara sells for $25 on the black market. Brassieres are sturdy, but hardly flattering. There is an acute shortage of razor blades, and the women are horrified by the prospect of being unable to control the growth of hair on their legs. Castro now wants them to stop wearing scanty bathing suits and the form-fitting sheath dresses that are their trademark.

Cuban women are among the most beautiful in the world, and are aware of it. They will abide all manner of shortages and inconvenience. But their pride is severely hurt now, and that is the one thing they will not accept.

It is the small things, far too numerous to chronicle in detail, which, piled upon the continuing failures of Castro's major programs, have produced the great resentment toward, and growing lack of cooperation with, his government.

He now is preparing to nationalize the taxi industry, one of the very few remaining fields of free enterprise on the island. Almost all Cubans now will be working directly for the state.

DIFFERENT VIEW

Cubans are not by nature self-sacrificing people. They are not at all pleased by the growing awareness they will never again revert to the overall material well-being of pre-Castro days, and that everything now is projected in terms of succeeding generations.

"That was all right for the Russians and the Chinese," says a disgruntled former member of the Castro government still living, but precariously, in Havana. "They had nothing to begin with when they adopted communism.

"We had plenty. Now we have less." He went into the bathroom of my Capri Hotel room for a glass of water, and spewed it into the sink. It was sea water. The fresh water plumbing had broken down.

If there are two positive points of Castro's revolution, they are the education he has made available, and the increased sense of dignity he has brought to such people as the sugar workers who had been so cruelly exploited by the U.S. companies. They are no better off materially now, but at least they feel they no longer are serfs of foreigners.

All others are opposed to him, including a proportionate number of the Negro third of the population, against whom official discrimination has been ended and to whom most miracles have been promised.

Castro is making ever louder threats against the United States. He warns now he will shoot down the U–2 reconnaissance planes which are of such great annoyance to him as soon as the Russians fulfill their promise to turn over control of their surface-to-air missiles to him.

His opponents in Cuba hope he will, indeed, shoot one down and that the action will trigger armed repercussion by the United States.

However, for all his threats, Castro so far has stopped short of anything that might be considered an act of aggression. An example was his threat to take over the U.S. Embassy building in Havana, now occupied by Swiss diplomats. The Swiss warned him of possible consequences, and he relented.

In total, the Cubans are in a quandary. Most hate Castro's system, and want it destroyed. But they know that the only way it can be destroyed is by a full-scale invasion supported by the United States.

And they certainly do not want to revert to unrestricted U.S. exploitation.

Somewhere, they hope, is an answer.

ECONOMIES AT BROOKLYN NAVY YARD

Mr. **KEATING**. Mr. President, through the years the Brooklyn Navy Yard has exhibited a spirit and maintained high standards which are most impressive. Recently the Navy's Bureau of Ships has announced that the Brooklyn Navy Yard has reduced its operating expenses during the last fiscal year $11.2 million.

This is indeed an impressive figure and is yet another example of the teamwork which that yard has exhibited for years. The Brooklyn Navy Yard has a tradition of doing work that can be done nowhere else in the world; this tradition is being maintained today and I have seen it in action on my several visits to the yard.

Mr. President, this pride and spirit can never be duplicated. It would be a serious mistake to close the Brooklyn yard when its employees continue to exhibit a desire and an ability to perform some of the best shipbuilding work in the world.

I ask unanimous consent that the article describing the savings in operating costs realized at the Brooklyn Navy Yard this past fiscal year be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Cite Navy Yard for Axing Costs

Employees at the Brooklyn Navy Yard were cheered this week by praise from the Navy's Bureau of Ships for effecting an appreciable reduction in operating costs.

The cost-cutting kudos came from the Chief of the Bureau, Rear Adm. William A. Brockett.

In a letter to Rear Adm. Ernest C. Holtzworth, Commander of the Brooklyn yard, Admiral Brockett reported:

"It has been easily recognized by the Bureau's staff that the employees of the New York Naval Shipyard at all levels have been constantly alert to the need to effect reductions in shipyard costs.

"Please extend my thanks to the shipyard personnel responsible for this superior performance."

The Brooklyn Navy Yard is one of two of the Navy's 11 shipyards to have attained savings of over $10 million in fiscal year 1964. The Navy's fiscal year runs from July 1 to June 30 of the following year. Brooklyn's savings, as validated by Navy auditors, amounted to an impressive $11.2 million for the 12-month period.

CLEVELAND HILL NORTH ELEMENTARY SCHOOL EDITORIAL CONTEST

Mr. **KEATING**. Mr. President, there are to be no more guns, or tobacco in the schoolrooms of the Cleveland Hill schools in Cheektowaga, N.Y., a suburb of Buffalo. That decree was given by the school board to its students 127 years ago and was discovered by one of the students at the Cleveland Hill North Elementary School during her search into the history of her school. It was considered quite an improvement back in the days when Buffalo was the wild West.

The students have decided that the United States has made great progress since the days when a teacher made $52 for 4 weeks' work. What impressed me the most, however, in reading the elementary school paper, the Reporter, was the students' knowledge of the type of men who made this country great as well as of the major problems that face our country today.

This elementary school paper sponsored an editorial contest in American history and current Communist activities affecting our Nation. This was done under the sponsorship of Mrs. Eve Allis, a fifth grade teacher who has recently won an award for her article on teaching of Americanism through newspaper work. I was very interested in these editorials from the Cleveland Hill North Elementary School Reporter and think they set unusually high standards for elementary school journalism. I therefore ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record articles by Daniel Johnston, Kevin Bradley, and Peter Dunghe.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Cleveland Hill North Elementary School Reporter]

Guns, Tobacco Forbidden, School Board Decrees

(By Daniel Johnston)

"What, no more tobacco and guns in school?" Parents and children in district 3 are astonished at the new directive passed by the board of education.

No, you are not reading a story found in the attic. This is part of district 3's history told from scratch in a program presented during Education Week.

History and facts presented in the play were discovered after much research by Mrs. Catherine Gunning and Mrs. Marie Morgan, third-grade teachers.

Cleveland Hill's $5.5 million school system, containing two elementary schools and one high school, had its beginnings as a 20- by 25-foot schoolhouse built of the "finest materials" for $150, 127 years ago.

The name of our community has also changed from the Indian "Ji-ik-do-wah-gah" to the modern "Cheektowaga."

Teachers have changed quite a bit also. The first teacher in 1836 earned a salary of $52 for 4 months, and was obligated to arrive much earlier than the pupils to start the fire in the potbellied stove.

She had to teach all grades and all subjects. In 1885 the salary jumped to $288 for the school year.

The primative school mentioned here is a far cry from the 167-teacher, 2,380-pupil school system that exists today.

Other comparisons include: the boy of long ago walking many miles barefoot to school to save his shoes; one pail and one dipper for water, used by everyone; lunch buckets with cold lunches.

Arbor Day was an important celebration. A tree was planted along with jars containing names of all the children in that class.

Every child's education was affected by the cat-o'-nine-tails. If a child's attention was distracted, the teacher and the cat-o'-nine-tails would "help him along the path of learning."

Information used in the play was taken from conversations with Mrs. Pauline Tauriello, who is the most experienced teacher in the district and Mrs. Morgan's mother, Mrs. John Hofmann.

Mr. Walter J. Heffley's thesis, written for his master's degree, was very helpful because its topic was the "History of Our District."

[From the Cleveland Hill North Elementary School Reporter]

Keep Informed To Keep Free

(By Kevin Bradley, age 12)

For the past 18 or more years, the prime danger to our democracy has been communism. This menace, however, cannot be defeated if we, as Americans, all sit back in our easy chairs and watch television.

One of the best ways to combat this challenge is to keep informed. People who are informed are less likely to believe communistic propaganda and lies.

We must take the responsibility of a good, active American citizen. What is a good, active American citizen? A good American takes interest in his or her government, whether it's in the community, county, State, or Nation.

Even at our young age it is our duty to have knowledge of the numerous advantages of a democracy and the many disadvantages of communism.

Urge your parents to take an interest in our government. Help to strengthen your family's knowledge of the Communist threat.

Try to make your friends and neighbors aware of this constant danger to our freedom. Point out that for them, for our country, and for our flag the blood of many patriots has been shed.

Let's be a good example for other nations. And remember, it's our choice between freedom and communism. Which will you pick?

[From the Cleveland Hill North Elementary School Reporter]

BOYS AMERICANISM ESSAY: AMERICANISM AND THOMAS JEFFERSON

(By Peter Dunghe)

When we say the name of Thomas Jefferson, what do we think of? Most people regard him as an American President who wrote the Declaration of Independence.

Of course, he did write our "great declaration" but that wasn't all. He did many more things.

Jefferson was always wealthy. In his boyhood, his home was on the Piedmont Plateau. He grew up with the Piedmont farmers and their families. Thus, Jefferson had a better understanding of the common people.

Because of this understanding of common people they are now allowed to hold political office.

During Revolutionary times, Jefferson made many statements that aroused the people. His ideas are still used today as inspirations.

For example, he said "The tree of liberty must be refreshed from time to time with the blood of patriots and tyrants."

In his day, the tyrants were the English. Today we can use the same thoughts, but the tyrants of today are the Communists.

We schoolchildren can benefit by Mr. Jefferson's boyhood statements. Once while studying, he was about to get upset, but he calmly said to himself, "While I am still young, I am supposed to stick to my studies, and not contradict. There will be enough time for that later."

Most people give Lincoln credit for saying "All men are created equal," but actually Jefferson said that. In his home at Monticello, he had slaves but he treated each and every one of them like one of the family.

Today, Congress is trying to pass a civil rights bill, based on the fact that all men are created equal.

Now you can see that this great statesman deserves more credit for his contributions every day.

Don't you think so?

[From the Cleveland Hill North Elementary School Reporter]

GIRLS AMERICANISM ESSAY: AMERICANISM AND THOMAS JEFFERSON

(By Nancy Umfreville)

Thomas Jefferson, more than any other man, has formed and molded the American mind and spirit. Every later generation has turned to his mementos and writings for inspiration and never in vain.

"I have sworn upon the altar of God, eternal hostility against every form of tyranny over the mind of man," he declared.

Through 60 years of public service he was faithful to this vow.

Jefferson was not merely a theorist, but a very practical man. He held that all men are created equal, and did more than any man of his time to bring about equality of opportunity among Americans.

Thomas Jefferson cherished liberty in every form and was largely responsible for the guarantees of freedom of speech, press, and religion in the Federal Constitution and in several State constitutions.

Just as Abraham Lincoln did, he wanted to abolish slavery. His family had slaves, but they were treated like members of the family. Although he was very rich, he understood how the common man felt and wanted to do something for him. He believed all men are endowed with inalienable rights.

His writings have stood as a torch to the defenders of individual freedom. His plans for the future helped America grow. Jefferson's beliefs have been the foundation for many of our beliefs today.

"Give the people light, and they will find their own way," he declared.

THE RIOTS IN HARLEM

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I invite the attention of Senators to three perceptive and thoughtful editorials which appeared in the New York Times and the Washington Post this morning. I am sure there are many similar editorials in the Nation's press which express the same thoughts. Both relate to the violence, the disorder, the troubles, and the difficulties which have taken place during last weekend's rioting in Harlem.

These editorials do not seek to castigate or chastise; nor do they seek to arouse further the emotions of our people. They seek, rather, to bring the searchlight of truth and understanding upon some of the most difficult social problems which exist in certain areas of our country, problems of race relations, social relations, economic opportunity, and education.

As one who is not a resident of the city of New York, I believe the great city of New York oftentimes receives more than its share of blows and black eyes in terms of public relations. These stories do not portray the other face of New York, for it is truly a magnificent city. Basically, it is well governed. It is the cultural and financial capital of America. However, it is the largest metropolitan area in our Nation, and therefore it poses for us problems which go along with metropolitan, urban, and industrialized living. New York is a big city and therefore its problems cannot be small. Let us recognize the full dimensions of the problem facing the governing officials and law enforcement officials in a city the size of New York. It is a stupendous challenge.

If we learn nothing else from these troubled days and from these most unfortunate circumstances, it is that we have not yet come to grips with the problems of urban life. We believe in law enforcement. Essentially it is the responsibility of State and local governments. I hope that we will not grow up with the idea that it is necessary to have a national police take over law enforcement on every occasion. The responsibility, essentially, is local. If we truly value freedom in America, it should remain local.

Having spoken about law enforcement, let us also remember there is no substitute for social and environmental conditions which contribute to a peaceful and tranquil community.

As the editorials point out so vividly, such serious social and economic problems exist in this area that it is no wonder there are moments of disturbance and troubled times. I do not wish to be misunderstood. Many good citizens in this area have made it clear that these acts of violence are committed by a limited number of citizens, some of whom have bad records, and some of whom are nothing but hoodlums.

However, there is tension. There is trouble. There is frustration. There is a sense of being cut off from the freedoms and opportunities of white America. We should not be too surprised that trouble will break out in these conditions. It is a truly tragic situation.

I believe that the New York Times editorial states the situation quite well when it says:

> Harlem at the moment is a sick community. Many thousands of decent, law-abiding people, jammed into its miserable housing and suffering from its high incidence of crime and delinquency, its lack of job opportunities and discriminations of many kinds, are being drawn into emotional turmoil. New York City owes Harlem the duty of treating it with firmness, with kindness, and with understanding.
>
> Harlem is in great need of the long-range program that the Federal and city governments are planning for it in the war against poverty. But riots will not help the people of Harlem in the long run.

As I have said before, civil wrongs do not make civil rights; disobedience does not make for law enforcement and law observance.

The 88th Congress must do its job in these times of domestic turmoil. Soon we shall have before us a bill to do something about this situation. We must do something about poverty in Harlem and in other sections of America. The New York Times appropriately refers to this subject in its next editorial entitled "Debate Over Poverty." It indicates that something needs to be done of a constructive nature. Some of our cities need to be completely rebuilt in their tenement areas in a way which does not displace thousands of residents. We cannot have happy living and good economic conditions in crowded tenement conditions. We must expect a sense of growing bitterness, and the frustration that comes over a person living in such circumstances. The potential for an explosion is indeed high.

If we were to pass the poverty bill, we would be able to provide many thousands of jobs for young people who are dropouts and potential delinquents and potential troublemakers. It would give them a constructive outlet.

Since the 85th Congress, I have been the author of legislation to establish a Youth Conservation Corps. Twice this legislation has passed the Senate. It is nothing short of tragic that we have not done something along this line.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the two editorials published in the New

York Times and the editorial published in the Washington Post.

I stand here as one citizen who once served as a mayor of a great city, responsible for a police department. I know that the law must be enforced and that law and order must be preserved. I realize that violence cannot be condoned, and that the ransacking and destruction of private property cannot be permitted. I also say that there are not enough policemen in the world to hold down a section of a city or of a nation that lives in misery and poverty, frustration, hopelessness, sickness, and illiteracy.

What we see here in our local areas is what has been taking place around the world. I have visited such cities as Caracas; I have been in the cities of Lima, Peru, and Santiago, Chile, and I have seen the filth and dirt of those slums.

As I insist that the law be enforced, I also insist that we fulfill our social responsibilities. It is a rotten shame that America, the land of the free and the home of the brave, the richest nation on the face of the earth, should condone conditions of poverty and despair which are a disgrace to humankind.

The press of our country and the other news media have brought out some of the sordid facts. The coverage of this situation has been nothing short of miraculous in its completeness and fairness. I hope that we finally will be shocked into doing something constructive, something which can stand as a bold beginning to these despartely serious problems of poverty and urban life.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, July 21, 1964]

HARLEM AND THE POLICE

When the spokesmen for the Negro community met with Acting Mayor Screvane at city hall yesterday to discuss the recent horrifying riots, they advanced four principal demands which, in their judgment at least, would allay the bitter resentment against the police department that pervades Harlem. One of them frankly warned that unless better relations could be established between the Negro community and the department, there would be more riots.

The first of these was for the immediate suspension and arrest on suspicion of homicide of the police lieutenant who killed a 15-year-old Negro boy last week, asserting that the boy had attacked him with a knife. We share the concern of many citizens about this episode, who feel that a police lieutenant should be able to cope with a 15-year-old boy without killing him, even if the boy does have a knife. But the lieutenant is entitled to the same presumption of innocence as any other citizen. The matter is being investigated by District Attorney Frank S. Hogan, in whose fairness and thoroughness we have confidence.

The demand for establishment of a civilian review board to hear allegations of police brutality, which has been backed by civil rights groups for a long time, was renewed. Police Commissioner Michael J. Murphy has strongly opposed the idea, but for a time indicated some receptivity to the appointment of one or two outside civilians to his own civilian complaint review board, which now consists of three deputy police commissioners. We believe that such a step might improve relations between the police department and the Negro community, without impairing the discipline or morale of the department.

Mr. Screvane and Commissioner Murphy agreed that Deputy Mayor Edward F. Cavanagh, Jr., would review the procedures of the existing board and make recommendations for Mayor Wagner's consideration on his return. Mr. Murphy has also promised to increase the number of Negro patrolmen on duty in Harlem—a wise concession that we hope will conciliate reasonable groups in that tormented community.

Harlem at the moment is a sick community. Many thousands of decent, law-abiding people, jammed into its miserable housing and suffering from its high incidence of crime and delinquency, its lack of job opportunities and discriminations of many kinds, are being drawn into emotional turmoil. New York City owes Harlem the duty of treating it with firmness, with kindness, and with understanding. Harlem is in great need of the long-range program that the Federal and city governments are planning for it in the war against poverty. But riots will not help the people of Harlem.

[From the New York Times, July 21, 1964]

DEBATE OVER POVERTY

Senate conservatives led by BARRY M. GOLDWATER are mustering their forces for a counterattack against the administration's request for $962.5 million to conduct its war on poverty. Senator GOLDWATER and his comrade in arms, Senator JOHN G. TOWER of Texas, served notice of their opposition by voting against the antipoverty program in the Labor Committee, and they will now carry their fight against handouts and the "institutionalization of poverty" to the Senate floor.

The administration's antipoverty bill has its shortcomings, but Mr. GOLDWATER's criticisms do not make sense. Handouts are conspicuously absent in the proposed Job Corps, which will give basic education and work experience to teenagers, and in the work-study program, which will enable promising youngsters to go to college. The specter of increasing Federal control cannot be reconciled with the program's emphasis on community action with Government aid specifically channeled and distributed by local groups. These projects will account for most of the funds being sought by the administration.

Far from being wasteful or overly ambitious, the antipoverty program is, we believe, too small and too limited to cope effectively with the problem. The whole idea of opening up opportunities to get people off relief and out of the rut of poverty calls for much greater stress on education and expansion of other needed public services. The program will also demand greater imagination in exploring techniques that can furnish work training and education to those who are deficient in discipline and skills.

The administration's plan represents the bare beginning of an assault against poverty. It is essential to make an initial commitment to eradicate the tangled and stubborn roots that have kept so many people from sharing in the Nation's prosperity. The debate will serve little purpose if the Republicans simply seek to oppose the administration's program. Debate will be meaningful, however, if it focuses on the flaws—the lack of any statistical criteria to evaluate projects, the gaps in education and training, the duplication of effort—that will handicap the antipoverty campaign. Even more important, the war on poverty depends on unity between Federal, local, and private bodies, and avoidance of narrowly partisan discord.

[From the Washington Post, July 21, 1964]

ERUPTION

The weekend's terrible rioting in Harlem is a hideous portent—and a symptom of deep-rooted evil. No useful purpose will be served by mere denunciation of the rioters or of the police. The causation was complex—as complex as the causation leading to eruption of a long dormant volcano. It must be understood if it is to be overcome.

Harlem, once a village on the island of Manhattan, has long been the world's most notorious and most troubled ghetto. A noted Negro psychologist, Dr. Kenneth Clark of New York's City College, calls it "a ghetto wherein human beings are confined and are exploited because they cannot escape. Harlem is a racial colony within the most liberal, cosmopolitan and sophisticated city of our Nation * * * a community dominated by chronic frustration, stagnation, despair, and a pervading sense of powerlessness and hopelessness."

Isolated from the city itself, segregated by economic and social pressures, goughed by landlords, overcrowded in loathsome tenements, limited by their own ignorance as well as by race barriers to employment, Negroes in Harlem have understandably come to believe that the community's hand was raised against them. And they have understandably become responsive to demagogic appeals.

In such a context the killing of a colored teenager by a white policeman was understandably explosive. One need not pass judgment on the particular incident. The policeman, in a tense situation, attacked by a 15-year-old boy armed with a knife, shot his assailant dead. An investigation has been pledged in this case and will no doubt produce, in time, an authoritative assessment of responsibility.

To Negroes in Harlem, however, the incident no doubt seemed another instance of a policeman's snuffing out the life of a Negro as of little consequence. "Come on, shoot another nigger," a hysterical colored girl shouted at police at the scene of the shooting. What one must understand about the subsequent rioting in Harlem is the bitterness, the frustration, the sense of apartness which lie behind it.

There are responsible and heroic Negro leaders striving desperately to hold these emotions in check, doing everything within their power to keep Negro protest within peaceful political limits. But Negroes are not now receptive or responsive to homilies from white authorities who have been responsible for segregating them. There is not much use in trying to tell them—what is patently the truth—that disorders now threaten progress in civil rights. There is not much use in telling them—although it is fundamental to their interest—that they must respect the law if they are to enjoy the protection of the law.

Law and order must, of course, be enforced—in New York and in Birmingham alike. But along with enforcement must go a redoubled effort to give Negroes a stake in the maintenance of law and order—a place in the society whose values they are called upon to uphold.

THE NOMINATIONS FOR PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT AT THE REPUBLICAN NATIONAL CONVENTION

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, last week a historic Republican National Convention was held in the city of San Francisco.

A distinguished Member of the Senate was nominated for President of the United States. This great man's nomination has brought hope to millions of Americans living in every one of our States. Senator GOLDWATER was the favorite and he is now the choice and the favorite of all Republicans.

A distinguished Member of the House of Representatives, Hon. William E. Miller, was nominated for Vice President. His nomination is a wise choice, and a great addition to the ticket.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point the nominating speech by the minority leader, Hon. Everett McKinley Dirksen, and the acceptance speech by Hon. Barry Goldwater, the Republican nominee for President; also the speech of the distinguished senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. Allott], placing in nomination the name of Hon. William E. Miller for Vice President, and the acceptance speech of the nominee for Vice President.

There being no objection, the text of the speeches were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

GOLDWATER NOMINATION ADDRESS BY SENATOR DIRKSEN

My friend and colleague, Senator Morton, delegates, alternates, Republicans, and fellow countrymen, in a few days, we shall return home. We shall have had the energizing fellowship of a spirited national convention. We shall carry with us the set of principles we have adopted, declaring where we stand. We shall have selected the leaders to command our forces. We shall be prepared to march to victory.

Let neither doubt nor defeatism impair our forces and our strength. Beyond the rough terrain of the intervening months lies the sweet, green valley of victory and that valley can be ours.

In this spirit, let me tell you briefly about a man. He is the grandson of a peddler, a peddler who was a proud, honorable and spirited man who left his ancestral home in Europe at an early age and came to this land a century ago. He arrived 9 years before the Civil War—in 1852. Almost immediately he set across the Nation to make a home on the hardy frontier of the Far West. There he peddled his wares among the mining and lumber camps and the peoples of that western land. There were then but 31 States in the Union. There he eventually gained renown as a merchant and frontier leader and it is of his grandson I would speak to you. His name is Barry Goldwater.

I want to speak of him as the whole man moving toward whatever destiny may provide. There is today a strange and destructive cynicism which has fastened itself upon our thinking. It may be a kind of sadistic sport to hear a statement by one who marches at the head of the parade and then unleash some seemingly contrary sentiment which he may have uttered 10 years before and to assail him for inconsistency. Our appraisal of the individual so often becomes fragmented instead of thinking of the whole man, impelled by conviction to say or do what at the moment should be said or done. Quoting only a part of what a man has said has become a favorite indoor sport. By this standard of appraisal, the man never lived, and the hero was never born who by singling out some vote, some utterance, some opinion cannot be crucified upon the cross erected by the cynics. It is time that in the larger and more tolerant spirit, we consider the whole man, his life, his actions, his works and his attributes measured against the problems, duties, and responsibilities which loom upon the horizon both at home and abroad.

Consider the moral courage of this humble peddler's grandson, Barry Goldwater. When a poll was taken some years ago to select five former Senators whose portraits might adorn the unfilled ovals in the Senate reception room, those who participated selected Henry Clay and John C. Calhoun, Daniel Webster and Robert Marion La Follette and Robert A. Taft. Their common attribute was courage in facing the challenge of their day and time.

Each took to heart the thunderous admonition of the Lord to Joshua as he took command of that ancient host: "Have I not commanded thee. Be strong and of good courage. Be not afraid, neither be thou dismayed."

Already in 12 short years in the U.S. Senate, Barry Goldwater has repeatedly cast votes that won him no applause, that gained him nothing politically, that did nothing more than show the man's blazing courage in refusing to take the easy paths already so heavily trafficked by some of his colleagues.

In the days and years ahead, as we assess the fevers which beset us abroad and the problems which afflict us at home, it will take courage of a high order to make the decisions and to withstand the multitude if it beckons one on to an unsound course. The peddler's grandson has courage, and it is but a part of the whole man.

He is a man of conscience. How commonly we think of conscience as the still small accusing voice to persuade the individual that a certain act or course of conduct is morally wrong. The true sensitive conscience does not wait until the act is about to be committed or the course of conduct is to be followed. It is always there to monitor the morals, the conduct, the actions of any man. It is like a fixed star in the firmament to light the way. What is deemed snap judgment is more often than not a judgment directed by an acute conscience which can operate faster than reason. And whether it be in the domain of peace or war, in rearmament or the scrapping of weapons, in domestic policy or internal security, conscience can be an unfailing guide. The peddler's grandson has a conscience to chart his course and when he committed the fruit of conscience to paper in a book called "The Conscience of a Conservative" 4 years ago, more than 2½ million copies were sold—an incredible testament to the interest of the American people. Conscience is another indelible part of the whole man.

Whether in commerce or finance, in business or industry, in private or public service, there is such a thing as competence. What is it but the right vision, the right touch, in the right way, at the right time? What man could be a jet pilot without this touch? But Barry Goldwater has demonstrated it over and over in his every activity. As Chief of Staff of his State National Guard, he brought about its desegregation, shortly after World War II and long before civil rights became a burning issue. He brought integration to his own retail enterprises. For his own employees he established the 5-day week and a health and life insurance plan. All this was done without fanfare or the marching of bands. My friends, in an age of self-congratulating do-gooders, Barry Goldwater stands out as a good-doer, and what a breath of fresh air that is. Yes, the grandson of that peddler who came to this land 112 years ago has demonstrated his competence in many fields.

In an age when gratitude is scant for services rendered, we so often overlook the contribution of time and effort which a man makes to his party. Yet the whole man must be judged by his fidelity to his party and his willingness to go forth and assist in making it a vital instrument. From the moment he came to the U.S. Senate more than 12 years ago until this good hour, I can name no man in the Republican Party who day after day, year after year, has applied his talents and his zeal to the Republican cause as the grandson of that peddler. No weather was too foul, no journey too long, no sacrifice too great to take him forth on a mission for his party and its candidates. He has raised money, he has made speeches, and he has rallied organization support. And I ask you: Who will forget his great speech, in an hour dark for his supporters, to the 1960 Republican National Convention calling on them and all Republicans to help the party unite? And who will forget his 126 speeches in 26 States in the next 3 months in support of the Nixon-Lodge ticket? I haven't forgotten it and I know you haven't either.

In my office is a set of silver spurs, mounted on a plaque as a token of appreciation for service to the party. I doubt that I deserve them or the generous inscription on that plaque. As for the grandson of that peddler of long ago, surely he merits spurs of gold for the immeasurable effort, energy and sacrifice which he has devoted to his party and to the espousal of Republican gospel. Yes, cheerful contribution has been one of the shining graces of this man and it has been performed with a spirit of dedication in his heart.

All of us were raised to love our country, to take pride in its glorious history, and to defend it with our lives if necessary. We call it patriotism, a word once revered by all. Today it is the fashion of our critics to sneer at patriotism, to label positions of strength as extremism, to find other nations' points of view right more often than our own. Perhaps too long the bugles have sounded retreat in our relations with other lands.

Our diplomatic representative in Zanzibar is hustled to a dock at bayonet point and told to leave. Our Embassy flag in Ghana is hauled down and desecrated. A nation like Panama, which would not exist today but for the United States, can abuse us with impunity. A bearded Communist in Cuba can revile and insult us and confiscate the property of our citizens. There is such a thing as going the first mile and even the second mile of forbearance and tolerance but there is also such a thing as a nation's honor and prestige and the rights of her citizens.

Twenty centuries ago, the Apostle Paul needed but to say to the Roman captain of the guard when he was about to be scourged that he was a freeborn Roman citizen and immediately they loosed the thongs with which he was bound. We have come far since then. But why today are indignities so freely hurled at us as a nation, against our people, and against our flag? What, oh what, has become of that vital thrill, that pride in being an American? We heard so much about American prestige in the 1960 campaign. It was a phony issue then, but what a real issue it has become in 4 short years. The time is here for America to retrieve its self-respect. I believe that through firmness, through the sure hand, Barry Goldwater, the grandson of that immigrant frontier peddler, could retrieve it. This is part of the whole man.

Could there be a more devoted person to the Constitution than Barry Goldwater, the peddler's grandson? That document not only created the balanced structure of our Government but became our charter of freedom as well. Barry Goldwater's grandfather could come here 112 years ago and share its protection and its benefits along with all others—the rich, the mighty, the poor, the humble.

It has been the central core of Republican gospel. One hundred years ago, the Republican Party met in Baltimore, Md., to renominate Lincoln and adopt the platform of 1864. The very first pledge in that platform reads, "Resolved that it is the highest duty of every American citizen to maintain against all their enemies, the integrity of the Union and the permanent authority of the Constitution and laws of the United States." Today, no person can sit in the U.S. Senate without first holding up his hand and swearing before God that he "will support and defend the Constitution of the United States" and that he will bear true faith and allegiance to it.

But is the Constitution anything more than words on parchment until the human touch is applied and the minds of men indicate what it means? Seldom does a day go by but what some individual clothed in judicial robes sets forth his view of what it means as he interprets an ordinance, a resolution, an administrative order of a statute. Is it not proper that a legislator who has sworn to uphold and defend it and bear true faith to it is entitled to his own view whether any measure before the Congress squares with his estimate of the Constitution?

So it was that BARRY GOLDWATER, grandson of an immigrant peddler, took his stand on the constitutionality of certain provisions in the most controversial law of the 1960's and in so doing, exhibited that quality of moral courage which has won him the admiration of the citizens of this land whether they agree with him or not. For a lifetime, with high fidelity, he has carried out his oath as a soldier and a Senator. With equal fidelity BARRY GOLDWATER would discharge his Presidential oath to enforce and execute all the laws of the land.

We come then to one last consideration as we contemplate the courage, the conscience, the competence, the contribution to party service, the pride in country, the constitutional devotion of BARRY GOLDWATER, the grandson of an immigrant peddler. That consideration is the opportunity for an ideological choice for the Republican Party and for the country.

For 20 years, the controversy on the conservative position has hovered over our party like a menacing specter. Simply expressed, it has meant that, like Bismarck whose federated Germany withered away, like Britain's almost nonexistent Liberty Party, we should give an inch here, a foot there, and finally a mile to the Socialist philosophy that has already debilitated three-fourths of the world.

Gradually the enervating effect of this divisive philosophy has become quite noticeable. Those strongly wedded to Republican policy and conservatism began to sit on their hands on election day or take a walk. Others, perceiving no marked difference between the two parties came to take the ADA version of socialism straight. Still others, with high and fervent hopes felt that this philosophical cleavage would be healed by the gentle hands of time; that complete unity of purpose and action would be restored; that with banners unfurled and trumpets sounding a common note we could inscribe the iridescent "V" of victory upon our Republican shields once more.

But even as Paul of old wrote, "For if the trumpet give an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself to the battle?" So today in this convention there is a chance to make a choice. Ask yourselves, Why is it that this man, who so certainly has sounded the call to conservatism, should be subjected to the abuse which has been heaped upon him? Is it because he offers a choice, a clear-cut choice, that the Democratic Party, as now constituted, doesn't dare face? Is it because there is a fear that the American people, in their traditional sense of fair play, are beginning to grasp the truth this man utters? Delegates to this convention, the tide is turning. Let's give it a chance.

With the platform as our chart and compass and with the militant son of an immigrant peddler as our leader, let's give 190 million Americans the choice they have been waiting for. Let's place before our people the cause of a party which was born to preserve the Union, to save constitutional government and to keep government the servant and not the master of the people. Let's rededicate ourselves and our Nation to those goals. It is in that spirit that I nominate my friend and colleague, BARRY GOLDWATER, of Arizona, to be the Republican candidate for President of the United States.

ACCEPTANCE SPEECH BY SENATOR BARRY GOLDWATER, REPUBLICAN NATIONAL CONVENTION, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.

From this moment, united and determined, we will go forward together—dedicated to the ultimate and undeniable greatness of the whole man.

Together, we will win.

I accept your nomination with a deep sense of humility. I accept the responsibility that goes with it. I seek your continued help and guidance.

Our cause is too great for any man to feel worthy of it.

Our task would be too great for any man, did he not have with him the hearts and hands of this great Republican Party.

I promise you that every fiber of my being is consecrated to our cause—that nothing shall be lacking from the struggle that can be brought to it by enthusiasm and devotion—and hard work.

In this world, no person—no party—can guarantee anything. What we can do, and what we shall do, is to deserve victory.

The good Lord raised up this mighty Republic to be a home for the brave and to flourish as the land of the free—not to stagnate in the swampland of collectivism—not to cringe before the bullying of communism.

The tide has been running against freedom. Our people have followed false prophets. We must and we shall return to proven ways—not because they are old, but because they are true. We must and we shall set the tides running again in the cause of freedom.

This party, with its every action, every word, every breath, and every heartbeat has but a single resolve:

Freedom.

Freedom—made orderly for this Nation by our constitutional government.

Freedom—under a government limited by the laws of nature and of nature's God.

Freedom—balanced so that order, lacking liberty, will not become a slavery of the prison cell; balanced so that liberty, lacking order, will not become the license of the mob and the jungle.

We Americans understand freedom. We have earned it, lived for it, and died for it.

This Nation and its people are freedom's model in a searching world. We can be freedom's missionaries in a doubting world. But first we must renew freedom's vision in our own hearts and in our own homes.

During 4 futile years, the administration which we shall replace has distorted and lost that vision.

It has talked and talked and talked the words of freedom. But it has failed and failed and failed in the works of freedom.

Failures cement the wall of shame in Berlin. Failures blot the sands of shame at the Bay of Pigs. Failures mark the slow death of freedom in Laos. Failures infest the jungles of Vietnam. Failures haunt the houses of our once great alliances, and undermine the greatest bulwark ever erected by free nations—the NATO community.

Failures proclaim lost leadership, obscure purpose, weakening will, and the risk of inciting our sworn enemies to new aggressions and new excesses.

Because of this administration, we are a world divided—we are a nation becalmed.

We have lost the brisk pace of diversity and the genius of individual creativity. We are plodding at a pace set by centralized planning, redtape, rules without responsibility, and regimentation without recourse.

Rather than useful jobs, our people have been offered bureaucratic makework. Rather than moral leadership, they have been given bread and circuses, spectacle and even scandal.

There is violence in our streets, corruption in our highest offices, aimlessness among our youth, anxiety among our elders. There is virtual despair among the many who look beyond material success for the inner meaning of their lives.

Where examples of morality should be set, the opposite is seen. Small men, seeking great wealth or power, have too often and too long turned even the highest levels of public services into mere personal opportunity.

Certainly, simple honesty is not too much to demand of men in government. We find it in most. Republicans demand it from everyone—no matter how exalted or protected his position.

The growing menance to personal safety, to life, limb, and property, in homes, churches, playgrounds, and places of business, particularly in our great cities, is the mounting concern of every thoughtful citizen. Security from domestic violence, no less than from foreign aggression, is the most elementary and fundamental purpose of any government. A government that cannot fulfill this purpose is one that cannot long command the loyalty of its citizens. History demonstrates that nothing prepares the way for tyranny more than the failure of public officials to keep the streets safe from bullies and marauders.

We Republicans see all this as more, much more than the result of mere political differences, or mere political mistakes. We see this as the result of a fundamentally and absolutely wrong view of man, his nature, and his destiny.

Those who seek to live your lives for you, to take your liberties in return for relieving you of your responsibilities—those who elevate the state and downgrade the citizen—must see ultimately a world in which earthly power can be substituted for divine will. This Nation was founded upon the rejection of that notion and upon the acceptance of God as the author of freedom.

Those who seek absolute power, even though they seek it to do what they regard as good, are simply demanding the right to enforce their version of heaven on earth. They are the very ones who always create the most hellish tyrannies.

Absolute power does corrupt. And those who seek it must be suspect and must be opposed.

Their mistaken course stems from false notions of equality.

Equality, rightly understood, as our Founding Fathers understood it, leads to liberty and to the emancipation of creative differences.

Wrongly understood, as it has been so tragically in our time, it leads first to conformity and then to despotism.

It is the cause of Republicanism to resist concentrations of power, private or public, which enforce such conformity and inflict such despotism.

It is the cause of Republicanism to insure that power remains in the hands of the people. And, so help us God, that is exactly what a Republican President will do—with the help of a Republican Congress.

It is the cause of Republicanism to restore a clear understanding of the tyranny of man over man in the world at large. It is our cause to dispel the foggy thinking which avoids hard decisions in the delusion that a world of conflict will mysteriously resolve itself into a world of harmony—if we just don't rock the boat or irritate the forces of aggression.

It is the cause of Republicanism to remind ourselves and the world that only the strong can remain free—that only the strong can keep the peace.

Republicans have shouldered this hard responsibility and marched in this cause before.

It was Republican leadership under Dwight David Eisenhower that kept the peace and passed along to this administration the mightiest arsenal for defense the world has ever known.

It was the strength and believable will of the Eisenhower years that kept the peace by using our strength—by using it in the Formosa Straits and in Lebanon, and by showing it courageously at all times.

It was during those Republican years that the thrust of Communist imperialism was blunted. It was during those years of Republican leadership that this world moved closer to peace than at any other time in the last three decades.

It has been during Democratic years that our strength to deter war has stood still and even gone into a planned decline.

It has been during Democratic years that we have weakly stumbled into conflict—timidly refusing to draw our own lines against aggression—deceitfully refusing to tell even our own people of our full participation—and tragically letting our finest men die on battlefields unmarked by purpose, pride, or the prospect of victory.

Yesterday it was Korea. Today it is Vietnam.

We are at war in Vietnam—yet the President who is the Commander in Chief of our forces refuses to say whether or not the objective is victory. His Secretary of Defense continues to mislead and misinform the American people.

It has been during Democratic years that a billion persons were cast into Communist captivity and their fate cynically sealed. Today, we have an administration which seems eager to deal with communism in every coin known—from gold to wheat, from consulates to confidences, and even human freedom itself.

The Republican cause demands that we brand communism as the principal disturber of peace in the world today—indeed, the only significant disturber of the peace. We must make clear that until its goals of conquest are absolutely renounced, and its relations with all nations tempered, communism and the governments it now controls are enemies of every man on earth who is or wants to be free.

We can keep the peace only if we remain vigilant and strong. Only if we keep our eyes open and keep our guard up can we prevent war.

I do not intend to let peace or freedom be torn from our grasp because of lack of strength or lack of will. That I promise you.

I believe that we must look beyond the defense of freedom today to its extension tomorrow. I believe that the communism which boasts it will "bury us," will instead give way to the forces of freedom.

And I can see, in the distant and yet recognizable future, the outlines of a world worthy of our dedication, our every risk, our every effort, our every sacrifice along the way. Yes, a world that will redeem the suffering of those who will be liberated from tyranny.

I can see, and I suggest that all thoughtful men must contemplate, the flowering of an Atlantic civilization: the whole of Europe reunified and freed, trading openly across its borders, communicating openly across the world.

This is a goal more meaningful than a moon shot—a truly inspiring goal for all free men to set for themselves during the latter half of the twentieth century.

I can see, and all free men must thrill to, the advance of this Atlantic civilization joined by its great ocean highway to the United States. What a destiny can be ours—to stand as a great central pillar linking Europe, the Americas, and the venerable and vital peoples and cultures of the Pacific.

I can see a day when all the Americas, north and south, will be linked in a mighty system, a system in which the errors and misunderstandings of the past will be submerged, one by one, in a rising tide of prosperity and interdependence. We know that the misunderstandings of centuries are not to be wiped away in a day or an hour. But we pledge that human sympathy—what our neighbors to the south call an attitude that is "simpatico"—no less than enlightened self-interest, will be our guide.

I can see this Atlantic civilization galvanizing and guiding emergent nations everywhere.

I know that freedom is not the fruit of every soil. I know that our own freedom was achieved through centuries by the unremitting efforts of brave and wise men. I know that the road to freedom is a long and a challenging road. I know that some men may walk away from it, that some men resist challenge—accepting the false security of governmental paternalism.

I pledge that the America I envision in the years ahead will extend its hand in help, in teaching, and in cultivation, so that all new nations will at least be encouraged to go our way—so that they will not wander down the dark alleys of tyranny, or the deadend streets of collectivism.

We do no man a service by hiding freedom's light under a bushel of mistaken humility.

I seek an America proud of its past, proud of its ways, proud of its dreams, and determined actively to proclaim them.

But our example to the world must, like charity, begin at home.

In our vision of a good and decent future, free and peaceful, there must be room for the liberation of the energy and the talent of the individual—otherwise our vision is blind at the outset.

We must assure a society here which, while never abandoning the needy or forsaking the helpless, nurtures incentives and opportunities for the creative and the productive.

We must know the whole good as the product of many single contributions.

I cherish a day when our children, once again, will restore as heroes the sort of men and women who—unafraid and undaunted—pursue the truth, strive to cure disease, subdue and make fruitful our natural environment, and produce the inventive engines of production, science, and technology.

This Nation, whose creative people have enhanced this entire span of history, should again thrive upon the greatness of all those things which we—as individual citizens—can and should do.

During Republican years this again will be a nation of men and women, of families proud of their roles, jealous of their responsibilities, unlimited in their aspirations—a nation where all who can will be self-reliant.

We Republicans see in our constitutional form of government the great framework which assures the orderly but dynamic fulfillment of the whole man—and we see the whole man as the great reason for instituting orderly government in the first place.

We see, in private property and an economy based upon and fostering private property, the one way to make government a durable ally of the whole man, rather than his determined enemy. We see, in the sanctity of private property, the only durable foundation for constitutional government in a free society.

And beyond that, we see and cherish diversity of ways, diversity of thoughts, of motives and accomplishments. We do not seek to live anyone's life for him—we seek only to secure his rights, guarantee him opportunity to strive, with government performing only those needed and constitutionally sanctioned tasks which cannot otherwise be performed.

We seek a government that attends to its inherent responsibilities of maintaining a stable monetary and fiscal climate—encouraging a free and competitive economy, and enforcing law and order.

Thus do we seek inventiveness, diversity, and creative difference within a stable order. For we Republicans define government's role, where needed, at many levels, preferably the one closest to the people involved.

Our towns and our cities, then our counties and States, then our regional compacts—and only then the National Government. That is the ladder of liberty built by decentralized power. On it, also, we must have balance between branches of government at every level.

Balance, diversity, creative difference—these are the elements of the Republican equation. Republicans agree on these elements and they heartily agree to disagree on many, many of their applications.

This is a party for free men—not for blind followers and not for conformists.

In 1858, Lincoln said of the Republican Party that it was composed of "strange, discordant, and even hostile elements." Yet all of the elements agreed on one paramount objective—to arrest the progress of slavery and place it in the course of ultimate extinction.

Today as then, but more urgently and more broadly than then, the task of preserving and enlarging freedom at home, and of safeguarding it from the forces of tyranny abroad, is great enough to challenge all our resources and to require all our strength.

Any who join us in all sincerity, we welcome. Those who do not care for our cause we do not expect to enter our ranks in any case.

And let our Republicanism, so focused and so dedicated, not be made fuzzy and futile by unthinking labels.

Extremism in the defense of liberty is no vice. Moderation in the pursuit of justice is no virtue.

The beauty of the very system we Republicans are pledged to restore and revitalize, the beauty of this Federal system of ours, is in its reconciliation of diversity with unity. We must not see malice in honest differences of opinion, no matter how great, so long as they are not inconsistent with the pledges we have given to each other in and through the Constitution.

Our Republican cause is not to level out the world or make its people conform in computer-regimented sameness.

Our Republican cause is to free our people and light the way for liberty throughout the world.

Ours is a very human cause for very humane goals.

This party, its good people, and its unquenchable devotion to freedom will not fulfill the high purpose of the campaign—which we launch here and now—until our cause has won the day, inspired the world, and shown the way to a tomorrow worthy of all our yesterdays.

SENATOR GORDON ALLOTT'S SPEECH PLACING IN NOMINATION THE NAME OF CONGRESSMAN WILLIAM E. MILLER FOR THE VICE-PRESIDENCY

In the closing hours of this convention, we delegates face the last of our three primary responsibilities. The first was the nomination of a President of the United States, the second the adoption of a platform, and now, the nomination of a man for Vice President. For the high office of Vice President of the United States, we Republicans owe to the people of this Nation no less than our very best. The tragic events of the past 2 years have demonstrated sadly how important it is that we have not only a great President, BARRY GOLDWATER, but that he be backed up by a great Vice President. I am here to nominate a dynamic man. I am here to nominate the great Congressman from the State of New York, the hard-driving chairman of the Republican National Committee, the Honorable WILLIAM E. MILLER.

You all know his outstanding service as chairman of the national committee. You know that in the building of the Republican Party he has traveled the length and breadth of this country. You all know that this leadership and hard work has resulted in the election of 44 new Republicans in the House of Representatives and the election of new Republican Governors in our more heavily populated States—and this, even though we were completely "Cubanized" in 1962. With his leadership, we have seen for the first time the development of a real two-party system throughout this country. As national chairman, BILL MILLER inherited a $750,000 debt and as national chairman, he developed a firm financial grassroots support which wiped out that debt. His stepped-up operation has built a modest surplus. But, don't let me mislead you. We still need money.

BILL MILLER was born in Lockport, N.Y., and started his professional career as a district attorney in Niagara County of that State. As proof of his own drive and his own ability, he was elected seven times to Congress from New York's 40th District, where he has served and applied his talents in his own particular field—the Judiciary Committee. His legal artisanship is reflected in every bill that has passed through that committee. His artisanship is reflected along with that of many other Republicans in the civil rights bill of 1964, which he supported and for which he voted. At the age of 50, he has an unbroken 14-year string of triumphs and victories to his credit. Here is a man with the intelligence to win. Here is a man with the will to win.

The record of the legislative history of this country for 32 years is a dismal democratic debacle. Only 4 years out of those 32 years have the Republicans been in control of Congress. The records of these two Republican Congresses are hallmarked by their sense of responsibility to the American people. Only these two attempted to reduce the piling of bureaucracy upon bureaucracy, commission upon commission, board upon board. Only these two made any attempt to stem the fantastic growth of debt. Now, we not only have a debt ceiling, which increases day by day, we have had a temporary debt ceiling, and this last year even a temporary-temporary debt ceiling. Under these two Republican majorities, this country showed the highest rate of economic growth it ever had. And it was done without that greatest tax of all—that great thief of men's pocketbooks, that great eroder of the security which men and women have a right to build for their retirement—inflation. For inflation trades the hard dollars of today for the softer dollars of tomorrow—and if the Demcratic policies continue in this country, we will trade the dollars of today for the pennies of tomorrow

So, the legislative history of these last years, the frustrations of centralized government, the harassment of a Government agent sitting at your elbow, at your desk, in your store, in your home, and beside the farmer as he plows his field—all these are the history of the Democratic Party and not the Republican Party.

We are here to end that history.

We are here to do more than listen to speeches, to cast a vote, and return home. We are here because we are concerned about the very fundamentals of the structure of our Government. We are not here to porkbarrel $1 billion as a sop for votes. We are here to say that overlapping and duplication of these thousands of Government projects can be eliminated. In doing so, we shall not only balance the budget, but we will accomplish the job about which the Democrats only talk. We will build an economy where men can work and prosper. We can understand their confusion—with them it is traditional—but organized confusion?

To meet this challenge will require the greatest talents we have. It will require more than a committee meeting or quite attendance at the precinct caucus. It will demand the greatest effort on an hour-by-hour basis until we bring home for the American people in November the fruits of a Republican victory.

As we have already selected a great man and a great fighter to lead our party, we must now select for our vice presidential nominee a man who is no less a man with fighting qualities to match those of BARRY GOLDWATER. We of America are of a mind to fight. BILL MILLER'S own record demonstrates that capacity. You have seen it in your State, you have seen it in your own county, and you have seen it even in your precincts.

We need a man to carry our beliefs and ideals to the door of every home in our land. We need a man to articulate what the basic principles of a free enterprise, captalistic system has done for this Nation—and what is more important—what it can do for this country for tomorrow and tomorrow. We need a man to sit at the council tables of the world with a full consciousness of the freedom, destiny, leadership, and strength of America—and the courage to keep it intact. We need a man with the mental equipment, the balance, the judgment, the integrity, for which BILL MILLER'S life as a lawyer, as a district attorney, as a great Member of Congress provides in such ample abundance. We need for our vice presidential candidate the best that we have. In BILL MILLER, we have all of these plus that great intangible quality of a great spirit, a fighting spirit, which will never relax, never relent, never give in.

This is the spirit which has the will to win, and with this will to win, we can win. Mr. Chairman, I place the name of the Honorable WILLIAM E. MILLER in nomination as Vice President of the United States.

ADDRESS BY HON. WILLIAM E. MILLER, JULY 16, 1964

There are no words to convey my feeling. I love this country with all my heart.

I love this party—the finest instrument for good Government our Nation has ever known.

I love the people of the United States—200 million strong, devoted to God, consecrated to liberty, and all crusaders for justice—all crusaders for equality of opportunity for every person on the face of this earth.

And on this point, I want the RECORD unmistakably clear—I vastly respect and admire the courage, the integrity, the selfless commitment to principle of one of the most dynamic and forceful leaders in all our Nation's history—Senator BARRY GOLDWATER.

To be asked to serve under his leadership is a tremendous honor.

To be asked to carry forward with him his struggle for victory for all freedoms is a magnificent opportunity.

To be asked to join with millions of fellow citizens in a nationwide crusade to regain respect abroad for this land of liberty and to reestablish reason in Government here at home is no less than a thrilling experience.

I have no misconceptions about my role.

Our party is favored with vibrant, able, and dedicated leadership from Maine to Hawaii, and Florida to Alaska.

I know them all and I know that any of these leaders are fitted far better than I to wage the great struggle ahead.

But my friends, my family and I here pledge ourselves to you that we shall devote our hearts and our hands, our energies and our abilities, and our spirit and our enthusiasm to this greatest challenge of my lifetime.

And we shall do so every minute of every hour, of every day, from this point forward.

My fellow Republicans, 4 years have passed since the most beloved American in the world retired from the Presidency to a Gettysburg farm.

During his Republican administration, loyally supported by Republicans in Congress, this Nation had a new birth of freedom, a new dignity in the community of nations, and a new strength and domestic tranquility at home.

His inspiration and his example permeate our party.

His inspiration and his example guide us still.

As he indicated two evenings ago, he stands ready to join with us in once again carrying forward our commitments for the well-being of every human being.

So in this great common purpose, I now stand at the side of a man who more than any other I have ever known in American life speaks the truth to the people, courageously stands for principle, and devotes himself completely to keeping America free—the great son from Arizona—BARRY GOLDWATER.

It is in this great purpose that now I humbly accept the great honor you have here bestowed upon me—your nomination for the Vice-Presidency of the United States.

PROFESSIONAL TEAM SPORTS AND THE ANTITRUST LAWS

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, at the present time there is a bill pending before the Senate Judiciary Committee which is of real concern to me. The bill is S. 2391, which would exempt from the antitrust laws the sporting aspects of professional team sports. In my opinion, the basic purpose of this bill is sound. However, recent developments both in St. Louis and Kansas City indicate that it may be necessary to impose certain restrictions on professional sports at the same time the general antitrust exemption is granted if the public interest is to be protected. There seems to be a trend developing for professional clubs to induce the cities where they are located to invest large sums of public funds in stadiums and then attempt to move to another city at the first opportunity to make a better financial deal. This complete disregard for the public interest cannot be tolerated.

Early this year we had a situation in Kansas City where the owner of the Athletics, Mr. Charles O. Finley, tried every trick in the books to move his club. However, thanks to the responsibility of the rest of the club owners in the American League this irresponsible effort by Mr. Finley was thwarted.

Today we are faced with a similar difficulty in St. Louis. However, this time it involves a professional football team, the St. Louis Cardinals. St. Louis has developed plans and is moving forward in the construction of a new municipal stadium. The city received commitments from both the St. Louis Cardinal baseball team and the St. Louis Cardinal football team as to use of the stadium. The city is relying heavily on these commitments.

But now the city is faced with an attempt by the pro football team to move. So far, the owners have failed to show any reasons for the move which would overcome their obligation to the city of St. Louis and the many fans of the football team. Again, we are faced with a club ready to pull up stakes to move to supposedly greener financial pastures without any thoughts for the people and the city which has supported it. When S. 2391 was before the Antitrust Subcommittee, I suggested an amendment which would require club owners before moving from a city that had made a substantial investment in a stadium to offer the club for sale at a reasonable price to local people. However, at that time, it was decided by the subcommittee not to include the amendment but rather to place language in the recommended report calling on club owners to recognize and meet their responsibilities.

Since then I have concluded that this is not enough. I believe that before professional teams sports are granted the benefits of exemption from the antitrust laws this problem must be solved.

At the present time, I am considering whether it would be best to oppose the enactment of S. 2391 until there is further evidence that the professional team owners can meet their obligations and responsibilities to the people or to offer an appropriate amendment to prevent moves that are contrary to the public interest. It is my hope that if this measure comes before the Senate, appropriate action will be taken to meet this problem.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR DIRKSEN AND MESSAGE BY HERBERT HOOVER TO REPUBLICAN NATIONAL CONVENTION

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the body of the RECORD the address delivered by the minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], in presenting the message of former President Herbert Clark Hoover to the Republican National Convention in San Francisco, on Monday, July 13, 1964.

There being no objection, the address and the message were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESENTATION OF A MESSAGE FROM THE HONORABLE HERBERT HOOVER TO THE CONVENTION ON MONDAY, JULY 13, BY THE HONORABLE EVERETT M. DIRKSEN

Mr. Chairman, delegates, alternates, and my fellow countrymen, there is a "Grand Old Person" in the Grand Old Party. He will soon be 90 years of age. He has lived longer than any other former President, save John Adams. He has lived to witness the profound truth of what James Russell Lowell wrote long ago, in his great poem, "The Present Crisis":

> "Truth forever on the scaffold,
> Wrong forever on the throne.
> Yet that scaffold sways the future;
> And behind the dim unknown
> Standeth God within the shadow,
> Keeping watch upon his own."

No public official in our time was so castigated and vilified because of economic forces which had their genesis outside our country and over which he had no control. No man in our time was so drenched with contumely and abuse.

Yet, no man in this century has so completely devoted his genius, his organizing talent, and his heart to the relief of wretchedness, misery, and hunger in war-torn countries, and especially among children.

I have listened to the schoolchildren in other nations as they sang his praises. I have watched them develop scrapbooks in which, in prose and poetry, they recorded their childlike tributes for his help and compassion. I have seen them reverently salute his photograph as a mark of gratitude for the food which he and his organization provided to sustain life in their frail and tender bodies.

Truly, history has vindicated his judgments. Events have vindicated his efforts. Time has vindicated his patience and brought the approbation so long denied. Grateful generations have and will continue to pay tribute to his Christian virtue.

Today, he stands at the very forefront of our cause. He is the "Grand Old Person" of the Grand Old Party. At fourscore and ten, his dedication to Republican principles, his devotion to Republican tradition, his unremitting faith in the worth and dignity of the individual is unsurpassed.

This year, he cannot be with us. We miss him. But he has sent a message to the convention—clear, concise, and challenging.

I have been asked to read that message. I count it an honor and privilege therefore to present a message from President Herbert Clark Hoover, the "Grand Old Person" of the Grand Old Party.

STATEMENT FOR REPUBLICAN NATIONAL CONVENTION BY HERBERT CLARK HOOVER

With each succeeding convention, for 28 years, you have honored me with a request that I speak to you. At recent conventions I have given you assurance that this is my last appearance. But this is really it.

I have recently canvassed the many dangers to our Republic. With the delicate adjustments which representative government occasionally requires, and the many objectionable persons overseas, we shall always be in some sort of crisis.

The people too often consider party conventions as merely handshaking political powwows. Quite to the contrary, the purpose of these meetings is the way to meet these crises. And here are the deepest emotions of patriotism and devotion to our country's welfare.

I have long thought that we need some better method to spread to the country the spirit of crusade devotion which dominates this room.

That method was to substitute a short statement of principles for which our party stands instead of a platform which requires eight or nine columns of newspaper type to explain itself. The people need to know your conclusions on public questions, but their presentation does not require more than two columns. Even the Bill of Rights requires no more than one column.

The purpose of our platform is to warn the American people of threats to their freedom as individuals and to the Nation, and to assure them that Republicans will not fail them in protection of their liberties. The Founding Fathers proclaimed that the rights of men came from their Creator, and to protect them in those rights they drafted our Constitution. Later, the people demanded further guarantees and the Bill of Rights was adopted. The dangers and crises of today call for a renewed declaration of those principles, and further assurance that Americans will be guarded in their rights. Thus, we as Republicans hold:

1. That the peace of the world is the first obligation of statesmen and governments, and that we as Americans must maintain our defenses at such strength as will deter Moscow and Peiping from an attack on us and the free world.

2. That the major world issue today is whether Government shall be the servant or the master of men. As Americans, we hold further that the rights guaranteed by the Constitution are the foundation of individual liberty, that the strict division of powers and the primary responsibilities of State and local governments must be maintained, and that centralization of powers in the National Government leads to mastery of our lives.

3. That the protection of our freedom requires that budgets be balanced, waste in Government be eliminated, and taxes be reduced.

4. That our social and economic system must be based upon private enterprise, regulated to prevent monopoly and unfair competition, that Government should not undertake business enterprises except in economic crises or wars or when public works are greater than the people themselves can undertake, and that the Federal Government should divest itself of the thousands of such enterprises it now operates when the emergencies for which they were created are ended.

5. That the businessman and the farmer are entitled to a fair profit and labor to a fair wage.

6. That the teachings of Karl Marx, whether they be communism, socialism, economic materialism, or atheism, be rejected absolutely as leading to slavery.

7. That our Nation can survive only by binding together the forces of freemen—men of religious faith, of loyalty to our American traditions, of integrity in public office, who deeply love our country.

Finally, we hold that the long record of the Republican Party gives the best assurance that these principles will prevail in the United States, and with the help of God they will. They serve as a challenge for the future.

SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY AND SOVEREIGN LIABILITY FOR CRIMES AGAINST PERSON OF CITIZENS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, on July 2, 1964, I had the privilege of appearing before the convention of the Texas Association of Plaintiff's Attorneys, in Houston, Tex. At that time, I discussed the subject of sovereign immunity, which, although much progress has been made, is still an area which cries out for enlightened and sensible reform, particularly with regard to the immunities of States and municipal corporations.

Although the Federal Tort Claims Act of 1946 is a landmark of responsible legislation, 18 years of experience with the act have brought to light the need for various perfecting amendments regarding the responsibility of the Federal Government. At an early date, I hope to be able to introduce proposed legislation embodying the changes called for.

In addition to sovereign immunity, there is another field of Government responsibility to which Congress and the State legislatures should be directing attention in the years to come—the responsibility of the Government to citizens who have lost their lives or suffered bodily injury through crimes of violence.

As more becomes possible, more becomes necessary in this world, Mr. President. I feel sure that the time is not too distant when the Federal Government will assume responsibility to compensate innocent victims of crimes of violence committed in areas of Federal criminal jurisdiction, such as the District of Columbia. Just as society decides that certain behavior is not to be countenanced, by enacting laws providing punishment for criminal behavior, so should society recognize responsibility toward innocent people who suffer at the hands of those who are not deterred by criminal laws.

I ask unanimous consent that the address given in Houston, Tex., on July 2, 1964, before the convention of the Texas Association of Plaintiff's Attorneys, be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY AND SOVEREIGN RESPONSIBILITY FOR CRIMES TO CITIZENS

(Address by Senator Ralph W. Yarborough before the Texas Association of Plaintiffs' Attorneys Convention luncheon, Thursday, July 2, at the Rice Hotel in Houston, Tex.)

Although I am now a part of the strongest, wealthiest government on earth, I find that as a former co-laborer of yours who frequently appeared on the plaintiff's side of the docket, I have not put behind me a concern for securing justice and compensation for those suffering damage through no fault of their own. In fact, some of my political enemies seem to think this concern is my biggest fault.

I hope that this group will not hold it against me if my thoughts today follow the topic of improving our laws to assure greater justice to every injured person. Though I work now in the field of legislation, the blood still rises at the words "the adequate award."

Specifically, I am concerned with the responsibility of our Government to our citizens for wrongs done to them. Every lawyer who has considered this problem has immediately met that great legal mistake, the doctrine of sovereign immunity.

I combat that familiar whipping boy because we can get results if we continue to point out that our constructive criticism can lead to corrective action.

The Federal Tort Claims Act is, of course, the outstanding example. In addition, a few States have in varying degrees waived their immunity. The second point is that although we have made some progress, much work remains to be done. As a legislator, much of my attention is called to deserving claimants who yet do not have a remedy against the Federal Government except through private legislation. Serious imperfections in the Federal Tort Claims Act require attention, and most important, the great majority of the States have not acted constructively in this field.

It has been due to the work of members of the bar that advances have come, and from this same source, from individuals who comprise groups such as this gathering of members of the plaintiff's attorneys' bar, must come the force for the reforms which have not yet been enacted and which are long overdue.

A brief look at the history of sovereign immunity begins with the statement that in England the King could not be sued without his consent. But this did not mean that the claimant was without a remedy. Quite the contrary, a variety of devices emerged which allowed either recovery against the crown itself with its consent, or recovery against an officer or agency of the government not requiring consent.

The crown apparently gave its consent to recovery against it fairly and impartially, on the basis of law rather than of expedience.

It has been well stated that after the Revolutionary War, "the Americans lost half of the rights against government which as Englishmen they had previously enjoyed. Because the King had been abolished, the courts concluded that where in the past the procedure had been by petition of right there was no one authorized to consent to suit. If there was any successor to the King as sovereign it was the legislature. It has taken the State and Federal legislatures a long time to authorize suit."

The most widely important piece of legislation in the field of governmental immunity is the Federal Tort Claims Act of 1946. This extends to claims for money on account of property damage, personal injury, or death "caused by the negligence or wrongful act or omission of any employee of the Government while acting within the scope of his office or employment, under circumstances where the United States, if a private person, would be liable."

An objective appraisal of this legislation today, 18 years after its enactment, reveals that it has to a considerable extent been fulfilling the role for which it was intended. As one would expect, however, nearly two decades of experience with the act have brought to light the need for various perfecting amendments.

The most controversial section of the act is that which rules out "any claim based upon the exercise or performance or failure to exercise or perform a discretionary function or duty on the part of a Federal agency or an employee of the Government, whether or not the discretion involved be abused." This section has been called by one distinguished commentator "an ill-conceived and poorly thought out attempt to solve some of the most sensitive problems concerning the proper limits of government liability." On the one hand, no one contends that the Government should be liable for damage as a result of a legislative or executive decision of a political nature, for example, congressional termination of OPA controls or authorization of game sanctuaries. We do not want to unduly restrict the ability of the Government to govern. On the other hand, there is room for discretionary activities at levels of Government where all would agree the Government should be liable; for example, the manner of operating a truck involves choice and judgment. Somewhere between the upper policy planning levels of Government and the lower levels, the line of demarcation of Government liability must be drawn. Where the challenged conduct involves a legislative or regulatory decision, or a matter of broad governmental policy, the act or omission should be exempt from liability. Language must be written into the act which would clearly indicate that the "discretionary" exemption is meant to cover only those acts knowingly and deliberately authorized by a Government official to accomplish a governmental objective pursuant to authority granted by the Constitution, a statute, or a regulation.

A second shortcoming of the act is the so-called 20-percent clause. This clause says that the "court rendering a judgment for the plaintiff * * * may * * * allow reasonable attorney fees which * * * shall not exceed 20 per centum of the amount recovered." This is an inconsistent statement, and I need not dwell further on it.

Two other shortcomings of the act involve areas of tortious conduct not at all covered under the present legislation. Coverage should be extended to include liability for deliberate torts, and to impose strict liability where such liability is already a part of our general tort law.

After 18 years it is time to reexamine the Federal Tort Claims Act and correct whatever defects we can discover. At a not-too-distant date, I hope to be able to introduce a bill to amend the act and cure the defects which our experience with it thus far has brought to light, those defects which I have just discussed.

Let us keep open the discussion of sovereign immunity to stimulate enough interest so that more of the States will be moved to act. Except for a handful of States which have partially or completely waived their immunity, State governments are not liable for the torts of their agents or officers, even though committed in the scope of their employment.

Some say that funds devoted to public purposes should not be diverted to private ends. In answer to this, let it be said that if the public activity produces private injury, then the cost of compensation should be viewed as a part of the cost of carrying on the public activity.

Another argument is that the liability would involve the Government "in all its operations in endless embarrassments, and difficulties, and losses, which would be subversive of the public interests." These so-called embarrassments have never stifled comparable private enterprise. And it is better to distribute these losses among the beneficiaries of Government activity than to let them rest upon the unfortunate victims of Government activity.

The time has come for the State governments to act, to move themselves into line with modern notions of tort liability. The ideal is to utilize the insurance principle to spread the cost to the community, where the weight falls lightly upon the shoulders of each, rather than allowing the full force of the blow to fall upon one person, where the effect would be disastrous. If Government activity produces risks of injury, then the Government should consider compensation for these injuries as part of the cost of doing governmental business.

Texas should enact its own torts claims act to protect its citizens from the acts of its agents to the same extent that a private corporation would be liable. Texas has moved up to fourth place among the States in population. Its more than 10 million population gives it more people than each of 86 of the 114 independent nations on earth. The rationale of exempting a poor frontier State from liability on the ground that it is too weak to respond is inapplicable—Texas is too strong not to respond to a cry of justice from its citizens.

"Sovereign immunity" is an unjust immunity—it is a doctrine that will be fading soon from our statutes and courts.

NEW FRONTIER OF GOVERNMENT RESPONSIBILITY—LIABILITY FOR CRIMES AGAINST PERSON OF CITIZENS

Let us look beyond that field to a new frontier of the responsibility of the sovereign government: that government's responsibility to protect its citizens from crime.

Our governments spend billions in protection of us from criminals. We all salute the fact that our governments take extraordinary pains to protect suspected criminals from punishment. But should not our governments owe an obligation to compensate innocent victims of crime, crimes inevitably resulting through the difficulty of providing perfect police protection?

Other countries of the common law tradition are answering this question "Yes." The English Parliament is debating such legislation now; New Zealand has made it law.

A white paper entitled "Compensation for Victims of Crimes of Violence," was presented to the English Parliament in June 1961.

In this report, two different types of proposals were considered. In the first, weekly payments would be made to persons who suffered injuries as a result of a crime of violence, and in addition, payments might be made to dependents of persons killed. The alternative was a "court scheme" in which the victim of a crime of violence, or the dependent of a deceased victim, could make a claim against the Home Secretary substantially similar to the claim for damages which he could, under the existing law, make against the aggressor; entitlement to compensation, which would take the form of a lump sum, would be decided by the courts, unless a settlement were reached out of court; and the Home Secretary would have the right to recover from the aggressor as much as possible of any compensation awarded the victim. The working party's report was published, as was explained in its preface, "with a view to electing further opinion."

The alternatives were: (a) Outright recognition of liability by the Government with payment of damages, or (b) suit in a court of claims to establish liability and damages.

The British Government's proposal for a compensation scheme was presented to Parliament in March of this year, and is now under consideration by that body.

The latest information I have from the British Embassy in Washington (as of June 25, 1964) is that the proposal apparently has not yet been approved.

I will summarize for you the major provisions of the English proposal now under consideration by Parliament.

The state would compensate victims of crimes of violence, not as a matter of right, but ex gratia.

The Government (as stated in the proposal) does not accept the proposition that the state is liable for injuries caused to people by the acts of others. The public does, however, feel a sense of responsibility for and sympathy with the innocent victim, and it is right that this feeling should find practical expression in the provision of compensation on behalf of the community.

In the House of Lords, the Lord Chancellor said of the proposal that he regarded it as not extending the law by imposing a legal liability on the state but as a proper extension of the welfare system.

We are not (he said) proposing any system of charity but a system by which compensation can be given in appropriate cases by the state—not because the state is under any legal liability to pay but because we feel that provision should be made for victims of crimes of violence.

The scheme would be administered by the victims of crimes of violence compensation board, composed of a chairman and five other members, all legally qualified.

The money for compensation would come out of public funds. The board would be responsible for deciding what compensation should be paid in individual cases, and its decisions would not be subject to appeal or to ministerial review.

With respect to the scope of the compensation scheme, it is not proposed to specify a comprehensive list of crimes, the victims of which may apply for compensation. Broadly speaking, however, applications are likely to arise either out of offenses against the person, such as murder, manslaughter, assault and sexual offenses; from offenses against property accompanied by personal violence—principally robbery; or from personal injuries due to malicious damage to property, including arson.

Some types of cases are excluded altogether: motoring offenses, except where the vehicle has been used in a deliberate attempt to run the victim down; and offenses committed against members of a household where the person is living.

It is made clear that the board will take into account any share of responsibility attaching to the victim of the crime.

This was a fundamental point on which everyone who had studied the problem agreed. The board would have before it not only the applicant's own version but the relevant circumstances obtained from the police. This would be particularly important in cases such as a public house brawl or a fight between rival gangs.

As to the New Zealand statute, the Criminal Injuries Compensation Act was enacted October 24, 1963, to become effective on January 1, 1964.

As its title indicates, the act provides for the compensation of victims of certain crimes of violence. The responsibility for compensation to the extent provided for is undertaken by the state, with provision for recovery from the offender where practicable.

Compensable crimes can be broadly grouped under the headings of homicide, assaults and woundings, and sexual offenses of violence. The offenses concerned are set out in a schedule to the act.

A crimes compensation tribunal consisting of three members, of whom one shall be a barrister or solicitor of not less than 7 years practice, is created.

With respect to the award and payment of compensation, the statute provides generally that where any person is injured or killed by any act or omission of any other person which is within the description of any of the offenses in the schedule, the tribunal in its discretion, on application, may make an order for the payment of compensation to or for the benefit of the injured person or to any person responsible for the victim's maintenance.

Where the tribunal decides to make an order for the payment of compensation it may, within certain ceilings, award such amount as it thinks fit.

In this country, there does not appear to be in existence at the National or State level a law or plan directly in point. Restitution or reparation may be required of the defendant by the Federal Government and by some of the States in certain situations. Under Federal law, a criminal court, when suspending sentence, may require the defendant to make restitution or reparation to the aggrieved party or parties for actual damages or loss caused by the offense for which he was convicted.

The States have not all adopted the same system, and various rules apply to one who is the victim of a criminal wrong.

The outstanding and most universal system of restitution permits the compromise of misdemeanors, for which an offender is brought before a magistrate, and for which the injured victim has a remedy by means of a civil action.

In some jurisdictions either the property must be returned or its value must be paid to the owner; and others require the payment of double the value of the property, in addition to a fine or imprisonment. Double or treble damages in addition to a fine or imprisonment in criminal proceedings is frequently found in the criminal codes of the States.

A compensation plan for victims of crime has support in this country. Its chief proponent is Mr. Justice Goldberg of the U.S. Supreme Court who, in his James Madison Lecture at New York University School of Law in February of this year, urged study of systems under which a government would compensate victims of crime. The victim of a robbery or an assault, he said, has been denied the "protection" of the laws in a very real sense, and society should assume some responsibility for making him whole.

Gentlemen, I, too, believe that we should give serious consideration to the formulation and adoption of some plan to compensate victims of crime. I think the time has come for the greatest, richest, most powerful Nation on earth and the States which compose it, each in its own sphere, to recognize the justice of the claim of its citizens wronged by criminal acts against the person. If our criminology, science, education, and conduct were sufficiently advanced, we would not suffer the rash of crimes against the person which are mushrooming in our society.

In my opinion such plans in America should go beyond the theory of that proposed in England. I would not regard such payments as charity, like the theory on old-age pension. The Government owes a higher duty to protect its citizens from criminal conduct, in a dual way, both in prevention of general criminal activity in our society and in specific protection of its citizens against individual injury.

In 1962 there were 8,404 cases of murder and nonnegligent manslaughter in America, and 155,938 cases of persons intentionally personally injured. If we are to allow such rates of criminal action against the person to continue to increase, we must meet our collective responsibilities to the injured.

I believe in an approach to this problem of governmental responsibility rather than mere charity.

If a person is murdered, raped, maimed or feloniously assaulted, we give the person accused of the crime protection in every way, at Government expense, if need be. The Government furnishes him an attorney, psychiatrists, and other sanity experts, medical attention if he is injured in his crime or becomes ill in jail.

But what of the family of the murdered person? What of a person feloniously assaulted, maimed or raped, and left with a broken body because of the criminal action? What protection does the Government, meaning "we, the people," furnish them?

The answer is none. But it is time to move in America, and to give a positive answer to this question.

We are the world's industrial, military, and commercial leaders. We should be its leaders also in the system of justice we build for our own people.

Let justice, rather than raw might and power alone, become a hallmark of America. As the late John F. Kennedy said: "The energy, the faith, the devotion which we bring to this endeavor will light our country and all who serve it—and the glow from that fire can truly light the world."

You in the Plaintiffs' Attorneys Association individually and collectively, are working to extend the boundaries of responsibility for wrongful act in America—you reach for a remedy for each wrong.

Now it is time for you to help reach to the Government itself for those remedies—by waiver of sovereign immunity, and by the acceptance by Government of liability for injuries from wrongful criminal act.

The furthering of justice in these fields will help light our country, and the glow from that fire can truly help light the world.

APPROPRIATION NEEDED TO PREVENT SCREWWORM REINFESTATION OF FREE AREAS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, a screwworm eradication program of major importance to the Southwestern cattle industry has been successfully conducted by the Department of Agriculture, in cooperation with the State and the cattlemen whose livelihoods are so directly affected.

There is a need for continuation of this program. Unless it is continued by the establishment of a barrier zone against screwworms along the Mexican border, reinfestation of previously free acres will occur.

The screwworm lays its eggs in the open wounds of range stock—such as those from cuts by barbed wire. The result is fatal to the animal and disastrous to the cattlemen.

Soon, all local funds will have been exhausted; and the threat of reinfestation by the screwworm faces the cattle industry at a time when it is already plagued with unbearably excessive meat imports into this country—a matter which also needs congressional attention, and which many of us in Congress are working to obtain.

I have appealed to the Senate Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations, under the able chairmanship of the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. Holland], for favorable consideration of an appropriation of $5½ million, to continue the screwworm eradication program.

This letter sets forth the reasons for securing additional funds for a program in which this Nation already has a very sound investment.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

July 20, 1964.

Hon. Spessard L. Holland,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Agriculture Appropriations, 1235 New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: I am deeply concerned with the present situation in the Southwest regarding the Department of Agriculture's screwworm eradication program. Soon local funds supporting this highly successful project will be depleted with no prospect of additional funds to match the Federal appropriation. This has placed the future of the program in jeopardy.

The project has been highly successful to date, and the research findings have convinced me that this menace can at last be eliminated in the United States. The Southeastern States have been freed from screwworm infestation, while in the Southwest it was to some extent contained in 1963.

Now we are faced with an international problem. The gains made in the Southwest and the success experienced in the Southeast are constantly threatened by reinfestation from the Republic of Mexico. The proposed plan for keeping the United States free from reinfestation from Mexico is to establish a barrier zone along the border in which sterile flies can be systematically distributed. This proposed barrier zone is a national responsibility and cannot be accomplished by the State of Texas, nor by local interests.

The request in this regard is for the appropriation of $5,500,000 with no requirement of local matching. This sum is sufficient for the continuation of a highly effective program of great importance to the Southwest. Unless the Department of Agriculture can assume responsibility for the program, the $12 million investment which has been made may be sacrificed and the gains made in screwworm eradication will be lost.

I shall be happy to supply additional information and urge your subcommittee's favorable consideration of this matter.

Sincerely yours,
Ralph W. Yarborough.

COFFEE AGREEMENT WILL SOLVE ONE PROBLEM BY CREATING ANOTHER

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, H.R. 8864 purports to implement the International Coffee Agreement of 1962.

When the Senate gave its advice and consent to the ratification of this treaty on May 21, 1963, there were doubts as to whether this agreement would be in the best interest of the United States. The pending legislation recalls and renews those reservations.

Any international commodity treaty is a mixture of economic and diplomatic purposes. This coffee agreement is no exception.

Economically, the stated purpose of the agreement is to keep the price of coffee stable, by placing a floor under its price in the world market.

Diplomatically, the unstated purpose of the agreement is to provide for stable coffee prices for many Latin and South American nations having a one-crop economy, thereby providing for a stable government.

Mr. President, that treaty and this legislation would solve one problem by creating another. While the treaty and H.R. 8864 would place a floor under world coffee prices, it would establish no ceiling. Price stability would be achieved only below a certain price. Above the international price-support level, fluctuations are probable and possible. The United States, as the purchaser of 52 percent of the world's supply of coffee, as the largest coffee importer in the world, has a justifiable concern.

Mr. President, it should be noted that between the time when the treaty was ratified and the time when H.R. 8864 was made the pending business of the Senate, there has been an increase of 17 cents a pound—or 50 percent—in the wholesale price of coffee.

We are told that natural disasters in Brazil have reduced coffee stocks. But a shortage attributed to this cause is artificial. Brazil has a stored surplus sufficient to offset the past year's disaster.

Moreover, these facts were known to the International Coffee Council. The Council, however, refused to increase quotas, accepted the artificial shortage, and thereby raised the price for all—including the American consumer.

Under this treaty and legislation, a single producing and exporting nation, or a coalition of such countries, could limit supplies and could increase the world price.

Proponents of the treaty and the legislation claim that the United States has sufficient influence as the largest coffee importer and enough votes on the International Coffee Council to be able to prevent actions which would be adverse to our consumer interest and our rising cost-of-living index.

In answer to this assertion, it should be noted that our voting power on the International Coffee Council is not equal to our percentage of imports or to our interest in the world coffee market. Second, in the first test—the quota problem due to the Brazilian shortage—our representatives were unable to prevent the increase.

Proponents of the treaty and the legislation assert that the United States could always "swing a vote" by exerting greater diplomatic pressure. Such a move would indeed be a poor substitute for appropriate voting power, and would be certain to result in a loss of trust and friendship with our Latin American neighbors.

Proponents of the treaty and this legislation claim that defeat of this implementing legislation would be inconsistent with our pledges under the Alliance for Progress. It is true that we have promised to promote stable and strong economies in Latin America.

The inconsistency, however, lies in the possible detrimental effects of this treaty on the economy of the United States. In order for the United States to promote and encourage stable and strong economies abroad, we must have one ourselves.

Enactment of this legislation could be another element of disruption to the U.S. economy, as much as it would be an element of stabilization to the Latin American economies.

Proponents of the treaty and the legislation point out that the United States can always withdraw from the agreement, after serving a 90-day notice of such intention. Technically, this is true. Yet such an argument discounts diplomatic pressures. A better answer is the rejection of this bill.

CUTTING COSTS OF ARCTIC OIL DEVELOPMENT

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, over a year ago, I introduced Senate bill 1496. This measure would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to produce and sell crude oil from the Umiat field, Navy Petroleum Reserve No. 4, with the purpose of making local fuel available for limited use in oil and gas exploration now being carried on north of the Brooks Range, in Arctic Alaska. A companion measure was introduced in the House by Congressman Ralph Rivers.

Yesterday, the Senate gave its final approval to this measure; and it is on its way to the President, for his signature. I believe this measure, although not a major piece of legislation, will contribute in a significant manner to the development of the newest and most significant industry in Alaska: oil. Alaska's burgeoning oil industry has been, until now, largely concentrated in the southwestern part of the State. There are at the present time 66 producing wells in the Swanson River and in the Kenai and Sterling fields. Soon there will be additional producing wells in the Cook Inlet region.

These resources are both rich and extensive; their development will be of great assistance to Alaska's economic advancement.

Far to the north, however, deep within the Arctic Circle, over the Brooks Range, there lie oil and gas reserves which may be of even greater import. These may, according to the New York Times, even rival the resources of the Arab Peninsula.

The bill passed yesterday will assist in the exploration and development of these great resources.

Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 4 lies in the center of this region rich in oil potential. The Umiat oil field, which is part of the reserve, was discovered in 1945. Eight successful wells have been drilled. This field, completely held by the Navy, is estimated to contain at least 50 million barrels of recoverable oil. Although this is recoverable oil, and although there are even now wells and pumps on the site, there has been no recovery. The oil is not used, nor is the equipment, although it is kept in a condition of standby readiness. The wells at Umiat are comparatively shallow ones. The oil produced will fuel diesel engines or stoves just as it comes from the ground. No treatment or processing of any kind is necessary.

The bill provides that the oil as it comes out of the ground may be sold to companies doing exploration and development work in the field, to be used to fuel their drill rigs and to keep their equipment warm and operable in the freezing temperatures of winter.

At the present time, fuel costs constitute the largest single expense in Arctic exploration work. Recently, a gas well was drilled in the nearby Gubik area. The fuel costs of this operation exceeded by 20 percent the drilling costs.

All fuel oil used on the Arctic slopes must be flown in from Fairbanks, 450 miles away, or barged in during the summer from Norman Wells, in Canada, 1,000 miles away. Costs range from 93 cents to $1.30 a gallon. A barrel of oil selling for $3 in Anchorage will cost in excess of $35 at Umiat.

The Navy has petroleum ready and available. Two of its wells are in operating condition. The drilling rig, the pumping unit, and the diesel engine are installed at the wellhead. This oil is now available without additional expense to the Government.

The sale of Umiat oil would be made at no cost to the Government; in fact, it is expected that the Government will receive a profit from the operation. It is contemplated that the oil would be sold in the ground, with the purchaser being obliged to pump it from the existing productive wells, for limited use, and only for companies exploring the area. The sale would be through competitive bids, and all proceeds would be clear profit to the Government.

The Government will gain more than money from the development of a commercial oil field in the Arctic. At the present time, the Navy has its oil and its field, but no means of transporting the oil from the field to wherever it might be needed. A commercial oil field must develop practical means of transporting the oil out of the Arctic—either by pipeline or by tanker, or by a combination of the two. When this is done, the Navy will then have means of access to its supplies of crude oil within the reserve, which then would be available for use in time of emergency. Development of a commercial oil field in the Arctic will thus be of substantial value to the Navy's oil field, as well.

There is no intention of putting the Navy in the oil-selling business, in competition with private enterprise. Disposition of the oil is to be made only in the immediate area of Umiat, and only for the purpose of supporting oil exploration operations. The authority to make such sales is to expire January 1, 1969. It is not contemplated that by means of this bill the Navy should have any but temporary authority to sell oil.

Alaska is rich in natural resources which have yet to be developed. In the years to come, Alaska will be rich, in fact—but not until her resources are developed. The bill finally passed yesterday will assist in this; and, as such, it will be to the benefit of both Alaska and the Union.

OAS MINISTERS MEETING ON CUBAN SANCTIONS

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, today in Washington there opens an event that should have an immense impact upon the future of the Western Hemisphere and particularly upon the fortunates of Cuban-based communism. Today in the salubrious chambers of the Pan American Union Building, 19 of the 20 member states of the OAS begin deliberations on a resolution calling for sanctions against "Doctor" Castro's Communist empire.

The meeting of Latin American foreign ministers, augmented by a Mexican Ambassador, will consider a question which stripped of its tinsel and euphamization is simply: Will the Inter-American Organization which ostensibly represents the peaceful aspirations of 400 million people continue to condone acts of aggression and lawlessness by Communist Cuba, or will the Organization of all the free Americas, with the United States as its helm, take significant actions against the malignancy that infests our hemisphere?

Despite the fact that the press has virtually ignored this meeting, the decisions emanating from it could be of tremendous importance in the free world's struggle against communism.

Under the terms of the Rio Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance the Latin American ministers have a limitless latitude of choice. They could vote to make war against Cuba, which is unlikely; or they could vote to do nothing whatsoever about the formal charge of aggression entered by Venezuela. If the U.S. position prevails they may do the latter. If the Venezuelan and Costa Rican positions triumph the vote could favor strong sanctions—probably the termination of diplomatic, trade, and communications links between the continent and the Pearl of the Antilles. Hopefully the stronger view will seek the most articulate champions. Realistically the meeting can be expected to produce some sort of compromise the exact degree of which concerns this Nation vitally.

I was privileged last March 3 to read into the RECORD almost the entire text of the OAS indictment which is the basis for this meeting. The report was masterfully prepared—comprehensive, completely documented, and absolutely unchallengeable.

The facts of Castro's aggressions against Latin America—particularly Venezuela—are too well known to require elaboration now.

This meeting gets underway only 3 days after Captive Nations Week. Since the ministers are to determine or at least discuss the future of the newest and most sorely oppressed of the captive nations I think it behooves us to dwell a moment on the week past and to propound at least four points of inquiry:

First. Why are the captive nations captive?

Second. To whom are the captive nations indebted for their involuntary servitude?

Third. What are we doing about their plight?

Fourth. Who will be the next captive nation?

The ploy that ceded the bulk of Eastern Europe to communism at the end of World War II was pathetically simple. The Soviets dropped an Iron Curtain "from Stettin in the Baltic to Trieste in the Adriatic"—as Winston Churchill phrased it. The curtain encompassed nine nations. There soon followed China on the Asian land mass and 10 years later, Cuba.

Today there are captive nations on three—and possibly four—continents. And as the administration continues its assurances that the dynanism of communism's advance has been blunted by Khrushchev's smile, nations throughout Latin America, Asia, and Africa face that moment that will determine whether their future holds freedom, or captivity.

The "why" of the captive nations then is basically that communism wanted to bring nearly a billion people under its hegomony more than the free world which takes its signals from the United States, wanted to secure their liberty.

The decision affecting the peoples to whom Captive Nations Week is consecrated are made in Moscow and Peiping—not Washington.

In his book, "Protracted Conflict," author Max Eastman points out:

> The measure of success of Communist strategy is that the Reds have gained control of region, heretofore, firmly held by the Western Powers—without provoking a counterattack by the West. The West has been willing to give a round and take a round, but the result has been a steady loss of power.

This lesson is patent in a study of recent history and yet the administration fails to realize that every tactical offensive we launch has been not to advance the cause of freedom but to maintain a previous status quo which intrinsically favors the enemy.

I submit, Mr. President, that in the face of a patently spurious threat emanating from a nation that never once has used force against a major power to fulfill her illicit desires, we have forfeited the freedom of more than one-third of the people on this earth.

Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Albania, Bulgaria, Outer Mongolia, Yugoslavia, Poland, Rumania, Czechoslovakia, North Korea, Hungary, East Germany, Mainland China, Tibet, North Vietnam, and Cuba: these are some of the captive nations. They owe their captivity as much to American duplicity, timidity, and indecision as to the conquestodorial aspirations of their Communist masters.

One year ago I took the floor to point out that "the last remaining colonial empire in the world is ruled by the Soviet Union. It is the cruelest, the most oppressive and the least responsive to the legitimate aspirations of the captive people." I opined that "freedom will not come to the captive nations unless the United States exerts unrelenting pressure to drive the wedge of freedom into the cracks of discontent that are appearing in the Iron Curtain." I believe, Mr. President, that those assertions are still credible today.

I ventured the thought also on that occasion that "the ultimate objective of communism is to add the bastion of freedom, America, to its growing list of captive nations. Whether or not they succeed will depend not on our readiness to accommodate ourselves to their chicanery but on our strength, our courage, and our dedication to the eventual freedom of all mankind. We must never place ourselves in a position of surrendering freedom for a compromising peace."

We are today seeking a compromising peace and we are failing to acknowledge the substantive distinction between peace and freedom. We observe Captive Nations Week, not in the hope of bringing peace to the captive nations, for they have peace, a Communist peace, circa 1964.

Captive Nations Week, pursuant to the joint resolution of July 17, 1959, involves itself not a whit with peace. It commits the United States absolutely to the principle of absolute freedom—to "the cause of freedom and justice everywhere," as this year's proclamation phrases it.

I should like to interject at this point, Mr. President, that I was struck by the text of the Captive Nations Week proclamation. Nowhere in its 8 paragraphs and 21 lines did it identify the jailor of the captive nations. There is no reference to Russia or to Peiping or even to Cuba. There is one declarative sentence, which is certainly commendable, but were a stranger to apprise himself of Captive Nations Week by reading the President's proclamation, he would be sorely pressed to identify the nations, the captives, or the circumstances which created them.

Mr. President, some 6,000 Cubans attempt every month to flee Castro's police state. About one-third of them reach safety. The other 4,000 are either swallowed up by the sea or are executed by Castro for their efforts.

I recently interviewed the chairman of the Committee of Cuban Jurists of Washington, D.C., Dr. Juan Lliteras, and in the words of this articulate and knowledgeable attorney and author:

> There are thousands, constantly, that are escaping in small boats with small children, and women. Most of these people do not belong to the upper classes or the middle classes which have long since abandoned the country or been killed. These are working people. We realize that there must be terrible conditions inside Cuba. People simply cannot stand it. Recently one boat was found carrying 17 persons, among them 5 women and 4 children. Of these only one was alive when the boat reached Jamaica. The captain of a boat that travels the Caribbean said recently there is not a single trip in which he does not find several refugee boats bullet riddled, full of dead bodies and bodies floating around. Nevertheless, we hear nothing about these terrible things that are happening.

In the words of Premier Castro's sister, who defected recently, the people of Cuba have been nailed to a "cross of torment" and all of Latin America is endangered by the Communist apparatus headquartered in Havana.

The third of our four inquiries—what are we going to do about the captive nations—is easier to ask than to answer.

Essential to any victory over communism and hence the freedom of the captive peoples is a cognizance that, in the words of Max Eastman:

> Communist theory holds that the whole world is a battlefield upon which opposing forces are locked in a conflict of indefinite duration * * * to the Communists what we call peace is merely war conducted by other than military means.

The first step toward a termination of the enslavement of the captive nations becomes then the realization that we are engaged in a mortal struggle for the future of our society; our philosophy of government, which is the foundation of all contemporary representative governments; and indeed the future of mankind itself.

Such an admission would constitute an ipso facto indictment of the preposterous anomalies which find the United States condemning the sale of buses to Cuba in the same breath drawn to announce the sale of wheat to Russia.

Wheat sales to the Soviet Union and its satellites are only a part of the new accommodation line toward world communism. Georgetown University professor, Dr. Lev Dobriansky, speaking on the Georgetown University Forum July 12, said:

> I think one of the greatest faults on really a most serious intellectual error that's going to drive us into considerable danger in months or maybe years to come is the present orientation of our policy accommodating the various regimes in Central Europe, in my judgment, with the illusions of thinking that they will wean them away from Moscow completely and as a consequence bring about freedom and independence for the people; namely, the Nation itself. Instead, we will, I think * * * find ourselves working for the entrenchment of these regimes against the peoples, the nations, and in aggregate really helping the entire Communist empire.

The fundamental question of "Which way the captive nations?" was answered in part by another program speaker, Freedom Facts editor, Donald Miller:

> The people who have studied revolution thoroughly over the years have come to the conclusion that three elements are necessary in a change of this kind. One is a strong desire for freedom or strong desire for independence among the people in the countries involved. Second is a weakness in the ruling regime—inability of the regime to apply their full coercive force. And the third is an outside power which at one hand is encouraging people within captive nations to express their freedom and speak it, and on the other hand it's seeking to weaken the power of the ruling regimes to enforce their dominion over these people.

The question of captive nations did not end with the Captive Nations Week. It will certainly not end with this week's OAS meeting in Washington, but it might be brought a step closer to a solution.

Several thousand Cuban exiles are in Washington today, Mr. President, to "vote with their feet" in support of a firm position by the OAS. The exiles will meet near the Washington Monument and proceed in midafternoon to the site of the Conference, there to present a petition to the ministers.

These exiles harbor no illusions as to the outcome of this Conference. As one of their spokesmen put it in a statement released to the press today:

> If after 5 years of servitude and incredible suffering at the hands of their Communist oppressors, the rights of the Cuban people have not been recognized, we would be less than candid were we to expect that the Inter-American Conference meeting in Washington today will break their shackles.

The Cuban statement continues by saying:

> We have long learned the bitter lesson taught by our apostle, Jose Marti: "Liberty is not to be begged. It must be conquered, by freemen."

The Cubans with whom I have spoken have their own reply to the fourth point of my original inquiries. In their opinion, if America would take cognizance of the lessons of recent history and recognize the imminent and very real danger facing the United States and the free world, there would be no new partners to the ignominious confederation of captive nations and Cuba would be freed.

As to their own situation, the Cubans who are marching on Washington today make this statement:

> In this war against the forces of evil, we labor under no illusions; we are counting neither on governments nor on international bodies. Our faith is pinned on man alone—man, fashioned after the likeness of God and who thus must ever aspire and struggle to be free.

It is to be sincerely hoped that the message of these Cubans will be heard by the ministers meeting in Washington today, especially by the American representatives, for there is much at stake here.

I turn again to the exiles for a summation of the question: Whether this despotism implanted in Cuba, while our friends looked away, is to overwhelm America; whether the Red tide, already lapping these shores, is to engulf us all, time shall tell. Time shall tell whether liberty, born in America, is to perish in America.

SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE ORVILLE FREEMAN TOURS WEST VIRGINIA SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICTS AND STRIP MINE RECLAMATION PROJECTS—STATE PROGRAM DEMONSTRATES DYNAMIC NATIONAL LEADERSHIP

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, in my view there are few opportunities more satisfying than those afforded to observe the dedicated efforts of officials and citizens engaged cooperatively in making the soil conservation program the workable and useful instrumentality that it has become throughout the country.

Because of our terrain contours and because of the further fact that we have substantial extractive natural resource industrial operations in West Virginia, we have a special need for the best practices and the most aggressive efforts in soil conservation.

These are activities in which I have had a special interest and concern over a long span of time.

Yesterday, Mr. President, the West Virginia soil conservationists and the program to which they are dedicated received the acclaim, the encouragement, and the cooperation to which they are entitled.

The occasion was the sixth annual tridistrict tour on Monday, July 20, sponsored by the West Fork, Tygarts Valley, and Monongahela Soil Conservation Districts, with six additional districts as guests and participants.

The principal inspiration was provided by the diligent, dedicated, and capable U.S. Secretary of Agriculture, the Honorable Orville L. Freeman, whom I was privileged to accompany on his much appreciated West Virginia all day visit. We were joined by Donald A. Williams, Administrator of the Department of Agriculture's Soil Conservation Service, and Gordon Zimmerman, executive secretary of the National Association of Water Conservation Districts.

A tour in Lewis County to observe strip mine reclamation work was conducted during the morning, with Luther Britton, secretary of the West Virginia Association of Soil Conservation Districts, as the leader. At the Yates-Norris farm, Mr. Britton discussed with clarity, "The Soil Conservation District's Part in Reclamation of Surface Mine Spoil." Harold Gregoire, reclamation inspector for the West Virginia Department of Natural Resources, helpfully explained the responsibilities of this department in enforcement and reclamation. State Director W. F. Eigenbrod, of the State department of mines, stated well the responsibilities of his department in the reclamation program.

When the group moved to the Laura Evans farm, Dr. A. H. VanLandingham, director of the West Virginia University Experiment Station, spoke knowingly of the role of the experiment station in revegetation of mine spoil. Everett R. Leadbetter, State soil conservationist for the soil conservation service, discussed factually the planning for reclamation of surface mine spoil. And Thomas B. Evans, State conservationist for the soil conservation service, gave a graphic summary of the stabilization work.

During the noon hour, Secretary Freeman and those in his party were honored at the pavilion of the beautiful 4-H camp at Jackson's Mill, near Weston, where the farm women from several counties served luncheon to a large gathering which grew to over 600 persons at the program which followed.

Clarence Jackson, president of the West Virginia Association of Soil Conservation Districts, delivered the welcome message and introduced this Senator, affording me the privilege of presenting Secretary Freeman for the third time in our State.

The former Governor of Minnesota was the Shepherd College commencement orator and also the featured honor guest speaker at the Elkins Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. President, I shall ask subsequently for permission to have excerpts from the thought-provoking speech of the able Secretary of Agriculture printed in the RECORD. It was a gratefully received and much-appreciated message on the role and the future of rural America.

At the conclusion of his address, Secretary Freeman was introduced to the boards of supervisors of the nine participating soil conservation districts. He then signed a memorandum of understanding between the U.S. Department of Agriculture and each of the following boards: West Fork, Tygarts Valley, Monongahela, Elk, Potomac Valley, Little Kanawha, Upper Ohio, Guyan, and Southern.

Following these ceremonies, the Secretary and party were joined by conservation officials and citizens from many areas in a watershed development tour, visiting installations completed and under construction in the Polk Creek watershed west of Weston in Lewis County.

Paul Butcher, Sr., president, and Raymond Squires, treasurer, of the Polk Creek Watershed Association, led an informative discussion of local participations in watershed activities. Mr. Squires spoke also as a member of the county court of Lewis County, a group most earnest in its support. Subsequently, Jack Busfield of the Salt Lick Watershed Association and a veteran soil conservation district leader, related the soil conservation districts and the watershed program in the final discussion of the tour.

Special recognition should be given the efforts of Chester Cunningham, secretary of the Tri-District Soil Conservation Association. Mr. Cunningham was instrumental in the planning and coordination of many events included in this worthwhile tour.

Mr. President, the leadership and inspiration supplied by Secretary Freeman, the demonstration of dedication, teamwork, and enthusiasm demonstrated by all who participated in the program—and by the directors of the soil conservation districts and watershed associations—reinforce our conviction that West Virginia will maintain its consistent record of leadership in the vital work of reclamation. In the spirit of coordinated cooperation we are striving to insure a more meaningful future for citizens of the Mountain State and of the Nation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from statements by officials participating in the sixth annual tridistrict tour, together with excerpts from an address by Secretary Freeman on that occasion, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM REMARKS OF HAROLD C. GREGOIRE, RECLAMATION INSPECTOR, DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES, STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA

In 1961 West Virginia's Legislature created the reclamation division in the department of natural resources. All land and water aspects of surface mining reclamation was placed under the jurisdiction of this division.

The reclamation division is responsible for regrading to insure proper drainage and revegetation of all affected areas where surface mining has been conducted. I emphasize the importance of the regrading process in minimizing soil erosion and water pollution.

The entire program of reclamation in West Virginia is based on cooperation between the State departments of natural resources, the Bureau of Mines, the Soil Conservation Service, and the soil conservation districts.

EXCERPTS FROM A STATEMENT BY HON. DON A. WILLIAMS, ADMINISTRATOR, U.S. SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

West Virginia has taken the lead among the Appalachian States in its strip mine reclamation work. Here is a wonderful evidence of cooperation on privately owned lands through team effort. Strip mine operators are financing the vegetating of spoil areas by contracting with local soil conservation districts for the tree, shrub, grass, and legume planting. This work is done in conformity with the requirements of the State department of natural resources and as planned by the U.S. Soil Conservation Service. Excellent results have been obtained at reasonable cost. This cooperative and voluntary approach benefits all concerned and may well be an example for other States having this kind of problem.

TWENTY-FIVE YEARS OF STRIP MINING

(Excerpts from a statement by W. F. Eigenbrod, director, West Virginia Department of Mines)

For over a quarter of a century West Virginia has had a strip mine law. During World War II this method of procuring coal was widely used because of its speed and convenience, and even then the need for reclamation was noted.

John G. Hall, of Reedsville, was a pioneer in this vital work. Too often, strip mining resulted in harmful erosion and water pollution, and various State agencies began the tasks of regulation, control, and reclamation.

During the course of this experimentation it became evident that special techniques were required in this effort at all levels of planning and implementation. Today, with the cooperation of the soil conservation districts and Soil Conservation Service technicians reclamation plans have been developed and well over 90 percent of revegetation planting is being done by the districts.

The success of our programs was recognized at a recent meeting attended by representatives of 20 Eastern States. It is worthwhile to note that West Virginia was the only State with a functioning plan for the reclamation of barren areas which have for some reason been overlooked. This procedure, now written into law, calls for cooperation between strip mine operators and the State and has proven a significant source of conservation revenue.

In 1961 the department of natural resources assumed responsibility for the reclaiming of strip mined areas. The department of mines maintained supervision as long as the production of coal continues. The department administers all mine operation to insure safe working conditions, preserve life, limb, and property, and to protect our natural resources.

ROLE OF WEST VIRGINIA UNIVERSITY AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATION IN REGULATION OF MINE SPOIL

(Excerpts from a statement by A. H. VanLandingham, director, Agricultural Experiment Station)

The experiment station is involved in research dealing with the many factors related to the handling of spoil material, grading drainage, and the treatment of spoil for planting. We are also concerned with the evaluation of plant materials, trees, grasses, and vines which are most suitable for use in spoil areas. We seek to improve methods of material handling resulting from planning of mining operations.

The experiment station, through the State land reclamation specialist (a member of the station staff), serves as a liaison between agencies and individuals with interest or responsibility in strip mine reclamation work.

Excerpts From a Statement by Thomas B. Evans, State Conservationist, Soil Conservation Service

As I listened to the splendid presentations by Luther Britton, Harold Gregoire, Dr. VanLandingham, and Everett Leadbetter, I could think of no better way to summarize than to accent the cooperative effort which has resulted in bringing thousands of devastated acres back to the condition of these you have seen today.

Such a change does not come about automatically. Because we have people with vision to see the need for the future and the gumption to fight for what they believe, we have in West Virginia one of the finest strip mine reclamation laws in the Nation. The reclamation work is financed by the organizations that cause the problem, i.e., the strip mine operators themselves.

West Virginia is a beautiful State and its beautiful green hills and rushing streams are among its main scenic attractions. Ugly scars caused by strip mining operations adversely effect the image West Virginia is endeavoring to project to tourists and vacationers. Likewise, silt from spoil areas has clogged many small streams and damaged much good farm bottom land, and streams and reservoirs have been polluted from mine acids. On the other hand, strip mining is an established industry and represents employment and profits. Therefore, one industry is in direct competition with the other. Reclaiming strip mined areas is a way of mitigating the extreme differences between the two.

Although our laws are good and the cooperation between agencies is excellent, we should not rest on our laurels but continue to strive to improve in the years ahead.

Address by Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman at Jackson's Mill, W. Va., During Annual Conservation Tour Sponsored by the West Fork, Tygarts Valley, and Monongahela Soil Conservation Districts, July 20, 1964

I have come here today to talk to you about something very close to my heart: the future of rural America—a future that holds the promise of a better life for people in town and country alike—a promise that is well within our grasp because for the first time in the history of mankind our society is now capable of producing enough for all.

The outpouring of our farms and factories has created an order of plenty, a new world of potential abundance in America. Since early 1961, this Nation has achieved a new pinnacle of affluence. Industrial production has increased by a fourth. Income per farm is up 16 percent. Unemployment has fallen to its lowest point in 7 years, and employment is now at a record high of over 71.7 million jobs. Wages and salaries have increased 19 percent. Personal income after taxes is up 18 percent over the 1960 level.

The brave and difficult decision to cut taxes has produced the results hoped for. Private business has responded with aggressive leadership.

The greatest peacetime expansion of our economy in this century is underway.

President Johnson has challenged us to use this wealth to enrich and advance the quality of American civilization * * * to build a great society founded on abundance, quality and education * * * a society in which there no longer will be a place for scarcity, racial injustice and ignorance. He has held out to us the vision of a society in which all of the benefits of our affluence will be available to all Americans.

When the President talks about the great society, he is talking about all of society. His vision is America in its totality, not just part of it.

The challenge of achieving the President's goal is greater in many ways in rural America than it is in urban areas.

Nearly one out of three persons in rural America lives in poverty—a much greater proportion than is found in urban areas. Public services in rural communities still lag behind those in our cities.

The quality of education often is inferior and the economic opportunities fewer. And despite the 16 percent increase in net income per farm since 1960, the average farmer still earns 40 percent less than individuals in other lines of work.

This must not continue.

We have the makings and we have the ability to build a great society in rural America.

How then do we go about it?

The answer is: We don't—you do. Neither the President, nor I, nor any other official in Washington is going to draft a plan of action. That is up to you—the people, and that is why I came here today and why I have sounded a call to action in rural communities from one end of this country to the other. You must draw up your own plans for progress, for a society can be no greater than the deeds, the imagination, the desires of its people. It is up to you to lead, and your Government to respond, by providing the extra financial and technical resources that you need to reach your goal.

This working partnership between you and your democratically selected government at all levels—local, State and national—is the formula by which the great society can come into being from one end of America to the other.

In the great society, the wastage of America's precious land, water and forest resources will be brought to an end.

Here you already have made an important beginning.

Conservation projects such as those we are seeing today to reclaim strip mines * * * to harness floods * * * to provide recreation as well as improve farming * * * these are essential to rural progress and development.

But we must raise our sights even higher if we are to create the new dimension of living envisioned by the President. We must recapture the determination and zeal that drove the late Hugh Bennett to arouse the public for a crusade against the ravages of erosion, and wornout land, duststorms, and silted reservoirs. Today, that crusade must reach even further to encompass the great society.

Bennett's vision led to the formation of the Soil Conservation Service, and to the locally run and locally administered soil conservation districts that help individuals carry out conservation programs.

The operation of these districts has changed since they were first organized some 27 years ago. At first the aim of your districts was to control erosion—then you added water conservation—and now your concern encompasses water development, recreation, and rural development in all its aspects.

In West Virginia, over half the districts have expanded their programs and entered into new agreements with the Department—agreements that provide expanded service to the rural landowner. Today I will sign new agreements with 9 West Virginia districts covering some 41 counties.

But all of us—not just the district leaders—must broaden our understanding and objectives in resource planning. We must look at the whole resource job. We must move boldly into new fields. We must think as creatively and imaginatively, move as vigorously and work as hard as Hugh Bennett did so we may progress in the next 10 years as much as we have in the last 30 years.

The rural phases of the great society embrace a wide field, and vary from area to area, according to local needs.

But basically there are four great aims: To increase the number of fully adequate family farms; to create a wide range of jobs and economic opportunities that will allow people to live and work in rural America if they choose, rather than working in the city and rushing to the countryside each weekend to relax the spirit and body; to train and rehabilitate the former sharecroppers, the exminers, and others in new skills that will allow them to take their places in the world of tomorrow; and to build the public facilities that make a modern community.

This, in essence, is the opportunity our new abundance presents to rural America. This is the challenge and the opportunity that is ours in this decade of the sixties.

How, then, do we build this great society?

This is the challenge which nearly 100,000 local citizens through rural America are already beginning to meet through the Rural Areas Development, or RAD, effort.

RAD is a people's program. It was undertaken by the people of rural America to redirect the forces of change that pushed many communities to the brink of economic oblivion, to redirect these forces so that they work for the community, rather than against it. County development committees are a means by which local communities can pull together into a unified partnership effort all of the Federal and State programs that can help in this folk movement. Every soil conservation district is part of the rural development movement. So is every watershed district. So, too, is every other institution for economic advancement in rural America, from the local farmer cooperative to the community chamber of commerce.

The initiative and the leadership to put outstanding human resources to work is rapidly coming to the front. Already in all communities across the Nation real progress is taking place. Local RAD committees have completed 8,000 income- and job-producing projects in the last 3½ years, and another 8,000 are underway. More than 125,000 jobs have been created. Projects now underway will produce another 125,000.

A rural renaissance is already well underway.

Your national administration asked for and received new legislative authorities to make Federal programs more responsive to local needs—programs which President Johnson in his down to earth way describes as "good for the folks."

Local RAD committees, or county development committees, as they are called here in West Virginia, are bringing new industry to rural America to create jobs for those who cannot hope to make a living on the farm.

They are developing outdoor recreation areas as a new source of income for the family farmer and the rural community and to serve the growing urban need for recreation.

They are helping their communities obtain hospitals, water and sewer systems, and other community facilities to provide rural people with some of the services that are taken for granted in urban areas.

They are stimulating individuals and builders to construct new homes for senior citizens as well as young families.

They are obtaining Government training programs that permit their people to learn skills sought by employers in a modern, automated society.

They are promoting the organization of cooperatives to help rural residents broaden markets for their services, to give farmers more muscle in the market.

And they are encouraging shifts in land use to boost farm income.

For a specific example of how rural development works, we need look no further than the Polk Creek Watershed near Weston, which we shall visit this afternoon, or to the now completed Upper Graves Creek Watershed project at Cameron, W. Va.

Take the Upper Graves Creek project. Floods and drought alternately plagued Cameron—one threatening to wash away local resources, the other stalling economic growth.

The local conservation district got together with civic leaders in Cameron and developed what came to be the Nation's first multiple-purpose watershed project. It provided for municipal water storage as well as flood prevention.

That project is now complete. Last year in the midst of one of the worst droughts in the area's history, the Cameron Reservoir supplied all local needs, and water to neighboring communities as well.

But more than that, the health of the local economy has improved. A dependable water supply is attracting new industry—which means new jobs. And the community now is planning to develop a recreation area adjoining the reservoir, an added attraction for visitors.

The watershed project cost a little over $550,000. The Federal Government provided about $350,000 of that amount plus technical aid and assistance. But the key factor was the determination and leadership among local people who conceived, directed, and are maintaining what has become an irreplaceable community asset. This is what RAD means. Here we see rural renaissance underway.

Watershed projects are but one tool in the Department of Agriculture's total RAD partnership kit to help people help themselves. Other tools include a broadened loan program to encourage adequate housing, recreation, and community facilities; technical help in establishing income-producing recreation facilities; grants and cost sharing to convert land now producing excess crops to timber or recreation; resource conservation and development projects to stimulate conservation activities that improve the economy of a multicounty area; and rural renewal projects for areas where poverty is so widespread that it retards growth.

Other Federal and State agencies are valuable partners in this great movement—the Small Business Administration, the Area Redevelopment Administration, the Community Facilities Administration, the Corps of Engineers, the State departments of agriculture and conservation, just to name a few.

Often help comes from several sources engaged in a multiple partnership effort.

Here in West Virginia we have just given tentative approval to another project that is equally promising. It involves an $820,000 loan that will be used by a group of farm and rural residents to develop a large scale recreation area in Preston County, near Terra Alta. The project, to be known as Mountain Top Vacationland, will include facilitates for camping, fishing, hunting, skiing, boating, target ranges, nature trails, golf, and riding. This project will turn nearly 2,000 acres of land into a recreation complex that should attract thousands of outdoor recreationists to the area and greatly expand the economy of Terra Alta.

To develop such projects, of course, takes money. But I would like to point out that less than $1 in $10 invested in RAD projects comes from the Federal Government. And of that the vast majority is in the form of loans that are repaid with interest.

This is part of the essential process of recapitalizing the rural economy of diversifying its economic base to meet the challenge of abundance, just as farmers earlier diversified their crops to protect the soil and to achieve economic stability.

The return on this investment is going to be a stronger, more vital rural economy, and thus, a stronger, more vigorous national economy.

The time to launch this great partnership drive to revitalize rural America is long overdue. It is time for the people of this Nation to recall that it was our farms and rural communities that built this country in the first place. Exports of the products from our farms brought us the foreign funds we needed to carve a home out of the wilderness. They financed our westward expansion and the basic development of our industry. Moreover, as agriculture became progressively more productive, it was rural America that released the people needed to run the factories, invent the machines and perform the countless services that give us the highest standard of living known in the world today.

This paved the way for what has become our new order of abundance.

Now the time has come to balance the scales * * * to move resources and capital back into rural America.

In addition to the broadened economic development attack launched during the past 3½ years, two exciting new partnership measures to foster more rapid rural development are now on their way through Congress.

One of them is the Appalachian regional development bill. It would authorize construction of more than 2,100 miles of roads to open up this region to tourists and industry and it would accelerate construction of watershed projects and reservoirs.

It contains pasture and timber development programs. We estimate agricultural income of the area could be increased by up to $2 billion a year, an average increase of $360 to $500 per family throughout the region.

The other is the antipoverty legislation proposed by President Johnson. This legislation would carry out the promise of abundance that the late President Kennedy envisioned when he said in his inaugural address: "For man holds in his mortal hands the power to abolish all forms of human poverty."

The Job Corps, the work-training programs, and the work-study programs proposed in this bill would bring new opportunity to rural youths who will never have that opportunity otherwise.

The bill contains provisions for a community action program that would place new Federal resources at the disposal of local leaders * * * resources that would enable them to carry out development projects that have been shelved for a lack of financing or technical knowledge.

It also would provide special loans and grants for the 1 million farmers who are in what I call the "boxed-in" group. These are poverty-stricken farmers and tenants who, because of age, physical disability, or other problems, cannot be retrained to achieve success outside of farming. The proposed loans and grants would permit them to remain on the land where I assure you the vast majority want to stay, and also give them an opportunity to achieve more than a subsistence standard of living.

Other titles in this legislation would help us encourage and promote cooperatives to serve low-income rural families and tackle the problem of farmers without land.

The promise of the Appalachia and antipoverty program—as well as the promise of all the combined partnership efforts to develop new hope and opportunity in rural America—will not be realized easily or quickly. Rather, it will come as a gradual building of momentum from a thousand and one development projects in community after community throughout the land.

Working together—government and citizens can launch a rural renaissance of creative living that will be the propulsive force of the great society.

In the bountiful physical resources of rural America, we have the economic potential. In the people, we have the leadership.

Let us keep faith with those who came to this land in its formative years. They sought to build more than a new nation—they sought a new world and a new way of life, and they built it. But each generation must build its own new world. With this new age of automation, mechanization, and technology, we have it in our power to build a world in which there will be abundance for all.

President Johnson has said, "Your imagination, your initiative, your indignation will determine whether we build a society where progress is the servant of our needs, or a society where old values and new visions are buried under unbridled growth."

Let us as partners begin now to master progress—to build a society where man is assured not only his economic wants, but leisure to enjoy the out of doors, educational challenges to stimulate his mind, and an equal opportunity to enjoy the fruits of abundance.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

PROHIBITION OF TRADING IN IRISH POTATO FUTURES ON COMMODITY EXCHANGES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (S. 332) to prohibit trading in Irish potato futures on commodity exchanges.

AMENDMENT OF MERCHANT MARINE ACT OF 1936—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I understand that at the desk is a conference report on the amendment of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, H.R. 82. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 82) to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in order to provide for the reimbursement of certain vessel construction expenses. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Ribicoff in the chair). The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of July 28, 1964, p. 17214, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. **BARTLETT.** Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. **BARTLETT.** Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. **BARTLETT.** Mr. President, H.R. 82 amends the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to provide for the reimbursement of certain vessel construction expenses. Under the present law, any ship operator may apply to the Maritime Administration for a subsidy to construct a vessel in a shipyard in the United States. If the petition is approved, the construction contract is awarded the lowest bidder, except in those cases when the Government for purposes of national defense, allocates the contract to another shipyard. The basic purpose of H.R. 82 is to provide that if as a result of any allocation, the applicant incurs extra expenses for inspection and supervision and for the delivery voyage, the Secretary of Commerce is required to reimburse to the applicant on account of such excess. If a savings to the applicant results, a repayment to the Government is required under the bill. There was no opposition to the prospective features of this legislation.

However, the provisions of the bill also apply retroactively. This conference report pertains primarily to retroactive features of the bill and more specifically to a difference between the House and the Senate as to two amendments that were added by the Senate.

The first Senate amendment provided that no interest would be paid on any refund authorized under the act. The House receded in conference from its disagreement to this Senate amendment. However, the conference report of the House points out that the amendment was unnecessary.

The second amendment was not so easily resolved. Section 2 of the original House bill provided that the act would be retroactively effective but the Secretary of Commerce could not authorize any payment by the United States unless provision has been made for payment to the Secretary of any amounts which would be due the United States.

The Senate modified, with the amendment of the Senator from Ohio, the effect of section 2 by requiring that before any retroactive payment was made by the Government, first, all modifications of contracts entered into prior to the date of enactment which would result in a payment to the United States had been agreed to; and, second, each applicant agreeing to a retroactive modification of his contract has executed and filed with the Secretary an affidavit that he has not and will not receive any payment of any kind for agreeing to such modification or as reimbursement of such payment to the United States. The Senate amendment further provided that the provisions of section 1001 of title 18 of the United States Code would be applicable with respect to such affidavits.

The record shows that three applicants would be affected by the retroactive feature of the bill. Two of them incurred substantial extra expense for inspection and supervision during construction and for the delivery voyages as a result of the Government's decision to allocate construction of the vessels to shipyards other than the low bidder. One of them incurred less inspection, supervisory, and delivery expense by reason of the allocation than he would have if the construction had been performed by the low bidder. Two ships for American Export Lines were allocated for construction at San Diego, Calif., despite a low bid from a Camden, N.J., shipyard, and the allocation resulted in extra inspection costs estimated at $150,000 and delivery costs estimated at $120,000. Two ships for Moore-McCormack Lines were allocated to San Pedro, Calif., despite a low bid from a Chester, Pa., shipyard, and the allocation resulted in increased costs estimated at $140,000 for inspection services and $120,000 for delivery.

Two ships for American President Lines were allocated to San Francisco, the home port of American President Lines, despite a low bid from a Los Angeles shipyard, and the allocation is estimated to have saved American President Lines approximately $41,000.

I should add, however, that the $41,000 figure is purely in the realm of speculation at this time. I do not believe that the American President Lines agrees with that figure, neither is it one which the Government has insisted upon.

In respect to the second Senate amendment, the conference adopted a substitute. The conference substitute provides that no payment shall be made by the Secretary of Commerce with respect to any contract prospectively entered into unless the recipient of such payment has agreed to the modification of any prior contract which, if modified under the authority of the section, would result in a payment to the United States.

I believe that the conference substitute achieves the proper objectives of both the House bill and the Senate amendment, effectively and equitably.

In conference the House conferees were not willing to accept the language which had been adopted by the Senate. The substitute language which is now presented in the conference report was discussed and finally agreed to unanimously on the part of the House and in respect to two of the three Senate conferees.

I hope that the conference report will be adopted, because I believe that it represents a fair compromise, a compromise which is equitable insofar as the steamship lines are concerned, and also protective of the interests of the United States.

Mr. **PROUTY.** Mr. President, the purpose of this bill is to correct an unforeseen inequity to shipowners which results when the Government, for national defense purposes, assigns the construction of a new ship to a shipyard which was not the low bidder.

The background can be stated briefly. The basic policy of the Merchant Marine Act requires that ships built with a construction subsidy should be built by the lowest responsible bidder—and this bill would not change that policy, nor would it have any effect on it. However, the law permits an exception to the low bid policy. In cases where the Secretary of Commerce determines that certain shipyards need to be encouraged, he may assign, or allocate, the construction of a vessel to a shipyard which was not the lowest bidder. This exception has its roots in the national defense needs of the Nation. Defense considerations require that the Nation have effective and adequate shipyard capacity on all our seacoasts—Atlantic, Pacific, and gulf. The Secretary of Commerce was given the authority to allocate vessel construction in order to assure that adequate shipyard capacity was maintained in all these essential areas.

The need for the bill arises because recent experiences with the allocation of vessel construction have disclosed that it places unexpected and unfair burdens on the vessel owners, who, after all, are not really parties to the decision as to where the ship will be built. These added burdens have involved the expenses of maintaining additional inspection teams at distant shipyards and the cost of transporting the finished ship from the shipyard back to its home port.

The bill would authorize the Government to reimburse the vessel owner for these additional expenses—expenses which do not bring any benefits to the shipowner, but which were incurred solely as a result of a policy decision by the Federal Government.

The bill makes it perfectly clear that only the net increase in costs will be reimbursed. Furthermore, if the allocation results in reduced costs to the shipowner, the Federal Government will be the beneficiary of the saving.

Mr. President, only one small aspect of this whole problem was before the conferees: that was the question of the preconditions that must be met before a ship operator could be reimbursed for expenses he has already incurred in connection with the construction of a vessel which was assigned to a specific shipyard.

The issue is not whether the bill should be retroactive. Both the House and Senate approved retroactive application of the bill, which would affect three shipping companies. The only question was the technical one of the conditions which have to be met with respect to the one company which apparently incurred smaller inspection, supervisory, and delivery expenses by reason of the allocation than he would have if the construction had been performed by the low bidder.

The conferees of the House took very strong exception to the specific Senate language. They felt that the requirement for an affidavit subject to criminal penalties was both offensive and unnecessary. They proposed substitute language which can be found in the conference report. I believe that the conference substitute fairly and adequately protects the interests of the public and of the Government.

Mr. President, in my view, those who are damaged by the policy acts of the Federal Government are entitled, as a matter of simple justice, to some reimbursement for their added expenses. That is all this bill does, and I believe that the conference report should be approved.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I rise to express opposition to the adoption of the conference report. In my opinion there is no justification for the expenditure of the money involved in the bill.

The bill is a special relief bill, although it is not so called. It contemplates giving money to ship companies that do not rightfully belong to them. It contemplates taking the taxpayers' money and making a gift of it to navigation companies who have been the recipients of the Government's bounty. The bill was not initiated by any department of the Government. It was initiated by those who will be the beneficiaries of the bill if the bill is passed.

I have deep feelings about this transaction. I shall have no hesitation in expressing those feelings. Probably the Senate will take up the Bobby Baker case today. It is perhaps fitting that on this day we also take up this unjustified, unwarranted giveaway of taxpayers' money—not at the request of the Government, or of any taxpayer, but because of the power of the shipbuilding company that is to be the beneficiary of the gift.

When the bill was recommended by the committee, I filed a minority report setting forth my reasons why the bill ought not to be approved. In the minority views I stated:

> As a result of my longstanding objection to bills providing for retroactive payments by the Government, I must record my opposition to this measure, H.R. 82. Stated as a general principle, I believe it unjustified for a private person or company to take willing action under the existing and known statutory ground rules and then, when a loss occurs, seek to have the Government provide reimbursement.
>
> When the ship operators made applications for subsidies they knew of the existing law under which the then Maritime Board might award the contract to a shipbuilder who was not the low bidder. They knew that a possibility existed that an applicant carrier on the waters of the Pacific might find himself in the position that the low bidder for the building of a ship was on the east coast and the higher bidder on the west coast, and that the Maritime agency, in the interest of national defense, might make the award to the west coast company.

What I have read from my dissenting opinion deals with retroactive payments contemplated by the bill. When the vessel operators asked the Government for subsidies, they knew that the condition about which they now complain might come into existence. Yet they went to the Board and asked for relief. They obtained relief. That relief is rather substantial—55 percent of the cost, or perhaps at that time it was 50 percent. The taxpayers do not generally understand that for every ship that is built for the purpose of carrying the American flag, although owned by private industry, the company receives a subsidy from the Government of an amount equal to the difference between the cost of building the ship in the United States and the cost of building the ship in a foreign country. Taxpayers do not generally know that in the operation of these ships, we subsidize the operators in a sum equal to the difference between what it would cost to hire American labor and what it would cost to hire foreign labor.

Our Government has been good to the shipping industry. I shall point out how much it has cost the taxpayers to subsidize the building of ships, and how much it has cost to subsidize operations.

The annual expenditures for ship construction subsidies have risen from $16 million in 1957 to $90 million in 1963. In spite of this increase, during the same period, in expenditures to cover operations, differential subsidies have risen from $108,292,274 to $220,676,685. In other words, in 1963 the Federal Government paid out $220 million as a subsidy for vessel operators in the hiring of their employees. The total ship construction and reconstruction subsidy expenditures between 1936 and 1963 have been $659,512,385, while the total operating subsidies have been $1,532,443,081. In other words, in the course of 27 years the taxpayers' money has been given in part to the vessel operators and in part to the shipbuilding companies in the amount of $2,300 million.

I point those facts out in order to demonstrate the generosity of the U.S. taxpayers in attempting to help the shipbuilding industry. This largess has not been appreciated. When the law was originally enacted, we subsidized up to 50 percent. The argument was made in 1936 that subsidies of 50 percent in 1936 would gradually dwindle when we were placed in a better competitive position with foreign shipbuilding companies. But instead of the subsidies going down, they are going up.

We are now required to pay 55 percent of the cost. I fear that if we continue the course of conduct that is involved in the promotion of the bill, we shall finally be paying 60 percent, 65 percent, 70 percent and, probably in the end, we shall enter into a socialistic operation of the ships themselves.

No one will deny that the companies involved are not legally entitled to the money. No one can dare make the argument that they are legally entitled to it. It is a gift and nothing else. Congress is contemplating going into the pockets of taxpayers, taking out $530,000, and giving it to the operators of the vessels. I cannot subscribe to such a proposal.

There is another phase of the transaction that should be discussed. When the suggestion was originally made by the vessel operators that they wanted this gift, the Maritime Department said, "You who have supposedly lost $530,000 want the $530,000 to be paid to you, although the Government is not legally obligated to pay the money." Other vessel operators were benefited by the bill, but they refused to pay the benefit to the Government.

So we had a situation in which the Government was paying moneys that it was not obligated to pay, but not receiving the moneys that the beneficiary was not obligated to pay.

The thought was finally developed that the operator who benefited should pay to the Government the amount by which it profited. That was $40,000. The vessel operated at a loss would be subsidized by the Government to the extent of $530,000, although the Government was not legally responsible to pay that amount.

That measure came to the floor of the Senate. The Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] and I pondered the proposal. We could not believe that a private ship operator would voluntarily give to the Government $40,000 which it was not obligated to pay. We understood that the one that was to receive $530,000 would gladly accept it, although the Government was not legally responsible.

Mr. President, in the belief that the one that profited would not voluntarily pay back the $40,000, it was proposed by the Senator from Delaware and myself that we would approve of this transaction if an affidavit were filed by the one that was to pay the $40,000 to the effect that it would not receive reimbursement from the one that was to receive the $530,000.

I mentioned the Bobby Baker case; and I wish now to point out the connection. I suspected that company B, which was to receive the $530,000, would pay company A, which was to pay the $40,000. And my suspicions were sound. There was collusion. Those companies met and devised a plan. The representatives of the companies said. "You, company B, will get $530,000; you, company A, will pay $40,000, but you will suffer no loss, because behind the curtain company B will give to company A the $40,000 that must be paid."

The amendment offered was accepted on the floor of the Senate, I believe, in complete sincerity.

I then waited to see what would happen. Would the curtain be drawn back and the plot and conspiracy revealed?

Mr. President, I respectfully point out that the curtain was drawn back and that it became apparent that there was a deal, a plot, and a conspiracy between the participants. When the company that was to pay the $40,000 was asked or required to sign an affidavit that it would not be reimbursed by the company that was receiving the $530,000, it refused to sign the document that would make possible the consummation of the transaction.

I may be unduly concerned about the matter. The $530,000, as some have said, means nothing. But there is more involved than the $530,000. There is involved the integrity of the operation of Government.

I am waiting rather anxiously to see what the discussion will be later about the Bobby Baker case. It will be rather interesting. But the final development in the Bobby Baker case could have been anticipated years ago. Are we going to lend the stamp of approval of the Senate to a transaction that is so obviously steeped in improprieties? Are we going to say that this body, with its dignity, its integrity, its honesty and honor, will place its embrace around and its hand of approval upon those who have plotted and schemed to take out of the Treasury $490,000?

I shall answer the question. I suppose it will be done. It will be done because the facts will not be known by the Members of the Senate.

Mr. President, if I had a jury of 12 men or women before me, I would win this case without any question. I would win it speedily, because that jury would look impartially and objectively into the facts and attempt to do justice. It would then make pronouncements and deter the type of conduct which is involved here.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I concur in what the Senator from Ohio has said. There is neither a legal nor a moral obligation on the part of the Government to make the proposed payment to this company. Quite to the contrary, the bill is nothing more than a private bill for the advantage of one individual company, and no justification can be made for it, except on the ground that it is an outright grant of the taxpayer's money. I see no justification whatever for the bill even receiving the consideration of the Senate, let alone being passed.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I appreciate the comments made by the Senator from Delaware. In a lonely way, we shall stand together on this measure. It does not make any difference to me what the final vote will be on the measure—I know that this bill ought not to be passed; it does not have the attributes of bills that the Congress of the United States ought to adopt.

I now want to ask a question: Why did the company that was to pay $40,000 refuse to sign an affidavit that it was not being reimbursed? That question is very pertinent.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. BARTLETT. I should like to ask the Senator if, to his knowledge, the company was ever asked to sign an affidavit by the Government or anyone else.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The record will disclose discussions.

I cannot answer the Senator's question directly, but my amendment was accepted on the basis that the company would sign the affidavit, and the implication was that it was prepared to sign the affidavit. No word of protest ever came with respect to the proposal which the Senator from Delaware and I made until it was actually in the bill and the time came for collection and payment.

Mr. BARTLETT. I suggest that no such request was ever made to the company because the bill was not law and the company could not be called upon to make such an affidavit unless such a law were in effect, with the provision which the Senator drafted.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I do not care what the Senator from Alaska says on this matter——

Mr. BARTLETT. I appreciate that.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I realize that he is sincere in his presentation. The facts speak for themselves. They speak loudly. They cry out in protest against what is being proposed.

The bill has finally been amended, but speaking of the bill as it was when we took it up, the Senator from Delaware and I knew that if an affidavit were required by which the company which benefited by $40,000 was to pay back the money, that company would never do it. That is what happened. The Senator from Delaware will quickly confirm that statement.

I waited rather anxiously to see what would be the result when my amendment was written into the bill. I expected that the company that was to pay the $40,000 would not sign the affidavit. Sure enough, word reached me that the whole transaction would fail because the company that was to pay the money would not go along with the provisions of the bill.

With regard to the merchant marine, Congress has been passing retroactive bills. It passed a number of them. When Congress raised the subsidy for shipbuilding from 50 to 55 percent, it was made retroactive. This bill is made retroactive. The bill, however, is nothing more than a gift, a takeaway of the taxpayers' money, which, in my judgment, this body should not approve.

Mr. President, I serve notice that I shall ask for the yeas and nays on the conference report.

I yield the floor.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate for long. I am bound to speak out against the implication that there is a lack of integrity in the presentation of the bill and of the conference report.

What is the actual situation? Let me quote the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], who has just been speaking against the bill. I quote from the minority views he presented back in 1963. He said:

> Perhaps the fault really lies in the original decision to provide Government aid. Once the web of subsidy is started, there can be no end to the efforts of the beneficiaries.

And so forth. The fact is, whether it is good or bad—I make no judgment on that question now—that long ago, long before the Senator from Ohio was born, long before the Senator from Alaska was born, it became Government policy to give support. To build up, maintain, and cause this country to have a viable merchant marine, and that to accomplish this public purpose certain Government assistance would have to be provided. The law long ago encouraged American operators to construct their vessels in American shipyards.

The conference report has to do with that essential fact. There is nothing wrong about this policy. It is a continuation of a policy adopted long ago.

The statement was made by the Senator from Ohio that this measure proposes a gift to a navigating company, as he termed it. I do not see why. In 1936 the Congress provided that, in certain instances, the Government might choose to allocate the building of ships to shipyards that were not the low bidders, in order to preserve for national defense a shipbuilding industry. This was never done until 1958.

At that time the maritime agency allocated from the low bid shipyards on the east coast to two California yards the building of two ships by the American Export Lines and two by the Moore-McCormack Lines. In respect to these construction controls, the companies would have preferred to have those ships built on the east coast. Here their headquarters were. Here their staffs were. The allocation charge was required not for the operators benefit, but because it was considered essential, or important, at least, to the purposes of national defense, to have the ships built on the west coast.

Moore-McCormack paid an additional cost because the west coast shipyard was separated from its headquarters by 2,500 miles or so. They incurred an additional inspection cost of $140,000 and an extra delivery cost of $120,000, for a total of $260,000. These are figures supplied by the Maritime Administration. The American Export Lines likewise had two ships allocated to the west coast from the east coast, at an additional cost of $270,000.

American President Lines gained, as the Maritime Administration has estimated, $41,000.

In no case has there been any final determination of the benefits or losses.

The Senator from Ohio referred more than once to the failure of APL to sign an affidavit. Of course, APL would not sign an affidavit, because the language in the bill provided for such affidavit upon the language becoming law. There was no possible arrangement for signing such an affidavit in advance.

No proof has been presented to show that there was any collusion at any time. I do not think there was any collusion. What did occur, and the only thing that did occur to my personal knowledge, was that in the House hearings a witness said that the language of the bill was broad enough to make it possible for Moore-McCormack and American Export Lines, or either of them, to pay the obligation of APL, to make certain that these two companies that were to benefit would receive the money promptly.

What was the final decision? The final decision on the part of the conferees was that this would not be treated on an industrywide basis, but would be treated on a company-by-company basis. This makes good sense.

That is what is in the conference report now before us.

It has been said that there is no legal obligation on the part of the U.S. Government to pay Moore-McCormack or the American Export Lines approximately $500,000. That is certainly true. That is why we have the bill here, to provide for that legal obligation.

This should also be made very clear. The operators were not the beneficiaries. All of this was done for the sake of the shipyards, to keep our shipyard industry strong within the United States.

It was the judgment of the Senate Commerce Committee and likewise the decision of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee that there was no reason whatever for these two companies to be required to pay an aggregate of a half million dollars out of their own funds for acts which were beneficial not to them—in the main they were hurtful to them—but beneficial only to the U.S. Government in pursuance of its national defense policy.

I fail to see anything wicked or bad or black in the measure now before us, as incorporated in the conference report. On the contrary, I think it seeks to effectuate justice to all.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARTLETT. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. As one who came into the Chamber during the debate and who has not had an opportunity to study the matter, do I understand that the only issue involved is the particular amendment which appears in the conference report?

Mr. BARTLETT. I hope so. I think so. This situation is somewhat confusing. Of course the bill had already passed the Senate, and we are now considering the conference report on it. There was a great fight within the committee as to whether any retroactive payment should be made. Some felt that it should not be done at all. They felt that the companies, which were put to this additional cost by reason of the 1958 allocation, should not be reimbursed. Others felt that they should be. Apparently those who opposed the retroactive feature so strongly have now agreed to it. All they seem to want to do now is to require one company to file an affidavit. The House conferees frankly will not accept such a provision. I believe we can all agree on that point. Therefore, we have language before us which I honestly believe is protective of all concerned.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Does the bill extend into the future the rather controversial differential in favor of west coast shipyards?

Mr. BARTLETT. No; the bill has absolutely nothing whatever to do with that.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. That issue is not involved here?

Mr. BARTLETT. No; that is not involved in the slightest degree.

I am concerned, of course, because of the allegation that there is something improper about all this. If there is, every member of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee and all the members of the Commerce Committee of the Senate, except the Senator from Ohio, have misread everything connected with the bill. I do not believe so. I believe this represents fair, decent, honorable treatment, which is owed to these companies which had the ships allocated to the west coast, not for their own interest, but because it was considered to be to the benefit of the U.S. Government.

Finally, we have the suggestion made that collusive practices have been entered into concerning, at the maximum, $41,000.

Who is allegedly engaging in those practices? There is no proof that this has occurred, and I do not think it has. It is alleged that it is the American President Lines. The American President Lines is a very large and respected company. It has many ships sailing the seas in the interest of the American merchant marine and American commerce. The Moore-McCormack Lines and the American Export Lines are also very big concerns.

I find it impossible to believe that these big, responsible companies, with honorable men conducting their affairs, are even thinking of entering into collusion relating to $41,000.

I believe the language in the conference report protects the Government, protects the taxpayers, and does justice to the companies. I hope the conference report will be adopted.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, as the Senator from Alaska has pointed out, under laws which were passed by Congress 20 or 25 years ago, we are obligated to make certain payments to these companies as a differential in the cost of constructing ships in American shipyards, as compared with what it would cost to construct the ships in foreign shipyards.

The Government has paid what it owed to these companies under the law.

There is no basis, and the Senator from Alaska would not argue that there is any basis, for saying that the Government owes this company any money. This can be interpreted only as an outright gift which we are not legally or morally obligated to pay.

Mr. President, the conference report should not be adopted. We do not owe this company any more than we owe any other company or any citizen a half million dollars of taxpayers' money in the Treasury. This is a pure gift.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. BARTLETT. I do not wish to prolong the debate. I agree with the Senator that there is no legal responsibility.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. And there is no moral responsibility.

Mr. BARTLETT. I believe there is a moral responsibility. When a company is out of pocket $250,000, for doing something that the company did not want done, but was required to do by the Government, the Government has an obligation.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I disagree completely. The company did want it done, or it would not have had it done. In the first place, the company had it done for the simple reason that it wanted to obtain a saving of millions of dollars in construction subsidy by having the Government pay the difference in construction costs. The company signed a contract and agreed to it upon the terms of the Government. The Government has lived up to its obligation. If the Government did not want to proceed otherwise, the company was not under any obligation to accept a subsidy in the beginning.

Mr. BARTLETT. Oh, yes; it was.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I recognize that the company, if it had wanted to, could have contracted for the construction of the ships on the east coast rather than on the west coast and would have been half a million dollars better off. But that does not mean that the company was obligated to take the subsidy unless it signed, of its own accord, a contract with the U.S. Government. If the company did not want to sign a contract, some other company would have been sitting by, waiting to sign a contract the next day. It is not correct to say that the company had to sign the contract. No one has to take a subsidy if he does not wish to do so; but if he does take a subsidy, he must take it according to the law as it is at the time he signs the contract.

In my opinion, the Government has paid every dime it is morally bound to pay. This is a private bill, for one company only.

Mr. BARTLETT. No; first, three companies are involved. I agree that they are under no compulsion to accept subsidies. They can go out of business. But public policy is to encourage a merchant marine. But so long as they are in business, they are required, among other things, to build new ships, so that the American merchant marine can be kept strong. I do not see why the companies should be charged with supervision and inspection costs incurred for the benefit of the Government.

I hope the conference report will be agreed to.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, there has been some discussion as to whether or not evidence exists that the tab to the American President Lines, amounting to about $40,000, that it would owe to the Government, would be picked up. I wish to read the testimony of Mr. Ewers before the Subcommittee on Merchant Marine of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries:

> It is conceivable that to get anything of our $250,000 we might have to agree to pick up the APL tab that is in dispute but, as our friend, Brinson, so adequately expressed this so often, it is better than nothing.

The tab of the American President Lines was to be picked up, possibly, according to this word, but it was better to pick up that tab and get $250,000 rather than get nothing.

> The CHAIRMAN. Then Export does not agree to that?

Mr. Ewers. There is no obligation on our part, Mr. Chairman. It is purely a privilege. Should such an eventuality arise, the legislation is drafted so that we could avoid frustration by picking up the tab if we so decided.

Mr. President, I suggest that there is testimony in the record that it was envisioned that the tab would have to be picked up, so that the $530,000 to be received by those two companies would become available.

There has been an argument as to whether there is a moral obligation on the part of the Federal Government to pay the $530,000. The law was clear. Its provisions were understood. The ships that were built cost about $46 million. The subsidy was about $23 million. The companies had their lawyers and knew what the law meant. They made their applications. The transaction is closed.

Now, after it has been closed, the companies say, "Change the law and provide for us $530,000."

If there is a moral obligation, let it be fulfilled in the form of a relief bill. Do not try to give the obligation sanctity and legality by passing a retroactive law. This is a special relief bill. Such bills are not easily passed by the Senate or by Congress. It is necessary to have proper contacts.

It was not dared to make this proposal a special relief bill on the grounds of a moral obligation. A course was adopted to give the procedure the appearance of a legal liability, a liability which never existed. Where is the moral obligation? Was the law doubtful? Was there any misunderstanding? Did the Government do something it should not have done? It is admitted that the Government performed every legal obligation which it had; but the beneficiaries now are saying, "Change the law, so that the Government may pay us $530,000."

Mr. President, it is wrong if we countenance the passage of bills of this type. Regardless of what may be done in the Baker case, conditions will continue to grow worse and worse. Entirely too many men are moving about the Capitol and in the corridors, representing themselves as being able to secure the passage of special relief bills. I shall not be one to give them additional glamor and additional attributes of trust. They should be hit on the head with all the power of the Senate.

This is my case on this subject. I have no sanguine hopes that my argument will prevail. I have already stated that. But I will feel better for having expressed myself on this issue, because I have been appalled at what has taken place during the past 7 years since I became a Member of the Senate.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, on the adoption of the conference report, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. KUCHEL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call may be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Inouye in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the conference report. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Hayden], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. Bible] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Bayh], and the Senator from California [Mr. Engle] are absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Anderson], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Edmondson], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Ervin], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Jordan], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Edmondson], the Senator from California [Mr. Engle], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Dominick], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Goldwater], and the senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Cotton], and the Senator from New York [Mr. Javits] are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott], and the Senator from New York [Mr. Javits] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 49, nays 30, as follows:

[No. 472 Leg.]

YEAS—49

Aiken
Bartlett
Beall
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Case
Church
Dodd
Eastland
Fong
Gore
Hartke
Hill
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Johnston
Keating
Kuchel
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalf
Monroney
Morton
Moss
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Prouty
Randolph
Saltonstall
Smathers
Smith
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough

NAYS—30

Allott
Bennett
Boggs
Byrd, Va.
Carlson
Curtis
Dirksen
Douglas
Ellender
Fulbright
Hickenlooper
Holland
Hruska
Jordan, Idaho
Lausche
Mechem
Miller
Mundt
Pearson
Proxmire
Ribicoff
Robertson
Russell
Simpson
Thurmond
Tower
Walters
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—21

Anderson
Bayh
Bible
Clark
Cooper
Cotton
Dominick
Edmondson
Engle
Ervin
Goldwater
Gruening
Hart
Hayden
Javits
Jordan, N.C.
Kennedy
Magnuson
Morse
Scott
Sparkman

So the conference report was agreed to.

PROHIBITION OF TRADING IN IRISH POTATO FUTURES ON COMMODITY EXCHANGES

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Nelson in the chair). The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 332) to prohibit trading in Irish potato futures on commodity exchanges.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

The Senator from Maine is recognized.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, the proposed legislation would remove potatoes from speculation on the futures markets as was done in the case of onions in 1958. After 15 years or more actual experience with the operations of the potato future market it has become apparent to the great majority of the industry from growers to retail outlets that this perishable product is not adaptable to futures trading. Many had hoped that potato futures could become a useful part of the marketing system, as is true of the more storable commodities such as grain and cotton. Unfortunately and disappointingly, far from promoting orderly marketing, increasing futures activity has been accompanied by increasing demoralization of the industry, erratic price movements unrelated to supply and demand and a steady and drastic deterioration of Maine's position as compared to the producing areas not dominated by the futures market.

Nine principal points have been developed setting forth the need for elimination of this market activity as follows:

Point 1. An overwhelming majority of growers and dealers in actual potatoes are strongly opposed to futures trading and urge its immediate elimination.

The 2,500 growers in Maine in a series of polls over the past 10 years have indicated that about 90 percent support the effort to get rid of what they are convinced is an economic burden. In replying to ballots sent to some 2,500 active growers, some 90 percent of those replying indicated not only a desire to get rid of futures trading, but a willingness to be taxed in order to finance the effort to get the necessary legislation.

Point 2. Futures trading in potatoes is limited to Maine. About 85 percent of the producing areas in the United States do not use futures. Elimination of futures will have no unfavorable impact on any area.

I have in my hand a tabulation designated exhibit A, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXHIBIT A

Maine potato futures: Distribution of traders and open contracts by geographic areas, New York Mercantile Exchange, Oct. 27, 1961[1]

[Positions in carlots]

State, division, and country	Speculators			Hedgers			Total		
	Number of traders	Positions		Number of traders	Positions		Number of traders	Positions	
		Long	Short		Long	Short		Long	Short
Maine	96	651	309	121	832	4,343	217	1,483	4,652
New Hampshire	3	11	0	1	20	5	4	31	5
Massachusetts	37	260	65	15	207	250	52	467	315
Rhode Island	2	32	29	3	163	20	5	195	49
Connecticut	16	59	25	2	15	4	18	74	29
New York (excluding New York City)	89	650	643	37	609	490	126	1,259	1,133
New York City	203	1,407	897	25	501	1,143	228	1,908	2,040
New Jersey	53	302	153	18	134	60	71	436	213
Pennsylvania	53	171	72	11	150	70	64	321	142
North Atlantic	552	3,543	2,193	233	2,631	6,385	785	6,174	8,578
Ohio	43	97	32	0	0	0	43	97	32
Indiana	15	51	30	2	30	2	17	81	32
Illinois	71	1,164	650	4	16	25	75	1,180	675
Michigan	37	117	162	17	75	121	54	192	283
Wisconsin	11	46	25	1	10	0	12	56	25
East North Central	177	1,475	899	24	131	148	201	1,606	1,047
Minnesota	20	58	3	2	5	7	22	63	10
Iowa	8	37	0	0	0	0	8	37	0
Missouri	9	94	1	0	0	0	9	94	1
North Dakota	2	3	0	0	0	0	2	3	0
South Dakota	2	4	0	0	0	0	2	4	0
Nebraska	2	7	0	0	0	0	2	7	0
Kansas	3	12	1	1	3	0	4	15	1
West North Central	46	215	5	3	8	7	49	223	12
Delaware	3	13	0	0	0	0	3	13	0
Maryland	8	76	1	0	0	0	8	76	1
District of Columbia	6	24	22	0	0	0	6	24	22
Virginia	6	3	5	1	0	15	7	3	20
West Virginia	3	2	3	0	0	0	3	2	3
North Carolina	12	47	10	1	4	0	13	51	10
South Carolina	5	17	1	0	0	0	5	17	1
Georgia	11	28	8	1	3	0	12	31	8
Florida	39	378	97	4	40	8	43	418	105
South Atlantic	93	589	147	7	47	23	100	635	170
Kentucky	3	21	10	0	0	0	3	21	10
Tennessee	8	42	5	0	0	0	8	42	5
Alabama	9	29	1	0	0	0	9	29	1
Mississippi	2	5	0	0	0	0	2	5	0
Arkansas	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0
Louisiana	6	5	18	0	0	0	6	5	18
Oklahoma	5	16	6	1	6	0	6	22	6
Texas	39	133	16	1	4	0	40	137	16
South Central	73	252	56	2	10	0	75	262	56
Montana	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	0
Idaho	11	252	90	5	36	15	16	288	105
Wyoming	2	5	0	0	0	0	2	5	0
Colorado	9	44	48	0	0	0	9	44	48
New Mexico	2	4	3	0	0	0	2	4	3
Arizona	2	4	0	0	0	0	2	4	0
Washington	15	63	6	0	0	0	15	63	6
Oregon	16	37	13	0	0	0	16	37	13
California	83	293	140	2	0	30	85	293	170
Western	141	704	300	7	36	45	148	740	345
Hawaii	5	9	2	0	0	0	5	9	2
Puerto Rico	3	3	0	0	0	0	3	3	0
Total	1,090	6,789	3,602	276	2,863	6,608	1,366	9,652	10,210
Brazil	2	6	0	0	0	0	2	6	0
Canada	73	659	340	24	333	171	97	992	511
Germany	1	5	0	0	0	0	1	5	0
Italy	1	3	0	0	0	0	1	3	0
Mexico	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	0
Switzerland	2	2	2	0	0	0	2	2	2
Total	80	677	342	24	333	171	104	1,010	513
Grand total	1,170	7,466	3,944	300	3,196	6,779	1,470	10,662	10,723

---

[1] Some positions as of Oct. 31, 1961.

Mr. **MUSKIE**. Mr. President, that exhibit shows the geographical distribution of traders in the market as of October 27, 1961; it shows that there were 1,470 accounts open on that date, 300 of which were classified as hedging. Two hunderd and thirty-three of those 300 were in Maine and nearby areas. Only a negligible number appeared elsewhere.

In Idaho, for example, which is a large producing area, there were only five hedging accounts. Florida had four and North Carolina one. Alabama had none.

Point 3. Maine's situation as regards both actual price and price stability has deteriorated in relation to competitive areas as futures activity has increased in Maine potatoes. Expressed in terms of money value the price deterioration amounts to about $15 million per year for the 10 years 1951–52 to 1960–61. Growers in the 75 percent of the country where there is no use of futures trading have consistently fared better than those in Maine and the Maine growers' position has progressively worsened as futures speculation has tightened its hold on that market.

Maine's deterioration as compared to other areas, particularly Idaho, is clearly set forth in a tabulation which shows that before futures trading became dominant in Maine, the price of actual potatoes in Maine was approximately 88 percent of that in Idaho. As futures trading took hold in Maine this relationship changed until that market was receiving only 69 percent of the Idaho price. This has resulted in a financial disadvantage to the Maine producers estimated at $15 million per year as set forth in two tabulations and an accompanying explanation which I have before me.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the explanation and tabulations, which I have designated exhibit B.

There being no objection, the explanation and tabulations were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXHIBIT B–1

COMPARISON OF MAINE WITH IDAHO

The comparison of wholesale prices of Maine and Idaho potatoes for the 15-year period from 1946–47 through 1960–61 shows the steadily worsening competitive position of the potato industry of Maine as compared with that of Idaho.

Idaho was selected for this comparison because the harvesting season and volume of production make it more similar to Maine than are any of the other producing areas.

There were no futures trading of any significance in Idaho potatoes at any time during the period, and during the first 5 years there was no such trading of any consequence in the Maine contract. In this 5-year period the wholesale prices of "most Katahdin" potatoes at Aroostook County points averaged 88 percent of the prices of Russet Burbank's at Upper Valley points in Idaho. During the next 5 years (1952 to 1956) futures trading in Maine potatoes on the New York Mercantile Exchange began to reach sizable proportions, averaging 106,536 carlots per year. During this period the Maine price declined in relation to Idaho and averaged 76 percent of the latter.

In the third period shown (1957 to 1961) futures trading in Maine potatoes continued to increase, averaging 178,997 cars per year, and this was accompanied by a further decline in Maine's relationship to Idaho to 69 percent.

During the most recent 3 years shown, 1959 to 1961 futures trading averaged about 190,000 cars per year and wholesale prices in Maine declined to an average of 64 percent of those in Idaho.

While the general price level in the two areas may be presumed to reflect a usually higher price for Russets as compared with Katahdins the striking change in the relationship in 15 years seems most significant. It was considered that an increase in Maine production as compared with Idaho production might be expected to bring lower Maine prices as compared to Idaho prices.

The fact is, however, that during the first 5-year period of heavy futures trading Maine produced an average of 34,690,000 hundredweight or 124 percent of Idaho's average of 28,066,000 hundredweight.

During the next 5 years (1957–61) Maine increased production only slightly to an average of 35,797,000 hundredweight, failing to approach Idaho's increase to an average of 42,318,000 hundredweight. Maine's percentage of production declined drastically from 124 to 85 percent. Thus Maine's position (with futures trading) deteriorated sharply in relation to Idaho (without futures trading) both pricewise and productionwise.

The financial effect of the striking deterioration of Maine's competitive position can be to some extent judged by a calculation of what the Maine crop would have brought if for the 10-year period of heavy futures trading the same relationship with Idaho had existed as during the 5 years before such trading had become an important factor.

If instead of being on a 76-percent basis with Idaho during the 5 years 1951–56 as shown in the tabulation, Maine had been able to maintain its prefutures position of 88 percent, the wholesale price of $2.42 shown on the tabulation would have been $2.79, a difference of 37 cents per hundredweight. Applying this difference to the 5-year total production of 173,454,000 hundredweight gives the startling figure of $64,177,980 as the additional amount at wholesale prices which would have gone to the Maine potato industry in the 5 crop years of 1951–52 to 1955–56. The average is $12,835,000 per year.

During the next 5-year period of heavy futures activity the financial disadvantage to Maine continued. Applying the figure of $1.89 per hundred to the production of 178,988,000 hundredweight results in a valuation of $338,287,320 or $67,657,464 average per year.

If Maine had remained on its prefutures 88-percent basis with Idaho the price would have averaged $2.39, exactly 50 cents per hundred more than that shown by the table. This would have increased the valuation for the 5-year production by $89,494,000 or $17,898,800 per year.

To summarize, it appears that the decline in Maine's position in relation to Idaho amounted to a financial disadvantage to Maine of an average of $15,366,900 per year over the 10-year period from 1951–52 to 1960–61.

EXHIBIT B–2

Wholesale potato prices f.o.b. shipping point, Idaho compared with Maine, crop years 1946–47 to 1960–61

Crop year	Idaho [1]	Maine [2]	Percent Maine to Idaho
1946–47	$2.37	$2.13	90
1947–48	3.89	2.93	75
1948–49	2.90	3.20	110
1949–50	2.77	1.91	69
1950–51	1.73	1.82	105
Average	2.73	2.40	88
1951–52	4.06	3.61	89
1952–53	3.96	2.51	63
1953–54	1.82	.95	52
1954–55	3.36	2.43	72
1955–56	2.67	2.58	96
Average	3.17	2.42	76
1956–57	2.16	1.54	71
1957–58	2.65	2.27	85
1958–59	1.97	1.57	80
1959–60	3.58	2.53	71
1960–61	3.26	1.56	47
Average	2.72	1.89	69

[1] Russet Burbank No. 1, size A, sales f.o.b. shipping point, Idaho Falls, Twin Falls district.

[2] Mostly Katahdin type, U.S. No. 1, size A, sales, Aroostook County points, Presque Isle, f.o.b. shipping point.

Source: "Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Prices," Agricultural Marketing Service, USDA.

EXHIBIT B–3

Summary of financial effect of decline in Maine prices in relation to Idaho

Period	Production (hundredweight)	Average price per hundredweight		Value of crop					
				As reported		88 percent of Idaho		Maine under Idaho basis	
		As reported	88 percent of Idaho	Total	Average per year	Total	Average per year	Total	Average per year
1951–52 to 1955–56	173,454,000	$2.42	$2.79	$419,750,000	$83,951,000	$483,936,000	$96,787,000	$64,178,000	$12,836,000
1956–57 to 1960–61	178,988,000	1.89	2.39	338,287,000	67,657,000	427,781,000	85,556,000	89,494,000	17,898,000
10-year total	352,442,000	2.15	2.59	758,045,000	75,804,000	911,717,000	91,172,000	153,672,000	15,367,000

Mr. MUSKIE. Point 4. Perishable products such as potatoes and onions are not adaptable to constructive and orderly futures trading. The price instability of such perishable commodities as onions and potatoes is illustrated in a table which I have designated exhibit C, and which I ask to have printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXHIBIT C

Season average prices received by farmers for selected commodities and percentage change from previous season's price, 1929–30 through 1955–56

Season	Onions		Potatoes		Wheat		Corn		Oats		Soybeans		Cotton		Eggs	
	Average price	Percent change	Average price	Percent change	Average price	Percent change	Average price	Percent change	Average price	Percent change	Average price	Percent change	Average price	Percent change	Average price	Percent change
	Dollars per 50-pound sack		*Dollars per bushel*		*Cents per bushel*		*Cents per bushel*		*Cents per bushel*		*Dollars per bushel*		*Cents per pound*		*Cents per dozen*	
1929–30	0.74	--------	1.30	--------	103.6	--------	79.9	--------	41.8	--------	1.88	--------	16.78	--------	29.8	--------
1930–31	.48	−35.1	.88	−32.3	67.1	−35.2	59.8	−25.2	32.2	−23.0	1.37	−27.1	9.46	−43.6	23.7	−20.5
1931–32	.93	+93.8	.45	−48.9	39.1	−41.7	32.1	−46.3	21.3	−33.9	.50	−63.5	5.66	−40.2	17.6	−25.7
1932–33	.41	−55.9	.38	−15.6	38.2	−2.3	31.6	−1.6	15.7	−26.3	.54	+8.0	6.52	+15.2	14.2	−19.3
1933–34	.64	+56.1	.81	+113.2	74.4	+94.8	52.0	+64.6	33.5	+113.4	.94	+74.1	[1] 10.17	+56.0	13.8	−2.8
1934–35	.67	+4.7	.42	−48.1	84.8	+14.0	81.5	+56.7	48.1	+43.6	.99	+5.3	[1] 12.36	+21.5	17.0	+23.2
1935–36	.71	+6.0	.59	+40.5	83.1	−2.0	65.5	−19.6	26.4	−45.1	.73	−26.3	11.09	−10.3	23.4	+37.6
1936–37	.43	−39.4	1.12	+89.8	102.5	+23.3	104.4	+59.4	44.9	+70.1	1.27	+74.0	12.36	+11.5	21.8	−6.8
1937–38	.66	+53.5	.50	−55.4	96.2	−6.1	[1] 51.8	−50.4	30.2	−32.7	.85	−33.1	[1] 8.41	−32.0	21.3	−2.3
1938–39	.55	−16.7	.54	+8.0	[1] 56.2	−41.6	[1] 48.6	−6.2	23.8	−21.2	.67	−21.2	[1] 8.60	+2.3	20.3	−4.7
1939–40	.45	−18.2	.69	+27.8	[1] 69.1	+23.0	[1] 56.8	+16.9	31.0	+30.3	.81	+20.9	[1] 9.09	+5.7	17.4	−14.3
1940–41	.70	+55.6	.51	−26.1	[1] 68.2	−1.3	[1] 61.8	+8.8	30.3	−2.3	.90	+11.1	[1] 9.89	+8.8	18.0	+3.4
1941–42	1.10	+57.1	.79	+54.9	[1] 94.4	+38.4	[1] 75.1	+21.5	41.1	+35.6	1.55	+72.2	[1] 17.03	+72.2	23.5	+30.6
1942–43	.99	−10.0	1.14	+44.3	[1] 110	+16.5	[1] 91.7	+22.1	48.8	+18.7	[1] 1.61	+3.9	[1] 19.05	+11.9	30.0	+27.7
1943–44	1.68	+69.7	1.26	+10.5	[1] 136	+23.6	[1] 112	+22.1	72.2	+48.0	[1] 1.81	+12.4	[1] 19.90	+4.5	37.1	+23.7
1944–45	1.20	−28.6	1.44	+14.3	[1] 141	+3.7	[1] 109	−2.7	70.9	−1.8	[1] 2.05	+13.3	[1] 20.73	+4.2	32.5	−12.4
1945–46	1.69	+40.8	1.38	−4.2	150	+6.4	127	+16.5	66.7	−5.9	2.08	+1.5	[1] 22.52	+8.6	37.7	+16.0
1946–47	.89	−47.3	1.21	−12.3	191	+27.3	156	+22.8	80.9	+21.8	2.57	+23.6	[1] 32.64	+44.9	37.6	−.3
1947–48	2.08	+133.7	1.60	+32.2	229	+19.9	216	+38.5	105.0	+29.8	3.33	+29.6	[1] 31.93	−2.2	45.3	+20.5
1948–49	1.32	−36.5	1.52	−5.0	[1] 199	−13.1	[1] 130	−39.8	[1] 72.3	−31.1	[1] 2.27	−31.8	[2] 30.38	−4.9	47.2	+4.2
1949–50	1.47	+11.4	1.27	−16.4	[1] 188	−5.5	[1] 125	−3.8	[1] 65.7	−9.1	[1] 2.16	−4.8	[1] 28.58	−5.9	45.2	−4.2
1950–51	.87	−40.8	.90	−29.1	[1] 200	+6.4	[1] 153	+22.4	[1] 79.1	+20.4	[1] 2.47	+14.4	[1] 40.07	+40.2	36.3	−19.7
1951–52	1.67	+92.0	1.63	+81.1	[1] 211	+5.5	[1] 166	+8.5	[1] 82.3	+4.0	[1] 2.73	+10.5	[1] 37.88	−5.5	47.8	+31.7
1952–53	2.31	+38.3	1.95	+19.6	[1] 209	−.9	[1] 153	−7.8	[1] 78.6	−4.5	[1] 2.72	−.4	[1] 34 59	−8.7	41.6	−13.0
1953–54	.68	−70.6	.78	−60.0	[1] 204	−2.4	[1] 149	−2.6	[1] 74.3	−5.5	[1] 2.72	0	[1] 92.25	−6.8	47.7	+14.7
1954–55	1.07	+57.4	1.30	+66.7	[1] 212	+3.9	[1] 143	−4.0	[1] 71.4	−3.9	2.46	−9.6	[1] 33.61	+4.2	36.8	−22.9
1955–56 [3]	1.31	+22.4	.94	−27.7	[1] 199	−6.1	[1] 131	−8.4	[1] 59.2	−17.1	2.10	−14.6	[4] 33.0	−1.8	--------	--------
Average [5]	--------	45.8	--------	37.8	--------	17.9	--------	23.0	--------	26.9	--------	23.4	--------	18.2	--------	[6] 16.1

[1] Includes allowance for unredeemed loans.
[2] Includes an allowance for all cotton put under loan.
[3] Preliminary.
[4] Aug. 1–Dec. 1, 1955.
[5] Disregarding algebraic signs.
[6] 1929–30 through 1954–55.

NOTE.—Averages are for crop marketing seasons, which overlap calendar years for all commodities shown, except eggs, in which data are on a calendar year basis for the 1st year shown.

Source: For 1929–30 through 1952–53, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Statistics and Agricultural Marketing Service Statistical Bulletin No. 140, "Potato Prices." For 1953–54, U.S. Department of Agriculture-Agricultural Marketing Service—potatoes, wheat, corn, oats, and soybeans—"Field and Seed Crops," May 1955; onions, "Agricultural Prices," Feb. 15, 1955; cotton, "Cotton Production," May 9, 1955; eggs, "Crops and Markets," 1955. For 1954–55 and 1955–56, Agricultural Marketing Service, "Crop Values," Dec. 19, 1955.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, that table compares price movements for a number of commodities over a period of approximately 25 years. This shows that onions had an average seasonal price change of more than 45 percent with potatoes next at approximately 38 percent. This instability is partly the result of a reluctance on the part of traders to take delivery of a product which is likely to go out of condition very rapidly. At the same time wide price movements encouraged reckless speculation by persons having no interest or knowledge of the actual supply and demand conditions. The situation in onions finally became so intolerable that trading in onion futures was outlawed in 1958. The potato producers, having observed the improvement in the onion situation, feel very strongly that they should have the same relief.

Point 5. The potato futures market is used only to a negligible extent for hedging and much of this is done in a manner damaging to the price structure and to the average grower.

The use of the potato futures market for bona fide hedging is negligible.

I ask to have printed at this point in the RECORD a table which I have designated exhibit D.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

EXHIBIT D

Maine potato futures—Occupational distribution of traders, by number and class of trader, New York Mercantile Exchange, Oct. 27, 1961 [1]

[Positions in carlots]

Occupational group	Spectators			Hedgers			Total		
	Number of traders	Positions		Number of traders	Positions		Number of traders	Positions	
		Long	Short		Long	Short		Long	Short
Potato growers [2]	27	223	107	105	276	567	132	499	674
Potato shippers and warehouses	47	853	520	104	1,141	4,548	151	1,994	5,068
Potato receivers, merchants, and jobbers	68	1,101	626	66	981	1,021	134	2,082	1,647
Grocery and chainstore organizations	4	14	2	4	54	1	8	68	3
Potato processors	6	178	167	9	608	150	15	786	317
Fertilizer dealers	0	0	0	4	123	288	4	123	288
Subtotal	152	2,369	1,422	292	3,183	6,575	444	5,552	7,997
Farmers (other than potato growers)	48	212	116	2	1	14	50	213	130
Brokerage firms and employees	33	362	310	1	0	172	34	362	482
Floor traders and professional speculators	34	434	341	0	0	0	34	434	341
Employees of potato shippers, receivers, and processors, and others in the potato trade	23	103	32	1	2	3	24	105	35
Manufacturers, merchandisers, and wholesalers (other than in potatoes), capitalists, financiers, and bankers	145	1,165	485	1	0	3	146	1,165	488
Retailers	73	369	130	2	5	2	75	374	132
Sales managers, purchasing agents, and administrative personnel	90	362	216	1	5	10	91	367	226
Manufacturers'a gents, and salesmen	58	222	51	0	0	0	58	222	51
Clerical employees, craftsmen, and service workers	102	253	155	0	0	0	102	253	155
Physicians, lawyers, teachers, engineers, contractors, and other professional occupations	206	760	330	0	0	0	206	760	330

See footnotes at end of table.

EXHIBIT D—Continued

Maine potato futures—Occupational distribution of traders, by number and class of trader, New York Mercantile Exchange, Oct. 27, 1961 [1]—Continued

[Positions in carlots]

Occupational group	Spectators			Hedgers			Total		
	Number of traders	Positions		Number of traders	Positions		Number of traders	Positions	
		Long	Short		Long	Short		Long	Short
Housewives	58	254	53	0	0	0	58	254	53
Retired	103	487	209	0	0	0	103	487	209
Other	45	114	94	0	0	0	45	114	94
Subtotal	1,018	5,097	2,522	8	13	204	1,026	5,110	2,726
Total	1,170	7,466	3,944	300	3,196	6,779	1,470	10,662	10,723

[1] Some positions as of Oct. 31, 1961.

[2] Grower classification does not include grower-shippers who are here classified as shippers.

Mr. MUSKIE. That table shows the occupational distribution of traders in the market; for example, 206 physicians, lawyers, and other professional persons, 58 housewives, and 103 retired persons. Many of the accounts purporting to be hedging are simply those of persons who have sufficient contact with the potato business to use their actual potatoes as an adjunct to operations which are essentially speculative.

Point 6. Futures trading causes confusion, disorder, and price gyrations.

The potato futures market has a history of price movements which cannot possibly reflect supply and demand. Changes of 40 cents per 100 pounds in one trading season or 15 cents in a few minutes can only be the result of speculators trying to outguess each other.

Point 7. The potato futures market is often completely dominated and controlled by speculative interests.

The Commodity Exchange Authority has proven instances of manipulation in which traders or groups of traders in both potatoes and onions have completely dominated the market. Generally these activities have featured heavy selling accompanied by deliveries and threats of deliveries which cause panic conditions. In addition to the cases which have been legally established as violations of the Commodity Exchange Act, there have been many situations in which the market was pushed out of its normal supply and demand position, but in which the activities were not sufficiently flagrant and provable so as to justify legal proceedings.

Point 8. Growers are demoralized and confused by the antics of the futures market. This causes failure to make constructive efforts to solve other problems.

Many of the growers in Maine have become so discouraged and demoralized by the futures market that they have abandoned their farms. Some 1,400 have dropped away in a 7-year period. Those who continue the struggle fail to give proper attention to other problems facing the industry because their thinking is so dominated by the antics of the futures market.

Point 9. Legislation as was the case in onions is the only remedy. Those burdened with this activity cannot simply ignore it.

The only way the producers and legitimate handlers of potatoes can get relief from the burden of futures trade is through legislation as was done in onions in 1958. As long as the Exchange exists and the prices are sent out over the network of wires, every person attempting to buy or sell actual potatoes will be forced to use these prices as the starting point in any transaction. This becomes difficult indeed when the "board" prices fluctuate as frequently and drastically as they do.

The need for this legislation is strongly evidenced by the organizations on record as supporting it, which include the National Grange, the American Farm Bureau Federation, the Farmers' Union, the National Council of Farm Cooperatives, the National Potato Council, and the Farmer's Cooperative Council of North Carolina.

The Legislature of Maine, whose members include many persons closely connected with the potato industry, have endorsed this legislation.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a memorial from the Legislature of Maine.

There being no objection, the memorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOINT RESOLUTION PROPOSING ABOLITION OF FUTURES TRADING OF POTATOES ON THE NEW YORK MERCANTILE EXCHANGE BY THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

We, your memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Maine in the 101st legislative session assembled, most respectfully present and petition your honorable body as follows:

Whereas the Constitution of the United States provides that the Congress may regulate commerce among the several States; and

Whereas potatoes are now traded in futures contracts on the New York Mercantile Exchange, 6 Harrison Street, New York, N.Y.; and

Whereas the price at which future contracts are bought and sold has a direct and immediate effect on cash prices received by producers for potatoes in Maine and all other areas producing potatoes for market; and

Whereas futures prices reflect the effects of manipulations and unlimited speculation to the detriment of producers of potatoes; and

Whereas futures trading of potatoes obstructs all attempts of Maine potato producers to market their product in an orderly fashion; and

Whereas futures trading of potatoes encourages overproduction in Maine and all other producing areas with resulting disastrously low prices for the producer; and

Whereas experience has proven that futures trading can be carried on without detrimental and depressing effect on price only in the case of those commodities which can be stored for extensive periods of time either within the areas of production or the areas of marketing and distribution; and

Whereas Irish potatoes are a perishable commodity that do not lend themselves to extended periods of storage, especially following preparation for market; and

Whereas Irish potatoes historically are one of the most volatile commodities in terms of price range and in degree of sensitivity to myriad market factors, including total volume produced, anticipated production, available supply on track and in the marketplaces, as well as many others; and

Whereas many areas of production have vehemently registered their opposition to the continued trading of Irish potato futures, either with or without the supervision of the Commodity Exchange Authority of the USDA and producers in Maine, by mail ballot, have voted overwhelmingly in favor of abolishing futures trading in Maine potatoes; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States has already established a precedent for the action to be proposed by this resolution in the instance of another perishable commodity, namely onions, leaving potatoes as the only perishable commodity now being traded on the futures market: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, your memorialists, recommend that the Congress enact legislation abolishing futures trading in Irish potatoes upon the New York Mercantile Exchange or upon any Commodity Exchange; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this memorial, duly authenticated by the secretary of state, be immediately transmitted by the secretary of state, by mail, to the Senate and House of Representatives in Congress, to the Members of the said Senate and House of Representatives from this State.

In senate chamber, February 12, 1963, read and adopted, sent down for concurrence.

CHESTER T. WINSLOW,
Secretary.

House of representatives, read and adopted, February 13, 1963, in concurrence.

HARVEY R. PEASE,
Clerk.

I, Paul A. MacDonald, secretary of state of the State of Maine, and custodian of the seal of said State, do hereby certify:

That I have carefully compared the annexed copy of the memorial to the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America assembled, with the original thereof, and that it is a full, true, and complete transcript therefrom and of the whole thereof.

In testimony whereof, I have caused the seal of the State to be hereunto affixed. Given under my hand at Augusta, this 25th day of February, in the year of our Lord 1963 and in the 187th year of the independence of the United States of America.

PAUL A. MACDONALD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, these are people whose welfare is dependent upon a sound and orderly marketing system. It is inconceivable that they would be influenced by any motive which they were not convinced would be beneficial to the whole potato industry from producer to consumer.

The uncertain and unpredictable price movements brought about by futures speculation are reflected not only in lower prices to producers, but also often in higher prices to consumers. This seeming paradox results from the necessity of potato dealers to have a higher margin of profit, in order to protect themselves against these unwarranted price movements.

In closing, I should like to emphasize the significant reasons why I believe the bill should be passed.

First. For all practical purposes, Maine grown potatoes are the only potatoes traded on the futures market. Maine potato growers overwhelmingly oppose futures trading. In 1962, 90 percent of Maine growers opposed futures trading in a poll conducted by the Maine Potato Council.

Second. The principal issue at stake is the orderly marketing of the Maine potato crop. This bill is not directed against the mechanics of futures trading on any other commodity. The existence of the futures market has encouraged Maine farmers to delay marketing of their crops until late in the season, into May, sometimes into June and even July. Because of the perishability of potatoes, this has resulted in spoilage and loss of investment to the farmer. This has also brought the Maine farmer into serious competition with the producers of new potatoes from Southern States.

Third. This bill does not establish a precedent. Legislation abolishing onion futures trading was enacted by Congress in 1958.

Fourth. The price quotations on potato futures do not accurately reflect supply and demand. In one 24-hour period, the market dropped 31 points and then jumped back 21 points.

Mr. President, the bill pending before the Senate should be amended in one respect, and I send an amendment to the desk and ask to have it stated by the clerk.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The amendment offered by the Senator from Maine will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed on page 1, after the period in line 5, to insert the following new sentence:

> Notwithstanding the foregoing sentence, futures trading in Irish potatoes shall be permitted in the case of any future with respect to which trading has been initiated on or before the date of enactment of this Act, but in no event shall such trading be permitted in the case of any future which would mature more than twelve calendar months after the calendar month in which this Act is enacted.

On page 1, line 9, strike out "section" and insert in lieu thereof "Act".

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, the purpose of this amendment is to avoid the unfortunate conditions which might follow in the event trading were cut off immediately upon enactment of the bill. This amendment would permit the continuation of trading in potato futures for all months in which trading has already been initiated up to a period of 1 year. If the bill were to be effective on enactment, those who held short positions on that date would have to deliver actual potatoes, and those who held long positions would have to accept delivery. This would not only unfairly create a situation not contemplated at the time the positions were acquired, but might have unfortunate repercussions on the cash potato market.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a table showing the number of open contracts in potato futures as of July 17, 1964.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Open contracts in potato futures, July 17, 1964—source: Commodity Exchange Authority

November 1964	1,702
March 1965	1,357
April 1965	920
May 1964	936
Total	4,915

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, since trading in potato futures has appeared to benefit only a comparatively few people and has actually been damaging to a large number, namely, the potato growers, I favor enactment of S. 332.

As the Senator from Maine has stated, this bill is favored by virtually all the major farm organizations of the United States. An hour or so ago, I received a telegram from the American Farm Bureau Federation, which reads as follows:

> Farm Bureau supports S. 332 to prohibit potato futures trading. We do not think it serves the interest of potato growers or the cause of futures trading generally to continue an unworkable program of futures trading in a perishable commodity, especially when it involves only one of the producing areas. Because potatoes are perishable commodities they do not lend themselves to sound futures trading. The small volume traded provides the opportunity for sharp price fluctuations and facilitates price manipulations. We do believe that futures trading in potatoes does not help the potato marketing system nor potato growers, but is in fact a detriment. We support the passage of S. 332.
>
> JOHN C. LYNN,
> *Legislative Director, American Farm Bureau Federation.*

To be perfectly fair, I must also state that the bill is opposed by certain elements of the grain-trading business. I assume they feel that if trading in potato futures is eliminated, some efforts may be made to eliminate trading in some other commodities and they are, therefore, apprehensive.

I feel that they are taking a mistaken position. Legitimate trading in nonperishable commodities will be on a much sounder basis and in a much safer position if the questionable trading is eliminated. We all recall the chaos and the trading atrocities that were committed under the onion futures trading. I cannot help feeling that commodity trading in general will be much safer if the bill is passed.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. The Senator read a telegram from the American Farm Bureau Federation in regard to its views about the pending bill dealing with trading in the potato market, which the Bureau favors. I believe the Senator also mentioned that there were other legitimate uses for futures trading. In order to emphasize that, I should like to read from page 231 of the hearings, which contains a statement filed by the American Farm Bureau Federation:

> Farm Bureau believes in the market price system. We believe that futures trading plays a valuable role in agricultural marketing of many commodities. Our support of S. 332, to eliminate potato futures trading, does not in any way change this belief. We do, however, feel that futures trading in potatoes does not help the potato marketing system, but is in fact a detriment. We, therefore, support S. 332 and urge its prompt enactment.

I wanted to read that portion because it expresses my view on this particular legislation.

Mr. AIKEN. That statement by the Farm Bureau before the committee corresponds to my own view that there is a legitimate field for futures trading in nonperishable commodities; but I realize that a small number trading in futures have succeeded in demoralizing the potato market in some areas. There may be some who would like to have futures trading in strawberries, where they could speculate from day to day. Certainly we do not want to do that. We want to preserve the legitimate market. I do not say potato trading is not legitimate, because Congress has said it is, but we want to preserve the practical trading market without jeopardizing it by including commodities which I do not think should have been included in the first place.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I wish to join in the remarks made by the Senator from Vermont, because I believe there is a place for futures trading in agricultural commodities. Therefore, I shall support the bill.

Mr. MUSKIE. I thank the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from Kansas for their comments.

I think it might be well to read from a letter sent to me by Mr. Harry L. Graham, legislative assistant to the National Master, National Grange. I read very briefly from that letter:

> We believe very strongly that futures trading has an important place in our American economy as long as it is confined to storable products. A few years ago we had a very unfortunate experience with onions and it was found necessary to eliminate them from futures trading. In the last few years, we have had the same experience in potatoes grown in the Northeast section of our country.
>
> There is a limit which crops such as potatoes and onions can be held in a marketing year and it is at the end of the marketing period that the perishable commodities which are traded in futures always get into difficulty. The futures trading has had a tendency to move the marketing period for fall potatoes from Maine back from about an April 1 cleanup day up into the last of May. This puts these potatoes in competition with the early spring potatoes that are grown in our Southern States and we are faced with two crops of potatoes coming onto the mar-

ket at the same time. This certainly is not conducive to the orderly marketing processes which are necessary if farmers are to receive an adequate return for their products.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the letter included in full in the Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

National Grange,
Washington, D.C., July 10, 1964.

The Honorable Edmund S. Muskie,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Muskie: Permit me to take this method to reassert the vigorous support of the National Grange for S. 332 which is ready for consideration in the U.S. Senate. This bill would eliminate futures trading in potatoes.

We believe very strongly that futures trading has an important place in our American economy as long as it is confined to storable products. A few years ago we had a very unfortunate experience with onions and it was found necessary to eliminate them from futures trading. In the last few years, we have had the same experience in potatoes grown in the Northeast section of our country.

There is a limit which crops such as potatoes and onions can be held in a marketing year and it is at the end of the marketing period that the perishable commodities which are traded in futures always get into difficulty. The futures trading has had a tendency to move the marketing period for fall potatoes from Maine back from about an April 1 cleanup day up into the last of May. This puts these potatoes in competition with the early spring potatoes that are grown in our Southern States and we are faced with two crops of potatoes coming onto the market at the same time. This certainly is not conducive to the orderly marketing processes which are necessary if farmers are to receive an adequate return for their products.

In addition, during periods of oversupply such as we have been experiencing in potatoes for a number of years, the "shorts" are able to drive down the prices to unreasonably low levels. It has been conservatively estimated that this had cost Maine producers $15 million per year in income and has depressed prices along the eastern seaboard by an amount that is not easily determined.

However, this does not always accrue to the best interests of the consumer as was demonstrated by what happened in the futures trading in potatoes a little over a month ago. The fact of the matter was that there was no reason for the exceedingly low prices that the traders had forced upon potatoes as was demonstrated when one purchaser began covering all of the "shorts" and was able or forced to buy over 1,900 carloads of potatoes. He justified his price by the fact that there was really a shortage of potatoes for all the market demands, including sales to consumers through grocery stores and sales to the processing companies. This undoubtedly has led to higher prices for potatoes, especially on the eastern seaboard but this seems to us to be a completely unrealistic reason for opposing the elimination of futures. Had it not been for the futures trading, this situation would not have arisen because the potatoes would have moved more normally into the market channels without having been held up through the ownership of future receipts.

Furthermore, if futures trading is such a good thing for potatoes, why not extend it to the whole Nation instead of just to one small market?

This is an economic injustice that should be righted and it can be righted only by the passage of S. 332 in the Senate and the companion bill introduced by Congressman McIntire in the House.

Respectfully yours,
Harry L. Graham,
Legislative Assistant to the National Master.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUSKIE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. The distinguished Senator from Maine has so well presented the argument on the bill that I merely wish to add that I am a member of the Subcommittee on Agricultural Research and General Legislation of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, which conducted hearings last fall and reported the bill to the calendar on March 13 of this year.

Growers generally, and Maine potato growers in particular, testified that the potato futures market serves no useful purpose and has an adverse effect on cash potato prices. Rather than providing against hedging, it provides an opportunity for price manipulations. Most impressively they pointed out that it has a depressing effect on prices and encourages price fluctuations.

The feeling of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was that the bill should be passed, and I wholeheartedly support it.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, indicating the concern in my State with respect to this problem, not only among growers and people connected with the potato industry, I read from an editorial published in the Portland Sunday Telegram of Sunday, May 10, 1963:

It's time for Maine to come out fighting.

The Maine potato industry has been in the doldrums for several years, and, although the price is the best right now that it has been in all that time, the depressed condition of the industry isn't likely to change basically until futures trading in Maine potatoes has been halted. At the same time, the future of the Maine broiler industry is threatened by the refusal of out-of-State railroads to reduce rates for feed grains to this State as they have to other areas.

Harold Bryant, executive vice president of the Maine Potato Council, put his finger on the mercantile exchange trading in potato futures as the sore spot of the industry. He cited a comparison with Idaho potato prices showing that the Maine prices have declined steadily since futures trading began in earnest.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial may be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Portland (Maine) Sunday Telegram, May 10, 1964]

Maine Potatoes

It's time for Maine to come out fighting.

The Maine potato industry has been in the doldrums for several years, and, although the price is the best right now that it has been in all that time, the depressed condition of the industry isn't likely to change basically until futures trading in Maine potatoes has been halted. At the same time, the future of the Maine broiler industry is threatened by the refusal of out-of-State railroads to reduce rates for feed grains to this State as they have to other areas.

Harold Bryant, executive vice president of the Maine Potato Council, put his finger on the merchantile exchange trading in potato futures as the sore spot of the industry. He cited a comparison with Idaho potato prices showing that the Maine prices have declined steadily since futures trading began in earnest. And he went so far as to say that there is "collusion in the futures market." That is no new accusation. Most Aroostook farmers and dealers in potatoes are convinced that the market is manipulated, to the detriment of the Aroostook industry.

Maine should be shouting with all its might for Congress to pass a bill that would ban trading in potato futures. It should also be shouting with all its might for an investigation, by the Interstate Commerce Commission or a congressional committee, of preferential railroad rates that give competition in Middle Atlantic and Southern States a decided advantage over Maine broiler growers.

For a while, it appeared that Maine growers had been able to get half a loaf. Where rates to the other States had been cut $5 a ton, the rate to Maine had been reduced $2.50 a ton—not enough to keep one large Maine poultry producer from moving to Tennessee, but enough to give hope that the differential could be wiped out. Then suddenly last week, the $2.50 reduction was canceled. The committee appointed by Governor Reed to study the problem thus has a doubly hard job to do.

Maine has won one of its battles, the effort to get a sugarbeet acreage allotment and a new sugar refinery. Perhaps if the same coordination of efforts and persistence is brought to bear on the futures trading and the grain rates, additional battles can be won. The State doesn't seem to have much choice but to hit the obstacles as hard as it can. The outcome could be a matter of life or death for large segments of the State's economy.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUSKIE. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. As a preface to some questions which I would like to ask the Senator from Maine, I do not believe it can be said that I am prejudiced against the State of Maine. I grew up in that State, and my family has lived there for almost 250 years.

Nor can I be accused of being prejudiced in favor of the Chicago Board of Trade, since there is a very small amount of potato trading on the Chicago Board of Trade, and also because the members of that organization have never been conspicuous among my supporters. In fact, quite the contrary.

I believe there are some questions, however, which at least should be considered before we vote on the bill. I wonder if my friend from Maine remembers the statement which was filed by Prof. Roger W. Gray, professor of the Food Research Institute at Stanford University, which appears at page 76 of the hearings. I refer to the fourth paragraph, which reads:

The March future has averaged 43 cents higher than the November future on October 15 for these 11 years, which has been the assured average return for storing potatoes until late February. But once again, not only has the hedger benefited in this way, but he has benefited, relative to the unhedged grower, in the tendency to profit from his futures position. Whereas the November future was 13 cents higher on April 15

> than it was on October 15, during these 11 years, the March future was 34 cents higher on October 15 than it was on February 28. Thus the more typical Maine grower, who stores potatoes, has had much more benefit from hedging than the grower who sells at harvesttime.

In other words, by selling for future delivery, rather than selling for delivery at the harvesttime, the farmer would get more. I wonder what comment the Senator from Maine would care to make on that point.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, it is difficult for me to comment directly on the statistics to which the Senator has made reference, relating to the testimony of Mr. Gray. There are statistics on both sides of the question as to whether hedging is beneficial for the grower. In response to the statistics offered by Mr. Gray, I can only cite the belief of the growers themselves. First of all, it is important to understand to what degree hedging is a part of trading on the mercantile exchange. For example, a table was placed in the RECORD earlier this afternoon, which appears at page 27 of the House hearings. I believe the Senator does not have the House hearings before him.

Mr. DOUGLAS. We do not have the House hearings.

Mr. MUSKIE. The same table is in the record of the Senate hearings. We shall try to find it. On October 27, 1961, the table shows that in Maine there were 96 traders who were classified as speculators and 121 traders who were classified as hedgers.

The total number of traders on that day was 217. The total number of traders in the North Atlantic section of the country was 552, of which 233 were hedgers. On that day the total number of traders in the country was 1,170. Of the total number of traders on the New York Mercantile Exchange in Maine potatoes, less than 300 out of 1,170 were in the market for hedging purposes.

The second point I should like to make is that although Maine potatoes represent something like 15 percent of the total potatoes sold throughout the country, Maine potatoes are the only potatoes traded on the mercantile exchange.

There is negligible trading in Idaho potatoes, Long Island potatoes, and potatoes grown in other sections of the country. The principal trading is in the 15 percent of the market which is Maine potatoes. If hedging is such a useful device for the grower, and if it would return to him the financial benefits that some suggest, I submit to the Senator from Illinois that the arguments have been singularly lacking in persuasiveness to the potato growers in the potato-growing areas of the country outside Maine.

I would again emphasize that while Maine produces 15 percent of the Nation's potatoes, only a small percentage of the growers participate in the hedging function.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Would the Senator from Maine deny the usefulness of trading in futures on most commodities?

Mr. MUSKIE. As to storable commodities, I concede the value of commodity exchanges.

Mr. DOUGLAS. For corn, wheat, rye, and barley?

Mr. MUSKIE. I have not studied those commodities; but I will say to the Senator from Illinois that my impression is that trading, on the whole, serves a useful function in the storage of nonperishable commodities.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does not trading in futures enable growers to protect themselves against price fluctuations, by buying and selling at the same time, so that they are not injured by the course of future fluctuations?

Mr. MUSKIE. Hedging has worked well with many commodities, but not as to potatoes and onions, because they are perishable and nonstorable. With the exception of storage to cover certain marketing periods, such as the April and May markets for Maine potatoes, the storage of potatoes creates difficulty. All those engaged in the industry, in the growing and selling of the commodity itself, agree with that conclusion. The only ones who disagree are the traders on the exchanges.

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I follow that thought a bit? To what degree has the air conditioning of potato storage houses in the summertime and the heating of them in the wintertime overcome the difficulties of weather and made potatoes relatively less perishable and more stable in quality?

Mr. MUSKIE. In my State, efforts are being made in this direction. They are commendable and constructive efforts. But I suggest that we would be doing even more in this direction, and also in the direction of better merchandising, better distribution, and better handling by the industry all around, if we could turn the minds of those in the industry away from trading on mercantile exchanges.

Farmers and dealers feel they must deal with the exchange because it has such a strong impact on the price for the cash crop. They devote so much time to the problems that the exchange creates for them that they tend to neglect some of the proper aspects of the program in which they are interested. They tend to neglect the activities which would enable them to make progress.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am not an expert on the marketing of potatoes; but is it not easy for people to find a scapegoat for their troubles by suspecting city folks?

Mr. MUSKIE. I suppose it is natural even for Senators to find scapegoats. But let me emphasize again that we are dealing only with Maine potatoes. Those who grow and sell Maine potatoes and try to make a living from them, those who have the problem of carrying the mortgages on their farms, are the ones directly involved. If their position is weak in the instance suggested by the Senator from Illinois, at least they are dealing with their own problem and are asking to be relieved from dealing with other forces which to them are detrimental and destructive.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If they are deluded, should we legislate on the basis of their delusion, merely because it is too difficult to remove?

Mr. MUSKIE. I do not think they are deluded; but if they are, the Senator from Illinois should not be concerned, because they are not the potatoes of Illinois farmers. They are Maine potatoes, and the Maine growers, if the polls mean anything, are 90 percent for the bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. This bill is merely a part of a general program. As I recall, it was in 1958 that Congress abolished futures trading in onions. This was a problem that affected Illinois, because there was a great deal of trading in onion futures on the Chicago Board of Trade. There was no evidence that futures trading in onions was inherently injurious. Nevertheless, the onion growers thought it was, so trading in onion futures was abolished.

Now the Senator from Maine and those who agree with him would abolish futures trading in potatoes. When will this process stop? Will it shortly be said that there are other farm commodities as to which futures trading is injurious; and will the growers and sellers determine what the policy of the United States is to be?

Mr. MUSKIE. Each case would have to be decided on its own merits. I am not saying that trading in potato futures should be eliminated because onion futures trading was eliminated. I am not suggesting any such causal relationship. I am not suggesting the elimination of futures trading in the case of other commodities.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The next might be eggs; and following that might be butter.

Mr. MUSKIE. Each is a problem to be dealt with on its own merits. Today we are considering the potato problem on its merits.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes; but in acting we also lay the basis for future action. Does the Senator from Maine say that there have been abuses on the part of traders in Maine potatoes which have improperly depressed the price of Maine potatoes to the growers? If there have been such, they should be condemned. Does the Senator have any evidence to that effect?

Mr. MUSKIE. I would like to respond to the Senator from Illinois concerning the abuse of trading procedures referred to as manipulation. Manipulation in the field of potato futures trading is illustrated by four cases in which the operations were so flagrant as to warrant legal action. These are: C.E.A. Docket 68, Winn and Lovett, et al. C.E.A. Docket 69, Jacob Stern, et al. C.E.A. Docket 73, Vincent Kosuga, et al. C.E.A. Docket 78, Murlas Brothers, et al.

Each of these cases followed the same pattern of making heavy short sales of futures and threatening the delivery of undesirable stocks of the actual commodity to force down the "board" price.

For each case in which legal proof could be developed, there were undoubtedly many others better concealed and on a smaller scale.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Were those acts in violation of the Commodity Exchanges Act?

Mr. MUSKIE. Yes; they were.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Were they found guilty?

Mr. MUSKIE. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Why does not the Senator from Maine content himself with the authority granted by law to the Commodity Exchange Authority, and seek to have the regulatory body cure the abuses?

Offhand, I should say that my good friend from Maine is in the position of a doctor who, when he found the patient had a cold in his head, instead of trying to treat the cold, would cut the man's head off. Is it necessary to abolish trading in futures in order to remove abuses? There are abuses on the New York Stock Exchange; but Congress established the Securities and Exchange Commission to prevent certain abuses. We did not put the New York Stock Exchange out of business. Nor do we intend to do so.

Mr. MUSKIE. To use another figure of speech, if I were to follow the course of action suggested by the Senator from Illinois, I would be in the position of locking the barn door after the horse had been stolen. It does no good for a potato farmer in Maine to prove someone guilty of a violation of law and have a fine imposed or a prison sentence imposed, if there is such a penalty, when the damage to his market has been done. I emphasize again that what we are talking about is trading in Maine potatoes, not Illinois potatoes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I understand.

Mr. MUSKIE. Not Florida, not New York, not Long Island, not California, not Idaho, but Maine potatoes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I understand.

Mr. MUSKIE. This market is so small that it is subject, in an exaggerated way, to some of the consequences which I have tried to spell out this afternoon.

If trade in Maine potatoes is so beneficial as to suggest that the Maine farmers should bear the burden of the abuses which follow the penalties laid down by law, why do not other potato growers in other parts of the country also resort to trading on the exchange? Why are not their potatoes traded on the exchange?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Let me say to my good friend the Senator from Maine, in reply to the first part of his statement, that while it is true that a fine upon traders who violate the Commodity Exchange Act does not immediately benefit the Maine grower of potatoes, it does act as a deterrent against future illegal and improper acts.

I believe that there may be involved in this action the whole question of trading in futures on farm commodities.

I know that it is easy for people who suffer from price fluctuations to blame the traders rather than to blame the relative elasticity of demand. Most farm commodities are subject to what the economists call the inelasticity of demand, where an increase in a given percent in quantity results in a far greater relative decrease in unit price, so that the farmers as a whole receive less for producing more.

This is one of the innate difficulties in the farm situation with which we have tried to wrestle for over 30 years.

I should prefer to see the problem attacked from this angle, rather than to try to prohibit trading in futures, a practice which certainly performs, in general, an economic function to protect the farmers against fluctuations in prices. I believe in a greater stabilization of farm prices. I do not believe that trading in futures unstabilizes prices, although there may have been cases of short selling. It is due more to the inelastic demand and the fact that slight fluctuations in production can produce a great fluctuation in unit price. But the farmers then blame the commodity exchanges.

I believe in the regulation of the commodity exchanges. I thought that we had a fairly satisfactory law and a fairly satisfactory regulatory body. If we have not, I would certainly be in favor of making more stringent laws which would provide for a better authority. But to prohibit trading in futures seems to me to be like breaking a thermometer in order to try to prevent the temperature from rising.

I shall not press this issue any further. I believe that the Senator from Maine has the votes on this point. My State is really not economically involved. I am not directly involved in this problem so far as any material or political influences are concerned. I am however somewhat distressed by the obvious turn which Congress is taking. In 1958, we prohibited trading in futures on onions, and now we are prohibiting the trading in futures on potatoes.

What will be next? Apples? Eggs? Butter? Cases can be made in connection with all of them.

I am afraid that we may have allowed ourselves to be influenced by current prejudices not founded on facts.

Mr. MUSKIE. I thank the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. President, what is the pending question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that permission may be granted to the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] to file a statement on the pending measure at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Statement by Senator Javits on Bill To Prohibit Potato Futures Trading in Irish Potatoes (S. 332)

There have been many arguments offered in favor of and against this measure which prohibits futures trading in Irish potatoes, and I think it is important that we realize that there are two sides to this difficult issue and not just one.

As a Senator from New York, I am naturally greatly concerned that S. 332 would have the effect of abolishing potato futures trading on the New York Mercantile Exchange and would thus do away with the major portion of the operations of a significant New York institution. The New York Mercantile Exchange, a nonprofit membership corporation, has been in existence in the State of New York since 1872. I could hardly allow the pending measure, which has support in my State among a number of potato growers, to be enacted without expressing this deep concern over the effect it will have on the New York Mercantile Exchange.

The major objections to potato futures trading as expressed by the proponents of this bill are generally as follows: (1) that futures market deals in only a very small part of actual potato production and is used largely for speculation; (2) since it deals in a commodity which is perishable, prices established on this market will frequently be influenced by factors other than supply and demand; (3) that futures trading is the cause of price fluctuations in the potato industry and that use of futures trading has tended to distort the orderly marketing of potatoes from Maine. As my colleagues know, New York has a substantial potato industry, and I have always been concerned with the stability and growth of this market. My interest in the welfare of my State's potato growers, I believe, is fully equal to the Senator from Maine's interest in the welfare of Maine potato growers. If the trading in potato futures does, in fact, have a harmful effect on the potato industry, I would certainly not want to encourage this harmful effect, but I do want to make it clear that there are many agricultural experts who feel that basic problems in the potato industry are not attributable to trading in potato futures.

The New York Mercantile Exchange provides three important functions for the potato industry. First, it provides a trading place and facilities for a continuous market every business day of the year. Second, it is argued that potato growers, dealers, and processors of potatoes may shift part of their risk of price changes in potatoes by hedging operations on the exchange and thus permit them to operate on narrower margins. This may provide consumers with potatoes and potato products at somewhat lower costs. Third, there is, of course, opportunity for speculation on the exchange but is subject to strict regulation under the Commodity Exchange Act by the Commodity Exchange Authority of the Department of Agriculture, which supervises the operation of the exchanges. Legislation has recently been introduced on behalf of the administration to improve the effectiveness of regulatory supervision over the commodity exchanges.

The record of hearings which the Committee on Agriculture conducted on S. 332 is filled with testimony of agricultural experts who state that a harmful effect on potato futures is created by trading on futures exchange. For example, Assistant Prof. Raymond Goldberg, of the Harvard School of Graduate Business Administration, testified before the committee that "all economic evidence from impartial sources who have analyzed the futures activities of this exchange (the New York Mercantile Exchange) have been unanimous in the conclusion that the futures market has been a beneficial marketing tool for the whole potato industry and its market structure." With respect to the argument that potato futures trading causes harmful price fluctuation, Prof. C. D. Kearl, professor of agricultural economics, New York State College of Agriculture, Cornell University, was one of many experts who stated before the Agriculture Committee that if farmers and traders have ready access to a futures market, unwarranted fluctuations would be eliminated. He stated that: "The idea put forward that the presence of a well-recognized and widely used market, such as is found for potatoes, will be the cause of potato price fluctuation is amusing. * * * A trader on the futures market, whether he be a farmer or otherwise, who feels that the price of the commodity is to high or too low, can shift his position too readily to let the price get out of line. The awareness of all such traders as to the probabilities of the supply and demand situation is enough to keep any individual or group of individuals from getting away from the price that the actual conditions dictate. Informed buyers and sellers have access to a widely used market where they have the opportunity of expressing themselves in buying and selling create price stability."

Similarly, with respect to the effect of potato futures trading on prices, Dr. Charles H. Merchant, former professor and head of the Department of Agricultural Business at the University of Maine stated: "A comparison was made of cash prices of potatoes for the past six seasons at Cleveland, Boston, and Presque Isle with similiar prices on the New York market. The price relationships are practically identical for each of the six seasons * * * For these seasons the average price differential between Presque Isle street price and Boston was 66 cents per hundredweight, and from Presque Isle to New York 105 cents per hundredweight, and from Presque Isle to Cleveland 160 cents per hundredweight. These differences amounted to approximately the freight rate and marketing charges from Presque Isle to the respective markets. While there was some variation in price differential between markets from week to week, the differences were very small. When the price changed in one market, nearly an equal change occurred at other markets and at Presque Isle. Therefore, whatever the influence the New York Mercantile Exchange may have had on the cash potato market in New York was simultaneously reflected to other markets in the Northeast."

On this point, Secretary of Agriculture Freeman on July 21, 1961, wrote House Agriculture Committee Chairman COOLEY concerning legislation similar to S. 332 introduced in the 87th Congress that "Even though there is a wide variation in the prices of Maine potatoes from season to season and within a particular market season, price fluctuations do not appear to be increased by futures trading. The average prices received by farmers for Maine potatoes generally fluctuates no more than the prices of potatoes produced in other States which are not trading on futures market. The prohibition of futures trading could not be expected to eliminate these wide price movements which are inherent in the marketing of a commodity having, as does potatoes, an inelastic demand and substantial variations in the size of the crop from year to year."

By his letter of August 27, 1963, to the chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee on S. 332 Secretary of Agriculture Freeman wrote the following:

"The exchange generally appears to perform satisfactorily in crystalizing market information and in disseminating futures price quotations which furnish a basis for cash trading. Expressions of many persons familiar with the Maine potato industry indicate that this might be done as well at country shipping points in spot bargaining between buyers and sellers. On the question of price, it is not clear that either longrun price changes or shortrun changes would be greatly altered if there were no trading in potato futures. But many of those engaged in growing and handling Maine potatoes feel that the exchange disrupts orderly marketing by encouraging growers to hold potatoes until late in the season thus abandoning early season markets to other producing areas."

The President's message on agriculture transmitted to the Congress on January 31, 1964, recognized the value of the concept of regulated futures trading, in stating that: "Trading in futures contracts on commodity exchanges is an old and valuable method of providing essential pricing service to farmers, processors, and handlers. When adequately policed and protected, it is an essential means of shielding producers from the hazards of major price fluctuations."

I am aware that a great many potato growers in my State are in favor of abolishing the trading of potato futures, and I am sympathetic to their concerns. On the other hand, I believe it should be made clear that there are substantial arguments in favor of the continued operation of the potato futures exchanges as demonstrated by the extensive evidence presented to the Agriculture Committee by experts in this field during hearings on S. 332. In view of the fact that the administration has introduced S. 2859, legislation to improve regulatory machinery under the Commodity Exchange Act, I believe it would be more prudent for the Congress to consider the question of abolishing trading in Irish potato futures on commodity exchanges after the adequacy of existing or improved regulation of these markets is fully considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (S. 332) was passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) no contract for the sale of Irish potatoes for future delivery shall be made on or subject to the rules of any board of trade in the United States. Notwithstanding the foregoing sentence, futures trading in Irish potatoes shall be permitted in the case of any future with respect to which trading has been initiated on or before the date of enactment of this Act, but in no event shall such trading be permitted in the case of any future which would mature more than twelve calendar months after the calendar month in which this Act is enacted. The terms used in this Act shall have the same meaning as when used in the Commodity Exchange Act.

(b) Any person who shall violate the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof be fined not more than $5,000.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE OF ADEQUATE SYSTEM OF ROADS AND TRAILS FOR THE NATIONAL FORESTS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1110, the bill S. 1147, and that it be made the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1147) to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to construct and maintain an adequate system of roads and trails for the national forests, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Works, with an amendment on page 3, line 14, after the word *"Provided,"*, to strike out "That where roads of a higher standard than that needed in the harvesting and removal of the timber and other products from lands tributary thereto are to be constructed, the purchasers of national forest timber and other products shall not be required to bear that part of the costs necessary to meet such higher standard and the Secretary is authorized to make such arrangements to this end as may be appropriate." and insert "That where roads of a higher standard than that needed in the harvesting and removal of the timber and other products covered by the particular sale are to be constructed, the purchaser of the national forest timber and other products shall not be required to bear that part of the costs necessary to meet such higher standard, and the Secretary is authorized to make such arrangements to this end as may be appropriated."; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Congress hereby finds and declares that the construction and maintenance of an adequate system of roads and trails within and near the national forests and other lands administered by the Forest Service is essential if increasing demands for timber, recreation, and other uses of such lands are to be met; that the existence of such a system would have the effect, among other things, of increasing the value of timber and other resources tributary to such roads; and that such a system is essential to enable the Secretary of Agriculture (hereinafter called the Secretary) to provide for intensive use, protection, development, and management of these lands under principles of multiple use and sustained yield of products and services.

SEC. 2. The Secretary is authorized, under such regulations as he may prescribe, subject to the provisions of this Act, to grant permanent or temporary easements for specified periods or otherwise for road rights-of-way (1) over national forest lands and other lands administered by the Forest Service, and (2) over any other related lands with respect to which the Department of Agriculture has rights under the terms of the grant to it.

SEC. 3. An easement granted under this Act may be terminated by consent of the owner of the easement, by condemnation, or after a five-year period of nonuse the Secretary may, if he finds the owner has abandoned the easement, make a determination to cancel it. Before the Secretary may cancel an easement for nonuse the owner of such easement must be notified of the determination to cancel and be given, upon his request made within sixty days after receipt of the notice, a hearing in accordance with such rules and regulations as may be issued by the Secretary.

SEC. 4. The Secretary is authorized to provide for the acquisition, construction, and maintenance of forest development roads within and near the national forests and other lands administered by the Forest Service in locations and according to specifications which will permit maximum economy in harvesting timber from such lands tributary to such roads and at the same time meet the requirements for protection, development, and management thereof, and for utilization of the other resources thereof. Financing of such roads may be accomplished (1) by the Secretary utilizing appropriated funds, (2) by requirements on purchasers of national forest timber and other products, including provisions for amortization of road costs in contracts, (3) by cooperative financing with other public agencies and with private agencies or persons, or (4) by a combination of these methods: *Provided,* That where roads of a higher standard than that needed in the harvesting and removal of the timber and other products covered by the particular sale are to be constructed, the purchaser of the national forest timber and other products shall not be required to bear that part of the costs necessary to meet such higher standard, and the Secretary is authorized to make such arrangements to this end as may be appropriated.

SEC. 5. Copies of all instruments affecting permanent interests in land executed pursuant to this Act shall be recorded in each county where the lands are located. Copies of all instruments affecting interests in lands reserved from the public domain shall be furnished to the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 6. The Secretary may require the user or users of a road under the control of the Forest Service, including purchasers of Government timber and other products, to maintain such roads in a satisfactory condition commensurate with the particular use requirements of each. Such maintenance to be borne by each user shall be proportionate to total use. The Secretary may also require the user or users of such a road to reconstruct the same when such reconstruction is determined to be necessary to accommodate such use. If such maintenance or reconstruction cannot be so provided or if the Secretary determines that maintenance or reconstruction by a user would not be practical, then the Secretary may require that sufficient funds be deposited by the user to provide his portion of such total maintenance or reconstruction. Deposits made to cover the maintenance or reconstruction of roads are hereby made available until expended to cover the cost to the United States of accomplishing the purposes for which deposited: *Provided,* That deposits received for work on adjacent and overlapping areas may be combined when it is the most practicable and efficient manner of performing the work, and cost thereof may be determined by estimates: *And provided further,* That unexpended balances upon accomplishment of the purpose for which deposited shall be transferred to miscellaneous receipts or refunded.

SEC. 7. Whenever the agreement under which the United States has obtained for the use of, or in connection with, the national forests and other lands administered by the Forest Service a right-of-way or easement for a road or an existing road or the right to use an existing road provides for delayed payments to the Government's grantor, any fees or other collections received by the Secretary for the use of the road may be placed in a fund to be available for making payments to the grantor.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, the bill before the Senate is an administration bill. It was introduced to clarify some of the regulations and laws relating to forest access roads. For many years there was an Attorney General's opinion which provided that the administration could not have access to private property in some of the checkerboard claims in the western part of the United States, including the State of Montana.

Senators will recall that when the land grants were made to the railroads and other corporations, alternate sections were granted. Many of the claims provide for ownership of alternate sections of the Forest Service, and the sections in between are owned by the Northern Pacific Railroad, the Anaconda Co. in Montana, and other companies. So there is a great problem of access to private landholdings, and a problem of access to Federal land ownership.

Recently the Attorney General issued an opinion that provided for reciprocity in granting claims to access to various lands and reciprocity in easements. The bill before the Senate is to implement the Attorney General's opinion so as to carry out the reciprocity which the Attorney General provided.

When the bill was sent to Congress, it contained many meritorious provisions to which both lumbermen and the Forest Service agreed.

During the course of the hearings the timber users and lumbermen came in with a series of amendments that would have changed the whole complexion of the proposed legislation. Those amendments came somewhat as a surprise to the subcommittee which was holding the hearings. It came somewhat as a surprise to the administration, I believe.

Subsequent hearings were held. At those hearings conservationist groups complained that the amendments submitted by the lumbermen would interfere with the development of recreation and recreational resources.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] submitted some suggested amendments which he proposed to substitute in lieu of the amendments submitted by the timbers users and the lumbermen's association. But he submitted them to be used only in the event that the committee considered the amendments submitted by the timbermen and the lumbermen's association.

After consideration, first by the subcommittee, and finally by the full committee, it was decided to recommend only the bill that was sent to the Congress by the administration, and which had the approval of both the Forest Service and the lumber users. The committee decided to adopt the bill which would clarify the Attorney General's opinion and then let the administrative function take place. We would then rely upon Executive orders to take care of the further suggestions propounded by both the timber users and the conservationists.

That is the bill which is before the Senate. It has the unanimous approval of the Forest Service. It has the approval of the timber users and the lumbermen's association. It would help them. It would not go as far as they would like to go, but the bill would clarify certain reciprocal programs that are necessary to carry out the provisions of the Attorney General's opinion. The bill has universal support.

The report of the committee is, of course, the report of the chairman. It is a report which, had I been chairman of the committee, I would not have written. However, it directs the Forest Service to do some of the things that were included in the amendments which were proposed by the lumbermen's association, and directs the attention of the Forest Service to some of the abuses in the operation that have taken place.

In my opinion the language of the report is somewhat too strong. But the report of the committee is the report of the chairman. It is not the report of all members of the committee. It is necessary in the report, and it is necessary in the consideration of the proposed legislation, to direct the attention of the Forest Service to certain abuses in which they have participated—and the Forest Service is not completely innocent in its administration of this legislation.

Therefore, I am in complete accord with the objectives of the bill. I am in complete accord with the language of the bill and the amendment which has been included in it. I feel that perhaps the language of the report directed to the correction of abuses is necessary.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. METCALF. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Oregon, who has cooperated so thoroughly, who has shown such a profound knowledge of the proposed legislation, and who has been so helpful in working out this problem.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I highly commend the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF] for the very able leadership he has given to the Senate and to the committee in handling the bill through the committee. I also compliment the efforts of the subcommittee chairman [Mr. RANDOLPH] for his diligent work on this legislation. The Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF] has given an accurate report as to what the bill would accomplish, and he has given an accurate report with regard to the history of the bill.

Simply stated, the bill would in no way change the objectives and principles of the Attorney General's opinion which was handed down some time ago. That opinion, in effect, brought the policies of the Forest Service in line with the policies of the Bureau of Land Management, which have existed for many years, and have dealt with the question of access roads. The policies give assurance that when Federal timber is landlocked by private timber, the Federal Government will have access to the Federal timber, and when private timber is landlocked by the Federal Government, the private owners will have access to their timber. That in effect and in essence is what the Attorney General's opinion has accomplished. In his opinion he has merely brought the policies of the Forest Service in line with the policies of the Bureau of Land Management, and in effect he has stated that, as a matter of law, the parties involved in any of the access roads disputes have a legal right. That is the essence of the Attorney General's opinion.

I agree with the Senator from Montana that the report of the chairman of the committee goes further than is necessary. For legislative history, let me say that the Committee report is not binding upon the Forest Service, but is a recommendation to the Forest Service. But I also want the Forest Service to understand—and I am sure the Senator from Montana will agree with the senior Senator from Oregon—that the timber people, the conservationists, the timber users, need have no concern about the continued interest of the Senator from Montana and the Senator from Oregon and the members of the committee in seeing to it that no wrong is done by not carrying out the policies of the Attorney General's opinion. We always stand ready and willing to see to it that equity and justice are done to them.

The Senator from Montana and I opposed the amendments offered by the timber companies because we could not read those amendments without reaching the conclusion that they would have the effect of undermining, and in my opinion emasculating, the opinion of the Attorney General, and all the work that had been accomplished by the Department of Justice in bringing the two great departments of the Government that have jurisdiction over timber; namely, the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management—into a common access road policy would have gone in vain.

I congratulate the committee. I wish particularly to congratulate the Senator from Montana for the excellent work he has done in connection with the bill. And I believe that the chairman of the Public Works Committee [Mr. McNamara] and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph] deserve congratulations for bringing this bill to a vote.

Mr. METCALF. I am very grateful to the Senator from Oregon for his comment. The question of access roads in timber areas of the West, especially, involves not merely getting timber out from private lands and from national forest lands, but such roads are useful for fire control, for access to dam sites and mineral sites, and primarily for recreational purposes. Hunters and fishermen by the thousands use these timber roads for access to national forests for recreational purposes.

The pending bill protects the multiuse concept for national forests in connection with timber production, lumber production, minerals, power, and especially recreation.

We have not lost sight of the fact made by our friends in the conservation movements that these roads are needed for conservation purposes in order to preserve for tourists and others the hunting and fishing that are so important to the economy of our Western States and forests—almost as important as the production of timber itself.

So we have carried out the concept of the Attorney General's opinion. We have provided reciprocal access for private and public forest lands. We have provided in the bill for access for recreational purposes.

We have served a warning—by this report, which, as I have said, is a little too strong—to the Forest Service that it carry out some of the provisions contained in the proposed amendments wanted by the lumber users association and correct some of the abuses within the organization.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse] and I and the chairman will pay continued attention in future sessions of the Congress to see that these matters are carried out.

I join the Senator from Oregon in complimenting the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph] and the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNamara] for their attention, their work, and their development of a new concept of access roads in the national forests.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, from the Committee on Public Works we reported S. 1147, a bill to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to construct and maintain an adequate system of roads and trails for the national forests.

The measure was requested in an executive communication of January 10, 1963, and I introduced it in the Senate on March 19, 1963. The principal feature of the legislation is that it would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to grant temporary and permanent easements over national forest lands and other lands administered by the U.S. Forest Service. The bill was the subject of extensive hearings by the committee on June 11, 1963, and July 31, 1963. Frequent consultations with representatives of the U.S. Forest Service, the forest products industry, and conservation and recreation groups were held subsequent to the hearings. Also, committee members, including the chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Roads, consulted with other western Senators who are not members of the Committee on Public Works, but who are intensely interested in and knowledgeable on matters relating to the forest products industry.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Roads I wish to commend and express appreciation for the conscientious and cooperative efforts of my esteemed committee colleague, the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. Metcalf] in connection with our joint attempt to resolve the problems related to this measure. In a similar spirit, I acknowledge my gratitude to the able senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse] for his thoughtful consultation on the bill and for his valuable suggestions regarding general problems of access and the development of roads on the national forests.

The question may occur to some Members of this body as to why it is necessary or desirable for the Secretary of Agriculture to grant permanent easements over national forest land. Why may not easements be limited to 40 or 50 years and made renewable at their date of expiration, if necessary? A brief summary of the landownership patterns prevailing in our national forests will, I believe, answer this question.

There are under the administration of the Forest Service approximately 186 million acres of land in 44 States and in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, of which about 181.5 million acres are in national forests. The major portion of national forest lands, about 160 million acres, are lands which were withdrawn from the public domain, while the remaining lands were largely acquired subsequent to enactment of the Weeks law in 1911, or were acquired by exchange.

Within the exterior boundaries of the national forest are some 38 million acres of land in private ownership, much of it in the Western States falling in a typical checkerboard pattern of alternating square mile sections of private and Federal ownership. This pattern, as Members know, resulted from the railroad grants of alternating sections in the latter part of the 19th century.

The sections remaining in the public domain, after the railroad grants, frequently became a part of the national forests as the national forests were subsequently established by withdrawal of lands from the public domain, while the railroad lands passed into diverse private ownership. Though the checkerboard pattern is typical only of the Western States, intermingled ownership is common on the national forests of the Eastern and Southern States as well.

Prior to 1962 owners of intermingled lands were regarded as having statutory assurance of ingress and egress to and from their lands by reason of the provisions of the act of June 4, 1897. In 1962 the Attorney General ruled that there was no such right vested in owners of intermingled lands other than "actual settlers." This ruling is not at issue in the pending legislation.

However, the Attorney General's opinion, coupled with the Department of Agriculture's lack of legislative authority to grant permanent easements across national forest lands for a private timber grower to reach his own lands, gave rise to an additional set of problems in negotiating the right-of-way agreements so vital to the long-term management and harvesting of the timber resources of the national forests.

One of the important provisions of S. 1147 is that it would enable the Secretary of Agriculture to grant permanent access rights across national forest lands to private landowners. This is a just and much-needed provision. For the Forest Service is under obligation to the public to obtain permanent access across private lands to reach intermingled national forest lands. And private landowners and timber growers, who are engaged in the same kind of long-term management on a sustained yield basis as is the Government, also require the same assured access to their lands as the Forest Service does to national forest lands.

S. 1147 will overcome that problem and provide at least a partial answer to several other longstanding problems stemming from intermingled ownership within the national forests.

It should be the long-range objective of the Federal Government to provide prompt access for everyone. The Federal Government has the right of condemnation where needed. Owners of intermingled private lands should also be assured of prompt access under reasonable conditions which protect the interests of the Government. The pending measure and the regulations of the Forest Service provide such conditions and protection, and S. 1147 also provides for the termination of the easement for reasons of nonuse. Additional benefits accrue to the general public in that this measure, by providing for greater access, will further open up national forest lands for recreational uses.

Several amendments to the bill were proposed by the forest products industry. Forest Service representatives expressed agreement regarding the objectives of two of these amendments and offered a substitute amendment for a third, this substitute having been adopted by the committee. With regard to the other amendments, the Forest Service testified that administrative regulations would offer more flexible means of accomplishing the same goals. The Committee on Public Works has accepted the suggestions of the Forest Service on these matters. But the committee has noted that should subsequent experience demonstrate that additional legislation is needed to assure fair and equitable solutions to right-of-way problems in connection with the administration of the national forests, it is prepared to consider legislative solutions.

Mr. President, S. 1147 offers a fair and equitable solution to a longstanding problem regarding the administration of our national forests and the utilization of our natural resources. It will cost the Government nothing, and in the long run will save the Government money by facilitating cost-share agreements on road construction between the Government and private landowners. And finally, it will be a step forward in creating greater access to national forests for the benefit of the general public. I, therefore, strongly urge the Senate to pass the bill as amended.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The bill is open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. **METCALF**. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

DISCLOSURE OF FINANCIAL INTEREST—JURISDICTION OF COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION—POSTPONEMENT OF CONSIDERATION OF SENATE RESOLUTION 337 AND SENATE RESOLUTION 338

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Mr. President, it is with regret that I announce to the Senate that Senate Resolution 337 and Senate Resolution 338, both reported from the Rules Committee, will not be called up this afternoon. Senate Resolution 337 is a resolution to provide disclosure of financial interest and to enumerate certain prohibited activities. Senate Resolution 338 is a resolution amending rule XXV of the standing rules of the Senate relative to the jurisdiction of the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The reason why I regretfully announce the postponement of consideration of these resolutions, which will be brought up later in the session, is that certain key Members are absent at the moment and were unable, because of circumstances over which they had little or no control, to be present at this time.

Had I known about it yesterday, I would not have announced that these resolutions would be taken up. But I assure the Senate that they will be taken up this session, before Congress adjourns sine die.

I would hope that it would be the practice of Senators to be prepared on any day from now on to face any legislation which the leadership may feel constrained to call up. The calendar is fairly clear. There is not too much in the way of legislative proposals listed. All of those which are listed have a "hold" on them or are being held back for some reason or another.

Mr. **DIRKSEN**. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. I yield.

Mr. **DIRKSEN**. There are key members of the Rules Committee on both sides of the aisle who found it impossible to get back to Washington. I have been on the long-distance telephone. I know the majority leader has been most diligent in hoping they would reach here in time at least to start discussion of the two proposed amendments to the rules, but frankly, it is impossible to bring them here.

I am happy indeed that the majority leader has seen fit to lay the resolutions aside until they return to the Capitol.

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. It is my understanding that certain commitments have been made to various Members of the Senate that they would be given more notice than they had yesterday. Therefore, such commitments will be honored.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT OF 1964

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1111, S. 2642.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2642) to mobilize the human and financial resources of the Nation to combat poverty in the United States.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That this Act may be cited as the "Economic Opportunity Act of 1964".

Findings and Declaration of Purpose

SEC. 2. Although the economic well-being and prosperity of the United States have progressed to a level surpassing any achieved in world history, and although these benefits are widely shared throughout the Nation, poverty continues to be the lot of a substantial number of our people. The United States can achieve its full economic and social potential as a nation only if every individual has the opportunity to contribute to the full extent of his capabilities and to participate in the workings of our society. It is, therefore, the policy of the United States to eliminate the paradox of poverty in the midst of plenty in this Nation by opening to everyone the opportunity for education and training, the opportunity to work, and the opportunity to live in decency and dignity. It is the purpose of this Act to strengthen, supplement, and coordinate efforts in furtherance of that policy.

TITLE I—YOUTH PROGRAMS

Part A—Job Corps

Statement of Purpose

SEC. 101. The purpose of this part is to prepare for the responsibilities of citizenship and to increase the employability of young men and young women aged sixteen through twenty-one by providing them in rural and urban residential centers with education, vocational training, useful work experience, including work directed toward the conservation of natural resources, and other appropriate activities.

Establishment of Job Corps

SEC. 102. In order to carry out the purposes of this part, there is hereby established within the Office of Economic Opportunity (hereinafter referred to as the "Office"), established by title VI, a Job Corps (hereinafter referred to as the "Corps").

Job Corps Program

SEC. 103. The Director of the Office (hereinafter referred to as the "Director") is authorized to—

(a) enter into agreements with any Federal, State, or local agency or private organization for the establishment and operation, in rural and urban areas, of conservation camps and training centers and for the provision of such facilities and services as in his judgment are needed to carry out the purposes of this part, including but not limited to agreements with agencies charged with the responsibility of conserving, developing, and managing the public natural resources of the Nation and of developing, managing, and protecting public recreational areas, whereby the enrollees of the Corps may be utilized by such agencies in carrying out, under the immediate supervision of such agencies, programs planned and designed by such agencies to fulfill such responsibility, and including agreements for a botanical survey program involving surveys and maps of existing vegetation and investigations of the plants, soils, and environments of natural and disturbed plant communities;

(b) arrange for the provision of education and vocational training of enrollees in the Corps: *Provided*, That, where practicable such programs may be provided through local public educational agencies or by private vocational educational institutions or technical institutes where such institutions or institutes can provide substantially equivalent training with reduced Federal expenditures;

(c) provide or arrange for the provision of programs of useful work experience and other appropriate activities for enrollees;

(d) establish standards of safety and health for enrollees, and furnish or arrange for the furnishing of health services; and

(e) prescribe such rules and regulations and make such arrangements as he deems necessary to provide for the selection of enrollees and to govern their conduct after enrollment, including appropriate regulations as to the circumstances under which enrollment may be terminated.

Composition of the Corps

SEC. 104. (a) The Corps shall be composed of young men and young women who are permanent residents of the United States, who have attained age sixteen but have not attained age twenty-two at the time of enrollment, and who meet the standards for enrollment prescribed by the Director. Participation in the Corps shall not relieve any enrollee of obligations under the Universal Military Training and Service Act (50 U.S.C. App. 451 et seq.). Only in exceptional cases shall enrollees in the Corps be graduates of an accredited high school, and no person shall be accepted for enrollment in the Corps unless the local school authorities have concluded that further school attendance by such person in any regular academic, vocational, or training program, is not practicable.

(b) In order to enroll as a member of the Corps, an individual must agree to comply with rules and regulations promulgated by the Director for the government of the Corps.

(c) The total enrollment of any individual in the Corps shall not exceed two years except as the Director may determine in special cases.

Allowance and Maintenance

SEC. 105. (a) Enrollees may be provided with such living, travel, and leave allowances, and such quarters, subsistence, transportation, equipment, clothing, recreational services, medical, dental, hospital, and other health services, and other expenses as the Director may deem necessary or appropriate for their needs. Transportation and travel allowances may also be provided, in such circumstances as the Director may determine, for applicants for enrollment to or from places of enrollment, and for former enrollees from places of termination to their homes.

(b) Upon termination of his or her enrollment in the Corps, each enrollee shall be entitled to receive a readjustment allowance at a rate not to exceed $50 for each month of satisfactory participation therein as determined by the Director: *Provided, however,* That under such circumstances as the Director may determine a portion of the readjustment allowance of an enrollee not exceeding $25 for each month of satisfactory service may be paid during the period of service of the enrollee directly to a member of his or her family (as defined in section 609(c)) and any sum so paid shall be supplemented by the payment of an equal amount by the Director. In the event of the enrollee's death during the period of his or her service, the amount of any unpaid readjustment allowance shall be paid in accordance with the provisions of section 1 of the Act of August 3, 1950 (5 U.S.C. 61f).

Application of Provisions of Federal Law

SEC. 106. (a) Except as otherwise specifically provided in this part, an enrollee shall be deemed not to be a Federal employee and shall not be subject to the provisions of laws relating to Federal employment, including those relating to hours of work, rates of compensation, leave, unemployment compensation, and Federal employee benefits.

(b) Enrollees shall be deemed to be employees of the United States for the purposes of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (26 U.S.C. 1 et seq.) and of title II of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 401 et seq.), and any service performed by an individual as an enrollee shall be deemed for such purposes to be performed in the employ of the United States.

(c)(1) Enrollees under this part shall, for the purposes of the administration of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act (5 U.S.C. 751 et seq.), be deemed to be civil employees of the United States within the meaning of the term "employee" as defined in section 40 of such Act (5 U.S.C. 790) and the provisions thereof shall apply except as hereinafter provided.

(2) For purposes of this subsection:

(A) The term "performance of duty" in the Federal Employees' Compensation Act shall not include any act of an enrollee—

(i) while on authorized leave or pass; or

(ii) while absent from his or her assigned post of duty, except while participating in an activity authorized by or under the direction or supervision of the Corps.

(B) In computing compensation benefits for disability or death under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, the monthly pay of an enrollee shall be deemed to be $150, except that with respect to compensation for disability accruing after the individual concerned reaches the age of twenty-one, such monthly pay shall be deemed to be that received under the entrance salary for GS-2 under the Classification Act of 1949 (5 U.S.C. 1071 et seq.), and section 6(d)(1) of the former Act (5 U.S.C. 756(d)(1)) shall apply to enrollees.

(C) Compensation for disability shall not begin to accrue until the day following the date on which the enrollment of the injured enrollee is terminated.

(d) An enrollee shall be deemed to be an employee of the Government for the purposes of the Federal tort claims provisions of title 28, United States Code.

(e) Personnel of the uniformed services who are detailed or assigned to duty in the performance of agreements made by the Director for the support of the Corps shall not be counted in computing strengths under any law limiting the strength of such services or in computing the percentage authorized by law for any grade therein.

State-Operated Youth Camps

SEC. 107. The Director is authorized to enter into agreements with States to assist in the operation or administration of State-operated programs which carry out the purpose of this part. The Director may, pursuant to such regulations as he may adopt, pay part or all of the operative or administrative costs of such programs.

Part B—Work-training programs

Statement of Purpose

SEC. 111. The purpose of this part is to provide useful work experience opportunities for unemployed young men and young women, through participation in State and community work-training programs, so that their employability may be increased or their education resumed or continued and so that public agencies and private nonprofit organizations will be enabled to carry out programs which will permit or contribute to an undertaking or service in the public interest that would not otherwise be provided, or will contribute to the conservation and development of natural resources and recreational areas.

Development of Programs

SEC. 112. In order to carry out the purposes of this part, the Director shall assist and cooperate with State and local agencies and private nonprofit organizations in developing programs for the employment of young people in State and community activities hereinafter authorized, which, whenever appropriate, shall be coordinated with programs of training and education provided by local public educational agencies.

Financial Assistance

SEC. 113. (a) The Director is authorized to enter into agreements providing for the payment by him of part or all of the cost of a State or local program submitted hereunder if he determines, in accordance with such regulations as he may prescribe, that—

(1) enrollees in the program will be employed either (A) on publicly owned and operated facilities or projects, or (B) on local projects sponsored by private nonprofit organizations, other than projects involving the construction, operation, or maintenance of so much of any facility used or to be used for sectarian instruction or as a place for religious worship;

(2) the program will increase the employability of the enrollees by providing work experience and training in occupational skills or pursuits in classifications in which the Director finds there is a reasonable expectation of employment, or will enable student enrollees to resume or to maintain school attendance;

(3) the program will permit or contribute to an undertaking or service in the public interest that would not otherwise be provided, or will contribute to the conservation, development, or management of the natural resources of the State or community or to the development, management, or protection of State or community recreational areas;

(4) the program will not result in the displacement of employed workers or impair existing contracts for services;

(5) the rates of pay and other conditions of employment will be appropriate and reasonable in the light of such factors as the type of work performed, geographical region, and proficiency of the employee;

(6) to the maximum extent feasible, the program will be coordinated with vocational training and educational services adapted to the special needs of enrollees in such program and sponsored by State or local public educational agencies: *Provided, however,* That where such services are inadequate or unavailable, the program may make provision for the enlargement, improvement, development, and coordination of such services with the cooperation of, or where appropriate pursuant to agreement with, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare; and

(7) the program includes standards and procedures for the selection of applicants, including provisions assuring full coordination and cooperation with local and other authorities to encourage students to resume or maintain school attendance.

(b) In approving projects under this part, the Director shall give priority to projects with high training potential.

Enrollees in Program

SEC. 114. (a) Participation in programs under this part shall be limited to young men and women who are permanent residents of the United States, who have attained age sixteen but have not attained age twenty-two, and whose participation in such programs will be consistent with the purposes of this part.

(b) Enrollees shall be deemed not to be Federal employees and shall not be subject to the provisions of laws relating to Federal employment, including those relating to hours of work, rates of compensation, leave, unemployment compensation, and Federal employee benefits.

(c) Where appropriate to carry out the purposes of this Act, the Director may provide for testing, counseling, job development, and referral services to youths through public agencies or private nonprofit organizations.

Limitations on Federal Assistance

SEC. 115. Federal assistance to any program pursuant to this part paid for the period ending two years after the date of enactment of this Act, or June 30, 1966, whichever is later, shall not exceed 90 per centum of the costs of such program, including costs of administration, and such assistance paid for periods thereafter shall not exceed 50 per centum of such costs, unless the Director determines, pursuant to regulations adopted and promulgated by him establishing objective criteria for such determinations, that assistance in excess of such percentages is required in furtherance of the purposes of this part. Non-Federal contributions may be in cash or in kind, fairly evaluated, including but not limited to plant, equipment, and services.

Equitable Distribution of Assistance

SEC. 116. The Director shall establish criteria designed to achieve an equitable distribution of assistance under this part among the States. In developing such criteria, he shall consider among other relevant factors the ratios of population, unemployment, and family income levels. Not more than 12½ per centum of the sums appropriated or allocated for any fiscal year to carry out the purposes of this part shall be used within any one State.

Part C—Work-study programs

Statement of Purpose

SEC. 121. The purpose of this part is to stimulate and promote the part-time employment of students in institutions of higher education who are from low-income families and are in need of the earnings from such employment to pursue courses of study at such institutions.

Allotments to States

SEC. 122. (a) From the sums appropriated to carry out this title for a fiscal year, the Director shall reserve the amount needed for making grants under section 123. Not to exceed 2 per centum of the amount so reserved shall be allotted by the Director among Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands according to their respective needs for assistance under this part. The remainder of the sums so reserved shall be allotted among the States as provided in subsection (b).

(b) Of the sums being allotted under this subsection—

(1) one-third shall be allotted by the Director among the States so that the allotment to each State under this clause will be an amount which bears the same ratio to such one-third as the number of persons enrolled on a full-time basis in institutions of higher education in such State bears to the total number of persons enrolled on a full-time basis in institutions of higher education in all the States,

(2) one-third shall be allotted by the Director among the States so that the allotment to each State under this clause will be an amount which bears the same ratio to such one-third as the number of high school graduates (as defined in section 103 (d)(3) of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963) of such State bears to the total number of such high school graduates of all the States, and

(3) one-third shall be allotted by him among the States so that the allotment to each State under this clause will be an amount which bears the same ratio to such one-third as the number of related children under eighteen years of age living in families with annual incomes of less than $3,000 in such State bears to the number of related children under eighteen years of age living in families with annual incomes of less than $3,000 in all the States.

(c) The amount of any State's allotment which has not been granted to an institution of higher education under section 123 at the end of the fiscal year for which appropriated shall be reallotted by the Director, in such manner as he determines will best assist in achieving the purposes of this Act. Amounts reallotted under this subsection shall be available for making grants under section 123 until the close of the fiscal year next succeeding the fiscal year for which appropriated.

(d) For purposes of this section, the term "State" does not include Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands.

Grants for Work-study Programs

SEC. 123. The Director is authorized to enter into agreements with institutions of higher education (as defined by section 401(f) of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 (Public Law 88-204)) under which the Director will make grants to such institutions to assist in the operation of work-study programs as hereinafter provided.

Conditions of Agreements

SEC. 124. An agreement entered into pursuant to section 123 shall—

(a) provide for the operation by the institution of a program for the part-time employment of its students in work—

(1) for the institution itself, or

(2) for a public or private nonprofit organization when the position is obtained through an arrangement between the institution and such an organization and—

(A) the work is related to the student's educational objective, or

(B) such work (i) will be in the public interest and is work which would not otherwise be provided, (ii) will not result in the displacement of employed workers or impair existing contracts for services, and (iii) will be governed by such conditions of employment as will be appropriate and reasonable in light of such factors as the type of work performed, geographical region, and proficiency of the employee:

Provided, however, That no such work shall involve the construction, operation, or maintenance of so much of any facility used or to be used for sectarian instruction or as a place for religious worship;

(b) provide that funds granted an institution of higher education, pursuant to section 123 may be used only to make payments to students participating in work-study programs, except that an institution may use a portion of the sums granted to it to meet administrative expenses, but the amount so used may not exceed 5 per centum of the payments made by the Director to such institution for that part of the work-study program in which students are working for public or nonprofit organizations other than the institution itself;

(c) provide that employment under such work-study program shall be furnished only to a student who (1) is from a low-income family, (2) is in need of the earnings from such employment in order to pursue a course of study at such institution, (3) is capable, in the opinion of the institution, of maintaining good standing in such course of study while employed under the program covered by the agreement, and (4) has been accepted for enrollment as a full-time student at the institution or, in the case of a student already enrolled in and attending the institution, is in good standing and in full-time attendance there either as an undergraduate, graduate, or professional student;

(d) provide that no student shall be employed under such work-study program for more than fifteen hours in any week in which classes in which he is enrolled are in session;

(e) provide that in each fiscal year during which the agreement remains in effect, the institution shall expend (from sources other than payments under this part) for the employment of its students (whether or not in employment eligible for assistance under this part) an amount that is not less than its average annual expenditure for such employment during the three fiscal years preceding the fiscal year in which the agreement is entered into;

(f) provide that the Federal share of the compensation of students employed in the work-study program in accordance with the agreement will not exceed 90 per centum of such compensation for work performed during the period ending two years after the date of enactment of this Act, or June 30, 1966, whichever is later, and 75 per centum thereafter;

(g) include provisions designed to make employment under such work-study program, or equivalent employment offered or arranged for by the institution, reasonably available (to the extent of available funds) to all eligible students in the institution in need thereof; and

(h) include such other provisions as the Director shall deem necessary or appropriate to carry out the purposes of this part.

Sources of Matching Funds

SEC. 125. Nothing in this part shall be construed as restricting the source (other than this part) from which the institution may pay its share of the compensation of a student employed under a work-study program covered by an agreement under this part.

Equitable Distribution of Assistance

SEC. 126. The Director shall establish criteria designed to achieve such distribution of assistance under this part among institutions of higher education within a State as will most effectively carry out the purposes of this Act.

Part D—Authorization of appropriations

SEC. 131. The Director shall carry out the programs provided for in this title during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and the two succeeding fiscal years. For the purpose of carrying out this title, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $412,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965; and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, such sums may be appropriated as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law.

TITLE II—URBAN AND RURAL COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS

Part A—General community action programs

Statement of Purpose

SEC. 201. The purpose of this part is to provide stimulation and incentive for urban and rural communities to mobilize their resources to combat poverty through community action programs.

Community Action Programs

SEC. 202. (a) The term "community action program" means a program—

(1) which mobilizes and utilizes resources, public or private, of any urban or rural, or combined urban and rural, geographical area (referred to in this part as a "community"), including but not limited to a State, metropolitan area, county, city, town, multicity unit, or multicounty unit in an attack on poverty;

(2) which provides services, assistance, and other activities of sufficient scope and size to give promise of progress toward elimination of poverty or a cause or causes of poverty through developing employment opportunities, improving human performance, motivation, and productivity, or bettering the conditions under which people live, learn, and work;

(3) which is developed, conducted, and administered with the maximum feasible participation of residents of the areas and members of the groups served; and

(4) which is conducted, administered, or coordinated by a public or private nonprofit agency, or a combination thereof, with maximum feasible participation of public agencies and private nonprofit organizations primarily concerned with the community's problems of poverty.

(b) The Director is authorized to prescribe such additional criteria for programs carried on under this part as he shall deem appropriate.

Allotments to States

SEC. 203. (a) From the sums appropriated to carry out this title for a fiscal year, the Director shall reserve the amount needed for carrying out sections 204 and 205. Not to exceed 2 per centum of the amount so reserved shall be allotted by the Director among Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands according to their respective needs for assistance under this part. Twenty per centum of the amount so reserved shall be allotted among the States as the Director shall determine. The remainder of the sums so reserved shall be allotted among the States as provided in subsection (b).

(b) Of the sums being allotted under this subsection—

(1) one-third shall be allotted by the Director among the States so that the allotment to each State under this clause will be an amount which bears the same ratio to such one-third as the number of public assistance recipients in such State bears to the total number of public assistance recipients in all the States;

(2) one-third shall be allotted by him among the States so that the allotment to each State under this clause will be an amount which bears the same ratio to such one-third as the annual average number of persons unemployed in such State bears to the annual average number of persons unemployed in all the States; and

(3) the remaining one-third shall be allotted by him among the States so that the allotment to each State under this clause will be an amount which bears the same ratio to such one-third as the number of related children under 18 years of age living in families with incomes of less than $1,000 in such State bears to the number of related children under 18 years of age living in families with incomes of less than $1,000 in all the States.

(c) The portion of any State's allotment under subsection (a) for a fiscal year which the Director determines will not be required for such fiscal year for carrying out this part shall be available for reallotment from time to time, on such dates during such year as the Director may fix, to other States in proportion to their original allotments for such year, but with such proportionate amount for any of such other States being reduced to the extent it exceeds the sum which the Director estimates such State needs and will be able to use for such year for carrying out this part; and the total of such reductions shall be similarly reallotted among the States whose proportionate amounts are not so reduced. Any amount reallotted to a State under this subsection during a year shall be deemed part of its allotment under subsection (a) for such year.

(d) For the purposes of this section, the term "State" does not include Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands.

Financial Assistance for Development of Community Action Programs

SEC. 204. The Director is authorized to make grants to, or to contract with, appropriate public or private nonprofit agencies, or combinations thereof, to pay part or all of the costs of development of community action programs.

Financial Assistance for Conduct and Administration of Community Action Programs

SEC. 205. (a) The Director is authorized to make grants to, or to contract with, public or private nonprofit agencies, or combinations thereof, to pay part or all of the costs of community action programs which have been approved by him pursuant to this part, including the cost of carrying out programs which are components of a community action program and which are designed to achieve the purposes of this part. Such component programs shall be focused upon the needs of low-income individuals and families and shall provide expanded and improved services, assistance, and other activities, and facilities necessary in connection therewith. Such programs shall be conducted in those fields which fall within the purposes of this part including employment, job training and counseling, health, vocational rehabilitation, housing, home management, welfare, and special remedial and other noncurricular educational assistance for the benefit of low-income individuals and families.

(b) No grant or contract authorized under this part may provide for general aid to elementary or secondary education in any school or school system.

(c) In determining whether to extend assistance under this section the Director shall consider among other relevant factors the incidence of poverty within the community and within the areas or groups to be affected by the specific program or programs, and the extent to which the applicant is in a position to utilize efficiently and expeditiously the assistance for which application is made. In determining the incidence of poverty the Director shall consider information available with respect to such factors as: the concentration of low-income families, particularly those with children; the extent of persistent unemployment and underemployment; the number and proportion of persons receiving cash or other assistance on a needs basis from public agencies or private organizations; the number of migrant or transient low-income families; school dropout rates, military service rejection rates, and other evidences of low educational attainment; the incidence of disease, disability, and infant mortality; housing conditions; adequacy of community facilities and services; and the incidence of crime and juvenile delinquency.

(d) In extending assistance under this section the Director shall give special consideration to programs which give promise of effecting a permanent increase in the capacity of individuals, groups, and communities to deal with their problems without further assistance.

Technical Assistance

SEC. 206. The Director is authorized to provide, either directly or through grants or other arrangements, (1) technical assistance to communities in developing, conducting, and administering community action programs, and (2) training for specialized personnel needed to develop, conduct, or administer such programs or to provide services or other assistance thereunder.

Research, Training, and Demonstrations

SEC. 207. The Director is authorized to conduct, or to make grants to or enter into contracts with institutions of higher education or other appropriate public agencies or private nonprofit organizations for the conduct of, research, training, and demonstrations pertaining to the purposes of this part. Expenditures under this section in any fiscal year shall not exceed 15 per centum of the sums appropriated or allocated for such year to carry out the purposes of this part.

Limitations on Federal Assistance

SEC. 208. (a) Assistance pursuant to sections 204 and 205 paid for the period ending two years after the date of enactment of this Act, or June 30, 1966, whichever is later, shall not exceed 90 per centum of the costs referred to in those sections, respectively, and thereafter shall not exceed 50 per centum of such costs, unless the Director determines, pursuant to regulations adopted and promulgated by him establishing objective criteria for such determinations, that assistance in excess of such percentages is required in furtherance of the purposes of this part. Non-Federal contributions may be in cash or in kind, fairly evaluated, including but not limited to plant, equipment, and services.

(b) The expenditures or contributions made from non-Federal sources for a community action program or component thereof shall be in addition to the aggregate expenditures or contributions from non-Federal sources which were being made for similar purposes prior to the extension of Federal assistance.

Participation of State Agencies

SEC. 209. (a) The Director shall establish procedures which will facilitate effective participation of the States in community action programs. Such procedures shall include provision for the referral of applications for assistance under this part to the Governor of each State affected, or his designee, for such comments as he may deem appropriate.

(b) The Director is authorized to make grants to, or to contract with, appropriate State agencies for the payment of the expenses of such agencies in providing technical assistance to communities in developing, conducting, and administering community action programs.

Equitable Distribution of Assistance

SEC. 210. The Director shall establish criteria designed to achieve an equitable distribution of assistance under this part within the States between urban and rural areas. In developing such criteria, he shall consider the relative numbers in the States or areas therein of: (1) low-income families, particularly those with children; (2) unemployed persons; (3) persons receiving cash or other assistance on a needs basis from public agencies or private organizations; (4) school dropouts; (5) adults with less than an eighth-grade education; and (6) persons rejected for military service.

Preference for Components of Approved Programs

SEC. 211. In determining whether to extend assistance under this Act, the Director shall, to the extent feasible, give preference to programs and projects which are components of a community action program approved pursuant to this part.

Part B.—Adult basic education programs

Declaration of Purpose

SEC. 212. It is the purpose of this part to initiate programs of instruction for individuals who have attained age eighteen and whose inability to read and write the English language constitutes a substantial impairment of their ability to get or retain employment commensurate with their real ability, so as to help eliminate such inability and raise the level of education of such individuals with a view to making them less likely to become dependent on others, improving their ability to benefit from occupational training and otherwise increasing their opportunities for more productive and profitable employment, and making them better able to meet their adult responsibilities.

Grants to States

SEC. 213. (a) From the sums appropriated to carry out this title, the Director shall make grants to States which have State plans approved by him under this section.

(b) Grants under subsection (a) may be used, in accordance with regulations of the Director, to—

(1) assist in establishment of pilot projects by local educational agencies, relating to instruction in public schools, or other facilities used for the purpose by such agencies, of individuals described in section 212, to (A) demonstrate, test, or develop modifications, or adaptations in the light of local needs, of special materials or methods for instruction of such individuals, (B) stimulate the development of local educa-

tional agency programs for instruction of such individuals in such schools or other facilities, and (C) acquire additional information concerning the materials or methods needed for an effective program for raising adult basic educational skills;

(2) assist in meeting the cost of local educational agency programs for instruction of such individuals in such schools or other facilities; and

(3) assist in development or improvement of technical or supervisory services by the State educational agency relating to adult basic education programs.

State Plans

SEC. 214. (a) The Director shall approve for purposes of this part the plan of a State which—

(1) provides for administration thereof by the State educational agency;

(2) provides that such agency will make such reports to the Director, in such form and containing such information, as may reasonably be necessary to enable the Director to perform his duties under this part and will keep such records and afford such access thereto as the Director finds necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports;

(3) provides such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of and accounting for Federal funds paid to the State under this part (including such funds paid by the State to local educational agencies);

(4) provides for cooperative arrangements between the State educational agency and the State health authority looking toward provision of such health information and services for individuals described in section 212 as may be available from such agencies and as may reasonably be necessary to enable them to benefit from the instruction provided under programs conducted pursuant to grants under this part; and

(5) sets forth a program for use, in accordance with section 213(b), of grants under this part which affords assurance of substantial progress, within a reasonable period and with respect to all segments of the population and all areas of the State, toward elimination of the inability of adults to read and write English and toward substantially raising the level of education of individuals described in section 212.

(b) The Director shall not finally disapprove any State plan submitted under this part, or any modification thereof, without first affording the State educational agency reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing.

Allotments

SEC. 215. (a) From the sums allocated for grants to States under section 213 for any fiscal year, the Director shall reserve such amount, but not in excess of 2 per centum thereof, as he may determine, and shall allot such amount among Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands according to their respective needs for assistance under this part. The remainder of the sums so allocated for a fiscal year shall be allotted by the Director on the basis of the relative number of individuals in each State who have attained age eighteen and who have completed not more than five grades of school or have not achieved an equivalent level of education, as determined by the Director on the basis of the best and most recent information available to him, including any relevant data furnished to him by the Department of Commerce. The amount allotted to any State under the preceding sentence for any fiscal year which is less than $50,000 shall be increased to that amount, the total thereby required being derived by proportionately reducing the amount allotted to each of the remaining States under the preceding sentence, but with such adjustments as may be necessary to prevent the allotment of any of such remaining States from being thereby reduced to less than $50,000. For the purposes of this subsection, the term "State" shall not include Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands.

(b) The portion of any State's allotment under subsection (a) for a fiscal year which the Director determines will not be required, for the period such allotment is available, for carrying out the State plan (if any) approved under this part shall be available for reallotment from time to time, on such dates during such period as the Director may fix, to other States in proportion to the original allotments to such States under subsection (a) for such year, but with such proportionate amount for any of such other States being reduced to the extent it exceeds the sum which the Director estimates such State needs and will be able to use for such period for carrying out its State plan approved under this part; and the total of such reductions shall be similarly reallocated among the States whose proportionate amounts are not so reduced. Any amount reallotted to a State under this subsection during a year shall be deemed part of its allotment under subsection (a) for such year.

(c) The allotment of any State under subsection (a) for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, shall, except to the extent reallotted under subsection (b), remain available until June 30, 1966, for obligation by such State for carrying out its State plan approved under this part.

Payments

SEC. 216. (a) From a State's allotment available for the purpose, the Federal share of expenditures, under its State plan, for the purposes set forth in section 213(b) shall be paid to such State. Such payments shall be made in advance on the basis of estimates by the Director; and may be made in such installments as the Director may determine, after making appropriate adjustments to take account of previously made overpayments or underpayments; except that no such payments shall be made for any fiscal year unless the Director finds that the amount available for expenditures for adult basic educational programs and services from State sources for such year will be not less than the amount expended for such purposes from such sources during the preceding fiscal year.

(b) For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, the Federal share for each State shall be 90 per centum. For the succeeding fiscal year the Federal share for any State shall be 50 per centum.

Operation of State Plans; Hearings and Judicial Review

SEC. 217. (a) Whenever the Director, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State educational agency administering a State plan approved under this part, finds that—

(1) the State plan has been so changed that it no longer complies with the provisions of section 214, or

(2) in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with any such provision, the Director shall notify such State agency that no further payments will be made to the State under this part (or in his discretion, that further payments to the State will be limited to programs under or portions of the State plan not affected by such failure), until he is satisfied that there will no longer be any failure to comply. Until he is so satisfied, no further payments may be made to such State under this part (or payments shall be limited to programs under or portions of the State plan not affected by such failure).

(b) A State educational agency dissatisfied with a final action of the Director under section 214 or subsection (a) of this section may appeal to the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which the State is located, by filing a petition with such court within sixty days after such final action. A copy of the petition shall be forthwith transmitted by the clerk of the court to the Director, or any officer designated by him for that purpose. The Director thereupon shall file in the court the record of the proceedings on which he based his action, as provided in section 2112 of title 28, United States Code. Upon the filing of such petition, the court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Director or to set it aside, in whole or in part, temporarily or permanently, but until the filing of the record, the Director may modify or set aside his order. The findings of the Director as to the facts, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive, but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Director to take further evidence, and the Director may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous action, and shall file in the court the record of the further proceedings. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive if supported by substantial evidence. The judgment of the court affirming or setting aside, in whole or in part, any action of the Director shall be final, subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in section 1254 of title 28, United States Code. The commencement of proceedings under this subsection shall not, unless so specifically ordered by the court, operate as a stay of the Director's action.

Miscellaneous

SEC. 218. For purposes of this part—

(1) the term "State educational agency" means the State board of education or other agency or officer primarily responsible for the State supervision of public elementary and secondary schools, or, if different, the agency or officer primarily responsible for supervision of adult basic education in public schools, whichever may be designated by the Governor or by State law, or, if there is no such agency or officer, an agency or officer designated by the Governor or by State law;

(2) the term "local educational agency" means a board of education or other legally constituted local school authority having administrative control and direction of public elementary or secondary schools in a city, county, township, school district, or political subdivision in a State, except that if there is a separate board or other legally constituted local authority having administrative control and direction of adult basic education in public schools therein, it means such other board or authority.

Part C—Authorization of appropriations

SEC. 221. The Director shall carry out the programs provided for in this title during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and the two succeeding fiscal years. For the purpose of carrying out this title, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $340,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965; and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, such sums may be appropriated as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law.

TITLE III—SPECIAL PROGRAMS TO COMBAT POVERTY IN RURAL AREAS

Statement of Purpose

SEC. 301. It is the purpose of this title to meet some of the special problems of rural poverty and thereby to raise and maintain the income and living standards of low-income rural families and migrant agricultural employees and their families.

Part A—Authority to make grants and loans

SEC. 302. (a) The Director is authorized to make—

(1) grants of not to exceed $1,500 to low-income rural families where, in the judgment of the Director, such grants have a reasonable possibility of effecting a permanent increase in the income of such families by assisting or permitting them to—

(A) acquire or improve real estate or reduce encumbrances or erect improvements thereon,

(B) operate or improve the operation of farms not larger than family sized, including but not limited to the purchase of feed, seed, fertilizer, livestock, poultry, and equipment,

(C) participate in cooperative associations, or

(D) finance nonagricultural enterprises which will enable such families to supplement their income; and

(2) loans to such families, having a maximum maturity of fifteen years and in amounts not exceeding $2,500 in the aggregate to any family at any one time, for the purpose set forth in subparagraph (a)(1)(D) of this section.

(b) Grants under this section shall be made only if the family is not qualified to obtain such funds by loan under other Federal programs: *Provided, however,* That nothing herein shall be construed to prevent the making of grants where appropriate in combination with or as supplements to loans under this program or other Federal programs.

Family Farm Development Corporations

SEC. 303. (a) The Director is authorized to cooperate with, furnish technical assistance to, and otherwise assist in the organization of public or private nonprofit corporations having as their objective the improvement of the productivity and income of low-income farmers. Such corporations shall be eligible for assistance under this section if they are organized for the purpose of and have the power to acquire real property or any interest therein in rural areas, to develop or reconstitute such real property into units not larger than family farms, including necessary fences, farm buildings, land and water development, and related facilities, and to sell the farms so developed or reconstituted to low-income farm families at prices equal to their appraised value when used for agricultural purposes and in a manner that the Director determines will further the purposes of this title: *Provided, however,* That such sales shall be subject to the condition that, for twenty years from the date of sale by the corporation, upon any resale of the farm, the resale proceeds in excess of such appraised value up to the corporation's investment in the property (less the then value as determined by the corporation of any improvements placed on the farm by the purchaser from the corporation or his heirs, successors, or assigns), shall be payable to the corporation; and there is hereby created a first lien on such property running to the corporation and to the United States to secure the payment of such amounts.

(b) The Director may prescribe such rules and regulations regarding the organization, financial resources, operations, and activities of such corporations as he deems appropriate.

(c) The Director is authorized to purchase the obligations of, or make loans to, such corporations upon such terms and conditions as he may determine subject to the limitations of sections 305 and 306.

(d) The Director is authorized to make grants to such corporations in amounts sufficient to make up the deficiency between the cost of the farms developed or reconstituted by them and the net proceeds received from the sale of such farms at the prices specified in subsection (a).

Cooperative Associations

SEC. 304. The Director is authorized to make loans to local cooperative associations furnishing essential processing, purchasing, or marketing services, supplies, or facilities predominantly to low-income rural families.

Limitations on Assistance

SEC. 305. No financial or other assistance shall be provided under this part unless the Director determines that—

(a) the providing of such assistance will materially further the purposes of this part, and

(b) in the case of assistance provided pursuant to sections 303 and 304, the applicant is fulfilling or will fulfill a need for services, facilities, or activities which is not otherwise being met.

Loan Terms and Conditions

SEC. 306. Loans pursuant to sections 302, 303, and 304 (including obligations purchased pursuant to section 303) shall have such terms and conditions as the Director shall determine, subject to the following limitations:

(a) there is reasonable assurance of repayment of the loan;

(b) the credit is not otherwise available on reasonable terms from private sources or other Federal, State, or local programs;

(c) the amount of the loan, together with other funds available, is adequate to assure completion of the project or achievement of the purposes for which the loan is made;

(d) the loan bears interest at a rate not less than (1) a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the average market yield on outstanding Treasury obligations of comparable maturity, plus (2) such additional charge, if any, toward covering other costs of the program as the Director may determine to be consistent with its purposes;

(e) with respect to loans made pursuant to sections 303 and 304, the loan is repayable within not more than thirty years; and

(f) no financial or other assistance shall be provided under this part to or in connection with any corporation or cooperative organization for the production of agricultural commodities or for manufacturing purposes.

Part B.—Assistance for migrant agricultural employees and their families

SEC. 311. The Director shall develop and implement as soon as practicable a program to assist the States, political subdivisions of States, public and nonprofit agencies, institutions, organizations, farm associations, or individuals in establishing and operating programs of assistance for migrant agricultural employees and their families which programs shall be limited to housing, sanitation, education, and day care of children. Institutions, organizations, farm associations, or individuals shall be limited to direct loans.

Part C—Authorization of appropriations

SEC. 321. The Director shall carry out the program provided for in this title during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and the two succeeding fiscal years. For the purpose of carrying out this title, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $50,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965; and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, such sums may be appropriated as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law. Not to exceed $15,000,000 of the funds appropriated under other titles of this Act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, may also be utilized for the purposes of part B of this title.

TITLE IV—EMPLOYMENT AND INVESTMENT INCENTIVES

Statement of Purpose

SEC. 401. It is the purpose of this title to assist in the establishment, preservation, and strengthening of small business concerns and improve the managerial skills employed in such enterprises; and to mobilize for these objectives private as well as public managerial skills and resources.

Loans, Participations, and Guarantees

SEC. 402. The Director is authorized to make, participate (on an immediate basis) in, or guarantee loans, repayable in not more than fifteen years, to any small business concern (as defined in section 3 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632) and regulations issued thereunder), or to any qualified person seeking to establish such a concern, when he determines that such loans will assist in carrying out the purposes of this title, with particular emphasis on employment of the long-term unemployed: *Provided, however,* That no such loans shall be made, participated in, or guaranteed if the total of such Federal assistance to a single borrower outstanding at any one time would exceed $25,000. The Director may defer payments on the principal of such loans for a grace period and use such other methods as he deems necessary and appropriate to assure the successful establishment and operation of such concern. The Director may, in his discretion, as a condition of such financial assistance, require that the borrower take steps to improve his management skills by participating in a management training program approved by the Director. The Director shall encourage, as far as possible, the participation of the private business community in the program of assistance to such concerns.

Coordination With Community Action Programs

SEC. 403. No financial assistance shall be provided under section 402 in any community for which the Director has approved a community action program pursuant to title II of this Act unless such financial assistance is determined by him to be consistent with such program.

Financing Under Small Business Act

SEC. 404. Such lending and guaranty functions under this title as may be delegated to the Small Business Administration may be financed with funds appropriated to the revolving fund established by section 4(c) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 633(c)) for the purposes of sections 7(a), 7(b), and 8(a) of that Act (15 U.S.C. 636(a), 636(b), 637(a)).

Loan Terms and Conditions

SEC. 405. Loans made pursuant to section 402 (including immediate participations in and guaranties of such loans) shall have such terms and conditions as the Director shall determine, subject to the following limitations—

(a) there is reasonable assurance of repayment of the loan;

(b) the financial assistance is not otherwise available on reasonable terms from private sources or other Federal, State, or local programs;

(c) the amount of the loan, together with other funds available, is adequate to assure completion of the project or achievement of the purposes for which the loan is made;

(d) the loan bears interest at a rate not less than (1) a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the average market yield on outstanding Treasury obligations of comparable maturity, plus (2) such additional charge, if any, toward covering other costs of the program as the Director may determine to be consistent with its purposes: *Provided, how-*

ever, That the rate of interest charged on loans made in redevelopment areas designated under the Area Redevelopment Act (42 U.S.C. 2501 et seq.) shall not exceed the rate currently applicable to new loans made under section 6 of that Act (42 U.S.C. 2505); and

(e) fees not in excess of amounts necessary to cover administrative expenses and probable losses may be required on loan guarantees.

Limitation on Financial Assistance

SEC. 406. No financial assistance shall be extended pursuant to this title where the Director determines that the assistance will be used in relocating establishments from one area to another or in financing subcontractors to enable them to undertake work theretofore performed in another area by other subcontractors or contractors.

Duration of Program

SEC. 407. The Director shall carry out the programs provided for in this title during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and the two succeeding fiscal years.

TITLE V—WORK EXPERIENCE PROGRAMS

Statement of Purpose

SEC. 501. It is the purpose of this title to expand the opportunities for constructive work experience and other needed training available to persons who are unable to support or care for themselves or their families. In carrying out this purpose, the Director shall make maximum use of the programs available under the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, as amended, and Vocational Education Act of 1963.

Payments for Experimental, Pilot, and Demonstration Projects

SEC. 502. In order to stimulate the adoption of programs designed to help unemployed fathers and other needy persons to secure and retain employment or to attain or retain capability for self-support or personal independence, the Director is authorized to transfer funds appropriated or allocated to carry out the purposes of this title to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to enable him to make payments for experimental, pilot, or demonstration projects under section 1115 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1315), subject to the limitations contained in section 409(a)(1) to (6), inclusive, of such Act (42 U.S.C. 609(a)(1)–(6)), in addition to the sums otherwise available pursuant thereto. The costs of such projects to the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, shall, notwithstanding the provisions of such Act, be met entirely from funds appropriated or allocated to carry out the purposes of this title.

Authorization of Appropriations

SEC. 503. The Director shall carry out the programs provided for in this title during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and the two succeeding fiscal years. For the purpose of carrying out this title, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $150,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965; and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, such sums may be appropriated as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law.

TITLE VI—ADMINISTRATION AND COORDINATION

Part A—Administration

Office of Economic Opportunity

SEC. 601. (a) There is hereby established in the Executive Officer of the President the Office of Economic Opportunity. The Office shall be headed by a Director who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. There shall also be in the Office one Deputy Director and three Assistant Directors who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Deputy Director and the Assistant Directors shall perform such functions as the Director may from time to time prescribe.

(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 5(b) of the Reorganization Act of 1949 (5 U.S.C. 133z–3(b)), at any time after one year from the date of enactment hereof the President may, by complying with the procedures established by that Act, provide for the transfer of the Office from the Executive Office of the President and for its establishment elsewhere in the executive branch as he deems appropriate.

(c) The compensation of the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity shall be fixed by the President at a rate not in excess of the annual rate of compensation payable to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

(d) The compensation of the Deputy Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity shall be fixed by the President at a rate not in excess of the annual rate of compensation payable to the Deputy Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

(e) The compensation of the Assistant Directors of the Office of Economic Opportunity shall be fixed by the President at a rate not in excess of the annual rate of compensation payable to the Assistant Secretaries of the Executive Departments.

Authority of Director

SEC. 602. In addition to the authority conferred upon him by other sections of this Act, the Director is authorized, in carrying out his functions under this Act, to—

(a) Appoint in accordance with the civil service laws such personnel as may be necessary to enable the Office to carry out its functions, and, except as otherwise provided herein, fix their compensation in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949 (5 U.S.C. 1071 et seq.);

(b) employ experts and consultants or organizations thereof as authorized by section 15 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), compensate individuals so employed at rates not in excess of $100 per diem, including travel time, and allow them, while away from their homes or regular places of business, travel expenses (including per diem in lieu of subsistence) as authorized by section 5 of such Act (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently, while so employed: *Provided, however,* That contracts for such employment may be renewed annually;

(c) appoint, without regard to the civil service laws, one or more advisory committees composed of such private citizens and officials of the Federal, State, and local governments as he deems desirable to advise him with respect to his functions under this Act; and members of such committees (including the National Advisory Council established in section 605), other than those regularly employed by the Federal Government, while attending meetings of such committees or otherwise serving at the request of the Director, shall be entitled to receive compensation and travel expenses as provided in subsection (b) with respect to experts and consultants;

(d) with the approval of the President, arrange with and reimburse the heads of other Federal agencies for the performance of any of his functions under this Act and, as necessary or appropriate, delegate any of his powers under this Act and authorize the redelegation thereof;

(e) utilize, with their consent, the services and facilities of Federal agencies without reimbursement, and, with the consent of any State or a political subdivision of a State, accept and utilize the services and facilities of the agencies of such State or subdivision without reimbursement;

(f) accept in the name of the Office, and employ or dispose of in furtherance of the purposes of this Act, or of any title thereof, any money or property, real, personal, or mixed, tangible or intangible, received by gift, devise, bequest, or otherwise;

(g) accept voluntary and uncompensated services, notwithstanding the provisions of section 3679(b) of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 665(b));

(h) allocate and expend, or transfer to other Federal agencies for expenditure, funds made available under this Act as he deems necessary to carry out the provisions hereof, including (without regard to the provisions of section 4774(d) of title 10, United States Code) expenditure for construction, repairs, and capital improvements;

(i) disseminate, without regard to the provisions of section 4154 of title 39, United States Code, data and information, in such form as he shall deem appropriate, to public agencies, private organizations, and the general public;

(j) adopt an official seal, which shall be judicially noticed;

(k) notwithstanding any other provision of law relating to the acquisition, handling, or disposal of real or personal property by the United States, deal with, complete, rent, renovate, modernize, or sell for cash or credit at his discretion any properties acquired by him in connection with loans, participations, and guaranties made by him pursuant to titles III and IV of this Act;

(l) collect or compromise all obligations to or held by him and all legal or equitable rights accruing to him in connection with the payment of obligations until such time as such obligations may be referred to the Attorney General for suit or collection;

(m) expend, without regard to the provisions of any other law or regulation, funds made available for purposes of this Act (1) for printing and binding, and (2) for rent of buildings and space in buildings and for repair, alteration, and improvement of buildings and space in buildings rented by him; but the Director shall not utilize the authority contained in this clause (A) except when necessary in order to obtain an item, service, or facility, which is required in the proper administration of this Act, and which otherwise could not be obtained, or could not be obtained in the quantity or quality needed, or at the time, in the form, or under the conditions in which, it is needed, and (B) prior to having given written notification to the Administrator of General Services (if the exercise of such authority would affect an activity which otherwise would be under the jurisdiction of the General Services Administration) or the Chairman of the Joint Committee on Printing (if the exercise of such authority would affect an activity which otherwise would be under the jurisdiction of such Committee) of his intention to exercise such authority, the item, service, or facility with respect to which such authority is proposed to be exercised, and the reasons and justifications for the exercise of such authority; and

(n) establish such policies, standards, criteria, and procedures, prescribe such rules and regulations, enter into such contracts and agreements with public agencies and private organizations and persons, make such payments (in lump sum or installments, and in advance or by way of reimbursement, and in the case of grants, with necessary adjustment on account of overpayments or underpayments), and generally perform such functions and take such steps as he may deem to be necessary or appropriate to carry out the provisions of this Act.

Volunteers in Service to America

SEC. 603. (a) The Director is authorized to recruit, select, train, and—

(1) upon request of State or local agencies or private nonprofit organizations, refer volunteers to perform duties in furtherance of programs combating poverty at a State or local level; and

(2) in cooperation with other Federal, State, or local agencies involved, assign volunteers to work (A) in meeting the health, education, welfare, or related needs of Indians living on reservations, of migratory workers and their families, or of residents of the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, or the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands; (B) in the care and rehabilitation of the mentally ill or mentally retarded under treatment at nonprofit mental health or mental retardation facilities assisted in their construction or operation by Federal funds; and (C) in furtherance of programs or activities authorized or supported under title I or II of this Act.

(b) The referral or assignment of volunteers, shall be on such terms and conditions as the Director may determine, but volunteers shall not be referred or assigned to duties or work in any State without the consent of the Governor.

(c) The Director is authorized to provide to all volunteers during training and to volunteers assigned pursuant to subsection (a)(2) such stipend, not to exceed $50 per month, such living, travel, and leave allowances, and such housing, transportation (including travel to and from the place of training), supplies, equipment, subsistence, clothing, and health and dental care as the Director may deem necessary or appropriate for their needs.

(d) Volunteers shall be deemed not to be Federal employees and shall not be subject to the provisions of laws relating to Federal employment, including those relating to hours of work, rates of compensation, leave, unemployment compensation, and Federal employee benefits, except that all volunteers during training and such volunteers as are assigned pursuant to subsection (a)(2) shall be deemed Federal employees to the same extent as enrollees of the Corps under section 106 (b), (c), (d) of this Act.

Economic Opportunity Council

SEC. 604. (a) There is hereby established an Economic Opportunity Council, which shall consult with and advise the Director in carrying out his functions, including the coordination of antipoverty efforts by all segments of the Federal Government.

(b) The Council shall include the Director, who shall be Chairman, the Secretary of Defense, the Attorney General, the Secretaries of the Interior, Agriculture, Commerce, Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, the Housing and Home Finance Administrator, the Administrator of the Small Business Administration, the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, the Director of Selective Service, and such other agency heads as the President may designate, or delegates thereof.

National Advisory Council

SEC. 605. There is hereby established in the Office a National Advisory Council. The Council shall be composed of the Director, who shall be Chairman, and not more than fourteen additional members appointed by the President, without regard to the civil service laws, who shall be representative of the public in general and appropriate fields of endeavor related to the purposes of this Act. Upon the request of the Director, the Council shall review the operations and activities of the Office, and shall make such recommendations with respect thereto as are appropriate. The Council shall meet at least once each year and at such other times as the Director may request.

Revolving Fund

SEC. 606. (a) To carry out the lending and guaranty functions authorized under titles III and IV of this Act, there is authorized to be established a revolving fund. The capital of the fund shall consist of such amounts as may be advanced to it by the Director from funds appropriated pursuant to section 321 and shall remain available until expended.

(b) The Director shall pay into miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury, at the close of each fiscal year, interest on the capital of the fund at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the average market yield on outstanding Treasury obligations of comparable maturity during the last month of the preceding fiscal year. Interest payments may be deferred with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, but any interest payments so deferred shall themselves bear interest.

(c) Whenever any capital in the fund is determined by the Director to be in excess of current needs, such capital shall be credited to the appropriation from which advanced, where it shall be held for future advances.

(d) Receipts from any lending and guaranty operations under this Act (except operations under title IV carried on by the Small Business Administration) shall be credited to the fund. The fund shall be available for the payment of all expenditures of the Director for loans, participations, and guaranties authorized under titles III and IV of this Act.

Labor Standards

SEC. 607. All laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors in the construction, alteration or repair, including painting and decorating of projects, buildings and works which are federally assisted under this Act shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276a—276a-5). The Secretary of Labor shall have, with respect to such labor standards, the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 (15 F.R. 3176; 64 Stat. 1267; 5 U.S.C 133—133z-15), and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (48 Stat. 948, as amended; 40 U.S.C. 276(c)).

Reports

SEC. 608. Not later than one hundred and twenty days after the close of each fiscal year, the Director shall prepare and submit to the President for transmittal to the Congress a full and complete report on the activities of the Office during such year.

Definitions

SEC. 609. As used in this Act:

(a) The term "State" means a State, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, Guam, American Samoa, or the Virgin Islands, and the term "United States", when used in a geographical sense, includes the foregoing and all other places, continental or insular, including the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, subject to the jurisdiction of the United States.

(b) The term "agency", unless the context requires otherwise, means department, agency, or other component of a Federal, State, or local governmental entity.

(c) The term "family," in the case of a Job Corps enrollee, means—

(1) the spouse or child of an enrollee, and

(2) any other relative who draws substantial support from the enrollee.

Part B—Coordination of antipoverty programs

Coordination

, SEC 611. (a) In order to insure that all Federal programs related to the purposes of this Act are carried out in a coordinated manner—

(1) the Director is authorized to call upon other Federal agencies to supply such statistical data, program reports, and other materials as he deems necessary to discharge his responsibilities under this Act, and to assist the President in coordinating the antipoverty efforts of all Federal agencies;

(2) Federal agencies which are engaged in administering programs related to the purposes of this Act, or which otherwise perform functions relating thereto, shall—

(A) cooperate with the Director in carrying out his duties and responsibilities under this Act; and

(B) carry out their programs and exercise their functions in such manner as will, to the maximum extent permitted by other applicable law, assist in carrying out the purposes of this Act; and

(3) the President may direct that particular programs and functions, including the expenditure of funds, of the Federal agencies referred to in paragraph (2) shall be carried out, to the extent not inconsistent with other applicable law, in conjunction with or in support of programs authorized under this Act.

(b) In order to insure that all existing Federal agencies are utilized to the maximum extent possible in carrying out the purposes of this Act, no funds appropriated to carry out this Act shall be used to establish any new department or office when the intended function is being performed by an existing department or office.

Preference to Community Action Programs

SEC. 612. To the extent feasible and consistent with the provisions of law governing any Federal program and with the purposes of this Act, the head of each Federal agency administering any Federal program is directed to give preference to any application for assistance or benefits which is made pursuant to or in connection with a community action program approved pursuant to title II of this Act.

Information Center

SEC. 613. In order to insure that all Federal programs related to the purposes of this Act are utilized to the maximum extent possible, and to insure that information concerning such programs and other relevant information is readily available in one place to public officials and other interested persons, the Director is authorized as he deems appropriate to collect, prepare, analyze, correlate, and distribute such information, either free of charge or by sale at cost (any funds so received to be deposited to the Director's account as an offset to such cost), and make arrangements and pay for any printing and binding without regard to the provisions of any other law or regulation.

Prohibition of Federal Control

SEC. 614. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the curriculum, program of instruction, administration, or personnel of any educational institution or school system.

Authorization of Appropriations

SEC. 615. The Director shall carry out the programs provided for in this title during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and the two succeeding fiscal years. For the purpose of carrying out this title (other than for purposes of making credits to the revolving fund established by section 606(a)), there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965; and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, such sums may be appropriated as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law.

TITLE VII—TREATMENT OF UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION BENEFITS AND INCOME FOR CERTAIN PUBLIC ASSISTANCE PURPOSES

Unemployment Compensation

SEC. 701. (a) No individual who otherwise is entitled, under title XV of the Social Security Act or the unemployment compensation law of any State, to any unemployment benefit shall be denied such benefit, or have such benefit reduced, solely because he or any other person participated in any work, training, or other activity, provided by any program established by, pursuant to, or assisted under, title I or II of this Act.

(b) No individual shall be denied participation in any work, training, or other activity provided by any program established by, pursuant to, or assisted under, title I or II of this Act solely because he, or any other person, receives, or is entitled to receive, any benefit under any unemployment compensation law.

Public Assistance

SEC. 702. (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of titles I, IV, X, XIV, and XVI of the Social Security Act, a State plan approved under any such title shall provide that—

(1) the first $85 plus one-half of the excess over $85 of payments made to or on behalf of any person for or with respect to any month under title I or II of this Act or any program assisted under such title shall not be regarded (A) as income or resources of such person in determining his need under such approved State plan, or (B) as income or resources of any other individual in determining the need of such other individual under such approved State plan;

(2) no payments made to or on behalf of any person for or with respect to any month under such title or any such program shall be regarded as income or resources of any other individual in determining the need of such other individual under such approved State plan except to the extent made available to or for the benefit of such other individual; and

(3) no grant made to any family under title III of this Act shall be regarded as income or resources of such family in determining the need of any member thereof under such approved State plan.

(b) No funds to which a State is otherwise entitled under title I, IV, X, XIV, or XVI of the Social Security Act for any period before July 1, 1965, shall be withheld by reason of any action taken pursuant to a State statute which prevents such State from complying with the requirements of subsection (a).

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 40 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, July 22, 1964, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JULY 21, 1964

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

I Peter 4: 8: *And above all things have fervent charity among yourselves.*

O Thou God of all grace and goodness, to whom we must look for wisdom and understanding, for light and leading, may each day be filled with new expectations and hopes, with new desires and strong determinations to build a better world.

Grant that in the structure of a nobler civilization we may be intent upon applying the moral and spiritual principles of the Sermon on the Mount to all our economic, social, and political affairs, and may the selfish rivalry among the nations be supplanted by the spirit of fellowship.

May we have a faith that is strong and courageous enough to sustain us as we meet the challenge of this tremendous adventure of establishing a world order that is more magnanimous and brotherly.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace who will be with us in all our plans and purposes to achieve the more abundant life for ourselves and all mankind. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 393. An act to make retrocession to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts of jurisdiction over certain land in the vicinity of Fort Devens, Mass.;

H.R. 4177. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey to the city of St. Paul, Minn., all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain lands heretofore conveyed to such city;

H.R. 6299 An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to produce and sell crude oil from the Umiat field, Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 4, for the purpose of making local fuel available for use in connection with the drilling, mechanical, and heating operations of those involved in oil and gas exploration and development work in the nearby areas outside Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 4, and for other purposes;

H.R. 7248. An act to change the designated use of certain real property conveyed by the Department of the Air Force to the city of Fort Walton Beach, Fla., under the terms of Public Law 86–194;

H.R. 7499. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force or his designee to convey 0.25 acre of land to the city of Oroville, Calif.;

H.R. 10322. An act to extend the provisions of the act of August 11, 1959, Public Law 86–155, as amended (74 Stat. 396) to provide improved opportunity for promotion for certain officers in the naval service;

H.R. 10736. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to adjust the legislative jurisdiction exercised by the United States over lands comprising the U.S. naval hospital, Portsmouth, Va.; and

H.J. Res. 888. Joint resolution to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to promulgate special regulations for the period of the 91st annual session of the Imperial Council, Ancient Arabic Order of the Nobles of the Mystic Shrine for North America, to be held in Washington, D.C., in July 1965, to authorize the granting of certain permits to "Imperial Shrine Convention, 1965, Inc.," on the occasions of such sessions, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 7381. An act to simplify, modernize, and consolidate the laws relating to the employment of civilians in more than one position and the laws concerning the civilian employment of retired members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8954. An act to amend section 409 of title 37, United States Code, to authorize the transportation of house trailers and mobile dwellings of members of the uniformed services within the continental United States, within Alaska, or between the continental United States and Alaska, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 9021. An act to authorize the conveyance of two tracts of land situated in Salt Lake City, Utah, to the Board of Education of Salt Lake City.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2339. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the U.S. Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Sarpy County, Nebr.;

S. 2369. An act to retrocede to the State of Kansas exclusive jurisdiction over certain State highways bordering Fort Leavenworth Military Reservation and the U.S. Penitentiary at Leavenworth; and

S. 3001. An act to amend title 37, United States Code, to increase the rates of basic pay for members of the uniformed services.

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, volumes have been written about the operation of the regulatory agencies of Government. Much of the comment has been about the fact that Congress created these agencies independently and that it must leave them free to regulate independently. Comments continue to appear in the press about very determined efforts from Capitol Hill to influence the Civil Aeronautics Board. It is well to reaffirm the fact that we have commanded the Civil Aeronautics Board to make decisions in accordance with its best judgment. It is composed of honorable men, appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. It is my pleasure personally to know well its Chairman, the Honorable Alan Boyd, of Florida. He is a man of highest integrity and principles. I know that he has exercised his judgment honestly and for the good of the Nation as a whole. Without intending at all to comment on the merits of the matter decided by the Board, I commend the Board for its courage and the strength of its convictions as reflected in its deliberations and decisions.

TERROR IN THE STREETS

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the distressing rise in crime rates revealed by FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover yesterday presents strong evidence that this country should make its major attack on a bipartisan basis against terror in the streets in our beloved country. There should be nothing partisan about this effort and we should all try to find ways to bring about the much-needed improvements.

I suggest that the condoning of violation of law by many segments of our society in behalf of reforms in civil rights is a major factor in the present disregard of law in our country. So I feel that the first thing that needs to be done is to make it crystal clear that it is not in accord with the security or the best interest of our country for people to violate laws, even when they are attempting to put across or to forward legislative changes. Now is a time for cool heads on this subject.

Any reforms or changes which are to be made should be presented in the courts of law if they are judicial matters, or in the legislative branch if they are legislative. Where the Constitution is involved, the constitutional processes of amending the Constitution should be relied upon. In no case should the people violate the law or condone the violation of the law to forward or to retard the changes they may seek. As Senator RUSSELL recently said: "Violence and law violation will only compound our difficulties and increase our troubles."

There should be no more lying in the streets and no more baseball bats and ax handles. Civil violence is anti-American, whether it is violating laws to stimulate self-persecution on the one hand, or passionate, thoughtless reaction on the other. Whether it be in Philadelphia, Miss, or Philadelphia, Pa., terror in the streets must end.

LEASING OF REAL PROPERTY BY THE POSTMASTER GENERAL

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 9653) to extend the authority of the Postmaster General to enter into leases of real property for periods not exceeding 30 years, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. MURRAY, MORRISON, DULSKI, CORBETT, and CUNNINGHAM.

WHERE IS THE TRIGGER HAPPY LEADERSHIP?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, according to this morning's leftwing Washington newspaper, House Speaker McCORMACK yesterday attacked the foreign policy statements of Senator BARRY GOLDWATER as dangerous and asked if American parents would want to entrust their children's future to "trigger happy" leadership.

Well, let us look at the record.

It was a Democrat who sat in the White House during World War I. And remember the Democrat President who, engaging in political gimmickry, said he would never send American boys to die on foreign soil? Yet hundreds of thousands were killed and wounded in foreign lands in World War II.

A Democrat President sat in the White House while another 150,000 Americans were being killed or wounded in Korea.

Democrat Presidents have been holding forth in the White House and sending Americans to fight and die in the jungles and rice paddies of Vietnam.

Who, Mr. Speaker, has been sending the children of American parents to die in foreign lands? Who, Mr. Speaker, are the "trigger happy"?

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ACCOUNTS, COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Accounts of the Committee on House Administration may be permitted to sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is the day set for the call of the Consent Calendar. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

PROVIDING FOR ACQUISITION OF PROPERTY IN SQUARE 758 IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AS AN ADDITION TO THE GROUNDS OF THE U.S. SUPREME COURT BUILDING

The Clerk called the bill (S. 254) to provide for the acquisition of certain property in square 758 in the District of Columbia, as an addition to the grounds of the U.S. Supreme Court Building.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR ADDITIONAL COMMISSIONERS OF THE U.S. COURT OF CLAIMS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 102) to provide for additional commissioners of the U.S. Court of Claims.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

EDITH NOURSE ROGERS MEMORIAL HOSPITAL

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10926) to designate a Veterans' Administration hospital in Bedford, Mass., as the Edith Nourse Rogers Memorial Veterans Hospital.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill, H.R. 10926, be stricken from the Consent Calendar.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

SAM RAYBURN MEMORIAL HOSPITAL

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10936) to designate the Veterans' Administration center at Bonham, Tex., as the Sam Rayburn Memorial Veterans Center.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill, H.R. 10936, be stricken from the Consent Calendar.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

JOHN ELLIOTT RANKIN MEMORIAL HOSPITAL

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 146) to designate the Veterans' Administration hospital at Jackson, Miss., as the John Elliott Rankin Memorial Veterans Hospital.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill, H.R. 146, be stricken from the Consent Calendar.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

RELATING TO THE ESTABLISHMENT OF CONCESSION POLICIES IN THE AREAS ADMINISTERED BY NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5886) relating to the establishment of concession policies in the areas administered by National Park Service and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask someone if the criticisms of this bill and the suggestions made for amending this bill by the Comptroller General have been met. These objections and criticisms can be found especially on pages 18, 19, and 20 of the report.

Mr. MORRIS. The committee had the General Accounting Office before it to testify and considered all the amendments that they asked for. We did not put them all in. We did make some changes that the General Accounting Office suggested.

Mr. GROSS. Was the amendment giving the General Accounting Office the right to go into these accounts taken care of in this bill?

Mr. MORRIS. The right giving the General Accounting Office to go into what accounts?

Mr. GROSS. The right to go into the accounts of the concessionaires.

Mr. MORRIS. No.

Mr. GROSS. Why not?

Mr. MORRIS. We do not believe that is a proper function of the General Accounting Office. They are set up to audit Government agencies, not private businesses.

Mr. GROSS. Are not these concessionaires operating through contracts with the Federal Government?

Mr. MORRIS. They operate under a contract with the Department of the Interior, through the Park Service, but they are private businessmen and not Government entities. Does the gentleman want the General Accounting Office to audit every private businessmen who has a contract with the Federal Government?

Mr. GROSS. I believe they ought to be able to look at the records.

Mr. Speaker, I have no desire to pursue this discussion at this time. I believe the bill ought to come out under a rule. I believe there ought to be an adequate explanation and debate of the bill. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—it so happens that the chairman of the committee having jurisdiction over this legislation apparently has already out-thought his friend from Iowa. It was his intention to see that the bill was passed over, because a hearing for a rule has been requested already.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

APPLICATION OF EVACUATION AND ALLOTMENT PAY LAW TO GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8827) to extend the act of September 26, 1961, relating to allotment and assignment of pay, to cover the Government Printing Office, and for other purposes.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

PLACING IN TRUST STATUS CERTAIN LANDS ON THE ROSEBUD SIOUX RESERVATION IN SOUTH DAKOTA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 136) to place in trust status certain lands on the Rosebud Sioux Reservation in South Dakota.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That all the right, title, and interest in and to the following described tracts of land and the improvements thereon on the Rosebud Sioux Reservation in South Dakota, purchased by the United States with funds derived from the "Indian moneys, proceeds of labor, Rosebud School" account, shall hereafter be held by the United States in trust for the benefit of the Rosebud Sioux Tribe of South Dakota.

Tract I-BIA-107	Land description	Acres
	T.38 N., R. 29 W., 6th principal meridian	
L-4	Sec. 5, SW¼	160.0
L-5	Sec. 6, SE¼	160.0
L-6	Sec. 6, lots 6, 7, E½SW¼	149.51
L-7	Sec. 6, lots 3, 4, 5, SE¼NW¼	147.09
	T. 38 N., R. 30 W., 6th principal meridian	
L-9	Sec. 2, lots 3, 4, S½NW¼, SW¼.	321.64
L-10	Sec. 2, lots 1, 2, S½NE¼	160.47
L-11	Sec. 3, lots 1, 2, S½NE¼	161.95
L-12	Sec. 3, SE¼	160.0
L-13	Sec. 3, lots 3, 4, S½NW¼, SW¼.	321.36
L-14	Sec. 4, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, S½NW¼, S½NE¼.	323.50
L-15	Sec. 5, lots 1, 2, S½NE¼	161.69
L-16	Sec. 5, SE¼	160.0
L-17	Sec. 5, SW¼	160.0
L-18	Sec. 6, lots 1, 2, S½NE¼	158.85
L-19	Sec. 6, SE¼	160.0
L-20	Sec. 7, SE¼	160.0
L-21	Sec. 7, lots 3, 4, E½SW¼	151.29
L-22	Sec. 8, S½	320.0
L-23	Sec. 9, NE¼	160.0
L-25	Sec. 9, NW¼	160.0
L-26	Sec. 10, NE¼	160.0
L-27	Sec. 10, SE¼	160.0
L-28	Sec. 10, NW¼	160.0
L-29	Sec. 11, SE¼	160.0
L-30	Sec. 11, NW¼	160.0
L-31	Sec. 12, NW¼	160.0
L-35	Sec. 17, NW¼	160.0
L-37	Sec. 18, SE¼	160.0
L-38	Sec. 18, all of lots 1, 2, E½ NW¼, NE¼, lying north of old U.S. Highway No. 18	261.0
L-39	Sec. 21, E½	320.0
L-40	Sec. 21, W½	320.0
	T. 39 N., R. 30 W., 6th principal meridian	
L-42	Sec. 26, SW¼, except that part lying north of U.S. Highway No. 18	49.3
L-43	Sec. 27, SE¼, except that part lying north of U.S. Highway No. 18	72.1
L-44	Sec. 28 W½SE¼SW¼, except the S½NE¼NE¼NW¼ SE¼SW¼, and N½SE¼ NE¼NW¼SE¼SW¼ containing 0.3125 acre each	19.375
L-47	Sec. 32, all of the north half lying south of U.S. Highway No. 18	189.6
L-48	Sec. 32, all of the south half lying south of U.S. Highway No. 18.	312.65
L-49 L-50	Sec. 33, NE¼, S½NW¼, W½ NE¼NW¼, SE¼NE¼ NW¼, NW¼NW¼.	310.0
L-51	Sec. 34, NE¼	160.0
L-52	Sec. 34, SE¼	160.0
L-53	Sec. 34, SW¼	160.0
L-54	Sec. 35, W½	320.0
L-55	Sec. 35, E½	320.0
L-56	Sec. 36, NE¼ except that part lying north of U.S. Highway No. 18.	104.8
	T. 38 N., R. 32 W., 6th principal meridian	
L-73	Sec. 1, Lots 3, 4, S½NW¼	161.8
	T. 36 N., R. 32 W., 6th principal meridian	
L-74	Sec. 12, N½NE¼	80.0
L-75	Sec. 12, E½NW¼, S½NE¼	160.0
L-76	Sec. 12, W½NW¼ and sec. 1, lots 1, 2, N½SW¼, SW¼ SW¼.	260.34
	Total	8,838.335

SEC. 2. That all the right, title, and interest in and to the following described tracts of land and the improvements thereon on the Rosebud Sioux Reservation in South Dakota, shall hereafter be held by the United States in trust for the benefit of the Rosebud Sioux Tribe of South Dakota:

Tract I-BIA-107	Description	Acres
	T. 38 N., R. 30 W., 6th principal meridian	
L-32	Sec. 16, S½	320.0
L-33	Sec. 17, NE¼	160.0
L-34	Sec. 17, SE¼	160.0
L-36	Sec. 17, SW¼	160.0
	T. 39 N., R. 29 W., 6th principal meridian	
L-41	Sec. 18, NE¼SW¼	40.0
	T. 39 N., R. 30 W., 6th principal meridian	
L-45	Sec. 28, SW¼ SW¼	40.0
	T. 42 N., R. 33 W., 6th principal meridian	
L-68	Sec. 35, E½	320.0
	T. 37 N., R. 30 W., 6th principal meridian	
L-71	Sec. 30, NE¼SE¼	40.0
	T. 36 N., R. 32 W., 6th principal meridian	
L-77	Sec. 1, SE¼SW¼	40.0
L-78	Sec. 1, W½W½SW¼SE¼, E½E½SW¼SE¼, SE¼ SE¼.	60.0
	T. 36 N., R. 31 W., 6th principal meridian	
L-97	Sec. 6, lot 6	35.01
	Total	1,075.01

SEC. 3. That all the right, title, and interest in and to the south half section 9, township 38 north, range 30 west, sixth principal meridian, containing 281.91 acres, more or less (Bureau of Indian Affairs reference: Tract 1-BIA-107-L-24), on the Rosebud Sioux Reservation in South Dakota, purchased by the United States with funds derived from the "Indian moneys, proceeds of labor, Rosebud School" account, shall hereafter be held by the United States in trust for the benefit of the Rosebud Sioux Tribe of South Dakota.

SEC. 4. This conveyance is subject to all valid existing rights-of-way of record and subject to that certain proposed right-of-way for sewer purposes to the United States Public Health Service on which construction was authorized by the Superintendent, Rosebud Agency, on July 31, 1962.

SEC. 5. The Indian Claims Commission is directed to determine in accordance with the provisions of section 2 of the Act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1050), the extent to which the value of the title conveyed by this Act should or should not be set off against any claim against the United States determined by the Commission.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DIRECTING THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR TO CONVEY CERTAIN LANDS TO THE CITIZEN BANDS OF POTAWATOMI INDIANS AND CERTAIN OTHER LANDS TO THE ABSENTEE-SHAWNEE TRIBE OF INDIANS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7215) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands to the United States in trust for the Citizen Band of

Potawatomi Indians of Oklahoma and to convey certain other lands to the United States in trust for the Absentee-Shawnee Tribe of Indians of Oklahoma, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, subject to valid existing rights, all the right, title, and interest of the United States in the following described lands of the Shawnee Indian School and Agency Reserve, including reversionary rights and retained mineral interests under existing grants, together with all improvements located thereon, are hereby declared to be held by the United States in trust for the Citizen Band of Potawatomi Indians of Oklahoma:

TRACT NUMBERED 1

Northeast quarter northeast quarter, southeast quarter northeast quarter, southwest quarter northeast quarter section 31, township 10 north, range 4 east, Indian meridian, Pottawatomie County, Oklahoma, containing 120.00 acres, more or less.

TRACT NUMBERED 2

That part of the northwest quarter southeast quarter section 31, township 10 north, range 4 east, Indian meridian, Pottawatomie County, Oklahoma, described as: Beginning at the southwest corner of said northwest quarter southeast quarter; thence east 1,320 feet; thence north 1,320 feet; thence west 1,320 feet to the center of said section; thence south 167 feet; thence east 183 feet to the intersection with the west line of the Atchison, Topeka, and Santa Fe Railroad right-of-way; thence southwesterly along the west right-of-way line a distance of 856 feet to the intersection with a point in the west line of the northwest quarter southeast quarter, said point being 983 feet south of the center of section 31; thence south along the west line of the northwest quarter southeast quarter, a distance of 337 feet, to the point of beginning; containing 38.29 acres, more or less.

TRACT NUMBERED 3

That part of the southeast quarter northwest quarter section 31, township 10 north, range 4 east, Indian meridian, Pottawatomie County, Oklahoma, described as: Beginning at the northeast corner of said southeast quarter northwest quarter; thence south 1,320 feet to the center of said section 31; thence west along the south line of said southeast quarter northwest quarter, a distance of 1,255.4 feet to the intersection with the centerline of Oklahoma State Highway Numbered 18; thence northwesterly along the centerline of the highway a distance of 660.58 feet to a point on the south line of the northwest quarter southeast quarter northwest quarter; thence east 38 feet to the intersection with the east right-of-way line of Oklahoma State Highway Numbered 18; thence northwesterly along the east right-of-way line to a point in the north line of said southeast quarter northwest quarter, said point being 58 feet east of the northwest corner of said southeast quarter northwest quarter; thence east a distance of 1,262 feet to the point of beginning; containing 38.63 acres, more or less.

TRACT NUMBERED 4

That part of the northeast quarter southwest quarter section 31, township 10 north, range 4 east, Indian meridian, Pottawatomie County, Oklahoma, described as: Beginning at the northeast corner of said northeast quarter southwest quarter, said point being the center of section 31; thence south 167 feet; thence west 1,302 feet to the intersection with the west line of the right-of-way of Oklahoma State Highway Numbered 18; thence northeasterly along the west right-of-way line a distance of 167 feet to the north line of said northeast quarter southwest quarter; thence east along said north line a distance of 1,297.4 feet to the point of beginning; containing 4.678 acres, more or less.

TRACT NUMBERED 5

That part of the northeast quarter southwest quarter section 31, township 10 north, range 4 east, Indian meridian, Pottawatomie County, Oklahoma, described as: Beginning at the southeast corner of said northeast quarter southwest quarter; thence north along the east line of said northeast quarter southwest quarter a distance of 337 feet to the intersection with the west right-of-way line of the Atchison, Topeka, and Santa Fe Railroad right-of-way; thence southwesterly along said west right-of-way line a distance of 367 feet to the intersection with the south line of said northeast quarter southwest quarter; thence east along the south line a distance of 129 feet to the point of beginning; containing .498 acre, more or less.

TRACT NUMBERED 6

The reserved mineral deposits, including the right to prospect for and remove the same, in and under lands described as the south half of lot 2 (southwest quarter northwest quarter), and that part of the southwest quarter southeast quarter northwest quarter lying west of the centerline of Oklahoma State Highway Numbered 18 and adjacent to the south half of said lot 2, all in section 31, township 10 north, range 4 east, Indian meridian, Pottawatomie County, Oklahoma, containing 19.87 acres, more or less, which lands were previously conveyed to Pottawatomie County, Oklahoma, by quitclaim deed dated December 17, 1959, pursuant to the Act of June 4, 1953 (67 Stat. 71; 25 U.S.C. 293a), said deed appearing of record in Pottawatomie County, Oklahoma, in deed book 174 at page 367 of the land records of said county.

Sec. 2. Subject to valid existing rights, all the right, title, and interest of the United States in the following described lands of the Shawnee Indian School and Agency Reserve, including reversionary rights and retained mineral interests under existing grants, together with all improvements located thereon, are hereby declared to be held by the United States in trust for the Absentee-Shawnee Tribe of Indians of Oklahoma:

TRACT NUMBERED 7

That part of the northeast quarter southwest quarter section 31, township 10 north, range 4 east, Indian meridian, Pottawatomie County, Oklahoma, described as: Beginning at a point, 1,320 feet south and 726 feet west of the northeast corner of said northeast quarter southwest quarter; thence north 220.44 feet; thence west 594 feet to the point of intersection with the west line of said northeast quarter southwest quarter; thence north along the west line a distance of 439.56 feet to the midpoint of the west line of said northeast quarter southwest quarter; thence east a distance of 17 feet to the intersection with the west right-of-way line of Oklahoma State Highway Numbered 18; thence northeasterly along said west right-of-way line a distance of 493 feet; thence east 1,485 feet to the west right-of-way line of the Atchison, Topeka, and Santa Fe Railroad right-of-way; thence southwesterly along said west railroad right-of-way line a distance of 1,223 feet to a point in the south line of said northeast quarter southwest quarter, said point being 129 feet west of the southeast corner of said northeast quarter southwest quarter; thence west along the south line of said northeast quarter southwest quarter a distance of 597 feet to the point of beginning; containing 33.23 acres, more or less.

Sec. 3. The Act of September 13, 1960 (74 Stat. 903), is hereby amended to declare that the 57.99 acres of land, more or less, heretofore conveyed to the Citizen Band of Potawatomi Indians of Oklahoma by the Secretary of the Interior by deed dated November 28, 1960, covering lot 1 (northwest quarter northwest quarter) and north half of lot 2 (southwest quarter northwest quarter) and the part of the north half southeast quarter northwest quarter lying west of the east right-of-way line of Oklahoma State Highway Numbered 18, all in section 31, township 10 north, range 4 east, Indian meridian, Oklahoma, shall be held in trust by the United States for the use and benefit of the Citizen Band of Potawatomi Indians of Oklahoma.

Sec. 4. The Indian Claims Commission is directed to determine in accordance with the provisions of section 2 of the Act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1050), the extent to which the value of the title conveyed by this Act should or should not be set off against any claim against the United States determined by the Commission.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 3, strike out everything through page 2, line 3, and insert the following: "That, subject to valid existing rights, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to convey to the Citizen Band of Potawatomi Indians of Oklahoma all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the following described lands of the Shawnee Indian School and Agency Reserve, including reversionary rights and retained mineral interests under existing grants, together with all improvements located thereon:".

Page 5, after line 13, add a new paragraph, as follows:

"The title of the tribe to the lands hereinbefore described and the improvements thereon shall be subject to no exemption from taxation or restriction on use, management, or disposition because of Indian ownership."

Page 5, line 14, strike out everything through line 21 and insert the following:

"Sec. 2. Subject to valid existing rights, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to convey to the Absentee-Shawnee Tribe of Indians of Oklahoma all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the following described lands of the Shawnee Indian School and Agency Reserve, including reversionary rights and retained mineral interests under existing grants, together with all improvements located thereon:".

Page 6, after line 20, add a new paragraph, as follows:

"The title of the tribe to the lands hereinbefore described and the improvements thereon shall be subject to no exemption from taxation or restriction on use, management, or disposition because of Indian ownership."

Page 6, line 21, strike out all of section 3 through page 7, line 8. Page 7, line 9, renumber "Sec. 4." as "Sec. 3."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands to the Citizen Band of Potawatomi Indians and certain other lands to the Absentee-Shawnee Tribe of Indians, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE EXCHANGE OF LANDS WITHIN THE SALT RIVER PIMA-MARICOPA INDIAN RESERVATION

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8334) to authorize the exchange of lands within the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Reservation, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the following-described lands within the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Reservation, Arizona, consisting of approximately 27.3625 acres, purchased for school purposes from Indian moneys of labor funds and now excess to the needs of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, are hereby declared to be held by the United States in trust for the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian community:

South half north half south half northeast quarter southwest quarter southeast quarter, south half south half northeast quarter southwest quarter southeast quarter, north half northwest quarter southwest quarter southeast quarter, north half north half south half northwest quarter southwest quarter southeast quarter, west half east half southeast quarter southwest quarter, west half east half east half southeast quarter southwest quarter, east half northeast quarter northeast quarter southeast quarter southwest quarter, north half northeast quarter southeast quarter northeast quarter southeast quarter southwest quarter, section 32, township 2 north, range 5 east, G. and S.R.P. and M., Arizona.

Sec. 2. In exchange for the lands transferred by this Act to the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized, in his discretion, to accept on behalf of the United States all right, title and interest of the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community in and to the following described lands within the reservation, consisting of approximately 27 acres: "That portion of lot 7, section 28, township 3 north, range 7 east, Gila and Salt River base and meridian, Arizona, lying within the Salt River Indian Reservation."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "proceds" and insert "proceeds".

Page 2, line 12, strike out all of section 2.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to transfer to the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian community certain lands within the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Reservation."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR THE DISPOSITION OF JUDGMENT FUNDS ON DEPOSIT TO THE CREDIT OF THE LOWER PEND D'OREILLE OR KALISPEL TRIBE OF INDIANS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10973) to provide for the disposition of judgment funds on deposit to the credit of the Lower Pend D'Oreille or Kalispel Tribe of Indians.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the unexpended balance of funds on deposit in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Lower Pend D'Oreille or Kalispel Tribe of Indians that were appropriated by the Act of May 17, 1963 (Public Law 88–25; 77 Stat. 20, 43), to pay a judgment by the Indian Claims Commission in docket 94, and the interest thereon, less payment of attorneys' fees and expenses, may be advanced or expended for any purpose that is authorized by the tribal governing body and approved by the Secretary of the Interior. Any part of such funds that may be distributed to the members of the tribe shall not be subject to the Federal or State income tax.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR THE DISPOSITION OF FUNDS FROM JUDGMENTS IN FAVOR OF THE NEHALEM BAND OF THE TILLAMOOK INDIANS AND THE TILLAMOOK BAND OF THE TILLAMOOK INDIANS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 11118) to provide for the disposition of funds from judgments in favor of the Nehalem Band of the Tillamook Indians and the Tillamook Band of the Tillamook Indians.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior shall prepare a roll of all persons who meet both of the following requirements for eligibility: (1) They were born on or prior to and living on the date of this Act; and (2) their name or the name of an ancestor through whom they claim eligibility appears either on the census roll of the Naalem (Nehalem) Band of Tillamook Indians dated January 28, 1898, or on the annuity payment roll of the Tillamook Band of Tillamook Indians prepared in 1914 under the provisions of the Act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. L. 519–535). Applications for enrollment must be filed with the area director of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Portland, Oregon, within six months after the date of this Act on forms prescribed for that purpose. The determination of the Secretary regarding the eligibility for enrollment of an applicant shall be final.

Sec. 2. The Secretary is authorized and directed to withdraw the funds on deposit in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Nehalem and Tillamook Bands of Indians that were appropriated by the Act of May 17, 1963 (77 Stat. 43), in satisfaction of a judgment obtained by the bands in the Indian Claims Commission against the United States in Dakota Numbered 240 together with the interest accrued thereon and to pro rate such funds among those persons whose names appear on the roll prepared pursuant to section 1 of this Act. The Secretary shall distribute shares payable to living persons enrolled pursuant to section 1 of this Act and shares payable to the heirs and legatees of deceased persons enrolled pursuant to section 1 of this Act according to such rules and regulations as he may prescribe.

Sec. 3. The funds distributed in accordance with this Act shall not be subject to the Federal or State income tax and no part of such funds shall be subject to any lien, debt, or claim of any nature whatsoever against the tribe, band, or individual Indians, except delinquent debts owed by the tribe or band to the United States or owed by individual Indians to the tribe, band, or to the United States.

Sec. 4. Any costs incurred by the Secretary in the preparation of the rolls and in the distribution of payment of pro rata shares in accordance with the provisions of this Act shall be paid by appropriate withdrawals from the judgment fund.

Sec. 5. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to prescribe rules and regulations to carry out the provisions of this Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE PAYMENT OF EXPENSES INCIDENT TO THE EVACUATION OF DEPENDENTS OF MILITARY PERSONNEL FROM PANAMA AND CYPRUS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 11626) to authorize the payment of expenses incident to the evacuation of dependents of military personnel from Panama and Cyprus.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wonder why the expenses of evacuees from Panama should be picked up by the taxpayers.

My question is: Why were these military dependents not moved into the Canal Zone and protected in the Canal Zone, without being evacuated further?

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. The evacuation was in the light of the circumstances. The gentleman understands the law. If the evacuation had taken place and they had been put in some haven of security in foreign area such as, for instance, Colombia, the law would permit payment.

However, when the dependents come to the United States, the law does not permit payment. Therefore, it is necessary, in view of the emergency situation in Panama, to authorize the same payment that a civilian dependent would receive.

Mr. GROSS. I will say to the gentleman from Georgia that I am well aware that there was an emergency situation last January in Panama when the President of Panama thumbed his nose at the United States and refused to use the troops of that country to protect the lives and the property of Panamanians as well as Americans. My question is still unanswered. Why were these Americans, if they were outside the area of the Canal Zone, not moved into the Canal Zone and protected?

Mr. VINSON. May I say they were moved completely out of the Canal Zone for their own safety.

Mr. GROSS. Why?

Mr. VINSON. The women and children were, because we wanted to protect them. We did not know what was going to happen. Therefore, from the point of the security of these helpless people who were dependents of military personnel, we moved them.

Mr. GROSS. Are you saying that a Nation spending more than $50 billion a year on defense; for troops, equipment and all that goes with it cannot protect their own people in the Panama Canal Zone?

Mr. VINSON. There had been fighting right in the area where they were, so we did not want the women and children in that hostile area. That is the only reason. Now, suppose it happens in some other country. It would be proper to take the women and children out of the area near the firing line. I think so, and I hope that the gentleman does.

Mr. GROSS. Of course, and there were a lot of women and children, dependents of American civil employees, left in the Canal Zone.

Mr. VINSON. That is true.

Mr. GROSS. And they were not moved out.

Mr. VINSON. That is true.

Mr. GROSS. What you are admitting with this kind of legislation is that this administration did not, initially, have the courage to protect our own people in a territory where we have complete sovereignty. Panama is not Colombia, or Peru, or Brazil, or Hungary, or any other country that you can think of. The United States has full sovereignty in the Panama Canal Zone.

Mr. VINSON. On that I agree with you.

Mr. GROSS. Yet we do not have the courage and, let me say, the decency to protect our own citizens in the Canal Zone. Instead we yielded and evacuated some of them completely out of the area and to the United States.

Mr. VINSON. The situation was so acute that we did not know whether we actually would have fighting take place all over the Canal Zone. Therefore, in the interest of security and for the protection of the helpless women and children, we evacuated them. I merely point out that if we had sent them to some other place in that area, the Government would have absorbed the cost, but when we brought them back to the United States there was no authority to pay them. We are merely giving to these dependents of the military the same consideration and the same protection that we give to a civilian employees' dependents. I also point out that 300,000 and some odd dollars are being absorbed by the money that is in the appropriation bill for the Department of Defense.

Mr. GROSS. I ask the gentleman, who started the shooting in Panama last January? Was it the trigger-happy Panamanians or U.S. troops? The gentleman well knows that it was a Panamanian mob that started the trouble.

Mr. VINSON. It does not make any difference who started it.

Mr. GROSS. It makes a difference to me.

Mr. VINSON. The purpose is to secure the protection of women and children of the military. If the gentleman wants them on the firing line that is his view. I think we should take them out as rapidly as possible, particularly when there is no additional appropriation involved.

Mr. GROSS. I believe in protecting American women and children in any danger zone. But why were they not moved into the Canal Zone and protected there, thus saving this bill of expense? That is my question. It has not been answered; it is not going to be answered.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, payments to military personnel are authorized from current appropriations in consideration of extraordinary expenses incurred by reason of the evacuation from Panama and Cyprus to the United States in January 1964, and February 1964, of approximately two thousand dependents of military personnel. Payment in each case shall not exceed that amount which would be payable by law and regulation to a civilian employee under similar circumstances, and the total amount of payments shall not exceed $500,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 4, strike "to military personnel".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROMOTION OF QUALIFIED RESERVE OFFICERS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2501) to authorize the promotion of qualified Reserve officers of the Army and the Air Force to existing unit vacancies.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask someone from the Committee on Armed Services a question or two concerning the provisions that are in or those that might have been left out of this proposed legislation. May I ask the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WINSTEAD] or the distinguished chairman of the committee from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] whether or not there is any ceiling or limitation on the amounts that may be paid on the direction of the Secretary of the Army, Navy, or Air Force.

Mr. WINSTEAD. No, there are no limitations. I believe the gentleman has reference to another bill, H.R. 2502.

Mr. FORD. I am sorry; I believe it is the next bill I had in mind.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask a question with regard to the bill, as to whether this bill, which applies to the Army and Air Force, will handle any similar problem with regard to the Navy. There is a related piece of legislation on the other side with regard to the Navy and I am wondering what the situation will be if it does not pass over there.

Mr. WINSTEAD. The Navy has no problem whatsoever, which is the reason they are not included in this bill.

Mr. VINSON. They have no unit promotions.

Mr. WINSTEAD. They have no unit promotions in their Reserve units.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the gentleman; Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Public Law 86–559 is amended as follows:

Section 1 is amended by—

(a) striking out the last sentence of subsection (6); and

(b) striking out the last sentence of subsection (48).

SEC. 2. Title 10, United States Code, is amended by repealing subsection (e) of section 3383.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CANCELLATION OF INDEBTEDNESS OF ENLISTED MEMBERS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2502) to provide for the remission or cancellation of an indebtedness due the United States by enlisted members of the National Guard.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the question I posed a minute ago on the other bill I intended to ask concerning this legislation. Will the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi respond to the question I raised?

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, there are no limitations in existence at the present time. The record shows that the average has been approximately $500 for the Army and $600 for the Navy and still less for the Air Force. But there are no limitations in the present bill.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, this gives to the Reserve the same right that has existed for many years in the regular services. The amount involved has always been relatively small. I know from personal knowledge that the Secretaries even of the services has been very, very careful in the relieving of members of the Armed Forces from financial liability. In fact, many Members of Congress personally know of where the Secretary has been even unfair to the serviceman in cases of this type.

In my opinion, this is a worthy bill.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That chapter 7 of title 32, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by adding the following new section at the end thereof:

"§ 716. Settlement of accounts: remission or cancellation.

"If he considers it in the best interest of the United States, the Secretary concerned or his designated representative may have remitted or canceled any or all of an enlisted member's indebtedness to the United States or any of its instrumentalities remaining unpaid before, or at the time of, that member's honorable discharge.";

(2) by adding the following new item at the end of the analysis thereof:

"716. Settlement of accounts: remission or cancellation."

With the following committee amendments:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

"(1) Chapter 165 is amended—

"(A) by adding the following new section at the end thereof:

" '§ 2774. Remission of indebtedness of enlisted members

" 'A debt owed to the United States or its instrumentalities by an enlisted member of an armed force (including an enlisted member or former enlisted member who has been retired or becomes entitled to retired or retainer pay, or one who is a member of a reserve component, whether or not on active duty) may be remitted or canceled by the Secretary concerned if he considers it to be in the best interest of the United States. This authority applies only to debts incurred by the member while he was on active duty or engaged in inactive-duty training. It may be used to remit or cancel debts incurred during service with another armed force or imposed by another armed force, but only with the concurrence of the Secretary having jurisdiction over that other armed force.'; and

"(B) by adding the following new item at the end of the analysis:

" '2774. Remission of indebtedness of enlisted members.'

"(2) Sections 4837(d), 6161, and 9837(d) are repealed.

"(3) The analysis of chapter 453 is amended by striking out the following item:

" '4837. Settlement of accounts: deductions from pay.'

"(4) The analysis of chapter 561 is amended by striking out the following item:

" '6161. Remission of indebtedness of enlisted members upon discharge.'

"(5) The analysis of chapter 953 is amended by striking out the following item:

" '9837. Settlement of accounts: deductions from pay.'

"Sec. 2. Chapter 13 of title 14, United States Code, is amended—

"(1) by repealing section 461(c); and

"(2) by striking out the following item in the analysis:

" '461. Pay and allowances; pay of officers indebted to the United States; remission of indebtedness of enlisted members.'

"And inserting the following item in place thereof:

" '461. Pay and allowances; pay of officers indebted to the United States.'

"Sec. 3. Chapter 7 of title 32, United States Code, is amended—

"(1) by adding the following new section at the end thereof:

" '§ 716. Remission of indebtedness of enlisted members

" 'A debt owed to the United States or its instrumentalities by an enlisted member of the National Guard may be remitted or canceled by the Secretary of the Army or the Secretary of the Air Force, as the case may be, if he considers it to be in the best interest of the United States. This authority applies only to debts incurred by the member while he was on active duty or engaged in training authorized by this title. It may be used to remit or cancel debts incurred during service with another armed force or imposed by another armed force, but only with the concurrence of the Secretary having jurisdiction over that other armed force.'; and

"(2) by adding the following new item at the end of the analysis:

" '716. Remission of indebtedness of enlisted members'."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend titles 10, 14, and 32, United States Code, with respect to the remission or cancellation of indebtedness of enlisted members of the Armed Forces and the National Guard to the United States."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADDITIONAL BRIDGE ACROSS CHESAPEAKE BAY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10619) to amend the act of June 16, 1948, to authorize the construction of an additional bridge across the Chesapeake Bay in the State of Maryland, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first section of the Act of June 16, 1948 (62 Stat. 463; Public Law 654, Eightieth Congress), is amended by striking out "and (2)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(2)" and by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the following: "and (3) a bridge across the Chesapeake Bay in the State of Maryland from a point in Anne Arundel County at or near Sandy Point to a point approximately opposite on Kent Island substantially paralleling the bridge authorized by clause (1) of this section, and approaches thereto."

Sec. 2. (a) The first sentence of section 3 of such Act of June 16, 1948, is amended by striking out "either or both" at each of the places where it appears and inserting in lieu thereof at each such place "any".

(b) The last sentence of section 3 of such Act of June 16, 1948, is amended by inserting ", as amended," immediately after "by this Act".

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRESENTATION OF MONUMENT TO MEXICO

The Clerk called the bill (S. 944) to provide for the presentation by the United States to the people of Mexico of a monument commemorating the independence of Mexico, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of State is authorized and requested to procure a statue of Lincoln to commemorate appropriately the independence of Mexico, and present the same, on behalf of the people of the United States, to the people of Mexico. Such monument shall be prepared only after the design, plans, and specifications therefor have been submitted to and approved by the Commission of Fine Arts.

Sec. 2. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act, including payment of the cost of such statue, the design and construction of a suitable pedestal therefor, transportation, including insurance, erection of the statue in Mexico, and traveling expenses of persons delegated by the Secretary of State to present such statue, on behalf of the people of the United States, to the people of Mexico.

With the following committee amendment:

Beginning on line 10, page 1, after "Sec. 2", strike out the words "There are authorized to appropriate such sums as may be necessary", and insert in lieu thereof "There is hereby authorized to be appropriated not in excess of $150,000".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RIO GRANDE CANALIZATION PROJECT

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2370) authorizing maintenance of flood and arroyo sediment control dams and related works to facilitate Rio Grande canalization project and authorizing appropriations for that purpose.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That for the purposes of facilitating and implementing operation and maintenance of the international Rio Grande canalization project, the United States Commissioner, International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, is authorized to enter into agreements with the appropriate official or officials of local organizations, as defined in the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act of August 4, 1954 (70 Stat. 1088), as amended (16 U.S.C.A. 1001 et seq.), for the maintenance by said local organizations either directly or indirectly through mutually satisfactory maintenance agreements with others, including the United States, of all those flood and arroyo sediment control dams, together with all related works, hereafter installed or constructed in the Rio Grande watershed between Caballo Dam and El Paso, Texas, in accordance with said Act, and which are necessary, in the opinion of said Commissioner, to facilitate and implement the operation and maintenance of said project.

Such maintenance agreements between the local organization and the United States shall provide the extent of contribution by the United States as may be mutually agreed by the two parties, based on the degree of benefits to be derived from said dams and related works, and the contribution by the United States may be either in the form of funds or performance of the actual operation and maintenance.

Control gates shall not be installed on any of the dams which, in the opinion of the United States Commissioner, International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, are necessary to facilitate and implement the operation and maintenance of the Rio Grande canalization project.

Arrangements made between the United States and the local organizations shall be satisfactory to the Secretary of Agriculture for defraying cost of maintaining such work of improvement in accordance with regulations prescribed by said Secretary.

There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be required for contributions to maintenance authorized by this Act.

With the following committee amendment:

Beginning on line 4, page 3, strike out through the word "required" on line 5, page 3, and insert in lieu thereof, "There is hereby authorized to be appropriated not in excess of $23,000 per annum".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FLOOD CONTROL WORKS, LOWER COLORADO RIVER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7419) to authorize the conclusion of agreements with Mexico for joint construction, operation, and maintenance of flood control works on the lower Colorado River, in accordance with the provisions of article 13 of the 1944 Water Treaty with Mexico, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of State, acting through the United States Commissioner, International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, is authorized to conclude, with the appropriate official or officials of the Government of Mexico, agreements for flood control measures of international character in the reaches of the lower Colorado River between Imperial Dam and the Gulf of California, in both the United States and Mexico, such agreements to provide: (a) for the joint clearing and maintaining free of trees and brush the bed and banks of the channel; for levees along the channel; and (b) for corrective actions to guard against sedimentation and consequent aggradation of the river channel incident to desilting operations at diversion dams in the two countries:, *Provided,* That, prior approval of the Secretary of the Interior is required of any proposed agreement with Mexico under clause (b) of this section which would involve construction and/or operation of works on the Colorado River in the United States under the jurisdiction of the Secretary. The measures contemplated herein are for the purpose of controlling floods on the lower Colorado River in accordance with article 13 of the 1944 Water Treaty with Mexico, and accomplishment thereof by the International Boundary and Water Commission, United States Section, would be in accord with the "Memorandum of Understanding as to Functions and Jurisdiction of Agencies of the United States in Relation to the Colorado and Tijuana Rivers and the Rio Grande Below Fort Quitman, Texas, Under Water Treaty Signed at Washington, February 3, 1944," between the Department of State and the United States Section, International Boundary and Water Commission, and the Department of the Interior dated February 14, 1945.

SEC. 2. The United States Commissioner, International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, is authorized to carry out those measures agreed upon for execution by the United States in the agreements concluded pursuant to section 1 of this Act.

SEC. 3. There is authorized to be appropriated to the Department of State for use of the United States Section, International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

With the following committee amendments:

1. On page 1, line 7, before the words "flood control", insert the word "emergency".

2. On page 2, line 5, strike out the words "for levees along the channel;" and insert in lieu thereof, "for removing sediment deposits from the river channel;".

3. On page 2, line 19, strike out "the "Memorandum of Understanding as to" and insert in lieu thereof "the Memorandum of Understanding "as to".

4. On page 3, lines 11 and 12, strike out "such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act." and insert in lieu thereof "not in excess of $300,000 for the initial cost of the work authorized in this Act, and not to exceed $20,000 annually thereafter for necessary maintenance."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize the conclusion of agreements with Mexico for joint construction, operation, and maintenance of emergency flood control works on the lower Colorado River, in accordance with the provisions of article 13 of the 1944 Water Treaty with Mexico, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LANDS ON THE ROSEBUD SIOUX RESERVATION, S. DAK.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to vacate the proceedings of the House whereby the bill (S. 136) to place in trust status certain lands on the Rosebud Sioux Reservation in South Dakota, was passed and reconsider the bill at this time, with a clarifying amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That all the right, title, and interest in and to the following described tracts of land and the improvements thereon on the Rosebud Sioux Reservation in South Dakota, purchased by the United States with funds derived from the "Indian moneys, proceeds of labor, Rosebud School" account, shall hereafter be held by the United States in trust for the benefit of the Rosebud Sioux Tribe of South Dakota.

Tract I-BIA-107	Land description	Acres
	T. 38 N., R. 29 W., 6th principal meridian	
L-4	Sec. 5, SW¼	160.0
L-5	Sec. 6, SE¼	160.0
L-6	Sec. 6, lots 6, 7, E½SW¼	149.51
L-7	Sec. 6, lots 3, 4, 5, SE¼NW¼	147.09
	T 38 N., R. 30 W., 6th principal meridian	
L-9	Sec. 2, lots 3, 4, S½NW¼, SW¼	321.64
L-10	Sec. 2, lots 1, 2, S½NE¼	160.47
L-11	Sec. 3, lots 1, 2, S½NE¼	161.95
L-12	Sec. 3, SE¼	160.0
L-13	Sec. 3, lots 3, 4, S½NW¼, SW¼	321.36
L-14	Sec. 4, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, S½NW¼ S½NE¼	323.50
L-15	Sec. 5, lots 1, 2, S½NE¼	161.69
L-16	Sec. 5, SE¼	160.0
L-17	Sec. 5, SW¼	160.0
L-18	Sec. 6, lots 1, 2, S½NE¼	158.85
L-19	Sec. 6, SE¼	160.0
L-20	Sec. 7, SE¼	160.0
L-21	Sec. 7, lots 3, 4, E½SW¼	151.29
L-22	Sec. 8, S½	320.0
L-23	Sec. 9, NE¼	160.0
L-25	Sec. 9, NW¼	160.0
L-26	Sec. 10, NE¼	160.0
L-27	Sec. 10, SE¼	160.0
L-28	Sec. 10, NW¼	160.0
L-29	Sec. 11, SE¼	160.0
L-30	Sec. 11, NW¼	160.0
L-31	Sec. 12, NW¼	160.0
L-35	Sec. 17, NW¼	160.0
L-37	Sec. 18, SE¼	160.0
L-38	Sec. 18, all of lots 1, 2, E½NW¼, NE¼, lying north of old U.S. Highway No. 18.	261.0
L-39	Sec. 21, E½	320.0
L-40	Sec. 21, W½	320.0
	T. 39 N., R. 30 W., 6th principal meridian	
L-42	Sec. 26, SE¼, except that part lying north of U.S. Highway No. 18.	40.3
L-43	Sec. 27, SE¼, except that part lying north of U.S. Highway No. 18.	72.1
L-44	Sec. 28, W½SE¼SW¼, except the S½NE¼NE¼-NW¼SE¼SW¼, and N½-SE¼NE¼NW¼SE¼SW¼ containing 0.3125 acre each.	19.375
L-47	Sec. 32, all of the north half lying south of U.S. Highway No. 18.	189.6
L-48	Sec. 32, all of the south half lying south of U.S. Highway No. 18.	312.67
L-49 L-50	Sec. 33, NE¼, S½NW¼, W½NE¼NW¼, SE¼NE¼-NW¼, NW¼NW¼.	310.0
L-51	Sec. 34, NE¼	160.0
L-52	Sec. 34, SE¼	160.0
L-53	Sec. 34, SW¼	160.0
L-54	Sec. 35, W½	320.0
L-55	Sec. 35, E½	320.0
L-56	Sec. 36, NE¼, except that part lying north of U.S. Highway No. 18.	104.8
	T. 38 N., R. 32 W., 6th principal meridan	
L-73	Sec. 1, lots 3, 4, S½NW¼	161.8
	T. 36 N., R. 32 W., 6th principal meridian	
L-74	Sec. 12, N½NE¼	80.0
L-75	Sec. 12, E½NW¼, S½NE¼	160.0
L-76	Sec. 12, W½NW¼ and sec. 1, lots 1, 2, N½SW¼, SW¼-SW¼.	280.34
	Total	8,838.335

SEC. 2. That all the right, title, and interest in and to the following described tracts of land and the improvements thereon on the Rosebud Sioux Reservation in South Dakota,

shall hereafter be held by the United States in trust for the benefit of the Rosebud Sioux Tribe of South Dakota:

Tract I-BIA-107	Description	Acres
	T. 38 N., R. 30 W., 6th principal meridian	
L-32	Sec. 16, S½	320.0
L-33	Sec. 17, NE¼	160.0
L-34	Sec. 17, SE¼	160.0
L-36	Sec. 17, SW¼	160.0
	T. 39 N., R. 29 W., 6th principal meridian	
L-41	Sec. 18, NE¼SW¼	40.0
	T. 39 N., R. 30 W., 6th principal meridian	
L-45	Sec. 28, SW¼SW¼	40.0
	T. 42 N., R. 33 W., 6th principal meridian	
L-68	Sec. 35, E½	320.0
	T. 37 N., R. 30 W., 6th principal meridian	
L-71	Sec. 30, NE¼SE¼	40.0
	T. 36 N., R. 32 W., 6th principal meridian	
L-77	Sec. 1, SE¼SW¼	40.0
L-78	Sec. 1, W½W½SW¼SE¼, E½E½SW¼SE¼, SE¼SE¼.	60.0
	T. 36 N., R. 31 W., 6th principal meridian	
L-97	Sec. 6, lot 6	35.01
	Total	1,075.01

SEC. 3. That all the right, title, and interest in and to the south half section 9, township 38 north, range 30 west, sixth principal meridian, containing 281.91 acres, more or less (Bureau of Indian Affairs reference: Tract 1-BIA-107-L-24), on the Rosebud Sioux Reservation in South Dakota, purchased by the United States with funds derived from the "Indian moneys, proceeds of labor, Rosebud School" account, shall hereafter be held by the United States in trust for the benefit of the Rosebud Sioux Tribe of South Dakota.

SEC. 4. This conveyance is subject to all valid existing rights-of-way of record and subject to that certain proposed right-of-way for sewer purposes to the United States Public Health Service on which construction was authorized by the Superintendent, Rosebud Agency, on July 31, 1962.

SEC. 5. The Indian Claims Commission is directed to determine in accordance with the provisions of section 2 of the Act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1050), the extent to which the value of the title conveyed by this Act should or should not be set off against any claim against the United States determined by the Commission.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I offer a clarifying amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ASPINALL: on page 4, after line 2, strike out the total acreage figure "1,075.01", and insert in lieu thereof "1,375.01".

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill, as amended, was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMIT U.S.S. "ALABAMA" TO PASS THROUGH PANAMA CANAL

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 11622) to permit the vessel U.S.S. *Alabama* to pass through the Panama Canal without payment of tolls, with an amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER]?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, in order to facilitate the movement of the vessel United States ship *Alabama* from the west coast of the United States to a site in the State of Alabama where it is to be established as a public shrine, the vessel United States ship *Alabama* shall be permitted to pass through the Panama Canal from west to east without payment of tolls of any kind.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BONNER: Page 1, after line 9, add the following:

"For the purposes of such transit through the Panama Canal the said vessel shall be regarded as a vessel operated by the United States within the meaning of section 412(c) of title 2 of Canal Zone Code (76A Stat. 27)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first individual bill on the Private Calendar.

DR. AND MRS. ABEL GORFAIN

The Clerk called the first bill on the Private Calendar (H.R. 2706) for the relief of Dr. and Mrs. Abel Gorfain.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

CHARLES WAVERLY WATSON, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2728) for the relief of Charles Waverly Watson, Jr.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

JOHN F. MACPHAIL

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5145) for the relief of John F. MacPhail, lieutenant, U.S. Navy.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

ESTATE OF J. W. GWIN, SR.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2747) for the relief of the estate of J. W. Gwin, Sr.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

CWO ELDEN R. COMER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6136) for the relief of CWO Elden R. Comer.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

HELEN J. GOOGINS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6839) for the relief of Helen J. Googins.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

JONG WAN LEE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6479) for the relief of Jong Wan Lee.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

N. M. BENTLEY AND GEORGE MARKWALTER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7823) granting jurisdiction to the Court of Claims to render judgment on certain claims of N. M. Bentley against the United States.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. This concludes the call of bills on the Private Calendar.

NURSE TRAINING ACT OF 1964

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 11241) to amend the Public Health Service Act to increase the opportunities for training professional nursing personnel, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Nurse Training Act of 1964".

SEC. 2. The Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C., ch. 6A) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new title:

"TITLE VIII—NURSE TRAINING

"Part A—Grants for expansion and improvement of nurse training

"Authorization of Appropriations for Constuction Grants

"SEC. 801. (a) There are authorized to be appropriated—

"(1) for grants to assist in the construction of new facilities for collegiate schools of nursing, or replacement or rehabilitation of existing faciliting for such schools, $5,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and $10,000,000 for each of the next three fiscal years;

"(2) for grants to assist in the construction of new facilities for associate degree or diploma schools of nursing, or replacement or rehabilitation of existing facilities for such schools, $10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and $15,000,000 for each of the next three fiscal years.

There are also authorized to be appropriated for each of such fiscal years ending after June 30, 1966, for grants specified in clause (1) or (2) of the preceding sentence, the amount by which the total of the sums authorized to be appropriated under such clause for previous years exceeds the aggregate of the appropriations thereunder for such years.

"(b) Sums appropriated pursuant to clause (1) or (2) of subsection (a) for a fiscal year shall remain available for grants specified in such clause until the close of the next fiscal year.

"Approval of Applications for Construction Grants

"SEC. 802. (a) No application for a grant for a construction project under this part may be approved unless it is submitted to the Surgeon General prior to July 1, 1968.

"(b) A grant for a construction project under this part may be made only if the application therefor is approved by the Surgeon General upon his determination that—

"(1) the applicant is a public or nonprofit private school of nursing providing an accredited program of nursing education;

"(2) the application contains or is supported by reasonable assurances that (A) for not less than twenty years after completion of construction, the facility will be used for the purposes of the training for which it is to be constructed, and will not be used for sectarian instruction or as a place for religious worship, (B) sufficient funds will be available to meet the non-Federal share of the cost of constructing the facility, (C) sufficient funds will be available, when construction is completed, for effective use of the facility for the training for which it is being constructed, and (D) in the case of an application for a grant for construction to expand the training capacity of a school of nursing, the first-year enrollment at such school during the first full school year after the completion of the construction and for each of the nine years thereafter will exceed the highest first-year enrollment at such school for any of the five full school years preceding the year in which the application is made by at least 5 per centum of such highest first-year enrollment, or by five students, whichever is greater;

"(3) (A) in the case of an application for a grant for construction of a new facility, such application is for aid in the construction of a new school of nursing, or construction which will expand the training capacity of an existing school of nursing, or (B) in the case of an application for a grant for replacement or rehabilitation of existing facilities, such application is for aid in construction which will replace or rehabilitate facilities of an existing school of nursing which are so obsolete as to require the school to curtail substantially either its enrollment or the quality of the training provided;

"(4) the plans and specifications are in accordance with regulations relating to minimum standards of construction and equipment; and

"(5) the application contains or is supported by adequate assurance that any laborer or mechanic employed by any contractor or subcontractor in the performance of work on the construction of the facility will be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276a–276a5). The Secretary of Labor shall have, with respect to the labor standards specified in this paragraph, the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 (15 F.R. 3176; 64 Stat. 1267), and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276c).

Before approving or disapproving an application for a construction project under this part, the Surgeon General shall secure the advice of the National Advisory Council on Nurse Training established by section 841 (hereinafter in this part referred to as the 'council').

"(c) In considering applications for grants, the Council and the Surgeon General shall take into account—

"(1) (A) in the case of a project for a new school or for expansion of the facilities of an existing school, the relative effectiveness of the proposed facilities in expanding the capacity for the training of first-year students of nursing in the field involved and in promoting an equitable geographical distribution of opportunities for such training (giving due consideration to population, relative unavailability of nurses of the kind to be trained by such school, and available resources in various areas of the Nation for training such nurses); or

"(B) in the case of a project for replacement or rehabilitation of existing facilities of a school, the relative need for such replacement or rehabilitation to prevent curtailment of the school's enrollment or deterioration of the quality of the training provided by the school, and the relative size of any such curtailment and its effect on the geographical distribution of opportunities for training in the field of nursing involved (giving consideration to the factors mentioned above in paragraph (A)); and

"(2) in the case of an applicant in a State which has in existence a State or local area agency involved with planning for nurse training facilities, or which participates in a regional or other interstate agency involved with planning for nurse training facilities, the relationship of the application to the construction or training program which is being developed by such agency or agencies and, if such agency or agencies have reviewed such application, any comment thereon submitted by them.

"Amount of Construction Grant; Payments

"SEC. 803. (a) The amount of any grant for a construction project under this part shall be such amount as the Surgeon General determines to be appropriate after obtaining the advice of the Council; except that (A) in the case of a grant for a project for a new school, and in the case of a grant for a project for new facilities for an existing school in cases where such facilities are of particular importance in providing a major expansion of training capacity, as determined in accordance with regulations, such amount may not exceed 66⅔ per centum of the necessary cost of construction, as determined by the Surgeon General, of such project; and (B) in the case of any other grant, such amount may not exceed 50 per centum of the necessary cost of construction, as so determined, of the project with respect to which the grant is made.

"(b) Upon approval of any application for a grant for a construction project under this part, the Surgeon General shall reserve, from any appropriation available therefor, the amount of such grant as determined under subsection (a); the amount so reserved may be paid in advance or by way of reimbursement, and in such installments consistent with construction progress, as the Surgeon General may determine. The Surgeon General's reservation of any amount under this section may be amended by him, either upon approval of an amendment of the application or upon revision of the estimated cost of construction of the facility.

"(c) In determining the amount of any such grant under this part, there shall be excluded from the cost of construction an amount equal to the sum of (1) the amount of any other Federal grant which the applicant has obtained, or is assured of obtaining, with respect to the construction which is to be financed in part by grants authorized under this part, and (2) the amount of any non-Federal funds required to be expended as a condition of such other Federal grant.

"Recapture of Payments

"SEC. 804. If, within twenty years after completion of any construction for which funds have been paid under this part—

"(a) the applicant or other owner of the facility shall cease to be a public or nonprofit private school, or

"(b) the facility shall cease to be used for the training purposes for which it was constructed (unless the Surgeon General determines, in accordance with regulations, that there is good cause for releasing the applicant or other owner from the obligation to do so), or

"(c) the facility is used for sectarian instruction or as a place for religious worship, the United States shall be entitled to recover from the applicant or other owner of the facility the amount bearing the same ratio to the then value (as determined by agreement of the parties or by action brought in the United States district court for the district in which such facility is situated) of the facility, as the amount of the Federal participation bore to the cost of construction of such facility.

"Improvement in Nurse Training

"SEC. 805. (a) There are authorized to be appropriated for grants to public and nonprofit private collegiate and associate degree schools of nursing to assist them in meeting the additional costs of projects of limited duration which will strengthen, improve, or expand their programs to teach and train nurses, $2,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, $3,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, $4,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and each of the next two fiscal years, and such sums for each of the next four fiscal years as may be necessary to complete projects for which a grant was made under this section from funds appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, or any preceding year.

"(b) In determining whether to approve applications for grants described in subsection (a), the order in which to approve such applications, and the amount of the grants, the Surgeon General shall give consideration to the extent to which such projects will contribute to general improvement in the teaching and training of nurses of the kind involved, the extent to which they will aid in attaining a wider geographical distribution throughout the United States of high quality schools of the type involved, and the relative need in the area in which the school is situated and surrounding areas for nurses of the type trained in such school.

"(c) No grant may be made under subsection (a) of this section for any project for any period after grants have been made with respect to such project for five fiscal years.

"Partial Reimbursement to Diploma Schools for Costs Attributable to This Title

"Sec. 806. (a) In order to prevent further attrition and promote the development of public and nonprofit private diploma schools of nursing, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated $4,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, $7,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and $10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and each of the two succeeding fiscal years, to defray a portion of the cost of training students of nursing whose enrollment in such schools can be reasonably attributed to the provisions of this title.

"(b) From the amounts appropriated pursuant to subsection (a), the Surgeon General shall pay to each public or nonprofit private diploma school of nursing for each fiscal year in the five-year period beginning on July 1, 1964, and ending June 30, 1969, an amount equal to the product of $250 and the sum of the number of federally-sponsored students in such school during such year and the number by which the full-time enrollment in such school during such year exceeds the average of the full-time enrollments in such school during the fiscal years ending June 30, 1962, June 30, 1963, and June 30, 1964, except that no such diploma school of nursing shall for any fiscal year receive an amount in excess of the product of $100 and the full-time enrollment in such school during such year. If the amounts appropriated pursuant to subsection (a) for any fiscal year are inadequate to make the grants provided for in the preceding sentence, the amount of the grant to each such diploma school of nursing shall be reduced so that it shall bear the same ratio to such amounts appropriated for such year as the amounts such school would be entitled to under the preceding sentence bears to the aggregate amount which all diploma schools of nursing would be entitled to for such year under such sentence.

"(c) For the purposes of this section—

"(1) the term 'federally-sponsored student' means any student enrolled in a public or nonprofit private diploma school of nursing on a full-time basis who has received for that year a loan of $100 or more from a loan fund established pursuant to section 822; and

"(2) the full-time enrollment in any school and the number of federally-sponsored students in any school shall be determined as of February 15 of each fiscal year.

"Part B—Assistance to nursing students

"Traineeship for Advanced Training of Professional Nurses

"Sec. 821. (a) There are authorized to be appropriated $8,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, $9,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, $10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, $11,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and $12,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30. 1969, to cover the cost of traineeships for the training of professional nurses to teach in the various fields of nurse training (including practical nurse training), to serve in administrative or supervisory capacities, or to serve in other professional nursing specialties determined by the Surgeon General to require advanced training.

"(b) Traineeships under this section shall be awarded by the Surgeon General through grants to public or nonprofit private institutions providing the training.

"(c) Payments to institutions under this section may be made in advance or by way of reimbursement, and at such intervals and on such conditions, as the Surgeon General finds necessary. Such payments may be used only for traineeships and shall be limited to such amounts as the Surgeon General finds necessary to cover the costs of tuition and fees, and a stipend and allowances (including travel and subsistence expenses) for the trainees.

"Loan Agreements

"Sec. 822. (a) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized to enter into an agreement for the establishment and operation of a student loan fund in accordance with this part with any public or nonprofit private school of nursing which is located in a State.

"(b) Each agreement entered into under this section shall—

"(1) provide for establishment of a student loan fund by the school;

"(2) provide for deposit in the fund of (A) the Federal capital contributions paid under this part to the school by the Secretary, (B) an additional amount from other sources equal to not less than one-ninth of such Federal capital contributions, (C) collections of principal and interest on loans made from the fund, and (D) any other earnings of the fund;

"(3) provide that the fund shall be used only for loans to students of the school in accordance with the agreement and for costs of collection of such loans and interest thereon;

"(4) provide that loans may be made from such fund only to students pursuing a full-time course of study at the school leading to a baccalaureate or associate degree in nursing or an equivalent degree or a diploma in nursing, or to a graduate degree in nursing, and that while the agreement remains in effect no such student who has attended such school before July 1, 1969, shall receive a loan from a loan fund established under section 204 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958; and

"(5) contain such other provisions as are necessary to protect the financial interests of the United States.

"Loan Provisions

"Sec. 823. (a) The total of the loans for any academic year (or its equivalent, as determined under regulations of the Secretary) made by schools of nursing from loan funds established pursuant to agreements under this part may not exceed $1,000 in the case of any student. In the granting of such loans, a school shall give preference to persons who enter as first-year students after enactment of this title.

"(b) Loans from any such student loan fund by any school shall be made on such terms and conditions as the school may determine; subject, however, to such conditions, limitations, and requirements as the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare may prescribe (by regulation or in the agreement with the school) with a view to preventing impairment of the capital of such fund to the maximum extent practicable in the light of the objective of enabling the student to complete his course of study; and except that—

"(1) such a loan may be made only to a student who (A) is in need of the amount of the loan to pursue a full-time course of study at the school leading to a baccalaureate or associate degree in nursing or an equivalent degree, or a diploma in nursing, or a graduate degree in nursing, and (B) is capable, in the opinion of the school, of maintaining good standing in such course of study;

"(2) such a loan shall be repayable in equal or graduated periodic installments (with the right of the borrower to accelerate repayment) over the ten-year period which begins one year after the student ceases to pursue a full-time course of study at a school of nursing, except that (A) interest shall not accrue on any such loan, and periodic installments need not be paid, during any period during which the borrower is pursuing a full-time course of study at a collegiate school of nursing leading to a baccalaureate degree in nursing or an equivalent degree, or to a graduate degree in nursing, and (B) any such period shall not be included in determining such ten-year period;

"(3) not to exceed 50 per centum of any such loan (plus interest) shall be canceled for full-time employment as a professional nurse (including teaching in any of the fields of nurse training and service as an administrator, supervisor, or consultant in any of the fields of nursing) in any public or nonprofit private institution or agency, at the rate of 10 per centum of the amount of such loan plus interest thereon, which was unpaid on the first day of such service, for each complete year of such service;

"(4) the liability to repay the unpaid balance of such loan and accrued interest thereon shall be canceled upon the death of the borrower, or if the Secretary determines that he has become permanently and totally disabled;

"(5) such a loan shall bear interest on the unpaid balance of the loan, computed only for periods during which the loan is repayable, at the rate of 3 per centum per annum or the going Federal rate at the time the loan is made, whichever is the greater; and for purposes of this paragraph, the term 'going Federal rate' means the rate of interest which the Secretary of the Treasury specifies during June of each year for purposes of loans made during the fiscal year beginning on the next July 1, determined by estimating the average yield to maturity, on the basis of daily closing market quotations or prices during the preceding May on all outstanding marketable obligations of the United States having a maturity date of fifteen or more years from the first day of such month of May, and by rounding off such estimated average annual yield to the next higher multiple of one-eighth of 1 per centum;

"(6) such a loan shall be made without security or endorsement, except that if the borrower is a minor and the note or other evidence of obligation executed by him would not, under the applicable law, create a binding obligation, either security or endorsement may be required;

"(7) no note or other evidence of any such loan may be transferred or assigned by the school making the loan except that, if the borrower transfers to another school participating in the program under this part, such note or other evidence of a loan may be transferred to such other school.

"(c) Where all or any part of a loan, or interest, is canceled under this section, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall pay to the school an amount equal to the school's proportionate share of the canceled portion, as determined by the Secretary.

"(d) Any loan for any year by a school from a student loan fund established pursuant to an agreement under this part shall be made in such installments as may be provided in regulations of the Secretary or such agreement and, upon notice to the Secretary by the school that any recipient of a loan is failing to maintain satisfactory standing, any or all further installments of his loan shall be withheld, as may be appropriate.

"(e) An agreement under this part with any school shall include provisions designed to make loans from the student loan fund established thereunder reasonably available (to the extent of the available funds in such fund) to all eligible students in the school in need thereof.

"Authorization of Appropriations for Loans

"Sec. 824. There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for Federal capital contributions to student loan funds pursuant to section 822(b)(2)(A) $3,100,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, $8,900,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, $16,800,000 for the fiscal year ending June

30, 1967, $25,300,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, $30,900,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and such sums for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and each of the two succeeding fiscal years as may be necessary to enable students who have received a loan for any academic year ending before July 1, 1969, to continue or complete their education. Sums appropriated pursuant to this section for any fiscal year shall be available, in accordance with agreements under this part, for Federal capital contributions to schools with which such agreements have been made, to be used, together with deposits in such fund pursuant to section 822(b) (2) (B), for establishment and maintenance of student loan funds.

"Allotments and Payments of Federal Capital Contributions

"SEC. 825. (a) Sums appropriated pursuant to section 824 for any fiscal year shall be allotted by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare among the States as follows: (1) He shall allot to each State an amount which bears the same ratio to 50 per centum of such sums as the number of students who graduated from secondary schools in such State during the preceding fiscal year bears to the total number of students who graduated from secondary schools in all of the States during such year; and (2) he shall also allot to each State an amount which bears the same ratio to 50 per centum of such sums as the number of students who will be enrolled full time in public or nonprofit private schools of nursing in such State bears to the total number of students who will be enrolled full time in all such schools of nursing in all of the States. The sum of such two amounts for each State shall be its allotment. For purposes of allotments under this section, a school of nursing also includes any school with which the Secretary has, prior to the time the allotment is made, entered into an agreement for establishment of a student loan fund under this part.

"(b) (1) The Secretary shall from time to time set dates by which schools of nursing with which he has in effect agreements under this part must file applications for Federal capital contributions to their loan funds pursuant to section 822(b) (2) (A).

"(2) If the total of the amounts requested for any fiscal year in such applications which are made by schools in a State exceeds the amount of the allotment of such State for that fiscal year, the amounts to be paid to the loan fund of each such school shall be reduced to whichever of the following is the smaller: (A) the amount requested in its application or (B) an amount which bears the same ratio to the amount of the allotment of such State as the number of students who will be enrolled full time in such school during such fiscal year bears to the total number of students who will be enrolled full time in all such schools in such State during such year. Amounts remaining after allotment under the preceding sentence shall be redistributed in accordance with clause (B) of such sentence among schools which in their applications requested more than the amounts so paid to their loan funds, but with such adjustments as may be necessary to prevent the total paid to any such school's loan fund from exceeding the total so requested by it. If the total of the amounts requested for any fiscal year in such applications which are made by schools in a State is less than the amount of the allotment of such State for that fiscal year, the Secretary may reallot the remaining amount from time to time, on such date or dates as he may fix, to other States in proportion to the original allotments to such States under subsection (a) for such year. For the purpose of this section, the number of students who graduated from secondary schools in each State during a fiscal year and the number of students who will be enrolled full time in schools of nursing in each State shall be estimated by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare on the basis of the best information available to him; and in making such estimates, the number of students enrolled full time in any collegiate school of nursing shall be deemed to be twice their actual number.

"(c) The Federal capital contributions to a loan fund of a school under this part shall be paid to it from time to time in such installments as the Secretary determines will not result in unnecessary accumulations in the loan fund at such school.

"Distribution of Assets From Loan Funds

"SEC. 826. (a) After June 30, 1972, and not later than September 30, 1972, there shall be a capital distribution of the balance of the loan fund established under this part by each school as follows:

"(1) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall first be paid an amount which bears the same ratio to the balance in such fund at the close of June 30, 1972, as the total amount of the Federal capital contributions to such fund by the Secretary pursuant to section 822(b) (2) (A) bears to the total amount in such fund derived from such Federal capital contributions and from funds deposited therein pursuant to section 822(b) (2) (B).

"(2) The remainder of such balance shall be paid to the school.

"(b) After September 30, 1972, each school with which the Secretary has made an agreement under this part shall pay to the Secretary, not less often than quarterly, the same proportionate share of amounts received by the school after June 30, 1972, in payment of principal or interest on loans made from the loan fund established pursuant to such agreement as was determined for the Secretary under subsection (a).

"Loans to Schools

"SEC. 827. (a) Upon application by any school with which he has made an agreement under this part, the Secretary may make a loan to such school for the purpose of helping to finance deposits required by section 822(b) (2) (B) in a loan fund established pursuant to such agreement. Such loan may be made only if the school shows it is unable to secure such funds upon reasonable terms and conditions from non-Federal sources. Loans made under this section shall bear interest at a rate sufficient to cover (1) the cost of the funds to the Treasury, (2) the cost of administering this section, and (3) probable losses.

"(b) There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this section.

"(c) Loans by the Secretary under this section shall mature within such period as the Secretary determines to be appropriate in each case, but not exceeding fifteen years.

"Administrative Provisions

"SEC. 828. The Secretary may agree to modifications of agreements or loans made under this part, and may compromise, waive, or release any right, title, claim, or demand of the United States arising or acquired under this part.

"Part C—General

"National Advisory Council on Nurse Training; Review Committee

"SEC. 841. (a) (1) There is hereby established a National Advisory Council on Nurse Training, consisting of the Surgeon General, who shall be Chairman, and the Commissioner of Education, both of whom shall be ex offico members, and sixteen members appointed by the Secretary without regard to the civil service laws. Four of the appointed members shall be selected from the general public and twelve shall be selected from among leading authorities in the various fields of nursing, higher, and secondary education, and from representatives of hospitals and other institutions and organizations which provide nursing services.

"(2) The Council shall advise the Surgeon General in the preparation of general regulations and with respect to policy matters arising in the administration of this title, and in the review of applications for construction projects under part A and of applications under section 805.

"(b) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall, prior to July 1, 1967, and without regard to the civil service laws, appoint a committee, consisting of members of the public, of various groups particularly interested in or expert in matters relating to education of various types of nurses, for the purpose of reviewing the programs authorized by this title and making recommendations with respect to continuation, extension, and modification of any of such programs. A report of the findings and recommendations of such committee shall be submitted to the Secretary not later than November 1, 1967, after which date such committee shall cease to exist. The Secretary shall submit such report, together with his comments and recommendations thereon, to the Congress on or before January 1, 1968.

"(c) Appointed members of the Council or the review committee who are not regular full-time employees of the United States shall, while attending conferences or meetings thereof, be entitled to receive compensation at a rate to be fixed by the Secretary but not exceeding $75 per diem, including travel time, and while away from their homes or regular places of business they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

"Noninterference With Administration of Institutions

"SEC. 842. Nothing contained in this title shall be construed as authorizing any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over, or impose any requirement or condition with respect to, the personnel, curriculum, methods of instruction, or administration of any institution.

"Definitions

"SEC. 843. For purposes of this title—

"(a) The term 'State' means a State, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, the Canal Zone, Guam, American Samoa, or the Virgin Islands.

"(b) The term 'school of nursing' means a collegiate, associate degree, or diploma school of nursing.

"(c) The term 'collegiate school of nursing' means a department, division, or other administrative unit in a college or university which provides primarily or exclusively an accredited program of education in professional nursing and allied subjects leading to the degree of bachelor of arts, bachelor of science, bachelor of nursing, or to an equivalent degree, or to a graduate degree in nursing.

"(d) The term 'associate degree school of nursing' means a department, division, or other administrative unit in a junior college, community college, college, or university which provides primarily or exclusively an accredited two-year program of education in professional nursing and allied subjects leading to an associate degree in nursing or to an equivalent degree.

"(e) The term 'diploma school of nursing' means a school affiliated with a hospital or university, or an independent school, which provides primarily or exclusively an accredited program of education in professional nursing and allied subjects leading to a diploma or to equivalent indicia that such program has been satisfactorily completed.

"(f) The term 'accredited' when applied to any program of nurse education means a program accredited by a recognized body or bodies approved for such purpose by the Commissioner of Education, except that a program which is not, at the time of the application under this title by the school which provides or will provide such program, eligible for accreditation by such recognized body or bodies, shall be deemed accredited for purposes of this title in the following cases if the Commissioner of Education finds, after consultation with the appropriate accreditation body or bodies, that there is reasonable assurance that the program will meet the accreditation standards of such body or bodies (1) in the case of an applicant under part A for a grant for a project for construction of a new school, prior to or upon completion of the facility with respect to which the application is filed; (2) in the case of a school applying for a grant under section 805 for a project to strengthen, improve, or expand its programs to teach and train nurses, prior to or upon completion of the project with respect to which the application is filed; and (3) in the case of a school seeking an agreement under part B for establishment of a student loan fund, prior to the beginning of the academic year following the normal graduation date of students who are in their first year of instruction at such school during the fiscal year in which the agreement with such school is made under part B; except that the provisions of this clause (3) shall not apply for purposes of section 825.

"(g) The term 'nonprofit' as applied to any school, agency, organization, or institution means one which is a corporation or association, or is owned and operated by one or more corporations or associations, no part of the net earnings of which inures, or may lawfully inure, to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual.

"(h) The term 'secondary school' means a school which provides secondary education, as determined under State law except that it does not include any education provided beyond grade 12.

"(i) The terms 'construction' and 'cost of construction' include (1) the construction of new buildings, and the acquisition, expansion, remodeling, replacement, and alteration of existing buildings, including architects' fees, but not including the cost of acquisition of land (except in the case of acquisition of an existing building), off-site improvements, living quarters, or patient-care facilities, and (2) equipping new buildings and existing buildings, whether or not acquired, expanded, remodeled, or altered."

SEC. 3. (a) Effective with respect to appropriations for fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1964, section 720 of the Public Health Service Act is amended by striking out "nurses," wherever it appears therein.

(b) Effective with respect to applications for grants from appropriations for fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1964, subsections (b), (c), and (d) of section 721 of such Act are amended by striking out "nursing," and "nurses," wherever they appear therein, and section 631(e) of such Act is amended by striking out "nurses' home and training facilities" and inserting in lieu thereof "nurses' home facilities."

(c) Effective with respect to appointments to the National Advisory Council on Education for Health Professions made after enactment of this Act, section 725(a) of such Act is amended by striking out "nursing,".

(d) Effective July 1, 1964, section 728 of such Act is amended by striking out "nursing,".

SEC. 4. (a) Section 1 of the Public Health Service Act is amended to read as follows:

"SECTION 1. Titles I to VIII, inclusive, of this Act may be cited as the 'Public Health Service Act'."

(b) The Act of July 1, 1944 (58 Stat. 682), as amended, is further amended by renumbering title VIII (as in effect prior to the enactment of this Act) as title IX and by renumbering sections 801 through 814 (as in effect prior to the enactment of this Act), and references thereto, as sections 901 through 914, respectively.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is designed to increase the supply of nurses in the United States by establishing or continuing four interrelated programs. The bill would:

First. Establish a 4-year program of grants totaling $90 million for construction and rehabilitation of nursing schools;

Second. Establish a program of grants totaling $17 million over a 5-year period to assist collegiate and associate degree schools of nursing to meet the additional costs of strengthening, improving, or expanding their training programs; and establish a system of formula grants totaling $41 million over a 5-year period to diploma schools of nursing;

Third. Continue for 5 more years and expand the existing program of traineeships for advanced training of professional nurses; and

Fourth. Establish a student loan program, modeled after the National Defense Education Act and the Health Professions Education Assistance Act of 1963, for students of nursing at collegiate, associate degree, and diploma schools of nursing.

In the spring of 1961, the Surgeon General appointed a very distinguished group of citizens to serve as a consultant group on nursing to study existing needs for nurses, and projected needs for the future. This group found that we have approximately 550,000 professional nurses in practice today, and in order to meet the needs of this Nation for nurses by 1970, it would be necessary to increase this number by 300,000; in other words, to 850,000 by 1970.

Obviously, the attainment of this objective is not feasible at the present time, but the needs are urgent, and we need to make a start on meeting this appalling deficit of nurses to meet the medical care needs of our Nation.

The administration drafted and submitted to the Congress, legislation designed to increase the supply of nurses in the United States by an estimated 130,000 additional nurses by 1970. The Subcommittee on Public Health and Safety held hearings on this legislation, and considered it during five separate executive sessions, and ordered a clean bill reported to the full committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. The full committee amended the bill further, and that is the measure we have before us now.

As proposed by the administration, the legislation would have cost $345 million over a 5-year period. The bill before us today would cost $287,630,000, a reduction of almost $60 million.

There are three types of programs for the training of nurses: the baccalaureate program, usually conducted at a college and leading to a bachelor's degree; the associate degree program, usually conducted at a junior college, and the diploma program, usually conducted in association with a hospital. This bill provides assistance for all three types of programs.

The bill provides funds for bricks and mortar, authorizing a total of $90 million for grants for the construction, replacement or rehabilitation of teaching facilities. The bill authorizes a total of $35 million over a 4-year period in assistance for collegiate schools of nursing. I should point out at this time that authorization for this type of assistance is already contained in the law, in the Health Professions Education Assistance Act; however, there is no specified amount provided, and no appropriation requests have been made under this authorization. The bill, of course, repeals the existing authorization since it is replaced by this bill. The bill also provides for authorization over a 4-year period of $55 million in grants for construction, replacement, or rehabilitation of facilities for associate degree and diploma schools of nursing. This construction program is modeled very closely after the Health Professions Education Assistance Act.

The bill authorizes grants totaling $17 million for special projects designed to strengthen, improve, or expand programs of collegiate and associate degree schools of nursing to teach and train nurses. It is the intent of the committee that these grants primarily be used to pay faculty salaries and otherwise to improve the programs at these schools.

The Surgeon General, who will approve applications for these grants must take into account the extent to which projects will contribute to general improvement of quality training of nurses, and aid in obtaining a wider geographical distribution of high-quality schools.

Section 805 of the Public Health Service Act, as added by this bill, authorizes $41 million for formula grants to diploma schools of nursing. The committee was quite concerned by the trend which has been developing in recent years, under which the number of diploma schools of nursing has declined from 1,134 in 1949 to only 875 today. In addition, a number of these 875 schools face the very real possibility of having to close their doors because they are unable to meet the additional costs to them for training nurses. These schools run a continuing deficit, which, of course, is borne by increased costs to patients at hospitals. In order to aid in stopping this trend, the committee adopted an amendment under which each national accredited diploma school of nursing in the United States will receive grants totaling $250 times the number of federally sponsored students in their schools and the number of students by which their enrollment is increased, subject however to an overall limitation under which the maximum amount that any school may receive may not exceed $100 times the total number of students in the school.

If it turns out that appropriations as authorized in the bill are inadequate for any fiscal year to make the total payments authorized, the grants to each diploma school will be proportionately reduced.

The bill also extends and expands the existing program contained in section 307 of the Public Health Service Act under which traineeships are awarded to professional nurses to prepare them to teach or to serve in administrative or supervisory capacities. A recent evaluation conference recommended that this program be doubled by 1970, and the administration recommended appropriation authorizations totaling $72.5 million for this purpose. The committee cut this proposal by a total of $22.5 million, and authorized a total of $50 million for this purpose, spread over 5 fiscal years. Payments for any individual under this program may not exceed the cost of his tuition and fees, travel and subsistence expenses, and a modest stipend and allowances for the trainees.

Section 822 of the bill provides for the establishment at collegiate, associate degree and diploma schools of nursing of student loan programs modeled very closely after the loan program established for medical students under the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act with changes necessary to tailor the program closely to the needs of nurses. The United States puts up 90 percent of the money in a school's loan fund and the school puts up the other 10 percent. The school makes and administers the loan. Loans may be made to a student up to a total of $1,000 a year, and are repayable over the 10-year period which begins 1 year after the student completes her course of study. Because of the acute need for nurses, the bill seeks to encourage young women to remain in the nursing profession by providing that up to 50 percent of the loans may be forgiven at the rate of 10 percent a year for each year during which the student engages in full-time employment as a professional nurse.

Assistance provided under this act is limited to nationally accredited schools. There are a number of schools of nursing today which qualify for national accreditation, but have not done so because there is no incentive for them to do so. If we are to have a Federal program of assistance to schools of nursing, it seems reasonable to require that the schools meet certain minimum standards, and this is provided for in the bill.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is the result of a great deal of work on the part of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, and by the Subcommittee on Public Health and Safety, of which I have the honor to be chairman. We think it is a good bill and it should be passed.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FOGARTY. I should like to compliment the chairman of the Subcommittee on Health of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee on the excellent work he has done in the health field ever since he has been a Member of Congress. I think this is one of the best bills we have had under consideration this year. I want to compliment the gentleman and his committee for the leadership they have given in this legislative field.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in support of the measure introduced by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ROBERTS]. This measure is designed to increase the number of professional nurses in the United States, a measure which I feel must be passed by this Congress if we are to fulfill the responsibility placed upon us as elected Representatives of the American people.

Under the Nurses Training Act of 1964 a 4-year program of grants for construction and rehabilitation of our nursing schools would be established, along with a program of project grants to aid these schools in meeting additional costs necessary to strengthen and improve their training programs. The bill also extends and expands the existing program of traineeships to help professional nurses meet the growing costs of desperately needed advanced training. The measure would establish a student loan program for nurses modeled after the National Defense Education Act to encourage more of our Nation's youth to enter nursing and make this education possible for those who are willing to serve as nurses on our medical health team. The Health Professions Educational Assistance Act of last year regrettably failed to provide such student loans.

I have been urged to give my attention to this measure by the dean and assistant dean of the College of Nursing of the University of Rhode Island, and by many other constituents who are concerned with this critical shortage of nurses. I have examined this measure and urge my colleagues in the House of Representatives to give careful attention and support to this bill.

We enjoy, in this Nation of ours, an enviably high standard of health care. Through biomedical research, we have developed new drugs, new methods of diagnosis and treatment, and increased our knowledge of the nature and causes of the many diseases that plague mankind.

We have watched as the great epidemic diseases of a generation ago have fallen to modern methods of vaccination and immunization. We have seen poliomyelitis, the dread killer and crippler of children, virtually destroyed. Thousands of our citizens, who 10 years ago would have been doomed to early death, are saved each year by innovations in heart surgery to correct congenital defects, by newly developed drugs and treatments to combat mental retardation and illness, arthritis, diabetes, cystic fibrosis, hemophilia, multiple sclerosis, and a long list of other chronic disorders.

Every day our newspapers carry announcements of some new piece of information about disease, some new clinical device invented, or some new technique or procedure developed in this fight against disease and its accompanying pain and premature death.

In the past few weeks we have been informed that a cure for leukemia—cancer of the blood which results in so many tragic losses each year—may be found in the near future. Research scientists have recently cracked the "genetic code," the basic pattern of human inheritance, which contains locked within it the secrets to so many dread disorders that now afflict our population in ever-increasing numbers.

As chairman of the House Subcommittee on Appropriations for Health, Education, and Welfare, I am particularly proud that many of these advances have been achieved through the support offered by Federal funds—support that you and I, through our active interest in the health of the Nation have made possible.

Yet, you and I stand condemned today by the thousands who die needlessly each year, thousands who could be saved with present medical knowledge if there were enough trained health workers to carry our laboratory successes into the Nation's hospitals and clinics. The growing shortage of manpower for our medical health team has been presented to this Congress many times. Last fall I was gratified, as I know many of you were, by the passage of the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act which provided funds for the construction of teaching facilities for nursing schools. This, I felt, was a first step in meeting the ever-growing need for health workers.

The time has come—the time is long past due—for us to act again. So long as we do not act, we will continue to negate our many research accomplishments. The measure for which I urge your support is concentrated on helping to meet a critical shortage of one of the most vital members of our medical team—our nurses.

There was a time, not many years ago, when a nurse was necessarily preoccupied with delivering trays, changing beds, giving back rubs, and emptying bedpans. Today the nurses' role in medical care has drastically changed. Today, due to the ever-increasing advances in medicine that require more time and more elaborate treatment to be effective, the doctors of this Nation, already too few in number, have been forced to increase the number of patients under their care. Nurses have been called upon to take over some of the highly technical medical procedures once regarded as the prerogative of the physicians. Today it is the nurse who administers oxygen, performs infusions and catheterizations, and dispenses lifegiving drugs.

Our Nation's nurses are women of spirit; they have risen admirably to the challenge before them. The National League for Nursing has emphasized the continuing need to improve the training offered in schools of nursing across the country, and consequently the professional nurse of today is a highly skilled, technical competent health worker. But no matter how highly trained or skillful she is, one nurse simply cannot adequately perform the increasing number of tasks delegated to her that require the hands and the hearts of two or even more of her profession.

Too often this is the case. Too often tragic stories are told of fatal mistakes made because some professional tasks must be performed by those who do not have the necessary training demanded by the advancing technology of the times.

A recent study of some 325 hospitals indicates that about 20 percent of the positions for professional nurses are vacant. In New York City, over half the positions for professional nurses in public hospitals were unfilled in 1961. Some hospitals report that, due to the nursing shortage, up to 80 percent of direct nursing services are being performed by untrained auxiliary personnel.

Year by year the nurse shortage grows more critical, not only in our general hospitals, but in psychiatric hospitals, nursing homes, public health agencies, and clinics. In the field of occupational health it is estimated that at least 5,000 professional nurses should be added to the 17,000 presently working in this field.

In her testimony before the Subcommittee on Public Health and Safety, Miss Mildred Schwier, director of nursing of the Rhode Island Hospital School of Nursing, in Providence, noted the crucial shortage in nursing education. The 728 diploma schools of nursing report that 27.3 percent of their faculty members do not even hold a baccalaureate degree. Miss Schwier commented that, "Asking those without advanced preparation to teach in diploma schools is comparable to asking the high school graduate to teach high school students." This is unthinkable to most of us.

I am told that 52 of the collegiate schools of nursing have already applied for construction funds under the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act in an effort to increase their enrollments and meet some of the need for nurses with advanced training. Funds have not yet been appropriated under this act, and when they are, these nursing schools must complete with medical and dental schools which will almost undoubtedly be given priority.

If we fail to act favorably on this measure, if these conditions continue to prevail, we can expect not only an increasing shortage of professional nurses, but a deterioration in the quality of newly trained nurses entering the profession.

According to the report of the Surgeon General's consultant group on nursing, by 1970 the Nation will need some 850,000 nurses, an increase of 55 percent over the total number in nursing today. We have already waited too long to act to meet this need. This distinguished group reported that even with a substantial program of incentive and assistance we could, at best, achieve a goal of 680,000 nurses by 1970—still 170,000 short of the need. The Roberts bill was designed to assure that at least the minimum goal is attained.

The cost of this bill is less than $288 million over a 5-year period. At a time when it has not only proven feasible but enormously profitable to mount a Federal program for the support of medical research at a level of more than $1 billion each year, this Nation can ill afford to neglect the need for nursing services. In fact, this investment in public health is only a small contribution to the abridgment of the gap between the finding of research results and making them available to the public. I am concerned about this gap—and I know my colleagues are concerned, also. In terms of needless suffering and sorrow, this is an awesome responsibility we—you and I—have, to do what we can to further the health and welfare of the American people. More nurses, and better trained nurses, will play an increasingly vital part in better health care. We, in conscience, can do no less than support that goal in the interest of the people of this Nation.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. I thank the gentleman from Rhode Island, who has perhaps the most distinguished record in the field of health, for his contribution in support of this bill.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. I yield.

Mr. RYAN of New York. I also should like to rise to commend the distinguished gentleman for his leadership in bringing this bill to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, in the context of a growing national awareness of the urgent need for more adequate medical care for all citizens, we must come to grips with the need to increase the number and quality of those who provide health services. Today there is a growing shortage of qualified nurses, accompanied by an alarming decline in the quality of nursing care. The Nurse Training Act of 1964, by amending the Public Health Service Act, would attack the shortage of nurses at its roots by increasing facilities and funds for nurse training.

The consultant group on nursing, appointed by the Surgeon General in 1961, reports that by 1970 we will need 300,000 more professional nurses than we presently have. Since they did not feel that an increase of that magnitude was feasible, they recommended an increase of 130,000. H.R. 11241 aims at this minimal goal.

According to the committee report, there are 20 percent fewer professional nurses and 18 percent fewer practical nurses than are needed in some 325 hospitals. In New York City alone over half the positions for professional nurses in public hospitals were vacant in 1961. As a result, in some hospitals, as much as 80 percent of nursing services are performed by nurses aids and auxiliary workers.

With talented and deserving youngsters graduating each year from our high schools with no means of continuing their education and insufficient jobs in the labor force, we can reap a double benefit from enlarging the opportunities for their increased enrollment in nursing schools. Indeed, we cannot afford the double neglect of our young and our ailing.

The bill responds to a need that extends into every phase of nursing. By 1970 general hospitals will require half again the current number of nurses; psychiatric hospitals will need double their present staff; nearly three times the number of public health and school nurses will be needed; one third again the number of staff members of nursing schools will be required. Existing facilities cannot train the needed number of nurses.

By providing $90 million over 4 years for construction and rehabilitation of nursing school facilities, the bill would cope with this simple physical plant shortage. A 5-year grant program is designed to stimulate collegiate and associate degree nursing schools to exploit the latent teaching methods, and expand, strengthen, and improve their training programs. Additional grants are intended to bolster diploma schools of nursing which cannot meet operating costs.

To attract students into nursing who would otherwise not be able to afford continued education, the bill would provide loans of up to $1,000 a year per person with provisions for "forgiveness" of part of the debt for every year of nursing practice. This, in addition to continuation and expansion for 5 years of the existing traineeships for advanced training of professional nurses, would begin to meet the shortage. The National Advisory Council on Nurse Training, which would advise the Surgeon General on new developments and review grant applications, would insure that the administration of the act would keep abreast of the changing needs for nurses.

Mr. Speaker, in 1963 Congress passed the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act which provided grants for the purpose of construction of new teaching facilities for physicians, pharmacists, optometrists, podiatrists, as well as nurses. However, it is inadequate to the need of expanding nurses training facilities and in aiding nursing schools to improve the quality of their training. Under that act, the total amount allocated for all institutions through fiscal year 1965 is $60 million. The pending bill focuses more broadly on the nursing problem alone. It is worthy of our support as a substantial beginning, as a part of an overall effort to provide a better life for our youth through broader educational opportunities and to provide more and better medical care for all our citizens.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. I yield to the gentlewoman from Missouri.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, first I want to congratulate the gentleman from Alabama for the truly outstanding work he has done as chairman of the Subcommittee on Health and Safety of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. These two bills today are further evidence of the fine work he does to protect the health and safety of the American people. He has sponsored much legislation to protect the public from injury and illness. In these two bills he is instrumental in assuring the recovery of the sick and the injured.

Mr. Speaker, almost every day brings mail from my district pointing out how desperately we need to increase our supply of doctors and nurses and other trained health specialists to take care of the health needs of our expanding population—not only the elderly whose ranks are increasing because of improved health facilities leading to longer lives, but also the very young and the adolescents and the emotionally disturbed and the mentally retarded, and so on. We need far more of the general practitioner type of doctors and nurses and other health workers. But we also need many more specialists in the medical profession—people trained to provide the latest and best care for the multitude of needs in the health field in our increasingly complex society.

Passage of H.R. 12, the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act of 1963—Public Law 88-129—was a giant step forward in meeting the needs of the institutions providing training in the health professions, and it also established a new program of long-term low-interest loans for students of medicine and dentistry. Many of us would have preferred scholarships and traineeships, but the loan program can be of tremendous help, just as the National Defense Education Act loan program has been of great importance to students in all fields of higher education.

The two bills before us today continue and expand two outstanding programs in the health education field which have been most successful. One is the Public Health training program providing grants for schools of public health, schools of nursing, and schools of engineering and to include also schools of medicine, dentistry, social work, and pharmacy. Under this bill, the program begun in 1957 to provide traineeships for graduate or specialized training in public health for physicians, engineers, nurses, and other professional health personnel, would be continued. More than 5,000 such traineeships have been awarded since 1957.

The other bill continues and expands the Nurse Training Act. This has been an eminently successful program. The bill carries out many of the recommendations made by President Johnson in his message to Congress on February 10, 1964, to expand the facilities for training nurses, to set up a Federal loan program for nurses similar to that for doctors and dentists in the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act and to continue the traineeships at the graduate level for professional nurses in colleges and universities.

Mr. Speaker, while I wish that H.R. 11241, the Nurse Training Act of 1964, contained the scholarships recommended by President Johnson for students in nursing schools, I support the bill as far as it goes—for it is by no means a weak bill. It improves the present program very substantially. The changes are significant ones. If this is the best bill we can get through, it is certainly worth supporting. If we can do better, particularly if the Senate improves the legislation, I will be very pleased. The American Nurses' Association, while somewhat disappointed that H.R. 11241 does not carry out all the proposals made in February by President Johnson, nevertheless has informed me that it supports the bill and hopes it will be passed by the House today.

H.R. 11083, the graduate public health training amendments bill which is to be called up immediately after H.R. 11241, also deserves the support of the House. Both bills feature incentives bound to make the health professions more attractive to young men and women who are planning their careers, and to further careers already launched in that direction.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. I thank the gentlewoman.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PICKLE. I also should like to congratulate the gentlemen of the subcommittee for their work in bringing this bill to the floor. There is a shortage of nurses. We need to do something about it. This bill is not a total answer because local communities and States must support this bill to carry out its purposes, but it is needed. I have worked on this particular committee and I know the work of the gentleman on this very fine bill.

Mr. Speaker, the key to the serious shortage of professional nurses today is education.

Right now there are only 550,000 professional nurses working in the United States—and of this number, 70,000 are working on a part-time basis.

The report last year from the Surgeon General's Consultant Group on Nursing stressed the importance of increasing the number of professional nurses to 680,000 full-time practitioners by 1970.

The only practical solution right now in obtaining professional nurses seems to be to send young women to schools of nursing where they can be educated as professional nurses.

The Nurse Training Act which we are considering today is one of the ways in which the Federal Government can offer a program to attract an adequate number of professional nurses to meet the serious shortage of nursing personnel which prevails throughout the United States in all health facilities.

The fact is that we are already hard hit by a critical shortage of nurses. Large numbers of health positions are unfilled, budgeted faculty positions are vacant in nursing schools, and wings and floors in hospitals cannot be utilized for lack of trained personnel.

Without action, the situation might become catastrophic. Right now hospitals are forced to utilize inadequately trained attendants to do the work that should only be done by professionally trained nurses.

The Surgeon General's consultant group found that there are too few schools providing adequate education for nursing. There are not enough capable young people being recruited to meet the demands and too few college-bound students are entering the nursing field. More nursing schools are needed within colleges, universities, junior colleges, and hospital schools. There is a continuing lag in the economic status of nurses and this discourages young people from entering the field and remaining active in it. Figures show that a nurse receives nearly $1,000 less per year than a comparable position of teacher or stenographer.

The report of the consultant group also stressed that nursing schools themselves simply cannot bear the tremendous financial burden involved in expanding to meet the educational needs of providing close to 20,000 new nurse graduates each year. There are 31,000 students graduating from nursing schools each year now, but in order to reach the feasible goal for 1970, that number must be increased by nearly 75 percent. If adequate nursing services are to be insured now, Federal financial aid is needed; and more needs to be done by all the health profession in telling this need to the public.

The feasible goal of 680,000 nurses by 1970 includes 120,000 with academic degrees. Many of these should be advanced degrees to provide the academic and leadership positions needed. The consultant report recommends doctoral degrees for deans of collegiate programs, faculty of graduate programs, research investigators, and nursing service directors of large hospital or health agency systems.

Masters degrees are recommended for teachers in all nursing education programs, directors and assistant directors of nursing service in hospitals, related institutions, and health agencies, inservice education, supervisors, clinical specialists, and consultants.

It is known that scholarship and loan funds for nursing students are limited and those available now come mostly from professional groups, business and industrial firms, and some national voluntary organizations. Too few State legislatures have set aside money for nursing education.

The Nurses Training Act recommends that we provide financial assistance to expand teaching facilities for nurses training. It provides a program of grants for construction of new schools of nursing for the major expansion of existing schools, and for the replacement or rehabilitation of existing teaching facilities. In addition, there are grants to assist nursing schools in meeting the additional costs of projects which will strengthen, improve, or expand their programs to train and teach nurses. And, it further recommends the provision of financial assistance to students of nursing, many of whom cannot afford an education beyond high school.

One of the most important provisions of the bill provides for loans up to $1,000 a year for students in all types of professional nursing schools. The loans would be repayable over a 10-year period beginning 1 year after the end of studies. Up to 50 percent of the amount of the loan would be canceled at the rate of 10 percent for each complete year of full-time employment as a professional nurse in any public or nonprofit private institution or agency.

The loan provisions, especially the forgiveness feature, is one of the provisions of this bill which could provide the vital need for attracting more talented young women. Nursing does not compare favorably with other careers requiring equivalent capabilities and education. Salaries of hospital staff nurses are lower, on the average, than those of secretaries.

A recent survey showed that almost half of the degree programs reported that most students needed full or partial help. A high rate of personal financial assistance is also evident in diploma schools.

If we are to encourage financially needy students to enter a program which will lead them into a worthy but economically inadequate profession, we must offer the incentive.

Under normal circumstances, the recruitment of nurses basically should be a matter for local action. It is apparent, however, that the shortage of nurses has become, or is fast becoming, a national problem.

In view of these circumstances, it seems desirable that the Federal Government would help in the recruitment and attraction of nurses by the passage of an act which we are presenting today. The facts submitted to our committee seem emphatic that there is a shortage now and that this shortage will continue in the immediate years ahead, not only because of the normal trend, but because of the increased demands made by the public for additional nursing needs, such as become apparent in this scientific and space age.

However, I think it is mandatory that all health professions do a great deal more than they are now doing in attracting these young ladies—and men—into the nursing profession. It is too easy to come before the Congress and ask us for large sums of money to carry on this work in the public health field when, in truth, more could be done on a local basis. We have every reason to expect the medical profession, the hospital associations, the public health officials, and particularly the nursing profession itself to provide more funds and give more direct help themselves in the recruitment program. I think we have every right to expect our schools and our cities and our States to provide funds and to put on programs of a public-relations nature which will point out the need, as well as the great satisfaction that comes from dedicating oneself in the nursing profession.

It was my pleasure recently to spend considerable time with a representative of the National Advertising Council, an organization which has helped many businesses and professions in years past in their endeavors of public service. I found this organization willing to cooperate in every way possible if they can be given proper information and ammunition with which to advertise the attractiveness of the nursing profession. For a little investment, I think this great organization can give to the nursing profession millions of dollars worth of advertisement. I am very hopeful that a broad campaign can be undertaken by all governmental and private agencies to tell this story to the American public. If the American public understands, it will respond and relieve the Federal Government of this responsibility which basically should be a local responsibility.

This has become a national problem, and I think the Congress should act favorably on this legislation. The nursing profession is a great profession and deserves our support and help.

Nursing has been symbolized for over a century by a faintly burning lamp—a flame which guides the nurse to the bedside of the sick.

The Nurse Training Act of 1964 could help to brighten this flame, for in actuality, the symbol has always been the lamp of learning.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. I thank the gentleman from Texas, and also say I appreciate the fact he has served on our Subcommittee on Health and Safety and has done a very outstanding job.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALL. I would like to ask the distinguished gentleman who has brought this bill to the floor under the title of Nurse Training Act of 1964, H.R. 11241, if it is true that the scholarship aid for assistance to students entering collegiate schools of nursing has, in fact, been deleted from the bill?

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. That is correct. We felt we had no precedent for this provision and we took it out.

Mr. HALL. I would like to ask the gentleman further if the committee in its wisdom balanced the fact that we do furnish large amounts of Federal funds for the training of practical nurses and hospital auxiliary workers thus increasing the number of these personnel under the registered or graduate nurse supervision in our hospitals affording care to the patient, and that is what we are ultimately interested in; on balance with the lack of scholastic aid to those seeking the higher degree.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. I think the gentleman has stated fairly what the committee is trying to do. We did not, insofar as I know, put any funds into those fields that are already covered.

Mr. HALL. Yes, but the gentleman realizes there are funds, not through his committee, or indeed the great Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, available to these other workers and I am a little bit worried lest the proportion get out of balance between the registered nurses, nurses with a degree, the supervising nurses in hospitals; and those who are trained under other programs such as the Manpower Retraining Act, for example, Rehabilitation Act, and so forth, to a deterioration in the quality of nursing service afforded the patient. I would like to be reassured by the gentleman and his subcommittee that you do think this would be on balance and, therefore, that you were justified in taking these scholastic aid funds out, where they were originally in the bill.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. That is correct. We found where under the National Defense Education Act, many of the young ladies would have been eligible or have been eligible under the National Defense Education Act for a scholarship loan they would have to compete with students going into the scientific fields and other fields of education. These girls are in a low bracket of pay and we felt they should be given more incentive and we tried to apply these funds to those who would be leading the way, so to speak, those who are going to college or are going to make a career of teaching or who are going to try to bring others into the profession.

Mr. HALL. Now I did understand the gentleman correctly, in the beginning, to the effect that the scholarship aid for assistance to these students entering the collegiate schools of nursing has been deleted; did I not?

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. That is correct. In the bill there was set up, I believe, $10½ million for scholarships, but the committee felt in its wisdom the loan proposition was a better situation and that is the one we put in the bill.

Mr. HALL. We are using loans instead of scholarships?

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. That is correct; the same thing that we have been doing in other fields.

Mr. HALL. I want to commend the gentleman and the committee for bringing this most worthwhile bill on the floor of the House, in spite of the deletion; and although I am a little bit staggered at the total expense over a 5-year period, with an option for renewal, I am for it. I would submit to the Members of the House, as the gentleman has, that there is probably no one area in which we need, across the country and across State lines, to aid and abet the training of those who render personal service. This is training for which the recipient must be extremely well qualified in this day of technical assistance, surgical and medical and all other matters in hospital care ending up in the ultimate care of the patient. I would hope that we have adequate safeguards here wherein Federal funds are being used to insure that all schools, including the diploma schools—as they are known—are required to submit projects of high quality and regular standards which will meet with the requirements that the gentleman's subcommittee has set up.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. I am grateful to the gentleman, who has a fine record in his own profession and here in the Congress. We greatly appreciate his support.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. I am glad to yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. As the gentleman knows, I have been very much interested in the whole nursing problem for a great many years and am grateful indeed that this committee has brought this bill to the floor. I have been wondering about the associate degree program, which is mentioned at the top of page 6 of the report. It states:

> The curriculum is offered within a 2-year period, with a ratio of general and nursing education, including clinical experience, developed in accordance with college policy and

the regulations of the State licensing authority.

Everywhere there is a dramatic lack of bedside nurses. Does this bill give real assurance that these students will be adequately prepared really to nurse the sick?

The diploma nurses and the collegiate nurses, have been going into teaching, administration, and supervision rather than actually nursing the sick. I have been unable to obtain from the profession any kind of reply to my question as to how much the phrase "including clinical experience" means in the 2-year program.

Can the gentleman give me information?

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Certainly I know that no one else who serves in the Congress has been as devoted to solving this problem as has been the gentlewoman from Ohio. We have had many conversations about bills which have been before our committee. I am grateful for her long-time interest.

I believe that what we did with the Younger amendment was to try to put some emphasis on the hospital schools because of the fact that we felt this perhaps would give us more bedside nurses.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. When the gentleman refers to hospital nurses, does he mean nurses trained to nurse at the bedside?

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. That is correct. Also, if they wish to go ahead, we believe this will cut down a little bit on the time they would have to spend to qualify for advancement in the profession. We took the formula grant proposal by the gentleman from California, which was a modification of an amendment by the gentleman from Minnesota, because of the fact that we felt some emphasis probably should be placed on the hospital schools, which furnish the major portion of nurses in the profession. At the same time, we did not wish to neglect the collegiate level. We did not wish to neglect many fine junior colleges already in the program, and many which are going into the program.

We believe we have a fairly good, balanced bill, which will bring back into existence many schools in the great States of California, Florida, Alabama, Texas—and many others—which have had to go out of business because they have had to pass on the costs to the patients in the hospitals. They simply could not go ahead. We believe this bill, with proper local support, will do a good job.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Of course it will do a great deal. I have been informed that this should give 130,000 bedside nurses. But it has been impossible for me to get any accurate information as to exactly what will be included in the course.

May I say that for a great many years I have felt the longer courses—the 3-year and 4-year courses—were rather overdoing the length of time required to give a student what she needs to know.

Efforts have been made to cut the time for training. Until this time it has been impossible. I hope that through our committee I might be able to obtain some accurate information relative to the content of the 2-year course. We have given so much money in the last few years for the teaching of nurses. That is very important, for we cannot have more nurses unless we have more teaching personnel. But, on the other hand, we are closing wards everywhere for lack of bedside nurses and we still keep on building new facilities. Whom they are going to be nursed by, Heaven only knows.

I want to ask one other question if I may. There are certain schools that have had to close down because of lack of funds, and so on. They have the facilities there and everything. Are you proposing to build new facilities in the neighborhood or are you going to use the old facilities?

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. The bill will provide, in my opinion, for the opening of these schools without having to build these facilities where they are already in existence. That is where we think the wisdom of the Younger amendment stressed the point that we would be channeling money to the schools. The Surgeon General's authority has been reduced. It will mainly be up to the schools to make the move. Where they have done a good job in the past they can qualify for these formula grants. That was one reason why we went to that particular device, because we thought it would do just what you are saying and we would utilize a lot of properties and facilities already in existence. However, we simply cannot carry on there because the patient cost is so high and is out of reason. We felt it was time to lift this burden of cost from the patient and put it where it should be, which is in the State and the Federal grant system. We think we have an ample precedent for it, and I believe it will work out, too.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. I do not suppose you have been able to study this yet, but may I ask what provisions do you make for the salary pay raise—or will that be left entirely to the hospitals?

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. As the gentlewoman is well aware, we will have no right, in my opinion, nor the authority to study the levels of pay. We think it is strictly a local matter and better handled at that level, but we do believe that the quality will be upgraded and the chances for achievement in the profession will be enhanced and that by and large the nursing profession will be a better paid profession.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. May I express my appreciation for the work you have done on this bill. I know what a difficult job it is and how very hard it is to get anything worked out.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. I am grateful for that statement.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DAWSON). The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to revise and extend their remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CURTIN].

Mr. CURTIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 11241, a bill to increase the number of nurses in the United States.

This legislation will implement the provisions of H.R. 12, which is now Public Law 88–129, and which was designed to increase the number of doctors and other medical personnel in this country.

H.R. 11241 has three purposes: First, to provide facilities for the training of nurses; second, to provide, through qualified personnel, for the teaching of nurses; and third, through loans, to assist and encourage nursing as a course of study. There is also a forgiveness feature, in such loans, to encourage continuation of such nurses in their profession.

Through the years, the Congress has enacted legislation in the field of medical facilities, both as to numbers and kinds. We have made provision for more hospitals, made provision for mental health care at the community level and made provision for more doctors. All of this means that we need more nurses, and H.R. 11241 is designed to fill that gap. Nursing is a hard and exhausting profession; it requires not only dedicated persons, but we should do whatever is necessary to make it attractive to young persons who have a leaning toward it.

For these reasons, I think this is a good bill and I am happy to support it.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have served on the subcommittee which considered this important legislation and its need was made only too obvious to us by the testimony given at our hearings. There is at present an alarmingly increasing shortage of trained professional nurses in this country. This shortage appears at a time when medicine has made striking advances toward the curing of society's health problems. This bill is designed to alleviate that shortage and through planned educational programs to insure an adequate nursing supply in years to come.

Mr. Speaker, when this measure came before the committee, the total of the administration requests was over $345 million. We cut the bill down to $287 million, the minimum which will allow us to guarantee an adequate nursing program.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to cite some statistics which reveal the plight of nursing in this country:

First. Twenty percent of the positions for professional nurses in hospitals in the United States are now vacant. This problem is not confined to the rural areas of the country, as shown in New York City where in 1961 over half the positions in public hospitals were unfilled.

Second. Nearly one-third of the Nation's cities of 25,000 population or over, have no programs of nursing care of the sick at home.

Third. There are 1,200 faculty vacancies in the professional nursing schools throughout the country. It is at this void that the traineeship program of the bill is aimed.

Fourth. Between 1955 and 1960 the number of students enrolling in college increased by 50 percent. During this same time period the enrollment in nursing schools increased by only 6 percent.

Fifth. There are now 550,000 professional nurses in practice. It is projected that in 1970 a feasible goal would be 680,000 nurses. In order for our schools to meet this demand they would have to increase their present 31,000 graduates per year to a total of 53,000 graduates by 1969. This is a 70-percent increase and quite impossible under existing conditions.

Take for instance the situation in my State of Florida: In 1957 there were 11,760 practicing nurses; in 1962 this figure increased to 14,109. Although the number of nurses in the State has increased, the ratio of nurses per 100,000 population has gone down from 277 in 1957 to 260 in 1962. These figures take on even more importance when we consider that in 1962 the national ratio per 100,000 population was 286.

As you know, the diploma or hospital schools of nursing provide the great bulk of our professional nurses. These schools have been subjected to the greatest operational strains, and one of the main objectives of this bill is to attempt to alleviate some of the problems of running diploma schools of nursing. Again, Florida proves an excellent example of what is happening throughout the country: In 1957 there were 12 diploma schools of nursing in Florida. In 1963 this number had shrunk to six. Considering that diploma schools provide over 60 percent of all graduating nurses, this situation should not be allowed to continue.

I urge passage of this important legislation.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the Nurse Training Act of 1964 is a very important piece in the pattern of legislation passed by this Congress to provide medical and hospital services in keeping with the expanding needs of our population. The Medical Education Act should provide facilities to teach doctors, dentists, and other medical personnel and assist such students through loans. The Mental Health and Mental Retardation Act will eventually provide mental health facilities on a community basis. The renewed and expanded Hill-Burton Act will assure a continued increase of hospital beds for our rural areas and additional beds for metropolitan areas through modernization of existing hospitals. As these programs go forward they will create an unprecedented demand for nurses. The bill we have before us today seeks to fill this last important requirement with a rounded and thoughtful program.

If one wonders why the various elements contained in this bill were not included in the various other bills already passed he can be assured that it was not because of any oversight or neglect on the part of the committee. It was keenly aware at every stage that the need for nurses must be met. When these other bills were under consideration, however, the group assigned to study the problems of the nursing profession as a whole had not had sufficient opportunity to assemble its material and draw final conclusions. It was therefore felt that the entire matter should be left to a comprehensive bill to be drawn when the facts were clear. The final recommendations and conclusions of the consultant group indicate that we will need 850,000 professional nurses by 1970, of which 300,000 should have academic degrees. The group also concluded that the desired increase from the present 550,000 nurses to the 850,000 figure could not realistically be met and tailored its recommendations to a lesser increase which is more feasible. This figure is 680,000 nurses. The bill, although modifying in some particulars the various programs recommended to provide this increase, embodies most of the recommendations and aims at the more realistic goal.

The problems facing the nursing profession are many. Enrollments are dwindling and so are teaching facilities. More technical training is necessary to meet the standards of the medical profession than was needed some years ago. The work is hard and many girls look to less demanding jobs. Pay is too low for those who do dedicate themselves to the profession. Teachers, supervisors, and specialists are in short supply. Research indicates that those who decide to pursue nurse training come from families of limited income in most instances and need financial assistance if they are to follow it through.

The bill attacks these problems. However, the consultant group, your committee, and this House readily recognizes that Federal action is not enough. As we say in the report:

> State and local governments, schools, hospitals, the health professions and private citizens all have a big stake in solving the nursing shortage.
>
> Each must take on added responsibilities if the growing demand for essential and high quality nursing services is to be met.

The approaches used in the bill have precedent in other actions we have taken in education and medical matters. First it helps provide for the facilities in which to teach more nurses. This is done by construction grants to the various kinds of nursing schools, baccalaureate—or college, associate, junior college, and diploma schools, hospitals—for new facilities, for expansion and for rehabilitation of outmoded facilities. Expansion must be based on a minimum increase of 5 percent or five students, whichever is greater.

Hospital schools have found that the cost of maintaining nursing schools has been far greater than the income to the hospitals from tuition and student help. Consequently many such schools have closed or are considering doing so. To reverse this trend the bill provides for grants to such diploma schools of $250 per federally sponsored student and also for the increase of students over previous averages.

Along with additional facilities there is a need for new methods and concepts. We want better training as well as more of it. Projects grants with fairly tight limitations seek to strengthen, improve, and expand programs to teach and train nurses.

Since it appears conclusively that most nursing students will require some assistance the bill provides for loans in the National Defense Education Act pattern with a 50-percent forgiveness. Last year we did not include forgiveness of loans to medical students but we have in the past done so for teachers because of the particularly critical need and the salary levels to be expected by graduates. There is ample reason to treat the nurses in this regard as we have the teachers for the same reasons.

Graduate traineeships for nurses have existed for some time. In this particular regard the present bill is an extension of law which was effective until July 1 of this year. It allows payments to graduate nurses to take additional training in order to qualify as specialists, supervisors, or teachers.

The committee felt that the consultant group had done an excellent job of outlining the problem and it accepted its recommendations generally. The subcommittee refined the original bill in many respects and the full committee made some further changes. The overall amount of the bill was reduced from $345 million to $287 million. Scholarships for undergraduate students were eliminated as being contrary to the basic principles which have been applied by the House when it considered and passed legislation having to do with education assistance.

As it now stands I recommend the bill to the House for favorable action.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation and wish to commend the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for having done an excellent job in this regard.

I have a letter of inquiry here from the acting dean of the College of Nursing of South Dakota State University. She raises some questions with regard to the Younger amendment, section 806, wherein she expresses some concern to the effect that there would be no request for evidence from the school seeking the assistance as to how the money ought to be used for improving the quality of nursing and education.

She goes on to point out that under section 805 of the bill where financial aid is given to improve teaching and nursing in collegiate schools, the request has to be made by the school outlining the specific purposes for which it is to be used.

I wonder of the gentleman would care to comment on that?

Mr. SPRINGER. Where you are attempting to improve the quality of nursing you have to show you are going to improve the quality if you want to qualify under that section.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, there should be no apprehension or concern here in this regard?

Mr. SPRINGER. None whatever. I think with that idea in mind your university certainly could qualify for funds.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman has raised another question, and that is whether or not the schools that are now closed can reopen, and that refers to the "Younger amendment," that primarily has to do with assistance to those schools at the rate of $250 a pupil for schools which have already closed because of lack of funds but with financial help can reopen.

May I say to the gentleman, about 15 years ago we had 1,150 schools of nursing. Today we have about 845 schools of nursing. This means that over 300 nursing schools throughout the country have been closed during the past 15 years for one reason or another. We are hoping to get back in operation those schools that have been closed. The only way to do that is to provide them with assistance. The cost of nurses' training in many areas became prohibitive. Therefore, there was nothing for the hospitals to do but to close the schools of nursing. In the particular instance that the gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER] referred to and the reason for his amendment, was that three or four nursing schools operated by hospitals in the San Francisco area had closed just in that area alone. It was for this reason that he offered his amendment, in an effort to see if we could get those nursing schools, and others in like condition, back into operation.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSEN].

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I will speak very briefly on this bill. Most of the details have been covered. We had long and extensive hearings on the bill. It was very obvious that nationwide there was a tremendous shortage of nurses. In the bill there are provisions for bricks and mortar to build facilities whereby the nurses might be trained to teach. There was, however, not enough emphasis on the one provision in the bill that I think has been corrected. That was providing some manner and means whereby the hospitals might be stimulated into greater action.

As has been pointed out by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER], the hospital schools previously numbered about 1,150, and are now down to about 840. All over the country hospital schools are being closed. So that it would seem to me where we have the bricks and mortar already there, where we have the facilities already there—at the same time we have a shortage of nurses prevailing nationwide—it would be only logical and right that the hospital schools be stimulated into greater production, at the same time not forgetting other necessary provisions of the bill.

We attempted first in our subcommittee to attack the hospital school problem by providing in the bill some assistance as was done in title III of the mental retardation bill, where assistance would be given to the instructors that would be in these hospital schools. But it was thought to be more productive and more easily administered by using the type of approach that the gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER], proposed in the full committee, which was substituted, whereby the hospital schools will be granted some assistance which would be prorated on the basis of the number of students that came from schools, providing quality standards were followed. This will stimulate our hospital schools to produce more nurses. All over the country we find some of our hospitals standing with wings of the hospital not being used because they cannot be staffed—the need certainly is there.

I think all of us must agree when we passed the National Defense Education Act we provided loans with forgiveness provisions in them. In H.R. 12 we provided loans for those who go into the medical profession. It is quite likely that competition has drained away many who might have become nurses.

It is true we did want to encourage the baccalaureate degree, or the 4-year college student, who goes on to become a nurse. My daughter is one of them. It is also true we need many more nurses with such qualification.

It did, however, seem obvious that if our high school girls could go into the hospital school to become nurses and if our hospital schools could be reopened we would then satisfy the need the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. FRANCES BOLTON] has brought to the attention of this body so many times; that is, the need for bedside nurses. This provision has been added to the bill where some of the money that was to have gone into other areas goes to the hospital school, not only on loans to the student, but also with some provision that the hospital may receive a little assistance to stimulate expansion in this area.

This is a good bill, and I am happy to support it. I want to thank the chairman of the committee, Mr. ROBERTS, for the fine work he and the committee have done, especially with reference to the gentlewoman from Ohio's [Mrs. BOLTON] proposition, because we think the thing the gentlewoman has advocated all of these years is in this bill.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NELSEN. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. I wonder if in connection with the study on this bill there was any study made on why girls do not go into nursing or why they leave the nursing profession. Did you have some studies on that?

Mr. NELSEN. The facts show one of the contributing factors to the shortage of nurses has been the fact that the salary received by nurses is not on a parallel with salaries in the teaching profession or other areas. That is one of the great competing factors, I believe.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. And in addition there are many other factors that contribute—namely, the way the work is arranged in the hospital, the things that hospitals do and do not do, things that nurses are expected to do. There is so much to that. I just wondered if the committee had made a study of the many findings that are in existance.

Mr. NELSEN. Not to the extent and in the detail the gentlewoman has referred to, but I am sure that is available to the committee. We were relating our work particularly to a stimulation in the area as such. I think the point the gentlewoman has brought to the attention of the House is well taken.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. I did introduce a bill, but it was killed in committee by the nurses. I was hoping very much that as background the committee would have studied the reasons why, because after all that is a very important problem in our lack of bedside nurses.

I am very happy to go along with you on the bill.

Mr. NELSEN. I am very glad to say our committee will go into those recommendations of the gentlewoman.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NELSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SPRINGER. I think it is very important that this House know in connection with the remarks of the gentlewoman from Ohio that the chief reason we found was that the girls who were applying for nurses training seemed to be in a financial category where they simply could not undertake further schooling, or once they started to undertake nurse's training they dropped out. Most trouble was economic. It was a technical thing with the girls going into nursing. I am talking about the girls in the diploma schools, whose finances were inadequate. We are here trying to keep the girls in the nursing schools.

Mr. NELSEN. I think the girl who graduates from a diploma school usually stays with the profession. Many of the others go into other professions because they find it more financially remunerative.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NELSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I am proud to be a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I supported this bill in committee. I support it now, and certainly hope it will pass overwhelmingly.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if there is a Representative in Congress who has never been visited in his office by a nurse?

For the Member of Congress who has never received such a visit, he can look forward to this encounter with a nurse who is "on duty." Oh, she would not ask after his health or take his pulse, but she will be quite concerned about the state of the Nation or the progress of a particular bill in Congress.

Apparently, those qualities and characteristics which are a part of the nursing profession—dedication, devotion, standards of achievement—somehow carry her beyond the limited hospital community and on to a concern for the national community.

Generally these nurses will agree that they can usually expect a friendly welcome. They will be complimented for their accomplishments—past and present. They will be lauded for their industry and devotion—often in the face of hardship. Everyone has a kind word for the nurses, and they appreciate this, but they sometimes feel a little bit like that old phrase about the weather—"Everyone talks about it, but nobody does anything about it."

We are here today not only to talk about the nurses, but also to do something about them in our consideration of the Nurse Training Act of 1964.

As early as 1850, a report to the Legislature of Massachusetts recommended that:

> Institutions be formed to educate and qualify females to be nurses of the sick—bad nursing often defeats the intention of the best medical advice, and good nursing often supplants the defects of bad advice.

And in 1858 it was a doctor who said:

> It seems to me to be just as necessary to have well-trained, well-instructed nurses as to have intelligent and skillful physicians. I have long been of the opinion that there ought to be, in all the principal towns and cities of the Union, institutions for the education of men and women whose duty it is to take care of the sick, and to carry out the injunctions of the medical attendant.

Over 100 years later, in February 1963, there was a message from the White House to the Congress of the United States. In it, President John F. Kennedy said:

> Perhaps the most threatened breach in our health defenses is the shortage of trained health manpower. Our health can be no better than the knowledge and skills of the physicians, dentists, nurses, and others to whom we entrust it.

And it was only recently that President Johnson said that one of the most important pieces of legislation this year was the Nurse Training Act—the bill which we are considering here today.

Perhaps the reason that nurses are welcomed wherever they go is because the work they have done and the history of their endeavors, is so closely tied to the growth and struggles and history of our country.

Perhaps the nurses have reason to complain. Many of the improvements in education and nursing care which nurses fought for in the early part of the last century are still being fought today. For although improvements have been made, nursing, like so many other fields is a growing and dynamic profession that affects all the citizens of this country—not just the dedicated young women who have chosen nursing as their career.

Although there are probably few here who could speak up authoritatively on the history of nursing, there is probably no child in this country today who is not familiar with the names of those women who were pioneers in the field of nursing. Not all were nurses, and probably the most recognized name—not an American—is Florence Nightingale. She was an English nurse.

Probably no other single nurse figure in history has emerged to gain such popular acclaim and heroic proportions. Although in a large measure it was the Christian Church which created nursing, the American system of nursing education has grown from the basic precepts of nursing which were pioneered by Florence Nightingale.

In the London Times on July 6, 1934, it was pointed out that she reformed, remade, and gave a new direction and a more lively inspiration to nursing.

The Times said:

> Her service, indeed, was personal, in that she brought her vivid and alert personality into wards and dressing stations where disorder and even despair prevailed, and by her personality—compounded of courage, discipline, and a valiant faith in love of her fellows—exorcised the evil and established a new order of goodness and mercy. Her new order has endured because it was built on the sure foundations of knowledge and experience.

Perhaps the reason nurses are regarded so highly is because these basic qualities of Miss Nightingale have remained in those who enter nursing today.

We find too often today that original goals have been replaced with something less idealistic. Goals have a way of accommodating themselves to a "practical approach." We are the children who grow up to lose their inspired visions and replace them with something else.

But today in nursing we still find that dedication to the original vision. Like Florence Nightingale, the nursing practitioner still displays the courage, discipline, faith, and love of her fellows.

With the complexities of the 20th century it is not difficult to understand why many alter and adjust their goals. But these adjustments provide a contrast to the singleness of purpose and the standards which nurses have not only maintained, but have strengthened and clarified.

There are many names familiar to nursing. Clara Barton—not a nurse, but the founder of the Red Cross. There was Dorothea Lynde Dix, a crusader for better care of mental patients and appointed as Superintendent of Women Nurses by the Secretary of War during the Civil War. Another was Louisa Lee Schuyler, a great-granddaughter of Alexander Hamilton, who was considered the organizing genius behind much of the work of the U.S. Sanitary Commission; and there are many more.

But consistent to nursing yesterday and today is the responsibility it fosters in its practitioners far beyond the requirements of the job itself. There is probably no other group of women whose interest and promotion of the well-being of society extends so far beyond the 8-hour day. It is a rare nurse who leaves her responsibilties when she leaves her patients.

It would be hard to say if nursing attracts those individuals with this broad dedication or if they find it in their training and later in the practice of their profession.

We hope in all fields of education that what results will be a more responsible individual, a better citizen, a person who will be responsible to the needs of all society rather than to their individual needs alone.

For some unknown reason, the nurse emerges in the broadest pattern of social responsibility. Wherever improvements have appeared in the development of health care and facilities in our Nation, the nurse has emerged as a moving force in these improvements. The nurse is militant of her own training and has constantly worked toward its improvement—knowing that as the nurse improves, the health and condition of those she attends will also improve.

Today there is a serious shortage of nurses. This should not be the burden alone of those who enter nursing. It is a concern to all citizens. All must benefit, so all must share in the responsibility and concern. Nurses today need more than admiration.

The provisions in this bill will provide a small part of the vital educational needs and facilities. The benefits to be derived are well beyond the number of additional nurses who will emerge within a given number of years to staff medical facilities.

It will give us much more than a larger work force. It will provide the kind of women who have been involved in every war along with our soldiers—it will provide the kind of women who will maintain and improve their own professional standards—and it will enrich this country with the kind of citizens who actively involve themselves with the welfare and growth of their Nation.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I rise in favor of H.R. 11241, to amend the Public Health Service Act to increase the opportunities for training professional nursing personnel.

The purpose of this bill is to increase the supply of nurses in the United States through a variety of approaches recommended by the administration, based upon recommendations of the Surgeon General's Consultant Group on Nursing.

The legislation would establish a 4-year program of grants totaling $90 million for construction and rehabilitation of nursing schools; establish a program of grants totaling $17 million over a 5-year period to assist collegiate and associate degree schools of nursing to meet the additional costs of strengthening, improving, or expanding their training programs; and establish a system of formula grants totaling $41 million over a 5-year period to diploma schools of nursing; continue for 5 more years and expand the existing program of traineeships for advanced training of professional nurses; and establish a student loan program, modeled after the National Defense Education Act and the Health Professions Education Assistance Act of 1963, for students of nursing at collegiate, associate degree, and diploma schools of nursing. I urge my colleagues to vote through this vitally needed legislation.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 11241, the Nurse Training Act of 1964, which would increase the opportunities for training professional nurses, and which would markedly alleviate the present shortage of properly trained personnel. I would like particularly to take this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to commend the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ROBERTS] for his persistent interest in this critical matter and for his leadership in bringing this bill before the House.

It is well known that during the last few decades medical science has made phenomenal advances in the prevention and cure of disease. In order, however, to implement such technical advances, an adequate number of highly trained medical personnel, including nurses, is essential. Unfortunately, such is not the case today.

As the extensive hearing of the committee made clear, it is imperative that we expand both the quantity and quality of our collegiate and hospital programs of nursing education. As a matter of fact, a survey authorized by President Kennedy in 1962 showed that an increase of 25 percent in the present number of professional nurses is required to fill even the positions vacant at this moment in our Nation's 6,400 hospitals, and by 1970 the number of practicing nurses will have to increase to 680,000—nearly double the 350,000 available in 1960.

This bill, Mr. Speaker, would provide constructive assistance both for expanding the quantity and for increasing the quality of professional nurses serving in and out of the hospitals of our country. It would expand and supplement existing training facilities and would upgrade the quality of nursing education.

Mr. Speaker, the conditions which this bill is designed to correct have long been chronic in nursing. It represents a comprehensive, balanced, and practical approach to their solution, and as one who has long been deeply interested in this field, I urge that it be passed and implemented without delay.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, anyone who has had the misfortune to be a patient in a hospital, including the best, during the past several years can testify personally to the acute and growing shortage of professional nurses in this country. It is a rare and critical case which today receives adequate professional nursing care, for, as the shortage has grown more and more serious, professional nurses have increasingly been assigned to supervisory duties and the nursing services which they were trained to provide have been left to often inexperienced and inadequately trained nurses' aids.

The committee report cites a number of impressive statistics to document the shortage of professional nurses. In some hospitals, for instance, the shortage is so severe that nursing aids provide as much as 80 percent of the direct nursing services, and in New York City over half the positions for professional nurses in the public hospitals were unfilled in 1961.

This is not a new situation, Mr. Speaker; many of us recognized the growing crisis as far back as the mid-1950's and publicly urged a program to encourage the training of more nurses and nursing educators. Legislation for this purpose has been pending in Congress for several years. The astonishing fact about this bill is the length of time it has taken to bring a proposed program to the floor of the House for action. In early 1961, the Surgeon General appointed a Consultant Group on Nursing to study the nursing needs of the country and recommend an appropriate role for the Federal Government in helping to meet these needs. Despite the urgency of the matter and the fact that a reporting date of later that year had been set, the study dragged on and it was not until December 1962, that the group reported. I recall the many inquiries I made of the Public Health Service about the progress of the study during this period only to be told on each occasion that, "It won't be much longer."

In February 1963 the President included recommendations based on the group's report in his message to Congress on the health needs of the country, at which time he announced he would send draft legislation to Congress. Yet, another full year elapsed before an administration bill was drafted and introduced. Throughout this period, of course, the nursing shortage was getting worse. Implementation of the Kerr-Mills law further strained the Nation's nursing resources, and the administration continued to press for enactment of health care for the elderly legislation—a measure which could be made nearly inoperative by the lack of nursing personnel to provide the services called for in the legislation.

Finally, in the latter half of 1964, we have a bill, a good bill, which I strongly support. Nevertheless, it is a significant measure of the dimension of the nursing shortage that in 1962 the Surgeon General's Consultant Group determined it would not be feasible to recommend a goal of more than 130,000 additional nurses by 1970 even though they identified the need as being more than twice that number, 300,000. The present bill accepts the group's recommended goal of 130,000 nurses, but the committee has been frank to warn in its report that even if this goal is reached the country will remain seriously short of nurses in 1970.

In the face of this shortage—and undoubtedly contributing to it—the number of nursing schools awarding 3-year diplomas has steadily declined, from 1,134 in 1949 to 875 in 1962. The hospitals which operate most of these diploma schools have reported heavy deficits which they are forced to meet through higher charges to their patients, a not very happy arrangement especially in view of the already high costs of hospital care, and many have been forced to abandon their nursing schools as a result.

The pending bill, Mr. Speaker, will help to deal effectively with the nursing shortage in several of its aspects. The program of grants for construction of teaching facilities will help encourage the major expansion of such facilities which is necessary if the annual production of graduate nurses is to be increased from the present 30,000 to the projected 53,000.

The new program of project grants will help stimulate nursing schools to experiment with and develop new methods of training more nurses, in less teaching time and learning time, and with a resulting higher degree of technical and scientific competence.

Because of the heavy deficits incurred by hospitals which operate nursing schools, and because other provisions of this legislation will inevitably increase such operating losses, a new program in the bill will partially reimburse these institutions for costs arising from increased enrollments and from the presence of students receiving assistance under the bill.

Another provision of the bill will continue and expand the professional nurse traineeship program which, since 1956, has focused attention and support on the preparation of nurses in leadership positions—administrators, supervisors, and instructors—upon whom we must depend in large measure for the increased quantity and quality of professionally trained nursing personnel.

Perhaps the most significant part of the bill will establish a student loan program for prospective nursing students who need financial help in order to continue their educations past the high school level. This program, I believe, reaches the heart of the problem of too few nurses—the young women, and men, themselves who can become our future nurses, if they find the incentive, the opportunity and, where necessary, the financial assistance, to pursue this objective.

Finally, the bill will set up a National Advisory Council on Nurse Training, a step which will help assure expert guidance to the Surgeon General in establishing regulations and developing policies for the administration of this legislation.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that Congress can expedite enactment of this extremely important bill and that the Surgeon General can be prepared to implement it as soon as possible. We have lost too much time as it is in seeking to overcome the shortage of nurses. The demand for professionally competent nursing services is not now being filled, and we cannot bring the full benefits of our advanced medical-scientific discoveries to the people who need them until we remedy this critical deficit. This bill is a good, though belated, beginning.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DAWSON). All time has expired.

The question is, Will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill as amended?

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended, and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GRADUATE PUBLIC HEALTH TRAINING AMENDMENTS OF 1964

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 11083) to amend the Public Health Service Act to extend the authorization for assistance in the provision of graduate or specialized public health training, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Graduate Public Health Training Amendments of 1964".

SEC. 2. (a) Subsection (a) of section 306 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 242d), relating to traineeships for professional public health personnel, is amended by striking out "seven" and inserting in lieu thereof "twelve" and by inserting immediately after "Congress may determine," the following: "but not to exceed $4,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, $7,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, $8,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and $10,000,000 each for the fiscal year ending June 3, 1968, and the succeeding fiscal year,".

(b) Subsection (e) of such section is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "The Surgeon General shall, between June 30, 1967, and December 1, 1967, call a similar conference, and shall submit to the Congress, on or before January 1, 1968, a report of such conference, including any recommendations by it relating to the limitation, extension, or modification of this section."

SEC. 3. (a) Subsection (a) of section 309 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 242g), relating to project grants to schools for graduate public health training, is amended by striking out "June 30, 1965" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1964, $2,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, $4,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, $5,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, $7,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and $9,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969".

(b) Effective in the case of grants from appropriations for any fiscal year beginning after June 30, 1964, such subsection (a) is amended by striking out "and to those schools of nursing or engineering which provide graduate or specialized training in public health for nurses or engineers, for the purpose of strengthening or expanding graduate public health training in such schools" and inserting in lieu thereof "and to other public or nonprofit private institutions providing graduate or specialized training in public health, for the purpose of strengthening or expanding graduate or specialized public health training in such institutions".

(c) Subsection (b) of such section is amended by striking out "schools" wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "institutions".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 11083 is a bill to extend and expand two existing programs administered by the Public Health Service, public health traineeships authorized under section 306 of the Public Health Service Act, and project grants at schools of public health and other schools under section 309 of the Public Health Service Act. A National Conference on Public Health Training was called by the Surgeon General in conformity with section 306 of the Public Health Service Act in October 1963 to evaluate existing programs. That conference made a number of recommendations designed to increase the supply of critically needed professional public health manpower. Today, only a little more than 50 percent of the professional personnel in State and local health departments have received the training necessary to qualify them formally for their public health responsibilities.

The present rate of training of public health personnel barely offsets attrition in this field and program expansion. To maintain even the present inadequate staffing pattern in State and local health departments and to offset attrition, at least 17,000 more trained workers must be produced by 1970. Many more in addition to this 17,000 will be needed by voluntary health agencies and Federal agencies; many will also be needed to overcome the present acute shortage of teachers. As an example of the current shortages of personnel in this field, more than 5,000 budgeted positions are now vacant in State and local health departments. This bill is designed to help meet this problem by providing traineeships for professional public health personnel and project grants for schools of public health.

Section 306 of the Public Health Act today authorizes appropriations of such sums as Congress may determine to cover the cost of traineeships. The committee amended this section to eliminate this "open end" authorization, and included specific appropriation ceilings for each of the next 5 years, totaling $39,500,000.

There are two types of traineeships, the long term lasting for 1 academic year, and the short term lasting from a few days to a few weeks. Under the long-term traineeships, payments are made to cover the standard charges of the school for tuition and fees, transportation to the school at 6 cents per mile and a monthly stipend based on the highest academic degree held by the recipient and the number of his dependents. This stipend amounts to $200 a month for prebaccalaureate degree trainees, $250 a month for postbachelor degree traineers, $320 a month for postmaster degree trainees, and $400 a month for trainees who have Ph. D. degrees. An additional $30 a month is paid for each dependent.

The average cost of these long-term traineeships was a little over $3,700 in 1963. There are tables on pages 4 and 5 of the committee report that show the past operation of this program and projected future operations under it.

The bill also amends section 309 of the Public Health Service Act so as to extend for 4 additional years the authority of the Surgeon General to make project grants for training public health personnel. An advisory committee which is established under section 306 of the Public Health Service Act must approve each project before a grant may be made for it by the Surgeon General. Under this program the Public Health Service has approved nearly 100 different projects to strengthen or expand public health training in 60 schools in the fields of public health, engineering, and so on. About 75 percent of these project grants cover faculty salaries and other personal services, and about 25 percent of these grants are used for equipment and other kinds of operating expenses. There are tables on pages 6 through 10 of the committee report that show the types of project grants that have been made, and what they have been used for.

The bill also expands the types of institutions which may qualify for project grants to include, in addition to schools of public health and other similar schools, other public or nonprofit private institutions providing graduate or specialized training in public health. For example, under the amendment made by the bill, project grants may be made to schools of medicine, dentistry, social work, and pharmacy.

Mr. Speaker, approval of this bill would help meet the needs of our Nation for professional public health personnel. It was reported out of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee without a dissenting vote, and I urge its passage.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I would like to join the gentleman from Alabama in urging the passage of this legislation. As the gentleman has pointed out, this is legislation that has been on the books. It is a going program. This is simply an extension of the program which the Congress has approved on two previous occasions. Furthermore, I think this House would be pleased by the fact that the committee rather than continuing the program as an open end program has provided specific limitations for spending which is in line with the thinking of the House of Representatives. We should have some specific limitations on spending and the committee has provided for that. It is a very much needed and urgent program and I join with the gentleman from Alabama, chairman of the subcommittee, in urging its passage.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PEPPER. Would the gentleman kindly advise us whether or not there is provision in this bill for recruitment of nurses for the Public Health Service?

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. I might say to the gentleman, I think there are so many applicants for this particular training that there is no need for any recruitment under this bill. These places are very much sought after by people who seek work in the postgraduate fields. They are more than covered by applications so there is no shortage of people who want to get into this work in view of the tuition and the travel allowance they get in this particular type of program. So that is beside the point in my opinion.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. I am glad to yield further to the gentleman.

Mr. PEPPER. I was disturbed to learn after the bill came out of the committee, of which the able gentleman is chairman of the subcommittee, that in the previous bill which the House enacted there is no provision for recruitment of nurses into the private nursing fields of the country as distinguished from the provision in the bill as originally introduced, I believe, H.R. 1042. It has been my observation and the observation of many people who are interested in the subject of public health and who are vitally concerned that there be an adequate number of nurses for the necessary service, that one of the questionable phases of the matter is how to get enough nurses of qualified character and competence into the nursing field. It strikes me as a rather regrettable deficiency that provision was eliminated from the previous bill for encouraging recruitment of capable and competent nurses into the regular nursing profession. Will the gentleman kindly enlighten me as to whether there was such an omission and, if so, why there was such an omission?

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. In my opinion some of the money which goes to project grants may possibly serve to make the profession more attractive. Basically I believe the trouble is that we have not provided our supply of nurses with a program comparable to those provided for people who wish to go into the scientific fields, or educational work, or even social work.

We believe we are putting them on a par with those people in this particular bill. We believe that by extending the foregiveness feature to them, as is provided for the students under the National Defense Education Act, this in itself will be an incentive.

I personally believe it will not take a great deal of advertising and that sort of thing. I believe they will see the possibilities under the bill, the opportunity to obtain a fine professional career and to pay the money back at a modest rate of interest. That in itself will be all the recruitment we will need.

I may be incorrect about that. Time will tell.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. All of us are concerned that we obtain a sufficient number of young ladies in the nursing profession. It was the feeling of the committee, after hearing the testimony, that the incentives provided in the bill just passed by the House would be an attraction, as the chairman has pointed out. Those incentives include the forgiveness feature, the traineeships, the loans, and so forth. There will be aid to the colleges to bring training up to the latest standards. There will be an incentive to have the finest teaching, and these people will be treated as equals with those in other professions.

As we discuss this provision, I believe, as has been done before as a public service, it may be possible to have some approach by the advertisers for the nursing profession, and that when there is a need this can be provided as a public service without cost to the Government.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank my able colleague the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS], for his remarks.

As the able chairman of the subcommittee knows, many private organizations in this country have been struggling, with economic difficulties, devoting themselves to a nurse-procurement program, endeavoring to bring qualified and competent nurses into the field of nursing.

Many of the friends and advocates of nursing were hopeful that the nursing bill would provide some public support to supplement these private endeavors worthily carried on for some time.

As I understand the able chairman, the bill makes provision for bringing more nurses into the nursing profession by giving better opportunities for training and by tending to upgrade the economic status of nurses.

May I also have some encouragement from the able chairman in the belief that if it is found these provisions and these incentives are not sufficient to bring into the nursing profession the number of competent and qualified people needed, the able committee will give further consideration to whether there should be additional stimuli to provide recruitment in the nursing field?

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Certainly I should like to be able to give the gentleman that assurance. Many of these programs we must try out, to see how they will work.

Certainly it will be my intention, if I am still in the Congress, to encourage an additional program if this program does not work satisfactorily.

With respect to most programs which have come out of the committee with the strong vote provided for this bill, they have worked. Many people on the committee have been in the health work for many years. When we considered the bill, we cut all the "fat" out of it, and we believe we will have a workable program. Of course, we all hope that will turn out that way.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the able chairman. May I say that the leading organization of a private character in the recruitment of nurses to which I referred is the National Committee on Careers in Nursing, which has done a splendid public service by the recruitment of nurses in this country. I thank the able gentleman for the encouraging remarks that he has made.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. I thank the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. As to these trainees who will be the beneficiaries of Federal funds, will they be protected against possible political exploitation by those who happen to be in control of the Government?

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. I have found very little of that in the public health field, I will say to the gentleman. I will certainly join him in any effort he might suggest to prevent such exploitation. Many of these people who come in for these traineeships go right back to civilian life. Many of them are local city employees and county employees. I do not know just what the gentleman has in mind.

Mr. GROSS. I have this in mind. It has been revealed that young people, students, who are on the Government payroll for summer employment, are being called to so-called seminars at the White House and at the White House they are being handed political propaganda and invited to attend the Democratic National Convention in August. Of course, it is suggested to them that they resign before they attend the Democratic convention. Otherwise it would be just a little bit too obvious, being civil service employees, but they are being exploited now, and before the Democratic National Convention, by being called to the White House and handed this political propaganda. That is why I raise the question as to whether those to be benefited by this bill could be exploited in like manner.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. I would say to the gentleman it certainly would not be my wish to see any political interference or political action in this type of program. We have not had it in the past and I do not think we will have it in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this proposed legislation is another piece of a total package of health legislation upon which the Congress has been acting during the last 2 years. It fits in logically and naturally with the Hill-Burton program, the medical school training program, the Nurse Training Act and the other significant health legislation already passed or ready for action by this body. It is not a new program, however, but merely an extension and expansion of a going program which expired July 1. We have had years of experience with it and can now see clearly its value and the projected needs.

Public health is more than a branch of the medical profession. Public health activities embrace the broader problems of hygiene, sanitation, and engineering. Many of the problems could be called social problems rather than purely technical or medical problems. As population grows our concern with public health must expand. It is the purpose of this legislation to encourage and assist institutions of learning to increase the awareness of and training for the various facets of public health. The physician and the dentist can be a strong force for public health in his regular activity if he has been trained to carry out that activity with one eye on public health implications. But there must also be a large group of professionals and technicians trained specifically for and dedicated to the growing field of public health practice. The present indications are that the country will need an additional 17,000 full-time public health people of all kinds in order to maintain even present inadequate levels of staffing for public health agencies. If we are to meet the real demands in this area those needs are far more than 20,000 additional personnel by 1970.

A program which has been tried and proved to be sound can safely be expanded when the need is clear. This is such a program. We have been supporting project grants and traineeships such as here provided since 1956. Present legislation includes an open end authorization for appropriations. Although we have been circumspect in the resulting appropriations it was the feeling of your committee that definite authorizations reflect better understanding and consideration of the needs and the probable costs in the years ahead and better legislative policy.

The bill calls for $39.5 million over 5 years to cover the cost of short-and long-term traineeships in public health subjects for graduate professionals. Long-term courses are comprehensive training courses in public health practice and administration. The short courses create or improve skills in such areas as chronic diseases, accident prevention, care in nursing homes, and public health aspects of physical therapy.

Project grants over the years have provided strong curriculums in public health in the various schools of public health, nursing, and engineering. It appears to the committee on the basis of this experience and the testimony of various experts in the field that public health education could be greatly enhanced by encouraging and assisting other institutions in also creating or expanding public health curriculums. Consequently, the bill provides for project grants to medical schools, dental schools, schools of social work, and pharmacy schools. I am convinced that these measures will accomplish in the broad and increasingly important field of public health what was successfully tried in supporting strong courses in military and disaster medicine as an integral part of medical education.

I support H.R. 11083 and recommend it to the House.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, I support the pending bill on the basis of the clear and authenticated facts which have been gathered and presented by the committee—facts which show that despite the rapid growth of population and the increasingly complex character of our society, we are lagging dangerously far behind in the provision of public health services and in the training of public health personnel.

We are rightfully proud of the relatively high standards of public health we have maintained in this country over the years, but it is obvious that we cannot rest on our reputation. We cannot assure the protection of our people's health unless we assure that public health agencies and programs throughout the country are adequate to the needs.

As the committee report documents, we are failing to produce public health physicians, nurses, dentists, engineers, sanitation personnel, laboratory technicians, nutritionists, social workers, and other professionally trained personnel to help guarantee that the medical and scientific knowledge we possess will be put to the service of the general public. Thousands of professional positions in public health agencies are now vacant; only about 50 percent of professional State and local health personnel are adequately trained; and the number of public health physicians employed by State and local agencies has actually declined since 1950. Even to hold our own in this vital field, let alone make progress in the face of growing needs, we must provide the means for training a greatly increased supply of professional public health personnel.

In the face of this need, the legislation we are considering today would make only a modest contribution. Nevertheless, by extending the present authorization for public health traineeships and by making additional project grants to schools of public health, schools of nursing, and schools of engineering for public health training, we can continue, even though slowly, the progress which we began in 1956. I do not see, Mr. Speaker, how we can conscientiously do less.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DAWSON). The question is, Will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 11083?

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROTECTION FROM MORALLY OFFENSIVE MAIL MATTER

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 319) to protect postal patrons from obscene mail matter and Communist propaganda, as reported with committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That chapter 51 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end of such chapter the following new section:

"§ 4009. Morally offensive mail matter

"(a) Any person may return to the Postmaster General mail which, in his opinion, is morally offensive and which is addressed to and received by him or any child of his. On making such a return, he may request that the Postmaster General notify the sender not to send mail to him or any child of his, except mail which he has solicited. The request shall set forth the name of the person making it, a statement that in his opinion the mail returned is morally offensive, the name and date of birth of each child to whom the request pertains, and each address to which mail should not be sent. The Postmaster General shall give the sender notice of such request and the information contained therein, directing that, effective on the thirtieth day after the date of the notice, the sender, and anyone acting on his behalf with knowledge of such notice, shall not send mail in violation of its terms. The notice shall apply to a sender under any name or designation.

"(b) Whenever the Postmaster General believes that the sender or anyone acting on his behalf has violated or is violating the notice given under subsection (a) of this section, the Postmaster General shall serve upon either or both, as the case may be, by registered or certified mail, a complaint stating his belief and the information on which it is based and requiring that any response thereto be filed in writing with the Postmaster General within fifteen days after the date of such service. If the Postmaster General thereafter determines that the notice given under subsection (a) has been or is being violated, he is authorized to request the Attorney General to make application, and the Attorney General is authorized to make application, to a district court of the United States for an order directing compliance with such notice.

"(c) Any district court of the United States within the jurisdiction of which any mail matter shall have been sent or received in violation of the notice provided for by subsection (a) of this section shall have jurisdiction, upon application by the Attorney General, to issue an order commanding compliance with such notice. Failure to obey such order may be punished by the court as contempt thereof.

"(d) For the purposes of this section—

"(1) Mail addressed to a specific address without designation of a specific addressee shall be considered as addressed to the head of the household at that address.

"(2) The term 'child' means an unmarried child who has not attained his nineteenth birthday, including (A) a stepchild, (B) an adopted child, and (C) a child who is the ward of, or in the custody of, the person concerned, or who is living with such person in a regular parent-child relationship.

"(e) Receipt of mail matter thirty days or more after the effective date of a notice or of a court order provided for by this section shall create a rebuttable presumption that such mail was sent after such effective date.

"(f) The Administrative Procedure Act (5 U.S.C. 1001–1011) shall not apply to any provision of this section."

SEC. 2. The analysis of chapter 51 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by adding

"4009. Morally offensive mail matter."

immediately below

"4008. Communist political propaganda."

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to protect postal patrons from morally offensive mail matter."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second, in opposition to the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman from Nebraska opposed to the bill?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman from New York opposed to the bill?

Mr. LINDSAY. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman qualifies. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DULSKI].

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I was privileged to serve as chairman of the subcommittee which considered H.R. 319. This bill was reported favorably by unanimous vote of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee after extensive hearings by my subcommittee. We gave both opponents and proponents of the bill an adequate opportunity to present their views.

The purpose of this legislation is to give every person served by our Postal Establishment an effective and urgently needed means to prevent the forced entry into his home, or into the hands of his children, of morally offensive matter sent through the U.S. mails.

The Members of this great body are aware, I am sure, that in recent years the volume of indecent matter in the mails has been increasing steadily. The effects of this trend have been greatest on the children of America—the leaders of the America of the future. J. Edgar Hoover has said that pornography is a major cause of sex violence. Much of that pornography is passing through the U.S. mails and is directed to your children and mine.

The Post Office Department and the Department of Justice are continually waging the fight under our existing laws to keep some of this obscene material from reaching the home through the U.S. mails.

The so-called hard-core obscenity and pornography mailers can be prosecuted successfully under existing statutes. But the public and particularly the homeowner continues to have his mailbox invaded with immoral and suggestive matter which is not within the legal definition of obscenity and hence the mailers of this obnoxious material are safe from criminal prosecution. This kind of obscenity not now covered by the statutes is just as poisonous, though perhaps not initially so shocking, as the hard-core obscenity in its appeal to children, whose minds are highly susceptible during their formative years.

This legislation will give the homeowner the necessary legislative tools to stop repeated mailings of matter which, in his opinion, is morally offensive, particularly when that matter does not meet the strict legal standards of obscenity and escapes penal penalties.

Mr. Speaker, the homeowner has a right to prevent a trespasser from coming into his home without his consent. Why should he not have an equal right to prevent the intrusion of filthy literature into his mailbox without his consent? Something must be done to keep morally offensive literature and products out of the mailbox. That is the primary purpose of H.R. 319.

This legislation is intended to insure protection for patrons of the postal service from unsolicited "morally offensive" mail. The standard of what is "morally offensive" is to be determined by the mail patron. This procedure is prescribed in order to avoid the difficulties arising under existing statutes in classifying objectionable material as obscene.

It will give a person receiving mail, addressed to him or his children, which, in his opinion, is morally offensive, the right to return such mail to the Postmaster General and request him to notify the sender not to send any mail to him or to his child except mail which he has solicited. The Postmaster General shall give the sender notice of this request and inform him that after 30 days from the receipt of the notice he should not send any mail to the recipient unless it is solicited. The notice is to apply to the sender under any name or designation.

The procedure provides for a second notice with opportunity to reply within 15 days and then if the sender continues mailing morally offensive matter to the patron, the Postmaster General can request the Attorney General to apply to a Federel district court for an order directing the sender to comply with the Postmaster General's directive. Failure to obey the court order could lead to punishment in the form of contempt of court.

The Post Office Department could not give the committee any estimate of the cost of administering this program, but their representatives did testify that the administration would not be difficult. Even if it were to result in the need for additional funds for the Post Office Department, it is surely worth the extra cost in view of the substantial amount of good it will accomplish.

Mr. Speaker, there are compelling reasons why the Congress should protect American families from the forced intrusion of morally objectionable materials into their homes. I urge each and every Member of the House to join with me in supporting the principle of the sanctity of the home and in voting for this bill.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 183]

Alger
Andrews, Ala.
Ashley
Auchincloss
Avery
Baring
Barry
Bass
Battin
Bennett, Mich.
Berry
Blatnik
Bolling
Brock
Buckley
Celler
Chelf
Clausen, Don H.
Colmer
Cooley
Corman
Davis, Tenn.
Diggs
Dingell
Dwyer
Ellsworth
Evins
Feighan
Fino
Flynt
Foreman
Glenn
Goodell
Goodling
Grabowski
Griffiths
Gubser
Gurney
Halpern
Hanna
Hansen
Harris
Harvey, Mich.
Healey
Hébert
Herlong
Hoffman
Hull
Jones, Ala.
Kee
Kilburn
Kilgore
King, Calif.
Knox
Laird
Landrum
Lankford
Leggett
Lipscomb
Lloyd
Long, La.
MacGregor
Martin, Calif.
Martin, Mass.
Meader
Miller, Calif.
Miller, N.Y.
Moore
Moorhead
Morrison
Morton
Mosher
Moss
Norblad
O'Hara, Mich.
Pepper
Pilcher
Powell
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Rains
Randall
Reid, N.Y.
Robison
Rogers, Colo.
Rooney, Pa.
Roybal
Ryan, Mich.
St Germain
Senner
Sheppard
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thomas
Thompson, La.
Toll
Utt
Wallhauser

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 334 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY], is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I am in opposition to this bill, especially under this procedure, and I hope the Members will vote it down. I trust that the Members will find in their hearts at least the possibility of voting against this bill because of the procedure under which it is presented to the House of Representatives. This comes to us under a gag rule with a total 40 minutes of debate and no amendments permitted.

First of all, let us remember that those departments of the executive branch that will have to do with the enforcement of this bill should it become law are opposed to it. The Justice Department says that in its opinion the bill is unconstitutional. The Post Office Department says that in its opinion the bill is unworkable.

The bill requires the Postmaster General to notify the sender of mail which is considered "morally offensive" to the recipient of the mail that he, the sender, is forbidden from then on to send any mail of any description, any mail matter at all, to the same recipient unless that recipient should solicit such mail.

Now, what kind of mail are we talking about? It will be argued we are talking about obscenity. Maybe we are, maybe we are not. We do not know. We do not know because there is no standard at all. As one of my constitutents wrote me:

> To some people dyeing hair or putting on lipstick is morally offensive. Others might find moral offense in a set of books which include such classics as "The Scarlet Letter" or "The Red and The Black." Still others are offended by another man's religion or his favorite charity.

So the substantive standard is nonexistent.

Second. All mail from then on is barred to that recipient. That means that should the Bible be sent, or a letter saying the Bible is coming, following the offensive piece of literature, "The Scarlet Letter," or whatever the case may be, it is then barred.

Next point: The recipient is then empowered automatically to bring down the full weight of the Federal Government against the sender. The choice is up to the recipient. The Postmaster General has no option but must refer the matter to the Department of Justice. Is there a hearing leading up to this? Is there a procedure of any kind leading up to this? There is not. The Federal Government is required to pursue this course of action, without hearing, and no agency of the Government is even permitted to make any preliminary judgment as to whether or not the mail material is within the scope of the first amendment of the Constitution.

Does the House realize that this bill means that the U.S. Post Office must perforce act as a mail censor at the request of a single person? Does the House realize that this is a plain invasion of first amendment rights? Let me quote from Supreme Court Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes, who once said this:

> The United States may give up the Post Office when it sees fit; but while it carries it on, the use of the mails is almost as much a part of free speech as the right to use our tongues.

Members of the House, I respectfully ask you to consider carefully before you vote for this bill. And if my colleagues feel that they will be judged as being "for obscenity" if they vote against this bill, which could not possibly be further from the truth, they may quite properly base their vote on the procedure that is employed to bring this bill to the floor. A bill, the constitutionality of which has been put in doubt, should be subject to complete and full debate and amendments on the floor of the House of Representatives.

Every citizen in this country has within himself the power to exercise that censorship that he wishes on himself if he wants to. If an idea comes to him which he rejects or finds offensive, if it be expressed on a street corner he may walk away. But that does not stop the speaker from making the statement. If it be expressed on radio or television he may shut it off. If it be in a letter he may tear it up. But he may not constitutionally compel the U.S. Government—and this is what the bill is about—to do this for him, or to penalize the speaker with which he is in disagreement. Let the committee that presented this bill present us with a better thought out bill, a less dangerous and more workable, thought-out proposal, and under a procedure that permits full debate and amendments.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINDSAY. I yield.

Mr. DANIELS. Will the gentleman point out to me where in the bill the Attorney General must take action at the request of any individual?

Mr. LINDSAY. If the gentleman will read page 5 of the bill, he will find the following:

> Any person may return to the Postmaster General mail which, in his opinion, is morally offensive and which is addressed to and received by him or any child of his.

Mr. DANIELS. If the gentleman will yield further. At that point is it not the right of the individual to exercise his own right of free speech?

Mr. LINDSAY. Further quoting from page 5 of the bill:

> On making such a return, he may request that the Postmaster General notify the sender not to send mail to him or any child of his, except mail which he has solicited.

Now reading beginning at line 12 of the bill on page 5:

> The Postmaster General shall give the sender notice of such request and the information contained therein, directing that, effective on the thirtieth day after the date of the notice, the sender, and anyone acting on his behalf with knowledge of such notice, shall not send mail in violation of its terms.

Then, further:

> Whenever the Postmaster General believes that the sender or anyone acting on his behalf has violated or is violating the notice given under subsection (a) of this section, the Postmaster General shall serve, upon either or both, as the case may be, by registered or certified mail, a complaint, etc.

I submit to the gentleman from New Jersey that if he thinks there is anything discretionary about that language others will disagree. If he wants or intended it to be discretionary it ought to be clarified by amendment. That we are not permitted to do under this amendment.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. LINDSAY. I do not yield further. The language should be clarified in an amendment, which is impossible under this procedure here before us.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINDSAY. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. UDALL. The gentleman from New York is a respected Member of the House of Representatives but he has made three misstatements and I know he does not want the Members of the House to be misled.

The first misstatement is that the departments are against the bill. They are not for the bill, but they are not against the bill.

Mr. LINDSAY. I beg to correct the gentleman right there.

If the gentleman will turn to his own report, the report accompanying this bill when it was reported out of the committee, and take a look at the response of the Department of Justice, he will find that the Department of Justice says as follows:

> It is the view of the Department of Justice that this bill raises grave constitutional questions and, accordingly, it is unable to recommend the enactment of this legislation.

Mr. UDALL. If the gentleman will yield further, read the next sentence:

> However, the Department realizes that the Congress may desire to enact this bill and leave these issues for determination by the Court.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL].

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I was one of the cosponsors of this legislation. It has gone through about five drafts in our committee. At one point, with regard to a particular draft, I withdrew my support of the bill. However, I am wholehearted in my support of this legislation as finally reported by the committee.

Mr. Speaker, this bill has been widely misunderstood. The ACLU has sent a letter to most of the Members of the House. There are several misapprehensions about this bill that I want to correct.

Mr. Speaker, we create a new departure here. Children in high school get on mailing lists and are sent all kinds of obscene and pornographic material. The trouble with censorship under previous legislation is that we attempt to set someone up as an authority to determine what is obscene and pornographic. We depart from that whole concept in this bill. All this bill does, all that it amounts to is this: It says that a homeowner can tell someone who has a mailing list and is sending any materials or any matter through that mailing list, to take his name off. He cannot affect the receipt of or censor or stop the sending of mail to any other people, except himself, his own children.

Mr. Speaker, the mechanics of the bill are very simple. It has nothing to do with all these official government censors about which the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY] is rightly concerned. If my child receives obscene or pornographic material, I can notify the Postmaster General that I do not want anything more from that sender whoever he be. The sender is given 30 days, and my name has to go off the list. If it does not go off the list, I complain to the Postmaster General again and the Postmaster General then gives the sender the opportunity to explain in writing his failure to remove my name. This is provided for right in the bill. He advises the sender with reference to this and if there is an honest mistake, if the sender has innocently made an honest mistake, the Postmaster General does not have to carry it further and that is the end of it. However, if the Postmaster General thinks it is deliberate—and this is the kind of mailers who have been cluttering up the mail with this sort of thing—he reports it to the Attorney General, and the Attorney General may or may not at this point go to court.

Then he goes to court. The judge may or may not, after he has held a hearing, determine whether to make an order against the man who has been sending this material through the mail. Then, later on you have a contempt hearing. Only if a sender persists in sending mail to people who have asked that their names be taken off may an order be issued. This is not a statute of broad application. It is not a statute that goes into all the problems of censorship by public or private agencies. This does one thing and one thing only, and lets a homeowner get his name off the mailing list if offensive material is being sent to him.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LINDSAY. Where is the provision in the bill for hearing?

Mr. UDALL. Reference to the hearing is on page 5, bottom of the page, where the Postmaster General advises the mailer a request has been made to take him off the mailing list.

Mr. LINDSAY. There is no hearing provided.

Mr. UDALL. It is a hearing in the sense he is given an opportunity to answer the complaint.

Mr. LINDSAY. He gets a letter from the Postmaster saying "You have had it." That is all.

Mr. UDALL. Oh, no.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Is it not true that this lascivious matter is sent in sealed first-class envelopes only?

Mr. UDALL. That is primarily the way in which it is distributed.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Is it not fair to point out that second-class mail is not used to send out pornographic literature?

Mr. UDALL. It can be used, but most of it goes first class.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. The third-class mail can be opened by the Post Office. First-class mail is not.

Mr. UDALL. The gentleman has made a distinction that is important.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Would this extend to the control of the circulation of magazines, catalogs—particularly unsolicited catalogs?

Mr. UDALL. The bill applies to all classes of mail. I would make the point that in the case of second-class mail you get it only if you subscribe. Here you have the constitutional right to cancel your subscription.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. There are thousands of controlled magazines?

Mr. UDALL. Yes.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. It would apply to them?

Mr. UDALL. Yes.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. It would apply to unsolicited catalogs, would it not?

Mr. UDALL. All classes of mail covered by postal laws.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DENT. The gentleman from New York made a point which was valid when he said that you could turn off your radio if you saw or heard something you did not like, or that was obscene. I am sure that is true, because most of us did turn it off last week.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Arizona has expired.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Arizona 2 additional minutes.

Mr. DENT. In the valid part of the argument it was said you should not stop the sender, yet is it not true that my name, my address, my mail address, and my private property is the same as my garden? If my neighbor dumps garbage in my garden or on my property, I tell him to stop or I will call the police. Now, if someone wants to send garbage through the mails we ought to be able to stop it.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. COHELAN. I wish the gentleman would tell the Members of the House just exactly why this bill, with all of its complexities, is brought up under suspension of the rules.

Why could we not bring it up under a rule?

Mr. UDALL. The gentleman will have to refer that question to someone other than the gentleman from Arizona. I did not think there was any great opposition to this bill. It came out of our committee practically unanimously.

Mr. COHELAN. I do not think any Member of the House is opposed to the objectives of the committee, but it seems to me some very serious questions about constitutionality have been raised that might need refining in the legislative processes.

Mr. UDALL. I spent 2 years on this legislation, and I am satisfied with it. If the House is not, it has the right to vote it down.

Mr. COHELAN. The gentleman does not perceive there are any constitutional questions involved?

Mr. UDALL. Of course, there is always a constitutional question, but as a lawyer I am satisfied with this bill.

Mr. COHELAN. The gentleman is satisfied?

Mr. UDALL. Yes, I am.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I am surprised to hear some of those here today raising constitutional questions and worrying about complaints being filed, and the procedure for filing complaints. Where were these same people on the civil rights bill recently?

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to make the point that if this bill becomes law, the Members of the House of Representatives are going to spend a good deal of time in the courthouse defending themselves against charges of constituents that Members are sending and constituents are receiving mail that is "morally offensive." How to resolve this dilemma will be particularly difficult for those Members who persist in using "occupant" mail. Think of the spot they will be in. I do not like "occupant" mail and do not defend it, but do not Members who use a proper list have a right and obligation to keep their constituents informed, even those who do not agree with them? I wonder how Members will feel when they are taken to court when they persist in sending news reports from Capitol Hill to their constituents back home.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I want to emphasize that I think all Members are aware that there is a real problem involved in this matter of pornography that is sent through the mail and would like to do something about it. That is not the issue. If I thought, for example, this bill provided a practical way of getting at it and a constitutional way, I would have a different opinion. However, I do not; and therefore I am opposed to suspending the rules. I would say to the gentlemen I know on our side of the aisle who are proponents of the bill and have made some complaint that the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY], who has the time and is opposed is not yielding time to the proponents on our side. This is the trouble with bringing a bill out under suspension of the rules, where we have only 20 minutes on a side and also no amendments are permitted.

This is serious legislation and the committee's report recognizes it. I call your attention to the language that appears on page 2 of the committee report.

> Admittedly, the rights are in extremely delicate balance when weighed against each other in considering this proposed legislative enactment.

Let us have a debate. If the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL] has spent 2 years studying it, that deserves exposure. We want the benefit of his study in this area. This can only be done with full debate. I would like to see this bill come up under a regular rule so we can hear those who are for and those who are against it. Maybe the proponents can convince us that our fears of unconstitutionality are unfounded. I gain most of my fears from reading the reports of the Post Office and Justice Departments. The question of constitutionality has been raised, I might say to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS]. I am always concerned about constitutionality. I try to follow very closely any time a Member raises that question.

There is only one thing that protects the Constitution of the United States, when all is said and done, in what the House of Representatives or the Senate does, and that is our oath of office. We have to consider that carefully. It is not something to be passed on just to the courts. Certainly the courts may act upon it. But again there are many measures on which the courts are never called upon to pass judgment. But we have an obligation to ourselves to look into these matters and to make up our own minds as to the constitutionality.

I have here a letter from the American Civil Liberties Union addressed to me and I presume similar letters were sent to others, too. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include this letter at the conclusion of my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. In that letter some very pertinent points are made against this bill. Let me say that I do not always place great value in the views of the American Civil Liberties Union. However, regrettably it has been subject to unfortunate press reporting, just as many of us in Congress have experienced. When it defends Communists or attacks the House Un-American Activities Committee it gets a great press reception, but when it defends people identified with the right wing or criticizes executive agencies it receives short shrift.

The American Civil Liberties Union did stand up in the General Walker case, the Jimmy Hoffa case, and the steel pricing case to register strong protest against certain actions of the Attorney General. It did the same with the Kroger Bakery case where the Federal Trade Commission went beyond its powers, as it thought. There are just a few of the cases which come to my mind. So the American Civil Liberties Union does concern itself with things other than communism or cases before the Un-American Activities Committee. It is a respectable organization and its arguments and allegations merit consideration. I do not agree with all of the points made in this letter, but some seem well taken.

All I am urging is that this bill be brought up on the floor under a rule so the matter can be debated with proper deliberation. If the Members sponsoring it have enough confidence in its merits, I am sure they would want to provide for a full opportunity to discuss and debate it.

The issue is simple. Should we suspend the rules? I have so often said that the House must get back to orderly procedures of debate. Suspension of the rules serves a purpose on matters that are relatively simple—on matters on which there is not too much controversy. We can save time on such relatively simple and relatively noncontroversial matters, but certainly not on a matter such as this, which involves serious questions of constitutionality. It is particularly important not to pass measures by suspending the rules which bear attractive or popular labels and so lend themselves to demagoguery. Furthermore, I might say, there is a question of fiscal responsibility to be answered. The Post Office Department says, frankly, it will have to come in for further appropriations to enforce this bill. I urge my colleagues to vote against suspending the rules.

Mr. Speaker, the letter to which I referred is as follows:

Washington Office,
American Civil Liberties Union,
Washington, D.C., July 15, 1964.

The Honorable Thomas B. Curtis,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Curtis: As a nonpartisan organization whose sole function is the protection of the letter and spirit of the Bill of Rights, we write you to express our opposition to H.R. 319, which we understand will be brought up on Tuesday, July 21, 1964, under suspension of the rules.

The bill provides that any person may return to the Postmaster General mail matter which in that recipient's opinion is morally offensive, with the result that the Postmaster General notifies the sender not to send mail to such recipient or any child of his, except mail which he has solicited. Violation of this notice would result in the Postmaster General serving a complaint, with the Postmaster General thereafter being authorized to request the Attorney General, and the Attorney General being authorized to make application to a Federal court for an order directing compliance with the notice. The Federal court is then given jurisdiction to issue an order commanding compliance with the notice—and failure to obey such an order may be punished by the court as contempt thereof.

May we point out, under suspension of the rules, no amendments may be offered, and debate is limited to 20 minutes on each side of the question; this procedure certainly is an affront to proper debate which the House should enjoy, particularly on those measures which raise significant constitutional problems.

The committee report accompanying H.R. 319 (H. Rept. No. 1506) notes that "the bill is designed to stop repeated mailings of morally offensive material before they start, not to punish such mailings after they have occurred." Thus, the plain and admitted purpose of the proposed legislation is that of precensorship, to censor mail before it is even sent. Such a form of prior restraint on publications has always been condemned by the courts as an especially aggravating form of denial of freedom of speech. The peculiar vice of this particular prior restraint is that it would permit the stopping of all mailings from one source if but one mailing is found morally offensive by the recipient: thus, one who objected to being solicited for the purchase of, for example, "Fanny Hill" could stop that same publisher from later soliciting his purchase of the Bible, a pro-Goldwater or pro-Johnson book, or a news magazine—and from sending any communication to him whatsoever.

The committee report also indicates that the legislation is aimed at the suppression of "immoral and suggestive matter which, under court decisions, is not per se 'obscene.'" But the U.S. Supreme Court has told us under *Roth* v. *United States*, 354 U.S. 476, and again only the other day in *Jacobellis* v. *Ohio*, *—U.S.—* (June 22, 1964), that material which is not obscene enjoys the freedom of the press. Thus, this legislation is clearly aimed at material which enjoys constitutional protection of the freedom of the press.

The practical dangers of the bill equal its obvious constitutional defects. As a practical matter, this "every man his own censor" bill, by providing no standards whatsoever as to what is "morally offensive" and permitting each and every person in the United States to restrict mailers by making his own determination on moral offensiveness, might have the clear potential of paralyzing expression on the most important issues of our day. To a segregationist, literature of the NAACP or of CORE might be morally offensive, and such a person could effectively demand the stoppage of mailings to him by such organizations of materials clearly protected by the first amendment to the U.S. Constiution. Conversely, mailings from White Citizens Councils could be deemed morally offensive to those who sympathize with the NAACP. Mailings from the American Civil Liberties Union, mailings from Senator Barry Goldwater, mailings from Governor Scranton—to go to an extreme, even mailings from the Internal Revenue Service—might be deemed morally offensive to someone, and such senders would be put to the task of censoring their mailing list, at the risk of contempt convictions otherwise.

In truth, all great ideas have been morally offensive to someone. To use the full force of the Attorney General's office and the courts of the United States to protect individuals against mailings which they think might be morally offensive to them is to use the full force of the U.S. Government to protect individuals from materials they might conceivably be offended by. This is the very antithesis of the function of free speech in our society, which is to permit maximum exposure to all ideas and materials so that the truth may emerge from the battlefield of ideas.

If one finds mail material morally offensive, he need do no more than tear it up and throw it in his trash basket. If one is afraid of the effect of unsolicited materials upon his children, he need do no more than get his mail before the children receive it, or, if for some reason he cannot establish this or other discipline in his own home, he could always open a post office box. But to use the full force of the U.S. executive and judicial departments to stop a person from mailing any and all material to a recipient who has found one piece of such sender's material to be morally offensive, is to invite the Federal Government to traffic in the suppression of unpopular—but constitutionally protected—ideas and literature. Moreover, it would even permit a minority to help stop the circulation of ideas and reading materials which have met the acceptance of the majority.

In any event, the proposed legislation should, we believe, be rejected by the House of Representatives as a violation of the rule against prior restraints, because of its deleterious effect upon circulation of ideas and written materials, and as a travesty upon the right to freely circulate ideas and written materials having constitutional protection.

Sincerely yours,
Lawrence Speiser,
Director, Washington Office.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. Cunningham].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I have been a member of the Postal Operations Subcommittee for 8 years. I am the ranking minority member. For many of the 8 years, our very distinguished former colleague, Mrs. Granahan, was chairman of the subcommittee and the committee went around the country on investigations concerning obscenity. We held hearings and heard testimony and we know what this problem is. It is a very serious problem. Now under the very capable and energetic leadership of the gentleman from New York [Mr. Dulski], the committee has brought to you a piece of legislation that has been studied very carefully. It has been gone over very carefully with the Department of Justice and with the Post Office Department over a period of months. I might say that the Justice Department stated:

> However, the Department realizes that the Congress may desire to enact this bill and leave the constitutionality of it to the courts.

Well, I do not think we should pass or defeat a bill because we think it is or is not constitutional. That is up to the courts to decide. Neither do I think we should pass or defeat a bill because we think the President may veto it. We should use our judgment.

In all of these years, Mrs. Granahan and I, and now the gentleman from New York [Mr. Dulski], and the rest of our committee know that there are millions of American mothers and fathers who are terribly disturbed about the unsolicited dumping of this trash into the mail boxes of American homes.

This bill is based on the old English law that a man's home is his castle. You cannot come into my home unless I invite you or unless you have a search warrant. Neither shall you dump trash into my home through the mailbox which is a part of my home and an invasion of my privacy. Therefore, this is an effective remedy against these cheap filth peddlers and these cesspool racketeers who are invading the homes of America through the device of getting names from legitimate lists and then selling or renting them to some obscene mailer who uses some young teenager's name on that list to get this material into the homes.

Mr. Speaker, this is the only device that we will have for many, many years to come to stop this filth from coming into your home unsolicited. There is no censorship about this. There is no question in my mind about its constitutionality. So I say to you, literally millions of American mothers and fathers want this legislation. I am going to be proud to say that this Congress has lived up to its obligations and has done something about it. We have evidence all through the hearings, evidence from J. Edgar Hoover and from psychiatrists and from every person who knows something about juvenile delinquency that this is the type of tripe that is invading our homes and that this is a terrible problem that exists in the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROOSEVELT). The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I also wish to say that we are certainly not in any way wishing to harm the legitimate direct mail advertising people. There is nothing in the bill which would in any way harm legitimate mailings.

As a matter of fact, I have a statement from Mr. Harry J. Maginnis, president, Associated Third-Class Mail Users, 100 Indiana Avenue, Washington, D.C., which reads as follows:

> We have had a number of meetings with Congressman CUNNINGHAM to discuss H.R. 319. We recognize that he has the highest regard for the countless thousands of business firms which use the U.S. mails to advertise their products. All legitimate users of the mails are as concerned about the mail traffic in morally offensive products as Members of Congress. Congressman CUNNINGHAM feels that every obscene, lewd, lascivious, indecent, filthy, or vile article, matter, thing, device, or substance which is sent through the mail hurts the cause of the legitimate business mailer. So does this association.
>
> Many mailers feel that the language of H.R. 319 could be so construed by the Post Office Department, the Justice Department, and the courts as to encompass their perfectly proper advertising literature. We have been assured by Congressman CUNNINGHAM that this is the farthest thing from his mind and the thinking of the members of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee. Most mail patrons can be counted on to make a sound judgment as to the content of the mail he receives. If it is obscene, lewd, lascivious, indecent, or vile, adding up to being morally offensive, he should be entitled to file a complaint with established authority and to thus prevent the offender from sending similar mail matter to him in the future. H.R. 319 does not pretend to solve the overall problem of the illicit pornography trade. It is, however, a step in the right direction. It is designed to discourage the filth peddlers from using postal facilities for the transportation of their products. Should it be used as a weapon against legitimate direct mail advertising, we would then urge the Congress to take remedial steps to correct a great injustice.

All Members will remember the gracious lady from Pennsylvania, Congresswoman Granahan, who worked so hard and so long in this particular field. I went with her and with the committee, as I mentioned before, throughout the country, as the ranking minority member. We know what the problem is. Some speakers who have preceded me have not gone into this problem, but our committee has gone into it.

In my opinion, this will be the most effective piece of legislation to be enacted by this Congress in many a year. It will allow the homeowner to decide whether he wants obscenity dumped into his mailbox. That is the "guts" of this particular piece of legislation.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. COHELAN. I wonder if the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska, who worked so hard in this area and whose objectives are shared by the House, would tell us something about that portion of the bill which would cover material manifestly not obscene. How would we get at that problem? The gentleman says he is not opposed to direct mailings. What about clearly nonprurient, nonobscene material? How would we manage that area?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. The whole "guts" of this bill, I say to the gentleman from California, is to allow the mother and father in the home to decide whether it is obscene or not.

Mr. COHELAN. What the gentleman is saying is that the standard which is set for morally offensive material could include anything which any reasonable person would indicate was not obscene.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. That is not true at all. There are many safeguards in the bill. If someone objected to some particular advertisement in a mail-order catalog, he would not get anywhere, because the Postmaster General would decide whether it should be taken further. If he did decide that, the bill provides that the Justice Department would not be mandated to take it to court, but only that the Justice Department may.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON].

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the suspension of the rules.

Mr. Speaker, I must strenuously protest the procedure under which H.R. 319 is being presented here to the House of Representatives. This is a bill authorizing the censorship of mail, and fundamental constitutional rights of free speech are here involved.

Why should a bill of this significance be brought up under suspension of the rules, where debate is limited to 20 minutes on each side and no amendments permitted?

Why was the Rules Committee bypassed? Why are we not allowed to consider this bill under the customary procedure, with opportunity for full debate and amendment?

It seems to me that any bill which raises such grave constitutional issues should be most carefully examined. Prior restraints on free speech have been repeatedly condemned. This bill provides no test of the reasonableness of the censorship which would be involved. In effect, it allows any citizen to bring into play the power of the United States, to censor another citizen. Any law which can do that deserves searching scrutiny by this body.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that the rules not be suspended and that H.R. 319 not be approved.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I suppose if one is opposed to the bill H.R. 319 in its present form, or to the manner in which it is brought before the House today, he is "soft" on obscene literature or Communist literature. That is not the case with this individual, who happens to be very much opposed to both.

I am also opposed to Fascist, Nazi, and other types of subversive literature, but I am not afraid to read it.

I wonder, however, if it would not have been infinitely the more efficient and fair way to bring this to the floor under a rule which would have allowed a full debate and amendments.

I can think of almost innumerable instances in which great literature, great poetry, and great books would have been prohibited from the mails under this proposal. "The Canterbury Tales," for instance, the early Elizabethan plays, Robert Burns' ballads, and innumerable other works would be taboo. Today, to some people the Manion Forum perhaps would be offensive. It is to me, and yet it comes to my house. This is not the way to handle this problem. It is absurd to handle it in this way. Of course, it looks expedient and easy. You do not make it incumbent on any agency of the Government to do anything here except to support every individual's judgment. You say let 170 million censors exist. Is this a protection of the freedom of speech to which we are all entitled and of which we are so proud? I think not. This is an evasive way to attack the problem.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROOSEVELT). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 30 seconds.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. This is what appears to the sponsors, an easy and evasive way to get around the constitutional questions, but they have not succeeded, I am very much afraid. I am also afraid that my distinguished lawyer friend from Arizona [Mr. UDALL] is a bit wrong on his constitutional analysis. I urge the defeat of the bill and urge that it be brought back under regular procedures.

Mr. Speaker, as a matter of principle, I oppose censorship, for it is almost always oppressive and it presupposes that the people are ignorant. This legislation would be but the first step toward even more obnoxious laws in the future. Have our colleagues no more faith in the moral and intellectual fiber of our people than is represented in this proposal? Can it really be that receipt of obscene literature is a major cause of juvenile delinquency as the committee report says? I doubt it, but if I am wrong, the country is in a hell of a state—this is said before the bill becomes law, so I am safe.

Mr. Speaker, this is a well-intentioned bill, but of such questionable constitutionality that it should be defeated.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, a few moments ago the distinguished gentleman from Arizona [Mr. Udall] said there was nothing mandatory in this bill. I deeply respect the able gentleman, but I cannot see that he is right from a simple reading of the bill. The bill requires the Postmaster General to take action and thus put into motion the machinery of the Justice Department. The Federal Government then goes to work on the sender, be he a book publisher, a mail order house, or what. I have no particular hopes that those of us in opposition to this bill under this procedure are going to win—they say the bill is politically difficult to vote against—but I ask that the bill be defeated under this procedure calling for suspension of the rules.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Daniels].

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DANIELS. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. UDALL. I ask for this time for two purposes. I know, Mr. Speaker, a number of Members have asked to be heard and to extend their remarks in the Record on this legislation. I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. UDALL. Secondly, and I thank the gentleman for yielding to me, in response to the point just made by my friend from New York [Mr. Lindsay], the only place in this bill mandatory action is required is in the first instance, when I decide I do not want mail from this mailing list or this sender. I notify the Postmaster General, and then he must notify the sender not to send me any more mail, but beyond that in all subsequent proceedings and on all three different levels of procedure, by the Postmaster General, the Attorney General, and the court, it is entirely discretionary as to whether or not action is taken.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DANIELS. Yes. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LINDSAY. The answer to that is that if there is any violation of the notice, the Attorney General's department must go to work. It must uphold the law.

Mr. UDALL. He may or he may not.

Mr. LINDSAY. He must uphold the law. He cannot let it pass. But then if there is doubt, we should be able to argue over amendments. This bill should not pass on a gag rule that does not permit amendments.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, I decline to yield further.

Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in supporting H.R. 319 as amended. This legislation is the fifth in a series of legislative improvements in the postal and criminal statutes developed by the Postal Operations Subcommittee of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to aid in keeping obscenity and other unfit matter out of the U.S. mails. The earlier measures encountered substantially the same degree of opposition that has occurred during the consideration of H.R. 319. They have long since proved their value to the postal service and to the public. You may be interested to read the discussion concerning these measures as summarized on page 5 of the House Report No. 1506 accompanying H.R. 319.

The need for this legislation is obvious. Recognized authorities presented overwhelming evidence to our subcommittee that a multimillion dollar traffic in obscene and immoral products is still growing with much of it directed to the debasement of the morals of the very young and impressionable. This undesirable traffic continues to increase in spite of the increased and successful efforts of the Post Office Department and the Department of Justice in prosecuting the purveyors of this undesirable material under the postal and penal laws. However, the efforts under the existing laws are limited to the small area of material that comes within the legal definition of obscenity. Of equal or greater damage, particularly to children, is the immoral and suggestive matter which under court decisions is not per se "obscene."

This legislation proposes a workable solution to stop any morally offensive material from being delivered to any person's mailbox. It will allow any person to return to the Postmaster General mail which, in his opinion, is morally offensive and which is addressed to and received by him or his child. The Postmaster General will be required to notify the distributor to discontinue sending mail to him unless it is solicited. The legislation also prescribes a method of having the notice from the Postmaster General enforced by a court order if necessary.

The opponents of this legislation claim that it makes everybody a censor, that it tends to infringe on the constitutionally protected right of freedom of speech, and that it infringes on the constitutional right of due process.

There certainly can be no legitimate basis for the cry of censorship. The restriction under this legislation resulting from a request of a postal patron, at most, would apply to one addressee or to one family. There is no restriction whatever on the right of the public to have access to the material involved. The right of the public to receive the material remains inviolate. Under these circumstances there is no justification for contending that there would be censorship under this legislation.

The constitutional rights of freedom of the press and due process of law are always cited in opposition to proposed controls over offensive matter in the U.S. mails. These rights have not been overlooked. On the contrary, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and our subcommittee which considered this legislation have thoroughly scrutinized all aspects of the rights and liberties involved. We have analyzed the merits of each right in relation to the others with the greatest of care.

I am referring particularly to the members of the subcommittee which included four outstanding members of the bar—Mr. Udall, Mr. Nix, Mr. Johnson of Pennsylvania, and Mr. Ellsworth. I might also add that I have practiced law since 1930. The other Members of our subcommittee were Mr. Dulski, chairman, Mr. Roybal, Mr. Charles Wilson of California, Mr. Cunningham, Mr. Wallhauser, and Mr. Barry.

It is hard to believe that a prohibition to send mail matter to one person or one family, such as contemplated by this legislation, will violate the constitutionally guaranteed freedom of speech. Even if there is some degree of restriction, we are faced with a question whether the right of privacy of an addressee would balance the right of the distributor of freedom of speech or the right to distribute the mail matter to that particular addressee.

The constitutional right of due process is intended to be protected by the requirement for action by the court in contempt proceedings before the mailer is subject to any penalty.

Mr. Speaker, any questions on these matters are for the courts to decide. The need for a more effective tool to protect the right of a person to keep morally offensive material out of his mailbox far outweighs any assumption or threat of the proposal being unconstitutional.

This legislation in my opinion should have the highest priority. I earnestly hope it will have your approval.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the suspension of the rules and passage of this bill without any opportunity to amend it.

I believe that the individual's right of privacy includes the right to require the sender of unwelcome or undesired matter to refrain from sending it to him.

At the same time, that right does not privilege the recipient to brand the matter as "morally offensive." The Holy Testament might be termed morally offensive by Communists or atheists.

If I miscall a good piece of literature as obscene, I can be called to account in a court of law and made to respond in damages. This bill would cloak even my deliberately designed wrong with legality. We should not permit that.

If the bill sought to give the addressee the right to insist that a sender refrain from sending unsolicited matter for any reason whatsoever but without labeling it, I could support the legislation.

I urge that the bill be brought before the House under an open rule.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this legislation is to give every person served by the U.S. mails an effective and urgently needed means to prevent the forced entry into his mailbox or into the hands of his children of morally offensive matter sent through the U.S. mail.

It provides the homeowner with some protection against smut peddlers. Therefore, I give my wholehearted support to H.R. 319.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this legislation. This legislation with the proposed committee amendments is designed to protect our homes and children from those people who utilize postal patron type of mailings in not only first class, but in other classifications of our mails to disseminate filth and subversion.

Pornography, obscene material, and Communist propaganda can be easily dumped into the households of America without much opportunity on the part of the householder to strike back. Should someone dump garbage on our lawn, we have an easy remedy to prosecute him for this offense. However, if garbage is dumped in our mailboxes, we are powerless to retaliate. Through this bill we will have a remedy to strike back at the offender.

There is a belief that sufficient legislation is now in force to regulate the mailing of obscene material. This bill will add strength to that belief.

In conclusion, I would want to caution and make crystal clear that I in no way want to see unnecessary censorship imposed in any way, shape or form in this country. However, we must exercise our responsibility to protect the public and to insure that our existing laws, as well as this one, are properly funded to make more vigorous enforcement possible as well as greater penalties for offenses. I would also urge State and local organizations, both public and private, to continue and increase their efforts in this area.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 319. I have long been interested in protecting our citizens from the barrage of obscene literature which flows through our mails. In the 86th Congress I cosponsored legislation which subsequently became law and was also aimed at this same problem; however, the increased appearance of morally offensive matter has made even stronger sanctions necessary.

The present legislation allows any person who has received any unsolicited, morally offensive matter to return it with a request to the Postmaster General who, acting upon the request, will direct the sender to discontinue such mailing within 30 days. If this order is violated, the Postmaster General is empowered to seek a court order commanding compliance with this notice.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of this legislation in order to protect our postal patrons by putting some new teeth in our mailing laws.

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, there are many people making a business of selling pornographic filth through the mails. While many try to label their obnoxious business as being related to art, literature, education, or culture, they are only interested in making a profit for themselves by appealing to the young or those with low ideals. The ability to force this material, and advertisements about it, into the home lowers the moral fiber of the Nation and violates the time-honored right of an individual to a clean mailbox.

These peddlers of filth seek primarily the patronage of our young people. Law enforcement officers, the Director of the FBI, as well as church, business and youth leaders have all testified that the wide distribution of this immoral literature is a major factor in the frightening growth of juvenile delinquency throughout the United States.

There can be little doubt that the unrestricted use of the U.S. postal service makes possible a great portion of this evil business.

We must be careful not to violate the citizens' right to use our mails, nor to attempt to censor every piece of mail. By passing H.R. 319 we will at least make it possible for a citizen to have some recourse when he receives an unwanted flow of offensive mailing pieces.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I am most pleased to support H.R. 319, a bill to protect postal patrons from morally offensive mail matter. And it is hoped that all Members will support this legislation which, in effect, can close one more door against the filth peddlers who would corrupt our youth for a few pieces of gold.

I have long been concerned with the problem of effectively stopping the deluge of obscene and pornographic material that floods the country daily, and have on numerous occasions introduced legislation aimed at solving this problem.

It is recognized by authorities that existing law has not stopped this traffic, that the multimillion-dollar business in obscene and immoral products is still growing, with too much of it directed at the very young who are not yet mentally equipped to evaluate the moral content of such literature. Our respected Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation has officially tied this filthy commerce to the frightening growth of juvenile delinquency.

This bill before us will furnish an additional weapon in the fight against this corrupting influence by giving the recipients of such material a chance to strike back. Once morally offensive mail was received in a household, this bill would give the individual or his parents the legal right of stopping further mailings.

All of us have the legal right to stop undesirable people from entering our homes, and this bill would give American families a tool to use in making sure their privacy was not being invaded through the letter slot in the door.

There is a critical need for added public protection against the dispensers of filth. H.R. 319 takes us a step closer to reversing the tide.

While I have a bill of my own that proposes a somewhat different approach, I am happy to support this bill.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 319 because I am deeply concerned, as are many of the constituents in my district, about the insidious attempt on the part of a few unscrupulous operators who attempt to make profit at the expense of the morals of this Nation's youth. I would have preferred to have had this bill brought before the House with a rule granting opportunity for thorough debate and amendment but since it is evident that it is highly improbable that any action to correct this present abuse of flooding our homes with literature offensive to us—literature we do not seek or do not want—I am supporting this bill at this time.

The bill properly does two things: First, it preserves the rights of those who are recipients of literature offensive to them to stop the invasion of their homes with such literature at its source. The right to keep one's home safe from those who would vandalize valuable possessions is a right which is previous to all. In my mind it is equally important that a right to protect one's family from intruders whose mission it is to corrupt the minds and morals of our children—our most precious of all possessions—is equally precious. Second, this bill places responsibility for censorship where it belongs—in the hands of the recipient of the offensive literature. It does not involve a third party whose responsibility it is to serve the public and not to be a judge of public morals.

This legislation is a step in the right direction. It is a proper beginning. I am confident it will be an effective step that will lead to the adequate protection of those who through the years have sought such protection without denying the freedom of others.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 319 and urge its passage.

This bill affords protection to the individual against offensive trespass by mail on the moral standards of his own home.

It is as simple a device and as rightful a remedy as the lock on your front door.

If a parent or other individual has the right to bar his home to a depraved or perverted outsider it follows that he has a similar right to bar his mail slot to the cause, effect, and product of perversion and depravity.

No mailer has the right to dump unsolicited garbage and filth in the doorway of another man's home.

This bill provides a simple procedure to prevent such deposits of dirt. The offended addressee on behalf of himself and his minor children requests the Department to notify the sender to discontinue such mailings.

The sender is requested to comply with such notice. If he fails to do so, at the request of the Postmaster General the Department of Justice may move for an order in the U.S. district court forcing compliance.

Failure to obey the order would be punishable by contempt after trial and hearing under the usual procedure in Federal cases. The procedure involves no great hardship upon the mailer since his only prospective loss is the use of the nameplate of the addressee.

Since the addressee by rejection of the solicitation has already indicated that the mailed matter is unwanted or unwelcome no prospective loss is involved.

More than this, since this is an individual act of addressee versus mailer it involves no suppression, censorship, or mass mandate over the mailer's publication or communication.

The rationale of the bill is simple. It recognizes the right of the parent to protect his home, family, and especially minor children against postal pollution.

It is not an infringement upon freedom but a balancing of the privilege of mailing with the right to receive or refuse offensive material.

It is true that the addressee enlists the aid of postal authorities in invoking his right but this is neither a great burden nor a novel precedent.

A man can exercise his right to clean air by enlisting Federal, State, and local aid against pollution of the atmosphere.

A man can assert his right to pure water by enjoining another with aid of the Federal and State Government from polluting his supply from a point upstream.

A man can protect the wholesome quality of his food and the potency of his medicine by enlisting the aid of Government through inspection, labeling, and testing of products and ingredients.

Why then, Mr. Speaker, cannot a man enlist the appropriate offices of his Government in a defense of his home against the demonstrated danger of offensive mail.

In the words of the president of the National Association of Letter Carriers, Jerome J. Keating:

> We believe that the youth of America are entitled to sunshine in their formative years rather than the slimy material that is furtively sent to them. The youth of America are entitled to a clean, wholesome outlook on life. We cannot expect to develop healthy attitudes in sordid surroundings. We should encourage, for the youth of America, wholesome, youthful activities. Peddling of licentious, obscene trash is defended by many on the grounds that it is realism. Garbage is real, too, but we don't feed it to our children or park it in our living room. There must be some way to prevent the purveyors of filth from forcing their wares upon innocent victims. We know the dangers of censorship and the need for free speech. We believe in freedom of thought; however, there is such a thing as licentiousness. There are certain businesses that are prohibited by law and their counterparts in literature should likewise be restrained.

I am aware that the opponents of this bill will cry that this involves an act of personal censorship. Is not each of us now a personal censor as to his own appetite, likes, and habits?

How is it censorship if one man notifies another that he personally wants no further communication from him without regard to his rights?

Is it censorship to hang up the receiver on an obscene telephone call, or to have an unlisted number to avoid annoyances? Is it censorship to close one's window to shut out a braying loudspeaker in a political campaign?

Is it censorship to refuse a piece of mail by marking it "return to sender"?

I am not overly excited about the difficulty or practicality of enforcement of this statute.

For years we have had a statute prohibiting the distribution of fraudulent or lottery matter—and I confess I don't know why the two are joined—under section 4005, chapter 51, section 39, United States Code.

This has presented no great hardship to enforcement authorities.

If the eagle eye of the postal authorities has been able to detect and deter lotteries, why is it such a hardship to ask such authorities to put a stop to licentious letters.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I want to suggest a possible alternative in extension and improvement of this bill which I suggested to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DULSKI], the author of the bill, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CUNNINGHAM], and other members.

I pointed out that a way to overcome some of the objections raised by the Postmaster General and the Department of Justice was by way of a statutory civil action for injunction and/or damages by the addressee against a mailer.

This would allow for a confrontation of the two and after a showing of injury by one and due process to the other, a civil remedy in damages would lie. By statute, such damages could be trebled as a deterrent to a persistent or recurrent offender.

Such statutory damages already lie, for instance, in actions for restraint of trade in interstate commerce.

A similar remedy in our postal law would allow a parent or other plaintiff to hit the incorrigible mailer of filth in the pocketbook.

There is no question that huge profits are involved in smut mail. These would be short lived if parties whose children were tainted by this filth could respond in an action for damages.

I hope that the committee in its further deliberations will consider this line of attack and I regret that under the procedure we are following today that such an amendment is not possible.

In closing, I want to commend the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DULSKI], and the author of the bill, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CUNNINGHAM], for their diligent and devoted effort in this legislation.

That this legislation is needed and timely is established by the statement in the committee report as follows:

> CRITICAL NEED FOR PUBLIC PROTECTION
>
> Recognized authorities have presented to the committee overwhelming evidence that a multimillion-dollar traffic in obscene and immoral products is still growing, with much of it directed to debasement of the morals of the very young and impressionable. The Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation has officially reported that this filthy commerce is a major factor in the frightening growth of juvenile delinquency. His judgment is strongly supported by other law enforcement officers and by church, lay, business, and youth leaders who speak from practical experience in this area. It is a sad commentary on the moral climate of America that this societal cancer continues to flourish, notwithstanding the existence of deterrent penal and civil statutes. The muck merchants thinly disguise their products as "art" or "literature" or "culture" or "education," and their well-paid lawyers make sure that they have more than full protection of the Constitution. In truth, their sole purpose is to obtain a quick profit, without regard to the public interest and the damaging consequences that result from dissemination of such material.
>
> In principle, at least, dealings in obscenity and pornography always have been illegal and contrary to the moral, ethical and social standards of the United States. But in recent years long-standing laws on the subject have been attacked with such arrogance and cunning that their protective value has been seriously impaired. Even the recently enacted postal obscenity laws discussed later have provided only partial public protection. While so-called hard-core obscenity and pornography mailers can be successfully prosecuted under penal statutes, the public now is confronted by the possibility of equal or greater damage from the "gray areas" of indecent and offcolor mailings.

Mr. Speaker, freedom of speech, of publication, of expression is worthy of our viligant devotion. Part of that devotion is to secure the true freedom from its abuse by those who would enslave the mind of the young to the narcotic effect of aberrations in the name of worthless, artless, disgusting license.

Let us clear the air for freedom by cleaning the mailbox of a decent home.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I find nothing in this bill to justify the fears of some of my colleagues and friends with whom I am frequently in agreement. I can see no trespass upon civil rights in a bill that gives a decent father and mother the power of effective protest when an unwelcome peddler of indecency invades through the mails the sanctity of their home. No one questions the right of the law to step in when unwanted and uninvited persons pile garbage in another's parlor. It is difficult for me to draw a line of distinction between the vendor of filth and smut who comes without invitation into another's home by the door or by the mail.

I see nothing in this bill to justify the fears that in some manner it will contribute to a censorship that will cripple the individual's exercise of his right of self-determination of the books and written papers of his own choosing.

I respect the earnestness and sincerity of the opponents of the measure, but I think in this instance they are overstraining themselves. All that this bill does, and I have read it several times, is to give the householder some means of stopping the flow of mail into his home that he does not want and which in his judgment is unfit for the members of his family to read. This is not censorship except in the proper and usual parent and child relationship. The parent writes to the postmaster that he does not wish to receive further mailings from the stated source, and the postmaster thereupon requests the sender to desist. At no stage is there raised the question of the actual character of the mail matter or a determination of its morality and propriety or its unfitness. If this power were given I would have serious doubts and certainly would insist on the fullest protection of judicial hearings. But such is not the case.

Frankly, I do not know how well the law will work. I imagine many persons will have mailings stopped for other than reasons of morality. Conceivably the expense to the Post Office Department can soar. But, Mr. Speaker, I think it is a start, a safe and sound start, without infringement on individual rights and without imposition of unwholesome censorship, on a crusade for decency and cleanliness that is long overdue. I commend the good work in a good cause of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CUNNINGHAM], the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL], and the chairman and members of the great Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I agree with and support the basic objective of this bill. I agree with the committee that a person should be able to protect himself and his family from receiving mail which he believes is obscenely and morally offensive and which he does not want in his house.

But I do disagree, and disagree strongly, with the manner in which this bill is being presented and considered today. This bill raises several serious and complicated questions, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY] has pointed out, which call for thorough debate, for clarification, and for amendment.

Yet today, under suspension of the rules, with only 20 minutes of debate permitted for each side of the question, and with no provision for amendment, we are denied these essential elements of adequate legislative consideration.

Mr. Speaker, in his report to the committee, the General Counsel of the Post Office Department, the very Department which would administer this bill if it were made law, recommended against its enactment.

And the Department of Justice, in a lengthy analysis, emphasized that the bill raised "grave constitutional questions."

With such significant reservations and opposition, I strongly suggest that the House should not pass this bill today under the limiting procedures of suspension. Rather, in the interest of effective, fully constitutional legislation, I urge that it be rejected so that at a later date the House may give it the full and careful scrutiny which a measure of this magnitude warrants.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I believe we would be unwise to suspend the rules and with only 40 minutes of debate pass this new restriction on the use of the mails.

At the outset, Mr. Speaker, I concur with those who find extremely distasteful some of the material which is mailed into the homes of our people, just as I find distasteful some material which is distributed covertly, or sold openly on our newsstands and in other places of business. I am referring to material which is obscene. Such material has no constitutional protection, and the mailing of such material is already a Federal offense.

The objections of the U.S. Attorney General to many features of this bill carry great weight with me. I have heard no adequate explanations of the problems he raises.

I quote from the June 3, 1964, letter from the U.S. Department of Justice to the chairman of the committee:

> The bill evidently contemplates that proceedings will be brought to restrict the mailing of any matter if the addressee has determined, in his subjective opinion, that a prior mailing by the same sender is "morally offensive." Its procedures could be set in motion by an addressee's objection to a solicitation for contributions to a cause with which the addressee was out of sympathy—to a religious tract or circular, or to political literature, including reprints of speeches in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, to give some examples. Moreover, the testimony before the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service as to the way in which large mailings are carried out indicates that the practical effect of an order, or a number of orders, issued under the bill, may be not only to prohibit mailings to the objecting addressee but to impede the dissemination of written matter to others who have not objected. This effect of the bill is heightened by the fact that it appears on its face to authorize contempt proceedings for any "failure to obey" an order, regardless of whether it was willful or inadvertent.
>
> It is the view of the Department of Justice that this bill raises grave constitutional questions and, accordingly, it is unable to recommend the enactment of this legislation.

These are strong objections from the Attorney General's office. We ought not to rush through such a novel approach in American jurisprudence under a suspension of the rules of the House.

The objections of the Post Office Department to this bill are equally persuasive:

> In addition to the constitutional and legal issues which the legislation would leave unsettled, and the additional burdens imposed, the Department at this time is also unable to determine the costs involved should the program be initiated. "It is entirely possible that, because of our presently restricted budgetary requirements, any sizable increase in the development of the program might necessitate a request by the Department for supplemental funds." For these reasons, we are unable to recommend enactment of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that this bill should not be passed until the serious objections as to its constitutionality and the cost and difficulty of administering the new law can be determined.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, I have studied the pending bill, H.R. 319, and the committee report very carefully, and in my judgment it would do no more or no less than what is claimed for it: that is, provide a simple and effective means for people to protect themselves against the intrusion of mail matter which they consider to be morally offensive.

I have also carefully considered the few objections which I have seen raised against the bill, and I do not believe—in spite of the obvious sincerity of the objectors—that they are soundly grounded. There is nothing in this legislation that smacks of censorship. There is nothing that would inhibit or interfere with the free circulation of ideas or of published material. There is nothing, so far as I can see, that would jeopardize the constitutional protection of free speech or freedom of the press. There is nothing here that would contradict established principles of constitutional law as enunciated by the Supreme Court. Nor is there anything in the pending bill which would impose unreasonable burdens or restraints upon those who use the mails for commercial, political, or other purposes.

The basic premise of this bill, Mr. Speaker, is unobjectionable. It implies that people have a right to refuse certain mail, just as they have a right to turn off their television or radio sets, or refuse to patronize theaters, bookstores, or other establishments, or refrain from reading certain newspapers or magazines, because of whatever they may find there that is morally objectionable to them. These are personal judgments which people have a right and a responsibility to make for themselves. They also have a right to act on those judgments, so long as they do not interfere with the equal rights of others in doing so. This bill would implement that right with regard to matter received in the mail, and thus it would protect our right to privacy and our freedom of choice.

Without this bill, Mr. Speaker, the U.S. mails would remain the principal medium of communication from which individual persons are unable to protect themselves against the intrusion of morally objectionable matter. As I have suggested, if a person finds that a particular radio or television station, theater, newsstand, magazine, or other purveyor of information or ideas has offended his sense of moral probity, he can simply stay away from the offending medium. He cannot do so, at present, in the case of mail. Since a great deal of the most offensive mail arrives in plain envelopes or other unmarked covers, thereby effectively obscuring the origin of the mail, the recipient cannot even identify it as offensive until he opens it and is exposed to its offensive character. No one is forced to attend a movie, read a magazine, or watch a television program until the offending material actually reaches his eyes; no one should be forced to accept offending material through the mails.

I must respectfully disagree, Mr. Speaker, with those who characterize such an exercise of judgment or choice as "prior restraint" or "precensorship" or the "antithesis of free speech." I believe as deeply as anyone in permitting maximum exposure to all ideas and materials so that the truth may emerge from the resulting competition. But I insist there is a distinction between permitting or encouraging or making available such ideas and materials, on the one hand, and forcing or imposing those ideas and materials on people who have found them objectionable and freely chosen to reject them. I shall defend the former even while I oppose the latter.

The bill before us respects this distinction. It would do nothing to impede, restrain, discourage or otherwise hamper the availability or circulation of constitutionally protected ideas and materials. Under this bill, one man's exercise of his right to refuse objectionable mailings would have no adverse effect on his neighbor's equal right to receive anything and everything addressed to him through the mail. One man's private judgment that certain material is morally objectionable would remain just that—a private judgment having no force or effect upon anyone else. Neither the Government nor the publisher or the mailer of the objectionable material would be required to accept this judgment as of general validity; they would be required only to respect the complainant's freedom of choice and his right to privacy.

If this is censorship, Mr. Speaker, it is a pretty harmless variety. "Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary," second edition, 1956, defines censorship as "One. The office or power of a censor. Second. The action of a censor." And censor is defined as:

> 1. Antiq. One of two magistrates of Rome who took the census and became overseers of morals and conduct. 2. One who acts as an overseer of morals and conduct; esp: (a) An official empowered to examine written or printed matter, motion pictures, etc., in order to forbid publication if objectionable. (b) An official or a military officer charged in time of war with examining letters, printed matter, etc., in order to delete or suppress anything that might aid the enemy, injure discipline or morale, etc. 3. A faultfinder; adverse critic.

It should be clear that this bill establishes no offices of a censor, empowers no official or private person to act as an overseer of morals and conduct other than for himself, nor authorizes anyone to examine written or printed matter, motion pictures, etc., in order to forbid publication if objectionable. At worst, the person who refuses to accept offensive mail could be termed a censor only in the sense of faultfinder or adverse critic, and who would deny anyone's right to be a critic.

As this bill is written, Mr. Speaker, the absence of standards by which to determine what is "morally offensive" is a strength rather than a weakness. So long as the judgment is a purely private one and has no direct or indirect effect on the judgment or standards or values of another, then the standard should remain personal and private. Indeed, if the bill in fact established standards of decency or morality, Congress would be in the questionable position of imposing common standards on all our people, without regard to differences in education, background, taste, and values. In such an event, Congress would be establishing itself as the Nation's censor, or delegating such authority to the Post Office Department or to the Attorney General. I much prefer the arrangement proposed by the bill where, if each man is his own censor, he cannot impose censorship on others.

Two other points should be mentioned, Mr. Speaker, the effect of the bill on mailers and the enforcement authority given to Government agencies and the courts. So far as I can determine, the only burden mailers would face as a result of this bill would be the need to keep their mailing lists in reasonably up-to-date condition, at least to the extent of removing the names of those who have objected to continued mailings. This may be a nuisance and perhaps something of an added expense in certain cases, but it seems to me a reasonable burden.

The use of the mails for mass distribution of material to the general public should certainly involve some responsibility. In the past, Congress has decided that such mailings must be directed to a particular address and has specifically prohibited the use of unaddressed "junk" mail. This decision may have been a costly one to some mailers but it was a reasonable one. So, I believe, is the provision in the bill requiring mailers to stop sending mail to recipients who object and who follow the procedures outlined in the bill. Many of our colleagues, Mr. Speaker, maintain mailing lists of varying sizes and I suspect that those of us who receive requests from constituents to remove their names comply rather expeditiously—simply as a matter of good public relations. I do not believe, therefore, that the burden is an intolerable one.

In this connection, it is worth observing that the bill grants discretion to the Postmaster General and to the Attorney General in carrying out their responsibilities. While the Postmaster General must notify the sender to stop sending unsolicited mail to an addressee who makes such a request, he is authorized rather than directed to pursue violations of the notification. The Attorney General is provided similar authority. In both cases, therefore, enforcement would not be blind and automatic, but would undoubtedly be tempered by recognition of the realities and concern for the equities of particular situations. Those who violated the law intentionally could be treated differently than those who did so by mistake.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, this bill attacks a serious problem—the matter of the multimillion-dollar traffic in obscene materials through the mails—in a way that effectively harmonizes the rights of the individual with those of society in general. I hope the bill will be approved.

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to support this much-needed and important legislation.

Recently I received the following letter from a constituent:

> Representative Ralph R. Harding,
> *Blackfoot, Idaho.*
>
> Dear Representative Harding: The enclosed is an example of the type of mail of which we are lately beseiged.
>
> This example was addressed to my 16-year-old daughter.
>
> I consider this highly improper and anything you can do to limit or eliminate this type of trash mail will be greatly appreciated.
>
> Respectfully yours,
> John W. Wilderman.
>
> Sun Valley, Idaho.

I forwarded this letter with the enclosures which this understandably irate parent considered highly improper trash mail to be addressed to his 16-year-old daughter to both the Post Office Department and the Department of Justice.

I received back sympathetic letters to the effect that under the law there is presently no corrective action that can be taken. However, under this legislation today, as has been pointed out by the gentleman from Arizona, [Mr. Udall] and the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. Cunningham], the parent would be able to file a complaint with the Postmaster General and the sender would be required to remove this family's name from his mailing list or face the consequences.

I fully support this legislation as needed to assist parents who are attempting to raise families in an atmosphere of righteousness and correct moral principles to prevent this unwanted invasion of pornographic, immoral literature.

Mr. Speaker, I firmly believe that one of the greatest threats that America is facing today is the threat of immorality and the accompanying loosening and destruction of family ties and the accompanying crime which it brings with it.

Every blow that we can strike against this evil is in the best interest of a stronger and a better America.

Therefore, I am proud to strongly support H.R. 319 to protect postal patrons from morally offensive mail matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Roosevelt). The question is, Will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 319, as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and forty-two Members are present, not a quorum.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 326, nays 19, not voting 87, as follows:

[Roll No. 184]

YEAS—326

Abbitt
Abele
Abernethy
Adair
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson
Andrews, N. Dak.
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Aspinall
Auchincloss
Ayres
Baker
Baldwin
Barrett
Bates
Becker
Beckworth
Beermann
Belcher
Bell
Bennett, Fla.
Berry
Betts
Boggs
Boland
Bolton, Frances P.
Bolton, Oliver P.
Bonner
Bow
Brademas
Bray
Bromwell
Brooks
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Bruce
Burke
Burleson
Burton, Utah
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Cameron
Carey
Casey
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Chenoweth
Clancy
Clark
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Collier
Colmer
Conte
Corbett
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtin
Daddario
Dague
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Derounian
Derwinski
Devine
Dole
Donohue
Dorn
Dowdy
Downing
Dulski
Duncan
Edmondson
Elliott
Ellsworth
Everett
Fallon
Fascell
Findley
Finnegan
Fisher
Flood
Fogarty
Ford
Forrester
Fountain
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gary
Gathings
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gonzalez
Grant
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffin
Gross
Grover
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Harding
Hardy
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Hays
Hechler
Henderson
Hoeven
Holifield
Holland
Horan
Horton
Hosmer
Huddleston
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jarman
Jennings

Jensen
Joelson
Johansen
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Pa.
Johnson, Wis.
Jonas
Jones, Mo.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Keith
Kelly
Keogh
King, N.Y.
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Kunkel
Kyl
Landrum
Langen
Latta
Leggett
Lennon
Lesinski
Libonati
Long, Md.
McClory
McCulloch
McDade
McDowell
McFall
McIntire
McLoskey
McMillan
Macdonald
MacGregor
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin, Nebr.
Matthews
May
Michel
Milliken
Mills
Minish
Minshall
Monagan
Montoya
Morgan
Morris
Morse
Moss
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen

Nix
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill
Osmers
Ostertag
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pike
Pillion
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Pool
Price
Quillen
Reid, Ill.
Reifel
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Rich
Riehlman
Rivers, Alaska
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts, Ala.
Roberts, Tex.
Rodino
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rostenkowski
Roudebush
Roush
Rumsfeld
St. George
St. Onge
Saylor
Schadeberg
Schenck
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Schwengel
Scott
Secrest
Selden
Sheppard
Shipley
Short
Shriver
Sibal
Sikes

Siler
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Smith, Va.
Snyder
Springer
Staebler
Stafford
Staggers
Steed
Stephens
Stinson
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Taft
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Tollefson
Trimble
Tuck
Tupper
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Utt
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Van Pelt
Vinson
Waggonner
Watson
Watts
Weaver
Weltner
Westland
Whalley
Wharton
Whitener
Whitten
Wickersham
Widnall
Williams
Willis
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.
Wilson, Ind.
Winstead
Wright
Wydler
Wyman
Young
Younger
Zablocki

NAYS—19

Brown, Calif.
Burton, Calif.
Celler
Cohelan
Curtis
Edwards
Farbstein

Fraser
Gilbert
Hawkins
Lindsay
Mathias
Matsunaga
Multer

Roosevelt
Rosenthal
Ryan, N.Y.
Sickles
Thompson, N.J.

NOT VOTING—87

Alger
Andrews, Ala.
Ashley
Avery
Baring
Barry
Bass
Battin
Bennett, Mich.
Blatnik
Bolling
Brock
Buckley
Burkhalter
Chelf
Clausen, Don H.
Cooley
Corman
Diggs
Dingell
Dwyer
Evins
Feighan
Fino
Flynt
Foreman
Gill
Glenn

Goodell
Goodling
Grabowski
Griffiths
Gubser
Gurney
Halpern
Hanna
Hansen
Harris
Harvey, Mich.
Healey
Hébert
Herlong
Hoffman
Hull
Jones, Ala.
Kee
Kilburn
Kilgore
King, Calif.
Knox
Laird
Lankford
Lipscomb
Lloyd
Long, La.
Martin, Calif.
Martin, Mass.

Meader
Miller, Calif.
Miller, N.Y.
Moore
Moorhead
Morrison
Morton
Mosher
Norblad
Pilcher
Powell
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Rains
Randall
Reid, N.Y.
Robison
Rogers, Colo.
Roybal
Ryan, Mich.
St Germain
Senner
Skubitz
Thomas
Thompson, La.
Toll
Wallhauser
White

So, two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Robison.
Mr. White with Mr. Norblad.
Mr. King of California with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. Cooley with Mr. Alger.
Mr. Toll with Mr. Foreman.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Skubitz.
Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Lipscomb.
Mr. Feighan with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Barry.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Laird.
Mr. Pucinski with Mr. Martin of California.
Mr. Grabowski with Mr. Battin.
Mr. Gill with Mr. Fino.
Mr. Thomas with Mr. Glenn.
Mr. Blatnik with Mrs. Dwyer.
Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Brock.
Mr. Moorhead with Mr. Miller of New York.
Mr. Chelf with Mr. Morton.
Mr. Rogers of Colorado with Mr. Don Clausen.
Mr. Corman with Mr. Wallhauser.
Mr. Ashley with Mr. Goodell.
Mr. Andrews of Alabama with Mr. Knox.
Mr. Hull with Mr. Harvey of Michigan.
Mr. Healey with Mr. Gurney.
Mr. Randall with Mr. Quie.
Mr. St Germain with Mr. Reid of New York.
Mr. Baring with Mr. Goodling.
Mr. Flynt with Mr. Mosher.
Mr. Harris with Mr. Gubser.
Mr. Evins with Mr. Moore.
Mr. Hanna with Mr. Bennett of Michigan.
Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. Meader.
Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. Hoffman.
Mrs. Hansen with Mr. Avery.
Mr. Roybal with Mrs. Kee.
Mr. Senner with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. Herlong with Mr. Ryan of Michigan.
Mr. Rains with Mr. Frankford.
Mr. Burkhalter with Mr. Powell.
Mr. Purcell with Mr. Pilcher.
Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Kilgore.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to protect postal patrons from morally offensive mail matter."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 11865, TO INCREASE BENEFITS UNDER THE FEDERAL OLD-AGE, SURVIVORS, AND DISABILITY INSURANCE SYSTEM, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. SISK, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 802, Rept. No. 1557) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11865) to increase benefits under the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system, to provide child's insurance benefits beyond age 18 while in school, to provide widow's benefits at age 60 on a reduced basis, to provide benefits for certain individuals not otherwise eligible at age 72, to improve the actuarial status of the trust funds, to extend coverage, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed five hours, the bill shall be considered as having been read for amendment. No amendment shall be in order to said bill except amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means, and said amendments shall be in order, any rule of the House to the contrary notwithstanding. Amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means may be offered to any section of the bill at the conclusion of the general debate, but said amendments shall not be subject to amendment. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

N. M. BENTLEY AND GEORGE MARKWALTER

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return for consideration to Private Calendar No. 409, the bill (H.R. 7823) granting jurisdiction to the Court of Claims to render judgment on certain claims of N. M. Bentley against the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding any statute of limitations or administrative determination, jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment for any amount found to be legally or equitably due upon the claims of N. M. Bentley and George Markwalter, jointly, who compose a copartnership under the name and style N. M. Bentley of Macon, Georgia, against the United States for losses, if any, incurred in the performance of contract numbered AF–09(603)–25991 with the United States of America (Robins Air Force Base, Georgia). Such suit shall be instituted within six months after the date of the enactment of this Act: *Provided,* That the procedure for the determination of such claims, and review thereof, and payment thereon, shall be the same as in the case of claims over which the Court of Claims has jurisdiction as now provided by law.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING THE ALASKA OMNIBUS ACT TO PROVIDE ASSISTANCE TO THE STATE OF ALASKA FOR THE RECONSTRUCTION OF AREAS DAMAGED BY THE EARTHQUAKE OF MARCH 1964 AND SUBSEQUENT SEISMIC WAVES

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 11438) to amend the Alaska Omnibus Act to provide assistance to the State of Alaska for the reconstruction of areas damaged by the earthquake of March 1964 and subsequent seismic waves, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "1964 Amendments to the Alaska Omnibus Act".

Sec. 2. The Congress hereby recognizes that the State of Alaska has experienced extensive property loss and damage as a result of the earthquake of March 27, 1964, and subsequent seismic waves, and declares the need for special measures designed to aid and accelerate the State's efforts in providing for the reconstruction of the areas in the State devastated by this natural disaster.

Sec. 3. Section 21 of the Alaska Omnibus Act (73 Stat. 145) is amended by adding a new subsection (f) to read as follows:

"(f) Notwithstanding the limitation contained in subsection (f) of section 120 of title 23, United States Code, the Secretary of Commerce is authorized to make expenditures from the emergency fund under section 125 of such title for the repair or reconstruction of highways on the Federal-aid highway systems of Alaska which have been damaged or destroyed by the 1964 earthquake and subsequent seismic waves, in accordance with the Federal share payable under subsection (a) of section 120 of such title. The increase in expenditures resulting from the difference between the Federal share authorized by this subsection and that authorized by subsection (f) of section 120 of such title shall be reimbursed to the emergency fund by an appropriation from the general fund of the Treasury: *Provided,* That such increase in expenditures shall not exceed $15,000,000 in the aggregate."

Sec. 4. The Alaska Omnibus Act (73 Stat. 141) is amended by adding the following new sections at the end of section 50 thereof:

"NEW FEDERAL LOAN ADJUSTMENTS

"Sec. 51. (a) The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to compromise or release such portion of a borrower's indebtedness under programs administered by the Farmers Home Administration in Alaska as he finds necessary because of loss resulting from the 1964 earthquake and subsequent seismic waves, and he may refinance outstanding indebtedness of applicants in Alaska for loans under section 502 of the Housing Act of 1949 for the repair, reconstruction, or replacement of dwellings or farm buildings lost, destroyed, or damaged by such causes and securing such outstanding indebtedness. Such loans may also provide for the purchase of building sites, when the original sites cannot be utilized.

"(b) The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to compromise or release such portion of a borrower's indebtedness under programs administered by the Rural Electrification Administration in Alaska as he finds necessary because of loss, destruction, or damage of property resulting from the 1964 earthquake and subsequent seismic waves.

"Sec. 52. The Housing and Home Finance Administrator is authorized to compromise or release such portion of any note or other obligation held by him with respect to property in Alaska pursuant to title II of the Housing Amendments of 1955 or included within the revolving fund for liquidating programs established by the Independent Offices Appropriation Act of 1955, as he finds necessary because of loss, destruction, or damage to facilities securing such obligations by the 1964 earthquake and subsequent seismic waves.

"URBAN RENEWAL

"Sec. 53. The Housing and Home Finance Administrator is authorized to enter into contracts for grants not exceeding $25,000,000 for urban renewal projects in Alaska, including open land projects, under section 111 of the Housing Act of 1949, which he determines will aid the communities in which they are located in reconstruction and redevelopment made necessary by the 1964 earthquake and subsequent seismic waves. Such authorization shall be in addition to and separate from any grant authorization contained in section 103(b) of said Act.

"The Administrator may increase the capital grant for a project assisted under this section to not more than 90 per centum of net project cost where he determines that a major portion of the project area has either been rendered unusable as a result of the 1964 earthquake and subsequent seismic waves or is needed in order adequately to provide, in accordance with the urban renewal plan for the project, new locations for persons, business, and facilities displaced by the earthquake."

"EXTENSION OF TERM OF HOME DISASTER LOANS

"Sec. 54. Loans made pursuant to paragraph (1) of section 7(b) of the Small Business Act (72 Stat. 387), as amended (15 U.S.C. 636(b)), for the purpose of replacing, reconstructing, or repairing dwellings in Alaska damaged or destroyed by the 1964 earthquake and subsequent seismic waves, may have a maturity of up to thirty years: *Provided,* That the provisions of section 7(c) of said Act shall not be applicable to such loans.

"MODIFICATION OF CIVIL WORKS PROJECTS

"Sec. 55. The Chief of Engineers, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, is hereby authorized to make such modifications to previously authorized civil works projects in Alaska adversely affected by the 1964 earthquake and subsequent seismic waves as he finds necessary to meet changed conditions and to provide for current and reasonably prospective requirements of the communities they serve, at an estimated cost of $10,000,000.

"PURCHASE OF ALASKA STATE BONDS

"Sec. 56. The Housing and Home Finance Administrator is authorized to purchase, in accordance with the provisions of sections 202(b), 203, and 204 of title II of the Housing Amendments of 1955, the securities and obligations of, or make loans to, the State of Alaska to finance any part of the programs needed to carry out the reconstruction activities in Alaska related to the 1964 earthquake and subsequent seismic waves or to complete capital improvements begun prior to the earthquake: *Provided,* That the aggregate amount of such purchase or loan shall not exceed $25,000,000: *Provided further,* That the terms of repayment of such securities and obligations or loans shall be as follows: Repayment of the principal sum in fifty years from the date of the borrowing payable in equal annual payments beginning ten years after the money is lent at an annual interest rate not to exceed three per centum on the unpaid balance.

"PURCHASE OF HOME MORTGAGES

"Sec. 57. The Federal National Mortgage Association is authorized to repurchase at a cost not to exceed par any home mortgage insured by the Federal Housing Administration which is secured by property in Alaska which was lost, destroyed, or severely damaged as a result of the 1964 earthquake or subsequent seismic waves. Any such purchase shall be made from funds available to the Association for carrying out its special assistance functions pursuant to section 305 of the National Housing Act; except that the aggregate amount of such purchases shall not exceed $10,000,000."

APPROPRIATION AUTHORIZATION

Sec. 5. There is authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act, which shall be available for obligation until June 30, 1967. There is also authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the expenses of such advisory commissions or committees as the President may establish in connection with the reconstruction and development planning of the State of Alaska. The total amount authorized to be appropriated pursuant to this section shall not exceed $50,150,000.

TERMINATION DATE

Sec. 6. The authority contained in this Act shall expire on June 30, 1967, except that such expiration shall not affect the payment of expenditures for any obligation or commitment entered into under this Act prior to June 30, 1967.

REPORTING

Sec. 7. The President shall report semiannually during the term of this Act to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House on the actions taken under this Act by the various Federal agencies. The first such report shall be submitted not later than February 1, 1965, and shall cover the period ending December 31, 1964.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL].

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I urge favorable consideration of H.R. 11438 in its amended form. The bill amends the 1959 Alaska Omnibus Act in several respects in order to assist the State of Alaska in reconstruction activities necessitated by the March 27, 1964, earthquake and seismic waves which took the lives of 115 persons and wrought damages up to a half billion dollars.

This total includes losses to Federal facilities amounting to some $70 million, such as damages to the Alaska Railroad; State and local property losses of about $148 million; and in the private sector, real property losses of about $77 million. These damage estimates do not include private personal property losses which have not yet been completely surveyed.

Our colleague, the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. RIVERS], is sponsoring this legislation which came to Congress at the request of the President and the Federal Reconstruction and Development Planning Commission for Alaska which is under the chairmanship of Senator ANDERSON of New Mexico. Not only does the bill authorize the appropriation of $50,150,000 in Federal funds to implement its purposes but it also amends several existing statutes which will extend and/or encourage Federal agencies to render sorely needed assistance to Alaska estimated to be in the neighborhood of $275 to $300 million.

Let me explain the major items included in the $275 million reconstruction program. Roughly $80 million of grants under the existing authority of the Office of Emergency Planning will be allocated for restoration of public facilities. This work has already commenced with funds promptly transferred to Alaska by OEP. Some $75 million will be used for restoring Federal facilities; $60 million in grants for highway repair; and up to $45 million for urban renewal projects.

You will recall that a few weeks ago legislation was enacted to authorize $23.5 million in transitional grants to the State to make up losses of State and local tax revenues and to insure continuity of government. I am advised that these funds have been put to work and the State government is in full operation carrying on its regular duties as well as those necessitated by the earthquake.

The Office of Emergency Planning is aiding in cleaning rubble, providing shelter, making emergency repairs, and restoring essential services. The Small Business Administration is making disaster loans to individual homeowners and businessmen. Commercial fishermen are being aided by the Department of the Interior in repairing their vessels. The Housing and Home Finance Agency and the Veterans' Administration are adjusting loans to homeowners whose dwellings were lost or destroyed.

Mr. Speaker, the sponsor of H.R. 11438 will present the details of the bill and explain the committee amendments. I merely wish to assure the House of the committee's concurrence to the legislation and to urge its acceptance.

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the gentleman from Colorado on his explanation of this legislation, legislation which I have supported in committee and shall support on the floor of the House.

Two things come to mind about which I should like to ask the gentleman. First, there has been considerable criticism in the State of Washington by some of the newspapers that Congress and the executive branch of the Government have failed to act rapidly, in an expeditious manner, in relieving this situation in Alaska. Would the gentleman care to comment on that?

Mr. ASPINALL. I shall be glad to comment on that. It is my opinion that we have acted as quickly as it is humanly possible to act under the circumstances. What we wish to see done in Alaska is, of course, a logical, constructive plan to rebuild and rehabilitate the area. We do not wish to use Federal funds where they are not needed. We do not wish to put Federal personnel into an area where they are not needed at the time. This sort of program could be handled quickly and unwisely or it could be handled with a proper amount of study so that the results would represent a constructive approach. I think that is what we have done; we have followed the latter course.

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, I have been of the opinion that as a result of this earthquake and disaster, there is required the making of plans and specifications by Army engineers, by the highway department, in many areas, and that funds which might have been appropriated sooner actually would have had to lie idle until those plans were finished; is not that correct?

Mr. ASPINALL. I think my friend from Washington is right. We moved in and took care of the immediate needs. There were no personal hardships other than those that occurred immediately that needed to be taken care of at once.

Mr. WESTLAND. There was a $50 million authorization almost immediately, I believe the week following, is that right?

Mr. ASPINALL. The gentleman is correct. That was part of the activities of the Office of Emergency Planning. Those funds went not only to the Alaskan area but also to the California area which was stricken.

Mr. WESTLAND. What is the estimate of the total amount of funds Congress has either appropriated or authorized for the relief of Alaska?

Mr. ASPINALL. I think it is impossible to put a definite figure on that at the present time. We have already increased the emergency funds by $50 million, most of which will be used up there. We provided $23½ million for governmental services. In this legislation we provide another $50½ million for direct aid and also provide that certain agencies of the Government serving in the stricken area must be funded to a greater extent than they are at the present time to the extent of $275 or $300 million. And then there may be some additional funds needed in order to see that the citizens of that area are back where they can carry on.

Mr. WESTLAND. There have been direct appropriations already in the neighborhood of $125 million. This legislation would provide up to almost another $275 million?

Mr. ASPINALL. That is a part of it, for lending authority.

Mr. WESTLAND. Yes; I understand that. I want to thank the gentleman for giving me this information.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has again expired.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield to my friend the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Do I understand that the Federal funds dedicated to this project, already expended or on the way to being expended and authorized, run somewhere around $200 million or more?

Mr. ASPINALL. I believe that the amount is closer to $125 million to $150 million, with this legislation.

Mr. GROSS. With this amount?

Mr. ASPINALL. Counting also the lending authority which goes with this legislation, it would bring it up another $275 million.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, can the gentleman give us any indication as to how much of this will be recovered eventually?

Mr. ASPINALL. I cannot do that presently, because if we do a half job, as my friend the gentleman from Iowa knows, then of course, we will not get any of it back. But if we go ahead and do it properly and build the economy these recipients will be able to get on their feet and a larger part of the funds will come back to us.

Of the original $75 million, plus $50 million as provided in this bill, very little of that is going to be recovered. That amounts to grants for the rebuilding of the area so that it can become economically serviceable again—so that the highways and the public buildings may be used again in carrying on the governmental operations, and so forth.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, there will be loans made?

Mr. ASPINALL. Oh, yes. Under this $275 to $300 million most of this is lending. Most of it will be lent with interest which would be complementary to any other interest that Uncle Sam receives under such circumstances.

Mr. GROSS. In some circumstances, 3⅝ percent interest, I believe?

Mr. ASPINALL. That is right. This constitutes one of the differences between the Senate bill and the House bill wherein the House may have to give.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has again expired.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, there were many people in the House of Representatives when the State of Alaska was admitted to statehood who doubted whether or not that State would be able to carry on all of the obligations which we placed upon it when it assumed its position in the sisterhood of States.

Mr. Speaker, the State of Alaska was making excellent progress until it was severely damaged on Good Friday in March 1964.

Mr. Speaker, there is every reason to believe that the State of Alaska would have been able to assume its full position in accordance with the Omnibus Act which Congress passed admitting that State to the sisterhood of States. However, on Good Friday of March 1964, an earthquake occurred which was unprecedented not only in American history but in world history. As a result thereof, it was necessary for the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee to hold hearings and determine just what changes should be made in the basic act admitting Alaska to statehood.

Mr. Speaker, my only complaint and criticism of this bill falls into two categories: First, that this bill does not solve the problem. This is a piecemeal measure. The representatives of Government who appeared before our committee all testified that it would take two and probably three times as much money as is included in this bill. I was one of those who at that time felt that we should face up to the problem now and look at the situation realistically. However, because of the debate which was then taking place on the other side of the Capitol, there was a feeling that if we looked at the entire proposition, we would not be able to have that bill brought up on the floor of the other body.

That time has passed. That bill is now law. And if we were doing the proper thing we would look at this situation as a whole problem and not try to fragment it. However, the committee in its wisdom has chosen to take this fragmented process. I can assure the Members of the House that next year we will be back with a bill calling for at least twice this amount of money to take care of the needs of the new State of Alaska.

My second complaint has to do with section 51. The Secretary of Agriculture is given absolutely no guidelines whatsoever in his compromise or release of any portion of those who borrowed or have an indebtedness through the Farmers Home Administration in Alaska. The chairman of the full committee was correct when he said that there was absolutely nothing in this bill by which we attempted to take care of the private losses of $77 million; but the Secretary of Agriculture is in a position under the terms of this bill to take care of any private loans that were made if they were fortunate enough to make the loans through the Farmers Home Administration. I feel that the committee should have placed in section 51 of the bill the guidelines that the Secretary should use in compromising or releasing any portion of the indebtedness.

This is a minor criticism, and I hope that when the bill goes to conference it will be possible for us to work out some guidelines for the Secretary of Agriculture to follow.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. Rivers].

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, as might be expected, I have just returned from Alaska where I personally observed the progress thus far made in the earthquake disaster area by my courageous fellow Alaskans. The cleanup is virtually done, and soil testing and planning and preconstruction engineering and design and the letting of contracts have proceeded apace. However, the actual reconstruction is just getting started, and because Alaska's construction season is comparatively short, time is of the essence.

This bill is the last of a series of legislative measures to be acted upon this year to authorize Federal assistance in the reconstruction of the earthquake stricken areas of Alaska. The fact that this legislation, H.R. 11438, was sent to us for introduction upon executive request after being drafted by the Federal Reconstruction and Development Planning Commission for Alaska, prompts me to express appreciation and thanks not only for myself but in behalf of the people of Alaska. This thanks goes not only to President Johnson and to Director Edward McDermott of the Office of Emergency Planning, but to Senator Clinton Anderson, of New Mexico, in his role as chairman of the Federal Reconstruction and Development Planning Commission for Alaska, and to the heads of all the agencies represented upon that Commission. My deepest appreciation also goes to our beloved Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCormack], and our dedicated majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Albert], both of whom gave me help and encouragement and expedited the scheduling of this bill. I am also most appreciative of the unstinting interest and assistance of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. Aspinall], and of the fine cooperation of the ranking minority member of the committee, the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Saylor] who, incidentally, supported statehood, and of the never failing help of the chairman of the Subcommittee on Territorial and Insular Affairs, the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'Brien], who so ably guided the Alaska statehood bill to passage through the House in 1958, and is again willing to espouse Alaska's cause in its hour of greatest need. Needless to say, I would be remiss if I did not acknowledge the warm interest and support of all my colleagues of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs who unanimously reported this bill, and the interest and sympathy expressed by so many of the rest of you on both sides of the aisle since the shattering earthquake and tidal waves and seismic tides caused so much loss of life and property in south-central Alaska on March 27 of this year.

The urgency which surrounds this bill is well expressed by President Johnson in his letter to Speaker McCormack under date of May 27 with which the draft of this bill was transmitted. After speaking of the efforts of the people of Alaska to rebuild from the ruins of the quake and of the initial steps taken by the Federal Government, the President wrote, and I quote:

> But new legislative authority is urgently needed to provide the additional special assistance essential to their reconstruction efforts—the legislation which I am proposing—based upon recommendations of the Federal Reconstruction and Development Planning Commission for Alaska—will provide greater flexibility in Federal programs to cope with the extraordinary circumstances arising out of the earthquake. Included among the programs involved are highways, urban renewal, housing, and harbor improvements.

Also included is a provision authorizing the Small Business Administration to make 3-percent disaster loans to homeowners whose property was destroyed or seriously damaged, for terms up to 30 years instead of within the 20-year maximum period prescribed by existing law. The bill also provides for Federal assistance to the State in marketing up to $25 million of State bonds, the proceeds to be for use in coping with the disaster and for a capital improvement program.

New amounts authorized in this bill would aggregate $50,150,000.

Three amendments approved by the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs are as follows:

First. Change of the matching formula for urban renewal projects in the disaster area from 75 percent Federal-25 percent local to a high of 90 percent Federal and a low of 10 percent local. The "open space" reference in the urban renewal paragraph on page 4 of the bill would be applied to Valdez which is to be relocated at a new site about 4 miles away from its present location and might be applied to a pilot project at Turnagain Arm near Anchorage.

Second. Establishment of a ceiling of 3-percent interest upon the purchase by the Federal Government of the State bonds I mentioned; and

Third. Authorization to the Federal National Mortgage Association to repurchase at not to exceed par any home mortgage in Alaska insured by FHA, the property securing same having been destroyed or severely damaged in the disaster. The significance of the word "repurchase" stems from the fact that during territorial days Fannie Mae and the Veterans' Administration acquired many of these home mortgages in Alaska and subsequently sold and assigned most of them to private lenders who became willing to enter into such transactions pertaining to homes in Alaska. After each such repurchase, Fannie May would be authorized to adjust the balance owed down to $1,000 and forgive the remainder, so that the stricken homeowner would have a fair chance to borrow and build again. Such reduction of balance and forgiveness is already being carried out with respect to the home mortgages upon destroyed or severely damaged property still held by Fannie Mae or the VA. Thus, this amendment would treat alike all of the disaster victims whose destroyed or severely damaged homes were initially financed by Fannie Mae or the VA in conjunction with being FHA insured. Two other amendments are merely technical.

All of the special assistance authorizations contained in this bill would expire June 30, 1967.

The need of accomplishing as much as possible of the required reconstruction during this summer and fall before winter sets in is indeed most urgent. I trust that this situation is apparent and that this measure will be adopted by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. Matsunaga] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 11438 and urge its immediate passage. I congratulate the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. Rivers], for his excellent and most effective presentment of the case for his great State of Alaska. The people of the 49th State are indeed fortunate to have his dedicated services in the Congress.

We of the 50th State can more fully appreciate the problems confronting Alaska because we too in years past have been subjected to the same type of disaster which Alaska suffered recently. The people of Hawaii have been plagued from time to time by volcano eruptions, earthquakes and tidal waves and can fully sympathize with the disaster-stricken Alaskans. This is a time of great need for our sister State. Too much delay has already been allowed. Let us waste no more time in giving needed assistance to our fellow Americans. Let us pass H.R. 11438 without a single dissenting vote.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Rogers].

UNITED STATES SHOULD LOOK AT MEXICO'S ACTIONS IN OAS DURING SUGAR LEGISLATION CONSIDERATION

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of the regular order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the Organization of American States is at this moment meeting to consider adopting strong sanctions against Communist Cuba. However, recent reports show a danger of weaker action being taken.

The danger reportedly lies with Mexico, which is on record as being opposed to sanctions in previous meetings.

But it must also be reported that last year Mexico sold 379,000 tons of sugar in the United States, and took home some $55 million in profits as a result.

And this year Mexico is in line to sell as much as 480,000 tons of sugar, making even greater profits from the U.S. consumer.

Do these same U.S. consumers agree with Mexico that Communist Cuba should be spared strong action by the OAS? Emphatically not.

Castro has already admitted that he is spreading subversion throughout the hemisphere by offering to stop in exchange for reconciliation with the free world. If admissions of guilt such as this one are not enough to convince Mexico, and nations like her, that Castro warrants stiff action by the free world nations, then perhaps the United States should review its policies toward Mexico or any other nation which cooperates with Castro. Particularly should this Congress keep Mexico's actions in mind when sugar legislation is next before this body.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the bill, H.R. 11438.

Up to the time that disaster struck in March of this year, Alaska was making great progress in the painful struggle toward a sound economy. I would like to devote my closing remarks to a discussion of a point raised by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. Westland]. In effect, he asked the distinguished chairman of the full committee if there had been any heel dragging in this matter of coming to the aid of the 49th State. I would say from my experience in this matter that the answer is emphatically "No." After the quake struck, there was an enormous and a very complex job to be done by a special commission set up to evaluate the damage and to recommend what should be done about it. Almost immediately after the report of that commission was received, the responsible committees of both Houses went into action and the bill we have before us was reported by the House committee in very rapid order.

I would say to the people of Alaska and to the Members of this House that a great deal of advanced planning has been undertaken already in Alaska in anticipation of what we are about to do here today. I feel that this planning and the actual appropriation to carry out what must be done will meet in their proper place in spite of the fact that there is a very short building season in Alaska.

I would like to say in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, that the people of Alaska demonstrated to all of us throughout the United States their great spirit at the time of the great tragedy of the earthquake. There was no one who spoke about picking up the chips and leaving the game. Even those whose homes were destroyed and whose businesses toppled announced for all to hear that they were going to stay in their great State and rebuild their homes and their businesses.

Mr. Speaker, I think the passage of this bill today would be in harmony with the great spirit expressed by those true pioneers of the State of Alaska.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Horton] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to add my voice in support of the measure now before us for the help it will provide our fellow citizens in the State of Alaska. The passage and approval of this proposal is essential to insure recovery from the devastating blow Alaskans were dealt by earthquakes earlier this year.

This bill would amend the Alaska Omnibus Act of 1959 by authorizing a 3-year program of Federal assistance. In specific form, that aid would empower the Federal Government to adjust Federal loans on homes or businesses or permit new loans on longer terms, to purchase Alaska State bonds, and to provide additional funds for highway, urban renewal, and Corps of Engineers projects.

While this assistance to Alaska, of necessity is measured in dollars, its meaning can be related to the higher value of humanitarianism. One of the most noble traits of our democratic society concerns the willingness, even the desire, of our people to rally to the support of the sufferers of natural disasters. And, over the years, this charitable characteristic has involved the Federal Government.

Where the magnitude of a disaster is such that it is clearly beyond the resources of the States and localities to respond adequately, Federal action becomes imperative. This responsibility can be traced to the early 1800's when Congress extended the time for discharging customhouse bonds of those victims of the great Portsmouth fire.

The help to be made available by this legislation is both necessary and justified. I have willingly supported other measures relating to the Alaska earthquake, which already have been enacted by this Congress, and recognizing that additional assistance is required, I intend to endorse with my vote the bill now under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Pepper). The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'Brien] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 11438.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2881) to amend the Alaska Omnibus Act to provide assistance to the State of Alaska for the reconstruction of areas damaged by the earthquake of March 1964, and subsequent seismic waves, and for other purposes, a similar bill to the bill just passed by the House.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ASPINALL

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 2881 and to insert the provisions of H.R. 11438, as passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Aspinall: Strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 2881 and insert the provisions of H.R. 11438 as passed.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 11438) was laid on the table.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION, FISCAL YEAR 1965—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. VINSON submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 10300) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

NATIONAL COMMISSION ON TECHNOLOGY, AUTOMATION, AND ECONOMIC PROGRESS

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 11611) to establish a National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Congress finds it imperative to accelerate the national effort to—

(a) identify and assess the past effects and the current and prospective role and pace of technological change;

(b) identify and describe the impact of technological and economic change on production and employment, including new job requirements and the major types of worker displacement, both technological and economic, which are likely to occur during the next ten years; the specific industries, occupations, and geographic areas which are most likely to be involved; and the social and economic effects of these developments on the

Nation's economy, manpower, communities, families, social structure, and human values;

(c) define those areas of unmet community and human needs toward which application of new technologies might most effectively be directed, encompassing an examination of technological developments that have occurred in recent years, including those resulting from the Federal Government's research and development programs;

(d) assess the most effective means for channeling new technologies into promising directions, including civilian industries where accelerated technological advancements will yield general benefits, and assess the proper relationship between governmental and private investment in the application of new technologies to large-scale human and community needs;

(e) recommend, in addition to those actions which are the responsibility of management and labor, specific administrative and legislative steps which it believes should be taken by the Federal, State, and local governments in meeting their responsibilities (1) to support and promote technological change in the interest of continued economic growth and improved well-being of our people, (2) to continue and adopt measures which will facilitate occupational adjustment and geographical mobility, and (3) to share the costs and help prevent and alleviate the adverse impact of change on displaced workers.

SEC. 2. In order to carry out the objectives of this Act there is hereby established the National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress, hereinafter referred to as the "Commission".

SEC. 3. The Commission shall be composed of fourteen members appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, from among persons outside the Government with a competency in the areas to be dealt with by the Commission. The Commission shall be broadly representative and shall include not less than four members drawn equally from labor and management. One of the members shall be designated by the President as Chairman of the Commission. Eight members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum. Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its power, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

SEC. 4. The Commission shall make a comprehensive and impartial study and make recommendations from time to time as needed for constructive action in the areas designated in section 1 of this Act.

SEC. 5. Members of the Commission appointed from outside Government shall each receive $100 per diem when engaged in the actual performance of duties of the Commission.

SEC. 6. There is hereby established a Federal Interagency Committee consisting of the heads of the Departments of Agriculture, Labor, Commerce, Defense, Health, Education, and Welfare, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, and the Director of the Office of Science and Technology, and the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, or their designees, to advise the Commission and to maintain effective liaison with the resources of such departments and agencies. The Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Commerce shall serve as Cochairmen of the Committee.

SEC. 7. (a) The Commission shall have power to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable, without regard to the provision of the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended. In addition, the Commission may procure temporary and intermittent services to the same extent as is authorized for the departments by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 810), but at rates not to exceed $75 per diem for individuals.

(b) The Commission is authorized to appoint an executive secretary to oversee the work of the staff under the general direction of the Commission.

SEC. 8. All members and other personnel of the Commission shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and necessary expenses in accordance with law.

SEC. 9. The Department of Labor shall provide the Commission necessary administrative services (including those related to budgeting, accounting, financial reporting, personnel, and procurement) for which payment shall be made in advance, or by reimbursement, from funds of the Commission in such amounts as may be agreed upon by the Commission and the Secretary of Labor.

SEC. 10. The Commission, or on the authorization of the Commission, any subcommittee or panel thereof, may, for the purpose of carrying out its functions and duties, hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places as the Commission or such subcommittee or panel may deem advisable.

SEC. 11. The Commission is authorized to negotiate and enter into contracts with private organizations to carry out such studies and to prepare such reports as the Commission determines to be necessary in order to carry out its duties.

SEC. 12. The Commission is authorized to secure directly from any executive department, agency, or independent instrumentality of the Government any information it deems necessary to carry out its functions under this Act; and each such department, agency, and instrumentality is authorized and directed to cooperate with the Commission and, to the extent permitted by law, to furnish such information to the Commission, upon request made by the Chairman.

SEC. 13. The Commission shall submit a final report of its findings and recommendations to the President and the Congress by January 1, 1966. The Commission shall cease to exist thirty days after submitting its final report.

SEC. 14. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Commission, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums not in excess of $2,000,000, as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. FREYLINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, before the House, today, is legislation establishing a National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress.

As the sponsor of this bill, H.R. 11611, I ask the support of my colleagues, on both sides of the aisle, for the amended version now on your desk.

Let me assure the Members, Mr. Speaker, that during our hearings on this bill, no opposition to the proposal was expressed—verbally or in writing.

However, since obtaining permission to consider the legislation under suspension of the rules, some questions arose pertaining to the interpretation of section 10. For this reason we have agreed upon the amended version which removes the subpena power as we have been reassured that full cooperation will be given to this Commission.

The National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress is actually the outgrowth of recommendations to the President by leaders of industry, labor, our educators, and just plain people who have experienced, firsthand, the effects of technological growth. In fact, in July of 1963, President Kennedy had suggested that a Commission on Automation be created.

Last January, President Johnson requested this present legislation and placed it on his "urgent" list as he felt there was need for serious study and constructive suggestions—and further delay could be dangerous. I am happy to sponsor this administration proposal and have so many of my colleagues join me as cosponsors.

All of you know how interested I have been, over the years, in automation and its effects on employment and production.

The Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 was our first constructive attack on one of its effects—our growing rate of unemployment.

When I asked the Members of this House to vote for it, in February of 1962, I said: "This is the first step of many we will have to take if we hope to solve the problem of unemployment."

Last December I asked you to support needed amendments to that program, and I said we were taking another step toward the solution.

Today, I ask you to step a little farther up the road to our ultimate goal of full employment and an ever-expanding economy.

You may ask, "Why is such a commission necessary?" It is, I assure you, and the reasons are not difficult to find.

The population growth of this Nation is one reason. With the passing of each day we see more Americans entering the labor market, and we also see, along with the creation of new opportunities and jobs, the elimination of many other jobs in certain fields.

The need for unskilled and semiskilled labor is just about ended. Even the need for highly skilled labor in certain fields, has disappeared.

We have watched the output—or production—in our mines, mills, railroads, factories, petroleum and communications industries steadily climb upward. At the same time, we have watched the employment of the production workers steadily decrease.

We are now watching the output increase in our insurance industries, our banking businesses and our retail trades. And, we are also watching jobs in these areas disappear from the labor market. The need for standard clerical help is vanishing. Even our Government offices—at all levels—are installing computers and not filling jobs that become vacated through retirement or change of jobs.

The "silent-firing" practice is quite common today.

The Wall Street Journal has been running a series of articles titled "Electronic Wizards." This paper points out that 13 years ago the first computer was available on the market.

Today, we see a $1.3 billion a year business.

Tomorrow no one actually knows what to expect.

You have heard, time and again, that in the sixties approximately 2.5 million jobs a year will be eliminated.

Others will be created—this is true—but will our people be prepared to fill them?

Reports are coming in each day telling of still other fields in which computers are entering the professions—law, medicine, education—all are being "computerized."

Several weeks ago, the Saturday Evening Post had quite a story on the steel industry. One statement hit the reader right away: "5 guys and a computer to replace 230 men at the rolling mill."

Another item was rather frightening: "Armco's Ashland, Ky., works 'Amanda,' can turn out 3,340 tons of iron a day."

Similar facts are being revealed by other large industries—automobile, mining, railroading, electrical, and still more.

If some sort of action is not taken soon the ultimate results may be far from satisfactory.

The members of this National Commission—all 14 of them—must be dedicated persons, willing and anxious to work, and determined to attain their goal.

They are to "look into the future" and see what may lie ahead. They will report to the Nation as to the necessary steps to be taken so that our people may be prepared for—and capable of—living in the world of the 1970's.

I wish it were possible for them to predict even further ahead, but with new developments occurring so rapidly, I fear this is impossible.

All sectors of our society are to be on this Commission—and full cooperation from all sectors is mandatory if America is to survive and our people are to be employed.

Official recognition of this problem has come from leaders of both our political parties. All recognize the need for immediate action.

May I ask you to join me, again, and take another step toward our common goal?

The Commission is to make a report to the President and to Congress in January of 1966, and to suggest additional measures it may be well for us to consider.

While a final solution to this problem seems far away, each move we make brings us closer to it.

So, let us keep moving in the right direction by getting this legislation enacted into law.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point the remarks of the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL]; and that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

STATEMENT BY MR. POWELL

I support H.R. 11611, a bill to establish a National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress.

The National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress which would be established by the terms of H.R. 11611 is a Commission whose work will go directly to the heart of the domestic matters that confront our Nation, and to the economic and competitive position of our Nation in the world.

Technology has been, is now, and should be in the future the means we use to achieve a great society. It has brought us the basis for our modern industry and our modern agriculture, and for our great system of distributing the products of our farms and our industry to our people. It has been the source of rising income and purchasing power, at a rate of 3 percent a year. The fruits of technology are indeed our wealth and the source of our progress. And not the least of the fruits of technology has been the technical superiority it has given us in military preparedness.

But with these fruits of progress have come problems and doubts: What is the role and pace of technological change in the next decade?

How can we most effectively apply new technologies to achieve continuing and more rapid economic growth?

How can we apply them to meet community and human needs?

How can we prevent technology from permanently enlarging the numbers of unemployed?

Will new technology and investment in technology mean as much for economic progress in the future as they have meant in the past?

Can we make sure that new investment in technology is not directed at cutting costs instead of expanding our economy?

Will technology produce a series of new industries in the 1960's and 1970's that would do for the economy what the automobile industry did in past years?

Is the character of new technology something entirely different from that of the past, and will it require a new approach to the way people are trained for jobs, and how much of their working life they spend in jobs?

How can we assure that workers displaced by new technologies do not have to bear the burden alone?

We know from reports of the Department of Labor that there are many specific industries in which jobs are being eliminated as technology progresses. We know that new equipment is today, on the average, outmoded after 12 years, and that when it is replaced, jobs are replaced, too. We know that many workers have serious problems of adjustment as new technology is introduced. We know that there are many new forms of technology that are making their way in American industry. We know that the pace of technological development, as measured by the Department of Labor's official figures on growth in productivity, has in fact been unusually rapid in the last few years.

We also know that employment is growing as a result of the measures that the administration has sponsored, and the Congress has enacted, to stimulate the economy. We know that there are many jobs that are vacant, opened up by new technology and unfilled because of the lack of trained people. We know that many new inventions are in fact opening up both new opportunities for employment and new vistas for a better life for our people.

But this knowledge has not been enough to resolve the doubts, or to ease the hardships of those who are hit by automation or who fear its coming effects, or who are in poverty status and have not yet been reached by the benefits of advancing progress. For a very few who have been the chief beneficiaries of past technological progress, new inventions, still improving technology, and some job vacancies have meant that everything is all right in the world. To some 19th century economists, with unbounded faith that new technology brings jobs quickly to people thrown out of old jobs, that this works automatically, and that human needs will always create enough jobs, there never has been a problem and never will be. Fortunately, in our concern to deal with human problems and to insure that our economy does move forward, we are beyond this level of thinking.

What we need now is an assessment of the state of technology in our country, as a basis for our future deliberations. We need to know what the present effect of technology is upon our well-being and upon our people as individuals.

We need the best information and judgment we can muster concerning the expected future of technology in our Nation. We need to know what current and expected changes will mean for specific industries, worker skills, and geographic areas.

We need to know how technology can best be harnessed to meet our unmet needs.

We no longer accept the principle that individuals should be ruthlessly cast aside as the inevitable price of progress, and we need a new assessment of what we are substituting for the old law of the jungle.

The proposed National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress will be a major step in determining those needs, and how to resolve the problems.

Its work will encompass the best technical brains of the Nation in the field of science, engineering, technology, management, economics, and the handling of the human problems of adjustment.

Its work should give us a foundation for a spirit of national unity which will subdue fears, resolve doubts, and enable us to move forward rapidly in applying technology to human needs, to our standard of living, to the shifting of individuals from one job to another, and to our position in the economic world.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the motion to suspend the rule, in order that the House may proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 11611, as amended. These amendments are of some consequence. Adoption of the proposed amendments will eliminate an authority over which there could be controversy.

For a number of years there has been a general awareness that the forces of automation are exerting a profound and continuing impact on the economy of America. To some, automation has been regarded as a destructive force which must be discouraged if not destroyed; to others, automation has been labeled as a harbinger of unlimited progress and achievement.

Whether either of these views is sound or accurate is beside the point. The fact remains that the rise of new technology and the advance of automation have wrought major, almost miraculous, changes in nearly every phase of our economic life. The fact remains also that these changes have brought about numerous dislocations of individuals and groups. These dislocations pose a serious challenge to our society. We must take enlightened steps to meet that challenge.

Mr. Speaker, up to this time the advance of technology, with its attendant rise of automation, has been treated much like the weather: everyone is aware of it; almost everyone talks about it; but no one has done much about it. The pending measure seeks to do something constructive about automation.

Automation is at once a national asset and a national problem. It affects every individual, every undertaking, and every community, directly or indirectly. This being so, the problem must be studied and analyzed from a national point of view, with the full cooperation and participation of all segments of the Nation directly concerned.

The so-called National Commission on Automation which will be established if this bill is approved, will have a real potential for achievement. It will be comprised of 14 members of the highest caliber, with diverse backgrounds, each of whom can bring to the task of evaluating this problem a wealth of knowledge and experience.

It is my hope that this Commission will be able, at the completion of its work, to present to the Congress and to the people a complete picture of the actual and potential impact of automation—a picture which we already sorely need but which we do not now have. It is my hope also that the Commission will scrutinize closely the appropriations already made by Congress to various agencies of government to study automation, and that it will evaluate those programs in terms of concrete accomplishment or the lack thereof. Finally, I am hopeful, as a result of this study, that it will be possible for all segments of the Nation to adopt a program which will sustain an orderly progress of automation, but which at the same time will ease or overcome the economic dislocations and difficulties which have attended its rise thus far.

Mr. Speaker, if these ends can be accomplished, then the $2 million authorized for this Commission will be a wise and rewarding investment in the future of America.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. There are no facilities in any of the agencies presently existing to accumulate this information?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Well, I might say to the gentleman from Iowa that it is not simply a question of accumulation. There have been a number of studies made by Presidential committees and various other activities within the Federal departments.

It is not proposed that the establishment of this Commission is going to eliminate those efforts. It is simply to establish a 14-man group to oversee the operation and to try to coordinate and project into the future the effect of automation. It will be a more broad-ranging effort than we presently have within the Federal Establishment.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, here we go again establishing another commission in Government. I do not know when I have heard of one being abolished or dispensed with.

I thought there was some concern on the part of this administration about stopping the growth of big Government. But, apparently, not.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I might say to the gentleman from Iowa that we did establish a dollar ceiling on the amount that might be appropriated for this purpose of $2 million for the Commission, which is to make its report by January 1966. So, I do not think the amount of money to be made available to the Commission is excessive in view of the responsibilities which it is to undertake.

I might say to the gentleman from Iowa that I do not usually sympathize with the tendency to establish too many Federal agencies. I have been very much opposed to a new Federal agency being established to fight the so-called war on poverty. It seems to me that we would do a better job with existing efforts, perhaps a streamlining of existing efforts, rather than establishing a new Federal agency. So, I sympathize with the feelings of the gentleman about new agencies being the proper way to accomplish a goal. But in this case I do not think we are going to lose any ground, but will conceivably gain ground.

Mr. GROSS. On page 4, section 7, of the bill the following appears:

> The Commission shall have power to appoint and fix compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable, without regard to the provision of the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

What can this possibly mean? That the personnel for this new Commission cannot be obtained and paid for under the formulas of the Classification Act?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I might say to the gentleman from Iowa that I do not know specifically what the Commission might do with the authority to be provided under section 7. But it was the understanding of the Secretary of the Department of Labor that what we are contemplating is a reasonably small Federal effort. We are not contemplating a gigantic bureaucracy with unlimited powers in the use of such language.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, you go further and provide that the work can be contracted out.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Well, I believe one of the reasons this new agency is to be small is that there will be an effort to contract out some of the research effort which is going to be made, instead of establishing a new bureaucracy to do the job, perhaps no more efficiently but certainly far more expensively.

Mr. GROSS. I should like to point out to the gentleman that the report has not conformed to Public Law 801. Under other circumstances, if this bill were not brought up under a suspension of the rules, I certainly would make a point of order against the bill.

Public Law 801 provides that there must be information—the intent of Congress was that there be in the report certain information setting forth the man-hours of labor to be used, the estimated maximum additional man-years of civilian employment by general categories and positions, expenditures for personal services, and expenditures for all jobs other than personal services.

This committee has not conformed to Public Law 801 insofar as the report accompanying this bill is concerned. I would hope that in the creation of any further commission or boards or bureaus there would be some regard for the laws enacted by Congress.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I would like to say to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] that through inadvertence this material was left out of the report. We have obtained such information from the agency.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEPPER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The material referred to follows:

JULY 20, 1964.

To: Mr. Curt Aller.
From: V. S. Hudson, Department of Labor.
Subject: Commission on Automation.

My judgment is that the Department of Labor could build up a budget estimate tied to the $2 million House figure that would be reasonable under the circumstances.

This would break down into the following components:

(a) $870,000 for personal services for Commission expenses (including staff for the Commission of 25 people; 9 man-years for the Federal Interagency Committee and about 6 man-years for administrative services). A total of about 40 man-years for the lifespan of the Commission (20 professional and 20 clerical).

(b) $760,000 for research by sources outside the Federal government and services of other agencies.

(c) $370,000 for nonpersonal services such as travel, rent, communications, printing, etc.

We are working on the details of this.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. COHELAN].

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, as one of the sponsors of this bill to establish a National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress, and as one who has had a long-time concern with this critical problem, I urge support of this farsighted measure.

It is sometimes difficult to believe, Mr. Speaker, that our rapid rate of technological growth has taken a heavy human toll. It is difficult to believe that progress and prosperity have been accompanied by economic misery when we see 95 percent of our people doing better than any previous people at any time in history.

But the fact of the matter is that the very technological growth which has so materially advanced our national productivity and welfare has placed a growing burden on 5 percent of the workers in our society—a burden which keeps the condition of these less advantaged men and women in sharp contrast with their better educated and trained brothers who are prepared to meet the demands and take advantage of the opportunities of changing times.

As a consequence of technological development, of their own educational failures or denials, of environments of poverty, and other causes that disqualify them from employment in a skilled economy, these workers cannot and will not find employment without special help. They will remain a public charge rather than a public asset until their special needs and problems are recognized.

Secretary of Labor Wirtz emphasized earlier this year, in an address given in California, that we are today piling up a "human scrap heap" of between 250,000 and 500,000 people each year; people without the skills or training to participate in the modern world of work.

And the problem can get worse. In the next 10 years 35 million people will be coming into the labor force. About 9.5 million of them will not have a high school education, and 3 million of them will not even have completed grade school. These people are going to have a difficult time holding a job, if they can find one at all.

This is a pure and simple waste of human resources—a waste which holds disastrous effects both for the individual and for the national economy—and we must and can take steps to prevent it.

This legislation, Mr. Speaker, will provide us with a tool which we have needed for a long time. It is based on the conviction that man can be the master of technology, that he can direct it to fulfill his needs and desires, but that more than blind faith and wishful thinking is required.

This legislation, by drawing both on leaders with scientific competence and on those with broad social skills and economic awareness, will enable us to take a hard look at the meaning, the benefits and the costs of technological change. It will also allow us to investigate how government, operating at all levels, can cooperate with labor and business to facilitate necessary adjustments. And, it will permit us to make reasonable, practical recommendations to meet the manpower needs of tomorrow, to minimize the human distress and to fulfill the promises of technological progress for a better society.

The fruits of automation have been rich, and will be richer. But the toll in human misery and national loss can grow greater, too, if we are not prepared, if we are not willing to look ahead.

This bill, Mr. Speaker, offers us an opportunity to look where we must—to the future. It is an investment in the economic well-being of our country and I strongly urge its passage.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WELTNER].

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 11611, a bill to establish a National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress.

In March of this year, a 1-day conference was held at the Georgia Institute of Technology in Atlanta on automation, education, and employment. Reflecting the broad-based local interest in these areas were the sponsors of that conference: The Georgia Tech Industrial Management Center, Atlanta Chamber of Commerce, Atlanta Labor Council, AFL–CIO, and the Associated Industries of Georgia.

More than 300 local, State, and area educators, governmental officials, and community leaders attended the conference. U.S. Commissioner of Education Francis Keppel and Dr. Seymour Wolfbein, Director of Manpower, Automation, and Training, Department of Labor, participated in the program.

One of the resolutions passed by that conference called for the establishment of a national commission to study the needs and problems discussed at the local level. H.R. 11611 fulfills the intent of that resolution, and I wholeheartedly support it.

At the Atlanta conference, the responsibility of facing these problems locally was recognized, and the Atlanta Commission on Automation, Education, and Employment was formed. This commission, under the chairmanship of Dr. Walter Buckingham, of Georgia Tech, noted in the field of automation, has met regularly.

It stands ready to assist the National Commission provided by H.R. 11611 in obtaining information about problems at home. Further, it should act as a ready source for evaluation of recommendations the new Commission may make at the national level.

I hope the Congress will pass this legislation and that the President will appoint the Commission at the earliest possible moment. Coordinated effort, alone, can change automation from bane to blessing.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN].

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation and urge its adoption.

We are today living in an age of rapid change and revolution on many fronts of our society of which perhaps one of the most important is in the area of economics. We are on the threshold of an economic revolution whose achievements, consequences, and social upheaval may be as great as the achievements and social upheaval which originally flowed from the industrial revolution 150 years ago. Automation, technological change, rapid mechanization, replacement of men by machines, have invaded every facet of our economy, and from every corner of our country we hear the question: "Is the age of automation a boon or a curse?"

Is automation creating as many jobs as it wipes out? Is automation truly the essence of progress, upgrading the labor force by relieving men and women of drudgery and toil? Or is automation a "Loch Ness monster," swallowing up its millions of victims and then disgorging them into a sea of poverty-stricken idleness and despair?

What is automation? I am reminded of a photograph of part of a control panel in a completely automated carbon dioxide plant, requiring only two men per shift. However, as used today the word has several meanings. According to a brief study on automation by the Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia, "to the purists, it refers to the mechanization of decisionmaking and control functions—machines that run other machines. To the public, automation has come to stand for technological change in general."

I refer to automation in the more general sense of rapid mechanization, inclusive of the latest "pushbutton" techniques.

Mr. Speaker, we are today considering H.R. 11611, a bill calling for the establishment of a National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress. I strongly urge all my colleagues to vote approval of this bill.

Under the terms of H.R. 11611, the Commission would be composed of 14 members appointed by the President. It is intended that the membership will be broadly representative and shall not include less than four members drawn equally from labor and management. The Commission's responsibilities are wisely drawn in such a manner as to allow the Commission broad latitude in its investigations. The Commission will:

First. Identify and assess the past effects and the current and prospective role and pace of technological change.

Second. Identify and describe the impact of technological and economic change on production and employment, including new job requirements and the major types of worker displacement, both technological and economic, which are likely to occur during the next 10 years; the specific industries, occupations, and geographic areas which are most likely to be involved; and the social and economic effects of these developments on the Nation's economy, manpower, communities, families, social structure, and human values.

Third. Define those areas of unmet community and human needs toward which application of new technologies might most effectively be directed, encompassing an examination of technological developments that have occurred in recent years, including those resulting from the Federal Government's research and development programs.

Fourth. Assess the most effective means for channeling new technologies into promising directions, including civilian industries where accelerated technological advancement will yield general benefits, and assess the proper relationship between governmental and private investment in the application of new technologies to large-scale human and community needs.

Fifth. Recommend, in addition to those actions which are the responsibility of management and labor, specific administrative and legislative steps which it believes should be taken by the Federal, State, and local governments in meeting their responsibilities (a) to support and promote technological change in the interest of continued economic growth and improved well-being of our people, (b) to continue and adopt measures which will facilitate occupational adjustment and geographic mobility, and (c) to share the costs and help prevent and alleviate the adverse impact of change on displaced workers.

The bill also establishes a Federal Interagency Committee consisting of the heads of the Departments of Agriculture, Labor, Commerce, Defense, Health, Education, and Welfare, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, the Director of the Office of Science and Technology, and the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. The purpose of this Committee is to advise the Commission and provide liaison between the Commission and these Departments and agencies.

The bill authorizes not more than $2 million for the work of the Commission which will submit a final report of its findings and recommendations to the President and the Congress by January 1, 1966.

Mr. Speaker, I am particularly pleased that the Committee on Education and Labor has approved H.R. 11611, particularly since I introduced the first bill in the House (H.R. 8429) to establish a Federal Commission on Automation. On September 12, 1963, I introduced H.R. 8429 which proposed a commission to study the economic, governmental, and social effects of automation on employment, education, leisure time, politics, social relations, economic structures, foreign affairs, and any other areas affected by automation. Under my proposal the Commission would conduct and arrange seminars, discussions and meetings, and correlate all governmental studies on automation. The Commission would also be the agency for the dissemination of automation studies and information to the public. H.R. 8429 would require the Commission to submit interim and annual reports of its activities, findings, and recommendations to the Congress and the President. The Federal Commission on Automation under my proposal would be a permanent body of five full-time members solely concerned with the problems of automation. I regret that the Commission proposed by H.R. 11611 would not be a permanent body consisting of full-time Commissioners.

On June 22, 1964, before the Select Subcommittee on Labor of the House Education and Labor Committee in supporting the creation of a Federal Commission on Automation, I pointed out that, unless we plan now, the effects of automation may plunge our economy into turmoil.

To understand the rapid developments in technology, let us consider the statement of Gardner Ackley of the Council of Economic Advisers in an article entitled "Automation, Threat, and Promise," which appeared in the New York Times magazine of March 22, 1964:

> This year it will take about 2 million fewer workers than were needed last year to produce the same total output (just as last year, the previous year's output could have been produced with about 2 million fewer workers) and to get the unemployment rate down to 4 percent by the end of 1965, we would need to create about 9 million new jobs during 1964 and 1965—about 4 million to offset productivity gains and 5 million to take care of the unemployed and those who will enter the labor force.

The creation of 9 million jobs within a 2-year span is a challenge for the keenest minds of management, labor, and government.

Radical changes in demand for manpower have been produced by recent technological developments. Since World War II, there has been an acceleration of a long-term increase in professional and white-collar occupations at the expense of manual jobs, both in industry and agriculture.

In manufacturing, for example, the proportion of nonproduction workers has increased sharply. As a percentage of total employment in manufacturing, nonproduction workers have risen from 16 percent in 1947 to 26 percent in 1963. On the other hand, production-worker employment is 600,000 below the 1957 level, and about a million and a half below the number employed a decade ago.

Furthermore, the shift in the employment structure has contributed to the high rates of unemployment suffered by many groups in the labor force.

Let us look at job disappearance in individual industries.

The effects of automation can be seen in the steel, coal, and automobile industries. For example, in 1951, it took 567,000 workers to produce 105 million tons of steel, while last year 450,000 workers could turn out the same amount. Since the close of World War II, the time needed to mine one ton of coal has been halved, and the number of miners has declined from 450,000 to 130,000. Similarly, in automobile manufacturing, during the same period, the number of manhours required to manufacture an automobile fell from 311 to 150.

The railroad industry has been particularly affected by automation. During the past decade at least 500,000 railroad jobs have been eliminated by progress in technology, according to union estimates.

In more and more industries the ultimate in automation will be reached such as the present operation of an entire oil refinery from a console studded with push buttons.

Blue-collar jobs are by no means the only category affected by the process of automation.

White-collar professional and management positions are also being displaced by technological change. More than 2 years ago, the Chrysler Corp., laid off 7,000 of its 36,000 white-collar employees. The villians in the story were electronic computers and data-processing systems.

Furthermore, many scientists are finding their specialties outmoded by rapid advances in technology. For example, many a vacuum-tube specialist must now look to new fields. The tiny transistor has rendered him obsolete.

Even among the ranks of management, intricate computer systems are programed to make high-level decisions, thus usurping certain functions of the executive.

Mr. Speaker, the facts speak for themselves. They present to us one of the great challenges of our time—a challenge which demands that we devote our intellectual resources to the planning of the constructive use of automation. The impact of automation and mechanization on our economy requires new economic thinking and comprehensive planning. As a first tentative and long overdue step toward meeting the challenge of automation, I wholeheartedly urge all my colleagues to vote for H.R. 11611.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT].

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation and commend the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HOLLAND], for a very fine piece of work, and also the ranking minority member, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN]. I am sure this legislation, while it is not an end-all, is a step in the direction of doing something positive in connection with the problem of automation.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], a member of the Subcommittee on Labor.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this measure. I think the fact that we still have in the United States an unemployment rate in excess of 5 percent, in spite of the fact that we are enjoying a very considerable degree of prosperity, is sufficient evidence as to the need for this study.

The problem is a serious one. The differences of opinion as to the matter of theory in approaching the problem which have been advanced and suggested in various hearings on this measure and other measures in the Committee on Education and Labor give further testimony to the need for this study.

There seems to be a split philosophy with regard to this problem and connected problems as to whether or not for some reason there is only a limited amount or work available in the United States which has to be spread among all of our people.

I and many other Members who have heard the testimony agree with me that automation in itself is a good thing. Of course, it does result in some maladjustments and some problems arising for which there should be a proper degree of governmental concern in attempting to adjust these differences and ease the adjustments that may result in hardship to particular individuals affected.

I hope that this study will go ahead and consider the alternative theories involved between the limited body of work theory which, if we had adopted it even within as short a time as 10 years ago, would by now have doubled the amount of unemployment we presently face in this country. I think we should go ahead and study the problem as it applies not only to the question of automation itself, but also to a proposal that is still pending before our committee and the Congress on which there has been considerable controversy. That is the double overtime proposition.

If there ever was a proposal which is completely contrary in theory to the theories upon which we have been able to create enough jobs in this country, this is it. We have succeeded by recognizing that there is unlimited amount of work. There is no end to the services and the material production to provide employment for the people of the country. We have made progress because we have realized this. I hope the Commission will be authorized and will go ahead and study realistically in the light of our past progress what can be done to ease the problems that arise because of automation, but that they will do so without artificially limiting automation.

There is a real challenge in the job to be done. I go along with the elimination of excessively oriented powers of subpena and investigation originally planned for the Commission but now eliminated from it.

I hope that the cost of the Commission can be kept to a minimum. It should be understood that the Commission under the legislation will expire on January 1, 1966.

Mr. **DANIELS**. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 11611 establishes a National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress to study our industrial life so that we may have deeper insight into the future scope of our economic world.

Vision is essential to progress. But the most creative vision must be undergirded by facts. It would be the vital task of the Commission to gather facts, particularly as related to the incredibly swift technological changes with which we are confronted, to assess these facts and to recommend actions to cope with the problems growing out of these changes. Not only do we want to solve these problems, but as importantly we want to grasp every constructive potentiality of these changes and bring them to the fullest possible realization.

The Commission will be composed of 14 Presidential appointees approved by the Senate. It will be broadly representative of the public and will include not less than two persons from labor and two from management.

It is contemplated that the Commission will draw upon the Nation's ablest minds from outside the ranks of government to study our technological course in the next 10 years. Companion to these resources, the Federal Interagency Committee which the bill authorizes, will furnish the channel for direct utilization of the knowledge and data available through its Federal agency members. The Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Commerce will be cochairmen.

H.R. 11611 mirrors the findings of the Holland Select Subcommittee on Labor. The Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 was an immediate outgrowth of the initial findings of the subcommittee. This act was the first step to meet automation and technological problems head on.

Public hearings on this proposal were held in April of this year at which prominent labor, management, and public officials testified. Additional spokesmen and groups were solicited for their views for inclusion in the record. It is noteworthy that not a single dissent respecting the need for this legislation or the major outlines of the Commission proposal was voiced. The problem of planning for the future, one might say, has been publicly recognized and proclaimed. The effectiveness of accomplishing this planning through the type of Commission proposal and the purposes set forth were uniformly, in all major respects, approved. It is a remarkable fact that so vital a measure raises no controversy.

It is to be noted that the Commission would be charged with recommendations as to actions which should appropriately be taken by management, labor, Federal, State, and local governments. The plan is to harness the strength of our varied forces in a unified effort for national growth. Measures to facilitate occupational adjustment and geographical mobility, with respect to technological demands, the Commission is expressly authorized to study. Further, study would be directed to the important task of sharing costs and alleviating the adverse impact of change on displaced workers.

Secretary Hodges in his testimony described the need for the proposed Commission in these terms:

> This Nation faces a challenging dilemma. On the one hand, we must achieve continuous technological change if we are to have rising productivity and hence rising incomes in this country. On the other hand, we must ease the problems which both labor and management face in their attempts to adjust to technological change.

Secretary Wirtz emphasized that it is not how far or how fast we are advancing on the whole, or on the average; it is how many people are being left out. In his opinion:

> The Commission's report will provide a base from which we will be able to move to higher levels of effectiveness with programs to promote economic and social progress and justice and to achieve full employment.

I urge speedy approval of this bill.

Mr. **FULTON** of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, as a cosponsor of this bill, I favor the passage of H.R. 11611 for several reasons:

First. In the next decade, from all indications, there will continue to be rapid technological change, increasing urbanization, and even greater demands for specialized skills. Based on these foreseeable future developments, we must begin now to consider how the Nation can best prepare for a constructive and effective adjustment to these changes with the maximum benefit and minimum adverse effect.

Second. Although total employment is around 70 million and factory workers average $101 in wages per week, there is a reservoir of forgotten people. First, the number of new jobs that are being created cannot keep pace with the growing ranks of the unemployed, particularly the youth. Seventeen percent of those aged 16 to 19 were jobless last year—triple the average unemployment rate for all age groups. About 750,000 teenagers will enter the labor market this year. Second, the automation innovations further reduce job opportunities. It has been estimated that five jobs are lost for every one created by automation. According to the most conservative estimates, 200,000 factory jobs are now being lost each year by increased productivity. Those displaced tend to be the most immobile and too often lack the specialized formal training for higher skilled jobs. Of the 61 million adult workers aged 22 to 64, only 24 million have had some formal job training and only 9 million others have been to college 3 years or more. The other 28 million have no formal training.

Let me emphasize that I do not oppose automation and technological change. These advances can release mankind from back-breaking labor, can create a more efficient product, and can bring the Nation many economic benefits.

At the same time, however, we must also face the challenges of dislocations, loss of jobs and the specter of poverty in the midst of plenty. We must allow the displaced workers effective mechanisms to permit them to have a successful transition into other methods of earning a living.

The National Commission on Automation and Technological Progress can provide the necessary comprehensive perspective to begin to assess the impact of technology. It can analyze how to increase output and productivity while minimizing hardships to individual workers. It can begin to provide recommendations that will aid in identifying and describing the technological and economic effects as they apply to displaced jobs, to new openings in specific industries and occupations and to the geographic areas most likely involved for the next decade. It can promote the application of recent technological advances to meet large-scale human needs.

In H.R. 9880, a bill I introduced concerning this subject, provisions were made for representatives from both labor and management to be part of this Commission. I am happy to see this provision included in this bill. In this manner the membership will be broadly representative and will include not less than four members drawn equally from labor and management. Automation and technological progress is of vital concern to both of these groups and we recognize that for maximum benefit a combination of private and governmental action is necessary.

Furthermore, I am particularly interested in the Commission's responsibility "to facilitate occupational adjustment and geographical mobility" and "to share the costs and help prevent and alleviate the adverse impact on displaced workers." Through the work of the Commission we can learn whether these technological advances are benefiting us all, at the expense of a few, or benefiting a few, at the expense of us all.

By providing a long-range comprehensive view of automation and by focusing attention on the alternative courses of action, the Commission can begin to provide a realistic program to meet future demands.

I respectfully urge passage of H.R. 11611.

Mrs. **DWYER**. Mr. Speaker, every American, no matter where he may live or what he may be doing, is now and will increasingly be affected by the technological revolution of our times. Virtually every aspect of our national life, but especially the means by which we earn a living and support our families, is undergoing a series of changes brought about by technological advancements, automation, computerization, and related developments which gave us greater and greater control over our environment.

Much of this represents solid progress. It is helping us reach and maintain the highest standard of living in the world. But there have been painful side effects, including the loss of jobs, the dislocation of families, and increasingly difficult standards of technical training and achievement. Unless we are able to understand and to master these harmful aspects of technological progress, we risk the loss of much of the benefit such progress holds out to humanity.

The problems associated with the new technology are much too complex and comprehensive to be dealt with successfully on a piecemeal basis. Before we can plan a national strategy for dealing with what is obviously a national problem, we must pool our resources of understanding and attempt to see the problem in all its diverse ramifications. This, as I understand it, is the purpose of the pending legislation. By bringing together outstanding citizens who are knowledgeable in and representative of the fields of labor, management, and other areas of our economy and society, we can hope to identify and evaluate the effects, direction, and future impact of technological change on employment, education, production, and the character of our family and community lives. With this new and deeper understanding, we can then map the most promising means of realizing the maximum advantages of technological progress, of preserving basic human values, and of minimizing the harmful effects of such change on individual workers, their families, and their communities.

The tendency in recent years, Mr. Speaker, has been to deal too often with problems such as these in terms of quick headlines and quick thinking which have resulted in both hasty proposals and hasty opposition. The Nation needs to get down to fundamentals, to understand our problems and their real dimensions and to propose thoughtful solutions which can unite our people on the basis of their merits.

The pending bill, Mr. Speaker, represents such an approach and I hope the House will pass it.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The question is, Will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended?

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that in the opinion of the Chair two-thirds had voted in the affirmative.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 261, nays 76, not voting 95, as follows:

[Roll No. 185]

YEAS—261

Adair
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson
Andrews, N. Dak.
Arends
Aspinall
Ayres
Baker
Baldwin
Barrett
Bates
Battin
Beckworth
Bell
Betts
Boggs
Boland
Bolton, Frances P.
Bolton, Oliver P.
Brademas
Bray
Bromwell
Brooks
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Calif.
Broyhill, N.C.
Burke
Burton, Calif.
Burton, Utah
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Cameron
Carey
Cederberg
Celler
Chamberlain
Chenoweth
Clancy
Clark
Cleveland
Cohelan
Collier
Conte
Corbett
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtin
Curtis
Daddario
Dague
Daniels
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Derounian
Derwinski
Donohue
Downing
Dulski
Duncan
Edmondson
Elliott
Ellsworth
Everett
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Findley
Finnegan
Flood
Fogarty
Ford
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gary
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffin
Grover
Hagen, Calif.
Halleck
Hanna
Harding
Hardy
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Hawkins
Hays
Hechler
Holifield
Holland
Horan
Horton
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Pa.
Johnson, Wis.
Jonas
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Keith
Kelly
Keogh
Kluczynski
Kunkel
Latta
Leggett
Lesinski
Libonati
Lindsay
Long, Md.
McCulloch
McDade
McDowell
McFall
McIntire
McLoskey
Macdonald
MacGregor
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Mathias
Matsunaga
May
Michel
Milliken
Mills
Minish
Minshall
Monagan
Montoya
Morgan
Morris
Morse
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Natcher
Nedzi
Nix
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill
Osmers
Ostertag
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Pillion
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Price
Reid, Ill.
Reifel
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Rich
Riehlman
Rivers, Alaska
Roberts, Ala.
Roberts, Tex.
Rodino
Rogers, Fla.
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Roosevelt
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roudebush
Roush
Rumsfeld
Ryan, N.Y.
St. Onge
Saylor
Schadeberg
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Schwengel
Scott
Secrest
Sheppard
Shipley
Shriver
Sibal
Sickles
Siler
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Snyder
Springer
Staebler
Stafford
Staggers
Stinson
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Taft
Talcott
Taylor
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Tollefson
Trimble
Tupper
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Weaver
Weltner
Westland
Whalley
White
Wickersham
Widnall
Willis
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Ind.
Wright
Wydler
Wyman
Young
Younger
Zablocki

NAYS—76

Abbitt
Abele
Abernethy
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Becker
Beermann
Belcher
Bennett, Fla.
Berry
Bonner
Bow
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, Va.
Bruce
Burleson
Casey
Clawson, Del
Colmer
Davis, Ga.
Devine
Dole
Dorn
Dowdy
Fisher
Fountain
Fuqua
Gathings
Grant
Gross
Hagan, Ga.
Haley
Hall
Henderson
Hoeven
Hosmer
Huddleston
Jarman
Jensen
Johansen
Jones, Mo.
King, N.Y.
Kornegay
Kyl
Langen
Lennon
McClory
Martin, Nebr.
Matthews
Murray
Nelsen
Passman
Pool
Quillen
Rivers, S.C.
Rogers, Tex.
St. George
Schenck
Selden
Sikes
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Va.
Stephens
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Tuck
Tuten
Utt
Van Pelt
Waggonner
Watson
Watts
Whitener
Whitten
Williams
Winstead

NOT VOTING—95

Alger
Andrews, Ala.
Ashley
Auchincloss
Avery
Baring
Barry
Bass
Bennett, Mich.
Blatnik
Bolling
Brock
Buckley
Burkhalter
Chelf
Clausen, Don H.
Cooley
Corman
Diggs
Dingell
Dwyer
Edwards
Evins
Feighan
Fino
Flynt
Foreman
Forrester
Gill
Glenn
Goodell
Goodling
Grabowski
Griffiths
Gubser
Gurney
Halpern
Hansen
Harris
Harvey, Mich.
Healey
Hébert
Herlong
Hoffman
Hull
Jones, Ala.
Kee
Kilburn
Kilgore
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Knox
Laird
Landrum
Lankford
Lipscomb
Lloyd
Long, La.
McMillan
Martin, Calif.
Martin, Mass.
Meader
Miller, Calif.
Miller, N.Y.
Moore
Moorhead
Morrison
Morton
Mosher
Norblad
Pilcher
Powell
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Rains
Randall
Reid, N.Y.
Robison
Rogers, Colo.
Roybal
Ryan, Mich.
St Germain
Senner
Short
Skubitz
Steed
Thomas
Thompson, La.
Toll
Vinson
Wallhauser
Wharton
Wilson, Charles H.

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Lipscomb.

Mr. King of California with Mr. Martin of California.

Mr. Cooley with Mr. Barry.

Mr. Toll with Mr. Goodling.

Mr. Dingell with Mr. Bennett of Michigan.

Mr. Morrison with Mr. Miller of New York.

Mr. Chelf with Mr. Alger.

Mr. St Germain with Mr. Wallhauser.

Mr. Healey with Mr. Goodell.

Mr. Evins with Mr. Moore.

Mrs. Griffiths with Mrs. Dwyer.

Mr. Randall with Mr. Knox.

Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Gubser.

Mr. Feighan with Mr. Norblad.

Mr. Buckley with Mr. Don Clausen.

Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Brock.

Mr. Thomas with Mr. Auchincloss.

Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Meader.

Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Laird.

Mr. Hull with Mr. Reid of New York.

Mr. Rogers of Colorado with Mr. Quie.

Mr. Moorhead with Mr. Glenn.

Mr. Herlong with Mr. Skubitz.

Mr. Kilgore with Mr. Foreman.

Mr. Andrews of Alabama with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.

Mr. Rains with Mr. Short.

Mr. Landrum with Mr. Morton.

Mr. Roybal with Mr. Harvey of Michigan.

Mr. Harris with Mr. Gurney.

Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Fino.
Mr. Corman with Mr. Halpern.
Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. Mosher.
Mr. Flynt with Mr. Robison.
Mr. Pilcher with Mr. Hoffman.
Mr. Gill with Mr. Wharton.
Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. Forrester with Mr. Avery.
Mr. Edwards with Mr. Powell.
Mr. Lankford with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. Baring with Mr. Ryan of Michigan.
Mrs. Hansen with Mr. McMillan.
Mr. Bass with Mrs. Kee.
Mr. Senner with Mr. Burkhalter.
Mr. Steed with Mr. Vinson.

Mr. **DOWNING** changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. **CASEY** changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR ADJUSTMENTS IN ANNUITIES UNDER THE FOREIGN SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY SYSTEM

Mr. **HAYS**. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 10485) to provide for adjustments in annuities under the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability System.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Foreign Service Annuity Adjustment Act of 1964".

SEC. 2. (a) Annuities paid from the Foreign Service retirement and disability fund on the date of enactment of this Act, based on service performed by annuitants which terminated prior to October 16, 1960, shall be adjusted under the provisions of section 821(b) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, relating to the formula for reduction in annuity to provide for a surviving widow, as though such provisions had been in effect on the date of the annuitant's separation from the Service, or, in the case of any annuitant who makes an election under paragraph (1) or (2) of this subsection, in accordance with the following:

(1) An annuitant who at time of retirement was married to a wife who is still living (and to whom he is married on the date of enactment of this Act), and for whom he has not elected a widow survivor benefit before such date of enactment, may, within one hundred and twenty days after such date of enactment, elect to provide a widow survivor benefit of $2,400 per annum. The annuity of an annuitant who makes an election under this paragraph shall be reduced by $300 per annum.

(2) An annuitant who at time of retirement was married to a wife who is still living (and to whom he is married on the date of enactment of this Act) and for whom he has elected, before such date of enactment, a widow survivor benefit of less than $2,400 per annum, may, within one hundred and twenty days after such date of enactment, elect to provide a widow survivor benefit of $2,400 per annum. The annuity of an annuitant who makes an election under this paragraph shall be reduced by $300 per annum in lieu of any reductions of his annuity in effect on the date of enactment of this Act because of elections made by him before such date of enactment in connection with the provision of a widow survivor annuity.

(b) If an annuitant referred to in paragraph (a)(1) or (a)(2) of this section dies within one hundred and twenty days after the date of enactment of this Act, without having made an election under such paragraph (a)(1) or (a)(2), his surviving widow shall be paid the greater of—

(1) $2,400; or

(2) the annuity to which she may be entitled from the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability Fund as his widow under any provision of law in effect on the date of the death of the annuitant.

SEC. 3. If a former participant whose service as a class 4 Foreign Service officer was terminated prior to October 16, 1960, and who elected a deferred annuity, dies before becoming eligible to receive an annuity, the benefit of the surviving widow, if she was eligible under the terms of the law in effect upon his separation from the Service, shall not be less than $2,400 per annum.

SEC. 4. In any case in which an annuitant who retired prior to October 16, 1960, dies before the date of enactment of this Act, leaving a widow to whom he was married at time of retirement who is not entitled to receive an annuity as his widow under the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability System, and who is not receiving benefits as his widow under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, the Secretary of State shall grant such widow, whether remarried or not, an annuity of $2,400 per annum.

SEC. 5. The annuity of each widow survivor annuitant who, on the date of enactment of this Act, is receiving a survivor annuity from the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability Fund of less than $2,400 per annum is hereby increased to $2,400 per annum.

SEC. 6. The annuity benefits elected or provided with respect to any widow under section 2, 3, 4, or 5 of this Act shall be in lieu of any annuity benefits to which such widow otherwise would be entitled as the widow of the Foreign Service officer with respect to whom such annuity benefits are so elected or provided.

SEC. 7. Any increase, adjustment, or grant of an annuity under section 2, 4, or 5 of this Act shall commence on the first day of the month following the expiration of the 120-day period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, and the monthly rate payable shall be fixed at the nearest dollar.

SEC. 8. Annuity benefits provided by this Act shall be paid from the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability Fund; except that, no part of such Fund shall be applied toward the payment of any benefits under section 2, 4, or 5 of this Act until an appropriation is made to such fund in an amount which the Secretary of the Treasury estimates to be necessary to prevent an increase in the unfunded liability to such fund for the first fiscal year during which such benefits are payable.

SEC. 9. Title VIII of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, is amended as follows:

(1) Section 821(b) of such Act (22 U.S.C. 1076(b)) is amended to read as follows:

"(b)(1) At the time of retirement, any married female participant may elect to receive a reduced annuity and to provide for an annuity payable to her husband, commencing on the date following such participant's death and terminating upon the death of such surviving husband. The annuity payable to the surviving husband after such participant's death shall be 50 per centum of the amount of the participant's annuity computed as prescribed in paragraph (a) of this section, up to the full amount of such annuity specified by her as the base for the survivor benefits. The annuity of the participant making such election shall be reduced by 2½ per centum of any amount up to $2,400 she specifies as the base for the survivor benefit plus 10 per centum of any amount over $2,400 so specified.

"(2) At the time of retirement, the annuity of each married male participant computed as prescribed in paragraph (a) of this section shall be reduced by $300 to provide for his surviving wife a minimum annuity of $2,400; except that, if his annuity is more than $4,800, he may elect up to 50 per centum of such annuity for his surviving wife, and if such election is made, his annuity shall be further reduced by 10 per centum of the difference between $4,800 and the base he specifies for the survivor benefit."

(2) The first sentence of section 832(b) of such Act (22 U.S.C. 1082(b)) is amended by inserting immediately before the period at the end thereof the following: "; except that the annuity of any widow shall not be less than $2,400".

(3) At the end of title VIII of such Act add the following:

"PART J—COST-OF-LIVING ADJUSTMENTS OF ANNUITIES

"SEC. 882. (a) On the basis of determination made by the Civil Service Commission pursuant to section 18 of the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, pertaining to per centum change in the price index, the following adjustments shall be made:

"(1) Effective April 1, 1964, if the change in the price index from 1962 to 1963 shall have equaled a rise of at least 3 per centum, each annuity payable from the fund which has a commencing date earlier than January 2, 1963, shall be increased by the per centum rise in the price index adjusted to the nearest one-tenth of 1 per centum.

"(2) Effective April 1 of any year other than 1964 after the price index change shall have equaled a rise of at least 3 per centum, each annuity payable from the fund which has a commencing date earlier than January 2 of the preceding year shall be increased by the per centum rise in the price index adjusted to the nearest one-tenth of 1 per centum.

"(b) Eligibility for an annuity increase under this section shall be governed by the commencing date of each annuity payable from the fund as of the effective date of an increase, except as follows:

"(1) Effective from the date of the first increase under this section, an annuity payable from the fund to an annuitant's survivor (other than a child entitled under section 821(c)), which annuity commenced the day after the annuitant's death, shall be increased as provided in subsection (a)(1) or (a)(2) if the commencing date of annuity to the annuitant was earlier than January 2 of the year preceding the first increase.

"(2) Effective from its commencing date, an annuity payable from the fund to an annuitant's survivor (other than a child entitled under section 821(c)), which annuity commences the day after the annuitant's death and after the effective date of the first increase under this section, shall be increased by the total per centum increase the annuitant was receiving under this section at death.

"(3) For purposes of computing an annuity which commences after the effective date of the first increase under this section to a child under section 821(c), the items $600, $720, $1,800, and $2,160 appearing in section 821(c) shall be increased by the total per centum increase allowed and in force under this section and, in case of a deceased annuitant, the items 40 per centum and 50 per centum appearing in section 821(c) shall be increased by the total per centum increase allowed and in force under this section to the annuitant at death. Effective from the date of the first increase under this section, the provisions of this paragraph shall apply as if such first increase were in effect with respect to computation of a child's annuity under section 821(c) which commenced between January 2 of the year preceding the first increase and the effective date of the first increase.

"(c) No increase in annuity provided by this section shall be computed on any additional annuity purchased at retirement by voluntary contributions.

"(d) No increase in annuity provided by this section shall apply to amounts paid under authority of section 5 of Public Law 84-503, as amended, section 4 of the Foreign Service Annuity Adjustment Act of 1964, or any other law authorizing annuity grants to widows.

"(e) The monthly installment of annuity after adjustment under this section shall be fixed at the nearest dollar."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this bill, H.R. 10485, is basically a bill focused on adjustments of annuities of retired Foreign Service officers and their widows.

The bill came out of the subcommittee unanimously, and came out of the full committee unanimously. It has four major provisions:

First, it permits the adjustment of survivor annuities for those who retired before October 1960, the date when the Foreign Service retirement system was amended so far as survivor benefits are concerned, and brought more nearly into accord with the civil service retirement system.

Second, it adjusts the annuities of widows whose husbands retired before October 1960. This is an important provision to prevent this kind of legislation being brought up in the future. It requires future annuitants to provide a minimum annuity of $2,400 for surviving widows. I am not condemning those who did not do it before because in some instances their pension was so low that if they paid for it they would not have had enough to live on. But under the new language since 1960 this has been remedied.

Fourth, it incorporates the language in the civil service law providing cost of living adjustments of annuities.

Those are the basic things that it does. As I said, the committee thought it eminently fair that this should be done and ought to be done. It was unanimously reported.

If there are any questions I will try to answer them.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I assume this bill comes out of the proper committee. Does the gentleman think it is being handled by the proper committee, or should it have come out of the Committee on the Civil Service?

Mr. HAYS. The only thing I can say to the gentleman, always in the past Foreign Service annuity legislation was handled by the Committee on Foreign Affairs. When the bill was introduced, it was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs by the Speaker and the Parliamentarian, and I assume that was the correct committee.

Mr. GROSS. In the past it has been my understanding that increases for Foreign Service officers came out of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, but of late that has gone over to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

I do not care to argue the point or to discuss it any further, but I was just wondering when the committee is going to handle the pay bill for the Foreign Service people.

Mr. HAYS. I think it works two ways. To amend the basic law it is referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and if it is a straight pay raise bill it is referred to the Committee on Civil Service.

Mr. GROSS. For expedition and convenience, I suppose.

Mr. HAYS. I would not know about that.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ADAIR. In reference to the point the gentleman from Ohio is making, I would say that, in my opinion, this is the type of bill that should be referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. This committee has been very careful not to intrude on the prerogatives of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. Here is one in which the subject matter relates primarily to those who deal with foreign affairs and, in my opinion, it is proper to be before this committee.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Speaker, the chairman of our subcommittee has explained and will explain more about what the bill really is. It is simple and very necessary.

I want to take this opportunity to say to the Congress that there is an organization of retired Foreign Service officers that I do not know how many of you know is in existence. It is most helpful. It is DACOR, which means Diplomatic and Consular Officers Retired. They are very helpful to us when we we are going into these matters. They come before us as witnesses, but they will also look up any kind of information we need, and they are very generous of their time. To me this is a most important and very much needed bill at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR].

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, since I have been a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the committee has had before it, at least once in each Congress, measures to adjust annuities of widows of retired Foreign Service officers. These bills were usually geared to the date of retirement of their husbands from the Foreign Service. Hence, each bill affected only a small number of widows. In a few instances, the measures were limited to relief for some destitute widows. In any case the approach was piecemeal, and the relief provided a few individuals invariably created inequities among those not included in the legislation.

The committee this year decided that the time had come to examine the matter of survivor annuities on an across-the-board basis. The justification for this approach arose in large part from amendments to the Foreign Service retirement system made by Congress in October 1960. Since that date an officer who retires is able to provide a survivor annuity at a cost much below that of an officer who retired before that date. By way of illustration a Foreign Service officer who retired with a full annuity of $7,000 before October 1960 could provide a widow's annuity of $2,500 at a cost of $1,250. Since that date an officer with the same full annuity can provide a widow's annuity of $3,500 at a cost of only $520. The amendments made in 1960 to the Foreign Service retirement system, I should add, brought that retirement system more nearly in accord with the civil service retirement system in regard to survivor benefits.

Section 2 of H.R. 10485 is the section that covers survivor benefits for those Foreign Service officers who retired before October 1960. It deals with the adjustment of survivor annuities of those officers. It should be noted that it covers only those who were married at the time of retirement and whose wife, as of the time of retirement, is still living. Briefly it divides retirees into three groups—those who elected a survivor annuity of more than $2,400, those who elected a survivor annuity of less than $2,400, and those who elected no survivor annuity. In the case of those who elected a survivor annuity of more than $2,400, the cost of such annuity will automatically be recomputed under the more favorable formula now in the law. Thus it will cost such individuals less to provide for their survivor annuity. For those who elected a survivor annuity of less than $2,400, or chose no survivor annuity, provision is made for them to elect within 120 days a maximum annuity of $2,400 at a cost of $300 per year. This cost figure is based upon the formula in effect since October 1960.

Thus the committee has in effect given individuals who retired before October 1960 an opportunity to make provision for their widows at the lowest cost. I do not know how many will avail themselves of this election. But once the decision is made, I would state that Congress had discharged its obligation in a fair and reasonable manner and should not be asked to consider further legislation on this subject. I think it is important to point out to the House that the committee has also included in this bill the cost-of-living adjustment for annuitants that is in the civil service retirement legislation.

This bill also adjusts the annuities of widows whose husbands retired before October 1960 by providing them an annuity of $2,400 if they presently are not receiving that sum.

The committee has also included a distinctive feature dealing with future retirees. Section 9(1) of the bill requires that all officers who retire after the date of enactment of this bill shall provide an annuity for their widows of not less than $2,400. Many of these officers will, of course, want to provide maximum coverage for their widows. This they can do under existing law. But in no case may an officer provide for less than $2,400.

A reading of the bill will lead to the conclusion that it is technical. I readily agree that it is. But it must be of that nature in order to cover the varied conditions it attempts to improve. In my judgment it is a constructive measure that treats equitably the older retired officers of the Foreign Service as well as their widows. At the same time it seeks to reduce, if not to eliminate entirely, the many hardship cases that have occupied the time of Congress. I recommend that H.R. 10485 pass.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may desire to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. KELLY].

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 10485, the Foreign Service Annuity Adjustment Act of 1964. As a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I assure my colleagues that a thorough study of this bill was undertaken. I compliment our chairman and members of your committee for supporting this bill.

This is a meritorious piece of legislation. It proposes to remedy some of the inequities suffered by a small group of Foreign Service officers who retired before October 16, 1960, and who were married at the time of their retirement. This group of officers, a maximum of 354, are not currently entitled to the more liberal annuity benefits provided by the Congress in Public Law 86–723 of October 16, 1960. The bill before the House today would eliminate this disparity in the treatment of retired Foreign Service officers and is, therefore, both justified and necessary.

The bill will also benefit a handful of widows of Foreign Service officers whose spouses did not provide them with survivors' benefits, and a few who are receiving an annuity of less than $2,400. These hardship cases have been handled from time to time by the Congress on an individual basis, through the passage of private relief bills. The bill before the House would take care of this group of widows and obviate the necessity of handling their cases on an individual basis.

Mr. Speaker, as I already mentioned, this is a deserving piece of legislation. It will provide for a number of hardship cases, and correct an inequity which has persisted for the past 4 years. I strongly urge its enactment.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MONAGAN].

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 10485.

This is legislation which is necessary to compensate for certain inequities which exist in the present law. It gives an opportunity for those Foreign Service officers who were unable to do so, to presently provide for widows' pensions at a rate which is reasonable. It also provides for outright pensions for widows, in a small number of cases, in situations where their husbands did not provide for annuities because of the then expense.

If we are to have an adequate Foreign Service, it is essential that Foreign Service officers receive adequate pay and, also, that the retirement provisions for the Foreign Service officers and their widows be at least comparable to those in other branches of the Government. In the particulars which I have mentioned, this has not been the case and the present legislation is calculated to remedy this deficiency.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 10485?

The question was taken; and, two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the rules were suspended, and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 745) to provide for adjustments in annuities under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system, a similar bill to the House bill just passed so that the text of the bill, H.R. 10485, as passed may be substituted for the text of the bill, S. 745.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HAYS

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HAYS: Strike out all after the enacting clause of the bill, S. 745, and insert the provisions of the bill, H.R. 10485, as passed.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill, H.R. 10485, was laid on the table.

AMENDING THE FOREIGN SERVICE BUILDINGS ACT, 1926, TO AUTHORIZE ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 11754) to amend the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926, to authorize additional appropriations, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) paragraph (2) of subsection (d) of section 4 of the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926, as amended (22 U.S.C. 295), is amended to read as follows:

"(2) for use to carry out the other purposes of this Act, not to exceed $11,500,000 for the fiscal year 1964, $12,000,000 for the fiscal year 1965, $12,200,000 for the fiscal year 1966, $12,400,000 for the fiscal year 1967."

(b) Subsection (d) of section 4 of such Act (22 U.S.C. 295) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "Beginning with the fiscal year 1966, not to exceed 10 per centum of the funds authorized for any subparagraph under paragraph (1) of this subsection may be used for any of the purposes for which funds are authorized under any other subparagraph of such paragraph (1)."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded? If not, the Chair will put the question.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, during the past 6 years the Committee on Foreign Affairs has given close scrutiny to all aspects of the buildings operations of the Department of State. Last year the committee reported out a bill that was enacted into law. That law authorized appropriations for the purchase and construction of buildings used by the Department of State overseas and also authorized appropriations for the maintenance, improvement, and general servicing of all the Department's buildings abroad. I think the House will be interested to learn that the present value of the Department's real estate holdings abroad are now estimated at about $220 million.

The bill now before the House, H.R. 11754, does not—and I repeat not—deal with any new construction or purchase of real estate abroad. It simply authorizes a sum for the "housekeeping" operations of existing buildings of the Department abroad. Last year Congress authorized for this purpose an appropriation of $23,500,000 for the 2 fiscal years 1964 and 1965. In this bill we are recommending an authorization of $24,600,000 for the fiscal years 1966 and 1967. The increase is due principally to the increased cost of maintaining the buildings in suitable condition. For example, in almost every country, custodial and janitorial and other local labor costs are rising as are local costs for utilities and fuel. A number of the structures require new furnishings and equipment. In the view of the committee the increase in the authorization contained in this bill is reasonable. In our examination of the Department's witnesses on this item last year I think all of us were impressed by the endeavor the administrators of the building program are making to keep expenses down without impairing the full utilization of the buildings.

In authorizing an appropriation for the purchase and construction of buildings last year Congress specified amounts by geographic areas to be used over a 2-year period. As a result of reduced appropriations, changes in construction or acquisition schedules and in local conditions, the Department has not used all the money authorized for some areas. In other areas of the world the program has proceeded pretty much on schedule. Instead of asking for a new authorization to carry on the building program the Department has proposed, and the committee is recommending in this bill, that the Department be permitted to transfer up to 10 percent of the funds specified for each of the several areas into the funds for other areas. This involves no new authorization of money. It permits the Department to use funds previously authorized for certain areas in other areas up to a maximum of 10 percent. In this way the Department will be able to carry forward the building program for another year without asking for a new authorization. Last year the subcommittee of which I am chairman screened each of the projects proposed by the Department. Hence we are familiar with the plans for the use of the funds. I think this request for a modest transfer authority is warranted. It will not lessen congressional supervision or control over the building program. At the same time it will provide a degree of flexibility to those responsible for carrying out the program.

I urge the House to support H.R. 11754.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 11754 has two purposes. First, it authorizes specific sums for 2 fiscal years for the operating expenses of the Department of State in carrying out its building program abroad. Second, it authorizes the transfer between geographic areas of sums previously authorized for the acquisition of buildings abroad. Each of these purposes requires a short explanation.

Last year Congress authorized specific amounts justified as sufficient for 2 fiscal years for the housekeeping functions that the Department of State must perform to maintain our many Government-owned structures abroad. The amount authorized for those 2 fiscal years was $23,500,000. This bill authorizes for fiscal year 1966 a sum of $12,200,000 and for fiscal year 1967 a sum of $12,400,000—a total of $24,600,000.

These funds are used for several purposes. One is to make minor improvements in buildings that we occupy in more than 280 posts abroad. These include office buildings, residences for our officers, staff houses and apartment buildings, warehouses and garages. Some of the improvements, such as protective fencing of our property or a new incinerator stack, cost only a few hundred dollars each. Other improvements, such as security features or a water supply system, run into the thousands of dollars. Based upon submissions by our missions abroad, the Department screens those of the highest priority for completion most immediately. With the increasing volume of real property holdings, the demand for such minor improvements has correspondingly increased until today there is a substantial backlog of proposals.

Another purpose of these funds is to make the annual rental payments on the property that we lease. These are fixed charges that must be met if the Government is to retain possession of the property.

The largest single item included in this authorization is for building operating expenses. These cover fuel, utilities, custodial and janitorial services and supplies, various municipal taxes, ground care, and similar expenses incident to the use of real property. These costs tend to move upward each year because of additional property holdings and local wage and utility rate increases. Occupancy of many of these buildings is shared with other U.S. Federal agencies which pay a pro rata share of these operating expenses.

Another item funded from this appropriation authorization is that for the repair and maintenance of our buildings abroad which represent a present value of more than $220 million. This may be for the replacement of a broken window, the painting of a building or the replacement of a wornout power generator. Moreover, the Department of State carries no insurance on its buildings. Thus losses caused by fire or storm must be met from the funds appropriated for this activity.

Finally, furniture and furnishings of our buildings, the cost of supervision and administration of the foreign buildings program, are included in the requested authorization.

In summary, most of the items included in this category represent fixed or relatively fixed costs to keep our buildings abroad habitable. I regard the amount in this authorization as reasonable, not excessive.

The second provision in this bill authorizes, beginning in fiscal year 1966, the transfer of not more than 10 percent of the funds previously authorized for the acquisition by purchase or construction of sites and buildings in each of the several geographic areas of the world. Last year the Subcommittee on State Department Organization and Foreign Operations spent many hours examining each building project proposed by the State Department. It rejected some, reduced the amounts of others, and approved still others. During the markup of the buildings bill, we faced three choices in authorizing for the program—first, a blanket authorization; second, a project-by-project authorization; or, third, an authorization on a geographic basis. The subcommittee adopted the third choice because it provided a balance between administrative flexibility and congressional control. The committee and the Congress accepted this approach. Thus Public Law 88-94 carries an authorization of $26,324,000, broken down by geographic areas. The sum was intended to be sufficient to carry the building program forward for 2 years. Due to appropriation reductions and changes in program priorities occasioned by local conditions there remains an unappropriated balance of $9,442,000. But this balance is concentrated in areas such as Africa and Latin America where the program is not moving according to expectation. On the other hand, the balances for the Far East and the Near East are about depleted. The grant of transfer authority contained in this bill will permit the use of unappropriated balances in areas where building priorities are highest. The Department advised that if this transfer authority is granted, it would make unnecessary a request for additional authorizations at least for another year. Since the subcommittee last year examined the proposed projects, the request in this bill does not seem to me to indicate any diminution of congressional control over the buildings program. Rather it provides a small degree of flexibility in the administration of a program that has already received careful congressional scrutiny.

This is a reasonable bill that is necessary and desirable for the effective operation of the building program. Accordingly I urge its passage.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. Kelly] may extend her remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 11754. This bill was approved unanimously by the Foreign Affairs Committee.

This bill authorizes funds needed to permit the State Department to cover operational costs of U.S. buildings abroad. The sum of $12,200,000 is authorized for fiscal year 1966 and $12,400,000 for fiscal year 1967. These operational costs include such items as maintenance, repair and operation of buildings, payments on existing leases, project supervision, capital improvements and the cost of administration of the program in the more than 280 posts we maintain abroad.

Last year, the Congress authorized funds, by geographic areas for the Foreign Service buildings program, for a 2-year period. As a result of reduced appropriations and changes in program priorities, there is a balance of $9,442,000 in authorization remaining against which appropriations may be made. The committee understands that this sum will be sufficient to carry the building program for fiscal year 1966 if it can be made available where it is most needed. Accordingly, provision is made in H.R. 11754 for authority to transfer not more than 10 percent of the funds authorized for each geographic area to other geographic areas for the building program. This transfer authority makes good sense. It eliminates the need for the Department to request additional authorization for capital items for the building program at least for another year, and does not in any way weaken the stronger legislative oversight which our committee has been exercising over this program.

Mr. Speaker, this bill merits our support and I urge its immediate passage.

The SPEAKER. The question is: Will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill?

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof), the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENTS TO THE ATOMIC ENERGY ACT OF 1954, AS AMENDED, THE ATOMIC ENERGY COMMUNITY ACT OF 1955, AS AMENDED, AND THE EURATOM COOPERATION ACT OF 1958, AS AMENDED

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 2963) to amend the Atomic

Energy Act of 1954, as amended, the Atomic Energy Community Act of 1955, as amended, and the EURATOM Cooperation Act of 1958, as amended.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection 153(h) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, is amended by striking out the date "September 1, 1964" and inserting in lieu thereof the date "September 1, 1969."

SEC. 2. Subsection 170c. of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "With respect to any production or utilization facility for which a construction permit is issued between August 30, 1954, and August 1, 1967, the requirements of this subsection shall apply to any license issued for such facility subsequent to August 1, 1967."

SEC. 3. Subsection 170k. of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "With respect to any production or utilization facility for which a construction permit is issued between August 30, 1954, and August 1, 1967, the requirements of this subsection shall apply to any license issued for such facility subsequent to August 1, 1967.

SEC. 4. The Atomic Energy Community Act of 1955, as amended, is amended by adding the following new section:

"SEC. 120. DISPOSAL OF PROPERTY.—In addition to any other authority the Commission may have, the Commission is authorized, without regard to the provisions of section 3708 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, to lease land, and to sell, lease, including leases with options to purchase, and otherwise dispose of improvements thereon, and such equipment and other personal property as is determined to be directly related thereto, in the Commission's Hanford project in and near Richland, Washington, upon a determination by the Commission that such disposition will serve to prevent or reduce the adverse economic impact of actual or anticipated reductions in Commission programs in that area: *Provided, however,* That the compensation to the Government for any such disposition shall be the estimated fair market value or estimated fair rental value of the property as determined by the Commission: *Provided further,* That before the Commission makes any disposition of property under the authority of this section, the basis for the proposed disposition (with necessary background and explanatory data) shall be submitted to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and a period of forty-five days shall elapse while Congress is in session (in computing such forty-five days, there shall be excluded the days on which either House is not in session because of adjournment of more than three days): *Provided, however,* That the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, after having received the basis for the proposed disposition, may by resolution in writing waive the conditions of, or all or any portion of, such forty-five day period."

SEC. 5. Section 5 of the EURATOM Cooperation Act of 1958, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 5. Pursuant to the provisions of section 54 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, there is hereby authorized for sale or lease to the Community:

Seventy thousand kilograms of contained uranium 235;

Five hundred kilograms of plutonium;

Thirty kilograms of uranium 233;

in accordance with the provisions of an agreement or agreements for cooperation between the Government of the United States and the Community entered into pursuant to the provisions of section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended: *Provided,* That the Government of the United States obtains the equivalent of a first lien on any such material sold to the Community for which payment is not made in full at the time of transfer."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, the bill now before the House, S. 2963, is the AEC omnibus bill for 1964.

The bill contains several amendments to basic laws in the atomic energy field. The amendments are not controversial. This bill was reported without dissent from the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. It was approved by the other body several weeks ago by voice vote.

This bill is in keeping with past AEC omnibus bills. Its function is to clarify and modify our atomic energy legislation in order to keep our laws current with new developments in the nuclear field.

Section 1 of the bill extends the Atomic Energy Commission's authority to require the licensing of certain patents for a 5-year period. This authority was initially included in the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 with a 5-year limitation. In 1959 the Congress approved an extension until September 1 of this year and the amendment now before us would continue this authority until September 1, 1969.

Even though the authority to compel the licensing of atomic energy patents has never been used, the committee believes that this authority is important. This "reserve" power can be a useful tool in preventing the creation of patent monopolies during the formative period of this young and expanding industry.

Turning briefly to sections 2 and 3 of the bill. These sections would clarify the Price-Anderson indemnity provisions of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954. The amendments would make it clear that a nuclear reactor for which the Commission issues a construction permit prior to August 1, 1967, will be afforded Price-Anderson indemnity coverage extending through the period of its operation even if the operating license for the facility is not issued until after that date.

I believe my colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] intends to discuss these amendments in greater detail. I would only stress that these amendments are simply for purposes of clarification and do not extend, alter, or modify in any way, the AEC's authority under the Price-Anderson Act.

The question of whether the Price-Anderson Act should be extended, and if so, under what conditions is a separate matter to be considered by the committee in the near future.

Turning to section 4 of the bill, this section would add a new provision to the Atomic Energy Community Act of 1955.

Section 4 would empower the Atomic Energy Commission to lease real property and to sell or lease personal property located in the Hanford project of the Atomic Energy Commission near Richland, Wash. Disposals of Commission property under this authority would be for the conduct of activities not related to atomic energy.

In requesting this amendment, the Atomic Energy Commission asserted that it now has the authority under the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 to dispose of Government property for use by the transferees for purposes related to the development and utilization of atomic energy. This amendment neither adds to, nor detracts from, whatever authority the Commission may now have to dispose of property for nuclear-related purposes. The matter of the Commission's existing authority is therefore not germane to the consideration of this amendment.

I believe that a word of background is necessary here. The reduction in the production of plutonium announced earlier this year by the President will have its greatest impact at the Hanford Works of the Atomic Energy Commission. To illustrate the point, I can tell you that for the 6-month period starting July 1, 1965, about 2,000 positions or about 24 percent of the present employment level of some 8,300 people, will be affected.

It is to the credit of the people of Richland that they have conducted a strong and dynamic effort over the past few years aimed at attracting new and diversified industry to the Richland area. It is also to the credit of the Atomic Energy Commission that this agency of Government has given sympathetic support to the efforts of the local community.

It is necessary to keep in mind that the production cutbacks do not mean that Richland will not be important to the future of the atomic energy program. There are many activities in both the military and the peaceful applications of atomic energy which are conducted at the Hanford Works of the Atomic Energy Commission, and in order to carry out these vital programs it is important that the Richland community remain viable and attractive. Only in this way can we retain and attract the brilliant scientists and technical people who are essential to the conduct of the atomic energy program.

Mr. Speaker, this is precisely what section 4 of this omnibus bill would help to achieve. By allowing property of the Atomic Energy Commission to be sold or leased in order to attract new industry we will help to broaden the economic base of the Richland community by creating new opportunities through private initiative and free enterprise.

It is also important to note that by attracting new industry to Richland, we will also be bringing in new taxpayers and this will help to reduce the amount of assistance payments that would otherwise have to be made by the Federal Government under the terms of the Atomic Energy Community Act of 1955.

I would like to emphasize, Mr. Speaker, that all dispositions of property under this legislation will be at the estimated fair market value or fair rental value of the property, arrived at after obtaining independent and realistic appraisals. Furthermore, all proposed dispositions of property under this section would have to be submitted to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy in order to assure that the terms and conditions of the disposition are in the national interest.

Mr. Speaker, this amendment is in the interest of the Richland community, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the Nation. It provides an opportunity to do something tangible and constructive in order to meet a problem which we must face squarely.

Finally section 5 of the bill would authorize the Atomic Energy Commission to transfer an additional 40,000 kilograms of uranium 235 and an additional 491 kilograms of plutonium to the European Atomic Energy Community.

Almost all of the 40,000 kilograms of uranium 235 added by this amendment will be sold to Euratom on a straight sale basis at the same charges made for similar material distributed domestically. This includes all shipping charges from the AEC plant site. Although firm supply contracts have not yet been signed, if the entire 40,000 kilograms is sold to Euratom, the United States will realize a return on the order of some $300 million. As you will readily appreciate, a return of $300 million would help in alleviating our balance-of-payments problem. In addition, if we can give long-term assurances of the availability of enriched uranium, this should help in encouraging the sale of our U.S.-developed reactors abroad.

All of the 491 kilograms of plutonium authorized by this amendment will be sold to Euratom on a straight sale basis at approximately $43 per gram. Euratom has already agreed to purchase 350 kilograms for use in its fast breeder reactor program.

The United States will realize approximately $15 million from the sale of this plutonium, of which $11 million is expected to be received during fiscal year 1965.

All material sold to Euratom will be paid for in U.S. dollars. All material sold to Euratom is subject to the Euratom multination safeguards system in order to assure against diversion to military purposes.

Mr. Speaker, again I would emphasize that there is nothing controversial in this bill. It is a sound bill and I urge its prompt enactment.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I will be happy to yield.

Mr. GROSS. I believe the gentleman stated fairly clearly that the sale of this enriched uranium, if that is what it is——

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Yes, it is.

Mr. GROSS. This will be for dollars?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. It will be for dollars.

Mr. GROSS. And not for foreign country currencies that cannot be converted into dollars?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. No, sir. One of the provisions is that this will be paid for in dollars, and it should contribute about $300 million inflow of dollars to be applied to our trade balance.

Mr. GROSS. I am glad we have something we can sell to foreign countries and get our money out of it, if not have a profit.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I might say, in selling it to foreign countries it will be used in reactors many of which will be made right here in the United States and should result in several hundred million dollars worth of American reactors being sold to these foreign countries in addition to the material being sold in this instance.

Mr. GROSS. This is not the type of material which can be used in the production of nuclear weapons. Is that correct?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. As I mentioned in my statement, the material that goes into the reactors will produce some plutonium but that plutonium is under international safeguards as to its disposition. This material will be used for civilian and not for military purposes.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I retain the balance of my time.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this amounts to a housekeeping type of legislation that brings up to date the Atomic Energy Act and related statutes to meet any situations that developed over the period of the last 12 months or which are anticipated to develop in the next 12 months. This simple piece of legislation took many years both in taking testimony and in discussion. We are all agreed on it on both sides of the aisle. It covers four points which are rather simple.

In our relationship with the advanced countries of Europe who are combined in the Euratom organization, we have numerous exchanges of information in the field of peaceful uses of atomic energy and, most importantly, in the field of the use of the atom for the production of power. That consumes a great deal of enriched uranium. There is not too much of a supply of enriched uranium except in the United States, where our vast developments have produced this material. We have more than we need for our own power purposes at this particular time. As a matter of fact, we have a treasure in enriched uranium. We continue to develop this treasure at the diffusion plants, and this is an opportunity for us to realize some $300 million in cash, American dollars, out of the sale of this material to Euratom for power-producing reactors in Europe. It is not a one-time sale, because although the European countries have in the past tended to use natural uranium in their reactors, if they can get this material and develop a going enriched uranium reactor technology, then they will continue to draw upon us for this material and we will ultimately stand to benefit in our foreign exchange by these sales.

Also along this line we are doing something with plutonium, but our amounts are in a very much smaller quantity. That plutonium will be sold for $43 a gram, and enriched uranium at charges estimated to total $300 million.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to go back now to sections 2 and 3 of this bill which will clarify the Price-Anderson Act.

The Price-Anderson indemnity amendment was added to the Atomic Energy Act in 1957. The purpose of the legislation was to provide financial protection for the public against injuries from nuclear reactor accidents. It was also the purpose of the amendment to help stimulate the development and construction of nuclear powerplants. The Price-Anderson Act authorized the Atomic Energy Commission to enter into contracts to indemnify reactor operators against public liability in the amount of $500 million over and above private insurance required by the Commission.

The approach of Price-Anderson was to provide a 10-year trial period—until 1967—during which more information could be gathered on the safety of nuclear powerplants and the ability of the insurance industry to provide adequate coverage.

As my colleague has already pointed out, the committee plans in the future to consider whether legislation of this type is needed any more and, if it is needed, the terms and conditions under which it might be extended.

In the meantime, a question has been raised concerning an interpretation of the Price-Anderson Act which we hope to clarify by the amendments in sections 2 and 3 of this bill.

There is absolutely no doubt on the part of any person who has examined the Price-Anderson Act that it was the intent of Congress that the Commission's authority would be effective for a full 10-year period to 1967. It was also the intent of Congress that Price-Anderson protection, once afforded, would continue in effect throughout the entire period of a reactor license. This was the conclusion of an extensive legal opinion by the General Counsel of the Atomic Energy Commission and it is also the view of the Joint Committee. Nevertheless, a doubt on this point has been raised by at least one utility company. It has been pointed out that section 170(c) of the Atomic Energy Act says that:

> A contract of indemnification shall cover public liability arising out of or in connection with the licensed activity.

People who are concerned about this question point out that "licensed activity" might only refer to that activity which has been licensed as of any given point in time. Following this interpretation, if only a construction permit had been issued prior to the 1967 cutoff date, then only the construction—and not the operation of the plant—could be indemnified.

As a practical matter this interpretation would mean that the reactor operator would have to have an operating license before August 1, 1967, in order to be eligible for full Price-Anderson coverage. In view of the leadtime involved in building a nuclear reactor, under this interpretation, the Price-Anderson Act, for practical purposes, would be terminated now.

This interpretation frustrates the intent of Congress. The amendments in sections 2 and 3 of this bill will give full expression to the true intent of Congress by making it clear that Price-Anderson indemnity protection will be extended to any facility for which a construction permit is issued between August 30, 1954, and August 1, 1967, notwithstanding that the operating license for the facility is issued after August 1, 1967.

With respect to section 1 of the bill, I believe we are in agreement that the compulsory patent licensing provisions of the Atomic Energy Act should be extended for another 5 years.

As my colleague has noted, this is a reserve power but it should be kept on the books until the atomic energy industry is more fully developed.

Section 4 of the bill concerning the disposition of property at Richland, Wash., has been tightened up very substantially by the committee. Although the Commission had requested authority to sell real property in addition to the authority to lease such property, the committee deleted the authority to sell. It was our view that the Commission would be in a better position to control the use and disposition of real property through the lease mechanism. Long-term leases will satisfactorily meet the Commission's requirements under this authority.

Second. Although the Atomic Energy Commission requested authority to dispose of property at less than fair market or fair rental value in special circumstances, the committee felt that this would be a departure from general Government policy which could not be justified. We rewrote the bill to require that sales of property would be at the fair market value while leases of property would be at the estimated fair rental value.

Finally the committee added a requirement that all dispositions of property under this section would have to be reported to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. In this way the Congress, through the Joint Committee, will have an opportunity to review the terms and conditions of each property disposition to assure that it is fair and in the national interest.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOSMER. I am delighted to yield to my colleague from Washington who represents the Hanford area.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say to the gentleman and to the chairman and members of this committee that I certainly do commend them for the fine work they have done in this area to help the community of Richland. I would call attention of our colleague to the fact that in the report on this bill on page 7 the problems facing the community of Richland, which is part of the Hanford work area are well outlined, concisely and articulately. I am happy to see also that the committee recognized that the community itself has done an excellent job of cooperating in its conversion problems.

The passage of this legislation, this particular portion of the legislation, is going to be immensely helpful to them in meeting their problems of conversion now and in the future.

I am sure that our colleagues know that although the Commission presently has the authority to dispose of property for activities relating to atomic energy, it does not have authority to dispose of property for purposes unrelated to atomic energy. It is felt essential, as the gentleman from California has pointed out, that if the AEC is to provide effective assistance in the economical stabilization of the Richland area, where there can be an adverse economic impact because of actual or probable reductions in the AEC program, that we must have the right to handle our land and property problems in a way that is made possible under the provisions of this bill. I thank the committee very much because we have needed this help and we are all very grateful for their very wise judgment and decisions in this matter.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlelady for her comments. I think that it is a matter of record that the gentlelady has been of great assistance herself to the committee in producing the kind of legislation that will, as we all believe, operate most effectively in the area she represents.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOSMER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding. I simply seek information. Will this assure the continuation of the reactors that we have set up through technical assistance in the United Nations in the neutral countries and other countries, as well as the friendly countries?

Mr. HOSMER. May I ask the gentleman specifically what reactors he is referring to?

Mr. HALL. I am specifically referring to the one, for example, under ETAP of the United Nations for Yugoslavia and/or Poland.

Mr. HOSMER. No. This has nothing to do with the reactors that are outside of the Euratom countries themselves. These are six nations in Western Europe. It has nothing to do with those who are not members of Euratom.

Mr. HALL. All of these countries that are affected are within Euratom, or is that similar to the NATO countries or Western Alliance countries?

Mr. HOSMER. The Euratom organization does not have as many member nations as NATO.

The Euratom organization was created as the combine among certain Western European nations to handle peaceful atomic matters. We deal then with Euratom as a unit rather than the individual nations in connection with this uranium and plutonium which will be used for peaceful purposes.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOSMER. I yield to the distinguished chairman of the committee.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I would like to say to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL] that the countries that comprise Euratom are Belgium, Luxembourg, Italy, the Netherlands, France, and West Germany. In the main the material to be transferred is for reactors, large reactors, that produce electricity. The reactors which the gentleman may have in mind are small research reactors. I believe there are about 30 or more of them in different nations of the world. They use a very small amount of research material.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, the thing that brought that up was the statement about the continuation of those that are under construction or in being. I believe this answers the question very satisfactorily.

Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HOSMER. I yield further to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Can the gentleman tell me if this continues our practice of the protection of patents and would have anything to do with our multilateral force agreement, and for proposed extension?

Mr. HOSMER. No, this is the nonmilitary side of the atom.

Mr. HALL. If the gentleman will yield further, with reference to the protection of patents are we using the patents in the sense that we patent a discovery of a device or a drug, or are we using them in another sense in the amendment as contained in this bill?

Mr. HOSMER. We are using patents in the ordinary meaning of the word, but it is in a little bit different context from the industrial standpoint.

As the gentleman knows and as he has participated in the consideration of the legislation that has had to do with the peaceful development of atomic energy, the Atomic Energy Commission has always been the guiding light and the leader. Many contracts have been made with different corporations for various developments. In the process of these contracts many patents have accrued to the Government. But at the same time the company—and it is generally a rather large one which gets the business—acquires a know-how in this field by reason of its doing business with the Government that other companies who do not do business with the Government have not been able to acquire. So they can go on in nongovernmental work and acquire patents or discoveries that they make on their own, but unless they are required to license those patents, they then could achieve a rather monopolistic position in the field of nuclear work both from the patent standpoint and from the standpoint of know-how. So this gives another company an opportunity to come in and say, "You do have a patent there and we would like to get into this business too." Where the invention is of "primary importance" to the field of atomic energy, the Atomic Energy Commission says to the company, "You must license other people to use your patent. You do not have to give it away;

you will get a fair return, but you must license its use." With the burgeoning of the atomic industry to come in the next 10 years, we feel that this could be of considerable importance, much more than it has been in the past. As a matter of fact, this provision in the law has never been used, but it could be used in the future. We do not anticipate any new discovery in the atomic field equivalent to the invention of the wheel on which someone gets a patent, but it is not impossible. It might be some process fundamental to the true economic production of nuclear electricity. Since the U.S. taxpayers put so much money into making it possible for this discovery to happen, then it should be licensed for the benefit of the rest of the country.

Mr. HALL. If the gentleman will yield further, I agree thoroughly with the distinguished gentleman and authority in the well of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman and the distinguished vice chairman of the committee this further question: Does the gentleman envisage any protective patents wherein internationally the member nations of Euratom, or outside of there, might honor them any better than they do now our broad patents in the broad spectrum of antibiotics in the field of medicine?

Mr. HOSMER. I yield to the vice chairman of the joint committee.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. This patent section in the bill is separate and not related to the provisions applicable to the Euratom matter.

I would like to call attention to a full explanation of the patent provision which is set forth on pages 3, 4, and 5 of the report. Down at the bottom of page 4 it says:

> The Commission has not exercised its power under section 153 to date.

And below it says:

> Even under circumstances in which this authority is employed, the patent owner has the right to receive reasonable royalty fees for the use of his patent.

Mr. HALL. My question is do we expect a corollary there, namely, that other nations or users will receive that patent?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I think the gentleman can answer that as well as I can. We know the history of some international patents. Some do and some do not.

Mr. HALL. I want to establish that for the record.

Mr. HOSMER. This falls into the category of patents covering any other activity. It is no better, it is no worse.

Mr. HALL. The gentleman mentioned what we are selling the uranium enriched, and the plutonium for. Do we have any estimate as to the cost of the same units in production in this country?

Mr. HOSMER. We sell at a price to recover what the Government has in it, including depreciation on plants that have produced this material, on an average of $7.50 a gram for the entire amount of enriched uranium, and $43 a gram for plutonium. We are getting out what we put in. We are not trying to make any profit. This $43 a gram for the plutonium is not going to last very much longer in my opinion. It will be less in the future, and it is to our advantage at this time when the market is still high to be able to make this kind of sale.

Mr. HALL. Having dealt through the Armed Services Committee with the disposal of stockpiles, I am interested in the point of the upset price by throwing this on the market.

Mr. HOSMER. There is a limited amount here. With respect to uranium 235 it amounts to 40,000 kilograms. It is estimated that the Euratom countries will require this additional material over a period of time, and this authorizes the transfer. So we are not disturbing any price situation. There is not a competitor offering this kind of material for sale except possibly the United Kingdom.

Mr. HALL. I notice that the United Kingdom is not participating in the Euratom list that was read by the Chairman a while ago. It might well be that the U.S.S.R. would throw some of this on the market as it did with molybdenum and other items of that nature.

Mr. HOSMER. You do not throw this material on the market. Not everyone can use it and I doubt that the U.S.S.R. will be throwing any of it on the market in the foreseeable future. In the second place, it is the kind of material you have to invest 50 to $100 million in a plant to be able to use any significant amount.

Mr. HALL. I think it is important to establish this. One final question for my own information: The vice chairman, and the gentleman in the well, have made it clear that we are finding a good return for the cost of production here; that we are under a controlled circumstance; that we are helping nations that are cooperating, to my satisfaction, at least; furthermore we are getting American dollars that will help our imbalance-of-payment situation. I recall the five stipulations that were made when the wheat sales were announced. One was American dollars, another transported in American bottoms. Have we any assurance that once we agree to this we will get American dollars or bullion or that which will effectively stay our outflow of gold, or help our imbalance of payments just because we agree to it today?

Mr. HOSMER. We have the assurance and, as the gentleman knows, the Joint Committee is your servant, and it has the cooperation of the Atomic Energy Commission. This type of thing is done by arrangement between the two authorities. We have the assurance that these sales will be made for cash.

Mr. HALL. And we will not be asked to come back and guarantee this credit in American dollars, like we did last Christmas?

Mr. HOSMER. Absolutely not. It will be paid in American dollars.

The committee has also arranged with the Commission that the delivery is in the United States at our point of storage, and all shipping costs, including cost of packaging, which is considerable, are borne by the purchaser.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. If the gentleman will yield, I might just add this for the record, that the committee did hold up this particular request from the agency for a year. One of the reasons we held it up was to insure that this was a bona fide sale for hard dollars and not some other type of a soft arrangement.

Mr. HALL. I appreciate the action of the committee. I certainly hope that all these things will be carried out. I am in thorough concurrence with the functions, the plans, and the progress of the agency and the Commission scientifically and, as the gentleman mentioned, about the packaging at the point of delivery. I am not so sure about the steadfastness of our Nation as far as insisting on its credit is concerned.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. I should like to inquire of the chairman of the committee, relating to the sales price I heard the minority member say that there is incorporated therein depreciation and cost. I should like to inquire whether or not the cost of our investment or the interest on our investment is covered in the price.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Yes, interest on our investment is incorporated in calculating the price. Each year we amortize in a businesslike way. The Commission has assured us that the sale price does include all costs of the raw material, feed material preparation, the separation of the material, and the amortization of the plant calculated in a businesslike way. Representatives of industry have reviewed the costing process which included access to classified information and have verified this.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. I would also like to inquire whether or not there are any reactors given away. A couple of years ago, I think it was, the Atomic Energy Commission gave a couple of atomic reactors away as foreign aid. Are any reactors given away today, as far as the gentleman knows?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Let me give the gentleman a very brief history. There was the time some years ago when we were asked by the executive branch to build a $30 million atomic ship. This ship was to be used for propaganda purposes. It was to go to the different ports of the world and demonstrate the peaceful uses of atomic energy. The Joint Committee did not accept that proposal. Instead, we recommended approximately $10 million for a series of research reactors that cost an average of between $250,000 and $300,000. These are for the use of scientists and universities. They are placed abroad in universities and research centers in different cities of the world. We thought that more could be accomplished at less cost to the United States under this program than the one suggested by the executive branch.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Are there still any of them being given away?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I do not know what the current program is because for some time now it has not been funded through the AEC but has been over in the aid program. I can check into it and let the gentleman know.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. I am asking these questions because I recall that reactors were being given away to countries that were fully able to pay for them. Yet, despite that fact, they were given away at no cost to them. I would like to have the chairman check into that to see if that is being done and, if so, to have it stopped.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I will check but I will say this, that in every case where we furnished them one of these American made small research reactors, I am sure the record will show they had to contribute a certain amount of money by furnishing buildings and setting up scientific training programs and that sort of thing in order to get the reactor.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. I can understand an underdeveloped country getting a reactor for nothing, but when a country is fully able to pay for it, I do not see any reason for giving them away under such circumstances.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Price].

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation. I would like to point out that this bill received the unanimous support of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. It was approved by the committee without any opposition.

With reference to provisions of the Price-Anderson Act which were mentioned by the gentleman from California [Mr. Hosmer] I would like to say just a word.

Mr. Speaker, as has been pointed out, sections 2 and 3 of the bill merely clarify the current provisions of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954.

As one of the sponsors of the Price-Anderson indemnity provisions, which was passed by the Congress in 1957, I would like the record to show that it was my intention that the indemnity provisions would apply to facilities for which construction permits were issued any time prior to the termination date of August 1, 1967, notwithstanding the date on which the operating license was issued. The General Counsel of the AEC has rendered an opinion consistent with this interpretation.

Sections 2 and 3 of the bill before us today remove any doubt and eliminate any possible ambiguity in the language of the law so that there is no question but that the provisions of the Price-Anderson indemnity act comply with the intent of the original legislation.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise to voice my dissatisfaction and displeasure with S. 2963, a bill to amend a variety of acts having to do with atomic energy. This bill has been called up for consideration and debate in this august House today. But by its nature it cannot be fairly considered or debated. The bill is a conglomeration. It is a potpourri, a mixture of miscellaneous but important items.

The title of S. 2963 states that it is to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, the Atomic Energy Community Act of 1955, and the Euratom Cooperation Act of 1958. The title itself, in my judgment, should be enough to warn us that the bill is too ambitious, that it covers too many different and unrelated subjects, that there will not be enough time to deliberate fully before the vote is called for. Even a cursory examination of the rest of the bill bears out this expectation.

For example, section I provides for a 5-year extension of the Atomic Energy Commission's authority to require the licensing of atomic energy patents. Now, that is a serious matter. It involves the question of incentives to stimulate the continued development of peacetime uses of atomic energy, as well as the possibility that the limited number of private companies in this area will be placed in an even greater preferred position. Since many of these companies have gained their experience substantially at public expense, I would say that the issue is weighty enough for Congress to consider separate and apart from any other issue.

Section 5 consists of amendments to the Euratom Cooperation Act of 1958. It authorizes the AEC to transfer to Euratom greater amounts of uranium and plutonium than is authorized under the existing law. What is Euratom? Why that alone would require an ordinary man at least 1 full day to completely understand. Yet, even I know that we are dealing with an international agreement involving the United States, Belgium, West Germany, France, Italy, Luxembourg, and the Netherlands, and that the aim of the agreement is to encourage the growth of nuclear industries in the member states. France, we all know, has refused to become a party to the nuclear test ban treaty. France belongs to Euratom. This bill authorizes the AEC to transfer great amounts of nuclear materials to Euratom. I would say that this is a matter requiring great deliberation and careful consideration.

But how can we deliberate carefully and fully on an amendment to the Euratom Cooperation Act and an amendment to the patent provisions of the Atomic Energy Act at the same time? In my judgment we cannot without undue haste.

Still there is more. There are sections 2 and 3, the Price-Anderson indemnity amendments. These amendments involve Federal subsidies to private industry as well as limitations on the ability of the public to be compensated in the event of a nuclear disaster at an atomic energy plant. And there is section 4, to authorize the AEC to sell or lease property owned by the Federal Government in and near Richland, Wash., known as the Hanford project. By this section the AEC will be permitted to dispose of this public property to private industry at less than its fair market value. I would think that these matters are important enough to be brought up on the floor of this representative body in a manner that would insure a fair and thorough debate.

A fair and thorough debate of all these separate and diverse matters is impossible with this bill. Everyone of us would need to have more ears than a field of corn in order to lend one ear to each of the different matters brought up in this single bill. That impossible prospect is no less absurd than S. 2963.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this brief time, and I am grateful to the gentleman for yielding, so that I may address a question to the chairman of the committee.

Did I understand the gentleman from California [Mr. Holifield] to say that with regard to section 4 of H.R. 11832, which would amend the Atomic Energy Community Act of 1955 to authorize disposals of property at the Commission's Hanford project in the State of Washington for non-nuclear-related purposes, I would like to emphasize the following sentences from the statement of the gentleman from California [Mr. Holifield]:

> This amendment neither adds to, nor detracts from, whatever authority the Commission may now have to dispose of property for nuclear-related purposes. The matter of the Commission's existing authority is thus not germane to the consideration of this amendment.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Those were my exact words except the word "thus" that you used, whereas I used the word "therefore." In other words, I said "The matter of the Commission's existing authority is therefore not germane to the consideration of this amendment." But otherwise it is verbatim.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, in view of the remarks made by the distinguished gentlewoman from Washington, I would like the Record to reflect that doubts exist as to the Commission's interpretation of the scope of its authority to dispose of property for nuclear-related purposes under existing provisions of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended. I will assure that documentation of these doubts is submitted to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

I might say for the benefit of the distinguished gentlewoman from the State of Washington that I am most hopeful that this bill, as written, will be helpful to the community that she represents.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Although a doubt on this point may exist in the mind of the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'Brien], I would not want the record to reflect that there is doubt in my mind on this point or doubt in the mind of any member of the Joint Committee. I say this because this matter is simply not germane to the matter that is before the House. If this matter that he is interested in comes up for the consideration of the committee, we will discuss it in detail. The Joint Committee is always willing to accept documentation from Members of the Congress or others who may wish to submit data for consideration.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KASTENMEIER). The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof), the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 11832) was laid on the table.

PASSENGER SAFETY STANDARDS FOR GOVERNMENT MOTOR VEHICLES

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1341) to require passenger-carrying motor vehicles purchased for use by the Federal Government to meet certain safety standards, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That no motor vehicle manufactured on or after the effective date of this section shall be acquired by purchase by the Federal Government for use by the Federal Government unless such motor vehicle is equipped with such reasonable passenger safety devices as the Administrator of General Services shall require which conform with standards prescribed by him in accordance with section 2.

SEC. 2. The Administrator of General Services shall prescribe and publish in the Federal Register commercial standards for such passenger safety devices as he may require under authority of the first section of this Act. The standards first established under this section shall be prescribed and published not later than one year from the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 3. As used in this Act—

(1) The term "motor vehicle" means any vehicle, self-propelled or drawn by mechanical power, designed for use on the highways principally for the transportation of passengers except any vehicle designed or used for military field training, combat, or tactical purposes.

(2) The term "Federal Government" includes the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of the Government of the United States, and the government of the District of Columbia.

SEC. 4. This Act shall take effect on the date of its enactment except that the first section of this Act shall take effect one year and ninety days after the date of publication of commercial standards first established under section 2 of this Act. If such standards as so first established are thereafter changed, such standards, as so changed, shall take effect one year and ninety days after the date of publication of such changed standards.

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to require passenger-carrying motor vehicles purchased for use by the Federal Government to meet certain passenger safety standards."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, although this bill appears last on the list of suspensions in order today, in my opinion it is by no means the least important bill.

The major purposes of H.R. 1341 are, first, to provide maximum safety protection to passengers in federally owned motor vehicles; and second, to set a national example for the public which would encourage greater use of available proven safety devices on automobiles.

As most of us are aware, traffic accidents exact a very heavy toll in human life, health, and property. Every year nearly 3 million Americans are injured on our highways. In 1963, more than 43,000 persons were killed. The direct and indirect economic loss in 1963 from these 43,000 deaths and 3 million injuries has been estimated by the National Safety Council at more than $8 billion.

There are, of course, a number of basic elements involved in traffic-accident causation; namely, the driver, the road, the vehicle, and the environment in which they operate. Engineering developments cannot make roads or vehicles completely safe for the unfit driver. Drivers who are mentally and physically capable and adequately trained, together with safer roads and safer cars—operating in a safer environment—are all essential for a balanced attack on this major health problem.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1341 deals with only one phase of the problem—safe cars.

The bill represents a reasonable and practical means of promoting the increased adoption of safety equipment in motor vehicles. This bill, which applies only to Government-purchased vehicles, requires the Administrator of General Services to prescribe by regulation reasonable passenger safety devices which meet commercial standards established by him. Although the GSA currently has—and exercises—the power under existing law to prescribe procurement standards for motor vehicles acquired for the use of executive agencies, this legislation represents express congressional affirmation of the need for continuing attention to this important aspect of safety. Passage of the legislation will, in my opinion, assist in the evolution of improved safety equipment on motor vehicles for the protection of all segments of the traveling public.

Support for the legislation is documented in the committee's report (H. Rept. 491). It should be enough to point out that the bill, prior to certain amendments adopted in the course of the committee's reconsideration during this Congress, has twice before been passed by the House. H.R. 1341 passed by voice vote on August 26, 1959, and again by voice vote August 13, 1962.

The bill has the endorsement of the National Safety Council, of the AMA, and of the American College of Surgeons. The industry itself has endorsed the objectives of the bill, but did recommend, however, that they would prefer to see the establishment of an automobile advisory procurement committee to work with the GSA in determining what safety standards should be included on these cars.

I believe this bill will provide us with an example on the part of the Government which will be in line with safety activities in aviation, in the food and drug field, in standards for the maritime industry, and in many other areas where there clearly is a need for Federal example, if not guidance.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. JENNINGS. First I wish to compliment the gentleman from Alabama for again bringing this legislation to the attention of the House.

Before addressing myself to the specific instance I have in mind, I also wish to say that it is certainly my feeling, and I believe it is shared by my colleagues in the House, that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ROBERTS] is becoming "Mr. Safety" himself as far as Congress is concerned. He certainly is to be complimented, along with the members of his subcommittee, for bringing not only this legislation but also other legislation of a safety nature before the Congress for the benefit of the American people.

The point specifically is that in the manufacturing of automobiles—and I happen to be an automobile dealer—it is a fact that the gear selection lever on some automobiles is different from others. For instance, I have two automobiles made by the same manufacturer. The "drive" in one is in exactly the same place as the "reverse" is in the other automobile. This causes a great deal of confusion, which could possibly lend itself to becoming a factor in causing accidents. It seems to me it is something that the manufacturers could correct with very little effort on their part. I just wonder if the gentleman has considered this fact which I am bringing to the attention of the Congress.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. After the gentleman and I discussed this I related this situation to the maker of that particular line of automobiles, and they told me that they were in the process of correcting that particular feature. I have not checked to see if it was corrected, but I did bring it to their attention after the gentleman pointed it out to me.

Mr. JENNINGS. I appreciate that. I hope no legislation is necessary. I would like to see, as far as possible, that this correction of an unsafe situation be left to the manufacturers and to the States with the hope that no national legislation would be necessary. I do feel, however it is of sufficient importance that we should call it to the attention of the manufacturers. Certainly it would appear to me that this one little simple improvement would contribute a great deal to safety; this could be rectified by simple engineering adjustments.

I thank the gentleman, and again I want to compliment him on this matter.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. I thank the gentleman. I believe that although this is a minor step, it is one which would focus greater attention on this important field of safety and would result in better cars in the Federal service.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Yes. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. May I ask the gentleman, it is not intended by this legislation in any way in the future to subsidize automobile manufacturers in the matter of providing safety devices, that is, to use Federal funds through any legislation, is it?

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Not at all.

Mr. GROSS. I have no quarrel with the bill. I do not think it accomplishes a great deal. I have no quarrel with the bill, but I just want to be sure that this is not intended in any way to use Federal funds to subsidize manufacturers of automobiles in their providing of safety devices.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Not in any way. I think you will find that the industry will cooperate with the objectives of this bill. They testified that they feel that the General Services Administration and the procurement agencies of the Government should ask for more safety features in federally purchased cars. I am not sure what this will do. I know when we passed the seat belt standards bill we did not know what that bill would do, but it has served the purpose of perhaps getting some 20 million Americans into seat belts whereas there was just a trickle of people using them a few years ago. So it is hard to tell what the effect of this bill could be. I am sure the gentleman joins me in the hope that it will make for a large reduction in deaths and injuries.

Mr. GROSS. Yes. I certainly do. I understand there is no direct cost involved through this piece of legislation.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. There is a ceiling on what the Government can pay on both passenger types and station wagon types of vehicles already. This bill does not disturb that ceiling.

Mr. GROSS. The only cost would be the added cost of safety belts or other devices that might be prescribed for Government owned and operated vehicles. Is that correct?

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Yes, and only in some instances. For instance, suppose you have a car with three cigarette lighters. It could mean the substitution of some lined paneling in place of those lighters or in place of a clock that never works or some other items that I could mention.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure we are all very deeply concerned about the increase in the crime rate in this Nation and we should be as deeply concerned or even more so about the rate of death and injury on the highways in traffic accidents.

PASSENGER SAFETY STANDARDS FOR GOVERNMENT MOTOR VEHICLES

Bills to provide for passenger safety standards in Government vehicles is not a recent suggestion or a new idea. We have considered similar bills before. It could be said that this one, like its predecessors, is a late bloomer. In the dying days of the last two Congresses we have passed bills much like this one only to have them die aborning. Certainly no one can say of this legislation that no hearings have been held. Three complete sets of hearings have been held and just about everything there is to be said on the subject has been said several times.

No one is apt to argue strongly against passenger safety in vehicles operated by the Federal Government. Accident figures by the Safety Council indicate that public service is among a few occupations in which death by accident is most likely. Not all of these will be by motor vehicle but with the Government operating more than 50,000 passenger cars and buying about 10,000 of them a year far too many deaths among Government employees will be caused by automobile accidents while on duty. If the creation of reasonable standards for such vehicles can decrease this loss appreciably, it is our duty to so provide.

In past years this proposal gave the Secretary of Commerce the duty of setting the standards. The bill before us today has changed that to the Administrator of General Services and this is proper. If there has been objection to the legislation it has been on the ground that the Commerce Department was about to become the dictator of automotive design. Obviously, it has never been the intention of this body to grant authority to any department which would interfere with the orderly processes of the industry. It is the duty of the General Services Administration, however, to see that the proper kinds of equipments are supplied to the agencies of Government. We are here telling him that safety is a legitimate consideration in minimum standards for purchase. We are telling him that it is a requirement and that he must determine what are reasonable standards.

Safety devices are not new nor are they presently unavailable. We are talking about such accepted and proven devices as seat belts, padded dashboards, recessed instruments, and the like. Certainly it could and should extend to items such as brakes and safety glass.

It is not to be denied that there is a certain educational objective joined with the purpose of protecting our employees. No doubt the minimum standards set for Government employee safety will be widely accepted by other entities, both private and governmental, which use motor vehicles in carrying out essential functions. It can be hoped that it will also have an impact upon the choices made by individual buyers of automobiles. If so, everyone wins including the automotive industry.

The bill provides for publication of the standards to be used in the purchase of vehicles and such standards do not become effective until 1 year and 90 days after such publication. This makes it clear that industry and those selling to the Government cannot be subjected to capricious, transitory, or last-minute standards which tend to make Government procurement suspect.

This was a good measure when we passed it before and it is a better measure in its present form. I recommend that we try again.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 1341, as amended?

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to require passenger-carrying motor vehicles purchased for use by the Federal Government to meet certain passenger safety standards."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FEDERAL PAY BILL

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include three editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I hope and trust that my colleagues would not brand me as an "I told you so" type of fellow. I would not want this fate. But I do think some of us need to be reminded of the dire predictions of calamity and doom which were commonplace in this chamber only a few weeks ago when we were approaching a vote on the Federal pay bill.

We were told at that time, Mr. Speaker, that a vote for an increase in congressional salaries would bring down the wrath of the gods upon us. Also, I think there was some reference to wrath in other places—like newspaper offices and voting booths.

Well, already history has shown these predictions to be false. We have had quite a number of primary elections in the various States, and to the best of my knowledge not one Member has been defeated for having voted for this bill. In one primary race I happen to know about, a luckless challenger tried to make the Member's vote for the pay bill a major issue in the campaign. This issue got nowhere because, as in all races, there were far more important issues at stake. In the end they said by their votes that they considered this Member worth an increase in salary.

Similarly, Mr. Speaker, we have had our courage on this issue bolstered by our colleagues in the Senate. When the time came to stand up and be counted, the Members of that body did so in impressive numbers. And I should like to call the attention of my colleagues to one vote which may have escaped their attention.

As we all know, the Federal pay bill has the solid backing of President Johnson. What some of us may not have noted is that the bill also has the solid support of the Republican candidate for President, Senator BARRY GOLDWATER.

Not only did Senator GOLDWATER vote for the bill on final passage, but he voted time and again against amendments designed to cripple the bill or make it ineffective. Thus, Mr. Speaker, the bill so many Members thought would hurt them in this election year has been taken out of the campaign. It is no longer an issue if it ever was.

Mr. Speaker, this is as it should be. We pride ourselves on the efficiency of private industry in this country, but I wonder how long that efficiency would hold up if personnel salaries had to be subject to the buffeting of national political campaigns. The same is true of Federal personnel and Federal efficiency. By voting for a sane and balanced Federal salary system the House and Senate have shown that they want an efficient Federal establishment. The salaries of Members of Congress had to be increased to accomplish this, and we did not shrink from this responsibility.

All of us, I suppose, have had some unfriendly correspondence on this subject. I know I have had a few such letters—perhaps a dozen, mostly from outside my district. And in these letters the point has been made that Members of Congress are already making more money than social security pensioners, World War I pensioners and persons on unemployment compensation. Mr. Speaker, who can deny it? But what sort of government would we have if it were run by people willing to work at pensioners' rates?

Mr. Speaker, when Senator GOLDWATER cast his vote in favor of the Federal pay bill, I am sure he did not feel he was discriminating against his own employees in Goldwater's Department Store in Phoenix. I do not know what salaries prevail in his store, but I cannot imagine any of Senator GOLDWATER's employees expect to make as much money as the head of the FBI or Director of the Central Intelligence Agency or Secretary of Defense. I even doubt that they expect to be paid as much as Members of Congress, since their responsibility isn't quite as heavy. Obviously, we need both shoe clerks and executives in this world, but no one—least of all the Federal Government—should expect to hire executives at shoe clerks' wages.

A few weeks ago when we were being told how disastrous it would be to vote a pay increase in an election year there was conjecture that the Nation's press would respond with anger and indignation if such a bill were to pass. Mr. Speaker, this has not occurred. There have been a few scattered exceptions, of course. The Scripps-Howard newspapers, which pay their own executives up to $115,000 a year, have been critical of the bill, but a great many more newspapers have congratulated the Congress for having the courage to do what needed doing.

I might mention that most of them have also spoken with favor on the House amendment providing machinery for adjusting congressional salaries whenever the classified service is voted an increase. While this feature was left out of the Senate version of the bill, I am hopeful the conferees will find it possible to write something like this into conference report next week.

Mr. Speaker, I have not been collecting editorials, but I do have three examples I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues. Without objection I will insert them at this point in my remarks.

[From The New York Times, July 3, 1964]

A CONGRESSMAN'S VALUE

The Senate yesterday completed legislative action on the administration-backed bill to provide pay increases totaling $564 million for 535 Members of Congress, more than 400 Federal executives, 486 Federal judges, and 1,700,000 Federal career employes, including members of the classified civil service and the postal service.

As President Johnson has said, this bill should perform the important service of maintaining a high level of Government efficiency and assuring that able, experienced men and women can continue to work for their country without financial penalty.

In raising their own salaries in an election year from $22,500 to $30,000 a year, Members of Congress acted courageously. Any Member of Congress who is not worth $30,000 a year is likely to cost this country a great deal more than that; a good Congressman is an investment at the price. Congress has not raised its own pay since 1955, nor that of Federal executives since 1956, although there have been four increases since 1955 for career employes. The new law contains a provision for automatic proportionate increases in the future for Members of Congress, Federal executives, and judges whenever increases are granted classified employees.

[From the Washington Post, July 6, 1964]

MATURITY ON PAY

With a sudden outburst of mature judgment and sophistication, both the House and Senate have passed substantial pay raises for their own Members along with top executives, judges and classified and postal employes. The action came about with relatively little fanfare on the eve of a major political campaign. We hope that it will mark the beginning of a more enlightened policy of adjusting Federal pay to the needs of the Nation.

In passing its bill on Thursday, however, the Senate lowered the high tone of its performance in several particulars. On the motion of Senator GORDON ALLOTT it voted to cut $5,000 from the recommended increase for Justices of the Supreme Court. The move was defended as a means of bringing the $42,500 salaries recommended for Justices closer to the $35,000 proposed for members of the Cabinet. If the gap was to be narrowed, however, it could have been done more reasonably by raising Cabinet members to $40,000. As the matter stands, it is an unwarranted slap at the Court at a time when it has been handing down controversial decisions. That belittling gesture should be wiped out in conference.

In one other respect the Senate bill is a disappointment. The House approved an amendment which provided that congressional salaries would hereafter be automatically adjusted on a proportionate basis whenever Congress enacted pay legislation for executive officials and employes. This would have minimized the embarrassment of Congressmen in voting pay increases for themselves. But the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service dropped the proposal and the Senate acquiesced. We hope the conference will restore it.

EDITORIAL BROADCAST JUNE 15 AND 16, 1964, ON WTMJ AND WTMJ-TV, THE MILWAUKEE JOURNAL STATIONS, MILWAUKEE, WIS.

House Members, who in March defeated a pay measure for themselves and other Federal employees, now have done an about turn and passed a similar bill. The action, unusual in an election year, showed courage and also an awareness of the increasing loss of valuable Federal employees who no longer can afford to stay in Government. These include Walter W. Heller, the President's Chief Economic Adviser, a former Shorewood resident who has said he will leave after the November election. Previously, Wilbur J. Cohen, a native of Wisconsin, said he was seriously considering returning to private life in July. He is Assistant Secretary for Legislation of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

One of the latest top Government officials to announce his resignation is Mortimer M. Caplin, Commissioner of Internal Revenue. He told President Johnson that personal responsibilities compelled him to return to private life effective July 10.

The new $533 million pay bill, which has been sent to the Senate, may help to halt this trend. Career officials now receive a top rate of $20,000 a year. They would be raised to $24,500. Supreme Court Justices, Cabinet officials, department heads, and Congressmen would receive increases of $7,500. In the $545 million measure defeated last March the proposed increase for these offices would have been $10,000. In the approved bill other Government employees would get raises on a sliding scale. Letter carriers would be given an increase of $325 a year and Government file clerks $310.

Congressmen now are paid $22,500 and have been since 1955. To guard against depriving themselves of future increases while voting raises for other Federal employees, the Representatives attached an amendment to the bill. This would guarantee that every time civil service workers are voted a pay raise, Congressmen, Cabinet members, and other top Government officials would get proportional increases. This should save Congressman from future embarrassment by voting for pay raises in election years. It also will assure that those in Congress and the high echelons of Government, who lack private means, will be better able to meet their expenses.

APPORTIONMENT OF STATE LEGISLATURES—EDITORIAL COMMENT CONCERNING U.S. SUPREME COURT DECISION

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, the recent decisions of the Supreme Court on apportionment of State legislatures have created concern across the land. On June 30 I introduced House Joint Resolution 1100 to amend the Constitution to permit States to apportion one house of their State legislatures on factors other than population, provided each State's system of apportionment was approved by the voters of that State. On July 1, 1964, I explained the reasons for my introducing the resolution—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 15602—and on July 2—page 15942—I presented an editorial from the Keene Evening Sentinel critical of the Supreme Court's imposition of uniformity of apportionment on all the States.

The Courier, in Littleton, N.H., discusses the effect of the Supreme Court's action on the State of New Hampshire in an editorial entitled "More 'Judicial Legislation,'" published June 18, 1964, which I would like to include at this point in the RECORD:

[From the Littleton (N.H.) Courier, June 18, 1964]

MORE JUDICIAL LEGISLATION

In what is termed by many as another example of "judicial legislation," the U.S. Supreme Court has thrown State election procedures into a turmoil with its decision regarding apportionment of State legislatures.

It has declared the legislative apportionment system of New York State is unconstitutional, holding that both houses of bicameral State legislatures must be apportioned on a strict population basis.

Richard F. Upton, president of the New Hampshire Constitutional Convention which closed last week, says that the Court decision means the apportionment of the New Hampshire House of Representatives will have to be restudied. The decision raises the question of whether the "Con Con" should be reconvened, Upton says, as he voices regret that the decision was not handed down a week ago before the "Con Con" adjourned.

The "Con Con" had approved a proposed amendment which would provide for the State senate being apportioned on a population basis, but it left intact a current system of apportioning the house which requires that a town or ward must have twice as many people to be entitled to a second representative as is required for the first.

This so-called two-for-one requirement weighs in favor of representation from small towns, while a strict population basis would swing the balance of legislative power to the cities.

The present system has worked well, providing for good distribution of influence in legislative action. The U.S. Supreme Court has, by its interpretation of the U.S. Constitution, decided to discard this time-honored system. The effects can be far reaching.

JOB VACANCIES: IS U.S. EMPLOYMENT SERVICE THE ONLY ANSWER?

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, one of the pressing needs in this period of rapid technological development which we call automation is to anticipate the new job coming into being and the old job becoming obsolete so that we have the time to train people for the new skills in demand and to retrain the people whose skills are to become obsolete with skills still in demand.

Fortunately, as is the usual case in a free society, at the very time a pressing economic and social problem comes to the attention of the general public and so to the attention of those in Government, the crisis in meeting the problem has already been reached and the solution of it is already coming about. So the increased demand for the professional services of employment brokerage, matching newly created jobs with human beings to fill the jobs, has been largely met at the time Government is just awakening to the fact that there has been this great need.

However, there is a great danger to the orderly solution of the problem now that governmental officials and ivory tower observers of our society have finally become aware of the situation and also aware of the fact that their panacea, increased consumer purchasing power, is not going to solve the unemployment problem inasmuch as it is essentially structural and frictional, not cyclical.

A recent article by Edward T. Chase in Harper's magazine of July 1964 entitled "The Job-Finding Machine: How to Crank It Up," points up the dangers the important function of job brokerage now faces from Government meddling. The author has not troubled himself to find out what the private employment agencies have been doing to meet the need for increased job brokeraging or what is being done by the employers to train, retrain, and upgrade the skill of their employees. He dismisses the tremendous response made by the private sector without comment.

The burden of Mr. Chase's article seems to be that the Government agency most responsible to assist in the area of job brokerage, the USES, has not done a good job and that the private employment agencies are attacking it now that, at long last, it is starting to gear itself to act effectively. Mr. Chase says:

> Although a heroic effort is now under way to improve it, the agency—as of this writing—is still pitifully unequal to its mammoth responsibility. * * * This new self-assertive spirit has triggered a savage assault on the agency. The attackers are private employment agencies, defending the sacred right to make a commissionable buck.

Mr. Chase asks if the goal of the "heroic effort" is "sinister" and then proceeds to beg the question. His answer is that, of course, the goal of the USES is not sinister because it seeks to meet a social and economic need. The question is, however, are not the private employment agencies meeting this social and economic need?

Mr. Chase does not directly attack the private enterprise system, the system that depends upon making a "commissionable buck," but the entire burden of his article is an attack upon it. He would set up a governmental agency in disregard of what the private enterprise system might or might not be doing to fill the economic and social need.

Mr. Chase berates the private employers for not using the governmental agency, USES. The reason is, of course, they are using private employment agencies instead.

How sinister to the private enterprise system, then, is Mr. Chase's proposal to massively increase the Federal bureau? This may be seen in the following quoted paragraphs:

> If such cooperation (on the part of business and industry) is not forthcoming voluntarily, conceivably it will have to be achieved by law. Organized labor has been pressing for mandatory listing of all job vacancies with USES. This has been done before but only in wartime. If unemployment grows worse, a Federal executive order might well be issued requiring all governmental contractors to list their job openings with USES. The rationale would be that a worker shouldn't have to pay a fee to a private agency to get employment deriving from Government business.
>
> Eventually all industries may be persuaded to list job vacancies by carrot and stick methods. For example, unemployment insurance tax rates might be lowered for employers who offer job vacancy data.

As a matter of fact, if Mr. Chase had devoted some time to studying the private employment agencies he would have found that not all of them require that a worker pay a fee to get employment, although this is certainly a service that is worth a fee from the worker. A number of employment agencies get their compensation from the employer—so hard pressed are some employers today to find competent help; so many jobs are there going begging; and so valuable have the employers found the professional services of the private employment agencies.

Mr. Chase's article is well worth reading in its entirety. It does point up how inadequate the USES is in meeting the great needs that automation has presented to us first, in the new jobs that need filling, and second, in the reemployment of the worker with the skill rendered obsolete. Dr. Yale Brozen in his study entitled "Automation—The Impact of Technological Change" which was written for the American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research and published by that organization in March 1963, points out that between 1951 and 1961, 20 million new jobs were created and 13 million jobs were destroyed, leaving a net gain of 7 million jobs. The biggest economic and social problem today is employment, not unemployment. It centers around training people with the skills that the newly created jobs demand. The unemployed far from being a welfare problem are our greatest economic asset in meeting this great demand.

Mr. Chase, however, as I have stated, fails to present what private enterprise has done to meet the need and the part that private employment agencies have played. There is a part for government to play, but, as always in a free society, government's part must be ancillary, not primary. It is difficult to determine what government's part should be if we have not yet studied what private enterprise has already been doing.

Here follows the full article of Mr. Chase:

[From Harper's, July 1964]

THE JOB-FINDING MACHINE: HOW TO CRANK IT UP

(By Edward T. Chase)

(Edward T. Chase, who has written extensively on technology and manpower problem, is currently consultant both for a Ford Foundation-sponsored national conference on unemployment, and for the New York City Planning Commission. He is also writing the official report on mobilization for youth and is active on the board of the Henry Street Settlement.)

Lots of jobs go empty while millions are unemployed—largely because the service which is supposed to bring the two together isn't working right.

On at least one vital front the war against poverty in the 1960's is being fought with tragically obsolete weapons. A crucial part of the battle consists in finding jobs for people who now don't have them, and the only nationwide mechanism designed to do this is the U.S. Employment Service.

Although a heroic effort is now under way to improve it, the agency—as of this writing—is still pitifully unequal to its mammoth responsibility. Indeed USES does not even know, on a national basis, where the job openings exist or are likely to occur, or the location, and skills or lack of them, of the unemployed men and women who might fill those vacancies. This is a major cause of that baffling phenomenon of our time—the existence of some 4 million unemployed workers while hundreds of thousands of jobs go begging.

This is not to say that USES has no dealings with the unemployed. On the contrary, you can see hundreds of them each morning in any large city waiting for the office to open—a nondescript crowd, bearing the unmistakable stamp of defeat. Inside, vast neon-lighted rooms are filled with lines of men inching toward placards marked "saladman," "busboy," "dishwasher." In a back corner, separated from these patient queues, are the "bottle money" applicants, chiefly alcoholics or others too unstable or unskilled to seek anything but the most menial part-time work. An alarming number of them are in their teens or early twenties; many are Negroes.

Waiting at their desks, the Employment Service interviewers do not seem seized of any great sense of urgency. Some are reading the morning paper: others are gossiping. But shortly they will begin the day's routine, which consists mostly in referring unskilled or semiskilled workers to employers who happen to have called the USES.

This dismal scene, and its miniature replica in smalltown offices, conveys an impression of an agency that does not rate high either with its clientele or in public support. Lamentably, this impression is correct. It is the consequence of past history as much as current practice.

USES was established in 1933 at the depth of the depression and was quickly overwhelmed by the task of referring millions of destitute men and women to public relief projects. With the advent of unemployment insurance later in the thirties it was swamped with unemployment claims. This task quickly took priority over job placement. Ever since, USES has been widely considered, and often called, the "unemployment" office. Skilled workers, white collar or blue, have seldom looked to it as a likely source of good leads for jobs. Though housewives and restaurant operators may phone in for casual help, personnel offices of most companies use other recruiting methods.

About 20 percent of all USES nonfarm job placements today are in domestic service, although household work accounts for only about 3 percent of all nonfarm jobs generally. The well-advertised concern of USES for parolees, Indians, disabled vets, school dropouts, and others at the bottom of the labor market has helped reinforce its reputation as a kind of welfare service for the unfortunate.

The 2,000 local offices of USES are financed out of the Federal payroll tax. But they are run by the individual States as neighborhood facilities. This local orientation is peculiarly frustrating at a time when the job market is increasingly regional and national. For instance, I know a conscientious young USES interviewer in a Brooklyn office who was recently confronted with several unemployed welders. There were no known local openings to offer them. Quite by chance, the interviewer had heard that welders were being sought right then in Connecticut. Now to match the applicants with the jobs through official channels would involve a cumbersome mailing process called interstate clearance. Since time is of the essence in getting a job, he urged the welders to go after the Connecticut jobs on their own.

This is not a step a man broke and out of work for many weeks can take; nor is it a satisfactory way for a national public employment service to function. Yet few interviewers can give even this much sensible advice. Most of them have had little contact with the world of business and industry, and few of them go calling at offices or factories.

As a result, even in their own hometowns, USES offices have only meager data about local job openings. And there is virtually no incentive for employers to make their needs known to USES, despite the urgency of the present manpower crisis. The whole operation has a voluntary character like that of a travel agency—while over 4 million Americans are jobless and triple that number will be out of work for varying intervals in the years ahead. Obviously, pinpointing the job opportunity is more than half the battle in placing a man. Dr. Arthur Burns, who was Chairman of President Eisenhower's Council of Economic Advisers, has called the lack of national job-vacancy statistics a "vital missing link in our entire system of economic intelligence."

IS ITS GOAL SINISTER?

Against great odds USES has been trying, within the past several years, to transform itself from a down-at-the-heels social-welfare relic of the New Deal—absorbed with unemployment compensation and the placement of domestics—into a national manpower agency responsible for the most efficient use of our total labor resources. This new self-assertive spirit has triggered a savage assault on the agency. The attackers are private employment agencies, defending the sacred right to make a commissionable buck. Ironically, their self-serving militancy may, in the end, boomerang by arousing an indifferent public to sympathetic support of the vital mission of USES.

Within the past year, the attack was pressed right into the Halls of Congress and even into a presidential press conference, where USES was accused of competing with private enterprise both in the business community and on the campus, and of the further sin of soliciting jobs for people who already are employed. President Kennedy promised to look into the matter.

Not long ago, I talked with the affable spokesman for the private employment agencies. He is John Willetts, a Dartmouth man from Milwaukee, who assured me that I'd perform a needed public service if I could somehow uncover what USES was really up to.

Its sinister goal is the monopolistic control of all manpower and this "could lead to eventual control of the Nation's means of production and distribution of goods," according to Harold Nelson, an Akron agency man, who testified before a Senate subcommittee. Nelson distributes sample letters for the like minded to copy and send to their Congressmen to alert them to the expected USES coup. In his Senate testimony Nelson compared USES practices with the Russians' the Third Reich's, Red China's, and Castro Cuba's.

The National Employment Association, headquartered in Detroit, which represents 4,300 agencies, is raising $75,000 for its current operation freedom campaign. It depicts USES as bent on destroying the private agencies, indifferent to the unemployed, and determined to control the entire labor market. The NEA has a voluble and thoroughly alarmed freedom fighter in the person of Representative Frank Bow, a Republican Congressman from Ohio, who ceaselessly guards the ramparts for the private agencies. "Never before, not even in the dramatic and devastating days of the New Deal and the Fair Deal, has the strangulation of private enterprise been so imminent," Bow told the recent NEA annual convention. The convention was reassured that his excessive agitation would not distract the Congressman from his mission. "I repeat you are not alone, or rather we are not alone, for I take a great and genuine pride in carrying a musket in your ranks in this battle. But this battle is not over; it is certain to be a continuing one in a long war—provided, as I have emphasized before, that we stand up and fight and fight hard. Each of you in the private employment industry has more than just this issue at stake. I say to you without hesitation that your very survival in business is at stake today. Even more significantly, your very rights and freedoms as Americans are threatened as never before in your lifetime or in the history of this Nation."

Such accusations might be dismissed as ludicrously exaggerated—and relatively harmless—manifestations of private greed or lunatic conservatism, were not our current need for an effective Federal employment service so critical. Under these conditions, this kind of sniping could cripple the effort just beginning to remedy the inadequacies of USES.

To assess the gap between what we need and what we now have, it is instructive to look at a successful national employment service in operation—Sweden's for instance.

To be sure, as defenders of the status quo love to point out, Sweden is a small nation with a homogeneous population and is therefore not comparable to the United States. Yet these particular characteristics lessen the smaller country's need for an effective national employment service. Sweden does not have to cope with our demographic variety, racial discrimination, and complex industrial development now racked by automation—all factors which complicate the adjustment of manpower supply and demand in this huge country.

ONE SERVICE THAT WORKS

The Swedes swear by their employment service. They credit it not only with mastering the employment process, but also with contributing to productivity and growth. The biggest difference, however, between their service and USES is the enthusiastic support it gets from the population generally and Swedish businessmen in particular.

Swedish employers use their service. They make their job vacancies known without any formal mandate. They also volunteer detailed advance notice of any important changes they contemplate that will affect the labor market. The Swedish Government then helps workers to move as needed. It provides travel allowances which include the cost of sending the man's wife along when he is interviewed for the job so that she may satisfy herself on housing and schooling in the new locality. Prefabricated houses are provided while the relocated worker looks for a permanent home and he gets an adequate family subsistance allowance and training and retraining as needed.

Employees of the Swedish service are mostly well-educated professionals. They are well paid and there are enough of them for the time-consuming task of keeping in touch with employers. A leading Swedish employment service officer, Nils Kelgren, after observing the American system over many weeks commented, "Not on one single occasion in the United States did I hear an employer himself calling an officer [of USES], presenting the vacancy and his wishes."

Gunnar Myrdal has pointed out that Sweden's employment service, unlike ours, spends more to prevent unemployment than it ever did for unemployment relief. "This policy is an investment in higher productivity," he says. "The state is seen to be rendering a service to expanding businesses as well as to the workers threatened by unemployment. For this the business community is grateful."

ANOTHER FIRST

Immediately after his inauguration, President Kennedy enjoined the Secretary of Labor to reform USES to cope with the already disturbing rise in the number of jobless. The then Secretary of Labor, now Supreme Court Justice, Arthur Goldberg, and his successor, Willard Wirtz, are both intellectuals intensely concerned with the dynamics of the labor market, and they have instructed USES to become a manpower service. President Johnson is equally emphatic. Appropriations have been increased, and there have been implementing directives and legislation. But the chief product until quite recently has been a welter of self-congratulatory literature about the new USES mission.

Much ballyhooed, for example, have been the steps to meet the deepening youth-unemployment crisis. A new USES youth kit was issued, but when an interviewer I know tried to track one down, no one in his office seemed to have heard of it. Eventually a veteran supervisor unearthed one beneath a towel and some old magazines. The kit, my friend found, was glossy and said the right things. But it could be brought to life only by a topnotch USES staff enthusiastically aided by businessmen. So far, neither the staff nor the cooperation have been forthcoming.

USES has also been beating the drums for its special new facilities for recruiting and placing professional people on a nationwide scale. The idea is sound but there remains a wide gap between promise and performance. By way of a test some weeks ago in New York I visited the Service's handsome professional quarters in the Newsweek Building on Madison Avenue. These are a far cry from the bleak offices where the unskilled applicants go.

I asked the interviewer to find two agricultural chemical writers—a not-too-arcane specialty today. Several weeks passed and I heard nothing from USES. I checked back with the earnest young woman handling the case, and discovered she had made only a routine and unsuccessful scrutiny of the local files. When I suggested that perhaps she might check with other State offices, she agreed, dimly, and maybe she did go this far. But I never heard from her again. Meantime a private agency filled the vacancies—for a profitable middleman's fee.

On the other hand, one also encounters tantalizing examples of what USES could be, given the staff and public support it needs. For instance, in one smalltown USES office I visited recently the morale of the manager and his staff was at a high pitch. He had reviewed his 1963 results and they confirmed his best hopes—the community, especially its employers, were "beginning to break down," as he put it, and turn to his office with their needs. Even as he spoke, the phone rang. He talked animatedly and when finished he turned to me with a grin saying, "Another first: it's happening every day lately."

It was in a sense pitiful, but significant—a call from the biggest liquor store in the adjacent resort village requesting a clerk. This represented a breakthrough, nonetheless, a "first time" employer turning to him. This USES office had won esteem for the initiative and good judgment it displayed in both referrals and its interviews with job applicants. Accordingly, it had lightened the stigma of being "the unemployment office." Many of its applicants were not jobless claimants for unemployment insurance, but people seeking better jobs, among them professionals.

This manager never gave up. He told me, for example, of a woman—an editorial assistant—who had moved to the town from New York. "How could I get her work here?" he said. "I figured it would only come through if I kept at it for a long time. I decided to try." And in due course, a doctor working on a book needed editorial help. He called USES after learning of its good reputation. "I get my kicks out of making tough placements," the manager said. He gets even greater kicks out of persuading long-unemployed men and women to relocate or to take retraining courses under the Manpower Development and Training Act program.

This experience illustrates what the whole USES must do to pick itself up by its bootstraps. It must win the confidence of employers so that job-vacancy information is forthcoming. Simultaneously it must win the cooperation of the labor force. And the key to both objectives is better service, not paper public relations gestures.

NEW MONEY, NEW ROLES

This means, among other things, more money to add more staff. In the decade from 1947 to 1957, the USES budget and staff dwindled by 23 percent and its job placements declined proportionately. With increased appropriations in 1961 and 1962, the reverse happened. What can be accomplished was demonstrated in 1962 in a test conducted in Muncie, Ind. In that typical small-city office, 5 interviewers and a clerk were added, bringing the total staff to 35. They were then able to call on every employer in Muncie. The office doubled its newspaper advertising, and mailed résumés of its applicants to 2,200 local employers. As a result, overall job placements increased by two-thirds, and among the semiskilled by 350 percent.

This kind of service must be made available all over the country if we are to have any hope of halting the creeping menace of long-term structural unemployment. The average 20-year-old today can anticipate six different careers in his lifetime, and at least 1 percent of workers now employed will have to be retrained annually if they are to find jobs. This means 700,000 workers a year—nearly 7 times as many as were trained last year under the pioneering Manpower Development and Training Act, which got underway in 1962.

USES is the agency which must set up retraining programs, interview employers in systematic surveys of regionals job prospects, and work closely with local vocational school systems if the program is to work. Moving into this area has proved an eye-opening experience for USES. In the past year 112,000 unemployed or underemployed men and women took retraining courses or have been approved for retraining. About 70 percent of the graduates got jobs. Eighteen-year-old draftees who flunk preinduction tests are now being referred to USES offices for counseling, training under the Manpower Development and Training Act, or job placement. To encourage this salvage operation, President Johnson announced in May that a personal letter from him urging young men to seek the help of their local employment offices will be enclosed with future draft rejection notices. USES counselors are discovering that many of those flunking the tests are from broken homes. Skilled referrals to social and psychiatric services are required. This is a novel but appropriate role for USES.

Amendments to the Manpower Development and Training Act passed last year permit programs for overcoming illiteracy as well as teaching vocational skills. This should make it possible for the training programs to reach those most in need of help. To date, this has not been the case. For example, I found that some 500 women had to be interviewed in one employment office to fill a class of 30 in practical nursing. In another instance, 287 men were lined up to pick 20 trainees for a hotel cooking course. Twenty percent of all the people now unemployed have had less than 8 years of schooling. Yet only 3 percent of the Manpower Development and Training Act trainees have been drawn from this group.

Amendments to Federal statutes on vocational education also will require (1) a closer working rapport between USES and vocational education, which—as a result of legislation passed in 1963—is scheduled for a steep increase in Federal financing, and (2) a new flexibility permitting more emphasis on office jobs and less on farm training. These reforms should help make USES more effective.

Better integration of interstate USES operations is also in prospect. It has set up a new professional office network with separate offices in 160 cities which use special phone and mail channels, chiefly to place engineers, teachers, accountants, and nurses. In a pilot program, nine such offices in California have been linked via teletype. USES is also exploring the use of electronic data processing in an attempt to cut through the elephantine paperwork now involved in matching man with job. Some day perhaps a meaningful file on an applicant will be stored on tape and made instantly usable through computers.

At the same time USES is struggling to rise above being "the unemployment office." In 44 large metropolitan centers the employment service and unemployment offices are physically separated. Unfortunately both services are still under one head in most States and where offices are short handed, the same people must hand out unemployment checks and act as job counselors. As a result, vital counseling, testing, and interviewing are skimped.

These functions also suffer because of the present need to justify an annual appropriation before Congress. Long-range planning, counseling, and testing services are less impressive at budget hearings than a high score on job placements. The fact that many of these jobs are temporary does not show up in the statistics. Actually, however, last year one-third of all USES placements were for less than 3 days. Though such achievements help raise the score, they have little bearing on a positive manpower policy.

GETTING BUSINESS TO USE IT

For the real role of an effective national employment service is—though few Americans realize this—actually to create employment. It does this through a battery of services which together perform the complicated job of matching labor supply with labor demand. The basic steps are to provide information on employment trends, to interview, counsel, test, and classify job applicants and refer them to prospective employers. Training and retraining as well as relocation may be necessary. Workers must be given early warning of technological or other trends which may result in unemployment. Many employers also need help in anticipating their manpower needs and in recruiting and testing applicants—a function USES has brought to a high level of proficiency.

To perform in this fashion USES needs more than increased funds, better personnel, modern equipment and operating methods.

it must have increased public support—above all, from business and industry. If such cooperation is not forthcoming voluntarily, conceivably it will have to be achieved by law. Organized labor has been pressing for mandatory listing of all job vacancies with USES. This has been done before but only in wartime. If unemployment grows worse, a Federal Executive order might well be issued requiring all Government contractors to list their job openings with USES. The rationale would be that a worker shouldn't have to pay a fee to a private agency to get employment deriving from Government business.

Eventually all industries may be persuaded to list their job vacancies by carrot-and-stick methods. For example, unemployment-insurance tax rates might be lowered by employers who offer job vacancy data. But however it is brought about, a national employment service can never be really useful if it does not have full information on jobs and, as a consequence, patronage by most of the qualified workers rather than just the ill-equipped. Otherwise it remains only a peripheral operation.

There are small signs on the horizon that industry is beginning to get the point. For example, the New Jersey Manufacturers Association has persuaded its members to list their hard-to-fill job vacancies with USES. In the first year, over 2,000 job openings were listed by some 200 companies and USES was able to fill a great many of them.

A substantial dollar saving is involved when the service can cut down the interval between jobs. Last year USES made 6.7 million job placements. If the time each of these workers spent looking for work was reduced by 1 week and his average weekly wage was $60, a total of $402 million was saved. That is a conservative estimate, yet the sum about equals the current annual appropriations for USES and the administration of unemployment insurance combined. And the $402 million is only the dollar wage income produced—it does not include the savings in relief costs or unemployment compensation nor the value of goods and services added to the gross national product by this employment.

FOR HOW LONG?

The real significance of speeding up the employment process is manifest when one considers that long-term unemployment (6 months or more) has been on a relentless increase in the United States regardless of boom or slump. In mid-1953 the very long term unemployed were 58,000, or 3.7 percent of the unemployed. In mid-1957 they numbered 260,000, or 9.6 percent of the unemployed. By mid-1960 they had grown to 411,000, or 11.9 percent, and in mid-1963 they numbered 643,000, or 15.8 percent of all the unemployed.

Half the rise in unemployment over the past decade is attributable to the longer duration of joblessness, rather than new unemployment. This is an ominous and entirely new experience for the United States. Against this dismal background, and the prospect of accelerating automation plus an explosively expanding labor force, USES can be properly seen as an indispensable agency. Clearly, a vastly strengthened USES is a necessary first step in any serious war on poverty.

PANAMA CANAL ZONE ANNIVERSARY MARRED BY ATTEMPTED MOB INVASION

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Weaver] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, most of our people hope for a permanent restoration of tranquil conditions in Panama, where Red-led mob assaults in the Canal Zone in January 1964, required its defense by the U.S. Army.

On July 4, 1964, the 61st anniversary of the first July 4 under U.S. occupation of the Canal Zone, Panamanian student mobs under communistic influence attempted to invade the Canal Zone again at Shaler Plaza. This was the spot where the Panama flag was first hoisted in 1960 in equal dignity with the flag of the United States under the authority of the then President of the United States as visual evidence of so-called "titular sovereignty" of Panama over this U.S. territorial possession.

The latest attempted mob invasion of the zone was prevented by the Panamanian National Guard, which dispersed the mob by firing into the air and tossing tear gas grenades among the demonstrators, showing that this protective force can perform its functions if called upon, or permitted to do so, by responsible Panamanian authorities. Such timely action was not taken in January because the President of Panama gave orders for the National Guard to remain in their barracks during the first 3 days of the riots, with the result that the mobsters got out of control. Their violence required the U.S. Army to protect the Canal Zone. As it was, the assaults caused widespread destruction of life and property in the Canal Zone territory.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I would emphasize that as long as the Government of Panama allows Red agents on the Isthmus there are going to be recurrent incidents of this nature, because wresting control of the Panama Canal from the United States has been, and is, a long range Communist revolutionary objective.

An Associated Press dispatch from Panama, Republic of Panama, giving a summary of the latest attempted mob invasion of the Canal Zone follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, July 5, 1964]

SHOTS AND TEAR GAS HALT PANAMA DEMONSTRATION

Panama, July 4.—Panamanian National Guardsmen, firing shots into the air and tossing teargas grenades, today broke up an attempted student march on Shaler Plaza in the U.S. controlled Canal Zone.

No Americans were involved.

Fifteen demonstrators were arrested, including Floyd Britton, identified as a ranking leftist Panamanian student leader who has been in the forefront of past anti-U.S. demonstrations.

A National Guard officer said no one was wounded, but a couple of demonstrators suffered minor injuries in a brief scuffle and fist fight between guardsmen and demonstrators.

After an original group that grew from about 30 to 100 persons was chased from the border of the Canal Zone and downtown Panama City, a second group formed in front of the city's biggest high school. Three speakers, one of them Britton's brother, threatened further demonstrations if those arrested were not released within 24 hours.

SCENE OF JANUARY RIOT

There was also a threat of disrupting an annual Fourth of July horse racing program at the Presidente Ramon track. But guardsmen reported no further incidents.

In the Canal Zone American civilian and military residents held traditional Fourth of July celebrations.

Shaler Plaza, known as Shaler Triangle, was the scene of some of the worst rioting during last January's flag raising incident that led to the deaths of more than 20 persons, including 4 U.S. soldiers. It is a crossing point on the zonal border with an entrance from Panama City's Central Avenue.

Since then the Plaza has become one of the sites where the Panamanian and United States flags are flown side-by-side.

GUARDSMEN WAITING

When the demonstrators showed up at the Panama City entrance to the Plaza, guardsmen were waiting for them in force. The students had called a meeting for the Plaza Friday, but Panama City authorities banned the meeting on the ground it was not inside the city and that a mandatory 24-hour notice had not been given.

Told to move on, the group congregated at a Panama City railroad station a block away. Britton harangued the crowd and called for a march on the Plaza.

When he jumped down from a speaking perch, guardsmen grabbed him. Fists flew and some rocks were thrown during a 10-minute scuffle that followed.

The demonstrators dispersed when guardsmen threw teargas grenades and fired some shots into the air.

The guard serves as Panama's military and police force.

A guard force remained posted at the entrance to Shaler Plaza.

PROSPERITY UNDER THE KENNEDY-JOHNSON ADMINISTRATIONS

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Gonzalez] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, the economic boom period which began shortly after the late John F. Kennedy became President is well into its 41st consecutive month. President Kennedy's economic policies, carried forward so successfully by President Lyndon B. Johnson, are paying off in a real and significant way for the American people. Business profits, personal income, and farm income have been increased; unemployment and taxes have been reduced. The message of prosperity comes on good authority not only from President Johnson, who released important and encouraging statistics in a recent news conference, but from the business community as well. Equally encouraging are the prospects for continued growth and prosperity under the Johnson administration.

What is the explanation for this prosperity in contrast to the recession we had fallen into during the tail end of the last Republican administration? Doubtlessly it is the positive programs of President Kennedy and President Johnson supported by two Democratic Congresses, the 87th and the 88th. John F. Kennedy promised to get this Nation moving forward again, and we are indeed moving forward in a healthy and hopeful way.

With unanimous consent I would like to introduce for the RECORD two recent articles from business publications: the first, entitled "Good Times Will Get Better," is from Nation's Business, July 1964; the second, entitled "Economic Thrust Shows No Slackening; Permits, Incomes, Profits, Jobs Rise," is from Scope, June 22, 1964, published by the National Association of Home Builders.

[From the Nation's Business, July 1964]

GOOD TIMES WILL GET BETTER: LEADING BUSINESSMEN SAY THERE'S LOTS OF ZIP LEFT IN CURRENT EXPANSION. HERE'S WHY THEY'RE BULLISH

America's economy will do a lot more surging before it begins to sag.

That sums up the mood of leading executives in a cross section of business and industry.

In a new semiannual survey of business expectations, Nation's Business finds three-fourths of the businessmen polled look for more growth in the next 12 months than we have experienced in the past 12.

Thirty-five percent say flatly that they don't expect a downturn either this year or next, despite the fact that the economy is entering its 41st month of uninterrupted growth. Some put the next recession as far away as mid-1966.

Things look so good that it scares some business leaders. "I can't find any cause for pessimism," one company president asserts, "unless it's the fact that there is so darned much optimism around."

Here—briefly—is how more than 200 top managers view the next 12 months:

Eighty-four percent expect sales of their own companies to do better in the next 12 months than they have in the past 12; only 2 percent anticipate a decline.

Fifty percent look for improvement in their profit per dollar of sales; 38 percent say it will hold at about the same level, and only 7 percent anticipate falling profits.

Thirty-six percent say they'll hire more people in the coming 12 months than they have in the past 12; 55 percent expect their employment to remain about the same, and only 9 percent predict a decrease.

Eighty-three percent report their companies plan to spend more or about the same for capital projects in the next 12 months; 13 percent say they plan to spend less.

Among those executives who can't foresee a slump either this year or in 1965 is R. I. Nowell, vice president and economist for the Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States. Mr. Nowell pinpoints the recent tax cut and "the availability of plenty of money at reasonable rates" as reasons for his optimistic assessment. He calls further tax relief the thing most needed to sustain a continued healthy rate of growth.

Just slightly less than half of the executives pick 1965 as the year in which the next downturn in business could begin. Fourteen percent have no solid opinion, and a scant 2 percent say a recession could begin later this year.

Many businessmen who concede that a slump could occur next year say it should not amount to more than a breath-catching adjustment.

DOWNTURN NOT INEVITABLE

Charles L. Huston, Jr., president of Lukens Steel Co., is one of the 49 percent who think stormy seas could develop in 1965. Robert S. Macfarlane, president of the Northern Pacific Railway Co., is another. T. C. Fogarty, chairman of the board of Continental Can Co., says a recession could begin in 1965, but adds: "This is not inevitable. Continued restraint on the part of consumers, government, and business could bring continued expansion."

Approximately half of the executives taking part in the Nation's Business survey are presidents, economists, or planning specialists of their companies.

A man with the title of "Director of Forward Planning" for a major manufacturing corporation sees no prospect of a downturn in 1964, and is not convinced that one will materialize next year. Bolstering his optimism, he explains, are the broad base of the current economic expansion, capital goods spending plans of business generally, and vigorous consumer spending.

The survey brings one message through loud and clear: Business confidence, knocked wobbly at some points in the recent past, is now riding a new crest of strength. Many executives cite President Johnson's overtures to business as a major prop to their own optimism. Other confidence-building factors: the impetus of the tax cut, improved relations with the Soviet Union, the spur of high-level spending by business and consumers, controlled inventory accumulation, and the stimulating effect on business of a growing American population.

In the opinion of many, renewed confidence among businessmen is rubbing off on the general public, and with good effect.

"There is a lack of excesses of the type that cause recessions," maintains Edward R. Heydinger, manager of the economics and statistics division of Marathon Oil Co. Mr. Heydinger expects good times to continue in the next 12 months. He adds, "I feel that the shape of our economy is that of a stair type. Currently the economy is horizontal and will not experience a real pickup until the latter part of the year. This pickup could well carry through 1965."

While some businessmen see cause for optimism in recent economy moves by the administration, others continue to rate Federal spending as one of the biggest causes for concern over economic prospects. But more frequently noted now are such potentially negative influences as a new inflationary spiral fed by wage demands, the impact of racial disorders, damaging strikes in major industries, overextended credit, the balance-of-payments problem, overbuilding and the age of the upturn itself.

Few executives see much to worry about in the possibility of additional defense spending cutbacks.

SALES THRUST WILL IMPROVE PROFIT PICTURE

Here are the kinds of dotted lines that businessmen are drawing on their projected charts for the next 12 months:

Sales, headed up, sharply.

Profits, up, but not so steeply as sales.

Labor, costs, also rising.

Prices, a few more will go up than down.

From the dollars-and-cents view, this compresses the expectations of top executives surveyed by Nation's Business.

Most corporate leaders expect both their own businesses and the economy as a whole to score new gains in the period between now and mid-1965.

Close up, the balance sheet items shape up this way:

SALES PROSPECTS

Powerful optimism here. Few businessmen can foresee anything but strong advances in their volume. The threat of further penetration of our markets by foreign firms haunts some managers, but even a steel company president who expresses this worry confidently predicts that sales of his company in the next 12 months will outrun a good performance in the past 12.

Overall, 84 percent of the business leaders surveyed forecast improving sales in the year ahead, 10 percent expect their sales to hold even and only 2 percent predict a downtrend. An additional 4 percent are unsure which way their sales curve will bend.

Forecasts of sales gains come from executives in companies across the board: insurance, heavy manufacturing, office equipment, retailing, public utilities, trucking, publishing, chemicals, rail transportation and others.

Within at least one major industry—steel—increasing or declining sales are projected by key executives of different companies.

In addition to steel, spokesmen for companies in automobile manufacturing, electronics, aircraft manufacturing and textiles anticipate possible sales setbacks in the coming year.

PROFIT OUTLOOK

Half the businessmen surveyed by Nation's Business expect their profit per dollar of sales to improve over the next 6 to 12 months.

Only 1 in 14 anticipates a decline in earnings.

The remainder who commented—more than a third of the total polled—believe profits will continue about as they are now.

Again, forecasts of profit improvement come from companies in a broad spectrum of business and industry.

Declining profitability is foreseen by executives in air and rail transportation, insurance, department store retailing, automobile manufacturing and steel.

LABOR COSTS

Two question marks hang over the business scene.

One question is what will emerge this summer from important management-union negotiations in the automobile industry.

The other is the more basic but murky question of whether general upward pressure on wages can be prevented from starting another cycle of wage-price inflation.

Joel Hunter, president of Crucible Steel Co. of America, lists upcoming auto-labor negotiations as a cause for pessimism, although he personally believes that general business conditions will improve in the next 12 months.

Another company president sees good times extending at least into late 1965, but finds cause for concern in "the emergence of pressures for uneconomic wage and fringe demands in important industries."

The Nation's Business survey asked executives to estimate how much they expect their labor costs, including fringe benefits, to increase in cents per hour in the 12 months ahead. There is wide variation in the replies, with estimates ranging from no increase to as much as 15 cents an hour. The median is roughly 8 cents.

A number of executives contend that current or impending labor negotiations make an answer impossible or inappropriate at this time; others decline to comment. In a few instances it is pointed out that present contracts still have a year or more to run.

THE PRICE PICTURE

More prices will go up in the next 12 months than will go down. This is the opinion of men who make daily buying and selling decisions.

Twenty-three percent of the managers surveyed say they expect prices to rise.

Eight percent expect to lower the price tag on their goods or services.

Of the remainder, most believe their prices will not change or that increases for some products in their line will be offset by lower prices for other products.

Businessmen explain that many price increases are overdue; they're needed to catch up, and in no way represent any forward movement into inflation.

Here is the view of one manufacturer:

"There seems to be a pretty good balance between the rate of industry's growth in ability to produce goods and the rate of growth in the demand for goods today."

He expects some advances in wholesale prices may result from demand pull as well as cost pressures.

"The pull will come from expanding markets and rising economic levels. The push may be exerted from wage and benefit rate increases that exceed gains in productivity."

Consumer demand, strong now, will continue to grow. Businessmen already have boosted new investment outlays for plant and equipment and the rate of investment is expected to remain high over the year ahead. On the whole, the Nation's economy is operating at a higher rate of capacity than at any time in recent years, though operations are still somewhat below full capacity.

These factors contribute to what economists call a firming up of prices. This means, as the survey indicates, that there's a chance more prices will rise than will fall.

Charles H. Sommer, president of Monsanto Co., St. Louis, supports the view that some price increases are overdue and that inflation is unlikely to result from business action in this field.

"In recent years," he points out, "price erosion has brought profit margins in many lines to dangerously low levels."

For his industry, he says, "We simply must have prices with adequate margins over costs to support the heavy research and development expenditures which are indigenous to our business."

Launching of new Federal spending programs is cited as a factor that could upset price stability.

Here's the view of a manufacturer in Cleveland:

"For a number of years I have been a prophet of doom with regard to extravagance in Government and the inevitability of inflation when a country continues to spend in excess of income and to pour money into other countries without regard to the safety of our own currency." He points to the rivalry of Government agencies competing for the taxpayer's dollar.

"It takes a long time to bring a rich Nation to its knees—but this can be accomplished and it will happen unless we mend our ways. I, for one, do not see any real signs of willingness to face up to the danger and begin the disciplinary action that is needed."

Other businessmen express similar views—among them Lewis E. Lloyd, economists and head of business research for Dow Chemical Co. He warns: "As a Nation we have lived beyond our income for years. One of these days we will run out of suckers."

A banker, Eugene C. Zorn, Jr., vice president and economist of the Republic National Bank of Dallas, summarizes the feelings of many business leaders in this survey comment:

"Resumption of the wage-price spiral could upset the present balance, but the importance of preserving stability appears to be more fully appreciated by Government, business, and labor. Therefore, our chances of maintaining a pattern of continued, orlerly growth are much enhanced."

WHY GUIDEPOSTS WON'T WORK

Strong views are expressed with regard to the ultimate impact Government may have on holding wages down to a noninflationary level.

"I don't think there's any question that the Government will continue to exert its influence in an effort to keep prices and wage costs in line," says another executive, "I suspect, however, that there will be more emphasis on holding prices than on holding wage costs." He is doubtful of the value of Government guideposts for wage increases. They are impractical and unwise for a number of reasons.

"They would remove a wide area of bargaining from the negotiating table, thus interfering with the freedom of negotiations and relieving the parties of the responsibility of arriving at the best settlement for their separate and mutual interests.

"They are based upon the fallacious productivity theory of union wage and benefit determination.

"They tend to assume exactness in the measurement of productivity gains that is not statistically possible. They also depend upon a questionable index number, are measured from a questionable base year and contain questionable elements of judgment.

"While intended as a means of moderating demands and settlements, they may actually hinder settlements, lead to unnecessary strikes, or bring about settlements not in the long-range interests of the parties, because they impose a nonapplicable national judgment into local situations."

PROPOSALS WOULD BOOST COSTS

Most businessmen are distinctly alarmed at proposals to raise wages for overtime work. One states: "The theory that overtime hours worked in an industrial plant can automatically be converted into jobs for additional workers appeals to the uninformed—especially those who are also unemployed. This theory just doesn't add up when consideration is given to the practical aspects of the operation of an industrial plant."

Another says: "The establishment of double pay for overtime work would not provide a significant increase in the number of jobs—even in the short run. It would, however, result in a substantial increase in manufacturing costs, necessitating a boost in prices and/or a reduction in employment."

He believes such a penalty would encourage some American manufacturers with worldwide facilities to produce more of their products abroad where costs are more competitive. It also would encourage the substitution of machines for workers. "And it would further inject the Government into the field of free collective bargaining and lead to serious problems in union-management relations."

Most overtime work is unavoidable "and involves added costs which every well-managed company strives to keep at a minimum."

For the longer run, businessmen are by no means sure that inflation can be avoided.

WHAT'S NEEDED FOR GREATER GROWTH

Further tax relief is the one thing most needed to sustain a continued rate of sound economic growth.

That's the opinion of a decisive majority of businessmen replying to a Nation's Business survey.

Running a photofinish second place are suggestions for more improvement in relations among government, business, and labor unions and calls for reduced Federal spending. Only two executives say they oppose further tax relief, and comparatively few regard possible further cutbacks in defense or space spending as serious threats to the economy.

In a typical comment, John W. Barriger, president of the Pittsburgh & Lake Erie Railroad, urges Government policies and actions that will generate business confidence and promote the private enterprise system. Judging from the tenor of numerous replies, many business leaders believe that an atmosphere of better understanding between business and Washington is in the process of developing.

Other factors receiving a significant number of votes include recommendations for changes in America's foreign trade policy, for union restraint and restraints on unions, for monetary policies designed to thwart inflation and for a stepped-up rate of business innovation and new product development.

Here are some sample observations:

John O. Nicklis, president, Pitney-Bowes, Inc.—We need "public confidence in our leaders in government and business."

Robert B. Semple, president, Wyandotte Chemicals Corp.—"Restraint on wage increases, especially in automated industries where wages are high, so that benefits can be passed on as lower prices, and a growth of reason and trust between Government and business."

STRONG SENTIMENT ON TAXES

Impressed by the effect which the recent reduction in taxes has had on the economy, many businessmen feel that additional cuts—especially in corporate taxes—would add new drive to business activity.

One manufacturing company president, for example, says, "Tax relief will help consumer spending. We need greater assistance through elimination of tax barriers and elimination of Government control of company activities in foreign countries to increase exports."

Another president comments, "Primarily it is a matter of the proper business climate and the positive attitude of the consumer. News, whether it is business, political or international, could have the greatest psychological effect and could do the most to dampen what presently looks like a very excellent outlook."

The vice president-general manager of an electronics firm sees further sound growth dependent upon "changes in trade policy to the extent that as tariffs are lowered foreign costs will go up at a greater rate than in the United States."

A prominent transportation industry executive who asked to remain unnamed asserts, "In the transportation field we need changes in what the late President Kennedy described as a 'chaotic patchwork of inconsistent and often obsolete legislation and regulations.'"

In the tax field, some state that new tax relief would have an invigorating effect on investment by companies and individuals. At the same time, other executives couple their pleas for additional tax cuts with requests for slashes in various spending programs of the Federal Government.

Settlement of the current civil rights controversy is among the prescriptions which some corporate officials believe to be indispensable for continued sound growth.

A Seattle banker pleads for "accelerated innovation in products, production methods, distribution, and all other lines of economic endeavor."

IF DEFENSE SPENDING DROPS

Most executives take a calm view of the impact which any future cuts in Federal spending for defense or space programs might have on business.

Few think such cuts—if they come—will be sudden or severe. Few believe dislocations caused by such cutbacks would be more than temporary and localized in their effect. Many see in the possibility of defense/space reductions an opportunity for further lowering of taxes and a boost to more normal business expansion.

John F. Rice, corporate research manager for Montgomery Ward, argues that "The business community has had ample warning of the proposed change, and has already begun to adjust." His view is echoed by other managers, including A. H. Aymond, board chairman of Consumers Power Co., Jackson, Mich., who sees "the insatiable demand of the people" making up for any defense or space cutbacks "in other areas." The controller of one of the Nation's largest companies conjectures that "the transition will be smooth * * * if further tax reduction is phased to occur concurrently, as I expect."

Among businessmen who take a more somber view of possible deep slashes is

Charles L. Huston, Jr., president of Lukens Steel. He cautions that, "A significant decrease, if made too rapidly, would have a serious, depressing effect on business. Industry and government would be required to find the means to employ the labor, the plant, and the physical resources that are now utilized by the Military Establishment."

Says Eldred H. Scott, vice president and controller of the Detroit Edison Co.: "If not accompanied by increased spending in some other sector of the economy, the effect will be deflationary."

Much rides on the amount and timing, according to many officials. There is fairly general agreement that cuts in spending should be made gradually and not on a crash basis, so that industry will have an opportunity to adjust to them.

More than a few executives affirm that there are ample unmet private and public needs to take up any slack left by curtailment of programs in the defense or space fields.

[From Scope, June 22, 1964]

ECONOMIC THRUST SHOWS NO SLACKENING; PERMITS, INCOMES, PROFITS, JOBS RISE

Rosy-hued reports on the Nation's economy continue to blossom with profits, production, personal income, and jobs up, and housing holding high.

May building permits, an indicator of future housing activity, rose slightly on a seasonally adjusted annual rate from April to 1,258,000 units.

The seasonally adjusted annual rate of private starts eased in May to 1,479,000 units from April's 1,485,000 with all of the decline in the West.

The NAHB Economics Department estimated multifamily starts at 7 percent higher in the first 5 months and 2 percent higher in singles compared to last year.

The annual rate of multifamily housing permits declined 6.5 percent to 425,000 units while singles climbed 4 percent to 734,000.

The unused permit rate has gradually increased, indicating multifamily market reappraisals are being made.

In other facets of the economy, business was gushing. President Johnson, certainly pleased in an election year, said the "economic prognosis is one of continued growth."

Only thorn seemed to be uneasiness voiced by some economists over the expanded volume of consumer debt.

Some of the reports from agencies:

Personal income rose to a seasonally adjusted rate of almost $485 billion in May, $25 billion above May 1963.

Industrial production increased in May for the ninth consecutive month. The index increased from 129.6 to 130.3, or 30.3 points higher than the 1957–59 average of 100.

Profits of manufacturing corporations were 27 percent higher in the first 3 months of this year than last. Profits after taxes were $5.12 billion, compared to $4.2 billion in the first 3 months of 1963.

And gains in construction, trade service industries, and manufacturing spurred May's bright employment picture as the jobless rate fell to a 4-year low of 5.1 percent of the labor force.

Businessmen and consumers increased their spending since the tax cut, hailed as a reliable indicator of still better times ahead.

CLOSING OF THE NEW ORLEANS COTTON EXCHANGE

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WAGGONNER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, one would have to hunt both high and low to find a better example of the result of the Federal Government's interference in and domination of an area heretofore reserved to private enterprise, than the recent closing of the New Orleans Cotton Exchange.

After 93 years, the Federal Government has finally worn down every vestige of resistance except for the one the exchange could not be robbed of: pride in almost a century of operation and useful service to the cotton industry.

To call to the attention of the entire Nation what has happened to this venerable exchange, every other commodity exchange in the country closed for 1 minute of silence. As one exchange vice president wired the New Orleans Exchange:

> On July 9, we will cease operations for 1 minute at noon, which minute we all should use for prayer, not just for our exchanges, but for all American citizens who appear to be complacently sitting by while our Government destroys the free enterprise system which our forefathers built for us. With sorrow in our hearts we mark your closing.

With that same sorrow, I call it to the attention of the Congress by inserting here in the RECORD an advertisement which the New Orleans Cotton Exchange ran to announce their closing.

The death rattle has sounded for this esteemed firm. We can only wonder what exchange, what commodity business, what industry will next come before the Federal hangman.

WHERE ARE WE HEADED NOW, MR. PRESIDENT?

Today, after 93 years of service to the cotton trade, the New Orleans Cotton Exchange will close its doors for trading in futures.

The history of the exchange has been the history of the cotton industry. A sizable majority of its membership originated on the cotton land of the South. Minute by minute, publicizing the world price, it brought order out of chaos, for the profit and safety of the producer, the ginner, the merchant and the textile industry. Its price insurance function meant that the cotton grower had a market when he had cotton to sell and that the mills and manufacturers were assured supplies and price stability when they were ready to use it.

Gradually through the years we have been worn down under a system of high nonrecourse loans that are at best price fixing systems wherein the Nation's taxpayers became the unwilling buyers of commodities, in addition to shouldering the cost of warehousing, interest and insurance, all of which add to the staggering cost of the Federal bureaucracy.

The final blow to the marketing system was supplied by an administrative decision of your Secretary of Agriculture, a man unknowledgeable to the extent that he believes in the myth of the family farm, or is demagog enough to say he does. He ignores the progress made by large commercial farming units. He proposes a new order: tax-favored cooperatives borrowing Government money at rates not available to the private cotton industry, building gins, warehouses, elevators, and worldwide sales forces to merchandise farm production out of Government loan stockpiles.

Secretary Freeman has said his actions were based upon a legal opinion by his Department's counsel. If this be true, why did he go through the mockery of public hearings and appoint a special industry committee to go through the pretense of advising him? And what about the intent expressed by Congress that the law be administered so that free channels of trade not be impaired?

Under your administration's unique substitute for the free enterprise system, cotton is the first to fall. Will the cotton manufacturing industry follow next, or will it be wheat, corn, beans, and all the rest?

Do you really mean cartels instead of cooperatives, Mr. President? After the commodity business has been wrecked, will they move against industry?

Every commodity exchange in the Nation will close for one minute at noon today to focus attention on the destruction of our exchange by those who have never understood the problems they seek to correct.

We cede our role in the marketplace to the Secretary of Agriculture, the cooperatives and to history.

NEW ORLEANS COTTON EXCHANGE.

FOREIGN CLAIMS SETTLEMENT COMMISSION CHAIRMAN EDWARD D. RE IS FIRST RECIPIENT OF KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS "PRO PATRIA" AWARD

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. ADDABBO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, each year the Long Island General Assembly, Fourth Degree, Knights of Columbus, sponsors the only Independence Day rally in Kings County commemorating the birth of our Nation. That unit of the Knights of Columbus, a worldwide fraternity of Catholic men, is devoted to fostering ideals of patriotism.

On July 4, the assembly observed its 59th annual Independence Day celebration with ceremonies conducted at Prospect Park, Brooklyn. The rally was preceded by a parade in which the American Legion, various war veteran units, and other civic and fraternal organizations participated. For the first time in its long and distinguished history, the assembly presented a "Pro Patria" Award to an outstanding Catholic layman "for his love of country and devotion to duty."

A distinguished public servant in Federal Government was selected for that singular honor. He is Dr. Edward D. Re, Chairman of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States, who on that occasion delivered an inspiring address entitled "The American Heritage in a World of Change." He referred to our ideals as a constant source of strength and stated that the central theme of the American heritage has been beautifully captured by President Lincoln, who said that ours was "a new nation conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal." Said Dr. Re:

> This immortal assertion is founded upon the eternal truths enshrined in our Declaration of Independence, a document that holds great meaning in our daily lives. For in truth, if all men are created equal, equality of opportunity can be denied to no American.

Dr. Re noted that "the enactment of the civil rights bill was another giant step toward the attainment of our national ideal."

Dr. Re was introduced to the large gathering by Sir Knight Stephen Drag, chairman of the celebration, and received the award from Sir Knight Matthew J. Wilson, faithful navigator of the assembly.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that we are all fortunate to have in Government such devoted public servants as Dr. Re. I am particularly proud that he is a fellow New Yorker and wish to take this opportunity to congratulate him for the award that he has richly earned.

The day before the Independence Day celebration, Dr. Re was the subject of an article which appeared in the Home Reporter and Sunset News of July 3, 1964. Because this very well written profile sheds some insight on the remarkable man we are privileged to have serving as head of one of our independent Federal agencies, I should like, under leave to extend my remarks, to insert into the RECORD excerpts of the article, as follows:

BAY RIDGE PROFILES: DR. EDWARD D. RE, OUR MAN IN WASHINGTON

(By Charles F. Otey)

President John F. Kennedy was a political realist * * *. At the same time he had a respect for intellectual prowess and administrative ability and, once elected, he scoured the country for men to fill appointive positions high in Government.

This is why, in 1961, Dr. Edward D. Re, 223 Bay Ridge Parkway, was sworn in as Chairman of the U.S. Foreign Claims Settlement Commission.

There is much to be said about Edward Re. At 43 his accomplishments could fill a book—and some day will. History never neglects such men.

An excellent speaker, Dr. Re recently confided that whenever apropos, he likes to open a speech on a note of humor.

Perhaps we should do the same: hereby relating an episode in his personal life which occurred in 1950. That was the year when pretty Margaret Anne Corcoran, a student of his at St. John's University School of Law, was anxiously awaiting the results of her bar examination.

When the bar list was published, "Peggy" looked for her name but couldn't find it. "I was sure I hadn't passed," she later told a friend. Relating her plight to the handsome young professor, he wryly replied, "Why don't you look for your name under 'Margaret Re?' "

Sure enough there it was, under the R's. It seems that prior to the release of the names, Dr. Re and his favorite student had become man and wife—a development which would confuse any law aspirant. They now have 10 children and "with God's will" expect the 11th to arrive within a few months.

Born in Santa Marina, Italy, the son of a ship captain, Dr. Re and his younger sister, Nancy, came here when Edward was 8.

As a reminder of their hometown, each has named a daughter Marina. Nancy is now Mrs. Clifford Scanlon, and mother of four. Her husband, a lifelong Bay Ridge resident, operates a Manhattan parking business.

Edward Re went to Public School 176 and New Utrecht High School, and received his B.S. cum laude from St. John's in 1941. Two years later he was a summa cum laude graduate of St. John's Law and that year was admitted to the New York bar. From 1943 to 1947 he served in the Air Force.

While a student at St. John's he wrote a paper on the subject of foreign confiscation of American property for the school's law review, precursor of a 1951 work, "Foreign Confiscations in Anglo-American Law", which is now considered to be the first authoritative book on the topic.

Destined to become one of the school's most illustrious sons, he joined the faculty there in 1947; became a full professor by 1951. In 1950 he obtained the doctor of juridical science degree from New York University School of Law.

Before long he began to have his impact on American juridical thinking. About a decade ago, Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall, then an Arizona Congressman, cited an article authored by Dr. Re in hearings on NATO before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs.

To sustain his argument on the alliance then, Representative Udall used as persuasive evidence, the articles by Dr. Re which, in 1955, was published in the Northwestern University Law Review.

Said Mr. Udall in part: "He [Dr. Re] has made a study of this whole matter. It is a scholarly treatise, and is the best presentation I have seen. I would commend the article to you and I would ask that it be placed in the RECORD, because it does throw a great deal of light on at least one point of view on this international law question."

While Washington was thus reaping the benefits of his fertile mind, Dr. Re kept busy with his legal writings and lectures. But, unlike many academicians, he chose to add action to his words.

In 1956, after he had penned several works, he was appointed a special hearing officer for the Department of Justice by the U.S. Attorney General. That year he received the Distinguished Service Award of the Brooklyn Junior Chamber of Commerce for his "outstanding contribution to the community, State, and Nation."

In 1958 he was appointed to the board of higher education by Mayor Wagner. To illustrate the man's unusual sense of responsibility, it should be noted that his attendance record is near-perfect * * * notwithstanding the fact that he must travel over 200 miles to each meeting. Mayor Wagner recently reappointed him to a new 9-year term.

Another reappointment, which demonstrated President Kennedy's satisfaction with the job the Bay Ridge official was doing, was fulfilled October 22, 1963, when Mr. Justice Arthur J. Goldberg administered another oath of office to place Dr. Re in his second term of office.

A more polite and politic man you will never meet; but his deep-set moral and religious principles leave little room for expedient compromise.

A quote from the Brooklyn Tablet (Mar. 4, 1961) relates an incident exemplifying these qualities.

"His [Dr. Re's] attitude in constantly keeping in mind the moral issue can be gleaned from a talk that he delivered in 1954 in Monte Carlo while addressing a conference of the International Bar Association on the legal aspects of the confiscation of private property.

"Taking sharp issue with previous speakers who had maintained that it is not within the province of lawyers to discuss moral issues, Dr. Re declared: 'Although we are discussing property rights, we are also discussing human rights. Property rights are human rights because they relate to man's right to retain the fruits of his labor.' "

Briefly, the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission determines claims of U.S. nationals against foreign governments for compensation for losses and injuries sustained by them. The Commission possesses the power and has the jurisdiction of the former War Claims Commission and the International Claims Commission.

Holding down one of the country's most complex jobs, one might wonder how he finds time for his family of 10, soon to be 11. But he does. Whenever possible he and Peggy pack the Re children into their station wagon and motor back to Bay Ridge from their Chevy Chase home.

And when the young Res get together with their Scanlon cousins (they're next-door neighbors), Bay Ridge Parkway rings with the sounds of happy young voices.

When he's home the phone is constantly ringing with calls from friends and associates; yet even the casual observer can note that he is never without one of his children, talking in his characteristically soft, deep voice either giving advice or listening attentively to the myriad of plights which beset the young.

Undeniably one of the true intellects of the New Frontier, Dr. Re's term of office expires in less than 3 years and if the trend toward talent in Government is sustained, his star will go even higher.

Prior to his present post he was recommended for Under Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. At that time (January 13, 1961) Home Reported and Sunset News Columnist Maurice Wade commented: "His [Dr. Re's] ability and talents are certainly more than enough to warrant inclusion in sub-Cabinet rank."

An orator of spellbinding eloquence, he returned home a few months after the assassination of President Kennedy to speak at a memorial meeting sponsored by the Holy Name Society at St. Ephrem's Church, himself a member of neighboring Our Lady of Angels Holy Name Society.

Attending that night from this newspaper were Maurice Wade and his wife, Patricia, also an HRSN writer, and myself.

At one point during his talk he asked rhetorically, "What was it like to be in Washington working with President Kennedy?"

Recollected here, through memories indelibly etched, is his answer:

"I felt I had been very, very fortunate in being in Washington at a marvelous time—more than 2 years of excitement, and a period of great interest to the Nation and the world."

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING, FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY ACT

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to read into the RECORD a letter to me from the Honorable Rex M. Whitton, Federal Highway Administrator, in which he summarizes the progress of the 219 urban areas toward meeting the transportation planning requirements of the 1962 Federal-Aid Highway Act.

U.S. Department of Commerce,
Bureau of Public Roads,
Washington, D.C., July 2, 1964.
Hon. George H. Fallon,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Fallon: I am pleased to report that every urban area that will have to meet the transportation planning requirements in accordance with the 1962 Federal-Aid Highway Act can do so, as I will outline below.

A recent resurvey of the status of the planning programs in each of the 219 urban areas that are included under the provisions of the act indicates that the planning process already is organized to meet the requirements of the act in well over 100 areas. We are, of course, concerned that 79 areas are not now making sufficient progress, but every one of these that will have to meet the requirements of the act by July 1, 1965, still has adequate time to do so if they appropriately accelerate their progress. There is still time for even the most lagging area to catch up. We are increasing our efforts to communicate to the States and these urban areas a sense of urgency, and we, of course, are continuing to provide all appropriate technical and financial assistance.

I would also mention that there are a few urban areas that are not making sufficient progress toward meeting the requirements of the act by July 1, 1965, but to whom this date will not mean a delay in construction. The States have scheduled their construction programs in these urban areas so that no project will be submitted for Federal-aid approval until some time after that date, at which time they will have an adequate transportation planning process.

Sincerely,

Rex M. Whitton,
Federal Highway Administrator.

Mr. Speaker, the 1962 Federal-Aid Highway Act declares:

> It is * * * in the national interest to encourage and promote the development of transportation systems, embracing various modes of transport in a manner that will serve the States and local communities efficiently and effectively.

To accomplish this objective, the Congress directed the Secretary of Commerce to "cooperate with the States in the development of long-range highway plans and programs which are properly coordinated with plans for improvements in other affected forms of transportation and which are formulated with due consideration to their probable effect on the future development of urban areas." To insure that that objective would be achieved, the Congress provided:

> After July 1, 1965, the Secretary shall not approve * * * any program for projects in any urban area of more than fifty thousand population unless he finds that such projects are based on a continuing comprehensive transportation planning process carried on cooperatively by States and local communities in conformance with the specifications stated in this section.

When Congress declared its policy toward urban transportation planning it recognized the need to provide the various urban areas with sufficient time to establish an appropriate planning process. The Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1962, which was enacted on October 23, 1962, provided nearly 3 years for urban areas in this country to meet the requirements of the act. That date was selected, after due consideration, as being adequate to the time needs of urban areas as well as being realistic in terms of the need to have highway planning properly coordinated with other planning as soon as possible.

I am gratified by the Federal Highway Administrator's report that all urban areas that will have to meet the requirements of the act by July 1, 1965, can do so provided those that are lagging appropriately accelerate their progress. The July 1, 1965, effective date for the planning requirements of the Federal-aid highway program was and is realistic. What remains is for every urban area to have a continuing transportation planning process not simply for the sake of meeting the requirements of the Federal-Aid Highway Act but for the sake primarily of insuring that their future development is efficient and orderly.

MAJOR LEAGUE BASEBALL IN ATLANTA

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Weltner] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, in the last several weeks there has been widespread speculation that the Milwaukee Braves baseball team will be moving to Atlanta, Ga., at the beginning of the 1965 baseball season. Although still unconfirmed by the owners of the Braves, this proposed move reflects great credit upon the city of Atlanta and its leaders, who are anxious to see our city enter the major league arena.

The suggestion has also brought criticism. Atlanta has been charged with stealing a baseball team. The team has been charged with moving for profit. Yet in 1953, when the Braves moved to Milwaukee, this accomplishment was hailed as a major achievement by that city.

The Milwaukee Journal, in a front page editorial, commended "the way Milwaukeeans interested in baseball went out and got a big league team." The president of the Greater Milwaukee Association called the move "the greatest psychological lift Milwaukee ever had." The executive director of Milwaukee Association of Commerce commented favorably on the "thousands of new visitors to Milwaukee every summer" and on the national exposure that the franchise transfer would bring.

The Governor of Wisconsin telegraphed the commissioner of baseball that the shift of a major league team to Milwaukee was "of tremendous importance to the State of Wisconsin and to the city of Milwaukee." The mayor of Milwaukee stated that Milwaukee had "long been in the big time in other respects" and that "our international reputation has been earned through several decades of good local government and through industrial progress." He was pleased at "Milwaukee's admittance to the select circle of major league baseball cities."

That was in 1953. But now, in 1964, there is a different tune—quite similar to that heard in Boston when the Braves left. At that time, one Boston newspaper carried the news on a front page edged in black. The Governor of Massachusetts was "very disappointed"; the mayor of Boston called the transfer "a body blow to Boston," and doubted that Milwaukee would "support the Braves as well as Boston did." He declared that Boston "was deserving of better treatment."

Today another ambitious city, recognized as the commercial, industrial, and transportation center of the Southeast, has realized that major league baseball will bring to Atlanta the same benefits foreseen by the citizens of Milwaukee in 1953. Atlanta presently has under construction a magnificent major league stadium.

The citizens of Atlanta are to be commended for the manner in which they have pursued major league baseball for our city. The owners of the Braves should be credited for realizing that Atlanta and the South deserve, and can well support, major league baseball.

It would indeed be unfortunate for forces, in Washington or elsewhere, to prevent a free choice for the Braves. And it would be unfortunate if Atlanta, with so much to offer major league baseball, were denied its benefits.

With so much talk of restricting the proposed move through congressional inquiries and league pressures, I would remind all concerned that baseball is still private enterprise. As such, the Braves should remain its own master, and Atlanta should not be penalized for the many advantages it can bestow upon a major league team.

DIRECTOR OF FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION TO INVESTIGATE RECENT DISTURBANCE IN HARLEM

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, today President Johnson directed the Director of the FBI to conduct an investigation of the possibility of the violation of Federal laws in connection with the recent disturbance in Harlem. The Federal Bureau of Investigation will find a welcome in New York. Unlike some other States, the local authorities, I am sure, will cooperate with the Federal authorities. Violence cannot be condoned, and law and order must be preserved.

Mr. Speaker, there are those who would use the recent trouble in Harlem as a weapon to attack the civil rights movement and its leaders. This approach can only be called cynical. Anyone who has even the slightest knowledge of the views and actions of such men as the Reverend Martin Luther King and James Farmer must know that consistently they have preached nonviolence. In fact, civil rights leaders have been urging nonviolence throughout the last 3 tense days in Harlem. To imply by innuendo or otherwise that civil rights leaders condone rioting and violence is nothing less than cynical.

We must not allow segregationists to use the unfortunate incidents in Harlem as an issue to divert us from the conditions in Mississippi and the South in general. Let us not forget that in Mississippi and in other parts of the South the white power structure is adamantly opposed to the exercise of constitutional rights, such as voting and free speech, of our Negro citizens. In many areas those in political power condone violence or encourage it. There is a clear distinction between the riots in Harlem which were touched off by the action of a policeman whose case is being presented to a grand jury, and the community-sanctioned police brutality in the South where policemen are not brought to justice.

The incidents in Harlem point up the fact that civil rights is not, and never has been, simply a regional problem. The incidents are a reflection of slum conditions created by racial discrimination. These conditions must be changed and changed fast. In New York City there is a willingness to meet this responsibility. Although conditions do not change fast enough, the city as a general community is dedicated to change and is dedicated to the implementation of constitutional rights for all citizens. In many parts of the South there is an unwillingness to recognize that the Constitution governs all of our States and all of our people.

REPORT ON THE CURRENT 17-NATION DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MONAGAN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I have taken this time to make a report to the House on my experience as an observer at the current 17-Nation Disarmament Conference which is presently being held in Geneva, Switzerland. I was present at the Conference through the designation of Speaker MCCORMACK and attended the plenary session of the Conference at Geneva on June 16, 1964.

Mr. Speaker, because of the recess in which the House has been for the last 2 weeks, it has not been possible for me to make any report. However, it would seem to me that since I had been an observer on the part of the House, along with other Members of the House, and also I might say along with other Members of the Senate, it would seem appropriate that I should at least briefly make a report to the House upon my attendance at this Conference.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to begin by expressing my appreciation to you for the designation to which I referred and also to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN], chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs which authorized my trip; to Dean Rusk, the Secretary of State for authorizing the arrangements necessary, and to facilitate my travel; and also to the Honorable William C. Foster, Director of the Arms Control Disarmament Agency, who was in Geneva when I was there, for his courtesy and his interest.

Mr. Speaker, the session to which I refer is the one at which the proposal of President Johnson for further steps toward total disarmament was discussed. It was a significant session because it provided an indication that the U.S.S.R. was willing publicly not only to state an acceptance of disarmament in principle, but also to agree to setting up a working committee to discuss concrete proposals, a point never before reached.

Two days after my attendance, the U.S.S.R. also agreed to the U.S. proposed agenda and indicated a willingness to compromise its previous position on the destruction of delivery vehicles.

These steps constitute a marked change in the public position of the Russian delegation and were particularly interesting to a student of Communist foreign policy. Of course, their long-range significance remains to be appraised.

During my stay in Geneva I attended the delegation staff meetings through the invitation of William C. Foster, who is Director of the Arms Control Disarmament Agency, and his interpretation of events there and the comments of the members of the U.S.S.R. delegation staff were extremely illuminating and helpful to me. I welcomed this, and the opportunity to see our Arms Control Disarmament Agency in action.

Since I had attended hearings before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs setting up the agency, and voted for it in committee and on the floor, it was instructive to compare the real organization with the theoretical one which we considered in the legislation.

In addition to the meetings already described, I was present and also attended a luncheon given by the Czech delegation and a reception given by the Italian Ambassador. At these sessions I had a gratifying opportunity to exchange views informally and off the record with members of most of the delegations to the conference.

While in Geneva, I also took the opportunity to meet with Roger Tubby, Chief of the U.S. Mission to Geneva, and Herbert Propps, Counselor of the U.S. Mission for Economic Affairs, and adviser to the U.S. delegation to the U.N. Conference on Trade and Development, to discuss diplomatic and trade problems and policies. This was not really connected with the purpose of the trip.

I also visited and inspected our consulates at Amsterdam and Munich and met with consular officials and members of the consular staff.

One very interesting experience I had at Munich I would like to call the attention of the Members of the House to. That was a visit to the headquarters of Radio Free Europe. While at the headquarters, I had a rewarding discussion with Gen. C. Rodney Smith and members of his staff. Although this organization is not an agency of our Government, I had been acquainted with its work, which is quasi-public, for a long time, and I was pleased to have a chance to view its extensive and impressive staff and facilities and to discuss its policies—past, present and future—with its chief executive officer.

I could not help but be impressed by the scope and efficiency of operation of this tremendous enterprise, and the searching and aggressive way in which its policies are executed. While I was there broadcasts were going on to several of the captive nations in Europe, and it was most impressive to see the facilities there for the gathering of news and to realize the extent and the capacity of the staff of people who were engaged in this very important work. I certainly recommend that more Members of Congress visit this facility whose work is so important in the struggle of the captive nations toward freedom.

Of course, it is difficult to appraise the ultimate value of these conferences that are going on.

There is much that is difficult, there is much that is frustrating to them. Yet in looking at an editorial on the conference that appeared in the Waterbury Republican of June 15, 1964, I saw a statement that seemed to me to express rather effectively the basis on which at least our Government proceeds in this connection.

This editorial reads in part:

> But both the United States and the U.S.S.R. are aware that the arms race cannot go on indefinitely without either an intentional or accidental thermonuclear war, and that in the foreseeable future several other nations will possess nuclear weapons and thereby complicate any and all disarmament sessions.

Therefore, this editorial supports the contention of the disarmament talks on the basis that at least while there is discussion the advent of actual fighting or a hot war is less likely. I must admit I saw during my visit no spectacular breakthrough, no extensive agreements entered into that would alter the whole course of our relations.

While it is true that there was a friendlier atmosphere on the part of the Communist countries, it might very well be expected that this change in their attitude was due to other considerations than an attempt to arrive at an agreement on a reduction of armaments. In fact, no substantial agreement has been made since the time I was in Geneva.

However, I found it a most interesting experience, one that I hope many other Members of the House will have the opportunity to share with me. I am grateful to the Speaker and to the other gentleman I have mentioned for having had this opportunity to see in operation the officials of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, and to see on the spot the actual negotiations in this 17-nation Disarmament Conference at Geneva.

BEET GROWERS PRESS SUGAR QUOTA DRIVE

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. MAY] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, during the just-concluded recess of the House of Representatives there have been several significant developments concerning the legislative program of the beet sugar industry which I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues.

The first of these is a report that the Nation's sugarbeet producers and processors are standing firm on their support of proposed amendments to the Sugar Act which would increase the basic beet sugar marketing quota by 750,000 tons. Many of us who represent beet sugar production areas are sponsoring such proposed amendments to the act.

The second matter I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues is the Government's July crop report released on July 10. Contrary to some intimations that the industry's estimate of the probable size of the 1964 crop overestimated 1964 prospects, the July crop report strongly suggests that the industry estimate was on the conservative side. This means that the beet sugar industry's position with regard to increases in the marketing quota is, as it has been, entirely justified.

Under unanimous consent, I wish to include at this point an article from the Journal of Commerce of July 16 which relates to the first point I have made, and a memorandum from the U.S. Beet Sugar Association regarding beet sugar production from the 1964 crop:

[From the Journal of Commerce, July 16, 1964]

BEET GROWERS PRESS SUGAR QUOTA DRIVE

WASHINGTON, July 15.—The Nation's sugarbeet producers and processors are standing firm on their support of proposed amendments to the Sugar Act which would increase the basic beet sugar marketing quota by 750,000 tons.

This announcement was made in Washington today following a series of industry meetings held in Western States culminated by a joint grower-processor session in Salt Lake City last week.

The meetings were held to reevaluate the situation in view of the possibility that the present session of Congress will end before the Democratic National Convention in late August.

A suggestion had been made in some quarters that there would be time only for a 1-year extension of foreign quotas, due to expire at the end of this year, with some temporary marketing increases for domestic producers.

REJECT TEMPORARY PACT

The beet sugar industry announcement rejected this suggestion since it would not authorize a basic quota increase in line with the industry's current production levels.

It was pointed out that a temporary increase in marketing authority would merely postpone settlement of the basic marketing problems created by the industry's response to Government requests for materially increased production. Based on last week's Government crop report, current estimates are that beet sugar production this year will be from 750,000 to 800,000 tons more than the beet sugar marketing quota for this year.

Industry spokesmen also said the month in which Congress will be in session between the political conventions is hardly less time than has been available in the past for consideration of sugar legislation. They expressed confidence that Congress could equitably resolve existing differences of opinion if hearings are called promptly by the House Agriculture Committee when Congress reconvenes next week.

URGE EARLY HEARINGS

Calling of hearings promptly, it was pointed out, would also give the administration an opportunity to present its views publicly at an early date.

The Sugarbeet Growers National Council, a Washington coordinating group representing State and regional sugarbeet growers organizations in 23 States, released a resolution passed in Salt Lake City reaffirming the growers position in support of the quota increase.

The council is represented in Washington by the active managers of the major growers organizations—Loren Armbruster, Saginaw, Mich.; Richard W. Blake, Greeley, Colo.; Al Bloomquist, Fargo, N. Dak.; and Gordon Lyons, Stockton, Calif.

Announcement of continued support of the 750,000-ton quota increase by the sugarbeet processors—that is, the beet sugar companies—was made in Washington by Robert H. Shields, president and general counsel of the U.S. Beet Sugar Association.

The growers resolution follows:

"We, the duly accredited representatives and spokesmen for 98 percent of all sugarbeet growers in the United States, assembled in session in Salt Lake City on Thursday, July 9, 1964, do hereby resolve:

"That we reaffirm and reemphasize our unreserved support of the position taken by us early in 1964 to the effect that the Congress take action during the current session on the Sugar Act of 1948 as amended in 1962 and that among amendments thereto the basic quota for the beet sugar industry be increased by 750,000 short tons raw value."

MEMORANDUM: BEET SUGAR PRODUCTION FROM THE 1964 CROP

In support of its legislative program the beet sugar industry has for the past several months asserted that, on the basis of the best information available to it, the 1964 beet sugar crop, with normal yields, should approximate 3,350,000 tons. This estimate, initially made in February of this year, was based on the expectation that 1,400,000 acres would be planted to sugarbeets this year.

There have been some intimations that the industry's estimate of the probable size of the 1964 crop was not a realistic projection—that it overestimated 1964 prospects. As a matter of fact, however, the Government's July crop report released last Friday, July 10, strongly suggests that the industry estimate was indeed conservative.

The Crop Reporting Board, USDA, now estimates 1964 planted acreage of 1,458,000—58,000 acres more than assumed in the industry's projection, made well in advance of planting time. On the basis of 2.4 tons of sugar per planted acre, the yield figure used by the industry in estimating the magnitude of the 1964 crop, 1964 beet sugar production of about 3,500,000 tons would be indicated—150,000 tons more than the industry's projection last February. If a lower sugar yield per acre of 2.37 tons is used—the average for the past 5 years and a figure sometimes used in the USDA—a beet sugar crop of 3,450,000 tons would be indicated, about 100,000 tons more than the industry's February estimate.

The July crop report was not made in terms of beet sugar but in terms of (1) acreage planted and expected to be harvested; and (2) expected sugarbeet production. The board forecasts 1964 sugarbeet production of 24,300,000 tons—4 percent higher than in 1963. The board arrived at this figure by estimating that 1,400,000 acres of the 1,458,000 planted acreage would be harvested and currently indicated beet tonnage per acre of 17.4. This year's harvested acreage is expected to be 13 percent more than in 1963; per acre beet yields in 1964 are currently estimated at well below the record 1963 level but still slightly above average.

It would appear that the differences in the estimates of the probable size of the 1964 crop reflected primarily different assumptions on the amount of acreage planted to beets this year. Since the 1964 sugarbeet crop has all been planted, except in parts of California, there can't be too much difference of opinion from here on about the 1964 acreage. The July crop report of 1,458,000 planted and 1,400,000 harvested acres, should pretty well settle the acreage point. The July crop report of 17.4 tons of beets per acre must also be recognized as the best indication at this time of the probable sugarbeet yield per acre which is in prospect this year. As the Crop Reporting Board noted, weather conditions delayed 1964 plantings in some parts of the beet territory this year, but growing conditions during recent weeks have been quite favorable and the adverse effect of late plantings has now been overcome in most parts of the territory. As stated above, the estimated yield of 17.4 tons of beets per acre is slightly above the average yields obtained during the 1958–62 period, even though it is significantly less than the record-breaking tonnage of 18.9 realized last year.

While weather conditions from now to harvest can materially affect beet tonnage, the question of quality of the sugarbeets, that is sugar content of the beet, is the most "iffy" question left with respect to the 1964 crop. Last year's sugar content was the lowest in 30 years, and with the exception of 1 year was the lowest since 1915. Only 248 pounds of refined sugar were extracted from a ton of beets last year; the normal extraction is from 260 to 265 pounds. Last year's extremely low sugar content is not expected to reoccur again this year. As indicated above, last year's beet tonnage was extraordinarily high. This was due largely to an unusually prolonged warm spell during the early part of the harvesting period last fall, during which the beets continued to grow. Typically when beet tonnage per acre is high, sugar content is low. With per acre yields in 1964 only slightly above normal levels, sugar content can logically be expected to be about normal, not excessively low as was content last year. This is the industry's experience as regards the relationship of sugarbeet yields and sugar content.

In conclusion, the July crop report clearly confirms the conservative nature of the industry's projections as to the size of the 1964 crop. As pointed out above, the acreage planted could easily result in sugar production, from the 1964 crop of beets, of from 100,000 to 150,000 tons more than the estimate of 3,350,000 tons made by the industry last February on the basis of estimated plantings, which turned out to be 58,000 acres less than the actual planted acreage.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. FLYNT (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today, on account of official business.

Mrs. DWYER (at the request of Mr. HALLECK), for today and tomorrow, on account of death in family.

Mrs. HANSEN, for Tuesday, July 21 through Monday, July 27, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. SCHADEBERG (at the request of Mr. REIFEL), for 1 hour, on Tuesday, August 4, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mrs. MAY (at the request of Mr. REIFEL), for 20 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. BENNETT of Florida.

Mr. WILLIAMS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ALGER.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. LIBONATI) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FRASER.

Mr. MOSS.

Mr. PEPPER in two instances.

Mr. PURCELL.

Mr. WATSON.

Mr. ST. ONGE.

Mr. NATCHER.

Mr. CASEY.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2339. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the U.S. Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Sarpy County, Nebr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2369. An act to retrocede to the State of Kansas exclusive jurisdiction over certain State highways bordering Fort Leavenworth Military Reservation and the U.S. Penitentiary at Leavenworth; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 3001. An act to amend title 37, United States Code, to increase the rates of basic pay for members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 393. An act to make retrocession to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts of jurisdiction over certain land in the vicinity of Fort Devens, Mass.;

H.R. 4177. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey to the city of St. Paul, Minn., all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain lands heretofore conveyed to such city;

H.R. 6299. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to produce and sell crude oil from the Umiat field, Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 4, for the purpose of making local fuel available for use in connection with the drilling, mechanical, and heating operations of those involved in oil and gas exploration and development work in the nearby areas outside Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 4, and for other purposes;

H.R. 7248. An act to change the designated use of certain real property conveyed by the Department of the Air Force to the city of Fort Walton Beach, Fla., under the terms of Public Law 86–194;

H.R. 10322. An act to extend the provisions of the act of August 11, 1959, Public Law 86–155, as amended (74 Stat. 396), to provide improved opportunity for promotion for certain officers in the naval service; and

H.R. 10736. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to adjust the legislative jurisdiction exercised by the United States over lands comprising the U.S. naval hospital, Portsmouth, Va.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on July 20, 1964, present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 287. An act to amend title II of the Social Security Act to include Nevada among those States which are permitted to divide their retirement systems into two parts for purposes of obtaining social security coverage under Federal-State agreement;

H.R. 4811. An act for the relief of Mrs. Marjorie Curtis;

H.R. 6237. An act to amend section 503 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to authorize grants for the collection, reproduction, and publication of documentary source material significant to the history of the United States, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 10392. An act authorizing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to locate a portion of a vehicular tunnel under parts of the U.S. Capitol Grounds and the U.S. Botanic Garden grounds, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 53 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, July 22, 1964, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2316. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Federal Housing Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency, for the fiscal years ended June 30, 1963, and 1962, and comments on the results of their financial statements (H. Doc. No. 330); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

2317. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated January 13, 1964, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on McKinney Bayou, Ark., and Tex., in final response to an item in the Flood Control Act approved October 23, 1962 (H. Doc. No. 331); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed.

2318. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Properties and Installations), relative to a letter dated February 4, 1964, with respect to certain construction projects for the Air Force Reserve to be undertaken within the $4,600,000 lump-sum authorization contained in subsection 701(3)(b) of Public Law 88–174, and relating to the cost of the Richards-Gebaur Air Force Base, Mo., maintenance dock, large; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2319. A letter from the Director, U.S. Information Agency, transmitting the 21st Semiannual Report of the U.S. Information Agency for the period July 1 to December 31, 1963, pursuant to Public Law 402, 80th Congress; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2320. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on a review relating to unnecessary costs incurred when privately owned vehicles are used for the convenience of personnel on temporary duty assignments, Department of Defense; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2321. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, General Services Administration, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal under the law; to the Committee on House Administration.

2322. A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission transmitting a report stating that proceedings have been concluded relating to the claims of certain Indians and Indian tribes, petitioners, against the United States of America, as of July 20, 1964, pursuant to 60 Stat. 1055; 25 U.S.C. 70t; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2323. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to prescribe penalties for the handling and collection of dishonored checks or money orders; to the Committee on District of Columbia.

2324. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a copy of a report to the Subcommittee for Special Investigations, Committee on Armed Services, House of Representatives, on survey of activities of selected defense contractors relating to employee recreation and morale, Department of Defense; to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WILLIS: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 10200. A bill to enact part III of the District of Columbia Code, entitled "Decedents' Estates and Fiduciary Relations," codifying the general and permanent laws relating to decedents' estates and fiduciary relations in the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 1555). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WILLIS: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 11466. A bill to enact subtitle II, "Other Commercial Transactions," of title 28, "Commercial Instruments and Transactions," of the District of Columbia Code, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1556). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. O'NEILL: Committee on Rules. H. Res. 802. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 11865. A bill to increase benefits under the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system, to provide child's insurance benefits beyond age 18 while in school, to provide widow's benefits at age 60 on a reduced basis, to provide benefits for certain individuals not otherwise eligible at age 72, to improve the actuarial status of the trust funds, to extend coverage, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1557). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. VINSON: Committee of conference. H.R. 10300. A bill to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1558). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H.R. 11960. A bill to authorize the exchange of public domain lands heretofore withdrawn and reserved for the use of the Hanford project of the Atomic Energy Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ASPINALL (by request):

H.R. 11961. A bill to amend the act of February 28, 1958, relating to the withdrawal reservation, or restriction of public lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 11962. A bill defining the jurisdiction of the U.S. Supreme Court and all Federal courts inferior thereto, in certain instances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H.R. 11963. A bill to exempt from the manufacturer's excise tax on automotive parts and accessories certain modifications involving lengthening of truck trailers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BONNER:

H.R. 11964. A bill to clarify the responsibility for marking of obstructions in navigable waters; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 11965. A bill to broaden the vessel exchange provisions of section 510(i) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to extend such provisions for an additional 5 years, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 11966. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the application of the unlimited charitable contribution deduction; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 11967. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the anniversary of the birth of the late General of the Army Douglas MacArthur; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. NORBLAD:

H.R. 11968. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a deduction for amounts expended by firemen for meals which they are required to eat at their post of duty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POOL:

H.R. 11969. A bill to provide for a national referendum on the provisions of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHORT:

H.R. 11970. A bill to amend the Trade Expansion Act of 1962; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H.R. 11971. A bill to limit jurisdiction of Federal courts in reapportionment cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WYMAN:

H.R. 11972. A bill to amend chapter 1 of title 18 of the United States Code to permit the publication and dissemination of information relating to the sweepstakes conducted by any State or the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota:

H.R. 11973. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the amount of club dues or membership fees exempt from the tax, on such dues and fees, from $10 to $25 per year; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COLMER:

H.R. 11974. A bill to amend the Trade Expansion Act of 1962; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.R. 11975. A bill to amend the Trade Expansion Act of 1962; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

H.R. 11976. A bill to encourage the training of employment counselors; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 11977. A bill to designate the lake to be formed by the waters impounded by the Clark Canyon in the State of Montana as Hap Hawkins Lake; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TALCOTT:

H.R. 11978. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without deductions from benefits thereunder, in the case of any individual whose benefits are less than the maximum which could be paid to a person in his benefit category; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASHMORE:

H.R. 11979. A bill to limit jurisdiction of Federal courts in reapportionment cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLMER:

H.R. 11980. A bill to limit jurisdiction of Federal courts in reapportionment cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H.R. 11981. A bill to amend title 18, chapter 39, of the United States Code, entitled "Explosives and Combustibles"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 11982. A bill to limit jurisdiction of Federal courts in reapportionment cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LENNON:

H.R. 11983. A bill to limit jurisdiction of Federal courts in reapportionment cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT:

H.R. 11984. A bill to limit jurisdiction of Federal courts in reapportionment cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H.J. Res. 1115. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to receive for instruction at the U.S. Naval Academy at Annapolis two citizens and subjects of the Kingdom of Thailand; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HALL:

H.J. Res. 1116. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TAFT:

H.J. Res. 1117. Joint resolution designating the 10th day of August 1964 as Herbert Clark Hoover Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H.J. Res. 1118. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H. Con. Res. 328. Concurrent resolution commending the President for his recent statement with respect to aggression in the Middle East and expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to such aggression; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. NIX:

H. Con. Res. 329. Concurrent resolution commending the President for his recent statement with respect to aggression in the Middle East and expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to such aggression; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. Con. Res. 330. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of hearings on the Federal Reserve System; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 11985. A bill for the relief of Wai Sing Ko; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11986. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Wan Yau Louie; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11987. A bill for the relief of Lee Foo Sai; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEROUNIAN:

H.R. 11988. A bill for the relief of Oliva Furlan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINNEGAN:

H.R. 11989. A bill for the relief of Miss Hermitas Perez-Fernandez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 11990. A bill for the relief of Giocondo Gino Tieppo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 11991. A bill for the relief of Leon Levy, Mira Levy, and Moses Levy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 11992. A bill for the relief of Lampros Nicolaides; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 11993. A bill for the relief of Dr. Parvis Pishvazadeh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEGGETT:

H.R. 11994. A bill for the relief of Luciano Vighi, Oliba Vighi, and Claudio Vighi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R. 11995. A bill for the relief of Lone Isaksen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland:

H.R. 11996. A bill for the relief of Dr. Lolita Lerma; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11997. A bill for the relief of K. S. Krishnaswami; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.R. 11998. A bill for the relief of Haider Raza and his wife, Irene Raza, and their children, Afzal and Hayder Raza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11999. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Thelma R. Gonzalez de Nuche; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H.R. 12000. A bill for the relief of Kwong Foon Dick; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12001. A bill for the relief of Stephen Tai Los; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12002. A bill for the relief of Serrafettin Tombuloglu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H.R. 12003. A bill for the relief of Marciano Domingo Malapira; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 12004. A bill for the relief of Miss Mary Chresanthakes; to the Committee cn the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.R. 12005. A bill for the relief of Gilmour C. MacDonald, colonel, U.S. Air Force (retired); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H.R. 12006. A bill for the relief of Miss Gloria Seborg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UTT:

H.R. 12007. A bill for the relief of Domingo Hernandez Valdez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.J. Res. 1119. Joint resolution for the relief of Gus Katranis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

974. By Mr. MONAGAN: Petition of the Waterbury Lithuanian American Council urging that self-determination be granted by conducting free elections in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia under the supervision of the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

975. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., relative to initiating legislation to require the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights under title V, section 104, of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, to compile data on the stripping of the civil rights of epileptics; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

We Build Our Competition With Foreign Aid Tax Funds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB CASEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 21, 1964

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, I have for some time been deeply concerned over the competition we are building abroad under the foreign aid program for our American workers and our industries.

A year ago, the House adopted my amendment to the foreign aid bill which would bring some protection to the jobs and the markets of our taxpayers footing the bill for this program. Unfortunately, the Senate refused to accept it, and it was lost in conference.

On June 10 of this year, the House again saw fit to adopt my amendment. Most of my colleagues know personally of industries in their own districts suffering from a deluge of foreign imports. They have watched, as I have, while our citizens' tax dollars are used abroad to build plants and modernize industries to take away American jobs. The need for my amendment is imperative to turn the spotlight of publicity upon the aid program, so that our people and this Congress will know just what we are building overseas.

Mr. Speaker, my amendment is not restrictive. It allows ample latitude to the Executive to carry out this program. Lest there be any doubt about the need for it, I call the attention of my colleagues to a few statistics.

From 1945 through fiscal year 1963, we built, modernized or expanded 179 foreign steel plants; and from 1958 through 1963, we built or expanded 31 pulp and paper plants; 24 chemical plants; 13 aluminum plants; 22 rubber plants; and we made 27 loans or grants for studies and to build plants for petroleum industries.

I did not, at that time, have information covering one segment of our economy suffering heavily from foreign imports—our textile industries.

My colleagues from textile manufacturing areas, and their taxpaying workers dependent upon this industry for their livelihood, will be delighted to know that in the past 5 fiscal years, we built, modernized or expanded 115 textile plants abroad under this program.

As I advised my colleagues a few days ago, I wish to update the statistics I presented to the House, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 109, part 12, pages 15601–15605. The statistics I submitted at that time were as complete as possible, but as the Library of Congress researcher pointed out:

> The enumeration of total foreign aid to specific industries can be undertaken with only limited success * * * The Agency itself does not compile aid figures according to industry or by name.

Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of my colleagues the following information for fiscal year 1963 on plants we have built, modernized or expanded for specific industries. In addition, I ask my colleagues to examine the text of my amendment, and if in their judgment it is sound and needed to protect the interests of the workers and industries in their areas, I urge its adoption by Congress. The amendment states:

> Page 8, immediately after line 10 insert the following:
>
> "(d) At the end of section 620, add the following new subsection:
>
> "'(n) No assistance shall be furnished under this Act for the construction or operation of any productive enterprise in any country unless the President determines that similar productive enterprises within the United States are operating at a substantial portion of their capacity and that such assistance will not result in depriving such United States enterprises of their reasonable share of world markets. The President shall keep the Foreign Relations Committee and the Appropriations Committee of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives fully and currently informed of assistance furnished under this Act for the construction or operation of productive enterprises in all countries, including specifically the numbers of such enterprises, the types of such enterprises, and the locations of such enterprises.'"

U.S. AID TO TEXTILE INDUSTRIES IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES FOR FISCAL YEARS, 1958, 1959, 1960, 1961, 1962

The following figures comprise the major aid totals by loans and grants given specifically to textile industries in foreign countries for the 5 fiscal years as noted. Under each country the various contracts or aid projects are given individually. Most of the larger listings is in the form of loans from the Export-Import Bank. Smaller totals represent specific projects sponsored by the Agency for International Development. In addition to the totals mentioned, aid to specific textile activities may also be hidden in disbursements for handicraft promotion centers, technical support, productivity training, industrial education and development, home industries, and vocational education. AID has no breakdown available for distinct projects readily assignable to the textile category.

FISCAL YEAR 1958

Austria: Textile machinery	$192,000
Germany: Drycleaning equipment training	9,000
Greece: Textile training	18,000
Korea: Silk equipment	200,000
Philippines: Textile equipment	7,125
Spain: Textile management	9,000
Yugoslavia: Textile processing	41,000

FISCAL YEAR 1959

Brazil: Textile education	27,000
Greece: Wool textile methods	17,000
Iraq: Industrial sewing	6,000
Nicaragua: Cotton machinery	53,368
Paraguay: Cotton machinery	1,000,000
Philippines:	
Textile dyeing units	41,000
Textile equipment	195,000
Textile machinery	15,116
Cotton mill equipment	98,352
Spinning machinery	141,945
Textile machinery	1,585,803
Do	1,661,381
Spain: Textile production assistance	42,000
Yugoslavia:	
Cotton textile manufacturing	81,000
Wool processing	140,000

FISCAL YEAR 1960

Argentina: Textile equipment	14,000
Belgium: Knitting machinery	10,247
Colombia:	
Textile equipment	102,000
Looms	242,500
Do	60,000
Textile equipment	17,554
Textile bleaching equipment	86,900
Looms	25,607
Cotton equipment	210,600
Textile equipment	20,400
Do	126,358
Korea: Silk manufacturing equipment	8,000
Mexico:	
Looms	94,901
Do	46,546
Textile equipment	15,600
Peru:	
Textile engineering	33,000
Looms	39,600
Philippines:	
Textile equipment	85,328
Yarn dyeing equipment	69,325
Textile equipment	394,203
Do	477,134
Do	1,750,000
Do	4,397,495
Yugoslavia: Manufacturing of cotton textiles	89,000

FISCAL YEAR 1961

Argentina:	
Sewing machinery	5,200
Textile mill equipment	86,000
Do	72,000
Do	18,500
Sewing machinery	186,000
CENTO: Textile development (wool)	2,000
Colombia:	
Fibers development	25,000
Textile equipment	45,000
Do	45,000
Textile washing equipment	36,000
Denmark: Textile machinery	261,000
El Salvador: Cotton machinery	315,800
Germany: Hosiery textile machinery	922,500
Guatemala: Fiber development	3,000
Iran:	
Cotton machinery	182,000
Do	90,000
Israel: Textile development	25,000
Mexico:	
Textile machinery	58,220
Textile equipment	12,657

FISCAL YEAR 1961—continued

Peru:	
Textile engineering	$6,000
Textile equipment	55,602
Spain: Cotton machinery	61,000
Thailand: Jute mill machinery	699,000
Uruguay:	
Textile equipment	467,500
Looms	16,878
Yugoslavia: Textile manufacturing	7,000

FISCAL YEAR 1962

Argentina:	
Looms	186,000
Do	38,000
Do	121,000
Do	78,500
Do	116,000
Do	38,000
Do	268,600
Do	122,000
Do	70,000
Do	81,500
Do	151,000
Sewing machinery	35,000
Do	46,500
Textile machinery	11,500
Looms	93,000
Yarn machinery	17,500
Textile equipment	218,000
Sewing machinery	27,000
Brazil: Looms	61,200
Colombia: Fiber development	17,000
El Salvador: Textile equipment	15,693
Guatemala: Cotton equipment	15,236
Honduras: Cotton equipment	207,436
Mexico:	
Textile machinery	352,000
Cotton equipment	67,195
Looms	51,184
Textile machinery	25,517
Looms	42,635
Do	27,818
Nigeria: Textile plant	2,000,000
Spain:	
Textile training	27,000
Do	5,000
Cotton machinery	48,053
Do	43,572
Do	48,881
Do	48,053
United Kingdom: Yarn processing equipment	23,768
Uruguay:	
Textile equipment	31,743
Looms	87,181
Venezuela:	
Looms	41,135
Do	122,524
Do	120,640
Yugoslavia: Wool textile training	6,000

Sources: Export-Import Bank, periodical loan releases. AID project books by fiscal years.

U.S. Aid to Specific Industries in Foreign Countries by Grants and Loans for Fiscal Year 1963

The following figures provide the basic listing of eight industries in foreign countries which have received some form of U.S. aid either by loans or grants during fiscal year 1963. Many of the larger loans were procured through the Export-Import Bank while aid projects were initiated through the Agency for International Development. In the latter instance itemized totals per industry and per country are not specified. Actual aid to the industries covered may also be included among disbursements for productivity centers, mining developments, research centers, metals fabricating plants, engineering laboratories and services. technical support, metallic and nonmineral surveys, and industry development and project assistance. The actual aid to the industries in question may therefore be higher than noted.

ALUMINUM INDUSTRY

Ghana: Volta Aluminum Co	$55,000,000
India: Hindustan fabricating plant	5,000,000

CHEMICAL INDUSTRY

India: Expansion of chemical facilities	7,650,000
Mexico: Soda ash plant	4,000,000

IRON AND STEEL INDUSTRIES

Afghanistan: Iron ore resources	210,000
India:	
Bokaro steel plant	750,000
Steel training	580,000
Forging factory	3,908,000
Locomotive plant	19,000,000
Korea: Iron ore production	37,000
Spain:	
Foundry services	10,000
Expansion of steel plant	6,600,000
Japan:	
Iron and steel facilities	26,000,000
Expansion of steel facilities	18,500,000
Philippines: Iron ore concentrator mills	5,000,000
Italy:	
Expansion of steel plant	25,000,000
Steel rolling plant	5,000,000
Steel mill expansion	50,000,000
Steel machinery materials	130,000,000
Chile: Expansion of steel plant	8,300,000
Mexico: Expansion of steel plant	16,900,000
Peru: Iron ore facilities	1,250,000

PETROLEUM INDUSTRY

Pakistan: Gas treating plant	2,800,000

PLASTICS

Nil.

RUBBER INDUSTRY

Guatemala: Rubber development	26,000
Thailand: Tire and tube plant	5,000,000
Dominican Republic: Rubber goods production	24,600

PULP AND PAPER INDUSTRY

Iran: Lumber for pulp	18,000
Nepal: Forest products development	244,000
Egypt: Cellophane plant	3,000,000
Laos: Lao photo press	84,000
Philippines:	
Pulp and paper mill	100,000
Machinery for pulp making	74,200
Uruguay: Pulp and paper machinery	450,000

TEXTILE INDUSTRY

India: Rayon tire cord	9,800,000
Spain: Textile production	27,000
Yugoslavia: Wool textile production	6,000
India: Yarn manufacturing plant	4,700,000
Greece: Cotton yarn mill	3,000,000
Mexico:	
Looms	42,840
Do	33,261

Sources: Export-Import Bank: loans fiscal year 1963.

AID: Project survey for fiscal year 1963.

Bureaucratic Bungling in HHFA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 21, 1964

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the House an experience I have had in corresponding with the Housing and Home Finance Agency—an experience that indicates some of the bureaucratic inefficiency and dilatory techniques that need to be corrected in many agencies of the Federal Government.

On April 16, 1964, the Community Facilities Administration of the Housing and Home Finance Agency notified a mayor in a town in my district that the accelerated public works application filed by that city would be held for future consideration should additional funds become available. In order to confirm the status of this application, the mayor wrote to Mr. Edward H. Baxter, acting regional director of community facilities in Atlanta, Ga. I, too, wrote to Mr. Baxter on June 29, merely requesting a copy of his reply to the mayor so that I would know the status of this particular project.

My request to Mr. Baxter was answered on July 7 by Mr. McClellan Ratchford, regional administrator, who advised me that my letter had been forwarded to the Agency's congressional liaison officer, Mr. Charles M. Smith, for attention and reply. It was not until July 16—17 days after my original letter was sent—that Mr. Smith sent his answer: On July 1, Mr. Baxter in Atlanta notified the mayor that the application was still current.

There is no excuse for making a chain letter out of a simple written request to the Atlanta regional office where the entire matter could have and should have been handled accurately and without delay.

This example of bureaucratic bungling in the Housing and Home Finance Agency wastes manpower, is costly to the taxpayers, and unnecessarily delays the transmission of information to Members of Congress.

Happily, Mr. Speaker, all Federal agencies are not hampered by inefficient procedures which permeate the HHFA in its central office.

Cummer Gallery of Art, Jacksonville, Fla., Commemorates Fort Caroline Quadricentennial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 21, 1964

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. The Cummer Gallery of Art, one of the Nation's youngest and most inspiring art galleries in Jacksonville, Fla., is commemorating the Fort Caroline quadricentennial, the 400th anniversary of the founding of the French fort on the banks of the St. Johns River in 1564.

The highlight of the commemoration is an exhibition of French art of the 16th century, the best ever assembled in this country. Joseph J. Dodge, director of the Cummer Gallery of Art, said in the prolog to an attractive booklet on the exhibition, pointing out the significance of the display:

> French art of this period has been somewhat neglected. This is only the second time it has been given an exhibition in this country. Although some of the outstanding paintings and sculpture have been, for various and good reasons, unobtainable, we are more than gratified at what has been made available to us by private collectors, museums, and dealers both here and abroad. These works of art will, I think, give contemporary Floridians and visitors a fairly good picture of the people and culture of France at the time this area was first settled. If, in addition, some of the works of art give pleasure for their own sakes and in terms of today's tastes, we will feel that our purposes have been accomplished.

It was my pleasure to be home in my district recently and to visit the Cummer Gallery of Art. The board of trustees of the gallery, Mr. John W. Donahoo, Mr. George D. Auchter, Mr. S. Kendrick Guernsey, Mr. Edward W. Lane, Jr., Mr. Edward C. Roe, Mr. Harold F. Saxelbye, Judge Bryan Simpson, and Mr. Powers Williams; the honorary trustees, Mrs. Alfred I. du Pont and Mr. Roger L. Main; the director, Mr. Dodge and his assistant, Mr. Edward F. Weeks; Mrs. John W. Donahoo, chairman of the preview and reception committees, and the DeEtte Holden Cummer Museum Foundation, are to be congratulated on their fine work, which will go a long way in strengthening the ties between France and the United States.

Galleries and private collectors around the world contributed to this exhibition and the Cummer Gallery had tremendous cooperation from the Government of France, including S. E. M. Hervé Alphand, French Ambassador to the United States; M. Edouard Morot-Sir, French Cultural Counselor to the United States, and M. Jean Chatelain, director of the Museums of France.

The area of Florida comprising the Second Congressional District is rich in history and tradition of the 16th century, as is evident by the works depicting the founding of Fort Caroline by René Laudonniere, the famous French admiral, in June 1564. This began the permanent settlement of what is now the United States, 400 years ago this year.

Minneapolis Aquatennial Celebrates Its Silver Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 21, 1964

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, Minneapolis is currently celebrating the silver anniversary of the birth of its world-famous summer festival, the Aquatennial.

The idea for a water carnival, whose purpose it would be to enhance the reputation of the City of Lakes as a unique summer vacation spot, was born in Winnipeg, Manitoba, in 1939. A group of prominent Minneapolitans, among them Tom Hastings, Jack Cornelius, and Dave Onan, had journeyed there to view a Canadian parade in honor of visiting King George VI.

They could think of no reason why their own city should not sponsor an annual summer festival of this kind. Within a year, they had pooled their enthusiasm and competence with that of others like Neil Messick, Sr., Pat Carr, Dave Kitchen, and Win Stephens to come up with the first Minneapolis Aquatennial.

The idea was an instant success, and the Aquatennial has been going strong ever since, attracting more and more visitors every year. During the war years, the Aquatennial switched its purpose from selling Minneapolis to selling war bonds and building morale, but the dominant theme of fun, sports, and laughter was not altered.

Cowboy movie star and singer Gene Autry participated in the first Aquatennial, and he is back this year to help the Aquatennial celebrate its birthday. He is being joined by other frequent Aquatennial visitors, including this year's entertainment master of ceremonies, Bob Hope.

The Minneapolis Aquatennial gets bigger and better every year, and is a source of real pride for all Minneapolitans. Two of its founders, Tom Hastings and Win Stephens, served as the original president and commodore of the Aquatennial. In this 25th year, William G. Hastings takes over the many responsibilities of the presidency, while O. D. Gay and Harold M. Atkinson will man the mainsails as commodores. And Miss Mary Margaret Schultz is the latest in a long line of charming and beautiful Aquatennial queens.

I take real pride in saluting the Minneapolis Aquatennial and the many people who have made it a constant success.

Speech by Hon. Hubert H. Humphrey at State Convention of the Young Democrats in Louisville, Ky., June 26, 1964

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 21, 1964

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include herewith a speech delivered by the Honorable Hubert H. Humphrey at the State convention of the Young Democrats in Louisville, Ky., on June 26.

The speech is as follows:

YOUNG DEMOCRATS CONVENTION, LOUISVILLE, KY.

Coming here to address a Young Democrats convention gives me a little pause. It seems like only yesterday that even my wife considered me a Young Democrat.

So, you not only honor me, you flatter me when you ask me to substitute for two such fine young Democrats as TED KENNEDY and BIRCH BAYH.

Since receiving your gracious invitation from Governor Breathitt I've taken a slightly different look at the Senate and it's made me do a little thinking.

The U.S. Senate is a changed body since that day back in 1949 when I first took the oath of office at the age of 37. For one thing, we have many more good Democrats in the chamber now. But there's been another change, too. The people are sending younger men to Washington.

Do you realize that there now are 11 men in the Senate who are under 45? All but two of them are Democrats.

And take a look at the freshmen class of 1962 that produced BIRCH BAYH and TED KENNEDY. There are eight freshmen Democrats in that class. Three of them are under 40—BIRCH BAYH, TED KENNEDY, and DAN INOUYE, of Hawaii. Four of those eight freshman Democrats are in their forties. And the oldest freshman Democrat is 54.

I think this tells us something about the appeal of the Democratic Party. I think this tells us that young people are attracted to the Democratic Party—that there is a future in the Democratic Party for young people.

The main reason for this is that the Democratic Party doesn't discourage its young. It is not afraid of new ideas. It doesn't fear the future.

The Democratic Party doesn't wring its hands over problems and grumble "that's the way things have always been—you can't do anything about it." No, we look on problems as challenges, opportunities, responsibilities.

The late President Kennedy put it well in his stirring inaugural address: "I do not shrink from this responsibility; I welcome it."

This is also the credo of the man who succeeded President Kennedy—Lyndon B. Johnson.

President Johnson has vowed to carry on the New Frontier programs of John F. Kennedy and work toward creation of the great society. He looks forward—not backward to the lost horizon.

The issue in November will be clear. The Republican Party—or at least those who claim to speak for it—is proclaiming its yearning for the good old days of long ago when everything was oh so simple. They would cope with the issues of the 1960's by retreating into the last century.

Now, I don't scoff at nostalgia. It's a lot of fun—in its proper place. But nostalgia is not an acceptable issue for the campaign of 1964. Retreat into the past does not solve the problems that confront us today.

Nor does it do any good to come up with a lot of "shoot from the hip" nonsense about selling the Tennessee Valley Authority or trying to scrap the social security system by making it voluntary.

No; we Democrats believe in keeping the best things of the past and building on them. We are not afraid to look into the future and work for the full development of each man's potential.

Our aim is to give every American the means and the opportunity to secure the better things of life for himself and his children. This is the primary goal of the "great society" envisioned by President Johnson.

It is to our advantage—to the Nation's advantage—to have everyone in this country aspiring to live a better life and reach a little higher on the ladder and have better economic opportunities and more social justice.

This is what we are talking about when we talk about civil rights. With the enactment of the civil rights bill we will be presented with a great opportunity to strive for a true community of people * * * where neighbors regard each other with charity and compassion * * * where Americans of all races live together in harmony and good will.

We must go to the people of America with the message that men are needed to seek peaceful, constructive, and positive responses to the blight of discrimination, segregation, and prejudice. Every American—from the President in Washington to the schoolchild in every State—must become active participants in this crusade for human dignity.

There are political theorists who claim that the essence of politics is power. They are wrong—even though power is a necessary element in the process of politics. The essence of politics is the search for just solutions to the fundamental problems of society. The essence of politics is the asking and reasking of the most difficult of all questions: What is justice? What is right?

I believe that in this country we have had too much emphasis placed on what is wrong in our country. I believe criticism is absolutely necessary in our democratic society. But we shouldn't let any lopsided emphasis on what is wrong with our society blind us to the gains we have made and are making.

Nor should we become so preoccupied with criticism that we fail to point the way to a better life. I am a positive Democrat. The politics of complaint and denunciation does not satisfy my sense of public duty nor my progressive spirit. I believe in the politics of advocacy and action.

That is why I am so proud of the record being made by our great President, Lyndon Johnson. In continuing and adding to the programs of the late President Kennedy he is making sure that the Kennedy-Johnson administration will be known to history as the time of the rebirth of the progressive spirit in America.

One of the clearest expressions of this is the President's declaration of war against poverty.

In ringing terms he has told us that the richest nation in the world can't afford to have one-fifth of its people living in poverty—that the richest nation in the world can't afford unemployment and periods of economic recession.

So far, I'm happy to report that under the Kennedy-Johnson administration we have had a recordbreaking period of more than 40 months of continuing prosperity and progress. Times are good, the number of people working is at a record high and profits and income are all up.

But this should not make us smug or satisfied. We have too much unemployment, too many pockets of poverty, and we must do more to attack the roots of poverty and the conditions that breed it.

One of the main battlegrounds in the war on poverty will be in the rural areas of America where the small farmer is being driven further and further to the wall—or forced to leave the life he and his family have known for generations for the pressure-cooker atmosphere of our big cities.

This administration is trying to help these hard-pressed farmers by providing technical assistance and loans so they can take unneeded and marginal cropland out of production and convert it to other profitable uses—grassland, woodland, wildlife and game refuges, or recreational areas.

We also are acting to improve rural housing, helping smaller communities with urban renewal projects and loans for new public facilities and new water and sewage systems.

All this will help win the war on poverty—but the primary effort will come in the field of education.

We must give better education to our children. I am sure no one would disagree with this. But I also am sure you will hear a lot of grumbling and quibbling about the cost from some of our shortsighted citizens.

I say there is no such thing as an expenditure for education. There is an investment in education. Every dollar we invest in education will come back tenfold. An investment for your sons and daughters, for your grandchildren, for your country * * * because education is power and education is wealth.

This present Congress—the 88th Congress—has done more for education than any Congress since the Morrill Land-Grant College Act was passed in 1863.

But we must do more—and we shall. President Johnson stated our goal in his speech on the Great Society last month. "For every child a place to sit and a teacher to learn from," the President said.

Mr. Johnson went on to say that the "place to build the Great Society is in the classrooms of America. There your children's lives will be shaped. Our society will not be great until every young mind is set free to scan the farthest reaches of thought and imagination. We are still far from that goal."

We still face a critical classroom shortage in this country. We still have too many underpaid teachers. We do not have enough guidance and counseling services for our high school students. We need more specially trained teachers to help 5 million retarded and handicapped children become useful citizens. We need more engineers, scientists, and technicians for an age where excellence is the standard—not merely a desirable goal.

These challenges we can meet. We have the opportunity to make the development of brainpower America's most important task and education our first and foremost industry.

But I can tell you here and now this is a challenge that will never be met by a political party that doesn't care—or even worse by a political party that is bent only on destruction.

We are going into the campaign of 1964 with a President who wants to unite this country and not tear it apart. And our task as fellow Democrats is to maintain that unity within our own party. Above all, we should conduct ourselves with good manners, good taste, and firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right.

Florida's Biggest American Flag User

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 21, 1964

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 4 I called to the attention of my colleagues and those who read that RECORD, an article entitled, "Red, White, and Blue." Shortly thereafter, the Washington Federal Savings & Loan Association located in my congressional district issued a press release announcing that the association claims to be "Florida's Biggest American Flag User" with a distribution of over 50,000 American flags in the past 3 years.

It has been an established practice of Washington Federal to have an annual Independence Day flag distribution for youngsters of all ages at the 4th of July celebration of oceanfront aerial fireworks display on Miami Beach.

In view of the excellent program of NBC, narrated by Walter Brennan on the American flag and the suggestions offered therein of more open display of the flag, I wish to commend this association of my district which has been proudly promoting patriotism and love for this great America which is ours, in the use and display of the American flag.

Agriculture Expands Information Access

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 21, 1964

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, the Agriculture Department has opened to public inspection a further phase of its operations. A few weeks ago I reported that the Department would make available to the public the comments the agency received on its proposed rule changes. That step toward full public disclosure of Government information apparently was so successful that the procedure has been extended to include comments received on all Department activities—changes in programs and other matters as well as proposed rule changes.

The Foreign Operations and Government Information Subcommittee worked closely with Assistant Secretary George L. Mehren to help develop the Department's new information procedures. Secretary Freeman has now informed the subcommittee that all comments the Department receives from interested parties—the comments which often form a basis for the agency's action—will be open to public inspection unless there is a compelling reason for confidentiality. And permission for confidentiality will be strictly limited, for the decision must be made at the secretarial level. Following is Secretary Freeman's letter announcing the expanded public access procedure:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY.

Hon. JOHN E. MOSS,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MOSS: The Department of Agriculture has taken another step in its effort to make information more readily available to the public. You will recall that recently we issued departmental regulations governing disclosure of information submitted by interested persons in any matters affecting rulemaking.

The basic policy of the Department is to disclose all information unless there be compelling reasons to hold part of it confidential. Thus, if viewpoints, data, or analyses relevant to such matters as proposed changes in grades of farm commodities are at issue, we outline in the announcement requesting such submittals the conditions under which they will or will not be held confidential. All information is to be made available to the public unless those submitting information can convince the Department that the standards for public access set out in our regulations should not apply. If it appears that to obtain useful data we must accept it on a confidential basis, clearance in these cases must be obtained at the secretarial level.

We have found that on occasion some requests are made for submittal of information where rulemaking, either formal or informal, is not contemplated. Accordingly, we have decided to apply precisely the same criteria to the disclosure of such submittals as those applied to the formal or informal rulemaking submittals outlined above. Accordingly, we are amending our rulemaking procedures regulations by adding the following subsection:

"(e) This section shall apply in any instance where the Department or agency thereof by published notice solicits, or affords interested members of the public an opportunity to submit, written views with respect to any proposed action relating to any program administered in the Department regardless of the fact that the issuance of a rule may not be contemplated."

We believe that we now have assured better access by the public as to what factors are considered in making public policy. We do not expect that confidential status will be granted frequently.

I want to thank you, your committee and your staff for the help you have given us in formulating these policies. We shall continue to try in the Department of Agriculture to make as much as possible of our data and information generally available.

Sincerely yours,

ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
Secretary.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 21, 1964

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD I would like to include my Washington Report for July 11, 1964:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas, July 11, 1964)

CIVIL RIGHTS

Although a number of the 11 sections of the Civil Rights Act may be questioned as to their constitutionality, two sections stand out as doing the most violence to the Constitution: Title II: Public Accommodations, and Title VII: Equal Employment Opportunity. I would like to highlight the provisions contained in these two sections as they affect private enterprise and the ownership and management of private property. This week we will discuss Title II: Public Accommodations, and next week we will treat with the FEPC section.

Part 1. Public accommodations

Hereafter, it will be a violation of law for the following business establishments to refuse to serve, accommodate or sell to any person on account of his race or religion:

1. Lodgings, except an owner-occupied rooming house with less than six rooms;

2. Eating establishments, and gasoline stations if interstate customers are served or if a substantial portion of products sold has moved in interstate commerce;

3. Places of entertainment, if the performers or films have moved in interstate commerce;

4. Any retail establishment in which one of the foregoing is located, or any retail establishment in any of the foregoing; and

5. Any establishment or place if segregation is required by law or order of a State or local government.

Enforcement

Upon violation of this law, the complaining customer may bring a suit in the Federal courts for an injunction compelling the businessman to serve him. In such a suit, the Attorney General may intervene as a party and assist the prosecution of the case. In addition, the Attorney General is empowered, even when the complainant does not sue, to bring suit himself in the name of the United States against the businessman. In such case, he is further authorized to ask the court to appoint a lawyer to represent the complainant and to waive court costs. The businessman must furnish his own lawyer and court costs.

Penalties

If the judge rules against the businessman, he will order him to serve the customer. If he still refuses to do so, he can be punished by a $1,000 fine and/or a 6-month jail sentence for contempt of court.

Explanation

1. Lodgings include hotels, motels, motor hotels, roomings houses, and other lodging establishments serving transient guests. Coverage applies whether or not guests have traveled or intend to travel across State lines.

2. Since most products sold by eating establishments and gasoline stations have moved across State lines or are sold to some interstate travelers, practically all such business places are covered. Bathroom facilities may not be segregated by race.

3. Places of entertainment include movie houses, theaters, coliseums, sports arenas, stadiums, exhibition halls, and so forth.

4. (a) A department store or any other retail establishment (otherwise not covered) is covered if a lunch counter or some other covered establishment is located therein.

(b) A beauty shop, barbershop, or any other service or sales establishment (otherwise not covered) is covered if it is located in a hotel or some other covered establishment.

5. If State or local laws or ordinances require racial segregation in any business place of any kind, it is covered even if not specifically otherwise covered.

Constitutionality

This new law is sought to be based on two clauses of the Constitution. The first is in the 14th amendment which, among other things, guarantees all citizens "equal protection of the laws." But in 1833, the Supreme Court struck down a public accommodations civil rights statute similar to this new law on the grounds that this clause "erects no shield against merely private conduct, however discriminatory or wrongful" but prohibits only acts of discrimination by a State or local government. As late as May 20, 1963, the Supreme Court ruled that "private conduct abridging individual rights does no violence to the equal protection clause."

The other constitutional basis urged is the "interstate commerce clause." But in 1959, the Federal courts ruled that "we do not find that a restaurant is engaged in interstate commerce merely because in the course of its business of furnishing accommodations to the general public it serves persons who are traveling from State to State. As an instrument of local commerce, the restaurant * * * is at liberty to deal with such persons as it may select." Another Federal case decided the same year ruled that the fact that goods sold by a store were obtained outside the State did not bring the business within the definition of the interstate commerce clause.

In my judgment, the public accommodations section of the new Civil Rights Act flies directly in the teeth of these court decisions, and until the Supreme Court changes its mind and reverses its own decisions, is plainly unconstitutional as an invasion of individual property rights.

The Migrant in America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 21, 1964

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, the plight of the migrant worker in America must no longer be overlooked by the Congress. The President has declared a war on poverty in our country and it is imperative that we take favorable action on the pending legislation affecting migrant workers who are probably the most poverty-stricken group in America.

I have prepared a statement on the subject of the Migrant in America which contains many facts illustrating the need of the Congress to take effective action on behalf of approximately 2 million migrant workers and their families and I respectfully request this statement be included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that my colleagues will be reminded of the great need for passage of effective legislation to help these 2 million Americans whose needs have been largely overlooked in the past.

The statement follows:

THE MIGRANT IN AMERICA

(By Hon. CLAUDE PEPPER, Congressman from the State of Florida)

I appear before you today to urge this body to take action on behalf of America's forgotten man—the migrant worker and his family. The phrase "forgotten" is particularly apt. More than 20 years ago, responsible Americans were jolted into an awareness of the plight of the migratory worker with the appearance of John Steinbeck's "Grapes of Wrath." Since that time, the sad story of the migrant has appeared in countless articles, reports, and broadcasts. There is no question about the fact that we are aware of the problems of the migrant, and there is no excuse for the fact that only 1 out of some 150 attempts of Congress to legislate on their behalf has been successful. The 1960 platforms of both major parties called specifically for action on behalf of the migrant: the Democrats—a "comprehensive program to bring them not only decent wages but also an adequate standard of health, housing, social security protection, education and welfare services": the Republicans—"improvement of job opportunities and working conditions."

There has been much talk in recent months of poverty in the United States. We have spoken of one-fifth of a nation that remains ill-housed, ill-clad, and ill-fed. Our national attention has suddenly been focused on the poor in general. We have been made aware of the fact that the poor exist and barely subsist in the city and on the farm, in California and in New York, among the very young and among the very old; $3,000 of annual income for a family of four has become the recognized yardstick for need. With a yearly income of only slightly more than $1,000 surely the migrant family must be regarded as among the most needy, the most deserving of our attention and our aid.

No one knows precisely how many American migrant farmworkers there are. The official estimate which counts only heads of families is 380,000 while the national sharecroppers fund sets the figure as high as 2 million when both the workers and their families are included. Their numbers may be disputed, but there can be little argument over the fact that the migrants are among the most desperately disadvantaged of all our fellow citizens. In 1962 the average migrant worked only 116 days of the year, and earned only $1,123. There are 750,000 children of migrants also employed in agricultural work. These migratory farm children enroll in several different schools each year which results in retardation early in their school careers. The 1960 White House Conference on Children and Youth revealed studies showing "that most of these children are far below grade level and that their school achievement generally is under fourth grade [the attainment established as a minimum standard for literacy in the United States]."

Adult migratory workers therefore have an extremely low educational attainment since lack of basic formal education in the children tends to make these children, as adults, follow in the footsteps of their parents. A vicious circle is in existence where the children without education have little incentive to move beyond the deplorable situation into which they were born. The migratory farmworker is deprived in other ways as well. Almost nowhere that he travels in search of work can he find adequate housing or sanitation facilities; he has no collective bargaining rights, frequently no social security benefits under the old-age and survivor's insurance provisions of the social security act; he is not entitled to workmen's compensation in many of the States in which he works, and in most instances he is ineligible for unemployment or welfare assistance.

Not only does he not receive the welfare benefits that most of the deprived in this country are eligible for, he cannot possibly make a living wage in his occupation as a farmworker because this Congress has never amended the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide for minimum wages for certain persons employed in agriculture.

As the law and circumstances now stand, the migrant worker is hemmed in from all sides. Unless we legislate on his behalf, the migrant will remain the forgotten man. He has no powerful lobbying group to champion his cause; he has no political power, for he is a wanderer and does not belong to a particular State or a particular district.

His problem may be regional in impact, but as Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS, the legislative champion of the migrant's rights, has so aptly put it, "it is interstate in nature and national in scope." Migrant workers exist in almost every State in the Union. In 1958 there were more than a thousand migrants in each State but eight. There are at least 22 States which are dependent on a skilled or semiskilled migratory labor force to harvest their perishable fruits and vegetables. For this simple basic economic reason, if for none other, we must not fail to legislate on the migrant's behalf. Because the migrant problem is interstate in nature, we must not leave this legislation up to the States. It is the duty and the responsibility of this Congress.

I wholeheartedly support the Economic Opportunity Act and the provisions for the migrant workers that it contains, but I do not think that it goes far enough. These provisions contained in part B of title III incorporate the substance of four Senate bills and cover the problems of education, day care of children, sanitation, and housing facilities. All three of the bills with the exception of S. 981 had been passed by the Senate and prior to their inclusion in the Economic Opportunity Act had been pending in the House committee. I am pleased to see that the House has taken this step in legislating for the migrant.

But there are other bills now pending which I strongly support and on which I should like to see the House take action. The bills in question are those that would establish a minimum wage rate applicable to migrant agricultural workers. That of my distinguished colleague from Hawaii, Mr. GILL, which would provide for the registration of contractors of migrant agricultural workers—H.R. 4516, which would amend the National Labor Relations Act as to make its provisions applicable to agriculture; and H.R. 4904, which would amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to extend the child labor provisions to certain children employed in agriculture. I should also like to recommend that we might go even further than this and that we examine the possibilities of legislating on behalf of the migrant in the areas of unemployment insurance, workmen's compensation, and that we look into the possibilities of amending the social security act so as to make its public assistance and old-age and social security benefits applicable to the large body of migrant workers to whom it does not now apply.

Now that war has been declared on poverty in general, I would like to see us fight this crucial battle for the migrant worker. Let us not forget him any longer. The 1930's brought a New Deal for many of the American impoverished. Somehow the migrant was excluded from the mainstream of the social legislation that began in the thirties and is still continuing today. We must no longer exclude him.

Report From Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GRAHAM PURCELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 21, 1964

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit my report from Congress dated July 21, 1964:

REPORT FROM CONGRESS

(By GRAHAM PURCELL, Representative, 13th District of Texas, July 21, 1964)

DEAR FRIENDS: I was appalled when I heard Senator GOLDWATER say in San Francisco, "It has been during Democratic years that our strength to deter war has stood still and even gone into a planned decline." What amazed me about this statement was that the Senator displayed such an astounding lack of information about our Defense Establishment.

If there is any area of our Federal Government in which Americans of all political philosophies can justifiably take pride, it is in the operation of the Department of Defense.

Is our strength declining? Let's look at the facts. In the past 3 years we have accomplished a 150-percent increase in the number of nuclear warheads in the strategic alert forces; a 60-percent increase in the tactical nuclear forces deployed in Western Europe; a 45-percent increase in the number of combat-ready Army divisions; a 44 percent increase in the number of tactical fighter squadrons; a 75-percent increase in airlift capability; a 100-percent increase in general ship construction and conversion to modernize the fleet; and an 800-percent increase in the special forces trained to deal with counterinsurgency threats.

There is no decrease in our defense capability. On the contrary, the United States today is stronger than it has ever been, and we maintain the greatest margin of military superiority over our adversaries than has been the case at any time since the start of the cold war.

And all of this has been accomplished in the midst of a cost reduction program which is saving the American taxpayer billions of dollars. Secretary of Defense McNamara recently issued the second annual progress report on his cost reduction program. Here is what the report shows. Savings of $2.5 billion were actually realized during fiscal year 1964, compared with the forecast of savings of $1.5 billion. Savings of $4.6 billion a year by fiscal year 1968 and each year thereafter have been set as the new long-range goal. This is an increase of $600 million per year over the previous objectives of the cost reduction program.

This program, which is helping to achieve the twin objectives of the required military strength and the lowest possible cost, has three parts:

1. Buying only what is needed to achieve balanced readiness.
2. Buying at the lowest sound price.
3. Reducing operating costs through termination of unnecessary operations, standardization, and consolidation.

The spending policies of the Department of Defense are particularly significant when we realize that this one Department spends over one half of the funds in each year's Federal budget. Over 50 cents out of each Federal tax dollar you pay goes to the task of keeping our Nation the strongest on earth. I think it is most significant that this administration has placed such emphasis on the dual responsibility of maintaining and increasing our defense capability while, at the same time, making an all-out effort to streamline and modernize our efforts to get the most possible benefit from each dollar spent.

Senator GOLDWATER said in San Francisco, "We can keep the peace only if we remain vigilant and strong. Only if we keep our eyes open and keep our guard up can we prevent war." I am in wholehearted agreement with that statement. This is why I support the present administration so strongly in this area. We are doing just that.

I have, in the past few days, had the opportunity of viewing firsthand our defense capabilities at the "top of the world" in Alaska and Greenland. This is our first line of defense in case of nuclear attack from the Soviet Union. I am proud to be able to report to you that our installations there are most impressive in their efficiency and capability. We have the most modern equipment available, and the most dedicated and well-trained personnel to operate it. My visit to these installations was most reassuring and informative.

I hope to be able to tell you more on this subject in a later newsletter.

Cordially,

GRAHAM PURCELL.

Marketing U.S. Films Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 21, 1964

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to an article of mine published in the July 17 issue of Sales magazine, a leading magazine for meeting and exhibit planners.

The article discusses the Motion Picture Service of the USIA. It refers to the skill exhibited by this Agency in its conduct of an important aspect of American foreign policy. It notes the Agency's capacity for producing maximum results with a minimum of financial costs. Most important, it brings to attention the methods and operations of the Motion Picture Service in the hope that our businessmen may thereby expand and perfect their marketing operations abroad.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert into the RECORD the text of this article, which reads as follows:

TEST YOUR OVERSEA FILMS

(Take a lesson from Uncle Sam. Before it is released, film produced by USIA is checked in country in which it is to be shown. It's easy to violate local taboo; not know it until too late.)

(By Congressman WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE)

Hollywood is considered the film capital of the world, but few realize the part played by the U.S. Government in the overall production and distribution of motion pictures on a worldwide basis. Despite all the talk about the high cost of Federal services, there's a branch of the U.S. Information Agency that provides films for 106 countries on an annual budget of only $6.5 million a year.

When you consider that a single picture, "Cleopatra," cost somewhere in the vicinity of $40 million, it seems incredible that Uncle Sam provides 359 film centers with 7,168 projectors and 207 mobile truck units in more than 100 countries for only one-seventh the cost. Included in this budget is the maintenance of a film library of 1,769 productions, 76 of which were made in 1963 alone.

The little-known branch of USIA responsible for all this is called Motion Picture Service. Its know-how, gained from making much out of a limited budget can be a big help to American industry concerned with producing films to sell the oversea markets.

MORE INDUSTRIAL FILMS

With the expansion of our export markets, American manufacturers are turning more and more to industrial films. These endeavor to train salesmen or to show why customers should buy their products, or consider their companies over competitors.

Unfortunately, many of these films fail to have the desired impact. Reason is that the rules that apply in the United States don't always apply in other countries. What is accepted here is often offensive to foreign cultures.

As an example, a radiant bride, gowned in white, being married because she used a certain brand of soap, would be incomprehensible in certain Eastern countries. White is a sign of mourning there.

A few years ago, USIA acquired a documentary film on Grandma Moses for inclusion in its oversea film program. At one point in the picture, the spry little old lady was shown putting a huge book on her chair so that she might perch higher as she worked at her easel.

When the film was sent abroad for appraisal, one USIA post in the Middle East came back with enthusiastic approval of the film, but asked that the scene that showed Grandma Moses seated on the big book be deleted. Muslim audiences might get the idea she was being disrespectful to the written word—i.e., the Koran.

MUST BE CAUTIOUS

This is typical of the kind of sensitivities which USIA must bear in mind as it produces films for foreign audiences. Same holds true for industry.

Outright taboos are comparatively few. Scenes of beef slaughter would be unacceptable in Hindu countries, where the cow is sacred. Similarly, scenes of rodeos or any event where even the slightest misinterpretation of American treatment of animals might occur would be best to avoid in Hindu or Buddhist countries.

SOME TABOOS

By the same token, it would be unwise to dwell on the raising of pigs or on pork as food in films intended for Muslim areas or in Israel. Where a film uses interior shots of a mosque, it would be advisable for the sound track to be silent. Muslim audiences would prefer this deference to the holy place depicted on the screen.

In Hindu areas, it would be unwise also to show humorous scenes involving elephants. In the case of Buddhist countries, the same caution would prevail with cobras.

CAN LEARN FROM USIA

Motion Picture Service of the USIA is not perfect, but when one considers that it has developed the most far-reaching film distribution network in existence, industry can learn a lot from its methods. More than 750 million people annually see documentaries, newsreels, and short subjects produced by this branch of the Government. Mistakes are inevitable, but every effort is made to insure accuracy and avoid giving offense.

There is no formal list of taboos maintained by USIA, according to my research. Documenting such for more than 100 different countries would be a stupendous and continuing task, particularly with the small budget allotted this branch. The agency has evolved an excellent method to overcome this lack, however. Industry, following the USIA procedure in the production of its own films, could save much time, trouble, and embarrassment.

First, the normal dictates of good taste govern what goes into USIA documentaries. Upon completion, English versions of the films are usually sent to the field before release for showing, to give the public affairs officers a chance to see them and make suggestions to improve their usefulness for a particular country.

Any company wishing to make films for selling overseas could use its own representatives or distributors in the same manner, to review these selling tools. Foreign representatives of American companies are certainly aware of their own countries' taboos.

FACTS FOR FILM PRODUCERS

If, for some reason, this cannot be done, the USIA can supply information on foreign events, customs and cultural values for producers and scriptwriters. Contact George Stevens, Jr., Motion Picture Service, U.S. Information Agency, 1776 Pennsylvania Avenue, Washington, D.C.

Additional aid can be secured by film producers, whether independent companies or individuals, from the film industry itself. Motion Picture Association of America, the film industry trade association, has established a special committee that cooperates closely with the Government. Information may be had by writing: International Film Relations Committee, 8480 Beverly Boulevard, Hollywood, Calif.

In 1942, Josef Stalin told Wendell Wilkie: "If I could control the medium of American motion pictures, I would need nothing else in order to convert the entire world to communism."

This observation may have been a trifle optimistic, but it clearly shows the tremendous impact our films have on the rest of the world. With care and good taste used in their production, American motion pictures can continue to sell our way of life and the products it produces.

Address of Senator Strom Thurmond, of South Carolina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT W. WATSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 21, 1964

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, a number of recent decisions by the Supreme Court have aroused cries of protest from many Constitution-loving Americans, not only from my State, but from all States in the Union. With this in mind, I would like to include at the end of my remarks a most timely address made recently before a joint meeting of the Greenville County Medical Society and the Greenville County Bar Association, Greenville, S.C., on July 3, 1964, by the distinguished junior Senator from South Carolina, Senator STROM THURMOND.

The address echoes the distress of many citizens at the excessive abuses of the Supreme Court in such decisions as the one dealing with legislative reapportionment. However, Senator THURMOND goes further than a simple discussion of the "counterrevolution" which the Supreme Court has instigated in its "preoccupation with equality," as he also explores possible remedies and methods of halting this arbitrary judicial usurpation of power.

I commend his remarks as worthy of the most careful attention and consideration of each of my colleagues in both Houses of Congress.

The text of the address follows:

ADDRESS OF SENATOR STROM THURMOND, DEMOCRAT, OF SOUTH CAROLINA, TO JOINT MEETING OF THE GREENVILLE COUNTY MEDICAL SOCIETY AND THE GREENVILLE COUNTY BAR ASSOCIATION, GREENVILLE, S.C., JULY 3, 1964

On the eve of the 188th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence, it is fitting and appropriate that we should turn our thoughts to revolutions, for it was of, by, and through revolution that the Declaration came into being. That Revolution was a noble undertaking, based on such devotion to principles of liberty and justice that the participants pledged to each other their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor.

Out of the American Revolution sprang a new political order, dedicated to implementing the same high principles for which the Revolution was waged. The genius of the new political order lay in its combinations of carefully designed checks and balances, and divisions and separations of power for the protection of individual rights against the will of a majority, while retaining the ultimate power of decision on political questions in the people.

Tonight I come not to speak to you of this glorious Revolution of almost two centuries ago, nor even of the dear and bountiful benefits which we all have enjoyed as a direct consequence. On the contrary, my remarks are directed at the counterrevolution taking place here and now, and which has already gone far toward destroying and undoing the accomplishments of the American Revolution.

Thomas Jefferson foresaw and predicted the main source of this counterrevolution, as is indicated by his statement in 1821 that:

"The germ of dissolution of our Federal Government is in the * * * Federal judiciary; an irresponsible body * * * working like gravity * * * gaining a little today and a little tomorrow, and advancing its noiseless step like a thief, over the field of jurisdiction, until all shall be usurped from the States, and the Government of all be consolidated into one. When all government * * * in little as in great things, shall be drawn to Washington as the center of all power, it will render powerless the checks provided of one government on another, and will become as venal and oppressive as the government from which we separated."

Thomas Jefferson through his wisdom rather than clairvoyance anticipated the role and course of the Supreme Court with astonishing accuracy. Although the Supreme Court is joined in its counterrevolution against our existing political, economic, and social order by the executive branch and apparently a majority of Congress as well as many outside the official structure of Government, it is concerning the role of the Court in this counterrevolution to which I shall address my remarks tonight.

The Supreme Court began its counterrevolution years ago. It is not my purpose to trace the genesis of the Court's assaults on the constitutional system, nor is there time available for such an exhaustive subject. The first priority is to understand how far this counterrevolution has already gone and its current rate of momentum. For that purpose, a brief review of some of the decisions of the Court in the past 90 days is quite adequate.

The most far reaching of the recent decisions of the Supreme Court are the cases on reapportionment of State legislatures handed down on June 15 of this year. Although only six States were parties to these cases, these decisions could ultimately destroy the existing political structure of at least 44 of the 50 States. In the reapportionment decisions, the Court so construed the 14th amendment to the Constitution as to prohibit either body of State legislatures from being apportioned on any other basis than population. As applied to South Carolina, these decisions would not only require drastic reapportionment of the State house of representatives, but would virtually preclude the existence of the senate, unless it was a substantial duplication of the reapportioned house.

In discussing the reapportionment decisions, there is no need, and indeed, no way, to become involved in legal technicalities. This is because the fundamental issue involved is not a legal question, but a political one. Political questions are not within the jurisdiction of the Court. Political questions are for decision of the people, exercised by the ballot and through legislative bodies.

Justice Harlan, dissenting in the Alabama case, said: "What is done today deepens my conviction that judicial entry into this realm is profoundly ill-advised and constitutionally impermissible. * * * I believe that the vitality of our political system, on which in the last analysis all else depends, is weakened by reliance on the judiciary for political reform."

Justice Harlan put his finger on the real key to the apportionment decisions—the Supreme Court is undermining our political system. In so doing, the Court took unto itself power which rightfully and constitutionally belongs to the people.

To understand the full consequence of this counterrevolutionary decision, we must look even beyond the Court's usurpation of the power of the people to decide the political question, however, and examine the substance of the new rule of political order sought to be imposed by the Court.

The new political principle sought to be imposed by the Court is characterized as "one person, one vote." In application, this "one person, one vote" would mean that numbers, or population, could be the only basis for representation.

The people, to whom the political decisions of apportionment rightfully belong, could, of course, decide to follow the "one person, one vote" idea. The fact is, however, that the people have never made such a choice. The Court arbitrarily assumed that the people had not made such a choice because they were powerless, under existing political structure, to do so. The Supreme Court never even recognized the possibility that the people had not adopted the "one person, one vote" concept because they did not believe that it was practical or sound. Yet the latter is obviously the case. Every State constitution which departs materially from the concept of "one person, one vote"—and nearly all of them do—was originally adopted in an election or referendum where the rule of "one person, one vote" was followed.

Population is, of course, the principal basis for apportionment of legislative representation in all States. But the various States have found it practical, workable, just, and beneficial to weight the apportionment of legislative representation with various other factors in their own States, just as was done in framing the structure of the National Government.

Consider just one illustration, the one about which the Supreme Court had its sensibilities so shocked; that is, the heavier weighting in one body of bicameral State legislatures in favor of rural residents.

Let me point out initially that such departures from apportionment based purely on population result in purely defensive powers to those so favored. The U.S. Congress provides a good example. Each State has equal representation in the Senate, regardless of its population. Thus Delaware has equal representation in the Senate with New York, although New York has at least 35 times more population. But Delaware, even with its equal representation in the Senate, nor even in combination with other small population States which might give them a majority in the Senate, does not have the affirmative power to pass legislation; for the House of Representatives must also concur, and its membership is based on population, or "one person, one vote."

Thus, the equal representation of Delaware in the Senate gives it at most an increased defensive power to what it would have were representation in Congress based solely on "one person, one vote."

Similarly, the weighting of representation in favor of rural residents gives them an increased defensive power, leaving them less vulnerable to the whims of a majority.

By the very nature of their occupations, agricultural areas are necessarily less densely populated than nonagricultural areas. We in the United States, with our consistent departure from the concept of "one person, one vote," have progressed to the point where approximately 8 percent of the population of the Nation produces the entire food and fiber for its consumption, with a large margin for export. This progress has been undoubtedly due in part to the fact that the agricultural sector through its defensive power stemming from its weighted representation has managed to protect its vital interests in the intertwined political and economic order.

Nor is the nature of agricultural enterprise such that those engaged therein can protect their vital interests outside the formal political structure by combined economic action through organization, as is done by industrial labor through the means of labor unions. So long as political issues have been left to the decision of the people, where they rightfully belong, these factors have been recognized, and the departures from the "one person, one vote" concept have not only been tolerated, but affirmatively approved by the majority of the people.

The arbitrary imposition of an unadulterated "one person, one vote" rule of legislative apportionment, could well, therefore, insofar as the agricultural sector is concerned, start the United States back down the road of inefficiency toward the status of such nations as the Soviet Union, where it takes 60 percent of the population to raise food and fibers for the nation, and even then there are severe shortages.

In no instance is the counterrevolutionary conduct of the Supreme Court more obvious than in the reapportionment decisions, for these cases strike at the heart of our political structure. A review of other decisions of the Court reveals, however, that the Court takes every opportunity, large or small, to undercut the constitutional, political, economic, and social order, and thereby to counter and destroy the products of the American Revolution.

Probably the most evident motivation which occasioned the American Revolution was the unwillingness of Americans to suffer taxation without representation. Therefore, one of the most fundamental concepts built into the resulting political structure was the vesting of the power of taxation and appropriation in legislatures where the people had representation. In our political order, as contrasted to authoritarian regimes, the power to tax and appropriate is legislative.

On May 25, 1964, the Supreme Court of the United States handed down a decision against Prince Edward County, Va., in which the Court claimed that the judiciary has the power to both tax and appropriate. The Court ruled that if the county failed to levy taxes for public schools and to appropriate for their operation, the Court had the power to do so. To exercise the power claimed, the Court would necessarily have to make the decision of how much to tax and how much to appropriate, and if the Court can decide how much taxes to levy and how much money to appropriate for schools at the county level, in one instance, it has also arrogated unto itself the power to decide in any case on the adequacy of taxes levied and funds appropriated. Yet it is hard to imagine any body on which the people have less representation than on the Supreme Court. Its members are appointed, not elected, and they are appointed for life, not for a term. Thus has the Court struck at the vitals of the motto of the American Revolution, "No taxation without representation."

Of course, the Court has long since arrogated unto itself all manners of executive powers. But it is worthy of note that in the Prince Edward County case, the Court also claimed the power to perform the function of operating the schools, a purely executive function.

While the Court has been usurping the rights of the people to decide political issues, and arrogating unto itself executive and legislative powers, it has also found opportunity and time to continue making a shambles of our system of justice.

The people, in establishing our political structure, correctly concluded that they were less able to protect themselves from abuses stemming from the power of the National Government than they were from State governments. Consequently, the fifth amendment to the Constitution imposed stricter requirements of due process on the National Government than is imposed on most State governments by State constitutions. The Court, however, has perverted the fifth amendment to apply to State, as well as Federal Government action.

On June 22, 1964, the Supreme Court held that an accused's statements made during a police interrogation could not be admitted as evidence in a trial in State court because the accused's lawyer was not present. In so holding, the Court abandoned the tried and proven test of whether the statement was in fact voluntary. This is but one of many rulings in criminal cases which have made it very difficult for our society to protect itself from crime and which fails to take cognizance of the fact that the purpose of a trial is actually to determine the truth.

While hopelessly perverting and misapplying due process requirements in criminal cases tried in State courts, the Court has at the same time continued to thwart the substantive requirements of due process. This is well illustrated by the steady expansion of the use and scope of injunctive proceedings and the concomitant denial of jury trials. A landmark in this insidious trend was the denial of a jury trial to Mississippi Governor Barnett in its decision handed down on April 6, 1964.

Indeed, the Supreme Court has made it nearly impossible for State and local authorities to maintain peace and good order by its repeated overturning of convictions of demonstrators who have violated trespass and breach of peace laws. The Court in order to reach such illogical ends, has even ruled that police action at the demand of owners and proprietors amounted to State action as to who was designated a trespasser. Demonstrably, the Court has no respect for law as such; it prefers to pick and choose from the valid laws those which it will permit to be enforced. In effect, the Court has arrogated unto itself a veto of what laws the people, through its legislature, may enact and enforce.

The complete disdain for the political order established as an outcome of the American Revolution is nowhere more bluntly stated than in the Court's decisions on internal security matters.

In the case of *Baggett* v. *Bullit,* decided on June 1, 1964, the Court was particularly disturbed by and overturned a State requirement that employees of the State swear that they would not in any way undertake, counsel, abet, or teach the overthrow of our constitutional form of government by means of revolution. Significantly, the Court conjectured that such a promise might make it imposible for "one to support * * * participation by this country in a world government."

In the same case, the Court held that a State cannot exact "undivided allegiance to the Government of the United States."

In the case of *Apetheker* v. *Secretary of State,* decided on June 22, 1964, the Court held that the Government could not refuse a passport to a person on the ground that the person was a member of a subversive organization—in this case, a member of the Communist Party. The Court so ruled in full knowledge of the fact that a passport is a privilege, not a right, and that the travel performed by members of the Communist Party by virtue of the passport was endangering the security of the Nation.

On June 1, 1964, the Court held that the Communist Party, U.S.A., cannot be compelled to register with the Attorney General and to provide pertinent information on its membership, finances, and meetings. The Court so held despite the fact that as late as June 4, 1961, the Court itself had recognized that the Communist Party, U.S.A., was an instrument and arm of a foreign power; namely, the Soviet Union.

Thus, not only has the Court led the counterrevolution against our political, economic, and social order from within, but it has protected and succored our enemies from without.

Some have found it difficult to understand what philosophy the Court could be following to reach such conclusions. I believe I have found the key to their philosophy from studying their decisions.

The point of departure of the philosophy followed by the Court from that underlying our political order is found in the very preamble to the Constitution.

The preamble states that one of the primary purposes of the Union is, and I quote, to "secure the blessings of liberty." The philosophy of the Supreme Court requires the substitution of the word "equality" for the word "liberty." The Court cares not for the blessings of liberty, with which we have been so bountifully blessed.

Rather, its preoccupation is with "equality," that keyword of socialism which seeks to even out all persons and all nations, even if it must be at the level of the lowest common denominator. Equality can be perfectly realized in the status of slavery; but equality can never be found in a society where liberty is present, for liberty demands that each individual have the opportunity to develop and enjoy the benefits of his unequal talents and abilities. Even more pertinent to the court's preoccupation with equality rather than liberty is the fact that arbitrary power concentration is consistent with equalitarian societies, but is an abomination to societies where the premium is placed on liberty.

The counterrevolution against our political order of liberty and justice has progressed so far that only drastic and forceful steps can crush it.

The Congress, of course, has the authority to check the Supreme Court. For example, it has the power under article III, section 2, to curtail the jurisdiction of the Federal Judiciary, including that of the Supreme Court, by passing a law. I have introduced bills to deprive the court of jurisdiction in education and legislative apportionment cases, as well as bills to curb the court itself. The Congress could also initiate a constitutional amendment to curb the usurpations of the courts. Unfortunately, it appears that there is enough of the same counterrevolutionary philosophy in the Congress as to preclude congressional remedies.

As a practical matter, the only remedy remaining is in the hands of the States and the people themselves. They must now take the initiative to amend the Constitution if our political, economic, and social order is to be secured against the counterrevolution.

Presently, constitutional amendments can be submitted for ratification only by the Congress or by a constitutional convention called by the Congress on application of the State legislatures.

There is a proposal—which I have introduced in Congress—which would amend the Constitution to give to two-thirds of the State legislatures approving an identical resolution the power to propose amendments to the Constitution for the purpose of ratification by three-fourths of the States. This amendment would permit the States to bypass the barrier of Congress in submitting constitutional amendments for ratification.

There is another proposal—which I have also introduced in the Congress—which would establish a Court of the Union. This court would consist of the chief justices of each State with authority to determine whether the power or jurisdiction sought to be exercised by the National Government in a particular case is a power granted to it under the Constitution. The Court of the Union could reverse U.S. Supreme Court decisions by a majority vote of the entire court, and determinations made by the Court of the Union could be changed only by amending the U.S. Constitution. To get an issue before the Court of the Union, however, would require an application by the legislatures of five States, "no two of which shall share any common boundary."

The State legislatures have a responsibility and an opportunity to act under the present article V of the U.S. Constitution to petition the Congress for a constitutional convention to consider specific proposals such as these two suggestions. Both of these proposals already have the support of units of the Council of State Governments. Former President Eisenhower has called upon State legislatures to exercise their right to propose constitutional amendments.

In the final analysis, however, it is with the people that the fight must now begin. It is they who must spur the legislatures to action. It is they who have enjoyed the blessings of liberty which have been possible under our political, economic, and social order which, in turn, was made possible by the American Revolution.

On this eve of the 188th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence, I would charge you, as community leaders, to go forth and lead the people to a victory over the forces of counterrevolution. By no other means can the products of the American Revolution be saved and the blessings of liberty secured.

May God bless your endeavors with victory.